

BEAM RECONFIGURATION OF LINEAR ANTENNA ARRAYS BY USING PARASITIC ELEMENTS AND GENETIC ALGORITHMS

J. A. Rodriguez⁽¹⁾, G. Franceschetti⁽²⁾, F. Ares⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾Radiating Systems Group, Department of Applied Physics, 15782, Univ. of Santiago de Compostela (Spain)
e-mails: (Ares) faares@usc.es - (Rodriguez) fatony@usc.es

⁽²⁾Dept. of Electronic Engineering, University of Naples, 80125 Napoli (Italy) and UCLA (USA)
e-mail: gfrance@unina.it

ABSTRACT

An innovative method for linear arrays beam configuration is presented. In the proposed method, every element of the linear array is connected to its feed through a switch, so it can be active or passive. Pattern reconfigurability is achieved by appropriately switching on or off the array elements. The optimal configuration of the switches for each of the radiated patterns as well the common voltages of the active elements is calculated by using a genetic algorithm. For each configuration, the currents in the driven and parasitic elements are determined, via their self and mutual impedances, by inversion of the impedance matrix. In the presented example, the method has been applied to a linear array of parallel dipoles that switches the power pattern from a pencil to a flat-topped beam.

1. INTRODUCTION

Antenna array pattern reconfiguration is usually achieved by changing the relative amplitudes and/or phases of the excitations of its radiating elements. However, this approach often requires the design of beam-forming networks of considerable complexity [1-5]. A recent work achieved pattern reconfiguration by performing a mechanical displacement of a parasitic array located in front of an active one [6]. The method calculates the currents in the driven and parasitic elements via their self and mutual impedances: their design leads to the desired radiation pattern change, thus achieving the antenna system reconfigurability. However, it has been found that the parasitic array must be very near to the driven array to obtain good results, which may complicate the implementation of the mechanical system that is required to move the parasitic dipoles. Besides, the method is not useful for applications that require real-time reconfigurability.

In this communication we present a method that performs antenna array pattern reconfiguration by appropriately switching on or off the array elements of an array composed of parallel dipoles. A “switched on” element is connected to the feed and performs as a driven element, whereas a “switched off” element is disconnected from the feed and performs as a parasitic

element. The required beam-forming network using this method is much simpler than in previous approaches of array pattern reconfiguration.




Figure 1. Geometry of the array of dipoles. For reference, a spherical system of co-ordinates (r, θ, ϕ) is also depicted, for subsequent computation of the radiated field.




Figure 2. Layout of the switched array.

2. THE ANTENNA

Consider a linear array composed by N $\lambda/2$ -dipoles parallel to the z axis and equispaced $\lambda/2$ along the x axis (Fig. 1). Each dipole is connected to the feed through a switch, so it can be active (with a voltage given by V_n) or passive, as Fig. 2 shows. Modifying the switches configuration changes the configuration (number and location) of driven/parasitic elements: accordingly, the current of both driven and parasitic dipoles are modified owing to the mutual coupling.

Computation of the radiation diagram requires evaluation of the current distribution. This can be accomplished by using the following matrix equation:

$$[V] = [Z][I] \Rightarrow [I] = [Z]^{-1} [V] \quad (1)$$

where $[V]$ is the (known) vector of the complex voltages applied to the driven and parasitic elements (see below), $[I]$ is the (unknown) vector of the relative complex excitations of both the driven and the parasitic elements, and $[Z]$ the impedance matrix. The entries of the latter are calculated by using a commercial software tool based on the method of moments [7] as far as the self-impedances Z_{nn} of centre-fed cylindrical dipoles are concerned, whereas the mutual impedances Z_{mn} are calculated using analytical expressions. Specifically, the mutual impedance Z_{mn} of two centre-fed dipoles with lengths $2l_m$ and $2l_n$ located at (x_m, y_m, z_m) and (x_n, y_n, z_n) were calculated using the expression given in [8, p. 332] for slender dipoles, when a sinusoidal current distribution is assumed:

$$Z_{mn} = A \int_{-l_n}^{l_n} \left(\frac{e^{-jkr_1}}{r_1} + \frac{e^{-jkr_2}}{r_2} - 2 \cos kl_n \frac{e^{-jkr}}{r} \right) \cdot \sin[k(l_n - |\zeta|) d\zeta] \quad (2)$$

where: $A = \frac{j30}{\sin kl_m \sin kl_n}$ [ohm]




Figure 3. Schematic representation of “extra port” method. a) Original dipole array: dipole 1: driven element, dipole 2: parasitic element; b) Current distribution on the dipoles when dipole 1 is excited; c) Definition of extra ports (dot points) on the parasitic dipole.

$$r = \left[(x_m - x_n)^2 + (y_m - y_n)^2 + (z_m - z_n + \zeta)^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

$$r_1 = \left[(x_m - x_n)^2 + (y_m - y_n)^2 + (z_m - z_n + \zeta - l_n)^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

$$r_2 = \left[(x_m - x_n)^2 + (y_m - y_n)^2 + (z_m - z_n + \zeta + l_n)^2 \right]^{1/2}$$

In this case, it is not worth calculating the mutual impedances by using the method of moments (MoM). As a matter of fact, we found that the values obtained with the expression (2) are quite similar to those obtained by the MoM. Besides, the latter method is not appropriate for its use in a genetic algorithm because it is very slow. Regarding to the self-impedances, since there are only two different dipoles (see next paragraph), they have been previously calculated using [7] and then tabulated on the genetic algorithm.

Since parasitic dipoles are disconnected from the feed, they have no input currents at their gaps. However if we set $I = 0$ for parasitic dipoles in (1), we are not taking into account their contribution to the radiated pattern. Although the input currents of the parasitic dipoles are zero, the driven elements induce currents along the arms of the parasitic dipoles that do contribute to the radiated pattern of the array. In order to calculate these currents correctly (and thus the radiated pattern), we have modelled every parasitic dipole using the “extra port” method described in [9]. In this method each parasitic dipole is divided into two sub-dipoles (each of length $\lambda/4$) and we define extra ports at the centre of each sub-dipole. A parasitic dipole with a zero input current is equivalent to two sub-dipoles with a zero voltage at their centres: a null voltage at the extra port yields a maximum current at this point that falls to the edges of each sub-dipoles (see Fig. 3): that is, by setting zero voltages at the extra ports, the current at the centre of the parasitic dipoles becomes negligible. By virtue of the above, the known quantities in the matrix equation (1) are the input voltages applied to the driven elements

and the input voltages, equal to zero, of each sub-dipole of the parasitic elements. The unknown quantities are the input currents of the active elements and the induced currents at the centre (input of extra ports) of each sub-dipole. Using the “extra port” method, the number of dipoles to compute is no longer N , but $N+P$, being P the number of parasitic dipoles (switched off), because we have to consider $N-P$ driven $\lambda/2$ -dipoles and $2P$ parasitic $\lambda/4$ -dipoles.

The resulting current distribution depends on: i) the configuration of the switches since it determines those dipoles that are performing as driven or parasitic elements; ii) the complex voltages $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{N-P}\}$ applied to the driven elements. These elements are the design parameters to compute the radiation diagram $F(\theta, \phi)$ of the considered antenna system by following the conventional approach:

$$F(\theta, \phi) = \sum_{m=1}^{N+P} I_m \exp\{jk(x_m \sin \theta \cos \phi + z_m \cos \theta)\} f_m(\theta) \quad (3)$$

with the m -th driven or parasitic dipole located at $(x_m, 0, z_m)$ and $f_m(\theta)$ being the element factor of dipole m with length $2l_m$ [8]:

$$f_m(\theta) = \frac{-2}{k \sin \theta} [\cos(kl_m \cos \theta) - \cos(kl_m)] \quad (4)$$

In equations (3) and (4), because of applying the “extra port” method, $z_m = 0$ and $2l_m = \lambda/2$ for driven dipoles, whereas $z_m = \pm\lambda/8$ and $2l_m = \lambda/4$ for parasitic ones. In the calculation of the radiation pattern, we assumed a sinusoidal distribution of current also on the $\lambda/4$ dipoles, as a result of numerical simulations performed by the MoM [7].

For two prescribed diagrams, a genetic algorithm [10] is used to calculate the optimal configuration of the

switches as well as the complex voltages of the driven elements to synthesise each pattern. It is noteworthy that the voltages of driven elements are common in both patterns. This method is capable of attaining additional desired features: in the presented example, the minimization of the maximum variation of active impedances of driven elements, $|\Delta \text{Re}(Z_n^A)|_{\max}$ and $|\Delta \text{Im}(Z_n^A)|_{\max}$, when the antenna switches between patterns, is implemented.

When a ground plane is placed behind the array ($y < 0$) to concentrate the radiation toward only one hemisphere of the space, the considerations from the image principle are applied to the self and mutual impedances evaluation. For a ground plane located $\lambda/4$ behind the array, the whole of the above analysis holds if Z_{nm} is replaced by $(Z_{nm} - Z_{nm}^{\prime\prime})$, where $Z_{nm}^{\prime\prime}$ is the mutual impedance between the n -th dipole and its image, and Z_{mm} is replaced by $(Z_{mm} - Z_{mm}^{\prime\prime})$, being $Z_{mm}^{\prime\prime}$ the mutual impedance between the n -th dipole and the image of the m -th dipole. The pattern of a dipole plus ground plane, in the half-space $y > 0$, is the pattern of an isolated dipole multiplied by the factor $2j \sin(kh \sin \theta \sin \phi)$ [8], therefore the expression of the element factor (4) must be replaced in this case by:

$$f_m(\theta) = \frac{-4j \sin(kh \sin \theta \sin \phi)}{k \sin \theta} [\cos(kl_m \cos \theta) - \cos(kl_m)] \quad (5)$$

where h is the distance from the dipoles to the ground plane.

The above described method has been validated by using the MoM [7]. Considering small antennas composed by a few driven and parasitic dipoles, we have found that the currents and the patterns obtained by using the proposed method are essentially the same than those obtained by using the MoM.




Figure 4. An example of the layout of the $(2N+2)$ -gene chromosome describing the configuration of the switches for both patterns and the amplitudes and phases of the complex voltages applied to the driven elements.

3. THE GENETIC ALGORITHM

For the purposes of optimization by a genetic algorithm, the design parameters can be described by a chromosome χ made up of $2N + 2$ genes (Fig. 4). The first two genes, each of length N bits, encode the configuration of the N switches of the antenna for each pattern (the value '1' indicates a driven element whereas the value '0' indicates a parasitic one). The additional $2N$ genes, each of length 6 bits, encode the N amplitudes and N phases of the complex voltages applied to driven elements.

The amplitudes $|V_n|$ of the N complex voltages are related to the bits of the gene by

$$|V_n| = 10^{-a/20}, \quad a = \sum_{q=1}^6 2^{q-3} h_{n+2}(q), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (6)$$

where $h_{n+2}(q)$ is the value of the q -th bit of the $(n+2)$ -th gene of the chromosome. Each gene thus encodes $|V_n|$ in steps of 0.25 dB in the range $[-15.75, 0]$ dB relative to the maximum amplitude.

The phases α_n of the N complex voltages are given in degrees by

$$\alpha_n = 22.5 \times \sum_{q=1}^6 2^{q-3} h_{n+N+2}(q), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (7)$$

so that the corresponding gene encodes α_n in steps of 5.625° .

Variations on this scheme can of course be introduced if desired; in the context in which this work was carried out, the use of a 6-bit code for $|V_n|$ and α_n was convenient for practical reasons related to implementation of beam-forming network using digital commercial attenuators and phase shifters, respectively. Note, however, that using too few bits will mean that the solution space is sampled too coarsely for effective optimizations, and that using too many bits may render the optimization process very slow.

For the example presented below, where the antenna switches the power pattern from a pencil to a flat-topped beam, optimization was performed to minimize a cost function $C(\chi)$ containing terms controlling the performance of both pencil and flat-topped beams achieved with a given chromosome χ :

$$C(\chi) = c_1 \Delta_p H(\Delta_p) + c_2 \Delta_{ft} H(\Delta_{ft}) + c_3 \Delta'_{ft} H(\Delta'_{ft}) \quad (8)$$

with:

$$\Delta_p = SLL_p^o(\chi) - SLL_p^d$$

$$\Delta_{ft} = SLL_{ft}^o(\chi) - SLL_{ft}^d$$

$$\Delta'_{ft} = Ripple_{ft}^o(\chi) - Ripple_{ft}^d$$

where H is the Heaviside step function that is used to penalize a maximum sidelobe level $SLL^o(\chi)$ or ripple level $Ripple_{ft}^o(\chi)$, of the patterns corresponding to χ , exceeding the specified tolerable level (SLL^d and $Ripple_{ft}^d$). The subscripts p and ft indicate the pencil beam and the flat-topped beam, respectively. The coefficients c_i determine the relative weight given to each term. Additional terms for parameters such as directivity, beamwidth, or variation of active impedances of driven elements when the antenna switches between patterns, could be also included in (8), if desired.

Calculations were performed using a program incorporating SUGAL modules [10]. It was found sufficient to use a population of 300 chromosomes. Population size was constant, with ranked replacement of parents bettered by their offspring. Offspring were generated by one-point crossover and the inclusion of one mutation of every chromosome. The final solution was obtained after 200 generations.

4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

As an example, we considered a 30-element linear array of parallel dipoles with a ground plane located $\lambda/4$ behind the array (at $y = -\lambda/4$, according to the geometry shown in Fig. 1). To reduce the number of variables in the optimisation process, all the design parameters are supposed to be symmetric with respect to the centre of the array.

This antenna will switch its radiation pattern from a pencil to a flat-topped broadside beam by using the switches configurations shown in Table 1 (as previously stated, the value '1' indicates a driven element whereas the value '0' indicates a parasitic one).

	$N-P$	Switches configuration
<i>Pencil beam</i>	28	1111111111101111101111111111
<i>Flat-topped beam</i>	8	000000001001011110100100000000

Table 1. Configurations of the switches for pencil and flat-topped beams. $N-P$ denotes the number of driven elements in each configuration.

Fig. 5 shows the pattern radiated by this antenna: a pencil beam with a -18.5 dB sidelobe level and a flat-topped beam pattern with 42 deg. beamwidth

measured at -3 dB, ± 0.6 dB of ripple and $SLL = -17.0$ dB. The maximum variation of the active impedance of driven elements obtained in this case is $|\Delta \text{Re}(Z_n^A)|_{\max} = 40.2 \Omega$ and $|\Delta \text{Im}(Z_n^A)|_{\max} = 47.6 \Omega$.




Figure 5. Patterns radiated in the $\theta = \pi/2$ plane by a 30-element linear array of dipoles using the switches configurations of Table 1. A ground plane is located $\lambda/4$ behind the driven array.

In a new optimization (whose data are not referred in the paper) the maximum variation of the active resistance can be greatly reduced to $|\Delta \text{Re}(Z_n^A)|_{\max} = 14.7 \Omega$, at the expense of increasing the variation of active reactance $|\Delta \text{Im}(Z_n^A)|_{\max} = 62.5 \Omega$ and slightly reducing the performance of the patterns (a pencil beam with -17.3 dB sidelobe level and a flat-topped beam with -16.6 dB sidelobe level and a ripple of ± 0.7 dB).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Above results show that, by means of a suitable genetic algorithm, beam reconfiguration using an array composed by parallel dipoles can be achieved without requiring the design of complex beamforming networks. The antenna changes the radiated pattern just by modifying the state of some switches that connects the dipoles to its feed. The method is useful for applications that require real-time reconfigurability.

In the presented example, the antenna switches the power pattern from a pencil to a flat-topped beam. However, the proposed technique may be applied to any other desired radiation pattern reconfiguration.

The method is easily generalized to planar arrays.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science under Project TEC2005-07985-C03-03.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Bucci O. M., Mazzarella G., and Panariello G., "Reconfigurable arrays by phase-only control", *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, Vol. 39, No. 7, pp. 919-925, 1991.
- [2] Dürr M., Trastoy A., and Ares F., "Multiple pattern linear antenna arrays with single prefixed amplitude distributions: modified Woodward-Lawson synthesis", *Electron. Lett.*, Vol. 36, No. 16, pp. 1345-1346, 2000.
- [3] Díaz X., Rodríguez J. A., Ares F., and Moreno E., "Design of phase-differentiated multiple-pattern antenna arrays", *Microw. Opt. Technol. Lett.*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 52-53, 2000.
- [4] Brégains J. C., Trastoy A., Ares F., and Moreno E., "Synthesis of multiple-pattern planar antenna arrays with single prefixed or jointly optimised amplitude distributions", *Microw. Opt. Technol. Lett.*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 74-78, 2002.
- [5] Trastoy A., Rahmat-Samii Y., Ares F., and Moreno E., "Two pattern linear array antenna: synthesis and analysis of tolerance", *IEE Proc., Microw. Antennas Propagat.*, Vol. 151, No. 2, pp. 127-130, 2004.
- [6] Rodríguez J. A., Trastoy A., Brégains Julio C., Ares F., and Franceschetti G., "Beam reconfiguration of linear arrays by using parasitic elements", *Electron. Lett.*, Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 131-133, 2006.
- [7] EM Software & Systems-S.A., *FEKO User's manual. Suite 5.1*, EMSS, 2005.
- [8] Elliott R. S., *Antenna Theory and Design, Revised Edition*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2003.
- [9] Xi Y. P., Fang D. G., Sun Y. X., and Chow Y. L., "Mutual coupling in a linear dipole array of finite size", *IEE Proc., Microw. Antennas Propagat.*, Vol. 152, No. 5, pp. 324-330, 2005.
- [10] Hunter A., *SUGAL Genetic Algorithm package v. 2.1*, University of Sunderland, England, 1995.