

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1:	Block diagram of part of (a) a microwave transmitter, and (b) a microwave receiver.	3
Figure 1.2:	Two-port network representation of a microwave filter. V_1, I_1 are the voltage and current at the port 1 and V_2, I_2 are port 2 quantities, Z_{01} and Z_{02} are the terminal impedances at the port 1 and 2 respectively.	3
Figure 1.3:	Antenna as a transition device.	5
Figure 1.4:	Equivalent circuit model of antenna.	5
Figure 1.5:	Geometrical configuration of (a) simple monopole antenna and (b) corresponding equivalent dipole with mirror image.	7
Figure 1.6:	Circular patch antenna with full and partial ground planes.	8
Figure 1.7:	Operating principle of the planar monopole antenna with overlapping closely spaced modes.	8
Figure 2.1:	(a) Layout of the conventional IBPF with dimensional details (all dimensions are in millimeter). Fabricated prototype of the conventional IBPF (b) top view, and (c) bottom view.	31
Figure 2.2:	Simulated and measured performances of S -parameters of the conventional IBPF with frequency.	32
Figure 2.3:	Simulated and measured performances of the conventional IBPF with frequency for desired operating band (a) group delay, and (b) phase response.	32
Figure 2.4:	(a) Layout of spurline with slit gap ‘g’, slit height ‘b’, and slit length ‘a’, and (b) equivalent circuit model of spurline.	35
Figure 2.5:	(a) Layout of IBPF with single pair of spurlines (all dimensions are in millimeter). (b) Simulated variations of S -parameters of IBPF having single pair of spurlines with frequency.	36
Figure 2.6:	(a) Layout of IBPF with two pairs of spurlines (all dimensions are in millimeter). (b) Simulated variations of S -parameters of IBPF with two pairs of spurlines with frequency.	36
Figure 2.7:	(a) Attenuation versus frequency characteristic of the BPF. (b) Equivalent circuit of the proposed DGS.	38
Figure 2.8:	(a) Layout of the proposed BPF with two pairs of spurlines and a pair of SIR-shaped DGS (all dimensions are in millimeter). Fabricated prototype of the proposed filter (b) top view, and (c)	39

	bottom view.	
Figure 2.9:	Simulated and measured variations of S -parameters of the proposed filter with frequency.	40
Figure 2.10:	a) Simulated and measured variations of group delay of the proposed filter with frequency for desired operating band, and (b) simulated and measured variations of phase plot of the proposed filter with frequency for desired operating band.	40
Figure 3.1:	Geometries of different monopole antennas: circular-shaped with partial rectangular ground plane (Type-I), circular-shaped with modified partial ground plane (Type-II), elliptic-shaped with partial rectangular ground plane (Type-III), elliptic-shaped with modified partial ground plane (Type-IV), modified elliptic-shaped with partial rectangular ground plane (Type-V), and modified elliptic-shaped with modified partial ground plane (proposed antenna).	49
Figure 3.2:	(a) Geometry of the proposed modified elliptic-shaped monopole antenna. (b) Top and bottom views of the fabricated prototype of the proposed modified elliptic-shaped monopole antenna.	49
Figure 3.3:	Simulated surface current distributions for different geometries (Type-I, Type-II, Type-III, Type-IV, Type-V and Proposed) of the monopole antennas at the frequencies of 1.0, 1.8, and 2.6 GHz.	50
Figure 3.4:	Numerically simulated variations of reflection coefficient with frequency for different geometries (Type-I, Type-II, Type-III, Type-IV, Type-V and Proposed) of the monopole antennas.	50
Figure 3.5:	Numerically simulated and measured variations of reflection coefficient of the proposed antenna with frequency.	53
Figure 3.6:	Numerically simulated and measured radiation patterns of the proposed antenna for three different frequencies of 1.1, 1.8, 2.5 GHz.	54
Figure 3.7:	Numerically simulated and measured gain values of the proposed antenna as functions of frequency.	54
Figure 3.8:	Simulated total efficiency of the proposed antenna as function of frequency.	55
Figure 3.9:	Geometry of the BPF (a) Perspective view, (b) Top view, and (c) Bottom view.	57
Figure 3.10:	Numerically simulated variations of the magnitude of S -parameters of the BPF versus frequency.	58

Figure 3.11:	(a) Geometry of the proposed integrated design of filtering antenna. (b) Top and bottom views of the fabricated prototype of the proposed integrated design of filtering antenna.	58
Figure 3.12:	Numerically simulated variations of reflection coefficient of the proposed antenna with and without integration of the BPF versus frequency.	61
Figure 3.13:	Numerically simulated and measured variations of reflection coefficient of the proposed filtering antenna versus frequency.	61
Figure 3.14:	Simulated surface current distributions of the proposed antenna at a frequency of 5.7 GHz (an undesired response frequency obtained without BPF) (a) without BPF, and (b) with BPF.	62
Figure 3.15:	Numerically simulated and measured radiation patterns of the proposed filtering antenna for two different frequencies.	62
Figure 3.16:	Numerically simulated variations of gain values of the proposed antenna with and without integration of the BPF versus frequency.	65
Figure 3.17:	Numerically simulated and measured gain values of the proposed filtering antenna as functions of frequency.	65
Figure 3.18:	Numerically simulated variations of total efficiency of the proposed antenna with and without integration of the proposed BPF versus frequency.	66
Figure 4.1:	Geometry of the MMR.	72
Figure 4.2:	Geometry of the MMR-based UWB BPF with optimized dimensions (all dimensions are in millimeter).	72
Figure 4.3:	Simulated variations of $ S_{21} $ of MMR-based UWB BPF with frequency for different values of coupling length l_c .	72
Figure 4.4:	Equivalent circuit model of the MMR.	74
Figure 4.5:	Equivalent circuit model of the MMR-based UWB BPF.	75
Figure 4.6:	Simulated variation of magnitudes of S-parameters of the MMR-based UWB BPF with frequency.	75
Figure 4.7:	Simulated variation of group delay of the MMR-based UWB BPF with frequency.	76
Figure 4.8:	Geometry of the modified MMR-based UWB BPF.	77
Figure 4.9:	Equivalent circuit model of the modified MMR-based UWB BPF.	78
Figure 4.10:	Simulated variations of magnitudes of S-parameters of modified MMR-based UWB BPF with and without SI stubs	78

	versus frequency.	
Figure 4.11:	Simulated and measured results for the modified MMR-based UWB BPF (inset view shows the fabricated prototype of the filter).	79
Figure 4.12:	(a) Geometry of single UDGS on the ground plane along with 50Ω microstrip line. (b) The equivalent RLC circuit model of single UDGS. (c) The magnitudes of S -parameters versus frequency for single UDGS having dimensions $l_1 = 3.35$ mm, $l_2 = 2.88$ mm, and $w = 0.25$ mm.	85
Figure 4.13:	Variations of numerically simulated magnitude of S_{21} of single UDGS-microstrip line combination with frequency for different values of (a) ' l_2 ', (b) ' l_1 ', and (c) ' w '; keeping other dimensions fixed.	88
Figure 4.14:	Geometries of different DGS configurations (a) Dumbbell-shaped DGS, (b) Fork-shaped DGS, and (c) U-shaped DGS.	88
Figure 4.15:	Variations of numerically simulated magnitudes of S -parameters for different DGS-microstrip line combinations with frequency.	89
Figure 4.16:	(a) Geometry of the proposed DGS unit-microstrip line combination. (b) Numerically simulated variation of $ S_{21} $ of the proposed DGS unit-microstrip line combination with frequency.	89
Figure 4.17:	Variations of numerically simulated magnitude of S_{21} of triple isosceles UDGS (proposed DGS unit)-microstrip line combination with frequency for different values of (a) ' l_2 ', (b) ' l_4 ', and (c) ' l_6 '; keeping other parameters fixed.	91
Figure 4.18:	Equivalent circuit model of the proposed DGS unit-microstrip line combination.	92
Figure 4.19:	The $ S_{21} $ -frequency characteristics of the proposed DGS unit-microstrip line combination determined through circuit analysis for different values of coupling capacitor (a) C_{C12} , (b) C_{C23} , and (c) C_{C13} .	92
Figure 4.20:	Variations of numerically simulated values of $ S_{21} $ and those determined through circuit analysis for the proposed triple isosceles UDGS unit-microstrip line combination with frequency.	94
Figure 4.21:	Geometry of the proposed DGS-based LPF using four cascaded triple isosceles UDGS units.	96
Figure 4.22:	Geometries of LPFs using cascaded DGSs (a) Type-I, and (b)	98

	Type-II (all dimensions are in millimetre).	
Figure 4.23:	Numerically simulated variations of the magnitudes of S -parameters of the proposed LPF versus frequency.	98
Figure 4.24:	Numerically simulated variations of $ S_{21} $ of the three DGS based LPFs (Proposed, Type-I, and Type-II) with frequency.	98
Figure 4.25:	Equivalent RLC circuit model of the proposed LPF.	99
Figure 4.26:	Variations of the magnitudes of S -parameters of the proposed LPF versus frequency determined through circuit simulation.	100
Figure 4.27:	Fabricated prototype of the proposed LPF (a) Top view shows the $50\ \Omega$ microstrip conductor, and (b) Bottom view shows DGS pattern on the ground plane.	101
Figure 4.28:	Variations of magnitude of S -parameters of the proposed LPF versus frequency obtained through numerical and circuit simulations as well as measurements.	101
Figure 4.29:	Geometry of the proposed compact UWB BPF.	105
Figure 4.30:	Variations of the magnitudes of S -parameters of the directly integrated BPF–LPF combination versus frequency obtained through numerical simulation.	105
Figure 4.31:	Simulation results for the proposed filter (a) S -parameter-frequency characteristics, and (b) Group delay-frequency characteristic.	106
Figure 4.32:	Equivalent circuit model of the proposed UWB BPF.	107
Figure 4.33:	Simulated surface current distributions of the proposed filter at a frequency of 16.7 GHz (undesired response frequency without DGSs) (a) Without DGS-based LPF, and (b) With DGS-based LPF.	108
Figure 4.34:	Fabricated prototype of the proposed filter (a) Top view, and (b) Bottom view.	108
Figure 4.35:	Simulation and measured results for the proposed filter (a) S -parameter-frequency characteristics, and (b) Group delay-frequency characteristics.	109
Figure 5.1:	Geometries of different monopole antennas: circular-shaped with partial rectangular ground plane (Type-I), circular-shaped with modified ground plane (Type-II), elliptic-shaped with modified ground plane (Type-III), two modified elliptic-shaped with modified ground plane (Type-IV), and three modified elliptic-shaped with modified ground plane (the proposed UWB antenna).	119

Figure 5.2:	(a) Geometry of the proposed modified elliptic-shaped UWB antenna. (b) Top and bottom views of the fabricated prototype of the proposed UWB antenna.	119
Figure 5.3:	Simulated surface current distribution for different geometries (Type-I, Type-II, Type-III, Type-IV, and Proposed) of the monopole antennas at different frequencies of 3.1, 6.8, and 10.6 GHz.	120
Figure 5.4:	Numerically simulated variations of reflection coefficient with frequency for different geometries (Type-I, Type-II, Type-III, Type-IV, and Proposed) of the monopole antennas.	120
Figure 5.5:	Numerically simulated and measured variations of reflection coefficient of the proposed UWB antenna with frequency.	123
Figure 5.6:	Numerically simulated and measured radiation patterns of the proposed UWB antenna for four different frequencies 3.5, 5.5, 7.5, 9.5 GHz.	124
Figure 5.7:	Numerically simulated and measured gain values of the proposed UWB antenna as functions of frequency.	124
Figure 5.8:	Simulated total efficiency of the proposed UWB antenna as a function of frequency.	125
Figure 5.9:	Excited and received pulses for different orientations of proposed UWB antennas at a distance of 30 cm (a) face-to-face, and (b) side-by-side.	125
Figure 5.10:	Simulated far-field group delays of proposed UWB antenna for different orientations at a distance of 30 cm.	126
Figure 5.11:	The geometry of the UWB BPF integrated with DGS-based LPF (a) Top view, (b) Bottom view, and (c) Proposed compact UWB BPF.	130
Figure 5.12:	Numerically simulated variations of S-parameters of the compact UWB BPF versus frequency.	131
Figure 5.13:	The geometries of the modified elliptic-shaped UWB antenna integrated with the compact UWB BPF: (a) Design-I, (b) Design-II, and (c) the proposed filtering antenna.	133
Figure 5.14:	Numerically simulated variations of reflection coefficient with frequency for different geometries (Design-I, Design-II, and Proposed) of the modified elliptic-shaped UWB antenna integrated with the compact UWB BPF.	134
Figure 5.15:	Fabricated prototype of the proposed UWB filtering antenna (a) Top view, and (b) Bottom view.	135

Figure 5.16:	Numerically simulated variation of reflection coefficient of the proposed UWB antenna with and without integration of the BPF versus frequency.	135
Figure 5.17:	Numerically simulated and measured variations of reflection coefficient of the proposed UWB filtering antenna versus frequency.	135
Figure 5.18:	Simulated surface current distributions of the proposed UWB antenna at a frequency of 18.5 GHz (an undesired response frequency without BPF) (a) Without UWB BPF, and (b) With UWB BPF.	135
Figure 5.19:	Numerically simulated and measured radiation patterns of the proposed UWB filtering antenna for four different frequencies.	136
Figure 5.20:	Numerically simulated gain values of the proposed UWB antenna with and without integration of the compact UWB BPF as a function of frequency.	141
Figure 5.21:	Numerically simulated and measured gain values of the proposed UWB filtering antenna as functions of frequency.	141
Figure 5.22:	Numerically simulated variations of total efficiency of the proposed antenna with and without integration of the proposed UWB BPF versus frequency.	141
Figure 5.23:	Excited and received pulses for different orientations of proposed UWB filtering antennas at a distance of 30 cm (a) face-to-face and (b) side-by-side.	142
Figure 5.24:	Simulated far-field group delays of the proposed UWB filtering antenna for different orientations at a distance of 30 cm.	142