

Generalized Circuit Elements

Idoia Cortes Garcia · Sebastian Schöps ·
Christian Strohm · Caren Tischendorf

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The structural analysis, i.e., the investigation of the differential-algebraic nature, of circuits containing simple elements, i.e., resistances, inductances and capacitances is well established. However, nowadays circuits contain all sorts of elements, e.g. behavioral models or partial differential equations stemming from refined device modelling. This paper proposes the definition of generalized circuit elements which may for example contain additional internal degrees of freedom, such that those elements still behave structurally like resistances, inductances and capacitances. Several complex examples demonstrate the relevance of those definitions.

1 Introduction

Circuits or electric networks are a common modeling technique to describe the electrotechnical behavior of large systems. Their structural analysis, i.e., the investigation of the properties of the underlying differential-algebraic equations (DAEs),

Supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy: the Berlin Mathematics Research Center MATH+ (EXC-2046/1, project ID: 390685689) and the Graduate School of Computational Engineering at TU Darmstadt (GSC 233) as well as the DFG grant SCHO1562/1-2 and the Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie (BMWi, Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy) grant 0324019E.

Idoia Cortes Garcia
TU Darmstadt, Computational Electromagnetics Group, Schlossgartenstr. 8, 64289 Darmstadt
E-mail: idoia.cortes@tu-darmstadt.de

Sebastian Schöps
TU Darmstadt, Computational Electromagnetics Group, Schlossgartenstr. 8, 64289 Darmstadt
E-mail: sebastian.schoeps@tu-darmstadt.de

Christian Strohm
Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin
E-mail: strohmch@math.hu-berlin.de

Caren Tischendorf
Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin
E-mail: tischendorf@math.hu-berlin.de

has a long tradition. For example Bill Gear studied in 1971 ‘the mixed differential and algebraic equations of the type that commonly occur in the transient analysis of large networks’ in [21]. At that time several competing formulations were used in the circuit simulation community, for example the sparse tableau analysis (STA) was popular. This changed with the introduction of the modified nodal analysis (MNA) by Ho et. al in [26] and the subsequent development of the code SPICE [33]. Nowadays all major circuit simulation tools are using some dialect of MNA, e.g. the traditional formulation or the flux/charge oriented one [20]. The mathematical structure has been very well understood in the case of simple elements, i.e., resistances, inductances and capacitances as well as sources [25, 19].

However, the complexity of element models has increased quickly. For example, the semiconductor community develops various phenomenological and physical models, which are standardized e.g. in the BSIM (Berkeley Short-channel IGFET Model) family, [40]. The development of *mixed-mode device simulation* has become popular, which is mathematically speaking the coupling of DAEs with partial differential equations (PDEs), e.g. [36, 30, 22, 24]. Even earlier, low frequency engineers have established *field-circuit-coupling*, i.e., the interconnection of finite element machine models with circuits, first based on loop analysis, later (modified) nodal analysis e.g. [35, 16].

Until now, the structural DAE analysis of circuits which are based on complex (‘refined’) elements has mainly been carried out on a case by case basis, e.g. for elliptic semiconductor models in [1], parabolic-elliptic models of electrical machines in [41, 2, 13] and hyperbolic models stemming from the full set of Maxwell’s equations in [4]. Based on the analysis made in [13], this contribution aims for a more systematic analysis: we consider each element as an arbitrary (smooth) function of voltages, currents, internal variables and their derivatives. Then, we formulate sets of assumptions (‘generalized elements’) on these functions, e.g. which quantity is derived or which DAE-index does the function have. Based on these assumptions we proof a DAE index result that generalizes [19]. Not surprisingly, it turns out that our generalized elements are natural generalizations of the classical elements, i.e., resistances, inductances and capacitances. All results are formulated in the context of electrical engineering but the presented approach is also of interest for the analysis and simulation of other networks such as gas transport networks [28, 23, 5] or power networks [31].

The paper is structured as follows: we start with a few basic mathematical definitions and results in Section 2, then we give the definitions of our generalized elements and some simple examples in Section 3. In Section 4 we discuss the mathematical modeling of circuits by modified nodal analysis. Finally, 5 proves the new DAE index results which are then applied to several very complex refined models in Section 6.

2 Mathematical Preliminaries

Let us collect some basic notations and definitions:

Definition 1 A function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is called strongly monotone if and only if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\forall x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \quad \langle f(x) - f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle \geq c \|x - \bar{x}\|^2.$$

Lemma 1 *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be a matrix. Then, the linear function $f(x) := Mx$ is strongly monotone if and only if M is positive definite.*

Proof If $f(x) := Mx$ is strongly monotone we find a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $x \neq 0$

$$\langle Mx, x \rangle = \langle f(x) - f(0), x - 0 \rangle \geq c\|x - 0\| > 0,$$

that means M is positive definite. Next, we show the opposite direction. Let M be positive definite. We split M into its symmetric and non-symmetric part

$$M = M_s + M_n, \quad M_s = \frac{1}{2}(M + M^\top), \quad M_n = \frac{1}{2}(M - M^\top).$$

Consequently, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $x \neq 0$,

$$\langle M_s x, x \rangle = \langle Mx, x \rangle > 0.$$

Since M_s is symmetric, we find a unitary matrix T and a diagonal matrix D such that $M_s = T^{-1}DT$. We get that

$$0 < \langle M_s x, x \rangle = \langle T^{-1}DTx, x \rangle = \langle DTx, Tx \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^m d_{jj} y_j^2 \quad \text{with } y := Tx.$$

Choosing the unit vectors $y := e_i$, we find that $d_{ii} > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Defining $c := \min_{i=1, \dots, m} d_{ii}$, we see that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$

$$\langle Mx, x \rangle = \langle M_s x, x \rangle \geq \sum_{j=1}^m c y_j^2 = c\|Tx\|^2 = c\|x\|^2.$$

Finally, we obtain, for any $x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$

$$\langle f(x) - f(\bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle = \langle M(x - \bar{x}), x - \bar{x} \rangle \geq c\|x - \bar{x}\|^2.$$

□

Definition 2 A function $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is called strongly monotone with respect to x if and only if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \quad \forall x, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m : \quad \langle f(x, y) - f(\bar{x}, y), x - \bar{x} \rangle \geq c\|x - \bar{x}\|^2.$$

Remark 1 In case of variable matrix functions $M(y)$, the function $f(x, y) := M(y)x$ might be not strongly monotone with respect to x even if $M(y)$ is positive definite for each y . For strong monotony, one has to ensure that the eigenvalues of the symmetric part of $M(y)$ can be bounded from below by a constant $c > 0$ independent of y .

Lemma 2 *Let $f = f(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be strongly monotone with respect to x and continuous. Then, there is a uniquely defined continuous function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $f(g(y), y) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof For fixed $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define $F_y : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by

$$F_y(x) := f(x, y) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Since f is strongly monotone with respect to x , the function F_y is strongly monotone. The Theorem of Browder-Minty, e.g. [44] and [34], provides a unique $z_y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that $F_y(z_y) = 0$ and, hence, $f(z_y, y) = 0$. We define $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by

$$g(y) := z_y.$$

Obviously, $f(g(y), y) = 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It remains to show that g is continuous. Let (y_k) be a convergent series in \mathbb{R}^n with $y_k \rightarrow y_* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since f is strongly monotone with respect to x , there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(y_k) - g(y_*)\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{c} \langle f(g(y_k), y_k) - f(g(y_*), y_k), g(y_k) - g(y_*) \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c} \|f(g(y_k), y_k) - f(g(y_*), y_k)\| \|g(y_k) - g(y_*)\| \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \|f(g(y_*) - g(y_k), y_k)\| \|g(y_k) - g(y_*)\| \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \|f(g(y_*) - g(y_k), y_k) - f(g(y_*) - g(y_k), y_*)\| \|g(y_k) - g(y_*)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Since f is continuous, we may conclude that $g(y_k) \rightarrow g(y_*)$ for $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 3 Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times k}$ be a matrix and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ be a projector along $\ker M$. Additionally, let $f = f(x, y) : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be strongly monotone with respect to x and continuous as well as $r : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a continuous function. Then, there is a continuous function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$M^\top f(Mz, y) + P^\top r(y) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad Pz = g(y). \quad (1)$$

Proof In the degenerated case that $M = 0$ we have $P = 0$ and the zero function $g(y) \equiv 0$ fulfills obviously the equivalence (1). Let be $M \neq 0$ for the further considerations. We chose a basis B of $\text{im } P$. For $r := \text{rank } P$, we form the full-column rank matrix $\tilde{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times r}$ as a matrix whose columns consist of all basis vectors of B . By construction, $\ker M\tilde{P} = \{0\}$ and, hence, the matrix $(M\tilde{P})^\top M\tilde{P}$ is non-singular. Next, we introduce a function $F : \mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ by

$$F(u, y) := (M\tilde{P})^\top f(M\tilde{P}u, y) + \tilde{P}^\top P^\top r(y).$$

Since f is continuous, also F is continuous. From the strong monotony of f with respect to x we can also conclude the strong monotony of F with respect to u since there is a constant $c > 0$ such that, for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and for all $u, \bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^r$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F(u, y) - F(\bar{u}, y), u - \bar{u} \rangle &= \langle (M\tilde{P})^\top f(M\tilde{P}u, y) - (M\tilde{P})^\top f(M\tilde{P}\bar{u}, y), u - \bar{u} \rangle \\ &= \langle f(M\tilde{P}u, y) - f(M\tilde{P}\bar{u}, y), M\tilde{P}u - M\tilde{P}\bar{u} \rangle \\ &\geq c \|M\tilde{P}u - M\tilde{P}\bar{u}\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \bar{u}\| &= \|((M\tilde{P})^\top M\tilde{P})^{-1} (M\tilde{P})^\top M\tilde{P}(u - \bar{u})\| \\ &\leq \|((M\tilde{P})^\top M\tilde{P})^{-1} (M\tilde{P})^\top\| \|M\tilde{P}(u - \bar{u})\| \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\langle F(u, y) - F(\bar{u}, y), u - \bar{u} \rangle \geq \frac{c}{c_1} \|u - \bar{u}\|^2$$

for $c_1 := \|((M\tilde{P})^\top M\tilde{P})^{-1}(M\tilde{P})^\top\|^2 > 0$ since M is a non-zero matrix. From Lemma 2 we know that there is a unique continuous function $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ such that

$$F(G(y), y) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It means that $F(u, y) = 0$ if and only if $u = G(y)$. Next, we show that the function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ defined by

$$g(y) := \tilde{P}G(y)$$

satisfies the equivalence (1). First, we see that

$$\tilde{P}^\top M^\top f(Mg(y), y) + \tilde{P}^\top P^\top r(y) = F(G(y), y) = 0.$$

By construction of \tilde{P} , we know that $\ker \tilde{P}^\top = \ker P^\top$ and, therefore,

$$P^\top M^\top f(Mg(y), y) + P^\top P^\top r(y) = 0.$$

Since P is a projector along $\ker M$, we see that $M = MP$ and, hence,

$$M^\top f(Mg(y), y) + P^\top r(y) = 0.$$

From here, we can directly conclude the following direction of the equivalence (1). If $Pz = g(y)$ then $M^\top f(Mz, y) + P^\top r(y) = 0$. Finally, we show the opposite direction. If $M^\top f(Mz, y) + P^\top r(y) = 0$ then we again exploit the monotony of f in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle M^\top f(Mz, y) + P^\top r(y) - M^\top f(Mg(y), y) - P^\top r(y), z - g(y) \rangle \\ &= \langle f(Mz, y) - f(Mg(y), y), Mz - Mg(y) \rangle \geq c \|Mz - Mg(y)\|, \end{aligned}$$

that means $M(z - g(y)) = 0$. By assumption we have $\ker M = \ker P$ and, hence, $P(z - g(y)) = 0$. It follows $Pz = Pg(y) = P\tilde{P}G(y) = \tilde{P}G(y) = g(y)$. \square

Corollary 1 *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$ be a matrix and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ be a projector along $\ker M$. Additionally, let $r : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be continuous. Then, there is a continuous function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that*

$$M^\top Mz + P^\top r(y) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad Pz = g(y). \quad (2)$$

Proof It follows directly from Lemma 3 using the function $F : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ defined by

$$F(x, y) := x.$$

\square

Following [8] we call a function $x(t)$ the solution of a general nonlinear DAE

$$f(x', x, t) = 0 \quad (3)$$

on an interval $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$, if x is continuously differentiable on I and satisfies (3) for all $t \in \mathcal{I}$.

Assumption 1 *We assume solvability of (3), see e.g. [8, Definition 2.2.1], and that all functions involved are sufficiently smooth.*

Definition 3 ([8]) The minimum number of times that all or part of (3) must be differentiated with respect to t in order to determine x' as a continuous function of x, t , is the index of the DAE.

3 Generalized Circuit Elements

In this section we define new classes of generalized circuit elements motivated by the classical ones, i.e., resistances, inductances and capacitances. The first inductance-like element is based on the definition in [13]. The original version was designed to represent a specific class of models but also to be minimally invasive in the sense that the proofs in [19] could still be used. The following definition is more general and a new proof of the corresponding index results is given in Section 5.

Definition 4 We define an **inductance-like** element as one element described by

$$f_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} m_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t), x_L, i_L, v_L, t \right) = 0$$

where there is at most one differentiation $\frac{d}{dt}$ needed to obtain a model description of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_L = \chi_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t \right) \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} i_L = g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \quad (5)$$

We call it a **strongly inductance-like** element if, additionally, the function

$$\begin{aligned} F_L(v'_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t) &:= \partial_{x_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \chi_L(v'_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \\ &\quad + \partial_{v_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t) v'_L \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

is continuous and strongly monotone with respect to v'_L .

Proposition 1 *Linear inductances defined as*

$$v_L - L \frac{d}{dt} i_L = 0,$$

with L being positive definite, are strongly inductance-like elements.

Proof By inverting L we obtain without the need of any differentiation a model description as required in (5) in Definition 4. Furthermore, $F_L(v_L') = L^{-1}v_L'$ is strongly monotone with respect to v_L' due to L^{-1} being positive definite and by using Lemma 1 in Definition 2. \square

Proposition 2 *Flux formulated inductances defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} v_L &= \frac{d}{dt}\Phi_L, \\ \Phi_L &= \phi(i_L, t), \end{aligned}$$

with $\partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)$ being positive definite, are strongly inductance-like elements.

Proof we chose $x_L = \Phi_L$. Then, one time differentiation of the second equation yields $\frac{d}{dt}x_L = \partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)\frac{d}{dt}i_L + \partial_t\phi(i_L, t)$ and exploiting the positive definiteness we write $\frac{d}{dt}i_L$ as in (5) Definition 4, for

$$g_L(i_L, v_L, t) := \partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}x_L - \partial_t\phi(i_L, t) = \partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)^{-1}v_L - \partial_t\phi(i_L, t).$$

Consequently, $F_L(v_L', i_L, t) = \partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)^{-1}v_L'$ and $F_L(v_L', i_L, t)$ is strongly monotone with respect to v_L' . The latter follows again from $\partial_{i_L}\phi(i_L, t)^{-1}$ being positive definite and by using Lemma 1 in Definition 2. \square

A more complex application of an electromagnetic element complying with this definition can be found in Section 6.1.

Definition 5 We define a **capacitance-like** element as one element described by

$$f_C\left(\frac{d}{dt}m_C(x_C, i_C, v_C, t), x_C, i_C, v_C, t\right) = 0$$

where there is at most one differentiation $\frac{d}{dt}$ needed to obtain a model description of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_C = \chi_C\left(\frac{d}{dt}i_C, x_C, i_C, v_C, t\right) \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}v_C = g_C(x_C, i_C, v_C, t) \quad (8)$$

We call it a **strongly capacitance-like** element if, additionally, the function

$$\begin{aligned} F_C(i_C', x_C, i_C, v_C, t) &:= \partial_{x_C}g_C(x_C, i_C, v_C, t)\chi_C(i_C', x_C, i_C, v_C, t) \\ &\quad + \partial_{i_C}g_C(x_C, i_C, v_C, t)i_C' \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

is continuous and strongly monotone with respect to i_C' .

Proposition 3 *Linear capacitances defined as*

$$C\frac{d}{dt}v_C - i_C = 0,$$

with C being positive definite, are strongly capacitance-like elements.

Proof Analogous to the proof in Proposition 1, we exploit the fact that C is positive definite and here, $F_C(i_C') = C^{-1}i_C'$ is shown to be strongly monotone with respect to i_C' by using by using Lemma 1 and Definition 2. \square

Proposition 4 *Charge formulated capacitances defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} i_C &= \frac{d}{dt}q_C, \\ q_C &= q(v_C, t), \end{aligned}$$

with $\partial_{v_C}q(v_C, t)$ being positive definite, are strongly capacitance-like elements.

Proof There proof is analogous to the one of Proposition 2 by setting $x_C = q_C$ and $F_C(i_C', v_C, t) = \partial_t q(v_C, t)^{-1}i_C'$. \square

Definition 6 We define a **resistance-like** element as one element described by

$$f_R\left(\frac{d}{dt}m_R(x_R, i_R, v_R, t), x_R, i_R, v_R, t\right) = 0$$

where there is at most one differentiation $\frac{d}{dt}$ needed to obtain a model description of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}x_R = \chi_R(x_R, i_R, v_R, t) \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}i_R = g_R\left(\frac{d}{dt}v_R, x_R, i_R, v_R, t\right) \quad (11)$$

We call it a **strongly resistance-like** element if, additionally, the function

$$g_R(v_R', x_R, i_R, v_R, t) \quad (12)$$

is continuous and strongly monotone with respect to v_R' .

Proposition 5 *Linear resistances defined as*

$$v_R - Ri_R = 0,$$

with R being positive definite, are strongly resistance-like elements.

Proof Here, the equation is differentiated once to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}v_R - R\frac{d}{dt}i_R = 0.$$

Now, analogously to the proof in 1, we exploit the positive definiteness of R to invert it and obtain a function $g_R(v_R') = R^{-1}v_R'$, which is strongly monotone with respect to v_R' . \square

Remark 2 Definitions 4-6 are made for one-port elements or multi-port elements which are structurally identically for each port and do not change their structure, e.g. depending on state, time (or frequency). However, in practice an inductance-like device may turn into a capacitance-like device depending on its working point. Also, a two-port element may simply consist of an inductance and a capacitance. Those examples are not covered by our generalizations.

4 Circuit Structures and Circuit Graph Describing Matrices

In this section we define the common ingredients for the analysis of circuits, see e.g. [37, 19].

Assumption 2 *Let a connected circuit be given whose elements belong to the set of capacitance-like devices, inductance-like devices, resistance-like devices, voltage sources and current sources.*

We consider the element related incidence matrices A_C , A_L , A_R , A_V and A_I whose entries a_{ij} are defined by

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if branch } j \text{ directs from node } i \\ -1 & \text{if branch } j \text{ directs to node } i \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

where the index i refers to a node (except the mass node) and the index j refers to branches of capacitance-like devices (A_C), inductance-like devices (A_L), resistance-like devices (A_R), voltage sources (A_V) and current sources (A_I).

Remark 3 If Assumption 2 is fulfilled then the incidence matrix A of the circuit is given by $A = [A_C \ A_L \ A_R \ A_V \ A_I]$ and has full row rank (see [9]).

Lemma 4 *Let a connected circuit be given and A_X be the incidence matrix of all branches of type X . All other branches shall be collected in the incidence matrix A_Y such that the incidence matrix of the circuit is given by $A = [A_X \ A_Y]$. Then,*

1. *the circuit contains no loops of only X -type branches if and only if A_X has full column rank,*
2. *the circuit contains no cutsets of only X -type branches if and only if A_Y has full row rank.*

Proof The incidence matrix of a subset S of branches of a circuit is non-singular if and only if S forms a spanning tree [9]. From this we can conclude the following statements.

1. The circuit contains no loops of only X -type branches if and only if there is a spanning tree containing all X -type branches. The latter condition is equivalent to the condition that A_X has full column rank.
2. The circuit contains no cutsets of only X -type branches if and only if there is a spanning tree containing only Y -type branches. The latter condition is equivalent to the condition that A_Y has full row rank.

□

Corollary 2 *Let Assumption 2 be fulfilled. Then,*

1. *the circuit contains no loops of only voltage sources if and only if A_V has full column rank,*
2. *the circuit contains no cutsets of only current sources if and only if $[A_C \ A_L \ A_R \ A_V]$ has full row rank.*

Since loops of only voltage sources and cutsets of only current sources are electrically forbidden, we suppose the following assumption to be fulfilled.

Assumption 3 *The matrix A_V has full column rank and the matrix $[A_C A_L A_R A_V]$ has full row rank.*

Definition 7 We call a loop of branches of a circuit a **CV-loop** if it contains only capacitance-like devices and voltage sources. We call a cutset of branches of a circuit an **LI-cutset** if it contains only inductance-like devices and current sources.

Corollary 3 *Let Assumption 2 be fulfilled. Then,*

1. *the circuit contains no CV-loops if and only if $[A_C A_V]$ has full column rank,*
2. *the circuit contains no LI-cutsets if and only if $[A_C A_R A_V]$ has full row rank.*

5 DAE Index for Circuits with Generalized Lumped Models

Let Assumption 2 and Assumption 3 be fulfilled. Following the idea of the modified nodal analysis for circuits, we introduce the nodal potentials e and form the circuit equations as

$$A_C i_C + A_R i_R + A_V i_V + A_L i_L + A_I i_S = 0, \quad (13a)$$

$$A_V^\top e = v_S, \quad (13b)$$

$$f_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} m_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t), x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t \right) = 0, \quad (13c)$$

$$f_C \left(\frac{d}{dt} m_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t), x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t \right) = 0, \quad (13d)$$

$$f_R \left(\frac{d}{dt} m_R(x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t), x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t \right) = 0 \quad (13e)$$

with given source functions $i_S = i_S(t)$ for current sources and $v_S = v_S(t)$ for voltage sources.

Remark 4 Please note that the currents i_C and i_R are variables of the system (13). This is in contrast to the traditional modified nodal analysis which is only based on simple lumped elements such that these variables can be eliminated by explicitly solving (13e) and (13d) for the currents i_C and i_R , respectively.

Theorem 1 *Let Assumption 2 be fulfilled. Furthermore, let all resistance-like devices be strongly resistance-like devices. If the circuit has no CV-loops and no LI-cutsets then the differentiation index of the system (13) is at most index 1.*

Proof Let Q_{CV} be a projector onto $\ker [A_C A_V]^\top$ and $P_{CV} := I - Q_{CV}$. It allows us to split

$$e = P_{CV} e + Q_{CV} e.$$

For the capacitance-like devices and the voltage sources we find after at most one differentiation of the device equations (13d) and (13b) that

$$A_C^\top \frac{d}{dt} e = g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \quad \text{and} \quad A_V^\top \frac{d}{dt} e = \frac{d}{dt} v_S. \quad (14)$$

It implies

$$[A_C \ A_V] \left(\begin{bmatrix} A_C^\top \\ A_V^\top \end{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} e - \begin{bmatrix} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ \frac{d}{dt} v_S \end{bmatrix} \right) = 0.$$

Applying Corollary 1 for $M := [A_C \ A_V]^\top$, $P := P_{CV}$,

$$z := \frac{d}{dt} e, \ y := (x_C, i_C, e, t), \ f(y) := \begin{bmatrix} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ \frac{d}{dt} v_S(t) \end{bmatrix}, \ r(y) := 0$$

we find a continuous function f_1 such that

$$P_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e = f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t). \quad (15)$$

Next we exploit the nodal equations (13a). Multiplication by Q_{CV}^\top and one differentiation yields

$$Q_{CV}^\top (A_R \frac{d}{dt} i_R + A_L \frac{d}{dt} i_L + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S) = 0. \quad (16)$$

For the resistance-like and inductance-like devices we get after at most one differentiation of the device equations (13e) and (13c) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} i_R = g_R \left(\frac{d}{dt} A_R^\top e, x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t \right) = g_R (A_R^\top Q_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_R^\top P_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e, x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t) \quad (17)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} i_L = g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t). \quad (18)$$

Together with (15) and (16) we obtain

$$Q_{CV}^\top \left(A_R g_R (A_R^\top Q_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_R^\top f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t), x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t) \right. \\ \left. + A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S \right) = 0. \quad (19)$$

We choose a projector P_{R-CV} along $\ker A_R^\top Q_{CV}$. Then, multiplication of (19) by P_{R-CV}^\top yields

$$P_{R-CV}^\top A_R g_R (A_R^\top Q_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_R^\top f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t), x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t) \\ + P_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top (A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S) = 0. \quad (20)$$

It allows us to apply Lemma 3 for

$$M := A_R^\top Q_{CV}, \ P := P_{R-CV}, \ z := \frac{d}{dt} e, \ y := (x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t),$$

and

$$f(x, y) := g_R(x + A_R^\top f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t), x_R, i_R, A_R^\top e, t), \\ r(y) := Q_{CV}^\top (A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S).$$

Thus, we find a continuous function f_2 such that

$$P_{R-CV} \frac{d}{dt} e = f_2(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (21)$$

Since the circuit does not contain LI-cutsets, the matrix $[A_C A_R A_V]^\top$ has full column rank (see Corollary 3). It implies for $Q_{R-CV} := I - P_{R-CV}$ that

$$\ker Q_{CV} = \ker A_R^\top Q_{CV} = \ker P_{R-CV} = \text{im } Q_{R-CV}$$

and, therefore, $Q_{CV} = Q_{CV} P_{R-CV}$. Consequently,

$$Q_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e = Q_{CV} f_2(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (22)$$

Regarding (15), (22) and (17), we find continuous functions f_3 and f_4 such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} e = f_3(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt} i_R = f_4(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (23)$$

Using again (13a), we get

$$[A_C A_V] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + A_R \frac{d}{dt} i_R + A_L \frac{d}{dt} i_L + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S = 0.$$

Together with (23) and (18) we have

$$[A_C A_V] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + A_R f_4(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S = 0. \quad (24)$$

Since the circuit does not contain CV-loops, the matrix $[A_C A_V]$ has full column rank and, hence, $\ker [A_C A_V] = 0$. Multiplying (24) by $[A_C A_V]^\top$ allows us to apply Corollary 1 for

$$M := [A_C A_V], \quad P := I, \quad z := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix}, \quad y := (x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t)$$

and

$$f(y) := A_R f_4(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S(t).$$

Consequently, we find a continuous function f_5 such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} = f_5(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (25)$$

Finally, we obtain from (4) and (23) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_L = \chi_L(A_L^\top f_3(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t), x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \quad (26)$$

and from (7) and (25) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_C = \chi_C([I \ 0] f_5(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t), x_C, i_C, v_C, t). \quad (27)$$

Consequently, the equations (23), (18), (25) and (26), (27), (10) represent an explicit ordinary differential equation system. That means the differentiation index of the circuit system (13) is at most 1. \square

Theorem 2 *Let Assumption 2 and Assumption 3 be fulfilled. Furthermore, let all resistance-like devices be strongly resistance-like devices. Additionally, let all inductance-like devices belonging to LI-cutsets be strongly inductance-like devices and all capacitance-like devices belonging to CV-loops be strongly capacitance-like devices. Then, the differentiation index of the system (13) is at most index 2.*

Proof First, we follow the proof of Theorem 1 and derive the equations (14)-(21). Then, multiplication of (19) by $Q_{R-CV}^\top := I - P_{R-CV}^\top$ yields

$$Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top (A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_s) = 0. \quad (28)$$

Differentiating (28) once again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top & \left(A_L \partial_{x_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \frac{d}{dt} x_L + A_L \partial_{i_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \frac{d}{dt} i_L \right. \\ & \left. + A_L \partial_{v_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \frac{d}{dt} A_L^\top e + A_L \partial_t g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d^2}{dt^2} i_s \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we plug in (4) and (18). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top & \left(A_L \partial_{x_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \chi_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} A_L^\top e, x_L, i_L, v_L, t \right) + A_L \partial_{v_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \frac{d}{dt} A_L^\top e \right. \\ & \left. + A_L \partial_{i_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_L \partial_t g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d^2}{dt^2} i_s \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top & \left(A_L F_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} A_L^\top e, x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t \right) + A_L \partial_t g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \right. \\ & \left. + A_L \partial_{i_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d^2}{dt^2} i_s \right) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Regarding (21) and (15), we can split

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} A_L^\top e &= A_L^\top Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_L^\top Q_{CV} P_{R-CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_L^\top P_{CV} \frac{d}{dt} e \\ &= A_L^\top Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} \frac{d}{dt} e + A_L^\top Q_{CV} f_2(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L^\top f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t). \end{aligned}$$

We choose a projector P_{LI-cut} along $\ker A_L^\top Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV}$. Since the circuit does not contain I-cutsets, the matrix $[A_C A_R A_V A_L]^\top$ has full column rank (see Corollary 2). It implies, for $Q_{LI-cut} := I - P_{LI-cut}$, that

$$\ker Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} = \ker A_L^\top Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} = \ker P_{LI-cut} = \text{im } Q_{LI-cut}$$

and, therefore, $Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} = Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} P_{LI-cut}$ as well as $Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top = P_{LI-cut}^\top Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top$. Consequently, we can apply Lemma 3 onto (29) with

$$M := A_L^\top Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV}, \quad P := P_{LI-cut}, \quad z := \frac{d}{dt} e, \quad y := (x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &:= F_L(x + A_L^\top Q_{CV} f_2(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L^\top f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t), x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t), \\ r(y) &:= Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top A_L \partial_{i_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) \\ &\quad + Q_{R-CV}^\top Q_{CV}^\top \left(A_L \partial_t g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d^2}{dt^2} i_S(t) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we find a continuous function f_6 such that

$$P_{LI-cut} \frac{d}{dt} e = f_6(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (30)$$

implying

$$Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} \frac{d}{dt} e = Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} f_6(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (31)$$

Regarding (21) and (15) again, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} e = f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) \quad (32)$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) &:= Q_{CV} Q_{R-CV} f_6(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) \\ &\quad + Q_{CV} f_2(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + f_1(x_C, i_C, e, t). \end{aligned}$$

Regarding (17), we get a continuous function f_7 such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} i_R = f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (33)$$

Using again (13a), we get

$$[A_C A_V] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + A_R \frac{d}{dt} i_R + A_L \frac{d}{dt} i_L + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S = 0.$$

Together with (33) and (18) we have

$$[A_C A_V] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + A_R f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S = 0. \quad (34)$$

We choose a projector $P_{CV-loop}$ along $\ker [A_C A_V]$. Multiplying (34) by $[A_C A_V]^\top$ allows us to apply Corollary 1 for

$$M := [A_C A_V], \quad P := P_{CV-loop}, \quad z := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix}, \quad y := (x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t)$$

and

$$f(y) := A_R f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + A_L g_L(x_L, i_L, A_L^\top e, t) + A_I \frac{d}{dt} i_S(t).$$

Consequently, we find a continuous function f_8 such that

$$P_{\text{CV-loop}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} = f_8(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (35)$$

Rewriting (14) as equation system in column form and multiplication by $Q_{\text{CV-loop}}^\top$ yields

$$Q_{\text{CV-loop}}^\top \begin{bmatrix} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ \frac{d}{dt} v_S \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

Differentiating this equation and regarding (7), (32) as well as (9), we obtain

$$Q_{\text{CV-loop}}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ \frac{d^2}{dt^2} v_S \end{bmatrix} = 0 \quad (36)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ &= \partial_{x_C} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \chi_C \left(\frac{d}{dt} i_C, x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t \right) + \partial_{i_C} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ & \quad + \partial_{v_C} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) A_C^\top f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + \partial_t g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ &= F_C \left(\frac{d}{dt} i_C, x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t \right) \\ & \quad + \partial_{v_C} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) A_C^\top f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + \partial_t g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t). \end{aligned}$$

Using (35), we can split

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} i_C &= [I \ 0] \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} = [I \ 0] Q_{\text{CV-loop}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + [I \ 0] P_{\text{CV-loop}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} \\ &= [I \ 0] Q_{\text{CV-loop}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} + [I \ 0] f_8(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \end{aligned}$$

Since the circuit has no V-loop, the matrix A_V has full column rank, see Corollary 2. It implies

$$\ker [I \ 0] Q_{\text{CV-loop}} = \ker \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ A_C & A_V \end{bmatrix} Q_{\text{CV-loop}} = \ker Q_{\text{CV-loop}}.$$

Rewriting (36) as

$$Q_{\text{CV-loop}}^\top \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) + Q_{\text{CV-loop}}^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} v_S = 0.$$

allows us to apply Lemma 3 with

$$M := [I \ 0] Q_{\text{CV-loop}}, \quad P := Q_{\text{CV-loop}}, \quad z := \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix}, \quad y := (x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, y) &:= F_C(x + [I \ 0] f_8(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t), x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) \\ &\quad + \partial_{v_C} g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t) A_C^\top f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + \partial_t g_C(x_C, i_C, A_C^\top e, t), \\ r(y) &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{bmatrix} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} v_s(t). \end{aligned}$$

It means that we find a continuous function f_9 such that

$$Q_{CV-loop} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} = f_9(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t).$$

Combining it with (35) we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt} i_C \\ \frac{d}{dt} i_V \end{bmatrix} = f_8(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t) + f_9(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t). \quad (37)$$

Finally, we obtain from (4) and (32) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_L = \chi_L(A_L^\top f_7(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t), x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \quad (38)$$

and from (7) and (37) that

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_C = \chi_C([I \ 0](f_8 + f_9)(x_C, i_C, x_R, i_R, x_L, i_L, e, t), x_C, i_C, v_C, t). \quad (39)$$

Consequently, the equations (32), (18), (37) and (38), (39), (10) represent an explicit ordinary differential equation system. That means the differentiation index of the circuit system (13) is at most 2. \square

Theorems 1 and 2 contain the results of [19] in the case of circuits that only contain simple lumped elements in either traditional, i.e., Prop. 1, 5 and 3, or flux/charge formulation, i.e. Prop. 2 and 4. Some minor differences arise due to Remark 4, e.g., loops of capacitances lead to index-2 systems since the corresponding current i_C is not eliminated from the system (13). Similarly, results for many refined models, for example when considering [41, 2, 13] as inductance-like elements, are included in Theorems 1 and 2. The next section discusses a few challenging examples.

6 Refined models

We present examples for refined models based on PDEs describing electromagnetic fields, that are coupled to the circuit system of DAEs and can be categorized with the generalized elements of Section 3.

All models appearing in this section arise from Maxwell's equations [29, 27]. Those can be written in differential form for a system at rest as

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{B}, \quad (40a)$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{H} = \partial_t \mathbf{D} + \mathbf{J}, \quad (40b)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = \rho, \quad (40c)$$

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \quad (40d)$$

where \mathbf{E} is the electric field strength, \mathbf{B} the magnetic flux density, \mathbf{H} the magnetic field strength, \mathbf{D} the electric flux density and \mathbf{J} the electric current density. All these quantities are vector fields $\Omega \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ defined in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and time interval $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The electric charge density ρ is a scalar field $\Omega \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The field quantities are related to each other through the material equations

$$\mathbf{D} = \varepsilon \mathbf{E}, \quad \mathbf{J}_c = \sigma \mathbf{E}, \quad \mathbf{H} = \mu \mathbf{B}, \quad (41)$$

where ε is the electric permittivity, σ the electric conductivity and μ the magnetic permeability. They are rank-2 tensor fields $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$. The current density in (40b) can be divided into the conduction current density \mathbf{J}_c of (41) and the source current density \mathbf{J}_s

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}_c + \mathbf{J}_s. \quad (42)$$

The inverse of the material relations in (41) is defined through the electric resistivity $\rho : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ and the magnetic reluctivity $\nu : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ such that

$$\mathbf{E} = \rho \mathbf{J}_c, \quad \mathbf{B} = \nu \mathbf{H}. \quad (43)$$

Assumption 4 ([15]) *We divide the space domain Ω into three disjoint subdomains Ω_c (the conducting domain), Ω_s (the source domain) and Ω_o (the excitation-free domain) such that*

- the material tensors ε , μ and ν are positive definite on the whole subdomain Ω .
- the material tensors ρ and σ are positive definite in Ω_c and zero everywhere else.
- the source current density is only nonzero in Ω_s .

In order to simulate Maxwell's equations and its approximations, often potentials are defined, that allow to rewrite the equations as systems of PDEs that can be resolved. For the examples that are presented next, the magnetic vector potential $\mathbf{A} : \Omega \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$ and the electric scalar potential $\phi : \Omega \times \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are relevant. They are defined such that

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{A} - \nabla \phi. \quad (44)$$

Following the *finite integration technique* (FIT), originally introduced in 1977 by Thomas Weiland [43], the discrete version of (40) is obtained as Maxwell's grid equations [39]

$$C e = -\frac{d}{dt} b \quad \tilde{C} h = \frac{d}{dt} d + j \quad \tilde{S} d = q \quad S b = 0, \quad (45)$$

here C , $\tilde{C} = C^\top$ (see [39]) and S , \tilde{S} are the discrete curl, dual curl, divergence and dual divergence operators, respectively. The discrete field vectors e , b , h , d , j and q are integrated quantities over points, edges, facets and volumes of two dual grids. Also, the material relations (41) and (43) can be formulated through the material matrices M_\star as

$$d = M_\varepsilon e \quad j_c = M_\sigma e \quad h = M_\mu b \quad e = M_\rho j_c \quad b = M_\nu h. \quad (46)$$

Analogous to the continuous case, discrete potentials can be defined, which lead to the relation

$$b = C a \quad e = -\frac{d}{dt} a - G \bar{\Phi}, \quad (47)$$

where a and $\bar{\Phi}$ are the discrete magnetic vector potential and electric scalar potential, respectively and $G = -\tilde{S}^\top$ (see [39]) is the discrete gradient operator.

Assumption 5 *The boundary of the domain $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ is divided into three disjoint sets $\Gamma_{\text{neu},0}$, $\Gamma_{\text{dir},0}$ and Γ_s , with*

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{neu},0} \cup \Gamma_{\text{dir},0} \cup \Gamma_s .$$

Here, $\Gamma_{\text{neu},0}$ and $\Gamma_{\text{dir},0}$ are the parts where homogeneous Neumann and Dirichlet boundary conditions are imposed and Γ_s where the field equation is excited.

In case of a device described by Maxwell's equations and coupled to a circuit through boundary conditions, Γ_s represents the area where the device is connected to the surrounding network.

Assumption 6 *We assume that at least the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions of $\Gamma_{\text{dir},0}$ are already incorporated into the discrete operator matrices, such that the gradient operator matrix $G = -\tilde{S}^\top$ has full column rank.*

This is a standard assumption and has already been shown and used e.g. in [3, 15].

Remark 5 Both material as well as operator matrices with similar properties are also obtained with a finite element (FE) discretization of the partial differential equations obtained from Maxwell's equations, whenever appropriate basis and test functions are used, that fulfil the discrete de Rham sequence [7, 13]. Therefore, the subsequent analysis of the discretized systems is also valid for FE discretizations.

6.1 Inductance-like element

In the following we give an example of an electromagnetic (EM) device, with its formulation taken from [4], based upon full wave Maxwell's equation, that fits the form of a strong inductance-like element.

In the absence of source terms and Neumann boundary conditions, i.e., $\Omega_s, \Gamma_{\text{neu},0} = \emptyset$, one possibility to rewrite Maxwell's equations in terms of potentials is given by the following second order PDE system (see [3])

$$\varepsilon \nabla \partial_t \phi + \zeta \nabla [\xi \nabla \cdot (\zeta \mathbf{A})] = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega , \quad (48a)$$

$$\nabla \times (\nu \nabla \times \mathbf{A}) + \partial_t [\varepsilon (\nabla \phi + \partial_t \mathbf{A})] + \sigma (\nabla \phi + \partial_t \mathbf{A}) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega , \quad (48b)$$

where ζ and ξ are artificial material tensors whose choice is discussed for example in [12] and [10]. We refer to system (48) as the $\mathbf{A} - \phi$ *formulation* which makes use of a *grad-type Lorenz gauge condition* in order to avoid ambiguity of the potentials, see [3] [12]. Let v_L and i_L be the time-dependent branch voltages and currents of the element, respectively. With Assumption 5 given, we complete (48) with the boundary conditions

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{A} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{dir},0} , \quad (49a)$$

$$\phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{dir},0} , \quad (49b)$$

$$\phi = v_L \quad \text{in } \Gamma_s . \quad (49c)$$

The branch currents i_L shall comply with the model

$$\int_{\Gamma_s} \nabla \times (\nu \nabla \times \mathbf{A}) \cdot d\mathbf{S} = i_L . \quad (50)$$

In order to apply the method of lines, we spatially discretize the system (48) using e.g. the finite integration technique. Since most of the required matrices and quantities were already introduced in this section's preliminaries, we proceed with the circuit coupling which is archived via the boundaries only ($\Omega_s = \emptyset$).

Given Assumption 6, the homogeneous Dirichlet boundaries (49a) and (49b) are already incorporated into the discrete operator matrices, e.g. G or \tilde{C} . To incorporate the inhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, we split $\bar{\Phi}$ into Φ_s and Φ , belonging to the degrees of freedom in Γ_s and the rest, as follows

$$\bar{\Phi} = Q_s \Phi + P_s \Phi_s, \quad (51)$$

with basis matrices Q_s and P_s of full column rank. The boundary voltage excitation (49c) is then obtained by setting $\Phi_s = \Lambda_s v_L$ with the element's terminal to $\Gamma_s^{(j)}$'s degrees of freedom mapping

$$(\Lambda_s)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (\Phi_s)_i \text{ belongs to the } j\text{-th terminal } \Gamma_s^{(j)} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here, $\Gamma_s = \Gamma_s^{(1)} \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_s^{(k)}$, for a k -port device, where

$$\Gamma_s^i \cap \Gamma_s^j = \emptyset, \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$

With the junction $Y_s = P_s \Lambda_s$ the discrete gradient in (47) reads:

$$G\bar{\Phi} = GQ_s \Phi + GY_s v_L.$$

Remark 6 Note that, as the different terminals $\Gamma_s^{(j)}$ are disjoint, per construction, Λ_s , and therefore also Y_s , have full column rank.

The spatially discretized version of (48) with incorporated boundary conditions (49) is then given by

$$Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\varepsilon G Q_s \frac{d}{dt} \Phi + Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\zeta G M_\xi \tilde{S} M_\zeta a = 0, \quad (52)$$

$$\tilde{C} M_\nu C a + \frac{d}{dt} [M_\varepsilon (GQ_s \Phi + GY_s v_L + \pi)] + M_\sigma \left(GQ_s \Phi + GY_s v_L + \frac{d}{dt} a \right) = 0, \quad (53)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} a - \pi = 0, \quad (54)$$

where π is a discrete quasi-canonical momentum introduced in order to avoid second order derivatives. The discretized current coupling model of (50) reads

$$i_L = Y_s^\top \tilde{S} \tilde{C} M_\nu C a. \quad (55)$$

For $x_L = (\Phi, a, \pi)$, we define the system matrices

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= \begin{bmatrix} Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\varepsilon G Q_s & 0 & 0 \\ M_\varepsilon G Q_s & M_\sigma & M_\varepsilon \\ 0 & I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & A &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\zeta G M_\xi \tilde{S} M_\zeta & 0 \\ M_\sigma G Q_s & \tilde{C} M_\nu C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I \end{bmatrix}, \\ N &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ M_\varepsilon G Y_s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, & B &:= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ M_\sigma G Y_s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ F &:= [0 \ Y_s^\top \tilde{S} \tilde{C} M_\nu C \ 0] \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude the EM device's element description

$$f_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} m_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t), x_L, i_L, v_L, t \right) := \begin{pmatrix} M \frac{d}{dt} x_L + A x_L + B v_L + N \frac{d}{dt} v_L \\ i_L - F x_L \end{pmatrix} = 0. \quad (56)$$

Proposition 6 *Provided Assumptions 4, 5 and 6 are fulfilled and the absence of inner sources and Neumann boundary conditions, the EM device, whose model is given by the element description (56), is a strongly inductance-like element.*

Proof The discrete gradient operator G and basis matrix Q_s have full column rank by Assumption 6 and construction (51). Further it is $G = -\tilde{S}^\top$ and together with M_ε being positive definite, as of Assumption 4, we deduce that the Laplace-operator $L_Q := Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\varepsilon G Q_s$ is non-singular. Hence, we find

$$M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} L_Q^{-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \\ -G Q_s L_Q^{-1} & M_\varepsilon^{-1} & -M_\varepsilon^{-1} M_\sigma \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, we can define the following matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A} := M^{-1} A &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & L_Q^{-1} H & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I \\ M_\varepsilon^{-1} M_\sigma G Q_s & -G Q_s L_Q^{-1} H + M_\varepsilon^{-1} \tilde{C} M_\nu C & M_\varepsilon^{-1} M_\sigma \end{bmatrix}, \\ \tilde{B} := M^{-1} B &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ M_\varepsilon^{-1} M_\sigma G Y_s \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{N} := M^{-1} N = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ G Y_s \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

with $H := Q_s^\top \tilde{S} M_\zeta G M_\zeta \tilde{S} M_\zeta$ and deduce from (56) a description for $\frac{d}{dt} x_L$ of the form (4)

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_L = -\tilde{A} x_L - \tilde{B} v_L - \tilde{N} \frac{d}{dt} v_L =: \chi_L \left(\frac{d}{dt} v_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t \right). \quad (57)$$

Next, we differentiate (56) once, in particular the second part, and insert the expression for $\frac{d}{dt} x_L$ from (57) yielding

$$\frac{d}{dt} i_L = F(-\tilde{A} x_L - \tilde{B} v_L - \tilde{N} \frac{d}{dt} v_L) = -F \tilde{A} x_L - F \tilde{B} v_L =: g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t).$$

Thus, we found an expression of $\frac{d}{dt} i_L$ fitting (5). Finally, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} F_L(v'_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t) &:= \partial_{x_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \chi_L(v'_L, x_L, i_L, v_L, t) \\ &\quad + \partial_{v_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t) v'_L \\ &= F \tilde{A} \tilde{A} x_L + F \tilde{A} \tilde{B} v_L + F \tilde{A} \tilde{N} v'_L - \underbrace{F \tilde{B}}_{=0} v'_L \end{aligned}$$

is continuous and strongly monotone with respect to v'_L , see Lemma 1 using that $F \tilde{A} \tilde{N} = -Y_s^\top \tilde{S} \tilde{C} M_\nu C G Y_s = Y_s^\top G^\top C^\top M_\nu C G Y_s$ is positive definite by construction. We conclude that this model for an EM device fulfills the strongly inductance-like property. \square

Remark 7 The fact that $FM^{-1}N$ vanishes, as obtained by elemental matrix operations, plays a key role in the EM device's model fitting the inductance-like element description.

For two different field approximations of Maxwell's equations that result in strongly inductance-like elements, see [13]. In contrast to our example, there the strongly inductance-like element is given by the term $\partial_{v_L} g_L(x_L, i_L, v_L, t)v_L'$ in (6), like in the case of classical and flux-formulated inductances.

6.2 Capacitance-like element

We consider the electroquasistatic field approximation of Maxwell's equations [11, 15]. As in this approximation, the electric field \mathbf{E} is rotation free, we can write it in terms of only the electric scalar potential ϕ [15].

Given a time-dependent excitation v_C , we can write the following boundary value problem to describe an electroquasistatic field

$$\nabla \cdot \sigma \nabla \phi + \frac{d}{dt} \nabla \cdot \varepsilon \nabla \phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (58a)$$

$$\phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{dir},0}, \quad (58b)$$

$$\partial_{\mathbf{n}} \phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{neu},0}, \quad (58c)$$

$$\phi = v_C \quad \text{in } \Gamma_s, \quad (58d)$$

with \mathbf{n} being the outer normal vector to $\Gamma_{\text{neu},0}$. To couple the electroquasistatic system (58) to a circuit, the extraction of a current is necessary, so as to obtain an implicit voltage-to-current relation. For that we integrate the current density (58a) over the boundary, where the connections to the circuit are located (Γ_s), i.e.

$$\int_{\Gamma_s} \left(\nabla \cdot \sigma \nabla \phi + \frac{d}{dt} \nabla \cdot \varepsilon \nabla \phi \right) \cdot d\mathbf{S} = i_C. \quad (59)$$

We assume first a spatial discretization of the PDEs (58a) and (59) has been applied, with only the boundary conditions

$$\phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{dir},0} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{\mathbf{n}} \phi = 0 \quad \text{in } \Gamma_{\text{neu},0}. \quad (60)$$

Analogously to the previous examples and given the homogeneous boundary conditions of (60) are incorporated in the operator matrices, i.e., Assumption 6 holds, the spatially discretized electroquasistatic field equation with circuit coupling equation is obtained as [15]

$$Q_s^\top L_\sigma Q_s \Phi + Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s \frac{d}{dt} \Phi + Q_s^\top L_\sigma Y_s v_C + Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Y_s \frac{d}{dt} v_C = 0, \quad (61a)$$

$$Y_s^\top L_\sigma Q_s \Phi + Y_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s \frac{d}{dt} \Phi + Y_s^\top L_\sigma Y_s v_C + Y_s^\top L_\varepsilon Y_s \frac{d}{dt} v_C = i_C, \quad (61b)$$

where $L_\sigma = \tilde{S} M_\sigma \tilde{S}^\top$ and $L_\varepsilon = \tilde{S} M_\varepsilon \tilde{S}^\top$ are two Laplace matrices.

Proposition 7 For Q_s and Y_s , we have that

$$Q_s x_1 \neq Y_s x_2, \text{ for } x_1, x_2 \neq 0.$$

Proof This property follows directly from the definition of both matrices. We have $Y_s x_2 = P_s y_2$ and, by construction, the image of P_s are the discrete elements living in Γ_s , while the image of Q_s are the rest. Also, by construction, both matrices have full column rank and thus a trivial kernel. \square

Proposition 8 *Provided Assumptions 4, 5 and 6 are fulfilled, then the semidiscrete electroquasistatic system of equations with circuit coupling equation (61) is a strongly capacitance-like element.*

Proof Due to Assumptions 6 and 4, and the fact that Q_s has full column rank, we start by rewriting (61a) as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\Phi = & - (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\sigma Q_s \Phi \\ & - (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} \left(Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Y_s \frac{d}{dt} v_C + Q_s^\top L_\sigma Y_s v_C \right). \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Inserting this into (61b) yields

$$\begin{aligned} i_C = & Y_s^\top \left(I - L_\varepsilon Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top \right) L_\sigma Q_s \Phi \\ & + Y_s^\top \left(I - L_\varepsilon Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top \right) L_\sigma Y_s v_C \\ & + Y_s^\top \left(L_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon \right) Y_s \frac{d}{dt} v_C. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Now we want to see that $C = Y_s^\top \left(L_\varepsilon - L_\varepsilon Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon \right) Y_s$ is positive definite. For that, using again that L_ε is symmetric positive definite (Assumptions 4 and 6) and thus its square root exists and is also symmetric positive definite, we rewrite

$$C = Y_s^\top L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(I - L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_s.$$

It can easily be seen that $\left(I - L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)$ is a symmetric projector and thus positive semidefinite. Therefore we have that C is positive semidefinite. Let's assume that there exists a vector x such that $x^\top C x = 0$, then,

$$\left(I - L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_s x = 0.$$

However, this implies that

$$L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_s x = L_\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} Q_s (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Y_s x$$

and multiplying this by $L_\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ would yield $Y_s x = Q_s y$, with $y = (Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Q_s)^{-1} Q_s^\top L_\varepsilon Y_s x$. Due to Proposition 7 this, however, is only possible if $Y_s x = 0$ and, as Y_s has full column rank (see Remark 6), $x = 0$. Therefore C has full rank and is positive definite.

According to Definition 5, we need to show that $\frac{d}{dt}\Phi$ can be written, with at most one differentiation, as a function depending only on $\frac{d}{dt}i_C$, Φ , v_C , i_C and t (see (7)). For that we invert C in (63) to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}v_C = g_C(\Phi, i_C, v_C). \quad (64)$$

This can now be inserted into (62) to obtain a function

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi = \chi_c(\Phi, i_c, v_c) , \quad (65)$$

without having required any differentiation of the original system.

Due to (64), we have already shown that we obtain a capacitance-like element. Furthermore, as $\partial_{i_c} g_c(\Phi, i_c, v_c) = C$, is positive definite, using Lemma 1 and Definition 2, the system is shown to be strongly capacitance-like. \square

6.3 Resistance-like element

The last refined model we study is the eddy current equation for the simulation of magnets with superconducting coils. For that we consider a magnetoquasistatic approximation of Maxwell's equations [27] in terms of the \mathbf{A}^* formulation [18]. Here, the gauging freedom of the magnetoquasistatic setting allows to choose a special magnetic vector potential \mathbf{A} , such that the electric scalar potential ϕ vanishes from the PDE. The governing equation reads

$$\nabla \times \nu \tau_{\text{eq}} \nabla \times \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{A} - \nabla \times \nu \nabla \times \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{J}_s .$$

The non-standard expression $\nabla \times \nu \tau_{\text{eq}} \nabla \times \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{A}$ is an homogenization model accounting for the cable magnetization, that represents the eddy current effects of the superconducting coils [17]. It contains the cable time constant τ_{eq} , which depends on certain properties of the cable [42]. This formulation is coupled to a circuit in order to simulate the superconducting magnet's protection system of the LHC at CERN [6, 14]. For the boundary value problem we also set the boundary conditions

$$\mathbf{n} \times \mathbf{A} = 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{dir},0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{n} \times (\nu \nabla \times \mathbf{A}) = 0, \quad \text{on } \Gamma_{\text{neu},0} , \quad (66)$$

where \mathbf{n} is again the outer normal vector to the boundary Γ . Please note that here, no boundary conditions were set on Γ_s , as for this example $\Gamma_s = \emptyset$.

In this case, as $\Gamma_s = \emptyset$, the circuit coupling is not performed through the boundary but by a characteristic function (winding density function) [38], that distributes the zero dimensional current i_R on the two or three dimensional domain of the PDE. For the excitation of the coil's cross-section we define a $\chi_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$, such that

$$\mathbf{J}_s = \chi_s i_R .$$

This also allows to extract the voltage across the coil as

$$v_R = - \int_{\Omega} \chi_s \cdot \mathbf{E} \, dV .$$

Assumption 7 *As the magnet is excited through the superconducting coils, we assume that the domain, where the source current density is nonzero also corresponds to the domain, where the cable time constant is positive, that is*

$$\sup \tau_{\text{eq}} = \sup \chi_s = \Omega_s .$$

After spatial discretisation of the eddy current PDE with coupling equation, we obtain the DAE

$$C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{\text{eq}}} C \frac{d}{dt} a + C^\top M_\nu C a = X i_R \quad (67a)$$

$$X^\top \frac{d}{dt} a = v_R, \quad (67b)$$

where X is a vector, containing the discretisation of the winding density function. We define the orthogonal projector Q_τ onto $\ker C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{\text{eq}}} C$ and its complementary $P_\tau = I - Q_\tau$.

Assumption 8 *We assume that*

- *the curl matrix C and the discrete magnetic vector potential a are gauged and contain homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, such that C has full column rank.*
- *there is no excitation outside of the coils, i.e., $Q_\tau^\top X = 0$.*

The first part of the assumption is necessary, such that the DAE system (67) is uniquely solvable. This is possible by for example using a tree-cotree gauge [32], where the degrees of freedom of a belonging to a gradient field are eliminated. The second part of the assumption is motivated by the fact that the source current density has to be divergence-free, together with Assumption 7.

Proposition 9 *Provided Assumptions 4, 7-8 are fulfilled, then the semidiscrete homogenized eddy current system of equations with circuit coupling equation (67) is a strongly resistance-like element.*

Proof We start by multiplying equation (67a) by Q_τ^\top and P_τ^\top and obtain

$$C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{\text{eq}}} C \frac{d}{dt} a + P_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C a = P_\tau^\top X i_R \quad (68a)$$

$$Q_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C a = Q_\tau^\top X i_R \quad (68b)$$

From (68a) we obtain without the need of any differentiation

$$P_\tau \frac{d}{dt} a = (C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{\text{eq}}} C + Q_\tau^\top Q_\tau)^{-1} (P_\tau^\top X i_R - P_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C a). \quad (69)$$

Differentiating (68b) once and using Assumption 8 we have

$$Q_\tau \frac{d}{dt} a = -(Q_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C Q_\tau + P_\tau^\top P_\tau)^{-1} Q_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C P_\tau \frac{d}{dt} a \quad (70)$$

Inserting (69) into (70) we obtain an ODE with the structure

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_R = \chi_R(x_R, i_R),$$

where $x_R = P_\tau a + Q_\tau a$. Now we use Assumption 8 and insert (69) into the circuit coupling equation to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_R &= X^\top \frac{d}{dt} (P_\tau a + Q_\tau a) = X^\top \frac{d}{dt} P_\tau a \\ &= X^\top P_\tau (C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{\text{eq}}} C + Q_\tau^\top Q_\tau)^{-1} (P_\tau^\top X i_R - P_\tau^\top C^\top M_\nu C a). \end{aligned}$$

To obtain this expression no differentiation was needed, thus if we differentiate it once, according to Definition 6 and using Lemma 1 and Definition 2, we now only need to show that $G = \partial_{v_R'} g_R(v_R', x_R, i_R, v_R, t)$, with

$$G^{-1} = X^\top P_\tau (C^\top M_{\nu, \tau_{eq}} C + Q_\tau^\top Q_\tau)^{-1} P_\tau^\top X,$$

is positive definite to obtain that (67) is a strongly resistance-like element. This follows immediately by the fact that $M_{\nu, \tau_{eq}}$ is positive semidefinite (Assumptions 4 and 7) and X has full column rank, as it is only a vector. \square

7 Conclusions

This paper has demonstrated that even very complicated refined models with internal degrees of freedom can be characterized by generalizations of the basic circuit elements, i.e., resistance, inductance and capacitance. This knowledge significantly simplifies the structural analysis of future networks consisting of refined models. Structural properties of the network, e.g. the differential algebraic index, can easily be deduced if the element is identified in terms of the proposed generalized elements.

References

1. Ali, G., Bartel, A., Günther, M., Tischendorf, C.: Elliptic partial differential-algebraic multiphysics models in electrical network design. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* **13**(9), 1261–1278 (2003)
2. Bartel, A., Baumanns, S., Schöps, S.: Structural analysis of electrical circuits including magnetoquasistatic devices. *Applied Numerical Mathematics* **61**, 1257–1270 (2011)
3. Baumanns, S.: Coupled electromagnetic field/circuit simulation: Modeling and numerical analysis. Ph.D. thesis, Universität zu Köln, Köln (2012)
4. Baumanns, S., Clemens, M., Schöps, S.: Structural aspects of regularized full Maxwell electrodynamic potential formulations using FIT. In: G. Manara (ed.) *Proceedings of 2013 URSI International Symposium on Electromagnetic Theory (EMTS)*, pp. 1007–1010. IEEE (2013)
5. Benner, P., Grundel, S., Himpe, C., Huck, C., Streubel, T., Tischendorf, C.: Gas network benchmark models. In: S. Campbell, A. Ilchmann, V. Mehrmann, T. Reis (eds.) *Applications of Differential-Algebraic Equations: Examples and Benchmarks*, *Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum*. Springer, Cham (2018)
6. Bortot, L., Auchmann, B., Cortes Garcia, I., Fernando Navarro, A.M., Maciejewski, M., Mentink, M., Prioli, M., Ravaioli, E., Schöps, S., Verweij, A.: STEAM: A hierarchical co-simulation framework for superconducting accelerator magnet circuits. *IEEE Trans. Appl. Super.* **28**(3) (2018). DOI 10.1109/TASC.2017.2787665
7. Bossavit, A.: *Computational Electromagnetism: Variational Formulations, Complementarity, Edge Elements*. Academic Press, San Diego (1998). DOI 10.1016/B978-0-12-118710-1.X5000-4. URL <http://natrium.em.tut.fi/~bossavit/>
8. Brenan, K.E., Campbell, S.L., Petzold, L.R.: *Numerical Solution of Initial-Value Problems in Differential-Algebraic Equations*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, USA (1995). DOI 10.1137/1.9781611971224
9. Chua, L.O., Desoer, C.A., Kuh, E.S.: *Linear and nonlinear Circuits*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Singapore (1987)
10. Clemens, M.: Large systems of equations in a discrete electromagnetism: formulations and numerical algorithms. *IEE Proceedings-Science, Measurement and Technology* **152**(2), 50–72 (2005). DOI 10.1049/ip-smt:20050849
11. Clemens, M., Steinmetz, T., Weida, D., Hinrichsen, V.: Coupled thermal-electroquasistatic 3D field simulation of high-voltage surge arrester structures. In: *Computational Electromagnetics Conference (CEM)* (2006)

12. Clemens, M., Weiland, T.: Regularization of eddy-current formulations using discrete grad-div operators. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **38**(2), 569–572 (2002)
13. Cortes Garcia, I., De Gersem, H., Schöps, S.: A structural analysis of field/circuit coupled problems based on a generalised circuit element. *Numer. Algorithm.* pp. 1–22 (2019). DOI 10.1007/s11075-019-00686-x
14. Cortes Garcia, I., Schöps, S., Bortot, L., Maciejewski, M., Prioli, M., Fernandez Navarro, A.M., Auchmann, B., Verweij, A.P.: Optimized field/circuit coupling for the simulation of quenches in superconducting magnets. *IEEE J. Multiscale Multiphys. Comput. Tech.* **2**(1), 97–104 (2017). DOI 10.1109/JMMCT.2017.2710128
15. Cortes Garcia, I., Schöps, S., De Gersem, H., Baumanns, S.: *Systems of Differential Algebraic Equations in Computational Electromagnetics*. Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum. Springer, Heidelberg (2018)
16. Costa, M.C., Nabeta, S.I., Cardoso, J.R.: Modified nodal analysis applied to electric circuits coupled with FEM in the simulation of a universal motor. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **36**(4), 1431–1434 (2000)
17. De Gersem, H., Weiland, T.: Finite-element models for superconductive cables with finite inter-wire resistance. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **40**(2), 667–670 (2004). DOI 10.1109/TMAG.2004.825454
18. Emson, C.R.I., Trowbridge, C.W.: Transient 3d eddy currents using modified magnetic vector potentials and magnetic scalar potentials. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **24**(1), 86–89 (1988). DOI 10.1109/20.43862
19. Estévez Schwarz, D., Tischendorf, C.: Structural analysis of electric circuits and consequences for mna. *International Journal of Circuit Theory and Applications* **28**(2), 131–162 (2000). DOI 10.1002/(SICI)1097-007X(200003/04)28:2<131::AID-CTA100>3.0.CO;2-W
20. Feldmann, U., Günther, M.: CAD-based electric-circuit modeling in industry I: mathematical structure and index of network equations. *Surveys on Mathematics for Industry* **8**(2), 97–129 (1999)
21. Gear, C.: Simultaneous numerical solution of differential-algebraic equations. *IEEE Transactions on Circuit Theory* **18**(1), 89–95 (1971)
22. Grassler, K.T., Selberherr, S.: Mixed-mode device simulation. *Microelectronics Journal* **31**(11), 873–881 (2000)
23. Grundel, S., Jansen, L., Hornung, N., Clees, T., Tischendorf, C., Benner, P.: Model order reduction of differential algebraic equations arising from the simulation of gas transport networks. In: S. Schöps, A. Bartel, M. Günther, E.J.W. ter Maten, P.C. Müller (eds.) *Progress in Differential-Algebraic Equations*, Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum, pp. 183–205. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2014). DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-44926-4_9
24. Günther, M.: A joint DAE/PDE model for interconnected electrical networks. *Mathematical Modelling of Systems* **1**(1), 000–111 (2000)
25. Günther, M., Feldmann, U.: The DAE-index in electric circuit simulation. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation* **39**, 573–582 (1995)
26. Ho, C.W., Ruehli, A.E., Brennan, P.A.: The modified nodal approach to network analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* **22**(6), 504–509 (1975)
27. Jackson, J.D.: *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd edn. Wiley & Sons, New York (1998). DOI 10.1017/CBO9780511760396
28. Jansen, L., Tischendorf, C.: A unified (P)DAE modeling approach for flow networks. In: S. Schöps, A. Bartel, M. Günther, E.J.W. ter Maten, P.C. Müller (eds.) *Progress in Differential-Algebraic Equations*, Differential-Algebraic Equations Forum, pp. 127–151. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2014). DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-44926-4_7. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44926-4_7
29. Maxwell, J.C.: A dynamical theory of the electromagnetic field. *Royal Society Transactions* **CLV**, 459–512 (1864)
30. Mayaram, K., Pederson, D.O.: Coupling algorithms for mixed-level circuit and device simulation. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* **11**(8), 1003–1012 (1992)
31. Mehrmann, V., Morandin, R., Olmi, S., Schöll, E.: Qualitative stability and synchronicity analysis of power network models in port-hamiltonian form. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **28**(10), 101,102 (2018). DOI 10.1063/1.5054850
32. Munteanu, I.: Tree-cotree condensation properties. *ICS Newsletter (International Compumag Society)* **9**, 10–14 (2002). URL <http://www.compumag.org/jsite/images/stories/newsletter/ICS-02-09-1-Munteanu.pdf>

33. Nagel, L.W.: SPICE2: a computer program to simulate semiconductor circuits. Tech. rep., University of Berkeley (1975)
34. Ortega, J.M., Rheinboldt, W.C.: Iterative solution of nonlinear equations in several variables, vol. 30. Siam (1970)
35. Potter, P.G., Cambrell, G.K.: A combined finite element and loop analysis for nonlinearly interacting magnetic fields and circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics* **19**(6), 2352–2355 (1983)
36. Rollins, J.G., Choma, J.: Mixed-mode PISCES-SPICE coupled circuit and device solver. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* **7**(8), 862–867 (1988)
37. Ruehli, A.E., Antonini, G., Jiang, L.: Circuit Oriented Electromagnetic Modeling Using the PEEC Techniques, 1 edn. John Wiley & Sons (2017)
38. Schöps, S., De Gersem, H., Weiland, T.: Winding functions in transient magnetoquasistatic field-circuit coupled simulations. *COMPEL* **32**(6), 2063–2083 (2013). DOI 10.1108/COMPEL-01-2013-0004
39. Schuhmann, R., Weiland, T.: Conservation of discrete energy and related laws in the finite integration technique. *PIER* **32**, 301–316 (2001). DOI 10.2528/PIER00080112. URL <http://ceta.mit.edu/PIER/pier32/12.00080112.shuhmann.pdf>
40. Sheu, B.J., Scharfetter, D.L., Ko, P.K., M.-C., J.: BSIM: Berkeley short-channel IGFET model for MOS transistors. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* **22**(4), 558–566 (1987)
41. Tsukerman, I.A.: Finite element differential-algebraic systems for eddy current problems. *Numerical Algorithms* **31**(1), 319–335 (2002)
42. Verweij, A.P.: Electrodynamics of superconducting cables in accelerator magnets. Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Twente, Twente, The Netherlands (1995)
43. Weiland, T.: A discretization method for the solution of Maxwell’s equations for six-component fields. *AE* **31**, 116–120 (1977)
44. Zeidler, E.: Nonlinear Functional Analysis and Its Applications: II/B: Nonlinear Monotone Operators. Springer Science & Business Media (2013)