Springer Series in Advanced Microelectronics

Volume 62

Series Editors

Kukjin Chun, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,
Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea (Republic of)
Kiyoo Itoh, Hitachi Ltd., Tokyo, Japan
Thomas H. Lee, Department of Electrical Engineering CIS-205,
Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
Rino Micheloni, Torre Sequoia, II piano, PMC-Sierra, Vimercate (MB), Italy
Takayasu Sakurai, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
Willy M. C. Sansen, ESAT-MICAS, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven,
Leuven, Belgium
Doris Schmitt-Landsiedel, Lehrstuhl fur Technische Elektronik,
Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany

The *Springer Series in Advanced Microelectronics* provides systematic information on all the topics relevant for the design, processing, and manufacturing of microelectronic devices. The books, each prepared by leading researchers or engineers in their fields, cover the basic and advanced aspects of topics such as wafer processing, materials, device design, device technologies, circuit design, VLSI implementation, and sub-system technology. The series forms a bridge between physics and engineering, therefore the volumes will appeal to practicing engineers as well as research scientists.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/4076

Klevis Ylli · Yiannos Manoli

Energy Harvesting for Wearable Sensor Systems

Inductive Architectures for the Swing Excitation of the Leg



Klevis Ylli Hahn-Schickard Villingen-Schwenningen, Baden-Württemberg, Germany Yiannos Manoli Department of Microsystems Engineering University of Freiburg Freiburg, Baden-Württemberg, Germany

ISSN 1437-0387 ISSN 2197-6643 (electronic) Springer Series in Advanced Microelectronics ISBN 978-981-33-4447-1 ISBN 978-981-33-4448-8 (eBook) https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-33-4448-8

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Preface

The term "Energy Harvesting" describes the generation of small amounts of electrical energy from the surrounding environment, be it kinetic energy, light or heat gradients. This technology offers the potential for the low-maintenance operation of wireless sensor systems without the need to charge or replace batteries. In order to power electronic systems on the human body, harvesting devices are being developed that use the body as an energy source. This book focuses on the human gait as a source of kinetic energy. The swing motion of the foot during walking provides the necessary excitation for flat inductive devices that can be integrated into the shoe sole. These devices are, in principle, comparatively simple to understand and fabricate. The main difficulty lies with the optimization of the geometrical parameters.

Several harvester architectures are investigated in this book, in order to find the magnet-coil arrangement that generates the largest power output. Before devices can be fabricated, the optimal geometrical parameters for the highly restricted space in the shoe sole need to be determined. A system model based on a differential equation of motion is developed that takes the relevant physical effects into account, i.e. the forces that act on the moving magnets and affect their motion. The steps taken to implement the required aspects of the system model in a numerical simulation environment are described in detail, and the model is subsequently used to calculate the motion of the magnets relative to the coils depending on the external excitation. The required simplifications as well as the drawbacks and limitations of the system model are described.

Based on the magnet motion, the induced voltage and the generated power output are determined. While the magnetic field distribution needs to be calculated for every setup separately, the system model is flexible and used across all architectures. The geometrical parameters of each architecture are variable, and an optimization algorithm is used to maximize the power output for each architecture.

The fabrication of harvester devices as closely as possible to the optimized design is the next step. The devices are characterized on a treadmill with two different test persons and at walking speeds of 4, 6, 8 and 10 km/h. The power output is determined using an ohmic load equal to the coil resistance. Of the four

analyzed architectures, the highest achieved average power output is 10.32 mW. In terms of power density, this translates into 1.15 mW/cm³ for an active volume of 8.96 cm^3 . The maximum device dimensions including the housing remain the same throughout this work at 77 mm in length, 41.5 mm in width and 15.75 mm in height (resulting in a total volume of 50.33 cm³).

The experimental results are used to revise and verify the system model. A new parameter optimization is performed for each architecture using the revised model. The second generation of fabricated devices (device volume remains 50 cm^3) achieves a greatly improved average power output of up to 43 mW during walking (power density of 0.85 mW/cm³).

Experiments are also carried out in industrial applications on a pneumatic piston and a pneumatic clutch-brake with power outputs reaching up to 15 mW. These results prove that this type of linear, non-resonant device can also be used in industrial applications where the excitation, while certainly not identical to human motion, shows a few similarities like non-resonant behavior and large amplitudes.

Lörrach, Germany Freiburg, Germany Klevis Ylli Yiannos Manoli

Contents

1	Intr	oduction	1
	1.1	Literature Review	2
		1.1.1 Kinetic Energy Harvesting from the Human Gait	2
		1.1.2 Examples of Piezoelectric Harvesting Devices	3
		1.1.3 Examples of Capacitive Harvesting Devices	4
		1.1.4 Examples of Triboelectric Harvesting Devices	6
		1.1.5 Examples of Inductive Harvesting Devices	6
		1.1.6 Examples of Inductive Swing-Excited Harvesting	
		Devices	8
	1.2	Human Gait as an Excitation Source	11
		1.2.1 Accelerations of the Foot During Walking	11
		1.2.2 Accelerations at Other Locations on the Body	14
	1.3	Basic Principle and Boundary Conditions	15
	1.4	EH Architectures	17
	1.5	Objectives of This Work and Major Achievements	19
	1.6	Organization of the Book	20
	Refe	rences	21
2	The	ory and Modeling	25
	2.1	Differential Equation of Motion	26
	2.2	Friction Model	29
	2.3	Mechanical Hardstops and Integrator Reset Conditions	30
	2.4	Calculating the Magnetic Flux Using Finite Element Analysis	32
	2.5	Electromagnetic Coupling Function	34
	2.6	Induced Voltage, Electrical Damping Force and Power Output	37
	2.7	Model Simplifications and Parameter Uncertainties	39
	2.8	Discussion	41
	Refe	rences	42

3	Geometrical Parameter Optimization 4
	3.1 Optimization Procedure 4
	3.2 Optimization Results 4
	3.2.1 HAC1—Axially Polarized Cylindrical Magnets 4
	3.2.2 HAC3—Coils Within Axially Polarized Ring Magnets 4
	3.2.3 HAC5—Rectangular Closed Magnetic Circuit 4
	3.2.4 HAC6—Rectangular Double Halbach Array 5
	3.3 Discussion
	References 5
4	Experimental Evaluation of Fabricated Architectures
	4.1 Introduction
	4.2 Swing Harvester Evolution
	4.3 Fabrication
	4.4 Experimental Results
	4.4.1 Experimental Setup
	4.4.2 HAC1
	4.4.3 HAC3
	4.4.4 HAC5
	4.4.5 HAC6
	4.5 Model Revision and Verification
	4.6 Discussion
	4.7 Outlook - Additional Experiments
	References
5	Second Ontimization Run 7
5	51 HAC1 7
	5.2 HAC3 7
	5.2 HAC5
	54 HAC6
	5.5 Discussion 8
	Reference 8
_	
6	Second Generation HAC Experimental Results
	6.1 Fabrication HACS
	b.2 Fabrication HACb 8 (2) Emaximum tal Data 8
	6.3 Experimental Data
	6.3.1 HAC5—2. Generation
	6.3.2 HAC6—2. Generation
	6.4 Discussion
	References

Contents

7	Indu	strial Applications	5
	7.1	Pneumatic Piston—Setup	5
		7.1.1 Experimental Setup 9	6
		7.1.2 Comparison to Human Gait	6
	7.2	Pneumatic Piston—Experimental Results	8
		7.2.1 HAC1—1. Generation	8
		7.2.2 HAC3—1. Generation 10	0
		7.2.3 HAC5—1. Generation 10	1
		7.2.4 HAC6—1. Generation 10	3
		7.2.5 Discussion 10	4
	7.3	Clutch-Brake—Setup 10	8
	7.4	Clutch-Brake—Experimental Results 11	1
		7.4.1 Discussion 11	3
	Refe	rences	3
8	Con	clusion and Outlook	5
	8.1	Conclusion	5
	8.2	Viable Human Body Application 12	0
	8.3	Outlook	2
	Refe	rences	4
Ap	opend	ix	5
In	dex .		1

Nomenclature

Abbreviations

BLE	Bluetooth Low-Energy
BWS	Body-worn systems
CMS	Condition-monitoring system
DOE	Design of experiments
edf	Electrical damping force
EH	Energy harvester
FEM	Finite element method
GCS	Global coordinate system
GP	Geometrical parameters
HAC	Harvester architecture
INT1	Integrator 1 of the system model, etc.
IR	Infrared
LCS	Local coordinate system
LED	Light-emitting diode
MOGA-2	Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithm, used in parameter optimization
N35	Polarization strength of NdFeB permanent magnets
NdFeB	Neodymium iron boron (rare earth permanent magnet material)
01	Data set from first optimization run. O2 Analogously
PCB	Printed circuit board
PV	Photovoltaic (cell)
RF	Radio-frequency
RMS	Root-mean-squared value
S1	Piston setup S1 in laboratory experiments. S2 and S3 analogously
WSN	Wireless sensor node

Symbols

Α	Area enclosed by coil windings (m ²)
Aext	External acceleration (e.g. from measurements of the foot motion)
	(m/s^2)
b_{mag}	Thickness of rectangular magnets (m)
B	Magnetic flux density (T)
Bmaan	Mean flux density (e.g. for a given coil winding) (T)
B _x	X-component of magnetic flux density B (perpendicular to the direction
- 1	of motion of the magnets in a cuboid setup) (T)
Br	Z-component of magnetic flux density B (along the direction of motion
- 2	of the magnets) (T)
Cw	Transition approximation coefficient of the friction model (s/m)
distInnen	Vector of the coil positions within the harvester housing. Used in the
	system model
d _{coil}	Thickness of cylindrical and rectangular coils (m)
$d_{C_{\mu}}$	Diameter of the copper wire used to wind the coils (m)
diron	Back flux guide thickness ("back iron") (m)
dmag	Wall thickness of ring magnets (m)
d _{Spacer}	Thickness of steel spacers (m)
f_c	Viscous friction coefficient $(N/m/s)$
F_{brk}	Breakaway friction force (N)
$F_{brk,S}$	Static breakaway friction force (N)
F_C	Coulomb friction force (N)
F_{el}	Electrical damping force (N)
F_R	Friction force (N)
F_S	Spring force (N)
F_T	Inertial force (N)
F_V	Viscous friction force (N)
8	Earth's gravity (m/s^2)
h_{coil}	Length of the edge of the rectangular coil located along the direction of
	motion (m)
h _{core}	Size of the air gap in the middle of the coil (same direction as h_{coil}) (m)
h_{mag}	Magnet height (m)
H_c	Coercive field strength of magnets (A/m)
k(x)	Electro-magnetic coupling function (V/m/s)
k_i	Coefficient of restitution (hardstop model) (-)
l _{coil}	Length of the edge of the rectangular coil located perpendicular to the
	direction of motion (into the drawing plane of the FEM-simulation).
	Coil height in the case of cylindrical coils (m)
μ_k	Coefficient of kinetic friction (-)
μ_s	Coefficient of static friction (-)
μ_{mag}	Relative permeability (–)

т	Number of coil windings in the direction perpendicular to the winding
	area of a coil (–)
m_{mag}	Magnet stack mass (including steel flux guides where applicable) (kg)
n	Number of coil windings in the radial direction of a cylindrical coil, or
	in the direction of motion in the case of rectangular coils (-)
<i>n_{coils}</i>	Number of coils simulated/used in a harvester (-)
n_{mag}	Number of magnets simulated/used in a harvester (-)
N	Number of total windings of a coil (-)
φ	Magnetic flux (Wb)
P_{avg}	Average power output (mW)
P_N	Normalized power output (-)
ho	Specific resistance of copper wire (Ω/m)
r_i	Radius of coil winding i (m)
r _{mag}	Inner magnet radius in the case of cylindrical magnets (m)
r _{mean}	Mean winding radius of a cylindrical coil (m)
R _{in}	Resistance of a coil (Ω)
R_l	Ohmic load resistance (Ω)
R_{mag}	Outer magnet radius in the case of cylindrical magnets (m)
R_{max}	Radius of the outermost (largest) winding of a cylindrical coil (m)
R_{min}	Radius of the innermost (smallest) winding of a cylindrical coil (m)
u_i	Logic signal number i in the Simulink environment (-)
U_{ind}	Induced voltage (V)
U_l	Voltage across the ohmic load (V)
v_{thr}	Threshold speed of the magnet in the friction model (m/s)
<i>x</i>	Magnet acceleration (m/s^2)
ż	Magnet speed (m/s)
x	Magnet position within housing (m)
x_{max}	Total motion space within the harvester housing (m)

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	Exemplary kinetic harvesting devices for various locations on the human body	4
Fig. 1.2	The experimental shoe from [20] is shown, with a bellow-like structure underneath the heel, which is used to expand the dielectric elastomer upon heel strike. Figure from [20]	5
Fig. 1.3	Schematic of the "Bubbler" REWOD device. The fixed electrodes covered in insulating material (5) are shown in red on the green silicon substrate (1). The white balls are the air bubbles (4). (2) and (3) are the membrane and top plate	U
Fig. 1.4	through which the air bubbles can escape. Figure from [23] Schematic of the folding-structure triboelectric generator in (a). The Kapton substrate is shown in yellow, while the alternating layers of PTFE and aluminum are shown in green and blue respectively. The fabricated device with total dimensions of 3.8 cm \times 3.8 cm \times 0.95 cm is shown in (b) and (a). Figures from [24]	5
Fig. 1.5	Schematic of the multilayered device shown in (a). The piezoelectric material PDMS (polydimethylsiloxane) is embedded within different materials to enable the triboelectric effect. The fabricated device is shown in (b). Figures from [25]	, 7
Fig. 1.6	Exemplary frequency up-conversion heel strike device in (a) and the generated voltage curve with a decaying amplitude in (b). Figures from [26]	8
Fig. 1.7	First exemplary swing-excited energy harvester with the device schematic shown in (a) and the fabricated device shown in (b). Figure from [13]	9
Fig. 1.8	Third exemplary swing-excited energy harvester with the device schematic shown in (a) and the fabricated device shown	

	in (b). This is the only device that was actually integrated in a shoe (albeit without any particular protection of the transducer). Figure from [221]	10
Fig. 1.9	Possible acceleration sources of the human gait. The measurement axes of the acceleration sensor are shown in blue	10
	color. The x-axis points forward along the shoe and the y-axis upward along the leg. The z-axis points away sideways from the body and is of no relayance in the human gait	12
Fig. 1.10	Accelerations recorded at the shoe sole on the x axis at a motion speed of 4 km/h in (a) and 10 km/h in (b) for test person "1". The green and red markers indicate acceleration	12
	peaks found by a peak detection algorithm. The separate	13
Fig. 1.11	 a Accelerations recorded at the ankle on the x axis at a motion speed of 4 km/h for test person "1". b The RMS acceleration of 	15
	several body parts, as calculated from the complete acceleration signal for test person "1". Figure 1.11a	
	from [37]	14
Fig. 1.12	X-ray pictures of a running shoe with an integrated energy harvesting device in side view (a , modified from [37].) and bottom view (b) The space that is available for the integration	
	of a device into the shoe sole is marked	16
Fig. 1.13	Schematics of the available building space in the shoe sole. Possible transducer arrangements along the full width of the housing in (a) and as two separate transducers in (b) are	
Fig. 1.14	marked in red. Figures from [34] Schematics of investigated swing harvesters HAC1 to HAC6.	17
	The dashed line indicates the axis of symmetry for the axisymmetric (cylindrical) architectures in (a) and (b). The rectangular architectures are shown in (c) and (d). All figures are shown in cross-sectional view. The direction of motion	
	shown in (c) is equal across all architectures. Figure modified from [38]	18
Fig. 1.15	FEM simulation results for HAC5 in (a) and a variation of	10
	HAC5 with the magnet polarization shifted by 90° in (b). The legend is shown in (c). The magnetic flux density in the coil space is far larger for the original HAC5 compared to its	
	variation. Figures from [34]	19
Fig. 2.1	Proof mass m resting on a plate (e.g. housing) that experiences the external acceleration $a_{h,ext}$. a Due to the stick friction force, at accelerations smaller than the threshold a_{thr} the proof mass moves with the plate at zero relative acceleration between the	
	two bodies. b At large accelerations, the plate pulls away under	

	the proof mass at the relative acceleration $\Delta a_m = -a_{h,ext}$ in the ideal case without kinetic friction. Figures from [9]	26
Fig 2.2	General block diagram of the system model. The optional	20
1 lg. 2.2	blocks that are not implemented in this work i.e. restoring	
	forces from anrings and from the air compression due to	
	notes from springs and from the an compression due to	
	dashad lines. Figure from [0]	20
E:- 2.2	The machine learning of the surface madel and here in	28
Fig. 2.3	The mechanical components of the system model are snown in	
	the Simulink environment. Blue blocks are integrators, yellow	
	blocks are the forces from the 'eom', green blocks trigger the	
	integrator reset, red blocks set the integrator input x and gray	
	blocks set the output start value of INTT after a reset. The	
	magnet position and speed serve as inputs to the	
	electromagnetic components that are described starting in	•
F : 0 (Sect. 2.4. Figure from [10]	28
Fig. 2.4	Friction force curve calculated with the exemplary parameters	
	$\mu_k = 0.2, \ \mu_s = 0.3, \ f_c = 0.01 \text{ N/(m/s)}, \ v_{thr} = 0.01 \text{ m/s},$	
	$c_v = 10$ s/m and $m_{mag} = 10 g$. This values were chosen	
	to generate a curve which clearly shows the highlighted	
	characteristic regions. Figure from [10]	30
Fig. 2.5	Exemplary drawing of parameterized harvester structures	
	within the FEM tool. a Shows the right half-plane of a	
	cylindrical magnet stack with the axis of symmetry being	
	represented by the left margin. b Shows the cross-sectional	
	drawing of a rectangular magnet stack where no symmetrical	
	relations can be exploited. The width of the magnet is directed	
	into the drawing plane. Figures from [9]	31
Fig. 2.6	a Schematic top view of an axis-symmetric magnet and coil	
	setup. b Schematic of the calculation of the magnetic flux	
	within a coils' winding for every position the coil can take	
	relative to the magnets used in the system. The dotted gray area	
	represents the magnetic flux distribution as a two-dimensional	
	data matrix. Figures from [10]	33
Fig. 2.7	Schematic showing the calculation of the mean flux density	
	within the radial windings of a coil for an exemplary	
	cylindrical architecture in (\mathbf{a}) and a rectangular architecture in	
	(b). The gray area represents the magnetic flux distribution as a	
	two-dimensional data matrix. Single windings are indicated as	
	black circles. Figures from [9]	34
Fig. 2.8	Schematics showing all relevant geometrical parameters of the	
	two HAC types used in this work. The direction of magnet	
	motion as well as the direction of the relevant component of	
	magnetic flux density are also shown. Figures from [9]	36

Fig. 2.9	Electromagnetic model components in the Simulink environment. The coil position is calculated in the blue blocks, the coupling coefficient look-up table is marked in yellow, the red block calculates U_{ind} and the green block calculates the power output and the electrical damping force which is	
	required as a feedback input to the mechanical subsystem. Figure from [10]	37
Fig. 3.1	Cross-sectional schematic in side view that explains three optimization constraints exemplarily for HAC1. Similar constraints exist for all harvester architectures. Figure	
Fig. 3.2	from [4] Parallel Coordinate Chart that shows all calculated designs of HAC1. Each column represents one parameter. Right-most is the average power output where a filter has been applied, highlighting the best designs. A clear tendency is visible for two parameters: R_{mag} has to be as large as possible, while r_{mag} has to be zero which means that cylindrical magnets are more fassible than ring magnets. Figure from [5]	45
Fig. 3.3	a Schematic of HAC1 with coils surrounding the axial magnets. The magnetic flux is shown in red. b Schematic of HAC3. The coils' enclosed area is crossed by different flux paths than in HAC1, where the flux path may close within the	40
Fig. 4.1	coil. Figures from [5] Pictures of devices that were previously fabricated during this work. These devices are not part of the detailed investigation shown in this work. Details on the devices are given in Table 4.1. Figure 4.1 (a) reproduced from [1]. Figure 4.1 (b) and (a) reproduced from [2]	47
Fig. 4.2	CAD Renderings of fabricated harvester architectures that show the magnet and coil placement. Devices are shown in order of their number from HAC1 in pane (a), HAC3 in (b),	50
Fig. 4.3	HACS in (c) and HACS in pane (d). Figures from [9] HAC6 3D-printed slider that holds the magnetic circuit. It can move freely within the housing and has no contact to the coils on PCR board within it. Figure from [0]	59
Fig. 4.4	Measurement setup with DAQ card and laptop on the left, treadmill on the right and harvester mounted to the shoe on the bottom right. Figure from [9]	61
Fig. 4.5	Picture of the fabricated device for the standard version of HAC1 in (a) and HAC1 XL mounted to the side of a shoe for the experimental evaluation in (b). Notice the larger coils of	UI
	HAC1 XL. Figures from [9]	62

xviii

List of Figures

Fig. 4.6	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 70 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC1 in (b). Measured on a	
Fig. 4.7	treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9] Voltage output across an ohmic load of 220 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC1 XL in (b). HAC1 XL is a version of HAC1 with larger coils (10 mm coil height instead	62
	of 3.2 mm for the standard setup). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9]	63
Fig. 4.8	The load sweep for HAC1 is shown in (a) (the total coil resistance of HAC1 is 70 Ω). The load sweep for HAC1 XL is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC1 XL is 220 Ω). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9]	63
Fig. 4.9	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 33 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC3 in (b). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9]	64
Fig. 4.10	A picture of the fabricated device for HAC3 is shown in (a). The magnet stack can be seen through the 3D-printed housing. The load sweep for HAC3 is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC3 is 33 Ω). Figures from [9]	64
Fig. 4.11	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 480 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC5 (b). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9]	65
Fig. 4.12	Load sweep for HAC5 (the total coil resistance of HAC5 is 480 Ω) in (a). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Two exemplary fabrication steps of HAC5 are shown in (b). Figures from [9]	65
Fig. 4.13	Picture of fabricated standard version of HAC5 in (a). One can notice the circuit board which holds the coils in between the two parts of the magnetic circuit. The rubber end stops were added later. The position of the springs in the modified version of HAC5 is shown in (b). The number of coils had to be	
Fig. 4.14	reduced due to the springs. Figures from [9] Voltage output across an ohmic load of 360 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC5 with springs in (b). This device uses only 12 coils instead of the 16 coils in the standard version, thus explaining the lower voltages when compared to Fig. 4.11. Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h Figures from [9]	66
Fig. 4.15	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 118 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC6 in (b). Measured on a	00
	treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9]	67

Fig. 4.16	A picture of the fabricated device for HAC6 is shown on the left. The load sweep for HAC6 is shown on the right (the total	
Fig. 4.17	coil resistance of HAC6 is 118 Ω). Figures from [9] Voltage output across an ohmic load of 280 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for HAC1 XL-N in (b). HAC1	68
	XL-N is a version of HAC1 XL with industrially fabricated coils that have a larger number of windings in the same volume and a total resistance of 280 Ω instead of 220 Ω . Measured on	
Fig. 4.18	a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h. Figures from [9] Voltage data obtained experimentally for HAC1 XL-N with two parallel magnet stacks within one housing for test person "1". The data is shown for only one of the two stacks. The coils and the load resistance of 284 Q per stack remain	74
Fig. 5.1	identical across all measurements. Figures from [9] Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for HAC1 during the optimization process along the height and radius of the magnet. Lengths scale in meters. Figure	75
Fig. 5.2	from [1]	78
Fig. 5.3	Figure from [1] Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for HAC5 during the optimization process along the width (h_{mag}) and thickness (b_{mag}) of the ring magnet. Lengths scale in	80
Fig. 5.4	meters. Figure from [1] Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for HAC6 during the optimization process along the widths (h_{mag}) and (h_{mag}) of the two magnet types used in the Halbach array.	81
Fig. 6.1	Lengths scale in meters. Figure from [1] The assembly steps during fabrication of the final HAC5	82
Fig. 6.2	design are shown	87
Fig. 6.3	iteration 6 in Table 6.1 Fabricated second generation of HAC6 based on CAD design iteration 4 in Table 6.2. The top side of the Halbach array is shown, as well as the grey milled POM (Polyoxymethylene)	87
	brackets on either side of the magnet stack. The PCB holding the coils fits exactly between the two brackets with a airgap of roughly 0.2 mm on either side	89
Fig. 6.4	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 390 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for the final device of HAC5 in (b). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h	89

Fig. 6.5	Voltage output across an ohmic load of 390 Ω in (a) and the corresponding power output for the final device of HAC5 in	
Fig. 6.6	(b). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 10 km/h Voltage output across an ohmic load of 220 Ω in (a) and the	90
F'. (7	(b). Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 4 km/h	90
Fig. 0.7	corresponding power output for the final device of HAC6 in (b) Measured on a treadmill at a motion speed of 10 km/h	00
Fig. 7.1	The measurement setup with a pneumatic piston and the required components is shown in (a). The harvester placement, in this case device HAC5 (1st generation), is shown in more detail in (b). Figures from [3]	90 97
Fig. 7.2	Comparison of Accelerations: Walking on a treadmill at 4 km/h in (a), the motion of the unregulated piston in (b), the motion of the piston with pressure regulated to produce accelerations of 4–5 g in (c) and the motion of the piston regulated to produce accelerations of 6–7 g in (d). Figures from [3]	98
Fig. 7.3	The voltage signal of HAC1 measured across the ohmic load of 70 Ω and piston setup S17 is given in (a). The load sweep for HAC1 is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC1 is 70 Ω). Figures from [3]	99
Fig. 7.4	The voltage signal of HAC1 XL measured across the ohmic load of 220 Ω and piston setup S1 is given in (a). The load sweep for HAC1 XL is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC1 XL is 220 Ω). Figures from [3]	100
Fig. 7.5	The voltage signal of HAC3 measured across the ohmic load of 33 Ω and piston setup S17 is given in (a). The load sweep for HAC3 is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC3 is 33 Ω). Figures from [3]	101
Fig. 7.6	The voltage signal of HAC5 measured across the ohmic load of 480 Ω and piston setup S17 is given in (a). The load sweep for HAC5 is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC5 is 480 Ω). Figures from [3]	102
Fig. 7.7	The voltage signal of HAC6 measured across the ohmic load of 118 Ω and piston setup S17 is given in (a). The load sweep for HAC6 is shown in (b) (the total coil resistance of HAC6 is 118 Ω). Figures from [3]	102
Fig. 7.8	The measured as well as the filtered accelerations for piston setup S17 are given in (a). In (b) the acceleration input into the integrator block in Simulink is shown in black and the resulting simulated magnet stack speed in red. (c) Shows an	
	enlarged section of the signals in (b). Figures from [3]	107

Fig. 7.9	An exemplary ramp-up of the used clutch-brake from 0 to 400 rpm is shown in (a). An exemplary ramp-down of the clutch-brake from 500 rpm to 0 rpm is depicted in (b). Figures from [1]	100
Fig. 7.10	Schematic graph showing the operating mode of the clutch- brake and a potential CMS. The time slot t_1 is the acceleration phase, t_2 is the clutched state, t_3 is the deceleration phase and t_4 is the standstill phase. The blue and green phases respectively mark the temperature and distance measurements. Figure from [1]	109
Fig. 7.11	Schematic of the used clutch-brake showing the mounting position of the harvester (red box) on the perimeter of the rotating steel plate in (a). Exemplary brakepads are shown in (b)	111
Fig. 7.12	The schematic of the inductive harvester based on HAC5 is shown in (a). Picture of several fabricated harvesting devices with a power management circuit placed in the lid in (b)	111
Fig. 7.13	The laboratory measurement where the harvester is attached to a pneumatic piston is shown in (a). The charging of the supercapacitor is shown in (b). The supercapacitor voltage is the black line and the regulated voltage output of the power	
Fig. 7.14	The actual clutch-brake measurement with the attached harvester is shown in (a) . The charging of the supercapacitor is	112
Fig. 8.1	Net diagram comparing the fabricated devices from Chaps. 4 and 6. The values are normalized to the maximum in each category. The power output is the only parameter that is required to be large. In the case of the remaining parameters, a smaller value is advantageous.	112
Fig. 8.2	Net diagram comparing the first generation devices from Chap. 4 with devices from literature in (a) and comparing the second generation HACs from Chap. 6 to devices from literature in (b). The values are normalized to the maximum in each category. The power output is the only parameter that is required to be large. In the case of the remaining parameters, a smaller value is advantageous. "D. Carroll et al." refers to [2], "W. Wang et al." refers to [4] and "J. X. Shen et al." refers to [1].	119
Fig. 8.3	Screenshot of the pulse measurement software implemented in Matlab by Hahn-Schickard. The green line shows the unfiltered sensor signal from exemplary measurements at the forehead. The single impulses indicating the pulse can be	,
	noticed. Figure from [3]	121

Fig. 8.4	Screenshot of a first implementation of a power management circuit using the "SimScape" toolbox. The model contains a full-bridge rectifier and hysteresis thresholds for the regulated voltage output at 3.3 and 2.2 V, as well as a variable load with	
Fig. A.1	a power output of 400 mW Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side)	123
	and test person "1". The load resistance of 70 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across all measurements.	
Fig. A.2	Figures from [1] Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC1 (one magnet stack)	126
	and test person "2". The load resistance of 70 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across all measurements.	107
Fig. A.3	Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC1 XL (one magnet stack) and test person "1". The load resistance of 220 Ω is equal to	127
	Figures from [1]	128
Fig. A.4	Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC3 (one magnet stack) and test person "1". The load resistance of 33 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across all measurements.	
Fig. A.5	Figures from [1] Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC3 (one magnet stack) and test person "2". The load resistance of 33 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across all measurements.	129
Fig. A.6	Figures from [1] Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC5 and test person "1". The load resistance of 480 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance	130
Fig. A.7	and identical across all measurements. Figures from [1] Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC5 and test person "2". The load resistance of 480 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance	131
Fig A 8	and identical across all measurements. Figures from [1]	132
нд. А.о	data obtained experimentally for HAC5 F (spring-loaded version of HAC5) and test person "1". The load resistance of 360 Q is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across	
	all measurements. Figures from [1]	133

Fig. A.9	Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC5 F (spring-loaded version of HAC5) and test person "2". The load resistance of 360 Q is equal to the total coil resistance and identical across	
	all measurements. Figures from [1]	134
Fig. A.10	Voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC6 and test person "1".	
	The load resistance of 118 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance	
F' 4 11	and identical across all measurements. Figures from [1]	135
F1g. A.11	voltage (on the left side) and power output (on the right side) data obtained experimentally for HAC6 and test person "2"	
	The load resistance of 118 Ω is equal to the total coil resistance	
	and identical across all measurements. Figures from [1]	136
Fig. A.12	Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for	
	HAC1 during the optimization process along the length and	
	wall thickness of the coils. Lengths scale in meters.	
F ' 1 10	Figure from [1].	137
F1g. A.13	Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for UAC_2 during the entimization process along the length and	
	wall thickness of the coils. Lengths scale in meters	
	Figure from [1]	138
Fig. A.14	Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for	100
C	HAC5 during the optimization process along the height (l_{Spule})	
	and width (h_{coil}) of the coils. Lengths scale in meters.	
	Figure from [1]	138
Fig. A.15	Scatter graph showing the distribution of the designs found for	
	HAC6 during the optimization process along the height (l_{Spule})	
	and width (h_{coil}) of the coils. Lengths scale in meters.	
	Figure from [1]	139

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Selection of parameters from swing-excited inductive harvesters presented in literature. Masses and volumes are	
	estimated, when not specifically given in the sources.	10
Table 1.2	Step frequencies for two test persons (obtained from treadmill acceleration measurements). Table from [34]	10
Table 1.3	Average acceleration peaks recorded on a treadmill with two test persons under different walking speeds. Table from [36]	14
Table 1.4	Size constraints for the simulations and prototypes fabricated in this work	16
Table 2.1	Normalized power output as a function of the coefficients of friction in the case of HAC1. The motion data from test person "1" at 4 km/h is used as input data. Results normalized to $P_N = 1$ at $\mu_k = 0.2$ and $\mu_s = 0.3$. The influence of the coefficients of friction on the power output is relatively small. Table from [9]	40
Table 2.2	Normalized power output as a function of the coefficient of restitution in the case of HAC1. The motion data from test person "1" at 4 km/h and 6 km/h is used as input data. Results normalized to $P_N = 1$ at $k_i = 0.6$ respectively. Table from [9]	40
Table 3.1	Parameter boundaries for the geometrical optimization of HAC1. Table from [5]	44
Table 3.2	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best design found for HAC1. All lengths are given in mm.	
Table 3.3	Table from [5] Parameter boundaries for the geometrical optimization of HA G2 Table from [5]	47
	HAU3. Table from [5]	48

Table 3.4	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best design found for HAC3. All lengths are given in mm.	
	Table from [5]	48
Table 3.5	Parameter boundaries for the geometrical optimization of HAC5. Table from [5]	49
Table 3.6	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best design found for HAC5. All lengths are given in mm. Table from [5]	50
Table 3.7	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best design found for HAC6. All lengths are given in mm. Table from [5]	51
Table 3.8	Summary of the optimized designs for architectures HAC1 to HAC6. In the case of cylindrical HACs, the "total" volume refers to a housing that is wide enough for two magnet stacks to be placed within it. Table modified from [5]	52
Table 4.1	Key geometry parameters of the previous harvester iterations as shown in Fig. 4.1. Table from [9]	56
Table 4.2	Average power output of previously fabricated swing harvesting devices for test person "1". The measurements were performed on a treadmill using an ohmic load equal to	57
Table 4.3	Key geometry parameters of the fabricated devices for HAC1 and HAC3. Table from [9]	57
Table 4.4	Key geometry parameters of the fabricated devices for HAC5 and HAC6. Table from [9]	58
Table 4.5	Comparison of simulated and measured average power output using an ohmic load equal to the total coil resistance. Because of uncertainties in the coefficient of restitution k_i according to Sect. 2.7, a range of simulated power outputs is given in addition to the values at $k_i = 0.6$ which were used in the optimization process in Chap. 3. The deviations between experiment and simulation are calculated with respect to $k_i = 0.6$. The friction coefficients remain constant as given in Chap. 2. "Sim.", "Exp." and "Dev." indicate simulations,	60
Table 4.6	experiments and the deviations respectively. Table from [9] Ranges of average power output obtained experimentally for HAC1. The coils and the load resistance of 70 Ω remain identical across all measurements, while the magnet stack is changed. The smallest and largest measured values are given	69
	for all investigated motion speeds. Table from [9]	70

Table 4.7	Overview of all performed measurements. "1" and "2" denote	
	the test persons. Measurements were performed at four motion	
	speeds. A dash indicates a missing measurement where a	71
T 11 40	device was broken. Table from [9]	/1
Table 4.8	Power output and power densities of all architectures for	
	motion speeds of 4 km/h and 6 km/h for test person "1". In the	
	case of cylindrical architectures HAC1 and HAC3, two	
	complete magnet stacks fit within the housing, although power	
	is lost to a certain degree due to the attractive force between	
	magnet stacks. Table from [9]	72
Table 4.9	Average power output measured experimentally for HAC1	
	XL-N with one or two parallel magnet stacks within one	
	housing. The data is given for four motion speeds and two	
	runners. "1/2" and "2/2" indicates the power output for the	
	first and second of the two parallel stacks. Table from [9]	75
Table 5.1	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best	
	design found for HAC1. The data is given for optimization run	
	"O1" and the corresponding experiment "E" as well as the	
	second optimization run "O2". All lengths are given in mm.	
	Table from [1]	78
Table 5.2	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best	
	design found for HAC3. The data is given for optimization run	
	"O1" and the corresponding experiment "E" as well as the	
	second optimization run "O2". All lengths are given in mm.	
	Table from [1]	79
Table 5.3	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best	
	design found for HAC5. The data is given for optimization run	
	"O1" and the corresponding experiment "E" as well as the	
	second optimization run "O2". All lengths are given in mm.	
	Table from [1]	80
Table 5.4	Geometrical Parameters and average power output of the best	
	design found for HAC6. The data is given for optimization run	
	"O1" and the corresponding experiment "E" as well as the	
	second optimization run "O2". All lengths are given in mm.	
	Table from [1]	82
Table 5.5	Summary of the optimized designs for architectures HAC1 to	
	HAC6. In the case of cylindrical HACs, the "total" volume	
	refers to the volume defined in Sect. 1.3. Table from [1]	83
Table 6.1	Simulated optimum design of HAC5 in the first column as	
	well as 3 design iterations that arose during the CAD design.	
	The design iteration 6 is the final design, that was fabricated.	
	Parameter changes from one design to the next are shown in	
	bold letters. The simulated power output for each design as	

	well as the power output normalized to 1, i.e. the optimum design are also given	86
Table 6.2	Simulated optimum design of HAC6 in the first column as well as 3 design iterations that arose during the CAD design.	00
	The design iteration 4 is the final design, that was fabricated.	
	hold letters. The simulated power output for each design as	
	well as the power output normalized to 1, i.e. the optimum	
	design, are also given.	88
Table 6.3	Overview of all performed measurements and the average	
	power output that was generated in each case. "1" and "2"	
	denote the test persons. Measurements were performed at four motion speeds. For the motion speed of four 4 km/h and test	
	notion speeds. For the motion speed of rour 4 km/n and test person "1" the simulated average power output is also listed	
	The bottom part of the table shows data from a second	
	measurement set with the HAC5 devices	92
Table 6.4	Overview of all the power densities corresponding to the top	
	part of Table 6.3 for an "active" volume of 34.22 cm ³ . "1" and	
Table 65	"2" denote the test persons.	93
	part of Table 6.3 for a total volume including housing of 50.33	
	cm ³ . "1" and "2" denote the test persons	93
Table 7.1	The average power output of HAC1 is given for all	
	measurements and each of the three piston settings.	
T 11 T 2	Table from [3]	99
Table 7.2	The average power output of HAC1 XL is given for all measurements and each of the three piston settings	
	Table from [3]	100
Table 7.3	The average power output of HAC3 is given for all	100
	measurements and each of the three piston settings.	
	Table from [3]	101
Table 7.4	The average power output of HAC5 is given for all	
	Table from [3]	102
Table 7.5	The average power output of HAC6 is given for all	102
	measurements and each of the three piston settings.	
	Table from [3]	103
Table 7.6	Power output and power densities of all architectures for	
	laboratory measurements using a pneumatic piston and the	
	above described measurement setup 517. In the case of cylindrical architectures HAC1 and HAC3, two complete	
	magnet stacks fit within the housing. In an actual device, the	
	power output may be lower depending on the attractive force	
	between magnet stacks. Table from [3]	105

Table 7.7	Comparison of experimental and simulated power outputs	
	of the HACs using piston setups S5 and S7 which show	
	accelerations in the same ranges as they appear in human leg	
	motion. Table from [3]	105
Table 8.1	Key components and properties for a biological tracker that	
	can measure the blood pulse at the ankle. Table from [3]	121