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EFFECTS OF STRAY CAPACITANCE TO GROUND IN BIPOLAR WATER IMPEDANCE MEASUREMENTS BASED ON CAPACITIVE ELECTRODES

Carles Aliau-Bonet, Ramon Pallas-Areny

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, BarcelonaTech (UPC), Castelldefels, Spain, ramon.pallas@upc.edu

Abstract – Liquid impedance measurements based on capacitive (or contactless) electrodes overcome electrode polarization problems but are affected by stray capacitance from the material being measured to ground, the same as measurements with direct-contact electrodes. This study shows that the effects of that capacitance depend on the impedance being measured and for bipolar impedance measurements they increase when the ratio between that stray capacitance and electrode capacitance increases.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Impedance measurements with capacitive electrodes avoid electrode-solution interactions [1][2] and can be performed through the walls of insulating tanks, pipes and hermetically closed containers such as sealed ampoules [3]. They have been applied to determining the conductivity of liquids [1][3], monitoring fermentation processes [2], multiphase measurements in large pipes [4] and impedance measurements in small capillaries [5][6]. The impedance of capacitive electrodes is certainly much higher than that of direct-contact electrodes based on electrochemical reactions, but measuring at a high-enough frequency reduces electrode impedance and bipolar impedance measurements that rely on various injection-detection strategies become feasible.

Nevertheless, high-value impedances makes the measurement system susceptible to interference from external electric fields, whatever the injection-detection strategy. That interference can be reduced by suitable electric shields but then the stray capacitance between the material being measured and the shield affects measurement results. When a continuous electric shield is impractical, the stray capacitance from the material to ground can also lead to anomalous results [4][6].

The effects of stray capacitance to ground in bipolar impedance measurements based on two direct-contact electrodes have already been reported [7], but no similar analysis seems to exist for capacitive electrodes, sometimes termed contactless electrodes although they usually establish mechanical contact with the container of the material being measured. In this paper, we analyse the effects of stray capacitance to ground in contactless bipolar impedance measurements performed with grounded auto-balancing bridges found in commercial impedance analysers that use voltage injection and output current detection.

2. IMPEDANCE MODEL

The lumped-parameter equivalent circuit for bipolar impedance measurements with capacitive electrodes when the measured current is that that has flown through the material is shown in Fig. 1. Capacitive electrodes consist of a metal surface covered by a dielectric material in contact with the material under test \(Z_x\) hence electrode impedance can in principle be modelled by a capacitance \(C_x\) if the electrical resistance of the dielectric material is high enough [2]. Electrode separation is assumed to be large enough for the “air” capacitance \(C_{hl}\) between them to be negligible. \(Z_x\) can be described by a resistance \(R_x\) shunted by a capacitance \(C_x\), which are assumed to be constant inside the frequency range of interest. The characteristic angular frequency of the material is \(\omega_k = (R_xC_x)^{-1}\) [3]. If the volume of the measured sample is large enough relative to the dimensions of the measurement setup, the (distributed) stray capacitance \(C_y\) from the sample to ground must be accounted for [6][7]. In order to include \(C_y\) in the lumped-parameter model in Fig. 1, we use the coefficient \(\alpha\) [7].

![Fig. 1. Three-terminal lumped-parameter model for bipolar impedance measurements with capacitive electrodes.](image)

When \(Z_x\) is measured with an earth-grounded commercial impedance analyser based on an auto-balancing bridge that uses the injection-detection strategy in Fig. 1, where terminal L is connected to virtual ground, the actual impedance measured between H and L, if \(I_y\) is disregarded, is \(Z_{HL} = V_{HL}/I_L = 2/j\omega C_x + Z_x\). Therefore, at low frequencies relative to \(\alpha_x\) we will have Re \(Z_{HL} \approx R_x\) and Im \(Z_{HL} \approx -2/j\omega C_x\), whereas at high frequencies relative to \(\alpha_x\), \(Z_{HL}\) becomes purely capacitive: \(Z_{HL} \approx 2/j\omega C_x + 1/j\omega C_{hl} = 1/j\omega C_{hl}\). Nevertheless, if the current through \(C_y\) is significant, then current \(I_L\) measured by the instrument will be smaller than the actual current provided by the voltage source and the
result will not be $2j\omega C_g + Z_e$, but a larger impedance which value will increase for increasing frequencies. By applying the delta-star transformation to the circuit in Fig. 1, the measured impedance $Z_{HL}$, when $I_g$ is included will be

$$Z_m(j\omega) = \frac{2 + C_g/C_e}{j\omega C_e} + \frac{R_e}{1 + j\omega R_e C_e} \left(1 + \frac{C_g}{C_e}\right) + \frac{j\omega(1 - \alpha) R_e C_g}{(1 + j\omega R_e C_e)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

that shows that $C_g$ greatly affects each of the three terms of the result. The first term is due to the impedance of the electrodes, the second term is due to the impedance of the material and the third term is due to $C_g$. Figure 2 is an impedance model for (1) that includes a resonant parallel LCR circuit, identical to that described in [7] for measurements performed with direct-contact electrodes and corresponds to the third term in (1). This term, additional to those attributable to electrodes and material, severely distorts the impedance measured at frequencies close to the characteristic frequency of the material, $\omega_c = (R_e C_e)^{-1}$. If in order to avoid that effect we measure at a lower frequency, $\omega < \omega_c$, the result is

$$Z_m(j\omega)|_{C_e = 0} = R_e \left(1 + \frac{C_g}{C_e}\right) + \frac{1}{j\omega C_e}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

that shows that even at frequencies well below $\omega_c$, both the real and the imaginary part of the result are affected by $C_g/C_e$. If this factor is not negligible with respect to 1, then the measured resistance, which will correspond to the two central $RC$ networks in Fig. 2, will be larger than that of the material ($\text{Re} Z_{HL} > R_e$). Contrarily, $\text{Im} Z_{HL} = (-\omega \text{Im} Z_{HL})^{\alpha}$, due to the two capacitances in the left of Fig. 2, will be smaller than $C_g/2$ and the measured capacitance will be smaller than the actual electrode capacitance.

Equation (2) also shows that measurements well below $\omega_c$ do not inform about $C_e$. If in order to estimate $C_e$ we measure at frequencies much larger than $\omega_c$, the result will be

$$Z_m(j\omega)|_{C_e \gg 0} = R_e \left(1 + \frac{C_g}{C_e}\right) + \frac{1}{j\omega C_e}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

which is a purely capacitive impedance that includes the five capacitances in Fig. 2. Therefore, in addition to the contribution of electrode impedance, affected by $C_g/C_e$, the measurement of the material capacitance ($C_e$) is affected by $C_g/C_e$ and by an additional factor $\alpha (1 - \alpha) C_g/C_e$ that depends on $\alpha$, $C_g$ and $C_e$ itself. This nonlinear relationship between the measured capacitance and the actual material capacitance is the same found for galvanic electrodes [7]. If the first term of (3) is determined from the imaginary part of (2), and subtracted from (3), the resulting capacitance will be smaller than $C_e$ and the deviation will depend on $C_e$ itself.

3. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We measured $\text{Re} Z_{HL}$ and $\text{Im} Z_{HL}$ for two water samples inside a cell built from a 100 mL polypropylene syringe Omnifix® (B. Braun Melsungen AG), which respective external and internal diameters were 30.6 mm and 28.0 mm and 12 cm length. The capacitive electrodes were two 25 mm-wide copper strips wrapped around the syringe and with inner ends 50 mm apart (Fig. 3). The electrodes were connected to an impedance analyser (Agilent 4294A) by two 90 mm long, single-core silicone-rubber-insulated cables with 1 mm² cross section. The syringe was placed over a 305 mm × 227 mm copper plane grounded at the enclosure of the impedance analyser (Fig. 4). The cell was successively placed at three different heights above ground, $h = \{52, 8, 17\}$ mm in order to obtain three different $C_g$ values $\{C_{g1} < C_{g2} < C_{g17}\}$. The frequency range of interest was from 1 kHz to 10 MHz but some results were displayed up to 100 MHz. The electrical conductivity of the two water samples used, measured with a Tetracon® 325 probe connected to a WTW conductivity meter model 340i were 0.01 ds/m (10 ± 1 μS/cm) and 1 ds/m (1000 ± 6 μS/cm), referred to 25.0 °C, and their relative permittivity was 78.3 [9]. The sample was at 22.0 °C so that the corrected conductivities and permittivity were 0.0094 ds/m, 0.94 ds/m and 79.4 [10] hence the characteristic frequency of the samples was $f_c = 213$ kHz and 21.3 MHz.

![Fig. 2. Equivalent two-terminal impedance model for bipolar impedance measurements with capacitive electrodes.](image)

![Fig. 3. Measurement cell with capacitive electrodes built from a polypropylene syringe and two copper rings.](image)

![Fig. 4. Measurement setup with the cell placed over a ground plane and connected to the impedance analyser by single core cables.](image)
Figure 5 shows that the measured real part of the impedance for the 0.01 dS/m sample was different for each cell height and increased for increasing $C_e$, as predicted by (2). At 15 kHz ($<< f_c = 213$ kHz) Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$ is flat, as expected, and Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$ is 119 kΩ when $h = 52$ mm, 125 kΩ when $h = 8$ mm and 138 kΩ when $h = 1.7$ mm. At frequencies below about 5 kHz, Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$ increases for decreasing frequencies whereas according to (2) it should remain constant. This suggests that maybe electrode resistance, in parallel with $C_e$, is not large enough to be neglected because $C_e$ is very small. But polypropylene is known to have a very high insulation resistance. An alternative explanation could be a limited surface resistance of the syringe, which decreases if it becomes moist. This was easily verified by blowing into it.

For the 1.0 dS/m water sample, Fig. 6 shows that at 1 MHz ($<< f_c = 21.3$ MHz) Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$ was 1220 Ω when $h = 52$ mm, 1293 Ω when $h = 8$ mm and 1423 Ω when $h = 1.7$ mm, that is, about 100 times smaller than in Fig. 5, as expected because it was 100 times more conductive. But now no flat region can be easily identified because of the “low-frequency” increase due to the electrode/cell resistance unaccounted for in Fig. 1 and (2). In order to assess the influence of that resistance, the ground plane in Fig. 4 was removed and Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$ was measured for the cell full of 1.0 dS/m water. At 10 kHz, the result was 2.6 kΩ, which increased to 4.8 kΩ when blowing into the cell. At 100 kHz the result was 1497 Ω, which increased to 1655 Ω when blowing into the cell.

The results for $C_{\text{ill}}$ from 1 kHz to 10 MHz for the first water sample (0.01 dS/m) are shown in Fig. 7. At low frequencies, $C_{\text{ill}}$ corresponds to the imaginary part of (2) hence depends mainly on electrode capacitance $C_e$ but it is affected by $C_g/C_e$ in such a way that instead of obtaining $C_e/2$, the apparent capacitance decreases for increasing $C_g/C_e$ ratio. In Fig. 7, at 1 kHz $C_{\text{ill}}$ is 16,9 pF when $h = 52$ mm, 16,3 pF when $h = 8$ mm and 15,4 pF when $h = 1.7$ mm, which corroborates that dependence. That is, reducing $h$ by 85 % when it is large (52 mm), decreases $C_{\text{ill}}$ only by 3,5 %, but reducing $h$ by 79 % when it is smaller (8 mm) reduces $C_{\text{ill}}$ by 5,5 %, which suggests that $C_g/C_e$ hence $C_g$ is not proportional to $h$. Instead, $C_g$ is proportionally larger for smaller $h$, as it could be expected because of the far smaller area of the sample as compared to that of the ground plane. The results for 1,0 dS/m water at 10 kHz were about the same: $C_{\text{ill}}$ is 17,0 pF when $h = 52$ mm, 16,3 pF when $h = 8$ mm and 15,4 pF when $h = 1.7$ mm. Therefore, $C_g$ and $C_e$ do not depend on material conductivity, whereas $C_e$ for direct-contact electrodes does.

At frequencies much higher than $f_c$ (3) applies and $C_{\text{ill}}$ corresponds to electrode capacitance “modified” by $C_g/C_e$, in series with material capacitance $C_g$, also modified by $C_g/C_e$ in addition to $C_g/C_e$. In both cases, the modification is in the sense of a decreasing measured capacitance for increasing $C_g/C_e$ and $C_g/C_e$ ratios. In Fig. 7, at 10 MHz $C_{\text{ill}}$ is 4,8 pF when $h = 52$ mm, 4,4 pF when $h = 8$ mm and 3,9 pF when $h = 1.7$ mm. Therefore, the decrease of $C_{\text{ill}}$ with increasing $C_g$ is verified: 85 % reduction in $h$ (from 52 to 8 mm) results in 8 % reduction in $C_{\text{ill}}$, and 79 % reduction in $h$ (from 8 to 1.7 mm) reduces $C_{\text{ill}}$ by 11 %. $C_g$ can be calculated from Im $Z_{\text{ill}}$ in (2) provided $C_e$ was known. In order to determine $C_e$, we measured the cell capacitance using a battery supplied RLC meter (Agilent U1733C). Battery supply implies negligible $C_e$ because of the isolation capacitance between the meter and earth ground. At 10 kHz, for the second water sample we obtained $C_e = (34.9 \pm 0.1 ) \text{ pF}$, which is compatible with $C_{\text{ill}}$ values in Fig. 7. Regrettably, the limited resolution of this low-cost instrument cannot produce stable readings for the real part of the impedance of the cell, but in (2) we can estimate $C_g$ from Im $Z_{\text{ill}}$, and then $R_x$ from Re $Z_{\text{ill}}$. In Table 1, relative $R_x$...
deviations in excess of 2% due to $C_g$ can be easily observed. The decrease of $C_g$ with increasing $h$, hence the reduction of its effect, is faster for small $h$ than for large $h$, as already deducted in Figs. 5, 6 and 7. However, this does not mean that $C_g$ becomes irrelevant for $h$ values about a few centimetres because the enclosure of the impedance analyser is grounded hence the material being measured is also capacitively coupled to ground through the instrument. Attempts to reduce this capacitive coupling by increasing the length of the connecting wires would fail because of the increased parasitic inductance of that connection.

Table 1. $C_g$ calculated from $\text{Im} Z_{\text{HL}}$ and $R_e$ from $\text{Re} Z_{\text{HL}}$ in (2) after $C_e (=34.9$ pF) has been measured with a battery-supplied RLC meter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$h$ (mm)</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1,7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 + C_g/C_e$</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_g$ (pF)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_e$ (kΩ)</td>
<td>[0.01 dS/m]</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>109.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_e$ (Ω)</td>
<td>[1.00 dS/m]</td>
<td>1145.4</td>
<td>1133.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approach used for $R_e$ cannot be applied to estimate $C_e$ because, in order to that, in (3) we need $\alpha(1-\alpha)$ in addition to $C_e$ and $C_g$. Further, (3) applies only when measuring at $f_f \gg f_e$, which for low-conductivity samples would mean frequencies well above, say, 10 MHz because $f_e = 213$ kHz and we need to measure in the flat region of the $C_{\text{HL}}$ curve. Then the distance between electrodes would be comparable to $\lambda/126$ and wave propagation effects would appear [11]. For example, at 10 MHz, $\lambda/126 \approx 2.6$ cm and electrode separation in the cell in Fig. 3 is just 5 cm. If the electrodes were closer, the capacitance between them in the absence of any material ($C_{\text{HL}}$) would be relevant and the model in Fig. 1 would not apply. For high-conductivity materials, the measurement frequency should be even higher.

Therefore, dielectric measurements with capacitive electrodes must be performed at too high frequencies for lumped-parameter models to hold. Measurements performed with direct-contact electrodes have been demonstrated to be also affected by $C_g/C_e$, but $C_g$ for direct-contact electrodes is orders of magnitude larger than for capacitive electrodes (tens of picofarads) hence those effects are negligible at low frequencies and, in some cases, even at frequencies close to the characteristic frequency of the material.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The measurement of water impedance by using two capacitive electrodes with a grounded instrument based on an auto-balancing bridge method is affected by the stray capacitance $C_{\text{HL}}$ from the volume of the sample to ground. The real part of the measured impedance $\text{Re} Z_{\text{HL}}$ increases and the measured capacitance $C_{\text{HL}}$ decreases for increasing $C_{\text{g}}$. At low frequencies relative to the characteristic frequency of the material, $\omega_0 = (R_e C_g)^{1/2}$, these effects depend on $C_g/C_e$ and imply an overestimation of $R_e$ and underestimation of electrode capacitance $C_e$.

$C_e$ cannot be determined form low frequency measurements. Measurements at frequencies close to $\omega_0$ are also strongly affected by $C_g$ and cannot help in determining $C_e$ either. At high frequencies relative to $\omega_0$, the decrease in $C_{\text{HL}}$ depends on $C_e$ but also on $C_g/C_e + \alpha(1-\alpha)C_e/C_g$ so that there is an underestimation of both $C_e$ and material capacitance $C_{\text{g}}$, $C_e$ can be reduced by increasing the distance between the cell with the sample material and nearby grounded objects. Nevertheless, distancing too much the cell from the grounded enclosure of impedance analyser would require long cables which stray inductance would affect high frequency measurements.

For materials which characteristic frequency exceeds about 100 kHz, $C_g$ should be measured at frequencies whose wavelength would be comparable to electrode separation, which would lead to wave propagation effects. Closer electrodes would reduce that effect but then inter-electrode capacitance could limit the maximal measurement frequency.
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