Identification of space- and temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient
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Abstract. The aim of this paper is to present a very efficient and accurate numerical algorithm to identify a variable (space- and temperature-dependent) heat transfer coefficient in two-dimensional inverse steady-state heat conduction problems involving irregular heat-conducting body shapes in the presence of Dirichlet, Neumann, and Robin boundary conditions. In this numerical method, a boundary-fitted grid generation technique (elliptic) is used to discretize the physical domain (heat-conducting body) and solve for the steady-state heat conduction equation by approximating the derivatives of the field variable (temperature) by algebraic ones. This paper describes a very accurate and efficient sensitivity analysis scheme to compute the sensitivity of the temperatures to variation of the variable heat transfer coefficient. The main advantage of the sensitivity analysis scheme is that it does not require the solution of adjoint equation. The conjugate gradient method (CGM) is used to reduce the mismatch between the computed temperature on part of the boundary and the simulated measured temperature distribution. The obtained results confirm that the proposed algorithm is very accurate, efficient, and robust.
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NOMENCLATURE:

\(d^{(k)}\)  
direction of descent at iteration \(k\)

\(\dot{q}\)  
heat flux \((\frac{W}{m^2})\)

\(h\)  
heat transfer coefficient \((\frac{W}{m^2 \cdot ^\circ C})\)

\(\mathbf{Ja}\)  
Jacobian matrix

\(J\)  
Jacobian of transformation

\(\mathcal{J}\)  
objective function

\(k_T\)  
thermal conductivity of the solid body \((\frac{W}{m \cdot ^\circ C})\)

\(n\)  
outward drawn unit vector

\(T\)  
temperature \((^\circ C)\)

\(T_m\)  
measured outer surface temperature \((^\circ C)\)

\(T_\infty\)  
ambient temperature \((^\circ C)\)

\(x, y\)  
Cartesian coordinates in the physical domain

Greek symbols

\(\alpha, \beta, \gamma\)  
metric coefficients in 2-D elliptic grid generation

\(\beta^{(k)}\)  
search step size at iteration \(k\)

\(\Gamma\)  
boundary

\(\gamma^{(k)}\)  
conjugation coefficient at iteration \(k\)

\(\Omega\)  
domain

\(\xi, \eta\)  
Cartesian coordinates in the computational domain

Subscripts

\(i\)  
grid index in \(\xi\)-direction

\(j\)  
grid index in \(\eta\)-direction

\(M\)  
number of grid points in the \(\xi\)-direction

\(N\)  
number of grid points in the \(\eta\)-direction

Superscript

\(k\)  
iteration number
1. Introduction

Inverse Heat Transfer Problems (IHTPs) are widely considered mathematically challenging problems. IHTPs are ill-posed and difficult to solve. Ill-posed problems are inherently unstable and very sensitive to noise. In other words, in such problems a small error in the input data can give rise to a large error in the solution [1-3]. Therefore, the development of efficient, accurate, and robust numerical schemes to solve IHTPs is of vital importance.

Direct well-posed heat transfer problems are concerned with the determination of the temperature distribution over a heat-conducting body given that the boundary conditions, the thermo-physical properties, the geometrical configuration of the body, and the applied heat flux are all known. In contrast, the inverse heat transfer problem deals with the determination of the boundary conditions, the thermo-physical properties, the geometrical configuration of the heat-conducting body, and the applied heat flux from the knowledge of the temperature distribution on some part of the body boundary. Inverse heat transfer analysis has been extensively used to determine the thermo-physical properties such as the thermal conductivity and the convection heat transfer coefficient [4-29], the heat flux [18, 29-36], and the boundary shape of bodies [37-43]. The evaluation of the convection heat transfer coefficient is a difficult task because convection is a very complex phenomenon [44]. The convection heat transfer coefficient depends on many variables such as the geometry of the surface as well as the surface temperature, to name a few. The estimation of a variable convection heat transfer coefficient using an inverse analysis has been less researched [45-48]. In the literature, there exist some limitations on the proposed methods by different researchers to identify such a variable parameter. Some of these limitations can be summarized as follows:

- the applicability of the direct solver to rectangular or circular heated bodies only (using traditional finite-difference method) and inability to consider a general 2D domain.
- the inability to handle a variety of boundary conditions. Most of the boundary conditions in the literature include a constant temperature (Dirichlet boundary condition) or insulated case.

Thus a general methodology for a general 2D domain and boundary conditions considering a variable convection heat transfer coefficient with a high degree of accuracy is required. This paper deals with a two dimensional inverse steady-state heat conduction problem. The objective of this study is to estimate a variable (space- and temperature-dependent) heat transfer coefficient in an irregular body. The convection heat transfer coefficient considered in this paper is a linearly space (boundary surface shape)- and temperature (boundary surface temperature)-dependent parameter. However, the linear form can be easily extended to other forms of dependency of the convective heat transfer coefficient on the space and temperature such as quadratic and cubic.

In the proposed numerical approach, an elliptic grid generation technique is used to generate a mesh over the irregular body and solve for the steady state heat conduction equation. The discretization in the computational domain is based on the finite-difference method, a method chosen for its simplicity and ease of implementation. The most innovative aspect of the numerical approach is its very efficient and accurate sensitivity analysis scheme, already introduced by the authors for other parameter estimation problems in heat transfer [18, 28, 29]. The sensitivity analysis scheme is formulated to compute the sensitivity of the temperatures to variation of the variable heat transfer coefficient. The conjugate gradient method is employed to minimize the difference between the computed temperature on part of the boundary and the simulated measured temperature. As will be shown, this numerical methodology does not require the solution of an adjoint problem. Explicit expressions for the sensitivity coefficients are derived which allow for the computation of the sensitivity coefficients in one single solve.
The proposed solution method introduced here is sufficiently general and can be employed for the estimation of a space- and temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient applied on part of the boundary of a general two-dimensional region as long as the general two-dimensional region can be mapped onto a regular computational domain. Moreover, there is no limitation on the type of the boundary conditions. In other words, Dirichlet, Neumann, and Robin boundary conditions can be imposed on the domain boundary.

2. Governing equation

The mathematical representation of the steady-state heat conduction problem of interest here can be expressed as below (see Fig. 1)

\[ \nabla^2 T = 0 \quad \text{in physical domain } \Omega \]  

subject to the boundary conditions

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = -\frac{\dot{q}}{k_T} \quad \text{on boundary surface } \Gamma_1
\]  

(2)

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = -\frac{h_i}{k_T}(T_i - T_\infty) \quad \text{on boundary surface } \Gamma_i, \quad i = 3, 4
\]  

(3)

Two different cases are considered for the boundary condition on the boundary surface \( \Gamma_2 \) which will be considered separately:

Case 1: The heat transfer coefficient is space-dependent (Fig. 1a):

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = -\frac{h_2(\Gamma_2)}{k_T}(T_{12} - T_{\infty_2}) \quad \text{on boundary surface } \Gamma_2
\]  

(4)

where \( h_2(\Gamma_2) = a_1 X_{\Gamma_2} + a_2 Y_{\Gamma_2} + a_3 \).
Case 2: The heat transfer coefficient is temperature-dependent (Fig. 1b):

\[
\frac{\partial T}{\partial n} = -\frac{h_2(T_{\Gamma_2})}{k_T} (T_{\Gamma_2} - T_{\infty_2}) \quad \text{on boundary surface } \Gamma_2
\]

where \( h_2(T_{\Gamma_2}) = a + bT_{\Gamma_2} \).

![Diagram of physical domain and boundary conditions](image)

Fig. 1 Physical domain (solid body) subjected to convective heat transfer on surfaces \( \Gamma_i, i = 2, 3, 4 \) and heat flux \( \dot{q} \) on surface \( \Gamma_1 \). The thermal conductivity of the body is \( k_T \).

In this study, the elliptic grid generation technique is employed to discretize the physical domain and approximate the derivatives of the field variable (temperature) by algebraic ones. This technique is based on solving a system of elliptic partial differential equations to distribute nodes in the interior of the physical domain by mapping the irregular physical domain from the \( x \) and \( y \) physical plane (Fig. 1) onto the \( \xi \) and \( \eta \) computational plane (Fig. 2), which is a regular region [49].
More details on the implementation of the elliptic grid generation technique and solution procedure for the steady-state heat conduction equation can be found in [50].

3. The inverse analysis

3.1. Objective function

An inverse analysis can be used to estimate the variable heat transfer coefficient $h_2$ (using the estimation of $a_1$, $a_2$, $a_3$ for the space-dependent heat transfer coefficient and $a$ and $b$ for the temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient separately) so that the square of the difference between the computed temperature of the outer surface $\Gamma_2$ and the measured temperature of the same surface is minimized. This can be mathematically expressed as

$$\min_{h_2 \text{ on } \Gamma_2} \mathcal{J} := C \left\| T_{\Gamma_2} - T_m \right\|^2 : \text{Eq.}(1) \text{ in } \Omega, \text{ BCs in Eqs.}(2)-(4) \text{ or } (5)$$

where $C$ is a positive constant and can be considered as $C = 10^n, n = 0,1,2,...$. The aim of the inverse analysis is to minimize the following objective function expression using the optimization of the value of $a_1$, $a_2$, $a_3$ for the space-dependent $h_2$ and $a$ and $b$ for the temperature-dependent $h_2$. 

Fig. 2 Computational domain.
\[ J = C \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m})^2 \]  

(7)

### 3.2 Sensitivity analysis

As the proposed method is concerned with a gradient-based optimization method (here, conjugate gradient method), the computation of derivative of the objective function with respect to the unknown variables is needed. Since two different cases are considered for the variable heat transfer coefficient, two different sensitivity analysis schemes are considered as follows:

**Case 1) Space-dependent heat transfer coefficient**

\[ h_2(\Gamma_2) = a_1 X_{\Gamma_2} + a_2 Y_{\Gamma_2} + a_3 \]

In this case, the sensitivity of the objective function \( J \) defined by Eq.(7) to the unknown variables \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) is calculated as follows

\[ \frac{\partial J}{\partial a_l} = 2C \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_l} = 2 \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_l} \]  

(8)

where \( l = 1,2,3 \). In Eq. (8), \( C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_l} (l = 1,2,3) \) are called the sensitivity coefficients. To obtain an algebraic expression for the sensitivity coefficients, from the boundary condition of the heat conduction equation at the surface \( \Gamma_2 \), Eq. (4), we have

\[ \dot{q}_{\text{conduction}} \bigg|_{\Gamma_2} = \dot{q}_{\text{convection}} \bigg|_{\Gamma_2} \]

\[ -k_T \frac{\partial T}{\partial n_2} = h_2(T_{\Gamma_2} - T_{\infty_2}) \]

\[ -k_T \frac{\partial T}{\partial n_2} = (a_1 X_{\Gamma_2} + a_2 Y_{\Gamma_2} + a_3)(T_{\Gamma_2} - T_{\infty_2}) \]  

(9)
The term $\frac{\partial T}{\partial n}$ at a boundary surface in the physical domain is related to $\frac{\partial T}{\partial \xi}$ and/or $\frac{\partial T}{\partial \eta}$ at the corresponding transformed boundary surface in the computational domain. At surface $\Gamma_2$ we have

$$\left.\frac{\partial T}{\partial n}\right|_{\Gamma_2} = \left.\frac{\partial T}{\partial \eta}\right|_{\Gamma_2} = \frac{1}{J \sqrt{\gamma}} \left( \gamma T_{\eta} - \beta T_{\xi} \right) \tag{10}$$

where (from the elliptic grid generation method)

$$\alpha = x_{\eta}^2 + y_{\eta}^2, \beta = x_{\xi} x_{\eta} + y_{\xi} y_{\eta}, \gamma = x_{\xi}^2 + y_{\xi}^2, J = x_{\xi} y_{\eta} - x_{\eta} y_{\xi} \tag{11}$$

Using the finite-difference method, the $T_{\eta}$ and $T_{\xi}$ at every boundary surface with Neumann and Robin conditions can be discretized. By substituting Eq. (10) and the finite-difference expressions for $T_{\xi}$ and $T_{\eta}$ (on the boundary surface $\Gamma_2$) into Eq. (9), we get

$$-k_T \left[ \frac{1}{J \sqrt{\gamma}} \left( \gamma \left( \frac{3T_{i,N} - 4T_{i,N-1} + T_{i,N-2}}{2} - \beta \frac{T_{i+1,N} - T_{i-1,N}}{2} \right) \right) \right] = (a_1 x_{i,N} + a_2 y_{i,N} + a_3) \left( T_{i,N} - T_{\infty} \right) \tag{12}$$

The following expression is obtained by solving Eq. (12) in terms of $T_{i,N}:

$$T_{i,N} = \frac{(4k_T \gamma T_{i,N-1} - k_T \gamma T_{i,N-2} + k_T \beta T_{i+1,N} - k_T \beta T_{i-1,N} + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_1 x_{i,N} T_{\infty_2} + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_2 y_{i,N} T_{\infty_2} + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_3 T_{\infty_2})}{(3k_T \gamma + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_1 x_{i,N} + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_2 y_{i,N} + 2J \sqrt{\gamma} a_3)} \tag{13}$$
Using an algebraic software, one can obtain an expression for the sensitivity coefficients

\[ C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_l} \quad (l = 1, 2, 3) \]

by differentiating the obtained expression for \( T_{i,N} \) with respect to \( a_1 \), \( a_2 \), and \( a_3 \), respectively, as follows

\[
\frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_1} = \frac{2J\sqrt{\gamma x_{i,N} k_T} (3T_{\infty} \gamma - 4\gamma T_{i,N-1} + \gamma T_{i,N-2} - \beta T_{i+1,N} + \beta T_{i-1,N})}{(3k_T \gamma + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_1 x_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_2 y_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_3}}})^2} \quad (14)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_2} = \frac{2J\sqrt{\gamma y_{i,N} k_T} (3T_{\infty} \gamma - 4\gamma T_{i,N-1} + \gamma T_{i,N-2} - \beta T_{i+1,N} + \beta T_{i-1,N})}{(3k_T \gamma + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_1 x_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_2 y_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_3}}})^2} \quad (15)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a_3} = \frac{2J\sqrt{\gamma z_{i,N} k_T} (3T_{\infty} \gamma - 4\gamma T_{i,N-1} + \gamma T_{i,N-2} - \beta T_{i+1,N} + \beta T_{i-1,N})}{(3k_T \gamma + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_1 x_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_2 y_{i,N} + 2J\sqrt{\gamma a_3}}})^2} \quad (16)
\]

**Case 2) Temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient** \( h_2(T_{\Gamma_2}) = a + b T_{\Gamma_2} \):

In this case, the sensitivity of the objective function \( J \) defined by Eq.(7) to the unknown variables \( a \) and \( b \) is calculated as follows

\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial a} = 2C \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a} = 2 \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a} \quad (17)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial b} = 2C \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial b} = 2 \sum_{i=2}^{M-1} (T_{i,N} - T_{(i,N)_m}) C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial b} \quad (18)
\]

In a similar fashion, Eq. (12) becomes

\[
-k_T \frac{1}{J\sqrt{\gamma}} \left[ \frac{3T_{i,N} - 4T_{i,N-1} + T_{i,N-2}}{2} - \beta \frac{T_{i+1,N} - T_{i-1,N}}{2} \right] = (a + b T_{i,N}) (T_{i,N} - T_{\infty}) \quad (19)
\]
Eq. (19) is a quadratic equation in terms of $T_{i,N}$. The following expression is obtained by solving Eq. (19) in terms of $T_{i,N}$:

$$
T_{i,N} = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{J\sqrt{\gamma b}} \left( 3k_T \gamma + 2J \sqrt{\gamma a} - 2J \sqrt{\gamma b T_{\infty}} - (9k_T^2 \gamma^3 + 12k_T \gamma^2 J a - 12k_T \gamma^2 J b T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma a^2 \\
+ 8J^2 \gamma a b T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma b^2 T_{\infty}^2 - 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i-1,N}} + 32J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-1} - 8J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-2} + 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i+1,N}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

(20)

Again, using an algebraic software, one can obtain an expression for the sensitivity coefficients $C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a}$ and $C \frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial b}$ by differentiating the obtained expression for $T_{i,N}$ with respect to $a$ and $b$, respectively, as follows

$$
\frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial a} = 
$$

$$
-\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{J\sqrt{\gamma b}} \left( 2J \sqrt{\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} (12k_T \gamma^2 J + 8J^2 \gamma a + 8J^2 \gamma b T_{\infty}) / (9k_T^2 \gamma^2 + 12k_T \gamma^2 J a - 12k_T \gamma^2 J b T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma a^2 \\
+ 8J^2 \gamma a b T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma b^2 T_{\infty}^2 - 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i-1,N}} + 32J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-1} - 8J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-2} + 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i+1,N}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

(21)

$$
\frac{\partial T_{i,N}}{\partial b} = 
$$

$$
-\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{J\sqrt{\gamma b}} \left( -2J \sqrt{\gamma T_{\infty}} - \frac{1}{2} ( -12k_T \gamma^2 J T_{\infty} + 8J^2 \gamma a T_{\infty} + 8J^2 \gamma b T_{\infty}^2 - 8J \sqrt{\gamma k_T \beta T_{i-1,N}} \\
- 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i-1,N}} + 32J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-1} - 8J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-2} + 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i+1,N}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$
+32J \gamma^2 k_T T_{i,N-1} \gamma^2 k_T T_{i,N-2} + 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i+1,N}} / (9k_T^2 \gamma^2 + 12k_T \gamma^2 Ja - 12k_T \gamma^2 Jb T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma a^2 + 8J^2 \gamma b T_{\infty} + 4J^2 \gamma b^2 T_{\infty}^2 - 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i-1,N} + 32J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-1} - 8J \gamma^2 b k_T T_{i,N-2} + 8J \sqrt{\gamma b k_T \beta T_{i+1,N}}^2} ) \right)

(22)

Moreover, other forms of dependency of the heat transfer coefficient on the temperature, such as \( h_2(T_{\Gamma_2}) = a + b T_{\Gamma_2} + c T_{\Gamma_2}^2 \) (quadratic) and \( h_2(T_{\Gamma_2}) = a + b T_{\Gamma_2} + c T_{\Gamma_2}^2 + d T_{\Gamma_2}^3 \) (cubic), may also be used resulting in a cubic and a quartic equation in terms of \( T_{i,N} \), respectively. Hence one can obtain an expression for the sensitivity coefficients by differentiating the obtained expression for \( T_{i,N} \) with respect to the coefficients appearing in the heat transfer coefficient expression (as there are algebraic expressions for the roots of cubic and quartic equations).

Using Eqs. (14)-(16), the sensitivity matrix \( Ja \) for Case 1 (space-dependent heat transfer coefficient) can be explicitly written as

\[
Ja_{a_1} = C \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial T_{2,N}}{\partial a_1} \\
\frac{\partial T_{3,N}}{\partial a_1} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial T_{M-1,N}}{\partial a_1}
\end{bmatrix}_{(M-2)\times1}, \quad \text{Ja}_{a_2} = C \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial T_{2,N}}{\partial a_2} \\
\frac{\partial T_{3,N}}{\partial a_2} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial T_{M-1,N}}{\partial a_2}
\end{bmatrix}_{(M-2)\times1}, \quad \text{Ja}_{a_3} = C \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial T_{2,N}}{\partial a_3} \\
\frac{\partial T_{3,N}}{\partial a_3} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial T_{M-1,N}}{\partial a_3}
\end{bmatrix}_{(M-2)\times1}
\]

(23)

And using Eqs. (21) and (22), the sensitivity matrix \( Ja \) for Case 2 (temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient) can be explicitly written as
\[
\mathbf{J}_a = C \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial T_{2,N}}{\partial a} \\
\frac{\partial T_{3,N}}{\partial a} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial T_{M-1,N}}{\partial a}
\end{bmatrix}_{(M-2)\times 1}, \mathbf{J}_b = C \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{\partial T_{2,N}}{\partial b} \\
\frac{\partial T_{3,N}}{\partial b} \\
\vdots \\
\frac{\partial T_{M-1,N}}{\partial b}
\end{bmatrix}_{(M-2)\times 1}
\]

Problems for which the value of \( \mathbf{J}^T \mathbf{J} \) is very small are referred to as ill-conditioned. In general, IHTPs are very ill-conditioned particularly near the initial guess used for the unknown parameters which may be far from the actual solution. This may result in a negative value for the variable heat transfer coefficient and hence the termination of the iterative process. To circumvent this problem, the constant \( C \) is introduced in the objective function expression to be able to incorporate it into the sensitivity coefficients and form a new set of sensitivity coefficients.

3.3 The Conjugate Gradient Method (CGM)

In this study, the conjugate gradient optimization method is used due to its reliable performance in treating the inverse heat transfer problems. The objective function given by Eq. (7) is minimized by searching along the direction of descent \( d^{(k)} \) using a search step size \( \beta^{(k)} \).

\[
f^{(k+1)} = f^{(k)} - \beta^{(k)} d^{(k)}
\]

where \( f \equiv a_1, a_2, a_3 \) for Case 1 and \( f \equiv a, b \) for Case 2. The direction of descent of the current iteration is obtained as a linear combination of the direction of descent of the previous iteration and the gradient direction \( \nabla f^{(k)} \). Therefore,

\[
d^{(k)} = \nabla f^{(k)} + \gamma^{(k)} d^{(k-1)}
\]
The Polak-Ribiere formula \([51]\) is employed to calculate the conjugation coefficient:

\[
\gamma^{(k)} = \frac{\left( \nabla J^{(k)} - \nabla J^{(k-1)} \right)}{\| \nabla J^{(k-1)} \|^2} = \left( \nabla J^{(k)} - \nabla J^{(k-1)} \right) \frac{\nabla J^{(k-1)}}{\nabla J^{(k-1)}}
\]

(27)

The search step size is given as follows \([2]\)

\[
\beta^{(k)} = \frac{\left( \mathbf{J} a^{(k)} d^{(k)} \right)^T \left( T_{i,n} - T_{(i,N)_{m}} \right)}{\left( \mathbf{J} a^{(k)} d^{(k)} \right)^T \mathbf{J} a^{(k)} d^{(k)}}
\]

(28)

The following algorithm represents the direct and inverse analysis steps used to estimate the space- and temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient in steady-state heat conduction problems separately:

1. Specify the physical domain, the boundary conditions, and the measured outer surface temperature.

2. Generate the boundary-fitted grid using the elliptic grid generation method.

3. Solve the direct problem of finding the temperature values at any grid points of the physical domain using an initial variable heat transfer coefficient (initial guess for \(a_1, a_2, a_3\) and \(a, b\)).

4. Using Eq. (7), compute the objective function \((J^{(k)})\).

5. If value of the objective function obtained in step 4 is less than the specified stopping criterion, the optimization is finished. Otherwise, go to step 6.

6. Compute the sensitivity matrices \(\mathbf{J} a_1\), \(\mathbf{J} a_2\), and \(\mathbf{J} a_3\) (for Case 1) from Eq. (23) and the sensitivity matrices \(\mathbf{J} a_2\) and \(\mathbf{J} a_3\) (for Case 2) from Eq. (24).
7. Compute the gradient directions $\nabla J_{a_l}^{(k)}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) from Eq. (8) and $\nabla J_{a}^{(k)}$ and $\nabla J_{b}^{(k)}$ from Eqs. (17) and (18), respectively.

8. Compute the conjugation coefficients $\gamma_{a_l}^{(k)}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) and $\gamma_{a}^{(k)}$ and $\gamma_{b}^{(k)}$ from Eq. (27). For $k = 0$, set $\gamma^{(0)} = 0$.

9. Compute the directions of descent $d_{a_l}^{(k)}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) and $d_{a}^{(k)}$ and $d_{b}^{(k)}$ from Eq. (26).

10. Compute the search step sizes $\beta_{a_l}^{(k)}$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) and $\beta_{a}^{(k)}$ and $\beta_{b}^{(k)}$ from Eq. (28).

11. From Eq. (25), evaluate the new values for $a_l$ ($l = 1, 2, 3$) and $a$ and $b$ separately, namely $a_{1}^{(k+1)}$, $a_{2}^{(k+1)}$, $a_{3}^{(k+1)}$, and $a^{(k+1)}$ and $b^{(k+1)}$.

12. Set the next iteration ($k = k + 1$) and return to the step 2.

In Eq. (25), if the value of the expression $\beta^{(k)}d^{(k)}$ is larger than the value of $f^{(k)}$, then the new value for the variable heat transfer coefficient, $h_{2}^{(k+1)} = a_{1}^{(k+1)}x_{i,N} + a_{2}^{(k+1)}y_{i,N} + a_{3}^{(k+1)}$ ($i = 2, \cdots, M - 1$) or $h_{2}^{(k+1)} = a^{(k+1)} + b^{(k+1)}T_{i,N}^{(k+1)}$, becomes negative resulting in termination of the iterative process. Thus the parameter $C$ is introduced in Eq. (6) to decrease the value of the expression $\beta^{(k)}d^{(k)}$ and obtain a positive value for the heat transfer coefficient in the next iteration, thereby continuing the iterative process. We start every problem with an ordinary least square objective function for which $n = 0, C = 1$. It is obvious that multiplication (or division) of the objective function value by a positive constant $C$ will not change the optimum solution [52].

### 3.4 stopping criterion

If the problem involves no measurement errors, the traditional check condition is specified as
where $\varepsilon$ is a small specified number. However, the measured temperatures will contain errors. In this case, the objective function value will not be zero at the end of the iterative process. As the computed temperatures approach the measured temperatures containing errors, during the minimization of the objective function (Eq. (7)), large oscillations may appear in the inverse problem solution resulting in an ill-posed character for the inverse problem. However, the conjugate gradient method may become well-posed if the Discrepancy Principle is used to stop the iterative procedure. In the Discrepancy Principle, the solution is assumed to be sufficiently accurate when the difference between computed and measured temperatures is of the order of magnitude of the measurement errors, that is,

$$
|T_{\text{computed}} - T_{\text{measured}}| \approx \sigma
$$

(30)

where $\sigma$ is the standard deviation of the measurement errors, which is assumed constant in the present analysis. We can obtain the following value for $\varepsilon$ by substituting Eq. (30) into Eq. (7) (objective function definition)

$$
\varepsilon = C(M - 2)\sigma^2
$$

(31)

Then the iterative procedure is stopped when the following criterion is satisfied [2]

$$
\mathbf{J}^{(k)} < \varepsilon
$$

(32)

4. Results

In this paper, two test cases are investigated to demonstrate the accuracy and efficiency of the proposed inverse analysis in the numerical treatment of inverse heat conduction problems involving variable heat transfer coefficient. Test Case 1 deals with a space-
dependent heat transfer coefficient and Test Case 2 treats a temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient. It is first assumed that the variable heat transfer coefficient $h_2$ is known, the heat conduction problem is solved using the given boundary conditions to obtain the temperature distribution on the surface $\Gamma_2$. Then the computed temperature distribution $T_{i,N} \ (i = 2,\ldots,M-1)$ is used as the simulated measured temperatures for inverse analysis to recover the initially used variable heat transfer coefficient $h_2$. To avoid committing an inverse crime, a different mesh is also used to recover the desired parameter ($h_2$).

4.1 Space-dependent heat transfer coefficient:

As stated above, the steady-state heat conduction problem is initially solved using the known values for the thermal conductivity of conducting body $k_T$, the constant heat transfer coefficient $h_i$ imposed on the surface $\Gamma_i \ (i = 3,4)$, the space-dependent heat transfer coefficient $h_2 = 0.05x_{i,N} + 0.007y_{i,N} + 2.5$ imposed on the surface $\Gamma_2$, and the heat flux $\dot{q}$ applied on the surface $\Gamma_1$ to obtain the temperature distribution on the outer surface $\Gamma_2 \ (T_{i,N}, \ i = 2,\ldots,M-1)$. To facilitate the computation of the sensitivity matrix coefficients using the central finite-difference relations, the grid nodes $(1,N)$ and $(M,N)$ on corners of the outer surface $\Gamma_2$ are excluded from computing the temperature distribution. Then the resulting outer surface temperature distribution is used as the simulated measured temperatures in the inverse analysis to recover the initially used values for three parameters $a_1 = 0.05$, $a_2 = 0.007$, and $a_3 = 2.5$. To do so, the square of the difference between the temperature distribution of the outer surface $\Gamma_2$ (obtained from the solution the direct problem at each iteration) and the simulated measured temperature distribution of the same surface ($\Gamma_2$) is to be minimized.
Test Case 1: Numerical values of the coefficients involved in this test case are listed in Table 1. The temperature distribution in the body (using a grid size of 50 × 40) and the simulated measured temperature distribution on the outer surface $\Gamma_2$, $T_{(i,N)m}$, are demonstrated in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, respectively. $T_{(i,N)m}$ will be used in the inverse analysis to recover the initial values of $a_1, a_2, a_3$. Using an inverse analysis, the known (desired) values of $a_{1d} = 0.05$, $a_{2d} = 0.007$, and $a_{3d} = 2.5$ are to be recovered by utilizing two different initial guesses:

$$a_{1\text{initial}_1} = 0.00002, a_{2\text{initial}_1} = 0.0004, a_{3\text{initial}_1} = 0.00001$$

$$a_{1\text{initial}_2} = 0.1, a_{2\text{initial}_2} = 0.7, a_{3\text{initial}_2} = -0.8$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\dot{q}(\text{W/m}^2)$</th>
<th>$k_T(\text{W/m.C})$</th>
<th>$h_2(\text{W/m}^2.\text{C})$</th>
<th>$h_3(\text{W/m}^2.\text{C})$</th>
<th>$h_4(\text{W/m}^2.\text{C})$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty_2}(^\circ\text{C})$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty_3}(^\circ\text{C})$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty_4}(^\circ\text{C})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0.05x_{i,N} + 0.007y_{i,N} + 2.5$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Data used for Test Case 1.
Fig. 3 Temperature distribution in irregular physical domain (a) and on outer surface $\Gamma_2$ (used as $T_m$ for inverse analysis) (b).

Fig. 4 Distribution of variable heat transfer coefficient on the outer surface $\Gamma_2$. 
Initial guess 1: \( h_{2_{\text{initial}}} = 0.00002x_{i,N} + 0.0004y_{i,N} + 0.00001(W/m^2.C) \)

Fig. 5 Estimation of \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) (\( h_2 = a_1x_{i,N} + a_2y_{i,N} + a_3 \)) and objective function versus iteration number for initial heat transfer coefficient \( h_{2_{\text{initial}}} = 0.00002x_{i,N} + 0.0004y_{i,N} + 0.00001(W/m^2.C) \) (a), and comparison of initial, optimal, and desired (simulated measured) heat transfer coefficient distributions (b).
Initial guess 2: 

$$h_{\text{initial}_2} = 0.1 x_{i,N} + 0.7 y_{i,N} - 0.8 \left( \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C} \right)$$

The inverse analysis is investigated using two different initial guesses which are far from the desired ones. The initial guesses are selected so that they can reflect the accuracy, efficiency, and robustness of the inverse analysis. For the first initial guess, a different grid size ($50 \times 60$) is used to avoid committing an *inverse crime*. The convergence history of the components of the variable heat transfer coefficient ($a_1, a_2, a_3$) and the decrease in the objective function versus the iteration number are shown in Fig. 5a (for initial 1), Fig. 6a (for initial 2), and Fig. 7a (for initial 2 with the measurement error). The comparison of the initial, optimal, and desired heat transfer coefficient distributions on the surface $\Gamma_2$ are shown in Fig. 5b (for initial 1), Fig. 6b (for initial 2), and Fig. 7b (for initial 2 with the measurement error). The details of the results, including the initial and final values for
$a_1, a_2, a_3$, the initial and final values of the objective function, the computation time, and the percentage of the decrease in the objective function are given in Table 2 (for both cases of no measurement error and a measurement error). As shown in Table 2, a 100% reduction in the objective function and complete recovering of the values for $a_1, a_2, a_3$ (the heat transfer coefficient components) are achieved in both initial cases with no measurement error. In case of the measurement error of $\sigma = 0.5$, there is also an approximately a 100% reduction in the objective function. As shown in Table 2, the errors in recovering the parameters $a_1, a_2, a_3$ are insignificant. The results are obtained by a FORTRAN compiler and computations are run on a PC with Intel Core i5 and 6G RAM. A tolerance of $10^{-7}$ is used in iterative loops to increase the accuracy of results.

**Initial guess 2 (with measurement error):**

$$h_{\text{initial}}_2 = 0.1x_{i,N} + 0.7y_{i,N} - 0.8\left(\frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C}\right)$$

In this study, for both cases of space- and temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient, the measured temperature containing random errors, $T_{i,N}^{\text{meas}} (i = 2, ..., M - 1)$, is generated by adding an error term $\omega \sigma$ to the exact temperature $T_{i,N}^{\text{exact}}$ to give

$$T_{i,N}^{\text{meas}} = T_{i,N}^{\text{exact}} + \omega \sigma \quad (33)$$

where $\omega$ is a random variable with normal distribution, zero mean, and unitary standard deviation. Assuming 99% confidence for the measured temperature, $\omega$ lies in the range $-2.576 \leq \omega \leq 2.576$ and it is randomly generated by using MATLAB. $\sigma$ is the standard deviation of the measurement errors and is considered as $\sigma = 0.5$ in this study. The initial guess 2 ( $h_{\text{initial}}_2 = 0.1x_{i,N} + 0.7y_{i,N} - 0.8\left(\frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C}\right)$ ) is considered again to initiate the optimization process.
Fig. 7 Estimation of $a_1$, $a_2$, and $a_3$ ($h_2 = a_1x_{i,N} + a_2y_{i,N} + a_3$) and objective function versus iteration number for initial heat transfer coefficient $h^{initial}_{2,i,N} = 0.1x_{i,N} + 0.7y_{i,N} - 0.8$(W/ m$^2$.C) by considering measurement error (a), and comparison of initial, optimal, and desired (simulated measured) heat transfer coefficient distributions (b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid size</th>
<th>Desired value (guess)</th>
<th>Initial value</th>
<th>Final value</th>
<th>Temperature measurement error</th>
<th>Initial value of $J$</th>
<th>Minimum value of $J$</th>
<th>Reduction in objective function &amp; computation time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 × 60</td>
<td>$a_1 = 0.05$ $a_2 = 0.007$ $a_3 = 2.5$</td>
<td>$a_1 = 0.000002$ $a_2 = 0.0004$ $a_3 = 0.00001$</td>
<td>$a_1 = 5.00 \times 10^{-2}$ $a_2 = 6.96 \times 10^{-3}$ $a_3 = 2.50$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 0$</td>
<td>$57267842.97$ ( (C = 10) )</td>
<td>$7.04 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>100% ( (34s) ) ( (1100 iterations) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 × 40</td>
<td>$a_1 = 0.1$ $a_2 = 0.7$ $a_3 = -0.8$</td>
<td>$a_1 = 5.00 \times 10^{-2}$ $a_2 = 7.00 \times 10^{-3}$ $a_3 = 2.50$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 0$</td>
<td>$13410671.43$ ( (C = 100) )</td>
<td>$8.21 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>100% ( (4m:52s) ) ( (13000 iterations) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 × 40</td>
<td>$a_1 = 0.1$ $a_2 = 0.7$ $a_3 = -0.8$</td>
<td>$a_1 = 5.01 \times 10^{-2}$ ( error=0.2% ) $a_2 = 7.34 \times 10^{-3}$ ( error=4.86% ) $a_3 = 2.49$ ( error=0.4% )</td>
<td>$\sigma = 0.5$</td>
<td>$13439285.83$ ( (C = 100) )</td>
<td>1199.87</td>
<td>- 100% ( (4138 iterations) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Results for the estimation the heat transfer coefficient components $a_1$, $a_2$, and $a_3$. 
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4.2 Temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient:

*Test Case 2:* Numerical values of the coefficients involved in this test case are listed in Table 3. Initially the direct problem is solved using the known values for the thermal conductivity, the heat flux, and the heat transfer coefficients to obtain the temperature distribution on the outer surface $\Gamma_2$ (Fig. 8a), $T_{i,N}$, which will be used as the simulated measured temperatures $T_{(i,N)m}$ for the inverse analysis to recover the initial values of $a$ and $b$. The grid size is 60 × 50. Using an inverse analysis, the known (desired) values of $a_d = 6.0$ and $b_d = 0.4$ are to be recovered by utilizing two different initial guesses:

\[
\begin{align*}
    a_{\text{initial}_1} &= 0.001, b_{\text{initial}_1} = 0.04 \\
    a_{\text{initial}_2} &= 10.0, b_{\text{initial}_2} = 0.9
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\dot{q} \left( \frac{W}{m^2} \right)$</th>
<th>$k_T \left( \frac{W}{m \cdot C} \right)$</th>
<th>$h_2 \left( \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C} \right)$</th>
<th>$h_3 \left( \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C} \right)$</th>
<th>$h_4 \left( \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C} \right)$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty 2} \left( ^\circ C \right)$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty 3} \left( ^\circ C \right)$</th>
<th>$T_{\infty 4} \left( ^\circ C \right)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$6.0 + 0.4T_{i,N}$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Data used for Test Case 2.
Fig. 8 The validation of the implemented numerical method for the direct heat transfer problem using the finite element analysis software COMSOL. Temperature distribution obtained by the proposed numerical method (a) and temperature distribution obtained by COMSOL (b).

Fig. 9 Distribution of variable heat transfer coefficient on the outer surface $\Gamma_2$. 
Initial guess 1: \( h_{\text{initial}_1} = 0.001 + 0.04T_{i,N}(\frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C}) \)

Fig. 10 Estimation of \( a \) and \( b \) (\( h_2 = a + b T_{i,N} \)) and objective function versus iteration number for initial heat transfer coefficient \( h_{\text{initial}_2} = 0.001 + 0.04T_{i,N}(W/m^2 \cdot C) \) (a), and comparison of initial, optimal, and desired (simulated measured) heat transfer coefficient distributions (b).
Initial guess 2: $h_{\text{initial}_2} = 10.0 + 0.9 T_{i,N} (\frac{W}{m^2.C})

Fig. 11 Estimation of $a$ and $b$ ($h_2 = a + bT_{i,N}$) and objective function versus iteration number for initial heat transfer coefficient $h_{\text{initial}_2} = 10.0 + 0.9 T_{i,N} (W/m^2.C)$ (a), and comparison of initial, optimal, and desired (simulated measured) heat transfer coefficient distributions (b).
Initial guess 2 (with measurement error): 

\[ h_{\text{initial}_2} = 10.0 + 0.9T_{i,N} \left( \frac{W}{m^2 \cdot C} \right) \]

Fig. 12 Estimation of \( a \) and \( b \) \( (h_2 = a + bT_{i,N}) \) and objective function versus iteration number for initial heat transfer coefficient \( h_{\text{initial}_2} = 10.0 + 0.9T_{i,N} (W/m^2 \cdot C) \) by considering measurement error (a), and comparison of initial, optimal, and desired (simulated measured) heat transfer coefficient distributions (b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid size</th>
<th>Desired value</th>
<th>Initial (guess) value</th>
<th>Final value</th>
<th>Temperature measurement error</th>
<th>Initial value of ( J )</th>
<th>Minimum value of ( J )</th>
<th>Reduction in objective function &amp; computation time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 × 30</td>
<td>( a = 6.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 0.001 )</td>
<td>( a = 6.0 )</td>
<td>( \sigma = 0 )</td>
<td>723557.90</td>
<td>4.28 \times 10^{-3}</td>
<td>100% (3m:41s), (10200 iterations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 0.4 )</td>
<td>( b = 0.04 )</td>
<td>( b = 0.4 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 × 80</td>
<td>( a = 10.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 6.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 6.0 )</td>
<td>( \sigma = 0 )</td>
<td>7574.36</td>
<td>4.32 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>100% (5m:13s), (4800 iterations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 0.9 )</td>
<td>( b = 0.4 )</td>
<td>( b = 0.4 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 × 80</td>
<td>( a = 10.0 )</td>
<td>( a = 9.36 ) (error=56%)</td>
<td>( a = 9.36 )</td>
<td>( \sigma = 0.5 )</td>
<td>7850.54</td>
<td>136.35</td>
<td>- 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b = 0.9 )</td>
<td>( b = 0.28 ) (error=29.25%)</td>
<td>( b = 0.28 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4000 iterations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Results for the estimation the heat transfer coefficient components \( a \) and \( b \).
Like the estimation of the space-dependent heat transfer coefficient, the inverse analysis used for estimation of the temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient is investigated using two different initial guesses which are far from the desired ones. For both initial guesses, different grid sizes (60 × 30 for the initial 1 and 60 × 80 for initial 2 and initial 2 with measurement error) used to avoid committing an inverse crime. The convergence history of the components of the variable heat transfer coefficient \((a, b)\) and the decrease in the objective function versus the iteration number are shown in Fig. 10a (for initial 1), Fig. 11a (for initial 2), and Fig. 12a (for initial 2 with the measurement error). The comparison of initial, optimal, and desired heat transfer distributions on the surface \(\Gamma_2\) are shown in Fig. 10b (for initial 1), Fig. 11b (for initial 2), and Fig. 12b (for initial 2 with the measurement error). The details of the results, including the initial and final values for \(a, b\), the initial and final values of the objective function, the computation time, and the percentage of the decrease in the objective function are given in Table 4 (for both cases of no measurement error and a measurement error). As shown in Table 4, a 100% reduction in the objective function and complete recovering of the values for \(a, b\) (the heat transfer coefficient components) are achieved in both initial cases with no measurement error. In case of the measurement error of \(\sigma = 0.5\), there is also an approximately a 100% reduction in the objective function. As shown in Table 4, the errors in recovering the parameters \(a, b\) are significant.

5. Conclusion

This paper presented a new numerical procedure for separate estimation of a space- and temperature-dependent heat transfer coefficient in a two dimensional irregular heat-conducting body using an inverse steady-state heat conduction analysis. The irregular body was transformed into a regular computational domain to perform all computations related to the direct and inverse heat conduction solution. To do this, an elliptic grid generation
scheme was used to generate a grid over the body. An accurate and very efficient sensitivity analysis scheme was used to calculate sensitivity coefficients needed in a gradient-based optimization method (here, conjugate gradient method). The explicit expressions for the sensitivity coefficients were derived for both dependence cases (space- and temperature- dependence) which allow for the computation of the sensitivity coefficients in one single solve, regardless of the number of unknown quantities. The conjugate gradient method was used as a tool to minimize the objective function and recover the desired quantities. The obtained results revealed that the proposed algorithm is very accurate and efficient.
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