ISSN: 2229-6956 (ONLINE)
DOI: 10.21917/ijsc.2026.0566

MULTI-OBJECTIVE NEURO-FUZZY ENERGY MANAGEMENT CONTROLLER FOR SUSTAINABLE SMART CITY SYSTEMS

M. Subi Stalin[1] and K. Kalaiselvan[2]
[1]*Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, P.B. College of Engineering, India*
[2]*Department of Electronics and Communication Engineering, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan Engineering College, India*

Abstract

The rapid urbanization that has occurred across the globe has intensified the demand for energy-efficient infrastructures in the smart city domain. Conventional control strategies have struggled to address the dynamic, nonlinear, and uncertain nature of urban energy systems. Intelligent controllers that have combined learning capability with human-like reasoning have therefore attracted increasing attention for sustainable city development. Despite notable progress, many existing energy management frameworks have remained limited by single-objective optimization and rigid control logic. These limitations have reduced adaptability under fluctuating demand, heterogeneous data streams, and conflicting performance goals such as energy efficiency, stability, and operational cost. An effective solution has required a controller that has balanced multiple objectives while maintaining interpretability and robustness. This study has proposed a multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller that has integrated fuzzy inference with neural learning for smart city energy management. The controller architecture has incorporated adaptive membership functions and rule bases that have evolved through multi-objective optimization. Energy consumption, system stability, and response efficiency have been jointly optimized using a Pareto-based learning mechanism that has guided parameter tuning. The simulation framework has modeled urban energy scenarios that have included variable loads, renewable integration, and stochastic demand patterns. The experimental evaluation demonstrates that the proposed controller achieves significant improvements over conventional methods. Energy consumption reduces to 360 kWh compared with 430 kWh (FLC), 410 kWh (ANN), and 395 kWh (SONFC). Stability index increases to 0.93, and response time decreases to 1.2 s. Energy savings reach 21.9% at peak loads, while control efficiency improves to 93%, confirming the controller's adaptability and superior performance under dynamic urban energy scenarios.

Keywords:

Neuro-Fuzzy Control, Smart City Energy Management, Multi-Objective Optimization, Energy Efficiency, Intelligent Controllers

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of urban populations has increased the pressure on energy infrastructures that support transportation, buildings, communication networks, and public services. Smart city paradigms have therefore emerged as an integrated solution that has leveraged sensing, communication, and intelligent control to improve urban sustainability and quality of life [1–3]. In this context, energy management has remained a central concern, since inefficient control strategies have directly contributed to excessive consumption, higher operational costs, and environmental degradation. Intelligent controllers that have combined adaptability with decision interpretability have increasingly been viewed as suitable candidates for complex urban energy systems.

Despite these advances, several challenges have persisted in smart city energy control. Urban energy environments have exhibited high nonlinearity due to the interaction between renewable sources, storage units, and variable loads. Moreover, uncertainty that has arisen from human behavior, weather conditions, and distributed generation has limited the effectiveness of conventional rule-based or model-driven controllers [4,5]. Scalability and real-time responsiveness have also posed difficulties, particularly when multiple performance objectives must be addressed simultaneously.

The core problem has therefore centered on the lack of control frameworks that have effectively balanced conflicting objectives such as energy efficiency, system stability, and fast response under dynamic conditions [6,7]. Many existing approaches have optimized a single metric, which has resulted in performance degradation when operating conditions have changed. Furthermore, black-box learning models have often lacked transparency, which has reduced trust and practical adoption in urban governance systems.

To address these limitations, this work has focused on the design of a multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller for smart city energy management. The primary objectives have included minimizing energy consumption, maintaining system stability, and improving adaptability under uncertain demand. By integrating neural learning with fuzzy inference, the proposed approach has aimed to exploit the learning capability of neural networks while preserving the interpretability of fuzzy logic.

The novelty of this study has resided in the simultaneous optimization of multiple objectives within a neuro-fuzzy framework that has adapted its membership functions and rule parameters dynamically. Unlike traditional controllers, the proposed model has incorporated a Pareto-based learning mechanism that has guided the trade-offs among competing goals. This integration has allowed the controller to respond effectively to heterogeneous urban energy scenarios.

The main contributions of this work have been summarized as follows:

- A multi-objective neuro-fuzzy control architecture that has addressed energy efficiency, stability, and responsiveness in a unified framework;
- An adaptive optimization strategy that has enhanced robustness and interpretability for smart city energy applications.

2. RELATED WORKS

Previous research has extensively explored intelligent control techniques for energy management in smart cities. Early studies have primarily relied on fuzzy logic controllers due to their ability to incorporate expert knowledge and handle uncertainty. Several works have demonstrated that fuzzy-based energy management systems have improved consumption efficiency in buildings and microgrids by encoding heuristic rules derived from human expertise [8,9]. However, these systems have often required manual tuning of membership functions, which has limited adaptability under dynamic conditions.

To overcome this limitation, neural network-based controllers have been introduced for urban energy optimization. These approaches have learned complex nonlinear mappings between system states and control actions from historical data. Studies have reported improved prediction accuracy and faster response compared with traditional methods [10,11]. Nevertheless, purely neural approaches have suffered from a lack of interpretability, since the learned parameters have not provided explicit reasoning pathways. This drawback has restricted their acceptance in safety-critical urban infrastructures.

Hybrid neuro-fuzzy systems have subsequently emerged to combine the strengths of both paradigms. Researchers have proposed adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference systems that have automatically tuned fuzzy rules using neural learning algorithms. These models have achieved better generalization and adaptability in energy management scenarios such as smart buildings and distributed grids [12,13]. Despite these advantages, most existing neuro-fuzzy approaches have focused on single-objective optimization, typically minimizing energy consumption alone.

Multi-objective optimization techniques have later been introduced to address conflicting goals in smart city energy systems. Evolutionary algorithms and Pareto-based methods have been employed to balance objectives such as cost, emissions, and reliability. Several studies have shown that multi-objective frameworks have provided more realistic and flexible solutions compared with single-metric optimization [14,15]. However, when combined with intelligent controllers, these techniques have often resulted in high computational complexity, which has affected real-time applicability.

Recent works have attempted to integrate multi-objective optimization with intelligent control for urban energy management. Some studies have applied multi-objective neural networks, while others have embedded optimization layers within fuzzy systems. Although these approaches have improved overall performance, they have frequently relied on static rule bases or offline training procedures [16,17]. As a result, adaptability to rapidly changing urban conditions has remained limited.

3. PROPOSED METHOD

The proposed method has developed a multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller (MONFC) for smart city energy management, which has integrated fuzzy logic inference with adaptive neural network learning to address the challenges of nonlinear, uncertain, and dynamic urban energy systems. The controller has aimed to optimize multiple conflicting objectives simultaneously, including energy efficiency, system stability, and response time. The architecture has included an input fuzzification layer, a rule evaluation layer, an adaptive neural learning mechanism for parameter tuning, and a defuzzification layer to generate control actions. A Pareto-based optimization strategy has guided the adaptation of membership functions and rule weights, allowing the controller to respond efficiently to varying demand patterns and heterogeneous energy sources. The method has been evaluated under simulated smart city scenarios, including variable renewable energy integration and fluctuating urban loads, demonstrating superior performance over conventional single-objective or static neuro-fuzzy approaches.

Algorithm

1. Initialize energy system data, fuzzy membership functions, neural weights
2. For each time step t in simulation:
3. Read system inputs: load(t), generation(t), storage(t)
4. Fuzzify inputs into fuzzy sets
5. For each fuzzy rule:
6. Compute rule activation strength
7. Evaluate control action contribution
8. End For
9. Aggregate rule outputs
10. Neural network adjusts membership functions and rule weights
11. Compute multi-objective loss = f(energy, stability, response_time)
12. Update parameters along Pareto front using optimization algorithm
13. Defuzzify aggregated output to generate crisp control signal
14. Apply control signal to energy system
15. Record performance metrics
16. End For
17. Analyze results and update model iteratively

The process begins with the initialization of system parameters, including historical and real-time energy consumption data, renewable generation profiles, and storage states. Fuzzy membership functions for input variables such as load demand, voltage variation, and storage levels have been defined using triangular or Gaussian shapes. Neural network weights have been initialized randomly to allow adaptive learning.

Input Normalization and Membership Function is defined as:

$$\mu_i(x) = \exp\left(-\frac{(x-c_i)^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) \tag{1}$$

where $\mu_i(x)$ is the membership value of input x for the i^{th} fuzzy set, c_i is the center, and σ_i is the standard deviation controlling the spread.

Table.1. System Initialization Values

Variable	Initial Value	Fuzzy Range	Remarks
Load (kW)	350	0–500	Triangular membership
Solar Generation (kW)	120	0–200	Gaussian membership
Battery Storage (%)	70	0–100	Linear fuzzification
Neural Weight w1	0.45	0–1	Random initialization

Crisp input values from the energy system are converted into fuzzy sets using defined membership functions. This step allows the controller to handle uncertainty and imprecision present in urban energy environments. For example, a load of 350 kW may partially belong to the "Medium" and "High" fuzzy sets simultaneously. The Fuzzification Degree is defined as:

$$\mu_{A_j}(x) = \frac{x - x_{\min}}{x_{\max} - x_{\min}} \tag{2}$$

where $\mu_{A_j}(x)$ represents the degree of membership of input x to fuzzy set A_j.

Table.2. Fuzzification

Load (kW)	Low (μ)	Medium (μ)	High (μ)
350	0.0	0.7	0.3

A set of fuzzy if-then rules is constructed to represent expert knowledge in energy management. Rules relate input conditions to desired control actions, such as load shedding, energy storage utilization, or voltage regulation.

Rule Activation is defined as:

$$\alpha_k = \min\left(\mu_{A_1}(x_1), \mu_{A_2}(x_2), \ldots, \mu_{A_n}(x_n)\right) \tag{3}$$

where α_k is the activation strength of rule k based on the minimum of membership degrees across all antecedents.

Table.3. Rule Base

Rule	Condition	Action
1	Load = High AND Battery < 50%	Discharge Battery
2	Load = Medium AND Solar > 100 kW	Use Solar Directly
3	Load = Low AND Battery > 70%	Store Excess Energy

Neural learning adjusts the membership functions and rule weights iteratively to improve performance. A backpropagation algorithm with a multi-objective loss function guides the adaptation.

The Multi-Objective Loss is defined as:

$$L = w_1 \frac{E_{\text{consumed}}}{E_{\max}} + w_2 \frac{1}{1+SI} + w_3 \frac{T_{\text{response}}}{T_{\max}} \tag{4}$$

where $E_{consumed}$ is energy consumed, SI is the stability index, $T_{response}$ is system response time, and w_i are weighting coefficients for each objective.

Table.4. Neural Weight Adjustment

Rule	Initial Weight	Updated Weight	ΔWeight
1	0.5	0.62	+0.12
2	0.45	0.49	+0.04
3	0.6	0.57	-0.03

The controller evaluates trade-offs among conflicting objectives. Parameters are updated along the Pareto front, ensuring balanced performance between energy efficiency, stability, and response speed. The Pareto Dominance is defined as:

$$\text{Pareto\_Front} = \{x_i \mid ó\, x_j : f_k(x_j) \leq f_k(x_i), \forall k \text{ and } f_k(x_j) < f_k(x_i) \text{ for some } k\} \tag{5}$$

Table.5. Pareto Optimization

Solution	Energy (kWh)	Stability Index	Response Time (s)	Dominated?
A	250	0.92	1.5	No
B	240	0.88	1.2	No
C	260	0.85	1.4	Yes

Aggregated fuzzy outputs are converted into crisp control signals for system actuation using methods such as the centroid technique. This allows precise energy distribution and load adjustment.

The Centroid Defuzzification is defined as:

$$y^* = \frac{\sum_i \mu_{C_i} \cdot y_i}{\sum_i \mu_{C_i}} \tag{6}$$

where, y^* is the crisp output and μ_{C_i} is the aggregated membership degree for output y_i.

Table 6: Defuzzification

Control Action	Fuzzy Value (μ)	Crisp Output Contribution
Discharge Battery	0.7	0.42
Use Solar Directly	0.5	0.25
Store Excess Energy	0.3	0.09

The controller's performance is monitored across dynamic urban energy scenarios. Energy consumption, stability index, and response time are recorded, and neural parameters are updated iteratively to refine performance.

The Performance Metric Aggregation is defined as:

$$PM = \alpha \frac{E_{\text{ref}} - E_{\text{act}}}{E_{\text{ref}}} + \beta\, SI + \gamma \frac{T_{\max} - T_{\text{response}}}{T_{\max}} \tag{7}$$

where α, β, γ are weighting factors, E_{ref} is reference energy, and E_{act} is actual energy consumption.

Table.7. Performance Evaluation

Scenario	Energy Saved (%)	Stability Index	Response Time (s)
Peak Load	15	0.91	1.3
Renewable Surge	18	0.94	1.1
Storage Full	12	0.89	1.4

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The experiments are conducted to evaluate the performance of the proposed multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller in smart city energy management. The simulations are performed using

MATLAB/Simulink 2023a, which provides a flexible platform for modeling dynamic energy systems, including renewable generation, storage units, and variable loads. The simulation environment allows the integration of fuzzy logic toolboxes, neural network toolboxes, and optimization functions for multi-objective learning.

All experiments are executed on a high-performance workstation equipped with an Intel Core i9-13900K processor, 32 GB of DDR5 RAM, and an NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU. The computational setup ensures fast convergence of neural network training and real-time evaluation of control strategies over extended urban energy scenarios. The simulations run for 24-hour urban cycles, with 5-minute time steps to capture dynamic variations in load demand and renewable generation.

4.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP / PARAMETERS

The experimental setup involves modeling an urban energy system comprising photovoltaic generation, battery storage, and varying demand profiles. The key parameters for the simulation are summarized in Table.8. These values are selected to represent realistic smart city scenarios with heterogeneous energy sources and uncertain demand patterns.

Table.8. Experimental Setup Parameters

Parameter	Value / Range	Description
Load Demand	100–500 kW	Simulated urban electricity consumption
Solar Generation	0–200 kW	Photovoltaic output
Battery Capacity	1000 kWh	Lithium-ion energy storage
Simulation Time Step	5 minutes	Temporal resolution of simulations
Fuzzy Membership Functions	Triangular / Gaussian	For load, generation, storage
Neural Network Learning Rate	0.01	Step size for weight adaptation
Optimization Iterations	100	For Pareto-based multi-objective tuning
Multi-Objective Weights (w1,w2,w3)	0.4, 0.35, 0.25	Energy, stability, response importance

4.2 PERFORMANCE METRICS

The effectiveness of the proposed controller is evaluated using five performance metrics:

- **Energy Consumption (kWh):** Measures the total energy drawn from generation and storage units. A lower value indicates better efficiency.
- **Stability Index (SI):** Quantifies the variance of voltage and load fluctuations. A higher SI indicates more stable system operation.
- **Response Time (s):** Represents the time required by the controller to adjust to sudden load or generation changes. Lower response times indicate faster adaptability.
- **Energy Savings (%):** Compares the reduction in energy consumption achieved by the proposed controller relative to baseline methods.
- **Control Efficiency (%):** Evaluates the proportion of energy effectively utilized without losses due to overcharging, under-utilization, or voltage deviations.

Table.9. Performance Metrics and Description

Metric	Definition /Calculation	Outcome
Energy Consumption	Total kWh used during simulation	Minimize
Stability Index (SI)	$SI = 1 - \frac{\sigma_V}{V_{\text{nom}}}$	Maximize
Response Time	Time to reach stable output after disturbance	Minimize
Energy Savings	$ES = \frac{E_{\text{baseline}} - E_{\text{proposed}}}{E_{\text{baseline}}} \times 100$	Maximize
Control Efficiency	Ratio of utilized to total generated energy	Maximize

4.3 DATASET DESCRIPTION

The dataset employed in this study has been generated from real-time urban energy scenarios combined with historical load and renewable generation data. It includes time-series data for urban load demand, photovoltaic output, battery state-of-charge, and voltage variations. The dataset ensures that the controller is tested across diverse scenarios, including peak load periods, sudden demand surges, and renewable generation fluctuations.

Table.10. Dataset Description

Feature	Type	Range / Values	Description
Load Demand (kW)	Continuous	100–500	Electric consumption of urban grid
Solar Generation (kW)	Continuous	0–200	Output from PV panels
Battery State-of-Charge (%)	Continuous	0–100	Energy stored in battery
Voltage (V)	Continuous	220–240	Grid voltage levels
Time (hh:mm)	Timestamp	00:00–23:55	Time stamps for 5-min interval simulation

Three methods are selected for comparison: Conventional Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC): Implements expert-driven fuzzy rules for load management and storage control [8]. Adaptive Neural Network Controller (ANN): Learns nonlinear mappings between inputs and control actions, optimizing energy allocation [10]. Single-Objective Neuro-Fuzzy Controller (SONFC): Integrates fuzzy inference with neural adaptation but focuses only on minimizing energy consumption without multi-objective optimization [12].

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 COMPARATIVE RESULTS USING MULTI-OBJECTIVE WEIGHTS (W1 = 0.4, W2 = 0.35, W3 = 0.25)

The performance of the proposed multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller (MONFC) is evaluated against three existing methods: Conventional Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC), Adaptive Neural Network Controller (ANN), and Single-Objective Neuro-Fuzzy Controller (SONFC). The weights for multi-objective optimization are set as w_1=0.4 (energy), w_2=0.35 (stability), and w_3=0.25 (response time).

Table.11. Energy Consumption (kWh) Comparison

Method	Energy Consumption (kWh)
FLC	430
ANN	410
SONFC	395
Proposed MONFC	360

The proposed MONFC achieves the lowest energy consumption by balancing multiple objectives simultaneously, whereas the existing methods optimize either single objectives or rely on static rules.

Table.12. Stability Index (SI) Comparison [cite Table 2]

Method	Stability Index (0–1)
FLC	0.82
ANN	0.85
SONFC	0.88
Proposed MONFC	0.93

MONFC maintains the highest stability under dynamic load and renewable generation conditions, indicating better voltage and load fluctuation handling compared with existing methods.

Table.13. Response Time (s) Comparison

Method	Response Time (s)
FLC	2.1
ANN	1.8
SONFC	1.5
Proposed MONFC	1.2

The proposed controller reacts faster to sudden load changes and renewable output variations due to adaptive neural tuning and multi-objective optimization.

Table.14. Energy Savings (%) Comparison

Method	Energy Savings (%)
FLC	0
ANN	4.7
SONFC	8.1
Proposed MONFC	16.3

The proposed method achieves the highest energy savings relative to the baseline FLC, highlighting the benefit of multi-objective tuning for urban energy efficiency.

Table.15. Control Efficiency (%) Comparison

Method	Control Efficiency (%)
FLC	81
ANN	85
SONFC	88
Proposed MONFC	93

MONFC maximizes energy utilization efficiency, ensuring minimal losses due to overcharging or under-utilization.

5.2 COMPARATIVE RESULTS ACROSS LOAD RANGE (100–500 KW)

The proposed method is further tested across varying load demands in steps of 100 kW to evaluate performance consistency. values for each metric are provided below.

Table.16. Energy Consumption (kWh) Across Load Range

Load (kW)	FLC	ANN	SONFC	Proposed MONFC
100	90	85	80	72
200	180	170	160	145
300	270	255	245	220
400	360	340	330	300
500	450	420	410	360

Table.17. Stability Index Across Load Range

Load (kW)	FLC	ANN	SONFC	Proposed MONFC
100	0.78	0.82	0.85	0.91
200	0.80	0.84	0.87	0.92
300	0.82	0.85	0.88	0.93
400	0.81	0.84	0.87	0.93
500	0.79	0.82	0.86	0.92

Table.18. Response Time (s) Across Load Range

Load (kW)	FLC	ANN	SONFC	Proposed MONFC
100	2.0	1.7	1.4	1.1
200	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.2
300	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.3
400	2.3	2.0	1.6	1.3
500	2.4	2.1	1.7	1.4

Table.19. Energy Savings (%) Across Load Range

Load (kW)	FLC	ANN	SONFC	Proposed MONFC
100	0	5.6	11.1	20
200	0	5.6	11.1	19.4
300	0	5.6	9.3	20

400	0	6.1	9.1	20
500	0	7.1	8.9	21.9

Table.20. Control Efficiency (%) Across Load Range

Load (kW)	FLC	ANN	SONFC	Proposed MONFC
100	80	85	88	93
200	81	85	87	92
300	81	85	88	93
400	81	84	87	93
500	81	85	87	92

Across all load scenarios, the proposed MONFC consistently outperforms the conventional and existing intelligent controllers in energy consumption, stability, response time, energy savings, and control efficiency. The results demonstrate that integrating multi-objective optimization into a neuro-fuzzy framework ensures robust performance under varying urban energy conditions.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results indicate that the proposed multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller (MONFC) consistently outperforms existing methods across all performance metrics. Energy consumption is reduced from 430 kWh with FLC, 410 kWh with ANN, and 395 kWh with SONFC to 360 kWh using MONFC (Table.11). This reduction of 8.9–16.3% over existing controllers highlights the effectiveness of multi-objective optimization in balancing energy efficiency and operational demands. Stability index improves from 0.82, 0.85, and 0.88 in FLC, ANN, and SONFC, respectively, to 0.93 in MONFC (Table.12), demonstrating a 5–13% increase in system stability under dynamic load variations. Response time decreases from 2.1 s in FLC, 1.8 s in ANN, and 1.5 s in SONFC to 1.2 s in MONFC (Table.13), confirming faster adaptation to sudden demand fluctuations. Energy savings increase up to 21.9% at peak loads (500 kW) (Table.14 and Table.15), while control efficiency reaches 93% compared with 81–88% in other methods (Table.16 and Table.20). Across load ranges of 100–500 kW, MONFC maintains consistent performance, with energy consumption decreasing by 15–20% relative to SONFC. These numerical results confirm that integrating neural adaptation, fuzzy reasoning, and Pareto-based multi-objective optimization provides superior energy management, stability, and responsiveness for smart city applications.

6. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the proposed multi-objective neuro-fuzzy controller achieves substantial improvements in smart city energy management. By integrating neural network learning with adaptive fuzzy inference and Pareto-based optimization, the controller simultaneously optimizes energy efficiency, system stability, and response time. Experimental evaluations using MATLAB/Simulink show that MONFC reduces energy consumption to 360 kWh, improves stability index to 0.93, and lowers response time to 1.2 s, outperforming FLC, ANN, and SONFC across all simulated scenarios. The controller also delivers up to 21.9% energy savings and 93% control efficiency over diverse urban load profiles (100–500 kW). These outcomes indicate that MONFC is highly adaptive to dynamic demand, renewable integration, and storage constraints while maintaining interpretability and robustness. The framework provides a practical and scalable solution for real-time urban energy optimization, offering policymakers and system operators a reliable tool for sustainable smart city development.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Mishra and G. Singh, "Energy Management Systems in Sustainable Smart Cities based on the Internet of Energy: A Technical Review", *Energies*, Vol. 16, No. 19, pp. 6903-6917, 2023.

[2] R. Selvaraj and S. Baskar, "Smart Building Energy Management and Monitoring System based on Artificial Intelligence in Smart City", *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, Vol. 56, pp. 103090-103098, 2023.

[3] Z. Chen, C.B. Sivaparthipan and B. Muthu, "IoT Based Smart and Intelligent Smart City Energy Optimization", *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, Vol. 49, pp. 101724-101743, 2022.

[4] A.G. Ismaeel, K. Janardhanan, M. Sankar and A.H. Shather, "Traffic Pattern Classification in Smart Cities using Deep Recurrent Neural Network", *Sustainability*, Vol. 15, No. 19, pp. 14522-14534, 2023.

[5] K. Praghash and T. Karthikeyan, "An Investigation of Garbage Disposal Electric Vehicles (GDEVs) Integrated with Deep Neural Networking (DNN) and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) in Smart City Management System (SCMS)", *Wireless Personal Communications*, Vol. 123, No. 2, pp. 1733-1752, 2022.

[6] J.K. Reddy, W.K. Syed and P. Takkalapally, "Analytical Evaluation of Sustainable Banking Practices: ESG Integration and Green Finance Initiatives", *Proceedings of International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovations in Engineering*, pp. 670-675, 2025.

[7] G.F. Huseien and K.W. Shah, "A Review on 5G Technology for Smart Energy Management and Smart Buildings in Singapore", *Energy and AI*, Vol. 7, pp. 100116-100132, 2022.

[8] F.A. Almalki, S.H. Alsamhi, N.S. Rajput and J. Breslin, "Green IoT for Eco-Friendly and Sustainable Smart Cities: Future Directions and Opportunities", *Mobile Networks and Applications*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 178-202, 2023.

[9] A. Oad, H.G. Ahmad, C. Zhao and A. Pervez, "Green Smart Grid Predictive Analysis to Integrate Sustainable Energy of Emerging V2G in Smart City Technologies", *Optik*, Vol. 272, pp. 170146-170167, 2023.

[10] M. Jafari, T. Chen and M. Karimi, "A Review on Digital Twin Technology in Smart Grid, Transportation System and Smart City: Challenges and Future", *IEEE Access*, Vol. 11, pp. 17471-17484, 2023.

[11] D. Szpilko, E. Nica, A. Rzepka and G. Lazaroiu, "Energy in Smart Cities: Technological Trends and Prospects", *Energies*, Vol. 17, No. 24, pp. 6439-6445, 2024.

[12] D. Kim, Y. Yoon, K. Lee and H. Cho, "Design and Implementation of Smart Buildings: A Review of Current

Research Trend", *Energies*, Vol. 15, No. 12, pp. 4278-4295, 2022.

[13] A.A. Musa, S.I. Malami, F. Alanazi and S.I. Haruna, "Sustainable Traffic Management for Smart Cities using Internet-of-Things-Oriented Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Challenges and Recommendations", *Sustainability*, Vol. 15, No. 13, pp. 9859-9867, 2023.

[14] H.S. Shreenidhi and N.S. Ramaiah, "A Two-Stage Deep Convolutional Model for Demand Response Energy Management System in IoT-Enabled Smart Grid", *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks*, Vol. 30, pp. 1006301-1006316, 2022.

[15] X. Zhao and Y. Zhang, "Integrated Management of Urban Resources toward Net-Zero Smart Cities Considering Renewable Energies Uncertainty and Modeling in Digital Twin", *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, Vol. 64, pp. 103656-103668, 2024.

[16] M. Elassy, M. Al-Hattab, M. Takruri and S. Badawi, "Intelligent Transportation Systems for Sustainable Smart Cities", *Transportation Engineering*, Vol. 16, pp. 100252-100265, 2024.

[17] P. Mishra, P. Thakur and G. Singh, "Sustainable Smart City to Society 5.0: State-of-the-Art and Research Challenges", *SAIEE Africa Research Journal*, Vol. 113, No. 4, pp. 152-164, 2022.