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Simple Modeling of the AC Hysteretic Property of a Grain-Oriented Silicon Steel Sheet
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A homogenized model based on the Pry and Bean model is generalized to represent the ac hysteretic characteristics of an actual grain-oriented silicon steel sheet. A parameter for the frequency dependence of eddy-current loss is introduced. The generalized model improves the evaluation accuracy of eddy-current loss and the representation of ac $B\rightarrow H$ loops under the condition of a sinusoidal magnetic flux. The generalized model also accurately represents ac $B\rightarrow H$ loops having minor loops.

Index Terms—AC hysteresis, excess eddy-current loss, homogenization, Pry and Bean model.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENT developments in computer technology have enabled us to simulate detailed $B$ and $H$ fields in electrical machines. However, the accurate computation of $B$ and $H$ fields remains difficult because of the complex magnetic properties of silicon steel sheets including their excess (or anomalous) eddy-current loss [1]–[3], their hysteresis [3], and their vector property [4].

Grain-oriented silicon steel sheets are widely used as a core material, not only for transformers, but also for segmented core motors. Grain-oriented steel sheets have large excess eddy-current losses because they have larger magnetic domain sizes than nonoriented steel sheets [2].

Magnetic fields in motor cores have higher time harmonics because of their spatial harmonics and pulsedwidth modulation (PWM) power control. Since higher time harmonics often cause complex minor hysteresis loops, the accurate representation of minor loops is required for detailed ac magnetic field analyses in motor cores.

On the other hand, several precise and efficient dc hysteresis models, such as play and stop models [5], [6] have been developed. For example, stop and play models having input-dependent shape functions [7], [8] have been applied to the accurate representations of the dc hysteretic characteristics of silicon steel sheets, including minor hysteresis loops [9].

A previous study [10] combines a dc hysteresis model and the Pry and Bean model [1] to derive a homogenized model for the ac characteristics of grain-oriented steel sheets. This homogenized model evaluates the excess eddy-current loss using an anomaly factor, which improves the representation of the ac hysteretic properties of a grain-oriented silicon steel sheet.

However, this homogenized model cannot achieve a sufficiently accurate representation of the ac properties because of its simplicity. This paper simply generalizes this ac hysteresis model to improve the accuracy of ac hysteretic representation.

II. AC HYSTERESIS MODEL

A. Simple Homogenized Model

Pry and Bean [1] have evaluated excess eddy-current losses assuming a one-dimensional (1-D) periodic magnetic domain structure. The Pry and Bean model gives the instantaneous eddy-current loss $P_E$ per unit volume as

$$P_E = k_E(B)P_C$$

$$k_E(B) = \frac{192L}{\pi^3d} \sum_{\text{model}} \cosh \left( \frac{w_{d/2}}{d} \left( 1 + \frac{B}{B_E} \right) \right) \cosh \left( \frac{w_{d/2}}{d} \left( 1 - \frac{B}{B_E} \right) \right)$$

$$P_C = \frac{\sigma d^2}{12} \left( \frac{dB}{dt} \right)^2$$

where $k_E$ is the anomaly factor, $P_C$ is the classical eddy-current loss, $\sigma$ is the electric conductivity, $2L$ is the average magnetic domain width, $d$ is the sheet thickness, and $B_E$ is the saturation magnetic flux density.

Reference [10] approximated $k_E(B)$ as $k_E(B) \approx k_E(0)$, independently of $B$. The eddy-current loss $P_E$ is factorized as

$$P_E = H_E(B)dB/dt$$

$$H_E = k_E(0)\frac{\sigma d^2}{12} \frac{dB}{dt}$$

where $H_E$ is the magnetic field caused by the eddy current. Accordingly, a simple homogenized model is derived as

$$H_{ac}(t) = H_{ak}(B(t)) + H_E.$$ (6)

where $H_{ac}$ is an applied ac magnetic field and $H_{ak}(B)$ represents the dc hysteretic property.

B. Generalized Model

When the magnetic property of the steel sheet is linear, a sinusoidal magnetic field with frequency $f$ yields an eddy-current loss per cycle $W_E$ given as in [3]

$$W_E = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi^2}{8} \sigma d^2 B_{\text{max}}^2 f & \text{(for small } f) \\ \frac{\pi^2}{2} \sqrt{\mu \rho_{\text{max}}^2} f^{1/2} & \text{(for large } f) \end{cases}$$

where $B_{\text{max}}$ is the amplitude of $B$. 
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Equation (7) implies that $W_E$ is equal to the classical eddy-current loss for small $f$ whereas it becomes proportional to $f^{1/2}$ for large $f$. This suggests that $H_E$ becomes

$$H_E \propto f^{3/2}$$

(8)

for a high-frequency eddy-current field.

On the other hand, the Pry and Bean model assumes that the magnetic domain walls are sufficiently rigid not to bow. If the magnetic domain walls are highly flexible and therefore allow the wall to bow freely, the eddy-current field in the steel sheet will satisfy (8) for large $f$ because of the skin effect.

Actual steel sheets are neither perfectly flexible nor rigid; their eddy-current field is assumed to obey

$$W_E \propto f^{\gamma}, \quad H_E \propto f^{\gamma}, \quad 0.5 \leq \gamma \leq 1.$$  

(9)

Accordingly, $H_E$ can be generalized as

$$H_E = h_{EA} \left( B, \frac{dB}{dt} \right) = c_A \kappa_{EA}(B) \frac{\sigma d^2}{12} \left( \frac{dB}{dt} \right)^\gamma$$

(10)

where $c_A$ is a constant and the function $\kappa_{EA}(X) \sqrt{X}$ is simply denoted by $X^\gamma$.

Zirka et al. [11] proposed an ac hysteresis model that also has a more general form than (5) given by

$$H_E = h_{EB} \left( B, \frac{dB}{dt} \right) = c_B \left( 1 - \frac{B^2}{B_S^2} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{12} \frac{dB}{dt}$$

(11)

where $c_B$ is a constant.

An ac hysteresis model (5) using (10) or (11) is examined in this paper.

III. SIMULATION FOR SINUSOIDAL MAGNETIC FLUX DENSITY

AC $B$–$H$ loops of a grain-oriented silicon steel sheet (JIS: 30P105) are simulated along its rolling direction. This steel sheet has an electric conductivity $\sigma$ of $2 \times 10^6$ S/m. The one-dimensional magnetic properties of the steel sheet are measured using a single sheet tester [12] under the condition of a sinusoidal $B$. The simulated magnetic field $H_{ac}$ is compared with the measured $H$ where the measured $B$ is given to calculate $H_{dc}$ and $H_E$. The dc hysteresis property $H_{dc}(B)$ is represented by the play model with an input-dependent shape function [8] identified from 20 symmetric $B$–$H$ loops.

Fig. 1 shows the frequency dependence of the eddy-current loss of the steel sheet for five amplitudes of $B_{max}$: 0.34, 0.68, 1.02, 1.36, and 1.70 T. The eddy-current loss per cycle $W_E$ is given as

$$W_E = \int_{cycle} H_{ac} dB - \int_{cycle} H_{dc} dB.$$  

(12)

Fig. 1 shows that $\gamma$ is almost constant at about 0.75.

This study compares three forms of the field $H_E$ as follows:

$$H_E = h_{EA}(0, dB/dt), h_{EA}(B, dB/dt), \text{and } h_{EB}(B, dB/dt).$$

Parameter $\gamma$ is set at 0.75 or 1.

Fig. 2(a) shows simulated $B$–$H$ loops using $h_{EA}(0, dB/dt)$ with $\gamma = 1$ at $f = 50$ and 400 Hz, where $L/d$ is set at 0.9 to minimize the representation error at $f = 50$ Hz with $c_A = 1$.

The simulated loops at 400 Hz differ greatly from the measured ones because the ac hysteresis model (6) with (5) is too simple.

Next, the frequency dependence of $\gamma = 0.75$ is used. Fig. 3 shows the evaluation error of the total ac loss ($\int_{cycle} H_{ac} dB$) given by $h_{EA}(0, dB/dt)$ and $h_{EB}(B, dB/dt)$ at 50 Hz. The error $\Delta \text{loss}($

(%) is given by the ratio of the discrepancy between the simulated and measured losses to the loss measured at a $B_{max}$ of 1.7 T. To minimize the evaluation error at 50 Hz, this paper sets $c_A$ for $h_{EA}(B, dB/dt)$ and $c_B$ for $h_{EB}(B, dB/dt)$.
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\[ \text{Fig. 3. Evaluation error of total ac loss at 50 Hz: (a) } h_{E_A}(B), \gamma = 0.75; (b) h_{E_B}(B), \gamma = 0.75. \]

\[ \text{Fig. 4. Evaluation error of the total ac loss with } B_{\text{max}} \text{ values of 1.02 and 1.7 T: (a) } \gamma = 1, B_{\text{max}} = 1.02 \text{ (T); (b) } \gamma = 1, B_{\text{max}} = 1.7 \text{ (T); (c) } \gamma = 0.75, B_{\text{max}} = 1.02 \text{ (T); (d) } \gamma = 0.75, B_{\text{max}} = 1.7 \text{ (T).} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 5. Average discrepancy in } H: (a) \gamma = 0.75, B_{\text{max}} = 1.02 \text{ (T); (b) } \gamma = 0.75, B_{\text{max}} = 1.7 \text{ (T).} \]

\[ \text{Fig. 6. Simulated and measured waveforms of } H \text{ at 400 Hz: (a) } h_{E_A}(B), \gamma = 0.75; (b) h_{E_B}(B), \gamma = 0.75. \]

B–H loops with an amplitude of 1.7 T at 400 Hz do not agree with the measured one in Fig. 2 because the models (10) and (11) are still too simple. For example, both \( h_{E_A}(B, dB/dt) \) and \( h_{E_B}(B, dB/dt) \) neglect the phase lag of \( H_E \) to \( dB/dt \) caused by the skin effect. Fig. 6 shows waveforms of \( H \) given by \( h_{E_A}(B, dB/dt) \) and \( h_{E_B}(B, dB/dt) \) at 400 Hz with \( \gamma = 0.75 \). The phase discrepancy between the measured and simulated waveforms is seen in Fig. 6(b) for the case using \( h_{E_B}(B, dB/dt) \). Fig. 6(b) also shows that \( h_{E_B}(B, dB/dt) \) overestimates the maximum value of \( H \).

IV. SIMULATION FOR NONSINUSOIDAL MAGNETIC FLUX DENSITY

This section compares simulated and measured ac hysteretic loops for the nonsinusoidal waveforms of \( B \). Two input waveforms of \( B \), shown in Fig. 7, are used to measure the minor loops of the grain-oriented silicon steel sheet. Inputs 1 and 2 contain third-order and 25th-order harmonics, respectively.

Fig. 8 shows simulated B–H loops for Inputs 1 and 2. It also lists the evaluation error of the total ac loss, \( \Delta \text{loss} \) and average discrepancy of \( H, \Delta H/(A/m) \). Fig. 8 shows that the ac model with \( \gamma = 1 \) yields inaccurate B–H loops. The fields \( h_{E_A}(B, dB/dt) \) and \( h_{E_B}(B, dB/dt) \) with \( \gamma = 0.75 \) give accurate representations of the B–H loops. Fig. 8 also shows that a small \( \Delta \text{loss} \) does not always mean an accurate representation of a complex B–H loop.
V. CONCLUSION

A simply generalized ac hysteresis model is proposed. It improves the evaluation accuracy of eddy-current loss and the representation of ac $B$–$H$ loops under the condition of a sinusoidal magnetic flux. The generalized model also accurately represents ac $B$–$H$ loops having minor loops. However, a further improvement in the ac model will be required to reduce the discrepancy between simulated and measured $B$–$H$ loops for high frequency fields.
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