Abstract-In this paper a robust three-dimensional (3D) finite element (FE) anisotropy model is introduced based on a particular scalar potential formulation. The specific 3D FE model is suitable for the accurate evaluation of the peak flux density distribution and no load loss of one-phase and three-phase wound core distribution transformers. The accuracy of the proposed 3D FE anisotropy model is validated by local flux density and no load loss measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Accurate flux density distribution and no load loss evaluation of wound core distribution transformers present significant difficulties and analytical relationships usually do not suffice [1]. A satisfactory estimation can be achieved however, by using field analysis numerical techniques in conjunction with the detailed modeling of the core’s magnetic material properties [2].

In order to compute accurately the wound core’s flux density distribution, each individual steel sheet and the varnish between successive sheets must be modeled. This approach was followed recently for the simulation of toroidal wound cores consisting of a small number of steel sheets [3]. The disadvantage of the aforementioned approach is its extremely high computational cost that limits the effectiveness of the method only to two-dimensional (2D) applications [3], despite the recent advancements in computing. Furthermore, typical wound cores, used for the construction of distribution transformers, consist of hundreds grain-oriented steel sheets and even the 2D field analysis is practically impossible due to the inherent large mesh size required to represent the laminated core.

In the present paper the accurate representation of the wound core with a low computational cost is achieved by considering the iron-laminated material as homogeneous media and by developing an elliptic anisotropy model specifically formulated for wound cores [4], [5]. The elliptic anisotropy model takes into account the directional dependence of the \( B - H \) characteristic due to the iron laminations and the grain orientation of the grain-oriented electrical steel used for the construction of the wound cores.

In order to reduce further the computational requirements a particular reduced scalar potential formulation, necessitating no prior source field calculation [6], is adopted enabling the three-dimensional (3D) magnetostatic field analysis of wound core distribution transformers.

II. 3D FE FORMULATION

The solution of 3D magnetostatic problems by the finite element (FE) method based on the magnetic vector potential (MVP) is quite laborious as there are three unknown components to be determined at each node of the FE mesh. Furthermore the solution has be found to be erroneous when the normal component of the MVP is significant at the interface between regions of different permeability, e.g. at the interface between iron and air [6].

On the other hand magnetic scalar potential (MSP) based FE formulations are advantageous in terms of computational effort, as there is only one degree of freedom to be evaluated for every node of the FE mesh. Despite this obvious advantage, many problems arise with the use of the MSP like inherent difficulties in handling 3D volume current distributions, cancellation errors in the iron domain, difficulties in modeling multiply connected iron regions, and multiply valued potentials [6]. A number of scalar potential formulations have been developed to address some of the latter problems like the difference potential (DP) and the total scalar potential (TP) formulation. Those early formulations have been united and extended by the general potential (GP) formulation [7], [8]. According to the GP formulation the magnetic field intensity \( H \) is sought in the following form

\[
H = H_g + \nabla \phi_g
\]

where \( H_g \) is an initial guess magnetic field and \( \phi_g \) is the general potential. If \( H_g \) satisfies Ampere's law and its absolute value is much larger than that of \( \nabla \phi_g \) then the solution of the problem can be found according to

\[
\nabla \cdot (\mu \cdot (H_g + \nabla \phi_g)) = 0.
\]

What remains is the evaluation of a suitable guess field \( H_g \) with the following three-step scheme proposed in [7], [8].

1. First compute the guess magnetic field \( H_g \), in the iron domain by satisfying the following conditions.

\[
\nabla \cdot (\mu \cdot H_g) = 0 \quad (3)
\]

\[
\mathbf{n} \cdot (\mu \cdot H_g) = 0 \quad (4)
\]
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2. Then compute the guess magnetic field $H_{go}$, in the air domain by satisfying the following conditions.

$$\nabla \cdot (\mu H_{go}) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

$$\nabla \times (H_{go}) = J_a$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

$$n \times (H_{go} - H_{go}) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

3. Calculate the general potential $\Phi_g$ over the whole domain by satisfying (2).

Even though the GP formulation covers successfully most of the practical engineering problems there are two disadvantages. The first one is the complexity of the GP formulation since a three-step procedure is required to obtain the solution. The second one is that for a nonlinear analysis several iterations are required during the execution not only of the third step but also of the first step. These disadvantages lead to increasing computational effort and time.

In this paper, it is proposed to use a particular scalar potential formulation necessitating no prior source field calculation, presented in [6]. According to this formulation $H$ is partitioned as follows

$$H = K - \nabla \Phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\Phi$ is a scalar potential extended all over the solution domain and $K$ is a fictitious field distribution that satisfies the following three conditions.

1. $K$ is confined in a simply connected subdomain comprising the coil region.

2. In the coil domain and outside the coil domain $K$ satisfies (9) and (10) respectively.

$$\nabla \times K = J$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$\nabla \times K = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

3. Finally $K$ is perpendicular on the boundary of the subdomain comprising the coil region.

The above conditions constitute a minimum enabling to simulate the coil. The distribution of $K$ is easily determined analytically or numerically by the conductors shape with little computational effort [6]. The problem's solution is obtained by discretizing (11) that ensures the total's field solenoidality.

$$\nabla \cdot (\mu (K - \nabla \Phi)) = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The previous formulation does not suffer from cancellation errors, it satisfies Ampere's law, and consequently it is applicable to multiply connected iron regions. Simplicity and computational efficiency are its main advantages in contrast with the GP formulation.

III. ELLIPTIC ANISOTROPY MODEL

By considering the iron-laminated material as homogeneous and anisotropic media at the level of finite elements an accurate representation of the wound core is achieved. An elliptic anisotropy model is best suited for the wound core transformer in contrast with the stack core transformer [9]. The specific model is based on the assumption that the magnetic field intensity has an elliptic trajectory for the modulus of the flux density constant [4], [5].

A simplified graphical interpretation of this assumption is given in Figs. 1, 2. Fig. 1 depicts $B - H$ characteristics of the electrical steel for various angles to the rolling direction. For a constant flux density the magnetic field intensity tends to increase as the angle to the rolling direction increases. By projecting the values of the magnetic field intensity for different directions of the field to the $H_p - H_q$ plane, where $p$ and $q$ is the direction tangential and normal to the rolling direction respectively, a curve is formed as shown in Fig 2. This curve can be approximated by an ellipse and in the case of laminated wound cores this approximation leads to an error that rarely exceeds a few percentage points.

Therefore, if $\mu_p$ is the magnetic permeability tangential to the electrical steel rolling direction, $\mu_q$ is the permeability normal to the rolling direction, and $r$ is the ratio of the ellipse $p$ semi-axes to the ellipse $q$ semi-axes then

$$\mu_q = r \mu_p, \quad 0 < r < 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Fig. 3 illustrates an ellipse in the $H_p - H_q$ plane for an arbitrary value of flux density, where $H(0^0), H(90^0)$ are the respective values of the magnetic field intensity tangential and normal to the rolling direction.

![Fig. 1. B-H characteristics for various angles to the rolling direction.](image-url)
The equation of the ellipse of Fig. 3 is given by (13) whereas the ratio of the ellipse semi-axes is given also by (14).

\[
\frac{H_p^2}{H(0^\circ)} + \frac{H_q^2}{H(90^\circ)} = 1 \tag{13}
\]

\[
r = \frac{H(0^\circ)}{H(90^\circ)} \tag{14}
\]

Substituting (14) into (13) yields

\[
H_p^2 + r^2H_q^2 = H(0^\circ)^2. \tag{15}
\]

For an arbitrary angle \(\theta\) to the rolling direction and from Fig. 3, it follows that the two components \(H_p, H_q\) of the magnetic field intensity are given by

\[
H_p = H \cos \theta, \quad H_q = H \sin \theta. \tag{16}
\]
1. For an arbitrary value of \( B \) calculate \( \mu_r \) from the normal magnetization curve of the electrical steel.

2. Compute \( \mu_p \) and \( \mu_q \) using (18) and (19).

3. Calculate \( r \) from (12) and \( H(0^+) \) from (20).

\[
H(0^+) = \frac{B}{\mu_p}
\]  

(20)

4. Finally, for an arbitrary \( \theta \) evaluate \( H \) using (17).

Due to the wound core’s geometry shown in Fig. 4, the permeability tensor must be rotated to a different coordinate system in some of the areas of the 3D FE model. The permeability tensor \( \mu \) in the global coordinate system is given by (21), where \( R \) is the rotation matrix and \( \mu_r \) is the permeability tensor in the local coordinate system.

\[
\mu = R^{-1} \mu_r R
\]  

(21)

The evaluation of the peak flux density distribution with the specific FE method is used in conjunction with the experimentally determined local specific core loss \( SCL_i \), expressed as a function of the peak flux density and approximated by cubic splines, for the evaluation of the wound core no load loss. Fig. 5 shows the post processing algorithm used for the evaluation of the no load loss where \( SCL_i, B_i, P_i, V_i \) are the specific core loss, peak flux density, no load loss and volume respectively of the \( i \)-th tetrahedron, \( d_{ms} \) is the magnetic steel’s density, \( P_{SLL} \) is the no load loss and \( n \) is the number of tetrahedrons of the 3D FE mesh.

### IV. EXPERIMENTAL VERIFICATION OF THE 3D FE MODEL

The 3D FE anisotropy model presented in Sections II and III was used for the numerical analysis of various one-phase, and three-phase wound core transformers. The computed no load loss value and peak flux density distribution were compared to the measured ones.

The experimental setup used for the local flux density and no load loss measurements of wound cores is illustrated in Fig. 6. It consists of a PC and a National Instruments (NI) 6143 data acquisition (DAQ) card (8 voltage differential inputs, 16 bit, 250 ksamples / s). The excitation coil terminals are connected to the input of the DAQ card via an active differential voltage probe (3 dB frequency of 18 MHz) and a current probe based on the Hall Effect (1 dB frequency of 150 kHz) is used for capturing the no load current, shown in Fig. 7. For the magnetization of the wound cores, a 23 turn excitation coil is supplied by a one-phase 230 V, 50 Hz source through a variable transformer. The no load loss was evaluated by the acquired voltage and current data with appropriate virtual instruments (VI) created with the use of LabVIEW.

![Fig. 6. Experimental setup.](image)

![Fig. 7. Current and differential voltage probes.](image)
Two turn search coils wound around the core’s sheets, were employed for determining the peak flux distribution along the core’s limb and corner for different magnetization levels. The voltages induced in the search coils were measured by connecting their terminals directly to the DAQ card’s voltage differential inputs. The local peak flux density $B_p$ is given by (22) where $\langle V \rangle$ is the average rectified voltage, $f$ is the frequency, $N$ is the number of turns of the search coils, and $S$ is the cross-section area of a single steel sheet.

$$B_p = \frac{\langle V \rangle}{4fNS}$$

Fig. 8 illustrates a perspective view of the geometry, and the flux density vector plot of a wound core, obtained by the 3D FEM anisotropy model. The 3D FE mesh consists of 8,516 nodes and 38,798 tetrahedral elements. The core is built of high permeability magnetic steel, and the mean flux density used for the FE analysis is 1.57 T. Figs. 9 and 10 display the flux density vector and nodal plot respectively, of the upper front part of the same wound core, for a mean flux density of 1.66 T.

The computed flux density distribution across the core’s limb, line AB of Fig. 8, and corner, line CD of Fig. 8, for two different magnetization levels, 1.57 T and 1.66 T, are compared with the measured ones in Figs. 11 to 14. The experimentally defined curves show that the peak flux density distribution along the limb is different from the peak flux density distribution along the corner. In both cases the peak flux density is low at the most inner steel sheets, and then it increases. However the gradient of the peak flux density is much steeper in the case of the flux density distribution across line AB.
The error between computed and measured no load loss is underestimated and also overestimated in some cases, whereas the error exceeds in one case 5%.

V. CONCLUSION

The proposed 3D FE model, exhibits two important advantages when compared to conventional numerical techniques based on common potential formulations: (a) simplicity as it is based on a one-step procedure, and (b) significant computational efficiency comparing to FE methods based on standard vector and scalar potential formulations. Furthermore, the usual anisotropy models appearing at the literature are suitable mainly for modeling the core material of stack core transformers. The wound core transformer however, differs significantly from the stack core transformer and the specific anisotropy models are not suitable for the representation of laminated wound cores. In the present paper a simple and computationally effective anisotropy model was developed, appropriate specifically for the modeling of laminated wound cores.
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TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent power (kVA)</th>
<th>Mean flux density (T)</th>
<th>Computed no load loss (W)</th>
<th>Measured no load loss (W)</th>
<th>Error (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The error between calculated and measured no load loss for a number of one-phase wound cores, was most of the times underestimated and less than 5%. However this is not the case for the three-phase wound core transformer where the evaluation of the no load loss calls for multiple magnetostatic analysis. Table I summarizes the computed and measured no load loss of three-phase transformers of different apparent power and working induction ratings.

Fig. 13. Comparison of computed and measured peak flux density distribution along line AB (B = 1.66 T).

Fig. 14. Comparison of computed and measured peak flux density distribution along line CD (B = 1.66 T).