Fixed switching frequency scheme for current predictive control of DFIG
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This paper suggests a new current predictive control algorithm for the wind-driven doubly-fed induction generator (DFIG) based on space vector modulation (SVM) with fixed switching frequency. Combining the current predictive controller and SVM has the benefits of a predictive controller, and fixing the switching frequency improves the output waveform quality. However, if classical predictive control is used, the computational burden will still be high. The proposed algorithm uses SVM to fix the switching frequency of the rotor side converter. Additionally, by using an incremental algorithm, the proposed technique prevents examining all inputs over the prediction horizon. As a result, in the proposed current predictive algorithm the computational time is significantly reduced. The detailed state-space model of DFIG and rotor side converter are used to execute the predictive algorithm. The proposed algorithm uses the rotor current to predict the next behavior of the DFIG, and then, by using SVM, the duty cycles of 2-level voltage source inverter are obtained. Finally, the proposed controller’s responses are compared to those of the SVM-based field-oriented control strategy. Simulation results of the proposed controller on a two-level voltage source inverter under a balanced three-phase power system illustrate the satisfactory active and reactive power tracking and improved quality of the inverter outputs. © 2021 Journal of Energy Management and Technology

keywords: Current predictive control; fixed switching frequency; space vector modulation; doubly fed induction generator.


NOMENCLATURE

Nomenclature

\( P_T \) Wind turbine output power.
\( \rho \) Air density.
\( A_T \) Rotor swept area.
\( r_T \) Blade radius.
\( \upsilon_w \) Wind speed.
\( C_P \) Power coefficient of the rotor blades.
\( \beta \) Pitch angle.
\( \lambda_T \) Optimal TSR.
\( \lambda_I \) Intermittent TSR.
\( r_{gb} \) Gearbox ratio.
\( n_m \) Generator speed.
\( n_T \) Turbine speed.
\( v_{s,dq}, v_{r,dq} \) Stator and rotor voltage vectors.
\( i_{s,dq}, i_{r,dq} \) Stator and rotor current vectors.
\( \psi_{s,dq}, \psi_{r,dq} \) Stator and rotor flux vectors.
\( R_s, R_r \) Stator and rotor winding resistance.
\( \omega_s \) Synchronous speed.
\( \omega_r \) Electrical rotor speed.
\( \omega_s l \) Slip angular speed.
\( L_{ls}, L_{lr} \) Stator and rotor leakage inductances.
\( L_s, L_r \) Stator and rotor self-inductances.
\( L_m \) Magnetizing inductance.
\( T_e \) Electromagnetic torque.
\( P_P \) Number of pole pairs.
\( P_s, Q_s \) Stator active and reactive powers.
\( A(t) \) State matric in continuous-time mode.
\( B \) Input matric in continuous-time mode.
\( T_s \) Control sampling time.
\( \Phi(k) \) State matric in discrete-time mode.
\( \Gamma \) Input matric in discrete-time mode.
\( I \) Unity matrix.
\( k \) Sample.
\( v_{p,s,dq}, v_{p,r,dq} \) Predicted stator and rotor voltage vectors.
\( i_{p,s,dq}, i_{p,r,dq} \) Predicted stator and rotor current vectors.
Today, new controllers have been proposed based on fuzzy, and variable speed wind turbines are used extensively due to its rapid development and cost-effectiveness [2, 3].

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, high greenhouse gas emissions due to fossil fuels are known as a global problem. Therefore, renewable energy sources play an essential role in global energy production [1]. However, the wind is more attractive due to its rapid development and cost-effectiveness [2, 3].

Today, variable speed wind turbines are used extensively due to the many advantages over the fixed speed ones. In the meantime, limited variable speed turbines with DFIG, due to fractionally-rated power converters, resulting in relatively low initial costs. Their ability to independently active and reactive power control through feeding the rotor currents has become very popular in the industry. Hence, more than 70 percent of today’s turbines are variable speed types with DFIG [4, 5].

Various control methods have been presented for DFIG. In [6–8], vector-based control and field-oriented control techniques are used to control the DFIG. Such methods control the output powers of DFIG by controlling the rotor currents. However, in these methods, despite the system’s proper performance in the steady-state, due to the cascade structure of the proportional-integral (PI) controllers, they are sensitive to changes in the machine parameters. They have inadequate dynamic response [9, 10]. In [11], direct torque control (DTC) based on hysteresis band and switching table are presented. In [12, 13], this method controls the rotor side converter in DFIG. However, this method simplifies DFIG control, but variable and high switching frequency, the high oscillation of torque, and the need for two switching tables are disadvantages of this method [14, 15]. Such have a complicated design and requires the exact adjustment of the modulator’s time. Also, due to the use of PI controllers, their dynamic are lower than conventional DTC.

Today, new controllers have been proposed based on fuzzy, and adaptive control, and sliding mode control. In [16], an adaptive virtual inertia controller for DFIGs is proposed. In this nonlinear control method, the aerodynamic efficiency is considered. In [17, 18], comprehensive direct power control with vector control methods for DFIG are proposed. A multimode controller for a DFIG is proposed in [19]. Fuzzy-based controllers for DFIG connected to the wind turbine are presented in [2, 20, 21].

In [22, 23], sliding mode-based strategies are proposed for controlling the power of DFIG. Such methods achieve significant DFIG control improvements, but most of them still need a cascade loop to hold and therefore have limited bandwidth [24, 25].

In recent years, predictive control-based methods have attracted more attention in the power converters and electric drive systems. [26, 27]. In model predictive control by using an explicit model the next behavior of the system is predicted, and finally the control system output is obtained by solving an optimization problem [28, 29]. A time efficient model predictive control method for DFIG is proposed in [30]. Here, the switching states of the converter are considered as the control inputs of the predictive controller. In [31, 32], robust finite control set model predictive control are proposed. In [31], a term is added to the predicted rotor voltages for considering the mistakes due to parameters’ estimation, and in [32], by using a matrix converter a model predictive rotor current control is proposed. To quality improvement of an electrical network a novel method that derives the power coefficient based on DFIG is proposed [33]. In [34], a model-free predictive control for a DFIG is presented in which an ultra-local model is used to replace the mathematical model of the plant. In [35], an effective sensor-less model predictive voltage control is used for a DFIG. Also, in [36], a continuous-time model predictive control is used for DFIG. Taylor series expansion is used to predict the current. All the above-mentioned methods have an excellent dynamic response and lowers the torque fluctuations, but they still need an accurate calculation of each voltage vector’s time interval, and they are very complex.

Direct predictive current control with pulse width modulation at low switching frequency is presented for a high power DFIG [37]. A robust model predictive control is proposed to reduce the torque oscillation in DFIG [38]. In [39], flux weakening control by flux linkage prediction controls the rotor flux during grid voltage dips. In [40], an overview of DFIG fault ride through methods is presented. By reducing the control inputs, linearization or raising the sampling frequency solutions are suggested in all these methods. In [41], the rotor side converter’s Switching frequency has been fixed by using SVM. However, the main problem is that it can only be implemented at low switching frequencies (below 1kHz). A model predictive direct power control with a three-level inverter is presented in [42].

Good results can be seen by fixing the switching frequency. Nevertheless, in this paper, similar to other predictive-based methods, the real-time evaluation is high. Therefore, the authors have been forced to decrease the degree of freedom of the controller, and only combinations are selected that have one switching variation in each step.

Since the wind intensity is always changing, the DFIG output must also be continuously adjusted to track its reference value. Control goals in the doubly fed induction generator are divided into two categories. The main goal is chasing the power and the second goal is to limit the rotor current when the voltage drop occurs [38]. Therefore, it is suggested to utilize a predictive control-based method to respond to both the problem in the best way. The proposed strategy utilizes the space vector modulation to fix the inverter switching frequency. Combining the current predictive controller and SVM has the benefits of two methods together. Also, it is suggested to use an incremental algorithm to reduce the computational time of predictive control implementation. The main contribution of this paper is to use a new current predictive control algorithm for the wind-driven DFIG. The detailed state-space model of DFIG and rotor side converter are used to execute the predictive algorithm. The proposed algorithm predicts the rotor current to estimate the future behavior of the DFIG, and then, by using SVM, the duty cycles are obtained. Using the current control in the synchronous reference frame, the proposed controller directly controls the active and reactive power of the DFIG. Thus, the online solving of the problem is straightforward and considers any constraint for the parameters. Finally, the main contribution of the suggested strategy can be summarized as follows:

- By using SVM, the switching frequency of the inverter can be fix
- The SVM’s calculations are performing in the prediction
- To reduce the computational burden of the proposed tech-
nique, an incremental algorithm is used in the online optimization process.

### 2. MODELING OF SYSTEM

#### A. Wind Turbine

According to [43], the following achieves the wind turbine output power

\[ P_T = P_w \times C_p = \frac{1}{2} \rho \pi T^3 \rho_{in} C_p \]  

(1)

\( C_p \) represents the rotor blades' power coefficient, which ranges from 0.32 to 0.52 in practical wind turbines. \( C_p \) could be defined as below

\[ C_p = C_1 \left( \frac{C_2}{\lambda_T} - C_3 \beta - C_4 \beta^2 - C_5 \right) e^{-\beta\lambda_T} + C_7 \lambda_T \]  

(2)

where \( \lambda_T \) is the optimal tip-speed ratio (O-TSR) and \( \lambda_I \) is intermittent TSR and is related to \( \lambda_T \) and \( \beta \). \( \lambda_T \) and \( \lambda_I \) are defined as:

\[ \lambda_T = \lambda_T^{opt} = \frac{\omega_T \times \tau_T}{\omega_{\text{rated}}} \]  

(3)

\[ \frac{1}{\lambda_I} = \frac{1}{\lambda_T + 0.08\beta} - \frac{0.035}{\beta^2 - 1} \]  

(4)

The gearbox ratio is calculated according to the rated speed of the wind turbine and generator that is

\[ r_{gb} = \frac{n_m}{n_T} \]  

(5)

Where \( n_m \) and \( n_T \) are the generator and turbine speed, respectively. The ratio is equal to 1 for a direct-drive turbine, and it is 96 for the studied DFIG [43].

#### B. Dynamic model of DFIG

The predictive control method utilizes the DFIG and rotor side converter (RSC) mathematical model to predictor currents' future behaviors. According to [43], the stator and rotor voltage vectors are defined as

\[ v_{s,dq} = R_s i_{s,dq} + d \frac{d}{dt} \psi_{s,dq} + j \omega_s \psi_{s,dq} \]  

(6)

\[ v_{r,dq} = R_r i_{r,dq} + d \frac{d}{dt} \psi_{r,dq} + j (\omega_s - \omega_r) \psi_{r,dq} \]  

(7)

Where \( \omega_s \) is the synchronous speed, and \( \omega_r \) is the electrical rotor speed. The slip angular velocity is defined \( \omega_s = (\omega_s - \omega_r) \). During the steady-state operation, the stator flux is obtained by

\[ P_T = P_w \times C_p = \frac{1}{2} \rho \pi T^3 \rho_{in} C_p \]  

(8)

Also, the stator and rotor flux linkage vectors are expressed as follow

\[ \psi_{s,dq} = L_s i_{s,dq} + L_m i_{r,dq} \]  

(9)

\[ \psi_{r,dq} = L_r i_{r,dq} + L_m i_{s,dq} \]  

(10)

where

\[ L_s = L_{ls} + L_m \]  

(11)

The electromagnetic torque is

\[ T_e = \frac{3 P_T L_m}{2 \omega_l L_s} (-i_{qr} v_{qs} + R_s i_{qs} i_{qr} + R_s i_{ds} i_{dr} - i_{dr} v_{ds}) \]  

(13)

The DFIG stator powers can be calculated by

\[ P_s = \frac{3}{2} (v_{ds} i_{ds} + v_{qs} i_{qs}) \]  

(14)

\[ Q_s = -\frac{3}{2} (v_{qs} i_{ds} - v_{ds} i_{qs}) \]  

(15)

Regarding the equations mentioned above, the rotor currents are expressed in terms of stator active and reactive powers [44, 45], as:

\[ i_{dr} = -\left( \frac{2L_s}{3v_{ds} L_m} \right) P_s - \frac{R_s}{\omega_s L_m} i_{qs} \]  

(16)

\[ i_{qr} = +\left( \frac{2L_s}{3v_{ds} L_m} \right) Q_s + \frac{R_s}{\omega_s L_m} i_{ds} - \frac{1}{\omega_s L_m} v_{ds} \]  

(17)

Since the stator resistance is low, it is concluded that the active power and reactive power of the stator can be controlled independently.

### 3. CURRENT PREDICTIVE CONTROL WITH SVM FOR DFIG

Fig. 1 shows the DFIG-based wind power system with the proposed predictive controller considered in this paper. In the proposed scheme, the rotor currents in \( \alpha \beta \) frame are obtained through a PWM.

#### A. Current Predictive Control

The state-space dynamic model of rotor and stator currents, stated in 18, is used to design the current predictive control scheme.

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} i_{ds} \\ i_{qs} \\ i_{dr} \\ i_{qr} \end{bmatrix} = k_r [A(t)]_{4 \times 4} i_{ds} + k_r [B]_{4 \times 4} + \begin{bmatrix} v_{ds} \\ v_{qs} \\ v_{dr} \\ v_{qr} \end{bmatrix} \]  

(18)

where \( A(t) \) and \( B \) are the state and input matrices, with the following values

\[ A(t) = k_r \begin{bmatrix} -R_s L_r & \omega_s L_m^2 + k_r & R_s L_m & \omega_s L_m L_r \\ -\omega_s L_m - k_r & -R_s L_r & -\omega_s L_m L_r & R_s L_m \\ R_s L_m & -\omega_s L_m L_s & -R_s L_s & -\omega_s L_r L_s + k_r \\ \omega_s L_m L_s & R_s L_m & \omega_s L_r L_s - k_r & -R_s L_s \end{bmatrix} \]  

\[ B = k_r \begin{bmatrix} L_r & 0 & -L_m & 0 \\ 0 & L_r & 0 & -L_m \\ -L_m & 0 & L_s & 0 \\ 0 & -L_m & 0 & L_s \end{bmatrix} \]
According to equations 16 and 17, to DFIG active and reactive power control, the RSC’s control objective includes the regulation of dq-axes rotor currents. Accordingly, the objective function is defined as:

$$J(k) = P_d(i_d^* (k+1) - i_d^r(k+1))^2 + P_q(i_q^* (k+1) - i_q^r(k+1))^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where \(P_d\) and \(P_q\) are the weighting factors. During each sampling period, the optimum voltage vector which minimizes the objective function is selected.

### C. SVM

After predicting the reference values of stator and rotor currents, the next step is to generate the required switching voltage vector. The space vector modulation technique is the best method among all the pulse with modulation (PWM) techniques [43]. The SVM gives higher voltage amplitude and a better harmonic spectrum. A three-phase 2-level voltage source inverter with \(V_{dc}\) as the DC link voltage has only eight possible switch position combinations. In this section, step-by-step implementation of the current predictive control with the SVM algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1.

Predictive control based methods could easily handle constraints of the system. In this paper, \(\sqrt{i_{dr}^2 + i_{dq}^2} \leq I_{r,\text{max}}\) is considered as the main constrait of the system.

### 4. SIMULATION RESULTS

To validate the proposed control strategy, the performance of a 3-MW DFIG is investigated. The main parameters of the studied system are given in Table 1 [43]. Simulation results are obtained with a detailed model of the machine and test-rig by using MATLAB/Simulink.

### A. Steady-state analysis of DFIG

The DFIG is assumed to operate at a unity power factor with \(v_{wo} = 9\ \text{m/s} (0.75\ \text{pu})\). Fig. 2, shows the slip angle \(\theta_{sl}\). Due to the constant wind and generator speed, the slip angle uniformly increases from 0 - 2\(\pi\). Steady-state waveforms of DFIG operating with the proposed strategy are presented in Fig. 3.

In the top plot of Fig. 3, active and reactive powers of DFIG are shown, which indicates that the DFIG generates 0.5pu as active power and zero reactive power. In the middle plot, voltage, and
current of stator phase “a” are shown. As observed, the stator operates in the generating mode at unity power factor (UPF). Finally, in the bottom plot of Fig. 3, the rotor currents are illustrated. It shows the sinusoidal waveforms at the frequency of 5 Hz, and there is almost no additional harmonic. To accurately compare the quality of the proposed strategy’s waveforms with previous methods, the phase ‘a’ rotor side converter voltage and the frequency spectrum are shown in Fig. 4. Figs. (a) and (b) show the PI FOC’s responses by using PWM. Figs. (e) and (f) show the current predictive controller’s responses without SVM. It is observed from such FFT plots that there are additional harmonics in both the FOC and current predictive control methods. Despite many such different harmonics in the current predictive controller, their amplitude is much lower than FOC. Therefore, by reducing the number of additional harmonics, the power quality is enhanced. The phase-a voltage and the spectrum analysis of the current predictive control with SVM are shown in Figs. (g) and (h). Also, Figs. (c) and (d) show the FOC method’s response using SVM. According to such plots, current predictive control with SVM results in much better FFT with lower additional harmonics, resulting in superior power quality.

### B. Transient analysis of DFIG

In this case, the dynamic performance of the DFIG during a change of rotor speed is investigated. According to the turbine and generator’s large inertia, the mechanical part dynamics are much slower than that of electric components in the MW wind turbines. Hence, the generator speed cannot be changed instantaneously. Therefore, a ramp change in wind speed is applied to increase the rotor speed from 0.75 pu (sub-synchronous mode) to 1 pu (super-synchronous mode). Fig. 5 shows the wind speed and the slip angle $\theta_s$. In this test, reactive power is kept constant at zero, while active power varies with the variations of wind speed.

Fig. 5(b), $\theta_s$ shows an accelerating nature until the rotor speed reaches the synchronous speed. Then, $\theta_s$ exhibits a decelerating character.

In Fig. 6, the transient waveforms of DFIG operating with the proposed controller and FOC-SVM are presented. Fig. 6 (a) indicates the excellent performance of DFIG in active and reactive power tracking by using the proposed strategy with lower overshoots and lower fluctuations.

Fig. 7, shows the rotor speed and the amplitude of rotor currents increases proportionally to the rotor speed. Also, at the rotor speed up to the synchronization speed, the frequency of rotor currents decreases and then changes RSC’s power direction, the frequency.

### C. Evaluation of proposed strategy

In this section, proposed predictive controller is evaluated in two cases.

First, the case of noise in input and output to investigate the robustness of the proposed controller. In this case, 5% error is added to all the measurements and estimations in the controller. Similar to Fig. 5, a ramp change of rotor speed is applied to the wind turbine. Fig. 8, shows the output power of the DFIG by using the proposed D-PCC-SVM for both noise without noise conditions.

As shown in Fig. 8, the proposed method has a small error in transient conditions. But after reaching the steady state, it tracks the final value with very good accuracy and without errors.

PCC. Fig. 9 shows the output power of the DFIG for the case of step changes in wind speed. As shown, two wind speed steps are applied. The first step is from 0.5 to 1 pu at $t = 1s$ and the second one is from 1 to 0.5 pu at $t = 2s$. The specification of proposed strategy and conventional one are listed in Table 2.

### Table 1. Main parameters of DFIG system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFIG Parameters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated power (kW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stator line to line voltages (V)</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stator current (A)</td>
<td>2076.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor line to line voltage (V)</td>
<td>158.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotor current (A)</td>
<td>2673.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole pairs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_s$ (Hz)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_s$ (mΩ)</td>
<td>1.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_r$ (mΩ)</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{ds}$ (mH)</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{dr}$ (mH)</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_m$ (mH)</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J_m$ (kg.m²)</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind Turbine Parameters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated power (kW)</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain of the gear box for DFIG</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The turbine radius (m)</td>
<td>43.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. CONTROL SPECIFICATION OF SIMULATION STEPS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drive system</th>
<th>Objective function</th>
<th>Prediction horizon ($N_p$)</th>
<th>Computational time [0-3 sec], (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional D-PCC</td>
<td>Eq. (22)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed D-PCC-SVM</td>
<td>Eq. (22)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 2, by using the proposed technique the computational burden of the system has reduced up to 35% compared to conventional D-PCC.

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a new predictive-based controller for DFIG is proposed. The proposed controller utilizes space vector modulation...
to fix the switching frequency of RSC. A new incremental algorithm based on the combination of current predictive control and SVM is offered to implement the proposed strategy. The results show fixed switching frequency for DFIG with adequate active power and reactive power tracking. Comparison of the proposed method’s responses with those of FOC-SVM strategy shows better FFT with lower additional harmonics, which means superior power quality by using the proposed approach. Moreover, the proposed current predictive control with SVM achieves high quality for the output currents of RSC.

The advantages of suggested strategy against conventional predictive control and FOC-SVM can be summarized as follows:

- Fix switching frequency
- Lower computational burden
- Lower overshoots
- Fast dynamic response

Proposes predictive control vs conventional predictive control
- Better FFT
- Lower additional harmonics
- Faster dynamic response
- Lower overshoots
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Fig. 4. Phase-a voltage of RSC and spectrum analysis, (a) and (b): responses of FOC without SVM, (c) and (d): responses of FOC with SVM, (e) and (f): responses of D-PCC without SVM and (g) and (h): responses of D-PCC with SVM.

Fig. 5. Wind speed and slip angle during the variation of wind speed.
**Fig. 6.** Output active and reactive power of the proposed strategy and the conventional FOC-SVM.

**Fig. 7.** Transient wave forms of the DFIG. (a) Mechanical rotor speed of the DFIG using the proposed method, (b) Three phase rotor currents of the DFIG with proposed technique.

**Fig. 8.** The output powers of the DFIG using proposed D-PCC-SVM for noise in input and noise in output.

---


Fig. 9. The output powers of the DFIG using proposed D-PCC-SVM and conventional D-PCC in the case of ramp change in wind speed.

Table 3. Algorithm 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Predictive Control with SVM algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initialize the controller % Initialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the $v_{s1}, i_{s1}, i_r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. and the wind speed at the $k$ moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_{op} = \infty, j = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. for $j = 1 : 8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current prediction by using (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{dr}^p(k+1), i_{dp}^p(k+1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i_{dq}^p(k+1), i_{dp}^p(k+1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % Prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost function Minimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by using (22) min $J(k)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of reference rotor voltages and corresponding $i_r^* = i_{ar}^* + j i_{br}^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v_r^* = v_{ar}^* + j v_{br}^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracting the magnitude and the angle of rotor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voltage $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta^* = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{v_{br}^<em>}{v_{ar}^</em>}\right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculating the modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. index $m_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_a = \sqrt{3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining the duty cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. $T_a$ % Duty cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Apply the duty cycles to the PWM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. $k = k+1$ and go to line 3. % go to next instant $(k+1)$ and repeat…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>