

# Re: Fluorescent heating

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-12/msg04057.html>

---

- *From:* [don@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:don@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Don Klipstein)
  - *Date:* Tue, 30 Dec 2008 00:38:10 +0000 (UTC)
- 

In article <kg4hl49vaeiq5gh67ogvpo89avlfmerkh2@xxxxxxx>, JosephKK wrote:

On Fri, 26 Dec 2008 18:07:46 +0100, Ken <ken\_3@xxxxxxx> wrote:

On Fri, 26 Dec 2008 11:35:36 -0500, "Paul E. Schoen"  
<pstech@xxxxxxx>  
wrote:

A  
fluorescent  
light  
is  
pretty  
much  
the  
same.  
They  
consume  
less  
power,  
dissapate  
less  
heat,  
but  
still  
most  
of  
the  
energy  
consumed  
is  
dissapated  
in  
the  
form  
of  
heat.

Re: Fluorescent heating

It  
doesn't  
take  
very  
much  
energy  
to  
radiate  
light  
—  
we  
just  
can't  
do  
it  
efficiently.  
Incandescent  
is  
horribly  
inefficient  
—  
but  
it's  
cheap  
and  
we  
don't  
care  
that  
we  
are  
wasting  
so  
much  
energy.  
Flourescent  
lights  
take  
a  
circuituous  
route  
to  
emit  
light  
in  
the  
visible  
spectrum  
—  
not  
very

Re: Fluorescent heating

efficient  
at  
all,  
but  
much  
better  
then  
incandescent.

LEDs  
are  
much  
more  
efficient,  
but  
still  
some  
of  
the  
energy  
goes  
to  
heat

–  
I'm  
not  
sure  
what  
the  
ratio  
is.  
Visible  
light  
itself  
is  
not  
very  
much  
energy.

It  
all  
goes  
to  
heat.

I  
wonder  
whether  
LED's

Re: Fluorescent heating

are  
more  
efficient  
than  
the  
good  
old  
tube  
fluorescent  
lamps.

Not yet.

Some white LEDs are pushing 160 lumen/watt now – at least if you believe Cree's press releases (they claimed 130 lumen/watt about 2 years ago).

<http://news.moneycentral.msn.com/ticker/article.aspx?Feed=PZ&Date=20081>

LEDs capable of 90+ lumens/watt are starting to appear in consumer LED lighting some of the claims made are a bit optimistic eg

<http://www.arraylighting.com/Story/index.html>

But there are very few fluorescents that can work as efficiently as that.

My  
gut  
feeling  
is  
they  
still  
have  
some  
distance  
to  
go  
to

Re: Fluorescent heating

get  
there.

Yes.

Consumer mass produced ones still lag a bit behind the best prototypes. Although for some coloured light sources like traffic lights and indicators LEDs can still come out ahead.

In answer to the original question a low pressure sodium lamp with the InO coating etched off the glass envelope would emit a pretty strong IR line source at very high efficiency (with a suitable low pass filter to stop the obvious visible yellow sodium D line escaping).

High Lumen/watt is not all we need. The color temperature (Kelvin) and Color Rendering Index (CRI) are very important factors. Today I can't buy LEDs that have better efficiency than fluorescents with 2700K and >CRI90 for my home lighting.

The other important factors are longevity (LEDs are typically 50,000+ hr), ability to work in cold environments, and the true environmental costs of manufacturing and disposal. I think there are white LEDs with a wide range of color temperature, and those that use RGB can be adjusted to whatever you need. Earlier white LEDs used a phosphor coating that made them less

## Re: Fluorescent heating

efficient, while newer ones I think use the light output directly, perhaps from a cluster of component colors.

Also the power conversion from line voltage to LED current can approach 97%, while I doubt that most CFLs are much better than 90%, but I'm just guessing by how hot the base of CFLs are. I think there has been a major investment in CFL technology and manufacturing that causes resistance to switching over to LEDs, and the fact that CFLs need more frequent replacement is also a plus for those who want a continuing business.

Paul

This is my favorite [http://tekniken.se/misc/philips\\_tld36w-92.jpg](http://tekniken.se/misc/philips_tld36w-92.jpg)  
This tube is 20 years old now and still going strong.  
I can't find any LED that have this light quality. 2700K CRI95

I challenge both the color temperature claim and the CRI claim, and especially the combination. 2700 K would be rather yellow-orange colored. Standard incandescent are around 3200 K color temperature and do not have over 90 CRI.

<http://www.betterphoto.com/article.asp?id=24>

<http://www.techmind.org/colour/coltemp.html>

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\\_body](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_body)

Most household incandescents have color temp. 2700–2900 K, and have CRI of 100 by definition. The 100 watt 750 hour 120V A19 has a color temp. of 2865 K according to Kodak.

<http://www.kodak.com/US/plugins/acrobat/en/motion/support/h2/h2fltrs.pdf>

(Though their figures for daylight sources appear a bit high to me. They say 5800K for direct sunlight in midsummer – and the color of the sun's light would have to be not yellowed at all by the atmosphere for that to be true. The color temp. of sunlight in outer space is a bit less. I suspect they are stating effective figures for usual films, including the ability of the film to react to UV.)

Re: Fluorescent heating

– Don Klipstein (don@xxxxxxxx)

.