Performance Comparison of single-slope solar still loaded with various nanofluids
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Abstract
Nanofluids are great heat transfer carriers for collecting thermal energy in solar thermal applications. In the present study, a theoretical study of single-slope solar still (passive type) has been carried out by incorporating CuO, Al2O3, Ag, Fe2O3, and SiC-water nanofluids at different volume concentrations (0.02, 0.05, 0.08, 0.12, and 0.2). This analysis has been carried out with an optimum water depth of 0.02m as obtained from the experimental and theoretical studies. In order to validate the model, the experiments were conducted on solar still and then performance of still was compared. The analytical expression of the characteristic equation using Runge-Kutta ODE, for passive single slope solar still was found to be in good agreement with experiments carried out in Patiala, India. The total deviation for both experimental and theoretical distillate output of a still for a day was found to be 12.24%. Daily production for Al2O3-water-based nanofluid was found to be (14.22%) higher than simple solar still without nanofluid, followed by CuO (10.82%), Ag (8.11%), Fe2O3 (7.63%) and SiC (7.61%).
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Earth, known as the mother of life, has a nectar-like fluid called water. Two-thirds of the earth’s surface is covered with water, 97% of which is salty and the remaining is fit for drinking. The quality of drinkable water is deteriorating due to regress development and industrial setups; so, to improve its quality, different water purification methods are investigated and desalination of water with the help of solar still1 was found to be the most efficient and clean way. The illustrative diagram of solar still is shown in Figure 1. Solar still operates on the principle of conversion of solar radiation into heat. First, the impure water is filled into the basin of the still. A tilted glass has been kept on the top of the still, through which the solar radiation is passed to the black absorber lining. The impure water in the basin absorbs the heat which gets evaporated and the pure water in the form of vapors is stuck on the surface of the glass and gets condensed. The condensed vapors get collected in a container through a distillate collection channel of the still.

Solar desalination systems are divided into two categories viz. passive solar stills and active solar stills. In the past few years, various researchers have studied the passive and active types of stills2 and concluded that the performance of the passive type of still is better than that of the active type still. Dwivedi et al3 investigate the performance of the double-slope passive-type solar still at three water levels. It was observed that in summers the performance of the double slope solar still was more, but the annual yield production of single slope solar still was higher than the double slope solar still. Xiao et al4 reviewed the different types of solar stills and presented the fundamental heat and mass transfer process analysis, stated by Dunkle, Adhikari, Kumar, Elsafty, Tanaka, and Zheng. They have also integrated the solar reflectors in their studies and found the better performance of still for the regions having low solar incidence. Tiwari et al5 analyzed the effects of orientation of still and glass cover inclination for the maximum yield both in summers and winters. Nafey et al6 used a floating wick system in experiments and found some major enhancements in the productivity of still. Singh et al7 studied the effects of some parameters like glass cover material, environmental conditions, insolation per day, the orientation of the still, wind speed, and inclination of the glass cover. Aboul-Enein5 investigated the effect of water depth, the inclination of the glass cover, and optimum insulation for the still. Samee et al8 studied various design parameters of single basin solar still and observed an optimum cover glass inclination and glass thickness of around 33.3° and 3 mm both in summer and winters for the southwest arid region. Abu-Hijleh et al9 performed some experiments having water film cooling on the glass cover and the efficiency of the film cooling still was found to be non-sensitive to the wind speeds. Tiwari and Anil10 analyzed the seasonal variation of distillate output at different water depths. Dunkle et al11 correlate both convective heat transfer coefficient and evaporative heat transfer coefficient with experimental validation and it was found to be in good agreement of about 2% of the variation. Kumar et al12 presented the annual performance of active solar still for the location in New Delhi. Singh et al13 proposed an experimental and theoretical model of double slope solar still with an inclination angle of 55°.

Sakthovel et al14 observed and proposed a mathematical model integrating jute cloth in the water medium, which maximizes the surface area of water and helps in getting more evaporation rates. Srivastava et al15 proposed an experimental setup with multiple porous floating absorbers and studied its performance. Aboul et al16 investigated the effects of deep basin-type solar stills. El-Bahi et al17 experimented with double glass solar still and integrated a
separate condenser. Abu-Arabi et al\textsuperscript{17} investigated double-glass cover solar still with an added cooling effect on the glass and observed that the efficiency for the still having perfect airtight insulation was more as compared to the double glass. Nafey et al\textsuperscript{6} developed a thermal model to estimate the distillate output of the still having floating balls and a thin sheet of black color. El-Sebaii\textsuperscript{18} worked with a suspended absorber which divides the water into two halves that increase daily productivity by (18.5%-20%). Al-Hussaini et al\textsuperscript{19} created a vacuum inside the solar still and observed an increase in more than 100% because of zero convective heat transfer coefficient and increase in evaporative heat transfer coefficient. Sodha et al\textsuperscript{20} worked with a multi-wick system and observed an increase of 42% in comparison with simple solar still.

The seeding nanoparticles in base fluid enhance the heat transfer coefficients and result in better performance of still. Several authors have done thermal modeling of nanofluids to find their properties and performance for various applications.\textsuperscript{31-38} Sahota et al\textsuperscript{29} investigated the performance of three different nanoparticles (Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}, TiO\textsubscript{2}, CuO) at different volume concentrations (0.01, 0.093, 0.131) and observed an increase in convective heat transfer coefficient by 67.03%, 63.56%, and 71.23%, also he observed an increase in Nusselt number by 119.72%, 98.64%, and 151.62%. Sahota et al\textsuperscript{30} observed a decrease in convective heat transfer coefficient by 44.91% and 53.95%. Rashidi et al\textsuperscript{34} investigated a CFD analysis with stepped solar still integrated with nanofluid and glass cover solar still with water-based nanofluid (Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3}, TiO\textsubscript{2}, and CuO) and observed an increase in (19.1%, 10.38%, 5.25%) in terms of productivity. Kabeel et al\textsuperscript{41} used graphene oxide nanoparticles in the phase change material (PCM) to improve the thermal conductivity of nano-doped phase changed material by 52%. Tubular solar still loaded with PCM increases the water temperature by 7°C and without phase change material it was found to be 3°C. There was a 24% increase in temperature of nano-doped phase change materials as compared to phase change material without nanoparticles. Total yield for tubular solar still, tubular solar still with PCM, and tubular solar still with NPCM was found to be 2.59, 3.35, and 5.62 kg/m\textsuperscript{2}, respectively. Subhedar et al\textsuperscript{42} performed an experiment in which a parabolic trough collector was integrated with conventional single-slope solar still. Water and Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3} nanofluid was taken as working fluid with 0.05% and 0.1% volume fraction, respectively. The rise in productivity and thermal efficiency was found to be 66% and 70% with the use of Al\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{3} nanofluid in the complete integrated system.

The performance of the still depends upon some properties, like the volume fraction, particle size, and thermophysical properties like specific heat capacity, viscosity, and density. Nanoparticle generally is defined as the ratio of its surface area to the volume, if it is significant, then it is known as nanoscale material. This ratio increases the properties like thermal conductivity, thermal diffusivity, viscosity, electric conductance, and optical sensitivity changes.\textsuperscript{7} Nanoparticles are tiny particles of size in the range of 1 to 100 nanometers (nm). As the particle size decreases, the transport and physical property of the particle change, which affects the performance of the still. Every nanoparticle size has a different wavelength at which it absorbs the maximum solar energy, which is known as resonant wavelength. So, the size of the nanoparticle is an important parameter.\textsuperscript{7} Specific heat capacity of the fluid has a great effect on the performance of the solar still. When the solar radiation hits the surface, a portion of the sun’s energy gets absorbed in sensible heating and the remaining goes into the latent heat storage. Thermal conductivity of the nanoparticle increases when the surface area to volume ratio increases, which means as size goes down, the performance of the solar still having nanofluid improves.\textsuperscript{9} Using metallic nanoparticles of different sizes help solar still to capture all the incident range because of different resonant wavelength to each size.\textsuperscript{7}

According to the coined literature review, limited research has been carried out on developing a thermal model on single-slope solar still having nanofluids, with a comparison of its effects at different volume concentrations. Therefore, the main purpose of the present research is to analytically investigate the effects of nanofluid at
different volume concentrations for various nanoparticles and validate it with the experimental result. Moreover, it can also help to fill the technological gap to compare the performance of solar still with different nanoparticles and their concentration.

2 | EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND PROCEDURE

The simple single-slope solar still have been constructed, a basin was made of stainless steel-grade 304 in the shape of a rectangular tray having an evaporating surface area of 1 m². The glass cover was inclined at 30° with the horizontal surface, which is almost equal to the latitude of the location. The sides of the tray were insulated with glass wool, rubber-type material was used as basin liner of thickness 5 mm to absorb the maximum solar energy and to transmit that energy to basin water. A constant water level is maintained by a constant head device arrangement. A sponge rubber gasket is installed between the glass and the tray, which helps to ensure there are no gaps between the glass panels. The tray is insulated from the ambient conditions as shown in Figure 2. The system was oriented toward the south. Window glass was used as a condensation surface and transparent cover from where the incident radiation enters into the still. To avoid some drops of distillate falling back to the evaporator surface, a rectangular plastic cross-sectional channel is fixed to the bottom of the glass cover.

In addition to this K-type, thermocouples were used to measure the temperatures and a data logger was employed to log the temperature data. The ambient temperature was observed between 31 and 41°C. Pyranometer was used to measure the direct radiation and diffused radiations incident on the surface. It has been found that the solar radiation varied from 12 to 830 W/m². The wind velocity was varied from 0.1 to 2.5 m/s and was measured using the anemometer. The distillate was collected in a container at an interval of 1 hour and measured with a digital weighing pan.

3 | THERMAL MODELING

3.1 | Mathematical model

The mathematical model attempts to describe the energy transition at every step of the still. Figure 1 shows the energy transfer involved in the still.

3.2 | Energy balance

3.2.1 | Energy balance for basin liner

The solar energy falling on solar still was stored in the basin and remaining energy lost to the atmosphere through a convective heat transfer and energy balance can be written as:

\[\alpha_b \tau_g \tau_w I(t) A_b = m_b c_p b \frac{dT_b}{dt} + Q_{cb} + Q_w\]  

(3.1)

where \(Q_{cb}\) convective heat transfer from basin liner to water, which can be calculated as

\[Q_{cb} = h_w A_b (T_b - T_w)\]  

(3.2)

and, \(Q_w\) is the heat lost to ambient and can be calculated as

\[Q_w = h_A A_b (T_b - T_a)\]  

(3.3)

\(T_b, T_w, T_a\) are the basin temperature, ambient temperature, and water temperature, respectively.
3.2.2 The transition energy balance for water mass

The energy balance of water can be represented as:

\[ Q_u + \alpha_w \tau_g I(t) A_w + Q_{cb} = m_w c_p w \frac{dT_w}{dt} + Q_{cw} + Q_{ew} + Q_{rw} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

where, \( Q_u \) is the external heat supplied. For this passive type of still, the value of \( Q_u \) is zero and \( Q_{cw} \) is the convective heat transfer from the water to glass.\(^{12}\)

\[ Q_{cw} = 0.884 \left( T_w - T_g + \frac{(P_w - P_g) (T_w + 273.15)}{268900 - P_w} \right) A_w (T_w - T_g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

where \( P_w \) and \( P_g \) are partial vapor pressure at the water and the glass cover and can be determined as\(^{12}\)

\[ P_w = \exp \left( 25.317 - \frac{5144}{T_w + 273.15} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

\[ P_g = \exp \left( 25.317 - \frac{5144}{T_g + 273.15} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)

\( Q_{rw} \) is the radiative heat transfer between water and glass, \( \varepsilon_{eff} \) is the effective emittance, and \( \sigma \) is the Stefan-Boltzmann’s constant and can be calculated as\(^{12}\)

\[ LH = 2.4935 \times 10^6 (1 - 9.4779 \times 10^{-4} T_w + 1.3132 \times 10^{-7} T_w^2 - 4.7974 \times 10^{-9} T_w^3) \quad \text{(If } T_w < 70) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.15)

\[ LH = 3.1615 \times 10^6 (1 - 7.616 \times 10^{-4} T_w) \quad \text{(If } T_w > 70) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.16)

On solving the energy balance Equations (3.1), (3.4), and (3.11), one can obtain the first-order differential equation to find the temperatures \( T_w, T_g, T_b \) after the time interval “\( \Delta t \)”:\(^{11}\)

\[ \frac{dT_w}{dt} + aT_w = f(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.17)

where

\[ f(t) = \frac{A_s F_R (a \tau_g) I' (t)}{m_w c_w} + \frac{(A_s F_R U_l + U_{lb} A_b + U_{lg} A_b) T_a}{m_w c_w} + \frac{(a_s h + \alpha_w \tau_g + \alpha_g \tau_l) h A_I (t)}{m_w c_w} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.18)

3.2.3 Energy balance for glass cover

The energy balance of the glass cover can be represented by the following equation:

\[ a_g I(t) A_g + Q_{cw} + Q_{rw} + Q_{ew} = m_g c_p g \frac{dT_g}{dt} + Q_{cg} + Q_{cg} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)

\( Q_{cg} \) is the convective heat transfer between the glass to ambient, and \( V \) is the wind velocity\(^{3}\)

\[ Q_{cg} = (2.8 + 3V) A_g \left( T_g - T_a \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)

\( Q_{cg} \) is the radiative heat transfer between glass cover to the sky\(^{3}\)

\[ Q_{cg} = \sigma \varepsilon_g A_g \left( \left( T_g + 273.15 \right)^4 - \left( T_{sky} + 273.15 \right)^4 \right) \left( T_g - T_a \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

To find the hourly distillate of the still,

\[ m_d = \frac{h \omega (T_w - T_g)}{LH} \times 3600 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.14)

where \( LH \) is the latent heat of vaporization and can be determined as\(^{3}\)

\[ Q_{cw} = \sigma \varepsilon_{eff} A_w \left( \left( T_w + 273.15 \right)^4 - \left( T_g + 273.15 \right)^4 \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

\( Q_{cw} \) is radiative heat transfer between water and glass and can be calculated as\(^{12}\)

\[ Q_{cw} = 0.016237 \left( \frac{h_{cw} (P_w - P_g)}{T_w - T_g} \right) A_w (T_w - T_g) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

If it is a passive solar still, \( Q_u = 0 \) signifies the external heat transfer and it can be calculated as\(^{10}\)

\[ Q_u = A_s F_R ( \alpha \tau_g ) I (t) \right) - U_L \left( T_w - T_a \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

where, \( I(t) \) is the incident radiation on solar collector surface.

If it is a passive solar still, \( Q_u = 0 \) signifies the external heat transfer and it can be calculated as\(^{10}\)

\[ Q_u = A_s F_R ( \alpha \tau_g ) I (t) \right) - U_L \left( T_w - T_a \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

where, \( I(t) \) is the incident radiation on solar collector surface.
3. There is no temperature gradient along the glass cover.

Mass of distillate $m_{ew}$ can be determined by only knowing the heat transfer by evaporation and the latent heat

$$m_{ew} = (q_{ew} \times 3600) / LH$$

(3.21)

where $q_{ew} = h_{ew} \times (T_w - T_g)$

(3.22)

$$T_{w(i+1)} = \left( A_g F_g (\alpha - r) I (t) + A_w (1 - \alpha_w) A_w I (t) + h_{b,w} A_w T_g + h_{b,w} A_w T_w - h_{b,w} A_w T_g - h_{b,w} A_w T_w - A_F g U_L T_w + \frac{m_{ew} c_p}{\Delta t} T_w \right) \frac{\Delta t}{m_{ew} c_p}$$

(3.25)

$$T_{g(i+1)} = \left( \alpha_g A_g I (t) + h_{b,g} A_g T_w + h_{b,g} A_g T_g - h_{b,g} A_g T_g \right) + \frac{m_{ew} c_p}{\Delta t} T_g$$

(3.26)

$$T_{b(i+1)} = \left( \alpha_b (1 - \alpha_b) A_b I (t) + h_{b,b-w} A_b T_w + h_{b,b-w} A_b T_g - h_{b,b-w} A_b T_g \right) + \frac{m_{ew} c_p}{\Delta t} T_b$$

(3.27)

The efficiency of the still is defined as the ratio of the useful energy output to the total energy incident on the surface. The useful energy is defined as the product of distillate output to the latent heat absorbed by it.

$$\eta_{stil} = \left( \frac{m_{ew} \times LH}{A_i (I(t))} \right) \times 100$$

(3.23)

where $I$ is the solar incident radiation for $t$ time.

Assumptions taken during the simulation

1. No vapor leakage from the still.
2. The heat capacity of the still has been neglected.
3. There is no temperature gradient along the glass cover thickness.
4. Each component of the system is perfectly insulated including pipes.
5. The solar distiller unit is vapor-leakage proof and is quasi-steady state.

3.3 Validation theories

3.3.1 Temporal discretization with a time step of 0.1 sec

A mathematical technique is adopted for transient conditions that happen to be the field of applied physics and mathematics; here, transient equations are being solved by discretizing time. Backward differencing for the first-order equation is used which is stated as

$$\frac{dT_w}{dt} = \frac{T_{w(i+1)} - T_{w(i)}}{\Delta t}$$

(3.24)

where $T_{w(i)}$ is the temperature of water at $t = 0$, and $T_{w(i+1)}$ is the water temperature after $\Delta t$ time.

Now, for temporal discretization, Equations (3.1), (3.4), and (3.11) can be written for the time step of 0.1 seconds as,

$T_w (i + 1) = T_w (i) + \left( k_{2w} T_w (i) + (1 / 6) (k_{1w} T_w + 2 k_{2w} T_g + 2 k_{3w} T_g) \right) \times \frac{\Delta t}{T_w}$$

(3.28)

$T_g (i + 1) = T_g (i) + \left( k_{1g} T_g + 2 k_{2g} T_g + 2 k_{3g} T_g + k_{4g} T_g \right) \times \frac{\Delta t}{T_g}$$

(3.29)

$T_b (i + 1) = T_b (i) + \left( k_{1b} T_b + 2 k_{2b} T_g + 2 k_{3b} T_g + k_{4b} T_g \right) \times \frac{\Delta t}{T_b}$$

(3.30)

where

$$k_{1w} = h_f (T_w + T_g + T_b, T_w, I (t), t)$$

(3.31)

$$k_{1g} = h_f (T_w + T_g + T_b, T_g, I (t), t)$$

(3.32)

$$k_{1b} = h_f (T_w + T_g + T_b, T_b, I (t), t)$$

(3.33)

In order to validate with accuracy of the mathematical model, the experiment was conducted on solar still on 14 July 2019.
4 | METHODOLOGY

An experiment is carried out on single-glass solar still on 14th July 2019 at Patiala, India. The water level in the still is maintained at 3 cm. The thermal model is being validated with the corresponding results obtained by the experiment.

The flow chart of thermal modeling done using MATLAB software is shown in Figure 3. Initially, the temperature values of $T_w$, $T_g$, and $T_b$ were taken equal to the ambient temperature. Further, the metalogical data measured using various instruments have been taken and loaded to compute heat transfer coefficients. The energy balance equations were then solved for glass cover, water, and basin liner. After this, the next iteration of temperatures of $T_w$, $T_g$, and $T_b$ have been calculated. Finally, the distillate output has been calculated, and then the program stopped. During the simulation, first, the temporal discretization is being carried out, which is a FEM (finite element method) technique, to get a minimum deviation from the results. Runga-Kutta method is employed with the time step of 0.1 seconds, which generates a lower scope of error because of the closeness in the ambient temperature and intensities for the time gap. The perimeters of both the experimental model and thermal model are then compared for the hourly variation of distillate output and heat transfer coefficients.

After validation, the same thermal model is extended to determine the performance while using nanoparticles at different volume fractions. This model is carried out with an assumption that the value of ambient temperature and solar intensity falling on the surface is not changing for $\Delta t$ time.

5 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

An experiment was performed on a single-slope solar still (passive type) with a water depth of 0.03 m and glass tilt angle of 30° on 14 July 2019, the total distillate output obtained was 3.327 kg/(day.m²). The hourly variation in solar intensity and ambient temperature with respect to time are shown in Figures 4 and 5, it can be seen from the graphs that the solar intensity and ambient temperature are maximum around 12:00 PM–01:00 PM, respectively. The maximum value of solar intensity was 830 W/m² and for ambient temperature was 41°C.

In the present study, the hourly experimental and theoretical observations were compared. The various design parameters of solar still are presented in Table 1. The inclination of the glass cover was kept at 30°C, which is equivalent to the latitude of the equation. The
basin and surface area of basin water was kept at 1 m². While the glass area can be calculated using the geometry of solar still as mentioned in Table 1. The basin of still was designed to store water up to the depth of 0.03 m. The convective heat transfer coefficients and optical properties of solar still components are also mentioned in Table 1.

### 5.1 Validation of Thermal model

Theoretical model (using Runge-Kutta ODE integrated with a analytical model by Tiwari) has been developed and compared with the experimentally obtained results. The predicted values of water temperature and glass temperature were in an average deviation range between 8% and 6% as shown in Figures 6 and 7. Figure 6 represents the hourly variation of theoretical and experimental water temperature and it has been observed a similar trend for both cases. The temperature of water starts rising as the solar intensity increased and tend to decrease during the later part of the day along with the solar intensity.

While Figure 7 represents the variation of glass temperature for 24 hours and it has been observed that variation in glass temperature of experimental and theoretical was more during the early part of the day. It is because the losses that occurred in actual condition were more than the theoretical loss considerations. From Figures 6 and 7, it has been observed that at the higher temperature, the ranges deviation from the experimental results are significant and it was because of the fact that the

| Table 1 | Various design parameters of solar still |
|---------|----------------------------------------|
| A_b     | 1 m²                                   |
| A_g     | A_b/cos(β) m²                          |
| C_w     | 4190 (J/kgK)                           |
| C_g     | 753 (J/kgK)                            |
| ρ_g     | 1500 (kg/m³)                           |
| α_w     | 1-τ_w-ρ_w                             |
| Water depth | 0.03 m       |
| Glass angle | 30°                  |

![Figure 5](image_url) Variation of ambient temperature on 14th July

![Figure 6](image_url) Hourly variation of theoretical and experimental water temperature
heat losses from the side insulations were more at higher temperatures.

The hourly variation of theoretical and experimental distillate output is shown in Figure 8. The productivity still follows the same trend as followed by the solar intensity. The experimental results are in good agreement with theoretical with a total deviation of 12.24% for both experimental and theoretical distillate output for a day and at higher temperatures, the range of deviation was found to be more. It is because of more losses from the still at higher temperature and solar intensity.

5.2 Effect of water depth on the performance of solar still

To obtain optimum water level, a mathematical simulation was carried at different water depths (0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05 m). As illustrated in Figure 9, at 0.01 m water depth, there exists a maximum peak value for distillate produced during the time 12:00 PM– 2:00 PM. As water depth increases, the graph shifts toward the right-hand side, which is because of the heat-storing capacity.
of water. The maximum distillate output was recorded for 0.02 m with 3.65 kg/(day.m²) and minimum for 0.08 m with 3.10 kg/(day.m²). As the depth of the basin water increased, the day distillate decreased but night distillate increased because heat storage takes place in the basin water at more basin water depth.

Figure 10 shows the variations of evaporative heat transfer coefficients at various depths of basin water and a similar trend has been found as of hourly distillate output. The evaporative heat transfer coefficient for different water depths is maximum for the water level at 0.01 m having a peak during 2:00 PM, followed by 0.02 m and so on. The increasing trend of evaporative heat transfer slightly decreases at about noon at all depths of basin water because the solar intensity is almost at peak and temperature difference decreased.

5.3 Variation in the performance of solar still with different Nanofluids

Seeding nanoparticles in the base fluid enhances heat transfer coefficients and results in higher performances. Also, increasing the volume fraction of the nanoparticle, the effective medium (surface area to volume ratio) increases, which contributes to higher efficiencies due to an increase in surface area.

Exceeding optimum levels of concentrations, there exists a noticeable change in flow resisting properties (with an increase in mass concentrations, the flow friction increases), and as a result, the viscosity increases. Increasing viscosity decreases the heat transfer efficiency. With the maximum distillate output of 3.65 kg/(day.m²) by simple solar still, 0.02 m was found to be the optimum water level to continue mathematical simulation for modified solar still, seeded with nanofluids.

The thermophysical behavior of a nanofluid depends on the particle size, volume fraction, and physical characteristics like density, thermal conductivity, and specific heat capacity. Also, the properties of nanoparticles are presented in Table 2. Figure 11 shows the distillate output for five different water-based nanofluids (CuO, Al₂O₃, SiC, Fe₂O₃, and Ag) that were simulated in MATLAB using Runge-Kutta numerical integration method. A higher yield of still was obtained for Al₂O₃ nanofluid with a 14.22% increase in productivity at a volume fraction of 0.2 as compared to water. While the enhancement of productivity with CuO, Ag, Fe₂O₃, and SiC at 0.2 volume fraction was found to be 10.82%, 8.11%, 7.63%, and 7.61%, respectively.

From simulation results, the temperature of nanofluid and base fluid (water) has been calculated and the differences of these temperatures have been taken. The temperature gradient for Al₂O₃ nanofluid was maximum because of the improved thermo-physical properties, as compared to the other simulated nanofluids. From Figure 12, it has been noticed that the peak temperatures for all the nanofluid were during the sunshine.

Table 2: Properties of nanoparticles

| Material | ρ (kg/m³) | K (W/mK) | C_p (J/K) |
|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| SiC      | 3160      | 490      | 675      |
| Al₂O₃    | 3880      | 36       | 773      |
| CuO      | 6350      | 69       | 535      |
| Fe₂O₃    | 5180      | 6        | 670      |
| Ag       | 10 490    | 0.235    | 429      |

Figure 10: Hourly variation in evaporative heat transfer coefficients at different water depths

Figure 11: Hourly variation of distillate output for different nanofluids
hours because of the resonant nature in near IR and the visible spectrum of nanoparticles. As the temperature of the nanofluid increases, the total heat transfer rate also increases.

6 | CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, the performance of five different nanofluids and base fluid has been analyzed. On the basis of the present study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The optimum water depth for single-slope solar still having water as a base fluid was found to be 2 cm. It has been found that if we increase the basin water depth, the inertia of water increases which leads to a decrease in productivity of still.

2. The peak temperature value during sunshine hours is maximum for Al₂O₃ at a volume concentration of 0.2, followed by CuO. Ag, Fe₂O₃, and SiC.

3. During sunshine hours, the solar absorption for the metallic nanoparticle was found to be maximum because of the resonant nature in near IR and visible spectrum. Thus, resulting in higher water temperatures.

4. Theoretical analysis by temporal discretization show a deviation of around 54% with a time step Δt = 0.1 sec, but as the value of the time step increases, the temperatures values obtained for the next hour shows an exponential deviation. So, to obtain promising results both space and time should be discretized.

5. The experimental results are in good agreement with theoretical with a total deviation of 12.24% for both experimental and theoretical distillate output for a day and at higher temperatures, the range of deviation was found to be more.

NOMENCLATURE

| Symbol | Description |
|--------|-------------|
| A      | Area of still (m²) |
| Cp     | Specific heat (J/kgK) |
| d_p    | Diameter of nanoparticle (nm) |
| F_R    | Heat removal factor |
| h_{cw} | Convective heat transfer coefficient of water (W/m²°C) |
| h_{ew} | Evaporative heat transfer coefficient of water (W/m²°C) |
| h_{rw} | Radiative heat transfer coefficient between water and glass (W/m²°C) |
| h_{cg} | Convective heat coefficient between glass and ambient (W/m²°C) |
| h_{rg} | Radiative heat transfer coefficient between glass and sky (W/m²°C) |
| h_w    | Heat transfer coefficient from basin to water (W/m²°C) |
| I(t)   | Solar incident radiation on solar still (W/m²) |

FIGURE 12 Hourly variation of ‘ΔT’ between base-fluid (water) and different nanofluids
I(t)  Solar incident radiation on Collector surface (W/m²)
K  Thermal conductivity (W/mK)
K_i  Thermal conductivity of insulation (W/mK)
L_i  Thickness of insulation (m)
LH  Latent heat of vaporization (J/kg)
m  Mass of water (kg)
m_{evw}  Mass of evaporated water (kg)
m_d  Hourly mass of distillate produced (kg/m²hr)
P_g  Partial vapor pressure on glass temperature (Pa)
Pr  Prandtl number = (μC_f/α)
P_w  Partial vapor pressure on water temperature (Pa)
Re  Reynolds number = (ρVD/μ)
Q_c  Convective heat transfer (W)
Q_e  Evaporative heat transfer (W)
Q_r  Radiative heat transfer (W)
Q_w  Bottom and side heat transfer losses in the still (W)
Q_u  Heat transfer from solar collector (W)
T_b  Temperature of basin (°C)
U_L  Overall heat transfer coefficient (W/m²°C)
Φ  Volume fraction
Δt  Time step (sec)

GREEK LETTERS
ε  Emissivity
r  Reflectivity of water
τ  Transmittivity of water
ρ  Density of water (kg/m³)
μ  Dynamic viscosity of water (Ns/m²)
β  Inclination angle of glass cover (degree)
α  Fraction of solar energy absorbed
σ  Stefan-Boltzman constant (W/m²K⁴)
β_{nf}  Coefficient of volumetric thermal expansion of nanofluid (K⁻¹)
β_v  Coefficient of volumetric thermal expansion of water vapor (K⁻¹)
β_{np}  Coefficient of volumetric thermal expansion of nanoparticle (K⁻¹)

SUBSCRIPTS AND SUPERSCRIPTS
a  Ambient
b  Basin
bf  Basefluid
c  Convective
e  Evaporative
g  Glass
nf  Nanofluid
r  Radiative
v  Vapor
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## APPENDIX

### TABLE A11 Thermo Physical properties of water vapor

| Property                    | Formula                                                                 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Density \( \rho_v \)       | \( 353.44(T_v + 237.15) \)                                            |
| Specific heat \( C_v \)   | \( 4217.629 - 3.20888T_v + 0.09503T_v^2 - 9.415 \times 10^{-5}T_v^3 - 2.5479 \times 10^{-8}T_v^4 \) |
| Viscosity \( \mu_v \)     | \( 0.00169 \times 10^{-5} + 4.9255 \times 10^{-7}T_v^2 - 2.0993504 \times 10^{-9}T_v^3 \) |
| Thermal Conductivity \( K_v \) | \( 0.56112 + 0.00193T_v - 9.1712 \times 10^{-9}T_v^2 + 2.60152749 \times 10^{-17}T_v^3 \) |

### Properties of water:

| Property                    | Formula                                                                 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Density \( \rho_w \)       | \( 1000 [1 - (T_w - 4)^2 / (119000 + 1365T_w)^4 T_w^2] \)           |
| Specific heat \( C_w \)   | \( 4217.629 - 3.20888T_w + 0.09503T_w^2 - 9.415 \times 10^{-5}T_w^3 - 2.5479 \times 10^{-8}T_w^4 \) |
| Viscosity \( \mu_w \)     | \( 0.00169 \times 10^{-5} + 4.9255 \times 10^{-7}T_w^2 - 2.0993504 \times 10^{-9}T_w^3 \) |
| Thermal Conductivity \( K_w \) | \( 0.56112 + 0.00193T_w - 9.1712 \times 10^{-9}T_w^2 + 2.60152749 \times 10^{-17}T_w^3 \) |

### TABLE A12 Thermo Physical properties of Nanofluid

| Property                    | Formula                                                                 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Density \( \rho_{nf} \)    | \( \rho_{nf} = (1 - \phi) \rho_p + \phi \rho_l \)                      |
| Specific heat \( C_{nf} \) | \( \frac{(1 - \phi) C_p + \phi C_l}{\rho_{nf}} \)                      |
| Viscosity \( \mu_{nf} \)   | \( \left( \frac{(1 + \phi)}{\mu_p} \right)^{0.058} \left( 1 + \frac{\mu_l}{\mu_p} \right)^{-0.058} \mu_{nf} \) |
| Thermal Conductivity \( K_{nf} \) | \( \left[ 1 + 4.4 \left( \frac{Re^{(4)} \phi^{0.66}}{K_p} \right) \left( \frac{T_{oil}}{T_p} \right)^{0.55} \frac{K_p}{K_l} \phi^{0.66} \right] K_{nf} \) |
| Thermal expansion coefficient \( \beta_{nf} \) | \( \beta_{nf} = (1 - \phi) \beta_p + \phi \beta_l \) |