Experimental evaluation of enthalpy efficiency and gas-phase contaminant transfer in an enthalpy recovery unit with polymer membrane foils - DTU Orbit (08/11/2017)

Experimental evaluation of enthalpy efficiency and gas-phase contaminant transfer in an enthalpy recovery unit with polymer membrane foils

Experimental studies were conducted in a laboratory setting to investigate the enthalpy efficiency and gas-phase contaminant transfer in a polymer membrane enthalpy recovery unit. One commercially available polymer membrane enthalpy recovery unit was used as a reference unit. Simulated indoor air and outdoor air by twin chambers was connected to the unit. Three chemical gases were dosed to the indoor exhaust air to mimic indoor air contaminants. Based on the measurements of temperature, humidity ratio, and contaminant concentrations of the indoor exhaust air and outdoor air supply upstream and downstream of the unit, the temperature efficiencies, humidity efficiencies, enthalpy efficiencies, and contaminant transfer ratios were calculated. The results showed that over 60% of enthalpy recovery efficiency in cold-dry climate conditions was slightly higher than in hot-humid climate conditions. The contaminant transfer ratio were independent of any hygrothermal difference between indoor and outdoor air and was unrelated to its molecule size or water solubility. The conclusion indicated that the polymer membrane enthalpy recovery unit may be a viable choice for energy recovery in ventilation systems.

General information

State: Published

Organisations: Department of Civil Engineering, Section for Indoor Climate and Building Physics, Tianjin University, Shanghai Research Institute of Building Sciences Authors: Nie, J. (Intern), Yang, J. (Ekstern), Fang, L. (Intern), Kong, X. (Ekstern) Number of pages: 10 Pages: 150-159 Publication date: 2015 Main Research Area: Technical/natural sciences

Publication information

Journal: Science and Technology for the Built Environment Volume: 21 Issue number: 2 ISSN (Print): 2374-474x Ratings: Web of Science (2017): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2016): CiteScore 1.01 Web of Science (2016): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2015): SJR 0.644 SNIP 0.888 Web of Science (2015): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2014): SJR 0.578 SNIP 0.846 Web of Science (2014): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2013): SJR 0.618 SNIP 0.89 Web of Science (2013): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2012): SJR 0.587 SNIP 1.109 Web of Science (2012): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2011): SJR 0.541 SNIP 0.74 Web of Science (2011): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2010): SJR 1.027 SNIP 0.955 Web of Science (2010): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2009): SJR 1.767 SNIP 1.187 Web of Science (2009): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2008): SJR 0.866 SNIP 0.903 Web of Science (2008): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2007): SJR 0.804 SNIP 1.625 Web of Science (2007): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2006): SJR 0.907 SNIP 1.302 Web of Science (2006): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2005): SJR 1.471 SNIP 1.257 Web of Science (2005): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2004): SJR 1.209 SNIP 1.999

Scopus rating (2003): SJR 1.091 SNIP 1.28 Web of Science (2003): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2002): SJR 0.938 SNIP 1.733 Web of Science (2002): Indexed yes Scopus rating (2001): SJR 2.473 SNIP 2.259 Scopus rating (2000): SJR 0.712 SNIP 2.004 Scopus rating (1999): SJR 0.368 SNIP 0.778 Original language: English DOIs: 10.1080/10789669.2014.967165 Source: Findlt Source-ID: 2263996115 Publication: Research - peer-review > Journal article – Annual report year: 2015