ELSEVIER



## **Building and Environment**



journal homepage: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/buildenv

# Improvement in airflow and temperature distribution with an in-rack UFAD system at a high-density data center

Xiaolei Yuan<sup>a, c</sup>, Xinjie Xu<sup>b</sup>, Jinxiang Liu<sup>b,\*</sup>, Yiqun Pan<sup>a,\*\*</sup>, Risto Kosonen<sup>b, c</sup>, Yang Gao<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Mechanical Engineering, Tongji University, 4800 Cao'an Road, 201804, Shanghai, China

<sup>b</sup> College of Urban Construction, Nanjing Tech University, P.O. Box 76, 210009, Nanjing, China

<sup>c</sup> School of Engineering, Aalto University, P.O. Box 14400, FI-00076 Espoo, Finland

<sup>d</sup> Nanjing Yangtze River Urban Architectural Design Co., LTD 210002 Nanjing, China

## ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Data centers Airflow management In-rack UFAD Temperature distribution Velocity distribution Energy saving

#### ABSTRACT

This paper introduced and analyzed a new concept where an under-floor air supply (UFAD) system with cold aisle containment (CAC) is replaced by a new in-rack UFAD system called an in-rack cold aisle (IR-CA). The IR-CA system is analyzed using CFD simulation, and on-site measurement was carried out to validate the feasibility and reliability of simulation models. The study is divided into eight cases with seven different dimensions for the rack air inlet (2.2 m × 0.6 m, 0.2 m × 0.6 m, 0.3 m × 0.6 m, 0.4 m × 0.6 m, 0.5 m × 0.6 m, 0.6 m × 0.6 m, and 0.7 m × 0.6 m), while an additional partition plane is placed in Case 8 with a 0.6 m × 0.6 m in-rack air inlet. The thermal distribution is compared and analyzed in the eight cases, while cooling efficiency and energy saving is compared between the original and optimal cases. The results showed that the optimal thermal distribution in Case 8 with a 0.6 m × 0.6 m in-CA and partition plane can save approximately 98 kW h/day in electricity consumption in the studied DC. A new evaluation index named the MS index is proposed to evaluate the optimization effects of the optimization model

## 1. Introduction

Building sectors are responsible for more than 40% of the world's energy consumption and about 30% of the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions [1]. The specific heat load of data center (DC) facilities could be more than 100 times larger than that of a typical similarly sized office building, while the energy use of DCs is 30–50 times that of office buildings [2,3]. Although DCs are just a small group of building sectors, its energy consumption accounts for about 1.5% of global electricity use, whose figure is especially high in the US at 2.8% [4–6]. Due to the high density and higher heat load of servers, the rising trend in energy use within DCs remains at 20% every year, which also challenges the safe operation of IT equipment [7–9]. IT equipment and cooling systems are two main electricity consumers in DCs, which are responsible for approximate 44% and 40% of total electricity use in a DC, respectively [10]. Cooling systems (e.g. refrigeration compressor and fans) are used to cool overheating IT equipment and keep them operating safely [11,12]. However,

\* Corresponding author.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106495

Received 22 July 2019; Received in revised form 21 October 2019; Accepted 23 October 2019 Available online 28 October 2019 0360-1323/© 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

a cooling system requires a lot of energy to guarantee safe operation of DCs [13]. The improvement in cooling efficiency and the balance of cooling energy consumption and safety operation of IT equipment are getting more attention and are worth further study.

According to Khalaj and Halgamuge [14], approaches to improving cooling performance varied from component-level to room-level solutions. Research on the component-level thermal optimization system is rather scant in the DC area [15]. Zimmermann et al. [16] attached micro-channel heat sinks to the electronic boards for heat dissipation from the components. Nie and Joshi [17] did the research on a multiple-scale reduction model by combining the Flow Network Method (FNM) and flux-matching Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) theory to achieve component-level conduction through rack-level convective transport. Compared to the component level, research on the room-level and rack-level high cooling efficiency method has been more popular in the past 20 years. Many researchers have studied the DC room-level methods based on free cooling technologies [18–20] and room-level airflow management, including operating parameters

<sup>\*\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: jxliu@njut.edu.cn (J. Liu), yiqunpan@tongji.edu.cn (Y. Pan).

| Nomenc               | lature   |
|----------------------|--|
| D1                   | Distance between the terminal of servers and the rack rear     |
| $\boldsymbol{\nu}_1$ | door m   |
| $D_2$                | Distance between server and the rack front door, m             |
| $D_3$                | Distance between two rows of rack, m                           |
| $D_4$                | Distance between the rear doors of two rack rows, m            |
| Ls                   | Length of server, m  |
| L <sub>c</sub>       | Length of air inlet of rack, m                                 |
| L <sub>r</sub>       | Length of rack, m  |
| $\overrightarrow{u}$ | Average velocity vector  |
| р                    | Static pressure, kPa   |
| Т                    | Static temperature, kPa  |
| $\overrightarrow{g}$ | Gravitational acceleration vector                              |
| $v_{eff}$            | Effective fluid viscosity                                      |
| $k_{eff}$            | Thermal conductivity   |
| ρ                    | Air density, kg/m <sup>3</sup>                                 |
| S                    | Volumetric heat sources  |
| $c_p$                | Specific heat capacity of air, kJ/(kg K)                       |
| $MT_{om}$            | Exhaust mean air temperature of the optimal model, °C          |
| $MT_o$               | Exhaust mean air temperature of the original model, $^\circ C$ |
| $SAT_{om}$           | SAT of the optimal model, °C                                   |
| $SAT_o$              | SAT of the original model, °C                                  |
| Q                    | Energy, kWh  |
| т                    | Mass of air, kg  |
| Δt                   | The SAT difference between the original and optimal            |
|                      | model, K   |
| V                    | The volume of air, m <sup>3</sup>                              |
| v                    | Airflow velocity from the air vent, m/s                        |
|                      |  |

| А            | Alea of all vent of CRACS, III            |
|--------------|---|
| $SAT_{C8-1}$ | SAT of Case 8–1, °C                       |
| $SAT_{C1}$   | SAT of Case 1, °C                         |
| Abbreviat    | ion                                       |
| DC           | Data center                               |
| HVAC         | Heating, ventilation and air conditioning |
| FNM          | Flow Network Method                       |
| POD          | Proper Orthogonal Decomposition           |
| FB           | Flexible baffle                           |
| LSTB         | Lower-side terminal baffles for server    |
| UFAD         | Under-floor air supply                    |
| CAC          | Cold aisle containment                    |
| IR-CA        | In-rack cold aisle                        |
| OHI          | Open hot aisle                            |
| CRACs        | Computer room air conditioning units      |
| SAT          | Supply air temperature                    |
| CA           | Cold aisle                                |
| RANS         | Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes           |
| VP           | Velocity point                            |
| RSM          | Reynolds Stress Model                     |
| DES          | Detached Eddy Simulations                 |
| MP           | Measuring point                           |
| RP           | Record point                              |
| VP           | Velocity point                            |
| SVP          | Simulation velocity point                 |
| MS           | Ratio of mean temperature to SAT          |
| COP          | Coefficient of performance                |

A map of simple  $f \in ODAC_2$   $m^2$ 

adjustment [21,22], ventilation configurations [23–26], and aisle containment configuration [23,27,28]. A free cooling system uses the natural clod sources to cool the DCs in the winter and transitional seasons with lower outdoor temperatures [10]. Wang et al. [18] analyzed the reliability and availability of a hybrid free cooling system with a water-side economizer in a DC, while they also did some uncertainty analysis of supervisory control performance in the same hybrid free cooling system [20]. In addition, Ding et al. [29] experimentally studied the influencing factor of the separated heat pipe system in a DC. There is no doubt that free cooling is a promising energy-saving method applied in a DC, but it is restricted by the limited external conditions in use [30, 31]. Thus, free cooling technology cannot be used effectively in all climate zones, while research on component-level thermal distribution optimization is in its infancy.

Room-level airflow management can improve the overall thermal distribution and reduce energy use, but it cannot solve the problem of thermal environment deterioration of a single rack or local part [13]. Recently, research on the room-level airflow optimization system has tended to be saturated and has come up against a bottleneck, while the rack-level thermal optimization system gets more attention. Almoli et al. [32] attached liquid loop heat exchangers and additional fans on the rack backdoor and found that it can improve the thermal distribution. The results show that the use of heat exchangers at the racks' rear door can improve the thermal environment and reduce cooling energy saving by free cooling. Yuan et al. [15] proposed flexible baffles (FBs) set in the front door of the rack, and they experimentally and numerically investigated the effects of FBs on the airflow distribution in a high-density DC. The results showed that the thermal and airflow distribution is successfully improved in the models with FBs, while the exhaust air temperature drop is proportional to the original temperature and the width of the FBs. Wang et al. [33] proposed an innovative rack-level drawer rack to improve airflow distribution, while the results showed that the hot-air recirculation and cold-air bypass could be significantly improved. Yuan et al. [13] proposed a novel rack-level DC airflow optimization system with lower-side terminal baffles for servers (LSTBs) and concluded that the application of  $45^{\circ}$  angle and  $8 \text{ cm} \times 46$ -cm LSTBs can alleviate the rack hotspot and improve cooling efficiency. Choi et al. [34] used CFD simulation software to build up a detailed DC model named ThermoStat to study the temperature and airflow distribution in rack-mounted server systems.

The performance of the cooling system can be improved by optimizing rack-level airflow management. The novelty of this paper is to introduce a new concept for the rack-level airflow management where a typical under-floor air supply (UFAD) system with cold aisle containment (CAC) is replaced by an in-rack UFAD system. In this concept, the CAC is converted into a virtue in-rack cold aisle (IR-CA). The study is divided into eight cases with seven different dimensions for the rack air inlet, while an additional partition plane is placed in Case 8 with a 0.6 m × 0.6-m rack air inlet. The simulation results of temperatures and velocities in Case 1 is fully validated by the corresponding on-site experimental results. In this paper, the feasibility of the in-rack UFAD system is validated, and then the impact of different in-rack UFAD systems on the thermal environment optimization in DC is investigated and analyzed. Finally, the energy saving is calculated.

## 2. Methodology

## 2.1. Data center description

The studied DC is a typical UFAD DC with CAC and an open hot aisle (OHI), which serves a campus in Nanjing, China, with Internet and communication service. It covers the network demand of approximately 30,000 people. Fig. 1 shows the studied DC and its layout and plan, while Table 1 lists the geometry and configuration of the DC. The cool



Fig. 1. The studied DC (left) and its layout & plan (right).

air generated by the computer room air conditioning units (CRACs) supplies the plenum chamber and flows into the CAC through perforated tiles afterwards. The cool air within the CAC is drawn into the rack front door and is exchanged with the hot air at the terminal of servers, and then the mixed air enters the OHI through the rack rear door. Finally, the mixed air in the OHI returns directly to the CRACs. The heat loss of the plenum is assumed to be insignificant.

Two CRACs supply cool air. Their specifications are listed in Table 2. The set supply air temperature (SAT) is 22 °C, while the actual operating SAT of the two CRACs is 22.2 °C and 22.1 °C, respectively. However, the slight deviation of SAT between set and operating SAT is within the acceptable limit. These two CRACs have to work continuously for 24 h/day, 365 days/year, while their total power is about 86 kW. This means significant annual electricity consumption at full load. Thus, under the premise of ensuring the safety operation of servers and an acceptable thermal environment in DC, reducing the load of CRACs as much as possible by adjusting its air supply parameters could improve cooling efficiency and minimize energy consumption [15,21].

The racks in the studied DC differ largely from each other; their servers' placement, dimensions, and heat load are different and uneven. Table 3 shows the geometry and technical description of racks and servers. The rated power varies from 600 W to 4000 W, while the dimensions of the server are also much different. For this study, Rack B4 is selected as the studied rack for the following reasons: 1. All the servers have the same dimensions; 2. The servers have only two rated powers (495 W  $\times$  2 and 750 W  $\times$  2); 3. Relatively even spacing between servers; 4. The highest rated power of 16.98 kW.

## 2.2. On-site experimental description

The simulation model is validated by on-site experiments carried out

| Table 1      |                  |            |      |
|--------------|------------------|------------|------|
| Geometry and | configuration of | the studie | d DC |

| Items                          | Value   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Dimensions of DC               | 11 m (L) $\times$ 8 m (W) $\times$ 4 m (H)                  |
| Plenum height                  | 0.45 m  |
| Height above the plenum        | 3.55 m  |
| Plenum                         | Slightly adiabatic  |
| Air supply mode                | UFAD & Direct air return                                    |
| Aisle configuration mode       | 1 CAC & 2 OHIs  |
| Dimensions of CACs             | 5.4 m (L) $	imes$ 1.8 m (W) $	imes$ 2.2 m (H)               |
| Number of perforated tiles     | Altogether 27 in three rows                                 |
| Dimensions of perforated tiles | $0.6\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(L)} 	imes 0.6\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(W)}$ |
| Porosity of perforated tiles   | 45%   |
| Room ambient humidity          | Below 36%   |

| Table 2        |           |
|----------------|-----------|
| Specifications | of CRACs. |

| Items                                | Values   |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Number of CRACs                      | 2  |
| Dimensions of CRACs                  | $1.8\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(L)}	imes0.8\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(W)}	imes2.25\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(H)}$ |
| Distance between CACs and CRACs      | 1.6 m  |
| Height of CRACs above the plenum     | 1.8 m  |
| Height of CRACs under the plenum     | 0.45 m   |
| Dimensions of CRACs' air outlet vent | $1.8\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(L)}	imes0.25\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(W)}$                               |
| Area of each air vent of CRACs       | $0.45  {\rm m}^2$  |
| Air velocity from the CRACs          | 5.33 m/s   |
| Set supply air temperature (SAT)     | 22 °C  |
| Operating SAT                        | 22.2 °C & 22.1 °C  |
| Total power per CRAC                 | 43.1 kW  |
| Supply air cooling capacity per CRAC | 65.8 kW  |
| COP                                  | 1.53   |
| Operation time                       | 24/24 h, 365 days/year   |

#### Table 3

Geometry and technical description of racks and servers.

| Items                                  | Values   |
|--|--|
| Number of racks                        | Altogether 18 in 2 rows (Rack A & Rack B)  |
| Dimensions of each rack                | $1.2 \mathrm{m}$ (L) $	imes$ 0.6 m (W) $	imes$ 2.2 m (H)                                       |
| Front door porosity                    | 65%  |
| Rear door porosity                     | 65%  |
| Rated power of racks                   | Varied between 0 kW and 16.98 kW   |
| Dimensions of servers                  | 0.8  m (L) $	imes$ 0.46 m (W) $	imes$ 0.09 m (H)   |
|  | 0.7 m (L) $	imes$ 0.46 m (W) $	imes$ 0.09 m (H)  |
|  | $0.8\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(L)} 	imes 0.46\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(W)} 	imes 0.045\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(H)}$ |
|  | $0.8\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(L)} 	imes 0.46\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(W)} 	imes 0.18\mathrm{m}\mathrm{(H)}$  |
| Rated power of servers                 | $300W\times 2 \qquad \qquad 495W\times 2$  |
|  | $600W\times 2 \qquad \qquad 750W\times 2$  |
|  | $900W\times 2 \qquad \qquad 2000W\times 2$   |
| Dimensions of servers in studied rack  | 0.8  m (L) $	imes$ 0.46 m (W) $	imes$ 0.09 m (H)   |
| Rated power of servers in studied rack | $(495\text{W}\times2)\times2 \qquad (750\text{W}\times2)\times10$                              |
| Distance between neighboring servers   | 0.09 m 0.045 m   |

in September 2018 at a university in Nanjing, China. Fig. 2 shows the temperature measuring points (MPs) in the experiments and the configuration of these points, while Table 4 shows the experimental equipment information. The measured object is Rack B4, while seven MPs were temperature sensors set at the rear door of the rack. The temperature sensors are linked to the data acquisition logger, while the temperatures from the sensors will be recorded by the logger, and then transmitted to the personal computer. The measurement period lasted approximate 2 h. The supply air temperature and velocity of CRACs are measured by the handheld airflow anemometer of model number 'KIMO

2.2 m





| Table 4                 |
|-------------------------|
| Experimental equipment. |

| Experimental equipment         | Model  | Measuring range             | Accuracy  |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Temperature<br>sensor          | Type K thermocouples<br>of nickel chromium-<br>silicon | -20 °C-400 °C               | ±0.4%     |
| Data acquisition<br>logger     | Aglient 34972A   | N/A                         | N/A       |
| Handheld airflow<br>anemometer | KIMO VT200/FC300                                       | Temperature:<br>20 °C–80 °C | ±0.4%     |
|                                |  | Velocity:0.15–30 m/s        | $\pm 2\%$ |

VT200/FC300'. The measured air temperature was 22.1  $^\circ C$ , and the air velocity was 5.33 m/s in the middle area of the air vent of CRACs.

Consistent with the MPs in the experiments, the corresponding record points (RPs) in the simulation are used to compare the experimental and simulation results. The positions of RPs are the same as the MPs shown in Fig. 2b. However, the temperature sensor in the MP 7 is broken in the experimental process; therefore, the data of MP 7 is excluded. According to Yuan et al. [13] and Yuan et al. [15], 6 temperature measuring points are enough to express exhaust air temperature distribution and validate the accuracy of simulation. In addition, the temperature in the MP 7 is relatively low, which cannot be the rack hotspot. Thus, the exclusion of MP 7 has little effect on the determination rack hotspot and validation. Expect of temperature MPs, the velocities of the servers' terminal are also measured by the handheld airflow anemometer. The positions of the velocity points (VPs) in the measurement are shown in Fig. 3, while the corresponding velocity record points in the simulation are named as simulation velocity points (SVPs). In addition, Fig. 3 also shows the detailed rated powers of each



Fig. 3. The positions of the velocity points (VPs) in the measurement.

## server.

## 2.3. Numerical simulation description

Refer to the geometry and specifications in Tables 1-3. A DC model is constructed using the commercial CFD software Airpak 3.0 for numerical investigation. Fig. 4 shows the CFD model of the studied DC. A trial simulation was done in the model with all the parameters of racks and servers consistent with the actual DC. The mesh number reached the  $28,000,000^+$  level, while the convergence time for the trial simulation took more than 7 h. Thus, the model was simplified to save simulation time. In the following numerical simulations, only racks B3-5 were equipped with servers based on the actual servers' status, while other racks are empty of servers for the simplification of the simulation model. The simulation results of Rack B4 before and after simplification were almost identical [13,15]. The simplified model is applied in all the cases described in Table 5. Table 5 shows the specific case description including cold aisle (CA) mode and geometry dimensions. Case 1 adapts a CAC, while cases 2–7 replaces the CAC by IR-CA. In cases 2–7, the only independent variable is D2 and Lc, and except in Case 1, D2, and Lc are the same parameter in cases 2–7. The value of D<sub>1</sub>, L<sub>s</sub>, and D<sub>3</sub> are the same in cases 2-7, respectively. D1 represents the distance between the terminal of servers and the rack rear door, while D<sub>2</sub> is the distance between the server and the rack's front door. In addition, D<sub>3</sub> is the distance between two rows of racks, and D<sub>4</sub> represents the distance between the rear doors of two rack rows. The air supply parameters of the CRACs in cases 1-8 are the same.

The layout and specification of Rack B4 in seven cases can be seen in Table 5 and Fig. 5. The schematic map of these cases in Fig. 5 is based on the central section of Rack A4, cold aisle, and Rack B4 in Fig. 4. The red dotted lines and blue solid lines in Fig. 5 represent the rack air outlet and inlet, respectively.

 $D_1$  is the distance between the terminal of servers and the rack rear door.  $D_2$  is the distance between server and the rack front door.  $D_3$  is the distance between two rack rows.  $D_4$  is the distance between the rear

doors of two rack rows.  $L_s$  is the length of the server.  $L_c$  is the length of a rack's air inlet.  $L_r$  is the rack's length.

The flow regime of the simulation models is turbulent mixed convection in consideration of the airflow conditions, scales of racks, and server in DC. Phan et al. [35] applied and compared server Reynolds-averaged Navier-Stokes (RANS) turbulent models in DC in terms of simulation time and accuracy. They found that the zero-equation model performs better than standard the k- $\epsilon$  model in consideration of well-balanced and time-targeting models. In addition, Wibron et al. [36] recommended that the RSM model performed better than DES and the  $k-\varepsilon$  model for precise simulation results. However, the simulation results in the zero-equation model is not as precise as that in the standard k- $\varepsilon$  model, while the RSM model takes 15-20% more memory and has a longer convergence time than the standard  $k-\varepsilon$  model [37,38]. In addition, the standard  $k-\varepsilon$  model has been applied in many DC researches, while research on the application of the zero-equation and RSM models in DC are relatively few [13,15,39-43]. Fig. 6 shows the comparison of temperature distributions between the experimental results and simulation results in different turbulent models. The RSM turbulent model ranks first in terms of deviation between experimental results and simulation results, followed by the standard k- $\varepsilon$  model, while the accuracy of the zero-equation model is the worst among them. However, the accuracy difference between the RSM model and standard k-ε model is slight, and the RSM model takes 1.8 times the convergence time compared with the standard  $k-\varepsilon$  model for each case. Thus, comprehensively considering the application scope, accuracy, CPU utilization percentage, and convergence time, the standard  $k-\varepsilon$  turbulent model is applied in this paper. As shown in Table 6, there are also some assumptions in the simulation process with the standard  $k-\varepsilon$  turbulent model, while the momentum, continuity, and energy conservation equations for the impressible fluid are also listed in Table 7.

Table 7 summarizes the convergence criteria, discretization solution, and other simulation parameters. Mesh number plays an important role in the simulation period, affecting the simulation time and accuracy and even directly deciding on the success or failure of the simulation [47]. A



Fig. 4. Schematic diagram of CFD model of the studied DC.

## Table 5

Case categories and descriptions.

| Case              | 1   | 2     | 3     | 4                   | 5     | 6     | 7     | Remarks                 |
|-------------------|---|-------|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------|
| CA mode           | CAC                                       | IR-CA | IR-CA | IR-CA               | IR-CA | IR-CA | IR-CA | N/A                     |
| $D_1/m$           |   |       |       | Constant value: 0.3 | 3     |       |       | N/A                     |
| L <sub>s</sub> /m |   |       |       | Constant value: 0.8 | 3     |       |       | N/A                     |
| $D_2/m$           | 0.1                                       | 0.2   | 0.3   | 0.4                 | 0.5   | 0.6   | 0.7   | N/A                     |
| L <sub>c</sub> /m | 2.2                                       | 0.2   | 0.3   | 0.4                 | 0.5   | 0.6   | 0.7   | N/A                     |
| D <sub>3</sub> /m | D <sub>3</sub> /m 1.8 Constant value: 0.6 |       |       |                     |       |       | N/A   |                         |
| L <sub>r</sub> /m | 1.2                                       | 1.3   | 1.4   | 1.5                 | 1.6   | 1.7   | 1.8   | $L_r = D_1 + L_s + D_2$ |
| D <sub>4</sub> /m | 4.2                                       | 3.2   | 3.4   | 3.6                 | 3.8   | 4     | 4.2   | $D_4\!=\!L_r+D_3$       |



Fig. 5. The size and location of rack air inlet in seven cases.

coarse grid can contribute to numerical errors, while significant increases in mesh number can cause round-off errors. Thus, a proper grid number can reduce both the numerical errors and round-off errors [13]. The grid independence test should be done to check the grid quality, while different grid numbers are chosen to find the proper grid number. The grid independence test applied in this paper has been used in many open literatures and is regarded as an appropriate method [13,15, [48–51]]. Fig. 7 shows the grid independent test of Case 1. When the mesh number is larger than 1,802,216, the maximum exhaust air temperature of Rack B4 remains steady. Thus, the mesh number of 1,802, 216 is chosen as the proper grid number, while the mesh quality is checked as qualified by the self-contained Grid Quality Inspection Tool of Airpak 3.0. In addition, no element has been distorted, as the calculation of face alignment was larger than 0.15.

## 2.4. Validation experiments

Fig. 8 shows the temperature validation between experimental results and simulation results in Case 1. The temperature trend of the points in the experiment and simulation are almost the same, while the simulated values are slightly larger than the measured values in all the MPs/RPs. In addition, the maximum deviation of the temperatures between corresponding MPs and RPs is smaller than 3.5%. Thus, the numerical results are consistent with the experimental results in terms of the temperature of the MPs/RPs. Likewise, as shown in Fig. 9, the velocity trend of the points in the experiment and simulation are the almost same, while the maximum deviation of the velocities between corresponding VPs and SVPs is smaller than 11.5%. Thus, the numerical results are consistent with the experimental results in terms of the velocities of the VPs/SVPs. In summary, the simulation model is strongly validated by the experimental results in terms of temperature and velocity. Fig. 9 can also explain why the exhaust temperatures of six



Fig. 6. The comparison of temperature distributions between the experimental results and simulation results in different turbulent models.

## Table 6

Simulation assumptions and governing equations.

| Items                 |            | Description   |
|-----------------------|------------|---|
| Assumptions [13,44-46 | 5]:        |   |
|                       |            | No radiation effects  |
|                       |            | No air leakage  |
|                       |            | Incompressible fluid used   |
|                       |            | The same supply air temperature in all tiles  |
| Governing equations:  |            |   |
| Continuity            | Equation 1 | $ abla \cdot \overrightarrow{u} = 0$  |
| Momentum              | Equation 2 | $\frac{\partial \vec{u}}{\partial \vec{u}} + \vec{u} \cdot \nabla \vec{u} = \nabla \cdot (\nu \cdot c \nabla \vec{u}) - \frac{1}{\nabla p} + \vec{e}$   |
| Energy conservation   | Equation 3 | $\frac{\partial t}{\partial t} + (\vec{u} \cdot \nabla t) = \nabla \cdot (k_{eff} \nabla T) + S$ $\rho c_p \left[ \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + (\vec{u} \cdot \nabla) T \right] = \nabla \cdot (k_{eff} \nabla T) + S$ |

## Table 7

Simulation discretization solution and parameter settings.

| Items           | Variables             | Value               | Remarks        |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| CRACs           | Airflow velocities    | 5.33 m/s            | 2 CRACs        |
|                 | SAT                   | 22 °C               | N/A            |
| Discretization  | Discretization        | Second-order        | For all        |
| solution [47]   | scheme                | upward              | temperature,   |
|                 | Under-relaxation      | 0.3                 | momentum,      |
|                 | Solving format        | AMG                 | and pressure   |
|                 | Type of linear solver | Flex                |                |
| Convergence     | X, Y, and Z direction | $1	imes 10^{-3}$    | N/A            |
| criteria [15]   | Continuity            | $1	imes 10^{-3}$    |                |
|                 | Energy                | $1 	imes 10^{-6}$   |                |
|                 | Dissipation rate      | $1 	imes 10^{-3}$   |                |
| Mesh parameters | Mesh type             | Hexa unstructured   | N/A            |
| [13,15]         | Grid generation       | Variable-based smoo | th N/A         |
|                 | criteria              | element & density   |                |
|                 |                       | changes             |                |
|                 | Mesh quality          | 1                   | More than      |
|                 |                       |                     | 95%            |
|                 | Face alignment        | Larger than 0.15    | No element     |
|                 |                       |                     | severely       |
|                 |                       |                     | distorted      |
|                 | Mesh spacing          | Non-uniform         | In the overall |
|                 |                       |                     | domain         |
|                 | Spacing between       | From 0.015 m to     | N/A            |
|                 | grid points           | 0.035 m             |                |

measuring points in the experiment are higher than the corresponding temperatures in the numerical results in Fig. 8. The larger velocities result in lower temperature distribution.



Fig. 7. The variations of maximum exhaust air temperature of Rack B4 with grid number in Case 1.



Fig. 8. Temperature validation between experimental results and simulation results in Case 1.

## 3. Temperature and airflow distribution analysis

The study is divided into eight cases with seven different dimensions of rack air inlet  $(2.2 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, 0.2 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, 0.3 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, 0.4 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, 0.5 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, 0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}, and 0.7 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m})$ , while an additional partition plane is placed in Case 8 with a  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  rack air inlet. The temperature and airflow distributions in cases 1-7 are obtained and analyzed, and then the impacts of IR-CA on the thermal environment were analyzed and discussed.

#### 3.1. Optimization of temperature distribution

Fig. 10 shows the exhaust air temperature distribution of Rack B4 in seven cases. In Case 1, the cool air is supplied through the front door of Rack B4 from the UFAD system with CAC, while the cool air is directly drawn into the rack through the under-floor perforated tiles within the rack in cases 2–7. Compared to Case 1, the CAC is replaced by a virtual IR-CA in cases 2–7. As shown in Fig. 10, an obvious heat accumulation exists in the lower part of Rack B4 in Case 1. The application of IR-CA can to varying degrees improve the exhaust air distribution of the



Fig. 9. Velocity validation between experimental results and simulation results in Case 1.

middle and top part of Rack B4 in all cases 2–7. For the lower part of Rack B4, the heat accumulation phenomenon in cases 2 and 3 gets worse, which means that the application of IR-CA in cases 2 and 3 cannot improve the airflow and thermal distribution of B4. However, when the width of IC-RA increases from 0.4 m in Case 4 to 0.6 m in Case 6, the heat accumulation in the lower part of Rack B4 is significantly reduced, while the heat is never accumulated in the lower part in Case 6. When the width of IR-CA increases to 0.7 m, the heat accumulation phenomenon recovers in the lower part of Rack B4. Thus, combining the optimization effects of the whole rack, Case 6 performed best in terms of heat accumulation mitigation and temperature distribution uniformity.

According to Yuan et al. [13], the rack hotspot was defined as the point where the maximum exhaust temperature of each rack is located. The rack hotspot can reflect the uniformity of the exhaust temperature of the racks. Fig. 11 illustrates the temperature variation of the rack hotspot and maximum temperature difference in seven cases. The temperature of the rack hotspot stands at  $33.2 \,^{\circ}$ C in Case 1 and then rapidly increases to up to  $35.3 \,^{\circ}$ C in Case 2, where there is an exponential decrease to an all-time low of  $30.8 \,^{\circ}$ C in Case 6. In Case 7, the rack hotspot temperature recovers to  $32.4 \,^{\circ}$ C. Thus, the rack hotspot of Rack

B4 reaches the minimum in Case 6. Likewise, the maximum exhaust air temperature difference of Rack B4 shares the same change trend with the rack hotspot, while the maximum exhaust air temperature difference is the lowest at 8.8 °C in Case 6. Thus, Case 6 can achieve the lowest rack hotspot and maximum temperature difference.

In Fig. 12, the purple bar represents the temperatures of six RPs in Case 1, while the lines represent the temperature of six RPs in cases 2–7. As shown in Fig. 12, there are always some points in cases 2–4 where the temperatures are higher than the corresponding points in Case 1. However, the temperature of all RPs in cases 5–7 is lower than the corresponding points in Case 1. In addition, compared to cases 5–7, the temperature range of six RPs in Case 6 is relatively smaller, which is concentrated in Zone 1 (from around 29.5 °C to about 30.5 °C). Therefore, the temperature of RPs is the most uniform in Case 6.

To sum up, when the width of IR-CA is larger than 0.3 m, the in-rack UFAD system can improve the thermal distribution of Rack B4. In addition, concerning the heat accumulation mitigation, exhaust air temperature distribution, rack hotspot, maximum temperature difference, and uniformity of RPs' temperature, the optimal thermal distribution can be obtained in Case 6 with 0.6 m IR-CA in width. The



Fig. 11. Temperature variation of rack hotspot and maximum temperature difference in seven cases.



Fig. 10. Exhaust air temperature profiles of Rack B4 in seven cases.



Fig. 12. The temperature variation of six RPs in seven cases.

maximum temperature drop in the rack hotspot can reach 2.4 K.

## 3.2. Airflow velocity optimization

Fig. 13 shows the airflow within the rack in Case 1. The airflow velocities in different parts of servers are quite different in height. In Fig. 13, air velocities are divided into four zones. The velocities in Zone 2 rank first, which is followed by those in Zone 3. Next come the velocities in Zone 4, while Zone 1 has the lowest airflow velocities among all four zones. As the analysis in Fig. 10 shows, heat is heavily accumulated in the lower part of Rack B4, while there is also a slight heat accumulation in the top part of the rack. Thus, the lowest airflow velocity in the lower part of the racks contributed to the heat accumulation in this part, while



Fig. 13. The airflow within the rack in Case 1 (side view).

the relatively lower airflow velocity led to another slight heat accumulation in the top part.

However, as shown in Fig. 14, the non-uniform airflow distribution is improved to varying degrees in the application of in-rack UFAD systems. Fig. 14 explains the principle of the in-rack UFAD system by analyzing the velocity map of the side of Rack B4, while it shows the airflow velocities within Rack B4 in seven cases. In Case 1, the velocity of the air inlet is very slow, while the air velocity through the air inlet has been greatly increased in all cases 2–7. The velocities in the lower part of Rack B4 is improved the most in Case 6, successfully alleviating the temperature accumulation in the lower part of Rack B4. In addition, the velocity distribution becomes more uniform at the terminal of the servers. Thus, Case 6 performs the best in terms of the velocity improvement in the lower part of Rack B4 and overall velocity distribution uniformity.

Fig. 15 shows the air velocity profiles of thirteen SVPs and the maximum velocity difference in seven cases: the larger the velocity difference, the less uniform supply air in the upper and lower part of the rack. The maximum velocity difference of thirteen VPs is the lowest at 0.41 m/s in Case 1, while those in cases 5–7 the difference is 0.54–0.61 m/s. However, the maximum velocity differences become too large in cases 2–4, whose figures are 0.97, 1.01, and 1.21 m/s, respectively. Thus, Case 1 ranks first in terms of supply air uniformity, which is followed by Case 6, then Case 5 and Case 7.

The bar graph in Fig. 15 shows the air velocities at thirteen SVPs in seven cases. The majority of velocities of SVPs are relatively low, which are below 0.5 m/s in Case 1, while the velocities of most SVPs are greater than 0.5 m/s in cases 2-7. There is only one SVP whose velocity is below 0.5 m/s in cases 5-6, while the number of VPs with a velocity below 0.5 m/s is at least three in the other cases. Thus, cases 5-6 have a relatively uniform air supply when there is a higher mean air velocity level. As shown in Figs. 10 and 13, heat accumulation exists in the lower part of Rack B4, while the supply of cool air in Zone 1 is insufficient. The greater supply air velocity of a rack's bottom part, the better airflow and temperature distribution. As shown in Fig. 15, the air velocities of a rack's bottom part in Case 6 are greater than those in Case 5. Thus, Case 6 performs the best in terms of high supply air velocity level and heat accumulation mitigation in the bottom part of Rack B4. Case 6 can achieve three optimizations at the same time: supply air uniformity, higher supply air velocity level, and heat accumulation mitigation.

To sum up, combining the analysis of both temperature and velocity distribution optimization in cases 1–7,  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  IR-CA in Case 6 can achieve the optimal thermal distribution and supply air uniformity and relieve the heat accumulation.

## 4. Advanced model analysis

Although Case 6 improves the airflow and thermal distribution of Rack B4 to a great extent, the airflow through the route between the upper side of the top server and rack top surface has a relatively high velocity compared to some other tunnels between neighboring servers in Rack B4, while the majority of the cold air bypassed and flowed directly out of the rack, causing the waste of cold air. Thus, an additional Partition plane is placed horizontally between the upper side of the top server and the rack front door in Case 8. The side description and the 3-D model of Rack B4 in Case 8 are shown in Fig. 16. The dimension of the partition planes is  $60 \text{ cm} \times 60 \text{ cm} \times 0.1 \text{ cm}$ .

#### 4.1. Temperature and airflow analysis

Fig. 17 shows the exhaust air temperature and airflow distribution of Rack B4 in cases 1, 6, and 8. The lower airflow velocity contributed to higher exhaust air temperature in the same horizontal plane. Compared to Case 1, the heat accumulation is reduced significantly in both cases 6 and 8, while the exhaust air temperature distribution is obviously improved. In addition, the velocities of rack lower part are greatly enhanced in both cases 6 and 8. However, the application of a partition



Fig. 14. Airflow velocities within Rack B4 in different cases.



Fig. 15. The air velocity profiles of thirteen VPs and maximum velocity difference in seven cases.

plane in Case 8 prevents the cold air escaping through the gap of the upper server side. As shown in Fig. 16, compared to Case 6 with Case 8, the airflow velocities of the middle and top part of Rack B4 are increased. The air velocities are the most uniform in Case 8. Thus, compared to Case 6, the heat accumulation in the top part is further mitigated in Case 8, while the heat accumulation in the lower part is

almost the same.

In addition, the temperatures and velocities of the corresponding RPs and SVPs in cases 6 and 8 are shown in Fig. 18 and Fig. 19, respectively. As shown in Fig. 18, the temperatures of all the RPs in cases 6 and 8 are much lower than the corresponding points in Case 1. The temperatures of six RPs in cases 6 and 8 are divided by the third RP. In RPs 1 and 2, the



Fig. 16. The side description (left) and 3-D model (right) of Rack B4 in Case 8.



Fig. 17. The exhaust air temperature distribution and airflow distribution of Rack B4 in cases 1, 6, and 8.



Fig. 18. The exhaust air temperature of six RPs in cases 1, 6, and 8.

temperature in Case 8 is slightly higher than that in Case 6, while the temperature in RP 3 is the same in cases 6 and 8. In VPs 4–6, Case 8 has obviously lower temperatures than Case 6. Thus, considering the temperature of all RPs synthetically, Case 8 improves the temperatures of



Fig. 19. Airflow velocities of thirteen VPs in cases 1, 6, and 8.

RPs more than Case 6. The corresponding analysis of velocity distributions in cases 6 and 8 is shown in Fig. 19. Except for SVP 8 in Case 6 and SVP 13 in Case 8, the velocities of all the VPs are higher than the corresponding VPs' velocities in Case 1. Thus, both cases 6 and 8 have a higher air velocity in Rack B4 than Case 1. However, Case 6 has slightly higher velocities in SVPs 1–3, while Case 8 has higher velocities than Case 6 in SVPs 4–12 to varying degrees.

Through comparing and analyzing the temperature and airflow distribution of cases 1, 6, and 8, it can be concluded that the airflow and temperature distribution in Case 8 is more uniform than that in Case 6.

## 4.2. Energy saving

Based on the thermal distribution analysis, the application of a 0.6 cm  $\times$  0.6 m IR-CA and 0.6 m  $\times$  0.6 m  $\times$  0.1-m partition plane in Case 8 can achieve optimal thermal distribution and minimize the rack hotspot. In order to calculate the energy-saving potential of Case 8 compared to Case 1, the SAT of CRACs is adjusted to 23 °C and 23.5 °C to simulate the temperature and airflow distribution. Case 8 with SATs of 23 °C and 23.5 °C are named cases 8–1 and 8–2, respectively.

Fig. 20 compared the exhaust air temperature distribution of Rack B4 in cases 1, 8–1, and 8–2. Compared to Case 1, whether the SAT is set to 23 °C or 23.5 °C, the heat accumulation in the lower part of the rack is mitigated to varying degrees. The heat accumulation in the top part of the rack deteriorates slightly in Case 8–1, while it deteriorates moderately in Case 8–2. However, the deterioration of the heat accumulation in both cases 8–1 and 8–2 is acceptable because the upper heat accumulation alleviates the lower heat accumulation. In addition, compared to the heat accumulation in the lower part of Rack B4 in Case 1, the heat accumulation in the upper and lower Rack B4 of cases 8–1 and 8–2 is more moderate.

Thus, both Case 8–1 and Case 8-2 have a better temperature distribution than Case 1. In addition, the heat accumulation phenomenon in Case 1 is also mitigated in cases 8–1 and 8–2. However, the temperature distribution and heat accumulation mitigation effect in Case 8–1 is much better than that in Case 8–2.

The exhaust air mean temperature and rack hotpot temperature in cases 1, 8–1, and 8–2 are shown in Fig. 21. The mean temperature increases with the rise in SAT. A new evaluation index of optimization model performance is proposed, which is defined as the ratio of the rack mean exhaust air temperature difference between the optimization and original model to the SAT difference between them. The new evaluation index is named the MS index, and the equation is shown in Equation (4). The MS index is inversely proportional to the SAT difference between the optimization and original model, while it is proportional to the mean exhaust air temperature difference between the optimization and original model. Thus, the bigger the MS index, the higher the thermal distribution and cooling efficiency. In Case 8–1, the SAT rises by 1 °C, but





**Fig. 21.** The mean temperature and temperature of rack hotspot of Rack B4 in cases 1, 8–1, and 8–2.

the mean temperature rises by only 0.4 °C. However, when the SAT rises by 1.5 °C, the mean temperature rises from 28.9 °C to 29.8 °C by 0.9 °C. The MS index in Case 8–1 is 0.4, and in Case 8–2 it is 0.6. Thus, Case 8-1 has better thermal distribution and cooling efficiency than Case 8–2 in terms of the MS index.

As shown in Fig. 21, the temperature of the rack hotspot is lowest in Case 8–1, reducing by 1.2 K compared to that in Case 1. Although the temperature of the rack hotspot in Case 8–2 also falls by 0.6 K, the temperature drop is not as obvious as in Case 8–1. Thus, Case 8–1 performed better than Case 8–2 in terms of thermal distribution, heat accumulation mitigation effect, cooling efficiency, and rack hotspot.

$$MS = \frac{MT_{om} - MT_o}{SAT_{om} - SAT_o}$$
(4)

$$Q = cp \cdot m \cdot \Delta t \tag{5}$$

$$m = \rho \cdot V \tag{6}$$

$$V = v \cdot A \tag{7}$$

$$\Delta t = SAT_{C8-1} - SAT_{C1} \tag{8}$$

 $Q = cp \cdot \rho \cdot v \cdot A \cdot (SAT_{C8-1} - SAT_{C1})$ 

$$1\frac{kJ}{kg\cdot K} \cdot 1.293\frac{kg}{m^3} \cdot 5.33\frac{m}{s} \cdot 0.45m^2 \cdot 2 \cdot (23^\circ C - 22^\circ C) = 6.2 \, kWh \tag{9}$$

The electricity use of CRACs should decrease due to the rise of SAT in Case 8–1, thus Equations (5)–(8) are used to calculate the electricity saving of Case 8–1 compared to Case 1. Equation (9) shows the hourly cooling energy saving of 6.2 kW h in Case 8, which means approximate 150 kW h/day cooling energy will be saved in this DC. According to Table 2, the COP of each CRAC is around 1.53. Thus, the total electricity saving of CRACs is about 98 kW h/day.

To sum up, Case 8–1 performed the best in terms of thermal distribution, heat accumulation mitigation effect and rack hotspot. In addition, it can also improve the cooling efficiency and save electricity use of 98 kW h/day in this DC.

## 5. Conclusion

The higher heat load densities of servers increase the risk of electronics overheating and threaten its operation safety. Simultaneously, higher loads increase the energy consumption in data centers. Thus, optimization of airflow management and cooling efficiency improvement in a data center (DC) have gotten more attention. This paper introduced and analyzed a new concept where an under-floor air supply (UFAD) system with cold aisle containment (CAC) is replaced by a new in-rack UFAD system called an in-rack cold aisle (IR-CA). The simulation model was validated by an on-site measurement, while the numerical and experimental results of both temperatures and velocities were in good agreement. The study is divided into eight cases with seven different dimensions for the rack air inlet ( $2.2 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ,  $0.2 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ,  $0.3 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ,  $0.4 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ,  $0.5 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ,  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ , and  $0.7 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$ ), while an additional partition plane is placed in Case 8 with a  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  rack air inlet. The thermal distribution is compared and analyzed in the eight cases, while the cooling efficiency and energy saving is compared between the original and optimal cases. The conclusions in this paper are drawn and shown as follows:

- (1) The replacement of a UFAD system with CAC by an in-rack UFAD system (IR-CA) can improve the thermal distribution when the width of IR-CA is larger than 0.3 m.
- (2) Although the thermal distribution in Case 6 with  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  IR-CA is much improved compared to cases 1-5 and 7, the optimal thermal distribution is achieved in Case 8 with a  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  IR-CA and a partition plane. Under the circumstances of Case 8, the maximum temperature drop of a rack hotspot can reach 2.4 K.
- (3) When the SAT is set to 23 °C and 23.5 °C in Case 8–1 and 8–2, respectively, the thermal distribution and rack hotspot are still better than those in Case 1. However, Case 8–1 performed much better than Case 8–2 in terms of thermal distribution and rack hotspot temperature.
- (4) The application of a  $0.6 \text{ m} \times 0.6 \text{ m}$  IR-CA and a partition plane in Case 8 with SAT of  $23 \,^{\circ}$ C can achieve about  $98 \,$ kW h/day electricity saving in this DC.
- (5) A new evaluation index named the MS index is proposed and defined as the ratio of the rack mean exhaust air temperature difference between the optimization and original model to the SAT difference between them. The bigger the MS index, the better the temperature distribution and cooling efficiency.

Also, there are some limitations in this paper. The parameters set in the numerical model cannot be completely consistent with the actual situation, contributing to inevitable deviation between the simulation and experimental results. In addition, the results may only be applicable to the rack whose heat accumulation is in the lower part, while for the racks with heat accumulation in the middle and top part, the optimization effect of the IR-CA should be further studied. Last but not least, the results are applicable for the racks only with 2 U servers. However, the optimization effects for the rack with 1 U, 4 U, 7U and other servers on the airflow and temperature distribution should be further investigated.

#### Declaration of competing interest

None.

#### Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the help from the Information Center of Nanjing Tech University for providing on-site experimental sites.

#### References

- A. Costa, M.M. Keane, J.I. Torrens, E. Corry, Building operation and energy performance: monitoring, analysis and optimisation toolkit, Appl. Energy 101 (2014) 310–316.
- [2] J. Wang, Q. Zhang, Y. Yu, An advanced control of hybrid cooling technology for telecommunication base stations, Energy Build. 133 (2016) 172–184.

- [3] Data Center Energy Consumption Trends. U.S. Department of Energy. Retrieved 2010-06-10.
- [4] J.G. Koomey, Growth in Data Centre Electricity Use 2005 to 2010, Analytics Press, Oakland, CA, 2011.
- [5] Z. Chkirbene, A. Gouissem, R. Hadjidi, S. Fougou, R. Hamila, Efficient techniques for energy saving in data center networks Zina, Comput. Commun. 129 (2018) 111–124.
- [6] R. Buyya, A. Beloglazov, J.H. Abawajy, Energy-efficient management of data center resources for cloud computing: a vision, architectural elements, and open challenges, CoRR abs/1006.0308. http://arxiv.org/abs/1006.0308, 2010.
- [7] Y. Kwon, A study on the evaluation of ventilation system suitable for outside air cooling applied in large data center for energy conservation, J. Mech. Sci. Technol. 30 (5) (2016) 2319–2324.
- [8] S.A. Nada, A.M.A. Attia, K.E. Elfeky, Experimental study of solving thermal heterogeneity problem of data center servers, Appl. Therm. Eng. 109 (2016) 466–474.
- [9] S.A. Nada, M.A. Said, Effect of CRAC units layout on thermal management of data center, Appl. Therm. Eng, 118 (2017) 339–344.
- [10] H. Zhang, S. Shao, H. Xu, H. Zou, C. Tian, Free cooling of data centers: a review, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev. 35 (2014) 171–182.
- [11] R. Gao, C. Wang, A. Li, S. Yu, B. Deng, A novel targeted personalized ventilation system based on the shooting concept, Build. Environ. 135 (2018) 269–279.
- [12] R. Gao, K. Liu, A. Li, Z. Fang, B. Cong, Biomimetic duct tee for reducing the local resistance of a ventilation and air-conditioning system, Build. Environ. 128 (2018) 130–141.
- [13] X. Yuan, X. Tao, J. Liu, Y. Wang, R. Kosonen, X. Xu, Experimental and numerical investigation of an airflow management system in data center with lower-side terminal baffles for servers, Build. Environ. 155 (2019) 308–319.
- [14] A. Khalaj, S.K. Halgamuge, A review on efficient thermal management of air- and liquid-cooled data centers: from chip to the cooling system, Appl. Energy 205 (2017) 1165–1188.
- [15] X. Yuan, Y. Wang, J. Liu, X. Xu, X. Yuan, Experimental and numerical study of airflow distribution optimisation in high-density data center with flexible baffles, Build. Environ. 140 (2018) 128–139.
- [16] S. Zimmermann, I. Meijer, M.K. Tiwari, S. Paredes, B. Michel, D. Poulikakos, Aquasar: a hot water-cooled data center with direct energy reuse, Energy 43 (1) (2012) 237–245.
- [17] Q. Nie, Y. Joshi, Reduced order modeling and experimental validation of steady turbulent convection in connected domains, Int. J. Heat Mass Transf. 51 (2008) 6063–6076.
- [18] S.D. Christy, S. Abimannan, Energy efficient free cooling system for data centers, in: Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom). 2011 IEEE third international conference on, 2011, pp. 646–651.
- [19] J. Wang, Q. Zhang, S. Yoon, Y. Yu, Reliability and availability analysis of a hybrid cooling system with waterside economizer in data center, Build. Environ. 148 (2019) 405–416.
- [20] J. Wang, Q. Zhang, S. Yoon, Y. Yu, Impact of uncertainties on the supervisory control performance of a hybrid cooling system in data center, Build. Environ. 148 (2019) 361–371.
- [21] S.W. Ham, J.S. Park, J.W. Jeong, Optimum supply air temperature ranges of various air-side economizers in a modular data center, Appl. Therm. Eng. 77 (2015) 163–179.
- [22] E. Oró, A. Garcia, J. Salom, Experimental and numerical analysis of the air management in a data center in Spain, Energy Build. 116 (2016) 553–561.
- [23] S.A. Nada, M.A. Said, M.A. Rady, CFD investigations of data centers' thermal performance for different configurations of CRACs units and aisles separation, Alexandria Eng. J. 55 (2016) 959–971.
- [24] R.R. Schmidt, M. Lyengar, Comparison between underfloor supply and overhead supply ventilation designs for data center high-density clusters, ASHRAE Transact. 13 (2007) 115–125.
- [25] V. Sorell, S. Escalante, J. Yang, Comparison of overhead and underfloor air delivery systems in a data center environment using CFD modelling, ASHRAE Transact. 111 (2005) 756–764.
- [26] J. Cho, T. Lim, K.B. Sean, Measurements and predictions systems in high compute density (Internet) data centers, Energy Build. 41 (2009) 1107–1115.
- [27] S.A. Nada, K.E. Elfeky, Experimental investigations of thermal managements solutions in data centers buildings for different arrangements of cold aisles containments, J. Build Eng. 5 (2016) 41–49.
- [28] V.K. Arghode, P. Kumar, Y. Joshi, T. Weiss, G. Meyer, Rack level modeling of airflow through perforated tile in a data center, J. Electron. Packag. 135 (3) (2013) 030902.
- [29] T. Ding, H. Cao, Z. He, Z. Li, Experiment research on influence factors of the separated heat pipe system, especially the filling ratio and Freon types, Appl. Therm. Eng. 118 (2017) 357–364.
- [30] Y. Ma, G. Ma, S. Zhang, F. Zhou, Cooling performance of a pump-driven two-phase cooling system for free cooling in data centers, Appl. Therm. Eng. 95 (2016) 143–149.
- [31] J. Siriwardana, S. Jayasekara, S.K. Halgamuge, Potential of air-side economizers for data center cooling: a case study for key Australian cities, Appl. Energy 104 (2013) 207–219.
- [32] A. Almoli, A. Thompson, N. Kapur, J. Summers, H. Thompson, G. Hannah, Computational fluid dynamic investigation of liquid rack cooling in data centers, Appl. Energy 89 (2012) 150–155.
- [33] I.N. Wang, Y. Tsui, C. Wang, Improvement of airflow distribution in a container data center, Energy Procedia 75 (2015) 1819–1824.

#### X. Yuan et al.

- [34] J. Choi, Y. Kim, A. Sivasubramaniam, J. Srebric, Q. Wang, J. Lee, A CFD-based Tool for studying temperature in rack-mounted servers computers, IEEE Trans. Comput. 57 (8) (2008) 1129–1142.
- [35] L. Phan, B. Hu, C.X. Lin, An evaluation of turbulence and tile models at server rack level for data centers, Build. Environ. 155 (2019) 421–435.
- [36] E. Wibron, A. L Ljung, T.S. Lundström, Computational fluid dynamics modelling and validating experiments of airflow in a data center, Energies 11 (2018) 644, https://doi.org/10.3390/en11030644.
- [37] J. Abanto, D. Barrero, M. Reggio, Airflow modelling in a computer room, Build. Environ. 39 (2004) 1393–1402.
- [38] Z. Song, Thermal performance of a contained data center with fan-assisted perforations, Appl. Therm. Eng. 102 (2016) 1175–1184.
- [39] M. Iyengar, R.R. Schmidt, H. Hamann, J. VanGilder, Comparison between numerical and experimental temperature distributions in a small data center test cell, in: ASME 2007 InterPACK Conference Collocated with the ASME/JSME 2007 Thermal Engineering Heat Transfer Summer Conference, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2007, pp. 819–826.
- [40] Z. Song, B. Murray, B. Sammakia, A dynamic compact thermal model for data center analysis and control using the zonal method and artificial neural networks, Appl. Therm. Eng. 62 (2014) 48–57.
- [41] J.W. VanGilder, Z.M. Pardey, P. Bemis, D.W. Plamondon, Compact modeling of data center raised-floor-plenum stanchions: pressure drop through sparse tube bundles, Thermal and Thermomechanical Phenomena in Electronic Systems (ITherm), in: 15th IEEE Intersociety Conference on, IEEE, 2016, May, 2016, pp. 1148–1155.
- [42] J.Z. Zhai, K.A. Hermansen, S. Al-Saadi, The development of simplified rack boundary conditions for numerical data center models, ASHRAE Transact. 118 (2) (2012).

- [43] L. Phan, C.X. Lin, A multi-zone buildings energy simulation of a data center model with hot and cold aisles, Energy Build. 77 (2014) 264–276.
- [44] J. Ni, B. Jin, B. Zhang, X. Wang, Simulation of thermal distribution and airflow for efficient energy consumption in a small data centers, Sustainability 9 (664) (2017), https://doi.org/10.3390/su9040664.
- [45] L. Phan, C. Lin, Reduced order modeling of a data center model with multiparameters, Energy Build. 136 (2017) 86–99.
- [46] S.A. Alkharabsheh, B.G. Sammakia, S.K. Shrivastava, Experimentally validated computational fluid dynamics model for a data center with cold aisle containment, J. Electron. Packag, 137 (2015) 021010–021011.
- [47] K. Zhang, X. Zhang, S. Li, G. Wang, Numerical study on the thermal environment of UFAD system with solar chimney for the data centre, Energy Procedia 48 (2014) 1047–1054.
- [48] L. Silva-Llanca, A. Ortega, K. Fouladi, M.D. Valle, V. Sundaralingam, Determining wasted energy in the airside of a perimeter-cooled data center via direct computation of the Exergy Destruction, Appl. Energy 213 (2018) 235–246.
- [49] S. Nada, H. El-Batsh, H. Elattar, N. Ali, CFD investigation of airflow pattern, temperature distribution and thermal comfort of UFAD system for theatre buildings applications, J. Build Eng. 6 (2016) 274–300.
- [50] J. Siriwardana, S. Halgamuge, T. Scherer, W. Schott, Minimizing the thermal impact of computing equipment upgrades in data centers, Energy Build. 50 (2012) 81–92.
- [51] X. yuan, X. Xu, Y. Wang, J. Liu, R. Kosonen, H. Cai, Design and validation of an airflow management system in data center with tilted server placement, Appl. Therm. Eng. 164 (2020) 114444.