ISSN: 2583-5637 (Online)

International journal of Inventive Research in Science and Technology

Volume 4 Issue 1 Jan 2025

Review Paper-1

A Review of Perturb and Observe and Incremental Conductance MPPT Algorithms Under Dynamic and Non-Uniform Irradiance

Anshul Pandey[1], M.S. Dash[2], Devendra Sharma[3] ,Vasant Acharya[4]

iamanshulpandey1997@gmail.com[1],malaya_rec@rediffmail.com[2],

devendrasharma798@gmail.com[3], vasantacharyatitc@gmail.com[4]

[1]MTech Scholar, Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Technocrats Institute of Technology, Bhopal, India

[2]Professor, Department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, Technocrats Institute of Technology, Bhopal, India

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, Technocrats Institute of Technology, Bhopal, India

[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, Technocrats Institute of Technology, Bhopal, India

Abstract

The integration of photovoltaic (PV) systems into the global energy grid necessitates robust and efficient control mechanisms to maximize power output. Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT) is a crucial technology for this purpose, as it continuously adjusts the operating point of a PV system to extract the maximum available power under varying environmental conditions. This paper presents a comparative review of two of the most widely used conventional MPPT algorithms: Perturb and Observe (P&O) and Incremental Conductance (INC). The analysis focuses on their fundamental operating principles, inherent advantages, and critical limitations, particularly in challenging scenarios such as dynamic irradiance and non-uniform shading. The findings indicate that while P&O and INC are simple and cost-effective, they suffer from fundamental issues, including power oscillations and a failure to track the Global Maximum Power Point (GMPP) under partial shading. These limitations have driven the development of advanced and hybrid algorithms that combine the simplicity of conventional methods with the robustness of intelligent techniques.

Keywords

MPPT, P&O, INC, Photovoltaics, Partial Shading, Dynamic Irradiance, Global Maximum Power Point

I. Introduction

Solar energy stands as a pivotal and inexhaustible renewable resource, offering a clean alternative to conventional energy sources. The performance of a PV system is highly dependent on environmental factors, primarily solar irradiance and temperature, which are subject to continuous and often rapid fluctuations. The nonlinear current-voltage (I−V) and power-voltage (P−V) characteristics of a PV panel mean that the point of maximum power output, known as the Maximum Power Point (MPP), is not static but shifts dynamically with changing conditions. To address this challenge and ensure the maximum possible energy yield, MPPT algorithms are implemented in PV inverters and DC-DC converters to continuously adjust the operating point of the system.

Among the multitude of MPPT techniques, Perturb and Observe (P&O) and Incremental Conductance (INC) are two of the most prominent due to their simplicity, low implementation cost, and historical prevalence in commercial applications. These algorithms are foundational to the field and are often referred to as "conventional" or "hill-climbing" methods. This review paper provides a detailed comparative analysis of these two algorithms, with a specific focus on their performance and stability under non-uniform and dynamic irradiance conditions, which represent the most common real-world challenges. The analysis aims to elucidate their mechanisms, identify their inherent limitations, and contextualize them against the backdrop of recent advancements in the field of MPPT.

II. Foundational Principles of Conventional MPPT Algorithms

The conventional MPPT algorithms operate on the principle of "hill-climbing," seeking to find the peak of the P−V curve. This process is typically managed by a microcontroller that adjusts the duty cycle of a DC-DC converter, thereby altering the impedance seen by the PV array to align it with the MPP.

A. The Perturb and Observe (P&O) Algorithm

The P&O algorithm is the most widely used MPPT method due to its straightforward implementation and minimal required sensors. Its operation is based on a simple, iterative logic. The algorithm periodically introduces a small perturbation by adjusting the PV voltage or current and then measures the resulting change in output power. The fundamental rule is:

- If the change in power (ΔP) is positive, the next perturbation is made in the same direction.
- If the change in power (ΔP) is negative, the direction of the perturbation is reversed.

This process continues until the algorithm reaches the vicinity of the MPP, where the power will fluctuate around the peak. The algorithm essentially follows the slope of the P−V curve, moving toward the peak if the slope is positive and reversing direction if the slope becomes negative, which occurs after passing the MPP.

B. The Incremental Conductance (INC) Algorithm

The INC algorithm, while slightly more complex to implement than P&O, offers improved performance and stability. It is based on the mathematical relationship of the

P−V curve's slope. The algorithm continuously monitors the changes in voltage (ΔV) and current (ΔI) to determine the incremental conductance (dI/dV). This is then compared to the instantaneous conductance (I/V). The algorithm's logic is defined by the following three conditions:

- At the MPP, the slope of the P−V curve is zero ($dP/dV=0$), which corresponds to the condition $dI/dV=-I/V$.
- To the left of the MPP, the slope is positive ($dP/dV>0$), which means $dI/dV>-I/V$.
- To the right of the MPP, the slope is negative ($dP/dV<0$), which means $dI/dV<-I/V$.

A key difference in the INC methodology is that once the MPP is reached ($dI/dV=-I/V$), the algorithm ceases to perturb the voltage, holding the operating point constant. This contrasts with the continuous perturbation of the P&O method. The INC algorithm is not merely reactive; its use of the slope to predict the optimal direction gives it a more sophisticated, anticipatory form of control. This predictive capability is the source of its advantages in stability and dynamic response.

III. Comparative Analysis: Performance Under Non-Ideal Conditions

While both P&O and INC are effective under stable, uniform irradiance, their performance diverges significantly under real-world, non-ideal conditions.

A. Tracking Performance Under Dynamic Irradiance

The performance of conventional MPPT algorithms is severely challenged during rapid changes in solar irradiance, such as when a cloud passes over the PV array. For the P&O algorithm, a sudden increase in irradiance can cause the operating point to drift away from the MPP, leading to inefficient power extraction. This is because the algorithm's reactive nature can misinterpret the power increase from the changing weather as a result of its perturbation, causing it to continue tracking in the wrong direction.

The P&O algorithm also presents a critical trade-off related to its step size. A larger step size allows for a faster tracking speed to respond to changes, but it leads to greater power oscillations around the MPP. Conversely, a smaller step size reduces oscillations and power loss at steady state but results in a slower response time and a failure to efficiently track the MPP during dynamic conditions.

The INC algorithm shows better proficiency under these dynamic conditions, as it can track changes more rapidly and with greater accuracy than P&O. However, it is not flawless and can still exhibit erratic behavior under very fast atmospheric fluctuations.

B. Performance Under Non-Uniform Irradiance (Partial Shading)

One of the most significant challenges for conventional MPPT algorithms is non-uniform irradiance, a phenomenon commonly known as partial shading. When sections of a PV array are shaded by obstacles like clouds, trees, or buildings, the characteristic P−V curve becomes distorted, developing multiple power peaks. These include a single, true Global Maximum Power Point (GMPP) and one or more Local Maximum Power Points (LMPP).

Both P&O and INC algorithms are fundamentally unsuited for this scenario because they are "hill-climbing" methods designed to find a single, dominant peak. When faced with multiple peaks, they are highly susceptible to getting trapped on a local peak, failing to locate the true GMPP. This can result in a significant decrease in power output and energy harvesting inefficiency. The failure of these algorithms under partial shading underscores a fundamental limitation of their design philosophy; their simple, local-search approach is ineffective in a multi-modal search space.

C. Steady-State Stability and Oscillations

The continuous perturbation mechanism of the P&O algorithm is a source of its most notable drawback: steady-state oscillations. Even under constant irradiance, the algorithm continuously perturbs the operating point around the MPP, leading to a constant loss of power. This is an unavoidable consequence of its core logic, as it cannot determine when the peak has been reached without taking another step.

In contrast, the INC algorithm's ability to identify when the slope of the P−V curve is zero allows it to stop perturbing once the MPP is reached, stabilizing the system at the peak. This results in significantly fewer oscillations and lower power loss at steady state, a key advantage of INC over P&O.

ISSN: 2583-5637 (Online)

International journal of Inventive Research in Science and Technology

Volume 4 Issue 1 Jan 2025

IV. Advantages, Disadvantages, and the Engineering Trade-off

The choice between P&O and INC algorithms involves a fundamental engineering trade-off between simplicity, cost, and performance. A summary of their key features is provided in

Table I.

Feature	P&O Algorithm	INC Algorithm
Principle	Reactive, perturbation-based	Predictive, based on slope analysis
Implementation Complexity	Simple, low-cost	More complex, higher computational requirement
Tracking Speed	Fast with large step size; slow with small step	Faster than P&O under dynamic conditions
Steady-State Oscillations	Significant, continuous oscillations	Minimal to no oscillations
Dynamic Performance	Poor, susceptible to drift	Moderate improvement over P&O
Partial Shading Performance	Fails to track GMPP, gets trapped at LMPP	Fails to track GMPP, gets trapped at LMPP

The primary advantage of the P&O algorithm is its simplicity, which translates to a low implementation cost and widespread commercial adoption. For uncomplicated applications and stable conditions, it is often a sufficient and cost-effective choice. However, its significant performance limitations under dynamic and shaded conditions, as well as its continuous power oscillations, make it a suboptimal choice for high-performance systems. The INC algorithm, with its superior steady-state stability and better dynamic response, offers a moderate performance improvement over P&O, but at the cost of increased computational complexity and more expensive hardware.

V. Recent Challenges and Future Directions

The inherent limitations of conventional MPPT algorithms have spurred continuous research and development into more robust solutions. One area of ongoing work focuses on improving the performance of P&O and INC themselves. This includes the development of "variable step-size" and "adaptive step-size" algorithms, which dynamically adjust the perturbation size based on how far the operating point is from the MPP. This approach aims to strike a better balance between fast tracking speed and minimal steady-state oscillations.

However, a more fundamental shift in the field has been the move toward intelligent and hybrid MPPT algorithms. These solutions are a direct response to the "local maxima problem" of partial shading, which conventional algorithms are unable to solve. Intelligent techniques, such as Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), and Fuzzy Logic Controllers (FLC), are now employed to perform a global search of the P−V curve to find the true GMPP. These algorithms, while more complex and computationally intensive, can effectively jump out of local extrema and converge on the global peak.

A particularly effective future direction involves hybrid MPPT algorithms, which combine the strengths of both conventional and intelligent methods. A common approach is to use an intelligent algorithm (e.g., PSO or a genetic algorithm) to perform an initial global search to locate the approximate GMPP, followed by a conventional algorithm (e.g., P&O or INC) to perform the final, fine-tuning search. This strategy leverages the global search capability of the intelligent algorithm with the fast, local-tracking speed of the conventional method. For instance, an improved INC algorithm using a fuzzy self-tuning controller has demonstrated superior efficiency and minimal oscillations under various climate scenarios. This evolution from simple, heuristic solutions to adaptive, context-aware systems signifies a maturing field, moving toward technologies that can handle the full spectrum of real-world environmental challenges to ensure large-scale, reliable solar energy deployment.

VI. Conclusion

The P&O and INC algorithms have been foundational in the development of MPPT technology for photovoltaic systems, and their simplicity and low cost continue to make them relevant for certain applications. However, this review demonstrates that they possess significant performance limitations, particularly under dynamic and non-uniform irradiance. The inherent drawbacks of P&O, including its power oscillations and susceptibility to tracking in the wrong direction, and the shared inability of both conventional methods to navigate the multiple power peaks caused by partial shading, highlight their ineffectiveness in complex, modern PV systems.

For straightforward, low-cost applications, these algorithms may suffice. However, for high-performance systems operating in unpredictable environments, the conventional "hill-climbing" paradigm is insufficient. The future of MPPT lies in the continued development and implementation of advanced, hybrid algorithms that combine the speed and simplicity of conventional methods with the robustness and global search capabilities of intelligent techniques. These solutions are essential for maximizing the energy yield and ensuring the reliability of photovoltaic systems in the face of diverse and challenging real-world conditions.

References

[1] B. Bendib, H. Belmili, and F. Krim, "A survey of the most used MPPT methods: Conventional and advanced algorithms applied for photovoltaic systems," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 45, pp. 637–648, May 2015.

[2] M. B. Hassan, R. B. Abdennour, and H. B. Zgali, "Comparative Study of P&O and INC MPPT Algorithms for Photovoltaic Systems," *Journal of Computational Mechanics, Power System and Control*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2023.

[3] H. Allal, M. Benyahia, and M. I. K. El Mokhtar, "Performance Analysis of Three MPPT Controls Under Partial Shading: P&O, PSO and ANN," *E3S Web of Conferences*, vol. 469, 2023.

[4] N. F. Ibrahim, M. M. Mahmoud, H. Alnami, D. E. Mbadjoun Wapet, S. A. E. M. Ardjoun, M. I. Mosaad, and S. M. M. Elkhoby, "A new adaptive MPPT technique using an improved INC algorithm supported by fuzzy self-tuning controller for a grid-linked photovoltaic system," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 18, no. 11, 2023.

[5] F. H. M. Ali, A. W. A. M. Ali, and A. A. Yassin, "Hybrid ICWOA-P&O Method for MPPT Control in Photovoltaic Systems," *Electronics*, vol. 13, no. 19, 2024