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I. INTRODUCTION

A unified network approach to the analysis of infinite regular arrays of antennas is presented. The periodically repeated constituent of the array is itself regarded as a sub-array, the sub-array taking a variety of particular forms. With the appropriate choice of sub-array, the same formulation yields as special cases the uniform linear, planar, and cylindrical arrays as well as such arrays comprising several heterogeneous elements or multimode elementary antennas. Three possibilities are illustrated in Figs. 1a through 1c. Figure 1a shows an in-line arrangement of 2-element sub-arrays; a typical sub-array is delineated by the dashed line. Similarly, Fig. 1b shows an arrangement of linear sub-arrays, each sub-array extending in a direction orthogonal to the principal array axis. The planar array illustrated is finite in one dimension; however, this restriction to finite sub-arrays is not essential. Figure 1c shows a cylindrical array. Each circular array may conveniently be regarded as a sub-array, bringing such (glide symmetric) cylindrical arrays within the purview of the general scheme. The network problem for the antenna terminal quantities is formulated as an infinite order finite-difference equation. The solution is
obtained as a matrix generalization to arrays of sub-array antennas of the technique presented in Reference 1.

The finite-difference formulation is applicable to arrays of quite general antennas and is not restricted to apertures in a conducting plane or cylinder. It is only necessary that the network parameters characterizing the interaction among the elementary antennas be known. For minimum scattering antennas, these network parameters may be calculated conveniently and exactly from the elementary radiation patterns, without reference to the structural type of the elements[1],[7]. The particular sub-array chosen for purposes of illustration consists of two inclined dipole radiators. Only one dipole of each sub-array is excited; the remaining dipoles act as passive parasitic radiators. Quite deliberately, no physical supporting structure for the dipoles is specified. However, the parasitic dipole radiators only are interconnected in a manner to be described. The array of fed dipoles, when excited with uniform amplitude (linear phase taper), will be found to exhibit peaks in the active reflection coefficient, or, equivalently, resonance nulls or minima in the pattern of a single excited element within the array of sub-arrays environment [2],[3],[4]. It is therefore demonstrated that such resonances, existing purely as circuit properties of the array network, can in principle occur generally in linear, planar or cylindrical arrays as opposed to being necessarily limited to specific kinds of structural configurations[5]. Further, it will be seen that these resonance minima (reflection coefficient maxima) may be arbitrarily placed and variable in depth. Conversely, the
ability to control and place rapid variations in reflection coefficient with scan angle holds promise with respect to matching out variations found in any given case [8],[9].

II. DIFFERENCE EQUATION FORMULATION FOR AN ARRAY OF SUB-ARRAY ANTENNAS

Consider an infinite, uniformly spaced linear array composed of identical M-element sub-arrays as shown in Fig. 1d. The terminal voltages and currents satisfy

\[ V_n = \sum_{n} Z_{n} I_{n} \]  

(1a)

where \( Z_{n} \) is an \( N \times N \) (open-circuit) impedance matrix coupling the \( n \)th and the \( n \)th sub-arrays; \( V_{n} \) and \( I_{n} \) are column matrices

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
V_{1,n} \\
V_{2,n} \\
\vdots \\
V_{n,n}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix}
I_{1,n} \\
I_{2,n} \\
\vdots \\
I_{n,n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The matrix \( Z_{n} \) has the form

\[
Z_{n} = \begin{bmatrix}
Z_{11,n} & Z_{12,n} & \cdots & Z_{1n,n} \\
Z_{21,n} & Z_{22,n} & \cdots & Z_{2n,n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
Z_{n1,n} & Z_{n2,n} & \cdots & Z_{nn,n}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
It follows from Lorentz reciprocity that

$$Z_{\infty} = \widetilde{Z}_{\infty}$$

wherein \(\sim\) denotes the transposed matrix. The translational symmetry of the infinite linear array implies that \(Z_{\infty}\) is, in fact, only a function of the difference \(\nu = m - n\); thus,

$$Z_{\nu} = \widetilde{Z}_{-\nu}.$$

Let \(Z\) be the diagonal matrix containing internal impedances of the driving generators, i.e.,

$$Z = \text{diag} \left[ Z_{11} Z_{22} \ldots Z_{nn} \right] = R + jX.$$

Then the array may alternatively be regarded as being excited by incident waves \(s\)

$$2R^\frac{1}{2} s = v + Zs.$$

(2a)

Since the internal impedances \(Z_{\infty}\) are, in general, complex the reflected waves \(s\) are given by

$$2R^\frac{1}{2} s = v - Zs.$$

(2b)

Explicitly then, the currents \(I\) produced by the incident waves \(s\) satisfy

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \sum_{\nu = -N}^{N} Z_{\nu}I_{\nu} + Z_{\nu}I_{\nu} = 2R^\frac{1}{2} s.$$

(1b)
The solution of (1b) for \( I_a \) with arbitrary excitations \( a_a \) may be obtained by recognizing that the \( I_a \) and \( a_a \) must be coefficients of (matrix) Fourier series (cf. [1] for the case \( M = 1 \)). Thus, substituting

\[
I_a = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} I(\xi) e^{-ja\xi} \, d\xi , \tag{3a}
\]

\[
a_a = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} A(\xi) e^{-jn\xi} \, d\xi , \tag{3b}
\]

into (1) yields

\[
I_a = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ \left( Q(\xi) + Z_\xi \right)^{-1} 2Re\left( \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} a_m e^{jm\xi} \right) \right] e^{-jn\xi} \, d\xi , \tag{4}
\]

where the matrix \( Q(\xi) \) is given by

\[
Q(\xi) = \sum_{\nu = -\infty}^{\infty} Z_\nu e^{-j\nu \xi} . \tag{5}
\]

When only the first element of each sub-array is excited (all others being terminated in \( Z_\xi \)) one sets in (4)

\[
\tilde{z}_{\nu} = [a_1, 0, 0, \ldots] .
\]

This yields

\[
I_a = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left[ \frac{2Re_{\nu_1} \det \hat{Q}_\xi (\xi) (-1)^{\nu_1 + 1} \sum_{\nu = \infty} a_{\nu_1} e^{j\nu_1 \xi}}{\det \hat{Q}(\xi)} \right] e^{-jn\xi} \, d\xi , \quad \nu_1 = 1, 2, \ldots M , \tag{6}
\]

where the matrix \( \hat{Q}(\xi) \) is given by
\[ \hat{Q}(\xi) = Q(\xi) + Z_0 \]  

and \( \hat{Q}_{\eta} \) is the minor of \( \hat{Q} \) obtained by striking out the 1st row and \( \eta \)-th column. The sub-array elements \( \eta = 2, 3, \ldots, M \) can be either physical parasitic radiators employed, e.g., to effect an improved match of the array with scan [4]) or equivalent radiators corresponding to higher order evanescent modes in the input transmission line [2],[5]. In the following, the sub-array element \( \eta = 1 \) will be referred to as the driven element.

Two types of array excitations are of particular importance: one in which only one driven element is excited (all others being terminated in \( Z_0 \)), while another corresponds to the excitation of all \( \eta = 1 \) elements by equal amplitude waves with a linear phase taper. In the former case, the currents at the driven elements are proportional to the mutual and self-coupling (scattering) coefficients. Thus, denoting these by \( S_{\eta \eta} \) and employing (2), one obtains

\[ S_{\eta \eta} = b + \frac{a_{\eta \eta}}{a_{1 \eta}}, \quad a_{1 \eta} = 0, \ n \neq m \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} -\sqrt{R_{\eta 1}} \frac{I_{1 \eta}}{a_{1 \eta}}, & n \neq m \\ 1 - \sqrt{R_{\eta 1}} \frac{I_{1 \eta}}{Q_{\eta \eta}}. & \end{array} \right. \]  

Setting \( a_{1 \eta} = 0, \ m \neq n \) and \( a_{1 \eta} = 1 \) in (6) one also has

\[ S_{\eta \eta} = \delta_{\eta \eta} - \frac{\sqrt{R_{\eta 1}}}{n} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\det \hat{Q}_{\eta} (\xi)}{\det \hat{Q}(\xi)} e^{-j(n - m) \xi} d\xi. \]  

When the array is excited with uniform amplitudes and a linear phase...
taper one sets \( a_{1,s} = e^{-j\alpha} \) (\( \alpha \) the phasing constant) and (6) yields

\[
I_{l,s} = 2\sqrt{R_1} \frac{\det \hat{Q}_l(a)}{\det \hat{Q}(a)} (-1)^{l+1} e^{-j\alpha} \quad l = 1, 2 \ldots M. \quad (10)
\]

Employing (10) with \( l = 1 \) together with (2a) one obtains the input (active) impedance looking into the typical driven element:

\[
Z_{1N}(\alpha) = \frac{\det \hat{Q}(a)}{\det q_{11}(a)} - Z_{s1}. \quad (11)
\]

Expanding the determinant, yields

\[
Z_{1N}(\alpha) = Q_{11}(\alpha) + \sum_{l=2}^{M} \frac{Q_{1l}(\alpha) \det \hat{q}_{1l}(\alpha) (-1)^{l+1}}{\det \hat{q}_{11}(\alpha)} \quad (12)
\]

where \( Q_{11}, Q_{1l} \) are (scalar) elements of \( Q \). If the array is matched at broadside then the active reflection coefficient \( \rho(\alpha) \) is

\[
\rho(\alpha) = \frac{Z_{1N}(\alpha) - Z_{1N}(0)}{Z_{1N}(\alpha) + Z_{1N}(0)}. \quad (13)
\]

In (12), the active impedance is expressed as a sum of two terms: \( Q_{11}(\alpha) \) which corresponds to the active impedance of the driven elements in the absence of parasitic radiators and a sum of terms taking account of coupling among the elements of a typical sub-array. Equation (12) holds quite generally and has, in fact, been derived from pure circuit considerations, i.e., without reference to structural properties of the radiators comprising each sub-array. If one is dealing with the special case of single mode elements, then in the range of \( \alpha \)
for which no grating lobes appear in the visible region, $Q_{11}(\alpha)$ will generally not exhibit sharp resonances and if resonance phenomena in the active reflection coefficient do appear they must necessarily be associated with the second term in (12). In particular, the possibility of such resonances exists whenever det $\hat{Q}_{11}(\alpha)$ possesses sharp minima (maxima). This has been noted by Borgiotti [5] in connection with a planar array of apertures where, in the present context, the parasitic radiators correspond to evanescent modes in the feed waveguides. The point being made here is that such resonances can be described adequately in pure network terms. The above considerations apply also to sub-array elements which are minimum-scattering (M.S.) antennas [1],[7] since they are completely defined in terms of their radiation patterns (without references to physical structures). For such antennas, the $Q_{11}(\alpha)$ can be readily computed since the mutual impedances entering into the definitions of $Z_v$, eq. (1), are given explicitly in terms of element patterns [7]. Moreover, certain single mode elements (in particular, planar apertures) can be rigorously treated as M.S. antennas [7]. In the following, a linear array of two-element sub-arrays consisting of two M.S. (dipole-type) antennas will be analyzed.

III. A LINEAR ARRAY OF DIPOLE SUB-ARRAYS

Figure 2a shows a linear array of two-element dipole sub-arrays. The dipoles are inclined at an angle $\theta_0 = \sin^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ with the array axis. The active impedance for a linear array ($M = 1$) containing dipoles with this particular orientation has been computed in [1]. The
active impedance has been shown to exhibit the interesting property of having a constant real part in the visible region if the inter-element spacing does not exceed \( \lambda/2 \). In addition, the imaginary part remains small throughout most of the visible region so that nearly perfect match is attained for a large range of scan angles. In the following, the effect on the active impedance looking into the port of the driven element is examined.

Employing (12) with \( M = 2 \), one obtains

\[
Z_{1n} (\alpha) = \frac{Q_{1s} (\alpha) Q_{s1} (\alpha)}{Q_{ss} (\alpha) + Z_{ss}} .
\]

The coupling impedance matrix \( Z_v \) for a two element sub-array is

\[
Z_v = \begin{bmatrix}
z_{11} (\nu) & z_{12} (\nu) \\
z_{21} (\nu) & z_{22} (\nu)
\end{bmatrix} .
\]

Employing the results of [1] and noting that the parasitic and driven elements are identical, one obtains

\[
z_{11} (\nu) = z_{22} (\nu) = \begin{cases} 
1 & ; \nu = 0 \\
\frac{je^{-jkD_1 |\nu|}}{kD_1} & ; \nu \neq 0 .
\end{cases}
\]

Similarly, the cross-coupling terms may be written

\[
z_{12} (\nu) = \zeta (k |\nu D_1 + D_0|) = \frac{je^{-jk|\nu D_1 + D_0|}}{k|\nu D_1 + D_0|} ,
\]
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\[ z_{11}(v) = \zeta(kvD_1 - D_2) = \frac{j e^{-jk|\nuD_1 - D_2|}}{k|\nuD_1 - D_2|}. \quad (17b) \]

By virtue of (5)

\[ Q_{11}(\alpha) = Q_{22}(\alpha) = \sum_{\nu = -\infty}^{\infty} z_{11}(\nu) e^{-j\nu\alpha}, \quad (18a) \]

\[ Q_{12}(\alpha) = \sum_{\nu = -\infty}^{\infty} z_{12}(\nu) e^{-j\nu\alpha}, \quad (18b) \]

\[ Q_{21}(\alpha) = \sum_{\nu = -\infty}^{\infty} z_{21}(\nu) e^{-j\nu\alpha} = Q_{22}(-\alpha). \]

Using (16), (18a) is readily summed to yield

\[ Q_{11}(\alpha) = Q_{22}(\alpha) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\pi}{kD_1} - \frac{j}{kD_1} \ln \left\{ 4 \sin \left( \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{kD_1 + \alpha}{2} \sin \frac{kD_1 - \alpha}{2} \right) \right\}, & |\alpha| < kD_1 < \pi, \\
-\frac{j}{kD_1} \ln \left\{ 4 \sin \left( \frac{1}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} \sin \frac{kD_1 - \alpha}{2} \right) \right\}, & kD_1 < |\alpha| < \pi. \end{array} \right. \quad (19) \]

Equation (19) is, of course, identical with the active impedance in the absence of a parasitic element as given in [1].

The series for \( Q_{12}(\alpha) \), i.e., eqs. (17) and (18b), cannot be summed in closed form. By summing all the terms having a \( 1/\nu \) dependence one obtains a representation which is more suitable for numerical computation than the original series. This is described in the Appendix. The result is
\[ Q_{12}(\alpha) = Q_{11}(-\alpha) = \frac{je^{-jKD_2}}{KD_2} - \cos kD_2 + h(D_1, D_2) \]  

\[ + \frac{j}{KD_1} \left[ \alpha \sin kD_2 - e^{jKD_2} \ln 2 \sin \left| \frac{kD_1 - \alpha}{kD_2} \right| - e^{-jKD_2} \ln 2 \sin \left| \frac{kD_1 + \alpha}{kD_2} \right| \right] \]  

\[ + \frac{jD_2}{KD_1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{e^{-j[V(kD_1 - \alpha) - kD_2]}}{V(kD_1 - D_2)} - \frac{e^{-j[V(kD_1 + \alpha) + kW_2]}}{V(kD_1 - D_2)} \right], \]

where

\[ h(D_1, D_2) = \begin{cases} \pi \cos kD_2; & |\alpha| < kD_1, \\ -\frac{j\pi}{KD_1} \sin kD_2; & kD_1 < \alpha < \pi, \\ \frac{j\pi}{KD_1} \sin kD_2; & -\pi < \alpha < -kD_1. \end{cases} \]

In the absence of external interconnections among the parasitic elements, Fig. 2a, \( Z_{g_2} \) in (14) is a fixed (i.e., scan independent) terminating impedance. If the parasitic elements are interconnected through external impedances \( Z_1 \) and \( Z_2 \) as shown in Fig. 2b, \( Z_{g_2} \) in (14) is replaced by the equivalent impedance which depends on \( Z \) and \( Z \) as well as on the phasing constant \( \alpha \) [8]. Referring to Fig. 2b, the voltage at the port of the parasitic element of the \( n \)th sub-array satisfies the following difference equation:

\[ V_{s,n} - \frac{V_{s,n-1}}{Z_1} + \frac{V_{s,n+1}}{Z_2} + I_{s,n} = \frac{V_{s,n+1}}{Z_1} - \frac{V_{s,n}}{Z_2}. \]  

For excitations (of the eigen-form) \( e^{-jka} \) one has

\[ V_{s,n} = V_0(\alpha) e^{-jka}, \quad I_{s,n} = I_0(\alpha) e^{-jka}. \]  

The above together with (21) yields
\[ Z_{1*}(\alpha) = \frac{v_{2,1}}{i_{2,1}} = \frac{v_{2}(\alpha)}{i_{2}(\alpha)} = \frac{Z_1 Z_2}{Z_1 + 4Z_2 \sin^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}. \] (23)

If one assumes that \( Z_1 \) and \( Z_2 \) are pure reactances, i.e., \( Z_1 = jX_1 \), \( Z_2 = jX_2 \), parallel resonance occurs for scan angles \( \alpha \) satisfying
\[ X_1 + 4X_2 \sin^2 \frac{\alpha}{2} = 0. \] (24)

The resonance point can be placed at any predetermined scan angle. Figure 3 shows the variation of the magnitude of the active reflection coefficient \( \rho(\alpha) \) for the array in Fig. 2 looking into sub-array element 1 for several values of \( \alpha \), and \( X = 1 \). For each \( \alpha \), the array is matched at broadside and the separation of sub-arrays is \( D_1 = \lambda/4 \) so that the visible region is \( |\alpha| < \pi/2 \); \( D_2 \) is chosen to be \( D_1/10 \). For comparison a curve of \( |\rho(\alpha)| \) in the absence of the parasitic element is included, and is seen to vary monotonically in the visible region. The pronounced peaks in the reflection coefficient occur at the resonant points \( \alpha \). Even though the reflection at \( \alpha \) is quite high, it is not total, i.e., \( |\rho(\alpha)| \neq 1 \). Indeed, the maximum value attained by \( |\rho(\alpha)| \) near \( \alpha \) may be adjusted by varying the reactance \( X \). This is demonstrated in Fig. 4.

The lack of total reflection at \( \alpha \) is due to the general character of \( Q(\alpha) \), which, for each \( \alpha \), represents the impedance matrix of a dissipative network, the dissipation being, of course, loss of energy due to radiation. Unless the equivalent network for \( Q(\alpha) \) degenerates into a pure shunt structure this dissipation precludes total reflection.
Although the amount of radiated power may be very small, nevertheless it is not identically zero except in the invisible region, i.e., $|\omega| > kD_1$.

The rapid variations introduced into $p(\alpha)$ by the parasitic element in the present example may in other circumstances be utilized for matching purposes. Were excited elements themselves to exhibit resonant behavior (as is known to occur in the case of multi-mode elements or an array covered by a dielectric sheet), interconnecting networks of the type shown in Figs. 2b and 5 together with a parasitic radiator could be employed to compensate for such resonances. In particular, if $Q_1(\alpha)$ exhibits a series resonance at $\alpha$, then, by virtue of (14), the network in Fig. 2b is appropriate which itself is parallel resonant at $\rho_\alpha$, as is evident from (23). On the other hand, were $Q_1(\alpha)$ to exhibit a parallel resonance, then the proper interconnecting network is that in Fig. 5. One can readily show that in this case

$$Z_{s1}(\alpha) = \frac{Z_0 + 4Z_1 \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2}}{4 \sin^2 \frac{\phi}{2}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

which is seen to be series resonant whenever the numerator vanishes.

For such compensations to be effective, the parasitic element should not introduce additional resonances, i.e., $Q_{s1}(\alpha)$ in (14) must be a slowly varying function of $\alpha$. This will usually be the case for single mode elements, or more generally, for minimum scattering antennas.
APPENDIX

TRANSFORMATION OF THE SERIES FOR $Q_1(a)$ INTO A MORE RAPIDLY CONVERGENT REPRESENTATION

Employing eqs. (17) and (18b), the series representation for $Q_1(a)$ is

$$Q_1(a) = i \sum_{\nu=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-j(k|D_0 + \omega_1| + \omega_2)}}{|D_0 + \omega_1|} \, . \quad (A1)$$

The above can be written in the alternate form

$$Q_1(a) = \frac{ja_{kD_0}}{D_0} + \frac{i}{k} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-j\nu(kD_1 + a)}}{\nu D_1 + D_0} e^{-j\nu D_1} + (A2)$$

$$+ \frac{i}{k} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-j\nu(kD_2 - a)}}{\nu D_1 - D_0} e^{-j\nu D_2}.$$  

Since the terms for large $\nu$ decrease as $1/\nu$, the series converges slowly and is not useful for numerical computations. A more rapidly convergent representation is obtained by employing the following identity:

$$\frac{1}{\omega_1 \pm D_0} = \sum_{\nu=0}^{p-1} \frac{\nu D_1}{(\omega_1)^{\nu+1}} + \left(\frac{D_0}{\omega_1}\right)^p \frac{1}{\omega_1 \pm D_0} \, . \quad (A3)$$
which holds for arbitrary integers \( p \).

Substituting the above into the infinite series in (A2) yields

\[
\sum_{v = 1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-jv(kD_1 \pm \alpha)}}{\omega_1 \pm \beta} = \sum_{v = 1}^{\infty} \left( \pm \frac{\beta}{\omega_1} \right)^p e^{-jv(kD_1 \pm \alpha)} + (A4)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{l = 0}^{P-1} \left[ \left( \pm \frac{\beta}{\omega_1} \right)^l \sum_{v = 1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-jv(kD_1 \pm \alpha)}}{\sqrt{v+1}} \right].
\]

The magnitudes of the terms in the first infinite series on the right
of (A4) are seen to decay with \( v \) as \( 1/\sqrt{v} \) and hence improved con-
vergence is obtained by increasing \( p \). The second term on the right
of (A4) is a sum of \( p \) infinite series which are slowly convergent.
However, for \( p = 1 \) the series has a known closed form solution which
is [10]:

\[
f_1(\alpha) = \sum_{v = 1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-jv(kD_1 + \alpha)}}{v} = (A5a)
\]

\[
= j \left( kD_1 + \alpha + \frac{(2n + 1)m}{2} \right) \sin \left[ 2 \sin \frac{kD_1 + \alpha + 2m}{2} \right],
\]

\[
f_0(\alpha) = \sum_{v = 1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-jv(kD_2 - \alpha)}}{v} = (A5b)
\]

\[
= j \left( kD_2 - \alpha + \frac{(2m + 1)n}{2} \right) \sin \left[ 2 \sin \frac{kD_2 - \alpha + 2m}{2} \right].
\]

where \( n, m \) are natural numbers satisfying

\[
0 < kD_1 + \alpha + 2m < 2\pi, \quad (A6)
\]
\[ 0 < kD_1 - \alpha + 2m\pi < 2\pi. \]  \hspace{1cm} (A7)

Employing (A5) and setting \( p = 1 \) in (A4), one obtains eq. (20).

For \( p > 1 \) one has series of the form

\[ \sum_{\nu = 1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{j\nu(kD_1 \pm \alpha)}}{\nu^p}, \]

which can be generated by repeated integrations (with limits, e.g., between 0 and \( \alpha \)) of the left side of (A5) with respect to \( \alpha \). The right side of (A5) then yields definite integrals of the logarithmic function which can be computed numerically. \( \text{For } p = 2 \text{ the resulting integral, known as Clausen's integral, has been tabulated [10].} \)
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FIGURE 1. Infinite Array of Sub-Array Antennas
FIGURE 2. Linear Dipole Array
FIGURE 3. Variation of Magnitude of Reflection Coefficient with Scan (X=1)

FIGURE 4. Variation of Magnitude of Reflection Coefficient with Scan for Different Tuning Conditions (α = 0.505)
FIGURE 5. Parasitic Element Interconnections for Series Resonance
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