Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Chemical Engineering Science

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

Assessment of analytical and numerical models on experimental data for the study of single-phase natural circulation dynamics in a vertical loop



CHEMICAL

ENGINEERING

L. Luzzi^{a,*}, M. Misale^b, F. Devia^b, A. Pini^a, M.T. Cauzzi^a, F. Fanale^a, A. Cammi^a

^a Politecnico di Milano, Department of Energy, Nuclear Engineering Division, via La Masa 34, 20156 Milano, Italy
^b University of Genoa, DIME-Tec, via Opera Pia 15-a, 16145 Genova, Italy

HIGHLIGHTS

• Analytical/numerical models for natural circulation loop dynamics are assessed against experiments.

• Thermal Inertia (TI) of piping materials influences Natural Circulation Loop (NCL) behaviour.

• The Heat-Exchanger (HE) section needs an accurate modelling.

• If TI and HE are properly modelled, 1D and CFD simulations are able to catch the L2 NCL dynamics.

• The SST k- ω model can be a good choice for the CFD turbulence treatment in the considered NCL.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 8 July 2016 Received in revised form 4 December 2016 Accepted 15 December 2016 Available online 29 December 2016

Keywords: Natural circulation Single-phase Stability analysis Thermal-hydraulics Object-oriented modelling CFD

ABSTRACT

In this paper, semi-analytical and numerical models developed in our previous works to study the dynamic behaviour of natural convection are assessed against the experimental data obtained by means of the L2 Natural Circulation Loop (NCL) of DIME-Tec Labs (University of Genoa). As for the experimental campaign, reference is made to a set of nine experiments performed using water as working fluid and providing a thermal power of 2 kW. This set of data is firstly adopted for the validation of a semianalytical linear analysis tool aimed at studying the asymptotic behaviour of NCLs through the definition of dimensionless stability maps. Then, two different numerical models (adopted in our previous work to confirm the linear analysis) are assessed, namely an Object-Oriented (0-0) one-dimensional model and a three-dimensional Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) model. In this regard, the O-O model represents a fast tool for the evaluation of the most important quantities, such as the velocity and the temperature fields in the loop along the axial coordinate. On the other hand, the CFD tool, which is intended as a support to the 1D analysis, is characterised by a high computational burden, but allows highlighting interesting 3D spatial effects. The validation of these tools is not secondary with respect to that of the stability maps. Actually, the numerical approach is fundamental to study the time-dependent behaviour of both stable and unstable natural circulation regimes, for which the stability maps do not provide information. As for the achieved results, the developed models are able to catch the behaviour of the experimental data. In particular, this outcome is possible if an accurate modelling of both the heat-exchanger section and the piping thermal inertia is considered.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

* Corresponding author.

Natural circulation systems are usually vertical rectangular or toroidal loops, in which the working fluid transfers heat between a hot source and a cold sink thanks to the action of the buoyancy force induced by temperature gradients. In Natural Circulation Loops (NCLs), the equilibrium state, which can be either dynamically stable or unstable, is achieved when the driving buoyancy force is in balance with the frictional one. In the unstable case, the fluid flow is characterised by oscillations in time of both velocity and temperature, whereas in the stable circumstance the velocity and the temperature distributions reach steady-state values.

In literature, NCLs are the subject of several works. Focusing on the analysis of natural circulation with single-phase fluids, the first theoretical studies were carried out by Keller (1966) and Welander (1967), while more recently Chen (1985), Nayak et al. (1995), Doster et al. (1998), Misale et al. (2000), Swapnalee and Vijayan (2011) and Saha et al. (2015) analysed the influence of the loop geometry on natural circulation instabilities. From the numerical

E-mail address: lelio.luzzi@polimi.it (L. Luzzi).



Latin symbols		λ	Darcy friction factor (-)	
B	parameter describing the effect of the heat exchange	μ	dynamic viscosity (Pa s)	
	(-)	ρ	density (kg m ^{-3})	
С	specific heat $(I \text{ kg}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1})$	0	coefficient of the thermo-physical polynomial	
D	diameter (m)	-	dependence on the temperature $(-)$	
$e_{a}(t)$	absolute error	θ	dummy variable (a u)	
$e_q(t)$	percentage error (-)	ê	spatial-dependent part of the dummy variable (au)	
eq,%(c)	mean/time-average of the absolute error	ф.	generic flow variable (2.11.)	
	$mean/time-average of the percentage error (_)$	φ w	perturbation pulsation (s^{-1})	
$\hat{c}_{q,\%}$	upit vector following the fluid flow (8 (m)	real part of the perturbation pulsation (s^{-1})	
$\hat{e}_{s}(s)$	unit vector pointing towards the positive vertical	$\mathfrak{n}(\omega)$	autocorrelation function	
e_z	direction ()	ĩ	autocorrelation function	
c		s č	length of the minintesimal shell of the pipe (m)	
J	frequency (Hz)	2	lateral surface of the infinitesimal shell of the pipe	
g	gravity acceleration (m s^{-2})	~	(m ²)	
G	mass flux (kg m ^{-2} s ^{-1})	V	volume of the infinitesimal shell of the pipe (m ³)	
Gr_m	modified Grashof number (–)	Y	generic signal	
h	convective heat transfer coefficient (W m ⁻² K ⁻¹)			
Н	height of the L2 facility (m)	Subscripts-si	ints-superscripts	
k	thermal conductivity (W $m^{-1} K^{-1}$)	0	steady-state value	
l	autocorrelation delay (s)	*	reference value	
L	length (m)	, C	cooler	
n.k	grade of the thermo-physical polynomial depen-	f	fluid	
,	dence on the temperature $(-)$	J h	hater	
Nu	Nusselt number (–)	n i	incatel	
n	pressure (Pa)	l O	inner shell of the give	
P Pr	Prandtl number (_)	0	outer shell of the loop	
a"	localized heat flux $(W m^{-2})$	l		
Ч Г	soporic variable of interest	w	wall of the pipe	
Ч Р	generic variable of interest	x	X direction	
ĸ	conductive thermal resistance of the pipe			
	$(\mathbf{m}^2 \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W}^2)$	Acronyms		
Re	Reynolds number (–)	1D	one dimensional	
S	curvilinear axial coordinate (m)	3D	three dimensional	
St_m	modified Stanton number (–)	amb	ambient	
t	time (s)	a.11.	arbitrary unit	
Т	temperature (K)	BC	Boundary condition	
и	velocity (m s ^{-1})	CFD	Computational Fluid Dynamics	
W	width of the L2 facility (m)	Ονναςτν	Dynamics of NAtural circulation for molten SalT	
Χ	X direction (–)	DIMASII	internally heated	
Y	Y direction (-)	EEM	Finite Floment Method	
Ζ	Z direction (–)	FEIVI	Finite Element Method	
			Fast Fourier Transform	
Special symbols		MSK	Molten Salt Reactor	
	thermal expansion coefficient (V^{-1})	NCL	Natural Circulation Loop	
p	nerturbation ()	PDS	Power Density Spectrum	
0	perturbation (-)	0-0	Object-Oriented	
$o_{q,\%}$	percentage difference (–)	RANS	Reynolds Average Navier-Stokes	
ΔI	temperature difference across the cooling section (K)	RE	Relative Error	
ΔT_m	weighted temperature difference inside natural cir-	T1, ,T30	Thermocouple No. 1,, thermocouple No. 30	
	culation loops (K)	TI	Thermal Inertia	

point of view, Ambrosini et al. (1998), Misale et al. (1999) and Mousavian et al. (2004) simulated natural circulation dynamics by means of both finite difference and system codes. As for the CFD approach, analyses were performed by Desrayaud et al. (2005), Ridouane et al. (2010) and Louisos et al. (2013) for toroidal loops, while for rectangular loops by Ambrosini et al. (2004),

Table 1

Summary of the main previous works on natural circulation dynamics dealing with experimental data.

Author	Year	Experimental facility	Analytical approach	Numerical approach	Direct comparison with experimental data
Mousavian et al. Vijayan et al. Pilkhwal et al. Devia and Misale IAEA-TE-1752 Kudariyawar et al.	2004 2007 2007 2012 2014 2016	L1 loop ¹ BARC loop BARC loop L2 loop L2 loop BARC loop BARC loop	No Yes No No No No	Finite difference, RELAP5 Finite difference GENLOOP, RELAP5 and CFD (Fluent) CFD (Fluent) RELAP5 CFD (Fluent)	Yes No No Yes Yes
Present work	2016	L2 loop	Yes	O-O, CFD (OpenFOAM)	Yes

¹ The L1 loop was the facility installed at University of Genoa before the construction of the L2 loop.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6467442

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6467442

Daneshyari.com