



# Toward a generalized correlation for liquid–vapor two-phase frictional pressure drop across staggered micro-pin-fin arrays<sup>☆</sup>



Christopher A. Konishi, Weilin Qu<sup>\*</sup>

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, United States

## ARTICLE INFO

Available online 30 April 2016

### Keywords:

Micro-pin-fins  
Heat sink  
Two-phase frictional pressure drop  
Two-phase friction multiplier  
Martinelli parameter

## ABSTRACT

In a previous study by the corresponding author and co-worker Mita and Qu (2015) (J. Mita, W. Qu, Pressure drop of water flow across a micro-pin-fin array part 2: adiabatic liquid–vapor two-phase flow, International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer 89 (2015) 1007–1015), a modified Martinelli–Chisholm type correlation was developed to predict adiabatic water liquid–vapor two-phase frictional pressure drop across an array of staggered circular micro-pin-fins. This work expands on the study in ref. Mita and Qu (2015) and examines whether the correlation is geometry specific or it can be extended to describe a different array configuration. A square micro-pin-fin array were prepared, and adiabatic water liquid–vapor two-phase frictional pressure drop across the array was experimentally investigated. The square pin-fins were 200 *microns* in side length, 670 *microns* in height, and 400 *microns* in both longitudinal and transverse pitches. Two-phase friction multiplier and Martinelli parameter were calculated based on the measured pressure drop as well as a single-phase friction factor correlation developed for the same square array. An excellent agreement was found between the experimental data and correlation predictions despite the distinctive geometrical features possessed by the two sets of micro-pin-fin arrays. The result points to the possibility of establishing the correlation as a generalized one applicable to a broad range of staggered micro-pin-fin array configurations.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Transport phenomena associated with flow boiling in micro-pin-fin structures have received considerable research attention in the past decade [2–7]. The underlying objective of these research activities was to develop a fundamental understanding of the transport process that is vital to the design and implementation of two-phase (boiling) micro-pin-fin heat sinks. The novel type of heat sink utilizes micro-pin-fins as its internal heat transfer enhancement structure, and is considered a promising alternative to micro-channel heat sink for high-heat-flux cooling applications.

A number of these previous studies were dedicated to pressure drop characteristics [5–7]. Koşar [5] experimentally investigated refrigerant R-123 flow boiling pressure drop across a staggered hydrofoil micro-pin-fin array. Existing two-phase pressure drop models and correlations were assessed and deemed unable to predict the data. New Martinelli–Chisholm type correlations were proposed for different flow patterns. Qu and Siu-Ho [6] studied water flow boiling pressure drop across a staggered square micro-pin-fin array. Among existing models and correlations, the Martinelli–Chisholm type correlation with a *C* factor of 5 yielded the best agreement with the data. Reeser et al. [7] studied

water and HFE-7200 flow boiling pressure drop across an aligned square and a staggered diamond micro-pin-fin array. Existing correlations were found unable to predict the data. New Martinelli–Chisholm type correlations were proposed for different combinations of working fluid and pin-fin geometry.

With heat induced flow boiling occurring in a micro-pin-fin array, vapor quality would increase appreciably in the stream-wise direction. Reduction in the density of the two-phase mixture leads to an increasing velocity along the flow path. Overall pressure drop across the micro-pin-fin array is thus composed of two components: frictional and accelerational. Accurate determination of the individual components is often a challenge with a variable vapor quality in the stream-wise direction.

To circumvent the difficulty, research efforts have been made to study only the frictional pressure drop by testing adiabatic two-phase flow across micro-pin-fin arrays [1,8,9]. In those studies, liquid–vapor (gas) two-phase mixtures with prescribed vapor quality were produced upstream of the micro-pin-fin arrays, and then forced to flow through the structures under adiabatic condition. With negligible stream-wise variation in vapor quality, the accelerational effect was absent, and the overall pressure drop was caused solely by the frictional effect.

Krishnamurthy and Peles [8] studied frictional pressure drop of adiabatic nitrogen–water two-phase flow across a staggered circular micro-pin-fin array. Existing models and correlations were found unable to predict the data, and a new Martinelli–Chisholm type correlation was

<sup>☆</sup> Communicated by W.J. Minkowycz.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [qu@hawaii.edu](mailto:qu@hawaii.edu) (W. Qu).

## Nomenclature

$A_{min}$	Minimum transverse flow area
$A_{p1}, A_{p2}$	Flow area of plenums
$C$	C factor in Martinelli–Chisholm type correlations
$D$	Diameter of a circular micro-pin-fin
$f_{sp,fin}$	Single-phase friction factor
$f_{sp,f,fin}$	Liquid single-phase friction factor based on actual liquid flow rate
$f_{sp,g,fin}$	Vapor single-phase friction factor based on actual vapor flow rate
$G_{max}$	Maximum mass velocity
$G_{p1}, G_{p2}$	Mass velocity in plenums
$h$	Enthalpy
$h_{fg}$	Latent heat of vaporization
$h_{vg,in}$	Enthalpy of the liquid water upstream of the vapor generator
$H$	Height of a micro-pin-fin
$H_{p1}, H_{p2}$	Height of plenums
$K_{c1}, K_{c2}$	Contraction loss coefficient
$K_{e1}, K_{e2}$	Expansion recovery coefficient
$\dot{m}$	Mass flow rate
$M$	Total number of data points
$MAE$	Mean absolute error
$N_L$	Total number of micro-pin-fin rows in stream-wise direction
$N_{T,O}$	Number of micro-pin-fins in an odd row
$P$	Pressure
$P_{W,vg}$	Heating power input to vapor generator
$\Delta P$	Pressure drop across test section
$\Delta P_{c1}, \Delta P_{c2}$	Contraction pressure loss
$\Delta P_{e1}, \Delta P_{e2}$	Expansion pressure recovery
$\Delta P_{fin}$	Pressure drop across micro-pin-fin array
$\Delta P_{sp,f,fin}$	Liquid single-phase frictional pressure drop across micro-pin-fin array based on actual liquid flow rate
$\Delta P_{sp,g,fin}$	Vapor single-phase frictional pressure drop across micro-pin-fin array based on actual vapor flow rate
$Q_{loss}$	Heat loss
$Re_{sp}$	Single-phase Reynolds number
$Re_{sp,f}$	Liquid single-phase Reynolds number based on actual liquid flow rate
$Re_{sp,g}$	Vapor single-phase Reynolds number based on actual vapor flow rate
$S$	Side length of a square micro-pin-fin
$S_L$	Longitudinal pitch
$S_T$	Transverse pitch
$S_w$	Minimum wall edge to pin center spacing
$T$	Temperature
$v$	Specific volume
$W_{p1}, W_{p2}$	Width of plenums
$W_{wall}$	Thickness of thin side walls along test section edges
$x_e$	Thermodynamic equilibrium quality
$X$	Martinelli parameter
$z$	Stream-wise distance
<b>Greek</b>	
$\phi_f$	Two-phase friction multiplier
$\mu$	Dynamic viscosity
<b>Subscripts</b>	
$avg$	Average
$exp$	Experimental
$f$	Liquid
$fg$	Difference between liquid and vapor

$fin$	Micro-pin-fin array
$g$	Vapor
$i$	Stream-wise segment
$ibd0$	Upstream boundary of segment $i$
$idb1$	Downstream boundary of segment $i$
$in$	Inlet
$out$	Outlet
$p_1$	Deep plenum
$p_2$	Shallow plenum
$pred$	Predicted
$sp$	Single-phase
$tp$	Two-phase
$ts$	Test section
$vg$	Vapor generator
$wall$	Side wall

proposed. The  $C$  factor in the correlation was linearly proportional to liquid Reynolds number. Konishi et al. [9] investigated frictional pressure drop of adiabatic water liquid–vapor two-phase flow across a staggered square micro-pin-fin array. The Martinelli–Chisholm type correlation with a  $C$  factor of 5 produced the best agreement among the existing models and correlations.

Mita and Qu [1] recently studied frictional pressure drop of adiabatic water liquid–vapor two-phase flow across a staggered circular micro-pin-fin array with  $D$  of 180  $\mu\text{m}$ ,  $H/D$  of 3.8, and  $S_L/D$  and  $S_T/D$  of 2.2. Experimental results revealed that a unique functional relationship existed between the two-phase friction multiplier  $\phi_f$  and Martinelli parameter  $X$ , indicating that the classic Lockhart–Martinelli generalized procedure, originally developed for calculating two-phase frictional pressure gradient along pipes [10], could be applied to the circular micro-pin-fin array. The following modified Martinelli–Chisholm type correlation was developed to depict the  $\phi_f$ - $X$  relationship:

$$\phi_f^2 = 1 + \frac{2.1675}{X^{0.76}} + \frac{1}{X^2}. \quad (1)$$

The present study expands on the work in ref. [1] by experimentally investigating two-phase frictional pressure drop across a staggered array of micro-pin-fins having a square cross-sectional shape. The goal is to assess whether the correlation, Eq. (1), is only accurate to the circular array for which it was originally developed, thus geometry specific, or whether the correlation can be extended to describe the present square array. Should latter be the case, Eq. (1) may have the potential to become a generalized correlation applicable to a broad range of staggered micro-pin-fin array configurations.

## 2. Experimental apparatus and procedure

### 2.1. Test module

Fig. 1(a) shows a schematic of the test module composed of a copper micro-pin-fin test section, a G-7 fiberglass plastic housing, and a polycarbonate plastic (Lexan) cover plate. The test section had a projected top platform area of 3.38 cm (longitudinal) by 1 cm (transverse). An array of staggered square micro-pin-fins were micro-end milled out of the top surface. The array contained 85 pin-fin rows in the longitudinal (stream-wise) direction. There were 24 pin-fins in every odd transverse row, and 23 pin-fins in every even transverse row. The square pin-fins were 200  $\mu\text{m}$  in side length  $S$ , 670  $\mu\text{m}$  in height  $H$ , and 400  $\mu\text{m}$  in both longitudinal pitch  $S_L$  and transverse pitch  $S_T$ . The resulting  $H/S$  was 3.35, and  $S_L/S$  and  $S_T/S$  2. Fig. 1(b) shows a top view and key dimensions of the array.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/7053354>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/7053354>

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