
Integrated Evaluation of Distributed Generation Impacts on Distribution Network Voltage Stability and the Optical Effectiveness of Smoke Screen Interference Systems: A Cross-Domain Analytical Study of Resilience, Control, and Performance Assessment

Dr. Mateo Reinhardt

Department of Systems Engineering, University of Heidelberg, Germany

Published Date: - 18 February 2026, Page No.: - 42-56

KEYWORDS

distributed generation; voltage stability; smoke screen interference; performance evaluation; system resilience; power flow analysis; shielding effectiveness.

ABSTRACT

Background: Contemporary engineering systems are increasingly defined by complexity, uncertainty, and the need for resilient performance under dynamic operating conditions. Two apparently distinct but conceptually related domains illustrate this challenge with particular clarity: distribution networks with distributed generation, and smoke screen interference systems used for optical and infrared shielding. In electrical distribution systems, the integration of distributed photovoltaic units, wind farms, and other distributed generators introduces benefits in flexibility and local energy support, but also creates voltage fluctuation, altered power flow, relay protection complications, node-type switching challenges, and new forms of voltage instability (Wei et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2006; Cui et al., 2015). In smoke screen systems, the demand for effective visual, infrared, and composite seeker shielding has generated a parallel need for rigorous evaluation metrics, image-quality-based measurement, extinction-coefficient correction, and coverage-area estimation (Chen et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2025).

Objective: This article develops an integrated conceptual analysis showing that both domains can be understood through a shared systems perspective centered on disturbance management, performance evaluation, model fidelity, and mitigation under uncertainty. It seeks to produce an original, publication-ready synthesis grounded strictly in the provided references.

Methodology: A qualitative integrative review and thematic synthesis was conducted using only the supplied sources. The literature was organized into two primary clusters—distributed generation and voltage stability, and smoke screen interference evaluation—and then interpreted through cross-domain themes including uncertainty, control logic, measurement design, and resilience.

Results: The reviewed literature shows that distributed generation improves network flexibility but complicates voltage behavior, protection coordination, and power-flow solvability, making optimal placement, reconfiguration, and stability-aware modeling essential (Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014; Mao et al., 2017; Zhou & Su, 2015). The smoke screen literature demonstrates a similar need for multidimensional assessment, where coverage, grayscale change, extinction properties, shielding performance, and seeker-specific interference mechanisms all determine operational effectiveness (Chen et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2024; Zou et al., 2023). Across both domains, system performance depends on adaptive evaluation frameworks rather than single indicators.

Conclusion: Despite their technical differences, both fields reveal a common engineering principle: complex protective systems must be evaluated not only by nominal function but by their dynamic behavior under uncertainty, their interaction with preexisting infrastructures, and the quality of the metrics used to judge success. Future advances

INTRODUCTION

Engineering research often progresses through increasing specialization, yet some of the most important conceptual advances emerge when seemingly unrelated technical domains are examined through a shared systems lens. The two bodies of literature provided for the present article—distributed generation and voltage stability in electrical distribution systems, and smoke screen interference effectiveness in optical and infrared defense environments—appear, at first glance, to belong to entirely separate worlds. One concerns electrical infrastructure, grid integration, power flow, and stability analysis. The other concerns aerosol-based occlusion, infrared attenuation, radar-guided weapons, composite seekers, and the measurement of shielding performance. However, a deeper reading reveals a common intellectual problem: how should engineers evaluate and control protective or supportive subsystems that alter the behavior of a larger host system under uncertain and dynamic conditions?

This question is central to the modernization of electrical distribution networks. The growth of distributed generation has transformed the once relatively passive distribution network into a more active, interactive, and less predictable environment. Conventional distribution systems were historically designed for one-way power flow, stable upstream supply, and comparatively manageable voltage profiles. The integration of distributed generation—whether from wind farms, grid-connected photovoltaic systems, or optimally placed local generators—has changed that design logic by introducing local injection points, bidirectional flows, altered voltage magnitudes, changed loss patterns, and increased reliance on advanced control and computational assessment methods (Chen et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2011; Michael & Ramesh, 2017). What was once a distribution problem of load delivery has become a dynamic coordination problem involving network response, nodal behavior, and stability margins.

The literature shows that distributed generation is not merely an incremental addition to existing systems. It changes the ontology of the network itself. Relay protection may malfunction or require improvement because fault currents and flow directions are altered (Wei et al., 2008). Voltage fluctuation becomes more difficult to analyze and mitigate when wind-based distributed sources create variable injections into distribution feeders (Cui et al., 2015). Static voltage stability characteristics must be reassessed because distributed generation modifies the equilibrium structure of power systems and the ways in which voltage collapse tendencies manifest (Li et al., 2014). Even fundamental computational procedures such as power-flow calculations require revision when PV-PQ switching logic becomes unstable or inadequate under DG-rich scenarios (Li et al., 2009). Thus, distributed generation simultaneously offers operational opportunity and analytical challenge.

The same duality appears in optimal placement and reconfiguration research. Distributed generation may reduce losses, improve voltage support, and enhance efficiency when placed intelligently, yet poor siting or poor dispatch logic can aggravate operational problems rather than solve them (Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014; Wang et al., 2012). Distribution system reconfiguration methods that incorporate optimal active power dispatching of DGs demonstrate that value does not arise from distributed generation in the abstract, but from how the network is configured to absorb and coordinate it (Mao et al., 2017). Similarly, back/forward sweep power-flow calculation methods must be adapted to account for DG and static load characteristics because classical methods may fail to capture the altered structure of the network (Zhou & Su, 2015). In other words, distributed generation is not just a new component. It is a new condition of system behavior.

A parallel condition exists in the smoke screen literature. Smoke screens are traditionally understood as protective mechanisms designed to

obscure, disrupt, or degrade hostile sensing and targeting systems. Yet modern evaluation research makes clear that their effectiveness cannot be understood in a simplistic binary manner, such as whether smoke exists or does not exist, or whether a target is visible or invisible. Instead, effectiveness depends on coverage area, optical density, grayscale change, extinction coefficient, sensor-specific shielding interaction, and environmental-operational context (Chen et al., 2024; Liang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023). Just as distributed generation transforms voltage behavior in nontrivial ways, smoke screens transform the sensing environment through variable and measurable interference mechanisms. Their value depends on how that transformation is characterized.

This is especially clear in recent work on smoke screen jamming effectiveness evaluation. Ding et al. (2024) identify evaluation indicators and calculation methods for smoke screen interference effectiveness, suggesting that operational performance must be decomposed into measurable dimensions rather than assumed from material deployment alone. Ding et al. (2025) further advance this assessment framework by experimentally studying jamming effectiveness based on image quality, indicating that the degradation experienced by a sensor or observer can be quantified through visual-information metrics rather than purely descriptive observation. Chen et al. (2024) use grayscale-based techniques to evaluate the shielding performance of infrared smoke screens, reinforcing the argument that optical or infrared occlusion must be expressed through analyzable signal transformation. Liang et al. (2024) propose a measurement and calculation method for smoke curtain coverage area, showing that geometric coverage itself is a technically meaningful variable in passive jammer testing. In this literature, as in the electrical literature, the problem is not simply whether a support or protective subsystem exists, but how its performance modifies the host operational environment.

The defense-oriented smoke literature also shows that effectiveness is target-relative. Smoke curtains

do not interfere abstractly; they interfere with specific sensing or guidance mechanisms. Zou et al. (2023) examine how smoke curtains influence TV/IR composite seekers, demonstrating that the performance of the obscurant depends on the architecture of the sensing system it seeks to disrupt. Tian et al. (2023) analyze the combat effectiveness of smoke screens in shielding radar-guided precision-guided weapons, emphasizing that operational evaluation must reflect the tactical relationship between defensive measure and offensive threat. This recalls a comparable principle from power systems: distributed generation cannot be assessed independently of the network topology, load structure, and protection architecture into which it is inserted. In both cases, subsystem value is relational rather than intrinsic.

The conceptual overlap between these fields becomes clearer when examined through four shared themes: uncertainty, system interaction, metric adequacy, and adaptive control. First, both domains confront uncertainty. Distributed generation may involve uncertain renewable output, especially from wind and solar resources, which affects optimal placement, power flow, and voltage response (Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014; Cui et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2013). Smoke screen performance may vary with material properties, deployment patterns, atmospheric behavior, and seeker characteristics, making effectiveness nonuniform across scenarios (Tan, 2023; Zou et al., 2023). Second, both involve strong system interaction. DG modifies the distribution network rather than operating outside it. Smoke modifies the observation environment rather than operating independently of it. Third, both require adequate metrics. Voltage stability, fluctuation, losses, and node logic in the electrical domain parallel grayscale change, extinction correction, coverage area, and image-quality degradation in the smoke domain. Fourth, both demand adaptive control or evaluation logic. Improved relay measures, node-switching logic, optimal reconfiguration, and dynamic flow control in power systems mirror the need for refined evaluation systems, corrected coefficients, and target-specific

effectiveness analysis in smoke interference research.

These commonalities reveal a broader engineering challenge. Modern complex systems require assessment methods that move beyond simple static indicators and incorporate the dynamic interaction between support/protective technologies and the environments they alter. This is precisely why the provided literature is valuable as a combined corpus. The electrical references alone can explain why DG-rich networks need better power-flow and stability frameworks. The smoke references alone can explain why interference systems need better evaluation indices. But read together, they reveal something larger: engineering resilience increasingly depends on how well we evaluate technologies that do not replace systems, but reshape their operating conditions.

The problem statement of this article follows from that insight. Although distributed generation research and smoke screen interference research have advanced within their own disciplinary tracks, there remains little conceptual work that places them within a common framework of dynamic system protection and performance evaluation. Yet both literatures address how inserted technologies—whether supportive or defensive—alter host system behavior under uncertain conditions. The literature gap, therefore, is not simply empirical but integrative. There is a need for a theoretically rigorous synthesis showing how cross-domain comparison can illuminate shared engineering principles of disturbance management, operational resilience, and evaluation design.

The objective of this article is to provide that synthesis. Based strictly on the references supplied, it develops a comprehensive, publication-ready research article that interprets distributed generation and smoke screen interference as parallel cases of complex system intervention. The article argues that both domains show the necessity of moving from nominal-function thinking to interaction-aware evaluation thinking. A distributed generator is not

valuable merely because it supplies power; it is valuable if it supports network performance without destabilizing voltage or protection behavior. A smoke screen is not valuable merely because it creates visible obscuration; it is valuable if it measurably degrades relevant sensing and targeting functions under operational conditions.

This perspective matters for both theory and practice. Theoretically, it suggests that resilience engineering should pay more attention to the evaluation of inserted subsystems whose role is to buffer, assist, or interfere within larger infrastructures. Practically, it encourages engineers to design better metrics, better computational models, and better deployment logics. In a world of increasingly complex energy networks and increasingly sophisticated sensing-threat environments, performance can no longer be assumed from presence alone. It must be demonstrated through system-aware, uncertainty-sensitive evaluation.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative integrative review and thematic synthesis methodology grounded strictly in the references supplied by the user. The methodological aim is not to produce a statistical meta-analysis or a mathematically aggregated evidence model, but rather to generate an original and conceptually rigorous research article that synthesizes insights across two specialized technical literatures: distributed generation and voltage stability in distribution systems, and smoke screen interference effectiveness evaluation in optical, infrared, and weapon-shielding contexts.

An integrative review is the most appropriate design for three reasons. First, the supplied references are heterogeneous in subject matter, methods, and application domain. Some address power-flow calculations, optimal placement, relay protection, and voltage stability in electrical engineering systems (Chen et al., 2006; Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014; Mao et al., 2017). Others focus on

grayscale-based shielding evaluation, image-quality assessment, coverage-area measurement, and combat-effectiveness analysis in smoke screen research (Chen et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2025; Liang et al., 2024; Tian et al., 2023). Because the corpus does not center on one common empirical variable, a quantitative pooling approach would be methodologically inappropriate. Second, the user explicitly requested a continuous, publication-style original article with deep elaboration rather than a segmented technical summary. Third, the most original contribution possible within the given source set lies in cross-domain conceptual synthesis rather than primary experimentation.

The first methodological step was corpus delimitation. Only the references listed in the user's prompt were treated as valid source material. No external studies, web pages, standards, or supplementary sources were introduced. This closed-corpus approach ensured that every analytical claim remained anchored in the provided literature and complied fully with the user's instruction to work strictly from those references. The article's originality therefore derives from how the supplied literature is interpreted, organized, and connected.

The second methodological step involved thematic classification of the literature into two primary clusters and multiple secondary themes. The first major cluster was the distributed generation and distribution network stability cluster. This included studies on relay protection under DG impact (Wei et al., 2008), voltage fluctuation due to distributed wind farm integration (Cui et al., 2015), power-flow study and voltage stability analysis in DG-based systems (Chen et al., 2006), distributed generation placement under uncertainty (Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014), dynamic and global optimal power flow in wind-integrated grids (Luo et al., 2013), PV-PQ node switching logic in power flow calculation (Li et al., 2009), back/forward sweep calculation considering DG and static load characteristics (Zhou & Su, 2015), and reconfiguration with optimal DG dispatch (Mao et al., 2017). Also included were studies examining loss and voltage effects (Zhang et

al., 2011), static voltage stability characteristics (Li et al., 2014), voltage stability in distribution networks (Wu et al., 2006), dynamic voltage collapse index with wind speed (Ma et al., 2009), optimized DG configuration (Wang et al., 2012), and single-phase grid-connected photovoltaic impacts using P-Q and P-V models (Michael & Ramesh, 2017).

The second major cluster was the smoke screen interference and shielding evaluation cluster. This included research on grayscale-based evaluation of infrared smoke shielding (Chen et al., 2024), smoke screen shielding and interference evaluation methods (Chen et al., 2023), smoke screen interference indicators and calculation methods (Ding et al., 2024), image-quality-based experimental evaluation of jamming effectiveness (Ding et al., 2025), smoke curtain coverage area measurement in passive jammer testing (Liang et al., 2024), interference-effectiveness evaluation and mass extinction coefficient correction (Li et al., 2023), R&D trends in smoke munition jamming evaluation systems (Guo & Gao, 2025), multifunctional fog generator design and optical occlusion performance of polyol aerosols (Tan, 2023), shielding of radar-guided precision-guided weapons by smoke screens (Tian et al., 2023), and influence mechanisms of smoke curtains on TV/IR composite seekers (Zou et al., 2023).

The third methodological step involved comparative thematic coding. Across both clusters, the literature was coded for recurring concepts rather than treated as isolated technical topics. The main cross-domain themes identified were uncertainty, system interaction, performance metrics, operational effectiveness, mitigation logic, and resilience. "Uncertainty" referred to variable generation conditions in power systems and variable shielding conditions in smoke systems. "System interaction" referred to how inserted technologies alter the host system rather than simply adding functionality. "Performance metrics" referred to the need for domain-appropriate indicators such as voltage collapse indices, losses, coverage area, grayscale

value, and image degradation. “Operational effectiveness” referred to how technical performance translates into practical function. “Mitigation logic” referred to strategies for managing undesirable effects, such as relay protection improvement or optimized smoke evaluation correction. “Resilience” referred to the broader capacity of systems to maintain function in altered or disturbed operating environments.

The fourth methodological step consisted of interpretive synthesis within and across domains. Within the power systems domain, the literature was read to identify how DG transforms distribution systems from passive to dynamically interactive infrastructures, requiring new models of stability, placement, reconfiguration, and protection. Within the smoke screen domain, the literature was read to identify how obscurants must be measured not just as physical substances but as interference-producing system agents whose effectiveness depends on optical, geometric, and target-specific parameters. Across domains, the synthesis focused on how both literatures address the insertion of an active modifier into a preexisting system. This comparative step was central to the originality of the article.

The fifth methodological step involved development of a narrative analytical structure aligned with the user’s requested publication format. The “results” section reports the key conceptual findings emerging from the synthesis, while the “discussion” section interprets those findings more deeply, engages with theoretical implications, identifies limitations, and outlines future scope. The article is therefore review-based in evidence and original in interpretation.

A crucial methodological principle in this article is that analogy is used carefully. The study does not claim that voltage stability and smoke shielding are technically identical problems. Instead, it claims that both exemplify a broader class of engineering challenges in which the performance of a subsystem can only be understood through its dynamic interaction with a host system. This distinction is important. The value of comparison lies not in

collapsing disciplinary boundaries, but in revealing common evaluation principles across different engineering contexts.

The study also recognizes limitations inherent to the source base. The references are rich in technical detail but domain-specific, and the cross-domain synthesis presented here is interpretive rather than empirically co-tested. There is no single reference in the corpus that explicitly links distributed generation and smoke screen interference. Accordingly, this article does not claim direct experimental integration of the two fields. Its contribution lies in constructing a high-level analytical framework that can illuminate both.

Finally, the methodology is shaped by the publication-oriented constraints of the prompt. The article avoids numerical tables, figures, equations, and explicit mathematical derivation, even where those may exist in the original literature. Instead, all quantitative and modeling ideas are translated into descriptive analytical language. This makes the synthesis continuous and readable while preserving the technical meaning of the source materials.

In summary, the methodology combines closed-corpus review, thematic classification, cross-domain coding, careful analogy, and narrative synthesis to produce an academically structured article that interprets distributed generation stability research and smoke screen effectiveness research as parallel cases of complex engineering performance evaluation under uncertainty.

RESULTS

The thematic synthesis reveals that the two literatures, although separated by disciplinary context, converge strongly around the problem of how inserted subsystems alter the behavior of host systems under uncertain and dynamic conditions. In the electrical domain, distributed generation changes the distribution network from a relatively predictable delivery structure into a more interactive system with new voltage and protection behaviors. In the smoke domain, smoke curtains and obscurants change the

sensory and targeting environment in ways that require evaluation beyond simple visibility reduction. The central result is that both bodies of literature reject simplistic performance assumptions and instead insist on multidimensional, system-aware assessment.

A first major result from the distributed generation literature is that DG integration fundamentally changes network operating logic. Chen et al. (2006) show that power-flow study and voltage stability analysis in distribution systems with distributed generation must account for altered local injection patterns and changed operating states. Traditional distribution systems were structured around downstream load consumption, but DG creates local sources whose interaction with network topology can shift voltages and losses in ways that are neither uniform nor always beneficial. Zhang et al. (2011) reinforce this by analyzing the effect of distributed generation on system voltage and loss, demonstrating that the consequences of integration depend on configuration and network context. The literature therefore does not present DG as inherently stabilizing or destabilizing. Its impact is conditional.

A second result is that voltage behavior emerges as one of the most sensitive indicators of DG impact. Voltage fluctuation in networks containing distributed wind farms illustrates how renewable integration introduces variable operating conditions that challenge conventional mitigation strategies (Cui et al., 2015). Li et al. (2014) further show that distributed generation changes the characteristics of static voltage stability in power systems. Wu et al. (2006) had already identified voltage stability in distribution networks as a crucial research problem even before the current wave of distributed integration intensified it. The combined implication is that DG magnifies the importance of voltage as both a performance variable and a vulnerability indicator. Voltage is no longer merely a quantity to be kept within range; it is a dynamic expression of whether the network remains coherent under changing input-output relations.

A third result concerns the need for improved computational models. Power systems with DG cannot rely uncritically on older calculation assumptions. Li et al. (2009) address the improvement of type switching logic of PV-PQ nodes in power-flow calculation, showing that even the internal logic of numerical power-flow procedures must be revised when DG changes network behavior. Zhou and Su (2015) adapt back/forward sweep power-flow calculation to include distributed generation and static load characteristics, further demonstrating that computational methods must follow physical system transformation. Hao and Chiang (2014) contribute a practical tool for tracing stationary behaviors of general distribution networks, indicating the importance of analytical tools capable of following complex operating regimes. These works collectively show that DG integration is as much an epistemic challenge as an operational one: engineers must redesign how they know the system, not just how they operate it.

A fourth result is that optimality in DG systems is inseparable from uncertainty handling. Evangelopoulos and Georgilakis (2014) investigate optimal distributed generation placement under uncertainties using a point-estimate approach embedded in a genetic algorithm, demonstrating that location and sizing decisions become more complex when uncertain system conditions are acknowledged. This is significant because it shifts the meaning of planning. In a deterministic system, placement can be treated as a fixed optimization problem. In a DG-rich environment, it becomes a conditional and probabilistic design challenge. Wang et al. (2012) similarly examine optimized configuration of distributed generators, indicating that effective deployment depends on structured planning rather than ad hoc insertion. These studies show that DG value is not only about technological capability, but about how uncertainty is incorporated into decision-making.

A fifth result is that DG affects system protection and reconfiguration, not only steady-state quantities. Wei

et al. (2008) examine the impact of distributed generation on relay protection and propose improved measures, highlighting the fact that DG can disturb fault-current assumptions and compromise existing protection coordination. Mao et al. (2017) address distribution system reconfiguration while considering optimal active power dispatching of DGs, showing that once DG becomes an active agent in the network, system topology and dispatch logic must be reconsidered together. Luo et al. (2013) emphasize dynamic global optimal power flow in wind-integrated grids and propose a two-stage control algorithm, reinforcing the insight that DG-rich systems require layered control structures rather than static operational assumptions. Thus, DG transforms not only where energy comes from, but how the network must protect and organize itself.

A sixth result comes from the photovoltaic and single-phase integration literature. Michael and Ramesh (2017) show that single-phase grid-connected distributed photovoltaic systems affect the distribution network differently depending on whether P-Q or P-V models are used. This finding is especially important because it underlines the dependence of system interpretation on modeling assumptions. In engineering evaluation, the model is not neutral. It determines what kinds of effects become visible and how operational risk is categorized. This insight has a close parallel in the smoke literature, where effectiveness varies depending on whether one evaluates grayscale value, coverage area, extinction correction, or image quality.

Turning to the smoke screen literature, a seventh result is that shielding effectiveness is inherently multidimensional. Chen et al. (2023) explicitly investigate evaluation methods for smoke screen shielding and interference effects, indicating that performance cannot be reduced to a single measure such as opacity or deployment density. Ding et al. (2024) advance this argument by defining evaluation indicators and calculation methods for smoke screen interference effectiveness. These studies collectively establish that smoke effectiveness is not an obvious

property of material presence, but a result of measurable interaction between obscurant properties, sensory systems, and operational conditions.

An eighth result is that image-based and grayscale-based metrics have emerged as important evaluation tools. Chen et al. (2024) present a grayscale-value-based technique for evaluating the shielding performance of infrared smoke screens. Ding et al. (2025) study smoke screen jamming effectiveness experimentally based on image quality. These contributions are crucial because they shift evaluation from descriptive language toward signal-quality analysis. Instead of asking only whether a target was obscured, the literature asks how the information content available to the observing system was degraded. This parallels the electrical literature's movement from generic DG integration narratives to specific assessments of voltage, losses, node logic, and dynamic behavior.

A ninth result is that geometric and physical characterization remain essential to smoke evaluation. Liang et al. (2024) propose a method for measuring and calculating smoke curtain coverage area in passive jammer testing, while Li et al. (2023) offer an evaluation method for smoke screen interference effectiveness that includes correction of the mass extinction coefficient. Tan (2023) investigates multifunctional fog generator design and the optical occlusion performance of polyol aerosols. Together, these studies show that smoke performance depends not only on end-effect metrics but also on careful characterization of deployment area, material behavior, and optical attenuation properties. Evaluation must therefore combine system-output indicators with physical-property understanding.

A tenth result is that threat-specific interaction shapes operational value. Tian et al. (2023) study the combat effectiveness of smoke screens in shielding radar-guided precision-guided weapons, while Zou et al. (2023) investigate the influence mechanism of smoke curtains on TV/IR composite seekers. These

works demonstrate that smoke effectiveness is not universal across all sensor systems. Rather, it depends on the type of sensing architecture being opposed. A smoke curtain that degrades one modality may not degrade another equally. This result is analogous to the finding in power systems that DG effects vary with topology, load characteristics, source type, and protection arrangement. In both cases, inserted technologies are only meaningful relative to the systems with which they interact.

An eleventh result is that evaluation systems themselves are becoming objects of research. Guo and Gao (2025) discuss research and development trends of smoke munition jamming effectiveness evaluation systems, suggesting that the field has moved beyond simply designing obscurants toward designing frameworks for judging them. This is conceptually similar to the power systems literature's attention to specialized computational tools, improved switching logic, and adaptive flow calculations (Hao & Chiang, 2014; Li et al., 2009; Zhou & Su, 2015). In both domains, the method of evaluation is now recognized as central to engineering progress.

A twelfth result is that cross-domain comparison reveals a shared logic of protective intervention. In electrical systems, distributed generation is usually introduced to support efficiency, local generation availability, or system modernization. Yet its insertion can also destabilize or complicate the network if not properly assessed. In smoke interference systems, obscurants are introduced to protect assets by degrading enemy sensing, but their performance may be misunderstood if evaluated through inadequate indicators. This shared logic can be expressed descriptively: protective or supportive technologies do not simply add benefit; they redistribute system behavior. As a result, performance must be evaluated relationally.

A thirteenth result is that both domains require mitigation-oriented design rather than one-time deployment logic. Power system research on relay

protection improvement, fluctuation mitigation, reconfiguration, and optimal placement shows that DG benefits depend on continual design refinement (Wei et al., 2008; Cui et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2017; Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014). Smoke screen research on extinction-coefficient correction, image-based evaluation, and coverage measurement similarly shows that successful shielding depends on calibrated evaluation and operational tailoring (Li et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2025; Liang et al., 2024). This indicates that both fields are evolving from component-level engineering toward lifecycle performance engineering.

A fourteenth result is that resilience in both systems depends on dynamic, not static, adequacy. A DG-integrated network that appears acceptable in a simplified steady-state view may still be vulnerable to fluctuation, collapse tendency, or protection mismatch. A smoke screen that appears visually dense may still perform poorly against infrared or composite seekers if grayscale or image-quality degradation is insufficient. This means that nominal adequacy is not equivalent to operational adequacy. The literature across both fields strongly supports the need for evaluation methods that capture real interaction effects rather than superficial proxies.

Taken together, the results show that the provided references support a broad engineering conclusion: inserted subsystems designed to support, stabilize, or protect larger systems must themselves be assessed as dynamic modifiers of system behavior. Voltage stability and smoke shielding are different technical objects, but the epistemic challenge is strikingly similar. Engineers must determine not only what the subsystem is, but what it does to the host environment over time, under uncertainty, and in relation to competing functional demands.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this synthesis support a deeper conceptual claim: modern engineering is increasingly concerned not only with system construction, but with the governance of system

interaction. This shift matters because it changes the location of technical difficulty. In classical engineering paradigms, performance could often be approximated by analyzing the designed object in relative isolation. In the literatures reviewed here, by contrast, the core challenge lies in how an introduced subsystem changes the behavior of a larger field of operation. Distributed generation changes the structure of the electrical network into which it is embedded. Smoke screens change the perceptual and targeting conditions of the battlespace or sensing environment in which they are deployed. Neither can be understood adequately through standalone performance claims.

This observation has significant implications for distribution network research. The enthusiasm surrounding distributed generation often focuses on its advantages: local energy support, reduced transmission dependence, renewable integration, and potentially improved voltage support. These advantages are real, but the literature clearly shows that they are conditional rather than automatic. DG may improve voltage in one configuration and worsen it in another; it may reduce losses when optimally placed and increase operational complications when poorly integrated (Zhang et al., 2011; Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014). It may enhance network flexibility while simultaneously undermining protection assumptions and complicating power-flow convergence (Wei et al., 2008; Li et al., 2009). Thus, the engineering meaning of distributed generation is relational. It cannot be judged by capacity or presence alone.

This relationality is especially apparent in voltage stability research. Voltage stability has long been a concern in power systems, but DG integration intensifies the issue by altering load-generation interactions and nodal behaviors in ways that standard models do not fully anticipate (Wu et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2006). The presence of variable wind and photovoltaic resources adds uncertainty, which means that stability is no longer simply a property of a fixed network state but of a fluctuating operating envelope (Cui et al., 2015; Michael &

Ramesh, 2017). The literature therefore invites a more sophisticated understanding of stability: not as a binary condition, but as a dynamically maintained compatibility between network topology, source behavior, load conditions, and control logic.

A similar reconceptualization occurs in the smoke interference literature. In its most basic form, smoke appears to be a straightforward concealment tool. Yet the reviewed studies show that operational effectiveness depends on multiple layers of interaction. Coverage area matters, but so do optical density, grayscale transformation, image-quality degradation, extinction coefficient accuracy, and the characteristics of the sensor being opposed (Liang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2025; Li et al., 2023). In other words, the “object” of engineering is not the smoke alone. It is the altered observation environment generated by the smoke. This is conceptually parallel to the electrical case, where the “object” of evaluation is not the DG unit alone, but the altered network environment created by its insertion.

This leads to a broader theoretical implication. Protective and supportive technologies in complex systems are often evaluated too simplistically when they are treated as additive solutions. The literature in both domains suggests that they should instead be treated as ecological interventions. An ecological intervention does not simply supply a new function; it changes the relationships among existing functions. Distributed generation changes current paths, voltage profiles, and protective logic. Smoke screens change line-of-sight conditions, signal quality, and seeker effectiveness. Once framed this way, the central engineering problem becomes one of adaptive assessment and controlled integration.

The importance of metrics follows directly from this insight. Metrics are not peripheral tools of validation; they are constitutive of what engineers can recognize as success or failure. In power systems, the shift from generic DG integration to detailed attention to voltage stability, losses, PV-PQ switching logic, reconfiguration quality, and

dynamic flow behavior shows that meaningful engineering progress required better variables of judgment (Li et al., 2009; Mao et al., 2017; Luo et al., 2013). In smoke system research, the shift toward grayscale value, image quality, and corrected extinction coefficients shows the same pattern: better metrics make it possible to distinguish nominal concealment from functionally relevant interference (Chen et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2025; Li et al., 2023). What both fields reveal is that evaluation frameworks are part of system design. Inadequate metrics produce inadequate engineering.

A related issue is model dependence. The literature on single-phase grid-connected photovoltaic systems explicitly shows that the observed network impact depends in part on whether P-Q or P-V models are employed (Michael & Ramesh, 2017). This is not a trivial technicality. It means that engineering knowledge is mediated by representational choice. Different models foreground different constraints and responses. The smoke literature exhibits the same principle. A system evaluated by visual coverage alone may appear effective, whereas a grayscale or image-quality-based method may reveal substantial residual sensor capability (Chen et al., 2024; Ding et al., 2025). Model choice therefore has normative as well as technical consequences. It affects procurement, deployment, and strategic belief about capability.

The literature also underscores the importance of uncertainty-sensitive planning. Distributed generation placement under uncertainty requires optimization strategies that explicitly incorporate variable conditions rather than assuming fixed system states (Evangelopoulos & Georgilakis, 2014). Wind-integrated power flow similarly demands dynamic global optimization and staged control logic (Luo et al., 2013). In smoke systems, uncertainty appears in a different form—in aerosol dispersion, sensor response, environmental conditions, and deployment geometry—but the evaluation challenge is comparable. A smoke screen that performs well under one set of observational or atmospheric assumptions may perform differently

under another. Although the provided smoke references do not build a unified probabilistic framework, their emphasis on experimental assessment, coefficient correction, and measurement refinement implies that uncertainty cannot be ignored.

Another important point is that both domains illustrate the transition from component engineering to system-of-systems engineering. A DG unit is no longer simply a generation component. It is part of a control ecosystem involving dispatch, protection, topology, load interaction, and computational analysis. A smoke generator is no longer simply a deployment device. It is part of an interference ecosystem involving aerosol material properties, coverage geometry, target sensor architecture, and evaluation instrumentation. This transition is a hallmark of modern engineering complexity. It also suggests that future training, standards, and research should place greater emphasis on interaction literacy—the capacity to understand not only what a subsystem does internally, but what it does to the system around it.

One of the most valuable contributions of the smoke literature is its insistence that effectiveness is observer-dependent. This has profound theoretical significance. In classical engineering, one may be tempted to define performance through intrinsic properties. Yet smoke screen performance is not intrinsic in a simple way; it is indexed to the sensor or weapon system against which it is deployed (Tian et al., 2023; Zou et al., 2023). This observer-dependence has an analogue in power systems. The effect of DG is likewise network-dependent. A generator that improves one feeder may complicate another; a node model that works in one topology may fail in another. These parallels suggest that future engineering evaluation should embrace context-embedded performance as a general principle. Performance is always about relation: relation to environment, relation to host system, relation to adversary or demand, relation to model assumptions.

The literature further implies that adaptation is more important than mere augmentation. Simply increasing the quantity of distributed generation does not solve voltage issues; what matters is placement, configuration, dispatch, and protection adaptation (Wang et al., 2012; Mao et al., 2017; Wei et al., 2008). Simply increasing smoke density does not guarantee effective interference; what matters is the optical and operational quality of obscuration as experienced by specific sensing systems (Chen et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023; Ding et al., 2025). This is a critical distinction because engineering organizations often gravitate toward additive thinking—more capacity, more material, more deployment—when the real issue is adaptive fit. Adaptive fit refers to how well the inserted system modifies the host environment in the intended way without causing unacceptable side effects or blind spots.

The cross-domain synthesis also raises the question of resilience. In common usage, resilience often means the ability of a system to continue operating despite disturbance. But the reviewed literature suggests a more refined understanding. Resilience depends in part on the quality of the supportive or protective subsystems introduced to buffer disturbance, and in part on the quality of the evaluation methods used to verify that they work. A distribution network becomes more resilient not simply by adding DG, but by ensuring that voltage behavior, protection coordination, and control logic remain stable under changed conditions. A protected platform becomes more resilient not simply by generating smoke, but by ensuring that the smoke measurably degrades relevant sensing and guidance functions. Resilience, then, is not only about design redundancy; it is about validated interaction control.

Several counterarguments or cautions deserve mention. One could argue that cross-domain synthesis between electrical engineering and smoke interference research risks overgeneralization. That concern is valid. The physical principles, operational environments, and practical stakes differ considerably. Yet the purpose of the present

comparison is not to erase those differences. It is to reveal a recurring engineering form: the insertion of a performance-modifying subsystem into a complex host environment. When viewed at that level, the comparison becomes analytically useful rather than reductive. Another possible objection is that the smoke literature is more measurement-oriented while the power systems literature is more computational and optimization-oriented. This too is correct, but it strengthens rather than weakens the argument. It shows that different engineering domains solve similar interaction problems through different methodological emphases, offering opportunities for cross-fertilization in evaluation design.

The limitations of this article should be stated clearly. First, the synthesis is based entirely on the provided references and therefore reflects the thematic scope and incompleteness of that corpus. Second, the cross-domain framework proposed here is interpretive rather than experimentally validated. No direct joint model of DG systems and smoke systems is implied or claimed. Third, some references contain abbreviated bibliographic information, which limits detailed reconstruction of their full empirical context. Fourth, because the article avoids formulas, figures, and quantitative derivations in compliance with the prompt, some technical nuances of the original studies have necessarily been translated into descriptive language. This preserves continuity and accessibility, but it also means that highly specialized mathematical distinctions are discussed conceptually rather than reproduced formally.

The future scope of research is substantial. In the power domain, further work should continue integrating uncertainty-aware optimization, protection adaptation, and dynamic stability tracing into unified decision-support frameworks for DG-rich distribution systems. Research should also deepen understanding of how model choice shapes operational interpretation in photovoltaic and wind-integrated networks. In the smoke domain, future studies should continue refining multimodal

evaluation metrics that capture not only geometric coverage but also sensor-specific degradation across visual, infrared, and composite systems. There is also room for stronger standardization of effectiveness evaluation systems, especially in ways that balance laboratory fidelity with field relevance.

More broadly, the cross-domain perspective proposed here suggests a new area of methodological development: engineering evaluation frameworks for inserted adaptive subsystems. Such frameworks would focus on technologies whose main role is to alter the operating conditions of larger systems. Examples extend beyond the current article and could include cybersecurity overlays, climate-control buffers, autonomous stabilization devices, or intelligent decoys. The key lesson from the current corpus is that such systems require relational metrics, dynamic modeling, uncertainty sensitivity, and operationally meaningful indicators.

In practical terms, the article suggests that engineering organizations should resist the temptation to equate deployment with effectiveness. Whether deploying distributed generation or smoke obscurants, practitioners need evidence of system interaction quality. That evidence must come from metrics designed to capture actual performance under real conditions, not just nominal capability under ideal assumptions. In that sense, both literatures converge on a simple but powerful conclusion: in complex systems, what matters is not only what a component is designed to do, but what it actually makes possible—or prevents—when it meets the rest of the system.

CONCLUSION

This article has developed an integrated, publication-style analysis of two technically distinct but conceptually resonant research domains: distributed generation in electrical distribution networks and smoke screen interference effectiveness in optical and infrared shielding contexts. Based strictly on the supplied references, the study has shown that both literatures address a shared engineering challenge:

how to evaluate subsystems that modify the operating behavior of larger host systems under uncertain and dynamic conditions.

The distributed generation literature demonstrates that local generation sources can improve network capability, flexibility, and efficiency, but also introduce significant complications related to voltage fluctuation, static and dynamic stability, relay protection, node logic, and power-flow modeling. These complications are not incidental; they are constitutive of DG-rich networks. As a result, successful integration depends on optimized placement, uncertainty-aware planning, improved computational logic, adaptive reconfiguration, and protection redesign.

The smoke screen literature demonstrates an analogous transformation in the evaluation of obscurant systems. Smoke screens are no longer judged merely by visible concealment, but by measurable effects on grayscale value, image quality, extinction behavior, coverage area, and target-specific sensing degradation. Their effectiveness depends not just on deployment, but on how they alter the information environment available to visual, infrared, radar-guided, or composite seeker systems.

The central conclusion emerging from both domains is that nominal function is an inadequate basis for engineering judgment. A distributed generator is not effective simply because it generates power locally. A smoke screen is not effective simply because it creates visual density. In both cases, performance must be evaluated relationally, through the altered behavior of the host system or host environment. This requires dynamic metrics, context-aware models, and operationally relevant assessment methods.

The article therefore advances a broader engineering principle: inserted supportive or protective technologies should be studied as dynamic modifiers of complex systems, not as isolated components. Their success depends on the quality of interaction

they produce, the side effects they create, the uncertainty they must withstand, and the adequacy of the metrics used to judge them. Across both electrical and defense-related engineering settings, resilience emerges not from deployment alone, but from validated, adaptive, and system-conscious integration.

REFERENCES

1. Chen, H. Y., Chen, J. F., Shi, D. Y., et al. (2006). Power flow study and voltage stability analysis for distribution systems with distributed generation. Power Engineering Society General Meeting.
2. Chen, L., Hu, Y., Gu, Y., et al. (2024). Technique based on the grayscale value for evaluating the shielding performance of infrared smokescreen. Optical Engineering, 63(3), 034107.
3. Chen, L., Li, X., Wang, X., et al. (2023). Research on evaluation methods for smoke screen shielding and interference effects. Progress in Laser and Optoelectronics, 60(22), 41-50.
4. Cui, J., Yang, J. Y., Li, L. F., et al. (2015). Voltage fluctuation analysis and mitigation of distribution network containing distributed wind farm. Power System Technology, 39(12), 3414-3420.
5. Ding, J., Chen, C., Li, Q., et al. (2024). Evaluation indicators and calculation methods for smoke screen interference effectiveness. Infrared, 45(3), 29-39.
6. Ding, J., Liu, S., Zhang, Q., et al. (2025). Experimental study on smoke screen jamming effectiveness evaluation based on image quality. Laser & Infrared, 55(2), 266-274.
7. Evangelopoulos, V. A., & Georgilakis, P. S. (2014). Optimal distributed generation placement under uncertainties based on point estimate method embedded genetic algorithm. IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution, 8(3), 389-400.
8. Guo, A., & Gao, X. (2025). Research and development trends of smoke munition jamming effectiveness evaluation system. Journal of Ordnance Engineering, 46(1), 38-45.
9. Hao, S., & Chiang, H. D. (2014). CDFLOV: A practical tool for tracing stationary behaviors of general distribution networks. IEEE Transactions on Power Systems, 25(3), 1365-137.
10. Li, B. W., Li, P. J., & Wei, H. (2009). A nonlinear programming model for improving type switching logic of PV-PQ nodes in power flow calculation. Power System Technology, 32-43.
11. Li, T. Y., Han, Y. Q., Hu, X. Q., et al. (2014). Characteristics of static voltage stability for distributed generation integrated into power system and its impacts analysis. Power System Protection and Control, 8-13.
12. Li, X., Li, T., Gao, X., et al. (2023). Evaluation method for smoke screen interference effectiveness and correction of mass extinction coefficient. Journal of Ordnance Engineering, 44(2), 187-194.
13. Liang, J., Chen, Q., Liu, H., et al. (2024). A measurement and calculation method for smoke curtain coverage area in passive jammer testing. Optics and Optoelectronic Technology, 22(3), 57-62.
14. Luo, Y. L., Li, Y., & Wu, K. (2013). Dynamic global optimal power flow and its two-stage control algorithm of a power grid integrated with wind power farms. Electrical Power, 131-137.
15. Ma, R., Zhou, Z. F., Xu, H. M., et al. (2009). Dynamic voltage collapse index with wind speed considering. Journal of Electric Power Science and Technology, 41-46.

16. Mao, W. J., Li, H. W., & Li, C. (2017). A distribution system reconfiguration method considering the optimal active power dispatching of DGs. *Power System Protection and Control*, 57-63.
17. Michael, E., & Ramesh, R. (2017). The impact of single-phase grid-connected distributed photovoltaic systems on the distribution network using P-Q and P-V models. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 91, 20-33.
18. Tan, H. (2023). Design of multifunctional fog generators and study on optical occlusion performance of polyol aerosols. Tianjin University of Science and Technology.
19. Tian, H., Rong, K., & Zhao, S. (2023). Study on the combat effectiveness of smoke screens in shielding radar-guided precision-guided weapons. *Aviation Weapons*, 30(6), 75-80.
20. Wang, X. T., Shi, L., Ren, J. W., et al. (2012). Optimized configuration of distributed generators based on power circle. *Electric Power Science and Engineering*, 28-32.
21. Wei, W., Pan, Z. C., Cong, W., et al. (2008). Impact of distributed generation on relay protection and its improved measures. *IEEE Electricity Distribution*, 1-5.
22. Wu, X. M., Liu, J., & Bi, P. X. (2006). Research on voltage stability of distribution networks. *Power System Technology*, 31-35.
23. Zhang, L. M., Tang, W., Zhao, Y. J., et al. (2011). Analysis of the effect on the system voltage and loss of distributed generation connected to distribution network. *Power System Protection and Control*, 39(5), 91-97.
24. Zhou, J. A., & Su, H. S. (2015). Back/forward sweep power flow calculation with distributed generation considering static load characteristics. *Power System Protection and Control*, 26-32.
25. Zou, J., Zhu, C., & Fu, Z. (2023). Study on the influence mechanism of smoke curtains on TV/IR composite seekers. *Naval Electronics Engineering*, 43(4), 186-189.