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ABSTRACT

In this study, a dynamic model of a microtube shell-and-tube heat exchanger has been developed in Aspen Custom Modeler (ACM) for a high temperature (HT) and low temperature (LT) recuperator in a 10 MWe indirect supercritical carbon dioxide (sCO₂) recompression closed Brayton cycle (RCBC) power plant. This model can be easily implemented into the plant-wide dynamic model developed in Aspen Plus Dynamic to investigate the system dynamic behavior, start-up, shut-down and control strategies of the proposed novel sCO₂ RCBC plant. The operating conditions of the recuperators are determined by a system-level analysis, while the recuperators’ geometry is optimized by a previously developed steady-state design model. In this dynamic model, only axial temperature variations are considered for the hot and cold fluids as well as the metal walls when computing heat, mass and momentum balances. The heat transfer coefficients and friction factors are calculated using empirical equations proven for sCO₂ fluids. Sensitivity studies have been conducted to analyze the effect of the discretization size and the time integral step size. Step changes and different ramp rates have been introduced to both HT and LT recuperators to test the dynamic behavior and numerical robustness. The results indicate that for the conditions studied here, the shell wall heat conduction has negligible effect on the steady-state and transient thermal performance of the recuperators, and the dynamic responses of the proposed compact recuperators are fast due to the small Biot number, metal mass and high heat transfer coefficient of the microtube shell-and-tube heat exchangers. These fast dynamic responses are consistent with the small lumped thermal residence time reported by a previously developed steady-state optimal design model.
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1. Introduction

The supercritical carbon dioxide (sCO₂) power cycle is a promising technology due to its potential higher efficiency and smaller turbomachinery compared with steam cycles (Zitney and Liese, 2016). Different from typical steam cycles, the whole sCO₂ RCBC plant is usually operated above the critical point of CO₂, and therefore undergoes drastic density changes instead of phase change over the operating range of temperature and pressure (Ahn et al., 2015). Thus, the engineering and operating experience as well as modeling approach of the conventional steam cycles cannot be directly applied to the sCO₂ power cycle. In the sCO₂ recompression closed Brayton cycle (RCBC) plant, the turbine outlet temperature is still high due to the small pressure ratio (Zitney and Liese, 2016). A considerable amount of energy has to be recovered by exchanging heat between hot turbine outlet stream and the cold inlet stream in order to achieve higher overall cycle efficiency (Jiang et al., 2017). Specially designed compact heat exchangers are superior to the conventional shell-and-tube heat exchanger in terms of capital cost and footprint (Jiang et al., 2017). Customized models are required since most of the conventional design and rating models are developed based on a constant property assumption, which is clearly not practical in sCO₂ cycles (Xie et al., 2008; Guo, 2016). Hence, the design and modeling of recuperators is of crucial importance.

Among different types of compact heat exchangers, microtube and printed circuit heat exchangers have been recommended for sCO₂ power cycles based on the experience of multiple researchers (Musgrove et al., 2017; Carstens, 2007; Chordia et al., 2016; Luu et al., 2017). In the sCO₂ RCBC test article built by Sandia National Laboratory, printed circuit heat exchangers were one of the selections (Kruizenga et al., 2014). Schmitt et al. designed micro-channel recuperators for a 100 MW e sCO₂ RCBC plant, of which the geometry is similar to that of microtube exchanger (Schmitt et al., 2015). Chordia et al. conducted preliminary designs for multiple types of heat exchangers, including microtube, stacked-sheet, plate-fin, double-pipe, etc., and suggested microtube heat exchanger for the 10 MW e sCO₂ RCBC plant (Chordia et al., 2016). The microtube shell-and-tube heat exchanger is like the conventional shell-and-tube heat exchanger, but using smaller tube diameters on the order of 1 mm instead of baffles in the shell to provide larger heat transfer coefficient to both shell and tube sides (Jiang et al., 2017; Musgrove et al., 2017). Previously, the National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) has developed an optimal design model of microtube shell-and-tube recuperators for sCO₂ RCBC application (Jiang et al., 2017). In this design model, the recuperator geometry variables are optimized in Aspen Custom Modeler (ACM) using a successive quadratic programming method with rigorous energy balance constraints, geometry calculations, and thermal-hydraulic correlations proven for sCO₂ flow (Jiang et al., 2017). It is noted that the existing rigorous simulation studies of heat exchangers in thermal systems, especially the sCO₂ based power cycle, are mostly steady-state analysis for system design and optimization (Guo, 2016; Xie et al., 2008; Schmitt et al., 2015). Few system-level dynamic studies are conducted based on rigorous non-conventional equipment models specialized for the application in sCO₂ power cycles (Zitney and Liese, 2016; Carstens, 2007; Luu et al., 2017; Francesco and Piero, 2011; Carstens, 2007). Since a reasonable estimation of dynamic behaviors of each component is critical when investigating the start-up, shut-down and load-following control strategies of the novel sCO₂ RCBC plant, in this study we developed a one-dimensional (1D) dynamic model for the microtube recuperators in a 10 MW e sCO₂ RCBC plant – with a turbine inlet temperature of 700°C and mass flow rate of ~ 100 kg/s - using the geometry design optimized by the design model developed by NETL previously. The paper presents the modeling approach and comparison, discretization sensitivity analysis, as well as the dynamic behaviors of the microtube recuperators subjected to changing inlet temperature and flowrate.

2. Dynamic model

In this study, microtube shell-and-tube heat exchangers are used to recuperate heat in the sCO₂ RCBC (Zitney and Liese, 2016; Jiang et al., 2017), which is similar to conventional shell-and-tube exchangers but with smaller tube size and considering no baffle in the shell (Musgrove et al., 2017). In the recuperator, the fluids flow counter-currently, where the cold high-pressure sCO₂ stream enters the tube side. A detailed optimal design model has been developed in a previous NETL study considering an industrial standard tube size (Jiang et al., 2017). The key design parameters are the number of tubes ($N_t$), tube
diameter \((D_{tc})\), pitch layout, and pitch to diameter ratio \((P_t/D_{tc})\), where pitch is the distance between tube centerlines. The tube length \((L)\) and shell diameter \((D_{so})\) can be evaluated based on the above design parameters and the desired extent of heat recovery \((\text{Jiang et al., 2017})\). The minimum thickness of tube wall, and the thickness of shell wall and tube sheet are calculated using ASME and TEMA standards. For the 10 MWe plant, the stream conditions and heat duty of the high temperature (HT) and low temperature (LT) recuperators are determined by the system-level model as shown in Table 1 \((\text{Zitney and Liese, 2016})\). The heat duty for the HT recuperator is 45.2 MWt, and the LT recuperator is 14.5 MWt. The general geometry variables as shown in Table 2 are given by the steady-state optimization model considering standard SS 316 microtubes \((\text{Jiang et al., 2017})\).

### Table 1 Operating conditions of the recuperators in the 10 MWe sCO\(_2\) cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>LT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T_{h,\text{in}} \ (\degree \text{C}))</td>
<td>578.15</td>
<td>191.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_{c,\text{in}} \ (\degree \text{C}))</td>
<td>181.95</td>
<td>68.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{h,\text{in}} ) (bar)</td>
<td>89.62</td>
<td>237.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P_{c,\text{in}} ) (bar)</td>
<td>100.17</td>
<td>100.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F_{h} ) (kg/s)</td>
<td>100.17</td>
<td>100.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Optimal design of recuperators in the 10 MWe sCO\(_2\) cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HT recuperator</th>
<th>LT recuperator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tube, (N_t)</td>
<td>47174</td>
<td>62872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch layout</td>
<td>Triangular</td>
<td>Triangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch ratio, (P_t/D_{tc})</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube outer diameter, (D_{tc}) (mm)</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube thickness, (t) (mm)</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tube length, (L) (m)</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td>2.263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transient heat, momentum and mass balance equations are developed for the hot and cold fluid in Aspen Custom Modeler (ACM). The NETL system dynamic model of the 10 MW RCBC cycle uses AspenTech® software, and ACM is a higher-level language modeling software tool for building non-library models. Heat conduction in the tube and shell wall is also considered. The ACM model is developed based on the following assumptions: (1) fully developed turbulent flow in both tube and shell sides, (2) ideal counter-current and annulus flow along tubes in the shell side, (3) negligible axial dispersion effects, (4) negligible radial temperature distribution in the hot fluid, cold fluid, and wall, (5) negligible heat losses to the environment, (6) quasi-static assumptions for evaluating the friction factor and the heat transfer coefficients \((\text{Carstens, 2007; Vaitekunas, 1990})\).

### 2.1 Heat balance

With the above assumptions, the 1D transient forced convection heat transfer equation of the cold sCO\(_2\) flow in the tube side can be written as Eq. (1), with the boundary condition given by Eq. (2).

\[
\left(\frac{\pi}{4}N_tD_{ti}^2\right)\frac{\partial (\rho_cU_c)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial (G_cH_c)}{\partial z} + h_c(\pi N_tD_{ti}) (T_t - T_c)
\] (1)
\[(T_c)_{z=0} = T_{c,in}\]  

Usually, heat conduction in the shell wall is negligible due to the large heat conductivity and small metal mass (Simoes et al., 2005). If the heat conduction in the shell wall is not considered, the heat balance of the hot sCO\(_2\) flow in the shell side can be written as Eq. (3), with the boundary condition given by Eq. (4).

\[
\frac{\pi}{4}(D_{si}^2 - N_t D_{co}^2) \frac{\partial (\rho h U_h)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial (G_h H_h)}{\partial z} + h_h (\pi N_t D_{co}) (T_t - T_h) \tag{3}
\]

\[
(T_h)_{z=L} = T_{h,in}\tag{4}
\]

In Eqs. (1) and (3), symbols \(\rho, U, H, G, h,\) and \(T\) denote the density, molar internal energy, molar enthalpy, molar flow rate, convection heat transfer coefficient, and temperature of the cold \((c)\) and hot \((h)\) sCO\(_2\) fluids, respectively. \(D_{ti}, D_{co}\) and \(D_{si}\) are the tube inner and outer diameter, and the shell inner diameter, respectively. \(T_t\) is the tube wall temperature given by the 1D heat conduction equation as shown in Eq. (5) with the boundary condition given by Eq. (6). In Eq. (5), symbols \(\rho_t, C_{pt}\), and \(k_t\) denote the density, specific heat and heat conductivity of the tube wall, respectively. Here, the heat conduction in the radial direction is neglected because of its small Biot number (Bi<0.1).

\[
\rho_t C_{pt} \frac{\partial T_t}{\partial t} = k_t \frac{\partial^2 T_t}{\partial z^2} + \frac{4h_t D_{co}(T_h - T_t)}{D_{co}^2 - D_{ti}^2} - \frac{4h_t D_{ti}(T_t - T_c)}{D_{co}^2 - D_{ti}^2} \tag{5}
\]

\[
\left(\frac{\partial T_t}{\partial z}\right)_{z=0} = \left(\frac{\partial T_t}{\partial z}\right)_{z=L} = 0 \tag{6}
\]

If the heat conduction in the shell wall is considered, the heat transfer between the hot fluid and the shell wall must be considered as well. The new transient heat balance of the hot fluid can be written as Eq. (7) by including the heat flux between the hot fluid and the shell wall into Eq. (3). In Eq. (7), \(h_h\) is the convection heat transfer coefficient between the hot fluid and shell wall.

\[
\frac{\pi}{4}(D_{si}^2 - N_t D_{co}^2) \frac{\partial (\rho h U_h)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial (G_h H_h)}{\partial z} + h_h (\pi N_t D_{co}) (T_t - T_h) + h'_h (\pi D_{si}) (T_s - T_h) \tag{7}
\]

Similarly, the Biot number of the shell wall is smaller than 0.1, and thus the heat conduction in the radial direction can be neglected. The 1D heat conduction in the shell wall can be written as Eq. (8), with the boundary condition given by Eq. (9), where \(D_{so}, \rho_s, C_{ps},\) and \(k_s\) are the shell outer diameter, density, specific heat and heat conductivity, respectively.

\[
\rho_s C_{ps} \frac{\partial T_s}{\partial t} = k_s \frac{\partial^2 T_s}{\partial z^2} + \frac{4h'_s D_{si}(T_h - T_s)}{D_{so}^2 - D_{si}^2} \tag{8}
\]

\[
\left(\frac{\partial T_s}{\partial z}\right)_{z=0} = \left(\frac{\partial T_s}{\partial z}\right)_{z=L} = 0 \tag{9}
\]

### 2.2 Mass and momentum balance

The mass and momentum balance of the hot and cold sCO\(_2\) fluids are given by Eqs. (10) and (11), where \(v, f, D_{ha},\) and \(P\) denote the velocity, Darcy friction factor, hydraulic diameter and pressure of the hot or cold sides, respectively. The inlet pressure and velocity are given as the boundary conditions.

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial (\rho v)}{\partial z} = 0 \tag{10}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial (\rho v)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial (\rho vv)}{\partial z} - \frac{dP}{dz} + \frac{1}{2} \rho v^2 f / D_{ht}
\]  

(11)

2.3 Property model and thermal-hydraulic correlations

In this study, REFPROP is used to evaluate the properties of sCO₂ fluids (Jiang et al., 2017; Span and Wagner, 1996). The \( k - T \) correlation and \( C_p - T \) correlation of the tube and shell wall are available in the open literatures for SS316 (Jiang et al., 2017). The thermal-hydraulic performance of the recuperators are characterized by the modified Dittus-Boelter equation (Eq. (12)) and Colebrook–White equation (Eqs. (13) and (14)) with wall temperature correction terms, which have been proven for sCO₂ flow in microtubes (Musgrove, 2017; Jackson, 2013; Jiang et al., 2017). Here, \( \rho_w \) is the fluid density evaluated at tube wall temperature \((T_w = T_i)\) and fluid pressure. In Eq. (13), the relative tube roughness \((\varepsilon / D)\) is assumed to be 0.0005. \( D_{ht} \) is the hydraulic diameter used for pressure drop calculation, \( D_{t_i} \) for the tube side, \( D'_{se} \) defined in Eq. (19) for the shell side.

\[
Nu = 0.023 Re^{0.8} Pr^{0.5} \left( \frac{\rho_w}{\rho} \right)^{0.3} \]  

(12)

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{f}}_C = -2 \log \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{3.7 D_{ht}} + \frac{2.51}{Re \sqrt{f}}_C \right) \]  

(13)

\[
\frac{f}{f_C} = \left( \frac{T}{T_w} \right)^{0.1} \]  

(14)

The hydraulic diameters of the tube side and the shell side are different, and furthermore, they are also different when evaluating heat transfer (Nusselt number) and pressure drop (Reynolds number) (Jiang et al., 2017). Eqs. (15) to (17) provide more detailed equations for evaluating the three heat transfer coefficients \( h_c, h_h, \) and \( h'_h \) in the heat balance equations discussed in Section 2.1.

\[
\frac{h_c D_{t_i}}{k_c} = 0.023 \left( \frac{\rho_c v_c D_{t_i}}{\mu_c} \right)^{0.8} \left( \frac{C_{pc} \mu_c}{\mu} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_c} \right)^{0.3} \]  

(15)

\[
\frac{h_h D_{se}}{k_h} = 0.023 \left( \frac{\rho_c v_h D'_{se}}{\mu_h} \right)^{0.8} \left( \frac{C_{ph} \mu_h}{k_h} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_h} \right)^{0.3} \]  

(16)

\[
\frac{h'_h D'_{si}}{k_h} = 0.023 \left( \frac{\rho_c v_h D'_{si}}{\mu_h} \right)^{0.8} \left( \frac{C_{ph} \mu_h}{k_h} \right)^{0.5} \left( \frac{\rho_w}{\rho_h} \right)^{0.3} \]  

(17)

In (18) to (20), \( \mu, C_p, \) and \( k \) denote viscosity, specific heat and heat conductivity of the hot and cold fluids, while \( D_{se} \) and \( D'_{se} \) are given in Eq. (18) and (19), which are the hydraulic diameters of the shell side defined as \( 4 \times \) free flow area / wetted perimeter (Jiang et al., 2017).

\[
D_{se} = \frac{4 \sqrt{3} P_t^2 / 4 - \pi D_{co}^2 / 8}{\pi D_{co} / 2} \]  

(18)

\[
D'_{se} = \frac{4 \sqrt{3} P_t^2 / 4 - \pi D_{co}^2 / 8}{(\pi D_{co} + \pi D_{si} / N_t) / 2} \]  

(19)
3. Results and discussion

In this study, the HT and LT microtube recuperators are simulated using the dynamic model described in Section 2 for a pilot-scale 10 MWe sCO\(_2\) RCBC plant. In section 3.1, the results generated by the partial differential equation (PDE) based dynamic model, setting the ACM run mode to steady state, are compared with the optimal design model using a system of algebraic equations (Jiang et al., 2017). In Section 3.2, sensitivity studies are conducted for the sizes of grids. In Section 3.3, dynamic behavior of the recuperators are studied by introducing ramp changes in the hot stream inlet temperature, where different integral step sizes are tested. In Section 3.4 and 3.5, time constants and dynamic behavior of the HT and LT recuperators are investigated by introducing step changes and fast or slow ramps to the inlet temperature and flowrate of both hot and cold fluids.

3.1 Steady-state performance and model comparison

In this section, the results generated by the PDE-based dynamic model using steady-state run mode are compared with those generated by the algebraic optimal design model developed in our previous study (Jiang et al., 2017). For each case, the axial direction is discretized into 100 grids. Table 3 shows the comparison in the heat duty, pressure drop and stream outlet conditions, while Figures 1 and 2 give the comparison in fluid and tube wall temperature profiles of the HT and LT recuperator. The temperature profiles are overlapped with each other. No significant difference is observed from the model comparison, which indicates that the PDE based model can properly predict the performance of the recuperators at steady state, while as expected the heat conduction in the shell wall does not have a strong effect on the steady-state thermal behavior of the recuperators. As shown in Figure 2, the tube wall temperature profiles almost lie in the middle of the hot and cold fluid temperature profiles for both LT and HT recuperators. This trend indicates that the heat transfer resistance of the tube and shell sides are similar, which is expected from an optimal designed heat exchanger with similar fluids in both sides.

In the design model, heat transfer in the shell wall is not considered. Hence, the steady-state results of the dynamic model are compared with or without the 1D heat conduction equation for the shell wall (w/o shell or 1D shell). The shell wall temperature profiles are plotted in Figure 3 with the hot fluid temperature profiles. Note that the shell wall temperature profile overlaps the hot side temperature profile, except at the two ends, mainly because of the no flux boundary condition, Eq. (9). A similar trend would be found in the tube wall temperature profile if zooming in on the ends in Figure 2; however, it is negligible in the tube wall because the heat flux between the tube wall and hot fluid is much larger than that between the shell wall and hot fluid, which weakens the effect of heat conduction in the tube wall.

| Table 3 Comparison between the dynamic model and design model at steady-state |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                 | HT Recuperator |                 | LT Recuperator |                 |                |
|                                 | Design | w/o shell | 1D shell | Design | w/o shell | 1D shell |                |
| Duty (MW)                       | 45.15  | 45.19     | 45.19     | 14.48  | 14.52     | 14.52     |
| \(T_{c,\text{out}}\) (°C)       | 532.07 | 532.13    | 532.13    | 181.95 | 182.42    | 182.42    |
| \(T_{h,\text{out}}\) (°C)       | 192.95 | 191.28    | 191.28    | 78.20  | 77.90     | 77.90     |
| \(\Delta P_c\) (bar)           | 1.40   | 1.40      | 1.40      | 1.41   | 1.41      | 1.41      |
| \(\Delta P_h\) (bar)           | 1.05   | 1.04      | 1.04      | 1.40   | 1.40      | 1.40      |
3.2 Grid sensitivity

In this section, the effect of the discretization size in the axial direction is investigated. In Figure 4, the relative error in terms of the total heat duty is plotted versus the number of grids. When the tolerance is about 0.001, it is observed that 100 and 70 grids are required for the HT and LT recuperators, respectively. This result is different from the design model (Jiang et al., 2017), since for the design model the axial direction is discretized to get the same heat duty (to improve numerical convergence) instead of the same length in each grid. In the following sections, the discretization number is set to 100 and 70 for the HT and LT recuperator, respectively.
3.3 Effect of shell wall models and integral time steps on dynamic results

In this section, the effects of the shell wall models (w/o or 1D Shell) and the size of integral time steps on the dynamic simulation results of the recuperators are studied. It is noted that the size of integral time steps is in proportion to the communication time and the dimensionless step size in ACM. A 30 °C decrease in the hot side inlet temperature is introduced to HT and LT recuperators with a ramp rate of either 1 °C per sec or 1 °C per min. The axial direction is discretized into 100 grids for the HT recuperator and 70 grids for the LT recuperator. Model specification and computational time (over a 100 second or 100 minute simulation span) for five dynamic runs with the HT recuperator (1 to 5) and the LT recuperator (6 to 10) are listed in Table 4. The cold stream outlet temperature and the hot stream inlet temperature are plotted in Figures 5 and 6 for the HT and LT recuperators, respectively. The results indicate the shell wall model has negligible effect on either the dynamic behavior of the recuperators or the computational time. In addition, the computational time can be significantly saved without affecting the results and creating numerical instability by increasing the communication time in ACM up to 1 time unit used in the model (AspenTech, 2017). For example, if the dynamic model is written with a time unit of second, then the communication time can be increased to about 1 second for less computational time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run</th>
<th>Shell wall</th>
<th>Communication Time</th>
<th>Computational Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 6’</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.01 sec, 0.01 min</td>
<td>11 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 7’</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>0.01 sec, 0.01 min</td>
<td>11 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 8’</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>0.1 sec, 0.1 min</td>
<td>2-3 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 9’</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>0.5 sec, 0.5 min</td>
<td>1-2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 10’</td>
<td>1D</td>
<td>1 sec, 1 min</td>
<td>&lt; 1 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Time unit in the heat, mass and momentum balance equations is converted to min from sec by a factor of 60.
3.4 Time constant of the recuperators

In this section, the time constants of the HT and LT recuperators are evaluated by introducing step changes of $\pm 30^\circ\text{C}$ to the inlet temperature and step changes of $\pm 10\%$ to the inlet flowrate of both the hot and cold fluid, as shown in Figures 7-10. Here, the time constant is a parameter characterizing the response to a step change input of a first-order time-invariant system, defined as the time for the system's step response to reach $1 - 1/e \approx 63.2\%$ of its final value. The values of the time constants of both recuperators are reported in Table 5. As shown in Table 5, the time constants vary from 4 sec to about 1 min, which indicates fast dynamic response of the recuperators as expected, since the optimal recuperator design gives small Biot number and larger heat transfer coefficient (Jiang et al., 2017). It is noted that the dynamic response to the step changes in temperature is faster than that in flowrate. It may be because of the varying thermal holdups of the compressible fluids, and the significant changes in the heat transfer coefficients, which are highly related to Reynolds number (Jiang et al., 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\tau$ (s)</th>
<th>HT Recuperator</th>
<th>LT Recuperator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T_{c,\text{in}}$</td>
<td>$T_{h,\text{in}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{c,\text{out}}$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{h,\text{out}}$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7 Step increase in the inlet temperature and flowrate of the HT recuperator

Figure 8 Step decrease in the inlet temperature and flowrate of the HT recuperator

Figure 9 Step increase in the inlet temperature and flowrate of the LT recuperator
3.4 Recuperator dynamics

In this section, the dynamic behavior is studied for the HT and LT recuperators with different ramp rates. The results are shown in Figures 11 and 13 for fast ramp rates (ramp period is per second, e.g., 30 °C for 30 seconds), and Figures 12 and 14 for slow ramp rates (ramp period is per minute). In Run 1, the dynamic profiles of the hot fluid inlet temperature (Th (L)) and cold fluid outlet temperature (Tc (L)) are plotted, when ramps in the hot fluid inlet temperature are introduced with a magnitude of ± 30 °C. In Run 2, the dynamic profiles of the cold fluid inlet temperature (Tc (0)) and the hot fluid outlet temperature (Th (0)) are plotted, when ramps in the cold fluid inlet temperature are introduced with a magnitude of ± 30 °C; In Run 3, the dynamic profiles of the cold fluid flowrate (Gc), Tc (L) and Th (0) are plotted, when ramps in the cold fluid flowrate are introduced with a magnitude of ± 10 %. In Run 4, the dynamic profiles of the hot fluid flowrate (Gh), Tc (L) and Th (0) are plotted, when ramps in the hot fluid flowrate are introduced with a magnitude of ± 10 %. As shown in Figures 8 to 10, the dynamic responses to the changes in temperature and flowrate are relatively fast, and thus the results corroborate the expectations for a very low Biot number heat exchange characteristic of compact heat exchanger design and high heat transfer coefficient of the microtube heat exchanger, in this case.

Figure 11 Dynamic behaviors of the HT recuperator with fast ramps
Figure 12 Dynamic behaviors of the HT recuperator with slow ramps

Figure 13 Dynamic behaviors of the LT recuperator with fast ramps

Figure 14 Dynamic behaviors of the LT recuperator with slow ramps
4. Conclusions

This paper presents a dynamic model developed in ACM for the HT and LT recuperators in a 10 MWe \( \text{sCO}_2 \) RCBC plant, of which the inlet conditions are given by the system-level studies; the geometry design is provided by the steady-state optimal design model; the heat transfer coefficients and friction factors are calculated using empirical equations proven for \( \text{sCO}_2 \) fluids. Rigorous 1D heat, mass and momentum balance equations are used to predict the temperature, velocity and pressure profiles for compressible flows. The dynamic model gives the same results as an optimal design model (Jiang et al., 2017) when running under the steady-state mode, while the heat conduction in the shell wall does not significantly affect the temperature profiles of both cold and hot fluids. Grid sensitivity shows that at least 100 and 70 grids are required for the HT and LT recuperators, respectively, to have a reasonable error tolerance. The time constants of the HT and LT are less than 10 sec if step changes are introduced to the \( \text{sCO}_2 \) inlet temperature, while they are about 1 min if step changes are introduced to the \( \text{sCO}_2 \) inlet flowrate. The dynamic responses are fast because of the small recuperator size, Biot number and the large heat transfer coefficient.
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