#### **Future Sustainability**

**Open Access Journal** 

ISSN 2995-0473

August 2024 | Volume 02 | Issue 03 | Pages 06-11

Journal homepage: https://fupubco.com/fusus

https://doi.org/10.55670/fpll.fusus.2.3.2



#### Article

# Supply of energy required for water-ammonia absorption refrigeration cycle for an industrial refrigerator using solar parabolic collectors and photovoltaic panels: case study Malaysia

### Kho Chung Ho, Jalal Tavalaei\*

Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Science, Swinburne University of Technology Sarawak, Kuching, Malaysia

## ARTICLE INFO

# ABSTRACT

Article history: Received 20 June 2024 Received in revised form 25 July 2024 Accepted 05 August 2024

Keywords: Parabolic trough collectors, Solar, Photovoltaic, Water-ammonia absorption refrigeration, Malaysia

\*Corresponding author Email address: jtavalaei@swinburne.edu.my

DOI: 10.55670/fpll.fusus.2.3.2

Conventional water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system in the industry uses heat energy generated by non-renewable energy sources such as the burning of natural gas, but it is just a matter of time before natural gas becomes depleted. Then, non-renewable energy often produces greenhouse gases that are harmful to the environment. Therefore, solar energy can be used as an alternative to supply the energy required by the absorption refrigeration cycle (ARC). Parabolic trough collectors (PTC) can supply the required heat energy to the reboiler, whereas photovoltaic (PV) panels can supply the electrical energy to the pump of an ARC. To prove the feasibility of using solar energy as a more sustainable alternative, a simulation of the PTC and PV models is conducted, and the average energy generated by each model is obtained. The result of this research proved that Malaysia is a suitable location for the implementation of solar technologies as the amount of solar radiation is sufficiently high throughout the year.

#### 1. Introduction

Non-renewable energy holds a dominant proportion of the world's energy demand, whereas the technology of renewable energy is much younger as compared to that of non-renewable energy. However, since non-renewable does not have an infinite amount of supply, renewable energy, such as solar energy, has gained much attention from various fields throughout the last few decades [1]. The transition to solar energy is advantageous due to its freely available nature [2]. While dual-axis sunlight trackers are well-developed and mature [3], an intelligent tracking program is crucial for optimizing solar PV panel generation [4]. Given Malaysia's abundant renewable energy potential, the development of a hybrid renewable energy system for villages is anticipated [5-6]. Furthermore, the growing interest in establishing a hydrogen hub is essential for examining the generation, transmission, distribution, and consumption of hydrogen in the East Asian market [7]. Therefore, implementing voltage generation using fuel cell technology has been initiated to find out the electrical equivalent component's values [8].

On the other hand, there is the presence of sunlight, and using proper equipment and tools, it can even be used to power up industrial processes such as industrial refrigeration systems. Most researchers discuss only the use of solar collectors to capture heat from direct sunlight and convert it to thermal energy for the reboiler in the absorption refrigeration system to operate. The most possible explanation is that the component in an absorption refrigeration system that requires the most power input is the reboiler, which is commonly located at the bottom part of the generator. Nonetheless, although most power is consumed by the generator in the form of heat, there is still a small fraction of power being consumed by the pump in the form of electrical energy. The aim of this research project is to simulate parabolic trough collector (PTC) and photovoltaic (PV) panels using MATLAB for the supply of energy required by water – ammonia absorption refrigeration in Malaysia.

#### 1.1 Water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system

Water – ammonia absorption refrigeration system is one of the most common methods of absorption refrigeration cycles (ARC). Throughout the entire ARC, the only component that requires a large amount of thermal energy is the reboiler, whereas the part that requires electrical energy is the pump located before the generator. Hence, these two components will be the main concern as the power required by these two components is the key to determining the scale of the photovoltaic (PV) system and parabolic trough collectors (PTC). Different scale of ARC requires different amount of heat and also electrical energy. Niasar et al. [9] have developed a hybrid integrated structure where the ARC system inside the structure receives high-temperature steam from the steam turbine; its reboiler and pump use 10839 kW of heat energy and 69.21 kW of electrical energy, respectively.

# 1.2 Existing design of solar-powered water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system

Over the last few decades, a great deal of research has been conducted on solar-powered water-ammonia absorption refrigeration systems. Abdulateef et al. [1] performed an investigation on a solar-powered absorption refrigeration system by constructing a real-life prototype under the climate of Malaysia. The experimental setup consists of an evacuated tube solar collector connected to a water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system and can produce a cooling capacity of up to 1.5 tons. They pointed out that for a solar-powered absorption refrigeration system to operate, the outlet temperature of the collector has to be higher than the cut-in/cut-off temperature, in which the cutin/cut-off temperature is essentially the minimum operating temperature of the generator.

#### 2. Methodology

2.1 Water-ammonia absorption refrigeration parameters

The heat energy required by the pump and electrical energy required by the reboiler are extracted from [9] and are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The energy required by the reboiler and pump

Parameter	Value
Heat energy required by reboiler (kW)	10,839
Electrical energy required by pump (kW)	69.21

#### 2.2 Parabolic trough collector (PTC) model

Sodhal et al. [10] introduced an equation that can be used to calculate the optical efficiency of the PTC.

$$\eta_{opt} = \rho \tau \alpha \Upsilon K(\theta) X_{end} \tag{1}$$

Where  $\rho$  is the mirror reflectance,  $\tau$  is the transmittance of the glass envelope,  $\alpha$  is the absorptance of the receiver,  $\Upsilon$  is the intercept factor,  $K(\theta)$  is the incident angle modifier, and  $X_{end}$  is the end loss. The outlet temperature of the Heat Transfer Fluid (HTF) can be obtained using the equation as shown in [11] which is shown below.

$$T_{out} = T_{in} + \frac{Q_{gained}}{\dot{m}Cp} \tag{2}$$

Where  $T_{in}$  is the inlet temperature,  $Q_{gained}$  is the useful heat gain,  $\dot{m}$  is the mass flow rate and Cp is the heat capacity of the fluid. Additionally, the thermal efficiency of PTC is determined by the useful heat gained by the collector part towards the direct normal incident radiation and area of the aperture [11].



Figure 1. Flowchart of PTC model

The equation is shown below:

$$\eta_{th} = \frac{Q_{gained}}{G_B A_a} \tag{3}$$

Where  $G_B$  is the beam of solar radiation and  $Q_{gained}$  can be expressed as shown below:

$$Q_{gained} = F_R \left( G_B \eta_{opt} A_a - A_r U_L (T_{in} - T_a) \right) \tag{4}$$

Where  $F_R$  is the heat removal factor,  $A_a$  is the aperture area,  $A_r$  is the receiver area and  $U_L$  is the heat loss coefficient of the collector. The overall flow of the PTC model is shown in Figure **1Error! Reference source not found.** 

#### 2.3 Photovoltaic (PV) model

The net current of the solar module will be the difference between the photocurrent ( $I_L$ ) and the normal diode current, as shown below [12]:

$$I = I_L - I_o \left[ \exp\left(\frac{q(V+IR_s)}{nkT} - 1\right) \right] - \frac{V+IR_s}{R_p}$$
(5)

Where *q* is the charge of the electron, *k* is the Boltzmann constant, *n* is the diode quality factor,  $R_s$  is the series resistance,  $R_p$  is the parallel resistance, *T* is the absolute cell temperature, and  $I_o$  is the diode saturation current. The maximum power of solar panels can be obtained using Ohm's law and is expressed as follows:

$$P_{max} = V_{max}I_{max} \tag{6}$$

Then, the maximum efficiency of the solar cell is essentially the ratio of the maximum dissipated power over the incident light power and is described as shown below:

$$\eta = \frac{P_{max}}{P_{in}} \tag{7}$$

The overall flow of the PV model is shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2. Flowchart of PV model

#### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Number of modules required

The amount of average solar irradiance in Kuching was measured to be  $636.19 W/m^2$ using light meter [13]. Meanwhile, the amount of average solar irradiance in Kuching obtained through simulation in this paper is approximately

643.40  $W/m^2$ , whereas the beam of solar radiation is around 514.711  $W/m^2$ . This shows that the solar radiation model being developed is fairly accurate. By looking at Figure **3Error! Reference source not found**, it shows that the solar r adiation intensity in Kuching is very consistent throughout the year, which means that it is appropriate to implement solar technology in Kuching.



Figure 3. Annual solar radiation of the PTC model

For modeling the PTC module, Figure 4 shows the monthly average optical efficiency of the PTC module in Kuching, whereas Figure 5 illustrates the monthly average thermal efficiency. The average optical efficiency throughout the year was calculated to be around 24.77%, while the average thermal efficiency was calculated to be around 26.56%. Then, Figure 6 shows the monthly average heat energy being captured by a single PTC module; the monthly heat energy being generated is measured in terms of kilowatt hour per square meter.



Figure 4. The annual optical efficiency of the PTC model

After converting the value to in terms of kilowatts for calculation purposes, the average heat generated by a single PTC module is approximately 1.86 kW. On the other hand, for modeling the PV panel, Figure 7 shows the monthly average electrical energy being generated by a single PV panel; the

average maximum power was calculated to be around 183.43 W. The energy generated by a single PTC module and PV panel will be used to calculate the number of PTC modules and PV panels required to supply the energy required by the reboiler and pump, as shown in Table 1. The number of modules



required for PTC modules and PV panels is shown in Table 2.



Figure 5. Annual thermal efficiency of the PTC model



Figure 6. Annual useful heat collected from the PTC model

Figure 7. Annual average power from	n PV panel
-------------------------------------	------------

Table 2. Number of PTC modules and PV panels required

Туре	Energy required (kW)	Energy generated per module (kW)	Number of modules required			
PTC	10,839	1.86	5828			
PV	69.21	0.183	379			

#### 3.2 Cost analysis

The cost to implement PTC technology is approximately 4,156 \$/kW as of year 2012 [14]. As explained by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, the capital cost for solar generation technology decreases by around 4% every 5 years due to technological improvement [15]. Hence, the approximate capital cost for PTC technology as of the year 2022 is  $3,823 \ /kW$ . The amount of heat energy required by the reboiler is around 10,839 kW, which means that the cost to implement the simulated PTC model in Kuching stands at around 41,437,497 \$. After converting the cost to be in terms of Malaysian ringgit, the cost is around RM172,413,137. Meanwhile, the cost to implement the simulated PV model in Kuching will be relatively cheaper as compared to the PTC system because the energy demand of the pump is significantly much smaller than that of the reboiler. The cost of implementing Q.Peak Duo-G5 solar panel is around  $2.7 \$  /*W* as of the year 2021 [16-17]. The electrical energy required by the pump is 69.21 kW, which indicates that the cost required to implement the PV model is around 186,867 \$, which can be converted to approximately RM 781,104. Table 3 compares the implementation cost of different technologies.

Table 3. The implementation cost of different technology

Technology	Capital cost
PTC	RM 172,413,137.00
PV	RM 781,104.00

To determine the payback period of both PTC and PV technology, the levelized cost of energy (LCOE) for PTC and PV technology has to be determined. The annual energy required to be produced by PTC is calculated to be 39,020,400 kWh, whereas PV is calculated to be 249,156 kWh. If the payback period is set to be 10 years, the LCOE for both PTC and PV is estimated to be around RM0.58 per kWh and RM0.37 per kWh. The annual revenue for both technologies is calculated as shown in Table 4. Assuming the annual revenue for both PTC and Table 6 are the steps taken to calculate the LCOE for both PTC and PV is Microsoft Excel, respectively.

Table 4. Annual revenue of PTC and PV

Technology	Interval	Revenue			
	Daily Revenue	RM 62,866.00			
PTC	Monthly Revenue	RM 1,885,986.00			
	Annual Revenue	RM 22,631,832.00			
	Daily Revenue	RM 256.00			
PV	Monthly Revenue	RM 7,682.00			
	Annual Revenue	RM 92,187.00			

#### Table 5. The payback period of PTC

Levelized Cost of Energy 1	Femplate (LCOE	E)									
Assumptions (in '000s)											
Initial Investment Cost (\$)	41,437,497										
Operations and Maintenance Costs (	487,755										
O&M Growth Rate (%)	5.00%										
Annual Fuel Costs (\$)	-										
Annual Electricity Output (kWH)	39,020,400										
Project Lifespan (years)											
Discount Rate (%)	1.00%										
Entry Date	1/1/2022										
Total Costs	Entry	Construction	Operations								
Date	1/1/2022	1/1/2023	1/1/2024	1/1/2025	1/1/2026	1/1/2027	1/1/2028	1/1/2029	1/1/2030	1/1/2031	1/1/2032
Year Frac (From Start Date)		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Initial Investment	41,437,497	-	-	-							-
O&M Costs	-	-	487,755	512,143	537,750	564,637	592,869	622,513	653,638	686,320	720,636
Fuel Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Discount Factor		99.0%	98.0%	97.1%	96.1%	95.1%	94.2%	93.3%	92.3%	91.4%	90.5%
Present Value of Costs	41,437,497	-	478,144	497,081	516,767	537,233	558,510	580,629	603,624	627,530	652,383
NPV of Total Costs	\$46,489,397										
Total Energy Output	Entry	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yearly Output	-	-	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400	39,020,400
Discount Factor	-	99.0%	98.0%	97.1%	96.1%	95.1%	94.2%	93.3%	92.3%	91.4%	90.5%
Present Value of Costs	-	-	38,251,544	37,872,816	37,497,837	37,126,572	36,758,982	36,395,032	36,034,685	35,677,906	35,324,659
NPV of Total Output	330,940,032 kWH										

LCOE \$0.14/kWH

#### Table 6. The payback period of PV

Assumptions (in '000s)         Initial Investment Cost (\$)         166, 667           Operations and Maintenance Costs (\$ 1,315	Levelized Cost of Energy T	emplate (LCO	E)									
Initial Investment Cost (\$) 186,867 Operations and Maintenance Costs (* 1,315 OQM Growth Rate (%) 5.00% Annual Fuel Costs (\$) - Annual Electricity Output (kWH) 249,156 Entry Date 11/12022 Total Costs Entry Construction Operations Operat	Assumptions (in '000s)											
Operations and Maintenance Costs (:         1,315           OBM Growth Rate (%)         500%           Annual Fuel Costs (S)         -           Annual Fuel Costs (S)         -           Annual Fuel Costs (S)         10           Discount Rate (%)         1.00%           Entry Date         11/12022           Total Costs         Entry Construction         Operations         Ope	Initial Investment Cost (\$)	186,867										
O&M Growth Rate (%)       5.00%         Annual Fuel Costs (\$)       -         Annual Fuel Costs (\$)       -         Annual Fuel Costs (\$)       -         Project Lifespan (years)       10         Discount Rate (%)       1.00%         Entry Date       11/12022         Total Costs       Entry Construction       Operations       Operations<	Operations and Maintenance Costs (	1,315										
Annual Electricity Output (kWH)       249,156         Project Lifespan (years)       10         Discount Rate (%)       1.00%         Entry Date       11/12022         Total Costs       Entry       Construction       Operations	O&M Growth Rate (%)	5.00%										
Annual Electricity Output (kWH)       249,156         Project Lifespan (years)       10         Discount Rate (%)       1.00%         Entry Date       11/1/2022         Total Costs       Entry       Construction       Operations	Annual Fuel Costs (\$)	-										
Project Lifespan (years)       10         Discount Rate (%)       1.00%         Entry Date       111/2022         Total Costs       Entry       Construction       Operations       Oper	Annual Electricity Output (kWH)	249,156										
Discount Rate (%)         1.00%           Entry Date         11/1/2022           Total Costs         Entry         Construction         Operations         Operations <t< td=""><td>Project Lifespan (years)</td><td>10</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Project Lifespan (years)	10										
Entry Date         1/1/2022           Total Costs         Entry         Construction         Operations	Discount Rate (%)	1.00%										
Total Costs         Entry         Construction         Operations         Operation	Entry Date	1/1/2022										
Date         1/1/2022         1/1/2023         1/1/2024         1/1/2025         1/1/2026         1/1/2027         1/1/2028         1/1/2029         1/1/2030         1/1/2031         1/1/2031           Year Frac (From Start Date)         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         9         10           Initial Investment         186,867         -	Total Costs	Entry	Construction	Operations								
Year Frac (From Start Date)         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         9         10           Initial Investment         186,867         -         <	Date	1/1/2022	1/1/2023	1/1/2024	1/1/2025	1/1/2026	1/1/2027	1/1/2028	1/1/2029	1/1/2030	1/1/2031	1/1/2032
Initial Investment       186,867       - </td <td>Year Frac (From Start Date)</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> <td>10</td>	Year Frac (From Start Date)		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
O&M Costs         -         -         1,315         1,381         1,450         1,522         1,598         1,678         1,762         1,850         1,943           Fuel Costs         -	Initial Investment	186,867	-		-		-					-
Fuel Costs       99.0%       98.0%       97.1%       96.1%       95.1%       94.2%       93.3%       92.3%       91.4%       90.5%         Discount Factor       99.0%       98.0%       97.1%       96.1%       95.1%       94.2%       93.3%       92.3%       91.4%       90.5%         Present Value of Costs       186,867       -       1,289       1,340       1,393       1,448       1,506       1,565       1,627       1,692       1,759         NPV of Total Costs       \$200,487       \$200,487       \$200,487       \$200,487       \$200,487       \$200,487       \$200,487         Total Energy Output       Entry       1       2       3       4       5       6       7       8       9       10         Yearly Output       -       -       249,156	O&M Costs	-	-	1,315	1,381	1,450	1,522	1,598	1,678	1,762	1,850	1,943
Discount Factor         99.0%         98.0%         97.1%         96.1%         95.1%         94.2%         93.3%         92.3%         91.4%         90.5%           Present Value of Costs         186,867         -         1,289         1,340         1,393         1,448         1,506         1,565         1,627         1,692         1,759           NPV of Total Costs         \$200,487         \$200,586         \$200,586         \$200,586	Fuel Costs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Present Value of Costs         186,867         -         1,289         1,340         1,393         1,448         1,506         1,565         1,627         1,692         1,759           NPV of Total Costs         \$200,487         * </td <td>Discount Factor</td> <td></td> <td>99.0%</td> <td>98.0%</td> <td>97.1%</td> <td>96.1%</td> <td>95.1%</td> <td>94.2%</td> <td>93.3%</td> <td>92.3%</td> <td>91.4%</td> <td>90.5%</td>	Discount Factor		99.0%	98.0%	97.1%	96.1%	95.1%	94.2%	93.3%	92.3%	91.4%	90.5%
NPV of Total Costs         \$200,487           Total Energy Output         Entry         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         9         10           Yearly Output         -         -         249,156         249	Present Value of Costs	186,867	-	1,289	1,340	1,393	1,448	1,506	1,565	1,627	1,692	1,759
Total Energy Output         Entry         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         9         10           Yearly Output         -         -         249,156 </td <td>NPV of Total Costs</td> <td>\$200,487</td> <td></td>	NPV of Total Costs	\$200,487										
Iotal Energy Output         Entry         1         2         3         4         5         6         7         8         9         10           Yearly Output         -         -         249,156 </td <td></td> <td>Esta</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td><u>_</u></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10</td>		Esta		0	2		-	<u>_</u>	-			10
Yearry Output         -         -         249,156         249,	Total Energy Output	Entry	1	2	3	4	5	6	/	8	9	10
Liscount Factor - 99.0% 96.0% 97.1% 96.1% 99.1% 94.2% 93.3% 92.3% 91.4% 90.5% Present Value of Costs 244,247 241,828 239,434 237,063 234,716 232,392 230,091 227,813 225,558	Yeany Output	-	-	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156	249,156
Present Value or Losts 244,247 241,828 239,434 237,063 234,716 232,392 230,091 227,813 225,558	Discount Factor		99.0%	98.0%	97.1%	96.1%	95.1%	94.2%	93.3%	92.3%	91.4%	90.5%
	Present Value of Costs	-	-	244,247	241,828	239,434	237,063	234,716	232,392	230,091	227,813	225,558

LCOE \$0.09/kWH

#### 4. Conclusion

To conclude this final year research project, it has been proven that it is possible to supply the energy required by a water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system purely using solar energy. The amount of average solar irradiance in Kuching obtained through simulation is approximately 643.40 W/m<sup>2</sup>. This has proven that Malaysia is a suitable location for the implementation of solar technologies as the amount of solar radiation is sufficiently high throughout the year. Then, the average heat collected by a single PTC is calculated to be 1.86 kW, and the average power generated by a single PV panel is 183.43W. To cope with the energy demand of the reboiler and pump, approximately 5828 PTC modules and 379 PV panels will be required. Integrating solar technologies into a water-ammonia absorption refrigeration system can be beneficial because the energy generation process does not generate any sort of greenhouse gases that

can harm the environment. Then, the payback period of the PTC and PV model is reasonable which shows that solar technologies are a long-term investment worth considering. If the payback period is set to 15 or even 20 years, LCOE will be even lower, which makes it even more attractive. Future research could incorporate the use of thermal energy storage (TEM) into the simulation model of PTC and conduct a cost analysis to determine the new payback period. The use of TEM would increase the overall capital cost of the PTC system but will generate better annual revenue due to its capability to store heat and release it whenever necessary.

#### Ethical issue

The authors are aware of and comply with best practices in publication ethics, specifically with regard to authorship (avoidance of guest authorship), dual submission, manipulation of figures, competing interests, and compliance with policies on research ethics. The authors adhere to publication requirements that the submitted work is original and has not been published elsewhere.

#### Data availability statement

The manuscript contains all the data. However, more data will be available upon request from the corresponding author.

#### **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest.

#### References

- [1] J. Abdulateef, M. Alghoul, A. Zaharim, and K. Sopian, "Experimental investigation on solar absorption refrigeration system in Malaysia," Renew. Energy Sources, pp. 267–271, 2010.
- [2] Naderipour, A., Abdul-Malek, Z., Arshad, R.N., Kamyab, H., Chelliapan, S., Ashokkumar, V. and Tavalaei, J., 2021. Assessment of carbon footprint from transportation, electricity, water, and waste generation: towards utilisation of renewable energy sources. Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 23, pp.183-201.
- [3] Wong, L.F., Afrouzi, H.N. and Tavalaei, J., 2024. Design and implementation of a dual-axis sun tracker for an Arduino-based micro-controller photovoltaic system. Future Technology, 3(3), pp.15-19.
- [4] Afrouzi, H.N., Mashak, S.V., Dastgheib, A.M. and Tavalaei, J., 2011, December. Economic Sizing of Solar Array for a Photovoltaic Building in Malaysia with Matlab. In 2011 First International Conference on Informatics and Computational Intelligence (pp. 306-311). IEEE.
- [5] Khavari, A.H., Abdul-Malek, Z., Moradi, M., Tavalaei, J., Abdolahzadeh Anbaran, S. and Wooi, C.L., 2016. An Economic Assessment of Hybrid Renewable Energy for a Remote Area Electrification in Iran. Applied Mechanics and Materials, 818, pp.151-155.
- [6] Zin, A.A.M., Moradi, M., Tavalaei, J., Naderipour, A., Khavari, A.H. and Moradi, M., 2017. Techno-economic analysis of stand-alone hybrid energy system for the electrification of Iran drilling oil rigs. TELKOMNIKA (Telecommunication Computing Electronics and Control), 15(2), pp.746-755.
- [7] Wong, M., Afrouzi, H.N., Hassan, A., Jayamani, E., Tavalaei, J., Sunarso, J. and Mehranzamir, K., 2024.

Design and Techno-Economic Analysis of a Hydrogen-Based Micro Hydro-Solar Hybrid Energy System for Sustainable Energy Access: A Case Study in Sri Aman, Sarawak.

- [8] Chieh, N.J.W., Afrouzi, H.N. and Tavalaei, J., 2023, December. Development of Integrated Structure of Hydrogen Production Using Photovoltaic Panels and Detailed Electrical Model for Electrolyser. In 2023 7th International Conference on Electronics, Materials Engineering & Nano-Technology (IEMENTech) (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
- [9] M. S. Niasar, B. Ghorbani, M. Amidpour, and R. Hayati, "Developing a hybrid integrated structure of natural gas conversion to liquid fuels, absorption refrigeration cycle and multi effect desalination (exergy and economic analysis)," Energy, vol. 189, p. 116162, 2019, doi: http://doi.org/10.1016/jj.p. 2010.116162
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.116162. [10] S. A. Kalogirou, "Chapter three - Solar Energy Collectors" in Solar Energy Engineering Boston:
- Collectors," in Solar Energy Engineering, Boston: Academic Press, 2009, pp. 121–217. [11] M. Marefati, M. Mehrpooya, and M. B. Shafii, "Optical
- and thermal analysis of a parabolic trough solar collector for production of thermal energy in different climates in Iran with comparison between the conventional nanofluids," J. Clean. Prod., vol. 175, pp. 294–313, 2018, doi:
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.080. [12] T. Khatib and W. Elmenreich, Modeling of Photovoltaic Systems Using MATLAB. 2016.
- M. Tabassum, S. Kashem, and J. Ahmed, "Feasibility Study of Solar Power System in Residential Area," vol. 5, pp. 10–17, May 2020.
- [14] R. Affandi, M. R. Ab Ghani, C. Gan, and Z. Jano, "A Review of Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) in Malaysian environment," IJEAT, vol. 3, pp. 378–382, Jan. 2013.
- [15] T. K. Aseri, C. Sharma, and T. C. Kandpal, "Estimating capital cost of parabolic trough collector based concentrating solar power plants for financial appraisal: Approaches and a case study for India," Renew. Energy, vol. 156, pp. 1117–1131, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2020.04.138.
- [16] Energysage, "The cost of solar panels in 2021: What price for solar can you expect?," Energysage, 2021. https://news.energysage.com/how-much-does-theaverage-solar-panel-installation-cost-in-the-u-s/ (accessed Oct. 05, 2021).
- [17] F. Baharum, M. H. Hassan, M. D. Sudirman, M. N. M. Nawi, and S. H. Ibrahim, "A comparative study of levelized cost of electricity between photovoltaic and concentrated solar powered power plants in Malaysia," J. Adv. Res. Fluid Mech. Therm. Sci., vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 134–145, 2018.

# $\odot$ $\odot$

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).