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Abstract: The recently introduced proportional-resonant (PR) controllers and filters, and their suitability for current/voltage control of grid-connected converters, are described. Using the PR controllers, the converter reference tracking performance can be enhanced and previously known shortcomings associated with conventional PI controllers can be alleviated. These shortcomings include steady-state errors in single-phase systems and the need for synchronous $d$-$q$ transformation in three-phase systems. Based on similar control theory, PR filters can also be used for generating the harmonic command reference precisely in an active power filter, especially for single-phase systems, where $d$-$q$ transformation theory is not directly applicable. Another advantage associated with the PR controllers and filters is the possibility of implementing selective harmonic compensation without requiring excessive computational resources. Given these advantages and the belief that PR control will find wide-ranging applications in grid-interfaced converters, PR control theory is revised in detail with a number of practical cases that have been implemented previously, described clearly to give a comprehensive reference on PR control and filtering.

1 Introduction

Over the years, power converters of various topologies have found wide application in numerous grid-interfaced systems, including distributed power generation with renewable energy sources (RES) like wind, hydro and solar energy, microgrid power conditioners and active power filters. Most of these systems include a grid-connected voltage-source converter whose functionality is to synchronise and transfer the variable produced power over to the grid. Another feature of the adopted converter is that it is usually pulse-width modulated (PWM) at a high switching frequency and is either current- or voltage-controlled using a selected linear or nonlinear control algorithm. The deciding criterion when selecting the appropriate control scheme usually involves an optimal tradeoff between cost, complexity and waveform quality needed for meeting (for example) new power quality standards for distributed generation in low-voltage grids, like IEEE-1547 in the USA and IEC61727 in Europe at a commercially favourable cost.

With the above-mentioned objective in view while evaluating previously reported control schemes, the general conclusion is that most controllers with precise reference tracking are either overburdened by complex computational requirements or have high parametric sensitivity (sometimes both). On the other hand, simple linear proportional–integral (PI) controllers are prone to known drawbacks, including the presence of steady-state error in the stationary frame and the need to decouple phase dependency in three-phase systems although they are relatively easy to implement [1]. Exploring the simplicity of PI controllers and to improve their overall performance, many variations have been proposed in the literature including the addition of a grid voltage feedforward path, multiple-state feedback and increasing the proportional gain. Generally, these variations can expand the PI controller bandwidth but, unfortunately, they also push the systems towards their stability limits. Another disadvantage associated with the modified PI controllers is the possibility of distorting the line current caused by background harmonics introduced along the feedforward path if the grid voltage is distorted. This distortion can in turn trigger LC resonance especially when a LCL filter is used at the converter AC output for filtering switching current ripple [2, 3].

Alternatively, for three-phase systems, synchronous frame PI control with voltage feedforward can be used, but it usually requires multiple frame transformations, and can be difficult to implement using a low-cost fixed-point digital signal processor (DSP). Overcoming the computational burden and still achieving virtually similar frequency response characteristics as a synchronous frame PI controller, [4, 5], develops the $P+$ resonant (PR) controller for reference tracking in the stationary frame. Interestingly, the same control structure can also be used for the precise control of a single-phase converter [5]. In brief, the basic functionality of the PR controller is to introduce an infinite gain at a selected resonant frequency for eliminating steady-state error at that frequency, and is therefore conceptually similar to an integrator whose infinite DC gain forces the DC steady-state error to zero. The resonant portion of the PR controller can therefore be viewed as a generalised AC integrator (GI), as proven in [6]. With the introduced
flexibility of tuning the resonant frequency, attempts at using multiple PR controllers for selectively compensating low-order harmonics have also been reported in [6, 7] for three-phase active power filters, in [8] for three-phase uninterruptible power supplies (UPS) and in [9] for single-phase photovoltaic (PV) inverters. Based on similar concept, various harmonic reference generators using PR filters have also been proposed for single-phase traction power conditioners [10] and three-phase active power filters [11].

From the viewpoint that electronic power converters will find increasing grid-interfaced applications either as inverters processing DC energy from RES for grid injection or as rectifiers conditioning grid energy for different load usages, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive reference for readers on the integration of PR controllers and filters to grid-connected converters for enhancing their tracking performances. To begin, the paper reviews frequency-domain derivation of the ideal and non-ideal PR controllers and filters, and discusses their similarities as compared to classical PI control. Generic control block diagrams for illustrating current or voltage tracking control are next described before a number of practical cases that the authors have implemented previously are discussed to provide readers with some implementation examples. Throughout the presentation, experimental results are presented for validating the theoretical and implementation concepts discussed.

2 PR control and filtering derivation

The transfer functions of single- and three-phase PR controllers and filters can be derived using internal model control, modified state transformation or frequency-domain approach presented in [12, 13–15] and [4, 16], respectively. In this work, the latter approach is chosen for presentation as it clearly demonstrates similarities between PR controllers and filters in the stationary reference frame and their equivalence in the synchronous frame, as shown in the following Sections.

2.1 Derivation of single-phase PR transfer functions

For single-phase PI control, the popularly used synchronous d-q transformation cannot be applied directly, and the closest equivalence developed to date is to multiply the feedback error $e(t)$, in turn, by sine and cosine functions usually synchronised with the grid voltage using a phase-locked-loop (PLL), as shown in Fig. 1 [10, 17]. This achieves the same effect of transforming the component at the chosen frequency to DC, leaving all other components as AC quantities. Take for example an error signal consisting of the fundamental and 3rd harmonic components, expressed as:

$$ e(t) = E_1 \cos(\omega t + \theta_1) + E_3 \cos(3\omega t + \theta_3) $$

(1)

where $\omega$, $\theta_1$ and $\theta_3$ represent the fundamental angular frequency, fundamental and third harmonic phase shifts respectively. Multiplying this with $\cos(\omega t)$ and $\sin(\omega t)$ gives, respectively:

$$ e_c(t) = \frac{E_1}{2} \{\cos(\theta_1) + \cos(2\omega t + \theta_1)\} + \frac{E_3}{2} \{\cos(2\omega t + \theta_1) + \cos(4\omega t + \theta_3)\} $$

$$ e_s(t) = \frac{E_1}{2} \{\sin(-\theta_1) + \sin(2\omega t + \theta_1)\} + \frac{E_3}{2} \{\sin(-2\omega t - \theta_3) + \sin(4\omega t + \theta_3)\} $$

(2)

It is observed that the fundamental term now appears as DC quantities $\cos(\theta_1)$ and $\sin(-\theta_1)$. The only complication with this equivalent single-phase conversion is that the chosen frequency component not only appears as a DC quantity in the synchronous frame, it also contributes to harmonic terms at a frequency of $2\omega$ (this is unlike three-phase synchronous d-q conversion where the chosen frequency component contributes only towards the DC term). Nevertheless, passing $e_c(t)$ and $e_s(t)$ through integral blocks would still force the fundamental error amplitude $E_1$ to zero, caused by the infinite gain of the integral blocks.

Instead of transforming the feedback error to the equivalent synchronous frame for processing, an alternative approach of transforming the controller $G_{DC}(s)$ from the synchronous to the stationary frame is also possible. This frequency-modulated process can be mathematically expressed as:

$$ G_{AC}(s) = G_{DC}(s - j\omega) + G_{DC}(s + j\omega) $$

(3)

where $G_{AC}(s)$ represents the equivalent stationary frame transfer function [10]. Therefore, for the ideal and non-ideal integrators of $G_{DC}(s) = K_i / s$ and $G_{DC}(s) = K_i / (1 + (s / \omega_i))$ ($K_i$ and $\omega_i \ll \omega$ represent controller gain and cutoff frequency respectively), the derived generalised AC integrators $G_{AC}(s)$ are expressed as:

$$ G_{AC}(s) = \frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = \frac{2K_i s}{s^2 + \omega^2} $$

(4)

$$ G_{AC}(s) = \frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = \frac{2K_i(\omega_i s + \omega_i^2)}{s^2 + 2\omega_i s + (\omega_i^2 + \omega^2)} $$

$$ \approx \frac{2K_i \omega_i s}{s^2 + 2\omega_i s + \omega^2} $$

(5)

Equation (4), when grouped with a proportional term $K_p$, gives the ideal PR controller with an infinite gain at the AC frequency of $\omega$ (see Fig. 2a), and no phase shift and gain at other frequencies. For $K_p$, it is tuned in the same way as for a PI controller, and it basically determines the dynamics of the system in terms of bandwidth, phase and gain margin. To avoid stability problems associated with an infinite gain, (5) can be used instead of (4) to give a non-ideal PR controller and, as illustrated in Fig. 2b, its gain is now finite, but still relatively high for enforcing small steady-state error. Another feature of (5) is that, unlike (4), its bandwidth can be widened by setting $\omega_i$ appropriately, which can be helpful for reducing sensitivity towards (for example) slight frequency variation in a typical utility grid (for (4), $K_i$ can be tuned for shifting the magnitude response vertically, but


this does not give rise to a significant variation in bandwidth. In passing, note that a third control structure of \( G_{dc}(s) = \frac{2K_{ih}\omega}{s^2 + (\omega^2)\omega^2} \), can similarly be used since according to the internal model principle, it introduces a mathematical model that can generate the required sinusoidal reference along the open-loop control path, and therefore can ensure overall zero steady-state error [12]. This third form is, however, not preferred since the absence of a zero at \( s = 0 \) causes its response to be relatively slower [12].

Besides single frequency compensation, selective harmonic compensation can also be achieved by cascading several resonant blocks tuned to resonate at the desired low-order harmonic frequencies to be compensated for. As an example, the transfer functions of an ideal and a non-ideal harmonic compensator (HC) designed to compensate for the 3rd, 5th and 7th harmonics (as they are the most prominent harmonics in a typical current spectrum) are given as:

\[
G_h(s) = \sum_{h=3,5,7} \frac{2K_{ih}s}{s^2 + (\omega h)^2} \quad (6)
\]

\[
G_h(s) = \sum_{h=3,5,7} \frac{2K_{ih}\omega_{h}s}{s^2 + 2\omega_{h}s + (\omega h)^2} \quad (7)
\]

where \( h \) is the harmonic order to be compensated for and \( K_{ih} \) represents the individual resonant gain, which must be tuned relatively high (but within stability limit) for minimising the steady-state error. An interesting feature of the HC is that it does not affect the dynamics of the fundamental PR controller, as it compensates only for frequencies that are very close to the selected resonant frequencies.

Because of this selectiveness, (7) with \( K_{ih} \) set to unity, implying that each resonant block now has a unity resonant peak, can also be used for generating harmonic command reference in an active filter. The generic block representation is given in Fig. 3a, where the distorted load current (or voltage) is sensed and fed to the resonant filter \( G_h(s) \), whose frequency response is shown in Fig. 3b for two different values of \( \omega_{h} \), \( \omega = 2\pi \times 50\text{rad/s} \) and \( h = 3, 5, 7 \). Obviously, Fig. 3b shows the presence of unity (or 0 dB) resonant peaks at only the selected filtering frequencies of 150, 250 and 350 Hz for extracting the selected harmonics as command reference for the inner current loop. Also noted in the Figure is that as, \( \omega_{h} \) gets smaller, \( G_h(s) \) becomes more selective (narrower resonant peaks). However, using a smaller \( \omega_{h} \) will make the filter more sensitive to frequency variations, lead to a slower transient response and make the filter implementation on a low-cost 16-bit DSP more difficult owing to coefficient quantisation and round-off errors. In practice, \( \omega_{h} \) values of 5–15 rad/s have been found to provide a good compromise [10].

### 2.2 Derivation of three-phase PR transfer functions

For three-phase systems, elimination of steady-state tracking error is usually performed by first transforming the feedback variable to the synchronous \( d-q \) reference frame before applying PI control. Using this approach, double computational effort must be devoted under unbalanced conditions, during which transformations to both the positive- and negative-sequence reference frames are
required (see Fig. 4). An alternative simpler method of implementation is therefore desired and can be derived by inverse transformation of the synchronous controller back to the stationary α-β frame $G_{dq}(s) \rightarrow G_{ab}(s)$. The inverse transformation can be performed by using the following 2 × 2 matrix:

$$G_{ab}(s) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} G_{d1} + G_{d2} & jG_{d1} - jG_{d2} \\ -jG_{d1} + jG_{d2} & G_{d1} + G_{d2} \end{bmatrix}$$

Given that $G_{d1}(s) = K_i/s$ and $G_{d2}(s) = K_i/(1 + s/\omega_i)$, the equivalent controllers in the stationary frame for compensating for positive-sequence feedback error are therefore expressed as:

$$G_{ab}^+(s) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2K_is & 2K_i\omega \\ \frac{2K_i\omega}{s^2 + \omega^2} & \frac{2K_is}{s^2 + \omega^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

(9)

Similarly, for compensating for negative sequence feedback error, the required transfer functions are expressed as:

$$G_{ab}^-(s) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} & 2K_i\omega_o \\ \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} & \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

(10)

Comparing (9) and (10) with (11) and (12), it is noted that the diagonal terms of $G_{ab}^+(s)$ and $G_{ab}^-(s)$ are identical, but their non-diagonal terms are opposite in polarity. This inversion of polarity can be viewed as equivalent to the reversal of rotating direction between the positive- and negative-sequence synchronous frames.

Combining the above equations, the resulting controllers for compensating for both positive- and negative-sequence feedback errors are expressed as:

$$G_{ab}(s) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2K_is & 2K_i\omega \\ \frac{2K_i\omega}{s^2 + \omega^2} & \frac{2K_is}{s^2 + \omega^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

(13)

$$G_{ab}(s) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} & 2K_i\omega_o \\ \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} & \frac{2K_i\omega_o}{s^2 + 2\omega_o s + \omega^2} \end{bmatrix}$$

(14)

Bode plots representing (13) and (14) are shown in Fig. 5, where their error-eliminating ability is clearly reflected by the presence of two resonant peaks at the positive frequency $\omega$ and negative frequency $-\omega$. Note that, if (9) or (10) ((11) or (12)) is used instead, only the resonant peak at $\omega$ ($-\omega$) is present since those equations represent PI control only in the positive-sequence (negative-sequence) synchronous frame. Another feature of (13) and (14) is that they have no cross-coupling non-diagonal terms, implying that each of the $x$ and $\beta$ stationary axes can be treated as a single-phase system. Therefore, the theoretical knowledge described earlier for single-phase PR control is equally applicable to the three-phase functions expressed in (13) and (14).

Fig. 4 Three-phase equivalent representations of PR and synchronous PI controllers considering both positive- and negative-sequence components

Fig. 5 Positive- and negative-sequence Bode diagrams of PR controller
3 Implementation of resonant controllers

The resonant transfer functions in (4) and (5) (similarly in (13) and (14)) can be implemented using analogue integrated circuits (IC) or a digital signal processor (DSP), with the latter being more popular. Because of this, two methods of digitising the controllers are presented in detail after a general description of the analogue approach is given.

3.1 Analogue implementation

The rational function in (4) can be rewritten as [9]:

\[
\frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = \frac{2K_y s}{s^2 + \omega^2} \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
Y(s) = \frac{1}{s} \left[ 2K_y E(s) - V_2(s) \right] \\
V_1(s) = \omega^2 Y(s) \\
V_2(s) = \frac{1}{s} \omega^2 Y(s)
\end{array} \right.
\]  

(15)

Similarly, the function in (5) can be rewritten as:

\[
\frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = \frac{2K_y \omega_0 s}{s^2 + 2\omega_0 s + \omega^2} \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
Y(s) = \frac{1}{s} \left[ 2K_y \omega_0 E(s) - V_1(s) - V_2(s) \right] \\
V_1(s) = 2\omega_0 Y(s) \\
V_2(s) = \frac{1}{s} \omega^2 Y(s)
\end{array} \right.
\]  

(16)

Equations (15) and (16) can both be represented by the control block representation shown in Fig. 6, where the upper feedback path is removed for representing (15). From this figure, it can be deduced that the resonant function can be physically implemented using op-amp integrators and inverting/non-inverting gain amplifiers. Note also that, while implementing (15), parasitic resistance and other second-order imperfections would cause it to degenerate into (16), but of course its bandwidth can only be tuned if additional components are added for implementing the upper feedback path.

3.2 Shift-operator digital implementation

The most commonly used digitisation technique is the pre-warped bilinear (Tustin) transform [18], given by:

\[
s = \frac{\omega_1}{\tan(\omega_1 T/2)} \frac{z - 1}{z + 1} = K_T \frac{z - 1}{z + 1}
\]  

(17)

where \( \omega_1 \) is the pre-warped frequency, \( T \) is the sampling period and \( z \) is the forward shift operator. Equation (17) can then be substituted into (5) (4) is not considered here owing to possible stability problems associated with its infinite resonant gain [4, 5]) for obtaining the \( z \)-domain discrete transfer function given in (18), from which the difference equation needed for DSP implementation is derived and expressed in (19) (where \( n \) represents the point of sampling):

\[
\begin{align*}
Y(z) &= a_1 z^{-1} - a_2 z^{-2} \\
E(z) &= b_0 - b_1 z^{-1} + b_2 z^{-2} \\
a_1 &= a_2 = 2K_y K_T \omega_0 \\
b_0 &= K_T^2 + 2K_T \omega_0 + \omega^2 \\
b_1 &= 2K_T^2 - 2\omega^2 \\
b_2 &= \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
K_T^2 + 2K_T \omega_0 + \omega^2 \\
K_T^2 + 2K_T \omega_0 + (h\omega)^2 & \text{for } h = 3, 5, 7
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]  

(18)

\[
y(n) = \frac{1}{b_0} \left[ a_1 e(n - 1) - e(n - 2) + b_1 y(n - 1) - b_2 y(n - 2) \right]
\]  

(19)

Equations (18) and (19) can similarly be used for implementing the HC compensator after the desired harmonic order \( h \) is substituted. The resulting difference equation can conveniently be programmed into a floating-point DSP, but when a fixed-point DSP is used instead, coefficients of (19) have to be normalised by multiplying them with the maximum integer value of the chosen word length [10, 19]. This multiplication is needed for minimising the extent of coefficient quantisation error, and the choice of word length is solely dictated by the size of error that can be tolerated (large coefficient quantisation error should be avoided since it can change the frequency characteristics of a resonant peak, and even render it ‘open-loop’ unstable). Unfortunately, no standard method of choosing this word length is available and, as discussed in [10, 19], the appropriate word length is usually determined experimentally with the aim of achieving the best tradeoff between execution speed and accuracy.

3.3 \( \delta \)-operator digital implementation

Generally, when the shift-operator resonant implementation given in (18) and (19) is programmed into a fixed-point DSP, some performance degradations can usually be observed and are caused mainly by round-off errors associated with the use of integer variables on the fixed-point DSP (so-called finite word length effect). 16-bit fixed-point implementation always has finite word length effects, but the problem is particularly pronounced at a fast sampling rate and for sharply tuned filters such as the resonant function used for PR control. Specifically, the roundoff errors cause the voltage or current wave shape to change slightly from cycle to cycle, resulting in significant fluctuations in its RMS value, as proven in [10].

To improve the resonant precision, the use of delta operator \( \delta \) in place of the conventional shift operator has been investigated. The delta operator has recently gained importance in fast digital control owing to its superior finite word length performance [19–22], and it can be defined in terms of the shift operator \( z \) as:

\[
\delta^{-1} = \frac{\Delta z^{-1}}{1 - z^{-1}}
\]  

(20)

Essentially, delta-operator resonant implementation involves converting a second-order section in \( z \) into a
corresponding second-order Section in $\delta$, as follows:

$$
H(z) = \frac{b_0 + b_1 z^{-1} + b_2 z^{-2}}{1 + a_1 z^{-1} + a_2 z^{-2}}
$$

$$
\Rightarrow H(\delta) = \frac{\beta_0 + \beta_1 \delta^{-1} + \beta_2 \delta^{-2}}{1 + \alpha_1 \delta^{-1} + \alpha_2 \delta^{-2}}
$$

where $\beta_0 = b_0$, $\beta_1 = (2b_0 + b_1)/\Delta$, $\beta_2 = (b_0 + b_1 + b_2)/\Delta^2$, $\alpha_0 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = (2 + a_1)/\Delta$, $\alpha_2 = (1 + a_1 + a_2)/\Delta^2$, and $\Delta$ is a positive constant less than unity, which is carefully chosen to select the appropriate ranges for the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ coefficients, and to minimise other internal variable truncation noise [22]. Equation (21) is then implemented using the transposed direct form II (DFIIt) structure shown in Fig. 7. The DFIIt structure is chosen out of the many filter structures available because it has the best roundoff noise performance for delta-operator-based filters [22]. From Fig. 7, the difference equations to be coded for the DSP can be written, in processing order, as:

$$
w_3(n) = \Delta w_2(n - 1) + w_4(n - 1)
$$

$$
w_2(n) = \Delta w_1(n - 1) + w_2(n - 1)
$$

$$
y(n) = \beta_0 x(n) + w_4(n)
$$

$$
w_3(n) = \beta_1 x(n) - x_1 y(n) + w_2(n)
$$

$$
w_5(n) = \beta_2 x(n) - x_2 y(n)
$$

Note that the first two equations in (22) for $w_4(n)$ and $w_2(n)$ are obtained from the definition of the delta operator given in (20). In addition, similar to (19), the coefficients in (22) will initially be floating-point numbers and must be normalised by multiplying them with the maximum integer value of the chosen word length for faster and accurate execution in a fixed-point DSP. This required word length and the constant $\Delta$ together represent two degrees of design freedom that can be used for optimising the round-off performance against coefficient quantisation and potential overflows, often through experimental testing.

4 Example cases using PR controllers or filters

Given the advantages of PR controllers and filters, a number of applications have since been proposed in the literature with most focusing on the control of converters interfaced directly to the utility grid. In this Section, two example cases are presented for demonstrating the effectiveness of using PR controllers in a single-phase PV converter [9], and a three-phase microgrid power quality compensator [14].

4.1 Single-phase PV grid-connected inverter

Single-phase grid inverters are commonly used in applications like residential RES (typically PV or fuel cell systems) and UPS. Figure 8 shows a typical RES where the DC-link voltage, active $P$ and reactive $Q$ power are controlled in the outer control loops (labelled as voltage controller and reference generator in the Figure). The reference current outputs of the outer loops ($i_{d}^{*}$ and $i_{q}^{*}$) are next tracked by an inner current loop whose output is eventually fed to a PWM modulator for switching the inverter.

Typically, the inner current loop is implemented using a stationary PI current controller with voltage feedforward, as shown in Fig. 9a. Using PI control, however, leads to steady-state current error (both in phase and magnitude) when tracking sinusoidal input, and hence a poor harmonic compensation performance is expected [9]. Synchronous PI control described in Section 2.1 can mitigate the tracking error, but is generally difficult to apply. Instead, the equivalent stationary PR controller can be used as the inner current controller, as shown in Fig. 9b. Compared to a stationary PI controller, the only computational requirement imposed by the PR controller is an extra integrator for implementing a second-order system, but with a modern low-cost 16-bit fixed-point DSP, this increase in computation can generally be ignored [9]. Besides that, using a PR controller would allow the removal of the grid voltage feedforward path, as proven in [9], and the simple cascading of a HC compensator for eliminating selected low-order harmonics.
The designed control scheme in Fig. 9b has been tested using an experimental 3 kW PV full-bridge inverter with an output LCL filter, as shown in Fig. 10. The inverter is powered from a regulated DC power supply (set to $U_{dc} = 350$ V) for simulating a PV string, and is interfaced to the utility grid with a voltage of $U_g = 230$ V RMS and a background THD of 1.46%. The resulting system is controlled digitally using a 16-bit fixed-point TMS320F24xx DSP platform with an execution time of 40 $\mu$s (including HC compensation) and the controller gains set as $K_p = 2$, $K_i = 300$ and $K_{ih} = 300$ for $h = 3$, 5 and 7. With these settings, the grid current and voltage at 50% load using PR and PR+HC controllers are shown in Figs. 11 and 12 respectively. As seen in Fig. 11, there is no phase error noted between the grid current and voltage, confirming the proper functioning of the PR controller. The harmonic distortion in Fig. 11 can be further reduced by cascading an HC compensator, as demonstrated by the smoother current waveform in Fig. 12.

The improved performance achieved here with a single-phase inverter can obviously be extended to a three-phase RES (e.g. small wind or water turbines and high-power PV plant) since as explained in Section 2.2, three-phase control in the stationary $\alpha$–$\beta$ frame can be viewed as two independent control paths along the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ axes, respectively. For illustration, Fig. 13b shows the inner current control scheme of a three-phase RES inverter, where a second PR controller is added, as compared to that in Fig. 9b. Also shown in Fig. 13a is the conventional synchronous PI method of implementation, where multiple frame transformations and control decoupling are needed. These complications are obviously removed from Fig. 13b when PR controllers are used instead.

### 4.2 Three-phase microgrid power quality compensator

In Section 4.1, the precise current tracking and selective harmonic compensation functionalities of the PR controllers in a single-phase inverter have been demonstrated. This Section now presents a second example on a microgrid power quality compensator for demonstrating that the PR controllers can equally be used in a voltage control loop and can simultaneously compensate for both positive- and negative-sequence components.

In general, microgrids can be viewed as ‘local area networks’ where clusters of micro-generators are installed for distributed power generation. For interfacing these microsystems to the utility grid, while simultaneously refining the waveform quality at the point of coupling (PCC), a microgrid power quality compensator, consisting of a shunt and a series inverter (labelled as inverters A and B, respectively), can be used [14], as shown in Fig. 14. In principle, shunt inverter A is controlled to maintain a balanced set of three-phase voltages in the microgrid under all grid and load operating conditions. Besides voltage regulation, inverter A is also tasked to perform other functions such as the proper dispatch of active and reactive power, and the synchronisation of the micro- and utility grids during the transition from islanding to grid-connected mode [14], but these are not described here since the focus of this paper is mainly on the application of PR controllers for voltage or current tracking. On the other hand, series inverter B is controlled to inject appropriate voltage components along the distribution feeder for blocking large
negative-sequence currents that might flow along the low-impedance line if the PCC voltages are unbalanced.

With the assigned control tasks in view, Fig. 15 shows the control block representation of shunt inverter A, where the measured inverter voltage phasor $V_{ab}(s)$ is forced to track its reference $V_{ab}^*(s)$ precisely using the PR control block $G_{ab}(s)$. The generated output is then fed to an inner proportional current regulator for providing a faster dynamic response. (In passing, it is commented that the same control structure can be used for controlling a UPS and a dynamic voltage restorer (DVR), as presented in [23] and [24], respectively.) Similarly, the control block diagram

Fig. 13  Three-phase grid inverter current control
a Using Synchronous PI controller
b Using PR controllers

Fig. 14  Schematic of microgrid interfaced to utility grid using power quality compensator
of series inverter B is shown in Fig. 16, where the line current phasor $I_{\text{Line}}(s)$ is measured and used for generating the required negative-sequence voltage command $V_{C3}^{\text{ab}}(s)$ needed for forcing the negative-sequence line current to zero. This command reference is then closely tracked by the measured inverter voltage phasor $V_{\text{C3}}^{\text{ab}}(s)$, again using a PR control block $G_{\text{ab}}(s)$. Note that an inner current loop for enhancing the dynamic response of inverter B is deemed unnecessary since the line current response is primarily limited by the feeder line impedance.

For verifying the tracking performance of the PR controllers in the inverter control schemes, a hardware prototype has been built in the laboratory using the system parameters listed in Table 1. For the experimental system, a programmable AC source is used to represent the utility grid and is connected to an emulated microgrid. The microgrid consists of shunt inverter A, series inverter B with an injection transformer and a connected RL load. Both inverters are controlled using a single dSPACE DS1103 processor card with the slave TMS320F240 processor on the card configured to perform carrier-based PWM.

Under grid-connected mode of operation, Figs. 17a and b show the utility voltages and microgrid load voltages, respectively, where the utility voltages become unbalanced with 0.1 p.u. negative-sequence and 0.1 p.u. zero-sequence voltage components added at $t = 3.8$ s. Despite this unbalance in utility voltages, the load voltages in the microgrid are kept balanced by controlling shunt inverter A. Similarly, by controlling series inverter B, the currents flowing between the microgrid and utility grid can be balanced. This is demonstrated in Fig. 18, where the captured line current waveforms are converted to the negative-sequence synchronous frame (post-processing in Matlab) for a better illustration of how the DC negative-sequence current components vary. As anticipated, the negative-sequence $d$-$q$ components gradually decrease to zero, implying the proper functioning of series inverter B.

### Table 1: Parameters of implemented microgrid power compensator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal line-to-line grid voltage</td>
<td>120 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>50 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC supply voltage</td>
<td>250 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching frequency for both inverters</td>
<td>10 kHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series inverter filter capacitance</td>
<td>10 µF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series inverter filter inductance</td>
<td>3.9 mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series transformer turns ratio</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunt inverter filter capacitance</td>
<td>30 µF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shunt inverter filter inductance</td>
<td>5 mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line resistance $R_{\text{Line}}$</td>
<td>3 Ω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line inductance $L_{\text{Line}}$</td>
<td>10 mH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid dispatch power</td>
<td>300 W, 160 var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive load in the microgrid</td>
<td>120 W, 90 var</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Other recent areas of development

Besides being used as PR controllers and filters, the frequency-domain resonant concept has also been used in a number of related control developments. These developments are summarised herein to give an insight into some perspective applications of the resonant concept.

5.1 Highpass equivalent stationary frame filter

In a three-phase active power filter, it is a common practice to transform the measured load current to the (positive-sequence) synchronous reference frame before extracting the harmonic components using a highpass filter [11, 25]. The extracted harmonics are then used as command reference for the active filter inner current loop, as shown in Fig. 19. Using a similar concept as in Section 2.2, the highpass filter block, expressed as $G_{\text{dq}}(s) = s/(s + \omega_c)$, can
be inverse-transformed to the stationary $x$–$\beta$ frame, and is expressed as [11]:

$$G_{2p}(s) = \begin{bmatrix}
  \frac{s^2 + \omega_0 s + \alpha^2}{s^2 + 2\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2 + \alpha^2} & -\omega_0 \frac{\omega_0}{s^2 + 2\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2 + \alpha^2} \\
  \frac{\omega_0}{s^2 + 2\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2 + \alpha^2} & \frac{s^2 + \omega_0 s + \alpha^2}{s^2 + 2\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2 + \alpha^2}
\end{bmatrix}$$

Since (23) is directly derived from the highpass filter in the positive-sequence synchronous frame, it is expected to filter out all positive- and negative-sequence harmonics from the distorted load current for compensation. The source current supplied by the grid would therefore consist only of a positive-sequence fundamental component assuming that the inner current loop of the active filter is implemented with high tracking precision.

### 5.2 Hybrid repetitive control

In [26–30], two alternative repetitive control schemes are presented, whose control block representations are shown in Figs. 20a and b. Empirically, the control schemes can be viewed as the cascaded connection of a delayed feedback path and a feedforward path that resemble classical repetitive [31, 32] and Posicast control [33–35], respectively. With the cascading of these two classical control theories, it is interesting that it is shown in [26–28] that the control scheme in Fig. 20a can be expressed as (24), while the
scheme in Fig. 20b can be expressed as (25):  
\[
\frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = 1 + e^{-sT_d} = \frac{2}{T_d} \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2s}{k \pi + (k \omega_0)} \right)
\]  
(24)  

\[
\frac{Y(s)}{E(s)} = 1 + e^{-sT_d/2} = \frac{4}{T_d} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2s}{k \pi + (2k - 1) \omega_0} \right)
\]  
(25)  

Obviously, (24) and (25) feature multiple harmonic resonant compensators for eliminating all harmonics in (24) and odd harmonics in (25). This extent of harmonic compensation would be computationally intensive if multiple resonant compensators in (4) or (5) are used, but with the schemes presented in Fig. 20, only a single time delay block is needed. These hybrid repetitive schemes are therefore attractive alternatives with promising application in grid converters.

Besides the schemes described above, another hybrid repetitive scheme with a degree of control freedom for selecting the desired harmonics to be compensated for is proposed in [36]. The proposed controller is recommended for discrete-time implementation using a DSP, and is shown schematically in Fig. 21. Compared with a traditional positive feedback repetitive controller, the controller described in [36] has an additional 'discrete-Fourier-transform (DFT) filter block ' \(F_{DFT}(z)\) inserted along the forward path, which is mathematically expressed as:

\[
F_{DFT}(z) = \sum_{h \in N_h} F_{ih}(z) = \sum_{h \in N_h} \left( \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} (i + Nh) \right) \right) z^{-i}
\]  
\[
\approx \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{h \in N_h} \cos \left( \frac{2\pi}{N} (i + Nh) \right) \right) z^{-i} = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \theta_i z^{-i}
\]  
(26)

where \(i, N, h\) and \(N_h\) represent the \(i\)th sample point, number of samples within a fundamental period, harmonic order and set of harmonics selected for compensation respectively. Equation (26) also includes an additional term \(N_h\) for introducing a defined number of leading steps (equivalent to a leading phase shift), which, when used with the feedback \(z^{N_h}\) block, stabilises the system against phase delays, rounding and quantisation errors introduced by the digital sampling process.

For showing that the DFT scheme approximates the HC compensator in (6), the transfer functions of both schemes should be re-expressed as (assuming \(N_i = 0\) for the DFT scheme):

\[
G_{DFT}(z) = \frac{Y(z)}{E(z)} = K_F \sum_{h \in N_h} F_{ih}(z)
\]  
(27)

\[
F_{ih}(z) = \frac{2\zeta_0 h \omega_0}{s^2 + 2\zeta_0 h \omega_0 + (\omega_0)^2} ; \quad K_{HC} = \frac{K_F}{\zeta_0 h \omega_0}
\]  
(28)

where \(K_F\) and \(K_{HC}\) are gain constants, and \(\zeta_0\) is the arbitrary damping factor of bandpass filter \(F_{ih}(z)\) (note that the approximation in (28) is always valid when multiple (very selective) bandpass filters are cascaded together [36]). Comparing (27) and (28), and noting that both \(F_{DFT}(z)\) and \(F_{ih}(z)\) have bandpass characteristics, the DFT repetitive scheme reported in [36] is virtually equivalent to the resonant HC compensator. However, observing (26), an identified feature of the DFT scheme is that its computational complexity does not worsen as the number of harmonics to be compensated for increases. Instead, the increase in harmonic number can simply be adapted by changing coefficient \(\theta_i\) in (26). The DFT scheme is therefore a recommended choice for digital implementation, especially when a fixed-point DSP is used.

### 5.3 Synchronous frame selective harmonic compensation

In [37], a synchronous frame HC scheme is proposed for three-phase systems, where multiple resonant compensators are again used for eliminating selected harmonics. The sole difference here is that compensation is performed in the positive-sequence synchronous frame rotated at the fundamental frequency, where all \((6k \pm 1)\) harmonics in the stationary frame are transformed to \(\pm 6k \omega_0\) positive- and negative-sequence components in the rotating frame. The number of resonant compensators needed in the synchronous frame is therefore one-half those in its stationary frame counterpart since, as noted in Section 2.2, the resonant functions in (13) and (14) can simultaneously compensate for opposite rotating sequence components. This method of implementation is thus highly suitable for use when the number of harmonics to be compensated for is high. A further development of the idea of using a harmonic controller in a synchronous frame has been proposed in [38], where a frame rotating at a generic speed is considered, and the advantages and limits of the approach are discussed.

### 5.4 Resonant phase-locked-loop

In [37], the application of a resonant filter in a standard PLL is also explored. As shown in Fig. 22a, the measured grid voltage \(V_g\) is assumed to be distorted and an orthogonal system generation block is used to extract the fundamental voltages \(V_{s0}\) and \(V_{b0}\). The orthogonal generation block consists of a resonant filter whose feedforward path produces an undistorted sinusoidal signal \(V_{s0}\), while its inner feedback path produces a second sinusoidal signal \(V_{b0}\) phase-shifted by 90° (see Fig. 22b). The filtered voltages \(V_{s0}\) and \(V_{b0}\) are then fed to a standard PLL, whose input block first converts \(V_{s0}\) and \(V_{b0}\) to the synchronous \(d-q\) frame. In the synchronous frame, the \(d\)-axis component \(V_{d0}\) is forced to zero by a PI controller, whose output is added to a nominal frequency value \(\nu_{ref}\) to give the commanded angular frequency of \(\omega^*\). \(\omega^*\) is next integrated to give an angle \(\theta\) synchronised with the utility grid (this angle is used in [37] for implementing the synchronous frame...
compensator presented in Section 5.3). Besides $\hat{\theta}$, the grid frequency and voltage amplitude can also be estimated by performing simple mathematical manipulations, which are also shown in Fig. 22a.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, single- and three-phase PR control schemes have been reviewed and their implementation options and suitability for current/voltage control of grid-interfaced converters evaluated. Advantages of the PR controllers include the possibility of tuning their individual resonant peaks to the grid frequency for precise fundamental reference tracking and to some low-order harmonic frequencies for selective harmonic compensation, and the possibility of implementing harmonic reference generator in the stationary frame needed for active filters. Implementation wise, the PR technique requires lesser computational overhead and does not require an explicit grid voltage feedforward control path, while still achieving the same performance as a synchronous PI controller. For three-phase systems, the PR technique also has the unique feature of compensating for both positive- and negative-sequence components simultaneously, unlike synchronous PI where separate frame transformations are needed. Given these advantages, it is in the view of the authors that PR controllers can certainly replace their PI counterparts. This includes the possibility of implementing harmonic reference generator in the stationary frame needed for active filters evaluated. Advantages of the PR controllers include the possibility of tuning their individual resonant peaks to the grid frequency for precise fundamental reference tracking and to some low-order harmonic frequencies for selective harmonic compensation, and the possibility of implementing harmonic reference generator in the stationary frame needed for active filters. Implementation wise, the PR technique requires lesser computational overhead and does not require an explicit grid voltage feedforward control path, while still achieving the same performance as a synchronous PI controller. For three-phase systems, the PR technique also has the unique feature of compensating for both positive- and negative-sequence components simultaneously, unlike synchronous PI where separate frame transformations are needed. Given these advantages, it is in the view of the authors that PR controllers can certainly replace their PI counterparts.
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