

INTELLIGENT POWER DISTRIBUTION NETWORK FOR AUTOMATED ENERGY MANAGEMENT

Sudhanya Kumar Upadhyay¹, Asst. Prof. Raghunandan Singh Baghel²

Research Scholar, Department of Electrical Engineering, Samrat Vikramaditya

Vishwavidyalaya, Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh¹

Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical Engineering, Samrat Vikramaditya

Vishwavidyalaya, Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh²

Email: sudhanya0015@gmail.com¹, raghunandan.baghel@gmail.com²

ABSTRACT

Emerging technologies and prospects of distribution systems during the last decades, the global energy demand is exponentially increasing, supplemented with the share of renewable energy sources (RESs) and smart grid technologies, which have shifted from a traditional centralized generation to more simplified, decentralized structures. Intelligent Automated Power Distribution Systems (IAPDS) is an integration of computational intelligence, real-time communication networks, and the adaptive control strategy that allows the Grid to operate in a self-healing, fault-tolerant and energy efficient manner. This review paper provides a systematic meta-analysis of previous works related to the design, implementation and performance evaluation of IAPDS (2005–2024). This paper addresses these issues by systematically reviewing and synthesizing the main enabling technologies driving modern intelligent distribution systems from published peer-reviewed publications (N = 200+), including: AI, ML, IoT, SCADA systems, and AMI. The review then goes on to critique existing techniques implemented in load forecasting, fault identification, demand-side management, and automated switching respectively, while stress-testing unresolved research barriers on cybersecurity threats, scalability problems, and interoperability challenges. The results reveal that the IAPDS architectures which merge the multi-agent systems with the deep reinforcement learning technology achieve the best performance in the aspects of fault recovery automatically and on-load balancing in real-time. Finally, this paper ends with a futures perspective on emerging avenues for research and the transformative role of IAPDS in realizing sustainable, resilient and carbon-neutral power systems.

Keywords: *Intelligent power distribution¹; automated grid control²; smart grid³; SCADA systems⁴; load forecasting⁵.*

1. Introduction

The modern electric power grid sits at the intersection of technology innovation and increasing demand from society. Based on estimations for global electricity consumption in 2050 (over 50% more than current levels), time-worn centralized distribution architectures, which embody passive network elements and poor

observability, reach their limits relative to the reliability, efficiency, and sustainability targets set out by modern energy policies. In response to these challenges, the notion of Intelligent Automated Power Distribution System (IAPDS) arises as a potential disruptive solution, consisting of a cyber-physical infrastructure organized according to a distributed structure, able to make autonomous decisions, self-reconfigure following exposing contingencies, widely adopt distributed energy resources (DERs). The primary motivation behind this review is the fact that existing research on this topic remain disjointed in different communities such as control engineering, computer science, and power systems engineering (see [4]), each discipline developing its concepts and innovations rather independently, making it difficult to gain the overall perspective needed for scalable IAPDS technology deployment.

1.1 Background and Motivation

What began as the direct current (DC) networks of Thomas Edison in the 1880s evolved through the alternating current (AC) transmission paradigm of Nikola Tesla, into the massive interconnected grids of the twentieth century? For most of this evolution, distribution systems operated under a fundamentally passive philosophy power was a one-way flow out of generating stations, along transmission lines, and into end consumers, constantly monitored but only loosely, with high-cost manual intervention as the dominant fault-response strategy. In an age of highly predictable and centralized generation known to be largely inelastic, this operational paradigm was acceptable. Nonetheless, the increasing penetration of distributed photovoltaic (PV) installations, electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure, and battery energy storage systems (BESS) has inspired bidirectional power flows and stochastic generation profiles that inherently violate passive distribution management. Such volatility in voltage profiles, frequency stability, and power quality requires a situation awareness and response control level that can only be realized through automatically/intelligent systems. In addition, the economic imperatives, such as monetizing demand flexibility with real-time pricing and ancillary service markets, has further underscored the need for automation and data-based decision making at the distribution network level.

1.2 Scope and Objectives of the Review

This review is deliberately scoped to cover the entire technological stack encompassing IAPDS implementation, from physical sensing and measurement infrastructure through communication protocols and data analytics layers to high level control and optimization algorithms. It has three main objectives: Objective (1) to conduct a systematic review of the main methods of IAPDS design described in the literature from 2005 to 2024. Second, to consolidate quantitative performance metrics such as reliability indices (the System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI) and the System Average Interruption Frequency Index (SAIFI)), percentage of reduction of energy loss and fault clearance time across heterogeneous study contexts. Third, for critically examining the methodological quality (how bias, inconsistency and limited generalizability are handled) of existing contributions. Fourth, to define research gaps and provide a systematic agenda for research.

The review covers journal articles, conference proceedings, technical reports, and standard documentation from IEEE Xplore, Elsevier ScienceDirect, Springer and the ACM Digital Library, with inclusion criteria of empirical validation, peer review, and a focus on distribution-level automation.

1.3 Organization of the Paper

The rest of this paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 is a comprehensive survey of previous work across the main thematic areas of IAPDS research, including sensing and metering infrastructure, communication architectures, fault management, load forecasting, optimization, and cybersecurity. Method: The third section will discuss the selected methodological framework used for the meta-analysis, including the literature search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, data extraction protocol, and synthesis method. Section 4 critically analyzes the strengths and limitations of the works surveyed, highlighting prevalent methodological weaknesses and contextual limitations. Section 5 analyzes the main findings and implications of these results for the research, industry practice, and policy. Finally, section 6 concludes the review and indicates paths for future work. At the end of the paper, we present a single list of thirty references in IEEE format.

2. Survey of Past Work

Intelligent automatic power distribution is a domain with more than two decades of intense research activity on the topic has resulted in a substantial body of knowledge. This literature is categorized in this following survey to six main thematic streams: (i) sensing, metering, and data acquisition infrastructure (ii) communication architectures and protocols (iii) fault detection, isolation and service restoration (FDIR) (iv) load forecasting and demand-side management (v) optimization algorithms and control strategies and (vi) cybersecurity and resilience. The sensing and measurement infrastructure is built on top of any IAPDS. Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) has been widely researched since the mid-2000s, initiated by early work of Depuru[1] establishing a taxonomy of smart metering technologies and appropriate solutions for two-way communication. Distribution level deployment of Phasor Measurement Units (PMUs) [20] the authors considered the deployment of PMUs on distribution network feeders, and finding optimal number case and placement of PMUs. competing interests[1], and then generalized by Kezunovic [2]. Normal microsecond resolution state estimation that changed the rate at which we can monitor the grid. More recently, Faheem et al. described the convergence of IoT sensing platforms with edge computing architectures. [4], which showed they can reduce data latency in a pilot smart grid implementation by 73% from cloud visual processing at the centre to distributed-edge nodes. Widespread availability of low-cost current and voltage sensors and SCADA systems that are to a degree augmented by real-time data historians together have provided the observation substrate that intelligent automation relies upon.

The communication infrastructure's design is widely debated in research, and such infrastructure serves as the nervous system of IAPDS. Most early implementations made use of some combination of power line

communication (PLC) and dedicated radio frequency (RF) networks [33]. The work of [5] is a very comprehensive study, where the authors compare the alternative communication technologies WiMax, ZigBee and cellular networks against the requirements of distribution automation. Fourth-generation (4G) and fifth-generation (5G) cellular networks now offer utility operators unprecedented choices for mobilizing communication capabilities. Agiwal et al. While [6] has shown the ultra-low latency features of 5G (sub-millisecond round trip times in laboratory settings) are sufficient to implement just-in-time real-time closed-loop control of distribution switchgear, practical deployments have measured higher latencies along the backhaul path, an order of magnitude higher. There has been significant work in analyzing the extension of the IEC 61850 standard, which has established itself as the leading communication protocol for the substation automation, to the distribution domain [7], [8] where Apostolov has recently identified interoperability issues arising from vendor-specific implementation variations. Narayanan et al. reported their hearing sensor networks (WSNs) deployments for distribution monitoring. [9], who presented robust mesh connectivity along a semi-urban Indian distribution network feeder over a span of 15 km.

The most operationally critical function of an IAPDS consists largely of fault detection, isolation, and service restoration. That classic method which relies on protective relay coordination and manual switching has gradually been replaced since the late 1990s by automated algorithms that operate within seconds to isolate faults and restore supply to healthy sections of the network. Sperandio et al. Chambers et al. [10] developed a multi-agent system (MAS) FDIR architecture resulting in fault isolation in less than 200 ms in simulation on a medium-voltage network, versus the 15–45 minutes average required for manual restoration. Many researchers have already used artificial intelligence to classify faults; a report from Sharaf and El-Gammal [11] introduced an SVM-based method that obtained 98.2% accuracy of fault type classification for a 33-bus test system. In recent years, deep learning architectures, such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and long short-term memory (LSTM) networks, have been used for transient fault detection with contributions from Tian et al. [12] achieving 99.1% detection accuracy with cycle times faster than real-time in a hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) simulation testbed. Lotfifard et al. addressed the integration of FDIR with network reconfiguration algorithms, where post-fault switching sequences are optimized for their sequential actions while minimizing load shedding, considering operational constraint limitations. [13] based on a variant of particle swarm optimization (PSO).

Load forecasting and demand-side management is one of the key enablers of proactive grid optimization. STLF simply means that it predicts the load for the next few hours or days ahead and have evolved from regression based methods towards machine learning and deep learning paradigms. The pitfalls of the then popular neural network approach, such as overfitting and failure to generalize across climatic zones [14]. Later works using ensemble methods random forests, gradient boosting showed that these methods generalized better than those of Zheng et al. [15] MAPE < 1.5 % on residential feeder-level forecasting. Zhou et al. introduced multi-step ahead forecasting framework with the use of transformer based architecture and attention mechanism achieving good accuracy. [16] a dataset of 370 smart meter time series. This paper has been supported by an introduction to the demand response (DR) programs including both incentive-based and price-based mechanisms which has been

widely used (Aalami et al. [17] concluding that, in a residential test bed, an application of time-of-use prices and automated direct load control reduced peak demand by 18.7%. Additionally, through their economic models for EV grid services, points Kempton and Tomić [18] demonstrated how V2G technology adds a layer of complexity- and opportunity- to demand-side management.

Optimization algorithms and control strategies form the computation kernel of IAPDS. The methods used for addressing distribution network reconfiguration and Volt-VAR optimization (VVO) are mostly linear methods like linear programming, mixed-integer linear programming, (MILP) As mentioned in [19] and extended in [20] by Baran and Wu, these methods are benchmarks. Metaheuristic algorithms, such as genetic algorithms (GA), PSO and, differential evolution were capable of scalability for large-scale networks, however, there was still no convergence guarantees. Deep QNETWORKS and Proximal Policy Optimization are some of reinforcement learning (RL) methods being applied for distribution control has become an important area of research. This study [21] showed that 12% distribution loss reduction and 34% voltage violation frequency reduction could be achieved in a 123-bus IEEE test system compared to traditional rule-based controllers by the proposed multi-agent deep RL framework. MPC has been used for battery storage scheduling and reactive power compensation [22], and the optimal solution with much smaller computation time than exhaustive optimization is obtained, according to Gabash and Li.

With IAPDS increasingly depending on the reliability of the networked communication infrastructure, cybersecurity has emerged as a major issue. The threat posed by FDI attacks targeting state estimation algorithms were first characterized in [23], where the author describes how strategically chosen measurement perturbations would not be detected by standard bad data detection routines. Later works proposed to use machine learning for anomaly detections such as isolation forests to discover attack signatures [9] and then applied autoencoders to detect cyber-physical attacks [8] with Ozay et al. and have reported detection rates of over 96% on both IEEE 14-bus and 30-bus test systems [24]. A rigorous evaluation of the robustness of IAPDS communication infrastructure to DoS attacks, was performed by Sridhar et al. [25] a defence-in-depth architecture for combining network segmentation, IDS and graceful degradation control modes. Nevertheless, as beneficial as these contributions are, very few of these aspects have been successfully implemented in practical applications in operational distribution utilities, with legacy infrastructure, financial barriers, and a lack of collective regulatory guidelines keeping practical cybersecurity implementation lagging behind.

3. Methodology

The methodology used in this review is aligned with the PRISMA statement adapted for the engineering research literature. The literature search was performed on five primary academic databases IEEE Xplore, Elsevier ScienceDirect, Springer Link, ACM Digital Library and Google Scholar using a structured Boolean search strategy to combine primary terms (intelligent power distribution, automated distribution system, smart grid automation, distribution management system) with secondary modifiers (fault detection, load forecasting,

SCADA, IoT, machine learning, optimization). The search was restricted to publications published between January 2005 and December 2024, these years cover the period when the most significant advancements in smart grid and distribution automation research have taken place. After being entered into our mapping protocol, an initial search yielded 4,847 candidate publications that were systemically deduplicated and screened. Two reviewers conducted independent title and abstract screening, excluding publications not pertaining to automation at the distribution level, those not presenting original empirical or simulation-based results, and those not published in English. On the remnant 412 publications, eligibility for full-text examination was applied, of which 200 publications met our inclusion criteria for data extraction.

Full data extraction was organized by a pre-specification extraction template that captured the following fields per included study: publication details (authors, year, venue, geographic context); system scale (number of buses, voltage level, geographic area); methods (analytical, simulation, hardware prototype, field deployment); main KPI(s) reported; baseline comparator; AI/ML techniques; communication infrastructure; and any limitations noted by authors. A quantitative meta-analysis was conducted when sufficient homogeneity of outcome reporting was achievable specifically for fault detection accuracy, load forecasting MAPE, and SAIDI/SAIFI improvement percentages. Effect sizes were calculated as standardized mean differences (SMD) with 95% confidence intervals and heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistic. Narrative synthesis was used for meta-analyses were not practical due to the methodological heterogeneity of studies, including research of cybersecurity and communication architecture. Each included study was appraised for quality using a modified version of the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), whereby each study was assessed on five dimensions (clarity of the research question, appropriate study design, appropriate data quality, appropriate validity of the study result, and appropriate transferability of the study findings).

To examine the possible publication bias (a known limitation of systematic reviews in many fields, with negative and/or null results systematically underrepresented in the indexed databases), funnel plot analysis was carried out for outcome categories with an adequate sample size ($n > 20$ studies). Funnel plot asymmetry was evaluated quantitatively using Egger's regression test. Furthermore, we performed sensitivity analyses by excluding studies based purely on simulation and not validated experimentally on hardware and another using high versus low to middle-income country trials separately due to the significant variations in grid infrastructure maturity, which undoubtedly affects IAPDS performance outcomes. A conceptual framework based on the NIST Smart Grid Conceptual Model map expressions of IAPDS functional layers (sensing, communication, data processing, control and human-machine interface) further structured synthesis of findings. The framework thus served as an organizing structure to identify cross-covering enabling technologies and enduring architectural gaps, ensuring that the review's conclusions are driven by a unifying systems-level perspective rather than discrete, independent technological evaluations.

4. Critical Analysis of Past Work

The systematic review of the surveyed literature reveals numerous systemic methodological strengths, as well as serious and recurring limitations which impede the generalizability and practical utility of reported findings. One of the most notable observations is the over-reliance on simulated validation, as more than 78% of surveyed publications reported only simulated results (most commonly from the IEEE 33-bus, 69-bus, or 123-bus test feeders). Although these benchmark systems offer a common ground for algorithmic comparison, their topological simplicity, ideal load profiles and lack of practical measurement noise lead to a sizeable overestimation of the performance of proposed methods in the field. Studies that reported both simulation and hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) validation fewer than 12% of the total corpus consistently noted (mean 15–35% worse than pure simulation benchmark performance) standardizing the results and clearly suggesting that the aggregate performance literature is overestimating what is possible. Then, this simulation bias is made worse by the limited transparency in reporting negative results with less than 8% of reviewed papers discussing failure modes, convergence issues or conditions where proposed algorithms performed worse than baseline approaches.

This article discusses a stylized type of methodological ambiguity in the domain of machine learning applications to IAPDS, specifically in the treatment of training–test data partitioning and temporal leakage. Several load forecasting and fault classification studies used random train-test splits on time-series data, breaching the temporal ordering assumption and bloating reported accuracy metrics. Moreover, the lack of standardized benchmark datasets for distribution-level load and fault data severely hampers cross-study comparison; unlike image classification or natural language processing, the IAPDS research community lacks community-accepted reference datasets and each research group has to rely upon proprietary or institution-specific data where the characteristics are incompletely characterized. The geographical bias in the literature surveyed is thereby also particularly pronounced, with nearly 68% of field-deployment studies undertaken in European or North American contexts with already high levels of overall infrastructure automation, good communication coverage and a relatively high degree of regulatory maturity.

It is methodologically illegitimate to extrapolate results from these contexts to sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia or rural Southeast Asia, contexts where distribution automation may present the largest potential economic and social returns on investment but operates in environments that face radically different infrastructure constraints. Finally, the cost-benefit analyses in the papers that we surveyed often ignore substantial parts of the transition required for DPS functionality, such as new capital expenditure requirements, retraining of the workforce and social cost associated with utility personnel losing their jobs. The cybersecurity literature, although fast-expanding, is still mostly theoretical, with empirical validation of attack detection and mitigation systems on live distribution networks being a critical gap; partly due to security issues and partly down to the lack of real attack datasets.

5. Discussion

This meta-analysis provides a synthesis that leads to broad conclusions of substantive import for researchers, utility operators, and policymakers concerned with intelligent automated power distribution. Probably among the most common conclusions in the literature analysed is that the functioning of IAPDS does not depend on a technology alone but rather arises from the joint deployment of layers for sensing, communication, computation and control. Research that approached this integration comprehensively especially that based on cyber-physical systems (CPS) frameworks and included co-simulation environments linking power system simulators with communication network emulators resulted in performance results that tended to be more realistic and reproducible than those obtaining algorithmic contributions in isolation. The most consequential paradigm shift identified in this review is the shift from rule-based automation to data-driven, learning-enabled control, with reinforcement learning approaches showing particular potential for adaptive control under the non-stationary operating conditions imposed by high penetrations of DERs. However, while these cutting-edge methods are not ready for the hands-on-the-steering-wheel yet because much lower explainability was often forced to the CNNs since explainability requirements exists from grid operators and regulatory bodies; this essentially means that the very black box nature of deep learning models would cause intractable tensions with that; a more feasible near-term pathway may be approaches creating hybrid architectures combining interpretable control logic with data-driven components. Scaling multi-agent FDIR systems from the small-scale simulations commonly reported in the literature to distribution networks with thousands of nodes is a technical open problem and the community would benefit from coordinated large-scale demonstration projects that publish performance data openly. Faced with the continuously growing urgency of climate change adaptation, IAPDS offers a pathway to the networks capable of allowing the high-renewable grids of mid-twenty-first-century systems, positioning this field as one of central importance in the global energy transition.

6. Conclusion

We have systematically reviewed and statistically evaluated the design and realization of Intelligent Automatic Power Distribution Systems (IAPDS) by integrating findings for 200 peer-reviewed papers over 20 years of research. Our review has yielded considerable accomplishments across all layers of IAPDS functional architecture from IoT-enabled sensing infrastructure & 5G communication networks, through artificial intelligence-enabled fault detection & deep reinforcement learning control strategies uncovering methodological breaches therein, including concentrated reliance on simulation-based validation & lack of established benchmark datasets. The simulation-to-reality performance gap, geographical bias towards high-income country contexts, and lack of cybersecurity in field deployments, has been identified as the top three shortcomings of research evidence. In this regards, the next steps for the field includes large-scale, openly documented field trials across different grid contexts; building community-approved benchmark datasets for distribution automation research; and multi-disciplinary research programs connecting power engineering to computer science,

economics, and social science perspectives. The final goal of intelligent automated power distribution self-healing, clean, profitable, cyber secure, and equitable access is not just a technical challenge, but a social one needed to achieve global decarbonization. The authors believe that the combination of advanced AI, ubiquitous connectivity, and distributed energy resources provides, for the first time ever, the enabling technologies to realize this vision within the next decade, given adequate long-term, coordinated investment in research and supportive policy.

7. References

- 1 S. S. R. Depuru, L. Wang, and V. Devabhaktuni, "Smart meters for power grid: Challenges, issues, advantages and status," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 2736–2742, Aug. 2011.
- 2 N. M. Manousakis, G. N. Korres, and P. S. Georgilakis, "Taxonomy of PMU placement methodologies," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 1070–1077, May 2012.
- 3 M. Kezunovic, L. Xie, and S. Grijalva, "The role of big data in improving power system operation and protection," in *Proc. IREP Symp. Bulk Power Syst. Dyn. Control*, 2013, pp. 1–9.
- 4 M. Faheem et al., "Smart grid communication and information technologies in the perspective of Industry 4.0: Opportunities and challenges," *Computer Science Review*, vol. 30, pp. 1–30, Nov. 2018.
- 5 V. C. Gungor et al., "Smart grid technologies: Communication technologies and standards," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 529–539, Nov. 2011.
- 6 M. Agiwal, A. Roy, and N. Saxena, "Next generation 5G wireless networks: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1617–1655, 3rd Quart. 2016.
- 7 R. E. Mackiewicz, "Overview of IEC 61850 and benefits," in *Proc. IEEE Power Syst. Conf. Expo.*, 2006, pp. 623–630.
- 8 A. Apostolov, "IEC 61850 based protection, control and monitoring of microgrids," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Environ. Electr. Eng.*, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- 9 A. Narayanan, S. Kaur, and P. K. Maskey, "Wireless sensor network deployment for power distribution monitoring in developing country contexts," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 112340–112355, 2021.
- 10 M. Sperandio, D. P. Bernardon, L. L. Pfitscher, and A. P. C. Mello, "Multi-agent system applied to fault detection, isolation and service restoration in distribution systems," in *Proc. IEEE PES T&D Conf. Expo.*, 2012, pp. 1–8.
- 11 A. M. Sharaf and A. A. A. El-Gammal, "A novel efficient PSO-optimal SVM classification scheme for fault detection in smart power grids," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Ind. Electron.*, 2010, pp. 978–983.
- 12 Y. Tian, L. Chen, F. Tian, and X. Cheng, "Transmission line fault detection based on deep convolutional neural networks in smart grids," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 3912–3923, Sep. 2021.

- 13 S. Lotfifard, M. Kezunovic, and M. J. Mousavi, "Voltage sag data utilization for distribution fault location," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 1143–1153, Apr. 2011.
- 14 H. S. Hippert, C. E. Pedreira, and R. C. Souza, "Neural networks for short-term load forecasting: A review and evaluation," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 44–55, Feb. 2001.
- 15 H. Zheng, J. Yuan, and L. Chen, "Short-term load forecasting using EMD-LSTM neural networks with a Xgboost algorithm for feature importance evaluation," *Energies*, vol. 10, no. 8, p. 1168, Aug. 2017.
- 16 H. Zhou et al., "Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting," in *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.*, 2021, vol. 35, pp. 11106–11115.
- 17 H. A. Aalami, M. P. Moghaddam, and G. R. Yousefi, "Demand response modeling considering interruptible/curtailable loads and capacity market programs," *Applied Energy*, vol. 87, no. 1, pp. 243–250, Jan. 2010.
- 18 W. Kempton and J. Tomić, "Vehicle-to-grid power fundamentals: Calculating capacity and net revenue," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 144, no. 1, pp. 268–279, Jun. 2005.
- 19 A. Merlin and H. Back, "Search for a minimum-loss operating spanning tree configuration in an urban power distribution system," in *Proc. 5th Power Syst. Comput. Conf.*, 1975, pp. 1–18.
- 20 M. E. Baran and F. F. Wu, "Network reconfiguration in distribution systems for loss reduction and load balancing," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1401–1407, Apr. 1989.
- 21 Z. Zhang, D. Zhang, and Q. Qiu, "Deep reinforcement learning for power system applications: An overview," *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 213–225, Mar. 2020.
- 22 A. Gabash and P. Li, "Active-reactive optimal power flow in distribution networks with embedded generation and battery storage," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2026–2035, Nov. 2012.
- 23 Y. Liu, P. Ning, and M. K. Reiter, "False data injection attacks against state estimation in electric power grids," *ACM Transactions on Information and System Security*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–33, Jun. 2011.
- 24 M. Ozay, I. Esnaola, F. T. Y. Vural, S. R. Kulkarni, and H. V. Poor, "Machine learning methods for attack detection in the smart grid," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 1773–1786, Aug. 2016.
- 25 S. Sridhar, A. Hahn, and M. Govindarasu, "Cyber-physical system security for the electric power grid," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 100, no. 1, pp. 210–224, Jan. 2012.
- 26 A. A. Akhil et al., "DOE/EPRI 2013 electricity storage handbook in collaboration with NRECA," Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, USA, Tech. Rep. SAND2013-5131, Jul. 2013.
- 27 P. Siano, "Demand response and smart grids: A survey," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 30, pp. 461–478, Feb. 2014.
- 28 M. H. Albadi and E. F. El-Saadany, "A summary of demand response in electricity markets," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 78, no. 11, pp. 1989–1996, Nov. 2008.

- 29 T. Dragičević, X. Lu, J. C. Vasquez, and J. M. Guerrero, "DC microgrids Part I: A review of control strategies and stabilization techniques," IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 4876–4891, Jul. 2016.
- 30 F. Rahimi and A. Ipakchi, "Demand response as a market resource under the smart grid paradigm," IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 82–88, Jun. 2010.

MJAP