§19. Critical Heat Flux on a Flat Plate in Subcooled He II at Atmospheric Pressure

Shiotsu, M., Hata, K., Takeuchi, Y., Hama, K. (Kyoto University)

Critical heat flux  $q_{st}$  on a flat plate in subcooled He II was measured for bulk liquid temperatures ranging from 1.9 to 2.1 K at atmospheric pressure. The flat plate was made of Manganin, one side insulated, 10.3 mm in width, 40 mm in length and 0.1 mm in thickness.

Figure 1 shows the data of  $q_{st}$  versus bulk liquid temperature,  $T_B$ . As shown in the figure, the value of  $q_{st}$  significantly increases with the decrease in  $T_B$ from near  $\lambda$  temperature. Experimental data of  $q_{st}$ by Kobayashi and Yasukochi [1] on a 5 mm  $\times$  25 mm flat plate are also shown in the figure for comparison. Their data are similar in the trend of dependence on  $T_B$ : they are about 12 % higher than our data at each  $T_B$ . Kobayashi and Yasukochi [1] measured the  $q_{st}$  on flat plates with the widths ranging from 0.6 to 9 mm. They reported that  $q_{st}$ were inversely dependent on the width. However, no theoretical correlation of  $q_{st}$  on a flat plate has been reported until now as far as the authors know.

On the other hand, the authors[2] have already presented the following correlation for the  $q_{st}$  on a horizontal test wire in subcooled He II (for  $T_{sat}(P_L) > T_{\lambda}$ ) by slightly modifying the solution obtained from the Gorter-Mellink equations.

$$q_{st} = K \left[\frac{2}{r_0} \int_{T_B}^{T_\lambda} \frac{1}{f(T)} dT\right]^{\frac{1}{3}}$$
(1)

where

$$\begin{split} & f(T)^{-1} = g(T_{\lambda}) [T_R^{6.8} (1 - T_R^{6.8})]^3 , \\ & g(T_{\lambda}) = \rho^2 s_{\lambda}^4 T_{\lambda}^3 / A_{\lambda} , \qquad T_R = T / T_{\lambda} , \\ & s_{\lambda} = 1559 \quad \mathrm{J} / (\mathrm{kg \ K}) , \qquad A_{\lambda} \simeq 1150 \quad \mathrm{m \ s/kg} . \end{split}$$

The modification coefficient K, in Eq.(1) was determined to be 0.58 by using the experimental data of  $q_{st}$  for various diameter wires. It was confirmed that the correlation can describe well the data of  $q_{st}$  for wire diameters ranging from 0.08 to 0.7 mm[3].

This correlation was modified as follows to describe the  $q_{st}$  for a flat plate of width w and length L. Suppose a box of the dimension  $\Delta x \times w \times L$ covering on the plate, and that the heat flux is uniform on the surface of the box with the total surface area of  $Lw + 2(L + w)\Delta x$ . The heat flux on the box surface is  $[X/(X + \Delta x)]q_0$  where  $X = Lw/\{2(L+w)\}$  and  $q_0$  is the heat flux on the surface of the flat plate. On the other hand, the heat flux for a cylinder at  $\Delta r$  from the cylinder surface is  $[r_0/(r_0 + \Delta r)]q_0$ . It can be understood by comparing these expressions for a flat plate and a cylinder, the term of  $X = Lw/\{2(L+w)\}$  in the former expression corresponds to the term of radius in the latter. By inserting X instead of  $r_0$  in Eq. (1), the equation of  $q_{st}$  for a plate is given by,

$$q_{st} = K \left[ \frac{2}{Lw/\{2(L+w)\}} \int_{T_B}^{T_\lambda} \frac{1}{f(T)} dT \right]^{\frac{1}{3}}$$
(2)

The values derived from Eq. (2) are compared with the corresponding experimental data in Fig. 1. As shown in the figure, these data are within 10 % of the predicted values: the data of this work are slightly higher than, and those by Kobayashi et al. are slightly lower than the predicted values. Figure 2 shows comparison of the  $q_{st}$  predicted by Eq.(2) with the data of Kobayashi and Yasukochi [1] for 2 cm-long flat plates with widths ranging from 0.7 to 9 mm. The experimental data are within  $\pm$  10 % of the predicted values.

References

[1] Kobayashi, H. and Yasukochi, K., Proc. of 8th Internat. Cryogenic Eng. Conf., (IPC Science and Technology Press 1980) 171.

[2] Shiotsu, M. et al., Advances in Cryogenic Engineering, <u>37A</u>, (Plenum 1992), 25-46.

[3] Shiotsu, M. et al., Advances in Cryogenic Engineering, <u>41</u>, (Plenum 1996) 241.



Fig.1 Relationship between critical heat flux and bulk liquid temperature



Fig.2 Comparison of the authors' CHF correlation with the experimental data by Kobayashi et al.