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NOMENCLATURE

$A_i$ cross-section area for subchannels $i$, $(L^2)$
$A_s$ cross-section area for any subchannel $(L^2)$
$A_k$ cross-section area for homogenized subchannels $k$ $(L^2)$
$c_{i,j}$ thermal conduction coefficient for subchannels $i$ and $j$ $(H/T\theta L)$
$c_{L,R}$ thermal conduction coefficient for homogenized subchannels $L$ and $R$ $(H/T\theta L)$
$c_i$ crossflow friction force for subchannel $i$ $(F)$
$C$ crossflow friction force for homogenized subchannels $(F)$
$\Delta x$ axial elevation increment, $(L)$
$\Delta \dot{h}$ axial change of radially averaged enthalpy in the multi-subchannel representation, $(H)$
$\Delta H$ axial change of radially averaged enthalpy in the homogenized representation, $(H)$
$F$ axial friction force per unit length $(F/L)$
$F_R$ Flow ratio
$\bar{F}$ average flow rate
$g$ gravitational constant, $(L/T^2)$
$g_i$ mass flux of channel $i$
$\bar{G}$ averaged mass flux
$h_i$ enthalpy for subchannel $i$, $(H)$
\( h^* \) effective enthalpy carried by diversion crossflow (\( H \))

\( \dot{h}_k \) radially averaged multi-subchannel enthalpy, (\( H \))

\( H_k \) homogenized enthalpy for region \( k \), (\( H \))

\( H_R \) inlet enthalpy ratio

\( K \) crossflow resistance coefficient

\( L \) channel length, (\( L \))

\( m_i \) flow rate for subchannel \( i \) (\( M/T \))

\( M_k \) flow rate for homogenized region \( k \), (\( M/T \))

\( N \) Total number of rods

\( N_{H,N_U,N_{TP},N_{SP},N_{TU}} \) coupling coefficients

\( \bar{N}_H \) averaged coupling coefficient

\( N' \) total number of subchannels equal to

\[ \begin{cases} \frac{N}{2} & \text{for } N \text{ even} \\ \frac{N}{2} + 1/2 & \text{for } N \text{ odd} \end{cases} \)

\( P_i \) pressure for subchannel \( i \) (\( F/L^2 \))

\( P_k \) pressure for homogenized region \( k \) (\( F/L^2 \))

\( P_R \) power ratio

\( q_i' \) heat addition per unit length, for subchannel \( i \) (\( H/L \))

\( \bar{q} \) averaged heat addition per unit length (\( H/L \))

\( Q_k \) heat addition per unit length for homogenized region \( k \) (\( H/L \))

\( R_{H,R_p} \) ratio of \( \bar{N}_H \) in the FLOW UPSET CASE

\( S \) rod spacing (\( L \))

\( u^* \) effective velocity carried by diversion

\( \bar{u} \) effective averaged velocity for adjacent channels
\[ u_i \] effective momentum velocity for subchannel \( i \), \((L/T)\)

\[ U_k \] effective momentum velocity for homogenized region \( k \), \((L/T)\)

\[ \bar{U} \] effective averaged velocity for homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \)

\[ W_{i,j} \] diversion crossflow between adjacent subchannels \((M/TL)\)

\[ W_{L,R} \] diversion crossflow between homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \) \((M/TL)\)

\[ W'_{i,j} \] turbulent interchange between adjacent subchannels \( i \) and \( j \) \((M/TL)\)

\[ W'_{L,R} \] turbulent interchange between adjacent homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \) \((M/TL)\)

\[ \rho^* \] density carried by the diversion crossflow \((M/L^3)\)

\[ \beta \] turbulent mixing parameter

**Subscripts**

\( i \) subchannel identification number

\( k \) homogenized region identification number

**Variables**

\( J \) axial elevation node along the subchannels
CHAPTER 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

1.0 Introduction.

The goal of this study was to develop a method for steady state analysis of the core of a Pressurized Water Reactor using publicly available computer codes. The Connecticut Yankee PWR core with abnormally high average heat flux was selected and its physical characteristics are presented in Appendix C. The computer code chosen was COBRA IIIC(1) in its MIT version, COBRA IIIC/MIT(2). A complete tabulation of the core cases analyzed in this study is presented in Appendix C.

It is clear that the ideal way to analyze a reactor core utilizing the lumped subchannel approach is by taking each radial node in the analysis at least as an actual subchannel. This implies that for the Connecticut Yankee PWR core 35,325 radial nodes should be considered (because of symmetry reasons this number may be reduced to 4,416). These numbers are so large that there is no available computer which could handle this problem, and even if such a computer were available the cost would be prohibitive. Therefore this possibility has historically been ruled out and two other general approaches have been developed.

One is the chain or cascade (multi-stage) method and the other is a one-stage method. The development of both schemes has reflected the limit imposed on the number of radial nodes in any single pass calculation by previously existing subchannel code formulations.
The chain method has maximized the radial mesh representation by performing a multistage analysis of the core\(^{(3,4)}\).

In the first stage the whole core is analyzed on an assembly to assembly basis (each radial node represents an actual assembly). From this analysis the hot assembly, i.e. the one with the largest enthalpy, and its boundary conditions can be identified. In the second stage of the two stage method the hot assembly is analyzed on a subchannel basis, (each radial node is an actual subchannel or is created by lumping of a few subchannels) taking advantage of the boundary conditions found in the previous stage. The three stage method sequentially analyzes the hot assembly as four regions and then the hottest of the four by subchannels. In our subsequent discussion of the chain method we will focus on the two stage approach as example although the uncertainties to be discussed are applicable in principle independent of the number of stages.

In the simplified one-stage method the core has been analyzed in only one stage using a fine mesh in a zone consisting of those subchannels with the larger radial peaking factors and a coarse mesh outside this zone. However because available codes require that the boundaries of any mesh node must be connected to another point or be impervious to mass, momentum and energy exchange, the coarse mesh zone has traditionally been extended to the core boundary. The severe limits on the number of radial nodes in available codes as COBRA has tended to maximize the core volume represented by each node in the coarse mesh zone.
In this study we have

(1) adopted the code COBRA IIIC/MIT for one-stage analysis thereby lifting the previous severe bound on the allowable number of radial nodes,
(2) recommended the optimum arrangement and size of fine and coarse mesh zones, and
(3) assessed the relative merits of the chain versus the simplified one-stage analysis for various cases of interest under steady state PWR operating conditions.

1.1 Uncertainties Associated with the Cascade Method

1.1.1 Boundary Conditions for the Hot Assembly Analysis

In deciding on what method of analysis to develop and recommend for PWR analysis, the option did exist for us to develop a chain method utilizing the COBRA code. This development would have required adaptation of COBRA to accept radial mass, momentum and energy transport into the hot assembly from the first stage analysis. While this could have been accomplished from a coding viewpoint, we perceived, based on our development of an approximate 2 stage method\(^5\) that any chain approach would still have significant physical uncertainties. Specifically we refer to the following uncertainties associated with the boundary conditions applied to the hot assembly, (second stage) analysis.

a) Flow distribution inside the hot assembly.

The only information that is obtained from the first stage of the chain method is the total crossflow that is
leaving or entering each boundary of the assembly. No information is obtained regarding the distribution of axial and transverse flow between subchannels of the hot assembly. Some assumption must be made for the flow distribution but the present lack of a means to verify the assumption leads to questionable results. These problems will be more noticeable at the outer rows of subchannels where the boundary conditions established for the whole assembly will have a larger effect while in the interior of the assembly this effect will be smaller.

Additionally this treatment of diversion crossflow will introduce a further approximation due to averaging in the estimation of lateral energy and momentum transport. Specifically, for example, the energy transport will need to be based on the average assembly enthalpy and this average crossflow whereas in fact the actual number of subchannels on a face through which crossflow and energy exchange is occurring may be localized. Further the enthalpy of the coolant undergoing crossflow may be significantly different than the bundle average. In those steps where diversion crossflow is entering or leaving the hot assembly the problem becomes important.

One final uncertainty relates to the adequacy of the crossflow boundary condition applied to the hot assembly analysis. It is clear that local conditions inside th
assembly effect the crossflow distribution. These local conditions are not taken into account in the assembly to assembly analysis where the boundary conditions for the hot assembly analysis are established.

b) Mixing between the hot assembly and its adjacent channels in the hot assembly analysis.

In the hot assembly analysis no turbulent interchange is taken into account \((\beta = 0.0)\) because no interconnection exists with the actual adjacent assemblies. This can lead to significant overestimation of the enthalpy in the outer row of the hot assembly subchannels. We can visualize some method to take into account this effect but the fact is that a new set of assumptions would have to be made and there is not a data base to support those assumptions.

1.1.2 Transport Coefficients for Momentum and Energy Exchange Between Homogenized Regions

In each stage of the chain analysis various size regions of the core are homogenized and represented by single nodes. The lumped analysis methods applied to these regions formulate momentum and energy exchange between these regions as proportional to differences in nodal properties. In reality, however, such exchanges between regions are proportional to the gradients of such properties across the boundary between regions. This deviation between homogenized nodal differences and gradients is developed in detail in Appendices A and B. To reflect the state of the art for PWR analy:
In these appendices the most detailed representation is assumed to be that of single subchannels. Therefore gradients cannot be obtained as differentials across boundaries but rather as differences between subchannel values on either side of a boundary between the homogenized regions.

Based on a two dimensional analysis carried out in Appendix E, the deviation between homogenized nodal enthalpy differences and enthalpy gradients based on boundary subchannel values is shown to be proportional to the number of subchannels in each homogenized region, $N$; the intensity of the turbulent interchange, $\beta$; and the axial length along the heated channel $z$. This result is consistent with the recognition of this problem for negligible crossflows as a thermally developing flow field which is analogous (as shown in Volumes II and III) to a transient thermal conduction problem. Section 3.1 discusses the difficulty in estimating deviations in 3D situations from those in 2D situations Table I presents deviations for the typical power upset case (different power between homogenized regions) in 2D.

This analysis shows a maximum error of 14.4 percent for conditions of maximum $\beta$, maximum axial position and intermediate $N$. All lumped region analyses should apply coefficients (transport coefficient $N_H$) to the homogenized region nodal enthalpy differences to correct these deviations. Generally none are employed. In application of the THINC method, a transport coefficient of $N$ is applied to the turbulent interchange term in the energy equation $^{(3)}$. This coefficient is exact for the two dimensional case of linear transverse enthalpy profile through $t$. 
assemblies on either side of the boundary in the absence of cross as demonstrated in Appendix F. The error involved in this assum for other various cases of interest needs further assessment. tionally as Appendix A illustrates, coefficients need also to be applied to other homogenized region nodal property differences a complete theoretical solution. Practical bounds on applica these additional coefficients need to be recommended.

1.2 PWR Analysis Needs

Two types of PWR analyses are now being performed within the nuclear industry. The first is a thermal analysis using a pres spatial energy generation rate to find the Minimum Departure fr Nucleate Boiling Ratio. A second potential limit is void fract However in almost all practical cases the MDNBR is the governing limit not channel void fraction. The second type of analysis be performed is coupled thermal hydraulic-neutronic analysis. Whi prime focus of this coupled analysis method is for transient ana and we have presently limited our efforts to steady state analys we consider it since our future efforts will include transient applications.

The nature of these two types of analyses lead to two diffe approaches for thermal analysis.

1.2.1 MDNBR Analysis

For a typical PWR the MDNBR is dependent on channel heat ge tion rate and enthalpy. The enthalpy of the channel is depende upon the heat generation rate and the characteristics of its ne
channels which effect interchannel energy exchange. The dominant parameter is the heat generation rate, which implies that the most restrictive conditions will take place in the subchannel where the heat generation rate is large and not necessarily in the subchannel with largest enthalpy. This will allow identification, by inspection of the core radial power distribution, of that area of the core where the most restrictive conditions are going to occur. Then a fine mesh of subchannels will be required in this zone while outside of this zone a coarse mesh will suffice.

1.2.2 Coupled Thermal Hydraulic-Neutronic Analysis

In the coupled analysis the neutronic analysis requires the number density of all isotopes and the fuel temperature in each region. The number densities are dependent on the nodal enthalpy and void fraction: Optimum nodal sizes have not yet been established in general and in particular in MIT's MEKIN development since feedback calculations have not been performed\(^{(6)}\). However, such sizes will be on the order of some fraction of a PWR assembly. In any event the nodal division of the core will be more uniform than for MDNBR analysis, will comprise the whole core, and will require accurate calculation of homogenized region enthalpies and void fractions.

1.3 Recommended Analysis Methods

For each type of analysis in the previous section the simplified one pass approach using COBRA IIIC/MIT is recommended. Specific
application of this approach further requires user specification of the following factors.

1) The size and number of regions into which the core should be subdivided.

2) The detail in which transport coefficients for mass, momentum and energy exchange should be expressed.

The remaining chapters of this volume address and resolve these questions for the two types of analysis considered.
CHAPTER 2
ANALYSIS METHOD FOR DNBR DETERMINATION

The recommended analysis method is a one stage approach using COBRA IIIC/MIT applied in the following manner.

a) identify the hot subchannel by virtue of its radial power peaking factor and its placement in the assembly with the highest assembly peaking factor. If rod power peaking factors are available, the hot subchannel will be identified by the rod power peaking factors.

b) provide a fine mesh or internal mesh (each node represents a subchannel) of sufficient nodes, to surround the hot subchannel with at least one ring of subchannels. For our Connecticut Yankee core example where two diagonally adjacent subchannels are equally hot, this recommendation leads to sixteen required nodes. For the case of one hot subchannel, nine nodes are required.

c) provide a coarse mesh or external mesh (each node represents a homogenized region) to represent the entire core region outside the fine mesh. The number of coarse mesh nodes can be determined by the following criteria:

- Whole core analysis is necessary.*
- Layout of at least two coarse mesh nodes representing concentric regions about the fine mesh is required.

*For symmetric core, whole core representation can be replaced by some of its fractions representation.
The size of the region represented by the most interior coarse mesh node should be larger than the area of layer of subchannels which is sufficient to surround the fine mesh. Usually, this most interior coarse mesh node represents the rest of the hot assembly.

Computer restrictions on the minimum number of coarse mesh nodes exist due to the limited number of mesh nodes adjacent to a common node. Thus these minimum number can be considered as the lower bound of the coarse mesh nodes.

d) by virtue of b) it is not necessary to utilize any transport coefficients, as mentioned in section 1.1.2. In the COBRA IIIC/MIT input only an enthalpy factor, \( N_H \), is built in which should be set equal to one. (\( N_H = 1 \) means that no enthalpy transport coefficient will be used.)

Channel layouts conforming to the above recommendation are illustrated in Figure's 1a and 2a. Figure 1a is an example of the simplified method channel layout for one eight core (because of symmetry reasons) with only one hot subcha (numbered 1). Eight (numbered 2 thru 9) of the nine fine me
nodes form a layer of subchannels surrounding the hot subchannel (numbered 1). Concentric regions outside the fine mesh have been represented by two coarse mesh nodes: one (numbered 10) represents the rest of the half hot assembly, while the other one (numbered 11) represents the rest of the one eighth core. Similarly, Figure 2a is the simplified method channel layout for one eighth core with two equally hot subchannels. Fourteen (numbered 3 thru 16) of the sixteen fine mesh nodes form a layer of subchannels which is sufficient to surround the two hot subchannels (numbered 1 and 2). In order to satisfy the COBRA IIIC/MIT code restriction, five instead of two coarse mesh nodes must be used to represent the two concentric regions (numbered 17 thru 20 can be considered as one region, numbered 21 as the other one) outside the fine mesh.

For those cases where the hot subchannel is three or more rows from the assembly boundary, this method should give results at least as accurate as chain approaches. For those remaining cases where the hot subchannel is closer to the assembly boundary, the
boundary factors discussed in Section 1.1.1 should adversely effect the chain method compared to this recommended approach if the chain method is applied in the traditional way with the second stage restricted to the hot assembly. If instead the second stage represents subchannels around the hot subchannel independent of their parent assembly, the methods should yield comparable results although the simplified method applied as recommended in a) through d) above will require less computer time and storage space.

Before presenting the detailed basis for the above recommendations and claims it is useful to briefly examine the procedure for the key parameter effecting DNBR. These are linear power, hot channel enthalpy and hot channel flowrate. The linear power is an input parameter while the other two are calculated by a subchannel analysis procedure.

Examination of the relevant energy equation illustrates that the phenomenon labeled turbulent interchange and crossflow across the hot subchannel boundaries as well as the axial mass flow rate itself directly effect the hot channel enthalpy. We demonstrate this by writing the COBRA IIIC/MIT formulation for the hot channel enthalpy at axial position \( J \), \( h_{HC}(J) \), in terms of the properties of its neighboring subchannels \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \) and the turbulent interchange flows \( w' \) and crossflows \( w \).

\[
\begin{align*}
h_{HC}(J) &= h_{HC}(J-1) + \frac{q'_{HC}(J-\frac{1}{2})}{m_{HC}(J-1)} \cdot \Delta x - \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left( \frac{t_{HC}(J-1)-t_{i}(J-1)}{m_{HC}(J-1)} \right) \cdot \Delta x \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left( \frac{h_{HC}(J-1)-h_{i}(J-1)}{m_{HC}(J-1)} \right) \cdot w'_{HC,1}(J-1) \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{4} \left( \frac{h_{HC}(J-1)-h^{*}(J-1)}{m_{HC}(J-1)} \right) \cdot w_{HC,1}(J-1)
\end{align*}
\] (1)
Homogenization of the subchannels adjacent to the hot channel with its outer neighbors will introduce errors in energy exchange in turbulent interchange and crossflows across the hot subchannel's boundaries. Theoretically these errors can be eliminated by application of proper transport coefficients but for cases of moderate crossflows the effects are non linear and as Appendix B demonstrates it is not fruitful to attempt to develop transport coefficients.

Therefore the most direct course is to represent all real subchannel boundaries in the region of the hot channel as single subchannel boundaries in the analysis approach. This means represent each subchannel by a radial node yielding a so-called fine (one per subchannel), or internal (region of the core in which the hot channel is located) mesh. For the hot channel from our analysis a 16 node interior region we estimate that the turbulent interchange and crossflow terms are 16.2% and 2.8% of the linear power term in the energy equation when each of these terms are summed from the inlet to the location of MDNBR. The conduction term for these water cooled cores of small axial coolant temperature rise operating with at least subcooled boiling is negligible and was neglected in the calculations. These estimates are based on case No. 1, but they are more or less constant for the hot channel of any other case. Notice that while the energy carried by the crossflow may be large, i.e., \( h^*(J-1)w_{HC,1}(J-1)Ax \), the contribution to the hot channel enthalpy rise is much smaller, i.e.,

\[
(h_{HC}(J-1) - h^*(J-1))w_{HC,1}(J-1)Ax.
\]
Also the mass flow rate has a strong direct effect on the hot channel enthalpy since it enters each term as a divisor. Consequently any error in this term will effect the enthalpy rise in the same proportion.

We can conclude then, that in order to match the results of our simplified method with the results that an actual subchannel analysis would yield, we have to obtain very close correspondence for the turbulent interchange terms and mass flow rates. Note that we can always match the linear power terms identically since these terms are input variables. For the crossflow terms, since their effect upon the enthalpy rise is very small, it is not necessary to achieve very close correspondence. However the crossflow alone enter the continuity equation thereby affecting the mass flow rate and hence the energy equation. This effect is important and will be treated subsequently. As will be indicated below, all the above considerations, when taken together, make it possible to obtain very good results for the MDNBR by use of the recommended simplified analysis procedure.

The following sections present the basis for the above recommendations for MDNBR calculation.

2.1 Identification of the Hot Subchannel

Examination of the W-3 correlation for a typical set of PWR core conditions has demonstrated that the onset of MDNBR is most sensitive to linear power generation rate. The other variables of channel enthalpy and flowrate are less important. This sensitivit
is demonstrated by Figures 1 and 2 based on results of a study described in Appendix G. These figures independently examine the effect of hot channel enthalpy and axial mass flowrate respectively on identification of the channel in which MDNBR occurs.

In both figures the MDNBR is calculated for a hot subchannel with an abnormally high power peaking factor of 2.266 and an adjacent subchannel with the next highest power peaking factor in the hot assembly of 2.060. Since these calculations were performed for the subchannels with adiabatic boundaries the input variations in inlet enthalpy can be interpreted and plotted in Figure 1 as enthalpy variations at the location of MDNBR. We next demonstrate on Figures 1 and 2 that for the real case of interacting channels, the MDNBR will still occur in the subchannel initially identified as the hot channel by virtue of its high power peaking factor. We do this by the following conservative procedure.

Consider first the reduction in hot subchannel enthalpy due to turbulent interchange and crossflow. This reduction is estimated to be about 16.2% + 2.8% of the adiabatic subchannel axial enthalpy rise to the location of MDNBR of 174 BTU/lbm or -33.0 BTU/lbm. On the other hand the adjacent channel enthalpy is increased by turbulent interchange and crossflow with the hot channel but decreased by turbulent interchange and crossflow with the three other adjacent channels which have smaller peaking factors. Again the net enthalpy change in the channel adjacent to the hot channel due to turbulent interchange and crossflow are calculated in Appendix G to be -21.22 BTU/lbm.
These values are plotted on Figure 1 to illustrate the margin for MDNBR shift from the high radial power factor subchannel. The margin is considerable.

Consider next the increase in hot subchannel enthalpy due to reduction in axial mass flowrate. This reduction for the hot channel and the adjacent subchannel are calculated in Appendix G to be 18.0% and 17.2%. The adjacent channel flowrate decreases less than the hot channel flowrate. Therefore the effect of mass flowrate reduction as illustrated on Figure 2 is to further increase the margin for MDNBR shift.

Based on the results of Figures 1 and 2 it can therefore be concluded that the hot subchannel can be identified by examination of a core map of channel radial power peaking factors when axial mass flowrates have been normalized. Should the channel power factors for a case of specific interest be significantly closer than in our example, the margin would be reduced and it might be prudent to perform an extra one pass calculation to confirm the validity of the identification made of the hot subchannel. If rod power peaking factors rather than channel peaking factors are available, exceptions to the above process are possible in subchannels composed of a zero power rod adjacent to a high power rod because of the cold wall effect. This case is discussed in Appendix G which recommends the procedure which should be used for hot subchannel identification in this case.

2.1a Base Case

In later sections we will determine the minimum number of and coarse mesh nodes necessary. With the hot channel identified next establish a base case using an excess number of nodes to which we can later compare our lesser node results. Cases with 54 nodes (Case 9) and 101 nodes (Case 5) were selected as the base cases.

Values of the mixing parameter $\beta$ should be dependent upon...
areas of the region represented by the radial nodes. Different values of $\beta$ should be utilized between nodes representing different sized regions. This was accomplished by introducing the transport coefficient, $N_H = N$, between channel boundaries to compare to the result obtained by using constant $\beta$. As shown in Table V, the improvement of MDNBR by the modification for the base case is negligible. Therefore, constant $\beta$ can be assumed for mixing between channels with different flow areas.

Based on a sensitivity study of the cross flow resistance coefficient $K$ to the MDNBRs of the base case (Case 5), it was demonstrated that the effect of the parameter $K$ on MDNBR is not significant. The results of the sensitivity are shown in Table VI. Note that unrealistic values of $K$ have been used to demonstrate the insensitivity of MDNBR to $K$.

The different results of MDNBR between a small nonuniform inlet flow case (Outer and Inner assemblies have 1.001 and .95 core average values respectively.) and the base case with its uniform inlet flow are shown in Table VII. Based on the small difference of MDNBR (1.1%), uniform inlet flow distribution has been assumed in the study.

2.2 Fine Mesh Size in the Region of the Hot Channel

In order to match the turbulent interchange term of the hot channel a fine mesh of actual subchannels has to be used around the hot one.

The necessary number of subchannels that have to be used in this fine mesh was established by a parameter study whose results are illustrated in Figure 3. This figure shows that 16 interior
mesh nodes are sufficient since results do not change compared to a 36 interior mesh array (Case No. 7 vs. Case No. 9, and Case No. vs. Case No. 15). However if we further reduce the mesh, for example to 4 nodes (Case No. 16 vs. Case No. 11) the results change significantly. This result indicates that while turbulent interchange effects on the hot channel boundaries and boundaries immediately adjacent to the hot channel (16 versus 4 nodes) are important, interchange across boundaries of the other channels in the region of the hot channel do not have a dramatic effect (36 versus 16 nodes). The conclusion of 16 internal nodes is based on placing one layer subchannels around the hot channel. Sixteen are required in the Connecticut Yankee case examined because of the existence of two hot subchannels. According to the same argument, 9 internal nodes are required if only one hot subchannel is presented.

Since there is no direct interchange between the hot subchannel and the core of the one layer channel which surrounds the hot ones, the fine mesh nodes can be decreased by eliminating those corner subchannels. By doing this, the requirements of sixteen and nine nodes can be decreased to twelve and four nodes respectively.

2.3 Coarse Mesh Size in Core Region Outside Fine Mesh

In order to match the mass flow rate of the hot channel, a coarse mesh or external mesh is needed outside of the fine mesh. The influence of this coarse mesh upon the MDNBR was studied from two different viewpoints. First the importance of the representation of the whole core versus the representation of only a part of the core was analyzed. The results are presented in Fig. 4, (Case No. 6 vs. Case No.
and Case No. 8 vs. Case No. 12). From these results it can be concluded that it is necessary to represent the whole core in order to have good results. The physical effect demonstrated by these pairs of cases is that radially directed crossflow is generated by the hot channel and its neighbors which normally is redistributed outward in the coarse region. The magnitude of the crossflow leaving the hot region is proportional to the pressure difference between this hot region and the rest of the core. When the whole core is not represented, the outer regions which are the coldest and the ones with lower pressure are eliminated. This implies that the pressure difference, which determines the amount of crossflows, is reduced and then less flow leaves the hot region radially. This leads to larger mass flow rate inside the hot channel which leads to smaller enthalpy rises and therefore to larger MDNBR's as indicated in Figure 4.

Once it is clear that the whole core needs to be represented, the next question is how this mesh outside of the hot region has to be established.

The question is answered in Figure 5 where Cases No. 5, 6, and 7 are represented. It can be observed that no change takes place in the MDNBR even when we go to very coarse external meshes (15 external nodes). This result was confirmed for the cases with \( N_H = N \) (Cases No. 1, 2 and 3) and for the situation where the hot channel is close to the boundary (Cases No. 19 and 20). The insensitivity of MDNBR to the coarse mesh size was investigated for Case 2 and 3. It is due, as shown in Fig. 6, to the fact that very similar total radial flow leaves the hot channel in the three cases and hence the axial mass flow in the hot channel is well determined.
independent of the layout of the coarse mesh. These results were confirmed for other cases.

Also the individual crossflows leaving each boundary of the hot channel were investigated. The values obtained for Cases No. 1, 2 and 3 are given in Figures 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. In all those cases, since the large number of external nodes, there are no large differences of channel area. It can be observed that the influence of the external mesh on these values is quite important but because the importance of the crossflow term upon the enthalpy rise is very small these changes do not effect the MDNBR results. The physical reason for having large differences in the individual crossflows while their sum is a constant value for the above case is the following. When we change the external mesh, the resistance to crossflow along specific directions is changed too, but the resistance of the core to the crossflow leaving the hot channel kept unchanged. Therefore we do not influence the total flow radially leaving the hot channel but we force it to leave in different directions. Fortunately the importance of the individual crossflow terms in the energy equation is very small and as long the total crossflow is similar we can use coarse external meshes (radial nodes) to predict MDNBR with a degree of exactness as good as with finer external meshes since the MDNBR quickly reaches an asymptotic value (Figures 3 and 5).

The reason why the lower bound of the number of external nodes is 5 is because of a computer limitation on permissible til pattern of whole core channel map for the 16 internal nodes case: the number of external nodes is less than 5, too many nodes will be adjacent to a common node. Under such conditions satisfacto
results can not be obtained from the COBRA IIIC/MIT. So the question comes to this: What is the physical result if the number of external nodes is less than 5, a situation which is possible if 9 internal nodes are utilized for a single hot channel case. To explore the effect of a decrease in the number of external nodes, a series of cases were run assuming an internal mesh of 4 nodes instead of 9. Four nodes were selected for economy in place of 9 in this study. In those 4 internal nodes cases, two external mesh nodes will be enough to give satisfactory results. If there is only one external node and it represents the balance of the core, it will never give a good result. Also, one should be very careful in laying out the external channel map as discussed later if only two external nodes are involved.

These conclusions were derived from analysis of the following four whole core cases.

The same internal channel map and radial power factors for the four cases, and the different external maps and radial power factors for the four cases are shown in Figure 11. The pattern of channel maps in Figure 11 are taken from Appendix D, but with different channel numbers. However, the assigned number of each case is consistent with the case number in Appendix D. The different results for the four cases can be seen in Table III. Comparing the MDNBR value from Table III with the values in Figure 3, it is clear that only case 3 gives a MDNBR value which is close to the asymptotic value in Figure 3. The MDNBR changes as the total cross flow out of the hot channel changes. As shown before, (Figure 6, 7, 8, 9, 10), for cases with a large number of exterior channels the different number of external nodes can only change the individual cross flow out of the hot channel but not the total cross flow out of the hot channel.
cross flow out of the hot channel in the single external node (even if it is for the whole core) is different from those total flows out of the hot channel in two of the two external nodes. Moreover, the total cross flow out of the hot channel is different even though the number of external nodes is the same but with different pattern of channel maps.

Referring to figure 11 the reason of the unsatisfactory results which come from the three cases (cases 35, 37, 38) can be seen: in case 35, since only one external node exists, there is no cross flow from channel 5 to channel 6. Therefore, the total cross flow out of the hot channel is small. In case 38, the two external channels are not concentric. The channel pattern has the same effect on the cross flow out of the hot channel as the single external node. In case 37, the area of the first layer of the external channels is equal to the area of one single subchannel layer which surrounds the internal meshes. Since the difference of the channel area between two external nodes is huge, the result is questionable. Note that layout of case 37 is like case 31 (Refers to Appendix D) except that case 31 the first layer of external nodes (2, 13, 12, 17) comprises an area closer to case 34 than 37. Because of the first layer area differences, case 34 gives a result which is close to the total values in figure 3.

The criteria for the layout of coarse mesh were based on facts presented in this section.

2.4 Use of Transport Coefficients

Because the interior region is represented on a subchannel basis, all transport coefficients are unity by definition.
our selection of the size of this region was made to insure that uncertainties in calculated enthalpies of exterior region nodes did not effect hot channel enthalpies. The results of Table II in which extremes of \( N_H \) were employed (Cases 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7) demonstrate that our selection accomplishes this goal and hence use of transport coefficients is not required for MDNBR prediction.

2.5 Accuracy of Results - This Method Compared to the Cascade Method

The uncertainties associated with the hot assembly boundaries in the cascade method were identified in Section 1.1. Since the simplified method inherently provides an improved method of dealing with these uncertainties, it should give at least as accurate results as the cascade method. Additionally in principle the cascade method should be increasingly poorer as the hot channel location moves to the assembly boundary and these uncertainties effect hot subchannel conditions. This presumption was investigate by a series of cases 21, 23 and 24 in which the hot subchannel was in the first row and the simplified analysis method was used but in a manner to progressively represent the cascade method. The base case, 21, provided an internal mesh about the hot channel which overlapped assembly boundaries as necessary. In Case 23, the cascade restriction on the subchannel or interior mesh that it lie within the hot assembly only was applied. Finally in Case 24 the additional restriction of no turbulent interchange along the hot assembly boundaries was added. The predicted MDNBR's for these cases are presented in Table IV. Overall the effect of the bound conditions (Case 21 vs. 24) is only 2%. In part this result occur because the successive changes introduced in Cases 23 and 24 effect the MDNBR in opposite directions. In another general case
it is possible that these effects would not oppose each other. It
would be interesting to examine the conditions of Case 21 with the
cascade method as suggested by the last entry in Table IV. However,
from the results available it appears that in practice the hot
assembly boundary conditions do not cause significant uncertain-
ity in the prediction of MDNBR. Conversely we can conclude that the
simplified method and the cascade method will yield very comparat-
ible results for the typical PWR core cases analyzed here.

3. Comparison with THINC-IV Results

To check the accuracy of the MDNBR results by the simplified
method, a Westinghouse PWR core has been analyzed by the one-
stage method. Since different numerical schemes and correlations
are used in the computer codes COBRA IIIC and THINC-IV, different
results may be expected. Perhaps coincidently, the differences
between results from the two different methods (chain method
using THINC-IV and one-stage method using COBRA IIIC) were not
significant as shown in Table VIII (Case 39, Case 40 see Appendix
WE can conclude that the simplified method and the chain method
will yield very comparable results for the typical PWR cases
analyzed here.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS METHOD FOR COUPLED THERMAL HYDRAULIC-NEUTRONIC ANALYSIS

The goal of this calculation is presumed to be the determination of the gross radial power distribution in the core. The thermal portion of this calculation is therefore aimed at yielding channel enthalpy and fuel temperature of homogenized regions. MDNBR's are not calculated in this first phase of the calculation but could be obtained using this gross distribution to yield a fine radial power distribution in an analysis of the type recommended in Chapter 3. Consequently for this first stage coupled analysis it is presumed that neutronics considerations will establish the desired mesh size, i.e. number of subchannels represented by each radial node.

The recommended analysis method is a one pass approach using COBRA IIIC/MIT applied in the following manner.

a) Identify the number of subchannels represented by each radial node. From Table I or Appendix E determine the percent error in homogenized region enthalpy for the assumed turbulent interchange coefficient \( \beta \) based on two dimensional analysis under the applicable case conditions, typically a power upset case. Errors in three dimensional analysis should differ only slightly from the two dimensional values. These errors can be reduced in varying degrees by the steps outlined below if their influence on the neutronics portion of the calculation warrants.
b) It is generally sufficient to apply only $N_H$ transport coefficients on the correction to the turbulent interchange and crossflow terms in the energy equation.

c) Determine the numerical values of $N_H(z)$ for a boundary between homogenized regions of the size identified in a) for a range of radial power distributions typical of core to be analyzed. The method of determining $N_H(z)$ is a multiregion COBRA IIIC/MIT analysis as detailed in Volume II. Since these multiregion analyses are time consuming it would be desirable to characterize the dependence of $N_H(z)$ on radial power distribution in a way to minimize the number of multiregion analyses required.

It should be emphasized that steps b) and c) should only be utilized if the increased accuracy in channel enthalpy determination is justified. Based on work to date in this area(6), known by the authors, no assessment of the range of error which warrants reduction is available.

3.1 Enthalpy Errors in 3D vs. 2D Analysis

In order to predict the relative importance of $N_H(z)$ in a 3D problem versus a 2D problem, the value of $N_H(z)$ for boundary A of Cases No. 25, 26, 27 and 28 in Volume III, was calculated. These cases represent a variety of 3D channel layouts of the channels around boundary A. These cases represent a sequence in which the 3D problem of interest (Case 28) is approached using 3D representations in progressive steps from the characteristic 2D problem (Case 25) which was extensively studied as described
in Chapter 2. The results of this sequence show that the proximity of the additional upper and lower strip of channels about the center 2D strip exerts an important effect (Case 28 vs. 27) and care should be exercised to make the dimensions of boundary A and the upper and lower channels comparable. The results are presented in Figure 12. From these results it can be concluded that for the particular cases analyzed the error found in a 3D problem will be larger than for the corresponding 2D problem. However it is not possible to say "a priori" whether or not this is the general trend, and it is expected that for some other power distributions the trend could change and the 2D errors may become the upper bound of the corresponding 3D problems instead of the lower one.

3.2 Application of Only the $N_H$ Transport Coefficient

This conclusion is drawn from a two dimensional study of the improvements in enthalpy prediction which result from progressive application of additional transport coefficients to the energy and momentum equations. Section 4.1.4, Volume II presents the results of this study for the typical power upset case and demonstrates the small gain achieved by applying more coefficients than solely $N_H$.

3.3 Numerical Value of $N_H(z)$ from 3D Multiregion Analysis

The 3D multiregion analysis presented in detail in Volume III utilizes the channel layout of Figure 13 with nodes representing an array of 3 x 3 subchannels. The $N_H(z)$ result is plotted in Figure 14 for illustration. Further this calculation yields the error in homogenized channel enthalpy which would be obtained without application of $N_H(z)$ as indicated in Figure 15.
This study has investigated only steady state conditions. Two types of PWR analysis are needed. One is a thermal analysis using a prescribed spatial energy generation rate to find the Minimum Departure from Nucleate Boiling Ratio (MDNBR). Another is a coupled thermal hydraulic-neutronic analysis. Since feedback calculations have not been performed, only analysis methods for MDNBR have been extensively investigated in this study. Based on MDNBR criteria, a so-called one-stage simplified method was developed. The optimum modeling technique for this one-stage method for PWR cores under steady state conditions can be categorized as follows:

a) Methods For Identifying Hot Subchannel:

The hot subchannel can be identified by examination of a core map of subchannel radial power peaking factor when axial power rates have been normalized. If the normalized rod radial power peaking factors are available, the procedure to identify the worst location will be: first, to identify the highest rod radial power peaking factor as the hottest rod; second, to check the existence of any cold rod (zero power rod) in the neighborhood of the hottest rod. If there is indeed a cold rod which exists in the neighborhood of the hottest rod, a two-channel COBRA IIIC/MIT analysis has to be performed in order to find the lower MDNBR of the hottest rod in the hot channel and the hottest rod in the cold channel considering the cold wall effect.

b) Fine Mesh Around Hot Subchannel

A fine mesh (each node represents a subchannel) of sufficient node to surround the hot subchannel with at least one ring of subchannels.
to be provided. For the Connecticut Yankee core example where two diagonally adjacent subchannels are equally hot, 16 nodes are required. For the case of one hot subchannel, 9 subchannels nodes are required to surround the hot subchannel.

c) Coarse Mesh Outside the Fine Mesh:

It is necessary to represent the radial extent of the whole core not a partial core by the coarse mesh. Specifically a partial, say 1/8. core segment can still be used as long as the full core radius is utilized.

Layout of at least two concentric layers of external channel about the internal nodes is required. Also the area of the first layer of the external channels should be at least larger than the area of the one subchannel layer which surrounds the internal meshes. For economic reasons, the minimum number of coarse mesh limited by COBRA IIIC/MIT can be considered as the number of coarse mesh nodes. For example, for 16 internal mesh nodes, 5 coarse mesh nodes are needed for 4 internal mesh nodes, even 1 coarse mesh node satisfies requirements of COBRA MIT/IIIC but from the above argument, 2 coarse mesh nodes are required.

d) Application of Transport Coefficients

If no coupling coefficients are applied, an error will result in the predicted exit enthalpy of the homogenized representation. For DNBR analyses by the chain method this error is probably tolerable since the absolute value of the errors is modest and the effect of hot channel compared to linear power on the DNBR is minimal. Also analysis by the simplified one-stage method eliminates the error by virtue of the proposed nodal layout. Therefore the utilizati
of transport coefficients is not necessary. However increasing interest is developing on methods for coupled neutronic-thermal hydraulic analysis. Here more accurate prediction of channel enthalpy is desired although coupled calculations have not been performed to date to assess either the degree of accuracy required or whether it can be achieved solely by proper sizing of the homogenized regions. Consequently derivation and prediction of transport coefficients is of potential application in the future development of these coupled analysis methods.

e) Limits of Applicability of the Simplified Method

The key core parameters which relate to the applicability of the method are the radial power peaking distribution and the inlet flow distribution. Significant changes in the power distribution from that assumed here may make the identification of the hot subchannel difficult. However, uncertainties in this area can be handled by performing an extra single pass calculation centered on the alternate suspected hot channel location.

Significant changes in the inlet flow distribution from that assumed (outer and inner assemblies have 1.001 and 0.95 core average values respectively) may lead to changes in the predicted MDNBR from the base case. While it is possible that the simplified method may correctly follow the change in MDNBR, a study of the limits of usefulness of the simplified method regarding inlet flow distribution has not been accomplished. Therefore the care should be taken in applying the simplified method for analysis of more severe flow upset situations than that considered here.
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Hot Subchannel: numbered 1*
Fine Mesh: numbered 2 through 9
Coarse Mesh: numbered 10 through 11

Figure 1.a  EXAMPLE OF LAYOUT OF CHANNELS USED IN SIMPLIFIED METHOD FOR ONE HOT SUBCHANNEL IN 1/8 PWR CORE
Hot Subchannel: numbered 1* and 2*
Fine Mesh: numbered 3 through 16
Coarse Mesh: numbered 17 through 21

Figure 2.a
EXAMPLE OF LAYOUT OF CHANNELS USED IN SIMPLIFIED METHOD FOR TWO EQUALLY HOT SUBCHANNELS IN 1/8 PWR CORE
Figure 1. The variation of MDRP as a function of enthalpy difference from base case for different radial.
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Figure 3: Effect of the Internal and External Size on MDNBR
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Figure 4: Effect of the representation of the whole core versus partial core on MDNR
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Figure 3: Effect of the Number of Coarse Mesh Nodes on MDNBR
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Figure 6: Comparison Between the Total Crossflow Leaving the Hot Subchannel in the Three Cases.

TOTAL CROSSFLOW PER AXIAL STEP, \( \Sigma \omega \Delta x \times 10^3 \), sec.
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The hot subchannel in the three cases is shown. Figure 7 compares the flows crossing the upper boundary of the hot channel. The graph shows the axial position in inches for three cases: Case No. 3, 16, and 16 (fine mesh nodes). The y-axis represents the axial step in "W (49, 57) lbm/sec ft."
CROSS FLOW BETWEEN CHANNELS 56 AND 57 PER AXIAL STEP, \( W(56,57) \) \( \text{lbm/sec-ft} \)

Figure 8: \( N_h = N \) Case. Comparison Between Flows Crossing the Left Boundary of the Hot Subchannels in the Three Cases
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Figure 9
N = 1 N Case. Comparison Between Flows Crossing the Right Boundary of the Hot Subchannel in the Three Cases.
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Figure 10: N = t case. Comparison between flows crossing the lower boundary of the hot subchannel in the three cases.
In whole core analyses

Figure 11. Different patterns of channels with small numbers of external node
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MULTICHANNEL REPRESENTATION

Properties and dimensions of the channels are those of Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOMOGENIZED REGIONS REPRESENTATION

\( (x) = \) Radial Power Factor in the Region = X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (.8)</th>
<th>2 (1.5)</th>
<th>3 (1.7)</th>
<th>4 (2.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (.9)</td>
<td>6 (1.3)</td>
<td>7 (1.5)</td>
<td>8 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (.6)</td>
<td>10 (1.0)</td>
<td>11 (1.2)</td>
<td>12 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Channel Layout for the 3D Multiregion Analysis

Figure 13
Figure 14: $N_H(Z)$ for the 3D problem of Figure 13.
\( (x) = \frac{y-z}{z-h_{\text{inlet}}} \)

\( y \equiv \text{Exit enthalpy of the region found with the homogeneous region analysis} \)

\( (z) \equiv \text{Average exit enthalpy of the region found the the multichannel analysis} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(4.5%)</th>
<th>(-1.73%)</th>
<th>(-2.36%)</th>
<th>(-2.91%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>635.40</td>
<td>673.18</td>
<td>696.76</td>
<td>716.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(636.66)</td>
<td>(675.38)</td>
<td>(700.35)</td>
<td>(721.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2.96%)</th>
<th>(-.53%)</th>
<th>(-2.56%)</th>
<th>(-1.44%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>633.59</td>
<td>660.91</td>
<td>681.59</td>
<td>697.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(631.15)</td>
<td>(661.51)</td>
<td>(685.08)</td>
<td>(699.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(7.50%)</th>
<th>(2.36%)</th>
<th>(1.14%)</th>
<th>(.48%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>617.86</td>
<td>643.00</td>
<td>662.74</td>
<td>677.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(613.04)</td>
<td>(640.83)</td>
<td>(661.45)</td>
<td>(676.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERRORS FOUND WITHOUT USING TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS

Figure 15.
TABLE I
EXPECTED ERRORS IN 2D HOMOGENIZED REGION ENTHALPY FOR POWER UPSET CASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.83</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-7.56</td>
<td>-5.31</td>
<td>-4.63</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>-9.34</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-6.12</td>
<td>-4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table is built by using

\[
\text{ERROR}\% = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{N_H}}{\frac{\overline{PRNAs}}{(Pr-1)LBS} - \frac{1}{N_H}}
\]

Equation E.20 Negative value of ERROR % means that the exit enthalpy of two-channel case is less than multi-channel case.

where \[ L = 12' \]
\[ A_s = 0.00519 \text{ ft}^2 \]
\[ Pr = 1.5 \]
\[ S' = 0.22'' \]

\[ N_H = 1 + \ln\left(1 + \left[353\left(\frac{N-2}{N}\right)^{3.58}0.015+8\right]^{1/3} + 5\% \right) \]

Equation 5.1.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Total Channels</th>
<th>Internal Mesh</th>
<th>External Mesh</th>
<th>$N_H = 1$</th>
<th>$N_H = N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MDNBR FOR THE DIFFERENT CASES ANALYZED

TABLE II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Enthalpy in Channel 1 Btu/lb</th>
<th>Flow rate in Channel 1 lb/sec</th>
<th>Total cross flow out of Channel 1 lb/sec</th>
<th>Mass density decrease rate of Channel 5 by cross flow to Channel 6 lb/in³·sec</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>686.45</td>
<td>0.5889</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>649.71</td>
<td>0.6622</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>inapplicable</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>670.86</td>
<td>0.6174</td>
<td>0.1118</td>
<td>9.172</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>649.03</td>
<td>0.6632</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>1.356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III Effect of Different Patterns of Channels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Internal Mesh</th>
<th>External Mesh</th>
<th>Features of Case</th>
<th>Turbulent Interchange Along Hot Assembly Boundary</th>
<th>MDNBR for $N_H = 1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hot Rod Centered Overlap Boundaries</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hot Rod Non Centered Non Overlap Boundary</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hot Rod Non Centered Non Overlap Boundary</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Equivalent to 16</td>
<td>Equivalent to 16</td>
<td>Per Standard Cascade Approach</td>
<td>Not Included</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nodes in 2nd Stage

** Nodes in 1st Stage

EFFECT OF HOT CHANNEL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS ON MDNBR

TABLE IV.
### TABLE V Sensitivity of MDNBR to $\beta$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>MIXING</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>Constant $\beta$</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 coarse mesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fine mesh</td>
<td>Variable $\beta$</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(case 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VI Demonstration of the Insensitivity of MDNBR to $K$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>$K$</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 coarse mesh</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fine mesh</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(case 5)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE INLET FLOW MDNBR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>INLET FLOW</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Case</td>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 coarse mesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fine Outer Assemblies (case 5)</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fine Inner Assemblies</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core avg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE VII** Effect of Inlet Flow Distribution on MDNBR

**COMPARISON WITH THINC-IV RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS</th>
<th>NO. OF FINE MESH NODES</th>
<th>NO. OF COARSE MESH NODES</th>
<th>COMPUTER CODE</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Stage Simplified Method</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>COBRA IIIC/MIT</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Stage Intermediate Method</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>COBRA IIIC/MIT</td>
<td>2.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-Stage Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>THINC-IV</td>
<td>1.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE VIII**
APPENDIX A

DERIVATIONS OF THE COUPLING COEFFICIENTS

In this appendix, the coupling coefficients, \( N_H, N_U, N_{TP}, N_{TF} \) and \( N_{TU} \) are derived in (A.1), (A.2) and (A.3). The multi-subchannel layout and homogenized representation layout can be seen in Figures A.2 and A.3 respectively. For \( N \) odd, subchannels C and D can be regarded as half channels. For \( N \) even, subchannels C and D can be regarded as full channels. The derivations presented here for these coupling coefficients are valid for \( N \) either even or odd.

A.1 Derivation of \( N_H \)

The steady state energy equation for adjacent sub-channels \( i \) and \( j \) following (7, equation A-6) can be written as:

\[
\frac{\partial \rho_{1} h_i}{\partial x} = q_{1} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} (t_{i,j} - t_{j}) c_{i,j} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} (h_{i,j} - h_{j}) w_{i,j} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{i,j} h^* \quad (A.1.1)
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
{w_{i,j}}^* & = {w_{i,j}} h_{i} & \text{if } {w_{i,j}} > 0 \\
{w_{i,j}}^* & = {w_{i,j}} h_{j} & \text{if } {w_{i,j}} < 0
\end{align*}
\quad (A.1.2)
\]

Note that \( w_{i,j} > 0 \) means the direction of diversion cross-flow is from channel \( i \) to channel \( j \), and \( w_{i,j} < 0 \) means
the direction of diversion crossflow is from channel $j$ to channel $i$.

We consider a multi-subchannel layout shown in Figure A.2 and write the energy equation for each subchannel.
\[ \frac{\partial m_A h_A}{\partial x} = q'_A - (t_{A-B})c_{A,B} - (h_{A-B})w'_{A,B} - w_{A,B}^* \]  
(A.1.3a)

\[ \frac{\partial m_B h_B}{\partial x} = q'_B - (t_{B-C})c_{B,A} - (t_{B-D})c_{B,A} - (h_{B-C})w'_{B,C} - (h_{B-A})w'_{B,A} - w_{B,A}^* \]  
(A.1.3b)

\[ \frac{\partial m_C h_C}{\partial x} = q'_C - (t_{C-D})c_{C,D} - (t_{C-B})c_{C,B} - (h_{C-D})w'_{C,D} - (h_{C-B})w'_{C,B} - w_{C,D}^* - w_{C,B}^* \]  
(A.1.3c)

\[ \frac{\partial m_D h_D}{\partial x} = q'_D - (t_{D-E})c_{D,E} - (t_{D-C})c_{D,C} - (h_{D-E})w'_{D,E} - (h_{D-C})w'_{D,C} - w_{D,E}^* - w_{D,C}^* \]  
(A.1.3d)

\[ \frac{\partial m_E h_E}{\partial x} = q'_E - (t_{E-F})c_{E,F} - (t_{E-D})c_{E,D} - (h_{E-F})w'_{E,F} - (h_{E-D})w'_{E,D} - w_{E,F}^* - w_{E,D}^* \]  
(A.1.3e)

\[ \frac{\partial m_F h_F}{\partial x} = q'_F - (t_{F-E})c_{F,E} - (h_{F-E})w'_{F,E} - w_{F,E}^* \]  
(A.1.3f)

Some relationships exist for each pair of channels between the energy carried by diversion flows, conductivity factors \( c_{i,j} \), and energy carried by turbulent interchanges.

For example for the channel pair A,B, the following relationships hold:
\[ c_{A,B} = c_{B,A} \] (A.1.4a)

\[ w_{A,B} = w_{B,A} \] (A.1.4b)

\[ w_{A,B} = -w_{B,A} \] (A.1.4c)

\[
\begin{cases}
  w_{A,B}^* = w_{A,B}^h_A & \text{if } w_{A,B} > 0 \text{ (i.e. } w_{B,A} < 0) \\
  w_{B,A}^* = w_{B,A}^h_A
\end{cases}
\] (A.1.4d)

\[
\begin{cases}
  w_{A,B}^* = w_{A,B}^h_B & \text{if } w_{A,B} < 0 \text{ (i.e. } w_{B,A} > 0) \\
  w_{B,A}^* = w_{B,A}^h_B
\end{cases}
\] (A.1.4e)

Therefore, a simple relationship between \( w_{A,B}^* \) and \( w_{B,A}^* \) can be derived from equations (A.1.4c), (A.1.4d) and (A.1.4e).

\[ w_{A,B}^* = -w_{B,A}^* \text{ for } w_{A,B} < 0 \] (A.1.5)

We define the region composed of subchannels A, B, and C as region L, and similarly, D, E, and F as region R. Now adding the energy equations for region L and region R and utilizing the relations of equations (A.1.4a, A.1.4b) and (A.1.5) we obtain the following two energy equations:
On the other hand, we can express the energy equation for the homogenized regions of Figure A.3 in (Volume II) directly as

\[
\frac{\partial H_{LM}}{\partial x} = Q_L' - \left( \frac{T_L - T_L''}{N_H} \right) C_{L,R} - \left( \frac{H_L - H_R}{N_H} \right) W_{L,R} - \frac{H}{N_H} W_{L,R} \quad (A.1.7a)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial H_{MR}}{\partial x} = Q_R' - \left( \frac{T_R - T_R''}{N_H} \right) C_{R,L} - \left( \frac{H_R - H_L}{N_H} \right) W_{R,L} - \frac{H}{N_H} W_{R,L} \quad (A.1.7b)
\]

If we assume

\[
\Sigma \frac{\partial h_{i,m}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial H_{LM}}{\partial x} \quad (A.1.8a)
\]

\[
\Sigma \frac{\partial h_{i,m}}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial H_{MR}}{\partial x} \quad (A.1.8b)
\]

\[
Q_L' = \Sigma q_i' \quad (A.1.8c)
\]
\[ Q'_R \equiv F \sum_{i=D} q'_i \]  
(A.1.8d)

and

\[ W'_{L,R} = w_{C,D} \]  
(A.1.8e)

\[ W_{L,R} = w_{C,D} \]  
(A.1.8f)

then \( N_H, N'_H, \) and \( N''_H \) can be defined as follows:

\[ N''_H \equiv \frac{\theta_L - \theta_R}{t_C - t_D} \]  
(A.1.9a)

\[ N_H \equiv \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_C - h_D} \]  
(A.1.9b)

\[ N'_H \equiv \frac{H^*_L}{h} \] where \( \frac{H^*_L}{h} = \frac{H_L}{h_C} \) if \( W_{L,R} > 0 \)  
(A.1.9c)

\[ \frac{H^*_R}{h} = \frac{H_R}{h_D} \] if \( W_{R,L} < 0 \)

If we assume the specific heat at each elevation is constant, then

\[ N''_H = N_H \]  
(A.1.10)
Also the subchannel enthalpy $h^*$ can be expressed as a function of $N_H$ in the following manner by virtue of the definitions of $H_L$, $H_R$ and $N_H$ (eqn. A.1.9b) and the assumption of a symmetric enthalpy profile with respect to the central boundary (see Appendix B Volume II for derivation of following relations).

$$\frac{h_C + h_D}{2} = \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} \quad (A.1.11)$$

$$h^* = \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + \frac{H_L - \frac{H_L + H_R}{2}}{N_H} \quad \text{if } w_{C,D} > 0 \quad (2.3.1)$$

and

$$h^* = \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - \frac{H_R - \frac{H_L + H_R}{2}}{N_H} \quad \text{if } w_{C,D} < 0 \quad (2.3.1a)$$

Therefore, we can obtain $N_H'$ in terms of $N_H$ and other known quantities.

$$N_H' = \frac{H^*}{h^*} = \frac{H_L}{H_L + H_R + \frac{H_L + H_R}{2}} \quad \text{if } w_{C,D} > 0 \quad (A.1.12a)$$

and

$$N_H' = \frac{H^*}{h^*} = \frac{H_R}{H_L + H_R - \frac{H_L + H_R}{2}} \quad \text{if } w_{C,D} < 0 \quad (A.1.12b)$$
From the above derivation we have determined the coupling coefficients required in the energy equations (A.1.7a) and (A.1.7b). By virtue of equations (A.1.10) and (A.1.12a and b) these coefficients are all expressable in terms of the single coefficient \( N_H \).

A.2 Derivation of \( N_U \)

The steady state axial momentum equation for channel \( i \) and adjacent channels \( j \) following (7, equation A-11) can be written as:

\[
-F_i - g_A \rho_i \cos \theta - A_i \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x} - \frac{3}{2} A_i u_i + (u_i - u_j) w_{i,j} + u^*_{w_i,j}
\]

(A.2.1)

where

\[
F = \text{friction factor} = \left[ \frac{Avf\phi}{2D} + \frac{akv}{2\Delta x} \right] \left[ \frac{m}{A} \right]^2
\]

where the parameters in the definition are per Cobra, BNWL-

\[
\begin{align*}
  u^*_{w_i,j} &= u_i w_{i,j} \quad \text{if} \ w_{i,j} > 0 \\
  u^*_{w_i,j} &= u_j w_{i,j} \quad \text{if} \ w_{i,j} < 0
\end{align*}
\]

Consider a multi-subchannel layout shown in Figure A2 and write the axial momentum equation for each channel. In the steady state condition, obtain:
\[
A_A \frac{\partial p_A}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_A u_A) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_A - w_{A,B}^r (u_A - u_B) + u w_{A,B} \\
A_B \frac{\partial p_B}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_B u_B) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_B - w_{B,C}^r (u_B - u_C) - w_{B,A}^r (u_B - u_A) + u w_{B,C}^r + u w_{B,A}^r \\
A_C \frac{\partial p_C}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_C u_C) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_C - w_{C,D}^r (u_C - u_D) - w_{C,B}^r (u_C - u_B) + u w_{C,D}^r + u w_{C,B}^r \\
A_D \frac{\partial p_D}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_D u_D) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_D - w_{D,E}^r (u_D - u_E) - w_{D,C}^r (u_D - u_C) + u w_{D,E}^r + u w_{D,C}^r \\
A_E \frac{\partial p_E}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_E u_E) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_E - w_{E,F}^r (u_E - u_F) - w_{E,D}^r (u_E - u_D) + u w_{E,F}^r + u w_{E,D}^r \\
A_F \frac{\partial p_F}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (m_F u_F) - (F + pgA\cos \theta)_F - w_{F,E}^r (u_F - u_E) + u w_{F,E}^r \\
\]

where \( w_{i,j}^r = w_{j,i}^r \) 
\( w_{i,j} = -w_{j,i} \)
\( u^* w_{i,j} = u_1 w_{i,j} \) if \( w_{i,j} > 0 \)
\( = u_j w_{i,j} \) if \( w_{i,j} < 0 \)

(A.1.2a)  
(A.2.2b)  
(A.2.2c)  
(A.2.2d)  
(A.2.2e)  
(A.2.2f)  
(A.2.3a)  
(A.2.3b)  
(A.2.3c)  
(A.2.3d)
We define the region composed of three channels A, B, and C as region L, and similarly channels D, E, and F as region R. Now, adding all the axial momentum equations for region L and R, we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} &= \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma \frac{\partial A_i p_1}{\partial x} &= \Sigma (m_1 u_1) - \Sigma [(F+gAcos \theta)_i] - w'_{C,D} (u_C-u_D) - u_w_{C,D} (A.2.4a) \\
\Sigma \frac{\partial A_i p_1}{\partial x} &= \Sigma (m_1 u_1) - \Sigma [(F+gAcos \theta)_i] - w'_{D,C} (u_D-u_C) - u_w_{D,C} (A.2.4b)
\end{align*}
\]

We now write the two axial momentum equations for regions L and R in the two channel representation obtained:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial A_L p_L}{\partial x} &= M_L U_L - [(F+gAcos \theta)_L] - w'_{L,R} \left( \frac{U_L-U_R}{N_U} \right) - \frac{U^* W_{L,R}}{N_U} (A.2.5a) \\
\frac{\partial A_R p_R}{\partial x} &= M_R U_R - [(F+gAcos \theta)_R] - w'_{R,L} \left( \frac{U_R-U_L}{N_U} \right) - \frac{U^* W_{R,L}}{N_U} (A.2.5b)
\end{align*}
\]
The $N_U$ and $N'_U$ can be defined as follows:

$$N_U = \frac{U_L - U_R}{u_C - u_D} \quad (A.2.7a)$$

$$N'_U = \frac{U^*_L}{u} \quad (A.2.7b)$$

where

$$N_U = \frac{U_L}{u_C} \quad \text{if} \quad w_{C,D} > 0 \quad (A.2.8a)$$

$$N_U = \frac{U_R}{u_D} \quad \text{if} \quad w_{C,D} < 0 \quad (A.2.8b)$$

The subchannel velocity $u^*$ can be expressed as a function of $N_U$ in the following manner by virtue of the previous specified definition of $N_U$ (equation A.2.7a) and the assumption of a symmetric axial velocity profile with respect to the central boundary

$$\frac{u_C + u_D}{2} = \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} \quad (A.2.9)$$

$$u^* = \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} + \frac{U_L - U_R}{2} \frac{1}{N_U} \quad \text{if} \quad w_{L,R} > 0 \quad (2.3.2) (Vol. I)$$

$$u^* = \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} + \frac{U_R - U_L}{2} \frac{1}{N_U} \quad \text{if} \quad w_{L,R} < 0 \quad (2.3.2a) (Vol. I)$$
Therefore we get:

\[ N_u' = \frac{U_L (U_L + U_R)}{2} + \frac{U_L - U_R}{2 NU} \quad \text{if } w_{L,R} > 0 \quad (A.2.10a) \]

\[ N_u' = \frac{U_R (U_L + U_R)}{2} + \frac{U_R - U_L}{2 NU} \quad \text{if } w_{L,R} < 0 \quad (A.2.10b) \]

From the above derivation we have determined the coupling coefficients required in the axial momentum equations (A.1.7a) and (A.1.7b). By virtue of equations (A.2.7b) and (A.2.10a and b), these coupling coefficients are all expressible in terms of the single coefficient \( N_u \).

A.3 Derivation of \( N_{TP} \), \( N_{TU} \) and \( N_{TP} \)

The steady state transverse momentum equation, for adjacent channels \( i \) and \( j \) following (7, equation A-17) can be written as:

\[ \frac{\partial (\bar{u}w_{i,j})}{\partial x} = \frac{s}{k} (p_i - p_j) - c_i \quad (A.3.1) \]
where

\[
\bar{u}w_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2} (u_i + u_j) w_{i,j} \quad (A.3.2a)
\]

\[
c_i = \frac{s}{k} \left( \frac{|w_{i,j}|}{2s^2 \rho_{i,j}^*} \right) w_{i,j} \quad (A.3.2b)
\]

\[
\rho_{i,j}^* = \rho_i \quad \text{if} \quad w_{i,j} > 0 \quad (A.3.2c)
\]

\[
\rho_j \quad \text{if} \quad w_{i,j} < 0 \quad (A.3.2d)
\]

where subscripts \( i \) and \( j \) denote adjacent channels.

Consider the multichannel layout shown in Figure A.2 and write the transverse momentum equations associated with each boundary we obtain:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial (\bar{u}w_{A,B})}{\partial x} &= \frac{s}{L} (p_A - p_B) - c_A \quad (A.3.3a) \\
\frac{\partial (\bar{u}w_{B,C})}{\partial x} &= \frac{s}{L} (p_B - p_C) - c_B \quad (A.3.3b) \\
\frac{\partial (\bar{u}w_{C,D})}{\partial x} &= \frac{s}{L} (p_C - p_D) - c_C \quad (A.3.3c)
\end{align*}
\]
We can derive a combined transverse momentum for all these channels.

\[
\sum_{i=A}^{E} \frac{\partial \bar{u}_{1,i}^{1+1}}{\partial x} = \frac{s}{\lambda} (P_A - P_E) - \sum_{i=A}^{E} c_i
\]  

(A.3.4)

If we consider these N channels as two channels, i.e., we combine channel A, B, and C as channel L and channel D, E and F as channel R, we can write the two channel transverse momentum equations as follows:

\[
\frac{\partial (\bar{U}W_{L,R})_{\text{NTU}}}{\partial x} = \frac{s}{\lambda} \left( \frac{P_L - P_R}{\text{NTP}} \right) - \frac{C}{\text{NTF}}
\]  

(A.3.5)

where \( \bar{U} = \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} \)  

(A.3.6)

and \( \text{NTU}, \text{NTP}, \text{NTF} \) are coupling coefficients introduced to match equation (A.3.4) with equation (A.3.5).
Therefore $N_{TU}$, $N_{TP}$ and $N_{TF}$ can be defined as follows:

$$N_{TU} \equiv \frac{\partial (\bar{u} w_{L,R})}{\partial x}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3.7a)

$$N_{TP} \equiv \frac{P_L - P_R}{P_A - P_F}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3.7b)

$$N_{TF} = \frac{C}{E} = \frac{w_{L,R}}{\rho_{L,R}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3.7c)

From the above derivation we have determined the coupling coefficients required in the transverse momentum equation (A.3.5).
APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF COUPLING COEFFICIENTS IN COBRA IIIC

Introduction

The general coupling coefficients $N_H$, $N'_H$, $N''_H$, $N_U$, $N'_U$, $N_{TP}$, $N_{TP}$ and $N_{TU}$ are derived from the differential conservation equations in Appendix A. However, it is questionable whether these derivations are applicable to the difference conservation equations which are always employed in the code computation.

The purpose of this appendix is first to show the difference between $H_L$ and $\overline{H}_L$ resulting from introduction of the coefficients $N_H$, $N'_H$ and $N''_H$ from Appendix A into the COBRA IIIC computation, and second, to investigate a general way to derive the coupling coefficients from the difference conservation equations.

B.1 Error Between $H_L$ and $\overline{H}_L$ Employing $N_H$, $N'_H$ and $N''_H$

in the Homogenized Computation

If the equations used in COBRA IIIC were those described in Appendix A, both values ($\overline{H}_L$ and $H_L$) should be identical in cases where either the diversion crossflow is negligible or is the same for the boundary that separates the left and right hand sides. But from the results presented in the study (Section 3.1.2 Volume II) we can observe the existence of slight differences between these values.
These differences, as will be shown below, are due to the fact that the difference equations used in COBRA IIIC are not exactly those of Appendix A.

Let us take the following example:

In the COBRA IIIC formulation, the energy equations for each channel are written as:

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_A(J) &= h_A(J-1) + \frac{q_A(J-1)}{m_A(J-1)} \cdot \Delta x - \frac{(t_A(J-1)-t_B(J-1))C_{A,B} \cdot \Delta x}{m_A(J-1)} \\
    &= \frac{(h_A(J-1)-h_B(J-1))w_{A,B}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_A(J-1)} \\
    &- \frac{(h_A(J-1)-h_B(J-1))w_{A,B}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_A(J-1)} \\
    &= (h_A(J-1)-h_B(J-1))w_{A,B}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x \quad \text{(B.1.1)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_B(J) &= h_B(J-1) + \frac{q_B(J-1)}{m_B(J-1)} \cdot \Delta x - \frac{(t_B(J-1)-t_C(J-1))C_{B,C} \cdot \Delta x}{m_B(J-1)} \\
    &= \frac{(t_B(J-1)-t_A(J-1))C_{A,B} \cdot \Delta x}{m_B(J-1)} \\
    &- \frac{(t_B(J-1)-t_A(J-1))C_{A,B} \cdot \Delta x}{m_B(J-1)}
\end{align*}
\]
The multi-subchannel averaged enthalpy for the left hand side strip can be calculated from the following equation:

\[ \overline{h}_L(J) = \frac{h_A(J)m_A(J) + h_B(J)m_B(J)}{m_A(J) + m_B(J)} \]  

(B.1.1)

Inserting equations (B.1.1) and (B.1.2) into equation (B.1.3) with the assumption \( C_{i,j} = 0 \), we obtain

\[ \overline{h}_L(J) = \frac{h_A(J-1)m_A(J) + h_B(J-1)m_B(J)}{m_A(J) + m_B(J)} + \left( \frac{q_A^{(J-\frac{1}{2})} m_A(J)}{m_A(J-1)} + \frac{q_B^{(J-\frac{1}{2})} m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)} \right) \Delta x \]  

(B.1.3)
In the COBRA IIIC formulation, the energy equation for the homogenized strip $L$ incorporating the coupling coefficients can be written as follows:

$$\Delta x \left[ \frac{h_B(J-1)-h_B(J)}{m_A(J-1)} w_{A,B}(J-1) m_A(J) + \frac{(h_B(J-1)-h_A(J-1) w_{B,A} m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)} \right] m_A(J) + m_B(J)$$

$$\Delta x \left[ \frac{(h_B(J-1)-h_C(J-1) w_{B,C}(J-1) m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)} \right] m_A(J) + m_B(J)$$

$$\Delta x \left[ \frac{(h_B(J-1)-h_B(J-1) w_{B,C} m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)} \right] m_A(J) + m_B(J)$$

(B.1.4)

where $N_H(J-1)$ and $N_H'(J-1)$ are the coupling coefficients for the turbulent and crossflow interchange, and are defined following equations (A.1.9a), (A.1.9b) and (A.1.9c) as:
\[ N_H(J-1) = \frac{H_L(J-1) - H_R(J-1)}{h_B(J-1) - h_C(J-1)} \]  
(B.1.6)

\[ N_H = \frac{H^*(J-1)}{h^*(J-1)} \]

where

\[ H^* = \begin{cases} 
\frac{H_L(J-1)}{h_B(J-1)} & \text{if } W_{L,R} > 0 \\
\frac{H_R(J-1)}{h_D(J-1)} & \text{if } W_{R,L} < 0
\end{cases} \]

(B.1.6)

and \( H_L(J-1) \) is defined as

\[ H_L(J-1) = \frac{h_A(J-1)m_A(J-1) - h_B(J-1)m_B(J-1)}{m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)} \]  
(B.1.6)

Inserting equations (B.1.6a), (B.1.6b) and (B.1.6c) into (B.1.5) we obtain

\[ H_L(J) = H_L(J-1) + \frac{Q_L(J-1)}{[m_A(J-1) - m_B(J-1)]} \Delta x - \frac{(h_B(J-1) - h_C(J-1))W_{L,R}(J-1)\Delta x}{[m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)]} \\
- \frac{(H_L(J-1) - h^*(J-1))W_{L,R}(J-1)\Delta x}{[m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)]} \]  
(B.1.7)

Therefore, forming the desired difference from equations (B.1.4) and (B.1.7), we obtain
From the above formulation, we find that the error between \( \overline{H}_L(J) \) and \( H_L(J) \) is composed of four terms, i.e., the four terms in parentheses in equation (B.1.8). Now, we examine equation (B.1.8) term by term to highlight the
factors causing the error between $H_L$ and $H_L(J)$.

**B.1.1 Error on the Averaged Enthalpy at (J-1)**

From the first term of equation (B.1.8), the error due to the averaged enthalpy at (J-1) can be rewritten as:

$$\text{ERROR1}(J) = \frac{h_A(J-1)m_A(J) + h_B(J-1)m_B(J)}{m_A(J) + m_B(J)} - \frac{h_A(J-1)m_A(J-1) + h_B(J-1)m_B(J-1)}{m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)}$$

(B.1.1.1)

From equation (B.1.1.1) we observe that ERROR1(J) increases as the diversion crossflow and subchannel enthalpy increase.

**B.1.2 Error on the Heat Added from Rods**

The second term of equation (B.1.8) is

$$\text{ERROR2}(J) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\left[ q_A(J-\frac{1}{2}) \frac{m_A(J)}{m_A(J-1)} + q_B(J-\frac{1}{2}) \frac{m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)} \right]}{m_A(J) + m_B(J)} - \frac{Q_L(J-\frac{1}{2})}{m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)} \end{array} \right\}$$

(B.1.2.1)

Now

$$Q_L(J-\frac{1}{2}) = q_A(J-\frac{1}{2}) + q_B(J-\frac{1}{2})$$

(B.1.2.2)

Inserting equation (B.1.2.2) into (B.1.2.1) we obtain
\[ \text{ERROR2}(J) = \left\{ \frac{\bar{m}_A(J) + \bar{m}_B(J)}{m_A(J) + m_B(J)} \right\} \]

\[ \frac{q_A^{(J-k)} + q_B^{(J-k)}}{m_A(J-1) + m_B(J-1)} \}

\Delta x \quad \text{(B.1.2.3)}

From the above equation, we observe ERROR2 increases as diversion crossflow increases and the rod linear power generation rate increases. For low power generation, this term is much smaller than the other terms.

B.1.3 Error on the Energy Carried by the Turbulent Interchange

From equation (B.1.8), the error on the energy transported by the turbulent interchange between \( \overline{H}_L(J) \) and \( H_L(J) \) can be written as:

\[ \text{ERROR3}(J) = \frac{(h_A(J-1)-h_B(J-1))w_{A,B}^{(J-1)}m_A(J) \Delta x}{[m_A(J) + m_B(J)]m_A(J-1)} \]

\[ + \frac{(h_B(J-1)-h_A(J-1))w_{B,A}^{(J-1)}m_B(J) \Delta x}{[m_A(J) + m_B(J)]m_B(J-1)} \]

\[ + \frac{(h_B(J-1)-h_C(J-1))w_{B,C}^{(J-1)}m_B(J) \Delta x}{[m_A(J) + m_B(J)]m_B(J-1)} \]
From the above equation, we observe ERROR3 increases as the diversion crossflow and the difference between \(W_{LR}(J-1)\) and \(w_{B,C}(J-1)\) increases. Usually, the difference between \(W_{LR}\) and \(w_{B,C}\) is small and does not contribute too much to the ERROR3.

### B.1.4 Error on the Energy Carried by the Diversion Crossflow

From equation (B.1.8), the error on the energy transported by the diversion crossflow between \(H_L(J)\) and \(H_L(J)\) can be written as

\[
\text{ERROR4}(J) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{[h_A(J-1)-h^*(J-1)]w_{A,B}(J-1)m_A(J)}{m_A(J-1)[m_B(J)+m_A(J)]} & \\
\frac{[h_B(J-1)-h^*(J-1)]w_{B,A}(J-1)m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)[m_B(J)+m_A(J)]} & \\
\frac{[h_B(J-1)-h^*(J-1)]w_{B,C}(J-1)m_B(J)}{m_B(J-1)[m_B(J)+m_A(J)]} & \\
-\frac{[H_L(J-1)-h^*(J-1)]W_{LR}(J-1)}{m_A(J-1)+m_B(J-1)} & 
\end{cases} 
\]

(B.1.4.1)

where \(H_L(J-1) = \frac{h_A(J-1)m_A(J-1)+h_B(J-1)m_B(J-1)}{m_A(J-1)+m_B(J-1)}\)  

(B.1.4.2)
For simplicity, we assume \( w_{A,B}, w_{B,C}, W_{L,R} \) are less than zero. Then

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{h} & (J-1)w_{A,B}(J-1) = h_{B}(J-1)w_{A,B}(J-1) \quad (B.1.4.3a) \\
\text{h} & (J-1)w_{A,B}(J-1) = h_{B}(J-1)w_{B,A}(J-1) \quad (B.1.4.3b) \\
\text{h} & (J-1)w_{B,C}(J-1) = h_{C}(J-1)w_{B,C}(J-1) \quad (B.1.4.3c)
\end{align*}
\]

Inserting equations (B.1.4.2), (B.1.4.3a), (B.1.4.3b), (B.1.4.3c) and (B.1.4.3d) into equation (B.1.4.1) we obtain,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ERROR4}(J) &= \left\{ \frac{[h_{A}(J-1)-h_{B}(J-1)]w_{A,B}(J-1)m_{A}(J) \Delta x}{m_{A}(J-1)[m_{B}(J) + m_{A}(J)]} \\
&+ \frac{[h_{B}(J-1)-h_{C}(J-1)]w_{B,C}(J-1)m_{B}(J) \Delta x}{m_{B}(J-1)[m_{B}(J) + m_{A}(J)]} \\
&- \frac{[h_{A}(J-1)m_{A}(J-1)+h_{B}(J-1)m_{B}(J-1)}{m_{A}(J-1) + m_{B}(J-1)} - h_{C}(J-1)]}{W_{L,R}(J-1) \Delta x} \right\} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\( (B.1.4.4) \)

\( \text{ERROR4}(J) \) can be rearranged as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ERROR4}(J) &= \left[ \frac{W_{L,R}(J-1) \Delta x}{m_{A}(J-1)+m_{B}(J-1)} - \frac{w_{B,C}(J-1)m_{B}^{3}(J) \Delta x}{[m_{B}(J)+m_{A}(J)]m_{B}(J-1)} \right] h_{C}(J-1)
\end{align*}
\]
Equation (B.1.4.5) is a general expression for the error on the diversion crossflow. This error increases as diversion crossflow and subchannel enthalpies increase.

B.1.5 Numerical Values of Errors Between $\bar{h}_L$ and $H_L$

From the above derivation, we conclude that all these four errors vanish as the diversion crossflow goes to zero. This gives us strong confidence to neglect the error introduced by using the coefficients $N_H$, $N_H'$ and $N_H''$ from Appendix A into the COBRA computation scheme which employs a forward differenced form for the conservation equations. However, this error may not be negligible when the diversion crossflow between subchannels is large.

Let us now evaluate the ERROR1, ERROR2, ERROR3 and ERROR4 in order to see their relative importance under two extreme conditions, i.e., low diversion crossflow condition (ENTHALPY UPSET CONDITION) and high diversion crossflow condition (POWER AND FLOW UPSET CONDITION).
The input energy and flow conditions together with input coefficients for the cases considered in this section are listed in Table B.1.

| TABLE B.1 |
|------------------|------------------|
| **ENTHALPY UPSET** | **FLOW AND POWER UPSET** |
| Bundle Geometry N = 5 | Bundle Geometry N = 5 |
| L = 144" | L = 144" |
| Flow Conditions $\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ mlbm/hr-ft}^2$ | Flow Conditions $\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ mlbm/hr-ft}^2$ |
| $F_R = 1.0$ | $F_R = 1.22$ |
| Energy Conditions $\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$ | Energy Conditions $\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$ |
| $\bar{q}'' = 0 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2$ | $\bar{q}'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2$ |
| $H_R = 1.22$ | $H_R = 1.0$ |
| $P_R = 1.0$ | $P_R = 1.5$ |
| Input Coefficients $\beta = 0.02$ | Input Coefficients $\beta = 0.02$ |
| $K = 0.5$ | $K = 0.5$ |
| $S/L = 0.5$ | $S/L = 0.5$ |
The total errors between \( \bar{h}_{\text{EXIT}} \) and \( H_{\text{EXIT}} \) can be evaluated by using equations similar to (B.1.1.1), (B.1.2.1), (B.1.3.1) and (B.1.4.1) but reformulated to deal with five subchannels. The results are tabulated in the following table (Table B.2).

**TABLE B.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENTHALPY UPSET</th>
<th>POWER AND FLOW UPSET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta H )</td>
<td>-34.4 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>21.5 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ( \sum ) ( \text{ERROR}_1(J) ) ( J=1 )</td>
<td>0.097 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>0.058 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ( \sum ) ( \text{ERROR}_2(J) ) ( J=1 )</td>
<td>0.0004 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>0.0004 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ( \sum ) ( \text{ERROR}_3(J) ) ( J=1 )</td>
<td>0.147 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>0.127 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT ( \sum ) ( \text{ERROR}_4(J) ) ( J=1 )</td>
<td>-0.233 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>-0.130 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.011 Btu/lbm</td>
<td>0.055 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.1.6 Conclusions**

The coupling coefficient derived in the differential form conservation equations can be used in the differential form conservation equations with some practical tolerable
error. However, if the subchannel enthalpies become abnormally high (under channel blockage condition) or the diversion crossflows between subchannels becomes very large (under severe boiling condition or channel blockage), the errors between $H_{L_{\text{EXIT}}}$ and $\bar{H}_{L_{\text{EXIT}}}$ will become substantial from the practical point of view.

B.2 General Approach to Derive Coupling Coefficients From the Different Conservation Equations

Coupling coefficients derived from the differential conservation equations are applicable to the code application only if the subchannel enthalpies and diversion crossflows are within the range of normal operation, as we discussed in Section B.1.6. One way to eliminate this constraint to handle abnormal operational conditions is to derive the coupling coefficients directly from the difference conservation equations. For instance, we derive coupling coefficients in the difference conservation equations by first letting

$$\bar{H}_L(J) = \bar{H}_L(J)$$

(B.2)

and then define the coupling coefficients in each term of $H_L$ to make $H_L(J)$ equal $\bar{H}_L(J)$ term by term. Using the same
procedures, we can derive the coupling coefficients for the axial velocity and axial pressure drop. However, it is worthwhile noting that the complexity of the coupling coefficients resulting from this kind of derivation generally will make them undesirable for practical application. Also results for Volume II show that the error due to no application of coupling coefficients is modest. For DNBR thermal analysis, utilization of coupling coefficients is not necessary. However more accurate predictions of channel enthalpy is desired for coupled neutronic-thermal hydraulic analysis. Consequently derivations and prediction of transport coefficients is of potential application in the future development of these coupled analysis meth
APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA USED IN THE ANALYSIS

In this appendix the data used in the present study will be given. The reactor analyzed is similar to CONNECTICUT YANKEE.

C.1.1 Operating Conditions

System Pressure 2150
Uniform Inlet Enthalpy 548.8 BTU/lb
Uniform Inlet Mass Velocity $2.217 \times 10^6$ lb/hr ft$^2$
Average Heat Flux $0.2034 \times 10^6$ BTU/hr ft$^2$

C.1.2 Dimensions of the Assemblies

The geometrical characteristics of the assemblies are:

Area $38.37$ in$^2$
Wetted Perimeter $322.8$ in
Heated Perimeter $270.5$ in
Boundary Gap $2.0$ in
Hydraulic Diameter $0.4755$ in
Channel Length $126.7$ in
Channel Orientation $0.0$ degrees
C.1.3 Dimension of the Subchannels.

The geometrical characteristics of the subchannels are:

- Area 0.1705 in$^2$
- Wetted Perimeter 1.435 in
- Boundary gap 0.133 in
- Hydraulic diameter 0.4755 in

C.1.4 Discussions of the Rods

All the rods are taken as having the same diameter of 0.422 inches.

C.1.5 Axial Heat Flux Distribution

The following heat flux distribution was used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position (X/L)</th>
<th>Relative Flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.1.6 Radial Power Factors

There are three different distributions of radial power factors which have been used in Appendix D (Case A, Case B, and Case C). Case A represented the base case. Cases B and C were developed to permit testing of the one pass method versus a simulation of the cascade method. Therefore case B was generated to provide subchannel peaking factors in the boundary region of neighboring assembly and movement of the hot subchannels closer to the assembly boundary. Case C is a variant of Case A with the hot subchannels moved closer to the assembly boundary using the same peaking factors as Case B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Relative Flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>1.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The radial power factors of each assembly for Case A are given in Figure C.1. These values were taken from Figures 4.2-16 of the report GTS-75-A-136 sent to Dr. E. Khan by J. Chunis of Northeast Utilities. Also the radial power factors of each assembly for cases B and C are given in Figures C.2 and C.3 respectively which were assumed by Pablo Moreno.

The radial power factors for the subchannels of the hot assembly for Case A which were assumed by Pablo Moreno are given in figure C.4. In figure C.5, the radial power factor for the subchannels both the hot assembly and a portion of one neighboring assembly for case B are given. The radial power factor of the subchannels in hot assembly for case were assumed by Dr. E, Khan except that two hot subchannels have been moved closer to the assembly boundary. The radial power factor of the neighboring subchannels to the hot assembly were obtained by multiplying the radial power factor of the subchannels in the hot assembly by a factor which is the ratio of the neighboring assembly power factor to the hot assembly power factor.

Figure C.6 gives the radial power factors for the subchannels of the hot assembly for Case C are the same as Case
C. 1.7 Spacer Data

In the following table the relative location and the type of spacer situated at that location are given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (X/L)</th>
<th>0.005</th>
<th>0.159</th>
<th>0.324</th>
<th>0.492</th>
<th>0.658</th>
<th>0.824</th>
<th>0.995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spacer Type No.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The drag coefficients assumed for each spacer type are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacer Type No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drag Coefficient</td>
<td>4.011</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>1.565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.1.8 Thermal-Hydraulic Model.

C.1.8.1 Mixing

Two values of the mixing coefficient B (0. and 0.02) have been used in the analysis.

The two-phase mixing coefficient is taken as equal to that of single phase.

Thermal conduction is neglected.
C. 1.8.2 Single-Phase Friction

It is calculated by:

\[ f = \frac{0.184}{R_e^{0.2}} \]

where \( R_e \) = n Reynolds Number

C. 1.8.3 Two-Phase Friction

The homogeneous model friction multipliers were selected to describe the two-phase pressure drop due to friction.

C. 1.8.4 Void Fraction

It was calculated using the Levy model and a slip ratio equal to one.

C. 1.8.5 Flow Division at Inlet

The inlet mass velocity was taken as uniform, equal to \( 2.217 \times 10^6 \) lb/hr ft\(^2\) for all channels.

C. 1.8.6 Constants

The constants used are:

Cross-flow resistance (KIJ) = 0.5
Momentum Turbulent Factor (FTM) = 0.0
Transverse Momentum Factor (S/L) = 0.5
The CHF correlation used in all the calculations was $\dot{W}$-3.

C. 1.8.7 Iteration
The flow convergence factor used was 0.01.
The number of axial steps in which the core was divided was 21. Then the length of each axial step was 6.003 inches.
All the calculations were done for steady state.

C. 1.8.8 Coupling Parameter
The following coupling parameter was used:

$$N_H = N$$

where

$N = \text{number of rods between the center lines of the channels making up the boundary conditions.}$

If no coupling parameter was used,

$$N_H = 1.$$
C.2.2 Dimensions of the Assemblies
Flow Area 38.11 in²
Wetted Perimeter 348.0 in
Heated Perimeter 310.2 in
Boundary Gap 2.108 in

C.2.3 Dimensions of the Channels
Rod Diameter: 0.374 in
Rod Pitch: 0.496 in
Diameter of Guide Tubes: 0.482 in

C.2.4 Axial Heat Flux Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position (X/L)</th>
<th>Relative Flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>1.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>1.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Position | Relative Flux
---|---
0.533 | 1.526
0.567 | 1.486
0.600 | 1.426
0.633 | 1.347
0.667 | 1.251
0.700 | 1.138
0.733 | 1.010
0.767 | 0.869
0.800 | 0.717
0.833 | 0.555
0.867 | 0.385
0.900 | 0.211
0.933 | 0.003
1.000 | 0.0

C.2.5 Radial Power Peaking Factors

Hot assembly rod peaking factors and Assembly average power peaking factors are shown in Figure's C.7 and C.8 respectively.

C.2.6 Spacer Data

Number of Types: 9

Single Phase Grid Coefficient for each Grid Type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Kc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure C.1 Radial power factors (Case A)
Figure C.2 Radial Power Factors (Case B)
Figure C.3 Radial Power Factor (Case C)
1.909 1.909 1.918 1.940 1.967 1.988 1.984 1.964 1.964 1.984 1.988 1.967 1.940 1.918 1.909 1.909
1.909 1.918 1.940 1.967 1.988 1.934 1.964 1.964 1.984 1.988 1.967 1.940 1.918 1.909 1.909
1.942 1.985 2.026 1.528 1.511 1.993 1.993 1.511 1.528 2.026 1.985 1.942 1.918 1.918
1.519 1.561 1.573 1.541 2.011 2.011 1.541 1.573 1.561 1.519 1.985 1.940 1.940
1.582 2.266 2.050 2.016 2.016 2.060 2.266*1.582 1.561 2.026 1.967 1.967
1.570 1.547 2.030 2.030 1.547 1.570 2.266*1.573 1.528 1.988 1.988
1.547 2.051 2.051 1.547 1.547 2.060 1.541 1.511 1.984 1.984
1.545 1.545 2.051 2.030 2.016 2.011 1.993 1.964 1.964
1.545 2.051 2.030 2.016 2.011 1.993 1.964 1.964
1.547 1.547 2.060 1.541 1.511 1.984 1.984
1.570 2.266 1.573 1.528 1.988 1.988
1.582 1.561 2.026 1.967 1.967
1.519 1.985 1.940 1.940
1.942 1.918 1.918
1.909 1.909
1.909

*Hot Subchannel

Figure C.4: Radial Peaking Factors for the Subchannels Inside the Hot Assembly (Case A)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundaries</th>
<th>Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.952 1.975 2.037 1.536 1.519 2.006 2.003 1.519 1.536 2.277* 1.995 1.952 1.928 1.928 1.928 1.928 1.928 1.928</td>
<td>1.528 1.570 1.579 1.547 2.021 2.021 2.021 1.547 1.579 1.579 1.570 1.528 1.995 1.951 1.951 1.951 1.951 1.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.528 1.570 1.579 1.547 2.021 2.021 2.021 1.547 1.579 1.579 1.579 1.570 1.528 1.995 1.951 1.951 1.951 1.951 1.951</td>
<td>1.591 2.277 2.071 2.026 2.026 2.071 1.999 1.591 1.570 2.037 1.973 1.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.577 1.555 2.041 2.091 1.555 1.577 2.037 1.579 1.536 1.999 1.999</td>
<td>1.555 2.062 2.062 1.555 1.535 2.071 1.567 1.516 1.995 1.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.553 1.553 2.062 2.041 2.026 2.021 2.003 1.975 1.975</td>
<td>1.553 2.062 2.041 2.026 2.021 2.003 1.975 1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.555 1.555 2.071 1.547 1.519 1.995 1.995</td>
<td>1.578 2.277 1.579 1.536 1.999 1.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.591 1.570 2.037 1.973 1.973</td>
<td>1.528 1.995 1.951 1.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.952 1.928 1.928</td>
<td>1.919 1.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hot Subchannel*

Figure C.5 = Radial Peaking Factors for the Subchannels inside the Assembly (Case B)
Figure C.7  1/3 Hot Assembly Rod Radial Power Peaking Factors
HOT ASSEMBLY (SEE FIG. C.7)

Figure C.8 Assembly Radial Power Peaking Factors
APPENDIX D

TABULATION OF CORE CASES ANALYZED IN THIS STUDY

In this appendix a summary of cases analyzed is presented in tabulated form. The pattern of channels used to represent the core and hot assembly for each case is shown in the figures. Also a discussion of some discrepancies between different cases is presented.
D.1 Summary of Cases Analyzed

There are three different power distributions (Case A, Case B, Case C in Appendix C) which have been used in the analysis. Only one $\beta$ value have been applied for all of the different cases. The internal nodes and external nodes have been defined in the text. The evaluation of the predicted MDNBR is based on the W-3 empirical correlation. A case number has been assigned to each case. These numbers are the same as in the text. The channel number is indicated in the figure.

D.2 Discussions:

The MDNBR value is neither a strong function of the $N_H$ value nor a strong function of the different number of internal and external meshes. But the MDNBR does change considerably according to whether it is a whole core or a partial core analysis. All these have been discussed in the text. But still some discrepancies between different cases need to be discussed here.

Case 8 is a whole core analysis with 5 internal and 5 external meshes. Case 36 is also a whole core analysis but with 4 internal and 5 external meshes. Even these two cases have very similar number of channels, still there is 0.7% difference of the MDNBR value between them. The reason is that the pattern of channels for the internal meshes is quite different (Referring to Fig. D.8, Fig. D.51), the cross flow of the hot channel for the two cases is different. Due to the different cross flow, the predicted MDNBR based on small cross flow is larger than based on large cross flow. Case 35 is a whole core analysis with 4 internal meshes and only one external mesh. Even though it is a whole core analysis, it still can not give a good result. Since there is no cross flow from the only one external channel to other external channels, the cross flow from the hot internal channel to the external channel is small. Therefore the predicted MDNB ratio is much higher than the real value.

It also should point out that since the abnormally high average heat flux has been used, the MDNBR is extremely small.
### SUMMARY OF CASES ANALYZED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Power Distribution</th>
<th>Transport Coef. N,</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>GEOMETRY</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 85</td>
<td>D.1,D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 45</td>
<td>D.3,D.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 14</td>
<td>D.5,D.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 5 External Nodes: 5</td>
<td>D.7,D.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 85</td>
<td>D.1,D.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 45</td>
<td>D.3,D.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 14</td>
<td>D.5,D.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 5 External Nodes: 5</td>
<td>D.7,D.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 36 External Nodes: 18</td>
<td>D.9,D.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 45</td>
<td>D.11,D.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 36 External Nodes: 0</td>
<td>D.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 5 External Nodes: 1</td>
<td>D.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 4 External Nodes: 83</td>
<td>D.15,D.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 4 External Nodes: 14</td>
<td>D.17,D.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 16 External Nodes: 0</td>
<td>D.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 4 External Nodes: 0</td>
<td>D.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 1 External Nodes: 0</td>
<td>D.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Internal Nodes: 5 External Nodes: 5</td>
<td>D.22,D.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Power Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Power Distribution</th>
<th>Transport Coef.</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Internal Nodes</th>
<th>External Nodes</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>MDNBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>D.24, D.25</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>D.26, D.27</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D.28, D.29</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>D.30, D.31</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D.32, D.33</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D.32, D.33</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>See Fig. D.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Refer to Fig. D.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>See Fig. D.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Refer to Fig. D.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>See Fig. D.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Refer to Fig. D.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>See Fig. D.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Refer to Fig. D.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>See Fig. 13 (Sect. 3.3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Refer to Fig. 13 (Sect. 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>D.38, D.39</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D.40, D.41</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>D.42, D.43</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D.44, D.45</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D.46, D.47</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D.48, D.49</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>D.50, D.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUED

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37 | A | 1. | .02 | 4 | 2 | D.52,D.53 | 1.159 |
| 38 | A | 1. | .02 | 4 | 2 | D.54,D.55 | 1.356 |

*Power Distribution See Appendix C

**Turbulent Interchange along Hot Assembly Boundaries
Not Included
Figure D.1

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core. (Case No. 1 and...)
Figure D.2
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 1 and 5)
Figure D.3
Pattern of the Channels Used to Represent the Core. (Case No. 2 and 6)
Figure D.4

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 2 and 6)
Figure D.5

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core. (Case No. 3 and 7)
Figure D.6
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 3 and 7)
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 4 and 5)
Figure D.8
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 4 and 8)
Figure D.9
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 9)
Figure D.10
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 9)
Figure D.11

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 10)
Figure D.12
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 10)
Figure D.13
Pattern of Channels Used in the Analysis (Case No. 11)
Fig. D.13a  Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 11)
Figure D.14

Channels Used in the Analysis (Case No. 12)
Figure D.15

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 13)
Figure D.16
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 13)
Figure D.17
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core
(Case No. 14)
Figure D.18
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 14)
Figure D.19

Channels Used in the Analysis (Case No. 15)
Figure D.20

Channels Used in the Analysis (Case No. 16)
Figure D.21
Channel Used in the Analysis (Case No. 17)
Figure D.22

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case 18)
Figure D.23

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 18)
Figure D.24

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 19)
Figure D.25
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 19)
Figure D.26

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 20)
Figure D.27
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 20)
Figure D.28
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core
(Case No. 21)
Figure D.29
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 21)
Figure D.30
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 22)
Figure D.31

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 22)
Figure D.32
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 23 Case No. 24)
Figure D.33

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 23, Case No. 24)
(x) = Radial peaking power \( \equiv x \)
Properties and dimensions of the channels are those of Appendix C.

Figure D.34
Case 25, 2D problem
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 subch.</th>
<th>3 subch.</th>
<th>4 subch.</th>
<th>5 subch.</th>
<th>7 subch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.9)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x) = Radial peaking power = x

Properties and Dimensions of the Channels are those of Appendix C.

Figure D.35
Case 25
(x) = Radial peaking factor \( \equiv x \).

Properties and dimensions of the channels are those of appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>1.7</th>
<th>2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D.36

Case 27
(x) = Radial power factor \( \equiv x \)

Properties and dimensions of the channels are those of Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(.8)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.9)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.6)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D.37

Case 28
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 30)
Figure D.39
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 30)
Figure D.40
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 31)
Figure D.41

Detail of the hot Assembly (Case No. 31)
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 32)
Figure D.43
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 32)
Figure D.44
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 33)
Figure D.45
Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 33)
Figure D.46

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 34)
Figure D.47

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 34)
Figure D.48
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 35)
Figure D.49

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 35)
Figure D.50
Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 36)
Figure D.51

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 36)
Figure D. 52

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 37)
Figure D. 53

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 37)
Figure D.54

Pattern of Channels Used to Represent the Core (Case No. 38)
HOT ASSEMBLY
(SEE FIG. D.57)

Figure D.56 1/8 Core Channel Mapping Scheme (Case No. 39)
Figure D.57 Hot Assembly Channel Mapping Scheme (Case No. 39)
HOT ASSEMBLY (SEE FIG D.59)

Figure D.58 1/8 Core Channel Mapping scheme (Case No. 40)
Figure D.59 1/8 Hot Assembly Channel and Rod Mapping Scheme
(Case No. 40)
Figure D.55

Detail of the Hot Assembly (Case No. 35)
APPENDIX E

PREDICTION OF ENTHALPY RISE IN THE HOT ZONE FOR MULTIREGION AND HOMOGENIZED REPRESENTATIONS

Define the difference between the enthalpy rises in the hot zone for the multi-subchannel and homogenized representations as the enthalpy rise deviation. The purpose of the factor $N_H(z)$ is to reduce this deviation to zero. In this appendix we derive relations for this deviation in the absence of application of this correction factor, i.e., taking $N_H = 1$, for the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE, ENTHALPY AND FLOW CASE, POWER UPSET CASE and the POWER AND FLOW UPSET CASE.

The defining equation for the enthalpy deviation is

\[
\text{Enthalpy deviation for hot zone} = \frac{h_{\text{EXIT}}(\text{homogenized}) - h_{\text{EXIT}}(\text{multi-subchannel})}{h_{\text{EXIT}}(\text{multi-subchannel}) - h_{\text{INLET}}} 
\]

(E.1.a)

Now

\[
h_{\text{EXIT}}(\text{multi-subchannel}) = \sum h_i \quad \text{no. of hot side subchannels}
\]

\[
h_{\text{EXIT}}(\text{homogenized}) = H
\]

\[
\Delta H = H - h_{IN}
\]

\[
\Delta h = \bar{h} - h_{IN}
\]
Hence equation (E.1.a) becomes

\[ \text{Enthalpy deviation} = \frac{\Delta H - \Delta h}{\Delta h} \quad \text{for hot zone} \]  

(E.1.b)

In the evaluation of equation (E.1.b) in terms of bundle parameters that follows, we assume that the amount of enthalpy interchange between channels due to turbulent mixing is much more than that due to diversion crossflow. Therefore

\[ \Delta h = \Delta h_q - \Delta h_{T,I} \]  

(E.2.a)

and  \[ \Delta H = \Delta H_{Q'} - \Delta H_{T,I} \]  

(E.2.b)

where the minus sign is introduced for the hot zone and

\[ \Delta H_{T,I} = \int_{\text{INLET}}^{\text{EXIT}} Q'_{T,I}dz \]  

(E.3)

Since per Appendix A for either side L or R

\[ Q' = \sum_i q'_i \]  

(E.4.a)
and
\[ \dot{M} = \dot{\sum}_i m_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (E.4.b)

then
\[ \Delta H_Q - 1 = \Delta H_{q'} \]  \hspace{1cm} (E.4.c)

From (E.2.a), (E.2.b) and (E.4.c), the following equation can be derived:
\[ \Delta H - \Delta h = \Delta H_{T.I} - \Delta H_{T.I} \]  \hspace{1cm} (E.5)

Hence we can rewrite equation (E.1.b) as
\[ \text{Enthalpy deviation for hot zone} = \frac{\Delta H_{T.I} - \Delta H_{T.I}}{\Delta H_{q'} - \Delta H_{T.I}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (E.6)

Now from equations (A.1.6a and A.1.7a) for an axial step
\[ \Sigma_{i=A}^{C} (\delta h_i m_i)_{T.I} = -(h_C - h_D)w_{CD} \Delta X \]

and
\[ (\delta H_L M_L)_{T.I} = -\frac{H_L - H_R}{N_H(x)} w'_{L} \Delta X \]
Since $N_H$ is established so that the LHS of both equations are equal,

$$N_H(x) = \frac{(H_L - H_R) \Delta x}{(h_C - h_D) \Delta x} \left[ \frac{w_{L,R}}{w_{C,D}} \right]$$

(E.7)

Now since

$$\delta H_{T,I} = (H_L - H_R) \left[ \frac{w_{L,R}}{w_{C,D}} \right] \quad \text{(E.8a)}$$

$$\delta h_{T,I} = (h_C - h_D) \left[ \frac{w_{C,D}}{\Sigma m_i} \right] \quad \text{(E.8b)}$$

$$M_L = \Sigma m_i \quad \text{(E.4b)}$$

then

$$N_H(x) = \frac{\delta H_{T,I}}{\delta h_{T,I}}$$

(E.9a)

or when summed over the axial length of the fuel pin

$$\bar{N}_H = \frac{\Delta H_{T,I}}{\Delta h_{T,I}}$$

(E.9b)
Also per equation (E.4b)

$$\Delta_{T}q'_{1} = \Delta H_{Q}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E.4b)

Insertion of equations (E.9b) and (E.4b) into (E.6) yields:

$$\text{Enthalpy deviation for hot zone} = \frac{1}{N_{H}} - 1$$

$$\frac{\Delta H_{Q}'}{\Delta H_{T,I}} = \frac{1}{N_{H}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E.11)

Now to evaluate equation (E.11) we express the ratio $\frac{\Delta H_{Q}'}{\Delta H_{T,I}}$ in terms as follows.

First we introduce power, flow and enthalpy ratio definitions

Power Ratio $\equiv P_{R} = \frac{Q_{HOT}}{Q_{COLD}}$  \hspace{1cm} (E.12a)

Flow Ratio $\equiv F_{R} = \frac{g_{HOT}}{g_{COLD}}$  \hspace{1cm} (E.12b)

Inlet Enthalpy Ratio $\equiv H_{R} = \frac{H_{HOT}(z=0)}{H_{COLD}(z=0)}$  \hspace{1cm} (E.12c)

and we recall the definition of $\beta$
\[ w' \equiv \beta_s \frac{G_1 + G_2}{2} \quad \text{(E.13)} \]

then

\[
\frac{\Delta H_{Q'}}{\Delta H_{T,I}} = \frac{[H'q'_{\text{hot,exit}}]/N'G_{\text{hot}}s}{\int_{\text{Exit}}^{\text{Inlet}} \left[ H_{\text{hot}}(z) - H_{\text{cold}}(z) \right] \beta_s \bar{G} \, dz} \cdot \frac{N'q'_{\text{hot}}}{(\bar{G} \beta_s)} \\
= \frac{\left[ q'_{\text{hot}} N'L - q'_{\text{cold}} N'L \right]/N'G_{\text{hot}}s}{N'G_{\text{cold}}s} - H_{\text{cold}}(0) + H_{\text{hot}}(0) \\
+ \frac{[N'q']_{\text{hot}} N'A_s/(\bar{G} \beta S)}{N'G_{\text{hot}}s} - \frac{[N'q']_{\text{cold}} N'A_s/(\bar{G} \beta S)}{N'G_{\text{cold}}s} + \frac{H_{\text{hot}}(0)}{N'A_s} - \frac{H_{\text{cold}}(0)}{N'A_s} \\
= \frac{\left[ P'N'L - N'L \right]/G_{\text{hot}}}{G_{\text{cold}}} + \frac{H_{\text{hot}}(0)}{q'_{\text{cold}} N'A_s} - \frac{H_{\text{cold}}(0)}{q'_{\text{cold}} N'A_s} \quad \text{(E.14)}
\[
\frac{[N' P_R] N' A_S/(BS)}{P' R N' L \over G_{hot} - N' L \over G_{cold}} + \left[ \frac{H_{hot}(0) - H_{cold}(0)}{q'_{cold}} \right] \frac{N' A_S}{N' A_S} \\
= \frac{[N' P_R] N' A_S/(BS)}{P' R N' L \over G_{hot} - N' L \over G_{cold}} + \left[ \frac{H_{hot}(0) - H_{cold}(0)}{q'_{cold}} \right] \frac{N' A_S}{N' A_S} \\
= \frac{1}{2} \left[ P_R N' (1 + \frac{1}{P_R}) - N' (1 + \frac{1}{P_R}) \right] L + \left[ \frac{H_{hot}(0) - H_{cold}(0)}{H_{in}} - \frac{H_{cold}(0)}{H_{in}} \right] \frac{N' A_S}{q'_{cold}} \\
= \frac{1}{q' \over 2} \left[ P_R N' (1 + \frac{1}{P_R}) - N' (1 + \frac{1}{P_R}) \right] L + \left[ \frac{2}{1 + H_{R}} - \frac{2}{1 + H_{R}} \right] \frac{N' A_S}{q'_{cold}} \\
= - \frac{1}{2} L \over q' \left[ P_R (1 + \frac{1}{P_R}) - (1 + P_R) \right] + \left[ \frac{H_{R} - 1}{1 - H_{R}} \right] \frac{N' A_S}{q'_{cold}} \\
= \text{(E.14)}
\]
For ENTHALPY UPSET CASE, since $F_R = 1$, $P_R = 1$ and $q' = 0$, equation (E.14) can be reduced to:

\[
\frac{\Delta H_{Q'}}{\Delta H_{T.1}} = \frac{q'}{\left[\frac{H_R-1}{H_R+1}\right] H_G \beta S} = 0
\]  

(E.15)

then equation (E.11) for this case becomes:

\[
\frac{1}{N_H} - 1 - \frac{1}{N_H} = -\frac{1}{N_H}
\]  

(E.16)

For ENTHALPY and FLOW UPSET CASE, since $q' = 0$, equation (E.14) can be reduced to:

\[
\frac{\Delta H Q'}{\Delta H_{T.1}} = 0
\]  

(E.17)

then equation (E.11) for this case becomes:

\[
\frac{1}{N_H} - 1 - \frac{1}{N_H} = (1 - \frac{1}{N_H})
\]  

(E.18)
For POWER UPSET CASE, since \( H_R = 1, F_R = 1 \), equation (E.14) can be reduced to:

\[
\frac{\Delta H_Q'}{\Delta H_{T.I}} = \frac{P_R N' A_S}{(P_R-1)LBS} \quad \text{(E.19)}
\]

then equation (E.11) for this case becomes:

\[
\frac{(1 - \frac{1}{N_H})}{P_R N' A_S} \frac{1}{(P_R-1)LBS} - \frac{1}{N_H} \quad \text{(E.20)}
\]

For FLOW and POWER UPSET CASE since \( H_R = 1 \), equation (E.14) can be reduced to:

\[
\frac{\Delta H_Q'}{\Delta H_{T.I}} = \frac{N' A_S}{\frac{1}{2} BS L \left[ P_R \left(1 + \frac{1}{F_R}\right) - (1+F_R) \right]} \quad \text{(E.21)}
\]

then the equation (E.11) for this case becomes:
\[
\frac{1}{N_H} - 1
\]
\[
\frac{1}{2} \beta S L \left[ P_R (1 + \frac{1}{F_R}) - (1 + P_R) \right] - \frac{1}{N_H}
\]

From equations (E.18) and (E.20) we know that the difference of enthalpy for the hot channel at the exit between the homogenized case with \(N_H = 1\) and multi-subchannel case for the power upset case and the power and flow upset case is a strong function of \(\beta, H_R, F_R, P_R, N'\) and \(\bar{N}_H\).
APPENDIX F

DERIVATION OF $N_H$, $N_U$ AND $N_{TP}$ FOR LINEAR GRADIENTS
OF ENTHALPY, VELOCITY AND PRESSURE

From Equations (A.1.1.6), (A.2.1.6a) and (A.3.1.6) we define $N_H$, $N_U$, $N_{TP}$ in the following way:

$$N_H = \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_C - h_D}$$

$$N_U = \frac{U_L - U_R}{U_C - U_D}$$

$$N_{TP} = \frac{P_L - P_R}{P_A - P_E}$$

If we assume the transverse enthalpy profile through channels is linear with slope $S_h$, $N_H$ becomes:

$$N_H = \frac{(\frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_h \cdot \frac{N}{2} \cdot S_{ij}) - (\frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_h \cdot \frac{N}{2} \cdot S_{ij})}{(\frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_h \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{4}) - (\frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_h \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{4})}$$

$$= \frac{\frac{N}{2} + \frac{N}{2}}{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4}} = 2N' = N \quad \text{for } N \text{ odd} \quad (F.1)$$
\[ N_H = \frac{\left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_n \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right) - \left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_h \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right)}{\left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_h \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{2} \right) - \left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_h \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{2} \right)} \]

\[ = \frac{\frac{N'}{2} + \frac{N'}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}} = N' \quad \text{for } N \text{ even} \quad (F.2) \]

For the same reason for \( N_U, N_{TP} \), we obtain:

\[ N_U = \frac{\left( \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} + S_u \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right) - \left( \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} - S_u \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right)}{\left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_u \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{4} \right) - \left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_u \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{4} \right)} \]

\[ = 2N' = N \quad \text{for } N \text{ odd} \quad (F.3) \]

\[ N_U = \frac{\left( \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} + S_u \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right) - \left( \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} - S_u \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right)}{\left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + S_u \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{2} \right) - \left( \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} - S_u \cdot \frac{S_{ij}}{2} \right)} = N' \]

\[ \quad \text{for } N \text{ even} \quad (F.4) \]

\[ N_{TP} = \frac{\left( \frac{P_L + P_R}{2} + S_p \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right) - \left( \frac{P_L + P_R}{2} - S_p \cdot \frac{N'}{2} \cdot S_{ij} \right)}{\left( \frac{P_L + P_R}{2} + S_p \cdot S_{ij} \cdot (N' \cdot \frac{1}{2}) \right) - \left( \frac{P_L + P_R}{2} - S_p \cdot S_{ij} \cdot (N' \cdot \frac{1}{2}) \right)} \]

\[ = \frac{\frac{N' + N'}{2}}{\frac{N' + N' - 1}{2N' - 1}} = \frac{N'}{2N' - 1} \quad \text{for } N \text{ odd or even} \quad (F.5) \]
where \( S_h, S_p \) and \( S_u \) = transverse slopes of enthalpy, pressure and velocity.
from the bottom of the channel to the location of MDNBR needs to be considered.

G.1.1 Changes of Enthalpy

The energy equation neglecting the conduction term for the hot subchannel was written in Equation 1 as:

\[
q_{HC} \left(J - \frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{q_{HC}(J-1)}{m_{HC}(J-1)} \cdot \Delta x - \sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{(h_{HC}(J-1) - h_i(J-1))w_{HC,i}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_{HC}(J-1)}
\]

\[
- \sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{(h_{HC}(J-1) - h_i(J-1))w_{HC,i}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_{HC}(J-1)}
\]

Let

\[
A = \frac{q_{HC}(J-\frac{1}{2})}{m_{HC}(J-1)}
\]

\[
B = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{(h_{HC}(J-1) - h_i(J-1))w_{HC,i}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_{HC}(J-1)}
\]

\[
C = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{(h_{HC}(J-1) - h_i(J-1))w_{HC,i}(J-1) \cdot \Delta x}{m_{HC}(J-1)}
\]

For the hot channel from Table G.1, the value of each term (A,B,C,), the ratios B/A and C/A in percent at different locations and the overall summation value from bottom to the location of MDNBR are listed in Table G.2. Table G.2 also lists the total values (summation from inlet to exit) for reference. The amount of enthalpy change due to the linear power in the hot subchannel is around 174 BTU/lbm, the turbulent interchange and cross flow terms are 16.2% and 2.8% of the linear power term. Therefore the net enthalpy change due to turbulent interchange and cross flow of the hot subchannel (Channel A) is around 33 BTU/lbm (174 BTU/lbm (16.2% + 2.8%)).
Using the same information (Table G.1 and Fig. G.1), for a colder subchannel (say channel 56 with a radial power factor of 2.060) calculation of the net enthalpy change due to turbulent interchange and cross flow can be performed in the following three steps: (Referring to Fig. G.1): First, from Table G.1, the turbulent interchange term (B) and cross flow term (C) at different locations between the hot subchannel (Channel 57, was designated as Channel A in Fig. G.1) and the surrounding adjacent subchannels (Channels 49, 56, 58, 63 were designated as Channels B in Fig. G.1) have been calculated and listed in Table G.3. Also, from Table G.1 for Channel 56, the total enthalpy change from inlet to the location of MDNBR is 136.72 BTU/lbm (685.52 - 548.8). Second, the enthalpy increase from inlet to location of MDNBR due to heat flux term \( A = \frac{q_{56}^{(J-\frac{1}{2})}}{m_{56}^{(J-1)}} \) is calculated to be 157.94 BTU/lbm. Third, from Table G.3 (which was obtained in the first step), the enthalpy across from Channel 57 to 56 due to turbulent interchange and cross flow is 1.2 (0.7978 + 0.4028). Based on the values obtained from above calculations, the enthalpy leaving from Channel 56 is 22.42 BTU/lbm (157.94 + 1.2 - 136.72). Therefore the net enthalpy change due to turbulent interchange and crossflow is -21.22 BTU/lbm (-22.42 + 1.2).

G.1.2 Changes of Mass Flow Rate

From Table G.1 the difference of mass flow rate between inlet and the location of MDNBR for each subchannel was calculated. The percentage changes in each of the four subchannels were listed in
Table G.4. The hot subchannel (Channel 57) has a larger mass flow rate decrease than the other subchannels, but the difference is small.

G.2 The Effect of Enthalpy Versus Linear Power on MDNBR

Two radial power factors (2.060, 2.266 having been marked as Curves A and B respectively in Fig. 2.3) and a sequence of difference inlet enthalpies have been used in the adiabatic subchannel analysis. According to Case No. 13, a base case has been consistently set up. Due to the adiabatic boundary, the variation of enthalpy at the location of MDNBR is the same as at inlet. As shown in Fig. 2.3, for a constant radial power factor the MDNBR changes slightly with the enthalpy variation at the location of MDNBR in a linear mode. The value of MDNBR is larger if the radial power factor is smaller. Curve B is always above Curve A and these two curves are parallel to each other. For the base case, the difference of MDNBR between Curve B and Curve A is .252. Referring to Fig. G.1, the hot subchannel with a radial power factor of 2.266 and with a radial power factor of 2.060 were designated as Channel A and B respectively. So Channel A will vary along Curve A, Channel B will vary along Curve B. The enthalpy of hot subchannel and adjacent subchannel will decrease due to the turbulent interchange and cross flow. The amount of changes have been obtained in Section G.1.1 and are repeated here: the net enthalpy change due to turbulent interchange and cross flow of Channel A and B is -33.0 BTU/lbm and -21.22 BTU/lbm respectively.
When enthalpy changes due to turbulent interchange and cross flow are considered between the two channels, the difference of MDNBR between Channel A and Channel B can be obtained along Curve A and Curve B as indicated by the dash line in Figure 1. The difference was marked as the margin with a value of 0.11. From this positive margin value, a conclusion can be drawn: even when enthalpy changes due to turbulent interchange and cross flow are considered between the two channels with maximum power factors, the channel with higher radial power factor still has the lower value of MDNBR. So the channel with the highest radial power factor is the crucial channel which needs more consideration.

G.3 The Effect of Mass Flow Rate Versus Linear Power on MDNBR

The same base case, the same two radial power factors have been used as in Section G.2, but the mass flow rate has been considered as the variable instead of the enthalpy. The results were plotted on Figure 2.4. The value of MDNBR is larger if the radial power factor is smaller. Also the value of MDNBR decreases with the decreasing of mass flow rate. Due to the effect of cross flow, the mass flow rate is different at each location. From the results in Section G.1.2 (Table G.4) the amount of change in mass flow rate of Channel A and B (Figure G.1) are -18.0% and -17.2% respectively. The difference of MDNBR between Channel A and B after the reduced mass flow rate effect can be found along Curves A and B as indicated by dash lines in Figure 2.4. The
difference was marked as the margin with a value of 0.29. Again from the positive margin value a conclusion can be stated that with the reduced mass flow rate considered, the channel with higher radial power factor still possesses the lower value of 

MDNBR.

G.4 The Effect of Cold Wall on MDNBR

In case both the hottest rod (highest power) and coldest rod (zero power) exist in the same channel, the predicted MDNBR might occur on the hottest rod even though the channel is not the hottest one. This is due to the cold wall effect of the coldest rod (zero power rod). The predicted CHF (by W-3 correlation) should be evaluated using the heated equivalent diameter (1.202 in.) versus the wetted equivalent diameter (1.435 in.) and should be multiplied by a factor $F$:

$$F = (1.36 + 0.12e^{9x}) (1.2 - 1.6e^{-1.9D_h}) (1.33 - 0.237e^{5.66x})$$

where $D_h = \text{heated equivalent diameter}$

$X = \text{local quality}$

For example, if the local quality is zero, the predicted CHF due to Cold Wall effect considering both the use of $D_h$ and $F$ will decrease around 5%. Referring to Figure G.2, G.3, and G.4, if the hot rod (with a power factor 2.26b) is in cold channel (with a power factor 2.060), along with a zero power rod due to the cold wall effect curve A (Figure G.3, G.4) will shift to Curve C. This net shift to lower MDNBR is because the cold
channel effect on MDNBR dominates the opposing effect of decrease of channel power.

Therefore, if rod power peaking factors are available, the procedure to identify the worst location (place of lowest MDNBR) is: first, to identify the highest rod power factor, as the hottest rod, second, to check the existence of any cold rod (zero power rod) in the neighborhood of the hottest rod. The predicted MDNBR might occur on the hottest rod with cold wall effect even if the channel is not hot. Figures G.3 and G.4 can quantitatively demonstrate this point. Curves A in both figures is the MDNBR of a hot rod in hot channel. Curve C in both figures is the MDNBR of a hot rod with cold wall effect but in cold channel.

A positive initial margin of 0.045 in both figure G.3 and G.4 can be seen for the base case. It means that the MDNBR of curve C is smaller than curve A at the base initial situation. But due to the cross flow and the energy interchange from the channel inlet till the location of MDNBR, both the mass flow rate and enthalpy in each channel will change. From the calculation in Section G.2, and Section G.3 the percentage change of enthalpy and mass flow rate for each channel can be used which were indicated on both figures by the dash lines as the enthalpy and mass flow rate shift. Even after those shift the margin is still positive which can be seen on figure G.3 and G.4 as the margin of 0.019 and 0.035 respectively.
Therefore the MDNBR of the hot rod with cold wall effect is still less than the hot rod without cold wall effect even with the shift of mass flow rate and enthalpy in the channel. This result does depend on the numerical values of rod peaking factors. The values in any particular situation should be compared to those used in this appendix to permit determination of the applicability of the result of this appendix to a new case.

Therefore the predicted MDNBR would rather occur on the hottest rod which is in the cold channel side than in the hot channel side.

G.5 Relative Effect of Rod Power and Channel Power on MDNBR

This section presents the comparison of MDNBR between cases of hot rod in cold channel and cold rod in hot channel, say hot rod with power peaking factor "A" located in cold channel with peaking factor "D" (channel power is obtained from the averaged power of the fuel rods comprising the channel) and cold rod with power peaking factor "B" located in hot channel with peaking factor "C". So, the following relations are always true: A-B > 0; C-D > 0. The relative effect of rod power and channel power on MDNBR is the only purpose of this section. Therefore, cross flow and turbulent interchange which are only magnitude effect were not included in the analysis.

The location of MDNBR which is either on the hot rod or on the cold rod depends on the following four numerical values:

1. A-B: differences between rod powers
2. C-D: differences between channel powers
These values are different from core to core, therefore, case by case analysis has to be performed to decide the location of MDNBR. Datum generated from a series of single channel thermal hydraulic computer runs have been used to plot the curves in Fig. G.5. The location of MDNBR for this example case can be determined from this figure. For example, suppose that the power factors were assigned as: $A = 1.8$, $B = 1.4$, $C = 2.2$, $D = 1.4$ (the same definition of $A$, $B$, $C$, $D$ as mentioned at the beginning of this section). From the plot (as shown by the dashed line), the location of MDNBR is on the cold rod which is located in the hot channel ($DNBR = 1.544$) not on the hot rod which is located in the cold channel ($DNBR = 1.818$). The outcome depends solely on the numerical value of these power factors.

Even though the individual value of the power factors plays a decisive role in determining the location of MDNBR, still from Fig. G.5 a qualitative conclusion can be made as follows:

1. The probability that the hot rod is the location of MDNBR will decrease first in case of $C-D$ increases but "A" and "B" are kept constant; second in case of $A$ increases but $A-B$, "C" and "D" are kept constant.

2. The same probability as (1) will increase instead of decrease first in case of $A-B$ increases but "C" and "D" are kept constant; second in case of "C" increase but $C-D$, "A" and "B" are kept constant.
G.6 Conclusion

The location of predicted MDNBR can be identified by the numerical values of rod power peaking factors and channel power peaking factors. The hot channel is the limiting case for DNBR evaluation when the rod power peaking factors are not available. If the rod power peaking factors are available, and the hot rod is located in the hot channel, the hot rod is the limiting case for DNBR evaluation. Also if a zero power rod is present, region which faces the zero power rod is the location of MDNBR. Since the numerical values of the rod power peaking factors are different from core to core, a simple single channel quantitative analysis like Fig. G.5 might be necessary to confirm the location of MDNBR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations (in)</th>
<th>Enthalpy (BTU/LB)</th>
<th>Mass Flux (MLB/HR-FT²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>548.80</td>
<td>548.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>549.87</td>
<td>550.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>552.58</td>
<td>553.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>556.91</td>
<td>558.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>562.82</td>
<td>565.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>570.18</td>
<td>574.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>578.86</td>
<td>584.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>588.74</td>
<td>595.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>599.53</td>
<td>607.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>611.07</td>
<td>619.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>623.21</td>
<td>633.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>635.92</td>
<td>647.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>649.01</td>
<td>660.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>661.23</td>
<td>672.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.5*</td>
<td>673.19</td>
<td>685.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>683.74</td>
<td>696.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>693.27</td>
<td>705.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>701.54</td>
<td>711.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>707.61</td>
<td>717.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>712.53</td>
<td>721.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>715.57</td>
<td>723.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>716.66</td>
<td>722.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.1. Output Data for Example Case

*Location of MDNBR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Mass Flow Rate (lb/sec)</th>
<th>Cross Flow Between Adjacent Channels (lb/sec ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M(49)</td>
<td>M(56)</td>
<td>M(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7292</td>
<td>0.7292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.7289</td>
<td>0.7288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.7283</td>
<td>0.7277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.7274</td>
<td>0.7262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>0.7263</td>
<td>0.7247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.7248</td>
<td>0.7226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.7227</td>
<td>0.7199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>0.7207</td>
<td>0.7176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>0.7164</td>
<td>0.7121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0.7155</td>
<td>0.6568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>0.7116</td>
<td>0.6534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>0.6772</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>0.6789</td>
<td>0.6365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>0.6694</td>
<td>0.6202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>0.6543</td>
<td>0.6039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>0.6435</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>0.6367</td>
<td>0.6015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>0.6316</td>
<td>0.6069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>0.6302</td>
<td>0.6066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>0.6268</td>
<td>0.6115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>0.6178</td>
<td>0.6142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>0.6161</td>
<td>0.6043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.1 Output Data for Example Case (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Enthalpy Change Btu/(\text{lb}) Due To Heat Flux A</th>
<th>Enthalpy Change Btu/(\text{lb}) Due To Turbulent B</th>
<th>Enthalpy Change Btu/(\text{lb}) Due To Cross Flow C</th>
<th>B/A (%)</th>
<th>C/A (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.693</td>
<td>.1453</td>
<td>.0004045</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.0150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.969</td>
<td>.3058</td>
<td>.005314</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.119</td>
<td>.2942</td>
<td>.005483</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.0770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>9.101</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>.001391</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>.0153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>.01794</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>.1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>1.959</td>
<td>.2308</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>1.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>.2221</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>1.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>.3045</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>2.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>2.701</td>
<td>.1418</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>6.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>9.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>.5868</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>3.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>.5283</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.5*</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>.01303</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>3.299</td>
<td>.6676</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>13.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>8.441</td>
<td>1.939</td>
<td>.2891</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>3.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>5.914</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>.1448</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>.2532</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>.5378</td>
<td>.5514</td>
<td>.03477</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.2731</td>
<td>.1232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDNBR</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.2 Percentage Contribution to the enthalpy change by the different energy transport modes. For the hot subchannel (Channel 57)

*Location of MDNBR
Table G.3. Amount of Energy Across the Hot Subchannel (Channel 57) Boundaries by Turbulent Interchange and Cross Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Turbulent interchange term (B) Btu/lbm</th>
<th>Cross flow term (C) Btu/lbm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries*</td>
<td>Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.04435</td>
<td>0.01321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.1369</td>
<td>0.03775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.2560</td>
<td>0.06215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>0.3882</td>
<td>0.08965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.5225</td>
<td>0.1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.6590</td>
<td>0.1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>0.7565</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>0.8525</td>
<td>0.1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0.9574</td>
<td>0.1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>0.08468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>0.01711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.01421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**84.5</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>0.04359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For Boundary number scheme see Fig. G.1

** Location of MDNBR

*** Total from inlet to the location of MDNBR (i.e. from 0. inch to 84.5 inches)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANNELS</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Change of Mass Flow Rate From Inlet To Location of MDNBR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
<td>-18.0</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G.4 Percentage changes of Mass Flow Rate in the example case. (Minus sign means Mass Flow Rate has been reduced.)
Hot Rod with power peaking factor = 2.266

MDNBR might occur here if zero power rod is in this channel

Cold channel with power peaking factor = 2.060

hot channel with power peaking factor = 2.266

Figure G.2 Example case of the Cold Wall Effect
MARGIN = MARGIN FOR MDNBR SHIFT
FROM HIGH RADIAL POWER
FACTOR CHANNEL

FINAL MARGIN = 0.19 CONSIDERING
COLD WALL EFFECT

HOT ROD WITH POWER FACTOR = 2.266 LOCATED 1.0
HOT CHANNEL WITH POWER FACTOR = 2.266 (CURVE)

INITIAL MARGIN
HOT ROD WITH POWER FACTOR = 2.266 SHIFT DUE TO
COLD WALL EFFECT IN COLD CHANNEL WITH POWER FACTOR
= 2.069 (CURVE C)

ENTHALPY DIFFERENCE FROM BASE CASE ENTHALPY AT MDNBR (BTU/LB)

BASE CASE
P = 2150.0 PSIA
G = 2.21/ H LF/FT² HR
INLET ENTHALPY = 548.8 BTU/LB
RADIAL POWER FACTOR: VARIABLE
**BASE CASE**

- **P=2150 PSIA**
- **G=2.217 Mlb/ft² hr**
- **INLET ENTHALPY=548.8 Btu/lb**
- **RADIAL POWER FACTOR VARIABLE**

**MARGIN = MARGIN FOR MDNBR SHIFT FROM HIGH RADIAL POWER FACTOR CHANNEL**

- **Hot Rod with Power Factor = 2.266 Located in Hot Channel with Power Factor 2.266 (Curve A)**
- **Hot Rod with Power Factor = 2.266 Shift Due to Cold Wall Effect in Cold Channel with Power Factor =2.060 (Curve C)**

**Final Margin = 0.035**
Considering the Cold Wall Effect
$P = 2150.0 \text{ PSIA}$

$G = 2.217 \text{ Mlb/ft}^2\text{hr}$

$H_{\text{inlet}} = 548.8 \text{ BTU/lb}$

**Figure C.5** RELATIVE EFFECT OF ROD POWER AND CHANNEL POWER ON MDNBR
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### NOMENCLATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A_i )</td>
<td>cross-section area for subchannels ( i ), ((L^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_s )</td>
<td>cross-section area for any subchannel ((L^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A_k )</td>
<td>cross-section area for homogenized subchannels ( k ) ((L^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{i,j} )</td>
<td>thermal conduction coefficient for subchannels ( i ) and ( j ) ((H/T\theta L))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{L,R} )</td>
<td>thermal conduction coefficient for homogenized subchannels ( L ) and ( R ) ((H/T\theta L))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_i )</td>
<td>crossflow friction force for subchannel ( i ) ((F))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C )</td>
<td>crossflow friction force for homogenized subchannels ((F))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta x )</td>
<td>axial elevation increment, ((L))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta h )</td>
<td>axial change of radially averaged enthalpy in the multi-subchannel representation, ((H))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \bar{h} )</td>
<td>axial change of radially averaged enthalpy in the homogenized representation, ((H))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F )</td>
<td>axial friction force per unit length ((F/L))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_R )</td>
<td>Flow ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{F} )</td>
<td>average flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( g )</td>
<td>gravitational constant, ((L/T^2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( g_i )</td>
<td>mass flux of channel ( i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{G} )</td>
<td>averaged mass flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( h_i )</td>
<td>enthalpy for subchannel ( i ), ((H))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\( h^* \) effective enthalpy carried by diversion crossflow \((H)\)

\( h^*_k \) radially averaged multi-subchannel enthalpy, \((H)\)

\( H_k \) homogenized enthalpy for region \( k \), \((H)\)

\( H_R \) inlet enthalpy ratio

\( K \) crossflow resistance coefficient

\( L \) channel length, \((L)\)

\( m_i \) flow rate for subchannel \( i \) \((M/T)\)

\( M_k \) flow rate for homogenized region \( k \), \((M/T)\)

\( N \) Total number of rods

\( N_{H}^{N_{U},N_{TP},N_{TP},N_{TU}} \) coupling coefficients

\( \bar{N}_H \) averaged coupling coefficient

\( N' \) total number of subchannels equal to

\[ \begin{align*}
N/2 \text{ for } N \text{ even} \\
N/2 + 1/2 \text{ for } N \text{ odd}
\end{align*} \]

\( p_i \) pressure for subchannel \( i \) \((F/L^2)\)

\( P_k \) pressure for homogenized region \( k \) \((F/L^2)\)

\( P_R \) power ratio

\( q_i \) heat addition per unit length, for subchannel \( i \) \((H/L)\)

\( \bar{q} \) averaged heat addition per unit length \((H/L)\)

\( Q_k \) heat addition per unit length for homogenized region \( k \) \((H/L)\)

\( R_{H}, R_p \) ratio of \( \bar{N}_H \) in the FLOW UPSET CASE

\( S^- \) rod spacing \((L)\)

\( u^* \) effective velocity carried by diversion

\( \bar{u} \) effective averaged velocity for adjacent channels
effective momentum velocity for subchannel \( i \), \((L/T)\)

\( U_k \)
effective momentum velocity for homogenized region \( k \), \((L/T)\)

\( \bar{U} \)
effective averaged velocity for homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \)

\( W_{i,j} \)
diversion crossflow between adjacent sub-channels \((M/TL)\)

\( W_{L,R} \)
diversion crossflow between homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \) \((M/TL)\)

\( W'_{i,j} \)
turbulent interchange between adjacent sub-channels \( i \) and \( j \) \((M/TL)\)

\( W'_{L,R} \)
turbulent interchange between adjacent homogenized region \( L \) and \( R \) \((M/TL)\)

\( \rho^* \)
density carried by the diversion crossflow \((M/L^3)\)

\( \beta \)
turbulent mixing parameter

Subscripts

\( i \)
subchannel identification number

\( k \)
homogenized region identification number

Variables

\( J \)
axial elevation node along the subchannels
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Thermal hydraulic design studies of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) core performance are carried out using lumped parameter computational methods typified by the COBRA¹ and THINC² developments. In analyses of these cores the smallest homogenized segment is a sub-channel which is characterized by properties of interest such as enthalpy, flow rate and pressure. For typical PWR open lattice core configurations, detailed core analyses are performed in a cascade fashion. In this approach, crossflows between fuel assemblies are first determined by treating each fuel assembly as a homogenized region and these crossflows are subsequently imposed as boundary conditions in the subchannel analysis of the hot assembly. Alternatively, some analyses are performed by representing the core by increasing coarsely homogenized regions around the hot subchannel of interest.

The common requirement of each of these procedures is for transport or coupling coefficients to represent exchange of momentum and energy between the homogenized regions. These coefficients are properly developed
when they produce properties in a homogenized region which are equivalent to those obtained by averaging local distributions of the same properties over the same region. The work of France and Ginsberg\textsuperscript{3} and Ramm, Johannsen and Todreas \textsuperscript{4} on developing transport coefficients for adjacent subchannels from local property distributions within a subchannel represents the solution to an analogous problem. In our case the smallest region is the subchannel so that our homogenized representation of the individual subchannels comprising an assembly becomes analogous to the earlier France et al. homogenized representation of the subchannel. However, as opposed to this previous work, in the case we now address, crossflows between subchannels exist and must be considered in the analysis.

1.2 General Problem Statement

We desired to represent a PWR assembly comprised of a square array of $N$ by $N$ rods as a single node in a corewide lumped parameter analysis. We seek those transport coefficients which when used in the lumped analysis will yield node enthalpies for all axial stations equivalent to those obtained by averaging the subchannel enthalpies over all subchannels comprising the single node. It is assumed that the axial enthalpy dis-
tribution of every subchannel in the N by N array is known. In our example we obtain this known distribution from analysis of the N by N assembly using arbitrary coefficients for interaction between subchannels. This known axial enthalpy distribution is ultimately to be derived from experiment. Interpretation of such experiments to yield coefficients and this known distribution is a topic separate from the task of this work.

1.3 Cases of Interest

Let us identify cases of interest and test the usefulness of our hypothesis in solving these cases.

a) Case 1: The prime case of interest is that of adjacent heated bundles with different linear power ratings and different inlet mass flow rates. Within each bundle the linear power and mass flow rate is taken constant. We identify this case as the POWER/FLOW UPSET CONDITION. This case has been studied for the condition leading to the maximum crossflow which occurs when the higher power and lower inlet flow exist together in the same bundle. Other variables in this case are the power and flow ratios between assemblies. These ratios were both taken as 1.2, the maximum anticipated in practice.
b) **Case 2:** A degenerate version of Case 1 is that of linear power upset but the same inlet mass flow to each assembly. This case was studied since crossflow is reduced versus Case 1 and is only due to radial enthalpy gradients between assemblies. This case is called the **POWER UPSET CONDITION.**

The following two non-prototypic reactor cases were also examined. These cases permitted almost complete separation of the enthalpy and crossflow effects. Additionally, they are of interest in themselves since experiments based on these cases may be performed since they are considerably less complex and costly than heated, multipin assembly tests. These cases are:

c) **Case 3:** Unheated rods with all subchannels in each of the two adjacent assemblies at a uniform inlet enthalpy. Each assembly however, has a different inlet enthalpy. Both assemblies have the same inlet mass flux to each subchannel. This case is called the **ENTHALPY UPSET CONDITION.**

d) **Case 4:** Same as Case 3 except the upset condition is in inlet mass flux plus the inlet enthalpy. This case is called the **ENTHALPY/FLOW UPSET CONDITION.**

For each case of interest, a range of bundle sizes, \( N' = f(N) \) and subchannel mixing rates, \( \beta \), were investi-
gated spanning the range of interest to PWR application. The input parameters $K$ and $S/L$ for the crossflow resistance and the control volume of the crossflow are kept constant as 0.5.
CHAPTER 2

METHODS OF PROBLEM SOLUTION

2.1 Detailed Problem Definition

Figure 1 illustrates a typical N by N assembly of interest (N odd) surrounded by neighboring assemblies. We develop a one dimensional solution by selecting adjacent strips of \( N' \) subchannels where for N odd, \( N' = \frac{N}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \), the edge subchannel being half the size of the interior subchannels (for N even, \( N' = \frac{N}{2} \) and the edge subchannel is equal to the interior subchannel). The selected adjacent strips shown in Figure 2 are assumed to be bounded by adiabatic, impervious boundaries. The homogenized representation of Figure 2 is shown in Figure 3 which has flow area, wetted perimeter, heat flux and mass flow equivalent to that of the strip of \( N' \) subchannels. It should be recognized that many equivalent pictorial homogenized representations satisfying these conditions are possible. However, since the following prescribed prediction technique does not utilize the distance between subchannel centroids of Figure 2, any equivalent pictorial representation can be adopted.

We require that at every axial position of the homogenized region, the total flow, the energy content and
the pressure drop from inlet should be the same as those obtainable by averaging the values of the individual subchannels. These conditions are met if the mass, heat and momentum transfer across the boundary between the adjacent strips at every axial position are the same in both cases. In calculating the boundary transport, we use subchannel values of the pressure and enthalpy differences in the multi-subchannel case but the difference in the averaged values in the homogenized representation.

For the homogenized representation calculation, we require a method of calculating the lateral transport in terms of what would have been the local parameter difference while knowing only the average differences.

2.2 Problem Solution by Analysis of the Differential Form of the Conservation Equations

We postulate that this can be accomplished by applying suitable coefficients to the terms in the conservation equations of the homogenized representation. The form of these coefficients which transform average (homogenized representation) parameter differences to local (multi-channel representation) differences are derived in Appendix A (Volume I) from the differential expression of the conservation equations. These forms are
\[ N_H = \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_C - h_D} \]

\[ N_U = \frac{U_L - U_R}{u_C - u_D} \]

\[ N_{TU} = \frac{\sum_{i=A}^{E} \frac{\partial (\bar{u}_L, R)}{\partial x}}{\partial x} \]

\[ N_{TP} = \frac{P_L - P_R}{P_A - P_F} \]

\[ N_{TF} = \frac{C}{E} = \frac{E}{\sum_{i=A}^{C} c_i} \frac{W_{L,R}}{W_{L,R}} \cdot \frac{\rho_{L,R}}{\rho_{L,R}} \]

\[ \frac{w_{1,1+1}}{w_{1,1+1}} \]

where \( \rho^* \) is the density of fluid at the donor channel for the diversion crossflow. (Refer to Figures 2 and 3 for subscripts A, B, C, D, E and F; L and R).

Appendix A (Volume I) further presents detailed formula for these coefficients in terms of parameters available from multi-channel analysis. In the remainder of this volume, we
a) assess the validity of these formula when analyses are made using the difference forms of the conservation equations used in COBRA IIIC,

b) utilize these formula to present recommended values of the coefficients for the 4 cases of Chapter 1 for a selected range of $\beta$ and $N'$,

c) assess the errors which still remain in homogenized representation results when these coefficients are employed.

2.3 Problem Solution by Analysis of the Difference (i.e. COBRA IIIC) Form of the Conservation Equations

For reactor analysis which is to be done by lumped channel methods, i.e., COBRA IIIC, difference approximations to the differential form of the conservation equations are employed. Appendix B,(Volume I) formulated with the assistance of Pablo Moreno, presents the conservation equations for both the multi-subchannel case and the homogenized representation in difference form. Unfortunately the complexity of these equations precludes the possibility of employing simple but exact coupling coefficients in the transverse momentum equations. However the simple, albeit approximate, forms of coupling coefficients summarized in the previous section, will
yield satisfactory results for most practical reactor conditions. The most limiting assumptions imposed in using these simple forms of coupling coefficients in the difference equations concern the diversion cross-flow terms. Therefore, results utilizing these approximate coefficients for analysis of conditions of severe flow and/or power upset conditions can be in significant error.

Specifically from Appendix B these assumptions are:

a) Use of the following expression for $h_\star^C$ in the energy equation:

$$h_\star = \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} + \frac{H_L - H_L + H_R}{2N_H} W_{L,R} > 0 \quad (2.3.1)$$

b) Use of the following expression for $u_\star^C$ in the axial momentum equation:

$$u_\star = \frac{U_L + U_R}{2} + \frac{U_L - U_L + U_R}{2N_U} W_{L,R} > 0 \quad (2.3.2)$$

This assumption holds for the condition of symmetric enthalpy profile with respect to the boundary. If not, $\frac{H_L + H_R}{2}$ cannot be regarded as the enthalpy at the boundary of two strips, L and R. Appendix B is written to show this asymmetric enthalpy feature around the boundary where diversion crossflow is large.
2.4 Proposed Approach of Utilizing Only One Coupling Coefficient

Study of these five coupling coefficients indicates that $N_H$ is the most important in calculating the changes in enthalpy and axial velocity of the homogenized representation over the axial region of interest. Thus the method of solution can be further simplified by employing only one coupling coefficient, i.e., $N_H$. However, it is suggested that $N_U$, $N_{TF}$ and $N_{TU}$ be employed if the diversion crossflow plays an important role in the transverse energy transport between channels. For $N$ less than 23 and flow ratio between assemblies at the inlet less than 1.2, the utilization of only one coupling coefficient ($N_H$) yields satisfactory results for all cases. Therefore, an analytical evaluation of the coupling coefficient ($N_H$) has been carried out in Appendix A.

Current approaches for the lumped-parameter calculations either adopt $N_H = 1$ or $N_H = N$ (refer to Reference 5, pg. 276). Further, in these approaches the coupling coefficient is used only in the turbulent mixing component term of the energy equation. With the approach of using $N_H = 1$, the energy transport by the turbulent mixing and the diversion crossflow in the homogenized region calculation is highly exaggerated. Therefore, optimistic results for the axial enthalpy changes in the hot channel are to be expected. On the other hand,
use of \( N_H = N \) can excessively suppress the energy transport by the turbulent mixing. Therefore in the case of \( N_H = N \), results for axial enthalpy changes of the hot channels in the homogenized region calculation are expected to be conservative but the deviation of the lumped enthalpy change from the averaged values in the multi-subchannel calculation is still rather large with respect to the approach employing \( N_H = 1 \). However, with the linear enthalpy profile throughout the subchannels, \( N_H \) becomes \( N \). (Refer to Appendix D (Volume I) for the derivation).

2.5 Assessment of Errors with the One Coefficient Approach

Since only one coupling coefficient \( (N_H) \) is used in our approach, deviations of the results in the homogenized region calculation from that in the multi-subchannel calculation are expected. The major reasons for these deviations are summarized below.

a) due to improper computation of the momentum and the energy carried by the diversion cross-flow through the boundary between homogenized regions, i.e., assumptions of equations (2.3.1) and (2.3.2),

b) due to the lack of a corrective method for
matching the homogenized region axial and transverse momentum to the standard values of the multichannel calculation, i.e., $N_U$, $N_{TU}$, $N_{TF}$ and $N_{TP}$ are not employed.

The general expectation for predictions using only $N_H$ in the homogenized region calculation is discussed below under the specific cases of interest since the importance of $N_H$ varies under different conditions, i.e., enthalpy upset, flow upset, power upset and power and flow upset. For the cases of small diversion crossflow, the importance of $N_H$ can be studied by assuming there is no diversion crossflow through the boundary. In Appendix E (Volume I) a relation between the errors of the homogenized region axial enthalpy changes and the operational conditions, i.e., $F_R$, $H_R$, $P_R$, $\overline{Q}$ and $\beta$ under the no crossflow condition has been derived. A qualitative study for the role of $N_H$ under different conditions has been made in the following sections. Also a comparison between analytical result and computer result is presented in Appendix A. It is convenient to study these cases in the order of ENTHALPY UPSET Case, ENTHALPY AND FLOW Case, POWER UPSET Case and POWER AND FLOW UPSET Case.

2.5.1 Unheated Cases
2.5.1.1 Enthalpy Upset Cases

Since there is no flow upset in this case, significant diversion crossflow does not occur. It is expected that good homogenized region enthalpy rise results can be obtained in this case by only employing $N_H$.

From the derivation in Appendix E, (Volume I) the error for the homogenized region axial enthalpy change using $N_H = 1$ of the hotter channel can be expressed as:

$$\text{ERROR} = (1 - \bar{N}_H)$$

where $\bar{N}_H$ is the axially averaged $N_H$ computed by our suggested method.

Since $\bar{N}_H$ is slightly proportional to the number of channels, i.e., $N$, and always larger than 1, the error is always negative and increases slightly as $N$ increases. The negative error means the predicted hot channel exit enthalpies are always less than that in the multi-subchannel calculation.

If $N_H = N$ is employed in the homogenized region calculation, the error for the homogenized region axial enthalpy change can be expressed as:

$$\text{ERROR} = (N - \bar{N}_H)$$

which is always positive. Since $\bar{N}_H$ is usually less
than one third of N, it is expected that the error in the case of \( N_H = N \) is about two times larger than that in the case of \( N_H = 1 \).

The effect of \( \beta \) and \( H_R \) do not directly come into play. However, the error is expected to increase as \( \beta \) decreases. This is because the axial rise of the homogenized enthalpy decreases as \( \beta \) decreases.

2.5.1.2 Enthalpy and Flow Upset Case

The role of the diversion crossflow in this case is between that in the enthalpy upset case and that in the power and flow upset case. Therefore the error in the axial enthalpy changes is expected to lie between that in the enthalpy upset case and in the power and flow upset case.

Furthermore, the error for the axial enthalpy changes in the hot channel by employing \( N_H = 1 \) can be expressed in the same way as that in the enthalpy upset case. Therefore, \( N_H \) has the same importance as that in the enthalpy upset case.

2.5.2 Heated Cases

2.5.2.1 Power Upset Case

Axial enthalpy changes are due to three mechanisms: heat added from the rods, energy transport by
the turbulent interchange between channels and energy transport by the diversion crossflow between channels.

From equation E.14 in Appendix E, (Volume I) the error for the enthalpy change in hot channel by using $N_H=1$ can be expressed as the following:

$$\frac{1}{N_H} - 1$$

$$\text{ERROR} = \frac{N_H}{(PR-1)\beta SL} - \frac{1}{N_H}$$  \hspace{1cm} (E.20)

Since the axial enthalpy change due to the heat added from the fuel rods is generally larger than that due to the diversion crossflow, the errors in the determination of the lumped energy transport by the diversion crossflow have less effect on the total axial enthalpy change than in the unheated cases. Thus, favorable results in the homogenized region predictions are expected to be obtained for even crude estimates of $N_H$.

It is interesting to note that the error is not a function of the heat generation rate ($q'$). In the meanwhile, the error decreases as $N$ increases and as $PR$ approaches unity. Thus, the larger the $PR$ and the smaller the $N$, the more important the $N_H$.

2.5.2.2 Power and Flow Upset Condition

For the same reason as stated in 2.2.1, good
results are expected to be obtained even though the
diversion crossflow in this case is larger than that
in the power upset case. The importance of $N_H$ is also
the same as that in the power upset case. However, the
tunnel increases as $F_R$ increases.
CHAPTER 3

RECOMMENDED COUPLING COEFFICIENTS FOR UNHEATED BUNDLES

Two cases are discussed in this chapter, i.e., the enthalpy upset case and the enthalpy and flow upset case. Numerical values of \( N_H \) of these two cases are obtained for three values of \( N \) and three values of \( \beta \), i.e., \( N = 5, 11 \) and 23; \( \beta = 0.005, 0.02, \) and 0.04. Other input data in COBRA IIIC, \( S \), \( L \) and \( K \), are kept constant and equal to 0.5.

3.1 Enthalpy Upset Case

The numerical values of \( N_H \) are evaluated from the results of multi-channel computation utilizing a step shaped inlet enthalpy upset. It is suggested that two half-sized subchannels C and D always be utilized to obtain the subchannel parameters \( h_C \) and \( h_D \). The reason is that the required difference, \( h_C - h_D \), in the definition of \( N_H \) is generally poorly approximated by the enthalpies of the subchannel B and E (refer to Figure 2 for subscripts B, C, D and E). For instance, if we compute \( N_H \) by the following relation

\[
N_H = \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_B - h_E} \frac{1}{4} \quad (3.1)
\]
the error of the enthalpy rise involved in the homogenized region case will be 45% higher than that using $N_H$ evaluated by the parameters of the half-sized sub-channels C and D.

It is worthwhile noting that the numeric solution of COBRA IIIC imposes a limitation on $\beta$ due to enthalpy fluctuation when the energy transport is assumed to occur only by the turbulent interchange which is more restrictive in the half-size channel computation than in the full-sized computation. The maximum allowable value for this case is 0.048 (refer to Appendix C for the derivation). Therefore $\beta=0.04$ is picked as the upper bound of $\beta$ in our approach.

3.1.1 Comparison Between Various Forms of $N_H$

In this section the results of hot zone enthalpy in the homogenized case using the following expressions for $N_H$ are examined

$$N_H(z)$$

$$\bar{N}_H$$

$N_H = 1.0, \text{ all } z$

$N_H = N, \text{ all } z$

where

$$\bar{N}_H = \frac{\Delta H_{T.I.}}{\sum \frac{\Delta H_{1,T.I.}}{N_{H_i}}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.1.1)
\( \Delta H_{T,I} \) = enthalpy rise of the "homogenized representation" due to turbulent interchange.

The results are illustrated in Figure 4. As we have seen in this figure, the enthalpy changes of the homogenized case by using \( N_H(z) \) and \( \bar{N}_H \) coincide with that of the multi-subchannel case. On the other hand, \( N_H = 1 \) and \( N_H = N \) have errors of enthalpy rise equal to \(-20.3\%\) and \(57.4\%\) respectively compared with the results of the multi-subchannel representation. This example demonstrates the need for utilizing a value of \( N_H \) other than 1 for application in ENTHALPY and ENTHALPY AND FLOW UPSET CASES.

### 3.1.2 \( N_H \) Values for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE

In this section \( N_H \) values for the enthalpy upset condition with different values of \( \beta \) and \( N \) are presented. The method used to compute \( N_H \) from the multi-subchannel computation is illustrated in Appendix D. The values of \( N_H(z) \) versus axial elevation is shown in Figures 5, 6 and 7. The analytical result is shown in Appendix A. The dips and humps of \( N_H \) at low elevation positions for \( \beta = 0.04 \) are due to enthalpy fluctuation by turbulent interchange as mentioned previously. Note that the fluctuation amplitude of \( N_H \) is not going to be damped out if values of \( \beta \) larger than 0.048 are used.
The validity of these recommended $N_h$ values is determined by comparing the hot zone enthalpy of the homogenized case with that of the multi-subchannel case at each axial node. The results for $\beta = 0.005$, 0.02 and 0.04; $N = 5$, 11 and 23 of the homogenized cases coincide with that calculated in the multi-subchannel case just as we expect. This equivalence is demonstrated in Figures 8, 9 and 10.

The inlet enthalpy shape for this case is a step function, abruptly changing at the center of the strip of the subchannels. For example, the inlet enthalpies of channel A, B and C are taken as a constant value and the inlet enthalpies of subchannel C, D and E are taken as another constant value. In the case of gradual enthalpy change at the center of the strip of subchannels, e.g., the inlet enthalpy at the center subchannel for $N$ odd is taken as the averaged value of the inlet enthalpy of the hot zone and that of the cold zone, the $N_h$ will have a completely different shape versus channel length from that of step inlet enthalpy case. $N_h$ in this case will be infinite at the inlet of the channel and abruptly dips and then gradually increase. The $N_h(z)$ for $N = 23$ in this case is shown in Figure 11. It is good to see
that even though \( N_H \) is changed abruptly versus channel length, the results for homogenized case still coincide with the multi-subchannel results (Figure 11a).

### 3.1.3. Recommended Values of \( N_H \) for Design Use

In this section, two methods are investigated to illustrate the behavior of \( N_H \) versus \( \beta, N \) and the axial position of the subchannel. One is curve fitting of our predicted \( N_H(z) \) results, the other is the averaging of the \( N_H(z) \) over the axial enthalpy increment of the hot zone to give an \( \bar{N}_H \). Each of them provides a convenient way to incorporate the \( N_H \) concept in design practice.

#### 3.1.3.1 Curve Fits

The \( N_H(z) \) predictions can be represented using a continuous function \( f(z) \) versus channel position \( z \).

\[
f(z) = 1.0 + \frac{b z}{a + z}
\]  

The values of "a" and "b" can be evaluated by fitting two values of \( N_H \) with smallest deviation from the true value at every elevation node. The values of "a" and "b" for the nine cases we have analyzed are tabulated in Table 1.
3.1.3.2 Averaged Value of $N_H(z)$, i.e. $\overline{N_H}$

From the definition of $\overline{N_H}$ (refer to equation 3.1.1), it is expected that the enthalpy of the hot zone at any axial position $z$ in the homogenized representation predicted using $\overline{N_H}$ will coincide with that in the multi-subchannel case. The $\overline{N_H}$ for $\beta = 0$, 0.005, 0.02 and 0.04, $N = 2$, 5, 11 and 23, and $L = 144$ inches are tabulated in Table 2. For $\beta = 0.02$, $\overline{N_H}$ for a range of channel lengths and $N = 2$, 5, 11, 17 and 23 are plotted in Figure 12. It is interesting to notice that $\overline{N_H}$ increases with channel length due to the development of the enthalpy profile along the channel (refer to Figure 13). Further, the $\overline{N_H}$ curve becomes asymptotic as $N$ increases for certain $\beta$ and $N$. The phenomenon is due to the average parameters $\overline{h_L}$ and $\overline{h_R}$ which becomes less dependent on the subchannel parameters of the center half-sized subchannels, i.e., $h_C$ and $h_D$ when $N$ is large.

3.2 Enthalpy and Flow Upset Case

For the step inlet flow upset with the higher flow rate in the hot zone, together with the inlet enthalpy upset, $N_H$ will increase as the flow ratio increases. It is convenient to define the ratio between these cases in terms of a multiplier, $R$ where
\[ R_H = \frac{N_H (\text{ENTHALPY AND FLOW UPSET})}{N_H (\text{ENTHALPY UPSET})} \quad (3.2) \]

Figure 14 demonstrates that this multiplication factor for \( H_R = 1.22 \) is roughly directly proportional to \( F_R \), where \( F_R \) is defined as:

\[ F_R = \frac{F_{\text{HOT}}}{F_{\text{COLD}}} \]

\( F_{\text{HOT}} \) = inlet flow of the hot zone in the homogenized representation
\( F_{\text{COLD}} \) = inlet flow of the cold zone in the homogenized representation

The comparison between the results of the homogenized cases using \( N_H(z) \) and \( N_H = 1 \) and the results of the multi-subchannel case is illustrated in Figure 15. It should be noticed that the result of the homogenized representation, using only one coupling coefficient \( N_H \), is not as good as that in the enthalpy upset case, Figure 4.

The 13% error for the enthalpy rise of the homogenized region case can be explained as follows:

1) Assumption (A.1.12a) (Volume I) made to derive the \( N_H' \) in terms of \( N_H \) and known parameters becomes invalid.
when flow upset goes up, i.e., diversion crossflow becomes significant.

2) Under the large diversion crossflow condition in this case the neglect of $N_U$, $N_{TF}$, $N_{TP}$ and $N_{TU}$ effects the results.

3) Error exists due to the difference approximation made in COBRA IIIC computation as assessed in Appendix B. (Volume I)
CHAPTER 4

RECOMMENDED COUPLING COEFFICIENTS FOR HEATED BUNDLES

Two cases are discussed in this chapter, i.e., the POWER UPSET CASE and the POWER AND FLOW UPSET CASE. The analytical result is shown in Appendix A.

4.1 POWER UPSET CASE

The numerical values of $N_H$ are evaluated for three values of $N$ and three values of $\beta$, i.e., $N = 5, 11$ and $23$; $\beta = 0.005, 0.02$ and $0.04$. The maximum $\beta$ in this case is limited to $0.048$ when half-sized subchannels are used to obtain the subchannel parameters required in the evaluation of $N_H$. Because the exit enthalpy difference between the homogenized representation and the multi-subchannel representation in this case is less sensitive to $N_H$ than that for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE (as mentioned in section 2.5.2.1), $N_H$ can be evaluated by equation (3.1) without the half-sized subchannels in the center region and yields good results of the homogenized representation.

4.1.1 Comparison Between Various Forms of $N_H$

In this section the results of the hot zone enthalpy in the homogenized representation using the following expressions for $N_H$ are examined:
\[ N_H(z) \]
\[ \overline{N_H} \]
\[ N_H = 1.0, \text{ all } z \]
\[ N_H = N, \text{ all } z \]

where \( \overline{N_H} \) is defined by equation (3.1.1).

The results are illustrated in Figure 16 for a typical \( N, \beta \) combination. The predicted hot zone enthalpies for the homogenized representation using \( N_H(z) \) coincide with that of the multi-subchannel representation. However, result for \( N_H = 1 \) and \( N_H = N \) have errors of enthalpy rise equal to -3.2% and 2.1% respectively. Note that for the POWER UPSET CASE the error in hot side enthalpy for the homogenized representation is not as sensitive to the form of \( N_H \) as in the unheated bundle cases. This example demonstrates that the need for computing \( N_H \) in the heated bundle is not as crucial as that in the unheated bundle case.

4.1.2 \( N_H \) Values for POWER UPSET CASE

In this section \( N_H \) values for the power upset condition with different values of \( \beta \) and \( N \) are presented. The method used to compute the \( N_H \) from the multi-subchannel computation is illustrated in Appendix D. The values of \( N_H(z) \) versus axial elevation are shown in Figs. 17, 18.
and 19. The dips and humps of $N_H$ at low elevation positions which were present in the analogous plots of the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE are not shown in these figures. The reason is that the heat added from the rods overcomes the small axial enthalpy fluctuation due to the turbulent interchange. However, the computational impossibility for the enthalpy fluctuation due to the turbulent interchange still imposes an upper limit on $\theta$, i.e. 0.048, in the homogenized calculation with half-sized subchannels in the center region.

The validity of these recommended $N_H$ values is determined by comparing the hot zone enthalpy of the homogenized representation with that of the multi-subchannel representation at each axial elevation. The results are shown in Figs. 20, 21, and 22. As demonstrated in Figure 16, the enthalpies of the homogenized representation employing $N_H(z)$ and $\bar{N}_H$ coincide with that of the multi-subchannel representation.

4.1.3 Recommended Values of $N_H$ for Design Use

In this section, the same methods are employed to illustrate the $N_H$ versus $\theta$, $N$ and the axial position of the subchannel as those discussed in 3.1.3. The details for each method are discussed in the following section.
4.1.3.1 Curve Fits

The $N_H$ can be presented by using a continuous function $f(z)$ versus channel position $z$ for $\beta = 0.005, 0.02$ and $0.04; N = 5, 11, 23$.

$$f(z) = a + \frac{cz}{b+z} \quad (4.1.4.1)$$

The values of $a$, $b$ and $c$ can be evaluated by fitting three values of $N_H$ with the smallest error deviating from the true value at every elevation node. The values of $a$, $b$ and $c$ for the nine cases (three $\beta$ and three $N$) are tabulated in Table 3.

4.1.3.2 Average Value of $N_H$

The $\bar{N}_H$ for $\beta = 0, 0.005, 0.02$, and $0.04; N = 2.5, 11$ and $23$ are tabulated in Table 4. For $\beta = 0.02$, $\bar{N}_H$ for a range of channel lengths and $N = 2, 5, 11$ and $23$ are plotted in Figure 23. As we can observe, $N_H$ saturates faster when $N$ increases than it does in the unheated bundle case. This is because the transverse power profile contributes much to the transverse enthalpy profile which determines the $\bar{N}_H$.

4.1.4 Effectiveness of Coupling Coefficients ($N_H$, $N_U$, $N_{TP}$, $N_{TF}$ and $N_{TU}$) in POWER UPSET CASE

The total enthalpy transport across the boundary between homogenized regions can be broken into three components.
These components listed below are consistent with the COBRA representation of the overall transport process as due to turbulent interchange and diversion crossflow where the enthalpy transport due to crossflow is itself broken into two components:

a) turbulent interchange  
b) enthalpy of the diversion crossflow  
c) mass flowrate of the diversion crossflow.

In this section three parameters of the homogenized representations are examined to compare with those of the multi-sub-channel representation in order to evaluate the effectiveness of using several coupling coefficients simultaneously.

The first component, the enthalpy change in the hot zone due to turbulent interchange only, gives us an idea of the effectiveness of each coupling coefficient for the homogenized representation on the energy transport due to turbulent mixing. The second parameter is the enthalpy increment in the hot zone due to the diversion crossflow transport. This will illustrate the effectiveness of each coupling coefficient on the energy transport by the diversion crossflow. The third parameter is the total diversion crossflow across the boundary in the homogenized representation. In the case we examine here, the diversion crossflows at the boundary always move toward the cold zone for any channel axial position, and therefore it is considered convenient to utilize the total diversion crossflow through the boundary as a para-
meter to illustrate the effectiveness of the coupling coefficients on the transverse momentum transport.

The results are shown in Tables 5, 6 and 7. Table 5 tabulates the parameters which are the enthalpy change with respect to the inlet enthalpy of the hot zone due to the turbulent interchange only. As can be observed in this table, the $N_H(z)$ used in the homogenized computation is most effective in matching the homogenized results to that of the multi-subchannel computation. All the other coupling coefficients show negligible effects on this parameter. Table 6 tabulates the second parameters for the multi-subchannel representation and homogenized representation, i.e., $\Delta H_{D.C.}$ and $\Delta H_{D.C.}$ respectively. It is worth noting that the results of the homogenized representation using all the coupling coefficients have the best agreement with that of the multi-subchannel representation. However, $N_H(z)$ and $N_U(z)$ are most effective compared to the other three coupling coefficients. Table 7 tabulates the integral value of diversion crossflow across the central boundary for both the multi-subchannel representation and the homogenized representation. The conclusion we can draw from this table is similar to that from Table 6. However, if accurate diversion crossflow is desired, it is recommended that $N_{TP}$, $N_{TF}$, and $N_{TU}$ be used together with $N_H$ and $N_U$. 
4.2 POWER and FLOW UPSET Case

For the step inlet flow upset, together with the step linear heat generation rate, $N_H$ for the homogenized representation will increase as the flow ratio increases. This phenomenon can be expected from the results of the ENTHALPY and FLOW UPSET Case (Section 3.2). The multiplication factor for this case is defined as

$$R_p = \frac{\overline{N_H}}{N_H}$$

and is plotted versus $F_R$ in Figure 24.

The validity of $N_H(z)$ and $\overline{N_H}$ is illustrated in Figure 25. In this figure, using $N_H = 1.0$ and $N_H = N$, the hot zone enthalpy results of the homogenized representation are also plotted in comparison to the results using $N_H = N_H(z)$. From our calculation, we are aware that there is a slight difference of 0.1% between the hot zone enthalpy results of the homogenized representation using $N_H = N_H(z)$ and that of the multi-sub-channel representation. This small difference is believed to be due to the error caused by the difference computation scheme as we mentioned in Section 2.3 and Appendix B. (Volume I).
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR ALL CASES

5.1 Numerical Values of $N_H(z)$ and $\overline{N_H}$

The numerical values for $N_H(z)$ and $\overline{N_H}$ for the two dimensional subchannel layout under different operational conditions considered in this study, are summarized in the following summary tables.

### $N_H(z)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENTHALPY UPSET</th>
<th>POWER UPSET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Flow Upset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5 (N=5)</td>
<td>Figure 17 (N=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6 (N=11)</td>
<td>Figure 18 (N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7 (N=23)</td>
<td>Figure 19 (N=23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1 (best fit curves)</td>
<td>Table 3 (best fit curves)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### $\overline{N_H}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENTHALPY UPSET</th>
<th>POWER UPSET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Flow Upset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 ($z=114''$)</td>
<td>Table 4 ($z=144''$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12($\beta=0.02$)</td>
<td>Figure 23($\beta=0.02$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flow Upset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 14 (multiplication factor)</td>
<td>Figure 24(multiplication factor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 5, 6 and 7 plot the $N_H(z)$ versus the channel length for $\beta = 0.005$, 0.02 and 0.04, $N = 5$, 11 and N, under the enthalpy upset condition. Figures 17, 18 and 19 plot the $N_H(z)$ versus the channel length for $\beta = 0.005$, 0.02 and...
0.04, N = 5, 11 and 23, under the power upset condition. Tables 1 and 3 tabulate the parameter values to obtain \( N_{H}(z) \) from the best fitting correlation for \( \beta = 0.005, 0.02 \) and 0.04, N = 5, 11 and 23, for the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE and the POWER UPSET CASE, respectively. Tables 2 and 4 tabulate the \( \overline{N}_{H} \) values for \( \beta = 0.005, 0.02 \) and 0.04, N = 5, 11 and 23 with the channel length equal to 12 ft., for the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE and the POWER UPSET CASE, respectively. Figures 12 and 23 plot the \( \overline{N}_{H} \) values versus N and L for \( \beta = 0.02 \) for channel length less than 12 ft. Figures 14 and 23 give the multiplication factors which are a function of \( F_{R} \) and are needed to evaluate \( \overline{N}_{H} \) from equations (3.2) and (4.2) for the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE and the POWER UPSET CASE, respectively.

For subchannels with axial length less than 12 ft., \( N_{H}(z) \) gives detailed values at each axial position up to the exit, whereas \( \overline{N}_{H} \) has been calculated for only certain specific axial locations (Figs. 12 and 23). However, it is easy to incorporate \( \overline{N}_{H} \) into the computer code. Two empirical correlations for \( \overline{N}_{H} \) for the cases we discussed in this volume are represented as follows by equations (5.1.1) and (5.1.2) which can be used directly without resorting to the tables and figures listed in the summary tables.

\[
\overline{N}_{H} = \{1+\ln[1+4200(N-2) \frac{1+1008}{N}] R_{H}\}^{1.5} + 15\% (5.12)
\]

Equation (5.1.1) determines the value of \( \overline{N}_{H} \) for the POWER
UPSET CASE and the POWER and FLOW UPSET CASE.

\[
N_H = \left(1 + \ln\left[1 + 353\left(\frac{N-2}{N}\right)\right]\right) R_H^{1.1} \left(\frac{L}{144}\right)^{1.5} R_p + 15\% (5.1.1)
\]

Equation (5.1.2) determines the value of \(N_H\) for the ENTHALPY UPSET CASE and the ENTHALPY and FLOW UPSET CASE.

These correlations are valid for \(N < 23\), \(\beta < 0.04\) and \(L < 144\) inches, where

- \(L\) = channel length in inches
- \(R_H\) and \(R_p\) = multiplication factors for Enthalpy Upset and Power Upset respectively, which can be obtained from Figs. 14 and 24 respectively. Under no flow upset condition, \(R_H = 1.0\) and \(R_p = 1.0\).

5.2 Suggestions on the \(N_H\) Values Under Exceptional Conditions

As we mentioned in Section 5.1, the characteristics of \(N_H\), together with some understanding of the basics of the coupling coefficient \(N_H\), suggest some reasonable values for \(N_H\) under exceptional conditions. They are as follows:

1) Since \(N_H\) approaches a saturated value as \(N\) increases, \(N_H\) for \(N > 23\) has the same value as \(N = 23\).

2) For the homogenized representation with two homogenized strips of subchannels with uneven subchannel numbers, \(N_H\) can be obtained by the following formula:
\[ \bar{N}_H = \frac{N_{H_L} + N_{H_R}}{2} \]

under the criteria

\[ \frac{N_L - N_R}{\min(N_L, N_R)} < 0.3 \]

where

\[ \bar{N}_{H_L} \equiv \bar{N}_H \text{ value for } N = 2N_L \]

\[ \bar{N}_{H_R} \equiv \bar{N}_H \text{ value for } N = 2N_R \]

(refer to Appendix E for the derivation).

3) Since \( \bar{N}_H \) is not a function of power level and \( P_R \), \( \bar{N}_H \) can be taken as a constant value through the period of power transient (power excursion or shut down transient) when \( \bar{N}_H \) is used in the transient computation.
CHAPTER 6.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK

6.1 Characteristics of Coupling Coefficients

Listed below are several conclusions relating to the characteristics of the coupling coefficients.

6.1.1 Overall Characteristics

6.1.1.1 Use of a single coupling coefficient \( N_H(z) \) can lead to favorable results in the homogenized representation as long as the diversion crossflow does not play a major role in the energy transport between channels.

6.1.1.2 \( N_H(z) \) and \( N_U(z) \) are most effective in getting good results for cases with diversion crossflow in the homogenized representation.

6.1.2 Thermal Entry Development Characteristics

6.1.2.1 \( N_H(z) \) is strongly dependent on the transverse enthalpy profile among subchannels at channel elevation \( z \).

6.1.2.2 \( \bar{N}_H \) approaches a saturated value as the number of subchannels, \( N \), increases.

6.1.3 Basic Characteristics

6.1.3.1 \( \bar{N}_H \) is not a function of \( \bar{q}' \), \( H_R \) OR \( P_R \). (Refer to Figs. 26, 27, and 28). This was demonstrated analytically in Appendix A and confirmed here for the case of numerical determination of coupling coefficients.
6.1.3.2 The effectiveness of $N_H(z)$ is not a function of heat generation rate ($\bar{q}'$). This characteristic can be illustrated by equation (E.20) (Volume I) and Figure 26 which show that the error of hot channel enthalpy rise between multi-subchannel case and homogenized case is independent of $\bar{q}'$.

6.2 Effectiveness of $N_H(z)$ Under Different N and $\beta$ Combinations

In this section, the effectiveness of $N_H(z)$ is explored under POWER UPSET CASE which is encountered in the practical application with different N and $\beta$ combinations. The effectiveness of $N_H$ on the homogenized case can be numerically indicated by the error of exit enthalpy rise between the multi-subchannel case and the homogenized case. A conservative scheme to estimate this error has been derived in Appendix E (Eq. E.20) (Volume I) and quoted in Section 2.5.2.1. With the aid of the correlation 5.1.1, we can evaluate the errors with different N and $\beta$ combinations. The results are tabulated in Table 8. As can be observed, the maximum error of 14.4% happens at large $\beta$ and intermediate N, i.e. $\beta = 0.06, N = 4$. In other words, $N_H(z)$ is relatively important at this specific combination of N and $\beta$.

6.3 Recommendations for Future Work

In response to the problems presented in this Volume, several recommendations for future work are listed below.
1) The characteristics of coupling coefficients $N_U$, $N_{TP}$, $N_{TP}$ and $N_{TU}$ need further investigation in order to deal with the homogenized representation with very large diversion crossflows.

2) Two dimensional (planar) linkage of the homogenized representation (with the aid of coupling coefficients) or the 3D problem should be studied in order to analyze the corewide thermal behavior in a more detailed way than that done by the cascade method$^5$ for the PWR.

3) Corewide study (with the aid of coupling coefficients) on MDNBR under power excursion transient case is recommended. Under this condition, large amount of diversion crossflow is expelled from the hot zone which can cause misleading MDNBR results provided there are no coupling coefficients incorporated.
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Figure 2. Strips of Adjacent \( N' \) Channels
Figure 3. Homogenized Representation of Strips of $N'$ Subchannels
Figure 4. Comparison between results of multi-subchannel representations and homogenized representations.
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Figure 6. $N_H(z)$ versus channel length for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE

$N = 11$

Bundle Geometry

$N = 11$
$L = 144''$

Flow Conditions

$\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$
$F_R = 1.0$

Energy Conditions

$\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/1bm}$
$q'' = 0$
$H_R = 1.2.2$
$P_R = 1.0$

Input Coefficients

$\beta = \text{Variable}$
$K = 0.5$
$S/L = 0.5$
Bundle Geometry

N = 23
L = 144"

Flow Conditions

G = 2.66 Mlbm/hr-ft²
PR = 1.00

Energy Conditions

H = 600 Btu/lbm
q'' = 0
HR = 1.22
PR = 1.0

Input Coefficients
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S/L = 0.5

Figure 7. NH(z) versus channel length for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE
N = 23
Figure 8. Validity of $N(z)$ for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE

$N = 5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>$N = 5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L = 144''$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Conditions</th>
<th>$\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_R = 1.0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Conditions</th>
<th>$H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\dot{q}'' = 0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_R = 1.22$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_R = 1.0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Coefficients</th>
<th>$\beta = \text{Variable}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K = 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S/L = 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Validity of $N(z)$ for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE
$N = 5$
Figure 9. Validity of $N_H(z)$ for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE, $N=11$

Axial Channel Location, Inches

- Multi-Subchannel Representation
- Homogenized Representation

Energy Conditions
- $\dot{H} = 600$ Btu/lbm
- $q'' = 0$
- $H_R = 1.22$
- $P_R = 1.0$

Input Coefficients
- $\beta = \text{Variable}$
- $K = 0.5$
- $S/L = 0.5$

Bundle Geometry
- $N = 11$
- $L = 144''$

Flow Conditions
- $\dot{G} = 2.66$ Mlbm/hr-ft$^2$
- $F_R = 1.0$
Bundle Geometry

- \( N = 23 \)
- \( L = 144" \)

Flow Conditions

- \( \bar{G} = 2.55 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( F_R = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions

- \( \bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( q" = 0 \)
- \( H_R = 1.22 \)
- \( P_R = 1.0 \)

Input Coefficients

- \( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

Figure 10. Validity of \( N_H(z) \) for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE

\( N = 23 \)
Figure 11. $N_H$ for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE with the gradually changed inlet enthalpy

Bundle Geometry

- $N = 23$
- $L = 144''$

Flow Conditions

- $\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$
- $\bar{F}_R = 1.0$

Energy Conditions

- $\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$
- $\bar{q}'' = 0$
- $H_R = 1.21$
- $P_R = 1.0$

Input Coefficients

- $\beta = \text{Variable}$
- $K = 0.5$
- $S/L = 0.5$
Bundle Geometry
- \( N = 23 \)
- \( L = 144" \)

Flow Conditions
- \( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( P_R = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions
- \( \bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( q^" = 0 \)
- \( H_R = 1.21 \)
- \( P_R = 1.0 \)

Input Coefficients
- \( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

---

Figure 11a. Validity of \( N_y \) for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>$N = \text{Variable}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L = \text{Variable}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Conditions</th>
<th>$\mathcal{C} = 2.66 \times 10^6 \text{ lbm/hr}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_R = 1.0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy Conditions</th>
<th>$\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{q}'' = 0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_R = 1.22$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_R = 1.0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Coefficients</th>
<th>$\beta = 0.02$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa = 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S/L = 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 12. $\frac{N}{H}$ versus $N$**

- $L=144''$
- $L=86.4''$
- $L=46.1''$
- $L=17.8''$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>( N = 11 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( L = \text{Variable} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/ft}^2\text{-hr} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{F}_R = 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>( \bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{q}^m = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( H_R = 1.22 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( P_R = 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>( \beta = 0.02 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( K = 0.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S/L = 0.5 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph](image)

Figure 13. Development of \( \bar{N}_H \) through channel length
Bundle Geometry

- \( N = 11 \)
- \( L = 144" \)

Flow Conditions

- \( \dot{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( F_R \) = Variable

Energy Conditions

- \( H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( \dot{q}'' = 0 \)
- \( H_R = 1.22 \)
- \( P_R = 1.0 \)

Input Coefficients

- \( \beta = 0.02 \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

Figure 14. Multiplication factor versus \( F_R \) for ENTHALPY and FLOW UPSET CASE
Figure 15. Comparison of multi-subchannel representation and homogenized representations with Enthalpy and Flow Upset.
Figure 16. Comparison between results of homogenized representations and multi-subchannel representation for Power Upset Case.
### Bundle Geometry
- \( N = 5 \)
- \( L = \text{Variable} \)

### Flow Conditions
- \( \overline{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( F_R = 1.0 \)

### Energy Conditions
- \( \overline{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( \overline{q}'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( H_R = 1.0 \)
- \( P_R = 1.5 \)

### Input Coefficients
- \( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

---

**Figure 17.** \( N_H(z) \) versus channel length for POWER UPSET CASE, \( N = 5 \)
Bundle Geometry  
\( N = 11 \)  
\( L = \text{Variable} \)

Flow Conditions  
\( \bar{G} = 2.66 \, \text{Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)  
\( \bar{F}_R = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions  
\( \bar{H} = 600 \, \text{Btu/lbm} \)  
\( \bar{q}'' = 0.04 \, \text{MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)  
\( \bar{H}_R = 1.0 \)  
\( \bar{P}_R = 1.5 \)

Input Coefficients  
\( \beta = \text{Variable} \)  
\( K = 0.5 \)  
\( S/L = 0.5 \)

---

Figure 18.  
\( N_H(z) \) versus channel length for  
POWER UPSET CASE, \( N=11 \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>N = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L = Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>G = 2.66 Mlbm/hr-ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr = 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>H = 600 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q² = 0.04 MBtu/hr-ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hr = 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pr = 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>β = Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K = 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S/L = 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. \( N_H(z) \) versus channel length for POWER UPSET CASE, N=23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L = Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{G} = 2.66$ Mlbm/hr-ft$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{F}_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{H} = 600$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{q}'' = 0.04$ MBtu/hr-ft$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P_R = 1.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>$\beta$ = Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S/L = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Validity of $N_H(z)$ for POWER UPSET CASE, $N=5$
Bundle Geometry  \( N = 11 \)
\( L = \text{Variable} \)

Flow Conditions  \( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( F_R = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions  \( H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
\( \bar{q}'' = 0.04 \times 10^6 \text{ Btu/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( H_R = 1.0 \)
\( P_R = 1.5 \)

Input Coefficients  \( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
\( K = 0.5 \)
\( S/L = 0.5 \)

HOMOGENIZED REPRESENTATION
AND MULTI-SUBCHANNEL REPRESENTATION

Figure 21. Validity of \( N_H(z) \) for POWER UPSET CASE
\( N = 11 \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>N = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L = Variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>( \overline{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR = 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>( \overline{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{q}'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR = 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR = 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>( \beta = \text{Variable} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K = 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L = 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOMOGENIZED REPRESENTATION AND MULTI-SUBCHANNEL REPRESENTATION**

**Figure 22.** Validity of \( N_h(z) \) for POWER UPSET CASE, N=23
Bundle Geometry

- N = Variable
- L = Variable

Flow Conditions

- $\overline{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/ft}^2\text{-hr}$
- $F_R = 1.0$

Energy Conditions

- $\overline{h} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$
- $q'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/ft}^2\text{-hr}$
- $H_R = 1.0$
- $P_R' = 1.5$

Input Coefficients

- $\beta = 0.02$
- $K = 0.5$
- $S/L = 0.5$

Figure 23. $\overline{N_H}$ versus N and L
Bundle Geometry
- \( N = 11 \)
- \( L = 144" \)

Flow Conditions
- \( \dot{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( F_R = \text{Variable} \)

Energy Conditions
- \( H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( \dot{q}'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( H_R = 1.0 \)
- \( F_R = 1.5 \)
- \( R = 0.02 \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

Figure 24. \( R_p \) versus \( F_R \)
Bundle Geometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>144&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flow Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.66 Mlbm/hr-ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>600 Btu/lbm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q²</td>
<td>0.04 MBtu/hr-ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Validity of $N_H(z)$ for POWER and FLOW UPSET CASE in the subchannel exit region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>$N = 11$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L = 144''$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{G} = 2.66$ Mlbm/ft$^2$-hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{F}_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{H} = 600$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{q}'' = \text{Variable}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P_R = 1.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S/L = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 26.** $\bar{N}_H$ versus $q''$
Figure 27. $N_H$ versus $H_R$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>$N = 11$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L = 144''$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>$\overline{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>$\overline{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\overline{q''} = 0.2 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$P_R = \text{Variable}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S/I. = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. $\overline{N_H}$ versus $P_R$
**Bundle Geometry**

- \( N = \text{Variable} \)
- \( L = 144'' \)

**Flow Conditions**

- \( \overline{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
- \( F_R = 1.0 \)

**Energy Conditions**

- \( \overline{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
- \( \overline{q}'' = 0 \)
- \( H_R = 1.22 \)
- \( P_R = 1.0 \)

**Input Coefficients**

- \( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
- \( K = 0.5 \)
- \( S/L = 0.5 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>( a = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 3.66 )</td>
<td>( a = 6.11 )</td>
<td>( a = 6.75 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 183 )</td>
<td>( b = 275 )</td>
<td>( b = 269 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>( a = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 2.04 )</td>
<td>( a = 4.36 )</td>
<td>( a = 5.96 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 9.22 )</td>
<td>( b = 3.40 )</td>
<td>( b = 52.4 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>( a = 1.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 1.93 )</td>
<td>( a = 4.79 )</td>
<td>( a = 8.09 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 0.31 )</td>
<td>( b = 22.7 )</td>
<td>( b = 54.8 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1**

Coefficients for \( N_H(z) = 1.0 + \frac{a z}{b + z} \)

Under Enthalpy Upset Condition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>~1.00</td>
<td>~1.00</td>
<td>~1.00</td>
<td>~1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

$\bar{N}_H$ for Different $\beta$ and Different $N$ over Z = 0 to 144"

Under Enthalpy Upset Condition

**Bundle Geometry**

$N = \text{Variable}$

$L = 144"$

**Flow Conditions**

$\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$

$\bar{F}_R = 1.0$

**Energy Conditions**

$\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$

$q'' = 0$

$H_R = 1.22$

$P_R = 1.0$

**Input Coefficients**

$\beta = \text{Variable}$

$K = 0.5$

$S/L = 0.5$
Bundle Geometry
N = Variable
L = 144"

Flow Conditions
\( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( FR = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions
\( H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
\( q'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( HR = 1.0 \)
\( PR = 1.5 \)

Input Coefficients
\( \beta = \text{Variable} \)
\( K = 0.5 \)
\( S/L = 0.5 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

Coefficients for \( N_H(z) = a + \frac{cz}{b+z} \) Under Power Upset Condition, Where \( z \) is the Channel Location
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bundle Geometry</th>
<th>N = Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L = 144&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conditions</td>
<td>$\bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{q}'' = 0.04 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$H_R = 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_R = 1.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Coefficients</td>
<td>$\beta = \text{Variable}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S/L = 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\sim 1$</td>
<td>$\sim 1$</td>
<td>$\sim 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

$\bar{N}_H$ For Different N and $\beta$ Under The Power Upset Condition

$z = 144"$
Bundle Geometry  
N = 11  
L = 144"

Flow Conditions  
\( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)  
FR = 1.0

Energy Conditions  
\( \bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)  
\( \bar{q}'' = 0.2 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)  
HR = 1.0  
PR = 1.5

Input Coefficients  
\( \beta = 0.02 \)  
K = 0.5  
S/L = 0.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homogenized Representation</th>
<th>( \Delta h_{T.I.} ) (Btu/lbm)</th>
<th>( \Delta H_{T.I.} ) (Btu/lbm)</th>
<th>ERROR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z), N_{TU}(z), N_{TF} ) and ( N_{TP} )</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>-3.096</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z) )</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z) )</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H = 1.0 )</td>
<td>-7.07</td>
<td>-3.012</td>
<td>+128.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{ERROR} = \frac{\Delta H_{T.I.} - \Delta h_{T.I.}}{\Delta h_{T.I.}} \]

**TABLE 5**

Comparison of the hot zone enthalpy increments due to turbulent interchange only between the multi-subchannel representation and the homogenized representations with different combination of coupling coefficients for Power Upset Case
Bundle Geometry

\( N = 11 \)
\( L = 144" \)

Flow Conditions

\( \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( F_R = 1.0 \)

Energy Conditions

\( \bar{H} = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \)
\( \bar{q}'' = 0.2 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \)
\( H_R = 1.0 \)
\( P_R = 1.5 \)

Input Coefficients

\( \beta = 0.02 \)
\( K = 0.5 \)
\( S/L = 0.5 \)

\[ \Delta h_{D.C.} (\text{Btu/lbm}) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Subchannel Representation</th>
<th>( \Delta h_{D.C.} ) (Btu/lbm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homogenized Representation</th>
<th>( \Delta H_{D.C.} ) (Btu/lbm)</th>
<th>ERROR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z), N_{TU}(z), N_{TF} ) and ( N_{TP} )</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z) )</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z) )</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H = 1.0 )</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-99.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{ERROR} = \frac{\Delta h_{D.C.} - \Delta h_{D.C.}}{\Delta h} \]

**TABLE 6**

Comparison of the hot zone enthalpy increments due to diversion crossflow only between the multi-subchannel representation and the homogenized representations with different combination of coupling coefficients for Power Upset Case.
Bundle Geometry  
\[ N = 11 \]
\[ L = 144" \]

Flow Conditions  
\[ \bar{G} = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2 \]
\[ F_R = 1.0 \]

Energy Conditions  
\[ H = 600 \text{ Btu/lbm} \]
\[ \bar{q}'' = 0.2 \text{ MBtu/hr-ft}^2 \]
\[ H_R = 1.0 \]
\[ P_R = 1.5 \]

Input Coefficients  
\[ \beta = 0.02 \]
\[ K = 0.5 \]
\[ S/L = 0.5 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Subchannel Representation</th>
<th>[ w_{C,D}(z)dz \text{ (Btu/hr)} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homogenized Representation</th>
<th>[ \int w_{L,R}(z)dz\text{ (Btu/hr)} ]</th>
<th>ERROR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z), N_{TU}(z), N_{TP} ) and ( N_{TF} )</td>
<td>0.1776</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z), N_U(z) )</td>
<td>0.1798</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H(z) )</td>
<td>0.1825</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N_H = 1.0 )</td>
<td>0.1120</td>
<td>-36.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ERROR} = \frac{\int w_{L,R}dz - \int w_{C,D}dz}{\int w_{C,D}dz}
\]

**TABLE 7**

Comparison of the total diversion crossflow only across the boundary between the multi-subchannel representation and the homogenized representations with different combination of coupling coefficients for Power Upset Case.
### TABLE 8

**EXPECTED ERRORS IN 2D HOMOGENIZED REGION ENTHALPY FOR POWER UPSET CASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.83</td>
<td>-8.5</td>
<td>-7.56</td>
<td>-5.31</td>
<td>-4.63</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>-12.3</td>
<td>-9.34</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>-6.12</td>
<td>-4.53</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This table is built by using

\[
\text{ERROR\%} = \frac{1 - \frac{1}{N_H}}{\frac{P_R N A_s}{(P_R-1)LBS} - \frac{1}{N_H}}
\]

Equation E.20

where \( L = 12' \)
\( A_s = 0.00519 \text{ ft}^2 \)
\( P_R = 1.5 \)
\( S' = 0.22'' \)

\[ N_H = 1 + \ln(1 + [353(N-2)^{0.015+B} S^{1.1}]) \pm 5\% \]

Equation 5.1.1
APPENDIX A

ANALYTIC DERIVATION OF TWO DIMENSIONAL TRANSPORT COEFFICIENTS
FOR THE ENERGY CONSERVATION EQUATION

This Appendix will present, for a two dimensional problem, an analytical deduction of two of such coefficients ($N_H, N'_H$) that are required in the energy conservation equation. It may be divided into two parts, first an analytical calculation is performed in order to find the enthalpy along the core and across the section chosen.

In the second part those transport coefficients are calculated for two particular cases and they are compared against values obtained by using the computer code COBRA IIIC/MIT and already presented in Chapter 4 of this Volume.

The two most severe simplifications introduced in this analysis are to assume that there is no diversion crossflow, and to solve the problem in only two dimensions.
A.1 Problem Statement

The energy conservation equation used in COBRA IIIC/MIT is

\[ h_{J+1}(A) = h_J(A) + \frac{q_{J+1/2}(A) \Delta x}{M_J(A)} - \frac{\Delta x}{M_J(A)} \sum_B w_J(A,B)(h_J^*(A) - h_J(B)) \]

\[ - \frac{\Delta x}{M_J(A)} \sum_B w_J(A,B)(h_J^* - h_J(A)) \]  

(A.1)

where

- \( h_{J+1}(A) \) is the enthalpy of Channel A at axial station \( J+1 \)
- \( h_J(A) \) is the enthalpy of Channel A at axial station \( J \)
- \( q_{J+1/2}(A) \) is the linear heat generation rate of Channel A at station \( J+1/2 \)
- \( \Delta x \) is the length of the axial step
- \( M_J(A) \) is the massflow rate of Channel A at axial station \( J \)
- \( w_J(A,B) \) is the interchange of mass between Channel A and one of its adjacent Channels B, due to turbulence at axial station \( J \).
- \( w_J(A,B) \) is the massflow that leaves Channel A toward Channel B at axial station \( J \)
- \( h_J^* \) is the enthalpy at axial station \( J \) of the donor channel (either A or B depending on the sign of \( w_J(A,B) \)).
Working with lumped channels, the code will take for 
$h_J(A) - h_J(B)$ and $h_J^*$ the values obtained for the 
lumped regions (channels A and B) while in fact those 
enthalpies should be those of the closest subchannel 
to the lumped region boundaries.

The idea is then to obtain the relationship between 
these enthalpy values or algebraically to obtain:

$$\frac{1}{N_H^J} = \frac{(h_J(a) - h_J(b))}{(h_J(A) - h_J(B))}$$  \quad (A.2)

where a and b will be either the two complete subchannels 
closest to the boundary when that boundary separates two 
full subchannels or the two half subchannels closest to the 
boundary when the boundary splits an actual subchannel into 
two halves. For the case of Figure(A.1 a and b will be then 
taken as two half subchannels

$$\frac{1}{N_H^J} \equiv \frac{h_J(a)}{h_J(A)} \text{ or } \frac{h_J(b)}{h_J(B)}$$  \quad (A.3)
Two Channel Case and Multichannel Case

Figure A.1
depending on which is the donor channel.

In order to find these coefficients the enthalpies should be found first.

A.2 Solution Procedure

The enthalpies will be found for a two dimensional problem utilizing an analytical procedure. Several assumptions will be introduced in the development and they will be pointed out when they appear.

The differential energy conservation equation is:

\[
\rho c_p \frac{DT}{Dt} = \text{div} (kVT) + w_i + T \beta \frac{DP}{Dt} + \mu \Xi \quad (A.4)
\]

Neglecting viscous and compressibility effects (which in fact are not going to affect the present problem) and for two dimensions \((x,z)\):

\[
\rho c_p \left[ \frac{dT}{dt} + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (v_z T) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (v_x T) \right] = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (k \frac{\partial T}{\partial z}) \right] + w_i \quad (A.5)
\]

For turbulent flows:

\[
v = \bar{v} + v' \quad \text{and} \quad T = \bar{T} + T' \quad (A.6)
\]

where overbars indicate time average.
Inserting equation A.6 into A.5 and time averaging, we obtain the following results:

\[ \rho c_p \left[ \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \vec{v}_z \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} + \vec{v}_x \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \right] = \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( k \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} - \rho c_p \vec{v}_x \vec{T}^{\prime \prime} \right) + \right. \]

\[ \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( k \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right) - \rho c_p \vec{v}_z \vec{T}^{\prime \prime} \right] + \omega_1 \quad (A.7) \]

Taking now

\[ \vec{v}_x \vec{T}^{\prime \prime} = -\varepsilon_H \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \quad (A.8) \]

\[ \vec{v}_z \vec{T}^{\prime \prime} = -\varepsilon_H \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \quad (A.9) \]

Assuming that the flow is fully developed, which in fact it is not, because it is well known that some diversion crossflow exists:

\[ \vec{v}_x = 0 \quad (A.10) \]

Assuming also that \( k \) is independent of the temperature we can transform A.7 into the following equation:

\[ \rho c_p \left[ \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \vec{v}_z \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} \right] = \left[ (k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H) \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + (k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H) \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} \right] + \omega_1 \]

\[ (A.11) \]
Now we neglect axial conduction relative to radial conduction because in fact the first is much smaller than the second:

\[ \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} > > \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} \quad (A.12) \]

If we consider only the steady state problem Equation A.11 reduces further to

\[ \rho c_p \bar{v}_z \frac{\partial T}{\partial z} = (k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H) \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + w_i \quad (A.13) \]

Now we define the variable \( z^* \):

\[ z^* = \frac{z}{\bar{v}_z} \quad (A.14) \]

where \( \bar{v}_z \) is not a function of \( x \).

\[ \rho c_p \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} = \left[ k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H \right] \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} + c_p w_i \quad (A.15) \]

This equation can be transformed to obtain:

\[ \frac{1}{k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H} \left( \frac{\rho c_p}{\varepsilon_H} \right) \frac{\partial h}{\partial z^*} = \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} + \frac{c_p w_i}{k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H} \quad (A.16) \]
It is also known that the interchange of energy due to molecular interactions is much smaller than that due to turbulence, therefore:

\[ a_t^* = \frac{k + \rho c_p \varepsilon_H}{\rho c_p} = \varepsilon_H \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.17)

and equation (A.16) yields:

\[ \frac{1}{a_t^*} \frac{\partial \bar{h}}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial^2 \bar{h}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{w_t}{\rho c_H} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.18)

The analogous equation for transient one dimensional heat conduction is:

\[ \frac{1}{a_t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{q''}{k} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.19)

Hence analogous parameters are:

\[ T \leftrightarrow \bar{h} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.20)

\[ a_t \leftrightarrow a_t^* \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.21)

\[ t \leftrightarrow z \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.22)

\[ k \leftrightarrow \rho \varepsilon_H \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.23)

We need to solve this equation (A.19) for the geometry and boundary conditions given in figure A.2.
Geometrical Description of the Problem

Figure A.2
A.3 Solution to the Problem

A.3.1 Equation to be solved:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{q''}{k} \quad (A.24)$$

A.3.2 Boundary Conditions

For the x-axis:

$$\left. \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} \right|_{x = \pm a} = 0 \quad (A.25)$$

The initial condition is:

T(x,0) is given by:

where $T_1$ and $T_2$ can be any value.
The heat generation rate will be given by the following equations:

\[ q''(x) = \begin{cases} 
  s_2 - x m_2 & \text{for } -a \leq x < 0 \\
  s_1 + (a-x)m_1 & \text{for } 0 < x \leq a 
\end{cases} \]  

(A.26)

or graphically:

where \( m_1, m_2, s_1 \) and \( s_2 \) can take any finite value.

A.3.3 Changes of Variables

The following changes of variables will be made:

\[ T(x,t) = \psi(x,t) + \phi(x) + \theta(t) \]  

(A.27)

\[ q'''(x) = q_1''' + q_2'''(x) \]  

(A.28)

where \( q_1''' \) will be the average value of \( q'''(x) \) along the x-axis.
These changes of variables will produce the following equation:

\[
\frac{1}{a_t} \frac{d\Theta}{dt} + \frac{1}{a_t} \frac{d\psi}{dt} = \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial x^2} + \frac{d^2 \phi}{dx^2} + \frac{k_1}{k} + \frac{q^m(x)}{k}
\]  
(A.30)

From the separation of variables assumed by equation A.27, we can split this equation into three equalities:

\[
\frac{1}{a_t} \frac{d\Theta}{dt} = \frac{k_1}{k}
\]  
(A.31)

\[
\frac{1}{a_t} \frac{d\psi(x,t)}{dt} = \frac{\partial^2 \psi(x,t)}{\partial x^2}
\]  
(A.32)

\[
\frac{\partial^2 \phi(x)}{\partial x^2} = -\frac{q''(x)}{k}
\]  
(A.33)

The boundary conditions can be also divided as follows:

\[
\left. \frac{\partial T(x,t)}{\partial x} \right|_{x=+a} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \left. \left( \frac{\partial \psi(x,t)}{\partial x} + \frac{d\phi(x)}{dx} \right) \right|_{x=+a} = 0
\]  
(A.34)
which implies:

\[ \frac{\partial \psi(x,t)}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=+a} = 0 \quad (A.35) \]

and the initial boundary condition:

\[ T(x,0) = \psi(x,0) + \phi(x) + \Theta(0) \quad (A.37) \]

**A.3.3.1 Solution of Equation A.31**

This equation is:

\[ \frac{d\Theta}{dt} = a_1 \frac{k_1}{k} \]

which has the solution:

\[ \Theta(t) = a_1 \frac{k_1}{k} t + c_1 \quad (A.38) \]

and \( c_1 \) will be found from the initial temperature condition, equation A.37.
A.3.3.2 Solution of Equation (A.32)

Assuming it is possible to make the following separation of variables:

\[ \psi(x, t) = X(x) F(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.39)

Equation A.32 becomes:

\[ \frac{1}{aF(t)} \frac{dF(t)}{dt} = -\alpha^2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.40)

\[ \frac{d^2X(x)}{dx^2} + \alpha^2 X(x) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.41)

Solving now equation (A.40)

\[ F(t) = c_2 e^{-\alpha^2 a t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.42)

Solving Equation (A.41)

\[ X_n(x) = c_3 \sin \alpha_n x + c_4 \cos \alpha_n x \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.43)

Using boundary condition Equation A.35:

\[ \left. \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial x} \right|_{x=\pm a} = F(t) \left. \frac{iX(x)}{i x} \right|_{x=\pm a} = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.44)
From the previous equation we can conclude:

\[
\frac{\partial X(x)}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=\pm a} = 0 \tag{A.45}
\]

This implies:

\[
c_3 \alpha_n \cos \alpha_n a - c_4 \alpha_n \sin \alpha_n a = 0 \tag{A.46}
\]

\[
c_3 \alpha_n \cos \alpha_n a + c_4 \alpha_n \sin \alpha_n a = 0 \tag{A.47}
\]

In order to have a solution other than trivial case of \(c_3 = c_4 = 0\), we must have

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
\cos \alpha_n a & -\sin \alpha_n a \\
\cos \alpha_n a & \sin \alpha_n a
\end{vmatrix} = 0
\]

\[
= \sin 2 \alpha_n a
\]

From Equation A.48 we can conclude:

\[
- \alpha_n = \frac{m}{2a} \text{ with } n = 0,1,2,3, \ldots \ldots \tag{A.49}
\]

From Equation A.46 we can relate \(c_3\) and \(c_4\):
\[ c_3 = c_4 \tan \alpha_n a \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.50)

Plugging this equation into Equation A.43 we can obtain:

\[ X_n(x) = c_4' \cos \alpha_n (x-a) \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.51)

\[ c_3 \sin \alpha_n x + c_4 \cos \alpha_n x = \]

\[ = c_4 \left[ \frac{\sin \alpha_n a \sin \alpha_n x + \cos \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n x}{\cos \alpha_n a} \right] \]

\[ = \frac{c_4}{\cos \alpha_n a} \left[ \cos \alpha_n (x-a) \right] \]

These results lead finally to:

\[ \psi(x,t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \cos \alpha_n (x-a) e^{-\alpha_n^2 a^2 t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A.52)

so far we have obtained \( \theta(t) \) and \( \psi(x,t) \) and we still have to find \( \phi(x) \).

A.3.3.3 Solution of Equation A.3.3

This equation is:

\[ \frac{d^2 \phi(x)}{dx^2} = -\frac{q''(x)}{k} \]
It is possible to express $q_1''(x)$ plus $q_2''(x)$ as a Fourier series:

$$q''_1(x) = b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos \alpha_n (x-a) \quad (A.53)$$

where

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-a}^{a} q''_1(x) \, dx = q''_1 = k_1 \quad (A.54)$$

and

$$b_n = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-a}^{a} q''_1(x) \cos \alpha_n (x-a) \, dx \quad (A.55)$$

It is clear from equations A.53 and A.54 and A.28 that:

$$q''_2(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos \alpha_n (x-a) \quad (A.56)$$

where $b_n$ is calculated from A.55, its value being:

$$b_n = \frac{1}{a \alpha_n} \left[ \left( s_1 - s_1 \right) + m_2 \right] \sin \alpha_n a - \frac{m_1}{\alpha_n} (1-\cos \alpha_n a) - \frac{m_2}{\alpha_n} \left( \cos \alpha_n a - \cos 2\alpha_n a \right) \quad (1.57)$$
Now integrating equation A.33:

\[ \frac{d\phi(x)}{dx} = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{a_n} \sin \alpha_n(x-a) + c_5 \quad (A.58) \]

applying the boundary condition of equation A.36

\[ \frac{d\phi(x)}{dx} \bigg|_{x=+a} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad c_5 = 0 \quad (A.59) \]

and integrating again we finally have

\[ \phi(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{a_n^2} \cos \alpha_n(x-a) + c_6 \quad (A.60) \]

\[ \text{A.3.4 Final Result} \]

Combining equations (A.60), (A.52), and (A.38):

\[ T(x,t) = c_1 + \frac{a_1 k t}{k} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \cos \alpha_n(x-a) e^{-\alpha_n^2 a t} + \]

\[ + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{a_n^2} \cos \alpha_n(x-a) \quad (A.61) \]

where we have combined the old \( c_1 \) and \( c_6 \) in only one constant, \( c_1 \).
In this expression, \( c_1 \) and \( c_n \) are still unknown and they have to be found from the initial boundary condition.

Expressing \( T(x,0) \) as the following Fourier series:

\[
T(x,0) = b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n \cos \alpha_n(x-a) \quad (A.62)
\]

where:

\[
b'_0 = \frac{1}{a} \int_{-a}^{a} T(x,0)dx = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} \quad (A.63)
\]

and \( b'_n \) can be found by setting \( m_1 = m_2 = 0 \),

\( s_1 = T_2 \) and \( s_2 = T_1 \) in equation \( A.57 \):

\[
b'_n = \frac{1}{\alpha_n} (T_2 - T_1) \sin \alpha_n a \quad (A.64)
\]

Plugging equations (A.63) and (A.64) into (A.62):

\[
T(x,0) = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{T_2 - T_1}{\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n(x-a) \quad (A.65)
\]

Comparing this equation with equation (A.61) when \( t = 0 \) we obtain:
\[ c_1 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n \cos \alpha_n(x-a) + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n}{\alpha_n^2} \cos \alpha_n(x-a) = \]

\[ = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{T_2 - T_1}{a\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n(x-a) \]

\[(A.66)\]

or:

\[ c_1 + c_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( c_n + \frac{b_n}{k\alpha_n^2} - \frac{T_2 - T_1}{a\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n(x-a) \right) = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} \]

\[(A.67)\]

Equation \(A.67\) leads to the following conclusions:

\[ c_1 + c_0 = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} \]

\[ c_n = \frac{T_2 - T_1}{a\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a - \frac{b_n}{k\alpha_n^2} \]

\[(A.68)\]

By substituting these two values into equation \((A.61)\)

we obtain finally:

\[ T(x,t) = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2} + \frac{a_k l t}{k} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{T_2 - T_1}{a\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a - \frac{b_n}{k\alpha_n^2} \right] \]
which expressed in terms of $h$, $\varepsilon_H$, $\frac{z}{v_z}$ and $\rho \varepsilon_H$ leads to the final expression:

$$h(x,z) = \frac{h_1 + h_2}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon_H k_1 z}{\rho \varepsilon_H v_z} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{h_2 - h_1}{a_n} \sin \alpha_n a - \frac{b_n}{\rho \varepsilon_H a_n^2} \right\} e^{-\frac{2\varepsilon_n z}{v_z}} + \frac{b_n}{\rho \varepsilon_H a_n^2} \right\} \cos \alpha_n (x-a)$$

(A.70)

All the terms of these equations, i.e. A.69 and A.70 are known except $\varepsilon_H$, the thermal eddy diffusivity. In order to obtain identical results for $N_H(z)$ using the analytical method to those given by the numerical method, we have to match the energy interchange due to turbulence for every boundary of the problem. This implies that $\varepsilon_H$ should be dependent of $x$ and $z$. However in our analytical derivation $\varepsilon_H$ had to be assumed constant to permit solution of the differential equation. So an approximation should be made in order to find an average value of $\varepsilon_H$. This value is calculated using the following equation:
\[
\frac{w'(I,J)(h(I) - h(J))}{M(I)} = \frac{\varepsilon_H \rho s_{ij}}{M(I)} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \bigg|_{\text{gap}} = \Delta h(I) \quad (A.71)
\]

where \( \Delta h(I) \) = enthalpy rise of channel I due to turbulent T.I. interchange.

Taking \( w'(I,J) \) as COBRA does:

\[
w'(I,J) = \beta s_{ij} \quad (A.72)
\]

we obtain:

\[
\varepsilon_H = \beta \bar{v}_z \left( h(I) - h(J) \right) \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \bigg|_{\text{gap}} \quad (A.73)
\]

The massflow ratio is required due to the different area of the subchannels in the analytic and the numerical method. (Appendix C, Volume I). The analytic method assumes each subchannel of area:

\[
A_{\text{analytic}} = Ps_{ij} = .666(.1333) = .074 \text{ in}^2 \quad (A.74)
\]

while the numerical method takes:

\[
A_{\text{numerical}} = .1705 \text{ in}^2
\]

The ratio:

\[
\frac{h(I) - h(J)}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}} = \bar{z}_{ij} \quad (A.75)
\]

is dependent upon axial position, radial position and power shape across the boundary. With these parameters, equation A.73 reduces to

\[
\varepsilon_H = .4348 \beta \bar{v}_z \bar{z}_{ij} \quad (A.76)
\]
An average value of the product, \( l_{ij} = 0.434z_{ij} \), equal to 0.0035 has been selected as the one that yields best results for all cases of Figures A.3, A.4 and A.5. This value was obtained by comparing analytical and numerical values of \( N_H(z) \) for a different set of values of \( l_{ij} \).

It is anticipated that because the solutions exhibit a developing length which decreases with small \( N \) and large \( P \), the product will be a function of \( N, \beta, \) and \( z \). The significance of these factors on the numerical value of the product and consequently \( N_H \) need further exploration.

Therefore equation A.76 becomes to:

\[
\bar{e}_H = 0.0035 \cdot v_z \quad \text{(A.77)}
\]

and the final expression for \( h(x,z) \) will be:

\[
h(x,z) = \frac{h_1 + h_2}{2} + \frac{k_1 z}{G} + \sum_{n=\text{odd}}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{h_2 - h_1}{a\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n a \right. \\
- \frac{b_n}{0.2\beta_o a_n^2} e^{-\alpha_n^2 z} \left. 0.0035 + \frac{b_n}{0.2\beta_o a_n^2} \right\}
\cos \alpha_n (x-a) \quad \text{(A.78)}
\]
with:

$$k_1 = \frac{s_1 + s_2}{2} + \frac{a}{4} (m_1 + m_2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.29)

$$b_n = \frac{1}{\alpha_n} \left[ [(s_1 - s_2) + m_1 a] \sin \alpha_n a - \frac{m_1}{\alpha_n} (1 - \cos \alpha_n a) - \frac{m_2}{\alpha_n} (\cos \alpha_n a - \cos 2\alpha_n a) \right] \hspace{1cm} (A.57)$$

$$\alpha_n = \frac{n\pi}{2a} \hspace{1cm} (A.49)$$

A.4 Calculation of $N_H$ and $N'_H$

Once the spatial distribution of $h$ is known the calculation of the $N_H$ and $N'_H$ is very simple:

$$\frac{1}{N_H(z)} = \frac{(h(a,z) - h(b,z))}{(h(A,Z) - H(B,Z))} \hspace{1cm} (A.2)$$

where if the subchannels are defined as in figure A.1:

$$\frac{1}{N_H(z)} = \frac{1}{P/2} \left[ \int_{-P/2}^{0} h(x,z)dx - \int_{0}^{P/2} h(x,z)dx \right] \hspace{1cm} (A.79)$$

$$\frac{1}{N_H(z)} = \frac{1}{a} \left[ \int_{-a}^{0} h(x,z)dx - \int_{a}^{0} h(x,z)dx \right]$$
For a different definition of subchannels a and b, the formula will be identical except for the limits of the integrals.

The process for finding \( N_H'(z) \) will be analogous.

A.5 Comparison of \( N_H(z) \) obtained as previously indicated with the values obtained by using COBRA IIIC/MIT.

A.5.1 Introduction

Parallel to the development of this method to find \( N_H \), the same parameters using the computer code COBRA IIIC/MIT were determined.

In order to establish how the assumptions introduced in the present method effect the results and then how good they are, \( N_H(z) \) was compared with that obtained by numerically.

The comparison was made for two of the cases analyzed numerically; enthalpy upset at the inlet without heat generation and heat generation upset with constant inlet enthalpy.
A.5.2 Enthalpy Upset with Heat Generation Rate Equal to Zero.

For this case \( b_n = k_1 = 0 \)

Equation (A.78) becomes:

\[
h(x, z) = \frac{h_1 + h_2}{2} + \sum_{n=\text{odd}}^{\infty} \frac{h_2 - h_1}{\alpha_n} \sin \alpha_n \epsilon \, \frac{-\alpha_n^2 z \beta 0.0035}{\cos \alpha_n (x-a)}
\]

(A.80)

where:

\[
\sin \alpha_n (x-a) \equiv \sin \alpha_n (\cos \alpha_n x \cos \alpha_n a + \sin \alpha_n a \sin \alpha_n x)
\]

(A.81)

but:

\[
\sin \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n a = 0 \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, 3 \ldots
\]

(A.82)

\[
\sin^2 \alpha_n a = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{for } n = 2, 4, 6 \ldots \\
1 & \text{for } n = 1, 3, 5 \ldots 
\end{cases}
\]

(A.83)

Applying these conclusions to equation (A.82)

\[
\sin \alpha_n a \cos \alpha_n (x-a) = \sin \alpha_n x \quad \text{with } n = 1, 3, 5
\]

(A.85)
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Figure A.5 $N_H(z)$ versus channel length for ENTHALPY UPSET CASE

$N = 5$

Bundle Geometry
- $N = 5$
- $L = 144''$

Flow Conditions
- $Q = 2.66 \text{ Mlbm/hr-ft}^2$
- $P_R = 1.0$

Energy Conditions
- $\bar{q}'' = 0$
- $H_R = 1.22$
- $P_R = 1.0$

Input Coefficients
- $\beta$ = Variable
- $K = 0.5$
- $S/L = 0.5$
In figures A.3, A.4 and A.5 the values of $N_H$ obtained with both method are compared.

Slight differences can be noticed between results. When the number of subchannels is small, the difference between the analytical results and computer results are largest. When the number of subchannels is large, the curves match well.

The reason for this poor match for small number of subchannels is not completely established. It is known that $\varepsilon_H$ is probably a function of rod pitch to diameter ratio, Reynolds number, Prandtl number, axial location, etc. and not a constant. However it was not possible to establish a match for the figure A.5 cases for any value of $\varepsilon_H$, because all the curves obtained from the numerical method have smaller asymptotic values than those from the analytical method. The other possible reason for some difference is the assumption of zero diversion crossflow in the analytic approach. However very little crossflow was calculated in the numerical cases.

**A.5.3 Heat Generation Upset with Constant Inlet Enthalpy.**

In this case:

$$h_1 = h_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.89)

$$m_1 = m_2 = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.90)

Then

$$k_1 = \frac{s_1 + s_2}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.91)

$$b_n = \frac{1}{a_n} (s_1 - s_2) \sin \alpha_n a$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.92)

Introducing these values into equation (A.78) and the value of 0.04 for better match to the computer results we obtain:
which yields the following value of $N_H(z)$:

$$N_H(z) = \frac{p}{2a} \sum_{n=\text{odd}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^3} (1 - e^{-\alpha_n^2 \beta z^{0.04}}) (\cos \alpha_n a - 1).$$

(A.94)

In figures A.6, A.7 and A.8, the results obtained are compared against those obtained by Chong Chiu.

An analogous problem to that of the previous case occurs here. The following volumetric energy generation rate profile is taken for the analytical calculation:

For this power upset case, the analytical results and computer results match well in general. But still due to the assumption made in the analytical approaches, slight difference between the two results is expected.
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APPENDIX B

VALIDITY OF EQUATION (2.3.1)

Equation (2.3.1) is written under the assumption that the enthalpy profile is symmetrical with respect to the central boundary. Under this assumption and from the definition of $N_H$, (Volume I)

$$ N_H = \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_C - h_D} $$

we get

$$ h_C - h_D = \frac{H_L - H_R}{N_H} \quad (3.1) $$

$$ \frac{h_C - h_D}{2} = \frac{H_L - H_R}{2N_H} \quad (3.2) $$

$$ \frac{h_C + h_D}{2} = \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} \quad (\text{under the assumption of the symmetrical enthalpy profile}) \quad (3.3) $$

Adding equations (B.3) and (B.2) we obtain

$$ h^* = h_C = \frac{h_C - h_D}{2} + \frac{h_C + h_D}{2} = \frac{H_L - H_R}{2N_H} - \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} $$

$$ = \frac{H_L - H_R}{N_H} + \frac{H_L + H_R}{2} \quad (\text{if } W_{L,R} > 0) \quad (3.4) $$
(B.4) is stated in Appendix A (Volume I) without any comments on it. However, the assumption of symmetrical enthalpy profile used in the derivation of (3.4) is not valid when the diversion crossflow and flow upset exist. This point is verified in detail in the following section (3.1).

B.1 Verification of validity of (B.4) only under the condition of no diversion crossflow and no flow upset

If there are no diversion crossflows and no flow upset between subchannels, equation (B.3) is valid. This can be proven by using equations (A.1.7a) and (A.1.7b) in Appendix A, Volume I with \( W_{L,R} = W_{R,L} = 0 \),

\[
\frac{\partial H_{L,M_L}}{\partial x} = Q_{L} - \left( \frac{H_{L} - H_{R}}{N_H} \right) W_{L,R} 
\]

\[
\frac{\partial H_{R,M_R}}{\partial x} = Q_{R} - \left( \frac{H_{R} - H_{L}}{N_H} \right) W_{R,L} 
\]

Since there are no diversion crossflows

\[ M_L = \text{constant} \] \hspace{1cm} (B.9a)

\[ M_R = \text{constant} \] \hspace{1cm} (B.9b)

and from (A.1.8c), (A.1.8d) and (A.1.9b) (Appendix A, Volume I).
\[ \begin{align*} 
Q_L' &= \sum_{i=A}^C q_{i1} \quad \text{(A.1.8c)} \\
Q_R' &= \sum_{i=D}^F q_{i1} \quad \text{(A.1.8d)} \\
N_H &= \frac{H_L - H_R}{h_C - h_D} \quad \text{(A.1.9b)}
\end{align*} \]

Equations (3.7) and (B.8) become

\[ \begin{align*} 
\Delta H_L &= \sum_{i} Q_L' M_L \Delta x_i - \sum_{i} (h_C - h_D) W_{L,R} \Delta x_i \quad \text{(B.10a)} \\
\Delta H_R &= \sum_{i} Q_R' M_R \Delta x_i - \sum_{i} (h_D - h_C) W_{R,L} \Delta x_i \quad \text{(B.10b)}
\end{align*} \]

Therefore

\[ \frac{\Delta H_L + \Delta H_R}{2} = \frac{H_L(z) + H_R(z)}{2} - \frac{H_L(0) + H_R(0)}{2} \]

\[ = \frac{\sum_{i} Q_L' M_L \Delta x_i + \sum_{i} Q_R' M_R \Delta x_i}{2} \quad \text{(3.11)} \]

and

\[ \frac{H_L(z) + H_R(z)}{2} = \frac{H_L(0) + H_R(0)}{2} + \frac{\sum_{i} Q_L' M_L \Delta x_i + \sum_{i} Q_R' M_R \Delta x_i}{2} \quad \text{(3.12)} \]

This evaluates the RHS of Eq. (C.3). Next we evaluate \( \frac{h_C + h_D}{2} \), the LHS of Eq. (C.3) to show the equality of RHS and LHS.
To obtain the expression for \( \frac{h_C(z) + h_D(z)}{2} \), we use a different derivation philosophy which is stated below.

From equations (A.1.3c) and (A.1.3d), (in Volume I), we get

\[
\frac{\partial m_C h_C}{\partial x} = q_C - (h_C - h_D) w_{C,D} - (h_C - h_B) w_{C,B} \tag{A.1.3c}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial m_D h_D}{\partial x} = q_D - (h_D - h_C) w_{D,C} - (h_D - h_E) w_{D,E} \tag{A.1.3d}
\]

In order to proceed with the derivation, we have to recognize the following statement as true:

"If the enthalpy profile at axial node \( j \) is transversely symmetrical, we can prove the enthalpy profile at axial node \( j+1 \) is also transversely symmetrical as long as the transverse linear heat generation profile is symmetric."

This statement needs an involved proof and we can heuristically prove this by observing equations (A.1.3c) and (A.1.3d) (Volume I) in the difference scheme:

\[
m_C \frac{h_C(J+1) - h_C(J)}{\Delta x} = q_C - (h_C(J) - h_D(J)) w_{C,D} - (h_C(J) - h_B(J)) w_{C,B} \tag{3.13}
\]

\[
m_D \frac{h_D(J+1) - h_D(J)}{\Delta x} = q_D - (h_D(J) - h_C(J)) w_{C,D} - (h_D(J) - h_E(J)) w_{D,E} \tag{3.14}
\]
Because of symmetry at the axial node $J$, we have

\[(h_C(J) - h_B(J)) = (h_D(J) - h_E(J)) \quad (3.15)\]

and

\[W_{D,C} = W_{C,D} \quad (3.16)\]
\[W_{C,B} = W_{C,E} \quad (3.17)\]

Thus we know is $q_C = q_D = 0$, the enthalpy increment in subchannel $C$ equals the enthalpy decrease in subchannel $D$. Also because the transverse linear heat generation rate is symmetrical, then $h_C(J+1)$ and $h_D(J+1)$ must be symmetrical with respect to

\[
\frac{q_C(J)}{m_C} + \frac{q_D(J)}{m_D} + \frac{h_C(J) + h_D(J)}{2}.
\]

Now we can obtain $\frac{h_c(z) + h_D(z)}{2}$ from equations (A.13c) and (A.13d) (Volume I) by recognizing that $(h_C - h_B) = (h_D - h_E)$. The result is

\[
\frac{h_c(z) + h_D(z)}{2} = \frac{\sum q_C^{i} \Delta x_1}{m_C} + \frac{\sum q_D^{i} \Delta x_1}{m_D} + \frac{h_C(o) + h_D(o)}{2} \quad (3.18)
\]
Since

\[ h_C(o) = H_L(o) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.19a)
\[ h_D(o) = H_R(o) \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.19b)
\[ \frac{q_C}{m_C} = \frac{\sum_{i=A}^{C} q_i}{\sum_{i=A}^{C} m_i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.19c)
\[ \frac{q_D}{m_D} = \frac{\sum_{i=D}^{F} q_i}{\sum_{i=D}^{F} m_i} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.19d)

under the condition \( q_A = q_B = q_C, m_A = m_B = m_C, q_D = q_E = q_F \) and \( m_D = m_E = m_F \).

Therefore, from equations (B.18) and (E.12) we get

\[ \frac{h_C(z) + h_D(z)}{2} = \frac{H_L(z) + H_R(z)}{2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (B.20)

However, under large inter-subchannel diversion crossflow or flow upset conditions, equations (B.15), (3.17), (3.19c) and (B.19d) will not hold and hence equations (3.20) and (3.4) become inequalities.

**P.2 Suggestions on \( h^* \) in terms of known parameters**

A suggestion is made below regarding \( h^* \) (stated in
equation (A.1.lla) and (A.1.11b) (Volume I) under the assumptions of no diversion crossflow and no flow upset) in order to cope with the conditions of large diversion crossflow and flow upset.

\[
h^* = \frac{H_L(M_L + M_L(o)) + H_R(M_R + M_R(o))}{2(M_L + M_R)} + \frac{H_L + H_R}{2N_H} \text{ if } W_{L,R} > 0 \quad (B.21)
\]

\[
h^* = \frac{H_L(M_L + M_L(o)) + H_R(M_R + M_R(o))}{2(M_L + M_R)} + \frac{H_R - H_L}{2N_H} \text{ if } W_{L,R} < 0 \quad (B.22)
\]

These two equations also hold under the conditions of low diversion crossflow and no flow upset, hence it can be used under any conditions we require in this study.
APPENDIX C

LIMITATIONS ON THE NUMERICAL VALUE OF $\beta$ USED IN CALCULATIONS WITH COBRA IIIC

The mixing coefficient, $\beta$, is an input in COBRA IIIC. It is used to calculate the turbulent interchange per unit length between channels in the lumped subchannel approach. Since it is physically impossible to have the axial enthalpy rise in the flow channel fluctuate for each axial step just due to the energy transport by the turbulent interchange between the channels, a limitation is imposed on the input value of $\beta$. Derivation of the limiting values for $\beta$ under different operating conditions are presented in the following sections.

C.1 Derivation of General Expressions

C.1.1 Unheated Bundles

The limiting condition on $\beta$ is that the enthalpy rise for each axial step $k$ in any channel $i$ by the energy transport with the adjacent channel $j$ should be less than one half of the transverse enthalpy difference between channels $i$ and $j$. This statement can be formulated by the following expression:
\[
\left| \frac{w_{i,j} (h_i - h_j) \Delta x}{m_1} \right| < \frac{|h_i - h_j|}{k} 
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.1.1)

where \( w_{i,m}, h_i, h_j \) are evaluated for any axial node \( k \).

Since

\[
w_{i,j} = \beta s \left( \frac{e_i + e_j}{2} \right)_k
\]

\[
m_1 = e_i A_i
\]

equation (C.1.1) also can be expressed in a general way:

\[
\Delta x \beta s \left( \frac{e_i + e_j}{2(e_i A_i)} \right)_k \left| (h_i - h_j) \right| < \frac{|h_i - h_j|}{2} 
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.1.2)

Therefore

\[
\beta < \frac{e_i A_i}{s(e_i + e_j) \Delta x} 
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.1.3)

**C.1.2 Heated Bundles**

Because the limitation set on \( \beta \) has nothing to do with the heat added from heated rods, the expression (C.1.3) is also true for heated bundles.
C.2 Evaluation of Numerical Values for $\beta_{\text{max}}$

C.2.1 Enthalpy Upset Case

In this case, the diversion crossflow is very small. Therefore, $\frac{e_i}{e_i + e_j}$ is close to one half throughout the entire length of the channels. For typical PWR geometry, equation (C.1.3) thus can be evaluated by letting:

$$s = 0.122 \text{ inch}$$
$$A_i = 0.0098 \text{ ft}^2$$
$$\Delta x = 5.76 \text{ inch}$$

then

$$\beta_{\text{max}} = \frac{0.5 \times 0.00094}{\frac{0.122}{12} \times \frac{5.76}{12}} = 0.096 \quad (C.2.1.1)$$

In particular, it should be noted that $\beta_{\text{max}}$ in the half-sized channel calculation becomes one half of its nominal value in the full sized channel calculation. Therefore, as long as a half sized channel is used, $\beta_{\text{max}}$ for half-sized channels becomes a limiting value for $\beta$ provided a constant $\beta$ is used for every channel in the calculation. The $\beta_{\text{max}}$ in the half-sized channel calculation can be established as follows:
\[ \beta_{\text{max}}(\text{half-sized channel}) = \frac{\varepsilon_1 A_1}{2s(g_1+g_j)\Delta x} \]

\[ = 0.5\beta_{\text{max}} \]

\[ = 0.048 \quad \text{(C.2.1.2)} \]

### C.2.2 Enthalpy and Flow Upset Case

In this case, the limiting value of \( \beta \) occurs in the region where the ratio \( \frac{\varepsilon_1}{g_1+g_j} \) has the smallest value provided a constant \( \beta \) is used throughout the channels.

There are three important features of the maximum \( \beta \) under the flow upset condition; i.e.,

1. \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) under the flow upset condition is always less than that under the enthalpy upset of the power upset condition (since \( \frac{\varepsilon_1}{g_1+g_j} < \frac{1}{2} \)).

2. The limiting \( \beta \) occurs at the inlet under the flow upset condition. This is because the momentum transport between channels tends to increase the value on \( \frac{\varepsilon_1}{g_1+g_j} \) along the channel.

3. The minimum value of \( \frac{\varepsilon_1}{g_1+g_j} \) depends on the upset flow ratio at the inlet. Generally, the higher the flow upset ratio, the smaller the value of \( \frac{\varepsilon_1}{g_1+g_j} \).
In our application, a step flow upset inlet condition is used where the higher flow rate \( \frac{N-1}{2} \) channels at the inlet is 1.1 times larger than that for the center channel and the lower flow rate at the inlet for the rest of the channels is 0.9 times lower than that for the center channel. Therefore, \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) in this case can be calculated by the following formula:

\[
\beta_{\text{max}} = \frac{g_1 A_1}{s(g_1 + g_j)Ax} = \frac{0.9 A_1}{s(1.1 + 0.9)Ax} = \frac{0.9 \times 0.00094}{0.122 \times (1.8) \frac{5.76}{12}} = 0.097
\]

(c.2.2.1)

If the half-sized channels are used for the center channel to calculate the coupling coefficients, the limiting \( \beta \) occurs in the half sized channel adjacent to the high flowrate channels. Hence the \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) can be calculated as follows:
\[ \beta_{\text{max}} = \frac{\varepsilon_1 A_1}{2s(g_1+g_j)\Delta x} \]

\[ = \frac{1.0 \times 0.00094}{2 \times \frac{0.122}{12} \times (1.0+1.1) \times \frac{5.76}{12}} \]

\[ = 0.046 \quad \text{(C.2.2.2)} \]

C.2.3 **Power Upset Case**

In this case, the \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) is the same as that in the enthalpy upset case.

C.2.4 **Power and Flow Upset Case**

In this case, the \( \beta_{\text{max}} \) is the same as that in the flow upset case.
APPENDIX D

METHODS TO ANALYZE HOMOGENIZED REPRESENTATIONS,
MULTI-SUBCHANNEL REPRESENTATIONS AND
TO COMPUTE $N_H(z)$

The purpose of this appendix is to illustrate the method to compute the multi-subchannel results, the homogenized results and the coupling coefficients. The procedure to obtain the multi-subchannel and homogenized results is discussed in section D.1. The input data for the homogenized representations which can be determined from the input data for the multi-subchannel representations are discussed in section D.2. Finally, the code changes are briefly discussed in section D.3 on the modifications made to fulfill the computations required in this study.

D.1 Procedures

COBRA IIIC/MIT version is used in this study to analyze the coupling coefficient $N_H$ in the energy conservation equation. The steps to accomplish this purpose are listed below:

1) Run a multi-subchannel case to obtain
   a) Multi-subchannel results - the average parameters for the multi-subchannel steps L and R
b) **Coupling Coefficients** - The following approximations are made so that coupling coefficients can be obtained from the multi-subchannel computation:

\[
\dot{h}_L(z) = H_L(z) \quad \text{(D.1)}
\]

\[
\dot{h}_R(z) = H_R(z) \quad \text{(D.2)}
\]

For instance, \( N_H \) is defined in Appendix A (Volume I):

\[
N_H = \frac{\bar{h}_L - \bar{h}_R}{h_C - h_D} \quad \text{(A.1.9c)}
\]

Insert (D.1) and (D.2) into (A.1.9c)

\[
N_H = \frac{\dot{h}_L - \dot{h}_R}{h_C - h_D} \quad \text{(D.3)}
\]

so \( N_H \) is expressible in the multi-subchannel parameters and can be evaluated in the multi-subchannel computation.

2) Run a homogenized case which lumps \( N \) subchannels into two homogenized channels L and R. The conservation equations in this case are modified
according to equations (A.1.7), (A.2.5) and (A.3.5) (Volume I) so as to compute the homogenized results with the coupling coefficients evaluated in step 1.

D.2 Input Data for Homogenized Representations

The relationships between the input data for the homogenized representation and for the multi-subchannel representation are summarized as follows:

\[
Q_L = \sum_{i=A} C q_i \quad \text{(D.2.1a)}
\]

\[
Q_R = \sum_{i=D} F q_i \quad \text{(D.2.1b)}
\]

\[
A_L = \sum_{i=A} C A_i \quad \text{(D.2.1c)}
\]

\[
A_R = \sum_{i=D} F A_i \quad \text{(D.2.1d)}
\]

\[
H_L = \frac{\sum_{i=A} C m_i h_i}{\sum_{i=A} m_i} \quad \text{at inlet} \quad \text{(D.2.1e)}
\]

\[
H_R = \frac{\sum_{i=D} F m_i h_i}{\sum_{i=D} m_i} \quad \text{at inlet} \quad \text{(D.2.1f)}
\]
From the above relationships, the input data for the homogenized representation can be determined from the input data for the multi-subchannel representation.

1.3 Code Changes

Part of the code has been modified to fulfill the purpose of this study. The code changes in the required subroutines are listed as follows:

1) **Subroutine EXPRIN** – Calculate the parameters in the homogenized representation and the coupling coefficients, i.e., \( N_H \), \( N_U \), \( N_{TP} \), \( N_{TU} \) and \( N_{TF} \).

2) **Subroutine SCHEME** – Read in the coupling coefficient either in a single value form or in a discrete value form. Calculate \( N_H \).

3) **Subroutines DIFFER and DIVERT** – Incorporate the coupling coefficients in the conservation equations.
APPENDIX E

\( N_H \) FOR THE HOMOGENIZED CASE COUPLING TWO STRIPS OF UNEVEN NUMBERS OF SUBCHANNELS

For the multi-subchannel strip with uneven subchannel numbers, i.e., coupling two multi-subchannel strips \( L \) and \( R \) with different number of subchannels, \( N_L \) and \( N_R \) respectively, the \( N_H \) can be derived as follows:

Assume the enthalpy at the center is zero as the reference point and

\[
N_{H_L} = \frac{\bar{H}_L}{h_M^-} \quad \text{for the multi-subchannel strip } L \tag{E.1}
\]

\[
N_{H_R} = \frac{\bar{H}_R}{h_M^+} \quad \text{for the multi-subchannel strip } R \tag{E.2}
\]

where

\( h_M^- \) = enthalpy of the half-sized subchannel in the strip \( L \) and adjacent to the strip \( R \)

\( h_M^+ \) = enthalpy of the half-sized subchannel in the strip \( R \) and adjacent to the strip \( L \).

From the definition of \( N_H \)

\[
N_H = \frac{\bar{H}_L - \bar{H}_R}{h_m^- - h_m^+} \tag{E.3}
\]

Insert equations E.1 and E.2 into E.3

\[
N_H = \frac{N_{H_L} h_m^- - N_{H_R} h_m^+}{h_m^- - h_m^+} \tag{E.4}
\]
Also assume

$$h_{m+} = - h_{m-} \quad (E.5)$$

Then equation (E.4) becomes

$$N_H = \frac{N_{H_L} + N_{H_R}}{2} \quad (E.6)$$

This relationship is expected to be valid as long as $N_L$ and $N_R$ are large enough to make the assumption (E.5) hold and the difference between $N_L$ and $N_R$ is small. An heuristic criteria is suggested to limit the validity of equation (E.6):

$$\frac{|N_L - N_R|}{\min(N_L, N_R)} < 0.3$$

where $\min(N_L, N_R)$ is the smaller number between $N_L$ and $N_R$. 
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3.0 Introduction

In the present volume the methods to calculate transport coefficients for 3D problems (in particular $N_H(z)$) will be given. An example case will be presented and the results of the numerical method will be compared against the results of the analytical method.

3.1 Numerical Method to Determine $N_H(z)$ for a Multiregion Analysis

3.1.1 Introduction

In order to find $N_H(z)$ for a particular boundary, the following steps should be followed:

1) Define the geometry to be adopted.
2) Using COBRA IIIC/MIT analyze the adopted geometry on an actual subchannel basis, i.e., each radial node being a subchannel.
3) Define $N_H(z)$.
4) Using the results from step 2 and the definition of step 3, find the numerical values of $N_H(z)$.

3.1.2 Solution Strategy

The following strategy is recommended:

3.1.2.1 Define the geometry to be adopted.

If the value of $N_H(z)$ for a boundary has to be calculated it is recommended that the geometry of Figure 13 (Chapter 3 Volume 1) be adopted where the boundary of interest is boundary A, and where now
the homogenized regions will be those of our specific problem. By imbedding the boundary of interest in this mesh of 12 channels we will significantly reduce the effect of \( N_H(z) \) of the actual channels which are not considered.

3.1.2.2 Analysis Needs of the Problem

Using COBRA IIIC/MIT the geometry adopted has to be analyzed in order to find the enthalpies of each subchannel that make-up the homogenized regions at each axial elevation. The analysis needs to be done on an actual subchannel basis and then the homogenized regions have to be split into subchannels as indicated in Figure 13, Chapter 3, Volume I.

3.1.2.3 Definition of \( N_H(z) \).

In order that the homogenized region analysis yield enthalpy results for these regions identical to those given by an actual subchannel analysis, the following definition of \( N_H(z) \) should be used: (See Figure 13, Chapter 3, Volume I).

\[
N_H(z) = \frac{\bar{w}_z^i(h_z(L) - h_z(R))}{w_z^{i(42,43)}(h_z(42) - h_z(43)) + w_z^{i(54,55)}(h_z(54) - h_z(55)) + w_z^{i(66,67)}(h_z(66) - h_z(67))}
\]  

(III.1)

where

\[
\bar{w}_z^i = w_z^{i(42,43)} + w_z^{i(54,55)} + w_z^{i(66,67)} \quad \text{(III.2)}
\]

\( h_z(L) = \text{Average enthalpy of the homogenized region to the left of the boundary (subchannels 40,41,42,52,53,54,64,65 and 66)} \)

\( h_z(R) = \text{Average enthalpy of the homogenized region to the right of the boundary (subchannels 43,44,45,55,56,67,68 and 69)} \)
However since this definition is very complicated because it also involves the effective massflow for the turbulent interchange, the following approximation is suggested:

\[ N_H(z) = \frac{3(\bar{h}_z(L) - \bar{h}_z(R))}{(h_z(42) - h_z(43)) + (h_z(54) - h_z(55)) + (h_z(66) - h_z(67))} \]  

(III.3)

which can be further transformed to:

\[ N_H(z) = \frac{\bar{h}_z(L) - \bar{h}_z(R)}{\left(\frac{h_z(42) + h_z(54) + h_z(66)}{3}\right) - \left(\frac{h_z(43) + h_z(55) + h_z(67)}{3}\right)} \]  

(III.4)

3.1.2.4 Calculation of \( N_H(z) \).

Using the previous definition and the enthalpy results found in Step 2, the numerical calculation of \( N_H(z) \) is straightforward.
3.2 3D Analytic Transport Coefficients

3.2.1 Solution of the General Equation

The general equation to be solved is:

\[
\frac{1}{a_t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T}{\partial z^2} \tag{III.5}
\]

where the following analogy has been built into the equation in order to transform the 3-D thermal/ hydraulic problem into a 2D, transient, thermal conduction problem:

\[
T \rightarrow h \\
t \rightarrow \frac{z}{\sigma_z} \\
a_t \rightarrow \varepsilon_H \\
k \rightarrow \rho \varepsilon_H \tag{III.6 - III.9}
\]

The boundary conditions are:

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=0} = 0 \quad ; \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x=x_4} = 0 \tag{III.10}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=0} = 0 \quad ; \quad \frac{\partial T}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=y_3} = 0 \tag{III.11}
\]

\[
T(x, y, 0) = T_0(x, y) \tag{III.12}
\]
Equation (III.5) can be divided as follows:

\[ \frac{1}{a_t} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 T_1}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T_1}{\partial y^2}. \]  

(III.13)

\[ \frac{1}{a_t} \frac{\partial T_2}{\partial t} = \frac{q'''}{k}. \]  

(III.14)

\[ \frac{\partial^2 T_3}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 T_3}{\partial y^2} + \frac{q'''}{k} = 0 \]  

(III.15)

where:

\[ T(x_1y_1t) = T_1(x_1y_1t) + T_2(t) + T_3(x,y) \]  

(III.16)

and where:

\[ q''' = \overline{q}''' + q_1''' \]  

(III.17)

The general solution for \( T(x_1y_1t) \) will be a Fourier series of sines and cosines, but because our boundary conditions are adiabatic the terms with sines will disappear and the solution will only have cosine terms.

Expression the heat generation as a Fourier series in cosines:

\[ q''' = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_{mn} \cos \frac{m\pi x}{x_4} \cos \frac{n\pi y}{y_3} \]  

(III.18)

except \( m=n=0 \)
where
\[ C_{00} = \frac{\int_0^{x_{14}} \int_0^{y_{14}} q'' \, dx \, dy}{\int_0^{y_{13}} \int_0^{x_{14}} dx \, dy} = q'' \] (III.19)

and
\[ C_{mn} = \frac{\int_0^{x_{14}} \int_0^{y_{13}} q'' \cos^{mn} x \cos^{n\pi} y \, dx \, dy}{\int_0^{y_{13}} \int_0^{x_{14}} \cos^{mn} x \cos^{n\pi} y \, dx \, dy} \] (III.20)

Solving Equation (III.15)

\[ T_3(x,y) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_{mn} \cos^{mn} x \cos^{n\pi} y \] (III.21)

except \( m=n=0 \)

where \( C'_{mn} : \)

\[ \left( \frac{m\pi}{x_{14}} \right)^2 C'_{mn} + \left( \frac{n\pi}{y_{13}} \right)^2 C'_{mn} = \frac{C_{mn}}{k} \] (III.22)

To solve equation (III.13):

\[ T_1(x,y,t) = 0(x,y) P(t) \] (III.23)
\[
\frac{1}{a_t^2 F(t)} \frac{dF(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{\theta(x,y)} \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial y^2} \frac{1}{\theta} = -\alpha_{mn}^2
\]  \quad (III.24)

Then:
\[
F(t) = C e^{-a_t \alpha_{mn}^2 t}
\]  \quad (III.25)

\[
\theta = B_{mn} \cos \alpha_x \cos \alpha_y
\]  \quad (III.26)

with \(\alpha_m = \frac{mn}{x_4} ; \quad \alpha_n = \frac{n\pi}{y_3}\)  \quad (III.27)

where \(\alpha_{mn}\):
\[
\alpha_{mn}^2 = \alpha_m^2 + \alpha_n^2
\]  \quad (III.28)

Then
\[
T_1(x,y,t) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_{mn} e^{-a_t \alpha_{mn}^2 t} \cos \alpha_x \cos \alpha_y
\]  \quad (III.29)

except \(m=n=0\)

Solving finally Equation (III.14)
\[
T_2(t) = \frac{\bar{a}_{nm}}{k} a_t \ t + C
\]  \quad (III.30)
The final solution is then:

\[
T(x,y,t) = \frac{q'''}{k} a_t t + C + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (A_{mn} e^{-a t \alpha_{mn}^2 t} + C'_{mn}) \cos \alpha_x^n \cos \alpha_y^n
\]

except \( m=n=0 \) \hspace{1cm} (III.31)

Using now the initial boundary condition:

\[
t = 0; \quad T(x,y,0) = T_0(x,y) = 0
\]

\[
C = 0
\]

\[
A_{mn} = -C'_{mn}
\]

\[
T(x,y,t) = \frac{q'''}{k} a_t t + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_{mn} (1-e^{-a t \alpha_{mn}^2 t}) \cos \alpha_x^n \cos \alpha_y^n
\]

except \( m=n=0 \) \hspace{1cm} (III.35)

where

\( C'_{mn} \) is given by Equation (III.22) and

\( C_{mn} \) is a function of the heat source distribution and is calculated from Equation (III.20).
3.2.2 Derivation of $N_H$

For boundary 9 (Figure III.1) between channels F and G, $N_H$ is defined as:

$$N_H(z) = \frac{\int_{x_1}^{x_2} \int_{y_1}^{y_2} h(x,y,z) \, dx \, dy}{\int_{x_1}^{x_2} \int_{y_1}^{y_2} h(x,y,z) \, dx \, dy}$$

Then once $h(x,y,z)$ is known, the derivation of $N_H$ is straightforward.
3.2.3 Calculation of $N_H$ of a Specific Problem:

The case of Figure III.1 was solved using constant power input for each of the channels that make up the core.

The powers are specified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>P11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>P21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>P31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>P41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>P12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>P22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>P32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>P42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>P13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>P23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>P43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constant $C_{mn}$ takes the following values:

$$C_{mn} = \frac{4}{x_4 y_3 a_m a_n} \left\{ [P_{11} \sin \alpha_{m_1} x_1 + P_{21} (\sin \alpha_{m_2} x_2 - \sin \alpha_{m_1} x_1)] + \ight.$$  

$$+ P_{31} (\sin \alpha_{m_3} x_3 - \sin \alpha_{m_2} x_2) - P_{41} \sin \alpha_{m_4} x_2 \sin \alpha_{n_1} + \ight.$$  

$$[P_{12} \sin \alpha_{m_1} x_1 + P_{22} (\sin \alpha_{m_2} x_2 - \sin \alpha_{m_1} x_1)] + \right.$$
\[ + P32(\sin a_m x_3 - \sin a_m x_2) - P42 \sin a_m x_3] + \]
\[ + [\sin a_n y_2 - \sin a_n y_1] [P13 \sin a_m x_1 + \]
\[ + P23(\sin a_m x_2 - \sin a_m x_1) + P33(\sin a_m x_3 - \sin a_m x_2) \]
\[ P43 \sin a_m x_3] \sin a_n y_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (III.37) \]

and

\[ C'_{mn} = \frac{C_{mn}}{k(a_m^2 + a_n^2)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (III.38) \]

When \( n = 0 \):

\[ C'_{mo} = \frac{2}{x_1 a_m} \left\{ \frac{P13(y_3-y_2)+P12(y_2-y_1)+P11(y_1)}{y_3} \right\} \sin a_m x_1 + \]
\[ + \left[ \frac{P23(y_3-y_2)+P22(y_2-y_1)+P21(y_1)}{y_3} \right] \sin a_m x_2 - \sin a_m x_1 \] +
\[ + \left[ \frac{P33(y_3-y_2)+P32(y_2-y_1)+P31(y_1)}{y_3} \right] \sin a_m x_3 - \sin a_m x_2 \] -
\[ - \left[ \frac{P43(y_3-y_2)+P42(y_2-y_1)+P41(y_1)}{y_3} \right] \sin a_m x_3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (III.39) \]

and

\[ C'_{mo} = \frac{C_{mo}}{k a_m^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (III.40) \]
when \( m = 0 \)

\[
C_{on} = \frac{2}{\alpha_{n3}^2} \left\{ \frac{P_{11}(x_1)+P_{21}(x_2-x_1)+P_{31}(x_3-x_2)+P_{41}(x_4-x_3)}{x_4} \right\} \sin n\gamma_1 + \\
+ \left\{ \frac{P_{12}(x_1)+P_{22}(x_2-x_1)+P_{32}(x_3-x_2)+P_{42}(x_4-x_3)}{x_4} \right\} \sin n\gamma_2 - \sin n\gamma_1 \\
- \left\{ \frac{P_{13}(x_1)+P_{23}(x_2-x_1)+P_{33}(x_3-x_2)+P_{43}(x_4-x_3)}{x_4} \right\} \sin n\gamma_2 \right\}
\]

(III.41)

and:

\[
C'_{on} = \frac{C_{on}}{ka_n^2}
\]

(III.42)

The final expression necessary is the series representation of the power, which is:

\[
q''' = \tilde{q}''' + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{mn} \cos \alpha_m x \cos \alpha_n y + \\
+ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{m0} \cos \alpha_m x + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_{0n} \cos \alpha_n y
\]

(III.43)
This series was tested to find the number of terms required to converge to the actual value of the power. Results are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Actual Power</th>
<th>Power With n = m = 30</th>
<th>Power with n = m = 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noticed that a large number of terms have to be considered to find the correct value of the power distribution. This point is very important since it has a large influence on the limitations of the analytical method for calculation of \( N_H \) values.

Once the constants \( C_{mn} \), \( C_{mo} \), and \( C_{on} \) are known, the calculation of \( N_H \) is quite simple.

Using Equation (III.36)

\[
N_H(z) = \frac{\text{NUMERATOR}}{\text{DENOMINATOR}} \quad \text{(III.44)}
\]
where:

\[
\text{NUMERATOR} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mn}^1}{\alpha_m \alpha_n} \left( 1 - e^{-a_t \alpha_{mn} t} \right) \left( \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2 - \sin \alpha_m x_1}{x_2 - x_1} \right) \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_3 - \sin \alpha_m x_2}{x_3 - x_2} \right\}
\]

\[+ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{m0}^1}{\alpha_m} \left( 1 - e^{-a_t \alpha_m t} \right) \left( \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2 - \sin \alpha_m x_1}{x_2 - x_1} \right) \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_3 - \sin \alpha_m x_2}{x_3 - x_2} \right\}
\]

\[= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mn}^1}{\alpha_m \alpha_n} (1-e^{-a_t \alpha_{mn} t}) \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2 - \sin \alpha_m x_1}{x_2 - x_1} \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_3 - \sin \alpha_m x_2}{x_3 - x_2} \right\}
\]

(III.45)

and

\[
\text{DENOMINATOR} = 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mn}^1}{\alpha_m \alpha_n} (1-e^{-a_t \alpha_{mn} t}) \left( \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2}{(1-\cos \alpha_m p)} \right) \frac{\sin \alpha_n y_2 - \sin \alpha_n y_1}{1-\cos \alpha_n p} \right\}
\]

\[+ 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{m0}^1}{\alpha_m} (1-e^{-a_t \alpha_m t}) \left( \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2}{(1-\cos \alpha_m p)} \right) \frac{\sin \alpha_n y_2 - \sin \alpha_n y_1}{1-\cos \alpha_n p} \right\}
\]

(III.46)

and where:

\[a_t = \frac{\epsilon_H}{H} \tag{III.47}\]
\[t = \frac{z}{\nu_z} \tag{III.48}\]
\[\alpha_{mn}^2 = \alpha_m^2 + \alpha_n^2 \tag{III.49}\]
All the terms of these equations, i.e. (III.45) and (III.46) are known except $\varepsilon_H$, the thermal eddy diffusivity. In order to obtain identical results for $N_H(z)$ using the analytical method to those given by the numerical method, we have to match the energy interchange due to turbulence for every boundary of the problem. This implies that $\varepsilon_H$ should be dependent on $x$, $y$ and $z$. However in our analytical derivation $\varepsilon_H$ had to be assumed constant to permit solution of the differential equation. So an approximation should be made in order to find an average value of $\varepsilon_H$.

This value is calculated using the following equation:

$$\frac{w'(I,J)(h(I)-h(J))}{M(I)} = \frac{\varepsilon_H^{PS}_{ij}}{M(I)} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}_{\text{gap}} \equiv \Delta h(I) \quad \text{(III.49)}$$

where $\Delta h(I) = \text{enthalpy rise of channel I due to turbulent T.I. interchange}$

Taking $w'(I,J)$ as COBRA does:

$$w'(I,J) = \beta s_{ij} \bar{G} \quad \text{(III.50)}$$

we obtain:

$$\varepsilon_H = \beta v z \frac{(h(I)-h(J))}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}_{\text{gap}}} \frac{M(I)}{M(I)_{\text{analyt.}}} \frac{M(I)}{M(I)_{\text{numer.}}} \quad \text{(III.51)}$$
The massflow ratio is required due to the different area of the subchannels in the analytic and the numerical method (Appendix C Volume I). The analytic method assumes each subchannel of area:

\[ A_{\text{analytic}} = P_{sij} = 0.666(0.1333) = 0.074 \text{ in}^2 \quad (\text{III.52}) \]

while the numerical method takes:

\[ A_{\text{numerical}} = 0.1705 \text{ in}^2 \quad (\text{III.53}) \]

The ratio:

\[ \frac{h(I)-h(J)}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}|_{\text{gap}}} = z_{ij} \quad (\text{III.54}) \]

is dependent upon axial position, radial position and power shape across the boundary. With these parameters, equation (III.51) reduces to

\[ \varepsilon_{H} = 0.4348 \bar{v}z_{ij} \quad (\text{III.55}) \]

An average value of the product:

\[ l_{ij} = 0.434z_{ij} \quad (\text{III.56}) \]

has been correlated as a function of \( \beta \) (Figure III.2). This value was obtained by comparing analytical and numerical values of \( N_{H}(z) \)
for a different set of values of $l_{ij}$. However, Figure III.2 is not a general one and in order to apply the analytical method to different problems (different channel dimensions or power shapes) a new correlation should be obtained.

Using now Equations (III.56), (III.55), (III.46), (III.45), and (III.44) we obtain the following expression for $N_H(z)$:
\[ \frac{N_H(z)}{\text{DENOMINATOR}} = \frac{\text{NUMERATOR}}{\text{DENOMINATOR}} \]  

(III.57)

\[
\text{NUMERATOR} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mn}'}{\alpha_m \alpha_n} (1-e^{-\beta l_{ij} z \alpha_{mn}}) \left( \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2 - \sin \alpha_m x_1}{x_2 - x_1} \right) \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_3 - \sin \alpha_m x_2}{x_3 - x_2} (\sin \alpha_n y_2 - \sin \alpha_n y_1) \right\} + \\
+ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mo}'}{\alpha_m} \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_2 - \sin \alpha_m x_1}{x_2 - x_1} \frac{\sin \alpha_m x_3 - \sin \alpha_m x_2}{x_3 - x_2} \right\} 
\]  

(III.58)

\[
\text{DENOMINATOR} = 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mn}'}{\alpha_m \alpha_n} (1-e^{-\beta l_{ij} z \alpha_{mn}}) (\sin \alpha_m x_2) (1-\cos \alpha_m P) (\sin \alpha_n y_2 - \sin \alpha_n y_1) \right\} + \\
+ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{C_{mo}'}{\alpha_m} (1-e^{-\beta l_{ij} z \alpha_{mn}}) (\sin \alpha_m x_2) (1-\cos \alpha_m P) \right\} 
\]  

(III.59)
3.3 Comparison Between the Numerical and the Analytical Methods

The Case of No. 29 (Section 3.3) ($\beta = 0.2$) was run numerically and analytically using two different values for the parameter $l_{ij}$. The results are presented in Figure III.3. It can be observed that the results do not match exactly even for the recommended value of $l_{ij}$ (i.e., $l_{ij} = .11$). As indicated in the previous section it is due to the fact that in order to match the numerical results exactly $l_{ij}$ should be a variable with $x$, $y$ and $z$.

3.4 Conclusion

The development of transport coefficients should be based on three dimensional model considering arbitrary bundle power generation rates. In our investigation we did develop the general methodology and applied it to a specific case. The result indicated that

a) enthalpy errors in the 3D case without application of coupling coefficients were greater than an analogous 2D problem

b) $N_H$ values from 2D problem exhibited the same trends but different numerical values from those from the 3D problem.

c) the $N_H$ values from 3D problems are sensitive to power levels in regions adjacent to the boundary of interest.

From these results we conclude that practical 3D recommendations for $N_H$ will require development of a means to consolidate the large number of boundaries having unique neighboring region power profiles that would be encountered in analysis of any one core.
Figure III.1
3D Example Case
Comparison between $N_H(z)$ determined by analytical and numerical methods for the case of figure 13 (Chapter 3, Volume I)

Figure III.3