

A Novel Fully Informed Water Cycle Algorithm for Solving Optimal Power Flow Problems in Electric Grids

Alireza Barzegar,^{*} Ali Sadollah,[†] and Rong Su,^{*}

Abstract—Optimal power flow (OPF) is a key tool for planning and operations in energy grids. The line-flow constraints, generator loading effect, piece-wise cost functions, emission, and voltage quality cost make the optimization model non-convex and computationally cumbersome to solve. Metaheuristic techniques for solving the problem have emerged as a promising solution to solve the complex OPF problem. Recently, the water cycle algorithm (WCA), a method inspired by the observation of the water cycle process and the surface run-off model was proposed for solving optimization problems. This paper proposes an improved version of WCA that uses the concept of sharing global and local information among individuals to improve the exploitation ability compared with the standard WCA. The so called fully informed WCA (FIWCA) is tested against standard WCA and other metaheuristic techniques studied in the literature on IEEE 30 and 57 bus systems for various scenarios. Comparison and discussion regarding the performance and reliability of the metaheuristic approaches studied in literature are discussed. The obtained optimization results show that the better performance of proposed FIWCA comparing with the WCA and other algorithms especially in term of stability performance over replications. Consequently, it emerges as a tool for solving OPF in a reliable and efficient manner.

Index Terms—Optimal power flow, Fully informed water cycle algorithm, Evolutionary algorithm, Global optimization, Nonlinear constrained programming

I. INTRODUCTION

TYPICALLY, an optimal power flow (OPF) problem determines the values of grid operating or planning decision variables by solving a non-convex and nonlinear optimization problem [1] with underlying physical and operating constraints. The non-convex and nonlinear terms in the OPF optimization model are due to power flow conditions, generator loading effects, voltage cost, piecewise cost function and emission cost. This makes the OPF problem computationally intensive to solve and, usually, determining the globally optimal solution is a time-consuming process. In literature, the mathematical programming approaches such as linear programming [2], quadratic programming [3], mixed integer programming [4], nonlinear programming [5] and Newton-based approaches and interior point methods [6] have been developed and employed to solve the OPF problem. However, these approaches usually provide a feasible solution, rather than a global one [7]. To overcome the computational difficulty as well as to obtain a global solution, meta-heuristic approaches such as genetic algorithms (GA) [8], simulated

annealing (SA) [9], particle swarm optimization (PSO) [10], ant colony optimization (ACO) [11], and others have been studied in the literature.

Owing to the ability of these meta-heuristic techniques in finding global or near-global optimum of complex constrained optimization problems, their applications in electrical networks and specially planning and scheduling problems such as power allocation, load management, economic dispatch, and the OPF have been attracted researchers in recent years. For instances, using the evolutionary optimization methods such as SA [12], PSO [13], fuzzy GA [14], biogeography based optimization (BBO) [15], teaching-learning based optimization (TLBO) [16], efficient evolutionary algorithm (EEA) [17], glowworm swarm optimization (GSO) [18], and hybrid differential evolution and harmony search algorithm (Hybrid DE-HA) [19].

However, since these approaches use meta-heuristics, performance improvements in these algorithms are sought to make them more deterministic and optimal. More recently, the water cycle algorithm (WCA), an optimization algorithm inspired by the water cycle process and observation of how streams and rivers flow into the sea, has been implemented for finding better optimal solutions of power flow optimization problems [20]. Typically the WCA simulates the surface run-off process, i.e., one of the main phases in the water cycle process observed in nature, as updating formulation for generating new individuals during iterative optimization process [21].

So far, many applications in different fields of research have utilized the efficiency of WCA for solving complex optimization problems in the literature. For instance, some modified versions of WCA have been implemented in different applications such as rough set theory [22], detecting optimum reactive power dispatch problems [23], optimal operation of reservoir systems [24] and antenna array pattern synthesis [25]. While improvements on WCA continue to evolve, its use in solving OPF problem has also not been explored.

First introduced by Eberhart and Kennedy [10] in 1995, the swarm optimization methods play an important role as the nature-inspired meta-heuristic optimization tools. Each of these algorithms is mainly induced by a phenomenon in nature such as fish schooling or bird flocking. In the canonical PSO algorithm every individual particle learns to update its velocity using the influence of the particle with the best so far obtained solution as well as the best obtained solution obtained by itself.

The idea of population organization and structure in swarm algorithm was first presented in [26]. Recent works show

^{*}: School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanayang Technological University, Singapore, alireza001@e.ntu.edu.sg, rsu@ntu.edu.sg.

[†]: University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran sadollah@usc.ac.ir.




Fig. 1. Population Topologies in Particle Swarms [27].

the significant impact of population structure and topology in improving the performance of these algorithms [27]–[29]. Figure 1 demonstrates the most common population topologies in particle swarms and how each individual communicate with other members during the exploitation phase of swarm algorithms [27].

Implementing the new communication topologies into the classical PSO results in new optimization new optimization meta-heuristics which aim to improve the performance of original algorithm by modifying the transferred information among individuals. Mendes et al. proposed a fully informed particle swarm optimization (FIPSO) [30] in which every particle's update strategy is influenced by all other members in the swarm. Some other algorithms also have been proposed based on the other communication topologies such as Firefly Algorithm (FA) [31], [32] which benefits from ring/cluster topology or glowworm swarm optimization (GSO) [33] in which every individual is influenced only by its better-performing neighbors within a specific radius. Therefore, considering the similarity between these algorithms and FIPSO, all these techniques can be represented as a family of Fully informed swarm (FIS) algorithms [34].

Since communicating with all the swarm members may cause to considering redundant information, some FIS algorithms are proposed to utilize a more efficient of information from the neighbors instead of absorbing complete information of all the swarm members [35]–[37].

Owing to the population-based properties of water cycle algorithm (WCA), communication topology among the individuals plays an important role in this optimization algorithm. The population individuals classified into three categories of sea, rivers and streams in which sea is a stream with the best solution and rivers are the next best solutions among the streams. Each stream may flows toward one of the rivers or sea, i.e. influenced by the information from only one of the rivers or sea, and the rivers may only flow towards the sea means that the each stream receives the information only from one of the rivers and/or sea and the rivers only communicate with the sea during the exploitation phase.

This investigation proposes an improved WCA that uses the idea of sharing global information among individuals during the exploitation phase, i.e. every stream benefits from the information not only from its allocated river/sea but also from all other rivers/sea during the exploration phase. Consequently, the proposed approach provides diversity in the selection of solution and eliminates the possibility of getting trapped at local optima, thereby enhancing the efficiency and accuracy of the algorithm significantly.

In the original WCA populations are clustered into a few sets, so we utilize this feature in the fully-informed algorithm and instead of using a complete communication topology among all the streams, only consider the information from the leader of each cluster, i.e. rivers or sea which leads to a more efficient algorithm in term of computation complexity while obtaining a higher performance toward finding the global solution.

The main contributions of this investigation are: (i) proposing a novel WCA with the concept of exchanging global and local information among individuals in the population, i.e. fully informed water cycle algorithm (FIWCA), (ii) solving the OPF problem considering nonlinearities introduced due to generator loading effect, line-flows, piece-wise cost, voltage quality cost and emission cost, and (iii) comparing the performance of the FIWCA with other meta-heuristic techniques including the traditional WCA for IEEE 30-bus, 57-bus test case, and renewable resources integrated 30-bus test case. Looking at obtained optimization results, the proposed FIWCA emerges as a promising technique for solving OPF with nonlinear cost/constraints and has the ability to reach the global optimum within a more reasonable time than existing techniques.

This paper is organized into 5 sections as given follows. The optimization model of the OPF and the different components are explained in Section 2. The proposed fully informed water cycle algorithm (FIWCA) is presented in Section 3 along with standard WCA. The optimization results, comparisons and discussions are provided in Section 4 for two reported test systems under different scenarios. Finally, conclusions and future research are given in Section 5.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider an n -bus electric power system in which $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ shows the set of all buses and \mathcal{L} denotes the set of all lines where $(l, m) \in \mathcal{L}$ shows the line connecting bus l to bus m . The optimal power flow (OPF) problem tries to minimize an objective function, $J(x, u)$, (e.g., generation cost) subject to several equality and inequality constraints, where x is the state vector of dependent variables including the slack bus real power output, P_{G1} , load bus voltages, V_{Dk} , generators reactive power outputs, Q_{Gk} , and the transmission lines apparent power, S_{lm} . Vector u shows the set of independent variables that contains the generators voltage V_{Gk} , generators real power outputs, P_{Gk} , except for the slack bus, P_{G1} , transformer tap settings, T_{lm} , and shunt VAR compensations, Q_{Ck} . The OPF problem deals with two groups of constraints including equality and inequality constraints given in the following subsections.

A. Equality Constraints

The equality constraints representing typical load flow equations are given as follows:

$$P_{Gk} - P_{Dk} = |V_k| \sum_{i=1}^n |V_i| \left(\mathbf{G}_{ik} (\cos(\theta_i - \theta_k)) + \mathbf{B}_{ik} (\sin(\theta_i - \theta_k)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (1a)$$

$$Q_{Gk} - Q_{Dk} = |V_k| \sum_{i=1}^n |V_i| \left(\mathbf{G}_{ik} (\sin(\theta_i - \theta_k)) - \mathbf{B}_{ik} (\cos(\theta_i - \theta_k)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (1b)$$

where P_{Gk} is the active power generation and Q_{Gk} is the reactive power generation at bus k -th and NB is the number of buses. G_{ik} , B_{ij} , and are conductance, susceptance, and phase difference of voltages between bus k -th and bus i -th, respectively. The active and reactive load demands at bus k -th are represented by P_{Dk} and Q_{Dk} , respectively.

B. Inequality constraints

Inequality constraints include a set of system operating constraints, which are given as follows. Note that the superscripts “*min*” and “*max*” denotes the lower and upper limits of the intended variable.

1) *Generator constraints*: the generator real and reactive power outputs and generator voltage are bounded as given follows:

$$P_{Gk}^{min} \leq P_{Gk} \leq P_{Gk}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2)$$

$$Q_{Gk}^{min} \leq Q_{Gk} \leq Q_{Gk}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (3)$$

$$|V_{Gk}^{min}| \leq |V_{Gk}| \leq |V_{Gk}^{max}| \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (4)$$

2) *Transformer constraints*: The transformer tap settings are restricted by their lower and upper limits as given follows

$$T_{lm}^{min} \leq T_{lm} \leq T_{lm}^{max} \quad \forall (l, m) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (5)$$

3) *Shunt VAR compensator constraints*: The shunt VAR are bounded by their limits defined as provided follows:

$$Q_{Ck}^{min} \leq Q_{Ck} \leq Q_{Ck}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (6)$$

4) *Security constraints*: The security limits include a set of constraints on load buses voltages and transmission lines powers given as follows

$$|V_{Lk}^{min}| \leq |V_{Lk}| \leq |V_{Lk}^{max}| \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (7)$$

$$|S_{lm}| \leq S_{lm}^{max} \quad \forall (l, m) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (8)$$

The intended OPF problem is then

$$\min J \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad (9b)$$

$$P_{Gk}^{min} \leq P_{Gk} \leq P_{Gk}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (9c)$$

$$Q_{Gk}^{min} \leq Q_{Gk} \leq Q_{Gk}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (9d)$$

$$|V_k^{min}| \leq |V_k| \leq |V_k^{max}| \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (9e)$$

$$|S_{lm}| \leq S_{lm}^{max} \quad \forall (l, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (9f)$$

$$(S_{lm})^2 = (P_{lm})^2 + (Q_{lm})^2 \quad \forall (l, m) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (9g)$$

$$P_{Gk} - P_{Dk} = |V_k| \sum_{i=1}^n |V_i| \left(\mathbf{G}_{ik} (\cos(\theta_i - \theta_k)) + \mathbf{B}_{ik} (\sin(\theta_i - \theta_k)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (9h)$$

$$Q_{Gk} - Q_{Dk} = |V_k| \sum_{i=1}^n |V_i| \left(\mathbf{G}_{ik} (\sin(\theta_i - \theta_k)) - \mathbf{B}_{ik} (\cos(\theta_i - \theta_k)) \right) \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (9i)$$

$$Q_{Ck}^{min} \leq Q_{Ck} \leq Q_{Ck}^{max} \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (9j)$$

$$T_{lm}^{min} \leq T_{lm} \leq T_{lm}^{max} \quad \forall (l, m) \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (9k)$$

The set of independent variables, i.e. control variables u , contains the generator voltage V_{Gk} , generator active power outputs P_{Gk} , except for the slack bus P_{G1} , transformer tap settings T_{lm} , and shunt VAR compensations Q_{Ck} .

III. WATER CYCLE ALGORITHM USING THE CONCEPT OF GLOBAL INFORMATION

In this section, the standard Water Cycle Algorithm (WCA) and an improved WCA are described in details. Subsequently, Fully informed WCA, denoted as FIWCA, is proposed by equipping the standard WCA with the concepts of moving strategies toward the best solutions. In order to explain the FIWCA, first, the whole processes of WCA are given in the following section.

A. Standard Water Cycle Algorithm

The water cycle algorithm (WCA), as a meta-heuristic optimization technique, which emulates the natural water flow process first has been presented in [20]. The algorithm initiates with the rain or precipitation phenomena by generation of a random population of design variables, or the streams population between lower and upper bounds. Then, the best stream, i.e. the stream with the minimum objective function value (for minimization problems) is selected as the sea.

Afterward, a set of streams with the closest objective values to the best objective value are selected as the rivers. Note that it is assumed that the remaining streams move toward the rivers and sea. Now let's see the mathematical explanation of the water cycle algorithm. Let us assume the $1 \times D$ dimensional array as a candidate solution (i.e., stream)

$$X = [x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_D], \quad (10)$$

where D is the number of design variable. Hence, the initial randomly generated population can be represented by an $N_{pop} \times D$ matrix as given follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Population} = & \begin{bmatrix} \text{Sea} \\ \text{River}_1 \\ \text{River}_2 \\ \text{River}_3 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Stream}_{N_{sr}+1} \\ \text{Stream}_{N_{sr}+1} \\ \text{Stream}_{N_{sr}+3} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Stream}_{N_{pop}} \end{bmatrix} \\ = & \begin{bmatrix} x_1^1 & x_2^1 & x_3^1 & \dots & x_D^1 \\ x_1^2 & x_2^2 & x_3^2 & \dots & x_D^1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_1^{N_{pop}} & x_2^{N_{pop}} & x_3^{N_{pop}} & \dots & x_D^{N_{pop}} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where N_{pop} is the population size. To choose the rivers and sea, first of all the cost value of every generated population, i.e. every stream, need to be determined. The cost of every stream X^i is calculated by evaluating the problem cost function for that stream as given follows

$$C_i = Cost_i = f(x_1^i, x_2^i, \dots, x_D^i) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{pop}. \quad (12)$$

A user parameter which is summation of number of rivers and sea so called N_{sr} is selected. Among this set, the individual stream with the smallest objective value is selected as the sea and the others are chosen as the rivers, given in the following equations

$$N_{sr} = \text{Number of Rivers} + \underbrace{1}_{\text{Sea}}, \quad (13)$$

$$N_{Stream} = N_{pop} - N_{sr}. \quad (14)$$

Therefore, the population of streams that flow towards the rivers and sea is given as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Population of Streams} = & \begin{bmatrix} \text{Stream}_1 \\ \text{Stream}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \text{Stream}_{N_{Stream}} \end{bmatrix} \\ = & \begin{bmatrix} x_1^1 & x_2^1 & \dots & x_D^1 \\ x_1^2 & x_2^2 & \dots & x_D^1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_1^{N_{Stream}} & x_2^{N_{Stream}} & \dots & x_D^{N_{Stream}} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In fact (15) which is a part of the total population with the size of N_{Stream} , (14). The sea and every river absorb water from the streams. As a matter of fact, water is flowing from streams toward the rivers and the sea by its own nature. The amount of water flow that enters a river or/and sea is different from one stream to another. The rivers also flow towards the sea which is in the deepest location. Therefore, the group of streams designated for every river and sea is determined by the following equation [21]

$$C_n = Cost_n - Cost_{N_{sr}+1} \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N_{sr}, \quad (16)$$

$$NS_n = \text{Round} \left\{ \left| \frac{C_n}{\sum_{n=1}^{N_{sr}} C_n} \right| \times N_{Stream} \right\} \quad n = 1, \dots, N_{sr}, \quad (17)$$

where NS_n is the number of streams which move toward the specific rivers and sea, i.e. NS_1 is the number of streams move toward the sea and $NS_2, \dots, NS_{N_{sr}}$ are the number of streams that flow toward their corresponding rivers.

As it can be observed in nature, raining and precipitation build the streams and the rivers are created by joining the streams to each other. Some of the streams might even move to the sea, directly. Eventually, all the streams and rivers reach the sea which is considered as the current best solution. Fig. 2 illustrates the process of WCA in which diamond, stars and circles represent the sea, rivers and streams, respectively. The black circles and stars show the current position of streams and rivers and the white ones denote their new position at the next iteration [20].

B. Fully Informed Water Cycle Algorithm

In the standard WCA, each stream corresponds to one of the rivers and/or sea without considering the influence of other rivers and the sea. The rivers also just consider the sea as their reference to exchange information for flowing. In this section, a fully informed water cycle algorithm has been proposed which every stream receives the influence of all rivers and/or sea as the information reference for the flowing and updating the new positions. The information in rivers flows not only to the sea, but these information flows can also be affected by all rivers and the sea to update their new positions and to intensively exploit the searching space. Fig. 3 displays the schematic view of the movement process used in FIWCA.

Now, mathematical explanations of updating the streams and rivers positions can be expressed. Let us assume N_{pop} is the




Fig. 2. Schematic View of the WCA Optimization Process [20].

total number of streams, of which $N_{sr} - 1$ are selected as the rivers and one individual is chosen as the sea. Let $(\vec{\cdot})$ represent a vector, the new position of streams and rivers are then given as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t+1) &= \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t) \\ &+ rand \times C \times (\vec{X}_{Sea}(t) - \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (18a)$$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, NS_1,$

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t+1) &= \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{N_{sr}-1} rand \times C \times (\vec{X}_{River}^j(t) - \vec{X}_{Stream}^i(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (18b)$$


$i = 1, 2, \dots, NS_2 - N_{sr},$

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{X}_{River}^i(t+1) &= \vec{X}_{River}^i(t) \\ &+ rand \times C \times (\vec{X}_{Sea}(t) - \vec{X}_{River}^i(t)) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{N_{sr}-1} rand \times C \times (\vec{X}_{River}^j(t) - \vec{X}_{River}^i(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (18c)$$


$i = 1, 2, \dots, (N_{sr} - 1),$

where $1 < C < 2$ as proposed in [20]. For the best performance C can be equal to 2, “rand” is a uniformly distributed random number between 0 and 1, t is the iteration index, and i is the number of individuals. Note that (18a) defines the new position for the streams that directly move toward the sea, see Fig. 3a, in the same way as the one used in standard WCA [20] and (18b) shows the new position for the streams which flow toward the rivers, not only its corresponding river, see Fig. 3b. In fact, in (18b), a stream flowing to the river, has been influenced not only by its specific river, but other rivers are also affecting the stream to provide full information of all the rivers for its new position. (18c) represents the new position of every river by considering the influence of the sea and all other rivers, see Fig. 3c.


Note that whenever the cost value of any stream becomes better (smaller) than the cost value of its corresponding river, the status of that stream and river are exchanged, i.e. the stream turns into a river and the river becomes a stream. The same replacement will occur between a river and the sea.



(a) New Position of the Streams which Directly Flow toward the Sea.



(b) New Position of the Streams which Flow toward the Rivers.



(c) New Position of Every River by Considering the Influence of Sea and all other Rivers.

Fig. 3. Schematic View of the Fully Informed Water Cycle Algorithm (FIWCA) Optimization Process.

In order to avoid getting trapped in local optima, the evaporation process has been introduced [21]. In nature, the evaporation process occurs as the streams and rivers run toward the sea, which leads to new precipitations.

The evaporation condition in the WCA is defined by whether any stream or river gets close enough (using Euclidian distance) to the sea. This idea is implemented in the standard WCA and FIWCA by the following criteria for the rivers flowing into the sea as well as the streams flowing into the sea, respectively, given as follows [21]

if $|\vec{X}_{Sea} - \vec{X}_{River}| < d_{max}$ or
 $rand < 0.1, i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{sr} - 1$ **then**
 Perform precipitation process using (19).
end if

Algorithm 1: Fully Informed Water Cycle Algorithm

Input: Set user parameters of the WCA: N_{pop} , N_{sr} , d_{max} , and Max Iteration.

Output: Optimized objective value and design variables.

- 1: *Initialisation:* Create a random initial population of streams between LB and UB (11).
- 2: **while** “($t \leq \text{Max Iteration}$)” or (any assumed stopping condition) **do**
- 3: **for** “ $i = 1 : N_{pop}$ ” **do**
- 4: Update the position of stream directly toward the sea using (18a).
- 5: Calculate the objective function of the newly generated stream.
- 6: **if** “ $\text{Objective}(\text{New Stream}) < \text{Objective}(\text{Sea})$ ” **then**
- 7: “ $\text{Sea} = \text{New Stream}$ ”.
- 8: **end if**
- 9: Update the position of stream to its corresponding river while considering the information flow from the other rivers using (18b).
- 10: Compute the objective function value of the newly generated stream.
- 11: **if** “ $\text{Objective}(\text{New Stream}) < \text{Objective}(\text{River})$ ” **then**
- 12: River = New Stream.
- 13: **if** “ $\text{Objective}(\text{River}) < \text{Objective}(\text{Sea})$ ” **then**
- 14: “ $\text{Sea} = \text{River}$ ”.
- 15: **end if**
- 16: **end if**
- 17: Update the position of river to the sea while considering the information flow from other rivers using (18c).
- 18: Compute the objective function value of the newly generated river.
- 19: **if** “ $\text{Objective}(\text{New River}) < \text{Objective}(\text{Sea})$ ” **then**
- 20: “ $\text{Sea} = \text{New River}$ ”.
- 21: **end if**
- 22: **end for**
- 23: %% Evaporation Condition for rivers
- 24: **for** “ $i = 1 : N_{sr} - 1$ ” **do**
- 25: **if** “ $|\vec{X}_{Sea} - \vec{X}_{River}| < d_{max}$ or ($rand < 0.1$)” **then**
- 26: Create new streams and a river (the best one) using (19).
- 27: **end if**
- 28: **end for**
- 29: %% Evaporation Condition for streams who directly flow to the sea
- 30: **for** “ $i = 1 : NS_1$ ” **do**
- 31: **if** “ $|\vec{X}_{Sea} - \vec{X}_{Stream}| < d_{max}$ ” **then**
- 32: Create New streams using (19) and the best one is considered as the sea.
- 33: **end if**
- 34: **end for**
- 35: Reduce the d_{max} using (20).
- 36: **end while**
- 37: **return** Post-process the results and visualization.

if $|\vec{X}_{Sea} - \vec{X}_{Stream}| < d_{max}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, NS_1$ **then**
 Perform precipitation process using (19).
end if

which states that if any river (stream) gets closer than d_{max} to the sea, then the evaporation process occurs. After the evaporation condition is satisfied, it is required to randomly form the new streams in a different position between lower and upper bounds. This phenomenon happens by the precipitation process which provides a new sub-population for which the best stream becomes the river (sea) and the other streams moves toward this river (sea). Indeed, the evaporation and raining process help in the exploration phase of the WCA. The location of newly generated sub-population of the corresponding evaporated river (stream) can be specified as follows

$$\vec{X}_{Stream}(t+1) = \vec{LB} + rand \times (\vec{UB} - \vec{LB}), \quad (19)$$

in which \vec{LB} and \vec{UB} represent the lower and upper bounds of the optimization problem, respectively. Since large values of d_{max} cause extra exploration and very small values lead to the search gravity around the sea, i.e. more exploitation, thus, this parameter, d_{max} , may directly affect the search intensity near the sea. For the sake of convergence, it is recommended in [21] to decrease the value of d_{max} adaptively as given follows

$$d_{max}(t+1) = d_{max}(t) - \frac{d_{max}(t)}{\text{Max Iteration}} \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, \text{Max Iteration}. \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, Algorithm 1 shows the pseudo-code of FIWCA in details.

C. Constraint Handling and Feasibility Rules

The OPF problem includes a set of constraints on the independent or design variables, such as generators active power outputs and generators voltages, and a set of constraints on the dependent variables, such as line power flows, generators reactive power outputs, and voltages of non-generators buses. The optimization tools and techniques have to be able to handle all these constraints.

Here, the proposed FIWCA utilizes different procedures to maintain each of these groups of constrains to maintain the feasibility of the candidate solutions at each iteration.

To handle the constraints on the design variables which are directly considered by the FIWCA, the following rules are defined [38]:

- **Rule 1:** Between any two feasible candidate solutions the one with the best objective function value is preferred.
- **Rule 2:** Any feasible candidate solution is preferred to any infeasible candidate solution.
- **Rule 3:** Infeasible solutions containing slight violation of the constraints (from 0.01 in the first iteration to 0.001 in the last iteration) are considered as feasible candidate solutions.
- **Rule 4:** Between two infeasible solution the one with the lowest sum of constraint violation is preferred.

As discussed, the OPF problem also includes a set of constraints on the independent variables which are not directly

considered in the proposed algorithm. To overcome these constraints, the penalty function approach is utilized, i.e. a penalty function of the each constraint violation is defined and added to the original objective function with a large penalty multiplier.

IV. OPTIMIZATION RESULTS

The proposed FIWCA and WCA have been implemented in OPF problems for the IEEE standard 30-bus and 57-bus test systems to obtain better optimal solutions using the proposed improved version and also for the sake of comparison among previous works. The optimization methods considered in this paper have been coded in “MATLAB” and solved on an “Intel 3.40 GHz” computer with “8 GB of RAM”. For the original WCA and the fully informed WCA, the population size and the maximum iteration number are fixed to 200 and 100, respectively, i.e. the maximum number of function evaluation of 20,000, in order to have a fair comparison with other algorithms. All numerical test systems are performed for 50 independent replications. Note that in the FIWCA and WCA, the total number of sea and rivers, N_{sr} , is considered as 5.

In the literature, a variety of meta-heuristic optimization techniques have been studied for the OPF problems. In this work, the following optimizers have been considered: shuffled frog-leaping algorithm (SFLA) [16], constant inertia particle swarm optimization (CI-PSO) [39], dragonfly algorithm and particle swarm optimization (DA-PSO) [40], teaching-learning based optimization (TLBO) and Levy TLBO (LTLBO) [16], multi-objective TLBO (MOTLBO) [41], particle swarm optimization and gravitational search algorithm (PSOGSA) [42], grey wolf optimizer (GWO) and developed grey wolf optimizer (DGWO) [43], enhanced differential evolution (Enhanced DE) [44], artificial bee colony (ABC) [45], Jaya algorithm [46], evolving ant direction differential evolution (EADDE), efficient evolutionary algorithm (EEA), enhanced GA for decoupled quadratic load flow (EGA-DQLF) [47], glowworm swarm optimization (GSO) [18], hybrid differential evolution and harmony search algorithm (Hybrid DE-HS) [19], modified sine-cosine algorithm(MSCA) [48], bare-bones multi-objective particle swarm optimization (BB-MOPSO) [49], biogeography-based optimization (BBO) [50], chaotic self-adaptive differential harmony search algorithm (CSA-DHS) [51], modified non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm (MNSGA-II) [49], hybrid differential evolution and pattern search (DE-PS) [52], modified particle swarm optimization (MPSO) [53], [54], improved particle swarm optimization (IPSO) [55], differential search algorithm (DSA) [56], hybrid modified PSO-SFLA (HMPSO-SFLA) [57], gravitational search algorithm (GSA) [58], linearly decreasing inertia weight PSO (LDI-PSO) [45], harmony search algorithm (HSA) [59].

A. IEEE 30-bus Test System

The IEEE 30-bus test system, as shown in Fig. 4, has six generators fixed at buses 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, and 13, four transformers with the off-nominal tap ratio at lines 6-9, 6-10, 4-12, and 28-27. Load data and line data for the IEEE




Fig. 4. Schematic View of IEEE 30-bus Test System.

30-bus test system can be found in [13]. According to the literature [13], buses 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 29 are considered as shunt VAR compensation buses. The minimum and maximum limits on control variables can be found in Appendix, Table XI. The proposed FIWCA is implemented on OPF problem with different objective function scenarios to evaluate its effectiveness, as presented in the following subsections.

1) *Case 1: Minimization of Quadratic Fuel Cost:* In this case, the objective function of the OPF problem is to minimize the total generation fuel cost by defining a quadratic objective function J_1 as given follows

$$J_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} f_i(P_{Gi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2), \quad (21)$$

where P_{Gi} and f_i are the output power and the generation fuel cost of i -th generator, respectively, and c_{i0} , c_{i1} , and c_{i2} are the cost coefficients of the i -th generator which can be found in Appendix, Table XII. The optimal values of design variables for Case 1, achieved by the proposed FIWCA, can be found in Table I. The total generation fuel cost achieved by FIWCA is \$798.8608 per hour, while the total emission and power losses are 0.3661 ton per hour and 8.5719 MW, respectively. Comparison of the optimized fuel cost using the FIWCA along with the other reported optimization methods is tabulated in Table II.

By observing Table II, the minimum total fuel cost obtained by FIWCA shows better stability in terms of statistical results where the average fuel cost for FIWCA is \$798.8609 per hour. The best attainable results of Case 1 have been highlighted in bold in Table II.

2) *Case 2: Improvement of Voltage Profiles:* One of the critical variables of any power flow system, closely correlated

OPTIMAL CONTROL SETTINGS FOR DIFFERENT ON IEEE STANDARD CASES 30-BUS TEST SYSTEM USING THE WCA AND FIWCA. "N/A" STANDS FOR NOT AVAILABLE.

Design Variables	Case 1		Case 2		Case 3		Case 4		Case 5	
	WCA	FIWCA	WCA	FIWCA	WCA	FIWCA	WCA	FIWCA	WCA	FIWCA
P_{G1} (MW)	177.0771	177.0756	177.1920	176.0293	139.9999	139.9995	199.5996	199.5996	64.9297	64.9350
P_{G2} (MW)	48.6765	48.6800	50.0000	50.0007	54.9998	54.9988	20.0000	0.0000	66.4293	66.4241
P_{G5} (MW)	21.2971	21.2965	21.7403	21.6417	24.1771	25.0704	21.9998	22.5907	50.0000	50.0000
P_{G8} (MW)	21.0805	21.0806	23.2284	22.4090	34.9303	34.8609	26.1736	24.5433	35.0000	35.0000
P_{G11} (MW)	11.8404	11.8390	10.0009	12.2134	18.8638	16.3878	12.7518	13.5448	30.0000	30.0000
P_{G13} (MW)	12.0000	12.0000	11.2310	11.0339	17.4422	18.8228	12.0616	12.2930	40.0000	40.0000
V_{G1} (p.u.)	1.1000	1.0999	1.0347	1.0369	1.0500	1.0862	1.1000	1.1000	1.1000	1.1000
V_{G2} (p.u.)	1.0877	1.0877	1.0189	1.0218	1.0404	1.0711	1.0845	1.0846	1.0956	1.0957
V_{G5} (p.u.)	1.0614	1.0614	1.0105	1.0141	1.0157	1.0377	1.0589	1.0592	1.0781	1.0781
V_{G8} (p.u.)	1.0693	1.0693	1.0056	1.0071	1.0260	1.0536	1.0684	1.0682	1.0855	1.0856
V_{G11} (p.u.)	1.1000	1.1000	1.0273	0.9973	1.1000	1.0152	1.1000	1.1000	1.1000	1.1000
V_{G13} (p.u.)	1.0999	1.0999	0.9978	0.9977	1.0909	1.0506	1.0999	1.1000	1.1000	1.1000
T_{6-9} (p.u.)	1.0311	1.0311	1.0433	1.0111	0.9247	0.9949	1.0297	1.0297	1.0343	1.0340
T_{6-10} (p.u.)	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	1.0205	1.0065	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000	0.9000
T_{4-12} (p.u.)	0.9679	0.9679	0.9540	0.9541	0.9563	1.0343	0.9678	0.9666	0.9597	0.9600
T_{28-27} (p.u.)	0.9584	0.9583	0.9694	0.9688	0.9281	0.9997	0.9572	0.9570	0.9623	0.9625
Q_{C10} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	4.9877	N/A	N/A	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C12} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	0.0000	0.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C15} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	4.9450	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C17} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	0.0213	0.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C20} (MVAR)	4.3034	4.3069	5.0000	5.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	4.9677	4.1321	4.1505
Q_{C21} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C23} (MVAR)	2.6507	2.6422	5.0000	5.0000	N/A	N/A	5.0000	2.5560	2.5322	2.5603
Q_{C24} (MVAR)	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000	N/A	N/A	0.0003	5.0000	5.0000	5.0000
Q_{C29} (MVAR)	2.3028	2.3045	2.6755	2.6105	N/A	N/A	4.9994	2.2920	2.1391	2.1450
Fuel cost (\$/h)	798.8608	798.8608	803.9741	803.9370	647.5310	646.6892	917.0858	917.0740	941.8130	941.8048
Emission (ton/h)	0.3661	0.3661	0.3671	0.3634	0.2834	0.2835	0.4405	0.4401	0.2047	0.2047
Power loss (MW)	8.5718	8.5719	9.9928	9.9282	7.0133	6.7404	9.1866	9.1715	2.9591	2.9591
VD (p.u.)	2.0379	2.0381	0.0974	0.0969	1.1870	0.4675	1.9943	2.0398	2.2653	2.2671

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR CASE 1, I.E. FUEL COSTS (\$/H), USING SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Minimum Fuel Cost	Average Fuel Cost	Maximum Fuel Cost
SFLA [16]	802.2100	N/A	N/A
DA-PSO [40]	802.1241	N/A	N/A
MTLBO [60]	801.8925	801.95	N/A
PSO [16]	801.8900	N/A	N/A
PSOGSA [42]	801.4986	N/A	N/A
GWO [43]	801.2590	802.6630	804.8980
Enhanced DE [44]	801.2300	N/A	N/A
ABC [45]	800.6600	800.8715	801.8674
Jaya [46]	800.4986	N/A	N/A
DGWO [43]	800.4330	800.4674	800.4989
EADDE [61]	800.2041	N/A	N/A
EEA [17]	800.0831	800.1730	800.2123
EGA-DQLF [47]	799.5600	N/A	N/A
FIWCA (This Study)	798.8608	798.8609	798.8612

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR CASE 2, I.E. TOTAL VOLTAGE DEVIATION (V.D.) (P.U.), OBTAINED BY SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Minimum V.D.	Average V.D.	Maximum V.D.
ABC [39]	0.1351	N/A	N/A
CI-PSO [39]	0.1350	N/A	N/A
MABC [39]	0.1292	N/A	N/A
Jaya [46]	0.1243	N/A	N/A
GWO [62]	0.1076	N/A	N/A
MSCA [48]	0.1031	N/A	N/A
BB-MOPSO [49]	0.1021	N/A	N/A
BBO [50]	0.1020	0.1105	0.1207
CSA-DHS [51]	0.1006	N/A	N/A
MNSGA-II [49]	0.0989	N/A	N/A
FIWCA (This Study)	0.0969	0.0972	0.0998

with the stability and security of the power system, is bus voltages of the grid. Hence, improving the quality of the bus voltage profiles and keeping them close to the reference value of 1.0 p.u. can be considered as one of the desired goals of OPF problem. In this case, the improved algorithm has been implemented to minimize the total generation fuel cost, while forcing the bus voltages close to 1.0 p.u.. Thus, the objective function can be defined as given follows

$$J_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2) + w \sum_{i=1}^{NPQ} |V_i - 1.0|. \quad (22)$$

The first term of (22) demonstrates the total fuel cost and the second term shows the cost on voltage profile tracking which tries to minimize the total voltage deviation (V.D.) and w is the weighting factor and considered as 100 in this simulation. The FIWCA has been applied to this case to determine the optimal values of design variables by minimizing the fuel cost, as presented in Table I, while keeping the bus voltage profiles close to the desired profile.

The total voltage deviation obtained by the FIWCA is 0.0969 p.u.. Table III demonstrates a comparison of performances among the previous studies and FIWCA on the cost of voltage profiles. The best attainable voltage deviation cost values have been highlighted in bold in Table III which shows the minimum total voltage deviation is obtained by FIWCA

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR CASE 3, I.E. FUEL COSTS (\$/H), OBTAINED BY SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Minimum Fuel Cost	Average Fuel Cost	Maximum Fuel Cost
MDE [54]	650.2800	N/A	N/A
ABC [45]	649.0855	654.0784	659.7708
Fuzzy-GA [63]	648.2309	648.4410	648.7682
TLBO [16]	647.8125	647.8335	647.8415
BBO [50]	647.7437	647.7645	647.7928
DE-PS [52]	647.5500	647.6029	647.9253
LTLBO [16]	647.4315	647.4725	647.8638
FIWCA (This Study)	646.6892	647.4275	647.5760

is smaller than the other algorithms. The obtained statistical results also show better performance of FIWCA with average total voltage deviation of 0.0971 p.u. which is very reasonable comparing to the other algorithms.

3) Case 3: Piecewise Quadratic Fuel Cost Function:

In real power generation units, it is possible that thermal generating units can be supplied by various types of fuel sources, e.g., natural gas, coal, and oil. Therefore, the total fuel cost function of this generation units may be composed of piecewise quadratic cost functions specified by the type of consuming fuel. Here, we suppose that the generation units at buses 1 and 2 may be fed by different fuel types depending on their ranges of working. Hence, the generation fuel cost function of these units can be redefined using the following equation

$$f_i(P_{Gi}) = \begin{cases} c_{i0_1} + c_{i1_1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2_1}P_{Gi}^2 & P_{Gi}^{min} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi_1} \\ c_{i0_2} + c_{i1_2}P_{Gi} + c_{i2_2}P_{Gi}^2 & P_{Gi_1} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi_2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ c_{i0_3} + c_{i1_3}P_{Gi} + c_{i2_3}P_{Gi}^2 & P_{Gi_{k-1}} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi}^{max} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (23)$$

where c_{i0_k} , c_{i1_k} , and c_{i2_k} are the cost coefficients of i -th generator with fuel type k which their values can be seen in Appendix, Table XIII. Thus, the total generation fuel cost function can be defined as follows

$$J_3 = \sum_{i=1}^2 (c_{i0_k} + c_{i1_k}P_{Gi} + c_{i2_k}P_{Gi}^2) + \sum_{i=3}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2). \quad (24)$$

In order to have a fair comparison with the previous works, the upper limit of bus voltages is set to 1.05 and also no VAR compensation bus is considered. As presented in Table I, the total fuel cost obtained by the FIWCA is \$646.6892 per hour. Table IV demonstrates the statistical comparison using different optimizers for solving this specific case of OPF problem, which shows better performance of the FIWCA comparing to the other algorithms in case of the minimum and average cost values over 50 replications, where the average cost value by

FIWCA is \$647.4275 per hour. The best attainable fuel cost values have been highlighted in bold in Table IV.

4) **Case 4: Quadratic Cost function with Valve Point Loading Effect:** To improve the optimal solution of power flow problems with non-convex cost functions, the valve point loading effect on generators can be considered in the generation fuel cost function of the generators. As reported in the literature [13], the new fuel cost function can be re-written for Generators 1 and 2 and the other generators cost functions would be kept as the same with Case 1.

The new fuel cost function of Generators 1 and 2 can be given as follows

$$f_i(P_{Gi}) = c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2 + \left| d_i \sin(e_i(P_{Gi}^{min} - P_{Gi})) \right| \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (25)$$

The cost coefficients of quadratic part of cost function c_{i0} , c_{i1} and, c_{i2} and the coefficients of valve point loading effect term, d_i and e_i , can be found in Appendix, Table XIV. So, the modified objective function for Case 4 is defined as

$$J_4 = \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2 + \left| d_i \sin(e_i(P_{Gi}^{min} - P_{Gi})) \right| \right) + \sum_{i=3}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2). \quad (26)$$

To find the detailed optimized control parameters by WCA and FIWCA for this case readers are referred to Table I. Table V tabulates the obtained statistical optimization results using the different optimization algorithms which demonstrate better performance of the WCA and especially FIWCA comparing to the previous algorithms

The best fuel cost value obtained by the FIWCA is \$917.0740 per hour. The emission and power loss obtained by the FIWCA are 0.4401 ton per hour and 9.1715 MW, respectively, which are lower values comparing to the other algorithms, i.e. the FIWCA resulted in smaller fuel cost value, emission and power loss. The average cost values obtained by the FIWCA is \$917.3205 per hour.

The best-obtained fuel cost values have been highlighted in bold in Table V. As can be seen in Table V, the only algorithm that could compete in terms of solution quality with the proposed method is BBO with the average of \$919.8389 per hour against the value of \$917.3205 per hour obtained by the FIWCA. The remaining optimization methods show worse optimal solutions.

5) **Case 5: Minimization of Fuel Cost and Emission:** In this case, we minimize the emission function for the OPF problem as well as the fuel cost. For this purpose, the emission function of SOX and NOX, two impressive emitted gas of electrical power generation processes, are considered. The emission function can be presented as given follows

$$f_{E_i}(P_{Gi}) = c_{i0}^{SOX} + c_{i1}^{SOX}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}^{SOX}P_{Gi}^2 + d_i^{NOX} \exp(e_i^{NOX}P_{Gi}), \quad (27)$$

TABLE V
COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR CASE 4, I.E. FUEL COSTS (\$/H), OBTAINED BY SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Minimum Fuel Cost	Average Fuel Cost	Maximum Fuel Cost
MPSO [53], [54]	952.3000	N/A	N/A
ABC [45]	945.4495	960.5647	973.5995
MDE [54]	930.94	N/A	N/A
BBO [50]	919.7647	919.8389	919.8876
PSOGSA [42]	919.65785	N/A	N/A
TLBO [16]	919.3943	919.4710	919.6483
DE-PS [52]	919.0175	919.4750	919.9842
FIWCA (This Study)	917.0740	917.3205	918.1678

TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR CASE 5, I.E. TOTAL EMISSION (TON/H), OBTAINED BY SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Minimum Emission	Average Emission	Maximum Emission
TLBO [16]	0.2124	0.2141	0.2156
MDE [54]	0.2093	N/A	N/A
IPSO [55]	0.2058	N/A	N/A
DSA [56]	0.2058	N/A	N/A
DE-PS [52]	0.2052	0.2071	0.2177
HMPSO-SFLA [57]	0.2052	N/A	N/A
DA-PSO [40]	0.2049	N/A	N/A
ABC [45]	0.2048	N/A	N/A
FIWCA (This Study)	0.2047	0.2047	0.2047

where c_{i0}^{SOX} , c_{i1}^{SOX} , and c_{i2}^{SOX} are the SOX emission coefficients, and d_i^{NOX} and e_i^{NOX} are the NOX emission coefficient of i -th generator. The values of these coefficients can be found in Appendix, Table XV. Hence, the objective function of this case can be expressed as given follows

$$J_5 = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2) + \tau \sum_{i=1}^{NG} \left(c_{i0}^{SOX} + c_{i1}^{SOX}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}^{SOX}P_{Gi}^2 + d_i^{NOX} \exp(e_i^{NOX}P_{Gi}) \right). \quad (28)$$

Note that in this simulation, the value of τ is set to 50000. The optimized value of control variables for this case also can be observed in Table I. Table VI represents the total amount of emission of generator by optimizing the power flow problem attained by reported methods in the literature.

The total emission obtained by the FIWCA is 0.2047 ton per hour, while the total fuel cost achieved by the FIWCA is \$941.8048 per hour. Looking at Table VI, the FIWCA shows the best stability in obtained solutions, with the average emission of 0.2047 ton per hour, compared with the other algorithms. The best obtained total emission values have been highlighted in bold in Table VI.

B. IEEE 57-bus Test System

As mentioned in Section 1, one of the main features of the OPF problem, which makes it more complicated, is the size of the problem especially in large-scale power systems. To figure out the performance of the FIWCA in a larger system, the IEEE standard 57-bus test system has been considered. The




Fig. 5. Schematic View of IEEE 57-bus Test System.

IEEE standard 57-bus test system, as shown in Fig. 5, consists of seven generators, 17 transformers with off-nominal tap ratio, and three shunt VAR compensation buses. The lower and upper limits on control variables are available in Appendix, Table XVI. The WCA and FIWCA have been applied to this problem for a quadratic cost function given below

$$J_{57-Bus} = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} f_i(P_{Gi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{NG} (c_{i0} + c_{i1}P_{Gi} + c_{i2}P_{Gi}^2), \quad (29)$$

where the coefficients of the i -th generator c_{i0} , c_{i1} and c_{i2} are presented in Appendix, Table XVII. The optimal control variables achieved by implementing the WCA and FIWCA for the IEEE 57-bus test system can be found in Table VII.

By evaluating the total optimized costs using the FIWCA, comparing with the previous works, as presented in Table VIII, the superior performance of the FIWCA against the other considered optimizers is visible. The minimum value of the total generation fuel cost for this test system is \$41,675.07 per hour, best optimal solution obtained by different optimization algorithms. As demonstrated in Table VII, not only the total fuel cost but also the total power loss obtained by the FIWCA is smaller than the standard WCA.

C. Multi-period OPF problem with Renewable Resources

Inserting the renewable energy resources into the power grid has many advantages, e.g., reducing the total network emission as the renewable sources are non-pollutant, requiring less

maintainable comparing to the traditional power generation units, and decreasing the total power loss in transmission lines as the renewable resources are possible to be distributed within whole the network which decreases the amount of transmitted power through the lines. The total generated power by these renewable resources is dependent on the natural condition, i.e. wind speed, solar radiation, etc., which leads to time and location variant power output. On the other hand, the required power demand is variant during different periods of the day so it is required to solve a multi-period OPF problem.

The performance of FIWCA in solving the multi-period OPF problem including the renewable energy resources is the other challenge which would be investigated in this section. For this aim, the IEEE 30-Bus test system is considered for a period of 24 hours with 1-hour time steps with assumed variable load demands and distributed renewable resources with time and location variant power inserted at the load buses.

To illustrate the performance of FIWCA in solving multi-period OPF problem with integrated renewable resources, Fig. 6 shows how to algorithm works in presence of renewable resources. Fig. 6a represents the power demand at each time step and total generated power by the traditional generators in two different scenarios, with integrated renewable resources and without them. The difference between the generated power of these scenarios is shown in Fig. 6b which shows a total reduction of about 557.64 \$ per day. The total power loss at each time is also demonstrated in Fig. 6c and total cost saving percentage at each time period is presented in Fig 6d where the average saving during the day is about 10.4 %.

Table IX presents the comparison results of total fuel cost, total power loss and total emission for the period of 24 hours between the renewable integrated grid and the grid without any renewable resources. The simulation results show that total fuel cost is reduced about 12 %, total power loss is approximately decreased 21 % and total emission from the fossil fuels is reduced around 7 %.

D. Discussion

The simulation results obtained for the IEEE 30-bus and 57-bus test systems show the better performance of FIWCA in case of finding almost smaller cost function in different conditions, e.g. minimization of fuel cost, emission and voltage deviation compared with the standard WCA and the other reported optimizers. It is worth mentioning that the OPF problems are categorized as well-studied problems, whose solution quality is very tight to the globally optimal solution in some cases.

Therefore, the expected improvement level can be marginal, and no further major improvements can be performed. However, the statistical results validate the better quality of the proposed algorithm in term of stability of solution over replications which guarantees the reliability of the FIWCA comparing with the WCA and the other compared algorithms.

Furthermore, Fig. 7 depicts the fuel cost value (\$/h) vs. iteration numbers for the IEEE 30-bus system, i.e. case 1, and IEEE 57-bus system which show the convergence characteristic of the proposed FIWCA. Looking at Fig. 7, the FIWCA has faster and mature convergence rate compared with the standard

TABLE VII
THE BEST CONTROL DESIGN VARIABLES OBTAINED BY THE FIWCA AND WCA FOR IEEE 57-BUS TEST SYSTEM.

Design Variables	WCA	FIWCA	Design Variables	WCA	FIWCA
P_{G1} (MW)	143.7551	142.9590	T_{24-25} (p.u.)	1.1000	0.9977
P_{G2} (MW)	90.3183	91.4265	T_{24-25} (p.u.)	0.9691	1.0486
P_{G3} (MW)	44.8778	45.0336	T_{24-26} (p.u.)	1.0206	1.0231
P_{G6} (MW)	69.4730	71.0449	T_{7-29} (p.u.)	0.9766	0.9827
P_{G8} (MW)	460.7114	460.3489	T_{34-32} (p.u.)	0.9621	0.9652
P_{G9} (MW)	96.2347	94.5440	T_{11-41} (p.u.)	0.9000	0.9001
P_{G12} (MW)	360.5641	360.5006	T_{15-45} (p.u.)	0.9619	0.9668
V_{G1} (p.u.)	1.0600	1.0597	T_{14-46} (p.u.)	0.9491	0.9540
V_{G2} (p.u.)	1.0558	1.0574	T_{10-51} (p.u.)	0.9563	0.9613
V_{G3} (p.u.)	1.0440	1.0494	T_{13-49} (p.u.)	0.9055	0.9267
V_{G6} (p.u.)	1.0545	1.0566	T_{11-43} (p.u.)	0.9543	0.9610
V_{G8} (p.u.)	1.0589	1.0600	T_{40-56} (p.u.)	0.9866	0.9949
V_{G9} (p.u.)	1.0326	1.0362	T_{39-57} (p.u.)	0.9813	0.9708
V_{G12} (p.u.)	1.0314	1.0393	T_{9-55} (p.u.)	0.9687	0.9745
T_{4-18} (p.u.)	1.0438	0.9000	Q_{C18} (MVAR)	0.0699	0.1289
T_{4-18} (p.u.)	0.9313	1.0792	Q_{C25} (MVAR)	0.1478	0.1445
T_{21-20} (p.u.)	1.0269	1.0116	Q_{C53} (MVAR)	0.1318	0.1312
Fuel cost (\$/h)	41,678.9350	41,675.0794			
Power loss ((MW))	15.1347	15.0578			

TABLE VIII
OBTAINED OPTIMIZATION RESULTS FOR THE IEEE 57-BUS TEST SYSTEM, I.E. FUEL COSTS (\$/H), OBTAINED BY SEVERAL OPTIMIZERS.

Algorithms	Fuel Cost
LDI-PSO [45]	41,815.50
EADDE [61]	41,713.62
GSA [58]	41,695.87
TLBO [16]	41,695.66
ABC [45]	41,693.96
FIWCA (This Study)	41,675.07

TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF TOTAL FUEL COST, POWER LOSS AND EMISSION FOR MULTI-PERIOD OPF PROBLEM WITH AND WITHOUT RENEWABLE RESOURCES OBTAINED BY FIWCA.


Test System	Fuel Cost (\$)	Power Loss (MW)	Emission (tons)
IEEE 30-Bus without Renewables	14111.73	130.10	7.2178
IEEE 30-Bus with Renewables	12402.43	102.99	6.6917

WCA, and it has converged within a reasonable number of iterations, i.e. around 20 iterations which is faster than the WCA with almost 30 iterations.


Table X presents the comparison of computational time for solving the OPF problem obtained by different optimization algorithms. The optimal solutions and computational times show that the proposed FIWCA helps to enhance the quality of obtained solutions while being faster than the classical WCA and some other algorithms presented in Table X.

TABLE X
COMPARISON OF COMPUTATIONAL TIME FOR THE IEEE 30-BUS AND 57-BUS TEST SYSTEMS, OBTAINED BY DIFFERENT OPTIMIZERS.


Algorithms	Computational Time (sec)	
	30-Bus	57-Bus
DE-PS [52]	27.33	N.A.
TLBO [16]	24.27	N.A.
MDE [64]	23.25	N.A.
LTLBO [16]	22.14	N.A.
Fuzzy-GA [63]	22.07	N.A.
NPSO [65]	20.45	N.A.
GSA [45]	19.71	N.A.
WCA (This Study)	20.38	48.70
FIWCA (This Study)	17.71	43.35




(a) Demand Power and Generation Power



(b) Difference Between Generated Power with and without Renewable Resources




(c) Power Loss with and without Renewables




(d) Fuel Cost Savings by Implementing Renewable Resources

Fig. 6. Simulation Results of Solving Multi-period OPF Problem for IEEE 30-Bus Test System with and without Renewable Resources Using FIWCA



(a) IEEE 30-bus Test Case System.



(b) IEEE 57-bus Test Case system.

Fig. 7. Convergence Rate and Cost Reduction History Obtained by WCA and FIWCA.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

This paper proposed an improved water cycle algorithm (WCA), called fully informed WCA (FIWCA) for solving the optimal power flow problem, a nonlinear and nonconvex optimization problem. The improvement to the WCA was the idea of using global and local information exchange for updating the positions of each individual in the population. Using fully informed algorithms help to increase the diversity in the selection of solution and consequently decrease the possibility of getting trapped at local optima, thereby enhancing the efficiency and accuracy significantly. The optimal power flow (OPF) problem studied different nonlinear constraints/objectives and evaluated the FIWCA for the optimality and efficiency of the algorithm. The OPF solution to IEEE 30-bus and 57-bus test systems was used to study the performance of the FIWCA with the existing approaches. Obtained optimization results demonstrated the computation benefits and efficiency of the FIWCA in reaching global optimal solutions with reasonable accuracy that is better than that of existing techniques such as standard WCA, genetic algorithm, particle swarm optimization, ant colony, and the others studied in the literature. Applying the proposed FIWCA to the multi-period OPF considering renewable energy fluctuations and storage devices is the future purpose of this investigation. Developing the proposed FIWCA to implement on the multi-objective OPF problem considering different objective values is another scope for future research works.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. C. Lesieutre and I. A. Hiskens, "Convexity of the set of feasible injections and revenue adequacy in ftr markets," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1790–1798, 2005.
- [2] T. A. Al-Muhawesh and I. S. Qamber, "The established mega watt linear programming-based optimal power flow model applied to the real power 56-bus system in eastern province of saudi arabia," *Energy*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 12–21, 2008.
- [3] R. Burchett, H. Happ, and D. Vierath, "Quadratically convergent optimal power flow," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, no. 11, pp. 3267–3275, 1984.
- [4] A. Barzegar, R. Su, C. Wen, L. Rajabpour, Y. Zhang, A. Gupta, C. Gajanayake, and M. Y. Lee, "Intelligent power allocation and load management of more electric aircraft," in *Power Electronics and Drive Systems (PEDS), 2015 IEEE 11th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 533–538.
- [5] H. Habibollahzadeh, G.-X. Luo, and A. Semlyen, "Hydrothermal optimal power flow based on a combined linear and nonlinear programming methodology," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 530–537, 1989.
- [6] X. Yan and V. H. Quintana, "Improving an interior-point-based opf by dynamic adjustments of step sizes and tolerances," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 709–717, 1999.
- [7] A. Maffei, S. Srinivasan, P. Castillejo, J. F. Martínez, L. Iannelli, E. Bjerkan, and L. Glielmo, "A semantic-middleware-supported receding horizon optimal power flow in energy grids," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 35–46, 2018.
- [8] D. E. Goldberg and J. H. Holland, "Genetic algorithms and machine learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 95–99, 1988.
- [9] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi, "Optimization by simulated annealing," *science*, vol. 220, no. 4598, pp. 671–680, 1983.
- [10] R. Eberhart and J. Kennedy, "A new optimizer using particle swarm theory," in *Micro Machine and Human Science, 1995. MHS'95., Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium on*. IEEE, 1995, pp. 39–43.
- [11] A. Colomi, M. Dorigo, and V. Maniezzo, "Distributed optimization by ant colonies, actes de la première conférence européenne sur la vie artificielle (pp. 134–142)," *France: Elsevier Publishing*, 1991.
- [12] C. Roa-Sepulveda and B. Pavez-Lazo, "A solution to the optimal power flow using simulated annealing," *International journal of electrical power & energy systems*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 47–57, 2003.
- [13] M. Abido, "Optimal power flow using particle swarm optimization," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 563–571, 2002.
- [14] Z.-L. Gaing and H.-S. Huang, "Real-coded mixed-integer genetic algorithm for constrained optimal power flow," in *TENCON 2004. 2004 IEEE Region 10 Conference*, vol. 100. IEEE, 2004, pp. 323–326.
- [15] P. Roy, S. Ghoshal, and S. Thakur, "Biogeography based optimization for multi-constraint optimal power flow with emission and non-smooth cost function," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 37, no. 12, pp. 8221–8228, 2010.
- [16] M. Ghasemi, S. Ghavidel, M. Gitizadeh, and E. Akbari, "An improved teaching–learning-based optimization algorithm using lévy mutation strategy for non-smooth optimal power flow," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 65, pp. 375–384, 2015.
- [17] S. S. Reddy, P. Bijwe, and A. Abhyankar, "Faster evolutionary algorithm based optimal power flow using incremental variables," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 54, pp. 198–210, 2014.
- [18] S. S. Reddy and C. S. Rathnam, "Optimal power flow using glowworm swarm optimization," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 80, pp. 128–139, 2016.
- [19] S. S. Reddy, "Optimal power flow using hybrid differential evolution and harmony search algorithm," *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, pp. 1–15, 2018.
- [20] H. Eskandar, A. Sadollah, A. Bahreininejad, and M. Hamdi, "Water cycle algorithm—a novel metaheuristic optimization method for solving constrained engineering optimization problems," *Computers & Structures*, vol. 110, pp. 151–166, 2012.
- [21] A. Sadollah, H. Eskandar, and J. H. Kim, "Water cycle algorithm for solving constrained multi-objective optimization problems," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 27, pp. 279–298, 2015.
- [22] A. Jabbar and S. Zainudin, "Water cycle algorithm for attribute reduction problems in rough set theory," *Journal of Theoretical & Applied Information Technology*, vol. 61, no. 1, 2014.
- [23] K. Lenin, B. R. Reddy, and M. S. Kalavathi, "Water cycle algorithm for solving optimal reactive power dispatch problem," *Journal of Engineering Technology and Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–11, 2014.
- [24] O. B. Haddad, M. Moravej, and H. A. Loáiciga, "Application of the water cycle algorithm to the optimal operation of reservoir systems," *Journal of Irrigation and Drainage Engineering*, vol. 141, no. 5, p. 04014064, 2014.
- [25] K. Guney and S. Basbug, "A quantized water cycle optimization algorithm for antenna array synthesis by using digital phase shifters," *International Journal of RF and Microwave Computer-Aided Engineering*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 21–29, 2015.
- [26] M. Clerc and J. Kennedy, "The particle swarm-explosion, stability, and convergence in a multidimensional complex space," *IEEE transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 58–73, 2002.
- [27] N. Lynn, M. Z. Ali, and P. N. Suganthan, "Population topologies for particle swarm optimization and differential evolution," *Swarm and evolutionary computation*, vol. 39, pp. 24–35, 2018.
- [28] J. L. Payne, M. Giacobini, and J. H. Moore, "Complex and dynamic population structures: synthesis, open questions, and future directions," *Soft Computing*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 1109–1120, 2013.
- [29] M. Z. Ali, P. N. Suganthan, R. G. Reynolds, and A. F. Al-Badarnah, "Leveraged neighborhood restructuring in cultural algorithms for solving real-world numerical optimization problems," *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 218–231, 2016.
- [30] R. Mendes, J. Kennedy, and J. Neves, "The fully informed particle swarm: simpler, maybe better," *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 204–210, 2004.
- [31] X.-S. Yang, *Nature-inspired metaheuristic algorithms*. Luniver press, 2010.
- [32] S. Łukasik and S. Żak, "Firefly algorithm for continuous constrained optimization tasks," in *International conference on computational collective intelligence*. Springer, 2009, pp. 97–106.
- [33] K. Krishnanand and D. Ghose, "Glowworm swarm optimization for simultaneous capture of multiple local optima of multimodal functions," *Swarm intelligence*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 87–124, 2009.
- [34] S. Łukasik and P. A. Kowalski, "Fully informed swarm optimization algorithms: basic concepts, variants and experimental evaluation," in *2014 Federated Conference on Computer Science and Information Systems*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 155–161.

- [35] Y. Gao, W. Du, and G. Yan, "Selectively-informed particle swarm optimization," *Scientific reports*, vol. 5, p. 9295, 2015.
- [36] W.-B. Du, Y. Gao, C. Liu, Z. Zheng, and Z. Wang, "Adequate is better: particle swarm optimization with limited-information," *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, vol. 268, pp. 832–838, 2015.
- [37] W.-B. Du, W. Ying, G. Yan, Y.-B. Zhu, and X.-B. Cao, "Heterogeneous strategy particle swarm optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 467–471, 2017.
- [38] E. Mezura-Montes and C. A. C. Coello, "An empirical study about the usefulness of evolution strategies to solve constrained optimization problems," *International Journal of General Systems*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 443–473, 2008.
- [39] A. Khorsandi, S. Hosseini, and A. Ghazanfari, "Modified artificial bee colony algorithm based on fuzzy multi-objective technique for optimal power flow problem," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 95, pp. 206–213, 2013.
- [40] S. Khunkitti, A. Siritaratiwat, S. Premrudeepreechacharn, R. Chatthaworn, and N. Watson, "A hybrid da-pso optimization algorithm for multiobjective optimal power flow problems," *Energies*, vol. 11, no. 9, p. 2270, 2018.
- [41] M. Nayak, C. Nayak, and P. Rout, "Application of multi-objective teaching learning based optimization algorithm to optimal power flow problem," *Procedia Technology*, vol. 6, pp. 255–264, 2012.
- [42] J. Radosavljević, D. Kliment, M. Jevtić, and N. Arsić, "Optimal power flow using a hybrid optimization algorithm of particle swarm optimization and gravitational search algorithm," *Electric Power Components and Systems*, vol. 43, no. 17, pp. 1958–1970, 2015.
- [43] M. Abdo, S. Kamel, M. Ebeed, J. Yu, and F. Jurado, "Solving non-smooth optimal power flow problems using a developed grey wolf optimizer," *Energies*, vol. 11, no. 7, p. 1692, 2018.
- [44] A. A. El-Fergany and H. M. Hasanien, "Single and multi-objective optimal power flow using grey wolf optimizer and differential evolution algorithms," *Electric Power Components and Systems*, vol. 43, no. 13, pp. 1548–1559, 2015.
- [45] M. R. Adaryani and A. Karami, "Artificial bee colony algorithm for solving multi-objective optimal power flow problem," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 53, pp. 219–230, 2013.
- [46] W. Warid, H. Hizam, N. Mariun, and N. Abdul-Wahab, "Optimal power flow using the jaya algorithm," *Energies*, vol. 9, no. 9, p. 678, 2016.
- [47] M. S. Kumari and S. Maheswarapu, "Enhanced genetic algorithm based computation technique for multi-objective optimal power flow solution," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 736–742, 2010.
- [48] A.-F. Attia, R. A. El Sehiemy, and H. M. Hasanien, "Optimal power flow solution in power systems using a novel sine-cosine algorithm," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 99, pp. 331–343, 2018.
- [49] M. Ghasemi, S. Ghavidel, M. M. Ghanbarian, M. Gharibzadeh, and A. A. Vahed, "Multi-objective optimal power flow considering the cost, emission, voltage deviation and power losses using multi-objective modified imperialist competitive algorithm," *Energy*, vol. 78, pp. 276–289, 2014.
- [50] A. Bhattacharya and P. Chattopadhyay, "Application of biogeography-based optimisation to solve different optimal power flow problems," *IET generation, transmission & distribution*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 70–80, 2011.
- [51] R. Arul, G. Ravi, and S. Velusami, "Solving optimal power flow problems using chaotic self-adaptive differential harmony search algorithm," *Electric Power Components and Systems*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 782–805, 2013.
- [52] M. Gitizadeh, S. Ghavidel, and J. Aghaei, "Using svc to economically improve transient stability in long transmission lines," *IETE Journal of Research*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 319–327, 2014.
- [53] A. Karami and M. Guerrero-Zapata, "A fuzzy anomaly detection system based on hybrid pso-kmeans algorithm in content-centric networks," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 149, pp. 1253–1269, 2015.
- [54] J. Ben Hmida, M. Javad Morshed, J. Lee, and T. Chambers, "Hybrid imperialist competitive and grey wolf algorithm to solve multiobjective optimal power flow with wind and solar units," *Energies*, vol. 11, no. 11, p. 2891, 2018.
- [55] T. Niknam, M. Narimani, J. Aghaei, and R. Azizpanah-Abarghoee, "Improved particle swarm optimisation for multi-objective optimal power flow considering the cost, loss, emission and voltage stability index," *IET generation, transmission & distribution*, vol. 6, no. 6, pp. 515–527, 2012.
- [56] K. Abaci and V. Yamacli, "Differential search algorithm for solving multi-objective optimal power flow problem," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 79, pp. 1–10, 2016.
- [57] M. R. Narimani, R. Azizpanah-Abarghoee, B. Zoghdar-Moghadam-Shahrekohe, and K. Gholami, "A novel approach to multi-objective optimal power flow by a new hybrid optimization algorithm considering generator constraints and multi-fuel type," *Energy*, vol. 49, pp. 119–136, 2013.
- [58] S. Duman, U. Güvenç, Y. Sönmez, and N. Yörükeren, "Optimal power flow using gravitational search algorithm," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 59, pp. 86–95, 2012.
- [59] K. Pandiarajan and C. Babulal, "Fuzzy harmony search algorithm based optimal power flow for power system security enhancement," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 78, pp. 72–79, 2016.
- [60] A. Shabanpour-Haghighi, A. R. Seifi, and T. Niknam, "A modified teaching-learning based optimization for multi-objective optimal power flow problem," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 77, pp. 597–607, 2014.
- [61] K. Vaisakh and L. Srinivas, "Evolving ant direction differential evolution for opf with non-smooth cost functions," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 426–436, 2011.
- [62] B. Mahdad and K. Srairi, "Blackout risk prevention in a smart grid based flexible optimal strategy using grey wolf-pattern search algorithms," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 98, pp. 411–429, 2015.
- [63] Y.-T. Hsiao, C.-H. Chen, and C.-C. Chien, "Optimal capacitor placement in distribution systems using a combination fuzzy-ga method," *International journal of electrical power & energy systems*, vol. 26, no. 7, pp. 501–508, 2004.
- [64] S. Sayah and K. Zehar, "Modified differential evolution algorithm for optimal power flow with non-smooth cost functions," *Energy conversion and Management*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 3036–3042, 2008.
- [65] A. I. Selvakumar and K. Thanushkodi, "A new particle swarm optimization solution to nonconvex economic dispatch problems," *IEEE transactions on power systems*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 42–51, 2007.
- [66] K. Lee, Y. Park, and J. Ortiz, "A united approach to optimal real and reactive power dispatch," *IEEE Transactions on power Apparatus and systems*, no. 5, pp. 1147–1153, 1985.

VI. APPENDIX

The design variable limits and cost coefficients of different test cases for IEEE 30-bus and IEEE 57-bus systems are presented as following:

TABLE XI
THE CONTROL VARIABLES LIMITS FOR IEEE STANDARD 30-BUS [66].

Control Vars	Min	Max	Control Vars	Min	Max
P_{G1} (MW)	50.00	200.00	T_{6-10} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G2} (MW)	20.00	80.00	T_{4-12} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G5} (MW)	15.00	50.00	T_{28-27} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G8} (MW)	10.00	35.00	QC_{10} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
P_{G11} (MW)	10.00	30.00	QC_{12} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
P_{G13} (MW)	12.00	40.00	QC_{15} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G1} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{17} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G2} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{20} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G5} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{21} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G8} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{23} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G11} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{24} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
V_{G13} (p.u.)	0.95	1.10	QC_{29} (MVAR)	0.00	5.00
T_{6-9} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10			

TABLE XII
GENERATION COST COEFFICIENTS FOR CASE 1 (IEEE 30-BUS) [66].

Bus No.	Cost Coefficients		
	c_{i0}	c_{i1}	c_{i2}
1	0.00	2.00	0.00375
2	0.00	1.75	0.01750
5	0.00	1.00	0.06250
8	0.00	3.25	0.00834
11	0.00	3.00	0.02500
13	0.00	3.00	0.02500

TABLE XIII
GENERATION COST COEFFICIENTS FOR CASE 3 (IEEE 30-BUS) [13].

Bus No.	From (MW)	To (MW)	Cost Coefficients		
			c_{i0_k}	c_{i1_k}	c_{i2_k}
1	50	140	55.00	0.70	0.0050
	140	200	82.50	1.05	0.0075
2	20	55	40.00	0.30	0.0100
	55	80	80.00	0.60	0.2000

TABLE XIV
GENERATION COST COEFFICIENTS FOR CASE 4 (IEEE 30-BUS) [65].

Bus No.	P_{Gi}^{\min} (MW)	P_{Gi}^{\max} (MW)	Cost Coefficients				
			c_{k0}	c_{k1}	c_{k2}	d_k	e_k
1	50	200	150	2.00	0.0016	50	0.0630
2	20	80	25	2.50	0.0100	40	0.0980

TABLE XV
GENERATION EMISSION COEFFICIENTS USED IN CASE 5 (IEEE 30-BUS)
[66].

Bus No.	Cost Coefficients				
	c_{k0}^{SOX}	c_{k1}^{SOX}	c_{k2}^{SOX}	d_k^{NOX}	e_k^{NOX}
1	0.04091	-0.05554	0.06490	0.000200	2.857
2	0.02543	-0.06047	0.05638	0.000500	3.333
5	0.04258	-0.05094	0.04586	0.000001	8.000
8	0.05326	-0.03550	0.03380	0.002000	2.000
11	0.04258	-0.05094	0.04586	0.000001	8.000
13	0.06131	-0.05555	0.05151	0.000010	6.667

TABLE XVI
THE CONTROL VARIABLES LIMITS FOR THE IEEE 57-BUS TEST SYSTEM
[61].

Control Vars	Min	Max	Control Varss	Min	Max
P_{G1} (MW)	0.00	575.88	T_{24-25} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G3} (MW)	0.00	140.00	T_{24-26} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G6} (MW)	0.00	100.00	T_{7-29} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G8} (MW)	0.00	550.00	T_{34-32} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G9} (MW)	0.00	100.00	T_{11-41} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
P_{G12} (MW)	0.00	410.00	T_{15-45} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G1} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{14-46} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G2} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{10-51} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G3} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{13-49} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G6} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{11-43} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G8} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{40-56} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G9} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{39-57} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
V_{G12} (p.u.)	0.94	1.06	T_{9-55} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10
T_{4-18} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10	QC_{18} (MVAR)	0.00	30.00
T_{4-18} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10	QC_{25} (MVAR)	0.00	30.00
T_{21-20} (p.u.)	0.90	1.10	QC_{53} (MVAR)	0.00	30.00

TABLE XVII
GENERATION COST COEFFICIENTS FOR IEEE 57-BUS [61].

Bus No.	Cost Coefficients		
	c_{k0}	c_{k1}	c_{k2}
1	0.00	20.00	0.0775
2	0.00	40.00	0.0100
3	0.00	20.00	0.2500
6	0.00	40.00	0.0100
8	0.00	20.00	0.0222
9	0.00	40.00	0.0100