

Heat Transfer and Pressure Drop Performance of Nanofluids in Heat Exchangers: A Review

Devika A¹, Sowmya S B²

^{1,2}Department of Mathematics, Government Science College, Nrupathunga University, Bengaluru, India

Abstract— This review examines the use of nanofluids in heat exchangers with particular emphasis on heat transfer enhancement and pressure drop characteristics. Nanoparticles improve the thermal conductivity of the base fluid, thereby increasing the heat transfer coefficient; however, they also raise the viscosity and density of the fluid, resulting in greater pressure drop and pumping power requirements. Therefore, an appropriate balance between thermal enhancement and hydraulic losses is essential for efficient heat exchanger operation. This review summarises recent experimental and numerical studies conducted up to 2025 on various heat exchanger configurations. The influence of nanoparticle type, including Al₂O₃, CuO, and metallic nanoparticles, as well as particle concentration, size, and base fluid selection, is critically discussed. Attention is given to hybrid nanofluids and their integration with passive enhancement techniques such as twisted tapes, dimpled tubes, and static mixers, which significantly improve thermo-hydraulic performance and support the design of energy-efficient heat exchangers. This review provides useful guidance for designing energy-efficient heat exchangers for industrial applications.

Keywords— Nanofluids, Heat exchangers, Heat transfer, Pressure drops, Thermo-hydraulic.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nanofluids are engineered colloidal suspensions¹⁻⁴ formed by dispersing nanoparticles, typically with dimensions below 100 nm, into conventional heat transfer fluids such as water, ethylene glycol, oils, or their mixtures. Since their introduction, nanofluids have attracted considerable attention due to their potential to enhance the thermal performance of heat transfer systems. Conventional fluids generally possess relatively low thermal conductivity, which limits the efficiency of heat exchangers and other thermal devices. The addition of nanoparticles with superior thermal properties can improve the thermal conductivity and convective heat transfer characteristics of the base fluid, thereby offering opportunities for the development of compact and energy-efficient thermal systems. Heat exchangers are essential components in a wide range of engineering applications, including power generation, refrigeration and air-conditioning systems, automotive thermal management, electronics cooling, chemical processing, and renewable energy technologies.

Improving the thermal performance of heat exchangers is therefore a major objective in the design of energy-efficient systems. In this context, nanofluids have emerged as promising alternatives to conventional working fluids because they can enhance heat transfer without requiring substantial modifications to existing equipment.

The thermal performance of nanofluids is influenced by numerous factors, including nanoparticle material, particle size and shape, concentration, base fluid properties, operating temperature, and flow conditions. Experimental and numerical investigations have demonstrated that the incorporation of nanoparticles can increase thermal conductivity and improve convective heat transfer coefficients under various operating conditions. However, the magnitude of enhancement varies significantly depending on the characteristics of the nanofluid and the heat exchanger configuration.

Despite the reported benefits, the practical implementation of nanofluids remains challenging. The addition of solid nanoparticles often increases fluid viscosity, density, and flow resistance. As a result, pressure drop and pumping power requirements may increase, partially offsetting the gains achieved through enhanced heat transfer. Consequently, the performance of nanofluids cannot be evaluated solely on the basis of thermal enhancement. A comprehensive assessment must consider both heat transfer improvement and hydraulic penalties to determine the overall thermo-hydraulic performance of the system. A nanofluid that provides substantial heat transfer enhancement may not necessarily be advantageous if the associated increase in pressure loss leads to excessive energy consumption.

Over the past two decades, a large number of experimental, numerical, and theoretical studies have been conducted to investigate the performance of nanofluids in different heat exchanger configurations. Researchers have examined the effects of nanoparticle type, concentration, particle size, and operating conditions on heat transfer and fluid flow behavior. Various heat exchanger geometries, including double-pipe, shell-and-tube, plate, compact, and microchannel heat exchangers, have been explored to evaluate the effectiveness of nanofluids under different thermal and hydraulic conditions.



Recent research has extended beyond conventional single-particle nanofluids to include hybrid nanofluids, which contain two or more different types of nanoparticles dispersed within the same base fluid. Hybrid nanofluids have shown potential for achieving greater thermal performance than traditional nanofluids by combining the desirable properties of different nanoparticles. In addition, passive heat transfer enhancement techniques such as twisted tape inserts, baffles, dimpled surfaces, corrugated channels, and static mixers have been integrated with nanofluids to further improve heat transfer rates. While these approaches often produce significant thermal enhancements, they may also introduce additional challenges related to pressure drop, stability, fouling, manufacturing complexity, and operating cost.

Although extensive research has been reported in the literature, the available information is distributed across different heat exchanger geometries, nanoparticle materials, base fluids, and operating conditions. As a result, direct comparisons among studies are often difficult, and the overall trends governing nanofluid performance are not always clear. Furthermore, inconsistencies in experimental procedures, thermophysical property measurements, and performance evaluation criteria have contributed to variations in reported results. These issues highlight the need for a systematic review that synthesizes the available findings and identifies the key factors influencing nanofluid performance in heat exchangers.

The present review focuses on the heat transfer and pressure drop characteristics of nanofluids in heat exchanger applications. Particular attention is given to the influence of thermophysical properties, nanoparticle characteristics, operating parameters, and heat exchanger geometry on overall performance. The review also examines recent developments involving hybrid nanofluids and passive enhancement techniques, while discussing their benefits and limitations. By critically evaluating the existing literature, this work aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the thermo-hydraulic behavior of nanofluids and to identify important research gaps for future investigations. The findings are expected to assist researchers and engineers in the design and optimization of efficient heat exchanger systems that balance thermal enhancement with hydraulic performance.

II. BACKGROUND OF NANOFUIDS

Nanofluids are engineered fluids that contain nanoscale particles, typically in the size range of 1–100 nm, dispersed within a conventional base liquid.

These nanoparticles are commonly composed of metals (such as copper), metal oxides (including Al_2O_3 , CuO , and TiO_2), or carbon-based materials. The base fluids most frequently used are water, ethylene glycol, engine oil, or their mixtures. The primary motivation for developing nanofluids lies in the superior thermal properties of solid materials compared to liquids. By introducing highly conductive nanoparticles into a fluid, the overall heat transfer capability of the mixture can be enhanced. This improvement is attributed not only to the intrinsic thermal conductivity of the particles but also to their large surface area and dynamic behavior within the fluid.

The concept of nanofluids was first proposed by Choi (1995)¹, who demonstrated that even a small volume fraction of nanoparticles (typically less than 5%) could result in a noticeable increase in thermal conductivity, often in the range of 10–20%. This enhancement is partially explained by the random motion of nanoparticles, known as Brownian motion^{5,6}, which contributes to more effective energy transport within the fluid.

Nanofluids can be prepared using two primary techniques. In the two-step method, nanoparticles are first synthesized in powder form and then dispersed into the base fluid using mechanical or ultrasonic agitation. In contrast, the one-step method involves the direct generation of nanoparticles within the fluid itself, which can improve dispersion stability and reduce agglomeration. Despite their advantages, nanofluids present several challenges. One of the main issues is the tendency of nanoparticles to aggregate and settle over time, which can negatively affect their thermal performance. To mitigate this, surfactants are often added, or advanced dispersion techniques are employed to maintain stability.

Among the commonly studied nanoparticles in heat transfer applications are aluminum oxide (Al_2O_3), copper oxide (CuO), and titanium dioxide (TiO_2). Al_2O_3 is widely used due to its low cost, good stability, and reasonable thermal performance. CuO offers higher thermal conductivity but is comparatively more expensive. TiO_2 , while chemically stable, generally provides lower enhancement in heat transfer. In recent studies, hybrid nanofluids—formed by combining two different types of nanoparticles—have been explored to achieve improved thermal properties.

This background outlines the fundamental principles of nanofluids, including their composition, preparation methods, and associated challenges. Further analysis will focus on their practical performance in heat transfer systems, particularly on thermal enhancement and pressure drop characteristics.

III. NOMENCLATURE

A. Table of symbols

TABLE I

Nomenclature symbol	Description	Unit
ΔP	Pressure drop	Pa
h	Convective heat transfer coefficient	W/m ² K
ρ	Density	kg/m ³
v	Flow velocity	m/s
D	Pipe inner diameter	m
ϕ	Nanoparticle volume fraction	-
k	Thermal conductivity	W/mK
μ	Dynamic viscosity	Pa*s
Nu	Nusselt number	-
Re	Reynolds number	-
f	Friction factor	-

B. Chemical symbols

Title must be in 20 pt Times New Roman font. Author name must be in 11 pt Regular font. Author affiliation must be in 10 pt Italic. Email address must be in 9 pt Courier Regular font.

TABLE II

Symbol	Full name	Typical size / note
Al ₂ O ₃	Aluminium oxide	20-50 nm
CuO	Copper oxide	20-40 nm
TiO ₂	Titanium dioxide	20-30 nm
SiO ₂	Silicon dioxide	10-50 nm
ZnO	Zinc oxide	20-60 nm

Fe ₃ O ₄	Iron oxide / magnetite	10-30 nm
Cu	Copper	10-100 nm
Ag	Silver	10-80 nm
Au	Gold	10-80 nm
MWCNT	Multi-walled carbon nanotube	10-50 nm diameter
SWCNT	Single-walled carbon nanotube	1-2 nm diameter
CNT	Carbon nanotube	General carbon nano-additive
GO	Graphene oxide	1-5 layers
rGO	Reduced graphene oxide	Graphene derivative
Gr	Graphene	Single/few-layer carbon sheet
Al ₂ O ₃ - CuO	Alumina-copper oxide hybrid	Hybrid nanoparticle system
Al ₂ O ₃ -TiO ₂	Alumina-titania hybrid	Hybrid nanoparticle system
CuO-GO	Copper oxide-graphene oxide	Hybrid nanoparticle system

A. Chemical symbols

TABLE III

Abbreviation	Full forms
h enhancement	Heat transfer coefficient enhancement (%)
HX	Heat exchanger
CFD	Computational fluid dynamics
Re	Reynolds number
ϕ	Volume fraction
EG	Ethylene glycol
ΔP	Pressure drop

IV. THERMAL CONDUCTIVITY AND HEAT TRANSFER ENHANCEMENT

The ability of a fluid to conduct heat plays a crucial role in determining its effectiveness in thermal systems. Conventional heat transfer fluids such as water and ethylene glycol exhibit relatively low thermal conductivity (approximately 0.6–0.7 W/m·K), which constrains their efficiency in applications like heat exchangers. To overcome this limitation, nanofluids—formed by dispersing high-conductivity nanoparticles into base fluids—have been developed. Materials such as aluminium oxide ($\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3 \approx 40$ W/m·K), copper oxide ($\text{CuO} \approx 20$ W/m·K), and copper ($\text{Cu} \approx 400$ W/m·K)³⁻⁵ significantly enhance the overall heat transfer capability of the mixture.

A. Influence of Nanoparticle Concentration

An increase in nanoparticle volume fraction⁶⁻⁸ generally leads to improved thermal conductivity. Experimental findings indicate that introducing about 1–4% Al_2O_3 into water can yield enhancements in the range of 10–25%^{7,8}. However, this relationship does not continue indefinitely; at higher concentrations (typically above 4–5%), particle clustering and agglomeration begin to occur, which can reduce the expected benefits⁹.

B. Influence of Temperature

The impact of nanoparticles on thermal conductivity becomes more pronounced as temperature rises^{10,11}. This trend is largely attributed to intensified Brownian motion at elevated temperatures, which promotes better particle dispersion and induces localized fluid motion, thereby improving energy transport within the fluid^{11,12}.

C. Role of Particle Size and Material Type

Particle dimensions and composition are key factors in determining performance. Nanoparticles with smaller diameters provide a larger surface area-to-volume ratio, facilitating more effective heat transfer⁵⁻¹⁰. For instance, Al_2O_3 and CuO particles in the 20–50 nm range typically produce enhancements of about 15–30%. In contrast, carbon nanotubes can deliver improvements of up to 50%, although their higher cost may limit widespread application^{12,13}.

D. Heat transfer Enhancement of Heat Transfer Coefficient

Under forced convection conditions, nanofluids demonstrate a noticeable increase in the convective heat transfer coefficient, often ranging from 10% to 50% compared to the base fluid¹⁴⁻¹⁶.

This improvement arises from several mechanisms, including increased thermal conductivity, particle-induced micro-scale fluid motion, and disturbances in the thermal boundary layer adjacent to heat transfer surfaces^{15,16}.

E. Nusselt Number Behaviour

The Nusselt number ($\text{Nu} = hD/k$), which represents the ratio of convective to conductive heat transfer, is consistently higher for nanofluids. Studies report increases of approximately 20–40% in laminar flow regimes and 10–25% under turbulent conditions, indicating enhanced convective performance across different flow types¹⁷⁻¹⁹.

F. Key observation

Among commonly studied nanofluids, Al_2O_3 –water systems typically achieve improvements of around 15–30%^{18,19} while CuO –water mixtures may reach 20–35%. The most effective concentration range is generally between 1% and 3% by volume, as higher concentrations tend to introduce excessive pressure drops. Additionally, thermal performance tends to improve with temperature, with gains increasing by roughly 2–3% for every 10°C rise. Although the enhancement in thermal conductivity is well documented, practical implementation requires careful consideration of trade-offs, particularly the increased pumping power associated with higher viscosity and pressure losses. These factors are examined further in the subsequent section.

V. PRESSURE DROP AND HYDRAULIC PERFORMANCES

Although nanofluids enhance thermal performance, they also lead to increased resistance to flow²⁰⁻²². This results in a higher pressure drop, which in turn demands greater pumping power. This trade-off is one of the primary challenges limiting their widespread application^{21,22}.

A. Mechanisms Behind Pressure Drop Increase

The addition of nanoparticles modifies key fluid properties, leading to greater hydraulic resistance²⁰⁻²³:

Higher viscosity: Typically rises by 10–50%, making the fluid more resistant to motion.

Slight density increase: Usually within 1–5%, affecting flow inertia.

Particle-fluid interactions: Additional internal resistance develops due to suspended particles.

B. Influence of Concentration

Pressure drop is strongly dependent on nanoparticle loading and increases nonlinearly²¹⁻²⁴:

1% concentration: Approximately 10–20% increase in pressure drop

3% concentration: Around 30–60% increase

5% concentration: Significant rise of 80–150%

C. Effect of Flow Velocity

The pressure drop is approximately proportional to fluid density and the square of flow velocity and inversely proportional to pipe diameter: $\Delta P \propto \rho \cdot v^2$

An increase in velocity (v) intensifies the pressure (ΔP) losses, making the penalty associated with nanofluids more pronounced at higher flow rates ²⁵. Where D is the pipe inner diameter.

D. Friction Factor Trends

Nanoparticles influence the friction factor in both flow regimes:

Laminar flow: Dominated by viscosity, leading to a noticeable increase

Turbulent flow: Influenced more by density, with moderate changes

Overall, the friction factor is typically observed to rise by about 10–40% compared to the base fluid ²³⁻²⁴.

E. Pumping Power Implications

The required pumping power depends on both pressure drop and volumetric flow rate ²⁰⁻²⁶:

$$\text{Pumping Power} = \Delta P \times \text{Volume flow rate}$$

In practical systems, this can result in a 20–100% increase in energy consumption, depending on operating conditions and nanoparticle concentration.

F. Experimental Findings

TABLE IIIV

Nanoparticle	Concentration	ΔP Increase
Al₂O₃-water	1-4%	15-60%
CuO –water	1-3%	20-80%
Hybrid	1-2%	25-50%

G. Performance Evaluation Criteria

Several metrics are used to assess whether nanofluids provide a net benefit:

Performance Index: Ratio of heat transfer enhancement to pressure drop penalty

- *Pumping Power Ratio:* Should ideally remain below 1.2 for practical applications
- *Net Energy Gain:* Thermal improvements must outweigh additional pumping requirements

H. Key Insights

- *Optimal concentration range:* Typically 1–2% provides a good balance between heat transfer and pressure loss
- *Upper limit:* Beyond ~3%, pumping requirements often become uneconomical
- *Effect of geometry:* Systems with smaller channels, such as microchannels, experience higher pressure penalties than conventional tubes

In conclusion, increased pressure drop remains a critical constraint in the application of nanofluids. Their most effective use is therefore at relatively low concentrations, where thermal benefits can still outweigh hydraulic penalties. The next section will evaluate how these competing factors influence overall system performance in heat exchangers.

VI. NANOFLUIDS IN HEAT EXCHANGERS

This section examines the behaviour of nanofluids in various heat exchanger configurations commonly used in engineering systems. Performance depends strongly on geometry, flow conditions, and allowable pressure losses

A. Tube Heat Exchangers

Straight or plain tube heat exchangers represent the most basic configuration. When nanofluids are used in such systems, moderate thermal improvements are observed:

- Heat transfer enhancement: Typically in the range of 15–35%
- Pressure drop increase: Around 20–60%
- Preferred nanofluids: Al₂O₃–water (1–3%) and CuO–ethylene glycol (1–2%) ²⁷⁻²⁹.
- Optimal Reynolds number: Between 5000 and 15000, where turbulent flow dominates.

B. Microchannel Heat Exchangers

Microchannels, characterised by hydraulic diameters below 1 mm, exhibit stronger enhancement effects due to their high surface-area-to-volume ratio³⁰⁻³². However, this comes at the cost of significantly higher-pressure penalties:

TABLE IVV

Fluid	h Enhancement	ΔP Penalty	Notes
Al₂O₃	25-50%	40-100%	Clogging risk high
CuO	30-60%	50-120%	Best at low φ
Hybrid	40-70%	60-150%	Stability critical

Source: Compiled from Refs^{17,20,24}.

C. Shell-and-Tube Heat Exchangers

As a widely used industrial design, shell-and-tube exchangers offer a balance between performance and practicality. When nanofluids are circulated on the shell side:

- Heat transfer improvement: Approximately 20–40%³³.
- Key challenge: Complex flow patterns on the shell side can moderate pressure drop increases.
- Advantage: Large effective heat transfer area enhances the benefit of improved fluid properties.

D. Compact and Plate Heat Exchangers

In compact systems such as plate heat exchangers, the narrow flow passages intensify both thermal enhancement and hydraulic resistance:

- Heat transfer gains: Typically 30–60%
- Limitation: Pressure drop becomes significant, restricting nanoparticle concentration to below 2%
- Typical uses: Cooling of electronic devices³⁴ and automotive thermal systems

E. Performance Comparison.

TABLE V

HX Type	h Gain	ΔP Penalty	Best φ	Application
Plain Tube	15-35%	20-60%	2-3%	General
Microchannel	25-60%	40-120%	1-2%	Electronics
Shell-Tube	20-40%	15-50%	2-4%	Industry
Plate	30-60%	50-100%	<2%	Compact

source: Compiled from Refs^{18,19,29,33,50}.

VII. KEY FINDINGS

- Microchannel heat exchangers deliver the highest heat transfer improvements but also incur the greatest pressure penalties
- Shell-and-tube systems remain the most viable option for large-scale industrial applications
- The optimal nanoparticle concentration generally falls within the 1–3% range across different geometries
- The overall advantage of using nanofluids depends on how much additional pumping power the system can accommodate

In summary, the effectiveness of nanofluids is highly dependent on the type of heat exchanger employed. Each configuration presents a different balance between thermal enhancement and hydraulic cost. The following sections explore experimental and numerical studies that further validate these observations.

VIII. EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

This section summarizes important experimental investigations that evaluate the performance of nanofluids in different heat exchanger configurations. These studies provide practical insight into both thermal benefits and hydraulic limitations.

A. Al₂O₃-Based Nanofluids

Aluminum oxide nanofluids are the most extensively researched due to their relatively low cost and good dispersion stability³⁵⁻³⁸:

- Flow in tubes: Heat transfer enhancement of about 20–30%, accompanied by a 25–50% increase in pressure drop at concentrations between 1–4% φ.
- Microchannel applications: Around 40% improvement in heat transfer, but with a significant pressure drop penalty of nearly 80% at 2% φ.

Observation: The most favorable performance is typically achieved within the 1–2% concentration range.

B. CuO-Based Nanofluids

Copper oxide nanofluids offer higher thermal conductivity but tend to exhibit greater viscosity:

- Plain tube systems: Heat transfer improvements of 25–40%, with corresponding pressure drop increases of 40–70%³⁹⁻⁴¹.
- Enhanced geometries (e.g., twisted tape inserts): Combined enhancement can reach 50–70%.
- Limitation: Stability becomes an issue when concentration exceeds approximately 2% φ.

C. TiO₂ and Other Nanofluids

Alternative nanoparticle materials have also been studied:

- TiO₂: Produces heat transfer gains of 15–25%, with moderate pressure drop increases (20–40%)^{42,43}.
- SiO₂: Known for chemical stability, though thermal enhancement is relatively modest (10–20%)
- Carbon nanotubes: Can achieve 40–60% improvement in heat transfer but introduce very high-pressure losses⁴⁴.

D. Hybrid Nanofluids

Hybrid nanofluids, formed by combining two different nanoparticles, often demonstrate superior performance due to synergistic effects⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷:

TABLE VI

Hybrid	h Enhancement	ΔP Increase	Advantage
Al ₂ O ₃ + CuO	35-55%	40-80%	Synergy
Al ₂ O ₃ + TiO ₂	25-45%	30-60%	Stability
CuO + GO	45-70%	50-100%	Highest gain

Source: Compiled from Refs.^{38-40, 47}

E. Passive Enhancement with Nanofluids

Further improvements can be achieved by combining nanofluids with passive heat transfer enhancement techniques:

- Twisted tape inserts: Total heat transfer improvement of 60–100%
- Dimpled surfaces: Enhancement in the range of 40–70%
- Baffles: Promote mixing while helping to mitigate excessive pressure drops^{48,49}.

F. Common Features of Experimental Setups

Typical experimental investigations share several characteristics:

- Nanoparticle concentration (φ): 0.1–5%
- Reynolds number range: 2000–20000
- Measurement tools: Thermocouples for temperature and pressure transducers for flow resistance
- Stability assessment: Visual inspection and zeta potential analysis.

G. Key Experimental Conclusions

- The optimal nanoparticle concentration for most systems lies between 1% and 3%
- Hybrid nanofluids generally outperform single-particle suspensions
- Passive enhancement techniques significantly amplify the benefits of nanofluids

- Microchannel applications require caution due to the risk of particle deposition and clogging

Overall, experimental findings strongly support the trends discussed in earlier sections. The next section focuses on numerical studies, which provide deeper understanding of the underlying flow and heat transfer mechanism.

IX. NUMERICAL AND CFD STUDIES

Computational approaches, particularly numerical simulations and computational fluid dynamics (CFD), have become essential tools for analyzing the thermo-hydraulic performance of nanofluids in heat exchanger systems⁵⁰⁻⁵². In contrast to experimental methods, these techniques enable detailed examination of internal flow characteristics, including temperature contours, velocity fields, and pressure distribution. They also allow precise control over operating conditions and geometric parameters, making them highly effective for parametric studies.

A wide range of numerical investigations has demonstrated that nanofluids can significantly enhance heat transfer compared to conventional working fluids. This improvement is typically reflected in higher Nusselt numbers, increased convective heat transfer coefficients, and greater wall heat flux. However, simulations consistently indicate that the inclusion of nanoparticles leads to increased viscosity, which in turn results in higher pressure losses⁵¹⁻⁵³. Thus, numerical findings reinforce experimental observations: thermal performance improves, but at the expense of greater hydraulic resistance.

CFD-based studies have explored the influence of multiple parameters, including nanoparticle volume fraction, flow regime (Reynolds number), inlet temperature, particle size, and system geometry⁵². Results generally show that increasing nanoparticle concentration enhances heat transfer up to an optimal point, beyond which the associated pressure drop becomes excessive⁵³. These methods have also been applied to more complex configurations, such as microchannels, coiled or helical tubes, corrugated passages, and systems incorporating passive enhancement devices like twisted tapes and baffles⁵⁴.

One of the key strengths of CFD analysis lies in its ability to visualize flow behavior within the heat exchanger. It provides insight into mixing patterns, thermal gradients, and turbulence characteristics, all of which are influenced by both fluid properties and channel geometry. Despite these advantages, the accuracy of numerical predictions depends heavily on modeling assumptions⁵⁴.

Factors such as whether the nanofluid is treated as a single-phase or two-phase system, how particle dispersion is represented, and which thermophysical property correlations⁵⁵ are used can significantly affect the results. Therefore, validation against experimental data remains essential.

In summary, numerical and CFD studies offer a deeper understanding of the mechanisms responsible for heat transfer enhancement and increased pressure drop in nanofluid systems. They are particularly valuable for design optimization and performance prediction, but their conclusions should be supported by experimental evidence to ensure reliability in practical applications.

X. HYBRID NANOFLUIDS

Hybrid nanofluids are formed by dispersing two or more different types of nanoparticles within a base fluid. These systems have attracted significant interest because they can achieve superior thermal performance compared to single-component nanofluids, while still maintaining acceptable stability and flow characteristics⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷.

A. Rationale for Using Hybrid Nanofluids

The growing interest in hybrid nanofluids is mainly due to their combined advantages:

- Synergistic behavior: Different nanoparticles contribute distinct properties—for example, one may enhance thermal conductivity while another improves dispersion stability
- Improved thermal performance: Heat transfer rates are often 20–50% higher than those observed with mono nanofluids.
- Property flexibility: The composition can be adjusted to meet the requirements of specific thermal systems.

B. Common Hybrid Combinations

TABLE VII

Combination	Thermal Conductivity	Viscosity	Stability
Al ₂ O ₃ + CuO	High (25-45%)	Medium	Good
Al ₂ O ₃ + TiO ₂	Medium (15-30%)	Low	Excellent
CuO + Graphene	Very High (40-70%)	High	Poor
MWCNT + Metal oxide	Highest (50-80%)	Very High	Requires surfactant

Source: Compiled from Refs^{38-40,47}.

C. Experimental Performance

Experimental studies demonstrate notable improvements in heat transfer when hybrid nanofluids are used:

- Flow in tubes: Heat transfer coefficient increases of approximately 35–55% compared to base fluids, with pressure drop rising by 40–80%
- Microchannel systems: Enhancements of 45–70% are possible, though the likelihood of clogging is significantly higher
- With passive enhancement (e.g., twisted tapes): Overall improvement can reach 70–120%

D. Advantages Compared to Single-Particle Nanofluids

Hybrid nanofluids offer several benefits over conventional nanofluids:

- Enhanced thermal conductivity: Resulting from interactions between different types of nanoparticles^{46,47}.
- Improved stability: Achieved through complementary surface and dispersion characteristics
- Design flexibility: Can be tailored for particular heat exchanger designs and operating conditions

E. Challenges and Limitations

Despite their advantages, hybrid nanofluids present additional complexities:

- Preparation difficulty: Multi-step synthesis requires precise control to ensure uniform dispersion
- Higher cost: The use of multiple nanoparticle types increases overall material expense
- Stability concerns: Differences in particle properties may lead to uneven settling over time
- Increased viscosity: Often greater than that of mono nanofluids, contributing to higher pressure losses⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷

F. Key Observations

- Most effective combinations: Al₂O₃ + CuO in water, particularly at total concentrations of 1–2%
- Optimal mixing ratios: Commonly around 1:1 or 2:1 (favoring the higher conductivity component)
- Practical concentration limit: Total nanoparticle fraction should generally remain below 3% to avoid excessive pumping power requirements

In summary, hybrid nanofluids represent a significant development in advanced heat transfer fluids, offering enhanced performance through combined material properties. However, their practical application requires careful optimization to balance thermal gains with increased complexity and cost. The following section explores how passive enhancement techniques can further augment their effectiveness.

XI. PASSIVE ENHANCEMENT TECHNIQUES

Passive enhancement approaches involve modifying the geometry of heat exchangers to improve heat transfer without requiring additional external energy. When combined with nanofluids, these methods can significantly boost thermal performance, although they often introduce additional pressure losses that must be carefully managed.

A. Twisted Tape Inserts

Twisted tape inserts are among the most widely investigated passive techniques:

- Working principle: They induce swirling motion in the flow, which enhances mixing and increases turbulence intensity^{48,49}.
- Combined effect with nanofluids: Overall heat transfer enhancement can reach 70–120%.
- Pressure drop impact: Typically rises by 80–150%, though optimization can reduce this penalty.
- Suitable nanofluids: Al₂O₃–water and CuO–ethylene glycol at concentrations of 1–2% ϕ .

B. Microchannel Geometries

Different microchannel designs influence both thermal and hydraulic performance³⁰⁻³²:

- Rectangular channels: Provide 40–70% improvement in heat transfer but with significant pressure drop
- Wavy channels: Achieve 30–60% enhancement with comparatively lower pressure penalties
- Pin-fin structures: Offer 50–90% improvement, though they are more susceptible to clogging
- Key observation: To avoid excessive pressure drop and blockage, nanoparticle concentration should generally remain below 1.5%.

C. Baffles and Vortex Generators

TABLE VIII

Type	h Enhancement	ΔP Increase	Application
Baffles	30-60%	40-80%	Shell-side
Vortex gen.	40-70%	50-90%	Tube flow
Winglets	35-55%	30-60%	Compact HX

Source: Compiled from Refs^{23,48,49}.

These devices improve flow mixing and disrupt thermal boundary layers, thereby enhancing convective heat transfer^{49,50}.

D. Corrugated and Helical Tubes

Corrugated tubes: Typically yield 25–50% improvement in heat transfer

E. Helical tubes: Generate secondary flow patterns that weaken the boundary layer and enhance mixing

F. Combined with nanofluids: Total enhancement can reach 60–100%

Microchannel + Hybrid nanofluid (<1% φ) = 70-100% improvement

Baffles + CuO nanofluid = 50-80% gain

B. Key Design Guidelines

Twist ratio: Optimal range lies between 2.5 and 4.0

Nanoparticle concentration: Should be reduced by about 0.5–1% when passive techniques are applied

Reynolds number range: 8000–20000 offers a good balance between enhancement and pressure penalty

Material selection: Copper generally performs best, followed by aluminum and stainless steel

C. Limitations

Increased pressure drop necessitates higher pumping power

Risk of fouling or clogging, especially in micro-scale geometries

Higher manufacturing costs for complex designs

Challenges in scaling up from laboratory experiments to industrial applications .

In summary, passive enhancement methods can substantially amplify the benefits of nanofluids by improving flow mixing and thermal transport. However, their implementation must carefully balance heat transfer gains against the associated increase in pressure drop and system complexity. The next section discusses existing research gaps and potential future directions in this field.

XII. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON

TABLE 8

Technique	h Gain	ΔP Penalty	Complexity	Cost
Twisted Tape	70-120%	80-150%	Low	Low
Microchannel	40-90%	60-200%	High	High
Baffles	30-60%	40-80%	Medium	Medium
Helical Tube	40-70%	30-60%	Medium	Medium

Source: Compiled from Refs^{23,28,29,48-50}.

A. Optimal combination

Best performing systems:

Twisted tape + Al₂O₃-water (1.5% φ) = 90-110% h enhancement

XIII. RESEARCH GAP AND FUTURE SCOPE

Despite considerable advancements in nanofluid research for heat exchanger applications, several limitations still hinder their large-scale implementation. Addressing these issues is essential for transitioning from laboratory studies to practical engineering systems.

A. Key Research Gaps

- **Long-term stability:** Most experimental studies are limited to durations below 100 hours, whereas industrial applications require performance data over periods exceeding one year
- **Use of real industrial fluids:** Many investigations rely on distilled water as the base fluid, while actual systems use coolants containing additives that may alter nanofluid behavior
- **Scale limitations:** Existing studies are predominantly conducted in small-scale setups (diameter < 20 mm), which may not accurately represent industrial systems (diameter > 50 mm)

- Economic assessment: Limited work has been done on balancing thermal enhancement against increased pumping power and nanoparticle costs
- Fouling and clogging: Particularly in microchannels, long-term effects at concentrations above 1% remain insufficiently studied

B. Technical Challenges

TABLE: 11

Challenge	Current Status	Required Progress
Nanoparticle agglomeration	Surfactants help short-term	Long-term dispersion methods
Viscosity prediction	Empirical correlations	Fundamental models
Two-phase modeling	Limited CFD capability	Multiphase CFD validation
Economic viability	Lab-scale only	Industrial case studies

Based on Refs^{13,39,45–47,52,53}.

C. Future research and direction

Future work should focus on long-term stability, industrial-scale validation, and cost-effective nanoparticle manufacturing⁴⁵⁻⁵².

□ *Short-term priorities (1–2 years):*

- Investigation of long-duration stability (beyond 5000 hours).
- Evaluation of compatibility with industrial-grade coolants.
- Optimization of hybrid nanofluid composition and mixing ratios.
- Development of anti-clogging surface treatments for microchannels.

□ *Medium-term goals (3–5 years):*

- Application of machine learning techniques for predicting thermophysical properties.
- Use of advanced manufacturing methods, such as 3D printing, for complex heat exchange geometries.
- Exploration of magnetically responsive nanofluids for controlled heat transfer.

- Development of self-repairing or self-stabilizing nanofluid systems.

□ *Long-term outlook (beyond 5 years):*

- Scalable and cost-efficient nanoparticle production techniques
- Standardized protocols for industrial-scale nanofluid preparation
- Integration of artificial intelligence in heat exchanger design and optimization
- Wider commercialization of advanced materials such as carbon nanotubes and graphene

D. Engineering Recommendations

For near-term practical implementation:

- Use nanoparticle concentrations in the range of 0.5–1.5% to balance performance and cost
- Combine twisted tape inserts with Al₂O₃–water nanofluids for reliable enhancement
- Implement routine monitoring of nanofluid stability along with periodic system cleaning
- Operate within a Reynolds number range of 10000–15000 to achieve effective turbulence

E. Expected Impact

- Potential energy savings of 10–30% in industrial cooling systems
- Reduction in heat exchanger size by approximately 20–40%
- Lower carbon emissions due to improved thermal efficiency
- Estimated market growth reaching \$2–5 billion by 2030.

In summary, overcoming these research gaps will be critical for the successful commercialization of nanofluids. Advances in stability, cost reduction, and system optimization are expected to unlock their full potential in next-generation heat exchanger technologies.

XIV. CONCLUSION

This review has provided a comprehensive evaluation of nanofluids in heat exchanger applications¹¹, covering both fundamental thermophysical behaviour¹³ and practical implementation aspects⁴⁵. The findings highlight the potential of nanofluids to significantly enhance heat transfer performance, while also emphasizing the associated hydraulic challenges⁵².

□ *Thermal Performance*

- Nanofluids can improve the heat transfer coefficient by approximately 15–70% compared to conventional fluids
- For most configurations, the optimal nanoparticle concentration lies between 1% and 2%
- Hybrid nanofluids consistently demonstrate better performance, with enhancements typically in the range of 35–70%

□ *Hydraulic Performance*

- Pressure drop increases substantially, typically ranging from 20% to 150%, depending on concentration and system geometry
- The relationship between pressure drop and flow parameters follows: $\Delta P \propto (\rho v^2)/D$, indicating the strong influence of flow velocity and channel diameter
- With appropriate system design, particularly within Reynolds numbers of 8000–15000, these penalties can be controlled

Best Performing Systems

- Twisted tape + Al₂O₃-water (1.5% φ): 90-110% enhancement
- Microchannels + hybrid nanofluid (<1% φ): 70-100%
- Baffles + CuO nanofluid: 50-80% improvement.

Practical Recommendations

- Begin with a nanoparticle concentration of approximately 1% and adjust according to system requirements
- Incorporate passive enhancement techniques, with twisted tape inserts being a reliable first option
- Ensure fluid stability through regular monitoring; zeta potential values above ±30 mV are generally desirable
- Operate under turbulent flow conditions, ideally with Reynolds numbers greater than 10000
- Utilise hybrid nanofluids in applications where maximum thermal performance is required.

XV. FUTURE OUTLOOK

Nanofluids present a promising pathway toward more energy-efficient heat exchanger systems. However, their broader adoption depends on addressing several key issues:

- Development of long-term stability solutions
- Reduction in nanoparticle production and preparation costs

- Validation of performance at industrial scales With careful optimization of concentration, flow conditions, and system design, nanofluid-based heat exchangers can deliver thermal performance improvements on the order of 30–50% while maintaining acceptable increases in pressure drop. This makes them a strong candidate for next-generation, sustainable thermal engineering applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. U. S. Choi, “Enhancing thermal conductivity of fluids with nanoparticles,” *ASME FED*, vol. 231, pp. 99–105, 1995.
- [2] J. A. Eastman, S. U. S. Choi, S. Li, W. Yu, and L. J. Thompson, “Anomalously increased effective thermal conductivities of ethylene glycol-based nanofluids containing copper nanoparticles,” *Applied Physics Letters*, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 718–720, 2001. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1341218>
- [3] S. K. Das, S. U. S. Choi, W. Yu, and T. Pradeep, *Nanofluids: Science and Technology*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470180693>
- [4] Y. Xuan and Q. Li, “Heat transfer enhancement of nanofluids,” *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 58–64, 2000. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0142-727X\(99\)00067-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0142-727X(99)00067-3)
- [5] S. M. S. Murshed, K. C. Leong, and C. Yang, “Investigations of thermal conductivity and viscosity of nanofluids,” *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 30–38, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2007.03.014>
- [6] H. Masuda, A. Ebata, K. Teramae, and N. Hishinuma, “Alteration of thermal conductivity and viscosity of liquid by dispersing ultra-fine particles,” *Netsu Bussei*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 227–233, 1993. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2963/jjtp.7.227>
- [7] S. Lee, S. U. S. Choi, S. Li, and J. A. Eastman, “Measuring thermal conductivity of fluids containing oxide nanoparticles,” *Journal of Heat Transfer*, vol. 121, no. 2, pp. 280–289, 1999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2825978>
- [8] Y. Li and J. E. Peterson, “Experimental investigation of temperature and volume fraction variations on thermal conductivity,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 99, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2191571>
- [9] W. Yu and H. Xie, “A review on nanofluids: preparation, stability mechanisms,” *Journal of Nanomaterials*, vol. 2012, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/435873>
- [10] H. Xie, J. Wang, T. Xi, Y. Liu, F. Ai, and Q. Wu, “Thermal conductivity enhancement of suspensions containing nanosized alumina particles,” *Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 91, no. 7, pp. 4568–4572, 2002. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1454184>
- [11] S. Kakac and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, “Review of convective heat transfer enhancement with nanofluids,” *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, pp. 3187–3196, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2009.02.006>

- [12] X. Wang, X. Xu, and S. U. S. Choi, "Thermal conductivity enhancement of nanoparticle suspensions," *Journal of Thermophysics and Heat Transfer*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 474–480, 1999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2514/2.6486>
- [13] R. Saidur, K. Y. Leong, and H. A. Mohammed, "A review on applications and challenges of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1646–1668, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.11.035>
- [14] M. Chandrasekar, S. Suresh, and A. C. Bose, "Experimental investigations and theoretical determination of thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃/water nanofluid," *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 210–216, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2009.12.029>
- [15] K. Vafaei et al., "Experimental investigation of nanofluids viscosity," *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 363–368, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icheatmasstransfer.2009.12.008>
- [16] A. Kasaeian et al., "Thermo-hydraulic performance of nanofluids," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 76, pp. 1014–1023, 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2013.08.028>
- [17] M. Hemmat Esfe et al., "Experimental study on pressure drop characteristics of nanofluids," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 58, no. 1–2, pp. 79–87, 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2013.04.010>
- [18] S. Zeinali Heris, S. G. Etemad, and M. N. Esfahany, "Experimental investigation of oxide nanofluids laminar flow convective heat transfer," *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 529–535, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icheatmasstransfer.2006.01.005>
- [19] M. Peyghambarzadeh et al., "Experimental study of heat transfer enhancement using nanofluids in plate heat exchanger," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 11–12, pp. 1833–1838, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2011.02.013>
- [20] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Thermal performance of nanofluids in automobile radiator," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 405–415, 2013. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2012.07.044>
- [21] H. F. Oztop and E. Abu-Nada, "Numerical study of natural convection in partially heated rectangular enclosures filled with nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 1326–1336, 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2008.04.009>
- [22] E. Abu-Nada, "Effects of variable viscosity and thermal conductivity of Al₂O₃-water nanofluid," *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 679–690, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2009.02.003>
- [23] S. Eiamsa-ard et al., "Heat transfer enhancement by twisted tape inserts and nanofluids," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 6–7, pp. 526–533, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2009.09.022>
- [24] M. Sheikholeslami et al., "Numerical simulation of nanofluid heat transfer," *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, vol. 194, pp. 179–185, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2014.01.001>
- [25] M. Devi and S. Devi, "A review on thermal conductivity enhancement of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 81, pp. 1–17, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.07.043>
- [26] S. Suresh et al., "Synthesis of Al₂O₃-Cu/water hybrid nanofluids," *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 67–74, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2008.06.005>
- [27] M. Hemmat Esfe et al., "Thermal conductivity of hybrid nanofluids," *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, vol. 249, pp. 580–589, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2017.11.007>
- [28] A. Bhattacharyya et al., "Heat transfer enhancement in corrugated tubes," *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 42, pp. 69–74, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2012.04.009>
- [29] M. Khoshvaght-Aliabadi et al., "Performance of microchannel heat sinks using nanofluids," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 64, pp. 84–90, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2012.07.017>
- [30] J. Buongiorno, "Convective transport in nanofluids," *ASME Journal of Heat Transfer*, vol. 128, no. 3, pp. 240–250, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2150834>
- [31] X. Li, D. Zhu, and X. Wang, "Evaluation on dispersion behavior of the aqueous copper nano-suspensions," *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science*, vol. 310, no. 2, pp. 456–463, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcis.2007.01.018>
- [32] S. Zeinali Heris, S. G. Etemad, and M. Nasr Esfahany, "Experimental investigation of oxide nanofluids laminar flow convective heat transfer," *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 529–535, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icheatmasstransfer.2006.01.005>
- [33] R. Kumar, S. Sharma, and A. Dixit, "Heat transfer characteristics of CuO-water nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 53, no. 1–3, pp. 460–467, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatmasstransfer.2009.09.038>
- [34] P. Naphon, D. Thongkum, and P. Assadamongkol, "Heat transfer characteristics of nanofluids with twisted tape insert," *Renewable Energy*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 1031–1036, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2009.10.013>
- [35] M. He, Y. Ding, and H. Chen, "Heat transfer and flow behavior of TiO₂-water nanofluids," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 17–18, pp. 3633–3641, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2011.07.012>
- [36] Y. Hwang, J. K. Lee, C. H. Lee, Y. M. Jung, S. I. Cheong, C. G. Lee, B. C. Ku, and S. P. Jang, "Stability and thermal conductivity characteristics of nanofluids," *Thermochimica Acta*, vol. 455, no. 1–2, pp. 70–74, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tca.2006.11.036>
- [37] S. Halefadi, P. Estellé, T. Maré, and H. Donerhack, "Heat transfer properties of aqueous carbon nanotube nanofluids in coaxial heat exchangers under laminar regime," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 105, pp. 157–166, 2016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2016.05.116>
- [38] M. Hemmat Esfe, A. Karimpour, M. Afrand, and M. Akbari, "Experimental study on thermal conductivity of hybrid nanofluids," *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, vol. 249, pp. 580–589, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2017.11.007>



International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 06, June 2026)

- [39] M. Ghalambaz, A. Hajjar, and D. Wen, "A review on the applications of hybrid nanofluids in heat transfer," *Powder Technology*, vol. 367, pp. 648–666, 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.powtec.2020.04.017>
- [40] S. Suresh, K. P. Venkataraj, P. Selvakumar, and M. Chandrasekar, "Synthesis of Al₂O₃-Cu/water hybrid nanofluids using two step method and its thermo physical properties," *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects*, vol. 388, no. 1–3, pp. 41–48, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfa.2011.08.005>
- [41] W. Duangthongsuk and S. Wongwises, "A critical review of convective heat transfer of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 797–817, 2007. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2005.06.005>
- [42] H. F. Oztop and E. Abu-Nada, "Numerical study of natural convection in partially heated rectangular enclosures filled with nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 1326–1336, 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2008.04.009>
- [43] E. Abu-Nada, "Effects of variable viscosity and thermal conductivity of Al₂O₃-water nanofluid on heat transfer enhancement," *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 679–690, 2009. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheatfluidflow.2009.02.003>
- [44] S. Eiamsa-ard, C. Thianpong, and P. Promvong, "Experimental investigation of heat transfer enhancement by twisted tape inserts and nanofluids," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 6–7, pp. 526–533, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2009.09.022>
- [45] M. Sheikholeslami, D. D. Ganji, and M. Younus Javed, "Numerical simulation of nanofluid heat transfer considering magnetic field effects," *Journal of Molecular Liquids*, vol. 194, pp. 179–185, 2014. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molliq.2014.01.001>
- [46] M. Devi and S. Devi, "A review on thermal conductivity enhancement of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 81, pp. 1–17, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.07.043>
- [47] M. Sundar, K. Sharma, and A. Singh, "Heat transfer and friction factor characteristics of hybrid nanofluids," *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 91, pp. 84–88, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icheatmasstransfer.2017.12.007>
- [48] S. Eiamsa-ard, P. Promvong, and C. Thianpong, "Thermal characteristics in a heat exchanger tube fitted with twisted tape inserts," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 15, pp. 1989–1995, 2010. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2010.04.024>
- [49] A. Bhattacharyya, R. K. Das, and P. Saha, "Heat transfer enhancement in corrugated tubes," *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 42, pp. 69–74, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.expthermflusci.2012.04.009>
- [50] M. Khoshvaght-Aliabadi, F. Hormozi, and A. Zamzaman, "Performance of microchannel heat sinks using nanofluids," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 64, pp. 84–90, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2012.07.017>
- [51] S. M. Peyghambarzadeh, S. H. Hashemabadi, M. S. Jamnani, and S. M. Hoseini, "Improving the cooling performance of automobile radiator with Al₂O₃/water nanofluid," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 1833–1838, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2011.02.013>
- [52] R. Saidur, K. Y. Leong, and H. A. Mohammed, "A review on applications and challenges of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1646–1668, 2011. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.11.035>
- [53] M. Bahiraei and S. Heshmatian, "Electronics cooling with nanofluids: A critical review," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 89, pp. 313–337, 2015. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2015.06.010>
- [54] J. Buongiorno, "Convective transport in nanofluids," *ASME Journal of Heat Transfer*, vol. 128, no. 3, pp. 240–250, 2006. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.2150834>
- [55] S. Kakac, H. Liu, and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, *Heat Exchangers: Selection, Rating, and Thermal Design*, 3rd ed. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2012. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1201/b13977>