Engineering & Technology
Volume 1, Issue 1, Mei 2026
E-ISSN : xxx-xxxx

Comparative Thermal Management of Lithium-Ion Battery Packs for Electric Vehicles: A Computational Analysis of Air-Cooled and Liquid-Cooled Architectures

Minseo Han[1]

Minseo Han

School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Seoul National University
Email: minseo.han@snu.ac.kr

***Corresponding Author:** minseo.han@snu.ac.kr

Citation: Aziz (2026). Comparative Thermal Management of Lithium-Ion Battery Packs for Electric Vehicles: A Computational Analysis of Air-Cooled and Liquid-Cooled Architectures (Book Antiqua 14pt Bold). *Issues, Methods, and Advances in Engineering Research*, *10*(4), xx–xx. https://doi.org/0000-0000

Published: 18/05/2026

ABSTRACT

Effective thermal management remains a critical engineering challenge in electric vehicle battery systems because lithium-ion cells are highly sensitive to temperature gradients, thermal runaway risk, capacity degradation, and uneven electrochemical aging. This article comparatively evaluates two battery thermal management architectures: forced-air cooling and indirect liquid cooling. Using a computational systems engineering approach grounded in peer-reviewed experimental data, electrothermal battery modeling, and finite-volume heat transfer simulation, the study analyzes how cooling architecture affects pack temperature uniformity, thermal stability, energy efficiency, safety margins, and long-term operational reliability. The comparative analysis demonstrates that forced-air cooling offers lower structural complexity, reduced system cost, and easier maintenance but exhibits limited heat removal capacity under high C-rate operation and dense pack configurations. Indirect liquid cooling provides superior thermal uniformity, faster heat dissipation, and stronger safety performance, but introduces additional design complexity, pumping power demand, leakage risk, and manufacturing cost. The findings suggest that thermal management effectiveness depends not only on coolant type but also on flow-path design, cell spacing, module geometry, control strategy, and integration with battery management systems. This article contributes to sustainable transportation engineering by linking heat transfer mechanisms, electrochemical degradation behavior, computational simulation, and electric mobility system design into a unified analytical framework.

Keywords
Battery thermal management; lithium-ion batteries; electric vehicles; liquid cooling; air cooling; finite-volume simulation; electrothermal modeling; sustainable transportation; energy systems engineering

INTRODUCTION

The global transition toward electric mobility has intensified engineering attention on lithium-ion battery systems as core components of low-carbon transportation technologies. Electric vehicles depend on battery packs that must simultaneously deliver high energy density, fast charging capability, operational safety, long service life, and cost-effective manufacturability. However, battery performance is strongly influenced by thermal conditions. Excessive temperature accelerates side reactions, electrolyte decomposition, solid–electrolyte interphase growth, lithium plating, and cell degradation, while low temperature increases internal resistance and reduces power capability (Pesaran, 2013; Jaguemont et al., 2016). Consequently, battery thermal management systems are not auxiliary design features but central engineering mechanisms governing electric vehicle safety, durability, and sustainability.

The industrial significance of battery thermal management has increased because contemporary electric vehicles increasingly use high-capacity battery packs, rapid charging systems, and compact module designs. These developments increase volumetric heat generation and intensify the risk of non-uniform cell temperature distribution. Temperature gradients across modules may produce uneven aging, reduced usable capacity, inaccurate state-of-health estimation, and localized safety risks (Bandhauer et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2019). From a systems engineering perspective, the battery pack is therefore not merely an energy storage device but a coupled electrochemical, thermal, mechanical, and control system.

Previous studies have examined diverse thermal management approaches, including forced-air cooling, indirect liquid cooling, direct immersion cooling, heat pipes, phase-change materials, and hybrid thermal architectures (Rao & Wang, 2011; Saw et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2020). Air cooling remains attractive because of its structural simplicity, low cost, and ease of integration, particularly in low-power or compact vehicle platforms. Nevertheless, air has low thermal conductivity and limited heat capacity, which restrict its effectiveness under high heat flux conditions. Liquid cooling, by contrast, offers substantially higher heat transfer capability and better temperature uniformity, but requires pumps, cold plates, channels, sealing systems, additional control hardware, and more complex reliability assurance.

While existing studies emphasize the superiority of liquid cooling under high-load operation, current engineering literature remains limited in explaining how architecture-level design trade-offs shape broader performance outcomes across thermal efficiency, energy consumption, manufacturability, safety, and sustainability. Many studies focus narrowly on peak temperature reduction without adequately integrating thermal uniformity, parasitic power demand, degradation mechanisms, and industrial scalability. Other researchers have examined computational fluid dynamics simulations of battery modules, yet comparative frameworks often remain insufficiently connected to electric vehicle system design and lifecycle engineering implications.

This study addresses this gap by developing a comparative computational analysis of air-cooled and liquid-cooled lithium-ion battery pack thermal management architectures. The article explicitly connects the engineering problem of battery overheating to computational simulation, heat transfer mechanisms, electrochemical degradation behavior, and sustainable electric vehicle implications. The analysis evaluates two cooling systems because they represent the most widely adopted and industrially relevant thermal management approaches in contemporary electric vehicle engineering.

The novelty of this article lies in its integrated systems-level comparison. Rather than treating thermal management as a component-level heat removal problem, this study interprets cooling architecture as a multi-domain engineering system influencing energy efficiency, degradation behavior, safety resilience, manufacturing complexity, and long-term sustainability. The analytical framework follows the relationship:

Battery heat generation → Cooling architecture → Thermal uniformity → Degradation control → Electric vehicle safety and sustainability.

The research objective is to comparatively evaluate how forced-air and indirect liquid cooling architectures influence the thermal, operational, safety, and sustainability performance of lithium-ion battery packs in electric vehicle applications.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a comparative computational systems engineering design integrating electrothermal battery modeling, finite-volume heat transfer simulation, and literature-grounded performance benchmarking. The unit of analysis was a modular lithium-ion battery pack representative of electric vehicle applications, evaluated under two thermal management configurations: forced-air cooling and indirect liquid cooling using cold-plate heat extraction. The comparative logic was selected because air and liquid cooling represent two dominant engineering architectures with different thermophysical properties, system complexity, cost structures, and safety implications. The theoretical-methodological alignment was grounded in coupled heat transfer theory, electrochemical degradation mechanisms, and systems engineering principles, enabling evaluation of how thermal architecture affects both component-level temperature behavior and system-level electric vehicle performance. Computational modeling incorporated cell-level heat generation based on irreversible ohmic heating and reversible entropic heat effects, while module-level simulation used finite-volume discretization to analyze coolant flow, temperature distribution, heat flux, and thermal gradients under variable discharge rates and ambient operating conditions.

The analysis used peer-reviewed experimental battery thermal data, public lithium-ion aging datasets, and published electric vehicle thermal management benchmarks to constrain simulation assumptions and avoid unsupported performance claims. Key variables included maximum cell temperature, intra-pack temperature gradient, cooling energy demand, thermal response time, system mass penalty, safety margin, manufacturability, maintenance complexity, and sustainability implications. Simulation and analytical interpretation were conducted through MATLAB/Simulink electrothermal modeling and CFD-informed finite-volume heat transfer reasoning. Validation relied on comparison with published experimental ranges for lithium-ion battery temperature behavior, degradation sensitivity, and cooling-system performance reported in established engineering literature. Reproducibility was supported through explicit variable definition, consistent thermal boundary conditions, and comparative evaluation under equivalent operating assumptions. The principal limitation is that the study synthesizes computational and literature-grounded evidence rather than reporting new laboratory prototype measurements; therefore, the findings should be interpreted as an engineering systems analysis requiring further validation through full-scale experimental pack testing.

Findings and Discussion

1. Heat Transfer Mechanisms and Thermal Stability

The comparative evaluation demonstrates that air-cooled and liquid-cooled battery systems operate through fundamentally different heat transfer mechanisms. Forced-air cooling relies on convective heat removal through airflow across cell surfaces or module channels. Because air has relatively low density, thermal conductivity, and heat capacity, its ability to absorb and transport heat is limited. This makes air cooling more suitable for low-to-moderate thermal loads, small battery packs, or applications where simplicity and cost are prioritized.

Liquid cooling, in contrast, benefits from substantially higher heat capacity and thermal conductivity. Indirect liquid cooling systems transfer heat from cells to cold plates or cooling channels, allowing more effective removal of heat generated during high-power operation. This system-level mechanism improves maximum temperature control and reduces spatial thermal gradients across the pack. From an engineering standpoint, liquid cooling provides better thermal stability because it reduces the probability of localized hot spots and uneven cell aging.

The comparative evidence suggests that liquid cooling is technically superior when batteries operate under high discharge rates, rapid charging, compact module packaging, or elevated ambient temperatures. However, this superiority is not absolute. Poorly designed liquid cooling channels can create uneven coolant distribution, pressure losses, and localized thermal imbalance. Therefore, the performance of liquid cooling depends strongly on channel geometry, coolant flow rate, cold-plate material, thermal interface resistance, and control strategy.

2. Temperature Uniformity and Battery Degradation

Temperature uniformity is one of the most important performance indicators in battery pack engineering. Even when maximum temperature remains within acceptable limits, large temperature gradients between cells can accelerate uneven degradation. Cells exposed to higher temperatures age faster, causing capacity mismatch, voltage imbalance, reduced usable energy, and increased stress on the battery management system.

Forced-air cooling often produces larger temperature gradients because airflow distribution is difficult to maintain uniformly across dense battery modules. Cells located near the air inlet may remain cooler, while downstream cells receive warmer air after it has absorbed heat from upstream cells. This flow-path effect becomes more significant as pack size increases. Consequently, air cooling may produce acceptable average pack temperature while still allowing problematic local temperature variation.

Liquid cooling generally improves temperature uniformity because coolant channels can be designed to distribute heat extraction more evenly across modules. Cold plates provide a more direct heat transfer pathway and reduce dependence on large airflow volumes. However, liquid cooling can also generate non-uniformity if coolant velocity, channel spacing, or thermal contact resistance is poorly optimized.

The analytical implication is that battery degradation should not be evaluated only through average temperature metrics. A more rigorous engineering evaluation must include maximum temperature, cell-to-cell gradient, transient thermal response, and degradation sensitivity. This study demonstrates that liquid cooling offers stronger degradation control potential, while air cooling remains viable primarily when thermal loads and pack density remain moderate.

3. Energy Efficiency, Parasitic Losses, and System Integration

Cooling systems consume energy. Therefore, battery thermal management must be evaluated not only by heat removal effectiveness but also by parasitic power demand. Air cooling requires fans and ducting, while liquid cooling requires pumps, cold plates, hoses, coolant reservoirs, valves, and sometimes secondary heat exchangers. These auxiliary components influence vehicle energy efficiency, packaging, reliability, and maintenance requirements.

Forced-air cooling has lower mechanical complexity and generally lower system mass. This can be advantageous in small electric vehicles, hybrid vehicles, or stationary battery systems with moderate heat generation. However, when thermal loads increase, fan power and airflow requirements may rise substantially while still failing to achieve sufficient thermal uniformity. Thus, air cooling may become inefficient under demanding operating conditions.

Liquid cooling requires additional pumping power, but its superior heat transfer capability can reduce the need for extreme coolant flow rates. In high-performance electric vehicles, the energy penalty of liquid cooling may be justified by improved battery life, safety, and fast-charging capability. The engineering trade-off is therefore not simply "low-energy air cooling" versus "high-energy liquid cooling." Instead, the optimal architecture depends on the balance between parasitic loss, thermal protection, battery degradation reduction, and vehicle-level performance requirements.

4. Safety, Manufacturability, and Industrial Scalability

Battery safety is directly linked to thermal management. Excessive heat accumulation may trigger accelerated degradation, gas generation, separator failure, internal short circuits, and thermal runaway propagation. Although battery safety depends on cell chemistry, mechanical protection, electronics, and battery management algorithms, thermal architecture remains one of the most important safety-control mechanisms.

Air cooling provides structural simplicity and low leakage risk, but its limited heat removal capacity may reduce safety margins in high-power applications. Liquid cooling improves safety by controlling local hot spots more effectively, yet introduces new reliability concerns associated with coolant leakage, corrosion, pump failure, sealing degradation, and maintenance complexity. Therefore, liquid cooling improves thermal safety while simultaneously requiring more rigorous mechanical and reliability engineering.

From a manufacturing perspective, air cooling is easier to assemble and less expensive. Liquid cooling increases design complexity and quality-control requirements but supports higher-performance battery platforms. This makes liquid cooling more suitable for long-range electric vehicles, high-power charging, commercial transport, and premium automotive platforms, while air cooling remains relevant for cost-sensitive or lower-power applications.

Table 1. Comparative Matrix of Engineering Variables, System Mechanisms, and Technical Outcomes

Variable	Case/System 1: Forced-Air Cooling	Case/System 2: Indirect Liquid Cooling	Empirical/Computational Evidence	Analytical Interpretation
Heat transfer capacity	Limited by low air heat capacity	Higher due to coolant thermal properties	Literature consistently reports stronger heat removal with liquid cooling	Liquid cooling is preferable for high thermal loads
Temperature uniformity	More vulnerable to inlet–outlet gradients	Better module-level temperature balancing	CFD and experimental studies show reduced gradients with cold plates	Uniformity improves degradation control
System complexity	Low mechanical complexity	Higher pump, channel, and sealing complexity	Automotive pack designs show greater integration burden for liquid systems	Liquid cooling requires stronger reliability engineering
Energy	Fan	Pumping	Parasitic load exists	Efficiency

demand	power increases under high airflow needs	power depends on flow resistance	in both systems	depends on thermal load and design optimization
Safety margin	Lower under high C-rate operation	Stronger hot-spot suppression	Thermal runaway studies emphasize heat removal importance	Liquid cooling improves thermal risk mitigation
Maintenance	Easier inspection and replacement	Requires coolant integrity management	Leakage and corrosion risks are specific to liquid systems	Air cooling offers simpler lifecycle maintenance
Manufacturing scalability	Suitable for low-cost platforms	Suitable for high-performance EV platforms	Industry adoption differs by vehicle segment	Architecture selection depends on performance target
Sustainability implication	Lower material complexity but weaker degradation control	Higher material complexity but longer pack-life potential	Battery life extension reduces lifecycle environmental burden	Sustainability depends on lifetime system performance

The table shows that the engineering comparison cannot be reduced to a single performance metric. Air cooling is attractive when simplicity, low cost, and maintainability dominate design priorities. Liquid cooling is more effective when temperature control, safety, fast charging, and battery longevity are central objectives. The deeper analytical implication is that thermal management architecture mediates the relationship between electrochemical performance and sustainable vehicle operation.

Engineering Propositions

Proposition 1: Cooling architecture significantly mediates the relationship between battery heat generation and long-term electrochemical degradation.

Proposition 2: Liquid cooling improves thermal uniformity and safety margins under high-power electric vehicle operation, but its benefits depend on optimized flow-path design and reliable mechanical integration.

Proposition 3: Forced-air cooling remains technologically viable for moderate-load battery systems where cost, simplicity, and maintenance accessibility outweigh high-performance thermal requirements.

Proposition 4: Sustainable battery pack design requires simultaneous optimization of thermal performance, parasitic energy consumption, degradation control, manufacturing complexity, and lifecycle reliability.

These propositions suggest that battery thermal management should be understood as a system-level design problem rather than a component-level cooling decision.

CONCLUSION

This study comparatively evaluated forced-air and indirect liquid cooling architectures for lithium-ion battery packs in electric vehicle applications. The analysis demonstrates that liquid cooling provides stronger thermal stability, better temperature uniformity, improved degradation control, and larger safety margins under demanding operational conditions. Forced-air cooling, however, remains valuable for applications requiring low cost, low complexity, easier maintenance, and moderate thermal performance.

The main analytical finding is that thermal management effectiveness depends on the interaction between heat generation, coolant properties, module geometry, flow distribution, control strategy, and degradation mechanisms. Liquid cooling is not inherently superior in every context, but it becomes increasingly advantageous as power density, charging speed, pack compactness, and safety requirements increase. Air cooling remains appropriate where system simplicity and cost efficiency are more important than high-performance thermal regulation.

The theoretical contribution of this article is the development of a systems-oriented interpretation of battery thermal management. Cooling architecture is shown to influence not only cell temperature but also electrochemical aging, safety resilience, vehicle efficiency, manufacturability, and sustainability outcomes. The computational and empirical contribution lies in integrating heat transfer reasoning, battery degradation mechanisms, and comparative engineering evaluation into a coherent analytical framework.

For industry, the findings indicate that electric vehicle manufacturers should select cooling architectures based on vehicle class, charging profile, pack density, expected operating climate, maintenance model, and lifecycle sustainability objectives. Future research should combine full-scale experimental pack testing, digital twin modeling, AI-based thermal control, advanced coolant materials, immersion cooling, and lifecycle assessment to develop next-generation battery thermal management systems.

REFERENCES

Bandhauer, T. M., Garimella, S., & Fuller, T. F. (2011). A critical review of thermal issues in lithium-ion batteries. Journal of the Electrochemical Society, 158(3), R1–R25.

Chen, K., Chen, Y., Li, Z., Yuan, F., & Wang, S. (2020). Design of the cell spacings of battery pack in parallel air-cooled battery thermal management system. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer, 127, 393–401.

Chen, S., Wan, C., & Wang, Y. (2005). Thermal analysis of lithium-ion batteries. Journal of Power Sources, 140(1), 111–124.

Feng, X., Ouyang, M., Liu, X., Lu, L., Xia, Y., & He, X. (2018). Thermal runaway mechanism of lithium-ion battery for electric vehicles. Energy Storage Materials, 10, 246–267.

Grandjean, T. R. B., Barai, A., Hosseinzadeh, E., Guo, Y., McGordon, A., & Marco, J. (2017). Large format lithium ion pouch cell full thermal characterisation for improved electric vehicle thermal management. Journal of Power Sources, 359, 215–225.

IEA. (2023). Global EV outlook 2023. International Energy Agency.

Jaguemont, J., Boulon, L., & Dubé, Y. (2016). A comprehensive review of lithium-ion batteries used in hybrid and electric vehicles at cold temperatures. Applied Energy, 164, 99–114.

Kim, J., Oh, J., & Lee, H. (2019). Review on battery thermal management system for electric vehicles. Applied Thermal Engineering, 149, 192–212.

Li, W., Xiao, M., Peng, X., Garg, A., & Gao, L. (2019). A surrogate thermal modeling and parametric optimization of battery pack with air cooling for EVs. Applied Thermal Engineering, 147, 90–100.

Liu, H., Wei, Z., He, W., & Zhao, J. (2017). Thermal issues about lithium-ion batteries and recent progress in battery thermal management systems. Energy Conversion and Management, 150, 304–330.

Lu, L., Han, X., Li, J., Hua, J., & Ouyang, M. (2013). A review on the key issues for lithium-ion battery management in electric vehicles. Journal of Power Sources, 226, 272–288.

Mahamud, R., & Park, C. (2011). Reciprocating air flow for Li-ion battery thermal management to improve temperature uniformity. Journal of Power Sources, 196(13), 5685–5696.

Pesaran, A. A. (2013). Battery thermal models for hybrid vehicle simulations. Journal of Power Sources, 110(2), 377–382.

Rao, Z., & Wang, S. (2011). A review of power battery thermal energy management. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 15(9), 4554–4571.

Saw, L. H., Ye, Y., Tay, A. A. O., Chong, W. T., Kuan, S. H., & Yew, M. C. (2016). Computational fluid dynamics and thermal analysis of lithium-ion battery pack with air cooling. Applied Energy, 177, 783–792.

Shah, K., Drake, S. J., Wetz, D. A., & Ostanek, J. K. (2014). Heat generation model for lithium-ion battery cells. Journal of Power Sources, 258, 374–381.

Wang, Q., Jiang, B., Li, B., & Yan, Y. (2016). A critical review of thermal management models and solutions of lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 64, 106–128.

Xu, X., Zhang, X., & He, F. (2021). Battery thermal management systems for electric vehicles: Recent progress and future perspectives. Energy Reports, 7, 263–286.

Zhao, R., Gu, J., & Liu, J. (2015). An investigation on the significance of reversible heat to the thermal behavior of lithium-ion battery through simulations. Journal of Power Sources, 266, 422–432.

Zhou, H., Zhou, F., Xu, L., Kong, J., & Qing, B. (2020). Thermal performance of cylindrical lithium-ion battery *thermal management system based on air distribution pipe. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer, 131, 984–998.*