Highly efficient heterogeneous modal superposition method for the full-wave analysis of arbitrarily shaped H-plane structures fed through rectangular waveguides
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Abstract: A new fully modal characterisation procedure is proposed to reduce the number of unknowns needed to characterise the ports of an arbitrary H-plane device in rectangular waveguide, so that no equivalent currents will be involved in the characterisation of the ports. Moreover, since no currents are needed to characterise the ports, the weights of the scattered modes can be unknowns of the resulting system of equations. This is an important fact, since, to find the wanted modal weights, a subsequent projection step is not necessary anymore. The new method is then advantageous when compared to other hybrid alternatives in the literature, not only because the ports are solved using fewer unknowns, which is the main advantage of the proposal, but also because the scattering parameters can be computed directly, once the system of equations is posed.

1 Introduction

The use of hybrid techniques is not a new idea. In certain situations, for example when the problem is big compared to the wavelength of the excitation, it is possible to apply approximate expressions of Maxwell’s equations. These approximate expressions are easier to solve; this is the case of the geometrical theory of diffraction or the unified theory of diffraction. The first attempts of combining several solving techniques include one of these asymptotic formulations and another more rigorous numerical technique [1, 2]. Recently, some works still treat this topic because it is necessary to employ these asymptotic approximations of Maxwell’s equations when the problem is really large [3–5].

One of the most common techniques employed in developing hybrid formulations is mode-matching, which is a very fast but not a general approach. A very popular choice to combine with mode-matching is then the method of moments technique [1, 2]. A hybrid mode-matching and method of moments technique was recently published. This technique can be applied to solve arbitrarily shaped problems fed through one or more canonical waveguides, that is, a waveguide whose modes are known analytically. In [6], the ports of the problem are characterised by means of a single-current formulation; in other formulations [7] the ports are solved using both electric and magnetic currents. Thanks to this simplification, the weights of the scattered modes become unknowns of the resulting system of equations; this fact is exploited to achieve certain efficiency improvement.

In this paper, a fully modal characterisation of the ports is proposed, in opposition to the traditional two-currents based approach of [7] or the single-current based approach of [6].

This fully modal characterisation of the ports produces smaller systems of equations, so an additional efficiency improvement is achieved.

2 Problem formulation

In this section an arbitrarily shaped H-plane closed cavity fed through several canonical waveguides (see Fig. 1) is solved using a fully modal characterisation of the ports.

Obviously, the total reflected field towards medium I can be expressed in terms of the regressive modes of the rectangular waveguides that feed the ports

\[ E_{(x_i,y_i,z_i)}^{T,I} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_I} b_n E_{nI}^{T,I,\ast}(x_i,y_i)e^{j\beta_n z_i} \]

\[ H_{(x_i,y_i,z_i)}^{T,I} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_I} b_n H_{nI}^{T,I,\ast}(x_i,y_i)e^{j\beta_n z_i} \]
and the same is valid for the transversal fields, that is

$$
E^l_{(x_i, y_i, z_i)} = \bar{T}E^{T, l}_{(x_i, y_i, z_i)} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_i} b_n e^l_{n}(x_i, y_i)e^{j\beta_n z_i} \tag{3}
$$

$$
H^l_{(x_i, y_i, z_i)} = \bar{T}H^{T, l}_{(x_i, y_i, z_i)} = -\sum_{n=1}^{N_i} b_{n} h^l_{n}(x_i, y_i)e^{j\beta_n z_i} \tag{4}
$$

where

- $N_i$ is the number of modes considered for the $i$th port.
- $b_{n}$ is the weight associated to the $n$th mode emergent through the $i$th port.
- $e^l_{n}(x_i, y_i)$ are the regressive auto-vectors for the modes belonging to the waveguide of the $i$th port for the total electric/magnetic field.
- $\bar{T}$ is the projection matrix over the transversal coordinates of the $i$th port.
- $h^l_{n}(x_i, y_i)$ are the auto-vectors for the modes belonging to the waveguide of the $i$th port for the transversal electric/magnetic field.

If the modes of the cavity were known, the same could be done for the fields of medium II. The cavity that defines the medium II, however, is arbitrarily shaped, so the modes are not known. Fortunately, it is not necessary to know the modes of the cavity to modally characterise the ports.

In fact, if superposition is applied, it can be concluded that several modal sets can be simultaneously used to characterise the problem. Every modal set, of course, must accomplish by itself the Maxwell’s equations inside the cavity.

To see that this is possible the cavity contour has to be broken into pieces and a different modal set has to be independently assigned to each piece. Every chosen modal set has to be valid at every point inside the cavity; it has also to be able to force the accomplishment of arbitrary boundary conditions along its own contour piece.

When all of these modal sets are defined, arbitrary boundary conditions can be forced along the whole contour of the cavity. If the uniqueness theorem [8] is applied, it means that any solution of the problem could be synthesised using a proper linear superposition of these modal sets.

Clearly, the most difficult part of this procedure is finding an appropriate division of the cavity contour and modal sets associated to each considered contour piece.

A good starting point could be to treat separately each port, that is, to break the cavity contour in port and non-port parts, $S_o$ and $S_i$, respectively (see Fig. 1). Then, $S_o$ can be broken again, and every piece of the contour belonging to each port can be separately treated. In other words, $S_o$ can be broken into $S_{o1}, \ldots, S_{on}$, where $n$ is the number of ports feeding the cavity (see again Fig. 1).

The ports are always plane, so the most appropriate modal set for these ports is a plane wave spectrum. The plane wave spectrum, which emanates from a plane, is physically valid in only one of the half-spaces that this plane defines [9]. This means that the position of a given port has to be chosen, so that the entire cavity belongs to the half-space where the plane spectrum associated to this port remains physically valid; fortunately, this is always possible.

In order to construct a fully valid plane wave spectrum for the $i$th port, with coordinates $x_i$, $y_i$, and $z_i$, two different sets of plane waves are necessary, a TM$^I$ plane wave set plus a TE$^I$ plane wave set [9]. Fortunately, thanks to the symmetry of a rectangular waveguide H-plane problem, in this case, only a TM$^I$ plane wave will be necessary.

The TM$^I$ plane wave has the following expression

$$
\epsilon^{T, I, \text{TM}} = (a_x^{(\text{TM})} e^{-j\beta_x x} + a_y^{(\text{TM})} e^{j\beta_x y}) e^{-j\beta_z z} \tag{5}
$$

$$
\eta^{T, I, \text{TM}} = -\frac{-\beta_z}{k} (a_x^{(\text{TM})} e^{-j\beta_x x} + a_y^{(\text{TM})} e^{j\beta_x y}) e^{-j\beta_z z} \tag{6}
$$

where

- $a_x^{(\text{TM})}$, $a_y^{(\text{TM})}$: are arbitrary weights,
- $\beta_x^2 + \beta_y^2 + \beta_z^2 = k^2$.
- These modes have physical sense in the cavity since the waves are attenuated when $z_i$ grows, once $\beta_x$ and $\beta_y$ are fixed, and a propagating solution is not obtained ($\beta_z$ pure imaginary).

In addition, if the excitation is constant along $y$, and the only non-zero component of its electric field is $E_x$, the scattered field generated by the arbitrarily shaped cavity of Fig. 1 will show the same properties than the excitation. This happens, for example, when the cavity is excited by the fundamental mode of the feeding rectangular waveguides. In this case, $\beta_x$ must be equal to zero, and the appropriate plane wave spectrum to characterise the problem is then

$$
\epsilon^{T, I, \text{TM}} = (a_x^{(\text{TM})} e^{-j\beta_x x} + a_y^{(\text{TM})} e^{j\beta_x y}) e^{-j\beta_z z} \tag{7}
$$

$$
\eta^{T, I, \text{TM}} = -\frac{-\beta_z}{k} (a_x^{(\text{TM})} e^{-j\beta_x x} + a_y^{(\text{TM})} e^{j\beta_x y}) e^{-j\beta_z z} \tag{8}
$$

These plane waves can synthesize arbitrary tangential fields at every port, so that a given boundary condition can be forced. The spectrum derived from the plane waves of (5) and (6)
is continuous; however, a discrete spectrum is needed. A discrete spectrum is obtained when the field over the whole plane containing the port is periodic. Fortunately, it is necessary to synthesise only an arbitrary field in the region of the plane belonging to the port, while the fields outside the port surface are not important, so a discrete spectrum can be used to force an arbitrary contour condition at the port.

To obtain the expressions for the modes, let us analyse a simple case: synthesising an arbitrary $E_i$ field using the TM' wave of (5). Since the port is the region of interest, and a periodic solution is possible, a Fourier series in $x_i$ can be used to synthesise the field. Moreover, since the port is of size $a$ in $x_i$, the most attractive possibility is to choose this size, $a$, as the base period of the Fourier series.

A Fourier series with $\beta_{(m)} = 2m \pi / a$ will allow us to synthesise an arbitrary function over the port surface. This Fourier expansion has a high risk, however, of showing an undesirable Gibbs' effect; this is because it is not guaranteed that the synthesized periodic function is continuous. To ensure continuity, rather than considering the period of Fig. 2, a bigger period, specifically, a period continuous. To ensure continuity, rather than considering the period, a discrete spectrum is needed. Using the modes of (10) an arbitrary tangential electric or magnetic field can be synthesised at the port; it is known from uniqueness [8] that this will be enough to successfully accomplish an arbitrary boundary condition at the port.

To be more specific, the field at every point of medium II, $(x, y, z)$, generated by these plane wave modes associated to ports of the cavity can be calculated as

$$\Phi_{(TM)}^T = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{n=1}^N q_m \Phi_{(TM)}^T(x, y, z)$$

where

- $M$ is the total number of modes considered at all ports.
- $e/\mu$ is the electric/magnetic part of the $m$th TM plane wave mode.
- $d_m$ is the weight associated to the $m$th mode.

Until now, the ports, $S_n$, have been characterised, but the conducting part of the cavity, $S_c$, have not yet been solved. Unfortunately, the shape of this part of the contour it is not known a priori (it was known that every $S_a$ was plane). Therefore another strategy has to be used to force the boundary condition over $S_c$, for example, an unknown surface current, $J_c$, over $S_c$. Finally, in order to complete the discretisation of the equations, the current, $J_c$, has to be expanded as sum of certain basis functions; that is, the well-known method of moments [10] is going to be applied.

$$J_c = \sum_{q=1}^Q I_q J_q$$

To pose the problem, the corresponding boundary conditions over the cavity limits have to be enforced, that is, continuity of electric and magnetic field at the ports and null tangential electric field over $S_c$

$$E_{inc,S_c}^I + \sum_{n=1}^N b_n E_{inc,S_n}^I = \Phi_{(TM)}^T(x, y, z)$$

$$i = 1, 2, \ldots, A$$

expressions, the modes can be written definitely as

$$\Phi_{(TM)}^T = \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{n=1}^N q_m \Phi_{(TM)}^T(x, y, z)$$

$$i = 1, 2, \ldots, A$$
\[
H^I_{\text{inc},S_0} - \sum_{n=1}^{N_i} b_{ni} H^T_{m}(S_0^n) = \hat{I}\sum_{m=1}^{M} d_{m} H^T_{m}(S_0) + \sum_{q=1}^{Q} I_q H^T_{a q}(J_q)
\]

where \( E^T_{a q}(J), H^T_{a q}(J) \) is the total electric/magnetic field over \( S_0 \) generated by an electric current \( J \) in the medium II and \( E^T_{m}(J), H^T_{m}(J) \) is the electric/magnetic field tangential to \( S_0 \) generated by an electric current \( J \) in the medium II.

There are, fortunately, some shapes for the conducting contour that can be solved modally. For instance, if a certain piece of the conducting contour was plane, and if the whole cavity belonged to the physically valid half-space of an hypothetically plane wave spectrum over such plane part of the contour, the same modes presented before for every \( S_0^n \) could be used to characterise this conducting and plane part of the contour. This situation is not as uncommon as one would think. There are many structures with such plane conducting surfaces limiting the cavity, as can be seen in the results. Of course, these special parts of the contour have been used to improve the efficiency of the technique presented in this paper.

### 3 Testing the equations

To determine the modal coefficients and the weights for the currents, (13)–(15) must be discretised. They will be projected over a well-chosen set of test functions distributed along \( S_0 = S_0 \cup S_x \).

Considering that the electric current, \( J \), has been expanded as a weighted sum of \( Q \) different basis functions, (15) should be tested using also \( Q \) test functions, \( \omega_i, r = 1, 2, \ldots, R \), \( R = Q \), placed along \( S_x \).

The rest of test functions will be placed over \( S_0 \). For the \( r \)th port \( N_r \) modes have been used to expand the field in the medium I and \( M_r \) modes to expand the field in the medium II. Equation (13) will be therefore projected over a certain set of test functions \( u_{sr}, s = 1, 2, \ldots, S_0 \) and (14) over a different set of test functions \( v_{ir}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, T_r \). The same process will be repeated for every part of the problem.

To simplify the notation, it is more convenient to reorder the port-dependent parameters, \( b_{ni}, e_{m}^{i}, h_{m}^{i}, u_{ni}, u_{vi}, v_{ni}, v_{vi}, \) and \( \omega_i \) in terms of a single index. Then the index \( i \), which refers to the port number in all the port-dependent parameters, can be eliminated. For example, if this reordering is applied to the coefficients of the emergent modes, \( b_{ni} \), the column vector \( \vec{b} = [b_{n_1}, b_{n_2}, b_{n_3}, \ldots, b_{N_r}] \) can be defined

\[
\vec{b} = [b_{n_1}, b_{n_2}, b_{n_3}, \ldots, b_{N_r}] \quad (16)
\]

By applying the reordering to the other port-dependent variables, the column vectors \( \vec{e}, \vec{h}, \vec{u}, \vec{v} \) of \( N \) elements and the vectors \( \vec{S} = [S_1, S_2, S_3, \ldots, S_t] \) of \( T \) elements can be defined

\[
\vec{S} = [S_1, S_2, S_3, \ldots, S_t] \quad (17)
\]

The construction of this matrix system is detailed in the appendix. The solution of this system provides \( b_{ni}, d_{m} \) and \( I_q \)

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\vec{Z}_{11} & \vec{Z}_{12} & \vec{Z}_{13} \\
\vec{Z}_{21} & \vec{Z}_{22} & \vec{Z}_{23} \\
\vec{Z}_{31} & \vec{Z}_{32} & \vec{Z}_{33}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\vec{b} \\
\vec{I}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
\vec{E} \\
\vec{H}
\end{pmatrix}
\quad (18)
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\vec{Z}_{11} & \vec{Z}_{12} & \vec{Z}_{13} \\
\vec{Z}_{21} & \vec{Z}_{22} & \vec{Z}_{23} \\
\vec{Z}_{31} & \vec{Z}_{32} & \vec{Z}_{33}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\vec{b} \\
\vec{I}
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
\vec{E} \\
\vec{H}
\end{pmatrix}
\quad (17)
\]

### 4 Scattering parameters computation

In (17), the first set of unknowns are the weights \( b_{ni} \) for the scattered modes through the ports towards medium I. Then, in order to compute the scattering parameters, only a port, for example, port \( j \), has to be excited with a single mode, for example the \( m \)th mode, with unitary amplitude \( (a_{mj} = 1) \)

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\vec{E}/\vec{H}^j_{\text{inc},S_0} = \left[ [e/h]_{\text{inc}}(S_0^j), \text{ if } k = j \\
0, \text{ rest}
\end{pmatrix}
\quad (18)
\]

then \( s^j_{\text{num}} = b_{ni} \)

#### 4.1 Direct solution

That can be done if the following matrices are defined

\[
\begin{align*}
\vec{Z}_{ac} &= -\vec{Z}_{23}^{-1}\vec{Z}_{12} \quad (19) \\
\vec{Z}_G &= \vec{Z}_{11}(\vec{Z}_{12} + \vec{Z}_{13}\vec{Z}_{ac}) \quad (20) \\
\vec{Z}_G &= \vec{Z}_{21}(\vec{Z}_{22} + \vec{Z}_{23}\vec{Z}_{ac})
\end{align*}
\]

and it is taken into account that \( E_j = -\vec{Z}_{ac}\vec{Z}_j \) and \( H_j = \vec{Z}_G\vec{Z}_j \), where \( \vec{Z}_j \) is a vector, which contains the weights for the incident modes. Then the generalised scattering matrix is

\[
\vec{s} = -\left[ (-\vec{Z}_G + 2\vec{Z}_G\vec{Z}_G^{-1}) \right] \quad (21)
\]

### 5 Comparison against the reference

To compare the technique of [6] and the technique of this paper, the same test functions, \( u_{sr}, v_{ir} \), and \( \omega_i \) have to be used; the same basis functions, \( J_{sr}, J_{ir} \), have to be used to expand the current over the conducting limits of the cavity in both methods, as well; so that \( Q_1 = Q_2 \) in Table 1.

Owing to the fact that the characterisation of the ports is very different in both methods, \( N_1 \neq N_2 \); the comparison requires a more exhaustive analysis.

If simple basis functions, such as pulses, are used to discretise the currents of [6], more unknowns will be needed to adequately characterise the ports than using plane wave modes, that is \( N_2 < N_1 \). The cost of filling the matrices and computing the matrix products and inversions will be notably smaller for the method of this paper (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Cost comparison</th>
<th>Belenguer et al. [6]</th>
<th>New method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num. of elem.</td>
<td>4N_r^2 + 3Q_rN_r + Q_r^2</td>
<td>4N_r^2 + 3Q_rN_r + Q_r^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of prod.</td>
<td>Q_r^2N_r + 2Q_rN_r^2 + 3N_r^2</td>
<td>Q_r^2N_r + 2Q_rN_r^2 + 3N_r^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost of inv.</td>
<td>O(Q_r^2 + (1 + 2 / \lambda c)N_r^2)</td>
<td>O(Q_r^2 + (1 + 2 / \lambda c)N_r^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If full domain basis functions are used to characterise the ports, for example the \( \cos() \) part of (10), \( N_1 \) can be reduced, and forced to be almost equal to \( N_2 \). In this case, the cost of the matrix products and inversions is the same for the techniques compared here. However, the cost of computing the matrix elements related to the ports, \( Z_{12}, X_{22} \) and \( Z_{32} \), will be nearly prohibitive in the technique of [6]. This is because full domain basis functions have been used and that will imply the solution of large and difficult (singular at many evaluation points) numerical quadrature rules to compute the port-related matrix elements. In short, in this case, the technique of [6] will be also slower and, furthermore, very difficult to implement.

6 Results

At this point several simple problems will be solved using the technique proposed in the previous sections. Specifically, a 90° bend, several beveled bends, a 135° bend, a charged T-junction and two filters of coupled cavities will be analysed (all H-plane problems inside a rectangular waveguide); the solutions will be compared with some results found in the literature [6, 11].

As test and basis functions, a combination of basis and test functions that facilitate the computation of the coefficients matrix elements is chosen.

The basis functions will be \( J_q = P_q \hat{y} \), where \( P_q \) are rectangular pulses uniformly distributed along \( S_c \).

The test functions, \( \omega_r \), will be \( \omega_r = W_r \hat{y} \), with \( W_r \) equal to Dirac’s delta functions uniformly distributed along \( S_c \). The test functions, \( u_{si} \) and \( v_{ti} \), will be \( u_{si} = U_{si} \hat{y} \) and \( v_{ti} = V_{ti}(\hat{n} \times \hat{y}) \), with \( U_{si} \) and \( V_{ti} \) also Dirac’s delta functions uniformly distributed along \( S_a \), so that the method has been reduced to a typical point-matching.

The rectangular waveguide modes and the solution of a two-dimensional (2D) scattering problem using the method of moments (point-matching) are well documented in the literature [10, 12, 13], so they will not be reproduced here.

As it was mentioned before, to increase the efficiency of the technique, the straight conducting limits of the cavity will be modally characterised, as the ports are. This implies, for example, that for the 90° bend, the discretisation of Fig. 4a will be replaced by the discretisation of Fig. 4b. Both alternatives are valid, but the modal one (Fig. 4b) is more efficient.

To find the solution of the analysed problems, a basis functions density equal to 100 pulses per wavelength has been used; in ports \( N_i = M_i = 20 \) modes have proven to be enough to provide accurate results. Or in other words, the scattering parameters of \( N_i = 20 \) different modes will be found at each port after the method is applied.

For the beveled bends of Fig. 5a and the 135° bend of Fig. 5b, the waveguides will have a width equal to \( a = 15.799 \) mm. Three beveled bends will be analysed, with

---

**Fig. 4** Discretisation for the 90° bend when the straight conducting segments are and are not modally characterised

- a With currents
- b With modes

**Fig. 5** Discretisation proposed for the devices analysed in this paper

- a Beveled bend
- b 135° bend
- c Charged T-junction
- d Coupling window 1
- e Coupling window 2
\[ a_b = \sqrt{2}, \quad a_b = \sqrt{2} \quad (\text{the } 90^\circ \text{ bend of Fig. 4b}). \]

On the other hand, for the charged T-junction of Fig. 5c, the width of the waveguides will be 
\[ a \approx 22.86 \text{ mm}; \]
the values for \( \delta \) and \( h \) will be, \( \delta = 0.1 \text{ mm} \) and \( h = 8.8 \text{ mm}. \)
Finally, the coupling windows of Figs. 5d and e will be used to analyse two filters of coupled cavities. To improve the efficiency of the solution, every coupling window will be analysed separately. Then, all of the coupling windows will be linked using only 11 of the 20 modes (for efficiency) calculated at each port and the generalised scattering matrix of the whole filter will be computed using the procedure of [14]. In this particular case, the scattering matrices computed for each coupling window must be unavoidably multimodal, since the cascade cannot be accurately done using

monomodal scattering matrices. First, a filter with rounded \((r_c = 3 \text{ mm})\) corners in the coupled cavities (Fig. 5d) will be considered. Second, a filter with rounded corners \((r_w = 2 \text{ mm})\) in the coupling windows (Fig. 5e) will be analysed. The dimensions of the filters are tabulated in Tables 2 and 3.

### Table 2 Dimensions for the filter with rounded corners in the cavities \((r_c = 3 \text{ mm})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( l )</th>
<th>( l )</th>
<th>( L )</th>
<th>( a_{\text{in}} )</th>
<th>( a_{\text{out}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.284 mm</td>
<td>9.77 mm</td>
<td>19.05 mm</td>
<td>9.284 mm</td>
<td>9.77 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.344 mm</td>
<td>11.118 mm</td>
<td>19.05 mm</td>
<td>6.344 mm</td>
<td>11.118 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.814 mm</td>
<td>11.273 mm</td>
<td>22 mm</td>
<td>5.814 mm</td>
<td>11.273 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.738 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 Dimensions for the filter with rounded corners in the coupling windows \((r_w = 2 \text{ mm})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( h )</th>
<th>( L )</th>
<th>( a_{\text{in}} )</th>
<th>( a_{\text{out}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.768 mm</td>
<td>9.159 mm</td>
<td>19.05 mm</td>
<td>9.159 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.837 mm</td>
<td>10.581 mm</td>
<td>19.05 mm</td>
<td>10.581 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.311 mm</td>
<td>10.752 mm</td>
<td>22 mm</td>
<td>10.752 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.235 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 6** Filter of coupled cavities

**Fig. 7** Comparison of the results with the references

- a Beveled bends
- b Bends
- c Charged T-junction
- d Filter \( r_w = 2 \text{ mm} \)
- e Filter \( r_c = 3 \text{ mm} \)
The meaning of the parameters shown in these tables can be seen in Fig. 6.

In Fig. 7, one can see the comparison between the results obtained after applying the technique developed in the present paper and several results taken from the literature. A good agreement for both responses can be observed.

In Table 4, a summary of solving temporal costs is shown. There, one can see that the cost of solving these problems is actually smaller than the cost of applying the technique of [6], as it was advanced in Section 5.

Not only the generalised scattering matrix of the different structures has been computed, but also the field scattered in response to the incidence against the port 1 of the fundamental mode. The graphical representation of the fields for the beveled bend with $a_b = a/\sqrt{2}$ can be seen in Fig. 8.

7 Conclusions

A new formulation for a hybrid mode-matching and method of moments technique, which modally characterises every port of an arbitrarily shaped cavity (see Fig. 1) has been developed.

When the ports are characterised using a planar modal expansion, the number of unknowns in most situations is smaller than in [6]. If more elaborate basis functions are used, the number of unknowns can be comparable, but at a high cost; this is because it is necessary to evaluate an important number of numerical integrals in order to fill the matrices while, in the technique presented in this paper, this numerical integration does not appear. This can be seen in Section 6, where the efficiency of the new method is compared with the method of [6]. From this comparison one can conclude that, for a general device, the new method performs, at least, twice faster, even ten times faster for particular geometries.

Finally, it is necessary to remark that the technique presented in this paper has been particularised to analyse arbitrary H-plane problems in rectangular waveguides, but this technique can be used to solve full 3D problems after applying the appropriate generalisations. The work presented in this paper for the 2D case can be a good starting point to extend the technique to 3D problems. The solution and the analysis of the results of several 3D devices will show if this formulation is able to provide efficiency improvements comparable to those obtained for the 2D devices analysed in this paper.
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\[ B \times 1, \ B = N + M + Q = S + T + R \]

and finally, a \( B \times B \) matrix, \( \bar{Z} \), is defined, whose elements can be grouped in the following sub-matrices

\[ \bar{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{Z}_{11(S \times N)} & \cdots & \bar{Z}_{12(S \times M)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \bar{Z}_{13(R \times N)} & \cdots & \bar{Z}_{13(R \times Q)} \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{2cm} (25)

\[ \bar{Z}_{11(S \times N)} \] also can be divided into blocks

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \bar{F}_{11(S \times N_{1})} & \cdots & \bar{F}_{11(S \times N_{N})} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \bar{F}_{13(R \times N_{1})} & \cdots & \bar{F}_{13(R \times N_{N})} \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{2cm} (26)

and only the diagonal blocks will be non-zero. The elements of a diagonal block, \( \bar{F}_{ii} \), can be computed

\[ c_{im}^{(i)} = -\langle u_{s}, E_{m}^{i}(s) \rangle \]  \hspace{2cm} (27)

with \( s = 1, 2, \ldots, S_{i}, \ n = 1, 2, \ldots, N_{i} \).

• \( \bar{F}_{12(S \times M)} \)

\[ z_{im}^{(12)} = \langle u_{s}, \bar{E}_{m}^{1}(s) \rangle \]  \hspace{2cm} (28)

\[ s = 1, 2, \ldots, S, \ m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \] and \( i \) is the port, which \( s \) belongs to.

• \( \bar{F}_{13(S \times Q)} \)

\[ z_{iq}^{(13)} = \langle u_{s}, E_{m}^{i}(J_{Q}) \rangle \]  \hspace{2cm} (29)

\[ s = 1, 2, \ldots, S \] and \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, Q \).

• \( \bar{F}_{21(T \times N)} \) whose elements can also be grouped

\[ \begin{bmatrix} \bar{F}_{11(T \times N_{1})} & \cdots & \bar{F}_{11(T \times N_{N})} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \bar{F}_{13(T \times N_{1})} & \cdots & \bar{F}_{13(T \times N_{N})} \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{2cm} (30)

and a block-diagonal matrix is obtained. The elements of a block in the main diagonal, \( \bar{F}_{ii} \), can be computed

\[ h_{m}^{(i)} = \langle v_{q}, h_{m}^{i}(S_{i}) \rangle \]  \hspace{2cm} (31)

with \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T_{i} \) and \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N_{i} \).

10 Appendix

To complete the calculation of the system of equations resulting from the discretisation of (13)–(15), the projection operator, which will allow to discretise the equations needs to be defined

\[ \langle \kappa, \nabla(x, y, z) \rangle = \int_{S} [\kappa \cdot \nabla(x, y, z)]dS \]  \hspace{2cm} (22)

where \( \kappa \cdot \nabla \) is the scalar product between the vectors \( \kappa \) and \( \nabla \), \( S \) can be \( S_{p} \) or \( S_{q} \); \( \kappa \) is any of the vectorial test functions that has been defined in Section 3.

Next, the expression for the resulting system of equations after applying the method of moments to (13)–(15) is presented. In order to do that, first the unknowns are organised in a column vector \( \bar{x} \)

\[ \bar{x} = [a_{1}, b_{2}, \ldots, b_{N}, d_{1}, d_{2}, \ldots, d_{M}, I_{1}, I_{2}, \ldots, I_{Q}] \]  \hspace{2cm} (23)

the excitation is stored in another column vector, \( \bar{z}^{\text{inc}} \) of size

\[ B \times 1, \ B = N + M + Q = S + T + R \]

\[ \bar{z}^{\text{inc}} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{1}^{1}(E_{\text{inc},S_{1}}^{1}) \\ u_{2}^{1}(E_{\text{inc},S_{2}}^{1}) \\ \vdots \\ u_{S_{i}}^{1}(E_{\text{inc},S_{S_{i}}^{1}}^{1}) \\ v_{1}^{1}(H_{\text{inc},S_{1}}^{1}) \\ \vdots \\ v_{S_{i}}^{1}(H_{\text{inc},S_{S_{i}}^{1}}^{1}) \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \]  \hspace{2cm} (24)

\[ I \times 1, \ I = N + Q = S + T + R \]
\[ x^{(22)}_{im} = \langle \mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{h}^{T,II}_m(S'_l) \rangle \] (32)

\( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T, m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \) and \( i \) is the port, which \( t \) belongs to.

\[ x^{(23)}_{iq} = \langle \mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{H}^{\parallel}_{Sc}(J_q) \rangle \] (33)

\( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \) and \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, Q \).

\[ \overline{Z}_{31}(R \times N) = 0, \] because (15) do not depend on \( b_n \).

\[ \overline{Z}_{32}(R \times M) \]

\[ z^{(32)}_{rm} = \langle \mathbf{w}, \hat{n}_{Sc} \times \mathbf{e}^{T,II}_m(S'_l) \rangle \] (34)

\( r = 1, 2, \ldots, R \) and \( m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \).

\[ \overline{Z}_{33}(R \times Q) \]

\[ z^{(33)}_{rq} = \langle \mathbf{w}, \hat{n}_{Sc} \times \mathbf{E}^{T,II}_{Sc}(J_q) \rangle \] (35)

\( r = 1, 2, \ldots, R \) and \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, Q \).

Finally, the following system of equations can be constructed

\[ \overline{Z} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{C}^{inc} \] (36)