# The Heat Transfer Characteristics in Helical Tube Bundle for DTBSG Concepts

Bo Young Choi\*, Seyun Kim, Jae-Hyuk Eoh, Eui Kwang Kim, Jong-Hyun Choi, Seong-O Kim Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute, 150 Dukjindong, Yuseong, Deajeon, 305-353, Korea, bychoi@kaeri.re.kr

# 1. Introduction

In LMR development, Sodium-water reaction is very a critical problem. To resolve it, many design concepts have been proposed. Recently, KAERI suggested DTBSG concept with various structures and analysis for performance and 1-dimension sizing are studied[1]. However, throughout this analysis, multidimensional effects are not considered, so multidimensional studies are needed in view of experimental and CFD analysis. Basically, DTBSG concept is a combination of 2 kinds of heat exchanger system, hot tube and cold shell system (reverse 2 components system), and cold tube and hot shell system (normal 2 components system). In this paper, characteristics of heat transfer in basic two configurations with 2 fluid components are studied experimentally and numerically.

# 2. Experiments and Numerical analysis

# 2.1 Experiments

To investigate the effects of heat transfer in DTBSG basically, two configurations are considered. First, hot fluid flows in the tube and cold fluid flows in the shell. This configuration named as normal 2 components system. In vice versa, Reverse 2 components system. The shell side of test section has  $\varphi$ 178mm outer cylinder and  $\varphi$ 100mm inner cylinder and  $\varphi$ 6mm helical coiled tubes are located in the shell with 4,4,5,6 tubes in each row. Tube bundle area has height of 206mm. and tube length is 1.4m. The other dimensions are depicted in Fig. Thermocouples for shell side 1. temperature measurement are located in tube bundle area at interval 40mm in z direction. For radial temperature distribution measurement, thermocouple groups are installed at interval 120°. To mimic liquid metal flow, woodmetal is adopted in shell side, and subcooled water is flown in the tubes.

In prior to experiment, thermal and hydraulic properties are measured and formulated by



Figure 1. Test section for 2 components heat exchanger system

Table 1.2 components normal system experimental conditions

|                        | Tube side (water)          |                          |                   | shell (woodmetal)  |                         |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 2 components<br>Normal | Inlet<br>Pressure<br>(Mpa) | mass flow<br>rate (kg/s) | Inlet Temp<br>(℃) | Inlet<br>Temp.(°C) | mass flow<br>rate(kg/s) |
| Exp1-1                 | 0.614                      | 0.08366                  | 150.08            | 111.03             | 2.892                   |
| Exp2-1                 | 0.800                      | 0.02964                  | 150.46            | 111.12             | 0.999                   |
| Exp2-2                 | 0.740                      | 0.04639                  | 150.65            | 111.10             | 1.589                   |
| Exp2-3                 | 0.690                      | 0.06327                  | 149.65            | 111.19             | 2.188                   |
| Exp2-4                 | 0.614                      | 0.08366                  | 150.08            | 111.03             | 2.892                   |
| Exp3-1                 | 0.689                      | 0.07421                  | 150.78            | 111.18             | 2.892                   |
| Exp3-2                 | 0.564                      | 0.13491                  | 150.23            | 111.21             | 2.892                   |
| Exp3-3                 | 0.556                      | 0.19626                  | 150.32            | 111.20             | 2.892                   |
| Exp3-4                 | 0.544                      | 0.25998                  | 150.25            | 111.05             | 2.892                   |
| Exp4-1                 | 0.592                      | 0.08253                  | 149.93            | 111.07             | 0.523                   |
| Exp4-2                 | 0.661                      | 0.08255                  | 150.02            | 111.18             | 1.351                   |
| Exp4-3                 | 0.677                      | 0.08249                  | 149.93            | 111.12             | 2.416                   |
| Exp4-4                 | 0.681                      | 0.08251                  | 150.78            | 111.04             | 2.892                   |

| Table   | 2.2  | components | reverse | system | experiment | al |
|---------|------|------------|---------|--------|------------|----|
| conditi | ions |            |         |        |            |    |

|                          | Tube (water)               |                          |                    | shell (woodmetal) |                                |  |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 2 components,<br>Reverse | Inlet<br>Pressure<br>(Mpa) | mass flow<br>rate (kg/s) | Inlet<br>Temp.(°C) | Inlet<br>Temp(°C) | mass<br>flow<br>rate(kg/s<br>) |  |
| Exp1-1                   | 0.282                      | 0.08679                  | 111.01             | 150.23            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp2-1                   | 0.543                      | 0.03066                  | 111.06             | 150.38            | 0.999                          |  |
| Exp2-2                   | 0.536                      | 0.04824                  | 111.12             | 150.45            | 1.589                          |  |
| Exp2-3                   | 0.513                      | 0.06579                  | 111.05             | 150.30            | 2.188                          |  |
| Exp2-4                   | 0.282                      | 0.08679                  | 111.01             | 150.23            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp3-1                   | 0.308                      | 0.07698                  | 111.06             | 150.00            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp3-2                   | 0.277                      | 0.13970                  | 111.18             | 150.50            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp3-3                   | 0.266                      | 0.20331                  | 111.15             | 150.77            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp3-4                   | 0.244                      | 0.26933                  | 111.00             | 150.38            | 2.892                          |  |
| Exp4-1                   | 0.493                      | 0.08561                  | 111.01             | 150.04            | 0.523                          |  |
| Exp4-2                   | 0.491                      | 0.08581                  | 111.07             | 150.59            | 1.351                          |  |
| Exp4-3                   | 0.504                      | 0.08544                  | 111.19             | 150.35            | 2.416                          |  |
| Exp4-4                   | 0.294                      | 0.08547                  | 111.13             | 150.22            | 2.892                          |  |
| $c_p = 164(J/kgK)$       |                            |                          |                    |                   |                                |  |

$$\rho = 9510(kg/m^3)$$
 (2)

$$k = 3.61 + 0.003T(W/mK)$$
(3)

$$\mu = 7.3 \times 10^{-3} - 0.01 \times 10^{-3} T(cP)$$
 (4)

where T is temperature of shell. Experiments are performed by 12 inlet conditions to resolve the effects of thermal capacity ratio for each system shown in table 1 and table 2. For each case, heat balance errors are calculated within 20% with measured thermal and hydraulic properties. And in radial direction, with temperature's low deviation, the axisymmetric assumption is valid for these systems.

# 2.3 Numerical analysis

In this paper, to simulate the flow in these 2 components heat exchanger, COMMIX-AR/P code is modified. From assumption of axisymmetric, 2D analysis is considered and tube bundle area is modeled thermal and force construction. For tube bundle, 1-dimensional and 1-directional flow is assumed. Because the tubes are divided at inlet and outlet plenum, pressure drop in each tube are same. That is,

$$w = \sum w_i \tag{5}$$

$$p_{inlet} = p_{i,inlet} \tag{6}$$

$$p_{outlet} = p_{i,outlet} \tag{7}$$

Tube bundle are modeled by Kalish and Dwyer correlation [2] and modeled by Gunter-Shaw correlation [3] for pressure drop model. Also, the inner flows in tubes are modeled by Mori-Nakayama correlation [4] for pressure drop and heater transfer.

# 2.4 Results and Discussion.

Physically some case in 2 component reverse system is not solved for that in these cases pressure drop is not found in flow direction. For a comparison of analysis, 1D analysis code (ISGA) which is originated from sizing code for DTBSG was referred[5]. From Figure 2 and 3, 2D analysis code predict more accurate heat transfer rate then 1D code does. But these two analysis code overestimate the heat transfer. Temperature profile along the z direction has + curvature in Fig. 4 in contrary to Fig. 5 due to the thermal capacity ratio of two fluids. In Fig.4 and Fig.5, abrupt temperature variation is measured. These effects illustrate that the flow in shell side across the tube bundle is not fully developed and in this area local heat transfer coefficient is varied along the flow. In the heat transfer modeling of tube bundle in shell side, the application of length averaged Nusselt number does not simulate the effects. In reverse 2 components system, at shell side near the tube inlet, lowest temperature is shown and outlet temperature is higher then this temperature. The woodmetal flow near to the wall has minor heat exchange effects and the temperature is retained in shown in Fig.6(a). After woodmetal being mixed throughout the tube region, the outlet temperature is higher and shown in Fig. 4. In normal 2 components system, as like reverse 2 components system, wood metal temperature near to tube inlet region is higher then outlet temperature and shown in Fig 6(a).

#### 3. Conclusion

From this study, 2D analysis code gives the more accurate temperature data in comparison to ISGA code and these two code overestimate the heat transfer rate.



Figure 2. 2 component normal system heat transfer rate



Figure 3. 2components reverse system heat transfer rate



Figure 4. Temperature comparison for 2 component reverse case 2-3







(a) (b) Figure 6. Shell side temperature distribution (a) 2 component reverse system

(b) 2 component normal system

And multidimensional effects are investigated which is not shown in 1D analysis. To describe the temperature distribution of tube bundle region more precisely, the study of local Nusselt number is needed.

### Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the Korean Ministry of Science & Technology through its National Nuclear Technology Program.

# REFERENCES

[1] Y.S. Sim, et al., A new LMR steam generator free from SWR with a double tube bundle configuration, Nuclear Engineering and Design,236,2006,p1471-1480

[2] S.Kalish,et al.,Heat Transfer to NaK Flowing through Unbaffled Rod Bundles, 1967, Int.J. Heat Mass Transfer, 10,p 1533-1558

[3] A.Y.Gunter, et al., A General Correlation of Friction Factors for Various Types of Surfaces in Crossflow, Trans. ASME. 1945, p 643-660

[4] Y.Mori, et al. Study on Forced Convective Heat Transfer in Curved Pipes (1<sup>st</sup> Report, Laminar region) Int. J. Heat Mass transfer. 1965, 8, p 67-82

[5] Kim, E.K. et al.,Development of a Thermal Hydraulic Analysis Code for a Combined Steam Generator-IHX Heat Exchanger", Proc. Of KNS,2004 Spring Meeting,Kyeong-Ju, Korea,May 28,2004