Sawa Medical Journal

Reprint from Sawa Medical Journal

Nano-Enhanced Phase Change Materials for Thermal Management of Medical Devices: A Focused Review on Finned Latent Heat Buffers, Cycling Performance, and Design Optimization

Muayad Algburi[1]

[1] *Department of Medical Physics and Radiotherapy Technology Engineering, Sawa University, Muthanna, Iraq.*

Abstract

Temperature stability is a critical requirement in many medical devices and healthcare workflows, where uncontrolled thermal excursions can degrade measurement accuracy, reliability, and component lifetime. Phase change materials (PCMs) offer compact, near-isothermal thermal buffering; however, practical deployment is often limited by low thermal conductivity and cycle-dependent heat-transfer behavior. This focused review synthesizes peer-reviewed studies on nano-enhanced PCMs (NePCMs) and finned latent-heat buffer architectures for medical-oriented thermal management, with emphasis on melting–freezing cycling, repeatability, and design trade-offs relevant to device integration. We summarize enhancement routes (extended surfaces, high-conductivity nanoparticles, and hybrid structures), discuss the competing effects of nanoparticle loading (conductivity gains versus viscosity-driven weakening of natural convection), and highlight why conclusions drawn from melting alone may not translate to full-cycle performance. The review also outlines common evaluation and design-optimization approaches (e.g., CFD-based parametric studies and systematic optimization methods) and identifies performance metrics that better reflect medical needs (e.g., cycle time, thermal holdover, and temperature-band compliance). Finally, we provide practical design guidelines and research gaps for translating NePCM-based latent-heat buffers into medical-device component cooling, including packaging, leakage prevention, cycling reliability, and manufacturability.

Keywords: Medical device thermal management; medical device cooling; nano-enhanced phase change materials (NePCMs); finned latent-heat buffers; melting–freezing cycling; thermal holdover; temperature-band compliance; design optimization.

Nomenclature

C_p	Specific heat at constant pressure $(\mathrm{J/kg\ K})$
k	Thermal conductivity $(\mathrm{W/mK})$
L	Latent heat $(\mathrm{J/kg})$
T	Temperature (K)
α	Liquid fraction
φ	Volumetric fraction of nano-particle
NePCM	Nano-enhanced phase change material
PCM	Phase change material

Scope & Method of Review

This article is a focused narrative review that discusses the use of nano-enhanced phase change materials (NePCMs) and finned latent-heat buffer architectures for medical-device thermal management. The scope is limited to thermal buffering concepts that can be integrated into device housings or auxiliary thermal modules, with emphasis on melting–freezing cycling behavior, repeatability, and the design trade-offs that control practical performance (e.g., conductivity enhancement versus viscosity-driven convection weakening). The review focuses on principles, architectures, and evaluation metrics that are relevant to medical-oriented applications such as device component cooling and temperature stabilization.

The literature discussed herein is drawn from peer-reviewed journal articles and established numerical/experimental studies on PCM/NePCM thermal buffers and heat-transfer enhancement. The discussion prioritizes studies that (i) report cycle-resolved behavior (melting and freezing), (ii) quantify performance using clearly defined metrics (cycle time, thermal holdover, or temperature-window compliance), and (iii) provide design-relevant parameters (geometry, enhancement method, flow arrangement, or operating conditions). This review does not present new experimental/clinical validation; instead, it synthesizes reported findings to extract practical guidance and highlight research gaps for translation into medical-device contexts.

Introduction

Thermal stability is a practical requirement in many medical devices and healthcare workflows. In real operating environments, devices may experience fluctuating ambient conditions, intermittent power loads, and varying duty cycles. These thermal disturbances can affect measurement repeatability, electronic reliability, and long-term component performance. For this reason, medical-device thermal management is not only about removing heat but also about buffering temperature excursions and maintaining predictable thermal behavior over time [21,27].

Passive or semi-passive thermal buffering solutions are often attractive in medical settings because they can reduce complexity, noise, and maintenance requirements. Among these solutions, latent heat thermal buffering based on phase change materials (PCMs) offers a compact route to absorb or release significant thermal energy while keeping temperature variation relatively small around the phase-change range. This characteristic is particularly relevant to medical-oriented use cases such as stabilizing sensitive electronics, improving thermal resilience in portable systems, and supporting short-term temperature maintenance in transport or storage modules [29,30,31].

Despite these advantages, PCM-based buffers have known limitations in practical implementation. Many commonly used PCMs exhibit **low thermal conductivity** [17,21], which can slow down the charging/discharging process and create non-uniform temperature fields. Moreover, PCM behavior is often **cycle-dependent**: the heat-transfer mechanisms during melting can differ from those during freezing, mainly because buoyancy-driven flow patterns and thermal gradients evolve differently across the two stages. Therefore, performance claims based on melting alone may not reliably predict full-cycle operation.

Accordingly, recent research has moved toward enhancement strategies that improve heat-transfer rates and cycling response. Two main directions appear repeatedly in the literature: (i) **geometric enhancement**, such as fins and extended surfaces that increase conductive pathways [2,3,8,10,25,26], and (ii) **material enhancement**, such as **nano-additives** that increase effective thermal transport within the PCM [17,2,3,6]. In a medical-device context, the key question is not only whether enhancement improves melting or freezing, but whether it improves **repeatable full-cycle performance** while remaining compatible with packaging, reliability, and manufacturability constraints.

This review summarizes and organizes the available evidence on **NePCMs** and **finned latent-heat buffers** from a medical-oriented perspective. The goal is to clarify what has been demonstrated, what trade-offs remain, and which performance metrics best translate to real medical-device thermal management needs.

PCM vs NePCM:

A conventional PCM stores and releases thermal energy primarily through latent heat during phase transition. In practice, the effectiveness of a PCM buffer is governed not only by latent heat capacity but also by how quickly heat can be transported into and out of the PCM region. For many organic PCMs, the limiting factor is low thermal conductivity, which can lead to long charging/discharging times and delayed thermal response under transient heat loads.

Nano-enhanced PCMs (NePCMs) attempt to address this limitation by dispersing high-conductivity nanoparticles within the base PCM [17,18,24,25,26]. In principle, nanoparticle loading can increase the effective thermal conductivity of the composite and strengthen conductive heat paths, which tends to accelerate temperature equalization and reduce thermal gradients. This is the main reason NePCMs continue to attract attention for compact thermal buffers and for applications where size constraints make conventional heat exchangers less convenient.

However, NePCM behavior is not (monotonically better) in every operating mode. Alongside conductivity gains, nanoparticle loading can increase the effective viscosity of the liquid phase. Higher viscosity can weaken buoyancy-driven natural convection within the melted PCM region, which may offset the conductivity benefit—especially in configurations where convection plays a dominant role in heat transfer [19,16,25,26]. This trade-off is particularly important when discussing melting–freezing cycling, because the relative contributions of conduction and convection can shift across stages and with orientation.

From a design perspective, this means NePCM performance should be evaluated using metrics that reflect the intended duty. For medical-oriented thermal buffering, useful metrics include full-cycle time (melting + freezing), thermal holdover (how long temperature remains within a desired band), and temperature-band compliance under realistic boundary conditions. In many studies, the best-performing solution is not determined by nanoparticle loading alone but by how nanoparticle loading interacts with geometry (e.g., fins), orientation, and the heat-exchange boundary conditions.

Finally, NePCM implementation introduces practical considerations that are directly relevant to medical-device deployment: long-term dispersion stability, repeatability over many cycles, containment and leakage prevention, and compatibility with manufacturing and packaging requirements [25,26]. Therefore, the literature must be interpreted not only in terms of heat-transfer enhancement, but also in terms of reliability and integration feasibility.

Heat-Transfer Enhancement Routes for NePCM Latent-Heat Buffers

3.1. Geometric enhancement (fins and extended surfaces)

Most PCM systems are limited by internal thermal resistance, so the first practical step is to build conductive pathways inside the storage domain. Fins (straight, helical, spiral, multi-layer, or non-uniform) are used to spread heat deeper into the PCM and to reduce the "dead zones" that melt/solidify late [2,3,6,10,23]. Studies on finned cylindrical enclosures consistently report that fin arrangement and placement are not cosmetic details; they reshape the buoyancy flow and control how fast the phase front moves [1].

A useful takeaway from the published literature is that fins alone can be a stronger lever than nanoparticles alone in many geometries, and the benefit depends on whether the design is targeting melting, freezing, or the full cycle [4,7,13,1].

3.2. Material enhancement

NePCMs aim to push heat faster through the PCM by increasing the effective thermal conductivity. This usually helps the early part of melting and reduces temperature gradients [17,18,20,24]. But nanoparticle loading also increases viscosity in the liquid phase, which can weaken natural convection. In full-cycle operation, this conductivity gain vs. viscosity penalty is the key trade-off [19,16,25,26].

A clear example is that nanoparticles may not improve freezing time; in one cycle-resolved dataset, adding nanoparticles slightly increased freezing time (~3%), consistent with convection weakening during solidification while conductivity increases[1,9].

3.3. Configuration-level enhancement (orientation and flow direction)

Beyond "what material" and "what fin," performance can shift noticeably by changing orientation and HTF flow direction relative to gravity. Importantly, reversing the flow direction alone is not automatically beneficial; in a published finned-cylinder case, it increased the total cycle time by about 5.4% [1]..

By contrast, inverting the chamber orientation (geometry flipped) reduced the total cycle time by up to 25%, mainly because melting became much faster even though freezing could become longer.

When chamber inversion was combined with reversed flow, the net reduction reached about 36%, because the melting gain dominated the full-cycle result [1]..

3.4. Hybrid approach

In practice, the best outcome comes from stacking the levers: conductive structure (fins) + NePCM + a configuration that supports favorable convection patterns. The published cycle-time table for the 12 tested cases shows the combined effect clearly: the best case (reversed chamber + reversed flow with 5% nanoparticles) achieved the shortest total time (56 h), while changing a single factor alone gave smaller or even negative returns.

So the enhancement route in medical-oriented thermal buffering should be treated as a system choice, not a single-parameter upgrade: pick the architecture, then tune nanoparticle loading and configuration against the metric that matters (full-cycle time/thermal holdover/temperature-band compliance).

1. Cycling Performance and Medical-Relevant Metrics

The main practical question in medical-oriented thermal management is not only "how fast the PCM melts," but how the buffer behaves over **repeated melting–freezing cycles** under realistic operating conditions. Many designs show a clear improvement in melting, yet the same configuration may not provide the best freezing response. This is expected because the balance between conduction and natural convection changes between stages and with orientation. Therefore, review conclusions should be built on **full-cycle behavior**, not on melting alone.

For medical device integration, three metrics are more useful than reporting melting time only:

1. Full-cycle time (melting + freezing): This indicates how quickly the thermal buffer can recover its capacity and be ready for the next duty cycle.
2. Thermal holdover (time within a safe band): In many device cases, the goal is to keep a component within a temperature window for as long as possible, not to maximize stored energy.
3. Temperature-band compliance and peak excursions: What matters is whether the buffer prevents overshoot/overheating and how stable the temperature remains during transient loads.

From the reviewed evidence, improvement is usually achieved when enhancement is treated as a system-level decision: the conductive structure (fins/extended pathways), the NePCM loading, and the operating configuration are tuned together against the metric that matters (cycle time and/or time-in-band). This is exactly why cycle-resolved reporting is essential; without it, a design can appear "excellent" in melting but become weak in freezing or under repeated cycling.

2. Evaluation and Design Optimization Approaches

Most studies evaluate PCM/NePCM buffers using a combination of numerical modeling and, less frequently, experimental validation. On the numerical side, CFD-based models are widely used to capture conjugate heat transfer and phase change, and then parametric studies are run to quantify the effect of geometry [2,3,5,14,15], enhancement level, and operating conditions [2,15,16,20,24]. The benefit of this approach is that it can separate the role of each factor and explain why a design works (or fails) across melting and freezing.

For optimization, the common practice is to move from "one-variable-at-a-time" to systematic design exploration, especially when the target is full-cycle performance. Practical optimization in medical-oriented design usually becomes multi-objective, because improving heat transfer alone is not sufficient. Typical competing objectives are:

- reducing cycle time versus limiting mass/volume,
- increasing conductivity versus avoiding viscosity penalties,
- improving response versus maintaining reliability and containment.

A simple but effective approach is to define a small set of performance metrics that reflect medical needs (cycle time + time-in-band + peak temperature) and then use a structured search method (screening designs first, then refining around promising configurations). The main point is to keep the optimization target aligned with **device integration**, not with isolated thermal metrics.

3. Medical Device Use-Cases and Integration Constraints

NePCM-based latent heat buffers are best viewed as thermal stabilizers that smooth temperature excursions and reduce peaks. Potential medical-oriented use cases include:

- Device electronics stabilization [21,27]: buffering transient heat loads in compact housings to reduce overheating peaks and temperature-driven drift.
- Portable and point-of-care equipment: improving stability when ambient conditions fluctuate and duty cycles are intermittent [21].
- Healthcare transport/short-term storage modules: improving thermal holdover for temperature-sensitive materials when active cooling is not available continuously [29,30,31].

However, medical translation is not only a thermal problem. Integration constraints often decide whether a solution is feasible:

- Packaging and leakage prevention: containment is non-negotiable; a design must tolerate cycling without seepage or mechanical failure [25,26].
- Reliability under repeated cycling: many concepts work for a few cycles, but medical deployment needs repeatability and stable performance over many cycles.
- Manufacturability and maintainability: the buffer must be buildable, inspectable, and compatible with device assembly practices.

Therefore, when interpreting NePCM improvements, the correct question is, "Does this enhancement improve cycling performance without creating integration risks?" This is where review papers add value: they connect thermal gains with the constraints that matter in real medical devices.

4. Gaps and Future Directions

Across the reviewed literature, several gaps remain important for medical-oriented deployment:

1. Property uncertainty and reporting consistency: not all studies report the same set of thermo-physical properties or clearly define nanoparticle fraction (volume vs mass). This makes comparisons difficult.
2. Long-term stability of NePCM: dispersion stability, potential settling, and repeatability over many cycles require more consistent testing protocols.
3. Cycle-resolved performance as a standard: many papers still emphasize melting only; full-cycle metrics should be the default for device-oriented thermal buffering.
4. Integration-focused evidence: packaging, leakage resistance, and manufacturability are often treated as secondary, while they are central in medical devices.

Future work that targets medical translation should standardize the evaluation around time-in-band and cycling reliability and should report designs in a way that makes integration decisions possible.

Conclusions

This focused review highlights that NePCM latent heat buffers can support medical-oriented thermal management when designs are evaluated and optimized based on full-cycle behavior and device-relevant metrics. Conductive structures (especially fins/extended pathways) remain a primary lever, while nanoparticle loading provides benefits that must be balanced against viscosity-driven convection weakening. The most reliable improvements come from system-level configuration [1,25,26], where geometry, NePCM loading, and operating arrangement are tuned together. For medical-device component cooling, the practical success of NePCM buffers depends not only on heat-transfer enhancement but also on packaging, leakage prevention, cycling reliability, and manufacturability [25,26].

References

[1] Algburi M, Pasdarshahri H, Maerefat M, Zabetian Targhi M. Numerical Investigation of Melting-Freezing Cycle of Phase Change Material (PCM) Contained in Finned Cylindrical Heat Storage Systems Integrated with Nano-Particles Additives. Iranian Journal of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering. 2023;42(9):3102–3113.

[2] Bouhal T, Meghari Z, El Rhafiki T, Kousksou T, Jamil A, Ben Ghoulam E. Parametric CFD analysis and impact of PCM intrinsic parameters on melting process inside enclosure integrating fins: Solar building applications. Journal of Building Engineering. 2018;20:634–646.

[3] Deng S, Nie C, Jiang H, Ye WB. Evaluation and optimization of thermal performance for a finned double tube latent heat thermal energy storage. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer. 2019;130:532–544.

[4] Sefidan AM, Sojoudi A, Saha SC, Cholette M. Multi-layer PCM solidification in a finned triplex tube considering natural convection. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2017;123:901–916.

[5] Liang H, Niu J, Gan Y. Performance optimization for shell-and-tube PCM thermal energy storage. Journal of Energy Storage. 2020;30:101421.

[6] Zhang S, Pu L, Xu L, Liu R, Li Y. Melting performance analysis of phase change materials in different finned thermal energy storage. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2020;176:115425.

[7] Nóbrega CRES, Ismail KAR, Lino FAM. Solidification around axial finned tube submersed in PCM: modeling and experiments. Journal of Energy Storage. 2020;29:101438.

[8] Mahdi JM, Nsofor EC. Melting enhancement in triplex-tube latent thermal energy storage system using nanoparticles–fins combination. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer. 2017;109:417–427.

[9] Sarani I, Payan S, Nada SA, Payan A. Numerical investigation of an innovative discontinuous distribution of fins for solidification rate enhancement in PCM with and without nanoparticles. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2020;176:115017.

[10] Mousavi S, Siavashi M, Heyhat MM. Numerical melting performance analysis of a cylindrical thermal energy storage unit using nano-enhanced PCM and multiple horizontal fins. Numerical Heat Transfer, Part A: Applications. 2019;75(8):560–577.

[11] Essa MA, Rofaiel IY, Ahmed MA. Experimental and theoretical analysis for the performance of evacuated tube collector integrated with helical finned heat pipes using PCM energy storage. Energy. 2020;206:118166.

[12] Ju Y, et al. Discharge Enhancement in a Triple-Pipe Heat Exchanger Filled with Phase Change Material. Nanomaterials. 2022;12(9):1605.

[13] Kalapala L, Devanuri JK. Effect of orientation on thermal performance of a latent heat storage system equipped with annular fins—An experimental and numerical investigation. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2021;183:116244.

[14] Kalapala L, Devanuri JK. Optimization of fin parameters to reduce entropy generation and melting time of a latent heat storage unit. Journal of Solar Energy Engineering. 2020;142(6):61005.

[15] Ghosh D, Kumar P, Sharma S, Guha C, Ghose J. Numerical investigation on latent heat thermal energy storage in a phase change material using a heat exchanger. Heat Transfer. 2021;50(5):4289–4308.

[16] Ebrahimi A, Dadvand A. Simulation of melting of a nano-enhanced phase change material (NePCM) in a square cavity with two heat source–sink pairs. Alexandria Engineering Journal. 2015;54(4):1003–1017.

[17] Chow LC, Zhong JK, Beam JE. Thermal conductivity enhancement for phase change storage media. International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer. 1996;23(1):91–100.

[18] Valan AA, Sasmito AP, Mujumdar AS. Numerical performance study of paraffin wax dispersed with alumina in a concentric pipe latent heat storage system. Thermal Science. 2013;17(2):419–430.

[19] Vajjha RS, Das DK. Experimental determination of thermal conductivity of three nanofluids and development of new correlations. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer. 2009;52(21–22):4675–4682.

[20] Sheikholeslami M, Jafaryar M, Shafee A, Li Z. Simulation of nanoparticles application for expediting melting of PCM inside a finned enclosure. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications. 2019;523:544–556.

[21] Marri GK, Srikanth R, Balaji C. Effect of phase change and ambient temperatures on the thermal performance of a solid–liquid phase change material based heat sinks. Journal of Energy Storage. 2020;30:101327.

[22] Qaiser R, Khan MM, Khan LA, Irfan M. Melting performance enhancement of PCM based thermal energy storage system using multiple tubes and modified shell designs. Journal of Energy Storage. 2021;33:102161.

[23] Nakhchi ME, Esfahani JA. Improving the melting performance of PCM thermal energy storage with novel stepped fins. Journal of Energy Storage. 2020;30:101424.

[24] Arasu AV, Mujumdar AS. Numerical study on melting of paraffin wax with Al_2O_3 in a square enclosure. International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer. 2012;39(1):8–16.

[25] Xiong T, Zheng L, Shah KW. Nano-enhanced phase change materials (NePCMs): A review of numerical simulations. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2020;178:115492.

[26] Irwan M, et al. Review on numerical simulations for nano-enhanced phase change material (NEPCM) phase change process. Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry. 2020;141:669–684.

[27] Wang Y, et al. Preparation and thermal performance of paraffin/Nano-SiO_2 nanocomposite for passive thermal protection of electronic devices. Applied Thermal Engineering. 2016;96:699–707.

[28] Roy RK. Design of Experiments Using the Taguchi Approach: 16 Steps to Product and Process Improvement. John Wiley & Sons; 2001.

[29] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Pink Book Web-on-Demand Series: Vaccine Storage and Handling. 2024.

[30] World Health Organization (WHO). The controlled temperature chain (CTC): Frequently asked questions. 2023.

[31] World Health Organization (WHO) & UNICEF. Joint Statement on Immunization Supply Chain / Effective Vaccine Management (EVM). 2014.