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ABSTRACT

Online state estimations require an accurate EIS model to reduce the estimation error. To evaluate the inconsistency of battery characteristics and aging, an online EIS-integrated equalizer circuit for individual-cell has been presented in [1]. By virtue of switch-matrix structure, every cell can be connected to the equalizing capacitor directly, and the equalizer series as an EIS model identifier. However, the model accuracy is heavily dependent on the current sampling strategy. This paper studies various current sampling schemes required for analyzing the exponential current waveforms to further enhance the accuracy. The strategies are assessed by a real-time test system and are compared with the EIS model from a commercial EIS analyzer. The results show that the start and end time-point strategy can achieve good accuracy, but it is difficult to determine optimal sampling instant. On the other hand, the multiple time-points strategy can accurately estimate the model parameters and overcome the disadvantages of the start and end time-point strategy.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the applications of lithium-ion batteries have been strongly developed. Along with the development of battery applications, the research on battery management systems is also focused on. Even if the cells have identical characteristics in the beginning, the inconsistency of the battery cell during operation is unavoidable [2]. The SOC deviation is known as one of the reasons for over-charging and over-discharging. Among various SOC estimation methods [3], model-based approaches are widely adopted.

On the contrary, the EIS model can be identified based on the correlation between the battery voltage and battery current [4]. The sinusoidal injection method is the most popular, but its execution-time is long and it requires extra signal generation circuits. Thus, it is hard to be applied to online estimation applications. This paper compares different current measurement schemes for EIS-integrated equalizer that has been presented in [1]in terms of accuracy and simplicity. The strategies are assessed by a real-time test system and are compared with the EIS model from a commercial EIS analyzer. A brief review of the online estimation scheme is shown in section 2. The strategies are shown in section 3, section 4 is the verification results and section 5 is the conclusion.

2. REVIEW OF ONLINE MODEL IDENTIFICATION

The online measuring scheme is embedded into a switch matrix single-capacitor equalizer as Fig. 1. Simple additional circuit consisting of resistor, switch and voltage sensor are utilized to constitute the system. By virtue of the switch-matrix structure, the individual EIS-model of the cells can be identified one by one. The impedance measurement process is divided into two phases: charge transfer in phase A (t0 ~ t1) and capacitor recalibration in phase B (t2 ~ t3). The EIS-model identification is executed in phase A, when the battery cell is connected to the capacitor, C. The capacitor is fully discharged by Rdummy in phase B. The single R-C Thévenin model is chosen to balance the trade-off between the accuracy and the calculation complexity. The current flow through the loop and the voltage of the capacitor are expressed by

\[ i_C(t) = \frac{\Delta V}{R_n + R_p} \left( 1 + \frac{R_p}{R_n} \left[ \frac{R_n + R_p}{2R_n} \right]^t \right) \]  

(1)

\[ \Delta V = OCV - v_c(t) \]  

(2)

where OCV is the open-circuit voltage of the battery, which is measured in the initial process. \( v_c(t) \), \( i_c(t) \) are the measured voltage and current of the capacitor at \( t \), respectively; \( R_n \) is the sum of the model’s serial resistance, \( R_p \), and the circuit \( R_{op} \) resistance (including ESR of the capacitor, on-resistance of switches, and resistance of the sensor circuit).

3. COMPARATIVE STUDY

Based on the measured current and voltage of the balancing capacitor, the battery model parameters can be determined. Because the capacitor current, \( i_c \), is an exponential form as Fig.2(a), the model parameters can be identified by appropriately choosing the measurement points. In this paper, two promising sampling schemes in Fig.2(b) and Fig.2(c) are compared.

3.1 Start and end time-point strategy (S-ETPS)

In the technique, since equation (1) has 3 parameters, they can be solved by measuring at 3 points during phase A.

![Fig. 1. EIS-integrated equalizer in [1]](image1)

![Fig. 2. Theoretical waveforms (a) current and voltage of the measuring capacitor; (b) start and end point strategy; (c) multiple time-points strategy](image2)
Additionally, (1) is also the exponential function. By assuming $t_{M1} \approx 0$, $t_{M3} \rightarrow \infty$, and $t_{M2}$ as a mid-point between $t_{M1}$ and $t_{M3}$, the computational effort can be reduced as follow.

At $t_{M1} \approx 0$, $R_n$ can be obtained by

$$R_n = \frac{OCV - v_c(t_{M1})}{i_c(t_{M1})} \tag{3}$$

Meanwhile, the battery impedance becomes a sum of $R_n$ and $R_p$ at $t_{M3}$. Thus, $R_p$ is determined by

$$R_p = \frac{OCV - v_c(t_{M3})}{i_c(t_{M3})} - R_n \tag{4}$$

At $t_{M2}$, $C_p$ is calculated by

$$C_p = \frac{(R_n + R_p) t_{M2}}{R_n R_p \ln(1/K)} \tag{5}$$

where $K$ is denoted by

$$K = \frac{i_c(t_{M2})(R_n + R_p)}{OCV - v_c(t_{M3})} - 1 \frac{R_n}{R_p} \tag{6}$$

3.2 Multiple time-points strategy (MTPS)

In this strategy, equation (1) is transformed to

$$\frac{i_c(t)}{\Delta t} = \frac{1}{R_n + R_p} + \frac{R_p}{R_n(R_n + R_p)} e^{-(R_n + R_p) t} \tag{7}$$

By using the exponential curve fitting method, the EIS model of the battery cell is identified. In this paper, the current and the voltage of the equalization capacitor are measured at multiple time-points during phase A to identify the model.

4. VERIFICATION TESTS

To assess the performances, both measuring strategies are implemented for a 3S1P battery string, which consists of three 18650 cells (3.6V/2.85Ah). The switching frequency of the equalizer is 1Hz and the equalization capacitance is 2000μF. The individual EIS-model of the cells is examined by EIS measurement equipment (Zive SP10) as a reference. The reference parameters of the battery model are programmed into a real-time simulator to eliminate the influence of the environment change. For each battery cell, the measurement schemes are repeated 4 times, and the average value is calculated to reduce the measuring noise.

In the S-ETPS, the measuring accuracy of $C_p$ is dependent on $t_{M1}$ while $R_n$ and $R_p$ are calculated at two fixed time point, $t_{M1}$ and $t_{M3}$, respectively. To analyze the impact of $t_{M2}$, the estimation error of the model parameters in three battery cells are illustrated in Fig. 3. The results show a large estimation error of $C_p$ when $t_{M1}$ is closed to $t_{M1}$ and $t_{M3}$. Besides, the optimal $t_{M2}$ point of three battery cells are different, which raise a big challenge to fix a $t_{M2}$ point for all estimations.

To assess the impact of the sampling on the estimation error, the MTPS is implemented by multiple measurement points (from 3 to 100). The estimation error is calculated and illustrated in Fig. 4, which shows a concave error trend. With the initial setup in this paper, the error becomes the smallest with 50 time-points during phase A.

Table 1 shows the estimated model-parameters. The errors of the S-ETPS are within 4% for all model-parameters. For the MTPS, the estimation error is good more accurate for $R_n$ and $R_p$. However, the error becomes up to 8% for $C_p$. Therefore, it is found that the MTPS can partially improve the model accuracy, but the number of time-point should be optimized for all three parameters.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper assesses two estimation strategies for online EIS-model identification for EIS-integrated equalizers. The test results indicate that the MTPS has more advantages than S-ETPS in terms of practical implementation. While the S-ETPS is sensitive to the characteristics mismatching of the cells, the MTPS can estimate the model parameters just by some arbitrary estimation point.
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