COMPARATIVE THERMODYNAMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF VAPOR COMPRESSION REFRIGERATION SYSTEM USING C-PENTANE AS REFRIGERANT

Bayram KILIÇ^{1*}, Emre ARABACI², Ali ÖZ³

¹Department of Electricity and Energy, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University ²Department of Automotive Engineering, Pamukkale University ³Department of Automotive, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University

ABSTRACT: The selection of refrigerant is one of the most important parameters when designing a cooling system. Hydrocarbon refrigerants have low primary energy requirements for effective cooling capacity and favorable thermodynamic properties that reduce both direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions. In this study, a comparative performance and environmental analysis of the vapor compression refrigeration cycle using C-Pentane as the refrigerant was performed. The cooling performance and environmental effect of C-Pentane has been compared with the cooling performance and environmental effect of R134A, R407C and R404A refrigerants in the cooling system. During the analysis, the cooling system was examined under different operating conditions. The highest coefficient of performance (COP) value in the analysis was 6.485 for the refrigeration cycle using C-Pentane, and this value was obtained at 0 °C evaporator temperature and 25 °C condenser temperature operating condition. According to the Life Cycle Climate Performance (LCCP) analysis for refrigerants, the lowest total emission value belongs to C-Pentane. Direct Emission (DE) value and indirect emission (IE) value of C-Pentane are 57.5 kgCO₂ and 24928.04 kgCO₂, respectively. **Keywords:** C-Pentane, Environmental Analysis, Thermodynamic Analysis, Refrigeration System.

1. INTRODUCTION

AK BILGİSAYAR VE BILİSİM FAKÜLTESİ

Hydrocarbons are called natural coolants because they occur in the matter cycle in the soil. For example, they are byproducts of natural gas production or oil refineries. Hydrocarbons are highly flammable, combustible and virtually odorless. Cooling systems using natural refrigerants can play an important role against global warming. Hydrocarbon refrigerants have become important for refrigeration systems, as halogenated and fluorinated refrigerants cannot be used in a very short time. The most known hydrocarbon fluids are n-butane, iso-butane, propane, propylene, n-pentane and C-pentane which has been the most preferred in recent years. C-pentane is preferred as a refrigerant used especially in cooling systems and thermal balancing applications. This refrigerant is often used in place of other refrigerants such as R-12 and R-134a. C-pentane has an ozone depletion potential (ODP) of 0 and a global warming potential (GWP) of 5. This feature is quite remarkable when compared to other refrigerants. C-pentane was developed to reduce the use of refrigerants such as chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) and hydrofluorocarbon (HFC), which damage the ozone layer. Therefore, it is an environmentally friendly refrigerant. C-pentane has high heat transfer properties. Therefore, this fluid provides more effective and efficient working conditions in cooling systems. Additionally, C-pentane is an economical option compared to many other refrigerants. Because production costs are generally low, this makes it preferred in industrial applications. C-pentane also has some disadvantages. C-pentane is a highly flammable refrigerant. Therefore, one should be careful about fire safety and take appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, due to its flammability, the storage and transportation of C-pentane must comply with certain safety standards. This may require additional security measures in transactions. In addition to being flammable, C-pentane can, in some cases, contribute to global warming by acting as a greenhouse gas among gases in the atmosphere. However, this effect is generally lower compared to other refrigerants. Kulkarni et al. [1] studied the performance of environmentally friendly refrigerants in cooling systems. It has been shown that these refrigerants have good performance, and that their use with nanofluids will make the performance even better. Liu et al. [2] determined that the use of mixed refrigerants instead of pure refrigerants in the refrigeration system is a factor that increases performance. Zhao et al. [3] performed energy and exergy analyses using R600a/R601a mixtures in the combined power and refrigeration cycle. He et al. [4] performed performance analysis for different operating conditions in the cascade cooling system. They determined that mixed refrigerants increased the cooling system performance. Sun et al. [5] investigated the performance of a single refrigerant cascade refrigeration system consisting of refrigerant pairs. The results determined that COP in conventional cascade refrigeration system can be improved by using single refrigerant pairs.

C-pentane is an environmentally friendly refrigerant as it is relatively harmless to the ozone layer and does not contribute to global warming. C-pentane has a good heat transfer capacity and provides high energy efficiency due to this feature.



https://dergipark.org.tr/sjmakeu

In recent years, C-pentane is the most preferred refrigerant in many cooling devices, especially home and commercial refrigerators, freezers, and air conditioning systems. Additionally, C-pentane is an economical refrigerant option. Being cost-competitive has an impact on the preferences of industries and consumers. Therefore, in this study, the energy analysis and environmental impact of the vapor compression refrigeration system using C-pentane, one of the hydrocarbon refrigerants that has stood out with both its thermodynamic and environmental properties in recent years, was made in comparison with R134A, R407C and R404A. Cooling systems using C-pentane, which is the subject of this study, also have significant advantages in terms of operating costs. It is seen that the critical temperature of C-pentane is larger than that of the other fluids used in the study. The critical temperature of refrigerants is an important physical property both in industrial applications and in daily use. In addition, high critical temperature is an expected property of refrigerants. This property of the fluid is a fundamental parameter used in thermodynamic and heat transfer calculations and plays a critical role in understanding and optimising the behaviour of the fluid. C-pentane has been used especially in commercial cooling systems, beverage cabinets and deep freezers in recent years. The properties of the refrigerants in this study are given in Table 1.

Refrigerants	Molecular Weight (kg/kmol)	Critical Temperature (°C)	Critical Pressure (MPa)	ODP	GWP100	GWP _{adp}	RFM	RFD
C-Pentane	70.13	238.54	4.515	0	5	-	-	-
R134A	102.032	101.06	4.059	0	1300	1.6	5	-
R407C	86.20	85.76	4.602	0	1530	_	_	-
R404A	97.60	71.96	3.722	0	3260	-	16.7	-

Table 1.	Properties	of refrigerants	[6]
----------	------------	-----------------	-----

The use of refrigerant C-pentane in both domestic appliances and industrial applications has increased considerably in recent years. This is because this fluid has both good thermodynamic properties and environmental effects are better than conventional refrigerants. In this study, a comparative performance and environmental analysis of a vapour compression refrigeration cycle using C-Pentane as refrigerant is carried out for different operating conditions. The cooling performance and environmental impact of C-Pentane are compared with the cooling performance and environmental impact of R134A, R407C and R404A refrigerants.

The vapor compression refrigeration system (VCRS) goes through the following processes during one cycle; The refrigerant in the saturated vapor state at point 1 is compressed by the compressor. The refrigerant at high temperature and pressure at point two enters the condenser as superheated steam. The refrigerant, which turns into a saturated liquid by throwing its temperature to the environment at point 3, leaves the condenser and enters the throttling valve. In the last stage of the cycle, the low-pressure fluid enters the liquid+vapor phase evaporator and completes the cycle. The representation of the VCRS and the temperature-entropy diagram of the cycle are given in Figure 1.



Fig. 1. The VCRS and T-s diagram.



2. THERMODYNAMIC ANALYSIS

The following assumptions are made for the thermodynamic analysis of the vapor compression refrigeration system; • All elements of the system work in steady state.

- The kinetic and potential energies of the components in the cycle are neglected.
- The isentropic efficiency of the compressor is $\eta_{comp}=70\%$.
- Heat losses and friction losses are neglected.
- Evaporator temperatures were chosen between 0, -5, -10, -15 and -20 °C.
- Condenser temperatures were chosen between 25, 30, 35 and 40 °C.
- Superheating and Subcooling have not been applied in the cooling system.

Due to the limited number of different refrigerants used in the analyzes and the variability of evaporator and condenser temperature ranges, the current results should be considered to be provisional. In this regard, it is emphasized that more studies are needed on this subject, both theoretically and experimentally, in order to reach more reliable results. Evaporator capacity of refrigeration cycle given in Fig. 1 can be determined as follows [7]:

$$\dot{Q}_E = \dot{m}_R (h_1 - h_4) \tag{1}$$

Compressor power is [8-10];

$$\dot{W}_{comp} = \dot{m}_R (h_2 - h_1) \tag{2}$$

Condenser capacity is;

$$\dot{Q}_C = \dot{m}_R (h_3 - h_2) \tag{3}$$

Coefficient of performance (COP) is the useful heating or cooling rate provided in return for the work done in a cooling system, that is, the ratio of output energy to input energy. The coefficient of performance (COP) of the refrigeration system is defined as the ratio of the evaporator capacity to the compressor power and can be calculated with Eq.4 [11-14];

$$COP = \frac{\dot{Q}_E}{\dot{W}_{Comp}} \tag{4}$$

Environmental analyzes of refrigerants were made according to the Life Cycle Climate Performance (LCCP) method. In LCCP analysis, all emissions of a system throughout its life are calculated. LCCP consists of two main categories; direct emissions and indirect emissions. Direct emissions consist of the effects of refrigerant released into the atmosphere over the life of the refrigeration system, including annual refrigerant loss due to leaks, refrigerant loss at the end of the unit's life, and atmospheric reaction products resulting from the breakdown of refrigerant in the atmosphere. Indirect emissions include emissions resulting from the use of the cooling system throughout its life. These are emissions from electricity generation, emissions from material production, emissions from the production of refrigerants, and emissions from post-life recycling of the unit [15-18].

LCCP = Direct Emission (DE) + Indirect Emission (IE) ((5)	ļ
--	-----	---

$$Direct Emission (DE) = C x [(GWP + GWP_{adp}) x (L x ALR + EOL)]$$

$$(6)$$

$$Indirect \ Emission \ (IE) = L \ x \ AEC \ x \ EM + MM \ x \ m + RM \ x \ m_r + RFM \ x \ C + L \ x \ ALR \ x \ RFM \ x \ C + C \ x \ (1 - EOL) \ x \ RFD$$

$$(7)$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The COP of the VCRS using C-pentane, R134A, R407C and R404A was calculated by keeping the condenser temperature constant at 25 °C and changing the evaporator temperature between 0 °C and -20 °C and is given in Fig. 2. It is seen that the highest COP value for all operating conditions given in Fig. 2 is reached in the cycle using C-pentane. This value is 6.485 in operating condition with 0 °C evaporator temperature and 25 °C condenser temperature. After C-pentane, the highest COP values were obtained for R134A, R407C and R404A, respectively.

The results of the second analysis made by keeping the condenser temperature constant at 30 °C and changing the evaporator temperature between 0 °C and -20 °C are given in Fig. 3. The highest COP value was obtained for the cycle using C-pentane. This value is 5.4 and was obtained for 0 °C evaporator temperature and 30 °C condenser temperature. The lowest COP value is approximately 2.5 for R404A, at -20 °C evaporator temperature and 30 °C condenser temperature.



Fig. 2. Variation of COP with evaporator temperature (for T_c=25 °C).



Fig. 3. Variation of COP with evaporator temperature (for T_c=30 °C).



Another analysis was made by keeping the condenser temperature constant at 35 °C and changing the evaporator temperature between 0 °C and -20 °C, and the results are given in Fig. 4. In the analysis under these operating conditions, the highest COP value is 4.418 and is obtained for the cycle using C-pentane. Then, the highest COP values were calculated for R134A, R407C and R404A, respectively. It is seen both in this analysis and in the two previous analyzes that the COP value decreases as the evaporator temperature decreases. The decrease in evaporator temperature increases the compressor work, which in this case causes a decrease in COP. For example, when the evaporator temperature is -5 °C, the compressor work is 0.2693 kW, and when the evaporator temperature is -20 °C, the compressor work is 0.422 kW.



Fig. 4. Variation of COP with evaporator temperature (for $T_c=35$ °C).

The final analysis results by keeping the condenser temperature constant at 40 °C and changing the evaporator temperature are given in Fig. 5. In this analysis, the highest COP value was obtained for the cycle using C-pentane. This value is 3.85 and is obtained for 0 °C evaporator temperature and 40 °C condenser temperature. It is seen that the COP values decrease as the evaporator temperature decreases. This result is valid for all refrigerants. Similar to our results, in the study of Ahamed et al., it was concluded that increasing the condenser temperature decreased the COP value, while increasing the evaporator temperature increased the COP values [19].

It has been clearly demonstrated that C-pentane is the most suitable refrigerant for all analyzed operating conditions. However, considering the environmental characteristics, C-pentane stands out when compared to other refrigerants.



Fig. 5. Variation of COP with evaporator temperature (for $T_c=40$ °C).



The results of the LCCP analysis for refrigerants are given in Fig. 6. When Fig. 6 is examined, the lowest emission value is for C-Pentane. The DE value of C-Pentane is 57.5 kgCO₂ and the IE value is 24928.04 kgCO₂. These values are lower than the values of all other fluids. It is noteworthy that the DE value is 0.23% of the IE value. The ratio of DE value to IE for other fluids is 5.39% for R134A, 12.95% for R404A, and 6.34% for R407C. Almost all of the emission values of refrigerants are due to their indirect emissions. The largest part of indirect emissions originates from energy consumption. Therefore, reducing both the energy consumed in the production of refrigerant and the energy consumption values of the refrigeration systems allows to reduce the total emission values.



Fig. 6. Comparison of LCCP analysis of refrigerants.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, the energy analysis and environmental effect of the vapor compression refrigeration system using Cpentane, which is one of the leading hydrocarbon refrigerants that has come to the fore with both thermodynamic and environmental properties in recent years, has been made comparatively. For the refrigeration system using C-pentane, R134A, R407C and R404A, it was observed that the COP increased when the evaporator temperature increased, and the COP decreased when the evaporator temperature decreased. However, increasing the condenser temperature also decreases the COP. Similar to our results, in Ref. [20], increasing the condenser temperature decreases the COP value, and increasing the evaporator temperature increases the COP value. Therefore, in order to obtain the most effective COP value, it is very important to determine the most suitable evaporator and condenser temperature as well as the selection of the refrigerant. The highest COP value in the analyzes is 6.485 and this value is obtained under the operating condition of 0 °C evaporator temperature and 25 °C condenser temperature. Therefore, in order to obtain high efficiency from the vapor compression cooling system using C-pentane, it would be appropriate to operate the system under the operating conditions obtained in the analysis. C-pentane has zero ozone depletion potential (ODP) and GWP100 is 5. Therefore, it is a very good refrigerant for refrigeration cycles and its use should be increased. In addition, according to the LCCP analysis for refrigerants, the lowest total emission value belongs to C-Pentane. DE value and IE value of C-Pentane are 57.5 kgCO₂ and 24928.04 kgCO₂, respectively. Similar results have been found in the literature. For example, the data in Ref. [21] clearly show that the direct contribution to global warming for the refrigerants in the study (HFOs and their binary mixtures with HFC134a) is negligible compared to the indirect contribution.

5. ORCID

Bayram KILIÇ[®] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8577-1845 Emre ARABACI[®] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6219-7246 Ali ÖZ[®] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0814-4020



REFERENCES

- Kulkarni, S., Chavali, S., & Dikshit, S. (2023). A review on analysis of vapour compression refrigeration system (VCRS) for its performance using different ecofriendly refrigerants and nanofluids. Materials Today: Proceedings, 72, 878-883.
- [2]. Liu, B., Guo, X., & Xi, X. (2023). Thermodynamic analyses of ejector refrigeration cycle with zeotropic mixture. Energy, 263, 125989.
- [3]. Zhao, D., Xu, W., & Zhao, R. (2023). Thermodynamic analysis of the combined organic flash and ejector refrigeration cycle using zeotropic mixtures. Applied Thermal Engineering, 219, 119605.
- [4]. He, Y., Wu, H., & Xu, K. (2023). Theoretical performance comparison for a regenerator-enhanced three-stage auto-cascade refrigeration system using different zeotropic mixed refrigerants. Energy & Buildings, 283, 112815.
- [5]. Sun, Z., Quan, J., & Wang, Y. (2022). Performance comparison of the single-refrigerant cascade refrigerating system. Energy Reports, 8, 8259-8270.
- [6]. https://solkane-refrigerants.software.informer.com/8.0/
- [7]. Çengel, A.Y., Boles, A.M. (1994). Thermodynamics: An Engineering Approach, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [8]. Pilla, T. S., Sunkari, P. K. G., & Padmanabhuni, S. L. (2017). Experimental evaluation mechanical performance of the compressor with mixed refrigerants R-290 and R-600a. Energy Procedia, 109, 113-121.
- [9]. Kılıç, B. (2012). Exergy analysis of vapor compression refrigeration cycle with two-stage and intercooler. Heat Mass Transfer, 48, 1207-1217.
- [10]. Kılıç. B. (2022). Energy and exergy analysis of transcritical carbon dioxide refrigeration cycle for different working conditions. El-Cezerî Journal of Science and Engineering, 9(1), 290-299.
- [11]. Rocca, V., & Panno, G. (2011). Experimental performance evaluation of a compression refrigeration plant when replacing R22 with alternative refrigerants. Applied Energy, 88, 2809-2815.
- [12]. Allgood, C. C., & Lawson, C. C. (2010). Performance of R-438A in R22 refrigeration and air conditioning systems. Int. Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Conference at Purdue, Indiana, 12-15.
- [13]. Rocca, A., Rocca, L., & Messineo, L. (2014). Use of HFC Fluids as Suitable Replacements in Low-Temperature Refrigeration Plants. ARPN Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences, 9(1), 74-79.
- [14]. Tejaswi, S. P., Pranay, K. G. S., & Sai, L. P. (2017). Experimental evaluation mechanical performance of the compressor with mixed refrigerants R-290 and R-600A. Energy Procedia, 109, 113-121.
- [15]. Yıldız, A., & Yıldırım, R. (2020). Energy and environmental analysis of vapor compression refrigeration systems using an alternative refrigerant (R513A) to R134A. Düzce University Journal of Science and Technology, 8, 1817-1828.
- [16]. IIR, Guideline for Life Cycle Climate Performance, (2016) 1828.
- [17]. Choi, S., Oh, J., & Hwang, Y. (2017). Life cycle climate performance evaluation (LCCP) on cooling and heating systems in South Korea. Applied Thermal Engineering, 120, 88-98.
- [18]. Atılgan, B., & Azapagic, A. (2016). Assessing the environmental sustainability of electricity generation in Turkey on a life cycle basis. Energies, 9, 31.
- [19]. Ahamed, J. U., Saidur, R., & Masjuki, H. H. (2011). Prospect of hydrocarbon uses based on exergy analysis in the vapor compression refrigeration system. IEEE First Conference on Clean Energy and Technology CET, 300-304.
- [20]. Şencan, A., Selbaş, R., & Kızılkan, Ö. (2006). Thermodynamic analysis of subcooling and superheating effects of alternative refrigerants for vapour compression refrigeration cycles. International Journal of Energy Research, 30, 323-347.
- [21]. Aprea, C., Greco, A., & Maiorino, A. (2018). HFOs and their binary mixtures with HFC134a working as dropin refrigerant in a household refrigerator: Energy analysis and environmental impact assessment. Applied Thermal Engineering, 141, 226-233.



CRefrigerant Charge (kg)Greek y=blsGWPGlobal Warming Potential (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) η EfficiencyGWP $_{adp}$ GWP of Atmospheric Degradation Product of the Refrigerant (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) i i LAverage Lifetime of Equipment (yr) i i ALRAnnual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)SubscriptionEOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge) i AECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserAECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatormMass of Unit/Material (kg) i i MRCO2 $_o$ Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) i , 2, 3,RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) i i MMCO2 $_o$ Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) i i MM CO2 $_o$ Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg) i i \dot{q} Heat transfer rate (kW) i i i \dot{r} Mass flow rate (kg/s) i i i \dot{q}_c Evaporator capacity (kW) i i i \dot{q}_c Condenser capacity (kW) i i i \dot{q}_c Condenser capacity (kW) i i i \dot{q}_c Condenser capacity (kW) i i i \dot{q}_c Condenser capacity (kW) i i i \dot{q}_c Condenser capacity (kW	Nomenclature					
GWPadpGWP of Atmospheric Degradation Product of the Refrigerant (kg CO_{2e}/kg)LAverage Lifetime of Equipment (yr)ALRAnnual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)AECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserEM CO_2 produced/kWh (kg CO_{2e}/kWh)mMass of Unit/Material (kg)RCO2e Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)nrMass of Recycled Material (kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e}/kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e}/kg)MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)MMCO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg) \hat{K} E M CO_{2e} produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e}/kg) M Mass flow rate (kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg) \hat{k} Evaporator capacity (kW) \hat{w}_{Comp} Compressor work (kW) $\hat{\psi}_{c}$ Condenser capacity (kW)	С	Refrigerant Charge (kg)	Greek sy	mbols		
Refrigerant (kg CO_{2e}/kg)LAverage Lifetime of Equipment (yr)ALRAnnual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)SubscriptsAECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCompMCO2 produced/kWh (kg CO_{2e}/kWh)CompCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRMCO2e Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)EEvaporatorRFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,State pointmrMass flow rate (kg/s) E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{Q}_{e} Evaporator capacity (kW) E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{Comp} Compressor work (kW) E Evaporator capacity (kW)	GWP	Global Warming Potential (kg CO _{2e} /kg)	η	Efficiency		
LAverage Lifetime of Equipment (yr)ALRAnnual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)SubscriptsAECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserEMCO2 produced/kWh (kg CO2 $_o$ /kWh)CompCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRMCO2 $_e$ Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)EEvaporatorRFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointMMCO2 $_e$ Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO2 $_o$ /kg)VV \dot{M} Mass flow rate (kg)EE \dot{q} Heat transfer rate (kW)Mass flow rate (kg/s)VV \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{q}_e EE \dot{Q}_c Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_c Compressor work (kW) \dot{W}_{Comp}	$\mathrm{GWP}_{\mathrm{adp}}$	GWP of Atmospheric Degradation Product of the				
ALRAnnual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)SubscriptsAECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserEMCO2 produced/kWh (kg CO2e/kWh)CompCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRMCO2e Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO2e/kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)IIIRFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2e/kg)IIIRFDCO2e Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO2e/kg)IIIMMCO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg)IIIMMCO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg)III \dot{M} Refrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2e/kg)III \dot{M} CO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg)III \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW)IIII \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s)IIIII \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW)IIIII \dot{W}_{Comp} Condenser capacity (kW)IIIII \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)IIIII \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)IIIIII \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)IIIIII<		Refrigerant (kg CO _{2e} /kg)				
EOLEnd of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)SubscriptsAECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserEMCO2 produced/kWh (kg CO2e/kWh)CompCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRMCO2e Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO2e/kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)If the second secon	L	Average Lifetime of Equipment (yr)				
AECAnnual Energy Consumption (kWh)CCondenserEMCO2 produced/kWh (kg CO2e/kWh)CompCompressormMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRMCO2e Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO2e/kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)TTRFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2e/kg)TTRFDCO2e Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg $CO2e/kg)$ TTMMCO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg)TT \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW)TT \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s)TT \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW)TT \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)TT	ALR	Annual Leakage Rate (% of Refrigerant Charge)				
EM CO_2 produced/kWh (kg CO_{2e} /kWh) $Comp$ $Compressor$ mMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Recy cled Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e} /kg)RFD CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e} /kg)MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{Comp} Condenser capacity (kW)	EOL	End of Life Emissions (% of Refrigerant Charge)	Subscrip	ots		
mMass of Unit/Material (kg)EEvaporatorRM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg)1, 2, 3,.State pointmrMass of Recycled Material (kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e} /kg)Image: State pointRFD CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e} /kg)Image: State pointImage: State pointMM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg)Image: State pointImage: State pointMM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg)Image: State pointImage: State point \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW)Image: State pointImage: State point \dot{M} Mass flow rate (kg/s)Image: State pointImage: State point \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW)Image: State pointImage: State point \dot{V}_{Comp} Condenser capacity (kW)Image: State pointImage: State point	AEC	Annual Energy Consumption (kWh)	С	Condenser		
RM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)1, 2, 3,.State point m_r Mass of Recycled Material (kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e}/kg)RFD CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e}/kg)MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{comp} Condenser capacity (kW)	EM	CO ₂ produced/kWh (kg CO _{2e} /kWh)	Comp	Compressor		
m_r Mass of Recycled Material (kg)RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2e/kg)RFDCO2e Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg $CO2e/kg)$ MMCO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)	m	Mass of Unit/Material (kg)	Е	Evaporator		
RFMRefrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO_{2e}/kg)RFD CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e}/kg)MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_c Condenser capacity (kW)	RM	CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Recycled Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg)	1, 2, 3,.	State point		
RFD CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg CO_{2e}/kg)MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_C Condenser capacity (kW)	m _r	Mass of Recycled Material (kg)				
$\begin{array}{ll} & CO_{2e}/kg) \\ \hline MM & CO_{2e} \mbox{ Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e}/kg)} \\ \hline \dot{Q} & Heat transfer rate (kW) \\ \hline \dot{m} & Mass flow rate (kg/s) \\ \hline \dot{Q}_E & Evaporator capacity (kW) \\ \hline \dot{W}_{comp} & Compressor work (kW) \\ \hline \dot{Q}_C & Condenser capacity (kW) \end{array}$	RFM	Refrigerant Manufacturing Emissions (kg CO2e/kg)				
MM CO_{2e} Produced/kg of Material (kg CO_{2e} /kg) \dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{Comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_C Condenser capacity (kW)	RFD	CO2e Produced/kg of Refrigerant Recycled (kg				
\dot{Q} Heat transfer rate (kW) \dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{Comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_C Condenser capacity (kW)		CO _{2e} /kg)				
\dot{m} Mass flow rate (kg/s) \dot{Q}_E Evaporator capacity (kW) \dot{W}_{comp} Compressor work (kW) \dot{Q}_C Condenser capacity (kW)	MM	CO2e Produced/kg of Material (kg CO2e/kg)				
	Q	Heat transfer rate (kW)				
	'n	Mass flow rate (kg/s)				
\dot{Q}_{c} Condenser capacity (kW)	\dot{Q}_E	Evaporator capacity (kW)				
	\dot{W}_{Comp}	Compressor work (kW)				
COP Coefficient of Performance	\dot{Q}_{C}	Condenser capacity (kW)				
	COP	Coefficient of Performance				

Techno-Science Paper ID:1473745