Optimal power scheduling for economic dispatch using moth flame optimizer
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ABSTRACT

This paper proposes the optimal generator allocation to solve Economic Dispatch (ED) problem in power system using Moth Flame Optimizer (MFO). With this approach, the optimum power for each unit generating in the system will be searched based on the power constraints per unit and the amount of power demand. The objective function of this study is to minimize the total cost of generation. The amount of power loss is measured to determine the effectiveness of the proposed technique. The performance of the MFO technique is also compared to the evolutionary programming (EP) and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) methods. Five- and thirty-bus power system networks are selected as test systems and simulated using MATLAB. Based on simulation results, MFO provides better results in regulating the optimum power generation with minimum generation cost and power loss, compared to EP and PSO.

Keywords: Economic dispatch, Evolutionary programming, Moth flame optimizer, Particle swarm optimization

INTRODUCTION

Today, the issue of electricity generation has always been a major topic. The ever-increasing population, coupled with the lack of new oil sources, has led to rising fuel costs. This has forced scientists to develop a system for optimum fuel use without compromising power demand. This system will ensure proper power unit scheduling and power capacity are generated according to demand. This scheduling system can be created based on the economic dispatch (ED) calculation. The purpose of ED is to determine the optimal power generation unit with the lowest cost of power generation. At the same time, it has to produce the total amount of power supply according to the power demand and power constraints of each generator unit. ED can be categorized as one type of optimization problem. ED solutions using optimization techniques can be categorized into two parts, namely mathematical and heuristic techniques. Some of the mathematical techniques that have been introduced to solve ED problems include linear programming [1, 2], quadratic programming [3] and mixed integer programming [4]. These traditional methods used to solve ED problems are time consuming and cannot solve non-linear cost functions. The solutions obtained using this method are also not optimal. Due to the disadvantages of this traditional method, heuristic approaches have been introduced as one of the solutions to ED problems. ED problems can be categorized into Convex and Non-Convex. In the Non-Convex problem, the impact of the valve point is considered in the power generation cost function. Both Convex and Non-Convex problems were successfully solved using heuristic techniques as reported, respectively in [5, 6] and [7, 8].
The artificial intelligence (AI) approach has been widely used in the field of power systems. Among the techniques used are evolutionary programming (EP) [9-12], particle swarm optimization (PSO) [13-17], ant colony optimization (ACO) [18-21], gravitational search algorithm (GSA) [22, 23] and whale optimization algorithm (WOA) [24, 25]. EP is developed based on biological evolutionary processes. A key feature of the EP process is the mutation, in which each parent produces a new breed with different characteristics. Selection will be based on the most fitness generation. Whereas, the PSO technique attempts to mimic the behavior of a herd of animals or insects. During the search process, two types of exploration: global and local are conducted. Balance between these two explorations is the key to search for optimal solution. Meanwhile, ACO is a heuristic method that inspired by the behavior of colony of ants. This method was mainly used to solve the travelling salesman problem (TSP). Ant colonies will track the same path between the source of their food and colony, based on pheromone trail left by other ants. After finding the pheromone trail, the ants will stop the random travelling and begin to follow the trail. In this study, a new metaheuristic-based method called Moth Flame Optimizer (MFO) was introduced [26-30]. The MFO was developed based on the method of flying moths at night, called transverse orientation. At night, flying moths are guided by moonlight, where they maintain a constant angle to find their way. Among the advantages of MFO over other techniques is the simplicity and speed of the search. Its optimization capabilities have been proven and used in a variety of optimization problems such as economics delivery, engineering design and medical applications.

This study proposes efficient techniques for calculating optimal power generation capacity based on the power demand and constraints of each generator unit using MFO optimization techniques. Two events using a five-bus system with three power generation units and a thirty-bus system with six power generation were simulated using Matlab. The objective function of this optimization process is to minimize the total cost of power generation. To determine the performance of the proposed technique, the MFO approach will also be compared to the EP and PSO methods. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the formulation of ED. Section 3 explained the MFO algorithm. Section 4 discussed the optimal power scheduling algorithm. Section 5 provided the simulation results and discussions. Lastly, Section 6 presents the conclusions.

2. FORMULATION OF ELD

Economic load dispatch (ELD) aims to schedule power generation for each generating unit that is in accordance with the conditions and constraints of a given operation. The total production cost \( C_T \) of one power system network can be expressed as [5]:

\[
C_T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i (P_i) \tag{1}
\]

where \( C_T \) is the total production cost, \( C_i (P_i) \) is the production cost of the \( i \)th generating unit \( P_i \), and \( n \) is number of the generating units in the system. To calculate the production cost per unit of generator, the power generation cost function \( C_i (P_i) \) is based on the fuel cost coefficient and the corresponding power output for that unit. \( C_i (P_i) \) is usually expressed in the form of quadratic equations as follows:

\[
C_i (P_i) = a_i + b_i \cdot P_i + c_i \cdot P_i^2 \tag{2}
\]

Here, \( a_i \), \( b_i \), and \( c_i \) are the fuel cost coefficients for the \( i \)th generating unit \( P_i \). The objective function \( J \) of the optimization process can be written as,

\[
J = \text{Minimize} (C_T) \tag{3}
\]

In this study, operating limits for each generator unit and power demand are constraints that need to be considered in order to optimize the objective function. The cost function of one generator unit is unique compared to the cost function of the other generator unit. The operating limit for each generator unit can be written as,

\[
P_{i,\text{min}} \leq P_i \leq P_{i,\text{max}} \tag{4}
\]

where \( P_{i,\text{max}} \) and \( P_{i,\text{min}} \) are respectively the maximum and minimum operating limits of the \( i \)th generating unit \( P_i \). To ensure that the power supply is enough, the amount of power generated by the generator unit must always adhere to the total power demand. A good generation system also produces a low amount of power.
loss. In this study, the amount of power generated by all generation units \( P_i \) is equal to the sum of the total power demand \( P_D \) and total power loss \( P_L \).

\[
P_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i = P_L + P_D \tag{5}
\]

3. MFO

Moth-Flame Optimizer (MFO) was proposed by Mirjalili in 2015. MFO is a new optimization technique inspired by moth navigation methods in nature. Known as a transverse orientation, this approach ensures that the moth is at a constant angle to the source of light such as the moon and the candle flame for orientation [26]. In the MFO algorithm, moths are considered as search agents that move around the search space, while light sources are considered the best position now. Therefore, each agent moth will search around the source of the light to obtain a better position and update the best position. In this study, the set of moths (agent) \( M \) can be described as follows:

\[
M = \begin{bmatrix}
m_{1,1} & \cdots & m_{1,d} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
m_{n,1} & \cdots & m_{n,d}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{6}
\]

Here, \( d \) is the number of variable and \( n \) is the number of moths. Meanwhile, the set of light source (position) \( F \) can be described as follows:

\[
F = \begin{bmatrix}
F_{1,1} & \cdots & F_{1,d} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
F_{n,1} & \cdots & F_{n,d}
\end{bmatrix} \tag{7}
\]

Here, both \( n \) and \( d \) are the set of moth dimension. The position of \( i^{th} \) moth \( M_i \) can be described as the following:

\[
M_i = S(M_i, F_j) \tag{8}
\]

Here, \( S \) is the spiral function, \( M_i \) is the number of \( i^{th} \) moth and \( F_j \) is the number of \( j^{th} \) light source. The equation of spiral function \( S \) in (5) can be shown as follows,

\[
S(M_i, F_j) = M_i - F_j \cdot e^{\beta r} \cdot \cos(2\pi r) + F_j \tag{9}
\]

Here, \( \beta \) is a constant and \( r \) is the random number between -1 to 1. The detailed explanations of the MFO algorithm process can be found in [25].

In this study, MFO techniques will be compared to existing techniques of EP and PSO. Further details on the concepts, equations and pseudocodes of EP and PSO can be found in [12] and [16], respectively.

4. OPTIMAL POWER SCHEDULING ALGORITHM

To find the minimum value of \( C_T \), the optimization process for power generation scheduling for all generating units was done repeatedly, until the stopping criteria were met. Following is the optimization process for power scheduling using MFO:

a) Determine the value of \( P_i \) using MFO based on the given constraint limit for each generating unit.

b) Calculate \( C_T \) using (1) and (2).

c) Determine \( P_i \) using (5).

d) Evaluate the values of the selected parameters and repeat Steps (i), (ii) and (iii) until the difference between the maximum and minimum values of objective function \( J \) is 0.001 or the number of iterations reaches 100.

5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

In this study, simulations were conducted on a five-bus system with three generators and a thirty-bus reliability test system system with six generators, respectively, as Event A and Event B. There were three cases evaluated for each event. All the events and cases carried out under the specific power demand are
illustrated in Table 1. Table 2 presents the fuel cost coefficients \((a_i, b_i, c_i)\) with minimum and maximum power limits \((P_{\text{min}} \text{ and } P_{\text{max}})\) for each generator unit in Event A and B [5].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Test System</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Power Demand</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Test System</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Power Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Five-bus system with three generators</td>
<td>Case A-1</td>
<td>75 MW</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Thirty-bus reliability test system with six generators</td>
<td>Case B-1</td>
<td>570 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case A-2</td>
<td>135 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case B-2</td>
<td>790 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case A-3</td>
<td>195 MW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case B-3</td>
<td>1030 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2. Fuel cost coefficients and power limits for generator units in Event A and Event B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>(a_i) (MW)</th>
<th>(b_i) (MW)</th>
<th>(c_i)</th>
<th>(P_{\text{min}}) (MW)</th>
<th>(P_{\text{max}}) (MW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.1. Event A**

In Event A, optimal power scheduling is performed on three cases: Case A-1, A-2 and A-3 with different power demands. For each case, three optimization techniques: EP, PSO and MFO are used in the power scheduling optimization process. The results for the generated power values \((P_1, P_2, P_3, P_D)\), total power loss \(P_L\) and total power generation costs \(C_T\) using EP, PSO and MFO optimization techniques for all cases in Event A are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>(P_1) (MW)</th>
<th>(P_2) (MW)</th>
<th>(P_3) (MW)</th>
<th>(P_D) (MW)</th>
<th>(P_L) (MW)</th>
<th>(C_T) ($/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSO [5]</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>1923.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MFO</td>
<td>1031.34</td>
<td>1467.64</td>
<td>1469.25</td>
<td>1467.64</td>
<td>1925.49</td>
<td>1923.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Case A-1, it is found that the values of generator units \(P_1, P_2\) and \(P_3\) selected based on EP, PSO and MFO techniques are scattered. This indicates that more options for scheduling of generating units due to the small power demand \(P_D\). Based on the A-1 results, the MFO and PSO methods appear to generate the total amount of power \(P_D\) that same as \(P_D\), without power losses. This shows that both PSO and MFO perform very well compared to EP technique. In terms of power generation costs, MFO provides the lowest cost, followed by PSO and EP techniques.

5.2. Event B

Same as Event A, optimal power scheduling in Event B is performed on three cases, namely Case B-1, B-2 and B-3 with different power demands using EP, PSO and MFO methods. The results for \(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_D, P_L\) and \(C_T\) using all three optimization techniques in Event B are summarized in Table 4.
Table 4. Power scheduling for generator units in Event B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Case B-1 (P_D = 570 MW)</th>
<th>Case B-2 (P_D = 790 MW)</th>
<th>Case B-3 (P_D = 1030 MW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P_1 (MW)</td>
<td>P_2 (MW)</td>
<td>P_3 (MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_1 (MW)</td>
<td>246.7543</td>
<td>51.0785</td>
<td>61.2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_2 (MW)</td>
<td>219.3933</td>
<td>50.0034</td>
<td>50.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_3 (MW)</td>
<td>245.4596</td>
<td>55.2024</td>
<td>106.7976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_4 (MW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_5 (MW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.4445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_6 (MW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.2890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_7 (MW)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_8 (MW)</td>
<td>52.1014</td>
<td>50.0010</td>
<td>50.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_9 (MW)</td>
<td>570.0816</td>
<td>790.0000</td>
<td>790.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_10 (MW)</td>
<td>0.0916</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_T ($/h)</td>
<td>6909.57</td>
<td>106.7906</td>
<td>198.6866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Event B show a pattern similar to Event A. The values for each generator unit in Case B-1 and B-2 give different values for the three optimization techniques. This is due to the low power demand, so there are many options for coupling the generator unit to get the required power demand. Meanwhile, the results for Case B-3 shows the value of each unit of the generator is in a narrow range for the three optimization techniques. This is because there are very few options for coupling generator units to obtain high power demand. Overall, the six-unit generator scheduling technique using PSO and MFO is capable of delivering the same value with power demand, without power loss. For the same generator system, EP method also produces almost identical power to the demand. However, there is a slight power loss generated by the EP, not exceeding 0.1 MW for Case B-1, Case B-2 and Case B-3. For all three cases, MFO is able to save on generating costs, followed by PSO and EP. From this result, MFO remains at the forefront of producing the lowest power generation cost and the lowest power loss compared to PSO and EP techniques.

6. CONCLUSION

This study proposes a power scheduling strategy using MFO to achieve optimum power output by generator units at minimum power generation costs. Two test systems which each has three different power demand is chosen as a test system and is carried out using MATLAB. The results show that MFO and PSO have successfully generated the same amount of power generation as power demand, with no loss of power. In terms of cost, MFO outperforms PSO in providing lower generation costs for the same power demand. In addition, the EP provides the highest total cost of generation compared to MFO and PSO. In fact, power generation using EP also results in power loss. In conclusion, MFO is the most appropriate technique in power scheduling for economic dispatch (ED) problems in power systems.
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