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Thermal Modeling of a Single Ultralight Fabric Reflux Tube

Executive Summary

A thermal model of a single Ultralight Fabric Reflux Tube (UFRT) was constructed and tested against data for an array of such tubes tested in the NASA-JSC facility. Modifications to the single fin model were necessary to accommodate the change in radiation shape factors due to adjacent tubes. There was good agreement between the test data and data generated for the same cases by the thermal model. The thermal model was also used to generate single and linear array data for the lunar environment (the primary difference between the test and lunar data was due to lunar gravity). The model was also used to optimize the linear spacing of the reflux tubes in an array. The optimal spacing of the tubes was recommended to be about 5 tube diameters based on maximizing the heat transfer per unit mass. The model also showed that the thermal conductivity of the Nextel fabric was the major limitation to the heat transfer. This led to a suggestion that the feasibility of jacketing the Nextel fiber bundles with copper strands be investigated. This jacketing arrangement was estimated to be able to double the thermal conductivity of the fabric at a volume concentration of about 12-14%. Doubling the thermal conductivity of the fabric would double the amount of heat transferred at the same steam saturation temperature.

The thermal model consisted of a one-dimensional, composite convection-conduction model. The one-dimensional assumption was very good on the shaded side of the tube that experienced condensation and was less so when the other side experienced solar insolation of sufficient magnitude to cause heat addition to the tube. The radiation was modeled as involving diffuse surfaces. On the shade side radiation exchange with the lunar surface and space was considered. On the sun side, a solar heat flux was input at the radiosity node of the fin since it really represented the net energy exchange with the sun.

Introduction

A project was initiated at Lamar University to design and test a thermal model of the new type heat transfer fin shown in the sketch below. The model results were compared with data obtained in NASA's facility at JSC (Building 33, Chamber E) and then used to predict performance on the lunar surface.
Nextel 0.56 mm thick
Titanium 0.0026 in thick

Figure 1. A sketch of the Ultralight Fabric Reflux Tube (UFRT) to be modeled.

The Model

The thermal model consisted of a sequence of quasi-one-dimensional processes: starting at the saturation temperature of the steam inside the tube the processes are; a convection process at the tube inside wall, a conduction process through the titanium liner, a conduction process through the containment fabric, and a radiation process from the fabric outer surface. The process is shown by the sketch of the electric circuit analogy shown in Figure 2. below.

Figure 2. A sketch of the electric circuit analogy of the thermal model.
$R_{\text{cond}}$ represents the condensation process inside the tube. In Appendix I it was shown that the condensation process could be modeled as laminar film condensation on a flat plate. Further it was shown that the magnitude of the temperature drop across the film for the range of interest of our study was less than 0.1 degree Celsius. The heat transfer coefficient for the condensation process was taken at a constant value for the JSC test and for the lunar environment at the values shown below.

\[
h_{\text{JSC}} = 60 \text{ kW/m}^2\text{-K} \\
h_{\text{lunar}} = 40 \text{ kW/m}^2\text{-K}
\]

Conservative Estimates from Appendix I

Unfortunately, it was postulated in Appendix II and demonstrated in analyzing test data in Appendix III that a simple one-dimensional model would not adequately represent the behavior of the system. Since solar insolation impacts only one side of the tube, the model had to be divided into two parts as shown in the sketch of Figure 3. below.

![Solar Insolation](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Figure 3. The two parts (sides) of the thermal model.
Some combinations of the radiant boundary conditions cause the direction of heat transfer to reverse. Such reversal changes the internal convective process from condensation to free convection. In Appendix VII the free convection heat transfer coefficients are calculated to be:

\[ h_{JSC} = 57 \text{ watt/m}^2\text{ K} \]

Conservative Estimates from Appendix VIII

\[ h_{lunar} = 31 \text{ watt/m}^2\text{ K} \]

Comparison with Experiment

In Appendix III the thermal model was used to generate data for the cases of the NASA-JSC test.

Conclusions

1. The thermal model contained in this report closely reproduces the test data generated in the NASA-JSC test facility.

2. From a heat transfer perspective, the optimal tube length to diameter ratio does not appear to have been reached. It appears that the optimal value would be limited by the thickness of the laminar condensate layer at the bottom of the tube which could be increased above the values calculated.

3. A simple model of the tube, heat transfer fluid system, and support structure for the fins indicates that the optimal pitch of a linear tube array should be about 5 tube diameters. This result is based on a mass of heat transfer fluid, fluid lines and support structure which would be about three times that of the tube itself per meter of pitch spacing. The parameter optimized, heat transfer per Kg of mass, is very sensitive to smaller values of pitch to diameter ratio but much less sensitive to larger values (see Appendix VI).

4. As expected, the thermal conductivity of the fabric containment limits the heat transfer. 
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transfer from the tube. A method of introducing a small volume fraction (about 12-14%) of copper fibers into the Nextel fabric is suggested in Appendix VII which it is estimated would double the effective thermal conductivity of the fabric and thereby double the heat transfer from the tube at the same saturation temperature of the steam inside the tubes.

---

End of Section
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APPENDIX I

Thermal Modeling of the Condensation Process
Inside a Single Ultralight Fabric Reflux Tube (UFRT)
Project Objective: To formulate and test a thermal model of the new type heat transfer fin shown in the sketch below. The model is to be tested against data obtained in NASA's facility at JSC and then used to predict performance on the Lunar surface.

The first step will be to examine the condensation process in the condenser to determine the complexity of the model needed. We will begin by making simple assumptions of laminar filmwise condensation on a vertical flat plate with no interface shear between the vapor and liquid film. We must test to see whether each of these assumptions is valid.

To begin, we will take saturated steam at 20 lb/in² abs condensing on the inside of a vertical 1 in diameter tube 1.13 m tall. The tube wall temperature is constant and varied from 227.8 to 227.95 °F. The heat transfer coefficient, the heat transfer and the condensate flow will be calculated for each wall temperature. Take $T_{sat} = 227.96$ °F and $h_{fg} = 960.1$ Btu/lb.
Tw_j = \left(460 + t_j\right) \cdot R \quad T_{\text{sat}} = \left(460 + 227.96\right) \cdot R \quad h_{fg} = 960.1 \frac{\text{BTU}}{\text{lb}}

\Delta T_j = T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w_j}

L = 1.13 \text{ m} \quad 5.1 \text{ cm}

d = 1 \text{ in}

N = \text{READ(sz_h2o)} \quad \text{Number of data points in water properties}

i = 0 \ldots (N - 1)

Th_i = \text{READ(T_h2o)} \quad \mu h_i = \text{READ(mu_h2o)} \quad \rho h_i = \text{READ(ro_h2o)}

kh_i = \text{READ(k_h2o)} \quad GrPr_i = \text{READ(GrPr_h2o)}

Chp_i = \text{READ(CP_h2o)}

\mu f_j = \text{interp}\left(Th_i, \mu h, T f_j\right) \quad \text{kg/m sec}

\rho f_j = \text{interp}\left(Th_i, \rho h, T f_j\right) \quad \text{kg/m}^3

k f_j = \text{interp}\left(Th_i, kh, T f_j\right) \quad \text{watt/m K}

\rho v_{l_j} = 0.5542 + \frac{0.4902}{50} \times \left(0.943, 0.5542\right)

\rho v_{j} = 14.7 \quad \text{kg/m}^3

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
h_j &= 0.943 \left[ \frac{\rho f_j \left(\rho f_j - \rho v_j\right) g h_{fg} \left(k f_j\right)^3}{\mu f_j d \left(\Delta T_j\right)} \right]^{1/4} \\
q_j &= h_j \cdot d \cdot L \cdot \left(\Delta T_j\right)
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Eqn. 9-10 in Holman

Eqn. 9-15 in Holman
Condensation Heat Transfer vs. Del(Temp)

Heat Transfer - Watts

Delta Temperature - degrees K

\[ \delta_j = \frac{4 \mu_f k_f L (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{\text{w}_j})}{gh_f \rho_f (\rho_f \rho_{v_j})} \]

Eqn. 9-6 in Holman

\[ w_j = \frac{\rho f_j (\rho f_j - \rho v_j) g (\delta_j)^3 \pi d}{3 \mu f_j} \]
Condensate Layer Thickness

Condensate Mass Flowrate

\[ \text{Eqn. 9-13 in Holman} \]

\[
Re_f = \frac{4w_j}{\pi d \mu f_j}
\]

1-5
Condensate Layer Thickness

Condensate Mass Flowrate

\[ \text{Eqn. 9-13 in Holman} \]

\[ \text{Re}_j = \frac{4 \cdot w_j}{\pi d_{eq} \mu_f} \]

1 - 5
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From which we can see that assuming an \( h = 60 \text{ Kw/m}^2\text{K} \) would be conservative.

\[
h_{\text{cond}} = 60 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{K}}
\]
Therefore, we can examine our assumptions. The filmwise condensation process is laminar as shown by Reynold's Numbers in the range of 2 to 14 in the figure above. The figure for condensate layer thickness at the bottom of the tube gives a maximum of:

$$\delta_{\text{max}} = 3.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}$$

at the maximum heat dissipation that we are interested in of 150 Watts.

The ratio of diameter to condensate thickness is then:

$$\text{ratio} \frac{\delta_{\text{max}}}{d} = 1.378 \times 10^{-3}$$

which validates our vertical flat plate assumption.

We will calculate and plot the upward vapor velocity to determine whether our no interface shear assumption is approximately correct. We know that for steady state the upward mass flowrate of vapor must be equal to the downward flow of condensate.

$$w_{\text{vapor}} = w_{\text{condensate}}$$

$$V_{v} = \frac{w_{j}}{\rho_{v} A_{v}}$$
which validates our assumption of no interface shear.

We know that the initial water charge is 20 cm³. Let us check to see the maximum volume of water contained in the film to be sure that the evaporator section does not go dry. The volume of water contained in the film is given by:

\[
\text{Volume} = \int_0^L \pi d \delta \, dx
\]

\[
\text{Volume} = \pi d \int_0^L \frac{4 \mu k x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_w)^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \, dx
\]

\[
\text{Volume} = \pi d \left[ \frac{4 \mu k x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_w)^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \right]_0^L
\]

\[
\text{Volume} = \pi d \left[ \frac{4 \mu k x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w,j})^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \right]_0^L
\]

\[
\text{Volume} = \pi d \left[ \frac{4 \mu f_j k_f x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w,j})^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \right]_0^L
\]

\[
\text{Volume} = \pi d \left[ \frac{4 \mu f_j k_f x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w,j})^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \right]_0^L
\]

\[
\text{Volume}_j = \pi d \left[ \frac{4 \mu f_j k_f x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w,j})^4}{g h f_g \left( \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_f} + \frac{\rho_v}{\rho_v} \right)} \right]_0^L
\]

\[
v_g = 20.089 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{lb}}
\]

\[
m_{\text{vapor}} = \frac{\pi q^2 L + 5.1 \text{ cm}}{4 v_g}
\]

\[
m_{\text{vapor}} = 4.566 \cdot 10^4 \text{ kg}
\]

but at \( T_{\text{sat}} = 500 \cdot \text{K} \)

\[
v_g = 3.788 \frac{\text{ft}^3}{\text{lb}}
\]
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So about 10% of the 20 cm³ charge is contained in the film at the maximum anticipated heat load of 150 Watts, however, the mass of water vapor becomes the same order of magnitude for a saturation temperature of 500°K.

**Lunar Environment**

Now we need to repeat the calculations for the lunar environment.

\[ g = \frac{9.8 \text{ m}}{6 \text{ sec}^2} \]

Again, we will take saturated steam at 20 lb/in² abs condensing on the inside of a vertical 1 in diameter tube 1.13 m tall. The tube wall temperature is constant and varied from 227.8 to 227.95 °F. The heat transfer coefficient, the heat transfer and the condensate flow will be calculated for each wall temperature. Take \( T_{sat} = 227.96 \) °F and \( h_{fg} = 960.1 \) Btu/lb.
\[ j = 0 \ldots 15 \quad t_j = 227.8 + j \cdot 0.1 \]

\[ T_{w_j} = (460 \cdot t_j) \cdot R \quad T_{sat} = (460 \cdot 227.96) \cdot R \quad h_{fg} = 960.1 \text{ BTU/} \text{lb} \]

\[ T_f j = \frac{T_{w_j} - T_{sat}}{2 \cdot K} \quad \Delta T_j = T_{sat} - T_{w_j} \quad L = 1.13 \text{ m} - 5.1 \text{ cm} \]

\[ d = 1 \text{ in} \]

\[ N = \text{READ(sz_h2o)} \] Number of data points in water properties

\[ i = 0 \ldots (N - 1) \]

\[ T_{h_i} = \text{READ(T_h2o)} \quad \mu_{h_i} = \text{READ(mu_h2o)} \quad \rho_{h_i} = \text{READ(ro_h2o)} \]

\[ k_{h_i} = \text{READ(k_h2o)} \quad GrPr_{h_i} = \text{READ(GrPr_h2o)} \]

\[ Chp_{h_i} = \text{READ(CP_h2o)} \]

\[ \mu_{f_j} = \text{linterp}(T_h, \mu_h, T_{f_j}) \quad \text{kg \ m/sec} \]

\[ \rho_{f_j} = \text{linterp}(T_h, \rho_h, T_{f_j}) \quad \text{kg \ m}^3 \]

\[ k_{f_j} = \text{linterp}(T_h, k_h, T_{f_j}) \quad \text{watt \ m-K} \]

\[ \frac{T_{f_j}}{400} = 0.5542 + \frac{j}{50} \quad (0.4902, 0.5542) \]

\[ \rho_{v1_j} = 100 \cdot \rho_{v_j} \quad \text{kg \ m}^3 \]

\[ \rho_{v_j} = \frac{14.7}{14.7} \quad \text{kg \ m}^3 \]

\[ h_j = 0.943 \left[ \frac{\rho_{f_j} \left( \rho_{f_j} \cdot \rho_{v_j} \right)}{\mu_{f_j} \cdot d} \frac{g \cdot h_{fg} \cdot (k_{f_j})^3}{(T_{sat} - T_{w_j})} \right]^4 \]

\[ q_j = h_j \pi d L \cdot (T_{sat} - T_{w_j}) \]
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Condensation Heat Transfer vs. Del(Temp)

\[ \delta_j \]
\[ \frac{4 \mu f_j k f_j L (T_{\text{sat}} - T_{w_j})}{gh_f \rho f_j (\rho f_j - \rho v_j)} \]

\[ w_j = \frac{\rho f_j (\rho f_j - \rho v_j) g (\delta_j)^3 \pi d}{3 \mu f_j} \]
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Condensate Layer Thickness

Condensate Mass Flowrate

Delta Temperature - degrees K

Mass Flowrate - g/min
From which we can see that assuming an $h = 40 \text{ Kw/m}^2\text{K}$ would be conservative.
Therefore, we can examine our assumptions. The filmwise condensation process is laminar as shown by Reynold's Numbers in the range of 2 to 10 in the figure above. The figure for condensate layer thickness at the bottom of the tube gives a maximum of:

\[ \delta_{\text{max}} = 4.2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m} \]

at the maximum heat dissipation that we are interested in of 150 Watts.

The ratio of diameter to condensate thickness is then:

\[ \text{ratio} = \frac{\delta_{\text{max}}}{d} \quad \text{ratio} = 1.654 \times 10^3 \]

which validates our vertical flat plate assumption.

We will calculate and plot the upward vapor velocity to determine whether our no interface shear assumption is approximately correct.

We know that for steady state the upward mass flowrate of vapor must be equal to the downward flow of condensate.

\[ \Lambda_{v_j} \frac{\pi (d - 2 \delta_j)^2}{4} \quad w_{\text{vapor}} = w_{\text{condensate}} \quad V_{v_j} = \frac{w_j}{\rho_{v_j} A_{v_j}} \]
which validates our assumption of no interface shear.

We know that the initial water charge is 20 cm$^3$. Let us check to see the maximum volume of water contained in the film to be sure that the evaporator section does not go dry. The volume of water contained in the film is given by:

$$\text{Volume} = \pi \int_0^L \pi d \delta dx$$

$$\text{Volume} = \pi \int_0^L \left[ \frac{4 \mu k x (T_{\text{sat}} - T_w)}{g h f_{fg} \rho f (\rho f \rho_v)} \right] dx$$

$$\text{Volume} = \pi \int_0^L \left[ \frac{4 \mu f_j k f_j (T_{\text{sat}} - T_w)}{g h f_{fg} \rho f_j (\rho f_j \rho_v)} \right] dx$$

$$\nu_g = 20.089 \text{ ft}^3 \text{ lb}^{-1}$$

$$m_{\text{vapor}} = \pi d^2 L + 5.1 \text{ cm} \quad \text{m}_{\text{vapor}} = 4.566 \times 10^{-4} \text{ kg}$$
\[ m_{\text{vapor}} = 4.566 \times 10^4 \text{ kg} \]

but at \( T_{\text{sat}} = 500 \text{ K} \)
\[ v_g = 3.788 \text{ ft}^3 \text{ lb} \]

\[ m_{\text{vapor}} = 2.421 \times 10^3 \text{ kg} \]

So about 25\% of the 20 cm\(^3\) charge is contained in the film at the maximum anticipated heat load of 150 Watts, however, the mass of water vapor increases the total to about 35\% at a saturation temperature of 500\(^{\circ}\)K.

End of Section
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Radiation Modeling
Radiation Heat Transfer

If solar insolation is present, we might note that the insolation is incident on only half the fin area as shown in the sketch below.

Solar Insolation

The area of the fin will be composed of equal areas on the sun side and on the shade side.

Radiant energy exchange will be assumed to be diffuse. The electric circuit analogy for the radiant energy exchange between the fin, the lunar surface, the sun and black space can be represented by the partial sketch below.

The reason we have presented only a partial sketch is that we will show that it is all that is necessary to determine the net radiant energy exchange with the fin. In each of the surface resistances there is an area term in the denominator. All other terms will be expressed with the area of
term in the denominator. All other terms will be expressed with the area of
the fin in the denominator. Since $A_{\text{space}}$, $A_{\text{moon}}$, and $A_{\text{sun}}$ are much much
larger than $A_{\text{fin}}$, their associated resistances can be taken as zero. In
addition, we know the net heat transfer with the sun to be the solar
insolation value. Hence, the modified electric circuit analogy would look
like that below.

Solar Insolation

For which we can sum the heat flows into the node $J_{\text{fin}}$ and set them to zero.

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
E_{\text{bfin}} & J_{\text{fin}}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
1 - \frac{c_{\text{em}}}{T_{\text{fin}} A_{\text{fin}}} & E_{\text{bspace}} & J_{\text{fin}} & E_{\text{bmoon}} & J_{\text{fin}}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin-moon}}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin-space}}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

which applies on the sun side and a similar equation would apply on the
shade side.
\[ E_{b\text{fin}} - J_{\text{fin}} \]
\[ E_{b\text{space}} - J_{\text{fin}} \]
\[ E_{b\text{moon}} - J_{\text{fin}} = 0 \]

In these equations we know that \( E_{b\text{space}} = 0 \), \( E_{b\text{fin}} = \sigma T_{\text{fin}}^4 \), \( E_{b\text{moon}} = \sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4 \) and \( \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} = 0.89 \). The configuration factors may be determined in the following manner: consider the sketch below,

From the figure above it is obvious that \( F_{dA\text{-moon}} \) and \( F_{dA\text{-space}} \) are both 0.5 for any position on the surface of the fin (assumes lunar surface is an infinite flat plate). Therefore \( F_{\text{fin-moon}} \) and \( F_{\text{fin-space}} \) are 0.5 for either the whole fin area or half the fin area (divided into sun side and shade side). The equations above then reduce to on the sun side taking \( q_{\text{sun}} \) to be the energy incident on the fin per unit area times the perpendicular area:

\[ J_{\text{fin}} = \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_{\text{fin}}^4 \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}}}{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} A_{\text{fin}}} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4}{2} \frac{q_{\text{sun}}}{A_{\text{fin}}} \right) \]
and on the shade side:

\[ J_{\text{fin2}} = \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_{\text{fin2}}^4 \left( 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \frac{\sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4}{2} \right) \]

where \( A_{\text{fin}} \) is half the total fin area, \( T_{\text{fin}} \) is the outside temperature of the Nextel exposed to the sun, and \( T_{\text{fin2}} \) is the Nextel temperature on the shade side.

We can now examine the simple but important case of what minimum heat transfer is necessary to keep the fin from freezing-up during the lunar night. For this time we will take \( T_{\text{moon}} = 88 \, ^o\text{K} \), \( T_{\text{sat}} = 273 \, ^o\text{K} \) and no solar insolation.

\[ d = 1.13 \, \text{m} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} = 0.89 \quad T_{\text{sat}} = 273 \, ^o\text{K} \quad T_{\text{moon}} = 88 \, ^o\text{K} \]

\[ d_0 = 0.027 \, \text{m} \]

We will iterate for the outside Nextel surface temperature such that the heat loss by radiation is equal to the heat convected and conducted through the cylindrical fin wall. We will take only half the fin area so that we will be consistent later on when we must consider sun side and shade side.

\[ A_{\text{fin}} = \frac{\pi d_0 L}{2} \quad A_{\text{fin}} = 0.047 \, \text{m}^2 \]

\[ k_{\text{ti}} = 8.4 \, \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \quad k_{\text{nex}} = 0.00012 \, \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \quad h_{\text{cond}} = 60 \, \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{K}} \]

The iteration process is shown in the sketch below.
There is a more compact way to do the calculations below, however, this method has been used to try to illustrate the calculation methodology.

Assume $T_0 = 271.694$ K

$q_1 = \frac{T_{sat}}{R_{cond} + R_{ti} + R_{Nex}} \cdot q_1 = 12.935 \text{ watt}$

$\sigma = 5.669 \times 10^{-8} \text{ watt m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4}$

$J_{fin} = \varepsilon_{fin} \cdot \sigma \cdot T_0^4 \cdot (1 - \varepsilon_{fin}) \cdot \left( \frac{\sigma \cdot T_{moon}^4}{2} \right) \quad J_{fin} = 275.114 \text{ watt m}^{-2}$

$q_2 = \frac{\sigma \cdot T_0^4 - J_{fin}}{1 - \varepsilon_{fin} \cdot A_{fin}} \quad q_2 = 12.935 \text{ watt}$

Therefore it takes $q_{tot} = 2 \cdot q_1 \quad q_{tot} = 25.871 \text{ watt}$

to keep the fin from freezing during the lunar night.

Increasing the saturation temperature to $300^\circ$K. $T_{sat} = 300$ K

$k_j = 0.4 \quad T_{s_{kj}} = 0 \quad q_{t_{kj}} = 0 \quad T_{s_0} = 273 \quad q_{t_0} = \frac{q_{tot}}{watt}$
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Assume $T_0 = 298.104\text{ K}$

\[
q_1 = \frac{T_{\text{sat}}}{R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{Nex}}} T_0 \quad q_1 = 18.779\text{ watt}
\]

\[
\sigma = 5.669 \times 10^{-8}\text{ watt m}^{-2}\text{ K}^{-4}
\]

\[
J_{\text{fin}} = \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_0^4 \left(1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}\right) \left(\sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4\right) \quad J_{\text{fin}} = 398.631\text{ watt m}^2
\]

\[
q_2 = \frac{\sigma T_0^4 - J_{\text{fin}}}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \quad q_2 = 18.778\text{ watt}
\]

\[
q_{\text{tot}} = 2q_1
\]

at $T_{\text{sat}} = 300\text{ K}$

\[
q_{\text{tot}} = 37.558\text{ watt} \quad T_{s_1} = 300 \quad q_{t_1} = \frac{q_{\text{tot}}}{2}
\]

Increase $T_{\text{sat}}$ to 350 K

Assume $T_0 = 346.532\text{ K}$

\[
q_1 = \frac{T_{\text{sat}}}{R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{Nex}}} T_0 \quad q_1 = 34.349\text{ watt}
\]

\[
J_{\text{fin}} = \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_0^4 \left(1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}\right) \left(\sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4\right) \quad J_{\text{fin}} = 727.749\text{ watt m}^2
\]

\[
q_2 = \frac{\sigma T_0^4 - J_{\text{fin}}}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \quad q_2 = 34.348\text{ watt}
\]

\[
q_{\text{tot}} = 2q_1
\]
at $T_{sat} = 350 \cdot K$ $q_{tot} = 68.698 \cdot \text{watt}$ $T_{s_2} = 350$ $q_{t_2} = \frac{q_{tot}}{\text{watt}}$

Increase $T_{sat} = 400 \cdot K$

Assume $T_o = 394.189 \cdot K$

$q_{1} = \frac{T_{sat} - T_o}{R_{cond} + R_{ti} + R_{Nex}}$ $q_{1} = 57.556 \cdot \text{watt}$

$J_{fin} = \varepsilon_{fin} \sigma \left( T_o - T_{moon} \right) \frac{4}{2}$ $J_{fin} = 727.749 \cdot \frac{\text{watt}}{m^2}$

$q_{2} = \frac{\sigma \cdot T_o^4 - J_{fin}}{\left( 1 - \varepsilon_{fin} \right) \left( \varepsilon_{fin} \cdot A_{fin} \right)}$ $q_{2} = 57.558 \cdot \text{watt}$

$q_{tot} = 2 \cdot q_{1}$

at $T_{sat} = 400 \cdot K$ $q_{tot} = 115.111 \cdot \text{watt}$ $T_{s_3} = 400$ $q_{t_3} = \frac{q_{tot}}{\text{watt}}$

Increase $T_{sat} = 500 \cdot K$

Assume $T_o = 486.507 \cdot K$

$q_{1} = \frac{T_{sat} - T_o}{R_{cond} + R_{ti} + R_{Nex}}$ $q_{1} = 133.643 \cdot \text{watt}$
\[ J_{\text{fin}} = \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_o^4 \left( 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4}{2} \right) \]

\[ J_{\text{fin}} = 2.827 \cdot 10^3 \text{ watt/m}^2 \]

\[ q_2 = \frac{\sigma T_o^4 J_{\text{fin}}}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \]

\[ q_2 = 133.644 \text{ watt} \]

\[ q_{\text{tot}} = 2q_1 \]

at \( T_{\text{sat}} = 500 \text{ K} \)

\[ q_{\text{tot}} = 267.286 \text{ watt} \]

\[ s_4 = 500 \]

\[ q_{t_4} = \frac{q_{\text{tot}}}{\text{watt}} \]

Lunar Night Fin q vs Sat. Temperature
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Thermal Model of the JSC Test
JSC Test Model

Simulated Solar Insolation

Simulated Lunar Heat Flux

\[ J_{\text{fin}} = \frac{E_{\text{fin}}}{A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin-chamb}}} \]

Simulated Solar Insolation

\[ E_{\text{fin}} = \sqrt{W \cdot L} \]

Simulated Lunar Heat Flux

\[ E_{\text{chamb}} = \frac{1}{A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin-chamb}}} \]

\( k_{\text{nex}} = 0.00012 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \)

\( L = 1.13 \text{ m} \quad 5.1 \text{ cm} \)

\( h_{\text{cond}} = 60 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{K}} \)

\( k_{\text{ti}} = 8.4 \frac{\text{watt}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \)

\( d = 1 \text{ in} \)

\( \sigma = 5.669 \times 10^8 \frac{\text{watt}}{\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{K}^4} \)

\( \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} = 0.89 \)

\( d_0 = d + 2 \times 0.0026 \text{ m} + 2 \times 0.0026 \text{ in} \)

\( d_0 = 0.027 \text{ m} \)

\( h_{\text{fc}} = 57 \frac{\text{watt}}{\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{K}} \)

\( d = 0.0026 \text{ in} \)

\( \rho_{\text{fin}} = \frac{\pi \cdot d_0 \cdot L}{2} \)

\( A_{\text{fin}} = 0.045 \text{ m}^2 \)

\( R_{\text{cond}} = \frac{L}{h_{\text{cond}} \cdot \pi \cdot d \cdot L} \)

\( R_{\text{ti}} = \frac{d}{\pi \cdot k_{\text{ti}} \cdot L} \)

\( R_{\text{Nex}} = \frac{d_0}{\pi \cdot k_{\text{nex}} \cdot L} \)

\( R_{\text{equiv}} = R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{Nex}} \)

\( R_{\text{eqv2}} = h_{\text{cond}} \cdot R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{Nex}} \)
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Therefore the energy balance at the radiosity node is:

\[
\begin{align*}
E_{\text{bfin}} - J_{\text{fin}} &= \left( \frac{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}}{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} A_{\text{fin}}} \right) \left( q_{\text{ss}} + q_{\text{sl}} \right) + \left( \frac{1}{A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin}_\text{chamb}}} \right) E_{\text{bchamb}} - J_{\text{fin}} = 0 \\
J_{\text{fin}} &= \left( \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \right) \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} T_{\text{osun}}^4}{A_{\text{fin}}} + \left( \frac{q_{\text{ss}} + q_{\text{sl}}}{A_{\text{fin}}} \right) + \left( F_{\text{fin}_\text{chamb}} \sigma T_{\text{chamb}}^4 \right)
\end{align*}
\]

or without solar:

\[
J_{\text{fin}} = \left( \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \right) \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} T_{\text{osh}}^4}{A_{\text{fin}}} + \left( \frac{q_{\text{sl}}}{A_{\text{fin}}} \right) + \left( F_{\text{fin}_\text{chamb}} \sigma T_{\text{chamb}}^4 \right)
\]

Then an energy balance setting the energy transfer through the composite wall equal to the energy radiated from the outer surface gives:

\[
T_{\text{chamb}} = 120 \text{ K} \quad F_{\text{fin}_\text{chamb}} = 1
\]

\[
q_{\text{sl}} = 16120 \text{ watt/m}^2 \cdot A_{\text{fin}} \quad q_{\text{ss}} = 1370 \text{ watt/d L}
\]

\[
F(T_o) = \left( \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} \right) \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} T_o^4}{A_{\text{fin}}} + \left( \frac{q_{\text{sl}}}{A_{\text{fin}}} \right) + \left( F_{\text{fin}_\text{chamb}} \sigma T_{\text{chamb}}^4 \right)
\]

\[
Z(T_s, T_o) = \frac{T_s - T_o}{R} \sigma T_o^4 \frac{F(T_o)}{1 - \varepsilon} \quad 10/17/98
\]
\[
R_{\text{equiv}} = \left( \frac{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}}{\varepsilon_{\text{fin}} A_{\text{fin}}} \right)
\]

\[
F_{s}(T_{o}) = \left| \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}}} - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \cdot \frac{q_{s1} + q_{ss}}{A_{\text{fin}}} + F_{\text{fin\_chamb}} \cdot \sigma \cdot T_{\text{chamb}}^{4} \right|
\]

\[
Z_{s}(T_{s}, T_{o}) = \frac{T_{s} - T_{o}}{R_{\text{equiv}}} - \frac{\sigma \cdot T_{o}^{4} - F_{s}(T_{o})}{\left( 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \right)}
\]

\[
Z_{s2}(T_{s}, T_{o}) = \frac{T_{s} - T_{o}}{R_{\text{equiv}2}} - \frac{\sigma \cdot T_{o}^{4} - F_{s}(T_{o})}{\left( 1 - \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} \right)}
\]

\[
T_{\text{sat}} = 373 \cdot \text{K} \quad T_{\text{on}} = 300 \cdot \text{K}
\]

\[
T_{\text{osh}} = \text{root}(Z(T_{\text{sat}}, T_{\text{on}}), T_{\text{on}}) \quad T_{\text{osh}} = 433.294 \cdot \text{K}
\]
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Modeling of a Single Fin on the Lunar Surface
Single Fin Model for the Lunar Environment

Solar Insolation

\[ E_{b\text{fin}} = E_{b\text{moon}} \]

\[ 1 = A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin moon}} \]

\[ J_{\text{fin}} = A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin space}} \]

Test Series 6: Single Fin - Lunar night just prior to sunrise

\[ k_{\text{nex}} = 0.00015 \text{ kW m}^{-1} \text{ K} \]

\[ L = 1.13 \text{ m} \]

\[ 5.1 \text{ cm} \]

\[ h_{\text{cond}} = 40 \text{ kW m}^{-2} \text{ K} \]

\[ k_{\text{ti}} = 8.4 \text{ watt m}^{-1} \text{ K} \]

\[ d = 1 \text{ in} \]

\[ \sigma = 5.669 \times 10^{-8} \text{ watt m}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-4} \]

\[ \tau_{\text{fin}} = 0.89 \]

\[ d_{0} = 0.0056 \text{ m} \]

\[ 0.026 \text{ in} \]

\[ d_{0} = 0.027 \text{ m} \]

\[ h_{\text{fc}} = 31 \text{ watt m}^{-2} \text{ K} \]

\[ A_{\text{fin}} = 0.045 \text{ m}^{2} \]

\[ \pi d_{0} L \]

\[ R_{\text{cond}} = \frac{1}{h_{\text{cond}} \pi d_{0} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{ti}} = \frac{1}{\pi k_{\text{ti}} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{nex}} = \frac{1}{\pi k_{\text{nex}} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{eqv}} = R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{nex}} \]

\[ R_{\text{eqv2}} = h_{\text{cond}} R_{\text{cond}} + h_{\text{fc}} R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{nex}} \]

\[ T_{\text{moon}} = 88 \text{ K} \]

\[ F_{\text{bm}} = \sigma T_{\text{moon}}^{4} \]
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Single Fin, Just Prior to Sunrise

Lunar Night q from Fin

- Tsat
- Toutsurf
Test Series 1 - 5

To model the different test series, set the model input parameters as shown - results plotted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Series</th>
<th>T_moon</th>
<th>Theta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T_{\text{moon}} = 388 \text{ K} \]
\[ q' = 442 \text{ BTU/hr ft}^2 \]

\[ E_{\text{bm}} = \sigma T_{\text{moon}}^4 q_{\text{sun}} q'.dL \cos(\theta) \]

\[ E_{\text{q}} = \frac{E_{\text{bm}} + q_{\text{sun}}}{2} \]

\[ Z_1(T_{oe}, T_{sate}) = \frac{T_{sate} - T_{oe}}{\epsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_{oe}^4 (1 - \epsilon_{\text{fin}}) E_{\text{q}}} \]

\[ R_{\text{equiv}} \]

\[ Z_2(T_{oe}, T_{sate}) = \frac{T_{sate} - T_{oe}}{\epsilon_{\text{fin}} \sigma T_{oe}^4 (1 - \epsilon_{\text{fin}}) E_{\text{q}}} \]

\[ R_{\text{equiv2}} \]

\[ T_{o2n} = 300 \text{ K} \]
\[ j = 0.10 \quad T_{sat_j} = 273 \text{ K}, \quad j = 10 \text{ K} \]

\[ T_{osun_j} = \text{root}_1 \left[ T_{o2n \cdot T_{sat_j} \cdot T_{o2n}} \right] \]

\[ T_{oshade_j} = \text{root}_1 \left[ T_{o2n \cdot T_{sat_j} \cdot T_{o2n}} \right] \]

\[ T_{osunfc_j} = \text{root}_1 \left[ T_{o2n \cdot T_{sat_j} \cdot T_{o2n}} \right] \]

\[ q_{sun_j} = R_{eqv} \]

\[ q_{shade_j} = R_{eqv} \]

\[ q_{sunfc_j} = R_{eqv2} \]

\[ q_{tt(kk)} = \begin{cases} q_{sun_{kk}} \cdot q_{shade_{kk}} & \text{if } T_{sat_{kk}} < T_{osun_{kk}} \\ (q_{sunfc_{kk}} \cdot q_{shade_{kk}}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ q_{tot_j} = q_{tt(j)} \]
Single Fin on the Lunar Surface

Fin \( q \) vs. Temperature

--- Tsat
--- T sun side
--- T shade side

Free Convection and Condensation Heat Transfer

\( q_{sunj} \)
---
\( q_{sunfcj} \)
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The Shape Factor Between Adjacent Tubes in a Linear Array
To determine the shape factor between adjacent tubes in a linear array we will treat them as infinitely long. Then the shape factor is simply the difference in the sum of the crossed strings minus the uncrossed strings divided by the base length. The sketch below shows two tubes of diameter, d, in such an array separated by a pitch distance p.

\[
F_{1,2} = \frac{4(s + q)\frac{p}{2}}{\pi d} = \frac{8(s + q)}{\pi d d} \frac{p}{2 d}
\]

but \( s = \frac{p^2}{4} \frac{d^2}{4} \) or \( s = \left(\frac{p}{d}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} \)

\( \alpha = \frac{d}{p} \) and \( q = \frac{d}{p} \)

therefore

\[
F_{1,2} = \frac{4}{\pi} \left| \frac{p^2}{d} \right| 1 - \frac{d}{p} \frac{p}{d}
\]

V - 2
\[ F_{cc}(pd) = \left( \frac{pd}{d} \right)^2 - 1 + \sin \left( \frac{1}{pd} \right) \]

\[ j = 0, 20 \]

\[ pp_j \quad 4 \quad j \quad F_{12_j} \quad F_{cc}(pp_j) \]

---

Shape Factor Between Two Infinite Cyl.

End of Section

Table of Contents
APPENDIX VI

Pitch Optimization of Linear Tube Arrays
Solar Insolation

\[ E_{b\text{fin}} \to E_{b\text{moon}} \]

\[ 1 \to A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin moon}} \]

\[ 1 \to A_{\text{fin}} F_{\text{fin-space}} \]

\[ J_{\text{fin}} \]

\[ k_{\text{nex}} = 0.00012 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \]

\[ k_{\text{ti}} = 8.4 \frac{\text{watt}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \]

\[ \varepsilon_{\text{fin}} = 0.89 \]

\[ d_{0} = 0.027 \text{m} \]

\[ \frac{\pi d_{0} L}{2} \]

\[ \frac{L}{h_{\text{cond}} \pi d_{0} L} \]

\[ \ln \left( \frac{d_{0}}{d_{0}} \right) \]

\[ \ln \left( \frac{d_{0}}{d_{0}} \right) \]

\[ R_{\text{cond}} \frac{1}{h_{\text{cond}} \pi d_{0} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{ti}} \frac{\pi k_{\text{ti}} L}{\pi k_{\text{nex}} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{nex}} \frac{\pi k_{\text{nex}} L}{\pi k_{\text{nex}} L} \]

\[ R_{\text{eqv}} = \frac{R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{nex}}}{h_{\text{fc}} + R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{ti}} + R_{\text{nex}}} \]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z(\text{T}_{oe}, \text{F}_m)</td>
<td>Z(\text{T}<em>{oe}, \text{T}</em>{sale}, \text{F}_m)</td>
<td>T_{sale} \text{T}_{oe}</td>
<td>\text{Rey}</td>
<td>\text{Rey}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G(\text{T}_{oe}, \text{F}_m)</td>
<td>G(\text{T}<em>{oe}, \text{T}</em>{sale}, \text{F}_m)</td>
<td>T_{sale} \text{T}_{oe}</td>
<td>\text{Rey}</td>
<td>\text{Rey}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{F}_m \text{F}_m</td>
<td>\text{F}_m \text{F}_m</td>
<td>\text{F}_m \text{F}_m</td>
<td>\text{F}_m \text{F}_m</td>
<td>\text{F}_m \text{F}_m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but \quad \text{F}_s = \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m \text{F}_m

\begin{align*}
Z_{\text{T}_{oe}, \text{T}_{sale}, \text{F}_m} &= Z_{\text{T}_{oe}, \text{F}_m} \\
G_{\text{T}_{oe}, \text{F}_m} &= G_{\text{T}_{oe}, \text{T}_{sale}, \text{F}_m}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{F}_m &= 80 \text{ K} \\
\text{F}_m &= 180 \text{ K}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{F}_s &= \text{F}_m \\
\text{F}_m &= \text{F}_m \cos(\theta)
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{F}_m &= 442 \text{ BTU} \\
\theta &= 45 \degree
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Rey} &= \text{Rey} \\
\text{Rey} &= \text{Rey}
\end{align*}
\[ Z_2(T_{oe} \cdot T_{sate} \cdot F_{f_m}) \quad T_{sate} \quad T_{oe} \quad \sigma \quad T_{oe} \quad R_{eqv2} \quad G(T_{oe} \cdot F_{f_m}) \quad \left( \begin{array}{c} \epsilon_f \cdot 2 \cdot F_{f_m} \\ 1 \\ \epsilon_f \cdot A_{fin} \end{array} \right) \]

\[ T_{o2n} \quad 300 \text{ K} \]

\[ j \quad 0 \to 40 \quad pd_j \quad 1 + j \cdot 0.5 \]

\[ T_{sat} \quad 373 \text{ K} \]

\[ F_{cc}(pd) \quad \left( \begin{array}{ccc} (pd)^2 & 1 & \sin \left( \frac{1}{pd} \right) \end{array} \right) \]

\[ F_{fm_j} \quad 0.5 \quad F_{cc}(pd) \]

\[ T_{osun_j} \quad \text{root} \left( Z_1(T_{o2n} \cdot T_{sat} \cdot F_{fm_j} \cdot T_{o2n}) \right) \]

\[ T_{oshade_j} \quad \text{root} \left( Z_2(T_{o2n} \cdot T_{sat} \cdot F_{fm_j} \cdot T_{o2n}) \right) \]

\[ T_{osunfc_j} \quad \text{root} \left( Z_2(T_{o2n} \cdot T_{sat} \cdot F_{fm_j} \cdot T_{o2n}) \right) \]

\[ \frac{T_{sat} \quad T_{osun_j}}{R_{eqv}} \]

\[ q_{sun_j} \quad \frac{T_{sat} \quad T_{oshade_j}}{R_{eqv}} \]

\[ q_{shade_j} \quad \frac{T_{sat} \quad T_{oshade_j}}{R_{eqv}} \]
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\[ q_{\text{sunfc}_j} = \frac{T_{\text{sat}} - T_{\text{osun}_j}}{R_{\text{eqv2}}} \]

\[ q_{\text{tt}(kk)} = \begin{cases}  & (q_{\text{sun}_kk} + q_{\text{shade}_kk}) \text{ if } T_{\text{sat}} > T_{\text{osun}_kk} \\ & (q_{\text{sunfc}_kk} + q_{\text{shade}_kk}) \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \]

\[ q_{\text{tot1}_j} = q_{\text{tt}(j)} \cdot \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m} + \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m} \]

\[ q_{\text{tot2}_j} = q_{\text{tt}(j)} \cdot \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m} + \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m^2} \]

\[ q_{\text{tot3}_j} = q_{\text{tt}(j)} \cdot \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m} + \frac{131.7 \text{ gm}}{m^3} \]

A mass fraction of 1, i.e. each meter of spacing adds a mass equal to the reflux tube mass.
For a Saturation Temperature of 373°K, Lunar Temperature of 80°K, and a Solar Angle of 45°

This figure indicates that a reasonable design pitch/diameter ratio would be about 5. A higher saturation temperature would perhaps push this ratio down to 4 to 4.5 as would more massive structure and piping arrangements. Even in these cases, the use of a ratio of 5 would not be costly since the function is not as sensitive to the right of the peak as it is to the left.

End of Section
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Equivalent Thermal Conductivity of Concentric Layers of Copper and Nextel
The model below shows copper wires covering Nextel threads in a composite fabric weave. The purpose of the fine copper wires is to increase the thermal conductivity of the fabric while minimizing the loss of strength provided by the Nextel fibers. The copper layer is shown around the Nextel fibers so that the weave of the fabric allows the heat to be conducted along the copper wires or strands and thereby carries the heat from the inside surface to the cross layers of fibers and from these cross layers to the outside surface as shown in the figure below. Copper is used instead of gold to avoid an undesirable decrease in outside surface emissivity.

\[
k_{\text{Nex}} w^2 \frac{\Delta T}{t} = k_{\text{cu}} w^2 x^2 \frac{\Delta T}{t} + k_{\text{cu}} w^2 x^2 \frac{\Delta T}{t}
\]

\[
k_e = k_{\text{Nex}} + k_{\text{cu}} \frac{t}{w^2} \frac{\Delta T}{t}
\]

\[
k_e = \frac{k_{\text{Nex}} k_{\text{cu}} t^2}{k_{\text{Nex}} + k_{\text{cu}} t^2} \frac{\Delta T}{t}
\]
\[ k_{\text{Nex}} = 0.00012 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \quad t = 0.0026 \text{ in} \quad w = 0.05 \text{ in} \]

\[ k_{\text{cu}} = 0.386 \frac{\text{kW}}{\text{m} \cdot \text{K}} \]

\[ k_{\text{Nex}} (x) \frac{1}{k_{\text{cu}}} \left( \frac{t}{w} \right)^2 \]

\[ i = 0.20 \quad x_i = 0 \quad i = 0.0075 \]

\[ \text{krat}_i = k_{\text{cu}} (x_i) \]

\[ k_{\text{cu}} = 3.217 \cdot 10^3 \]

\[ k_{\text{Nex}} \]

\[ \left( \frac{t}{w} \right)^2 = 2.704 \cdot 10^3 \]

---

**Volume Fraction - Copper**

\[ \text{Eqy. K of Nexel} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Fraction - Copper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Estimation of the free convection heat transfer coefficient between the inside tube wall and the saturated steam from the evaporator. This condition exists when the radiant boundary conditions produce an external surface temperature above the saturated steam temperature.

The heat transfer coefficient will be taken as that for a vertical flat plate even though the tube will not behave in this fashion. This will give a larger value which in our case will produce a higher heat transfer to the tube and thereby give conservative results.

Properties of steam at 573°K.


\[ \mu = 19.7 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa sec} \]

\[ \rho = 37.4 \text{ kg/m}^3 \]

\[ \beta = 1/573 \text{ K} \]

\[ k = 0.0641 \text{ watt/m K} \]

\[ \Delta T = 5 \text{ K} \]

\[ L = 1.13 \text{ m} \]

\[ g = 9.8 \text{ m/sec}^2 \]

\[ Gr = g \beta \Delta T L^3 \left( \frac{\mu}{\rho} \right)^2 \]

\[ Gr = 4.447 \times 10^{11} \text{ therefore, turbulent} \]

\[ Nu = 0.15 (Gr Pr)^{3/16} \]

\[ Nu = 999.452 \]

\[ h = \frac{Nu k}{L} \]

\[ h = 56.695 \text{ watt/m}^2\text{K} \]

\[ h = 9.984 \text{ BTU/hr ft}^2\text{R} \]
Use \( h = 57 \text{ watt/m}^2\text{oK} \) for the JSC test and:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gr} & = \frac{g \beta \Delta T \cdot L^3}{(\mu^2/\rho)} \\
\text{Gr} & = 7.412 \cdot 10^{10} \quad \text{still turbulent}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nu} & = \frac{1}{0.15 \cdot (\text{Gr} \cdot \text{Pr})^{\frac{1}{16}}} \\
& = 550.02
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nu} & = \frac{k}{L} \\
\text{h} & = 31.2 \cdot \text{watt/m}^2\text{K} \\
\text{h} & = 5.495 \cdot \text{BTU/hr ft}^2\text{R}
\end{align*}
\]

\( h = 31 \text{ watt/m}^2\text{oK} \) for the lunar surface.
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Next Section