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ABSTRACT 2D coil design limits the use of wireless power transfer (WPT) in many products with freeform outer shapes. In this paper, enabled by 3D printed electronics, we propose a systematic approach to design and fabricate 3D coils for WPT. Based on the circular spiral and rectangular spiral patterns, 3D receiver and transmitter coils can be generated on an arbitrarily selected region of a product and its offset, respectively. Mathematical models are proposed to estimate the self-inductance and the mutual-inductance of the 3D arbitrarily shaped coils for 3D WPT. This leads to a new design approach of a 3D WPT system. Several sets of 3D printed WPT systems were designed, simulated, and prototyped to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed design approach as well as the mathematical models. The calculation speed of the proposed mathematical models is 30 times faster than the simulation, and compared with the measurement results, the calculation results have mean absolute errors of 2.63% and 4.45% regarding the self- and the mutual-inductance, where the simulation results have mean absolute errors of 1.20% and 2.38%, respectively. Measurements also indicate that with a 5V input, the prototypes are able to deliver 1-watt power at an efficiency ranging between 20.9% and 25.3%. It was concluded that the proposed approach is feasible and promising for designing and manufacturing WPT using 3D printed electronics.

INDEX TERMS 3D coil, WPT, IPT, 3D printed electronics, design.

I. INTRODUCTION

Inductive power transfer (IPT) is a popular working mechanism in near-field techniques where the QI standard [3] is a typical example. Traditionally, most IPT systems consist of a pair of mass-produced planar spiral coils connected to their two respective compensation networks. Recent developments of (consumer) product design introduces more 3D (freeform) outer shapes [4], as the visual appearance and usability play fundamental roles in the final decision of a customer when seeking congruency between price and functionality. This is especially true for personalized designs, where besides the form factors, rapid and accurate response to customers’ demands is another key. These trends pose challenges to the designers of IPT as: 1) reducing possible lateral misalignment of two coils in the design, e.g. it is difficult to fully align the receiver coil in a rectangular-shaped phone to a circular charger; 2) reducing possible axial misalignment of...
two coils, e.g. 3D forms may create a large gap between two embedded 2D planar coils; 3) increasing the transmitted power as there are limited planar areas to accommodate coils, e.g. the diameter of a QI charging coil is about 30 mm [3] and 4) Accelerating the design to production process, as for personalized products, each design may have its unique intrinsic properties.

Researchers and engineers tried different methods to tackle these challenges of embedding IPT in designs, for instance by adding more transmitter coils to the charging pad for tightly coupled systems [3]. Improving the quality factor of coils was also suggested to compensate smaller coupling factors in those scenarios [5]. In addition, the resonant WPT system was introduced to accommodate free positioning of products [4], [6]. However, such solutions usually lead to higher material cost, larger dimensions of the charging device, and/or reduced efficiency. In many cases, product designers have to sacrifice other features/functions for incorporating IPT in the design.

Recent development of 3D printed electronics offers new ways for designing and manufacturing IPT systems. Utilizing conductive materials in multi-material printing, 3D printed electronics [7] offers an extra dimension in designing and prototyping/manufacturing transmitter and receiver coils, i.e. those coils do not have to be planar. Using 3D coils, a large (projected) area can be utilized for IPT and a shorter distance between the transmitter and the receiver coils can be achieved. Both contribute to a more effective and efficient IPT.

In this paper, we propose a systematic approach for designing 3D transmitter and receiver coils that can be fabricated by 3D printed electronics, enabling a more effective and efficient IPT for freeform designs. Our main technical contributions are:

1. We proposed a new approach for designing 3D coils on an arbitrary 3D (freeform) surface for IPT;
2. We developed new mathematical models, which are extensions of current work, for calculating the self- and mutual- inductance of an arbitrarily shaped 3D coil(s); both the design approach and the models were verified by simulations and experiments, where prototypes were manufactured using 3D printed electronics.

The remainder of this paper is arranged as follows: First, literatures regarding the coil design of IPT, the methods for calculating self- and mutual- inductance of a coil(s), 3D printed electronics and its applications in WPT are presented. In Section III, the method of designing 3D coils is proposed based on Non-Uniform Rational B-Spline (NURBS) representations. Section IV describes the mathematical models for calculating self- and mutual- inductances of (a pair of) arbitrarily shaped 3D coil(s). The design and models were further verified by Finite Element Method (FEM) simulations (Section V) and experiments (Section VI). Different factors influencing the performance of the design, the model, the simulation and the manufacturing process are discussed in Section VII. Section VIII concludes the paper where future work is also highlighted.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. COIL DESIGN FOR IPT

Generally, a simple IPT system consists of a power source, the transmitter (primary coil) and the receiver coil (pick-up coil), and their respective compensation networks, which include the primary and secondary circuits on the power and load side, respectively. The maximum transmitted power and the power transfer efficiency are crucial indicators in evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of an IPT system. Key factors that influence these two key indicators are the design of the coils, the materials of the coils, the design of the compensation networks, etc. [5]

Given a simple IPT system where the transmitter coil and the receiver coil are directly connected to the power source and the load impedance, respectively, the maximal efficiency of the system can be described by $\eta_{\text{max}} = K_{12}^2 Q_1 Q_2 / \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + K_{12}^2 Q_1 Q_2}\right)^2$, and the maximum achievable energy in near-field coupled power-transfer system can be calculated as $P_{\text{out, max}} = K_{12} Q_1 Q_2 R_1 R_2 R_1^2 V^2 / (R_1 (R_2 + R_L) + K_{12} Q_1 Q_2 R_1 R_2)^2$ [8]. Here $K_{12}$ is the coupling factor between the transmitter and receiver coils, $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ are the quality factors of two coils, $R_1$, $R_2$ and $R_L$ are the resistances of the transmitter coil, the receiver coil and the load, respectively. $V$ is the voltage impinged on the primary side.

The coupling factor can be expressed as $K_{12} = M_{12} / \sqrt{L_1 L_2}$, where $M_{12}$ is the mutual-inductance between the transmitter coil and the receiver coil. $L_1$ and $L_2$ are the self-inductance of these two coils, respectively. The value of the coupling factor is always between 0 and 1. The quality factor $Q$, which resembles a figure-of-merit of a coil [9], can be denoted as $Q = 2 \pi f L / R$, where $f$ is the frequency of the exciting current, $L$ is the self-inductance of the coil and $R$ is the resistance of the coil. In mass production, $Q$ of a litz wire coil is typically 100 [10].

The power transfer efficiency of an IPT system is able to reach 70% to 80% [3]. Normally, a larger self-inductance of a coil indicates the potential of a higher quality factor of the coil. Together with larger mutual- inductances, the IPT system then has the potential of a high efficiency. Planar circular spiral coils and rectangular spiral coils are often used in the design of an IPT system. The advantage of using planar circular coils is that a pair of them has higher self- and mutual-inductances than square shaped coils regarding the same length of conductors [11]. But a rectangular spiral coil may have a larger inductive area compared with the circular spiral coil when the design is limited to a rectangular shape [12]. Coils in other shapes, e.g. elliptical coils, are also reported in the literature for specific applications [14]. Besides the properties of the coils, the mutual-inductances, and subsequently the coupling factor, can be significantly influenced by many
factors of practical usage scenarios, e.g. the angular, lateral and axial misalignments of these two coils. Misalignments often lead to a significant loss of magnetic flux during the power transfer, especially when the receiver coil is small [15]. In an example given by Hou et al. [16], the coupling factor of two coils in an IPT system may reduce 17 times due to large lateral misalignment, when compared to the most optimal alignment.

**B. ESTIMATING SELF- AND MUTUAL- INDUCTANCE**

Both the quality factor and the coupling factor are defined based on the resistances, the self- and/or mutual- inducances of the coils. The resistance of a coil can be calculated based on the geometry and the volumetric resistivity of the conductive material, e.g. the silver ink. For computing the self-inductance of a pair of 2D coils, many researchers had denoted frequency dependent formulas which consider the non-uniform current distribution in the coil and power loss on magnetic media [17], [18]. For instance, Sonntag et al. [19] proposed a method for estimating the mutual-inductance between two planar printed circuit board inductors featuring straight tracks. A new pseudo-analytical model for calculating DC inductance of flat circular inductors with rectangular cross section was proposed by Penalver et al. [20]. Based on the partial inductance method, Tavakkoli et al. [21] proposed a new way to calculate the mutual inductance of two planar polygonal spiral coils with arbitrary number of sides. Researchers [22], [23] also derived the equations for calculating the self-inductance of the arbitrary shaped single-layer coils based on the shape functions.

Though most of research focused on 2D coils, researchers also paid attention on calculating of inductance of 3D coils. For example, Budnik et al. [24] developed a method to calculate mutual-inductance of 3D coaxial helical coils. Tominaka [25] derived an analytical expression for calculating the mutual-inductance of long coaxial helical conductors/solenoids from the Neumann’s formula, and he also proposed a method for calculating the inductance of twisted conducting loops using the broken line approximation [26]. Sijoy and Chaturvedi [27] developed an efficient and accurate method for calculating the inductance of arbitrarily-wound helical coils. Volkmar et al. [28] proposed an algorithmic solution to calculate the inductance of a coil based on the Biot-Savart law. However, most of these methods were developed for calculating the inductance of the 2D planar coils or simple 3D coils. Moreover, literature research did not reveal any methods for calculating the self- and mutual-inductance of (a pair of) 3D arbitrarily shaped coil(s).

**C. 3D PRINTED ELECTRONICS**

Recently, various kinds of conductive materials have been introduced to 3D printing. The usage of both dielectric and conductive materials, i.e. 3D printed electronics, introduces another modality to the 3D printed designs, i.e. electric currents can flow through these conductive materials to transmit signals, to power actuators and/or to generate electromagnetic fields [29]. One of the first printers which is able to print electronic elements was the Voxel8 printer [30]. It adopts the multi-material Fused Deposition Modeling (FDM) [31] printing principle by utilizing Polylactic Acid (PLA) as the substrate material and the silver ink (or paste) as the conductive material. Additionally, a manual pick-n-place function is embedded in its printing procedure allowing for the incorporation of complicated electronics components in the prints. Similarly, the Aerosol Jet® system developed by Optomec® [32] is able to directly deposits conductive materials onto the (3D) substrate using the aerodynamic focusing technique. Several other techniques were also introduced for the construction of conductive connections (or traces) within a 3D structure as summarized by Mahto and Snideman [29]. Among them, inkjet printing is another commonly used technique, e.g. the ElectroJet from ChemCubed [33]. The Nano dimension DragonFly™Pro [34] is another typical example which combines multi-material inkjet printing and nano-ink technology to build 3 μm thick layers with two materials (one nano-silver ink, one dielectric polymer ink).

In most of 3D printed electronics applications, the conductive ink (or paste) is one of the key enablers [35]. Today the nano-silver conductive ink is one of the most popular types of inks in 3D printing electronics, mainly due to its high conductivity and oxidative stability [36]. However, applications of the silver inks are still limited compared to using pure silver/copper/aluminum wires/traces in WPT, mainly due to its high resistivity. For instance, the volume resistivity (ρ, the reciprocal of conductivity) of the silver ink provided by Voxel8 is 3 · 10⁻⁷Ω·m [37], which is 16.8 times higher than that of the pure copper (1.68 · 10⁻⁸Ω·m). Therefore in some applications, post-processing techniques were introduced after the “cold extrusion/printing” for better electrical/electromagnetic performance, e.g. annealing [38], hot-pressure sintering [39], laser sintering [40]. To further lower the resistivity of the conductive ink, researchers also introduced several methods to use molten metal as “inks”.

For instance, Océ Technologies [41] developed an inkjet printer which was able to dispense liquid metal droplets (up to 1800°C) through its printing heads.

**D. APPLICATIONS OF 3D PRINTED ELECTRONICS IN WPT**

Though the conductivity of silver inks is less than copper wires, the low fabrication cost and the ability of using flexible substrates attracted the attention of researchers and industry. 2D Printed electronics, i.e. single layer silver ink printing on various substrates, was introduced for designing low-power WPT systems earlier than for 3D designs. For instance, Jeong et al. [43] integrated a WPT system in a smartwatch strap using flexible 2D coils and magnetic field shielding materials.

3D printed electronics can offer more flexibility and capabilities in building complex objects with multiple mechanical and electronic functionalities, e.g. mouse, wireless sensors and gaming die [44]–[47]. Though most of 3D printed electronics applications focused on sensing systems with
embedded components [48], researchers also paid attention to the low-power IPT based on this newly developed technology. For instance, Yu et al. [49] used 3D additive manufacturing techniques to make electronics components, such as inductors, resistors, as well as circuits and passive wireless sensors. Recently Zhu et al. [50] developed an on-site 3D electronics printing technique to print sensors as well as a coil for WPT on human hands. Lazarus et al. [51] also incorporated conductive and magnetic materials into a 3D printed part for improving the inductance density as well as the power coupling for WPT. However, literature research did not reveal any systematic studies regarding the design, modelling and manufacturing of 3D coils for IPT. Meanwhile, product designers ask for such a tool to accelerate their design to manufacturing process, especially for embedding IPT in product designs with outer 3D (freeform) surfaces.

III. 3D COIL GEOMETRIC DESIGN

In our 3D coil design method, the planar spiral coil and the rectangular spiral coil are selected as patterns as for reasons listed in Section II. Given a Region-of-Interest (ROI) that represents (part of) a surface where the receiver coil will be located on/in the product, the design of 3D coils for IPT can be obtained in four steps as illustrated in Fig.1: 1) pattern generation - a circular spiral coil/rectangular spiral coil is selected as the pattern and the centerline of a coil is described as a NURBS curve in the parametric domain of a NURBS surface; 2) ROI selection, re-parameterization and offset creation - the ROI is re-parameterized using the NURBS representation. An offset surface, which resembles the location of the transmitter coil, is created, where the offset distance is specified based on the design requirements and characteristics of the coils; 3) mapping – a selected discretized pattern in the form of a sequential pointset are mapped to the two 3D surfaces, respectively; and 4) interpolation and design integration - by interpolating the mapped sequential pointset in both surfaces, the centerlines of the transmitter and the receiver coil are created, respectively. Based on the generated centerlines of the 3D coil, a minimal spiral growth rate is determined to maximize the performance as well as to avoid possible overlaps between adjacent traces. Both coils are then created by sweeping the designed cross-section of the coil along the centerlines. In the rest of this section, we present details of these four steps.

A. PATTERN GENERATION

In a 2D plane, the centerline of a n-turn spiral coil (Fig.2(a)), which is enclosed by a 2D rectangle $RECT = \{\text{Vertex}_i | (0,0), (0,1), (1,1), (1,0)\}$ (blue boundary in Fig.2(a)), can be described as:

$$C_{cs}(\theta) = \{(x,y)| 1/2 + (a + b\theta/2\pi) \cos(\theta), 1/2 + (a + b\theta/2\pi) \sin(\theta), \theta = 0..2\pi n\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $a$ and $b$ are parameters that define the initial radius of the spiral and the distance between its adjacent turns (the spiral growth rate), respectively. As the spiral curve is enclosed by the rectangle $RECT$, relations between numbers of turns $n$ and the initial radius $a$ can be found as $a = (1 - 2(n - 1) b)/2$. For the centerline of a planar rectangular coil, the representation is more complicated than the circular spiral curve. The corners of each turn of a rectangular spiral coil pattern.

RectCtp = \left\{(x_i, y_i)| \frac{1}{2} - \text{sign}(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\pi}{2} i)(a + \text{floor}\left(\frac{i + 1}{4}\right) b), \frac{1}{2} - \text{sign}(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\pi}{2} i)(a + \text{floor}\left(\frac{i - 1}{4} + 1\right) b), i = 0 \ldots n\right\}$  \hspace{1cm} (2)
where $2a$ is the starting width of the rectangle and $b$ is the distance between two adjacent turns. As (2) only represents the corner points of the rectangular spiral pattern, to describe the complete pattern, we introduce a degree one NURBS curve [52] as:

$$C_{rs}(u) = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n} N_{i,p}(u) \omega_i \text{RectCtp}_i}{\sum_{i=0}^{n} N_{i,p}(u) \omega_i} \quad (3)$$

where $\text{RectCtp}_i$ are points on $\text{RectCtp}$, $p = 1$ and $\omega_i = 1$, which is the weight of each control point. $\{N_{i,p}(u)\}$ is the non-uniform rational B-spline basis function defined on the uniform knot vectors [52], $u \in (0, 1)$, which is the parameter of the curve.

B. ROI SECTION, RE-PARAMETERIZATION & OFFSET GENERATION

If a designer wants to deploy the 3D receiver coil in (part of) a 3D surface(s) in the product, he/she may select this region as the ROI, which can be fitted with a NURBS surface $S_r(u, v)$ with a given accuracy (in our cases it was specified as 0.05 mm, which is a quarter of the resolution of the 3D printer). The transmitter coil will be located in $S_r(u, v)$, which is an offset of $S_r(u, v)$. In practice, the offset distance $d$ is the sum of the thickness of the “walls” of the receiver and charging devices (with tolerance), and the positive and negative signs of $d$ indicate an outward or an inward offset, respectively.

C. MAPPING

The transmitter and the receiver coils are created based on mapping the pattern (Equation (1) or (3)) to the ROI surface $S_r(u, v)$ and its offset surface $S_i(u, v)$, respectively. Using the principle of UV mapping [53], a selected pattern (e.g. Equation (3)) can be discretized and mapped to $S_r(u, v)$ and $S_i(u, v)$ as two sequential pointsets $\text{Coilpts}_r = \{S_r(u_{kp}, v_{kp}) | kp=0..m\}$ and $\text{Coilpts}_i = \{S_i(u_{kp}, v_{kp}) | kp=0..m\}$, which resemble the centerlines of the transmitter and the receiver coils, respectively. It is worth mentioning that the UV mapping is not a linear mapping, i.e., the shape of the coils will be stretched and/or deformed according to the intrinsic properties of surfaces $S_r(u, v)$ and $S_i(u, v)$.

D. INTERPOLATION AND DESIGN INTEGRATION

Based on $\text{Coilpts}_r$ and $\text{Coilpts}_i$, centerlines of the receiver and the transmitter coils can be generated by interpolating these two pointsets to one-degree NURBS curves as $C_r(u)$ and $C_i(u)$. If the weight of every control point for $C_r(u)$ and $C_i(u)$ is 1, they can be simplified as:

$$C_r(u) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} N_{i,p}(u) \text{Coilpts}_r \quad u \in (0, 1)$$
$$C_i(u) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} N_{i,p}(u) \text{Coilpts}_i \quad u \in (0, 1) \quad (4)$$

Figure 3 illustrates an example of the proposed approach where a spiral coil pattern is mapped to a 3D freeform surface. Though both patterns utilize a uniform growth rate, distances between each turn of coils are not uniform in 3D due to the properties of UV mapping. Therefore, to avoid possible overlap/collision of adjacent “spiral traces”, it is crucial to find the smallest the distance between consecutive turns of both patterns. If the distance is less than the sum of the width of the coil and the resolution of the printer (for separating each turn), this turn will be removed.

To generate the 3D shapes of the coils, we sweep a rectangular profile, which resembles the cross section of the coil, along the curve to create the trace. The created solids can be integrated into 3D CAD designs, while the material is specified as the silver ink.

IV. SELF- AND MUTUAL- INDUCTANCE OF 3D COILS

In this section, new models for calculating the self-and mutual-inductance of an arbitrary 3D coil(s) are proposed based on the Biot-Savart law and existing work on calculating the self-inductance of a coil [25]. In the following, the proposed method is presented first with three steps. Based on this method, the calculation of multi-coil 3D transmitter(s) and receiver(s), which is designed to transfer larger power, is presented as well.

A. SELF- /MUTUAL- INDUCTANCE OF COILS

Given an arbitrary coil where $C(u)$ is its centerline, its self-inductance can be calculated as the sum of the internal and the external inductances as:

$$L = L_{\text{external}} + L_{\text{internal}} \quad (5)$$

Here the internal inductance of the coil can be calculated from the magnetic energy within the coil as $L_{\text{internal}} = \mu_0/8\pi \int_0^1 C(u) \mu_0 du$ [54], where $\mu_0$ denotes the magnetic permeability of the vacuum ($4\pi \times 10^{-7}$ H/m).

Based on the method proposed by Tominaka [25], the external inductance of the coil can be approximated by the mean of the mutual-inductance ($M_{\text{mid-inn}}$) between the centerline and the inner edge of the coil, and the mutual-inductance ($M_{\text{mid-out}}$) between the centerline and the outer edge of the coil as:

$$L_{\text{external}} = (M_{\text{mid-inn}} + M_{\text{mid-out}})/2 \quad (6)$$
Given a 3D arbitrary shape coil, its \( M_{\text{mid-in}} \) and \( M_{\text{mid-out}} \) can be calculated in 3 steps:

1) 
**DIVIDE THE 3D CURVE INTO N TURNS**

In this step, based on the concept of the loop model [25], a coil can be decomposed to \( N \) 3D turns (loops), where \( N \) is the number of turns of the curve. Figure 4 presents an example of this decomposition. Given a starting point \( C_{\text{in}}(u_0) \) of a NURBS curve \( \{C_{\text{in}}(u)|u \in (0,1)\} \), where \( u_0 \) is a constant in the parameter space and \( C_{\text{in}}(u) \) is the inner edge of a coil, the end point of the first turn \( C_{\text{in}}(u_0) \) can be found as the second solution (the solution with the smallest Euclidean distance between two points) of

\[
\partial D(C_{\text{in}}(u), C_{\text{in}}(u)) \bigg/ \partial u = 0
\]  
\[ (7) \]

where \( D \) is the Euclidean distance between point \( C_{\text{in}}(u_0) \) and curve \( C_{\text{in}}(u) \). If such a solution cannot be found, that means the previous turn is the end of the coil.

With the starting point \( C_{\text{in}}(u_0) \) and the ending point \( C_{\text{in}}(u_m) \), the first turn of the 3D coil can be represented as: \( \{C_{\text{in}}^0(u)|u \in (u_0, u_m)\} \) as the green curve segment in Fig.4. A local Cartesian coordinate system of this turn can be established as \( \{0_0 X_0 Y_0 Z_0\} \) (Fig.4). Its origin is defined as the geometric center of curve \( C_{\text{in}}^0(u) \), the \( X_0 \) and \( Y_0 \) axes are located at the best fit plane of \( C_{\text{in}}^0(u) \), where \( X_0 \) is aligned along the projected line of \( O_0 C_{\text{in}}(u) \) on the best fit plane. Repeating this procedure, the second turn \( C_{\text{in}}^1(u) \), the third turn \( C_{\text{in}}^2(u) \) and their local coordinate systems can be established as the red, blue curves and \( O_1 X_1 Y_1 Z_1 \) and \( O_2 X_2 Y_2 Z_2 \) in Fig.4, respectively. Finally, \( C_{\text{in}}(u) \) can be approached as \( n+1 \) turns as \( \{C_{\text{in}}^i(u)|i=0..n\} \).


**B. DISCRETIZE THE AREA OF EACH LOOP**

The second step is to find the area enclosed by a turn of the 3D coil. For the inner edge of the \( i^\text{th} \) turn of a coil \( \{C_{\text{in}}^i(u)|u \in (u_{ij}, u_{ik})\} \), it can be discretized to a pointset as \( PS_{\text{in}}^i(u) = \{PS_{\text{in}}^{ij}(u) | j = 0..m_{\text{in}} \} \). Given two adjacent points \( PS_{\text{in}}^{ij} \) and \( PS_{\text{in}}^{ij+1} \) which are represented as point B and C in Fig.5, they can be projected to the Z-axis of the local coordinate system as point E and D, respectively. Using the segment of \( C_{\text{mid}}^i(u) \) between B and C, two lines BE and CD, and line DE along the local Z-axis, a NURBS surface \( \{S_{\text{BC}}(u,v) | u, v \in (0,1)\} \) is created as the area enclosed by the blue lines in the figure. By tessellating surface \( S_{\text{BC}}(u,v) \) along its \( u \) and \( v \) directions, a mesh with finite triangles can be generated as an approximation of the enclosed area where one of the triangles is highlighted in yellow (Fig.5). Repeating this step for all adjacent points \( PS_{\text{in}}^{ij} \) and \( PS_{\text{in}}^{ij+1} \) in this turn, the enclosed area of this 3D turn \( C_{\text{mid}}^i(u) \) can be represented as a triangular mesh \( Mesh_i = \{T_k^i | k = 0..h_i\} \), where \( T_k^i \) is a triangle in the mesh, its geometric center can be represented as \( \text{Center}_k^i \), its area is \( A_k^i \) and its normal direction is \( n_k^i \).

**C. CALCULATE THE MUTUAL INDUCTANCE**

The mutual-inductance between \( C_{\text{in}}^i \) and \( C_{\text{mid}} \) can be approximated as:

\[
M_{\text{mid-in}} = \iiint_A \frac{\Phi_A}{I} = \iiint_A \vec{d}B \cdot \vec{d}A/I
\]  
\[ (8) \]

where \( \vec{d}B \) is the magnet flux that induced by \( C_{\text{mid}} \) and crossed the enclosed area of \( C_{\text{in}}^i \). A is the enclosed area of the \( C_{\text{in}}^i \) and \( I \) is the current. Using the Biot–Savart law, \( \vec{d}B \) can be defined as \( \vec{d}B = \iiint_{\text{mid}} \frac{\mu_0 I dC_{\text{mid}} \times \vec{r}_k}{4\pi |\vec{r}_k|^3} \), where \( \vec{r}_k \) is the distance vector between \( \vec{d}A \) and \( dC_{\text{mid}} \).

Given \( C_{\text{mid}} \) as a curve \( \{C_{\text{mid}}(u) | u \in (0,1)\} \), it can be discretized as a point set \( PS_{\text{mid}}(u) = \{PS_{\text{mid}}^j | j = 0..m_{\text{mid}} \} \). As the enclosed area of each turn is discretized to \( T_k^i \) \( k = 0..h_i \) for \( C_{\text{in}}^i \), \( M_{\text{mid-in}} \) can be approximated as:

\[
M_{\text{mid-in}} = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{m_{\text{in}}} \sum_{k=0}^{h_i} \left( \frac{C_{\text{mid}}^i(u) \times \vec{r}_k}{r_k^3} \right) \cdot A_k^i n_k^i
\]  
\[ (9) \]

Here \( C_{\text{mid}}^i = PS_{\text{mid}}^{j+1} - PS_{\text{mid}}^{j} \), which is an approximation of a segment of \( C_{\text{mid}}(u) \), \( \vec{r}_k = \text{Center}_k^i - (PS_{\text{mid}}^{j+1} + PS_{\text{mid}}^{j})/2 \), which is the distance between the center of the triangle \( T_k^i \) and \( C_{\text{mid}} \). Besides, \( n_k^i \) is defined as the normal direction of the triangle and it is used to calculate the projection area of \( A_k^i \) perpendicular to the magnetic field \( \vec{d}B_k \).
Similarly, $M_{mid-out}$ can be calculated using (9) as well. Then the external inductance $L_{external}$ can be found based on the average of the sum of $M_{mid-out}$ and $M_{mid-in}$ as (6). Consecutively, the self-inductance $L$ of the coil can be found using (5). For calculating the mutual-inductance of arbitrarily shaped two 3D coils, Equation (9) can also be used by replacing $C^i_{mid}(u)$ as the centerline of one coil and $C^i_{inn}(u)$ as the centerline of another coil, respectively.

**D. MULTI-COIL TRANSMITTER/RECEIVER**

In many designs, it is difficult to design a large enough coil to transfer the needed power due to geometric and manufacturing constrains [55]. A possible solution is to connect multiple small coils in either/or both side(s) of the transmitter or/receiver to increase the self-inductance of the transmitter/receiver coil(s) and therefore to increase the power that can be transmitted.

Given a multi-coil which consists of $n$ small coils in a series connection, the self-inductance of the multi-coil can be found as $L_{series} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} L_i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} M_{ij}$. Here $L_i$ is the self-inductance of the $i^{th}$ small coil (Equation (6)) and $M_{ij}$ is the mutual-inductance between the $i^{th}$ and the $j^{th}$ coil. For the mutual-inductance between the transmitter coils ($n$ small coils) and receiver coils ($m$ small coils), it can be calculated as $M_{multi} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{m} M_{i,k}$, where $M_{i,k}$ is the mutual-inductance between the $i^{th}$ coil of the transmitter and the $k^{th}$ coil of the receiver coil.

**V. SIMULATION**

To evaluate the proposed approach, we designed a set of 3D coils based on the method proposed in Section III and evaluated their performance using the proposed model (Section IV) as well as the ANSYS\textsuperscript{TM}Maxwell\textsuperscript{TM} simulation tool. In the designs, a series of ROIs were created by projecting the same rectangle (66 mm $\times$ 66 mm) along z-axis to different hemispherical surfaces with different radii (range from 50 to 105 mm with a 5 mm step, shown in Fig.6(a)). Then the transmitter coil was designed by mapping a 10-turn circular spiral pattern to each ROI. For each receiver coil, its receiver coil was created by mapping the same pattern to a 2 mm offset (not shown in Fig.6(a)) of the ROI. In addition, the receiver coil can be moved along the z-axis from 0 to 15 mm (1 mm per step) to simulate the axial misalignment. The varying radii of the hemisphere and the simulated axial misalignment resulted in 192 setups in the calculation and the simulation.

The mathematical models were implemented by Python using the NumPy and the NURBS python library. In the simulation, we used theagnetostatics analysis with a 2A current at 100 KHZ, which is a typical input following the QI standard [3]. Figure 6(b) presents the simulated B field of one of these setups. With an Intel\textsuperscript{TM}Core i5\textsuperscript{TM} 3.7GHZ CPU, it took about 7 minutes to simulate each setup, which resulted in a total 1344 minutes computing time. This was much longer than the computing time of using the proposed mathematical models, which cost 14 seconds for each setup and 44.8 minutes for all setups using the same computer (30 times faster).

In Fig.7, the simulated self-inductance is compared to the results calculated by the proposed mathematical models. It can be found that self-inductances calculated by the mathematical model is larger than the simulation in both cases. The mean absolute error is $2.3 \times 10^{-7}$ H, which accounts for 3.25% of the average of the simulation results. The figures also show that, the self-inductance of the circular spiral coil decreases when the radius increases from 50 mm to 105 mm.

**FIGURE 6.** Simulation setups and results a: Pattern mapped to the ROIs; b: Simulated B field of the IPT system.

**FIGURE 7.** Calculation and simulation results of the self-inductance of 3D coils on hemispherical surfaces with different radii.

**FIGURE 8.** Mutual-inductances of coils a: Simulation results; b: Comparing the calculation results to the simulation results.

Figure 8 presents a comparison of the calculated and simulated mutual-inductance of two pairs of coils, respectively. In Fig.8(a), the simulation results of the mutual-inductance against the radius of the hemispherical surface (varying from 50 to 105 mm) and the movement of the transmitter coil along the Z-axis (axial misalignment, varying from 0 to 15 mm)
are presented. It can be seen that the axial misalignment has a much larger influence on the mutual-inductance than the radius of the hemisphere. Figure 8(b) shows the errors between the calculation and the simulation. The mean absolute error between the calculation and simulation is $1.9 \times 10^{-8}$ H, and on average the calculation result is 1.6% larger than the simulation result.

![Figure 9](image_url)

**FIGURE 9.** Multi-coil IPT a. The design of the multi-coil IPT system where two coils are connected in series as the transmitter (green) and a single coil (red) is used as the receiver; b. Simulation results.

Figure 9 presents the simulation results of the design of a shaver with a multi-coil WPT system. In the system (Fig.9(a)), the transmitter coil consists of two small coils (green) where the receiver only has a large coil (red). The calculated self-inductance of the multi-coil is $1.28 \times 10^{-7}$ H, and the mutual-inductance between the transmitter and receiver coil is $9.26 \times 10^{-6}$ H where for the simulation, the values are $1.25 \times 10^{-5}$ H and $9.18 \times 10^{-6}$ H, respectively. Simulation results are in accordance with the calculation results, and the error is less than 5%.

**VI. EXPERIMENTS**

To further verify the performance of the proposed approach for designing 3D WPT system, two sets of circular spiral coils and two sets of rectangular spiral coils were printed using a Voxel8 printer. In the 3D prints, the PLA was used as the substrate and the Voxel8 silver ink was used as conductive material. It has a density of 3700 kg/m$^3$ and the volume resistivity is below $3 \times 10^{-7}$ Ω·m. According to its specification, it will take approx. 12 hours to dry at room temperature to get 90% of the specified conductivity [37]. In practice, we dried it for more than 24 hours for a better performance. The adhesion strength between the silver ink and the PLA is approx. 4-5 based on the tape test of ASTM [56]. The dried silver ink was able to withstand small deformation as the strain of the silver trace at electrical break is 5% [56].

In Fig 10(a), the printing process of a 3D rectangular spiral coil is presented. Figure 10(b) presents four sets of coils with different 3D shapes. For a better visualization, those coils were not embedded in the design, therefore silver traces can be observed directly. Table 1 presents the measurement results of these four sets of coils. In the Table, $T$ represents the transmitter coil and $R$ represents the receiver coil. Regarding the resistances, for Set 1 and Set 2, the values are about 1.4 Ω and for Set 3 and Set 4, the resistances are about 1.6 Ω. For both the circular spiral coils and the rectangular spiral coils, the measurements of self-inductances are close to the results of calculation and simulation. All coupling factors are above 0.7, which indicates the potential for a high efficiency IPT system. The quality factors of all the four pairs of coils are not high, mainly due to the large resistances introduced by the silver ink.

Using the measurement method (Fig.11(a)) recommended by the Wireless Power Consortium [57], we measured the actual power transfer efficiency as $\eta = \frac{V_2 A_2}{V_1 A_1}$. In the experiment, the input power was about 5 Watt and a 10 Ω resistive load was deployed on the receiver side. No electromagnetic shield was used for the IPT. The measured power transfer efficiency of the 4 sets of coils were 21.8% (3D circular spiral coils on the hemispherical surface with a radius of 100 mm), 22.6% (2D circular spiral coil), 25.3% (3D rectangular spiral coil on the cylindrical surface with a radius of 100 mm) and 25.1% (2D rectangular spiral coil) respectively. It is worth mentioning that the power consumption of the circuits of the transmitter and the receiver were included in all measurements as well.

To further verify the possibility of using 3D coils in product design, we redesigned the 3D IPT system for an electric toothbrush using the proposed approach and printed a prototype using the Voxel8 printer. In this new design, the receiver coil is embedded in the shell of the toothbrush and the transmitter coil is embedded in the holder. Figure 12(a) and Fig.12(b) show intermediate steps in printing the transmitter (and the holder) and the receiver coils (and the shell), respectively. Figure 12(c) presents the prototype. The power transfer efficiency between the coils in the holder and the shell was measured as 18.6%, which was slight lower than the printed
TABLE 1. Measurement results of 4 sets of coils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circular spiral coils</th>
<th>Rectangular spiral coils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set 1 (R=100 mm)</td>
<td>Set 2 (R=∞)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance(Ω)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-inductance(μH)</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation error</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation error</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual inductance(μH)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation error</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation error</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality factor</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation error</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupling factor</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation error</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation error</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power transfer efficiency</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. DISCUSSION

A. DIRECTIONAL POWER TRANSFER EFFICIENCY

In our design, a same pattern is mapped to an ROI and its offset to form the centerlines of the transmitter and the receiver coils, respectively. As the geometries of the ROI and its offset are different, the shapes of the two coils are different as well. Generally, using a small coil as the transmitter, the power transfer efficiency is higher than using the larger coil, as the large coil encloses the small coil and is able to capture more electromagnetic energy radiated by the transmitter. Experiment results also proved this as the coupling factors from the smaller coil to the larger coil were slightly larger (in average 2.6%) in both Set 1 and Set 3. Therefore, it is preferred to use the smaller coil as the transmitter in the design of a 3D IPT system.

4 sets of coils. The major reason was that the thickness of the shell was increased (around 2.5 mm) for better mechanical properties.

B. CALCULATION, SIMULATION AND EXPERIMENT RESULTS

In general, measurement results regarding the self-inductance, the mutual-inductance and the coupling factor of coil(s) were slightly lower than the simulation, and the calculation was the highest. For instance, regarding the self-inductances, the mean absolute errors of the calculation and the simulation regarding the measurement are 2.63% and 1.20% higher, respectively. And for the mutual-inductance, the mean absolute errors are 4.45% and 2.38% higher, respectively. These errors can be explained by multiple factors. First, for accelerating the speeds of the calculation and simulation, we set surround environment of the coil as vacuum, and in the experiment, those coils were printed on the PLA substrate surrounded by the air. Though the magnetic permeabilities of the PLA, the air and the vacuum are similar, there are slight differences and errors were introduced. Secondly, the silver traces were treated as solid lines with uniform cross-sections in the calculation and the simulation. However, in the...
3D printed coils, it cannot be guaranteed. Details of the limitations of the manufacturing process will be discussed in the next section. Regarding the difference between the calculation and the simulation, the skin effect, which might influence the results, was taken into consideration in the simulation [58], but not in the calculation. For instance, the mutual-inductance were calculated based on the centerline and edges of the coil, however, the current density might be different in those locations due to skin effect.

Though there were errors in the calculation and the simulation, the absolute mean errors were consistent and were below 5%. Considering the cost of the prototype and the speed of the simulation (30 times slower than the calculation), the models that developed in this paper are useful tools for estimating the coil properties for designing a WPT system, especially in the design exploration and design optimization, where many iterations of calculation might be needed.

C. MANUFACTURING PROCESS

The effectiveness and efficiency of an IPT strongly depends on the resistance of the coil, the coupling factors (k) between the coils and their quality factors (Q). For the resistances of the prototypes, all measurements are higher than the simulation.

![Toolpath for printing a 3D coil](image)

**FIGURE 13. Toolpath for printing a 3D coil.**

This can be explained by the nature of the 3D printing process. The “cold” extruded silver ink has a round shape, and the fragments of inks are stacked together to form the conductive trace that is higher than the thickness of the extruded ink. It is inevitable that extra resistance will be introduced and this was especially true for traces with large inclination angles regarding the building plane, as the number of building layers for each segment of a trace may vary according the angle. Figure 13 shows the toolpath for printing a silver coil where the height of the coil is designed as 3 horizontal layers. It can be seen that the silver trace fragments are “stacked” on each other in different layers to approximate the traces on the curved surface. In some cases, only 2 layers are available as the thickness is discretized according to the resolution of the printer (0.19 mm). This also introduces extra resistances.

In the proposed research we increased the thickness of the trace to guarantee that the “minimal” number of layers of silver in the toolpath. Researchers also proposed different methods to reduce the resistance. For instance, Kim et al. [59] demonstrated the possibility of connecting multiple layers by inserting metal connector between them in the printing process. Angel et al. [60] proposed a new curing method for parts printed on a uniaxial double sloped 3D surface by photonic sintering. Hawasli et al. [61] also demonstrated that the resistances of 3D printed traces can be lowered by using a combination of photonic sintering and copper electroplating.

Our experiments indicated that the bond between the conductive ink and the substrate material (ASTM Tape Adhesion: 4-5 [56]) were able to support the usage of the WPT system. To further improve the adhesion, the metal ink proposed by Yung et al. [62] could be considered. Silane coupling agents suggested by Lee et al. [63] can be considered as well.

D. THE QUALITY FACTORS (Q)

Though calculation, simulation and experiments indicate the potentials of high efficiency of the proposed 3D design, the quality factor of the coils are around 3, which is not high compared to conventional wireless charging coils. And it is also the major reason for the relatively low efficiency. However, the 3D design might already be used to charge/power devices that has limited power requirements, for instance, electrical toothbrush, sensors for Internet of Things (IoT) applications, and biosensors [49].

For applications where large currents are needed, the quality factor can be further improved by decreasing the resistance of the coils, for instance by enlarging the cross-section area of a trace; designing more parallel traces in available space; improving contact between traces and/or, using inks with better conductivity. Although theoretically enlarging the cross-section area could reduce the resistance, due to the skin effect, the improvement is likely to be limited. 3D designs offer more available space to accommodate parallel traces, but the number of traces also depends on the printing resolution. At current stage, the resolution of the Voxel8 is about 0.19 mm (layer height), which makes it difficult to reach the same number of strands as a litz wire. The volume resistivity of the silver link used in this research, is approximately $3 \cdot 10^{-7} \Omega \cdot m$, which is 17.2 times larger than that of the pure silver ($1.65 \cdot 10^{-8} \Omega \cdot m$). Besides methods discussed in previous section, if a metal-jet [41], which is able to print pure silver with higher resolution, is used, the quality factor of a coil could be greatly improved from ~3 to ~55.

E. LIMITATIONS

In the proposed research, we limited our discussion on the design and manufacturing of 3D coils. Topologies of the compensation network, e.g., SS, SP, PS and PP, were not discussed. The use of metamaterial with negative permeability and permittivity is to be investigated as well [64]. Additionally, we mapped patterns as close as possible to the boundary of the ROI for a better performance of the 3D IPT. For complicated freeform surfaces, more study is needed to investigate the optimal orientation of (each turn of) the
coil regarding the self- and mutual- inductance of the coils. Regarding the materials, further study on the curing methods, as well as the adhesion of the silver trace on surfaces with different inclination angles and different textures, are needed.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, a systematic approach of designing, modelling and manufacturing 3D coils for IPT is presented based on 3D printed electronics. Two patterns are proposed as the basic shapes of the 3D coils. Using UV mapping, these patterns can be mapped to an arbitrarily selected region of a product and its offset surface to generate 3D transmitter and the receiver coils, respectively. Self- and mutual- inductances of the 3D coils, as well as the efficiency of the IPT system, can be directly calculated using the proposed mathematical models. The design and the mathematical models were further verified by simulation and experiments, where two sets of circular spiral coils and two sets of rectangular spiral coils were designed based on the proposed method and manufactured by 3D printed electronics. It is concluded that the proposed approach is feasible and promising for manufacturing IPT using 3D printed electronics.

Current work is directed towards further improvements of the design approach and the performance of the coils. More complicated freeform surfaces will be studied for utilizing the proposed approach in more designs. Regarding the quality factor (Q) of the coils, different types of conductive inks, the spatial arrangement of the conductive traces and the manufacturing methods are being investigated. The possibility of printing ferrite materials as electromagnetic shields will be explored as well.
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