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Abstract—Cloud computing is a type of distributed computing that enables public, on-demand network (internet) access to a large pool of shared computing resources, making it easier than ever to outsource computing tasks on a pay-as-you-go basis. In this paper, a cloud computing service is used to complement an existing high-fidelity multi-physics power inductor design workflow by enabling multiple instances of the design analysis to be executed in parallel on virtual computers in a cloud computing environment. This method accelerates the design development cycle and can allow a more thorough evaluation of the design space within a short time-frame, at a moderate cost and can potentially lead to improved designs. The modified workflow is demonstrated by the design optimisation of a high-energy-density filter inductor for an automotive application.

I. INTRODUCTION

In order to meet the ever increasing demand for higher power-density, energy-efficiency and lower-cost of electrical machines and devices, multiple coupled physical phenomena must be accounted for at the design stage, [1]. As a minimum the design synthesis should capture the close interrelation between the electromagnetic and thermal behaviour, [2]. This would ideally be achieved using high-fidelity electromagnetic and thermal models which are coupled through a loss estimation. The bulk of the losses are generally temperature dependent requiring the electromagnetic and thermal models to be iteratively evaluated, [3]. This significantly increases computation time and tends to prohibit the use of such models, particularly for iterative design optimisation. The problem is often addressed by employing computationally efficient modelling methods, [4], or by compromising the detail and accuracy of the models, [2], [5]–[7], in favour of short solution times. Thereby, enabling a design optimisation to be performed using commonplace desktop computing hardware, [4], [7]. An alternative is to adopt a distributed computing approach, [8], where high-fidelity models are evaluated using many networked computers in parallel to reduce solution times. This approach has been adopted in areas such as Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC), [9], electronic chip-package design, [10] and photonics, [11]. It has also been adopted in the electromagnetic and later coupled electromagnetic and thermal design optimisation of a Permanent Magnet (PM) machine, [12], [13]. However, other efforts are not widely reported in the area of electrical machine and wound passive component design, [12], despite the idea being known for a number of years, [14], and tools being available, [15], [16]. This is perhaps due to the perceived complexity of integrating the use of such distributed computing systems in existing workflows.

Cloud computing is a type of distributed computing that enables public, on-demand network (internet) access to a large pool of shared computing resources, [8], making it easier than ever to outsource computing tasks on a pay-as-you-go basis. In this paper, the use of cloud computing to complement an existing multi-physics power inductor design workflow is presented, [17]. The implementation of the computationally efficient power inductor model is described along with its role in the current workflow. Limitations of the present single desktop computer arrangement, such as reaching computational feasibility limits and excessive design times, are alleviated by using a simple algorithm to execute multiple instances of the multi-physics analysis on virtual computers in a cloud computing environment. The modified workflow is demonstrated by the design optimisation of a high-energy-density filter inductor for an automotive application. An indication of the economic costs of using the cloud based service is given along with a discussion of advantages and future improvements to the implementation.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXISTING WORKFLOW

In the existing workflow, a parametrically defined, computationally efficient multi-physics model of an E-core power inductor is used to manually assess the design parameter space for a given specification. This allows infeasible solutions to be ruled out based on previous experience and a wider understanding of the application. Parametric studies are then performed using a simple algorithm to systematically vary a parameter of interest and assessing the impact on performance. For example, the effect of rectangular strip or edge wound conductors on ac losses can be studied. An indication of the economic costs of using the cloud based service is given along with a discussion of advantages and future improvements to the implementation.
A. Multi-Physics Power Inductor Model

The multi-physics inductor model is composed of individual electromagnetic and thermal Finite Element (FE) models coupled by winding and core loss estimations, as illustrated in Fig. 2, [17]. The models are fully parametrically defined and appear as a “black-box” problem which takes a set of design parameters, \( D_p \), containing geometric, material, boundary condition and specification data as input and returns a high-fidelity approximation of the electromagnetic, loss and thermal behaviour of the inductor as output.

1) Electromagnetic Model: A parametric time-harmonic non-linear 2-D FE model is used to predict the electromagnetic behaviour and losses, Fig. 3, [18]. Due to symmetry, only one half of the inductor cross-section is modelled to reduce computation time. The 2-D nature of the model prohibits transposed conductors from being directly catered for. The contribution of the end-winding to inductance and ac loss is assumed negligible and is confirmed by 3-D FE analysis in a post-design validation step. The inductance is estimated as the ratio of change in flux linkage, \( \Psi \), to change in winding current, \( I \), (1) which requires two FE analyses to be performed at a winding current of \( I \pm \delta I \).

\[
L = \frac{d\Psi}{dT} \tag{1}
\]

2) Winding Loss: The temperature and frequency dependent ac winding loss is determined from the ratio of effective ac to dc resistance, \( \frac{R_{ac}}{R_{dc}} \), [19], [20]. The operating temperature of the inductor is emulated by scaling the resistivity, \( \rho \), of the winding material with the well established linearised equation, (2), where \( T_{op} \), \( T_0 \) and \( \alpha \) are the operating temperature, reference temperature and temperature coefficient of resistance respectively.

\[
\rho|_{T_{op}} = \rho|_{T_0} (1 + \alpha (T_{op} - T_0)) \tag{2}
\]

\[
\frac{R_{ac}}{R_{dc}|_{T_{op}}} = \left( \frac{R_{ac}|_{T_0}}{R_{dc}|_{T_0}} - 1 \right) \left( 1 + \alpha (T_{op} - T_0) \right)^{\beta+1} + 1 \tag{3}
\]

\[
\beta = \frac{\log \left( \frac{R_{ac}|_{T_0}}{R_{dc}|_{T_0}} - 1 \right) - \log \left( \frac{R_{ac}|_{T_{max}}}{R_{dc}|_{T_{max}}} - 1 \right)}{\log (1 + \alpha (T_{max} - T_0))} - 1 \tag{4}
\]

The \( \frac{R_{ac}}{R_{dc}} \) ratio is estimated at \( T_{op} \) for a fixed frequency using an analytical loss function, (3) and (4), informed by two \( \frac{R_{ac}}{R_{dc}} \) values obtained from the electromagnetic FE analysis at the reference temperature and the maximum ex-
pected operating temperature, $T_{\text{max}}$, respectively, where $\beta$ is a curve fitting term, [3]. Hence, two FE analyses are required to determine the ac winding loss over the expected operating temperature range at each frequency of interest.

3) Core Loss: The core loss arising from hysteresis, eddy current and excess loss effects is estimated using the Bertotti iron loss model, (5), [21], where $f$ and $B$ are the frequency and peak flux density respectively. The coefficients $k_h$, $k_e$ and $k_a$ are derived from measured loss data provided by the electrical steel manufacturer. Only one FE analysis is required at each frequency of interest to estimate the iron loss.

$$W_{Fe} = k_h f B^{\alpha/\epsilon} + k_e f^2 B^2 + k_a f^{1.5} B^{1.5} \quad (5)$$

B. Thermal Model

A parametric steady-state 3-D FE model is used to predict the thermal behaviour, Fig. 4. The inductor is assumed to be potted and housed within a case mounted to a cold-plate at a fixed temperature. Hence, the model is reduced to a pure conduction problem with boundary conditions. The heat extraction from the cold plate is assumed to dominate over convection and radiation effects. An adiabatic boundary condition is applied to each surface with the exception of the base where fixed temperature. Hence, the model is reduced to a pure conduction problem with boundary conditions. The heat extraction from the cold plate is assumed to dominate over convection and radiation effects. An adiabatic boundary condition is applied to each surface with the exception of the base where fixed temperature is performed internally by the modelling software, [24].

C. Parallel Model Execution

Table I details the set of electromagnetic FE analyses, along with the appropriate winding current, frequency and temperature cases, required to characterise the electromagnetic and loss behaviour over the temperature range of interest at a fixed frequency, $f_0$, Sections II-A1 to II-A3. The electromagnetic model assumes pure sinusoidal excitation current, however, non-sinusoidal current can be approximated by decomposing the waveform into its Fourier components and evaluating the electromagnetic, loss and temperature behaviour of an inductor with sinusoidal excitation current, however, non-sinusoidal current can be approximated by decomposing the waveform into its Fourier components and evaluating the electromagnetic and loss behaviour is given by, (6), where $N_h$ is the number of significant harmonics.

$$N_{EM} = 2 + 2N_h \quad (6)$$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Winding Current</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inductance and winding loss (dc)</td>
<td>$I_{pk} + \delta I$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$T_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductance and winding loss (dc)</td>
<td>$I_{pk} - \delta I$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$T_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding and Core loss</td>
<td>$I_{rms}$</td>
<td>$f_0$</td>
<td>$T_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding loss</td>
<td>$I_{rms}$</td>
<td>$f_0$</td>
<td>$T_{\text{max}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The electromagnetic FE analyses are independent and as such can be performed in parallel. A simple queuing algorithm is used to control the timing of the model executions as illustrated in Fig. 5. Initially all of the required FE models are generated and one model is executed for each available processor core, $N_{\text{core}}$, typically in the range 1–8 for a desktop computer. When a model is complete, the results are written to a file and the next model is executed. The process repeats until all $N_{EM}$ FE analyses are complete. This ensures a high utilisation of modern multi-core processors and minimises the computation time of the electromagnetic and loss modelling stage. The time required to predict the electromagnetic, loss and temperature behaviour of an inductor with sinusoidal current excitation is in the range 60 - 90 seconds using $N_{\text{core}} = 4$ processor cores. The computation time is difficult to approximate as it is dependent on many factors including the size and mesh density of the models as well as their non-linear behaviour.

D. Limitations of the Existing Workflow

Despite the computationally efficient implementation of the inductor model, Section II-A, the number of model analyses
required by the parametric studies and optimisation lead to a typical computation time of between 5 and 12 hours. These studies are performed sequentially by necessity and can therefore lead to excessive design times. However, if multiple parametric studies and optimisations could be performed simultaneously, using a simple to implement approach, then the design time can be significantly reduced. This could enable a more thorough evaluation of the design space to be performed and lead to further design improvements.

III. MODIFIED WORKFLOW - EXPLOITING CLOUD COMPUTING

Cloud computing, in the context of this work, provides on-demand, pay-as-you-go, network (internet) access to a large pool of shared computing resources, [8]. Virtualisation software allows users to request the creation of virtual computers with specific software and hardware configurations which run on the underlying physical hardware, Table II, [26]. In essence, the existing workflow can be complemented by enabling parametric studies and optimisations to be executed on many virtual computers in parallel on a pay-per-hour basis.

A. Executing Parametric Studies and Optimisations in a Cloud Computing Environment

An adaptation of the queueing algorithm, Section II-C and Fig. 5, and an Application Programming Interface (API) are used to interact with the cloud computing service in a simple manner and execute the desired parametric studies or optimisations, as illustrated in Fig. 6. Numerous cloud computing services are available, however the Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2) is used in this work, [26]. The algorithm begins by requesting and starting \( N_{comp} \) identical preconfigured virtual computers referred to as compute instances, Fig. 6. At this point the compute time is charged on a per-hour basis for each instance until they are terminated, Table II, [26]. The inductor model, associated parametric study or optimisation algorithm and data, such as parameter ranges, material properties and specification details are uploaded to each compute instance. The design tool is executed on the \( N_{comp} \) compute instances simultaneously. The algorithm polls for results, if found, they are downloaded and the next study is executed on the now idle compute instance. This process repeats until all of the studies or optimisations, \( N_{EXEC} \), are complete. When a compute instance becomes idle and there are no more executions required it is terminated.

IV. FILTER INDUCTOR DESIGN CASE STUDY

The benefits of incorporating additional computing resources into the workflow are illustrated by the design optimisation of a high-energy-density filter inductor intended to be integrated into the power electronic stage and water cooling circuit of an automotive power converter. The full specification is given in Table III. In order to reduce material costs and simplify manufacture, aluminium conductors arranged in a single layer strip winding are assumed. The six design parameters, \( D_p \), to be optimised are given in Table IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current rating, ( I_{rms} )</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating frequency, ( f_{op} )</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductance, ( L_t )</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>( \mu )H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum operating temperature, ( T_i )</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target energy density (complete assembly), ( E_{d,t} )</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>J/kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Optimisation Routine

The inductor specification is described in terms of a target inductance, \( L_t \), peak operating temperature, \( T_i \), and energy density, \( E_{d,t} \). The energy density is defined as the energy stored in the magnetic field per unit mass of the complete inductor assembly, including the case, where \( L, M, I_{pk} \) and \( I_{rms} \) are the inductance, mass and peak and rms winding current respectively, (7).
The multiple design objectives are treated as a single global objective by formulating the objective function, (8), as a sum of three normalised error terms representing the deviation of a candidate design from the inductance, \( L_t \), energy density, \( E_{dt} \), and peak operating temperature, \( T_t \), targets, respectively. A Particle Swarm Optimisation (PSO) routine is employed to systematically vary the design parameters, \( D_p \), within predetermined bounds and minimise the objective function, \( E(D_p) \), (8). The objective function is multi-valued, meaning that a number of design parameter sets, \( D_p \), can equally satisfy the design specification. Therefore, the design tool is used to generate a set of 150 design candidates and the results studied.

**B. Optimised Filter Inductor Design**

Figs. 7 to 9 show the resulting inductance, energy density and maximum operating temperature of the 150 design candidates identified by the design tool. Each design candidate is within 5 \%, 4.6 \% and 2.7 \% of the inductance, energy density and temperature targets and could be considered equally optimal from this limited data. However, when the predicted total loss is plotted against the predicted mass for each design, Fig. 10, an approximation to the Pareto front is identified. Designs which lie on this line are non-dominated meaning that an improvement in one characteristic, mass or loss, cannot be realised without a corresponding compromise in the other, [27]. Six design candidates were identified using the existing single desktop workflow, Section II and Fig. 10, in approximately the same time it took to identify the 150 design candidates using the cloud computing service. The additional information afforded by the high number of optimisation executions allows a design to be selected, as shown in Figs. 7 to 10, which exhibits the best compromise between mass and loss and satisfies secondary considerations which are beneficial to the inductor design but are not expressly specified. The resulting inductor design is within 5 \% (76 \( \mu \)H), 1.7\% (177 \( ^\circ \)C) and 1.7\% (1.18) of the inductance, temperature and energy density targets respectively, the optimised design parameters are given in Table V, [17].

\[
E_d = \frac{L_{I_{pk}}^2}{4M} = \frac{L_{I_{rms}}^2}{M} \quad (7)
\]

\[
E(D_p) = \left| \frac{L_t - L_c(D_p)}{L_t} \right| + \left| \frac{E_{dt} - E_{dc}(D_p)}{E_{dt}} \right| + \left| \frac{T_t - T_c(D_p)}{T_t} \right| \quad (8)
\]

**C. Computation Time and Cost**

The computation time required to perform the multi-physics analysis for one PSO particle, one PSO generation and one optimised design are given in Table VI along with the approximate cost in USD. Hardware configuration 1 featuring 4 processor cores and 7.5 GB of RAM was used for each compute execution.

**TABLE IV**

**INDUCTOR DESIGN PARAMETERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value Range</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core thickness, ( T_{core} )</td>
<td>( 1 \leq T_{core} \leq 50 )</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of turns, ( N_t )</td>
<td>( 1 \leq N_t \leq 75 )</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-gap length (normalised), ( L_{ag} )</td>
<td>( 0.01 \leq L_{ag} \leq 0.99 )</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active length, ( L_{act} )</td>
<td>( 1 \leq L_{act} \leq 300 )</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor current density, ( J_c )</td>
<td>( 1 \leq J_c \leq 40 )</td>
<td>A/mm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio, ( AR )</td>
<td>( 0.1 \leq AR \leq 10 )</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*refer to Figs. 3 and 4

**TABLE V**

**OPTIMISED INDUCTOR DESIGN PARAMETERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core thickness, ( T_{core} )</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of turns, ( N_t )</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air-gap length, ( L_{ag} )</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active length, ( L_{act} )</td>
<td>133.6</td>
<td>mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductor current density, ( J_c )</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>A/mm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio, ( AR )</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE VI**

**EXECUTION TIMES AND COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware Configuration</th>
<th>Execution Time (min)</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Processor Core</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Processor Cores</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Processor Cores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Processor Cores</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Simplified queueing algorithm used to execute the design tool in a cloud computing environment.
instance, Table II. The timing information was collected by recording the start and end time of each multi-physics analysis during each design tool evaluation, $N_{DTE}$, and averaging over the number of particles and generations. The timing data does not include the overheads incurred during the initialisation of the compute instances which are dependent on a number of factors including the desired hardware configuration, Table II, and resource availability. However, in this case they were relatively small compared to the overall computation time. The 150 design tool evaluations were completed in approximately 68 real-time hours translating to approximately 1688 compute hours at a cost of approximately 725 USD.

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Computation Time</th>
<th>Computation Cost [USD]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One particle</td>
<td>90 seconds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One generation</td>
<td>13.50 minutes</td>
<td>0.10 (36 particles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(36 particles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One optimised</td>
<td>11.25 hours</td>
<td>4.84 (50 generations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*assuming hardware configuration 1, Table II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Computation Time and Cost Reduction

The generation of a Pareto optimal set using the PSO algorithm is contingent on the stochastic nature of the PSO and performing a sufficiently large set of optimisations, [27], [28]. Hence this method is computationally inefficient and tends to result in a low quality approximation to the Pareto front, where the Pareto points are bunched close together, [27]. A Pareto set can be identified more efficiently using alternative optimisation techniques such as Differential Evolution, [4], or Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-II), [29] and can reduce both time and economic cost. Implementing such a change in optimisation approach would require the inductor model, Fig. 2, to be executed in the cloud, controlled by a local optimisation routine which would add significant complexity to the implementation. This
arrangement is adopted in [12], however, the numerical models are executed on a local distributed computing environment using a specialised compute job and resource management system, [15], [30].

V. Conclusion

In this paper, an existing power inductor design workflow, [17], is extended to enable parametric studies and design optimisation to be executed in a publicly accessible, pay-as-you-go cloud computing environment. The extension is demonstrated by the design optimisation of a filter inductor for an automotive application, Section IV. The optimisation is performed 150 times using 25 compute instances in parallel in order to generate a set of design candidates which meet the primary design drivers of inductance, energy density and maximum operating temperature, Table III. The mass and loss of each candidate design are compared, enabling a Pareto front to be identified, Fig. 10. This information is used to select a design that not only meets the inductance, energy density and temperature specification within 5 %, 1.7 % and 1.7 % respectively but enables the design with the best compromise between mass and loss to be selected.

The 150 design candidates were identified in approximately 68 hours, approximately 25 times faster than the existing workflow, at a cost of approximately 725 USD. Alternative optimisation methods could identify a Pareto front in a more robust and efficient manner, [4], [27], [29]. Adding compute resources using the simple algorithm presented here, Section III, accelerates the design development cycle and can allow a more thorough evaluation of the design space within a short time-frame, at a moderate cost and can potentially lead to improved designs. Multiple designs for different applications can be considered simultaneously and the optimisation procedures and modelling methods can be experimented with more quickly, enabling the design tools to be further developed and refined.
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