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Current Distribution and Anode Potential Modelling in Battery Modules with a Real-World Busbar System

Yaxing Ren, Kailong Liu, Member, IEEE, Thomas Grandjean, W. Dhammika Widanage, Member, IEEE, James Marco

Abstract — The performance of a lithium-ion battery pack is not only related to the behavior of the individual cells within the pack, but also presents a strong interdependency with the temperature distributions, interconnect resistance between cells, and the cell’s physical location within the complete battery pack. This paper develops representative busbar circuits with different fidelities to simulate the behavior of cells within a battery module and analyses the influence of cell-to-cell heat transfer and interconnect resistance on the distribution of cell current and anode potential in a battery module. This work investigates multi-physics interactions within the battery module, including cells, interconnect resistances, and temperature distributions, while analyzing the lithium plating problem at the module level. Specifically, the cell model used in this study is a validated thermally coupled single-particle model with electrolyte, and the battery module uses a commercially representative busbar design to include 30-cells in parallel. The effects of parameter changes within the battery pack on individual cells are simulated and analyzed. The study highlights that some cells in the battery module would present a higher risk of lithium plating during fast-charge conditions as they experience a lower anode potential during the charge events.

Index Terms — Current inhomogeneity, busbar design, current distribution, lithium plating, interconnect resistance, cell-to-cell heat transfer

MATHEMATICAL NOTATION

- $l$ Applied current [A]
- $V_t$ Terminal voltage [V]
- $\phi_a^+$ Solid electric anode potential [V]
- $\phi_a^-$ Solid electric cathode potential [V]
- $U^\pm$ Open circuit potential [V]
- $\eta^\pm$ Over-potential [V]
- $\phi_e^{+,-}$ Electrolyte electric potential [V]
- $c_{ss}^+$ Lithium concentration in solid phase at particle surface [mol m$^{-3}$]
- $i_d^\pm$ Exchange current density [A m$^{-2}$]
- $T$ Cell temperature [K]
- $T_{amb}$ Ambient temperature [K]
- $\theta$ Volumetric heat capacity of the cell [J m$^{-3}$ K$^{-1}$]
- $h$ Convective heat transfer coefficient [W m$^{-2}$ K$^{-1}$]
- $A$ Cooling surface area of the cell [m$^2$]

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the demand for electrical energy storage has increased significantly with the popularity of intermittent renewable energy and electric vehicles (EVs). Lithium-ion (Li-ion) batteries, currently the most power-dense and commercially mature electrical energy storage technology, have become the dominant choice for power transmission systems [1-3]. In order to meet the mileage requirements of EVs, the power battery is usually composed of hundreds of cells in series and parallel configuration [4, 5]. A variety of factors can cause variations in cell current, temperature, and capacity within parallel-connected battery modules, such as cell manufacturing variability, busbar interconnect resistances and poorly designed thermal management systems [6-8]. In parallel strings, cells with different internal resistances caused by non-ideal busbar design and cell-to-cell temperature variations cause the cells with lower internal resistance to discharge at higher currents and hence generate more heat due to the current inhomogeneity [9, 10]. The variation in cell-to-cell resistance and thermal uniformity limits the total energy capacity of the battery pack, resulting in reduced driving range and divergence of individual cell state of health (SoH) [11-13].

In real EV applications, due to the complexity and cost of installing current sensors in each parallel string, battery management systems (BMS) generally do not monitor the current variation between paralleled cells nor measure the current and temperature of each cell [14]. In this context, the current and temperature sensors are only positioned at strategic locations within the battery pack [15-17]. In addition to this, many recent studies have found that the loss of lithium inventory (LLI) due to lithium plating would greatly reduce the available energy capacity of the battery [18]. But most studies on lithium plating have been undertaken in the context of single...
cells [19-21] without considering the lithium plating problem in battery modules or packs. In a battery pack, the busbar interconnect resistances on the busbar affect the current distribution in the parallel strings that in turn cause parameter variations across the cells, and eventually manifests more obvious inhomogeneities at the system level [22-24]. Therefore, it is critical to understand the impact of busbar design on current distribution as well as variations in state of charge (SoC), temperature and the potential for lithium plating of cells within parallel strings of battery packs.

To date, only a small number of studies have examined imbalance scenarios based on battery pack models in parallel configurations, and most of these studies have tested or simulated the battery pack consisting of small strings, i.e. only 4-10 cells in parallel [23, 24]. It should be noted that in real EV applications, there are usually more than 30 cells within a module [22]. The limited studies on battery pack degradation have only considered simple one-dimensional Z- or Ladder-configuration connections [25], rather than the real-word cell arrangements used in commercial battery assemblies. Furthermore, in many studies that analyzed the effect of interconnect resistance ($R_{IC}$) between cells, the value of $R_{IC}$ is usually obtained by measuring the hand soldering resistance in the laboratory [26]. The differences in resistance values between commercial battery busbars and laboratory-based prototypes hand-soldering $R_{IC}$ can greatly affect the relevance and reliability of these research results. At the time of writing, there are no studies in literature which analyze the effects of busbar interconnect resistance on current distribution that include cell-to-cell heat transfer and consider lithium plating within a battery pack with parallel strings. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to predict the current, temperature, SoC, and electrode potentials of each cell within a battery module for mitigating lithium plating conditions by simulating the interactions and heat transfer between the cells and the busbar.

This paper develops models with different fidelity busbar circuit models to simulate the current distribution in a battery module with 30 cells in parallel, and studies the influence of different factors on the current inhomogeneity and anode potential distribution of cells within a representative battery module, making it possible to estimate the lithium plating of individual cells in battery packs. To make the analysis results more relevant to real world usage, the busbar circuit used in this study is from a representative commercial battery module, and the thermally coupled single-particle model used to accurately estimate battery lithium plating within the battery pack has been validated with experimental data developed in [27, 28]. Specifically, the main contributions of this work are as follows: 1) Based on the busbar of a commercial battery pack, the busbar circuit models with different fidelity levels are developed and compared with the finite element method model for verification. 2) Compared with previous works where the battery modules are assumed as a simplified ideal parallel or series arrangement, this work investigates multi-physics interactions within the battery module, including cells, interconnect resistances, and temperature distributions. 3) The lithium plating problems are analyzed at the module level, including the influence of different interconnect resistances on the anode potential distribution of cells, and the cells with higher risk of lithium plating in the battery module.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 details the development of electrochemical cell model, the busbar of the battery module, and thermal model for heat transfer between cells, followed by the description of battery module parameterization process in Section 3. Section 4 presents the result and discussion of cell current, SoC, temperature, anode potential distribution. Section 5 presents the conclusions and further work of this research.

II. MODEL DEVELOPMENT

A. Electrochemical cell model

To account for each cell’s dynamic behavior, the pack model used in this study consists of a combination of single cell submodels. There are two main types of single-cell battery models, namely equivalent circuit models (ECM) and physical based electrochemical models. ECMs are not suitable for our application as they do not contain information about the anode potential required for lithium plating considerations. In order to access unmeasurable physical variables of the cells, the electrochemical model can enable more accurate state estimation [29]. As such, a Thermally-coupled Single Particle Model with electrolyte (TSPMe) is adopted to simulate the performance of individual cells. Terminal voltage, $V(t)$, is calculated by [27]:

$$V(t) = \phi^+(t) - \phi^-(t)$$  (1)

where $\phi^+(t)$ and $\phi^-(t)$ represent the cathode (positive) and anode (negative) potentials, respectively. The cathode and anode potentials can be expressed as the sum of the open-circuit voltage (OCV), $U^\pm$, overpotential, $\eta^\pm$, and electrolyte potential, $\phi^\pm$, as follows:

$$\phi^\pm(t) = U^\pm(c_{SS}^\pm(t)) + \eta^\pm(t) + \phi^\pm(t)$$  (2)

where

$$\phi^+(t) = \frac{1}{\text{F}} \int_{L_n-L_p}^{L_p} \left(1 - t + \frac{2RT}{F} \log \left(\frac{c_{S_L}(x,t)}{c_{SS}}\right) - \frac{i_L(x,t)}{a_n c_{S_L}(x,t)} \right) \text{d}x$$  (3)

$$\phi^-(t) = \frac{1}{\text{F}} \int_0^{L_n} \left(1 - t + \frac{2RT}{F} \log \left(\frac{c_{S_L}(x,t)}{c_{SS}}\right) - \frac{i_L(x,t)}{a_p c_{S_L}(x,t)} \right) \text{d}x$$  (4)

$$\eta^+(t) = \frac{2RT(1 - t)}{F} \int_{L_n-L_p}^{L_p} \sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{F\sigma^+(x,t)}{a_ne_L(x,t)}\right) \text{d}x$$  (5)

$$\eta^-(t) = \frac{2RT(1 - t)}{F} \int_0^{L_n} \sinh^{-1}\left(\frac{F\sigma^-(x,t)}{a_p e_L(x,t)}\right) \text{d}x$$  (6)

where $L_n$, $L_p$, $a_n$, and $a_p$ are the thickness and surface area density of negative and positive electrodes, respectively. $L$ is the total cell thickness. $R$ is the universal gas constant and $F$ is the Faraday constant. $B(x)$ is the geometric factor. $\sigma^+$ is the ionic conductivity of the electrolyte. $c_{SS}$ is the lithium-ion concentration in the electrolyte. $i_L$ is the current in the electrolyte. $j_{SS}^\pm$ is the exchange current density that can be presented as:

$$j_{SS}^\pm = m \frac{e_c c_{SS}^\pm}{c_{SS}^{\pm max} - c_{SS}^\pm}$$  (7)
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where \( c_{\text{Li}^+} \) indicates the concentration of lithium-ion in solid surface, \( c_{\text{Li}^+}^{\text{max}} \) is the maximum concentration in the electrode, \( m \) is the intercalation reaction rate.

![Fig. 1. Modelling of busbar: (a) Traditional Z- or Ladder-configuration; (b) Commercial battery module with cells, connectivity tabs and busbar.](image)

The thermodynamic OCV in the TSPMe model is a function of Li-ion concentration on the surface of the electrodes, which is defined by a mathematical fit to experimental data of voltage and lithium concentration. The OCV is related to the electrode material and the manufacturing process of the cell. It is generally unique to the type, capacity and brand of the target cell and difficult to express in a unified formula. The fitted mathematical equation of OCV used in this study refers to the result in the previous published work [27, 28] and the detailed boundary conditions can also be found from those publications.

This information will therefore not be duplicated here.

The thermal behavior of Li-ion cell is given by:

\[
\theta \frac{dT}{dt} = I(t) \cdot (V_e(t) - U(t) + U(t)) - h A (T(t) - T_{\text{amb}}(t))
\]

where \( T \) is the average temperature of the cell, \( \theta \) is the volumetric heat capacity of the cell, \( h \) is the convective heat transfer coefficient, \( A \) is the cooling surface area of the cell, and \( T_{\text{amb}}(t) \) is the ambient temperature.

**B. Busbar topology of the battery module**

Typically in literature, the cell connections are assumed to be one-dimensional connections in a simplified Z-configuration or a Ladder-configuration [22], as shown in Fig. 1 (a). This assumption is not sufficient to accurately simulate the current distribution in a production grade battery module.

As this paper aims to simulate the current distribution in a battery module and its impact on the homogeneity of cell degradation on the basis of a realistic commercial busbar design, this paper adopts the real commercial busbar design from practical applications in order to make the work and its conclusion more realistic. To explore the effects of cell-to-cell variation and thermal gradients on battery pack performance, the commercially representative busbar model from a production EV is used. The commercial busbar is designed considering not only the current input and output direction, but also more complex indices, such as welding, fixing and cooling of cells within the real commercial battery pack. The structure of the battery module is shown in Fig. 1 (b). The battery module is comprised of 30 cells in parallel, and is connected by positive/negative busbars, welded lattices and connectivity resistors.

Detailed parameters of the welding process can be found in [30]. For this commercial battery module, 30 cells are divided into 5 columns, while each column consists of 6 single cells arranged in a straight line.

Three different representations of the busbar equivalent circuit (shown in Fig. 2) are proposed in order to investigate the trade-off between model fidelity and the ability to accurately represent individual cell currents and internal states (e.g. SoC).

In the first representation, EC1, shown in Fig. 2 (a), all the cells are ideally connected in parallel, with no interconnect resistance \( R_{IC} \) between the cells. This configuration ignores the influence of \( R_{IC} \) in the busbar on the current distribution, which allows the influence of the battery thermal effects on current distribution to be studied independent from \( R_{IC} \).

In the second configuration, EC2, the \( R_{IC} \) between columns are considered and shown as black resistors in Fig. 2 (b). However, the \( R_{IC} \) within each column is ignored. Therefore, EC2 is equivalent to a one-dimensional structure due to the \( R_{IC} \) between columns. Most of the previous work in the literature is based on this assumption. The black resistors represent the lateral equivalent \( R_{IC} \) on the battery busbar, and the current flowing through it can be used to represent the current distribution on the busbar. Since commercial busbars are designed to use the least amount of material while meeting the strength and robustness requirements, some metal materials in non-critical positions will be removed to save manufacturing costs. Therefore, when simulating a real commercial busbar, the last column on the right side has only 5 equivalent resistors, while the busbars between other columns have 6 equivalent resistors.

The most complex circuit is EC3, which takes into account the interconnect resistances in both rows and columns based on the geometric connection of each cell in the battery module. It can be found that each individual cell between the row and column has a unique \( R_{IC} \) value illustrated as black resistors. In the real commercial busbar, due to the different shapes and
temperatures on different part of the busbar, the interconnect resistances are different and time-varying. However, these differences are difficult to simulate accurately. Due to the staggered arrangement of the batteries, the interconnection resistances on the busbar are arranged in a hexagonal, like a honeycomb shape. Considering that the material and thickness of the busbars are consistent, and each side of the hexagon is approximately the same length, it is assumed that the resistance values of the six interconnect resistors (represented by black resistors) around each cell in Fig. 2 (c) are all the same. The ohmic resistance value of the metal material is linearly related to the surface temperature. However, due to the small temperature variation range between the cells considered in this paper, the variation range of the resistance at different positions on the busbar affected by temperature can be ignored. Therefore, this paper does not consider the influence of temperature on the change of the \( R_{IC} \) value on the busbar.

The welding resistances between each cell and the busbar are shown as blue resistors, whose value highly depends on the quality of the welding process [30] and is assumed to be the same for all cells. Therefore, the welding resistances are independently increased for each cell. Its resistance value will not affect the current distribution in the battery module. Therefore, this paper only discusses the influence of interconnect resistance on the busbar and the influence of welding resistance is not discussed.

C. Heat transfer between cells

To study the effects of cell physical location within the battery module on each cell’s individual temperature, the heat transfer between the cells is considered. In commercial battery packs, there is no direct contact between cells. The heat transfer between cells is mainly the convective heat transfer through the side surface of cells and small air gap between cells. The cell terminals are connected to the busbar by welding, so heat can also be transferred via heat conduction through the busbar. In the literature, in addition to surface cooling, there are also terminal cooling configurations [31]. However, the surface of terminal cooling only accounts small amount compared with the side surface of cell, and it will be a challenge for the battery terminals to represent not only the electrical but also the thermal interface [31]. Therefore, the terminal cooling configuration needs further studies before it can become the main cooling configuration. Based on this consideration, this paper only considers the convective heat transfer through the air gaps as the main method of heat transfer between the cells.

Here the battery module contains 30 cells arranged in 5 columns (C) and 6 rows (R), as shown in Fig. 3. For example, C1R1 represents the cell located at the 1st Column and 1st Row of the battery module. Within the module, each cell is surrounded by six adjacent cells, see Cell A in Fig. 3. Thus, a small circular triangular space is formed between each trio of cells for heat transfer. The six sectors of Cell A (C4R4) exchange heat with two adjacent cells, while Cell B (C1R6) at the edge of module only has two sectors to exchange heat with other cells. The remaining surface of the cell will dissipate heat to the ambient environment.

From literatures [32, 33], the convective heat transfer coefficient is proportional to the thermal conductivity of the air coolant and inversely proportional to the hydraulic diameter of the air cooling channel. For commercial battery modules, the shape and space of air cooling channel are fixed. The thermal conductivity is mainly affected by different air coolants fluid and cooling strategies. According to many publications on battery pack cooling [33, 34], cooling conditions such as cooling air flow rate, flow direction, inlet and outlet temperatures are considered. In order to simplify the battery cooling process, the effects of different cooling conditions and strategies are lumped into the change of the convective heat transfer coefficient in this study. The cooling surface area, \( A \), is calculated as 1/6 of the total surface area of the cylindrical battery, i.e.:

\[
A = \pi dl / 6 \quad (9)
\]

where \( d \) and \( l \) are the cell diameter and height, respectively. For a 21700 cell, \( d \) is 21 mm while \( l \) is 70 mm.

In addition to the Li-ion cell self-heating, there is the ohmic heating of the busbar and welds. However, the values of the busbar and weld resistances are much smaller than the internal
resistance of the cells [23, 24]. Therefore, the heat generated by the busbar and welds is ignored in this study.

Fig. 3. Heat transfer among cells in densely packed battery module.

III. BATTERY MODULE PARAMETERIZATION

A. TSPMe effective resistance

The Li-ion battery used in this study is based on a 5 Ah cylindrical 21700 cell produced by LG Chem with an operating voltage of 2.5–4.2 V. Here the TSPMe model is calibrated from data obtained by using a three-electrode experiment. In which, the cylindrical cell was disassembled to harvest the electrodes, which are used to fabricate a three-electrode PAT-Cell. The specific experimental procedures and the parameterization process defined in our previous publication [28].

Unlike ECMs, physical based electrochemical models do not use an electrical resistance to represent the internal resistance. For such electrochemical models, the electrolyte diffusion, surface polarization, and back electromotive forces are represented by overpotentials. Therefore, the standard Galvanostatic Intermittent Titration Technique (GITT) test is used to calculate the equivalent internal resistance of the TSPMe cell model.

Fig. 4 illustrates the equivalent internal resistance of the TSPMe model at different discharging capacities and temperatures. It can be seen that when the temperature is low, the effective equivalent internal resistance of battery will increase significantly.

B. Busbar FEM simulation

For battery modules, the busbar design affects the current distribution between the cells. For the measurement of \( R_{IC} \) on the target commercial busbar, it is difficult to measure the point-to-point interconnect resistance value on the busbar by laboratory methods due to the high integration of the busbar and the complicated paths on the busbar. If dismantling the commercial busbar for measurement, it cannot be guaranteed that the welding resistance is the same as before dismantling. In addition, due to the short distance between cell to cell, the equivalent interconnection resistance on the busbar is only a few to tens of micro-ohms, which also poses a challenge to the measurement accuracy of the laboratory ohmmeter. Based on the above considerations, this paper uses the finite-element simulation method to simulate the busbar of commercial battery module. By importing the design parameters and materials of the commercial busbar, the model and the real object are matched as much as possible. Then the interconnect resistance in the finite-element model (FEM) is used as the reference of actual commercial busbar.

To verify and parameterize the equivalent circuit representing the cell connections, this study refers to the current distribution in the real-world commercial busbar simulated by STAR-CCM+ computational fluid dynamics software as its reference data. Specifically, the busbar model uses FEM based on the busbar geometry and material properties. The purpose here is to simulate the current flow in three-dimensional space within the busbar based on the voltage potential, current density, and temperature distribution within the busbar. An algebraic multigrid-based iterative solver is used in the simulation to ensure the spatial and temporal accuracy and reasonable simulation speed. In order to improve the numerical stability of the simulation, the time step is set to 1 s, and the simulation stop time is set as 30 minutes. During which the battery module model was continuously charged with a constant current of 179 A (about 1.2C). The initial temperature of the cell and the ambient are set to 35 °C. The temperature, potential, and current at specific locations are extracted from the model of cells and busbars in the battery module. Since the finite element simulation is to simulate the flow of current in three-dimensional space, the current at a certain location is calculated as the root mean square of the current in the x, y, and z directions of the cross-sectional area in the model. Fig. 5 shows an extract from the 3D modelling of current density in the FEM model.

In this study, the FEM model is intended to simulate the current distribution on the busbar rather than the cell behavior within the module. Based upon this consideration, equivalent thermo-sensitive resistors are used in the FEM model instead of Li-ion cells. Therefore, the electrical characteristics of the cells and the resulting current distribution in the busbar can be
simulated in the FEM model. The thermos-sensitive resistors use the TSPMe effective resistance described in the previous section. The current distribution results from the FE model are used as the reference data for parameterization and comparison of the busbar models in the Simscape simulation environment.

From the result, the busbar Columns 1, 2, 3 and 4 indicate the position in the middle of the connection bridge between each row and column of battery cells. For example, the cells located at Column 4 are the closest to the current input power source, so the sum of the currents flowing through this column is the total current of the entire battery module. Busbar Column 1 is the position farthest from the current input power supply, so the current passing through its different positions is only the sum of the currents of cells at the most edge position. The average current of the Busbar Column 4 is around four times larger than that of the Busbar Column 1. The current distribution in the Simscape model matches that at specific position from the FE model. This verifies that the busbar circuit of EC3 in Simscape is a good representation of the commercial busbar and can be used to model the current flows of the whole battery module. The Simscape model of the battery module includes a positive busbar, a negative busbar, and 30 TSPMe cell models, whose electrochemical parameters of the cells can be modified accordingly.

There are various arrangements of cells in the battery pack, and the arrangement considered in this paper is only one of them, that is, the staggered arrangement of 30 cylindrical cells. Each cell is surrounded by 6 other cells, and the \( R_{IC} \) on the busbars are also arranged in a hexagonal, or a honeycomb shape. For other battery module arrangements, such as aligned arrangement battery pack [35], as well as different busbar materials and thicknesses, the ohmic value of the interconnect resistance is likely to be different from that used in this paper.

D. Simscape implementation of battery module

The comparison results between the FEM model and the Simscape model verified that the busbar equivalent circuit in Simscape can achieve similar performance to the FEM model. Therefore, it can be used to build a model of the battery module. The Simscape model of the battery module includes a positive busbar, a negative busbar, and 30 TSPMe cell models, as shown in Fig. 7. The positive and negative busbars have been verified by the FEM model. The 30 cells are thermally and electrically connected in the battery module. The blue lines represent the electrical connections to the positive and negative terminals of the cells. The orange line represents the thermal connection of the cells to their surrounding cells or the ambient temperature.

In the cell model, the equivalent thermo-sensitive resistors are replaced by the TSPMe cell models described in Section 2.1. The electrochemical parameters of the cells can be modified in the cell model. The block "A→B" represents the heat transfer between the cell and the ambient and can set the heat transfer coefficient in the block. The entire battery module is connected to a charger block for setting the current or voltage input and charging mode.

In the simulation of the battery module model, the current flows from the positive terminal of the charger to the positive busbar, and is distributed over the busbar due to the influence of the busbar structure and cell voltage. The current flows into each cell and eventually flows into the negative busbar and back to the negative terminal of the charger. The following section presents the detailed simulation result of the battery module.
IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

An in-depth understanding of the causal relationships between parameter variations and cell current distribution is critical. This section discusses three case studies of the impact of different battery module parameters with 30 TSPMe cells with positive and negative busbars. In this section, the initial capacity, resistance, SoC and thermal boundary conditions of the cells have been defined to be the same for each cell.

A. Impact of different busbar equivalent circuit models

In the simulation based on the LG M50 21700 Li-ion battery, the operating voltage window is 2.5–4.2 V. Fig. 8 shows the current response of all single cells in the battery module for a 1C constant current charge (CCC) and constant current discharge (CCD). The interconnect resistance on the busbar is chosen as a medium value from the range, which is set as 0.1 mΩ. The figure shows the current distribution of 30 cells in the battery module, arranged in 6 rows (R) and 5 columns (C) in a 6x5 battery module.

When the charging current is 1C, the average current of a single cell is approximately 5 A. However, due to the influence of the interconnect resistances ($R_{IC} = 0.1 \text{ mΩ}$), there is a significant spread in current distribution between cells. Fig. 8
shows the largest current during CCC reaches a maximum of 5.17 A and the smallest reaches a minimum of 4.9 A, which is equivalent to a current imbalance of approximately ±3%. This phenomenon is more pronounced in CCD where the current can reach as low as 4.55 A and as high as 5.4 A (±9% current imbalance).

**Fig. 9.** Current distribution comparison among three different equivalent circuits of busbar under ideal cooling conditions.

To compare the effects of the three different busbar circuits proposed in Section 2.2, the peak current distributions across the busbar circuits during CCC and CCD is shown in Fig. 9. In order to isolate the impact of the busbar on the current distribution, the heat transfer between cells is not considered. The current distribution of charge with EC1, EC2 and EC3 are shown in Fig. 9 (a)-(c), respectively, while that of discharge are shown in Fig. 9 (d)-(f). The results show that in EC1, all cells distribute the total current evenly, so the current distribution surface graph is a flat plane. In EC2, there are some differences in the current distribution across the busbars, where the same current is evenly distributed among the cells in each column, but the $R_{IC}$ between columns causes a gradient in the current variation. In EC3, the effect of the row and column $R_{IC}$ on the current distribution of each cell is modelled. In addition, the results also show that the same cell has the highest current during both charging and discharging. This result highlights the potential for accelerated degradation of cells in that module location.

**B. Impact of heat transfer coefficient and interconnection resistance**

This section investigates the current distribution in the battery module with different heat transfer coefficients (HTC) and $R_{IC}$ values. Different busbar circuits are used to simulate different scenarios and the impact of busbar fidelities.

In the literature, $R_{IC}$ is often assumed as 1-10% of the rated internal resistance of the cells [22], or fixed to 1-5 mΩ [23-25]. However, these approximations are usually based on laboratory manual welding and are not representative of the welding used in battery module manufacture. From the busbar FEM simulation, the values of the busbar interconnect resistances $R_{IC}$ are significantly smaller than the values commonly used in the literature. Therefore, this paper expands the range of $R_{IC}$ to between 0.01 mΩ and 3 mΩ, which is approximate 0.02%-6% of the rated internal resistance of the LG M50 21700 cells. There are also large variances in the battery module HTC due to the different cooling approaches utilized. A survey of the literature reveals, the typical range of heat transfer coefficient in battery packs are between 5 and 55 W/m²K [15, 36-41]. This range is therefore used in this work to investigate the thermal behavior of cells in a battery module.

**Fig. 10.** Variation of cell temperature and current difference in battery module (BBEC1) as heat transfer coefficient increases.

To isolate the effect of different HTC on cell temperature and current distribution, the simulations are performed with EC1 (see Fig. 2) as this busbar ignores the $R_{IC}$ effects. Fig. 10 shows the variation in cell temperature and current distribution for six different HTC values in increments of 5 W/m²K, covering the range of HTCs commonly used in battery modules in the literature. Since the unite of temperature is in Kelvin, its percentage change is difficult to present the difference in battery temperature at different locations intuitively. The cell temperature variation, $\Delta T$, is calculated as the difference between each individual cell temperature and the average temperature of all 30 cells. A positive value indicates the cell temperature is above the average, while a negative value implies the battery temperature is below the average. Similarly, the battery current range is calculated as the peak value of the positive and negative variations in the cell current, $\Delta I$, divided by the average current to express as a percentage. In the boxplots, the horizontal red line represents the median, the blue box represents the range between the first and third quartiles, and the dashed black line represents the values taken to lie within three standard deviations of the mean. According to the 'three-sigma rule of thumb', the values beyond the three standard deviations are considered as outliers, indicated by red crosses in the boxplot. They represent cell currents or temperatures that exceed the average current and average.
temperature of the module by more than three standard deviations. Therefore, these cells also need to be observed carefully as they have higher risks of failure in the battery module, including overcurrent, overtemperature, and accelerated degradation. In this paper, the cell inhomogeneity is defined as the percentage difference between the maximum and minimum value. For example, the current inhomogeneity is defined as the highest cell current minus the lowest cell current in the battery module and divided by the average current of the module. Therefore, the higher value of cell inhomogeneity shows the larger difference of cell current or temperature within the battery module.

Since different charging/discharging current will cause different current inhomogeneity, it is clearer to use percentage current difference to represent the proportion of cell current differences. In order to better express the results and quantify the comparison, the detailed data of maximum and minimum value of temperature, current in ampere and current difference in percentage are given in Table I. It can be seen from the results that the spread in cell temperature during charging increases from approximately ±3.5 K to ±9.5 K, while the current distribution spread caused by the temperature inhomogeneity doubles from ±2% to ±4%. During discharge, the battery temperature spread does not increase with increasing values of HTC. The difference between individual cell temperature and the average temperature of all 30 cells reaches a maximum or approximately ±15 K when the HTC is 15 W/m²K. It reduces with increasing values of HTC to a minimum of approximately ±10 K at 55 W/m²K. However, the current spread during discharge significantly larger during charge, ranging between ±7% and ±10%.

To investigate the effect of the busbar $R_{IC}$ on current distribution and SoC, the simulations are repeated with EC3 (see Fig. 2) as the busbar circuit. However, in order to isolate the effect of busbar $R_{IC}$, the heat transfer between cells is ignored. Fig. 11 shows the effect of different interconnect resistance values on the current and SoC spread. The reveals strong positive correlation between $R_{IC}$ and current/SoC spread during both charge and discharge. When the $R_{IC}$ reaches 3 mΩ (approximately 6% of the rated internal resistance of the cell), the highest current is 65% above the average current while the lowest current is 35% below the average current during charging. This means that if the average charge current per cell is 5 A, the maximum current of a single cell can be as high as 8 A, such as cell C5R4 in the module, and the minimum current of cells in the same module is only 3.2 A.

Table I. Temperature and current distribution value during CCC and CCD under different heat transfer coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$ (W/m²K)</th>
<th>5 W/m²K</th>
<th>15 W/m²K</th>
<th>25 W/m²K</th>
<th>35 W/m²K</th>
<th>45 W/m²K</th>
<th>55 W/m²K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T$ (K)</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta T$ (K)</td>
<td>-4.04</td>
<td>-6.77</td>
<td>-8.15</td>
<td>-8.61</td>
<td>-8.64</td>
<td>-8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{max}$ (A)</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>5.129</td>
<td>5.149</td>
<td>5.168</td>
<td>5.182</td>
<td>5.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_{min}$ (A)</td>
<td>4.897</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>4.827</td>
<td>4.812</td>
<td>4.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta I$ (%)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta I$ (%)</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>-3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. Variation of cell current and SoC difference in battery module (BBEC3) as interconnect resistance increases.

Since the design of battery busbars and interconnect resistance values vary greatly, this paper gives a wide range of interconnect resistance in order to study its effect on current inhomogeneity. Under normal circumstances, the interconnection resistance of commercial busbars should be much smaller than the case of 3 mΩ. But in extreme cases, such as when the busbar has faults, such as virtual welding, moisture, oxidation, such unexpected value may occur in the interconnection resistance. The current difference represents the transient current imbalance, and the SoC difference represents the accumulation of the current imbalance. Also taking the $R_{IC}$ of 3 mΩ as an example, the highest SoC in the battery pack is 18% higher than the average, and the lowest SoC...
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TABLE II
CURRENT AND SoC DISTRIBUTION VALUE DURING CCC AND CCD UNDER DIFFERENT INTERCONNECTION RESISTANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$R_{IC}$</th>
<th>0.01 mΩ</th>
<th>0.03 mΩ</th>
<th>0.1 mΩ</th>
<th>0.3 mΩ</th>
<th>1 mΩ</th>
<th>3 mΩ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min$I$ in [A]</td>
<td>5.024 A</td>
<td>5.058 A</td>
<td>5.171 A</td>
<td>5.481 A</td>
<td>6.410 A</td>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max($\Delta$I) in [%]</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>5.195 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min($\Delta$I) in [%]</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
<td>-1.92%</td>
<td>-5.47%</td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>4.804 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max($\Delta$SoC)</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min($\Delta$SoC)</td>
<td>-0.074%</td>
<td>-0.18%</td>
<td>-0.56%</td>
<td>-1.61%</td>
<td>-4.94%</td>
<td>-3.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

while, when the $R_{IC}$ value is smaller than 0.1 mΩ, the current imbalance is mainly caused by the cell temperature differences. When the $R_{IC}$ increases, the effect of the cell temperature difference is smaller than the effect of $R_{IC}$ on the busbar. This result is based on the LG M50 21700 battery. Other cell types may vary, especially if the cell resistance is more sensitive to temperature, the effect of temperature on the current imbalance would be more pronounced.

C. SoC distribution under dynamic current

While the effects of $R_{IC}$ and HTC on current distribution have been verified separately in the last section, the effect of current distribution on SoC non-uniformity was also confirmed. However, there is usually a resting period of at least 30 minutes between regular constant current charging and constant current discharging in the laboratory. This period aims to allow the cells to be stabilized electrochemically and thermally. For the battery module, the resting period will also allow the cells to be rebalanced, that is, the cells are charged and discharged from each other to achieve the same OCV and SoC as there is only inter-cell current flow and no external load applied.

However, in the practical use of battery packs in an electric vehicle, there may be frequent switching between charging and discharging, which does not give a chance for cells to rebalance inside the battery pack. This can cause some cells to charge less than others. This section is mainly to perform a dynamic current test to verify the SoC distribution of the cells inside the battery module in the case of frequent charging and discharging.

Fig. 12 shows the voltage, current, and SoC of the battery module after two complete cycles of constant current charge and constant current discharge with no resting period when the $R_{IC}$ is 1 mΩ and the HTC is 25 W/m²K. From the

Fig. 12. Cell voltage, current, temperature and SoC distribution under dynamic current loop.
results in Fig. 12, the current and SoC distributions of the cells are significantly different. For example, the charging current of C1R1 and C1R6 is smaller than that of other cells, resulting in the slowest rise in SoC during charging. Their discharge current is also smaller than other cells. It finally results in that these cells having a lower charge throughput, \( Q_c \), which is calculated by the integration of absolute current flow through the cells in the unit of Ah. In addition to current and SoC, Fig. 12 (c) also shows the changes in cell temperature. The temperature of C3R2, C3R3, C4R3 and C4R4 located in the middle area of the battery module rises the fastest, while the temperature of C1R1 and other cells located at the edge always has the lowest temperature.

The impact of uneven SoC is presented by the charge throughput, which is calculated by integrating the absolute value of current on each cell in the unit of Ah. The charge throughput of all cells after 2 complete charge-discharge cycles are shown in Fig. 13. The cells in each column are represented by the same lines with different colors and marks, and the x-axis represents the position of the cells in each row. It can be seen from the results that the cells with the highest usage rate are located in the 3rd and 4th rows of the column 5, reaching a value of 16 Ah. The cells with the lowest usage rate are located in the 1st and 6th rows of the Column 1, with a value of only 12.3 Ah, which is 23% less than that of the cells with the highest charge throughput value.

\[ R \leq 0.3 \text{ m}\Omega \]

Fig. 14 reveals that for low interconnect resistances (\( R_{IC} \leq 0.3 \text{ m}\Omega \)), the lowest anode potential consistently occurs at the transition point from 1C CC to 4.2V CV to prevent the cells from being overcharged and going over the voltage limits defined for the cell. Beyond this voltage there is a higher risk of lithium plating. When the \( R_{IC} \) is 0.03 m\Ω and 0.3 m\Ω, the cells in the battery module are experiencing similar values of anode potential. However, when the \( R_{IC} \) rises to 3 m\Ω, the individual cell currents and anode potentials are significantly different. In some cells, such as C5R4 in Fig. 14, the lowest anode potential occurs much earlier than the switching point from CC to CV and its anode potential is still decreasing during the CV stage.

Fig. 15 illustrates the lowest cell anode potentials for six \( R_{IC} \) values (from 0.01 m\Ω to 3 m\Ω) depending on the cell location within the module. A different color is used for each column and the y-axis is negative. When the \( R_{IC} \) is small, the anode potential distribution of the battery is almost uniform as shown in Fig. 15 (b), (c) and (d). The cells on the edge of the module experience more cooling than the cells within the module. This uneven cooling results in the cells on the edge of the module have slightly higher anode potential.

When the \( R_{IC} \) increases; see Fig. 15 (e), (f) and (g), the temperature of the cells close to the power source terminal are higher than the rest of the module. The cells close to the power source have a shorter current path with lower resistance, therefore they draw more current and generate greater heat. Consequently, the anode potential of the cells in Column 4 and 5 are significantly lower than cells in other columns. This indicates that the cells in Column 4 and 5 have a higher risk of lithium plating. The imbalance is most pronounced when the \( R_{IC} \) reaches 3 m\Ω, see Fig. 15 (g), where the cells in Column 1 and 2 do not have negative anode potentials, and will degrade at a lower rate than the cells in Column 4 and 5.

Fig. 16 (a) and (b) show the cells’ current distribution and anode potential distribution, respectively, at the switching point of CC to CV, for six different \( R_{IC} \) values (from 0.01 m\Ω to 3 m\Ω). When the \( R_{IC} \) is less than 0.1 m\Ω, the cell current 5 A, with only \( \pm 0.9\% \) to \( \pm 2\% \) fluctuation. At the same time, the average anode potential of the cell is 0.043 mV, and the distribution has an inhomogeneity of about \( \pm 3 \) mV to \( \pm 4 \) mV. When the \( R_{IC} \) is larger than 0.1 m\Ω, the inhomogeneity of the cell current and anode potential distributions increases significantly. The current inhomogeneity increases up to \( \pm 41\% \), and the maximum cell current reaches 7.9 A. At the same time, the anode potential distribution increases to \( \pm 35 \) mV. At \( R_{IC} = 3 \text{ m}\Omega \), some cells have positive anode potentials whilst others are negative, which will result in differential ageing rates as only the later may experience higher levels of lithium plating.

This work has been undertaken on one cell type, namely LG M50 21700 cells, and one commercial busbar design. The conclusions may differ for other cell types and different busbar connection methods, especially for cells that are more sensitive
To temperatur and variations in SoC. In addition, this paper mainly considers the battery module with cylindrical cells, which is also the most widely used battery today. In addition to this, there are other types such as prismatic battery cells. But each type of cells has its own characteristics in terms of heat dissipation and interconnect resistance. Therefore, the conclusions of this paper cannot be guaranteed to be applicable to all type of cells. But for cell types other than cylindrical cell, they can use similar research methods to analyze the effect of interconnect resistance on the distribution of current, temperature and lithium plating in the battery module.

The cell model used in this paper does not take into account cell degradation or aging. However, it can be seen from previous experiments and literature that the high or low temperature of the battery will cause cell degradation, and more throughputs will accelerate the cell aging. Therefore, although the degradation and aging of cells are not directly modelled and analyzed in this paper, the throughput and temperature of cells at different positions in the battery module are analyzed, which indirectly proves that cells in different positions in the module will have different ageing rate and risk of degradation.
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The research content of this paper has a potential application scenario that is to make it possible for BMS to estimate the state of each cell in the battery module. Currently, the computational power of most BMSs cannot simultaneously estimate the states of dozens or hundreds of cells. The simplified commercial busbar model and the impact of the equivalent interconnect resistance to current and temperature distribution in the battery module studied in this paper can help to reduce the complexity of battery module model. With the development of more powerful microchips, the BMS can realize the function of real-time estimation of the states of each cell in the battery module in the foreseeable future. In future work, the busbar busbar model will be validated in an experimental study to further confirm the simulated current inhomogeneities. The impact of heat generated by the busbar and welds will also be considered to add another element of fidelity to the model. In addition, an aging model for the cells will be integrated in future works, and based on this, the model of the battery module will be used to analyze the unevenness of the aging degree of the cells in the battery module after long-term use.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, according to electrochemical cell models and a representative production busbar circuit, the effects of different factors on the current inhomogeneity and anode potential distribution of cells within a battery pack are analyzed. These factors include cell-to-cell heat transfer coefficient, interconnect resistance on the busbar, and different fidelities of busbar circuit models. It can be seen from the results that when \( R_{IC} \) is less than 0.2\%, the current distribution is mainly caused by temperature distributions from the heat transfer between cells. When \( R_{IC} \) becomes over 0.2\%, its influence is greater than that of the temperature distribution between cells. The inhomogeneity of current distribution and anode potential exceeds 40\%. This study also analyzes the potential for lithium plating issues at the battery module level through some of the most important scenarios and parametric effects, indicating that cells located at certain locations within a battery module could present a higher risk of lithium plating. The significance of this work is that it analyses the effect of busbar parameter changes, including \( R_{IC} \) and HTC, within the battery pack on individual cells and highlights the important factors for realizing the optimal design of the battery assembly. In light of this, it could benefit the design of observers and optimize control schemes in the BMS in the future to estimate and optimize the current profile, SoC, temperature and lithium plating risk of each cell within the battery module.
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