



Simulation of Taylor flow evaporation for bubble-pump applications



Alexander S. Rattner^a, Srinivas Garimella^{b,*}

^a Department of Mechanical and Nuclear Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, United States

^b George W. Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30318, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 June 2017

Received in revised form 13 August 2017

Accepted 28 August 2017

Keywords:

Bubble pump

Volume of fluid

Flow boiling

Absorption refrigeration

ABSTRACT

Single-pressure absorption systems incorporate bubble-pump generators (BPGs) for refrigerant separation and passive fluid circulation. In conventional spot-heated BPGs, heat is transferred over a small area, requiring high source temperatures. Distributed-heated BPGs receive thermal input over most of the component surface, enabling low temperature operation. In this investigation, a Volume-of-Fluid phase-change simulation formulation is developed and validated. This approach is applied to the evaporating Taylor flow pattern in distributed-heated BPGs. A 2-D axisymmetric simulation is performed, which yields detailed information about the developing heat transfer and two-phase flow phenomena. Results are used to assess predicted trends and sub-models from a 1-D segmented BPG model. Close agreement is obtained between segmented model and simulation results for bubble rise velocity (5–7% deviation), bubble and slug lengths, void fraction (3%), and hydrodynamic pressure drop (18%). Specifying average Taylor bubble lengths from the simulation as an input to the segmented model reduces hydrodynamic pressure drop deviation to 6%. Simulated flow-evaporation heat transfer coefficients are significantly higher than those predicted using analytic models from the literature. A new flow evaporation heat transfer correlation that accounts for developing slug flow effects is proposed, and yields close agreement with simulation results for heat transfer coefficient (AAD = 11%) and overall heat transfer rate (2%). Overall, this investigation provides validation for a distributed-heated BPG modeling approach, which can enable passive refrigeration for diverse applications.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Bubble-pump generators (BPGs) are key components of single-pressure absorption refrigeration technologies, such as the diffusion absorption refrigeration (DAR) cycle. BPGs are usually configured as externally heated vertical tubes that receive liquid refrigerant-absorbent solution from a lower reservoir. External heat is supplied to desorb vapor refrigerant from the solution, and the buoyancy of rising bubbles pumps liquid through the BPG tube (Fig. 1). Thus, the BPG component separates the refrigerant stream and provides the hydrostatic head to drive solution flow through other components, enabling fully passive system operation. The liquid-vapor mixture usually flows through the BPG in the Taylor or slug flow regime [1].

Conventional BPGs are *spot heated* [2,3], with all heat transfer occurring over a small area near the base of the component (indicated in Fig. 1). This mode of operation enables high solution

pumping rates and simple analysis, as flow rates are uniform along the major portion of the component. However, these designs require high input temperatures (150–200 °C [4,5]), usually delivered with electrical resistance heaters or chemical fuel (e.g., propane). If the heat transfer area can be increased, then lower temperature thermal sources such as solar heat or engine waste heat can be employed. Recently, a number of investigations of *distributed-heated* BPGs in which heat transfer occurs over most of the component surface [4,6] have been performed. Rattner and Garimella [1] demonstrated stable distributed-heated operation of a steam-water BPG with thermal input only ~10 K above the fluid saturation temperature.

Few experimental or modeling studies have been conducted for distributed-heated BPGs. Experimental validation of models has primarily been global in nature, focusing on outlet flow rates and overall heat transfer. This approach does not provide local details of axially varying quantities (e.g., void fraction, pressure gradient, wall heat flux), and does not permit independent evaluation of sub-models. It is difficult to perform more detailed experimental investigations because the two-phase flow pattern develops continuously, and the need for external heat input and insulation may preclude optical access. However, by directly simulating these

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: sgarimella@gatech.edu (S. Garimella).

Nomenclature

A	area (m^2)		
A_D	diagonal entry in discretized momentum matrix equation ($\text{kg m}^{-3} \text{s}^{-1}$)	<i>Greek characters</i>	
Bo	Bond number ($(\rho_L - \rho_V)gD^2/\sigma$)	α	void fraction
C_0	distribution parameter in bubble velocity model	α_1	liquid-phase-fraction in a mesh cell
Ca	capillary number ($\mu_l j/\sigma$)	$\dot{\alpha}_{1,pc}$	phase-fraction volumetric source due to phase change (s^{-1})
c_p	specific heat ($\text{kJ kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$)	β	length fraction of Taylor-flow unit cell occupied by Taylor bubble
D	diameter (m)	δ_f	liquid film thickness (m)
D_H	hydraulic diameter (m)	Γ	drift flux parameter in bubble velocity model
f_i	body force vector ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-2}$)	Δ	difference
f	Darcy friction factor, or blending factor	θ	generic material property
G	mass flux ($\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	μ	dynamic viscosity ($\text{kg m}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$)
Gz	Graetz number ($D Re_j Pr_L/L_s$)	ρ	fluid density (kg m^{-3})
g	gravitational acceleration (9.81 m s^{-2})	σ	surface tension (kg s^{-2})
h	convection heat transfer coefficient ($\text{W m}^{-2} \text{K}^{-1}$)	τ	shear stress ($\text{kg m}^{-1} \text{s}^{-2}$)
H	height (m)	φ	volumetric flow rate through mesh cell faces ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$)
i	enthalpy (kJ kg^{-1})		
ID	inner diameter (m)	<i>Subscripts</i>	
j	superficial velocity (m s^{-1})	0	non-limited value
k	thermal conductivity ($\text{W m}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$)	avg	average value
L	length (of liquid slug or Taylor bubble)	b	Taylor bubble (in Taylor-flow model)
L_b^*	dimensionless bubble length ($L_b/(Re_b D_b)$)	BPG	bubble pump generator
\dot{m}	mass flow rate (kg s^{-1})	Ca	capillary scale
n	number of mesh cells in a direction	CF	coupling fluid
\hat{n}	cell-face normal	d	dynamic component of pressure drop
N_f	viscous force parameter ($\sqrt{\rho_L(\rho_L - \rho_V)gD^3/\mu_L^2}$)	DevSlug	model assuming developing flow in liquid slug
Nu	Nusselt number ($Nu = h D/k$)	evap	evaporation
OD	outer diameter (m)	f	cell-face value
p	pressure (Pa)	hs	hydrostatic forces
$p_{\rho gh}$	dynamic pressure (hydrostatic contribution removed) (Pa)	i	initial value, inner tube, cell or node index in discretized model
Pr	Prandtl number ($\mu c_p/k$)	in	inlet value
Q	heat transfer rate (W)	int	interface threshold value (in phase-change model), or interface position
q	heat flux (W m^{-2})	L	liquid phase
\dot{q}_{pc}	Volumetric phase-change heat source (kW kg^{-1})	L0	value for all channel flow being liquid
r	radius (m)	LS	large diameter tube scale
R'	thermal resistance \times unit length (m K W^{-1})	LV	phase change (liquid-to-vapor)
R''	thermal resistance \times unit area ($\text{m}^2 \text{K W}^{-1}$)	LW	value from Liu and Winterton boiling model [47]
Re_b	Taylor bubble Reynolds number ($\rho_V(U_B - U_{LF})D_B/\mu_V$)	mod	model value
Re_{CF}	coupling-fluid Reynolds number ($\rho_{CF}U_{CF}D_{H,CF}/\mu_{CF}$)	o	outer tube
Re_j	superficial Reynolds number ($\rho_l j D/\mu_L$)	out	outlet value
s	under-relaxation factor	r	radial component
t	time (s)	s	liquid slug (in Taylor-flow model)
T	temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	sat	saturated thermodynamic state
T_0	reference temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	seg	segment value in discretized model
u	velocity vector (m s^{-1})	sim	simulation value
u^*	velocity field, corrected to prevent interface smearing (m s^{-1})	trans	flow-transition pressure drop
U	phasic velocity (m s^{-1})	V	vapor phase
V	volumetric flow rate ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$)	wall	domain wall or inside wall of steam tube
\dot{v}_{pc}	volumetric dilatation rate due to phase change (s^{-1})	WF	working fluid
x	mass flow quality	WK	value from model of Wadekar and Kenning [48]
x_i	position vector (m)	z	axial component
z	axial position from bubble pump inlet (m)		

flows, it is possible to evaluate spatially varying quantities and individually assess BPG sub-models.

A number of mature approaches have been developed to simulate adiabatic two-phase flows, including Volume-of-Fluid (VOF) [7], level set [8], direct interface tracking [9], and two-fluid Eulerian-Eulerian formulations. However, techniques for simulating two-phase flows with phase-change heat transfer are still in their infancy. Phase-change formulations generally incorporate a

thermal-energy transport equation in addition to the governing flow equations, and apply appropriate phase-change source terms in the vicinity of liquid-vapor interfaces [10,11]. Such techniques can be applied to investigate developing two-phase flow phenomena in BPGs, enabling high fidelity assessment of incorporated sub-models. In the next section, reviews of prior work on distributed-heated BPGs and the most relevant phase-change flow simulation studies are presented.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4993757>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4993757>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)