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Abstract—The end-winding region is usually overlooked in the roebel design of large AC machines. However, saturated stator slots cause overhang parts to impact the circulating currents significantly. In fact, a precise knowledge of the winding overhang strand inductances is crucial when optimising the transpositions of large roebel bars, especially in the case of under-roebeling (having less than 360-transposition in the active part) where the goal is to compensate the winding overhang parasitic field with the slot-parasitic field. In this paper, a rectangular inductance calculation model (R-ICM) is proposed. It results in a circuital lumped-element model (LEM) that takes the strand dimensions, the bar bending, as well as small-scale effects into account. Moreover, the work describes how to model finite current-carrying rectangular segments (straight and arced) from first principles. Finally, the methodology was demonstrated for two prototype specimens with different bending-shapes corresponding to the fundamental elements on a stator bar in the winding overhang of large electrical machines.

Index Terms—Circulating currents, inductance calculation, machine overhang, end-winding, stator bars, roebel bars.

I. INTRODUCTION

CIRCULATING currents are inevitably useless as they contribute to joule losses in electrical machines and are therefore a key challenge in winding design. These currents flow in a closed cycle between conducting bars that are separated into several parallel strands, which are used to reduce the eddy current losses in the conductors. However, the complexity in the calculation has been a major issue since their discovery.

The phenomenon was initially studied for turbo-generators in the 1970s, where there have been several cases of stator bar damages [1], [2]. The problem was mainly due to local overheating produced by circulating current losses. In the recent years, there have been plenty of efforts on the calculation, optimisation and detection of circulating currents in wide range of large AC machines [3]–[17]. The industry responded with patents for special transpositions that reduces these circulating current losses [18].

In order to improve the analysis of the stator armature, the strand slot-leakage reactance calculation has been proposed using analytical and numerical approaches [6]–[10]. In [15], a strand current measurement method based on a search coil was presented. Moreover, the finite element analysis (FEA) environment has been improved to include small-scale effects, transpositions, non-uniformities and inter-turn faults [19]–[24].

Usually, the non-saturated strand inductances in the active part are factor 10-20 times bigger than in the overhang of large AC machines [25]. Such conditions exist during the stator short-circuit measurement according to the IEC60034 standard, or in the approach of [15]. However, in nominal conditions, the strand inductance ratio usually drops by a factor 5-7 for doubly-fed induction machines (DFIMs) when the stator slots are saturated [25]. As a result, the winding overhang strand inductance has a significantly stronger influence on the circulating currents. Therefore, one has to rely on a precise strand inductance model of the end-winding to compute circulating current losses in nominal conditions, and thus, avoid any damaged bar due to local overheating.

The present methods to compute the strand inductances are based on a 2-D filament approach [11]–[14], which takes neither the bar bendings nor the exact strand dimensions into account. The inductances should reflect the bar geometry data since the magnetic field has a significant impact in the vicinity of the strands [25]. Moreover, a uniform definition of the return conductor seems to be lacking. In this article, a detailed overhang strand inductance model based on the partial inductance (PI) concept is proposed to overcome these obstacles. Using PIs, there is no need to define a return conductor anymore [25], as the exact strand geometry is inserted.

This paper is validated on two small-scale specimens of the two fundamental strand models, i.e., the straight and the arced configurations (depicted in Fig. 2). They correspond to the fundamental parts of any roebel bar in the winding overhang (refer to segments 4 and 5 of Fig 1). In this
experimental setup, the space between the conductor needed to be increased in comparison to a standard roebel bar. In this way, there is enough space to place the hall-sensors, thus enabling non-invasive measurement. It is worth noting that a direct series-resistance current measurement method would have significantly influenced the results. In fact, a small-scale model enables the study of different phenomena, such as the impact of internal field (as in this paper). Moreover, one could study the impact of an external field (e.g., the rotor field) or of a magnetizable iron. Such flexibility could not be achieved using a full-scale model. The chosen small-scale configuration allows analysing each impact separately so that the models can be validated with high accuracy. In addition, the small-scale models can also identify small-scale effects that are negligible in a full-scale model.

II. ELECTROMAGNETIC MODEL

Two different approaches are used to do the calculation of circulating currents in roebel bars: Namely, the direct calculation method (DCM) [26] and the inductance calculation method (ICM) [27]. In the DCM, a 3-D non-linear finite-difference (FD) calculation scheme is used to obtain the magnetic field at a given time, from which the circulating currents can be deduced. Induced voltages are computed for each time step, and they are used to solve a damper-bar type circuit with only resistive elements. In the ICM, the circulating currents are derived also solving a damper-bar type of circuit. It is composed by voltage sources \(u_i\), inductances \(L_{i,k}\) and resistances, with elements that can be obtained from an analytical calculation or numerical field calculation [1], [2], [25]. The main advantage of the ICM is to be able to identify the coupling between the different branches in the winding overhang of AC machines.

There will be no induced voltage \(u_i\) as there is no external flux source that interacts with the specimens (emulating the end-winding). The experimental results will be accessed against both the filament model (FM) [1], [2] and the rectangular model (RM) [25], which is the proposed novel model. Both models are based on the ICM, but they differ by the underlying hypothesis on the conductor path. In the FM, the conductors are seen as infinite with zero cross-sections, as a 2D approach. In the RM, the conductors are fully modelled using their complete and exact 3D geometry, making only a hypothesis on a constant current density within their cross-section. We expect to get significantly better results over a wide range of geometries with the RM approach. It incorporates the exact geometry to better account for the electromagnetic problem. The RM was initially developed in [25], where it has been shown that the detailed dimensions of the branches have a significant impact on the inductance components. This is based on the concept of partial inductance (PD) [28]–[30], whereas the subdivision of the inductance loops into fundamental parts (refer to Sec. II-A3) is arbitrary and has no influence on the mutual inductance [25].

A. Inductance calculation methodology for the RM method

Fig. 3 outlines a simplified ICM procedure with straight parallel branches. The different steps needed and the employed equations are detailed in this subsection. The methodology feeds inductance parameters into the lumped-element model (LEM), which are detailed in the following subsection.

Consequently, the inductances (e.g., \(L_{01,01}\), etc.) will be determined only on the branches as the branches will implicitly form loops as the circuit is closed to enable a current to flow. The inductances are computed using a 3D-volume iterative numerical quadrature scheme [25] to achieve a precision of around 100 times the machine precision on the computed inductances. Basically, the iterative numerical scheme is adjusting the number of sub-segments to be integrated as well as the order of the numerical quadrature until reaching the required numerical precision [25]. The inductance component \(L_{ik}\) (e.g., \(L_{01,02}\)) is computed using the following formula [31]

\[
L_{i,k} = \frac{1}{I} \int_{S_i} \int_{S_c} (<A_{ik}dS) \cdot d\mathbf{l}
\]

(1)

where the integration is first done over the surface \(S_i\) of the conductor (2mm x 8.75mm) and then over its length (156mm for straight branches). The index \(i\) represents the source conductor, while \(k\) corresponds to the conductor where the vector potential is applied. Consequently, the self-inductance is calculated when \(i = k\). For example, \(L_{01,01}\) refers to \(L_{i,k}\) and \(L_{k,i}\) term to take the inductance saturation into account [25].
the self-inductance of branch 1, whereas \( L_{11,11} \) is the self-
inductance of branch 11 and so on. The integration over the
surface (\( \int_S (A_i \cdot dS) \)) yields a prediction of the mean value
of the vector potential over the strand surface and enables,
therefore, to take the exact strand geometry into account.

The inductance components for the prototypes of Fig. 2
are found from analytical expressions for straight conductors,
and arced conductors, which are detailed in the following
paragraphs of this subsection, before the inductance cal-
cluation algorithm is described in the next subsection.

1) The Vector Potential from Straight Conductors: For a
straight conductor parallel to the z axis, with cross-section
\( (x_2 - x_1) \times (y_2 - y_1) \) (x and y can be chosen arbitrary, for
example 2 mm x 8.75 mm), length \( (z_2 - z_1) \) (for example
156 mm) and assuming a constant current density\(^2\) in positive
z direction\(^3\), the vector potential formula for a unitary current
can be taken from [32]. It is recalled hereafter that the
vector potential originating from the current flowing in one
individual branch to be

\[
A_z(x, y, z) = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi} \sum_{i,j,k=1}^{2} \left( (-1)^{i+j+k} [x_i y_j \arcsinh(\theta_1) + y_j z_k \arcsinh(\theta_2) + z_k x_i \arcsinh(\theta_3) - \frac{1}{2} (x_i^2 \arctan(\theta_4) + y_j^2 \arctan(\theta_5) + z_k^2 \arctan(\theta_6))] \right)
\]

where \( \theta_1 = \frac{\varphi_2 - \varphi_1}{\gamma_{2j}} \), \( \theta_2 = \frac{\varphi_2}{\gamma_{1j}} \), \( \theta_3 = \frac{\varphi_1}{\gamma_{1j}} \), \( \theta_4 = \frac{z_k - z}{w_j} \), \( \theta_5 = \frac{y_j}{w_j} \), \( \theta_6 = \frac{x_i}{w_j} \), with \( \alpha_{ij}^2 = u_i^2 + v_i^2 \), \( \beta_{ij}^2 = v_i^2 + w_j^2 \), \( \gamma_{ij}^2 = w_i^2 + u_i^2 \), \( u_i = x_i - x \), \( v_j = y_j - y \), \( w_k = z_k - z \), \( i, j, k = 1, 2 \) and \( J \) is the current of the conductor.

Fig. 3 depicts the source conductor where the different
geometrical indexes are applied to x, y and z coordinates.

2) The Vector Potential from Arced Conductors: In the
case of an arced conductor oriented along the tangential axis,
with a rectangular cross-section \( (r_2 - r_1) \times (z_2 - z_1) \), length
\( (\phi_2 - \phi_1) \) and assuming a constant current density\(^4\) in positive
tangential direction, the formula for the vector potentials
can be taken from [25], [33], using a similar procedure as
for straight conductors. Eq. (3) and eq. (27) of [33] yields
\( A_r \) and \( A_\varphi \), whereas the arced current density is in the
\( \varphi \)-direction. The transformation between local and global
coordinates makes both \( A_r \) and \( A_\varphi \) necessary for eq. (1).

3) Inductance calculation algorithm: The full geometry
of the branched circuit must be known. The inductance
calculation is done proceeding in the following way.
1) Divide the circuit into straight and arced parts, i.e.,
fundamental parts (refer to Figs. 2 and 5).
2) Define for each fundamental part in a local coordinate
system, as the vector potential formulas of subsections
II-A1 and II-A2 are given in local coordinates.
3) Define the coordinate transformation from the local
coordinate system to the global coordinate system,
where the inductances are computed.
4) Choose a conductor where the inductance must be
computed and a source conductor.
5) Compute the inductance applying eq. (1) and using the
adaptive numerical quadrature algorithm to achieve
sufficient precision.
6) Repeat 4) and 5) until all individual inductance rela-
tionships between the branches have been computed.

B. Lumped-element model (LEM)

Once all inductances have been calculated, a circuit equa-
tion solver like SIMSEN\(^5\) is used to compute the circulating
currents. The circuit corresponding to the experimental setup
(see Fig. 2a) is depicted in Fig. 5. This circuit is adapted
accordingly for the second experimental setup (see Fig. 2b).
The equivalent circuit is composed of 15 linked inductors. A
15x15 inductance matrix presented in Table I). The current
source is modelled using a voltage source VS1 (with a
sinusoidal feeding at 50 Hz) with a 1000 k\( \Omega \) series resistor \( R_1 \).
The current feeding and return branch of the current can be
neglected from the equivalent circuit. The experimental setup
has been intentionally designed (long straight cables) to annul
the impact of the feeding on the experiment.

At first glance, the computation model is composed of
elements (straight bars) without considering the bar junctions

\(^2\) In other words neglecting the skin effect.
\(^3\) As the vector potential is linked to the current density by a laplacian-
operator, they are co-linear.
\(^4\) I.e., neglecting the skin effect.
\(^5\) https://simsen.epfl.ch.
1. For parasitic length $l_R$ of the rectangular conductor ($w$ section of the rectangular conductor) the cross-section of these ohmic resistances is equal to the cross-section of the equivalent resistance in the X-crossing is half of the conductor width ($w$). It postulates that a leading order of the equivalent resistance in the X-crossing is half of the conductor width. The same principle is applied for $l_T$. The resistance components with and without parasitic add-ons are depicted in Table II.

$$l_R = \frac{w}{2} + \frac{1}{r} \int_0^w \frac{\pi}{2} r dr = \frac{w}{2} + \frac{\pi}{4} w = 11.247 \text{ mm}, \quad (3)$$

$$l_T = \frac{w}{2} = 4.375 \text{ mm}, \quad (4)$$

$$l_X = \frac{w}{2} = 4.375 \text{ mm}. \quad (5)$$

For parasitic length $l_R$, the whole edge length was considered (as indicated in Fig. 4). The mean arch length was calculated plus an additional experience-based length ($w/2$) added to take into account the non-uniform current density. The corner yields a mathematical singularity from an analytical point of view, i.e., the additional path length must be approximated numerically. For $l_X$, the numerical value corresponds to half of the conductor width ($w$). It postulates that a leading order of the equivalent resistance in the X-crossing is half of the conductor width. The same principle is applied for $l_T$. The resistance components with and without parasitic add-ons are depicted in Table II.

### Table II: Straight circuit: Normalized DC-resistive components for Fig. 4 with 210.405 $\mu\Omega$ base (with & without parasitic adds). An FEA study showed that the resistance increase due to eddy currents as well as proximity effect could be neglected due to the surrounding of air and the distance between conductors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R01</th>
<th>R02</th>
<th>R03</th>
<th>R04</th>
<th>R05</th>
<th>R06</th>
<th>R07</th>
<th>R08</th>
<th>R09</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>R11</th>
<th>R12</th>
<th>R13</th>
<th>R14</th>
<th>R15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With adds</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adds</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: Upper edge segment of the specimens indicating shaded areas for straight bars and bar junctions. Different junction segments (R, T and X) with their associated resistive parasitic networks are depicted. The corner yields a mathematical singularity from an analytical point of view, i.e., the additional path length must be approximated numerically. For $l_X$, the numerical value corresponds to half of the conductor width ($w$). It postulates that a leading order of the equivalent resistance in the X-crossing is half of the conductor width. The same principle is applied for $l_T$. The resistance components with and without parasitic add-ons are depicted in Table II.

### III. Experimental Calibration

The current measurements were indirectly obtained from special uniaxial hall sensors (one per leg). The arrangement made non-invasive measurements possible. They convert the current-sourced magnetic fields into measurable voltages (by the hall effect). All the cables are twisted and shielded. Moreover, each hall sensor has a separate DC current source. The AC current measurement is indirect. As a result, the experimental precision is predicated on their calibration.

In the calibration process (identical for each circuit), each individual branches were fed with known AC sinusoidal current (varying from 5A to 60A) at 50Hz. This was achieved practically by opening the screws and insulating the current from flowing in the other branches. In this way, the induced voltages in each branch are recorded. This information is gathered and utilized to obtain a vector that relates the coupling between a current of a branch and the voltage recordings of the hall sensor in all other branches. Repeating this step for all branches leads to an experimental transfer matrix, exhibiting the couplings in the circuit. As a result, the matrix can be used to compute the branch currents as a function of the measured induced voltages in the hall sensors (due to the linearity of the circuit).

---

6 Melexis MLX91205 AAH-003 and AAL-003.
In a second step, the precision of the measurement is determined using an alternative circuit configuration and the experimental transfer matrix. The circuit presented in Fig. 5 is fed applying known AC-current into the branches 1 to 7, with some branches being isolated. First, the symmetrical branches 1 and 7 are fed exclusively. Then, branches 2 and 6, and branches 3 and 5, are fed in a similar way. Finally, branch 4 is fed, with all the others being isolated. The same procedure is done for the arced circuit, feeding branches 1 and 6, 2 and 5, and 3 and 4, respectively. It is reasonably postulated that the current ideally must be the same in each symmetric branch (constant current source). The results of the pairwise experiments are shown in tables III (for the straight circuit) and table IV (for the arced circuit). In fact, the current should be ideally zero for the isolated branches. The current amplitude should match with the one measured with a high-precision current probe. The differences between the probe and the ones computed using the transfer matrix and the hall sensors yield the measurement precision. Moreover, the threshold current can be determined from the maximal value of current calculated from the isolated branches.

For the straight circuit, the determined mean measurement precision is around 3.2% with the highest error for the hall sensor of leg number 7. The “threshold” current is around 1.5A, i.e., the maximum non-zero current obtained for the isolated branches yielding minimal current that can be determined using the indirect (non-invasive) current measurement method.

For the arced circuit, there are two outliers with a significant error (one overestimation and one underestimation). The mean precision is about 3.1% for all results. It should be noted that the threshold current is about 2.5A, i.e., higher than for the straight circuit. In fact, the arc portion has a negative impact on the magnetic field sensed by the hall sensors. The impact can only be partially removed by the calibration process.

It is very important to notice that the main goal of the calibration process it helps to remove the impact of the not perfectly aligned circuits and hall sensors as well as any other external impact on the measurement.

### TABLE III: Straight circuit (depicted in Fig. 2a) : Pairwise cross-check of symmetrical branch currents $I_1$ & $I_7$, $I_2$ & $I_6$, $I_3$ & $I_5$ and $I_4$ (other legs isolated) against injected current $I_{tot}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Legs 1 &amp; 7</th>
<th>Legs 2 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Legs 3 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Leg 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I_1$</td>
<td>33.844 A</td>
<td>1.393 A</td>
<td>1.333 A</td>
<td>1.470 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_2$</td>
<td>0.530 A</td>
<td>31.794 A</td>
<td>0.508 A</td>
<td>0.457 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_3$</td>
<td>0.167 A</td>
<td>0.168 A</td>
<td>30.144 A</td>
<td>0.179 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_4$</td>
<td>1.217 A</td>
<td>1.326 A</td>
<td>1.617 A</td>
<td>57.023 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_5$</td>
<td>1.054 A</td>
<td>0.834 A</td>
<td>30.153 A</td>
<td>1.278 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_6$</td>
<td>0.680 A</td>
<td>31.357 A</td>
<td>0.795 A</td>
<td>0.721 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_7$</td>
<td>30.625 A</td>
<td>0.228 A</td>
<td>0.084 A</td>
<td>0.042 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_1 + ... + I_7$</td>
<td>68.127 A</td>
<td>67.100 A</td>
<td>64.633 A</td>
<td>61.740 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{tot}$ (injected)</td>
<td>65.523 A</td>
<td>64.549 A</td>
<td>62.473 A</td>
<td>58.314 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{tot}/2$</td>
<td>32.762 A</td>
<td>32.275 A</td>
<td>31.237 A</td>
<td>58.314 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error</strong></td>
<td><strong>1st leg</strong></td>
<td><strong>2nd leg</strong></td>
<td><strong>3rd leg</strong></td>
<td><strong>4th leg</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$+3.303%$</td>
<td>$-1.489%$</td>
<td>$-3.498%$</td>
<td>$-1.185%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-6.523%$</td>
<td>$-2.843%$</td>
<td>$-3.472%$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. MAIN RESULTS

The objective of the small-scale experiments was to assess the resistive effects from the current magnitudes and the inductive effects from the phase shifts between the strand currents fed with a sinusoidal current source at 50Hz. Both circuits were made of copper, and they were surrounded by air (linear environment), implying a reduced inductive effect. As a result, both inductive and resistive effects could be observed in the model assessment. The remainder of this section presents the main experimental results and validations.
TABLE IV: Arced circuit (depicted in Fig. 2b): Pairwise cross-check of symmetrical branch currents $I_1$ & $I_6$, $I_2$ & $I_5$ and $I_3$ & $I_4$ (other legs isolated) against injected current $I_{tot}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Legs 1 &amp; 6</th>
<th>Legs 2 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Legs 3 &amp; 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I_1$</td>
<td>32.572 A</td>
<td>1.397 A</td>
<td>1.199 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_2$</td>
<td>1.152 A</td>
<td>28.774 A</td>
<td>1.318 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_3$</td>
<td>1.546 A</td>
<td>1.470 A</td>
<td>30.799 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_4$</td>
<td>1.859 A</td>
<td>1.972 A</td>
<td>30.586 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_5$</td>
<td>2.150 A</td>
<td>30.665 A</td>
<td>1.923 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_6$</td>
<td>29.691 A</td>
<td>2.470 A</td>
<td>2.471 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_1 + ... + I_6$</td>
<td>66.820 A</td>
<td>66.748 A</td>
<td>68.296 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{tot}$ (injected)</td>
<td>63.660 A</td>
<td>61.912 A</td>
<td>62.411 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{tot}/2$</td>
<td>31.830 A</td>
<td>30.596 A</td>
<td>31.205 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error 1st leg</td>
<td>+2.331%</td>
<td>-5.955%</td>
<td>-1.301%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error 2nd leg</td>
<td>-6.720%</td>
<td>+0.225%</td>
<td>-1.984%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Validation of the Circuital Model

First, a one-half period of the simulated current (with and without resistive adds) is assessed against the measurements. Theoretically, one would expect that the currents in branches 1 and 7, 2 and 6, and 3 and 5 to be the same. Fig. 6 shows excellent agreement for branches 2, 4, 5 and 6. However, there are more discrepancies for branches 1, 3 and 7. Fig. 7 depicts that six branch currents out of seven are within the measurement tolerances when using the additional parasitic resistances in the model. Only branch 4 remains outside. In fact, the measured currents seem to be in the middle of both models.

It must be stated that the presented measurement is nothing else than a short-circuit measurement where any piece of resistance and inductance will heavily influence the result. It is therefore straightforward that even small parametric errors in the model will have a significant impact on the calculated values. The additional parasitic resistances in the computational model improved the predictability, without clearing out all possible errors. In fact, the T-crossings (refer to the “T” in Fig. 4) cannot be modelled in detail using the LEM circuit. As a result, a smaller precision cannot be achieved for this particular crossing with the accessible LEM methodologies.

B. Model Sensitivity to the Current Feeding Point

There is a need to do a richer sensitivity study of the model against experiments, to highlight all possible mismatches. Therefore, an additional measurement series have been performed, modifying the location of the current feeding point. Fig. 5 depicts the circuit when the current is fed in and out of the nodes associated with leg 4 (center node). Alternatively, the nodes of legs 2, 3, 5 and 6 have been tested as feeding points as well. The study was performed using current clamps to change the current feeding location. The results of these measurements are shown in Table V. The precision (1.5 A) causes the legs with the least current to have the highest error. As a result, some extreme cases occurred for some of the non-symmetrical test (feeding nodes of leg 2 or leg 3). However, the biggest errors were not exceeding the measurement precision (found in Sec. III).

For the other branches, it seems that there is a correlation between the feeding branch and an error minimum (taking the measurement error into account), which could be interpreted as a positive sign that supports the proposed T- and X-crossing add-on to the LEM model resistive components (as highlighted in Fig. 3 and Table II).

C. The proposed RM vs. the FM

Fig. 8 depicts the calculated branch currents using the FM and compares with the values from the RM developed in this paper. The currents computed with the FM present no symmetry since distance with respect to the return conductor has no symmetry; thus, the inductances are asymmetric as well as the currents. In addition, the return conductor is arbitrarily placed near conductor 1 (8.75 mm to the left of conductor 1, same y coordinate and length as conductor 1). As a result, the value predicted for this branch is far away from reality. Similarly, if the return conductor would have been placed near another conductor, then the current of the nearest
The presented problems with the FM approach is avoided by the RM presented in this paper. As seen, only three currents agree with the measurements using the FM. The predictability below the best case using the RM. Due to its symmetry problem, the FM has not been enhanced to take the edge and T-crossing into account. The FM generates significantly less precise results than with the RM presented in this paper.

Figs. 9 and 10 presents a comparison between the amplitude of the measured circulating currents and the computed ones using different computational models: 1) Rectangular model [RM - This Work]; 2) Filament model [FM - Ref. [2]]; 3) Resistive circuit [R only]; 4) Resistive circuit with additional elements [R only w/ add]. The FM generates outliers due to the position of the return conductor. Moreover, the FM exhibits significantly higher differences with the measurements compared to the other models and will, therefore, be left out for further comparisons. The "R only w/ add" has a slightly better match with the measurements, exhibiting a Poisson distribution of the differences. However, this primitive model cannot predict the phase of the currents. The phase shift in the currents is depicted in Fig. 6.

Fig. 11 assesses the measured circulating currents the proposed Rm with and without resistive adds. It must be emphasized that the RM with additional elements generates in

---

### TABLE V: Straight circuit: Sensitivity to the current feeding location on the model error (highest branch current highlighted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Leg 2 Value</th>
<th>Leg 3 Value</th>
<th>Leg 3 Error [%]</th>
<th>Leg 4 Value</th>
<th>Leg 5 Value</th>
<th>Leg 5 Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>13.357 A</td>
<td>9.106 A</td>
<td>-2.10%</td>
<td>6.276 A</td>
<td>4.562 A</td>
<td>-1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>14.157 A</td>
<td>10.356 A</td>
<td>-1.47%</td>
<td>7.358 A</td>
<td>5.282 A</td>
<td>-1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>16.810 A</td>
<td>11.405 A</td>
<td>-0.96%</td>
<td>7.809 A</td>
<td>5.608 A</td>
<td>-1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>16.024 A</td>
<td>11.515 A</td>
<td>+0.88%</td>
<td>7.741 A</td>
<td>5.283 A</td>
<td>+0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>11.296 A</td>
<td>10.183 A</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
<td>10.128 A</td>
<td>7.211 A</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>11.407 A</td>
<td>10.687 A</td>
<td>-3.30%</td>
<td>10.474 A</td>
<td>7.162 A</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>7.759 A</td>
<td>10.183 A</td>
<td>+2.85%</td>
<td>13.827 A</td>
<td>10.075 A</td>
<td>-5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>8.227 A</td>
<td>10.687 A</td>
<td>-5.08%</td>
<td>13.827 A</td>
<td>10.695 A</td>
<td>-5.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>5.581 A</td>
<td>7.289 A</td>
<td>+2.46%</td>
<td>11.129 A</td>
<td>14.709 A</td>
<td>+5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>5.304 A</td>
<td>7.114 A</td>
<td>-1.50%</td>
<td>10.283 A</td>
<td>13.998 A</td>
<td>+5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>4.369 A</td>
<td>5.590 A</td>
<td>-2.46%</td>
<td>8.326 A</td>
<td>12.423 A</td>
<td>+12.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>3.605 A</td>
<td>4.613 A</td>
<td>+1.40%</td>
<td>6.293 A</td>
<td>9.014 A</td>
<td>+7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>3.645 A</td>
<td>4.568 A</td>
<td>-1.40%</td>
<td>5.638 A</td>
<td>8.405 A</td>
<td>+12.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tot</td>
<td>Simulated</td>
<td>62.783 A</td>
<td>91.128 A</td>
<td>+0.32%</td>
<td>62.665 A</td>
<td>62.465 A</td>
<td>+0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>61.689 A</td>
<td>91.128 A</td>
<td>-1.43%</td>
<td>62.665 A</td>
<td>62.465 A</td>
<td>+0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Injected</td>
<td>62.583 A</td>
<td>62.984 A</td>
<td>-0.53%</td>
<td>62.656 A</td>
<td>62.327 A</td>
<td>+1.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Fig. 8: Straight circuit: Branch current vs Total current in comparison with filament model (FM) [2] with this study.

---

Fig. 9: Straight circuit: Bar graph of the branch current amplitude, comparison between different models.
all cases a smaller difference to the measurements. It seems that the phase error increases with increased distance from the current feeding point (as also highlighted in Table V). The main results show that the additional elements have a positive impact on the calculation of both the amplitude and the phase shift on the computed circulating currents.

D. Additional Considerations from the Arced Circuit

Fig. 12 depicts the main results from the investigations of the arced circuit. Without any additional resistance, only two branch currents are inside the measurement tolerance (neglecting branch 6 due to its significant error). With the additional resistances, four branch currents are inside, and the last two are much closer to the measurements. As a result, the positive impact of the additional elements into the RM model is demonstrated.

Fig. 13 presents a similar assessment of the arced circuit as for the straight circuit in Fig. 10. The additional elements reduced the difference between the computed and the measured amplitudes significantly.

V. Conclusion

This paper presents and validates a novel winding overhang strand inductance model that takes the strand dimensions and bar bending into account and get rid of the return conductor. A comparison with existing models shows its significant enhancement in numerical precision. The opportunities and limitations of the lumped-element model (LEM) have been demonstrated experimentally in the small-scale case. In our case, the dimensions of the connection point are comparable to the strand dimensions. Additional parasitic resistance elements have been proposed and validated experimentally to increase the domain of use of LEMs in circulating current prediction of AC machines.

The experimental setup highlights the importance of precise and complete inductive-resistive model to achieve a high fidelity agreement between the measurements and the simulations. In fact, the circulating current calculation is nothing else than a short-circuit current calculation. Moreover, the skin effect and the proximity effect may also impact the
measurement. However, this effect was not quantified in detail for this contribution. Future efforts will handle the remaining peculiarities and differences between the simulation and the measurement. One approach would be to work on other LEM-based extensions. Moreover, a second generation of an arced conductor experimental device having longer arc-lengths will be designed to obtain better results for arc-shaped segments.
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