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Abstract—A full-wave moment method implementation, using a combination of spatial and spectral domains, is developed for the analysis of quasi-optical systems. An electric field dyadic Green's function, including resonant and nonresonant terms corresponding to coupling from modal and nonmodal fields, is employed in a Galerkin routine. The dyadic Green's function is derived by separately considering paraxial and nonparaxial fields and is much easier to develop than a mixed, scalar and vector, potential Green's function. The driving point impedance of several antenna elements in a quasi-optical open cavity resonator and a 3 × 3 grid in free space are computed and compared with measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

QUASI-OPTICAL power combining techniques provide a means for combining power from numerous solid-state millimeter-wave sources attached to radiating elements such as antenna arrays or grids, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The power from the radiating elements is combined in free-space over a distance of many wavelengths to channel power predominately into a single paraxial mode. The complex device field interactions render it difficult to optimize efficiencies and ensure stable operation. However, computer aided analysis techniques are evolving to aid in design. The strategy is to develop, using numerical field analysis, a multiport impedance model of the linear part of the quasi-optical system. This can then be interfaced with commercial microwave circuit simulators. Efficiency requires that volumetric discretization must be avoided. By utilizing Green's functions appropriate to the physical structure, discretization can be limited to surfaces. In [1]–[4] a series of developments culminated in a straightforward methodology for developing the dyadic Green's function of a quasi-optical structure. The dyadic Green's function is derived by separately considering paraxial and nonparaxial fields. It is not feasible to derive a mixed, scalar and vector, potential Green's function, as required in conventional space domain moment method techniques. As an alternative, we have adapted an efficient moment method field solver [5], [6] to use dyadic Green's functions.

The modeling of quasi-optical systems has generally been based on the unit cell approach [7], [8] where the minimum three dimensional cell of an array, generally containing a single active device, is modeled using symmetry of the structure to establish electrical and magnetic side-walls for the cell. A moment method or finite element program is then used to electrically characterize the cell and obtain the impedance presented to a single device. The unit cell approach assumes an infinitely periodic structure with no mutual coupling. In order to obtain accurate modeling, structures of finite extent must be considered along with mutual coupling. In this paper we introduce a moment method technique [9] using a dyadic Green's function which describes all of the electric fields, including paraxial and nonparaxial fields, for radiating elements of finite size in an open cavity resonator and for a 3 × 3 grid in free space. Mutual coupling from all of the elements in the quasi-optical systems are considered.

II. OPEN CAVITY RESONATOR DYADIC GREEN'S FUNCTION

A. General Description

A dyadic Green's function for the plano-concave quasi-optical open cavity resonator was developed by Heron et al. [2]–[4]. The cavity resonator, shown in Fig. 1, consists of a planar reflector at \( z = 0 \) and a partially transmitting spherical reflector with its center located at \( z = D \). The planar reflector is assumed to be perfectly conducting with infinite dimensions in the transverse direction and the spherical reflector is of finite dimension with focal length with respect to the \( x \) and \( y \) axis, \( F_x \) and \( F_y \), respectively. The medium in the cavity is free space. The electric field dyadic Green's function of the open cavity resonator is derived in two parts [3], [4]

\[
\mathbf{G}_E = \mathbf{G}_{E_n} + \mathbf{G}_{E_r}
\]

(1)
where $\tilde{G}_{Er}$ describes the effect of the resonator (cavity) modal fields and $\tilde{G}_{En}$ describes the nonresonator fields. The nonresonator fields are found by removing the paraxial component $\tilde{G}_{Ep}$ from the half-space Green’s function, $\tilde{G}_{Eh}$, to give

$$\tilde{G}_E = \tilde{G}_{Eh} - \tilde{G}_{Ep} + \tilde{G}_{Er}. \quad (2)$$

The Green’s function is evaluated in two parts

$$\tilde{G}_E = \tilde{G}_{Ec} + \tilde{G}_{Eh} \quad (3)$$

where $\tilde{G}_{Ec} = \tilde{G}_{Eh} - \tilde{G}_{Ep}$ represents the cavity contribution of the open cavity resonator and $\tilde{G}_{Eh}$ represents the half-space (direct radiation) contribution. However, $\tilde{G}_{Eh}$, as presented in [3], is not suitable for inclusion in a moment method field solver because of numerical problems. We develop here a half-space dyadic Green’s function in the spectral domain which has both the required numerical stability and compatibility with the cavity dyadic Green’s function. The development of $\tilde{G}_{Ec}$ is based on that described in [2].

### B. Cavity Contribution

The cavity resonant dyadic Green’s function $\tilde{G}_{Ec}$ describes the coupling between an electric current source, located on the plane $z = d$, and the cavity modal fields in the cavity whereas the paraxial dyadic Green’s function $\tilde{G}_{Ep}$ describes the paraxial propagation due to the traveling wave-beams in the absence of the spherical reflector. With the subtraction of the paraxial components from the resonator components, the dyadic Green’s function, for the range $0 < z < D$, is given by [3]

$$\tilde{G}_{Ec} = -\sum_{m=0}^{N_m} \sum_{n=0}^{N_n} \frac{R_{mn} \psi_{mn}}{2(1 + R_{mn} \psi_{mn})} \cdot (E_{mn} - E_{mn}^+) \cdot (E_{mn} - E_{mn}^+) \tilde{I}_1 \quad (4)$$

where $N_m$ and $N_n$ represent the number of transverse modes and $\tilde{I}_1 = \tilde{a}_x \tilde{a}_x + \tilde{a}_y \tilde{a}_y$ is the unit transverse dyad. Primed coordinates denote the source location and unprimed coordinates denote the test location. The terms $R_{mn}$ and $\psi_{mn}$ represent the reflection coefficient and phase, respectively, of the traveling wave-beam modes. The scalar electric modal field $E_{mn}$ is given by the Hermite-Gaussian traveling wave-beam as [10]

$$E_{mn}(x, y, z) = \sqrt{\frac{Z_0}{\pi X Y m! n!}} (1 + u^2)^{-1/4} (1 + v^2)^{-1/4} \cdot H_m(\sqrt{2}x/x_0) H_n(\sqrt{2}y/y_0) \cdot \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[ (x/x_0)^2 + (y/y_0)^2 \right] \right\} \cdot \exp \left\{ j \left[ k_0 z + \frac{1}{2} (u(x/x_0)^2 + v(y/y_0)^2) \right. \right.$$

$$\left. \left. - \left( m + \frac{1}{2} \right) \tan^{-1}(u) \right\} \right\}$$

where

$$u = \frac{x}{k_0 X^2}, \quad v = \frac{z}{k_0 Y^2}, \quad x_0^2 = X^2(1 + u^2), \quad y_0^2 = Y^2(1 + v^2)$$

with the Gaussian mode parameters defined as [10]

$$X^2 = \frac{1}{k_0} \sqrt{F_x D \left( 2 - \frac{D}{F_x} \right)} \quad (6)$$

$$Y^2 = \frac{1}{k_0} \sqrt{F_y D \left( 2 - \frac{D}{F_y} \right)} \quad (7)$$

The Gaussian mode parameters $X$ and $Y$ determine the rate at which the field strength decays in the $\tilde{a}_x$ and $\tilde{a}_y$ directions respectively. In the above expressions $Z_0$ and $k_0$ represent the free space impedance and wavenumber, respectively, given by

$$Z_0 = \frac{\mu_0}{\epsilon_0}, \quad k_0 = \omega \sqrt{\mu_0 \epsilon_0}.$$

The Hermite polynomials, defined in [11]

$$H_n(x) = (-1)^n \exp(x^2/2) \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \exp(-x^2/2)$$

are orthogonal functions. The $E_{mn}^\pm$ fields represent the desired wave-beam modes with the beam waist at $z = 0$. $E_{mn}^+$
refers to propagation in the positive \( \hat{a}_x \) direction and \( E_{mn} \) in the negative \( \hat{a}_y \) direction. An assumption is made that the electric field has only transverse components and no \( \hat{a}_z \) component (quasi-TEM modes). This assumption is valid since the spherical reflector has a radius of curvature much greater than the wavelength of operation. This approximation holds true especially near \( z = 0 \) where the phase front is flat and the fields are purely transverse. The antennas are sufficiently close to \( z = 0 \) (\( d << D \)) that the fields are approximately TEM.

The phase term \( \psi_{mn} \) is the ratio, for the \( mn \)th mode, of the intensity for each mode of the outgoing wave-beam to the incoming wave-beam evaluated at the spherical reflector surface, \( z = D \), given as

\[
\psi_{mn} = \frac{E_{mn}(x, y, D)}{E_{mn}(x, y, D)}.
\]

A good approximation for \( \psi_{mn} \) can be found by evaluating (9) at \( x = y = 0 \). At resonance, the phase of the traveling wave-beam should remain unchanged after one complete pass through the resonator so that the resonant frequency for each cavity mode occurs when the product \( R_{mn} \psi_{mn} \) in the cavity Green’s function (4) approaches \(-1\). For an \( mn \) transverse family there is an infinite number of resonant frequencies which we will index by \( q \) where \( q \) is the number of half wavelengths along the cavity axis. Thus the field structure in the cavity can be designated fully as TEM\(_{m,n,q}\).

C. Cavity Losses

For the open cavity resonator two types of losses are considered, conductor and diffraction losses which are due to the finite conductivity and aperture size of the spherical reflector, respectively. With the combination of these losses, the modal value for \( R_{mn} \) can be found as

\[
R_{mn} = -|\Gamma| \alpha_{d,mn}
\]

where \( \Gamma \) represents conductor losses and \( \alpha_{d,mn} \) represents diffraction losses and power extracted from the cavity. The reader is referred to [2] for techniques for the evaluation of (10).

D. Half-Space Green’s Function

The half-space is defined to be the region, \( z > 0 \), with the absence of the spherical reflector. A dyadic Green’s function in the spatial domain for this geometry is given in [12] as

\[
\tilde{G}_{EH}(r | r') = \frac{j \omega \mu_0}{k_0} \left( I_0 - \frac{\nabla I_0}{k_0^2} \right) \cdot (G_0(r | r') - G_0(r_i | r_i'))
\]

where \( G_0(r | r') \) is the free space Green’s function

\[
G_0(r | r') = e^{-jk_0 |r-r'|} \frac{4\pi |r-r'|}{4\pi |r-r'|}
\]

with the distance between source and test locations

\[
|r - r'| = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 + dz^2}
\]

and the distance between source and test locations due to the image of the ground plane

\[
|r - r'| = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2 + 4dz^2}.
\]

When the test location equals the source location, \( x = x' \) and \( y = y' \), the Green’s function exhibits a strong singularity. A singularity of this order can cause severe numerical error when trying to numerically integrate such a function. For this reason it is desirable to work in the spectral domain. The spectral domain Green’s functions are [13]

\[
\tilde{G}_{EH}^{\sigma_0}(k_z, k_y) = \frac{-Z_0}{2k_0} \left( k_z^2 - k_y^2 \right) (1 - e^{-j2k_zz})
\]

\[
\tilde{G}_{EH}^{\sigma_y}(k_z, k_y) = \frac{-Z_0}{2k_0} \left( k_z^2 - k_y^2 \right) (1 - e^{-j2k_yz})
\]

and

\[
\tilde{G}_{EH}^{\sigma_0}(k_z, k_y) = \frac{Z_0}{2k_0} \left( k_z k_y \right) (1 - e^{-j2k_zz})
\]

where

\[
k_z^2 = k_0^2 - k_x^2 - k_y^2, \quad \text{Im}(k_z) < 0.
\]

III. METHOD OF MOMENTS

A. General Formulation

The boundary value problem for the current distribution on the planar radiating elements in the quasi-optical system is formulated as an electric field integral equation (EFIE). From the boundary condition stating that the total tangential electric field on the antenna surface is zero

\[
\mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{inc}}(x, y) = \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{scat}}(x, y)
\]

where subscript \( t \) denotes the tangential components of the electric fields. \( \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{inc}} \) is the incident electric field and \( \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{scat}} \) is the scattered electric field. The incident field is the electric field produced by the source that is used to excite the antenna surface. The incident field \( \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{inc}} \) produces a surface current density \( \mathbf{J}_S \) on the patch surface which in turn produces a scattered field \( \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{scat}} \) where some of the field is coupled into the quasi-optical system and the rest of the field is radiated out of the system. The scattered field can be written in terms of a dyadic Green’s function

\[
\mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{scat}}(x, y) = \int_{y'} \int_{y'} \tilde{G}_{E} \cdot \mathbf{J}_S(x', y') \, dx' \, dy'.
\]

In order to solve for \( \mathbf{E}_{t}^{\text{scat}} \) in (20) an approximation for the unknown surface current density is needed. The unknown surface current density can be expanded in a set of \( N \) basis functions

\[
\mathbf{J}_S(x', y') = \sum_{i=1}^{N} I_i \mathbf{W}_i(x', y')
\]

where \( \mathbf{W}_i \) is the \( i \)th basis function and \( I_i \) is its unknown complex amplitude. The basis functions \( \mathbf{W}_i \) can represent currents in the \( x \) and \( y \) directions

\[
\mathbf{W}_i(x', y') = W_i^x(x')\hat{a}_x + W_i^y(y')\hat{a}_y.
\]
Substituting (21) into (20) and testing (19) with the same set of basis functions, known as the Galerkin method, yields a set of linear algebraic equations to be solved for the unknown currents \( I_i \)

\[
[Z][I] = [V] \tag{23}
\]

where the elements of the \( Z \) matrix are

\[
Z_{jix} = - \int_y \int_x \int_{y'} \int_{x'} W_j(x, y) \cdot \tilde{G}_{Ec}(x, y; x', y') \cdot \tilde{W}_i(x', y') dx' dy' dx dy \tag{24}
\]

and the elements of \( V \) are

\[
V_j = \int_y \int_x W_j(x, y) \cdot E_{inc}^e(x, y) dx \tag{25}
\]

**B. Open Cavity Resonator**

With the dyadic Green’s function for the open cavity resonator being comprised of cavity and half-space contributions, it is best to work with the moment matrix elements in the same manner

\[
Z_{ji} = Z_{c,ji} + Z_{h,ji} \tag{26}
\]

where \( Z_c \) and \( Z_h \) represent the cavity and half-space contributions, respectively, with elements given by

\[
Z_{c,ji} = - \int_y \int_x \int_{y'} \int_{x'} W_j(x, y) \cdot \tilde{G}_{Ec}(x, y; x', y') \cdot \tilde{W}_i(x', y') dx' dy' dx dy \tag{27}
\]

and

\[
Z_{h,ji} = - \int_y \int_x \int_{y'} \int_{x'} W_j(x, y) \cdot \tilde{G}_{EH}(x \mid x'; y \mid y') \cdot \tilde{W}_i(x', y') dx' dy' dx dy. \tag{28}
\]

It is important to note that \( \tilde{G}_{Ec} \) in (27) is not a function of the distance between the source and test location whereas \( \tilde{G}_{EH} \) in (28) is a function of this distance. The final set of linear equations when solving for the \( x \) and \( y \) currents becomes

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
Z_{xx}^e \\
Z_{xy}^e \\
Z_{yx}^e \\
Z_{yy}^e
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
I_x^e \\
I_y^e
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
[V]_x \\
[V]_y
\end{pmatrix}
\tag{29}
\]

where

\[
Z_{xx}^e = Z_{c,xx}^e + Z_{h,xx}^e, \quad Z_{xy}^e = Z_{c,xy}^e + Z_{h,xy}^e, \quad Z_{yx}^e = Z_{c,yx}^e + Z_{h,yx}^e, \quad Z_{yy}^e = Z_{c,yy}^e + Z_{h,yy}^e.
\]

\[
Z_{ll} = Z_{c,ll} + Z_{h,ll}, \quad j,k = 1, 2, \ldots, N_c \quad \text{and} \quad l,k = N_x + 1, N_x + 2, \ldots, N \quad \text{with} \quad N = N_x + N_y.
\]

\( N_x \) and \( N_y \) are the number of \( x \)- and \( y \)-directed basis functions, respectively. The submatrix \( [Z]_{ll} \) denotes the contribution of \( m \)-directed testing of the field produced by \( m \)-directed current basis elements and the subscripts \( l \) and \( s \) refer to the individual test and source basis elements, respectively. The voltage vectors \( [V]_{l} \) and \( [V]_{s} \) of length \( N_x \) and \( N_y \), respectively, correspond to \( x \)- and \( y \)-directed testing of the incident field. Similarly, \( [I]_{l} \) and \( [I]_{s} \) refer to the current expansion coefficients associated with each source basis function. The moment matrix \( [Z] \) is a square matrix of order \( N \) which is symmetrical (due to the Galerkin method) and diagonally strong.

Sinusoidal basis functions are used for the current expansion and testing functions. An \( x \)-directed sinusoidal basis function centered at \( (x_i, y_i) \) is shown in Fig. 3 for a cell size of \( a \times b \) and is given by

\[
W_i^x(x) = \begin{cases} \sin \left( \frac{\sin(b(x-x_i))}{b \sin(\alpha b)} \right), & |x-x_i| \leq a \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{30}
\]

and for a \( y \)-directed sinusoidal basis function

\[
W_i^y(y) = \begin{cases} \sin \left( \frac{\sin(a(y-y_i))}{a \sin(\beta a)} \right), & |y-y_i| \leq b \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{31}
\]

A basis function is spanned over two rectangular cells and the current amplitudes \( I_i \) are computed at the peak of each basis function as shown in Fig. 4.
For a grid divided into equal size rectangular cells of dimension $a \times b$, the moment matrix elements for the cavity contribution are found by substituting the Green's function given in (4) into (27) yielding

$$Z_{c,jl} = \sum_{m=0}^{N_m} \sum_{n=0}^{N_n} \frac{R_{mn} \psi_{mn}}{2(1 + R_{mn} \psi_{mn})}$$

$$\int_{y_{l_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_1} - a}^{x_{l_1} + a} W^x_{y_l}(x') \cdot \left[ E_{mn}^-(x', y', d) - E_{mn}^+(x', y', d) \right] \, dx' \, dy'$$

$$\int_{y_{l_2} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_2} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_2} - a}^{x_{l_2} + a} W^y_{y_l}(y') \cdot \left[ E_{mn}^-(x, y, d) - E_{mn}^+(x, y, d) \right] \, dx \, dy.$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

and

$$Z_{c,kl} = \sum_{m=0}^{N_m} \sum_{n=0}^{N_n} \frac{R_{mn} \psi_{mn}}{2(1 + R_{mn} \psi_{mn})}$$

$$\int_{y_{k_1} - b}^{y_{k_1} + b} \int_{x_{k_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{x_{k_1} + \frac{b}{2}} W^x_{y_k}(y') \cdot \left[ E_{mn}^-(x', y', d) - E_{mn}^+(x', y', d) \right] \, dx' \, dy'$$

$$\int_{y_{k_2} - b}^{y_{k_2} + b} \int_{x_{k_2} - \frac{b}{2}}^{x_{k_2} + \frac{b}{2}} W^y_{y_k}(y) \cdot \left[ E_{mn}^-(x, y, d) - E_{mn}^+(x, y, d) \right] \, dx \, dy.$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

The elements are calculated on the plane $z = d$ and contain no cross-terms. Since the Green's function given in (4) is a function of the source and test location and not the distance between the two, the four dimensional integration can be divided into two separate double integrations over the source and test fields. The double integration can be computed very efficiently and has no convergence problems. Since the elements are a sum of all the modes being considered, it is most efficient to combine separate computations of the double integration for each mode.

The moment matrix elements for the half-space having equal size cells of dimension $a \times b$ are found from (28) as

$$Z_{h,jl} = -\int_{y_{j_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{j_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{j_1} - a}^{x_{j_1} + a} \int_{y_{l_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_1} - a}^{x_{l_1} + a} G^x_{Eh}(x | x', y | y')$$

$$\cdot W^x_{j_l}(x) W^x_{l_j}(x') \, dx' \, dy' \, dx \, dy$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

$$Z_{h,kl} = -\int_{y_{k_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{k_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{k_1} - a}^{x_{k_1} + a} \int_{y_{l_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_1} - a}^{x_{l_1} + a} G^y_{Eh}(x | x', y | y')$$

$$\cdot W^y_{j_l}(x) W^y_{l_j}(y') \, dx' \, dy' \, dx \, dy.$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

$$Z_{h,jl} = -\int_{y_{j_1} - b}^{y_{j_1} + b} \int_{x_{j_1} + \frac{b}{2}}^{x_{j_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{y_{l_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_1} - a}^{x_{l_1} + a} G^x_{Eh}(x | x', y | y')$$

$$\cdot W^x_{j_l}(x') W^x_{l_j}(x') \, dx' \, dy' \, dx \, dy.$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

$$Z_{h,kl} = -\int_{y_{k_1} - b}^{y_{k_1} + b} \int_{x_{k_1} + \frac{b}{2}}^{x_{k_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{y_{l_1} - \frac{b}{2}}^{y_{l_1} + \frac{b}{2}} \int_{x_{l_1} - a}^{x_{l_1} + a} G^y_{Eh}(x | x', y | y')$$

$$\cdot W^y_{j_l}(y) W^y_{l_j}(y') \, dx' \, dy' \, dx \, dy.$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

As mentioned earlier direct evaluation of (34) and (37) would be very difficult due to the singularity that occurs when the source and test location are at the same point (self-term). The self-terms are the dominate terms in the moment matrix and inaccurate evaluation of these terms will result in unreliable solutions. For the cross terms (35) and (36) no singularity occurs because the source and test fields are never at the same location, but direct evaluation is still difficult due to the four integrations required. With these problems it is best to work in the spectral domain.

The dyadic Green's function for the half-space can be written as the inverse Fourier transform of

$$\hat{G}_{EH}(x | x'; y | y') = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{G}_{EH}(k_x, k_y)$$

$$\cdot e^{ik_x(x-x')} e^{ik_y(y-y')} \, dk_x \, dk_y.$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)
Fig. 6. Driving point impedance of the inverted L antenna for the TEM$_{0,0.25}$ mode. (a) Magnitude. (b) Phase. Solid line, simulation; dashed line, measurement.

Applying (38) to (34)–(37) and using the even and odd properties of the integrands along with a transformation to polar coordinates, $k_x = \beta \cos \alpha$ and $k_y = \beta \sin \alpha$, results in the following

$$Z_{hji}^x = -\frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty G_{Eh}^{xx}(k_x, k_y) \cdot F_{ji}^{xx}(k_x, k_y) \beta d\beta d\alpha$$

$$Z_{h,k}^y = -\frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty G_{Eh}^{yy}(k_x, k_y) \cdot F_{jk}^{yy}(k_x, k_y) \beta d\beta d\alpha$$

$$Z_{h,ij}^y = Z_{h,il}^x = -\frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty G_{Eh}^{xy}(k_x, k_y) \cdot F_{ji}^{yx}(k_x, k_y) \beta d\beta d\alpha$$

Fig. 7. Driving point impedance of the inverted L antenna for the TEM$_{1,0.25}$ and TEM$_{1,0.25}$ modes: (a) magnitude; (b) phase. Solid line, simulation; dashed line, measurement.

where

$$F_{ji}^{xx}(k_x, k_y) = \cos [k_x(x_j - x_i)] \cos [k_y(y_j - y_i)]$$

$$\cdot \left( \frac{2k_0}{\sin (k_0\alpha)} \right)^2 \left[ \sin (k_yb/2) \right]^2$$

$$\left( \cos (k_xa) - \cos (k_0\alpha) \right)^2$$

$$\left( \frac{k_0^2 - k_y^2}{k_0^2} \right)^2$$

$$F_{jk}^{yy}(k_x, k_y) = \cos [k_x(x_i - x_k)] \cos [k_y(y_i - y_k)]$$

$$\cdot \left( \frac{2k_0}{\sin (k_0\beta)} \right)^2 \left[ \sin (k_xa/2) \right]^2$$

$$\left( \cos (k_yb) - \cos (k_0\beta) \right)^2$$

$$\left( \frac{k_0^2 - k_x^2}{k_0^2} \right)^2$$
Fig. 8. A coaxial fed rectangular patch antenna.

\[ F_{jk}^{xy}(k_x, k_y) = \sin[k_x(x_j - x_k)] \sin[k_y(y_j - y_k)] \]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
-4k_0^2 \\
\sin(k_0a) \sin(k_0b) \\
\sin(k_0a/2) \sin(k_0b/2) \\
(k_0a/2) - (k_0b/2) \\
\cos(k_0a) - \cos(k_0b) \\
\frac{k_0^2 - k^2_x}{k_0^2 - k^2_y}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The driving point impedance at the location of the delta-gap voltage generator is computed as

\[ Z_{in} = \frac{V_p}{I_p} \quad (46) \]

where \( I_p \) is the current at the delta-gap computed by the method of moments.

IV. COMPARISON OF COMPUTED AND EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Inverted L Antenna

Comparisons of measured and simulated results were made for the open cavity structure shown in Fig. 1 with an electrically short inverted L antenna, shown in Fig. 5. The radii of focal lengths of the spherical reflector are \( F_0 = 0.894308 \) m, \( F_0 = 0.953839 \) m and \( D = 0.620494 \) m as determined in [2] and for the antenna the wire diameter is 0.9 mm and length \( L \) is 2.6 mm located at the planar reflector. The simulated results are virtually identical to those in [2]. Note that the previous work [2] is restricted to short wire antennas. For the simulation the \( L \) antenna was divided into 10 cells with a delta-gap source
placed between the first and second cells. The location of the antenna in the cavity was at $(-90.6 \text{ mm}, 15 \text{ mm})$ with $d = 1.9 \text{ mm}$. The magnitude and phase of the driving point impedance are shown in Fig. 6 for the $\text{TEM}_{0,0.35}$ mode and in Fig. 7 for the $\text{TEM}_{0,1.35}$ and $\text{TEM}_{1,0.35}$ modes (the $\text{TEM}_{0,1.35}$ mode occurs first in frequency and then the $\text{TEM}_{1,0.35}$ mode.)

B. Rectangular Patch Antenna

A measurement of a coaxial center fed rectangular patch antenna, shown in Fig. 8 with dimension $L = 15 \text{ mm}$, $W = 5 \text{ mm}$, and $d = 1 \text{ mm}$, was taken without the reflector. The driving point impedance is shown in Fig. 9. Here the patch was divided into 16 cells with a delta-gap source placed in the center.

C. $3 \times 3$ Grid in Free Space

Measurements and simulations were performed in free space for the $3 \times 3$ grid shown in Fig. 10. The grid consists of 9 unit cells where each unit cell is of dimension $51.8 \text{ mm} \times 51.8 \text{ mm}$ with the metallic grid lines having a length of $L = 42 \text{ mm}$ and a width of $W = 6.35 \text{ mm}$. The gap spacing where the active device would be was 9.8 mm. Fig. 11 shows the driving point reflection coefficient magnitude for an extended unit cell ($93.8 \text{ mm} \times 93.8 \text{ mm}$) with the same grid line width and gap spacing. Next the whole $3 \times 3$ grid structure was considered. Fig. 12 shows the driving point reflection coefficient magnitude in the center gap for the entire grid. From these results we can observe that there is significant mutual coupling between the grid elements. Measurements and simulations were also performed for the other gaps in the grid. The results indicate that the impedance for edge and corner gaps differs from that of the middle gap due to the finite extent of the grid. The technique presented here can calculate coupling parameters and location specific impedances which cannot be obtained using a unit cell approach.

V. CONCLUSION

A full-wave moment method implementation has been developed for the analysis of quasi-optical systems. This technique uses a dyadic Green’s function which is derived by separately considering the paraxial and nonparaxial fields. This form of the dyadic Green’s function is particularly convenient for quasi-optical systems because of its relative ease of development. This leads to computation of the moment matrix elements using a combination of spatial and spectral domains. Two types of quasi-optical systems were analyzed: the open cavity resonator, free space patch antenna resonator, and the grid radiator, where the radiating elements in each system were of finite size making no unit cell approximations. As a verification of the moment method, simulated results have been shown to compare favorably with measurements. The
technique presented here will aid in the design of quasi-optical systems by accurately predicting the driving point impedances of the radiating elements.
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