NOMENCLATURE

E	volts
h	conventional heat transfer coefficient
h_{ph}	heat transfer coefficient defined by equation (2)
I	amps
q	heat flux
q_{in}	heat flux from a source into an interface
q_{out}, q_w	heat flux from an interface into a sink
R	ohms
T_w	wall temperature
ΔT	temperature difference across a boundary layer

Comments on E. F. Adiutori's contribution

I WAS GLAD to be informed about the contribution of Mr. Adiutori, author of the *New Heat Transfer*. I myself respect his book very much, which is the art of the precise, purposeful and data-based model building. Of course, the 'new heat transfer coefficient' indicated in the title of [1] has not been found out for the purpose of Mr. Adiutori's *New Heat Transfer*, since the latter entirely eliminates the heat transfer coefficient. The new heat transfer coefficient has been made for the purposes of the 'old' type calculations. This is a new efficient means of heat transfer measurement and model building, and it can be well integrated into the conventional handling of heat transport. However, even in the most simple linear cases, a conversion is needed to turn to the usual boundary conditions. In addition to the definition and interpretation, this has been discussed by [1].

(1) In his contribution, Adiutori has made a summary which is insufficient regarding some important questions. The brief summary of statement [1] might be given, for example, in the following way:

The local heat transfer coefficient is a parameter, which is defined by equation 2, where dq_w and dT_w fulfil two postulates:

(a) they tend to zero in a way that, in limit value, the disturbed process is identical to the undisturbed one;
(b) they are of local difference relating to a single point of the heat transferring surface, while elsewhere T_w and q_w are undisturbed.

The following comments are supposed to explain that the above summary can be derived from [1].

(2) The Introduction of [1] defines a parameter by equation (2), which assigns a differential quotient to the heat transport in each point of the surface:

$$h_{ph} = \frac{dq_w}{dT_w} \tag{2}$$

where dq_w and $dT_w \to 0$, and dq_w is parallel to q_w.

However, all these are not sufficient to have equation (2) properly express the local physical heat transfer coefficient. For the purpose of interpreting the differential quotient in equation (2) the preliminary equation (12) has been made. Through this equation postulates (a) and (b) can be fulfilled simultaneously:

ad (a) the Prandtl–Taylor analogy used refers to equilibrium state, and consequently (a) is satisfied,
ad (b) the penetration of local disturbance can be expressed by the differential quotient dT/dT_w of equation (12).

It means that though equation (12) offers a formal differential quotient only, it allows the expression of the physical heat transfer coefficient. It is important to emphasize that if the surface extension of the thermal disturbance is not local, but refers to the whole surface, then the disturbance penetrates the entire thermal boundary layer, and therefore dq_w/dT_w equals to the h_t technical heat transfer coefficient. Now, however, the problem is not that. The disturbance is local, and either the value or the meaning of the dq_w/dT_w differential quotient is quite different. According to definition (13) by the value of δ^+, which is declared as the penetration depth of the local heat transfer, equation (12) really gives h_{ph}.

The estimate of the penetration depth of the local heat transfer in [1] was studied in the case of a fully developed turbulent flow, and finally the result (21) was obtained. Since the upper limit of δ^+ was 30, no doubt, in the case presented, the local heat transport cannot take place in one step through the entire heat transferring boundary layer with δ^+ of around 1000.

As a summary, equation (2) of [1] itself, picked out of the relevant conditions, cannot be reviewed. Together with the postulates a particular parameter was given, which supposedly had not appeared in the literature previously. Consequently $h_{ph} = dq_w/dT_w$ defined as above does not correspond to dq_w/dT_w in equations (a), (24), (e) and (c) of Mr. Adiutori's contribution.

(3) It can be disputed whether the notation of h_{ph} is proper or not. If we started from the aspect of h_{ph} measurement, it could be called 'local heat transfer coefficient determined by local perturbation'. However, the adjective 'physical' is shorter, and it tends to express, that the point in question is an objective characteristic determined unambiguously by the physical process of the local heat transport generated by the temperature gradient. Namely, the thermal boundary layer gives an unambiguous and free-from-engineers' preconditions answer to the question raised in the form of thermal disturbance. The h_{ph} depends on the physical reality, and not on the technical aspect—and within this frame on an enforced (e.g. linearized, etc) model—of the phenomenon. In this respect only, there is a close connection with the text on page 6.34 of [2], since the physical heat transfer coefficient does not require an *a priori* deduction either, over and above the simple model conception.

The notation 'dynamic' for the $h = dq_w/dT_w$ differential quotient advised in [2] and in the contribution—even in general—seems to be easily misunderstandable. Dynamics is connected with changes in time, though either in [2] or in the case of the physical heat transfer coefficient, the dq_w and dT_w changes are emphatically of stationary nature.

(4) Newton's famous cooling law, in which the heat transfer coefficient, as a proportion factor appeared at the first time, was related actually to the average heat transfer coefficient obtainable from the ratio of finite changes: $h = \Delta q_w/\Delta T_w$. Since then the cooling process of the surface has many times been used for the measurement of the heat transfer coefficient. A separate chapter of [3] deals with the measurement technique of dynamic Δq_w (changing effectively in time), obviously for the purposes of heat transfer measurement. Even in this Journal an article was presented definitely about the measurement of the heat transfer coefficient based on the

evaluation of cooling curves, i.e. effectively based on the determination of the dq_w/dT_w differential quotient [4]. The first reference of [1] also gives information about an application. The discussion after lecture [5] with regard to the local measurement by impulse method offered a great help for the author. However, the conception of applying the local physical heat transfer coefficient, was at first formed by the results presented in [1]. The theory has been generalized and tested by concrete applications [6], improved and developed [7] and finally summarized [8].

Technical University of Budapest G. DANKO
Institute of Thermal Energy and System Engineering
Budapest 1502 *P*8 91
Hungary

REFERENCES

1. G. Dankó, The possibility of determining and using a new local heat transfer coefficient. *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer* **26**(11), 1679–1684 (1983).
2. E. F. Adiutori, *The New Heat Transfer*, Ventuno Press, Cincinnati, Ohio (1974).
3. E. R. G. Eckert, R. J. Goldstein, *Measurements in Heat Transfer*, 2nd Edn, pp. 397–423, McGraw-Hill, New York (1976).
4. Cz. O. Popiel and L. Boguslawski, Local heat transfer coefficients on the rotating disc in still air, *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer* **18**, 167–170 (1975).
5. G. Dankó, Measurement of local heat coefficients, Seminar, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (1978).
6. G. Dankó and I. Cifka, Measurement of the convective heat transfer coefficient on naturally rough tunnel surfaces. Third International Mine Ventilation Congress, Harrogate (1984).
7. G. Dankó, Extended theory and some experimental. investigations for the physical heat transfer coefficient. Under preparation.
8. G. Dankó, Measurement and model building for examining the local heat convection, Candidate's dissertation submitted to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (1984).