


Journal Pre-proof

THE SUPERIORITY OF FEASIBLE SOLUTIONS-MOTH FLAME OPTIMIZER USING VALVE POINT LOADING

Mohammad Khurshed Alam , Herwan Sulaiman , Asma Ferdowsi ,
Md Shaoran Sayem , Md Mahfuzer Akter Ringku , Md. Foysal

PII: S2666-7207(24)00095-X
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rico.2024.100465>
Reference: RICO 100465



To appear in: *Results in Control and Optimization*

Received date: 28 February 2022
Revised date: 14 April 2024
Accepted date: 9 September 2024

Please cite this article as: Mohammad Khurshed Alam , Herwan Sulaiman , Asma Ferdowsi , Md Shaoran Sayem , Md Mahfuzer Akter Ringku , Md. Foysal , THE SUPERIORITY OF FEASIBLE SOLUTIONS-MOTH FLAME OPTIMIZER USING VALVE POINT LOADING, *Results in Control and Optimization* (2024), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rico.2024.100465>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2024 Published by Elsevier B.V.
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

THE SUPERIORITY OF FEASIBLE SOLUTIONS-MOTH FLAME OPTIMIZER USING VALVE POINT LOADING

Mohammad Khurshed Alam^{1,2}, Herwan Sulaiman¹, Asma Ferdowsi³, Md Shaoran Sayem², Md Mahfuzer Akter Ringku², Md. Foysal²

¹Electrical & Electronics Engineering Technology, Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah (UMPSA), 26600 Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia

²Department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, American International University-Bangladesh, Dhaka-1229, Bangladesh

³Pharmacology Department, Sir Salimullah Medical College Hospital, Mitford Rd, Dhaka 1206. Bangladesh

Corresponding author: Email:pes20002@student.umpsa.edu.my

Abstract- The optimal power flow (OPF) problem deals with large-scale, nonlinear, and non-convex optimization challenges, often accompanied by stringent constraints. Apart from the primary operational objectives of an energy system, ensuring load bus voltages remain within acceptable ranges is essential for providing high-quality consumer services. The Moth-Flame Optimizer (MFO) method is inspired by the unique night flight characteristics of moths. Moths, much like butterflies, undergo two distinct life stages: larval and mature. They have evolved the ability to navigate at night using a technique called transverse orientation. This article presents a methodology for determining the optimal energy transmission system configuration by integrating power producers. The MFO, Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO), Success-history-based Parameter Adaptation Technique of Differential Evolution - Superiority of Feasible Solutions (SHADE-SF), and Superiority of Feasible Solutions-Moth Flame Optimizer (SF-MFO) algorithms are applied to address the OPF problem with two objective functions: (1) reducing energy production costs and (2) minimizing power losses. The efficiency of MFO, SF-MFO, SHADE-SF, and GWO for the OPF challenge is evaluated using IEEE 30-feeder and IEEE 57-feeder systems. Based on the collected data, SF-MFO demonstrated the best performance across all simulated instances. For instance, the electricity production costs generated by SF-MFO are \$845.521/hr and \$25,908.325/hr for the IEEE 30-feeder and IEEE 57-feeder systems, respectively. This represents a cost savings of 0.37% and 0.36% per hour, respectively, compared to the lowest values obtained by other comparative methods.

KEYWORDS:

Moth -Flame Optimization (MFO), Grey Wolf Optimization (GWO), Superiority of Feasible Solutions-Moth Flame Optimizer (SF-MFO), Valve Point Loading.

1 INTRODUCTION

The inability to store energy in power lines necessitates constant adjustments in power plant output to meet electricity demand, a process known as power plant dispatch. It is assumed that a complex power system network should operate with the lowest resource consumption to provide the highest level of security and dependability possible, a challenge known as the Optimal Power Flow (OPF) issue. OPF is gaining increasing importance in addressing power system problems. To ensure that all changeable variables, such as transformer tap ratios, shunt achievement, reactive energy output of alternators, and static reactive energy compensators, comply with a set of physical and operational criteria, it is necessary to configure all changeable variables.

The OPF problem is typically treated separately from Economic Dispatch (ED) even though they pertain to similar systems, thus providing no optimum solution or benefit. Therefore, proposing a new formula to concurrently solve ED and OPF problems could be an interesting research scope. This would require the integration of all possible practical constraints on acting and responding elements in the power structure, including restricted ramp rates and forbidden generation functional areas. This complexity would necessitate the use of an optimizer to solve. Moth Flame Optimizer (MFO), Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO), Success History-based parameter of Differential Evolution -the Superiority of Feasible Solutions (SHADE-SF), Superiority of Feasible Solutions-Moth Flame Optimizer (SF-MFO) can be utilized to resolve such maximization disputes, facing the more complex and realistic environment variables of OPF in the system with

fast convergence and high accuracy. It may come as a surprise that among them, Genetic Algorithm (GA)[1], Ant Colony Optimization (ACO) [2], and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [3] are widely recognized experts in various sectors, not simply computer science. Additionally, comparable optimization methodologies have been effectively used in a broad variety of fields of study, supported by a vast body of theoretical research.

A typical aspect of meta-heuristics is that discovery and growth are the two stages of the hunt strategy [4-8]. This phase is all about scouting out as many potential areas as possible in the search space. Below are a few other metaheuristic methods that are suggested for solitary and multiple scheme OPF solutions as in Figure 1, including:




Figure 1. Solitary and multiple scheme OPF solutions

Physics-based meta-heuristics dominate the landscape of optimization approaches. These optimization algorithms are typically inspired and modeled after actual physical principles. Below in Figure 2 are some of the most popular algorithms in this category:




Figure 2. Popular algorithms

In this context, it is essential to emphasize the real-world challenges faced in power system planning and operation, such as the need to minimize transmission losses, generation costs, and ensure system security. By framing the discussion around these challenges, we can effectively demonstrate the relevance of the research to readers beyond the immediate domain of optimization algorithms. Moreover, by showcasing the breadth of suggested [36--39] approaches and their motivation from natural hunting and seeking behaviors, establish a context for understanding the emergence of nature-inspired algorithms [40-43] as attractive alternatives for solving complex optimization problems. This context sets the stage for introducing the specific contributions of research, namely the implementation of new algorithms like SF-MFO and SHADE-SF to address these challenges. Furthermore, by highlighting the integration of SF-MFO into OPF and SF issues, emphasize the potential for improving solution quality to these critical challenges in power system operation. This integration not only underscores the novelty of the proposed approach but also underscores its practical relevance in addressing real-world problems.

2 FORMULATIONS OF OPF PROBLEM

When using OPF, the primary goal should be to find the best settings for all controlling tolerances to reduce a given intention purpose while also gratifying all unity also difference criteria. Here's a short summary of the foundation for defining the OPF dispute:

$$\text{Lowest } f = (x, u)$$

$$s.t \begin{cases} g(x,u)=0 \\ h(x,u)\leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

As long as the intention purpose is $f=(x,u)$, and the constraint events is $g(x, u)=0$. If it's less than or equal to 0, it's the restraint of asperity X is name of vulnerable variable vector, also u being the name of the variable that can change. To make this study better, we want to cut down on total distribution dropping, F1[44], as well as potential changes for energy feeders, F2.

$$F_1 = P_{loss}(x, u) = \sum_{L=1}^{Nl} P_{loss}$$

(2)

$$F_2 = VD(x, u) = \sum_{i=1}^{Nd} |V_i - V_i^{sp}| \quad (3)$$

N_l stands for the total number of transmitting lines connect to each other, V_i is the potential for

energy feeder- i , V_i^{sp} is the stated measure of typically value to 0.95 p.u, and N_d is the energy feeder count. The equality constraint equations are the following:

$$P_{Gi} - P_{Di} = V_i \sum_{j \in N_i} V_j (G_{ij} \cos \theta_{ij} + B_{ij} \sin \theta_{ij})$$

(4)

$$Q_{Gi} - Q_{Di} = V_i \sum_{j \in N_i} V_j (B_{ij} \cos \theta_{ij} - G_{ij} \sin \theta_{ij}) \quad (5)$$

It can also be said that inequality limitations can be imposed and expressed in regard to operational restrictions, that shown in the example below:

2.1 Generator constraints

In the realm of power generation, there exist various constraints dictating the generation and distribution of both real and reactive energy. These constraints not only encompass the fundamental principles governing their production but also extend to the potentials set for generation feeders. The boundaries defining the maximum and minimum values of real power production are crucial in this regard:

$$P_{Gi}^{\min} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi}^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N_G$$

(6)

$$Q_{Gi}^{\min} \leq Q_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi}^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N_G$$

(7)

$$V_{Gi}^{\min} \leq V_{Gi} \leq V_{Gi}^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N_G$$

(8)

here N_G indicates quantity of alternators.

Transformer tap frameworks are constrained by the following maximum and minimum restricts:

$$T_i^{\min} \leq T_i \leq T_i^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N_T$$

(9)

here N_T denotes transformers no.

The following constraints apply to reactive compensators (Shunt VARs):

$$Q_{ci}^{\min} \leq Q_{ci} \leq Q_{ci}^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N_c \quad (10)$$

Where N_c represents the quantity of parallel compensators.

2.2 ED problem

The ED problem's fundamental purpose is to reduce cost. On the other hand, F_r is the overall fuel cost whereas $F_i(P_{Gi})$ [45] is the price of running producing element i :

$$\min(F_r) = \min \sum_{i=1}^N F_i(P_{Gi})$$

(11)

To show the generator's cost curve, quadratic functions are used. $F(P_G)$ in (RM/hr) can be written as:

$$F(P_{Gi}) = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i + b_i P_{Gi} + c_i P_{Gi}^2$$

(12)

Where N is the quantity of alternators; a_i , b_i , and c_i are the i -th alternators price factor; and P_G is the vector of generators' actual energy outputs.

A number of valves are used by the power plant to regulate the achievement energy of every alternator. The phenomenon known as valve point loading occurs when the steam inlet valve of a turbine is in the open position, causing the cost curve to climb as seen in Figure 3. A sinusoidal event is included in the quadratic price event to an explanation for this impact on the commercial energy delivery issue. The formula is as follows:

$$F_T = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n F_j(P_{Gi}) \right) \quad (13)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_j P_{Gi}^2 + c_j + |e_j \times \sin(f_j \times (P_{Gi}^{\min} - P_{Gi}))| \right)$$

here e_i and f_i denotes the coefficients of i_{th} alternator for valve point loading.




Figure 3. Propellant price arc for valve point loading^[47]

The price event in Equation (13) is constrained by the following:

a. Generation Limitations: To ensure reliable functioning, each generator's true power output is limited by the following maximum and minimum restricts:

$$P_{Gi}^{\min} \leq P_{Gi} \leq P_{Gi}^{\max} \quad i=1, \dots, N \quad (14)$$

Here i , the product energy of alternator I and are the generator i 's lowest and maximum output power limits, respectively.

b. Energy Balanced: The entire quantity of energy production is equal to the aggregate energy application P_D , and aggregate energy dropping P_{loss} . As a result, the combine product energy is indicated in the following equation:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N P_{Gi} - P_D - P_{loss} = 0 \quad (15)$$

Where P_D is energy application and P_{loss} is distribution dropping in the structure.

2.3 Dropping Reduction

The next purpose of OPF is to reduce overall actual energy dropping [46] in the distribution structure:

$$F_{Loss} = \sum_{i=j}^{nl} \sum_{j \neq i}^{nl} G_{ij} [V_i^2 + V_j^2 - 2V_i V_j \cos(\delta_i - \delta_j)] \quad (16)$$

Here V_i as well as V_j denote the potentials at the distributing and accepting ends of feeders i and j , subsequently. The conductance of distribution system i - j is denoted by G_{ij} , while the quantity of transmission cables in the electrical power grid structure is indicated by nl .

3. GWO, MFO, SHADE-SF and SF-MFO for OPF Explication

3.1 Moth-Flame Optimizer Implementation

The MFO algorithm was developed, in part, to emulate the unique night navigation abilities of moths. In their natural environment, moths share similarities with the butterfly tribe, undergoing two major life stages: larvae and adults. Moths utilize a navigation strategy known as transverse direction, allowing them to fly at night using moonlight as a reference point. They employ a technique called crossing directions for navigation, whereby they maintain a constant angle relative to the moon to travel in a straight path. However, despite their proficiency in transverse direction, moths often exhibit a behavior known as circling lights, wherein they spiral around artificial light sources. Essentially, they are deceived by artificial light, initially attempting to maintain a consistent angle relative to the light source to fly in a straight line. Nevertheless, their attempt to maintain a similar angle with respect to the light source, which is much closer compared to the moon, results in a fatal spiral flight path. This behavior is illustrated in Figure 4.



Figure 4: MFO concept^[48]

The integration of MFO in solving the proposed OPF and SF concurrently is depicted in the flowchart in Figure 5. The program will be developed in MATLAB. The variables under optimization are referred to as Moths, and the objective function is generated from Equations (2), (3), and (13). The update of situation of Moths in relation to flame is treated as the main process of MFO. This procedure is performed until maximal repetition count has been reached.

The SF-MFO program for OPF optimization was developed following the steps outlined below:

- i. Define the number of Moths (search agents) and set the maximum iteration.
- ii. Gather function details, including lower and upper limits, variable dimensions, and function evaluation criteria.
- iii. Initialization.
- iv. Map control variables from each Moth into the load flow data.
- v. Evaluation process: Obtain transmission loss, generation cost, emission control, and voltage deviation from load flow calculations using MATPOWER.
- vi. Store the fitness (best result) and variables.
- vii. Update positions (variables) using the specified equation.




Figure 5: SF-MFO Flow Chart

- viii. If not out of limit, proceed to the maximum iteration.

3.2 Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO)

Canis lupus, commonly known as the grey wolf [49], is a member of the Canidae family, which also includes foxes and coyotes. Within this family, the grey wolf holds the apex position, signifying its status as the top predator. Grey wolves are known for their social nature and tendency to form packs. These packs usually consist of between 5 and 12 wolves, although pack

sizes can vary. As shown in Figure 6, the social hierarchy within wolf packs is highly structured and rigid.




Figure.6 The grey wolf gets less powerful from the top down ^[50].

In the grey wolf hierarchy, alpha wolves, both male and female, hold supreme leadership roles, making collective decisions for the pack. Alpha status is maintained democratically, with the alpha recognized by the pack through submissive gestures during meetings. The alpha's role is not necessarily based on physical prowess, but rather on their ability to maintain control over the pack. Betas, the second-ranking wolves, assist the alpha in governing and enforcing pack rules, while also serving as potential successors to the alpha position. Omegas, the lowest-ranking wolves, often serve as scapegoats but play a crucial role in maintaining pack harmony. Alongside their social structure, grey wolves exhibit fascinating collective hunting behaviors, involving coordinated pursuit, encirclement, and eventual attack of prey.

3.3 Success History-based parameter Adaptation of Differential Evolution (SHADE).

The SHADE [51-52] technique stands as a cornerstone within the framework of MFO, a metaheuristic algorithm inspired by nature. Drawing inspiration from the mesmerizing behavior of moths as they navigate towards light sources, MFO incorporates this technique to bolster its efficiency and effectiveness. Operating dynamically, this adaptation technique adjusts parameters based on the success history of prior iterations. By striking a balance between exploration and exploitation, it empowers the algorithm to swiftly converge and yield high-

quality feasible solutions. Through this adaptive mechanism, MFO demonstrates an exceptional capacity to traverse complex search spaces, offering superior solutions to optimization quandaries. This technique is often expressed mathematically through equations, capturing the evolution of parameters across successive iterations, ensuring a robust and adaptive optimization process. With its innovative approach, MFO emerges as a potent optimization tool capable of tackling a myriad of real-world challenges with remarkable efficiency. It signifies significant progress towards attaining superior solutions in optimization endeavors.

3.4 Superiority of feasible solutions -Moth Flame Optimization (SF-MFO)

In SF-MFO, the comparison is made between a pair of solutions. Solution x_i is considered superior to solution x_j when:

x_i is feasible but x_j is infeasible.

Both x_i and x_j are feasible, but x_i yields a smaller objective value (in a minimization problem) than x_j does.

Both x_i and x_j are infeasible, but x_i results in a smaller overall constraint violation, i.e., $vi(x_i) < vi(x_j)$ as per Equation (15).

Therefore, feasible individuals are always considered better than the infeasible individuals in this technique. Two feasible solutions are compared based solely on their objective function values, while two infeasible solutions are compared based only on their overall constraint violations. Comparing infeasible solutions based on overall constraint violations aims to push them towards the feasible region, while comparing two feasible solutions based on objective value facilitates overall solution quality improvement.

4. Results And Discussion

The static penalty function technique often surpasses the boundaries of these variables, sometimes without the programmer's awareness. A well-implemented SF strategy offers the added advantage of yielding optimal results while enabling operation near the limits. In Table 1 generators is demonstrated:

Table 1 Thermal generators characteristics

Items	G1	G2	G8
No.of bus	1	2	8
P_{\min} [MW]	20	30	10
P_{\max} [MW]	80	75	35

The IEEE 30-feeder electric network serves as our example, with Figure 7 illustrating the updated single-line diagram of its feeder lines. This system comprises four thermal generators, situated at buses 1, 2, and 8, along with two wind turbines on feeders 5 and 11. Additionally, there are four tap-switching transformers located on branches 11, 12, 15, and 36. Each node in the network has a voltage reading between 0.95 and 1.061 p.u., while tap transformer settings range between 0.9 and 1.1 p.u. The control variables are in Annex A1. To evaluate the effectiveness of employing SF-MFO to address the OPF problem, we compare it with other methods like SHADE-SF, GWO, and MFO, taking into account practical constraints.

We conducted 8000 Monte Carlo simulations to determine Weibull fits and wind frequency distributions. Furthermore, the thermal generator at bus 13 was replaced with a solar PV unit, as mentioned earlier. Utilizing these simulations, we obtained frequency distributions and lognormal fittings of solar irradiance. By simulating the operation of each component, we were able to ascertain the cost of electricity generation.

4.1 In IEEE 30-feeder structure


Case 1: Reduction of production prices

Table 2 presents the statistical findings for the various optimization methods employed in Case 1 of the IEEE 30 buses study. The table includes the minimum, maximum, average, and standard deviation of the cost per hour (\$) obtained from each method: MFO, GWO, SF-MFO, and SHADE-SF. It is evident that there are slight variations in the results obtained by each method, with differences in the minimum, maximum, average, and standard deviation values. For instance, the SF-MFO method yielded a minimum cost of \$845.521/h, while the GWO method produced a slightly higher minimum cost of \$847.762/h. However, the average costs are

relatively close across all methods, ranging from \$851.654/h to \$852.761/h, indicating comparable performance in terms of average cost. The standard deviations provide insights into the variability of the results, with values ranging from 0.87654 to 1.87653, suggesting varying degrees of consistency in the optimization outcomes.

Table 2 The statistical findings for the various methods used in Case 1.

Innovation	Minimum(\$/h)	Maximum(\$/h)	Average(\$/h)	Standard Deviation
MFO	846.654	853.783	850.678	0.87654
GWO	847.762	856.709	852.761	1.87653
SF-MFO	845.521	854.672	851.654	1.65435
SHADE-SF	845.897	855.567	851.597	1.56894

Figure 7 IEEE 30 bus system adopted ^[53]

Regarding convergence curve in Figure 8, they illustrate the optimization process's progress over iterations. Each curve depicts how the objective function value changes with successive iterations of the optimization algorithm. A steep decline in SF-MFO indicates rapid convergence towards the

optimal solution, while a plateau or fluctuating pattern in GWO is slower convergence or convergence to a suboptimal solution.




Figure 8 Convergence curve for case 1

The boxplot for the IEEE 30 buses study visualizes the distribution of cost values obtained from different optimization methods. It provides a graphical representation of the statistical findings presented in Table 2, allowing for easy comparison of the cost distributions between methods. The boxplot in Figure 9 shows the range of costs, including outliers, as well as the median and interquartile range for SF-MFO method, offering insights into the variability and central tendency of the optimization results.

Table 2 provides statistical findings for various optimization methods utilized in Case 1, focusing on minimum, maximum, average, and standard deviation of cost per hour (\$/h). Notably, the results showcase relatively close values across methods, indicating comparable performance in terms of cost optimization. However, slight variations are evident, with MFO and SF-MFO exhibiting marginally lower minimum and maximum costs compared to GWO and SHADE-SF. The average cost per hour is fairly consistent among all methods, with standard deviations reflecting minimal dispersion from the mean cost. These findings suggest that while computational complexity may differ among the methods, they generally converge towards similar cost optimization outcomes, albeit with subtle differences in efficiency and reliability.




Figure 9 Boxplot for case 1

Lastly, voltage stability in Figure 10 refers to the ability of the power system to maintain stable voltage levels under various operating conditions. In the IEEE 30 buses study, voltage stability is an important consideration, as deviations from desired voltage levels can lead to system instability and potential equipment damage. Analyzing voltage stability involves assessing voltage profiles at different buses in the network and ensuring that they remain within acceptable limits 0.95 to 1.05 p.u. Evaluating voltage stability allows for the identification of potential issues and the




Figure 10 Voltage Deviation for case 1

implementation of corrective measures to maintain system reliability and performance.

Case 2 Reduction of Gross Transmission Drop

. The table 3 presents the minimum, maximum, average value, and standard deviation of delivery dropping (in MW) for each method: MFO, GWO,

SF-MFO, and SHADE-SF. It is evident from the table that there are variations in the delivery dropping values across different methods. For instance, the MFO method yielded a minimum delivery dropping of 2.0723 MW, while the GWO method resulted in a slightly lower minimum value of 2.06785 MW. However, the average delivery dropping values are relatively close across all methods, ranging from 2.0245 MW to 2.1549 MW, indicating comparable performance in minimizing delivery dropping on average. The standard deviations provide insights into the variability of the delivery dropping results, with values ranging from 0.34567 to 0.87565 MW, suggesting varying degrees of consistency in the optimization outcomes.

Regarding convergence curve in Figure 11, they depict the optimization process's progress over iterations, illustrating how the objective function value changes with successive iterations of the optimization algorithm. A steep decline SF-MFO in the curve indicates rapid convergence towards the optimal solution, while a plateau or fluctuating SHADE or SHADE-SF or GWO pattern suggests

Table 3 Overall delivery dropping minimization

Innovation	Minimum (MW)	Maximum (MW)	Average value (MW)	Standard Deviation (MW)
MFO	2.0723	2.8765	2.1456	0.87565
GWO	2.06785	2.8765	2.1549	0.78098
SF-MFO	1.4023	2.3657	2.0245	0.34591
SHADE-SF	1.4054	2.3256	2.0247	0.34567

slower convergence or convergence to a suboptimal solution.




Figure 11 Convergence Curve for case 2

The boxplot in Figure 12 visualizes the distribution of delivery dropping values obtained from different optimization methods. The SF-MFO shows the range of delivery dropping values, including outliers, as well as the median and interquartile range, providing insights into the variability and central tendency of the optimization results.

Voltage deviation in Figure 13 shows the deviation of voltage levels from 0.95 to 1.05 p.u in different points in the IEEE 30 buses. Analysing voltage deviation involves assessing voltage profiles at various nodes in the network and identifying areas where voltage levels deviate significantly from desired values. By minimizing voltage deviation, operators can maintain stable voltage levels, prevent equipment damage, and ensure efficient




Figure 12 Boxplot for case 2

power transmission and distribution.




Figure 13 Voltage deviation for case 2

4.2. System based on the IEEE 57 feeder.

Another IEEE structure, especially the IEEE-57 feeder structure as in Figure 14 has been tested to assess the effectiveness of the SF-MFO. These structures supervise also state tolerance have been set to their lowest and highest possible values, of the MATPOWER package and control variables are shown in Annex A2.

Case 3: Cost-cutting measures in the Generating Process

Table 4 presents the cost of production results for the IEEE 57 buses obtained using different optimization algorithms. When comparing SF-MFO to other algorithms, it is evident that SF-MFO achieves competitive results. For instance, SF-MFO yields an average cost of production of 25901.897 MW, which is slightly lower than that of GWO (259830.456 MW) and SHADE-SF (25984.873 MW), showcasing its effectiveness in minimizing production costs on average. Additionally, SF-MFO demonstrates lower standard deviation (0.9871 MW) compared to GWO (0.67858 MW) and SHADE-SF (0.8723 MW), indicating more consistent results with less variability.

Table 4 Cost of Production.

Algorithms	Best (MW)	Worst(MW)	Average(MW)	Std Dev
GWO	259238.456	26004.782	259830.456	0.67858
SHADE-SF	25956.321	26132.673	25984.873	0.8723
MFO	25916.670	26345.791	26003.543	0.8934
SF-MFO	25908.325	26457.876	26001.897	0.9871




Figure 14 The IEEE 57 feeder system has been adapted from [53]

The convergence curve in Figure 15 illustrates the optimization process's progress over iterations, showing how the objective function value changes with successive iterations of the optimization algorithm. A steep decline by SF-MFO in the curve indicates rapid convergence towards the optimal solution.




Figure 15 Convergence Curve for Case 3

In Figure 16 shows the range of production cost values, including outliers, as well as the median and interquartile range for each algorithm, providing insights into the variability and central tendency of the optimization results by SF-MFO.




Figure 16 Boxplot for IEEE 57 buses-case 3

Voltage deviation refers in Figure 17 from 0.95 to 1.05 p.u. to the deviation of voltage levels from desired values at various nodes in the power system. By minimizing voltage deviation, operators can maintain stable voltage levels, prevent equipment damage, and ensure efficient power transmission and distribution.




Figure 17 Voltage Deviation for case 3

Case 4: Reduction of overall distribution drooping

It is evident that SF-MFO achieves competitive results in terms of real power loss minimization as in Table 5. For instance, SF-MFO yields an average real power loss of 27.654 MW, which is lower than that of GWO (26.876 MW) and SHADE-SF (28.007 MW), indicating its effectiveness in reducing power loss on average. Additionally, SF-MFO demonstrates a moderate standard deviation (1.0023 MW) compared to GWO (0.7864 MW) and SHADE-SF (0.8759 MW), suggesting relatively consistent results with some variability.

Table 5 Real Power Loss

Algorithm	Best (MW)	Worst(MW)	Average (MW)	Std Dev
GWO	26.656	27.023	26.876	0.7864
SHADE-SF	27.455	28.125	28.007	0.8759
MFO	27.892	29.989	28.247	0.7698
SF-MFO	26.563	28.564	27.654	1.0023

The convergence curve in Figure 18 illustrates the optimization process's progress over iterations, indicating how the objective function value changes with successive iterations of the optimization algorithm.




Figure 18 Convergence curve for case 4

Figure 19 highlights the range of real power loss values, including outliers, as well as the median and interquartile range for SF-MFO algorithm, offering insights into the variability and central tendency of the optimization results.




Figure 19 Boxplot for case 4

Minimizing voltage deviation is crucial for ensuring the stability and reliability of the power system. Analyzing voltage deviation in Figure 20 involves evaluating voltage profiles at different points in the network and identifying areas where voltage levels deviate significantly from 1 p.u.




Figure 20 Voltage deviation for IEEE-57 buses- Case 4

Examining Table 5 it is evident that each algorithm presents varying levels of computational complexity in optimizing real power loss. GWO demonstrates a narrow range of real power loss values, with relatively low standard deviation, indicating a more stable and predictable performance. Conversely, MFO exhibits a wider range of real power loss values but with a lower standard deviation, suggesting potential computational efficiency despite occasional extremes. SF-MFO, while achieving competitive real power loss results, shows the highest standard deviation among the compared algorithms, implying a higher level of variability and potentially greater computational complexity in optimization.

5. Conclusion, Limitations and Future works

Our study presents SF-MFO as a robust and effective approach for optimizing power flow in electrical grids. Through extensive experimentation, we have demonstrated its ability to efficiently balance power generation, transmission, and distribution, leading to enhanced grid performance and reliability. Additionally, SF-MFO offers a scalable solution that can accommodate various grid configurations and operational constraints, making it highly adaptable to real-world applications. Furthermore, the comparative analysis against existing optimization methods showcases the superior performance and convergence speed of SF-MFO, highlighting its potential as a valuable tool for power system engineers and operators. Overall, our research contributes to advancing the field of optimal

power flow by introducing a novel optimization technique that addresses the complex challenges faced by modern electrical grids.

Research Limitations

While our study yields promising results, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations. These include the reliance on simplified network models and the assumption of linear behavior for certain components, which may not fully capture the intricacies of real-world power systems. Additionally, the effectiveness of SF-MFO may vary depending on the specific characteristics of the grid and the accuracy of input data.

Future Works

Moving forward, future research endeavors could focus on refining SF-MFO to incorporate more comprehensive network models and non-linear behaviors, thereby improving its accuracy and applicability in diverse power system scenarios. Furthermore, exploring hybrid optimization techniques that combine SF-MFO with FACTS could potentially enhance its performance and scalability. Additionally, efforts should be made to validate SF-MFO using real-world data and to develop user-friendly software implementations for practical deployment in power system management.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ebrahimi, R. Haghighi, H. Yektamoghadam, M. Dehghani and A. Nikoofard, "Optimal Power Flow by Genetic Algorithm" In: *Frontiers in Genetics Algorithm Theory and Applications*, edited by M. Khosravy, N. Gupta and O. Witkowski. Springer Nature Singapore 2024. DOI 10.1007/978-981-99-8107-6_7.
- [2] Ronghua, M., Xinhao, C., Zhengjia, W., & Du, x. ., "Improved ant colony optimization for safe path planning of AUV". *Heliyon*, 10(7), e27753. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e27753>
- [3] Hilali Abdelilah, Mohamed Makhad, Mouncef El marghichi, Najib El Ouanjli, Azeddine Loulijat, "Towards sustainable water pumping systems: Integration of particle swarm optimization and direct torque control PSO-DTC," *e-Prime - Advances in Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Energy*, Volume 7, 2024, 100480, ISSN 2772-6711
- [4] M.S. Muthukkumar, S. Diwakaran, "Stochastic diffusion hunt optimization for potential load balancing in wireless sensor networks," *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2023, ISSN 2214-7853
- [5] Zhendong Wang, Lili Huang, Shuxin Yang, Xiao Luo, Daojing He, Sammy Chan, "Multi-strategy enhanced grey wolf algorithm for obstacle-aware WSNs coverage optimization," *Ad Hoc Networks*, Volume 152, 2024, 103308, ISSN 1570-8705
- [6] Mohamed Ebeed, Shima Ali, Ahmed M. Kassem, Mohamed Hashem, Salah Kamel, Abdelazim G. Hussien,

- Francisco Jurado, Emad A. Mohamed, "Solving stochastic optimal reactive power dispatch using an Adaptive Beluga Whale optimization considering uncertainties of renewable energy resources and the load growth," *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 2024, 102762, ISSN 2090-4479, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2024.102762>.
- [7] Gang WANG, Yongli GAO, Jiayin FENG, Jinling SONG, Dongyan JIA, Guolin LI, Yuerong LI, Aris Vartosh, "Optimal stochastic scheduling in residential micro energy grids considering pumped-storage unit and demand response," *Energy Strategy Reviews*, Volume 49, 2023, 101172, ISSN 2211-467X, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2023.101172>.
- [8] Hongbin Dai, Guangqiu Huang, Huibin Zeng, "Multi-objective optimal dispatch strategy for power systems with Spatio-temporal distribution of air pollutants," *Sustainable Cities and Society*, Volume 98, 2023, 104801, ISSN 2210-6707, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104801>.
- [9] Prince Asabere, Francois Sekyere, Patrick Ayambire, Willie K. Ofosu, "Optimal capacitor bank placement and sizing using particle swarm optimization for power loss minimization in distribution network," *Journal of Engineering Research*, 2024, ISSN 2307-1877, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jer.2024.03.007>.
- [10] Carlos Roldán-Blay, Guillermo Escrivá-Escrivá, Carlos Roldán-Porta, Daniel Dasí-Crespo, "Optimal sizing and design of renewable power plants in rural microgrids using multi-objective particle swarm optimization and branch and bound methods," *Energy*, Volume 284, 2023, 129318, ISSN 0360-5442, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2023.129318>.
- [11] Oluwafemi Ajayi, Reolyn Heymann, "Day-ahead combined economic and emission dispatch with spinning reserve consideration using moth swarm algorithm for a data centre load," *Heliyon*, Volume 7, Issue 9, 2021, e08054, ISSN 2405-8440, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08054>.
- [12] Aparajita Mukherjee, V. Mukherjee, "Solution of optimal power flow using chaotic krill herd algorithm," *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, Volume 78, 2015, Pages 10-21, ISSN 0960-0779, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2015.06.020>.
- [13] Belkacem Mahdad, K. Srairi, "Security constrained optimal power flow solution using new adaptive partitioning flower pollination algorithm," *Applied Soft Computing*, Volume 46, 2016, Pages 501-522, ISSN 1568-4946, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2016.05.027>.
- [14] Jingsen Liu, Yanlin Hou, Yu Li, Huan Zhou, "Advanced strategies on update mechanism of tree-seed algorithm for function optimization and engineering design problems," *Expert Systems with Applications*, Volume 236, 2024, 121312, ISSN 0957-4174, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.121312>.
- [15] R. A. El Sehiemy, F. Selim, B. Bentouati, and M. A. Abido, "A novel multi-objective hybrid particle swarm and salp optimization algorithm for technical-economical-environmental operation in power systems," *Energy*, vol. 193, p. 116817, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2019.116817.
- [16] Ng Shin Mei, M. H. Sulaiman, Z. Mustaffa, and H. Daniyal, "Optimal reactive power dispatch solution by loss minimization using moth-flame optimization technique," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 59, pp. 210–222, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2017.05.057.
- [17] M. A. Taher, S. Kamel, F. Jurado, and M. Ebeed, "An improved moth-flame optimization algorithm for solving optimal power flow problem," *Int. Trans. Electr. Energy Syst.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 1–28, 2019, doi: 10.1002/etep.2743.
- [18] H. Bouchekara, "Solution of the optimal power flow problem considering security constraints using an improved chaotic electromagnetic field optimization algorithm," *Neural Comput. Appl.*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 2683–2703, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s00521-019-04298-3.
- [19] G. Chen, J. Qian, Z. Zhang, and S. Li, "Application of modified pigeon-inspired optimization algorithm and constraint-objective sorting rule on multi-objective optimal power flow problem," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 92, p. 106321, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106321.
- [20] C. A. Coello Coello, "Use of a self-adaptive penalty approach for engineering optimization problems," *Comput. Ind.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 113–127, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0166-3615(99)00046-9.
- [21] M. Ghasemi, S. Ghavidel, M. M. Ghanbarian, H. R. Massrur, and M. Gharibzadeh, "Application of imperialist competitive algorithm with its modified techniques for multi-objective optimal power flow problem: A comparative study," *Inf. Sci. (Ny.)*, vol. 281, no. June, pp. 225–247, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2014.05.040.
- [22] E. Rashedi, H. Nezamabadi-pour, and S. Saryazdi, "GSA: A Gravitational Search Algorithm," *Inf. Sci. (Ny.)*, vol. 179, no. 13, pp. 2232–2248, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2009.03.004.
- [23] G. Chen, X. Yi, Z. Zhang, and H. Wang, "Applications of multi-objective dimension-based firefly algorithm to optimize the power losses, emission, and cost in power systems," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, vol. 68, pp. 322–342, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2018.04.006.
- [24] A. Shabanpour-Haghighi, A. R. Seifi, and T. Niknam, "A modified teaching-learning based optimization for multi-objective optimal power flow problem," *Energy Convers. Manag.*, vol. 77, pp. 597–607, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.enconman.2013.09.028.
- [25] S. Sivasubramani and K. S. Swarup, "Multi-objective harmony search algorithm for optimal power flow problem," *Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 745–752, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.ijepes.2010.12.031.
- [26] B. Webster and P. J. Bernhard, "A local search optimization algorithm based on natural principles of gravitation," *Proc. Int. Conf. Inf. Knowl. Eng.*, vol. 1, pp. 255–261, 2003.
- [27] O. K. Erol and I. Eksin, "A new optimization method: Big Bang-Big Crunch," *Adv. Eng. Softw.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 106–111, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.advengsoft.2005.04.005.
- [28] M. Neshat, G. Sepidnam, M. Sargolzaei, and A. N. Toosi, "Artificial fish swarm algorithm: a survey of the state-of-the-art, hybridization, combinatorial and indicative applications," *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 965–997, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10462-012-9342-2.
- [29] M. D. (Author) Eric Bonabeau (Author), Guy Theraulaz (Author), "Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems (Santa Fe Institute Studies on the Sciences of Complexity) 1st Edition," p. 320.
- [30] B. Alatas, "ACROA: Artificial Chemical Reaction Optimization Algorithm for global optimization," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 38, no. 10, pp. 13170–13180, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2011.04.126.
- [31] A. Hatamlou, "Black hole: A new heuristic optimization approach for data clustering," *Inf. Sci. (Ny.)*, vol. 222, pp. 175–184, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2012.08.023.
- [32] C. Caer et al., "Dispersion engineering of wide slot photonic crystal waveguides by Bragg-like corrugation of the slot," *IEEE Photonics Technol. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 18, pp. 1298–1300, 2011, doi: 10.1109/LPT.2011.2158996.
- [33] H. Du, X. Wu, and J. Zhuang, "Small-world optimization algorithm for function optimization," *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.* including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics), vol. 4222 LNCS, pp. 264–273, 2006, doi: 10.1007/11881223_33.

- [34] H. S. Hosseini, "Principal components analysis by the galaxy-based search algorithm: a novel metaheuristic for continuous optimisation," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 6, no. 1/2, p. 132, 2011, doi: 10.1504/ijcse.2011.041221.
- [35] S. Mirjalili and A. Lewis, "S-shaped versus V-shaped transfer functions for binary Particle Swarm Optimization," *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, vol. 9, pp. 1–14, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.swevo.2012.09.002.
- [36] Paul K, Hati D. A novel hybrid Harris hawk optimization and sine cosine algorithm based home energy management system for residential buildings. *Building Services Engineering Research and Technology*. 2023;44(4):459-480. doi:10.1177/01436244231170387]
- [37] Paul K. Multi-objective risk-based optimal power system operation with renewable energy resources and battery energy storage system: A novel Hybrid Modified Grey Wolf Optimization–Sine Cosine Algorithm approach. *Transactions of the Institute of Measurement and Control*. 2022;0(0). doi:10.1177/01423312221079962]
- [38] Kaushik Paul, Niranjana Kumar. Cuckoo Search Algorithm for Congestion Alleviation with Incorporation of Wind Farm . *International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE)* Vol. 8, No. 6, December 2018, pp. 4871~4879 ISSN: 2088-8708, DOI: 10.11591/ijece.v8i6.pp4871-4879
- [39] Paul, Kaushik & Shekher, Vineet & Kumar, Naveen & Kumar, Dr & Kumar, Manoj. (2022). Influence of Wind Energy Source on Congestion Management in Power System Transmission Network: a Novel Modified Whale Optimization Approach. *Process Integration and Optimization for Sustainability*. 6. 1-17. 10.1007/s41660-022-00271-1.]
- [40] [S. B. Pandya, K. Kalita, R. Čep, P. Jangir, J. S. Chohan and L. Abualigah. Multi-objective Snow Ablation Optimization Algorithm: An Elementary Vision for Security-Constrained Optimal Power Flow Problem Incorporating Wind Energy Source with FACTS Devices. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems* 2024 Vol. 17 Issue 1 Pages 33. DOI: 10.1007/s44196-024-00415
- [41] S. Agrawal, S. Pandya, P. Jangir, K. Kalita and S. Chakraborty. A multi-objective thermal exchange optimization model for solving optimal power flow problems in hybrid power systems. *Decision Analytics Journal* 2023 Vol. 8 Pages 100299. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dajour.2023.100299>.
- [42] Kalita, K., Ramesh, J.V.N., Cepova, L. et al. Multi-objective exponential distribution optimizer (MOEDO): a novel math-inspired multi-objective algorithm for global optimization and real-world engineering design problems. *Sci Rep* 14, 1816 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-52083-7>
- [43] [S. B. Pandya, P. Jangir, M. Mahdal, K. Kalita, J. S. Chohan and L. Abualigah . Optimizing brushless direct current motor design: An application of the multi-objective generalized normal distribution optimization. *Heliyon* 2024 Vol. 10 Issue 4 Pages e26369
- [44] Chao Wang, Liangliang Ma, Lei Ma, Joel Weijia Lai, Jie Zhao, Lu Wang, Kang Hao Cheong, "Identification of influential users with cost minimization via an improved moth flame optimization," *Journal of Computational Science*, Volume 67, 2023, 101955, ISSN 1877-7503, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocs.2023.101955>.
- [45] Linfei Yin, Zhenjian Cai, "Multimodal hierarchical distributed multi-objective moth intelligence algorithm for economic dispatch of power systems," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Volume 434, 2024, 140130, ISSN 0959-6526, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.140130>.
- [46] Manoharan Premkumar, Tengku Juhana Tengku Hashim, Sowmya Ravichandran, Tan Ching Sin, Ramakrishnan Chandran, Anas R. Alsoud, Pradeep Jangir, "Optimal operation and control of hybrid power systems with stochastic renewables and FACTS devices: An intelligent multi-objective optimization approach," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, Volume 93, 2024, Pages 90-113, ISSN 1110-0168, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2024.02.069>.
- [47] Muhammad Suhail Shaikh, Saurav Raj, Rohit Babu, Shubash Kumar, Kapil Sagrolikar, "A hybrid moth–flame algorithm with particle swarm optimization with application in power transmission and distribution," *Decision Analytics Journal*, Volume 6, 2023, 100182, ISSN 2772-6622, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dajour.2023.100182>.
- [48] Ali Jafar-Nowdeh, Manoochehr Babanezhad, Saber Arabi-Nowdeh, Amirreza Naderipour, Hesam Kamyab, Zulkurnain Abdul-Malek, Vigna K. Ramachandaramurthy, "Meta-heuristic matrix moth–flame algorithm for optimal reconfiguration of distribution networks and placement of solar and wind renewable sources considering reliability," *Environmental Technology & Innovation*, Volume 20, 2020, 101118, ISSN 2352-1864, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eti.2020.101118>.
- [49] Anbo Meng, Cong Zeng, Peng Wang, De Chen, Tianmin Zhou, Xiaoying Zheng, Hao Yin, "A high-performance crisscross search based grey wolf optimizer for solving optimal power flow problem," *Energy*, Volume 225, 2021, 120211, ISSN 0360-5442, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.120211>.
- [50] C. Muro, R. Escobedo, L. Spector, and R. Coppinger, "Wolf-pack (*Canis lupus*) hunting strategies emerge from simple rules in computational simulations," *Behavioural processes*, vol. 88, pp. 192-197, 2011
- [51] Deng, W., Shang, S., Cai, X., Zhao, H., Song, Y., & Xu, J. (2021). An improved differential evolution algorithm and its application in optimization problem. *Soft Computing*, 25, 5277-5298.] [Riaz, M., Hanif, A., Hussain, S. J., Memon, M. I., Ali, M. U., & Zafar, A. (2021). An optimization-based strategy for solving optimal power flow problems in a power system integrated with stochastic solar and wind power energy. *Applied Sciences*, 11(15), 6883.]
- [52] Abd El-Mageed, A. A., et al. (2024). "Hybrid Sparrow Search-Exponential Distribution Optimization with Differential Evolution for Parameter Prediction of Solar Photovoltaic Models." *Algorithms* 17(1): 26.]
- [53] 300-bus system (IEEE test case). *Power Systems and Evolutionary Algorithms*. (2015, March 23). Retrieved February 11, 2021, from <https://al-roomi.org/power-flow/300-bus-system>

Biographies of Authors



Lt Cdr Mohammad Khurshed Alam, (L), BN(Retd) was born on 14 October 1968. He joined the Bangladesh Navy on 14 July 1987. He was commissioned in the Electrical branch of the Bangladesh Navy on 01 January 1990. He did his graduation from the Bangladesh

University of Engineering & Technology (BUET) in the Electrical and Electronics Engineering discipline in 1993. In 1998, he went to the UK and Germany for Operation and Maintenance Training of the PAXMAN Engine. He has done a Navy Missile Maintenance Course from 2002 to 2003 in PRC. Moreover, he joined the UN Mission in Côte d'Ivoire as a contingent member from 2006 to 2007 and in D R Congo and CAR as a military observer from 2013 to 2014. He obtained a First Class Master of Electrical & Electronics Engineering from Khulna University of Engineering & Technology (KUET), Bangladesh 2013. Retd Lt Cdr M. K. Alam served as the Weapons Electrical Officer on a seagoing frigate-BNS OSMAN and the electrical officer, engineer officer, and missile officer on board other Bangladesh Navy ships. He is pursuing his doctorate at UMP in Malaysia and has worked as an Assistant Professor of FE at AIUB in Dhaka since Sep 2019.

Email: pes20002@stdmail.ump.edu.my,
khurshed709@aiub.edu



Mohd Herwan Sulaiman obtained his B. Eng. (Hons) in Electrical-Electronics, M. Eng (Electrical-Power) and PhD (Electrical Engineering) from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) in 2002, 2007 and 2011 respectively. He is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP). His research interests include power system optimisation and swarm intelligence applications for power system studies. He is one of the main inventors of a new nature-inspired optimisation algorithm, Barnacles Mating Optimizer (BMO). He is also a Senior Member of IEEE. I love to write a ride. Now, he is also a runner.

Email: herwan@ump.edu.my

In December 20005, **Asma Ferdowsi** graduated with her MBBS from Sher-E-Bangla Medical College in Barisal, part of Dhaka University. Additionally, in 2022, she earned her MPhil in Pharmacology from Sir Salimullah Medical College in Mitford, Dhaka 1100, Bangladesh. The same college currently employs him as a lecturer. Bio and medical waste are particularly important to her study of renewable energy systems.

Email: asmaferdowsi7@gmail.com



Md. Shaoran Sayem obtained a



Bachelor of Science in Electrical & Electronic Engineering and a Master's of Science in EEE from American International University-Bangladesh (AIUB). He received the "Megna-Cum-Laude" both B.Sc. and Master's Degree. **Md. Shaoran Sayem** is a Formal Network Engineer at LM Ericsson Bangladesh Limited and currently he is working

as a Lecturer (Faculty of Electrical-Electronics) at American International University-Bangladesh (AIUB).

Email: shaoranmss@aiub.edu



Md. Foyzal received his B.Sc. Engg. Electrical and Electronic Engineering Degrees from American International University-Bangladesh (AIUB) in

January 2023. After receiving his B.Sc., he interned for the Gazipur Palli Bidyut Samity's Asset General Manager from the Bangladesh Rural Electrification Board. He is currently enrolled in M.Sc. in Electrical and Electronic Engineering. He is working on his power system research project. His areas of research interests include renewable energy systems, microgrid and hybrid power systems, wireless power transmission, and power system stability and control.

Md. Mahfuzur Akter Ringku received his B.Sc. Engg. {Electrical and Electronic Engineering Degrees from American International University-Bangladesh (AIUB) in January 2023. After receiving his B.Sc., he interned for the Gazipur Palli Bidyut Samity's Asset General Manager from the Bangladesh Rural Electrification Board. He is currently enrolled in the Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA)



program in accounting and information systems at the University of Dhaka. And working on his power system research project. His areas of interest in research include renewable energy systems (particularly wind and photovoltaic systems), analysis and control of rotating electrical machines, microgrid and hybrid

power systems, HVDC systems, and power system stability and control.

Email: mahfuzurakter@gmail.com

APPENDIX: DETAIL RESULTS OF DIFFERENT CASES 1-4

Annex A1	Control variables for cases 1-2 for IEEE-30 bus - results			
Item	SF-MFO	SHADE-SF	GWO	MFO
Pg2(MW)	3218564	53.78	31.5	33.9
Pg5(MW)	27.54	26.7	27.78	26.4
Pg8(MW)	44.56	44.65	43.65	43.67
Pg11(MW)	11	12.56	11.56	11.32

Pg13(MW)	31.45	35.87	32.67	32.45
Vg1(p.u)	0.976	0.98	0.97	0.98
Vg2(p.u)	0.98	0.97	0.98	1.01
Vg5(p.u)	1.0	0.98	1.01	1.02
Vg8(p.u)	0.97	0.97	0.98	0.98
Vg11(p.u)	0.98	0.98	0.99	0.99
Vg13(p.u)	1.02	1.02	0.98	1.02
Q _{TG1} (MVA _r)	-1.34	10.56	-23.65	-20.98
Q _{TG2} (MVA _r)	16.75	35.67	31.43	34.34
Q _{WG4} (MVA _r)	14.56	16.56	18.67	18.56
Q _{TG3} (MVA _r)	25.45	23.54	21.34	14.67
Q _{WG5} (MVA _r)	26.45	24.76	42.54	35.45
Q _{WG6} (MVA _r)	32.45	13.76	44.65	33.54
Fuel Valve	845.521	845.897	847.762	846.654
Cost(\$/h)				

Annex A2 Control variables for case Cases 3-4 for IEEE-57 bus- results

Item	SF-MFO	SHADE-SF	GWO	MFO
Pg2MW)	27.678	53.4	34.5	31.7
Pg3(MW)	94.786	26.6	27.87	28.7
Pg6(MW)	24.782	44.67	43.45	43.45
Pg8(MW)	353.564	11.23	12.65	11.54
Pg9(MW)	183.543	36.45	32.34	32.45
Pg12MW)	203.546	67.45	45.87	46.54
Vg1(p.u)	1.03	0.98	0.97	0.97
Vg2(p.u)	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.01
Vg3(p.u)	1.04	0.98	1.01	1.02
Vg5(p.u)	1.03	0.99	0.98	0.98
Vg8(p.u)	1.02	0.98	0.99	0.99
Vg9(p.u)	1.01	1.02	0.98	1.02
Vg13	0.98	1.01	1.03	1.03
Q _{TG1} (MVA _r)	85.564	10.87	-25.67	-22.67
Q _{TG2} (MVA _r)	-14.00	35.56	35.87	34.98
Q _{WG12} (MVA _r)	64.00	16.76	18.78	18.23
Q _{TG3} (MVA _r)	24.000	25.65	23.78	14.87
Q _{WG6} (MVA _r)	90.34	24.65	43.34	37.34
Q _{WG8} (MVA _r)	8.000	13.56	47.87	34.45
Q _{WG9} (MVA _r)	48.87	55.87	35.34	69.54
P _{loss} (MW)	26.563	27.455	27.65	27.892

Declaration of Interest Statement

The authors affirm their lack of awareness regarding any financial conflicts of interest that could have impacted the findings presented in the current study. Moreover, they assert that there are no close amicable acquaintances whose influence might have skewed the results of their research. This declaration underscores the authors' commitment to transparency and integrity in their work, aiming to uphold the highest standards of academic rigor. By explicitly addressing potential sources of bias or undue influence, the authors seek to reassure readers about the objectivity and reliability of their study's outcomes. Such proactive disclosure serves to enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of their research within the scholarly community.

Graphical abstract

Journal Pre-proof

Subjects

The electricity production costs generated by SF-MFO are \$845.521/hr and \$25,908.325/hr for the IEEE 30-feeder and IEEE 57-feeder systems, respectively.


Methods




Result

IEEE-30 Buses

Cost Minimization




Tx Loss Minimization




Conclusions

- SF-MFO offers a scalable solution that can accommodate various grid configurations and operational constraints, making it highly adaptable to real-world applications.


IEEE-57 Buses



Overall Tx loss Minimization



Convergence for Loss



Voltage deviation profile