Abstract—DC microgrids fed with substantial intermittent renewable energy sources (RES) face the immediate problem of power imbalance and the subsequent DC bus voltage fluctuation problem (that can easily breach power system standards). It has recently been demonstrated that DC electric springs (DCES), when connected with series non-critical loads, are capable of stabilizing the voltage of local nodes and improving the power quality of DC microgrids without large energy storage. In this paper, two centralized model predictive control (CMPC) schemes with (i) non-adaptive weighting factors and (ii) adaptive weighting factors are proposed to extend the existing functions of the DCES in the microgrid. The control schemes coordinate the DCES to mitigate the distribution power loss in the DC microgrids, while simultaneously providing their original function of DC bus voltage regulation. Using the DCES model that was previously validated with experiments, simulations based on MATLAB/SIMULINK platform are conducted to validate the control schemes. The results show that with the proposed CMPC schemes, the DCES are capable of eliminating the bus voltage offsets as well as reducing the distribution power loss of the DC microgrid.
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I. INTRODUCTION

DC microgrids are gaining increasing attention in the microgrid community due to various merits such as high reliability, high efficiency and ease of renewable energy sources (RES) interconnection, as compared to the AC microgrids [1]–[6]. Many microgrid facilities such as fuel cells, photovoltaic (PV) systems, battery systems, and electronics loads such as computers and TVs are inherently of DC nature. Therefore, the normal front-end AC/DC conversion stage and its associated hardware infrastructures can be eliminated in the DC microgrids. This significantly improves the reliability and efficiency of the energy transmission [7]. However, similar to their AC counterparts, DC microgrids also suffer from significant bus voltage fluctuations induced by the RES, especially the DC voltage offsets, if the energy storage capacities are insufficient. Additionally, the instantaneous power imbalance between the power generation and the power consumption can lead to severe instability of the DC microgrids that may cause catastrophic blackouts. Therefore, well-designed regulation schemes to stabilize the bus voltage of the DC microgrids are critical for the grid connections of those voltage sensitive loads.

DC electric spring (DCES), which originates from the concept of AC electric spring (ES) [8], is one of the schemes to stabilize and improve the power quality of DC microgrids [9], [10]. Being analogous to the ES in the AC microgrids, DCES are associated with non-critical loads to function as a new type of smart loads. The named non-critical loads refer to those appliances that can tolerate a wide range of voltage and power fluctuation. So far, several versions of AC ES-based smart loads are validated to improve the regulations of microgrids with grid voltage regulation [8], [11]–[16], energy storage reduction [17], power factor correction [18], neutral current minimization [19], three-phase power balance [20], and frequency stabilization [16], [21]. The first version of ES (ES-I) in [8] is limited to compensate the reactive power of the grids, since energy storage components are not included. For this reason, the second version of ES (ES-II) comprising batteries is later proposed to achieve both active and reactive power compensation [14].

The DCES follows the general configuration of ES-II. It has been investigated for the functions of bus-voltage stabilization, fault ride-through, and harmonics reduction [9], [10], [22], [23]. In [9], DCES are proved to effectively stabilize the bus voltage with unstable supply voltage of RES and alleviate the droop effect along a radical DC network for both constant-resistive and constant-power loads as non-critical loads. In [10], DCES are extended from the traditional series-type DCES (which is connected in series with the non-critical load) to the shunt-type DCES (which is connected in parallel with the non-critical load). Similar to the low power battery system [24], [25], the shunt-type DCES has a faster dynamic performance than the series-type DCES. Besides, the shunt-type DCES can reduce the harmonics of the bus voltage with less energy consumption than the series-type DCES. However, [10] also points out that series-type DCES has less energy storage capacities as compared to the shunt-type DCES, since the power consumption of the non-critical load can be manipulated by the control of DCES. Meanwhile, both series-type and shunt-type DCES are verified to eliminate the double-line frequency harmonics and support the fault-ride-through of the DC microgrid. Except [10], most of the published papers on DCES are based on the series-type DCES. In [22], the photovoltaic (PV) system is incorporated into the DCES to replace the battery systems in order to reduce energy storage capacities. Reference [23] extends the topologies of DCES from bi-directional full bridge inverters to bi-directional paralleled buck-boost converters and...
bi-directional phase-shift full-bridge converters.

Research reported on the use of DCES primarily focuses on the use of single unit. Coordinated use of multiple DCES has not been explored. In view of this, the use of multiple DCES involving a new centralized controller is presented in this paper. This controller is a high-level centralized model predictive controller (CMPC) that generates the required voltage references for the different DCES located on various buses of the microgrid. The local proportional-integral (PI) controllers of the respective DCES will be operated to track these voltage references to achieve the overall required functions. Model predictive control (MPC) is a well-known process control strategy of which future control inputs and system response are predicted using a model and are optimized at regular intervals with respect to a performance index [26]. MPC inherits several advantages. First, the underlying idea of MPC is intuitive and does not involve complicated plant modeling. Second, the basic formulation of MPC is easily extendable to different multivariable plants with almost no modification. Third, the control objectives of MPC can be readily reconfigured by changing the cost function. Fourth, MPC can deal routinely with equipment and safety constraints [27].

By incorporating the terms of distribution power loss and bus voltage deviations into the feedback, this project shows that the CMPC can enhance the operation of the DCES in terms of reducing the distribution loss in the DC microgrids. This is possible since practical loads, even for the critical loads, can tolerate a certain degree of voltage offset. The benefits of allowing the bus voltage to deviate within an acceptable percentage is to reconfigure the power flow paths of the microgrid to reduce the power loss on the distribution lines. This is achieved by manipulating the weighting factors of the cost function and executing the algorithm of CMPC to minimize the cost function. Certainly, the constraints of the bus voltage have to be included in the algorithm to guarantee the safe operation of the entire DC microgrid. For the weighting factors design, the operations of the CMPC with both non-adaptive and adaptive weighting factors are presented and compared. This comparative study is based on computer simulations using a DCES model that has previously been verified with experiments [9], [10].

A simplified DC microgrid consists of \( n \) RES units and \( m \) buses is shown in Fig. 1 [28]. The loads on each buses can be classified as non-critical loads (NL) and critical loads (CL) [8]. The NL refers to those loads that can tolerate a relatively large degree of power and voltage fluctuations. Examples are thermal loads such as water heaters, general heat pumps and thermal storage systems. The CL are voltage sensitive loads that require well-regulated bus voltage, such as medical equipment. Generally, the NL are resistive loads and the CL can be resistive loads or constant power loads. The RES can be wind energy sources, solar energy sources and biofuel energy sources. The intermittency and uncertainty of these RES give rise to the difficulty in achieving instantaneous power balance between the supply side and the demand side. To overcome this problem, battery systems are typically installed to buffer the instantaneous power imbalance and stabilize the bus voltage. However, this battery solution is expensive and has limited energy capacities [29]. The distributed smart loads (SL) based on DC electric springs (DCES) involves simple power electronics and thus provide a competitive means of achieving distributed power compensation [9], [10], [22], [23] with the possibility of reducing energy storage requirements.
A simplified diagram of a DCES installed at one of the DC microgrid buses is shown in Fig. 2. The DCES is connected to the non-critical load $R_n$ in series to form a smart load. Here, $V_g$ is a constant voltage source, indicating the traditional DC power supply; $R_g$ is the internal resistance of $V_g$; $I_R$ is a time-varying current source, indicating the RES supply; $R_d$ is the resistive distribution line; $R_c$ is the critical load; $V_n$ is the voltage over the non-critical load; $V_{ES}$ is the ES voltage; and $V_{bus}$ is the bus voltage.

![Fig. 2. Simplified diagram of a DC microgrid bus with a DCES.](image)

The equivalent circuit of the system in Fig. 2 is shown in Fig. 3(a). Without DCES, if the power supply side and the demand side are balanced, the nominal power $P_{nom}$ can be derived as

$$P_{nom} = V_{nom}^2 \frac{R_n + R_c}{R_n R_c},$$

(1)

where $V_{nom}$ is the nominal bus voltage. However, the actual power of the bus $P$ can be different from the nominal power $P_{nom}$ as

$$P = V_{bus}^2 \frac{R_d}{R_c}.$$  

(2)

Then, the difference between the nominal and the actual power of the bus is

$$\Delta P = P_{nom} - P.$$  

(3)

Substituting (1) and (2) into (3),

$$\Delta P = (V_{nom} - V_{bus})(V_{nom} + V_{bus}) \frac{R_n + R_c}{R_n R_c}.$$  

(4)

According to (4), when the power supply is insufficient, $\Delta P > 0$ and the bus voltage $V_{bus} < V_{nom}$. When the power supply is excessive, $\Delta P < 0$ and the bus voltage $V_{bus} > V_{nom}$. When the power supply and demand are balanced, $\Delta P = 0$, the bus voltage $V_{bus} = V_{nom}$. As to the RES, the power supply often fluctuates, so $\Delta P$ is unsteady and so $V_{bus}$ varies with offsets.

However, when the DCES is installed,

$$V_{bus} = \left( \frac{P}{V_{bus}} \frac{V_n}{R_n} \right) R_c = V_{ES} + V_n,$$

(5)

Re-arranging $V_{ES}$ as the subject of the equation,


\[ V_{ES} = \frac{R_n + R_c}{R_c} V_{bus} - \frac{PR_n}{V_{bus}}. \]  

(6)

Hence, only if \( V_{ES} \) is regulated at

\[ V_{ES} = \frac{R_n + R_c}{R_c} V_{nom} - \frac{PR_n}{V_{nom}}, \]  

(7)

the bus voltage will be equal to the nominal bus voltage, i.e., \( V_{bus} = V_{nom} \). The \( V_{ES}-P \) curve can be depicted as shown in Fig. 4, where \( V_{ES\text{max}} \) and \( V_{ES\text{min}} \) are the maximum and minimum voltage DCES, respectively.

\[ P_{nom} = \frac{R_n + R_c}{R_n R_c} V_{nom}^2. \]

![Fig. 4. \( V_{ES}-P \) curve.](image)

Obviously, when the power supply is insufficient such that \( P < P_{nom} \), the DCES is activated as a voltage source within the range of \( 0 < V_{ES} \leq V_{ES\text{max}} \). When the power supply is excessive such that \( P > P_{nom} \), the DCES is activated as a voltage sink within the range of \( V_{ES\text{min}} \leq V_{ES} < 0 \). When the power is balanced such that \( P = P_{nom} \), the DCES is deactivated as \( V_{ES} = 0 \).

The local control strategy of DCES is given in Fig. 3(b). A classic PI controller is used to regulate the bus voltage. The corresponding control block diagram in the frequency domain is shown in Fig. 5.

![Fig. 5. Control block diagram of the classic local control strategy for DCES.](image)

The closed-loop transfer function of the system is

\[ \frac{V_{bus}(s)}{V_{nom}(s)} = \frac{K_p V_{dc} s + K_i V_{dc}}{(1 + K_p V_{dc}) s + K_i V_{dc}}. \]  

(8)

The transfer function between the error signal \( e(s) \) and the reference signal \( V_{nom}(s) \) is

\[ \frac{e(s)}{V_{nom}(s)} = \frac{V_{nom}(s) - V_{bus}(s)}{V_{nom}(s)} = \frac{s}{(1 + K_p V_{dc}) s + K_i V_{dc}}. \]  

(9)

Then, the steady-state error for a unit-step response can be obtained by applying the final-value theorem as

\[ e_{ss} = \lim_{s \to 0} se(s) = 0, \]  

(10)

which means the bus voltage \( V_{bus} \) can track the reference \( V_{nom} \).

### III. CENTRALIZED MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL OF DCES

For an \( m \)-bus DC microgrid, a maximum of \( m(m-1)/2 \) distribution lines can be possibly installed to link any two of the buses. However, the actual number of distribution lines is less than \( m(m-1)/2 \), since some of the buses are not connected. For instance, the DC microgrid in Fig. 1 has \( 3(m-1)/n \) distribution lines, which is less than \( m(m-1)/2 \). Hence, the state of the connections between any two buses is denoted as \( C_{ij} \in \{0,1\} \), where \( C_{ij} = 1 \) indicates the bus \( i \) and the bus \( j \) are connected and \( C_{ij} = 0 \) indicates the bus \( i \)
and the bus j are disconnected. Besides, the resistance of the distribution line between the bus i and the bus j is denoted as $R_{ij}$; The voltage of the bus i is denoted as $V_{bus,i}$; The total power supplied by the sources is denoted as $P_s$; The total power stored or supplied by the batteries is denoted as $P_b$; The total power consumed by the constant power loads is denoted as $P_{pl}$; The resistance of the critical load at the bus i is denoted as $R_{ci}$; The resistance of the non-critical load at the bus i is denoted as $R_{ni}$.

For an m-bus DC microgrid, the power supply and demand are balanced if

$$P_s - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{m} C_j \frac{(V_{bus,i} - V_{bus,j})^2}{R_{ij}} \right] = P_b + P_{pl} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} V_{bus,i}^2 \left( \frac{R_{ni} + R_{ci}}{R_{ni}R_{ci}} \right),$$

(11)

where $P_b > 0$ indicates the batteries absorbing excessive power and $P_b < 0$ indicates the batteries providing insufficient power. However, when the RES extract more power significantly than the nominal power, the power supply and demand are not balanced even if the batteries operate at the maximum capacity as

$$\Delta P = \Delta P_s - (P_{b_{max}} - P_b) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \frac{(V_{bus,i}^2 - V_{bus,j}^2)}{R_{ij}} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{m} C_j \frac{(V_{bus,i}^2 - V_{bus,j}^2)}{R_{ij}} \right],$$

(12)

where $\Delta P_s$ is the excessive source power; $P_{b_{max}}$ is the maximum capacity of the batteries; $\Delta P$ is the excessive power inducing the offsets of the buses voltage; $V_{bus,i}$ and $V_{bus,j}$ are the nominal voltage of the bus i and the bus j, respectively; $V_{bus,i}'$ and $V_{bus,j}'$ are the voltage of the bus i and the bus j after the increment of the source power. Besides, according to the Thevenin’s theorem, any two of the buses voltage, i.e. the bus i and the bus j in a purely resistive DC microgrid are proportional as

$$V_{bus,i}' = kV_{bus,i},$$

(13)

Substituting (13) into (12),

$$\Delta P = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ (V_{bus,i}^2 - V_{bus,j}^2) \right] \left( \frac{R_{ni} + R_{ci}}{R_{ni}R_{ci}} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{m} C_j \frac{(V_{bus,i}^2 - V_{bus,j}^2)}{R_{ij}} \right].$$

(14)

In (14), when the RES extract more power than the nominal power such that $\Delta P > 0$, $V_{bus,i}' > V_{bus,i}$ is established indicating the bus voltage will increase. On the contrary, when the RES extract less power than the nominal power such that $\Delta P < 0$, $V_{bus,i}' < V_{bus,i}$ is established indicating the bus voltage will decrease.

While a single DCES is effective in stabilizing a local bus voltage, multiple DCES without considering any global regulations may lead to the system instability. Such unstable phenomenon caused by multiple ES in the AC microgrid is reported in [30]. As critical loads can generally tolerate about 5% DC offsets, the bus voltage are allowed to have 5% offset. Therefore, the power flow of the DC microgrid can be regulated by the control of the bus voltage. Importantly, the power loss on the distribution lines can be mitigated by the global regulation of providing adequate references for the local controllers. A centralized model predictive control (CMPC) can be used as the global controller.

The objective function of the CMPC is

$$\min J = \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{m} (V_{nom} - V_{bus,i})^2 + (1 - \alpha) \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \sum_{j=i+1}^{m} C_j \frac{(V_{bus,i} - V_{bus,j})^2}{R_{ij}} \right],$$

(15)

s.t.

$$0 \leq \alpha \leq 1,$$

$$(1 - \eta)V_{nom} \leq V_{bus,i}' \leq (1 + \eta)V_{nom}.$$

where $V_{nom}$ is the nominal bus voltage of the DC microgrid; $\eta$ is the voltage tolerance of the critical loads by percentage; $V_{bus,i}'$ are the bus voltage with smart loads; $\alpha$ is the weighting factor. $\alpha = 1$ means only the regulation of the bus voltage is concerned. $\alpha = 0$ means only the power loss on the distribution lines is concerned.
The flowchart of the algorithm of the CMPC is presented in Fig. 6. Initially, the entire power loss on the distribution lines \( \hat{P}_{\text{loss}} \) is predicted using the searched bus voltage and the measured bus voltage. The term \( V'_{\text{busi}} = (1-\eta)V_{\text{nom}} : \Delta V'_{\text{busi}} : (1+\eta)V_{\text{nom}} \) indicates that the values of \( V'_{\text{busi}} \) are searched from \((1-\eta)V_{\text{nom}}\) to \((1+\eta)V_{\text{nom}}\) with the step of \( \Delta V'_{\text{busi}} \). \( n \) denotes the number of the buses with smart loads. Then, the quadratic sums of the voltage deviations \( \hat{V}_e^2 \) are calculated for all the buses. By incorporating the weighting factor \( \alpha \), quadratic sum of the voltage deviations \( \hat{V}_e^2 \) and the predicted power loss \( \hat{P}_{\text{loss}} \), the objective function \( J = \alpha \hat{V}_e^2 + (1-\alpha) \hat{P}_{\text{loss}} \) can be obtained to find the optimal references of the buses with smart loads. After several iterations, the optimal references of the buses with smart loads \( V_{\text{refi}}' \) are found and used for local controllers. The comprehensive control block diagram of multiple DCES in an \( m \)-bus DC microgrid is shown in Fig. 7.
$V'_{bus_i}(k) \ (i=1,2,...,n)$ are the voltage of the buses with smart loads; $V_{bus_i}(k) \ (i=n+1,n+2,...,m)$ are the voltage of the buses without smart loads; $u_k(i=1,2,...,n)$ are the duty ratios of the DCES in smart loads; The sampling time $k$ abbreviates for the sampling period of the CMPC $kT_{CMPC}$. It is emphasized that the sampling frequency of the CMPC $f_{CMPC}$ is much lower than the sampling frequency of the local controllers $f_{PI}$, so that the local PI control can be implemented within a sampling period of the CMPC.

The proposed CMPC can be classified as (i) CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors and (ii) CMPC with adaptive weighting factors. The advantage of the CMPC with adaptive weighting factors over the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors is that the power loss on the distribution lines can be further minimized, since the weighting factor can be changed corresponding to the varying power conditions of both supply side and demand side. The flowchart of the adaptive weighting factor algorithm is shown in Fig. 8.

![Flowchart of the adaptive weighting factor algorithm](image)

Fig. 8. Flowchart of the adaptive weighting factor algorithm.

At the sampling time $k$, all the bus voltage are measured and checked. If all the bus voltages are within the tolerance, the weighting factor $\alpha$ decreases by a step of $\Delta \alpha$. If any one of the bus voltage is beyond the tolerance, the weighting factor $\alpha$ increases by a step of $\Delta \alpha$. Then, the bus voltage at the sampling time $k+\lambda$ are checked and compared with the bus voltage at the sampling time $k$. If any one of the bus voltage is changed, all the bus voltages are checked whether they are within the tolerance or not. If all the bus voltages are unchanged, the weighting factor $\alpha$ remains unchanged. The comparison between the bus voltage at the sampling time $k+\lambda$ and the bus voltage at the sampling time $k$ can help avoid undesirable oscillation of the bus voltage. Otherwise, the weighting factor $\alpha$ will decrease and increase cycle by cycle around the tolerant value even if the system power is balanced. The time sequence of the comprehensive control strategy is shown in Fig. 9.
ADC and data transmission of the buses voltage without smart load
CMPC to find $V_{ref}$ for the next iteration
ADC of the buses voltage with smart load
Local PI control to calculate and PWM
ADC of all the buses voltage and determine $\alpha$ for the next iteration

$$\alpha(k) = \alpha(k-1) - \alpha(k+1)$$

Find $V_{ref}(k)$
Find $V_{ref}(k+1)$
Find $V_{ref}(k+2)$

$(k-1)T_{CMPC}$ $kT_{CMPC}$ $(k+1)T_{CMPC}$ $(k+2)T_{CMPC}$ $t$

Fig. 9. Time sequence of the comprehensive control strategy.

IV. CASE STUDY AND SIMULATION RESULTS

The case study is conducted on a 48 V five-bus DC microgrid without batteries. The schematic of the DC microgrid system is shown in Fig. 10. Two RES are installed at the bus 1 and the bus 5. The specifications of the DC microgrid, including the parameters of the two RES, the resistance of the distribution lines and the resistance of the loads are listed in Table I. The tolerance of the bus voltage is ±5%. i.e., 45.6 V to 50.4 V. Simulation is carried out on MATLAB/SIMULINK with the solver type of Tustin at a sampling frequency of 1 kHz.

![Fig. 10. A 48 V five-bus DC microgrid without batteries.](image)

TABLE I. SPECIFICATIONS OF THE DC MICROGRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power rating of the RES 1</td>
<td>$P_{g1}$</td>
<td>624.5 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resistance of the energy source 1</td>
<td>$R_{g1}$</td>
<td>0.5 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power rating of the RES 2</td>
<td>$P_{g2}$</td>
<td>679.8 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resistance of the energy source 2</td>
<td>$R_{g2}$</td>
<td>0.5 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the source 1 and the bus 1</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>0.2 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the bus 1 and the bus 2</td>
<td>$R_{12}$</td>
<td>0.3 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the bus 1 and the bus 3</td>
<td>$R_{13}$</td>
<td>0.5 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the bus 2 and the bus 4</td>
<td>$R_{24}$</td>
<td>0.3 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the bus 4 and the bus 5</td>
<td>$R_{45}$</td>
<td>0.4 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the bus 3 and the bus 5</td>
<td>$R_{35}$</td>
<td>0.4 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance of the distribution line between the source 2 and the bus 5</td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>0.2 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-critical load at bus 1</td>
<td>$R_{n1}$</td>
<td>55 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical load at bus 1</td>
<td>$R_{c1}$</td>
<td>50 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-critical load at bus 2</td>
<td>$R_{n2}$</td>
<td>15 Ω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical load at bus 2  
\( R_{c2} \) 15 Ω

Non-critical load at bus 3  
\( R_{n3} \) 22 Ω

Critical load at bus 3  
\( R_{c3} \) 10 Ω

Non-critical load at bus 4  
\( R_{n4} \) 15 Ω

Critical load at bus 4  
\( R_{c4} \) 10 Ω

Non-critical load at bus 5  
\( R_{n5} \) 45 Ω

Critical load at bus 5  
\( R_{c5} \) 60 Ω

1) DC Microgrid without DCES.

When both RES 1 and RES 2 operate at the power rating of 624.5 W and 679.8 W, the voltage of the five buses are 49.59 V, 47.37 V, 48.12 V, 47.04 V and 49.74 V respectively, as shown in Fig. 11(b) (period 0 to 1 second). All the five bus voltages are within the ±5% tolerance. Then, \( P_{g1} \) is changed in a sequence at intervals of 1 second from 624.5 W (0% deviation of the rating power) to 1105.8 W (+77.1%) to 245.1 W (−60.8%) to 346.5 W (+68.2%) to 1050.2 W (+68.2%) to 346.4 W (−44.5%), and \( P_{g2} \) is changed from 679.8 W (0% deviation of the rating power) to 987.2 W (+45.2%) to 346.5 W (−49.0%) to 1170.9 W (+68.2%) to 245.2 W (−44.5%). Such changes are shown in Fig. 11(a). The waveforms of the bus voltage corresponding to the power variations of the RES are shown in Fig. 11(b). The values of the bus voltages are listed in Table II. Obviously, all the buses voltage exceed the tolerance in a certain period of time (excessive values are emphasized).

![Graph](image)

(a) Power variations of the RES

(b) Bus voltages

**Fig. 11.** (a) Waveforms of the power supply by RES and the bus voltages of the DC microgrid without DCES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Number</th>
<th>0 to 1 s</th>
<th>1 to 2 s</th>
<th>2 to 3 s</th>
<th>3 to 4 s</th>
<th>4 to 5 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.59 V</td>
<td>52.54 V</td>
<td>46.76 V</td>
<td>52.72 V</td>
<td>47.02 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.37 V</td>
<td>50.08 V</td>
<td>44.71 V</td>
<td>50.39 V</td>
<td>44.81 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.12 V</td>
<td>50.77 V</td>
<td>45.45 V</td>
<td>51.22 V</td>
<td>45.42 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.04 V</td>
<td>49.62 V</td>
<td>44.44 V</td>
<td>50.08 V</td>
<td>44.39 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49.74 V</td>
<td>52.31 V</td>
<td>47.04 V</td>
<td>53.00 V</td>
<td>46.79 V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) DC Microgrid with One DCES.

Assume only one DCES is installed in the DC microgrid. Five different cases can be considered because the DCES can be installed at each of the five buses. The topology of the first case that the DCES is installed at bus 1 is shown in Fig. 12. The parameters of the CMPC and the local controller are listed in Table III. The weighting factor \( \alpha \) of the CMPC is set to be 1, which means the precise voltage regulation is the only concern. The searching step of the CMPC \( \Delta V_{bus} \) is set as 0.1 V. Fig. 13 shows the waveforms of the bus voltages of the DC microgrid when the DCES is installed at the five buses, respectively. The values of the bus voltages in Fig. 13 are listed in Table IV.

![Graph](image)

**Table II. Bus Voltages of the DC Microgrid without DCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Number</th>
<th>0 to 1 s</th>
<th>1 to 2 s</th>
<th>2 to 3 s</th>
<th>3 to 4 s</th>
<th>4 to 5 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.59 V</td>
<td>52.54 V</td>
<td>46.76 V</td>
<td>52.72 V</td>
<td>47.02 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.37 V</td>
<td>50.08 V</td>
<td>44.71 V</td>
<td>50.39 V</td>
<td>44.81 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.12 V</td>
<td>50.77 V</td>
<td>45.45 V</td>
<td>51.22 V</td>
<td>45.42 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.04 V</td>
<td>49.62 V</td>
<td>44.44 V</td>
<td>50.08 V</td>
<td>44.39 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49.74 V</td>
<td>52.31 V</td>
<td>47.04 V</td>
<td>53.00 V</td>
<td>46.79 V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 12: The 48 V five-bus DC microgrid with one DCES installed at bus 1.

### TABLE III. PARAMETERS OF THE CMPC AND THE LOCAL CONTROLLER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMPC</th>
<th>Local PI controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parameter</strong></td>
<td><strong>CMPC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting factor $\alpha$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching step $\Delta V_{bus}$</td>
<td>0.1 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frequency</td>
<td>1 kHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 13: Waveforms of the bus voltages of the DC microgrid when the DCES is installed at the five buses.

### TABLE IV. BUS VOLTAGES OF THE DC MICROGRID WITH ONE DCES

(a) At bus 1

(b) At bus 2

(c) At bus 3

(d) At bus 4

(e) At bus 5
### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>0 to 1 s</th>
<th>1 to 2 s</th>
<th>2 to 3 s</th>
<th>3 to 4 s</th>
<th>4 to 5 s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCES at Bus 1</strong></td>
<td>49.00 V</td>
<td>49.00 V</td>
<td>49.00 V</td>
<td>49.00 V</td>
<td>49.00 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.17 V</td>
<td>46.67 V</td>
<td>45.63 V</td>
<td>46.84 V</td>
<td><strong>45.55 V</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.20 V</td>
<td>48.12 V</td>
<td>46.16 V</td>
<td>48.48 V</td>
<td>49.99 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.19 V</td>
<td>47.20 V</td>
<td><strong>45.09 V</strong></td>
<td>47.56 V</td>
<td><strong>44.91 V</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.30 V</td>
<td><strong>51.06 V</strong></td>
<td>47.38 V</td>
<td>51.69 V</td>
<td>47.06 V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **DCES at Bus 2** | 49.83 V  | **51.76 V** | 48.00 V  | 51.82 V  | 48.22 V  |
|                  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  |
|                  | 48.30 V  | 50.17 V  | 46.40 V  | **50.53 V** | 46.35 V  |
|                  | 47.45 V  | 48.26 V  | 46.59 V  | 48.52 V  | 46.48 V  |
|                  | 49.89 V  | **51.83 V** | 47.81 V  | **52.44 V** | 47.54 V  |

| **DCES at Bus 3** | 49.56 V  | **51.76 V** | 47.79 V  | 51.80 V  | 47.62 V  |
|                  | 47.34 V  | 49.30 V  | 45.42 V  | 49.48 V  | 45.53 V  |
|                  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  |
|                  | 47.00 V  | 48.82 V  | **45.12 V** | 49.14 V  | **45.14 V** |
|                  | 49.70 V  | **51.42 V** | 47.86 V  | **51.96 V** | 47.62 V  |

| **DCES at Bus 4** | 49.83 V  | **52.13 V** | 47.66 V  | **52.20 V** | 47.93 V  |
|                  | 47.96 V  | 49.09 V  | 46.89 V  | **49.12 V** | 47.02 V  |
|                  | 48.39 V  | 50.32 V  | 46.44 V  | **50.64 V** | 46.43 V  |
|                  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  |
|                  | 50.05 V  | **51.80 V** | 48.17 V  | **52.34 V** | 47.94 V  |

| **DCES at Bus 5** | 49.11 V  | **51.35 V** | 47.03 V  | **51.33 V** | 47.35 V  |
|                  | 46.56 V  | 48.06 V  | **45.16 V** | 48.05 V  | **45.37 V** |
|                  | 46.97 V  | 47.94 V  | 46.08 V  | 47.93 V  | 46.22 V  |
|                  | 45.86 V  | 46.70 V  | **45.09 V** | 46.70 V  | **45.21 V** |
|                  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  | 48.00 V  |

Clearly, the offsets of the bus voltages are mitigated for all five cases, as compared to the results in Table II. Besides, the number of the periods that the bus voltages exceeding the tolerance is significantly reduced. One index indicating the quality of the buses voltage regulation is

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (V_{busi} - V_{nom})^2,$$

where \(N\) is the total number of the bus voltages, i.e., \(N=25\) for Table II. The comparisons of \(\sigma^2\) among the DC microgrid without DCES and the DC microgrid with one DCES at the five buses are given in Fig. 14. Obviously, all the \(\sigma^2\) values of the DC microgrid with one DCES are smaller than the \(\sigma^2\) values of the DC microgrid without DCES. This means that even one DCES can help mitigate the offsets of the bus voltages.

![Fig. 14. The comparisons of \(\sigma^2\) between the DC microgrid without DCES and the DC microgrid with one DCES.](image)

#### 3) DC Microgrid with Multiple DCES.

While one DCES can mitigate the offsets of the buses voltage, some of the bus voltages still exceed the tolerance. In order to make sure all the bus voltages are within the tolerance, multiple DCES are installed. Three DCES are installed at bus 1, bus 4 and bus 5, respectively. The parameters of the CMPC and local controllers are listed in Table III. With the same power variations of RES in Fig. 11(a), the buses voltage are shown in Fig. 15(a). All the five bus voltages are now within the tolerance at steady state. Furthermore, since the bus voltages are well-regulated within the tolerance, reducing the weighting factor \(\alpha\) may reduce the power loss on the distribution lines. The waveforms of the bus voltages when \(\alpha=0.9\) are shown in Fig. 15(b). It can be seen that the bus...
voltages are still within the tolerance and the power loss on the distribution lines is reduced. The comparisons of the power loss on the distribution lines for the CMPC with $\alpha=1$ and the CMPC with $\alpha=0.9$ are given in Fig. 16. Integrating the difference of their power loss, the energy saving over 5 seconds is about 49.4% (the energy loss for $\alpha=1$ is 1927.48 J and the energy loss for $\alpha=0.9$ is 974.53 J) by only setting the weighting factor $\alpha$ from 1 to 0.9.

Next, four DCES are installed at bus 1, bus 2, bus 4, and bus 5, respectively. The searching step of the CMPC $\Delta V_{bus}$ is changed from 0.1 to 0.2 to accelerate the computing speed while the sacrifice of the searching precision is trivial. The values of the weighting factor $\alpha$ decrease from 1 to 0.5 with an interval of 0.1 (Note: $\alpha=0.4$ results in the bus voltages exceeding the tolerance). With the same power variations of RES in Fig. 11(a), the bus voltages are shown in Fig. 17. The comparisons of the power loss on the distribution lines for the CMPC with different values of $\alpha$ are given in Fig. 18. These results show that the power loss on the distribution lines can be reduced significantly when $\alpha$ is changed from 1 to 0.9. The reduction of power loss can also be visually observed when $\alpha$ is changed from 0.9 to 0.8. The reduction of power loss is not distinct when $\alpha$ is changed from 0.8 to 0.7 to 0.6 to 0.5. Fig. 19 shows the energy saving in the 5 seconds from $\alpha=1$ to 0.9, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6 and 0.5, respectively. Obviously, the most energy saving case is $\alpha=0.5$. 
Fig. 17. Waveforms of the bus voltages of the DC microgrid with four DCES installed at bus 1, bus 2, bus 4 and bus 5.

Fig. 18. Comparisons of the power loss on the distribution lines for different values of $\alpha$ when four DCES are installed.

Fig. 19. Energy saving in the 5 seconds from $\alpha=1$ to 0.9, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6 and 0.5.

The aforementioned CMPC refers to the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors. The CMPC with adaptive weighting factors can further reduce the power loss on the distribution lines. The searching step of the CMPC $\Delta V_{bus}$ is kept as 0.2 V. The parameter $\lambda$ of the adaptive weighting factor algorithm in Fig. 8 is set as 5. With the same power variations of RES in Fig. 11(a), the adaptive weighting factor can change correspondingly as shown in Fig. 20. Fig. 21 shows the comparisons of the energy saving in the 5 seconds between the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factor $\alpha=0.5$ and the CMPC with adaptive weighting factor.
Obviously, the CMPC with adaptive weighting factor saves about 0.8% more energy in the 5 seconds compared to the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factor $\alpha=0.5$.

Fig. 20. Variations of the adaptive weighting factor.

Fig. 21. Comparisons of the energy saving in the 5 seconds between the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factor $\alpha=0.5$ and the CMPC with adaptive weighting factors.

V. CONCLUSIONS

DC electric springs (DCES) is an emerging technology that can be used to stabilize and improve the power quality of DC microgrids. In this paper, a centralized model predictive control (CMPC) with both non-adaptive weighting factors and adaptive weighting factors is proposed for multiple DCES to further mitigate the power loss on the distribution lines of a DC microgrid. Using a DCES model previously verified with experiments, simulation studies have been conducted for a DC microgrid setup. Simulation results on a 48 V five-bus DC microgrid show that the energy is saved about 49.4% in the 5 seconds when three DCES are controlled by the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors and is saved about 58.5% in the 5 seconds when four DCES are controlled by the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors. It is also demonstrated that the power loss on the distribution lines of the DC microgrid can be further reduced by the CMPC with adaptive weighting factors, as compared to the CMPC with non-adaptive weighting factors.
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