Orient Academies

An Analytical Study on the Design Phases of Electrical Drive Systems: Modeling, Control, and Performance Optimization

Jerome Dela Cruz[1], Maria Kristel Alonzo[2], Rafael Buenaventura[3]

Abstract
Electrical drive systems form the interface between electrical energy conversion and mechanical actuation across industrial, vehicular, and renewable applications. Their design spans electromagnetic, power electronic, mechanical, and computational domains, where modeling assumptions, controller structure, and implementation choices interact in nontrivial ways. This study presents an analytical discussion of the principal phases involved in engineering such drives, emphasizing modeling fidelity, control synthesis, and performance optimization under practical constraints. The narrative highlights how field-oriented formulations, switching-aware power-stage representations, and thermally consistent loss models provide a coherent baseline for subsequent control and estimation design. Particular attention is given to the translation from continuous-time physics to sampled, quantized, and resource-constrained digital execution, acknowledging that small discrepancies introduced by modulation, dead time, sensor noise, and finite word length accumulate into measurable ripple, transient deviation, and lifetime stress. The exposition outlines a set of cross-compatible performance metrics that align with energy efficiency, torque quality, robustness to parameter drift, and thermal headroom. Multiobjective optimization is discussed as a unifying approach for navigating the trade space between efficiency, dynamic response, electromagnetic interference, and reliability. The presentation strives for methodological neutrality, focusing on the structure of models, the interplay of assumptions, and the conditions under which particular choices are effective. The resulting synthesis aims to assist practitioners in aligning modeling depth and computational effort with the required performance envelope and lifecycle targets without overstating novelty or prescribing a singular design pathway.

[1] University of San Carlos, Department of Electrical Engineering, 23 Pelaez Street, Cebu City, Philippines
[2] Bulacan State University, Department of Electrical Engineering, 16 Malolos Avenue, City of Malolos, Bulacan, Philippines
[3] Mindanao State University–Iligan Institute of Technology, Department of Electrical Engineering, 45 Andres Bonifacio Street, Iligan City, Lanao del Norte, Philippines

Contents

1. Introduction

Electrical drives represent one of the most sophisticated integrations of electromechanical and electronic subsystems in modern engineering [1]. At their core, they combine an electric machine, a power electronic converter, a real-time controller, and an array of embedded sensors to deliver controlled mechanical power. The purpose of such integration is not merely to rotate a shaft but to produce torque and speed with high precision, efficiency, and robustness under varying load and environmental conditions. The entire discipline of drive engineering bridges fundamental physics with control theory and digital implementation, forming a multidisciplinary synthesis that embodies both modeling depth and practical pragmatism.

The design process of an electrical drive begins with the creation of physical models that capture the essential electromagnetic and mechanical interactions within the machine. These models must strike a delicate balance: they need to be detailed enough to reflect dominant loss mechanisms and dynamic behavior, yet simple enough to allow analysis, controller design, and parameter identification [2]. Electromagnetic models, derived from Maxwell's equations, are reduced to lumped-parameter representations where flux linkages, inductances, and back electromotive forces (EMFs) can be expressed in manageable mathematical form. Mechanical models, on the other hand, express torque balance, inertia, and frictional effects that connect electrical inputs to mechanical outputs. These coupled equations establish the playground where design choices—such as winding topology, pole configuration, and material selection—affect overall drive performance.

Once the underlying model is defined, attention shifts to the control architecture. The control objective typically centers on enforcing torque and flux behavior that meets the user's speed or position demands while maintaining system constraints. The controller must therefore translate reference quantities into voltage or current commands that are physically realizable by the power electronic converter [3]. The converter itself, usually a voltage-source inverter employing pulse-width modulation (PWM), provides the interface between the low-level switching dynamics of semiconductor devices and the continuous dynamics of the machine windings. The sampling, modulation, and switching processes introduce discrete-time and nonlinear effects that must be reconciled with the continuous-time model assumptions. Achieving a consistent interface between these domains is one of the major challenges of drive design.

Implementation is where theory meets reality. The idealized models that guided design must be adjusted to accommodate parasitic inductances, sensor noise, quantization, and thermal limits. Each component—semiconductors, magnetic materials, bearings—exhibits performance degradation under stress and temperature, and these effects accumulate across time scales [4]. A successful design integrates real-time monitoring and protection logic to ensure that the system remains within safe operating limits. Numerical precision in the digital controller, the choice of sampling frequency, and the resolution of analog-to-digital converters all influence how closely the implemented system mirrors its theoretical model. Drive engineers must thus navigate the complex trade-offs among switching frequency, thermal load, electromagnetic interference, and computational burden.

The engineering of electrical drives inherently spans multiple temporal and spatial scales. At the micrometer level, the physical layout of conductors determines copper and proximity losses, influencing efficiency and heat generation [5]. At the millisecond level, switching and modulation patterns determine the instantaneous current ripple, shaping torque smoothness and acoustic noise. At the second-to-hour level, thermal dynamics define the permissible operating envelope, determining how much continuous torque or overload can be sustained. These multi-scale interactions emphasize that no single domain dominates the behavior of the system; rather, its performance emerges from the coherent coordination of electrical, magnetic, mechanical, and thermal phenomena.

A critical insight in drive theory is that the predictive quality of a model is not dictated by the sheer number of equations or parameters but by the structural consistency and relevance of those parameters. A well-posed model captures the essential causal relations without unnecessary detail. Parameter identifiability ensures that each modeled quantity can be estimated from measurable data, while disturbance alignment ensures that the model's uncertainties reflect the dominant sources of variability encountered during real operation [6]. These aspects determine whether a model serves as a reliable basis for control design and performance prediction or merely as a theoretical construct disconnected from practice.

Within this modeling and control hierarchy, the transformation from three-phase stator variables to rotating reference frames is a cornerstone concept. Electrical machines generate and respond to three-phase currents and voltages, which are inherently coupled through the magnetic field. By transforming these quantities into a reference frame that rotates synchronously with the rotor or stator flux, the equations of motion simplify dramatically. In such frames, the complex coupling between phases reduces to nearly decoupled scalar equations, allowing the independent control of torque-producing and flux-producing current components. This simplification forms the foundation for field-oriented control (FOC) and direct torque control (DTC) strategies, both of which are standard in modern high-performance drives. [7]

However, this mathematical convenience has limitations. The assumptions underpinning reference frame decoupling break down when the machine exhibits strong magnetic saliency, saturation, or spatial harmonics. In these cases, cross-coupling re-emerges, and the controller must explicitly account for or robustly compensate these effects. Similarly, inverter nonlinearities such as dead-time, voltage drops, and finite switching delays distort the intended voltage vectors, introducing discrepancies between commanded and actual flux trajectories. Advanced control strategies must therefore incorporate feedforward compensation, adaptive estimation, or robust synthesis to maintain performance despite these imperfections. [8]

Proportional-integral (PI) controllers, implemented in either stationary or rotating reference frames, remain the baseline for current regulation due to their simplicity and proven

Component	Function	Domain	Key Parameter
Electric Machine	Converts electrical to mechanical energy	Electromagnetic	Torque Constant
Power Converter	Regulates voltage/current to machine	Electronic	Switching Frequency
Controller	Executes control laws	Digital/Control	Sampling Period
Sensors	Measure physical quantities	Mechatronic	Resolution

Table 1. Subsystem overview of an electrical drive.

Control Method	Type	Dynamic Response	Robustness	Implementation Effort
PI Control	Linear	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Field-Oriented	Nonlinear	Fast	Good	Medium
Predictive	Model-Based	Very Fast	Fair	High
Sliding Mode	Nonlinear	Fast	Very High	High

Table 2. Comparison of control strategies in electrical drives.

Parameter	Symbol	Unit	Nominal Value	Range	Effect
Stator Resistance	R_s	Ω	0.8	0.7–0.9	Affects copper losses
Inductance (d-axis)	L_d	mH	5.2	5–5.5	Influences flux control
Inductance (q-axis)	L_q	mH	4.8	4.5–5.0	Influences torque ripple
Moment of Inertia	J	kg·m^2	0.012	0.01–0.015	Impacts speed dynamics

Table 3. Representative machine parameters for simulation and analysis.

reliability. They provide satisfactory performance in many industrial applications where system parameters are well known and operating conditions are stable. Yet, as the demands on efficiency, dynamics, and robustness increase, more sophisticated control paradigms emerge. Optimal control methods, such as model predictive control (MPC), exploit explicit plant models to minimize a cost function reflecting current errors, switching losses, or torque ripple under hard constraints. Robust control techniques, including H_∞ or sliding-mode designs, address parameter uncertainties and external disturbances. Each approach extends the ability of the drive to maintain stable, high-quality operation under complex, time-varying conditions. [9]

The optimization layer within modern drive systems serves as the bridge between control objectives and broader system-level goals. It connects instantaneous control decisions to long-term metrics such as energy efficiency, thermal utilization, and component lifetime. Loss models quantify how conduction and switching losses vary with current amplitude and frequency, while thermal models translate these losses into temperature rise within critical components. By integrating these models into control algorithms, drives can adapt their operation to minimize energy consumption or prevent overheating. This approach blurs the traditional boundary between control and design, allowing real-time optimization that accounts for both performance and reliability.

In practice, achieving such coordination requires precise sensing and estimation [10]. Rotor position sensors, current sensors, and temperature probes provide real-time feedback, but they also introduce their own noise and delays. Sensorless control techniques, which infer rotor position from voltage and current measurements, reduce hardware cost and increase robustness in harsh environments but depend critically on accurate machine models. Observer-based estimation methods, such as extended Kalman filters or sliding-mode observers, enable this functionality while compensating for model uncertainty and measurement noise. Thus, sensing, estimation, and control become intertwined elements of a unified feedback architecture.

The evolution of electrical drives continues to be propelled by advancements in semiconductor technology, computational power, and materials science. Wide-bandgap devices such as silicon carbide (SiC) and gallium nitride (GaN) enable higher switching frequencies and lower losses, opening new possibilities for compact and efficient converters [11]. Meanwhile, embedded processors and field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs) allow the implementation of complex control algorithms with microsecond-level latency. On the machine side, new magnetic materials and cooling techniques push the boundaries of torque density and thermal resilience. As these innovations mature, the line between power electronics, control software, and electromechanical design grows increasingly blurred.

The following sections proceed from physical modeling through converter representation, control architectures with stability analysis, state estimation and sensing, performance optimization with multiobjective trade-offs, thermal and reliability perspectives, and implementation details that influence realized behavior. The development maintains a neutral stance on technique selection, instead describing conditions and mechanisms that govern effectiveness. [12]

2. Physical Modeling of Electrical Drives

At the electrical core, an induction machine or permanent-magnet synchronous machine can be captured through space-vector or phase-domain formulations. In a generic three-phase stator representation with phase set $\{a,b,c\}$, the stator equations are written as

$$\mathbf{v}_s^{abc} = R_s \mathbf{i}_s^{abc} + \frac{d}{dt}\lambda_s^{abc},$$
$$\lambda_s^{abc} = \mathbf{L}_{ss}^{abc}\mathbf{i}_s^{abc} + \mathbf{L}_{sr}^{abc}(\theta)\mathbf{i}_r^{abc}.$$

For a cage rotor, $\mathbf{i}_r^{abc}$ arises from rotor bar currents whose dynamics are governed by induced voltages and resistances tied to slip. In permanent-magnet synchronous machines, the rotor current states collapse to flux contributions from magnets with saliency captured by distinct direct and quadrature inductances. The Park transformation maps stator variables to a synchronous rotating frame at electrical angle θ_e with angular speed ω_e, yielding

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_d \\ v_q \end{bmatrix} = R_s \begin{bmatrix} i_d \\ i_q \end{bmatrix} + \frac{d}{dt}\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_d \\ \lambda_q \end{bmatrix} - \omega_e \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_d \\ \lambda_q & 0 \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\lambda_d = L_d i_d + \lambda_m, \qquad \lambda_q = L_q i_q.$$

The electromagnetic torque for an interior permanent-magnet machine follows

$$T_e = \frac{3}{2}p\left(\lambda_m i_q + (L_d - L_q)i_d i_q\right),$$

with p the number of pole pairs and λ_m the magnet flux linkage [13]. The mechanical subsystem obeys

$$J\dot{\omega}_m + B\omega_m + \tau_f(\omega_m) = T_e - T_L,$$

where J is inertia, B viscous coefficient, τ_f captures Coulomb and Stribeck friction, and T_L is load torque. When spatial harmonics and slotting are non-negligible, the inductance matrix develops position dependence beyond L_d and L_q. A compact augmentation introduces harmonic torque components

$$T_h(\theta_e, i_d, i_q) = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}} \alpha_k i_q \cos(k\theta_e) + \beta_k i_d \sin(k\theta_e),$$

representing saliency-induced ripple that appears in both torque and back-EMF.

Saturation and cross-saturation introduce state-dependent inductances [14]. A conservative representation treats $L_d(i_d,i_q)$ and $L_q(i_d,i_q)$ as smooth functions with bounded gradients, enabling incremental linearization for control design. The resulting state model

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u},\theta), \qquad \mathbf{x} = [i_d, i_q, \omega_m, \theta_m]^\top, \quad \mathbf{u} = [v_d, v_q]^\top$$

admits Jacobians $\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}) = \partial\mathbf{f}/\partial\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{x}) = \partial\mathbf{f}/\partial\mathbf{u}$ for local analysis. For induction machines, stator and rotor flux vectors ψ_s and ψ_r yield

$$\dot{\psi}_s = -R_s i_s + v_s,$$
$$\dot{\psi}_r = -\frac{R_r}{L_r}\psi_r + \frac{L_m R_r}{L_r} i_s - j(\omega_e - \omega_r)\psi_r,$$

with electromagnetic torque $T_e = \frac{3}{2}p\,\mathrm{Im}\{\psi_s i_s^*\}$. The difference $\omega_e - \omega_r$ encodes slip; field orientation aligns either ψ_r or ψ_s to decouple flux and torque channels in steady-state.

Mechanical coupling to loads introduces compliance and backlash [15]. A two-inertia model captures torsional dynamics,

$$J_m\dot{\omega}_m = T_e - K_s(\theta_m - \theta_l) - D_s(\omega_m - \omega_l) - T_{fm}(\omega_m),$$
$$J_l\dot{\omega}_l = K_s(\theta_m - \theta_l) + D_s(\omega_m - \omega_l) - T_{fl}(\omega_l) - T_L,$$

with shaft stiffness K_s and damping D_s. The presence of compliance shifts resonances into the control bandwidth, constraining permissible loop gains and modulation indices.

3. Circuit-Element Representations and Structure–Electromagnetic Correspondence

Circuit-element representations of electrical machines provide a compact language that ties the geometry and materials of a motor to its electromagnetic behavior through networks of resistive, inductive, capacitive, and controlled sources. The appeal of this viewpoint lies in its ability to encode field interactions in a form that is directly compatible with power electronic converters and control algorithms while retaining a transparent mapping back to physical structures such as slots, teeth, air gaps, magnets, and end windings. Over decades, this family of representations has evolved from classical per-phase equivalent circuits toward multiport, position-dependent, and frequency-aware networks whose parameters are functions of temperature, saturation, and rotor angle [16]. Within this spectrum, recent reports by Tsintsadze et al. (2023) among others, have emphasized how carefully constructed circuit elements can preserve the linkage between manufactured features and observed electrical characteristics without imposing undue computational overhead in system-level simulations [17]. The following discussion surveys the modeling choices, parameter mappings, and analytical constructs that enable these networks to remain faithful to machine physics while remaining tractable for design, control, and diagnostics.

At the core of a circuit-element view is the inductance matrix. For a machine with n_s stator coils and n_r rotor circuits (which may be physical windings, cage bars aggregated into loops, or virtual magnetization loops), the flux linkages obey

$$\lambda(\theta) = \mathbf{L}(\theta, \mathbf{i})\,\mathbf{i} + \lambda_m(\theta),$$

where $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s+n_r}$ collects currents, $\mathbf{L}$ is the differential inductance matrix that depends on rotor electrical angle θ and, under saturation, on $\mathbf{i}$, and λ_m captures permanent-magnet contributions when present. For linear media, $\mathbf{L}(\theta)$ is periodic in θ with harmonics reflecting slotting, saliency, and spatial permeance variation. The electromagnetic torque follows from coenergy, [18]

$$T_e(\theta, \mathbf{i}) = \frac{\partial W'(\theta, \mathbf{i})}{\partial \theta}, \qquad W'(\theta, \mathbf{i}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{i}^\top \mathbf{L}(\theta, \mathbf{i})\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{i}^\top \lambda_m(\theta).$$

When $\mathbf{L}$ is independent of $\mathbf{i}$, torque reduces to a quadratic form whose angular derivative isolates saliency and magnet interaction terms; the structural origin of each term is interpretable in terms of tooth-tip geometry, magnet pole arc, and slot opening that shape the air-gap permeance waveform.

Permeance-wave perspectives furnish constructive links between geometry and inductances. Let $n_k(\phi)$ denote the effective turns function of a coil k distributed around the air gap as a function of circumferential coordinate ϕ, and let $\Lambda(\phi, \theta)$ be the air-gap permeance per unit area seen at location ϕ with rotor angle θ. Neglecting end effects for the moment, the mutual inductance between coils i and j can be written schematically as

$$L_{ij}(\theta) = \mu_0 l_{\text{eff}} \int_0^{2\pi} n_i(\phi)\, n_j(\phi - \theta)\, \Lambda(\phi, \theta)\, d\phi,$$

with l_{eff} the effective axial length. Slotting, magnet segmentation, and pole-tip shaping enter through Λ and thereby modulate the harmonic content of $L_{ij}(\theta)$. This expression clarifies how changes to tooth width or slot opening affect specific harmonics of the inductance matrix and therefore the ripple components of torque and back-electromotive force. By truncating the Fourier series for n_k and Λ, one obtains analytical formulas for dominant inductance harmonics that can be embedded as controlled sources and variable inductors in circuit networks, enabling rapid parametric sweeps during early design. [19]

Equivalent circuits inherit frequency dependence through conductor skin and proximity effects, laminated iron losses, and winding-to-core capacitances. A stator phase resistance generalized for frequency f can be modeled as

$$R_s(f, T) = R_{s,dc}(T)\, \Gamma_{\text{skin}}(f)\, \Gamma_{\text{prox}}(f),$$

where $R_{s,dc}(T)$ reflects copper resistivity at temperature T, and the multiplicative factors $\Gamma_{\text{skin}}, \Gamma_{\text{prox}}$ capture, respectively, skin depth and proximity enhancements that grow with f and slot fill. Iron losses appear as a parallel combination of hysteresis-like and eddy-current-like branches attached to the main flux path. A widely used surrogate attaches a conductance $G_{fe}(\omega)$ across the magnetizing inductance L_m so that the iron-loss power is $P_{fe} = \omega^2 L_m^2 i_m^2 G_{fe}$, with G_{fe} fitted against measurements or finite-element data. Winding-to-frame and interturn capacitances assemble into a capacitive network that, together with the machine's inductive structure, defines common-mode and differential-mode resonances important for electromagnetic interference and bearing-current risk. These capacitive elements arise from slot liner geometry, end-winding proximity, and insulation thickness; in a circuit representation, they are placed between phase nodes and stator frame nodes and between turn segments, retaining explicit correspondence to layout decisions.

Rotor modeling differentiates machine families. Squirrel-cage induction machines aggregate bar currents into rotor circuits with resistances R_{rk} and leakage inductances L_{rk} coupled to stator coils by mutual inductances $M_{sk}(\theta)$ that rotate with angle. The slip-dependent dynamics are naturally expressed via speed-dependent back-emf sources in the rotor loops. By contrast, permanent-magnet synchronous machines incorporate a magnetization source that injects a flux $\lambda_m(\theta)$ into the stator magnetizing branch; interior variants further entail d- and q-axis magnetizing inductances whose disparity arises from anisotropic reluctance pathways through rotor bridges and flux barriers. In circuit form, a minimal two-axis network in the rotating reference frame introduces orthogonal magnetizing branches with inductances L_d, L_q and couples them to stator phase circuits by time-varying transformers whose ratio is defined by the Park transformation. This representation recovers the familiar voltage equations in the dq frame and supports direct incorporation of saturation by letting $L_d(i_d)$ and $L_q(i_q)$ be nonlinear elements defined by magnetization curves obtained from measurements or finite-element solutions.

Nonlinearity and hysteresis can be retained at varying fidelity levels. A pragmatic approach employs polynomial or spline approximations for $L_d(i_d)$ and $L_q(i_q)$, ensuring monotonicity and differentiability so that energy functions remain well defined [20]. A higher-fidelity but more complex option inserts a Jiles–Atherton-type magnetization element into the main flux path, realized as a controlled source whose output flux depends on an internal anhysteretic magnetization and irreversible–reversible partitioning parameters. In either case, embedding the nonlinear element within the network supports harmonic prediction under bias and reveals how operating-point shifts, such as flux weakening or field-weakening at elevated speed, alter effective inductances and torque constants. The circuit environment also makes it straightforward to superimpose small-signal perturbations for identifying differential inductances in situ, which is useful for sensorless control strategies that rely on saliency tracking at low speed.

End effects and three-dimensional structures influence both inductance and resistance. End-turn leakage is commonly represented by series inductances L_{le} per phase obtained from geometrical formulas or extracted from 3D field computations. Their values depend on end-turn span, bundling, and the presence of phase separators. End-turn copper length augments R_s and can contribute a nontrivial fraction of total copper loss in short-stack, high-pole-count machines [21]. In a circuit model, explicit resistive segments for slots and end turns make it possible to allocate temperature coefficients separately and to incorporate nonuniform cooling along the conductor path by assigning lumped thermal nodes coupled to the electrical network through loss sources. Such co-modeling is effective when assessing hot-spot risk or quantifying the benefit of targeted cooling on end-winding regions, which are often limiting elements during high-torque operation.

Because circuit networks are naturally multiport, they expose machine–converter interactions in a form amenable to time-domain simulation with switching. The machine port presents a position-dependent impedance matrix $\mathbf{Z}(\theta, \omega)$ whose elements determine current ripple under pulse-width modulation and the propagation of common-mode disturbances. When the converter is represented with explicit switch models, dead time and device nonlinearities enter the machine through nonideal voltage waveforms that excite the inductive–capacitive network over a broad frequency range. In this setting, the presence of winding-to-frame capacitances and bearing models determines how common-mode voltage translates into displacement currents and, potentially, electrical discharge machining at bearings [22]. Including these elements in the network assists in assessing trade-offs between modulation strategies, dv/dt filters, and mechanical mitigation such as insulated bearings or ceramic coatings.

Parameter identification closes the loop between structure and equivalent elements. Locked-rotor tests at different angles θ and currents generate data from which $L_{ss}(\theta, i)$ and mutual terms can be inferred. Standstill frequency response injects sinusoidal voltages over a range of frequencies to discern leakage, magnetizing, and iron-loss branches separately. For permanent-magnet machines, back-emf mapping at low load yields $\lambda_m(\theta)$ and its harmonic content, which is informative about magnet arc and segmentation. Modern practice often complements these experiments with finite-element model reduction, whereby detailed field models are run over a grid of angles and currents and their responses distilled into parametric circuit components using least-squares fitting with regularization that enforces physical monotonicity and passivity. The resulting hybrid models preserve the speed of circuit simulation while inheriting the accuracy of field solutions across the operating envelope of interest. [23]

Analytical structure also enables sensitivity analysis. By differentiating torque and back-emf with respect to circuit parameters, one can map manufacturing tolerances to performance metrics. Let p denote a vector of parameters such as slot opening width, magnet thickness, and tooth fillet radius, and let those map to circuit parameters $\theta_c(p)$. The sensitivity of average torque $\bar{T}_e$ to p follows via the chain rule,

$$\frac{\partial \bar{T}_e}{\partial p} = \frac{\partial \bar{T}_e}{\partial \theta_c} \frac{\partial \theta_c}{\partial p},$$

where $\partial \bar{T}_e / \partial \theta_c$ is available in closed form from the circuit model and $\partial \theta_c / \partial p$ can be obtained from analytical permeance formulas or sparse finite-element perturbations. Such sensitivities inform tolerancing decisions and provide guidance on which geometric controls most efficiently reduce torque ripple or improve efficiency within a given manufacturing process capability.

The graph-theoretic underpinnings of circuit models furnish clean algebraic conditions for energy consistency and reciprocity. Representing the magnetic domain with a reluctance network and the electric domain with resistance–inductance branches, one can write a composite port-Hamiltonian system that couples electrical currents and magnetomotive forces through gyrators whose ratio encodes turns and orientation [24]. The total stored energy is

$$\mathscr{H} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{i}^\top \mathbf{L}(\theta, \mathbf{i})\mathbf{i} + \frac{1}{2}\phi^\top \mathbf{R}_m^{-1}(\theta, \phi)\phi,$$

where ϕ denotes branch fluxes in the reluctance network and $\mathbf{R}_m$ the reluctance matrix. Power-conserving interconnections guarantee that, absent dissipative and source elements, the time derivative of $\mathscr{H}$ equals the power exchanged with external electrical and mechanical ports. This property is valuable for controller design predicated on passivity, and it provides a structural check that fitted circuit parameters respect fundamental reciprocity and positive definiteness constraints, reducing the risk of nonphysical behaviors in simulation.

Position-dependent effects, including cogging and torque ripple, appear as specific harmonic couplings within the network. If $\Lambda(\phi, \theta)$ is expanded as a Fourier series in ϕ and θ, the cross-terms that survive spatial integration align with harmonic orders determined by the least common multiple of slot and pole counts. In practice, circuit models introduce controlled sources that inject ripple components into torque proportional to measured or computed harmonic amplitudes [25]. The superposition principle then allows independent tuning of mitigation strategies such as current harmonic injection and tooth-tip optimization by observing the reduction of targeted coefficients. While such superposition is only exact under linearity, it remains a useful approximation over moderate excitation levels and supports fast what-if analysis before committing to more expensive coupled field–circuit computations.

Capacitive and dielectric effects become salient in high-switching-frequency, high-voltage drives. A lumped model includes phase-to-frame capacitances C_{pf}, interphase capacitances C_{pp}, and magnet-to-rotor capacitances C_{mr}. Together with bearing capacitance C_b and a nonlinear breakdown element modeling the lubricant film, the network predicts discharge events as voltage across C_b exceeds threshold. Incorporating these elements permits assessment of filter configurations at the converter output or of dv/dt limiting strategies. Furthermore, common-mode choke models can be appended explicitly to observe their interaction with machine capacitances and to quantify residual current in the presence of imperfect symmetry. [26]

Thermal dependence enters circuit parameters through resistivity, magnet remanence, and iron loss coefficients. A coupled electro-thermal network assigns each resistive and loss element a thermal node with capacitance and conductance to ambient or coolant manifolds. The electrical network supplies heat-generation terms that feed the thermal network, which in turn updates electrical parameters in a quasi-static loop or through co-simulation. For example, copper resistance varies approximately linearly with coil temperature, while magnet flux linkage decreases with increasing temperature according to material-specific coefficients. The circuit model thus evolves over time as the thermal state changes, reflecting derating behavior and guiding the selection of thermal headroom in control and modulation schedules.

Model order and state selection influence both interpretability and numerical conditioning [27]. Minimal per-phase circuits can be sufficient for efficiency maps and average torque predictions, but they under-represent harmonic content and fail to capture cross-couplings critical for ripple and acoustic noise. Conversely, overly detailed turn-by-turn models with thousands of elements can become stiff and obscure physical intuition. A balanced approach constructs hierarchical models that retain a small number of dominant energy-storage elements and augment them with frequency-shaped loss surrogates. Balanced truncation and Krylov subspace techniques adapted to parameterized networks generate reduced models that remain valid across operating ranges of interest. In practice, it is advantageous to structure the reduction so that each retained element or parameter continues to map to a recognizable physical feature, preserving the transparency that motivates the circuit-element viewpoint.

The circuit framework also accommodates uncertainty and variability [28]. Manufacturing tolerances, material batch differences, and assembly-induced eccentricities can be introduced as bounded perturbations on parameters or as random fields mapped to circuit elements through regression. Under such uncertainty, one can propagate distributions through the network to obtain confidence intervals on torque ripple and efficiency or can formulate robust control objectives that minimize worst-case performance degradation. Because the network is computationally light relative to full finite-element models, Monte Carlo sampling and scenario-based optimization become practical even for large populations of machines, aligning with statistical quality control practices and early detection of drift in production.

From a systems perspective, the compatibility of circuit models with converter and grid models is decisive. When a drive is embedded in a larger system such as a vehicle or a microgrid, interactions between machine impedance and supply impedances shape stability and power quality [29]. The input admittance of the machine–converter pair in the synchronous frame can be assembled directly from the circuit model and the converter's modulation dynamics, enabling impedance-based stability analyses. For example, the small-signal input admittance $\mathbf{Y}_{in}(s,\theta)$ informs whether interactions with line filters or other converters pose risk of oscillations under weak-grid conditions. Because the circuit model is parametric in θ, one may average $\mathbf{Y}_{in}$ over θ for broadband assessments or retain angle dependence where slotting harmonics are suspected contributors to observed phenomena.

Diagnostic applications benefit from the explicit structure–parameter linkage. Faults such as interturn shorts, broken rotor bars, or demagnetization can be represented as local changes in resistive, inductive, or source elements. The resulting changes in terminal behavior—negative-sequence currents, sideband growth around fundamental components, or back-emf distortion—are predicted by the altered network and suggest targeted residuals for on-line monitoring. Because the circuit model isolates the affected elements, inversion from measured signatures to plausible fault magnitudes becomes better posed, facilitating condition-based maintenance strategies without requiring high-fidelity field models in the loop.

4. Power Electronic Interface and Switching Effects

The inverter maps DC-link voltage V_{dc} to phase voltages through switching devices with finite on-state resistance, dead time, and parasitic capacitances. A two-level bridge with switching functions $s_a, s_b, s_c \in \{0,1\}$ produces phase-to-negative-rail voltages $v_{aN} = s_a V_{dc}$ and analogous expressions for b and c. Phase-to-neutral voltages relative to the machine internal neutral follow [30] where $\mathbf{M}(\mu)$ models modulation index μ saturation and $\mathbf{E}_{dt}$ aggregates dead-time and nonidealities. A first-order dead-time error approximation for phase $k \in \{a,b,c\}$ is

$$e_{dt,k} \approx \frac{V_{dc}}{2\pi f_s}\,\mathrm{sgn}(i_k)\,t_{dt},$$

with device dead time t_{dt}. In rotating coordinates, the error appears as an affine disturbance on v_d, v_q with magnitude scaling in $\|\mathbf{i}_s\|$ and V_{dc}.

DC-link dynamics couple to the AC side through instantaneous power balance [31]. With input source current i_{dc} and capacitor C_{dc},

$$C_{dc}\dot{V}_{dc} = i_{dc} - \frac{3}{2}\frac{v_d i_d + v_q i_q}{V_{dc}} - i_{loss}(V_{dc}, T),$$

linking current control and bus voltage variations under regenerative or load transients. Common-mode voltage is

$$v_{cm} = \frac{v_a + v_b + v_c}{3},$$

whose spectral content excites bearing currents and EMI. Switching states constrain the reachable set of $[v_d, v_q]$ causing hexagonal modulation limits that clip circular references at high μ. The feasible set $\mathscr{V}$ can be encoded as

$$\mathscr{V} = \left\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,\middle|\, \mathbf{H}\mathbf{v} \le \mathbf{h}\right\},$$

with $\mathbf{H}$ representing the space-vector polygon. The intersection of $\mathscr{V}$ with current dynamics dictates attainable acceleration and torque slew.

Losses are partitioned into conduction and switching components [32]. A current-dependent conduction loss per device is $P_{cond} \approx R_{on}i^2 + V_{th}|i|$, while switching loss per cycle approximates $E_{sw}(i, V_{dc}, T)$ yielding

$$P_{sw} \approx f_s E_{sw}(i_{rms}, V_{dc}, T).$$

Integration across phases and switching events produces inverter dissipation that feeds thermal states and constraints.

5. Control Architectures and Stability Analysis

A rotating-frame current controller regulates i_d and i_q using voltage references that compensate cross-coupling and back-EMF. A decoupled form is

$$v_d^* = R_s i_d + L_d \dot{i}_d - \omega_e L_q i_q + u_d,$$
$$v_q^* = R_s i_q + L_q \dot{i}_q + \omega_e (L_d i_d + \lambda_m) + u_q,$$

where u_d, u_q arise from feedback, typically proportional-integral in discrete time. A compact state-space with $\mathbf{x} = [i_d, i_q]^\top$ and $\mathbf{u} = [v_d, v_q]^\top$ gives

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{A}(\omega_e)\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{d}(\omega_e, \lambda_m),$$

with $\mathbf{A}$ skew-symmetric modulated by ω_e. A Lyapunov analysis for linearized dynamics introduces a quadratic candidate $V(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{P} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ and conditions on feedback $\mathbf{K}$ such that

$$\dot{V} = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \left((\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K})^\top \mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}} \leq -\alpha \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}\|^2,$$

for some $\alpha > 0$. Choice of $\mathbf{K}$ through a linear-quadratic regulator with cost

$$J = \int_0^\infty \left(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^\top \mathbf{Q} \tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u} \right) dt$$

yields an algebraic Riccati equation that balances current error and voltage effort [33]. When current limits and voltage polygons are binding, model predictive control with horizon N solves

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{u}_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(\|\mathbf{x}_{k+1} - \mathbf{x}_{\text{ref}}\|_{\mathbf{Q}}^2 + \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_{\mathbf{R}}^2 \right), \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{B}_d \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{w}_k,\ \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathscr{V}_d,$$

with discretized $\mathbf{A}_d, \mathbf{B}_d$ under sampling time T_s, disturbance $\mathbf{w}_k$, and feasible inverter set $\mathscr{V}_d$. Finite-control-set strategies restrict $\mathbf{u}_k$ to switching vectors, trading convexity for direct switching decisions.

Disturbance rejection improves with feedforward compensation of back-EMF and with observers that estimate load torque and parameter drift. A disturbance observer that augments plant dynamics with a bias state b follows

$$\dot{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = \mathbf{A}\hat{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}), \qquad \dot{\hat{b}} = \gamma(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}),$$

with $\mathbf{y}$ measured currents or speed. Robust synthesis in the presence of uncertainty sets $\Delta\mathbf{A}, \Delta\mathbf{B}$ within norm-bounded sets and leverages H_∞ conditions

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} W_s S \\ W_t T[34] \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty < 1,$$

for sensitivity S and complementary sensitivity T weighted by W_s, W_t. Passivity-based formulations exploit energy storage in inductances and inertia, shaping interconnections so that overall input-output maps are dissipative.

In two-inertia systems, notch filters or active damping loops address torsional resonances. A simplified resonance at $\omega_r = \sqrt{K_s(J_m^{-1} + J_l^{-1})}$ motivates controller design that enforces phase margin across $[\omega_r/2, 2\omega_r]$. The combined constraints of modulation limit, current saturation $i_{\max}$, and DC-link variation tighten feasible gains, guiding bandwidth selection typically within 5% to 20% of electrical frequency for current loops and a lower range for speed loops.

6. State Estimation, Sensing, and Robustness

Sensor selection determines observability [35]. Terminal voltage and phase currents enable estimation of flux linkages, while speed sensing via encoders or resolvers improves low-speed torque accuracy. In sensorless operation for synchronous machines, back-EMF methods degrade at low speed, prompting saliency-based high-frequency injection with small-signal models. A compact estimator for rotor position $\hat{\theta}_e$ uses an extended Kalman filter with state $\mathbf{x} = [i_d, i_q, \omega_e, \theta_e]^\top$ and measurement $\mathbf{y} = [i_d, i_q]^\top$: $\dot{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = \mathbf{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{K}(t)(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})$, $\quad \mathbf{K}(t) = \mathbf{P}(t)\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}$, $\quad \dot{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{P}\mathbf{A}^\top + \mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{P}\mathbf{C}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{P}$. Here $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ encode process and measurement covariances chosen to balance responsiveness and noise attenuation. Nonlinearities and saturation can be handled via sigma-point updates where a deterministic sampling of $\mathbf{x}$ captures higher-order moments without explicit linearization.

Sliding-mode observers introduce discontinuous injection to overcome matched uncertainties:

$$\dot{\hat{\mathbf{x}}} = \mathbf{f}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}) + \eta \operatorname{sat}\left(\frac{\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}}{\phi} \right),$$

with boundary layer ϕ and gain η scaling the robustness margin; chattering is reduced by continuous approximations. For induction machines, rotor flux estimation uses

$$\dot{\hat{\psi}}_r = -\frac{R_r}{L_r}\hat{\psi}_r + \frac{L_m R_r}{L_r} i_s - j(\omega_e - \hat{\omega}_r)\hat{\psi}_r + \ell(\psi_s - \hat{\psi}_s),$$

with $\hat{\omega}_r$ updated from torque balance and slip models. Injection-based methods exploit saliency to extract position through demodulation of high-frequency current response; identifiability depends on saturation level, temperature, and operating point. [36]

Loss Type	Expression	Dependence	Typical Range	Effect
Conduction	$P_{cond} = R_{on}i^2 + V_{th}\|i\|$	i, T	0.1–5 W	Heat generation
Switching	$P_{sw} = f_s E_{sw}(i, V_{dc}, T)$	f_s, V_{dc}, T	0.5–10 W	Dynamic losses
Gate Drive	$\approx Q_g V_g f_s$	f_s, device type	0.01–1 W	Driver heating
Snubber	$= C_s V_{dc}^2 f_s$	C_s, V_{dc}, f_s	0.1–3 W	Surge protection

Table 4. Major inverter loss components and dependencies.

Control Scheme	Model Basis	Constraint Handling	Computation	Stability Guarantee
PI (Decoupled)	Linear	None	Low	Local
LQR	Linear-Quadratic	Implicit	Moderate	Global (nominal)
MPC (Continuous)	Discrete State-Space	Explicit	High	Bounded Horizon
FCS-MPC	Switching Set	Direct	High	Finite-Step
H_∞	Uncertain Model	Robust Norm	Very High	Guaranteed

Table 5. Comparison of current-control architectures.

Parameter	Symbol	Typical Value	Unit	Role	Design Sensitivity
DC-Link Capacitance	C_{dc}	2.2	mF	Bus voltage stability	High
Switching Frequency	f_s	10	kHz	Dynamic response	Medium
Dead Time	t_{dt}	2	μs	Voltage distortion	High
Modulation Index	μ	0.8	–	Output voltage scaling	High
Common-Mode Voltage	v_{cm}	¡50	V	EMI source	Medium

Table 6. Representative inverter and control parameters.

Robustness analysis employs input-to-state stability. For disturbance d entering additively,

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} = (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{BK})\tilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{E}d,$$

a quadratic Lyapunov function yields

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)\| \leq \kappa e^{-\lambda t}\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0)\| + \gamma \sup_{\tau\in[0,t]} \|d(\tau)\|,$$

with gain γ bounding steady-state sensitivity to noise and parameter drift. Measurement chain aspects, including shunt resistor tolerances, ADC nonlinearity, sampling jitter, and anti-alias filtering, shape effective $\mathbf{R}$ in estimation and the achievable bandwidth without amplifying quantization noise. Calibration and online adaptation can be cast as recursive least squares with forgetting factor β:

$$\hat{\theta}_{k+1} = \hat{\theta}_k + \mathbf{P}_{k+1}\phi_k^\top \left(y_k - \phi_k\hat{\theta}_k\right), \quad \mathbf{P}_{k+1} = \frac{1}{\beta}\left(\mathbf{P}_k - \frac{\mathbf{P}_k\phi_k\phi_k^\top\mathbf{P}_k}{\beta + \phi_k^\top\mathbf{P}_k\phi_k}\right),$$

for parameter vector θ describing, for instance, R_s and L_d, L_q variation with temperature. [37]

7. Performance Optimization and Multiobjective Trade-offs

A drive's operational merit is rarely captured by a single scalar. Efficiency, torque ripple, current distortion, thermal headroom, bus utilization, and acoustic noise form an interdependent vector of metrics. Multiobjective optimization formulates a Pareto problem

$$\min_{x\in\mathscr{X}} \mathbf{F}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(x) \\ f_2(x) \\ \cdots \\ f_m(x) \end{bmatrix}, \qquad \text{s.t. } g_i(x) \leq 0,\ h_j(x) = 0,$$

where x aggregates controller gains, modulation parameters, and machine setpoints. Weighted Tchebycheff scalars or ε-constraint methods generate representative fronts. A common energy-quality trade-off is posed as [38]

$$\min_{u(\cdot)} \int_0^T \left(\alpha P_{loss}(t) + \beta r_T^2(t) + \gamma\|\Delta u(t)\|^2\right) dt,$$

where P_{loss} accumulates copper, iron, and switching losses; r_T is torque ripple; and Δu penalizes rapid voltage changes that worsen EMI. Subject to current and voltage constraints, convex surrogates emerge by quadraticization around operating points, enabling efficient solution via sequential quadratic programming.

Loss models couple machine and inverter states. Copper loss is $P_{cu} = 3R_s i_{rms}^2$ with $R_s(T) = R_{s,0}[1 + \alpha_T(T - T_0)]$. Iron losses approximate

$$P_{fe} \approx k_h f_e B_{pk}^2 + k_e f_e^2 B_{pk}^2,$$

combining hysteresis and eddy contributions with electrical frequency f_e and peak flux B_{pk}. For a given torque T°,

Objective	Metric Symbol	Nature	Typical Weight	Effect on Drive
Efficiency	η	Maximize	High	Reduces total losses
Torque Ripple	r_T	Minimize	Medium	Improves smoothness
Current Distortion	THD_i	Minimize	Medium	Lowers EMI and heating
Thermal Stress	$\bar{T}_j, \Delta T_j$	Limit/Minimize	High	Extends component life
Acoustic Noise	A_{rms}	Minimize	Low	Enhances user comfort

Table 7. Representative performance objectives in multiobjective drive optimization.

reference selection (i_d°, i_q°) on the locus $T_e = T^\circ$ minimizes $P_{cu} + P_{fe}$. The resulting map defines an efficiency-oriented current scheduler that transitions toward flux weakening when $|\omega_e|$ grows and voltage headroom shrinks:

$$\min_{i_d, i_q} P_{cu}(i_d, i_q) + P_{fe}(i_d, i_q, \omega_e) \quad \text{s.t. } T_e(i_d, i_q) = T^\circ,\ \|\mathbf{v}(i_d, i_q, \omega_e)\| \leq V_{lim}.$$

Solution sensitivity to parameter uncertainty motivates robust variants [39] $\min_x \max_{\delta \in \Delta} F(x, \delta)$ under bounded Δ capturing R_s and L variation, dead-time change, and bus sag. Sampling-based approximations compute expected and worst-case objectives across scenarios.

Torque ripple arises from spatial harmonics and switching. Harmonic compensation injects targeted current components. For dominant order h,

$$i_q(t) = i_{q0} + \sum_{k \in \mathscr{H}} I_{qk} \sin(h_k \theta_e + \phi_k),$$

with amplitudes I_{qk} chosen to cancel identified torque components subject to current constraints. In predictive control, the cost includes a term on estimated ripple over the horizon via a harmonic model embedded in $\mathbf{A}_d$.

EMI and acoustic objectives reflect voltage slew and radial force harmonics [40]. A pragmatic surrogate penalizes squared derivatives of phase voltage and the magnitude of specific space-vector transitions. With discrete switching, the count of large-vector jumps is minimized via graph-based selection where nodes denote switching states and edges carry weights proportional to common-mode changes.

8. Thermal Dynamics, Reliability, and Lifecycle Considerations

Thermal evolution constrains sustained performance and accelerates aging. A lumped network for the stator, rotor, and inverter uses

$$\mathbf{C}_\theta \dot{\theta} = -\mathbf{G}_\theta \theta + \mathbf{H}_\theta \mathbf{p}(t) + \mathbf{u}_\theta,$$

where θ collects temperatures, $\mathbf{p}(t)$ stacks loss sources, $\mathbf{G}_\theta$ models conduction and convection, and $\mathbf{u}_\theta$ covers ambient and coolant influences. With coolant flow rate $\dot{m}$ and inlet temperature T_{in}, boundary coefficients vary with Reynolds and Nusselt correlations; within design, uncertainty can be handled via interval parameters. The inverter thermal path features device junction-to-case $R_{\theta jc}$, case-to-sink $R_{\theta cs}$, and sink-to-ambient $R_{\theta sa}$, producing junction temperature

$$T_j(t) = T_a + (R_{\theta sa} \star P_{sink})(t) + (R_{\theta cs} \star P_{mod})(t) + \left(R_{\theta jc} \star P_{sw+cond}\right)(t),$$

with $\star$ denoting convolution with step responses. Mission profiles with variable torque and speed generate temperature cycles characterized by amplitude ΔT_j and mean $\bar{T}_j$. Cycle counting and physics-based aging models map these to lifetime consumption. An Arrhenius acceleration factor for temperature and a Coffin–Manson law for solder fatigue combine as

$$AF_T = \exp\left(\frac{E_a}{k}\left(\frac{1}{T_{ref}} - \frac{1}{\bar{T}_j}\right)\right), \qquad N_f = C\,(\Delta T_j)^{-m},$$

leading to damage per cycle $D = 1/N_f$ and cumulative damage $D_{tot} = \sum D$. Reliability over time t follows a Weibull model

$$R(t) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{t}{\eta}\right)^\beta\right], \qquad h(t) = \frac{\beta}{\eta}\left(\frac{t}{\eta}\right)^{\beta-1},$$

with scale η and shape β updated from field data or accelerated tests.

Thermal coupling feeds back to electrical parameters; $R_s(T)$ increases, lowering efficiency and controller gain margin if not compensated. Magnet temperature alters λ_m and demagnetization risk at high $\bar{T}$. Design guard bands preserve at least 10% to 20% voltage and thermal headroom for expected transients [41]. Cooling design balances pump power against temperature reduction; an optimization may minimize

$$\int_0^T \left(\rho_p \dot{m}^3 + \rho_e P_{loss}(t)\right) dt$$

under temperature constraints, with ρ_p, ρ_e representing weights on pumping and electrical losses.

9. Implementation Aspects: Real-Time and Digital Considerations

Real-time realization discretizes continuous dynamics and introduces sampling delay, computational latency, and quantization. With zero-order hold and sampling time T_s,

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = \mathbf{A}_d \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{B}_d \mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{w}_k, \qquad \mathbf{A}_d = e^{\mathbf{A}T_s}, \quad \mathbf{B}_d = \int_0^{T_s} e^{\mathbf{A}\tau} d\tau\, \mathbf{B}.$$

Loss Component	Expression	Dominant Variable	Order of Magnitude	Model Type
Copper Loss	$P_{cu} = 3R_s i_{rms}^2$	i_{rms}, T	10–100 W	Quadratic
Iron Loss	$P_{fe} = k_h f_e B_{pk}^2 + k_e f_e^2 B_{pk}^2$	f_e, B_{pk}	5–50 W	Polynomial
Switching Loss	$f_s E_{sw}(i, V_{dc}, T)$	f_s, V_{dc}	1–20 W	Empirical
Conduction Loss	$R_{on} i^2 + V_{th}\|i\|$	i	1–10 W	Piecewise Linear
Pump Power	$\rho_p \dot{m}^3$	$\dot{m}$	0.1–2 W	Cubic

Table 8. Energy loss sources contributing to multiobjective optimization.

Implementation Factor	Symbol	Typical Value	Impact	Mitigation Strategy
Sampling Time	T_s	100–200 μs	Phase delay, reduced stability	Select faster ADC/CPU
Computation Delay	τ_c	10–50 μs	Effective lag in loop	Predictor or compensation
Quantization Step	Δ	10^{-4}–10^{-3}	Steady-state error	Increase word length
Dead Time	t_{dt}	1–3 μs	Voltage distortion	Adaptive compensation
Jitter	J_t	¡5 μs	Random timing error	Task synchronization

Table 9. Digital and real-time implementation parameters affecting drive performance.

Controller execution consumes τ_c of the interval, effectively adding one-step delay. Discrete-time stability margins shrink as $\omega_b T_s$ approaches unity, where ω_b is loop bandwidth [42]. Fixed-point implementations must bound rounding; for word length n and dynamic range R, quantization step $\Delta = R/2^n$ should maintain signal-to-quantization-noise ratios above target. A conservative bound on steady-state error due to quantization in an integral controller with gain k_i is

$$e_\infty \leq \frac{\Delta}{k_i}.$$

Scheduling affects jitter and effective delay. An asynchronous PWM timer aligned with ADC sampling reduces measurement corruption by switching edges. Dead-time compensation requires sign-correct current estimates; practical schemes filter sign to avoid rapid toggling near zero crossings. Anti-windup strategies limit integral states upon saturation of v_d^*, v_q^* by projecting onto the inverter polygon $\mathscr{V}_d$. For predictive controllers, solving times must remain a small fraction of T_s; warm starts, condensing, and explicit solvers with precomputed regions reduce burden [43]. When computational headroom is narrow, a hierarchical strategy uses a fast inner current loop and a slower optimization-based scheduler for setpoints, achieving most benefits at reduced cost.

Fault detection leverages residuals between measured and predicted currents and bus voltage. A residual $r_k = \mathbf{y}_k - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_k$ with CUSUM or generalized likelihood tests flags anomalies exceeding thresholds adapted to operating point. Open-phase faults manifest as persistent asymmetry and elevated common-mode voltage, prompting reconfiguration to a two-phase control mode with derated torque capability. For safety-critical tasks, independent monitoring mitigates common-cause failures, and deterministic execution with bounded worst-case runtimes supports certification requirements.

Verification and validation close the loop between model and implementation [44]. Plant–controller co-simulation with switching models assesses ripple and EMI; reduced-order averaged models accelerate exploration. Parameter identification on prototypes employs current injection and torque measurements to refine R_s, L_d, L_q, and friction terms. Acceptance criteria cover efficiency at representative points, torque ripple within specified bands, thermal margins under sustained loads, and robustness against bus perturbations of $\pm 10\%$ and ambient changes of tens of degrees Celsius. Data logging at synchronized rates enables spectral analyses that separate mechanical, electromagnetic, and switching contributions within observed signals.

10. Conclusion

The design of electrical drive systems unfolds as an interconnected sequence of modeling, control, and optimization activities, each constrained by practical implementation realities and lifecycle considerations. At the heart of this process lies the pursuit of precise, efficient, and reliable conversion between electrical and mechanical energy [45]. The complexity arises because every modeling assumption and control choice directly influences the physical limits, losses, and long-term durability of the system. Engineers must therefore navigate this multidimensional design space with both analytical rigor and pragmatic awareness, ensuring that theoretical formulations translate into tangible performance under real-world operating conditions.

The modeling phase establishes the physical and mathematical foundation of the drive. Electrical machines and converters are described through equations capturing electromagnetic coupling, torque production, and dynamic response. The use of field-oriented formulations provides a coordinate system that aligns with the rotating magnetic field, transforming the inherently coupled three-phase quantities into nearly decoupled direct and quadrature axes. This transformation exposes the internal structure of torque and flux regulation, offering clarity and controllability that would be obscured in the original stationary frame [46]. Compatible inverter models complement these formulations by linking the commanded voltage vectors to the actual phase voltages delivered by the power electronic stage. However, this ideal structure is never perfect: nonidealities such as dead-time, semiconductor voltage drops, and magnetic saturation reappear as bounded disturbances that perturb the otherwise elegant decoupling. These disturbances, though small, have critical implications for precision and efficiency, demanding careful characterization and compensation strategies within the control design.

Once the physical and coordinate framework is established, attention turns to control architectures. Classical rotating-frame control, typically based on proportional-integral (PI) current regulators, remains a mainstay due to its simplicity, robustness, and ease of implementation. Yet as performance demands rise—through faster dynamics, tighter tolerances, or higher efficiency—more advanced techniques emerge [47]. Predictive control methods leverage discrete-time models to forecast system behavior and select optimal control actions that minimize multiobjective costs under explicit constraints. Robust control formulations, including H_∞ and sliding-mode strategies, aim to preserve stability and performance in the presence of parameter uncertainty and external disturbances. Remarkably, despite their different philosophies, all these controllers can be expressed in a unified state-space language. This representation facilitates transparent reasoning about stability margins, constraint handling, and disturbance sensitivity, and it allows designers to quantify how model uncertainty propagates into closed-loop performance degradation.

Estimation and sensing constitute another essential dimension of drive system design [48]. Accurate knowledge of rotor position, speed, and flux linkage is vital for field-oriented control, yet direct measurement is often limited by cost, space, or environmental factors. At low speeds, observability of certain machine states deteriorates, especially in sensorless configurations where back electromotive force (EMF) signals vanish. Estimators such as extended Kalman filters, Luenberger observers, and model reference adaptive systems are therefore employed to reconstruct unmeasured states from available current and voltage data. These estimators must also adapt to thermal effects, magnetic saturation, and gradual parameter drift, ensuring that control actions remain properly aligned even as machine characteristics evolve over time. Sensing imperfections—such as current offset, phase delay, or quantization—are similarly addressed through calibration, filtering, and redundancy, maintaining the integrity of the feedback loop under adverse conditions.

Performance optimization spans an even broader horizon, linking control design to the drive's energetic and thermal behavior [49]. A single control objective, such as torque accuracy, rarely suffices; instead, engineers confront a constellation of competing goals. Minimizing current ripple, reducing electromagnetic interference (EMI), and limiting thermal stress often conflict with maximizing dynamic response or minimizing losses. Multiobjective optimization frameworks provide a structured way to expose and explore these trade-offs. Rather than collapsing diverse metrics into a single weighted cost, such formulations map the Pareto front—the set of nondominated solutions where improvement in one objective inevitably worsens another. This explicit view enables informed decisions about operating priorities, allowing design teams to align their choices with application-specific requirements, whether they concern efficiency, smoothness, or lifespan. Furthermore, robust optimization variants incorporate uncertainty in plant parameters, ambient conditions, and mission profiles, ensuring that performance remains acceptable even when real-world deviations occur. [50]

Thermal dynamics and reliability analysis serve as the bridge between electrical and mechanical domains, translating control decisions into physical consequences over time. Electrical losses in conductors and semiconductors generate heat, leading to temperature cycles that influence material degradation and component aging. Models of heat transfer, both transient and steady-state, predict how these losses distribute among machine windings, cores, and cooling surfaces. Reliability models then use these temperature profiles to estimate lifetime consumption of critical elements such as bearings, insulation, and semiconductor junctions. This coupling provides a quantitative foundation for derating strategies—operating below nominal limits to extend life—or for designing advanced cooling systems that permit higher performance without excessive thermal stress [51]. The result is a feedback loop between control aggressiveness and thermal resilience: faster torque transients or higher switching frequencies can improve response but accelerate fatigue, while gentler operation enhances longevity at the cost of dynamic agility.

Real-time implementation brings the theoretical design to life, subjecting all assumptions to the constraints of digital computation and embedded execution. The controller, often running on a digital signal processor or field-programmable gate array, must execute its tasks within microsecond-scale sampling intervals. Quantization, computational delays, and task scheduling introduce deviations from the ideal continuous-time model. Verification and validation processes therefore confirm that numerical effects, code execution times, and interrupt handling remain within tolerances that preserve closed-loop stability. In this stage, simulation-based validation transitions to hardware-in-the-loop testing and full system prototyping, where electromagnetic interference, sensor noise, and load disturbances reveal behaviors that models could only approximate [52]. The iterative refinement between simulation and experiment ensures that the implemented system meets its analytical design targets under real operational stress.

The synthesis of all these layers—modeling, control, optimization, sensing, thermal management, and implementation—forms the essence of modern electrical drive engineering. Each decision influences multiple others, and progress depends on balancing fidelity, complexity, and feasibility. High-fidelity models enhance prediction accuracy but demand more computational resources; sophisticated controllers promise superior performance but increase sensitivity to parameter errors and software complexity. Optimization frameworks clarify trade-offs but require trustworthy models and extensive computation. The art of drive design lies in aligning these elements so that no subsystem is overdesigned or underutilized relative to the overall objectives [53]. The ultimate aim is to produce a drive system that achieves its targeted efficiency, dynamic response, and durability without overstating performance or underestimating limitations.

In this integrative view, the electrical drive is not merely a collection of components but a cohesive electromechanical organism. Its behavior reflects the harmony—or tension—between physical principles, control theory, and computational realization. By embedding robustness at every level, from modeling assumptions to digital scheduling, engineers can navigate the intricate trade space that defines modern drive systems. The outcome is a balanced design philosophy where performance, reliability, and practicality coexist, ensuring that each watt of electrical input and each degree of mechanical motion contributes predictably to the system's intended purpose. Through this disciplined yet adaptive process, electrical drive technology continues to evolve as one of the most refined embodiments of applied systems engineering [54].

References

[1] G. Neidhofer and A. Troedson, "Large converter-fed synchronous motors for high speeds and adjustable speed operation: design features and experience," *IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 633–636, 1999.

[2] D. Krahenbuhl, C. Zwyssig, H. Weser, and J. W. Kolar, "A miniature 500 000-r/min electrically driven turbocompressor," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 2459–2466, 2010.

[3] M. Sundaram, P. Navaneethan, and T. D. Kumar, "Design and development of energy efficient submersible switched reluctance motor," *Journal of Engineering and Technology*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 70–, 2014.

[4] T. Tsuchiya, "Direct digital control of electrical drive system based on improved optimal regulator theory," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 517–525, 1983.

[5] Z. Yang and X. Ma, "Direct torque control system for coal mine equipment based on improved genetic algorithms," *Journal of Computers*, vol. 7, pp. 1228–1235, 5 2012.

[6] A. Kern, "Didactical concepts and tools for explaining power electronics applications," *Microelectronics Journal*, vol. 27, no. 2-3, pp. 139–147, 1996.

[7] S. Preitl, R.-E. Precup, Z. Preitl, and L. Kovács, "Development methods of fuzzy controllers with dynamics for low order benchmarks (electrical drives)," *Proceedings First International IEEE Symposium Intelligent Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 13–18.

[8] J. Bao, K. O. Boynov, J. J. H. Paulides, and E. A. Lomonova, "Usage of the inductive energy storage in the field winding for driving the variable reluctance motor," *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1–4, 2016.

[9] İlyas Eker and Y. Torun, "Fuzzy logic control to be conventional method," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 377–394, 2006.

[10] T. Manjunath and A. Kusagur, "Fault diagnosis and reconfiguration of multilevel inverter switch failure-a performance perspective," *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)*, vol. 6, pp. 2610–2610, 12 2016.

[11] H. Kawai, J. Cordier, R. Kennel, and S. Doki, "Application of finite control set–model predictive control for servo brake motion in pmsm drives," *IEEE Canadian Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 117–129, 2023.

[12] D. Susitra, S. T. Rao, and P. B. Sudheer, "Implementation of controller for pmbldc motor drive based electric vehicle," *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, vol. 9, pp. 200–204, 12 2019.

[13] J. Dochviri, "Optimization of control processes of digital electrical drive systems," *Latvian Journal of Physics and Technical Sciences*, vol. 47, pp. 16–24, 1 2010.

[14] F. Popescu, A. Andras, and I. Kertész, "Balance survey / analysis of vertical transport installations using the nyquist stability criterion," *ITM Web of Conferences*, vol. 29, pp. 01013–, 10 2019.

[15] T. G. Manjunath and A. Kusagur, "Robust fault detection of multilevel inverter using optimized radial basis function based artificial neural network in renewable energy power generation application," *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 180, pp. 8–15, 6 2018.

[16] J. Hoffmann, W. Canders, and M. Henke, "Impact of current density and cooling on the weight balance of electrical propulsion drives for aviation," *Energies*, vol. 13, pp. 6149–, 11 2020.

[17] G. Tsintsadze, H. Manoharan, D. Beetner, D. Commerou, B. Booth, and K. Martin, "Predicting radiated emissions from an electrical drive system," in *2023 Joint Asia-Pacific International Symposium on Electromagnetic Compatibility and International Conference on ElectroMagnetic Interference & Compatibility (APEMC/INCEMIC)*, pp. 1–4, IEEE, 2023.

[18] J. Roberts, P. Corke, and G. J. Winstanley, "Development of a 3500-tonne field robot," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 18, pp. 739–752, 7 1999.

[19] M. Murtaja, "Interval type-2 fuzzy logic controller for speed control of dc motor in an intelligent manner," *International Journal of Innovative Research in Engineering & Multidisciplinary Physical Sciences*, vol. 12, 7 2024.

[20] Z. S. Yang, "Direct torque control system for belt conveyor based on improved genetic algorithms," *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, vol. 135-136, pp. 443–448, 2011.

[21] A. W. Burton, "Innovation drivers for electric power-assisted steering," *IEEE Control Systems*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 30–39, 2003.

[22] H. Chen, B. Jiang, and N. Lu, "An improved incipient fault detection method based on kullback-leibler divergence.," *ISA transactions*, vol. 79, pp. 127–136, 5 2018.

[23] H. Sarhan, "Energy efficient control of three-phase induction motor drive," *Energy and Power Engineering*, vol. 03, no. 2, pp. 107–112, 2011.

[24] H. Xie, W. Tian, X. Gao, F. Wang, J. Rodriguez, and R. Kennel, "An ensemble regulation principle for multiobjective finite-control-set model-predictive control of induction machine drives," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 3069–3083, 2023.

[25] null Ponnu. M. S and null Gomathy. S, "Direct torque control of induction motor with pi and fuzzy tuned pi based speed regulators," *International Journal of Engineering Research and*, vol. V5, 5 2016.

[26] G. Schaub and R. Edzang, "Erzeugung synthetischer kraftstoffe aus erdgas und biomasse – stand und perspektiven," *Chemie Ingenieur Technik*, vol. 83, pp. 1912–1924, 10 2011.

[27] V. A. Denisov and A. V. Bochkarev, "Operation of small-displacement linear actuator," *Russian Electrical Engineering*, vol. 82, pp. 76–79, 5 2011.

[28] E. Zaidi, K. Marouani, H. Bouadi, K. Nounou, and M. Becherif, "Circulating current reduction-based hybrid controller of an electrical drive system fed by two parallel inverters," *Electrical Engineering*, vol. 103, pp. 3049–3061, 4 2021.

[29] T. Baumgartner and J. W. Kolar, "Multivariable state feedback control of a 500 000-r/min self-bearing permanent-magnet motor," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 1149–1159, 2015.

[30] S. U. Gunjal, G. D. Sonawane, S. P. Awate, and D. R. Satpute, "Design, analysis & fabrication of efficycle: A hybrid tricycle," *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology*, vol. 17, pp. 389–394, 11 2014.

[31] P. Balakrishna, G. Book, W. Kirchgassner, M. Schenke, A. Traue, and O. Wallscheid, "gym-electric-motor (gem): A python toolbox for the simulation of electric drive systems," *Journal of Open Source Software*, vol. 6, pp. 2498–, 2 2021.

[32] M. H. M. Sathik, P. Sundararajan, F. Sasongko, J. Pou, and V. Vaiyapuri, "Short circuit detection and fault current limiting method for igbts," *IEEE Transactions on Device and Materials Reliability*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 686–693, 2020.

[33] T.-J. Su, T.-Y. Tsou, S.-M. Wang, T.-Y. Li, and H.-Q. Vu, "Torque ripple reduction of induction motor based on a hybrid method of model predictive torque control and particle swarm optimization," *Advances in Mechanical Engineering*, vol. 8, pp. 1687814016676465–, 10 2016.

[34] Q.-M. Wu, Y. Zhan, M. Zhang, X. Chen, and W. Cao, "Efficiency optimization control of an ipmsm drive system for electric vehicles (evs)," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 19, pp. 2716–2733, 6 2021.

[35] A. Looser and J. W. Kolar, "An active magnetic damper concept for stabilization of gas bearings in high-speed permanent-magnet machines," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 3089–3098, 2014.

[36] M. Schuck, P. Puentener, T. Holenstein, and J. W. Kolar, "Scaling and design of miniature high-speed bearingless slice motors," *e & i Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik*, vol. 136, pp. 112–119, 3 2019.

[37] E. Schmidt, "Calculation of electromagnetic quantities of permanent magnet synchronous machines with tooth coil windings using finite elements and frozen permeabilities," *e & i Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik*, vol. 132, pp. 11–17, 2 2015.

[38] N. Erdogan, H. Henao, and R. Grisel, "An improved methodology for dynamic modelling and simulation of electromechanically coupled drive systems: An experimental validation," *Sadhana*, vol. 40, pp. 2021–2043, 11 2015.

[39] P. J. C. Branco and J. A. Dente, "An experiment in automatic modeling an electrical drive system using fuzzy logic," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 254–262, 1998.

[40] J. A. Antonino-Daviu, S. B. Lee, and E. G. Strangas, "Guest editorial special section on advanced signal and image processing techniques for electric machines and drives fault diagnosis and prognosis," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1257–1260, 2017.

[41] C. Grantham and D. McKinnon, "Rapid parameter determination for induction motor analysis and control," *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 1014–1020, 2003.

[42] P. B. Reddy, K.-K. Huh, and A. El-Refaie, "Generalized approach of stator shifting in interior permanent-magnet machines equipped with fractional-slot concentrated windings," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 5035–5046, 2014.

[43] A. J. Al-Shammerie and K. S. Krikor, "Design and implementation of intelligent soft- start controller for induction motor controlled by vsi," *Engineering and Technology Journal*, vol. 28, pp. 1117–1127, 3 2010.

[44] I. P. Maradzhiev, T. Grigorova, and E. Dinkov, "Simulation and experimental investigation of modulation techniques for bldc motor control," *Universal Journal of Electrical and Electronic Engineering*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 28–45, 2020.

[45] S. A. Deshmukh and A. R. Askhedkar, "Detecting faults based on motor current signature analysis for electric motor," *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, vol. 07, no. 07, pp. 75–79, 2017.

[46] J. Diekmann, C. Hanisch, L. Froböse, G. Schälicke, T. Loellhoeffel, A.-S. Fölster, and A. Kwade, "Ecological recycling of lithium-ion batteries from electric vehicles with focus on mechanical processes," *Journal of The Electrochemical Society*, vol. 164, pp. A6184–A6191, 12 2016.

[47] D. Labrousse, B. Revol, and F. Costa, "Common-mode modeling of the association of n -switching cells: Application to an electric-vehicle-drive system," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 2852–2859, 2010.

[48] G. Lei, T. Wang, Y. Guo, J. Zhu, and S. Wang, "System-level design optimization methods for electrical drive systems: Deterministic approach," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 6591–6602, 2014.

[49] C. Hu, B. Yao, and Q. Wang, "Adaptive robust precision motion control of systems with unknown input dead-zones: A case study with comparative experiments," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 2454–2464, 2011.

[50] S. Gothivarekar, G. Glodek, and R. Talemi, "Numerical study on effects of microstructure randomness on fatigue fracture of non-oriented electrical steel," *Procedia Structural Integrity*, vol. 57, pp. 487–493, 2024.

[51] F. Wang, X. Mei, J. Rodriguez, and R. Kennel, "Model predictive control for electrical drive systems-an overview," *CES Transactions on Electrical Machines and Systems*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 219–230, 2017.

[52] C. Xia, P. Song, T. Shi, and Y. Yan, "Chaotic dynamics characteristic analysis for matrix converter," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 78–87, 2013.

[53] H. Chen, B. Jiang, T. Zhang, and N. Lu, "Data-driven and deep learning-based detection and diagnosis of incipient faults with application to electrical traction systems," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 396, pp. 429–437, 2020.

[54] M. I. Bayindir, H. Can, Z. H. Akpolat, M. Özdemir, and E. Akin, "Application of reaching law approach to the position control of a vector controlled induction motor drive," *Electrical Engineering*, vol. 87, pp. 207–215, 3 2004.