

Detecting 5G Signal Jammers Using Spectrograms with Supervised and Unsupervised Learning

Matteo Varotto*, Stefan Valentin*, and Stefano Tomasin**

matteo.varotto@h-da.de, stefan.valentin@h-da.de, tomasin@dei.unipd.it

*Dep. of Computer Science, Darmstadt University of Applied Sciences, Germany

**Dep. of Information Engineering, Dep. of Mathematics, University of Padova, Italy

Abstract—Cellular networks are potential targets of jamming attacks to disrupt wireless communications. Since the fifth generation (5G) of cellular networks enables mission-critical applications, such as autonomous driving or smart manufacturing, the resulting malfunctions can cause serious damage. This paper proposes to detect broadband jammers by an online classification of spectrograms. These spectrograms are computed from a stream of in-phase and quadrature (IQ) samples of 5G radio signals. We obtain these signals experimentally and describe how to design a suitable dataset for training. Based on this data, we compare two classification methods: a supervised learning model built on a basic convolutional neural network (CNN) and an unsupervised learning model based on a convolutional autoencoder (CAE). After comparing the structure of these models, their performance is assessed in terms of accuracy and computational complexity.

Index Terms—5G, Wireless Intrusion Detection, Jammer, Convolutional Autoencoder, Convolutional Neural Network, Spectrogram, Software Defined Radio

I. INTRODUCTION

The advent of fifth-generation (5G) technology promises very high data rates, low latency, and the support of mission-critical applications. However, 5G networks are vulnerable to jamming attacks which may cause a denial of service (DoS) of critical applications, with potentially serious consequences on persons and things [1].

One approach to cope with the threat of jamming is the use of wireless intrusion prevention systems (WIPSs) that monitor communication by analyzing features such as packet error rate (PER), bit error rate (BER), and signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) [2]. Using such features at a relatively high abstraction level (i) may be misleading since their high variation is typical in wireless channels and can, thus, only hardly be attributed to a single cause and (ii) has been shown to fail at detecting jammers that target essential 5G signaling channels, such as the signal synchronization block (SSB) [3]. At a lower abstraction level, we find approaches that manipulate the 5G radio signals, e.g., by nulling some subcarriers and comparing the received power on such subcarriers with a threshold [4]–[6]. This not only lowers the data rate of the system but also

requires changes in current cellular network standards and systems. It is also inefficient since a simple threshold can be easily evaded by an intermittent jammer [6].

From a methodological perspective, some early machine learning (ML) and deep learning (DL) models have shown promising results through the direct analysis of received radio signals [7], [8]. Effective features were the number of transmissions or the clear channel assessments [9] or aggregate measurements on the link layer [10].

In this paper, we propose a WIPS that obtains features directly from the radio signal at the physical baseband. Based on received in-phase and quadrature (IQ) samples, a stream of spectrograms is computed, which is then used by a machine learning model to detect jammed signals. This process can be performed on a separate system (called watchdog) and requires neither changes to the 5G architecture nor to its signals. The watchdog can be functionally simple as measuring received power requires only static parameterization, without further processing the radio signals, e.g., for equalization or decoding. A spectrogram, or more precisely, a power spectral density (PSD), can be still obtained from power measurements even when the received signal power is too low for communication. This allows to detect jamming attacks even at very low SINR – an important benefit compared to the mentioned approaches based on specific OFDM signals [4]–[6] and to the approaches using link-layer measurements [2], [9], [10].

Using spectrograms as samples, we will compare a (i) convolutional neural network (CNN) trained with *supervised* learning to a (ii) convolutional autoencoder (CAE) built with *unsupervised* learning in terms of accuracy and computational complexity. Unsupervised learning is only using data from the non-jammed system, which avoids overfitting the model to a specific jammer. Supervised learning, however, requires data from jammed cases. We produce this data from lab experiments based on software-defined radios (SDRs), where a broadband jammer attacks an indoor 5G network.

For this scenario, we will experimentally demonstrate high detection rates and short classification times. After detailing the scenario in Sec. II, we describe experimental setup and data collection in Sec. III. Designing and training the machine learning models are described in Sec. IV and performance results are presented in Sec. V. Sec. VI concludes the paper.

This work was partially supported by the German Federal Office for Information Security within the project ADWISOR5G under grant ID 01MO23030B. This work has been partially funded by the European Commission through the Horizon Europe/JU SNS project ROBUST-6G (Grant Agreement no. 101139068).




Fig. 1. Considered security scenario: blue arrows indicate legitimate cellular communications and red arrows indicate the jamming signals.

II. SECURITY SCENARIO

We consider the scenario in Fig. 1. We assume that the area of interest is served by at least one legitimate cellular network. This setting includes the case of private 5G networks for industrial applications. In such a scenario, cellular communications are used to support industrial activity, e.g., to connect robots and production devices, or to coordinate devices and operators as in railway networks [11].

The attacker aims to disrupt the network's operation until Denial of Service (Dos) is achieved. We focus on the jamming attack, where the attacker transmits a signal that interferes with regular cellular communications and prevents the correct decoding of received data. To this end, the attacker may simply transmit a powerful noise-like signal to reduce the SINR.

A first defense against jamming is its detection, which enables countermeasures such as the localization and removal of the jammer. Focusing on detection only, we consider the presence of a dedicated device, called *watchdog*, which detects the presence of jammed radio signals. The watchdog is not associated with the monitored radio access network (RAN), i.e., it does not exchange information with the base station (gNB).

Without excluding control through higher-layer networks (e.g., core network), this separation simplifies the watchdog deployment in many contexts. For instance, users or operators that are not under the direct control of their 5G network (or have doubts thereof) may deploy a watchdog without further notice. Such a case is not unlikely in the fragmented business space of mobile networks, where network operators have outsourced most of their RAN operation and deployment. It is worth noting that a watchdog only receives wireless signals, thus remaining undetectable to the attacker at the radio level.

III. DATASET CREATION

A. Basic assumptions

We assume that the watchdog knows basic radio parameters. This assumption is feasible since the required numerology (i.e.,

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode for creating the spectrogram matrix

Require: `sampling_rate, IQ_STREAM`
`mat` ← `zeros(100, 1024)` ▷ empty matrix
`x` ← `READ_IQ_STREAM` ▷ Array for recorded IQ stream
`n` ← 1024 ▷ Time window
`lower_index` ← 0
`upper_index` ← `n`
for `i` ← 0 to 100 **do**
 `y` ← `x[lower_index:upper_index]` ▷ Portion of the dataset of 1024 samples.
 `PSD` ← `FFT(y)`² / `n*sampling_rate` ▷ Apply FFT to y
 `PSD_shifted` ← `FFT_SHIFT(PSD)` ▷ Center PSD at 0 Hz
 `mat[i,:]` ← `PSD_shifted` ▷ Insert PSD as i th row of the matrix
 `lower_index` ← `lower_index` + `n`
 `upper_index` ← `upper_index` + `n` ▷ Iterating over dataset
end for

carrier frequency, bandwidth, and pilot structure) is constant and known to the RAN operator. With this parameterization, the watchdog records data from the physical baseband channel, outputting a stream of IQ samples. From that stream, the watchdog obtains the *spectrogram*, by first taking the fast Fourier transform (FFT) over a window of IQ samples and then obtaining the PSD array collecting the modulus square of each frequency sample. Then, n PSD arrays are stacked into a final matrix, called spectrogram. This procedure is specified in Algorithm 1.

The collected IQ samples are assumed to contain three cases:

- 1) **Empty channel, no jammer:** gNB actively transmitting beacons but UE not transmitting,
- 2) **Active channel, no jammer:** UE and/or gNB are transmitting data in time-division duplexing (TDD) mode,
- 3) **Active Jammer:** UE and gNB occasionally send signals (e.g., beacons, connection requests) but no communication is possible.

The first two cases are classified as legitimate, while the third one is considered as anomalous. We assume that the jammer always successfully disrupts the communication between UE and gNB. This assumption holds for jammers in close distance to the gNB, as verified experimentally in our laboratory scenario.

B. Experimental Setup

Fig. 2 shows the experimental setup. We are running a private 5G network in the frequency band n78 with center frequency $f_c = 3750$ MHz. The system operates at 100 MHz bandwidth in TDD mode. The gNB implements the 5G new radio (NR) air interface using srsRAN 23.10 [12] and the universal software radio peripheral (USRP) n300 radio frequency (RF) frontend [13]. The user equipment (UE) is a Quectel RM520N-GL modem [14], which is connected via USB 3.0 to a laptop computer. The core network functionality is provided by Open5GS 2.6.6 [15], running on the same generic computer as srsRAN. This setting provides a 5G standalone network and complies with Release 17.4.0 of the 3rd generation partnership project (3GPP) standard series 38 [16].

The jammer and the watchdog run on separate computers, each using one USRP X310 [17] RF frontend. The jammer



Fig. 2. Experimental setup: (1) 5G UE and the RF frontends for the (2) jammer, (3) watchdog, and (4) gNB. The corresponding PCs for (2–4) are not shown. The shown distances between the devices are for illustration purposes only. During experiments, the distance between adjacent devices was 1 m.

permanently transmits uniform or Gaussian noise signals of 100 MHz bandwidth, thus covering the complete frequency band. The watchdog permanently records IQ samples over 120 MHz to include the potential emission into the neighboring bands.

Dataset creation, training and the measuring classification time was performed on a single workstation with an Intel Xeon w7-2495X CPU and an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU.

C. Data processing

An PSD array is obtained by applying an FFT to a window of 1024 samples, leading to a frequency resolution of 117 kHz. We used an FFT rather than Welch’s method [18], thus, sacrificing precision for computational speed. A spectrogram is then composed as a 100×1024 matrix by stacking 100 PSDs. This corresponds to a time window of 0.8 ms.

The resulting matrices presented two problems when fed into a deep learning (DL) model. First, the power of received radio signals is very low and is, thus, usually expressed in the logarithmic domain (decibel). Similarly, we apply the monotonic function $f(x) = -\log x$ to the value x of PSD at each frequency, which avoids the vanishing gradient problem [19]. Second, due to approximation errors in the empty channel case, some values of the PSDs turned out to be 0, which causes computation errors. We replaced such values by the small constant $\epsilon = 10^{-21}$, leading to the applied transformation $f(x) = -\log(x + \epsilon)$.

IV. MODELING

We now describe the two models used to detect jammers, based on unsupervised and supervised learning.

A. Unsupervised Learning

With this approach, we adopt a CAE to detect jamming since the autoencoder (AE) is widely used for the one-class classification required for anomaly detection [20]. As we are dealing with two-dimensional (2D) data structures with spatial correlation, convolution and max-pooling operations are useful.

An AE is a DL structure that, given an input \mathbf{X} , compresses it to a latent space with reduced dimensionality (Encoder) and then reconstructs the original input by outputting \mathbf{Y} (Decoder). In this case, \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} are the 100×1024 matrices obtained

TABLE I
STRUCTURE OF THE EMPLOYED CAE

	Layer	Output size	No. of parameters
Encoder	Input	$100 \times 1024 \times 1$	0
	Convolutional 1	$49 \times 511 \times 32$	320
	Max Pooling	$24 \times 255 \times 32$	0
	Convolutional 2	$22 \times 253 \times 64$	18496
	Flatten	88704	0
	Dense	8	709640
Decoder	Input	8	0
	Dense	88704	798336
	Reshape	$11 \times 126 \times 64$	0
	Convolutional 1^T	$23 \times 253 \times 128$	73856
	Convolutional 2^T	$47 \times 507 \times 64$	73792
	Zero Padding	$50 \times 512 \times 64$	0
	Convolutional 2^T	$100 \times 1024 \times 1$	577

by PSD stacking. The goal of our model is then to minimize the mean squared error (MSE) as the loss function between the input and the output, i.e.,

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \mathbb{E}[\Gamma], \quad \Gamma = \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}\|^2. \quad (1)$$

When the model is trained with *no-jamming* spectrograms, it will minimize reconstruction error only in this case. For the *jammed* cases, however, the reconstruction error can be assumed to be relatively high. In fact, when the CAE input corresponds to a signal including jamming, we expect that it will have a structure that cannot be properly described by the latent representation.

Letting \mathcal{H}_0 be the hypothesis class of no jamming and \mathcal{H}_1 the hypothesis class of jamming, the detection of jamming is performed by the following *test function* on the input image \mathbf{X} to obtain decision $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{H}_0; & \Gamma < \tau, \\ \mathcal{H}_1; & \Gamma \geq \tau, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where τ is a chosen threshold. With this approach, type I and type II errors can be directly obtained. We, thus, measure accuracy as probability of false alarm (FA) and misdetection (MD) defined as

$$P_{\text{FA},C} = \mathbb{P}[\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_1 | \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0], \quad (3)$$

$$P_{\text{MD},C} = \mathbb{P}[\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_0 | \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1]. \quad (4)$$

B. Supervised Learning

While the AE only has to be trained with not-jammed cases in order to detect anomalies, with supervised learning this approach changes. First, the model is trained with jammed and not-jammed samples. To each sample i , a label y_i is assigned, taking values 0 for trusted cases and 1 for jammed cases. Second, the samples are not reconstructed from a latent space but the output of the network is a single neuron. Third, the prediction is not computed on the same input sample but on the label associated with it.

The designed model is a CNN (recall that the input is a 2D data structure) with the objective to return a 0 at the final layer

TABLE II
STRUCTURE OF THE EMPLOYED CNN.

Layer	Output size	No. of parameters
Input	$100 \times 1024 \times 1$	0
Convolutional 1	$49 \times 511 \times 32$	320
Max Pooling	$24 \times 255 \times 32$	0
Convolutional 2	$22 \times 253 \times 64$	18496
Max Pooling	$11 \times 126 \times 64$	0
Convolutional 3	$9 \times 124 \times 128$	73856
Flatten	31744	0
Dense	16	507920
Dense	8	136
Dense	1	9

whenever the input sample is taken from the trusted cases and a 1 whenever the sample is a jammed case. The chosen loss function is the binary cross-entropy, defined as

$$L = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i \cdot \log(\tilde{y}_i) + (1 - y_i) \cdot \log(1 - \tilde{y}_i), \quad (5)$$

where \tilde{y}_i is the prediction of the i th sample. This function can approach infinity even if the prediction error cannot be above 1, thus, allowing so the model to update its weights.

For consistency, we also assess the performance of the supervised approach in terms of MD and FA as well as in computational complexity. Being a binary classification problem, MD and FA rates can be directly computed from the output of the last neuron of the CNN for a varying threshold.

V. PERFORMANCE RESULTS

A. Unsupervised Learning

The training set is composed of 6000 matrices taken from trusted situations, with cases divided equally between an empty channel and an ongoing transmission. The validation set is used to monitor and to stop the training whenever the loss increases for 6 epochs. This set is composed of 800 matrices with the same equal distribution as the training set. The test set is composed of 800 samples, divided equally between jammed and not-jammed cases.

From Fig. 3 and 4, we can see how the model distinguishes perfectly between the jammed and not-jammed cases. This perfect detection is possible because the reconstruction error of the jammed case is approximately 50 times higher than the reconstruction error of the case without jamming. Comparing Fig. 3 and 4 shows no significant effect for the noise distribution of the jammer.

Fig. 5 plots the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the classification time per sample for 1000 trials. Each measurement was obtained using the CPU and includes the following steps:

- Loading into the memory the slice of data required to create a sample as described before.
- Creating the matrix through the PSD array computations and applying the monotonic function.




Fig. 3. FA and MD probabilities as a function of the threshold τ for the uniform noise generator with the unsupervised learning approach.




Fig. 4. FA and MD probabilities as a function of the threshold τ for the Gaussian noise generator with the unsupervised learning approach.

- Computing the output of the pre-trained model having as input the same sample.
- Comparing the output of the model to a given threshold using an **if** statement.

This CDF allows to conclude that the classification time stays under 48 ms in 95% of the cases, allowing relatively fast detection and reaction to jamming attacks.

B. Supervised Learning

The training set was composed of 4500 samples, equally distributed between the three cases: jammed, not-jammed and empty channel, not-jammed and ongoing transmission. Using the same distribution, the validation set was composed of 1800 samples. This set is used to monitor the validation loss and stop the training as for the unsupervised learning process. The test




Fig. 5. CDF of the classification time performed by the CAE with unsupervised learning: in 95% of the cases it was below 48 ms.




Fig. 7. FA and MD probabilities as a function of the threshold $\tau \in [0, 1]$ (with y axis values normalized to 1) for the Gaussian noise generator with the supervised learning approach.




Fig. 6. FA and MD probabilities as a function of the threshold $\tau \in [0, 1]$ (with y axis values normalized to 1) for the uniform noise generator with the supervised learning approach.




Fig. 8. CDF of the classification time performed by the CNN with supervised learning: in 95% of the cases it was below 46 ms.

set was composed of 1200 samples, distributed in the same way as the training and validation set.

Comparing the detection rates in Fig. 6 and 7 to the results in Section V-A, shows that supervised learning reaches the highest accuracy. This becomes apparent by the absence of misdetection events and by the large threshold interval without false classification. This benefit of supervised learning, however, comes at a significant drawback that training is based on the signals of specific jamming attacks. Even slightly changing these signals may allow an attacker to evade the detection. Albeit showing slightly worse performance, the unsupervised learning model is not based on specific attacks but models not-jammed signals. A jamming attack is then detected as a significant deviation from this trusted state.

Fig. 8 plots the CDF of the classification time per sample

with the supervised learning model. The CDF is based on 1000 trials. This result is similar to the classification time with unsupervised learning, despite the fact that the CNN (supervised) uses only half the parameters of the CAE (unsupervised). This suggests that a significant part of the computational complexity lies in the overhead of the ML model.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We proposed a method to detect jammers in 5G signals based on the PSDs of received radio signals. The method can be implemented as a separate network element (watchdog) and requires no interaction with the 5G system and no change of the 5G signals or standards. The computational complexity at the watchdog is low since measuring PSDs requires neither equalization nor synchronization. After stacking these PSDs

to spectrograms, we constructed a trainable dataset avoiding the vanishing gradient problem.

In our experiments, this approach shows very high accuracy at low computational complexity. CAE and CNN models both robustly distinguish between the jammed and not-jammed cases. The unsupervised CAE provides the additional benefit of being independent of the attacker.

Based on these promising models, future work will cover a wider range of wireless scenarios and jammer operations. In particular, datasets for jamming the 5G Synchronization Signal Block (SSB) will be created and studied.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Navarro-Ortiz, P. Romero-Díaz, S. Sendra, P. Ameigeiras, J. J. Ramos-Munoz, and J. M. Lopez-Soler, "A survey on 5G usage scenarios and traffic models," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 905–929, 2020.
- [2] Y. Zhang, G. Chen, W. Weng, and Z. Wang, "An overview of wireless intrusion prevention systems," in *Proc. Int. Conf. on Communication Systems, Networks and Applications (ICCSNA)*, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 147–150.
- [3] H. Pirayesh and H. Zeng, "Jamming attacks and anti-jamming strategies in wireless networks: A comprehensive survey," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 767–809, 2022.
- [4] S. Hong, K. Kim, and S.-H. Lee, "A hybrid jamming detection algorithm for wireless communications: Simultaneous classification of known attacks and detection of unknown attacks," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1769–1773, 2023.
- [5] H. Xu, Y. Cheng, and P. Wang, "Jamming detection in broadband frequency hopping systems based on multi-segment signals spectrum clustering," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 29 980–29 992, 2021.
- [6] L. Chiarello, P. Baracca, K. Upadhyay, S. R. Khosravirad, and T. Wild, "Jamming detection with subcarrier blanking for 5G and beyond in Industry 4.0 scenarios," in *Proc. IEEE Ann. Int. Symp. on Personal, Indoor and Mobile Radio Communications (PIMRC)*, 2021, pp. 758–764.
- [7] Y. Zhou, J. Chen, M. Zhang, D. Li, and Y. Gao, "Applications of machine learning for 5G advanced wireless systems," in *Proc. Int. Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conf. (IWCMC)*, 2021, pp. 1700–1704.
- [8] Y. Arjoune, F. Salahdine, M. S. Islam, E. Ghribi, and N. Kaabouch, "A novel jamming attacks detection approach based on machine learning for wireless communication," in *Proc. Int. Conf. on Information Networking (ICOIN)*, 2020, pp. 459–464.
- [9] M. Hachimi, G. Kaddoum, G. Gagnon, and P. Illy, "Multi-stage jamming attacks detection using deep learning combined with kernelized support vector machine in 5G cloud radio access networks," in *Proc. Int. Symp. on Networks, Computers and Communications (ISNCC)*, 2020, pp. 1–5.
- [10] S. Jere, Y. Wang, I. Aryendu, S. Dayekh, and L. Liu, "Machine learning-assisted Bayesian inference for jamming detection in 5G NR," *arXiv*, no. 2304.13660, Aug. 2023.
- [11] L. Chettri and R. Bera, "A comprehensive survey on internet of things (IoT) toward 5G wireless systems," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 16–32, 2020.
- [12] Software Radio Systems, "SRS RAN documentation," <https://docs.srsran.com/en/latest/>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [13] National Instruments, "USRP N300 datasheet," <https://www.ettus.com/all-products/usrp-n300/>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [14] Quectel, "RM520-GL modem datasheet," <https://www.quectel.com/product/5g-rm520n-series>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [15] OPEN5GS, "OPEN5GS documentation," <https://open5gs.org/open5gs/docs/>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [16] 3GPP, "3GPP specification series 38: 5G standards," <https://www.3gpp.org/dynareport?code=38-series.htm>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [17] Ettus, "USRP x310 datasheet," <https://www.ettus.com/all-products/x310-kit/>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [18] N.N., "Scipy Welch periodogram," <https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.signal.periodogram.html>, accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [19] Z. Hu, J. Zhang, and Y. Ge, "Handling vanishing gradient problem using artificial derivative," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 22 371–22 377, 2021.
- [20] Z. Chen, C. K. Yeo, B. S. Lee, and C. T. Lau, "Autoencoder-based network anomaly detection," in *Proc. Wireless Telecommunications Symposium (WTS)*, 2018, pp. 1–5.