Underwater Acoustic Communication Using Multiple-Input-Multiple-Output Doppler-Resilient Orthogonal Signal Division Multiplexing

Ebihara, Tadashi; Ogasawara, Hanako; Leus, Geert

DOI

[10.1109/JOE.2019.2922094](https://doi.org/10.1109/JOE.2019.2922094)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering

Citation (APA)

Ebihara, T., Ogasawara, H., & Leus, G. (2020). Underwater Acoustic Communication Using Multiple-Input-Multiple-Output Doppler-Resilient Orthogonal Signal Division Multiplexing. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering*, 45(4), 1594-1610. [8768317]. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JOE.2019.2922094>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

Peer-Reviewed Technical Communication

Underwater Acoustic Communication Using Multiple-Input–Multiple-Output Doppler-Resilient Orthogonal Signal Division Multiplexing

Tadashi Ebihara , *Member, IEEE*, Hanako Ogasawara, and Geert Leus, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—In this paper, we propose a novel underwater acoustic (UWA) communication scheme that achieves energy and spectrum efficiency simultaneously by combining Doppler-resilient orthogonal signal division multiplexing (D-OSDM) and multiple-input–multiple-output (MIMO) signaling. We present both the transmitter processing and the receiver processing for MIMO D-OSDM. We evaluate the performance of MIMO D-OSDM in simulations with a large intersymbol interference of 25 symbols and a Doppler spread with a maximum Doppler shift of 8 Hz. In addition, the sea trial is performed in Suruga Bay, where the receiver is mounted on a barge and a research vessel with the transmitter makes round trips along a line with a speed of 4 kn. In the experiments, we obtain an intersymbol interference of 3.6–29.7 symbols and a Doppler spread of several Hertz (leading to a spread of over two to three subcarrier spacings). The simulation results suggest that MIMO D-OSDM has an advantage over normal D-OSDM, Doppler-resilient MIMO orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (MIMO D-OFDM), and classical OFDM with MIMO signaling (MIMO OFDM)—MIMO D-OSDM achieves better bit error rate performance than the benchmarks. The sea trial results also support the advantage of MIMO D-OSDM—it achieves a coded block error rate of 3.2% while normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM achieve a coded block error rate of 9.7% and 9.3%, respectively. We conclude that MIMO D-OSDM can become a viable technique that achieves reliable and effective UWA communication.

Index Terms—Delay spread, Doppler spread, underwater acoustic (UWA) communication.

I. INTRODUCTION

RECENTLY, underwater wireless communication systems have diversified dramatically. Multiple media (e.g., acoustic [1], [2], optical [3], and radio [4]) have been utilized to satisfy system requirements such as communication range and speed. Among these systems, underwater acoustic (UWA) communication offers wide-area connectivity, since acoustic waves propagate over long distances in the underwater environment.

Manuscript received August 28, 2018; revised April 20, 2019; accepted June 5, 2019. Date of publication July 22, 2019; date of current version October 13, 2020. This work was supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (A) under Grant JP15H05560, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science; and in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) under Grant JP19H02351, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. (*Corresponding author: Tadashi Ebihara.*)

Associate Editor: M. Stojanovic.

T. Ebihara is with the Faculty of Engineering, Information and Systems, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba 305-8573, Japan (e-mail: ebihara@iit.tsukuba.ac.jp).

H. Ogasawara is with the Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, National Defense Academy of Japan, Yokosuka 239-8686, Japan (e-mail: ogasawar@nda.ac.jp).

G. Leus is with the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft University of Technology, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands (e-mail: g.j.t.leus@tudelft.nl).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/JOE.2019.2922094

Although UWA communication has the potential to provide wide-area connectivity, achieving reliable and high-speed UWA communication is still challenging. This is because UWA communication suffers from the large delay and Doppler spreads of the UWA channel, whose impact is much larger than for land mobile RF communication [5]. To achieve reliable communication in such doubly spread channels, numerous physical layer technologies using single-carrier [6]–[9] and multicarrier [e.g., orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM)] [10]–[17] approaches have been proposed. In addition, the combination of advanced hardware and signal processing techniques, such as multiple-input–multiple-output (MIMO) signaling, has also been considered to improve the effective data rate [18]–[22].

To achieve reliable UWA communication, we have proposed Doppler-resilient orthogonal signal division multiplexing (hereafter, we call this normal D-OSDM) [23], [24]. Normal D-OSDM is a communication technique for a single user and it is a combination of OSDM [25] and orthogonal multiple access [26]; it places the pilot and data signals on a rectangular lattice in the time–frequency domain so that they do not interfere even in doubly spread channels. This signal structure enables the receiver to counteract the delay-Doppler spread of the UWA channel efficiently, resulting in a reduction of the required transmission power. We have tested normal D-OSDM in simulations and test tank experiments and found that a normal D-OSDM can reduce the power consumption requirements compared to the latest techniques based on OFDM. In addition, we have also conducted a demonstration of a normal D-OSDM in a harbor with a mobile receiver and confirmed that the normal D-OSDM delivers excellent reliability in an actual UWA environment [27]. However, a normal D-OSDM has a small spectrum efficiency, a limitation that should be addressed before we utilize this technique in an actual underwater application.

In this paper, we combine single-user MIMO signaling and normal D-OSDM to achieve both energy- and spectrum-efficient UWA communications. There exist several advanced MIMO techniques in UWA communication to enhance the communication quality, such as space–time, space–frequency, and space–time–frequency MIMO techniques [20], [28], [29]. Furthermore, the study of multiuser MIMO systems, where multiple transmitters transmit multiple data streams to their corresponding receivers using MIMO, has emerged recently as an important topic to establish a UWA network [21]. However, the scope of this paper is to maximize the transmission rate of a single user, since high data rate transmission systems providing a significant robustness against delay and Doppler spread are of great importance for UWA communication. Hence, we only consider a traditional MIMO system for a single-user environment in this paper. Furthermore, traditional single-user MIMO OFDM is the most popular form of UWA communication using MIMO [18], [19], [22]. Considering all the above, we prefer to combine traditional single-user MIMO signaling (with different data

Fig. 1. Time–frequency structure of communication signals. (a) Single carrier. (b) OFDM. (c) OSDM. (d) D-OFDM. (e) D-OSDM.

streams on different antennas) with OSDM, and we employ normal D-OSDM and the well-known OFDM techniques [Doppler-resilient MIMO OFDM (MIMO D-OFDM) and classical MIMO OFDM] as benchmarks [18].

We develop the transmitter processing and receiver processing for MIMO D-OSDM and show that MIMO D-OSDM can improve the spectrum efficiency while preserving the characteristics of D-OSDM in terms of its resilience against delay and Doppler spreads. We also evaluate the performance of MIMO D-OSDM in doubly spread channels in both simulations and sea trials.

The remaining of this paper is structured as follows. Section II explains the signal processing flow of MIMO D-OSDM at the transmitter and receiver. Section III evaluates its performance in simulations. Section IV evaluates its performance in sea trials. Section V concludes this paper.

Notation: We use upper/lower bold face letters to denote matrices/row vectors. We define $x[i]$ as the i th element of the vector $\mathbf{x}$ starting with index 0. $(\cdot)^*$, $(\cdot)^T$, and $(\cdot)^{-1}$ denote conjugate transpose, transpose, and inverse, respectively. The sets of nonnegative integer numbers and positive integer numbers are defined as $\mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathbb{Z}^+$, respectively. $\mathbf{0}_{R \times C}$, $\mathbf{F}_N$, and $\mathbf{I}_M$ represent the $R \times C$ all-zero matrix, the $N \times N$ inverse discrete Fourier transform (IDFT) matrix, and the $M \times M$ identity matrix, respectively. W_{MN} represents the basic element of the IDFT matrix, i.e., $W_{MN} = \exp[2\pi\sqrt{-1}/(MN)]/\sqrt{MN}$. $\mathbf{Z}_M$ is a cyclic shift matrix of size $M \times M$, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{Z}_M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

II. MIMO DOPPLER-RESILIENT ORTHOGONAL SIGNAL DIVISION MULTIPLEXING

A. Overview of OSDM and D-OSDM

Before describing MIMO D-OSDM, we would like to present an overview of the basics of our OSDM and D-OSDM technologies. Fig. 1

shows the time–frequency structure of baseband communication signals that are considered for UWA communication, where each colored box represents the information (modulated symbol). In the well-known single-carrier system, the information appears once in the time domain [see Fig. 1(a)]. In an OFDM system, the information is transmitted block by block [with a zero-padded suffix to avoid interblock interference (IBI)] and each information appears once in the frequency domain [see Fig. 1(b)]. On the other hand, in OSDM, the modulated symbols periodically appear in both the time and frequency domains [see Fig. 1(c)]. In our previous work, we found that such a signal structure gives resilience against large delay spreads, and that OSDM outperforms single-carrier and OFDM systems in a test tank for a static environment [25]. However, we also found that the performance of OSDM drops in a dynamic environment, since the symbols interfere in the frequency domain [intercarrier interference (ICI)] due to Doppler spread.

To cope with the Doppler spread in UWA channels, the use of carefully spaced null subcarriers was found to be effective in OFDM systems (D-OFDM) [11]. In D-OFDM, null subcarriers are inserted between subcarriers (where each modulated symbol is allocated in each subcarrier) to prevent adjacent-carrier interference [see Fig. 1(d)]. To give Doppler resilience as in D-OFDM, we proposed D-OSDM, by combining OSDM and orthogonal multiple access [26]. In D-OSDM, null subcarriers are inserted between subcarriers as in D-OFDM [see Fig. 1(e)]. Furthermore, we found that D-OSDM is robust to both large delay and Doppler spreads, and D-OSDM outperforms D-OFDM (D-OSDM requires a lower signal transmission power to achieve the same error probability as D-OFDM) in a test tank for a dynamic environment, in exchange for effective data rate (spectrum efficiency) and receiver complexity [24].

In Sections II-B and II-C, we would like to combine single-user MIMO signaling and D-OSDM to achieve both energy- and spectrum-efficient UWA communications.

B. Signal Processing at the Transmitter

We would like to show the signal processing flow of MIMO D-OSDM at the transmitter (Tx) and receiver (Rx) employing J emitters and K hydrophones, respectively (see Fig. 2), using parameters and notations shown in Tables I and II, respectively. The Tx calculates the transmission signal $\mathbf{x}_j$ ($j = 0, 1, \dots, J - 1$) from message data

Fig. 2. Signal processing flow of MIMO D-OSDM at the transmitter and receiver.

TABLE I
PARAMETERS USED FOR THE DESIGN OF MIMO D-OSDM

Message vector length	$M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
Total number of message vectors per message block	$P \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
Total number of message blocks	$U \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
Maximum Doppler shift	$Q \in \mathbb{Z}^*$
Total number of pilot vector, message vectors, and zero vectors in a data matrix	$N = 1 + 2Q + U(P + 2Q)$
Delay spread length of the UWA channel	$L \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (L \leq M)$
Measurable delay spread in MIMO system	$\tilde{L} = \lfloor L/J \rfloor$
Number of emitters at Tx	$J \in \mathbb{Z}^+$
Number of hydrophones at Rx	$K \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (J \leq K)$

vectors $\mathbf{m}_{j,u,p}$ ($u = 0, 1, \dots, U-1$ and $p = 0, 1, \dots, P-1$) whose elements are complex modulated symbols. The signal processing steps at the Tx can be described as follows.

- 1) Create data matrices $\mathbf{D}_j$ as

$$\mathbf{D}_j = (\mathbf{p}_j^T, \mathbf{0}_{2Q \times M}^T, \mathbf{m}_{j,0,0}^T, \mathbf{m}_{j,0,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,0,P-1}^T, \mathbf{0}_{2Q \times M}^T, \mathbf{m}_{j,1,0}^T, \mathbf{m}_{j,1,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,1,P-1}^T, \mathbf{0}_{2Q \times M}^T, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,U-1,0}^T, \mathbf{m}_{j,U-1,1}^T, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,U-1,P-1}^T, \mathbf{0}_{2Q \times M}^T)^T \quad (1)$$

where the structure of $\mathbf{D}_j$ is shown in Fig. 3. Q corresponds to the maximum (discrete) Doppler shift of the UWA channel. $\mathbf{p}_j$ is a pilot vector and it is shared between the Tx and Rx before the communication. More specifically, based on one common pilot vector $\mathbf{p}$, the pilot vector $\mathbf{p}_j$ is constructed as

$$\mathbf{p}_j = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{Z}_M)^{j\tilde{L}} \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{L} = \lfloor L/J \rfloor. \quad (3)$$

Here, L corresponds to a rough estimate of the delay spread length of the UWA channel. The reason for constructing the different pilot vectors this way will become clear later on.

- 2) Convert data matrices $\mathbf{D}_j$ to vectors $\mathbf{d}_j^r$ by reading $\mathbf{D}_j$ in a rowwise direction as

$$\mathbf{d}_j^r = (\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2QM}, \mathbf{m}_{j,0}, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2QM}, \mathbf{m}_{j,1}, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2QM}, \dots, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,U-1}, \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2QM}) \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{m}_{j,u} = (\mathbf{m}_{j,u,0}, \mathbf{m}_{j,u,1}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{j,u,P-1}). \quad (5)$$

Fig. 3. Structure of data matrix $\mathbf{D}_j$.

- 3) Calculate the transmit signal block $\mathbf{x}_j$ by applying a transformation matrix to $\mathbf{d}_j^r$ as

$$\mathbf{x}_j = \mathbf{d}_j^r (\mathbf{F}_N \otimes \mathbf{I}_M) \quad (6)$$

TABLE II
NOTATIONS USED FOR THE DESIGN OF MIMO D-OSDM (E: EMITTER AND H: HYDROPHONE)

Name	Size	Notation
Common pilot vector	$1 \times M$	$\mathbf{p}$
Pilot vector from E# j	$1 \times M$	$\mathbf{p}_j$
Message vector	$1 \times M$	$\mathbf{m}_{j,u,p}$
Combination of $\mathbf{m}_{j,u,p}$ for all p	$1 \times MP$	$\mathbf{m}_{j,u}$
Data matrix	$N \times M$	$\mathbf{D}_j$
Data vector by reading $\mathbf{D}_j$ in a row-wise direction	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{d}_j^r$
Transmit signal block from E# j	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{x}_j$
Channel impulse response (E# $j \rightarrow$ H# k , Doppler shift of q)	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{h}_q^{j \rightarrow k}$
Channel matrix via a basis expansion model using $\mathbf{h}_q^{j \rightarrow k}$	$MN \times MN$	$\mathbf{H}_q^{j \rightarrow k}$
Diagonal matrix to represent Doppler shift of q	$MN \times MN$	$\mathbf{\Lambda}_q$
Received signal at hydrophone # k	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{y}_k$
Additive noise on $\mathbf{y}_k$	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{n}_k$
Delay-Doppler channel matrix	$MN \times MN$	$\mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k}$
– Submatrix of $\mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k}$	$M \times M$	$\mathbf{C}_{n,q}^{j \rightarrow k}$
– Approximated $\mathbf{C}_{n,q}^{j \rightarrow k}$	$M \times M$	$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{n,q}^{j \rightarrow k}$
Combined $\mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k}$ for all j and k	$JMN \times KMN$	$\mathbf{C}_a$
Transformed received signal (combined $\mathbf{y}_k$ for all k)	$1 \times KMN$	$\mathbf{z}$
– Subvector of $\mathbf{z}$	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{z}_k$
— Additive noise on $\mathbf{z}_k$	$1 \times MN$	$\mathbf{\eta}_k$
— Left-side part of $\mathbf{z}_k$	$1 \times M(Q+1)$	$\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}$
— Middle part of $\mathbf{z}_k$	$1 \times M(P+2Q)$	$\mathbf{z}_{k,u}$
— Right-side part of $\mathbf{z}_k$	$1 \times MQ$	$\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}$
— Element of $\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}$	$1 \times M(Q+1)$	$\mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}$
— Element of $\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}$	$1 \times MQ$	$\mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}$
— Element of $\mathbf{z}_{k,u}$	$1 \times M(P+2Q)$	$\mathbf{z}_{j,k,u}$
— Noise component on $(\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}, \mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q})$	$1 \times M(1+2Q)$	$\mathbf{\eta}_{p,k}$
— Additive noise on $\mathbf{z}_{k,u}$	$1 \times M(P+2Q)$	$\mathbf{\eta}_{k,u}$
Approximated channel matrix obtained from pilot	$M \times M$	$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,q}^k$
Approximated and combined channel matrix to obtain message	$JMP \times KM(P+2Q)$	$\mathbf{C}_{cu}$
– Submatrix of $\mathbf{C}_{cu}$	$MP \times M(P+2Q)$	$\mathbf{C}_{cu}^{j \rightarrow k}$
Noise component on received message	$1 \times MP$	$\tilde{\mathbf{\eta}}_{j,u}$

where “ $\otimes$ ” is the Kronecker product. By this transformation, the pilot and data blocks appear on a rectangular lattice in the time–frequency domain so that they do not interfere even in doubly spread channels.

- 4) Add L zeros to the signal block $\mathbf{x}_j$ (zero padding) and emit $\mathbf{x}_j$ from emitter # j . The transmission happens simultaneously for all emitters resulting in a boost of the effective data rate.

Note that the above-mentioned signal processing flow of MIMO D-OSDM is the same as that of D-OSDM [24] when $J = 1$. Furthermore, classical MIMO OFDM and MIMO D-OFDM can be calculated by reading the data matrices $\mathbf{D}_j$ in a *columnwise* direction and applying an inverse fast Fourier transform when $J = 1$ and $J > 1$, respectively. In that case, the transmit signal block of size $1 \times MN$ becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_j^{\text{OFDM}} = \mathbf{d}_j^c \mathbf{F}_{MN} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{d}_j^c$ is a vector of size $1 \times MN$ that is obtained by reading $\mathbf{D}_j$ in a *column-wise* direction

$$\mathbf{d}_j^c = (p_j[0], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, m_{j,0,0}[0], m_{j,0,1}[0], \dots, m_{j,0,P-1}[0], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, m_{j,1,0}[0], m_{j,1,1}[0], \dots, m_{j,1,P-1}[0], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \dots, m_{j,U-1,0}[0], m_{j,U-1,1}[0], \dots, m_{j,U-1,P-1}[0], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q})$$

$$\begin{aligned} & p_j[1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, m_{j,0,0}[1], m_{j,0,1}[1], \dots, m_{j,0,P-1}[1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \\ & m_{j,1,0}[1], m_{j,1,1}[1], \dots, m_{j,1,P-1}[1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \dots, \\ & \dots, m_{j,U-1,0}[1], m_{j,U-1,1}[1], \dots, m_{j,U-1,P-1}[1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \dots \\ & \dots, p_j[M-1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, m_{j,0,0}[M-1], m_{j,0,1}[M-1], \dots, m_{j,0,P-1}[M-1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \\ & \dots, m_{j,1,0}[M-1], m_{j,1,1}[M-1], \dots, m_{j,1,P-1}[M-1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}, \dots, \\ & \dots, m_{j,U-1,0}[M-1], m_{j,U-1,1}[M-1], \dots, m_{j,U-1,P-1}[M-1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times 2Q}). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

C. Signal Processing at the Receiver

In the UWA channel, the transmitted signal blocks $\mathbf{x}_j$ interfere with each other. In addition, $\mathbf{x}_j$ is affected by delay and Doppler spreads, and received by the Rx with K hydrophones. The Rx receives K signals simultaneously and obtains sequences $\mathbf{y}_k$ ($k = 0, 1, \dots, K-1$), by an overlap-add operation on each received signal. The obtained sequence

can be expressed using a BEM [30] as follows:

$$\mathbf{y}_k = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\{ \mathbf{x}_j \sum_{q=-Q}^Q (\mathbf{H}_q^{j \rightarrow k} \mathbf{\Lambda}_q) \right\} + \mathbf{n}_k \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{n}_k$ represents the additive noise component. $\mathbf{H}_q^{j \rightarrow k}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_q$ represent the effects of the delay and Doppler spreads, respectively

$$\mathbf{H}_q^{j \rightarrow k} = \begin{pmatrix} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[MN-1] \\ h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[MN-1] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[MN-2] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_q = \text{diag} [W_{MN}^0, W_{MN}^q, \dots, W_{MN}^{(MN-1)q}]. \quad (11)$$

Here, $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]$ ($h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m] = 0$ when $m > L$) is the channel impulse response from emitter $\#j$ to hydrophone $\#k$ at Doppler scale q .

The relationship between $\mathbf{d}_j^F$ and $\mathbf{y}_k$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{K-1}) (\mathbf{I}_K \otimes \mathbf{F}_N^* \otimes \mathbf{I}_M) \\ &= (\mathbf{d}_0^r, \mathbf{d}_1^r, \dots, \mathbf{d}_{J-1}^r) \mathbf{C}_a + (\boldsymbol{\eta}_0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{K-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_a$ is the combined channel matrix

$$\mathbf{C}_a = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{0 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}^{0 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}^{0 \rightarrow K-1} \\ \mathbf{C}^{1 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}^{1 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}^{1 \rightarrow K-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}^{J-1 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}^{J-1 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}^{J-1 \rightarrow K-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

with $\mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k}$ the delay-Doppler channel matrix from emitter $\#j$ to hydrophone $\#k$

$$\mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k} = \sum_{q=-Q}^Q \text{diag} (\mathbf{C}_{0,q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \mathbf{C}_{1,q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{N-1,q}^{j \rightarrow k}) \mathbf{Z}_{MN}^{Mq} \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{n,q}^{j \rightarrow k} = \begin{pmatrix} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[M-1] \\ W_N^{-n} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[M-1] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[M-2] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ W_N^{-n} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & W_N^{-n} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] \end{pmatrix} \quad (15)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ represents the additive noise component.

The signal processing steps at the Rx can be described as follows.

- 1) Combine the received signals $\mathbf{y}_k$ and transform the received signal to compute the vector $\mathbf{z}$

$$\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{K-1}) (\mathbf{I}_K \otimes \mathbf{F}_N^* \otimes \mathbf{I}_M) \quad (16)$$

$$= (\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{K-1}) + (\boldsymbol{\eta}_0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{K-1}) \quad (17)$$

where

$$\mathbf{z}_k = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} (\mathbf{d}_j^r \mathbf{C}^{j \rightarrow k}) \quad (18)$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} (\mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}, \mathbf{z}_{j,k,0}, \mathbf{z}_{j,k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{j,k,U-1}, \mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}) \quad (19)$$

$$= (\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}, \mathbf{z}_{k,0}, \mathbf{z}_{k,1}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{k,U-1}, \mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}). \quad (20)$$

- 2) Obtain $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]$ by channel sensing (using the received pilot blocks $\mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{p,j,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}$). Specifically, there is a relationship between the pilot block $\mathbf{p}_j$ and $\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}$ in (20) as

$$(\mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{-Q \rightarrow -1}, \mathbf{z}_{p,k}^{0 \rightarrow Q}) = \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\{ \mathbf{p}_j (\mathbf{C}_{0,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \mathbf{C}_{0,-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k}, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{0,Q}^{j \rightarrow k}) \right\} \quad (21)$$

$$= \mathbf{p} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q}^k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q+1}^k, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,Q}^k) + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{p,k} \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,q}^k$ is a circulant matrix given by (23), shown at the bottom of this page, whose elements are the channel impulse responses of length $\tilde{L}$ from all emitters to receiver $\#k$, and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{p,k}$ is an approximation error. This approximation comes from the fact that we ignore the latter part of the channel impulse response as we assume that $(h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0], h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1], \dots, h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[L-1]) \simeq (h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0], h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1], \dots, h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1], \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (L-J\tilde{L})})$. By this assumption, (22) can be obtained from (2) and (21) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\{ \mathbf{p}_j (\mathbf{C}_{0,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \mathbf{C}_{0,-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k}, \dots, \mathbf{C}_{0,Q}^{j \rightarrow k}) \right\} \\ & \simeq \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\{ \mathbf{p}_j (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,Q}^{j \rightarrow k}) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \left\{ \mathbf{p} (\mathbf{Z}_M)^{j\tilde{L}} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k}, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,Q}^{j \rightarrow k}) \right\} \quad (25)$$

$$= \mathbf{p} (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q}^k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,-Q+1}^k, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,Q}^k) \quad (26)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,q}^{j \rightarrow k}$ is a matrix given by (27) and (28), shown at the bottom of the next page. Hence, the Rx obtains $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]$ ($m \leq \tilde{L}-1$) by calculating (22).

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,q}^k = \begin{pmatrix} h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & \dots \\ h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-2] & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-2] & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \\ h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[1] & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[1] & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & h_q^{1 \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots \\ \dots & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (M-J\tilde{L})} & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & h_q^{J-2 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-1] & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L}-2] & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (M-J\tilde{L})} & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \dots & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[1] & h_q^{J-1 \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & h_q^{0 \rightarrow k}[0] & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times (M-J\tilde{L})} & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

3) Obtain message $\mathbf{m}_{j,u}$ by equalization. Specifically, there is a relationship between the message block $\mathbf{m}_{j,u}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{k,u}$ in (20) as

$$(\mathbf{z}_{0,u}, \mathbf{z}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{K-1,u}) = (\mathbf{m}_{0,u}, \mathbf{m}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{J-1,u}) \mathbf{C}_{cu} \quad (29)$$

$$= (\mathbf{m}_{0,u}, \mathbf{m}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{J-1,u}) \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{0 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{0 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{0 \rightarrow K-1} \\ \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{1 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{1 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{1 \rightarrow K-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{J-1 \rightarrow 0} & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{J-1 \rightarrow 1} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{cu}^{J-1 \rightarrow K-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)$$

where $\mathbf{C}_{cu}^{j \rightarrow k}$ is given by (31), shown at the bottom of this page, and $\tilde{u} = (1 + 2Q) + u(P + 2Q)$.

Hence, the Rx calculates $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{cu} = \mathbf{C}_{cu}|_{h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]=0 \ (m \geq \tilde{L})}$ using $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m] \ (m \leq \tilde{L} - 1)$ and obtains the received message $\mathbf{r}_{j,u}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{r}_{0,u}, \mathbf{r}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{J-1,u}) \\ &= [(\mathbf{z}_{0,u}, \mathbf{z}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{K-1,u}) + (\tilde{\eta}_{0,u}, \tilde{\eta}_{1,u}, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{J-1,u})] \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{cu}^* (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{cu} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{cu}^*)^{-1} \quad (32) \\ &= (\mathbf{m}_{0,u}, \mathbf{m}_{1,u}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{J-1,u}) + (\tilde{\eta}_{0,u}, \tilde{\eta}_{1,u}, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{J-1,u}) \quad (33) \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_{k,u}$ is a part of η_k . Notice that $\tilde{\eta}_{j,u}$ is a sum of three noises; part of the additive noise, approximation error in Step 3), and the channel measurement noise (if an estimated channel is used).

Note that the above-mentioned signal processing steps are based on the following assumptions.

- 1) All transmitted signals reach the Rx at the same time.
- 2) The Doppler shift is the same for all the Tx-Rx pairs.

In simulations (see Section III), we will consider the communication quality of MIMO systems if there exist time and frequency lags between the significant paths.

D. Characteristics of MIMO D-OSDM

In this paper, we employ normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM as main benchmarks. First, we briefly discuss our MIMO D-OSDM in comparison to the existing normal D-OSDM approach. The advantage of MIMO D-OSDM is an improvement of the spectrum efficiency; it

Fig. 4. Channel impulse response obtained at Suruga Bay (Tx-Rx distance: 350 m).

can improve the spectrum efficiency J times that of normal D-OSDM while almost preserving its resilience against delay and Doppler spread without employing a higher modulation rate (e.g., QPSK to 16QAM) that is sensitive to channel noise. On the other hand, the disadvantage of MIMO D-OSDM is an increase in noise in the received message, since the measurable delay spread of MIMO D-OSDM is limited compared to normal D-OSDM, as described in Section II-C. Specifically, MIMO D-OSDM measures $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]$ for $0 \leq m \leq \tilde{L} - 1$ and assumes $h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m] = 0$ for $m \geq \tilde{L}$. Hence, MIMO D-OSDM can be extended to larger architectures, but the maximum tolerated delay spread is inversely proportional to the number of senders. In other words, the communication speed increases proportional to the number of senders, but the communication quality becomes worse. However, the increase in noise due to the above-mentioned assumption remains small when the number of senders J is small, since the average power of the channel impulse response decays with the delay, as shown in Fig. 4. In Sections III and IV, we show that the advantages of MIMO D-OSDM outweigh its disadvantages when $J = 2$.

We also briefly discuss our MIMO D-OSDM in comparison to the existing MIMO D-OFDM approach. Fig. 5(a) shows the signal structure of the MIMO D-OSDM signal (emitted from a specific emitter # j) in the time-frequency domain, where T represents the symbol time. As shown in the figure, the data matrix $\mathbf{D}_j$ periodically appears in the MIMO D-OSDM signal in the time-frequency domain. Focusing on the structure of the MIMO D-OSDM signal in the frequency domain, there are MN subcarriers with M pilot subcarriers and U groups of P data subcarriers. Both pilot and data subcarrier groups are separated using $2Q$ null subcarriers. In that sense, the MIMO D-OSDM signal is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{0,q}^{j \rightarrow k} = \mathbf{C}_{0,q}^{j \rightarrow k} \Big|_{h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[m]=0 \ (m \geq \tilde{L})} \quad (27)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L} - 1] & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L} - 2] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[\tilde{L} - 1] & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[1] & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[2] & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & h_q^{j \rightarrow k}[0] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

$$\mathbf{C}_{cu}^{j \rightarrow k} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u},-Q}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u},-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u},Q-1}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u},Q}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+1,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+1,Q-2}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+1,Q-1}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+1,Q}^{j \rightarrow k} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_{M \times M} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+P-1,-Q}^{j \rightarrow k} & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+P-1,-Q+1}^{j \rightarrow k} & \dots & \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{u}+P-1,Q}^{j \rightarrow k} \end{pmatrix} \quad (31)$$

Fig. 5. Structure of (a) MIMO D-OSDM signal and (b) MIMO D-OFDM signal in the time–frequency domain.

comparable to the MIMO OFDM signal that also separates data subcarrier groups from pilot subcarriers using null subcarriers (MIMO D-OFDM), as shown in Fig. 5(b).

In [24], we showed that normal D-OSDM has advantages over normal D-OFDM [11]–[13] in terms of the low dynamic range of the transmitted signal and a better communication quality, in exchange for receiver complexity. These advantages and disadvantages still hold true when we compare MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM. Let us first focus on the peak-to-average power ratio (PAPR) of these signals. The maximum PAPR of the MIMO D-OSDM signal is proportional to the total number of message and pilot blocks $(1 + PU)$, whereas that of the MIMO D-OFDM signal is proportional to the total number of active subcarriers $M(1 + PU)$. Hence, MIMO D-OSDM is attractive from a practical point of view, since a small PAPR can avoid problems derived from the nonlinearity of the signal power amplifier at the Tx. Next, let us focus on the delay and Doppler resilience of these signals. In both techniques, the null subcarriers between the pilot and data signals are used to facilitate Doppler compensation by avoiding ICI. On the other hand, comparing Fig. 5(a) and (b), it is clear that both the message and pilot signals appear periodically in both the time and frequency domains in the MIMO D-OSDM signal, whereas they appear at unique subcarriers in the MIMO D-OFDM signal. This periodical appearance of pilot and data signals in MIMO D-OSDM provides robustness against frequency-selective fading, hence, MIMO D-OSDM would achieve better communication quality than MIMO D-OFDM in a UWA channel with a large delay spread. Note that such information spreading in this way is not unique to OSDM; it can be done with multiple frequency-shift keying [31] and Leus and van Walree [15] did it with OFDM.

III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN SIMULATIONS

A. Simulation Environment

In this section, we evaluate the performance of MIMO D-OSDM in simulations. In simulation I, we evaluated the performance [output signal-to-noise ratio (OSNR) and bit error rate (BER)] of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, MIMO D-OFDM, and classical MIMO OFDM in a UWA channel with various f_d values at a specific E_b/N_0 of 25 dB. In simulation II, we evaluated the BER of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM in a UWA channel with various E_b/N_0 values at a specific f_d of 8 Hz. In simulation III, we evaluated the OSNR and BER of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM in a UWA channel at a specific E_b/N_0 of 15 dB and f_d of 8 Hz, with time and frequency lags of the significant paths (Δt and Δf).

Table III shows the parameters used in simulation I. We consider MIMO D-OSDM with two emitters and two hydrophones (2×2). We also consider normal D-OSDM with a single emitter and two hydrophones (1×2), as well as MIMO D-OFDM and classical MIMO OFDM with two emitters and two hydrophones (2×2) as references. Note that the signal bandwidth, data rate, and total output power of the MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM are the same, whereas the data rate of classical MIMO OFDM is double to those of Doppler-resilient schemes (MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM).

Table IV shows the parameters used in simulations II and III. Different from simulation I, we do not employ classical MIMO OFDM since the performance of MIMO OFDM was not good in UWA channels with large Doppler spread. Hence, we consider MIMO D-OSDM

TABLE III
PARAMETERS OF NORMAL D-OSDM, MIMO D-OSDM, CLASSICAL MIMO OFDM, AND MIMO D-OFDM USED IN SIMULATION I

	Normal D-OSDM	MIMO D-OSDM	MIMO D-OFDM	Classical MIMO-OFDM
M	127			
P	2			1
U	1			1
Q	2			0
L	127			
J	1	2		
K	2			
Modulation (b : Number of bits per symbol)	16QAM ($b = 4$)	QPSK ($b = 2$)		
Channel coding (R : Code rate)	N/A ($R = 1$)			
Carrier frequency f_c (kHz)	24			
Signal bandwidth B (kHz)	4.8			
Effective data rate (kbps) $bJMPUBR/(MN + L)$	3.20			6.40
Spectrum efficiency (bps/Hz) $bJMPUR/(MN + L)$	0.66			1.33

TABLE IV
PARAMETERS OF NORMAL D-OSDM, MIMO D-OSDM, AND MIMO D-OFDM USED IN SIMULATIONS II AND III AND EXPERIMENTS

	Normal D-OSDM	MIMO D-OSDM	MIMO D-OFDM
M	127		
P	2		
U	1		
Q	2		
L	127		
J	1	2	
K	2		
Modulation (b : Number of bits per symbol)	16QAM ($b = 4$)	QPSK ($b = 2$)	
Channel coding (R : Code rate)	Turbo code ($R = 1/3$)		
Carrier frequency f_c (kHz)	24		
Signal bandwidth B (kHz)	4.8		
Effective data rate (kbps) $bJMPUBR/(MN + L)$	1.06 (with coding) 3.20 (without coding)		
Spectrum efficiency (bps/Hz) $bJMPUR/(MN + L)$	0.22 (with coding) 0.66 (without coding)		

with two emitters and two hydrophones (2×2) and normal D-OSDM with a single emitter and two hydrophones (1×2), as well as MIMO D-OFDM with two emitters and two hydrophones (2×2) as references. Note that the signal bandwidth, data rate, and total output power of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM are the same. Furthermore, a Turbo code with a code rate R of 1/3 is employed in simulations II and III, to evaluate the performance of communication schemes in practical circumstances. The channel encoding is performed block by block so that the input block length to the encoder is the same for D-OSDM, MIMO D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM. Specifically, the following statements hold.

- 1) The transmitter reads binary data of length 328 b.
- 2) The transmitter calculates the encoded message of length $328 \times 3 + 12$ (tail bits) = 996 b using the considered Turbo code (code rate R : 1/3).
- 3) For the 2×2 MIMO system (MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM), the transmitter calculates 498 QPSK symbols from 996 b and adds ten redundant symbols to generate a symbol length of 508 ($JMPU$). Note that the redundant symbols are not used to calculate the BER.
- 4) For the 1×2 single-input-multiple-output (SIMO) system (normal D-OSDM), the transmitter calculates 249 16QAM symbols

Fig. 6. Results of simulation I. Relationship between the normalized maximum Doppler shift and (a) OSNR and (b) BER without coding.

from 996 b and adds five redundant symbols to generate a symbol length of 254 ($JMPU$). Note that the redundant symbols are again not used to calculate the BER.

- 5) These $JMPU$ symbols are then converted to vectors $\mathbf{m}_{j,u,p}$ of size $1 \times M$.
- 6) Finally, the transmitter calculates $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{J-1}$ and $\mathbf{x}_0^{\text{OFDM}}, \mathbf{x}_1^{\text{OFDM}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{J-1}^{\text{OFDM}}$ from $\mathbf{m}_{j,u,p}$, and outputs them to the UWA channel.

In simulations, a discrete-time equivalent baseband channel model was established with a maximum delay of 127 taps (26.4 ms) and a maximum Doppler spread of f_d (Hz) taking various values, to simulate a UWA channel with large delay and Doppler spreads. The first path exhibits a Rice distribution with Rice factor (the ratio of signal power in dominant component over the scattered power) of 0 dB, considering the fact that the experiment was performed in a line-of-sight environment, where the direct-path signal and surface-reflected signal arrive within a symbol time. Other paths exhibit a Rayleigh distribution where the gain of the discrete paths decreased 0.31 dB per tap in power. In such condition, the root-mean-square (rms) delay spread of the channel was about 5 ms (approximately 25 symbols) [32]. The channel impulse responses from emitter # j to hydrophone # k were independent of each other. The Doppler spectrum was assumed to have a bell shape with a maximum Doppler shift of f_d (Hz). A Gaussian white process was used as additive noise.

B. Results of Simulations I and II

Let us focus on the result of simulation I (see Fig. 6). Fig. 6(a) and (b) shows the relationship between the normalized maximum Doppler shift (ratio of f_d to subcarrier spacing) and the OSNR and BER without coding, respectively. Note that the OSNR is the ratio of the average reference signal power to the mean square error. It is computed by measuring the modulation accuracy by comparing the received symbol constellation with the ideal input signal (reference constellation). Specifically, the OSNR is calculated as follows:

$$\text{OSNR} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} \sum_{u=0}^{U-1} |\tilde{M}_{j,u}[p, m]|^2}{\sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{p=0}^{P-1} \sum_{u=0}^{U-1} |M_{j,u}[p, m] - \tilde{M}_{j,u}[p, m]|^2} \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{M}_{j,u}[p, m]$ and $M_{j,u}[p, m]$ are the received symbol constellation and ideal input signal (reference constellation), respectively.

As shown in Fig. 6(a), classical MIMO OFDM performs best without any Doppler spread, and the OSNR curve of classical MIMO OFDM is a monotonically decreasing function. This is because the Doppler factor becomes noise to the classical MIMO OFDM scheme due to ICI. Different from classical MIMO OFDM, the decrease in the OSNR of normal D-OSDM is suppressed until the normalized Doppler shift is about 2.4 times larger than the subcarrier spacing (as indicated by the dotted line in Fig. 6). Furthermore, the OSNR curves of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM have a local maximum at the dotted line. This is because they can utilize both the delay and Doppler diversity as f_d increases, but if f_d is too high, it causes interference between the pilot and data subcarriers.

Focusing on the BER curves of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, MIMO D-OFDM, and classical MIMO OFDM at the dotted line in Fig. 6(b), it is clear that MIMO D-OSDM achieves a better performance than the benchmarks.¹ As shown in the figure, MIMO D-OSDM achieves a BER of 2.5×10^{-5} at the dotted line, whereas normal D-OSDM, MIMO D-OFDM, and classical MIMO OFDM achieve a BER of 5.6×10^{-5} , 1.4×10^{-3} , and 9.0×10^{-2} at the same Doppler shift, respectively.

Let us next focus on the result of simulation II (see Fig. 7). Fig. 7(a) and (b) shows a relationship between E_b/N_0 and BER with/without coding, respectively, when the normalized Doppler shift is about 2.4 times larger than the subcarrier spacing ($f_d = 8$ Hz). As shown in Fig. 7(a), MIMO D-OSDM achieves a BER of 10^{-3} when E_b/N_0 is 18.0 dB, whereas normal D-OSDM achieves the same BER when E_b/N_0 is 22.0 dB and MIMO D-OFDM has a BER floor above 10^{-3} . The advantage of MIMO D-OSDM over normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM still holds true when we compare them with channel coding. As shown in Fig. 7(b), MIMO D-OSDM achieves a BER of 10^{-3} when E_b/N_0 is 7.4 dB, whereas normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM achieve the same BER when E_b/N_0 is 8.7 dB and 9.1 dB, respectively.

These simulation results suggest that MIMO D-OSDM is attractive for UWA communication. From simulation I, we found that MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM achieve better performance than that by the classical MIMO OFDM under the presence of

¹Note that the BER curves cross one another, but not the OSNR curves in Fig. 6. This is because we employ different symbol constellations in the red, green, blue, and orange lines. In this paper, we compare 16QAM (red line, sensitive to noise, fast) with one transmit antenna and QPSK (green, blue, and orange lines, robust to noise, slow) with two transmit antennas resulting in the same effective data rate. Hence, the relationship between OSNR and the BER of 16QAM (red line) and QPSK (blue, green, and orange lines) is different, resulting in a different tendency for the two graphs.

Fig. 7. Results of simulation II. Relationship between E_b/N_0 and (a) BER without coding and (b) BER with coding.

Doppler spread. In UWA communication, the channel diversity can enhance the communication system performance, whereas the noise limits the communication system performance. Since MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM have null subcarriers to safeguard against ICI, they can utilize the Doppler factor to give the communication system channel diversity, resulting in a better performance than classical schemes under the presence of Doppler spread [33]. Furthermore, from simulations I and II, we found that the performance of MIMO D-OSDM is better than those of the normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM. This means that the advantages of MIMO D-OSDM (increase in spectrum efficiency without using a higher modulation rate) outweigh its disadvantage (an increase in noise due to channel approximation), as described in Section II-D. In addition, the resilience of MIMO D-OSDM with respect to the delay spread is better than that of MIMO D-OFDM, as described in Section II-D. These advantages of MIMO D-OSDM were also validated in the following experiments.

C. Results of Simulation III

Let us next focus on the result of simulation III. In simulation III, we evaluated the OSNR and BER of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM in a UWA channel with time and frequency lags between the significant paths. Fig. 8(a) shows a scenario when there exist a time lag between significant paths. As shown in the figure, there are four significant paths between the Tx and Rx ($E\#0 \rightarrow H\#0$, $E\#0 \rightarrow H\#1$, $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#0$, and $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#1$), and the spatial position difference between emitters and hydrophones causes a different time of arrival

Fig. 8. Results of simulation III. (a) Simulation scenario and relationship between the time lag Δt between significant paths and (b) OSNR and (c) BER without coding.

(in this figure, the transmitted signals passing through $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#0$ and $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#1$ arrive at the Rx with a delay of Δt compared to the signals passing through $E\#0 \rightarrow H\#0$ and $E\#0 \rightarrow H\#1$). Fig. 9(a) shows a scenario when there exist a frequency lag between significant paths. As shown in the figure, the Doppler shift of each path differs due to the movement of the communication platform (in this figure, $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#0$ and $E\#1 \rightarrow H\#1$ have a Doppler shift of Δf compared to that passes through $E\#0 \rightarrow H\#0$ and $E\#0 \rightarrow H\#1$).

Fig. 8(b) and (c) shows the relationship between Δt and the OSNR and BER with coding, respectively. From these figures, we found that a small time lag between the received signals does not affect the performance of the MIMO system much. As shown in Fig. 8(b), the OSNR curves of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM gradually decrease as the time lag between the two received signals increases, and suddenly drops when Δt exceeds the maximum tolerated delay spread $[L/(JB)]$. However, as shown in Fig. 8(c), the BER remains under 10^{-4} when Δt remains within 10 ms. Hence, a time-lag among the received signals does not affect the performance of a MIMO system much, since Δt of

Fig. 9. Results of simulation III. (a) Simulation scenario and relationship between the frequency lag Δf between received signals and (b) OSNR and (c) BER without coding.

10 ms already corresponds to a length difference of 15 m. However, it was also found that an extension to larger architectures and an increase in bandwidth (increase in J and B) limit the allowable time lag, and a careful design of the Tx and Rx (e.g., physical arrangement of emitters and hydrophones) is necessary.

Fig. 9(b) and (c) shows the relationship between Δf and the OSNR and BER with coding, respectively. As before, the OSNR curves of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM gradually decrease as the frequency lag between the two received signals increases, and the BER remains under 10^{-4} when Δf remains within two subcarrier spacings [$2B/(MN) = 6.2$ Hz]. From these results, it was found that the effect of frequency lag among the received signals may affect the performance of a MIMO system, since the rotational movement of the communication platform can easily exceed the allowable frequency lag for practical parameter values. Specifically, a velocity difference Δv of 0.4 m/s between E#0 and E#1 creates Δf of two subcarrier spacings when we use the parameters shown in Table IV, where

$$\Delta v = c \frac{\Delta f}{f_c + \Delta f} \quad (35)$$

Fig. 10. Side view of the transmitter and receiver.

Fig. 11. Top view of the transmitter and receiver.

and c is the sound velocity in water (approximately 1500 m/s). However, considering the facts that the rudder of underwater vehicles has a deflection to avoid stalling and the turning radius increases as the speed increases [34], such a maneuver generates a large velocity difference between emitters or hydrophones and thus a performance degradation remains rare in actual underwater vehicle operations. Of course, a careful design of the Tx and Rx (e.g., parameters M , N , and B) is necessary, since an increase in M and N and a decrease in signal bandwidth B make the subcarrier spacing small, and an increase in the carrier frequency makes the Doppler difference Δf large, which all limit the allowable frequency lag.

These simulation results suggest that MIMO D-OSDM is attractive for UWA communication, but careful consideration is necessary since the communication quality of MIMO systems drops if there exist time and frequency lags of the significant paths. Especially, the effect of frequency lag among the received signals may affect the performance of a MIMO system, since the rotational movement of the communication platform can exceed the allowable frequency lag easily for practical parameter values (see Table IV). Such effects were also validated in the following experiments.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IN SEA TRIALS

A. Experimental Setup and Procedure

In this section, we evaluate the performance of MIMO D-OSDM in sea trials. The experiment was performed in the Suruga Bay, Japan (35.02° N, 138.89° E) on June 22, 2018. Figs. 10 and 11 show the experimental setup. As shown in the figures, the Tx and Rx are mounted on a research vessel and a floating barge, respectively. At the Tx, two emitters (OST-2120, OKI Seatec, Shizuoka, Japan) were fixed 2.0 m below the water level using a stainless tube, and the distance between emitters was about 3.2 m. At the Rx, two hydrophones (OST-2120,

Fig. 12. Map of the sea trial area.

OKI Seatec) were hung 12.4 m below the water level, and the distance between hydrophones was about 3.0 m. The water depth at the Rx was 32 m, and it increases up to 54 m as the Tx–Rx distance increases. The position and velocity of the Tx were monitored by a GPS receiver throughout the experiment.

During the sea trial, the research vessel with the Tx makes round trips between the starting point and turning point (see Fig. 12). Specifically, the round trip was performed by the following steps.

Step 1: The Tx starts emitting the signal.

Step 2: The Tx departs the starting area located 35 m from the Rx and runs toward the turning area with constant speed.

Step 3: When the Tx approaches the turning area located 550 m from the Rx, the Tx decreases its speed, changes its direction, and runs toward the starting area with constant speed.

Step 4: When the Tx approaches the starting area, the Tx decreases its speed, changes its direction, and stops emitting the signal.

The sea trial was divided into two parts—channel probing and testing the UWA communication. In the channel probing, we measured the delay and Doppler spreads of the UWA channel. As probing signal, two signals—a burst chirp signal (center frequency: 24 kHz, bandwidth: 4.8 kHz) and a continuous sinusoid of 24 kHz—are employed to measure the delay and Doppler spread. The above-mentioned round trip was repeated two times for each signal.

To test the UWA communication, we emitted MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM signals with parameters as in Table III. Different from the simulation that is performed using baseband signals, the experiment was performed using passband signals whose center frequency was 24 kHz. As for channel probing, the Tx made two round trips for each signal. During the round trips, the Tx outputs 36 signal blocks 49 times (in total: 1764 signal blocks) with an interval of 30 s for each signal. The Rx recorded the signal, performed the Doppler shift correction, performed the signal demodulation, and calculated the E_b/N_0 and output BER of the received signal. Specifically, the Rx removes the overall Doppler shift before the signal demodulation in the following two steps: First, rough Doppler shift correction using measured velocity of the Tx by the GPS; and second, precise Doppler shift correction by minimizing the spillover energy in null subcarriers block by block. Furthermore, the E_b/N_0 is calculated by measuring the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) under the following assumptions on the communication signal and noise.

1) During the sea trial, the transmitter outputs 36 signal blocks 49 times with an interval of 30 s for each signal. We call a group of 36 signal blocks as frame.

- 2) The receiver first calculates the mean power of each received signal block (with a bandpass filter whose cutoff frequencies are 21.5 and 26.5 kHz) and stores it as $S_{n_b, n_r} + N_{n_b, n_r}$, where $n_b = 0, 1, \dots, 35$ (block number) and $n_r = 0, 1, \dots, 48$ (frame number).
- 3) Then, the receiver calculates the mean power of the noise from the recorded signal and stores it as $\tilde{N}_{n_r}$ when the transmitter is not active.
- 4) The SNR of each signal block is calculated as $(S_{n_b, n_r} + N_{n_b, n_r} - \tilde{N}_{n_r}) / \tilde{N}_{n_r}$.
- 5) Finally, the E_b/N_0 is calculated by dividing the SNR by the (effective) spectrum efficiency, as shown in Table III.

In experiments, the distance between transmitters/hydrophones was set as 3.2 m and 3.0 m, respectively. In this case, the maximal time lag Δt in Section III-C becomes approximately 4 ms, when the Tx changes its direction at the starting and turning areas (path length from E#0 and E#1 to the Rx differs 3.2 m at most). Since the length of the guard interval was 26.5 ms, such a time lag does not affect the communication quality much.

B. Results of Channel Probing

Fig. 13 shows the results of channel probing. Let us focus on the results obtained by GPS [see Fig. 13(a) and (b)], which show the relationship of the experiment time with the Tx–Rx distance and speed of the Tx. As shown in Fig. 13(a), the Tx makes two round trips between the starting area (Tx–Rx distance: 35 m) and turning area (Tx–Rx distance: 550 m) for 26 min. As shown in Fig. 13(b), the Tx runs between the starting area and turning area with almost constant speed (4 kn). When the Tx changes its direction, the Tx speed was reduced to 0.5 kn.

Let us next focus on the results obtained by the probing signals [see Fig. 13(c) and (d)]. The figures show the relationship of the experiment time with the delay and Doppler spreads of the UWA channel. Note that the delay and Doppler spreads are corrected for the transmission loss using the Tx–Rx distance. The white dotted lines in Fig. 13(c) show the maximum delay spread that can be measured by normal D-OSDM (L) and MIMO D-OSDM ($\tilde{L}$). The white dotted lines in Fig. 13(d) show the subcarrier spacing of normal D-OSDM, MIMO D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM in the frequency domain.

Focusing on the delay spread of the UWA channel, Fig. 13(c) shows that we can test UWA communication with various delay spreads. The figure clearly illustrates that the delay spread of the UWA channel (−20 to 0 dB) ranges from a few to tens of milliseconds. To evaluate this more quantitatively, we calculated the rms delay spread of the UWA channel [32]. Fig. 14 shows a histogram of the rms delay spread using the dominant paths of the UWA channel (−20 to 0 dB). As shown in the figure, the rms delay spread distributes from 7.5×10^{-1} (3.6 symbols) to 6.2 ms (29.7 symbols), and their average was 2.0 ms (9.6 symbols). By comparing Fig. 13(a) and (c), we found that the delay spread of the UWA channel becomes large when the Tx is in the starting area, and it sometimes exceeds the white dotted lines meaning that it results in IBI. Note that the effect of IBI on MIMO D-OSDM is larger than that on normal D-OSDM (the measurable delay spread of MIMO D-OSDM is half that of normal D-OSDM).

Furthermore, since the performance of MIMO systems depends largely on the correlation between the UWA channel coefficients, we also calculated the correlation coefficient among four significant paths between the Tx and Rx (E#0 → H#0, E#0 → H#1, E#1 → H#0, and E#1 → H#1). The correlation coefficient is computed by taking the impulse response values in each path, and then calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient between them. As a result, we found that many of the UWA channels are only slightly correlated, but some UWA channels

Fig. 13. Experimental environment. Relationship between experiment time and (a) Tx-Rx distance, (b) speed of Tx, (c) delay spread, and (d) Doppler spread of the UWA channel. “S” and “T” show the periods when the Tx is located at the starting area and turning area, respectively.

Fig. 14. Histogram of rms delay spread of the UWA channel.

have a high correlation value, because the spatial diversity of the Rx is weak compared to that of the Tx.

Fig. 15 shows a histogram of the channel correlation coefficient from the experiment, where values 0 and 1 indicate that the UWA channel is low and high correlated, respectively. From this figure, it was found that many of the UWA channels are only slightly correlated [average correlation coefficient of (E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#0, E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#0), (E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#0, E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#1), (E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#1, E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#0), and (E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#1, E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#1) is approximately 0.3]. However, some UWA channels have a high correlation value [average correlation coefficients of (E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#0, E#0 $\rightarrow$ H#1) and (E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#0, E#1 $\rightarrow$ H#1) are 0.78 and 0.62, respectively]. This means that the spatial diversity of the Rx (H#1 and H#2) is weak compared to that of the Tx (E#1 and E#2). However, we will show that MIMO systems (MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM) outperform SIMO systems (normal D-OSDM) in such an environment.

Focusing on the Doppler spread of the UWA channel, it was found that the Doppler spread is large enough to boost the Doppler diversity. Note that the averaging time for the Doppler spread was 1.5 s, whereas the block duration of the communication signal was 264.6 ms. As shown in Fig. 13(d), the maximum Doppler spread of the UWA channel (-20 to 0 dB) was about several Hertz, and sometimes spreads over two to three subcarrier spacings. In addition, by comparing Fig. 13(b) and (d), we found that the effect of the Doppler spread is dominant when the Rx is at the starting and turning areas, where the velocity and direction of the Tx changes dynamically. Such an environment would be ideal for UWA communication, since the performance of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM would be good when the normalized Doppler shift is about 2.4 times larger than the subcarrier spacing, as described in Section III.

Consequently, we can conclude that the UWA channel used in this experiment has various delay and Doppler spreads, which makes it desirable to evaluate the UWA communication performance.

C. Results of UWA Communication

The experimental results are shown in Figs. 16 and 17 and Table V. At first, we would like to discuss whether we can compare the performances of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM. Fig. 12 shows the Tx courses measured by GPS. As shown in the figure, the test courses of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM are almost the same. Hence, it is considered that the performances of MIMO D-OSDM, normal D-OSDM, and MIMO D-OFDM are evaluated under almost the same experimental conditions. In the following, we show that MIMO D-OSDM can achieve more reliable UWA communication than normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM even in the experiments.

Fig. 15. Histogram of correlation coefficients of channel impulse response obtained in the experiment (E: emitter and H: hydrophone).

1) *MIMO D-OSDM Versus Normal D-OSDM*: Let us compare the performance of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM. Fig. 16(a) and (c) shows the relationship of the experiment time with the BER without coding and BER with coding, respectively. As shown in Fig. 16(a), the BER (without coding) of MIMO D-OSDM (blue points) is smaller than that of normal D-OSDM (red points) generally. This means that the advantages of MIMO D-OSDM (increase in spectrum efficiency without using a higher modulation rate) generally outweigh its disadvantages (an increase in noise due to channel approximation). On the other hand, the BER of MIMO D-OSDM is larger than that of

normal D-OSDM when the Tx is in the starting area, where the delay spread of the UWA channel largely exceeds the measurable delay spread [see Fig. 13(c)]. In such cases, it was found that the advantages of MIMO D-OSDM do not outweigh its disadvantages.

The advantage of MIMO D-OSDM over normal D-OSDM still holds true when we compare their performances with channel coding [see Fig. 16(c)]. As shown in Fig. 16(c), the BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM improve dramatically. As for the experimental results without coding, the BER of MIMO D-OSDM is smaller than that of normal D-OSDM in general, except when the Tx is in the starting area.

Fig. 16. Experimental results. Relationship between experiment time and (a) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM (without coding), (b) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM (without coding), (c) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM (with coding), and (d) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM (with coding). “S” and “T” show the periods when the Tx locates at the starting area and turning area, respectively.

TABLE V
UNCODED AND CODED BLOCK ERROR RATE (BLER) OBTAINED IN THE SEA TRIAL

	Normal D-OSDM	MIMO D-OSDM	MIMO D-OFDM
Uncoded block error rate (%)	100	87.8	91.7
Coded block error rate (%)	9.7	3.2	9.3

From the experimental results, we also found that MIMO D-OSDM has several errors even at the starting area although normal D-OSDM achieves error-free communication [see Fig. 16(a) and (c)]. One of the reasons considered is the existence of the frequency lag among the received signals, which was considered in simulation III. As described in Section III-C, the frequency lag among the received signals affects the performance of a MIMO system when the communication platform makes a rotational motion, and the Tx actually makes such a motion in this experiment. However, as discussed in Section III-C, such a maneuver that creates a large velocity difference between emitters or hydrophones remains rare in actual underwater vehicle operations. Hence, it would not affect communication much in actual underwater vehicle operations.

We would also like to compare the experimental results and simulation results. Fig. 17(a) and (c) shows the relationship of the E_b/N_0 with the BER without coding and BER with coding, respectively. Similar to the simulation results [see Fig. 7(a) and (b)], it seems that MIMO D-OSDM has a better BER performance than normal D-OSDM. On the other hand, the BER of MIMO D-OSDM is sometimes larger than normal D-OSDM when the E_b/N_0 is larger than 30 dB, due to the

effect of a large delay spread. These results suggest that we should use MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM depending on the delay spread length—when the delay spread greatly exceeds the guard interval, the use of normal D-OSDM would be better than the use of MIMO D-OSDM.

Finally, we would like to compare the advantages of MIMO D-OSDM over normal D-OSDM from a practical perspective. Table V shows the BLER of normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OSDM. The BLER was calculated by dividing the number of erroneous blocks to the total number of transmitted blocks. As shown in the table, MIMO D-OSDM achieves a better BLER than normal D-OSDM. Especially, the BLER of MIMO D-OSDM is about one-third compared to that of normal D-OSDM when we use channel coding. The obtained results suggest that MIMO D-OSDM can achieve more reliable UWA communication than normal D-OSDM.

2) *MIMO D-OSDM Versus MIMO D-OFDM*: Let us next compare the performance of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM. Fig. 16(b) and (d) shows the relationships of the experiment time with the BER without coding and BER with coding, respectively. Different from Section IV-C1, we could not observe a clear difference between

Fig. 17. Experimental results. Relationship between E_b/N_0 and (a) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM (without coding), (b) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM (without coding), (c) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and normal D-OSDM (with coding), and (d) BERs of MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM (with coding).

the BER (without coding) of MIMO D-OSDM (blue points) and MIMO D-OFDM (green points) generally. However, the performance difference becomes clear when we focus on the communication results with channel coding [see Fig. 16(d)]. As shown in Fig. 16(d), the BER of MIMO D-OSDM is smaller than that of MIMO D-OFDM in general.

We also would like to compare the experimental results and simulation results. Fig. 17(b) and (d) shows the relationships of E_b/N_0 with the BER without coding and BER with coding, respectively. From Fig. 17(b), we could not find a clear difference between MIMO D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM when we compare them without channel coding. On the other hand, the number of errors in MIMO D-OFDM seems to be larger than that of MIMO D-OSDM, when we compare them with channel coding [see Fig. 17(d)].

Finally, we would like to show an advantage of MIMO D-OSDM over MIMO D-OFDM from a practical perspective. As shown in Table V, MIMO D-OSDM achieves a better BLER than normal D-OSDM. As in Section IV-C1, the BLER of MIMO D-OSDM is about one-third compared to that of MIMO D-OFDM when we use channel coding. The obtained results suggest that MIMO D-OSDM can also achieve more reliable UWA communication than MIMO D-OFDM.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have combined MIMO signaling and normal D-OSDM to achieve both energy- and spectrum-efficient UWA communications. We developed the transmitter processing and receiver processing for MIMO D-OSDM and showed that MIMO D-OSDM can improve the spectrum efficiency while preserving the characteristics

of D-OSDM in terms of its resilience against delay and Doppler spreads. We also evaluated the performance of MIMO D-OSDM in doubly spread channels in both simulations and sea trials. The simulation and experimental results suggested that MIMO D-OSDM has an advantage over normal D-OSDM, MIMO D-OFDM, and classical MIMO OFDM—MIMO D-OSDM achieved a better BER than the benchmarks. In addition, in the sea trial, the BLER of MIMO D-OSDM was about one-third compared to that of normal D-OSDM and MIMO D-OFDM. We can conclude that MIMO D-OSDM is a viable technique that achieves reliable and effective UWA communication. An extension of our technique to a multiuser environment and the consideration of multiuser interference is one of our future works.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Stojanovic, "Recent advances in high-speed underwater acoustic communications," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 125–136, Apr. 1996.
- [2] M. Chitre, S. Shahabudeen, and M. Stojanovic, "Underwater acoustic communications and networking: Recent advances and future challenges," *Mar. Technol. Soc. J.*, vol. 42, pp. 103–116, 2008.
- [3] Z. Zeng, S. Fu, H. Zhang, Y. Dong, and J. Cheng, "A survey of underwater optical wireless communications," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tut.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 204–238, Jan.–Mar. 2017.
- [4] X. Che, I. Wells, G. Dickers, P. Kear, and X. Gong, "Re-evaluation of RF electromagnetic communication in underwater sensor networks," *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 48, no. 12, pp. 143–151, Dec. 2010.
- [5] R. Istepanian and M. Stojanovic, *Underwater Acoustic Digital Signal Processing and Communication Systems*. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2013.

- [6] M. Stojanovic, J. Catipovic, and J. G. Proakis, "Adaptive multichannel combining and equalization for underwater acoustic communications," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 94, no. 3, pp. 1621–1631, 1993.
- [7] M. Stojanovic, J. A. Catipovic, and J. G. Proakis, "Phase-coherent digital communications for underwater acoustic channels," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 100–111, Jan. 1994.
- [8] M. Stojanovic, J. A. Catipovic, and J. G. Proakis, "Reduced-complexity spatial and temporal processing of underwater acoustic communication signals," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 98, no. 2, pp. 961–972, 1995.
- [9] M. Stojanovic, J. G. Proakis, and J. A. Catipovic, "Performance of high-rate adaptive equalization on a shallow water acoustic channel," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 100, no. 4, pp. 2213–2219, 1996.
- [10] S. Coatalan and A. Glavieux, "Design and test of a coding OFDM system on the shallow water acoustic channel," in *Proc. MTS/IEEE OCEANS Conf. Challenges Changing Global Environ.*, Oct. 1995, vol. 3, pp. 2065–2070.
- [11] S. F. Mason, C. R. Berger, S. Zhou, and P. Willett, "Detection, synchronization, and Doppler scale estimation with multicarrier waveforms in underwater acoustic communication," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1638–1649, Dec. 2008.
- [12] B. Li, S. Zhou, M. Stojanovic, L. Freitag, and P. Willett, "Multicarrier communication over underwater acoustic channels with nonuniform Doppler shifts," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 198–209, Apr. 2008.
- [13] Z. Wang, S. Zhou, G. B. Giannakis, C. R. Berger, and J. Huang, "Frequency-domain oversampling for zero-padded OFDM in underwater acoustic communications," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 14–24, Jan. 2012.
- [14] S. J. Hwang and P. Schniter, "Efficient multicarrier communication for highly spread underwater acoustic channels," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1674–1683, Dec. 2008.
- [15] G. Leus and P. A. van Walree, "Multiband OFDM for covert acoustic communications," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1662–1673, Dec. 2008.
- [16] K. Tu, T. M. Duman, M. Stojanovic, and J. G. Proakis, "Multiple-resampling receiver design for OFDM over Doppler-distorted underwater acoustic channels," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 333–346, Apr. 2013.
- [17] Y. M. Aval and M. Stojanovic, "Differentially coherent multichannel detection of acoustic OFDM signals," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 251–268, Apr. 2015.
- [18] B. Li *et al.*, "MIMO-OFDM for high-rate underwater acoustic communications," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 634–644, Oct. 2009.
- [19] P. C. Carrascosa and M. Stojanovic, "Adaptive channel estimation and data detection for underwater acoustic MIMO-OFDM systems," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 635–646, Jul. 2010.
- [20] K. Pelekanakis and A. B. Baggeroer, "Exploiting space-time-frequency diversity with MIMO-OFDM for underwater acoustic communications," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 502–513, Oct. 2011.
- [21] J. Huang, S. Zhou, and Z. Wang, "Performance results of two iterative receivers for distributed MIMO OFDM with large Doppler deviations," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 347–357, Apr. 2013.
- [22] J. Han, L. Zhang, and G. Leus, "Partial FFT demodulation for MIMO-OFDM over time-varying underwater acoustic channels," *IEEE Signal Process. Lett.*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 282–286, Feb. 2016.
- [23] T. Ebihara and G. Leus, "Underwater acoustic communication using Doppler-resilient orthogonal signal division multiplexing," in *Proc. OCEANS Conf.*, Taipei Taiwan, Apr. 2014, pp. 1–4.
- [24] T. Ebihara and G. Leus, "Doppler-resilient orthogonal signal-division multiplexing for underwater acoustic communication," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 408–427, Apr. 2016.
- [25] T. Ebihara and K. Mizutani, "Underwater acoustic communication with an orthogonal signal division multiplexing scheme in doubly spread channels," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 47–58, Jan. 2014.
- [26] G. Leus, S. Zhou, and G. B. Giannakis, "Orthogonal multiple access over time- and frequency-selective channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 1942–1950, Aug. 2003.
- [27] T. Ebihara, G. Leus, and H. Ogasawara, "Underwater acoustic communication using Doppler-resilient orthogonal signal division multiplexing in a harbor environment," *Phys. Commun.*, vol. 27, pp. 24–35, 2018.
- [28] J. Han, W. Shi, and G. Leus, "Space-frequency coded orthogonal signal-division multiplexing over underwater acoustic channels," *J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.*, vol. 141, no. 6, pp. EL513–EL518, 2017.
- [29] J. Han and G. Leus, "Space-time and space-frequency block coded vector OFDM modulation," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 204–207, Jan. 2017.
- [30] F. Qu and L. Yang, "Basis expansion model for underwater acoustic channels?" in *Proc. OCEANS Conf.*, Sep. 2008, pp. 1–7.
- [31] K. F. Scussel, J. A. Rice, and S. Merriam, "A new MFSK acoustic modem for operation in adverse underwater channels," in *Proc. MTS/IEEE OCEANS Conf.*, Oct. 1997, vol. 1, pp. 247–254.
- [32] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005, p. 87, ch. 3.3.
- [33] A. M. Sayeed and B. Aazhang, "Joint multipath-Doppler diversity in mobile wireless communications," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 123–132, Jan. 1999.
- [34] Y. H. Eng, K. M. Teo, M. Chitre, and K. M. Ng, "Online system identification of an autonomous underwater vehicle via in-field experiments," *IEEE J. Ocean. Eng.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 5–17, Jan. 2016.

Tadashi Ebihara (S'09–M'10) was born in Tokyo, Japan, in 1986. He received the Ph.D. degree in engineering from the University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan, in 2010.

From September 2013 to December 2013, he was a Visiting Professor with Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands. He is currently an Associate Professor with the Faculty of Engineering, Information and Systems, University of Tsukuba. His research interests include mobile communications and their applications to underwater acoustic communication systems.

Dr. Ebihara was the recipient of the 2017 IEEE Oceanic Engineering Society Japan Chapter Young Researcher Award. For the period of 2009–2010, he was the recipient of the Research Fellowship for Young Scientists (DC1) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Hanako Ogasawara was born in Kochi, Japan. She received the Ph.D. degree in engineering from the University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan, in 2009.

During 2011–2012, she was a Postdoctoral Researcher with Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California San Diego, San Diego, CA, USA. She is currently an Associate Professor with the National Defense Academy of Japan, Yokosuka, Japan. Her research topic is underwater acoustic monitoring including ocean acoustic tomography.

Geert Leus (M'01–SM'05–F'12) was born in Leuven, Belgium, in 1973. He received the M.Sc. degree in electrical engineering and the Ph.D. degree in applied sciences from Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, in 1996 and 2000, respectively.

He was a Research Assistant and a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Fund for Scientific Research—Flanders, Brussel, Belgium, from October 1996 to September 2003. During that period, he was affiliated with the Electrical Engineering Department, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. He is currently a Professor with the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands. During the summer of 1998, he visited Stanford University, and from March 2001 to May 2002, he was a Visiting Researcher and a Lecturer with the University of Minnesota. His research interests include signal processing for communications.

Dr. Leus was the recipient of the 2002 IEEE Signal Processing Society Young Author Best Paper Award and the 2005 IEEE Signal Processing Society Best Paper Award.