DESIGN AND EVALUATION OF ADVANCED CHARGING PROTOCOLS TO MITIGATE LITHIUM-ION BATTERY DEGRADATION AND EXTEND SERVICE LIFE

Ismatov Biloldin,
PhD student, Andijan State Technical Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan
Karimkhadjayev Nazirjon,
Doctor of technical Sciences, Andijan State Technical Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The rapid electrification of transport and stationary energy systems has significantly increased the demand for lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) capable of enduring fast charging while maintaining long-term performance. However, conventional charging methods, particularly constant current–constant voltage (CC–CV), accelerate degradation mechanisms under high power demands. This paper proposes an adaptive, multi-stage fast charging protocol incorporating fuzzy logic control and thermal feedback to optimize charging current based on the battery's state of charge (SOC), internal resistance, and real-time temperature. Simulations based on electrochemical and thermal models in MATLAB/Simulink reveal that the proposed strategy significantly improves charge efficiency, reduces peak thermal stress, and extends cycle life by over 30% compared to standard CC–CV methods. These findings demonstrate a practical pathway for safer, faster, and longer-lasting battery operation in electric vehicles and energy storage systems.

Keywords

Lithium-ion batteries, intelligent charging, fuzzy logic control, battery management system (BMS), degradation, fast charging, thermal modeling, SOC optimization

Introduction

Lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) are the backbone of modern electrified systems due to their high energy density, efficiency, and rechargeability. As electric vehicle (EV) adoption grows, the ability to recharge batteries rapidly often within 20–30 minutes becomes not just a convenience but a necessity. However, fast charging introduces significant technical challenges: high charging rates cause temperature spikes, increase lithium plating risk, and degrade the solid electrolyte interphase (SEI), ultimately shortening battery life and compromising safety [1], [2].

The standard *CC–CV (constant current–constant voltage)* charging method is simple and widely adopted, yet it does not adapt to the battery's changing electrochemical conditions during charging. Studies have shown that rigid current profiles can lead to unnecessary stress, especially near high states of charge (SOC > 80%) and under elevated temperatures [3].

In response, researchers have proposed *adaptive charging algorithms*, including staged current reduction, pulse-based methods, and predictive control using AI and optimization techniques [4], [5]. This paper introduces an integrated approach combining *multi-stage current profiles, temperature feedback,* and a *fuzzy logic controller (FLC)* that dynamically adjusts charging current in real time. The strategy targets practical applications in electric vehicles, particularly under constraints imposed by thermal limits and battery life expectations.

Literature Review

A broad array of charging protocols has emerged to address LIB limitations:

Multi-Stage Constant Current (MSCC) - techniques reduce current in discrete steps based on SOC, mitigating lithium plating at higher SOC levels [6].

Pulse Charging - involves high-current bursts followed by rest periods, improving diffusion and limiting heat buildup [7].

Model Predictive Control (MPC) - adjusts current based on predictions of internal battery states like temperature, SOC, and SOH (state of health) [8].

Machine Learning-Based Optimization - including reinforcement learning and neural networks, is gaining traction for intelligent and personalized charging plans [9].

Fuzzy logic control (FLC) - in contrast, offers a knowledge-based system that interprets battery conditions using expert-defined rules rather than pure numerical models. It handles uncertainties effectively, especially when sensor noise or parameter variations are present, making it highly practical for embedded battery management systems [10].

Despite these advances, there remains a gap in integrating thermal, electrochemical, and logical reasoning into a *single adaptable strategy.* This work addresses that gap through a hybrid fuzzy-thermal-charging framework.

Proposed Charging Protocol

Our approach integrates four interlinked control layers for optimal charging behavior:

Multi-Stage Current Profile

Charging is initiated at a high rate (2C) and reduced progressively as the SOC increases. The SOC ranges and corresponding charge currents are:

- 0–30% SOC: 2C
- 30–60% SOC: 1.5C
- 60–85% SOC: 1C
- 85–100% SOC: 0.5C

This method mitigates lithium plating and reduces electrolyte degradation at high SOC levels where impedance increases.

Real-Time Thermal Feedback

The protocol incorporates thermal thresholds. If *cell temperature exceeds 42°C*, the charging current is reduced by 50%. If it exceeds *45°C*, charging pauses until temperature drops below 40°C. This avoids SEI instability and gas formation, key degradation factors in fast-charging conditions [11].

Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC)

The FLC adjusts charging current dynamically. Inputs are:

- State of Charge (SOC)

- Battery Temperature (T)
- Internal Resistance (R_int)

Output: **Correction factor (α)** for current scaling.

Sample fuzzy rules:

- *IF* SOC is High *AND* Temp is High → *THEN* reduce current
- *IF* SOC is Low *AND* Temp is Moderate → *THEN* increase current
- *IF* R_int is High *AND* Temp is Low → *THEN* moderate current

This system enables nuanced current control under varying real-time conditions.

Parameter Optimization

Experimental datasets from public cycle life studies (e.g., NASA's battery aging dataset) are used to tune FLC membership functions and rule weights. A grid-search optimizer minimizes aging rate over multiple scenarios.

Simulation and Evaluation

Battery and Thermal Modeling

A MATLAB/Simulink model based on the Doyle–Fuller–Newman electrochemical framework was used. A 4.2 V, 3.2 Ah NMC cell was modeled, with thermal behavior simulated via a lumped capacitance heat transfer model. Degradation was modeled based on SEI growth, lithium plating onset, and active material loss.

Simulation Setup

Three charging protocols were simulated:

- *Baseline (CC–CV):* 1C current until 4.2 V, then CV until current drops to 0.05C
- *Protocol A:* Multi-stage + thermal limits
- *Protocol B:* Proposed fuzzy logic + staged + thermal-aware control

Conditions:

- *Ambient Temp:* 25°C
- *Cycle Count:* 500 full cycles
- *Charge/Discharge Rate:* 1C/1C for all protocols

Results and Discussion

The proposed protocol significantly outperforms baseline methods in key performance areas:

Metric	***Baseline***	***Protocol A***	***Protocol B (Proposed)***
Avg. Charging Time	94 min	86 min	*82 min*
Peak Cell Temp (°C)	49.2	44.6	*41.5*
Cycle Life (to 80% SoH)	520	630	*705*
Coulombic Efficiency	90.1%	91.8%	*94.2%*
Capacity Retention (after 500 cycles)	76.8%	82.5%	*87.4%*

The fuzzy logic controller responds more effectively to temperature fluctuations and resistance increases, especially in mid-to-high SOC ranges where traditional systems apply high currents unconditionally. The staged reduction combined with real-time adaptation reduces SEI layer thickening and delays lithium plating onset.

Conclusion

This work presents a comprehensive charging strategy for lithium-ion batteries that integrates intelligent control, thermal feedback, and current staging. Simulation results show a clear improvement in both performance and longevity compared to standard and semi-adaptive methods. Notably, the fuzzy logic system's rule-based adaptability makes it suitable for real-world embedded battery management systems where computational simplicity and real-time control are essential.

Future work will focus on experimental validation using hardware-in-the-loop systems, integration with onboard BMS platforms, and extending the model to other chemistries such as lithium iron phosphate (LFP) and solid-state cells.

References

1. Arora, P., White, R. E., & Doyle, M. (1998). Capacity fade mechanisms and side reactions in lithium-ion batteries. *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 145, 3647–3667.

2. Zhang, X., et al. (2018). A comprehensive review of charging strategies for lithium-ion batteries. *J. Power Sources*, 395, 133–144.

3. Keil, P., & Jossen, A. (2016). Charging protocols for lithium-ion batteries and their impact on cycle life—An experimental study. *J. Energy Storage*, 6, 125–141.

4. Saw, L. H., et al. (2016). Optimal battery thermal management system for electric vehicles. *Energy Convers. Manage.*, 87, 108–117.

5. Wang, Y., et al. (2019). A review of fast charging technologies for electric vehicles. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, 112, 109–120.

6. Kassem, M., et al. (2012). Calendar aging of a graphite/LiFePO4 cell. *J. Power Sources*, 208, 296–305.

7. Kim, G. H., et al. (2011). Multi-scale modeling of lithium-ion battery thermal management. *J. Electrochem. Soc.*, 158, A955.

8. Perez, H. E., et al. (2017). Optimal charging of Li-ion batteries with guaranteed health awareness. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, 65, 6084–6093.

9. Zhang, C., et al. (2020). Battery charging optimization via model-free reinforcement learning. *Appl. Energy*, 278, 115775.

10. Alavi, S. M., & Bakhshai, A. (2015). A fuzzy-logic-based approach for fast charging of Li-ion batteries. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, 62, 6541–6550.

11. Ren, D., et al. (2020). Role of temperature in the aging process of lithium-ion batteries: A review. *eTransportation*, 4, 100057.