Heat Transfer and Exergy Analysis of a Shell and Tube Heat Exchanger using PGW based ZnO Nanofluids
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ABSTRACT – In this experimental work, ZnO nanoparticles were synthesized using the chemical precipitation method, and the nanoparticle structure and morphology were characterized through XRD and SEM. Heat transfer and exergetic characteristics were then studied in a shell and tube heat exchanger using PGW-based ZnO nanofluids varying nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid (shell side) flow rate at 6, 8, 10 and 12 litres/min. The hot water flow rate was fixed at 12 litres/min. The experimental results show that the heat transfer rate was improved by increasing the nanoparticle concentration and nanofluid flow rate. When the nanoparticle volume concentration was 0.3 per cent, the maximum enhancement of heat transfer rate and average heat transfer coefficient using ZnO nanofluids were 35.9 per cent and 40.2 per cent, respectively, in comparison to the base fluid. Exergy loss and dimensionless exergy loss both increased with nanoparticle volume flow rate and dropped substantially with increased nanoparticle volume concentrations. The average increment of exergetic effectiveness at three different nanoparticle volume concentration (0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3%) are 10.68%, 23.64%, and 31.23% respectively. The highest exergetic sustainability index (0.41) and lowest environmental impact factor (2.42) were observed when the nanoparticle concentration was 0.3% with the nanofluid flow rate of 6 litres/min.

INTRODUCTION

With an increasing emphasis on global warming, greenhouse gas effects, as well as energy concerns, a more efficient heat exchanger system is required to transfer heat effectively. The properties of heat transfer fluids like thermal and physical properties are vital factors that determine the performance of the heat exchanger. There are several methods for enhancing the performance of the heat exchanger, such as the application of fins, usage of microchannels and increasing the heat transfer area. Heat transferability can also be increased by improving the thermal conductivity of the working fluid [1-3]. In recent years, high thermal conductivity solid particles blended into heat transfer fluids have been considered to enhance the heat transfer performance of the fluids. However, suspended micrometre or millimetre-sized particles may cause a variety of problems, including high-pressure drop, clogging, abrasion, and particle sedimentation. The addition of nanoparticles (mean size less than 100 nm) into the fluid instead of large suspended particles may overcome these obstacles [4]. Nanofluids [5] are colloidal suspensions of different types of nanoparticles in the base fluid, which can be used in various engineering applications and are expected to replace conventional fluids soon [6].

A conventional nanofluid is produced by dispersing particular types of selected nanoparticles into an appropriate base fluid with different volume concentrations. The commercial coolants made of water and antifreeze (ethylene glycol and propylene glycol) are used fluid in a variety of industrial applications, including automobiles as engine coolants, coolants for electronic equipment, and industrial heating. Note that ethylene glycol-water mixture (EGW) has better physical properties than propylene glycol-water mixture (PGW). In contrast, EGW is very toxic. Hence, PGW is used in situations where toxicity might be a concern [7]. It is important to note that the PGW solution is generally known to be safe for use in food processing applications. There has been a lot of research using water, Ethylene Glycol, or EGW mixture as working fluid. Nevertheless, in the open literature, similar studies on PGW-based nanofluids are scarce. Devireddy et al. [6] studied the heat transfer rate of EGW (40% ethylene glycol and 60% water) mixture-based TiO2 nanofluids as an automobile coolant and found that the maximum heat transfer rate was enhanced by about 37% compared to the base fluid. Jiang et al. [8] used distilled water-based Al2O3 nanofluids and PGW-based ZnO nanofluids to numerically examine the heat transfer and flow rate in a rectangular cavity. Their findings indicated that the convective intensity and heat transfer performance of distilled water-based Al2O3 nanofluids show a nonmonotonic transition as the volume fraction of nanoparticles increases, while the convective intensity and heat transfer performance of nanofluid PGW–ZnO decreases monotonously.

Although numerous experimental studies have been conducted to estimate the heat transfer characteristics of nanofluids in several sorts of heat exchangers [9–14], relatively little work has been related to shell and tube heat exchangers in the open literature. Elias et al. [15] analyzed the effect of various nanoparticle shapes on the performance of shell and tube heat exchanger by using water and ethylene glycol mixture based on γ-AlOOH nanofluid analytically.
Their results found that a cylindrical shape had greater heat transfer characteristics and a faster heat transfer rate among the five nanoparticle shapes. The thermal performance of different types of nanoparticles (Fe3O4, ZnO, TiO2, CuO, and Al2O3) in the shell and tube heat exchanger was investigated by Shahrl et al. [3]. In their experiment, the author showed that the highest energy effectiveness was found in the ZnO nanofluid, whereas the Al2O3 nanofluid shows the highest heat transfer coefficient. Farajollahi et al. [16] compared the heat transfer characteristics of water-based γ-Al2O3 and TiO2 nanofluids in the shell and tube heat exchanger. Their results suggest that TiO2 nanofluids have greater heat transfer properties compared to Al2O3 nanofluids. Fares et al. [17] investigated the convective heat transfer coefficient in a vertical type shell and tube heat exchanger using graphene nanofluids. Their findings revealed that using 0.2 percent graphene/water nanofluids can increase the heat transfer coefficient by up to 29 percent while increasing the mean thermal efficiency by 13.7 percent. The effects of water-based MWNT (multi-walled carbon nanotube) nanofluid on heat transfer enhancement in a horizontal type shell and tube heat exchanger were examined by Lotfi et al. [18]. The results revealed that heat transfer increases with multi-wall nanotubes in comparison with the base fluid. Albadr et al. [19] investigated convective heat transfer and flow characteristics of a water-based Al2O3 nanofluid in the horizontal type shell and tube heat exchanger. The heat transfer coefficient improved slightly according to the results of their experimental study. Ghozatloo et al. [20] analyzed the convective heat transfer coefficients in a shell and tube heat exchanger using graphene/water nanofluids under laminar flow. The results showed a significant amount of augmentation in the convective heat transfer coefficient of up to 35.6% as compared to the base fluid.

Nowadays, the energy crisis has become a major concern for a developing country like Bangladesh. To emerge from the energy crisis, we need adequate information on energy uses and losses. Energy analysis only shows how much energy is consumed and how much energy is lost from a system. But that doesn’t give us a lot of information on the internal inefficiency of the equipment. Moreover, because of the irreversible nature of the system and the system environment, energy analysis is inadequate. On the other hand, exergy analysis can give us information about the usable work potential or exergy of a system [21,22]. It has also been studied that the system with the highest and lowest exergy destroyed in a system can be used to improve the performance of the system. In this respect, exergy analysis is currently a popular topic of research all over the world, and it has a good prospect in the field of sustainable green energy. Although several studies have been conducted on energy and exergy analysis of a system [23,24], work related to exergy analysis in shell and tube heat exchanger was relatively less in the open literature. Durmuş [25] investigated heat transfer, exergy, and pressure loss in a heat exchanger (with and without cut-out conical turbulators). Dizaji et al. [26] studied the effects of water (hot or cold) flow rates, temperature, and geometrical parameters on exergy loss, dimensionless exergy loss, and exergetic effectiveness for a TTTHC heat exchanger. In their study, the authors showed that the amount of exergy loss rises with the increment of hot or cold-water flow rates, the inlet temperature of hot water, and coil diameter. Khairul et al. [27] investigated the effects of water-based CuO nanofluids on exergy loss in the corrugated plate heat exchanger. Their experimental results showed that the exergy destruction was significantly reduced using nanofluids compared to the base fluid. Esfahani et al. [28] used graphene oxide nanofluid to investigate the exergy loss in a shell and tube heat exchanger. The author claimed that the exergy loss was greatly reduced under both laminar and turbulent conditions by using graphene oxide nanofluids as the hot fluid.

This experimental study attempts to analyze the heat transfer rate, overall heat transfer coefficient, energy effectiveness, exergy loss, dimensionless exergy loss, exergetic effectiveness, exergetic sustainability index (SI), and environmental impact factor (EIP) at different nanofluid (cold fluid) flow rates and nanoparticle volume concentrations in a shell and tube heat exchanger using polyethylene glycol and water mixer (PGW)-based ZnO nanofluid. In this study, the nanofluid was prepared using 40% propylene glycol and 60% water with three different volume concentrations (0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3%) of ZnO nanoparticles by using the two-step method. The flow rate of the nanofluid (shell side) was set at 6, 8, 10, and 12 liters/min. The flow rate of hot fluid was kept constant at 12 liters/min.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Materials**

Extra-pure ZnO powders were obtained from Taj Scientific, Chittagong, Bangladesh (manufactured by PT. Smart-Lab, Indonesia). Analytical grade NH4HCO3 was purchased from Jonaki Scientific Store, Dhaka, Bangladesh (manufactured by Loba Chemie Pvt. Ltd., India).

**ZnO Nanoparticle Synthesis and Characterization**

In this paper, the zinc oxide nanoparticles have been synthesized using a simple method named chemical precipitation technique [29] that is cost-effective, able to synthesize at a large volume, and environmentally friendly. According to our lab facility, the method of the synthesis process was slightly modified. At first, 120 ml of distilled water was put into a 500 ml beaker, and 96 gm of ammonium bicarbonate was dissolved in distilled water. Then 16 gm of ZnO powder was added to the prepared NH4HCO3 solution and stirred with a glass rod for approximately 5-6 min to dissolve ZnO completely in the solution. The beaker was then placed on the hot plate stirrer (magnetic stirrer with hot plate), and 32 gm of ZnO powder was added to the solution under stirring at 60 °C. After two hours, the beaker was put down from the hot plate stirrer and white precipitates were dried in a water bath at about 70 °C for 10 hours. The resulting product was then calcined at 400 °C for about 1 hour 30 mins. The whole process of synthesizing ZnO nanoparticles is presented in a schematic diagram (Figure 1). After calcination, the final product was well ground using mortar and pestle. The reactions occurring in the ZnO formation are shown in the Eq. (1) to Eq. (4) [29].
NH₄HCO₃ + H₂O → NH₄⁺ + HCO₃⁻ + NH₃ + CO₃²⁻ + OH⁻  \hspace{1cm} (1)

NH₄⁺ + HCO₃⁻ + NH₃ + CO₃²⁻ + OH⁻ → NH₄⁺; NH₄OH; (NH₄)₂CO₃; NH₄HCO₃; H₂O \hspace{1cm} (2)

AHCH (Ammonium hydrogen carbonate solution)

ZnO + AHCH → ZnO \downarrow + xNH₃ \uparrow + yH₂O \uparrow + zCO₂ \uparrow + Zn₅(OH)₆(CO₃)₂ \downarrow  \hspace{1cm} (3)

The results of XRD show that precipitated Zn₅(OH)₆(CO₃)₂ completely converts into zinc oxide after calcination at 400 °C.

Zn₅(OH)₆(CO₃)₂ → 5ZnO + 2CO₂ + 3H₂O \hspace{1cm} (4)

In this experimental study, the crystal structure and microstructure of the synthesized and ZnO nanoparticles were investigated using XRD (GBC scientific; Cu_Kα₁: λ = 1.54062Å radiation source) and SEM (model: JSM 7600F, JEOL-Japan). The crystallite size ZnO nanoparticles were evaluated using the Debye-Scherrer formula, Williamson-Hall method, and the Size-strain plot method (SSP).

**Figure 1.** Schematic representation of ZnO nanoparticle synthesis process.

### Preparation of ZnO Nanofluid

In this study, the nanofluid was prepared using 40% propylene glycol and 60% water with different volume concentrations of ZnO nanoparticles by using the two-step method. The required amount of nanoparticles for the preparation of the nanofluid of a particular volume fraction, using PGW (40:60) mixture as base fluid was calculated by using the following relation:

\[
\text{% vol. concentration, } \varphi = \frac{W_{\text{nanoparticle}}}{P_{\text{nanoparticle}}} = \frac{\rho_{\text{nano}}}{\rho_{\text{nano}} + \rho_{\text{base fluid}}} \hspace{1cm} (5)
\]

The required nanoparticles were added with the 1 liter base fluid, and the solution was subjected to the mixing process using a magnetic stirrer for 10 hours and then underwent a sonication process using an ultrasonic bath for 1 hour. No surfactant was used as it could deteriorate the thermal properties of the nanofluid [30]. A total of 5 liters nanofluid of a
particular volume concentration was prepared for the present investigation. In this study, three different volume concentration (0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3%) of ZnO nanoparticles were used. The components and process of nanofluid preparation are shown in Figure 2.

![ZnO nanofluids preparation process.](image)

**Figure 2.** ZnO nanofluids preparation process.

**Experimental Setup and Procedure**

For experimental, an NFU-type shell and tube heat exchanger was used. The heat exchanger had two tubes inside a cylindrical shell. The heat exchanger was made of stainless steel. Each tube was 0.49 m long and had inside and outside diameters of 0.009 m and 0.0095 m, respectively. The cylindrical shell had a 0.15 m outer diameter and it was 0.3045 m long. According to the flow arrangement, it was a parallel flow type heat exchanger. A shell and tube heat exchanger was modeled in SolidWorks, as shown in Figure 3.

![Solidworks model of the test section](image)

**Figure 3.** SolidWorks model of the test section (a) Shell and tube heat exchanger and (b) Section view of a heat exchanger.

In this experimental investigation, an experimental setup of shell and tube heat exchanger was developed to analyze the effects of (PGW) -based ZnO nanofluid on the heat transfer performance. It consisted of a hot fluid tank, a cold fluid tank, two 0.5 hp centrifugal pumps (RFL Water Pump, Centrifugal 1 “X1”-0.5HP (RCm-130)), two flow measuring devices (PRM FMZ400410GPM 1-10 GPM Water Rotameter Flow Meter, ± 4% accuracy), two flow control valves, an electric heater, pipes, joints, etc. The experimental setup was well insulated by using insulation tape, glass wool, and aluminum foil to eliminate the heat loss between the test rig and the surrounding. The specifications of the water pumps used in this experiment are shown in Table 1. A schematic diagram and an actual image of the experimental setup are shown in Figures 4 and 5, respectively.
Table 1. Specifications of water pumps used in this experimental study.

| Specifications  | Value                  |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Model          | BBY03343               |
| Motor power    | 0.5 hp (0.37 KW)       |
| Motor voltage  | 220 V                  |
| Max. head      | 24 m                   |
| Max. flow rate | 50 L/min               |
| Sn.            | 1 inch                 |
| Dn.            | 1 inch                 |

In Figure 5, two buckets were connected in a closed-loop with the heat exchanger where in one there was nanofluid (coolant) and in another, there was hot water that was heated by using an electric heater. Both the hot water and nanofluid were circulated by two different pumps through a pipe of 1-inch diameter. Hot water was circulated in the tube side and nanofluid was circulated in the shell side. The volume flow rate was measured using two flow meters (rotameter) which were connected to the loop. Gate valves were used for changing the flow rate. The flow rate of hot fluid was kept constant at 12 Liters/min. In this experiment, the flow rate of nanofluid was varied at 6, 8, 10, and 12 liters/min. There were four N2 filled Laboratory Thermometer (ZEAL, made in England, range: -10 to 110 ºC (0.1 ºC)) inserted in the pipe at both inlet and outlet of the nanofluid and hot water to measure the required temperatures. The data were collected when the flows were in steady condition.

Figure 5. Image of experimental setup.
CALCULATION METHOD

Structural Studies

Lattice parameter unit volume

The lattice parameters \((a = b \text{ and } c)\) were estimated using Miller indices \(<hkl>\) and \(d\) spacing according to the following relations since the crystal structure of the ZnO nanoparticle is a hexagonal wurtzite structure [31]. For the \(<100>\) plane, the lattice parameter ‘\(a\)’ can be calculated by

\[
a = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{3}\sin\theta}
\]

And the lattice parameter ‘\(c\)’ for the \(<002>\) plane, is estimated by

\[
c = \frac{\lambda}{\sin\theta}
\]

The unit cell volume of the fabricated ZnO nanoparticles can be calculated using the following relation [31]:

\[
V = \frac{\sqrt{3}a^2c}{2}
\]

Now, the Zn–O bond length \(L\) can be calculated by

\[
L = \sqrt{\left(\frac{a^2}{3} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - u\right)^2\right)c^2}
\]

where \(u\) is the wurtzite structure’s positional parameter [31] and may be calculated by

\[
u = \frac{a^2}{3c^2} + 0.25
\]

Crystallite Size Analysis

Scherrer method

The average crystallite size of the as-prepared ZnO particles was estimated by using the Debye-Scherrer formula [32] as

\[
D = \frac{k \lambda}{\beta \cos\theta}
\]

where \(D\) is the crystallite size, \(\lambda\) is the X-ray wavelength (0.154062nm), \(k\) is the Scherrer constant (0.89), \(\beta\) is FWHM (full width at half maximum). The inter-planar spacing between atoms (d-spacing) can be calculated by Bragg’s Law (Eq. (12)).

\[
2d \sin\theta = n\lambda
\]

here, \(\theta\) is diffraction angle, and \(d\) is interplanar spacing.

Williamson-Hall method

A perfect crystal is one in which all atoms are in their ideal position and has no imperfections. According to Williamson-Hall, crystal is imperfect due to the size of the finite crystal and their corresponding lattice strain(\(\varepsilon\)) [33]. Williamson–Hall plot equation to estimate the crystallite size and lattice strain of the samples is as follow [34]:

\[
\beta \cos\theta = \frac{k \lambda}{D} + 4\varepsilon \sin\theta
\]

The above equation is also referred to as Uniform Deformation Model (UDM). Here, the crystal is regarded as isotropic and it is presumed that the material properties are not dependent on the crystallographic directions [31].
Size-strain plot method (SSP)

The size–strain parameters can also be found by using the ‘Size–Strain Plot’ (SSP) method. It provides a more accurate evaluation of size-strain parameters where the strain profile is expressed by the Gaussian function and the crystallite size by the Lorentzian function[31,35].

\[
\left( d_{hkl} \beta_{hkl} \cos \theta_{hkl} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{v_s} \left( d_{hkl}^2 \beta_{hkl} \cos \theta_{hkl} + \left( \frac{e_a}{2} \right)^2 \right) \tag{14}
\]

where \( d_{hkl} \) is the interplanar lattice spacing, \( v_s \) is the apparent volume-weighted average size, and \( e_a \) is the apparent strain. For spherical crystallites, the crystallite size can be determined by [31].

\[
D_v = \frac{3}{4} v_s \tag{15}
\]

Hence, we can determine crystallite size from the slope of the linear fit and from the y-intercept, find out the strain value.

Physical Properties

The Pak and Cho [36] Eq. (16), was employed to evaluate the density of nanofluid in this experimental study. The specific heat of nanofluids was estimated using the Eq. (17) which was developed by Zhou et al. [37] and is favorable for a wide range of volume concentrations [38,39]. The Maxwell equation in Eq. (19) was used to determine the thermal conductivity of nanofluids, and the dynamic viscosity of nanofluids was used to estimate using Eq. (18) which was developed by Naik and Syam Sundar [38,40]. The measured thermo-physical properties [3,41-43] of nanoparticle, water, and PGW mixture (base fluid) are presented in Table 2.

\[
\rho_{nf} = \varphi \rho_{np} + (1 - \varphi) \rho_{bf} \tag{16}
\]

\[
C_{p,nf} = \frac{\varphi (\rho C_p)_{np} + (1 - \varphi) (\rho C_p)_{bf}}{\rho_{nf}} \tag{17}
\]

\[
\mu_{nf} = \mu_{bf} (1 + 2.5 \varphi + 6.2 \varphi^2) \tag{18}
\]

\[
K_{nf} = \frac{K_{np} + 2 K_{bf} - 2 \varphi (K_{bf} - K_{np})}{K_{np} + 2 K_{bf} + \varphi (K_{bf} - K_{np})} \tag{19}
\]

| Material   | Density (kg/m³) | Specific heat (J/Kg K) | Thermal conductivity (W/m K) | Dynamic viscosity (Pa.s) |
|------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| ZnO        | 7133           | 383                    | 111                         | 0.5606                   |
| Water      | 998.9          | 4181                   | 0.613                       | 0.00894                  |
| PGW (40:60)| 1026.5         | 3747.186               | 0.388                       | 0.58                     |

Thermal Performance

The heat transfer rate of the cold fluid (nanofluid) can be expressed as

\[
\dot{Q}_c = \dot{m}_c C_{pe} (T_{c,\text{out}} - T_{c,\text{in}}) \tag{20}
\]

where \( \dot{m}_c \) is the mass flow rate of nanofluid, \( C_{pe} \) is the specific heat of nanofluid, \( T_{c,\text{in}} \) and \( T_{c,\text{out}} \) are the inlet and outlet temperature of the nanofluid respectively.

Overall heat transfer coefficient of nanofluid can be expressed as

\[
U_o = \frac{\dot{Q}_c}{A_o F \Delta T_m} \tag{21}
\]

where \( \Delta T_m \) is the log mean temperature difference, \( A_o \) is the total tube area (outer side), and \( F \) is the LMTD correction factor can be obtained from Holman et al. [44] chart. Effectiveness of an NFU type shell and tube heat exchanger can be expressed as:

\[
\epsilon = \frac{\text{Actual heat transfer rate}}{\text{Maximum possible heat transfer rate}} = \frac{\dot{Q}}{\dot{Q}_{\text{max}}} \tag{22}
\]
where,
\[
\dot{Q} = \dot{m}_c C_{pc} (T_{c,\text{out}} - T_{c,\text{in}}) = \dot{m}_h C_{ph} (T_{h,\text{out}} - T_{h,\text{in}})
\]  
(23)

\[
\dot{Q}_{\text{max}} = C_{\text{min}} (T_{h,\text{in}} - T_{c,\text{in}})
\]  
(24)

here, \(C_{\text{min}} = \) The smaller of \(\dot{m}_c C_{pc}\) and \(\dot{m}_h C_{ph}\)

Exergy Analysis

The following equation can be used to evaluate the amount of exergy loss in a steady-state open system\[26\]:
\[
E = T_e \left[ \dot{m}_h C_{ph} \ln \left( \frac{T_{h,\text{out}}}{T_{h,\text{in}}} \right) + \dot{m}_c C_{pc} \ln \left( \frac{T_{c,\text{out}}}{T_{c,\text{in}}} \right) \right]
\]  
(25)

The dimensionless exergy loss can be determined as \[24\]
\[
e = \frac{E}{\dot{m}_h C_{ph} \{ T_{h,\text{in}} - T_{h,\text{out}} \}} = \frac{E}{\dot{m}_c C_{pc} \{ T_{c,\text{in}} - T_{c,\text{out}} \}}
\]  
(26)

The exergetic effectiveness (second law efficiency) for a system that does not participate in the generation or input of work (heat exchangers) can be defined as the achievement of the goal of the process in terms of availability changes or transfers relative to the process input. The second law efficiency of a heat exchanger, where heat energy is exchanged from a high-temperature fluid stream to a low-temperature fluid stream, can be defined as \[26\]:
\[
\eta = \frac{\dot{m}_c C_{pc} \{ T_{c,\text{out}} - T_{c,\text{in}} \} - T_e \ln \left( \frac{T_{c,\text{out}}}{T_{c,\text{in}}} \right)}{\dot{m}_h C_{ph} \{ T_{h,\text{in}} - T_{h,\text{out}} \} - T_e \ln \left( \frac{T_{h,\text{out}}}{T_{h,\text{in}}} \right)}
\]  
(27)

Another parameter that is often used to express exergy performance is the exergetic sustainability index (SI) \[45\]. The exergetic sustainability index (SI) helps to evaluate the stability of the energy process. The exergetic sustainability index can be calculated by \[24\]:
\[
SI = \frac{\eta}{1 - \eta}
\]  
(28)

The environmental impact factor (EIF), on the other hand, illustrates whether exergy losses affect the environment. Lower EIF indicates that the system is more environmentally friendly. Environmental impact factors can be estimated by \[24\]:
\[
EIF = \frac{1}{SI}
\]  
(29)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

XRD Analysis

The XRD data of synthesized ZnO nanoparticles is presented in Table 3 and graphically illustrated in Figure 6. In Figure 6, it has been observed that the characteristic peaks of the hexagonal zinc oxide wurtzite located at 2θ values of 31.8, 34.44, 36.26, 47.54, 56.62, 62.86, 66.4, 67.94, 69.06, and 72.56° which was originated by the reflections from the lattice planes of \(<100>, <002>, <101>, <102>, <110>, <103>, <200>, <112>, <201>\) and \(<004>\), respectively. Here, the XRD pattern is consistent with JCPDS data (JCPDS Card No.: 01-089-0510) and also agreed with previously reported data. The sharp and narrow peak intensity confirms that the synthesized ZnO nanoparticle is of high quality with fine grain size and good crystallinity.

Table 4 shows the lattice parameters and unit cell volume of the synthesized ZnO nanoparticles which were determined using Eqs. (6), (7), and (8). The estimated Zn–O bond length is 1.9763 Å, while the reported Zn–O bond length is 1.9767 Å \[46\]. The measured bond length, lattice parameters, and unit cell volume of the synthesized ZnO nanoparticles are agreed very well with the experimental data of hexagonal wurtzite ZnO \[47\].

The average crystallite size of the fabricated ZnO nanoparticles was calculated from XRD peak width \(<101>\) using the Scherrer formula and tabulated in Table 5. Figure 7 shows the Williamson-Hall (W-H) plot for ZnO nanoparticles. Here, the line through the points has positive slopes and non-zero y-intercepts, implying that they are isotropic in nature.
In Figure 8, a size strain plot was drawn taking \((d_{hkl} \beta_{hkl} \cos\theta_{hkl})^2\) on the y-axis and \(d_{hkl}^2 \beta_{hkl} \cos\theta_{hkl}\) on the x-axis for synthesized ZnO nanoparticles. Table 5 shows the crystallite size and strain value which were determined by the Scherrer method, Williamson-Hall, and size-strain plot method. Noted that the crystallite size of the ZnO nanoparticles obtained from the different models is somewhat similar, suggesting that the inclusion of strain in various forms has very little effect on the average crystallite size of ZnO nanoparticles. However, the average crystallite size found from the Scherrer formula shows a large variation with the Williamson-Hall analysis due to the difference in averaging the particle size distribution, while the SSP method shows little variation. It was observed that the result of the SSP model (Figure 8) was more accurate than the UDM (Figure 7), as the data were well closed in the fitting line.

| Plane \((hkl)\) | \(2\theta\) (degree) | FWHM (radian) | Crystallite size (nm) | Interplanar spacing (Å) |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 100           | 31.8            | 0.00642       | 22.15                | 2.81                   |
| 002           | 34.44           | 0.00611       | 23.74                | 2.60                   |
| 101           | 36.26           | 0.00735       | 19.85                | 2.48                   |
| 102           | 47.54           | 0.00936       | 16.20                | 1.91                   |
| 110           | 56.62           | 0.00955       | 16.48                | 1.62                   |
| 103           | 62.86           | 0.00881       | 18.45                | 1.48                   |
| 200           | 66.4            | 0.00766       | 21.63                | 1.41                   |
| 112           | 67.94           | 0.00895       | 16.56                | 1.38                   |
| 201           | 69.06           | 0.00895       | 18.79                | 1.36                   |
| 004           | 72.56           | 0.01046       | 16.43                | 1.30                   |

**Figure 6.** X-ray diffraction pattern of the fabricated ZnO nanoparticle.

Table 3. XRD data and structural parameters of synthesized ZnO nanoparticles.

| Plane \((hkl)\) | \(2\theta\) (degree) | FWHM (radian) | Crystallite size (nm) | Interplanar spacing (Å) |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 100           | 31.8            | 0.00642       | 22.15                | 2.81                   |
| 002           | 34.44           | 0.00611       | 23.74                | 2.60                   |
| 101           | 36.26           | 0.00735       | 19.85                | 2.48                   |
| 102           | 47.54           | 0.00936       | 16.20                | 1.91                   |
| 110           | 56.62           | 0.00955       | 16.48                | 1.62                   |
| 103           | 62.86           | 0.00881       | 18.45                | 1.48                   |
| 200           | 66.4            | 0.00766       | 21.63                | 1.41                   |
| 112           | 67.94           | 0.00895       | 16.56                | 1.38                   |
| 201           | 69.06           | 0.00895       | 18.79                | 1.36                   |
| 004           | 72.56           | 0.01046       | 16.43                | 1.30                   |

**Table 4.** The lattice parameters and unit cell volume of the synthesized ZnO nanoparticles and their differences with the experimental measurements.

| Sample          | \(a\) (nm) | \(c\) (nm) | \(V\) (nm³) |
|-----------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Synthesized ZnO | 0.3247     | 0.5204     | 0.04752     |
| Experimental [47]| 0.3254     | 0.5215     | 0.04782     |

| Deviation (%)   | 0.154%     | 0.211%     | 0.627%      |

The average crystallite size of the fabricated ZnO nanoparticles was calculated from XRD peak width \(<101>\) using the Scherrer formula and tabulated in Table 5. Figure 7 shows the Williamson-Hall (W-H) plot for ZnO nanoparticles. Here, the line through the points has positive slopes and non-zero y-intercepts implying that they are isotropic in nature. In Figure 8, a size strain plot was drawn taking \((d_{hkl} \beta_{hkl} \cos\theta_{hkl})^2\) on the y-axis and \(d_{hkl}^2 \beta_{hkl} \cos\theta_{hkl}\) on the x-axis for synthesized ZnO nanoparticles. Table 5 shows the crystallite size and strain value which were determined by the Scherrer method, Williamson-Hall, and size-strain plot method. Noted that the crystallite size of the ZnO nanoparticles obtained from the different models is somewhat similar, suggesting that the inclusion of strain in various forms has very little effect on the average crystallite size of ZnO nanoparticles. However, the average crystallite size found from the Scherrer formula shows a large variation with the Williamson-Hall analysis due to the difference in averaging the particle size distribution, while the SSP method shows little variation. It was observed that the result of the SSP model (Figure 8) was more accurate than the UDM (Figure 7), as the data were well closed in the fitting line.

Table 5. Geometrical parameters of the synthesized ZnO nanoparticles.

| Scherrer method | Williamson-Hall plot method (UDM) | Size-strain plot (SSP) method | SEM |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| \(D_{avg}\) (nm) | \(D\) (nm) | \(\varepsilon\) (no unit) | \(D\) (nm) | \(\varepsilon\) (no unit) | \(D\) (nm) |
| 19.85           | 26.02      | 0.00118            | 22.71      | 0.0115            | 40.96      |
SEM Analysis

The shape and morphology of ZnO nanoparticles were observed in the FESEM micrograph as shown in Figure 9. The SEM images demonstrate a uniform structure and size for ZnO nanoparticles. It is clearly shown that the particles are predominantly spherical in shape. However, some moderately agglomerated particles and elongated particles are also observed in the SEM images. The average grain size is around 40.96 nm (using ImageJ software). The grain size distribution of the fabricated ZnO nanoparticles is presented in Figure 10.

Figure 7. Williamson-Hall plot.

Figure 8. The size-strain plot (SSP).

Figure 9. SEM image of the synthesized ZnO nanoparticles (a) 50,000 magnification and (b) 100,000 magnification.
Stability Analysis of Prepared Nanofluids

The stability check of prepared nanofluids is critical, and several methods, such as sedimentation photograph method, centrifugation method, zeta potential method, electron microscopy method, and so on, have been utilized to examine the stability of nanofluids [40]. In this study, the sedimentation photograph method was employed to observe the nanofluids stability after a 4 hours interval. No surfactant was used in this experiment to prepare the PGW-based ZnO nanofluids (0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% volume concentration). However, the stability of PGW-based ZnO nanofluids with and without surfactant (0.1wt% EBT (eriochrome black T)) was examined. This will aid in understanding the influence of EBT surfactant in PGW-based ZnO nanofluids, as well as future research into the effect of EBT surfactant in PGW-based ZnO nanofluids on thermophysical characteristics and heat transfer. Figure 11 depicts the sedimentation of ZnO nanoparticles with and without the use of EBT surfactant. Nanofluids with a volume concentration of 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3% without EBT were all stable till 1 day since no sedimentation occurred. After 2 days, we noticed some sedimentation in the 0.1% concentration, but the 0.2% and 0.3% concentrations remained stable. This is because there were not sufficient nanoparticles to provide adequate repulsive force to form a stable suspension, 0.1% volume concentration nanofluid agglomerate easily compared to 0.2% and 0.3% nanofluids. After 3 days, however, some sediment was observed in the 0.2% and 0.3% concentration nanofluids. The amount of sedimentation was smaller in the case of 0.3% than 0.2%. After 4 days, we noticed more precipitation in 0.3% ZnO nanofluids without surfactant. Regardless of concentration, the nanofluids prepared with 0.1 wt% EBT shows good stability even after 14 days.
Figure 11. Sedimentation of ZnO nanoparticles with and without surfactant at different time periods: (a) after 10 hours, (b) after 1 day, (c) after 2 days, (d) after 3 days, (e) after 4 days, (f) after 7 days, and (g) after 14 days.

Heat Transfer Analysis

Figure 12(a) and 12(b) demonstrate the effect of nanoparticle concentration on heat transfer rate and overall heat transfer coefficient. As the nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate increase, so do the heat transfer rate and overall heat transfer coefficient. This could be due to the increased mass flow rate as well as improved thermal conductivity and other thermal properties of the heat transfer fluid as a result of the enhanced collision between nanoparticles, Brownian motion, the effect of nanoparticle clustering, and so on [48]. The maximum value of the heat transfer rate was 464.42 W at 0.3% volume concentration and 12 litres/min flow rate of nanofluid. The average enhancement of heat transfer rate at 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% volume concentration of nanoparticle were 7.51%, 18.23%, and 30.29%, respectively compared to base fluid (PGW). In Figure 13, we can see that the maximum value of the overall heat transfer coefficient was 1077.07 W/m².K at 0.3% volume concentration and 12 litres/min flow rate of nanofluid. The average enhancement of overall heat transfer coefficient at 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% nanoparticle volume concentration were 10.64%, 22.2%, and 35.25% respectively. In this experimental study, heat exchanger effectiveness was increased with the increment of nanoparticle volume concentration. A comparison between the enhancement of heat exchanger effectiveness at different nanofluid flow rates and nanoparticle volume concentration was presented in Figure 13. The average enhancement of heat exchanger effectiveness at 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% nanoparticle volume concentration were 10.84%, 21.96%, and 34.96% respectively compared to base fluid. It is interesting to note that the maximum heat exchanger effectiveness was observed at 10 litres/min flow rate of nanofluid.
Exergetic Performance Analysis

The effect of nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate on exergy loss and dimensionless exergy loss are presented in Figures 14(a) and 14(b), respectively. As the flow rate of nanofluid (cold fluid) increases, both exergy loss and dimensionless exergy loss were increased; however, exergy loss and dimensionless exergy loss were significantly reduced with the increment of nanoparticle concentration. This could be due to increased frictional loss as the flow rate increased, increasing the system’s irreversibility and, as a result, increasing exergy loss. Adding nanoparticles, on the other hand, improves thermal characteristics, promoting better heat transfer and lowering exergy loss. The average decrement of exergy loss at 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% nanoparticle volume concentration were 11.87%, 28.55%, and 35.9% respectively. The minimum values of dimensionless exergy loss are 0.08 at 0.3% volume concentration and 6 liters/min flow rate of nanofluid when the hot fluid flow rate was constant (12 liters/min).
Figure 14. Changes of (a) exergy loss and (b) dimensional exergy loss with nanofluid flowrate for different nanoparticle volume concentrations.

In Figure 15, the effect of nanoparticle volume concentration and flow rate on exergetic effectiveness is shown. Exergetic effectiveness improved when nanoparticle volume concentration increased and cold fluid flow rate decreased, owing to the reduction in exergy loss. The maximum exergetic effectiveness was observed 29.23% at 0.3% volume concentration of nanofluid when the cold fluid flow rate was 6 liters/min. The average increment of exergetic effectiveness at 0.1%, 0.2%, and 0.3% nanoparticle volume concentration were observed 10.68%, 23.64%, and 31.23% respectively.

Variation of the exergetic sustainability index (SI) by the effect of nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate is shown in Figure 16(a). It was observed that exergetic sustainability index increases with the increment of nanoparticle volume concentration but decreases with the nanofluid flow rate since the exergetic sustainability index is directly proportional to the exergetic effectiveness. The maximum exergetic sustainability index (SI) is 0.41 when nanoparticle concentration is 0.3% and nanofluid flow rate is 6 Litres/min. The environmental impact factor has an inverse relationship with the sustainability index. Figure 16(b) depicts the impact of nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate on the environmental impact factor (EIF). The environmental impact factor decreased as the concentration of nanoparticles increased, but increased with the increment of nanofluid flow rate. The lowest environmental impact factor (EIF) is 2.42 when nanoparticle concentration is 0.3% and nanofluid flow rate is 6 Litres/min. It should be noted that the process/system is more environmentally friendly when the EIF becomes lower value.

Figure 15. Exergetic effectiveness vs nanofluid flow rate.
CONCLUSION

In this study, ZnO nanoparticles were successfully fabricated and the structural and morphological properties were characterized through X-ray diffraction (XRD) and a scanning electron microscope (SEM). Using PGW-based ZnO Nanofluids instead of PGW as cold fluid on the shell side of the shell and tube heat exchanger resulted in a substantial improvement in energetic and exergetic performance. The following are the key findings:

i. The heat transfer rate and overall heat transfer coefficient increased with the increment of the nanoparticle volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate. Experimental results showed that the maximum heat transfer rate of PGW-based ZnO nanofluid was 464.42 W at 0.3% nanoparticle volume concentration and 12 Liters/min flow rate of nanofluid. When the overall heat transfer volume concentration and nanofluid flow rate were 0.3% and 12 Litres/min, respectively, the overall heat transfer coefficient reached its highest value of 1077.06 W/m²K.

ii. The heat exchanger effectiveness was increased with the increment of nanoparticle volume concentration at a certain amount of nanofluid flow.

iii. Exergetic performance in the shell and tube heat exchanger improved as the nanoparticle volume concentration increased, but decreased as the nanofluid flow rate increased.

iv. When the nanoparticle concentration was 0.3% and the nanofluid flow rate was 6 Litres/min, it observed the maximum exergetic sustainability index (0.41) and lowest environmental impact factor (2.42).

According to the results of this experimental analysis, while the amount of heat transfer increased with both the nanoparticle volume concentration and the nanofluid flow rate, the nanofluid (shell side) flow rate should be kept as low as possible to minimize exergy loss and make the process more sustainable and environmentally friendly.
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