DTC, DPC and Nonlinear Vector Control Strategies Applied to the DFIG Operated at Variable Speed
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Abstract: In this paper we present the modeling and control designs for a variable-speed constant-frequency wind energy conversion system using double fed induction generator (DFIG). The aim of this paper is to design and compare two distinct control strategies to control the rotor side power converter and two control strategies to control the grid side power converter. For the rotor side converter (RSC), a nonlinear vector control strategy using the second Lyapunov approach is firstly developed. Secondly, a direct torque control strategy, constructed around two hysteresis controllers that allow flux and torque regulation, is presented. For the grid side converter (GSC), the network voltage vector oriented control based on PI controllers and a direct power control strategy constructed around two hysteresis controllers that allow grid injected power regulation, are presented, respectively. Simulation results have shown good performances of the wind energy converter system operate under typical wind variations and every propose control strategies.
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1 Introduction

To produce electrical energy using a wind energy conversion system (WECS), various control strategies have been developed in the literature [1-12]. The most widely used control techniques are the vector control (VC) [1-4] and the direct control techniques [5-8]. All these techniques have the goal to bring down the cost of electrical energy produced by the WECS and to converge the system for operating at unity power factor.

For the rotor side converter (RSC), the VC strategy which guarantees high dynamics and static performance via an internal current control loops, has attracted much attention in the past few decades. However, the performance of the VC largely depends on the design of the current controllers and the tuning of their parameters [3,4].

Direct Control eliminates the need for current regulators and specific modulations. Direct torque control (DTC) provides direct control of machine’s torque and flux. This approach achieves better steady state and transient torque control conditions, but it is penalized by the electromagnetic torque noises and the high switching frequency [11,17].

The grid side converter (GSC) can also be controlled by VC technique [1,9,10,11]. This method guarantees a high static performance but it is affected by the stability requirements of the feedback loops.

In the last few years, the use of direct control techniques like the DPC which select the converter switching patterns from an optimal switching table based on the instantaneous errors of the active and reactive powers, and the angular position of the converter terminal voltage vector, for high power systems like WECS, is spreading due to the advantages, such as a fast dynamics and simplicity, when compared with other methods [13,14].

The aim of this paper is to present, discuss and compare various control strategies for DFIG driven by wind turbine under typical wind variations. The DFIG will be connected to a rural grid directly by the stator and through a back to back converter by the rotor. This structure has the advantage of using power converter rated for approximately 30% of the total exchanged power, which makes this solution more suitable for variable speed wind turbines [9,12].
For the RSC, a non linear vector control (NLVC) and a direct torque control (DTC) will be developed. Without any internal current control loops, the proposed NLVC technique allows to overcome the problems of the classical field oriented control. It is based on the second approach of Lyapunov theory which rests on the definition of positive definite candidate function \( V \) whose convergence towards zero generates the convergence of the state of the system towards its equilibrium. In this study, the definition of the candidate function is based on the minimization of the energy criterion. The DTC strategy controls directly the electromagnetic torque and flux by selecting voltage vectors from a look-up-table. In DTC, the flux is conventionally obtained from the rotor voltage model, using the measured rotor voltages and currents [5,6]. This method, utilizing open-loop pure integration, suffers from increased noise on voltage and current and quantization errors in the digital system, in addition to the offset gain and conversions factors in the low speed range, even with the correct knowledge of the rotor resistance. In this paper, the proposed DTC approach uses the measured stator and rotor currents to estimate flux and torque. For both proposed control strategies, we will maximize the energy captured from the wind turbine and injected to the grid.

2 DFIG model

In complex notation, the DFIG mechanical and electrical equations are derived from Park model expressed in a reference frame d-q rotating at synchronous speed \( \omega_s \) as follows [9].

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\tilde{r}}{dt} &= -a_{sr}\tilde{r} + a_{sv}v_s - b_{sr}\tilde{v}_r \\
\frac{dv}{dt} &= a_{sv}\tilde{r} - a_{sr}v_s + b_{sr}\tilde{v}_r \\
J_m + \frac{1}{m^2}\frac{d\omega}{dt} + f\omega &= T_e - T_m
\end{align*}
\]

All electrical and mechanical variables and notations are defined in appendix 1.

With:

\[
\begin{align*}
& a_{ss} = \frac{1}{\sigma r} + j(\omega_s - \omega_r)M^2 \\
& a_{sr} = \frac{M}{\sigma L_r} + j\frac{M}{\sigma L_s}(\omega_s - \omega_r) \\
& a_{sv} = \frac{M}{\sigma L_s} + j\frac{M}{\sigma L_r}(\omega_s - \omega_r) \\
& a_{rv} = \frac{1}{\sigma r} + j(\omega_s - \omega_r)M^2 \\
& b_{ss} = \frac{1}{\sigma L_s}; b_{sr} = \frac{M}{\sigma L_r}; b_{rv} = \frac{1}{\sigma L_r}
\end{align*}
\]

Using stator and rotor space vector currents, the electromagnetic torque generated by the DFIG is given by:

\[
T_{em} = \frac{3}{2} p M \Im(i_s i_r^*)
\]

The developed wind turbine torque is given by [7]:

\[
T_t = \frac{\rho \pi R_o^2 V_r^3 C_p}{2\Omega_e}
\]

In this study, for each wind speed the rotational speed is varied to track the maximum power curve as shown in fig.1. The maximum mechanical power extracted from the wind turbine is given by:

\[
P_{\max} = \frac{1}{2} \rho \pi R_o^2 V_r^3 C_{p\max}
\]

The optimum power produced by the turbine vs. electrical speed can be described by the following polynomial equation:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_t &= 0.081\omega^3 + 5.1\omega^2 & \text{if } V_r < 25\text{m/s} \\
&-1.310^5\omega + 3.410^4 & \text{if } V_r \geq 25\text{m/s}
\end{align*}
\]
The active and reactive powers exchanged between the stator and the grid are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_e &= \frac{3}{2} \Re \{ v_s^* i_s^* \} \\
Q_m &= \frac{3}{2} \Im \{ v_s^* i_s^* \}
\end{align*}
\]  

(6)

In this paper, the reference powers are specified in order to extract the maximum power from wind energy for a given wind speed and to operate at unity power factor.

Stator and rotor currents are expressed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{i}_s &= b_r \bar{\varphi}_s - b_p \bar{\varphi}_r \\
\bar{i}_r &= b_p \bar{\varphi}_s - b_r \bar{\varphi}_r
\end{align*}
\]  

(7)

The DFIM equations derived from Park model given by (1), can be expressed using rotor and stator flux vectors as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\bar{\varphi}_s}{dt} &= -f_{ss} \bar{\varphi}_s + f_{sr} \bar{\varphi}_r + \bar{v}_s \\
\frac{d\bar{\varphi}_r}{dt} &= f_{rs} \bar{\varphi}_s - f_{rr} \bar{\varphi}_r + \bar{v}_r \\
T_{em} &= \frac{3}{2} p \frac{M}{L_s L_r} \Im \{ \varphi_s \varphi_r^* \}
\end{align*}
\]  

(8)

With:

\[
\begin{align*}
f_{ss} &= \frac{1}{\sigma \tau_s} + j \omega_s; \quad f_{sr} = \frac{M}{\sigma \tau_r L_r} \\
f_{rs} &= \frac{M}{\sigma \tau_s L_s}; \quad f_{rr} = \frac{1}{\sigma \tau_r} + j \omega_r
\end{align*}
\]

3 RSC control

The general structure of the WECS proposed in the work is given by fig. 2. In this part, we present two control strategies. The first is a nonlinear vector control based on the Lyapunov stability theory. The second is the direct torque control strategy.

3.1 NLVC based on the Lyapunov approach

For large power generator, we can neglect the effect of stator resistance face the stator voltage and magneto-motive force. So, in a Park reference frame linked to the stator flux, the stator voltage vector is consequently in quadratic advance with the stator flux vector. This implies that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\varphi_{sd} &= \varphi_x, \quad \varphi_{sq} = 0 \\
v_{sq} &= v_s
\end{align*}
\]  

(9)

With this consideration, for each value of stator flux we can control the stator active and reactive powers by the quadrature and the direct rotor currents respectively \[8,9\].

The stability study of the system is based on the definition of a candidate function \( V \) which convergence towards zero constitutes the principle stability condition of the system. In this study, one considers a function of Lyapunov, definite positive, which minimizes the energy criterion, as follows:

\[
V = \frac{1}{2} (P_s - P_{s,ref})^2 + \frac{1}{2} (Q_s - Q_{s,ref})^2
\]  

(10)

According to Lyapunov theory the system is stable if the derivative of \( V \) is definite negative \[15\].

\[
\dot{V} = (P_s - P_{s,ref})(P_s - P_{s,ref}) + (Q_s - Q_{s,ref})(Q_s - Q_{s,ref})
\]  

(11)
Where:
\( P_s \) et \( Q_s \) represent respectively, the derivative of the active and reactive stator powers.
Let be considering the following function:
\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1 &= \Re(-f_{ss} \bar{\varphi}_s + f_{sr} \bar{\varphi}_r) \\
    f_2 &= \Im(-f_{ss} \varphi_s + f_{sr} \varphi_r) \\
    f_3 &= \Re(f_{ss} \bar{\varphi}_s - f_{sr} \bar{\varphi}_r) \\
    f_4 &= \Im(f_{ss} \varphi_s - f_{sr} \varphi_r)
\end{align*}
\] (12)

By applying the hypothesis of orientation of flux and of voltage to the systems (8) the relation (11) becomes:
\[
\dot{V} = \Delta P \left[ \frac{-3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} v_{sq} (f_4 + v_{rq}) - \dot{P}_{ref} \right] + \Delta Q \left[ \frac{3v_{sq}}{2\sigma L_s} f_1 - \frac{3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} v_{sq} (f_1 + v_{rd}) - \dot{Q}_{ref} \right]
\] (13)

Knowing that to satisfy the energy criterion the derivative of Lyapunov function must be definite negative, one defines then two numbers \( K_p \) and \( K_q \) strictly positive, such as:
\[
\dot{V} = -K_p (P_s - P_{ref})^2 - K_q (Q_s - Q_{ref})^2 \quad (14)
\]

\( K_p \) and \( K_q \) should be chosen such that they satisfy the following conditions:
\[
\begin{align*}
    K_p &\geq \frac{1}{\Delta P} \left[ \frac{3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} v_{sq} (f_4 + v_{rq}) + \dot{P}_{ref} \right] \\
    K_q &\geq \frac{1}{\Delta Q} \left[ \frac{-3v_{sq}}{2\sigma L_s} f_1 + \frac{3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} v_{sq} (f_1 + v_{rd}) + \dot{Q}_{ref} \right]
\end{align*}
\] (15)

The control voltages of RSC are consequently expressed as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
    v_{rd} &= \frac{2\sigma L_s L_r}{3M v_{sq}} (\frac{3}{2\sigma L_s} f_1 v_{sq} - \frac{3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} f_4 v_{rq} - \dot{Q}_{ref} + K_q \Delta Q_t) \\
    v_{rq} &= \frac{2\sigma L_s L_r}{3M v_{sq}} (\frac{-3M}{2\sigma L_s L_r} f_4 v_{rq} - \dot{P}_{ref} + K_p \Delta P_t)
\end{align*}
\] (16)

The RSC control broad level 2 is illustrated by Fig.3.
3.2 Direct torque control

Direct torque control is derived by the fact that, on the basis of the errors between the reference and the estimated values of electromagnetic torque and flux, it is possible to directly control the inverter states in order to reduce the torque and flux errors within the prefixed band limits. The used DTC in our case is based on the same principle as for squirrel cage induction machine [11,16,17,18]. The flux controller is based on a two level hysteresis comparator with HF hysteresis band illustrated by Fig.4.a, while the electromagnetic torque controller uses a three level hysteresis comparator with HT hysteresis band illustrated by Fig.4.b.

In order to reduce torque and flux ripples, the hysteresis bands width of both controllers (HT and HF) should be set to small values. In practice, those values are limited by the minimum switching sample period of the hardware used for the implementation [11,17].

The rotor flux space evolution is divided into six sector ($N_{sk}$). When rotor flux is in a sector (k), the control of flux and torque can be ensured by selecting one of the eight following voltage vector:

$$V_k = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
V_{0} = V_{7} = 0 \\
V_{k} = \frac{2}{3} V_{dc} e^{j\frac{\pi}{3}(k-1)} & k \in [1,6]
\end{array} \right. \quad (17)$$

So, the voltage vector selection is carried out according following table 1.

In this paper, rotor flux estimation uses measured stator and rotor currents. So, the rotor flux linkage vector is estimated in the stator reference frame using the following equation:

$$\vec{\psi}_r = L_s i_s e^{j\theta} + M_i \vec{e} \quad (18)$$

Table 1. Rotor voltage vector selection according to torque and flux errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flux</th>
<th>Torque</th>
<th>$e_T$</th>
<th>$e_\phi$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$V_{k-1}$</td>
<td>$V_0$, $V_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$V_{k-2}$</td>
<td>$V_0$, $V_7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The location of the rotor flux vector represents the actual sector and it is computed as follows:

$$\alpha_r = \arctan \left( \frac{\psi_{r\phi}}{\psi_{r\alpha}} \right) \quad (19)$$

The estimate electromagnetic torque $T_{eme}$ is directly calculated from the measured currents and the machine parameters as follows:

$$T_{eme} = \frac{3}{2} p M \Im(i_{j_r} \cdot) \quad (20)$$

The structure of the direct torque control is illustrated by Fig.5.

Fig.4(a) Electromagnetic torque hysteresis comparator:
(a1) Subsynchronism, (a2) Hypersynchronism, (b) Rotor flux hysteresis comparator.

Fig.5 RSC control broad level 2: DTC.
4 GSC control

The GSC is equipped by a two-stage controller operating in a grid AC voltage reference frame. It controls the power flow exchange with the grid via the rotor. The GSC current output is determined by Kirchhoff laws applied at the connection between the grid and the wind generation system as follows:

\[
\vec{v}_g - \vec{v}_G = (R_L + jX_L) \vec{i}_g + L_L \frac{d\vec{i}_g}{dt} \tag{21}
\]

With:

\[
\begin{align*}
\vec{v}_G &= \vec{v}_s \\
\vec{i}_G &= \vec{i}_s + \vec{i}_g
\end{align*} \tag{22}
\]

The grid powers at the connection between the grid and the wind generation system are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_G &= P_s + P_g \\
Q_G &= Q_s + Q_g
\end{align*} \tag{23}
\]

The power in the dc bus is expressed as:

\[
P_{dc} = \frac{dW_{dc}}{dt} = CV_{dc} \frac{dv_{dc}}{dt} \tag{24}
\]

In terms of different losses and powers, \( P_{dc} \) can be also written as follows:

\[
P_{dc} = P_m - P_{loss,s} - P_{loss,r} - P_s - P_g \tag{25}
\]

With:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_m &= T_{em} \frac{\alpha}{p} \\
P_{loss,s} &= \frac{3}{2} R_s (i_{sa}^2 + i_{sb}^2) \\
P_{loss,r} &= \frac{3}{2} R_r (i_{ra}^2 + i_{rb}^2) \\
P_s &= \frac{3}{2} \Re(\vec{v}_s \vec{i}_s) \\
P_g &= \frac{3}{2} \Re(\vec{v}_G \vec{i}_g)
\end{align*} \tag{26}
\]

4.1 NVVOC

The NVVOC strategy principle consists in orienting the d-axis Park frame (rotating at synchronous speed) according to the network voltage. This implies that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\vec{v}_G &= \left[ \vec{v}_G \right] \\
v_{Gq} &= 0
\end{align*} \tag{27}
\]

In these conditions, one can write:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_g &= \frac{3}{2} V_{Gd} i_{gd} \\
Q_g &= -\frac{3}{2} V_{Gd} i_{gy}
\end{align*} \tag{28}
\]

Thus, the dynamics of the active and reactive powers becomes directly linked to the control of network currents components \([9,10]\). Fig.6 illustrates the proposed NVVOC strategy. For this algorithm, the dc-bus reference voltage is constant and equal to the nominal AC voltage.

4.2 DPC

The basic idea of the DPC approach is the direct control of active and reactive power injected to the grid via the GSC without any internal control loop or PWM modulator. Converter switching states are selected from an optimal switching table based on the instantaneous errors of active and reactive powers and of the angular position of the vector voltage as illustrated by Fig.7. The selection of the voltage vector is carried out with the same principle of the DTC \([18,19]\).

To calculate the reference GSC powers and to operate at unity stator power factor, we have neglected the stator and rotor windings' copper losses and the loss power in the dc-bus. So, they are chosen as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_{ref} &= K_s P_{max} \\
Q_{ref} &= 0
\end{align*} \tag{29}
\]

Knowing that the total active power generated by a DFIG system is the sum of the active power outputs from the DFIG stator and the GSC as expressed in (23), with the proposed hypothesis, we can express the electromagnetic power as follows:

\[
P_s = P_g = P_s + P_r \tag{30}
\]

With:

\[
P_r = g P_s
\]
5 Simulation results
Simulations results are made by using the real parameters of a wind turbine AE43 and a DFIG rated at 660KW and 690V. The operation of the WECS is simulated under the following combinations of different control strategies. Simulations results are summarized in the table 2.

Table 2: Summarization table of simulation results illustrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>RSC</th>
<th>GSC</th>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1</td>
<td>NLVC</td>
<td>NVVOC</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2</td>
<td>DTC</td>
<td>NVVOC</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3</td>
<td>NLVC</td>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4</td>
<td>DTC</td>
<td>DPC</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to made a comparison between the proposed control strategies, all the simulations are carried out in the same operation conditions, i.e.:

- The rotor flux reference is chosen equal to 3.1Wb (rated value).
- The dc-voltage reference is equal to 1700V.
- The chosen wind speed profile is illustrated by Fig.8.

![Wind speed profile](image)
As it can be seen in Fig.10, 12(a,b), the combinations of proposed control strategies are able to follow the wind speed changes rapidly despite the important fluctuations of the wind speed and the big inertia of the machine.

The use of the DTC influence the location of system operation mode. Indeed, as shown in electromagnetic torque variations illustrate by Fig.10, 12(c,d), we observe that for a peak of wind speed, the WECS switches between the generating mode \( (T_{em}<0) \) and the motoring mode \( (T_{em}>0) \) which introduce a sudden jump in the stator power factor (SPF) illustrated by Fig.11,13(f). Something that does not occur for NLVC strategy combined with NVVOC or DPC strategies due to the convergence towards zero of the Lyapunov function. Indeed, the stator power factor, illustrated by Fig.11,13(e), converges to -1 confirming the null-VAR generating mode.

Moreover, this wind variations have an effect on the transient’s active power variations, illustrated by Fig.11,13(d) and the current injected to the grid, illustrated by Fig.11,13(h).

The stator flux is shown in Fig. 10,12(e,f). The proposed approaches allows a quick stator flux response justified by the directly connection between the stator and the grid. However, one can register in the DTC cases a stator flux peak equal to the double of the rated value.

Fig.10,12(h) show that the hysteresis controller in the DTC strategy allow a well and quickly rotor flux regulation and we notice that the GSC control strategies haven’t consequence on this regulation. However, with NLVC strategy, the rotor flux is affected by wind variations and we notice that the GSC control has influence on the rotor flux variations which is limited by the DPC strategy. Indeed, as we can show in Fig.10,12(g), an increase , respectively, a decrease of the wind; introduce an increase, respectively, a decrease, of the rotor flux especially in the hyper synchronous mode.

It is important to highlight that for all the proposed algorithms the currents in the three phase’s network, illustrate by Fig.11,13(g,h), constitute a balanced system of the rural network frequency.

6 Conclusion
This work treated some control strategies applied of the wind energy conversion system (WECS) based on the double fed induction generator (DFIG). We have designed and compared two control strategies for the rotor side converter (RSC): a direct torque control (DTC) and a nonlinear vector control (NLVC) using the second approach of Lyapunov and two control strategies for the grid side converter (GSC): a network vector voltage oriented control (NVVOC) and a direct power control (DPC). The bi-directional power converters allow the power energy to transit between the local grid and the WECS.

For every proposed case, the system operates at maximum power generation mode. Simulation results of four combine control strategies NLVC-NVVOC, DTC-NVVOC, NLVC-DPC and DTC-DPC, illustrated in table 2, have proven that the proposed algorithms are able to offer convergence of the dynamic response of the system to the reference values despite wind variations. The case number 3, NLVC-DPC strategy is a good candidate for controlling the WECS based on a DFIG interconnected to the grid.

Appendix
Induction generator data
Rated power: 660 kW, Rated stator voltage: 400/690V, 50Hz, \( R_r=0.0238 \Omega \), \( R_s=0.0146 \Omega \), \( L_s=0.0306 \) H, \( L_r=0.0303 \) H, \( M=0.0299H \), \( J_m=28kg.m^2 \), \( p=2 \),

Wind turbine data
Number of blades=3, Rotor diameter: \( 2R_b=43m \), Gearbox coefficient: \( G= 55.747 \), Cut-in wind speed: \( V_{v,min}=3m/s \), Cutoff wind speed: \( V_{v,max}=25m/s \), Optimal tip speed ratio: \( \lambda_{opt}=4 \), \( J_t=238kg.m^2 \), \( f=26 \),

Grid parameters
Network rated voltage: \( v_G =975V \), 50Hz, \( L_L=3 \) \( \Omega \), \( L_f=0.051H \).

Power coefficient expression
\[
C_p = \sum_{i=0}^{S} a_i \lambda^i
\]

With:
\( a_0=0.000373 \), \( a_1=0.009309 \), \( a_2=-0.081857 \), \( a_3=0.2774 \), \( a_4=-0.19084 \), \( a_5=0.021945 \).

Nomenclature
\( i_s, i_r \) Stator, rotor current vector (A).
\( v_s, v_r \) Stator, rotor voltage vector (V).
\( T_{em} \) Electromagnetic Torque (Nm).
Inertia and viscous friction.

\[ J \cdot f \]

Stator, rotor flux linkage vector (Wb).

\[ \varphi_s, \varphi_r \]

Stator, rotor active, reactive power.

\[ P_s, Q_s \]

Rotor active, reactive power.

\[ P_r, Q_r \]

Synchronous, rotor and slip speeds (rad/s).

\[ \omega_s, \omega_r \]

Stator, rotor resistance (Ω).

\[ R_s, R_r \]

Mutual inductance.

\[ L_s, L_r \]

Stator, rotor total cyclic inductance

\[ p \]

Machine pole pairs.

\[ V_v \]

Wind speed (m/s).

\[ T_i \]

Wind turbine Torque (Nm).

\[ C_p \]

Power coefficient

\[ \lambda \]

Tip speed ratio

\[ v_{g}, v_{G} \]

Output grid side converter, grid voltage vector (V).

\[ i_{g}, i_{G} \]

Output grid side converter, grid current vector (V).

\[ R_{L}, X_L \]

Line resistance, inductance.

\[ e_{r} \]

Rotor flux error

\[ e_{p} \]

Active power error

\[ e_{q} \]

Reactive power error

\[ \sigma \]

Leakage factor, \( \sigma = 1 - \frac{M^2}{L_s L_r} \)

Subscripts

\[ a, b, c \]

Quantities in \( a, b \) and \( c \)-axis

\[ a, \beta \]

Quantities in \( \alpha \)-axis and \( \beta \)-axis

\[ d, q \]

Quantities in \( d \)-axis and \( q \)-axis

\[ \text{ref} \]

Reference value.

\[ e \]

Estimated value

Superscripts

\[ s \]

Stationary reference frame

\[ r \]

Rotor reference frame
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Fig. 10 WECS Response under NLVC-NVVOC and DTC-NVVOC control strategies.
Legend: $\omega$ (a, b), $T_{em}$ (c, d), $\phi_s$ (e, f), $\phi_r$ (g, h)
Fig. 11. WECS Response under NLVC-NVVOC and DTC-NVVOC control strategies.

Legend: $v_{dc}$ (a,b); $P_s, P_r, P_m, P_{m,ref}$ (c,d); SPF (e,f); $I_{s1,2,3}$ (g,h)
Fig. 12 WECS Response under NLVC-DPC and DTC-DPC control strategies.
Legend: $\omega$, $\omega_r$ (rad/s); $T_{em}$, $T_m$ ($N \cdot m$); $\varphi_s$, $\varphi_r$ (Wb);
Fig. 13 WECS Response under NLVC-DPC and DTC-DPC control strategies.

Legend: $v_{gq}$ vs. $v_{gd}$ (a,b) ; $P_s, P_r, P_m, P_{m_{ref}}$ (c,d) ; SPF (e,f) ; $I_{s1}, I_{s2}, I_{s3}$ (g,h)