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The synchronization of power generators is an important condition for the proper functioning of a power system, in which the fluctuations in frequency and the phase angle differences between the generators are sufficiently small when subjected to stochastic disturbances. Serious fluctuations can prompt desynchronization, which may lead to widespread power outages. Here, we derive explicit formulas that relate the fluctuations to the disturbances, and we reveal the role of system parameters. In particular, the relationship between synchronization stability and network theory is established, which characterizes the impact of the network topology on the fluctuations. Our analysis provides guidelines for the system parameter assignments and the design of the network topology to suppress the fluctuations and further enhance the synchronization stability of future smart grids integrated with a large amount of renewable energy.
1 Introduction

The synchronization of networks has motivated broad research in expectation that theoretical studies will help to understand the natural behaviour of real complex networks, such as the network of Kuramoto oscillators, the modelling of chimera spatiotemporal patterns, consensus problems and power systems. Significant insights have been obtained regarding the existence of a synchronous state, the linear and nonlinear stability of power systems and synchronization coherence, which can be utilized to improve synchronization or increase the ability to maintain synchronization. However, the impact of system parameters and the connection between synchronization and network theory remain under-explored. This is due to the limitations of the metrics for synchronization or of the theoretical concepts of the model of an idealized deterministic system in a power system in which the severity of disturbances is not involved.

Here, we focus on the synchronization of power systems under stochastic disturbances. We explore the role of system parameters in a framework of stochastic systems that can be extended to other real complex networks with synchronization. In a synchronous state of a power system, the frequencies of the synchronous machines (e.g., rotor-generators driven by steam or gas turbines) should all be equal or close to the nominal frequency (e.g., 50 Hz or 60 Hz). Here, the frequency is the derivative of the rotational phase angle and is equal to the rotational speed of the synchronous machine in units of rad/s. The synchronization stability is defined as the ability to maintain synchronization under disturbances, which is also called transient stability. The parameters that determine synchronization include the power flows, inertia and damping coefficients of the synchronous machines as well as the coupling strength between the synchronous machines and the network topology, which can be modified to enhance stability by load-frequency control or by constructing new power generators, virtual inertia and transmission lines. In the analysis of the existence condition of a synchronous state and the linear and nonlinear stability of that state, the focus is on the synchronous state, on the local convergence or on the basin of attraction. However, in practice, the state of the power system never stays at the synchronous state but is always fluctuating due to various disturbances. A sign of desynchronization is that both the fluctuations of the frequency and the phase angle difference are so large that the system cannot return to the synchronous state. Hence, the impact of the disturbances cannot be neglected and the size of the fluctuations directly characterizes the stability of the system. By modelling the disturbances as inputs to the associated linearized system, the fluctuations are evaluated by the $\mathcal{H}_2$ norm of the input-output linear system. However, the fluctuations of the frequency at each node and the phase angle difference at each line cannot be explicitly characterized due to the limitations of the $\mathcal{H}_2$ norm. In contrast, we investigate the fluctuations of the frequency at each node and the phase angle difference at each line in a stochastic system. Explicit formulas for the variances of the fluctuations in the frequencies and phase angle differences are derived below, which can be used to strengthen the synchronization stability.
Power grids deliver a growing share of the energy consumed in the world and are undergoing an unprecedented revolution because of the increasing integration of intermittent power sources such as solar and wind energy and the commercialization of plug-in electric automobiles. These developments will change the structure of power sources and decrease carbon emissions dramatically, but they will also lead to new disturbances associated with fluctuations in energy production and load. These disturbances not only deteriorate the quality of the power supply but may trigger loss of synchronization, which can result in serious blackouts\textsuperscript{22}. This indicates the necessity to study synchronization under stochastic disturbances.

2 The mathematical model

The power grid can be modelled by a graph $G(V, \mathcal{E})$ with nodes $V$ and edges $\mathcal{E} \subset V \times V$, where a node represents a bus and an edge $(i, j)$ represents the transmission line between nodes $i$ and $j$. We focus on the transmission network and assume the lines are lossless. We denote the number of nodes in $V$ and edges in $\mathcal{E}$ by $n$ and $m$, respectively. Because the state of the power system always fluctuates around the synchronous state due to various disturbances, we study the deviation of the frequency and the phase angle difference from the synchronous state, which is the state of the linearized system of the nonlinear power system. We model the disturbances by a Brownian motion process, which is then input to a linear system, and study the stochastic system

$$d\delta_i(t) = \omega_i(t)dt,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1a)

$$d\omega_i(t) = -m_i^{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} l_{ci,j} (\delta_i(t) - \delta_j(t)) + d_i \omega_i(t)\right)dt + m_i^{-1} b_i d\mu_i(t) \hspace{1cm} (1b)$$

where $\delta_i$ is the phase angle deviation from the phase angle at the synchronous state at node $i$; $\omega_i$ is the frequency deviation from the nominal frequency; $m_i > 0$ describes the inertia of the synchronous generators; $l_{ci,j} = l_{ij} \cos \delta_{ij}^*$, where $l_{ij} = \hat{b}_{ij} V_i V_j$ is the effective susceptance and $\delta_{ij}^* = \delta_i^* - \delta_j^*$ is the phase angle difference in line $e_k \in \mathcal{E}$ connecting nodes $i$ and $j$ at the synchronous state, which is defined in the Appendix; $V_i$ is the voltage; $d_i > 0$ is the damping coefficient with droop control; $b_i > 0$ is the strength of the disturbances; and $\mu_i(t)$ is a Brownian motion process that results in Gaussian distributed incremental disturbances at the nodes. For the derivation of this model, refer to the Appendix. Here, we refer to $l_{ij}$ as the line capacity of line $e_k$, which is also called the coupling strength between generators, and refer to $l_{ci,j}$ as the weight of line $e_k$. It is obvious that the weights of the lines are determined by the line capacity and the power flows at the synchronous state. Since the dynamics of the voltage and frequency can be decoupled\textsuperscript{23}, we restrict attention to modelling only the dynamics of the frequency and assume that the voltage of each node is a constant. In practice, the voltage can be controlled well by an Automatic Voltage Regulator\textsuperscript{13}. The choice of a model for the fluctuations in a power system should be based on the criteria that the model is realistic and that the subsequent analysis is not too complex. To address
the problem of how the fluctuations in the frequency and the phase angle difference depend on the system parameters, we model the disturbances by independent Brownian motion processes at the nodes and deduce the explicit formulas of the variance matrices of the frequency and the phase angle differences of the invariant probability distribution.

A realistic model of the actual disturbances affecting a power system at each node requires an extensive system identification procedure, including the collection of a large amount of data on the fluctuations of the power system. The disturbances come from both the loads and the various power sources, such as wind parks and photovoltaic units. It seems likely that a realistic model will not use Gaussian white noise for the disturbance process. For example, in modeling the power generation of a wind turbine, an investigation of the disturbance due to wind turbulence was made; see ref [24]. A model is then a nonlinear stochastic differential equation of the power system driven by either Brownian motion or another process with independent increments. However, the performance evaluation of a nonlinear stochastic system driven by a stochastic process that is not a Brownian motion process requires the numerical approximation of the solution of a partial differential equation [25]. This model is too complicated for the analysis of a power system consisting of a large number of synchronous machines.

An alternative to the modelling approach described above is to formulate a deterministic linear system obtained by linearization of a nonlinear power system at a synchronous state of the power system. The deterministic linear system is then transformed into a linear stochastic differential equation driven by Brownian motion. Such models are often used in control engineering and in mathematical finance, and these models are regarded as reasonable approximations of realistic models. Moreover, these models have a low algebraic complexity. The model will be termed a linear stochastic power system with the understanding that it is driven by Brownian motion disturbances. It is well known that for a linear stochastic differential equation with a system matrix that is Hurwitz, there exists an invariant probability distribution of the state that is a Gaussian probability distribution characterized by the mean value and the variance of the state. For power systems, the fluctuations in the frequency and the phase angle difference are described by the variance matrices in the invariant probability distribution of the associated linear stochastic system. The dependence on the system parameters is indicated. The complexity of the performance of this model is manageable.

In the model (1), the disturbances denoted by $\mu_i(t)$ at node $i$ are assumed to be independent, which is reasonable because the locations of the power generators, including renewable power generators, are usually far from each other. Because the system (1) is linear, at any time, the probability distribution of the state is Gaussian. In practice, in order to achieve fair power sharing, the drooping coefficients $d_i$ are often scheduled proportionally to the rating of the power source. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that the strength of the disturbance is proportional to the rating
of the power source. Hence, we consider the fluctuations of the frequency and the phase angle differences of the networks with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio such that \( b_i^2 / d_i = \eta \) holds for all the nodes. It is obvious that the ratio \( \eta \) increases quadratically with respect to the strength \( b_i \) of the disturbance and inversely to the droop coefficient \( d_i \). The incidence matrix \( \mathbf{C} = (C_{ik}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) of the graph \( G \) is defined as

\[
C_{ik} = \begin{cases} 
+1, & \text{if node } i \text{ is the begin of line } e_k, \\
-1, & \text{if node } i \text{ is the end of line } e_k, \\
0, & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases}
\]

where the direction of line \( e_k \) is specified arbitrarily without influence on the study below. We denote the variance matrix of the frequencies and the phase angle differences at the invariant distribution by

\[
\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Q}_\delta & \mathbf{Q}_\delta^T \\ \mathbf{Q}_\delta \mathbf{Q}_\omega & \mathbf{Q}_\omega \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times (m+n)}
\]

where \( \mathbf{Q}_\delta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \) denotes the variance matrix of the phase angle differences, \( \mathbf{Q}_\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) denotes the variance matrix of the frequencies, and \( \mathbf{Q}_\delta \mathbf{Q}_\omega \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \) denotes the correlation between the phase angle differences and the frequencies. Based on the theory of linear stochastic Gaussian systems, \( \mathbf{Q} \) is derived by solving a Lyapunov equation, as presented in the Appendix. However, because the system matrix of the linear system has a zero eigenvalue, the Lyapunov equation for the state variance matrix is not well conditioned and the solution of the Lyapunov equation either does not exist or is not unique. Therefore, the variance matrix \( \mathbf{Q} \) cannot be solved from the Lyapunov equation directly. A coordinate transformation is made to calculate the matrix. For networks with \( b_i^2 / d_i = \eta \) at all the nodes, we deduce the explicit form of \( \mathbf{Q}_\delta \omega \), that is,

\[
\mathbf{Q}_\delta \omega = 0,
\]

which indicates that the frequency and the phase angle differences are independent in the invariant distribution. In other words, the fluctuations in the frequency and the phase angle differences have no impact on each other. The explicit forms of \( \mathbf{Q}_\delta \) and \( \mathbf{Q}_\omega \) are introduced in the next two sections.

### 3 The variances of the frequencies

For the networks with \( b_i^2 / d_i = \eta \) for all the nodes, we derive the explicit formula of the variance matrix \( \mathbf{Q}_\omega \) of the frequencies at all the nodes,

\[
\mathbf{Q}_\omega = \frac{1}{2} \eta \mathbf{M}^{-1}.
\]
Formula (3) conveys how the variances of the frequencies at the nodes depend on the system parameters. This formula is verified in Table 2 for the variance of the frequency in the networks of the Example presented in the next Section. First, the variance matrix $Q_\omega$ is a diagonal matrix with $M = \text{diag}(m_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, thus the frequencies of different nodes are independent in the invariant probability distribution. Second, the variance of the frequency at each node increases linearly with the disturbance-damping ratio and inversely proportional to the inertia of the synchronous machine at this node. This shows the importance of the inertia and the damping coefficient on suppressing the frequency deviation in the power network. However, increasing the inertia at a node only suppresses the frequency at this node without any effect on the other nodes. Finally, the parameters, the power generation and loads which determine the synchronous state $(\delta^*, 0)$ and play their role in the value $l_{cij}$ (see Appendix), the line capacity and the network topology are all absent from the formula. It is surprising that these parameters have no impact on the variance of the frequencies.

For networks with $b_i^2/d_i = \eta$ for all the nodes, we derive the explicit formula of the variance matrix $Q_\omega$ of the frequencies at all the nodes,

$$Q_\omega = \frac{1}{2} \eta M^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

Formula (3) shows how the variances of the frequencies at the nodes depend on the system parameters. This formula is verified in Table 2 for the variance of the frequency in the networks of the example presented in the next Section. First, the variance matrix $Q_\omega$ is a diagonal matrix with $M = \text{diag}(m_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$; thus, the frequencies of different nodes are independent in the invariant probability distribution. Second, the variance of the frequency at each node increases linearly with the disturbance-damping ratio and is inversely proportional to the inertia of the synchronous machine at this node. This shows the importance of the inertia and the damping coefficient in suppressing the frequency deviation in the power network. However, increasing the inertia at a node suppresses the frequency only at this node, without any effect on the other nodes. Finally, the parameters, the power generation and the loads, which determine the synchronous state $(\delta^*, 0)$ and play roles in determining the value $l_{cij}$ (see Appendix), the line capacity and the network topology are all absent from the formula. It is surprising that these parameters have no impact on the variance of the frequencies.

4 The variances of the phase angle differences

We now turn to the variance matrix $Q_\delta$ of the phase angle differences. Under the condition of the uniform disturbance-damping ratio, we derive an explicit formula for $Q_\delta$, which satisfies

$$Q_\delta = \frac{\eta}{2} R^{-1/2} (I_m - \sum_{i=1}^{m-n+1} X_i X_i^T) R^{-1/2} \quad (4)$$
where $R = \text{diag}(R_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is a diagonal matrix such that $R_k = l_{e_{ij}}$ is the weight of line $e_k$ connecting nodes $i$ and $j$, $I_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is an identity matrix and $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an orthonormal basis vector of the kernel of the matrix $\tilde{C}R^{1/2}$ such that $\tilde{C}R^{1/2}X_i = 0$. Following the procedure described in Appendix, the vector $X_i$ can be calculated from the basis vectors of the kernel of $\tilde{C}$. The explicit formula (4) of $Q_\delta$ describes the dependence of the variances of the phase angle differences on the disturbance-damping ratio, the transmission line capacity and the network topology. It is shown that the variances of the phase angle differences increase linearly as the disturbance-damping ratio $\eta$ increases. Since the inertia values are absent from the formula, they have no impact on the variance of the phase angle difference.

In particular, formula (4) reveals the role of the network topology with weight $l_{e_{ij}}$ for line $e_k$. In the complex network theory, the kernel of $\tilde{C}$ is the cycle space of the graph $G$. Hence, it follows from formula (5) that the stability of the power system is related to the cycle space of the power graph. This is the first time that this important relation appears. The way that changes in the topology of the power network affect the variances of the phase angle differences and hence stability can be investigated by a study of the cycle space of the graph. The first conclusion from the formula is that if the number of cycles increases, then the variances of the phase angle differences decrease because $\text{diag}(X_i^TX_i) > 0$. In the next subsection, we make a further investigation of the impact of the network topology by studying the cycle space of the graph.

The role of the network topology The orthonormal basis vectors of the kernel of $\tilde{C}R^{1/2}$ are calculated by the formula for the basis of the cycle space, which is introduced in the Appendix. To fully explore the role of the network topology from the formula (4), we introduce two definitions for graphs, i.e., a cycle-cluster, defined as a sub-graph of the power network graph for which there exists a path in the subgraph from any initial node along all other nodes without duplication that returns to the initial node, and a single line, defined as a line that does not belong to any cycles. With these two definitions, it is deduced that a graph is composed of cycle-clusters and single lines, a line either belongs to a cycle-cluster or is a single line, and there is only one common node between two neighbouring cycle-clusters. The network topology has two effects on the stability of the power system: the power flows at the synchronous state $(\delta^s, 0)$ and the variance of the phase angle differences. Formula (4) indicates that the variance also depends on the power flows because $R_k = l_{e_{ij}}$ and $l_{e_{ij}} = l_{ij} \cos \delta_{ij}$. This demonstrates the nonlinear character of the impacts of the network topology on stability. A network can be constructed mathematically in two steps, i.e., first connecting all the nodes to form a tree network and then constructing new lines or replacing the existing lines by ones with larger capacities. By following these steps, in addition to investigating the tree network, we reveal the role of the network topology by studying the impact of constructing new lines and increasing the capacity of the lines. We introduce 4 power networks with different network topologies in the next example to explain our findings.
Example: Consider the 4 power networks shown in Fig. 1. There are 7 nodes in the 4 networks. The red nodes are generators, and the blue nodes are loads. The directions of the lines are specified arbitrarily, and the directions of all the cycles are chosen to be clockwise. The cycle-clusters and single lines of the networks are described in Table 1. We set \( d_i = i \), \( M_i = i \), \( b_i^2 = i \) for all the nodes in the four networks, which leads to \( b_i^2 / d_i = \eta = 1 \) for all the nodes. We study the following four cases with different settings of \( P_i \).

Case 1: \( P_i = 0 \) for all the nodes and \( l_{ij} = 10 \) for all the lines in networks (a-d), which leads to \( l_{cij} = 10 \) for all the lines;

Case 2: \( P_i = 0 \) for all the nodes and \( l_{45} = 20 \) for line \( e_4 \) and \( l_{ij} = 10 \) for all the other lines in network (d);

Case 3: \( P_i = 4 \) for the red nodes, \( P_i = -3 \) for the blue nodes and \( l_{ij} = 10 \) for all the lines in networks (a-d);

Case 4: \( P_i = 4 \) for the red nodes, \( P_i = -3 \) for the blue nodes and \( l_{45} = 20 \) for line \( e_4 \) and \( l_{ij} = 10 \) for all the other lines in network (d);

The weights of the lines in Cases 2-4 are shown in Table 2. The variances of the frequencies at the nodes and the phase angle differences in the lines are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The values in the tables are first calculated by formulas (3) and (4) and then verified using Matlab. In Cases 1-2, the setting of \( P_i = 0 \) for all the nodes leads to \( \delta_{ij} \) for all the lines in the networks. Thus, the power flows are independent of the network topology, which leads to \( l_{cij} = l_{ij} \). In this case, the impact of the network topology alone on the variance of the phase angle difference can be observed. In Cases 3-4, because \( P_i \) is nonzero, updating the network topology, such as constructing new lines and increasing the line capacities, changes both the weight \( l_{cij} \) and the cycle space. Hence, the overall impact of the network topology can be analysed. Here, the changes in the weights \( l_{cij} = l_{ij} \cos \delta_{ij} \) are caused by the update of the power flows with new lines.

Regarding the role of the network topology, we obtain the following findings:

First, the variance of the phase angle difference in a single line connecting nodes \( i \) and \( j \) is
\[
\frac{\eta}{2} l_{cij}^{-1}
\]
which is not influenced either when a new line is constructed without forming a cycle-cluster that includes this line or when the capacities of the other lines are increased. This is because neither the construction of new lines nor the increase in the capacity of the other lines changes the power flow \( l_{ij} \sin \delta_{ij} \) in this line, and the invariant distribution of the phase angle difference in the single line is independent of those of the phase angle differences in all the other lines. In the acyclic network (a) in Cases 1 and 3, all the lines are single lines, and in networks (b-d) in the 4 cases, line
Second, for a cycle-cluster with only one cycle with lines in set $E_c$ in the graph, the variance of the phase angle difference in the line connecting nodes $i$ and $j$ is

$$\frac{n}{2} \left( l_{c_{ij}}^{-1} - l_{c_{ij}}^{-2} \left( \sum_{(r,q) \in E_c} l_{c_{rq}}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right).$$

In particular, if $l_{c_{ij}} = \gamma$ for all the lines, the variance of the phase angle differences in the lines in this cycle is $\frac{n}{2\gamma} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{N} \right)$, where $N$ is the number of lines in the cycle. With formula (5) and the example, we focus on the benefit of the construction of new lines to form a cycle and the increase of the line capacity of a line in a cycle. We first focus on Cases 1 and 2 with $\delta_{ij} = 0$ for all the lines that are not changed by either constructing new lines or increasing the line capacity. The impact of the construction of lines $e_7$ and $e_8$ is explained with network (b) of Case 1. The variance matrix can be calculated from the kernel of the cycle space directly. The bases of the kernel of the cycle space are $\xi_1 = [-1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]^{T}$ and $\xi_2 = [0, 0, 0, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0, -1]^{T}$, which are orthogonal because the two cycles belong to two different cycle-clusters. By scaling these vectors to unit length, we obtain $X_1 = [-1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3}, 0, 0, 0, 0, -1/\sqrt{3}, 0]^{T}$ and $X_2 = [0, 0, 0, -1/2, 1/2, 1/2, 0, -1/2]^{T}$. From formula (4), we obtain that the diagonal elements of $Q_8$ at positions (1,2,7) are all 1/30 and those at positions (4,5,6,8) are all 3/80, which indicates that the variances of the phase angle differences in the lines of the cycle ($e_1$, $e_2$, $e_7$) are 1/30 and those in the lines of the cycle ($e_4$, $e_6$, $e_8$, $e_5$) are 3/80. Hence, the construction of lines $e_7$ and $e_8$ decreases the variances of the phase angle differences, and the size of the decrease depends on the length of the cycle. It is indicated by formula (5) that when the weight of a line increases, the variances of the phase angle differences in the lines of the cycle decrease. This is shown in Table 4 for network (d) of Case 2 where the weight of line $e_4$ increases from 10 to 20. However, in practice, constructing new lines or increasing the capacity of lines also changes the power flows, which further influence the weight $l_{c_{ij}}$. For example, as shown in Table 2, after constructing line $e_8$ in network (b) of Case 3 based on network (a), the weight of $e_4$ decreases from 9.9499 to 9.6825, and those of $e_5$ and $e_6$ increase from 9.1652 and 9.5393 to 9.6825 and 9.8869, respectively. Here, decreasing the weight of line $e_4$ may lead to a smaller linear stability, which is a type of Braess’s paradox that occurs when new lines are constructed. Similarly, this happens when the line capacity of line $e_4$ is increased from 10 to 20 in network (d) of Case 4, where the weight of line $e_8$ decreases from 9.8452 to 9.8132. Although only some of the weights decrease, as shown in Table 4, the variances of the phase angle differences in lines $e_4 - e_6$ of network (b) in Case 3 all decrease, and those in lines $e_4 - e_6$ and $e_8 - e_9$ also decrease. This is due to the fact that the negative impact brought by the decrease in
the weights cannot overcome the positive impact brought by forming small cycles. However, if the negative impact surpasses the positive impact, then the variance will increase, which may happen in a subset of networks.

Third, constructing new lines and increasing the capacities of lines in a cycle-cluster have no impact on the variance of the phase angle differences in the lines of other cycle-clusters. This is because constructing new lines or increasing the capacities of lines in a cycle-cluster has no influence on the power flows in other cycle-clusters, and the invariant distribution of the phase angle differences in the lines of a cycle-cluster is independent of those in the lines that are not in this cycle-cluster. This is demonstrated in the example. It is found in Table 2 that the weights of lines $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_7$ do not change either when line $e_9$ is constructed in networks (c-d) in Case 3 or when the line capacity of $e_4$ is increased in network (d) in Case 4. Similarly, it is shown in Table 4 that the variances of the phase angle differences in these 4 lines in networks (c-d) are not influenced either by constructing line $e_9$ in Case 3 or by increasing the capacity of line $e_4$ in Case 4. This is because these 4 lines are not in the cycle-cluster of $e_9$ and $e_4$.

Finally, by either increasing the weights $l_{c_{ij}}$ of lines or constructing new lines without changing the weights of the other lines in a cycle-cluster, the variances of the phase angle differences in the lines of this cycle-cluster will decrease. Here, it has been assumed that the power flows are not influenced by constructing new lines or by increasing the capacities of lines. These conclusions are verified in networks (c-d) in Case 1 and in network (d) in Case 2, where the power flows are not changed either by constructing line $e_9$ or by increasing the capacity of line $e_4$, respectively. We first focus on the variances of the phase angle differences in lines $e_4, e_5, e_6, e_8$, which are in the same cycle-cluster as $e_9$ in network (c). The basis vectors corresponding to cycles $(e_4, e_5, e_9)$ and $(e_6, e_8, e_9)$ are $\xi_1 = [0, 0, 0, -1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1]^T$ and $\xi_2 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, -1, -1]^T$, which are orthogonalized by the Gram-Schmidt method to $X_1 = [0, 0, 0, -1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3}, 0, 0, 1/\sqrt{3}]^T$ and $X_2 = [0, 0, 0, -\sqrt{6}/12, \sqrt{6}/12, \sqrt{6}/4, 0, -\sqrt{6}/4, -\sqrt{6}/4]^T$. Hence, the variances of the phase angle differences in lines $e_4, e_5, e_6, e_8, e_9$ are 1/32, 1/32, 1/32, 1/32 and 1/40, respectively. Similarly, we obtain that the variances of the phase angle differences in lines $e_4, e_5, e_6, e_8, e_9$ in network (d) are 1/32, 1/32, 1/32, 1/32 and 1/40, respectively. Thus, constructing line $l_9$ decreases the variances of the phase angle differences in lines $e_4, e_5, e_6, e_8$. In addition, the variances in these 4 lines are smaller than those in lines $e_1, e_2, e_7$ due to the fact that they are in multiple cycles. This indicates that forming small cycles improves the stability of the system. We then focus on the variances in network (d) in Case 4, where the weight of line $e_4$ increases from 10 to 20. By comparing the variances of the phase angle differences of network (d) in Cases 1 and 2, it is seen that increasing the capacity of $e_4$ decreases the variances of the phase angle differences in $e_4, e_5, e_6, e_8$ but has no influence on those in $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_7$. This finding also indicates that formula (5) provides a conservative estimation of the variances in the lines in cycle-clusters. In other words, the variance in a line that is in multiple cycles can be approximated by formula (5) by taking the smallest cycle that includes this
line. For example, the variance in line \( e_4 \) of network (d) in Case 3 can be approximated as 0.0341 for simplicity from formula (5) by taking \( \mathcal{E}_c = \{e_4, e_5, e_9\} \) with weights as shown in Table 2. This value is larger than 0.0319, as shown in Table 4, which demonstrates that this approximation is conservative. Because constructing new lines to form cycles or increasing the capacities of lines changes the power flows, which may decrease the weights of the lines in the cycle-cluster or even destroy the synchronization, it is complicated to analyze how the variances of the lines of this cycle-cluster change. However, in a real network, the phase angle differences are usually small, and the weight \( l_{e_{ij}} \approx l_{ij} \), which is often assumed in the investigation of the synchronization of power systems. In this case, the negative influences on the weight can be neglected and the variances decrease if new lines are constructed to form small cycles or the capacities of the lines are increased. The reduction in the variances can be approximated using formula (5).
Figure 1: The networks studied in the Example

Table 1: The cycle-clusters and single-lines of the 4 networks in the Example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>cycle-clusters</th>
<th>single-lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>$l_1 - l_6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>($l_1, l_2, l_7$), ($l_4, l_5, l_6, l_8$)</td>
<td>$l_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>($l_1, l_2, l_7$), ($l_4, l_5, l_6, l_8, l_9$)</td>
<td>$l_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>($l_1, l_2, l_7$), ($l_4, l_5, l_6, l_8, l_9$)</td>
<td>$l_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The weights of the lines of the networks of Cases (2-3) in the Example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>$l_1$</th>
<th>$l_2$</th>
<th>$l_3$</th>
<th>$l_4$</th>
<th>$l_5$</th>
<th>$l_6$</th>
<th>$l_7$</th>
<th>$l_8$</th>
<th>$l_9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The variances of the frequencies at the nodes of the networks of the 4 cases in the Example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a-d)</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>1/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The variances of the phase angle differences of the networks of Cases (1-4) in the Example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>network</th>
<th>$l_1$</th>
<th>$l_2$</th>
<th>$l_3$</th>
<th>$l_4$</th>
<th>$l_5$</th>
<th>$l_6$</th>
<th>$l_7$</th>
<th>$l_8$</th>
<th>$l_9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.0321</td>
<td>0.0321</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.0319</td>
<td>0.0319</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>0.0318</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0347</td>
<td>0.0510</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.0339</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Bounds of the variance matrices

In the previous sections, we discussed the role of the parameters in systems with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio at the nodes. Here, we present the findings for a system with non-uniform ratios. We define

\[ \eta = \max \{ \eta_i, i = 1, \ldots, n \} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\eta} = \min \{ \eta_i, i = 1, \ldots, n \} \]

with \( \eta_i = b_i^2/d_i \). For \( A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n} \), we say that \( A \leq B \) if the matrix \( A - B \) is non-positive. Based on formulas (3) and (4), it is deduced that

\[ \frac{1}{2} \eta M^{-1} \leq Q_{\omega} \leq \frac{1}{2} \underline{\eta} M^{-1}, \tag{6} \]

and

\[ \frac{1}{2} \eta R^{-1/2} (I_m - \sum_{i=1}^{m-n+1} X_i X_i^T) R^{-1/2} \leq Q_\delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \underline{\eta} R^{-1/2} (I_m - \sum_{i=1}^{m-n+1} X_i X_i^T) R^{-1/2}. \tag{7} \]

It is well known that the diagonal elements of a semi-positive definite symmetric matrix are all non-negative. Hence, the bounds of the variances of the frequencies at the nodes and the phase angle differences in the lines are derived directly from (6) and (7).

Formula (6) reveals the factors that impact the variance of the frequencies at nodes in networks with a non-uniform disturbance-damping ratio. First, as in networks with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio, the inertias of the synchronous machines locally impact the variances of the frequencies at the nodes, and the network topology and the parameter \( l_{cij} \) have little impact because they are absent in the formula. Second, in networks with a non-uniform disturbance-damping ratio, the variance of the frequencies will increase as the minimum value \( \underline{\eta} \) increases and decrease as the maximum value \( \eta \) decreases. Hence, by decreasing all the disturbance-damping ratios, the variances of the frequencies will be decreased, which is consistent with the findings in networks with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio. In addition, by decreasing the maximum value \( \eta \), there are nodes at which the variance of the frequencies will be decreased.

Formula (7) illustrates the role played by the system parameters in determining the variances of the phase angle differences in networks with a non-uniform disturbance-damping ratio. First, the role of the values \( \eta \) and \( \underline{\eta} \) in determining the variances of the phase angle differences is the same as that in determining the variances of the frequencies. Decreasing the largest disturbance-damping ratio can decrease the variance of the phase angle differences at some lines. Second, as in a network with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio, the inertia is absent from the formula, and the role of the network topology is also reflected by the basis of the cycle space. Hence, the inertia has little impact on the variance of the phase angle differences, and by forming small cycles, the variance of the phase angle differences can also be effectively decreased in the network. Third, the impact
of constructing new lines to form cycles and increasing the capacities of the lines on the upper and lower bounds are the same as in the analysis of the networks with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio, as given in the previous section.

6 Conclusion

Design rules are proposed in this section that will suppress the fluctuations and further help to enhance the synchronous stability of real power systems with small phase angle differences at their synchronous states. The rules use the dependence of the variances of the frequencies at the nodes and those of the phase angle differences in the lines on the parameters of the power system, including the variances of the power sources and the power lines.

Formulas (3-4) state that constructing virtual inertia at a node can effectively suppress the frequency fluctuation at this node, which, however, has no impact on the suppression of the fluctuations of the phase angle differences. Hence, improving the rotor angle stability should not be included among the control objectives for the construction of virtual inertia. Here, the rotor angle stability is the ability of the phase angles to maintain their coherence.

The formulas also state that control of a power system can effectively suppress the fluctuations of the frequency and the phase angle differences and hence enhance the synchronous stability. This can be achieved by decreasing the largest value of the disturbance-damping ratio. For example, energy storage in combination with droop control, which affects the parameter $d_i$ at the relevant nodes, will directly decrease the disturbance-damping ratios. Because the variance of the phase angle differences decreases linearly with the parameter $l_{cij} = l_{ij} \cos \delta_{ij}^*$, the control of the power flows to increase the value $\cos \delta_{ij}^*$ can also decrease the fluctuations of the phase angle differences in the lines.

The results of this paper provide guidelines in designing future power networks, which should have low variances in phase-angle differences and in frequencies when subjected to stochastic disturbances from power sources and power loads. Changing a power network by adding lines to form small cycles or by increasing the capacity of particular lines will suppress the fluctuations in the phase differences in the lines of the corresponding cycle-cluster. The benefit of forming small cycles is that the fluctuations in the phase angle differences decrease by $O(1/N)$, where $N$ denotes the length of the cycle. This is consistent with the findings obtained by studying the energy barrier of a nonlinear system with a cyclic network in Xi et al. Future power grids will comprise many small distributed generation sites, such as rooftop solar panels and windmills at farms. The best design rule is to group these objects as cycle-clusters. The fluctuations in the phase angle differences can be decreased by replacing transmission lines with small line capacities by ones with large line capacities. This is the same rule as for the transient stability analysis of the SMIB model.
by the equal area criterion. Since the inertias are absent from the formula, they have no impact on the variance of the phase angle difference, which is consistent with the analysis in Poola et al.

Following formulas (3-4, 6-7), we see that increasing the scale of the network by constructing nodes with disturbance-damping ratios close to $\eta$ will not dramatically increase or decrease the fluctuation in the frequency or in the phase angle difference in the network. Hence, the stability will be changed little by increasing the scale of the network. This follows formula (3) for networks with a uniform disturbance-damping ratio, which states that the newly connected nodes with disturbance-damping ratios equal to $\eta$ will not bring fluctuations to the frequency at the other nodes. Since $\delta_i^* \approx \delta_j$ for all the nodes, the newly connected nodes have little influence on the phase angle difference in the synchronous state, and it is indicated by formula (4) that the fluctuation of the phase angle difference will not change greatly. Similarly, for networks with a non-uniform disturbance-damping ratio, the newly connected nodes with disturbance-damping ratios in the set $[\eta, \overline{\eta}]$ will not change the bounds of the variance, as follows from the formulas (6) and (7). This conclusion is different from that obtained by a study of linear stability, where the linear stability decreased if the scale of the network increased.

The principle of synchronization is often applied in the algorithmic design of the distributed control of power systems and multi-agent systems. The performance of these distributed control algorithms may be investigated by an extension of the framework of this paper to study synchronization under stochastic disturbances.
Appendix

The Derivation of the Model  The dynamics of the power system is described by the following swing equations\textsuperscript{19,20,32}

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\delta}_i &= \omega_i, \\
m_i \dot{\omega}_i &= P_i - d_i \omega_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n} l_{ij} \sin(\delta_i - \delta_j),
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\delta_i\) and \(\omega_i\) denote the phase angle and the frequency deviation of the synchronous machine at node \(i\), \(P_i\) denotes power generation if \(P_i > 0\) and denotes power load otherwise. The resistance of the transmission lines is neglected. The model is often applied to study the transient stability and rotor angle stability, which is an equivalent model of power systems\textsuperscript{33}.

The stability region of the system\textsuperscript{8} is analyzed by Chiang\textsuperscript{20} et al and Zaborszky et al\textsuperscript{19}. The stability analysis of a power system makes use of the concept of the synchronous state \((\delta^*, 0)\) which satisfies for \(i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_i(t) &= \omega_{syn}, \\
\delta_i(t) &= \omega_{syn} t + \delta_i^*,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(\delta_i^*\) and the synchronized frequency satisfy respectively

\[
P_i - D_i \omega_{syn} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} l_{ij} \sin \delta_{ij}^* = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{syn} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_i}
\]

with \(\delta_{ij}^* = \delta_i^* - \delta_j^*\) being the phase angle difference between the nodes \(i\) and \(j\) which are directly connected by the transmission line \((i, j)\). The power flow in line \((i, j)\) is \(l_{ij} \sin \delta_{ij}^*\). The power generation and load are balanced in the secondary and tertiary control. Without loss of generality for the investigation of the frequency synchronization, we assume in this paper the power generation and load are balanced such that \(\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i = 0\) which leads to \(\omega_{syn} = 0\).

Due to low line capacities, the synchronous state might not exist. For the condition of the existence of the synchronous state, we refer to\textsuperscript{11}. It has been shown that there might be more than \(2^{n-1}\) synchronous states and the actual number of such states depends on the network topology and the distribution of power generation and loads, see refs\textsuperscript{34-36} for details.
Assume there exists a synchronous state \((\delta^*, 0)\) for the system (8), at which the non-linear system (8) can be linearized as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\dot{\delta} \\
\dot{\omega}
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & I_n \\
M^{-1}L_c & -M^{-1}D
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
\delta \\
\omega
\end{pmatrix} = J \begin{pmatrix}
\delta \\
\omega
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where \(\delta = \text{col}(\delta_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n, I_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is the identity matrix, \(\omega = \text{col}(\omega_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n, M = \text{diag}(m_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, D = \text{diag}(d_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, L_c = (l_{c_{ij}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is the Laplacian matrix of the network generated by \((\delta^*, 0)\), which satisfies

\[
l_{c_{ij}} = \begin{cases} 
-l_{ij} \cos \delta^*_{ij}, & i \neq j, \\
-\sum_{k \neq i} l_{c_{ik}}, & i = j.
\end{cases}
\]

\(J \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}\) is also called the Jacobian matrix. Note that the state variables in (10) are the deviations of the phase angles and frequencies from the synchronous state \((\delta^*, 0)\). By the second Lyapunov method, the stability of \((\delta^*, 0)\) can be determined by the sign of the real part of the eigenvalues of \(J\). The analysis of the eigenvalue of the matrix \(J\) of (10) is also called Small-Signal Stability Analysis. The system is stable in the sense of Lyapunov if and only if (1) there do not exist eigenvalues with strictly positive real part, and (2) any eigenvalue on the imaginary axis is a simple zero of the minimal polynomial of the system matrix. The system is exponentially stable if and only if all eigenvalues of the system matrix have strictly negative real part. It has been proven that if \(l_{ij} \cos \delta^*_{ij} \geq 0\), then the system is stable at the synchronous state \((\delta^*, 0)\) \(^{37,38}\), which leads to the security condition

\[
\Theta = \{ \delta \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |\delta_{ij}| < \frac{\pi}{2}, \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E} \},
\]

Because the state of the power system always fluctuates around the synchronous state because of the disturbances, we study the deviations of the frequency and the phase angle difference from the set point. In the linear system (10), the state is the deviation of the frequency and the phase angle. The variance of the deviation of the frequency and the phase angle difference are equal to the variance of the frequency and the phase angle difference.

The calculation of the variance matrix Consider a linear stochastic system,

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) & = Ax(t) + Bd\mu(t), \\
y(t) & = Cx(t),
\end{align*}
\]

where \(x \in \mathbb{R}^n, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}\) is Hurwitz, \(B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, C \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times n}\), the input is denoted by \(\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n\) and the output of the system is denoted by \(y \in \mathbb{R}^2\). The controllability Grammian of the pair \((A, B)\) is defined as

\[
Q_x = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{At}BB^Te^{A^Tt}dt
\]
which is the unique solution of the Lyapunov equation due to the Hurwitz condition

\[ AQ_x + Q_x A^T + BB^T = 0, \]

The variance matrix \( Q \) of the output is equal to \( CQ_xC^T \).\(^{39,40} \)

The stochastic process \((1)\) is written into the general form with state variable, system matrix and input matrix being

\[ x = \begin{bmatrix} \delta \\ \omega \end{bmatrix}, \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -M^{-1}C & -M^{-1}D \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ M^{-1}B \end{bmatrix}, \]

where \( \widetilde{B} = \text{diag}(b_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \). When considering the variance matrix at the invariant distribution, we set the output matrix such that

\[ y = Cx, \quad y = \begin{bmatrix} y_\delta \\ y_\omega \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{C}^T & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times 2n}. \] (13)

The matrix \( \widetilde{C} = (C_{ik}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) is the incidence matrix of the network. The \( m \) elements in \( y_\delta \) are the phase angle differences in the \( m \) lines and the \( n \) elements in \( y_\omega \) are the frequencies at the \( n \) nodes. However, for a linear stochastic power system, the system matrix \( A \) is not Hurwitz. This is due to the singularity of the Laplacian matrix \( L_c \) which has a zero eigenvalue. Therefore, the variance matrix \( Q \) cannot be calculated directly from the corresponding Lyapunov equation. A coordinate transformation is required.

**The basis vectors of the kernel of \( \widetilde{C}R^{1/2} \)** The cycle space of a graph is defined as the kernel of the incidence matrix \( \widetilde{C} \), which is a vector subspace in \( \mathbb{R}^m \). By graph theory, we have \( \text{rank}(\widetilde{C}) = n - 1 \). Hence, the dimension of the cycle space is \( m - n + 1 \). It is obvious that the cycle space of an acyclic graph is an empty space. For a graph with cycles, the basis for the cycle space is derived by the following method: Considering a cycle \( C \) with a set \( E_c \) of edges in the graph \( G \), we specify a direction for \( C \); then, the vector \( \xi_c = [\xi_{c_1}, \xi_{c_2}, \cdots, \xi_{c_m}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m \) such that

\[ \xi_{ck} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if line } e_k \in E_c \text{ and its direction } = \text{the cycle direction}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]

belongs to the kernel of \( \widetilde{C} \) such that \( \widetilde{C}\xi_c = 0 \).\(^{41} \) The basis for the cycle space can be derived by taking the vectors as \( \xi_c \), corresponding to the \(( m - n + 1) \) fundamental cycles in the graph. Because \( R \) is non-singular, the vectors \( R^{-1/2}\xi_c \) for all the cycles are the basis vectors of the kernel of \( \widetilde{C}R^{1/2} \). The orthonormal basis vectors \( X_i \) are obtained by Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization of the basis vectors \( R^{-1/2}\xi_c \).


