Abstract – The paper develops the model of a V-shape IPM motor for automotive applications. The approach, design oriented, considers saturation and cross-coupling, by suited saturation factors. A torque sizing equation is obtained, independent on the winding data, and the main constructional data are gained, considering the corner operating point. Then the detailed motor design is completed, and the calculation of the torque-speed curve is extended also in the flux-weakening zone. FEM analysis validates the model.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The IPM motor is widely popular in automotive applications, thanks to a few positive features: high torque density and efficiency, wide flux weakening region extension, simple stator structure and compact rotor layout. However, its model is not simple, for several reasons: critical rotor bridges sizing; highly saturated operating conditions, with significant cross-coupling; cogging and torque ripple. During the last years, significant efforts have been devoted to improving the IPM motor model.

Most of the papers are aimed to develop accurate models for the motor operation analysis: in [1], some equivalent magnetic circuits are settled, valid for no-load operation; [2] compares some rotor topologies, by considering phasor diagrams; [3]-[8] analyze air-gap flux density distributions, develop equivalent magnetic circuits, and identify d-q flux-current links and inductance curves, by FEM analysis.

Other papers are focused on control aspects: d-q flux-current curve linearization [9], rotor layout analysis and FEM parameter identification for sensorless control [10].

Some papers are oriented to the motor design, sometimes with analytical approach [11]-[13]; in other cases, optimization methods are developed, based on FEM [14].

Moreover, a few commercial software tools (Speed®, Ansys MotorCad®, Ansys Rnxprt®) developed the motor design: however, usually input data are motor dimensions, while no sizing equations are offered, to start the procedure.

This paper develops an IPM motor sizing procedure, implemented in MathCad®, based on a torque sizing equation: it includes saturation and cross-coupling effects by suited pu saturation factors. Section II defines the motor layout, and some basic quantities. Section III develops the q-axis saturation model. Section IV defines the rotor bridges and gains the PM flux cross-coupling saturation function. Section V develops the sizing torque function and finds the optimal phase advance. Section VI obtains winding and core data. Section VII calculates reaction factors and electrical parameters. Section VIII presents performance calculations in the full operating range, and compares results with FEM.

II. IPM MOTOR LAYOUT AND BASIC DATA

Fig. 1 shows the IPM motor layout, with the main dimensions, and Table I reports some motor basic data.

Some comments are suitable: 
- the choice of stator diameter $D$ and air-gap width $g$ leads to calculate other design quantities directly and accurately;
- a 2-layer winding, with $q = 5/2$, limits cogging and torque ripple; with coil pitch $y_r = 6$, the winding factor is $k_r = 0.91$;
- the last row of Table I reports iterative quantities, defined later and updated during the design process: here the final values are given, reached in one or two iterations.

III. q-AXIS SATURATION MODEL

The $H_B(B_{e})$ lamination magnetization curve, provided by the manufacturer, is suitably extended to high $B_{e}$ values, in such a way that the end incremental permeability tends to $\mu_0$. 
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**Fig. 1.** IPM motor layout, with the main dimensions.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Specifications, Used Materials, Basic Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corner point: torque $T_c$ [Nm]; speed $N_c$ [rpm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. speed $N_{max}$ [RPM]; DC link V, $V_{dc}$ [V]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials: stator and rotor laminations; PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM param.: $B_{max}$ [T]; $\mu_r$ [pu]; $b_{e}$ [mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding ref. temper.; PM ref. temper. [°C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stator bore $D$; air-gap g; slot open. $b_{oe}$ [mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases; poles No: p; slots(pole-phase) No: q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters: $\rho_{cu}$; $\rho_{sw}$; $\sigma_{alum}$; $C_r$; $\rho_{fr}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The corresponding pu apparent permeability curve \( \mu_{A Pu}(B_g) \), from (1), is shown in fig. 2: depending on the equations to be managed, \( H_{f c}(B_g) \) or \( \mu_{A Pu}(B_g) \) will be used.

\[
\mu_{A Pu}(B_g) = B_g \left[ \mu_0 \cdot H_{f c}(B_g) \right] \quad (1)
\]

In the next following function will be used:

\[
y(x) = \text{root} \left( f \left( x, y_G \right) \right) \quad (2)
\]

\( y_G \) is a guess value of \( y \), that satisfies the condition: \( f(x, y)=0 \).

A first case of (2) is (3), that gives the peak flux density \( B_i \) in the q-axis aligned tooth as a function of the air-gap peak flux density \( B_{g0} \), due to the q-axis reaction current \( I_q \) only:

\[
B_i(B_{g0}) = \text{root} \left( B_{g0} - \frac{B_{g0}}{\rho_{he.g}} - H_{f c}(B_{g0}) \left( \frac{1}{\rho_{he.g}} - 1 \right) \cdot B_{g0} \right) \quad (3)
\]

(3) follows from the equality between the pole air-gap flux and the sum of the flux in the teeth in one pole and in the slots in one pole, in parallel with the teeth; \( \rho_{he.g} = h_t / \tau_s \) is the tooth width over tooth pitch ratio, \( h_t = 0.97 \) stacking factor.

Assuming that the magnetic voltage drop (MVD) in the teeth \( U_t \) is the main ferromagnetic voltage drop contribution, the saturation ratio function, due to q-axis reaction, equals:

\[
\rho_{sat} \left( B_{g0} \right) = \frac{U_g + U_t}{U_g} = 1 + \frac{H_{f c}(B_{g0}) \left( \frac{1}{\rho_{he.g}} - 1 \right) \cdot B_{g0}}{B_{g0} \cdot \mu_0 \cdot k_c} \quad (4)
\]

\( \rho_{he.g} = h_t / g \) is the tooth heigh over air-gap width ratio; \( k_c = 1.071 \) is the Carter’s factor, function of \( \tau_s = \pi D / (3p_q) \), \( b_{int.g} \).

(4) leads to obtain the peak stator MMF \( M_f \) (acting along q axis), able to give the peak flux density \( B_{g0} \) in the air-gap, by (5), and its inverse function, (6) (with \( g \) used instead of \( D \)):

\[
M_f \left( B_{g0} \right) = \left( B_{g0} / H_{f c} \right) \cdot g \cdot k_c \cdot \rho_{sat} \left( B_{g0} \right) \quad (5)
\]

\[
B_{g0} \left( M_{pq} \right) = \text{root} \left( M_f \left( B_{g0} / H_{f c} \right) \cdot M_{pq} / \rho_{sat} \left( B_{g0} \right) \right) \quad (6)
\]

where \( M_{pq} \) is the q axis reaction MMF.

Finally, the saturation factor \( \sigma_{sat} \) can be defined as follows:

\[
\sigma_{sat} \left( M_{pq} \right) = B_{g0} \left( M_{pq} \right) / \left[ \mu_0 \cdot M_{pq} / (g \cdot k_c) \right] \quad (7)
\]

Fig. 3 shows the saturation factor curve: it should be observed that the shape of \( \sigma_{sat} \) for small \( M_{pq} \) values is similar to the initial behavior of the curve \( \mu_{A Pu}(B_g) \) in fig. 2.

**IV. ROTOR BRIDGES SIZING AND CHECK**

AND **PM FLUX SATURATION FACTOR**

Fig. 4 shows the field map of the IPM motor under no-load conditions, for the following design parameters (fig. 1):

- \( h_w = 6 \text{mm}; \quad \nu = 78 \text{ deg}; \quad w_{ob} = 0.55 \text{mm}; \quad w_{ib} = 2.55 \text{mm}; \quad w_{ob} = 0.55 \cdot \tau_s = 4.66 \text{mm}; \quad h_{gy} = 1.5 \cdot w_{hr} = 6.99 \text{mm}; \quad \alpha_m = 0.754 \text{ pu}. \)

As concerns the width of the bridges, \( w_{ob} = 5 \cdot w_{ib} \) occurs: in fact, \( w_{ob} \) is sized at the maximum value (respecting the practical rule \( w_{ob} > w_{lam} = 0.35 \text{mm} \)), while the centrifugal force \( f_{max} \) at the maximum speed, due to the mass \( m_{ps} \) of pole shoe and PM segments, is sustained by the inner bridge: specific max centrifugal force:

\[
f_{max} = m_{ps} \cdot R_{av} \cdot \Omega_{max}^2 \quad (19)
\]

ideal stress of the inner bridge:

\[
\sigma_{ib} = f_{max} / \left( w_{ib} \cdot k_s \right) \quad (20)
\]

actual stress (\( K_f = 1.66 \) concentration factor): \( \sigma_{ib} = K_f \sigma_{ib} \) (21)

(bridge stress)/(lam. yield strength): \( \sigma_{ib} / \sigma_{y, lam} = 0.783 \) (22)

The analysis of the cross coupling effect of the q-axis reaction MMF on the air-gap flux delivered by the PM can be based on the equivalent magnetic network of fig. 5.
Fig. 5. Per-pole magnetic network for the analysis of the cross coupling effect of the q-axis reaction MMF on the air-gap flux delivered by the PM.

The network, for unity length in axial direction, consists of a concentrated parameter rotor sub-network (bottom part), and of a distributed parameter sub-network (top part), modeling the distributed toothed portion and MMF. The pole shoe, that connects the two sub-networks, has a scalar magnetic potential equal to $U_{i0}$, unknown. The equations are:

- q-axis MMF distribution $m_{pq}(\theta, M_{pq}) = M_{pq} \cdot \sin(\theta)$ (23)
- PM residual specific flux: $\psi_{PM} = B_a \cdot 2 \cdot h_m$ (24)
- PM specific permeance: $\lambda_{PM} = \mu_{nc, PM} \cdot h_m^{-1}$ (25)
- inner bridge MVD: $U_{ib}(B_{ib}) = h_{ib} \cdot B_{ib} \cdot \left(\mu_0 \cdot \mu_{nc, pm}(B_{ib})\right)$ (26)
- outer bridge MVD: $U_{ob}(B_{ob}) = h_{ob} \cdot B_{ob} \cdot \left(\mu_0 \cdot \mu_{nc, pm}(B_{ob})\right)$ (27)
- outer br. flux density: $B_{ob}(U) =$ root $\left[U_{ob}(B_{ob}) - U, B_{ob}\right]$ (28)
- inner br. flux density: $B_{ib}(U) =$ root $\left[U_{ib}(B_{ib}) - U, B_{ib}\right]$ (29)
- leakage flux: $\phi_l(U_{ps}) = B_{ib}(U_{ps}) \cdot k_s \cdot w_s + 2B_{ob}(U_{ps}) \cdot k_o \cdot w_o$ (30)
- air-gap specific flux, as delivered by the rotor: $\phi_{gg}(U_{ps}) = \phi_{PM} - \lambda_{PM} \cdot U_{ps} - \phi_l(U_{ps})$ (31)
- air-gap MVD distribution (with $U_{ps}$ unknown):
  
  $u_q(\theta, M_{pq},U_{ps},b_{gg}) = U_{ps} - M_{pq} \sin(\theta) - H_{kg}(B_{gg}) \cdot \rho_{nc, g} \cdot g$ (32)
- air-gap flux density distribution $b_{gg}(U_{ps})$ (with $U_{ps}$ unknown):
  
  $b_{gg}(U_{ps},M_{pq}) = \rho_{nc, g} \cdot \frac{\psi_{PM}}{g-k_c} \cdot \frac{2}{D} \cdot \int_{-\alpha_m \pi/2}^{\alpha_m \pi/2} b_{gg}(U_{ps},M_{pq},U_{ps}) \cdot d\theta_e$ (34)
- pole shoe potential, as a function of the reaction MMF $M_{pq}$:
  
  $U_{ps}(M_{pq}) = \text{root} \left[\phi_{gg}(U_{ps}) - \phi_{gg}(U_{ps \cdot g}, M_{pq}) \cdot U_{ps \cdot g}\right]$ (35)
- flux density distribution in the air-gap, as a function of $M_{pq}$:
  
  $b_{gg}(\theta_e, M_{pq}) = b_{gg}(U_{ps},M_{pq},U_{ps \cdot g}, M_{pq}) \cdot \frac{2}{D} \cdot \int_{-\alpha_m \pi/2}^{\alpha_m \pi/2} b_{gg}(U_{ps},M_{pq},U_{ps \cdot g}, M_{pq}) \cdot d\theta_e$ (36)

In fig. 6, (35) and (36) are shown; it can be observed that:

- the pole shoe potential highly changes with $M_{pq}$ increase;
- the flux density distribution $b_{gg}$ is distorted if $M_{pq}$ rises;
- moreover, due to local teeth saturation, the $b_{gg}$ increase on the left is lower than the $b_{gg}$ decrease on the right.

By integrating $b_{gg}(\theta_e, M_{pq})$ within the pole shoe extension ($|\theta_e| < \alpha_m \pi/2$) gives the specific air-gap flux, due to PM:

$$\psi_{gg}(M_{pq}) = \phi_{gg}(U_{ps}, M_{pq})$$ (37)

It is useful to introduce the PM flux saturation factor:

$$\psi_{sat}(M_{pq}) = \phi_{gg}(U_{ps}, M_{pq}) \cdot \psi_{gg}(0)$$ (38)

whose dependence on $M_{pq}$ is shown in fig. 7.

In (38) $\psi_{gg}(0)$ is the specific air gap flux within the pole shoe extension, due to PMs, with zero $M_{pq}$, corresponding to the flat flux density yellow distribution in fig. 6 right:

$$\psi_{gg}(\theta) = \psi_{gg}(0) = 38.801 \text{ mWb/m}$$ (39)

Another diagram of interest is the leakage ratio $\phi_{gg}/\phi_{in}$ between the leakage flux in the bridges and the PM flux, shown in fig. 8: it gives information about the magnetic effect of the bridges sizing. As can be seen, in no-load conditions the leakage ratio equals 16.6%, that is acceptable; however it increases significantly at the increase of $M_{pq}$.

The no-load flux density $B_{gg}$ of the $b_{gg}(\theta_e,0)$ distribution is:

$$B_{gg} = \phi_{gg}/(\alpha_m \cdot \tau) = 0.819 \text{ T}$$ (iterative result), (40)

while its fundamental component equals:

$$B_{gg^1} = \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \int_0^{\alpha_m \pi/2} B_{gg} \cdot \cos(\theta) \cdot d\theta_e \cdot \frac{4}{\pi} \cdot \sin(\alpha_m \pi/2) \cdot B_{gg} = 0.965 \text{ T}$$ (41)

The no-load specific fundamental flux is given by:

$$\psi_{gg^1} = (2/\pi) \cdot B_{gg^1} \cdot \tau = 38.616 \text{ mWb/m}$$ (42)
Finally, it is assumed that the fundamental air-gap flux due to the PM, as a function of \( M_{pg} \), can be calculated as follows:

\[
\Phi_{g1}(M_{pq}) = \Phi_{g1o} \cdot \eta_{M} \cdot (M_{pq}) \quad \text{(43)}
\]

V. TORQUE FUNCTION

As well known, the phasor diagram of fig. 9 leads to obtain the expression (44) of the electromagnetic torque:

\[
T = \frac{3}{2} \frac{P}{\pi} \left[ \Psi_{PM1} \cdot L_{d} - (L_{q} - L_{d}) \cdot I_{d} \right] \quad \text{(44)}
\]

Considering that the winding data are unknown at this stage, all the quantities should be given in terms of loadings: air-gap flux density \( B_{g} \), and linear current density \( \lambda \). So, the reaction MMF \( M_{p} \), the saturation functions \( \sigma_{al}, \eta_{M} \), and the PM flux linkage \( \Psi_{PM1} \) should be rewritten as follows:

\[
M_{pg} = k_{M} \cdot I = \frac{3}{\pi} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{p} k_{u} \cdot U_{c} \cdot I = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} k_{u} \cdot \lambda \cdot \Delta \quad \text{(45)}
\]

\[
\sigma_{a}(\Delta, \gamma) = \sigma_{al}(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} k_{u} \cdot \lambda \cdot \Delta \cdot \cos(\gamma)) \quad \text{(46)}
\]

\[
\eta_{M}(\Delta, \gamma) = \eta_{M0}(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} k_{u} \cdot \lambda \cdot \Delta \cdot \cos(\gamma)) \quad \text{(47)}
\]

\[
\Psi_{PM1} = \Psi_{PM1o} \cdot \eta_{M}(\Delta, \gamma) = k_{u} \cdot U_{c} \cdot \Phi_{g1o} \cdot \eta_{M}(\Delta, \gamma) \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{k_{u} \cdot U_{c}}{2} \quad \text{(48)}
\]

with \( U_{c} = \) phase series connected conductors. The \( L_{q} - L_{d} \) difference equals the reaction inductance difference:

\[
L_{q} - L_{d} = L_{pq} - L_{pd} \quad \text{(49)}
\]

In case of isotropic rotor and unsaturated motor, the reaction inductance is given by (50), with \( \lambda_{p} \) specific permeance:

\[
L_{p} = \frac{\Phi_{g1o} \cdot \lambda_{p} \cdot \ell}{\Phi_{g1o} \cdot \lambda_{p}} \quad \text{(50)}
\]

\[
\lambda_{p} = \mu_{0} \cdot k_{u}^{2} \cdot \left(3/\pi^{2}\right) \cdot \tau(g, k_{c}) = 15.543 \, \mu H/m \quad \text{(51)}
\]

The unsaturated reaction inductances are expressed as:

\[
L_{pd} = c_{d} \cdot L_{p} \quad , \quad L_{pq} = c_{q} \cdot L_{p} \quad \text{(52)}
\]

with \( c_{d}, c_{q} \) reaction factors: their ratio is the anisotropy ratio:

\[
\sigma_{an.o} = \frac{L_{pq}}{L_{pd}} = \frac{c_{q}}{c_{d}} \quad \text{(53)}
\]

In the following, the d-axis reaction inductance \( L_{pq} \) will be considered as unsaturated:

\[
L_{pq} = L_{pd} \quad \text{(54)}
\]

The reason for this model approximation, acceptable for a practical design approach, is the high d-axis equivalent air-gap \( g_{d,eq} = g_{k} + h_{na}/\mu_{0} \), that linearizes the \( \Psi_{pd} \) - \( I_{d} \) curve.

In contrast, the q-axis reaction inductance is saturated, because of the small equivalent air-gap \( g_{d,eq} = g_{k} \): \n
\[
L_{pq} = L_{pq0} \cdot \sigma_{q}(\Delta, \gamma) \quad . \quad \text{(55)}
\]

Thus, the inductance difference \( L_{pq} - L_{pd} \) can be written as:

\[
L_{pq} - L_{pd} = L_{pd0} \cdot \left( \sigma_{an.o} \cdot \sigma_{s}(\Delta, \gamma) - 1 \right) \quad . \quad \text{(56)}
\]

By considering (44) (in which \( L_{d} < 0 \), (48) and (56), it is useful to introduce the following pu torque function \( f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma) \):

\[
f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma) = f_{T,al}(\Delta, \gamma) + f_{T,an}(\Delta, \gamma) = \eta_{M}(\Delta, \gamma) \cos(\gamma) + \sqrt{3} \frac{k_{u} B_{g0}}{6} \Delta \cdot \sigma_{an.o} \cdot \sigma_{s}(\Delta, \gamma) - 1 \cdot \sin(2\gamma) \quad . \quad \text{(57)}
\]

\( f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma) \) consists of an alignment term, \( f_{T,al} \), and of an anisotropy term, \( f_{T,an} \); fig. 10 shows \( f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma) \) as a function of \( \gamma \), with parameter \( \Delta \). As can be observed, for any \( \Delta \) value, a value of \( \gamma \) exists for which \( f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma) \) reaches a maximum. Thus, (58) allows to obtain the optimum phase advance \( \gamma_{opt} \) as a function of the linear current density \( \lambda \), as shown in fig. 11:

\[
\gamma_{opt}(\Delta) = \arctan \left( \frac{d_{T}(\Delta, \gamma_{opt})}{d_{T,al}(\Delta, \gamma_{opt})} \right) \quad . \quad \text{(58)}
\]

From (44), the optimal specific torque (for unity length in axial direction) can be written as:

\[
T_{s}(\Delta) = f_{T}(\Delta, \gamma_{opt}(\Delta)) \frac{\pi k_{u} B_{g0} \Delta D^{2}}{2 \sqrt{2}} \quad , \quad \text{(59)}
\]

and its trend is shown in fig. 12.
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– the choice of $\Delta$ mainly depends on thermal considerations (steady-state or short-term thermal conditions). $\Delta_e = 90 \text{ kA/m}$ will be adopted for the corner point (a water-glycol cooling system is supposed); it implies:

$$\gamma_{opt,e} = \gamma_{opt}(\Delta_e) = 48.15 \text{ deg}.$$  

and the following values occur:

$$\eta_{bc} = \eta_{p}(\Delta_e, \gamma_{opt,e}) = 0.909$$  

$$\sigma_{we} = \sigma_{p}(\Delta_e, \gamma_{opt,e}) = 0.667$$  

$$T_{ic} = T_i(\Delta_e) = 2.461 \text{ kNm/m}.$$  

Thus, the needed lamination stack length $\ell$ equals:

$$\ell = \frac{T_i}{T_{ic}} = 81.3 \text{ mm}.$$  

VI. WINDING DATA AND STATOR CORE DIMENSIONS

In the following, the detailed stator design is defined:

fundam. pole flux: $\Phi_{gel} = \eta_{bc} \Phi_{glo} \ell = 2.853 \text{ mWb}$

conductor EMF: $E_{cc} = \left(\pi \sqrt{2}\right) f_e \Phi_{gel} = 1.225 V_{rms}$

EMF over Voltage ratio (iterative result): $\rho_{U V} = 0.650$

max. inverter phase voltage $V_{inM} = 0.95 V_{dc}/\left(\sqrt{2}\right)$

conductors in series: $U_{cc} = \left(\rho_{E} V_{inM}\right)/(k_u E_{cc}) = 127.30$

parallel paths: $a = p/2 = 4$

conductors in slot (thor): $u_{th} = \left(3 - U_{cc} \cdot a\right)/N_s = 25.46$

actual conductors in slot: $u = 2 \cdot \text{round}(0.5 \cdot u_{th}) = 26$

actual conductors in series: $U_e = \left(N_s \cdot u\right)/(3-a) = 130$

phase EMF: $E_e = E_{cc} \cdot U \cdot k_u = 144.9 V_{rms}$

phase current: $I_e = \left(\Delta_e \cdot p \cdot \tau\right)/(3-U) = 116 A_{rms}$

path current: $I_{e, path} = I_e / a$

theoretical current density: $S_{th} = 8 A/mm^2$

conductor cross section: $A_c = I_{e, path}/S_{th} = 3.625 mm^2$

max wire diameter: $d_{max} = b_{as} - d_{clearance}$

strands in hand: $n_w = \lceil(4\pi / 4) \cdot A_c / d_{max}^2\rceil = 8$

wire diameter: $d_{wau} = \sqrt{(4\pi / 4) \cdot A_c / n_w} = 0.75 mm$

copper cross section in slot: $A_{cc,slot} = u \cdot n_w (\pi/4) \cdot d_{wau}^2$

copper filling factor in slot: $\alpha_{cc} = 0.4$

slot cross section: $A_{slot} = A_{cc,slot} / \alpha_{cc}$

tooth width: $b_t = \left(B_{glo} / B_{th}\right) \tau / k_u = 5.89 mm$

$\rho_{bc,t}$ ratio: $\rho_{bc,t} = b_t / t_s = 0.704$ (iterative result)

minor slot width: $b_m = \left[\pi \cdot (D + 2 \cdot h_u) / N_s \cdot t_{th}\right] / (N_s - \pi)$

auxiliary slot parameter: $k_0 = \tan(\theta) = \tan(\pi / N_s)$

slot height: $h = \left(h_h + b_t + 2b_m \cdot \left[2A_{slot} - b_t^2 \cdot \pi/4\right] / (2b_m)\right)$

total tooth equivalent height: $h_{eq} = h + h_t / 2 + h_u + h_m$

ratio $\rho_{bc,e}$ (iterative result): $h_{eq} / g = 52.44$

major slot width: $b_2 = b_h + 2 \cdot h \cdot k_u = 7.44 mm$

stator yoke width: $b_y = \Phi_{glo} / \left(2 \cdot B_{wh} \cdot k_u\right) = 20.0 mm$

ext. stator $Q$: $D_{ext} = D + 2 \cdot \left(h_{as} + h_r + b_y\right) = 294.5 mm$. 

Eq. (90) shows that the equivalent tooth height is higher than the stator tooth height: in fact, it includes the rotor rib height, saturated by $M_{eq}$ roughly in the same way of the stator teeth.

VII. ELECTRICAL PARAMETERS

The peak reaction flux densities with isotropic rotor are:

$$B_{pd,as} = \mu_0 \cdot M_{pd} / (k_{c} \cdot g), \quad B_{pq,as} = \mu_0 \cdot M_{pq} / (k_{c} \cdot g).$$

In the following, the reaction coefficients $c_d, c_q$ are obtained: they are defined assuming unsaturated conditions (apart from the bridges, that are considered as consisting of air, because completely saturated by the PM leakage fluxes).

A. d-axis reaction

The air-gap MVd due to d-axis reaction equals:

$$u_{pd}(\theta_e) = M_{pd} \cdot \cos(\theta_e) - U_{upqd},$$

$$M_{pd} = 3 \cdot \sqrt{2} / \pi \cdot \left(k_{u} \cdot U / p \cdot I_d\right)$$

$U_{upqd}$ is the d-axis reaction pole shoe potential (unknown).

The distribution of d-axis reaction flux density in the air-gap is expressed as follows:

$$b_{pd}(\theta_e) = \begin{cases} 
\mu_0 \cdot u_{pd}(\theta_e) / (k_{c} \cdot g), & 0 < \theta_e < \alpha_{w} \cdot \pi / 2 \\
0, & \alpha_{w} \pi / 2 < \theta_e < \theta_{e,rib} = \alpha_{w} \cdot \pi / 2 + (b_{sh} / D_r) / 2 \\
b_{sh} / D_r, & \theta_{e,rib} < \theta_e < \pi / 2 
\end{cases}$$

The radial permeance of the rotor internal V-shape holes is:

$$\Lambda_{ps,ir} = \mu_0 \cdot \left(2 \cdot b_{sh} + h_u \cdot \cos(\psi) + w_{sh}\right) / h_m,$$

and the North flux from inner rotor part to the pole shoe is:

$$\Phi_{ps,ir} = \Lambda_{ps,ir} \cdot U_{upqd}.$$ 

The flux delivered by the pole shoe to the air-gap is given by:

$$\Phi_{ps,g} = 2 \cdot \left[\int_{0}^{\alpha_w \pi / 2} \mu_0 \cdot M_{pd} \cdot \cos(\pi / \tau) - U_{upqd} \right] \cdot \frac{d\tau}{k_c \cdot g}.$$ 

The air-gap permeance in front of the pole shoe equals:

$$\Lambda_g = \mu_0 \cdot \alpha_m \cdot (\pi / \ell) / (k_c \cdot g).$$

By imposing the following condition:

$$\Phi_{ps,ir} = \Phi_{ps,g},$$

the pole shoe scalar magnetic potential is obtained:

$$U_{upqd} = \frac{1}{1 + \Lambda_{ps,ir} / \Lambda_g} \cdot \frac{\sin(\alpha_m \cdot \pi / 2)}{\alpha_m \cdot \pi / 2},$$

from which, using (96)-(98), $b_{sh}(0_e)$ is completely defined. Its fundamental component can be calculated as:

$$B_{pd,1}(\theta_e) = \left(4 \cdot \pi \right) \cdot \left[\int_{0}^{\pi / 2} b_{pd}(0_e) \cdot \cos(\theta_e) d\theta_e\right],$$

and the d-axis reaction coefficient equals:

$$c_d = B_{pd,1} / B_{pd,ir} = 0.201$$ (iterative result).
B. q-axis reaction

The air-gap q-axis reaction flux density distribution is:

\[ B_{qg} \cdot \sin(\theta_q) \quad 0 < \theta_q < \alpha_m \pi/2 \]

\[ b_{qg}(\theta_q) = \left[ 0, \alpha_m \pi/2 - \theta_q < \theta_{cib} < \alpha_m \pi/2 + \frac{h_{cib}}{D_2} \right] \quad (107) \]

Its fundamental component can be calculated as:

\[ B_{pq} = (4/\pi) \int_0^{\pi/2} b_{qg}(\theta_q) \cdot \sin(\theta_q) d\theta_q \quad (108) \]

and the q-axis reaction coefficient equals:

\[ c_q = B_{pq}/B_{pq,ix} = 0.825 \quad (109) \]

Thus, the unsaturated anisotropy ratio is given by:

\[ \sigma_{anis, q} = c_q^2 = 4.11 \quad \text{(iterative result)} \quad (110) \]

C. Resistive and inductive parameters

The end-winding length can be estimated as:

\[ \ell_{ew} = \left( \pi \cdot (D + 2h_{aw} + h_{cib}) \right) / \left( 3 \cdot p \cdot q \right) \cdot \gamma_c \cdot \pi/2 \]

and the AC phase resistance can be expressed as:

\[ R(f) = k_a(f) \cdot \rho_{cu,Tref,T} \cdot \left( U_c(f) \cdot (\ell + \ell_{ew}) \right) / (a \cdot n_w \cdot A_n), \quad (112) \]

where \( k_a(f) \) is the classical additional loss coefficient; at corner and maximum speed it is: \( k_a(f_c) = 1.004; \quad k_a(f_M) = 1.094. \)

The inductive parameters are estimated as follows:

- Harmonic fields leak. coeff. \( \sigma_h = \sigma_h(q, y_c) = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-2} \) \( (114) \)
- Harm. fields leakage specific permeance: \( \lambda_{al} = \sigma_h \cdot \lambda_{al} \) \( (115) \)
- Teeth tips leak. sp. perm. \( \lambda_i = \mu_0 \cdot \alpha_m \cdot g / (b_{aw} + 0.8 \cdot g) \) \( (116) \)
- End-winding leakage sp. permeance: \( \lambda_{ew} = 0.3 \cdot 10^{-6} \) \( (117) \)
- Tot. leak. sp. perm. \( \lambda = \lambda_{al} / q + \lambda_h + \lambda_i + \lambda_{ew} \cdot \ell / \ell_{ew} \) \( (118) \)
- Phase leakage inductance: \( L_c = \left( U_c^2 / \rho_c \right) \cdot \ell \cdot \lambda \) \( (119) \)
- Synchr. L: \( L_d = L_{qd} + L_{c} \); \( L_q(M_{pq}) = L_{pq}(M_{pq}) + L_{c} \) \( (120) \)

VIII. OPERATION ANALYSIS, FEM VALIDATION

In the following, the IPM motor operating quantities, both in MTPA and in Flux Weakening (FW) range are evaluated, considering winding data and quantities at the terminals: no-load flux linkage: \( \Psi_{lo} = k_w \cdot U_{c} \cdot \ell \cdot \phi_{qlo} / \left( 2 \sqrt{2} \right) \quad (121) \)

PM flux sat. factor: \( \eta_{M}(I, \gamma) = \eta_{M}((3 \cdot U_{c} \cdot I) / (\pi \cdot p) \cdot \gamma) \quad (122) \)

electromagnetic torque:

\[ T(I, \gamma) = T_a + T_{aw} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot p \cdot \eta_{M}(I, \gamma) \cdot \Psi_{lo} \cdot I \cdot \cos(\gamma) + \frac{3}{2} \cdot p \cdot L_{M} \cdot \left( \sigma_{anis, q} \cdot \sigma_{AM} \cdot (k_{M} \cdot I \cdot \cos(\gamma))^2 - \right) \cdot I^2 \cdot \sin(2 \gamma) \quad (123) \]

opt. \( \gamma \) angle: \( \gamma_{M}(I) = \text{root}(dT(I, \gamma_{MG}) / d\gamma_{MG}, \cdot \gamma_{MG}) \quad (124) \)

torque in MTPA range: \( T_{MTPA}(I) = T(I, \gamma_{M}(I)) \quad (125) \)

corner p. I: \( I_c = \text{root}(T_{MTPA}(I) - T_c, I_c) = 116.0 \text{ Ams} \quad (126) \)

corner point opt. phase adv.: \( \gamma_{Me} = \gamma_{M}(I_c) = 48.15 \text{ deg} \quad (127) \)

\[ V_q(I, \gamma, f) = -R(f) \cdot I \cdot \sin(\gamma) + -2 \pi f \cdot L_{d} \cdot (k_{M} \cdot I \cdot \cos(\gamma)) + \cdot I \cdot \cos(\gamma) \quad (128) \]

\[ V_q(I, \gamma, f) = 2 \pi f \cdot \Psi_{lo} \cdot \eta_{Mf}(I, \gamma) + + R(f) \cdot I \cdot \cos(\gamma) \quad (129) \]

phase voltage: \( V(I, \gamma, f) = \sqrt{V_d^2(I, \gamma, f) + V_q^2(I, \gamma, f)} \quad (130) \)

FW \( \gamma \) ang: \( \gamma_{FW, I}(f) = \text{root}(V(I, \gamma_{FWG}, f) - V_c \cdot \gamma_{FWG}) \quad (131) \)

\[ \quad \gamma \quad \text{in all the range:} \quad \gamma(f) = \begin{cases} \gamma_{Me} \quad 0 < f < f_{c} \quad (132) \\\\gamma_{FW, I}(f) \quad f_{c} < f < f_{M} \quad (132) \\\\end{cases} \]

Fig. 13 shows the transient FEM simulation of the electromagnetic torque, corresponding to the operating condition of the corner point; the following remarks arise:

– the average torque is very close to the corner point torque \( (T_{avg}/T_c = 0.9996); \)
– the peak-peak torque ripple equals 3.48%, that confirms the good initial choice of \( q = 5/2 \) slots/pole-phase.

Fig. 14 shows the phase advance as a function of speed, calculated analytically by (132).

For \( 0 < N < N_{Ms} \), with \( I = I_c \) and by (123), (130), (132), the torque and voltage analytical curves follow, shown in fig. 15, together with the corresponding FEM calculated values (for \( N = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 13.5 \text{ kRPM} \)).

Fig. 15. Torque and voltage, calculated analytically by (123) \( (\cdots) \) and (130) \( (\cdots) \) and by FEM (points \( \square \) and \( \blacktriangle \)), using phase advance (132).
As can be observed, while the agreement in MPTA range ($N < N_c = 2.9$ kRPM) is good, a significant discrepancy occurs in FW range; the reasons for this behavior are:

- in MTPA range, the imposed condition is $T = T_c$ by (126); in FW range the condition is $V = V_c$ by (131), that suffers of a lower parameter accuracy in $V$ estimation, by (130);

- the sensitivity of torque and speed on the angle $\gamma$, low in the MTPA range, increases significantly with the increase of speed above $N_c = 2900$ RPM, as shown in fig. 16.

Fig. 17 shows again the $\gamma$ curve calculated analytically ($\gamma_{ANA}$), together with a $\gamma$ curve calculated by FEM ($\gamma_{FEM}$): each point of the $\gamma_{FEM}$ curve has been chosen in such a way to obtain the same torque calculated analytically (by (123), with $I = I_c$ and $\gamma$ from (132)): by inserting the $\gamma_{FEM}$ values in (130), more congruent $V$ values follow, as can be seen in fig. 18.

**IX. CONCLUSION**

A model of the IPM motor has been developed, oriented to design, considering saturation and cross-coupling effects.

A sizing equation has been obtained, not dependent on winding data and useful to guide the sizing procedure: this approach not only is quicker compared with FEM, but it gives an insight into the motor electromagnetic behavior.

Comparison with FEM calculations have shown very good agreement in the corner point and in MTPA range, while some inaccuracies arise in FW range, mainly due to imperfect estimation of the phase advance.
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