One common approach to computing the magnetic field produced by a filamentary current-carrying coil is to approximate the coil as a series of straight segments. The Biot-Savart field from each straight segment is known analytically. However, if the endpoints of the straight segments are chosen to lie on the coil, then the accuracy of the Biot-Savart computation is generally only second-order in the number of endpoints. We propose a simple modification: shift each endpoint off the coil in the outwards normal direction by an amount proportional to the local curvature. With this modification, the Biot-Savart accuracy is higher order and the numerical error is dramatically reduced for a given number of discretization points.

1. Introduction

Every student of first-year college physics learns the Biot-Savart formula for the magnetic field produced by a current-carrying wire loop:

\[ B(r) = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi} \int \frac{dr' \times (r - r')}{|r - r'|^3}. \] (1.1)

These students learn to use the Biot-Savart law to compute the magnetic field produced by a variety of symmetric configurations such as straight segments and circular coils. But if the magnetic field cannot be calculated analytically, then equation 1.1 must be computed numerically. Ideally, we would have a highly accurate and conceptually simple means of computing the Biot-Savart line integral that could be taught even to students of first-year physics.

There are three main approaches to computing the Biot-Savart line integral given by equation 1.1. The first approach involves using a numerical quadrature and is usually highly accurate, but requires storing the coil parameterization \( r'(s) \) or a series of position vectors \( r'_i \) and tangent vectors \( \delta r'_i \). The second approach, described in the next paragraph, is relatively inaccurate but is conceptually simple and is widely used because it only requires storing a series of discrete points \( r'_i \). The third approach relies on the Fast Multipole Method (Greengard & Rokhlin) and is discussed in the related work section (section 3). The purpose of this paper is to propose a new approach to evaluating the Biot-Savart line integral which is both highly accurate and conceptually simple, thereby enjoying the benefits of both the first and second approaches.

The second approach to numerically computing equation 1.1 is to approximate the coil-carrying filament as a series of straight segments, then sum the magnetic field from each segment. As a convenient analytic expression is known for the magnetic field resulting from a straight segment (Hanson & Hirshman), a filamentary coil may be simply represented as an array of discrete endpoints. These endpoints lie on the coil and are typically equally spaced in distance or parameterization angle. This approach to computing equation 1.1, which we call the ‘standard piecewise linear approach’, is
Figure 1: (a) Standard piecewise linear approach. Here the endpoints (red) lie on the filamentary curve (black). (b) Shifted piecewise linear approach. Here the endpoints are shifted in the outwards normal direction relative to the curve.

illustrated in figure 1a. In figure 1a, the filamentary curve is shown in black, the discrete endpoints are shown in red, and the piecewise linear segments are shown in blue.

Although the standard piecewise linear approach is convenient, simple, and flexible, it is not a particularly accurate way of computing the Biot-Savart line integral. One source of numerical inaccuracy can be understood from figure 1a: because the red endpoints lie on the curve, then the blue straight segments always lie locally inside the black curve. Because the straight segment always lies locally inside the curve, the field from the segment is biased and the result is that the accuracy of the Biot-Savart computation is only second-order in the number of endpoints.

We therefore propose a slightly different approach. Instead of choosing endpoints which lie on the filament, we choose endpoints which are slightly shifted in the outwards normal direction. This alternative approach, which we call the ‘shifted piecewise linear approach’, is sketched in figure 1b. Now the blue segments sometimes lie inside and sometimes lie outside the black curve, which eliminates the source of bias mentioned in the previous paragraph. The result is that, if the proper shift is chosen, then the accuracy of the Biot-Savart computation will be higher order in the number of endpoints and the error will be dramatically reduced.

It remains to determine by what magnitude to shift the endpoints in the outwards normal direction. Figure 2 sketches a close-up of the geometry of a shifted linear segment, where the magnitude of the shift is labeled by $\alpha$. In appendix A we compare the Biot-Savart fields from a curved segment and shifted straight segment, and show that a shift of $\alpha = \kappa |\delta r'|^2 / 12$ in the outwards normal direction cancels the second-order error in the Biot-Savart computation near the center of the coil. Similarly, in appendix B we show that the same shift minimizes the mean squared deviation between the curved segment and the straight segment. Here, the curvature $\kappa \equiv 1/R$, where $R$ is the radius of curvature, $\delta r' \equiv (dr'/ds)\delta s$, $s$ is a coordinate parametrizing the coil, $\delta s$ is the coordinate spacing between points, and the normal direction is defined by the Frenet-Serret formulas. Therefore, we propose choosing

$$\alpha = \frac{\kappa |\delta r'|^2}{12}$$

as this minimizes both the squared distance in real space and the error of the produced magnetic fields.

In summary, the shifted piecewise linear approach is a highly accurate method of computing the magnetic field produced by a twice-differentiable filamentary coil (if differentiability is only piecewise, see appendix D). The piecewise linear approach results in a piecewise constant representation of the tangent vector to the curve and therefore only requires storing a series of discrete points $\mathbf{r}'_i$. This is in contrast to the numerical quadrature method, which requires storing a set of discrete points $\mathbf{r}'_i$ along with their associated tangent vectors $\delta \mathbf{r}'_i$. 
Figure 2: A close-up of the geometry of a shifted linear segment. The filamentary coil is shown in black. The normal vector to the curve $N$ is drawn in green, and the straight segment is drawn in blue. The black crosses represent the endpoints of the straight segments, and the magnitude of the shift is given by $\alpha$. To lowest order, the area shaded in grey (positive) is equal to the area shaded in brown (negative) if $\alpha$ is given by equation 1.2.

We note in passing that it is possible to further improve the numerical accuracy of the Biot-Savart line integral by choosing a non-constant density of points $\rho$ with respect to parameterization coordinate $s$. In appendix C, we show that choosing the density of endpoints $\rho(s) \propto \kappa^{2/5}$ minimizes the mean squared deviation between the curved section and the filament. We do not investigate this approach in the numerical tests of section 2.

2. Numerical Tests

In this section, we perform a few numerical tests of our proposed approach, the so-called ‘shifted piecewise linear approach’. To do so, we compare the Biot-Savart accuracy of the shifted piecewise linear approach to the accuracy of the standard piecewise linear approach as a function of the number of discretization points $N$ for three separate test problems: (1) an off-axis measurement from a circular coil, (2) an off-axis measurement from a non-planar modular stellarator-like coil, and (3) an on-axis measurement of the magnetic field from a D-shaped, tokamak-like coil. We measure the error as a function of the number of discretization points $N$, $\epsilon_N$, using the normalized $\ell^2$ norm between the produced magnetic field for a given number of discretization points, $B_N(r)$, and the magnetic field as $N \to \infty$, $B_\infty(r)$:

$$\epsilon_N = \frac{|B_N(r) - B_\infty(r)|}{|B_\infty(r)|}. \quad (2.1)$$

To avoid possible biases related to the particular choice of measurement point $r$, in each test problem we average the error $\epsilon_N$ over a set of $R$ measurement points $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^R$ where $r_j = r + \delta_j$ and $\delta_j$ is a small random vector. For each test case, we set $R = 10$.

Our results are shown in figure 3. In each case, $\epsilon_N$ is smaller using the shifted piecewise linear approach by at least an order of magnitude compared to the standard piecewise linear approach for all $N > 20$. Additionally, while the accuracy of the standard piecewise linear approach is second-order, the accuracy of the shifted piecewise linear approach is fourth-order for each experiment. The shifted piecewise linear approach is significantly more accurate than the standard piecewise linear approach for a given number of discretization points.

We also find that our results are robust to the choice of measurement point $r$: it doesn’t matter whether $r$ is on-axis, off-axis, near the coil or far from the coil, inside or outside the coil. In each case, the results in figure 3 are qualitatively unchanged.
3. Related Work

Early work by Urankar has developed analytic expressions for the magnetic field produced by filamentary circular (1980) and elliptic (1985) arc segments, thin conic current sheets (1982\textsuperscript{b}), rectangular cross-section circular arcs with azimuthal (1982\textsuperscript{a}) and arbitrary (1984) current densities, and polygonal cross-section circular arcs (1990). Hanson & Hirshman (2002) present new compact expressions for the analytic fields from a straight line segment. Suh (2000) develops closed-form expressions for the magnetic field from volumetric elements with planar edges and constant and/or linear current density which involve line integrals over the boundary edges of the element. Fontana et al. (2001) examine a variety of methods for computing the Biot-Savart fields from a volumetric current-carrying coil, including (i) splitting the domain into tetrahedral regions and performing a quadrature on each domain, and (ii) numerically integrating a semi-analytic one-dimensional integral based on Urankar’s analytic expressions. Babic & Akyel (2005) generate analytic expressions for the magnetic field from trapezoidal prisms. Nunes et al. (2018) approximate filamentary, surface current, and volumetric current densities as first-order or second-order finite elements, then use a quadrature to evaluate the current from each finite element and an adaptive method which reduces the required number of Gauss points.

Wobig et al. (2009) rewrite the Biot-Savart volume integral for a rectangular cross-section finite-build modular stellarator coil as a simpler, tractable integral over finite-build coil coordinates. Although the integrals over the coil cross-section have no analytic solution, they can either be evaluated numerically or semi-numerically in a power series. McGreivy et al. (2020) have approximated the same integral using a multi-filament approximation and a quadrature-based approach to computing the Biot-Savart line integral. The approach of using a numerical quadrature requires computing the tangent vector to the filamentary coil; this approach is often also significantly more accurate than the standard piecewise linear approach but is not examined in this paper to simplify the presentation.

An entirely different approach to computing the Biot-Savart law uses the Fast Multipole Method (FMM) to improve the runtime scaling of the Biot-Savart law from $O(NM)$ to $O(N + M)$ where $N$ is the number of sources and $M$ is the number of evaluation points.
points. This approach to computing the Biot-Savart law will improve the runtime of a Biot-Savart computation which requires a large number of evaluation points \( M \), but a runtime comparison of these approaches as \( N \) and \( M \) vary is outside of the scope of this paper. Recently, van Nugteren & Deelen (2020) have developed an open-source library called Project Rat which implements this approach.

4. Conclusion

We investigated the standard piecewise linear approach to computing the magnetic field from a filamentary coil. We found that this approach is only second-order accurate if the endpoints lie on the coil, because the straight segments are biased to always lie locally inside the coil. We propose a new approach, the shifted piecewise linear approach, where the endpoints are shifted in the outwards normal direction by an amount proportional to the local curvature. We find that a shift of \( \kappa |\delta r'|^2/12 \) minimizes the squared distance in real space between the filament and the straight segment, while also cancelling the second-order errors in the Biot-Savart field near the radius of curvature of the filament. We conduct simple numerical tests, and find that the shifted piecewise linear approach has higher-order convergence than the standard piecewise linear approach and is dramatically more accurate for a given number of discretization points.

There are two main conclusions. First, the shifted piecewise linear approach is superior to the standard piecewise linear approach, and should be used when possible. Second, when filamentary coils are stored in databases, the stored endpoints should not lie on the coil but rather should be shifted normally outwards.
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Appendix A. Derivation of Piecewise Linear Shift

Here we show that by shifting each point on the filamentary coil in the outwards normal direction by an amount $\kappa |\delta r'|^2 /12$, where $\kappa$ is the local curvature and $dr' \equiv (dr'/ds)\delta s$, cancels the second-order error in the Biot-Savart field near the center of the coil. To do this, we compare the Biot-Savart fields for the straight segment and curved section as shown in figure 2. We compute the magnetic field at the point $r_0 = (0, -R, 0)$ where $R \equiv 1/\kappa$. The straight segment can be written (to second order) as $r' = x' \hat{x} + \alpha \hat{y}$ for $x' \in [-L/2(1 + \alpha /R), L/2(1 + \alpha /R)]$, while the curved segment can (to second order) be written as $r' = x' \hat{x} + (L^2/8R - x'^2/2R) \hat{y}$ for $x' \in [-L/2, L/2]$. We compute the Biot-Savart fields for the straight segment and curved segment and work in the limits $L/R \sim \alpha /L \sim O(\epsilon)$ and $\alpha /R \sim O(\epsilon^2)$, keeping all terms of up to second order.

The magnetic field for the straight segment at $r_0$ is given by the Biot-Savart law (equation 1.1) and equal to

$$B(r_0) = -(R + \alpha) \hat{z} \int_{-L/2(1+\alpha/R)}^{L/2(1+\alpha/R)} \frac{dx'}{x'^2 + (R + \alpha)^2}^{3/2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

Defining $\beta \equiv x'/L$, this can be written as

$$B(r_0) = \frac{L}{R^2} (1 + \frac{\alpha}{R}) \hat{z} \int_{-(1+\frac{\alpha}{R})/2}^{(1+\frac{\alpha}{R})/2} \frac{d\beta}{(1 + \frac{\alpha}{R})^2 + \frac{L^2}{R^2} \beta^2}^{3/2}. \hspace{1cm} (A2)$$

The integral can be performed analytically, it gives

$$B(r_0) = -\frac{L}{R^2} \frac{\hat{z}}{\sqrt{\frac{L^2}{R^2} (1 + \frac{\alpha}{R})^2 + (1 + \frac{\alpha}{R})^2}}. \hspace{1cm} (A3)$$

Expanding the denominator gives

$$B(r_0) = -\frac{L}{R^2} \hat{z} \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha}{R} - \frac{L^2}{8R^2} \right) + O(\epsilon^4). \hspace{1cm} (A4)$$
The magnetic field for the curved segment is given by

\[
B(r_0) = -\hat{z} \int_{-L/2}^{L/2} \frac{R + \frac{L^2}{8R} + \frac{x'^2}{2R}}{(x'^2 + (R + \frac{L^2}{8R} - \frac{x'^2}{2R})^2)^{3/2}} dx'. \quad (A5)
\]

Again defining \( \beta \equiv x'/L \), this can be written as

\[
B(r_0) = -\hat{z} \frac{L}{R^2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \frac{1 + \frac{L^2}{8R^2}(1 + 4\beta^2)}{\left(\frac{L^2}{R^2} \beta^2 + (1 + \frac{L^2}{8R^2}(1 - 4\beta^2))^2\right)^{3/2}} d\beta. \quad (A6)
\]

Expanding the denominator, this gives

\[
B(r_0) = -\hat{z} \frac{L}{R^2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left(1 + \frac{L^2}{8R^2}(1 + 4\beta^2) - \frac{3L^2}{2R^2} \beta^2 - \frac{3L^2}{8R^2}(1 - 4\beta^2)\right) d\beta \quad (A7)
\]

\[
B(r_0) = -\hat{z} \frac{L}{R^2} \left(1 - \frac{5L^2}{24R^2}\right) + O(\epsilon^4) \quad (A8)
\]

Comparing equations A4 and A8, we see that setting \( \alpha = L^2/12R \) gives the same second-order error in \( B_z \) at \( r_0 = (0, -R, 0) \). Here, \( R \equiv 1/\kappa \) and to fourth order \( L^2 = |\delta r'|^2 \equiv |(dr'/ds)\delta s|^2 \). The conclusion is that we can reduce the order of the error of the piecewise linear approach by shifting each point by an amount \( \kappa |\delta r'|^2/12 \) in the outwards normal direction.

Appendix B. Minimization of Mean Squared Distance

With the same parameterization as above, we have that the squared distance from the curved segment to the straight segment is \((\alpha x'/R)^2 + (L^2/8R - x'^2/2R - \alpha)^2\) for \( x' \in [-L/2, L/2] \). Taking the average over the segment gives

\[
\langle|\Delta r'\rangle^2\rangle = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \left(\frac{L^2}{8R} - \alpha\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{R^2} - \frac{1}{R} \left(\frac{L^2}{8R} - \alpha\right)\right) L^2 \beta^2 + \frac{1}{4R^2} L^4 \beta^4 \rangle d\beta
\]

\[
= \left(\frac{L^4}{64R^2} - \frac{L^2}{4R} \alpha + \alpha^2\right) + \frac{1}{12} \left(-\frac{L^4}{8R^2} + \frac{L^2}{R} \alpha + \frac{L^2}{R^2} \alpha^2\right) + \frac{1}{80} \left(\frac{L^4}{4R^2}\right). \quad (B1)
\]

The derivative with respect to \( \alpha \),

\[
d\langle|\Delta r'\rangle^2\rangle/\alpha = -\frac{L^2}{4R} + 2\alpha + \frac{L^2}{12R} + \frac{L^2}{6R^2} \alpha, \quad (B2)
\]

when set to zero, gives the optimal shift of the straight segment:

\[
\alpha = \frac{1}{12} \frac{L^2}{R} \left(1 + O(\epsilon^2)\right) \quad (B3)
\]

Appendix C. Optimal Spacing of Endpoints

Substituting Equation B3 into Equation B1 provides the scaling of the squared error:

\[
\langle|\Delta r'\rangle^2\rangle = \frac{L^4}{720R^2} = O(\kappa^2 \rho^{-4}), \quad (C1)
\]
where $\rho = 1/L$ denotes the density of endpoints. Parameterizing the curve by $s \in [0, 1]$, we seek to minimize the integral of the squared error,

$$
\int_0^1 \kappa^2(s)\rho^{-4}(s)ds,
$$

subject to a constraint on the number of points,

$$
N = \int_0^1 \rho(s)ds.
$$

Thus, we set to zero the variation (with respect to perturbations of $\rho(s)$) of the following integral:

$$
\int_0^1 \left(\kappa^2(s)\rho^{-4}(s) + \lambda \rho(s)\right)ds,
$$

resulting in the condition $\rho(s) \propto \left(\kappa(s)\right)^{2/5}$.

**Appendix D. Prescription for Discontinuous Curvature**

If the coil curvature is only piecewise continuous, one should approximate each section individually. The objective is to obtain the same rate of convergence as for closed curves with curvature that is continuous everywhere.

Consider approximating the magnetic field coming from one such section, parameterized by $s_i \in [0, 1]$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, N$. The procedure is the same as before, with the following modulations:

(i) Set $s_0 = 0$ and $s_N = 1$. These points will not be shifted.

(ii) For $i \in 1, 2, \ldots, N - 1$, we used to place $s_i$ uniformly. Instead, spread them out slightly, such that the spacing in $s$ between $(s_0$ and $s_1)$ and $(s_{N-1}$ and $s_N)$ are smaller than the others by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$.

(iii) Shift the points $1, 2, \ldots, N - 1$ using equation (1.2). For all shifts, use the $\delta s$ between the interior points, not the shorter length of the endpoints.