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Abstract—Battery fault diagnosis is crucial for stable, reliable, and safe operation of electric vehicles, especially the thermal runaway early warning. Developing methods for early failure detection and reducing safety risks from failing high energy lithium-ion batteries has become a major challenge for industry. In this work, a real-time early fault diagnosis scheme for lithium-ion batteries is proposed. By applying both the discrete Fréchet distance (DFD) and local outlier factor (LOF) to the voltage and temperature data of the battery cell/module that measured in real time, the battery cell that will have thermal runaway is detected before thermal runaway happens. Compared with the widely used single parameter based diagnosis approach, the proposed one considerably improve the reliability of the fault diagnosis and reduce the false diagnosis rate. The effectiveness of the proposed method is validated with the operational data from electric vehicles with/without thermal runaway in daily use.

Index Terms—Lithium-ion battery, Fault diagnosis, Discrete Fréchet distance, Local outlier factor

I. INTRODUCTION

With the ambition to achieve carbon neutrality in 2050, vehicle electrification has been attracting a significant amount of attention [1]. Lithium-ion batteries (LIBs) are widely used for applications on electric vehicles (EVs) due to their relatively low self-discharge rates, high energy density, high power density, long cycle life compared with the counterparts such as lead-acid batteries, nickel-cadmium batteries, nickel-hydrogen batteries, etc. [2]. To meet the voltage, power, and energy requirements of the applications, a typical LIB system contains many battery cells connected in series and parallel [3, 4]. It is of high importance and also quite challenging to maintain safety of battery packs under complex operating conditions [5]. Recently, the increasing number of reported EV fire accidents has drawn much attention, most of which are due to battery system catching fire [6, 7]. As a result, the fault diagnosis and early detection of thermal runaway of EVs become essential.

However, the failure mechanism of LIB system is extremely complicated because it is a non-linear time-varying system with a mass of dynamic electrochemical and mechanical phenomena [8–10]. Faults of the LIB system can be categorized into internal and external ones [11]. The former include overcharge, over-discharge, internal short circuit, external short circuit, and overheat. The latter include fault of sensors, connection, and cooling system. Both of the two types of faults can lead to abnormal voltages, temperatures, and pressure in the battery pack [12, 13]. Nonetheless, there is a higher possibility that the internal faults cause a fire accident or explosion rather than the external faults.

The fault diagnosis approaches of LIB systems can be classified into three types: a) rule-based, b) model-based, and c) data-driven methods. For rule-based methods, if the value of critical parameters, such as voltage and temperature exceed the specified threshold, an alarm will be tripped. For example, Pesaran et al. [14] suggested the maximum temperature difference between modules should be less than 5°C. To diagnose external short circuit fault, Xia et al. [15] proposed three diagnostic criteria utilizing measurement parameters such as the voltage, current and temperature increase. However, the appropriate threshold is hard to define, due to the complex operating circumstances of the EV. If the threshold is too low, the alarm can be too sensitive and easily faultly tripped; on the other hand, if the threshold is too high, when the alarm is tripped, severe faults may already happen and make the fault detection meaningless.

For model-based methods, analytical models are used to generate residuals which can be monitored and analyzed to detect faults. With simulation on a three-cell battery string model, Chen et al. [16] proposed a bank of reduced-order Luenberger observers and the learning observers for fault
isolation and estimation. Liu et al. [17] developed adaptive extended Kalman filter (AEKF) to estimate output voltage of equivalent circuit models (ECM) and detect sensor fault by residual evaluation. Dey et al. presented a thermal model to diagnose thermal faults of LIBs by Luenberger observer [18], nonlinear observer [19], partial differential equation [20]. Feng et al. [21, 22] raised an electrochemical-thermal coupled model to internal short circuit. In general, the model-based methods are more accurate and reliable than threshold-based methods. Nevertheless, the computational cost is much larger, and some sophisticated and highly coupled electrochemical models can hardly be implemented for online implementation.

In recent years, data-driven fault diagnosis methods are drawing more and more attention, including statistical methods [23], signal-based [10], machine learning [24], etc. Xia et al. [25] applied the correlation coefficient between cell voltages to identify the short circuit fault. On top of this, by incorporating also the measured battery cell data from the lab setup, Kang et al. [26] implemented an improved correlation coefficient method to diagnose several types of faults, such as short circuits, sensor faults, and connection faults. To detect connection failure, Yao built general regression neural networks (GRNN) and grid search support vector machine [27, 28]. Chen et al. [29] proposed local outlier factor (LOF) and Grubbs outlier filter to identify the battery with abnormal internal resistance. The above methods however have not been verified by operational data from vehicles in daily use. The fault diagnosis approaches by using cloud data platform, which is in real-time gathering the operational data from vehicles in daily use, are thus studied. Based on statistics, Zhao et al. [30] proposed a 3σ multi-level screening strategy to find the faulty cell. Based on this, a combined method of k-mean clustering, z-score, and 3σ screening approach is used to locate abnormal cells by Xue [31]. Li et al. [32] utilized the interclass correlation coefficient (ICC) method to detect voltage faults. Hong et al. [33, 34] established a fault diagnosis mechanism for voltage and temperature faults.

Fig. 1. Schematic of the proposed method
using the modified Shannon entropy approach respectively. In order to overcome the difficulty of selecting the calculation window, Hong proposed the modified multiscale sample entropy to predict the thermal runaway of lithium-ion battery [35]. Li et al. [36] combine Long Short-Term Memory Neural Network (LSTMN) and ECM to diagnose over-voltage and under-voltage. These methods focus more on the diagnosis of single-parameter faults, such as voltage or temperature, rather than multiple parameters coupled with each other in actual battery operation. Thus, they also overlook the information regarding fault reflected by other parameters. In this paper, a multi-parameter-based battery early fault diagnosis approach is proposed. The operational data of EV batteries are obtained from the National Big Data Alliance of New Energy Vehicles (NDANEV) in Beijing, including the voltages and temperatures of the battery cells. As shown in Fig. 1, the fault diagnosis approach has two layers. The first layer is for severe fault detection, which the battery cell voltage and temperature are compared with predefined upper and lower limits (for temperature only upper limit). Once the voltage or temperature is beyond the limit, alarm is tripped. Since severe faults already happen in this scenario, the battery management system will stop the operation of the EV ASAP. As the first layer is nothing new, it will not be further elaborated. The focus of this paper and the major challenge are the second layer, where severe faults have not happened yet, but some battery cells already show abnormalities. If they are detected, damage of the battery will be avoided. Moreover, it will also buy enough time to remind the driver of the EV to go for maintenance. In the end, the cost of the fault will be very much reduced.

However, to identify the abnormal voltages or temperatures is complicated as they marginally deviate from the normal value, thus false alarm often happens, especially only single parameter (voltage or temperature) is used for diagnosis. To improve the reliability of the fault diagnosis, the correlation of the voltage and temperature is considered in the second layer by combining the discrete Fréchet distance with the LOF. More details are elaborated in Section II. The content of this paper is structured as follows: Section II explains the data source and studied battery systems. In Section III, diagnostic strategies based on voltage and temperature data are described. Results and discussions are presented in Section IV. Finally, conclusions are summarized in Section V.

II. DATA SOURCE AND ONLINE DIAGNOSIS PROCESS

A. NDANEV

As depicted in Fig. 2, the NDANEV is built to provide data resources of BEV for researchers and pursue a safe operation of EVs. Using real-operating data of battery systems from NDANEV can solve the problem of insufficient BMS calculation capabilities. According to the protocol named technical specifications of remote service and management system for EVs, vehicle status data and power battery data are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of vehicle</th>
<th>Cathode Chemistry</th>
<th>The number of voltage sensors</th>
<th>The number of temperature sensors</th>
<th>The resolution of the voltage sensor (V)</th>
<th>The resolution of the temperature sensor (°C)</th>
<th>Vehicle state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle 1#</td>
<td>Li(NiMnCo)O2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thermal runaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle 2#</td>
<td>Li(NiMnCo)O2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle 3#</td>
<td>Li(NiMnCo)O2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thermal runaway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Data Collection Schematic

Fig. 3. Structure of the battery pack: (a) battery cell. (b) one battery module. (c) the connection structure of the modules

TABLE I
DETAILED INFORMATION OF ALL VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal capacity (Ah)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voltage range (V)</td>
<td>266–408.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total energy (kWh)</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery pack size (length * width * height, mm)</td>
<td>2040<em>1096</em>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell nominal voltage (V)</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating temperature (°C)</td>
<td>-30 ~ 55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collected from real running vehicles. To be more specific, power battery data includes voltage and current of battery pack, cell voltage, and temperature. Vehicle status data consist of speed, mileage, and positional information.

B. Object of study

Two accident EVs (vehicle 1# and vehicle 3#) and one normal EV (vehicle 2#) with a data sampling frequency of 0.1Hz are considered in this study. Some more information of the EVs is shown in Table 1. Vehicle 1 and vehicle 2# are of the same model, while vehicle 3# is a different model. Vehicle 1# is used as the training the detection approach. Vehicles 2# and 3# are utilized to verify it. The battery pack of vehicle 1# and 2# consists 17 modules (95 cells in total) connected in series, and has 95 voltage sensors and 34 temperature sensors, as indicated in Fig. 3 and Table 1. The LIB system of the vehicle 3# is a bit different, and it has 84 cells connected in series and 28 temperature sensors. In this paper, the algorithm code was compiled based on Python 3.7.5 and implemented on a PC (processor AMD Ryzen 7 4800H with Radeon Graphics CPU @2.9GHz).

Taking vehicle 1# as an example, the voltage and temperature of the accident vehicle 1# near the thermal runaway are shown in Fig. 4. Note that, since the sampling rate is 0.1 Hz, there is one frame per 10 seconds. However, as a rule of the NDANEV, the data sampling only happens when the vehicle is running. Thus, the voltage and temperature shown in Fig. 4 are the same as the voltage and temperature in time series but with the data during parking (except charging) of the vehicle cut out. Nonetheless, it would not affect the fault detection, since faults rarely happen during parking while not charging. As seen in the figure, the battery pack encountered a thermal runaway during charging process. The No.17 cell of module 4# is the source that triggered the thermal runaway. An over-discharge warning (under 2.8 V) occurred in the No.17 cell whose voltage was 0.03V at the 5241-th frame (2019-07-05 14:27:32) in Fig. 4a. But the maximum temperature of this LIB system was 50 °C (below 55 °C), as depicted in Fig. 4b, which proves the ineffectiveness of the fault detection approaches that rely on one parameter. After the accident, the battery system structure has been severely damaged, as seen in Fig. 4c.

C. Online diagnosis process

The first layer algorithm is applied every time point. The voltage and temperature of one battery primarily measured at one time point is compared with two thresholds, upper and lower. If the voltage/temperature at that time point is beyond the upper threshold, the battery is considered as over-voltage/over-heat; if the voltage is below the lower threshold, the battery is considered as under-voltage. It is usually used for detection of extreme over-voltage, under-voltage/over-heat. If no alarm occurred during the first level detection process, the second layer is activated. Firstly, abnormal behavior has not been detected by the first layer. When maximum voltage range or temperature range in charging/discharging cycles is more than 0.06 V or 3°C at time te, all voltage/temperature data from the start of cycle (charging/discharging) to time te will be used as input for the discrete Fréchet distance (DFD) and LOF. If the LOF values of voltage/temperature less than the given threshold, no alarm will be triggered. On the contrary, the faulty cell/module can be diagnosed and effective measures should be taken to prevent further damage from happening.

III. EARLY STAGE ABNORMAL OPERATION DETECTION OF BATTERY

Thermal runaway of battery system is always triggered by various kinds of abuse, including mechanical abuse, electrical abuse, and thermal abuse. The mechanical abuse condition includes crash, penetration and bend. Overheating and fire exposure belong to the thermal abuse. Overcharge, over discharge and short circuit are electrical abuse. In the case of electrical abuse or faults, multiple failure modes can be coupled to result in complicated mechanism. Without suitable diagnostics and fault handling, a minor fault of battery system could develop into thermal runaway [37]. Voltage and temperature are the two factors controlling the battery reactions. To prevent thermal runaway and other severe damage of the battery pack, the abnormal cell or module should be identified before the severe damage happens. In order to achieve this, the LOF of the battery cell voltages can be calculated at each time being. The cell which has the largest LOF is then considered as the abnormal cell. However, this approach does not consider the correlation of the voltages of one cell at different time beings. In fact, in the early stage of abnormal operation, the cell voltage/temperature will gradually deviate from the healthy cells. This gradual change in the cell voltage/temperature can be very useful for detecting the abnormal operation. Therefore, the discrete Fréchet distance (DFD) between the voltage/temperature curve of a cell and the median voltage/temperature curve is calculated first, where Savitzky-Golay filter is employed to remove the noise from the voltage and temperature data beforehand. Then LOF is calculated based on DFD and standard deviation of each cell voltage and module temperature in time series. The LOF value is then used to judge if the cell is in early stage of a fault or abnormal operation. More details are as follows,

A. Discrete Fréchet Distance

Owing to the discrete acquisition data, the discrete Fréchet distance (DFD) with origin from Fréchet Distance [38] needed to be used [39]. The DFD was defined by Eiter and Mannila in 1994 and was further expanded by Mosig et al. in 2005 [40, 41].

As mentioned above, the cell voltage and module temperature are monitored and recorded with 0.1 Hz sampling frequency. The time series voltage and temperature are chopped into pieces for analysis. The starting and ending point of each piece is actually the starting of a charging event and the next charging event, respectively. As such, an abnormal operation detection of the battery is executed after each charging/discharging cycle, and not data point is missing in the analysis. Taking the piece between t0 to tE as an example to elaborate the detection approach, the cell voltages are expressed as:
Fig. 4. Vehicle 1#: (a) voltages (cell 1 to 95); (b) temperature (sensor 1 to 34); (c) battery pack and module 4 after fire

\[
U^{i-t} = \begin{bmatrix}
U^{i_0-t_0} \\
\vdots \\
U^{i_{n-1}-t_{n-1}} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[U^{i_0-t_0} = [u^{i_0}, u^{i_1}, \ldots, u^{i_n}] \]

where \( n \) is the total number of cells, so \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). The median voltage vector between time \( t_0 \) and time \( t_e \) is indicated as:

\[
\overline{U}^{i-t} = \left[ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^{i_0}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^{i_1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u^{i_n} \right]
\]

In order to eliminate the influence of cell voltage bias error on the DFD, the voltages of each cell are deducted by a bias voltage, so that the initial voltages of all the cells will equal to the median value of the initial voltages of all cells. The bias voltage deduction for the \( i \)-th cell is defined as,

\[u_{bud,i} = u^{i_0} - \overline{u}^{i} \]

The calibrated cell voltages then become,

\[
U^{i-t}_{\text{cali}} = \begin{bmatrix}
U^{i_0-t_0}_{\text{cali},i} \\
\vdots \\
U^{i_{n-1}-t_{n-1}}_{\text{cali},i} \\
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
U^{i_0-t_0}_{i} - u_{bud,i} \\
\vdots \\
U^{i_{n-1}-t_{n-1}}_{i} - u_{bud,i} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( U^{i_0-t_0}_{\text{cali},i} = [u^{i_0}_{\text{cali},i}, u^{i_1}_{\text{cali},i}, \ldots, u^{i_n}_{\text{cali},i}] \).

The DFD between the calibrated voltages of the \( i \)- and the median voltage vector \( \overline{U}^{i-t} \) is then calculated and shown as below,

\[DFD_i = \inf_{u_{\text{bud},i}} \max_{\alpha, \beta} \left| u^{\alpha}_{\text{cali},i} - \overline{u}^{\beta} \right| \]
B. Local Outlier Factor
In the end, each cell should be represented by two parameters as input of LOF calculation. Beside DFD, the standard deviation of each cell’s voltage between $t_0 \sim t_e$ is used as the other parameter, and it is calculated as,

$$\sigma_i = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (u_i' - \mu)^2}$$

where $\mu = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n} u_i'$. So $i$-th cell now is expressed as $(DFD_i, \sigma_i)$. LOF of $i$-th cell’s voltage is depicted as $LOF_i(u)$. More details of the LOF calculation can be found in [27]. Similarly, LOF of $i$-th module’s temperature can be calculated, and it is illustrated as $LOF_i(T)$. Note that since the temperature sensor resolution is 1℃, the LOF values of temperatures are reset to 0 if the temperature variation is less than 3 ℃. A cell or module will be labeled as abnormal, if $LOF_i(u)$ or $LOF_i(T)$ is beyond the threshold. The flag $F_u$ or $F_T$ is then set to 1, as follows,

$$F_u^i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } LOF_i(u) \geq \delta^u \\ 0, & \text{if } LOF_i(u) < \delta^u \end{cases}$$

where $\delta^u$ and $\delta^T$ are the LOF threshold of voltage and temperature, respectively. Apparently, these two thresholds affect the sensitivity of the detection. Moreover, the LOF value relates to $k$. The selection of $k$, $\delta^u$ and $\delta^T$ is then elaborated as follows.

C. Selection of $k$ and threshold $\delta$
The goal of setting $k$, $\delta^u$ and $\delta^T$ is that abnormal cells and modules can be screened out as outliers and require a low calculation time. The evaluation function is expressed as

$$E(k) = \frac{\Delta LOF(k)}{t_{cal}(k)}$$

where $t_{cal}(k)$ is calculation time, and $\Delta LOF(k)$ is the maximum LOF variation at $k$. Thus, larger value of $E(k)$ indicates that the abnormal cells are more differentiated from the normal cells, and thereby the detection becomes easier. The idea here is to use the data from an accident vehicle to extract a proper value of $k$, $\delta^u$ and $\delta^T$. Fig. 5a shows the voltage LOF value of No.17 cell and other cells at different $k$ of the accident vehicle.

Fig. 6. The LOF value for vehicle 1# at different cycle:(a) charging voltage data (b) discharging voltage data, (c) charging temperature data (d) discharging temperature data
vehicle 1#, where the time piece includes the time being of the fault shown in Fig. 4. Fig. 5b shows $t_{\text{cons}(k)}$ of No.17 cell as a function of $k$. As seen, $E(k)$ has the maximum value at $k=8$. Therefore, the $k$ in this paper is taken as 8.

The charging data are relatively stable, while the data during the discharging process are more complex. In this paper, the charging and discharging conditions are studied separately. Charging and discharging processes with less than 50 frames are excluded from the pre-processing. As shown in Fig. 4, thermal runaway happens to the cell No.17. To prevent thermal runaway, the fault needs to be detected in its early stage. The data of vehicle 1# two minutes before the thermal runaway (14:27:22, 2019-07-05) is then used to train the detection algorithm, where both the voltage and temperature are within the safe range, and the layer 1 is not tripped yet. The LOF of the voltage and temperature are then calculated and they are shown in Fig. 6. The voltage LOF of No.17 cell is greater than 20 during the 148th charging cycle. Before it, the voltage LOF during charging is not higher than 5. The voltage LOF does not exceed 15 during discharging cycle. Fig. 6c show that the temperature LOF of No.7 sensor (which is the in the same module as the No. 17 cell) within module 4# is much larger than 30, while others are less than 14 during charging. Fig. 6d shows the temperature LOF of all sensors during discharging is less than 28. Therefore, the voltage diagnostic factor $\delta^v$ is set to 15, and the temperature diagnostic factor $\delta^t$ is set to 30.

Fig. 7. The last charging process of vehicle 1#: (a) voltage curve (cell 1 to 95), (b) the LOF value of voltage, (c) temperature curve (sensor 1 to 34), (d) the lof value of temperature.

Fig. 8. Parametric curves of vehicle 2#: (a) voltages values (cell 1 to 95); (b) The temperature values (sensor 1 to 34)
D. Verifying the approach

Taking the voltage and temperature data of 148th charging process for vehicle 1# as an example, all data are shown in Fig. 7 and the vehicle caught fire at the 307th frame (14:28:52, 2019-07-05, event ⊗ in Fig. 7a). As shown in Fig. 7a, the cell No. 17 was detected under-voltage (first layer) at event ⊝, which is 8 frames earlier than thermal runaway (298th frame, 14:27:22, 2019-07-05). While by using LOF voltage-based detection (second layer), the faulty cell No. 17 can be detected at frame 277, which is 21 frames earlier than the first layer detection. It might be noted that in Fig. 7c, the LOF is null before frame 256. That is because, LOF calculation of voltage is only activated when the voltage difference is larger than 0.06 V, which is only the case science frame 256.

Fig. 7b and Fig. 7d shows the comparison between the first and second layer detection in terms of temperature. Specifically, the first layer detection is not tripped because the temperature is always below the threshold (typically 55 °C for EV batteries, red line in Fig 7b). However, with the second layer detection relying on LOF of temperature, the faulty cell is detected at frame 241 (event ⊞), which is 66 frames (660 s) earlier than thermal runaway. Note that, each temperature sensor is shared two or three cells, and the temperature sensor No. 7 is the one most close to the cell No. 17.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Validity Analysis

Vehicle 2# (same model as vehicle 1#, but with no fault happened) is selected to verify if the proposed detection

![Fig. 9. The LOF value of (a) voltage data and (b) temperature data of vehicle 2# during charging and discharging processes](image)

![Fig. 10. The last discharging process of vehicle 3#: (a) voltage curve (cell 1 to 84), (b) the LOF value of voltage, (c) temperature curve (sensor 1 to 28), (d) the LOF value of temperature.](image)
approach can have faulty trip. Fig. 8a and Fig. 8b showed the voltage and temperature of the cells during a whole charging and discharging cycle. In the two processes, the maximum voltage and minimum voltage in the battery system are respectively 4.24V and 3.63V, and the maximum temperature is 38 °C. These values are in the normal range, so no alarm can be tripped in the first layer.

The voltage and temperature LOF are shown in Fig. 9. As seen, the voltage LOF is always less than 3, no matter in charging (C1) or discharging (D1), and it is far lower than the threshold 15. The temperature LOF is always less than 1. Therefore, it can be concluded that battery that in normal condition will not trip the proposed detection approach in the second layer.

B. Universality analysis

Vehicle 3#, which is a different model from vehicle 1# but also encountered thermal runaway, is selected to verify if the proposed detection approach is effective in a generic way. The battery system of vehicle 3# caught fire during discharging on March 14, 2019. The ignition source was No. 47 cell of module 4# according to the incident investigation. From 20:48:19, on March 13, 2019, to 12:22:59, on March 14, 2019, voltage data of the last discharging cycle of vehicle 3# were shown in Fig. 10a. Before the 928th frame (09:59:03, 2019-03-14), voltage values of all cells were within normal range. After the 928th frame, voltage data of all cells including No.47 were 1.44V, which can trigger an under-voltage alarm on the first layer because the voltage is lower than the cut-off voltage in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10a. At the 1064th frame (12:22:59, 2019-03-14), the vehicle 3# has experienced thermal runaway and data cannot be obtained in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10a. The original temperature curve during the 3rd discharging process was shown in Fig. 10c. At the 859th frame (08:25:34, 2019-03-14), the temperature of No.13 and No.14 sensors from module 4# reached 60 °C and an overheat alarm of the first layer was triggered in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10a.

The voltage and temperature LOF values of vehicle 3# for fault detection were shown in Fig. 10b and Fig. 10d. At the 829th frame, (08:25:08, 2019-03-14) in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10b, the No.47 cell is detected by the second layer, which is 1000 s earlier than the over voltage detection in the first layer. As shown in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10d, the temperature of No.13 sensor can be detected at 145th frame (04:57:45, 2019-03-14). This abnormal temperature alarm lasted for two frames. Then, at 867th frame (08:25:46, 2019-03-14), abnormal temperature alarm is activated again in \( \sigma \) of Fig. 10d. Because No. 47 voltage sensor is in the same module 4# as No. 13 temperature sensor, it proved that the fault of module 4# can be accurately detected by the proposed approach and it has considerable leading time than the thermal runaway.

C. Different methods comparison

In order to evaluate the performance of proposed method, other three methods including correlation coefficient [25], 3σ multi-level screening strategy [30] and Shannon entropy [34] were used to compare. The data of the first 930 frames of the last process of vehicle 3# was selected. The length of each window in [25] and [34] was 30 and 100 sample points.

![Fig. 11. (a) correlation coefficient, (b) 3σ multi-level screening strategy, and (c) abnormal coefficient of Shannon entropy of vehicle 3#.

The correlation coefficient of the selected voltage data was shown in Fig. 11a. The calculation time of each window of this method is 0.03s. However, false alarms are given frequently when the correlation coefficient value was below 0.9. It was noted that this method had the short calculation time and low accuracy.

Fig. 11b showed the cell faulty frequency by 3σ multi-level screening strategy. The calculation time of all data is 0.86s. Cell 73 was considered the most likely faulty cell in battery pack because its frequency was 0.23. But the faulty source was No. 47 cell, which indicated that this method cannot give an accurate fault cell of vehicle 3#.

Fig. 11c showed the abnormal coefficient based on Shannon entropy. The calculation time of each window was 0.1s. The threshold of the abnormal coefficient was \( \pm 4 \) in [34]. The abnormal coefficient of the all cells was \([-4,4]\), so no abnormal cell will be given. This indicated that this method did not accurately identify abnormal cell.

The calculation time of the proposed method is 0.09s, can meet the practical application. And faulty battery can be diagnosed by the proposed approach
v. Conclusions

An online data-driven EV battery fault diagnosis scheme using both the cell voltage and temperature is proposed. Both discrete Fréchet distance method and LOF are used to quantify the correlation between the different battery cells’ voltage and temperature. In this way, the faulty cell can be detected considerably earlier than thermal runaway happens, which gives sufficient time to start maintenance or protection scheme, to very much reduce the cost of fault. The data from vehicles with thermal runaway is used to train the detection approach. The trained detection approach is then applied to vehicles with or without thermal runaway to check its sensitivity and it works perfectly. All the data is obtained from NDANEV, which is a national cloud platform that gathering operational data from vehicles in daily use with 0.1 Hz sampling rate, rather than lab data that obtained in an artificial scenario. Therefore, the proposed early fault detection approach is very practical and promising for real application.
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