Some aspects of magnetic force computation using BEM-FEM coupling
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Abstract—For the calculation of magnetic forces with the Maxwell stress tensor normal and the tangential derivatives of the vector potential \( \vec{A} \) have to be known. We choose \( C^0 \)-continuous elements, therefore \( \vec{A} \) and its tangential derivatives are continuous. In contrast, the normal derivative \( \partial \vec{A} / \partial n \) calculated with the finite element method is continuous only in a weak sense. When BEM-FEM coupling is used however, the value of \( \partial \vec{A} / \partial n \) is uniquely available on the coupling surfaces from the BEM formulation. Two methods of magnetic force computation using \( \partial \vec{A} / \partial n \) either from FEM or from BEM data will be presented. Their accuracy will be compared by means of several examples.

I. BEM-FEM COUPLING

Starting from Maxwell-equations describing magneto-static problems and taking into account the constitutive relation \( \vec{F} = \mu_0 \vec{H} + \vec{M} \) and the magnetic vector potential \( \vec{A} \), the equation

\[
- \frac{1}{\mu_0} \nabla^2 \vec{A} = \vec{g}_s + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \text{rot} \vec{M}
\]

(1)

can be derived. The boundary condition \( \vec{A} = 0 \) at infinity ensures that the solution of (1) satisfies the Coulomb gauge \( \text{div} \vec{A} = 0 \). The magnetic fields to be calculated are caused by the impressed current density \( \vec{g}_s \) and by the magnetization \( \vec{M} \).

The domain \( \Omega \) of the boundary value problem (1) is decomposed into a set of finite element subdomains \( \Omega_{FEM} \) which coincide with the magnetic parts of the problem and a BEM subdomain \( \Omega_{BEM} \) which represents the surrounding vacuum space and the impressed source currents, Fig. 1. The common boundaries \( \Gamma_{FEM} = \Gamma_{BEM} \) correspond to iron-air interfaces.

The application of the finite element method in \( \Omega_{FEM} \) and the application of the boundary element method in \( \Omega_{BEM} \) both yield a linear system of equations [1], namely

\[
[K] \{ \vec{A}^{FEM} \} - [T] \{ \vec{Q}^{FEM} \} = \{ \vec{F}(\vec{M}) \},
\]

(2)

\[
[G] \{ \vec{Q}^{BEM} \} - [H] \{ \vec{A}^{BEM} \} = \{ \vec{R}(\vec{g}_s) \}.
\]

(3)

Isoparametric nodal finite elements and boundary elements have been used for the discretization. \( \{ \vec{A}^{FEM} \} \) and \( \{ \vec{A}^{BEM} \} \) are the nodal values of \( \vec{A} \) in \( \Omega_{FEM} \cup \Gamma_{FEM} \) and on \( \Gamma_{BEM} \), respectively. \( \{ \vec{Q}^{FEM} \} \) and \( \{ \vec{Q}^{BEM} \} \) are the nodal values of

\[
\vec{Q} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \left( \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial n} - \vec{M} \times \hat{n} \right)
\]

(4)

on \( \Gamma_{FEM} = \Gamma_{BEM} \) with \( \vec{M} = 0 \) in \( \Omega_{BEM} \). The boundary values \( \{ \vec{Q}^{FEM} \} \), \( \{ \vec{A}^{BEM} \} \) and \( \{ \vec{Q}^{BEM} \} \) at the nodes on the common boundaries can be eliminated from (2), (3) due to their continuity [2] resulting in

\[
\frac{\{ \vec{F}(\vec{M}) \} - [T][G]^{-1} \{ \vec{R}(\vec{g}_s) \}}{\{ \vec{F}^\prime(\vec{g}_s, \vec{M}) \}} = \{ \vec{F}^\prime(\vec{g}_s, \vec{M}) \},
\]

(5)

The second member vector \( \{ \vec{F}^\prime \} \) does not depend on the impressed current density \( \vec{g}_s \) only, but also on the magnetization \( \vec{M} \), specified by the prescribed magnetization.
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curve. Therefore (5) has to be solved iteratively. In this case, the so-called "combined iteration" [3] which is a variant of the M(B)-iteration has been used.

II. FORCE COMPUTATION

The magnetic force is computed using the well known Maxwell stress tensor (MST) method, i.e. by the integration of a normal and a tangential force density

\[ f_n = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{B_n^2}{\mu_0} - \mu_0 H_t^2 \right) n, \]  
\[ f_t = B_n H_t \]  

(6a)

(6b)

over a surface, which entirely encloses the object under consideration,

\[ \mathbf{F} = \oint_S \mathbf{f} d\Gamma. \]  

(7)

Considering a Cartesian coordinate system \((\bar{n}, \bar{t}_1, \bar{t}_2)\), which is rotated against the original coordinate system so that \(\bar{n}\) is orthogonal to the boundary in the considered point (Fig. 2), the components \(B_n, H_{t1}, \) and \(H_{t2}\) are related to the vector potential as follows

\[ B_n = \frac{\partial A_{t2}}{\partial t_1} - \frac{\partial A_{t1}}{\partial t_2}, \]  
\[ H_{t1} = \frac{1}{\mu} \left( \frac{\partial A_n}{\partial t_2} - \frac{\partial A_{t2}}{\partial n} \right), \]  
\[ H_{t2} = \frac{1}{\mu} \left( \frac{\partial A_{t1}}{\partial n} - \frac{\partial A_n}{\partial t_1} \right). \]  

(8a)

(8b)

(8c)

It can be seen from (8a) that \(B_n\) is continuous on the boundaries between adjacent finite elements due to the continuity of \(\bar{A}\). In contrast, \(\bar{H}_t\) is only weakly continuous on such boundaries because it depends on \(\partial \bar{A}/\partial n\). The FE formulation satisfies the interface condition for \(\partial \bar{A}/\partial n\) resulting from (4) only in a weak sense. Computation of the MST may therefore cause difficulties, because it is not clear, which one of the two different values of \(\bar{H}_t\) should be used, especially on iron-air interfaces [4].

In the context of BEM-FEM coupling, it is natural to choose \(S = \Gamma_{\text{FEM} \nu} = \Gamma_{\text{BEM} \nu}\), which means that the integration is actually performed over the iron-air interface of the considered part. According to the above, there are two different ways for the computation of the MST. The values of \(\partial \bar{A}/\partial n\) can be obtained either from FEM or from BEM data.

A. Computation of the MST by FEM Data (MST FEM)

Introducing the permeability \(\mu = 1/\nu\) which may be field dependent, the force density (6) can equivalently be expressed as

\[ f = \frac{1}{2\mu} \left[ \left( \bar{B} \cdot \bar{n} \right) \bar{B} - \left( \bar{B} \times \bar{n} \right) \times \bar{B} \right] + \frac{1}{2} (\nu_0 - \nu) \left( B_n^2 + \frac{\nu}{\nu_0} \bar{B}_t^2 \right) \bar{n}. \]  

(9)

Equation (5) has to be solved before the values of \(\bar{B}\) on the boundary \(S = \Gamma_{\text{FEM} \nu}\) can be obtained by the usual differentiation of the FE shape functions. The global force can then be calculated with the help of (7) and (9).

B. Computation of the MST by BEM Data (MST BEM)

In the case of \(\mu = \mu_0\) like in \(\Omega_{\text{BEM}}\), the second term in (9) vanishes resulting in

\[ f = \frac{1}{2\mu_0} \left[ \left( \bar{B} \cdot \bar{n} \right) \bar{B} - \left( \bar{B} \times \bar{n} \right) \times \bar{B} \right]. \]  

(10)

The derivatives of \(\bar{A}\) with respect to \(x, y, z\) are now required to compute \(\bar{B} = \text{rot} \bar{A}\). From (3), (4) we have (\(\bar{M} = 0\))

\[ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mu_0 \\ \partial \bar{A} \\ \partial n \end{pmatrix} = \{ \bar{Q} \}^{-1} \left( [H] \{ \bar{A} \} + \{ \bar{R} \bar{S} \{ \bar{g}_n \} \} \right), \]  

(11)

where the superscripts \(\text{BEM}\) have been omitted. Assuming the usual isoparametric nodal boundary elements, \(\bar{r}, \bar{A}\) and \(\bar{Q}\) are interpolated from their nodal values as follows

\[ \bar{r} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i(\xi, \eta) \bar{r}_i, \]  
\[ \bar{A} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i(\xi, \eta) \bar{A}_i, \]  
\[ \bar{Q} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i(\xi, \eta) \bar{Q}_i, \]  

(12a)

(12b)

(12c)

where \(\xi, \eta\) are the local coordinates, \(N_i\) the shape functions and \(k\) the number of nodes of the boundary element. The derivatives of (12a) are

\[ \frac{\partial \bar{r}_\xi}{\partial \xi} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\partial N_i(\xi, \eta)}{\partial \xi} \bar{r}_i, \]  
\[ \frac{\partial \bar{r}_\eta}{\partial \eta} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\partial N_i(\xi, \eta)}{\partial \eta} \bar{r}_i. \]  

(13a)

(13b)
TABLE I
COMPUTATIONAL DATA FOR THE HOLLOW SPHERE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coarse Mesh Linear Elements</th>
<th>Fine Mesh Linear Elements</th>
<th>Coarse Mesh Quadratic Elements</th>
<th>Analytical [5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of nodes</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>3389</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FEM elements</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>9726</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of boundary nodes</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of BEM elements</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of equations</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>6039</td>
<td>8649</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force $F_x$ by MST BEM</td>
<td>341.83 N</td>
<td>364.55 N</td>
<td>372.90 N</td>
<td>372.88 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force $F_x$ by MST FEM</td>
<td>339.84 N</td>
<td>363.87 N</td>
<td>372.81 N</td>
<td>372.88 N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit normal vector is
\[ \vec{n} = \frac{\vec{\xi} \times \vec{\eta}}{|\vec{\xi} \times \vec{\eta}|} = \frac{\partial \vec{r}}{\partial n}. \]  
(14)

Application of
\[ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial x}{\partial \xi} \\ \frac{\partial y}{\partial \xi} \\ \frac{\partial z}{\partial \xi} \end{pmatrix} = J^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial n} \\ \frac{\partial \eta}{\partial n} \end{pmatrix}, \]  
(15)

\[ J = (\vec{\xi}, \vec{\eta}, \vec{n})^T \]  
(16)

allows the calculation of the desired derivatives from (12). The global force can then be calculated with the help of (7) and (10).

III. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, two numerical examples are presented to compare the computed forces of both methods (MST FEM, MST BEM) with each other and with analytical or measured values. Both examples are modelled with the coupled BEM-FEM scheme of Fig. 1, where the BEM region is air.

A. Magnetic Attraction of a Ferromagnetic Sphere

This problem is discussed in [5] and has an analytical solution. A hollow ferromagnetic sphere is placed under a circular current loop, which exerts an attractive force on it. The parameters are given in Fig. 3. For symmetry reasons only a quarter of the sphere needs to be discretized. Computations have been performed with linear elements (3-noded triangles, 6-noded tetrahedrons) as well as quadratic elements (6-noded triangles, 10-noded tetrahedrons) and with two different meshes. Fig. 4 shows the coarse and Fig. 5 the fine BE mesh. Some computational data and the results for the attractive force are summarized in Table I. Both methods yield nearly identical forces. Especially the computation based on quadratic...
elements gives excellent results. The reason for this might be that quadratic isoparametric elements are better suited for the modeling of a smooth surface.

B. TEAM Workshop Problem 20

As a second example we consider TEAM Workshop problem 20, which consists of a steel center pole surrounded by an exciting coil. The magnetic circuit is completed by a steel yoke. A complete definition of the geometry can be found in [6]. Taking advantage of the symmetry, only a quarter of the problem region had to be discretized using 8-noded quadratic quadrilaterals and 20-noded quadratic hexahedrons, Fig. 6. Some computational data are given in Table II. The measured and computed values of the force $F_z$ acting on the center pole can be seen from Table III and Fig. 7. Again, there is good agreement between both methods and the measured data.

Fig. 6. Discretization of $1/4$ of TEAM problem 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of nodes</th>
<th>15068</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FEM elements</td>
<td>2784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of boundary nodes</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of BEM elements</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of equations</td>
<td>38231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

**FORCE $F_z$ ACTING ON THE CENTER POLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excitation</th>
<th>Measured [7]</th>
<th>MST BEM</th>
<th>MST FEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 AT</td>
<td>7.8 N</td>
<td>8.7 N</td>
<td>8.4 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 AT</td>
<td>54.3 N</td>
<td>56.8 N</td>
<td>54.5 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500 AT</td>
<td>75.5 N</td>
<td>76.0 N</td>
<td>73.6 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 AT</td>
<td>81.0 N</td>
<td>81.4 N</td>
<td>78.7 N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Force $F_z$ acting on the center pole of TEAM problem 20

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Two methods have been presented for the evaluation of the Maxwell stress tensor in the context of BEM-FEM coupling. It has been demonstrated that a good accuracy can be achieved even when the surface of integration coincides with the iron-air interface provided that the discretization is appropriate. In connection with BEM-FEM coupling, the MST method is easy to implement in an existing code, because no additional surfaces have to be introduced for the integration.
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