## Participation Factors

This material is related to VMAF, p. 281-284.
The mode shape, as indicated by the right eigenvector, gives the relative phase of each state in a particular mode.
However, it does not give the influence of each state on the mode.
We would like to be able to obtain the influence of states on modes because then we will know which states (machines) to control in order to increase damping of a certain problem mode.

Let's define a new state variable ("xi") as follows:

$$
\xi_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x} \Rightarrow \dot{\xi}_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{\dot{x}}
$$

Notice that $\xi_{k}$ is a scalar since the transpose of the left eigenvector is a $1 \times n$ and the state vector is an $n \times 1$.

Thus, $\xi_{k}$ is a combination of all states, but the manner in which all states are combined is through the left eigenvector elements of the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode. In the words of VMAF (p.284), "The left eigenvector describes what weighted combination of state variables is needed to construct the mode, referred to as the mode composition."

An important attribute of $\xi_{k}$, and the reason why it is of great interest here, is that it is a state that is associated with the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode and no other mode, proven as follows. Start with system state equations:

$$
\underline{\dot{x}}=\underline{A} \underline{x}
$$

Pre-multiply both sides by $\underline{q}_{k}^{T}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \dot{x}=q_{k}^{T} \underline{A} x \tag{P-1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that the left eigenvector is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{A}=\lambda_{k} \underline{q}_{k}^{T} \tag{P-2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that the left-hand-side of eq. (P-2), is on the right-hand-side of eq. (P-1). Substituting the right-hand-side of eq. (P-2) into the right-hand-side of eq. (P-1), we obtain:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{\underline{x}}=\lambda_{k} \underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x} \tag{P-3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Returning to the definition of our new state variable, which is $\xi_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x} \Rightarrow \dot{\xi}_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{\dot{x}}$, we note the left-hand-side of eq. (P-3) is $\dot{\xi}_{k}$ while the right hand side of eq. (P-3) is $\lambda_{k} \xi_{k}$. Making these substitutions, eq. (P-3) becomes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\xi}_{k}=\lambda_{k} \xi_{k} \tag{P-4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now eq. (P-4) is a time-domain expression. So let's take the LaPlace transform to obtain (" $\Xi$ " is upper case " $\xi$ ', letter "xi" pronounced "zigh").

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s \Xi_{k}(s)-\xi_{k}(0)=\lambda_{k} \Xi_{k}(s) \\
& \Rightarrow s \Xi_{k}(s)-\lambda_{k} \Xi_{k}(s)=\xi_{k}(0) \\
& \Rightarrow\left(s-\lambda_{k}\right) \Xi_{k}(s)=\xi_{k}(0) \\
& \Rightarrow \Xi_{k}(s)=\frac{\xi_{k}(0)}{\left(s-\lambda_{k}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking the inverse LaPlace transform, we find that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}(t)=\xi_{k}(0) e^{\lambda_{k} t} \tag{P-5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This confirms that $\xi_{k}$ is associated with only the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode and no other mode. That is, the only dynamics associated with $\xi_{k}$ are $e^{\left(\lambda_{k}\right) t}$.

What is the implication of this fact? The state variables that influence $\xi_{k}$ are the state variables that influence the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode. So we can study $\xi_{k}$ to learn about the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode.

Let's see if we can determine which state variables influence $\xi_{k} \ldots$..
Recall from the notes called "Linear system theory" eq. (L-5), which was:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{x}(t)=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0) e^{\lambda_{k} t}\right] \underline{p}_{k} \tag{L-5}
\end{equation*}
$$

I will change the summation index so as to not confuse with the index ( $k$ ) used previously in these notes:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{x}(t)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left[\underline{q}_{j}^{T} \underline{x}(0) e^{\lambda_{j} t}\right] \underline{p}_{j} \tag{P-6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now substitute eq. (P-6) into the definition of $\xi_{k}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left[q_{j}^{T} \underline{x}(0) e^{\lambda_{j} t}\right] \underline{p}_{j} \tag{P-7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that the part of the summation in brackets is a scalar. Therefore we can move the $\underline{q}_{k}^{T}$ inside the summation, beyond the brackets, so as to pre-multiply $\underline{p}_{j}$. This results in:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left[\underline{q}_{j}^{T} \underline{x}(0) e^{\lambda_{j} t}\right] \underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{j} \tag{P-8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recalling that the matrices $\underline{\mathrm{P}}$ and $\underline{\mathrm{Q}}$ are orthogonal, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{j}=0 \quad \text { for } k \neq j \tag{P-9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, there is only one non-zero term in the summation of eq. ( $\mathrm{P}-8$ ), and that is the term for which $k=j$. As a result, eq. ( $\mathrm{P}-8$ ) is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0) e^{\lambda_{k} t}\right] \underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{k} \tag{P-10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Rearranging slightly, we have,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0)\right]\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{k}\right] e^{\lambda_{k} t} \tag{P-11}
\end{equation*}
$$

But note:

$$
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
q_{1 k} & q_{2 k} & \cdots & q_{n k}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
p_{1 k}  \tag{P-12}\\
p_{2 k} \\
\vdots \\
p_{n k}
\end{array}\right]
$$

We may express the above vector product as a summation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{p}_{k}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{j k} p_{j k} \tag{P-13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substitution of eq. (P-13) into eq. (P-11), we obtain:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0)\right]\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} q_{j k} p_{j k}\right] e^{\lambda_{k} t} \tag{P-14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we are in a position to make a definition:
Participation factor:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{j k}=q_{j k} p_{j k} \tag{P-15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substitution of eq. (P-15) in eq. (P-14) results in:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xi_{k}=\left[\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0)\right]\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_{j k}\right] e^{\lambda_{k} t} \tag{P-16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Three observations:

1. If all $\rho_{j k}=0$, then the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode would not exist, an observation that leads to a conclusion that existence, or prevalence, of a mode depends on the magnitudes of the various $\rho_{j k}$.
2. The first bracketed term of ( $\mathrm{P}-16$ ) and the exponential to the right are independent of subscript " $j$ ", that is, they are independent of states. However, the second bracketed term, the summation, depends not only on mode " $k$ " but also on state " $j$ ", that is, it depends on both the mode and the state.
3. Inspection of (P-15) shows that $\rho_{j k}$ depends on "state-related" terms, the $j^{\text {th }}$ elements in the $k^{\text {th }}$ left and right eigenvectors.

It is the intention that these three observations provide that the definition of the participation factor be intuitive:

The participation factor $\rho_{j k}$ indicates the participation (influence) of the $j^{\text {th }}$ state in the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode.

The participation factor is extremely useful. Consider you learn via eigenvalue calculation and/or time-domain simulation that mode $k$ is a "problem mode," i.e., it is marginally damped or negatively damped. Then one can identify what to do about this problem mode (which state to control) by inspecting participation factors for it.

There will be " $n$ " participation factors for each mode $k, \rho_{j k}$, $j=1, \ldots, n$ (where " $n$ " is the number of states). The states having the larger participation factors (magnitudes) are the states which should be most strongly considered to control to affect problem mode $k$. Note: in contrast to $\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0), \rho_{j k}$ is less ${ }^{1}$ dependent of the initial conditions and therefore serves as more of a structural indicator of participation than does $\underline{q}_{k}^{T} \underline{x}(0)$.

Let's look at big picture - how do we proceed in a small-signal analysis study?

1. Compute eigenvalues $\&$ eigenvectors for an operating condition.
2. Choose an $\varepsilon$, If any $\lambda_{k}=\sigma_{k} \pm j \omega_{k}$ has $\left|\sigma_{k}\right|<\varepsilon$, or $\sigma_{k}>0$, then this is a problem mode at that operating condition.
3. Identify right $\underline{p}_{k}$ and left $q_{k}$ eigenvectors for mode $k$.
a. Identify "groups" of generators based on mode shape using $p_{k}$ (use the angles of the elements of $p_{k}$ corresponding to the speed deviation states).
b. For each group, identify the speed deviation states (and thus the generators) most heavily participating (influencing) the mode, based on $\rho_{j k}$.
4. Install, or retune the power system stabilizer (PSS) on the generators identified in step 3-b using speed deviation as a control signal so that they increase damping of the $k^{\text {th }}$ mode.
Last comment: This is for linearized (small-signal) analysis, not large-signal (fault) analysis.
[^0]Going back to our example (see notes on linear system theory), we recall that

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\Delta \dot{\delta}_{13} \\
\Delta \dot{\delta}_{23} \\
\Delta \dot{\omega}_{13} \\
\Delta \dot{\omega}_{23}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-104.096 & -59.524 & 0 & 0 \\
-33.841 & -153.460 & 0 & 0
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\Delta \delta_{13} \\
\Delta \delta_{23} \\
\Delta \omega_{13} \\
\Delta \omega_{23}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Observe the eigenvalues in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2. Frequencies of Oscillation of a Nine-Bus System

| Quantity | Eigenvalue 1 | Eigenvalue 2 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\lambda$ | $\pm \mathrm{j} 8.807$ | $\pm \mathrm{j} 13.416$ |
| $\omega \mathrm{rad} / \mathrm{s}$ | 8.807 | 13.416 |
| $f \mathrm{~Hz}$ | 1.402 | 2.135 |
| $T \mathrm{~s}$ | 0.713 | 0.468 |

Also observe the relative rotor angle plots of Fig. 3.3-b, where we see that one mode can be clearly observed having a period of about $0.7 \mathrm{sec}(\mathrm{f}=1.4 \mathrm{hz}$ ). The other mode is not readily observable, although its presence is probably responsible for the distortion seen in the $\delta_{31}$ plot.

(a)

(b)

Fig. 3.3 Unregulated response of the nine-bus system to a sudden load application at bus 8: (a) absolute angles, (b) angles relative to $\delta_{1}$.

Using matlab...
$[P, D]=\operatorname{eig}(A)$ where $A$ is the matrix given above.

Then the matrix of eigenvalues D is given by

| +13.4164 i | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | -13.4164 i | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | +8.8067 i | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | -8.8067 i |

And the matrix of right eigenvectors P is given by

$$
\left.\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.0459-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.0459+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.1030-0.0000 \mathrm{i}
\end{array}-0.1030+0.0000 \mathrm{i}\right)
$$

And the matrix of left eigenvectors $\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{T}}$ is given by $\mathrm{P}^{-1}$, which is:
$-2.8240+0.0000 \mathrm{i}-6.3340+0.0000 \mathrm{i} \quad 0.0000+0.2105 \mathrm{i} \quad 0.0000+0.4721 \mathrm{i}$
$-2.8240-0.0000 \mathrm{i}-6.3340-0.0000 \mathrm{i} \quad 0.0000-0.2105 \mathrm{i} 0.0000-0.4721 \mathrm{i}$
$-3.5951+0.0000 \mathrm{i} \quad 2.8194-0.0000 \mathrm{i} \quad 0.0000+0.4082 \mathrm{i}-0.0000-0.3201 \mathrm{i}$
$-3.5951-0.0000 \mathrm{i} 2.8194+0.0000 \mathrm{i} \quad 0.0000-0.4082 \mathrm{i}-0.0000+0.3201 \mathrm{i}$
Note that here, the eigenvectors are along the rows. Taking transpose, we get Q , which is

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
-2.8240+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -2.8240-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -3.5951+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -3.5951-0.0000 \mathrm{i} \\
-6.3340+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -6.3340-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 2.8194-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 2.8194+0.0000 \mathrm{i} \\
0.0000+0.2105 \mathrm{i} & 0.0000-0.2105 \mathrm{i} & 0.0000+0.4082 \mathrm{i} & 0.0000-0.4082 \mathrm{i} \\
0.0000+0.4721 \mathrm{i} & 0.0000-0.4721 \mathrm{i} & -0.0000-0.3201 \mathrm{i} & -0.0000+0.3201 \mathrm{i}
\end{array}
$$

Now I compute the participation matrix below.

```
a=[0 0 1 0; 0 0 0 1; -104.096 -59.524 0 0; -33.841 -153.46 0 0];
[P, D]=eig(a);
QT=inv(P);
Q=QT';
j=1;
% j is index on columns (modes)
% i is index on rows (states)
while j<5,
    i=1;
    while i<5,
        pf(i,j)=Q(i,j)*P(i,j);
        i=i+1;
    end
    j=j+1;
end
pf
```

This gives

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text { DELTA13 } & 0.1295+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.1295-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.3705+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.3705-0.0000 \mathrm{i} \\
\text { DELTA23 } & 0.3705+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.3705-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.1295+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & 0.1295-0.0000 \mathrm{i} \\
\text { OMEGA13 } & -0.1295-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.1295+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.3705-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.3705+0.0000 \mathrm{i} \\
\text { OMEGA23 } & -0.3705-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.3705+0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.1295-0.0000 \mathrm{i} & -0.1295+0.0000 \mathrm{i}
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { MODE } 1 & \text { MODE } 1 & \text { MODE } 2 & \text { MODE2 }
\end{array}
$$

From this, we see that $\omega_{23}$ participates most heavily in mode 1. $\omega_{13}$ participates most heavily in mode 2.
This is the information that we would use to decide where to place a PSS to enhance damping of a particular mode, although there is some ambiguity regarding whether $\omega_{1 k}$ is a state associated with unit 1 or unit k.

Returning to Fig. 3.3 in the book (and given above), we observe that although mode 1 is clearly visible in both plots, mode 2 is only visible in the $\omega_{13}$ plot. This is consistent with the indication from the participation factors.
Recall that with uniform damping, we were able to eliminate one speed deviation state. In general, this is not possible, and so you end up with one speed generation state for each generator, a development which solves the ambiguity problem mentioned above.

As an example, the paper by Mansour provides participation factors for several cases, as indicated below. Note that for all participation "vectors" the participation factor is a normalized magnitude.

1998 HEAVY WINTER CASE
PALO VERDE DEVERS LINE OUT OF SERVICE 0.72 HE MODE $(-0.057+J$ 4．43）

| Exame victor |  |  |  | PABTICIPATKOM VECTOE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cam | Amen | maso | ＊ | axsm | A | mac |
| ayyamis34 <br>  axyaxim7s mracmink mincowne cixymis <br>  वッチョมำ a포표 $c$ FOEsomi FOZ．momz3 м²meknor <br> TNTMEMZa xhuntin 1 xntwrmia EMUMT： 2 nismmangea momavzce moravice AFACMCT3 remantce mOVRABAS NIEMTLAN4S BLMDL ai | pan풀 <br> pa＊룰 <br> pan <br> 3．caz <br> pana <br> panis <br> pa＊： <br> Pa＊풀 <br> Pa＊ <br> Pa＊ <br> pa＊룰 <br> pa＊풀 <br> ．． <br> UTAM <br> UTAM <br> UTAM <br> uTan <br> ns．minx <br> －．cal <br> 3．caz <br>  <br>  <br> wapa <br> 4，MEx <br> UTAN | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ |  | m표ํa mackinix мемpano anyayin $D$ remantec mencmanco <br>  moxa 7 <br>  Mincowin <br>  Dxamiol CEYBEM7＊ DrABLO2 <br>  comancmi | pacir <br> 5．cax <br> B．C． <br> Pas표 <br>  <br> PGAN <br> Foan <br> Fank <br> FaAx <br> PaAn <br> paen <br>  <br> FaA표 <br> paan <br> pakir <br> coziod | 1.0 0.0 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0． 2 0.2 |





[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We say "less dependent" instead of "independent" because eigenvalues and both right/left eigenvectors are initially computed as a function of initial conditions, as our 3-generator example has shown.

