

# Multi-source, multi-object and multi-domain (M-SOD) electromagnetic interference system optimised by intelligent optimisation approaches

Yihua Hu<sup>1</sup> · Minle Li<sup>1</sup> · Xiangyu Liu<sup>2</sup> · Ying Tan<sup>2</sup>

Published online: 13 January 2019 © Springer Nature B.V. 2019

#### Abstract

With the wide use of electromagnetic information equipment, a large number of wireless radiation systems coexisting in the same region produce intentional or unintentional interference on electronic receivers. For the purpose of intentional electromagnetic interference, it is necessary to realise the efficient suppression of other receivers at little cost. When multiple transmitting sources are used to interfere with multiple receivers, the parameters of multiple transmitting sources are required to be comprehensively optimised and set so as to achieve a desired high-efficiency interference. Therefore, we propose a novel method to optimise the setting of parameters of a multi-source, multi-object and multi-domain (M-SOD) interference system based on intelligent optimisation approaches. Furthermore, this study also builds an intelligent optimisation model, which contains multiple transmitters and receivers which involved many parameters include position, direction of space domain, frequency, bandwidth, and power. Then the model is abstracted to the problem of single-objective optimisation with constraints and optimised through a traditional GA and an improved FWA method. The extensive experiments and comparisons show that the proposed algorithm is an effective approach for setting the parameters of an M-SOD electromagnetic interference system and superior to the conventional method.

**Keywords** Electromagnetic interference  $\cdot$  Transmitting sources  $\cdot$  Parameter setting  $\cdot$  Intelligent optimisation  $\cdot$  Evolutionary computation algorithm

# 1 Introduction

In the modern information society, electromagnetic waves are frequently used to acquire and utilise information, however, it often happens that equipment fails to work normally because various electromagnetic devices in the same region influence each other (Zang et al. 2010). Intentional and unintentional interference generally appears under the circumstance of military or civil tasks, such as electronic countermeasures on the battlefield, crosstalk in a telecommunication network, and radio interference. Owing to the problem of multi-device interaction becoming increasingly serious and inevitable, it is necessary for whether the

🖂 Minle Li

15555483329@163.com

interfering party or the interfered party to study interference problem (Grover et al. 2014). The interfering party requires reasonable interference strategies to achieve interference effects and reduce the cost. While the interfered party needs to study the interference strategies adopted by the other party and propose corresponding defensive measures and anti-interference means, so as to improve the survival rate of equipment and reduce associated losses.

At present, although there is much literature on interference and anti-interference, the problems of multiple transmitting sources to multiple objective receivers in multiple electromagnetic domains parameter setting have not yet been reported. For the interfering party, it is very important to set parameters for interference transmitting equipment and parameters need to be set specifically according to electronic reconnaissance results. Owing to their wide scope of coverage, broadband omni-directional equipment does not need to set a particular frequency and antenna direction, while their operating distance is limited. To interfere with the remoter objective receivers, narrow frequency bands and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> College of Electronic Engineering, National University of Defense Technology, Hefei 230037, China

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> School of Electronics Engineering and Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

directional antennas can be properly set on the premise of obtaining the reconnaissance parameters. When multiple transmitters are utilised to interfere with multiple receivers simultaneously, the method of parameter setting represents the selection of interference strategies to some extent, which significantly influences the results. For example, receivers with a similar frequency in the same region can be interfered with by a transmitter. On the contrary, the reasonable parameter setting can obtain satisfactory interference effects at low cost, such as is associated with a low transmission power. It is of great practical significance to reduce the transmission power of interference equipment to protect it from anti-interference equipment and anti-radiation weapons belonging to a hostile party.

To use intelligent optimisation approach to optimise the parameters of multiple transmitting sources for transmitting high-effective interference signal, first of all, it is necessary to establish a model for multiple transmitting sources to multiple objective receivers in multiple electromagnetic domains. The model proposed in the research includes multiple transmitters and receivers and parameters in multiple domains, such as position, direction, frequency, bandwidth, and power, all of which need to be optimised, so it is described as an M-SOD interference system model. The model can be extended. When the parameters, such as position, direction, frequency, and bandwidth are known, the corresponding relationship between interference transmitters and receivers can be determined. At this time, it is convenient to include the choices of the optimal interference pattern and encoding mode which have no influence on the existing parameters. In solving the model, this study utilises two intelligent optimisation approaches and compares them with a traditional experience-based algorithm, which verifies the effectiveness of the intelligent optimisation approaches.

This paper investigates the aforementioned problems systematically and proposes a novel intelligence optimisation-based framework to resolved them. Our major contribution is threefold: (1) We establish a model, M-SOD, for multiple transmitting sources to multiple objective receivers in multiple electromagnetic inference system domains. (2) We formulize the problem as single-objective optimisation with constraints and optimised through a traditional GA and an improved FWA method. (3) We analyze the interference effect of EA-based methods (including GA and FWA) in simulation, and also test on large-scale inference tasks. Our experiements indicated that EA-based approaches are superior to those of the conventional design method, which also showed robustness and scalability.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Sect. 2 introduces the related research work, in Sect. 3, the novel M-SOD interference system model is described, followed by the derivation of the formula governing the bit error rate (BER) of objective receivers based on the specific assumptions, Sect. 4 describes the solutions obtained by use of an intelligent optimisation approach, while the experiments are elaborated in Sect. 5, and then the conclusions.

# 2 Related work

# 2.1 Communication interference and antiinterference

At present, many research achievements have been made in the fields of communication interference and anti-interference. Most research into anti-interfer- ence aims at unintentional interference and such research generally analyses interference effects and then puts forward methods by which to reduce such adverse influences (Wang et al. 2013; Liu et al. 2011a, 2013; Li and Dai 2013; Zhang et al. 2014). On the contrary, studies of communication interference (intentional interference) are divided into two categories: one-to-one communication interference and many-to-many communication interference according to the number of interfering and interfered parties.

The existing research on one-to-one communication interference focus on analysing interference effects of a single transmitter on a single receiver (Dey et al. 2013) and studying interference patterns. Other workers (Li et al. 2010) have carried out theoretical analysis and simulation on performances of direct sequence spread spectrum system under monophonic interference. Elsewhere researchers (Luo et al. 2007) analysed the performances of an orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) system under several different narrowband interference spectra. It was assumed that interference channels are additive white Gaussian noise channels or time-invariant Rayleigh fading channels. The selection of the best interference pattern attracts a wide spread attention. In general, the theories of parameter optimisation, such as game theory, particle swarm optimisation, and genetic algorithms (GA) can be used to seek optimal interference strategies to set power and signal patterns (Amuru and Buehrer 2015; Bayram et al. 2012; Veronica Belmega and Chorti 2017).

Many-to-many communication interference can be divided into two types according to different objects. One is distributed interference to communication network. In view of different characteristics of nodes and links in communication network, the interference strategies are designed separately to achieve interference on the whole communication network (Lee et al. 2011a, b; Law et al. 2009a). In some reports, game theory is used for analysing and modelling the relationship between the interfering, and interfered, parties (Vadlamani et al. 2014; Yang et al. 2013; Chen and Leneutre 2011; Sagduyu et al. 2010, 2011; Altman et al. 2010, 2011; Song et al. 2016) and the relevant equilibrium theories are adopted. The other is the optimal setting of parameters of many-to-many communication interference. In such research, problems are generally modelled according to the specific background and the optimisation of several parameters is studied, showing strong pertinence (Medal 2016; Li and Koutsopoulos 2010; Naseem et al. 2017; Tayebi et al. 2017). Of them, some (Pelechrinis et al. 2016; Heyns and van Vuuren 2018) have investigated the deployment positions of equipment. For the deployment of interference position in a communication network without prior information, some teams (Commander et al. 2008) deduced the upper and lower bounds of the results of the problem through the steps for optimising the maximum number of grid points. Moreover, theoretical analysis proves that the method is superior to the traditional suppression method. By employing decision support systems, some workers (Tanergülü et al. 2012; Gencer et al. 2008) solved the optimisation strategies provided in the program package for assessing deployment positions under countermeasures of firepower systems, radar and communications systems, etc.; however, the specific schemes for determining candidate locations were not given. Literature (Zhang and Yang 2014) established the model for the deployment of transmitters in ground-toair interference of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) groups and determined the optimal position by utilising a triangulation method and GA. Simulation experiment demonstrates that these two algorithms are superior to random deployment patterns. In addition, in view of different types of communication protocols, some literatures studied the interference in physical layer (Dong et al. 2010; Fan et al. 2016) and link layer and obtained certain effects. In view of the specific communication protocol, literature (Law et al. 2009b) put forward the corresponding distributed interference strategies in link layer, so that good interference effects can be obtained by using a low transmission power.

Others generally only optimise a certain parameter: owing to many parameters being involved in practical problems, multi-parameter optimisation needs to be studied. In the field of intentional electromagnetic interference, due to numerous and various objective communication receivers, multiple interference equipment items are required for effective interference thereto. To achieve ideal interference effects, it is necessary to simultaneously set interference parameters in multi-domain: time, space, frequency, power, and code domains.

Differing from the existing literature, this study summarises the interference problem as the optimisation of M-SOD interference system parameters and deduces the signal expression and formula for communication BER for multiple transmitters to multiple receivers. Furthermore, the optimisation goal is set to achieve the interference effects with the minimum power. Owing to lots of parameters being involved, and the problem complexity, the intelligent optimisation approach is used for solving the problem.

#### 2.2 Intelligent optimisation approach

Evolutionary computation, as the main part of the intelligent optimisation approach, is inspired by the genetic phenomenon of biological reproduction and natural selection mechanism of "survival of the fittest" in Darwinian theory. The algorithm imitates the phenomenon of survival, evolution and finally high adaptation of biological populations in the environment. By regarding the problem as environment, the evolutionary algorithm maintains a swarm with feasible solutions. By constantly generating new solutions and eliminating the poor solutions, the swarm is updated, so that the swarm finally finds the optimal solution to the problem. Evolutionary computation is mainly used for solving problems that are difficult to be solved by gradient-based method, such as discrete problem, multimodal problem, non-differentiable problem and even optimisation problems without analytic expression of the objective function. In the meantime, evolutionary computation algorithm can be quickly applied into the complex problems, like multi-objective optimisation and dynamic optimisation and shows advantages, such as good parallelizability. Therefore, it forms a big part of the current artificial intelligence boom.

Many scholars researched evolutionary algorithm and then proposed various computing methods successively. The typical representatives include Genetic Algorithm (GA), evolutionary strategy (ES), differential evolution (DE). Among them, GA is the basic and most widely used evolutionary algorithm. The algorithm was first proposed by Fraser (1957a, b) and then again by Fogel and Anderson (2000) and Reed et al. (1967) et al., and finally it has become widely used after much work by Holland. As another important algorithm, ES was put forward by Rechenberg (1965, 1971) for the first time in 1960s and then further developed by Schwefel (1975). The core idea is the evolution of evolution, that is, the evolutionary method of living things itself is constantly updated in evolution. As for the algorithm, strategic parameters are continuously adjusted and evolved in the algorithm process. Price et al. (2006), Storn and Price (1997) proposed the DE in 1995. By utilising the unique differential variation method, the distance and direction information of the swarm are effectively utilised to guide the search.

Furthermore, the evolutionary algorithm based on swarm intelligence is also a research hotspot and plays an important role in optimisation studies. The algorithms comprise the ant colony optimisation algorithm (Dorigo 1992), particle swarm optimisation algorithm (Eberhart and Kennedy 2002), bee colony algorithm (Karaboga 2005), fish swarm algorithm (Filho et al. 2009), firefly algorithm (Yang 2009), fireworks algorithm (FWA) (Tan and Zhu 2010), etc. Of them, the FWA is a new swarm intelligence algorithm. It is a mathematical model for the behaviour of fireworks exploding in the air, and forms a parallel search method by introducing random factors and selection strategies. As a new swarm intelligence algorithm, the FWA has shown strong problem-solving ability since its inception. By using a new search mechanism, the algorithm can display both global and local search capabilities by adjusting the explosion radius of each firework in a swarm.

# 3 Proposed M-SOD interference system model

#### 3.1 Scene description

The model proposed in the study contains multiple transmitters and receivers. The parameters to be set include position, direction, frequency, bandwidth, and power. Moreover, the space domain, time domain, frequency domain, and energy domain are designed, so the model is called the M-SOD interference system model. The scene settings of the model are shown in Fig. 1. N radio receivers are distributed in the region without any influence on each other and there are M interference transmitters in the region which affect receivers in receiving signals. All receivers adopt omni-directional antennae, while directional antennae are used in all transmitters.

Owing to the position parameters of transmitters generally needing to be preset, without loss of generality, first this study designs the transmitter set into a triangular formation and presents its accurate position. For receivers, two layout scenes are designed as cases for test, as displayed in Fig. 1.

(1) Case 1: Centralised layout. The nine receivers are centralised in a specified closed area, locating in one side of the closed area of transmitters. The given parameter settings are listed in the following Table 1.

(2) Case 2: Distributed layout. Eight receivers are dispersed around the periphery of the transmitters and the parameters of the receiver set are as set in the following Table 2.

#### 3.2 Interference computation model

It is assumed that the *n*th receiver  $(x_{r,n}, y_{r,n})$  in the communication system can receive signals from the m(m = 1, 2, ..., M)th interference transmitter besides predetermined communication signals. Moreover, except for communication signals, there are only interference and AWGN noise in the system. The model meets the following assumptions:

- Radio receivers and interference transmitters are distributed in the two-dimensional plane in a specific range, without considering the elevation factor.
- (2) Interference transmitters are definitely able to obtain various parameters of receivers and interference parameters are set accordingly.
- (3) Transmitters have upper and lower bounds to parameters, such as bandwidth and energy.



Fig. 1 Sketch scene map for the model (by taking the interference of six transmitters to eight or nine receivers as examples, the red and blue blocks represent the interference transmitters and communication receivers, respectively). (Color figure online)

Receiver number	X position (km)	Y position (km)	Frequency (MHz)	Bandwidth (MHz)	Transmitter number	X position (km)	Y position (km)	Beam width (°)
1	7	40	2017.1	1.6	1	35	0	30
2	21	40	2018.8	1.6	2	32.5	- 5	30
3	35	40	2019.2	1.6	3	37.5	- 5	30
4	49	40	2018.3	1.6	4	30	- 10	30
5	63	40	2016.6	1.6	5	35	- 10	30
6	14	50	2016.2	1.6	6	40	- 10	30
7	28	50	2017.9	1.6				
8	42	50	2017.5	1.6				
9	56	50	2015.8	1.6				

Table 1 Parameters of receiver and transmitter sets in Scene1

Table 2 Parameters of receiver and transmitter sets in Scene2

Receiver number	X position (km)	Y position (km)	Frequency (MHz)	Bandwidth (MHz)	Transmitter number	X position (km)	Y position (km)	Beam width (°)
1	10	30	2015.8	1.6	50	55	30	
2	10	70	2016.3	1.6	2	47.5	50	30
3	90	30	2016.8	1.6	3	52.5	50	30
4	90	70	2017.3	1.6	4	45	45	30
5	40	10	2017.7	1.6	5	50	45	30
6	60	10	2018.2	1.6	6	55	45	30
7	40	90	2018.7	1.6				
8	60	90	2019.2	1.6				

The interference signals with noise amplitude modulation of the *m*th transmitter  $(x_{t,m}, y_{t,m})$  are described thus:

$$J_{m,t}(t) = (U_m + U_n(t))e^{j(2\pi f_m t + \theta_m)}$$
(1)

where  $U_m, f_m, \theta_m$  represent the carrier power, frequency and phase, respectively and  $\theta_m$  obeys uniform distribution in  $[0, 2\pi)$ .  $U_n(t)$  indicates the baseband noise and white Gaussian noise is obtained through a low-pass filter. By changing the bandwidth of this baseband noise, the bandwidth of all interference signals can be adjusted accordingly. Considering other factors, such as signal propagation in space and the gains of the antenna transmitters and receivers, the power of signals received by each receiver at (x, y) in the coordinate system from the *m*th transmitter can be expressed as:

$$P_{m,r} = \frac{P_m F(\Delta \beta_m) G_r \lambda^2 L_b}{(4\pi R_m)^2}$$
(2)

where  $G_r$  and  $\lambda$  represent the gain and operating wavelength of receiving antenna, respectively.  $R_m$ indicates the distance to the *m*th transmitter and  $R_m = \sqrt{(x - x_{t,m})^2 + (y - y_{t,m})^2}$ .  $L_b$  denotes the mismatch loss of bandwidth.  $F(\Delta\beta_m)$  shows the pattern function of the gain of the  $F(\Delta\beta_m, \Omega)$  antenna of the *m*th transmitter and the directional angle of the transmitter is  $\beta_m$  (defined as the angle of X-axis rotating counter-clockwise around the origin to (x, y)). The angle of the coordinate (x, y) with the principal axis of beams is  $\Delta\beta_m = |\beta_m - \beta_{x,y}|$  and

$$\beta_{x,y} = \begin{cases} \arccos\left(\frac{x - x_{t,m}}{R_m}\right), & y \ge y_{t,m} \\ 2\pi - \arccos\left(\frac{x - x_{t,m}}{R_m}\right), & y < y_{t,m}. \end{cases}$$

The amplitude of signals from the *m*th transmitter arriving at each receiver can be expressed as:

$$J_m(t) = \sqrt{\frac{F(\Delta\beta_m)G_r\lambda^2 L_b}{(4\pi R_m)^2}} (U_m + U_n(t))e^{j(2\pi f_m t + \theta_m)}$$
(3)

The interference channel of interference source is modelled as a time-varying Rayleigh fading channel (Gao et al. 2009):

$$h_m(t) = \alpha_m e^{i \left(2\pi f_{d,m} t \cos \phi_m + \varphi_m\right)} \tag{4}$$

where  $\alpha_m$  represents the channel fading range and is an independent and identically distributed Gaussian random

variable with mean value and variance being 0 and  $\sigma_{\alpha}^2$  separately.  $f_{d,m}$  indicates the maximum Doppler frequency shift caused by the movement of interference sources (Gomaa and Al-Dhahir 2011).  $\phi_m$  is the angle of arrival of received signals and follows a uniform distribution on  $[0, 2\pi]$ .  $\phi_m$  denotes the random phase obeying the uniform distribution.

The total signals received by the *n*th receiver can be expressed as:

$$r_n(t) = \sqrt{P_s} x(t) c(t) + \sum_{m=1}^M h_m(t) J_m(t) + n(t)$$
(5)

where  $P_s$  indicates the power of spread spectrum signals from predetermined communication transmitter. x(t)denotes the spread spectrum signal, meeting  $E[x^2(t)] = 1$ . c(t) represents the spread spectrum code sequence. n(t)denotes additive white Gaussian noise and its one-sided power spectral density (PSD) is  $N_0$ .

Formulae (3) and (4) are substituted into Formula (5) to obtain:

$$r_{n}(t) = \sqrt{P_{s}}x(t)c(t) + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_{m} \sqrt{\frac{F(\Delta\beta_{m})G_{r}\lambda^{2}L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}}} (U_{m} + U_{n}(t))e^{j[2\pi(f_{d}+f_{m})t+\theta_{m}]} + n(t)$$
(6)

Dispreading is performed on the total received signals, thus giving:

$$r'_{n}(t) = \sqrt{P_{s}}x(t) + \sum_{m=1}^{M} h_{m}(t)J_{m}c^{*}(t) + n(t)c^{*}(t)$$
(7)

where  $(\cdot)^*$  demonstrates the conjugate operation.

The instantaneous signal to interference plus noise ratio (SINR)  $\gamma$  of the receiver is<sup>1</sup>:

$$\gamma = \frac{P_s T_b}{|\alpha|^2 N_I + N_0} = \frac{E_b}{|\alpha|^2 N_I + N_0} = \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2 N_I / N_0 + 1} \frac{E_b}{N_0}$$
(8)

where  $E_b = P_s T_b$  and  $T_b$  indicate the bit energy and symbol period, respectively.  $N_I$  represents the power spectral density of  $\sum_{m=1}^{M} h_m(t) J_m c^*(t)$  at  $f_0$  and is closely correlated with the transmitter parameters. Furthermore, the average BER  $p_{b,n}$  of the *n*th receiver is calculated as<sup>2</sup>:

$$p_{b,n} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{E_b/N_0} \frac{E_b/N_0}{2\sigma^2 \gamma^2 N_I/N_0} \exp\left(\frac{-\gamma^2}{\sin^2 \varphi}\right) \\ \times \exp\left(-\frac{E_b/\gamma N_0 - 1}{2\sigma^2 N_I/N_0}\right) d\gamma d\varphi$$
(9)

When the BER of receivers exceeds a certain threshold, it can be considered that interference effects are achieved.

<sup>1</sup> The derivation is provided in "Appendix 1".

According to the above derivations, it is found that BER of receivers is closely correlated with the transmitter parameters. To realise interference, the power needs to be increased under the condition that the frequency and antenna beam are directed to receivers, so as to reduce the instantaneous SINR  $\gamma$  and increase BER  $p_{b,n}$ . If an interference transmitter suppresses multiple receivers, both the bandwidth and power need to be increased, thus raising the overall cost. Therefore, in an M-SOD interference system, the goal of optimising the setting of multiple transmitters is to obtain better interference effects at low cost (e.g., transmitter power).

# 4 Principle and application design of the intelligent optimisation approach

The computation model used when optimising the setting of transmitters is complex, especially for the combined interference of multiple transmitters on multiple receivers: when the BERs of each receiver are calculated by using the forward model (Sect. 3.2), it is difficult to calculate the optimal parameters of transmitters by finding an analytical solution. A feasible design method is to set the parameters manually based on experience or constantly adjust the parameters of transmitters by using the trail-and-error method and observing the BER results; however, these methods generally depend on experience, need manual debugging and intervention, which lack flexibility, so they are unable to be extended to large-scale deployment.

The evolutionary algorithm of intelligent optimisation can be used to solve such problems. It can automatically learn and design parameters. The evolutionary algorithm has the following advantages in dealing with the research problems:

- As a black box optimisation method, the evolutionary algorithm regards the computing model as an objective function relating to parameter optimisation, while ignoring specific function form.
- (2) The evolutionary algorithm is a stochastic optimisation method. Candidate solutions are randomly generated in the parameter space by means of population. The next generation of individuals is selected and generated according to certain mechanisms, showing good global convergence.
- (3) The evolutionary algorithm can design a reasonable evaluation function (fitness function) so that the generated optimal solutions can have good properties on the basis of ensuring a solution.

The parameter setting method is proposed in the study and experiment is carried out based on the evolutionary algorithm. Through a traditional GA and an improved FWA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The derivation is provided in "Appendix 2".

method, namely loser-out tournament based fireworks algorithm (LoT-FWA), the interference computation model of receiver set is optimised. Moreover, the optimisation results and interference effects of the method are compared with a baseline method based on experience.

# 4.1 GA

In a GA, a population of candidate solutions (individuals) is evolved toward better solutions. A fitness function is to evaluate the solution domain. For the general minimisation problem, the smaller the fitness, the better the solution is. In a basic GA, the individuals are encoded with 01 vectors of fixed size. The evolution starts from randomly generated individuals. Through iterative process, the fitness of each individuals, and modifies each individual's genome by recombination and being possibly randomly mutated. Three operators, i.e. crossover, mutation and selection are

#### 4.2 FWA

The Firework Algorithm (FWA) is a novel swarm intelligence algorithm inspired by a shower of sparks filling the local space around the firework. The FWA consists of four parts: an explosive operator, mutation operator, mapping rule, and selection strategy. The role of the explosive operator is to generate new sparks around the fireworks, and the number of generated sparks and the explosive range are determined by the explosive operator. Furthermore, the sparks generated through the mutation operator follow a Gaussian distribution. Under the effects of the two operators, the newly generated sparks are mapped to the feasible range by utilising the mapping rule and new sparks are selected as the next generation of fireworks through use of the selection strategy.

The framework of the FWA is outlined in Algorithm 2.

Rai	ndomly selecting positions for n fireworks
$\mathbf{w}\mathbf{h}$	ile the termination condition is not met, do
1	<i>n</i> fireworks
f	for all fireworks $x_i$ , do
	calculating the number $S_i$ of sparks generated by each firework
	calculating the range $A_i$ of sparks generated by each firework
e	end for
r	randomly generating sparks
f	for $k = 1 \rightarrow \hat{m}  \operatorname{do}$
	$(\hat{m}  represents the number of sparks generated from Gaussian mutation of fireworks randomly selecting a firework x_i and generating a spark$
e	end for
ľ	Mapping sparks according to the mapping rule
c L	Selecting the best fireworks and other fireworks in accordance with the selection strat
e	egy
enc	d while

the core in the iteration of GA. The framework of the GA is outlined below as Algorithm 1.

To improve the synergistic efficiency of fireworks, Li and Tanying (2017) proposed an improved method based on the independent selection mechanisms. To be specific, for each firework, the progressive speed of the current generation is calculated. If the current generation cannot

Algorithm 1 Framework of the GA
Establishing initial population $P_0$ and evaluating fitness, $t = 0$
while the termination condition is not met, do
Crossover on population $P_t$
Mutation on population $P_t$
Evaluating the generated fitness of offspring
Selecting population $P_t$ and their generated offspring to obtain a new population $P_{t+1}$
t = t + 1
end while

Table 3Value ranges ofparameters to be optimised

	Min	Max
beta_m (radian)	0	2π
Pm (W)	0	1000
f_tm (MHz)	2010	2025
f_bm (MHz)	1.6	7

exceed the fitness of the optimal fireworks at the current progressive speed, it is a loser and needs to be reinitialised. The benefits are: (1) parameters in collaborative framework of fireworks algorithm are avoided. (2) Whether, or not, it is worthwhile to continue searching the region can be determined before fireworks get too close.

#### 4.3 Parameter setting

#### (1) Genetic representation of the solution domain

For each transmitter, parameters to be optimised include directional angle of antenna (beta\_m), power (Pm), frequency (f\_tm) and bandwidth (f\_bm). The corresponding optimisation ranges are summarised in Table 3.

The parameters to be optimised are concatenated to form a 24-dimensional vector, that is, the dimension of the optimisation problem. The evolutionary algorithm maintains a population to seek the optimal solutions and each individual indicates a feasible solution to the problem. Each parameter is normalised on the interval (0, 1).

#### (2) Design of fitness

The fitness function is used to evaluate the solution domain (corresponding to the individual). The design of fitness is crucial to the convergence of optimisation algorithm and is expected to reflect the desired properties. The following aspects are mainly considered in the design of a fitness function:

(a)  $L_{pbn}$ : BERs of all receivers have to meet certain requirements, which is the primary goal for interference. In the simulation experiments, without loss generality, it is assumed that the interference goal is satisfied when the BER of a receiver is larger than 0.2. No distinction is made as long as the BER is greater than 0.2, while more punishment should be given if it is less than 0.2. Therefore, a great punishment of linear attenuation is applied to solutions that do not meet the interference and the specific design is demonstrated as follows:

$$L_{pbn}^{i} = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{10} - e^{1}}{0 - 0.2} p_{b,n}^{i} + e^{10}, & p_{b,n}^{i} < 0.2 \\ 0, & p_{b,n}^{i} \ge 0.2 \end{cases}$$

$$L_{pbn} = \sum_{i} L_{pbn}^{i}$$
(10)

where *i* represents the *i*th receiver.

(b)  $L_{Pm}$ : the sum of powers of all transmitters should be as small as possible.

$$L_{Pm} = \sum_{i} Pm_i \tag{11}$$

(c)  $L_{Pm_dist}$ : the difference of powers should not be too large. If there is a transmitter with an extremely small transmission power, it has little or no influences on interference effects. This reduces fault tolerance on a transmitter set and robustness of interference effects and wastes setting resources.

$$L_{Pm\_dist} = \max_{i} \{Pm_i\} - \min_{j} \{Pm_j\}$$
(12)

(d)  $L_{pbn_dist}$ : the difference of BERs of transmitters should be small. The consideration of this item is similar with  $L_{Pm_dist}$ , hoping to reach a uniform interference effect.

$$L_{pbn\_dist} = \max_{i} \left\{ p_{b,n}^{i} \right\} - \min_{j} \left\{ p_{b,n}^{j} \right\}$$
(13)

The overall fitness function is:

Fitness = 
$$\lambda_1 L_{pbn} + \lambda_2 L_{Pm} + \lambda_3 L_{Pm\_dist} + \lambda_4 L_{pbn\_dist}$$
(14)

where the hyper-parameters  $\lambda_i$  (i = 1, 2, 3, 4) are used to indicate the importance of each term.

#### **5** Experiments

#### 5.1 Hyper-parameter setting

In the experiment, it is assumed that interference effect is reached when BER of each receiver is greater than 0.2. The parameters settings are  $\lambda_1 = 1.0$ ,  $\lambda_2 = 1.0$ ,  $\lambda_3 = 10.0$ ,  $\lambda_4 = 10.0$ . For the GA, the elite selection mechanism is used. It ensures that the optimal individual or several optimal individuals are reserved to the next generation, while the other individuals adopt tournament selection mode. The number of populations is set to 2,000 and the number of elite individuals retained is 200. Moreover, the mutation probability is set to 0.1. For the Lot-FWA, the number of fireworks is 10 and the number of sparks is 500, while the other parameters are set with reference to the literature (Li and Tanying 2017).

The generational process is repeated until a termination condition has been reached (when there is no obvious progress after 30 consecutive rounds). Ten groups of experiments are repeatedly conducted in each case and the obtained best results are regarded as the optimal solution of the algorithm.

# 5.2 Baseline algorithm—traditional parameter setting method based on experience

In view of the two cases, the traditional parameter setting method based on experience is designed and the sketch map of interference in groups is shown in Fig. 2 (the transmitters interfere with receivers of the same colour).

Case 1: considering the position and beam coverage, to give full play to the transmitters, the transmitters and receivers are separately divided into three groups, shown in three colours. The transmitters interfere with receivers of the same colour, for example, T1 and T5 interfere with receivers R3, R7, and R8. According to the situation of receivers, the parameters of corresponding transmitters are set. For instance, the centre frequencies of T1 and T5 are set at the points trisecting bandwidth covered by R3, R7, and R8. The directions are geometric centres of R3, R7, and R8.

Case 2: due to non-uniform distribution of receivers, R5 and R6 are divided into a group according to the coverage of beams and interfered with by T1. T5 interferes with the group consisting of R7 and R8. Moreover, the other four transmitters interfere with the four receivers, separately. When one transmitter interferes with two receivers, the parameters are set as follows: the centre frequency and beam direction of T1 are set to be the midpoint of the frequency band and geometric centre, respectively. In the situation of one transmitter interfering with one receiver, the corresponding transmitter is set according to the parameters of the receiver.

The power is uniformly set on a step-by-step basis, that is, the powers of transmitters (groups) are increased in certain step length (set to be 1 W in the experiment), until the corresponding receivers (groups) are completely interfered. Such a setting method based on experience completely neglects the interactions between transmitters (groups) and receivers (groups) not being interfered with by the former, which may waste a lot of resources. In addition, such a method requires prior knowledge of problem cases and needs geometric design and manual intervention, so it is difficult to be extended and applied in more complex cases.

# 5.3 Experimental result and its comparison analysis

#### 5.3.1 Comparison of convergence of optimisation algorithms

Figure 3 shows the comparison of convergence of two optimisation algorithms: the horizontal axis represents the times of evaluating solutions using the algorithm and the vertical axis indicates the optimal fitness. Moreover, the dotted line shows the fitness corresponding to parameter setting as calculated by the baseline algorithm based on interference between groups. Figure 4 shows the boxplots of fitness at the end of optimisation. The horizontal axis shows different scenes and algorithms, while the vertical axis indicates the average optimal fitness and error bar of the algorithms in each experiment. It can be seen that these two algorithms finally converge within the acceptable range of fitness, indicating that the algorithms can achieve interference effects on all receivers and search the solution space better than the baseline algorithm. Based on the optimisation process of these algorithms, the response time of the GA is obviously better than that of the LoT-FWA, which is correlated with the encoding form of the individuals. As mentioned in Sect. 4.3, the parameters of



Fig. 2 Schematic diagram of empirical parameter setting method for interference in groups (transmitter sets of the same colour are designated to interfere with the same colour of receiver sets). (Color figure online)



Fig. 3 Comparisons of convergence in the optimisation of GA and LoT-FWA

**Fig. 4** Boxplots of fitness errors (the horizontal axis shows different scenes and algorithms, while the vertical axis indicates the average optimal fitness and error bar of the algorithms in each experiment)



each transmitter are combined to a long vector, while the GA shows an explicit crossover operation. This is favourable for information exchange in populations, thus searching the feasible solutions more quickly: however, prematurity arises quickly in a GA, so the final optimisation results of the GA are not as good as those arising from the use of LoT-FWA. LoT-FWA shows strong local search ability and maintains higher diversity, thus effectively avoiding the occurrence of prematurity. Furthermore, the algorithm is able to search the optimal solution constantly and the result after multiple operations is better, and more stable, than that of a GA. The key is that such loser-out mechanism of LoT-FWA can increase the probability of finding the globally optimal solution of the algorithm.



Fig. 5 Comparison of BERs of receivers (the horizontal axis represents the number of receivers, while the vertical axis indicates the corresponding BER values of receivers)

#### 5.3.2 Interference effect

#### (1) BER

Figure 5 shows the comparison of interference effects on receiver groups. The horizontal axis represents the number of receivers, while the vertical axis indicates the corresponding BER values of receivers. It can be seen that the optimisation results of GA and LoT-FWA optimisation algorithms can interfere to all receivers in two cases. Moreover, the BER values of receivers are approximate, which meets the considerations required when designing a fitness function. The BERs of algorithms, when setting parameters based on experience (Baseline) in Case 1, are generally high. The reason for this is that, in the process of interference among groups, owing to the receivers being distributed on one side of the transmitters, a transmitter can interfere with receivers in other groups, so the while-loop used in such cyclic power adjustment wastes a lot of energy. The BER of optimisation results of the GA is generally higher than that of the LoT-FWA. This is because the GA first searches feasible solutions in the parameter space with a large power, while its local searchability is not better than the LoT-FWA, resulting in larger BER.

Table 4 lists the comparisons of powers of transmitters in optimisation results in different cases. The total transmission power and extreme deviation of transmission powers are compared: through the comparison, the total power of the optimal solutions obtained by using the GA is larger, while the results obtained by utilising LoT-FWA show more energy-saving effects. Although the total power of the baseline based on experience in Case 2 is lower, the method has a higher extreme deviation of power and needs to be used by virtue of geometric design and manual intervention, so it is difficult to be extended and applied in complex cases.

#### (2) Interference to signal ratio (ISR)

The ISR is defined as the logarithm of ratio of power of interference signals entering the receivers to that of the communication signals. It reflects the interference effects of each transmitter on each receiver. The experience shows that when ISR  $\in$  [10, 15] dB, the corresponding transmitters induce strong interference on the receivers.

Figure 6 shows the ISR map: each receiver is affected by strong interference from at least one transmitter. Especially in Case 1, transmitters have strong interference effects on multiple receivers. If a transmitter cannot work due to some fault, interference can also be maintained to its maximum extent, which reflects the redundancy and robustness of swarm intelligence. In Case 2, owing to the disperse distribution of receivers around transmitters and limitation of directional angle of antenna, it is very difficult for a single transmitter to impart strong interference to multiple receivers simultaneously while exerting a less intense interference effect.

#### 5.3.3 Large-scale interference tasks

To verify the effect of intelligent optimisation approaches in large-scale radiation interference scenarios, we conducted extensive verification experiments in both scenarios (central layout and distributed layout). Adjusting the number of transmitters and receivers to 21:20, we still use the two evolutionary algorithms (GA and LoT-FWA) in the text for parameter optimisation. The parameter to be optimised is 84 dimensions, which becomes a high-dimensional optimisation problem.

**Table 4** Power comparison oftransmitters

	Method	Sum of Pm (W)	Extreme deviation of Pm (W)
Case 1	Baseline	4149	660
	GA	3606.29	0.99
	LoT-FWA	2359.17	0.01
Case 2	Baseline	1324	65
	GA	2664.33	0.39
	LoT-FWA	1878.16	0.01



**Fig. 6** map of interference to signal ratio (the horizontal axis represents the number of receivers, while the vertical axis indicates the number of transmitters. Moreover, the value in matrix shows the

interference effect of the corresponding transmitters on receivers, namely, the value of interference to signal ratio (ISR))

Figure 7 shows the schematic diagram of the interference task. Figure 8 shows the convergence comparison of the algorithm. Figure 9 shows the ISR mapping of the transmitter to the receiver.

In the scenario of large-scale interference task, the experience-based manual parameter setting method will be very complicated and cumbersome, and the evolutionary algorithm can adjust the automatic learning parameters based on the feedback composed of the fitness value. It can be seen, from Fig. 8, that the response time of LoT-FWA is not as good as that of GA algorithm, but it converges to a better solution, which is consistent with our conclusion in Sect. 5.3.1. From the interference effect of the generator set to the interfering party in Fig. 9, when the scale of the problem is raised, the solution obtained by the optimisation

algorithm has some redundancy (that is, some transmitters do not impart any effective interference to any receiver). The combined effect of transmitters makes it possible for us to complete all tasks without needing more transmitters: however, from another point of view, maintaining a certain redundancy is beneficial to the robustness of the system. Table 5 lists the number of invalid transmitters in the optimisation results. It is not difficult to see that the LoT-FWA algorithm is more redundant, that is, each transmitter can interfere with multiple receivers as much as possible. This characteristic will be beneficial to the whole interference system when confronted with unexpected conditions (for example, if there are sudden failures in some transmitters).



Fig. 7 Sketch maps of 21:20 (# of Transmitters: # of Receivers)



Fig. 8 Converge curve



Fig. 9 Map of ISR

# 6 Conclusions

Even though the studies of electromagnetic interference of electronic equipment attract much attention, there is still no study, available in practice, on the problems inherent to parameter setting of multi-source, multi-object and multidomain (M-SOD) interference systems. In view of the setting problem of interference parameters in a complex electromagnetic environment, we established an M-SOD interference system model, which contains multiple transmitters and receivers which involved many parameters include position, direction of space domain, frequency, bandwidth, and power. In optimisation calculations, the model is abstracted to the problem of a single-objective optimisation with constraints. Owing to many parameters being involved, better effects cannot be obtained by using the traditional method, so this study solved the problem by utilising the intelligent optimisation approach.

Table 5	The	number	of	invalid	transmitters

The number of invalid transmitters	Case 1	Case 2
GA	14	7
LoT-FWA	3	3

To verify the effectiveness of the model and algorithm, a comparison experiment with the baseline algorithm is carried out, which demonstrates the efficacy of the intelligent optimisation approach to solving such interference problems. Moreover, parameter setting that meets the interference effects can be found in the feasible region of parameters of transmitters and there is no need for an explicit optimisation function expression. The comparison experiment indicates that the proposed intelligent optimisation approach is superior to the method designed based on experience, and that it obtains optimal solutions and also reduces energy consumption, therefore making it an effective method for optimising the setting of parameters for transmitters.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grant Nos. 61673025, 61271353 and partially supported by National Key Basic Research Development Plan (973 Plan) Project of China under Grant No. 2015CB352302.

# Appendices

# Appendix 1: Derivation of instantaneous SINR $\gamma$

In the research, the communication mode used in the interfered communication system is TD-SCDMA and the uplink data frame structure is shown in Fig. 10 (Liu et al. 2011b). The structure comprises two data blocks in the length of 352 chips, a midamble code (training sequence) in the length of 144 chips and a guard interval in the length of 16 chips.

Assuming that the spread spectrum code sequence c(t) is a PN code, the autocorrelation function of this PN code can be expressed as:

$$R_{c}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 - |\tau|/T_{c} & |\tau| \le T_{c} \\ 0 & |\tau| > T_{c} \end{cases}$$
(15)

where  $T_c$  represents the chip period. The power spectral density function of PN code is obtained via the Fourier transform of the autocorrelation function:

data block	Midamable	data block	GP	
352 chip	144 chip	352 chip	16 chip	
4	8	64 <i>Tc</i>		

Fig. 10 Data frame structure of TD-SCDMA system (GP represents the guard interval and  $T_c$  indicates the chip period)

$$S_c(t) = \mathbf{F}(R_c(t)) = T_c Sa^2(fT_c)$$
(16)

where  $\mathbf{F}$  indicates the Fourier transform, and

$$Sa(x) = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x} \tag{17}$$

Supposing that the interference signals are independent, the correlation function and the power spectral density of  $J_{m,t}(t)$  are given by:

$$R_J(\tau) = \left(U_m^2 + R_{U_n}(\tau)\right)e^{j2\pi f_m \tau}$$
(18)

$$S_{J}(f) = U_{m}^{2} \delta(f - f_{m}) + S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m})$$
  
=  $\frac{F(\Delta \beta_{m})G_{r}\lambda^{2}L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}} (U_{m}^{2}\delta(f - f_{m}) + S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m}))$  (19)

The power of  $J_{m,t}(t)$  is  $P_m(P_m = U_m^2 + R_{U_n}(0))$ , where  $R_{U_n}(\tau)$  indicates the autocorrelation function.

If it is assumed that the channels are classical Clarke spectra, the autocorrelation function of  $h_i(t)$  is:

$$R_h(\tau) = J_0 \left( 2\pi f_{d,i} \tau \right) \tag{20}$$

where  $J_0(t)$  denotes the first-class zero-order Bessel function. The power spectral density of h(t) is:

$$\begin{split} S(f) &= \sum_{m=1}^{M} S_{h}(f) * S_{J}(f) * S_{c}(f) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{1}{\pi f_{d,m}} S_{h}(f) * \frac{F(\Delta \beta_{m}) G_{r} \lambda^{2} L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}} \left( U_{m}^{2} \delta(f - f_{m}) + S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m}) \right) * T_{c} Sa^{2}(fT_{c}) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{T_{c}}{\pi f_{d,m}} \frac{F(\Delta \beta_{m}) G_{r} \lambda^{2} L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}} \left\{ U_{m}^{2} S_{h}(f) * Sa^{2}[(f - f_{m})T_{c}] + S_{h}(f) * S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m}) * Sa^{2}(fT_{c}) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{T_{c}}{\pi f_{d,m}} \frac{F(\Delta \beta_{m}) G_{r} \lambda^{2} L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}} \left\{ \frac{U_{m}^{2}}{\sqrt{1 - (f/f_{d,m})^{2}}} * Sa^{2}[(f - f_{m})T_{c}] + S_{h}(f) * S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m}) * Sa^{2}(fT_{c}) \right\} \end{split}$$

$$(23)$$

$$&= \sum_{m=1}^{M} \frac{T_{c}}{\pi f_{d,m}} \frac{F(\Delta \beta_{m}) G_{r} \lambda^{2} L_{b}}{(4\pi R_{m})^{2}} \left\{ \int_{-f_{d,m}}^{f_{d,m}} \frac{U_{m}^{2} Sa^{2}[(f - t - f_{m})T_{c}]}{\sqrt{1 - (t/f_{d,m})^{2}}} dt + S_{h}(f) * S_{U_{n}}(f - f_{m}) * Sa^{2}(fT_{c}) \right\}$$

$$S_{h}(f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi f_{d,i}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - (f/f_{d,i})^{2}}} & |f| < f_{d,i} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
(21)

Assuming that  $h_i(t)$ ,  $J_i(t)$ , and c(t) are independent, the autocorrelation function of  $\sum_{i=1}^{Q_n} h_i(t)J_i(t)c^*(t)$  is:

$$R(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^{Q_n} R_h(\tau) R_J(\tau) R_c(\tau)$$
(22)

According to the property of convolution, the power spectral density function of

$$\sum_{i=1}^{Q_n} h_i(t) J_i(t) c^*(t)$$
 is

Supposing that  $f_0$  is the carrier frequency, the power spectral density of  $\sum_{m=1}^{M} h_m(t) J_m c^*(t)$  at  $f_0$  is:

$$N_I = S(f_0) \tag{24}$$

Supposing that the power spectral density function of received noise n(t) is  $S_n(f)$ , the power spectral density of  $n(t)c^*(t)$  at  $f_0$  is:

$$S_{nc}(f_0) = S_n(f_0) * S_c(f_0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} N_0 S_c(f - f_0) df = N_0$$
(25)

The received instantaneous SINR  $\gamma$  is:

$$\gamma = \frac{P_s T_b}{|\alpha|^2 N_I + N_0} = \frac{E_b}{|\alpha|^2 N_I + N_0} = \frac{1}{|\alpha|^2 N_I / N_0 + 1} \frac{E_b}{N_0}$$
(26)

where  $E_b = P_s T_b$  denotes the bit energy and  $T_b$  represents the symbol period.

# **Appendix 2: Derivation of BER**

Based on the literature (Goldsmith 2005), the average BER of the *n*th receiver is:

$$p_{b,n} = \int_0^\infty Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma}\right) p(\gamma) d\gamma \tag{27}$$

where  $Q(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_x^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right) du$  and  $p(\gamma)$  indicates the probability density function of  $\gamma$ . According to the probability density function of  $|\alpha|^{[57]}$ :

$$p(|\alpha|) = \frac{|\alpha|}{\sigma^2} \exp\left(-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$
(28)

Thus:

į

$$p(\gamma) = \frac{E_b/N_0}{2\sigma^2 \gamma^2 N_I/N_0} \exp\left(-\frac{E_b/\gamma N_0 - 1}{2\sigma^2 N_I/N_0}\right)$$
(29)

Q(x) can be expressed as (Goldsmith 2005):

$$Q(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \exp\left(\frac{-x^2}{2\sin^2\varphi}\right) d\varphi$$
(30)

In accordance with the literature (Goldsmith 2005), the average BER of QPSK modulation is:

$$p_{b,n} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty \exp\left(\frac{-\gamma^2}{\sin^2 \varphi}\right) p(\gamma) d\gamma d\varphi \tag{31}$$

Substituting Formula (29) into Formula (31) gives:

$$p_{b,n} = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{E_b/N_0} \frac{E_b/N_0}{2\sigma^2 \gamma^2 N_I/N_0} \exp\left(\frac{-\gamma^2}{\sin^2 \varphi}\right) \\ \times \exp\left(-\frac{E_b/\gamma N_0 - 1}{2\sigma^2 N_I/N_0}\right) d\gamma d\varphi$$
(32)

# Appendix 3: Parameter design table

Solutions in Case 1
 Parameter optimisation result
 See Table 6.

601.76

600.79

601.21

393.2

393.19

393.19

393.2

393.2

393.19

1.3494

2.2063

1.2988

1.4807

1.8828

2.0511

1.6651

1.1953

1.29

Transmitter number	Power (W)	Directional angle of antenna (rad)	Frequency (MHz)	Bandwidth (MHz)
1	430.0	1.5708	2018.9	1.10
2	1090.0	1.9364	2018.19	1.3833
3	1090.0	1.2052	2017.77	1.3833
4	1090.0	1.8623	2016.81	1.3833
5	430.0	1.5708	2017.8	1.10
6	1090.0	1.2793	2016.38	1.3833
1	600.77	1.8842	2016.81	2.3411
2	600.95	1.7116	2018.98	6.9738
3	600.81	1.7313	2017.86	1.6082

2016.12

2020.05

2016.24

2017.82

2016.79

2016.39

2019.0

2016.19

2016.17

Table 6 Parameter optimis

(2) Sketch maps

See Fig. 11.

Solution

Baseline

GA

LoT-FWA

5

6

1

2

3

4

5

6



Fig. 11 Parameter optimisation result of evolutionary algorithm in Case 1 (the red and blue rectangles represent the interference transmitter and communication receiver and the short line indicates the antenna direction)

2.5589

6.4888

4.1537

6.7815

5.4053

2.9856

4.1654 2.9592

2.53

(1) Parameter optimisation result

See Table 7.

Solution	Transmitter number	Power (W)	Directional angle of antenna (rad)	Frequency (MHz)	Bandwidth (MHz)
Baseline	1	249.0	4.7124	2017.99	0.2429
	2	229.0	2.6516	2016.29	1.6
	3	229.0	0.4910	2017.26	1.6
	4	184.0	3.5465	2015.8	1.6
	5	249.0	1.5708	2018.96	0.2429
	6	184.0	5.8783	2016.77	1.6
GA	1	444.2	1.3262	2018.61	6.9679
	2	444.16	4.8907	2017.92	5.0927
	3	443.81	3.1378	2015.97	1.7873
	4	444.15	0.9905	2018.21	1.9301
	5	444.2	0.1145	2017.08	1.6017
	6	443.81	3.1565	2016.94	1.8430
LoT-FWA	1	313.03	0.35867	2017.37	5.1312
	2	313.03	5.906	2016.78	4.2202
	3	313.02	1.7235	2018.95	2.7720
	4	313.03	3.4086	2015.48	4.8264
	5	313.02	2.7533	2016.25	2.0198
	6	313.03	4.6349	2017.86	3.6067

 Table 7 Parameter optimisation results of different algorithms in Case 2

(2) Sketch maps See Fig. 12.



Fig. 12 Parameter optimisation results of evolutionary algorithms in Case 2

#### References

- Altman E, Avrachenkov K, Garnaev A (2010) Fair resource allocation in wireless networks in the presence of a jammer. Perform Eval 67(4):338–349
- Altman E, Avrachenkov K, Garnaev A (2011) Jamming in wireless networks under uncertainty. Mob Netw Appl 16(2):246–254
- Amuru SD, Buehrer RM (2015) Optimal jamming against digital modulation. IEEE Trans Inf Forensics Secur 10(10):2212–2224
- Bayram S, Vanli ND, Dulek B et al (2012) Optimum power allocation for average. IEEE Commun Lett 16(8):1153–1156
- Chen L, Leneutre J (2011) Fight jamming with jamming—a game theoretic analysis of jamming attack in wireless networks and defense strategy. Comput Netw 55(9):2259–2270
- Commander CW, Pardalos PM, Ryabchenko V et al (2008) Jamming communication networks under complete uncertainty. Optim Lett 2(1):53–70
- Dey BK, Jaggi S, Langberg M et al (2013) Upper bounds on the capacity of binary channels with causal adversaries. IEEE Trans Inf Theory 59(6):3753–3763
- Dong L, Han Z, Petropulu AP et al (2010) Improving wireless physical layer security via cooperating relays. IEEE Trans Signal Process 58(3 PART 2):1875–1888
- Dorigo M (1992) Optimization, learning and natural algorithms. Politecnico di Milano, Milan
- Eberhart R, Kennedy J (2002) A new optimizer using particle swarm theory. In: International symposium on MICRO machine and human science, pp 39–43
- Fan Y, Liao X, Gao Z et al (2016) Physical layer security based on real interference alignment in K-user MIMO Y wiretap channels. In: 2016 IEEE international conference on communications workshops (ICC), (61302067), pp 207–212
- Filho C, Neto F, Lins A et al (2009) A novel search algorithm based on fish school behavior. In: IEEE international conference on systems, man and cybernetics, pp 2646–2651
- Fogel DB, Anderson RW (2000) Revisiting Bremermann's genetic algorithm. I. Simultaneous mutation of all parameters. In: Congress on evolutionary computation, vol 2, pp 1204–1209
- Fraser A (1957a) Simulation of genetic systems by automatic digital computers I. Introduction. Aust J Biol Sci 10(4):484–491
- Fraser A (1957b) Simulation of genetic systems by automatic digital computers II. Effects of linkage on rates of advance under selection. Aust J Biol Sci 10(4):492–500
- Gao Y, Chen W, Xie T et al (2009) Doppler spread estimation for nonrayleigh fading channel. In: The 4th IEEE conference on industrial electronics and applications, Xi'an, pp 1106–1109
- Gencer C, Aydogan EK, Celik C (2008) A decision support system for locating VHF/UHF radio jammer systems on the terrain. Inf Syst Front 10(1):111–124
- Goldsmith A (2005) Wireless communications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Gomaa A, Al-Dhahir N (2011) A sparsity-aware approach for NBI estimation in MIMO-OFDM. IEEE Trans Wirel Commun 10(6):1854–1862
- Grover K, Lim A, Yang Q (2014) Jamming and anti-jamming techniques in wireless networks: a survey. Int J Ad Hoc Ubiquitous Comput 17(4):197
- Heyns AM, van Vuuren JH (2018) Multi-type, multi-zone facility location. Geograph Anal 50(1):3–31
- Karaboga D (2005) An idea based on honey bee swarm for numerical optimization. Erciyes University, Kayseri
- Law YW, Palaniswami M, Van Hoesel L et al (2009a) Energyefficient link-layer jamming attacks against wireless sensor network MAC protocols. ACM Trans Sens Netw (TOSN). https://doi.org/10.1145/1464420.1464426

- Law YW, Palaniswami M, Van Hoesel L et al (2009b) Energyefficient link-layer jamming attacks against wireless sensor network MAC protocols. ACM Trans Sens Netw 5(1):1–38
- Lee K, Kwon HM, Ding Y et al (2011a) Noncooperative distributed MMSE relay schemes under jamming environment and node geometry in wireless relay networks. In: IEEE wireless telecommunications symposium (WTS), pp 1–5
- Lee K, Kwon HM, Ding Y et al (2011b) Node geometry and broadband jamming in noncooperative relay networks under received power constraint. In: The 34th IEEE Sarnoff symposium, pp 1–5
- Li C, Dai H (2013) Connectivity of multi-channel wireless networks under jamming attacks. In: IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM), pp 706–711
- Li M, Koutsopoulos I (2010) Optimal jamming attack strategies and network defense policies in wireless sensor networks. IEEE Trans Mob Comput 9(8):1119–1133
- Li J, Tanying (2017) Loser-out tournament based fireworks algorithm for multi-modal function optimization. IEEE Trans Evolut Comput
- Li H, Pei B, Huang Y (2010) Performance of the direct sequence spread spectrum system with single-tong jamming. In: IEEE international conference on information theory and information security, pp 458–461
- Liu Z, Liu H, Xu W et al (2011a) Exploiting jamming-caused neighbor changes for jammer localization. IEEE Trans Parallel Distrib Syst 23(3):547–555
- Liu S, Bai W, Xue S et al (2011b) Research of the comparative analysis of the frame structure of TD-SCDMA and WCDMA. In: Global mobile congress, Shanghai, pp 1–3
- Liu Y, Li J, Petropulu AP (2013) Destination assisted cooperative jamming for wireless physical-layer security. IEEE Trans Inf Forensics Secur 8(4):682–694
- Luo J, Andrian JH, Zhou C (2007) Bit error rate analysis of jamming for OFDM systems. In: Wireless telecommunications symposium
- Medal HR (2016) The wireless network jamming problem subject to protocol interference. Networks 47(1):26–36
- Naseem A, Khan SA, Malik AW (2017) A real-time man-in-loop threat evaluation and resource assignment in defense. J Oper Res Soc 68(6):725–738
- Pelechrinis K, Koutsopoulos I, Broustis I et al (2016) Jammer localization in wireless networks: an experimentation-driven approach. Comput Commun 86:75–85
- Price KV, Storn RM, Lampinen JA (2006) Differential evolution: a practical approach to global optimization. Springer, Berlin
- Rechenberg I (1965) Cybernetic solution path of an experimental problem. In Royal Aircraft Establishment Translation No. 1122 (trans: Toms BF) (August 1965). Key: citeulike:1505176
- Rechenberg I (1971) Evolutionstrategie: optimierung technisher systeme nach prinzipien des biologischen evolution. Technical University of Berlin, Berlin
- Reed J, Toombs R, Barricelli NA (1967) Simulation of biological evolution and machine learning. J Theor Biol 17(3):319–342
- Sagduyu YE, Berryt RA, Ephremidesi A (2010) Wireless jamming attacks under dynamic traffic uncertainty. In: Modeling and optimization in mobile, ad hoc and wireless networks (WiOpt), pp 303–312
- Sagduyu YE, Berry RA, Ephremides A (2011) Jamming games in wireless networks with incomplete information. IEEE Commun Mag 49(8):112–118
- Schwefel HP (1975) Evolutionsstrategie und numerische optimierung. Technical University of Berlin, Berlin
- Song T, Stark WE, Li T et al (2016) Optimal multiband transmission under hostile jamming. IEEE Trans Commun 64(9):4013–4027

- Storn R, Price K (1997) Differential evolution—a simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces. J Glob Optim 11(4):341–359
- Tanergüçlü T, Maraş H, Gencer C et al (2012) A decision support system for locating weapon and radar positions in stationary point air defence. Inf Syst Front 14(2):423–444
- Tan Y, Zhu Y (2010) Fireworks algorithm for optimization. In: International conference on advances in swarm intelligence, pp 355–364
- Tayebi A, Berber S, Swain A (2017) A new approach for error rate analysis of wide-band DSSS-CDMA system with imperfect synchronization. Wirel Pers Commun 98(10):1–28
- Vadlamani S, Medal HR et al (2014) A bi-level programming model for the wireless network jamming placement problem. In: Proceedings of the 2014 industrial and systems engineering research conference
- Veronica Belmega E, Chorti A (2017) Protecting secret key generation systems against jamming: energy harvesting and channel hopping approaches. IEEE Trans Inf Forensics Secur 12(11):2611–2626
- Wang L, Cao C, Ma JX et al (2013) Cluster-based cooperative jamming in wireless multi-hop networks. In: Personal indoor and mobile radio communications (PIMRC), pp 169–174

- Yang XS (2009) Firefly algorithms for multimodal optimization. In: Watanabe O, Zeugmann T (eds) Stochastic algorithms: foundations and applications. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 5792. Springer, Berlin, pp 169–178
- Yang D, Xue G, Zhang J et al (2013) Coping with a smart jammer in wireless networks: a Stackelberg game approach. IEEE Trans Wirel Commun 12(8):4038–4047
- Zang G, Gao Y, Mu J (2010) Performance analysis of the cooperative DS/SS systems in single-tone interference over flat Rayleigh fading channels. In: International conference on communications, circuits and systems, pp 126–130
- Zhang Y, Yang L (2014) Triangle and GA methods for UAVs jamming. Math Probl Eng 2014(2):1–8
- Zhang L, Guan Z, Melodia T (2014) Cooperative anti-jamming for infrastructure-less wireless networks with stochastic relaying. In: INFO-COM, pp 549–557

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.