A 200 000 rpm, 2 kW Slotless Permanent Magnet Motor
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Abstract—The paper presents the development of a very high speed (200 krpm, 2 kW) slotless permanent magnet motor, using an analytical model. The multiphysics analytical model allows a quick optimization process. The presented model includes the magnetic fields, the mechanical stresses in the rotor, the electromagnetic power losses, the windage power losses and the power losses in the bearings. The paper also presents the results of the measurements on a prototype that reached 200 krpm.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Due to their high power density, very high speed (VHS) permanent magnet (PM) motors are increasingly demanded on the market [1]. Indeed, as the mechanical power is given by

$$P = T \omega,$$

for a given output power $P$ at high speeds $\omega$ one needs a much lower torque $T$ and volume than at lower speeds.

VHS motors can allow small energy conversion systems to have high efficiency. They are hence used in energy conversion systems such as gas turbines, turbochargers [2] and superchargers [3].

The domains of applications of VHS machines are very diverse: automotive industry (supercharger, electrically assisted turbocharger, fuel cell compressor), machining industry (micro-machining), home appliance industry (vacuum cleaner), medical industry (teeth cutter), and other specific applications (compressors, cryocooler, vacuum pump, gas turbines).

In a VHS motor, the different parts and materials are pushed to their thermal and mechanical limits. Indeed, as the speed is very high, high stresses appear in the rotor. The mechanical aspects need to be considered. Also, as the energy density is high, it is critical to optimize the efficiency to decrease the power losses and hence its temperature.

A traditional way to design motors is to do the optimization using each of its submodels (thermal, mechanical, electromagnetic, ...) separately, iteratively. This is called a fragmented conception. In our case, the mechanical optimum for the motor would be to reduce the rotor diameter to diminish the stress in it, but it would reduce the motor torque. The magnetic optimum would be to reduce the air gap, but it would increase the windage power losses. These two simple examples show us the necessity of having an optimization which uses the complete multiphysics model of the system.

There are two different approaches for doing multiphysics systems optimization. The first one is with finite elements methods. It has the advantage that it can solve complicated structures. The disadvantage is that the computer time requirements are too long when there are different physical aspects and different parameters to optimize.

The second method is to create a fully analytical model and to do a mathematical optimization. The advantage of this method is that it is extremely fast. This method was chosen for our VHS motor development.

This article shows this innovative multiphysics analytical optimization approach and prototype measurements.

II. THE ANALYTICAL MODEL

The analytical model is applied to the motor structure shown in Fig. 1. Our geometry is: a PM at the center, a sleeve, an air gap, 3 coils and a stator yoke.

Figure 1. Motor structure

A. The torque due to magnetostatic fields

Using Xia and Zhu’s article [4], the torque $T$ produced by the interaction of one coil and the PM is calculated as presented in [5]:

$$T = \frac{2B_R J_1 p+1}{(1+p) \left[1 + \mu_r \left(\frac{r_{ci}}{r_{ce}}\right)^2\right]} \left[\frac{r_{ci}^{p+2} - r_{ce}^{p+2}}{r_{ce}^{p+2}} + g(p, r_{ce}, r_{ci}) \right] f(\alpha_i, \theta, p)$$

(1)
with $B_R$ the PM remanent field, $\mu_r$ the PM relative permeability, $p$ the number of pole pairs, $J$ the current density, $r_1$ the outer radius of the PM, $r_{ci}$ the inner radius of the coil, $r_{ce}$ the outer radius of the coil, $r_{yi}$ the inner radius of the stator yoke, $\theta$ the rotor position, $l_a$ the active length, and
\[
g(p, r_{ce}, r_{ci}) = \begin{cases} \frac{r_{ce}^{p+2} - r_{ci}^{p+2}}{r_{ce}^{p} - r_{ci}^{p}} & \text{if } p \in \mathbb{N}^* \setminus \{2\} \\ \ln \left(\frac{r_{ce}}{r_{ci}}\right) & \text{if } p = 2 \end{cases}
\]
and
\[f(\alpha_i, \theta, p) = \sin(p(\alpha_1 - \theta)) - \sin(p(\alpha_3 - \theta)) - (\sin(p(\alpha_2 - \theta)) - \sin(p(\alpha_1 - \theta))) \quad (3)
\]
with $\alpha_i = 1, \ldots, 4$ the angles which set the dimensions of one coil.

**B. Mechanical stresses**

The mechanical stresses ($\sigma_r$, $\sigma_\theta$, $\sigma_z$) in the rotor are calculated using the equilibrium equation [6]:
\[
\frac{d\sigma_r}{dr} + \frac{\sigma_r - \sigma_\theta}{r} + F_r = 0 \quad (4)
\]
with $F_r$ the radial force density.

As we make the hypothesis of a constant speed and because of the symmetry of the problem, the strain can be expressed by:

\[\varepsilon_r = \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}, \quad \varepsilon_\theta = \frac{\nu}{r} \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} \quad (5)\]

with $u$ being the radial displacement function.

Hook’s law gives the dependence of the strain $\varepsilon$ on the stresses:

\[\varepsilon_r = \frac{1}{E} (\sigma_r - \nu \sigma_\theta) \quad (7)\]

\[\varepsilon_\theta = \frac{1}{E} (\sigma_\theta - \nu \sigma_r) \quad (8)\]

with $E$ Young’s modulus and $\nu$ Poisson’s ratio.

In a rotating system a volume element is subject to the following force density $F$:
\[
F = \rho \omega^2 r \quad (9)
\]
with $\omega$ the angular velocity.

Equations (7) and (8) are inverted to obtain:

\[\sigma_r = -\frac{E}{1 - \nu^2} (2 \varepsilon_r + \nu \varepsilon_\theta) \quad (10)\]

\[\sigma_\theta = -\frac{E}{1 - \nu^2} (\varepsilon_\theta + \nu \varepsilon_r) \quad (11)\]

Using (4), (5), (6), (10) and (11) we find:
\[
\frac{d^2 u}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{du}{dr} - u = -\frac{1 - \nu^2}{E} \rho \omega^2 r \quad (12)
\]

The solution of the differential equation is:
\[u = -(1 - \nu^2) \frac{\rho \omega^2 r^3}{8E} + C_1 r + C_2 \quad (13)\]

with $C_1$ and $C_2$ being constants.

Two regions are defined, the sleeve (s) and the PM (m).

Using (5), (6) and (13), we find for the sleeve and the PM $i = s, m$:
\[
u_i = -(1 - \nu^2) \frac{\rho \omega^2 r^3}{8E} + C_1 r + \frac{C_2}{r} \quad (14)
\]

\[\sigma_{sr} = \frac{E_i}{1 - \nu^2} \left\{ -(3 + \nu_i)(1 - \nu_i) \rho \omega^2 r^2 \right\} \quad (15)
\]

\[\sigma_{sr} = \frac{E_i}{1 - \nu^2} \left\{ -(1 + 3 \nu_i)(1 - \nu_i) \rho \omega^2 r^2 \right\} \quad (16)
\]

Let $r_2$ the outer radius of the sleeve. We have the following conditions at the boundaries:

\[\sigma_{sr}(r = 0) = \sigma_m(r = 0) \quad (17)\]

\[\sigma_{sr}(r = r_1) = \sigma_{sr}(r = r_1) \quad (18)\]

\[\sigma_{sr}(r = r_2) = 0 \quad (19)\]

\[u_m(r = 0) = 0 \quad (20)\]

\[u_m(r = r_1) = u_s(r = r_1) \quad (21)\]

We define $\sigma_1$, the radial stress at the interface:

\[\sigma_1 = \sigma_{sr}(r = r_1) = \sigma_{sr}(r = r_1) \quad (22)\]

If there is no prestressing, at no angular velocity we have:

\[\sigma_1 = 0 \quad (23)\]

Equations (14), (15), (16) have to be finite at $r = 0$. It implies that $C_{m2} = 0$.

Using (22) and (15), we find the constant $C_{m1}$:
\[
C_{m1} = \frac{\sigma_1 \left(1 - \frac{\nu^2}{E_m}\right) + (3 + \nu_m)(1 - \nu_m) \rho \omega^2 r_1^3}{8E_m} \quad (24)
\]

Using (14), (15), (16) we find the stresses and the displacement function in the PM:

\[\sigma_{mr}(r) = \frac{3 + \nu_m}{8} \rho m \omega^2 r_1^2 \left\{ 1 - \left(\frac{r}{r_1}\right)^2 \right\} + \sigma_1 \quad (25)\]

\[\sigma_{ma}(r) = \frac{3 + \nu_m}{8} \rho m \omega^2 r_1^2 \left\{ 1 - \frac{1 + 3 \nu_m}{3 + \nu_m} \left(\frac{r}{r_1}\right)^2 \right\} + \sigma_1 \quad (26)\]

\[u_m(r) = \frac{1 - \nu_m}{8E_m} \rho \omega^2 r_1^3 \left\{ (3 + \nu_m) \left(\frac{r}{r_1}\right) - (1 + \nu_m) \left(\frac{r}{r_1}\right)^3 \right\} + \sigma_1 \quad (27)\]

Equations (15), (19) and (22) define $C_{s1}$ and $C_{s2}$. Knowing these constants and using (15) and (16) we find the stresses
in the sleeve:
\[
\sigma_{sr}(r) = \frac{3 + \nu_s}{8} \rho_s \sigma_e r^2 \left[ \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 + 1 - \left( \frac{r}{r_2} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 \right] \\
+ \sigma_1 \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 \frac{r^2}{r_2} - \frac{r^2}{r_1 - r_1^2} \\
\sigma_{sr}(r) = \frac{3 + \nu_s}{8} \rho_s \sigma_e r^2 \left[ \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 + 1 + \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 - \frac{1 + 3\nu_s}{3 + \nu_s} \left( \frac{r}{r_2} \right)^2 \right] + \sigma_1 \left( \frac{r_1}{r} \right)^2 \frac{r^2}{r_1 - r_1^2} 
\]
(28)

We need to calculate the contact stress \( \sigma_1 \) at the interface. We do that in two steps: first we calculate the stress in a no speed case and then we add the effect of the speed.

Let’s first consider the case where the speed is equal to zero. The PM is fragile. In order that it does not break at high speed case and then we add the effect of the speed.

It defines the values of the two constants that we use in (14). We obtain:
\[
u_0^0 = \frac{-\sigma_1 r_1}{E_s (r_2^2 - r_1^2)} (1 - \nu_s) r_1^2 + (1 + \nu_s) r_2^2 
\]
(33)

To calculate \( u_0^0 \) we consider first the sleeve without PM and calculate the displacement as a function of the stress at the interface. We use (15) with the following boundary conditions:
\[
\sigma_{sr}(r_1) = \sigma_1 
\]
(31)
\[
\sigma_{sr}(r_2) = 0 
\]
(32)

It defines the values of the two constants that we use in (14). We obtain:
\[
u_0^0 = \frac{\sigma_1 (1 - \nu_m) r_1}{E_m} 
\]
(36)

From (30), (33) and (36) we can define \( \sigma_1 \):
\[
\sigma_1 = \frac{\nu_0^0}{\sigma_1 (1 - \nu_m) r_1} 
\]
(37)

The second step is as follows: the calculation of interference \( e \) needs to take into account the effect of the speed. We calculate \( u_m^0 (r_1) \) and \( u_m^0 (r_1) \) as if there was no contact between the PM and the sleeve, no pressure, but with a given \( \omega \).

For the calculation of \( u_m^\omega \), we use the following boundary conditions:
\[
u_m^\omega (0) = 0 
\]
(38)
\[
\sigma_{mr}(r_1) = 0 
\]
(39)

and we obtain:
\[
u_m^\omega = \frac{1 - \nu_m}{4E_m} \rho_m \omega r_1^3 
\]
(40)

For the calculation of \( u_m^\omega \) we use the boundary conditions:
\[
\sigma_{sr}(r_1) = 0 
\]
(41)
\[
\sigma_{sr}(r_2) = 0 
\]
(42)

and we obtain:
\[
u_m^\omega = \frac{(3 + \nu_s)(1 - \nu_s)}{8E_s} \rho_s \omega r_1^2 r_2 \left( \frac{2 + \nu_s}{1 - \nu_s} \frac{4 + \nu_s}{3 + \nu_s} \left( \frac{r_1}{r_2} \right)^2 \right) 
\]
(43)

Now \( e \) is modeled the following way:
\[
e = \nu_m^\omega - \nu_m^0 + \frac{1}{2} (c_m - c_s)(T_r - 20 \degree C) 
\]
(44)

with \( c_0 \) the interference between the PM and the sleeve at no speed and \( 20 \degree C \), \( c_m \) and \( c_s \) the dilatation coefficients of the PM and the sleeve, \( T_r \) the rotor temperature given in \( \degree C \).

Using the following values:
\[
\nu_s = 0.32 \\
\rho_s = 4.42 \times 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3 \\
E_s = 116 \times 10^9 \text{ N/m}^2 \\
c_m = 6.244 \times 10^{-3} \text{ m} \\
T_r = 20 \degree C 
\]

we obtain the results shown in Fig. 2.

The limiting factors are the radial stress at the center of the PM, the tangential stress at the inner side of the sleeve at high speeds, and the radial stress at the interface. A negative radial stress \( \sigma_1 \) at the interface ensures that there is no contact between the PM and the sleeve. Fig. 2 represents feasible designs according to this last limiting factor.
C. Thermal model

The steady state temperature $T$ is calculated using the heat diffusion equation [7]:

$$k \nabla^2 T + \dot{q} = \rho C_p \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}$$

(45)

with $k$ the thermal conductivity, $\rho$ the material density, $\dot{q}$ the rate at which thermal energy is generated per unit of volume and $C_p$ the specific heat.

Because of the 3D thermal interactions in the motor, and because of the air movements in the air gap, this 2D thermal model is not consistent with the reality. It is used to give us indications and not to constraint the model. Further investigations in the thermal modeling need to be done.

As the motor is designed by minimizing the total power losses, the thermal aspect is indirectly taken into account.

D. Electromagnetic power losses

Joule power losses density $p_{cop}$ in the coils is calculated as:

$$p_{cop} = \rho c J^2$$

(46)

with $\rho_c$ the resistivity and $J$ the current density.

The stator iron power losses $P_{iron}$ are assumed to be generated only by the PM. Their density $p_{iron}$ is calculated approximately using Steinmetz equation:

$$p_{iron} = c_1 f^2 \hat{B} c_3$$

(47)

with $c_1, i = 1, 2, 3$ being empirical coefficients, $\hat{B}$ the maximum magnetic field and $f$ the frequency. The same empirical approach used in [8] for the hysteresis power losses is used here for the iron power losses.

The eddy current and hysteresis power losses in the PM are neglected. The eddy currents in the sleeve and in the coils are also neglected.

E. Windage power losses

The article from Vrancik [9] indicates us that the windage power losses $P_w$ are calculated as:

$$P_w = \pi C_d l r_2^3 \omega^3 \rho_{air}$$

(48)

with $l$ the length considered, $\omega$ the angular velocity and $\rho_{air}$ the air density. The skin friction coefficient $C_d$ is calculated using an empirical formula:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{C_d}} = 2.04 + 1.768 \ln(Re \sqrt{C_d})$$

(49)

with $Re$ the Reynolds number:

$$Re = \frac{r_2(r_3 - r_2)\omega}{\nu}$$

(50)

with $\nu$ the kinematic viscosity.

Fig. 3 shows the windage power losses given by this model for a sleeve outer radius of 8.24 mm.

F. Mechanical power losses in the bearings

The power losses in the bearings $P_{bearings}$ [10] can be estimated by:

$$P_{bearings} = c_4 \omega c_5$$

(51)

with $c_4$ and $c_5$ be two empirical constants.

In our case, ceramic ball bearing are used. To define this model, an experimental setup was designed [11].

The measurements are fitted to the given model, as shown in Fig. 4. The friction torque of the ball bearings is dependent on the speed and on the preload.

The results are shown in Tab. I.

III. MODEL OPTIMIZATION

A. Optimization procedure

The analytical model contains more than 140 equations and 190 variables. The system has 13 degrees of freedom.

Two commercial software are used for the optimization: Pro@Design [12] and Mathematica. Pro@Design includes different optimization algorithms. Some are based on a sequential quadratic programming (SQP) solver using the partial derivatives and penalty functions. One parameter is chosen to be the objective function and all the others are fixed, constrained in intervals or free. Mathematica also includes many optimization algorithms. A code in Mathematica was written to handle models with large number of parameters.

B. Pareto frontiers

The suggested method for designing VHS motors allows studying Pareto frontiers.
The Pareto frontier defines optimal parameters sets. It the boundary between the feasible parameters sets and the parameters sets which are not feasible. For example in Fig. 5, the point of the surface represents the design with the lower possible power losses for a given air gap and coil thickness. Below the surface, there is no feasible design. Above the surface, the designs are not optimal.

The Figs 5 and 6 are realized by doing 100 optimizations for each figures. Nevertheless, the advantage of the purely analytical method is that it is extremely fast. It took less than 21 s for the calculation of the 100 optimizations of Fig. 6.

C. Optimization

Because of the mechanical natural frequencies, the active length of the motor was constrained to be smaller or equal to 30 mm. The prototype specifications are:
- Active length of the motor \( l_a \) \( \leq 30 \) mm
- PM remanence \( (B_{R}) \) 1.18 T
- Number of phases 3
- Mechanical power 2 kW
- Speed 200 krpm

IV. PROTOTYPE AND MEASUREMENTS

A prototype designed using this analytical model is shown in Fig. 7.

Fig. 8 shows the measurement of the electrical input power of the power bridge and the mechanical output power of the prototype. The maximum output power measured is 1.7 kW at 150 krpm. At this speed, the efficiency overcome 80% and the power losses are 500 W. Below 150 krpm, the prototype was limited by the current provided by the electronics; above, it was limited by the voltage. The limitation for the production
of higher powers is the electronics. With this electronics, it takes 382 ms to accelerate the motor from 0 to 200 krpm. The measurement method is shown in [11].

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The comparison of the two software used for the optimization showed that:

1) Pro@Design is easier to use, has more capabilities with discrete variables and is more convenient with the debugging process of the model.

2) Mathematica gives to the user the possibility to create tools and link them with the optimization process (mathematical language translation, advanced representation functions, other optimization algorithms, ...).

3) The same results were obtained with the two programs.

The optimization process showed in our case that:

1) It is very fast: it takes only a few seconds to find the optimum.

2) With the given restriction on the active length a 1 pole pair motor is more efficient than a 2 pole pairs.

The measurements showed that the power losses are higher than the predicted one. But the model does not include the power losses due to the power supply in the motor (except copper power losses), nor the power losses in the power supply. To improve the model, we need to consider:

1) The eddy currents power losses in the rotor produced by the field created by the coils.

2) The eddy currents power losses in the coils.

3) The iron power losses in the stator yoke due to the field created by the coils.

The construction phase showed that they are mechanical limitations that were not foreseen with the equations. In fact, the construction gave constraints on the model variables.

We are working on the electronics to be able to reach higher powers with our prototype.
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