



Brief paper

Evolutionary game theoretic demand-side management and control for a class of networked smart grid[☆]



Bing Zhu^{a,b,1}, Xiaohua Xia^a, Zhou Wu^{c,a}

^a Department of Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0028, South Africa

^b School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 639798, Singapore

^c School of Automation, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, PR China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 September 2015

Received in revised form

28 February 2016

Accepted 6 March 2016

Keywords:

Demand-side management

Game theory

Semi-tensor product

Optimal control

Binary decision systems

ABSTRACT

In this paper, a new demand-side management problem of networked smart grid is formulated and solved based on evolutionary game theory. The objective is to minimize the overall cost of the smart grid, where individual communities can switch between grid power and local power according to strategies of their neighbors. The distinctive feature of the proposed formulation is that, a small portion of the communities are cooperative, while others pursue their own benefits. This formulation can be categorized as control networked evolutionary game, which can be solved systematically by using semi-tensor product. A new binary optimal control algorithm is applied to optimize transient performances of the networked evolutionary game.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Demand-side management of energy systems becomes increasingly popular, because of its great potential in improving energy efficiency in industries. Smart grid is a typical platform where demand-side management strategies can be applied. A core issue in smart grid is that, dynamic user behaviors should be addressed in designing demand-side management strategies. Widely-used techniques for demand-side management of smart grid include game theoretic approach (Mohsenian-Rad, Wong, Jatskevich, Schober, & Leon-Garcia, 2014), multi-objective optimization (Malatji, Zhang, & Xia, 2013; Nwulu & Xia, 2015), distributed energy consumption control (Ma, Hu, & Spanos, 2014), and model predictive control (Zhang & Xia, 2011), etc.

Smart grids can be analyzed in the perspective of network systems, since there usually exist multiple interactive users consuming powers from grids. In networked smart grid systems, stability and optimization are two main issues. Stability of the

networked smart grid system indicates that interactive users reach an equilibrium. Some methodologies, i.e. game theory (Mohsenian-Rad et al., 2014), can be applied to prove the existence of equilibria in networked smart grid system. Optimization of the network smart grid system implies that, in the transient process to reach the equilibrium, some indexes can be optimized. The grid provider is capable of influencing decisions of users in the network by presenting dynamic pricing strategies (Jiang, Cao, Yu, & Wang, 2014; Li, Lu, Lin, & Shen, 2013). It is possible that the smart grid provider and some of the users cooperate to affect decisions of other users, such that the common benefit can be improved.

Game theory has been widely applied to energy systems (Du, Grijalva, & Harley, 2015; Hong, Su, & Chou, 2014). In previous researches on game theoretic policy for energy systems, fundamental games are usually played between two individual users (Xiao, Mandayam, & Poor, 2015), or between the power company and users (Fadlullah, Quan, Keto, & Stojmenovic, 2014). Pay-off functions and strategies are usually defined such that existence of Nash Equilibrium (NE) can be proved. Optimization (or model predictive control Stephens, Smith, & Mahanti, 2015) can be employed to search for NE. Sometimes the fundamental game is played repeatedly, and strategies of users are updated in real-time. In this situation, it is named evolutionary game (Cheng, He, Qi, & Xu, 2015). Networked evolutionary game indicates that, the repeated game is played among networked users, and updating laws relate to topological structure of the network (Cheng, 2009).

[☆] The material in this paper was not presented at any conference. This paper was recommended for publication in revised form by Associate Editor Kok Lay Teo under the direction of Editor Ian R. Petersen.

E-mail addresses: bing.zhu@ntu.edu.sg (B. Zhu), xxia@up.ac.za (X. Xia), wuzhsky@gmail.com (Z. Wu).

¹ Tel.: +65 67904242; fax: +65 67904242.

In some networked evolutionary games, actions of some users can be actively assigned, such that other users are induced to improve common benefit. The users with actively assigned actions can be defined as controllers; and the networked evolutionary game with controllers can be defined as control networked evolutionary game (Zhao, Li, & Cheng, 2011).

During recent years, a new semi-tensor product (Cheng, Qi, & Xue, 2007) is developed to solve the problem of networked evolutionary game. The semi-tensor product is an extension of ordinary matrix product. By using semi-tensor product, dynamics of evolutionary games can be formulated into an algebraic form (Cheng, 2009), and the existence of NE can be proved systematically (Cheng et al., 2015). For the control networked evolutionary game, control strategies can be designed to reach the NE by using semi-tensor product. Moreover, classical control methods can be introduced and extended in the framework of semi-tensor product to attain the NE of the networked evolutionary game.

In this paper, demand-side management of a class of smart grid is studied within the framework of control networked evolutionary game. The smart grid is built among interactive communities using either grid power or local generated power. It is assumed that a small portion of the communities are subsidized, thus cooperative with the grid provider. However, other communities are unsubsidized and pursuing individual benefits. We aim to design actions for the cooperative communities (controllers), such that the common benefits can be improved even if other communities are noncooperative. The main contributions of this paper include that: (1) the demand-side management of a smart grid is modeled into a control networked evolutionary game; (2) the networked evolutionary game is composed by fundamental games played simultaneously among several players instead of 2-player games; (3) semi-tensor product is applied to solve the demand-side management problem; and (4) a new binary optimal control is introduced to optimize the transient performance of the control networked evolutionary game.

The layout of this paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, mathematical preliminaries are introduced. In Section 3, the demand-side management of a simple smart grid is formulated within the framework of control networked evolutionary game. In Section 4, the proposed control evolutionary game is analyzed and solved by using semi-tensor product, and a new optimal control approach is proposed to improve transient performance. In Section 5, a simulation example is presented to illustrate the proposed demand-side management approach. This paper is concluded in the final section.

2. Mathematical preliminaries

2.1. Control networked evolutionary game

Information interchange within networked system can be described by a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n\}$ is a set of nodes, and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is a set of edges that depict information flow between nodes. An edge (π_i, π_j) in \mathcal{G} denotes that the information of node π_i is available to π_j , and π_i is defined as a neighbor of π_j . The index set of all neighbors of node π_j is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_j = \{i : (\pi_i, \pi_j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. In an undirected graph, $(\pi_i, \pi_j) \in \mathcal{E} \Leftrightarrow (\pi_j, \pi_i) \in \mathcal{E}$. The adjacent matrix $\mathcal{A} \triangleq [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, where $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(\pi_j, \pi_i) \in \mathcal{E}$, and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. It is assumed that $a_{ii} = 0$. More details on network system can be found in Ren (2010).

Definition 1. A normal finite game \mathcal{H} can be formulated by (1) the set of players: $\mathcal{V} = \{\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_n\}$; (2) the strategy set for each player: $\mathcal{X}_i = \{x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ik}\}$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$; and (3) the cost function: $c_i(x_i, x_{-i})$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ denotes the strategy selected by player i , and x_{-i} denotes strategies of other players excluding player i .

Definition 2. Nash equilibrium (NE), denoted by $(x_1^*, x_2^*, \dots, x_n^*)$, is a local optimal response for a normal finite game, where no individual would gain by unilaterally changing its own strategy: $c_i(x_i^*, x_{-i}^*) \leq c_i(x_i, x_{-i}^*)$.

If a game can be played repeatedly with an updating law: $\Pi : x_i(t+1) = f(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t), c_i(t))$, where $t \geq 0$ denotes the discrete sampling time, then it is named evolutionary game.

In an evolutionary game played by multiple players, a typical updating law can be given by Unconditional Imitation with fixed priority (Cheng et al., 2015):

$$x_i(t+1) = x_{j^*}(t), \quad j^* = \arg \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} c_j(x_j(t), x_{-j}(t)). \quad (1)$$

If j^* is non-unique, then select the minimal j^* as priority.

Definition 3. The networked evolutionary game is composed by (1) a networked graph \mathcal{G} ; (2) a normal finite game \mathcal{H} that can be played repeatedly; and (3) an updating law Π .

Remark 1. The above definition of the networked evolutionary game is slightly different from that of Cheng et al. (2015), where fundamental networked game (FNG) is required. In this paper, the normal finite game is used in Definition 3.

Definition 4. The control networked evolutionary game is composed by (1) a normal finite game \mathcal{H} that is played repeatedly; (2) a networked graph $\mathcal{G}_c = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{E})$, where $\{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{U}\}$ is a partition of \mathcal{V} ($\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} = \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{U} = \emptyset$), and strategies of \mathcal{U} can be actively assigned; and (3) an updating law Π .

2.2. Semi-tensor product

Definition 5. The semi-tensor product of two matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ can be defined by

$$A \ltimes B \triangleq (A \otimes I_{o/n})(B \otimes I_{o/p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(mo/n) \times (qo/p)}, \quad (2)$$

where $o = \text{lcm}(n, p)$ denotes the least common multiple of n and p ; and \otimes denotes the Kronecker product.

Definition 6. The fundamental vector $\delta_n^i \in \mathcal{D}_n$ is defined as the i th column of the identity matrix $I_{n \times n}$. It can be further defined that $\delta_n[i, j, \dots, k] \triangleq [\delta_n^i, \delta_n^j, \dots, \delta_n^k]$.

Theorem 1 (Cheng et al., 2015). With equivalence $i \sim \delta_n^i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, a logic function $f : \mathcal{D}_n^k \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_n$ can be rewritten by $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = M_f \ltimes_{i=1}^k x_i$, where M_f is the structure matrix of logic function f .

Theorem 2 (Cheng et al., 2015). For a logic dynamic system $x_i(t+1) = f_i(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t)) = M_{f_i} \ltimes_{i=1}^n x_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, it can be rewritten in the form of

$$x(t+1) = M_f x(t), \quad (3)$$

where $x(t) \triangleq \ltimes_{i=1}^n x_i$, and $M_f \triangleq M_{f_1} * M_{f_2} * \dots * M_{f_n}$. Here, $*$ denotes the Khatri–Rao product: $M * N \triangleq [\text{col}_1(M) \ltimes \text{col}_1(N), \dots, \text{col}_s(M) \ltimes \text{col}_s(N)]$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times s}$ and $N \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times s}$; and $\text{col}_i(M)$ denotes the i th column of matrix M .

Theorem 3 (Cheng et al., 2015). For a logic dynamic system given by (3), δ_n^i is its fixed point, if and only if the diagonal element m_{ii} of M_f equals 1.




Fig. 1. Topological structure of the graph given in Cases 1 and 2.

3. Problem formulation

In this paper, the evolutionary game is played among some remote rural communities, where a networked power grid is newly constructed. Before the construction of the power grid, the communities were using power generated by local facilities, e.g., diesel generators. To cover the cost, the price of grid power is high when there are less users. As the number of users grows, the price of grid power would decrease. However, if the number of users grows excessively large, the price would increase again due to supply shortage.

The main problem of this price policy is that, no individual community would like to become the first user of the grid, since its price would be high at the initial stage. Another problem is that, even if an optimal common benefit is reached, it might be unstable.

Case 1. Consider a grid connecting 4 communities. Each community has the choices of either local diesel power or grid power. The diesel power price p_d is constant, and the grid power price $p_g(t)$ varies with the numbers of users, as is displayed in Table 1. Denote the strategy space of community i by $\mathcal{X}_i = \{1, 2\}$, where 1 indicates using grid power, and 2 indicates using of local diesel power. The topological structure of the network is given by Fig. 1, where edges are all undirected. It follows that the adjacent matrix is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Communities have no direct knowledge of real-time prices, but they fully know costs of their neighbors. Define p_i as the price paid by community i . The cost function is defined by

$$c_i(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t)) = p_i(t) + \alpha \left(p_i(t) - \min_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_j(t) \right), \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a constant weight coefficient. The cost function (4) indicates that each community, while pursuing the lowest price, feels uncomfortable if paying higher price than its neighbors. The updating law Π is given by (1), implying one community would change its strategy to that of the neighbor with the lowest cost. The common benefit at time t is defined as $C(t) = \sum_{i=1}^4 p_i(t)$. It should be noted that, in this case, the optimal common benefit happens when three communities use grid power, and one uses diesel power.

Consider the scenario that the states are already in one of the cases of the optimal common benefit:

$$\{x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t), x_4(t)\} = \{2, 1, 1, 1\}. \quad (5)$$

It follows that, according to the updating law (1), $\{x_1(t+1), x_2(t+1), x_3(t+1), x_4(t+1)\} = \{1, 1, 1, 1\}$, deviating from the optimal common benefit.

In this case, $\{2, 2, 2, 2\}$ indicates a fixed point; however, it is not an NE. If any community changes from 2 to 1, its cost would become

Table 1

Prices of diesel power and grid power.

User number	0	1	2	3	4
Grid power price	8	7	7	6.5	7.5
Diesel power price	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2

Note: values in this table are not absolute prices; they are assigned to reflect differences of prices in various scenarios.

smaller; however, no community would like to change unilaterally, because others might also make the same choice, and the states come to $\{1, 1, 1, 1\}$.

Remark 2. The weight coefficient $\alpha > 0$ is necessary in (4), because the direct subtraction would be inappropriate if the two terms are with different physical implications. Another physical meaning of α is users' priorities between actual costs and psychological comforts. Without loss of generality, $\alpha = 1$ is assumed in this paper. Uncertain/time-varying α will be investigated in the future research.

Case 2. Suppose that all conditions in Case 1 are satisfied, except that the real-time price can be fully accessible, and the updating law is given by

$$x_i(t+1) = g(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t)) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } p_g(t) > p_d(t); \\ 1, & \text{if } p_g(t) \leq p_d(t), \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

indicating that the less expensive choice is preferred.

Consider one of the cases of optimal common benefit given by (5). It follows from (6) that $\{x_1(t+1), x_2(t+1), x_3(t+1), x_4(t+1)\} = \{1, 1, 1, 1\}$, and $\{x_1(t+2), x_2(t+2), x_3(t+2), x_4(t+2)\} = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}$, and the situation will remain in the future.

Suppose that the game is a controlled network evolutionary game defined by Definition 3. The objective of this paper is to design strategies for \mathcal{U} , such that optimal common benefit is achieved and maintained.

Case 3. Consider node 4 as the controller; and suppose the updating law is given by (1). The objective is to design $u = x_4 \in \mathcal{X}_4$, such that the total cost $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ is minimized.

Case 4. Consider node 4 as the controller; and suppose the updating law is given by (6). The objective is to design $u = x_4 \in \mathcal{X}_4$, such that the total cost $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i(x_i, x_{-i})$ is minimized.

4. Control design

4.1. Algorithm for calculating the algebraic form

Suppose that there are n communities, and their communication topology can be given by adjacent matrix $\mathcal{A} = \{a_{ik}\}_{n \times n}$. The algorithm for calculating the algebraic form (3) can be designed as follows.

- i. Set $j = 1$.
- ii. Set initial value $x_0 = \delta_{2^n}^j$. Based on the initial value, calculate the grid power price p_g and the price p_i .
- iii. Use a_{ik} and p_i to calculate the cost function c_i .
- iv. Based on a_{ik} , c_k and the updating law, the updated strategy can be obtained: $x_i(j) = f(x_0, a_{ik}, c_k)$.
- v. Set $j = j + 1$, and go to ii until $j = 2^n$.
- vi. Calculate $M_f = M_{f_1} * M_{f_2} * \dots * M_{f_n}$, where $M_{f_i} = [x_i(1), x_i(2), \dots, x_i(2^n)]$. The algebraic form can be obtained by $x(k+1) = M_f x(k)$.

Table 2
True value diagram of Case 3 when $u = 1$.

Profile	111	112	121	122	211	212	221	222
c_1	7.5	6.5	6.5	7	7.9	7.2	7.4	7.2
c_2	7.5	6.5	7.9	7.4	6.5	7	7.4	7.4
c_3	7.5	7.9	6.5	7.4	6.5	7.4	7	7.4
c_4	7.5	6.5	6.5	7	6.5	7	7	7
$x_1(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
$x_2(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$x_3(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 3
True value diagram of Case 3 when $u = 2$.

Profile	111	112	121	122	211	212	221	222
c_1	6.5	7	7	7	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.2
c_2	6.5	7	7.4	7.4	7	7	7.4	7.2
c_3	6.5	7.4	7	7.4	7	7.4	7	7.2
c_4	7.9	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.2
$x_1(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
$x_2(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
$x_3(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2

Table 4
True value diagram of Case 4 when $u = 1$.

Profile	111	112	121	122	211	212	221	222
p_d	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2
p_g	7.5	6.5	6.5	7	6.5	7	7	7
$x_1(t+1)$	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$x_2(t+1)$	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$x_3(t+1)$	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 5
True value diagram of Case 4 when $u = 2$.

Profile	111	112	121	122	211	212	221	222
p_d	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2
p_g	6.5	7	7	7	7	7	7	8
$x_1(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
$x_2(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
$x_3(t+1)$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2

4.2. Analysis on Case 3

Based on the updating law given by (1), the true value diagram can be calculated with the algorithm in Section 4.1, and listed by Tables 2 and 3. Identify 1 with $\delta_2^1 \triangleq [1, 0]^T$, and 2 with $\delta_2^2 \triangleq [0, 1]^T$. The cost function can be calculated by (4). According to semi-tensor product theory, the controlled network evolutionary game can be described by

$$x_i(t+1) = f(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t), c_i(t)) = M_{f_i} x(t), \tag{7}$$

where $x(t) = \times_{i=1}^3 x_i(t)$, and

$$M_{f_1} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$M_{f_2} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$M_{f_3} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Theorem 2 that the overall controlled logic dynamics can be expressed by $x(t+1) = M_f(u(t))x(t)$, where

$$\begin{cases} M_f(\delta_2^1) = M_{f_1}(\delta_2^1) * M_{f_2}(\delta_2^1) * M_{f_3}(\delta_2^1) \\ \quad = \delta_8[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5], \\ M_f(\delta_2^2) = M_{f_1}(\delta_2^2) * M_{f_2}(\delta_2^2) * M_{f_3}(\delta_2^2) \\ \quad = \delta_8[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 8]. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

By using Theorem 3, it can be claimed that

- (1) When the controller is $u = \delta_2^1$ (grid power), there is only one fixed point δ_8^1 . Here, $(x_1, x_2, x_3, u) \sim (1, 1, 1, 1)$ is an NE, but not the optimal NE.
- (2) When the controller is $u = \delta_2^2$ (diesel power), there are two fixed points, namely $(1, 1, 1)$ and $(2, 2, 2)$. Here, $(x_1, x_2, x_3, u) \sim (1, 1, 1, 2)$ is an optimal NE, while $(x_1, x_2, x_3, u) \sim (2, 2, 2, 2)$ is not an NE.

The following strategies of $u(t)$ is capable of reaching and maintaining the optimal NE point:

- (1) For $x(0) \in \{\delta_8^1, \delta_8^2, \delta_8^3, \delta_8^4, \delta_8^5\}$, select either $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ or $u(0) = \delta_2^2$, and it follows from Tables 2 and 3 and (8) that $x(1) = \delta_8^1$. Then, set $u(t) = \delta_2^2$ for $t \geq 1$, such that the optimal NE $(1, 1, 1, 2)$ will be maintained.
- (2) For $x(0) \in \{\delta_8^6, \delta_8^7\} \sim \{212, 221\}$, select $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ and it follows that $x(1) = \delta_8^1$. Then, set $u(t) = \delta_2^2$ for $t \geq 1$, such that the optimal NE $(1, 1, 1, 2)$ will be maintained.
- (3) For $x(0) \in \{\delta_8^8\} \sim \{222\}$, it can be calculated that $M_f(\delta_2^1) \times M_f(\delta_2^1) = \delta_8[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1]$. Consequently, select $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ and $u(1) = \delta_2^1$; it follows that $x(2) = \delta_8^1$. Then, set $u(t) = \delta_2^2$ for $t \geq 2$, such that the optimal NE $(1, 1, 1, 2)$ will be maintained.

4.3. Analysis on Case 4

Based on the updating law given by (6), the true value diagram can be calculated through the algorithm proposed in Section 4.1, and listed by Tables 4 and 5. It follows that, according to semi-tensor product, the controlled network evolutionary game can be described by $x_i(t+1) = g(x_i(t), x_{-i}(t)) = M_{g_i} x(t)$, where $x(t) = \times_{i=1}^3 x_i(t)$, and

$$M_{g_1} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$M_{g_2} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2, \end{cases}$$

$$M_{g_3} = \begin{cases} \delta_2[2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], & \text{for } u = 1, \\ \delta_2[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2], & \text{for } u = 2. \end{cases}$$

It follows from Theorem 2 that the overall dynamics can be expressed by $x(t+1) = M_g(u(t))x(t)$, where the structure matrix can be calculated by

$$\begin{cases} M_g(\delta_2^1) = M_{g_1}(\delta_2^1) * M_{g_2}(\delta_2^1) * M_{g_3}(\delta_2^1) \\ \quad = \delta_8[8, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1], \\ M_g(\delta_2^2) = M_{g_1}(\delta_2^2) * M_{g_2}(\delta_2^2) * M_{g_3}(\delta_2^2) \\ \quad = \delta_8[1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 8]. \end{cases}$$

It can be seen from structure matrix that, when $u = \delta_2^1$, there is no fixed point; when $u = \delta_2^2$, there are two fixed points $x = \delta_8^1$ and $x = \delta_8^8$. The fixed point $x = \delta_8^1$ is an optimal NE, while $x = \delta_8^8$ is not an optimal NE.

The optimal NE can be reached and maintained by using the following strategies.

- (1) For $x(0) = \delta_8^1$, select $u(t) = \delta_2^2$, such that the optimal NE can be maintained.
- (2) For $x(0) \in \{\delta_8^2, \delta_8^3, \delta_8^4, \delta_8^5, \delta_8^6, \delta_8^7\}$, select either $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ or $u(0) = \delta_2^2$, such that $x(1) = \delta_8^1$. Then, select $u(t) = \delta_2^2$ for $t \geq 2$, such that the optimal NE can be maintained.
- (3) For $x(0) = \delta_8^8$, select $u(t) = \delta_2^1$, such that $x(1) = \delta_8^1$. Then, select $u(t) = \delta_2^2$ for $t \geq 2$, such that the optimal NE can be maintained.

Remark 3. Cases 3 and 4 are controllable cases. It should be noted that controllability of networked evolutionary games depends on topological structure, strategy set, updating law, and selection of control variables. Detailed information of controllability can be found in Cheng et al. (2015).

4.4. Optimal control design

As can be seen from Section 4.2, to achieve the optimal NE, there may exist different strategies. For example, if the initial states are given by $x(0) = \delta_8^4 \sim (1, 2, 2)$, either $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ or $u(0) = \delta_2^2$ enables the state to become $x(1) = \delta_8^1$. If $u(0) = \delta_2^1$, the overall cost at $t = 0$ is $C(x(0), u(0)) = 28.4$; if $u(0) = \delta_2^2$, the overall cost at $t = 0$ is $C(x(0), u(0)) = 28.6$. Comparatively, for initial states $x(0) = \delta_8^4$, $u(0) = \delta_2^1$ is superior. In this section, we propose an optimal control to minimize the overall cost in transient process.

Suppose that the system is required to reach the optimal NE within T steps, and define $U = [u(0), u(1), \dots, u(T)]^T$. The cost function for optimization can be designed by $J \triangleq \sum_{t=0}^T C(x(t), u(t))$. Dynamics of the system can be given in algebraic form (3). The terminal states should reach the optimal NE: $x(T) = x_{NE^*}$. Suppose that the initial states are denoted by $x(0) = x_0$. The optimization can be formulated by

$$U^* = \arg \min_U J, \quad (9)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(t+1) = M_f(u(t))x(t), \quad (10)$$

$$u(t) = \times_i u_i(t), \quad u_i(t) \in [\delta_2^1, \delta_2^2], \quad (11)$$

$$x(0) = x_0, \quad (12)$$

$$x(T) = x_{NE^*}, \quad (13)$$

where the optimal solution $U^* = [u^*(0), u^*(1), \dots, u^*(T)]^T$ can be regarded as the optimal control sequence.

As can be seen from the control constraint (11), the problem (9) is a binary optimization. The system constraint (10) seems linear; however, since the product is semi-tensor product, it is actually nonlinear. The nonlinear binary optimization can be solved by using a newly developed algorithm named Bounded Neighborhood Field Optimization (BNFO) (Wu & Chow, 2013a,b). The algorithm of BNFO is incapable of addressing the terminal constraint (13). Consequently, the optimization can be reformulated by (9)–(12), where no terminal constraint is included.

Remark 4. BNFO can be categorized as switching optimization. Typical results in switching optimization can be seen in Li, Teo, Wong, and Duan (2006) and literatures therein. General optimal control of Boolean networks can be found in Zhao et al. (2011).

Theorem 4. Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied: (1) the optimal NE x_{NE^*} is a global optimal point; and (2) with certain control series $[\hat{u}(0), \hat{u}(1), \dots, \hat{u}(N)]$, the optimal NE x_{NE^*} can be reached within finite time $t = N < T$ from initial states $x(0) = x_0$. Then, with large enough control horizon T , the closed-loop system with the optimal control (9)–(12) is capable of reaching the optimal NE.

Proof. The result can be proved by contradiction. Assume that, with control horizon T and the optimal control (9)–(12), the closed-loop system fails to reach x_{NE^*} . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J^* &= \sum_{t=0}^T C(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(x^*(t), u^*(t)) + \sum_{t=N}^T C(x^*(t), u^*(t)), \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 2. Topological structure of the circular network with 10 nodes.

where x^*t is the corresponding optimal states under optimal control $u^*(t)$; and $x^*(t) \neq x_{NE^*}$.

In another aspect, according to conditions of the theorem, there exists at least another control series $[\hat{u}(0), \hat{u}(1), \dots, \hat{u}(N), \dots, \hat{u}(T)]$, such that x_{NE^*} is reached and maintained. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J} &= \sum_{t=0}^T C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) = \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) + \sum_{t=N}^T C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) + (T - N)C(x_{NE^*}, u_{NE^*}), \end{aligned}$$

where u_{NE^*} is the corresponding control to maintain the optimal NE. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{J} - J^* &= \left(\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) - \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(x^*(t), u^*(t)) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=N}^T (C(x_{NE^*}, u_{NE^*}) - C(x^*(t), u^*(t))), \end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(\hat{x}(t), \hat{u}(t)) - \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} C(x^*(t), u^*(t))$ is finite; and $\sum_{t=N}^T (C(x_{NE^*}, u_{NE^*}) - C(x^*(t), u^*(t)))$ is negative and decreases strictly as T increases. Consequently, it can be claimed that $\hat{J} - J^* < 0$ for large enough T , indicating that $\hat{u}(t)$ is superior over $u^*(t)$; hence $u^*(t)$ is not an optimal solution, which contradicts the assumption given at the beginning of this proof. Based on the contradiction, it can be proved that the optimal control (9)–(12) guarantees the convergence to the optimal NE x_{NE^*} . \square

For Case 3, suppose the initial state is given by $x(0) = \delta_8^4$. Set $T = 3$, and $x(T) = \delta_8^1$. Solving the optimization formulated by (9)–(12) yields $U^* = [\delta_2^1, \delta_2^2, \delta_2^2]$.

5. A simulation example

In this section, an illustrative example is presented by considering a smart grid with more communities. Its topological structure is given by an undirected circular network with 10 nodes, as can be seen from Fig. 2. Based on concepts in Section 2.1, its adjacent matrix can be calculated accordingly. The diesel power price is given by $p_d = 7$, and the grid power price is given by $p_g(n) = \frac{(n-5)^2}{25} + 6.5$, where n is the number of communities using the grid power. In this simulation example, x_7 and x_{10} are selected as controls u_1 and u_2 ; their values can be assigned arbitrarily to δ_2^1 or δ_2^2 . We suppose that the updating law is given by (1), and the cost function is given by (4) with the coefficient $\alpha = 0.8$.

By using the algorithm proposed in Section 4.1, the algebraic form of the game can be obtained by $x(t+1) = M_f(u_1(t), u_2(t))x(t)$, where $x(t) = \times_{i=1, i \neq 7, i \neq 10}^{10} x_i$. All NEs can be calculated by using Theorem 3: $x_{NE}(u_1 = \delta_2^1, u_2 = \delta_2^1) = \delta_{256}[1]$, $x_{NE}(u_1 = \delta_2^1, u_2 = \delta_2^2) = \delta_{256}[256]$, $x_{NE}(u_1 = \delta_2^2, u_2 = \delta_2^1) = \delta_{256}[256]$, $x_{NE}(u_1 = \delta_2^2, u_2 = \delta_2^2) = \delta_{256}[1, 4, 253, 256]$, where $x_{NE^*} = \delta_{256}^4$ is the optimal NE.

Suppose that the initial states are given by $x(1) = \delta_{256}^{200}$. Applying the optimal control (9)–(12) with control horizon




Fig. 3. Number of communities using grid power, in case of $x(0) = \delta_{256}^{200}$.




Fig. 4. Price of grid power, in case of $x(0) = \delta_{256}^{200}$.




Fig. 5. Total cost paid by communities, in case of $x(0) = \delta_{256}^{200}$.

$T = 8$ to the control networked evolutionary game yields $u(t) = u_1(t) \times u_2(t) = \delta_4[4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4]$, and $x(t) = \delta_{256}[200, 132, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4]$, where $t = 1, 2, \dots, 8$; and the closed-loop system reaches $x_{NE^*} = \delta_{256}^4$. Simulation results are illustrated by Figs. 3–5, where the number of communities using grid power, the real-time price of the grid power, and the overall cost paid by all communities are displayed. As can be seen from simulation results, with the proposed optimal control based on evolutionary game theory and semi-tensor products, the overall cost converges to the optimal NE.

Suppose that the initial states are given by $x(1) = \delta_{256}^{78}$ and the control horizon is set to $T = 6$. The result can be obtained by using the optimal control (9)–(12):

$$u(t) = u_1(t) \times u_2(t) = \delta_4[3, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4], \quad (14)$$

$$x(t) = \delta_{256}[78, 5, 1, 1, 1, 1], \quad (15)$$

where $t = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$. As can be seen from (15), the closed-loop system fails to reach $x_{NE^*} = \delta_{256}^4$; the reasons include that (1) x_{NE^*} may be un-reachable from the initial point $x(0) = \delta_{256}^{78}$, and (2) the control horizon is not large enough.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, control networked evolutionary game and semi-tensor product are applied to solve the demand-side management problem of a simple smart grid. By using the semi-tensor product to solve the control networked evolutionary game, NEs can be proved systematically, and control series can be designed to reach and maintain the optimal NE. The BNFO algorithm is introduced

to optimize the transient performance of the control networked evolutionary game.

Some future works of this research include: (1) optimal control with dynamic price policies (instead of static ones in this paper), and (2) adaptive control in case of uncertain/time-varying weight coefficient in the cost function.

References

- Cheng, D. (2009). Input-state approach to Boolean networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(3), 512–521.
- Cheng, D., He, F., Qi, H., & Xu, T. (2015). Modeling, analysis and control of networked evolutionary games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(9), 2402–2415.
- Cheng, D., Qi, H., & Xue, A. (2007). A survey on semi-tensor product of matrices. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 20, 304–322.
- Du, L., Grijalva, S., & Harley, R. G. (2015). Game-theoretic formulation of power dispatch with guaranteed convergence and prioritized best response. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, 6(1), 51–59.
- Fadlullah, Z., Quan, D. M., Keto, N., & Stojmenovic, I. (2014). GTES: an optimized game-theoretic demand side management scheme for smart grid. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 8(2), 588–597.
- Hong, B., Su, W., & Chou, C. (2014). LPV modeling and game-theoretic control synthesis to design energy-motion regulators for electric scooters. *Automatica*, 50, 1196–1200.
- Jiang, T., Cao, Y., Yu, L., & Wang, Z. (2014). Load shaping strategy based on energy storage and dynamic pricing in smart grid. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 5(6), 2868–2876.
- Li, R., Teo, K. L., Wong, K. H., & Duan, G. R. (2006). Control parameterization enhancing transform for optimal control of the switched systems. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 43, 1393–1403.
- Liang, X., Li, X., Lu, R., Lin, X., & Shen, X. (2013). UDP: usage-based dynamic pricing with privacy preservation for smart grid. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 4(1), 141–150.
- Ma, K., Hu, G., & Spanos, C. J. (2014). Distributed energy consumption control via real-time pricing feedback in smart grid. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 22(5), 1907–1914.
- Malatji, E. M., Zhang, J., & Xia, X. (2013). A multiple objective optimisation model for building energy efficiency investment decision. *Energy and Buildings*, 61, 81–87.
- Mohsenian-Rad, A., Wong, V. W. S., Jatskevich, J., Schober, R., & Leon-Garcia, A. (2014). Autonomous demand-side management based on game-theoretic energy consumption scheduling for the future smart grid. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 1(3), 320–331.
- Nwulu, N. I., & Xia, X. (2015). Multi-objective dynamic economic emission dispatch of electric power generation integrated with game theory based demand response programs. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 89, 963–974.
- Ren, W. (2010). Consensus tracking under directed interaction topologies: algorithms and experiments. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 18(1), 230–237.
- Stephens, E. R., Smith, D. B., & Mahanti, A. (2015). Game theoretic model predictive control for distributed energy demand-side management. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 6(3), 1394–1402.
- Wu, Z., & Chow, T. (2013a). Binary neighbourhood field optimisation for unit commitment problems. *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, 7(3), 298–308.
- Wu, Z., & Chow, T. (2013b). Neighborhood field for cooperative optimization. *Soft Computing*, 17(5), 819–834.
- Xiao, L., Mandayam, N. B., & Poor, H. V. (2015). Prospect theoretic analysis of energy exchange among microgrids. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 6(1), 63–72.
- Zhang, J., & Xia, X. (2011). A model predictive control approach to the periodic implementation of the solutions of the optimal dynamic resource allocation problem. *Automatica*, 47(2), 358–362.
- Zhao, Y., Li, Z., & Cheng, D. (2011). Optimal control of logical control networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(8), 1766–1776.



tems.


Bing Zhu was born in Wuhan, China, in 1985. He received his B.S. and Ph.D. degrees in control theory and applications from Beihang University (formerly named Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics), Beijing, China P.R., in 2007 and 2013, respectively. He has been with University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa, as a postdoctoral fellow with Vice-Chancellor Postdoctoral Fellowship from 2013 to 2015. He is currently a research fellow at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. His research interests include demand-side management, model predictive control, nonlinear control, flight control, and multi-agent systems.



Xiaohua Xia obtained his Ph.D. degree at Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Beijing, China, in 1989. He stayed at the University of Stuttgart, Germany, as an Alexander von Humboldt fellow in May 1994 and for two years, followed by two short visits to Ecole Centrale de Nantes, France and National University of Singapore during 1996 and 1997, respectively, both as a post-doctoral fellow. He joined the University of Pretoria, South Africa, since 1998, and became a full professor in 2000. He also held a number of visiting positions, as an invited professor at IRCCYN, Nantes, France, in 2001, 2004 and 2005, as

a guest professor at Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China, and as a Cheung Kong chair professor at Wuhan University, China. He is an IEEE fellow, served as the South African IEEE Section/Control Chapter Chair, as the chair of the Technical Committee of Non-linear Systems, as a member of the Technical Board (both of IFAC). He is an A-rated scientist by the National Research Foundation of South Africa, an elected fellow of the South African Academy of Engineering, and an elected member of the Academy of Science of South Africa. He has been an Associate Editor of *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II*, and the Specialist Editor (Control) of the *SAIEE Africa Research Journal*. His research interests include: non-linear feedback control, observer design, time-delay systems, hybrid systems, modeling and control of HIV/AIDS, control and handling of heavy-haul trains and energy modeling and optimization. He is a registered professional engineering by the Engineering Council of South Africa, and

a certified measurement and verification professional by the American Association of Energy Engineers. He is the director of both the Centre of New Energy Systems at the University of Pretoria and the National Hub for the Postgraduate Programme in Energy Efficiency and Demand Side Management. He is an elected board member of measurement and verification council of South Africa (MVCSA) since 2014. He is the founding director of Onga Energy Efficiency and Management Pty Ltd—the first SANAS accredited M&V Company against ISO 17020 and he is invited as a technical assessor for the South African National Accreditation Systems (SANAS) for M&V inspection bodies in South Africa.



Zhou Wu was born in Anhui, China, in 1985. He received his B.S and M.S. degrees in control engineering from Wuhan University, Wuhan, China P.R., in 2007 and 2009, respectively, and his Ph.D. degree in electronic engineering from City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, in 2012. Then he joined in University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa, as a Senior Research Fellow in the Centre of New Energy Systems. Since 2016, he joined Chongqing University, Chongqing, as a full professor. His research interests include evolutionary algorithms, pattern recognition, energy system optimization, demand side management, and optimal control.