

International Journal of Research in Engineering and Innovation (IJREI) journal home page: http://www.ijrei.com

ISSN (Online): 2456-6934



Methods for improving thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system

R.S. Mishra

Department of Mechanical and Production Industrial and Automobiles Engineering, Delhi Technological University, Delhi, India

Abstract

The refrigerant R134a widely used in vapour compression refrigeration and air conditioning systems. It has zero ozone depilation potential factor (ODP) but have 1360 global warming potential (GWP) and their interaction with heat radiation. In this paper, Two HFO refrigerants (i.e. R1234yf & R1234ze) are used as an alternatives refrigerant to.R134a. The method for improving thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration systems have been discussed in detail and thermal model was developed for computing thermodynamic performances and found that the super heating in evaporator and sub cooling in condenser improves thermodynamic performances. The variation in evaporator temperature, condenser temperature, effectiveness of heat exchanger significantly effecting the first and second law performances. The theoretical model shows that, HFO refrigerants give slightly less thermodynamic performances than that of R134a used in vapour compression refrigeration systems can replaceHFC-134a in near future. The numerical computations show that the HFO-1234ze (has zero ODP and six GWP) has 0.8575% less second law efficiency than HFC-134a while HFO-1234yf (has zero ODP and four GWP) gives 5.6757 % lower first and second law performances than using R134a in vapour compression refrigeration systems.

Keywords: Thermodynamic analysis, HFO refrigerants, Performance improvement, Vapour compression refrigeration system

1. Introduction

Refrigeration is a technology which absorbs heat at low temperature and provides temperature below the surrounding by rejecting heat to the surrounding at higher temperature. Simple vapour compression refrigeration system which consists of four major components compressor, expansion valve, condenser and evaporator in which total cooling load is carried at one temperature by single evaporator but in many applications like large hotels, food storage and food processing plants, food items are stored in different compartment and at different temperatures. Therefore there is need of multi evaporator vapour compression refrigeration system. The systems under vapour compression technology consume huge amount of electricity, this problem can be solved by improving performance of system. Performance of systems based on vapour compression refrigeration technology can be improved by following:

(i) The performance of refrigerator is evaluated in term of COP which is the ratio of refrigeration effect to the net-

work input given to the system. The COP of vapour compression refrigeration system can be improved either by increasing refrigeration effect or by reducing work input given to the system.

(ii) It is well known that throttling process in VCR is an irreversible expansion process. Expansion process is one of the main factors responsible for exergy loss in cycle performance because of entering the portion of the refrigerant flashing to vapour in evaporator which will not only reduce the cooling capacity but also increase the size of evaporator. This problem can be eliminated by adopting multi-stage expansion where the flash vapours is removed after each stage of expansion as a consequence there will be increase in cooling capacity and reduce the size of the evaporator.

Kumar et al. [1], carried out energy and exergy analysis of vapour compression refrigeration system using R11 and R12 as refrigerants by the using of exergy-enthalpy diagram and found that the first law analysis (energy analysis) for calculating the coefficient of performance and exergy analysis

for calculating various losses occurred in different components of vapour compression cycle.

Nikolaidis and Probert [2], studied analytically thermal performances that changing with evaporator and condenser temperatures of two stage vapour compression refrigeration plant using R22 and found considerable effect on plant irreversibility and concluded that there is need for optimizing the conditions imposed upon the condenser and evaporator.

Yumrutaset al.[3], carried out exergy analysis by considering the effect of condensing and evaporating temperature on vapour compression refrigeration cycle for computing pressure losses, COP, second law efficiency and exergy losses in the various components and found that thevariation in temperature of condenser have negligible effect on exergy losses of compressor and expansion valve. Similarly the first law efficiency and exergy efficiency increase but total exergy losses of system decrease with increase in evaporator and condenser temperature. Halimic et al. [4], compared performance of R401A, R290 and R134A with R12 by using in vapour compression refrigeration system and found similar performance of R134a and R290 in comparison with R12 and concluded that the R134A can be replaced in the same system without any modification in the system components. But in reference to greenhouse impact and due to low GWP the hydrocarbon R290 presented best results due to high GWP of R134a. Xuan and Chen [5], (2004) presented in this manuscript about the replacement of R502 by mixture of HFC-161. Through experimental study it was found that mixture of HFC-161 gives same and higher performance than R404A at lower and higher evaporative temperature respectively on the vapour compression refrigeration system designed for R404A. Cabello et al.[6-7], experimentally found the effect of condensing pressure, evaporating pressure and degree of superheating on single stage vapour compression refrigeration system using R22, R134a and R407C.and found that the mass flow rate is greatly affected by change in suction conditions of compressor which results refrigeration capacity because refrigeration capacity depended on mass flow rate through evaporator and also observed the higher compression ratio of R22 gives lower COP than R407C. Cabello et al. [7], studied about the effect of operating parameters on COP, work input and cooling capacity of single-stage vapour compression refrigeration system. There is great influence on energetic parameters due change in suction pressure, condensing and evaporating temperatures. Spatz and Motta [8], focused on replacement of R12 with R410a through experimental investigation of medium temperature vapour compression refrigeration cycles. In terms of thermodynamic analysis, comparison of heat transfer and pressure drop characteristics, R410a gives best performance among R12, R404a and R290a. Bolaji et al.[9], had done experimentally comparative analysis of R32, R152a and R134a refrigerants in vapour compression refrigerator. They reached to the conclusions that R32 shows lowest performance whereas R134a and R152a showing nearly same performance but best performance was obtained of system using R152a. Padilla et al. [10, 16], carried out theexergy analysis of domestic vapour compression refrigeration system using R12 and R413A and concluded that performance in terms of power consumption, irreversibility and exergy efficiency of R413A is better than R12. Therefore R12 can be replaced by R413A in domestic vapour compression refrigeration system. Ahamed et al. [11]emphasized on use of hydrocarbons and mixture of hydrocarbons and R134a by using exergy analysis in vapour compression refrigeration system and found that compressor shows much higher exergy destruction as compared to rest of components of vapour compression refrigeration system and this exergy destruction can be minimized by using of nanofluid and nano-lubricants in compressor. Ahamed et al.[12], had performed experimental investigation on domestic refrigerator using hydrocarbons (isobutene and butane) by energy and exergy analysis. They concluded to the results that energy efficiency ratio of hydrocarbons comparable with R134a but exergy efficiency and sustainability index of hydrocarbons much higher than that of R134a at considered evaporator temperature and also found that compressors shows highest exergy destruction in terms of system defect (69%) among components of considered system.

Stanciu et al. [13], carried out numerical computation of single stage vapour compression refrigeration system using following refrigerants (R22, R134a, R717, R507a, R404a) in terms of COP, compressor work, exergy efficiency and refrigeration effect. Effect of subcooling, superheating and compression ratio was also studied on the same system using considered refrigerants and present system optimization when working with specific refrigerant.

Han et al. [14] carried out experimental investigations under different working conditions revealed that there could be replacement of R407C in vapour compression refrigeration system having rotor compressor with mixture of R32/R125/R161 showing higher COP, less pressure ratio and slightly high discharge compressor temperature without any modification in the same system. Selladurai and Saravana kumar[15]also compared the performance of a domestic refrigerator using R134a and R290/R600a mixture and found that R290/R600a hydrocarbon mixture showed higher COP and exergetic efficiency than R134a and found that the highest irreversibility occurred in the compressor as compared to condenser, expansion valve and evaporator.

Anand and Tyagi [16], carried out detailed exergy analysis of 2TR window air conditioning test rig using R22 and found that the irreversibility in system components will be highest when the system is 100% charged and lowest when 25% charged and also found the irreversibility in compressor is highest among system components. Based on the literature it was observed that the investigators have gone through detailed first law analysis in terms of coefficient of performance and second law analysis in term of exergetic efficiency of simple vapour compression refrigeration system with single evaporator.

- (i) The irreversibility analysis or second law analysis of vapour compression refrigeration systems using liquid vapour heat exchanger.
- (ii) Researchers did not go through detailed analysis for irreversibility and second law analysis of single stage

vapour compression refrigeration systems using HFO refrigerants by considering the effect of sub cooling of condenser and super heating of evaporator.

2. Results and Discussions

Following numerical values have been chosen for numerical computation for validation of thermal model.

Condenser temperature = 40° C

Evaporator temperature = -40° C

Load on Evaporator = 3.567 "kW"

Compressor efficiency=100% Refrigerant used: R12

Ambient Temperature = 40° C.

The computed results are shown in Table-1(a). It is clear that computed values by thermal model matches well with the reference values as shown in Table-1(a) respectively.

Table 1 (a): Validation of results using R12 in vapour compression refrigeration system

| Performance Parameters | Results obtained | Ref [19] |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------|
| | by Model | |
| COP | 1.976 | 1.97 |
| COP_Carnot | 2.913 | 2.9125 |
| Mass flow Rate "Kg/sec) | 0.03698 | 0.0370 |
| Work done by compressor"kW" | 1.78 | 1.781 |
| Second law efficiency | 0.6783 | 0.6760 |
| Irreversibility/ Lost Work "kW" | 0.5735 | 0.5730 |
| Q_Eva"kW" | 3.5167 | 3.5167 |
| Exergy_Product "kW" | 1.207 | 1.20 |
| Exergy_Fuel "kW" | 1.78 | 1.781 |
| Compressor Efficiency (%) | 100 % | 100% |

The numerical computations have been carried out for dead state temperature of 298K with the following input data have been chosen by using HFO refrigerant for reducing global warming and ozone depletion. Condenser temperature = 40° C

Evaporator temperature = 40°C Evaporator temperature = -40°C Load on Evaporator = 3.567 "kW" Compressor efficiency=100% Refrigerant used: R1234yf Ambient Temperature =27°C. The computed results are shown in Table-1(b).

| compression refrigeration | compression refrigeration system for T_Ambient= 298 K | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Performance Parameters | R1234yf | R1234ze | R134a | | | | | | | |
| COP_Actual | 1.344 | 1.449 | 1.505 | | | | | | | |
| COP_Carnot | 3.583 | 3.583 | 3.583 | | | | | | | |
| Mass flow Rate (Kg/sec) | 0.04261 | 0.03506 | 0.2987 | | | | | | | |
| Work done by compressor kW | 2.616 | 2.427 | 2.337 | | | | | | | |
| Second law efficiency | 0.3751 | 0.4062 | 0.4198 | | | | | | | |
| Q_Eva (kW) | 3.5167 | 3.5167 | 3.5167 | | | | | | | |
| Exergy_Product (kW) | 0.9811 | 0.9811 | 0.9811 | | | | | | | |
| Exergy_Fuel (kW) | 2.616 | 2.427 | 2.337 | | | | | | | |
| Compressor Efficiency (%) | 80 % | 80% | 80% | | | | | | | |

Table 1(b): Computed results obtained by Model in vapour

The computed results also obtained for following ecofriendly

refrigerants as shown in Table-1(c) and it is clear that performance using HFO-1234yf refrigerant is lower than while using HFC-134a refrigerant for 80% and 100% compressor efficiency.

Table 1(c): Computed results obtained by model in vapour compression refrigeration system for $T_{Ambient}$ = 298 K, T_{Cond} = 313K, T Eva=233K

| -515K, 1_EVA-255K | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Performance Parameters | R1234yf | R134a | | | | | | |
| COP | 1.881 | 1.505 | | | | | | |
| COP_Carnot | 3.583 | 3.583 | | | | | | |
| Mass flow Rate "Kg/sec) | 0.04261 | 0.2987 | | | | | | |
| Work done by compressor"kW" | 2.093 | 1.87 | | | | | | |
| Second law efficiency | 04688 | 0.5247 | | | | | | |
| Q_Eva"kW" | 3.5167 | 3.5167 | | | | | | |
| Exergy_Product "kW" | 0.9811 | 0.9811 | | | | | | |
| Exergy_Fuel "kW" | 2.616 | 2.337 | | | | | | |
| Compressor Efficiency (%) | 100 % | 100% | | | | | | |

The performance of vapour compression refrigeration system for 10° C of sub cooling in condenser and 10° C of super heating in evaporator for 80% of heat exchanger effectiveness using fifteen ecofriendly refrigerants is shown in Table-2 (a) to Table-2(b) respectively. The following numerical values have been considered for numerical computation of performance parameters of the vapour compression refrigeration system.

 T_{Cond} = 323K, $T_{Evaporator}$ = 253K.

Table-2(a) & Table-2(b) shows the thermal performances variation with changing eco-friendly refrigerants in the vapour compression refrigeration system. It is clear that the first law efficiency in terms of coefficient of performance of R141b is highest and R125 is lowest. The COP of R245fa is higher than R134a and R236fa. The first law efficiency of HFO-1234yf is 5.6757% lower than HFC-134a and HFO-1234ze has less than 1% lower (around 0.8575%) cop than using R134a. . Similarly second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using R141b is highest and R407c is lowest. While power consumption by compressor is lowest using R227ea and highest by using M32. Similarly exergy of product is highest using R32 and system exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product is highest by using R125 and lowest by using R123. It is clear that second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234ze is nearly approaching to the second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using R134a and second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf is slightly lower (around 5.67034%) by replacing R134a. and 0.85668% lower by using HFO-1234ze for replacing R134a. Table-3(a) and Table-3(b) show the thermal performance variation with variation of evaporator temperature in the vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant and it is found that as evaporator temperature is increasing, the first law efficiency (COP_VCRS) is increasing while second law efficiency is decreasing and exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and also rational EDR is decreasing. Similarly exergetic efficiency is also decreasing along with increasing system

EDR Table-4(a) and Table-4(b) show the thermal performance variation with variation of condenser temperature in the vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant and it is found that as condenser temperature is increasing, the first law efficiency (COP_VCRS) is decreasing while second law efficiency is also decreasing and exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and also rational EDR is increasing creasing.Similarly exergetic efficiency is also decreasing along with increasing system EDR.

Table-5(a) and Table-5(b) show the thermal performance variation with variation of effectiveness of heat exchanger and it is clear that first law efficiency in terms of coefficient of performance and second law efficiency and exergetic efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system is increasing as effectiveness of heat exchanger is increasing. Similarly exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (EDR_System) and Rational EDR (exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of fuel) is decreasing.

Table-6(a) shows the thermal performance variation with variation of super heating temperature in evaporator in the vapour compression refrigeration refrigeration system using

HFO-1234yf refrigerant and it is clear that first law efficiency in terms of coefficient of performance of vapour compression refrigeration system is increasing and second law efficiency as sub cooling temperature increasing (i.e. super heating takes place at higher temperature than the evaporator temperature). Similarly exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and rational EDR (exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of fuel system) is decreasing as super heating temperature is increasing.

Table-6(b) shows the thermal performance variation with variation of sub cooling temperature in condenser in the vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant and it is clear that first law efficiency in terms of coefficient of performance of vapour compression refrigeration system is increasing and second law efficiency as sub cooling temperature increasing (i.e. sub cooling takes place at lower than condenser temperature) .Similarly exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and rational EDR (exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of fuel system) is decreasing as sub cooling temperature is increasing.

| T (1) (1) T (1) T (1) | C C | · · · | • • • • • | 11 C · |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Table-2(a): Thermodynami | c pertormances of vapour | compression retrigerat | ion system using ecotrien | dlv retrigerants |
| | e perjermanees ej rapea | eempressien rejingeraa | ten bjøtem using eeej ten | ary rejrigerantis |

| Parameters | R134a | R1234yf | R1234ze | R245fa | R236fa | M32 | R227ea |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| COP_Actual | 2.449 | 2.31 | 2.428 | 2.588 | 2.372 | 2.369 | 2.146 |
| System EDR _{Second Law} | 1.296 | 1.434 | 1.315 | 1.172 | 1.371 | 1.373 | 1.62 |
| Second law Efficiency | 0.4356 | 0.4109 | 0.4319 | 0.4603 | 0.4218 | 0.4214 | 0.3817 |
| Rational EDR _{Second Law} | 0.5644 | 0.5891 | 0.5681 | 0.5397 | 0.578 | 0.5786 | 0.6183 |
| W_Comp(kW) | 55.86 | 44.69 | 49.98 | 55.62 | 42.68 | 102.5 | 32.91 |
| Exergy_Product (kW) | 24.33 | 18.36 | 21.53 | 25.6 | 18.05 | 43.19 | 12.56 |
| Exergy_Fuel (kW) | 55.86 | 44.69 | 49.8 | 55.82 | 42.78 | 102.5 | 32.91 |
| Exergetic Efficiency | 0.1289 | 0.1232 | 0.1283 | 0.1314 | 0.1261 | 0.1254 | 0.1169 |
| System EDR | 6.755 | 7.12 | 6.795 | 6.438 | 6.931 | 6.974 | 7.552 |

Table-2(b): Thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using ecofriendly refrigerants

| Parameters | R143a | R152a | R141b | R410a | R404a | R407c | R125 | R123 |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| COP_Actual | 2.20 | 2.577 | 2.769 | 2.307 | 2.121 | 2.089 | 1.99 | 2.668 |
| System EDR _{Second Law} | 1.554 | 1.181 | 1.031 | 1.437 | 1.651 | 1.692 | 1.825 | 1.107 |
| Second law Efficiency | 0.3916 | 0.4585 | 0.4925 | 0.4101 | 0.3772 | 0.3715 | 0.3340 | 0.4745 |
| Rational EDR _{Second Law} | 0.6084 | 0.5416 | 0.5075 | 0.5896 | 0.6228 | 0.6285 | 0.646 | 0.5255 |
| W_Comp(kW) | 54.41 | 88.90 | 66.54 | 67.86 | 47.89 | 69.29 | 37.58 | 50.11 |
| Exergy_Product (kW) | 21.31 | 40.15 | 32.77 | 27.85 | 18.07 | 25.13 | 13.30 | 23.78 |
| Exergy_Fuel (kW) | 54.41 | 88.90 | 66.54 | 67.86 | 47.89 | 69.29 | 37.58 | 50.11 |
| Exergetic Efficiency | 0.1190 | 0.1338 | 0.1441 | 0.1231 | 0.1156 | 0.1137 | 0.1101 | 0.1374 |
| System EDR | 7.403 | 6.473 | 6.088 | 7.121 | 7.65 | 7.794 | 8.801 | 6.279 |

Table-3(a): Effect of evaporator temperature on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf

| Tejfigerani | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|----------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| T_EVA (K) | COP Actual | System EDRSecond Law | Second law | Rational | Exergetic | System EDR | Rational EDR | | | | |
| | | | Efficiency | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | | | | | | |
| 253 | 2.31 | 1.434 | 0.4209 | 0.5791 | 0.1232 | 7.12 | 0.8768 | | | | |
| 258 | 2.656 | 1.428 | 0.4118 | 0.5882 | 0.1231 | 7.125 | 0.8769 | | | | |
| 263 | 3.075 | 1.444 | 0.4092 | 0.5908 | 0.1222 | 7.186 | 0.8778 | | | | |
| 268 | 3.590 | 1.489 | 0.4018 | 0.5982 | 0.1201 | 7.325 | 0.8799 | | | | |
| 273 | 4.237 | 1.578 | 0.388 | 0.6120 | 0.1166 | 7.579 | 0.8834 | | | | |
| 278 | 5.072 | 1.74 | 0.3649 | 0.6351 | 0.1108 | 8.029 | 0.8892 | | | | |
| 283 | 6.191 | 2.048 | 0.3281 | 0.6719 | 0.1014 | 8.86 | 0.8986 | | | | |

| | | 1 | | rejrigerani | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|--------|
| T_eva | Exergy_input/ | Q_Evaporator | COP_Actual | Exergy_Product | Second law | System | Exergetic | System |
| (K) | W_Compressor "kW" | "kW" | | "kW" | Efficiency | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | EDR |
| 253 | 44.69 | 103.2 | 2.31 | 18.36 | 0.4209 | 1.434 | 0.1232 | 7.12 |
| 258 | 40.18 | 106.7 | 2.656 | 16.55 | 0.4118 | 1.428 | 0.1231 | 7.125 |
| 263 | 35.84 | 110.2 | 3.075 | 14.66 | 0.4092 | 1.444 | 0.1222 | 7.186 |
| 268 | 31.66 | 113.6 | 3.590 | 12.72 | 0.4018 | 1.489 | 0.1201 | 7.325 |
| 273 | 27.63 | 117.1 | 4.237 | 10.72 | 0.388 | 1.578 | 0.1166 | 7.579 |
| 278 | 23.75 | 120.5 | 5.072 | 8.666 | 0.3649 | 1.74 | 0.1108 | 8.029 |
| 283 | 20.0 | 123.8 | 6.191 | 6.563 | 0.3281 | 2.048 | 0.1014 | 8.86 |

Table-3(b): Effect of evaporator temperature on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration systemusing HFO-1234yf refrigerant

Table- 4(a): Effect of condenser temperature on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf

| | refrigerant | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------|----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| T_Cond | COP Actual | System | Second law | Rational | Exergetic | System | Rational | | | | | |
| (K) | | EDRSecond Law | Efficiency | EDRSecond Law | Efficiency | EDR | EDR | | | | | |
| 333 | 1.755 | 2.203 | 0.3122 | 0.6878 | 0.09933 | 9.067 | 0.90067 | | | | | |
| 328 | 2.015 | 1.79 | 0.3585 | 0.6415 | 0.1109 | 8.021 | 0.8891 | | | | | |
| 323 | 2.310 | 1.434 | 0.4109 | 0.5891 | 0.1232 | 7.12 | 0.8768 | | | | | |
| 318 | 2.649 | 1.22 | 0.4712 | 0.5288 | 0.1364 | 6.331 | 0.8636 | | | | | |
| 313 | 3.047 | 0.8451 | 0.5420 | 0.4580 | 0.1509 | 5.628 | 0.8491 | | | | | |
| 308 | 3.525 | 0.5954 | 0.6268 | 0.3232 | 0.1668 | 4.994 | 0.8332 | | | | | |
| 303 | 4.111 | 0.3677 | 0.7311 | 0.2699 | 0.1846 | 4.416 | 0.8154 | | | | | |
| 298 | 4.854 | 0.1582 | 0.8634 | 0.1366 | 0.2048 | 3.883 | 0.7952 | | | | | |

Table- 4(b): Effect of condenser temperature on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant

| | | | | rejngeruni | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------|--------|
| $T_{Cond}(K)$ | Exergy_input/ | Q_Evaporator | COP_Actual | Exergy_Product | Second law | System | Exergetic | System |
| | W_Compressor "kW" | "kW" | | "kW" | Efficiency | EDRSecond Law | Efficiency | EDR |
| 333 | 50.31 | 88.31 | 1.755 | 15.71 | 0.3122 | 2.203 | 0.09933 | 9.067 |
| 328 | 47.56 | 95.86 | 2.015 | 17.05 | 0.3585 | 1.79 | 0.1109 | 8.021 |
| 323 | 44.69 | 103.2 | 2.310 | 18.36 | 0.4109 | 1.434 | 0.1232 | 7.12 |
| 318 | 41.70 | 110.5 | 2.649 | 19.65 | 0.4712 | 1.22 | 0.1364 | 6.331 |
| 313 | 38.58 | 117.6 | 3.047 | 20.91 | 0.5420 | 0.8451 | 0.1509 | 5.628 |
| 308 | 35.33 | 124.5 | 3.525 | 22.15 | 0.6268 | 0.5954 | 0.1668 | 4.994 |
| 303 | 31.96 | 131.4 | 4.111 | 23.36 | 0.7311 | 0.3677 | 0.1846 | 4.416 |
| 298 | 28.45 | 138.1 | 4.854 | 24.56 | 0.8634 | 0.1582 | 0.2048 | 3.883 |

 Table- 5(a): Effect of effectiveness of liquid vapour heat exchanger on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system

 using HFO-1234vf refrigerant

| | | i | 131118 111 0 123 | ryj rejngerani | | | |
|------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------|--------|----------|
| Effectiveness of | COP Actual | System | Second law | Rational | Exergetic | System | Rational |
| Heat Exchanger | | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | EDR | EDR |
| 0.50 | 2.253 | 1.496 | 0.4007 | 0.5993 | 0.1207 | 7.282 | 0.8793 |
| 0.55 | 2.262 | 1.485 | 0.4024 | 0.5976 | 0.1212 | 7.254 | 0.8788 |
| 0.60 | 2.272 | 1.475 | 0.4041 | 0.5959 | 0.1216 | 7.227 | 0.8784 |
| 0.65 | 2.281 | 1.464 | 0.4058 | 0.5942 | 0.1220 | 7.20 | 0.8780 |
| 0.70 | 2.291 | 1.454 | 0.4075 | 0.5925 | 0.1224 | 7.173 | 0.8776 |
| 0.75 | 2.30 | 1.444 | 0.4092 | 0.5908 | 0.1228 | 7.146 | 0.8772 |
| 0.80 | 2.31 | 1.434 | 0.4109 | 0.5891 | 0.1232 | 7.12 | 0.8768 |

 Table-5(b): Effect of effectiveness of liquid vapour heat exchanger on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant

| Effectiveness of Heat Exchanger | Exergy_input/ W_Compressor | Q_Evaporator | COP_Actual | Exergy_Product | Exergetic Efficiency | System EDR | Exergetic Efficiency | System EDR |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| 0.50 | 44.69 | 100.7 | 2.253 | 17.91 | 0.4007 | 1.496 | 0.1207 | 7.282 |
| 0.55 | 44.69 | 101.1 | 2.262 | 17.98 | 0.4024 | 1.485 | 0.1212 | 7.254 |
| 0.60 | 44.69 | 101.5 | 2.272 | 18.06 | 0.4041 | 1.475 | 0.1216 | 7.227 |
| 0.65 | 44.69 | 102.0 | 2.281 | 18.14 | 0.4058 | 1.464 | 0.1220 | 7.20 |
| 0.70 | 44.69 | 102.4 | 2.291 | 18.21 | 0.4075 | 1.454 | 0.1224 | 7.173 |
| 0.75 | 44.69 | 102.8 | 2.30 | 18.29 | 0.4092 | 1.444 | 0.1228 | 7.146 |
| 0.80 | 44.69 | 103.2 | 2.31 | 38.36 | 0.4109 | 1.434 | 0.1232 | 7.12 |

| Super Heating | COP_Actual | System EDRsecond | Second law | Rational | Exergetic | System | Rational |
|---------------|------------|------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|--------|----------|
| Temperature | | Law | efficiency | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | EDR | EDR |
| 10 | 2.31 | 1.434 | 0.4109 | 0.5891 | 0.1232 | 7.12 | 0.8768 |
| 9 | 2.306 | 1.438 | 0.4102 | 0.5896 | 0.1229 | 7.136 | 0.8771 |
| 8 | 2.303 | 1.441 | 0.4096 | 0.5904 | 0.1227 | 7.153 | 0.8773 |
| 7 | 2.30 | 1.445 | 0.4090 | 0.5910 | 0.1224 | 7.17 | 0.8776 |
| 6 | 2.296 | 1.449 | 0.4082 | 0.5916 | 0.1221 | 7.187 | 0.8779 |
| 5 | 2.293 | 1.452 | 0.4078 | 0.5922 | 0.1219 | 7.204 | 0.8781 |
| 4 | 2.289 | 1.456 | 0.4072 | 0.5928 | 0.1216 | 7.222 | 0.8784 |
| 3 | 2.286 | 1.459 | 0.4066 | 0.5934 | 0.1214 | 7.240 | 0.8786 |
| 2 | 2.283 | 1.462 | 0.4061 | 0.5939 | 0.1211 | 7.257 | 0.8789 |
| 1 | 2.281 | 1.465 | 0.4057 | 0.5943 | 0.1209 | 7.274 | 0.8791 |
| 0 | 2.278 | 1.468 | 0.4052 | 0.5948 | 0.1208 | 7.269 | 0.8792 |

 Table- 6(a): Effect of super heating of condenser on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration systemusing HFO-1234vf refrigerant

Table- 6(b): Effect of sub cooling of condenser on thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf refrigerant

| Carla and Line | COD | Contore | refrig | | Engradia | Contain EDD | Dational EDD |
|----------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| Sub-cooling | COP_Actual | System | Second law | Rational | Exergetic | System EDR | Rational EDR |
| Temperature | | EDR _{Second Law} | efficiency | EDR _{Second Law} | Efficiency | | |
| 15 | 2.649 | 1.122 | 0.4712 | 0.5288 | 0.1364 | 6.331 | 0.8636 |
| 14 | 2.577 | 1.182 | 0.4584 | 0.5416 | 0.1337 | 6.481 | 0.8663 |
| 13 | 2.507 | 1.242 | 0.4460 | 0.5540 | 0.1310 | 6.635 | 0.8690 |
| 12 | 2.44 | 1.305 | 0.4439 | 0.5661 | 0.1283 | 6.793 | 0.8663 |
| 11 | 2.374 | 1.368 | 0.4222 | 0.57781 | 0.1257 | 6.954 | 0.8743 |
| 10 | 2.310 | 1.434 | 0.4109 | 0.5891 | 0.1232 | 7.12 | 0.8768 |
| 9 | 2.248 | 1.501 | 0.3998 | 0.6002 | 0.1206 | 7.29 | 0.8794 |
| 8 | 2.187 | 1.570 | 0.3891 | 0.6109 | 0.1181 | 7.465 | 0.8819 |
| 7 | 2.129 | 1.641 | 0.3786 | 0.6214 | 0.1157 | 7.645 | 0.8843 |
| 6 | 2.071 | 1.714 | 0.3684 | 0.6316 | 0.1132 | 7.83 | 0.8868 |
| 5 | 2.015 | 1.79 | 0.3585 | 0.6415 | 0.1109 | 8.021 | 0.8891 |
| 4 | 1.961 | 1.867 | 0.3488 | 0.6512 | 0.1085 | 8.217 | 0.8915 |
| 3 | 1.908 | 1.947 | 0.3393 | 0.6607 | 0.1062 | 8.419 | 0.8938 |
| 2 | 1.856 | 2.030 | 0.3301 | 0.6699 | 0.1039 | 0.8628 | 0.8961 |
| 1 | 1.805 | 2.115 | 0.3210 | 0.6790 | 0.1016 | 8.844 | 0.8984 |
| 0 | 1.755 | 2.203 | 0.3122 | 0.6878 | 0.09933 | 9.067 | 0.90067 |

3. Conclusions

A The following conclusions were drawn from present investigation

- (i) First law efficiency in terms of coefficient of performance of R141b is highest and R125 is lowest.
- (ii) The COP of R245fa is higher than R134a and R236fa.
- (iii) The first law efficiency of HFO-1234yf is 5.6757% lower than HFC-134a and HFO-1234ze
- (iv) HFO-1234ze has less than 1% lower (around 0.8575%) first law efficiency than by using R134a.
- (v) The second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234yf is slightly lower (around 5.67034%) by replacing R134a.
- (vi) The second law efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system using HFO-1234ze is slightly lower (around 0.86%) for replacing R134a
- (vii) The first law efficiency (i.e. coefficient of performance) and second law efficiency and exergetic efficiency of vapour compression refrigeration system is increasing as effectiveness of heat exchanger is increasing.
- (viii) Exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product

(EDR_System) and Rational EDR (exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of fuel) is decreasing.

- (ix) As evaporator temperature is increasing, the first law efficiency(COP_VCRS) is increasing while second law efficiency is decreasing
- (x) The exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and also rational EDR is decreasing.
- (xi) Exergetic efficiency is also decreasing along with increasing system EDR when evaporator temperature.
- (xii) As condenser temperature is increasing, the first law efficiency(COP_VCRS) is decreasing while second law efficiency is also decreasing
- (xiii) The exergy destruction ratio based on exergy of product (System EDR) and also rational EDR is increasing creasing as condenser temperature is increasing. Exergetic efficiency is also decreasing when condenser temperature is increasing along with increasing system EDR.

References

- S.Kumar, M.Prevost, R.Bugarel [1989] Exergy analysis of a vapour compression refrigeration system. Heat Recovery Systems & CHP.Vol-9:page-151-157
- [2] C. Nikolaidis, D. Probert [1998]Exergy method analysis of a twostage vapour-compression refrigeration-plants performance. Int J Applied Thermal Engineering vol- 60, page-241-256.
- [3] RecepYumrutas, Mehmet Kunduz, Mehmet Kanoglu[2002]Exergy analysis of vapor compression refrigeration systems. Exergy, An International Journal.; 2:266-272.
- [4] E. Halimic, D. Ross, B. Agnew, A. Anderson, I. Potts. A comparison of the operating performance of alternative refrigerants. Int J Applied Thermal Engineering.2003; 23:1441-1451.
- [5] Yongmei Xuan, GuangmingChen. [2007] Experimental study on HFC-161 mixture as an alternative refrigerant to R502. Applied Thermal Engineering, vol. 27, pp. 2559-2365,
- [6] R. Cabello, J. Navarro-Esbri, R. Llopis, E. Torrella. [2007]Analysis of the variation mechanism in the main energetic parameters in a single-stage vapour compression plant. Int J Applied Thermal Engineering.; 27:167-176
- [7] R.Cabello a, E.Torrella b, J.Navarro-Esbr. [2004]Experimental evaluation of a vapour compression plant performance using R134a, R407C and R22 as working fluids. Int J Applied Thermal Engineering.; Vol-24, page-1905-1917.
- [8] Mark W. Spatz, Samuel F. Yana Motta.[2004] An evaluation of options for replacing HCFC-22 inmedium temperature refrigeration systems. Int J Refrigeration.; Vol-27:page-475-483.
- [9] B.O. Bolaji, M.A. Akintunde, T.O. Falade. [2011]Comparative analysis of performance of three ozone-friends HFC refrigerants in a vapor compression refrigerator. Int J Sustainable Energy & Environment.; 2:61-64.

- [10] M. Padilla, R. Revellin, J. Bonjour. [2010] Exergy analysis of R413A as replacement of R12 in a domestic refrigeration system. Int J Energy Conversion and Management.; Vol-51:page-2195-2201.
- [11] J.U Ahamed, R.saidur, H.H Masjuki, M.A Sattar- [2012]An analysis of energy, exergy and sustainable development of a vapour compression refrigeration system using hydrocarbon.International journal of Green energy.Vol-9:page-707-717.
- [12] J.U. Ahamed, R.Saidur, H.H.Masjuki.[2011] A review on exergy analysis of vapor compression refrigeration system. Int J Renewable and sustainable energy reviews.; 15:1593-1600.
- [13] Camelia Stanciu, Adina Gheorghian, DorinStanciu, AlexandruDobrovicescu- Exergy analysis and refrigerant effect on the operation and performance lomits of a one stage vapour compression refrigeration system.Termotehnica.2011;1:36-42.
- [14] H.O. Spauschus. [1988] HFC 134a as a substitute refrigerant for CFC 12. Int J of Refrigeration. 11:389-392.
- [15] QiyuChen,R.C Prasad. Simulation of a vapour compression refrigeration cycles HFC134A and CFC12.Int Comm.Heat Mass Transfer.1999; 26:513-521.
- [16] M. Padilla, R. Revellin, J. Bonjour. Exergy analysis of R413A as replacement of R12 in a domestic refrigeration system. Int J Energy Conversion and Management.2010; 51:2195-2201.
- [17] R.Saravanakumar, V.Selladurai [2013] Exergyanalysis of a domestic refrigerator using eco-friendly R290/R600a refrigerant mixture as an alternative to R134a.Int J Therm Anal Calorim.
- [18] S Anand, S.K. Tyagi [2012] Exergy analysis and experimental study of a vapour compression refrigeration cycle. Int. J. Therm. Anal. Calorim, Vol-110, Page-961-971.
- [19] C.P Arora [2010] Thermodynamics, Tata McGraw Hill New Delhi, page-499-501

Cite this article as: R.S. Mishra Methods for improving thermodynamic performances of vapour compression refrigeration, International Journal of Research in Engineering and Innovation Vol-3, Issue-3 (2019), 223-229.