Impact of Current-Compensated Choke Design on EML Filter Performance

Szymon Pasko Senior Research Manager

shaping electrical power

Goal of Presentation



- Current-compensated choke in EMI filter
- Comparison of different current-compensated choke designs concepts
- Parameters impact on current-compensated choke properties
- Comparison of core shapes
- Magnetic material impact on current-compensated choke properties:
 - Comparison of ferrite cores with different permeability
 - Comparison of nanocrystalline cores with different permeability
 - Comparison of nanocrystalline vs. ferrite cores
 - Comparison of nanocrystalline and ferrite saturation properties
- Impact of winding method on current-compensated choke properties
- Conclusion

Current-Compensated Choke in EMI Filter

SCHAFFNER shaping electrical power



Current-Compensated Choke Design Examples







Properties of current-compensated choke vs. frequency depends on:

$$L_s = \frac{\mu' \mu_o A_e N^2}{l_e} \qquad \qquad R_s = 2\pi f \frac{\mu'' \mu_o A_e N^2}{l_e}$$

Dimension and type of core, (cross section of core Ae, magnetic lenght of core I_e)

Properties of magnetic material (permeability μ ', μ '', magnetic flux B_s)

Saturation properties

Number of turns and method of winding (parasitic capacitance)



Comparison of Core Shape





Magnetic Material Impact

Assumptions:

- Core shape toroidal
- Type of magnetic material nanocrystalline and ferrite MnZn
- Dimension of ferrite core and nanocrystalline core are the same
- Different permeability
- The same number of turns
- To illustrate impact of the choke on the performance of the EMI filter, demo filter with 7 version of choke was tested
- Only difference was current-compensated choke





Ferrite

Nanocrystalline

© Schaffner Group

Material	Ferrite				Nanocrystalline		
Choke	no.1	no.2	no.3	no.4	no.5	no.6	no.7
Permeability	15 000	10 000	5000	5000 ¹⁾	100 000	70 000	50 000
Max. Flux Density [T] 25°C/100°C	0.40/0.17	0.41/0.21	0.44/0.3	0.44/0.3	1.2/1.1	1.2/1.1	1.2/1.1
Curie Temperature	110°C	130°C	140°C	140°C	600°C	600°C	600°C
Operation Temperature	100°C	120°C	120°C	120ºC	130ºC 150ºC	130ºC 150ºC	130ºC 150ºC
Dimension [mm]	63x38x28			65x40x28			
Turns	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
L@10kHz [mH]	15.2	10.4	7.4	7.4	56.6	48.4	29.8
L@100kHz [mH]	5.0	5.4	7.9	8.0	9.1	16.23	14.3
L@150kHz [mH]	3.5	3.4	8.6	8.7	6.4	10.6	9.8

Core of choke no.1, no.2, no.3 come from supplier A, no.4 supplier B, no.5, no.6, no.7 from supplier C

Magnetic Material Impact: Different Permeability





Magnetic Material Impact (Nanocrystalline): Different Permeability





Magnetic Material Impact (Ferrite MnZn): Different Permeability



SCHaffner

shaping electrical powe

Magnetic Material Impact : Comparision Nanocrystalline vs. Ferrite





Ferrite 63x38x28mm N=23



Nanocrystalline 65x40x28mm N=23 Very high impedance of choke made out of nanocrystalline material

32dB

15dB

100k

1M

Frequency Hz

50

40

30

20

10

10k

IL_{CM} [dB]

Impedance of choke no.4 (ferrite) is higher than no.5 (nanocrystalline) between 250 kHz and 500 kHz

> (no.3)MnZn μ 5000 (no.4) MnZn μ 5000 (no.5)Nano μ 100 000 (no.6) Nano μ 70 000

The impedance is similar in MHz range

10M 30M

Magnetic Material Impact: Comparision Nanocrystalline vs. Ferrite

SCHAFFNEC





Saturation due to common mode current:

Ferrite MnZn μ 5000 Nanocrystalline μ 50 000





$I_{s1} =$	$B_{s1}l_{e1}$,
	$\overline{\mu_e \mu_1 N_1}$	Ι

 I_{S2}

$$I_{s2} = \frac{B_{s2}l_{e2}}{\mu_e\mu_2N_2}$$

$$l_{e1} \approx l_{e2}$$

$$N_1 = N_2$$

$$\frac{B_{s1}}{2} = \frac{B_{s1}}{2} \frac{\mu_2}{2}$$

 $B_{S2} \mu_1$

Saturation current is higher for ferrite



The saturation current of nanocrystalline core will be higher only if permeability of cores will be equal

Saturation due to volt-time product:

Ferrite MnZn µ5 000





Nanocrystalline µ50 000

$$\int V_1 dt = N_1 B_{S1} A_{e1} \qquad \int V_2 dt = N_2 B_{S2} A_{e2}$$
$$N_1 = N_2$$
$$A_{e1} \approx A_{e2}$$
$$\frac{\int V_1 dt}{\int V_2 dt} = \frac{B_{s1}}{B_{s2}}$$

The nanocrystalline is more immune to saturation than ferrite.



SLIDE 15

SCHAFFNer

shaping electrical power

SCHAFFNEr shaping electrical power

Assumptions:

- Core shape -toroidal
- Material- ferrite 15 000
- Core dimension 63x38x28 mm
- The number of turns is 23
- Three methods of winding are compared, single layer, double layer, ``bifilar``
- The ``bifilar `` winding is made with cable with silicon isolation to achieve required isolation
- To illustrate impact of the choke on the performance of the EMI filter, demo filter with 3 version of choke was tested
- Only difference was current compensated choke

SLIDE 16









- Good attenuation at high frequency
- × Require more space for windings

- Require less space for windings
- × Less attenuation at high frequency



 Good attenuation at high frequency
 Require more space for windings
 Low attenuation at low frequency
 Require cable with thicker isolation









SLIDE 19





Conclusion



Core shape

Toroid cores have highest CM impedance, AL vs. volume, low leakage inductance but difficult to wind big wires

Rectangular cores have higher leakage inductance and more space for winding but lower impedance, AL

Cores with air gap have reduction by 50% of CM insertion loss

Core material

A high permeability material does not guarantee high EMI noise reduction at all frequencies

Lower permeability material more often gives better EMI noise reduction above 150kHz

Chokes with nanocrystalline material have higher CM insertion loss below 150 kHz compared to ferrite. However

nanocrystalline are no better than ferrite when DM noise dominates

Nanocrystalline cores are ca 5 times expensive than ferrite

Conclusion



Saturation properties

- Saturation current is proportional to the ratio Bs/µ when le and N are not changed
- Maximum flux density B_s for nanocrystalline is always higher than that for ferrite (ca 3 times), but if μ for
- nanocrystalline is much higher than that for ferrite then saturation current for the ferrite will be the higher
- Then nanocrystalline is more immune to saturation than ferrite if saturation is due to volt-time product. However if N
- and Ae are significantly reduced the advantage of nanocrystalline can be negated

Conclusion



Method of Winding

- Single layer winding has the highest EMI noise reduction at high frequencies due to the lowest value of parasitic capacitance
- Double layer winding has less EMI noise reduction at high frequencies due to higher parasitic capacitance. Therefore
- EMI noise is higher at high frequency range
- Bifilar winding has less parasitic capacitance but needs more space due to thicker insulation
- Bifilar has low leakage inductance so DM noise is higher especially at low frequencies (up to 300kHz)

Thank you for your attention

Schaffner EMV AG Nordstrasse 11 4542 Luterbach Switzerland