ANALOGY ESTIMATION OF CURRENT DENSITY, OHMIC POTENTIAL LOSS IN THE COPPER ELECTROLYSIS CELL MODEL
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ABSTRACT
A computational model of a Copper electrolysis cell is presented. The model includes the microscopic mass transfer, electric field effects and the effects of the ohmic loss of potential in the cell bulk electrolyte. Estimation for the cell ohmic loss is created by utilizing electric field model of the cell and the function is applied to include the effects of ohmic loss to the cell model. The model structure enables computing the cell current, the electrode overpotential and the cell ohmic loss, with the only model input variable being the cell voltage. The cell model is implemented as a coupled computational model, which is solved with the finite elements method. In an electrolysis cell, whose dimensions can be accurately adjusted and measured. The electrode equation parameters are found by fitting the model against the data of one experiment, after which the model is evaluated against three other measurements.
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INTRODUCTION
The important industrial application of copper electrodeposition is the manufacturing process of Printed Circuit Boards (PCBs). In modern PCBs, the circuit is created on several board layers, and interconnections between these layers are also made within the board, in the copper electroplating process known as micro by way of filling (Moffat et al., 2000). This work depicts copper electrolysis cell model for the electrode processes, as well as the cell geometry and the corresponding ohmic loss of potential in the bulk electrolyte, in a single computational system, with a reasonable computational attempt. The presented model structure is trusted to make scaling up of computer models effortless, by slot in the effects that the physical dimensions of the cell apparatus have on the estimates produced by the model. Still more studies have been published related to similar processes that are applied in microchip production, where the time and length scales are ca. hundred-fold smaller (Kondo et al., 2003; Vereecken, 2005; Newman and Thomas, 2004).

In a conventional micro by way of fill electroplating system, where the plated boards are positioned vertically between two soluble anodes, the distance between the anode and the cathode can be altered up to 30 cm. The Copper deposition process is typically controlled galvanostatical DC regulated power supply (Aplab L 3230), so that a cell current, that corresponds to a desired average cathode current density, is maintained in the cell by (automatically) adjusting the cell power source output. As a current flows through the cell, the distance between the electrodes and the resistance of the electrolyte cause an ohmic drop of electric potential (iR -drop) to occur over the electrolyte (Newman and Thomas, 2004) were recorded for every 30 seconds up to 30 minutes. Even though a supporting electrolyte is regularly used in industrial PCB production lines, the ohmic loss over the electrolyte is still notable due to the distance between the electrodes (Khandpur, 2005). In order to maintain a desired average plating current density, the cell power source must compensate for the iR -drop by increasing the potential difference.
between the electrodes. As a result, the electrode potentials are directly affected by the ohmic loss in the bulk electrolyte.

No reference electrode is typically available by way of fill electroplating system, because such a device would become unreliable due to contamination. The cathode potential cannot be directly measured. Recent studies show that the electrolyte additives affect the copper reduction reaction, is dependent on the cathode potential (Li et al., 2009; Moffat et al., 2005). Also, the electrode potentials are important factors for the cell current efficiency (Pletcher and Walsh, 1990) and be considered when high-performance cells are designed. Several computational models in both the sub-micron scale and the micrometer scale have also been accounted (Andricacos et al., 1998; West et al., 2001; Georgiadou et al., 2001; Moffat et al., 2007).

Usually the presented models in spatial dimensions that is equal to those of the modeled surface feature. It is also the phenomena taking place in the bulk of the physical system affect the fill process. The phenomena included in the system model distance a wide range in magnitude, in both scales of time and length, which presents a multiscale modeling problem. This problems call for an opinion of the computational implementation techniques for including the individual sub-processes to the model. The presented model produces estimates for all of the mentioned sub-processes, i.e., the current densities and (over) potentials on the electrodes, as well as the ohmic potential drop over the electrolyte. The model is structured so that it enables incorporating the sub-models, which describe the microscopic phenomena taking place within micrometers (or nanometers) from the electrode surface, and those describing the electric potential loss phenomenon in the bulk electrolyte, into the same computational system.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experimental apparatus

The reported model structure is illustrated in Figure 1 and 1.1. The distance (L) between the counter electrode (CE) and the working electrode (WE), and the electrolyte depth (D) can be adjusted, but the width of the cell is constant (5 cm). The working electrode is connected to the positive point of the DC power source, which is relevant to signs of potential variables are considered. The cell design is simple, so that the cell was constructed; the dimensions of the cell and of the electrodes can be accurately adjusted and measured the effects that the physical dimensions of the cell have on the cell current–voltage response. It is illustrated how the cell dimensions are included in the cell model as input parameters, and how a three-dimensional electric field model of the experiment cell is utilized to determine a function for estimating the ohmic loss over the cell bulk electrolyte.

The current density related to the rate of an electrochemical reaction at a single electrode–electrolyte interface as a function of the electrode over potential (Pohjoranta and Tenno, 2007). Ohm’s law yields the potential difference over a non-ideal conductor, carrying a known current. By considering the electrolysis cell as a system consisting of two electrode–electrolyte interfaces that are connected by a non-ideal conductor (the electrolyte), the cell can be divided into three sub-systems, which are all coupled. The coupling between the subsystems is formed by the cell current and the cell voltage, which both are easily measurable. Also the implemented cell model contains three coupled sub-models, which are solved simultaneously. Firstly, the electrochemical reactions, as well as the microscopic mass transfer phenomena and the electric field close to both of the two electrodes are modeled. This produces a partial differential equation (PDE) system, which is solved with a finite elements method (FEM). Secondly, the effects of the iR -drop over the bulk electrolyte are included to the FEM model i.e., with a function. However, because the electrode current density is a non-linear function of cell voltage as function is utilized.

A systematic description of the function and its evaluation is found in (Corless et al., 1996), and some examples of its application in physics have been documented (Valuri et al., 2000). The function has previously been utilized to obtain semi analytical and numerical solutions for problems related to
transistors and diodes (Chen et al., 2007; Banwell, 2000; Jung and Guzeiwicz, 2009; Jain et al., 2006), and also to solar cells (Ding and Radhakrishnan, 2008; Kelly et al., 2003; Bard and Faulkner, 2001). The common characteristics of the cell model are the descriptive equations contain the exponential function. As the function is utilized to couple the electrode subsystems to the ohmic loss over the bulk electrolyte, estimating the processes on the electrodes with potential.

Figure 1: Photo graphs of the cell model structure:

![Figure 1](image1.png)

**Figure 1.1: Schematic view of the cell.** D -is electrolyte depth, L -is cell length, CE and WE -counter electrode and working electrode surface.

Though, as mentioned, the industrial copper plating processes are galvanostatic controlled experiments were chosen for model development. The model parameters are determined based on one reference case then the model is evaluated, where the cell dimensions are modified. To keep only an aqueous CuSO₄ electrolyte is used in the experiments. It should be noted, however, that in practical copper electroplating baths, a supporting electrolyte is normally used.
The cell iR-drop estimate $U_\Omega$

The primary potential distribution (Newman and Thomas, 2004; Haung and Hibbert, 1995) inside the cell is examined. The potential distribution in the cell is solved by assuming a homogenous electrolyte domain, with a constant electric conductivity $b$ (S m$^{-1}$). For this study, the assumption is justified by the short duration of the plating experiments described in the following Section and the small ratio of the electrode areas versus the electrolyte volume in the apparatus (Newman, 1966). It is considered that the solution concentration in the bulk remains approximately constant and homogenous throughout the experiments. In practical plating system the bulk electrolyte would be continuously agitated and, therefore, no concentration gradients would exist. The 3D model geometry is configured to match that of the experiment cell (Figure 1 and 1.1) with varied length $(L)$ and varied cross-sectional area $(W \times D)$. The potential field inside the cell is then solved with the Poisson equation

$$\nabla \cdot (-\sigma \nabla \phi) = 0$$  \[1\]

Where $\phi$ is the electric potential (V) and $\sigma$ is the electric conductivity (S/m) of the electrolyte. $\sigma$ is given the value that is measured for the electrolyte conductivity as described in Section 5 and, therefore, $\sigma = \sigma_0 = b = 3.35$ S/m. The boundary condition $\phi = 0$ set on one electrode boundary and a constant, but varied, average current density $i_{\text{set}}$ (A/m$^2$) is set on the other electrode boundary

$$-n \cdot (\sigma \nabla \phi) = i_{\text{set}}$$  \[2\]

The current density boundary condition (equation 2) should be considered an average condition because a current density is set; the current density on the boundary is not constant over the complete boundary. In addition, with the given boundary condition, the integral of the current density over the electrode, divided with the electrode area equals the set current density. The purpose of the described static electric field model is only to clarify the primary potential distribution inside the cell when the cell dimensions change, so that an estimate for the cell iR-drop can be formulated. The actual electrochemical system is not included in this model and only the primary potential distribution, obtained by solving (equation 1) in a perfectly homogenous electrolyte domain, is examined. Though the primary potential distribution model is only an approximation of the electric field in the electrochemical system, this approach was chosen to keep the analysis simple. The main aim with the model noted here to find a lumped estimate for $U_\Omega$ which is linear with respect to cell current.

**Electric field simulation results**

![Electric potential along a straight line connecting the center points of the electrodes](image)

Figure 2: The electric potential $\phi$ along a straight line connecting the center points of the electrodes. Boundary conditions are given as a zero-potential on one electrode and a current density of 200 A/m$^2$ on the other electrode

The results of the electric field simulation are in line with the well known analytical results (Mandin et al., 2004; Takahashi and Gross, 1999). In the bulk of the domain the potential changes linearly in the
direction of the cell length, and close to the electrodes the potential changes non-linearly. Figure 2 illustrates the electric potential level $\phi$ on a straight line from the center point of the anode to the center point of the cathode, when the modeled cell length $L = 10$ cm ($D = 1.5$ cm, $W = 1.0$ cm).

The simulated potential field inside the cell in three different cases of cell length can be seen that when the electrodes are close to each other ($L = 3$ cm), the electric field is very irregular over the whole electrolyte. Conversely, when the electrodes are further apart, an area of a very regular electric field exists in the cell. A close-up of the electric equipotential levels near the electrode surface is $l = 0.1$ m. The potential equipotential very near the electrode surface form hemispherical planes, as described by Newman in (Newman, 1966). As a conclusion of examining Figure 2, along with the known analytical results, the cell ohmic loss is estimated with a function consisting of three distinct parts:

![Figure 3: Effect of (a) the cell length ($l_\Omega$), (b) the cell cross-sectional area ($A_\Omega = W \times D$) and (c) the set electrode current density ($i_{set}$) on the ohmic loss estimate. Also the values obtained by using $U_{\Omega b}$ and $U_{\Omega, WE} + U_{\Omega, CE}$ are plotted to illustrate the effect of each term. In Figures (a) and (b), the boundary condition current density is set to 200 A/m$^2$ and in Figure (c) the cell length is 0.1 m and cross-sectional area $8.5 \times 10^{-2}$m$^2$]
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The estimate for the main bulk, \( U_{\Omega,b} \)

In the main bulk electrolyte the ohmic loss is estimated by assuming both the electrolyte composition and the current density distribution homogenous (Equation 3). This corresponds to considering the bulk electrolyte as resistor material.

\[
U_{\Omega,b} = R_{\Omega}I_{\text{cell}} = \frac{I_{\Omega}}{A_{\Omega}r_{\text{WE}}} i_{\text{WE}} A_{\text{WE}}
\]  

[3]

In Equation 3: \( I \) is the mean length (m) and \( A \) — the mean cross-sectional area (m\(^2\)) of the current path in the electrolyte, which are here approximated with \( L \) and \( W \times D \), respectively.

The estimate near the electrodes, \( U_{\Omega,e} \)

The estimate for ohmic loss in the area close to the electrodes, where the electric field and the current density field are non-uniform, is based on the geometrical analysis given in (Newman, 1966). Because the electrodes are shaped, the electric equipotential levels are assumed to adopt the shape of oblate hemispheres near the electrodes. The (hypothetical) potential difference \( \Delta U \) from an equipotential level at \( \xi \) in the electrolyte, to an electrode through which a total current \( A_{\text{e}}i_{\text{e}} \) (A) passes, can be then formulated as a function of \( \xi \) as \( \Delta U = r_{\text{e}}i_{\text{e}}/(2\sigma_{\text{b}}) \tan^{-1} \xi \). Here \( \xi \) is the first coordinate in the rotational elliptic coordinate system in \(^2\). \( r_{\text{e}} \) — is the radius of the electrode disk (m) and \( i_{\text{e}} \) — the average current density \((\text{A}/\text{m}^2)\) on the electrode. At the limit, when \( \xi \) approaches infinity, the potential difference becomes \( \pi r_{\text{e}}i_{\text{e}}/(4\sigma_{\text{b}}) \).

As is shown in (Newman, 1966), the potential difference between the electrode and \( \xi \) increases rapidly when the areas near the electrode is examined. This phenomenon is also seen in Figure 2, at both ends of the plot. Therefore, the limit value for \( \Delta U \) is adopted here as the ohmic potential loss estimate at the electrodes and

\[
U_{\Omega,e} = \frac{\pi r_{\text{e}}}{(4\sigma_{\text{b}})} i_{\text{e}}
\]  

[4]

Full cell ohmic loss estimate

The full ohmic loss estimate is a sum of the terms in the bulk and near both of the electrodes, and is a linear function of \( i_{\text{WE}} \), as given in (Equation 5) and (Equation 6).

\[
U_{\Omega,e} = i_{\text{WE}} K_{\Omega}
\]  

[5]

\[
K_{\Omega} = \frac{\pi r_{\text{WE}}}{\sigma_{\text{b}}} \left(\frac{r_{\text{WE}} l_{\Omega}}{A_{\Omega}} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{k_{\Omega}}}\right)
\]  

[6]

Comparison of the estimate and the model

The estimate for the cell ohmic loss (Equation 5) is compared against the estimate in Figure 3. For the estimate, the plotted value is the potential difference between the electrodes. The estimate does overestimate the cell ohmic loss slightly, presumably because the electrodes are not infinitely far apart, which was assumed when formulating (equation 4). In Figure 3 (a), the estimate error, calculated as the difference between the estimates, are from −3 mV to −4 mV, when the cell length is above 3 cm. In Figure 3(b) the error is from 2 mV to −4 mV over the whole simulation range and in Figure3(c) the maximum error is −14 mV. Therefore, the estimates and the model can be observed to match rather well when the cell length is above 3 cm. For comparison, the estimate for ohmic loss in the main electrolyte bulk only, \( U_{\Omega,b} \), as well as the sum of the estimates near the electrodes, \( U_{\Omega,WE} + U_{\Omega,CE} \), are also shown. It is clear that neither of these alone would be a satisfactory estimate. The estimate can be observed to correspond sufficiently well with the model when the cell length is above 3 cm.

It is presumed, that when the estimate obtained by using the model is utilized in the electrolysis cell model, the quality of the final modeling results also express the quality of the estimate and model, equally.
The electrolyte domain

Mass transfer

Mass balance of the Cu$^{2+}$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ ions are considered in the model. The copper redox reactions cause a concentration gradient in the electrolyte close to the electrode surfaces and, consequently, mass transfer of these ions arises. Mass transfer is considered to be dominated by diffusion and migration (Newman and Thomas, 2004), with the electroneutrality condition valid, i.e., $\sum z_i c_i = 0$, where $c_i$ is the concentration (mol/m$^3$) of species $i$.

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_i \nabla c_i + z_i \frac{D_i}{RT} F c_i \nabla \phi)$$  \hspace{1cm} [7]

Convective mass transfer is not considered because (i) no agitation of the electrolyte is applied in the experiments and (ii) natural convection caused by density variations in the electrolyte are assumed small due to the short duration of the plating experiments. Several studies related to the mass transfer effects of convection have been published, e.g. (Mandin et al., 2004; Takahashi and Gross, 1999; Dow et al., 2005; COSMOL, 2008; Coombs, 2008; Kanagasabapathy) and, clearly, convective mass transfer should be considered separately per case.

The initial distribution of species is assumed uniform all over the system and equal to the bulk solution conditions, i.e.

$$n - n_e = n_{a,e}$$  \hspace{1cm} [8]

$n_e$ denotes the boundary outward normal vector.

The electric field

The electric potential $\phi(V)$ is solved based on the conservation of charge and coupled to the Nernst–Planck mass transfer system. Conservation of charge is maintained by setting $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{i} = 0$, where $\mathbf{i} = F \sum z_i \left(D_i \nabla c_i + F z_i \frac{D_i}{RT} c_i \nabla \phi\right) = i_e$ is the current density (A/m$^2$) corresponding to the mass transfer of ions in the electrolyte.

The boundary conditions are given as a fixed potential condition on one electrode boundary, where $\phi = \Delta \phi_e$, and as a current density condition (Equation 9) on the other electrode boundary.

$$-n_e F_{Z_{Cu}} \left(-D_{Cu} \nabla c_{Cu} - F z_{Cu} \frac{D_{Cu}}{RT} c_{Cu} \nabla \phi\right) = i_e$$  \hspace{1cm} [9]

In order to reduce the cell model size, mass transfer and the electric field in the bulk electrolyte are not included in the cell model explicitly.

Cell potential and cell current

The electromotive force driving the electrolysis is the cell power source output voltage, denoted $E_{out}$ (V). $E_{out}$ is consumed in the work done on the metal–electrolyte interfaces in order to transfer charge and mass according to (Equation 7), and in the bulk electrolyte to conduct current through it. The potential loss corresponding to the work done in the charge transfer reactions is represented by the electrode overpotential, denoted $\eta_{WE}$ and $\eta_{CE}$. The cell ohmic loss being $U_Q(V)$, the cell voltage can be written as a sum of these three components (Equation 11).

$$E_{out} = \eta_{WE} - \eta_{CE} + U_Q$$  \hspace{1cm} [10]

The contribution of concentration overpotential is not shown explicitly in (Equation 11). However, the potential of both electrodes is measured versus the same reference point; the concentration overpotential contribution is included through the electrode equilibrium potential terms in (Equation 11).

Cell current

The cell current, $I_{cell}$ (A) can be computed based on the electrode area ($A_e$ m$^2$) and electrode current density ($i_e$) of either one of the electrodes; $I_{cell} = A_e i_e$. Furthermore, since only one current runs through the cell, it couples the electrode current densities in proportion to their surface areas as

$$A_{WE} i_{WE} + A_{CE} i_{CE} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} [11]
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Equation (11) is utilized to derive the expressions for the potential components $\eta_i$ and $U_\Omega$ on the RHS of (Equation 10)

Overpotential terms
In the following, it is described how the working electrode overpotential (WE) is obtained as a function of the cell power source output $E_{out}$. The same applies to the equation for the WE current density ($i_{WE}$), which is also introduced below.

The coupling between WE and $E_{out}$ is obtained through the Butler-Volmer Equation (8) and the Kirchhoff’s laws applied on the cell circuit. The bi-directional form of Equation (8), however, does not enable solving electrode overpotential analytically and, therefore, a one-directional approximation of Equation (8) at each electrode is taken as the starting point. Equation (11) is applied next to couple the electrode current densities ($i_{WE}$ and $i_{CE}$) together through the electrode areas, which enables eliminating $i_{CE}$ from the equation system. Similarly, the voltage law Equation (10), enables formulating CE as a function of WE, and thereby, enables eliminating CE from the equation system. The ohmic loss of potential occurring in the cell ($U_\Omega$) is approximated with the estimate in Equation (5), which gives $U_\Omega$ as a function of the cell geometry, the bulk electrolyte conductivity and the working electrode current density.

Model implementation
All simulations were carried out using the Multiphysics solver software (Kanagasabapathy; MATLAB; Weisstein, 2008 Subramanian, 2006) and a desktop PC (2.4 GHz 2 Quad, 3.24 GB). The finite elements method (FEM) to solve the partial differential equation systems and standard, second order Lagrangian shape functions were used in all cases.

The Nernst–Planck mass transfer system for Cu$^{2+}$ and SO$_4^{2-}$ ions coupled with the electric field in the area of the electrodes was configured as an axially symmetric model. Though smaller than what would be allowed by the experiment apparatus, the model domain at each electrode was made wide enough so that no concentration change could be observed at the model boundaries during the simulations.

Table 1: Cell dimensions in the experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>L × D × W (m × m × m)</th>
<th>$A_{WE}$ (m$^2$)</th>
<th>$A_{CE}$ (m$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.03 × 0.21 × 0.005</td>
<td>7.85 × 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>1.65 × 10$^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.10 × 0.017 × 0.005</td>
<td>7.85 × 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>1.65 × 10$^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.16 × 0.017 × 0.005</td>
<td>7.85 × 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>1.65 × 10$^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.03 × 0.028 × 0.005</td>
<td>7.85 × 10$^{-7}$</td>
<td>7.85 × 10$^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The geometric model parameters corresponding to the experiment cases ($l_\Omega = L$ , $A_\Omega = D \times W$, $k_A = A_{CE}/A_{WE}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$l_\Omega$</th>
<th>$A_\Omega$ (m$^2$)</th>
<th>$k_A$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.05 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>8.5 × 10$^{-5}$</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>8.5 × 10$^{-5}$</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.4 × 10$^{-4}$</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental
The cell described in Figure 1. Aqueous CuSO$_4$ in a concentration of 500 mol/m$^3$ was used as the electrolyte solution in all tests. The electrolyte was prepared by dissolving AR grade copper sulfate (CuSO$_4$·5H$_2$O) in deionized water. Cross-sectioned copper wires with a diameter of 1.0 cm X 1.5 cm,
Imbedded in counter electrodes. The electrodes were polished and rinsed with sulfuric acid and deionized water before each experiment series. The cell width (W) was constant at 0.5 cm in all tests, but the cell depth (D) was varied from 2.0 cm to 3.0 cm and the cell length (L) was varied from 3 cm to 15 cm, in order to modify the cell resistance between experiments.

In addition, the effect of the electrode area ratio \( k_a \) was tested by varying the counter electrode (CE) copper wire of electrolytic grade (99.6%) diameter from 1.0 x 1.5 cm². This corresponds to a variation from 1 to 2 in the electrode area ratio, which is in the range of typical PCB manufacturing line operating conditions (Moffat et al., 2000). The working electrode (WE) diameter was constant at 1.0 x 2.0 cm² in all experiments.

In all experiments, the cell voltage was swept from 0V to −0.5 V and with a sweep rate of 50 mV/s, as also shown in Figure 4 \( (E_{out}) \). The working electrode overpotential was measured against reference electrode (RE) was saturated calomel electrode (SCE, \( E^0 = +0.2422 \) V). All experiments were repeated and the results were found consistent.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The electrolysis cell model geometry was configured according to the dimensions measured from the experiment cell Table 1. Electrode morphology was considered equal on both electrodes and, therefore, omitted from the model. The electrodes were assumed perfectly the geometric areas of the electrodes were used as the electrode areas. During model validation, the estimates produced by the model were compared to the data from the other experiment cases, while keeping all other but the geometric parameters in the model constant. The geometry parameters were changed according to the experiment conditions, as listed in Table 2. The simulation results are shown in Figs. 4–9. Figure 4 illustrates the electric potential components in the cell system as estimated by the model in the reference case \( S_1 \).

Figure 4: Cell potential \( E_{out} \), potentials \( U_\Omega, \Delta\phi_{WE} \), \( E \), \( \Delta\phi_{CE} \) as estimated by the model.

Figure 5: WE current density- cases \( S_1, M \) and \( L \). (cell length, \( l \), changes 3 cm to 15 cm.)

The electrode potentials are calculated with Equation (10) and the electrolyte ohmic loss with Equation (5). Also the cell power source output \( (E_{out}) \) is given.
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Figure 6: WE overpotential - cases S₁, M and L.
Figure 7: WE current density - cases S₁ and S₂. (Electrode area ratio, kₐ, changes from 2.1 to 1.)

Figure 8: WE overpotential - cases S₁ and S₂.
Figure 9: Output of the numerical function close to −1/e.

Figs. 8 and 9 show the estimate for the WE current density (iₜ Literature) and overpotential (WE), and the corresponding measured values, when the cell dimensions are varied. A small difference between the estimated and measured curve can be consistently observed during the return part of the cathodic sweep in both figures.

The proportional error is within ±3% of measured value during 0–10 sec of the sweep, but rises up to 30% close to the 30 sec time instant, when the current is small. In the compared cases, the error is similar but slightly smaller. Analogously to the current density estimate, also the reference case estimate for the WE overpotential (Figure 9) deviates from −5 mV to 20 mV from the measured value, depending on the sweep time instant.

A model structure that enables incorporating the ohmic loss of potential over the bulk electrolyte to an electrolysis cell model was presented. A lumped estimate for the cell ohmic potential loss was created by

---
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utilizing a 3D model of the primary potential distribution in the cell. It was found that the ohmic loss obtained with the examined 3D model can be fairly accurately estimated with a scalar function of the cell geometry, the bulk electrolyte conductivity and the cell current. The cell model was implemented computationally as a Finite Elements Model (FEM) including the estimate for ohmic loss. The model was found computationally light, feasible for online control development purposes. The electrode equation parameters for the cell model were found by fitting the model output with the data of one reference case measurement.
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