

A Scoping Review of Machine Learning Applications in Power System Protection and Disturbance Management

Julian Oelhaf^{a,*}, Georg Kordowich^b, Mehran Pashaei^a, Christian Bergler^c, Andreas Maier^a, Johann Jäger^b and Siming Bayer^a

^aPattern Recognition Lab, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

^bInstitute of Electrical Energy Systems, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

^cDepartment of Electrical Engineering, Media and Computer Science, Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule Amberg-Weiden, Amberg, Germany

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

machine learning
deep learning
power system protection
artificial intelligence
power grid

ABSTRACT

The integration of renewable and distributed energy resources has fundamentally reshaped modern power systems, challenging conventional protection schemes built around centralized generation. This scoping review synthesizes recent literature on machine learning (ML) applications in power system protection and disturbance management, following the PRISMA for Scoping Reviews framework. Based on over 100 publications, three key objectives are addressed: (i) assessing the scope of ML research in protection tasks; (ii) evaluating ML performance across diverse operational scenarios; and (iii) identifying methods suitable for evolving grid conditions.

Machine learning models often demonstrate high accuracy on simulated datasets; however, their performance under real-world conditions remains insufficiently validated. The existing literature is fragmented, with inconsistencies in methodological rigor, dataset quality, and evaluation metrics. This lack of standardization hampers the comparability of results and limits the generalizability of findings across different applications. To address these challenges, this review introduces a machine learning-oriented taxonomy for protection tasks, resolves key terminological inconsistencies, and advocates for standardized reporting practices. It further provides guidelines for comprehensive dataset documentation, methodological transparency, and consistent evaluation protocols, aiming to improve reproducibility and enhance the practical relevance of research outcomes.

Critical gaps remain, including the scarcity of real-world validation, insufficient robustness testing, and limited consideration of deployment feasibility. Future research should prioritize public benchmark datasets, realistic validation methods, and advanced ML architectures. These steps are essential to move ML-based protection from theoretical promise to practical deployment in increasingly dynamic and decentralized power systems.

1. Introduction

The transformation of electric power systems is accelerating, driven by widespread integration of renewable and distributed energy resources (DER). This shift from traditional, centralized generation – primarily coal, gas, and nuclear power – towards decentralized, variable sources fundamentally reshapes electricity generation, transmission, distribution, and protection [1, 2]. The transition to inverter-based resources (IBRs) and DERs introduces significant operational changes, as these technologies differ fundamentally from conventional synchronous machines and are poorly supported by legacy grid infrastructures [3]. This shift challenges traditional protection systems, as IBR-dominated grids face issues such as voltage instability, harmonic distortion, degraded power quality, reactive power imbalances, and synchronization difficulties [4]. These effects, once localized, now occur at scale with greater spatiotemporal variability, further diminishing the reliability of conventional protection schemes [5]. Further complications arise from increasingly meshed distribution networks [6], emerging hybrid AC-DC architectures [7], and dynamic, bidirectional power flows. Traditional threshold-based protection methods, optimized for unidirectional fault currents, struggle to maintain selectivity, sensitivity, and rapid response under these conditions [8, 9].

*Corresponding author.

✉ julian.oelhaf@fau.de (J. Oelhaf); georg.kordowich@fau.de (G. Kordowich); mehran.pashaei@fau.de (M. Pashaei); c.bergler@oth-aw.de (C. Bergler); andreas.maier@fau.de (A. Maier); johann.jaeger@fau.de (J. Jäger); siming.bayer@fau.de (S. Bayer)

🌐 <https://lme.tf.fau.de> (J. Oelhaf); <https://ees.tf.fau.de> (G. Kordowich); <https://oth-aw.de> (C. Bergler)
ORCID(s): 0009-0008-8204-589X (J. Oelhaf); 0000-0003-2225-7926 (G. Kordowich); 0009-0001-4755-0785 (M. Pashaei); 0000-0002-9550-5284 (A. Maier); 0000-0003-2874-4805 (S. Bayer)




Figure 1: This overview figure illustrates the analytical flow of the review. The study begins with the emerging challenges of modern power grids, which motivate the need for intelligent protection systems. These challenges are mapped onto core protection tasks, which are examined through the lens of machine learning - focusing on common approaches, architectures, and deployment considerations. The review concludes with structured contributions that synthesize insights, promote reproducibility, and guide future research.

1.1. Motivation and Background

Consequently, there is growing interest in leveraging data-driven approaches, particularly artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML), to enhance or replace conventional protection logic. Unlike fixed-threshold systems, ML methods can learn nonlinear decision boundaries, adapt to changing conditions, and extract fault-relevant features directly from high-frequency waveform data [10]. These models generalize from data without relying on explicit heuristic rules. Recently, a sub-domain of ML, deep learning (DL) has achieved significant breakthroughs across diverse domains, proving effective at tackling complex, high-dimensional tasks.

Notable achievements in computer vision (ResNet [11]), natural language processing (BERT [12], GPT [13]), strategic decision-making (AlphaGo [14]), and medical diagnostics [15] have exemplified DL's capacity to automatically learn hierarchical structures and generalize effectively from unstructured inputs. Motivated by these successes, power systems research increasingly adopts ML approaches, benefiting from the proliferation of high-resolution sensor data, computational advancements, and the need for adaptive protection schemes. Recent IEEE guidance underscores the practical promise of AI for power system protection, highlighting scenarios where such methods surpass conventional techniques in speed, accuracy, and adaptability [16].

As a result, the body of literature exploring ML-based protection strategies has expanded significantly, encompassing diverse models, datasets, and evaluation strategies. However, methodological inconsistencies, varying performance metrics, and inadequate consideration of deployment scenarios remain prevalent. Thus, a structured synthesis is needed to comprehensively evaluate current research, identify promising trends, and reveal gaps that impede practical application. To aid in this process, Figure 1 provides an overview of the review structure, highlighting key protection tasks, prevailing methodological patterns, and the main contributions of this work.

1.2. Terminology and Scope

Inconsistent terminology complicates the review of ML applications in power system protection. Central to this field is the concept of a *fault*, denoting abnormal conditions such as insulation breakdown or unintended conductive




Figure 2: Conceptual taxonomy of machine learning paradigms in power system protection and disturbance management. Supervised learning learns from labeled data, unsupervised learning learns from unlabeled data, and reinforcement learning learns through interaction with an environment. Deep learning provides a cross-cutting family that learns hierarchical representations directly from raw data and enhances all three paradigms.

paths (e.g., line-to-ground, line-to-line, or three-phase) that produce high currents, thermal and mechanical stress, and potential equipment damage. Protection schemes are designed to rapidly detect, classify, and localize faults so that the affected component can be isolated – typically through breaker tripping – to preserve system integrity and prevent cascading failures. These fault-related tasks remain the backbone of protection engineering and represent a primary focus of ML-based studies.

By contrast, *disturbances* denote abnormal operating states that do not necessarily require immediate disconnection, such as islanding, voltage or frequency deviations, oscillations, harmonics, and other power quality issues. We use the term *disturbance management* to describe the monitoring, detection, and mitigation of such events. While fault protection ensures safety by isolating permanent failures, disturbance management sustains stability and power quality. For ML, disturbances are particularly challenging because their signatures are weaker, more distributed, and data-sparse compared to faults.

The reviewed methods are organized by *learning paradigm*. *Supervised learning* dominates, using labeled data for tasks such as fault classification or disturbance detection. *Unsupervised learning* addresses clustering, anomaly detection, and dimensionality reduction when labels are unavailable. *Reinforcement learning* remains exploratory, targeting adaptive and coordinated protection. Finally, *deep learning* (e.g., convolutional, recurrent, and graph networks) enables hierarchical feature extraction across all paradigms (Figure 2).

1.3. Related Works

Several recent reviews address various facets of protection in power systems, albeit typically focusing narrowly on specific contexts or tasks. Perez-Molina et al. [17] and Sahebkar Farkhani et al. [18] specifically examine protection methods for multi-terminal high-voltage direct current (HVDC) grids, emphasizing hardware implementations and fault-clearing strategies. Similarly, Chandio et al. [19] extensively discuss control and protection methods specifically within modular multilevel converter (MMC)-based HVDC systems, whereas Mishra et al. [20] highlight signal processing and AI-integrated methods for HVDC networks. Panahi et al. [21] provide a broad review of fault localization methods for transmission networks, categorizing approaches such as traveling-wave techniques and impedance calculations. In contrast, De La Cruz et al. [22] investigate the localization of faults in distribution smart grids, emphasizing communication challenges and infrastructural considerations. Bindi et al. [23] explore both diagnostic and prognostic methods for medium and high-voltage lines, focusing primarily on predictive maintenance and algorithmic approaches. Alhamrouni et al. [24] broadly review AI's role across stability, control, and protection,




Figure 3: Classical ML pipeline applied to power system protection and disturbance management. The first stage, **Data Collection**, entails acquiring voltage and current measurements from transmission infrastructure and system-level monitoring devices (e.g., protective relays, PMUs, and SCADA systems). The **Feature Extraction** stage focuses on transforming raw signal data into informative representations, including time-domain amplitude features, frequency spectra (e.g., via Fourier analysis), and multi-resolution decompositions (e.g., wavelet transforms), to emphasize fault-related characteristics. In the **ML Models** stage, the extracted features are employed to train and evaluate classifiers such as ANNs and SVMs, enabling accurate discrimination between normal and faulty system states. Finally, the **Outputs** stage illustrates the model's decisions, such as identifying specific fault types (e.g., Fault A) versus no-fault conditions, and initiating system-level actions including trip signals, alarms, or holding operations. This end-to-end pipeline is designed to enhance protection reliability, improve situational awareness, and support faster, more adaptive disturbance management in modern, decentralized power systems. *Figure recreated and adapted after [28].*

albeit without detailed methodological comparisons across studies. Zaben et al. [25] systematically analyze ML-based fault diagnosis, but restrict their coverage to AC microgrid environments. Meanwhile, broader perspectives such as Xie et al. [26] emphasize general challenges and opportunities of digitized and AI-driven grids, rather than detailed protection-specific methodologies. Additionally, Dai et al. [27] specifically survey AI applications in relay protection but provide only a brief overview without comprehensive methodological synthesis. In contrast, our review uses a framework to systematically analyze ML methods specifically for power system protection and disturbance management, focusing on identifying where these methods are applied and how they are implemented across different protection tasks, datasets, and grid types.

1.4. Contributions of This Work

In this paper, we present a scoping review guided by the PRISMA for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) framework [29, 30]. We systematically analyze over 100 studies addressing ML applications in power system protection and disturbance management. As modern power grids grow increasingly complex, driven by renewable integration, decentralized generation, and digitalized infrastructure, conventional protection methods face mounting limitations in ensuring system resilience and responsiveness. In response, ML-based approaches have emerged as promising alternatives, offering adaptability to evolving grid conditions and the ability to extract actionable insights from heterogeneous data. However, the diversity of tasks, model architectures, and evaluation protocols across studies complicates comparison and impedes the development of generalizable conclusions. An overview of a classical ML pipeline tailored for power system protection and disturbance management is illustrated in Figure 3. Scoping reviews are particularly suitable for such rapidly evolving and interdisciplinary domains, as they enable a structured and transparent synthesis of research activity, highlight underexplored areas, and support alignment between academic developments

Table 1
List of Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition	Abbreviation	Definition
General / Methods			
AI	Artificial intelligence	ML	Machine learning
DL	Deep learning	PCA	Principal component analysis
Signal Processing			
FFT	Fast Fourier Transform	WT	Wavelet transform
CWT	Continuous wavelet transform	DWT	Discrete wavelet transform
Power & Energy Systems			
DER	Distributed energy resources	RES	Renewable energy sources
MG	Microgrid	HV	High voltage
LV	Low voltage	MV	Medium voltage
HVDC	High-voltage direct current	MTDC	Multi-terminal direct current
MMC	Modular multilevel converter	VSC	Voltage source converter
PMU	Phasor measurement unit	WAMS	Wide-area measurement systems
Protection Tasks			
FD	Fault detection	FC	Fault classification
FL	Fault localization	FLI	Fault line identification
DP	Distance protection	SC	Short circuit

and practical deployment needs. Our review provides a comprehensive foundation to better understand the current landscape, guide future research, and inform the design of more robust, scalable, and effective protection schemes.

1.5. Paper Organization

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 details our review methodology, including the search strategy, eligibility criteria, and synthesis approach. Sections 3 to 5 discuss findings categorized by protection task. Section 6 explores overarching trends, limitations, and future research opportunities. Section 7 provides recommendations to enhance methodological rigor and reproducibility. Section 8 concludes by highlighting key insights and implications for future work. For clarity, the key abbreviations used throughout this paper are summarized in Table 1.

2. Methods

This study adopts a structured scoping review methodology, guided by the PRISMA-ScR framework [29, 30]. The application of this standardized approach enhances transparency, reproducibility, and methodological rigor throughout the review process. The following subsections detail the procedures employed for data collection, screening, and analysis. A comprehensive PRISMA-ScR checklist is provided in Supplementary Table S.5.

Eligibility Criteria: This scoping review includes original research that contributes directly to the application of ML in power system protection and disturbance management. Eligible studies address tasks such as fault detection, fault classification, fault localization, protection coordination, or disturbance analysis using ML methods. To ensure scientific rigor, only peer-reviewed journal articles and conference papers published in English between January 2020 and December 2024 were included. Review articles, meta-analyses, and other secondary literature were excluded to maintain a focus on original methodological contributions. These criteria were designed to capture recent and relevant advancements in ML-based protection and disturbance management.

Information Sources: A systematic search was conducted in the Scopus and IEEE Xplore databases using a standardized set of keywords aligned with the review objectives. The complete search queries are provided in Supplementary Table S.6. All searches were carried out on January 24, 2025.

The *Search Strategy* was developed to capture literature at the intersection of power system protection and ML techniques. We constructed structured queries by combining keyword groups across three thematic areas: protection-related concepts (e.g., relay protection, protection coordination), ML methodologies (e.g., deep learning, reinforcement learning), and power system contexts (e.g., smart grids, HVDC, AC-DC systems). The complete search expressions




Figure 4: Trend in annual publications related to machine learning-based power system protection, based on results from Google Scholar using the same keyword combinations defined in the search strategy (see Table S.6). The plot illustrates a substantial increase in publication activity, particularly from 2018 onward, highlighting the growing research interest in this interdisciplinary field. The value for 2025 is extrapolated based on partial-year data.

used for each database are presented in Supplementary Table S.6. In addition to the systematic database queries, a manual search was conducted to identify relevant studies not captured through automated search, including recent publications and references cited in key articles.

To visualize the growth in this research area, a publication trend analysis was performed using Google Scholar, applying the same keyword combinations defined in the search strategy (see Table S.6). As illustrated in Figure 4, the number of publications on ML-based grid protection has increased considerably since 2018, reflecting the rising academic interest in this domain.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: To be included, studies had to apply ML or AI techniques to tasks directly related to power system protection and disturbance management. Relevant applications include fault detection, classification, localization, disturbance detection, and protection coordination. Eligible studies were required to clearly describe the dataset(s) used – particularly those involving protection or disturbance scenarios – and to specify the employed ML/AI methods along with a rationale for their selection. Moreover, studies had to report results supported by performance metrics, validation methods, or comparisons against baseline or state-of-the-art approaches.

Studies were excluded if they did not focus on protection or disturbance management, or did not employ ML/AI methods. Work of a purely theoretical nature, lacking simulations, case studies, or experimental validation, was also excluded. In addition, studies addressing cybersecurity issues such as intrusion detection or false data injection were excluded, as these fall outside the scope of physical protection and disturbance response. Forecasting and other operational tasks unrelated to protection or disturbance mitigation were likewise not considered.

Included Studies: After applying these criteria, a total of 119 studies were included in the review, out of an initial pool of 603 studies. The selection process followed a structured and transparent workflow aligned with the PRISMA-ScR framework. Initially, records retrieved from Scopus and IEEE Xplore were imported into *Rayyan* [31], a web-based tool that facilitates collaborative screening and duplicate removal. After eliminating duplicates, a two-stage screening process was conducted: first, titles and abstracts were reviewed to remove clearly irrelevant studies; second, the remaining articles underwent full-text assessment to determine final eligibility based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. In addition to the systematic search, a manual screening of key references and recent publications was performed to capture relevant studies not retrieved by the database queries. The complete study selection process, including the number of records retained or excluded at each stage, is visualized in Figure 5.

Synthesis of Results: The selected studies were analyzed across key dimensions, including dataset type (e.g., simulation or real-world), targeted grid components (e.g., transmission or distribution), applied ML models, and addressed protection tasks. For clarity, studies were grouped into three protection-related categories: fault detection (FD), fault classification (FC), and fault localization (FL), reflecting ascending task complexity. When studies covered




Figure 5: PRISMA-ScR flow diagram illustrating the structured study selection process used in this review. A total of 603 records were retrieved from Scopus and IEEE Xplore and imported into *Rayyan* for screening. After removing 55 duplicates, 548 unique studies were screened by title and abstract, resulting in the exclusion of 375 records. Full-text assessment led to the inclusion of 97 articles, with an additional 22 studies identified through manual search, totaling 119 included studies. The arrows in the diagram trace the sequential progression through identification, deduplication, screening, and eligibility assessment, clearly indicating how many records were retained or excluded at each step to ensure transparency and reproducibility.

multiple tasks, they were classified under the most advanced, FL over FC, and FC over FD, to avoid redundancy and highlight their highest contribution. Findings are presented through narrative summaries and comparative tables. The narratives focus on methods and application domains, while the tables summarize datasets, ML techniques, and evaluation strategies for each task: fault detection (Table S.1), fault classification (Table S.3), and fault localization (Table S.4). Together, they provide a structured overview of current trends and challenges in ML-based power system protection and disturbance management.

3. Fault Detection in Power System Protection

Fault detection is a fundamental component of power system protection, serving as the initial step in most protection schemes to promptly detect abnormal conditions such as short circuits or equipment failures. As power systems evolve – with growing integration of renewable energy, digital substations, and data-driven architectures – the scope and implementation of FD are also advancing. This section reviews its functional role, conventional methods, and recent research trends, with a focus on ML-based approaches.

3.1. Conventional Approaches and Emerging Challenges

Traditionally, FD has been performed locally within substations using protective relays, often relying solely on current transformers [5]. These hardwired relays operate autonomously to isolate faults in real time. With digital substations and IEC 61850 [32, 33], measurement and protection logic are decoupled, enabling synchronized data to be processed externally [34]. As a result, FD can now occur at various architectural levels: via edge devices [35], local substation processors [33], or centralized wide-area measurement systems (WAMS) [36], allowing ML-based methods to be adapted to different deployment scenarios.

While FD remains essential for promptly detecting conditions like short circuits or equipment failures, traditional schemes face growing limitations. They must operate quasi-instantaneously [37], yet rely on fixed thresholds (e.g., over-current, impedance, differential relays) originally designed for high fault currents [8]. In modern grids with inverter-based distributed generation (DG), fault currents are often lower and less predictable [38], reducing detection reliability, especially under high-impedance faults or dynamic topologies [10]. Renewable-dominated systems further complicate protection due to bidirectional power flows and varying short-circuit levels [37], often leading to incorrect or missed operations. Moreover, fixed-scenario designs limit adaptability to evolving grid conditions [8].

These challenges have spurred interest in data-driven FD methods that analyze current and voltage waveforms using signal processing and ML techniques [39]. Models such as wavelet transforms (WTs), SVMs, and deep neural networks (DNNs) have shown strong performance under realistic conditions [38]. This review identified 11 studies focusing exclusively on ML-based FD, covering distribution networks, transmission systems, and hybrid AC/DC configurations. The following sections explore these contributions, beginning with distribution-level approaches.

3.2. Machine Learning Approaches to Fault Detection

Several studies have proposed FD methods for distribution networks, addressing challenges such as high-impedance fault (HIF)s, variable DG, and limited observability. Bakkar et al. [40] introduced a dual neural network (NN)-based controller validated on simulation and lab-scale data. Çelik et al. [41] used a deep Group Method of Data Handling (GMDH)-ANN for HIF detection in an active distribution network (ADN), showing high accuracy on real 20 kV data. Diefenthaler et al. [42] trained a convolutional neural network (CNN) on RMS current images from a real medium voltage (MV) grid, while Nieminen et al. [43] applied a CNN to COMTRADE data for short circuit (SC) and earth fault (EF) detection. Other approaches include one-class classification for varying DER scenarios [44] and an ANN for FD in radial low voltage (LV) systems [45]. Kordowich et al. [46] proposed a deep Q-learning-based scheme that combines centralized and decentralized agents for adaptive detection, while Wu et al. introduced a nested reinforcement learning (RL) framework for relay coordination [47].

While fewer studies address transmission line FD, the demand for ultra-fast and accurate detection in high voltage (HV) systems remains critical. Chen et al. [37] emphasized the need for sub-cycle detection to prevent cascading failures. Kumar et al. [48] developed a hybrid SVM-CNN model trained on real voltage signals from the ENET Centre.

Hybrid AC/DC grids pose additional challenges due to power electronics and diverse fault signatures. Yousaf et al. [49] used a feedforward ANN combined with multi-resolution analysis for FD in a 320 kV, four-terminal multi-terminal high-voltage direct current (MT-HVDC) system, achieving high accuracy. Galkin et al. [50] applied a CNN to identify sympathetic inrush phenomena in transformer data generated in Simulink, aiming to prevent false tripping by distinguishing non-fault transient from actual faults. Rezaei et al. [51] proposed a FD algorithm for doubly fed induction generator (DFIG)-based wind farms under varying operating conditions.

The reviewed FD approaches exhibit diverse methodological and experimental designs. Most rely on simulated data – via tools like PowerFactory, Simulink, and OpenDSS – typically using IEEE test systems or real grid models. Some incorporate real measurements, such as voltage recordings from the ENET Centre [48] or COMTRADE files from the Finnish grid [43], enhancing realism. Others combine simulation with lab validation or hardware-in-the-loop testing [40, 51].

Dataset sizes vary widely, from fewer than 200 real events [43] to over 800 000 high-frequency samples [48]. Several studies assess robustness under varying DG levels, noise, fault types, and topologies. Many emphasize fast response times (e.g., sub-20 ms) and deployment aspects such as selective tripping, communication delays, and false-trip resilience, reflecting growing system maturity.

The studies span distribution and transmission networks, transformers, wind farms, and DC grids, applying a broad range of ML methods. Common techniques include CNNs, DNNs, and SVMs, along with hybrid models like SVM-CNN and RL-Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) frameworks [47]. Several also explore less conventional approaches, such as one-class classifiers [44], teacher-student strategies [46], and multi-resolution analysis with random search [52]. While FD remains a foundational task, many studies extend their focus to FC, aiming to distinguish between different fault types and improve situational awareness.

Islanding Detection

In addition to short circuits, high-impedance faults, and broken conductors, protection and disturbance management systems must also detect inadvertent islanding. Within the context of this review, inadvertent islanding is treated as an abnormal event and thus a critical disturbance to be addressed by protection systems. Inadvertent islanding

refers to a condition where a section of a distribution grid becomes electrically isolated from the main supply but remains energized by DERs. Such scenarios are a major concern for distribution system operators, as they can damage equipment and endanger maintenance crews. Therefore, DERs are commonly required to be disconnected rapidly in this case of islanding.

This scoping review identified and compared a substantial body of work on ML-based islanding detection, summarized in Table S.2. While earlier reviews often gave this topic limited attention, the growing penetration of renewable generation has motivated extensive research on fast and reliable detection, with both feature-driven and end-to-end ML approaches now widely explored.

Feature-driven methods extract information from voltage and current signals before classification. Examples include harmonic sequence components with LSTM, intrinsic mode or wavelet decompositions with ANN/DNN, and RMS- or THD-based features with SVM [53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59]. Such approaches report high accuracy, fast detection (often below 10 ms), and reduced non-detection zones (NDZs). End-to-end deep learning has emerged as an alternative, directly processing raw or time-frequency transformed signals via CNNs, LSTMs, or hybrid models. Reported accuracies typically exceed 95 %, with some studies demonstrating perfect recall under noisy conditions and strong robustness to topology changes [60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65].

A further trend addresses deployment and integration. Ali et al. [66] embedded an ANN-based detector into a hierarchical IoT framework, achieving IEEE 1547 compliance. Real-time and hardware-in-the-loop implementations demonstrate feasibility at scale, including classification speeds above 170,000 obs/s and dependable detection within 5–15 ms [67, 68].

A recurring focus across all studies is minimization of the NDZ, defined as the range of operating conditions where an islanding event occurs but remains undetected by the protection scheme. Some approaches consistently report near-zero NDZ using CNN, DNN, or recurrent neural network (RNN)/LSTM-based classifiers, while others achieve sub-5 ms detection with NDZs below 4% [62, 69, 70, 59]. Overall, ML-based methods achieve high accuracy, fast response, and improved robustness, but most rely on simulation data with limited field validation. Future work should address domain adaptation, interoperability, and integration with digital substation architectures to ensure reliable operation under practical grid conditions.

4. Fault Classification in Power System Protection

Faults are abnormal electrical conditions that interrupt the normal operation of power systems. Short circuits, either between phases or from a phase to ground, are especially critical, as the resulting high current flow can cause thermal and mechanical stress, potentially damaging equipment and compromising system stability [71]. Classifying faults accurately is a fundamental step in designing protection schemes and improving response time during disturbances [72]. In this section, we examine both conventional classification strategies and recent ML-based approaches across various grid types and protection contexts.

4.1. Conventional Approaches and Emerging Challenges

Power system faults typically fall into three categories: symmetrical, unsymmetrical, and open-circuit. Symmetrical faults, such as three-phase short circuits, are rare but severe, affecting all phases equally. Unsymmetrical faults – including single line-to-ground (L-G), line-to-line (L-L), and double line-to-ground (L-L-G) – occur more frequently and cause phase imbalances. Open-circuit faults involve conductor disconnection, leading to unbalanced currents and equipment stress. Each fault type exhibits distinct electrical characteristics, requiring tailored detection and mitigation strategies.

Conventional protective relays implicitly distinguish faults through specialized designs rather than explicit classification. Distance relays measure impedance trajectories to identify fault locations and indirectly infer fault types. Differential relays detect internal faults via current imbalances, while overcurrent relays trip based on exceeded current thresholds [5, 73]. Classical analytical methods like symmetrical components and traveling wave analysis also support fault discrimination but lack explicit classification capability [74].

Recent ML methods explicitly classify faults using waveform patterns captured from high-frequency signals. Techniques such as CNNs, RNNs (e.g., LSTMs, GRUs), and ensemble methods directly assign fault labels, while accounting for diverse grid topologies and noisy conditions [10, 75, 76]. Preprocessing techniques like wavelet transforms further improve feature extraction and model accuracy.

However, ML-based classification introduces significant challenges. Models typically rely on simulated data, limiting generalizability to real-world operational conditions. Strict real-time constraints impose trade-offs between model complexity and inference latency [16]. Additionally, the black-box nature of ML models complicates interpretability, trust, and deployment in safety-critical environments. Ultimately, explicit FC via ML offers promising avenues toward adaptive, proactive, and intelligent protection strategies, positioning it as an essential component of future grid reliability and resilience.

4.2. Machine Learning Approaches to Fault Classification

Recent studies have applied ML to FD and FC in transmission systems using simulation tools like Simulink, PSCAD, and PSS/E. Classifiers range from ANNs, decision trees (DTs), and SVM to probabilistic and ensemble models. Many works use single-line Simulink models with methods such as LSTM, double-channel extreme learning machines, or quadratic discriminant analysis (QDA), focusing on time-domain features from voltage and current signals [77, 78, 79, 80, 81].

More complex grid scenarios include IEEE 39-bus simulations to benchmark classifiers such as multi-layer extreme learning machine (ML-ELM), stacked autoencoders, multilayer perceptron (MLP), k-nearest neighbor (KNN), SVM, and Naive Bayes (NB) [82, 83]. Studies targeting TCSC-compensated lines use one-cycle post-fault data or fast S-transform features with ensemble classifiers [84, 85]. Uddin et al. [86] evaluate SVM-based detection on an IEC benchmark under varying conditions. Fahim et al. [81] present a self-attention CNN with time-series imaging and wavelet preprocessing for robust FD and FC.

Other contributions include Moloi et al. [87], who combine discrete wavelet transform (DWT) features with a particle swarm optimization (PSO)-optimized ANN, and Muntasir et al. [88], who compare multiple classifiers on data from a real 50 MW plant. Myint et al. [89] use traveling-wave features and a Bayesian-trained ANN for FC and phase identification in traction systems. Guama et al. [90] uniquely incorporate real COMTRADE data from a 230 kV substation, combined with PowerFactory simulations. Their two-stage self-organizing map-based model uses zero-sequence components to detect ground faults and modal currents for phase identification, generalizing well to unseen events. Han et al. [91] propose a gradient similarity-based classifier for faulted-phase identification in high-voltage grids, outperforming ANN and component-based approaches under noisy and high-impedance conditions.

While most FC studies focus on AC transmission systems, emerging HVDC and hybrid HVAC/HVDC grids introduce new challenges. Reviewed works span two- and four-terminal, bipolar, and MMC-based HVDC systems with voltages from 100 kV to 800 kV, simulated primarily in Simulink or EMTDC, with some incorporating real data or real-time digital simulator (RTDS)-based validation. Topologies include voltage source converter (VSC), line-commutated converter, multi-terminal meshes, and IEEE 39-bus extensions.

Several studies employ deep learning models on either raw or image-transformed waveforms. Li et al. [92] use a Con-Att-BiLSTM with adversarial training on 110 000 alarm records from a ± 800 kV UHVDC system, while Liang et al. [93] apply a CA-CNN to current trajectory images in hybrid grids. Others use signal-derived features for classification, including time- or frequency-domain attributes processed by ANNs, Boltzmann machine learning (BML), or logistic regression models [94, 95, 96].

Multi-stage and ensemble approaches are also common. Pragati et al. [97, 98] use Bayesian-optimized decision trees, Stockwell transforms, GRU-RNNs, and Teager–Kaiser operators in sequential FD/FC pipelines. Comparative evaluations of LSTM, random forest (RF), and ANN models using voltage-difference features are provided by Swetapadma et al. [99], while Tsotsopoulou et al. [100] propose a communication-free XGBoost classifier using only local data. Time-frequency analysis remains central in the work of Wong, Xiang, and Yousaf. Wong et al. [101] extract traveling wave features for binary FD/FC, Xiang et al. [102] use one-level DWT with a 5-class ANN, and Yousaf et al. [49, 103] combine DWT-based features with Bayesian optimization (BO)-optimized ANN and later propose a communication-independent LSTM for FC in a four-terminal 320 kV MT-HVDC mesh.

Together, these studies highlight a rich landscape of ML-based protection in HVDC and hybrid grids, combining deep learning, signal-driven features, and optimized classifiers, with growing emphasis on real-time performance and minimal communication needs.

Recent studies have extended ML-based FC to distribution networks, substations, and generation systems. Balan et al. [104] use supervised learning on three years of real-world IoT transformer data – including voltage, current, power, oil level, and temperature – for fault diagnosis without simulation. Wang et al. [105] apply decision trees to empirical substation data to detect abnormal topologies in three-phase transformers.

In distribution networks, simulated studies explore tasks such as islanding detection in photovoltaic generators (PV)-integrated grids [106], HIF detection in radial feeders [107], and microgrid protection with inverter-interfaced distributed generator (IIDG) [108]. Preprocessing includes DWT [107], modified Gabor wavelets [109], and transient-voltage features [108]. Classifiers span SVM [107, 110], ensemble trees [108], and compact CNNs [109], trained on signals sampled at 6.4 kHz to 20 kHz.

ML has also been applied to FC in power generation systems. Ashtiani et al. [111] develop a current-only relay for wind turbines using time-domain features and DT models. Ramadoss et al. [112] detect excitation failure in synchronous generators using statistical indicators and binary SVM classification of SMIB data. Sadiq et al. [113] classify faults in Zeta converters within DC microgrids using multi-class models under simulated degradation.

Microgrid-focused studies primarily rely on MATLAB/Simulink simulations, with occasional use of EMTDC. Aryan et al. [114] employ a radial basis function neural network (RBFNN) trained on simulated RMS signals for FD and FC. A few works incorporate real fault recordings, including a 750 V DC microgrid at ETL-KAFB [115] and additional data from Kirtland AFB [116]. Common test systems include IEEE 5-, 9-, and 13-bus networks, the CIGRÉ low-voltage benchmark, and custom topologies spanning 0.35 kV to 13 kV. Signal decomposition techniques such as DWT and multi-resolution analysis are widely used for feature extraction [117, 118], while classifiers range from conventional models (SVM, DT, NB) to advanced architectures, including CNNs, hybrid CNN-GRU [119], and both centralized and communication-free ANN-based schemes [120, 121]. Some studies assess generalization by training on simulations and testing on real data [115].

Across all domains – transmission, hybrid HVAC/HVDC systems, distribution networks, generation units, and microgrids – ML-based FC methods exhibit substantial diversity in system configurations, data sources, and classifier designs. While most rely on simulation tools like MATLAB/Simulink and PSCAD, several incorporate real-world measurements from substations, converters, and utility grids. Feature extraction spans time, frequency, and time-frequency domains, using techniques such as DWT, Stockwell transforms, and energy-based operators. Classifiers range from SVM, DT, and NB to deep architectures like CNN, LSTM, and hybrid ensembles. Recent trends emphasize robustness to noise, communication independence, cross-grid generalization, and real-time feasibility-reflecting a growing maturity of ML-based protection adapted to the complexity and decentralization of modern power systems.

Given this growing complexity, conventional FL methods often struggle with speed, scalability, and resilience under real-world constraints. As a result, recent research has shifted toward ML-based FL, leveraging data-driven models built on electrical signals, topology, and fault history to achieve faster, more accurate, and more adaptive localization-particularly in operational contexts where traditional techniques fall short.

5. Fault Localization in Power System Protection

Fault localization identifies the precise point along a power line where a disturbance has occurred (e.g., at 12.5% of the line length), enabling selective tripping and faster service restoration. Conventional methods rely on distance relays that divide lines into zones, triggering immediate response in the primary zone and delayed actions in others to preserve coordination.

However, the rise of IBRs, which supply limited fault current, reduces the effectiveness of impedance-based techniques. In response, high-resolution measurements and modern communication protocols have enabled more adaptable, data-driven and ML-based FL methods. This section reviews conventional approaches, their limitations, and recent advances in ML-based FL.

5.1. Conventional Approaches and Emerging Challenges

FL is a core function in power system protection, enabling selective tripping during faults and supporting faster post-event diagnosis. Accurate localization reduces outage durations, particularly in complex or remote networks, but its effectiveness depends on grid topology and data availability.

In distribution systems, non-uniform line parameters, lateral taps, and mixed conductor types hinder precision [5]. Still, detailed topology and impedance data can often narrow fault zones sufficiently. Transmission networks, with their more uniform structure and enhanced observability facilitated by a higher number of measurements, are better suited for automated FL, especially where manual inspection is costly or slow.

Recent standards like IEC 61850 [32] and high-speed communication protocols [122] have expanded FL's applicability by enabling time-synchronized, system-wide monitoring [5].

Conventional FL methods are typically classified into impedance-based and traveling-wave-based approaches. Impedance-based techniques are computationally efficient and easy to implement, but rely on simplifying assumptions that often do not hold in real-world conditions. Traveling-wave methods, using high-frequency transients and GPS-synchronized measurements, offer higher accuracy, especially in high-impedance or multi-line scenarios [123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128].

WAMS further improves FL by enabling system-wide data integration [129, 130, 131, 132], but traditional methods still face challenges such as blind zones, low observability, and hardware failures [133, 134, 135].

Emerging tasks like fault line identification (FLI) [136] and zonal fault classification [137] require scalable, data-rich algorithms capable of handling heterogeneous conditions. These were previously constrained by centralized architectures and limited communication but are now increasingly viable due to decentralized designs and fast data exchange. In this context, ML-based approaches are gaining traction. The next section reviews recent contributions that leverage signal-derived and topological features to improve fault classification where conventional methods fall short.

5.2. Machine Learning Approaches to Fault Localization

As discussed in Sec. 5.1, the higher measurement density and well-defined protection zones of transmission networks make them well-suited for FL, especially at HV and UHV levels, where rapid and accurate localization is critical for maintaining system stability, despite potentially complex topologies. Of the 43 reviewed studies on FL, 19 focus on transmission-level scenarios. However, only one includes hardware-in-the-loop validation, underscoring the persistent gap between simulation and real-world application. The following examples highlight selected studies that illustrate recent advances in FL using ML, particularly in terms of accuracy, integration with legacy systems, and noise robustness.

Tran [138] proposed a hybrid scheme combining conventional distance protection with an ML-based correction layer. An MLP, trained on 2136 simulated samples from a 118.5 km AC-185/29 line in Vietnam, processed 60 ms windows of wavelet, raw, and frequency-domain features. Replay via an Omicron CMC-356 and Siemens 7SA522 relay demonstrated that the MLP reduced average FL error from 0.92 % to 0.42 %, improving localization by 0.6 km and showcasing the value of ML-augmented legacy systems.

Raj et al. [139] developed a lightweight MLP model for FD, FC, and FL on a 132 kV, 100 km line using RMS voltage and current features from Fast Fourier Transform (FFT). While FD and FL performance was strong, FC lagged—highlighting the trade-offs in simplified architectures.

Najafzadeh et al. [140] applied WHO-optimized RF, DT, and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system (ANFIS) models with fuzzy thresholding on high-resolution phasor measurement unit (PMU) data under low SNR conditions. Their ensemble achieved sub-200 m localization error, demonstrating strong noise resilience and precise tuning for HV environments.

Together, these studies reflect the flexibility of ML-based FL in transmission systems—ranging from real-world hardware integration to lightweight simulation models and noise-robust ensembles.

Beyond targeted contributions, a broader body of work explores FL across diverse system configurations. Studies range from large-scale IEEE 68- and 145-bus networks using WAMS data and recurrent models [141], to single-line 400 kV, 100 km simulations with hybrid CNN-LSTM architectures [76]. Conventional approaches based on ANNs and RF remain common [142, 143], while lightweight models like extreme learning machine (ELM) [144] target resource-constrained environments. Several studies address practical issues such as incomplete relay coverage [145], limited measurement availability [139], and integration of synchronized phasor data [140], reflecting a growing focus on robustness and real-world feasibility. Hassan et al. [75] apply an optimizable ELM for FC and FL on IEEE 9-bus simulation data.

A subset of work addresses FL in wind-integrated systems, where variable generation introduces additional uncertainty. Prabhakar [146] uses a hybrid SVM-ANN on a modified IEEE 9-bus system with wind, while Uddin et al. [137] classify fault zones in DFIG-based farms using DT, SVM, and principal component analysis (PCA). Taheri et al. [147, 148] propose LSTM-based models for FL and impedance estimation, demonstrating robustness to noise and high fault resistance. Rizk-Allah et al. [149] improve accuracy by tuning neural network hyperparameters using PSO, while Garika et al. [150] apply bior1.5 wavelets and ANNs in IoT-enabled wind-SVM systems.

While these studies demonstrate the adaptability of ML-based FL, most rely on simulated data, small or non-standardized datasets, and lack field validation—limiting comparability and practical deployment. These limitations are

even more pronounced in HVDC systems, where fault behavior differs fundamentally and research remains in its early stages.

ML-based FL in HVDC systems is gaining traction due to the fast DC fault dynamics and the limitations of conventional methods in handling transient behavior and directional ambiguity. Recent studies cover point-to-point and multi-terminal current source converter (CSC)-, VSC-, and MMC-based topologies, typically operating between 100 kV and 500 kV. Yousaf et al. [151] addressed FL in a four-terminal MMC-HVDC grid using DWT-based features and a Bayesian-optimized feedforward neural network (FFNN), trained under varying fault resistances and noise.

Most studies use EMTDC or Simulink for simulation and apply different ML models for FD, FC, and FL. Classical methods rely on wavelet or statistical features—such as PCA, maximal overlap discrete WT, or moving averages—combined with SVM or general regression NN classifiers [152, 153, 154, 155]. More recent work explores hybrid and deep learning models, including semi-AI and CNN-SVM setups, achieving detection under 5 ms and handling high-resistance faults [156, 157].

Tiwari [158] extended CNN-based FL to wind-integrated HVDC systems, outperforming standard methods across different fault cases. Ren et al. [159] proposed a vision transformer (Vision Transformer (ViT)) model that turns voltage signals into image-like formats, Gramian angular field (GAF), recurrence plot (RP), Markov transition field (MTF), continuous wavelet transform (CWT), and processes them using small ViT networks. Trained on EMTDC data from a four-terminal 500 kV grid, the model reached a mean error of 0.441 km and stayed accurate even with noise, high resistance, and low sampling rates.

Together, these studies show increasing variety in methods and a stronger focus on reliable performance for ML-based FL in HVDC grids. As the field develops, similar work is now appearing in distribution and microgrid systems, where irregular layouts and limited measurements create new challenges.

Limited measurements and communication infrastructure in distribution networks and microgrids complicate FL, therefore ML-based methods are increasingly explored. Convolutional models are common, including hybrid CNN-LSTM for ring networks with variable DG, and pure CNN classifiers for compact grids [160, 161]. Some works incorporate DG effects using ANN, 1D-CNN, or variational mode decomposition (VMD)-CNN models [162, 163]. Kandasamy et al. [164] used a discrete Orthonormal Stockwell transform (DOST)-based deep model for FD, FC, and FL, while Zhang et al. [165] proposed a spatio-temporal protection scheme using multi-agent reinforcement learning. Sapountzoglou et al. [166] use gradient boosting trees for FD, FC, and FL in a simulated low-voltage smart grid.

In microgrids, characterized by low voltage and frequent mode transitions, most studies rely on Simulink simulations with DG and renewable energy sources (RES). Jayasinghe et al. [167] and Kumari et al. [168] used ANN-based models with strong FC and FL results. ANNs remain dominant, used in four of six reviewed studies [167, 168, 169, 170], while alternatives such as SVM [171], and ensembles methods like RF [172], which are based on DTs, offer gains in interpretability and training speed.


Mampilly and Sheeba [173] combined empirical wavelet transform (EWT)-based decomposition with a hybrid CNN-biLSTM model optimized via pelican algorithm in an IEEE 13-bus RES microgrid. Goli et al. [174] used wavelet-ANN methods for FD and FL in a hybrid PV-wind setup.

Feature engineering techniques—such as DWT [169] or task-specific filtering [172]—are commonly used to improve model robustness. Despite promising results, many studies lack detail on key dataset characteristics. Sampling frequency (f_s), which critically affects signal resolution, is often unreported. Sample sizes range from under 500 to over 2.4 million [168, 169], with sampling rates from 1 kHz to 260 kHz. Simulated topologies span transmission lines, distribution feeders, multi-terminal HVDC systems, and microgrids.

Some works move toward broader validation—evaluating cross-platform consistency between Simulink and EMTDC [167] or incorporating IEC 61850-based communication models [170], but overall reporting remains inconsistent. This hampers the assessment of realism and reproducibility, especially for FL, which depends on subtle spatial and temporal patterns. Moreover, many studies report only aggregate accuracy, omitting localization-specific metrics such as mean absolute or distance error.

While microgrid-focused work demonstrates the feasibility of ML-based FL under constrained conditions, progress across grid types would benefit from more standardized reporting, clearer evaluation protocols, and stronger links between simulation and real-world deployment.

AI Types Used in Protection Studies



Protection Focus in AI Studies




Figure 6: Distribution of AI types (a) and protection focus areas (b) in 119 selected studies on machine learning-based power system protection and disturbance management. The prevalence of ANN and DL methods in (a) reflects current modeling trends, while (b) shows a strong emphasis on FC and FL as the dominant protection tasks.

6. Analysis and Future Research Directions

This section synthesizes key patterns and limitations from the reviewed literature on ML-based power system protection and disturbance management. Building on the task-specific findings in Sections 3 to 5, we highlight overarching trends in Section 6.1, followed by recurring limitations in Section 6.2. These insights inform targeted research priorities outlined in Section 6.3 to enhance reproducibility, robustness, and real-world viability of future ML-based protection schemes. As shown in Figure 6, the majority of reviewed studies employ machine learning-based approaches – particularly ML and ANN – and focus primarily on either FC or FL, reflecting both a dominant modeling preference and a research emphasis on more complex protection tasks. Although papers were classified by their highest addressed task, many studies on FL also perform FC and FD, and similarly, most FC-focused works include FD as a foundational step. In addition, the FD category subsumes roughly 60% of islanding detection papers, which were grouped under FD due to their conceptual similarity.

6.1. Current Trends in ML-Based Protection

Recent advances in ML-based protection reflect growing efforts to address the complexity, decentralization, and data challenges of modern power systems. This review analyzes studies along four dimensions – protection task, data, methodology, and results – focusing on factors such as communication assumptions, measurement types, model complexity, robustness, and real-time feasibility.

Protection tasks, FD, FC, and FL, are typically framed as supervised learning problems using models like SVM, CNN, and shallow NNs (especially MLPs), trained on synthetic data from Simulink, EMTDC, or PowerFactory. While simulations enable scalable testing, they lack real-world variability. Only a few studies incorporate real fault data or hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) validation.

Measurement approaches differ by grid type: transmission studies often use phasor-domain features (e.g., RMS, symmetrical components), while HVDC, hybrid, and microgrid studies favor point-on-wave data to capture sub-cycle transients. Time–frequency transforms such as DWT, FFT, and short-time fourier transform are common, though inconsistently applied.

Model complexity is generally low to balance latency and interpretability. While some works explore hybrids (e.g., CNN–LSTM), simpler models dominate. RL is occasionally used for adaptive control; transformer-based methods are rare. About one-quarter of studies assume communication infrastructure but rarely assess latency or reliability, with communication-free models preferred for simplicity.

Table 2

Overview of common evaluation metrics in ML-based protection and disturbance management studies.

Metric	Definition	Strengths and Limitations
Accuracy	Ratio of correctly predicted samples to total samples.	Intuitive and widely used, but may obscure performance under class imbalance.
Precision	Fraction of correctly predicted positives among all predicted positives.	Reduces false alarms, but ignores missed detections.
Recall (Sensitivity)	Fraction of correctly predicted positives among all actual positives.	Captures detection ability, but high recall may increase false positives.
F1-Score	Harmonic mean of precision and recall.	Balances false positives and false negatives; more robust than accuracy on imbalanced data.

Evaluation in the reviewed studies is predominantly accuracy-centric, with limited attention to deployment factors. Robustness to noise, data loss, or topology changes is rarely assessed, runtime and hardware requirements are seldom reported, and validation with field data or hardware-in-the-loop setups remains scarce. In most cases, the reported metric “accuracy” refers to *classification accuracy*, defined as

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{\text{TP} + \text{TN}}{\text{TP} + \text{TN} + \text{FP} + \text{FN}}, \quad (1)$$

where TP, TN, FP, and FN denote true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives, respectively. Although accuracy is straightforward and widely used, it becomes misleading in imbalanced datasets where the majority class dominates. In such cases, a model may achieve high accuracy by consistently predicting the majority class while failing to capture minority fault types. To address this, task-specific measures such as precision (positive predictive value), recall (sensitivity), and their harmonic mean, the F1-score, provide a more nuanced assessment of classification performance. An overview of these metrics, including their definitions, strengths, and limitations, is summarized in Table 2.

6.2. Identified Gaps and Limitations

Despite significant progress in applying ML to power system protection, several limitations continue to impede reproducibility, comparability, and deployment. A primary challenge is the predominant reliance on simulation data. While simulations offer scalability, they cannot capture real-world variability. Only a small subset of studies incorporate real fault recordings, HIL setups, or field measurements, leaving generalizability largely untested.

Terminological inconsistencies further obstruct progress. Terms like fault detection, classification, diagnosis, and localization are often used interchangeably, despite referring to distinct tasks with different input requirements and evaluation metrics. These ambiguities, often reflecting differing task definitions in electrical engineering (EE) and ML, complicate comparison and reproducibility. The taxonomy in Sec. 7.2 seeks to standardize definitions and promote interdisciplinary clarity.

A lack of open, standardized datasets hinders benchmarking. Even when simulated or proprietary data are used, essential metadata such as sampling rates, voltage levels, and fault types are frequently omitted. While concerns around confidentiality are valid, insufficient documentation limits transparency and reuse. To address this, we propose a dataset documentation checklist in Sec. 7.3, applicable to both public and private data sources.

Evaluation practices are similarly inconsistent. While accuracy is widely reported, task-specific metrics – such as F1-score, detection latency, or localization error (see Sec. 5) – are often omitted. Few studies assess robustness under noise, missing data, or varying operating conditions. This lack of scenario-aware evaluation prevents fair comparison and limits confidence in real-world applicability.

Real-time feasibility is also underexplored. Most studies neglect latency, memory, and throughput constraints, despite the strict timing requirements of protection systems. Without runtime profiling, it remains unclear whether models can run on digital relays, edge devices, or microcontrollers. Future work should prioritize hardware-aware design and consider efficiency alongside accuracy.

6.3. Guiding Future Research Directions

To overcome the limitations outlined above, future research should focus on creating publicly accessible benchmark datasets with well-defined metadata. This includes clearly specifying voltage levels, sampling rates, grid topologies, and fault scenarios. Consistent task definitions, a standardized fault taxonomy (e.g., distinguishing DC pole-to-pole, pole-to-ground, and AC short-circuits), and unified terminology are also essential for enabling reproducible and comparable research. Without such information, meaningful comparison across studies remains impossible. At present, no commonly accepted taxonomy exists, and fault types are often described in inconsistent or ambiguous ways across publications. Addressing this gap is therefore a prerequisite for developing robust benchmarks and drawing generalizable conclusions from ML-based protection studies.

Evaluation metrics must capture not only accuracy, but also robustness to noise, missing data, and temporal misalignment. Runtime behavior and compatibility with field hardware should be included as standard performance indicators. For FL tasks in particular, spatial accuracy should primarily be reported as a percentage of the total line length to enable fair comparison across different scenarios; physical units (e.g., meters) may be included additionally to support practical interpretation. At the same time, many current datasets are “too clean,” often omitting common-mode disturbances, background noise, or switching events. Expanding datasets to incorporate these effects is necessary for testing model specificity and resilience under realistic operating conditions.

Bridging the gap between academic models and operational use cases will require validation under realistic conditions, including pilot deployments and collaborations with utilities. Although HIL simulations are useful for demonstrating real-time performance and hardware integration, they are limited in their ability to assess model robustness under real-world disturbances due to their reliance on simulation-based models. However, HIL becomes significantly more valuable when combined with real fault recordings, such as COMTRADE files, enabling researchers to verify model reliability under authentic disturbances.

In this context, digital twins emerge as a particularly promising enabler. By providing high-fidelity, real-time virtual representations of power grids, they bridge the gap between simulation-only validation and real-world deployment, and they facilitate the generation of standardized benchmark datasets with ground-truth labels.

Research should also extend beyond transmission grids to include microgrids, HVDC, and hybrid AC-DC systems. Transfer learning and domain adaptation may help build models that generalize across these diverse operating environments. Beyond this, feature extraction methods such as wavelet and time-frequency transforms deserve systematic benchmarking, as they remain widely applied in transient-rich domains (e.g., HVDC) yet lack rigorous comparative evaluation.

Looking ahead, ML-based protection systems will need to satisfy increasingly demanding real-world constraints. Speed remains a fundamental requirement: protection decisions must be made within milliseconds to ensure timely fault clearing. This calls for low-latency models that can operate reliably on embedded devices such as digital relays or substation controllers. In this context, model efficiency becomes as important as accuracy. Lightweight architectures and model compression techniques – including pruning, quantization, and knowledge distillation via teacher-student frameworks – will be key to achieving real-time performance under resource constraints. Moreover, robustness under varying levels of DER penetration should be explicitly tested, as increasing renewable integration changes system dynamics and fault signatures.

Another essential area of research concerns robustness to communication issues. As protection strategies become more distributed, they increasingly depend on data exchange between devices. Delays, packet loss, and link failures must be expected and managed. Models should either explicitly account for communication uncertainty or implement fallback mechanisms that maintain safety under degraded conditions. Hybrid input strategies that combine slow but resilient phasor data with high-resolution waveform signals could further enhance classification accuracy and robustness in distributed and hybrid AC/DC settings.

A related challenge is input robustness. ML-based protection systems must handle noisy or atypical inputs, including scenarios that unintentionally resemble adversarial examples. Although targeted attacks such as data poisoning or model tampering are theoretically possible, they are less relevant in secured environments where direct manipulation of sensor data is often more effective. Research should prioritize adversarial robustness, secure deployment, and update mechanisms that support auditability and traceability.

Explainability remains a critical challenge, as protection decisions are inherently safety-critical and must be trusted by human operators. Black-box ML models are difficult to adopt in this domain unless their behavior can be interpreted in a transparent and reliable manner. Methods from the broader field of explainable AI (XAI) – such as SHAP or LIME – offer post-hoc explanations that can enhance operator trust, but have so far been rarely applied in power system

protection. At the same time, it is important to distinguish these methods from approaches that embed prior knowledge or physical constraints into the model (e.g., known-operator networks or physics-informed neural networks), which pursue interpretability through structure rather than explanation. Both directions remain largely unexplored in the reviewed literature. Ultimately, progress in post-hoc explanation, confidence calibration, and inherently interpretable architectures must go hand in hand with broader access to real-world, labeled fault data. Enabling data sharing, improving dataset documentation, and developing standardized synthetic-to-real validation pipelines are crucial steps toward building trustworthy and deployable models.

Lastly, modern ML techniques remain underexplored. Transformer architectures [175], graph neural networks (GNNs) [176], and Physics-Informed Neural Networks (PINNs) [177] show promise in structured domains and may be valuable in protection tasks, for example by modeling spatiotemporal dependencies or physical constraints. An emerging direction is known operator learning (KOL), which embeds known operators, such as grid equations or relay logic, into trainable models [178, 179]. This hybrid strategy improves interpretability and robustness while reducing model complexity, and has the potential to enhance fault localization accuracy by embedding physical grid constraints directly into the learning process. Although widely adopted in medical imaging, KOL remains largely unexplored in power system protection.

7. Recommendations for Structured and Reproducible Research

Building on the trends, limitations, and opportunities identified in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, this section presents practical recommendations to improve the transparency, comparability, and reproducibility of ML-based research in power system protection. Section 7.1 presents general guidelines for open and structured research, data sharing, evaluation practices, and model documentation. Together with the unified taxonomy in Section 7.2 and the dataset documentation standards in Section 7.3, these recommendations support standardized benchmarking and reproducible comparison across studies.

7.1. Guidelines for Transparent and Reproducible ML Research in Power System Protection

Despite significant progress in ML-based protection, the field still suffers from limited reproducibility and inconsistent evaluation practices. Variability in performance metrics, undocumented model configurations, and inaccessible datasets or codebases hinder meaningful comparison and slow down translation to practice. To address these issues, we outline core guidelines grounded in open-source principles, emphasizing transparency, comparability, and reproducibility across the full research pipeline.

Studies should report more than aggregate accuracy. Task-specific metrics – such as precision, recall, F1-score, and class-wise performance – are essential for meaningful comparison, especially in imbalanced or multi-class settings. Yet, we found that 23.5 % of studies did not report any performance metric beyond general statements of accuracy, limiting interpretability and hindering fair comparison across methods. For FD, detection latency and false negative rates are particularly relevant, as they directly impact operational reliability. Robustness should be evaluated under realistic conditions, yet only a minority of studies conduct such analyses. Necessary ablation studies include evaluations under varying fault types, fault resistances, fault locations, load fluctuations, DER outages, and different network topologies. It is also important to check whether models can distinguish faults from normal but disruptive events such as inrush currents, line switching, or energization.

Notable examples such as [120] demonstrate the importance of systematically assessing performance across these dimensions. Noise robustness has been examined in [140, 147, 148, 151, 159], and generalization to unseen fault types in [42], while missing data remains largely unexplored in the reviewed literature. An example analysis is provided in our prior work [180]. Similarly, runtime efficiency [141, 156, 157], memory usage, and deployment constraints are rarely reported. While these factors may not limit small or moderately sized models, they become relevant for large-scale deployments, resource-constrained environments, or real-time protection logic. Their omission hinders comparability and makes practical applicability harder to assess. These omissions hinder comparability and practical relevance.

Transparency in experimental design is essential. Key aspects – such as model architecture (e.g., centralized vs. decentralized), input representation (phasor, waveform, frequency domain), output targets, and evaluation protocols – should be clearly stated. Training details (e.g., network layers, activation functions, optimizer settings, batch size, and epochs) and hyperparameter configurations must be reported. These are often omitted from the main text and instead shared via appendices or external repositories like GitHub, which is effective if properly documented and maintained.

Adopting open-source practices is vital for community progress. While only 1.7 % of the reviewed studies publicly released their code or models, we recommend that future work consistently share source code, preprocessing scripts, trained models, and evaluation tools. If proprietary or sensitive data cannot be shared, detailed documentation of data formats, preprocessing pipelines, and experimental protocols remains essential. These practices form the foundation for building rigorous, scalable, and practically relevant ML solutions in power system protection.

7.2. Proposed Taxonomy

Terminological inconsistencies remain a major barrier in ML-based power system protection research, largely due to its interdisciplinary nature. To improve communication, reproducibility, and benchmarking, we propose a unified taxonomy of protection tasks, aligning conventional protection concepts with common ML formulations.

Data window refers to the segment of voltage and current waveforms or phasor measurements used for analysis, typically spanning 1 ms to 100 ms to comply with relay response times [5, 73]. While training data are often aligned to fault inception, real-time models operate on continuously sampled signals. Discrete measurement points sampled within this window form the multivariate time-series input to ML models. The sampling rate (number of measurements per second), number of samples, and number of channels together determine the input dimensionality and influence the model's ability to capture transient behavior in real-time.

Fault detection determines whether a fault has occurred and is consistently framed as a binary classification task. This mirrors conventional protection logic (e.g., overcurrent and distance relays) [5, 73] and is widely adopted in recent literature [49, 118, 136, 140, 181].

Islanding detection is the task of identifying when DG or a microgrid (MG) is disconnected from the main utility grid but continues to energize a local subsection of the grid. Conventionally addressed by passive, active, or hybrid techniques, the problem in ML-based protection is typically formulated as a binary classification, where islanding must be distinguished from non-islanding disturbances such as faults, switching, or load variations [66, 69, 59].

Fault classification identifies the type of fault, such as single-phase-to-ground, line-to-line, or three-phase faults, and is typically formulated as a multi-class classification task. High-impedance faults often receive special attention due to their detection difficulty [100, 118, 140, 159, 182].

Fault Area Classification, instead of *Fault Zone Classification*, is suggested to avoid confusion with conventional distance protection zones, as it assigns faults to protection areas, only sometimes consistent with the zone reach of distance protection relays [5]. Though less common, this task is gaining importance in advanced distribution protection settings [181, 183].

Fault line identification involves determining the specific line, feeder, or substation where the fault occurred. It is increasingly relevant in centralized schemes and WAMS-based architectures, where distinguishing between multiple monitored elements is essential. This task is typically formulated as a multi-class classification [136, 184, 185]. A related but under-defined task is *fault bus identification*, which extends the concept to pinpoint the faulted bus in an interconnected grid.

Fault localization estimates the fault's location along a transmission line, usually expressed as distance (in kilometers or percentage of line length). In ML, this task is naturally modeled as a regression problem, with traditional impedance- and traveling-wave-based methods forming the foundation [5, 140, 159].

Centralized or *decentralized* architectures must be clearly specified when describing an ML-based scheme. Centralized schemes rely on synchronized data from multiple substations (grid-level centralized) or can also be centralized at the substation level, where data from different devices within a single substation are aggregated. In contrast, decentralized schemes use only local measurements. This distinction has significant implications for communication infrastructure, latency, and reliability [5].

This taxonomy promotes consistent definitions across studies, enabling clearer problem formulation and improving the comparability and reproducibility of ML-based protection research.

Extended Task Definitions and Distinctions: Beyond detection, classification, and localization, related terms are often used inconsistently across the literature. *Fault diagnosis* typically refers to a composite task that combines detection, classification, and localization. *Fault analysis*, in contrast, is used more broadly to describe the overall evaluation of power system behavior under fault conditions, including detection, classification, localization, and parameter estimation. *Fault isolation* describes the process of disconnecting the faulted section from the grid to prevent cascading failures, *restoration* involves reconfiguring the network to reroute power after a fault has been cleared, and *protection coordination* (or relay coordination) ensures the correct tripping sequence among multiple protection devices, often relying on teleprotection schemes in decentralized architectures to enable fast and selective operation.

Fault direction discrimination refers to determining whether a fault lies in the forward or reverse direction relative to a relay's location, which is critical for systems with bidirectional power flow or in meshed networks. *Faulty phase selection* aims to identify which specific phase(s) are involved in the fault. This is particularly important for unbalanced or asymmetrical faults and is often a prerequisite for accurate classification and localization [186]. It is strongly related to FC, as knowledge of the affected phases often implies the fault type.

Related tasks include *disturbance classification*, which involves identifying and categorizing non-fault events (e.g., switching, load fluctuations), and *anomaly detection*, which targets deviations from expected behavior using often unsupervised or self-supervised methods. *Adaptive protection* dynamically updates relay settings in response to changing grid conditions. Finally, *fault identification* refers to estimating specific fault parameters such as impedance, resistance, or location index.

7.3. Proposed Dataset Guidelines

High-quality data is essential for advancing ML-based protection research. However, obtaining real-world fault recordings remains highly challenging. Legal and regulatory barriers often prevent data sharing due to strict confidentiality agreements and critical infrastructure protection laws. Even anonymized datasets may fall under data privacy regulations such as the GDPR. Organizational and logistical constraints further limit access: many utilities lack the mandate or infrastructure to archive high-frequency data in a structured, accessible format. Where datasets do exist, they are frequently stored in proprietary systems with inconsistent or undocumented metadata, complicating retrieval and interpretation. Technical failures during fault events – such as communication loss, buffer overflows, or device limitations – can result in corrupted or incomplete recordings. Moreover, spatial gaps in sensor deployment reduce observational completeness and introduce sampling bias.

Despite these challenges, a few commendable efforts have contributed to improving data availability. Bera et al. [143] and Alhanaf et al. [162] published their dataset alongside the study. Public datasets were used in [48] and [79]. Other works note that data are available upon request from the corresponding author, including [86, 94, 118, 157, 159, 168], though this approach offers limited transparency and reproducibility. A notable example is provided by Galkin et al. [50], who released both the dataset and code, setting a strong precedent for open-source contributions in this field.

Out of the 119 studies reviewed, only 1.7% published their own datasets, and another 1.7% relied on publicly available ones. An additional 10.9% indicated that their data are available upon request, while 2.5% explicitly stated that their datasets are confidential. The remaining 82.5% did not provide access to any data. Notably, 21.0% employed standardized topologies – such as the IEEE 6-bus, 34-bus, or 123-bus systems – which may support structural reproducibility. However, meaningful replication is only possible if all simulation parameters, signal characteristics, and configuration details are fully documented. These figures highlight an urgent need for more transparent data-sharing practices and the development of standardized, openly available benchmark datasets to foster reproducibility and comparability in ML-based power system protection research.

In addition to access constraints, other challenges affect dataset quality. Faults are rare and geographically localized events, often resulting in sparse and highly imbalanced datasets. Certain fault types may not be observed at all during the recording period. Ground-truth labeling is particularly difficult and may require fusing multiple data sources or expert interpretation, making large-scale annotation costly and error-prone. As a result, most studies rely on simulated data, where fault conditions can be precisely defined. However, only 16.0% of the reviewed studies used real-world data, and simulation fidelity varies widely. Documentation practices are also inconsistent: 34.5% of studies do not specify the voltage level, 52.1% omit the sampling frequency – both essential for interpreting signal characteristics – and 7.6% fail to state the simulation tool or version. These gaps limit reproducibility, hinder comparability across studies, and complicate efforts to benchmark ML-based protection methods.

To address these issues, we introduce two reference tables. Table 3 specifies essential metadata that should accompany any dataset to ensure clarity and consistency. Table 4 outlines key design principles for constructing publicly available benchmark datasets that reflect diverse operating conditions and support standardized evaluation of ML-based protection methods. We encourage journals, conferences, and peer reviewers to adopt these recommendations as minimum standards for dataset publication in this domain.

Well-documented datasets are essential for transparent and reproducible research. These guidelines aim to support standardized reporting and future benchmarks that reflect realistic scenarios and enable fair comparison across methods.

Table 3
Minimum Reporting Standards for ML-Based Protection Studies

Attribute	Description	Example
Voltage level and grid type	Specify whether the data pertains to MV, HV, or HVDC networks.	90 kV AC-transmission line
Topology	Include number of buses and, if available, a single-line diagram.	IEEE 39-bus system
Simulation tool and version	Clearly state the tool used and its version.	PSCAD v4.6.1
Sampling frequency and signal domain	Report sampling rate and signal domain (e.g., EMT, RMS/phasor)	1.4 kHz, EMT domain
Time window and alignment	Define the time range and its alignment with the fault event.	-100 ms to 300 ms
Input channels used	List all input signals used in the study.	V_{abc}, I_{abc} , frequency
Fault specifications	Describe the fault types, locations, and resistances.	SLG @ Bus 3, $R_f = 10 \Omega$

Table 4
Essential Aspects and Examples for Public Power System Benchmark Datasets

Aspect	Recommendation	Examples
Topology diversity	Include multiple grid types and voltage levels to support generalization.	IEEE 13-bus (MV, radial); IEEE 123-bus (LV, urban); CIGRÉ HVDC test system (HVDC)
Fault scenario coverage	Simulate varied fault types, resistances, and locations to represent realistic fault conditions.	SLG, LLG, 3LG faults at buses and lines; $R_f = 0-100 \Omega$; multiple inception angles
Operating condition variation	Reflect daily and seasonal load changes, generation profiles, and DER penetration, and typical non-fault events.	Light, nominal, peak load; PV and wind integration; islanding events; inrush currents; line switching; load steps
Signal representation	Provide raw or derived signal domains for accurate modeling and analysis.	EMT waveforms at 10 kHz; phasors at 50 Hz; V_{abc}, I_{abc} , frequency, ROCOF
Ground-truth annotation	Label each instance for reproducibility and evaluation of downstream tasks.	Fault type = LLG; location = Bus 4; impedance = 20Ω ; event start = 2.3 s
Documentation and accessibility	Provide structured metadata, licensing, and version control to enable long-term reuse.	JSON/YAML config files; Simulink/PSCAD inputs; Zenodo DOI; CC-BY license; GitHub repository

8. Summary & Conclusion

This paper presents a comprehensive review of ML applications in power system protection, with a focus on fault detection, classification, and localization. The review identifies increasing methodological diversity, a strong reliance on supervised learning, and enduring challenges in task formulation, dataset design, and evaluation methodology. Widely adopted models include MLPs, SVMs, and CNNs, selected for their balance between accuracy and computational efficiency. Only a limited number of recent studies have explored more sophisticated architectures – such as hybrid CNN-LSTM networks, attention mechanisms (e.g., ViTs), and multi-agent reinforcement learning – to better capture spatiotemporal dependencies in grid dynamics.

Simulated data, predominantly generated using MATLAB/Simulink or PSCAD, remains the primary basis for model training and evaluation. Most studies focus on HV transmission systems (110 kV and above), typically with radial or weakly meshed topologies. LV grids, microgrids, and hybrid AC-DC systems remain underrepresented. Dataset sizes range from hundreds to millions of samples, with sampling frequencies from 1-100 kHz. However, key metadata – such as signal representation (e.g., EMT, RMS, phasor), fault parameters, and data partitioning strategies – are frequently omitted, limiting reproducibility and comparability. Although many models report near-perfect accuracy, most evaluations are limited to noise-free, fully observable, and latency-free conditions. Robustness to measurement

noise, missing data, communication delays, and other real-world constraints is rarely tested. Runtime analysis, hardware requirements, and fault recovery performance are often neglected, hindering practical deployment.

Three overarching limitations emerge: (i) near-perfect accuracies on synthetic datasets highlight a lack of realism in evaluation protocols; (ii) the absence of standardized datasets, reporting formats, and grid configurations impedes reproducibility and benchmarking; and (iii) validation practices rarely address deployment-critical aspects such as communication failures, noisy signals, or delayed responses.

We emphasize the importance of evaluation protocols that prioritize robustness, interpretability, and open-source practices. To complement this, we propose: (i) a task-oriented taxonomy that aligns protection objectives with standard ML formulations; and (ii) dataset reporting guidelines to improve transparency and reproducibility. Future research should prioritize benchmark datasets, hybrid validation approaches (e.g., HIL testing), and comprehensive coverage of underrepresented grid types. In addition to model accuracy, metrics such as runtime efficiency, scalability, and resilience to cyber and communication failures must be considered. Promising but underutilized techniques – including GNNs, PINNs, and known operator learning – offer opportunities to embed physical knowledge and exploit topological structure. Transfer learning, knowledge distillation, and domain adaptation may further enhance model generalization under varying grid conditions.

Advancing ML-based protection requires shared standards, realistic validation, and reproducible methodologies. With these in place, the community can move toward reliable, interpretable, and field-ready protection solutions for future power systems.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Julian Oelhaf: Writing - original draft, Methodology, Investigation. **Georg Kordowich:** Writing - original draft, Methodology, Investigation. **Mehran Pashaei:** Investigation. **Christian Bergler:** Writing - review & editing, Supervision. **Andreas Maier:** Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Johann Jäger:** Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Siming Bayer:** Writing - review & editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgment

This project was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - 535389056.

References

- [1] R.A. Walling, R. Saint, R.C. Dugan, J. Burke, and L.A. Kojovic. Summary of distributed resources impact on power delivery systems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 23(3):1636–1644, 2008.
- [2] Frede Blaabjerg, Yongheng Yang, Dongsheng Yang, and Xiongfei Wang. Distributed power-generation systems and protection. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(7):1311–1331, 2017.
- [3] Sanja Potrč, Lidija Čuček, Mariano Martin, and Zdravko Kravanja. Sustainable renewable energy supply networks optimization – The gradual transition to a renewable energy system within the European Union by 2050. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 146:111186, August 2021.
- [4] Tarun Kataray, B. Nitesh, Bharath Yarram, Sanyukta Sinha, Erdem Cuce, Saboor Shaik, Pethurajan Vigneshwaran, and Abin Roy. Integration of smart grid with renewable energy sources: Opportunities and challenges – A comprehensive review. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 58:103363, August 2023.
- [5] J. Lewis Blackburn. *Protective Relaying: Principles and Applications, Fourth Edition*. Taylor & Francis Group, Baton Rouge, 4th ed edition, 2014.
- [6] Martin Biller and Johann Jaeger. Protection Algorithms for Closed-Ring Grids With Distributed Generation. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 37(5):4042–4052, October 2022.
- [7] Jonas Prommetta, Jakob Schindler, Johann Jaeger, Timo Keil, Christoph Butterer, and Guenter Ebner. Protection Coordination of AC/DC Intersystem Faults in Hybrid Transmission Grids. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 35(6):2896–2904, December 2020.
- [8] Protection and automation (B5) and Active distribution systems and distributed energy resources (C6). Protection of distribution systems with distributed energy resources, 2015.

- [9] Central Power Research Institute, Vishnuvardhan Telukunta, Janmejaya Pradhan, Central Power Research Institute, Anubha Agrawal, Central Power Research Institute, Manohar Singh, Central Power Research Institute, Sankighatta Garudachar Srivani, and R V College of Engineering. Protection challenges under bulk penetration of renewable energy resources in power systems: A review. *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, 3(4):365–379, December 2017.
- [10] Rachna Vaish, U.D. Dwivedi, Saurabh Tewari, and S.M. Tripathi. Machine learning applications in power system fault diagnosis: Research advancements and perspectives. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 106:104504, 2021.
- [11] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 2016. IEEE.
- [12] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [13] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [14] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J. Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, Sander Dieleman, Dominik Grewe, John Nham, Nal Kalchbrenner, Ilya Sutskever, Timothy Lillicrap, Madeleine Leach, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Thore Graepel, and Demis Hassabis. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484–489, January 2016.
- [15] Andre Esteva, Brett Kuprel, Roberto A. Novoa, Justin Ko, Susan M. Swetter, Helen M. Blau, and Sebastian Thrun. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. *Nature*, 542(7639):115–118, February 2017.
- [16] Abder Elandaloussi, Alex Apostolov, Ali Bidram, Athula Rajapakse, Carolina Arbona, Dan Sabin, Jayaprakash Ponraj, Jean Raymond, Jörg Blumschein, Juan F. Piñeros S., Matthew Reno, Nirmal Nair, Ratan Das, Robert Fowler, Sebastien Billaut, Sukumar Brahma, Sukumar Kamalasadana, Vahid Madani, Yu Liu, and Yujie Yin. Practical applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning in power system protection and control. Technical Report PES-TP-TR112-PSRC-09052323, IEEE Power System Relaying and Control Committee, 2023. Publisher: IEEE.
- [17] M.J. Perez-Molina, D.M. Larruskain, P. Eguia Lopez, G. Buigues, and V. Valverde. Review of protection systems for multi-terminal high voltage direct current grids. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 144:111037, July 2021.
- [18] Jalal Sahebkar Farkhani, Özgür Çelik, Kaiqi Ma, Claus Leth Bak, and Zhe Chen. A comprehensive review of potential protection methods for VSC multi-terminal HVDC systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 192:114280, March 2024.
- [19] Rashid Hussain Chandio, Faheem Akhtar Chachar, Jahangeer Badar Soomro, Jamshed Ahmed Ansari, Hafiz Mudassir Munir, Hossam M. Zawbaa, and Salah Kamel. Control and protection of MMC-based HVDC systems: A review. *Energy Reports*, 9:1571–1588, December 2023.
- [20] Manohar Mishra, Abha Pragati, Debadatta Amaresh Gadanayak, and Tanmoy Parida. Signal processing and artificial intelligence based HVDC network protection: A systematic and state-up-the-art review. *e-Prime - Advances in Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Energy*, 8:100606, June 2024.
- [21] Habib Panahi, Reza Zamani, Majid Sanaye-Pasand, and Hasan Mehrjerdi. Advances in Transmission Network Fault Location in Modern Power Systems: Review, Outlook and Future Works. *IEEE Access*, 9:158599–158615, 2021.
- [22] Jorge De La Cruz, Eduardo Gómez-Luna, Majid Ali, Juan C. Vasquez, and Josep M. Guerrero. Fault Location for Distribution Smart Grids: Literature Overview, Challenges, Solutions, and Future Trends. *Energies*, 16(5):2280, February 2023.
- [23] Marco Bindi, Maria Cristina Piccirilli, Antonio Luchetta, and Francesco Grasso. A Comprehensive Review of Fault Diagnosis and Prognosis Techniques in High Voltage and Medium Voltage Electrical Power Lines. *Energies*, 16(21):7317, October 2023.
- [24] Ibrahim Alhamrouni, Nor Hidayah Abdul Kahar, Mohamed Salem, Mahmood Swadi, Younes Zahroui, Dheyaa Jasim Kadhim, Faisal A. Mohamed, and Mohammad Alhuyi Nazari. A Comprehensive Review on the Role of Artificial Intelligence in Power System Stability, Control, and Protection: Insights and Future Directions. *Applied Sciences*, 14(14):6214, July 2024.
- [25] Muiz M. Zaben, Muhammed Y. Worku, Mohamed A. Hassan, and Mohammad A. Abido. Machine Learning Methods for Fault Diagnosis in AC Microgrids: A Systematic Review. *IEEE Access*, 12:20260–20298, 2024.
- [26] Le Xie, Xiangtian Zheng, Yannan Sun, Tong Huang, and Tony Bruton. Massively Digitized Power Grid: Opportunities and Challenges of Use-Inspired AI. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 111(7):762–787, July 2023.
- [27] Ming Dai, Guomin Luo, Zhenlin Wang, and Qihui Chen. Review on Applications of Artificial Intelligence in Relay Protection. In Qingxin Yang, Xidong Liang, Yaohua Li, and Jinghan He, editors, *The proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference of China Electrotechnical Society*, volume 889, pages 724–733. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2022. Series Title: Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering.
- [28] Hanyu Yang, Xubin Liu, Di Zhang, Tao Chen, Canbing Li, and Wentao Huang. Machine learning for power system protection and control. *The Electricity Journal*, 34(1):106881, January 2021.
- [29] Andrea C. Tricco, Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly K. O’Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle Levac, David Moher, Micah D.J. Peters, Tanya Horsley, Laura Weeks, Susanne Hempel, Elie A. Akl, Christine Chang, Jessie McGowan, Lesley Stewart, Lisa Hartling, Adrian Aldcroft, Michael G. Wilson, Chantelle Garritty, Simon Lewin, Christina M. Godfrey, Marilyn T. Macdonald, Etienne V. Langlois, Karla Soares-Weiser, Jo Moriarty, Tammy Clifford, Ö. Tunçalp, and Sharon E. Straus. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7):467–473, 2018.
- [30] Matthew J Page, Joanne E McKenzie, Patrick M Bossuyt, Isabelle Boutron, Tammy C Hoffmann, Cynthia D Mulrow, Larissa Shamseer, Jennifer M Tetzlaff, Elie A Akl, Sue E Brennan, et al. The prisma 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews.

- bmj*, 372, 2021.
- [31] Mourad Ouzzani, Hossam Hammady, Zbys Fedorowicz, and Ahmed Elmagarmid. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic reviews*, 5:1–10, 2016.
- [32] International Electrotechnical Commission. IEC 61850:2024 SER | IEC, May 2024.
- [33] Richard Hunt, Byron Flynn, and Terry Smith. The Substation of the Future: Moving Toward a Digital Solution. *IEEE Power and Energy Magazine*, 17(4):47–55, July 2019.
- [34] Farrokh Aminifar, Mahmud Fotuhi-Firuzabad, Amir Safdarian, Ali Davoudi, and Mohammad Shahidehpour. Synchrophasor Measurement Technology in Power Systems: Panorama and State-of-the-Art. *IEEE Access*, 2:1607–1628, 2014.
- [35] Wenjie Huo, Fengchun Liu, Liya Wang, Yanfeng Jin, and Lei Wang. Research on Distributed Power Distribution Fault Detection Based on Edge Computing. *IEEE Access*, 8:24643–24652, 2020.
- [36] Wen Fan and Yuan Liao. Wide area measurements based fault detection and location method for transmission lines. *Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems*, 4(1):7, December 2019.
- [37] Wai-Kai Chen. *The electrical engineering handbook*. Elsevier Academic Press, 2005. OCLC: 57371415.
- [38] Younis M. Nsaif, M. S. Hossain Lipu, Afida Ayob, Yushaizad Yusof, and Aini Hussain. Fault Detection and Protection Schemes for Distributed Generation Integrated to Distribution Network: Challenges and Suggestions. *IEEE Access*, 9:142693–142717, 2021.
- [39] Saad Abdul Aleem, Nauman Shahid, and Ijaz Haider Naqvi. Methodologies in power systems fault detection and diagnosis. *Energy Systems*, 6(1):85–108, March 2015.
- [40] M. Bakkar, S. Bogarra, F. Córcoles, A. Aboelhasan, S. Wang, and J. Iglesias. Artificial Intelligence-Based Protection for Smart Grids. *Energies*, 15(13), 2022.
- [41] Ö. Çelik, J.S. Farkhani, A. Lashab, J.M. Guerrero, J.C. Vasquez, Z. Chen, and C.L. Bak. A Deep GMDH Neural-Network-Based Robust Fault Detection Method for Active Distribution Networks. *Energies*, 16(19), 2023.
- [42] A.T. Diefenthaler, A.T.Z.R. Sausen, M. De Campos, P.S. Sausen, and J.M. Lenz. Artificial Neural Networks: Modeling and Comparison to Detect High Impedance Faults. *IEEE Access*, 11:124499–124508, 2023.
- [43] T. Nieminen, O. Vaananen, P. Puttonen, T. Flyktman, and A. Latvala. Identifying electric power system fault types with Deep Neural Network. In *2023 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Industry 4.0 and IoT, MetroInd4.0 and IoT 2023 - Proceedings*, pages 371–375, 2023.
- [44] Zhidi Lin, Dongliang Duan, Qi Yang, Xuemin Hong, Xiang Cheng, Liuqing Yang, and Shuguang Cui. One-Class Classifier Based Fault Detection in Distribution Systems With Varying Penetration Levels of Distributed Energy Resources. *IEEE Access*, 8:130023–130035, 2020.
- [45] K. Moloi and A.A. Yusuff. Power Distribution System Fault Diagnostic Using Genetic Algorithm and Neural Network. In *2021 Southern African Universities Power Engineering Conference/Robotics and Mechatronics/Pattern Recognition Association of South Africa, SAUPEC/RobMech/PRASA 2021*, pages 1–5, 2021.
- [46] Georg Kordowich, Michael Jaworski, Tobias Lorz, Christian Scheibe, and Johann Jaeger. A hybrid Protection Scheme based on Deep Reinforcement Learning - 2022 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference Europe (ISGT-Europe). In *2022 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference Europe (ISGT-Europe)*, pages 1–6, October 2022.
- [47] Dongqi Wu, Dileep Kalathil, Miroslav M. Begovic, Kevin Q. Ding, and Le Xie. Deep Reinforcement Learning-Based Robust Protection in DER-Rich Distribution Grids. *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*, 9:537–548, 2022.
- [48] NMG Kumar, S.Shanmuga Priya, Vineetha Varghese, Renuga K, Jyoti Prasad Patra, and Neerav Nishant. An Improved Method for Fault Detection Electric Power System Protection using SVMCNN Model - 2024 International Conference on Electronics, Computing, Communication and Control Technology (ICECCC). In *2024 International Conference on Electronics, Computing, Communication and Control Technology (ICECCC)*, pages 1–6, May 2024.
- [49] M.Z. Yousaf, S. Khalid, M.F. Tahir, A. Tzes, and A. Raza. A novel dc fault protection scheme based on intelligent network for meshed dc grids. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 154, 2023.
- [50] N. Galkin, C.-W. Yang, N. Etherden, M. Bollen, V. Vyatkin, and Y. Wu. Toolset Development for Modelling Sympathetic Phenomenon and its Detection by a Neural Network. In *2023 IEEE 2nd Industrial Electronics Society Annual On-Line Conference, ONCON 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [51] N. Rezaei, M.N. Uddin, I.K. Amin, M.L. Othman, M.B. Marsadek, and M.M. Hasan. A Novel Hybrid Machine Learning Classifier-Based Digital Differential Protection Scheme for Intertie Zone of Large-Scale Centralized DFIG-Based Wind Farms. *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, 56(4):3453–3465, 2020.
- [52] M.Z. Yousaf, S. Mirsaedi, S. Khalid, A. Raza, C. Zhichu, W.U. Rehman, and F. Badshah. Multisegmented Intelligent Solution for MT-HVDC Grid Protection. *Electronics (Switzerland)*, 12(8), 2023.
- [53] Abdelazeem A. Abdelsalam, Ahmed A. Salem, Eyad S. Oda, and Azza A. Eldesouky. Islanding detection of microgrid incorporating inverter based DGs using long short-term memory network. *IEEE Access*, 8:106471–106486, 2020.
- [54] Samuel Admasie, Syed Basit Ali Bukhari, Teke Gush, Raza Haider, and Chul Hwan Kim. Intelligent islanding detection of multi-distributed generation using artificial neural network based on intrinsic mode function feature. *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, 8(3):511–520, 2020.
- [55] Hamid Reza Baghaee, Dragan Mlakic, Srete Nikolovski, and Tomislav Dragicevic. Anti-islanding protection of PV-based microgrids consisting of PHEVs using SVMs. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 11(1):483–500, 2020.
- [56] Hamid Reza Baghaee, Dragan Mlakic, Srete Nikolovski, and Tomislav Dragicevic. Support vector machine-based islanding and grid fault detection in active distribution networks. *IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics*, 8(3):2385–2403, 2020.
- [57] Anasuya Roy Choudhury, Ranjan Kumal Mallick, Ramachandra Agrawal, Sairam Mishra, Pravati Nayak, and Ashis Ranjan Behera. Islanding detection of PV-based microgrid based on empirical mode decomposition and decision tree. In *2021 Innovations in Power and Advanced Computing Technologies (i-PACT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.

- [58] Abolfazl Najar, Hossein Kazemi Karegar, and Saman Esmaeilbeigi. Intelligent islanding detection scheme for microgrid based on deep learning and wavelet transform. In *2020 10th Smart Grid Conference (SGC)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2020.
- [59] Younis M. Nsaif, M.S. Hossain Lipu, Aini Hussain, Afida Ayob, and Yushaizad Yusof. Island detection for grid connected photovoltaic distributed generations via integrated signal processing and machine learning approach. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 154:109468, 2023.
- [60] Omar A. Allan and Walid G. Morsi. A new passive islanding detection approach using wavelets and deep learning for grid-connected photovoltaic systems. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 199:107437, 2021.
- [61] Ch. Rami Reddy, K. Harinadha Reddy, B. Srikanth Goud, and B. Pakkiraiah. A deep learning approach for islanding detection of integrated DG with CWT and CNN. In *2021 International Conference on Sustainable Energy and Future Electric Transportation (SEFET)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2021.
- [62] Arif Hussain, Chul-Hwan Kim, and Muhammad Shahid Jabbar. An intelligent deep convolutional neural networks-based islanding detection for multi-DG systems. *IEEE Access*, 10:131920–131931, 2022.
- [63] Edson David, Jordan Rel Orillaza, and Jhoanna Rhodette Pedrasa. Islanding detection using transformer neural networks. In *2024 IEEE 4th International Conference on Power, Electronics and Computer Applications (ICPECA)*, pages 592–596. IEEE, 2024.
- [64] Asiye Kaymaz Özcanli and Mustafa Baysal. A novel multi-LSTM based deep learning method for islanding detection in the microgrid. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 202:107574, 2022.
- [65] Asiye Kaymaz Ozcanli and Mustafa Baysal. Islanding detection in microgrid using deep learning based on 1d CNN and CNN-LSTM networks. *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks*, 32:100839, 2022.
- [66] Waleed Ali, Abasin Ulasyar, Mussawir Ul Mehmood, Abraiz Khattak, Kashif Imran, Haris Sheh Zad, and Shibli Nisar. Hierarchical control of microgrid using IoT and machine learning based islanding detection. *IEEE Access*, 9:103019–103031, 2021.
- [67] Ahmed Ezzat, Basem E. Elnaghi, and Abdelazeem A. Abdelsalam. Microgrids islanding detection using fourier transform and machine learning algorithm. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 196:107224, 2021.
- [68] Izhar Ahmad Saifi, Ahteshamul Haque, Mohammad Amir, and V. S. Bharath Kurukuru. Intelligent islanding classification with MLPNN for hybrid distributed energy generations in microgrid system. In *2023 International Conference on Intelligent and Innovative Technologies in Computing, Electrical and Electronics (IITCEE)*, pages 982–987. IEEE, 2023.
- [69] Arif Hussain, Shakil Mirza, and Chul-Hwan Kim. Islanding detection and classification of non-islanding disturbance in multi-distributed generation power system using deep neural networks. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 224:109807, 2023.
- [70] Arif Hussain, Arif Mehdi, and Chul-Hwan Kim. A communication-less islanding detection scheme for hybrid distributed generation systems using recurrent neural network. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 155:109659, 2024.
- [71] George Lester. High Voltage Circuit Breaker Standards in the USA - Past, Present, and Future. *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, PAS-93(2):590–600, March 1974.
- [72] L. G. Hewitson, Mark Brown, and Ramesh Balakrishnan, editors. *Practical power systems protection*. Practical professional books from Elsevier. Newnes, Oxford Burlington, MA, 2005.
- [73] Stanley H. Horowitz, Arun G. Phadke, and Charles F. Henville. *Power system relaying*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, West Sussex, UK, fifth edition edition, 2023. OCLC: 1341343569.
- [74] Felipe Wilches-Bernal, Ali Bidram, Matthew J. Reno, Javier Hernandez-Alvidrez, Pedro Barba, Benjamin Reimer, Rudy Montoya, Christopher Carr, and Olga Lavrova. A Survey of Traveling Wave Protection Schemes in Electric Power Systems. *IEEE Access*, 9:72949–72969, 2021.
- [75] Mehedi Hassan, Shuvra Prokash Biswas, Shah Ariful Hoque Chowdhury, Sudipto Mondal, Md.Rabiul Islam, and Rakibuzzaman Shah. Fault classification and localization of multi-machine-based ieee benchmark test case power transmission lines using optimizable weighted extreme learning machine. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 235:110857, October 2024.
- [76] Raghda Alilouch and Fouad Slaoui-Hasnaoui. Intelligent Relay Based on Artificial Neural Networks ANN for Transmission Line - 2022 IEEE 9th International Conference on Sciences of Electronics, Technologies of Information and Telecommunications (SETIT). In *2022 IEEE 9th International Conference on Sciences of Electronics, Technologies of Information and Telecommunications (SETIT)*, pages 468–473, May 2022.
- [77] M.M. Devi, M. Sharma, and A. Ganguly. Detection and Classification of Transmission Line Faults using LSTM Algorithm. In *Proceedings of 2023 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Industrial Electronics: Developments and Applications, ICIDEA 2023*, pages 146–151, 2023.
- [78] E.U. Haq, H. Jianjun, K. Li, F. Ahmad, D. Banjerpongchai, and T. Zhang. Improved performance of detection and classification of 3-phase transmission line faults based on discrete wavelet transform and double-channel extreme learning machine. *Electrical Engineering*, 103(2):953–963, 2021.
- [79] B. Dhingra, A. Saini, and A. Tomar. A Machine Learning based Fault Identification Framework for Smart Grid Automation. In *2023 IEEE IAS Global Conference on Renewable Energy and Hydrogen Technologies, GlobConHT 2023*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [80] T. Sathish Kumar, RadheyShyam Meena, P.K Mani, S. Ramya, K. Lakshmi Khandan, Arshad Mohammed, and M Siva Ramkumar. Deep Learning based Fault Detection in Power Transmission Lines - 2022 4th International Conference on Inventive Research in Computing Applications (ICIRCA). In *2022 4th International Conference on Inventive Research in Computing Applications (ICIRCA)*, pages 861–867, September 2022.
- [81] Shahriar Rahman Fahim, Yeahia Sarker, Subrata K. Sarker, Md. Rafiqul Islam Sheikh, and Sajal K. Das. Self attention convolutional neural network with time series imaging based feature extraction for transmission line fault detection and classification. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 187:106437, October 2020.
- [82] A. Harish, P. Asok, and M.V. Jayan. A comparative evaluation of Stacked Auto-Encoder neural network and Multi-Layer Extreme Learning Machine for detection and classification of faults in transmission lines using WAMS data. *Energy and AI*, 14, 2023.
- [83] M. Massaoudi, S.S. Refaat, A. Ghrayeb, and H. Abu-Rub. Short-Term Dynamic Voltage Stability Status Estimation Using Multilayer Neural Networks. In *2023 IEEE Texas Power and Energy Conference, TPEC 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.

- [84] S.K. Mohanty, A. Karn, and S. Banerjee. Decision Tree Supported Distance relay for Fault Detection and Classification in a series compensated line. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Power Electronics, Smart Grid and Renewable Energy, PESGRE 2020*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [85] M. Ramana, S. Mohapatra, and S.K. Mohanty. Intelligent Hybrid Relaying Scheme For TCSC Compensated Line Using Machine Learning Approach. In *2023 10th IEEE International Conference on Power Systems, ICPS 2023*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [86] M.S. Uddin, M.Z. Hossain, S.R. Fahim, S.K. Sarker, E.A. Bhuiyan, S.M. Mueen, and S.K. Das. On the protection of power system: Transmission line fault analysis based on an optimal machine learning approach. *Energy Reports*, 8:10168–10182, 2022.
- [87] K. Moloi and A.A. Yusuff. A Wavelet-Neural Network-Based Technique for Fault Diagnostics in Power System. In *2020 7th International Conference on Soft Computing and Machine Intelligence, ISCFMI 2020*, pages 131–135, 2020.
- [88] F. Muntasir, W. Al Wazed Wasi, M. Nafis, and M.M. Hossain. A Fast Response Fault Detection Technique for HVAC Transmission Line Using Machine Learning. In *2023 10th IEEE International Conference on Power Systems, ICPS 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [89] S. Myint, P. Dey, P. Kirawanich, and C. Sumpavakup. Artificial Neural Network-Based Fault Identification for Grid-Connected Electric Traction Network. *IEEE Access*, 12:162238–162250, 2024.
- [90] Edison G. Guama and Ivan D. Claros. A Simple Method for Fault Classification Based on Two Stages of Self Organizing Map - 2021 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference - Latin America (ISGT Latin America). In *2021 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference - Latin America (ISGT Latin America)*, pages 1–5, September 2021.
- [91] Ji Han, Shihong Miao, Yaowang Li, Weichen Yang, and Haoran Yin. Faulted-Phase classification for transmission lines using gradient similarity visualization and cross-domain adaption-based convolutional neural network. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 191:106876, February 2021.
- [92] W. Li, Z. Wan, A. Shen, and K. Zhao. Data-Driven Hidden Fault Mechanism and Early Warning Method for Ultra-High Voltage Direct Current Control and Protection System. In *2024 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Control, Electronics and Computer Technology, ICCECT 2024*, pages 149–154, 2024.
- [93] Y. Liang, Y. Ren, J. Yu, and W. Zha. Current trajectory image-based protection algorithm for transmission lines connected to MMC-HVDC stations using CA-CNN. *Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems*, 8(1), 2023.
- [94] A. Mehdi, S. Jarjees Ul Hassan, and C.-H. Kim. Squaring and lowpass filtering data-driven technique for AC faults in AC/DC lines. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 223, 2023.
- [95] Victor Luiz Merlin, Ricardo Caneloi Dos Santos, Ahda Pionkoski Grilo Pavani, and José Carlos Melo Vieira. A frequency spectrum-based method for detecting and classifying faults in HVDC systems. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 207:107828, June 2022.
- [96] R. Muzzammel and A. Raza. Low Impedance Fault Identification and Classification Based on Boltzmann Machine Learning for HVDC Transmission Systems. *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy*, 10(2):440–449, 2022.
- [97] Abha Pragati, Debadatta Amaresh Gadanayak, Shazia Hasan, and Manohar Mishra. Bayesian Optimized Ensemble Decision Tree models for MT-VSC-HVDC Transmission Line Protection - 2023 International Conference in Advances in Power, Signal, and Information Technology (APSIT). In *2023 International Conference in Advances in Power, Signal, and Information Technology (APSIT)*, pages 385–390, June 2023.
- [98] A. Pragati, D.A. Gadanayak, and M. Mishra. Fault detection and fault phase identification in a VSC-MT-HVDC link using Stockwell transform and Teager energy operator. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 236, 2024.
- [99] A. Swetapadma, S. Agarwal, A.Y. Abdelaziz, H. Kotb, K.M. AboRas, A. Flah, and M. Shouran. A novel primary and backup relaying scheme considering internal and external faults in HVDC transmission lines. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 10, 2022.
- [100] E. Tsotsopoulou, X. Karagiannis, T. Papadopoulos, A. Chrysochos, A. Dýsko, and D. Tzelepis. Protection scheme for multi-terminal HVDC system with superconducting cables based on artificial intelligence algorithms. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 149, 2023.
- [101] Z.M. Wong, I.M. Chew, W.K. Wong, S. Sivakumar, and F.H. Juwono. Hybrid HVAC-HVDC Grid Fault Detection & Classification Using ANN. In *2024 10th International Conference on Smart Computing and Communication, ICSCC 2024*, pages 401–407, 2024.
- [102] W. Xiang, S. Yang, and J. Wen. ANN-based robust DC fault protection algorithm for MMC high-voltage direct current grids. *IET Renewable Power Generation*, 14(2):199–210, 2020.
- [103] M.Z. Yousaf, H. Liu, A. Raza, and A. Mustafa. Deep Learning-Based Robust DC Fault Protection Scheme for Meshed HVDC Grids. *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, 9(6):2423–2434, 2023.
- [104] A. Balan, T.L. Srujan, P.V. Manitha, and K. Deepa. Detection and Analysis of Faults in Transformer using Machine Learning. In *IDCIoT 2023 - International Conference on Intelligent Data Communication Technologies and Internet of Things, Proceedings*, pages 477–482, 2023.
- [105] Xudong Wang, Jie Duan, Zhuangzhuang He, Wei Chen, and Zhengyi Liu. Detection and Identification of Abnormal Topology Relationships in Three-Phase Power System Transformers Using ResNet Model - 2024 International Conference on Power, Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Control (PEEEEC). In *2024 International Conference on Power, Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Control (PEEEEC)*, pages 113–117, August 2024.
- [106] L. Buscariolli, R.C. Dos Santos, and A.P.G. Pavani. New ANN-Based Method for Islanding Detection in Distribution Systems with PV Generation. In *2023 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Latin America, ISGT-LA 2023*, pages 365–369, 2023.
- [107] K. Moloi and I. Davidson. High Impedance Fault Detection Protection Scheme for Power Distribution Systems. *Mathematics*, 10(22), 2022.
- [108] D. Chhetija, D. Khadka, Y. Gupta, Z.H. Rather, and S. Doolia. Fault detection and classification scheme for power islands with inverter interfaced distributed generators. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 233, 2024.
- [109] Shiyuan Wang and Payman Dehghanian. On the Use of Artificial Intelligence for High Impedance Fault Detection and Electrical Safety. *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, 56(6):7208–7216, November 2020.
- [110] C. Birk Jones, Adam Summers, and Matthew J. Reno. Machine Learning Embedded in Distribution Network Relays to Classify and Locate Faults - 2021 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT). In *2021 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT)*, pages 1–5, February 2021.

- [111] H.J. Ashtiani, S. Naeiji, A. Shabani, and Z.J. Shen. Supervised Machine Learning and Current Signal Based Universal Fault Protection Strategy for Distributed Generation Integrated into Power Systems. In *2024 8th International Conference on Green Energy and Applications, ICGEA 2024*, pages 43–47, 2024.
- [112] H. Ramadoss and G. Muthiah. Machine learning approach to differentiate excitation failure in synchronous generators from power swing. *Electrical Engineering*, 105(4):2041–2054, 2023.
- [113] U. Sadiq, F. Mallek, S. Ur Rehman, R.M. Asif, A. Ur Rehman, and H. Hamam. A Machine Learning-based Solution for Monitoring of Converters in Smart Grid Application. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 15(3):1290–1307, 2024.
- [114] B.K. Aryan, O. Sobhana, G.C. Prabhakar, and N.A. Reddy. Fault Detection and Classification in Micro Grid Using AI Technique. In *Proceedings - 2022 International Conference on Recent Trends in Microelectronics, Automation, Computing and Communications Systems, ICMACC 2022*, pages 517–522, 2022.
- [115] Samuel T. Ojetola, Matthew J. Reno, Jack Flicker, Daniel Bauer, and David Stoltzfuz. Testing Machine Learned Fault Detection and Classification on a DC Microgrid - 2022 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT). In *2022 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT)*, pages 1–5, April 2022.
- [116] B. Patnaik, M. Mishra, R.C. Bansal, and R.K. Jena. MODWT-XGBoost based smart energy solution for fault detection and classification in a smart microgrid. *Applied Energy*, 285, 2021.
- [117] Priya Thekkumparambath Mana, Mohammadreza Miranbeigi, Joseph Benzaquen, and Deepak M Divan. Detection and Classification of Single Line to Ground Faults in Unbalanced Islanded Microgrids - 2023 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT). In *2023 IEEE Power & Energy Society Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference (ISGT)*, pages 1–5, January 2023.
- [118] A. Cano, P. Arévalo, D. Benavides, and F. Jurado. Integrating discrete wavelet transform with neural networks and machine learning for fault detection in microgrids. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 155, 2024.
- [119] M. Alsaba and M. Abido. An Efficient Machine Learning Model for Microgrid Fault Detection and Classification: Protection Approach. In *IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, volume 2023, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [120] S. Prasad Tiwari, E. Koley, M. Manohar, S. Ghosh, D.K. Mohanta, and R.C. Bansal. Enhancing robustness of DC microgrid protection during weather intermittency and source outage for improved resilience and system integrity. *International Transactions on Electrical Energy Systems*, 31(12), 2021.
- [121] M.A. Kabeel, M.M. Eladany, and A.A. Eldesouky. A Centralized Protection Scheme for Microgrids with Artificial Neural Network-Based on Fault Detection and Location. In *2022 23rd International Middle East Power Systems Conference, MEPCON 2022*, pages 1–5. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., 2022.
- [122] S.M. Suhail Hussain et al. A novel PRP based deterministic, redundant and resilient IEC 61850 substation communication architecture. *Perspectives in Science*, 8:747–750, September 2016.
- [123] Felipe V. Lopes, Bernard F. Küsel, Kleber M. Silva, Damasio Fernandes, and Washington L.A. Neves. Fault location on transmission lines little longer than half-wavelength. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 114:101–109, September 2014.
- [124] C.F. Jensen, O.M.K.K. Nanayakkara, A.D. Rajapakse, U.S. Gudmundsdottir, and C.L. Bak. Online fault location on AC cables in underground transmission systems using sheath currents. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 115:74–79, October 2014.
- [125] Xiangning Lin, Feng Zhao, Gang Wu, Zhengtian Li, and Hanli Weng. Universal Wavefront Positioning Correction Method on Traveling-Wave-Based Fault-Location Algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 27(3):1601–1610, July 2012.
- [126] D.S. Gazzana, G.D. Ferreira, A.S. Bretas, A.L. Bettioli, A. Carniato, L.F.N. Passos, A.H. Ferreira, and J.E.M. Silva. An integrated technique for fault location and section identification in distribution systems. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 115:65–73, October 2014.
- [127] Rahman Dashti and Javad Sadeh. Fault section estimation in power distribution network using impedance-based fault distance calculation and frequency spectrum analysis. *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution*, 8(8):1406–1417, August 2014.
- [128] John Morales, Eduardo A. Orduna, and Christian Rehtanz. Identification of Lightning Stroke Due to Shielding Failure and Backflashover for Ultra-High-Speed Transmission-Line Protection. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 29(4):2008–2017, August 2014.
- [129] S.M. Brahma and A.A. Girgis. Fault Location on a Transmission Line Using Synchronized Voltage Measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 19(4):1619–1622, October 2004.
- [130] Ke Jia, David W. P. Thomas, and Mark Sumner. A New Double-Ended Fault-Location Scheme for Utilization in Integrated Power Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 28(2):594–603, April 2013.
- [131] J. Izykowski, E. Rosolowski, P. Balcerek, M. Fulczyk, and M.M. Saha. Accurate Noniterative Fault Location Algorithm Utilizing Two-End Unsynchronized Measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 25(1):72–80, January 2010.
- [132] Nagy I. Elkalashy, Tamer A. Kawady, Wagdy M. Khater, and Abdel-Maksoud I. Taalab. Unsynchronized Fault-Location Technique for Double-Circuit Transmission Systems Independent of Line Parameters. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 31(4):1591–1600, August 2016.
- [133] Abdelsalam Elhaffar. An optimized fault location system based on traveling waves for transmission networks. In *2012 16th IEEE Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference*, pages 954–958, Yasmine Hammamet, Tunisia, March 2012. IEEE.
- [134] Mert Korkali, Hanoeh Lev-Ari, and Ali Abur. Traveling-Wave-Based Fault-Location Technique for Transmission Grids Via Wide-Area Synchronized Voltage Measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(2):1003–1011, May 2012.
- [135] Mert Korkali and Ali Abur. Optimal Deployment of Wide-Area Synchronized Measurements for Fault-Location Observability. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(1):482–489, February 2013.
- [136] Julian Oelhaf, Georg Kordowich, Paula Andrea Pérez-Toro, Tomás Arias-Vergara, Andreas Maier, Johann Jäger, and Siming Bayer. A Systematic Evaluation of Machine Learning Methods for Fault Detection and Line Identification in Electrical Power Grids. In *ICASSP 2025 - 2025 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5, Hyderabad, India, April 2025. IEEE.

- [137] M.N. Uddin, N. Rezaei, and M.S. Arifin. Hybrid Machine Learning-based Intelligent Distance Protection and Control Schemes with Fault and Zonal Classification Capabilities for Grid-connected Wind Farms. In *Conference Record - IAS Annual Meeting (IEEE Industry Applications Society)*, volume 2022, pages 1–8, 2022.
- [138] H.L. Tran. Integration of neural network and distance relay to improve the fault localization on transmission lines. *Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences*, 31(3):566–580, 2023.
- [139] Jithu Raj and Lekshmi R Chandran. Transmission Line Monitoring and Protection with ANN aided Fault Detection, Classification and Location - 2021 2nd International Conference on Smart Electronics and Communication (ICOSEC). In *2021 2nd International Conference on Smart Electronics and Communication (ICOSEC)*, pages 883–889, October 2021.
- [140] M. Najafzadeh, J. Pouladi, A. Daghigh, J. Beiza, and T. Abedinzade. Fault Detection, Classification and Localization Along the Power Grid Line Using Optimized Machine Learning Algorithms. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 17(1), 2024.
- [141] S. Afrasiabi, M. Afrasiabi, M.A. Jarrahi, and M. Mohammadi. Fault Location and Faulty Line Selection in Transmission Networks: Application of Improved Gated Recurrent Unit. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 16(3):5056–5066, 2022.
- [142] A.A. Alrashdan, E.A. Feilat, M.A. Haj-Ahmed, and S.W. Alnaser. Artificial Neural Network-Based Protection Algorithm for Transmission Lines Connecting DFIG-Based Wind Farms. In *4th International Conference on Electrical, Communication and Computer Engineering, ICECCE 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [143] Pallav Kumar Bera, Samita Rani Pani, Can Isik, and Ramesh C. Bansal. A hybrid intelligent system for protection of transmission lines connected to PV farms based on linear trends. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 237:110991, December 2024.
- [144] R.R. Cholla, S. Kakkar, C. Natarajan, C. Gulati, V.K. Dwivedi, and A. Rajput. End-to-End Classification of Transmission Lines in Fault Detection Using SW and Extreme Learning Based Approach. *International Conference on Self Sustainable Artificial Intelligence Systems, ICSSAS 2023 - Proceedings*, pages 262–267, 2023.
- [145] G.J. Meyer, I. Dimopoulos, and J. Jaeger. System-based fault locator based on a pattern recognition approach. In *IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, volume 2020, pages 1–5, 2020.
- [146] S. Prabhakar. Distance protection schemes in distributed generation connected Transmission system combined with machine learning. In *2023 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Smart Technologies for Power, Energy and Control, STPEC 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [147] B. Taheri, S. Salehimehr, and M. Sedighzadeh. A fault-location algorithm for parallel line based on the long short-term memory model using the distributed parameter line model. *International Transactions on Electrical Energy Systems*, 31(11), 2021.
- [148] B. Taheri, S. Salehimehr, and M. Sedighzadeh. A novel strategy for fault location in shunt-compensated double circuit transmission lines equipped by wind farms based on long short-term memory. *Cleaner Engineering and Technology*, 6, 2022.
- [149] R.M. Rizk-Allah, N.I. Elkalashy, I.M. Eldesoky, and A.N. Ayad. Dynamic Shaping Neural Network-Based Fault Location Determination for Power Transmission Lines. In *2023 24th International Middle East Power System Conference, MEPCON 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [150] G.S. Garika and P. Kottala. Condition monitoring of IoT based Wind-SVC Integrated Two Area Power System Network Protection scheme using Neuro-wavelet approach. In *2022 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Energy and Future Electric Transportation, SeFeT 2022*, pages 1–8, 2022.
- [151] M.Z. Yousaf, M.F. Tahir, A. Raza, M.A. Khan, and F. Badshah. Intelligent Sensors for dc Fault Location Scheme Based on Optimized Intelligent Architecture for HVdc Systems. *Sensors*, 22(24), 2022.
- [152] R. Muzzammel and A. Raza. A support vector machine learning-based protection technique for MT-HVDC systems. *Energies*, 13(24), 2020.
- [153] R. Muzzammel, A. Raza, R. Arshad, N. Sobahi, and E.T. Attar. Wavelet multiscale principal components and traveling waves enabled machine learning technique for protection of MT-HVDC systems. *Energy Reports*, 9:4059–4084, 2023.
- [154] A. Imani, Z. Moravej, and M. Pazoki. A novel fault detection, classification and location scheme in non-homogenous MTDC transmission lines. In *2024 18th International Conference on Protection and Automation in Power Systems, IPAPS 2024*, pages 39–45, 2024.
- [155] M. Farshad and M. Karimi. Intelligent Protection of CSC-HVDC Lines Based on Moving Average and Maximum Coordinate Difference Criteria. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 199, 2021.
- [156] N. Tong, Z. Tang, Y. Wang, C.S. Lai, and L.L. Lai. Semi AI-based protection element for MMC-MTDC using local-measurements. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 142, 2022.
- [157] A.J. Gnanamalar, R. Bhavani, A.S. Arulini, and M.S. Veerajju. CNN-SVM Based Fault Detection, Classification and Location of Multi-terminal VSC-HVDC System. *Journal of Electrical Engineering and Technology*, 18(4):3335–3347, 2023.
- [158] S.P. Tiwari. A deep learning-based protection scheme for fault detection and classification in wind integrated HVDC transmission system under dissimilar fault scenarios and uncertain conditions. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 35(24):17929–17940, 2023.
- [159] B. Ren, Y. Luo, N. Zhou, and Q. Wang. Fault location in high-voltage direct-current grids based on panoramic voltage features and vision transformers. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 158, 2024.
- [160] A.S. Alhanaf, M. Farsadi, and H.H. Balik. Fault Detection and Classification in Ring Power System With DG Penetration Using Hybrid CNN-LSTM. *IEEE Access*, 12:59953–59975, 2024.
- [161] Li Rong, Ren Rui, Zheng Kuncheng, Yang Chen, Dong Xiaofeng, Yang Lifan, and Cao Yu. Convolutional Neural Network and Low Current Fault Line Selection - 2023 IEEE Sustainable Power and Energy Conference (iSPEC). In *2023 IEEE Sustainable Power and Energy Conference (iSPEC)*, pages 1–11, November 2023.
- [162] A.S. Alhanaf, H.H. Balik, and M. Farsadi. Intelligent Fault Detection and Classification Schemes for Smart Grids Based on Deep Neural Networks. *Energies*, 16(22), 2023.
- [163] Q. Zhang, W. Ma, G. Li, J. Ding, and M. Xie. Fault diagnosis of power grid based on variational mode decomposition and convolutional neural network. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 208, 2022.
- [164] L.M. Kandasamy and K. Jaganathan. Intelligent protection scheme using combined Stockwell-Transform and deep learning-based fault diagnosis for the active distribution system. *Turkish Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences*, 32(2):234–250, 2024.
- [165] T. Zhang, J. Liu, H. Wang, Y. Li, N. Wang, and C. Kang. Fault diagnosis and protection strategy based on spatio-temporal multi-agent reinforcement learning for active distribution system using phasor measurement units. *Measurement: Journal of the International*

- Measurement Confederation*, 220, 2023.
- [166] Nikolaos Sapountzoglou, Jesus Lago, and Bertrand Raison. Fault diagnosis in low voltage smart distribution grids using gradient boosting trees. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 182:106254, May 2020.
- [167] J.A.R.R. Jayasinghe, J.H.E. Malindi, R.M.A.M. Rajapaksha, V. Logeeshan, and C. Wanigasekara. Classification and Localization of Faults in AC Microgrids Through Discrete Wavelet Transform and Artificial Neural Networks. *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*, 11:303–313, 2024.
- [168] R. Kumari and B.K. Naick. Enhancing protection in AC microgrids: An adaptive approach with ANN and ANFIS models. *Computers and Electrical Engineering*, 115, 2024.
- [169] B.K. Ponukumati, P. Sinha, M.K. Maharana, C. Jenab, A.V. Pavan Kumar, and K. Akkenaguntla. Pattern Recognition Technique Based Fault Detection in Multi-Microgrid. In *IEEE 2nd International Conference on Applied Electromagnetics, Signal Processing, and Communication, AESPC 2021 - Proceedings*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [170] Ali F. Qusayer and S. M. Suhail Hussain. Communication Assisted Protection Scheme Based on Artificial Neural Networks for Multi-Microgrid. *IEEE Access*, 12:24442–24452, 2024.
- [171] S. Miraj, T. Rajeev, V. Vinod, and A. Joseph. An Improved Fault Identification and Location Prediction Method for AC Microgrid. In *2023 International Conference on Control, Communication and Computing, ICCCC 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [172] A. Srivastava, A. Kumar, A. Kumar, S. Sriharsh, S.K. Parida, and H. Priyadarshi. Random Forest based Fault Detection and Localization in Microgrid using Simplified Measurements. In *2023 IEEE IAS Global Conference on Emerging Technologies, GlobConET 2023*, pages 1–6, 2023.
- [173] B.J. Mampilly and V.S. Sheeba. An empirical wavelet transform based fault detection and hybrid convolutional recurrent neural network for fault classification in distribution network integrated power system. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 83(32):77445–77468, 2024.
- [174] R.K. Goli, Y.M. Sree, and G.V. Priya. Neuro-Wavelet Protection Scheme for PV-Wind Energy Source Integrated 6-Terminal Power Network with IoT-Based Smart Environment. *Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series B*, 103(6):2035–2048, 2022.
- [175] Yifei Ding, Minping Jia, Qihua Miao, and Yudong Cao. A novel time–frequency Transformer based on self–attention mechanism and its application in fault diagnosis of rolling bearings. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 168:108616, April 2022.
- [176] Dongyue Chen, Ruonan Liu, Qinghua Hu, and Steven X. Ding. Interaction-Aware Graph Neural Networks for Fault Diagnosis of Complex Industrial Processes. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(9):6015–6028, September 2023.
- [177] Mehdi Jabbari Zideh, Paroma Chatterjee, and Anurag K. Srivastava. Physics-Informed Machine Learning for Data Anomaly Detection, Classification, Localization, and Mitigation: A Review, Challenges, and Path Forward. *IEEE Access*, 12:4597–4617, 2024.
- [178] Andreas K. Maier, Christopher Syben, Bernhard Stimpel, Tobias Würfl, Mathis Hoffmann, Frank Schebesch, Weilin Fu, Leonid Mill, Lasse Kling, and Silke Christiansen. Learning with known operators reduces maximum error bounds. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(8):373–380, August 2019.
- [179] Andreas Maier, Harald Köstler, Marco Heisig, Patrick Krauss, and Seung Hee Yang. Known operator learning and hybrid machine learning in medical imaging—a review of the past, the present, and the future. *Progress in Biomedical Engineering*, 4(2):022002, April 2022.
- [180] Julian Oelhaf, Georg Kordowich, Changhun Kim, Paula Andrea Perez-Toro, Andreas Maier, Johann Jager, and Siming Bayer. Impact of Data Sparsity on Machine Learning for Fault Detection in Power System Protection, 2025. Version Number: 1.
- [181] B.P. Poudel, A. Bidram, M.J. Reno, and A. Summers. Zonal Machine Learning-Based Protection for Distribution Systems. *IEEE Access*, 10:66634–66645, 2022.
- [182] Amin Ghaderi, Herbert L. Ginn, and Hossein Ali Mohammadpour. High impedance fault detection: A review. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 143:376–388, February 2017.
- [183] F. Banihashemi and R.M. Cuzner. Novel XGBoost Classifier Based Relaying Approach with 2 Classes of Protection Zone. In *2023 IEEE Energy Conversion Congress and Exposition, ECCE 2023*, pages 951–956, 2023.
- [184] Ke Zhu, W. K. Lee, and Philip W. T. Pong. Fault-Line Identification of HVDC Transmission Lines by Frequency-Spectrum Correlation Based on Capacitive Coupling and Magnetic Field Sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, 54(11):1–5, November 2018.
- [185] Lili He, Yang Li, Xu Chu, Zhikang Shuai, Yelun Peng, and Z. John Shen. Single-Phase to Ground Fault Line Identification for Medium Voltage Islanded Microgrids With Neutral Ineffectively Grounded Modes. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 13(6):4312–4326, November 2022.
- [186] Anamika Yadav and Yajnaseni Dash. An Overview of Transmission Line Protection by Artificial Neural Network: Fault Detection, Fault Classification, Fault Location, and Fault Direction Discrimination. *Advances in Artificial Neural Systems*, 2014:1–20, December 2014.
- [187] S.U. Khan, M. Shazzad Hossain, and I. Sultan. Machine Learning Based Coordination for IDMT Overcurrent and Earth Fault Relays. In *2023 33rd Australasian Universities Power Engineering Conference, AUPEC 2023*, 2023.

Julian Oelhaf is a PhD student at the Pattern Recognition Lab, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), under the supervision of Dr.-Ing. Siming Bayer and Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Andreas Maier. He began his doctoral studies in 2024 after completing a Master's degree in Computer Science at FAU. His research focuses on ML applications for FD and protection coordination.

Georg Kordowich studied Electrical Energy Technologies at the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU). After completing his Master's Degree in 2021 he started working as a PhD Student at the Institute of Electrical Energy Systems at FAU under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Johann Jäger. His main research focus is the application of ML for FD and protection coordination.

Mehran Pashaei is a Master's student in Medical Engineering at Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), specializing in medical image and data processing. He holds a Bachelor's degree in Electrical and Electronics Engineering from Ege University, Turkey. His interests include robotics and the application of ML in healthcare, with prior experience in AI-driven navigation for autonomous robots.

Christian Bergler received his M.Eng. degree in Information Technology and Automation from Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule (OTH) Amberg-Weiden, Germany, in 2016. He earned his doctorate (Dr.-Ing.) in Computer Science from Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), Germany, in September 2023, graduating with highest distinction (summa cum laude). He is currently a Professor for Artificial Intelligence at OTH Amberg-Weiden, where he teaches and conducts research in deep learning and applied machine learning. In addition, he serves as CEO and co-founder of OrasTEC GmbH, a company specializing in AI-driven software solutions. His research is dedicated to the development of advanced deep learning methodologies, with a particular focus on architecturally and conceptually novel algorithmic frameworks tailored to a diverse set of data-centric and domain-specific applications.

Andreas Maier (M'05–SM'20) received a M.Sc. in computer science from the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), Erlangen, Germany, in 2005, and the Ph.D. degree in computer science from the same institution in 2009. He is currently a Professor and Head of the Pattern Recognition Lab at the University of Erlangen–Nuremberg, where he has been a faculty member since 2015. His research interests include medical imaging, image and audio processing, digital humanities, and interpretable ML. Prof. Maier has developed significant tools in medical signal processing, such as the PEAKS online speech intelligibility assessment tool, and has contributed to over 4,000 patient and control subject analyses. He has received numerous awards, including an ERC Synergy Grant for “4D Nanoscope”.

Johann Jäger received the Dipl.-Ing. and Dr.-Ing. degrees in electrical engineering from Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), Erlangen, Germany, in 1990 and 1996, respectively. From 1996, he was with Power System Planning Department, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany. He was working on different fields of FACTS devices, network planning and protection systems in worldwide projects. Since 2004, he is in charge of a Full Professorship for Electrical Power Systems with the FAU University Erlangen-Nürnberg. He is author of numerous publications and books as well as inventor of several patents.

Siming Bayer received her Dr.-Ing. in Computer Science from Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU) in 2022, where she developed ML algorithms for vascular structure registration in collaboration with Siemens Healthineers. She also holds an M.Sc. in Biomedical Engineering from FAU. She is currently a Research Scientist at FAU, leading the “Data Processing for Utility Infrastructure” group at the Pattern Recognition Lab, and a Strategic Research & Collaboration Manager at Siemens Healthineers, focusing on cross-business research in digital health. Her research interests include ML for medical imaging, industrial data processing, and innovation management in healthcare and utility infrastructures.

A. Supplementary information

A.1. Review Tables

Table S.1: Comparison of Recently Proposed ML-Based Approaches for Fault Detection.

Author	Description
Bakkar et al. [40] (2022)	<p>Focus: AI-based protection for distribution systems with high MG penetration</p> <p>Data: Simulation in PowerFactory and lab data from a scaled smart grid; 5000 fault cases with varying DG, fault types, and resistances; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Two ANN-based controllers (central and backup), trained with Levenberg–Marquardt algorithm</p> <p>Result: Fast tripping 10 ms; robust to varying DG penetration, fault types, fault locations, transformer configurations, and fault resistances; tolerant to communication issues</p>
Çelik et al. [41] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD under disturbances and HIFs in ADNs</p> <p>Data: Simulation in PowerFactory and Simulink, based on a real 20 kV network; 1200 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain I</p> <p>Method: Deep GMDH ANN</p> <p>Result: FD within 20 ms; MAPE of 3.51%</p>
Diefenthaler et al. [42] (2023)	<p>Focus: HIF detection in MV DGs using image-based ML</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a real MV grid in the Basque Country; 100 labeled RMS current images; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN on RMS current images</p> <p>Result: 96 % accuracy</p>
Galkin et al. [50] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD of transformer excitation phenomena</p> <p>Data: Simulink model of a real substation in Älvkarleby, Sweden; 1280 samples at 2 kHz; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN</p> <p>Result: 92 % precision</p>
Kordowich et al. [46] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD protection for transmission lines using centralized and decentralized agents</p> <p>Data: 30 000 simulated short circuits in PowerFactory; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Deep recurrent Q-learning with gated recurrent unit (GRU)-based ANN and teacher-student training</p> <p>Result: 100 % fault clearance; selective tripping with delays between 0.03 s and 0.1 s, 0 % false trips by student agents</p>
Kumar et al. [48] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD for transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Real voltage signals of 800 000 samples over 20 ms from 50 Hz power lines, labeled for partial discharge detection; $f_s = 40$ MHz; simulation software unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM-CNN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 95.7 %</p>
Lin et al. [44] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD in distribution systems with varying penetration levels of DER</p> <p>Data: Simulation using GridLAB-D on IEEE 123-bus system; 297 500 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain I, P, Q</p> <p>Method: SVDD, iSVDD, HISVDD</p> <p>Result: SVDD reduces mal-operations to 1.2 % with 0 % miss-trips under high DER penetration</p>
Moloi et al. [45] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD in radial LV distribution systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 3-phase, 16-bus radial distribution network; sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform I</p> <p>Method: ANN trained on statistical features extracted from fault current signals</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 97.1 %; faulted phase identification accuracy 95.8 %</p>
Nieminen et al. [43] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD of SC and EF events in distribution networks</p> <p>Data: 181 real COMTRADE event recordings (73 normal, 89 EF, 19 SC) from the Finnish grid; simulation software & f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform I</p> <p>Method: CNN</p> <p>Result: 100 % accuracy for SC and 97.9 % for EF</p>

Author	Description
Rezaei et al. [51] (2020)	<p>Focus: Differential-based protection relay (DBPR) scheme enhanced by ML to protect the intertie zone of large-scale centralized DFIG-based wind farms</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation and real-time testing on FPGA; internal/external faults under varying wind conditions; sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM classifier integrated with DBPR</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 97.5 %; no false trips during external faults or wind fluctuations; validated in simulation and FPGA tests</p>
Wu et al. [47] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and protective relay coordination in radial distribution system</p> <p>Data: Simulation of the IEEE 34-bus test system using OpenDSS; 5000 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Nested RL framework enhanced with LSTM</p> <p>Result: RL-based relays showed 0.38 % missed detections and 1.28 % coordination failures.</p>
Yousaf et al. [52] (2023)	<p>Focus: Single-ended FD in MT-HVDC grids</p> <p>Data: Simulations of 3477 DC transmission line faults under varying fault impedances; simulation software & f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Stationary wavelet transform for feature extraction; Random Search-optimized ANN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 98.13 % (20 to 45 dB noise); minimum trip time 0.9 ms</p>

Table S.2: Comparison of Recently Proposed ML-Based Approaches for Islanding Detection.

Author	Description
Abdelsalam et al. [53] (2020)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in inverter-based MGs</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a custom 0.4 kV MG with inverter-based wind DGs; laboratory validation on wind- and PV-based DG testbed; number of samples unspecified; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DFT-based extraction of 2nd-harmonic seq. comps. (V/I: pos., neg., zero); classification via LSTM</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.5 %; dependability 99.3 %; avg. detection time 6 ms</p>
Admasie et al. [54] (2020)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in grid-connected MGs with multiple DGs</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a custom 25 kV MG with inverter- and synchronous-based DGs; sample size not specified; $f_s = 3.84$ kHz; signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: IMF-based statistical feature extraction; classification via ANN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.5 %, precision 99.5 %</p>
Ali et al. [66] (2021)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in hierarchical MGs with IoT-based cloud ML</p> <p>Data: Simulink on modified IEEE-13 bus MG (4.16 kV) with four inverter-based DGs; real-time lab validation; samples and f_s not specified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN classifier integrated into 3-layer IoT control framework</p> <p>Result: Detection time <2 s; NDZ = none; IEEE 1547 compliant; THD 2.36 % (with IoT)</p>
Allan and Morsi [60] (2021)	<p>Focus: Passive islanding detection in PV-based grid-connected systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a custom 120 kV PV system; 5770 samples; $f_s = 3.84$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: CWT-based time–frequency representation; classification via CNN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 97.8–98.6 %; precision 95 %; recall 99 %; F1-score 97 %</p>
Baghaee et al. [55] (2020)	<p>Focus: Anti-islanding protection of PV-MGs with PHEV charging</p> <p>Data: Simulink model of a 0.4 kV, 20 kW PV plant (Bosnia); experimental PCC data via IED; sample size not specified; 8-sample (40 ms) stacks; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM with Gaussian kernel; 5 ms FIFO sampling; discrimination of islanding vs. PHEV charging; vs. other AI methods</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 %; DT \approx40 ms; NDZ \approx9.5 %; UL1741 compliant</p>

Author	Description
Baghaee et al. [56] (2020)	<p>Focus: Islanding and grid fault detection in PV-based active DNIs</p> <p>Data: Simulink with real PV plant parameters; sample size not specified; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: SVM with kernel dimension grouping; discrimination of islanding vs. grid faults; vs. passive/active methods</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 %; reduced NDZ and DT; robust against grid faults</p>
Choudhury et al. [57] (2021)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection of PV-based MGs</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a PV-based MG (0.5 kV); 1035 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: Empirical mode decomposition for feature extraction; classification via DT</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 97.4 % (noiseless); 91 % (SNR = 20 dB)</p>
David et al. [63] (2024)	<p>Focus: End-to-end islanding detection in PV-based MGs under noisy conditions</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a modified IEEE 13-bus MG; 2000 voltage samples; $f_s = 200$ kHz; signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: Time Series Transformer (TST), LSTM, and InceptionTime models</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 98.3 %; precision 96.6 %; recall 100 %</p>
Ezzat et al. [67] (2021)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in MGs</p> <p>Data: Simulink with lab validation on a custom 0.4 kV MG including PV/wind DGs; events: breaker opening, 3P/1P faults, P/Q mismatch, simultaneous; sample size not specified; $f_s = 6.4$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/II</p> <p>Method: Fourier transform features; KNN; vs. DT, SVM, LR, ensemble</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.2–99.8 % (20–40 dB noise); dependability 100 %; security 99.7 %; detection time 5–15 ms</p>
Hussain et al. [62] (2022)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in multi-DG systems with zero NDZ</p> <p>Data: Simulink on IEC 61850-7-420 system (25 kV); 3159 samples; $f_s = 3.84$ kHz; events: islanding + non-islanding (faults/switching); signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: STFT features; deep CNN; 5-fold CV</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 % (noiseless), 97–99.5 % (30–40 dB); zero NDZ</p>
Hussain et al. [69] (2023)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection and non-islanding disturbance classification in multi-DG systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink on IEC 61850-7-420 system; 1740 samples; $f_s = 3.84$ kHz; events: islanding, faults, load/capacitor switching; ; signal type: waveform V/II</p> <p>Method: Statistical Feature-based Deep Neural Network (S-DNN) with statistical features from PCC V; vs. DT, MLP, SVM, LSTM</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.8 %; precision 99.7 %; recall 100 %; F1 99.9 %; robust at 30–40 dB</p>
Hussain et al. [70] (2024)	<p>Focus: Communication-less islanding detection in hybrid DG systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink on IEC 61850-7-420 hybrid system with sync. + inverter DGs; 3159 samples; events: islanding, faults, load/capacitor switching; signal type: waveform V</p> <p>Method: Time-domain features (13) from PCC V; wrapper selection; RNN/LSTM; vs. ANN, SVM</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.7 %; F1 99.7 %; selectivity 99.4 %; sensitivity 100 %; robust at 30–40 dB; DT 72 ms</p>
Najar et al. [58] (2020)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in grid-connected MGs with PV, wind, and load variability</p> <p>Data: PowerFactory simulations on a custom MG; 11 264 samples; $f_s = 3.2$ kHz; signal type: V/II sequence components</p> <p>Method: DWT-based feature extraction; classification via DNN (TensorFlow)</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.9 %, dependability 99.6 %</p>
Nsaif et al. [59] (2023)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection for PV-based DGs in distribution grids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a modified Malaysian distribution grid; 2048 samples; $f_s = 400$ kHz; signal type: V sequence components + power signals at PCC</p> <p>Method: Variational mode decomposition for IMF extraction; classification via Ensemble Bagged Trees Model</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 %; NDZ <4 %; detection time 4.8 ms</p>
Özcanli and Baysal [64] (2022)	<p>Focus: Islanding detection in modified MGs</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on modified AEP/CERTS MG; 2800 samples; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: V/II harmonic distortion at PCC</p> <p>Method: Multi-LSTM classifier; compared with other intelligent IDMs</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.3 % (avg.); 97.9 % for ± 0.5 % power mismatch; detection time 50 ms</p>

Author	Description
Özcanli and Baysal [65] (2022)	Focus: Islanding detection in modified MGs Data: Simulink simulations on modified CERTS MG; 4000 cases; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: V/I harmonics at PCC Method: 1D-CNN and hybrid CNN-LSTM; compared with 2D-CNN Result: Accuracy up to 100 % (avg. 99.7 %); robust to low NDZ and topology changes
Reddy et al. [61] (2021)	Focus: Islanding detection in integrated DG systems Data: Simulink simulations on an DG system; 258 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I Method: CWT-based scalogram generation; classification via CNN; compared with ANN and fuzzy logic Result: Accuracy 95.4 %
Saifi et al. [68] (2023)	Focus: Islanding classification in hybrid MGs Data: Typhoon HIL simulations on a hybrid MG (13.8 kV) with PV, wind, diesel, and battery; 31 251 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I Method: MLP classifier trained on islanding and grid fault scenarios Result: Accuracy 99.5 %; classification speed 170k obs/s

Table S.3: Comparison of Recently Proposed ML-Based Approaches for Fault Classification

Author	Description
Alsaba et al. [119] (2022)	Focus: FD and FC in 20 kV MG Data: Simulink simulation on CIGRE 14-bus; 644 samples at 1.6 kHz; signal type: waveform I Method: CNN-GRU Result: Accuracy of 87.72 %
Aryan et al. [114] (2022)	Focus: FD and FC in a simulated MG Data: Simulink simulation of RMS signals from 4.16 kV MG; sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I Method: RBFNN Result: Accuracy of 82 %
Ashtiani et al. [111] (2024)	Focus: FD and FC for current-only ML-based relays Data: Simulink simulation of wind turbine distributed generators; 1200 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform I Method: KNN, RF, DT Result: Accuracy of 93 % (KNN), 92 % (RF), 90 % (DT)
Balan et al. [104] (2023)	Focus: FD and fault diagnosis in transformers using sensor data and ML Data: 4381 real-world samples collected via IoT sensors at 15 min intervals; simulation software & f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I Method: DT, RF, XGBoost, AdaBoost, Logistic Regression, KNN, SVM Result: Best performance: 98.79 % (DT), 98.36 % (RF); others >94 %
Buscarioli et al. [106] (2023)	Focus: Islanding detection in distribution systems with PV-based DG Data: Simulink simulation of UFABC network; 583 scenarios; sampling rate up to 128 samples/cycle; signal type: waveform V/I Method: MLP, ANN Result: 100 % accuracy; detection time between 0.06 s and 0.08 s
Cano et al. [118] (2024)	Focus: FD and FC in renewable MGs with PV, HKT, and variable loads under varying fault resistance Data: Simulink simulations on IEEE-5 bus microgrid testbed; 144 fault cases; $f_s \approx 2.5$ Hz; signal type: waveform V/I Method: DWT feature extraction; classification via RBFNN; compared with general regression NN, probabilistic neural network, FFNN, RNN, nonlinear autoregressive with external input, CNN, SVM, and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system Result: RBFNN achieved $MSE = 1.31 \times 10^{-31}$, $R^2 = 0.99998$; trained in 1.63 s, converged in 100 epochs; robust across 12 fault types and ground resistances up to 100 ohm

Author	Description
Chhetija et al. [108] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in islanded microgrids with IIDGs, using local voltage-based features</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of modified CIGRE LV microgrid; 16 038 cases, with fault variations across load levels, locations, and inception angles; f_s; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: Modified voltage-based transient magnitude factor and extremely randomized trees (EBT) classifier using fixed window</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.5 %; response time 10 ms</p>
Devi et al. [77] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a 55 Km short transmission line; 2400 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform I</p> <p>Method: LSTM</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy of 99.58 %, FC accuracy of 94.17 %</p>
Dhingra et al. [79] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a power system with 4 generators, transformers, and faults at the midpoint of the transmission line; sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: QDA</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy of 99.15 %, AUC score of 99.95 %</p>
Fahim et al. [81] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD and FC for HV transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on IEEE 39-bus system; 16 000 samples; $f_s = 10$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: Self-attention CNN using GAF-based time-series imaging and DWT preprocessing</p> <p>Result: Nearly 100 % accuracy across all fault types</p>
Guama et al. [90] (2021)	<p>Focus: FC for transmission line protection</p> <p>Data: 8000 samples from PowerFactory and real 230 kV substation faults; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Two-stage Self-Organizing Map</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99 % (stage 1), 96 % (stage 2)</p>
Han et al. [91] (2021)	<p>Focus: Faulted-phase classification in HV transmission systems</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulation on IEEE 39-bus system; $f_s = 10$ kHz; sample size unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Gradient similarity-based classification</p> <p>Result: Outperforms ANN and symmetrical component-based methods under noise and high-impedance faults</p>
Haq et al. [78] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD and FC for transmission line protection</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation with 31 680 three-phase current signals; custom topology; $f_s = 20$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: Double-channel Extreme Learning Machine</p> <p>Result: Accuracy >99 %; FD time 0.12 s</p>
Harish et al. [82] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC for transmission line protection</p> <p>Data: PowerWorld simulation of IEEE-39 bus (345 kV); 24 654 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Stacked autoencoder (SAE), ML-ELM</p> <p>Result: ML-ELM: 100 % FD, 99.92 % FC in 29 ms; SAE: 100 % FD, 97.99 % FC in 91 ms</p>
Jones et al. [110] (2021)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in distribution network relays</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on IEEE 123-bus system; 20 000 samples; 20 kHz sampling rate; signal type: unspecified V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 % (FC), 89 % (location)</p>
Kabeel et al. [121] (2022)	<p>Focus: Centralized protection of MGs using FD and FLI</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of IEEE 9-bus system; 3×10^6 samples across MG modes and topologies; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN</p> <p>Result: 99.0 % accuracy, consistent across different RES levels</p>

Author	Description
Khan et al. [187] (2023)	<p>Focus: ML-based coordination of IDMT overcurrent and earth fault relays</p> <p>Data: Synthetic dataset with 425 samples from a 132/33/11 kV substation scenario; 7 features incl. fault type, current, voltage, CT ratio, pickup setting; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Regression models (LR, DT, RF, SVR, GB); Gradient Boosting best</p> <p>Result: $R^2 = 97\%$, CV score: 86.2 % (GB); lowest MAE and MSE</p>
Kumar et al. [80] (2022)	<p>Focus: FC in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Public Kaggle dataset; 7861 samples; no simulation platform used & f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN, ANN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy for both models approximately 80 %</p>
Li et al. [92] (2024)	<p>Focus: Fault analysis and FD for UHVDC transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Dataset of alarm information set of the Sunan ± 800 kV UHV project in Jinping; 110 000 samples; no simulation platform used & f_s unspecified; signal type: alarm text</p> <p>Method: Con-Att-BiLSTM with adversarial training</p> <p>Result: F1 score of 96.81 %</p>
Liang et al. [93] (2023)	<p>Focus: FC in HVAC/HVDC systems with MMC stations</p> <p>Data: PSCAD (IEEE 39-bus) and RTDS data from 100 Km MMC-HVDC line; 3272 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: CA-CNN on current trajectory images with data augmentation</p> <p>Result: 100 % accuracy; robust to 0.5 ms delay and CT saturation</p>
Mana et al. [117] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC of SLG faults in unbalanced islanded microgrids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of modified IEEE 13-bus microgrid with diesel and inverter-based DERs; 499 scenarios; $f_s = 1$ MHz; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform I</p> <p>Method: Multi-resolution analysis with 8-level DWT; feature extraction using Shannon entropy and energy ratio; polynomial-kernel SVM</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 99 % (combined features); 96 % (entropy only)</p>
Massaoudi et al. [83] (2023)	<p>Focus: Short-term voltage stability (STVS) detection and FC in transmission networks</p> <p>Data: PSSE simulation of IEEE 39-bus system with CLOD model; 3753 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain $V/P/Q$</p> <p>Method: Feature selection and optimization with MLP, KNN, SVM, NB</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 98.0 % (STVS), 91.5 % (FC); precision, recall, and $F1$ reported</p>
Mehdi et al. [94] (2023)	<p>Focus: FC of AC faults in hybrid HVAC/HVDC transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on 200 km hybrid AC/DC two-line system; 1210 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: Squaring, lowpass filtering, and transient energy extraction; ANN-based classifier</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.3 % under noise-free conditions; 93.6 %–96.9 % across 10 to 40 dB SNR</p>
Merlin et al. [95] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in VSC- and CSC-based HVDC transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of HVDC network under various fault types and locations; 3000 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I and DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Frequency-domain voltage signal analysis with ANN-based detection and classification</p> <p>Result: 100 % FD accuracy in 4.9 ms; 97.2 % FC accuracy in 9.76 ms</p>
Mohanty et al. [84] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in series-compensated transmission lines</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulation of 400 kV, 300 Km two-area system with TCSC; 3600 samples; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DT trained on one-cycle post-fault current and voltage</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 97.5 to 98.7 % across fault types, locations, and resistances</p>
Moloi et al. [87] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in transmission lines of a South African utility network</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of 132 kV network with 3 lines and 4 loads; 42 000 samples; $f_s = 10$ kHz; signal type: waveform sI</p> <p>Method: DWT-based energy and entropy features; BP-ANN optimized with PSO</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.0 % (with PSO), 92.6 % (without); precision and recall > 96 % for all types of faults</p>

Author	Description
Moloi and Davidson [107] (2022)	<p>Focus: HIF detection in radial distribution networks</p> <p>Data: PowerFactory simulation of a 132 kV/22 kV Eskom feeder network with 3 feeders; 4000 samples; $f_s = 12.5$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT feature extraction (db4), statistical energy/entropy features, GA-optimized SVM; DT and ANN for comparison</p> <p>Result: SVM achieved 97.6 % accuracy (simulated), 87.0 % (experimental); lowest classification time: 0.90 ms</p>
Muntasir et al. [88] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in HVAC transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a 132 kV, 1 km line using real data from a 50 MW plant in Bangladesh; 6804 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: unspecified V/I</p> <p>Method: Hybrid sampling, label encoding, and MinMax scaling; DT, RF, SVM, KNN, XGBoost, CatBoost, MLP, and ANN</p> <p>Result: 100 % accuracy for tree/boosting models; execution time per instance: 11.2 ms (DT), 126.7 ms (XGBoost)</p>
Muzzammel et al. [96] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in two-terminal VSC-HVDC transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of 100 km bipolar VSC-HVDC system; pre- and post-fault TW voltage data; sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: BML for frequency-domain features; logistic regression for binary classification</p> <p>Result: Fault classification in as low as 2.17 ms; no accuracy, F1-score, or related metrics reported</p>
Myint et al. [89] (2024)	<p>Focus: FC and phase identification in transmission systems with railway traction loads</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on modified IEEE 9-bus system with traction load; 1188 scenarios; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT (db6, 3-level) for modal current TW features; ANN trained via Bayesian backpropagation</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 96.1 % in FC, including phase identification</p>
Ojetola et al. [115] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in low-voltage DC microgrids</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulation on 750 V microgrid (2 400 000 points); real data from ETL-KAFB testbed (4 000 000 points); downsampled to 10 μs; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM, NB, DT, nearest centroid (NC), MLP; binary FD and 5-class FC; trained on simulation, tested on real data</p> <p>Result: SVM, NC, MLP reached 99 % in FC; only MLP achieved 100 % in fault resistance classification</p>
Patnaik et al. [116] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD, fault type, and resistance classification in low-voltage DC microgrids</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulation of 750 V DC microgrid; real fault data from Kirtland AFB; 1585 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM, NC, MLP, DT, NB; binary FD, multi-class FC (type and resistance)</p> <p>Result: SVM, NC, MLP achieved 99 % in fault type classification; only MLP reached 99 % in fault resistance classification</p>
Pragati et al. [97] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and multi-stage FC in MT-VSC-HVDC systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of four-terminal 230 kV HVDC grid; 17 056 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Bayesian-optimized DT ensembles (AdaBoost, random under-sampling boosting (RUSBoost)); 3-class FD, followed by 4-class FC for internal DC faults</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy 99.9 % (internal vs. external faults); internal DC fault FC accuracy 99.3 % across 4 fault types</p>
Pragati et al. [98] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in MT-VSC-HVDC systems; FC aims to identify the faulted pole(s) (positive, negative, both, or none); signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of 4-terminal 100 kV symmetrical monopolar HVDC grid; 3744 fault and 13 312 non-fault samples; $f_s = 3.2$ kHz</p> <p>Method: Stockwell transform + bidirectional GRU-RNN for 3-class FD; TKEO-based 4-class FC to identify faulted pole(s)</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy 99.92 % (clean), 99.02 % (20 dB); FC (phase ID) achieved 100 % accuracy across all noise levels</p>
Prasad et al. [120] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and faulty section identification in reconfigurable DC microgrids with RES</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of PV and wind-based DERs; 8930 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: V/I</p> <p>Method: Communication-free CNN-based protection scheme</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.26 %; 98.8 %–98.91 % for DER disconnection; response time <2 ms</p>

Author	Description
Ramadoss et al. [112] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC of loss of excitation (LOE) in synchronous generators under power swing condition (PSC)</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of SMIB system; 98 378 samples across CLOE, PLOE, PSC, and normal conditions; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V</p> <p>Method: Hotelling's T^2 for FD; binary SVM for FC of LOE vs. non-LOE (normal/PSC)</p> <p>Result: FD time 5.31 s; FC accuracy 96.6 %, dependability 96.2 %, AUC = 0.985</p>
Ramana et al. [85] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in TCSC-compensated transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of 400 kV, 320 km line with TCSC; 15 000 fault cases; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: waveform I</p> <p>Method: fast discrete S-transform (FDST) feature extraction from 5-cycle current windows; ensemble bagging for binary FD and 10-class FC</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy 100 %, FC accuracy 99.99 %; response time 3 to 8 ms</p>
Sadiq et al. [113] (2024)	<p>Focus: FC of parametric faults in passive components of Zeta converters for predictive maintenance in PV-integrated smart grids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a 48 V DC microgrid with PV input and Zeta converter; 1500 samples under 3 operating conditions; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Multi-class SVM (OvR), KNN, and DT; classification into 5 classes (healthy, L1, L2, C1, C2 degradation)</p> <p>Result: Quadratic SVM achieved highest accuracy 99.2 %, F1 score 95.5 %, outperforming other ML methods</p>
Swetapadma et al. [99] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FC of internal vs. external faults near converters in bipolar LCC-HVDC systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of bipolar LCC-HVDC link with filters and reactors; 10 000 samples; $f_s = 5$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Voltage-difference-based features; binary FC using LSTM, RF, and ANN</p> <p>Result: LSTM achieved 100 % accuracy with response time <0.5 ms; robust under varying system conditions</p>
Tsotsopoulou et al. [100] (2023)	<p>Focus: Centralized FD and FC in MT-HVDC with superconducting cables</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of MT-HVDC grid with MMCs and SCs; 1800 samples; $f_s = 20$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: XGBoost on local voltage/current; no communication needed</p> <p>Result: $F_1 = 98$ %; operation time 0.08 to 1.23 ms; noise robust</p>
Uddin et al. [86] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on benchmark TL model (IEC standard); 4950 samples; $f_s = 20$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT feature extraction; SVM tuned via GridSearchCV</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.46 %; response time 1.99 ms; 96.11 % accuracy at 2 kHz; robust under varying fault and source conditions</p>
Wang et al. [109] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD and FC of HIFs in radial distribution systems for enhanced electrical safety</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation with improved HIF model on radial system; 60 000 samples; $f_s = 7680$ Hz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: PCQ-WT feature extraction with modified Gabor wavelets; compact CNN-based classifier</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.95 %; detection delay 33 ms + processing time 6.3 ms</p>
Wang et al. [105] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD of abnormal transformer-user topologies in three-phase distribution systems</p> <p>Data: Real voltage data from 3 substations; 14 000 samples; 50 Hz sampling; 128-point window; no simulation platform used; signal type: phasor domain V</p> <p>Method: ResNet-18 with data augmentation; binary FC</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 96.8 %, F1-score 96.1 %, AUC 98.0 %</p>
Wong et al. [101] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in hybrid HVAC-HVDC transmission systems using TW-based signals</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of bipolar hybrid HVAC-HVDC grid with rectifying VSCs; 116 fault scenarios; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: TW feature extraction (voltage, current, real and reactive power); pattern-recognition ANN for binary FD and FC</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 96.25 %; recall 96.29 %, precision 92.86 %</p>

Author	Description
Xiang et al. [102] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD and pole-specific FC for DC line and bus faults in MMC-based HVDC grids</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulation on 4-terminal symmetrical monopole MMC-HVDC grid; 816 samples; $f_s = 10$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: 1-level DWT on transient voltages; 5-output ANN for FC (PTP, P-PTG, N-PTG, DC line, DC bus)</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 100 % up to 350 ohm fault resistance; 94 % at 400 ohm; 78 % at 500 ohm; detection delay <2.5 ms</p>
Yousaf et al. [49] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FC in MT-HVDC grids using single-ended ANN-based main and backup protection with BO-optimized hyperparameters</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulation on 4-terminal ± 320 kV MMC-MT-HVDC mesh; 1260 training and 486 test samples; fault resistances up to 500 ohm, 20–45 dB noise; $f_s = 50$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT-based MRA and Parseval's theorem for feature extraction; 3-layer FFNN; BO with GP and Expected Improvement to optimize learning rate, neurons, epochs</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.38 % (main) and 100.0 % (backup); robust to 465 ohm faults and 20 dB noise; 5× faster training than grid/random search</p>
Yousaf et al. [103] (2023)	<p>Focus: DL-based FD and FC for DC transmission lines in MT-HVDC grids</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulation of custom 320 kV 4-terminal MT-HVDC mesh; 1892 samples; $f_s = 50$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: LSTM with DWT; communication-free design</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 98.6 %, robust to noise</p>

Table S.4: Comparison of Recently Proposed ML-Based Approaches for Fault Localization.

Author	Description
Afrasiabi et al. [141] (2022)	<p>Focus: FL and FLI in transmission systems using WAMS under noisy conditions</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on IEEE 68-bus system (44 000 samples) and 145-bus system (61 000 samples); f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Improved gated recurrent neural network (IGRNN)</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 98 % (68-bus) and 96 % (145-bus); average runtime of 2.64 ms</p>
Alhanaf et al. [160] (2024)	<p>Focus: FC, FLI, and FL in ring power systems with varying DG penetration and topology</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on IEEE 6-bus (115 220 samples) and 9-bus (51 840) systems with diverse fault types, locations, and resistances; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN, LSTM, and hybrid CNN-LSTM</p> <p>Result: Hybrid model achieved up to 99.97% (FC), 99.71% (FLI), and 97.25% (FL) accuracy on 6-bus; slightly lower on 9-bus</p>
Alhanaf et al. [162] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in smart grids using deep learning</p> <p>Data: Simulink on IEEE 6-bus system; 249 030 voltage and current samples; $f_s = 2.5$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN and 1D-CNN</p> <p>Result: Up to 99.99 % for FD and FC; FL accuracy lower (min 96.85 %)</p>
Alilouch et al. [76] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL for a single 400 kV, 100 km transmission line</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations with various types, resistances, and locations; sample size and f_s not reported; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN</p> <p>Result: No evaluation metrics reported</p>
Alrashdan et al. [142] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in DFIG-based 220 kV transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation; 18 360 samples; $f_s = 1.92$ kHz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN and DWT</p> <p>Result: 99.6 % accuracy for FC, 98.3 % for fault area classification</p>

Author	Description
Banihashemi and Cuzner [183] (2023)	<p>Focus: Fault area classification and zone discrimination in MG ring networks</p> <p>Data: Typhoon HIL simulation of 13.8 kV 2-bus MG with synchronous generator and PV (240 samples); $f_s = 6$ kHz; multi-class dataset across load and PV scenarios; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: XGBoost classifier with 4 protection zones; evaluated with and without communication</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 93.82 % (2 cycles); robust primary/backup zone discrimination and reduced fault clearance time</p>
Bera et al. [143] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in single-ended 230 kV transmission line in the zone between the grid and the PV farm</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulations on IEEE 9-bus system with PV farm at bus-9 (28 800 samples); $f_s = 7680$ Hz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DT, RF, SVM, KNN, and NB</p> <p>Result: Using RF balanced accuracy of 98.2 % for FD, 92.3 % for FL, 97.2 % for phase selection</p>
Cholla et al. [144] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD and FL in transmission lines using lightweight learning models</p> <p>Data: Single transmission line; no details provided on simulation software, sample size, or sampling rate; signal type: unspecified V/I</p> <p>Method: ELM and summation wavelet extreme learning machine</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 99.4 %</p>
Farshad et al. [155] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD and FC of internal and external SC faults in CSC-HVDC systems</p> <p>Data: EMTDC and Simulink simulations based on CIGRE bipolar HVDC model; 7863 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Multiclass SVM using features from moving average and max coordinate difference</p> <p>Result: Average FD time up to 10.7 ms; external fault detection accuracy 99.375 %</p>
Garika et al. [150] (2022)	<p>Focus: Fault analysis and condition monitoring in IoT-enabled wind-SVM integrated HV networks</p> <p>Data: 55 training and 9 testing samples per zone; $f_s = 264$ kHz; no simulation tool specified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN using wavelet features (bior1.5)</p> <p>Result: No quantitative performance metrics reported</p>
Gnanamalar et al. [157] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in multi-terminal VSC-HVDC systems for offshore wind integration</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation; 335 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Hybrid CNN-SVM model with Hilbert–Huang transform feature extraction; compared with SVM, ANN, and RNN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.87 %; FD, FC, and FL completed within 2 ms</p>
Goli et al. [174] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD and FL in a 6-terminal hybrid PV-Wind MG using neuro-wavelet protection</p> <p>Data: 21 600 samples; $f_s = 216$ kHz; simulation software not reported; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN with bior1.5 wavelet feature extraction</p> <p>Result: Fault location error within -3.97 to 3.68 %</p>
Hassan et al. [75] (2024)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation on IEEE 9-bus system; 20 760 samples; sampling rate not reported; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Optimizable Weighted Extreme Learning Machine</p> <p>Result: 99.83 % classification accuracy; 95.8 % localization accuracy</p>
Imani et al. [154] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in multi-terminal direct current (MTDC) transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a 4-terminal MMC–HVDC grid; 1212 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Maximal overlap discrete WT-based feature extraction; classification using rate of change of voltage and general regression NN</p> <p>Result: FD up to 200 ohm; FL error of 0.319 %; FC accuracy ≥ 94 %</p>
Jayasinghe et al. [167] (2024)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in low-voltage microgrids</p> <p>Data: Simulink and EMTDC simulations on 400 V AC microgrid (3-line system, University of Moratuwa); sample size & f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT feature extraction; ANN models for FC and FL</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.39 %; decision time < 72.5 ms; FL $R^2 = 0.866$</p>

Author	Description
Kandasamy et al. [164] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in active distribution networks</p> <p>Data: EMTP-RV/Simulink simulations on modified IEEE 13- and 34-bus ADNs; 51 158 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: DOST-based preprocessing; adaptive fault diagnosis (AFDD)-CNN optimized via multi-objective firefly algorithm; comparison with MLP baseline</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 99.74 % (FD), 99.69 % (FC), and 99.58 % (FL); fault location error between 0.6 to 2 % at 1000 ohm</p>
Kumari et al. [168] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in AC microgrids under grid-connected and islanded operation modes</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 10-bus AC microgrid with DG, PV, and variable fault resistances (2 442 000 samples); f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: ANN</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 98.82 %; FL 97.4 %; feeder isolation 92.3 %; robust to 300 ohm faults and 20 dB noise</p>
Mampilly et al. [173] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in hybrid RES-based microgrids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of IEEE 13-bus system; 44 000 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: EWT feature extraction; POA-optimized hybrid HC-RNN</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 99.97 %; outperformed 13 state-of-the-art methods; +1.56 % over SVM</p>
Meyer et al. [145] (2020)	<p>Focus: FL in transmission networks with incomplete distance protection (DP) coverage</p> <p>Data: PSS NETOMAC simulations on modified IEEE 9-bus system; 9800 three-phase fault scenarios with varying fault resistances; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Feedforward ANN trained on patterns from 14 DP relays</p> <p>Result: FL accuracy ≥ 95.1 % across all lines and resistances; 98.6 % for unmonitored line sections</p>
Miraj et al. [171] (2023)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in meshed AC microgrids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 9-bus AC microgrid with 6 line sections (6480 samples); f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM for FC and SVM for FL</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 98.99 %; FL $RMSE = 0.0081$; training time under 94 s</p>
Muzzammel et al. [152] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in MT-HVDC transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 4-terminal MT-HVDC grid; 81 001 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: PCA-based feature reduction followed by SVM for FD, FC, and FL</p> <p>Result: Accurate FD, FC, and FL within 0.15 ms; FL classification accuracy 100 %</p>
Muzzammel et al. [153] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in MT-HVDC transmission systems</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 4-terminal MT-HVDC grid; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Traveling wave and wavelet-based feature extraction with multiscale PCA; classification and localization via SVM</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.3 %; FL accuracy 98.4 %; total protection time 4 ms</p>
N et al. [139] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in transmission lines</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a single 132 kV, 100 km transmission line; 1200 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: MLP trained on raw current and voltage signals for all tasks</p> <p>Result: FD accuracy 100 %; FC accuracy 53.3 %; FL regression $R \approx 0.99$</p>
Najafzadeh et al. [140] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in HV transmission systems using PMU-based measurements</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on a 735 kV transmission line; 1100 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: WHO-optimized RF, DT, and (ANFIS); fuzzy logic for thresholding</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 100 % (RF), 98.1 % (DT); FL error < 153.6 m; robust under 10 dB noise</p>
Ponukumati et al. [169] (2021)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in multi-MG systems with RES integration</p> <p>Data: Simulations on multi-MG testbed with PV, wind, and battery; modified IEEE 33-bus system; 1536 samples; simulation tool and f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Backpropagation ANN using DWT and phase-locked loop (PLL)-based features</p> <p>Result: Accuracy > 90 % for FC and FL across all fault types</p>

Author	Description
Pouidel et al. [181] (2022)	<p>Focus: Fault area classification in distribution systems with DERs</p> <p>Data: PSS@CAPE, OpenDSS simulations on IEEE 123-bus system (4.16 kV) with 9 IBRs, multiple circuit topologies, and diverse fault scenarios; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: SVM classifiers for circuit topology, fault type, and zone identification</p> <p>Result: Topology estimation, fault type, and zone classification all above 99 % accuracy; response time ~ 2.6 ms after RMS calculation; robust operation without communication</p>
Prabhakar [146] (2023)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in wind-integrated transmission systems for adaptive distance protection</p> <p>Data: DIgSILENT PowerFactory simulations on IEEE 9-bus system with wind farm at bus 8; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Hybrid SVM-ANN model; SVM for FC, ANN for FL</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 88.5 % with partial data, 100 % with full-bus measurements; FL with negligible error</p>
Qusayer et al. [170] (2024)	<p>Focus: FD and FL in multi-MG systems under grid-connected, islanded, and hybrid modes with communication-assisted coordination</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on modified IEEE 14-bus multi-MG system; 478 980 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: Centralized ANN-based protection using Levenberg–Marquardt backpropagation</p> <p>Result: Testing accuracy up to 100 % across configurations; all models ≥ 99.21 %; includes end-to-end evaluation of ANN and communication delays</p>
Ren et al. [159] (2024)	<p>Focus: FL in multi-terminal HVDC grids using single-ended voltage measurements</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulations on a 4-terminal HVDC grid; 4752 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Panoramic voltage feature extraction via GAF, RP, MTF, and CWT; regression using lightweight ViT variants (MobileViT, efficient model (EMO), Edge Vision Transformer (EdgeViT))</p> <p>Result: FL error 0.441 km; robust to faults up to 400 ohm, noise up to 30 dB, and sampling rates as low as 30 kHz</p>
Rizk-Allah et al. [149] (2023)	<p>Focus: FL in long HV transmission lines using two-ended measurements</p> <p>Data: ATP and Simulink simulations on a 220 km transmission line; 1050 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Dynamically shaped feedforward ANN optimized via PSO; compared against RF and cross-validated ANN</p> <p>Result: Proposed model achieved FL error ≤ 0.40 km; baseline models showed errors up to 3.01 km</p>
Rong et al. [161] (2023)	<p>Focus: Faulted feeder identification in low-current resonant-earthed distribution systems</p> <p>Data: EMTP/ATP and RelaySimTest simulations on 6-feeder system; 1 800 000 samples; $f_s = 2400$ Hz; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN trained on transient superimposed zero-sequence currents within first post-fault cycle</p> <p>Result: Accuracy ≥ 99.5 % in simulation; 100 % in lab tests up to 5000 ohm fault resistance</p>
Sapountzoglou et al. [166] (2020)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in low-voltage smart grids</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulation of a semi-rural LV grid in Portugal; 230 688 samples; $f_s = 20$ Hz; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Gradient Boosting Trees (GBT) via XGBoost</p> <p>Result: 100 % feeder ID accuracy; 86.7 to 99.7 % fault classification; 86.2 to 95.8 % localization accuracy</p>
Srivastava et al. [172] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in AC microgrids with variable DG configurations</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on 7-bus AC microgrid with DG and PV sources; 34 020 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: RF with task-wise data filtering; compared with DT and ANN</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.73 %; line identification 97.08 %; FL error MSE reduced to 0.25 via task-specific segregation</p>
Taheri et al. [147] (2021)	<p>Focus: FL in wind-integrated parallel transmission systems using distributed parameter models</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulations on two-circuit 345 kV transmission network with wind and synchronous generation; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: LSTM-based estimation of network impedance and fault location</p> <p>Result: FL error < 0.86 %; robust to faults up to 150 ohm and noise up to 20 dB</p>

Author	Description
Taheri et al. [148] (2022)	<p>Focus: FL in wind-integrated, shunt-compensated parallel transmission lines</p> <p>Data: PSCAD simulations on double-circuit 345 kV transmission line with wind farm and SVM; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: LSTM-based estimation of source impedance and fault distance</p> <p>Result: FL error < 0.98 %; robust to 150 ohm faults and noise at 20 dB SNR</p>
Tiwari [158] (2023)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in wind-integrated HVDC transmission systems under variable fault and operating conditions</p> <p>Data: Simulink simulations on HVDC system integrated with DFIG-based wind array; 22 450 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: CNN; compared against SVM and DT</p> <p>Result: FC accuracy 99.58 %; FL error down to 0.104 %; validated via dependability and security metrics</p>
Tong et al. [156] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and FL in MMC-based MTDC systems using local measurements</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulations on 4-terminal 500 kV MMC-MTDC grid; 3100 samples; $f_s = 50$ kHz; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: Semi-AI protection scheme with startup logic and CNN-based internal fault identification; 1 ms data window</p> <p>Result: 100 % accuracy up to 500 ohm faults; 94 % at 800 ohm; robust for SNR > 30 dB</p>
Tran [138] (2023)	<p>Focus: FL enhancement for distance relays using ML based on local voltage and current signals</p> <p>Data: ATP/EMTP simulation; 2136 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: MLP integrated with Siemens 7SA522 relay via Omicron CMC-356</p> <p>Result: Average FL error reduced from 0.92 % to 0.42 %; max error reduced from 8.23 % to 2.49 %</p>
Uddin et al. [137] (2022)	<p>Focus: FD, FC, and fault area classification in grid-connected DFIG-based wind farms</p> <p>Data: PSCAD, ETAP, and Simulink simulations; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: waveform V/I</p> <p>Method: DT for FC, SVM with PCA for FL, PI-based control for wind energy conversion system</p> <p>Result: Accuracy of 97.9 % (DT) and 94.5 % (SVM); control scheme maintained stable operation under faults and wind variation</p>
Yousaf et al. [151] (2022)	<p>Focus: FL in MT-HVDC systems using local terminal data under varying fault resistance and noise</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulation of 4-terminal MMC–HVDC system with offshore wind; 714 samples; f_s unspecified; signal type: DC V/I</p> <p>Method: DWT-based features and FFNN optimized via Bayesian optimization and Levenberg–Marquardt back-propagation</p> <p>Result: 0.5144 % overall error across 10 to 485 ohm; robust to noise and fault variation</p>
Zhang et al. [163] (2022)	<p>Focus: FC and FL in small-current grounding distribution networks</p> <p>Data: Simulated 10 kV 6-line system using relay protection equipment; 3000 samples; $f_s = 1$ kHz; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Hybrid VMD-CNN with Hilbert–Huang transform-based features from positive-sequence current</p> <p>Result: 100 % accuracy in FC and FL; robust to fault resistance and distance</p>
Zhang et al. [165] (2023)	<p>Focus: Spatio-temporal FD and protection in ADN using multi-agent RL</p> <p>Data: EMTDC simulation of IEEE 34-bus ADN with 10 PMUs; sample size and f_s unspecified; signal type: phasor domain V/I</p> <p>Method: Augmented-state extended kalman filter phase lock loop, supervised multi-residual generation learning, and model-free spatio-temporal multi-agent reinforcement learning</p> <p>Result: Accuracy 97.125 %; response time 1.274 s; outperformed SOGI, wavelet neural network, State-Action-Reward-State-Action (SARSA), and deep deterministic policy gradient</p>

A.2. PRISMA-ScR Checklist

Table S.5: PRISMA-ScR checklist [29]

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Section
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Title
Abstract			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Abstract
Introduction			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	1
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	1
Methods			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	2
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	2
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	2
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	A.2
Selection of sources of evidence	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	2
Data charting process	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	2
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	2
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	N/A
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	2
Results			

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Section
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	2
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations	4, 5, 6
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	N/A
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	4, 5, 6
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives	4, 5, 6
Discussion			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	7
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process	7
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	7
Funding			
Funding	19	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	Additional information

A.3. Database search queries

Table S.6: Search results from different databases

Database	Results	Search string
Scopus	349	TITLE-ABS-KEY ("relay protection" OR "system integrity protection schemes" OR "protection schemes" OR "grid protection" OR "power system protection" OR "protection coordination") AND ("machine learning" OR "deep learning" OR "neural networks" OR "reinforcement learning" OR "artificial intelligence" OR "data-driven techniques") AND ("power grid" OR "electrical grid" OR "power network" OR "smart grid" OR "HVDC" OR "AC-DC power system" OR "high-voltage grid" OR "energy grid")
IEEE Xplore	254	("All Metadata": "relay protection" OR "All Metadata": "system integrity protection schemes" OR "All Metadata": "protection schemes" OR "All Metadata": "grid protection" OR "All Metadata": "power system protection" OR "All Metadata": "protection coordination") AND ("All Metadata": "machine learning" OR "All Metadata": "deep learning" OR "All Metadata": "neural networks" OR "All Metadata": "reinforcement learning" OR "All Metadata": "artificial intelligence" OR "All Metadata": "data-driven techniques") AND ("All Metadata": "power grid" OR "All Metadata": "electrical grid" OR "All Metadata": "power network" OR "All Metadata": "smart grid" OR "All Metadata": "HVDC" OR "All Metadata": "AC-DC power system" OR "All Metadata": "high-voltage grid" OR "All Metadata": "energy grid")