

Until Take Home Project

Brian Check

Files available on [GitHub](#)

Presentation Overview

Task 1: Mobile CPA Loading System


1. Problem Overview
2. System Architecture
3. Controller Design and Simulation
4. Hardware Overview

Task 2: Cradle Design

1. Task Overview
2. Design Overview
3. BOM

Task 1

Mobile CPA Loading System




Task Overview

Challenge

- Design mobile system to load cryoprotectants into porcine kidneys during transport

Requirements

- Temperature: $4^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$
- Pressure: $30 \text{ mmHg} \pm 3 \text{ mmHg}$
- Variable flow: 3-30 mL/min
- Two-fluid mixing
 - a. Carrier + CPA, ramping up CPA over time
- Single-pass perfusion
- ~2 hour runtime, battery powered



Domain Research and Benchmarking

LifePort Kidney Transporter - gold standard for clinical kidney transport

- Pulsatile flow, pressure control, recirculating
- Passive cooling with ice bath


LifePort keeps organs cold, but doesn't meet Until's requirements:

- Cooling: passively controlled, $\sim 2\text{-}10^\circ\text{C}$ (not $4\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ precision)
- Recirculating flow (not single-pass)
- Limited to hypothermic preservation (no CPA loading capability)



Key Takeaway: Until's challenge requires *active temperature control* with *single-pass perfusion* during CPA concentration ramping - fundamentally different operating regime than existing clinical transporters

System Architecture



How I got here

The Fundamental Challenge

- To hold $\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$, you need closed-loop control. Closed-loop control requires an actuator you can modulate
- *How do you actively control temperature in a fluid line?*
 - Peltier/TEC: Bulky, power-hungry, complex heat rejection
 - Recirculating chiller: Not mobile - requires benchtop equipment
 - Variable ice contact: No practical way to modulate heat transfer dynamically

The realization



- Cooling is hard to modulate. But *heating* is trivial - a resistive heater with PWM gives you precise, instantaneous control.

The architecture flip

- Instead of trying to cool *precisely* to 4°C , overcool *past* the setpoint, then heat back up.

System Architecture - Layout

Ice water cooling reservoir and isolated electronics compartment with insulated top lid and removable side access panel



Bottom View
Shows fluid lines

Control: Setup & Challenge



Two independent control loops:

- **Pressure → Pump speed** (sets flow rate)
- **Temperature → Heater power** (compensates for varying flow)

Challenge: Flow varies 10x during protocol - heater must maintain 4°C regardless despite temp being coupled with flow speed

Heat Transfer: Transient Dynamics Model [More Detail]

Before designing the controller, I modeled the heater dynamics. This isn't a steady-state problem. The wall has thermal mass, so there's a transient response. When I change heater power, the wall temperature evolves according to an energy balance ODE.



Simulation: Temp vs Time for Fixed Flow Rate and Heater Power
(Code: heater_dynamics.m)

Initial condition: $T_{wall}(0) = T_{in}$
Reynolds and Prandtl numbers:

$$Re = \frac{\rho V D}{\mu} = \frac{4\dot{m}}{\pi D \mu} \quad Pr = \frac{\mu c_p}{k}$$

Nusselt number [1]:

$$\overline{Nu}_D = 3.66 + \frac{0.0668(D/L)Re_DPr}{1 + 0.04[(D/L)Re_DPr]^{2/3}}$$

Heat transfer coefficient:

$$h = \frac{\overline{Nu}_D \cdot k}{D}$$

Number of Transfer Units [2]:

$$NTU = \frac{h \cdot \pi D L}{\dot{m} c_p}$$

Effectiveness [2]:

$$\varepsilon = 1 - e^{-NTU}$$

Wall energy balance (first principles):

$$C_{wall} \frac{dT_{wall}}{dt} = P_{heater} - \dot{m} c_p \varepsilon (T_{wall} - T_{in})$$


Update wall temperature (Euler integration):

$$T_{wall}^{n+1} = T_{wall}^n + \frac{dT_{wall}}{dt} \cdot \Delta t$$

Outlet temperature (effectiveness definition):

$$T_{out} = T_{in} + \varepsilon (T_{wall} - T_{in})$$

Control Attempt #1: Pure PI




"Worked great" - but suspiciously great

- Cranking K_p to 100, 1000, arbitrarily high → still perfect tracking, no overshoot
- Red flag: Real systems don't behave this way

The problem: First-order lag \neq transport delay

- Wall dynamics are a lag
 - a. Output starts changing immediately, just slowly
- Controller sees error right away, can start correcting
- First-order lag + PI is always stable, can't overshoot




"Perfect" temp control with $K_p = 1000$ in simulated pump velocity ramp up/down (Code: Pure_PI.m)

Control Attempt #2: Pure PI with Added Transport Delay

A Realization

- Sensor located 8 cm downstream of heater
 - Transport delay = tube volume / flow rate
 - At 30 mL/min: **1.1 s delay**
 - At 3 mL/min: **11.3 s delay**
- PI now controlling based on stale information
- Variable delay makes tuning impossible - gains that work at high flow oscillate at low flow




Adding delay to sensor input blew up controller
(Code: Pure_PI_Lag.m)


Final Control Architecture: Feedforward PI Controller

Temperature Loop

Change in Q or T_{in} modeled as Disturbance to the system. Compensated for by FF controller



Pressure Loop




Note: Mixing ratio open-loop controlled by ratio of flow rates
(Code: main.m and run_simulation.m)

Simulation Setup

30 min protocol: equilibrate → ramp CPA 0→70%



Disturbances modeled:

- Vascular resistance: $10 \rightarrow 1 \text{ mmHg}/(\text{mL/min})$ (organ relaxes)
 - a. $P = Q \times R$ - Pressure adjusts accordingly
- Ice bath drift: $+1^\circ\text{C}$ over 30 min
- Sensor noise/bias: Temp ($\sigma=0.1^\circ\text{C}$, bias= 0.1°C), pressure ($\sigma=0.3 \text{ mmHg}$, bias= 0.5 mmHg)



Environmental changes to ice bath and organ resistance over simulation

Simulation Results - Plots



Simulation - Results and Limitations


Metric	Result	Spec
Temp max error	0.23°C	±2°C
Temp mean error	0.06°C	—
Pressure max error	0.87 mmHg	±3 mmHg
Pressure mean error	0.37 mmHg	—
In spec	100%	—
Heater power	6.4 W max, 2.9 W mean	

Limitations


- FF uses same thermal model as plant → results are optimistic.
 - a. Real system will have model mismatch, would require tuning
 - b. C_p varies with CPA%, heater efficiency
- PI gains need tuning on hardware
- Not modeled: bubbles, pump pulsation, startup transients
- TLDR; have to tune IRL

Hardware Overview

Insulated lid, removable electronics panel




Flow outlet




Hardware Overview - Plumbing (Top view, no ice water)

3mm ID tubing



Mesh floor protects tubing from damage
while allowing water to circulate for cooling



Hardware Overview - Electronics

Components

- Temp Sensor
- Pressure Sensor
- Heater (wrapped around tube)
- Battery
- Bubble Trap
- Y fitting
- T100-WX10 OEM Peristaltic Pump
- Arduino/ESP32 Microcontroller



Power: 30W typical, 45W max

- Heater: 2.9W mean, 6.4W max
- Pumps: 2x 12W max
- Controller/Sensors: ~5W


Size: 14.3" × 20.2" × 9.9"

Next Steps

- Power distribution (12V → 5V/3.3V)
- Signal conditioning
- Battery charging
- Mechanical DFM/DFA



Task 2 Cradle



Task 2

Requirements


- Compliantly hold adult pig kidney in sealed bag
- Fit within 8" diameter × 12" length cylinder
- 9 sealable ports for fluid/probe access
- Arterial cannula at 90° to kidney

Kidney sizing (3 σ range) [Source]

- Length: 92 - 148 mm
- Width: 37 - 77 mm
- Thickness: 14 - 41 mm

Design envelope


- Fits largest kidney + margin for bag + effluent pool




Design Overview

Features


- Rectangular box with flanged rim
- Removable lid with 8 luer ports
 - a. 9th port on side wall
- Mesh sling suspended from hooks on rim
- Press fit hooks slide onto box
- Cannula holder on side wall (90° to kidney)
- Quarter-turn latches secure lid



It Fits! Dimensions: 5.75" x 10" x 5.5"



Largest (3σ) Kidney



BOM, Materials, and Manufacturing

Part	Qty	Prototype Mfg Method	Production Mfg Method
Box	1	SLS PA12, print upright	Injection molded PP
Lid	1	SLS PA12, print flat	Injection molded PP
Mesh hooks	4	SLS PA12, print on side	Injection molded PP
Mesh sling	1	Off-the-shelf	Off-the-shelf
Port fittings	9	Off-the-shelf luer	Same
Quarter turn fasteners	2	McMaster 91382A350	Same or molded snap-fit

Appendix

Heat Transfer Calculations

[\[Go Back\]](#)

Inputs:

- Geometry: D (tube diameter), L (heated length)
- Fluid properties: ρ , μ , c_p , k (functions of CPA concentration)
- Operating conditions: \dot{m} (mass flow rate), T_{in} (inlet temperature), P_{heater} (heater power)
- Thermal mass: C_{wall} (wall thermal capacitance)

Assumptions:

- Laminar flow
- Fully developed velocity profile, developing thermal profile
- Lumped wall thermal mass (uniform T_{wall} over heater length)
- Negligible axial conduction in fluid
- $C_r = 0$ (wall thermal capacity \gg fluid capacity in heater section)

This is a first-principles thermal model. The heater wall has thermal mass - it stores energy. When I apply power, the wall heats up, and heat transfers to the fluid based on the NTU-effectiveness relationship. The key thing is that the dynamics depend on flow rate: at high flow, the fluid pulls heat away faster, so the wall responds differently than at low flow. This is a nonlinear, flow-dependent system.

Initial condition: $T_{wall}(0) = T_{in}$
Reynolds and Prandtl numbers:

$$Re = \frac{\rho V D}{\mu} = \frac{4\dot{m}}{\pi D \mu} \quad Pr = \frac{\mu c_p}{k}$$

Nusselt number [1]:

$$\overline{Nu}_D = 3.66 + \frac{0.0668(D/L)Re_D Pr}{1 + 0.04[(D/L)Re_D Pr]^{2/3}}$$

Heat transfer coefficient:

$$h = \frac{\overline{Nu}_D \cdot k}{D}$$

Number of Transfer Units [2]:

$$NTU = \frac{h \cdot \pi D L}{\dot{m} c_p}$$

Effectiveness [2]:

$$\varepsilon = 1 - e^{-NTU}$$

Wall energy balance (first principles):

$$C_{wall} \frac{dT_{wall}}{dt} = P_{heater} - \dot{m} c_p \varepsilon (T_{wall} - T_{in})$$

Update wall temperature (Euler integration):

$$T_{wall}^{n+1} = T_{wall}^n + \frac{dT_{wall}}{dt} \cdot \Delta t$$

Outlet temperature (effectiveness definition):

$$T_{out} = T_{in} + \varepsilon (T_{wall} - T_{in})$$

Pig Kidney: Worst Case Dimensions ($+\!-\!3\sigma$)

Dimension	Mean	SD	Smallest (-3σ)	Largest ($+3\sigma$)
Length	120	9.2	92.4	147.6
Width (cranial pole)	56.9	6.7	36.8	77.0
Width (hilum)	52.6	6.1	34.3	70.9
Width (caudal pole)	52.4	6.7	32.3	72.5
Thickness	27.9	4.5	14.4	41.4

All dimensions in mm

Max: Roughly a 148x77x41 bean

Sources

1. Incropera, F.P., DeWitt, D.P., Bergman, T.L., Lavine, A.S. *Fundamentals of Heat and Mass Transfer*, 7th ed., Wiley, 2011, Eq. 8.57, p. 517
 - a. For heat transfer basics
2. Kays, W.M. & London, A.L. *Compact Heat Exchangers*, 3rd ed., McGraw-Hill, 1984, Ch. 2, pp. 19-24
 - a. For NTU effectiveness calculations to model changing wall temperature
3. Gómez FA, Ballesteros LE, Estupiñán HY. Anatomical study of the renal excretory system in pigs. A review of its characteristics as compared to its human counterpart. *Folia Morphologica*. 2017;76(2):262–268. doi:10.5603/FM.a2016.0065
 - a. For pig kidney size