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Abstract—This work studies control-theory-enabled intelligent charging management for battery systems in electric vehicles (EVs). Charging is crucial for the battery performance and life as well as a contributory factor to a user’s confidence in or anxiety about EVs. For existing practices and methods, many run with a lack of battery health awareness during charging, and none includes the user needs into the charging loop. To remedy such deficiencies, we propose to perform charging that, for the first time, allows the user to specify charging objectives and accomplish them through dynamic control, in addition to accommodating the health protection needs. A set of charging strategies are developed using the linear quadratic control theory. Among them, one is based on control with fixed terminal charging state, and the other on tracking a reference charging path. They are computationally competitive, without requiring real-time constrained optimization needed in most charging techniques available in the literature. A simulation-based study demonstrates their effectiveness and potential. It is anticipated that charging with health awareness and user involvement guaranteed by the proposed strategies will bring major improvements to not only the battery longevity but also EV user satisfaction.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Holding the promise for reduced fossil fuel use and air pollutant emissions, electrified transportation has been experiencing a surge of interest in recent years. Over 330,000 plug-in electric vehicles (EVs) are on the road in the United States as of May 2015 [1], with strong growth foreseeable in the coming decades. Most EVs rely on battery-based energy storage systems, which are crucial for the overall EV performance as well as consumer acceptance. An essential problem in the battery use is the charging strategies. Improper charging, e.g., charging with a high voltage or current density, can induce the rapid buildup of internal stress and resistance, crystallization and other negative effects [2]–[5]. The consequence is fast capacity fade and shortened life cycle, and even safety hazards in the extreme case, eventually impairing the consumer confidence.

Literature review: The popular charging ways, especially for inexpensive lead-acid batteries used for cars and backup power systems, are to apply a constant voltage or force a constant current flow through the battery [6]. Such methods, though easy to implement, can lead to serious detrimental effects for the battery. One improvement is the constant-current/constant-voltage charging [6], [7], which is illustrated in Figure 1a. Initially, a trickle charge (0.1C or even smaller) is used for depleted cells, which produces a rise of the voltage. Then a constant current between 0.2C and 1C is applied. This stage ends when the voltage increases to a desired level. The mode then switches to constant voltage, and the current diminishes accordingly to charge. Yet its application is empirical, with the optimal determination of the charge regimes remaining in question [8]. In recent years, pulse charging has gained much interest among practitioners. Its current profile is based on pulses, as shown in Figure 1b. Between two consecutive pulses is a short rest period, which allows the electrochemical reactions to stabilize by equalizing throughout the bulk of the electrode before the next charging begins. This brief relaxation can accelerate the charging process, reduce the gas reaction, inhibit dendrite growth and slow the capacity fade [9]–[11]. Its modified version, burp charging, applies
Fig. 1: (a) Constant-current/constant-voltage charging; (b) pulse charging and burp charging.

a very short negative pulse for discharging during the rest period, see Figure 1b, in order to remove the gas bubbles that have built up on the electrodes.

A main issue with the above methods is the lack of an effective feedback-based regulation mechanism. With an open-loop architecture, they simply take energy from power supply and put it into the battery. As a result, both the charging dynamics and the battery’s internal state are not well exploited to control the charging process for better efficiency and health protection. This motivates the deployment of closed-loop model-based control. Constrained optimal control is applied in [2], [12], [13], in conjunction with electrochemical or equivalent circuit models, to address fast charging subject to input, state and temperature constraints for health. With the ability of dealing with uncertain parameters, adaptive control is used for energy-efficient fast charging in [14]. In [15], the reference governor approaches are investigated for charging with state constraints. Leveraging the Pontryagin minimum principle, optimal control design of charging/discharging is studied in [16] to maximize the work that a battery can perform over a given duration while maintaining a desired final energy level. However, we observe that the research effort for feedback-controlled charging has remained limited to date. The existing works are mostly concerned with the fast charging scenario and employ a restricted number of investigation tools, thus leaving much scope for further research.

Research motivation: In this paper, we propose to perform control-based EV charging management in a health-aware and user-involved way. Since the battery system is the heart as well as the most expensive component of an EV, health protection during charging is of remarkable importance to prevent performance and longevity degradation. As such, it has been a major design consideration in the controlled charging literature mentioned above. Furthermore, we put forward that the user involvement, entirely out of consideration in the literature, will bring significant improvements to charging. Two advantages at least will be created if the user can give the charging management system some commands or advisement about the charging objectives based on his/her immediate situation. The first one will be improved battery health protection against charging-induced harm. Consider two scenarios: 1) after arriving at the work place in the morning, a user leaves the car charging at the parking point with a forecast in mind that the next drive will be in four hours; 2) he/she will have a drive to the airport in one hour, and a half full capacity will be enough. In both scenarios, the user needs can be translated into charging objectives (e.g., charge duration and target capacity). The charger then can make wiser, more health-oriented charging decisions when aiming to meet the user specifications with such information, rather than pumping, effectively but detrimentally, the maximum amount of energy into the batteries within the minimum duration. Second, a direct and positive impact on user satisfaction will result arguably, because offering a user options to meet his/her varying and immediate charging needs not only indicates a better service quality, but also enhances his/her perception of level of involvement.

Statement of contributions: We will build health-aware and user-involved charging strategies via exploring two problems. The first one is charging with fixed terminal charging state. In this case, the user will give target state-of-charge (SoC) and charging duration, which will be incorporated as terminal state constraint. The second problem is tracking-based charging, where the charging is implemented via tracking a charge trajectory. The trajectory is generated on the basis of user-specified objectives and battery health conditions. The solutions, developed in the framework of linear quadratic optimal control, will be presented as controlled charging
laws expressed in explicit equations. The proposed methods differ from those in the literature, e.g., [2], [12]–[16] in either of both of the following two aspects: 1) from the viewpoint of application, they keep into account both user specifications and battery health — such a notion is unavailable before and will have a potential impact on transforming the existing charging management practices; 2) technically, they, though based on optimization of quadratic cost functions, do not require real-time constrained optimization needed in many existing techniques [2], [12], [13], [15] and thus are computationally more attractive. In addition, the linear quadratic control is a fruitful area, so future expansion of this work can be aided with many established results and new progresses, e.g., [17]–[20].

Organization: The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces an equivalent circuit model oriented toward describing the battery charging dynamics. Section III presents the development of charging strategies. Section III-A studies the charging with fixed terminal charging state specified by the user. In Section III-B tracking-based charging is investigated. Section IV offers numerical results to illustrate the effectiveness of the design. Finally, concluding remarks are gathered in Section V.

II. CHARGING MODEL DESCRIPTION

While the energy storage within a battery res-ults from complex electrochemical and physical processes, it has been useful to draw an analogy between the battery electrical properties and an equivalent circuit which consists of multiple linear passive elements such as resistors, capacitors, inductors and virtual voltage sources. While plenty of equivalent circuit models have been proposed, we focus our attention throughout the paper on a second-order resistance-capacitance (RC) model shown in Figure 2a.

Developed by Saft Batteries, Inc., this model was intended for the simulation of battery packs in hybrid EVs [21], [22]. Identification of its parameters is discussed in [23]. The bulk capacitor $C_b$ represents the battery’s capability to store energy, and the capacitor $C_s$ accounts for the surface effects, where $C_b \gg C_s$. Their associated resistances are $R_b$ and $R_s$, respectively, with $R_b \gg R_s$. Let $Q_b$ and $Q_s$ be the charge stored by $C_b$ and $C_s$, respectively, and define them as the system states. The state-space representation of the model is show in (1). It can be verified that this system is controllable and observable, indicating the feasibility of controlled charging and state monitoring.

Based on the model, the overall SoC is given by

$$\text{SoC} = \frac{Q_b - Q_s}{Q_b - Q_s + Q_s - Q_s}$$

where $Q_j$ and $Q_j$ for $j = b, s$ denote the unusable and the maximum allowed charge held by the capacitor $C_j$. When the equilibrium $V_b = V_s$ is reached, the SoC can be simply expressed as the linear combination of $\text{SoC}_b$ and $\text{SoC}_s$, i.e.,

$$\text{SoC} = \frac{C_b}{C_b + C_s} \text{SoC}_b + \frac{C_s}{C_b + C_s} \text{SoC}_s.$$  

The RC model can well grasp the “rate capacity effect”, which means that the total charge absorbed by a battery goes down with the increase in charging current and is often stated as the Peukert’s law. To see this, consider that a positive current is applied for charging. Then both $Q_b$ and $Q_s$, and their voltages, $V_b$ and $V_s$, will grow. However, $V_s$, increases at a rate faster than $V_b$. When the current $I$ is large, the terminal voltage $V$, which is largely dependent on the fast increasing $V_s$, will grow quickly as a result. Then $V$ will reach the maximum in a short time. This will have the charging process terminated, though $Q_b$ still remains at a low level.
\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix}
Q_b(t) \\
Q_s(t)
\end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 \\
\frac{C_b(R_b + R_s)}{C_s(R_b + R_s)} & \frac{1}{C_s(R_b + R_s)}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
Q_b(t) \\
Q_s(t)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
R_s \\
R_b + R_s
\end{bmatrix} I(t) \\
V(t) &= \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{R_s}{C_b(R_b + R_s)} \\
\frac{R_b}{C_s(R_b + R_s)}
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
Q_b(t) \\
Q_s(t)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
R_s + \frac{R_b R_s}{R_b + R_s}
\end{bmatrix} I(t).
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

Fig. 3: The schematic diagram for charging based on linear quadratic control with fixed terminal charging state.

In addition, the RC model can also describe another essential characteristic, the “recovery effect”. That is, when the charging stops, the terminal voltage \( V \) will decrease, due to the charge transfer from \( C_s \) to \( C_b \).

To develop a digitally controlled charging scheme, the model in (1) is discretized with a sampling period of \( t_s \). The discrete-time model takes the following standard form:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + Bu_k \\
y_k &= Cx_k + Du_k.
\end{align*}
\]

(4)

where \( x = [Q_b \ Q_s]^\top \), \( u = I \), \( y = V \), and \( A, B, C \) and \( D \) can be decided based on the discretization method applied to (1).

The RC model is closely connected with the kinetic battery model (KiBaM) [24], [25], which is used in [16] for charging/discharging analysis. As is shown in Figure 2b, the charge in the KiBaM is stored in two wells: the available-charge well (labeled as #1) and bound-charge well (labeled as #2). The amount of charge in each well is determined by the its height \( h \) and cross-sectional area \( s \) with \( z = hs \). The current supplies ions to each well with a ratio coefficient \( c \). The bound-charge well, due to its smaller capacity, may grow faster in height and deliver ions to the available-charge well with a coefficient \( p \) driven by the pressure difference. Mathematically, it is given by

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\dot{z}_1(t) \\
\dot{z}_2(t)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
p & p \\
-s_1 & -s_2
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
z_1(t) \\
z_2(t)
\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}
c \\
1 - c
\end{bmatrix} I(t).
\]

(5)

By letting \( s_1 = C_b \), \( s_2 = C_s \), \( p = 1/(R_b + R_s) \) and \( c = R_s/(R_b + R_s) \), the equivalence between (5) and the state equation of (1) will be observed.

For health consideration, we need to constrain the difference between \( V_b \) and \( V_s \) throughout the charging process. Note that it is \( V_s - V_b \) that drives the migration of the charge from \( C_s \) to \( C_b \). It shares great resemblance with the gradient of the concentration of ions within the electrode. Created during charging, the concentration gradient induces the diffusion of ions. However, too large a gradient value will cause internal stress increase, heating, solid-electrolyte interphase (SEI) formation and other negative side effects [26]–[28]. Mechanical degradation in the electrode and capacity fade will consequently happen. Thus to reduce the battery health risk, uniformity of the ion concentration should be pursued during charging. It is also noteworthy that such a restriction should be implemented more strictly as the SoC increases, because the adverse effects of a large concentration...
difference would be stronger then. The same argument can be extended to the KiBaM-based charging, for which the height difference between \( h_1 \) and \( h_2 \) should be limited in order to defend the battery against the harm during charging.

Next, we will build the charging strategies on the basis of the RC model. The development will be laid out in the framework of linear quadratic control, taking into account both health awareness and user needs.

### III. Health-Aware and User-Involved Charging Strategies

In this section, we will develop two charging strategies. For both, the user specifies the desired charging duration and target capacity. The first strategy accomplishes the task via a treatment based on linear quadratic control subject to fixed terminal state resulting from the user objective. In the second case, charging is managed via tracking a charging trajectory which is produced from the user objective. A discussion of the strategies will follow.

#### A. Charging with Fixed Terminal Charging State

A charging scenario that frequently arises is: according to the next drive need, a user will inform the charging management system of his/her objective in terms of target SoC and charging duration. This can occur for overnight parking at home and daytime parking at the workplace, or when a drive to some place will set off in a predictable time. As afore discussed, the objective offered by the user, if incorporated into the dynamic charging decision making process, would create support for health protection more effectively than fast charging. This motivates us to propose a control-enabled charging system illustrated in Fig. 3. The charging objective given by the user is taken and translated into the desired terminal charging state. A linear quadratic controller will compute online the charging current to apply so as to achieve the target state when the charging ends. Meanwhile, a charging state estimator will monitor the battery status using the current and voltage measurements, and feed the information to the controller. In the following, we will present how to realize the above charging control.

From the perspective of control design, the considered charging task can be formulated as an optimal control problem, which minimizes a cost function commensurate with the harm to health and subject to the user’s goal. With the model in (4), the following linear quadratic control problem will be of interest:

\[
\min_{\bar{u}_0, \bar{u}_1, \ldots, \bar{u}_{N-1}} \frac{1}{2} x_N^T S_N x_N \\
+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (x_k^T G_k G x_k + u_k^T R u_k), \tag{6}
\]

subject to \( x_{k+1} = A x_k + B u_k, \ x_0 \)

\[x_N = \bar{x}.\]

where \( S_N \geq 0, Q_k \geq 0, R > 0 \) and

\[G = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{C_b} & 1 \end{bmatrix}.\]

In above, \( G x_k \) represents the potential difference between \( C_b \) and \( C_s \), and the time range \( N \) and the final state \( \bar{x} \) are generated from the user-specified charging duration and target SoC. Note that, together with (2)-(3), \( \bar{x} \) can be easily determined from the specified SoC value. The quadratic cost function intends to constrain the potential difference and magnitude of the charging current during the charging process. The minimization is subject to both the state equation and the fixed terminal state. In the final state, the battery should be at the equilibrium point with \( V_b = V_s \). The weight coefficient \( Q_k \) should be chosen in a way such that it increases over time, in order to offer stronger health protection that is needed as the SoC builds up.

Resolving the problem in (6) will lead to a state-feedback-based charging strategy, which can be expressed in a closed-form [17]:

\[
K_k = (B^T S_N B + R)^{-1} B^T S_{k+1} A, \tag{7}
\]

\[
S_k = A^T S_{k+1} (A - BK_k) + Q_k, \tag{8}
\]

\[
T_k = (A - BK_k)^T T_{k+1}, \quad T_N = I, \tag{9}
\]

\[
P_k = P_{k+1} - T_k^T (B^T S_{k+1} B + R)^{-1} B^T T_{k+1}, \quad P_N = 0, \tag{10}
\]

\[
K_k^u = \left( B^T S_{k+1} B + R \right)^{-1} B^T, \tag{11}
\]

\[
u_k = - \left( K_k - K_k^u T_k P_k^{-1} T_k^T \right) x_k - K_k^u T_k P_k^{-1} \bar{x}. \tag{12}
\]

This procedure comprises offline backward computation of the matrices \( K_k, S_k, T_k, P_k \) and \( K_k^u \) from the terminal state and online forward computation of the control input (i.e., charging current) \( u_k \).

The state variable \( x_k \) is not measurable directly in practice, so its real-world application necessitates
the conversion of the above state-feedback-based strategy to be output-feedback-based. One straightforward avenue to achieve this is to replace $x_k$ by its prediction $\hat{x}_k$. This is justifiable by the certainty equivalence principle, which allows the optimal output-feedback control design to be divided into the separate designs of an optimal state-feedback control and an optimal estimator [29]. The optimal estimation can be treated via minimizing
\[
\min_{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_N} \frac{1}{2} (x_0 - \hat{x}_0)\Sigma_0^{-1} (x_0 - \hat{x}_0) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} w_i W_i^{-1} w_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{K} v_i V_i^{-1} v_i,
\]
where $\Sigma_0 > 0$, $W > 0$, $V > 0$, and
\[
w_k = x_{k+1} - Ax_k - Bu_k,
\]
\[v_k = y_k - Cx_k - Du_k.
\]
The optimal solution resulting from (13), is the one-step-forward Kalman predictor given by
\[
L_k = A \Sigma_k C^T (C \Sigma_k C^T + V)^{-1},
\]
\[
\hat{x}_{k+1} = A \hat{x}_k + Bu_k + L_k (y_k - C \hat{x}_k - Du_k),
\]
\[
\Sigma_{k+1} = A \Sigma_k A^T + W - A \Sigma_k C^T \cdot (C \Sigma_k C^T + V)^{-1} C \Sigma_k A^T.
\]
Substituting $x_k$ with its estimate $\hat{x}_k$, the optimal control law in (12) will become
\[
u_k = - \left( K_k - K_k^u T_{k+1} P_{k-1}^{-1} T_k^\top \right) \hat{x}_k - K_k^u T_{k+1} P_{k-1}^{-1} \hat{x}_k.
\]
Putting together (7)-(11), (14)-(16) and (17), we will obtain a complete description of the charging method via linear quadratic control with fixed terminal state, which is named LQCwFTS and summarized in Table I. The LQCwFTS method performs state prediction at each time instant, and then feeds the predicted value, which is a timely update about the battery’s internal state, to generate the control input to charge the battery. Much of the computation for LQCwFTS can be performed prior to the implementation of the control law. The sequences, $K_k$, $S_k$, $T_k$, $P_k$ and $K_k^u$ can be computed offline, and then $K_k$, $K_k^u T_{k+1} P_{k-1}^{-1} T_k^\top$ and $K_k^u T_{k+1} P_{k-1}^{-1}$ are stored for use when the control is applied. On the side of the Kalman prediction, offline computation and storage of $L_k$ can be done. Then the only work to do during charging is to compute the optimal state prediction and control input by (15) and (17), reducing the computational burden.

B. Charging Based on Tracking

Tracking-control-based charging is another way to guarantee health awareness and user objective satisfaction. A realization is shown in Fig. 4. When a user specifies the charging objective, a charging path can be generated. A charging controller will be in place to track the path. The path generation will be conducted with a mix of prior knowledge of the battery electrochemistries, health awareness and user needs. It is arguably realistic that an EV manufacturer can embed path generation algorithms into BMSs mounted on EVs, from which the user can select the one that best fits the needs when he/she intends to charge the EV. Leaving optimal charging path generation for our future quest, we narrow our attention to the focus of path-tracking-based charging control here.

Suppose that the user describes the target SoC and duration for charging, which are translated into the final state $\bar{x}$. Then a reference trajectory $r_k$ for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, N$ is calculated with $r_N = \bar{x}$. Note that the trajectory should constrain the difference between $V_r$ and $V_s$ to guarantee health. A linear quadratic state-feedback tracking can be considered for charging:
\[
\min_{u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_{N-1}} \frac{1}{2} (x_N - r_N)^\top S_N (x_N - r_N) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left[ (x_k - r_k)^\top Q (x_k - r_k) + u_k^\top R u_k \right],
\]
subject to $x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k$, $x_0$

where $S_N \geq 0$, $Q \geq 0$ and $R > 0$. Referring to (17), the optimal solution to the above problem is expressed as follows:
\[
K_k = (B^\top S_{k+1} B + R)^{-1} B^\top S_{k+1} A,
\]
\[
K_k^u = (B^\top S_{k+1} B + R)^{-1} B^\top S_{k+1} K_k,
\]
\[S_k = A^\top S_{k+1} (A - BK_k) + Q,
\]
\[s_k = (A - BK_k) s_{k+1} + Q r_k, s_N = S_N r_N,
\]
\[u_k = -K_k x_k + K_k^u s_{k+1}.
\]
Resembling (7)-(12), the execution of the above procedure is in a backward-forward manner. Specifically, (19)-(22) computed offline and backward prior to charging, and (23) online and forward from the moment when charging begins.

Following lines analogous to the development of LQCwFTS, the output-feedback tracker for charging can be created based on (19)-(23) running with the Kalman predictor in (14)-(16). That is, (23) will use
Offline backward computation (from time $N$ to 0)

\[
K_k = (B^T S_N B + R)^{-1} B^T S_{k+1} A
\]
\[
S_k = A^T S_{k+1} (A - BK_k) + Q_k
\]
\[
T_k = (A - BK_k)^T T_{k+1}, \quad T_N = I
\]
\[
P_k = P_{k+1} - T_k^T B (B^T S_{k+1} B + R)^{-1} B^T T_{k+1}, \quad P_N = 0
\]
\[
K_k^* = (B^T S_{k+1} B + R)^{-1} B^T
\]

Online forward computation (from time 0 to $N$

Battery state prediction

\[
L_k = A \Sigma_k C^T (C \Sigma_k C^T + V)^{-1}
\]
\[
\hat{x}_{k+1} = A \hat{x}_k + B u_k + L_k (y_k - C \hat{x}_k - D u_k)
\]
\[
\Sigma_{k+1} = A \Sigma_k A^T + W - A \Sigma_k C^T (C \Sigma_k C^T + V)^{-1} C \Sigma_k A^T
\]

Charging decision

\[
u_k = -\left(K_k - K_k^* T_{k+1} P_k^{-1} T_k^T\right) \hat{x}_k - K_k^* T_{k+1} P_k^{-1} \hat{x}
\]

TABLE I: The LQCwFTS charging strategy (Linear Quadratic Control with Fixed Terminal State).

---

\[ \hat{x}_k \text{ rather than } x_k \text{ in practical implementation, i.e.,} \]
\[ u_k = -K_k \hat{x}_k + K_k^* s_{k+1}. \tag{24} \]

Summarizing (19)-22, (14)-16 and (24) will yield the linear quadratic tracking strategy, or LQT, for charging, see Table II. Similar to the aforementioned LQCwFTS, the LQT can have much computation completed offline. Then only the Kalman state prediction and optimal tracking control (24) need to be computed during the actual control run.

The computational cost of LQT can be further reduced if we use its steady-state counterpart, making it more desirable in the charging application. The steady-state tracker is deduced as follows. It is known that, if $(A, B)$ is stabilizable and $(A, Q^T)$ is detectable, $S_k$, as $N - k \to \infty$, will approach a unique stabilizing solution of the discrete algebraic Riccati equation (DARE)

\[ S = A^T S A - A^T S B (B^T S B + R)^{-1} B^T S A + Q. \]

Then $K_k$ and $K_k^*$ will approach their respective steady-state values, $\bar{K}$ and $\bar{K}^*$. In a similar way, the Kalman gain $L_k$ will achieve steady state $\bar{L}$ as $k \to \infty$ given the detectability of $(A, C)$ and stabilizability of $(A, Q^T)$, which is unique stabilizing solution to the DARE

\[ \Sigma = A \Sigma A^T - A \Sigma C^T (C \Sigma C^T + V)^{-1} C \Sigma A^T + W. \]

According to the DARE theory, $S$ and $\Sigma$ can be solved for analytically. With the steady-state gains $\bar{K}$, $\bar{K}^*$ and $\bar{L}$, the optimal prediction and control for charging will be

\[ u_k = -\bar{K} \hat{x}_k + \bar{K}^* s_{k+1}, \tag{25} \]
Offline backward computation (from time \( N \) to \( 0 \))

\[
\begin{align*}
K_k &= (B^\top S_{k+1}B + R)^{-1}B^\top S_{k+1}A \\
K_k^2 &= (B^\top S_{k+1}B + R)^{-1}B^\top \\
S_k &= A^\top S_{k+1}(A - BK_k) + Q \\
s_k &= (A - BK_k)^\top s_{k+1} + Qr_k, \quad s_N = S_Nr_N
\end{align*}
\]

Online forward computation (from time \( 0 \) to \( N \))

Battery state prediction

\[
\begin{align*}
L_k &= A\Sigma_kC^\top(C\Sigma_kC^\top + V)^{-1} \\
\hat{x}_{k+1} &= A\hat{x}_k + Bu_k + L_k(y_k - C\hat{x}_k - Du_k) \\
\Sigma_{k+1} &= A\Sigma_kA^\top + W - A\Sigma_kC^\top(C\Sigma_kC^\top + V)^{-1}C\Sigma_kA^\top \\
Charging decision
u_k &= -K_k\hat{x}_k + K_k^2s_{k+1}
\end{align*}
\]

Charging decision

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{x}_{k+1} &= A\hat{x}_k + Bu_k + L(y_k - C\hat{x}_k - Du_k) \\
\hat{s}_{k+1} &= (A - BK_k)^\top s_k + (A - BK_k)^\top Qr_k \\
u_k &= -K_k\hat{x}_k + K_k^2s_{k+1}
\end{align*}
\]

TABLE II: The \( \text{LQT} \) charging strategy (Linear Quadratic Tracking).

Offline computation of DAREs and gains

\[
\begin{align*}
S &= A^\top SA - A^\top SB(B^\top SB + R)^{-1}B^\top SA + Q \\
\Sigma &= A\Sigma A^\top - A\Sigma C^\top(C\Sigma C^\top + V)^{-1}C\Sigma A^\top + W \\
\bar{K} &= (B^\top SB + R)^{-1}B^\top SA \\
\bar{K}^2 &= (B^\top SB + R)^{-1}B^\top \\
\bar{L} &= A\Sigma C^\top(C\Sigma C^\top + V)^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]

Online forward computation (from time \( 0 \) to \( N \))

Battery state prediction

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{x}_{k+1} &= A\hat{x}_k + Bu_k + \bar{L}(y_k - C\hat{x}_k - Du_k) \\
Charging decision
\hat{s}_{k+1} &= (A - \bar{B}\bar{K})^\top s_k - (A - \bar{B}\bar{K})^\top Qr_k \\
u_k &= -\bar{K}\hat{x}_k + \bar{K}^2s_{k+1}
\end{align*}
\]

TABLE III: The \( \text{SS-LQT} \) charging strategy (Steady-State Linear Quadratic Tracking).

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{x}_{k+1} &= A\hat{x}_k + Bu_k + \bar{L}(y_k - C\hat{x}_k - Du_k). \quad (26)
\end{align*}
\]

If \((A - B\bar{K})\) is invertible, the backward computation of \(s_k\) can be substituted by the forward computation governed by

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{s}_{k+1} &= (A - B\bar{K})^\top s_k - (A - B\bar{K})^\top Qr_k. \quad (27)
\end{align*}
\]

Its implementation is initialized by \(s_0\) computed offline by \(\bar{22}\). We refer to this suboptimal charging strategy \(\bar{25}-\bar{27}\) as the steady-state \(\text{LQT}\), or \(\text{SS-LQT}\) and outline it in Table III. The \(\text{SS-LQT}\) strategy, due to its exceptional simplicity, has more computational appeal in terms of time and space complexity.

C. Discussion

The following remarks summarize our discussion of the proposed charging strategies.
Remark 1: (Soft-constraint-based health awareness). As is seen, the proposed LQCwFTS, LQT and SS-LQT strategies incorporate the health awareness as part of the cost functions rather than hard constraints. This soft-constraint-based treatment will bring the primary benefit of computational efficiency and convenience. This compares with the techniques based on real-time constrained optimization, which involve time-consuming computation and on occasions, face the issue that no feasible solution exists in the constrained region. Using soft constraints, however, does not compromise the effectiveness to protect the battery health. It is noted that the harm to health is associated with a proper weight \( Q \) is selected, minimizing the penalty cost will ensure a sufficient consciousness of the health.

Remark 2: (Robustness of SS-LQT). The SS-LQT strategy is based on a combination of linear quadratic tracker and a Kalman filter. Such a design may engender weak robustness in terms of gain and phase margins. To overcome this limitation, the loop transfer recovery can be used to build robust control design on the linear quadratic control structure [17].

Remark 3: (Continuous-time charging). The proposed charging strategies are developed in the context of digital control. Their extension to continuous-time control can be achieved through using the continuous-time in [1] and formulating integral-based cost functions. The solutions are readily available in the literature, and the interested reader is referred to [17], [30].

Remark 4: (Generality to other models). The proposed development has a potential applicability to other battery models based on equivalent circuits or electrochemical principles. Let us take the well-known single particle model (SPM) as an example. This model represents each battery electrode as a spherical particle and delineates the migration of ions in and between the particles as a diffusion process [31]. The PDE-based SPM can be converted into the standard linear state-space form, as shown in [32]. Then following similar lines to this work, linear quadratic problems can be established and solved for charging tasks, where the difference of ion concentration gradients are constrained to penalize charging-induced harm. Additionally, if a model has a nonlinear output equation, the state estimate can be acquired using a nonlinear Kalman filter.

IV. NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATION

In this section, we present two simulation examples to illustrate the performance of the proposed charging strategies.

Let us consider a lithium-ion battery described by the RC model in [1] with known parameters. Assume \( C_b = 82 \text{kF} \), \( R_b = 1.1 \text{m} \Omega \), \( C_s = 4.074 \text{kF} \), \( R_s = 0.4 \text{m} \Omega \), and \( R_o = 1.2 \text{m} \Omega \) [21]. It has a nominal capacity of 7 Ah. The model is discretized by a sampling period of \( t_s = 1 \text{s} \). The initial SoC is 30%. The user will specify that certain SoC must be achieved within certain duration.

Example 1 - Application of LQCwFTS: Suppose that the user wants to complete the charging in 2 hours. Meanwhile, he/she specifies the target SoC value. For the simulation purpose, different target SoC values, 55%, 65%, 75%, 85% and 95%, are set here. The total number of time instants is \( N = 7200 \).

We apply the LQCwFTS method to carry out the charging tasks. For the control run, \( Q_k = 0.1 \cdot (5 \times 10^7)^{k/N} \) and \( R = 0.1 \). The exponential increase of \( Q_k \) illustrates increasing emphasis on health owing to the growth of charge stored in the battery.

The computational results are illustrated in Figure 5. It is observed from Figure 5 that the different target SoCs are satisfied when the charging ends, meeting the user-specified objectives. The SoC increases approximately proportionally with time for the first 1.25 hours. Then the rate slows down gradually to zero as the charging objective is being approached. This results from a much larger weight \( Q_k \) in the later stage for health protection. The charging current is kept at almost a constant level initially during each charging implementation, as illustrated in Figure 5. For a higher target SoC, the magnitude is larger accordingly. However, the current drops quickly as the SoC grows further.

The concerned health indicator, voltage difference between \( C_s \) and \( C_b \) is characterized in Figure 5c. For each case, \( V_s - V_b \) remains around a constant value in the first hour, despite high-frequency fluctuations due to noise. This is because a battery can accept a higher internal stress at a low SoC level. However, the differences decreases drastically as more charge is pumped into the battery, in order to maximize the health of the battery’s internal structure. For comparison, we enforce a constant current of 2.275 A through the battery for 2 hours to reach 95% SoC. The potential difference, as shown in Figure 5d, will be kept at a fixed level unsurprisingly, which, however, will cause much more...
detrimental effects to the battery when SoC grows.

**Example 2 - Application of SS-LQT:** We consider the use of SS-LQT for charging in this example, which is an upgraded version of LQT but more computationally efficient. The problem setting is the same as in Example 1 — the tasks of charging the battery to from 30% of SoC to 55%, 65%, 75%, 85% and 95% in 2 hours. The charging trajectory is generated based on the task. For simplicity and convenience, we assume that the desired trajectories for $x_1$ and $x_2$, denoted as $r_b$ and $r_s$, is generated by

$$r_{jk} = \frac{1 - e^{-k t_s/\tau_j}}{1 - e^{-N t_s/\tau_j}} (r_{j,N} - r_{j,0}) + r_{j,0},$$

where $j = b$ or $s$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, N - 1$ and $r_{j,0}$ is the initial charge, $r_{j,N}$ the target charge, and $\tau_j$ the time coefficient for $j = b$ or $s$. Note that $r_{j,0}$ and that $r_{j,N}$ can be calculated from the initial SoC and user-specified target SoC. The resultant trajectories have a steep increase followed by a gentle slope, which are reasonable in view of health protection. Letting $\tau_b = \tau_s = N t_s / 4$, $V_s$ and $V_b$ are forced to be equal through the charging process. Thus at the trajectory design stage, we put the minimization of the detrimental effects well into consideration.

With the reference trajectories generated, the SS-LQT strategy is applied to charging. The actual SoC increase over time is demonstrated in Figure 6a. All the targets are met. In each case, the SoC grows at a fast rate when the SoC is at a low level but at a slower rate when the SoC becomes higher. Figure 6b shows the current produced by
Fig. 6: Example 2 - Application of LQT to charge the battery from 30% to 55%, 65%, 75%, 85% and 95%:
(a) the SoC trajectories; (b) the charging current profiles; (c) the potential differences; (d) tracking of $x_1$ (i.e., $Q_b$) for 95% target SoC; (e) tracking of $x_2$ (i.e., $Q_s$) for 95% target SoC.
SS-LQT. The current usually begins with a large magnitude but decreases quickly. The potential difference, given in Figure 6c, has the similar trend. It is relatively high when the charging starts, and then reduces fast. The state tracking for the task of 95% SoC is shown in Figures 6d and 6e. It is observed that tracking of $r_1$ by $x_1$ exhibits high accuracy. Tracking of $r_2$ by $x_2$, however, is increasingly accurate, despite a minor deviation in the first hour. Overall, the closer the target SoC is approached, the smaller the tracking error becomes.

In the above examples, different charging current profiles are generated for the same charging task. While the contributory factors include the selection of Q and the reference charging path generation, such a difference poses another important question: how to assess and compare the charging strategies? There is no clear-cut answer yet as it involves a mix of battery electrochemistry, charging performance, computational complexity, economic cost, and even user satisfaction. Though beyond scope of this paper, evaluation of charging strategies through theoretical analysis and experimental validation will be part of our future quest.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Effective battery charging management is vital for the development of EVs. In recent years, fast charging control has attracted some research effort. However, the problem of health-aware and user-involved charging has not been explored in the literature. In this paper, we propose a set of first-of-its-kind charging strategies, which aim to meet user-defined charging objectives with awareness of the hazards to health. They are developed in the framework of linear quadratic control. One of them is built on control with fixed terminal state, and the other two on tracking a reference charging trajectory. In addition to the merits of health consciousness and user involvement, they are more computationaly competitive than most existing charging techniques requiring online real-time optimization solvers. The usefulness of the proposed strategies is evaluated via a simulation study. This work will provide further incentives for research on EV charging management and is also applicable to other battery-powered applications such as consumer electronics devices and renewable energy systems. Our future research will include optimal charging trajectory generation and a multifaceted assessment of charging strategies.
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