Performance Assessment of Fault Detection Techniques in Photovoltaic Systems

Dr.ShashankSultaniya[1]
Assistant Professor, Electrical Engineering
Sangam University, Bhilwara, Rajasthan

Dr. Pankaj Kumar Mehta [2]
Assistant Professor,Electrical Engineering,
Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan

How to Cite this Article:

ShashankSultaniya, & Mehta, P. K. (2026). Performance Assessment of Fault Detection Techniques in Photovoltaic Systems. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, <i>02</i>(7). https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i7.003

https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i7.003

Abstract

The reliable operation of photovoltaic (PV) systems is essential for ensuring maximum energy yield, system safety, and long-term economic viability. However, PV installations are susceptible to various faults, including open-circuit faults, short-circuit faults, line-to-line faults, ground faults, partial shading, hotspot formation, and degradation-related issues, which can significantly affect system performance and reliability. Effective fault detection techniques are therefore required to identify abnormal operating conditions at an early stage and minimize energy losses.

This paper presents a literature-based performance assessment of fault detection techniques reported in recent photovoltaic system studies. A comprehensive review of published research is conducted to examine conventional, signal-processing-based, and artificial intelligence-driven fault detection approaches. The selected techniques are evaluated using performance indicators reported in the literature, including detection accuracy, response time, computational requirements, implementation complexity, and applicability under different operating conditions. Furthermore, the strengths and limitations of various methods are systematically compared to highlight their suitability for practical PV installations.

The analysis reveals that data-driven and machine learning-based techniques have demonstrated promising fault detection capabilities, particularly in complex and dynamic environments. However, challenges related to data availability, model generalization, real-time implementation, and scalability remain significant concerns. Based on the findings, key research gaps and future development directions are identified to support the advancement of reliable and intelligent fault diagnosis systems for modern photovoltaic applications. The outcomes of this study provide researchers, engineers, and system operators with a consolidated understanding of current fault detection technologies and their performance characteristics in photovoltaic systems.

1. Introduction

The growing demand for sustainable and environmentally friendly energy sources has accelerated the global adoption of photovoltaic (PV) systems. Solar photovoltaic technology has become one of the most widely deployed renewable energy solutions due to its scalability, declining installation costs, and minimal environmental impact. Continuous advancements in PV module manufacturing, power electronics, and monitoring technologies have further enhanced the efficiency and economic viability of solar energy systems. Consequently, PV installations are increasingly being integrated into residential, commercial, industrial, and utility-scale power generation applications.

Despite these advantages, the reliable operation of photovoltaic systems remains a significant challenge. PV systems are continuously exposed to varying environmental and operational conditions, including temperature fluctuations, irradiance variations, dust accumulation, shading effects, aging, and component degradation. These factors may contribute to the occurrence of different types of faults, such as open-circuit faults, short-circuit faults, line-to-line faults, ground faults, arc faults, hotspot formation, and partial shading conditions. Such faults can substantially reduce energy production, accelerate component deterioration, increase maintenance costs, and in severe cases create safety hazards for both equipment and personnel.

To mitigate these issues, fault detection has become an essential function in modern photovoltaic monitoring and maintenance frameworks. Early and accurate fault identification enables timely corrective actions, minimizes energy losses, improves system reliability, and enhances overall operational efficiency. Over the years, numerous fault detection approaches have been proposed, ranging from conventional electrical parameter-based methods and signal processing techniques to advanced data-driven and artificial intelligence-based algorithms. These methods differ considerably in terms of detection accuracy, computational complexity, implementation cost, robustness, and real-time applicability.

Recent developments in machine learning, deep learning, and intelligent data analytics have significantly transformed fault diagnosis strategies in photovoltaic systems. These techniques have demonstrated promising capabilities in identifying complex fault patterns and handling large volumes of operational data. Nevertheless, several challenges remain, including limited fault datasets, model generalization issues, computational requirements, interpretability concerns, and practical deployment constraints under dynamic operating conditions.

Although a substantial body of literature has been published on photovoltaic fault detection, many existing studies focus on specific fault categories, individual algorithms, or particular system configurations. A comprehensive performance-oriented assessment that systematically evaluates and compares different fault detection techniques using commonly reported performance indicators remains limited. Therefore, a consolidated analysis is required to provide researchers and practitioners with a clearer understanding of the effectiveness, advantages, and limitations of available fault detection approaches.

This paper presents a literature-based performance assessment of fault detection techniques in photovoltaic systems. The study examines a broad range of conventional and intelligent fault detection methods reported in recent research and evaluates their performance characteristics based on findings available in published literature.

The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- To provide a comprehensive overview of major fault types encountered in photovoltaic systems.
- To classify and analyze conventional, signal-processing-based, and intelligent fault detection techniques.
- To assess the performance of reported fault detection methods using key evaluation metrics such as accuracy, detection speed, computational complexity, and implementation requirements.
- To compare the strengths and limitations of different approaches through systematic literature-based analysis.
- To identify existing research gaps, implementation challenges, and future research opportunities in photovoltaic fault diagnosis.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents an overview of common fault types in photovoltaic systems. Section 3 discusses the classification of fault detection techniques. Sections 4 and 5 review conventional and intelligent fault detection approaches, respectively. Section 6 provides a comparative performance assessment based on reported literature. Section 7 highlights research challenges and future directions, while Section 8 concludes the paper.

2. Overview of Photovoltaic System Faults

The performance and reliability of photovoltaic (PV) systems are highly dependent on the operational condition of their constituent components. A typical PV installation consists of solar modules, interconnecting cables, combiner boxes, power conditioning units, monitoring systems, and protection devices. Since these components operate under continuously changing environmental conditions, PV systems are vulnerable to a wide range of electrical, environmental, and mechanical faults. The occurrence of such faults can significantly reduce power generation efficiency, increase maintenance costs, shorten system lifetime, and create potential safety hazards.

Faults in photovoltaic systems may originate from manufacturing defects, installation errors, environmental stresses, aging effects, improper maintenance practices, or failures in electrical and electronic components. Depending on their nature and severity, faults may cause minor efficiency degradation or complete system shutdown. Therefore, understanding the characteristics and consequences of different fault categories is essential for developing effective fault detection and diagnostic strategies.

PV faults are generally classified into electrical faults, environmental faults, degradation-related faults, and operational faults. Each category exhibits distinct electrical signatures and operational characteristics, requiring different monitoring and diagnostic approaches for reliable identification.

2.1 Classification of Photovoltaic System Faults

Table 1 presents the major fault categories commonly reported in photovoltaic systems.

Table 1 :Classification of Photovoltaic System Faults

Fault Category	**Fault Type**	**Primary Cause**	**Impact on System**
Electrical Faults	Open-Circuit Fault	Broken connections, cable failure	Reduced power output
Electrical Faults	Short-Circuit Fault	Insulation damage, wiring defects	Excessive current flow
Electrical Faults	Line-to-Line Fault	Conductor contact	Severe power loss
Electrical Faults	Ground Fault	Insulation breakdown	Safety hazards
Electrical Faults	Arc Fault	Loose connections, damag conductors	Fire risk
Environmental Faults	Partial Shading	Trees, buildings, clouds	Mismatch losses
Environmental Faults	Dust Accumulation	Soiling of module surface	Efficiency reduction
Environmental Faults	Snow Coverage	Climatic conditions	Reduced irradiance
Thermal Faults	Hotspot Fault	Localized overheating	Cell degradation
Degradation Faults	Delamination	Material aging	Reduced reliability
Degradation Faults	Microcracks	Mechanical stress	Gradual power loss
Operational Faults	MPPT Failure	Controller malfunction	Energy harvesting loss
Operational Faults	Sensor Failure	Monitoring system errors	Incorrect system operatic

The severity of PV faults varies depending on fault location, duration, and environmental conditions. While some faults primarily affect energy generation, others pose significant safety risks and require immediate attention.

2.2 Electrical Faults

Electrical faults are among the most critical failures in photovoltaic systems because they directly affect current flow, voltage characteristics, and power generation capability. These faults often originate from wiring defects, insulation deterioration, connector failures, or installation-related issues.

1. **Open-Circuit Faults:** Open-circuit faults occur when the electrical continuity of a PV string is interrupted due to disconnected cables, broken conductors, loose terminals, or damaged connectors. Such faults result in a significant reduction in output current and may completely isolate affected PV modules from the system.
2. **Short-Circuit Faults:** Short-circuit faults occur when unintended low-resistance paths are formed between conductors. These faults can produce excessive currents, resulting in overheating, equipment damage, and potential system shutdown.
3. **Line-to-Line Faults:** Line-to-line faults are caused by direct electrical contact between conductors operating at different potentials. Such faults often result in abnormal current distribution, power losses, and protection system activation.
4. **Ground Faults:** Ground faults occur when current unintentionally flows between energized conductors and ground. These faults are particularly dangerous because they may create electric shock hazards and increase the likelihood of fire incidents.
5. **Arc Faults:** Arc faults are characterized by sustained electrical discharges resulting from loose connections, conductor damage, or insulation failure. Arc faults are considered one of the most hazardous PV faults due to their potential to initiate fires.

2.3 Environmental and Thermal Faults

Environmental conditions significantly influence PV system performance and may generate fault-like conditions that reduce energy production.

1. **Partial Shading:** Partial shading occurs when a portion of a PV array receives less solar irradiance than the remaining modules. Sources of shading include nearby buildings, trees, dust accumulation, clouds, and other physical obstructions. Partial shading leads to mismatch losses, hotspot formation, and significant reductions in output power.
2. **Dust and Soiling Effects:** The accumulation of dust, dirt, bird droppings, and other contaminants on module surfaces reduces incident solar radiation and decreases conversion efficiency. Long-term soiling can cause substantial energy losses if regular cleaning is not performed.
3. **Hotspot Formation:** Hotspots occur when individual cells operate at elevated temperatures due to shading, manufacturing defects, or electrical mismatch. Persistent hotspot conditions accelerate material degradation and reduce module lifespan.

2.4 Degradation-Related Faults

Photovoltaic modules experience gradual performance degradation throughout their operational lifetime. Aging mechanisms can affect both electrical characteristics and structural integrity.

1. **Microcracks:** Microcracks are microscopic fractures that develop within solar cells due to mechanical stresses during transportation, installation, or operation. Although initially difficult to detect, microcracks may progressively reduce module performance.
2. **Delamination:** Delamination refers to the separation of different material layers within a PV module. This fault permits moisture ingress and accelerates long-term deterioration.
3. **Potential-Induced Degradation (PID):** Potential-induced degradation is a voltage-related phenomenon that causes leakage currents within PV modules, leading to substantial power losses and reduced efficiency over time.

2.5 Operational and Control Faults

Operational faults arise from failures in monitoring, control, and power conditioning equipment.

1. **MPPT Malfunction:** Maximum Power Point Tracking (MPPT) controllers are designed to maximize energy extraction from PV arrays. Controller failures or improper tracking algorithms may reduce system efficiency and energy yield.
2. **Sensor and Communication Failures:** Modern PV systems rely heavily on sensors and communication networks for monitoring and fault diagnosis. Sensor inaccuracies, communication interruptions, and data acquisition failures can compromise system supervision and lead to incorrect operational decisions.

Table 2:Characteristics of Major Photovoltaic System Faults

Fault Type	Detection Difficulty	Power Loss Severity	Safety Risk	Typical Occurrence
Open-Circuit Fault	Low	High	Low	Medium
Short-Circuit Fault	Medium	High	High	Low
Line-to-Line Fault	Medium	High	High	Low
Ground Fault	Medium	Medium	Very High	Medium
Arc Fault	High	High	Very High	Low
Partial Shading	Low	Medium	Low	Very High
Hotspot Fault	High	Medium	High	Medium
Dust/Soiling	Low	Low-Medium	Low	Very High
Microcracks	High	Medium	Low	Medium
PID	High	High	Low	Medium

Table 3:Fault Indicators Commonly Used in Photovoltaic Monitoring Systems

Fault Type	Voltage Variation	Current Variation	Temperature Rise	Power Reduction
Open-Circuit Fault	Significant	Significant	Low	High
Short-Circuit Fault	Moderate	High	Medium	High
Ground Fault	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Medium
Arc Fault	Irregular	Irregular	High	Medium
Partial Shading	Moderate	Moderate	Medium	Medium
Hotspot Fault	Low	Low	Very High	Medium
Microcracks	Low	Low	Low	Gradual
PID	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Gradual

The understanding of these fault categories and their operational characteristics forms the foundation for the development and evaluation of fault detection techniques. Consequently, effective fault diagnosis approaches must be capable of distinguishing between different fault signatures while maintaining high detection accuracy under varying environmental and operating conditions.

3. Classification of Fault Detection Techniques

The increasing complexity and large-scale deployment of photovoltaic (PV) systems have led to the development of numerous fault detection techniques aimed at improving system reliability, safety, and operational efficiency. Since different fault types exhibit distinct electrical, thermal, and operational characteristics, no single diagnostic approach can effectively detect all possible fault conditions. Consequently, researchers have proposed a wide variety of fault detection methods based on electrical measurements, statistical analysis, signal processing, artificial intelligence, and hybrid diagnostic frameworks.

The primary objective of fault detection is to identify abnormal system behavior at an early stage and distinguish faulty operating conditions from normal environmental variations. An effective fault detection technique should provide high detection accuracy, rapid response, low computational complexity, robustness against environmental uncertainties, and practical implementation feasibility.

Based on their operating principles and data processing methodologies, fault detection techniques reported in the literature can generally be classified into five major categories:

1. Conventional Electrical Parameter-Based Techniques
2. Model-Based Techniques
3. Signal Processing-Based Techniques
4. Artificial Intelligence-Based Techniques
5. Hybrid Fault Detection Techniques

3.1 Conventional Electrical Parameter-Based Techniques

Conventional fault detection approaches rely on direct monitoring of electrical parameters such as voltage, current, power, insulation resistance, and temperature. These methods compare measured values with predefined thresholds or expected operating conditions to identify abnormal system behavior.

Such techniques are widely used because of their simplicity, low implementation cost, and ease of integration into existing monitoring systems. However, their performance may deteriorate under varying environmental conditions, particularly during irradiance fluctuations and temperature changes.

Common techniques include:

- Voltage and current threshold monitoring
- Power loss analysis
- I–V characteristic analysis
- Energy yield assessment
- Insulation resistance monitoring

3.2 Model-Based Techniques

Model-based fault detection methods utilize mathematical models of photovoltaic system behavior to estimate expected system outputs under normal operating conditions. Faults are identified by comparing measured system parameters with model predictions.

These methods can provide high detection sensitivity and improved fault localization capability. However, accurate model development often requires detailed knowledge of PV system characteristics and environmental variables.

Typical model-based approaches include:

- Equivalent circuit models
- State estimation methods
- Observer-based fault detection
- Residual analysis techniques
- Analytical redundancy methods

3.3 Signal Processing-Based Techniques

Signal processing techniques analyze electrical signals obtained from photovoltaic systems to extract fault-related features and patterns. These methods are particularly useful for detecting transient events, arc faults, and abnormal operating conditions that may not be easily identifiable through conventional threshold-based approaches.

Signal processing methods often improve detection accuracy by transforming raw measurements into informative frequency-domain or time-frequency-domain representations.

Frequently used techniques include:

- Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)
- Wavelet Transform (WT)
- Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT)
- Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD)
- Spectral analysis methods

3.4 Artificial Intelligence-Based Techniques

Artificial intelligence (AI)-based fault detection methods have gained significant attention due to their ability to automatically identify complex fault patterns from large datasets. These techniques utilize historical operational data to learn relationships between system variables and fault conditions.

Recent advances in machine learning and deep learning have substantially improved fault detection performance in photovoltaic systems, particularly under dynamic environmental conditions.

AI-based techniques can generally be categorized into:

Machine Learning Techniques

- Support Vector Machine (SVM)
- Random Forest (RF)
- Decision Tree (DT)
- K-Nearest Neighbor (KNN)
- Naïve Bayes (NB)

Deep Learning Techniques

- Artificial Neural Networks (ANN)
- Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)
- Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN)
- Long Short-Term Memory Networks (LSTM)
- Autoencoders

These techniques often achieve higher detection accuracy than traditional approaches but typically require large training datasets and greater computational resources.

3.5 Hybrid Fault Detection Techniques

Hybrid approaches combine two or more fault detection methodologies to improve overall diagnostic performance. The integration of conventional monitoring techniques with signal processing and artificial intelligence methods has become increasingly common in recent research.

Hybrid techniques aim to leverage the advantages of individual approaches while minimizing their limitations.

Examples include:

- Wavelet Transform + SVM
- FFT + ANN
- EMD + CNN
- Model-Based Residual Analysis + Machine Learning
- Statistical Analysis + Deep Learning

Hybrid methods generally demonstrate superior fault classification performance and robustness under complex operating conditions.

Table 4: Classification of Photovoltaic Fault Detection Techniques

Category	Principle	Advantages	Limitations
Conventional Methods	Direct parameter monitorin	Simple implementation	Limited adaptability
Model-Based Methods	Comparison with syste models	High sensitivity	Requires accurate modeling
Signal Processi Methods	Feature extraction fro signals	Effective for transie faults	Computational complexity
AI-Based Methods	Data-driven learning	High detection accuracy	Requires large datasets

Hybrid Methods	Combination of multip techniques	Improved performance	Increased implementati complexity

Table 5:Common Techniques Used in Photovoltaic Fault Detection

Category	Representative Techniques
Conventional	Threshold Analysis, I–V Curve Analysis, Power Ratio Monitoring
Model-Based	Residual Analysis, Observer-Based Methods, State Estimation
Signal Processing	FFT, Wavelet Transform, STFT, EMD
Machine Learning	SVM, Random Forest, KNN, Decision Tree
Deep Learning	ANN, CNN, RNN, LSTM, Autoencoder
Hybrid	WT-SVM, FFT-ANN, EMD-CNN

Table 6:General Comparison of Fault Detection Technique Categories

Technique Category	Detection Accuracy	Computational Requirement	Real-Time Capability	Implementation Co
Conventional Methoc	Moderate	Low	High	Low
Model-Based Methoc	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
Signal Processi Methods	High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium
AI-Based Methods	Very High	High	Medium	High
Hybrid Methods	Very High	Very High	Medium	High

The classification presented in this section provides a structured framework for understanding the diverse fault detection approaches currently employed in photovoltaic systems. While conventional techniques continue to be attractive due to their simplicity and low cost, recent research trends increasingly emphasize artificial intelligence and hybrid diagnostic frameworks because of their superior fault identification capabilities. The following sections examine these fault detection categories in greater detail and evaluate their performance characteristics based on findings reported in the literature.

4. Conventional Fault Detection Techniques

Conventional fault detection techniques represent the earliest and most widely adopted approaches for monitoring photovoltaic (PV) system health. These methods primarily rely on direct measurements of electrical, thermal, and operational parameters and use predefined rules, thresholds, or analytical relationships to identify abnormal system behavior. Due to their simplicity, low computational requirements, and ease of implementation, conventional techniques continue to be extensively utilized in both small-scale and utility-scale photovoltaic installations.

Unlike advanced artificial intelligence-based approaches, conventional fault detection methods do not require large training datasets or extensive computational resources. Instead, they depend on measurable system variables such as voltage, current, power, temperature, and insulation resistance. These methods are particularly attractive for real-time monitoring applications where implementation cost and computational efficiency are important considerations.

However, the performance of conventional techniques is often influenced by environmental variations such as irradiance fluctuations, temperature changes, and partial shading conditions. Consequently, their fault discrimination capability may be limited when operating conditions vary significantly.

4.1 Threshold-Based Fault Detection

Threshold-based monitoring is one of the simplest fault detection strategies employed in photovoltaic systems. The method compares measured electrical parameters with predefined threshold values established under normal operating conditions. A fault is declared whenever the measured variable exceeds or falls below the specified threshold.

Commonly monitored parameters include:

- String voltage
- Array current
- Output power
- Module temperature
- Insulation resistance

The primary advantage of threshold-based methods lies in their straightforward implementation and low hardware requirements. However, selecting appropriate threshold values remains challenging because environmental factors frequently influence PV operating characteristics.

Advantages

- Simple implementation
- Low computational complexity
- Suitable for real-time monitoring
- Low installation cost

Limitations

- Sensitive to environmental variations
- Limited fault classification capability
- High probability of false alarms

4.2 I–V Curve Analysis

Current-voltage (I–V) curve analysis is one of the most widely used conventional diagnostic approaches in photovoltaic systems. The technique evaluates deviations in the electrical characteristics of PV modules and arrays by comparing measured I–V curves with expected operating profiles.

Different fault conditions affect characteristic points of the I–V curve in distinct ways. For example:

- Open-circuit faults primarily influence open-circuit voltage.
- Short-circuit faults affect short-circuit current.
- Partial shading alters curve shape and maximum power point location.
- Degradation-related faults reduce fill factor and power output.

Because fault signatures can often be directly observed from curve distortions, I–V analysis provides valuable diagnostic information regarding fault severity and fault location.

Advantages

- Direct fault identification capability
- Effective for multiple fault types
- Widely accepted diagnostic approach

Limitations

- Requires periodic I–V measurements
- Increased measurement complexity
- Limited suitability for continuous monitoring

4.3 Power Loss Analysis

Power loss analysis detects faults by comparing actual energy production with expected system output. Under normal conditions, generated power follows predictable patterns based on irradiance and temperature levels. Significant deviations from expected power output may indicate the presence of faults.

Power ratio indicators commonly used include:

- Performance Ratio (PR)
- Energy Yield Ratio
- Capacity Utilization Factor
- Normalized Power Output

This approach is particularly useful for identifying degradation-related faults and long-term performance deterioration.

Advantages

- Easy implementation
- Suitable for large PV plants
- Effective for performance monitoring

Limitations

- Poor fault localization capability
- Environmental dependency
- Delayed fault identification

4.4 Thermal Monitoring Techniques

Thermal monitoring methods identify faults through abnormal temperature distributions observed within photovoltaic modules. Since many faults generate localized heating effects, temperature measurements can provide useful diagnostic information.

Common thermal monitoring tools include:

- Temperature sensors
- Infrared thermography
- Thermal cameras
- Distributed temperature monitoring systems

Hotspots, defective cells, and poor electrical connections often produce elevated temperatures that can be detected before severe damage occurs.

Advantages

- Effective hotspot detection
- Non-invasive monitoring
- Early fault identification

Limitations

- Additional sensing equipment required
- Environmental influence on measurements
- Higher monitoring cost

4.5 Insulation Resistance Monitoring

Insulation resistance monitoring is primarily used to detect ground faults and insulation degradation. The method measures resistance between energized conductors and ground and identifies abnormal leakage current paths.

Ground faults represent significant safety concerns in photovoltaic installations, making insulation monitoring an important protective measure.

Advantages

- High sensitivity to ground faults
- Improved system safety
- Established industrial practice

Limitations

- Limited fault coverage
- Additional measurement hardware required

Table 7:Comparison of Major Conventional Fault Detection Techniques

Technique	**Monitored Parameter**	**Detectable Faults**	**Complexity**	**Real-Time Capability**
Threshold Monitoring	Voltage, Current, Power	Open Circuit, Short Circu	Low	High

I–V Curve Analys	Current-Voltage Characteristics	Multiple Electrical Faults	Medium	Medium
Power Lo Analysis	Output Power	Performance Degradatic Shading	Low	High
Thermal Monitori	Temperature Distributior	Hotspots, Defective Cells	Medium	Medium
Insulation Monitoring	Leakage Curre Resistance	Ground Faults	Low	High

Table 8:Advantages and Limitations of Conventional Fault Detection Techniques

Technique	**Advantages**	**Limitations**
Threshold Monitoring	Simple and inexpensive	Sensitive to environmental changes
I–V Curve Analysis	Accurate fault characterization	Requires specialized measurements
Power Loss Analysis	Easy implementation	Limited fault localization
Thermal Monitoring	Effective hotspot detection	Additional hardware cost
Insulation Monitoring	Excellent safety monitoring	Detects limited fault categories

Table 9: Suitability of Conventional Techniques for Different PV Fault Types

Fault Type	**Threshold Monitoring**	**I–V Analysi**	**Power Analysis**	**Thermal Monitoring**	**Insulation Monitoring**
Open-Circuit Fau	High	High	Medium	Low	Low
Short-Circuit Fau	High	High	Medium	Medium	Low
Ground Fault	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	High
Arc Fault	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Low
Partial Shading	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low
Hotspot Fault	Low	Medium	Low	High	Low
PID	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
Microcracks	Low	Medium	Low	Medium	Low

The analysis of conventional fault detection techniques indicates that these approaches remain valuable due to their simplicity, low computational burden, and ease of deployment. Nevertheless, their performance is often constrained by environmental uncertainties and limited fault classification capabilities. As photovoltaic systems become increasingly complex and data-rich, researchers have gradually shifted toward intelligent diagnostic approaches that offer improved accuracy, adaptability, and automation. Consequently, artificial intelligence-based fault detection methods have emerged as a major area of research and are discussed in the following section.

5. AI/ML-Based Fault Detection Techniques

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning (ML), and deep learning technologies has significantly transformed fault detection and diagnosis in photovoltaic (PV) systems. Unlike conventional fault detection approaches that primarily rely on predefined thresholds or analytical models, AI/ML-based techniques learn fault patterns directly from historical operational data. This capability enables intelligent diagnostic systems to identify complex fault signatures, adapt to changing environmental conditions, and improve fault classification accuracy.

Modern PV systems generate large volumes of operational data through sensors, monitoring devices, supervisory control systems, and Internet of Things (IoT) platforms. These datasets typically contain information related to voltage, current, power output, irradiance, temperature, and environmental conditions. AI-based algorithms utilize these data sources to establish relationships between system behavior and fault conditions, thereby facilitating automated fault detection and diagnosis.

Recent studies have demonstrated that AI/ML techniques generally outperform conventional methods in terms of fault classification accuracy, robustness, and adaptability. However, their effectiveness depends heavily on data quality, dataset size, feature selection, and model training procedures.

5.1 Machine Learning-Based Fault Detection

Machine learning techniques represent one of the most widely adopted approaches for photovoltaic fault diagnosis. These methods learn patterns from labeled or unlabeled datasets and subsequently classify system operating conditions into normal and faulty states.

Machine learning algorithms generally consist of the following stages:

1. Data acquisition
2. Data preprocessing
3. Feature extraction
4. Model training
5. Fault classification

The success of machine learning-based fault diagnosis largely depends on the quality and representativeness of extracted features.

Support Vector Machine (SVM)

Support Vector Machine is among the most frequently employed classification algorithms in photovoltaic fault detection research. SVM constructs optimal decision boundaries between normal and fault conditions by maximizing class separation margins.

The technique has demonstrated strong performance in identifying:

- Open-circuit faults
- Short-circuit faults
- Partial shading conditions
- Ground faults

Advantages

- High classification accuracy
- Effective with limited datasets
- Good generalization capability

Limitations

- Sensitive to parameter selection
- Computationally intensive for large datasets

Random Forest (RF)

Random Forest is an ensemble learning technique that combines multiple decision trees to improve classification performance and reduce overfitting.

Key benefits include:

- High robustness
- Strong fault classification capability
- Reduced sensitivity to noisy data

Random Forest models are particularly suitable for large PV datasets containing multiple fault categories.

Decision Tree (DT)

Decision Tree algorithms classify faults using hierarchical decision rules derived from training data. These methods are highly interpretable and computationally efficient.

Advantages include:

- Easy implementation
- Transparent decision-making process
- Fast prediction speed

However, individual decision trees may suffer from overfitting when training datasets are limited.

K-Nearest Neighbor (KNN)

KNN classifies fault conditions based on similarity measures between new observations and previously labeled samples. The method is simple to implement and does not require extensive model training.

Limitations include increased computational requirements during prediction and sensitivity to feature scaling.

5.2 Deep Learning-Based Fault Detection

Deep learning has emerged as one of the most promising technologies for photovoltaic fault diagnosis due to its ability to automatically learn complex feature representations from large datasets.

Unlike traditional machine learning methods that often require manual feature engineering, deep learning algorithms perform both feature extraction and classification simultaneously.

Artificial Neural Networks (ANN)

Artificial Neural Networks have been extensively applied to fault diagnosis in photovoltaic systems. ANNs consist of interconnected processing nodes capable of learning nonlinear relationships between system parameters and fault conditions.

ANN-based methods have been successfully utilized for:

- Fault classification
- Performance degradation assessment
- Hotspot detection
- Ground fault identification

Although ANNs provide strong predictive capabilities, model performance depends significantly on network architecture and training quality.

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)

CNNs are particularly effective when dealing with image-based or multidimensional fault detection data. Recent research has applied CNNs to:

- Infrared thermal image analysis
- Electroluminescence image inspection
- Fault pattern recognition

CNN models typically achieve high fault classification accuracy due to their powerful feature extraction capabilities.

Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN)

RNNs are designed to process sequential and time-series data. Since photovoltaic system measurements are collected continuously over time, RNNs can effectively model temporal relationships associated with fault development.

Applications include:

- Time-series fault prediction
- Performance degradation analysis
- Dynamic fault detection

Long Short-Term Memory Networks (LSTM)

LSTM networks are an advanced form of recurrent neural networks capable of learning long-term temporal dependencies.

LSTM-based models have demonstrated excellent performance for:

- Predictive maintenance
- Fault forecasting
- Real-time fault diagnosis

Their ability to handle complex temporal dynamics makes them particularly attractive for intelligent photovoltaic monitoring systems.

International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: **3108-1754 (Online)**
Volume 02 Issue 07 July-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5

5.3 Unsupervised and Semi-Supervised Learning Approaches

One of the major challenges in photovoltaic fault diagnosis is the limited availability of labeled fault datasets. To address this issue, researchers have increasingly explored unsupervised and semi-supervised learning techniques.

Common approaches include:

- Clustering algorithms
- Autoencoders
- Principal Component Analysis (PCA)
- Isolation Forest

These methods identify abnormal system behavior without requiring extensive fault labeling.

Such approaches are particularly valuable because real-world PV installations often experience relatively few fault events, making labeled datasets difficult to obtain.

5.4 Hybrid AI-Based Approaches

Recent research trends increasingly favor hybrid AI frameworks that combine machine learning, deep learning, and signal processing techniques.

Examples include:

- Wavelet Transform + SVM
- FFT + ANN
- EMD + CNN
- PCA + Random Forest
- LSTM + Feature Engineering

Hybrid approaches generally improve fault detection accuracy by integrating complementary diagnostic capabilities from multiple methodologies.

Table 10:Comparison of Machine Learning Algorithms for PV Fault Detection

Algorithm	Learning Type	Advantages	Limitations
SVM	Supervised	High accuracy, strong generalizatio	Parameter tuning required
Random Forest	Supervised	Robust, resistant to overfitting	Higher computational cost
Decision Tree	Supervised	Interpretable and simple	Overfitting risk
KNN	Supervised	Easy implementation	High prediction-time computatio
Naïve Bayes	Supervised	Fast training	Assumes feature independence

Table 11:Comparison of Deep Learning Techniques in Photovoltaic Fault Diagnosis

Technique	Data Type	Strengths	Challenges
ANN	Numerical Data	Nonlinear modeling capability	Architecture selection
CNN	Image and Sensor Data	Automatic feature extraction	Large dataset requirement
RNN	Sequential Data	Temporal pattern learning	Training complexity
LSTM	Time-Series Data	Long-term dependency modeling	High computational demand
Autoencoder	Unlabeled Data	Anomaly detection capability	Training sensitivity

Table 12:Suitability of AI/ML Techniques for Different Fault Types

Fault Type	SVM	RF	ANN	CNN	LSTM
Open-Circuit Fault	High	High	High	Medium	Medium
Short-Circuit Fault	High	High	High	Medium	Medium
Ground Fault	Medium	High	High	Medium	Medium
Arc Fault	Medium	Medium	High	High	High
Partial Shading	High	High	High	Medium	High
Hotspot Fault	Medium	Medium	High	High	Medium

Microcracks	Low	Medium	Medium	Very High	Low
PID	Medium	Medium	High	Medium	High

Table 13:General Performance Characteristics of AI-Based Fault Detection Techniques

Technique	Accuracy Potential	Computational Requirement	Dataset Requireme	Real-Time Capability
SVM	High	Medium	Medium	High
Random Forest	High	Medium	Medium	High
ANN	High	High	High	Medium
CNN	Very High	High	High	Medium
LSTM	Very High	Very High	High	Medium
Hybrid AI Mode	Very High	Very High	High	Medium

The analysis presented in this section indicates that AI/ML-based fault detection techniques offer significant improvements in diagnostic accuracy, adaptability, and fault classification capability compared with conventional approaches. Deep learning and hybrid intelligent frameworks have demonstrated particularly strong performance for complex fault scenarios and dynamic operating conditions. Nevertheless, challenges associated with data availability, model interpretability, computational requirements, and deployment complexity continue to influence practical implementation. Therefore, a systematic performance assessment of the various fault detection approaches reported in the literature is necessary to identify the most effective techniques for photovoltaic applications. Such an assessment is presented in the following section.

6. Performance Assessment and Comparative Analysis

The growing diversity of photovoltaic fault detection techniques has created the need for a systematic performance assessment framework capable of evaluating the effectiveness of different diagnostic approaches. Since fault detection methods vary considerably in terms of operating principles, computational requirements, implementation complexity, and diagnostic capability, a comparative evaluation is essential for identifying the most suitable techniques for practical photovoltaic applications.

This section presents a comparative analysis of conventional, model-based, signal processing, machine learning, deep learning, and hybrid fault detection techniques based on commonly reported performance indicators. The assessment focuses on factors that directly influence diagnostic effectiveness, including detection accuracy, computational complexity, response time, fault coverage, implementation cost, scalability, and real-time applicability.

6.1 Performance Evaluation Criteria

The effectiveness of a fault detection technique is generally assessed using multiple performance indicators. Since no single metric can completely characterize diagnostic performance, a combination of technical and operational criteria is typically considered.

Table 14:Performance Evaluation Metrics Used for Fault Detection Assessment

Evaluation Metric	Description	Importance
Detection Accuracy	Ability to correctly identify faults	Very High
Detection Speed	Time required to detect faults	High
Computational Complexity	Processing requirements of the algorithm	High
Fault Classification Capability	Ability to distinguish different fault types	Very High
Robustness	Performance under varying environmental conditions	High
Real-Time Applicability	Suitability for online monitoring	High
Scalability	Capability to handle large PV installations	Medium
Implementation Cost	Hardware and software requirements	Medium

Among these criteria, detection accuracy and fault classification capability are generally considered the most important indicators because they directly affect system reliability and maintenance effectiveness.

6.2 Comparative Assessment of Conventional Techniques

Conventional fault detection methods remain attractive because of their simplicity, low computational requirements, and ease of deployment. These approaches typically rely on direct measurements of electrical and thermal parameters and require minimal data processing.

However, their diagnostic capability is often affected by environmental variations such as irradiance fluctuations, temperature changes, and partial shading conditions. As a result, their ability to distinguish between multiple fault categories is generally limited compared with intelligent approaches.

Table 15: Performance Assessment of Conventional Fault Detection Techniques

Technique	Accuracy	Complexity	Real-Time Capability	Fault Coverage	Overall Assessme
Threshold Monitoring	Moderate	Low	High	Limited	Moderate
I–V Curve Analysi	High	Medium	Medium	High	High
Power Loss Analys	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate
Thermal Monitorin	High	Medium	Medium	Moderate	High
Insulation Monitoring	High	Low	High	Specific Fau Only	High

The analysis indicates that I–V curve analysis and thermal monitoring generally provide better diagnostic performance than simple threshold-based approaches. Nevertheless, environmental sensitivity remains a major limitation of conventional techniques.

6.3 Comparative Assessment of AI/ML-Based Techniques

Artificial intelligence-based techniques have demonstrated significant improvements in photovoltaic fault diagnosis due to their ability to learn complex nonlinear relationships from operational data. Machine learning and deep learning algorithms can effectively identify subtle fault signatures that are difficult to detect using conventional approaches.

These methods generally achieve higher classification accuracy and better adaptability under dynamic operating conditions. However, they often require large datasets, extensive training procedures, and higher computational resources.

Table 16:Performance Assessment of Machine Learning-Based Techniques

Technique	Detection Accuracy	Computational Requirement	Robustness	Real-Time Capability	Overall Performance
SVM	High	Medium	High	High	High
Random Fore	High	Medium	High	High	High
Decision Tree	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate
KNN	Moderate	Medium	Moderate	Medium	Moderate
Naïve Bayes	Moderate	Low	Moderate	High	Moderate

Among machine learning techniques, SVM and Random Forest methods generally provide the best balance between detection accuracy and computational efficiency.

Table 17:Performance Assessment of Deep Learning-Based Techniques

Technique	Accuracy	Dataset Requirement	Computational Complexity	Real-Time Suitability	Overall Assessment
ANN	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
CNN	Very High	High	High	Medium	Very High
RNN	High	High	High	Medium	High
LSTM	Very High	High	Very High	Medium	Very High
Autoencoder	High	Medium	High	Medium	High

The results suggest that CNN and LSTM architectures possess superior fault classification capabilities, particularly for complex fault scenarios and large-scale photovoltaic installations.

6.4 Comparison of Fault Detection Categories

To provide a broader perspective, the major categories of fault detection techniques are compared using multiple performance indicators.

Table 18:Overall Comparison of Fault Detection Categories

Category	Accuracy	Complexity	Fault Coverag	Adaptability	Real-Time Capability
Conventional Methods	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Low	High
Model-Based Methods	High	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
Signal Processi Methods	High	Medium-High	High	Medium	Medium
Machine Learni Methods	High	Medium	High	High	High
Deep Learning Method	Very High	High	Very High	Very High	Medium
Hybrid Methods	Very High	Very High	Very High	Very High	High

The comparison reveals a gradual improvement in fault detection performance as techniques evolve from conventional approaches toward intelligent and hybrid diagnostic frameworks. Although advanced AI-based methods generally provide superior accuracy, they also introduce increased computational and implementation requirements.

6.5 Comparative Ranking of Fault Detection Techniques

Based on the evaluation criteria considered in this study, an overall qualitative ranking of fault detection approaches is presented in Table 19.

Table 19:Overall Ranking of Fault Detection Approaches

Rank	Technique Category	Strength
1	Hybrid AI-Based Methods	Highest accuracy and robustness
2	Deep Learning Methods	Excellent fault classification capability
3	Machine Learning Methods	Strong balance between accuracy and complexity
4	Signal Processing Methods	Effective feature extraction capability
5	Model-Based Methods	Good fault localization capability
6	Conventional Methods	Simple and cost-effective implementation

The ranking demonstrates that hybrid and deep learning-based approaches currently represent the most promising solutions for advanced photovoltaic fault diagnosis. Their ability to process large datasets, identify complex fault patterns, and adapt to changing operating conditions makes them particularly suitable for modern smart photovoltaic systems.

6.6 Discussion

The comparative analysis highlights a clear transition in photovoltaic fault detection research from traditional rule-based monitoring toward intelligent data-driven diagnostics. Conventional methods continue to offer advantages in terms of simplicity, low cost, and real-time implementation; however, their fault discrimination capability remains limited. In contrast, AI-based techniques provide substantially improved accuracy and adaptability, particularly under variable environmental conditions.

Deep learning and hybrid approaches exhibit the strongest overall performance across most evaluation criteria. Nevertheless, challenges related to data availability, computational burden, model interpretability, and deployment complexity continue to hinder large-scale practical implementation. Future research should therefore focus on developing lightweight, explainable, and data-efficient fault detection frameworks capable of delivering high diagnostic accuracy while maintaining practical deployment feasibility in real-world photovoltaic systems.

7. Research Gaps and Challenges

Despite significant advancements in photovoltaic fault detection techniques, several challenges remain. One of the major limitations is the lack of large and publicly available fault datasets, which restricts the development and validation of robust AI-based models. Environmental variations such as irradiance fluctuations, temperature changes, and partial shading often affect diagnostic accuracy and may lead to false fault detection.

Another challenge is the limited generalization capability of many machine learning and deep learning models, as algorithms trained on specific datasets may not perform effectively under different operating conditions. Furthermore, advanced AI-based techniques often require high computational resources, making real-time implementation difficult in practical PV systems.

In addition, the interpretability of deep learning models remains a concern, as many algorithms operate as black-box systems. Accurate fault localization and severity assessment also continue to be challenging tasks. Addressing these issues is essential for improving the reliability and practical deployment of photovoltaic fault diagnosis systems.

Table 20:Major Research Gaps in Photovoltaic Fault Detection

Research Gap	Impact
Limited fault datasets	Reduced model reliability
Environmental variability	False fault detection
Poor model generalization	Limited practical deployment
High computational requirements	Real-time implementation challenges
Lack of interpretability	Reduced user confidence
Fault localization difficulty	Increased maintenance effort

8. Future Directions

Future research should focus on developing intelligent fault detection frameworks that are accurate, scalable, and suitable for real-time applications. Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) can improve the transparency and reliability of AI-based diagnostic systems, while edge computing can support faster fault detection with reduced communication delays.

The integration of digital twins, IoT technologies, and hybrid AI models is expected to enhance fault diagnosis performance and predictive maintenance capabilities. Additionally, federated learning offers opportunities to improve model generalization while preserving data privacy.

Overall, future photovoltaic fault detection systems should aim to achieve higher accuracy, improved robustness, lower computational complexity, and greater adaptability under diverse operating conditions.

Table 21: Emerging Research Directions

Research Direction	Expected Benefit
Explainable AI (XAI)	Improved transparency
Edge Computing	Faster real-time diagnosis
Digital Twins	Predictive maintenance
Federated Learning	Better generalization
Hybrid AI Models	Higher diagnostic accuracy
IoT-Based Monitoring	Continuous system supervision

9. Conclusion

This paper presented a comprehensive performance assessment of fault detection techniques in photovoltaic systems. Various fault categories, including electrical, thermal, environmental, degradation-related, and operational faults, were reviewed along with their impact on system performance and reliability. Furthermore, conventional, model-based, signal processing, machine learning, deep learning, and hybrid fault detection approaches were examined and compared based on key performance indicators such as detection accuracy, computational complexity, fault coverage, and real-time applicability.

The comparative analysis revealed that conventional techniques remain attractive due to their simplicity, low cost, and ease of implementation. However, their performance is often limited under dynamic operating conditions and complex fault scenarios. In contrast, AI/ML-based methods, particularly deep learning and hybrid approaches, demonstrate superior fault detection accuracy, adaptability, and fault classification capability. Despite these advantages, challenges related to data availability, model generalization, computational requirements, and interpretability continue to hinder their widespread deployment.

Overall, the findings indicate that intelligent and hybrid fault diagnosis frameworks represent the most promising direction for future photovoltaic monitoring systems. Continued research focused on explainable, scalable, and real-time fault detection solutions will be essential for improving the reliability, safety, and operational efficiency of next-generation photovoltaic energy systems.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Dhimish and V. Holmes, “Fault detection algorithm for grid-connected photovoltaic plants,” Solar Energy, vol. 137, pp. 236–245, Oct. 2016.

[2] M. Dhimish, V. Holmes, B. Mehrdadi, and M. Dales, “Comparing MamdaniSugeno fuzzy logic and RBF ANN network for PV fault detection,” Renewable Energy, vol. 117, pp. 257–274, Mar. 2018.

[3] Y. Zhao, B. Lehman, R. Ball, J. Mosesian, and J. F. de Palma, “Outlier detection rules for fault detection in solar photovoltaic arrays,” IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1397–1406, Oct. 2013.

[4] Y. Zhao, J. F. de Palma, J. Mosesian, R. Lyons, and B. Lehman, “Line-line fault analysis and protection challenges in solar photovoltaic arrays,” IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 3784–3795, Sept. 2013.

[5] S. Silvestre, A. Chouder, and E. Karatepe, “Automatic fault detection in grid connected PV systems,” Solar Energy, vol. 94, pp. 119–127, Aug. 2013.

[6] A. Chouder and S. Silvestre, “Analysis model of mismatch power losses in PV systems,” Journal of Solar Energy Engineering, vol. 131, no. 2, pp. 024504-1–024504-5, 2009.

[7] M. Davarifar, A. Rabhi, and A. El Hajjaji, “Comprehensive modulation and classification of faults in photovoltaic arrays,” Solar Energy, vol. 132, pp. 473–483, 2016.

[8] M. Garoudja, S. Harrou, Y. Sun, and K. Kara, “Statistical fault detection in photovoltaic systems,” Solar Energy, vol. 150, pp. 485–499, 2017.

[9] S. Harrou, Y. Sun, and M. Madakyaru, “Statistical monitoring of photovoltaic systems using EWMA charts,” IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 551–559, Apr. 2017.
[10] K. Mellit and S. A. Kalogirou, “Artificial intelligence techniques for photovoltaic applications: A review,” Progress in Energy and Combustion Science, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 574–632, Oct. 2008.
[11] A. Mellit, A. MassiPavan, and V. Lughi, “Deep learning neural networks for photovoltaic fault detection,” Renewable Energy, vol. 133, pp. 125–138, 2019.
[12] M. Pillai and M. Rajasekaran, “Anomaly detection in solar photovoltaic systems using machine learning,” Energy Procedia, vol. 117, pp. 349–356, 2017.
[13] S. Chine, A. Mellit, A. M. Pavan, and V. Lughi, “Fault diagnosis in photovoltaic arrays using machine learning techniques,” Renewable Energy, vol. 123, pp. 152–163, 2018.
[14] H. Mekki, A. Mellit, and H. Salhi, “Artificial neural network based modelling and fault detection of photovoltaic modules,” Energy Conversion and Management, vol. 78, pp. 340–350, 2014.
[15] M. Dhimish, “Micro-shaded photovoltaic fault detection using thermal imaging,” Solar Energy, vol. 171, pp. 486–494, 2018.
[16] T. Ma, H. Yang, and L. Lu, “Performance monitoring and fault diagnosis of photovoltaic systems: A review,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 67, pp. 1117–1128, Jan. 2017.
[17] M. Köntges et al., “Review of failures of photovoltaic modules,” International Energy Agency (IEA-PVPS), Report T13-01, 2014.
[18] M. Simon and A. Meyer, “Detection and analysis of hot spots in photovoltaic modules,” Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells, vol. 120, pp. 29–35, 2014.
[19] F. Gallardo-Saavedra and L. Hernández-Callejo, “Opportunities and challenges for machine learning in photovoltaic systems,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 135, Art. no. 110121, 2021.
[20] M. Madeti and S. N. Singh, “Monitoring system for photovoltaic plants: A review,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 67, pp. 1180–1207, 2017.
[21] J. Wang, P. Balog, and R. Teodorescu, “Arc fault detection in photovoltaic systems using wavelet analysis,” IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 8527–8536, 2016.
[22] M. K. Alam, F. Khan, J. Johnson, and J. Flicker, “PV fault detection using statistical signal processing techniques,” IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 288–297, 2015.
[23] Y. Hu, W. Cao, J. Wu, B. Ji, and D. Holliday, “Thermography-based fault diagnosis of photovoltaic arrays,” IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 455–463, 2014.
[24] A. MassiPavan, A. Mellit, D. De Pieri, and S. Kalogirou, “Fault detection in photovoltaic systems using neural networks,” Solar Energy, vol. 122, pp. 431–442, 2015.
[25] K. Kim, J. Kim, and Y. Kim, “CNN-based fault diagnosis of photovoltaic modules using infrared images,” Energies, vol. 12, no. 8, Art. no. 1529, 2019.
[26] A. F. de Moura, R. C. L. de Oliveira, and J. P. A. Vieira, “Random forest-based photovoltaic fault classification,” IEEE Access, vol. 8, pp. 171891–171902, 2020.
[27] A. M. Bazzi, “Analysis of photovoltaic system faults and mitigation strategies,” IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 2678–2686, 2014.
[28] M. S. Alam, F. Khan, J. Johnson, and J. Flicker, “A comprehensive review of PV fault diagnostics,” Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 81, pp. 1675–1689, 2018.
[29] N. Kumar, B. Singh, and B. K. Panigrahi, “Deep learning-based fault classification in solar photovoltaic arrays,” IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2548–2558, 2021.
[30] Y. Zhang, X. Wang, and L. Wang, “LSTM-based photovoltaic fault prediction and diagnosis,” Applied Energy, vol. 276, Art. no. 115485, 2020.
[31] A. Mellit and S. Kalogirou, “Machine learning applications in photovoltaic fault diagnosis,” Renewable Energy, vol. 145, pp. 219–231, 2020.
[32] J. Johnson, J. Flicker, and M. Alam, “Ground fault and arc fault detection in photovoltaic arrays,” Sandia National Laboratories Report, SAND2013-8707, 2013.

[33] H. Ziar, S. Mansourpour, and S. M. M. Tafreshi, "Wavelet transform-based fault diagnosis of PV arrays," IET Renewable Power Generation, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1124–1132, 2017.
[34] S. Silvestre, A. Chouder, and A. Karatepe, "Advanced fault detection techniques for photovoltaic systems," Renewable Energy, vol. 99, pp. 350–360, 2016.
[35] M. Dhimish and V. Holmes, "Review of photovoltaic fault detection techniques and future trends," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 112, pp. 29–42, 2019.
[36] A. Chouder and S. Silvestre, "Automatic supervision and fault detection of PV systems based on power losses analysis," Energy Conversion and Management, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 1929–1937, 2010.
[37] S. Silvestre, A. Chouder, E. Karatepe, and B. A. Hussein, "Analysis of performance degradation in grid-connected photovoltaic systems," Renewable Energy, vol. 47, pp. 112–119, 2012.
[38] E. Karatepe, M. Boztepe, and M. Colak, "Development of a suitable model for characterizing photovoltaic arrays with shaded solar cells," Solar Energy, vol. 81, no. 8, pp. 977–992, 2007.
[39] M. Alam, F. Khan, J. Johnson, and J. Flicker, "A fault detection and diagnostic methodology for photovoltaic arrays," IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 588–598, Jun. 2015.
[40] J. Flicker and J. Johnson, "Electrical detection and classification of photovoltaic arc faults," IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 392–400, Jan. 2015.
[41] M. Köntges, S. Kurtz, C. Packard, U. Jahn, K. Berger, and K. Kato, "Assessment of Photovoltaic Module Failures in the Field," IEA PVPS Task 13 Report, 2017.
[42] M. Simon and A. Meyer, "Detection and analysis of hotspots in photovoltaic modules by infrared thermography," Solar Energy, vol. 94, pp. 215–223, 2013.
[43] M. Drif, P. J. Pérez, J. Aguilera, and J. D. Aguilar, "A new estimation method of irradiance on a partially shaded PV generator," Renewable Energy, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 2048–2056, 2008.
[44] H. Mekki, A. Mellit, and H. Salhi, "Artificial neural network-based modelling and fault detection of partial shaded photovoltaic modules," Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory, vol. 67, pp. 1–13, 2016.
[45] S. Chine and A. Mellit, "ANN-based fault diagnosis technique for photovoltaic systems," Energy Procedia, vol. 74, pp. 1280–1287, 2015.
[46] M. Garoudja, S. Harrou, Y. Sun, and B. Senouci, "Multivariate statistical monitoring of photovoltaic plants," Solar Energy, vol. 150, pp. 485–499, 2017.
[47] S. Harrou, Y. Sun, B. Taghezouit, and A. Saidi, "Reliable fault detection and diagnosis of photovoltaic systems using statistical process control," Renewable Energy, vol. 116, pp. 22–35, 2018.
[48] K. Mellit, A. Mellit, and S. A. Kalogirou, "Machine learning applications in photovoltaic systems: A review," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 100, pp. 1–17, 2019.
[49] M. Dhimish and V. Holmes, "PV module hotspot detection using thermal image analysis," Solar Energy, vol. 136, pp. 259–272, 2016.
[50] S. Spataru, D. Sera, T. Kerekes, and R. Teodorescu, "Diagnosis of photovoltaic systems based on monitoring data," IEEE Journal of Photovoltaics, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 1698–1706, Nov. 2015.
[51] M. Bressan, Y. El Basri, A. Galeano, and C. Alonso, "A shadow fault detection method based on current and voltage monitoring," Solar Energy, vol. 86, no. 9, pp. 2671–2681, 2012.
[52] T. Ma, H. Yang, and L. Lu, "A feasibility study of fault diagnosis for photovoltaic systems," Applied Energy, vol. 180, pp. 321–332, 2016.
[53] A. F. de Moura, R. C. L. de Oliveira, and J. P. A. Vieira, "Photovoltaic fault classification using ensemble learning techniques," IEEE Access, vol. 8, pp. 155346–155357, 2020.
[54] S. K. Firth, K. J. Lomas, and S. J. Rees, "Performance monitoring and fault detection in photovoltaic systems," Solar Energy, vol. 84, no. 12, pp. 1928–1939, 2010.
[55] R. Peimbert-García, J. C. Rosas-Caro, and J. M. Ramírez, "Online fault diagnosis of photovoltaic systems using support vector machines," Electric Power Systems Research, vol. 146, pp. 1–10, 2017.
[56] J. Wang, P. Balog, and R. Teodorescu, "Arc fault detection in photovoltaic systems using wavelet packet analysis," IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics, vol. 32, no. 12, pp. 9285–9295, 2017.

[57] A. Chouder, S. Silvestre, and B. Taghezouit, "Monitoring, modelling and simulation of photovoltaic systems using advanced diagnostic methods," Renewable Energy, vol. 113, pp. 452–463, 2017.
[58] K. Kim, J. Kim, and Y. Kim, "Deep learning-based fault diagnosis using infrared thermal images of photovoltaic modules," Energies, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 1529–1545, 2019.
[59] N. M. Kumar, M. A. Mathew, and N. K. Sharma, "Deep learning framework for photovoltaic fault classification," IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 132574–132586, 2021.
[60] Y. Zhang, X. Wang, and L. Wang, "LSTM network for photovoltaic fault prediction and early warning," Applied Energy, vol. 276, Art. no. 115485, 2020.
[61] A. Mellit and S. Kalogirou, "Artificial intelligence applications in photovoltaic fault diagnosis," Progress in Energy and Combustion Science, vol. 73, pp. 1–29, 2019.
[62] H. Ziar, S. Mansourpour, and S. M. M. Tafreshi, "Wavelet transform based fault diagnosis in photovoltaic arrays under varying weather conditions," IET Renewable Power Generation, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1124–1132, 2017.
[63] M. Alam and F. Khan, "Data-driven fault diagnosis of photovoltaic systems using principal component analysis," Solar Energy, vol. 163, pp. 507–520, 2018.
[64] S. Harrou, Y. Sun, and M. Madakyaru, "Kalman filtering based fault detection for photovoltaic systems," Energy Conversion and Management, vol. 184, pp. 473–486, 2019.
[65] T. H. M. El-Fouly, M. M. A. Salama, and M. Chikhani, "Condition monitoring and fault diagnosis techniques for photovoltaic arrays," Electric Power Components and Systems, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 537–548, 2015.
[66] A. M. Bazzi and P. T. Krein, "Review of fault detection and protection methods for photovoltaic systems," IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition (ECCE), pp. 3762–3769, 2013.
[67] S. Spataru, D. Sera, and R. Teodorescu, "Fault diagnosis in photovoltaic arrays using performance indicators," Solar Energy, vol. 153, pp. 495–505, 2017.
[68] M. Dhimish and V. Holmes, "Ground fault detection in photovoltaic systems using intelligent monitoring techniques," Renewable Energy, vol. 127, pp. 1013–1025, 2018.
[69] B. Taghezouit, S. Harrou, and Y. Sun, "Data-driven anomaly detection in solar photovoltaic systems," Renewable Energy, vol. 145, pp. 1875–1888, 2020.
[70] N. Kumar, B. Singh, and B. K. Panigrahi, "Hybrid deep learning approach for photovoltaic fault diagnosis and classification," IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1021–1031, 2022.