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Abstract—An exact technique for the evaluation of the two-dimensional generalized exponential integral—as required in structures involving rectangular planar radiators and transmission lines—is presented. It is shown that the singularity is integrable if integration is performed in polar coordinates. The integral can be calculated exactly and with minimal computational effort, even if integration over the origin of the coordinate system is required—regardless of whether the origin is an internal or boundary point of the integration region. Comparison with a standard technique proves the presented approach superior. Stability of the algorithm and convergence is discussed. Performance is demonstrated for the example of an asymmetrically edge-fed patch antenna.

I. INTRODUCTION

Accurate calculation of the generalized exponential integral is of paramount importance for the method-of-moments solutions of problems involving radiating structures. Inaccuracies of the numerical evaluation of mutual and self-impedances can lead to grossly incorrect current distributions. In addition, varying the degree of inaccuracy of the numerically integrated elements of the impedance matrix is equivalent to tuning the results which, in effect, means inability to predict unknown values.

The generalized exponential integral in its one-dimensional form is well known from the calculation of mutual and self-impedances of wire antenna elements. The specific problem of calculating the self-impedance of a wire element of length 2π and radius a is, from the numerical point of view, reduced to the evaluation of the integral

\begin{equation}
I_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-jk\sqrt{x^2+a^2}} dx'.
\end{equation}

The presence of radius a in the expression reflects sampling the electric field just above the surface of the wire, which is in direct correspondence with physical reality. Despite the fact that an infinitiesmal thin wire (a = 0) is not of practical importance, it should not be left unnoticed that integral \(I_1\) in (1) does not exist for \(a = 0\).

A multitude of techniques for the evaluation of \(I_1\) can be found in the literature, and we will mention only a few representatives here. In [1], the one-dimensional exponential integral is expressed in terms of three integrals where the first is available in closed form, while the remaining two are given by tabulated generalized sine and cosine integrals. In [2], \(I_1\)
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Fig. 1. A pair of rising and falling half rooftops representing a surface current, and the rectangular integration region of the falling half rooftop in the Cartesian coordinate system.
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$$I_2 = \frac{j}{k} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ e^{-jk\sqrt{\rho_a^2 + a^2}} - e^{-jk|a|} \right] d\theta. \quad (5)$$

Clearly, the singularity which arises at $\rho = a$ in Cartesian coordinates [cf., (2)], has been removed, and the integral poses no numerical difficulties. Note that (5) is independent of the shape of the contour describing the boundary of the integration region. For the rectangular contour of Fig. 1, $\rho_p(\theta) = x_2/(\cos \theta)$ for the right vertical line, $\rho_p(\theta) = y_1/(\sin \theta)$ for the upper horizontal line, $\rho_p(\theta) = x_1/(\cos \theta)$ for the left vertical line, and $\rho_p(\theta) = y_1/(\sin \theta)$ for the lower horizontal line.

Finally, utilizing the result for $I_2$ and calculating the integral over $\rho$ by parts, we evaluate $I_3$ as

$$I_3 = I_2 - \frac{j}{k x_2} \int_0^{2\pi} \left[ \rho_p(\theta) e^{-jk\sqrt{\rho_p^2 + a^2}} - \int_0^\theta e^{-jk\sqrt{\rho_p^2 + a^2}} d\theta \right] \cos \theta d\theta. \quad (6)$$

Once again, the singularity is no longer present. Of course, the numerical integration over $\theta$, although involved in both components of $I_3$, does not have to be performed in two separate cycles. This integration for two different integrands (where the second integrand requires also integration over $\rho$) can be executed in a single cycle; as a result of that, our software implementation of $I_3$ requires only two loops, one submerged in the other.

### III. Numerical Results

Fig. 2 shows plots of the real part of integral $I_3$ versus $a$. Calculations produced by two different algorithms are presented: 1) two-dimensional Gaussian integration in Cartesian coordinates (dashed lines) and 2) the technique described in this paper, i.e., exact two-dimensional integration in polar coordinates, using the Gauss quadrature (solid lines). The Gaussian-integration results in polar coordinates (solid lines) were obtained by integrating in only three points in the inner integral and six points in the outer integral [cf., (6)], for each particular value of $a$. However, those in Cartesian coordinates (dashed lines) were calculated with six points in the inner and three points in the outer integral [cf., (3)]. This reversal of the number of points for inner and outer integrations in Cartesian coordinates produces more accurate results, because a higher number of points in the inner integral smooths the integrand of the outer integral. Each curve in Fig. 2 contains 2001 points and took 1.4 s of CPU time of an IBM RS/6000 530 machine.

Before evaluating the results of Fig. 2, some remarks about the presentation of values at $a = 0$ are in order. The solid...
Fig. 3. An asymmetrically edge-fed rectangular patch, and frequency dependence of its input reflection coefficient. Dashed line: measurement of [5]. Solid line: our calculation involving the new integration procedure of this paper.

lines are calculated exactly at $a = 0$, as no singularity exists in (6). Also the dashed line is calculated at $a = 0$, but the numerical integration carefully avoids the sampling point $(x', y') = (0, 0)$, for which the integration in Cartesian coordinates (3) fails to produce a finite value.

As expected, the results of the Gaussian integration in Cartesian coordinates (dashed line) converge to those in polar coordinates (solid line) as $a$ increases. Better convergence for smaller $a$ can be achieved by significantly increasing the number of integration points in (3). This is demonstrated in the inset of Fig. 2, using $96 \times 96$ integration points in Cartesian coordinates. However, the CPU time increases from the aforementioned 1.4 s to 199.2 s which, clearly, makes a further increase of precision in Cartesian coordinates unreasonable. On the other hand, the new technique using integration in polar coordinates (6) is stable with respect to an increase in the number of integration points. The maximum difference between the (6, 3)- and (96, 96)-point integration in polar coordinates occurs at $a = 0$ and is 0.1% thus falls within the plotting accuracy of the solid line of the Fig. 2 inset.

No problems have been encountered when evaluating the imaginary part of $I_3$. Computations using integration in both Cartesian and polar coordinates are in good agreement.

Fig. 2 proves that both techniques are stable, but their accuracies are very different, especially for small values of $a$. While integrating in either polar or Cartesian coordinates proves that $I_3$ is finite and can be calculated exactly (even at $a = 0$), the convergence analysis of the Gaussian integration proves that our technique is superior to the integration in Cartesian coordinates. We have stressed out the precision of integration at $a = 0$ and at small $a$’s, because these are the situations that are involved in the evaluation of self- and mutual impedances, respectively, of planar-radiator elements. Varying the degree of inaccuracy in the evaluation of the impedance elements results in a wide range of possible but inaccurate current distributions.

IV. APPLICATION

We have employed the new integration procedure of this paper to calculate the frequency dependence of the input reflection coefficient of an asymmetrically edge-fed rectangular patch depicted in the inset of Fig. 3. Our calculated values of $|S_{11}|$ (solid line) are plotted in comparison with measurement of [5] (dashed line). With the sole exception of the measured dip at 10.18 GHz, the calculation confirms the measurement over the entire frequency band. The slight ripple in the measurement in [5] is attributed to imperfections of measuring equipment. We have investigated the mechanism that gives rise to the dip of $|S_{11}|$ at 10.18 GHz and found that the dip is created by the feeding microstrip section and depends on its length. Because the length is not specified in [5], we subsequently varied the quantity and were able to move the dip over the entire frequency range; the solid line of Fig. 3 corresponds to the case in which the dip is below 4 GHz.

V. CONCLUSION

It is demonstrated that the two-dimensional generalized exponential integral, unlike the one-dimensional one, always
exists and can be calculated exactly and without any need for extensive computing. Integration in polar coordinates over the radial variable $\rho$ removes the singularity from the integrand and, therefore, leads to a stable and computationally efficient numerical algorithm. Only $6 \times 3$ points in the Gaussian quadrature are needed to achieve results accurate to better than 0.1%. Good agreement is observed between measured and calculated frequency dependences of the input reflection coefficient of an asymmetrically edge-fed rectangular patch antenna.
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