

# Optimal Location of Electric Vehicle Charging Station and Its Impact on Distribution Network: A Review

Fareed Ahmad<sup>a</sup>, Atif Iqbal<sup>b,\*</sup>, Imtiaz Ashraf<sup>c</sup>, Mousa Marzband<sup>d,e</sup>, Irfan Khan<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Aligarh Muslim University, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>b</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Qatar University, Doha, Qatar

<sup>c</sup>Department of Electrical Engineering, Aligarh Muslim University, Uttar Pradesh, India

<sup>d</sup>Department: Mathematics, Physics and Electrical Engineering, Northumbria University, UK

<sup>e</sup>Center of Research Excellence in Renewable Energy and Power Systems, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, 21589, Saudi Arabia

<sup>f</sup>Clean and Resilient Energy Systems (CARES) Lab, Texas A&M University, Galveston, TX 77573 USA

---

## Abstract

At present, the limited existence of fossil fuels and the environmental issues over greenhouse gas emissions have been directly affected to the transition from conventional vehicles to electric vehicles (EVs). In fact, the electrification of transportation system and the growing demand of EVs have prompted recent researchers to investigate the optimal location of electric vehicle charging stations (EVCSs). However, there are numerous challenges would face when implementing EVs at large scale. For instance, underdeveloped EVCSs infrastructure, optimal EVCS locations, and charge scheduling in EVCSs. In addition, the most fundamental EV questions, such as EV cost and range, could be partly answered only by a well-developed EVCS infrastructure. According to the literature, the researchers have been followed different types of approaches, objective functions, constraints for problem formulation. Moreover, according to the approaches, objective functions, constraints, EV load modeling, uncertainty, vehicle to grid strategy, integration of distributed generation, charging types, optimization techniques, and sensitivity analysis are reviewed for the recent research articles. Furthermore, optimization techniques for optimal solution are also reviewed in this article. In addition, the EV load impact on the distribution network, environmental impacts and economic impact are discussed.

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: [atif.iqbal@qu.edu.qa](mailto:atif.iqbal@qu.edu.qa) (Atif Iqbal)

*Keywords:* Electric vehicle, charging station, optimal placement, optimization algorithm, distribution network

---

## 1. Introduction

Over the recent decade, the demand on Electrical Vehicles (EVs) have been accelerate significantly due to the rapid decrease in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the operating costs compered to the internal combustion engines [1, 2]. According to research, EVs could reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 28% by 2030 [3]. However, there are two prime challenges which could affect to the general community when transferring to EVs, such as the high cost of EVs and the lack of charing facilities. The different industries and governments over the world is expected to reach the EVs market to USD 974,102.5 million by 2027 growing at a healthy compound annual growth rate in the forecast period of 2020 to 2027 [4]. One of the most critical issues addressed by the authors in this study is the lack of infrastructure for charging EVs. The number of EVs are exponentially increasing worldwide, posing a new challenge to the distribution network infrastructure and distribution network operators (DNO). In fact, excessive electrical power requirements due to EVs integration, bus voltages, power loss, stability, harmonic distortion, voltage mismatch, and power efficiency could be negatively affected to the distribution network. Furthermore, the more addition of EVs require more reliable electric vehicle charging station (EVCS) systems with less EV charging time. As a result, fast charging in the EVCSs is viable for charging an EV's battery in 20-30 minutes [5]. Beside from the drawbacks of fast charging in the EVCS, it has detrimental effects on the distribution system that colud be mitigated by accurate EVCS planning [6].

In addition, the optimal location of EVCSs and the impact of EVs load on the distribution system have become more prominent research topics [7] in the last decade. Therefore, the DNO approach, EVs users approach, and EVCS owner approach are reviewed for the placement of EVCS in this paper by the authors. Specially, several researches have already been published on the positioning of EVCSs by the DNO approach such as minimizing bus voltage, minimizing total power loss, and maxi-

mizing the reliability of the distribution system. The other researchers have found the EVCS investor approaches for the EVCS placement, while limited number of researches have considered the EV user's strategy for the EVCS placement.

### *1.1. Literature survey*

Figure 1 represents a survey which investigated the number of publicly available slow and fast charging stations among 13 prime countries 2020 [8]. According to this figure, the EVCSs market is expected to reach \$103.6 billion by 2028, with the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 26.4% between 2021 and 2028. Further, this market is for-casted to increase by 31.1% CAGR from 2021 to 11.6 million units by 2028[9]. The charging station development cost, active power loss cost, reactive power loss cost and voltage deviation cost are utilised as indicators of charging station optimal location and the results are obtained by balanced mayfly algorithm [10]. Literature [11] proposes power loss, voltage profile and EVs charging costs as objective function for the problem formulation for finding the optimal location of charging station and renewable energy sources which is solved by differential evolution algorithm.

In [12], authors suggested the objectives as investment costs, operation costs, maintenance costs, and network loss costs for problem formulation which was gained by the modified primal-dual interior-point algorithm for optimal location of EVCS. The authors in [13] proposed a multi objective optimization problem by transportation energy loss cost, station build-up cost and sub-station energy loss cost for the placement of FCSs, which was solved by the binary lighting search algorithm. Further, the authors in [14], initially have proposed a multi objective optimization problem by energy loss, voltage deviation, EV population and land cost, whereas the uncertain variable of EV are controlled by 2m point estimation method (2m PEM) efficiently and optimization problem have obtained by Harris hawks optimization (HHO) algorithm. In addition [15] proposed a two-stage fuzzy approach for optimal location of distributed generations (DGs), shunt capacitors (SCs) and charging stations. In first approach, a multi objective optimization problem was deployed to place the DGs and SCs and, in the second approach, a multi-objective




Figure 1: Number of available charging station in 2020

optimization problem utilised power loss and voltage profile. Ultimately the proposed problems was solved by grasshopper optimization algorithm (GOA).

The authors in [16] have identified the optimal location of parking lots by considering, the power loss cost, power from the grid cost, power from the distributed renewable energy resources (DER) cost and the garage charging/ discharging cost. In fact, the Artificial bee colony (ABC) algorithm and firefly algorithm (FA) was used to obtain the optimization problem. Further the station development cost, specific energy consumption of EVs user cost, network power loss cost and maximum voltage deviation are proposed for multi-objective optimization problem. In addition, this problem solved by novel hybrid shuffled frog leap-teaching learning based optimization (SFL-TLBO) algorithm in [17].

In [18], the GA technique is deployed to solve the proposed model of optimal location for EVCS, including two objective functions such as the construction cost of EVCS and charging station access cost. The Authors have dedicated the optimal location of charging station toward the sustainable cities in [19] and proposed the multi objective functions for the optimization problem. Moreover, the annual time opportunity cost, traveling cost, construction cost, and operating cost are considered as objectives functions and solved by GA. In [20], the authors have suggested the traveling cost, investment cost for EVCSs, the operation cost of the substations and power loss cost as economic factors for economic modeling. In fact, the pro-

posed economic model for charging station placement is solved by GA. The Power loss minimization with demand response at load side is the objective to placed the CS and problem answered by GA [21].

A mixed integer nonlinear problem (MINLP) is formulated in [22] by considering the CS equipment cost, land cost, cs electrification cost, electric grid loss cost, and EV loss cost for charging and the MINLP optimization problem was obtained by GA. In [23], the authors have investigated the optimal location of parking lots by maximize the revenue of parking lots and have considered the power loss cost, reliability cost, voltage improvement cost and parking lot cost as the decision function, whereas the GA has deployed the optimal results. Moreover, a mixed-integer programming model has developed to formulate the problem for maximizing the overall plug-in EVs flows in the network and the GA has used to solve the proposed problem [24]. In [25], the authors formulated a multi-objective mixed integer non linear problem (MINLP) with FCS development cost, cost of specific energy consumption of EVs, electrical network power loss cost, DGs cost and voltage deviation. In this study, the formulated problem for the placement of FCSs and DGs in distribution network was solved by non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II) and the proposed technique is evaluated by the 118-bus distribution system. In addition, the land cost, station equipment cost, operating and maintenance cost, real power loss cost and voltage profile improvement are proposed as objective functions for the placement of CS by authors in [26] and the proposed problem answered by advanced version of GA and PSO algorithm.

According to [27], a power loss of an unbalanced radial distribution system has suggested as an objective function for the placement of EVCS and the formulated optimization problem was solved by the PSO algorithm. In [28], the annual average construction cost of EVCS, the annual operating cost of EVCSs and the cost of charging have selected as the objective functions for the optimal location of EVCSs, which was solved by the PSO algorithm. Similarly, EVCS and DER are placed as an optimal location in the radial distribution system, power loss is considered as an objective function for optimization problems and solved by the PSO algorithm [29]. In [30], the authors have observed the land cost, bus attraction for EVs, reliability

of distribution network, and power loss cost with DERs which was proposed as the objective for EVs parking lots placement and optimization problem was obtained by GA and PSO algorithm. Further, PSO solved the optimal location and sizing of the EVCS problem by minimizing the grid power loss and the bus voltage deviation integrating the solar power generation [31]. The study in [32] minimizes the power loss and maximizes the distribution system's stability for the placement of EVCS, while the optimization problem was gained by APSO. With regards to [33], the investment cost of CS, operation and maintenance costs, electricity cost for battery charging, electricity cost for traveling to charge the battery, time cost for driving, waiting time cost and charging time cost was utilized as the objective for problem formulation, and the integrated planning problem solved by PSO algorithm.

### 1.2. Shortcoming

Regarding the previous studies, the EVCS placement problem formulation and its solution techniques consists of shortcomings (**Sh**) as follow:

- **Sh1**: Most of the researchers have considered one or two approaches for the placement of charging stations where it is not recommended for the real world problem. The problem formulation for optimal locations of CSs are equally important for the CS owner, distribution network operator and EV users.
- **Sh2**: Fluctuations of CS load on the distribution system due to uncertainty in EV users behaviour are not considered for the EV load modeling.
- **Sh3**: Demand-side management (DSM) and vehicle to grid (V2G) scheme have been ignored problem formulating of optimal CS locations.
- **Sh4**: Integration of renewable energy sources are not considered with problem formulation of EVCS placement.
- **Sh5**: The charging schedules with problem formulation of EVCS optimal location is not considered by the authors.
- **Sh6**: Most of the authors have placed the charging station (specially fast charging) by considering the cost functions while ignoring the impact of charging station.




Figure 2: Framework of FCS Placement

### 1.3. Contributions

The main purpose of this paper is to review different problem formulations proposed by researchers to determine the optimal location of CSs and identify the best solution by the various solution techniques. The major contributions could be summarized as follows.

1. An overview and comparative analysis of different problem formulation approaches of EVCSs placement adopted by researchers are provided. Every approach consist of different objective functions to place the EVCSs. Therefore all approaches have been reviewed in this paper to place the EVCSs (addressing **Sh1**).
2. The objective functions and constraints for the problem formulation to determine the EVCS optimal locations are reviewed in this paper. After the problem formulation, the solution techniques are reviewed in this paper for the optimal solution of problem (addressing **Sh1**).
3. The review of EV load integration impact at existing distribution networks is also discussed in this study (addressing **Sh6**).

In addition, this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, three different approaches for placement of charging stations, problem formulations, objective functions, equality/ inequality constraints with proper citations are presented. In Section 3, different types of solution techniques for a single objective and multi-objective problem are reviewed while in Section 4, EV load impact are investigated. Moreover, the summary and discussion are presented in Section 5 whereas the future research directions are concluded in Section 6, and Section 7 presents the conclusion of the review paper.

## 2. Review of problem formulation

The generalised framework for optimal location of charging stations is represented in Figure 2. According to the literature, the authors have been concluded that the investors of charging station require to place the CSs to minimize the installation cost and maximize the profit by charging the EVs. On the other hand

the EVs drivers intend to place the CSs to minimize the traveling cost, charging time, waiting time, charging, access cost etc, while the distribution network operator desire to place the CSs to minimize the impact at distribution system parameter. Therefore, three approaches have been reviewed in this paper for the optimal placement of EVCSs as shown in Figure 3. All types of approaches with their possible combinations are illustrated in the Table 1 [34].

### *2.1. Distribution network operator approach*

The distribution networks (DN) are responsible for providing the electric power for every connected electric loads in residential, commercial, and industrial areas. In fact, the location of the new loads would affect the parameters of DN. Therefore, active power loss cost [5, 10, 14, 15, 17, 20, 35, 36], reactive power loss cost, voltage deviation cost [10, 14, 17, 26, 37, 38], reliability cost[30, 38] and stability cost[39] of the distribution system are optimized to the placement of EVCSs under the DNO approach.

### *2.2. Charging stations owner approach*

Total costs related to the installation of EVCS is paid by charging station owner (CSO) to gain the maximum revenue from the EVCS through EVs charging. Therefore, the CSO are searching for CS locations with maximum revenues and minimum investments. Hence, the investment cost [40–43], installation cost [10, 17, 38, 44], operating cost [33, 38, 44], maintenance cost, road construction cost and land cost [10, 14, 26] are considered under the CSO approach for the optimal CS location.

### *2.3. Electric vehicle users approach*

The placement of EVCS affects the EV user charging behavior. In [45], access cost, traveling cost for charging from demand point to EVCS, waiting time cost[33, 42], and charging time cost have been considered as an objective function for the placement of EVCS under the EV drivers approach.

However, when accessing the optimal location of EVCS, more than one approaches should be considered with real-world data for accurate result. The authors typically




Figure 3: Approaches of problem formulation for placement of EVCS

use only one or two approaches and ignore others as shown in Table 2, which is not considered a promising approach in the real problem formulation. In reality, the problem formulation of EVCS placement in any dedicated area is a extremely complex when identifying the accurate location of EVCS. Identification of objective functions and constraints for the problem formulation are the important research work for the placement of charging stations.

Table 1: Different approaches and their references in literature for placement of EVCS.

Approaches for optimal location of EVCS	References
DNO approach	[15, 27–29, 31, 46, 47]
CSO approach	[7, 24, 40, 48]
EV user approach	[45, 49]
DNO and CSO mixed approach	[5, 10–12, 14, 16, 17, 23, 26, 35–38, 41, 50, 51]
CSO and EV user mixed approach	[18, 19, 42, 44, 52–56]
EV user and DNO mixed approach	[21]
DNO, CSO and EV user mixed approach	[13, 20, 22, 25, 30, 33, 34, 43, 57–63]

#### 2.4. Objective function

This subsection provides an outline of the various objective functions that were utilized when formulating the EVCS placement planning problem.

##### 2.4.1. Cost

The cost has been considered as an analytical function in several research studies. As could be seen in Figure 4, the cost functions can be formulated by using several factors and different approaches as mention earlier. The infrastructure cost is a one-time investment associated with the building of EVCSs and it could be further subdivided into land cost, building cost, charger cost, and labor cost. Further, the annual cost of electricity deployed to provide charging service is known as the operating cost. The additional expense paid by EV drivers when moving from the point of charging demand to the EVCS point is known as access cost. The cost of waiting in an EVCS due to the charging availability is known as waiting time cost.




Figure 4: Cost classification of the objective function for optimal placement of EVCS

The development cost of CS is defined in the equation (1) as an objective functions proposed in several research papers [10, 13, 17, 22, 38, 44] for the placement of EVCS.

$$DC_i = C_{int} + 25 \times C_{lan} \times S_i + PC \times C_{con} \times (S_i - 1) \quad (1)$$

where  $C_{int}$  is an initial cost of EVCS,  $C_{lan}$  is a land cost,  $S_i$  represents the number of connectors at  $i^{th}$  EVCS and  $C_{con}$  is a connector cost.

The traveling cost from charging demand point to EVCS are the prominent cost which was observed by researchers for the placement of EVCS. According to the equation (2), the objective function of EV user cost are expressed as below [25].

$$EVUC = \sum_{j=1}^{NFCS} \sum_{z=1}^{NZONE} d(z, j) \times SEC \times \sum_{h=1}^{24} CPEV(h) \times NEV(z) \times EP \quad (2)$$

where, NFCS and NZONE are the total number of fast charging stations and number of zone in study area respectively, while  $d(z, j)$  are the distance from possible charging station location to zone locations,  $CPEV(h)$  is the probabilistic set of EV charging in  $h$  hours, and SEC is the specific energy consumption of EV.

Further, the annual electricity cost of fast charging station for optimal placement of FCS is calculated as equation ((3)) which has formulated by the authors in [33].

$$C_E = \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{i_F=1}^{I_F} \sum_{j \in J_{i_F}} \left( D_s \times \frac{(\text{SOC}_j^d - \text{SOC}_j^a) \times B_j}{\eta} \times \text{EC} \right) \quad (3)$$

where,  $D_s$  are the total number of days,  $\text{SOC}_j^d$  and  $\text{SOC}_j^a$  are the departure and arrival SOC respectively, while  $B_j$  is the battery capacity of  $j_{\text{th}}$  PEV, and EC is the cost of electricity per unit in \$.

Table 2: Analysis of EVCS placement problem formulation and solution techniques using DN operator, CS owner and EV user approaches

Objective function	Year	solution techniques	Approaches			EVs load modeling	DGs integration	Uncertainty	V2G scheme	Types of charging	Sensitivity analysis
			DNO	CSO	EV users						
CS development cost, active and reactive power loss cost, voltage deviation cost [10]	2021	BMA	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	L3	N
CS installation cost, operating cost, penalty cost, traveling cost [62]	2021	CSO,TLBO	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L2,L3	N
Investment cost,installing devices cost, power loss cost [64]	2021	GA	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	L3	N
Power loss cost,charging zone centre deviation [65]	2021	BAT	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L3	N
Construction cost,travel distance cost, waiting time cost [66]	2021	MPGA,k-mean	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L2,L3	N
Power loss cost,cumulative voltage deviation [67]	2021	INBPSO	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	L3	Y
Real and reactive power loss cost [68]	2021	QGDA	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	Y
maximum profit, optimal voltage, minimum fluctuations in load, maximum charging satisfaction of the EV[69]	2021	IHPSO	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Energy loss cost, voltage deviation cost, EV population and land cost [14]	2021	HHO	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	L2,L3	Y
Power loss cost [28]	2020	PSO	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Power loss cost [29]	2020	PSO	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	-	N
Distribution power loss cost and voltage deviation cost [15]	2020	Fuzzy GOA	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	L3	N

EVCSs cost, voltage stability, reliability and power loss (VRP) [36]	2020	CSO, TLBO	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Active power losses cost [27]	2020	PSO	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	L3	N
Installation, chargers, waiting time, travel in TN, purchasing active and reactive power costs [34]	2020	GAMS	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Annual time opportunity cost, traveling cost, construction cost and operating cost [19]	2020	GA	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L3	N
traveling cost [49]	2020	EHDG	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Charging Likelihood, Charging Willingness of Drivers, Charging Demand, Distance Reduction [58]	2020	LGDG, LGEG	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Installation and power loss cost [5]	2020	PSO	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	L1,L2,L3	N
Benefit of DSO and EVCS [70]	2020	MOPSO	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	L2	N
Development cost, cost of specific energy consumption of EVs, electrical network power loss cost [25]	2019	NSGA-II	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	L3	N
Construction cost, operation cost and wastage cost in the process of user charging [52]	2019	GA	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Power loss cost and EV flow [35]	2019	GWO	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	L3	Y
Environmental, economic, technical and social criterion cost [57]	2019	BN	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L3	Y
Costs of CS, DN expansion, voltage regulation and protection device upgrade [71]	2019	convexification	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	L3	Y
User Charging Convenience cost, User Charging Cost and User Charging Time cost [45]	2019	Artificial Immune	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L3	N
Cost of EVCS [40]	2019	LP	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	L3	N
Construction and operational cost [44]	2019	Simulation	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L2	N
Station development cost, EV user cost, power loss cost and Maximum voltage deviation [17]	2019	Hybrid SFL-TLBO	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	L3	N
Installation, operation, voltage profile, reliability and power loss costs [38]	2019	Hybrid CSO-TLBO	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	L2,L3	N
Power loss cost, reliability cost, voltage improvement cost and parking lot cost [23]	2018	GA	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	L2,L3	N
Waiting time cost, traveling time cost and investment cost [42]	2018	SCE-UA	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	L2	N
Investment cost, connection cost, active power loss cost, demand response cost [43]	2018	PSO	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
For EVCS installing cost and management cost. For users charging cost, station access cost and waiting cost [53]	2018	CPLEX	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	-	N

Investment cost, the penalty for unsatisfied charging demands and power distribution network cost [50]	2018	B&B	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	L3	Y
Loss reduction benefit, Revenue of V2G and EV charging cost [41]	2018	-	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y		L3	N
Charging cost, charging waiting time, charging travel time, power loss voltage deviation [63]	2018	MAS simulation	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		L3	N
Number of charging stations [72]	2018	MCS,IP	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		L3	Y
plug-in EVs flows [24]	2018	HA,GA	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N		L3	N
voltage deviation, power loss, thermal effect [47]	2018	QBLSA	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N		L3	N
Transportation energy loss cost, Station build-up cost and Sub-station energy loss cost [13]	2018	BLSA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		L3	N
Waiting time cost and operating cost of CS [56]	2018	exhaustion method	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		L3	N
Total profit, voltage deviation cost and power loss cost [51]	2018	NSGA-II	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N		PL	Y
Power loss, voltage fluctuations and power purchased from the grid [37]	2017	GA,PSO	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N		L1	N
Land cost, bus attraction of EVs, reliability, power loss cost [30]	2017	GA,PSO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	L1,L3	N
charging station coverage [55]	2017	TSR	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		L3	N
service provider profit, distribution network disturbance, [61]	2017	BN	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N		L1,L2,L3	N
Land cost, station equipment, operating and maintenance cost, real power loss, reactive power loss and voltage profile [26]	2017	Hybrid of GA & PSO	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N		L1	N
construction cost and access cost [18]	2016	GA	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	-		N
Investment cost, operating and maintenance cost, EV owner profit, DN Operator profit [73]	2016	GA,LP	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		PL	N
Traveling cost, investment cost, the operation cost of the substations and power loss cost [20]	2016	GA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		L2	N
Investment, operation, electricity and time costs [33]	2016	PSO	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N		L3	Y
Profit of parking lots, power loss cost, voltage deviation and network reliability [59]	2015	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	L2	N
Power loss, voltage profile and EVs charging costs [11]	2015	DE	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N		L2	N
Power loss, power from the grid, power from DER and garage charging/discharging cost costs [16]	2015	ABC, FA	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N		L1	N
Construction cost [7]	2014	CRO	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N		L3	N

Station development, Station electrification, grid loss and EV loss costs [22]	2014	GA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Distribution energy loss cost [46]	2013	GA	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	L2,L3	N
Grid power loss cost and bus voltage deviation cost [31]	2013	PSO	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	-	N
EVs flow [48]	2013	LP	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	L1,L2	N
Power loss cost with DR [21]	2013	GA	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	L3	N
Revenue cost, capital cost, cost of purchased energy, reliability cost and power loss cost [60]	2013	GA	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	L2	N
Voltage sensitivity [54]	2013	Simulation	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	L1	N

---

#### 2.4.2. Net benefit

The charging stations could serve as a point of connection between EVs and the power grid. In addition, the V2G allows EVs to provide power to the grid through EVCSs during peak hours. For the planning of V2G-enabled EVCSs, net profit is contributed as the objective function as illustrated in Figure 5.

The monetary profit earned by EVCSs by purchasing electricity from EV owners instead of the grid at a lower price during peak demand hours is a prime benefit of discharging. EVs support the grid by serving as temporary energy storage by discharging (V2G scheme). In addition, the lower load demand and lower power price at night, charging EVs is more cost-effective. The EVCSs could earn money by providing daytime charging at a better price than night charging. Moreover, the revenue generated in equation ((4)) by EVCSs by supplying electricity to the grid at peak demand hours is a benefit of providing power from the upstream grid [60].

$$r(i) = Pr_p \times P_{\text{park}}(i) \times t_{\text{dis}}(i) \quad (4)$$

where  $r(i)$  is the gained total revenue from  $i^{\text{th}}$  charging station,  $t_{\text{dis}}(i)$  is total time in which EV battery discharging through V2G facility,  $Pr_p$  is the electricity market price at peak hours.

Further, the benefit of improved reliability and voltage profile refers to revenue generated by EVCSs with improved reliability indices and voltage profile as a result




Figure 5: Benefit review of the implementation of V2G in the placement of EVCS

of the V2G scheme's implementation given in equation ((5)) [60].

$$C_{NS}(j) = \left[ \sum_{b=1}^{NL} C_{inj} \times y_b \times L_b \times \left( \sum_{res=1}^{Nres} P_{res} \times t_{res} + \left( \sum_{rep=1}^{Nrep} P_{rep} \right) \times t_{rep} \right) \right] + C_{equipj} \quad (5)$$

where  $NL$  is the total lines in the network,  $C_{inj}$  is the rate of energy not supplied at load  $j$ ,  $y_b$  is the failure rate of branch  $b$ ,  $L_b$  is the length of branch  $b$ ,  $Nres$  is the total nodes which are isolated during fault,  $Nrep$  is the total nodes which are isolated during fault repair,  $P_{res}$  is the loads not supplied during fault,  $t_{res}$  is duration of the fault location,  $P_{rep}$  is the loads not supplied during fault repair,  $t_{rep}$  is the fault repair time, and  $C_{equipj}$  is the energy not supplied cost based on failure in equipment except for branches  $j$ .

If a parking lot is located in a distribution system, it could be utilized as an alternate source to restore power for a fraction of the loads that have failed and therefore the distribution system will be improved. The benefit of increased reliability for each year DISCO could be calculated by the equation ((6)) as given in [60].

$$DC_{NS}(j) = C_{NS}(j) - C_{NSV2G}(j) \quad (6)$$

where  $C_{NS}(j)$  is the energy not supplied cost without V2G, and  $C_{NSV2G}(j)$  is the energy not supplied cost with V2G.

### 2.4.3. Other objective functions

Power loss, distance, covered trip, and power supply moment balance index are also considered as objective functions by the researchers when dealing with charging stations placement planning problems, in addition to the above mentioned objective functions. Moreover, the installation of an EVCS adds to the load on the current network. An increment in load would result in a greater loss of electricity. Hence, EVCSs must be strategically located in the distribution network to reduce power loss. In addition, the power loss cost, voltage deviation cost are the main considerations for the placement of EVCS under DNO approach. Therefore, most of the researchers have included power loss cost [5, 10, 11, 14–17, 20, 35] as the objective function in equation (7) and voltage deviation cost [20, 33, 40–42] as objective function in equation (8).

The Gauss-Siedel method, Newton-Raphson method and Fast-Decoupled method, backward forward sweep algorithm, direct approach based algorithm are utilized for the power flow analysis [74–77]. Many literatures have used backward forward sweep algorithm and its improved version[78] for power flow analysis due to its various advantages.

$$P_{loss}^c = E_c \sum_{i=1}^{Nb} \sum_{j=1}^{Nb} G_{ij} (V_i^2 - V_j^2 - 2V_i V_j \cos(\theta_{ij})) \quad (7)$$

where,  $E_c$  is the electricity cost in \$,  $Nb$  is the number of bus,  $G_{ij}$  are the conductance of line between  $i^{th}$  bus to  $j^{th}$  bus,  $V_i$  is the  $i^{th}$  bus voltage,  $\theta_{ij}$  is the load angle difference,  $UD^t$  are the voltage deviation at time  $t$ ,  $U_{bu}^t$  are the voltage of  $bu^{th}$  bus at time  $t$ .

$$UD^t = \sum_{t=1}^{24} \sum_{bu=1}^{N_{bu}} \text{abs}(1 - U_{bu}^t) \quad (8)$$

The power supply moment balance is an indicator that determines the deviation and the degree of power supply dispersion. Further, a higher value of this index indicates less power supply fluctuation, less power loss, and improved system reliability. Therefore, when formulating the charging infrastructure planning problem, the minimization of the power supply moment balance index must be considered.




Figure 6: Constraints for problem formulation of EVCS placement

### 2.5. Constraints

The charging station location planning problem is performed under a set of equality and inequality constraints as illustrated in Figure 6. The voltage limits at each bus, current flow limits, and thermal limit must all be accomplished after EVCSs are installed in the distribution network. It is also necessary to determine the minimum and maximum number of EVCSs that will be installed. Furthermore, EVCSs should not be installed closely. The distance restriction takes into account the distances between EVCSs.

**Voltage constraints:** the authors applied an inequality limit of voltage at buses which is given in equation ((9)). Where  $V^{\min}$  and  $V^{\max}$  are the minimum and maximum value of voltage limits respectively at  $j^{\text{th}}$  bus [10, 26].

$$V_j^{\min} < V_j < V_j^{\max} \quad (9)$$

**Active and reactive power constraints:** active and reactive power at distribution system should be balanced [10, 26, 38, 62] therefore an equality constraints of the power is formulated by the researchers as determined in equations (10) and (11). Where  $P_{gi}$  and  $Q_{gi}$  are the active and reactive power obtained from the grid

respectively,  $P_{di}$  and  $Q_{di}$  are the total active and reactive power demand of distribution system respectively, while  $V_i$  and  $V_j$  are the voltages of  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  bus respectively,  $Y_{ij}$  is the admittance of line from  $i^{\text{th}}$  bus to  $j^{\text{th}}$  bus.

$$P_{gi} - P_{di} - V_i \sum_{j=1}^N V_j Y_{ij} \cos(\delta_i - \delta_j - \theta_{ij}) = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$Q_{gi} - Q_{di} - V_i \sum_{j=1}^N V_j Y_{ij} \sin(\delta_i - \delta_j - \theta_{ij}) = 0 \quad (11)$$

**Power inequality constraints:** A limit is imposed on the minimum and maximum value of the real and reactive power [10, 26, 38] on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bus as given in Eqs. (12) and (13).

$$P_{gi}^{\min} \leq P_{gi} \leq P_{gi}^{\max} \quad (12)$$

$$Q_{gi}^{\min} \leq Q_{gi} \leq Q_{gi}^{\max} \quad (13)$$

**Branch current constraints:** the current in every branch of distribution network should be followed maximum limit [14] as expressed in Eq. (14).

$$I_{br} < I_{br}^{\max} \quad (14)$$

**SOC of battery:** to keep battery health of EV the maximum and minimum SOC should be maintained [14] during charging and discharging as given in Eq. (15).

$$25\% \leq \text{SOC} \leq 90\% \quad (15)$$

Table 3: Review of the objective function and constraints considering different approaches for placement of EVCS

	Attributes	References	DNO approach	CSO approach	EV user approach
Objective functions	Power loss	[5, 10, 11, 14–17, 20–23, 25–31, 34–38, 43, 46, 50, 51, 59, 60, 63]	Y	N	N
	Voltage deviation	[10, 11, 14, 17, 26, 37, 38, 51, 54, 62, 63]	Y	N	N
	Investment cost	[20, 33, 40–43, 60]	N	Y	N
	Installation cost	[7, 10, 13, 17, 22, 38, 44, 62]	N	Y	N
	Connection cost	[43]	N	Y	N
	Traveling cost	[20, 22, 42, 49, 58, 62, 63]	N	N	Y
	Charging cost	[11, 33, 41]	N	Y	Y
	Transportation cost	[13]	N	N	Y
	Waiting time cost	[33, 42, 56, 63]	N	N	Y
	Operating cost	[20, 26, 33, 38, 44, 56, 62]	N	Y	N
	Maintenance cost	[26]	Y	Y	N
	Reliability cost	[30, 38, 60]	Y	N	N
	Land cost	[10, 14, 26, 30]	N	Y	N
	Net benefit of V2G	[41, 48]	N	Y	Y
	EV flow	[14, 24]	N	Y	N
Constraints	Thermal limit	[5, 10, 25, 35, 36, 46]	Y	N	N
	Distance	[43, 44]	N	N	Y
	Voltage limit	[5, 10, 25, 35, 46]	Y	N	N
	Number of chargers	[5, 14, 43]	Y	Y	N
	Power flow equation	[10, 25, 31, 35, 36, 46, 62]	Y	N	N
	Charging demand	[31, 43]	Y	N	N

### 3. Review of the techniques to solve the optimal location problem of EVCS

Optimization techniques are deployed to minimize or maximize the cost function of the formulated optimization problem. There are many optimization techniques available that could optimize the cost function as shown in Figure 7. In particular, the formulated optimization problems for the placement of EVCS can be a single objective or multi-objective, linear or nonlinear, convex or concave. According to the used variables, the formulated problem can be a continuous, integer, discrete and the combination. Therefore, the right selection of optimization techniques for the particular problem is a critical decision. In this paper authors give short review for some optimization techniques for the optimal location of EVCS. In addition, the classical and advance optimization are the two main categories of optimization techniques.

**Classical optimization techniques** are useful in finding the optimum solution or unconstrained maxima or minima of continuous and differentiable. Further, the classical methods have a limited scope in practical applications as some of them involve objective functions which are not continuous and/or differentiable functions.

**Advance optimization techniques** multi-modality, dimensionality and differentiability are connected with the optimization of large-scale problems, where the classical techniques fail to solve such large-scale problems. Most of the classical techniques require gradient information and hence it is not suitable to solve non-differentiable functions with the such techniques. Moreover, classical techniques often fail to solve optimization problems that have many local optima. However, the advance optimization techniques overcome these issues to solve the optimization problem.

#### 3.1. *Single objective optimization techniques*

The solution of single objective optimization problem is simple against the solution of multi objective problem. therefore, classical and advanced optimization algorithm are used to solve the single objective optimization problems.




Figure 7: Classification of optimization techniques

### *3.1.1. Genetic algorithm*

As the name implies, genetic algorithms (GA) mimic the genetic aspect of candidate populations to improve existing set selection. To apply a GA to a problem, careful design choices must be created to adapt the algorithm to the problem. In fact, the ability of the algorithm to find the right result is directly influenced by the gene-encoding system, its cross-over process, and fitness functions. A large pool of diverse data is also needed to ensure that the algorithm does not get stuck in local minima. This is usually accomplished by selecting genes for a crossover at random, which results in a slower convergence rate while ensuring exploration. When increasing the population size improves the solution of the GA, it also dramatically increases the computation time, even if the improvement in the solution is minor. In [20], traveling cost, investment cost for EVCSs, the operation cost of the substations and power loss cost are the objective functions to formulate the problem for placement of EVCS and problem solved by GA. Eventually, in [22] an MINLP is formulated which is solved by GA.

### *3.1.2. Simulated annealing*

The name and inspiration from annealing process in metallurgy, a technique involving heating and controlled cooling of a material to increase the size of its crystals and reduce their defects. In the simulated annealing method, each point of the search space is compared to a state of some physical system, and the function to be minimized is interpreted as the internal energy of the system in that state. Therefore, the goal is to bring the system, from an arbitrary initial state, to a state with the minimum possible energy [79].

### *3.1.3. Particle swarm optimization*

Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) is another common and efficient algorithm that optimizes performance by real number randomness and global communication among particles. The swarm of possible solutions (particles) scour the search space for the right solutions, constantly exchanging and reviewing the personal and global bests. In fact, each particle flies in a path vector derived from its personal best




Figure 8: Optimization techniques analysis in literature

and global best at the start of each iteration, ultimately converging into the global optima. Recently, some improvements to the original PSO were made to enhance computing time and provide more precise solutions, IPSO. In [28], EVCS and DER are placed at an optimal RDS location, power loss is considered as an objective function for the optimization problem and solved by the PSO algorithm.

#### 3.1.4. Teaching learning based optimization algorithm

The teaching learning based optimization (TLBO) algorithm is a teaching-learning process inspired algorithm which based on the effect of the influence of a teacher on the output of learners in a class. Further, the algorithm describes two basic modes of the learning: (i) through teacher known as teacher phase) and (ii) through interaction with the other learners (known as the learner phase). a hybrid CSO and TLBO algorithm are used for optimal location of EVCS in which three objective functions include EVCS cost, cost of voltage deviation, reliability of the system, power loss, and the other one accessibility of EVCSs index.

### 3.1.5. Grey wolf optimization

Mirjalili [80] is the creator of grey wolf optimization (GWO). The natural habit and hunting technique of grey wolves inspire the author. Moreover, grey wolves have a different leadership structure within their packs. The alpha wolf is the leader of the group members. Grey wolves are at second position in the following category. They make lives easier for alphas. They are referred to as beta wolves. Delta wolves are valued less than alpha and beta wolves. Their goal is to submit to alpha and beta wolves while still maintaining influence over omega wolves. The omegas are the wolves with the lowest importance since they must obey the leadership grey wolves.

### 3.1.6. Artificial bee colony algorithm

The artificial bee colony (ABC) algorithm was created by simulating the behaviors of real bees when it comes to seeking food sources, such as nectar, and sharing the knowledge with the other bees in the hive. In particular, the ABC is made up of three different types of bees: employed bees, onlooker bees, and scout bees. By flying around in a multi-dimensional search space that represents the solution space, each of them plays a different role in the process. In [16], ABC algorithm and FA, approaches are used to find the optimal parking lots in the distribution system by minimizing the power loss cost, power from grid cost, power from DER cost, and garage charging/discharging cost.

## 3.2. Multi-objective optimization techniques

There are two basic approaches for multi-objective optimization techniques: a **posteriori** vs a **priori**. In a priori approach multi-objective optimization problem is changed to a single-objective one by aggregating the objectives. Further, a set of weights specifies how significant the objectives are and how often given by a problem domain expert. However, one of the primary disadvantages of such approaches is that an algorithm must be run multiple times to identify the Pareto optimum set. Furthermore, an expert consultation is required, and some particular Pareto optimum fronts cannot be identified by this method [81].

Table 4: Review analysis of optimization techniques for the placement EVCS problem

Techniques	References where techniques is used	Origin of techniques	Benefits	Challenges
Genetic algorithm (GA)	[18–22, 22–24, 26, 46, 52, 52, 60]	Natural process of evolution of new offspring from a set of the randomly generated population by the process of selection, crossover, and mutation.	Easy to implement; more suitable for placement problems.	Takes a long time to solve the placement and sizing problem.
Particle swarm optimization (PSO)	[5, 26–31, 33, 37, 43]	Optimization algorithm inspired by the natural phenomenon of bird flocking.	Simple computation and the ability to find near-optimal solution.	Premature convergence; higher possibility to get stuck in local optima.
Grey wolf optimization (GWO)	[35]	GWO mimics the leadership hierarchy and hunting mechanism of grey wolves in nature.	Tackle unconstrained as well as constrained and multi-objective problems.	Low solving accuracy, bad local searching ability and slow convergence rate.
Teaching learning based optimization (TLBO)	[17, 36, 38]	Based on the effect of the influence of a teacher on the output of learners in a class.	not requiring any parameter of the algorithm for its operation.	Computation time is more and more space is required.
Branch and bound (B&B)	[50]	The set of candidate solutions is thought of as forming a rooted tree with the full set at the root.	Generally, it will inspect fewer subproblems and thus saves computation time.	Normally it will require more storage.
artificial bee colony (ABC)	[16]	It was inspired by the intelligent foraging behavior of honey bees.	simplicity and proper exploration ability.	it suffers from improper exploitation in solving complicated problems.
Linear programming (LP)	[40, 48]	-	Simplicity, solves many diverse combinations of problems.	Only works with linear variables; it cannot potentially solve stochastic problems.
CPLEX optimization software package	[53]	It was inspired by the intelligent foraging behavior of honey bees.	Efficiently solves linear, convex, or non-convex constrained problems.	Difficulty in modifying optimization routines.

The posterior techniques derive from the ability to maintain multi-objective formulations of multi-objective problems and identify the pareto optimum set in a single run. Another advantage is that these methods may be used to determine any type of Pareto front. However, they require a greater computing cost and the simultaneous pursuit of several objectives [81].

### *3.2.1. Non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm-II*

Non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm II (NSGA-II) is an efficient meta-heuristic multi-objective genetic algorithm that is commonly deployed to solve multi-objective optimization problems in applications such as facility distribution, supply network architecture, and congested facility location. The NSGA-II divides the population into several non-dominated chromosome fronts, where every set's chromosomes are ranked according to their diversity. In addition, the multi-objective function is formulated by considering EVCS development cost, cost of specific energy consumption of EVs, electrical network power loss cost, DER power generation cost and maximum voltage deviation for placement of EVCS and DER in the distribution network and solved by NSGA-II [25].

### *3.2.2. Multi-objective colliding optimization algorithm*

Colliding bodies optimization (CBO) is a population-based evolutionary method that mimics the rules of object collision [82]. The CBO has investigated positive results for a wide range of constrained and unconstrained benchmark functions, as well as engineering single-objective problems. This algorithm formulation is simple as it consumes no memory and requires no parameter tuning. Recently, a simplified multi-objective CBO [83] technique based on non-dominated sorting was developed for optimizing the building material prices of reinforced concrete structural components and carbon dioxide emissions.

### *3.2.3. Multi-Objective Ant Lion Optimizer*

A new meta heuristic multi-objective ant lion optimization (MOALO) algorithm proposed by [81] to solve the multi objective problem. Further, it mimics the natural interactions of ants and antlions. Antlions are a type of predatory bug that be-

longs to the Myrmeleontidae family that feeds on ants. Moreover, antlions excavate trenches in the sand and hide beneath the sand to await their preferred food, which they subsequently consume with their massive jaws. To understand the complete mathematical modeling of MOALO algorithm, it is important to understand first the modeling of single objective ALO which was proposed in [84]. The GA, PSO, and hybrid algorithms have been widely utilized in literature to address optimization problems, as could be seen in figure 8.

#### **4. Review analysis of EVs load impact**

Figure 9 shows how the effects of EV integration could be categorized. The first category is the effect of EV load on distribution network parameters, followed by the environmental and economic impacts. Figure 9 also represents the positive and negative impacts of EV load integration on the distribution network, with details on each form of impact is expressed below.

##### *4.1. Impact of EVs load on distribution system*

The current distribution system faces numerous problems as EV charging infrastructure expands. In recent years, these issues have been carefully assessed. EV impact analysis is primarily defined in the current literature to assess the effects of EVs on electricity generation adequacy, transformer aging, and distribution system power efficiency. In fact, it is possible that EV charging during peak load hours would increase peak load demand, requiring the expansion of generation capability. Furthermore, increased EV load demand would overload substation and service transformers, shortening their lifespan. Moreover, EV charging can cause voltage drops, power unbalances, and voltage/current harmonics, among other power quality issues.

##### *4.1.1. Negative impacts*

*Impact on the power quality of the distribution system.* : Power quality refers to a power grid network's ability to provide a reliable and clean power supply with a sinusoidal waveform and noise-free voltage and current harmonics. Particular,

harmonics and voltage sag/swelling are two typical power quality issues. When connecting to the grid, EV chargers are the components that cause these issues. According to IEEE standard 519, the total harmonics distortion (THD) value for up to 69 kV power networks should be less than 5% to preserve power quality. According to this study, the harmonic disturbances would be higher when the EV chargers are connected to the grid and distribution network. The THD is around 4.82 percent for single EVs attached to the device, 12.35 percent for three EVs, and 19.69 percent for five EVs with different configurations [85, 86].

*Impact on the voltage.* : This section discusses the effects of PEV integration on voltage change, which affect the efficiency of the power delivered to consumers. When EV load is added to the existing distribution system, the voltage drop at buses is related to charging. With regards to literature, in certain places, the voltage drop reported is less than 96 percent of the nominal voltage. As a result, system enhancements are required. In [73], various charging rates show a voltage deviation of 12.7 percent to 43.3 percent from rated voltage with 20 percent and 80 percent PEV penetration [87].

*Impact on power loss.* : When considering the future demand generated by gradual PEV grid integration, power system losses become a major concern. According to reference [88], energy losses in off-peak charging could increase by up to 40 percent, for 62 percent of PEV market penetration. According to the researchers, network power losses increased significantly as PEV penetration is increasing [87]. The increment of power loss could be minimized up to certain limits by applying optimal location of EVCS process.

*Impact on reliability of distribution network.* : The reliability analysis of the distribution network has been a challenging area of research in recent years. Specifically, the distribution network's reliability indices are calculated by statistical data on failure rate, repair rate, average outage duration, and the number of consumers [36]. Furthermore, the bus reliability index is a metric which used to assess the reliability and vulnerability of each distribution network bus. In fact, the stability




Figure 9: EV load impact classification

of the entire distribution network is measured by system reliability indices. Customer and energy-oriented reliability indices are subsets of system reliability indices. Customer-oriented reliability indexes primarily named as SAIFI, SAIDI, and CAIDI. SAIFI is defined as the number of times a system customer experiences interruption during a particular period, while the average interruption period per customer served is specified by SAIDI. In addition, SAIDI depends on the duration of the failure as well as the number of customers [87].

#### 4.1.2. Positive impacts

*Benefit of V2G scheme.* : The V2G deployment of EVCSs has several advantages, including lower costs for EV users, lower costs for EVCS operators, and smoother EVCS load curves. In fact, the key contribution of the V2G scheme is the transferring of vehicle battery energy to the grid at peak hours and the charging of the battery at off-peak hours. Further, the revenue generated by V2G power is determined by the form of electricity demand to which sold demand. For markets that only pay for electricity, such as peak power, revenue is the product of price and energy dispatched. In addition, V2G capacity would provide a portion of peak power, reducing the grid's requirement to purchase electricity on the wholesale market. As a result, cost savings could be formulated in [60] by providing loads of V2G power rather than purchasing power from the wholesale market.

*Easy handling of renewable generation.* : Due to the intermittency of renewable energy generation, power providers are dealing with difficulties when integrating huge amounts of renewable energy supplies into their grids. However, the EV charger's fast-responding control electronic interface, together with the battery storage, reveals a practical solution for source intermittency. The study's most positive customer is that when EV participated in primary frequency control, the system was capable of handling wind integration up to 59 percent of total grid generation ability. On the other hand, it is possible to utilize certain solar energy for charging the EV. Moreover, it measures the energy requirements of a mid-sized sport utility vehicle based on a regular driving range of 40 miles, which is common in North America. In addition, the energy demand for all-electric mode driving and frequent




Figure 10: Analysis of DGs integration, uncertainty, V2G, fast charger, sensitivity analysis in literature

charging is estimated to be 15-17 kWh. With respect to the normal average solar radiation year-round in Alberta, Canada, the derived panel sizes are 20 m<sup>2</sup> and 78 m<sup>2</sup> for the best and worst day solar radiation, respectively.

#### 4.2. Environment impact of EVs integration with grid

Instead of using gasoline based on conventional technology, the power demand of EVCS for EVs is served by a distribution network, which limits carbon emissions. Moreover, the large-scale integration of green energy systems to charge an EV battery would further to reduce pollutant emissions. Generally, all-electric cars emit an average of 4,450 pounds of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent each year as well-to-wheel emissions are also considered [89]. On the other hand, conventional diesel engines could emit more than twice as much annually. In addition, the amount of well-to-wheel pollution your EV produces is primarily determined by the location and the most widely used energy sources for electricity.

#### 4.3. Economic impact of EVCS load

The economic impacts of EVs could be seen from two perspectives: the EV owner and the utility provider. In particular, the cost of an EV is also high as compared to an ICE vehicle. On the other hand, because of the higher efficiency of electric motors, EVs consume less fuel and low maintenance costs than ICE vehicles. In addition, the average ICE vehicle's efficiency ranges from 15% to 18%, while

the efficiency of EV fluctuates from 60% to 70%. The EV owner would benefit from the V2G concept if it is transfer the battery's stored energy to the distribution network. According to research [88], EV fleets will save fundamental power system costs between USD 200-300 per vehicle per year.

## 5. Summary and discussions

It has been found that different optimization approaches were utilized to determine the best solution for EVCSs placement. Table 3 offers a comparative overview of different optimization approaches defined in EVCS placement problems in this context. Furthermore, various researchers have considered different approaches for optimal location EVCS. These methods are dependent on the choice of objective functions, constraints, solution mechanisms. According to the figure 10, the available literature primarily defines that different approaches determine the problem formulation of optimal location of EVCS. In fact, these approaches are the DNO approach, CSO approach, EV user approach and combination of given approaches. According to the literature, 15.2% of the study is focused on the DNO approach deployed to position, while 6.52% of the study was focused on the CSO approach for EVCS placement. Previous studies were focused on EV user approach has a proportion of 4.35% and the combination of DNO with CSO has 32.6%, CSO with EV user consist of 15.22%, EV user with DNO is 2.17% whereas the combination of three is 26.1% considered for problem formulation of EVCS placement as shown in figure 10. According to the Table 2, researchers use a variety of techniques to address the issue of EVCS placement. The two prime techniques used by researchers for problem-solving are GA and PSO. The other techniques of the authors to solve the problem could be introduced as ACO, ABC, TLBO, LP, greedy algorithm, GWO, GOA, branch and bound, and a detailed analysis is given in Table 4. Further, the Literature survey of voltage, power quality, power loss, reliability impact of the distribution system is also analyzed in this study. In addition, the past studies provides a review of the DGs integration, uncertainty, V2G scheme, rapid charger, and sensitivity analysis. Therefore, the percentage of all evaluated factors for every observed

papers that are reviewed for charging station location is illustrated in the figure 11.

## **6. Future research directions**

Even though EVCS research is critical, it is still in its early stages. For instance EVs currently account for a lower percentage of all vehicles in the world. The following are the possible research directions in this area.

### *6.1. Integration of renewable energy with EVCS placement*

The literature has already proved the advantages of integrating renewable energy, the capacity of solar energy and wind energy generation could be increased by using EV load in the grid. Due to the intermittency of renewable energy generation, power providers are facing difficulties when integrating vast amounts of renewable energy supplies into their grids. However, the EV charger's fast-responding control electronic interface, together with its battery storage, could control such source intermittency.

### *6.2. Multi-objective problem formulation using different approaches*

The current research on charging infrastructure planning indicates that the challenge has a wide range of behaviors. The certain shortcomings have been found with the problem formulation. Multi-objective functions such as running costs, construction costs, durability indexes, waiting time costs, and so forth must be included in the problem formulation. When defining the targets, reliability indexes such as average system interruption period, system average interruption duration, and system average interruption frequency index should be inserted. In addition, the intermittent of parameters should be included for EV flow, TN and EV load demand.

### *6.3. Techniques to solve the problem of EVCS placement*

It has been observed that the majority of researchers have utilized GA and PSO to solve the problem of EVCS positioning. However, for a better approach to the EVCS problem, other techniques such as grey wolf optimization, teaching-learning based optimization, grasshopper optimization, spider monkey optimization, game theory, artificial intelligence, machine learning could be added.




Figure 11: Analysis of different approaches

## 7. Conclusion

Electric vehicles are a promising solution for emission reduction in transportation system. Further, the rising popularity of electric vehicles has resulted an accelerate development of charging stations. However, this increment would impact negatively on the distribution network and it is necessary to consider EV driver behavior, the impact factor and the goal of investors when finding the optimal locations for the charging stations. As a result, research articles on optimal locations for charging stations are examined under three approaches: distribution network operator, charging station owner, and electric vehicle user. In the literature many papers have researched and evaluated the problem formulation, approaches, objective functions, and constraints to determine the best location for the charging stations. Therefore, this article includes approaches for the optimal locations of charging stations, objective functions and constraints for problem formulation, EV load modeling, handling of uncertainty, integration of renewable energy sources,

solution techniques, charging level, sensitivity analysis, and V2G strategies for researchers to evaluate. Further, the authors also discussed optimization techniques for solving the defined problem. Eventually, the impact of charging station load on the distribution network is also analyzed in this review article.

### **Declaration of interest**

The authors report no conflicts of interest. The authors alone are responsible for the content and writing of this article.

### **Acknowledgements**

This publication, was made possible by NPRP grant # [13S-0108-20008] from the Qatar National Research Fund (a member of Qatar Foundation). The statements made herein are solely the responsibility of the authors. The article processing charges (APC) will be funded by the Qatar National Library, Qatar.

### **References**

- [1] N. Parker, H. L. Breetz, D. Salon, M. W. Conway, J. Williams, M. Patterson, Who saves money buying electric vehicles? Heterogeneity in total cost of ownership, *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 96 (May) (2021) 102893.
- [2] M. Zhou, P. Long, N. Kong, L. Zhao, F. Jia, K. S. Campy, Characterizing the motivational mechanism behind taxi driver's adoption of electric vehicles for living: Insights from China, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 144 (2) (2021) 134–152.
- [3] N. Adnan, S. Md Nordin, M. A. bin Bahrudin, M. Ali, How trust can drive forward the user acceptance to the technology? In-vehicle technology for autonomous vehicle, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 118 (October) (2018) 819–836.

- [4] Electric Vehicle Market Size, Share, Analysis, Growth by 2027 (2020).  
URL <https://www.alliedmarketresearch.com/electric-vehicle-market>
- [5] M. Z. Zeb, K. Imran, A. Khattak, A. K. Janjua, A. Pal, M. Nadeem, J. Zhang, S. Khan, Optimal Placement of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in the Active Distribution Network, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 68124–68134.
- [6] D. Steen, L. A. Tuan, Impacts of fast charging of electric buses on electrical distribution systems, *CIREN - Open Access Proceedings Journal* 2017 (1) (2017) 2350–2353.
- [7] A. Y. Lam, Y. W. Leung, X. Chu, Electric vehicle charging station placement: Formulation, complexity, and solutions, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 5 (6) (2014) 2846–2856.
- [8] Publicly available EVSE chargers worldwide: country & type | Statista (2021).  
URL <https://www.statista.com/statistics/571564/publicly-available-electric-vehicle-chargers-by-country-type/>
- [9] Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Market | Meticulous Market Research Pvt. Ltd. (2021).  
URL <https://www.meticulousresearch.com/product/electric-vehicle-charging-stations-market-5078>
- [10] L. Chen, C. Xu, H. Song, K. Jermittiparsert, Optimal sizing and siting of EVCS in the distribution system using metaheuristics: A case study, *Energy Reports* 7 (2021) 208–217.
- [11] M. H. Moradi, M. Abedini, S. M. R. Tousi, S. M. Hosseinian, Electrical Power and Energy Systems Optimal siting and sizing of renewable energy sources and charging stations simultaneously based on Differential Evolution algorithm, *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ELECTRICAL POWER AND ENERGY SYSTEMS* 73 (2015) 1015–1024.

- [12] Z. Liu, F. Wen, G. Ledwich, Optimal planning of electric-vehicle charging stations in distribution systems, *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery* 28 (1) (2013) 102–110.
- [13] M. Mainul Islam, H. Shareef, A. Mohamed, Optimal location and sizing of fast charging stations for electric vehicles by incorporating traffic and power networks, *IET Intelligent Transport Systems* 12 (8) (2018) 947–957.
- [14] A. Pal, A. Bhattacharya, A. K. Chakraborty, Allocation of electric vehicle charging station considering uncertainties, *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks* 25 (2021) 100422.
- [15] S. R. Gampa, K. Jasthi, P. Goli, D. Das, R. C. Bansal, Grasshopper optimization algorithm based two stage fuzzy multiobjective approach for optimum sizing and placement of distributed generations, shunt capacitors and electric vehicle charging stations, *Journal of Energy Storage* 27 (November 2019) (2020) 101117.
- [16] A. El-Zonkoly, L. Dos Santos Coelho, Optimal allocation, sizing of PHEV parking lots in distribution system, *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems* 67 (2015) 472–477.
- [17] G. Battapothula, C. Yammani, S. Maheswarapu, Multi-objective optimal planning of fcps and dgs in distribution system with future ev load enhancement, *IET Electrical Systems in Transportation* 9 (3) (2019) 128–139.
- [18] Z.-h. Zhu, Z.-y. Gao, J.-f. Zheng, H.-m. Du, Charging station location problem of plug-in electric vehicles, *JTRG* 52 (2016) 11–22.
- [19] X. Luo, R. Qiu, Electric vehicle charging station location towards sustainable cities, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17 (8) (2020).
- [20] Y. Xiang, J. Liu, R. Li, F. Li, C. Gu, S. Tang, Economic planning of electric vehicle charging stations considering traffic constraints and load profile templates, *Applied Energy* 178 (2016) 647–659.

- [21] S. Pazouki, A. Mohsenzadeh, M.-R. Haghifam, Optimal planning of pevs charging stations and demand response programs considering distribution and traffic networks, in: 2013 Smart Grid Conference (SGC), IEEE, 2013, pp. 90–95.
- [22] P. Sadeghi-Barzani, A. Rajabi-Ghahnavieh, H. Kazemi-Karegar, Optimal fast charging station placing and sizing, *Applied Energy* 125 (2014) 289–299.
- [23] A. Mohsenzadeh, S. Pazouki, S. Ardalan, M. R. Haghifam, Optimal placing and sizing of parking lots including different levels of charging stations in electric distribution networks, *International Journal of Ambient Energy* 39 (7) (2018) 743–750.
- [24] Y. Wang, J. Shi, R. Wang, Z. Liu, L. Wang, Siting and sizing of fast charging stations in highway network with budget constraint, *Applied Energy* 228 (2018) 1255–1271.
- [25] G. Battapothula, C. Yammani, S. Maheswarapu, Multi-objective simultaneous optimal planning of electrical vehicle fast charging stations and DGs in distribution system, *Journal of Modern Power Systems and Clean Energy* 7 (4) (2019) 923–934.
- [26] A. Awasthi, K. Venkitesamy, S. Padmanaban, R. Selvamuthukumar, F. Blaabjerg, A. K. Singh, Optimal planning of electric vehicle charging station at the distribution system using hybrid optimization algorithm, *Energy* 133 (2017) 70–78.
- [27] M. S. K. Reddy, K. Selvajothi, Optimal placement of electric vehicle charging station for unbalanced radial distribution systems, *Energy Sources, Part A: Recovery, Utilization and Environmental Effects* 00 (00) (2020) 1–15.
- [28] M. S. K. Reddy, K. Selvajothi, Optimal placement of electric vehicle charging station for unbalanced radial distribution systems, *Energy Sources, Part A: Recovery, Utilization and Environmental Effects* 00 (00) (2020) 1–15.

- [29] K. Gupta, R. A. Narayanankutty, Environmental Effects Optimal location identification for aggregated charging of electric vehicles in solar photovoltaic powered microgrids with reduced distribution losses, *Energy Sources, Part A: Recovery, Utilization, and Environmental Effects* 00 (00) (2020) 1–16.
- [30] M. H. Amini, M. P. Moghaddam, O. Karabasoglu, Simultaneous allocation of electric vehicles' parking lots and distributed renewable resources in smart power distribution networks, *Sustainable Cities and Society* 28 (2017) 332–342.
- [31] E. Pashajavid, M. A. Golkar, Optimal placement and sizing of plug in electric vehicles charging stations within distribution networks with high penetration of photovoltaic panels, *Journal of Renewable and Sustainable Energy* 5 (5) (2013).
- [32] A. Eid, Allocation of distributed generations in radial distribution systems using adaptive PSO and modified GSA multi-objective optimizations, *Alexandria Engineering Journal* 59 (2020) 4771–4786.
- [33] H. Zhang, Z. Hu, Z. Xu, Y. Song, An Integrated Planning Framework for Different Types of PEV Charging Facilities in Urban Area, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 7 (5) (2016) 2273–2284.
- [34] S. N. Hashemian, M. A. Latify, G. R. Yousefi, PEV Fast-Charging Station Sizing and Placement in Coupled Transportation-Distribution Networks Considering Power Line Conditioning Capability, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 11 (6) (2020) 4773–4783.
- [35] A. Shukla, K. Verma, R. Kumar, Multi-objective synergistic planning of EV fast-charging stations in the distribution system coupled with the transportation network, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 13 (2019) 3421–3432.
- [36] S. Deb, S. Member, K. Tammi, X.-z. Gao, K. Kalita, P. Mahanta, A Hybrid Multi-Objective Chicken Swarm Optimization and Teaching Learning Based Algo-

- rithm for Charging Station Placement Problem, *IEEE Access* (2020) 92573–92590.
- [37] M. R. Mozafar, M. H. Moradi, M. H. Amini, A Simultaneous Approach for Optimal Allocation of Renewable Energy Sources and Charging Stations based on Improved GA-PSO Algorithm, *Sustainable Cities and Society* (2017).
- [38] S. Deb, K. Tammi, K. Kalita, P. Mahanta, Charging Station Placement for Electric Vehicles: A Case Study of Guwahati City, India, *IEEE Access* 7 (2019) 100270–100282.
- [39] V. K. B. Ponnamp, K. Swarnasri, Multi-Objective Optimal Allocation of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and Distributed Generators in Radial Distribution Systems using Metaheuristic Optimization Algorithms, *Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research* 10 (3) (2020).
- [40] B. Faridpak, H. F. Gharibeh, M. Farrokhifar, D. Pozo, Two-Step LP Approach for Optimal Placement and Operation of EV Charging Stations, *Proceedings of 2019 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Europe, ISGT-Europe 2019* (2019) 1–5.
- [41] M. Moradijoz, F. Moazzen, S. Allahmoradi, M. P. Moghaddam, M. R. Haghifam, A Two Stage Model for Optimum Allocation of Electric Vehicle Parking Lots in Smart Grids, *Proceedings - 2018 Smart Grid Conference, SGC 2018* (2018).
- [42] Z. Tian, W. Hou, X. Gu, F. Gu, B. Yao, The location optimization of electric vehicle charging stations considering charging behavior, *Simulation* 94 (7) (2018) 625–636.
- [43] H. Simorgh, H. Doagou-Mojarrad, H. Razmi, G. B. Gharehpetian, Cost-based optimal siting and sizing of electric vehicle charging stations considering demand response programmes, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 12 (8) (2018) 1712–1720.

- [44] W. Kong, Y. Luo, G. Feng, K. Li, H. Peng, Optimal location planning method of fast charging station for electric vehicles considering operators , drivers , vehicles , traffic flow and power grid, *Energy* 186 (2019) 115826.
- [45] T. Yi, X.-b. Cheng, H. Zheng, J.-p. Liu, Research on Location and Capacity Optimization Method for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations Considering User's Comprehensive Satisfaction, *energies* (2019).
- [46] C.-L. Su, R.-C. Leou, J.-C. Yang, C.-N. Lu, Optimal electric vehicle charging stations placement in distribution systems, in: *IECON 2013-39th Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society*, 2013, pp. 2121–2126.
- [47] A. Aljanad, A. Mohamed, H. Shareef, T. Khatib, A novel method for optimal placement of vehicle-to-grid charging stations in distribution power system using a quantum binary lightning search algorithm, *Sustainable Cities and Society* 38 (2018) 174–183.
- [48] X. Xi, R. Sioshansi, V. Marano, Simulation-optimization model for location of a public electric vehicle charging infrastructure, *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment* 22 (2013) 60–69.
- [49] A. M. Othman, H. A. Gabbar, F. Pino, M. Repetto, Optimal electrical fast charging stations by enhanced descent gradient and Voronoi diagram, *Computers and Electrical Engineering* 83 (2020) 106574.
- [50] H. Zhang, S. J. Moura, Z. Hu, Y. Song, PEV Fast-Charging Station Siting and Sizing on Coupled Transportation and Power Networks, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 9 (4) (2018) 2595–2605.
- [51] S. Faddel, A. T. Elsayed, O. A. Mohammed, Bilayer Multi-Objective Optimal Allocation and Sizing of Electric Vehicle Parking Garage, *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications* 54 (3) (2018) 1992–2001.
- [52] X. Ren, H. Zhang, R. Hu, Y. Qiu, Location of electric vehicle charging stations: A perspective using the grey decision-making model, *Energy* 173 (2019) 548–553.

- [53] Z. Zhu, Z. Gao, J. Zheng, H. Du, Charging Station Planning for Plug-In Electric Vehicles, *Journal of Systems Science and Systems Engineering* 27 (1) (2018) 24–45.
- [54] M. Rahman, S. Barua, S. Zohora, K. Hasan, T. Aziz, Voltage sensitivity based site selection for phev charging station in commercial distribution system, in: 2013 IEEE PES Asia-Pacific Power and Energy Engineering Conference (APPEEC), IEEE, 2013, pp. 1–6.
- [55] Y. A. Alhazmi, H. A. Mostafa, M. M. Salama, Optimal allocation for electric vehicle charging stations using Trip Success Ratio, *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems* 91 (2017) 101–116.
- [56] J. Ma, L. Zhang, A deploying method for predicting the size and optimizing the location of an electric vehicle charging stations, *Information (Switzerland)* 9 (7) (2018).
- [57] S. Hosseini, M. D. Sarder, Development of a Bayesian network model for optimal site selection of electric vehicle charging station, *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems* 105 (April 2018) (2019) 110–122.
- [58] Y. Zhang, Y. Wang, F. Li, B. Wu, Y.-Y. Chiang, X. Zhang, Efficient Deployment of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure: Simultaneous Optimization of Charging Station Placement and Charging Pile Assignment, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2020) 1–6.
- [59] N. Neyestani, M. Y. Damavandi, M. Shafie-Khah, J. Contreras, J. P. Catalão, Allocation of Plug-In Vehicles' Parking Lots in Distribution Systems Considering Network-Constrained Objectives, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 30 (5) (2015) 2643–2656.
- [60] M. Moradijoz, M. Parsa Moghaddam, M. R. Haghifam, E. Alishahi, A multi-objective optimization problem for allocating parking lots in a distribution network, *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems* 46 (1) (2013) 115–122.

- [61] C. Luo, Y. F. Huang, V. Gupta, Placement of EV Charging Stations-Balancing Benefits among Multiple Entities, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 8 (2) (2017) 759–768.
- [62] S. Deb, X. Z. Gao, K. Tammi, K. Kalita, P. Mahanta, A novel chicken swarm and teaching learning based algorithm for electric vehicle charging station placement problem, *Energy* 220 (2021) 119645.
- [63] C. Jiang, Z. Jing, T. Ji, Q. Wu, Optimal location of pevcss using mas and er approach, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 12 (20) (2018) 4377–4387.
- [64] P. Tadayon-Roody, M. Ramezani, H. Falaghi, Multi-objective locating of electric vehicle charging stations considering travel comfort in urban transportation system, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 15 (5) (2021) 960–971.
- [65] L. Bitencourt, T. P. Abud, B. H. Dias, B. S. Borba, R. S. Maciel, J. Quirós-Tortós, Optimal location of EV charging stations in a neighborhood considering a multi-objective approach, *Electric Power Systems Research* 199 (2021).
- [66] J. Li, Z. Liu, X. Wang, Public charging station location determination for electric ride-hailing vehicles based on an improved genetic algorithm, *Sustainable Cities and Society* 74 (2021) 103181.
- [67] D. Sengupta, A. Datta, Renewable Energy Supported Bi-directional Electric-Vehicle Charging Station Allocation in Distribution Network using INBPSO Technique, *International Journal of Renewable Energy Research* 11 (2) (2021) 750–761.
- [68] P. Rajesh, F. H. Shajin, Optimal allocation of EV charging spots and capacitors in distribution network improving voltage and power loss by Quantum-Behaved and Gaussian Mutational Dragonfly Algorithm (QGDA), *Electric Power Systems Research* 194 (2021) 107049.
- [69] L. Liu, F. Xie, Z. Huang, M. Wang, Multi-objective coordinated optimal allocation of DG and evcss based on the V2G mode, *Processes* 9 (1) (2021) 1–18.

- [70] E. Hadian, H. Akbari, M. Farzinfar, S. Saeed, Optimal Allocation of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations With Adopted Smart Charging/Discharging Schedule, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 196908–196919.
- [71] Q. Cui, Y. Weng, C. W. Tan, Electric Vehicle Charging Station Placement Method for Urban Areas, *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 10 (6) (2019) 6552–6565.
- [72] R. Xie, W. Wei, M. E. Khodayar, J. Wang, S. Mei, Planning Fully Renewable Powered Charging Stations on Highways: A Data-Driven Robust Optimization Approach, *IEEE Transactions on Transportation Electrification* 4 (3) (2018) 817–830.
- [73] M. A. Kazemi, M. Sedighzadeh, M. J. Mirzaei, O. Homaei, Optimal siting and sizing of distribution system operator owned EV parking lots, *Applied Energy* 179 (2016) 1176–1184.
- [74] A. Garces, A Linear Three-Phase Load Flow for Power Distribution Systems, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 31 (1) (2016) 827–828.
- [75] S. Kawambwa, R. Mwifunyi, D. Mnyanghwalo, N. Hamisi, E. Kalinga, An improved backward / forward sweep power flow method based on network tree depth for radial distribution systems, *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology* 0 (2021).
- [76] B. Sereeter, K. Vuik, C. Witteveen, Newton power flow methods for unbalanced three-phase distribution networks, *Energies* 10 (10) (2017).
- [77] J. a. M. Rupa, S. Ganesh, Power Flow Analysis for Radial Distribution System Using Backward/Forward Sweep Method, *International Journal of Electrical, Computer, Energetic, Electronic and Communication Engineering* 8 (10) (2014) 1537–1541.
- [78] S. Petridis, O. Blanas, D. Rakopoulos, F. Stergiopoulos, N. Nikolopoulos, S. Voutetakis, An efficient backward/forward sweep algorithm for power flow

analysis through a novel tree-like structure for unbalanced distribution networks, *Energies* 14 (4) (2021) 897.

- [79] Y. Eren, I. B. Küçükdemiral, I. Üstoğlu, Introduction to Optimization, Optimization in Renewable Energy Systems: Recent Perspectives (2017) 27–74.
- [80] S. Mirjalili, S. M. Mirjalili, A. Lewis, Grey Wolf Optimizer, *Advances in Engineering Software* 69 (2014) 46–61.
- [81] S. Mirjalili, P. Jangir, S. Saremi, Multi-objective ant lion optimizer: a multi-objective optimization algorithm for solving engineering problems, *Applied Intelligence* 46 (1) (2017) 79–95.
- [82] A. Kaveh, V.R. Mahdavi, Colliding bodies optimization: A novel meta-heuristic method, *Computers and Structures* 139 (2014) 18–27.
- [83] A. Kaveh, V. R. Mahdavi, Multi-objective colliding bodies optimization algorithm for design of trusses, *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering* 6 (1) (2019) 49–59.
- [84] S. Mirjalili, The Ant Lion Optimizer, *Advances in Engineering Software* 83 (2015) 80–98.
- [85] A. K. Karmaker, S. Roy, M. R. Ahmed, Analysis of the impact of electric vehicle charging station on power quality issues, in: 2019 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE), 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [86] A. Ahmed, A. Iqbal, I. Khan, A. Al-Wahedi, H. Mehrjerdi, S. Rahman, Impact of EV charging Station Penetration on Harmonic Distortion Level in Utility Distribution Network: A Case Study of Qatar, 2021 IEEE Texas Power and Energy Conference, TPEC 2021 (2021) 1–6.
- [87] S. Deb, K. Tammi, K. Kalita, P. Mahanta, Impact of electric vehicle charging station load on distribution network, *Energies* 11 (1) (2018) 1–25.

- [88] C. Dharmakeerthi, N. Mithulananthan, T. K. Saha, Overview of the impacts of plug-in electric vehicles on the power grid, in: 2011 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies, IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–8.
- [89] Z. Chen, A. L. Carrel, C. Gore, W. Shi, Environmental and economic impact of electric vehicle adoption in the U.S, Environmental Research Letters 16 (4) (2021).