




A Data-Driven Pool Strategy for Price-Makers Under Imperfect Information

Kedi Zheng , Member, IEEE, Hongye Guo , Member, IEEE, and Qixin Chen , Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract—This paper studies the pool strategy for price-makers under imperfect information. In this occasion, market participants cannot obtain essential transmission parameters of the power system. Thus, price-makers should estimate the market results with respect to their offer curves using available historical information. The linear programming model of economic dispatch is analyzed with the theory of rim multi-parametric linear programming (rim-MPLP). The characteristics of system patterns (combinations of status flags for generating units and transmission lines) are revealed. A multi-class classification model based on support vector machine (SVM) is trained to map the offer curves to system patterns, which is then integrated into the decision framework of the price-maker. The performance of the proposed method is validated on the IEEE 30-bus system, Illinois synthetic 200-bus system, and South Carolina synthetic 500-bus system.

Index Terms—Imperfect information, electricity market, parametric programming, probability estimation

NOMENCLATURE

Bold symbols denote vectors or matrices.

Sets and Indices

b	Index of blocks.
\mathfrak{b}	Feasible space for quadratic form bid.
\mathcal{B}	Set of binding constraint indices.
\mathcal{C}	Feasible space for block form bid.
\mathcal{G}	Set of generators owned by a GenCo.
g	Index for generators.
i, j	General Indices.
k	Index of critical regions.
\mathcal{L}	Feasible space for load.
\mathcal{N}	Set of nodes.
\mathcal{R}	Critical Region.
$\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{G}}$	Feasible space for the GenCo's decision variables.

Variables, Parameters and Functions

a_i, b_i	Coefficients of the quadratic cost curve at node i .
B	The number of blocks.
$c_{i,b}$	The block price of node i and block b .

$\mathbb{E}_p(\cdot)$	The expected value under probability p .
f	The decision value in classification.
$F_j^{+/-}$	Transmission capacity of line j .
\mathbf{G}	Left-hand side coefficients in OPF.
h_g	The cost function of generator g .
\mathbf{H}	The diagonal matrix of a_i .
J	The number of transmission lines.
L	Load.
N	The number of nodes.
P_G	Generated power.
p	Posterior probabilities of critical regions.
q	Cleared generation volume.
\mathbf{Q}	Ancillary matrix in pairwise probability conversion.
$Q^{U/L}$	Maximum/minimum generation volume.
r	Pairwise class probability.
\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{S}	Right-hand side coefficients in OPF.
w, ρ	Parameters of SVM.
\mathbf{x}	Decision variables of generators.
\mathbf{X}	Input features of the classifier.
y	Indicator for the class labels.
z	Revenue of the GenCo.
β_{ij}	Power transmission distribution factor.
λ	The dual variable of the power balance constraint.
$\mu^{+/-}$	The dual variables of the congestion constraints.
$\sigma^{U/L}$	The dual variables of the generation capacity constraints.
π	Nodal prices.
Λ	The general form of dual variables in OPF.
φ, ψ	Linear affine functions.

I. INTRODUCTION

PPRICE-MAKERS are a type of market participants whose market behaviors have a non-negligible impact on market outcomes. In electricity markets, they usually choose to bid strategically and their behaviors are studied in optimization-based frameworks ever since the beginning of market deregulation [1], [2]. In their strategies, both clearing prices and capacity should be considered as endogenous variables formed by the offer curves [3], and their estimation of the potential market structure as well as the supply and demand situation underlies such endogenous formation. The modeling of price-makers' pool strategies is beneficial for both market participants and market organizers, as it helps in market simulation, profitability estimation, and market power evaluation.

Manuscript received June 26, 2021; revised Jan 12, 2022; accepted April 10, 2022. Paper no. TPWRS-01000-2021. This work was supported in part by the Major Smart Grid Joint Project of National Natural Science Foundation of China and State Grid under Grant U2066205 and in part by Natural and Science Foundation of China under Grant 52107102. (Corresponding author: Qixin Chen).

K. Zheng, H. Guo, and Q. Chen are with the State Key Laboratory of Power Systems, Department of Electrical Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084 (e-mail: qxchen@tsinghua.edu.cn).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TPWRS.2022.3167096

© 2023 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

Currently, the spot electricity market is usually cleared using economic dispatch (ED) and locational marginal price (LMP) scheme [4]. The system operator collects the offers and the bids from market participants, constructs the ED optimization problem with some constraints and a welfare maximization objective, and then solves the problem ahead of the trading time. The clearing prices are calculated with the dual variables of the energy balance and security constraints (*a.k.a.* the shadow prices) in the ED problem. To ensure solvability and optimality, the objective function is assumed to be convex (linear or quadratic), and the constraints are assumed to be linear. Since essential transmission parameters are considered to be static during a certain time period, the inputs of the ED problem are mainly load forecasts and market bids and offers.

Market information is very important for the decision of pool strategies for price-makers. Under perfect information, market participants have access to all market data and transmission parameters. Thus, they can construct the precise mathematical model of the ED problem and integrate it into their decision model to form a bilevel optimization problem [5]. However, when the information is imperfect, the market participants may not have access to transmission parameters and some market data. Their decision model should rely on the estimated or inferred market model from available market data.

Existing research in the field of price-makers' pool strategies falls into two main categories: residual demand curve (RDC)-based methods [6]–[9] and mathematical program with equilibrium constraints (MPEC)-based methods [5], [10]–[13].

The RDC (*a.k.a.* price-quota curve) of a certain generation company (GenCo) is defined as a decreasing function representing its price-quota dependency [6], and it can be derived from the aggregate supply curve and the aggregate demand curve in the market pool. In its original form, RDC only takes the market supply and demand situation into consideration and ignores the impact resulting from transmission congestion. In [6], RDC was integrated into the constraints of GenCo's decision model. Since RDC is stepwise which makes the optimization problem nonlinear, a coordination-descent technique coupled with mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) techniques was proposed. In [7], the price-maker bidding problem of a retailer with flexible demands was modeled with RDC and solved with MILP techniques. Xu *et al.* extended RDC to apply in occasions when transmission constraints are binding and proposed the concept of transmission-constrained residual demand derivative (TCRDD) [8]. TCRDD is regarded as sensitivity analysis of the optimal power flow (OPF)¹ model and calculated *ex post* in OPF solution. González *et al.* extended RDC to consider complex offering conditions in the Iberian electricity market [9].

The MPEC-based methods nest the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of OPF in the GenCo's profit maximization problem. By linearizing the product term using the strong duality condition and the complementarity conditions using the big-M method, the MPEC model can be transformed into an MILP problem [10]. In [5], a penalty interior point algorithm

was used to compute a local optimal solution of the MPEC. In [10], uncertainties of consumers' bids and rival producers' offers are modeled in a scenario-based approach in MPEC and solved using MILP. In [11], MPEC was used to model the pool strategy of a price-maker wind power producer in the balancing market. In [14], the impact of energy storage on GenCo's strategic behaviors was modeled with MPEC. The market power of large GenCos in imperfect electricity market can be limited by the energy storage system. Ruiz *et al.* provided a tutorial review on the application of MPEC-related complementarity models in energy market decision problems [12]. In [13], the problem of high computational burden in the traditional MILP formulation of MPEC was discussed. A convex relaxation method based on Schmüdgen's Positivstellensatz Theorem in semialgebraic geometry is proposed to obtain efficient solutions. In [15], the optimal bidding and scheduling of aggregated battery swapping stations was studied using MPEC.

For the RDC-based methods, the main challenge is the modeling of price-makers' influence on the binding constraints of OPF, as RDC and TCRDD are constructed under fixed binding constraints. Although MPEC-based methods have a well-established and solid mathematical foundation and can precisely model price-makers' influence on market results, they are applicable only if perfect market information is available.

Several existing articles [16]–[18] discussed the strategic bidding problem of price-maker generators under imperfect information. In [16], the bidding problem was formulated in an RDC-like approach where the supply functions of generators were modeled with linear functions and transmission capacity constraints were ignored. It was assumed that each generator did not know the supply functions of its rivals. In [17], the GenCo's decision problem was modeled using a bilevel problem, and the lower level problem was OPF. Two types of cost coefficients were used to model the unknown supply functions of GenCo's rivals. In [18], the market equilibrium for a sequential game of a bilateral energy market was analyzed assuming each player had no access to all action of other players that moved before him at every state of the game.

It is shown that existing discussion on bidding strategy under imperfect information mainly focuses on the modeling of rivals' unknown supply functions, while bidding strategy in absence of transmission topology and parameters is still a problem.

Thus, this paper tries to propose a data-driven pool strategy for price-makers under imperfect information, which makes it more applicable in real markets. The OPF problem is analyzed and modeled using multi-parametric linear programming (MPLP) theory (rim-MPLP, more specifically). The impact of GenCo's bids on the binding constraints is learned using a multi-class support vector machine (SVM) classifier. The classifier is then integrated into the GenCo's decision framework which can be solved using gradient descent methods. The proposed method solves the decision problem in an approach similar to the MPEC-based methods. The major difference is that the proposed method uses a data-driven model instead of the precise OPF in MPEC to model the market outcomes.

¹Since DC-OPF is widely used in electricity markets, the abbreviation OPF stands for DC-OPF rather than AC-OPF in this paper.

The idea of using MPLP theory in the bilevel market decision problem is inspired by reference [19], [20]. In [19], it is shown that various classes of bilevel problems can be transformed into a set of independent single level problems using MPLP theory. Such transformation helps in obtaining global optimality. In [20], linearly constrained bilevel programming problems with lower-level primal and dual optimal solutions in the upper-level objective function (BPP-Ds) are specifically considered. When the parametric function of the lower level problem can be obtained, BPP-Ds can be solved efficiently. Cases of generation and transmission investment are also performed. However, obtaining the parametric functions of the lower level problem also requires a precise OPF model, which limits the direct application of MPLP under imperfect information.

An important concept in MPLP theory is the critical region (CR) which is also referred to as the system pattern or system pattern region (SPR) when analyzing the OPF problem. Each CR or system pattern corresponds to a unique set of binding constraints in OPF, *i.e.*, combination of status flags for generating units and transmission lines. The shadow prices and optimal solutions of OPF are linear-affine functions within each CR. More theoretical analysis on CR will be provided in Section II. Readers can also refer to [21]–[23].

Compared with the aforementioned research, this paper makes the following contributions:

- 1) Electricity markets' basic OPF models are analyzed using rim-MPLP with generation bids and nodal load as parameters of the linear programming problem. The characteristics of critical regions and parametric functions within each CR are revealed.
- 2) An integratable model based on machine learning (specifically a multi-class classifier) is proposed to learn and utilize the probabilistic map between the price-maker's bid and system patterns from available market data. The model can be solved using gradient descent methods and can help the price-maker decide its optimal bidding curve under imperfect information.
- 3) Numerical experiments based on the IEEE 30-bus system, Illinois synthetic 200-bus system, and South Carolina synthetic 500-bus system are conducted to demonstrate the performance of the proposed method.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section II presents theoretical analysis on OPF with rim MPLP. Section III details the learning of system patterns using multi-class classification models. Section IV gives the formulation of the price-maker's optimization problem and its solution method. The case study is conducted in Section V. Finally, Section VI draws the conclusion.

II. RIM-MPLP ANALYSIS FOR OPF

We consider two typical ways of parameterizing the bidding curve of a generator: the block form and the quadratic form. The OPF problem² for the block form can be formulated as follows:

²The unit for capacity is assumed to be MW, and the unit for payment and cost is \$, by default.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{P_G} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{b=1}^B c_{i,b} P_{G,i,b} \\
 \text{s.t. } & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{b=1}^B P_{G,i,b} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} L_i & : \lambda \\
 & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_{ij} \left(\sum_{b=1}^B P_{G,i,b} - L_i \right) \leq F_j^+ & : \mu_j^+ \\
 & - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_{ij} \left(\sum_{b=1}^B P_{G,i,b} - L_i \right) \leq F_j^- & : \mu_j^- \\
 & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J, \text{ and} \\
 & P_{G,i,b} \leq Q_{i,b}^U & : \sigma_{i,b}^U \\
 & - P_{G,i,b} \leq -Q_{i,b}^L & : \sigma_{i,b}^L \\
 & \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}, b = 1, \dots, B
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

\mathcal{N} denotes the set for nodes, and B denotes the number of blocks. For each i , $c_{i,b}$ is the block price submitted by the generator and satisfies $c_{i,1} < c_{i,2} < \dots < c_{i,B}$. $P_{G,i,b}$ is the generated power for node i and block b . It is assumed that each node has at most one generator. L_i is the nodal load, and $F_j^{+/-}$ denotes the transmission capacity. J is the number of lines, and β_{ij} is the power transmission distribution factor. $Q^{U/L}$ denotes the maximum/minimum generation volume. λ , μ , and σ are dual variables.

Also, the quadratic form is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{P_G} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{2} a_i P_{G,i}^2 + b_i P_{G,i} \\
 \text{s.t. } & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} P_{G,i} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} L_i & : \lambda \\
 & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_{ij} (P_{G,i} - L_i) \leq F_j^+ & : \mu_j^+ \\
 & - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_{ij} (P_{G,i} - L_i) \leq F_j^- & : \mu_j^- \\
 & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, J, \text{ and} \\
 & P_{G,i} \leq Q_i^U & : \sigma_i^U \\
 & - P_{G,i} \leq -Q_i^L & : \sigma_i^L \\
 & \text{for } i \in \mathcal{N}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where a_i and b_i are the coefficients of the quadratic cost curve submitted by the generator at node i .

To summarize, the OPF problems in (1) and (2) can be transformed into the following compact form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \min_{P_G} \mathbf{c}^\top P_G \\
 \text{s.t. } & \mathbf{G}_1 P_G = W_1 + \mathbf{S}_1 L & : \Lambda_1 \\
 & \mathbf{G}_i P_G \leq W_i + \mathbf{S}_i L & : \Lambda_i \\
 & \text{for } i = 2, \dots, 1 + 2J + 2N \times B
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for the block form, where $N = |\mathcal{N}|$. And:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{P}_G} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{P}_G^\top \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_G + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{P}_G \\ \text{s.t. } & \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{P}_G = \mathbf{W}_1 + \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{L} \quad : \Lambda_1 \\ & \mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{P}_G \leq \mathbf{W}_i + \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L} \quad : \Lambda_i \\ & \text{for } i = 2, \dots, 1 + 2J + 2N \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for the quadratic form. In a typical bidding problem of (1), $c_{i,b}$ and $Q_{i,b}^U$ are decided by generator i , and $Q_{i,b}^L = 0$. In (2), a_i is usually fixed, and b_i is decided by generator i .

Assume that β_{ij} and $F_j^{+/-}$ are fixed, so the parameters in (3) and (4) are limited to \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{b} in the objective function coefficients (OFC) as well as \mathbf{W}_i and \mathbf{L} in the right-hand side (RHS). The rim-MPLP is defined as a parametric linear programming problem with parameters in both OFC and RHS (Chapter 7 of [24]). When $Q_{i,b}^U$ is fixed³ (and \mathbf{W}_i is consequently fixed), we have the following proposition for the block form.

Proposition 1. *The feasible parameter space $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{L}$ for (3) is covered by convex polytopes, a.k.a. critical regions \mathcal{R}_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. (i) Within each critical region, the system primal and dual optimal variable solutions can be expressed as **linear-affine** functions of the parameter vector (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{L}) if the problem is non-degenerate. (ii) The interior of each critical region corresponds to a unique set of binding constraints (system pattern).*

Proof. The KKT first order necessary conditions for (3) can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{G}_{1+2J+2N \times B} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Lambda_{1+2J+2N \times B} \end{bmatrix} &= 0 \\ \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_1 - \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{L} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_i (\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L}) &= 0 \\ \Lambda_i &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L} \leq 0$$

$$\text{for } i = 2, \dots, 1 + 2J + 2N \times B.$$

Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of indices corresponding to the binding equality and inequality constraints in (5). Let $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$, $\mathbf{W}_\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathbf{S}_\mathcal{B}$ represent the matrices corresponding to \mathcal{B} , and $\Lambda_\mathcal{B}$ denote the dual variables. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^\top \Lambda_\mathcal{B} &= 0 \\ \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_\mathcal{B} - \mathbf{S}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{L} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

There is a condition for such situation when these binding constraints are linearly independent, named *linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ)*. LICQ holds if $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$ has full row rank. In the case of OPF, LICQ naturally holds, which is proved in [21]. Then, $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^\top$ is invertible, and:

$$\left(\Lambda^\mathcal{B} \right)^* = - \left(\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^\top \right)^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{c} \quad (7)$$

³It is easy to consider the variation of $Q_{i,b}^U$ by regarding it as part of the RHS vector \mathbf{L} in (3) and (4).

where the symbol $(\cdot)^*$ indicates the optimal value. We can see that the dual optimal value is a linear-affine function of \mathbf{c} .

The dimension of $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$ is $|\mathcal{B}| \times NB$. If $|\mathcal{B}| < NB$, then there are multiple \mathbf{P}_G satisfying (6), implying that the problem is degenerate. If the problem is non-degenerate, then $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$ has full column rank. Since $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$ has both full row rank and column rank, we have $|\mathcal{B}| = NB$ and $\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}$ is invertible. So the optimal primal value:

$$\left(\mathbf{P}_G \right)^* = \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{W}_\mathcal{B} + \mathbf{S}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{L} \right) \quad (8)$$

which is a linear-affine function of \mathbf{L} .

By substituting (7) and (8) into the inequalities in (5), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ - \left(\mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^\top \right)^{-1} \mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{c} \right\}_i &\geq 0 \\ \mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^{-1} \left(\mathbf{W}_\mathcal{B} + \mathbf{S}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{L} \right) - \mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L} &\leq 0, \\ &\text{for } i \in \mathcal{B} / \{1\} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which is a convex polytope in $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{L}$ corresponding to the set of binding constraints \mathcal{B} . \square

Similarly, the following proposition holds for the quadratic form.

Proposition 2. *The feasible parameter space $\mathfrak{b} \times \mathcal{L}$ for (4) is covered by convex polytopes, a.k.a. critical regions \mathcal{R}_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$. (i) Within each critical region, the system primal and dual optimal variable solutions can be expressed as **linear-affine** functions of the parameter vector (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{L}) if the problem is non-degenerate. (ii) The interior of each critical region corresponds to a unique set of binding constraints (system pattern). T*

Proof. The KKT first order necessary conditions for (4) can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_G + \mathbf{b} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{G}_{1+2J+2N} \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Lambda_{1+2J+2N} \end{bmatrix} &= 0 \\ \mathbf{G}_1 \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_1 - \mathbf{S}_1 \mathbf{L} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_i (\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L}) &= 0 \\ \Lambda_i &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_i - \mathbf{S}_i \mathbf{L} \leq 0$$

$$\text{for } i = 2, \dots, 1 + 2J + 2N.$$

Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of indices corresponding to the binding equality and inequality constraints. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{P}_G + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B}^\top \Lambda_\mathcal{B} &= 0 \\ \mathbf{G}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{P}_G - \mathbf{W}_\mathcal{B} - \mathbf{S}_\mathcal{B} \mathbf{L} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Since \mathbf{H} is positive-definite and \mathbf{G}_B has full row rank, $\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top$ is invertible. The optimal variables can be solved as:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Lambda^B)^* &= - \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbf{W}_B + \mathbf{S}_B \mathbf{L} \right) \\ (\mathbf{P}_G)^* &= - \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{W}_B + \mathbf{S}_B \mathbf{L} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which is linear-affine functions on $\mathbf{b} \times \mathcal{L}$.

By substituting (12) into the inequalities in (10), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ - \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{W}_B + \mathbf{S}_B \mathbf{L} \right) \right\}_i &\geq 0 \\ W_i + S_i L &\geq G_i \left(-\mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_B^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{G}_B \mathbf{H}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{W}_B + \mathbf{S}_B \mathbf{L} \right) \right) \\ &\quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{B} / \{1\} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which is a convex polytope on $\mathbf{b} \times \mathcal{L}$ corresponding to the set of binding constraints \mathcal{B} . \square


Propositions 1 and 2 set up the foundation for learning the parametric functions of Γ^* and \mathbf{P}_G^* under imperfect information. Although market participants may not have access to transmission parameters such as β_{ij} and $F_j^{+/-}$, the map between the parameters of (\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{L}) or (\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{L}) and their attribution of CR can be learned using machine learning methods. Also, the linear-affine coefficients and intercepts for each CR can be estimated using linear regression.

Fig. 1 gives an example of CRs using the simple three-bus system from [22], [23]. The block form is used with $B = 1$. $c_{1,1}$ and $c_{2,1}$ as well as L_2 and L_3 are considered as parameters. To visualize the CRs, randomly generated points of $(c_{1,1}, c_{2,1}, L_2, L_3)$ are plotted using multidimensional scaling (MDS) in a three-dimensional space. The CR borders are marked using transparent colored faces.


The main results in this section are derived from lossless OPF models of (1) and (2). When extending the results to lossy OPF models [25], [26], the characteristics of CR still hold as long as the loss sensitivity vector and loss distribution factor vector are fixed. If the two loss-related vectors are updated iteratively according to real-time market conditions, there will be overlaps between different CRs. However, such overlaps do not affect the proposed learning method in Section III. The case study on this will also be given and discussed in Section V.

III. LEARNING SYSTEM PATTERNS

According to the hyperplane separation theorem in geometry (Section 2.5.1 [27]), there exists a separating hyperplane for each pair of two CRs in the high-dimensional Euclidean space, which makes it possible to learn the system patterns from parameters using machine learning-based classifiers in a one-vs-one (OVO) approach. Among these classifiers, we



(a) The 3-bus system in [22], [23].



(b) The MDS plot of the four CRs. Axes: reduced dimensional feature space. Dots: feature points. Transparent polytopes: CRs.

Fig. 1: An example of CRs in a small-sized OPF case.

choose SVM because it can fit the hyperplane in a natural way and allow tolerance for CR overlapping by incorporating soft margins. In addition to learning the CRs, the linear-affine coefficients in the parameter functions should also be estimated.

A. Learning Probabilities of CRs

For consistency, we use the notation \mathbf{x} to represent the decision variables of the generators, *i.e.*, \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{Q}^U in block form and \mathbf{b} in quadratic form. Let $p_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L})$ denote the posterior probability of the k -th CR $\Pr(\mathcal{R}_k | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L})$. Let $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{L}]$. The input of the OVO classifier is the feature vector \mathbf{X} or part of vector \mathbf{X} (see the discussion in Section IV-B) The output is a vector $\mathbf{p} = [p_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L})]_k$ representing the estimated posterior probabilities of CR belonging.

In machine learning, the OVO estimation of multi-class posterior probabilities contains the following steps:

- 1) OVO classification. Obtain $\binom{K}{2}$ binary classifiers. Each classifier between classes i and j has a decision value $f_{ij} = f_{ij}(\mathbf{X})$. Here, we take SVM as an example, but note that the engine of binary classifiers is not limited to SVM. Let t denote the index of observations of \mathbf{X} whose CR falls in \mathcal{R}_i or \mathcal{R}_j . Let $y^{(t)}$ be the indicator for $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ so that $y^{(t)} = -1$ if $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$'s CR is \mathcal{R}_i , and $y^{(t)} = 1$

if $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$'s CR is \mathcal{R}_j . The following convex optimization problem is solved:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_{ij}, \rho_{ij}, \mathbf{s}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{w}_{ij} + C \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{y}^{(t)} (\mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{X}^{(t)} - \rho_{ij}) \geq 1 - s^{(t)} \\ & s^{(t)} \geq 0, \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \in \{-1, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where C is the tolerance for CR overlapping, and $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the ℓ_1 norm. The decision value is calculated:

$$f_{ij} = \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{X} - \rho_{ij} \quad (15)$$

- 2) OVO probability calibration with Platt's algorithm [28] (a.k.a. Platt scaling) which is a widely-used method in probability estimation for binary classifiers in well-known software such as scikit-learn and LIBSVM [29], [30]. The algorithm estimates parameters of A_{ij} and B_{ij} for the binary classifier between classes i and j ($i < j$). The pairwise class probabilities r_{ij} are obtained by:

$$r_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1 + e^{A_{ij} f_{ij} + B_{ij}}} & i < j \\ 1 - r_{ji} & i > j \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

- 3) Converting the pairwise probabilities r_{ij} to p_k . There are several ways of doing this [31]. We use the second approach proposed by Wu *et al.* which is also the one implemented in LIBSVM. First, obtain the matrix \mathbf{Q} by:

$$Q_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{s: s \neq i} r_{si}^2 & \text{if } i = j, \\ -r_{ji} r_{ij} & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Then solve the following quadratic problem and obtain \mathbf{p} :

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{p}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{p} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{p} = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

which has the following KKT condition:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q} & \mathbf{e} \\ \mathbf{e}^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p} \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (19)$$

where α is a scalar.

B. Learning of Parametric Functions

Let $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ denote the nodal prices resulting from OPF, which can be obtained from the shadow prices $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ [23], [25]. Since $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ are linear-affine functions within each CR, $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ are also linear-affine functions w.r.t. \mathbf{X} in each CR. For a system pattern k , let the following function denote $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and the cleared generation volume $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{P}_G^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\pi} &= \boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_x^{(k)} \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\varphi}_L^{(k)} \mathbf{L} + \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^{(k)} \\ \mathbf{q} &= \boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) = \boldsymbol{\psi}_x^{(k)} \mathbf{x} + \boldsymbol{\psi}_L^{(k)} \mathbf{L} + \boldsymbol{\psi}_0^{(k)} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The coefficient matrices $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_x^{(k)}$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_L^{(k)}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_x^{(k)}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_L^{(k)}$ and intercepts $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^{(k)}$, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0^{(k)}$ can be estimated using linear regression given market observations $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ if $\mathbf{X}^{(t)} \in \mathcal{R}_k$.

IV. OPTIMIZATION FRAMEWORK

This section introduces the optimal bidding problem for GenCos as price-makers and provides a discussion on the market information level. It also presents the overall framework for the proposed data-driven pool strategy.

A. GenCo's Optimization Problem

Assume that, K classes (of system patterns) are considered in the strategic bidding problem. For a GenCo defined by set $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{N}$ of generators located at $g \in \mathcal{G}$, the locational marginal price π_g and the cleared volume q_g determine its income from market settlement.

For the generator at g , define its cost as $h_g(q_g)$. Thus, for the GenCo defined by \mathcal{G} , its optimal offering problem is formulated as (with $\mathbf{x}_{\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{G}}$ and \mathbf{L} fixed):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{x}_G} z &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{p}} \left(\boldsymbol{\pi}_G^\top \mathbf{q}_G - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h_g(q_g) \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K p_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \cdot \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G \cdot \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h_g \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right) \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}_G \in \mathcal{X}_G \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_G} \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h_g \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}_g^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right) \right] \\ = \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(k)} \right)_G \right]_G \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} \right)_G + \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(k)} \right)_G \right]_G \left(\boldsymbol{\varphi}^{(k)} \right)_G \\ - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h'_g \left(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \boldsymbol{\psi}_g^{(k)} \right)_G \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Thus, the gradient of the GenCo's objective function can be shown as (23). An important item in (23) is the gradient of the probability output of the multi-class classifier $(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{p})_G$, which defines the market power of the GenCo on altering the binding constraints of the market under certain operation conditions. The calculation of $(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{p})_G$ is given in the Appendix A.

Once the gradient is obtained, the problem can be solved by gradient descent. In this paper, we use fixed learning rate in gradient descent:

$$\mathbf{x}_G^{(i+1)} := \mathbf{x}_G^{(i)} + \eta \cdot \frac{\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_G} z}{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{x}_G} z\|_2} \quad (24)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is ℓ_2 norm.

B. Discussion on Available Information

The method proposed in Section III and Section IV-A are based on the assumption that $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ and $\mathbf{L}^{(t)}$ are available to the GenCo. However, the level of market information disclosure

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_G} z = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_G} \mathbf{p} \cdot \left[\left(\varphi^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G \left(\psi^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right)_G - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h_g \left(\psi_g^{(k)}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L}) \right) \right]_{k=1}^K &= (\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{p})_G \left[\left(\varphi^{(k)} \right)_G \left(\psi^{(k)} \right)_G - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h_g \left(\psi_g^{(k)} \right) \right]_{k=1}^K \\ + \left(\left[\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(\varphi^{(k)} \right)_G \right]_G \left(\psi^{(k)} \right)_G + \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \left(\psi^{(k)} \right)_G \right]_G \left(\varphi^{(k)} \right)_G - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} h'_g \left[\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_g^{(k)} \right]_G \right) \mathbf{p} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$




Fig. 2: Framework of the proposed method.

depends on specific rules that differ in different markets. Thus, we consider the following levels of available information:

- I. Perfect information. All market data and the transmission parameters are available. Under perfect information, the GenCo can construct the MPEC model to evaluate its market power and theoretically achieve maximum revenue.
- II. Imperfect information. The transmission parameters are unavailable. All market data are available.
- III. Imperfect information. The transmission parameters are unavailable. Data of $\mathbf{L}^{(t)}$ are available. The GenCo only knows its own bidding data. Thus, only part of $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is available.
- IV. Imperfect information. The transmission parameters are unavailable. Only zonal load data (rather than nodal load data) and GenCo's own bidding data are available.

In levels III and IV, the original feature vector $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ is unavailable. A new vector can be constructed based on the available information of the GenCo. The learning of system patterns and the GenCo's optimization problem are performed with the new vector. The procedure is unchanged, but the accuracy of learning is likely to be lower since incomplete features result in a higher degree of CR overlapping. In levels III and IV, the new feature vector is also denoted using $\mathbf{X}^{(t)}$ for the rest of this paper.

C. The Overall Framework

The framework of the proposed method is shown in Fig. 2. The whole set of market data is split into the training & validation set and test set. Since SVM is sensitive to the feature scale, a Min-Max scaler is used to preprocess the features. The classifier and its hyperparameters are trained and tuned on the training & validation set. Also, the coefficients in the parametric functions $\varphi^{(k)}$ and $\psi^{(k)}$ for each system pattern are estimated using linear regression. Then, the optimal bidding problem based on the learned system patterns is constructed and solved, and the test set is used to validate the proposed method.

D. Complexity Analysis

The training of OVO SVM and its probabilistic calibration are well developed in machine learning software. Once the model is trained, it can be used for a certain time period. The time complexity for solving the optimization problem using gradient descent mainly comes from the calculation of the gradient, specifically $(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{p})_G$. The main computational burden comes from the calculation of \mathbf{M} in (34) and the updating of \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{Q} in (18)-(17). The calculation of \mathbf{M} requires a matrix inversion operation on \mathbf{Q} with a time complexity of $O(K^3)$. The complexity of updating \mathbf{q} is also $O(K^3)$ using Gaussian elimination on (19). The complexity of updating \mathbf{Q} is $O(N^2)$, where N defines the length of the feature vector \mathbf{X} .

V. CASE STUDY

To illustrate the application of the data-driven pool strategy, a case study based on simulated market data is conducted.

We perform the case study using the IEEE 30-bus system, Illinois synthetic 200-bus system, and South Carolina synthetic 500-bus system [32] whose data are provided in Matpower [33]. In the 30-bus system, all 6 generators are assumed to be strategic. In the 200-bus system, generators #26, #27, #28, #29, #30, and #37 are assumed to be strategic, while the other 43 generators that have small capacity or low generation cost are assumed to be nonstrategic. In the 500-bus system, 14 generators with generation capacity of more than 100 MW and relatively higher generation cost are set as strategic, while other 42 generators are set as nonstrategic. It is assumed that generators can price away freely from their true cost.

All numerical experiments are conducted on an Intel Core i9-10900K@3.70 GHz desktop with MATLAB 2020b. SVM is trained using LIBSVM [30].

For each test system, both the block form and the quadratic form of bid curves as well as both lossless and lossy OPF

TABLE I: Classification Accuracy (%) Under Different Case Settings

Case size	Bid curve form	OPF type	Dummy 1	Dummy 2	SVM Train	SVM Test
30	Block	Lossless	7.73	3.34	99.50	60.51
30	Block	Lossy	8.15	3.34	95.41	61.66
30	Quadratic	Lossless	54.53	32.86	98.48	91.70
30	Quadratic	Lossy	47.26	25.91	98.75	92.34
200	Block	Lossless	17.81	6.65	76.26	59.43
200	Block	Lossy	26.34	10.41	61.89	55.99
200	Quadratic	Lossless	38.27	17.12	88.46	75.02
200	Quadratic	Lossy	46.67	24.01	89.39	72.43
500	Block	Lossless	8.66	3.46	98.56	46.57
500	Block	Lossy	9.97	3.61	99.05	42.19
500	Quadratic	Lossless	14.66	7.09	94.39	69.52
500	Quadratic	Lossy	14.98	6.48	92.86	66.87

models are considered. For the block form, the number of price blocks B is set as 5, including 2 nonstrategic blocks (which are set at a sufficiently low price to ensure a minimum income) for the 30-bus system case and 1 nonstrategic block for the 200-bus system and 500-bus system. Each block has the same volume in the basic scenario. For each case (combination of different systems and block/quadratic and lossless/lossy), 8760 scenarios are generated by adding 10% Gaussian deviation on $c_{i,b}$ and $Q_{i,b}^U$ or b_i of the basic scenario. The nodal load scenarios are generated using the one-year hourly load scenarios of the Illinois synthetic 200-bus system contained in the Matpower scenario file.

The whole dataset is split into two sets: the training & validation set (80%) and the test set (20%). The training and validation procedure is performed in a 5-fold cross validation approach. The best hyperparameter C in SVM is chosen from $\{0.1, 1, 10, 100, 10^3, 10^4\}$. The learning rate in (24) is fixed at 0.01, and the maximum number of iterations is set at 200.

A. Comparisons

Different levels of information are tested as mentioned in Section IV-B. Three methods are used as benchmark for comparison. The first one is MPEC with information level I. It is solved using the big-M method in MILP with Gurobi. The second one is an RDC-like method. Assuming that the congestion status is fixed, the sensitivity of market results with respect to generator bids is estimated using historical data, and is embedded into the bidding problem. The third method uses the same information as level II but replaces the CR's probability $p_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{L})$ in (21) with its empirical value \bar{p}_k . This means that the impact of the GenCo's bid on the market results of system patterns is ignored. For the sake of simplicity, the third method using the empirical probability is further referred to as level V.

B. Classification Results

The performance of SVM in the multi-class classification task is presented. In comparison, two types of dummy classifiers are also used: The first one (Dummy 1) always predicts




Fig. 3: Confusion matrix for the 30-bus block-form lossless case.

the most frequent class, and the second one (Dummy 2) is a random guess according to empirical probability.

Table I shows the classification accuracy under different case settings. The accuracy is defined as the proportion of correctly classified samples in the whole set. The 50 most frequent CRs are chosen while other CRs are considered rare and filtered. As shown in the table, the SVM outperforms the dummy classifiers with much higher accuracies in all case settings. For the block form, the CRs become more diversified so that the SVM test accuracy is between 42% and 62%. For the quadratic form, the test accuracy is between 66% and 93%. In the 30-bus case, the test accuracy of lossy OPF is slightly higher than the accuracy of lossless OPF. This is because in the lossless case the 50 most frequent CRs cover more data than in the lossy case. Also, the overlap of CRs is not significant in this case.

It is also shown that the classifiers in larger cases perform somehow worse than in the 30-bus cases. This is because the overlaps between CRs become stronger when the power system is more complex.

The above accuracy is used for deterministic classification problems. A well-known metric for probabilistic classification is the confusion matrix, which in the multi-class (K -class) case is defined as follows:


$$[\text{Conf}]_i = \left[\sum_{j:y^{(j)}=i} \mathbf{p}^{(j)} \right]_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (25)$$

The diagonal dominance level of the confusion matrix represents the performance of the probabilistic classifier. Fig. 3 shows the confusion matrix for the 30-bus block-form lossless case with a strong dominance.


C. Bid Results in IEEE 30-Bus System

Since analyzing the cost of generators is not the focus of this paper, the cost functions for different generators $h_g(q_g)$ in (21) are set uniformly at a relatively low level:


$$h_g(q_g) = \frac{1}{2} \times 0.1q_g^2 + 5q_g \quad (26)$$




(a) Lossless OPF with block-form bidding curve.



(b) Lossy OPF with block-form bidding curve.



(c) Lossless OPF with quadratic-form bidding curve.



(d) Lossy OPF with quadratic-form bidding curve.

Axis: M denotes the MPEC method; R denotes the RDC-like method.

Fig. 4: Boxplots of revenues for different generators in the IEEE 30-bus system. Six groups represent the GenCos owning one of the six strategic generators, respectively.

By solving the revenue maximization problem according to different levels of information, 20 time intervals from the 10 most frequent CRs are used to test the performance. The boxplots of the revenues in different cases are plotted in Fig. 4. As shown in the figure, the proposed method outperforms the benchmark using empirical probability (V) in all levels of information. Note that although MPEC (level I) can obtain the




Fig. 5: An example on the change of objective function values in gradient descent.

theoretically maximum revenue, the big-M method may induce certain loss w.r.t. selection of the M value. Instead of carefully choosing M for every single time interval and every GenCo, we fix M at 1000 in this case. The RDC-like method (R) performs slightly better than the benchmark using empirical probability (V), because it assumes the CR is known and fixed to the generator. However, the proposed method outperforms the RDC-like method in most of the cases.

Table II shows the average revenue values of all six generators in the test set for the 30-bus case. The percentage values representing the proportion of revenue obtained under imperfect information to the theoretical revenue under perfect information by MPEC are also given. It is shown that the proposed method achieves on average approximately 70%-76% of the maximum revenue at information level II-IV, while the benchmark considering only the empirical probability achieves approximately 62% of the maximum revenue. The absolute improvement of the proposed method is approximately 8%-14%.

Fig. 5 gives an example of the change in objective function values during the gradient descent procedure. Usually, the proposed method converges within 100 iterations. The time consumption for a 200-iteration procedure is approximately 45 seconds.

D. Bid Results in Illinois 200-Bus System

The cost functions are set the same as (26) in the 200-bus system case. Table III shows the average revenue values of the six strategic generators in the test set for the 200-bus case. The proposed method achieves on average approximately 59%-65% of the maximum revenue at information level II-IV, while the benchmark method can only achieve approximately 54% of the maximum revenue. Thus, the improvement of the proposed method under imperfect information is approximately 5%-11%.

Compared with the results in the 30-bus case, the improvement becomes less when the system becomes larger. In the 200-bus case, there are many nonstrategic generators and the

TABLE II: Average Revenue and Percentage Values for the 30-Bus Case

Bid curve form	OPF type	MPEC		RDC-like		Level II		Level III		Level IV		Level V	
		Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)
Block	Lossless	1024.74	100	718.28	70.09	820.55	80.07	793.28	77.41	802.03	78.27	655.10	63.93
Block	Lossy	1000.53	100	735.66	73.53	794.35	79.39	760.09	75.97	777.51	77.71	708.62	70.82
Quadratic	Lossless	1067.71	100	662.70	59.71	804.99	75.39	704.71	66.00	720.82	67.51	602.85	56.46
Quadratic	Lossy	1121.66	100	613.36	56.43	772.16	68.84	712.73	63.54	717.38	63.96	635.12	56.62
Average		1053.66	100	682.50	64.77	798.01	75.74	742.70	70.49	754.44	71.60	650.42	61.73

TABLE III: Average Revenue and Percentage Values for the 200-Bus Case

Bid curve form	OPF type	MPEC		RDC-like		Level II		Level III		Level IV		Level V	
		Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)
Block	Lossless	3837.30	100	1793.23	46.73	2172.02	56.6	2078.83	54.17	2121.78	55.29	1793.23	46.73
Block	Lossy	3245.22	100	1711.78	52.75	1769.69	54.53	1740.13	53.62	1835.13	56.55	1714.98	52.85
Quadratic	Lossless	3900.77	100	2361.82	60.55	2643.75	67.78	2636.15	67.58	2337.74	59.93	1994.27	51.12
Quadratic	Lossy	3273.78	100	2044.77	62.46	2532.62	77.36	2486.67	75.96	2233.58	68.23	2227.42	68.04
Average		3564.27	100	1977.9	55.49	2279.52	63.95	2235.45	62.72	2132.06	59.82	1932.48	54.22

market power of each strategic generator is smaller. Thus, information extracted from historical market data decreases, and the performance of the proposed method is therefore negatively affected.

The time consumption for a 200-iteration procedure in this case is approximately 120 seconds.

E. Bid Results in South Carolina 500-Bus System

The cost functions are set the same as (26). Table IV shows the average revenue values of the two generators at bus #16 and #17. The results of level IV are not presented, because the Matpower case file only defines two regions for the 500-bus system. If the zonal load data are used to replace the nodal load data in this case, most information contained in the nodal load vector will be lost.

The main difference between the 500-bus cases and the smaller cases is that the market becomes more competitive when the system becomes larger and the number of generators increases. Thus, even if MPEC is used to calculate the optimal generation offer under perfect information, it cannot bring a significant extra revenue compared with other methods under imperfect information. The performance of MPEC is slightly worse than some other methods for the lossy OPF and block form of bid curves, since it is difficult to consider the loss factors in the lower level model of MPEC. In fact, MPEC only uses a lossless OPF which cannot fully simulate the lossy OPF.

Although the market power of the generators are smaller compared with the 30-bus and 200-bus cases, the proposed method with information levels II and III still performs better than the benchmark methods.

F. Discussion on Scalability to Larger Systems

Generally, as the power system become larger to thousands of nodes, the electricity market would become more competi-

tive. It is difficult for GenCos to seek extra revenue in a perfect competitive market. From the case study, it is shown that the proposed method could extract useful information from market data and support bidding decision in a moderate-sized power system. If the CR is not complex in a large system, the performance of the proposed method is expected to be similar to the performance in moderated-sized cases. If the CR is too complex, other strategies (e.g., RDC-based methods) are preferred.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a data-driven pool strategy for price-makers under imperfect information. Based on general OPF models, the critical region and system pattern characteristics of the market clearing model are analyzed using rim-MPLP theory. Then, such characteristics are used for the training of multi-class classifier with historical market data. The parametric functions of optimal dual and primal variables in OPF are fitted with linear regression. The learned classifier and parametric functions are integrated into the price-makers decision framework to form a revenue maximization problem. We then show that such problem can be solved using gradient descent-based methods. The proposed method can consider the impact of GenCo's bidding on both the market binding constraints and market clearing prices. It can be regarded as an extension of the famous MPEC method under imperfect information when essential power system parameters are unavailable. The proposed method can be used for both market participants and market organizers in decision-making, behavior evaluation and simulation. A case study based on the IEEE 30-bus system, Illinois 200-bus system, and South Carolina 500-bus system demonstrates the performance of the proposed method in small and moderate-sized systems.

Future work includes considering transmission network contingency in the method.

TABLE IV: Average Revenue and Percentage Values for the 500-Bus Case

Bid curve form	OPF type	MPEC		RDC-like		Level II		Level III		Level V	
		Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)	Revenue (\$)	Pct. (%)
Block	Lossless	24711.5	100	23393.2	94.67	23785.7	96.25	23891.9	96.68	22883.2	92.60
Block	Lossy	25389.2	100	26378.7	103.9	26158.1	103.0	26397.0	104.0	25166.1	99.12
Quadratic	Lossless	13227.9	100	11787.2	89.11	12095.0	91.44	11885.1	89.85	11740.3	88.75
Quadratic	Lossy	14564.4	100	12723.5	87.36	13083.9	89.83	13062.2	89.69	12737.4	87.46
Average		19473.3	100	18570.7	95.36	18780.7	96.44	18809.1	96.60	18131.8	93.11

APPENDIX A GRADIENT OF THE PROBABILITIES

Assume an infinitesimal $\Delta \mathbf{X} = [\Delta X_1, \Delta X_2, \dots]^\top$ is added to \mathbf{X} . For SVM, we have:

$$\Delta f_{ij} = \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X}, \quad i < j \quad (27)$$

And when $i < j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta r_{ij} &= -\frac{1}{(1 + e^{A_{ij}f_{ij} + B_{ij}})^2} e^{A_{ij}f_{ij} + B_{ij}} A_{ij} \Delta f_{ij} \\ &= -A_{ij} r_{ij}^2 (1/r_{ij} - 1) \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \\ &= -A_{ij} r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

When $i > j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta r_{ij} &= -\Delta r_{ji} = A_{ji} r_{ji} (1 - r_{ji}) \mathbf{w}_{ji}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \\ &= A_{ij} r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

With slight abuse of notation, $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ and $\mathbf{w}_{ij} = \mathbf{w}_{ji}$ for $i \neq j$. Then, to calculate $\Delta \mathbf{Q}$, for $i = j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Q_{ij} &= \sum_{s:s \neq i} 2r_{si} \Delta r_{si} \\ &= \left(\sum_{s:s \neq i} A_{si} (-1)^{\mathbb{1}(s < i)} 2r_{si}^2 (1 - r_{si}) \mathbf{w}_{si}^\top \right) \Delta \mathbf{X} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Where $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the boolean function for the input condition. For $i < j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Q_{ij} &= \Delta (r_{ij}^2 - r_{ij}) \\ &= -A_{ij} (2r_{ij} - 1) r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Since \mathbf{Q} is symmetric, for $i > j$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Q_{ij} &= \Delta Q_{ji} = -A_{ji} (2r_{ji} - 1) r_{ji} (1 - r_{ji}) \mathbf{w}_{ji}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \\ &= A_{ij} (2r_{ij} - 1) r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) \mathbf{w}_{ij}^\top \Delta \mathbf{X} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Now we have $\Delta \mathbf{Q}$ w.r.t. $\Delta \mathbf{X}$. From (19) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \mathbf{Q})\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{Q}\Delta \mathbf{p} + e\Delta \alpha &= 0 \\ e^\top \Delta \mathbf{p} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Since \mathbf{Q} is positive definite:

$$\begin{aligned} e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} [(\Delta \mathbf{Q})\mathbf{p} + e\Delta \alpha] &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \Delta \alpha &= (e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} e)^{-1} [e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} (\Delta \mathbf{Q})\mathbf{p}] \\ \Rightarrow \Delta \mathbf{p} &= \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \left[e (e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} e)^{-1} e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \right] (\Delta \mathbf{Q})\mathbf{p} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Let $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \left[e (e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} e)^{-1} e^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \right]$. To further simplify the gradient of \mathbf{p} w.r.t. \mathbf{X} , we focus on the change of X_k for some index k . When fixing $X_{k'}$ for all $k' \neq k$, ΔQ_{ij} can be represented as (35). Then, define matrix \mathbf{D}_k as (36).

Thus, $\partial \mathbf{Q} / \partial X_k = \mathbf{D}_K$. And:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathbf{p} &= \mathbf{M} \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{p} \Delta X_k \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\partial \mathbf{p}}{\partial X_k} &= \mathbf{M} \mathbf{D}_k \mathbf{p} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Due to linearity, the gradient is:

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{M} [\mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{D}_2 \mathbf{p}, \dots, \mathbf{D}_K \mathbf{p}] \quad (38)$$

By definition, $(\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{p})_{\mathcal{G}}$ is part of $\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{p}$.

Finally, the only thing that relates to SVM is (27). The above derivation holds for other classifiers as long as Δf_{ij} can be written w.r.t. $\Delta \mathbf{X}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. David and F. Wen, "Strategic bidding in competitive electricity markets: a literature survey," in *2000 Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting*, vol. 4, 2000, pp. 2168–2173.
- [2] G. Li, J. Shi, and X. Qu, "Modeling methods for GenCo bidding strategy optimization in the liberalized electricity spot market—a state-of-the-art review," *Energy*, vol. 36, no. 8, pp. 4686–4700, 2011.
- [3] T. Li and M. Shahidehpour, "Strategic bidding of transmission-constrained gencos with incomplete information," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 437–447, 2005.
- [4] E. Litvinov, "Design and operation of the locational marginal prices-based electricity markets," *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 315–323, 2010.
- [5] B. Hobbs, C. Metzler, and J.-S. Pang, "Strategic gaming analysis for electric power systems: an MPEC approach," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 638–645, 2000.
- [6] A. Conejo, J. Contreras, J. Arroyo, and S. de la Torre, "Optimal response of an oligopolistic generating company to a competitive pool-based electric power market," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 424–430, 2002.
- [7] M. Song and M. Amelin, "Price-maker bidding in day-ahead electricity market for a retailer with flexible demands," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 1948–1958, 2018.
- [8] L. Xu, R. Baldick, and Y. Sutjandra, "Bidding into electricity markets: A transmission-constrained residual demand derivative approach," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1380–1388, 2011.
- [9] J. Portela González, A. Muñoz San Roque, E. F. Sánchez-Úbeda, J. García-González, and R. González Hombrados, "Residual demand curves for modeling the effect of complex offering conditions on day-ahead electricity markets," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 50–61, 2017.
- [10] C. Ruiz and A. J. Conejo, "Pool strategy of a producer with endogenous formation of locational marginal prices," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 1855–1866, 2009.

$$\Delta Q_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{s:s \neq i} A_{si}(-1)^{\mathbb{1}(s < i)} 2r_{si}^2 (1 - r_{si}) w_{si,k} \Delta X_k & \text{if } i = j, \\ A_{ij}(-1)^{\mathbb{1}(i < j)} (2r_{ij} - 1) r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) w_{ij,k} \Delta X_k & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

$$[D_k]_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{s:s \neq i} A_{si}(-1)^{\mathbb{1}(s < i)} 2r_{si}^2 (1 - r_{si}) w_{si,k} & \text{if } i = j, \\ A_{ij}(-1)^{\mathbb{1}(i < j)} (2r_{ij} - 1) r_{ij} (1 - r_{ij}) w_{ij,k} & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

[11] M. Zugno, J. M. Morales, P. Pinson, and H. Madsen, "Pool strategy of a price-maker wind power producer," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 3440–3450, 2013.

[12] C. Ruiz, A. J. Conejo, J. D. Fuller, S. A. Gabriel, and B. F. Hobbs, "A tutorial review of complementarity models for decision-making in energy markets," *EURO Journal on Decision Processes*, vol. 2, no. 1-2, pp. 91–120, 2014.

[13] M. Ghamkhari, A. Sadeghi-Mobarakeh, and H. Mohsenian-Rad, "Strategic bidding for producers in nodal electricity markets: A convex relaxation approach," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 2324–2336, 2017.

[14] Y. Ye, D. Papadaskalopoulos, and G. Strbac, "An MPEC approach for analysing the impact of energy storage in imperfect electricity markets," in *2016 13th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–5.

[15] K. Šepetanc and H. Pandžić, "A cluster-based operation model of aggregated battery swapping stations," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 249–260, 2020.

[16] F. Wen and A. David, "Optimal bidding strategies and modeling of imperfect information among competitive generators," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 15–21, 2001.

[17] T. Li and M. Shahidehpour, "Strategic bidding of transmission-constrained GENCOs with incomplete information," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 437–447, 2005.

[18] E. Bompard, T. Huang, and L. Yang, "Market equilibrium under incomplete and imperfect information in bilateral electricity markets," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 1231–1240, 2011.

[19] N. P. Faísca, V. Dua, B. Rustem, P. M. Saraiva, and E. N. Pistikopoulos, "Parametric global optimisation for bilevel programming," *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 609–623, 2007.

[20] H. C. Bylling, S. A. Gabriel, and T. K. Boomsma, "A parametric programming approach to bilevel optimisation with lower-level variables in the upper level," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 71, no. 5, pp. 846–865, 2020.

[21] Q. Zhou, L. Tesfatsion, and C.-C. Liu, "Short-term congestion forecasting in wholesale power markets," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 2185–2196, 2011.

[22] X. Geng and L. Xie, "Learning the LMP-load coupling from data: A support vector machine based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 1127–1138, 2017.

[23] K. Zheng, Q. Chen, Y. Wang, C. Kang, and L. Xie, "Unsupervised congestion status identification using LMP data," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 726–736, 2021.

[24] T. Gal, *Postoptimal Analyses, Parametric Programming, and Related Topics: degeneracy, multicriteria decision making, redundancy*, 2nd ed. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

[25] E. Litvinov, T. Zheng, G. Rosenwald, and P. Shamsollahi, "Marginal loss modeling in LMP calculation," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 880–888, 2004.

[26] Z. Hu, H. Cheng, Z. Yan, and F. Li, "An iterative LMP calculation method considering loss distributions," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1469–1477, 2010.

[27] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, 7th ed. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[28] J. Platt, "Probabilistic outputs for support vector machines and comparisons to regularized likelihood methods," in *Advances in large margin classifiers*, A. J. Smola, P. Bartlett, B. Schölkopf, and D. Schuurmans, Eds. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2000, pp. 61–74.

[29] 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*, vol. 12, pp. 2825–2830, 2011.

[30] C.-C. Chang and C.-J. Lin, "LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 2, pp. 27:1–27:27, 2011.

[31] T.-F. Wu, C.-J. Lin, and R. C. Weng, "Probability estimates for multi-class classification by pairwise coupling," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 5, p. 975–1005, 2004.

[32] A. B. Birchfield, T. Xu, K. M. Gegner, K. S. Shetye, and T. J. Overbye, "Grid structural characteristics as validation criteria for synthetic networks," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 3258–3265, 2017.

[33] R. D. Zimmerman, C. E. Murillo-Sánchez, and R. J. Thomas, "Matpower: Steady-state operations, planning, and analysis tools for power systems research and education," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 12–19, 2011.



Kedi Zheng (S'17-M'22) received the B.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 2017 and 2022, respectively.

He is currently a Post-Doctoral Researcher with Tsinghua University. His research interests include data analytics in power systems and electricity markets.



Hongye Guo (S'15-M'20) received the B.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 2015 and 2020, respectively.

He is currently a postdoc research fellow at Tsinghua University. His research interests include electricity markets, game theory, energy economics and machine learning.



Qixin Chen (M'10-SM'15) received a Ph.D. degree from the Department of Electrical Engineering at Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 2010.

He is currently an Associate Professor at Tsinghua University. His research interests include electricity markets, power system economics and optimization, low-carbon electricity and power generation expansion planning.