

Differentiation of Internal Faults in Power Transformers using Decision Tree based Classifiers

Samita Rani Pani
KIIT University, Bhubaneswar, India
samita.panifel@kiit.ac.in

Pallav Kumar Bera
Syracuse University, USA
pkbera@syr.edu

Vajendra Kumar
IIT Roorkee, India
kumarvajendra@gmail.com

Abstract—This paper proposes a Decision Tree (DT) based classification of internal faults in a power transformer. The faults are simulated in Power System Computer Aided Design (PSCAD)/ Electromagnetic Transients including DC (EMTDC) by varying the fault resistance, fault inception angle, and percentage of winding under fault. 1146 features are extracted from the differential currents in phase a, b, and c belonging to the time, and frequency domains. Out of these, 3 most relevant features are selected to distinguish the internal faults in the primary and secondary of the transformer. DT, Random Forest (RF), and Gradient Boost (GB) classifiers are used to determine the fault types. The results show that the GB classifier performed the best among the three classifiers considered.

Index Terms—Power Transformer, PSCAD/EMTDC, Decision Tree, Random Forest, Gradient Boost, Internal Fault Classification

I. INTRODUCTION

Power transformers are an integral part of any Power network. They are expensive and once damaged their repairs are time-consuming. Thus, their protection is vital for reliable and stable operation of the power system. Transformer-protective relays are tested for their dependability, stability, and speed of operation. The protective relays should operate in cases of faults and avoid tripping the circuit breakers when there is no fault. Many relays having different characteristics such as the current differential, Buchholz, Volts/Hz, over current, etc. protect the transformers in case of internal conditions (phase (ph)-phase faults, phase-g faults, inter-turn faults, over fluxing). Differential protection has been the primary protection for many years. But it suffers from traditional challenges like magnetizing inrush current, saturation of core, CT ratio mismatch, external fault with CT saturation, etc.

Researchers have proposed different techniques for protection and classification of internal faults in power transformers. Tripathy et al. used the Probabilistic Neural Network (PNN) to detect different conditions in transformer operation [1]. Genetic algorithm-based parallel hidden layered Artificial Neural Network (ANN) was used by Balaga et al. for transformer protection [2]. [3] used genetic algorithm to select optimal gas ratios for power transformer fault diagnosis based on support vector machine (SVM). Bigdeli et al. [4] proposed SVM based classification method for the identification of different transformer winding faults. Koley et al. [5] worked on the protection of transmission lines where SVM was used for fault detection and classification

and ANN for zone identification. Patel et al. [6] reported that the Relevance Vector Machine (RVM) performs better than PNN and SVM for fault classification. Wavelet-based protection and fault classification in the Indirect Symmetrical Phase Shift transformer (ISPST) was used by Bhasker et al. [7] [8]. Shin et al. [9] used a fuzzy-based method to overcome the maloperation of conventional differential relays. Segatto et al. [10] proposed two algorithms for transformer protection based on ANN. Shah et al. [11] used Discrete Wavelet Transforms (DWT) and SVM based differential protection. Barbosa et al. [12] used Clarke's transformation and Fuzzy logic based technique to generate a trip signal in case of an internal fault. Gaouda et al. [13] used wavelet-based technique to monitor inrush and internal faults. Ensemble-based learning was used to classify 40 internal faults in ISPST and compared the accuracy with Multi-Layer Perceptron and SVM in [14]. In [15] Decision Tree based algorithms were used to discriminate the internal faults and other transient disturbances in an interconnected system with ISPST and power transformers. DWT and ANN were used for the detection and classification of internal faults in a two-winding three-phase transformer in [16]. Applicability of different machine learning algorithms with different features is used to distinguish and locate faults in [17]. Classification of internal faults provides information about the faulty side of the transformer, helps in the evaluation of the amount of repair and maintenance needed. In a direction similar to the above-mentioned authors this paper attempts to use the power of machine learning to determine the type of internal faults in power transformers. The main contributions of this paper are:

- 11,088 cases for 11 different internal faults on the primary and secondary sides (1008 cases for each) of the transformer are simulated.
- A series of features belonging to time and frequency domain are extracted. The top three features are used to train the three DT based classifiers. Gradient Boost Classifier gives a classification accuracy of 95.4%.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II illustrates the modeling and simulation of internal faults. Section III describes the feature extraction. Section IV and V consists of the classification framework and results. Section VI concludes the paper.

II. SYSTEM MODELING

PSCAD/EMTDC version 4.2 is used for the modeling and




Fig. 1: Transformer model showing the ac source, power transformer, multiple-run, faults, transmission line, and load components in PSCAD/EMTDC

simulation of the internal faults and normal operation in the power transformer. Figure 1 shows the model consisting of the ac source, transmission line, power transformer, multi-run component, faults component, and a 3-phase load working at 60Hz. The source is rated at 400kV, the transformer is rated at 315 MVA and 400kV/220kV, the transmission line is rated at 220kV with 100km length, and the load is rated at 240 MW and 180 MVAR. Power transformer operations can be categorized in normal operation, internal fault, external fault, overexcitation, and magnetizing inrush/sympathetic inrush. This paper focuses on the classification of the internal faults conditions. Winding phase-g faults (a-g, b-g, c-g), winding phase-phase-g faults (ab-g, ac-g, bc-g), winding phase-phase faults (ab, ac, bc), 3-phase and 3-phase-g faults are simulated using the multi-run component. The simulation run-time, fault inception time, and fault duration time are 0.12 secs, 0.05 secs, and 0.05 secs (3 cycles) respectively. The internal faults are simulated on the primary and secondary sides of the transformer. The differential currents from the 3-phases are plotted at the rate of 100 micro-secs. Three different parameters of the transformer are varied to get data for training and testing. The fault inception angle is varied from 0° to 345° in steps of 15° , fault resistance values are: 1, 5, and 10 ohms, and the percentage of winding under fault is varied from 20% to 80% in steps of 10% in the primary and secondary sides. Consequently, 11088 cases of differential currents for internal faults are generated with 1008 cases for each of the 11 different internal faults. Figure 2 shows the 3-phase differential currents in case of internal faults and no-fault conditions.

III. EXTRACTION OF FEATURES

The differential currents used to extract features are time series which can be differentiated in many ways. The similarity between time series can be established at data-level using Euclidean or Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) [18] distance measures. The differential currents from a distinct fault type can also be differentiated from rest using features (e.g., mean, standard deviation (std), frequency, entropy, skewness, kurtosis, or wavelet coefficients) and the distance between the features [19] [20]. Wang et al. [21] extracted features from trend, seasonality, periodicity, serial correlation, skewness,

kurtosis, chaos, non-linearity, and self-similarity. Wirth et al. [22] further extended this approach to multivariate time series signals. Kumar et al. [23] used a variety of features from time and frequency domains to distinguish users.

Here, features are extracted from the 3-phase differential currents considering time-domain (e.g., minimum, maximum, median, number of peaks, mean, skewness, number of mean crossings, quantiles, and absolute energy), information-theoretic (sample entropy, approximate entropy, and binned entropy), and coefficients of auto-regression, discrete wavelets, and fast Fourier transforms. A total of 1146 features are extracted from the a,b, and c phase differential currents. More information on these features can be found in [24]. Three most relevant features are obtained by comparing the relative importance of the 1146 features by using Random Forest Regressor in Scikit Learn. The three features are c-phase change quantile, a-phase change quantile, and b-phase absolute energy. Change quantile calculates the average absolute value of consecutive changes of the time series inside two constant values q_h and q_l . Absolute energy is the sum of the squares of all the data points of the time series. Change quantile and absolute energy are expressed mathematically as given by equation (1) & equation (2) respectively.

$$\text{Change quantile} = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{a=1}^{n-1} |S_{a+1} - S_a| \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Abs. energy} = \sum_{a=1}^n S_a^2 \quad (2)$$

where, n is the total number of data points in the differential current for phase a, b, and c considered, S represents phase a, b, and c differential current. The relative importance of the three selected features are shown in figure 3. These features are used as the input to the classifiers. The feature importance of a feature (f) at node j is calculated by optimising the objective function $I(j, f)$

$$I(j, f) = w_j \cdot I(D_p) - \frac{N_l}{N_p} \cdot I(D_l) - \frac{N_r}{N_p} \cdot I(D_r)$$

where, f is the feature to perform the split, w_j = number of samples that reach the node, divided by the total number of samples, D_p , D_l and D_r are the dataset of the parent and child nodes, I is "gini" impurity measure, and N_p , N_l and N_r are number of samples at the parent and child nodes.

IV. CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORK

Percentage restraint differential protection compares the operating current and restraining current and thus differentiates external faults and normal operating conditions from internal faults. Figure 4 shows the classification framework that is used. The work in this paper is applicable for three operating conditions in the power transformer: external faults, internal faults, and normal operation. The 3-phase differential currents are used to extract the relevant features. Decision Tree based




Fig. 2: 3-phase differential currents from left to right, top to bottom for (1) a-g, (2) b-g, (3) c-g, (4) ab-g, (5) ac-g, (6) bc-g, (7) 3-phase-g, (8) ab, (9) ac, (10) bc, (11) 3-phase internal faults, and (12) No fault conditions.




Fig. 3: Relative importance of the top three features.

classifiers are used to classify the internal faults into seven classes. The training of the classifiers is carried out on 4/5th and testing on 1/5th of the data. Pre-processing, feature extraction, and relevant feature extraction is done in Python 3.7 and scikit-learn library is used for training and testing [25].

The first classifier used is the Decision Tree (DT) [26] [27]. DT classifier works on the principle of splitting the data on the basis of one of the 3 features which gives the largest Information Gain (IG) in this case. The splitting is repeated at every node till the child nodes are pure or they belong to the same class. IG is the difference between the impurity of the parent node and the child node. The impurity of the child node decides the (IG). DT are easier to interpret, can be trained quickly and, they can model a high degree of nonlinearity in the relationship between the target and the predictor variables [28].

The second classifier is Random Forest (RF). RF Classifiers are a collection of decision trees that use majority vote of all the decision trees to make predictions. The trees are constructed by choosing random samples from the total training sample with replacement [29]. The $n_estimators$ hyperparameter which denotes the number of trees is the important parameter to be tuned. "Grid Search" is used to tune the number of trees in the RF classifier in this case. The third classifier used is the Gradient Boost (GB) [30]. GB is also

a collection of decision trees like RF. Unlike RF, in GB the trees are added in an iterative manner where each tree learns from the mistakes of previous trees. Thus, the learning rate becomes an important hyperparameter in GB. Higher learning rate and more number of trees increase the complexity of the model.




Fig. 4: Fault classification framework.

TABLE I: Classification Results for Decision Tree

Actual Fault Type	Predicted Fault type	# of misclassified cases
a-g(201)	-	0
b-g(218)	ab-g,ab	25
c-g(214)	bc-g, bc	6
ab-g, ab (398)	b-g	22
bc-g, bc(384)	c-g	10
ca-g,ca(411)	3-ph, 3-ph-g	37
3-ph, 3-ph-g(402)	ca-g,ca	42

V. RESULTS

At first, attempts were made to classify the internal faults into 11 classes. But, it was observed that line to line to ground faults was misclassified as line to line faults and 3-phase

TABLE II: Classification Results for Random Forest

Actual Fault Type	Predicted Fault type	# of misclassified cases
a-g(184)	-	0
b-g(198)	ab-g, ab	10
c-g(231)	bc-g, bc	11
ab-g, ab (394)	b-g	11
bc-g, bc (417)	c-g	4
ca-g,ca(388)	3-ph, 3-ph-g	28
3-ph, 3-ph-g(406)	ca-g,ca	45

TABLE III: Classification Results for Gradient Boost

Actual Fault Type	Predicted Fault type	# of misclassified cases
a-g(194)	-	0
b-g(190)	ab-g, ab	11
c-g(214)	bc-g, bc	8
ab-g, ab (413)	b-g	13
bc-g, bc (381)	c-g	4
ca-g,ca(404)	3-ph, 3-ph-g	35
3-ph, 3-ph-g(414)	ca-g,ca	31

faults as 3-phase-g. So, the line to line faults and line to line to ground faults are merged in one class. For instance fault types ab and ab-g form one class. Similarly, 3-phase and 3 phase-g faults form one class. After merging the 8 fault types into 4, the resultant number of classes became 7. Thus, the number of samples in each class of faults is no more equal in all the classes. The first three classes a-g, b-g, and c-g consist of 1008 samples, and the rest of the classes consist of 2016 samples. The presence of class imbalance is one of the reasons that Decision Tree based classifiers are preferred over other classifiers. The performance is measured using accuracy, where

$$Accuracy = \frac{\text{Correctly predicted instances}}{\text{Total predicted instances}} \quad (3)$$

The misclassification for DT, RF and GB classifiers between different types of internal faults are reported in Table I, Table II, and Table III respectively. The hyperparameters used for the Decision Tree Classifier are : criterion = 'gini', min_samples_leaf = 1, and min_samples_split = 2. The training and testing accuracies obtained are 93.65% and 93.6% respectively.

The best hyperparameters obtained using "grid search" for the Random Forest Classifier are : criterion = 'gini', n_estimators = 595, min_samples_leaf = 1, and min_samples_split = 2. The training and testing accuracies obtained in this case are 93.61% and 95.1% respectively.

The best hyperparameters obtained using "grid search" for the Gradient Boost Classifier are : learning_rate = 0.1, max_depth = 10, n_estimators = 10000, criterion = friedman_mse, min_samples_leaf = 1, and min_samples_split = 2. The training and testing accuracies obtained for GB are 93.95% and 95.4% respectively. The default hyperparameter values are used for the rest of the hyperparameters for all three classifiers.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, three DT based classifier networks were trained to classify the internal faults in the power transformer using the three most relevant features obtained from the differential currents in phases a, b, and c. The Gradient

Boost classifier achieved the highest accuracy of 95.4% whereas, the Decision Tree has the lowest accuracy of 93.6% among the three classifiers. In this paper, only the internal faults in the power transformer were considered. In the future, over-excitation, magnetizing inrush/sympathetic inrush, turn-to-turn faults, and inter-winding faults can be considered for detailed analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Tripathy, R. P. Maheshwari, and H. K. Verma, "Probabilistic neural-network-based protection of power transformer," *IET Electric Power Applications*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 793–798, Sep. 2007.
- [2] H. Balaga, N. Gupta, and D. N. Vishwakarma, "Ga trained parallel hidden layered ann based differential protection of three phase power transformer," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 67, pp. 286 – 297, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0142061514007108>
- [3] J. Li, Q. Zhang, K. Wang, J. Wang, T. Zhou, and Y. Zhang, "Optimal dissolved gas ratios selected by genetic algorithm for power transformer fault diagnosis based on support vector machine," *IEEE Transactions on Dielectrics and Electrical Insulation*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 1198–1206, April 2016.
- [4] M. Bigdeli, M. Vakilian, and E. Rahimpour, "Transformer winding faults classification based on transfer function analysis by support vector machine," *IET Electric Power Applications*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 268–276, May 2012.
- [5] E. Koley, S. K. Shukla, S. Ghosh, and D. K. Mohanta, "Protection scheme for power transmission lines based on svm and ann considering the presence of non-linear loads," *IET Generation, Transmission Distribution*, 2017.
- [6] D. Patel, N. G. Chothani, K. D. Mistry, and M. Raichura, "Design and development of fault classification algorithm based on relevance vector machine for power transformer," *IET Electric Power Applications*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 557–565, 2018.
- [7] S. Bhasker, P. K. Bera, V. Kumar, and M. Tripathy, "Differential protection of indirect symmetrical phase shift transformer and internal faults classification using wavelet and ann," in *TENCON 2015 - 2015 IEEE Region 10 Conference*, Nov 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [8] S. K. Bhasker, P. K. Bera, V. Kumar, and M. Tripathy, "Differential protection of indirect symmetrical phase shift transformer using wavelet transform," in *2015 Annual IEEE India Conference (INDICON)*, Dec 2015, pp. 1–6.
- [9] M.-C. Shin, C.-W. Park, and J.-H. Kim, "Fuzzy logic-based relaying for large power transformer protection," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, July 2003.

- [10] E. C. Segatto and D. V. Coury, "A differential relay for power transformers using intelligent tools," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, Aug 2006.
- [11] A. M. Shah and B. R. Bhalja, "Discrimination between internal faults and other disturbances in transformer using the support vector machine-based protection scheme," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, July 2013.
- [12] D. Barbosa, U. C. Netto, D. V. Coury, and M. Oleskovicz, "Power transformer differential protection based on clarke's transform and fuzzy systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, April 2011.
- [13] A. M. Gaouda and M. M. A. Salama, "Dsp wavelet-based tool for monitoring transformer inrush currents and internal faults," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, July 2010.
- [14] P. K. Bera, R. Kumar, and C. Isik, "Identification of internal faults in indirect symmetrical phase shift transformers using ensemble learning," in *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology (ISSPIT)*, Dec 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [15] P. K. Bera, C. Isik, and V. Kumar, "Discrimination of internal faults and other transients in an interconnected system with power transformers and phase angle regulators," *CoRR*, Apr, 2020, arXiv: 2004.06003.
- [16] A. Ngaopitakkul and A. Kunakorn, "Internal fault classification in transformer windings using combination of discrete wavelet transforms and back-propagation neural networks," *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems*, vol. 4, 06 2006.
- [17] P. K. Bera and C. Isik, "Intelligent protection & classification of transients in two-core symmetric phase angle regulating transformers," *CoRR*, June, 2020, arXiv: 2004.06003.
- [18] S. Salvador and P. Chan, "Toward accurate dynamic time warping in linear time and space," *Intell. Data Anal.*, Oct 2007.
- [19] B. D. Fulcher, "Feature-based time-series analysis," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1709.08055, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.08055>
- [20] A. Nanopoulos, R. Alcock, and Y. Manolopoulos, "Feature-based classification of time-series data," *International Journal of Computer Research*, 2001.
- [21] X. Wang, K. Smith, and R. Hyndman, "Characteristic-based clustering for time series data," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, Nov 2006.
- [22] A. Wirth, L. Wang, and X. Wang, "Structure-based statistical features and multivariate time series clustering," in *Seventh IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM 2007)*, Oct 2007.
- [23] A. Primo, V. V. Phoha, R. Kumar, and A. Serwadda, "Context-aware active authentication using smartphone accelerometer measurements," in *2014 IEEE CVPR Workshops*, June 2014.
- [24] M. Christ, N. Braun, J. Neuffer, and A. W. Kempa-Liehr, "Time series feature extraction on basis of scalable hypothesis tests (tsfresh – a python package)," *Neurocomputing*, 2018.
- [25] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay, "Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2011.
- [26] L. Breiman *et al.*, *Classification and Regression Trees*. New York: Chapman & Hall, 1984.
- [27] J. R. Quinlan, "Induction of decision trees," *Mach. Learn.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 81–106, Mar. 1986. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022643204877>
- [28] R. Nisbet, G. Miner, and K. Yale, "Chapter 9 - classification," in *Handbook of Statistical Analysis and Data Mining Applications (Second Edition)*, second edition ed., R. Nisbet, G. Miner, and K. Yale, Eds. Boston: Academic Press, 2018, pp. 169 – 186. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780124166325000098>
- [29] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine Learning*, Oct 2001.
- [30] L. Mason, J. Baxter, P. Bartlett, and M. Frean, "Boosting algorithms as gradient descent," in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, ser. NIPS'99. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1999.