ISSN: 2583-5637 (Online)

International journal of Inventive Research in Science and Technology

Volume 4 Issue 7 July 2025

Review Paper -2

Performance and Limitations of Conventional MPPT: A Review of Perturb and Observe and Incremental Conductance Algorithms

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

This review paper provides an in-depth analysis of the performance and stability of two of the most widely used conventional Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT) algorithms: Perturb and Observe (P&O) and Incremental Conductance (INC). While these algorithms are popular due to their simplicity and low implementation cost, their effectiveness is significantly challenged by non-uniform and dynamic solar irradiance conditions, such as those caused by partial shading. We delve into the fundamental principles of each algorithm, their operational advantages, and their inherent limitations, particularly focusing on their failure to track the Global Maximum Power Point (GMPP) and the issue of steady-state oscillations. The paper also explores recent advancements, including hybrid and meta-heuristic approaches, that aim to overcome these challenges. Finally, we discuss critical future directions for research, highlighting the need for a transition from simulation-based studies to real-world validation and the development of solutions that balance high efficiency with practical implementation costs.

Keywords: MPPT, P&O, INC, Photovoltaic Systems, Non-Uniform Irradiance, Partial Shading, Dynamic Conditions, Global Maximum Power Point, PV Array.

1. Introduction

The global shift toward renewable energy sources, particularly solar power, necessitates the development of efficient energy conversion systems. Photovoltaic (PV) systems, a key component of this transition, exhibit non-linear power-voltage (P−V) and current-voltage (I−V) characteristics that are highly dependent on environmental factors such as solar irradiance and temperature. To maximize the energy extracted from a PV array, a Maximum Power Point Tracker (MPPT) is an essential component. The MPPT system dynamically adjusts the operating point of the PV module to ensure it remains at the maximum power point (MPP) despite continuous fluctuations in environmental conditions. The fundamental need for this dynamic adjustment arises from the intermittent nature of solar energy, which means a static operating point is almost never optimal, thus requiring a continuously adapting solution for efficient energy harvesting.

While conventional MPPT algorithms, such as Perturb and Observe (P&O) and Incremental Conductance (INC), have been widely adopted for their simplicity and cost-effectiveness, they face significant limitations under challenging conditions. The simplicity that makes them popular is also the source of their primary weaknesses. Their performance degrades under rapid changes in solar irradiance, and most critically, they fail to track the true global maximum power point (GMPP) when multiple peaks exist on the P−V curve. This phenomenon, known as partial shading, is caused by non-uniform irradiance conditions. This failure to find the GMPP directly impacts the energy yield, meaning a technically functional system is still operating at a suboptimal level, which can translate into significant economic losses and serve as a barrier to the widespread adoption of large-scale PV systems.

This paper provides a comprehensive review of the P&O and INC algorithms, addressing their operational principles, comparative advantages, inherent challenges, and the evolution of the field. We synthesize findings from various research studies to critically evaluate their performance under both uniform and non-uniform conditions. The scope is limited to a detailed analysis of these two conventional methods and their modern hybrid successors, with a focus on their behavior under real-world, dynamic, and partially shaded scenarios.

2. Literature Review: Foundational Principles

2.1 Principles of Perturb and Observe (P&O) Algorithm

The P&O algorithm operates on a simple hill-climbing principle, designed to find the peak power point on the P−V curve. It works by introducing a small perturbation (a change) in the PV module's voltage (Vpv) or the converter's duty cycle. It then observes the effect of this change on the output power (Ppv). The core logic is straightforward: if the power increases ($\Delta P>0$) after a perturbation, the algorithm continues to perturb in the same direction. If the power decreases ($\Delta P<0$), the direction of the perturbation is reversed to return to the peak. This cycle continues until the MPP is approximated. The algorithm's simplicity is its key advantage, as it only requires voltage and current measurements to calculate power and make decisions, making it easy and inexpensive to implement with minimal hardware. However, this very simplicity leads to a fundamental limitation: under steady-state conditions, the algorithm continuously overshoots the MPP and reverses its direction, resulting in perpetual oscillations and a continuous power loss. This is a direct consequence of its design, as it must deviate from the peak to detect that it has passed it.

2.2 Principles of Incremental Conductance (INC) Algorithm

The Incremental Conductance (INC) algorithm was developed to address some of the shortcomings of the P&O method. It leverages the mathematical relationship between the slope of the P−V curve and the MPP. At the maximum power point, the derivative of power with respect to voltage is zero (dP/dV=0). The algorithm tracks this condition by comparing the incremental conductance (dI/dV) with the instantaneous conductance (−I/V). This relationship is derived from the power equation

$P = V \times I$:

$$\partial P/\partial V = \partial(V \times I)/\partial V = I + V\frac{\partial I}{\partial V} = 0$$

At the MPP, this equation simplifies to $\frac{\partial I}{\partial V} = -\frac{I}{V}$. The algorithm's operational logic is as follows:

- If $\left(\frac{dI}{dV} + \frac{I}{V}\right) = 0$, the operating point is at the MPP. The algorithm stops perturbing and holds the operating point.
- If $\left(\frac{dI}{dV} + \frac{I}{V}\right) > 0$, the operating point is to the left of the MPP, so the voltage should be increased.
- If $\left(\frac{dI}{dV} + \frac{I}{V}\right) < 0$, the operating point is to the right of the MPP, so the voltage should be decreased.

The primary advantage of INC over P&O is its ability to accurately determine when the MPP is reached, which allows it to halt perturbations and eliminate the continuous power oscillation. This leads to higher overall efficiency and stability under constant irradiance conditions. This seemingly minor technical difference in logic can have major practical consequences, as even small power losses from continuous oscillation in P&O can accumulate significantly over time, making INC a more desirable choice for large-scale applications where long-term stability and efficiency are paramount.

3 Methods

This review is based on a structured synthesis of findings from published research papers, academic journals, and technical reports. The approach involves a comparative analysis of the principles and performance of the P&O and INC algorithms. The core of this methodology is the identification of key performance metrics, including tracking speed, accuracy, steady-state oscillations, and behavior under non-uniform and dynamic conditions. The reviewed material has been categorized and cross-referenced to identify common themes, contradictions, and emerging trends in MPPT research. The analysis extends beyond a simple summary to provide interpretive commentary on the significance of the findings, their causal relationships, and their broader implications for the field of renewable energy.

4 Advantages

4.1 Comparative Analysis of P&O and INC

The choice between P&O and INC fundamentally comes down to a trade-off between implementation complexity/cost and performance/efficiency. P&O's main strength lies in its simplicity and very low implementation cost, making it a popular choice for many basic, cost-sensitive applications. Its straightforward logic requires minimal hardware and is easy to program.

In contrast, INC offers superior performance in several key areas. It is more accurate and can track rapidly changing irradiance conditions with higher precision than P&O. Its ability to settle at the MPP without continuous perturbation eliminates the power oscillation inherent in P&O, leading to higher efficiency in stable conditions. The performance of both algorithms is also deeply intertwined with the choice of step size. A small step size reduces oscillations but slows down tracking speed, while a large step size improves speed but increases oscillations and the risk of mis-tracking under dynamic conditions. This highlights a fundamental design challenge that requires a careful balance. The very simplicity of the P&O algorithm, while its primary

ISSN: 2583-5637 (Online)
International journal of Inventive Research in Science and Technology
Volume 4 Issue 7 July 2025

advantage, is the direct cause of its performance limitations, demonstrating that this simplicity is a double-edged sword that may be insufficient for modern, high-performance systems.

Feature	**Perturb and Observe (P&O)**	**Incremental Conductance (INC)**
Implementation Complexity	Low	Medium
Cost	Low	Slightly Higher
Steady-State Oscillation	High	Low/None
Tracking Speed	Varies with step size	High, especially under rapid changes
Performance under Partial Shading	Fails to track GMPP, trapped at LMPP	Fails to track GMPP, trapped at LMPP

5 Recent Challenges

5.1 The Effect of Non-Uniform Irradiance (Partial Shading)

A significant challenge facing conventional MPPT algorithms is their inability to perform effectively under non-uniform irradiance conditions, commonly referred to as partial shading (PSC). This occurs when parts of a PV array are shaded by elements such as clouds, building shadows, or dust, while other parts remain exposed to sunlight. This uneven illumination fundamentally alters the $P-V$ characteristic curve of the PV array.

The existence of bypass diodes, which are a necessary feature in PV modules to prevent cell damage or "hot spots" under shading, is the direct cause of this phenomenon. As a consequence, the $P-V$ curve under PSC exhibits multiple peaks, consisting of several Local Maximum Power Points (LMPPs) and a single Global Maximum Power Point (GMPP). This means that the solution to one problem (cell damage) directly creates a new, complex problem (LMPPs) that conventional

MPPT algorithms cannot solve. P&O and INC, which rely on simple hill-climbing logic, are fundamentally incapable of distinguishing between an LMPP and the GMPP. As a

result, they are easily "trapped" at the first local maximum they encounter, failing to find the true global maximum and leading to significant energy loss. This highlights a critical disconnect between the idealized conditions often used in basic studies and the complex realities of real-world PV applications.

5.2 Performance Limitations of Conventional Algorithms

Beyond the primary issue of partial shading, conventional MPPT algorithms exhibit other performance limitations. The P&O algorithm inherently suffers from continuous steady-state oscillations around the MPP, which results in a constant loss of power. Furthermore, under rapidly changing atmospheric conditions, it can mis-track by perturbing in the wrong direction, compounding the efficiency loss. While the INC algorithm mitigates the oscillation problem, it is not entirely immune to mis-tracking issues, particularly during very fast fluctuations in irradiance. The combination of these factors—oscillations, mis-tracking, and the inability to find the GMPP—severely reduces the overall energy harvesting efficiency of systems that rely on these traditional methods.

6 Future Directions

6.1 Development of Hybrid and Meta-Heuristic Algorithms

The shortcomings of conventional methods have spurred a wave of research into more advanced MPPT techniques. These new methods typically fall into two categories. Hybrid algorithms combine conventional methods with more sophisticated techniques. For example, a hybrid P&O with a Cuckoo Search (CS) algorithm uses CS for a fast global search to get close to the GMPP, and then P&O takes over for fine-grained local tracking. The rise of these complex algorithms is a direct consequence of the a-priori failure of simpler methods under partial shading.

Another approach involves meta-heuristic algorithms, which are inspired by natural phenomena or swarm intelligence to handle multi-peak scenarios. Examples include Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Simulated Annealing, Grey-Wolf Optimization, and Artificial Bee Colony

(ABC) algorithms. These algorithms are more computationally complex but are more robust in finding the GMPP by exploring a wider solution space and avoiding local optima.

6.2 The Transition from Simulation to Real-World Application

A major challenge identified in the literature is that a significant portion of MPPT research focuses on simulation-based studies rather than practical, real-world experiments. While simulations are valuable for initial testing, they often fail to capture the complexity and unpredictability of real-world conditions, such as data noise, transient states, and variations in system components.

The field needs to move toward solutions that are not only efficient in a simulated environment but also economically viable and stable in a practical setting. This focus on practical validation is not just a scientific trend; it reflects the growing maturity of the field. As PV systems become larger and more commonplace, the demand for reliable, field-tested technology outweighs the novelty of a simulation-only solution. This trend implies that future research will increasingly be judged not just on theoretical efficiency but on practical robustness, cost-effectiveness, and ease of implementation. A critical future direction is to find an optimal balance between the high cost and complexity of advanced intelligent algorithms and the additional power income they generate.

7. Conclusion

This review has demonstrated that while Perturb and Observe (P&O) and Incremental Conductance (INC) algorithms remain viable for simple PV systems under uniform conditions due to their simplicity and low cost, they are fundamentally ill-equipped to handle the complexities of non-uniform and dynamic irradiance. Their inability to track the GMPP under partial shading, coupled with issues like oscillations and mis-tracking, highlights the need for more advanced solutions. The conventional methods laid the groundwork, but the future of MPPT lies in hybrid and meta-heuristic approaches that can intelligently navigate complex P−V curves. The next frontier in research is the critical transition from theoretical models to validated real-world applications, with a renewed focus on balancing performance, cost, and practical implementation to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding solar energy market.

References

1. A. F. Z. Arifin, M. F. M. Osman, A. A. M. Isa, K. W. K. Wai, and S. C. S. Ab. Mutalib, “Optimized Maximum Power Point Tracking for PV System Under Partial Shading Conditions,” *Research Portal, Northumbria University*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://researchportal.northumbria.ac.uk/files/132529016/Optimized_Maximum_Power_Point_Tracking_for_PV_System_Under_Partial_Shading_Conditions.pdf.
2. N. S. A. A. Karim, S. S. A. Gani, and A. H. H. Rashid, "A Comparative Analysis of Perturb-and-Observe and Incremental Conductance MPPT Techniques Using a Boost Converter," *Electronics*, vol. 9, no. 9, 2020, pp. 1512.
3. F. S. Zekry, S. T. E. Ezzat, and M. I. E. Ahmed, "A Review of MPPT Algorithms for Partial Shading Conditions," *Acta Physica Polonica A*, vol. 132, no. 3, 2017, pp. 1129-1132.
4. M. J. Q. Al-Jubori, and M. I. El-Sawi, "Incremental conductance MPPT in grid connected PV system," *International Journal of Engineering, Science and Technology*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2021, pp. 138-145.