

# On the Solution Uniqueness of Data-Driven Modeling of Flexible Loads

Shuai Lu, Jiayi Ding, Wei Gu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Junpeng Zhu, Yijun Xu, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Zhaoyang Dong, *Fellow, IEEE*, Zezheng Sun

**Abstract**—This letter first explores the solution uniqueness of the data-driven modeling of price-responsive flexible loads (PFL). The PFL on the demand side is critical in modern power systems. An accurate PFL model is fundamental for system operations. Yet, whether the PFL model can be uniquely and correctly identified from operational data remains unclear. To address this, we analyze the structural and practical identifiability of the PFL model, deriving the condition for the solution uniqueness. Besides, we point out the practical implications of the results. Numerical tests validate this work.

**Index Terms**—Flexible loads, data-driven modeling, identifiability, inverse optimization, solution uniqueness.

## I. INTRODUCTION

THE demand-side flexible resources, including adjustable loads, distributed energy resources, and virtual power plants, are increasingly important in modern power systems. They can usually be modeled as price-responsive flexible loads (PFL) that actively respond to the electricity price to facilitate the system analysis. The model of the PFL that can accurately describe the temporal evolution of the aggregated power serves a critical interface role in power system operations.

Currently, two primary approaches exist for modeling the PFL: the physics-based and data-driven ones. The former starts from the individual components within the PFL. It usually frames the modeling of the PFL as a feasible region projection problem, and the commonly used techniques include the Minkowski sum methods [1], optimization-based outer/inner approximation methods [2], and heuristics-based feasible region elimination/expansion methods [3, 4]. However, this approach suffers from high computational demands and low accuracy, particularly as time periods expand. More critically, obtaining detailed models of each component within the PFL is impractical for power system operators.

Alternatively, the data-driven approach identifies the aggregated power model of PFL from the operational data, including the price and aggregated power, offering a more flexible and adaptable way. This approach usually resorts to the inverse optimization (IO) technique, as the aggregated power of the PFL is determined by an optimization model parametrized by the price. To name a few, Tan *et al.* [5] prescribe a physics-informed parametric virtual battery to describe the aggregate power of the PFL, the parameters of which are then identified by the IO method. Lyu *et al.* [6] further improve this approach by using machine learning to enhance the parameter updating efficiency. While the above work establishes the basic framework, some fundamental problems remain unsolved. This letter focuses on whether the PFL model can be uniquely identified from the data.

To address this, we analyze the structural and practical identifiability of the PFL model and derive the condition of the dataset under which the PFL model can be uniquely identified. Then, the practical implications of the results are discussed. Finally, numerical simulation validates the effectiveness of the results.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The PFL can actively respond to electricity prices to minimize costs. Under the price  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^T$ , the aggregated power  $P_*$  of the PFL can be calculated by the response model as

$$M(\Omega): P_*(\lambda, \Omega) = \underset{P \in \Omega}{\operatorname{argmin}} \lambda^T P, \quad (1)$$

wherein  $T$  is the length of periods;  $P$  is the aggregated power;  $P_*$  is the optimal solution of this model; and  $\Omega$  is the feasible region of the power  $P$  depending on the model of PFL.

The feasible region  $\Omega$  is usually characterized by the parameters  $\theta$ . A typical PFL model widely used in existing research is the storage-like model, which is a physical model using the battery to simulate the characteristics of PFL, as

$$\Omega(\theta) \triangleq \Omega_{\text{phy}}(\theta) = \left\{ P = \sum_{n \in N_{vb}} P_{vb}^n + \sum_{n \in N_{td}} P_{td}^n + \sum_{n \in N_{fix}} P_{fix}^n, \right. \\ \left. \begin{aligned} & \underline{E}_{vb}^n \leq P_{vb}^n \leq \bar{E}_{vb}^n, \forall n \in N_{vb} \\ & \underline{E}_{vb}^n \leq \Upsilon^n P_{vb}^n \Delta t + E_{vb,0}^n \leq \bar{E}_{vb}^n, \forall n \in N_{vb} \\ & P_{td}^n \leq P_{td}^n \leq \bar{P}_{td}^n, \forall n \in N_{td} \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

wherein  $P_{vb}^n, P_{td}^n \in \mathbb{R}^T$  are the power of the temporally coupled (i.e., virtual storage-like)/temporally decoupled adjustable loads;  $P_{fix}^n \in \mathbb{R}^T$  is the fixed load;  $\underline{P}_{vb}^n, \bar{P}_{vb}^n \in \mathbb{R}^T$  are the lower and upper bounds of  $P_{vb}^n$ ;  $\underline{P}_{td}^n, \bar{P}_{td}^n \in \mathbb{R}^T$  are the lower and upper bounds of  $P_{td}^n$ ;  $\underline{E}_{vb}^n, \bar{E}_{vb}^n, E_{vb,0}^n \in \mathbb{R}^T$  are the lower bound, upper bound, and initial value of the energy;  $\Upsilon^n \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$  is a lower triangular matrix, wherein  $(\Upsilon^n)_{ij} = (\sigma^n)^{i-j}$ ,  $i \geq j$  wherein  $\sigma^n$  denotes the energy loss ratio; and  $N_{vb}/N_{td}/N_{fix}$  is the index set of the temporally coupled adjustable loads/temporally decoupled adjustable loads/fixed loads in the PFL. In this model, the model parameters are  $\theta_{vb}^n = (\underline{P}_{vb}^n, \bar{P}_{vb}^n, \underline{P}_{td}^n, \bar{P}_{td}^n, \underline{E}_{vb}^n, \bar{E}_{vb}^n, E_{vb,0}^n, \sigma^n)$ .

Since the PFL model is embedded in the optimization model (1), its identification is a typical IO problem. After collecting the input-output pairs  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$ , we can use the following model to estimate the parameters  $\theta$ , as

$$\theta_* = \underset{\theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} f(\theta) = \sum_{k \in K} \|P_*^k - P^k(\theta)\| \\ \text{s.t. } P^k(\theta) = \underset{P \in \Omega(\theta)}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\lambda^k)^T P, \quad \forall k \in K \quad (3)$$

The model (3) is the core of the data-driven modeling of the PFL. Theoretically, if the model  $\Omega(\theta)$  is well defined so that  $\exists \theta$  making  $\Omega(\theta) \neq \emptyset$ , the model (3) always has (at least) a solution  $\theta$  such that  $f(\theta) < +\infty$ . Besides, if the dataset  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$  are noise-free and the model  $\Omega(\theta)$  is appropriately selected so that it can correctly describe the characteristics of the PFL, the optimal value of model (3) will be  $f(\theta) = 0$ .

## III. SOLUTION UNIQUENESS

First, let us introduce the definitions and assumptions to be used. These definitions are less rigorous but enough for this work.

**Definition 1 (Structural identifiability).** For the system

$y = y(u, \omega)$ , assuming that input  $u$  and output  $y$  are noise-free, it is said to be structurally identifiable if for all  $\omega$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  in the parameter space, there exists  $u$  in the input space  $U$  making that  $y(u, \omega) = y(u, \tilde{\omega})$  holds only when  $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$ .

**Definition 2 (Practical identifiability).** For the system  $y = y(u, \omega)$ , given the available input  $u \in U$  and output  $y$  (i.e., real and noisy), it is said to be practically identifiable if for all  $\omega$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  in the parameter space,  $y(u, \omega) = y(u, \tilde{\omega}), \forall u \in U$  implies  $\text{gap}(\omega - \tilde{\omega}) \leq \epsilon$ , wherein  $\text{gap}(\cdot)$  is a measure quantifying the uncertainties in the estimates, and  $\epsilon$  is a sufficiently small positive number.

**Assumption 1.** The set  $\Omega$  is a deterministic nonempty bounded polyhedron.

**Assumption 2.** The dataset  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), k \in K$  are noise-free.

**Remark 1.** Some extra explanations are as follows:

(1) Both structural and practical identifiability focus on whether we can uniquely determine the parameters  $\omega$ . The former is a necessary condition for the latter.

(2) With *Assumption 2*, the practical identifiability is equivalent to under the actually available  $u \in U$ , for all  $\omega$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  in the parameter space, if  $y(u, \omega) = y(u, \tilde{\omega}), \forall u \in U$  implies  $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$ .

Essentially, the solution uniqueness of the data-driven modeling of the PFL is equivalent to the practical identifiability of the response model  $M(\Omega)$  defined in (1) under the given dataset  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$ , also equivalent to the practical identifiability (or solution uniqueness) of the set  $\Omega$  in model (3) under the given dataset  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$ .

**Remark 2.** Apparently, the solution uniqueness of  $\Omega$  is critical for power system operators because  $\Omega$  describes the power adjustable ranges of the PFL, a false estimation of which will threaten the operational safety and economy.

Note that the solution uniqueness of the set  $\Omega$  is not necessarily equivalent to that of the parameters  $\theta$  in model (3). For example, for  $\Omega(\theta) \triangleq \{P | AP \leq b\}, \theta = \{A, b\}$ , we have  $\Omega(\theta) = \Omega(k\theta), \forall k > 0$ , indicating that any parameters  $k\theta, k > 0$  will produce the same  $\Omega$ . This makes the analysis of the solution uniqueness of the set  $\Omega$  in model (3) very complicated. To deal with this problem, with *Assumption 1*, we recast  $\Omega(\theta)$  into a vertex-based convex hull, as

$$\Omega(\theta) \triangleq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta) = \left\{ P \left| \begin{array}{l} P = \theta \zeta, 0 \leq \zeta \leq 1, \\ \mathbf{1}^T \zeta = 1, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^V \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (4)$$

wherein  $\theta = [\theta^1 \dots \theta^V] \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times V}$ ;  $\theta^i$  is the coordinate of the  $i$ th vertex; and  $V$  is the number of vertices.

It is evident that  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta) = \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\tilde{\theta})$  yields  $\theta = \tilde{\theta}$ . Therefore, the solution uniqueness of the set  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$  in model (3) is equivalent to that of the model parameters  $\theta$ .

Based on this, we can analyze the identifiability of the model  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$ . We first analyze the structural identifiability.

**Theorem 1 (Structural identifiability of  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$ ).** Under *Assumptions 1*,  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$  is structurally identifiable in model (3).

**Proof.** Since  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta)$  is a polyhedron, based on the supporting hyperplane theorem [7], for the  $i$ th vertex  $\theta^i$ , there exists some vector  $\lambda_*^i \in \mathbb{R}^T$  such that  $(\lambda_*^i)^T \theta^i \leq (\lambda_*^i)^T P, \forall P \in \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta)$ , wherein “=” holds if and only if  $P = \theta^i$ . Hence, we have  $P_*(\lambda_*^i, \theta^i) = \theta^i$ . This implies that the vertices  $\theta^i, i = 1, \dots, V$  can be uniquely determined by choosing a proper input  $\lambda_*^i$ . Therefore, once  $P_*(\lambda_*^i, \theta^i) = P_*(\lambda_*^i, \tilde{\theta}^i)$ , we can conclude  $\theta^i = \tilde{\theta}^i$ . ■

The next critical problem is the practical identifiability of  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$  under the dataset  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$  in model (3). Note

that if  $\exists \theta$  such that  $P_*(\lambda^k, \theta) = P_*^k, \forall k \in K$ , the optimal value of model (3) is  $f(\theta) = 0$ , but not vice versa. The reason is that there could exist multiple different  $\theta$  satisfying  $P_*(\lambda^k, \theta) = P_*^k$ , indicating that the model (3) will yield multiple different PFL model  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$ . Therefore, next we analyze the solutions of model (3).

Define the price matrix  $\Lambda = [\lambda^1 \dots \lambda^K]^T$ , the aggregate power matrix  $\Gamma_* = [P_*^1 \dots P_*^K]$ , the cost matrix  $\Xi = [(\lambda^1)^T P_*^1 \dots (\lambda^K)^T P_*^K]^T$ , and the set  $\Pi = \{P | \Lambda P \geq \Xi\}$ , wherein  $K = |K|$ . Then, the following theorem gives some insights into the solutions of model (3).

**Theorem 2 (Practical identifiability of  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}$ ).** Under *Assumptions 1 & 2*, for model (3) we have: (a)  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Pi$ ; (b) Any  $\theta_1$  satisfying  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1) \subseteq \Pi$  makes  $f(\theta_1) = 0$ , i.e., it is one of the optima of model (3); (c) Any  $\theta_2$  not satisfying  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2) \subseteq \Pi$  makes  $f(\theta_2) > 0$ , i.e., it is not the optimum of model (3).

**Proof.** (a) Since the pair  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$  is the solution of model (1), we have  $(\lambda^k)^T P_*^i \geq (\lambda^k)^T P_*^k, \forall i, k \in K$ . This yields  $\Lambda P_*^i \geq \Xi, \forall i \in K$ , i.e.,  $P_*^i \in \Pi, \forall i \in K$ , and hence we have  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Pi$ .

(b) For  $\theta_1$  satisfying  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1) \subseteq \Pi$ , since  $P_*^k \in \text{Conv}(\Gamma_*), \forall k \in K$  and  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1)$ , we have  $P_*^k \in \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1)$ . Since  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1) \subseteq \Pi$ , we have  $\Lambda P \geq \Xi, \forall P \in \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1)$ . This indicates  $\forall k \in K, P \in \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_1), (\Lambda)_k P \geq (\Xi)_k$ , i.e.,  $(\lambda^k)^T P \geq (\lambda^k)^T P_*^k$ . Hence, giving the with the input  $\lambda^k$ , one solution of model (1) is  $P_*(\lambda^k, \theta_1) = P_*^k, \forall k \in K$ . Hence, we have  $f(\theta_1) = 0$ . Note that  $\forall \theta, f(\theta) \geq 0$ , and thus  $\theta_1$  is one of the optima of model (3).

(c) The situation that  $\theta_2$  does not satisfy  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2) \subseteq \Pi$  includes two cases:  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \not\subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2)$  and  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2) \not\subseteq \Pi$ . The first case is obvious. We prove the second case in the following. For  $\theta_2$  satisfying  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2) \not\subseteq \Pi$ , we can always find a point  $P_o \in \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_2)$  and  $P_o \notin \Pi$ . Since  $P_o \notin \Pi$ , there exists at least one  $j \in K$  such that  $(\Lambda)_j P_o < (\Xi)_j$ , i.e.,  $(\lambda^j)^T P_o < (\lambda^j)^T P_*^j$ . Since  $P_*^j \in \Pi$ , we have  $P_*(\lambda^j, \theta_2) = P_o \neq P_*^j$ . This implies  $\|P_o - P_*^j\| > 0$ , and thus  $f(\theta_2) > 0$ . *Theorem 2.* (b) indicates that  $\exists \theta$  such that  $f(\theta) = 0$ . Hence,  $\theta_2$  is not the optimum of model (3). ■

**Remark 3.** *Theorem 2* gives some insightful conclusions, which are explained as follows:

(1) *Existence of solutions.* For model (3), there must exist at least one optimum  $\theta_*$  such that  $f(\theta_*) = 0$ , and  $\theta_*$  is the optimum if and only if  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta_*) \subseteq \Pi$ .

(2) *Uniqueness of solutions.* Denote  $\Delta\Omega \triangleq C_\Pi(\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*))$ , wherein  $C_X(Y)$  denotes the complement of  $Y$  in  $X$ . The case  $\Delta\Omega = \emptyset$  provides a certificate for the practical identifiability of the PFL under  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta)$ , i.e., the solution uniqueness of the data-driven modeling of PFL.

(3) *Information completeness of dataset.* The case  $\Delta\Omega \neq \emptyset$  indicates that the information in  $(\lambda^k, P_*^k), \forall k \in K$  is incomplete. In this case, it is unknown whether (part of)  $\Delta\Omega$  should be included in  $\Omega_{\text{vert}}(\theta)$ . The (part of)  $\Delta\Omega$  could be practically infeasible for the PFL or practically feasible but not being activated by the prices  $\lambda^k, \forall k \in K$ . Note that  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*)$  (or  $\Pi$ ) grows (or shrinks) as the effective information in  $\Gamma_*$  increases.

(4) *Computation of  $\Delta\Omega$ .* Although  $\Delta\Omega$  is hard to calculate, judging if  $\Delta\Omega = \emptyset$  is equivalent to checking whether  $\Pi \subseteq \text{Conv}(\Gamma_*)$ , i.e., checking if each point in the set  $\Pi$  is a feasible point in the set  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*)$ . This can be formulated into equivalent linear programming problems.

#### IV. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The above theoretical results reveal that the PFL model (specifically, the feasible region  $\Omega$ ) is not necessarily identifiable under the given dataset, in which model (3) will produce an incorrect PFL model that is inconsistent with reality. This will bring potential security risks and economic losses to the system operation but has not been fully noticed. Our results provide two implications for this problem, as follows.

##### (1) Checking the practical identifiability of $\Omega$

The results in Section III indicate that checking the practical identifiability of  $\Omega$  is essential to avoid false identification results. As shown in *Remark 3. (3)*, the practical identifiability of  $\Omega$  depends on the information completeness of the dataset. Based on this, *Remark 3. (4)* also provides a prior method to check the information completeness, which we can use to check the practical identifiability of  $\Omega$  in real-world applications. Note that this method relies on the noise-free assumption (i.e., *Assumption 2*). If the noise is non-negligible, we can use statistical methods, such as Bayesian inference, to posteriorly analyze the practical identifiability of  $\Omega$ , which is worthy of further study.

##### (2) Enhancing the practical identifiability of $\Omega$

As indicated in *Remark 3. (3)*, the practical unidentifiability of  $\Omega$  originates from the information completeness of the dataset. This inspires us to enhance practical identifiability using two different approaches. The first approach is to collect more effective data. Specifically, based on the conclusions of *Theorem 2*, we can choose any price  $\lambda \in \{\lambda|\lambda^T a \geq 0, \lambda^T b \geq 0\}$  to probe the undetermined region.

The second approach is to incorporate a priori physical knowledge of the PFL to eliminate the indetermination. The priori physical model, for example,  $\Omega_{phy}(\theta)$  in model (2), offers a concise but interpretable description of the PFL, and reduces the requirements for data quality and completeness. Essentially, this is equivalent to choosing a priori structure for the parameter space. *Remark 3* provides some implications for selecting a correct physical model  $\Omega_{phy}(\theta)$ . The case  $f(\theta_*) = 0$  and  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) = \Pi = \Omega_{phy}(\theta_*)$  indicates the information completeness of the dataset and the correctness of  $\Omega_{phy}(\theta)$ . The case  $f(\theta_*) > 0$  implies that the prior physical knowledge about the PFL is incorrect, meaning that we need to adjust the model  $\Omega_{phy}(\theta)$ . The final case is  $f(\theta_*) = 0$ ,  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subseteq \Omega_{phy}(\theta_*) \subseteq \Pi$ ,  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma_*) \subset \Pi$ , which reveals that the information in the dataset is incomplete. In this case, it remains unclear whether the physical model  $\Omega_{phy}(\theta)$  is correct or not, and more data is necessary.

#### V. NUMERICAL TEST

To validate the above results, we perform simulations on a hypothetical PFL consisting of a fixed load, a time-decoupled adjustable load, and four batteries. First, we randomly generate the electricity price samples and use model (1) to get the aggregated power of the PFL. Second, we choose the physical model  $\Omega_{phy}$  defined in (2) and use model (3) with 1-norm as the objective to identify the parameters. The length of the period is set to 2 for visualization. The detailed parameters and codes are provided in [8].

First, we investigate the impact of the sample size on sets  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma)$  and  $\Pi$ , as given in Fig. 1 (a). Consistent with theoretical results, the sets  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma)$  (or  $\Pi$ ) expands (or shrinks) as the sample size increases. Besides, the  $\Delta\Omega$  is still nonempty under 200 samples, indicating the information is insufficient. This means the operational characteristic of the




Fig. 1. (a)  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma)$  and  $\Pi$  under different sample sizes; (b) Identification results of  $\Omega_{phy}$  under different number of storage (1 and 2 for  $\Omega_{phy}^1$  and  $\Omega_{phy}^2$ , respectively). (A:  $\Pi$  shrinks as the sample sizes  $|K|$  increases from 20 to 50; B:  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma)$  expands as  $|K|$  increases from 20 to 50; C:  $\Pi$  shrinks as the  $|K|$  increases from 50 to 200; D: Undetermined region; E: Practically infeasible region; F: Undetermined region in  $\Omega_{phy}$ .)

PFL cannot be uniquely determined only by the current dataset, inspiring us to embed prior physical knowledge or design specific price vectors to detect if some undetermined region is feasible for the PFL. For example, we can choose any price  $\lambda \in \{\lambda|\lambda^T a \geq 0, \lambda^T b \geq 0\}$  to probe the undetermined region D in Fig. 1 (a).

Second, we analyze the identification results using 50 samples based on the physical model  $\Omega_{phy}$ , in which the numbers of storage are set to 1 and 2 for  $\Omega_{phy}^1$  and  $\Omega_{phy}^2$ , respectively. The feasible region of the aggregated power in  $\Omega_{phy}$  is given in Fig. 1 (b). Obviously, the embedding of physical knowledge significantly eliminates the undetermined regions, although the physical model  $\Omega_{phy}$  in (2) is not exactly correct since it contains the practically infeasible region E. Interestingly, the undetermined region F is also identified, which is not covered by  $\text{Conv}(\Gamma)$ . Besides, as the number of storage in the  $\Omega_{phy}$  increases, the identification result is more accurate, consistent with the theoretical results.

In summary, the simulation results validate the effectiveness of theoretical results. Besides, we provide extended numerical test results under noise-free and noisy datasets in the online supplementary material [8].

#### VI. CONCLUSION

This letter first investigates the solution uniqueness of the data-driven modeling of the PFL and gives some implications. We derive the condition of the dataset under which the PFL model can be uniquely identified from data. Overall, the data-driven modeling of the PFL is still in its initial stages. Future work includes (1) choosing a physics-compatible model for the PFL identification and (2) designing optimal prices to probe the undetermined region in the dataset.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] G. Chicco *et al.*, "Flexibility From Distributed Multienergy Systems," *P IEEE*, vol. 108, no. 9, pp. 1496-1517, 2020.
- [2] F. L. Muller *et al.*, "Aggregation and Disaggregation of Energetic Flexibility From Distributed Energy Resources," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 1205-1214, 2019.
- [3] Z. Tan *et al.*, "Non-Iterative Solution for Coordinated Optimal Dispatch via Equivalent Projection—Part II: Method and Applications," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 899-908, 2024.
- [4] Y. Wen *et al.*, "Aggregate temporally coupled power flexibility of DERs considering distribution system security constraints," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1-13, 2022.
- [5] Z. Tan *et al.*, "Data-Driven Inverse Optimization for Modeling Intertemporally Responsive Loads," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 4129-4132, 2023.
- [6] R. Lyu *et al.*, "Approximating energy-regulation feasible region of virtual power plants: a data-driven inverse optimization approach," *IEEE PES General Meeting*, 2024.
- [7] S. Boyd *et al.*, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [8] S. Lu *et al.*, "Data and codes," 2024; <https://github.com/Shuai-Lu/On-the-Identification-of-Generalized-Flexible-Load>.