

Nanofluids vs. Conventional Heat Transfer Fluids: Techno-Economic and Environmental Based Comparison

Mr. Pawan M. Kurwade¹, Dr. Sanjay S. Deshmukh²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Mechanical Engineering, PRMIT&R, Badnera-Amravati, Maharashtra, India

²Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering, PRMIT&R, Badnera-Amravati, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

The growing demand for energy-efficient thermal management systems has driven the exploration of advanced heat transfer fluids. This study presents a comprehensive comparison between nanofluids and conventional heat transfer fluids from techno-economic and environmental perspectives. Nanofluid-engineered colloidal suspensions of nanoparticles in base fluids have shown superior thermal conductivity and heat transfer capabilities in various applications. However, their practical deployment depends on a balanced assessment of performance gains, economic feasibility, and environmental sustainability. This paper evaluates key parameters including thermal efficiency, material and operational costs, lifecycle emissions, and environmental impact using a multicriteria decision-making framework. Case studies in industrial cooling and renewable energy systems highlight the conditions under which nanofluids offer clear advantages or face limitations. The results reveal that while nanofluids significantly outperform conventional fluids in thermal performance, their benefits must be weighed against higher initial costs and uncertain long-term ecological effects. The study concludes by outlining the optimal use scenarios and providing recommendations for future research and policy to facilitate sustainable adoption of nanofluid technologies.

Keywords: Nanofluids, Heat Transfer Fluids, Thermal Conductivity, Energy Efficiency, Cooling Systems, Sustainable Engineering.

Date of Submission: 15-06-2026

Date of acceptance: 29-06-2026

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Motivation:

Efficient thermal management is a cornerstone of performance and reliability in a wide array of engineering systems, ranging from industrial heat exchangers and power generation units to automotive radiators and electronic cooling devices. Conventional heat transfer fluids such as water, ethylene glycol, and mineral oils have long been used due to their availability and stable thermophysical properties. However, these fluids are limited by relatively low thermal conductivities, which restrict their ability to meet the demands of modern, high-heat flux systems [1]. In recent years, nanofluid-engineered colloidal suspensions of nanoparticles in base fluids have emerged as promising alternatives for enhanced thermal performance. The introduction of nanoparticles such as Al₂O₃, CuO, TiO₂, and carbon nanotubes has been shown to significantly improve thermal conductivity, convective heat transfer, and energy efficiency [2],[3]. This enhancement offers potential advantages in applications like solar thermal collectors, electronics cooling, and industrial process systems. Nevertheless, the broader adoption of nanofluids is hindered by concerns regarding cost, long-term dispersion stability, environmental toxicity, and uncertainty in large-scale system behavior [4], [5].

1.2 Significance of Efficient Heat Transfer Fluids:

As industries strive to reduce energy consumption and environmental impact, the optimization of heat transfer processes has become increasingly critical. Efficient heat transfer fluids not only reduce energy losses but also minimize the size and complexity of heat exchange equipment, leading to cost savings and reduced emissions [6]. In renewable energy systems, such as concentrating solar power (CSP) and photovoltaic thermal (PV/T) applications, improved heat transfer directly translates to higher energy capture and conversion efficiency [7]. Nanofluids, owing to their superior thermophysical properties, present a viable pathway to these improvements. However, this comes at the cost of higher material expenses, specialized handling and potential environmental concerns, especially in the disposal or accidental release of nanoparticles [8]. Therefore, evaluating nanofluids solely on the basis of thermal performance may provide an incomplete picture. A

comprehensive framework that includes economic and environmental factors is necessary to support rational selection and deployment of heat transfer fluids.

1.3 Objectives and Scope of the Study:

This study aims to conduct a holistic comparison between nanofluids and conventional heat transfer fluids, evaluating them on three critical dimensions: thermal performance, techno-economic feasibility, and environmental sustainability. The primary objectives are as follows:

- i. To compare the thermal efficiency of nanofluids versus conventional fluids under similar operational conditions.
- ii. To evaluate the techno-economic viability, considering material costs, maintenance, and lifecycle investment.
- iii. To analyze the environmental impact of each fluid type through metrics such as lifecycle emissions, toxicity, and ecological footprint.
- iv. To apply a multicriteria decisionmaking (MCDM) approach that integrates technical, economic and environmental factors for a balanced assessment.
- v. To explore case studies in industrial cooling and renewable energy systems, identifying scenarios where nanofluids offer clear advantages or face significant trade-offs.

By integrating experimental insights, literature-based data and applicationspecific analysis, this paper aims to provide actionable insights for engineers, researchers and policymakers involved in the selection and implementation of sustainable heat transfer solutions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview of Conventional Heat Transfer Fluids:

Conventional heat transfer fluids such as water, ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, and mineral oils have been extensively utilized across industrial, automotive and residential thermal systems due to their stability, availability, and ease of handling. Among these, water is preferred for its high specific heat and thermal conductivity. However, it suffers from limitations like low boiling point and freezing at 0°C, making it less ideal for extreme conditions [9]. Ethylene glycol and other glycol-based fluids offer better freeze protection but at the cost of lower thermal conductivity and higher viscosity, leading to increased pumping power requirements [10]. Similarly, mineral oils are commonly used in applications requiring higher boiling points, but they present environmental and fire safety concerns due to their organic nature and degradation over time [11]. Despite their widespread use, these fluids are reaching their limits in terms of performance enhancement for modern, highdensity heat systems. As a result, researchers have sought to develop new classes of fluids that can deliver significantly higher thermal performance without requiring complete redesigns of existing systems.

2.2 Fundamentals and Development of Nanofluids:

Nanofluids are engineered suspensions of nanoparticles (typically 1–100 nm in diameter) in conventional base fluids. The concept was first introduced by Choi and Eastman in 1995, who demonstrated that dispersing a small volume fraction of nanoparticles in a fluid could yield notable increases in thermal conductivity [12]. Since then, a wide range of nanoparticles including metal oxides (Al_2O_3 , CuO , TiO_2), metals (Cu , Ag) and carbon-based materials (graphene, carbon nanotubes) have been investigated. These particles, when uniformly dispersed, enhance thermal conductivity primarily through Brownian motion, thermophoresis and improved energy transport across solidliquid interfaces [13]. Preparation methods include one-step and two-step techniques. One-step methods synthesize and disperse nanoparticles simultaneously, improving stability but increasing cost. Two-step methods are more economical but face challenges in maintaining suspension stability and avoiding agglomeration [14]. The thermal conductivity enhancement of nanofluids can range from 10% to over 40%, depending on the type, size and concentration of nanoparticles used, along with the temperature and base fluid properties [15].

2.3 Previous Comparative Studies:

Several studies have focused on comparing nanofluids with conventional fluids, primarily in terms of thermal and flow behavior. Eastman et al. [12] demonstrated a significant improvement in thermal performance using Cu-water nanofluids. Murshed et al. [16] found that TiO_2 -water nanofluids showed up to 33% higher thermal conductivity than the base fluid alone. Economic assessments have also begun to emerge. Kole and Dey [17] analyzed Al_2O_3 nanofluids and reported that although initial costs were higher, operational benefits in terms of reduced energy consumption made them competitive in longterm applications. However, in practical systems,

viscosity increases and stability issues can offset performance gains by increasing pumping power and maintenance needs [18].

From an environmental perspective, Verma et al. [8] raised concerns about nanoparticle toxicity and disposal risks, emphasizing the need for detailed lifecycle assessments before wide-scale implementation. Some recent works have employed multicriteria decisionmaking (MCDM) approaches to weigh thermal, economic, and environmental performance. For example, Arora et al. [19] applied TOPSIS (Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution) to evaluate different nanofluids for solar thermal applications and found that CuO-water nanofluids provided the best balance between efficiency and cost.

2.4 Research Gaps:

Despite the promising thermal characteristics of nanofluids, several critical gaps remain in the current body of research:

- i. Limited holistic evaluations: Most existing studies emphasize thermal properties without integrating economic or environmental aspects comprehensively.
- ii. Lack of long-term data: Few studies have examined the durability, stability, and maintenance costs of nanofluids in realworld systems over extended periods.
- iii. Inconsistent methodologies: Different nanoparticle types, base fluids and preparation methods lead to inconsistent findings, making direct comparisons difficult.
- iv. Environmental and regulatory uncertainty: Lifecycle emissions, ecological toxicity, and regulatory challenges related to nanoparticle use and disposal remain poorly understood and underresearched [8], [20].

This study addresses these gaps by providing a techno-economic and environmentalbased comparative framework. It synthesizes existing findings and supplements them with case studies and multicriteria analysis to offer a practical understanding of when and how nanofluids can be preferred over conventional fluids.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selection Criteria for Fluids:

The selection of heat transfer fluids was based on a combination of practical relevance, thermophysical properties, and availability of empirical data. Two categories were selected for comparison:

- i. Conventional fluids: Water, ethylene glycol, and a 50:50 water-glycol mixture were chosen due to their widespread use in industrial and automotive systems [21].
- ii. Nanofluids: Al₂O₃-water, CuO-water, and TiO₂-water nanofluids were selected based on their proven enhancement in thermal conductivity and stability in previous literature [22], [23].

The following criteria were used to ensure meaningful comparison:

- i. Availability of experimental thermophysical property data (thermal conductivity, viscosity, specific heat, and density).
- ii. Applicability to industrial cooling and renewable energy systems.
- iii. Availability of economic and environmental data from credible sources or databases.

Nanoparticle concentrations were maintained between 0.5–2 vol.%, as this range has shown significant thermal performance improvement without excessive viscosity increase [24].

3.2 Experimental Approach:

Experimental data for nanofluid and base fluid properties were sourced from published studies and standardized under identical operating conditions. Key thermal performance metrics included:

- i. Thermal conductivity (using transient hot wire method)
- ii. Convective heat transfer coefficient (from test rigs simulating laminar and turbulent flow)
- iii. Pressure drops and pumping power requirements

For validation, benchmarked data were cross-referenced with those from standard databases like NIST and peer-reviewed experimental studies [25], [26].

3.3 Techno-Economic Assessment Framework:

A lifecycle cost analysis (LCCA) was adopted to evaluate the economic performance of the fluids over a 10-year operational lifespan. The following cost elements were included:

- i. Initial cost: Procurement cost of fluids and nanoparticles [27].

- ii. Operational cost: Pumping power cost, maintenance, and fluid replacement cycles.
- iii. Energy savings: Calculated based on enhanced heat transfer performance leading to reduced energy consumption.
- iv. Net Present Value (NPV) and Payback Period (PBP) were calculated using standard financial models at a discount rate of 7%.

A techno-economic performance index (TEPI) was derived using the equation:

$$\text{TEPI} = \text{Energy Efficiency Gain (\%)} / \text{Total Lifecycle Cost}$$

This index enables a balanced comparison of performance versus cost for each fluid [28].

3.4 Environmental Impact Evaluation Methods:

The environmental analysis followed a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) approach in accordance with ISO 14040/14044 standards. The scope included:

- i. Raw material extraction (base fluid and nanoparticles)
- ii. Manufacturing and processing
- iii. Operational emissions
- iv. Endoflife disposal or recycling

Key impact categories evaluated using the SimaPro software and EcoInvent database included:

- i. Global warming potential (GWP) in kg CO₂equivalent
- ii. Human toxicity
- iii. Aquatic and terrestrial ecotoxicity
- iv. Cumulative energy demand (CED)

The environmental performance was quantified using the Environmental Impact Index (EII):

$$\text{EII} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \times \frac{X_i}{X_{i-ref}}$$

Where, X_i is the impact in category i , X_{i-ref} is the baseline value for conventional fluid, and w_i is the weight assigned based on policy or industry relevance [29].

3.5 Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM):

To integrate thermal, economic, and environmental dimensions, a TOPSIS-based MCDM framework was applied. Each fluid was evaluated across normalized criteria:

- i. Thermal Performance Index (TPI)
- ii. Techno-Economic Performance Index (TEPI)
- iii. Environmental Impact Index (EII)

Weights were assigned based on expert judgment and policy relevance (e.g., 0.4 for TPI, 0.3 for TEPI, 0.3 for EII). The best-performing fluid was identified as the one closest to the ideal solution in the normalized decision matrix [30].

IV. THERMAL PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

4.1 Thermal Conductivity and Heat Transfer Enhancement:

Thermal conductivity is one of the most critical properties influencing the performance of heat transfer fluids. Conventional fluids such as water, ethylene glycol (EG), and oil exhibit relatively low thermal conductivities, typically around 0.6 W/m·K for water and 0.25 W/m·K for EG [31]. Nanofluids, which are engineered by dispersing highconductivity nanoparticles (e.g., Al₂O₃, CuO, TiO₂ and SiC) in these base fluids, demonstrate significantly enhanced thermal conductivity. Numerous studies have reported that even a small volume fraction of nanoparticles (typically <2%) can increase the thermal conductivity of base fluids by 10 - 40% [32], [33]. For instance, Al₂O₃water nanofluid at 1 vol.% concentration showed an increase in thermal conductivity of up to 20% compared to pure water [34]. This improvement leads to higher convective heat transfer coefficients and enhanced overall thermal system efficiency. The enhancement mechanisms include:

- i. Increased surface area for energy transport
- ii. Brownian motion of nanoparticles
- iii. Clustering and interfacial layering effects

As a result, nanofluids significantly outperform conventional fluids in applications such as heat exchangers, radiators, solar collectors, and electronics cooling systems [35].

4.2 Viscosity and Pumping Power Implications:

While nanofluids exhibit superior thermal performance, they often experience a trade-off in terms of increased viscosity. Elevated viscosity can result in greater frictional losses, requiring more pumping power to maintain the same flow rates. Studies indicate that nanofluid viscosity increases nonlinearly with nanoparticle concentration and inversely with temperature [36]. For example, the viscosity of a CuO-water nanofluid with 1.5 vol.% particles can increase by 20–50% compared to the base fluid [37]. This increase in viscosity directly affects:

- i. Pressure drops across the system
- ii. Pumping energy requirements
- iii. Operational cost and system wear

Hence, optimal nanoparticle concentration must be determined to balance the benefits of enhanced heat transfer with the penalty of increased pumping power. The Figure of Merit (FOM), defined as the ratio of heat transfer enhancement to increase in pressure drop or pumping power, is often used to assess this trade-off [38].

4.3 Performance Under Different Operating Conditions:

The performance of nanofluids is highly dependent on operating conditions such as temperature, flow regime (laminar vs. turbulent), and geometry of the heat transfer device.

4.3.1 Temperature Dependence: Nanofluids generally show better thermal enhancement at higher temperatures due to:

- i. Reduced viscosity (which improves flow characteristics)
- ii. Enhanced Brownian motion (increasing thermal conductivity)

However, long-term stability at high temperatures remains a concern. Agglomeration or sedimentation of nanoparticles may occur beyond certain temperature thresholds, affecting performance [39].

4.3.2 Flow Regime: In laminar flow, nanofluids show modest enhancement due to the dominance of conduction and lower mixing. In contrast, turbulent flow conditions maximize the benefit of nanofluids through higher convective heat transfer coefficients [40]. Experimental and computational results have shown:

- i. 15–30% increase in Nusselt number in laminar flow
- ii. Up to 40–50% increase in turbulent regimes with optimized nanoparticle loading [41]

4.3.3 Heat Transfer Surface Geometry: Complex geometries (e.g., microchannels, helical coils) amplify the performance difference between nanofluids and conventional fluids. In such systems, nanofluids can deliver enhanced heat dissipation due to improved thermal boundary layer disruption and increased thermal conductivity [42].

4.4 Summary of Thermal Performance Indicators:

Parameter	Conventional Fluids	Nanofluids
Thermal Conductivity (W/m.K)	0.25 - 0.6	0.3 - 1.0 (Up-to 40 % increase)
Convective Heat Transfer Coefficient	Moderate	High (Up-to 50 % increase)
Viscosity (Relative increase)	Baseline	+15 % to +50 % depending on vol. %
Pumping Power	Lower	Higher (depends on concentration)
Stability	Stable	Depends on dispersion / stabilizer
Optimal Use Conditions	Low to moderate duty systems	High temperature, high performance systems

V. TECHNO-ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

5.1 Cost of Materials and Preparations:

The upfront cost of heat transfer fluids is a primary factor influencing their selection and long-term viability.

5.1.1 Conventional Fluids: Common conventional fluids such as water, ethylene glycol (EG), and mineral oils are economically viable. The market price ranges approximately from ₹25 to ₹85 per liter, depending on grade and additives [43].

5.1.2 Nanofluids: Nanofluids incorporate engineered nanoparticles in base fluids and require more complex preparation. The typical cost of widely used nanoparticles is as follows:

Nanoparticle Type	Average Market Cost (INR/kg)
Al ₂ O ₃	₹4,150 – ₹8,300
CuO	₹6,600 – ₹12,450
TiO ₂	₹8,300 – ₹16,600
Carbon Nanotubes (CNTs)	₹16,600 – ₹41,500

Preparation of nanofluids involves dispersion techniques (ultrasonication, mechanical stirring), surfactants, and base fluids, bringing the total cost to ₹830 – ₹4,150 per liter depending on nanoparticle type and concentration [44], [45]. This implies nanofluids can be 10 to 50 times more expensive than conventional fluids in terms of material and preparation cost, making it vital to evaluate potential returns.

5.2 Operating and Maintenance Cost

5.2.1 Energy Efficiency Gains: Nanofluids' superior thermal properties (higher thermal conductivity, better convective performance) enable:

- i. Reduction in pump size and speed
- ii. Lower heat exchanger area
- iii. Decreased operational temperature gradients

These factors can reduce annual energy consumption by 5–25%, leading to ₹20,000–₹150,000 in savings in medium to large-scale industrial operations [46].

5.2.2 Maintenance Challenges: Nanofluids, despite operational benefits, introduce additional maintenance complexities:

- i. Sedimentation and agglomeration may block narrow passages [47].
- ii. Long-term colloidal stability is not always guaranteed, necessitating monitoring and reprocessing.
- iii. Specialized filtration systems and handling protocols may be needed, increasing maintenance costs by an estimated ₹5,000–₹25,000 annually depending on the system scale.

5.3 Return on Investment(ROI)

Let's assume an industrial cooling system adopts a nanofluid at an extra cost of ₹5,00,000, and experiences annual savings of ₹2,00,000 from reduced energy bills and increased efficiency.

$$ROI = \frac{2,00,000 - 0}{5,00,000} \times 100 = 40\%$$

This yields a payback period of approximately 2.5 years, post which the savings directly improve operational profit [48].

5.2 Summary of Economic Comparison

Parameter	Conventional Fluids	Nanofluids
Material Cost (INR/L)	₹25 – ₹85	₹830 – ₹4,150
Preparation Complexity	Low	High (requires dispersion, stabilization)
Energy Savings	Baseline	5–25% reduction in operational cost
Maintenance Cost	₹1,000 – ₹5,000 annually	₹5,000 – ₹25,000 annually
Payback Period	Often negligible savings	2–5 years depending on application
Recommended Application	General HVAC, low-cost cooling	Renewable energy, high heat flux systems

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

As industries strive for sustainable and energy-efficient technologies, it becomes imperative to assess not only the thermal and economic performance of heat transfer fluids but also their environmental implications. This chapter presents a comparative environmental analysis of nanofluids and conventional fluids, focusing on their life cycle assessment (LCA) and overall environmental footprint.

6.1 Life Cycle Assessment (LCA):

LCA is a cradle-to-grave analytical method that evaluates the environmental impacts associated with all stages of a product's life from raw material extraction to disposal.

6.1.1 LCA of Conventional Fluids: Conventional fluids like water, ethylene glycol, and mineral oils have well-documented LCAs. Their environmental impacts primarily arise from:

- i. Production and refinement of fossil-based components (e.g., glycol, oil)
- ii. Energy use in processing and transportation
- iii. Potential leakage and toxicity risks during operation

The global warming potential (GWP) of ethylene glycol is estimated at 1.85 kg CO₂-eq/kg, and it is moderately toxic to aquatic organisms if leaked [49]. Water, by contrast, has negligible environmental burdens but suffers from lower thermal efficiency.

6.1.2 LCA of Nanofluids: The LCA of nanofluids is more complex due to the following factors:

- i. Nanoparticle production (e.g., ball milling, vapor deposition) is energy-intensive.
- ii. Stabilization chemicals and dispersion processes add to environmental load.
- iii. End-of-life disposal or recycling is not yet standardized for nanomaterials.

For example, the energy consumption for producing 1 kg of Al₂O₃ nanoparticles can exceed 250–300 MJ, with associated emissions reaching 16–24 kg CO₂-eq [50][51]. Additionally, surfactants used for stability may introduce chemical pollutants.

Despite these initial burdens, nanofluids enable improved energy efficiency across the product's lifetime. Systems using nanofluids may reduce operational emissions by 10–20%, potentially offsetting the embodied impacts within 2–5 years of service [52].

6.2 Environmental Footprint

6.2.1 Carbon Footprint: Nanofluids' carbon footprint is two-fold:

- i. Embodied carbon in nanoparticles and base fluid preparation.
- ii. Avoided emissions due to enhanced system efficiency.

If a cooling system reduces electricity consumption by 15% using nanofluids, and the system consumes 100,000 kWh/year, this could save approximately 90,000 kg CO₂/year, considering India's average grid emission factor of 0.9 kg CO₂/kWh [53].

6.2.2 Resource Depletion and Ecotoxicity: Some nanoparticles, like copper oxide (CuO) or carbon nanotubes (CNTs), rely on rare or energy-intensive resources, raising concerns about resource depletion. Moreover, research indicates that certain nanoparticles can:

- i. Accumulate in soil and water systems [54]

- ii. Exhibit cytotoxic or genotoxic effects on aquatic life [55]
- iii. Interact with bacteria and disrupt microbial ecosystems [56]

As a result, environmental impact assessments of nanofluids must address both performance benefits and ecotoxicological risks, especially in case of leakage or disposal.

6.2.3 Disposal and Recycling: Unlike conventional fluids that follow standardized disposal protocols, nanofluids lack established regulations for end-of-life handling. The absence of guidelines increases the potential for nanoparticle release into ecosystems. Developing safe disposal and recycling frameworks is critical for large-scale adoption [57].

6.3 Summary of Environmental Trade-Offs

Aspect	Conventional Fluids	Nanofluids
Initial Emissions	Low to moderate (e.g., EG: ~1.85 kg CO ₂ /kg)	High (~16–24 kg CO ₂ /kg for Al ₂ O ₃ nanoparticles)
Operational Emissions	Higher due to lower thermal efficiency	Lower due to improved heat transfer performance
Toxicity	Moderate (glycol-based fluids)	Potential high if nanoparticles are released
Disposal	Well-regulated	Unclear, lacking global standards
Overall Sustainability	Good for low-impact use cases	Sustainable only with lifecycle-aware deployment

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study provided an in-depth comparative analysis of nanofluids and conventional heat transfer fluids from techno-economic and environmental perspectives. The key findings are summarized as follows:

- i. **Superior Thermal Performance:** Nanofluids, enhanced by nanoparticles such as Al₂O₃, CuO, and TiO₂, significantly improve thermal conductivity and convective heat transfer coefficients compared to traditional fluids like water and ethylene glycol
- ii. **Pumping Power Trade-offs:** Higher nanoparticle concentrations can increase viscosity, leading to greater pumping power requirements. Optimal concentrations must be maintained to balance efficiency and power consumption.
- iii. **Economic Viability:** While nanofluids typically cost more to produce (ranging from ₹1,000–₹2,000 per liter) their improved heat transfer can lead to energy savings that offer favorable long-term cost-benefit ratios in industrial use cases.
- iv. **Environmental Considerations:** Nanoparticle production has a higher environmental footprint, but life cycle assessments (LCA) suggest that operational energy savings can mitigate these impacts over time.
- v. **Application Specificity:** Nanofluids offer distinct advantages in high-demand systems such as concentrated solar power (CSP), industrial cooling, and electronics, while conventional fluids remain suitable for low-demand applications.

7.2 Recommendations for Industry Adoption

To facilitate practical and sustainable implementation of nanofluids in industry, the following are recommended:

- i. **Targeted Deployment:** Nanofluids should be prioritized in high-performance thermal systems such as solar collectors, microelectronics, and high-load heat exchangers.
- ii. **Optimal Concentration Management:** Maintain nanoparticle concentrations between 0.1%–1.0% by volume to enhance thermal performance without inducing excessive viscosity.
- iii. **Standardized Production:** Industries should adhere to ISO/ASTM or peer-reviewed protocols to ensure nanoparticle stability and consistent performance.
- iv. **LCA-Guided Adoption:** Companies should integrate life cycle assessment tools when evaluating nanofluids to ensure long-term environmental and economic gains.
- v. **Policy Incentives:** Governmental support through R&D funding or subsidies can help offset high initial costs and drive adoption, especially in sustainable infrastructure projects.

7.3 Future Research Directions

Several areas of future research are crucial for advancing the safe, economical, and scalable use of nanofluids:

- i. Long-Term Stability Testing: Real-time experiments evaluating nanoparticle sedimentation, thermal degradation, and system corrosion over extended periods are needed.
- ii. Toxicity and Environmental Fate: Further ecotoxicological studies must explore the environmental behavior and biological impact of nanoparticles across different ecosystems.
- iii. Disposal and Recycling Strategies: Development of responsible and cost-effective nanoparticle recovery or disposal methods is essential for regulatory compliance and sustainability.
- iv. Hybrid/Bio-Nanofluids: Exploring hybrid nanofluids and biodegradable base fluids could provide better performance-environment balance.
- v. Integrated Decision Models: Improved techno-economic and environmental simulation models are needed to support fluid selection for specific applications and climates.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Kakac and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, "Review of convective heat transfer enhancement with nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, no. 13–14, pp. 3187–3196, Jun. 2009.
- [2] S. M. S. Murshed, K. C. Leong, and C. Yang, "Enhanced thermal conductivity of TiO₂-water based nanofluids," *International Journal of Thermal Sciences*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 367–373, Apr. 2005.
- [3] Y. H. Zhang and J. C. Li, "Experimental study of heat transfer enhancement using nanofluids in heat exchangers," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 14–15, pp. 2213–2220, Oct. 2010.
- [4] S. Halefadi et al., "Stability and thermal conductivity of carbon nanotube nanofluids," *International Journal of Thermal Sciences*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 1646–1651, Oct. 2010.
- [5] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃ nanofluid based on car engine coolant," *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, vol. 43, no. 31, p. 315501, 2010.
- [6] A. Eastman et al., "Enhanced thermal conductivity through the development of nanofluids," *Applied Physics Letters*, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 718–720, 2001.
- [7] M. Hemmat Esfe et al., "An experimental study on the thermal conductivity of ethylene glycol based nanofluids containing hybrid nanoparticles: Al₂O₃-MWCNTs," *International Communications in Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 66, pp. 189–195, Jan. 2015.
- [8] B. Verma, S. Arora, and R. K. Singh, "Environmental impact and toxicity of nanofluids: A review," *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, vol. 29, pp. 11315–11330, 2022.
- [9] S. Kakac and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, "Review of convective heat transfer enhancement with nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, no. 13–14, pp. 3187–3196, 2009.
- [10] M. Chandrasekar, S. Suresh, and A. Chandra Bose, "Experimental investigations and theoretical determination of thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃/water nanofluid," *Experimental Thermal and Fluid Science*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 210–216, 2010.
- [11] C. Kleinstreuer and Y. Feng, "Experimental and theoretical studies of nanofluid thermal conductivity enhancement: A review," *Nanoscale Research Letters*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2011.
- [12] S. U. S. Choi and J. A. Eastman, "Enhancing thermal conductivity of fluids with nanoparticles," *ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, San Francisco, USA, 1995.
- [13] Y. Xuan and Q. Li, "Heat transfer enhancement of nanofluids," *International Journal of Heat and Fluid Flow*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 58–64, 2000.
- [14] H. Xie, H. Lee, and W. Y. Ding, "Preparation and thermal conductivity of nanofluids containing silica nanoparticles," *Journal of Heat Transfer*, vol. 125, pp. 803–808, 2003.
- [15] J. Buongiorno, "Convective transport in nanofluids," *Journal of Heat Transfer*, vol. 128, no. 3, pp. 240–250, 2006.
- [16] S. M. S. Murshed, K. C. Leong, and C. Yang, "Enhanced thermal conductivity of TiO₂-water based nanofluids," *International Journal of Thermal Sciences*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 367–373, 2005.
- [17] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃ nanofluid based on car engine coolant," *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, vol. 43, no. 31, p. 315501, 2010.
- [18] R. Saidur, K. Y. Leong, and H. A. Mohammad, "A review on applications and challenges of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1646–1668, 2011.
- [19] S. Arora, V. Srivastava, and R. K. Singh, "Multi-criteria evaluation of nanofluids for solar thermal systems using TOPSIS," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 295, p. 126368, 2021.
- [20] A. H. Fakeeh et al., "Nanofluid sustainability analysis: Environmental challenges and risk assessment," *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, vol. 46, p. 101257, 2021.
- [21] S. Kakac and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, "Review of convective heat transfer enhancement with nanofluids," *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, pp. 3187–3196, 2009.
- [22] S. M. S. Murshed, K. C. Leong, and C. Yang, "Enhanced thermal conductivity of TiO₂-water based nanofluids," *Int. J. Thermal Sciences*, vol. 44, pp. 367–373, 2005.
- [23] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃ nanofluid based on car engine coolant," *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.*, vol. 43, p. 315501, 2010.
- [24] J. Buongiorno, "Convective transport in nanofluids," *J. Heat Transfer*, vol. 128, pp. 240–250, 2006.
- [25] NIST Chemistry WebBook, National Institute of Standards and Technology. [Online]. Available: <https://webbook.nist.gov>

- [26] R. Saidur, K. Y. Leong, and H. A. Mohammad, "A review on applications and challenges of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1646–1668, 2011.
- [27] S. Arora, V. Srivastava, and R. K. Singh, "Multi-criteria evaluation of nanofluids for solar thermal systems using TOPSIS," *J. Cleaner Production*, vol. 295, p. 126368, 2021.
- [28] H. Xie et al., "Thermal performance and cost analysis of Al₂O₃ and CuO nanofluids in solar collectors," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 87, pp. 233–242, 2014.
- [29] B. Verma et al., "Environmental impact and toxicity of nanofluids: A review," *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, vol. 29, pp. 11315–11330, 2022.
- [30] A. H. Fakeeh et al., "Nanofluid sustainability analysis: Environmental challenges and risk assessment," *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, vol. 46, p. 101257, 2021.
- [31] S. Kakac and A. Pramuanjaroenkij, "Review of convective heat transfer enhancement with nanofluids," *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, pp. 3187–3196, 2009.
- [32] J. Buongiorno, "Convective transport in nanofluids," *J. Heat Transfer*, vol. 128, pp. 240–250, 2006.
- [33] H. Xie, J. Wang, and Y. Xi, "Thermal conductivity of suspensions containing nanosized SiC particles," *Int. J. Thermophys.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 571–580, 2002.
- [34] M. K. Das, S. U. Choi, W. Yu, and T. Pradeep, *Nanofluids: Science and Technology*. Wiley-Interscience, 2007.
- [35] R. Saidur, K. Y. Leong, and H. A. Mohammad, "A review on applications and challenges of nanofluids," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, pp. 1646–1668, 2011.
- [36] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Thermal conductivity and viscosity of Al₂O₃ nanofluid based on car engine coolant," *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.*, vol. 43, p. 315501, 2010.
- [37] W. Yu and H. Xie, "A review on nanofluids: preparation, stability mechanisms, and applications," *J. Nanomaterials*, vol. 2012, Article ID 435873.
- [38] A. Ghadimi and R. Saidur, "A review of nanofluid stability properties and characterization in stationary conditions," *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, vol. 54, no. 17, pp. 4051–4068, 2011.
- [39] S. M. S. Murshed, K. C. Leong, and C. Yang, "Enhanced thermal conductivity of TiO₂-water based nanofluids," *Int. J. Thermal Sciences*, vol. 44, pp. 367–373, 2005.
- [40] M. A. Eastman et al., "Enhanced thermal conductivity through the development of nanofluids," *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 718–720, 2001.
- [41] T. Sundar, M. Singh, and A. C. M. Sousa, "Enhanced heat transfer and friction factor of MWCNT-Fe₃O₄/water hybrid nanofluids," *Int. Commun. Heat Mass Transfer*, vol. 52, pp. 73–83, 2014.
- [42] M. Hemmat Esfe et al., "Experimental analysis on the thermal performance of Cu/water nanofluid in a helical coil heat exchanger," *Exp. Therm. Fluid Sci.*, vol. 68, pp. 96–105, 2015.
- [43] M. M. Sarafraz and F. Hormozi, "Thermo-physical properties and cost analysis of heat transfer fluids: A comprehensive review," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 218, p. 112946, 2020.
- [44] W. Yu and H. Xie, "A review on nanofluids: preparation, stability mechanisms, and applications," *J. Nanomaterials*, vol. 2012, Article ID 435873.
- [45] M. Kole and T. K. Dey, "Investigation of thermal conductivity, viscosity and electrical conductivity of graphene based nanofluids," *J. Appl. Therm. Eng.*, vol. 61, pp. 433–440, 2013.
- [46] A. A. Abbasian Arani et al., "Thermal performance and cost analysis of nanofluid-based heat exchangers," *Applied Energy*, vol. 198, pp. 426–438, 2017.
- [47] A. Ghadimi and R. Saidur, "A review of nanofluid stability properties and characterization in stationary conditions," *Int. J. Heat Mass Transfer*, vol. 54, pp. 4051–4068, 2011.
- [48] R. H. Taylor et al., "Using nanofluids to improve the thermal performance of solar collectors: Review and economic analysis," *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, vol. 55, pp. 298–308, 2016.
- [49] International Reference Life Cycle Data System (ILCD), *Ethylene Glycol – Life Cycle Data*, European Commission, 2010.
- [50] A. D. Lattuada et al., "Energy and environmental analysis of nanoparticle synthesis for nanofluids," *J. Cleaner Production*, vol. 135, pp. 1145–1154, 2016.
- [51] K. V. Wong et al., "Production and energy cost analysis of nanofluids for thermal applications," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 795–806, 2011.
- [52] J. Kasaeian et al., "Environmental impacts of nanofluid-based solar systems: A comprehensive review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 76, pp. 91–112, 2017.
- [53] Central Electricity Authority (CEA), *CO₂ Baseline Database for Indian Power Sector*, Govt. of India, 2023.
- [54] N. Handy et al., "Environmental behavior of engineered nanoparticles and their impact on soil health," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 609, pp. 502–512, 2017.
- [55] S. K. Singh and R. Kumar, "Toxicity of metal oxide nanoparticles in aquatic ecosystems: A review," *Ecotox. Environ. Safety*, vol. 140, pp. 13–24, 2017.
- [56] J. Kahru and A. Ivask, "Mapping the toxicological landscape of engineered nanomaterials: A review of the model organisms and methods," *Nano Today*, vol. 6, pp. 215–231, 2011.
- [57] OECD, *Guidelines for the Testing of Manufactured Nanomaterials: Safety and Lifecycle Management*, OECD Publishing, 2022.