ANL/FPP/TM-189

AML/FPP/TM--189

DEG4 017420

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, Illinois 60439

THERMAL-HYDRAULIC LIMITATIONS ON WATER-COOLED LIMITERS

by

Y. S. Cha and B. Misra

Fusion Power Program

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

August 1984

MASTER

 

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
NOMENCLATURE	vi
ABSTRACT	1
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. PRESSURE DROP AND PUMPING POWER	4
III. CRITICAL HEAT FLUX	5
IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	9
V. EXAMPLE	9
VI. CRITICAL HEAT FLUX FOR ASYMMETRICALLY HEATED SURFACES	13
VII. ENHANCEMENT OF HEAT TRANSFER	15
VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	17
APPENDIX: CHF Correlations	20
REFERENCES	22

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Geometry and dimensions of double-edged bottom limiter.	3
2	CHF versus velocity from various correlations for a limiter with a heated length of 1 m, a channel diameter of 5.33 mm, and an average system pressure of 3.44 MPa.	7
3	CHF versus velocity from various correlations for a limiter with a heated length of 1 m, a channel diameter of 5.33 mm, and an average system pressure of 6.89 MPa.	8
4	Variations of bulk fluid temperature and the wall temperature along the coolant channel of a limiter with a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m ² and an average velocity of 5 m/s.	11
5	Variations of bulk fluid temperature and the wall temperature along the coolant channel of a limiter with a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m ² and an average velocity of 7.5 m/s.	12

LIST OF TABLES

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
I	Range of Parameters Employed	2
II	Single-Phase Pressure Drop and Pumping Power for the Limiter ...	4
III	Parameter Ranges for Various CHF Correlations	6
IV	Thermal Hydraulic Parameters for a Limiter with a Peak Heat Flux of 3.5 MW/m ² , a Heated Length of 1 m, a Channel Diameters of 5.33 mm, and an Average System Pressure of 3.44 MPa	14
V	Ranges of Test Conditions at Burnout	16

NOMENCLATURE

C_p	specific heat
D	pipe inside diameter
f	friction factor
G	mass flux
h	heat transfer coefficient
k	thermal conductivity
L	heated length
Nu	Nusselt number
P	pressure
Pe	Peclet number ($Re \cdot Pr$)
Pr	Prandtl number (ν/α)
ΔP_b	pressure drop through bends
ΔP_p	pressure drop through straight pipes
ΔP_t	total pressure drop
q	surface heat flux
Re	Reynolds number (VD/ν)
T_B	bulk fluid temperature
T_{NVB}	bulk fluid temperature at the net vapor detachment point
T_{ONB}	bulk fluid temperature at onset of nucleate boiling
T_{SAT}	saturation temperature
V	average fluid velocity
W	pumping power
ν	kinematic viscosity
α	thermal diffusivity
ρ_L, ρ_V	liquid and vapor density, respectively
σ	surface tension

THERMAL-HYDRAULIC LIMITATIONS ON WATER-COOLED LIMITERS

Y. S. Cha and B. Misra

Fusion Power Program

ABSTRACT

An assessment of the cooling requirements for fusion reactor components, such as the first wall and limiter/divertor, was carried out using pressurized water as the coolant. In order to establish the coolant operating conditions, a survey of the literature on departure from nucleate boiling, critical heat flux, asymmetrical heating and heat transfer augmentation techniques was carried out. The experimental data and the empirical correlations indicate that thermal protection for the fusion reactor components based on current design concepts can be provided with an adequate margin of safety without resorting to either high coolant velocities, excessive coolant pressures, or heat transfer augmentation techniques. If, however, the future designs require heat transfer enhancement techniques, experimental verification would be necessary since no data on heat transfer augmentation techniques exist for complex geometries, especially under asymmetrically heated conditions. Since the data presented herein concern primarily with thermal protection, the final design should consider other factors such as thermal stresses, temperature limits, and fatigue.

I. INTRODUCTION

A critical parameter in fusion reactors is the upper bound of the surface heat flux on the limiter or divertor. Determination of the heat flux limits would allow the designer to accommodate the uncertainties in calculations (from plasma engineering) of surface heat fluxes, as well as provide some flexibility in determining the heat loads among various components, such as the first wall and the limiter/divertor.

The purpose of this scoping study is to establish an upper bound on the surface heat flux for a limiter from thermal hydraulic viewpoint which includes considerations of pressure drop, critical heat flux, etc. It should be noted that other factors, such as temperature limits of coating and structural materials, thermal stress, fatigue, etc., will also limit the surface heat flux and should be included in the overall design evaluation.

The geometry adopted in this study is a double-edge limiter shown in Fig. 1, which is similar to the design for FED/INTOR [1]. This design is considered to have the thermal hydraulic response that is typical of other impurity control systems. The linear length (L) that is exposed to surface heat flux is assumed to be one meter. The coolant channel cross-section is 8 mm x 4 mm which corresponds to a hydraulic diameter (D) of 5.33 mm. Table I summarizes the parameters adopted in this study.

Table I
Range of Parameters Employed

Pressure (P)	3.45 and 6.89 MPa (500 and 1000 psia)
Velocity (V)	2.5-15.0 m/s
Length (L)	1.0 m
Equivalent Diameter (D)	5.33 mm

SHAPED LIMITER - BOTTOM (DOUBLE EDGE)

Fig. 1, Geometry and dimensions of double-edged bottom limiter.

II. PRESSURE DROP AND PUMPING POWER

The coolant passage from supply manifold to return manifold includes three relatively straight sections and six 90-deg bends (see Fig. 1). The straight sections have a total length of approximately 2.5 m. For the velocities (V) used in this study, the flow is turbulent and the coolant channels are assumed to be made of smooth (copper) pipes. The pressure drop through bends (ΔP_b) depends on the ratio of the radius of curvature of the bend and the pipe diameter. For the present calculations, it is assumed that each bend has an average equivalent length to diameter ratio (L/D) of 20. Using the method described in Ref. 2, the results of single-phase pressure drop and pumping power (W) for the limiter are shown in Table II. The total pressure drop (ΔP_t) for a velocity of 15 m/s is approximately 1.6 MPa (230 psi). This pressure drop is not small, and it does not include the pressure losses associated with the piping system outside the limiter. Unless one is willing to accept even a higher pressure drop (and the associated piping and pumping costs), a velocity of 15 m/s in the coolant channels should not be exceeded. It is likely that the flow in a portion of the heated length (~ 1 m) will be in the two-phase regime and the pressure drop will be different from the single phase results shown in Table II. However, the total pressure drop is not likely to differ significantly from that shown in Table II since the length of the two-phase region is expected to be small compared to the overall length of the coolant channels.

Table II

Single-Phase Pressure Drop and Pumping Power for the Limiter

V (m/s)	Reynolds No. Re ($\times 10^{-5}$)	f (Friction Factor)	ΔP_p (MPa)	ΔP_b (MPa)	ΔP_t (MPa)	ΔP_t (psi)	W (kw)
2.5	0.366	0.040	0.057	0.015	0.072	10.4	1.15
5.0	0.732	0.033	0.188	0.048	0.236	34.2	7.55
7.5	1.10	0.030	0.380	0.103	0.483	70.1	23.20
10.0	1.46	0.028	0.640	0.162	0.802	116.3	51.33
12.5	1.83	0.026	0.920	0.240	1.160	168.3	92.80
15.0	2.20	0.025	1.280	0.330	1.610	233.5	154.56

III. CRITICAL HEAT FLUX

The critical heat flux (CHF) referred to here corresponds to the departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) in the subcooled or low-quality region at relatively high heat fluxes. If the applied heat flux exceeds the CHF, a sharp rise in the coolant channel wall temperature could occur leading to failure of coolant channel. Thus, CHF forms a practical upper limit for the imposed heat flux in a system.

Table III is a list of six CHF correlations employed in the present evaluation. The relevant parameter ranges for these correlations are also listed in Table III. Since all of these correlations are applicable only within the range of the parameters listed in Table III, extrapolation outside these parameter ranges is not recommended. The Bowring [3] and Katto [4] correlations are among the recommendations of a recent evaluation by Boyd, et al. [5]. Groeneveld and Snoek [6] recently provided the CHF table look-up techniques based on 10,000 tube CHF data. The Jens and Lottes [7], Westinghouse APD [8], and Bernath [9] correlations are some of the older correlations chosen here for comparison. All the correlations are developed for uniformly (axially and circumferentially) heated vertical tubes. Most of the correlations are based on the local parameters such as the quality or subcooling. CHF always occurs at the pipe exit for uniformly heated test sections.

Figure 2 shows the results of the various CHF correlations versus velocity (or mass flux) for a system pressure of 3.44 MPa (500 psia), an axial heated length of one meter, a pipe diameter of 5.33 mm, and an inlet water temperature of 60°C. Each correlation is represented by a solid line if it is within the parameter range listed in Table III. The dashed lines in Fig. 2 represent extrapolations outside the range of parameters listed in Table III. Several interesting observations can be made by examining the results shown in Fig. 2:

1. The results of various CHF correlations appear to differ significantly from each other. The magnitude of difference among some correlations can be very large (a factor of 2 to 3).
2. It appears that all of the correlations evaluated here are developed with velocity less than 10 m/s (except the Bowring correlation) and with heat flux less than 12.6 MW/m^2 (except the Bernath correlation).

Table III

Parameter Ranges for Various CHF Correlations

Correlation	Pressure P (MPa)	Mass Flux G (kg/m ² -s)	Axial Length L (m)	Diameter D (mm)	CHF MW/m ²	Ref/y
Bowring	0.20-19.3	136-18,600	0.15-3.7	2.0-45	(?)	3/1972
Katto	3.0-19.9	750-4,000	0.08-6.3	8	7.95	4/1981
Grosneveld & Snook	0.20-15.0	0-7,500	---	8	0.16-11.2	6/1983
Jens & Lottes	3.45-13.8	1,302-10,170	0.076-0.625	3.63-5.75	up to 12.6	7/1951
Westinghouse APD	5.51-18.9	271-10,848	L/D = 21-365	2.54-13.7	1.2-12.6	8/1963
Bernath	0.10-20.6	V = 1.82-12.8 m/s	L/D = 58	2.06-19.0	0.2-18.1	9/1960

Fig. 2. CHF versus velocity from various correlations for a limiter with a heated length of 1 m, a channel diameter of 5.33 mm, and an average system pressure of 3.44 MPa.

This indicates that there is a lack of data and reliable CHF correlations for high velocity and high heat flux applications.

3. The more recently published correlations (Bowring, Katto, and Groeneveld and Snoek) appear to give CHF values much lower than the older correlations (Jens and Lottes, Westinghouse, and Bernath).

The wide difference in CHF values among various correlations is an accurate description of the current state-of-the-art and shows the lack of understanding of the basic mechanism for CHF. For the present evaluation, the more recently published CHF correlations (Bowring, Katto, and Groeneveld and Snoek) will be adopted for the following two reasons: (1) the recently published CHF correlations give conservative results compared to the earlier correlations; and (2) the more recently published CHF correlations are probably based on

better and more extensive data base (for example, the Groeneveld and Snoek correlation is based on 10,000 tube CHF data).

Figure 3 shows the CHF versus velocity plot at a pressure of 6.89 MPa (1000 psia) by using the Bowring, the Katto, and the Groeneveld and Snoek correlations. Again, it must be noted that the reliability of these correlations decreases as the velocity is increased beyond 10 m/s.

Fig. 3. CHF versus velocity from various correlations for a limiter with a heated length of 1 m, a channel diameter of 5.33 mm, and an average system pressure of 6.89 MPa.

From the results shown in Figs. 2 and 3 (based on the three recently published correlations), it can be observed that the CHF is approximately 8 MW/m² for a velocity of 10 m/s and a pressure of 3.44 MPa, and 10 MW/m² for a velocity of 10 m/s and a pressure of 6.89 MPa. For the design of a limiter or other components, the applied heat flux must be lower than the CHF at the operating conditions. This is discussed further in Section V.

IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In addition to the pressure drop and CHF limitations, there are other thermal hydraulic constraints which may limit the velocity or pressure of the limiter system. Among these constraints are flow-induced vibrations, cavitation, erosion, two-phase flow instability, etc.

Referring to Fig. 1, the relatively thick core structure would probably prevent any large-amplitude vibration of the limiter for velocities up to 10 m/s. However, for velocities beyond 10 m/s, tests should be conducted to determine the impact of flow-induced vibrations on such a system.

In a moderately pressurized system (3.45 MPa), there is sufficient margin for cavitation even at relatively high velocities (>10 m/s). Erosion is not likely to be a problem for a water velocity of 10 m/s and a limiter lifetime of two years.

Two-phase flow instability is system-dependent and should be examined if subcooled boiling occurs in the coolant channels of the limiter.

V. EXAMPLE

As an example, we shall consider a limiter exposed to a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 , to determine the minimum coolant velocity and the heat transfer coefficient (h) for this design (the heat transfer coefficient is needed to calculate the structural temperature). The heated length is assumed to be 1 m and the coolant channel diameter is 5.33 mm. The average pressure in the heated coolant channel is assumed to be 3.44 MPa (500 psia) and the water inlet temperature is 60°C .

As mentioned previously, the applied heat flux should be lower than the critical heat flux to provide some margin of safety. For pressurized water reactors (PWR), this safety margin is expressed in terms of the DNB ratio [10]

$$\text{DNBR} = \frac{\text{DNB heat flux predicted by applicable correlation}}{\text{Reactor local heat flux}}$$

and a typical PWR design criterion is that $\text{DNBR} \geq 1.3$ at the maximum overpower conditions. Pending further evaluation of the safety margin for fusion applications, the PWR design criterion of

$$\text{DNBR} \geq 1.3$$

will be adopted here.

For an applied peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 and a DNB ratio of 1.3, the critical heat flux at the operating condition should be

$$\text{CHF} \geq 4.55 \text{ MW/m}^2 .$$

Examination of the results shown in Fig. 2 (use the Bowring correlation which appears to give the average CHF values between the Katto and the Groeneveld and Snoek correlations) indicates that the velocity should be greater than 5 m/s in order to satisfy the CHF requirement.

The designer now has the choice of a range of velocities (say between 5 and 10 m/s in order not to have excessive pressure drop in the limiter) to meet the CHF requirement. The higher the velocity, the larger the heat transfer coefficient, and the larger the safety margin towards CHF. The price one has to pay is larger pressure drop and pumping power.

To assist in selecting a velocity and the corresponding heat transfer coefficient, the designer must decide which flow regime (single phase or sub-cooled boiling) exists in the limiter. To do this, the method and procedure recommended by Boyd, et al. [5] will be employed. The bulk fluid temperature (T_b) increases along the pipe. The bulk fluid temperature at the location of onset of nucleate boiling (T_{ONB}) is given by

$$T_{\text{ONB}} = T_{\text{SAT}} - q/h + 14.6 q^{0.25}$$

where q (kW/cm^2) is the applied heat flux, h ($\text{kW/cm}^2\text{-C}$) is the single-phase heat transfer coefficient, and T_{SAT} is the saturation temperature. The bulk fluid temperature at the location of the net vapor detachment point (T_{NVD}) is given by the Saha and Zuber correlation,

$$T_{\text{SAT}} - T_{\text{NVD}} = \begin{cases} 0.22 (qD/k) & \text{for } \text{Pe} < 7 \times 10^4 \\ 153.8 (q/GC_p) & \text{for } \text{Pe} > 7 \times 10^4 \end{cases}$$

where D is the pipe diameter, k is the thermal conductivity of the fluid, C_p is the specific heat of the fluid, G is the mass flux, and Pe is the Peclet number. The inside wall temperature (T_w) along the pipe also increases along the pipe length and can be calculated by using h up to the point of onset of nucleate boiling.

Figure 4 shows the variations of various temperatures along the coolant channel for a velocity of 5 m/s which is the minimum velocity required to satisfy the CHF criterion. It is seen that the onset of nucleate boiling occurs at an axial distance of ~ 0.62 m from the inlet. From this point on, partial nucleate boiling exists in the channel. Fully-developed boiling does not exist anywhere in the heated channel since the bulk fluid temperature is always below that of net vapor detachment. This design (with a velocity of 5 m/s) is acceptable, but partial nucleate boiling must be tolerated in the limiter. To calculate the wall temperature accurately, two heat transfer coefficients should be used; one corresponding to the single-phase region and the other corresponding to the partial nucleate boiling region.

Fig. 4. Variations of bulk fluid temperature and the wall temperature along the coolant channel of a limiter with a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 and an average velocity of 5 m/s.

The alternate would be to increase the velocity and operate the entire limiter in the single-phase regime. Figure 5 shows the various temperature-versus-axial distance plots for a velocity of 7.5 m/s. In this case, the bulk liquid temperature is always below T_{ONB} (onset of nucleate boiling), and the wall temperature is always below the saturation temperature. Thus, the flow is single-phase and only one heat transfer coefficient is needed. For this case

$$Nu = \frac{hD}{k} = 0.023 Re^{0.8} Pr^{0.4},$$

Fig. 5. Variations of bulk fluid temperature and the wall temperature along the coolant channel of a limiter with a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 and an average velocity of 7.5 m/s.

where Nu is the Nusselt number, Re is the Reynolds number, and Pr is the Prandtl number. The total pressure drop for the limiter (Table II) is approximately 0.48 MPa (70 psi). This pressure drop is acceptable and thus this design is preferred since it eliminates partial nucleate boiling in the channel. Further increases in velocity will increase the heat transfer coefficient and the DNB ratio, reduce the bulk fluid and wall temperatures, and increase the pressure drop and pumping power.

Table IV summarizes the results of the thermal hydraulic parameters for a limiter with a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 , a uniformly heat length of 1 m, a channel diameter of 5.33 mm, and an average system pressure of 3.44 MPa.

It should be noted that in the example shown in Table IV, the peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 was assumed to be applied uniformly along the coolant channels. This is a conservative assumption since the heat flux decreases linearly from the center of the limiter (where the peak heat flux occurs) towards either leading edge. It should also be emphasized that the design described here is based on thermal hydraulic considerations only and the final acceptance of a design must include other considerations, such as structural temperature, thermal stress, fatigue, etc.

The results shown in Table IV are for a limiter with a uniformly heated length of one meter and a system pressure of 3.44 MPa (500 psia). For a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 , a velocity $\sim 5 \text{ m/s}$ is enough to satisfy the CHF requirement.

If the applied heat flux is increased, the velocity will have to be increased correspondingly to satisfy the CHF requirement until other constraints (such as pressure drop or flow-induced vibrations) become the limiting factors. The CHF can be further increased by varying the system pressure or by shortening the heated length through design changes. If none of these are feasible, heat transfer enhancement techniques should be considered and some of these techniques are described in the next section.

VI. CRITICAL HEAT FLUX FOR ASYMMETRICALLY HEATED SURFACES

A review of the literature was carried out to assess how nonsymmetrical heating influences DNB. The experimental data reviewed included both axial and radial flux variations covering a wide spectrum of flux profiles such as hot patches, cosine, chopped cosine, and skewed cosine [11,12]. The experimental parameters also cover a range of L/D ratio, inlet subcooling, inlet pressure, and heat fluxes. The results indicate that the experimentally observed variations in DNB values are so large that no single empirical correlation can be used to represent the data, especially in situations where marked nonuniformities exist. However, these data indicate that the influence of nonuniformities on CHF decrease as the inlet quality increases. Experimental

Table IV

Thermal Hydraulic Parameters for a Limiter With a Peak Heat Flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 , a Heated Length of 1 m, a Channel Diameter of 5.33 mm, and an Average System Pressure of 3.44 MPa

Velocity (m/s)	ΔP (MPa)	CHF (MW/m ²)	DNBR (a)	Flow Regime	Heat Transfer Coefficient $h \times 10^{-4}$ (W/m ² -C)	Bulk Temp. at Exit (T _B) (°C)	Wall Temp. at Exit (T _w) (°C)
5.0	0.236	4.8	1.37	Single-phase and partial nucleate boiling	3.09	189	302
7.5	0.483	6.2	1.77	Single phase	4.27	146	228
10.0	0.802	7.6	2.17	Single phase	5.38	124	189
12.5	1.160	9.2	2.63	Single phase	6.43	112	166
15.0	1.610	10.9	3.11	Single phase	7.44	103	150

^a Minimum required DNBR ≥ 1.3 .

data from an asymmetrically heated tube [13] show that correlations for uniformly heated tubes may be used to predict the DNB behavior of asymmetrically heated tubes. It should be noted that since Ref. 13 covers only a limited range of test parameters, its validity may be questionable. The experimental results as reported in Ref. 13 are limited to heat fluxes less than 1 MW/m^2 . Hence, there are not sufficient data for asymmetrically heated surfaces that would be directly applicable to limiter/divertor design.

VII. ENHANCEMENT OF HEAT TRANSFER

A survey of the literature on heat transfer enhancement techniques indicate that attempts to improve heat transfer characteristics dates back to the early 1930s [14]. These experiments were confined to simple techniques such as surface roughening, and no attempts have been made for a fundamental understanding of the nature of augmentation techniques until the mid-1950s. Since then a large number of augmentation techniques such as surface roughening, surface treatment, chemical additives, mechanical and acoustic vibrations, electrostatic fields, extended surfaces, turbulence promoters such as coiled wire inserts, twisted tapes, helical tubes, porous surfaces, porous coating, and reentrant cavities [15-20]. Experiments have been conducted under non-boiling, boiling, and condensation in free convection and forced convection modes to identify augmentation techniques that are best suited for a given operating systems. The experimental results show that the augmentation techniques have widely varying effects on heat transfer coefficients. From a modest improvement of the order of 20% for simple augmentation techniques such as surface roughening to more than a 20-fold increase in heat transfer coefficients for twisted tape inserts have been reported in the literature. Hence, it is desirable to make an assessment whether any of the proven augmentation methods is applicable to the fusion reactor components subjected to intense heat fluxes.

A closer examination of the literature indicates that most of the heat transfer enhancement techniques have been developed for simple shapes such as round tubes and flat surfaces. In addition, these techniques have been developed for the external surfaces using soft materials. Hence, most of the potential heat exchanger surfaces that have been examined may be unsuitable for fusion reactor components such as limiter/divertor and the first wall.

ever, the results of experiments based on turbulence promoters such as twisted tape seem to have special interest for fusion reactor components. The results of Ref. 15 are discussed below from the standpoint of components requiring protection from unusually high (e.g., $q > 10 \text{ MW/m}^2$) heat fluxes.

The operating conditions for the data of Ref. 13 are summarized in Table V. An examination of data presented in Table V shows that the experiments covered quite a wide range of operating conditions. The burnout heat fluxes

Table V
Ranges of Test Conditions at Burnout

Variable	Swirl Flow (40 Tests)
D, mm (in.)	3.45-10.2 (0.136-0.402)
Inlet pressure, MPa (psia)	0.1-3.75 (15-545)
y, diameters/180-deg twist	2.08-12.03
L/D	6.6-88.2
Tube material	Al, Cu, "A"-nickel
Velocity, m/s (fps)	4.5-47.5 (14.7-156.0 ^a)
Inlet temperature, °C (°F)	27-77 (48-138)
Outlet temperature, °C (°F)	51-194 (91-350)
ΔP (overall), MPa (psi)	0.02-3.0 (3.0-432)
Subcooling (Δt_{sub}), at wall	17 wt % quality - 144°C (260°F) subcooling
Critical heat flux, MW/m^2 (Btu/hr·ft ²)	8.7-117.8 ($2.77 \times 10^6 - 37.35 \times 10^6$)

^aWhich corresponds to a range of exit resultant velocity of 16.6 - 195.3 fps.

for twisted tape swirl generators are quite high, the lowest burnout heat flux being 8.7 MW/m^2 . This indicates that very high heat fluxes are possible with turbulence promoters. For the expected peak heat flux of 4.6 MW/m^2 for the limiter, the margin of safety can be very high for twisted tapes and can be incorporated into the limiter design. For the design concepts presently under consideration, it may not be feasible to include the twisted tapes. However, there is no reason why alternate designs cannot be pursued that will make it possible to use swirl generators to augment heat transfer. Incorporation of

turbulence promoters into the complex geometry will require further evaluation in terms of stresses, inlet and outlet ducting, inlet pressure, and coolant velocity requirements.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The three CHF correlations employed here also included the effects of heated length (L), channel diameter (D), and inlet subcooling which are not shown in Figs. 2 and 3. The users can choose these correlations to optimize their design. The Bowring and the Katto correlations are listed in the Appendix. These two correlations are straightforward to use since the CHF is expressed explicitly in terms of all the parameters. The table look-up method reported by Groeneveld and Snoek requires some iteration. For a set of given pressure, mass flux, and equilibrium quality, one can look up the table provided by Groeneveld and Snoek and determine the CHF. If this CHF divided by DNBR is greater than the applied heat flux, the chosen parameters for the design are acceptable. Otherwise one or more of the system parameters (pressure, flow rate, heated length, etc.) has to be changed to increase the CHF until it meets the design requirement. Again it must be cautioned that one should not extrapolate the results beyond the parameter ranges listed in Table III.

The data presented in Table V are limited to pressures less than 3.8 MPa (545 psia). These pressures fall within the expected limiter design pressure. Since the operating pressure for the first wall is of the order of 14 MPa (2000 psia); the data presented in Table V may not be directly applicable to first wall design.

As mentioned previously, most of the data used to develop CHF correlation are from tests of uniformly heated, both axially and circumferentially, tubes. For fusion components such as the limiter or divertor, the surface heat flux is nonsymmetric circumferentially and nonuniform axially, and the coolant channel may not be circular. The coolant channels are exposed to the surface heat flux on one side only.

Regarding the effect of nonuniformity, axial heat flux along the coolant channel, it is recommended that the peak heat flux be used as the requirement for CHF. This would give a conservative estimate of margin for CHF. This

requirement could be relaxed by examining the specific heat flux distribution of a given design together with the DNBR requirement described previously.

The following conclusions may be made:

1. The limiting factor for the water-cooled limiters is the critical heat flux (CHF). The limiter design must provide adequate margin of safety so that the expected peak heat flux never approaches the CHF.
2. The predicted CHF based on a number of empirical correlations vary over a wide range (by a factor of 2 to 3). For this study the most conservative correlations were chosen to determine the operating parameters.
3. For a moderately pressurized system (3.45 to 6.89 MPa), the upper bound of CHF is of the order of 10 MW/m^2 for an average velocity of 10 m/s over a heated length of 1 m . For velocities greater than 10 m/s and heat fluxes greater than 12 MW/m^2 , there are not sufficient data. The upper bound of CHF can be increased somewhat by increasing the system pressure and coolant velocity, and by decreasing the heated length.
4. The CHF can be increased significantly without increasing either the systems pressure or the coolant velocity by using heat transfer enhancement techniques (e.g., swirl generators). For the peak heat flux considered in this study, no heat transfer enhancement techniques are needed.
5. A numerical example for a peak heat flux of 3.5 MW/m^2 shows that the required CHF (with a margin of safety of 1.3) can be met in a 1 m long channel when the coolant inlet velocity is 7.5 m/s at a coolant pressure of 3.45 MPa. Hence, cooling of the limiter with an adequate margin of safety does not seem to be a problem for the limiter design considered herein.

Finally, it is considered to be convenient and useful to assess the CHF limit for water-cooled systems. The following statements and classifications are the opinions of the authors since a certain amount of judgment is involved, and is applicable for a system with a pressure below 6.90 MPa (1000 psia) and a heated length of 1 m .

a. $q \leq 10 \text{ MW/m}^2$

Adequate cooling of the component can be achieved based on existing technology.

b. $10 \text{ MW/m}^2 \leq q \leq 20 \text{ MW/m}^2$

Adequate cooling can be achieved only with heat transfer enhancement techniques.

It should be pointed out that for complex geometries such as the fusion reactor first wall and limiter/divertor, application of heat transfer enhancement techniques may not be feasible. Hence, one cannot rely on enhancement techniques if the heat flux exceeds 10 MW/m^2 . If one were to use heat transfer enhancement techniques for such critical parts, the results must be verified with prototype components under simulated operating conditions.

c. $q \geq 20 \text{ MW/m}^2$

Difficult to provide adequate cooling with a reasonable margin of safety.

APPENDIX

CHF CorrelationsBowring Correlation [3]

$$\text{CHF} = (A + B \Delta H_{\text{sub}})/(C + L)$$

where

$$B = 0.25 \text{ DG} ,$$

$$P_1 = 0.145 P ,$$

$$A = [2.317(0.25 H_{fg} \text{ DG})F_1]/[1.0 + 0.0143 F_2 D^{0.5} G] ,$$

$$n = 2.0 - 0.5 P_1 ,$$

$$C = 0.077 F_3 \text{ DG}/[1.0 + 0.347 F_4 (G/1356)^n] .$$

For $P_1 < 1$

$$F_1 = [P_1^{18.942} 20.89(1 - P_1) + 0.917]/1.917 ,$$

$$F_1/F_2 = [P_1^{1.316} 2.444(1 - P_1) + 0.309]/1.309 ,$$

$$F_3 = [P_1^{17.023} 16.658(1 - P_1) + 0.667]/1.667 ,$$

$$F_4/F_3 = P_1^{1.649} .$$

For $P_1 > 1$

$$F_1 = P_1^{-0.368} 0.648(1 - P_1) ,$$

$$F_1/F_2 = P_1^{-0.448} 0.245(1 - P_1) ,$$

$$F_3 = P_1^{0.216} ,$$

$$F_4/F_3 = P_1^{1.649} .$$

$$\text{CHF} = (W/\pi^2) ,$$

$$D = (\text{m}) ,$$

$$G = (\text{kg}/\text{m}^2\text{-s}) ,$$

$$\Delta H_{\text{sub}} = \text{enthalpy of subcooling} = (\text{J}/\text{kg}) ,$$

$$L = (\text{m}) ,$$

$$P = \text{MPa}$$

$$H_{fg} = \text{latent heat} = (\text{J}/\text{kg}) .$$

Katto Correlation [4]

$$\text{CHF} = \text{CHF}_O [(1 + K\Delta H_{\text{sub}})/h_{fg}] ,$$

$$K = 0.416 \frac{(0.0221 + D/L)(D/L)^{0.27}}{(\rho_v/\rho_L)^{0.133} \text{We}^{-0.433}} ,$$

$$\text{We} = G^2 L / \sigma \rho_L ,$$

$$(\text{CHF}_O / h_{fg}) = 0.098 (\rho_v / \rho_L)^{0.133} \text{We}^{-0.433} \frac{(L/D)^{0.27}}{1 + 0.0031 L/D} .$$

REFERENCES

- [1] W. M. Stacey, et al., "Critical Issues, U.S. FED-INTOR Activity and U.S. Contribution to the International Tokamak Reactor Phase-2A Workshop," USA FED-INTOR/82-1, Vol. 1, (October, 1982).
- [2] Crane, "Valves • Fittings," Catalog No. 60, Crane Co., 4100 S. Kedzie, Ave., Chicago, IL (1960).
- [3] R. W. Bowring, "A Simple but Accurate Round Tube Uniform Heat Flux, Dryout Correlation Over the Pressure Range 0.7-17 MN/m² (100-2500 psia)," AEEW-R 789 (1972).
- [4] Y. Katto, "On the Heat-Flux/Exit-Quality Type Correlation of CHF of Forced Convection Boiling in Uniformly Heated Vertical Tubes," Int. J. Heat Mass Transf. 24, 533-539 (1981).
- [5] R. D. Boyd, C. P. C. Wong, and Y. S. Cha, "Technical Assessment of Thermal-Hydraulics for High Heat Flux Fusion Applications," SAND84-0159, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM (1984).
- [6] D. C. Groeneveld and C. W. Snoek, "A Review of Current Heat Transfer Correlation Used in Reactor Safety Assessments," in Thermal-Hydraulics of Nuclear Reactors, 2nd Intern. Top. Mtg. on Nuclear Reactor Thermal-Hydraulics, Santa Barbara, CA, Vol. 1 (1983), pp. 20-28.
- [7] W. H. Jens and P. A. Lottes, "Analysis of Heat Transfer, Burnout, Pressure Drop and Density Data for High-Pressure Water," ANL-4621, Argonne National Laboratory (1951).
- [8] L. S. Tong, Boiling Heat Transfer and Two-Phase Flow, (John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1965), pp. 157-158.
- [9] L. Bernath, "A Theory of Local-Boiling Burnout and Its Application to Existing Data," Chem. Eng. Progr. Symp. Series 56, No. 30, (1960), pp. 95-116.
- [10] L. S. Tong and J. Weisman, Thermal Analysis of Pressurized Water Reactors, 2nd Ed., (American Nuclear Society 1979).
- [11] J. Liebenberg, "Five Tube Test Report," SAND-30-8020, Sandia National Laboratory, Livermore, CA (1980).
- [12] M. Guyette and N. Hoppe, "Bibliographical Review of DNB Data in Non-uniformly Heated Channels and Comparison with Theoretical Predictions," EURAEC-1915 (1967).
- [13] "ESURF-DNB Experiments on an Asymmetrically Heated Stainless Steel Tube," TR-01-3, Westinghouse Electric Corporation (1982).
- [14] M. Jakob, Heat Transfer, Vol. 1 (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949).

- [15] F. Kreith and D. Margolis, "Heat Transfer and Friction in Turbulent Vortex Flow," Appl. Scient. Res., Sec. A, 8, 457 (1959).
- [16] R. K. Young and R. L. Hummel, "Improved Nucleate Boiling Heat Transfer," Chem. Eng. Prog. 60, 53 (1964).
- [17] A. Owhadi and K. J. Bell, "Forced Convection Boiling Inside Helically-Coiled Tubes," Intern. J. Heat Mass Transf. 10, 397 (1967).
- [18] W. R. Gambili, et al., "Heat Transfer Burnout and Pressure-Drop for Water in Swirl Flow through Tubes with Internal Twisted Tapes," OENL-2911, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (1960).
- [19] A. E. Bergles, "Survey and Evaluation of Techniques to Augment Convection Heat and Mass Transfer," Prog. Heat & Mass Trans. 1, 331 (1969).
- [20] A. E. Bergles and R. L. Webb, "Bibliography on Augmentation of Convection Heat and Mass Transfer," Previews of Heat and Mass Transfer, Vol. 4 (1978), Vol. 5 (1979), Vol. 6 (1980).

Distribution for ANL/FPP/TM-189Internal:

G. Baker	S. Kim	D. Smith
J. Brooks	R. Kustom	H. Stevens
L. Burris	Y. Liu	M. Steindler
Y. Cha (5)	S. Majumdar	D. Sze
R. Clemmer	V. Maroni	L. Turner
D. Ehst	R. Mattas	R. Zeno
K. Evans	B. Misra (5)	ANL Patent Dept.
P. Finn	J. Norem	FP Program (15)
Y. Gohar	R. Nygren	ANL Contract File
A. Hassanein	W. Praeg	ANL Libraries (2)
G. Johnson	J. Roberts	TIS Files (6)
J. Jung	G. Rosenberg	
	W. Sha	

External:

DOE-TIC, for distribution per JC-20 (107)

Manager, Chicago Operations Office, DOE

Special Committee for the Fusion Program:

S. Baron, Burns & Roe, Inc., Oradell, NJ
 H. K. Forsen, Bechtel Group, Inc., San Francisco, CA
 J. Maniscalco, TRW, Inc., Redondo Beach, CA
 G. H. Miley, University of Illinois, Urbana
 P. J. Reardon, Brookhaven National Laboratory
 P. H. Rutherford, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
 D. Steiner, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
 K. R. Symon, University of Wisconsin-Madison
 K. Thomassen, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
 M. Abdou, University of California-Los Angeles
 J. Bialek, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
 R. Boyd, Sandia National Laboratory
 J. Cecchi, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory