Critical heat flux of pool boiling on Si nanowire array-coated surfaces
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A B S T R A C T

Pool boiling of saturated water on plain Si surfaces and surfaces covered with a dense array of Si nanowires (SiNWs) has been studied. Measured CHF and heat transfer coefficient (HTC) values of about 223 ± 5.61 W/cm\textsuperscript{2} and 9 ± 1.60 W/cm\textsuperscript{2}K, respectively, on the nanowire array-coated surface are among the highest reported in boiling heat transfer. Meanwhile, the CHFs on both nanowire-coated and Plain Si surfaces show a similar heater size dependence – the CHF increases as heater size decreases. The measured CHFs on both types of surfaces are approximately following the prediction of the hydrodynamic theory assuming the Helmholtz wavelength equal to the corresponded heater length. It suggests that the CHFs on both types of surfaces might be limited by pool hydrodynamics.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

With the increasingly growing concerns on climate change, the study of energy conversion, storage and transport has become a critical issue. More than 90% of the world’s total power is generated by heat engines and 40% of the heat engines are based on the Rankine cycle. In such heat engines, boiling heat transfer plays an important role in several thermal devices such as boilers, heat exchangers, and condensers etc. One of the most important parameters of boiling heat transfer is the critical heat flux (CHF), which determines the maximum power density that could be handled by a boiling heat transfer device. Reaching CHF in a thermohydraulic system can often lead to catastrophic failures due to large temperature jumps, such as those found in nuclear meltdown. Therefore, enhancing the CHF can have a significant impact on many energy conversion and utilization systems. However, the exact mechanism leading to CHF in boiling heat transfer remains elusive so far, because of the highly complex phenomena in boiling. In general, the mechanisms of CHF can be classified into two categories: (1) far-field and (2) near field.

1.1. Far-field mechanisms

The most well-known CHF models are based on the hydrodynamic instability theory, first proposed by Zuber [1] and later modified by Lienhard and Dhir [2], which asserts that the occurrence of CHF is because of pool hydrodynamics. As the applied heat flux rises, the velocity of vapor columns increases, resulting in an increase of velocity shear between up-flowing vapor and down-flowing liquid. Eventually, the vapor columns become unstable, causing a large retarding force on down-flowing liquid and preventing liquid from returning to the heater surface. A vapor blanket is then formed on the heater surface, which manifests itself as the CHF. The model of CHF based on the hydrodynamics can be expressed as:

\begin{align}
q_{\text{CHF}} &= u_c \rho_q h_f(A_h/A_v), \\
uc &= \left(\frac{2\sigma}{\rho_q \lambda_l} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},
\end{align}

where \( u_c \), \( \rho_q \), \( h_f \) and \( A_h/A_v \) in Eq. (1a) represent critical vapor velocity, vapor density, latent heat and an area ratio of vapor column and heater surface, respectively, and \( \sigma \) and \( \lambda_l \) in Eq. (1b) are the surface tension of liquid and the critical Helmholtz wavelength on vapor columns, respectively. The critical velocity in Eq. (1b) is obtained from a linearized instability analysis at an interface between two fluids with relative velocities [3,4]. This type of instability is referred to the Helmholtz instability [3,4], in which the velocity shear between two fluids disrupts the interface while surface tension of liquid tends to stabilize it. Zuber assumed that the Helmholtz wavelength (\( \lambda_h \)) should be equal to the perimeter of the vapor column (\( \lambda_h = 2\pi R_c \)), a condition of Plateau–Rayleigh instability of a liquid jet [5]. Meanwhile, in the transition boiling regime, an unstable vapor film forms underneath a liquid pool on the heater surface, a condition depicted by the Taylor instability [3,4,6]. By approaching
the CHF point from the transition boiling regime, he postulated that the radius of vapor columns \( R \) and the separation of vapor columns equal to \( \lambda_c/4 \) and \( \lambda_c \), respectively, where \( \lambda_c = \pi \sqrt{\sigma / (\rho_l - \rho_v)} \) is the critical wavelength of Taylor instability [3,6]. The area ratio of vapor columns and heater surface is then obtained as \( \pi/16 \), accordingly. The Helmholtz wavelength is derived as \( \lambda_H = \pi \lambda_c/2 \). Zuber further approximated the numerical term of \( 3/\sqrt{2\pi} \) as one to obtain the model of CHF expressed as:

\[
q_{CHF} = 0.131 \sqrt{\rho_l \rho_v} \sigma \left( \rho_l - \rho_v \right) \frac{1}{4},
\]

(2)

where \( \rho_l \) is the liquid density. Lienhard and Dhir [2] claimed that the Helmholtz wavelength \( \lambda_H \) should be equal to the most dangerous Taylor instability wavelength \( \lambda_0 \) \( \lambda_0 = \sqrt{3} \lambda_c \) since this mode of disturbance will be the fastest growing mode once it appears in the system. This results in a different proportionality constant shown as:

\[
q_{CHF} = 0.149 \sqrt{\rho_l \rho_v} \sigma \left( \rho_l - \rho_v \right) \frac{1}{4}.
\]

(3)

It is worth noting that both Eqs. (2) and (3) have the same functional form as the model proposed by Kutateladze [7] based on a dimensional analysis:

\[
q_{CHF} = K \sqrt{\rho_l \rho_v} \sigma \left( \rho_l - \rho_v \right) \frac{1}{4},
\]

(4)

where \( K \) is found to be 0.16 from the experimental data. For the past few decades, although the predictions of CHF values based on the hydrodynamic instability theories agree with some of the experimental results [8], they cannot explain the dependence of CHFs on surface/material properties such as surface wettability [9–16], spreading ability [17], surface capillarity [18,19], nucleation site density [20], thermal fin effect [21–23], etc.

1.2. Near-field mechanisms

Besides the hydrodynamic instability mechanism, which deals with the flow dynamics far away from the heater surface, there are other proposed CHF mechanisms which primarily consider the fluid flow and heat transfer close to the heater, so called near-field mechanisms. The literature investigating the near-field effects on CHF is summarized as follows:

Haramura and Katto [24] proposed a macrolayer dry-out model of CHF. The macrolayer is defined as a layer consisting of an array of small vapor jets underneath a large vapor mushroom. It was argued that CHF occurs when the liquid film in the macrolayer dries out before the mushroom departs. The obtained CHF model agrees well with Zuber’s model (Eq. (2)).

Dhir and Liaw [9] presented a study investigating the contact angle effect on CHF. The void fraction in the macrolayer was measured experimentally to predict the CHF. Two conclusions were made: (i) CHF occur as a result of the hydrodynamic limit for fully wetting surfaces with contact angle smaller than 20°. (ii) For poorly wetting surfaces with contact angle larger than 20°, the CHF is due to the merging of small vapor stems in the macrolayer, given that higher CHF is observed for surfaces with smaller contact angles.

Kandlikar in 2002 [10] proposed a theoretical model accounting for wettability effects on CHF. His model is based on a force balance applied on a vapor bubble approaching CHF, which also shows a similar trend, i.e., CHF increases as contact angle reduces:

\[
q_{CHF} = \rho \sqrt{h_{fg} \left( 1 + \cos \theta \right) \frac{1}{16} \left( 1 + \frac{\pi}{4} \left( 1 + \cos \theta \right) \cos \Omega \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\rho_l - \rho_v}{\rho_v^2} \right)^{1/4}}.
\]

(5)

The parameters \( \theta \) and \( \Omega \) are the contact angle and the angle relative to the horizontal, respectively.

Li and Peterson [18] used highly conductive microporous coated surfaces made of Cu wire meshes to increase the capillary force, which results in a higher CHF. Lifer and Kaviany [19] also illustrated an enhancement of CHF on modulated porous layer coated surface as a result of a larger capillary limit. The capillary limit denotes the maximum flow rate that can be provided by the surface geometry. For a porous material, at CHF condition, the largest capillary limit de

\[
\frac{\sigma}{\tau_c} = \frac{m_l}{\rho_l k A_c}.
\]

(6)

where \( \sigma \), \( \tau_c \), \( m_l \), \( \rho_l \), \( k \), \( A_c \) are surface tension of liquid, minimum radius of curvature, liquid dynamic viscosity, liquid mass flow rate, liquid flow distance, liquid density, permeability and flowing
They attributed the stronger heater size dependent on nanofluid is ers of boiling on nanofluid as compared to boiling on plain surfaces. et al. [28] found a much stronger enhancement of CHFs on small heat-compared with larger heaters, resulting in a higher CHF. Kwark that for smaller heaters a significant portion of the heater is rewetted and an increase of nucleation site density and an increase of heat transfer surface area by the thermal fin effect.

### 1.3. Heater size effect

The effects of heater size on pool boiling have also been studied. Park and Bergles [25] conducted pool boiling of vertical heaters with one side insulated. The height and width of the heaters were system-atically varied. It was shown that an increase of CHF was obtained as width decreased for heaters with small heights. Bar–Cohen and McNeil [26] determined the transitional point where heater size starts affecting CHF. The CHF becomes a function of the non-dimen-sional heater size \( L' = L/L_c \) for \( L < 20 \), where \( L \) is the heater height and \( L_c \) is the capillary length \( (L_c = \sqrt{g/\sigma (\rho_f - \rho_l)}) \). They attrib-uted the effect of heater size on CHF to the transient conduction ability of the heater. On the other hand, Gogonin and Kutateladze [8] have shown that the heater size effect on CHF is absent for \( L' > 2 \) through a systematic experimental study. Lienhard and Dhir [2] argued that the variation of heater size can affect the CHF via reducing the number of vapor columns present on the heater surface. As the number of vapor columns is confined by the size of the heater, the area ratio \( (A_1/A_2) \) in Eq. (1a) is modified. Through a system-atic study, it was shown that as the heater size is reduced to be smaller than three times the most dangerous Taylor instability wavelength \( (L < 3 \times \lambda_0 \text{ (i.e., } L' < 32)) \) the CHF is a function of heater size [2]

\[
q_{CHF} = 1.14 \times q_{CHF,2} \times \left( \frac{N_j \times \lambda_0}{A_1} \right),
\]

where \( q_{CHF,2} \) is the CHF obtained from Eq. (2) and \( N_j \) is the number of vapor columns present on the surface. It is noted that this equation applies only for certain conditions where heater size is larger than the most dangerous wavelength \( (L > \lambda_0) \). Rainey and You [27] argued that for smaller heaters a significant portion of the heater is rewetted from the edges of the heater, which has a smaller flow resistance compared with larger heaters, resulting in a higher CHF. Kwark et al. [28] found a much stronger enhancement of CHFs on small heat-ers of boiling on nanofluid as compared to boiling on plain surfaces. They attributed the stronger heater size dependent on nanofluid is due to a better rewetting for the nanofluid-coated surfaces.

### 1.4. Boiling on nanostructured surfaces

Recent studies found boiling augmentation on nanostructured surfaces, such as nanofluids [11–17,28], Cu nanorods [29], carbon nanotubes (CNTs) [30,31], nano-fins [32], flower-like nanostructures [33], and nanowires [34]. The enhancement of CHF using nano-fluids is mainly because of a change of surface property due to nanoparticle deposition. Here, a higher CHF is obtained for surfaces with smaller contact angles [11–15]. Meanwhile, for fully wetting surfaces with a zero contact angle, Kim et al. [11] have shown that a greater CHF is achieved for a surface with a larger capillary height where the height refers to the liquid column that can be sustained against gravity. This suggests that capillary force plays an important role in enhancing CHF. Ahn et al. [17] investigated the effect of liquid spreading on CHF using artificial surfaces with micro/nanostructures deposition similar to nano particles deposition. They attributed the enhancement of CHF to the increase of wettability and spreading ability on the artificial micro/nano structures.

In addition, Li et al. [29] reported a 200% increase in HTC due to the increase of nucleation site density using Cu nanorods. Ujereh et al. [30] reported the CHF augmentation by 45% on a CNT array due to the alternation of vapor embryo entrainment in the array and an increased surface area. Sathyamurthi et al. [31] also observed enhanced CHF by 58% on a CNT array due to an enhanced liquid–so-lid contact as a result of the disruption of microlayer by the CNT ar-ray. Siriram [32] used nano-finned surfaces to enhance boiling heat transfer. He found that the CHF increases by 120% due to the presence of the nano-fins. Hendrick et al. [33] found an increase of CHF for saturated water on a flower-like nanostructures on Al surface of \(-82.5 \text{ W/cm}^2\) as compared to the CHF on a bare Al surface of \(-23 \text{ W/cm}^2\). They concluded that there is an optimized contact angle leading to a maximum CHF due to a balance between capillary force and bubble dynamics. Recently, we have reported a twofold enhancement in CHF on Cu and Si nanowire arrays [34] presumably because of a large capillary force provided by the nanowire arrays.

In summary, the mechanisms causing CHF can be broadly clas-sified as far-field hydrodynamic instability-limited, e.g., Zuber [1] and Lienhard and Dhir [2] column Helmholtz–Taylor instability or near-field surface property-limited, e.g., the Katto vapor stem instability [24], wettability [9–16] and spreading ability [17], sur-face capillarity [18,19] and nucleation site density/bubble-dynam-ics instability [20–23,33]. Although much effort has been carried out to understand the mechanism of CHF for several decades, it is still an open question with regards to the exact mechanism caus-ing CHF. General observations are that both the pool hydrodynam-ics and surface properties could affect the values of the CHF. In addition, it is agreed that the effect of heater size on CHF is to in-crease the value of the CHF. But the exact transition value of the size of the heater at which heater size starts to appear is not con-sistent [2,8,26]. Moreover, the underlying physics of the heater size effect on the CHF is not consistent either [2,26–28]. Motivated by these intriguing questions of boiling and CHF enhancements on nanostructures [11–17] and nanostructured surfaces [29–33], we seek to explore the mechanisms causing CHF on surfaces with high CHFs, e.g., surfaces coated with silicon nanowires [34]. As com-pared to boiling on the surfaces with random deposited nanoparticles [11–17], or on the nano-scale structures-patterned surfaces [29,32,33], or on the CNT arrays surfaces (which are hydrophobic) [30,31], the silicon nanowires coated-surfaces have the following advantages: (1) the surfaces have a well-controlled surface morphology; (2) the silicon nanowires are hydrophilic; (3) the length of the nanowire array can be easily controlled to tens to hundreds micrometers. Thus, it is believed that using the nanowires could enhance the performance of boiling and assist in exploring the mechanism of CHF. Previously we have shown that a surface coated with a vertical array of nanowires displays a much higher CHF and HTC as compared to a plain surface [34], which is consist-ent with our assumption and similar to the findings of boiling enhancement on nanostructured surfaces [29–33]. However, the exact mechanism causing CHF on these nanostructured surfaces is still unexplored. In this study, we seek to systematically examine the CHF mechanism on the nanowire array-coated surface by tai-loring the length of the nanowires and the size of the heaters.

### 2. Nanowire synthesis

The SiNW coated-surface is obtained by wafer-scale electroless etching [35]. Briefly, the Si wafer is immersed in a 0.2 M HF
solution with AgNO₃. A redox reaction occurs at the surface, oxidizing the area of Si surface not covered by deposited Ag particles. The oxidized area is then etched via HF solution successively forming an array of SiNWs. The height and density of the NW array are determined by the concentration and etching time; approximately ~50 μm height of SiNW array can be obtained after 2 h of etching. The obtained NWs have a diameter in a range between 50 and 300 nm (see Fig. 1).

3. Experimental setup and test section

The experimental setup and procedure conducted here are the same as that in our previous paper [34]. The test assembly was immersed in a pool of saturated de-ionized (DI) water throughout the experiment. The liquid temperature was kept at 100 °C for at least 30 min before power was applied to degas the water. The power was then supplied by a power supply (Agilent N5750A) to the indium-tin-oxide (ITO) heater. The wall temperature was measured by two thermocouples (T type, OMEGA Engineering Inc) directly soldered onto the ITO heater surface using thermal epoxy (EPO-TEK 930, Epoxy Technology). The values of the temperature were recorded through the data acquisition system (Agilent 34970A). The CHF was postulated to be equal to the heating power corresponding to the last observed stable temperature, beyond which a sudden dramatic jump in heater temperature was observed.

In addition to the edge effect mentioned above, heat can still conduct through the Si substrate and this conduction heat loss is quantified as:

\[ q_s = k A_c \frac{T_{\text{edge}} - T_{\text{ref}}}{d} \]

where \( k \), \( T_{\text{edge}} \), \( T_{\text{ref}} \) are thermal conductivity of Si substrate, temperature at the edge of the heater and temperature at distance of \( d \) away from the edge (see Fig. 2), respectively, whereas \( A_c \) is the cross-sectional area of heater which equals to the perimeter of the heater times the thickness of the wafer (~ 500 μm) and \( d \) is taken to be 2 mm.

Fig. 1. SEM images of SiNW array with different heights: (a) ~16 μm, (b) ~32 μm, (c) ~59 μm, (d) ~122 μm.

Fig. 2. Test section: (a) side view, (b) bottom view. A test section is designed to minimize thermal spreading via coating a layer of low-conductivity photoresist (SU8, ~50 μm) over all areas not covered by the heater on the surface and precisely aligning the area covered by SiNWs to the ITO heater area on the wafer backside.
4. Uncertainty analysis

The uncertainty of the measured heat fluxes is mainly from the accuracy of the power supply. The resultant relative uncertainty of the applied heat flux from the power supply (Agilent N5750A) is about 2%. The uncertainty of wall temperatures is from the estimated thickness of the epoxy layer (k ~ 2 W/m-K) and the resolution of the thermocouples. Assuming an uncertainty of the thickness of the epoxy layer of 5 μm, the uncertainty of the wall temperature due to the estimated thickness of the epoxy layer under 224 W/cm² (as in the case of CHF for a heater size of 0.5 x 0.5 cm² and assuming a 1.5% of the applied power is lost through the back side of the test section) is equal to 0.084 °C. The uncertainty of the absolute temperature measurement of the thermocouples is 0.084 °C. Therefore, the overall uncertainty of the wall temperature measurement is about 1.584 °C. In addition, the uncertainty of the derived HTCs is from the uncertainties of the applied heat flux and measured wall temperature. The resultant relative uncertainties of the HTCs are also about 2%. The above-mentioned uncertainties are attributed to as the systematic uncertainties. In addition, there are standard deviations of the multiple data points from various samples of the same morphology. The average values of the relative standard deviations of the CHFs on SiNW array-coated surfaces and plain Si surfaces are 5.59% and 4.43%, respectively. The standard deviations of the multiple data points from various samples of the same morphology. The average values of the relative standard deviations of the CHFs are 5.59%, 4.43%, 4.68% ± 0.23% and 4.77 W/cm² K, respectively.

5. Results and discussion
5.1. Nanowire height effect on CHF

Both hydrodynamic instability and surface limited mechanisms leading to CHF are examined. First, the surfaces coated with SiNWs are superhydrophilic (zero contact angle (Fig. 3(b)) as compared to 40° on the plain Si surface (Fig. 3(a))), suggesting that wettability is not a limiting factor of CHF on the SiNW array-coated surfaces.

Pool boiling on the SiNW array-coated surfaces with four different NW lengths (~16, ~32, ~59 and ~122 μm as shown in SEM images of Fig. 1) with a heater area of 1 cm² has been carried out to investigate the capillary limit. The boiling curves are shown in Fig. 4(a) and (b). Fig. 4(a) compares our experimental results on the SiNW array-coated surface with the theoretical prediction of Rohsenow's correlation [36] and Fig. 4(b) shows our boiling results on the nanowire array-coated surfaces, a control experiment of boiling on a plain Si surface and the experimental results of boiling of nanofluid [16] and boiling on the copper nono-rod deposited surface [29]. The values of CHF and heat transfer coefficient, HTC (defined as the CHF divided by the superheat) for NW lengths of ~16, ~32, ~59 and ~122 μm are 162, 156, 159 ± 12 and 164 W/cm², respectively, and 5.59, 4.43, 4.68 ± 0.23 and 4.77 W/cm² K, respectively. The CHF values for these four lengths of NWs (see Fig. 4(b)). The boiling curves for the NW lengths of ~32, ~59 and ~122 μm approximately follow the Rohsenow's correlation [36] with C_L = 0.02. The boiling curve of the 16 μm height NW array shows a distinct characteristic as compared to other lengths of the nanowires (see Fig. 4(a)). This might be due to the following reason: The microscale cavity distribution formed on the NW-coated surface is a result of surface tension-driven sticking of nanowires that occurs when the nanowires are removed from the etching solution [34]. It is possible that this process is altered as the height of the nanowires changes, resulting in a distribution with greater numbers of large cavities for smaller nanowire heights. As a result, the boiling curve of the 16 μm height nanowire array displays a lower wall superheat under the same applied heat flux as compared to the taller nanowires. The boiling curve on the nano-rod array-coated surface [29] (with 500 nm high and 0.8 x 0.8 cm² size) displays a higher slope as compared to the boiling curves on the SiNW array-coated surfaces. The CHF of 172 W/cm² of the copper nano-rod array is close to that on the SiNW array-coated surfaces (~159 W/cm²). On the other hand, the boiling curve of the nanofluid [16] (having a cylindrical heater with a diameter of 2 cm and a thickness of 7 mm) has a lower slope as compared to the curves of the SiNW arrays. The CHF of the nanofluid displays a higher value of 226 W/cm² as compared to those on the nano-rod array-coated surface (172 W/cm²) and SiNW array-coated surfaces (~159 W/cm²).

The condition of the capillary limit is depicted by Eq. (6) at which the maximum flow rate is obtained corresponding to a minimum radius of curvature (rc). Since these nanowire arrays create the dominant flow resistance in the system, the maximum flow rate (the capillary limit) should be inversely proportional to the length of the nanowire provided that the maximum capillary pressure (σ/rc) is the same for the different heights of nanowires. The fact that the CHFs are independent of nanowire heights suggests that the CHFs of the NW array-coated surfaces are not due to the capillary limit. Meanwhile, the obtained CHF of ~159 ± 9.71 W/cm² is superior to ~110 W/cm² or 126 W/cm² as predicted by
the spacing of vapor columns are different sizes of heaters are shown in Fig. 5. Images of bubbles at 0.5°C2 heaters at CHF condition. The CHFs and HTCs for heater sizes of one vapor column/mushroom is present for all the sizes of (2.5 cm) is larger than the heater size adopted of 1 cm2 given that of CHFs are not affected by the height of the nanowires. arrays, on the plain Si surface, and the experimental results of boiling of nanofluid the hydrodynamic limits of saturated water (Eqs. (2) and (3)), which seems to suggest that the hydrodynamic limit does not apply to the surfaces as well. However, it is noted that the model is applied to an infinite heater surface in which the Helmholtz wavelength was assumed to be equal to the most dangerous Taylor wavelength (λH = λD) and the diameter of the vapor column and the spacing of vapor columns are λD/2 and λD, respectively, resulting in an area ratio of vapor columns and heater surface (Aν/Av in Eq. (1a)) of π/16. This Taylor wavelength (λD) for saturated water (2.5 cm) is larger than the heater size adopted of 1 cm2 given that only one vapor column can be present on the heater surface. Thus, the small size of heater may limit the value of the Helmholtz wavelength resulting in a heater size effect on CHF.

5.2. Heater size effect on CHF

To address this, pool boiling experiments on SiNW array-coated surfaces with various heater sizes have been carried out. The boiling curves of ~50 μm height SiNW array-coated surfaces with four different sizes of heaters are shown in Fig. 5. Images of bubbles at these heaters at CHF condition are shown in Fig. 6. Note that only one vapor column/mushroom is present for all the sizes of the heaters at CHF condition. The CHFs and HTCs for heater sizes of 0.5 × 0.5, 1 × 1, 1.5 × 1.5 and 2 × 2 cm² after subtracting heat conduction losses (Eq. (8)) are shown in Table 1. The CHF increases as heater size reduces. The obtained highest CHF and HTC of 223.90 ± 5.61 W/cm² and 9.06 ± 1.60 W/cm² K, respectively, on a heater size of 0.5 × 0.5 cm² are among the peak values reported in boiling heat transfer. The corresponded percentage of the heat conduction losses of the CHFs for various sizes of the heaters are also shown in Table 1. The conduction losses for various sizes of heaters are about 6.26 ± 1.60% of the CHF.

There are at least four different models of CHF: (1) the Zuber [1] and Lienhard and Dhir [2] column Helmholtz–Taylor instability model, (2) the Katto vapor stem instability [24], (3) wettability [9–16], spreading ability [17] and surface capillarity [18,19] and (4) nucleation site density/bubble-dynamics instability [20–23,33].

Since there is only one vapor column presented on the small size heaters, the observed heater size dependence of CHFs cannot be explained by the model of Eq. (7) proposed by Lienhard and Dhir [2] which assumes that the effect of heater size is due to a reduction of the number of vapor columns. Furthermore, the results of CHFs for different heights of nanowires indicate that the capillarity or spreading ability on such surfaces are not the limiting force for CHFs (as already discussed in Section 5.1). Moreover, the heater size dependent CHF cannot be explained by the models of nucleation site density/bubble-dynamics instability [20–23,33] since the nucleation site density/bubble dynamics should not be a function of heater size. Thus, the hydrodynamic instability is most likely responsible for the CHFs on the nanowire array-coated surfaces. Assuming the hydrodynamic instability is the mechanism causing CHFs, we need to know the Helmholtz wavelength and the area ratio (λH and Aν/Av, respectively, in Eq. (1a)) to correctly calculate the values of CHFs on these small size heaters. The original Helmholtz wavelength in the hydrodynamic theory is assumed equal to the most dangerous Taylor wavelength (λD = 2.5 cm), which is bigger than the heater size studied here. Thus, we believed that it is not appropriated to assume the same value to the Helmholtz wavelengths on the small heaters studied here. We speculate that the actual Helmholtz wavelength might be affected by the size of the heater and it is adopted as a control variable for the theoretical study of the hydrodynamic theory. Furthermore, the area ratio of π/16 in the models of Zuber [1], Lienhard and Dhir [2] is obtained from the ratio of the area covered by the vapor columns and the heater ([(π/4) · (λD/2)²]/λD² = π/16). But in the present study, there is only one vapor column presented on the small heaters. Thus, the area ratio might not be the same as that in the hydrodynamic models [1,2]. The area ratio for a heater having only one vapor column/mushroom should be proportional to the number of vapor stems in the macrolayer. The number of
vapor stem is directly related to the nucleation site density on the surfaces and has been demonstrated by Dhir and Liaw [9] as a function of the contact angle on the surface. However, we were unable to directly measure the area ratio on the heater surface in the current experimental setup. Thus, the area ratio in Eq. (1a) is adopted as a fitting factor here for the modeling of the hydrodynamic theory.

Therefore, we use the modified hydrodynamic model (Eq. (1a)) to calculate the CHF on various heater sizes, in which $k_H$ is a control variable and $A_v/A_s$ is a fitting factor for perdition.

The measured CHFs (after subtracting heat conduction losses in Si substrate) versus heater size along with the theoretical prediction of the modified hydrodynamic theory are shown in Fig. 7. The red filled circle marks are experimental results of SiNW array-coated surfaces of four different sizes of heaters. The red solid curve is the theoretical prediction of Eq. (1a) using the Helmholtz wavelength as a control variable assuming an area ratio ($A_v/A_s$) of 0.15 and the dark cross points are the results of plain Si surfaces and the dark solid curve is the theoretical prediction of hydrodynamic theory assuming an area ratio ($A_v/A_s$) of 0.055.

As a control experiment, the boiling curves for plain Si surfaces with corresponded heater sizes are shown in Fig. 8. The CHFs and HTC's for the heater sizes after subtracting heat conduction losses (Eq. (8)) are shown in Table 1. The obtained highest CHF and HTC

Table 1
Summary of experimental results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heater size</th>
<th>SiNW CHF (W/cm²)</th>
<th>0.5 x 0.5 (cm²)</th>
<th>1 x 1 (cm²)</th>
<th>1.5 x 1.5 (cm²)</th>
<th>2 x 2 (cm²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$223.9 \pm 5.61$</td>
<td>$150.67 \pm 12.42$</td>
<td>$124.85 \pm 16.21$</td>
<td>$125.52 \pm 3.06$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.06 ± 1.60</td>
<td>4.68 ± 0.23</td>
<td>3.89 ± 0.64</td>
<td>4.84 ± 0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Si</td>
<td>$81.48 \pm 0.87$</td>
<td>$67.40 \pm 15.52$</td>
<td>$46.82 \pm 6.46$</td>
<td>$44.22 \pm 12.33$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.98 ± 1.01</td>
<td>2.80 ± 0.47</td>
<td>1.82 ± 0.29</td>
<td>1.93 ± 0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Boiling images at CHF condition for different sizes of heaters: (a) 0.5 x 0.5 cm², (b) 1 x 1 cm², (c) 1.5 x 1.5 cm² and (d) 2 x 2 cm². Only one vapor column/mushroom is present for all the sizes of the heaters, note that the edges of heaters are outlined.

Fig. 7. CHF versus heater length (after subtracting conduction loss in Si substrate) where the red filled circle marks are experiment results of SiNW array-coated surfaces of four different sizes of heaters and the red solid curve is the theoretical prediction of hydrodynamic theory using the Helmholtz wavelength as a control variable assuming an area ratio ($A_v/A_s$) of 0.15 and the dark cross points are the results of plain Si surfaces and the dark solid curve is the theoretical prediction of hydrodynamic theory assuming an area ratio ($A_v/A_s$) of 0.055.
are 81.48 ± 0.87 W/cm² and 2.98 ± 1.01 W/cm² K, respectively, on a heater size of 0.5 × 0.5 cm². The percentages of the heat conduction losses of the CHFs are also shown in Table 1. The conduction losses for various sizes of heaters are about 14.40 ± 3.41% of the CHF. Since the HTCs on the plain Si surfaces are smaller than that on the nanowire array-coated surfaces, the correspondingly higher CHF. Since the HTCs on the plain Si surfaces are smaller than that on the nanowire array-coated surfaces, the correspondingly higher CHF.

6. Conclusion

The experimental results indicate that both the liquid spreading and the size of heater can retard the occurrence of CHF. The enhancement of CHF on SiNW array coated surface as compared to the plain Si surface is because of a better liquid spreading on the NW array surface. Meanwhile, the increase of CHF as heater size reduces is an indication of heater size effect on CHF. The heater size effect appears when the heater length is approximately smaller than 8 times the capillary length (i.e., \( L' < 8 \)). The CHFs on SiNW and plain Si surfaces for different sizes of heaters clearly indicate that the two effects (liquid spreading and heater size) on CHF are simultaneous and additive. In addition, the agreement of experimental results with theoretical prediction of the hydrodynamic theory may suggest that the effect of heater size is due to a confined Helmholtz wavelength by the small-sized heaters. Meanwhile, both the CHFs on SiNW array-coated and plain Si surfaces might be limited by pool hydrodynamics.
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