

## A Hybrid Method of FDTD(2,4) and Subgrid FDTD(2,2) for Modeling of Coupling

Stavros V. Georgakopoulos\*, Rosemary A. Renaut<sup>+</sup>, Constantine A. Balanis\*,  
Craig R. Birtcher\*, and Anastasios H. Panaretos\*

\*Dept. of Electrical Engineering  
Telecommunications Research Center  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287-7206

<sup>+</sup>Dept. of Mathematics  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287-1804

### 1 Introduction

The technological advancements of the last few decades have triggered new engineering problems and challenges. With the clock speed of all electronic equipment increasing communication systems operate at higher frequencies. Therefore, the antenna elements become smaller whereas the platforms they operate on, e.g., helicopter airframes, become electrically larger. These problems yield large computational domains and require significant computational resources, such as memory and execution time. Traditional finite methods (FDTD and FEM) are second-order accurate thereby restricting the size of the domains that can be handled efficiently.

Numerous attempts have been made in the field of FDTD research to minimize phase errors [1]. One of the most promising approaches is based on higher-order accuracy schemes [2]-[4]. Such schemes theoretically exhibit lower dispersion errors and can utilize coarser grids as compared to those needed to achieve comparable levels of accuracy with a second-order scheme.

The modeling of complex structures introduces additional challenges in high-order FDTD for the correct formulations of boundary conditions and discontinuities. The common method of dealing with these two issues is to implement one-sided higher-order finite differences. However, such one-sided stencils cause instabilities which are usually very difficult to resolve. Several papers have attempted to address these problems. In [5] time-stable boundary conditions for higher-order compact schemes were derived based on the summation-by-parts procedure, but only for one-dimensional hyperbolic problems. This approach was recently generalized to two-dimensional problems in [6]. All these methods, although promising, have not yet been verified for complex three-dimensional problems for which boundary conditions may be required not only on the external boundary of the computational space but also in the interior of the domain.

The proposed approach in this paper consists of combining a subgridding technique with a higher-order scheme. Subgridding techniques have been used in the past in the context of the standard FDTD [7]. These methods divide the simulation space into two separate grids; a fine one and a coarse one. Here, the subgridding method of [7] is used in conjunction with the second-order accurate in time and fourth-order accurate in space FDTD(2,4). On the fine grid the standard FDTD(2,2) is used to handle any of the fine features of the structure, whereas on the coarse grid FDTD(2,4) is used. Thus existing successfully-applied techniques in FDTD(2,2) for the incorporation of discontinuities, boundary conditions, and

thin features are available for use on the fine grid. On the coarse mesh, away from phenomena associated with the complex structure, FDTD(2,4) is used to mainly simulate the wave propagation in homogeneous media. Following, this approach high accuracy is obtained both around fine geometric features, such as thin wires, thin slots, etc., as well as in the wave propagation which is simulated by a higher-order scheme, i.e., FDTD(2,4).

## 2 Method and Results

The method developed here uses a modification of the subgridding technique of [7]. The boundary between the fine and the coarse grid is collocated with electric field components instead of magnetic field components. The ratio between the coarse and the fine grid cell sizes is chosen to be 1:3 as in [7]. This odd-ratio provides significant advantages, as discussed in [7]. A description of the hybridization procedure is given in [8].

To illustrate the accuracy of the hybrid FDTD(2,4)-Subgrid FDTD(2,2), a geometry of two monopole antennas mounted on a finite ground plane is analyzed. The specifications of the geometry are shown in Fig. 2, and the radius of the two monopoles is 0.60325 mm. The distance between the two monopoles was set to 32 cm so that it would be electrical large at the frequencies of interest [i.e., 32 cm is approximately 19 wavelengths ( $\lambda$ ) at 18 GHz].




Figure 1: Geometry of two monopoles on a ground plane.

Three test simulations were performed by using: 1) FDTD(2,2) with a cell size of 4 mm (or  $\lambda/4$  at 18 GHz), 2) FDTD(2,2) with a cell size of 1.67 mm (or  $\lambda/10$  at 18 GHz), and 3) the hybrid FDTD(2,4)-Subgrid FDTD(2,2) with a coarse grid cell size of 4 mm (or  $\lambda/4$  at 18 GHz) and a fine grid cell size  $4/3$  mm  $\approx$  1.334 mm (or  $\lambda/12$  at 18 GHz). These three simulations are labeled 1, 2, and 3 respectively. Notice that in simulation 3 a fine grid was applied around each wire and the rest of the space used a coarse grid. The fine grid extended two coarse grid cells (or six fine grid cells) around each wire. The radius of the monopoles was taken into account in all three simulations both along the wire (using a thin wire model) and the excitation (using a source based on the radial electric fields). The  $S$  parameters were computed by using the procedure described in [9]. To speed the simulation times all sources used a internal resistance of 50 ohms [9]. The results of the three simulations are illustrated in Fig. 2 where the  $S_{11}$  and  $S_{12}$  parameters of the two monopoles are compared against measurements performed in the Electromagnetic Anechoic Chamber facility (EMAC) at Arizona State University (ASU).  $S_{11}$  represents the reflection coefficient of the longest monopole (6 cm long) and  $S_{12}$  represents the coupling between the two monopoles. The accuracy of  $S_{11}$  is governed by the modeling of the wire and the discretization near the wire whereas the accuracy of  $S_{12}$  is governed by the accuracy of the

FDTD stencil used to simulate the wave propagation from one element to the other. For both  $S_{11}$  and  $S_{12}$  the computations of simulation 1 [FDTD(2,2) with  $\Delta x = 4$  mm] do not agree well with the measurements due to the poor discretization (only  $\lambda/4$  at 18 GHz). However, simulations 2 and 3 provided predictions that are in very good agreement with measurements. Simulation 2 used FDTD(2,2) and  $\Delta x = 1.67$  mm (or  $\lambda/10$  at 18 GHz) which is a good discretization of our structure. Simulation 3 used the hybrid FDTD(2,4)-Subgrid FDTD(2,2) and provided very good results for  $S_{11}$  since the discretization of the wires was done with a fine grid ( $\Delta x = 4/3$  mm or  $\lambda/12$  at 18 GHz). Furthermore, the hybrid FDTD(2,4)-Subgrid FDTD(2,2) computations for  $S_{12}$  were also accurate since the wave propagation from one element to the other was performed using the higher-order stencil FDTD(2,4), with  $\Delta x = 4$  mm (or  $\lambda/4$  at 18 GHz). Therefore, it can be concluded that in the hybrid approach the field variations around thin geometric features, such as wires, are captured using the standard FDTD(2,2) and the available sub-cell models on a fine grid. Moreover, the field propagation for large distances is accurately modeled by a higher-order FDTD stencil [FDTD(2,4) in our case] on a coarse grid.




Figure 2: (a)  $S_{11}$  of the 6 cm long monopole shown in Fig. 1. (b)  $S_{12}$  between the two monopoles shown in Fig. 1

For the computation of  $S$  parameters two simulations must be performed for each of our cases. The simulation times, as well as the memory requirements for each simulation, for cases 1, 2, and 3 are depicted and compared in Table 1. To obtain accurate results with FDTD(2,2), a cell size of 1.67 mm had to be used (case 2). This case required almost two and a half times more time, and three and a half times more memory than the respective time and memory of case 3, which used the hybrid FDTD(2,4)-Subgrid FDTD(2,2). It should be noted that the computational savings will be significantly larger in cases where the computational domain is electrically large in all three directions (in our geometry, see Fig. 2, the domain is electrically large along one direction only).

Table 1: Simulation times and memory requirements

Case	Simulation Time (min)	Memory (Mbytes)
1	15	3.5
2	118	14.0
3	48	3.9

## References

- [1] K. S. Kunz and L. Simpson, "A technique for increasing the resolution of finite-difference solutions of the Maxwell's equation," *IEEE Trans. Electromagn. Compat.*, vol. EMC-23, no. 4, pp. 419–422, 1981.
- [2] A. C. Cangellaris and R. Lee, "On the accuracy of numerical wave simulations based on finite methods," *J. Electromagnetic Waves and Applications*, vol. 6, no. 12, pp. 1635–1653, 1992.
- [3] J. Fang, *Time Domain Finite Difference Computation for Maxwell's Equations*. PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 1989.
- [4] M. F. Hadi and M. Piket-May, "A modified FDTD (2,4) scheme for modeling electrically large structures with high-phase accuracy," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 254–264, 1997.
- [5] M. H. Carpenter, D. Gottlieb, and S. Abarbanel, "Time-stable boundary conditions for finite-difference schemes solving hyperbolic systems: Methodology and application to high-order compact schemes," *J. Comput. Phys.*, vol. 111, pp. 220–236, 1994.
- [6] S. S. Abarbanel and A. E. Chertock, "Strict stability of high-order compact implicit finite-difference schemes: The role of boundary conditions for hyperbolic PDEs, I," *J. Comput. Phys.*, vol. 160, pp. 42–66, 2000.
- [7] M. W. Chevalier, R. J. Luebbers, and V. P. Cable, "FDTD local grid with material traverse," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 411–421, 1997.
- [8] S. V. Georgakopoulos, R. A. Renaut, C. A. Balanis, and C. R. Birtcher, "A hybrid fourth-order FDTD utilizing a second-order FDTD subgrid," *IEEE Microwave Wireless Components Lett.*, vol. 11, pp. 462–464, Nov. 2001.
- [9] S. V. Georgakopoulos, C. A. Balanis, and C. R. Birtcher, "Coupling between transmission line antennas: Analytic solution, FDTD, and measurements," *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propagat.*, vol. 47, pp. 978–985, June 1999.