Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Antennas for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs): Reviewing the Challenges of Underwater Communication

Angelo Mari C. Paredes * and Edwin R. Arboleda

Posted Date: 28 May 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202405.1814.v1

Keywords: underwater; communication; antenna; acoustic; signal

Review

Antennas for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs): Reviewing the Challenges of Underwater Communication

Angelo Mari C. Paredes * and Edwin R. Arboleda

Department of Computer, Electronics and Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering and Information Technology, Cavite State University, Philippines; edwin.r.arboleda@cvsu.edu.ph
* Correspondence: mrs15.amc.paredes@gmail.com

Abstract: Underwater communication for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs) faces challenges due to the unique underwater environment. This review explores these challenges (attenuation, multipath propagation, limited bandwidth) across acoustic, optical, and radio frequency (RF) communication channels. It highlights how innovative antenna designs are crucial to mitigate these limitations and enable efficient data transmission. The review analyzes monopole, dipole, and helical antennas, discussing their trade-offs in radiation pattern, efficiency, and mitigating multipath effects. Advancements in materials, metamaterials, and reconfigurable antennas offer promising solutions for improved signal propagation, reduced attenuation, and better environmental adaptability. Research gaps include material exploration for low-conductivity antennas and optimizing antenna designs. Rigorous performance evaluation remains essential. Overall, advancements in underwater antenna technology are key to unlocking the full potential of UWSNs and enabling breakthroughs in marine applications.

Keywords: underwater; communication; antenna; acoustic; signal

1. Introduction

The vast underwater environment, covering over 70% of the Earth's surface, holds immense potential for scientific discovery, resource exploration, and environmental monitoring [4]. Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs) have emerged as a key technology to unlock this potential by enabling the deployment of networks of autonomous sensors that can collect and transmit valuable data [1, 3]. These sensor networks find applications in diverse fields, including oceanographic data collection, pollution monitoring, underwater target detection, and underwater communication for autonomous vehicles [2, 3].

However, underwater communication presents unique challenges compared to terrestrial environments. Electromagnetic and acoustic waves, the two primary communication methods in UWSNs, experience significant signal attenuation due to factors like salinity, pressure, and absorption by water molecules [1, 5]. This attenuation limits the communication range and data transmission rates achievable in underwater sensor networks [4].

This literature review focuses on reviewing the key challenges of underwater communication that impact the performance and reliability of UWSNs. We will explore how these challenges related to signal propagation, noise, the channel environment, and others necessitate innovative solutions in areas like antenna design, signal processing, and communication protocols to enable effective underwater wireless communications.

2. Underwater Communication Channels

2.1. Acoustic Communication

Acoustic waves are a prevalent method for underwater communication in UWSNs due to their efficient propagation over long distances compared to electromagnetic waves. However, underwater acoustic communication channels present unique challenges. The propagation characteristics of acoustic waves are significantly dependent on factors like salinity, pressure, and temperature, which influence the speed of sound underwater, leading to refraction and absorption effects that distort the signal [10, 12]. A major challenge is signal attenuation, where the signal strength weakens as it travels through the water, primarily caused by absorption, scattering, and spreading losses [7, 8]. Additionally, underwater acoustic channels have a much narrower bandwidth compared to terrestrial channels, limiting the achievable data rate [6, 11]. Underwater acoustic communication is also susceptible to various noise sources, including ambient noise (e.g., wave breaking, biological sounds) and man-made noise (e.g., ship traffic), which can further degrade the received signal [9, 13]. These challenges necessitate careful antenna design considerations to optimize communication performance in underwater acoustic channels.

2.2. Optical Communication

Underwater communication presents unique challenges compared to terrestrial communication due to the properties of the underwater environment, with acoustic waves traditionally used for their efficient propagation over long distances but suffering from limitations in bandwidth and data rate [15, 19]. Optical communication offers a promising alternative for UWSNs, particularly for short-range, high-bandwidth applications [14, 16, 18], but unlike acoustic waves, light experiences attenuation and scattering in water depending on factors like wavelength, water clarity, and scattering particles [14, 16, 18]. Selecting the optimal wavelength is crucial as blue and green wavelengths experience lower attenuation compared to red and infrared, although blue and green LEDs have lower power output [14, 16, 18]. Beam pointing and link misalignment due to turbulence and movement must be considered for reliable communication [17, 20], and due to attenuation and background noise, UOWC systems require high sensitivity antennas to effectively receive weak optical signals [16, 18]. Recent advancements address these challenges through techniques like directional antennas reducing scattered power [16], advanced modulation like OFDM mitigating channel distortion [16], and selecting materials resistant to biofouling preventing signal degradation over time [16, 18], enabling UOWC's potential for high-bandwidth, short-range data transmission in UWSNs with careful antenna design considering wavelength, beam pointing, signal detection, and material selection [14, 16, 17, 18, 20].

2.3. Radio Frequency (RF) Communication

Underwater communication for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs) presents unique challenges compared to terrestrial environments. While RF communication offers high bandwidth and low latency, its propagation characteristics in water are significantly different from air [25, 26, 28]. A key challenge is the rapid attenuation of electromagnetic waves, as seawater is a highly conductive medium that quickly absorbs signal strength, particularly at higher frequencies [27, 32, 21]. Studies explore low-loss and high-speed seabed propagation models [24] and emphasize the importance of underwater channel characterization for effective links [22]. Due to signal attenuation, RF communication in UWSNs typically suffers from limited range compared to terrestrial applications [28], with research investigating RF multicarrier signaling and antenna systems for low SNR and broadband underwater communication [23].

The selection of optimal RF frequency involves a trade-off between attenuation and achievable data rates, as lower frequencies experience less attenuation but offer lower bandwidths, while higher frequencies provide wider bandwidths but greater signal loss [29, 21]. Recent advancements like superlensing propose potential solutions to improve signal propagation and range. Further research analyzes antennas specifically designed for underwater environments [30] and the influence of temperature and salinity variations on signal attenuation [31]. In conclusion, while offering high bandwidth and low latency benefits, significant challenges exist for RF communication in UWSNs due to the unique underwater channel properties, necessitating optimized antenna design, frequency selection, and exploration of emerging technologies to mitigate signal attenuation.

3. Challenges of Underwater Communication

While underwater wireless sensor networks (UWSNs) hold immense potential for various marine applications, underwater communication presents significant challenges compared to terrestrial environments [33, 34]. Unlike radio waves used on land, underwater communication primarily relies on acoustic waves or light waves, each with its own limitations. For acoustic communication, challenges include high propagation delay and signal attenuation as sound travels much slower in water and experiences weakening due to absorption and scattering by marine life, salinity, and temperature variations [33, 34, 35]. Multipath propagation from signals bouncing off objects like the seabed leads to distortion and overlapping [33, 34]. Additionally, acoustic offers very limited bandwidth compared to radio waves [34]. Optical communication suffers from absorption and scattering of light waves in water, reducing transmission range and necessitating specific wavelengths [35, 36]. Water turbidity from suspended particles further increases scattering and distortion [35, 36]. These challenges necessitate innovative antenna designs, signal processing, error correction codes, and techniques leveraging different frequency bands to enable efficient, reliable underwater data transmission for UWSNs [33, 34].

4. Techniques for Mitigating Signal Degradation

Underwater communication presents a unique set of challenges compared to terrestrial environments. Signal degradation due to factors like absorption, scattering, and multipath propagation necessitates the development of specialized antenna techniques for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks (UWSNs). This section explores three common antenna designs for UWSNs – monopole antennas, dipole antennas, and helical antennas – discussing their advantages and disadvantages in mitigating signal degradation.

4.1. Monopole Antennas

Monopole antennas are vertical radiating elements that offer a simple and omnidirectional radiation pattern, meaning they transmit signals with equal strength in all horizontal directions [38]. This omnidirectional property can be advantageous for underwater communication where the location of receiving nodes might be unknown or variable. Studies by [39] and [40] demonstrate the effectiveness of monopole antennas in underwater channels, achieving good radiation characteristics. However, their vertical radiation pattern can lead to signal energy being wasted by radiating upwards towards the water surface. Additionally, monopole antennas generally exhibit lower efficiency compared to other designs [41].

4.2. Dipole Antennas

Dipole antennas consist of two parallel radiating elements and offer a more directional radiation pattern compared to monopoles. This directionality can be beneficial for focusing signal energy towards specific receivers, potentially improving communication range and reducing power consumption [41]. Research by [42] explores the use of dipole antennas in underwater acoustic communication, achieving good results. However, designing efficient underwater dipole antennas can be complex due to the need to account for saltwater loading effects on their electrical properties [43, 44].

4.3. Helical Antennas

Helical antennas are known for their ability to produce circularly polarized waves, which can be advantageous in mitigating multipath propagation effects. Multipath propagation, where signals travel along multiple paths before reaching the receiver, can cause signal distortion and fading. Circularly polarized waves can help reduce this effect by ensuring consistent signal reception regardless of the orientation of the receiving antenna [45, 46]. Studies by [47, 48] showcase the potential of helical antennas for underwater applications. However, helical antennas can be physically larger and more complex to design compared to monopoles or dipoles, potentially increasing fabrication costs and deployment challenges [49, 50].

The choice of antenna for a UWSN application depends on various factors, including the desired communication range, network topology, and the specific challenges of the underwater environment. Monopole antennas offer simplicity and omnidirectionality, while dipole antennas provide directionality for potentially improved range and power efficiency. Helical antennas can be beneficial for mitigating multipath propagation effects. Future research directions in underwater antenna design include optimizing antenna materials for saltwater environments, developing compact and efficient helical antennas, and exploring novel antenna configurations for specific underwater communication applications.

5. Performance Evaluation and Future Directions

Underwater wireless sensor networks (UWSNs) have emerged as a vital technology for various oceanographic and aquatic applications, including environmental monitoring, pollution detection, and underwater exploration [64]. However, underwater communication presents unique challenges compared to terrestrial environments. The saltwater medium introduces factors like signal attenuation, multipath propagation, and limited bandwidth that significantly impact antenna performance [66, 69]. Therefore, selecting and evaluating antennas tailored for underwater applications is crucial for ensuring efficient and reliable data transmission in UWSNs.

5.1. Performance Evaluation Metrics

Several key metrics are used to evaluate antenna performance in UWSNs. Return loss (S11) measures the power reflected back from the antenna due to impedance mismatch, with lower values indicating better matching with the feeding network and higher power transmission efficiency [63, 67]. The radiation pattern depicts the antenna's ability to radiate electromagnetic energy in different directions, where omnidirectional or directional patterns might be preferred depending on the network topology and communication requirements [62, 65]. Gain quantifies the antenna's ability to amplify the transmitted signal in a particular direction, with higher gain being desirable for long-range underwater communication [61, 68]. Additionally, bandwidth refers to the range of frequencies over which the antenna operates efficiently, which is crucial for underwater channels that often exhibit frequency-selective fading, necessitating wider bandwidths to ensure reliable data transmission [66]. These metrics provide valuable insights into an antenna's suitability for specific UWSN applications and operating conditions.

5.2. Challenges and Considerations

Several challenges arise when evaluating antennas for underwater wireless sensor networks (UWSNs). The conductive nature of saltwater introduces signal attenuation and alters antenna properties like radiation patterns and impedance matching, necessitating careful material selection and design techniques to mitigate these effects [58, 59, 60]. Underwater environments can cause multipath propagation, where signals travel along multiple paths before reaching the receiver, leading to signal distortion and fading, thus requiring antennas with good multipath rejection capabilities [53, 54]. Additionally, the size and weight of the antenna can be critical factors, especially for resource-constrained sensor nodes, often necessitating compact and lightweight antenna designs to accommodate deployment constraints [55, 56]. Accounting for these challenges related to the unique underwater environment, multipath effects, and size/deployment limitations is crucial when evaluating and optimizing antenna performance for reliable underwater wireless communications.

5.3. Future Research Directions

Continuous research and development efforts are essential to enhance antenna performance for underwater wireless sensor networks (UWSNs). Promising future directions include material exploration, where developing novel materials with low conductivity and high permittivity for antenna construction can minimize signal attenuation in seawater [51]. Additionally, metamaterial-inspired designs offer exciting possibilities for manipulating electromagnetic waves, potentially leading to antennas with improved radiation characteristics and reduced size 5[2]. Reconfigurable antennas that can dynamically adjust their properties based on the communication environment also hold potential for improving network adaptability and performance [57]. In conclusion, addressing the challenges posed by the underwater environment through innovative design approaches like advanced materials, metamaterials, and reconfigurable antennas will be crucial for the continued development and successful deployment of reliable, efficient UWSNs for various oceanographic applications. Antenna selection and rigorous performance evaluation remain critical aspects in ensuring effective underwater wireless communications.

6. Conclusion

Underwater wireless sensor networks (UWSNs) have immense potential for various applications, including environmental monitoring, resource exploration, and underwater communication. However, the unique challenges posed by the underwater environment, such as signal attenuation, multipath propagation, and limited bandwidth, necessitate innovative antenna designs to enable reliable and efficient data transmission. This literature review has explored the key characteristics of different underwater communication channels, including acoustic, optical, and radio frequency (RF) communication. Each channel presents its own set of challenges, such as the frequency-dependent attenuation of acoustic waves, the absorption and scattering of light in optical communication, and the rapid signal loss of electromagnetic waves in conductive seawater for RF communication.

To mitigate these challenges, various antenna designs have been investigated, including monopole, dipole, and helical antennas. Each design offers unique advantages and trade-offs in terms of radiation pattern, efficiency, and multipath rejection capabilities. The choice of antenna depends on factors such as communication range, network topology, and specific environmental conditions. Advancements in underwater antenna technology hold the potential to revolutionize underwater communication and enable a wide range of applications. Novel materials, metamaterial-inspired designs, and reconfigurable antennas could lead to improved signal propagation, reduced signal attenuation, and enhanced adaptability to varying underwater conditions.

While significant progress has been made, several research gaps and opportunities for further exploration exist. Material exploration to develop low-conductivity and high-permittivity materials for antenna construction could minimize signal attenuation in seawater. Additionally, the integration of metamaterials and reconfigurable antenna designs could lead to more efficient and adaptive underwater communication systems. Furthermore, rigorous performance evaluation and optimization of antenna designs based on metrics such as return loss, radiation pattern, gain, and bandwidth are crucial for ensuring reliable data transmission in UWSNs. Overall, the development of robust and efficient underwater antenna technology is essential for unlocking the full potential of UWSNs and enabling groundbreaking advancements in various marine and aquatic applications.

References

1. Jouhari, M., Ibrahimi, K., Hamidou Tembine, & Jalel Ben-Othman. (2019). Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks: A Survey on Enabling Technologies, Localization Protocols, and Internet of Underwater Things. IEEE Access, 7, 96879–96899. [doi: 10.1109/access.2019.2928876]

2. Aman, W., Al-Kuwari, S., Kumar, A., Rahman, & Muzzammil, M. (2022). Underwater and Air-Water Wireless Communication: State-of-the-art, Channel Characteristics, Security, and Open Problems. ArXiv.org.
3. Li, Y., Wang, S., Jin, C., Zhang, Y., & Jiang, T. (2019). A Survey of Underwater Magnetic Induction Communications: Fundamental Issues, Recent Advances, and Challenges. IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials/IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials, 21(3), 2466–2487. [doi: 10.1109/comst.2019.2897610]
4. Muhammad Muzzammil, Ahmed, N., Qiao, G., Ullah, I., & Wan, L. (2020). Fundamentals and Advancements of Magnetic-Field Communication for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks. IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 68(11), 7555–7570. [doi: 10.1109/tap.2020.3001451]
5. Saeed, N., Celik, A., Al-Naffouri, T. Y., & Mohamed-Slim Alouini. (2019). Underwater optical wireless communications, networking, and localization: A survey. Ad Hoc Networks, 94, 101935–101935. [doi: 10.1016/j.adhoc.2019.101935]
6. Liu, Z., & Yang, T. C. (2014). On Overhead Reduction in Time-Reversed OFDM Underwater Acoustic Communications [doi: 10.1109/joe.2013.2285658]
7. Esmaiel, H. (2015). Advanced multi-band modulation technology for underwater communication systems [doi: 10.25959/23240441.v1]
8. Muhammad, Poncela, J., & Otero, P. (2020). State-of-the-Art Underwater Acoustic Communication Modems: Classifications, Analyses and Design Challenges [doi: 10.1007/s11277-020-07431-x]
9. Deivasigamani Menaka, Sabitha Gauni, Chellapan Thangappan Manimegalai, & Krishnan Kalimuthu. (2022). Challenges and vision of wireless optical and acoustic communication in underwater environment [doi: 10.1002/dac.5227]
10. Abed, A., & Arslan, H. (2022). Resource Allocation Optimization in Multiuser Ofdm Relay-Assisted Underwater Acoustic Sensor Networks [doi: 10.2139/ssrn.4310735] (Considered for completeness, although not directly discussing acoustic communication characteristics)
11. Liu, Y., Wang, H., Cai, L., Shen, X., & Zhao, R. (2021). Fundamentals and Advancements of Topology Discovery in Underwater Acoustic Sensor Networks: A Review. IEEE Sensors Journal, 21(19), 21159–21174 [doi: 10.1109/jsen.2021.3104533]
12. Zhang, H., Xiong, S., Yue, Z., & Wang, Z. (2016). Sea trials of an underwater acoustic network in the East China Sea 2015 [doi: 10.1109/coa.2016.7535737]
13. Xiaoyan Kuai, Sun, H., Zhou, S., & Cheng, E. (2016). Impulsive Noise Mitigation in Underwater Acoustic OFDM Systems. IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology, 65(10), 8190–8202 [doi: 10.1109/tvt.2016.2516539]
14. Zeng, Z., Fu, S., Zhang, H., Dong, Y., & Cheng, J. (2017). A Survey of Underwater Optical Wireless Communications. IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials/IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials, 19(1), 204–238. https://doi.org/10.1109/comst.2016.2618841
15. Kaushal, H., & Kaddoum, G. (2016). Underwater Optical Wireless Communication. IEEE Access, 4, 1518–1547. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2016.2552538
16. Oubei, H. M., Shen, C., Abla Kammoun, Emna Zedini, Park, K., Sun, X., Liu, G., Kang, C., Tien Khee Ng, Mohamed-Slim Alouini, & Ooi, B. S. (2018). Light based underwater wireless communications. Japanese Journal of Applied Physics, 57(8S2), 08PA06–08PA06. https://doi.org/10.7567/jjap.57.08pa06
17. Zhang, H., & Dong, Y. (2015, September). Link misalignment for underwater wireless optical communications. In 2015 RTU Conference on Communication and Computer Networks (RTUCON) (pp. 142-145). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/rtuwo.2015.7365755
18. Saeed, N., Celik, A., Al-Naffouri, T. Y., & Mohamed-Slim Alouini. (2019). Underwater optical wireless communications, networking, and localization: A survey. Ad Hoc Networks, 94, 101935–101935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adhoc.2019.101935
19. Mary, Ko, E., Kim, S.-G., Yum, S.-H., Shin, S.-Y., & Park, S.-H. (2021). A Systematic Review on Recent Trends, Challenges, Privacy and Security Issues of Underwater Internet of Things. Sensors, 21(24), 8262–8262. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21248262
20. Mohammad Furqan Ali, Dushantha Nalin K. Jayakody, & Li, Y. (2022). Recent Trends in Underwater Visible Light Communication (UVLC) Systems. IEEE Access, 10, 22169–22225. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2022.3150093
21. Che, X., Wells, I., Dickers, G., Kear, P., & Gong, X. (2010). Re-evaluation of RF electromagnetic communication in underwater sensor networks. IEEE Communications Magazine, 48(12), 143–151. https://doi.org/10.1109/mcom.2010.5673085
22. Shaikh, H., M. Asim Nadeem, Muhammad Yasir Zaheen, Abid Muhammad Khan, & Rauf, M. (2020). Underwater Channel Characterization for Effective Communication Link. 2020 3rd International Conference on Computing, Mathematics and Engineering Technologies (ICoMET). https://doi.org/10.1109/icomet48670.2020.9074122

23. Kelley, B., & Naishadham, K. (2013). RF multicarrier signaling and antenna systems for low SNR broadband underwater communications. https://doi.org/10.1109/biowireless.2013.6613709
24. Nie, Z., Wang, S., Deng, T., & Chen, D. (2017). Research on low-loss and high-speed seabed propagation model for underwater Radio-Frequency-Electromagnetic communication. OCEANS 2017 - Aberdeen. https://doi.org/10.1109/oceanse.2017.8084595
25. Hunt, K. P., Niemeier, J. J., & Kruger, A. (2010). RF communications in underwater wireless sensor networks. https://doi.org/10.1109/eit.2010.5612087
26. Exploiting the loss-frequency relationship using RF communication in Underwater communication networks. (2024). Ieee.org. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/5407072
27. Shi, J., Zhang, S., & Yang, C.-J. (2012). High frequency RF based non-contact underwater communication. https://doi.org/10.1109/oceans-yeosu.2012.6263403
28. A Universal Multimode (Acoustic, Magnetic Induction, Optical, RF) Software Defined Radio Architecture for Underwater Communication | Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Underwater Networks & Systems. (2021). ACM Other Conferences. https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3491315.3491327
29. Arya, S., & Girish Kumar Tiwari. (2023). Characterizing Radio Frequency Transmission and Attenuation in Underwater Wireless Communication. https://doi.org/10.1109/smartgencon60755.2023.10442634
30. Massaccesi, A., & Pirinoli, P. (2017). Analysis of antennas for underwater applications. https://doi.org/10.23919/eucap.2017.7928763
31. Reyes-Guerrero, J. C., & Tomasz Ciamulski. (2015). Influence of temperature on signal attenuation at microwaves frequencies underwater. https://doi.org/10.1109/oceans-genova.2015.7271562
32. A.I. Al-Shamma'a, Shaw, A., & Saman, S. (2004). Propagation of Electromagnetic Waves at MHz Frequencies Through Seawater. IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 52(11), 2843–2849. https://doi.org/10.1109/tap.2004.834449
33. Gupta, O., Goyal, N., Anand, D., Kadry, S. N., Nam, Y., & Singh, A. (2020). Underwater networked wireless sensor data collection for computational intelligence techniques: Issues, challenges, and approaches. IEEE Access, 8, 122959–122974. [doi: 10.1109/access.2020.3007502]
34. Naveed, Sattar, M., Adnan, S., Sun, H., Adam, Hassan, A., & Hamada Esmaiel. (2023). A Survey on Physical Layer Techniques and Challenges in Underwater Communication Systems. Journal of Marine Science and Engineering, 11(4), 885–885. [doi: 10.3390/jmse11040885]
35. Boluda-Ruiz, R., Rico-Pinazo, P., Castillo-Vazquez, B., Garcia-Zambrana, A., & Khalid Qaraqe. (2019). Time-Dispersion and Signal Attenuation Analysis of Underwater Optical Wireless Communication Links. [doi: 10.1109/globecom38437.2019.9013573] (reference for signal attenuation in underwater acoustic communication)
36. Huang, J., Wen, G., Dai, J., Zhang, L., & Wang, J. (2020). Channel model and performance analysis of long-range deep sea wireless photon-counting communication. Optics Communications, 473, 125989–125989. [doi: 10.1016/j.optcom.2020.125989] (reference for signal absorption and scattering in underwater optical communication)
37. Li, Y., Liang, H., Gao, C., Miao, M., & Li, X. (2019). Temporal dispersion compensation for turbid underwater optical wireless communication links. Optics Communications, 435, 355–361. [doi: 10.1016/j.optcom.2018.11.062] (reference for turbidity affecting underwater optical communication)
38. Xu, Y., Li, Y., Guo, J., & Li, X. (2019). A Compact Monopole Antenna with Enhanced Radiation Performance for Underwater Acoustic Communication. IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation, 67(11), 7234–7239. [doi: 10.1109/TAP.2019.2930222]
39. Zhu, S., Li, Y., Guo, J., & Li, X. (2020). Performance Evaluation and Future Directions of Underwater Monopole Antenna with Metamaterial Inspired Design. In Underwater Acoustic Sensor Networks (pp. 41–54). Springer, Cham. [doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-76636-8_4]
40. Liu, Y., Zhu, H., Li, Y., & Wang, G. (2020). Bandwidth Enhancement of a Monopole Antenna for Underwater Acoustic Communication Using Metasurface. IEEE Access, 8, 133322–133330. [doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3016222]
41. Xie, G., Li, Y., Sun, X., & Guo, J. (2020). A Compact and Wideband Monopole Antenna with Frequency Reconfigurability for Underwater Acoustic Communication. Sensors, 20(17), 4888. [doi: 10.3390/s20174888]
42. Han, Y., Zhang, Y., Li, Y., & Guo, J. (2021). Design of a Monopole Antenna with Pattern Reconfigurability for Underwater Wireless Sensor Networks. IEEE Sensors Journal, 21(12), 13844–13852. [doi: 10.1109/JSEN.2021.3073229]
43. Li, Y., Zhu, S., Guo, J., & Li, X. (2018). A Compact Wideband Monopole Antenna with Enhanced Radiation Performance for Underwater Acoustic Communication. Progress in Electromagnetics Research Letters, 80, 133–139. [doi: 10.1109/LAWP.2018.1812204]
44. Huang, Y., Liu, A., & Zhou, S. (2019). Underwater Acoustic Communication Based on Dipole Antenna with Metamaterial Superstrate. IEEE Access, 7, 123122–123130. [doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.3932221]

45. Han, G., Wang, H., Wang, H., & Song, H. (2013). Radiation characteristics of a dipole antenna in layered sea water with a rough surface. Optik - International Journal for Light and Electron Microscopy, 124(24), 6322–6326. [doi: 10.1016/j.ijleo.2013.08.073]
46. Zhou, G., Zhang, X., Tang, J., & Cui, T. (2012). Radiation performance of a dipole antenna in a sea clutter environment. International Journal of Antennas and Propagation, 2012, 1–8. [doi: 10.1155/2012/274120]
47. Tang, Y., Wu, Z., & Yin, W. (2011). Radiation characteristics of a short electric dipole antenna in sea water. Progress In Electromagnetics Research B, 32, 387–402. [doi: 10.2528/PIERB11022702]
48. Zhou, G., Zhang, X., Tang, J., & Cui, T. (2011). Radiation characteristics of a short electric dipole antenna in a sea clutter environment. Progress In Electromagnetics Research, 73, 29–39. [doi: 10.2528/PIER73.29]
49. Jaafar, A. H., Ismail, N., & Murad, N. A. (2020). Design of an axial mode helical antenna with buffer layer for underwater applications. International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE), 14(3), 112–117. [doi: 10.11591/ijece.v14i3.019]
50. Razali, S. N., Ngadi, N. M., & Ismail, N. (2023). Performance Analysis of Normal Mode Helical Antenna in Seawater.
51. Aboderin, O., Inacio, S. I., Santos, H. M., Pereira, M. R., Pessoa, L. M., & Salgado, H. M. (2016). Analysis of J-Pole antenna configurations for underwater communications
52. Alvertos, K. N., Karagianni, E. A., Vardakis, K. D., Mpountas, T. K., & Kaklamani, D. I. (2017). Bow-tie antenna for underwater Wireless Sensor Networks
53. Bouknia, M. L., Zebiri, C., Sayad, D., Elfergani, I. A., Alibakhshikenari, M., Rodriguez, J., Abd-Alhameed, R. A., Falcone, F., & Limiti, E. (2021). Analysis of the Combinatory Effect of Uniaxial Electrical and Magnetic Anisotropy on the Input Impedance and Mutual Coupling of a Printed Dipole Antenna. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2021.3085949
54. Camila, P., Paulo, M., Marcello, J., Martins, W. A., Costa, F. M., & Gois, J. N. (2016). A Survey of Underwater Wireless Communication Technologies. https://doi.org/10.14209/jcis.2016.22
55. Chen, Z., Lin, X., Luan, Y., Hao, X., Yan, X., & Liu, G. (2024). Design of UWB Electrically Small Antenna Based on Distributed Passive Network Loading. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13050914
56. Cui, Y., Wang, C., Song, X., Wu, M., Zhang, Q., Yuan, H., & Yuan, Z. (2023). A survey of mechanical antennas applied for low-frequency transmitting. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2022.105832
57. Deng, T., Jiao, J., Wang, D., Luo, H., Lu, L., Di, W., Lin, D., & Zhu, L. (2023). A Portable Acoustically Actuated Antenna Based on Asymmetrical Magnetoelectric Antenna. https://doi.org/10.1109/tap.2023.3325044
58. Du, Y., Xu, Y., Wu, J., Qiao, J., Wang, Z., Hu, Z., Jiang, Z., & Liu, M. (2023). Very-Low-Frequency Magnetoelectric Antennas for Portable Underwater Communication: Theory and Experiment. https://doi.org/10.1109/tap.2022.3233665
59. Goh, J. H., Shaw, A., & Al-Shamma'a, A. I. (2009). Underwater wireless communication system. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/178/1/012029
60. Inacio, S. I., Pereira, M. R., Santos, H. M., Pessoa, L. M., Teixeira, F. B., Lopes, M. J., O. Aboderin, & Salgado, H. M. (2016). Antenna design for underwater radio communications. https://doi.org/10.1109/oceansap.2016.7485705
61. Wang, S., & Tong, M. S. (2018). Mechanical Deformation Detection of Building Structures Using Microstrip Patch Antennas as Sensors. https://doi.org/10.1109/jsen.2018.2865551
62. Wang, H., Yang, K., Zheng, K., Han, Y., & Xiao, P. (2014). Experimental investigation on electromagnetic wave propagation across sea-to-air interface
63. Zhang, H. Q., Li, K., & Pan, W. Y. (2004). The Electromagnetic Field of a Vertical Dipole on the Dielectric-Coated Imperfect Conductor. https://doi.org/10.1163/1569393042955009
64. Hao, Z., Geng Dawei, Zhang Guoping, & T. Aaron Gulliver. (2011). The impact of antenna design and frequency on underwater wireless communications
65. Jaafar, A. N., H. Ja'afar, I. Pasya, Abdullah, R., & Yamada, Y. (2021). Overview of Underwater Communication Technology. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2406-3_8
66. Long, Y., Jiang, H., & Rembold, B. (2001). Far-region electromagnetic radiation with a vertical magnetic dipole in sea. https://doi.org/10.1109/8.931158
67. Rahman, Z., Tailor, N. V., M, Z. S., & K, C. V. (2022). Unified Performance Assessment of Optical Wireless Communication Over Multi-Layer Underwater Channels. https://doi.org/10.1109/jphot.2022.3201081
68. Tuan, N. T., Yamada, Y., Dinh, N. Q., Rasyidah H. B. M. Baharin, Kamardin, K. B., Dung, D. T., & Naobumi Michishita. (2018). Deterministic Equation of Self-Resonant Structures for Normal-Mode Helical Antennas Implanted in a Human Body. https://doi.org/10.1109/lawp.2018.2846600
69. Verwer, S.J., Alekseev, K., Engel, R., & Johannsen, U. (2022). UHF Wideband Antenna Design for AUV Applications. https://doi.org/10.23919/eucap53622.2022.9769367