Applied Thermal Engineering 76 (2015) 147-156

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Applied Thermal Engineering

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/apthermeng

Heat transfer correlation for saturated flow boiling of water

Xiande Fang^{*}, Zhanru Zhou, Hao Wang

Institute of Air Conditioning and Refrigeration, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 29 Yudao St., Nanjing 210016, China

HIGHLIGHTS

• Compiles a database of 1055 data points of H₂O flow boiling heat transfer.

• Evaluates 41 correlations of flow boiling heat transfer coefficient.

• Generalize approach for developing experiment-based correlation.

• Propose a correlation of H₂O flow boiling heat transfer in small channels.

• The new correlation has a mean absolute deviation of 10.1% for the database.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 July 2014 Accepted 10 November 2014 Available online 18 November 2014

Keywords: Water $H_{2}O$ Flow boiling

Correlation

Heat transfer Coefficient

ABSTRACT

The saturated flow boiling heat transfer of water (H₂O, R718) is encountered in many applications such as compact heat exchangers and electronic cooling, for which an accurate correlation of evaporative heat transfer coefficients is necessary. A number of correlations for two-phase flow boiling heat transfer coefficients were proposed. However, their prediction accuracies for H₂O are not satisfactory. This work compiles an H₂O database of 1055 experimental data points from micro/mini-channels from nine independent studies, evaluates 41 existing correlations to provide a clue for developing a better correlation of saturated flow boiling heat transfer coefficients for H₂O, and then proposes a new one. The new correlation incorporates a newly proposed dimensionless number and makes great progress in prediction accuracy. It has a mean absolute deviation of 10.1%, predicting 81.9% of the entire database within $\pm 15\%$ and 91.2% within $\pm 20\%$, far better than the best existing one. Besides, it also works well for several other working fluids, such as R22, R134a, R410A and NH₃ (ammonia, R717), being the best for R22, R410A and NH₃ so far.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The saturated flow boiling heat transfer of water (H₂O, R718) has many applications, such as compact heat exchangers and electronic cooling. The calculation of H₂O flow boiling heat transfer coefficients is important for designing such facilities. A number of correlations for two-phase flow boiling heat transfer coefficient have been proposed, and their applicability to H₂O is an interest issue. Many studies assessed the applicability to H₂O of the correlations of two-phase flow boiling heat transfer coefficients.

Sumith et al. [52] investigated experimentally the characteristics of H₂O flow boiling heat transfer in a 1.45 mm inner diameter

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2014.11.024 1359-4311/© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

(ID) vertical tube at atmospheric pressure, with mass flux from 23.4 to 152.7 kg/m²s, heat flux from 36 to 391 kW/m², and quality up to 0.6. They examined the effects of mass flux, heat flux and quality on the flow boiling heat transfer coefficient and compared the measurements with flow boiling heat transfer correlations of [4,30] and [38]. It was found that the liquid film evaporation was the predominant heat transfer mechanism, that slug-annular and annular flow patterns were dominated, and that the three correlations largely under-predicted the heat transfer coefficient, especially for a low heat flux condition. The underprediction gradually decreased with increasing heat flux.

Steinke and Kandlikar [47] preformed an experimental investigation of H₂O flow boiling heat transfer at the atmospheric pressure in six parallel horizontal copper micro-channels with a hydraulic diameter of 207 μ m in the range of mass flux from 157 to 1782 kg/ m^2 s, heat flux from 55 to 898 kW/ m^2 , and vapor quality up to 0.958. It was observed that the local flow boiling heat transfer coefficient



Research paper





Corresponding author. Tel./fax: +86 25 8489 6381. *E-mail address:* xd fang@vahoo.com (X. Fang).

Bdbond numberGreek symbolsBoboiling number λ thermal conductivity (W/m K)Covconvection number μ viscosity (kg/s m)Ddiameter, hydraulic diameter (m) ρ density (kg/m ³)FaFang number σ surface tension (N/m)FrFroude number σ surface tension (N/m)Gmass flux (kg/m ² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m ² K)critcritical pointh _{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg)expexperimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidPRreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m ²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gas	Nomenclature		x	vapor quality
Boboiling number λ thermal conductivity (W/m K)Covconvection number μ viscosity (kg/s m)Ddiameter, hydraulic diameter (m) ρ density (kg/m³)FaFang number σ surface tension (N/m)FrFroude number σ surface tension (N/m)Gmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)critcritical point h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidPRreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturblent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inper wall surface	Bd	bond number	Greek symbols	
Covconvection number μ viscosity (kg/s m)Ddiameter, hydraulic diameter (m) ρ density (kg/m³)FaFang number σ surface tension (N/m)FrFroude number σ surface tension (N/m)Gmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)critcritical point h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidP_Rreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	Во	boiling number	λ	thermal conductivity (W/m K)
Ddiameter, hydraulic diameter (m) ρ density (kg/m³)FaFang number σ surface tension (N/m)FrFroude number σ surface tension (N/m)Gmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)critcritical pointh_{lg}latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)Isaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidP_Rreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertwo-phasetwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inper wall surface	Cov	convection number	μ	viscosity (kg/s m)
FaFang number σ surface tension (N/m)FrFroude numberGmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)critcritical point h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidP_Rreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	D	diameter, hydraulic diameter (m)	ρ	density (kg/m ³)
FrFroude numberGmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)crith1glatent heat of vaporization (J/kg)expexperimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)fNuNusselt numbergppressure (Pa)lPrPrandtl numberloIquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidPRreduced pressureqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)saturatedReReynolds numbertpTtemperature (°C)ttWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	Fa	Fang number	σ	surface tension (N/m)
Gmass flux (kg/m² s)Subscriptshheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K) $crit$ critical point h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidP_Rreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	Fr	Froude number		
hheat transfer coefficient (W/m² K)critcritical point h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimentalMmolecular mass (kg/k mol)ffluidNuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquidP_Rreduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	G	mass flux (kg/m ² s)	Subscripts	
h_{lg} latent heat of vaporization (J/kg) exp experimental M molecular mass (kg/k mol) f fluid Nu Nusselt number g saturated vapor p pressure (Pa) l saturated liquid Pr Prandtl number lo liquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid P_{R} reduced pressurepredpredicted q heat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturated Re Reynolds number tp two-phase T temperature (°C) tt turbulent liquid/turbulent gas We Weber number w channel inner wall surface	h	heat transfer coefficient $(W/m^2 K)$	crit	critical point
M molecular mass (kg/k mol) f fluid Nu Nusselt number g saturated vapor p pressure (Pa) l saturated liquid Pr Prandtl number lo liquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid $P_{\rm R}$ reduced pressurepredpredicted q heat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m ²)satsaturated Re Reynolds number tp two-phase T temperature (°C) tt turbulent liquid/turbulent gas We Weber number w channel inper wall surface	$h_{ m lg}$	latent heat of vaporization (J/kg)	ехр	experimental
NuNusselt numbergsaturated vaporppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid $P_{\rm R}$ reduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inper wall surface	М	molecular mass (kg/k mol)	f^{-}	fluid
ppressure (Pa)lsaturated liquidPrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid $P_{\rm R}$ reduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inper wall surface	Nu	Nusselt number	g	saturated vapor
PrPrandtl numberloliquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid $P_{\rm R}$ reduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	р	pressure (Pa)	1	saturated liquid
$P_{\rm R}$ reduced pressurepredpredictedqheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	Pr	Prandtl number	lo	liquid only, assuming all fluid as liquid
qheat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m²)satsaturatedReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	$P_{\rm R}$	reduced pressure	pred	predicted
ReReynolds numbertptwo-phaseTtemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	q	heat flux from tube wall to fluid (W/m^2)	sat	saturated
Ttemperature (°C)ttturbulent liquid/turbulent gasWeWeber numberwchannel inner wall surface	Re	Reynolds number	tp	two-phase
We Weber number w channel inner wall surface	Т	temperature (°C)	tt	turbulent liquid/turbulent gas
Weber humber W Chamier Man Surface	We	Weber number	w	channel inner wall surface
X Martinelli parameter	Χ	Martinelli parameter		

exhibited a decreasing trend with increasing quality. The comparison of the measurements with the [22] correlation showed good agreement for x > 0.2. For x < 0.2, the [22] correlation showed large underprediction, and the underprediction increased with decreasing quality.

Wen et al. [62] conducted an experimental study of H_2O flow boiling heat transfer at the atmospheric pressure in a vertical rectangular tube of 2 mm by 1 mm with heat flux ranging from 27 to 160 kW/m², mass flux from 134 to 211 kg/m²s, and quality up to 0.3. They compared the measurements with 11 flow boiling heat transfer correlations [4,8,22,25,26,32,33,38,56,60,64]. It was shown that the [38] correlation had the smallest mean absolute deviation (MAD) of 28%, followed by the [25] correlation of 45%, the [4] of 46%, and the [64] of 47%. They thought that the conventional methods were unreliable and that it was in need to develop better correlations.

Qu and Mudawar [42,43] tested H_2O flow boiling heat transfer in rectangular channel heat sink containing 21 parallel 231 × 712 µm channels with mass flux from 135 to 402 kg/m²s, heat flux from 53.6 to 519.2 kW/m², quality up to 0.17, and outlet pressure of 1.17 bar. With the experimental data, they evaluated 11 flow boiling heat transfer correlations [4,17,22,32,33,38,45,48,56,60,64]. The results showed that the [64] correlation provided best predictions with an MAD of 19.3% but did not capture the correct trend of heat transfer coefficient with vapor quality, while the [60] correlation provided a closer prediction of the trend but had a greater MAD of 25.4%. They pointed a need for new predictive tools that could both capture the correct micro-channel heat transfer trends and yield more accurate predictions.

Diaz and Schmidt [9] conducted an experimental investigation of H_2O flow boiling heat transfer at the atmospheric pressure in a 0.3 \times 12.7 mm rectangular channel with mass flux from 200 to 500 kg/m²s, heat flux from 90.4 to 359.8 kW/m², and quality up to 0.32. They compared the experimental data with the predictions of six correlations [4,23,32,38,48,65]. The results showed that the measurements were largely overpredicted at higher quality and remarkably underpredicted when quality less than 0.05 by all the correlations, and that no correlation could capture the trend of heat transfer coefficient with vapor quality, indicating a strong need for new predictive methods.

Kuznetsov and Shamirzaev [31] conducted the experiment of boiling heat transfer of H₂O flow in rectangular parallel stainless steel microchannels with a size of 0.64×2.05 mm in cross-section and a typical wall roughness of $10-15 \mu$ m at atmospheric pressure. The local flow boiling heat transfer coefficients were measured at low mass flux of 17 and 51 kg/m²s, heat flux from 30 to 150 kW/m², and vapor quality up to 0.8. They compared the measurements with the correlations of [22] and [65] and observed that the two correlations demonstrated incorrect trend of heat transfer coefficient with vapor quality at smaller mass flux.

Kim and Mudawar [27,28] evaluated 13 previous correlations of saturated flow boiling heat transfer [1,3,8,11,17,32,37, 38,40,45,56,60,64] with a database for flow boiling in mini/microchannels, among which there are 485 data points from experiments with H₂O. The [3] correlation performed best for the H₂O data, with an MAD of 23.9%. They proposed a new generalized correlation for pre-dryout flow boiling in mini/micro-channels, which had an MAD of 21.2% for the H₂O data. The accuracies of the [27] and [3] correlations were quite good, but the data points for H₂O were limited. Therefore, their accuracies to H₂O need to be confirmed using a large database.

The above brief review clearly shows that the applicability of existing correlations of flow boiling heat transfer coefficients to H₂O remains unclear. Results from different authors are not consistent. One reason for this is that only very limited data were used. Most authors conducted the evaluations only with their own measurements. Kim and Mudawar [27] used H₂O data from multiple sources, but only 485 data points were compiled. Another reason for this is that the correlations evaluated were limited. The maximum number of the correlations involved was only 13, while the existing correlations of flow boiling heat transfer coefficients are more than 40. It is also clearly demonstrated that there is a need to develop a more accurate correlation for H₂O flow boiling heat transfer. Flow boiling heat transfer depends on working fluids. People have been studying flow boiling heat transfer intensively for more than 50 years, and a correlation that works satisfactorily for a majority of working fluids has not been found yet. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a correlation specific for $H_2O.$

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/645994

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/645994

Daneshyari.com