THE EFFECT OF VAPOR SUBCOOLING ON FILM CONDENSATION OF METALS

EUGENE D. FEDOROVICH* and WARREN M. ROHSENOW†

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

NOMENCLATURE

A, area;

a, thermal accommodation coefficient;

c_p, c_v, heat capacities of the vapor;

d, thickness of the discontinuity zone for temperature distribution (Knudsen zone);

G, relation between mass flow rate and temperature drop in the film, defined by equation (11);

g, gravitational acceleration;

h_{fg}, latent heat of vaporization;

h'_{fg}, latent heat, which includes change of enthalpy due to the subcooling of the liquid, $= h_{fg} + 0.68 \, c_l(T_s - T_w)$, c_l = heat capacity of the liquid;

k_v, thermal conductivity of vapor;

k_l, thermal conductivity of liquid;

M, molecular weight;

p_v, bulk saturation pressure of the vapor;

p_i, saturation pressure, which corresponds to temperature T_i of subcooled vapor;

p_s, saturation pressure which corresponds to liquid surface temperature T_s;

$(q/A)_{wall}$, measured heat flux;

T, temperature (identified by subscripts);

W/A, mass flux;

X, coordinate, normal to the wall.

R, universal gas constant;

Pr, vapor Prandtl number;

L, condenser plate length.

Greek symbols

δ, thickness of the condensate film;

λ, mean free path of the vapor molecules;

μ, dynamic viscosity;

η, kinematic viscosity;

ρ, density;

σ, condensation coefficient;

ξ, temperature jump coefficient.

Subscripts

c, condensation;

i, interface;

s, condensate surface;

v, vapor;

w, wall;

l, liquid.

INTRODUCTION

In the case of film condensation of liquid metals the experimental heat flux for given vapor and wall temperatures was found to be much smaller (5–30 times) (see for example, [1], [2]) in comparison with prediction by film theory [3]. The most probable cause of the lower heat-transfer rate is the presence of a thermal resistance at the liquid–vapor interface. This resistance was analyzed by means of kinetic theory and the application of a modified Hertz–Knudsen mass transfer equation ([4], [5]):

$$\frac{W}{A} = \frac{2\sigma}{2 - \sigma} \left(\frac{M}{2RT_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (p_v - p_s). \tag{1}$$

The interphase mass transfer was also studied in detail in other works. It is worth noticing that neglecting the temperature gradient in the vapor is a shortcoming of previous theory, as mentioned in [6–8].

So, the analysis of liquid metals condensation data was based on using the equation (1) for the interphase resistance and equation (11) for the liquid film resistance. In this case the condensation coefficient σ can be determined from experimental data because T_v, T_w and (q/A) are measured.

All the experimental results which have been reported for potassium, sodium and mercury show the condensation coefficient changes with experimental conditions and decreases with increasing vapor pressure as shown in Fig. 1.

Actually no physical consideration is able to support this behavior of the condensation coefficient. Moreover, most of the theoretical predictions [4] and experiments with pure metal surfaces [1] showed σ to be close to unity.

* Senior Research Assistant, Polytechnical Institute, Leningrad, and Visiting Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

† Professor in Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

FIG. 1. Condensation coefficient vs. pressure (without subcooling effect).

PROPOSED MODEL

Kinetic theory of condensation describes the process purely in terms of mass transfer and consists of the assumption that bulk vapor conditions prevail up to the liquid surface, i.e. it neglects the possibility that interactions between evaporation (and reflecting) molecules and condensing molecules might alter the energy (temperature) of vapor molecules near the interface. In terms of the macroscopic mass and energy transport equations it indicates that the phenomenon is associated with subcooling of the vapor boundary layer adjacent to the liquid.

Bulk nucleation theory [15] which requires a substantial degree of supersaturation to maintain net nucleation, permits subcooling.

It has been suggested ([6], [7]) that the vapor subcooling effect must be included in a more precise theory. This idea was used for describing gradients in vapor properties in terms of the macroscopic transport equations for condensing superheated steam [16] and for the analysis of the condensation of steam at low pressures [7]. However, the subcooling idea was not applied quantitatively to the analysis of liquid metal condensation data.

Let us consider a saturated vapor at uniform bulk temperature T_v in contact with the liquid film whose surface temperature T_s is *lower* than T_v. Therefore, heat transfer occurs from the vapor to the liquid and a non-zero temperature gradient exists in the vapor near the interface (Fig. 2). The temperature profile in the vapor can be found from the solution of the differential equation for conduction in the flow to the condensate surface (neglecting any convection effect):

$$\frac{W}{A} c_p \frac{dT}{dx} = K_v \frac{d^2 T}{d^2 x} \tag{2}$$

$$x = x_i \qquad T = T_i$$
$$x = \infty \qquad T = T_v$$

The solution is:

$$\frac{T_v - T}{T_v - T_i} = \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta x (W/A) C_p}{K_v}\right). \tag{3}$$


FIG. 2. Temperature distribution.

In most cases the size of zone $\Delta x = x - d$ (Fig. 2), in which the vapor temperature changes significantly (e.g. when $(T_v - T)/(T_v - T_i) = 0.90$) will not be more than a

few hundreths of an inch, which makes this subcooling effect very difficult to observe experimentally.

If the temperature gradient does exist, rather than a sharp discontinuity, $T_i - T_s < T_v - T_s$. The apparent condensation coefficient (see Fig. 1) is defined by the latter difference $(T_v - T_s)$. The true condensation coefficient is greater when it is calculated using the true difference $(T_i - T_s)$ or $(p_i - p_s)$.

ANALYSIS

Experience with heat transfer between rarefied gases and solid surfaces gives us from kinetic theory ([17], [18]) a relation between the temperature jump $T_i - T_s$ and the temperature gradient $(dT/dx)_i$ which we propose to apply here to the condensation process at the liquid–vapor interface. This relation is:

$$(T_i - T_s) = (\xi + d)\left(\frac{dT}{dx}\right) \tag{4}$$

where the temperature jump coefficient is given by:

$$\xi \equiv \frac{2}{Pr} \frac{2-a}{a} \frac{c_p/c_v}{(c_p/c_v)+1} \lambda. \tag{5}$$

Here T_i is the average temperature of molecules striking the surface and region of dimension d (Fig. 2) is known as the Knudsen zone and is the region where interaction between the molecules coming from the surface at T_s and the molecules going toward the surface prevail. The size of this zone is of the order of a few mean free paths. This distance is sometimes interpreted as the average distance from which the molecules striking a surface have their last collision. For the hard sphere model of a gas at uniform temperature in the absence of a solid surface d is calculated to be $2\lambda/3$. When a solid surface is present the magnitude may be in the range of λ to 5λ ([18], [19]). It is probable that d at liquid–vapor interfaces is also of this order of magnitude.

Anticipating a conclusion that the mass accommodation coefficient σ is unity, we conclude that the thermal accommodation coefficient a in equation (5) is unity because with $\sigma = 1$ all of the molecules going toward the surface condense and the molecules leaving the surface are at T_s [15], [17], [18]. Then equation (5) becomes:

$$\xi \equiv \frac{2\lambda}{Pr} \frac{c_p/c_v}{(c_p/c_v)+1}. \tag{6}$$

This temperature jump coefficient may be seen from equation (4) to be interpreted graphically by the distance ξ shown in Fig. 2.

Because of the existence of the temperature jump $T_i - T_s$ in this condensation problem the process in the vapor can be tested in terms of the rarefied gas temperature jump (or slip) theory. The effect of the mass transfer on the coefficient ξ was considered by Mills [20] who showed that equations (4) and (5) are valid provided the ratio of vapor bulk velocity toward the surface is small compared with the mean thermal velocity of the molecules, which is certainly true in any practical case of a condensing vapor.

An energy balance for the control volume between the plane at i and the vapor (Fig. 2) is:

$$\frac{W}{A} c_{p_v}(T_v - T_i) = k_v \left(\frac{dT}{dx}\right)_i, \tag{7}$$

combining equations (7) and (4) yields:

$$\frac{T_v - T_i}{T_i - T_s} = \frac{k_v}{\frac{W}{A} c_v(\xi + d)}. \tag{8}$$

An overall energy balance for a control volume between the wall and the vapor is:

$$\frac{q}{A}\bigg|_{wall} = \frac{W}{A} h''_{fg} \tag{9}$$

where

$$h''_{fg} = C_s(T_v - T_s) + h_{fg} + \tfrac{3}{8} C_l(T_s - T_w). \tag{10}$$

For determining the temperature drop across the liquid layer we use the ordinary Nusselt type analysis. This may be expressed as [21]

$$\frac{W}{A} = G(T_s - T_w) \tag{11}$$

where for a vertical plate:

$$G \equiv 0.943 \left[\frac{g\rho_l(\rho_l - \rho_v)k_l^3}{L\mu(T_s - T_w)h'_{fg}}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \tag{12}$$

and for a horizontal tube:

$$G \equiv 0.728 \left[\frac{g\rho_l(\rho_l - \rho_v)k_l^3}{D\mu(T_s - T_w)h'_{fg}}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \tag{13}$$

and

$$h'_{fg} \equiv h_{fg} + 0.68 \cdot c_l \cdot (T_s - T_w).$$

For the temperature jump $(T_i - T_s)$ equation (1) is revised as follows:

$$\frac{W}{A} = \frac{2\sigma}{2 - \sigma} \left(\frac{M}{2\pi R T_i}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (p_i - p_s) \tag{14}$$

where p_i is the saturation pressure corresponding to T_i and p_s is the saturation pressure corresponding to T_s.

The use of p_s as the saturation pressure corresponding to T_s in equation (14) represents the flow rate of molecules leaving the liquid surface if the entire system were uniformly at the temperature T_s.

The fact that the vapor is at T_i does not alter this rate of flow significantly. In other words, quasi-equilibrium is assumed. In a similar way we may use p_i as the saturation pressure corresponding to T_i to calculate the flow of vapor molecules toward the liquid surface if we postulate that a

small amount of homogeneous nucleation takes place in the subcooled vapor at T_i and that this condensate forms at the temperature T_i. Under these circumstances the energy balance equation (7) should really be written as follows:

$$k_v \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}T}{\mathrm{d}x}\right) = \frac{W}{A} c_{pv}(T_v - T_i) + \alpha \frac{W}{A} h_{fg} \qquad (15)$$

where α is the fraction of the mass flow to the surface which is condensed in the vapor by homogeneous nucleation. An evaluation of α from homogeneous nucleation theory (15) suggests that for the ranges of variables in the liquid metal data discussed here its magnitude is in the range of 10^{-3} to 10^{-5}. For the purposes of the present analysis, the term involving α in equation (15) will be neglected.

For a particular magnitude of d, equations (8), (9), (11) and (14) permit the calculation of (q/A) at the wall for particular values of T_v and T_w, assuming $\sigma = 1$.

It will be shown in the next section that d taken equal to 10λ yields results in good agreement with experimental data.

The mean free path λ was calculated from the expression (see for example [23])

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2)} \, \pi S(T) n}, \, \text{cm} \qquad (16)$$

where:

$$\pi S(T) = 266 \cdot 93 \frac{\sqrt{(M T_i)}}{\mu 10^7}$$

(T — °K, μ = poises, n = numerical density of vapor, $1/\text{cm}^3$).

The effect of dimerization was neglected for all the media. The properties of the media were taken from [24] and were evaluated at temperature T_i for calculating λ.

The data provides measurements of $(q/A)_w$, T_v and T_s. From these and the equations suggested here, the magnitude of σ may be calculated for any assumed value of d.

Figure 3 represents the condensation coefficient for re-calculated data as a function of the pressure p_s for $d = 10\lambda$.


FIG. 3. Condensation coefficient vs. pressure (with sub-cooling effect).

RESULTS

The analysis described above was used to treat experimental data [1, 2, 11–13, 22, 25, 26] for mercury, potassium and sodium saturation vapour, condensing on vertical and horizontal surfaces in the saturation pressure range $p_s = 0.0001 - 1.0$ atm.

The temperature jump coefficient, ξ, was calculated from equation (6).

The results for different vapors scattered about a horizontal straight line at $\sigma = 1.0$, except for the sodium data of Barry [13] and some of the mercury data of Misra and Bonilla [22].

It should be noted that the λ calculated from equation (16) is the λ appropriate for viscosity. The appropriate λ for this condensation process may be quite different, hence the magnitude of 10 for d/λ_{vis} should not be alarming.

CONCLUSIONS

(1) Taking into account the vapor subcooling effect (neglecting the quantitative effect of homogeneous nucleation) near the liquid surface during film condensation of liquid metal vapors leads to the conclusion that the condensation coefficient σ is independent of pressure and is equal to unity when the Knudsen zone thickness d is taken as 10λ.

(2) The suggested model employing equations (8), (9). (11) and (14) with equations (6) and (12) or (13) with the above magnitudes of $\sigma = 1$ and $d = 10\lambda$ may be used to predict heat flux associated with film condensation of saturated vapors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

1. S. SUKHATME and W. M. ROHSENOW, Film condensation of a liquid metal, J. Heat Transfer 88c, 19 (1966).
2. I. T. ALADYEV, N. S. KONDRARTYEV, V. A. MUKHIN, M. E. MUKHIN, M. E. KIPSHIDZE INNA PARFENTYEV and J. V. KISSELEV, Proc. 3rd Int. Heat Transfer Conf., Chicago 1966, Vol. 2, pp. 313–317.
3. E. M. SPARROW and J. L. GREGG, A boundary layer treatment of laminar film condensation. J. Heat Transfer 81c, pp. 13–18 (1959).
4. R. W. SCHRAGE, A Theoretical Study of Interphase Mass Transfer, Columbia University Press, New York (1953).
5. R. Y. KUCHEROV and L. RICKENGLAZ, Film condensation of sodium and potassium vapour, Soviet Phys. JETP 37, 10 (1959). Dokl. Akad. Nauk, SSSR 5, 133 (1960).
6. D. J. WILHELM, Film condensation of mercury vapour, theory of interphase heat transfer, PhD. Thesis, Ohio State University (1964).
7. A. F. MILLS and R. A. SEBAN, The condensation coefficient of water, Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer 10, 1815 (1967).
8. W. BORNHORST and G. N. HATSOPOULOS, Analysis of liquid–vapor phase changes by methods of irreversible thermodynamics, J. Appl. Mech. 34E, 840 (1967).
9. D. G. KROGER and W. M. ROHSENOW, Film condensation of saturated potassium vapor, Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer 10, 1891 (1967).
10. D. A. LABUNTSOV and S. I. SMIRNOV, Heat transfer in condensation of liquid metal vapors, Proc. 3rd Int. Heat Transfer Conference, Chicago, 1966, Vol. 2, pp. 329–336.
11. V. I. SUBBOTIN, M. N. IVANOVSKY, V. P. SOROKIN and V. A. CHULKOV, Teplofiz. Vysok. Temp. 4, 616 (1964).
12. V. I. SUBBOTIN, N. V. BAKULIN, M. N. IVANOSKII and V. P. SOROKIN, Teplofiz. Vysok. Temp. 5, (1967).
13. R. E. BARRY and R. E. BALZHISER, Condensation of sodium at high heat fluxes, in Proc. 3rd Int. Heat Transfer Conf., Chicago 1966, Vol. 2, pp. 318–328.
14. N. N. KOCHUROVA, Int. Chem. Engng 4, 603 (1964). Soviet Phys. JETP
15. Y. P. HIRTH and G. M. POUND, Condensation and Evaporation, Nucleation and Growth Kinetics, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1963).
16. R. S. SILVER and H. C. SIMPSON, Condensation of superheated steam, Proc. Conf., Nat. Engng Lab., Glasgow 1961, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Edinburgh (1962).
17. E. H. KENNARD, Kinetic Theory of Gases, McGraw-Hill, New York (1938).
18. R. D. PRESENT, Kinetic Theory of Gases. McGraw-Hill, New York (1958).
19. M. KAMINSKY, Atomic and ionic impact phenomena on metal surface, monograph for Ergebnisse der Exakten Naturwissenshaften (1964).
20. A. F. MILLS, The condensation of steam at low pressures, Tech. Rep. NSF GP-2520 Ser. No. 6, Issue No. 39, University of California, November 1965.
21. W. M. ROHSENOW and H. Y. CHOI, Heat, Mass and Momentum Transfer. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. (1961).
22. B. MISRA and C. F. BONILLA, Heat transfer in the condensation of metal vapors: mercury and sodium up to atmospheric pressure, Chem. Engng Prog. Sym. Ser. 18 52(7), 7–21 (1956).
23. J. D. HIRSCHFELDER and C. F. CURTISS, Molecular Theory of Gases and Liquids. John Wiley, New York (1954).
24. W. D. WEATHERFORD, J. C. TYLER and P. M. KU, Properties of inorganic energy conversion and heat transfer fluids for space applications, WADD Tech. Rep. No. 61096 (1961).
25. J. I. SUBBOTIN, M. N. IVANOVSKII and A. I. MILOVANOV, Condensation coefficient for mercury, Atomn Energ. Vol. 24, No. 2, 1968.
26. P. M. MEYRIAL, M. L. MORIN and W. M. ROHSENOW, Heat transfer during film condensation of potassium vapor on a horizontal plate, Tech. Rep. No. DSR 78008-52. Heat Transfer Laboratory, M.I.T., Cambridge, Mass., March 1, 1968.