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Abstract

Solar photovoltaic (SPV) power generation has been more popular throughout the world in recent years due to its recyclable and eco-friendly nature. As a result, extracting the maximum power from SPV systems is important. Our contribution to this problem is to harvest maximum power under changes in ambient conditions and parametric variations. This paper presents a novel robust model reference adaptive maximum power point tracking controller (RMRAC-MPPT) for PV systems under five different cases including temperature, load, irradiance, boost converter capacitance, and inductance variations. To assess the robustness of the proposed method, MATLAB/Simulink software is used to compare it to the state-of-the-art techniques such as INC, P\&O, FLC, Adaptive FLC, SMC, back stepping-SMC, PI, iRCS-MPC, P\&O-MPC, ANFIS, BAT-FLC, and IPID. The verification of the proposed method is also tested in a laboratory-based OPAL-RT real-time simulator. It is evident that the proposed MPPT technique improves maximum power point (MPP) tracking capabilities while reducing steady-state oscillations. Furthermore, with five different parameter variations, the time duration to capture MPP is 1.5ms, which is significantly faster than other state-of-the-art
techniques. In addition, the proposed technique has a tracking efficiency of 99.75% and an overall system efficiency of 96%.
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1. Introduction

The world's energy demands are rapidly growing. This has resulted in excessive fossil fuels usages, which has had significant environmental implications such as ozone layer depletion, global warming, and acid rain. Renewable energy would be a possible solution to this crisis. Various renewable energy methods i.e., solar, wind, tidal, geothermal, etc. have been invented that are efficient and cost-effective as compared to traditional power generation. Solar energy is a significant source of energy because of its worldwide accessibility, ease of installation, no noise, less maintenance and clean energy generation [1]. Solar photovoltaic (SPV) systems are used for a variety of purposes such as electric transportation, roadside lamps, remote power generation, commercial electricity generation, and solar-driven air conditioning system [2].

The key obstacles for solar power usage, which limit the amount of solar energy extracted, are atmosphere, temperature, dust, geographic areas, and cloud covering. On the other hand, rapid fluctuations in solar temperature and radiation have a negative impact on the PV system's performance. Due to these changes, PV systems cannot offer maximum power to the load indefinitely. As a result, algorithm like maximum power point tracking (MPPT) is required to quickly adjust the PV system for changing climate conditions and supply optimal power to the load [3]. The main goals of MPPT are to ensure fast, precise maximum power tracking and reduce oscillations. Boost converter is best suited to PV applications, as it allows low inductivity to eliminate current ripples and has lower switching losses. Under changeable weather circumstances, MPPT techniques modify the dc-dc converter duty cycle to transmit
maximum power generated from the PV source to the grid or load. The basic block diagram of a typical MPPT controller used in a PV system is illustrated in Figure 1.

1.1. Literature review
Many MPPT approaches have been introduced in the literature, each with a distinct level of complexity, tracking speed, cost-effectiveness, accuracy, and MPPT operating mechanism. Fundamental methodologies are devised using current, duty cycle, and voltage as well as PV cell mathematical model, and are used to estimate optimal operating points on the P-V curve. MPPT approaches may be divided into three types: artificial intelligence (AI), Indirect, and direct-based techniques [4].

Indirect MPPT approaches, such as short circuit current (SCC) and open-circuit voltage (OCV), rely on the performance characteristics of PV panels under a variety of environmental circumstances. The indirect techniques cannot provide exact tracking of MPP at any temperature and irradiance [5]. Further sophisticated MPPT algorithms are called direct techniques. The most often utilized direct approaches are Perturb and observe (P&O) and incremental conductance (INC). The P&O algorithm is well-known for its simplicity, low operational costs, and easy to implement. However, its shortcomings, such as incorrect tracking direction with a sudden increase in irradiance and seems significant fluctuations near MPP, become significant obstacles [6]. Another direct MPPT method is INC, which delivers better outcomes in terms of efficiency, speed, and accuracy as compared to P&O. Furthermore, during a considerable variation in solar irradiation, the P&O and INC may not offer the speed and accuracy necessary to attain the MPP [7].

AI-based MPPT techniques, including particle swarm optimization (PSO) [8], fuzzy logic control (FLC) [9], artificial neural networks (ANN) [10], and genetic algorithm (GA) [11], give better tracking performance and efficiency under rapidly fluctuating climate conditions. However, compared to traditional techniques, these MPPT algorithms are more difficult and expensive to apply. A variety of hybrid MPPT approaches such as INC-based FLC [12], BAT-
FLC [13], etc. have been proposed to combine the advantages of two different MPPT techniques and solve the problem to maintain MPP.

Extensive research has been done in the literature to alleviate the disadvantages of existing techniques. A SOFT (steady output & fast tracking)-MPPT algorithm is developed, which attempts to improve the tracking and steady-state performance of both INC and P&O algorithms. To follow the MPP, an adaptive step size is employed, which gives a faster tracking response. The experimental and simulation outcome have validated the algorithm performance under uniform climate situations [14]. To overcome the shortcoming of the standard P&O method, a coarse and fine control approach is introduced. This concept offers three control states, each with its own specific features. State 1 and 2 improve tracking speed whereas state 3 regulates steady-state oscillations. The simulated comparison study shows that the new approach has lower oscillations, greater tracking efficiency, faster-tracking speed, lower power loss compared to other strategies [15]. To enhance the PV system's performance, an adjustable variable step backstepping (VS-BS) MPPT approach is presented. The approach is a two-level hybrid MPPT technique that combines VS-P&O and BS controller. The goal of merging two independent MPPT approaches is to improve tracking accuracy and speed while maintaining a simple scheme [16]. A robust sliding mode controller (SMC) is introduced to track the MPP under solar radiation and temperature variations. In addition, the hysteresis quantized input is considered to overcome the chattering problem in traditional SMC [17]. A new MPPT approach based on adaptive FLC (AFLC) is described. The grey wolf optimization (GWO) approach is used to optimize the AFLC membership function. The suggested method follows global MPP under all shading situations and improves efficiency, tracking time, and oscillations [18]. A filter-based adaptive fuzzy proportional integral derivative (FPIDN) controller for MPPT is implemented. The suggested MPPT's efficacy has been compared to other MPPT approaches like AFLC, FLC, INC, and P&O. The new controller efficiency is between 99.45%-99.72% with MPP capture time at 0.048s under changing temperature and
radiation conditions [19]. An asymmetrical FLC are proposed to track the global MPP under changing radiation and temperature conditions [20]. Under varying climate conditions like temperature and radiation, an Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (ANFIS)-based MPPT controller for a standalone PV system is presented. The suggested controller can follow the MPP quicker than FLC and P&O under changing weather conditions [21]. Using FLC, an updated MPPT technique has been devised. Under varying temperature and radiation circumstances, the suggested method's accuracy ranges between 99.5% to 99.9%. Furthermore, the duration to capture MPP is 21ms. It is approximately five times and four times faster than INC and P&O respectively [4].

As per the literature survey, most of the proposed MPPT controllers are working under both temperature and radiation conditions only. These MPPT algorithms, on the other hand, are not discussed other parameter variations like load, boost converter inductance, and capacitance. Moreover, the time to follow the MPP is not so much impressive. In this paper, a novel robust model reference adaptive MPPT controller (RMRAC) is proposed for PV systems under five different cases including temperature, radiation, load, boost converter capacitance as well as inductance. Furthermore, MATLAB simulation results, as well as laboratory-based OPAL-RT real-time simulator validation, were performed to confirm the effectiveness of the proposed control scheme. Additionally, the time duration to capture MPP is 1.5ms under five different parameter variations which is much lower than other well-known techniques. The proposed method has 99.75% tracking and 96% overall system efficiency. Table 1 illustrates the comparison of various MPPT approaches.

The following are the primary contributions of the proposed research:

- To design and implementation of a novel robust model reference adaptive controller for MPPT application focused on boost converter.
• To evaluate the robustness of the proposed controller, five different cases are considered: temperature, load, solar irradiation, boost converter capacitance as well as inductance variation.

• The proposed controller results are compared with the state-of-the-art technique such as INC, P&O, FLC, Adaptive FLC, SMC, back stepping-SMC, PI, iRCS-MPC, P&O-MPC, ANFIS, BAT-FLC, and IPID in terms of tracking speed and efficiency.

• MATLAB/Simulink software is used to compare various state-of-the-art MPPT approaches for assessing its resilience.

• Real-time validation using the OPAL-RT simulator (OP-4510) further proves the applicability of the suggested method in the real world.

Four key sections are included in this paper: Section 2 addresses the PV system mathematical model. Boost converter dynamics and integration with PV systems are addressed in section 3. The MRAC design procedure is explained in section 4. Section 5 provides the simulation result of the research. Section 6 gives the concluding remark of the paper.

2. PV mathematical model

The PV cell’s most common model is made up of parallel and series resistors attached to a current source and a diode displayed in Figure 2. $R_{pe}$ and $R_{se}$ denote parallel and series resistance [4].

The equation for the solar cell's output current is

$$I = I_R - I_{d1} - I_{pe}.$$  (1)

where $I_R$ displays photo current without loss and depends on solar temperature and irradiance.

$I_{d1}$, $I$, and $I_{pe}$ represent diode, output, and parallel resistance leakage current respectively.

$$I_{d1} = I_{01} \left( e^{\frac{(V + B_{oc})}{nKT}} - 1 \right).$$  (2)
where $I_{01}$, $n$, $q$, $T$, and $K$ reflect reverse saturation current, diode factor, electron charge, p-n junction temperature, and Boltzmann constant respectively. The basic equation for current produced in PV cell is presented in Equation 3.

$$I_R = \frac{W}{W_0} (I_c + \lambda(t - t_0)).$$

where $I_c$ represents short circuit current. $W$ and $W_0$ are irradiances and reference irradiance during the day while $t$ and $t_0$ are temperature and reference temperature during the day. $\lambda$ is the temperature coefficient.

$$I = I_R - I_{01} e^{\frac{q(V + R_P I)}{nKT}} - 1 - \frac{V + R_P I}{R_{pv}}.$$  

(4)

The $I_{01}$ is defined by:

$$I_{01} = I_{01 ref} \left( \frac{1}{T_0} \right)^3 e^{\frac{qE_G}{nk} \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T_0} \right)}.$$  

(5)

where $E_G$ is the energy bandgap. Table 2 displays the specification of the PV panel adopted in this research.

More specifically, as displayed in Figure 3, the MPP changes with ambient conditions, and a controller is required to set the PV power close to the MPP. The method of the controller design relies essentially on the modeling of PV cells for the interface with environmental conditions.

The MPP exists when the rate of change of power with respect to voltage is zero, as illustrated in Figure 3(b). and it is expressed as in Equation 6.

$$\frac{dP}{dV_{pv}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{at MPP} \\ >0, & \text{at left side of MPP} \\ <0, & \text{at right side of MPP} \end{cases}$$  

(6)

For the MPPT adaptive controller, this Equation 6 will be used as the control rule.
3. Boost converter dynamics

Figure 4 illustrates the incorporation of a device where a boost converter is used to supply maximum power to load. The boost converter model in Figure 5 shows the MPPT controller senses solar current and voltage and provides the duty cycle \( D \) to the switch \( Q \). The \( D \) is connected to the array voltage through Equation 7.

\[
v_{pv} = i_{pv} R_0 (1 - D)^2. \tag{7}
\]

where \( i_{pv} \) and \( v_{pv} \) are array current and voltage respectively. \( R_0 \) is the load resistance. Both array current and voltage contain dc \( (I_{pv} \text{ and } V_{pv}) \) and ripple \( (\hat{i}_{pv} \text{ and } \hat{v}_{pv}) \) terms. The purpose is then to create a controller, which measures the optimum value of the loop continuously, to ensure that \( I_{pv} \) tracks \( I_M \) \( (V_{pv} \text{ tracks } V_M) \) to deliver the maximum power.

Equation 7 gives the foundation for the traditional MPPT method to evaluate \( D \) in a steady state. The MPPT control must take into account dynamics between the array voltage and \( D \) to maximize transient reactions. As transient oscillations are undesirable and can contribute to device inefficiency, MPPT controls must reduce oscillations from the array voltage after adjusting \( D \) for changing atmospheric conditions. The boost converter detailed dynamic model is discussed in [26]. A small-signal equivalent circuit is assumed to simplify the study of transient response as indicated in [27]. Figure 5 displays the small-signal equivalent circuit of PV. The solar array is modeled as resistor \( R_i \), small-signal array current \( (\hat{i}_{pv}) \), and voltage \( (\hat{v}_{pv}) \) across its terminal.

Now transfer function (TF) of the control signal \( (D) \) to array voltage is derived around an operating point. This TF presents the system dynamics. The dynamic model in Figure 5 displays a battery load that is realistic for the PV system. Here, we neglect the battery
dynamics in deriving the transfer function of array voltage to \( D \) in small-signal operations. We have the following relationship after analyzing Figure 5 [28]:

\[
\frac{\hat{V}_{pv}(s)}{R_i} + s\hat{V}_{pv}(s)C_i = \frac{g'(D)\hat{d}(s) - \hat{V}_{pv}(s)}{sL_{01}}. \tag{8}
\]

where \( d(s) \) reflects the small-signal variation around the \( D \). \( g(D) \) is the relation between \( D \) and \( V_{pv} \) while \( g'(D) \) is the derivative of \( g(D) \) w.r.t. \( D \). From Equation 8, we get

\[
\frac{\hat{V}_{pv}(s)}{\hat{d}(s)} = \frac{g'(D)}{L_{01}C_i s^2 + \frac{L_{01}}{R_i} s + 1}. \tag{9}
\]

It is well known that

\[
g(D) = V_{pv} = (1 - D)V_0. \tag{10}
\]

where \( V_0 \) is boost converter steady-state output. Equation 10 assumes that \( V_0 \) and \( g(D) \) are not influenced by transient switching behavior. From Equation 10, \( g'(D) = -V_0 \) and now Equation 9 will be

\[
\frac{\hat{V}_{pv}(s)}{\hat{d}(s)} = \frac{-\frac{V_0}{L_{01}C_i}}{s^2 + \frac{L_{01}}{R_iC_i} s + \frac{1}{L_{01}C_i}}. \tag{11}
\]

The minus sign indicates that a reduction in the duty ratio raises the voltage of the panel. This study does not include the parasitic components of the power stage. The transfer function referred to above is calculated from a linearized version (as Figure 5) of a nonlinear system (as Figure 4), near a single operating point. The plant parameters \( C, L, \) and \( R \) are not constant and fluctuate within the lower and upper range of their nominal values \((R^*, L^*, C^*)\) as:

\[
R_{\min} \leq R^* \leq R_{\max}. \tag{12}
\]

\[
C_{\min} \leq C^* \leq C_{\max}. \tag{13}
\]

\[
L_{\min} \leq L^* \leq L_{\max}. \tag{14}
\]
The goal is to ensure that the controller can handle a wide variety of load values \((R)\) and also that the controller can work with varied boost converter sizes, which are represented by \(C\) and \(L\). The ranges of values for each system parameter are displayed in Table 3.

To minimize current and voltage ripples, the boost converter inductance and capacitance values must be carefully chosen in the design. The capacitance is selected in such a way that the voltage ripples are minimized, as recommended in [26]:

\[ C \geq \frac{1}{f \Delta V} D. \]  

(15)

where \(\Delta V\) and \(f\) are voltage ripple and switching frequency respectively. Estimating the voltage ripple factor as:

\[ VRF = \frac{\Delta V}{V}. \]  

(16)

The inductance is selected in such a way that the current ripples are minimized, as recommended in [26]:

\[ L \geq \frac{V}{f \Delta I} D(D - 1). \]  

(17)

where \(\Delta I\) is the current ripple which is given as:

\[ CRF = \frac{\Delta I}{I}. \]  

(18)

where CRF is the current ripple factor.

4. Model reference adaptive control

The design of MRAC is presented to optimize the PV system output power. Figure 6 displays the overall schematic diagram of the proposed control scheme. A voltage-reference-based P&O algorithm is designed as the MPPT control scheme. Equation 6 refers to the MPPT control law where maximum power exists and the reference voltage of the controller can vary as per the following equation, where \(V_{pv}\) is array voltage and \(\Delta V\) is the small threshold voltage.
The adaptive control technology can deal with uncertainties and disruptions in system structure, as well as changes in the operating conditions unless the feedback control. Due to its special characteristics and ease of execution, MRAC is designed for MPP applications. The MRAC required only reference and array voltage as input [29, 30]. The MRAC primarily consists of a process, adaptation gain, and reference model as illustrated in Figure 7.

The key objective of MRAC is that the main process output should adopt the reference model output by use of adaptation gain. MRAC’s design parameters are based on the choice of the reference model to indicate the optimal output response and a controller is designed to mitigate the error \( e_z \) between the model and plant output. To regulate the control law, adaptive control is used. The MIT law is one of the fundamental adaptive methods focused on a gradient strategy. This is the basic approach of the MRAC controller developed at MIT around 1960 for aerospace applications to minimize the \( e_z \) between the reference and system output by changing the adaptation laws to reduce cost function:

\[
J(\phi) = \frac{e_z^2}{2}.
\]

where \( e_z \) is the error between plant and reference model \( e_z = V_{pv} - V_m \). The aim is to change the parameter to minimize \( J(\phi) \) in the direction of the negative gradient of \( J \):

\[
\frac{d\phi}{dt} = -\eta \frac{\partial J}{\partial \phi} = -\eta e_z \frac{\partial e_z}{\partial \phi}.
\]
where \( \eta \) is the adaptation gain, \( \frac{\partial e}{\partial \varphi} \) is system sensitivity and it is measured under the assumption that \( \varphi \) changes slowly. In the MRAC structure, the first-order model was chosen as follows:

\[
x'_m(t) = A_m x_m(t) + B_m u_m(t).
\] (22)

The assumed model parameters are

\[ A_m = [4]. \quad \text{and} \quad B_m = [4]. \]

The control signal \( D(t) \) is expressed as

\[
D(t) = \varphi_1 V_{ref}(t) - \varphi_2 V_{pv}(t).
\] (23)

where the vector parameter \( (\varphi) = [\phi_1 \phi_2] \). The adaptation law for MIT rule is:

\[
\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} = -\eta \left( \frac{A_m}{p + A_m} V_{ref}(t) \right) e_c(t).
\] (24)

\[
\frac{d\varphi(t)}{dt} = \eta \left( \frac{A_m}{p + a_m} V_{pv}(t) \right) e_c(t).
\] (25)

where \( p = \frac{d}{dt} \)

Now RMRAC controller design is completed, the next segment describes the results.

5. Result

The MPPT with RMRAC was simulated with the aid of the SIMULINK toolbox. The simulation comprises three major interconnected components: PV, Boost converter, and adaptive Controller model where the operating process is displayed in Figure 8. Considering the parameter value shown in Table 2. Here adaptation gain is considered as 0.08.

The PV cell maximum power (213.15 W) versus MPPT output power is shown in Figure 9 for 1000 W/m\(^2\) radiation at 25°C. This finding illustrates that the reaction time of the MRAC adaptive controller is lower than 0.02 sec, which is quicker than any other controller as in [26, ...
Figure 10 shows the voltage and current waveform. This adaptive controller will be able to track the MPP for any other solar radiation value easily.

In addition, the controller performance has been verified with various rapidly changing irradiation signals as shown in Figure 11. These variabilities can be described as distinct weather situations and are essential for validating the efficiency of the controller in cloudy or dusty weather.

The ideal power and PV power under three different varying irradiation signals (Figure 11) at constant temperature (25°C) with $R_d=20\Omega$ using normal P&O approach are shown in Figure 12. According to Figure 12 and its corresponding zoom view, it is clear that the P&O approach does not accurately track the ideal power under three different radiation signals.

The ideal power ($P_{\text{ideal}}$) and PV power ($P_{\text{PV}}$) under three different varying irradiation signals (Figure 11) at constant temperature (25°C) with $R_d=20\Omega$ using the proposed approach are shown in Figure 13. From Figure 13 and its zoom view, it is clear that the proposed approach accurately tracks the maximum power point compared to the traditional P&O approach with less oscillations. So, the proposed MPPT control is feasible under different rapidly changing radiation signals.

Now, the mentioned five different parameters are considered to check the robustness of the proposed approach. The irradiance, temperature, load, boost converter inductance, and capacitance signals are shown in Figure 14. The system operated in seven different states. State 1 is 1000W/m$^2$, 25°C, 15Ω, 0.4mH, and 100µF, State 2 is 1000W/m$^2$, 30°C, 20Ω, 0.4mH, and 100µF, State 3 is 800W/m$^2$, 35°C, 20Ω, 0.3mH, and 200µF, State 4 is 800W/m$^2$, 35°C to 20°C, 25Ω, 0.3mH, and 200-300µF, State 5 is 600W/m$^2$, 20°C to 35°C, 30Ω to 35Ω, 0.2mH, and 300µF to 100µF, State 6 is 600W/m$^2$, 35°C, 20Ω, 0.2mH, and, 100µF, State 7 is 1000W/m$^2$, 35°C,
20Ω, 0.3mH, and 100µF. All of the states described are inspired by daily load, temperature, and irradiance changes. Here three different combination conditions like both irradiances and temperature varying; irradiances, temperature and load varying; irradiances, temperature, load, inductance, and capacitance varying are used to verify the controller robustness.

The ideal power and the PV power generated from the suggested MPPT approach under changing irradiance (Figure 14(a)) and temperature (Figure 14(b)) signals are shown in Figure 15. As per Figure 15, the proposed scheme is capable of tracking the MPP. The embedded zoom view in Figure 15 shows that the $P_{PV}$ is capable of tracking the $P_{ideal}$ under sudden changes in irradiance and temperature. The time duration to capture MPP is 0.002 sec.

The ideal power and the PV power achieved from the suggested MPPT approach under changing irradiance (Figure 14(a)), temperature (Figure 14(b)), and load (Figure 14(c)) signal are shown in Figure 16. The time duration to capture MPP is 0.004 sec. The PV current, PV voltage, Output current, and output voltage achieved from the suggested MPPT approach under simultaneously changing irradiance, temperature, and load signal are shown in Figure 17.

The ideal power and the PV power achieved from the suggested MPPT under simultaneously varying irradiance (Figure 14(a)), temperature (Figure 14(b)), load (Figure 14(c)), inductance (Figure 14(d)), and capacitance (Figure 14(e)) signal are shown in Figure 18. According to Figure 18, the suggested scheme is capable of tracking the MPP. The embedded zoom view in Figure 18 shows that the $P_{PV}$ can track the $P_{ideal}$ even when all five parameters change simultaneously. The time to capture MPP is 0.0015 sec.

The PV current, PV voltage, Output current, and output voltage achieved from the suggested MPPT method under simultaneously varying irradiance, temperature, load, inductance, and capacitance signal are shown in Figure 19.
The proposed MPPT scheme’s performance is validated experimentally using a laboratory-based OPAL-RT real-time simulator (OP-4510) as displayed in Figure 20. It is a four-core real-time simulator. One of the features of this simulator is the RT-LAB system. It is divided into two sections. The first is the host computer, and the second is the RT simulator. Edits are made on the host computer. RT-LAB compiles the Simulink model and provides a user interface. The real-time model execution is handled by the RT simulator. It runs with the REDHAT operating system and communicates with the host via telnet.

The Simulink model was built in a real-time OPAL-RT environment and executed using the OPAL-RT (OP-4510) simulator. The signal such as $V_{pv}$, $I_{pv}$, and $P_{pv}$ have been observed on DSO. The experimental results for $P_{pv}$, $I_{pv}$, and $V_{pv}$ for the proposed controller are shown in Figure 21.

The proposed control method, as shown in Figure 21, tracks the MPP with low oscillations at any irradiation level. Furthermore, the MPP is accurately tracked when the radiation level changes abruptly from 350W/m$^2$ to 600W/m$^2$.

\[
\text{Tracking efficiency} = \frac{P_{\text{ideal}} - P_{pv}}{P_{\text{ideal}}} 
\]

\[
\text{Overall system efficiency} = \frac{P_{\text{ideal}} - P_{\text{out}}}{P_{\text{ideal}}} 
\]

The tracking efficiency and the overall system efficiency are calculated by the above equations. The tracking and overall system efficiency of the proposed controller are 99.8% and 96.1% respectively under changing irradiation conditions and it is illustrated in Figure 22(a) and (b). The proposed approach performed the best under all of the varied climate conditions.

The tracking and overall system efficiency of the proposed controller are 99.75% and 96% respectively under simultaneously changing five different parameters and it is illustrated in
Figure 23(a) and (b). The proposed approach performed the best under all of the varied climate conditions.

Table 4 shows the comparison of various recent MPPT algorithms with the novel RMRAC technique. It can clearly be seen that none of the exiting controller is able to track MPP after varying all five parameters simultaneously. It can also be seen that the tracking time of novel RMRAC is so much impressive. The bar plot of the tracking time under varying solar radiation and varying irradiation with temperature are shown in Figure 24.

The result demonstrates that the new MPPT technique for capturing MPP is the fastest and has the lowest oscillation rate at MPP, which implies the least amount of power loss. Also, the experimentally obtained results are close to the simulation results, indicating the proposed scheme is effective and feasible.

6. Conclusion

Adaptive control techniques are used extensively in time-changing or nonlinear systems due to their capability to adapt unpredictable changes in input or system dynamics. Furthermore, adaptive controllers often took less system previous knowledge and computing time. This research proposes a novel RMRAC-MPPT approach for PV systems under five different cases including temperature, irradiance, load, boost converter capacitance as well as inductance. To assess the robustness of the suggested method, MATLAB/Simulink software was utilized to compare it to well-established techniques such as P&O, INC, FLC, Adaptive FLC, SMC, back stepping-SMC, PI, iRCS-MPC, P&O-MPC, ANFIS, BAT-FLC, and IPID (incremental proportional integral derivative). The verification of the proposed method is also tested in a laboratory-based OPAL-RT real-time simulator. The proposed MPPT technique outperforms previous methods for determining MPP under rapid changes in system characteristics and
atmospheric operating conditions. The tracking and overall system efficiency of the suggested MPPT are 99.75% and 96% respectively. In comparison to frequently utilized techniques, the suggested MPPT method produced the lowest oscillation rate at the MPP. This elevates the technique to the top of the efficiency rankings. According to the simulation results, the suggested MPPT approach takes 5ms under radiation variation, 2ms under both temperature and radiation variation, 4ms under simultaneously varying load, temperature, and radiation, and 1.5ms under simultaneously varying all five parameters to attain a steady-state. This indicates that the proposed MPPT approach is the best in terms of speed. Simultaneously, the amount of oscillation is relatively minimal as compared to traditional techniques. The suggested approach has a high level of accuracy and is also simple to implement in the system. Future work might concentrate on the effect of partial shading conditions as well as grid integration.
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Table 1. Comparison of the various MPPT techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPPT Method</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Steady-state Oscillation</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Convergence Speed</th>
<th>Climate change and parameter variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified FLC [4]</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT-MPPT [14]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Only I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse and fine MPPT [15]</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I, T &amp; R individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS-BS [16]</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPIDN MPPT [19]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-SMC [22]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved restricted control set model (iRCS)-MPC [23]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very Fast</td>
<td>Only I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT-FLC [24]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>I &amp; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPID-MPPT [25]</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Only I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed MPPT

Medium No Very High Very Fast I, T, L, BI, and BC

I: Irradiation, T: Temperature, R: Load, BI-Boost Converter Inductance, BC-Boost Converter Capacitance

Table 2. Solar module 1Soltech 1STH-215-P specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Power</td>
<td>213.15 W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Voltage</td>
<td>29 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Current</td>
<td>7.35 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open circuit Voltage</td>
<td>36.3 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short circuit Current</td>
<td>7.84 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Ranges of values for the PV plant transfer function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R(Ω)</th>
<th>C(Farad)</th>
<th>L(Henry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2×10⁻⁴</td>
<td>3×10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1×10⁻⁴</td>
<td>2×10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3×10⁻⁴</td>
<td>4×10⁻⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. The comparison of RMRAC with exiting popular algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPPT Technique</th>
<th>Tracking time under varying</th>
<th>Tracking Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irradiation</td>
<td>Irradiation &amp; temp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;O [4]</td>
<td>0.28 sec</td>
<td>0.086 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INC [4]</td>
<td>0.24 sec</td>
<td>0.11 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLC [4]</td>
<td>0.17 sec</td>
<td>0.027 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive FLC [4]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.021 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-SMC [22]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.011 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI [22]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.048 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iRCS-MPC [23]</td>
<td>0.006 sec</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;O-MPC [23]</td>
<td>0.026 sec</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANFIS [21]</td>
<td>0.125 sec</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAT-FLC [24]</td>
<td>0.12 sec</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC [32]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPID MPPT [25]</td>
<td>0.6 sec</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novel RMRAC</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.005 sec</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.002 sec</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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