AD-AC	50 753	SYRA DESI DEC	GN OF	NIV N SKEWED K SARK	Y ISOPHA	SORS O	F ELEC	TROMAGN	ETIC E	MITTERS F30602	5.(U) -75-C-0	/6 9/5 121 NL	
	OF   AD 050753	·				And							
					*(2)] 			- Up (A second ) In the second secon				<ul> <li>The second seco</li></ul>	
N			Ŵ						The second secon	E P Separate and the Separate and the Se		$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3$	
An Instantion	E							END DATE FILMED 4 -78					
•													



RADC-TR-77-423 Phase Report December 1977

AD A 050753

Incocy

Mr.

DESIGN OF SKEWED ISOPHASORS OF ELECTROMAGNETIC

Tapan Kumar Sarkar

Rochester Institute of Technology



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ROME AIR DEVELOPMENT CENTER Air Force Systems Command Griffie Air Force Sese, New York 13441 This report has been reviewed by the RADC Information Office (OI) and is releasable to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). At NTIS it will be releasable to the general public, including foreign mations.

RADC-TR-77-423 has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

APPROVED: -Stte

PAUL VAN ETTEN Project Engineer

APPROVED: 57

JOSEPH L. RYERSON Technical Director Surveillance Division

FOR THE COMMANDER:

In P. Hurs

JOHN P. HUSS Acting Chief, Plane Office

If your address has changed or if you wish to be removed from the RADC mailing list, or if the addressee is no longer employed by your organization, please notify RADC (OCTS) Griffing AFB MY 13441. This will assist us in maintaining a current mailing list.

Do not return this copy. Retain or destroy.

E

(19) REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAG	E READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FOR
BEPORT NUMBER 2. GO	ACCESSION NOT 3. TECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
RADC-TR-77-423	
. TITLE (and Subtitie)	Phase Par Priod Cove
DESIGN OF SKEWED ISOPHASORS OF ELECTRO	MAGNETIC Mar Mar - Sept
EMITTERS .	
AUTHOR(+)	N/A 8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
	(15)
Tapan Kumar/Sarkar	F30602-75-C-0121 rew
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TA
Rochester Institute of Technology	C CATOR (I) dd
Department of Electrical Engineering Rochester NY 14623	6 956 70016 PP
1. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	12. REPORT DATE
Rome Air Development Center (OCTS) $\gamma$	Dec. 77
Griffiss AFB NY 13441	45 (2) 490
4. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different from	Controlling Office) 15. SECURIT CEASS (of this conch)
	UNCLASSIFIED
Same	15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADI
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)	N/A
Approved for public release, distribut	tion unlimited.
	D Vanter
	Caleburn
7. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Blo	ick 20, 11 dillerent from Report)
Same	MAR TT
	In TOTEL
8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	- Huber F
RADC Project Engineer: Paul Van Etten	(OCTS)
inge stojeet zigzneett tuut tui secen	(0000)
S. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if persenary and iden	ntity by black number)
. ALL HUNDS CONTINUE ON reverse ande it necessary and Iden	
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation	n
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation	a
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation	n
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation	(Ify by block number) Wed isophasor lines from electromagnet
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident A The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat	n n wed isophasor lines from electromagnet ed to the physical distance between th
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and identi A The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase other statially dist	n n web isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between th tributed electromagnetic emitters and the
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident A The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the ison	(Ify by block number) ewed isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between the tributed electromagnetic emitters and to trapolation of the skewed isophasor line phasor lines not only depends on the
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation O. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi	n n wed isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between th tributed electromagnetic emitters and t trapolation of the skewed isophasor lin ohasor lines not only depends on the litters but also on the inter-emitter
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and ident A The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi spacing. Finally, an optimization met	n n n we block number) ewed isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between the tributed electromagnetic emitters and the trapolation of the skewed isophasor line ohasor lines not only depends on the liters but also on the inter-emitter thod is utilized to obtain the excitation
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi spacing. Finally, an optimization met	(Ify by block number) ewed isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between the tributed electromagnetic emitters and to trapolation of the skewed isophasor line phasor lines not only depends on the itters but also on the inter-emitter thod is utilized to obtain the excitation UNCLASSIFIED
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident A The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi spacing. Finally, an optimization met D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	n n we block number) ewed isophasor lines from electromagnet ted to the physical distance between th tributed electromagnetic emitters and t trapolation of the skewed isophasor line phasor lines not only depends on the itters but also on the inter-emitter thod is utilized to obtain the excitation UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (The Data
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi spacing. Finally, an optimization met D rorm 1473 EDITION OF INOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	n n n n n n n n n n n n n n
Isophasors, Electromagnetic, Radiation ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side II necessary and ident The magnitude of the slope of ske emitters is shown to be directly relat geometric center of the spatially dist projected phase cebter obtained by ext It is shown that the slope of the isop excitations of the electromagnetic emi spacing. Finally, an optimization met D 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE	n n n n n n n n n n n n n n

u

X UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered) for a set of spatially distributed electromagnetic emitters for a specified slope of the isophasor lines, a fixed number of electromagnetic emitters and for a given minimum inter-emitter spacing. X ACCESSION for Wells section f Biff Seption E NTIS DDC 0 UNANNOUNCED JUSTIFICATION DISTRIBUTION AVAILABITITY CODES BY CIAL Dist. AVAIL UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

The author is grateful to Mr. Paul Van Etten of RADC for his continued interest in all aspects of the problem. Thanks are also due to Dr. James E. Palmer for providing a stimulating environment at Rochester Institute of Technology for studying the myriad problem of skewed-isophasor synthesis of electromagnetic emitters. Finally, the author is indebted to Mrs. Nicole Bruening for her expert typing of the manuscript. TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

A STREET BARRIES

Section		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	5
II	ANALYSIS OF SKEWED ISOPHASOR LINES	8
	IN FREQUENCY DOMAIN	
111	SKEWED ISOPHASOR DESIGN FOR ARBITRARY	17
	TIME SIGNALS	
IV	EXAMPLES	22
v	CONCLUSION	33
REFERENCE	5	34
APPENDIX	A - ROSENBROCK'S OPTIMIZATION METHOD	35
APPENDIX	B - COMPUTER PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	40
APPENDIX	C - COMPLEX EXCITATIONS OF THE OPTIMIZED ARRAY	44

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Emitter configuration	9
2	Spatial error due to skewed isophasor lines	13
3	Receiver mechanism for wideband waveform	15
4	Skewed isophasors of a 3 element array having a 3.0 $\lambda$ aperture	23
5	Skewed isophasors of a 2 element array having the same aperture length as of figure 4	24
6	Slope of the far field phase for a 2 and 3 element array	25
7	Skewed isophasors of a 3 element array having aperture length of 0.6 $\lambda$	27
8	Skewed isophasors of a 2 element array having the same aperture length as of figure 7	28
9	2L/A for various elements having 0.5 $\lambda$ as an interelement spacing	29
10	2L/A for various elements having 0.3 $\lambda$ as an interelement spacing	30
11	2L/A for various elements having 0.1 $\lambda$ as an interelement spacing	31

4

Ber de

#### I. INTRODUCTION

An electromagnetic emitter is defined as a source which emits electromagnetic waves. The wave as it propagates out from the source display a variation of both amplitude and phase. The points on the wave which have the same phase in a given region may be thought of joined by imaginary lines, known as isophasor lines. These are analogous to contours on a map, which define a constant elevation. For a point source emitting electromagnetic waves, the isophasor lines would then form concentric circles. The objective of this report is to design electromagnetic emitters whose isophasor lines would not form concentric circles with the center of the circles being located at the geometric center of the electromagnetic emitters. This implies that such an array of electromagnetic emitters would produce over a certain angle in the far field an electromagnetic wave whose phase center may not coincide with the geometric center of the electromagnetic emitters. The projected phase center may even be outside the spatial distribution of the electromagnetic emitters.

The report is organized in various sections. In section II the design of skewed isophasor lines is presented when the electromagnetic emitters are excited by a band-limited signal. The analysis has been carried out in the frequency domain. Section III presents the analysis of skewed isophasor lines when the emitters are excited by arbitrary time. The development for this case has been presented in the time domain. In both sections II and III the relationship between the slope of the isophasor lines to the measure of closeness between the projected phase center and the geometric center of the spatially distributed electromagnetic emitters has been developed.

In section IV some representative computations are made using an optimization method due to Rosenbrock. Appendix A describes the salient features of the optimization procedure. Appendix B provides the computer program listing along with sample input and output. This program has been utilized in obtaining the results of section IV.

There are various applications of this principle of design of skewed isophasor lines. One such application is to the phenomenon of angle noise or angle glint. Angle noise causes a change with time in the apparent location of the target with respect to a reference point on the target. The apparent angular location may even fall outside the target. This principle may thus be applied in providing misinformation to the receiver monitoring the target. This is because target locating systems can be divided into two major categories: phase comparison systems and amplitude comparison systems. The phase comparison technique involves two or more receiving elements separated in space so that the phase of the received signal at the two or more points can be compared. The phase comparison systems then measures the tilt of the phase front since it indicates the target to be in a direction normal to the line of receiving elements alignment required to receive the signal in phase at the receiving structure. Thus a phase comparison system measures the phase front of the received signal and points to the direction normal to the isophasor lines of the received signal.

Amplitude comparison systems generally use some type of secondary receiving elements which focuses the received signal to a spot in the focal plane. All amplitude comparison systems by some means or other, locate the target as the pointing angle of the receiving elements which

center the spot from the received signal in the focal plane. For example, a conventional amplitude comparison monopulse radar split the spot in four parts by a multiport feed such that the spot can be centered by adjusting the receiving elements for equal amplitudes in each port. The significant characteristic of the amplitude comparison techniques is that the spot location is determined by the isophasor lines of the received signal. Centering the spot is accomplished by rotating the receiving structure such that the receiving elements align with the received isophasor lines. Consequently, in general any target locating device is essentially a phase front measuring device. From this measurement the device tries to project the phase center of the received isophasor lines.

Another application of the principle of designing skewed isophasor lines may be found in missile guidance. A missile may be guided by the skewed isophasor lines and thereby reduce the complexity of the tracking mechanism.

A third application of this principle is a very interesting one. Goldman has shown in his book "Frequency Analysis, Modulation and Noise", that by the application of the principle of stationary phase the location of a signal in time could be obtained. Under certain conditions the transmitted signal may be made to appear originating from a point in time other than its true location. This apparent origin of the signal may even be outside the spatial distribution of the electromagnetic emitters, as the time information may be converted to a range information.

A fourth possible application of this principle may be in Displaced phase Center Antenna (DPCA). It may be possible this way to compensate for the deleterious effects of the airborne radar platform motion.

#### II. ANALYSIS OF SKEWED ISOPHASOR LINES IN FREQUENCY DOMAIN

### 2.1 For CW Waveforms

When the transmitted signal from a set of emitters is CW, the isophasor lines of such a signal is easy to visualize. The phase front in this case is the isophasor line of the set of emitters. The problem then is to select a set of emitters which would produce skewed isophasor lines in the far field. The tilt would be such that phase front measuring device looking at the waveform would project a phase center which may or may not coincide with the geometric location of the set of emitters. In this section a relationship is also derived relating the tilt of the skewed isophasor lines to the distance between the geometric center and the projected phase center of the spatially distributed emitters.

Consider a set of emitters situated on the x - axis as shown in Fig. 1. Each emitter is excited with a complex signal amplitude  $S_n$  (having both magnitude and phase) and they are separated from each other by a distance d. The electric far field pattern due to 2N + 1 emitters could be obtained as

 $\dot{E} = \sum_{n=-N} S_n \exp\left(\frac{j2\pi nd}{\lambda} \sin \theta\right)$  (2.1)

where  $\lambda$  is the wavelength of transmission. Let the complex excitation amplitudes  $S_n$  of the emitters have real parts  $a_n$  and imaginary parts as  $b_n$ . Then





$$\vec{E} = \sum_{n=-N}^{N} \left\{ a_n + j b_n \right\} \left\{ \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + j \sin \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right\}$$

... (2.2)

En alita hard

By taking the summation now for only positive values of n in eq. (2.2) leads to

$$\vec{E} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ \{a_n + jb_n\} \} \{ \cos\left(\frac{2\pi nd}{\lambda} \sin \theta\right) + j \sin\left(\frac{2\pi nd}{\lambda} \sin \theta\right) \} \right\}$$

$$+ \{a_{-n} + jb_{-n}\} \{\cos\left(\frac{2\pi nd}{\lambda}\sin\theta\right) - j\sin\left(\frac{2\pi nd}{\lambda}\sin\theta\right)\} + a_0 + jb_0$$

Let the complex far field  $\vec{E}$  has a magnitude |E| and an angle  $\psi$ . Then

$$|\mathbf{E}| \ e^{\mathbf{j}\Psi} = \begin{bmatrix} N \\ \Sigma \\ n=1 \end{bmatrix} \{ (a_n + a_{-n}) \ \cos\left(\frac{2\pi \ nd}{\lambda} \ \sin\theta\right) + (b_{-n} - b_n) \\ \sin\left(\frac{2\pi \ nd}{\lambda} \ \sin\theta\right) \} + a_0 \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{j} \begin{bmatrix} b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \{ (a_n - a_{-n}) \ \sin\left(\frac{2\pi \ nd}{\lambda} \ \sin\theta\right) \} \\ + (b_n + b_{-n}) \ \cos\left(\frac{2\pi \ nd}{\lambda} \ \sin\theta\right) \end{bmatrix} \\ \dots (2.4)$$

Hence from eq. (2.4)

$$\tan \psi = \frac{b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[ (a_n - a_{-n}) \sin \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + (b_n + b_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right]}{a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[ (a_n + a_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + (b_{-n} - b_n) \sin \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right]}$$
... (2.5)

The phase front in a particular direction  $\theta$  has a tilt  $\frac{d\psi}{d\theta}$ . By carrying out the derivative operation with respect to  $\theta$  in eq. (2.5) and after some algebric manipulations, the tilt is obtained as follows:

$$\frac{d\psi}{d\theta} = \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda} \cos \theta \quad \frac{\text{Numerator}}{\text{Denominator}}$$
(2.6)

where,

Numerator = 
$$\begin{bmatrix} N \\ \Sigma \\ n=1 \end{bmatrix} \left[ (a_n - a_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) - (b_n + b_{-n}) \right]$$
  
sin  $\left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] \left[ a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ (a_n + a_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] - (b_n - b_{-n}) \sin \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] + \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} n \left\{ (a_n + a_{-n}) \right\} \right]$   
sin  $\left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + (b_n - b_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ (a_n - a_{-n}) \right\} \right]$   
sin  $\left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + (b_n + b_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ (a_n - a_{-n}) \right\} \right]$   
sin  $\left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) + (b_n + b_{-n}) \cos \left( \frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta \right) \right] + b_0 \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left\{ (a_n - a_{-n}) \right\} \right]$ 

Denominator = 
$$\begin{bmatrix} a_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \{(a_n + a_{-n}) \cos(\frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta) \\ - (b_n - b_{-n}) \sin(\frac{2\pi n d}{\lambda} \sin \theta) \end{bmatrix}^2 + \begin{bmatrix} b_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \{(a_n - a_{-n}) \\ 0 & n = 1 \end{bmatrix}^2$$

$$\ln \left(\frac{2\pi \text{ nd}}{\lambda} \sin \theta\right) + \left(b_n + b_n\right) \cos \left(\frac{2\pi \text{ nd}}{\lambda} \sin \theta\right) \right\} = \dots (2.8)$$

For the particular case,

s

N=1,  $a_0 = 0$ ,  $b_0 = 0$ ,  $a_{+1} = 1$ ,  $a_{-1} = a$ ,  $b_{+1} = 0$ ,  $b_{-1} = 0$ eq. (2.6) reduces to

$$\frac{d\psi}{d\theta} = \frac{2\pi d}{\lambda} \cos \theta \frac{1-a^2}{1+a^2+2a} (\frac{4\pi d}{\lambda} \sin \theta) \qquad \dots (2.9)$$

Incidentally (2.9) is the same result as obtained by Meade  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \end{bmatrix}$  and Dean Howard  $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \end{bmatrix}$ .

Next, given the tilt  $\frac{d\psi}{d\theta}$  of the isophasor lines, what is the separation distance between the geometric center of the spatially distributed emitters and the projected phase center from the phase measuring device. A typical set up is shown in Fig. 2 where the part of a skewed isophasor line PQ is shown to have come from a spatially distributed emitters of length A. The isophasor line is being observed at a distance R which is in the far field of the emitters. Two receiving elements P and Q are properly aligned along the isophasor line so that their measured phase difference is zero. So the projected phase center would be along TS which is perpendicular to PQ and is tilted at an angle  $\beta$ to OT. The object is to find the length L. Now the path difference between OP and OQ is  $RQ(=\frac{\lambda}{2\pi} d\psi)$ . Here dy is the phase difference in the electric field between the points P and Q along the isophasor line. Also  $PR = R d\theta$ .

Hence  $\tan \beta = \frac{OS}{OT} = \frac{L}{R} = \frac{RQ}{PR} = \frac{\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}}{R}\frac{d\psi}{d\theta} = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi R}\frac{d\psi}{d\theta}$ 

... (2.10)



Hence $L = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi}{d\theta}$	(2.11)
So from (2.6)	
$L = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi}{d\theta} d \cos \theta \frac{\text{Numerator}}{\text{Denominator}}$	
or $\frac{L}{A} = \frac{\cos \theta}{M} \frac{Numerator}{Denominator}$	(2.12)
Where $A = Total$ spatial width of the emitted	r distribution

and M = (Total number of emitters -1)

Therefore it is possible to make the ratio  $\frac{L}{A}$  change with the complex voltage excitations of the spatially distributed emitters and their interelement spacing d. For some problems it is desirable to make  $\frac{L}{A}$  arbitrarily large by proper choice of d , a and b. In section IV some examples would be presented to illustrate these points.

### 2.2 For Wideband Waveforms:

For wideband waveforms, it is very difficult if not impossible to define isophasor lines. But it is still possible to define a projected phase center for a spatial distribution of emitters transmitting wideband waveforms. In order to obtain such a definition for a projected phase center it is necessary to define the model for the receiving elements of a wideband waveform. For this problem, the phase sensing device is assumed of the form shown in Fig. 3. Here two signals  $x_1$  ( $t_1$ , $\theta_1$ ) and  $x_2$  ( $t_1$ , $\theta_2$ ) are arriving at the two phase sensing devices A and B at a certain instance t. On one channel the Hilbert Transform of the signal is



Figure 3. Receiver mechanism for a wideband waveform

and the states of

performed and this is represented by  $x_1$  of the original signal  $x_1$  and then the two signals are multiplied and integrated to yield the output I. I is then related to the measure of closeness of the projected phase center to the geometrical center of the set of emitters. For I = 0, the projected phase center would coincide with the geometrical center of the spatially distributed emitters and for any other values of I  $\neq 0$ , the two centers would be far apart. The distance between the two centers could be obtained by taking known waveforms and calibrating I to the error distance.

For the special case of a signal originating from a single source  $x_1$  (t,  $\theta_1$ ) and  $x_2$  (t,  $\theta_2$ ) would be the same. For a real signal, the signal and its Hilbert Transform are always orthogonal and hence I would be zero. Mathematically,

$$I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t) \hat{x}(t) dt = 0 \qquad ...(2.13)$$

always holds if x (t) is real. So for a single source transmitting any arbitrary wideband waveforms, this device would make no error at all in prediction of the phase center of the spatially distributed emitters. However, for a general case of multiple sources, the situation would be different. This is dealt with in the next section but in the time domain.

For this case a set of emitters are chosen similar to the diagram of Fig. 1. Instead of exciting each emitter by a single frequency as in the previous case of 2.1, each emitter is now excited by currents of the form

$$i_m (x,t) = A_m (x) f (t)$$
 ...(3.1)

where  $A_m(x)$  is the spatial distribution of the current on emitter m and f (t) is the time dependence of the current. For an array of point sources one can write

$$i (x,t) = f (t) \sum_{m=-N}^{N} A_{m} (x) \delta(x-md) \qquad \dots (3.2)$$

where  $A_{m}$  (md) represents the strength of the discrete emitter at x = md. Now the far field at a distance R can be expressed as

$$\vec{E} (\theta, t) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R} \sum_{m=-N}^{N} A_m \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[ f \left( t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{md}{c} \sin \theta \right) \right]$$

$$\Delta = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R} \sum_{m=-N}^{N} A_m F(t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{md}{c} \sin \theta) \qquad \dots (3.3)$$

where c is the velocity of light and  $\mu_0$  is the permittivity of free space. This is essentially equation (20) of Tseng and Cheng  $\begin{bmatrix} 3 \end{bmatrix}$ .

The model of the receiver is assumed to be same as before. This is illustrated in Fig. 2. So for this case

$$I = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left[ \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R} \sum_{m=-N}^{N} A_m \mathcal{H} \left\{ F \left( t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{md}{c} \sin \theta_1 \right) \right\} \right] \times$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R} & \sum_{k=-N}^{N} A_k \left\{ F(t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{kd}{c} \sin \theta_2) \right\} \end{bmatrix} dt \qquad \dots (3.4)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  {·} denotes the Hilbert transform. The limits of integration correspond to the times when the integrator starts integrating (T<sub>1</sub>) and when the integrator stops integrating (T<sub>2</sub>).

For simplicity it is assumed that  $f(t) = \sin \omega t$ , so that

 $\mathcal{H}{F(t)} = \omega \cos (\omega t + 90^{\circ}) = -\omega \sin \omega t \qquad \dots (3.5)$ Hence,

$$I = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left(\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{m=-N \ k=-N}}^{N \ N} \left(-\omega^2\right) A_m A_k$$

 $\sin (\omega t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{md}{c} \sin \theta_1) \cos (\omega t - \frac{R}{c} + \frac{kd}{c} \sin \theta_2) dt$ 

or

$$\begin{bmatrix} T_2 \\ \int \\ T_1 \end{bmatrix} \sin\{2(\omega t - \frac{R}{c}) + \frac{d}{c} (\min \theta_1 + k \sin \theta_2) \end{bmatrix} dt$$

+ 
$$\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left[ \sin\left\{ \frac{d}{c} (m \sin \theta_1 - k \sin \theta_2) \right\} \right] dt \right\} \dots (3.6)$$

Since the purpose of the integrator in Fig. 2 is a smoothing operation, the average value of the first integral would be zero as the time average of a "sin" function is zero.

Let  $\theta_2 = \theta$ and  $\theta_1 = \theta + \Delta \theta$  ...(3.7) where  $\Delta \theta$  represent the azimuth angle subtended by the receiver at the origin. Then m sin  $\theta_1 - k \sin \theta_2 =$ 

$$\left[\sqrt{\left(m \cos \Delta \theta - k\right)^{2} + \left(m \sin \Delta \theta\right)^{2}}\right] \sin\left\{\theta + \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{m \sin \Delta \theta}{m \cos \Delta \theta - k}\right)\right\}$$
... (3.8)

X

So the error I can be expressed as

$$I = -\frac{\omega^2}{2} \left(\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi R}\right)^2 \sum_{\substack{m=-N \\ m=-N}}^{N} \sum_{k=-N}^{N} A_k A_m$$

$$\int_{T_{1}}^{T_{2}} \sin \left[ \sqrt{\left( m \cos \Delta \theta - k \right)^{2} + \left( m \sin \Delta \theta \right)^{2}} \frac{d}{c} \right] \times$$

$$\sin \left\{\theta + \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{m \sin \Delta \theta}{m \cos \Delta \theta - k} \right) \right\} dt \qquad \dots (3.9)$$
19

$$I = -1/2 \left(\frac{\omega \mu_0}{4\pi R}\right)^2 \sum_{m=-N}^{N} \sum_{k=-N}^{K} A_k A_m \left(T_2 - T_1\right)$$

$$sin\left[\frac{d}{c} \sqrt{(m \cos \Delta \theta - k)^2 + (m \sin \Delta \theta)^2} \sin \left\{\theta + \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{m \sin \Delta \theta}{m \cos \Delta \theta - k}\right)\right]$$
...(3.10)

It is interesting to note that since I is an odd function of  $\theta$ ,

$$\int_{0}^{2\pi} I(\theta) d\theta = A \int_{0}^{2\pi} \sin\left[z \sin\left(\theta + \psi\right)\right] d\theta$$

= A 
$$\int_{0}^{\pi} \sin \left[ z \sin (\theta + \psi) \right] d\theta + \int_{\pi}^{2\pi} \sin \left[ z \sin (\theta + \psi) \right] d\theta$$

This implies that the total error integrated around the set of emitters is always zero.

Now the error between the projected phase center and the geometrical center of the spatial distribution of apertures would be given by (2.11).

$$L = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \quad \frac{d\psi}{d\theta}$$

So the objective now is to find the relationship between I and  $\psi$ . Let

 $x_1 (t_1, \theta_1) = \sin \omega t$ and  $x_2 (t_1, \theta_2) = \sin (\omega t + \psi)$ 

then from a derivation similar to that presented in this section it can be shown that

$$I = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \cos \omega t \sin (\omega t + \psi) dt = \frac{T_2 - T_1}{2} \sin \psi$$

$$\dots (3.12)$$

Hence

$$L = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \frac{d\psi}{d\theta} = \frac{\lambda}{\pi} \left\{ \frac{1}{(T_2 - T_1^2 - 4I^2)} \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{dI}{d\theta} \dots (3.13)$$

So it is possible to make L larger than the half of the spatial distribution of the emitters by proper choice of the amplitude coefficient of the emitters.

Some examples are presented in the next section to illustrate it.

asso of Peaks [1] and Housed [1]. If he dear from this dimens that the shape of the phase of the Priblic is an increas linear sum the state states of it was for the 1 strain that is an increas linear sum the state that an higher interfer the mode states the forestant feature in the ine linear period of the chaps of the phase is situated as a single that interfer. Fights & presents the states (31) for the 1 and 2 and 2 and that interfer. Fights & presents the states (31) for the 1 and 2 and 2 and the state of the state of the states of the phase is stated as a single of the interfer. Fights & presents the states (31) for the 1 and 3 and 3 and the state of the s

#### IV. EXAMPLES

The mathematical formulations presented in the previous sections is utilized to obtain some representative numerical values for various electromagnetic emitter configuration.

Figure 4 represents the skewed isophasor lines of a 3 element array. The spacing between the elements is  $1.5\lambda$  so that the total width of the aperture is  $3.0\lambda$ . The objective then is to obtain the largest slope for the isophasor lines within an angle window of 10 degrees (between 175 and 185 degrees). The variables in this problem are the complex excitations of the elements. The phase reference for this diagram is referred to the geometric center of the array. The optimized phase of the far field is shown by the solid line in Figure 4. The dashed line represent the gain for the 3 element array. The gain is defined as the logarithimic ratio of the far field between the present 3 element array and an omnidirectional element fed with the same power as the 3 element array. It is interesting to note that within the angle window the electric field intensity remains relatively constant.

Figure 5 represents the optimized 2 element array having the same aperture length of 3.0 $\lambda$  as in Figure 4. This represents the optimized case of Meade [1] and Howard [2]. It is clear from this diagram that the slope of the phase of the E-field is no longer linear over the angle window as it was for the 3 element case. The gain for the 3 element case was higher outside the angle window. An important feature is that the linear portion of the slope of the phase is situated near a minimum field intensity. Figure 6 presents the slopes (2L) for the 2 and 3 element cases.







Figure 5: Skewed isophasors of a 2 element array having the same aperture length as of Figure 4.



Figure 6: Slope of the far field phase for a 2 and a 3 element array

Figures 7 and 8 represent the same cases as presented in Figures 4-6 except now the aperture length is restricted to  $0.6\lambda$  instead of  $3\lambda$ . Figure 7 represents both the phase of the far field and the gain of the 3 element array. This correspond to point A on Figure 10. Figure 8 represent the corresponding quantities for the 2 element array. For Figures 7 and 8 there is very little difference both in the phase of the far field and the gain. Hence the criterion (maximize the slope of the far field by proper choice of excitations) is not a valid one for closely spaced elements. This is true because for closely spaced elements the array becomes very sensitive to excitations. Hence a more meaningful criterion would be the maximization of the slope of the far field with respect to the excitations for a fixed power input. This is a very interesting area which would be investigated in future work.

Figures 9, 10 and 11 present results obtained for various windows and minimum interelement spacing. The plots are the ratio of the projected phase center by half the length of the aperture against the number of elements in the array. The maximum slope for the curves over a given window has been obtained by varying the excitations and interelement spacings. Care has been taken in the optimization procedure to make sure that the interelement spacings do not go below a certain value. For Figure 9, the minimum interelement spacing is  $0.5\lambda$ . It is interesting to note that a large ratio  $\frac{L}{A}$  could be achieved for the same number of elements over a smaller window.



Figure 7: Skewed isophasors of a 3 element array having aperture length of 0.6  $\lambda$ 







Station Constraints



Figure 10: 2L/A for various elements having 0.3  $\lambda$  as an interelement spacing

A CARLES



Figures 10 and 11 display the same characteristics as observed in Figure 9 but this time the interelement spacings are greater than or equal to 0.3 $\lambda$  and 0.2 $\lambda$  respectively.

For the optimized parameters, it is seen from Figures 9-11 that  $\frac{2L}{A}$  is always greater than 1.5 $\lambda$ . This implies that for the given windows and up to seven number of elements it is always possible to choose excitations which would produce skewed isophasor lines in the far field. These isophasor lines would project a phase center which is at least 0.5 times the aperture length outside the physical aperture.

The slopes of the isophasor lines in the far field becomes much larger as the elements come closer together. This is seen by comparing the curves of Figure 11 which correspond to a  $d \ge 0.1\lambda$  to those of Figure 9 and Figure 10 which correspond to a  $d \ge 0.3\lambda$  and  $d \ge 0.5\lambda$ respectively. Hence there is a strong indication that it may be possible to achieve larger slopes of the isophasor lines from a continuous spatial distribution of electromagnetic emitters rather than a discrete one. But as outlined before this criterion shall be used along with an additional constraint on the source norm for the arrays. This could be an worthwhile area to look into in future work.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The possibility of obtaining skewed isophasor lines from two emitters has been illustrated by Meade [1] and Howard [2]. From their results it is seen that large slopes of the isophasor lines could only be achieved over a narrow window. The theory developed in this report could be applied to obtain skewed isophasor lines over large angle windows. Also of importance is the fact that sometimes the power density is considerably greater than that indicated by Meade [1] and Howard [2].

The theory presented in this report can also be applied to time waveforms where the apparent time of arrival of the waveform can be changed with appropriate phasing of the electromagnetic emitters. Another important application is in the guidance of a missile by the skewed isophasor lines. It may also be applied in the case of Displaced Phase Center Antenna (DPCA) to counteract the linear motion of the airborne radar. However the technique presented here can find applications to many other electronic systems.

### REFERENCES

- J.E. Meade, "Target Considerations," in A.S. Locke, et. al., "Guidance," D. VanNostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J., ch. 11, 1955.
- D.D. Howard, "Radar Target Angular Scintillation In Tracking And Guidance Systems Based On Echo Signal Phase Front Distortion," Proceedings of National Electronics Conference, Vol. 15, pp. 840-849, 1959.
- F.I. Tseng and D.K. Cheng, "Transient and Steady-State Antenna Pattern Characteristics for Arbitrary Time Signals," Technical Report RADC-TR-66-101, June 1965. (484512)
- 4. H.H. Rosenbrock, "An Automatic Method for Finding the Greatest or Least Value of a Function," "The Computer Journal," Vol. 3, pp. 175-184.

### APPENDIX A - ROSENBROCK'S OPTIMIZATION METHOD

The function - minimization algorithm due to Rosenbrock [4] is well known but is included here for completeness.

The Rosenbrock search technique uses M mutually orthogonal directions during each search cycle to find a relative minimum. This strategy differs from a steepest descent technique which uses successive orthogonal directions, but these successive directions do not necessarily form a mutually orthogonal set. The M mutually orthogonal directions are the basis for the success of this technique. Moreover, unlike the other optimum search procedures this method does not require any derivatives of the functions to be minimized. The basic elements of the Rosenbrock algorithm are as follows:

a) Step Size: The step size in a given direction is chosen by specifying an arbitrary magnitude h and then, if a step h decreases the value of the function (for a minimization problem), h is multiplied by a constant

 $(\alpha>1)$ . If the value of the function increases, h is multiplied by a constant -  $\beta(0 \le \beta \le 1)$ . h should be on the order of one percent of the average magnitude of the variables. To determine the values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , a series of trials using various values of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  should be made for a given class of functions for which the function to be minimized belongs.

b) Direction: The Rosenbrock algorithm uses M mutually orthogonal directions  $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_M$  at each stage rather than choosing a single direction in which to progress. Therefore, a search is made in each orthogonal direction before the next step is chosen (at least, one trial has been successful - a value less than or equal to the old value - and one has failed in each direction).

There are three cases to consider:

- i) The first trial is a success.
- ii) The first trial is a failure and the second trial is a success.
- iii) The first trial is a failure and the second trial is a failure.

For a start, let  $[D^0] = [U]$  (identity matrix) where  $d_1^0, d_2^0, \ldots, d_M^0$ are individual directions in which steps are to be taken. The search technique progresses as follows (for one variable  $x_1$ ):

1) A step is taken in the direction  $d^0$  from an initial point  $x^0$  $x^1 = h (x^0, d_1^0)$ .

2) If  $f(x^1) < f(x^0)$ , the step is successful and the step size is multiplied by  $\alpha$  again and again until a failure is recorded. After this failure, the result of the last successful trial and the number of successful trials is stored.

3) If  $f(x^1) > f(x^0)$  on the first trial, a failure results and the sign of the step size h is changed and the search continues as in (2).

4) If  $f(x^1) > f(x^0)$  and  $f(x^2) > f(x^0)$ , the second and further trials are determined by multiplying h by minus  $\beta$  until a success is recorded. After a search has been made for each variable in all directions  $d_1^0$ , a new  $[D^1]$  is determined. Let  $g_i$  be the algebric sum of all the successful steps  $h_i$  in the direction  $d_i^0$ . Then the first element  $d_1^1$  of  $[D^1]$  is chosen as the vector sum of all the vectors  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i d_i^0$ . The other elements of  $[D^1]$  are determined using the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure. Let

> $A_{1} = g_{1}d_{1}^{0} + g_{2}d_{2}^{0} + \dots + g_{M}d_{M}^{0}$  $A_{2} = g_{2}d_{2}^{0} + \dots + g_{M}d_{M}^{0}$

where  $A_1$  is the vector joining the initial and final points obtained by the sum of vectors  $d_1^0$ , and  $A_2$  is the sum of the successes achieved in the directions

other than the first and so on. Then from the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure



So for the second iteration the searches are made in M orthogonal directions of  $[D^1]$ . The process is continued until a convergence criterion is satisfied. The computer program listing for this procedure is listed below.

```
1070 SUBROUTINE ROTATE(X,N,VF,U,H,VV,NFIRST)
1080 dimension d(39),x(30),u(30,30),a(30,30),b(30),un(30,30),ns(40)
1090 bb=0.5
1100 aa=3.0
1110 if(nfirst-1) 15,15,17
1120 15 do 24 i=1,n
1130 d(i)=0.0
1140 do 25 j=1,n
1150 25 u(i,j)=0.0
1160 24 u(i,i)=1.0
1170 vv=vf(x)
1180 17 do 1 j=1,n
1190 ns(j)=0
```

1200 1=1 1210 e=h 1220 vvt=vv 1230 2 do 3 i=1,n 1240 3 b(i)=x(i)+e\*u(j,i) 1250 dv=vf(b)-vv 1260 vv=vv+dv 1270 so to (4,5,26,27),1 1280 4 1=3 1290 if(dv) 28,28,29 1300 29 1=2 1310 vv=vv-dv 1320 e=-h 1330 so to 2 1340 5 1=3 1350 if(dv) 28,28,35 1360 35 1=4 1370 41 if(ns(j)+20) 44,44,47 1380 47 e=-bb\*e 1390 ns(j)=ns(j)-1 1400 so to 2 1410 28 e=aa\*e 1420 ns(j)=ns(j)+1 1430 so to 2 1440 26 if(dv) 28,28,42 1450 42 e=e/aa 1460 vv=vv-dv 1470 go to 44 1480 27 dv=vvt-vv 1490 if(dv)41,41,44 1500 44 do 45 i=1,n 1510 45 x(i)=x(i)+e\*u(j,i) 1520 1 d(j)=e 1530 do 9 m=1,n 1540 c=0.0 1550 do 6 i=1,n 1560 zz=0.0 1570 do 7 j=m,n 1580 7 zz=zz+d(j)\*u(j,i) 1590 if (m-1) 32,32,8 1600 8 mm=m-1 1610 do 11 j=1,mm 1620 z=0. 1630 do 12 k=1,n 1640 v=0. 1650 do 13 1=m,n 1660 13 v=v+d(1)\*u(1,k) 1670 12 z=z+v\*un(j+k) 1680 a(m,j)=z 1690 11 continue

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

```
1700 do 14 j=1,mm
1710 14 zz=zz-a(m,j)*un(j,i)
1720 32 b(i)=zz
1730 6 c=c+zz*zz
1740 c=1./sart(c)
1750 do 10 i=1,n
1760 10 un(m,i)=c*b(i)
1770 9 continue
1780 do 18 i=1,n
1790 b(i)=0.0
1800 do 19 j=1,n
1810 19 u(i,j)=un(i,j)
1820 18 continue
1830 return
1840 end
```

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

#### APPENDIX B - COMPUTER PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The user-oriented computer program consists of a main program which supplies all the necessary data required for the execution of the computer program and subprograms. The first subprogram FUN in this case, defines the function to be minimized and the second subprogram ROTATE is the optimization method due to Rosenbrock. The latter is described in Appendix A.

The main program supplies all the input data. The input data consist of the following statements. Statement number 40 provides the value for N (as shown in Fig. 1) through MNE.

Statement numbers 90-120 provide the initial guess for the excitations of the electromagnetic emitters in the first N8 elements of the array Y. The elements of Y(I) are defined in the following manner:

> $a_{1} = 0.5 [Y(1) + Y(2)]$   $b_{1} = 0.5 [Y(3) + Y(4)]$   $a_{-1} = 0.5 [Y(2) + Y(1)]$  $b_{-1} = 0.5 [Y(3) - Y(4)]$

BER AVAILABLE COPY

and so on. The statement number 130 provides the initial guess for the inter-emitter spacing for the array through Y(N9).

Statement number 150 defines the value of  $\frac{2L}{A}$  through the constant SLOPE.

Statement numbers 170-180 define the angle window over which the desired slope is to be achieved. MP provides the start of the angle window in degrees and MQ is the last angle of the window, taken at steps

of MR degrees. It is not necessary to have the window symmetrically placed around the z-axis of Fig. 1.

Statement number 250 specifies the maximum number of iterations to be made by the optimization method to yield the final result.

Statements 390, 400 and 480 provide the excitations for the array elements and 490 prints the value for the interelement spacing and the value of the function through VFVAL at the end of each iteration.

580 prints the slope, the magnitude and phase for the far field within the specified window. This is done at the end of the final iteration.

Statement 650 defines the constraint imposed on the inter-element spacing. For this problem interelement spacing cannot be less than or equal to  $0.4\lambda$ .

The program as presented represents a 3 element array for MNE=1. So for a 2-element array the necessary modifications of the program are as follows. The statements 450-490, 870-880 should be deleted. Statement 80 should read N9 = N7. Statement 641 should be introduced to read N9 = N7. In statement 650, the contraint should be changed to half the interelement spacing desired. For example, if the problem be such that the interelement spacing for a 2 element array be restricted to be greater than or equal to  $0.5 \lambda$  then  $Y(N9) \ge 0.25$ .

The computer program listing is presented below.

10 EXTERNAL FUN 20 COMMON /AJ/MP, MQ, MR, MS, SLOPE, MNE, N7, NB, N9, CC 30 DIMENSION Y(30), AXES(30, 30) 40 MNE=3 50 N6=4\*MNE 60 N7=N6+1 70 NB=N7+1 80 N9=N8+1 90 Y(1)=1.0 100 Y(2)=0.01 BEST AVAILABLE COPY

110 DO 11 I=3,N8 120 11 Y(I)=0. 130 Y(N9)=0.7 140 H=0.01 150 SLOPE=16 160 FF=180./3.14159263 170 MP=177 180 MQ=183 190 MR=1 200 MS=0 210 J=1 220 NQ=N9 230 FRINT 189, MNE, MP, MQ, SLOPE, Y(N9) 240 189 FORMAT( \*0 \*,319,2F10.5) 250 DO 2 II=1,10 260 CALL ROTATE (Y,NQ,FUN,AXES,H,VFVAL,J) 270 NN=1 280 CC=0 290 DO 23 NL=1, MNE 300 A1=0.5\*(Y(NN)+Y(NN+1)) 310 B1=0.5\*(Y(NN+2)+Y(NN+3)) 320 A2=0.5\*(Y(NN+1)-Y(NN)) 330 B2=0.5\*(Y(NN+2)-Y(NN+3)) 340 C1=SQRT(A1\*A1+B1\*B1) 350 C2=SQRT(A2\*A2+B2\*B2) 360 D1=FF\*ATAN2(B1,A1) 370 D2=PP\*ATAN2(B2,A2) 380 CC=CC+C1\*C1+C2\*C2 390 FRINT 108, NL, A1, B1, C1, D1 400 FRINT 108,-NL,A2,B2,C2,D2 410 108 FORMAT(\* \*, 15, 4F15.5) 420 NN=NN+4 430 23 CONTINUE 440 NL=0 450 C1=SQRT(Y(N7)\*Y(N7)+Y(N8)\*Y(N8)) 460 D1=PP\*ATAN2(Y(N8),Y(N7)) 470 CC=SQRT(CC+C1\*C1) 480 PRINT 108,NL,Y(N7),Y(N8),C1,D1 490 PRINT 100,Y(N9),VFVAL 500 IF (VFVAL.EQ.0.) GO TO 5 510 100 FORMAT(\* \*,4F15.7) 520 J=J+1 530 2 CONTINUE 540 5 MS=1 550 MP=MP-3 560 MQ=MQ+3 570 MR=1 580 ZZ=FUN(Y) 590 6 CONTINUE 600 STOP 610 END

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ISA MAV

```
620 FUNCTION
               FUN(Y)
630 DIMENSION Y(30)
640 COMMON /AJ/MP, MQ, MR, MS, SLOPE, MNE, N7, N8, N9, CC
650 IF(Y(N9).LE.0.4) GO TO 4
660 DO 12 I=1,N9
670 12 IF(ABS(Y(I)).GT.10.)GO TO 4
680 FUN=0.
690 DO 1 I=MP, MQ, MR
700 PI=0.0174533*FLOAT(I)
710 PHI=6.283186*SIN(PI)*Y(N9)
720 UP=0.0
730 DN=0.0
740 NN=1
750 U1=0.
760 13=0.
770 DO 2 N=1, MNE
780 THT=N*PHI
790 CT=COS(THT)
800 ST=SIN(THT)
810 UP=UP+Y(NN)*ST+Y(NN+2)*CT
820 DN=DN+Y(NN+1)*CT-Y(NN+3)*ST
830 U1=U1+N*(Y(NN)*CT-Y(NN+2)*ST)
840 U3=U3+N*(Y(NN+1)*ST+Y(NN+3)*CT)
850 NN=NN+4
860 2 CONTINUE
870 UP=UP+Y(N8)
880 DN=DN+Y(N7)
890 SP=COS(PI)*(U1*DN+U3*UP)/(UP*UP+DN*DN)
900 SP=SP/FLOAT(MNE)
910 IF (MS.EQ.1) GO TO 11
920 SP=ABS(SP)
930 IF(SP.LT.SLOPE) FUN=FUN+SLOPE-SP
940 GO TO 1
950 11 AAG=SQRT(UP*UP+DN*DN)
960 AAG=AAG/CC
970 AAG=20 XALOG10(AAG)
980 SR=ATAN2(UP, DN)
990 SI=180./3.14159263*SR
1000 PRINT 101, I, AAG, SI, SP
1010 101 FORMAT(" ",15,3F15.3)
1020 1 CONTINUE
1030 RETURN
1040 4 FUN=100.
1050 RETURN
1060 END
```



#### APPENDIX C - COMPLEX EXCITATIONS OF THE OPTIMIZED ARRAY

The complex excitations of the electromagnetic emitters that yield a prescribed slope of the phase of the far-field pattern are presented in this section.

The complex excitations required to yield the far-field pattern presented in Figure 4 are as follows:

<sup>a</sup> 1	=	0.087	12.20
a1	-	0.034	4.96°
a	=	0.093	-171.34°

Similarly for the field pattern for the 2 element array presented in Figure 5, the excitations are as follows:

<sup>a</sup> 1	-	0.165	8.37°
a_1	-	0.062	-171.63°

For Figure 7, the excitations are:

<sup>a</sup> 1	=	.111	L2.52°
a1	-	0.069	177.91°
a <sub>0</sub>	-	0.014	[164.35°

The corresponding excitations for Figure 8 are:

$$a_1 = 0.132$$
 [0.29°  
 $a_{-1} = 0.095$  [178.92°

Finally the complex excitations required for a 7 element array to yield point B in Figure 9 are as follows:

<sup>a</sup> 1	-	0.096	6.95
a1	-	0.082	<u>-175.34</u> °
a2	-	0.043	<u>-164.99</u> °
a2	-	0.045	<u> -5.58</u> °
a3	-	0.017	-84.82°
a_3	-	0.004	-72.45°
a <sub>0</sub>	-	0.032	124.42°

N. C. Martin