Genetic Algorithm Optimization of a Dual Polarized Concentric Ring Array
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Abstract — We use a genetic algorithm to minimize the relative sidelobe level (RSLL) of a dual polarized concentric ring array. The optimization variables are the placement of uniformly weight spiral antennas in an aperture with a small area. We optimized a cost function with isotropic sources instated of spiral elements to make the cost function reasonable to evaluate. We developed approaches to calculate a faster cost function and reduce the number of function calls in the optimization. We then calculated the array with an approximation of the element pattern to evaluate its performances.

Index Terms — Concentric ring array, genetic algorithms, optimization, phased array, planar array, spiral antenna, wideband array.

I. INTRODUCTION

Dual circularly polarized wideband arrays find use in several applications, including weather radar [1] and synthetic aperture radar [2]. As in [3], the array design in this paper has a bandwidth from 1 to 2 GHz with a maximum scan angle of 30°. The bandwidth is defined by a reflection coefficient smaller than -10 dB, dual circular polarization with an axial ratio smaller than 3 dB, and a relative sidelobe level smaller than -10 dB. Two-arm center-fed spiral antennas [4] are excellent elements for this application, because they are very wideband, conformal and circularly polarized. Dual polarization is possible by interleaving spirals of opposite polarization [5], [6]. A dual polarized concentric ring array was developed using two-arm center-fed Archimedean spirals as the radiating element with each ring of spirals backed by a cavity. To ensure a good axial ratio, we use the sequential rotation technique [7]. Non-uniformly spaced concentric rings mitigate the sidelobes [6]. In [3] we added a size constraint to the optimization to reduce the size of the array. This work expands on the paper presented at the ACES 2017 conference in Florence [8].

The number of spirals of the same polarization \( N_i \) in a ring of radius \( r_i \) is determined by:

\[
N_i = \left\lfloor \frac{2\pi r_i}{d_{\text{elem}}} \right\rfloor, \quad (1)
\]

where \( \lfloor x \rfloor \) is the floor function. We can then calculate the angular distance between two elements of the same polarization as follows:

\[
\Pi_i = \frac{2\pi}{N_i} \quad (2)
\]

For the optimization, the values of the ring rotations are restricted to \( 0 \leq \Phi_i \leq \Pi_i \) and the array radius is limited by a maximal value \( R_{\text{max}} = 1.3 \text{m} \) [3]. This optimization results in an array with a radius close to the maximum allowed. The surface area obtained in that case is equivalent to 42% of that in [6], similar to [3].
III. ONE RING ARRAY

As our final goal is to minimize the RSLL of the concentric ring array at all frequencies, we first look at the array factor (AF) at the highest frequency in the bandwidth, 2 GHz. In order to consider all steering directions up to \( \theta_s \), we will look at the u-v space in the region:

\[
u^2 + v^2 \leq (1 + \sin \theta_s)^2.
\]

In Fig. 2 we show the AF of a one ring array calculated at 2 GHz inside the region defined by \( u^2 + v^2 \leq 1.5^2 \), which contains all the sidelobes that can appear in the visible zone at 2 GHz for a maximal steering of \( \theta_s = 30^\circ \). By looking at the AF with the u-v axes normalized by \( d_{elem}/\lambda \), we observe high sidelobes in the rings with an integer radius, corresponding to the grating lobe regions. In the concentric ring array we should expect to have the larger sidelobes appearing in those regions.

IV. ARRAY BANDWIDTH

The isolated spirals used in this array have a reflection coefficient higher than -10 dB for frequencies below 1 GHz, so this is used as the lower limit of the bandwidth. In order to calculate the higher limit of the bandwidth of the array, we used a mean radiated element model to find the total radiated field, and then find the RSLL, that should be smaller than -10 dB [6].

To obtain an approximation of the embedded element pattern, which we will call \( E_{model} \), we simulated a small one ring array in FEKO. The array had 8 spiral elements (4 per polarization) backed by a cavity [6], and we simulated it with one of the spirals being excited with a voltage source and the other 7 spirals were adapted with 220 \( \Omega \) loads. In order to calculate the array pattern with the spiral elements and using the sequential rotation technique, we first calculated the radiated field of each of the rotated elements:

\[
E_{elji} = rotation \left( E_{model}, \alpha_{rotji} \right), \quad \alpha_{rotji} = \pm y_{ji},
\]

where \( y_{ji} \) is the angular position of the \( j \)-th element in the \( i \)-th ring of the array, having a positive value for the LH polarized elements and a negative value for the RH polarized elements. Then, we summed the radiated fields, multiplying each of them by the corresponding sequential rotation phase \( \alpha_{rotji} \) as well as the steering phase and the positioning phase, \( \delta_{posji} \):

\[
E(\phi, \theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{N_i-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} e^{-j\delta_{posji}} e^{-j\alpha_{rotji}} E_{elji}(\phi, \theta),
\]

\[
\delta_{posji} = 2\pi \left( x_{ji}(u-u_s) + y_{ji}(v-v_s) \right),
\]

with \( N_e \) being the number of elements in the \( i \)-th ring, \( x_{ji} \) and \( y_{ji} \) are the positions of the \( j \)-th element in the \( i \)-th ring, \( u \) and \( v \) are the observation direction in the u-v space, \( u_s \) and \( v_s \) are the steering directions in the u-v space.

V. GENETIC ALGORITHM OPTIMIZATION

A. First optimization: Optimizing all sidelobes

The goal of the optimization is to minimize the RSLL in the desired bandwidth (1-2 GHz), considering a maximum steering of \( \theta_s = 30^\circ \). In order to find the maximum sidelobe level, the array pattern was calculated, at 2 GHz, in the region defined by \( u^2 + v^2 \leq 1.5^2 \), considering \( \Delta_0 = \pm \Delta_1 = \pm \Delta_2 = \pm \Delta_3 \leq 1.5 \) (equation 3). The cost function analyzes that region and returns the highest RSLL in dB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opt.</th>
<th>( \Delta_0 ) (cm)</th>
<th>( \Delta_1 ) (cm)</th>
<th>( \Delta_2 ) (cm)</th>
<th>( \Delta_3 ) (cm)</th>
<th>( \Phi_1 ) (rad)</th>
<th>( \Phi_2 ) (rad)</th>
<th>( \Phi_3 ) (rad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>0.0467</td>
<td>0.0784</td>
<td>0.1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>29.84</td>
<td>0.1319</td>
<td>0.0895</td>
<td>0.0562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>0.0871</td>
<td>0.2416</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The genetic algorithm had a population size of 200 and ran for a maximum of 200 generations. A single function call for a concentric ring array of isotropic point sources took between 3.8 and 6.3 s. The whole optimization took 38 hours to finish using 4 cores, with a mean of 55 generations before reaching the stop criterion for each of the eight genetic algorithm iterations and a total of 88985 evaluations of the cost function. The optimization results can be seen in Table 1. Figure 3 shows the optimized array pattern in u-v space at 2 GHz. The whole optimization took 38 hours to finish using 4 cores, with a mean of 55 generations before reaching the stop criterion for each of the eight genetic algorithm iterations and a total of 88985 evaluations of the cost function.
what is happening in the array pattern, we will look at the radiated field of the steered array at 2 GHz (Fig. 6). We observe that the 1st ring of grating lobes is getting larger while the 2nd ring of grating lobes is being attenuated.

**Fig. 3.** Array factor of the array obtained from the 1st optimization at 2 GHz. In thick dashed pink we have the limits of the sidelobe search for the optimization cost function. In thin dashed blue and dotted blue, we have the 1st and 2nd grating lobe regions, respectively. In black we have the visible zone once steered to $[\theta_s, \phi_s] = [30°, 0°]$.

**B. Second optimization: Avoiding 2nd GLs**

By taking into account this reduction in the 2nd grating lobes, we decided to re-optimize the array, changing the optimized region in the AF to exclude those sidelobes, so the 1st grating lobes are prioritized and thus further reduced, which compensates the increase they get when we steer the array.

Now, the optimized region of the sidelobes in the AF at 2 GHz is defined by $u^2 + v^2 \leq 1.15^2$, which corresponds to $(u \ d_{element}/\lambda)^2 + (v \ d_{element}/\lambda)^2 \leq 1.866^2$ by normalizing as in section III and includes all sidelobes until just before the 2nd grating lobe region. By using the same optimization procedure as in section V-A, we got the results presented in Table 1. A single cost function call took between 2.2 and 3.7 s, 59% of the time required in section V-A. The whole optimization took 21 hours to finish using 4 cores, with a mean of 48 generations before reaching the stop criterion for each of the eight genetic algorithm iterations and a total of 77988 evaluations of the cost function. In Fig. 7 we show the AF of the optimized array and, in Fig. 8, two u-cuts of that AF representative of the sidelobe level. We can see from the figures that the new optimization was able to further reduce the prioritized sidelobes by relaxing the constraints on the sidelobes appearing in the 2nd GL region. In Fig. 5 we show the RSLL calculated via the method in section IV, and we observe that the bandwidth was successfully increased to 1-2 GHz (95% of [6]).

**Fig. 5.** RSLL in function of frequency of the 1st (continuous black), 2nd (dashed red) and 3rd (dotted blue) optimized array using the method described in Section IV.

**C. Third optimization: using only half of the AF**

Finally, we noticed that by optimizing the sidelobes in half of the u-v space, we got very similar results while significantly reducing the computation time. The optimization was repeated with the new cost function with the results presented in Table 2. The cost function evaluation time reduced to 1.1-1.9 s, 30% of the time required in section V-A. The whole optimization took 8 hours to finish using 4 cores, with a mean of 36 generations before reaching the stop criterion for each of the eight genetic algorithm iterations and a total of 59387 evaluations of the cost function. The resulting AF is similar to that obtained in the 2nd optimization (Fig. 7). In Fig. 5 we show the RSLL calculated via the method from Section IV. The resulting RSLL is so similar to that from the array of the 2nd optimization that their curves are almost superposed, showing that limiting the optimized zone to half of the u-v space is a good approach to reduce the computation time. Further reducing the optimized zone created an imbalance in the sidelobes of the
optimized array, resulting in larger sidelobes for the worst case scenario.
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Fig. 7. Array factor of the array obtained from the 2nd optimization at 2 GHz. In thick dashed pink we have the limits of the sidelobe search for the optimization cost function. In thin dashed blue and dotted blue, we have the 1st and 2nd grating lobe regions, respectively.
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Fig. 8. Array factor representative u-cuts ($\phi_1 = 165^\circ$and $\phi_2 = 265^\circ$) for the concentric ring array optimized at the $(u \cdot d_{elem}/\lambda)^2 + (v \cdot d_{elem}/\lambda)^2 \leq 1.866^2$ zone, at 2 GHz (2nd optimization).

VI. RESULTS DISCUSSION

By using three criteria for defining the array bandwidth, we have shown that limiting the optimized zone of the AF to exclude the 2nd GL zone is a good strategy for reducing the optimization time. The sidelobes in the 2nd GL zone are attenuated once the radiating pattern of the array’s elements are taken into account. Prioritizing the sidelobes in the 1st GL zone when optimizing the array’s AF compensates their rise once the radiating pattern is considered. By optimizing only half of the u-v space there was no bandwidth reduction, proving it to be a great way to reduce the computation time of the cost function. Further reduction of the optimized region consistently caused a reduction in the bandwidth, so it was not considered in this paper. As for the time reduction, there are two main factors. First, by limiting the optimized zone in the AF, there are less points to be computed in the u-v space, which results in a faster cost function. This is true for both the 2nd and 3rd optimizations. Second, in the 2nd and 3rd optimizations the genetic algorithms converged faster. We cannot draw any special conclusions from this faster convergence as we would need to validate that fact by re-optimizing the array enough times to have statistically meaningful results, which was time prohibitive in our case.

By comparing the first and last optimizations, the latter spent 22.3% of the time needed for the first one while enhancing the bandwidth from 27% to 95% (1-2 GHz) of [6].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimized zone</th>
<th>$\theta &lt; 30^\circ$ at 2 GHz</th>
<th>Avoid 2nd GL</th>
<th>Avoid 2nd GL, $u &gt; 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth (GHz)</td>
<td>1-1.3 (27%)</td>
<td>1-2 (95%)</td>
<td>1-2 (95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost function call time (s)</td>
<td>3.8-6.3 (100%)</td>
<td>2.2-3.7 (59%)</td>
<td>1.1-1.9 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost function calls</td>
<td>88985 (100%)</td>
<td>77988 (88%)</td>
<td>59387 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt. time (h)</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>21 (55%)</td>
<td>8 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. CONCLUSIONS

By analyzing the concentric ring array topology with a size constraint [3] and redesigning its cost function, it was possible to find an array with 95% of the bandwidth in [6] and 42% of its surface, as well as an optimization 4.5 times faster than in [3]. For the bandwidth, the key factor was to identify the sidelobes to be optimized when considering the embedded element model. As for the time reduction, by reducing the optimized area, we got a cost function that is 3.4 times faster.
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