Multi-objective thermal design optimization and comparative analysis of electronics cooling technologies
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ABSTRACT

A multi-objective thermal design optimization and comparative study of electronics cooling technologies is presented. The cooling technologies considered are: continuous parallel micro-channel heat sinks, in-line and staggered circular pin-fin heat sinks, offset strip fin heat sinks, and single and multiple submerged impinging jet(s). Using water and HFE-7000 as coolants, Matlab’s multi-objective genetic algorithm functions were utilized to determine the optimal thermal design of each technology based on the total thermal resistance and pumping power consumption under constant pressure drop and heat source base area of 100 mm². Plots of the Pareto front indicate a trade-off between the total thermal resistance and pumping power consumption. In general, the offset strip fin heat sink outperforms the other cooling technologies.

1. Introduction

With increasing power density of electronic chips and devices, interest in effective cooling technologies has been growing both in industry and academia. Today, most research efforts are focused on single phase and flow boiling heat transfer in enhanced compact heat sink geometries such as micro-channels, micro pin fins, and impinging jets. Each of these technologies has its advantages and disadvantages [1], and the challenge is to find their optimal performance for a given electronics cooling application. As has been shown (e.g., [2–4]), given certain constraints, micro-channels, pin fins, and jet impingement cooling technologies have optimum design configurations whereby the total thermal resistance and power consumption are minimized. However, analytical comparison of these technologies against each other has not been performed.

1.1. Micro-channels

Since the pioneering work of Tuckerman and Pease [5] in 1981, many studies have been conducted on micro-channel heat sinks as summarized by Phillips [6] and, more recently, by Morini [7]. A number of studies have investigated the thermal design optimization of micro-channel heat sinks to determine the geometric dimensions that give optimum performance. Early analytical studies [8,9] showed the effect of the number of channels and fin thickness to channel width ratio on the thermal resistance. However, these studies were based on the classical analytical fin method, which may inaccurately predict the results for channel height to channel width ratio greater than 8 [10]. As an alternative to the classical analytical fin method, Kim and Hyun [11] proposed a porous media model based on an averaging method in which the heat sink was treated as a fluid-saturated porous medium. The results obtained from this model agreed with their numerical model [10]. Recently Kim and Kim [2] have proposed a closed-form total thermal resistance correlation for the thermal design optimization of micro-channels. Beside analytical models, several numerical methods have been used to study the thermal performance of micro-channels heat sinks [12–15].

1.2. Circular pin-fin and offset strip fin heat sinks

The literature on heat transfer and flow around circular pin-fins and offset strip fins is extensive as a result of more than 50 years of numerical and experimental investigations. Interested readers are referred to the work of Zukauskas [16,17], Kays and London [18], Manglik and Bergles [19], and Metzger et al. [20]. More recent studies on the thermal fluid characteristics of circular pin-fins and offset strip fins can be found in the works of Dong et al. [21], Won et al. [22], and Kosar et al. [23].

A number of studies have investigated the thermal design optimization of circular pin-fins and offset strip fin heat sinks. Bejan and Morgan [24] reported the optimal geometry for an array of circular pin-fin and staggered offset strip fin heat sinks based on thermal resistance minimization. Based on their Darcy-flow porous medium, they concluded that the minimum thermal resistance of offset strip fin arrays is approximately half of the minimum ther-
nal resistance of heat sinks with continuous fins. Other studies [3,19,25–27] have also shown that design variables such as fin dimensions, and longitudinal and transversal pitches have significant effects on the thermal performance.

1.3. Single and multiple submerged jet impingement

Jet impingement heat transfer has been studied extensively in the literature due to its high heat transfer coefficients at the stagnation zone, low pressure drops, and the elimination of interface thermal resistance between the chip and the cooling system [28]. Recently, several studies have focused on single and multiple microjet impingement heat transfer for electronics cooling applications [1]. However, only a few studies have been conducted to study their thermal design optimization. Jet-to-jet spacing to jet diameter ratio, and jet height to jet diameter ratios were both found to have significant effects on the thermal hydraulic performance of impinging jet(s) [29–31].

1.4. Comparison of cooling technologies

Despite the attention on the study of individual cooling technologies, less emphasis has been applied to comparing them and determining their suitability for a particular cooling application. This deficiency can be attributed to the challenging task of practically comparing different technologies, each with complex interactive relationships among their respective design variables. Nevertheless, a few researchers have attempted to compare these technologies [4,32–35]. These studies, however, either compared only the pin-fin cross-sections or were based on limited experimental data. The numerical comparisons are often simplified (e.g., 2-D domain) and, therefore, did not take into account fin height. Most of the existing comparative studies were also carried out using parametric or single objective optimization comparisons. As this present work will show, single objective optimization (e.g., thermal resistance or pumping power) may not necessarily yield optimum performance.
The multi-objective thermal design optimization and comparative analysis of electronics cooling technologies undertaken in the present work is effectuated in two steps: (1) each cooling system is optimized separately by simultaneous minimization of the total thermal resistance and the pumping power consumption under imposed constraints; and (2) based on their optimum design, the cooling systems are then compared.

2. Optimization technique and thermal design models

2.1. Optimization metrics and design variables

Fig. 1 shows the different cooling technologies considered in the present study along with their respective design variables. The cooling systems consist of micro-channel, in-line and staggered circular pin-fin, offset strip fin heat sinks, single and multiple impinging jet(s). Two metrics, namely the total thermal resistance and power consumption, are simultaneously optimized under constant pressure drop for each of the separate cooling technologies. The total thermal resistance is defined as:

\[ R_{\text{tot}} = R_{\text{cond}} + R_{\text{conv}} + R_{\text{bulk}} = \frac{T_s - T_i}{Q} \]

(1)

\[ R_{\text{cond}} = \frac{t}{k_s A_b}, \quad R_{\text{conv}} = \frac{1}{\eta_f h b}, \quad R_{\text{bulk}} = \frac{1}{\rho_l c_p f G} \]

(2)

The power consumption is evaluated simply as:

\[ P = G \cdot \Delta p \]

(3)

The total thermal resistance models and design variables used in the present study are presented in Table 1.

2.2. Heat transfer and friction factor models

The heat transfer and friction factor models along with their experimental or analytical conditions used in the present study are summarized in Table 2. These models have been selected after a rigorous review of the existing relevant analytical and experimental correlations in the literature. Each of these models has been validated by their respective authors and were chosen based on each individual correlation’s generality (e.g., parameter space range), ability to predict the optimization results more accurately, and convenience (e.g., coolant). Heat transfer models are presented in terms of the Nusselt number, \(Nu\), and Colburn factor, \(j\), whereas the pressure drop for micro-channel and offset strip fin heat sinks [18] is defined as:

\[ \Delta p = \frac{\rho_l U^2}{2} \left[ (K_c + 1 - \sigma^2) + f \left( \frac{4L}{D_h} \right) - (1 - \sigma^2 - K_c) \right] \]

(4)

For circular pin-fin heat sinks [37], the expression is:

\[ \Delta p = \frac{\rho_l U^2}{2} \left[ (K_c + 1 - \sigma^2) + fN_{cp} - (1 - \sigma^2 - K_c) \right] \]

(5)

and for single and multiple jet impingement cooling [38], the expression is:

\[ \Delta p = \frac{\rho_l U^2}{2} \left[ (K_c + 1 - \sigma^2) + fN_{cp} - (1 - \sigma^2 - K_c) \right] \]
Total thermal resistance models and design variables used in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design variables</th>
<th>Total thermal resistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-channel heat sink [2]</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{ch}} ) ( \Delta T_{\text{sh}} ) ( W_{\text{ch}} ) ( R_{\text{ch}} = \frac{1}{(1+D_{\text{ch}}/W_{\text{ch}})+1+D_{\text{ch}}/W_{\text{ch}})+\frac{\Delta T_{\text{ch}}}{\Delta T_{\text{sh}}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular pin-fin heat sink (current work)</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{cp}} ) ( \Delta T_{\text{fp}} ) ( \Delta T_{\text{dp}} ) ( R_{\text{cpc}} = \frac{1}{(1+D_{\text{cp}}/W_{\text{cp}})+1+D_{\text{cp}}/W_{\text{cp}})+\frac{\Delta T_{\text{cp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset strip fin heat sink (current work)</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{sp}} ) ( \Delta T_{\text{fp}} ) ( \Delta T_{\text{af}} ) ( R_{\text{spc}} = \frac{1}{(1+D_{\text{sp}}/W_{\text{sp}})+1+D_{\text{sp}}/W_{\text{sp}})+\frac{\Delta T_{\text{sp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet impingement cooling (current work)</td>
<td>( \delta, \theta, \phi, d_f ) ( R_{\text{imp}} = \frac{1}{\lambda \mu /W_{\text{imp}}+\frac{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heat transfer and friction factor models used in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nusselt Number correlations</th>
<th>Friction factor correlations</th>
<th>Geometric and operating conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-channel heat sink [2]</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{ch}} = \frac{(k_{\text{sh}})}{(\rho_{\text{ch}} c_{\text{pch}})} )</td>
<td>( z_{\text{ch}} &gt; 4, k_{\text{ch}}/k_{\text{sh}} &gt; 20 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular pin-fin heat sink [3]</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{cp}} = C_{\text{cp}} \Delta T_{\text{fp}}^{0.67} ) ( C_{\text{cp}} = \frac{1}{(1+0.5\mu)^{0.67} \frac{D_{\text{cp}}^3}{D_{\text{fp}}^3}} ) ( \frac{C_{\text{cp}}}{C_{\text{fp}}} ) ( \frac{C_{\text{fp}}}{C_{\text{sh}}} ) ( f = \frac{\Delta T_{\text{cp}}}{(1+0.5\mu)^{0.67} \frac{D_{\text{cp}}^3}{D_{\text{fp}}^3}} )</td>
<td>( L/D_{\text{cp}} &gt; 0.05 ) ( \mu_{\text{cp}}/\mu_{\text{fp}} &gt; 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset strip fin heat sink [19]</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{sp}} = \frac{J_{\text{sp}}}{(\rho_{\text{sh}} c_{\text{psh}})} )</td>
<td>( L/D_{\text{sp}} &gt; 0.05 ) ( \mu_{\text{sp}}/\mu_{\text{sh}} &gt; 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet impingement cooling [31,36]</td>
<td>( \Delta T_{\text{imp}} = \frac{J_{\text{imp}}}{(\rho_{\text{sh}} c_{\text{psh}})} )</td>
<td>( L/D_{\text{imp}} &gt; 0.05 ) ( \mu_{\text{imp}}/\mu_{\text{sh}} &gt; 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The definitions of \( x, \beta, \sigma, D_{\text{m}}, \) and \( G \) for each of the cooling technologies are tabulated in Table 3. The coefficients of abrupt contraction and expansion, \( K_c \) and \( K_e \), are obtained from the graphs in [18] for micro-channels, offset strip fins, and jet impingement configurations are given by:

\[
K_c = -0.4446\sigma^2 + 0.0487\sigma + 0.7967
\]

\[
K_e = 0.9732\sigma^2 - 2.3668\sigma + 0.9973
\]

2.3. Optimization procedures

Each system is optimized separately through a multi-objective optimization of the total thermal resistance and pumping power while for circular pin fins [37], the following expressions are used:

\[
K_c = -0.03116\sigma^2 - 0.3722\sigma + 1.0676
\]

\[
K_e = 0.9301\sigma^2 - 2.5746\sigma + 0.973
\]

Table 3 Definition of some common terms used in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( x )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>( D_{\text{m}}(m) )</th>
<th>( G(\text{m}^2/\text{s}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-channel heat sink</td>
<td>( \frac{h_{\text{ch}}}{h_{\text{sh}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{ch}}}{\Delta T_{\text{sh}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{D_{\text{ch}}}{D_{\text{sh}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{ch}}}{\Delta T_{\text{sh}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular pin-fin heat sink</td>
<td>( \frac{h_{\text{cp}}}{h_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{cp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{D_{\text{cp}}}{D_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{cp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset strip fin heat sink</td>
<td>( \frac{h_{\text{sp}}}{h_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{sp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{D_{\text{sp}}}{D_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{sp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{fp}}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet impingement cooling</td>
<td>( \frac{h_{\text{imp}}}{h_{\text{imp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{D_{\text{imp}}}{D_{\text{imp}}} )</td>
<td>( \frac{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}}{\Delta T_{\text{imp}}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
under constant pressure drop and a fixed heat source base area of 100 mm². The heat sinks are made from silicon because of its high thermal conductivity and also because it is the most commonly used semiconductor in microelectronics. Water and HFE-7000, with constant properties assumption, are chosen as the coolants. The thickness of the heated areas is kept fixed while the cooling systems’ respective design variables are allowed to vary within imposed bounds.

For a given pressure drop, ∆p, the velocity, U, is iteratively solved from the pressure drop and friction factor equations. Once the velocity is known, the total thermal resistance and pumping power are easily computed.

Using Matlab’s multi-objective genetic algorithm [39], both the total thermal resistance and pumping power consumption are simultaneously minimized. Consider the vector:

\[ \tilde{F}(\tilde{X}) = [F_1(\tilde{X}), F_2(\tilde{X})] \]

where the competing objective functions \( F_1(\tilde{X}) \) and \( F_2(\tilde{X}) \) represent the total thermal resistance and pumping power, respectively, and the vector \( \tilde{X} \) denotes the design variables. The goal of the multi-objective optimization is to minimize the objective vector \( \tilde{F}(\tilde{X}) \) under a number of constraints and bounds. The mathematical representation of the problem may then be written as:

\[ \min \tilde{F}(\tilde{X}) \]

subjected to

\[ E_k(\tilde{X}) \leq 0 \quad k = 1, \ldots, k_c \]

\[ E_k(\tilde{X}) = 0 \quad k = k_c + 1, \ldots, k_t \]

\[ lb_v \leq X_v \leq ub_v \quad v = 1, \ldots, v_t \]

Matlab’s multi-objective function, gamultiobj, was called to solve the above problem. The function’s arguments consist of the objective functions and the parameter space along with some genetic algorithm options such as population size, Pareto fraction, and plot function. The computed results consist of sets of non-inferior solutions. Non-inferior solutions are sets of optimal solutions in which an improvement in one objective requires a degradation of another.

Tables 4 and 5 show the properties of the coolants, heat sink materials, and the values of the imposed optimization constraints used in the present study. In defining the parameter space, care was taken not to over-extrapolate the heat transfer and friction factor models.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Validation of models

As mentioned earlier, the heat transfer and friction factor models used in the present study have been developed and validated by their respective authors. However, to validate the calculation approach used in the present work, calculated thermal resistances are compared against experimental results. As shown in Table 6, the calculated results agree with the experimental values.

#### 3.2. Multi-objective optimization and Pareto optimal solutions

The multi-objective solution yields a set of optimal solutions in which an improvement in one objective requires a degradation of another. The plots of these optimal solutions with water are shown in Figs. 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A, 6A, and 7A. These curves are known as the Pareto front and show a clear trade-off between the total thermal resistance and power consumption, an improvement (a decrease) in the total thermal resistance results in an increase in the power consumption. The Pareto front also indicates that the nature of this trade-off is not uniform. As illustrated in Fig. 2A, for total thermal resistances less than 0.25 K/W, increasing the total thermal resistance gradually decreases the pumping power. However, at total thermal resistance values larger than 0.25 K/W, further increasing the total thermal resistance does not produce any significant improvement to the power consumption. Similarly, at relatively small pumping powers, and depending on the pressure drop, increasing the pumping power will decrease the total thermal resistance until it reaches a condition where any further increase of the pumping power will not have any significant effect on the total thermal resistance. It is evident from the above discussion that for a given pressure drop, the design variables corresponding

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heat sink/Solid</th>
<th>Width, W (mm)</th>
<th>Thickness, t (mm)</th>
<th>Heat transfer coefficient, ( k_s ) (W/m K)</th>
<th>PR, ( \rho_s ) (kg/m³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid Micro-channel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.33 × 10⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFE-7000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coolants</th>
<th>( k_f ) (W/m K)</th>
<th>( \rho_f ) (kg/m³)</th>
<th>( \mu_f ) (× 10⁻⁶ kg/m s)</th>
<th>Pr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>997.1</td>
<td>8.91×10⁴</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFE-7000</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>4.25×10⁴</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters used in calculations</th>
<th>R(K/W)</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-channel heat sink [40] (Table 2)</td>
<td>Water, ( L = W = 10 ) mm, ( w_s = 56 ) μm, ( x_s = 5.7 ), ( \beta_m = 0.78 ), ( f = 213 ) μm, ( C = 4.7 ) cm³/s</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular pin-fin heat sink [41]</td>
<td>Water, ( L = W = 18 ) mm, ( d_{hp} = 100 ) μm, ( \beta_{hp} = 2.43 ), ( \phi = 1.5 ), ( \Delta p = 14.7 ) kPa</td>
<td>−5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset strip fin heat sink [42]</td>
<td>Air, ( L = 100 ) mm, ( W = 50 ) mm, ( a = 3.24 ) mm, ( x_s = 3.08 ), ( \beta_m = 1.179 ), ( \phi = 0.268 ), ( m = 4 \times 10^{-3} ) kg/s</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet impingement cooling [31]</td>
<td>Water, ( d_f = 1.0 ) mm, ( \beta = 7 ), ( \phi = 2 ), ( Re_{ch} = 3000 ), ( Ah = 780 ) mm²</td>
<td>−0.044</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the lowest thermal resistance do not necessarily correspond to those of the lowest power consumption and vice versa.

A deeper insight into this trade-off can be gained by studying the effects of individual design variables on the total thermal resistance and power consumption. Taking the offset strip fin heat sink as an example, the total thermal resistance decreases with increasing aspect ratio, \( \alpha_{sf} \). This happens because as \( \alpha_{sf} \) increases, the total heat transfer area increases. Conversely, the power consumption will increase with increasing \( \alpha_{sf} \) and fin length. This is because for a constant pressure drop, increasing \( \alpha_{sf} \) would increase the volumetric flow rate and consequently increase the power consumption.

The role of pressure drop on the optimal heat sink design for a particular electronics cooling application can be also observed from these figures. As illustrated in Fig. 3A, at relatively low pumping powers, below 0.3 W, the lowest thermal resistance is achieved with the lower pressure drop of 30 kPa. However, at higher pumping power values, the lowest thermal resistance is achieved at higher pressure drops. In offset strip fins (Fig. 5A), the effect of pressure drop is somewhat limited to relatively large values of the optimal thermal resistance. For total thermal resistances less than 0.05 K/W, increasing the pressure drop will not significantly improve the thermal resistances for a given power consumption. As for impinging jet(s) (Figs. 6A and 7A), an increase in the pressure drop considerably reduces the total thermal resistance. This is due to the relatively low friction factor associated with jet impingement, which allows for a high Reynolds number, and thus enhancement of the heat transfer coefficients. For a given flow velocity, impinging jet(s) have smaller pressure drops compared to parallel flow heat sink configurations. This, thereby, explains why the effect of pressure drop on impinging jet(s) is more significant.

Figs. 2B, 3B, 4B, 5B, 6B, and 7B show the distribution of the cooling systems’ design variables along their respective Pareto optimal fronts for water at \( \Delta p = 70 \) kPa. Note that dimensions have been divided by a constant so that all design variables could easily be seen on a simple plot. As shown in these figures, the distribution of the cooling system’s respective design variables is complex. For the case of the micro-channel heat sink (Fig. 2B), it is observed that the optimal channel width does not vary significantly along the Pareto optimal front. This optimal channel width is calculated to be approximately 60 \( \mu m \). On the other hand, the aspect ratio, \( \alpha_{ch} \), decreases continuously along the Pareto optimal front with increasing optimal thermal resistances, while \( \beta_{ch} \) shows both decreasing and increasing behaviors. More pronounced fluctuating characteristics of design variables along their respective Pareto optimal fronts can be seen in circular pin fins (Figs. 3B and 4B) and offset strip fins (Fig. 5B). In Fig. 7B, the jet diameter shows an almost non-varying characteristic. This behavior is a direct result of the imposed constraints on the jet diameter.

Plots of the distribution of the cooling systems’ design variables along their respective Pareto optimal fronts for \( \Delta p = 30 \) kPa have shown similar trends, however with different magnitudes.

---

**Fig. 2.** (A) Micro-channel heat sink Pareto optimal solutions for water. (B) Distribution of the micro-channel heat sink design variables along its Pareto front for water at \( \Delta p = 70 \) kPa.

**Fig. 3.** (A) In-line circular pin-fin heat sink Pareto optimal solutions for water. (B) Distribution of in-line circular pin-fin heat sink design variables along its Pareto front for water at \( \Delta p = 70 \) kPa.
It is important to note that points along a single Pareto front (e.g., fixed pressure drop) do not necessarily correspond to fixed design variables. Likewise, for a given total thermal resistance or pumping power, the design variables are not necessarily fixed from one pressure drop curve to another. Therefore, one cannot easily decouple the effects of the Reynolds number and the effects of the friction factors, which makes it very difficult to physically explain some of the trends discussed earlier.

In light of the above paragraph, the simplest scenario to analyze may be the case of the multiple impinging jets. As illustrated in Fig. 7A, at relatively low pumping powers, the lowest thermal resistance is achieved with the lower pressure drop. This may be because for a fixed relatively low pumping power, the flow rate is relatively higher for lower pressure drops. However, this is not the case for relatively higher pumping powers as the lower pressure drops cannot permit high flow rate as a result of the friction factors’ effects, which slope decreases with increasing Reynolds number.

Also very interesting to note is that as a result of the pressure drop curves cross-overs, the lowest pumping power consumption does not necessarily occur at the lowest pressure drop for a given total thermal resistance value. This observation can be easily verified by drawing a vertical line around the proximity of a pressure drop curves cross-over (e.g., $R_{tot} = 0.18 \text{ K/W}$ in Fig. 6A). This will result to a pumping power curve in which the optimum pumping power (minimum pumping power) may not necessarily occur at the lowest pressure drop. These pressure drop curves cross-overs are not only specific to the current study but have been observed by previous researchers such as Bar-Cohen et al. [43].

Depending on the cooling needs, designers can rely on the combination of the abovementioned plots (Figs. 2–7) to determine the optimal design of a cooling system. Some of these optimum solutions are also tabulated in Table 7.

### 3.3. Comparison among the cooling technologies

Figs. 8 and 9 show comparisons of the cooling technologies considered in this study based on their respective Pareto optimal solutions at two different pressure drops with water. For a given pressure drop of 30 kPa and heat source base area of 100 mm² (Fig. 8), the offset strip fin heat sink offers the best thermal hydraulic performance. The relatively better performance of the offset strip fin heat sink can be attributed to its ability to enhance the heat transfer coefficients as well as to add surface area. In offset strip fins, the thermal boundary layers are stripped and reestablished; this causes the average heat transfer coefficients to be higher than those of continuous parallel plate fins. Besides interrupting the growth of the thermal boundary layers, offset strip fins may cause vortex shedding [44], which may increase the heat transfer coefficients [45]. However, this enhancement of the heat transfer coefficient...
coefficients is also associated with higher pressure drop and, consequently, higher pumping power consumption.

Next to the offset strip fin heat sink in performance are the staggered and in-line circular pin-fin heat sinks, with the staggered arrangement displaying slightly better performance than the in-line arrangement. The heat transfer coefficients of circular pin fins are higher than those of continuous parallel plate fins. This is due to the relatively small boundary layer thickness over the surface of the pin fins and the bulk mixing within the tube bundles. In comparison to the staggered pin-fin arrangement, the thermal performance of the in-line arrangement is slightly lower. Zukauskas and Ulinskas [17] came to a similar conclusion that in-line arrangements have lower heat transfer coefficients with, however, less hydraulic resistance as compared to staggered arrangements. For relatively very low pumping powers, below 0.05 W, micro-channel heat sinks offer the lowest thermal resistance.

The performance of multiple impinging jets is obviously better than that of a single impinging jet. The heat transfer coefficients in a single liquid impinging jet are very high at the stagnation zone; however, they decrease rapidly away from the stagnation point. To overcome this fall-off, multiple jets are used. In most of the cases studied, as shown in Fig. 8, the parallel flow heat sinks outperform jet impingement cooling. Even though jet impingement cooling yields very high heat transfer coefficients, its heat transfer area is much smaller compared to parallel flow heat sinks, and, therefore, the product \( hA \) is smaller. Lee and Vafai [4] have shown

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( d )</th>
<th>( w_c )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( \kappa_{cp} )</th>
<th>( \gamma_{cp} )</th>
<th>( \theta )</th>
<th>( \phi )</th>
<th>( P ) (W)</th>
<th>( R_{tot} ) (K/W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-channel heat sink</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-line circular pin-fin heat sink</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staggered circular pin-fin heat sink</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset strip fin heat sink</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single jet impingement*</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple jet impingements</td>
<td>997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( \delta = 0.25 \).
that micro-channel heat sinks can perform better or worse than multiple jet impingement cooling depending on the heat source base area. Nevertheless, even with much smaller heat transfer area, notice that multiple impinging jets display thermal performances similar to circular pin-fins at relatively large pumping power values.

Fig. 9, which presents a comparison of the cooling technologies at a pressure drop of 90 kPa, shows similar trends, however with lower thermal resistances and higher pumping power consumptions.

Figs. 10 and 11 show comparisons of the cooling technologies with HFE-7000 as the coolant. As expected, HFE-7000 performs poorly compared to water with total thermal resistance values much higher than those with water for a given pumping power. Similar to water, the offset strip fins outperform the other cooling technologies. Pin-fin arrangement has little to no effect on the thermal performance of the circular pin-fins. The micro-channels, compared to impinging jets, have better thermal performance for a wider range of total thermal resistances. This further highlights the complex nature of the thermal design optimization and the selection of electronics cooling technologies for a given application as the choice of the coolant not only dictates the maximum heat flux that can be dissipated but, also affects the selection of the cooling technologies.

4. Conclusions

A comprehensive comparative analysis of various electronics cooling technologies has been presented. The conclusions drawn from this study are subject to the imposed optimization constraints and the generality of the heat transfer and friction factor models used. In all cases studied, there is a trade-off between the total thermal resistance and pumping power consumption. The nature of this trade-off, however, is different from one cooling system to another. The main conclusions drawn from this study are as follows:

- Heat transfer and friction factor models used in present study are found to be reasonably valid for the range of operational conditions studied. The validity of Manglik and Bergles’ correlations [19] has not been yet extensively extended to liquids and micro-scale configurations. Thus more numerical and experimental studies with liquids at the micro-scale should be done to study the extent of their correlations.
- Single objective optimization of either the thermal resistance or pumping power may not necessarily yield optimum performance. The multiple-objective optimization approach is preferable as it provides a solution with different trade-offs among which designers can choose from to meet their cooling needs.
• The choice of a coolant has a significant effect on the selection of a cooling technology for a particular cooling application and should, therefore, be taken into consideration along with other design factors, such as geometric configuration, system mass, volume, cost, manufacturability, and environmental benevolence.

• In general, the offset strip fin heat sink outperformed the other cooling technologies. Next to the offset strip fin heat sink in performance are the staggered and in-line circular pin-fin heat sinks, with the staggered arrangement displaying slightly better performance than the in-line arrangement. For relatively very low pumping powers, the micro-channel heat sinks offer lowest thermal resistances.

• Jet impingement cooling yields very high heat transfer coefficients. However, to make efficient use of this technology, it should be coupled with sufficiently large heat sink surface area to increase the product $\Delta$h.
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