Comparison of MATLAB Scripts tms_1.m, tms_2.m, and tms_3.m for Battery Cooling Simulation

Matriculation Number: 5014405

May 14, 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Overview of the Scripts	2
3	Comparison of Explanatory Documents	2
	3.1 tms_1.m: Foundational Model	2
	3.2 tms_2.m: Enhanced Modeling	2
	3.3 tms_3.m: User-Friendly Interface	3
	3.4 Key Differences	4
4	Rationale for Using MATLAB Numerical Programming	4
5	Conclusion	5

1 Introduction

This document compares the MATLAB scripts tms_1.m, tms_2.m, and tms_3.m, which simulate the thermal behavior of a 48V, 4kWh lithium-ion battery pack with a liquid cooling system. Each script builds on its predecessor, introducing new features and improvements to enhance functionality, accuracy, and usability. Additionally, this write-up explains the decision to use MATLAB's numerical programming approach (Euler or RK4 solvers) instead of Simulink or Simscape models, driven by the availability of academic licenses and partial license limitations for Simscape.

2 Overview of the Scripts

All three scripts model a lithium-ion battery pack with a liquid cooling plate, aiming to maintain cell temperatures near 35°C under various discharge conditions. They share a common goal of simulating thermal dynamics but differ in complexity, solver methods, control strategies, and user interfaces. Below is a detailed comparison of their features, followed by a discussion of the license-driven implementation choice.

3 Comparison of Explanatory Documents

3.1 tms_1.m: Foundational Model

The explanatory document for tms_1.m (TMS_1.pdf) describes a baseline MATLAB script for simulating a 13s10p battery pack under a constant 2C discharge rate. Key features include:

- **Discharge Profile**: Fixed at 2C (171A total, 17.1A per cell), generating approximately 799.2W of heat per cell via $I^2R + 0.5$ W entropic heating.
- Solver: Supports Simulink (if licensed) with the ode23t solver or a numerical Euler method (0.01s step size) for systems without Simulink.
- Cooling System: Uses a liquid cooling plate (0.2 m² surface area, 800 W/m²-K convective coefficient) with proportional control (75 W/m²-K/°C gain) and a 30s coolant delay.
- Ambient Conditions: Nominal ambient temperature at 35°C with ± 0.5 °C Gaussian noise; coolant inlet at 30°C.
- Output: Command-line results (maximum and final temperatures, stability checks) and a traditional figure plot showing cell temperature, coolant, ambient, and 45°C limit lines.
- Limitations: Lacks a dynamic discharge profile, uses a simple Euler solver (less accurate), and has no graphical user interface (GUI).

The document emphasizes the script's simplicity and compatibility, making it suitable for users with or without Simulink. It includes troubleshooting notes for adjusting cooling parameters (e.g., increasing h_conv_base or reducing tau_delay) and checking MATLAB's configuration.

3.2 tms 2.m: Enhanced Modeling

The explanatory document for tms_2.m (TMS_2.pdf) details improvements over tms_1.m, introducing a more realistic and complex simulation. Key enhancements include:

• **Discharge Profile**: Dynamic drive cycle with 25 segments (0–3600s) and C-rates varying from 0.5C to 3C, interpolating heat generation for a realistic load.

- Solver: Replaces Euler with a Runge-Kutta 4 (RK4) solver for higher numerical accuracy, alongside Simulink support with ode23t.
- Cooling System: Upgrades to PID control (k_P = 120, k_I = 1.5, k_D = 25) for tighter temperature tracking, increases h_conv_base to 1000 W/m²-K, reduces R_thermal to 0.02 K/W, and shortens tau_delay to 10s. Adds coolant flow (0.02 kg/s) and specific heat (3500 J/kg-K) to calculate outlet temperature.
- Ambient Conditions: Supports nominal (35°C) and worst-case (40°C) ambient temperatures, with increased noise (± 1 °C) and a 60°C thermal runaway threshold.
- Battery Parameters: Reduces cell_resistance to 7 mOhm with ±10% variation across cells (seeded for reproducibility) and lowers T_coolant_in to 24°C.
- Output: Enhanced command-line results with runaway warnings and a figure plot including a 60°C runaway threshold line. Still lacks a GUI.
- Limitations: No GUI, requiring users to edit code directly for parameter changes.

The document highlights the script's robustness, with RK4 and PID control improving accuracy and stability. Troubleshooting notes focus on tuning PID parameters and verifying the RK4 implementation.

3.3 tms_3.m: User-Friendly Interface

The explanatory document for tms_3.m (TMS_3.pdf) describes the most advanced script, building on tms_2.m by adding a GUI and dialog-based output. Key features include:

- Discharge Profile: Retains tms_2.m's dynamic drive cycle, with C-rates input via a GUI text field (comma-separated values).
- Solver: Continues using RK4 for numerical simulations, with no Simulink dependency in the provided code (reflecting license constraints).
- Cooling System: Inherits tms_2.m's PID control and cooling parameters, but adds a coolant type dropdown (Water-Glycol 50/50, Water, Ethylene Glycol) that adjusts Cp coolant and h conv base dynamically based on pack size and discharge rate.
- Ambient Conditions: Supports nominal and worst-case ambient inputs via GUI fields, maintaining tms_2.m's 60°C runaway threshold.
- GUI: Uses uifigure (MATLAB R2016a+) with a 600x500 pixel window, split into:
 - **Left Panel**: Inputs for series/parallel cells, voltage, capacity, and C-rates.
 - Right Panel: Inputs for ambient temperatures and coolant type, with a "Run Simulation" button.
- Output: Displays results in an 800x500 uifigure dialog with a uitextarea for text (temperatures, stability) and a uiaxes for plotting, eliminating extra figure windows. Errors are shown in a separate dialog.
- Limitations: Troubleshooting notes incorrectly reference tms_2.m instead of tms_3.m, a minor documentation error.

The document emphasizes the GUI's usability, making the script accessible to users without coding expertise. Troubleshooting notes address GUI issues and parameter tuning, though the naming error is noted.

3.4 Key Differences

The progression from tms_1.m to tms_3.m reflects increasing sophistication:

- Discharge Complexity: tms_1.m uses a constant 2C rate, while tms_2.m and tms_3.m implement a dynamic 25-segment drive cycle (0.5C-3C), better mimicking real-world loads.
- Solver Accuracy: tms_1.m's Euler method is replaced by RK4 in tms_2.m and tms_3.m, improving numerical stability and precision.
- Cooling Control: tms_1.m uses proportional control, upgraded to PID in tms_2.m and tms_3.m for better temperature regulation. tms_3.m adds coolant type selection.
- Ambient Modeling: tms_1.m models only nominal conditions (35°C), while tms_2.m and tms 3.m include worst-case (40°C) and runaway thresholds (60°C).
- User Interface: tms_1.m and tms_2.m rely on command-line interaction and traditional plots, whereas tms_3.m introduces a GUI and dialog-based output for enhanced usability.
- Parameter Flexibility: tms_3.m allows runtime configuration of battery and cooling parameters via the GUI, unlike the hardcoded values in tms_1.m and tms_2.m.
- **Documentation Error**: Only tms_3.m's troubleshooting notes contain a naming inconsistency (referencing tms_2.m).

4 Rationale for Using MATLAB Numerical Programming

The scripts were implemented using MATLAB's numerical programming approach (Euler in tms_1.m, RK4 in tms_2.m and tms_3.m) instead of Simulink or Simscape models due to academic license constraints:

- MATLAB License Availability: The academic license provides full access to core MATLAB functionality, enabling the development of numerical solvers like Euler and RK4. These solvers are implemented directly in MATLAB code, ensuring compatibility across all licensed systems.
- Simulink License Limitations: While Simulink is supported in the scripts (checked via license('test', 'Simulink')), its availability is not guaranteed in all academic environments. To ensure portability, the scripts include numerical fallbacks, which were prioritized in tms_3.m's implementation (evident from the absence of Simulink-specific code in the simulation function).
- Simscape Partial License Issue: The scripts check for Simscape (license('test', 'Simscape')), but partial license availability prevents reliable use of Simscape blocks (e.g., thermal or electrical components). Simscape's dependency on specialized toolboxes, which may not be included in standard academic licenses, led to its exclusion. Instead, thermal dynamics are modeled using first-principles equations (e.g., $\frac{dT}{dt} = \frac{Q_{\text{heat}} Q_{\text{cool}}}{mCp}$).

By focusing on numerical methods, the scripts remain accessible to users with only a core MATLAB license, avoiding reliance on Simulink's graphical modeling or Simscape's physical modeling capabilities. The RK4 solver in tms_2.m and tms_3.m provides sufficient accuracy for thermal simulations, while the GUI in tms_3.m enhances usability without requiring additional toolboxes.

5 Conclusion

The tms_1.m, tms_2.m, and tms_3.m scripts represent a progression from a basic, constant-load thermal simulation to a sophisticated, user-friendly tool with dynamic discharge and GUI support. tms_1.m establishes a simple foundation, tms_2.m enhances realism with RK4 and PID control, and tms_3.m prioritizes accessibility with a GUI. The choice of numerical programming over Simulink and Simscape ensures compatibility with academic license constraints, making the scripts widely usable while maintaining robust thermal modeling capabilities. Future improvements could address the documentation error in tms_3.m and explore additional coolant types or discharge profiles within the numerical framework.