

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1:	Optimum combination of ‘ON’ (‘1’) and ‘OFF’ (‘0’) elements for half of the proposed 100-element TLA array.	40
Table 2-2:	Optimal combination of ‘active’ (‘1’) and ‘inactive’ (‘0’) elements for half of the proposed 100-element TLA array.	43
Table 2-3:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results of the proposed 100-element TLA array with those of the arrays reported in [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)], [Mahenti <i>et al.</i> (2007)], and [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012)].	45
Table 2-4:	Comparison of computational cost using the proposed approach with those employed methods reported in [Mahenti <i>et al.</i> (2007)], and [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012)] for the synthesis of 100-element TLA array.	46
Table 2-5:	Optimal combination of ‘ON’ (‘1’) and ‘OFF’ (‘0’) elements for half of the 200-element TLA array.	46
Table 2-6:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results of the proposed 200-element TLA array with those of the arrays reported in [Jin and Samii (2007)], [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012a)], and [Ha <i>et al.</i> (2016)].	47
Table 2-7:	Optimal combination of ‘ON’ (‘1’) and ‘OFF’ (‘0’) elements for half of the proposed 100-element TLA array.	49
Table 2-8:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the proposed 100-element TLA array with those of the arrays reported in [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)], [Mahanti <i>et al.</i> (2007)], and [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012b)].	50
Table 2-9:	Optimal combination of ‘ON’ (‘1’) and ‘OFF’ (‘0’) elements for half of the proposed 100-element TLA phased array.	53
Table 2-10:	Results for the proposed 100-element TLA phased array at boresight and at scan angles of 30^0 , 45^0 and 60^0 away from boresight.	54
Table 2-11:	Optimal combination of ‘ON’ (‘1’) and ‘OFF’ (‘0’) elements for half of the proposed 100-element TLA phased array.	56
Table 2-12:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the	57

	proposed 100-element TLA array with those of the arrays reported in [Haupt (1995)], and [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)].	
Table 2-13:	Comparison of design constraints for the proposed NUSLA array with those for 32-element uniformly spaced array and published results in [Goudos <i>et al.</i> (2010)] and [Caratelli and Vigano (2011)].	72
Table 2-14:	Geometry of the best array obtained for half of the proposed 24-element NUSLA array elements.	72
Table 2-15:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the proposed NUSLA array with those of uniformly spaced array and published literature in [Goudos <i>et al.</i> (2010)] and [Caratelli and Vigano (2011)].	73
Table 2-16:	Geometry of the best array obtained for half of the proposed 16- and 32-elements NUSLA arrays normalized to free space wavelength.	79
Table 2-17:	Comparison of PSLL for the proposed NUSLA arrays with those published in [Chen <i>et al.</i> (2006)], [Goudos <i>et al.</i> (2010)], [Lin <i>et al.</i> (2010)], [Goudos <i>et al.</i> (2011)], [Lin <i>et al.</i> (2012)], and [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2013)].	80
Table 2-18:	Geometry of the array positions obtained by the proposed PSO based method.	82
Table 2-19:	Comparison of PSLL performance obtained through the proposed 16-element NUSLA array with those of uniformly spaced array of same size.	83
Table 2-20:	Optimum combinations of inter-element spacing and amplitude excitations for half of the proposed 36-element NUSLA array.	84
Table 2-21:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the proposed NUSLA array with those for uniformly spaced array and the results published in literature [Chen <i>et al.</i> (2006)], [Lin <i>et al.</i> (2010)], [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2011)] and [Cen <i>et al.</i> (2012)].	86
Table 2-22:	Design parameters of the M-shaped patch antenna [Aggarwal and Gangwar (2014)].	88
Table 2-23:	Comparison of simulated results for the proposed NUSLA array with and without mutual coupling and with those	90

	published in literature [Caratelli and Vigano (2011)].	
Table 2-24:	Comparison of simulated and measured results for the proposed 24-element NUSLA array and with simulated ones published in literature [Caratelli and Vigano (2011)].	92
Table 3-1:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the proposed 10×20-element TPA array with those of the arrays reported in [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)], [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2010)], [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012)], and [Liu and Wu (2014)].	119
Table 3-2:	Comparison of computational cost of the proposed approach with that of the methods reported in [Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012)], and [Liu and Wu (2014)] for the synthesis of 10×20-element TPA array.	120
Table 3-3:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results of the proposed 10×10-element UE-TPA array at boresight with those of the proposed array at $(20^0, 20^0)$ and $(40^0, 40^0)$ and with those of the arrays reported in [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2010)], [Deb <i>et al.</i> (2012)], and [Nihad (2014)].	129
Table 3-4:	Comparison of numerically evaluated results for the proposed 14×14-element UE-TPA array at boresight with respect to $(20^0, 20^0)$ and $(40^0, 40^0)$ scan angles.	136
Table 3-5:	Comparison of design parameters of the proposed TPA array with those of fully dense array and arrays reported in [Haupt (1994)], [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)], and [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2010)].	137
Table 3-6:	Comparison of radiation pattern characteristics of the proposed TPA array with those of arrays reported in [Haupt (1994)], [Teruel and Iglesias (2006)], and [Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2010)] and Taylor-tapered fully dense array of equal size.	143
Table 3-7:	Comparison of radiation parameters of the proposed 10×20-elements TPA array with those of the arrays reported in [Teruel and Iglesias (2006), Zhang <i>et al.</i> (2010), Wang <i>et al.</i> (2012), and Liu and Wu (2014)].	151
Table 3-8:	Summary of the Computed Radiation Pattern Parameters of the Proposed 8x8 TPA-UA and AW-TPA Arrays.	156
Table 3-9:	Summary of the results obtained through simulation and experiment for the proposed 8×8-element AW-TPA array	166
Table 3-10:	Best inter-element spacings normalized to free space	173

	wavelength for one quadrant of the proposed NUSPA array.	
Table 3-11:	Comparison of numerical results of the proposed NUSPA array with those of uniformly spaced Taylor tapered array of equal size.	175
Table 3-12:	Best inter-element spacings normalized to free space wavelength, and amplitude excitations for the one quadrant of proposed NUSPA array.	176
Table 3-13:	Comparison of numerical results of the proposed amplitude weighted NUSPA array with those of uniformly spaced Taylor tapered array	179
Table 4-1:	Variation of inter-element spacing obtained by the proposed MBC-GA based method along X-axis normalized to wavelength for 8×16 -element RSPA array.	187
Table 4-2:	Variation of inter-element spacing obtained by the proposed MBC-GA based method along Y-axis normalized to wavelength for 8×16 -element RSPA array.	187
Table 4-3:	Numerically evaluated PSLL for the proposed 8×16 -element RSPA array.	189
Table 4-4:	Variation of inter-element spacing along X-axis normalized to wavelength for 4×4 -element RSPA array obtained by proposed method.	193
Table 4-5:	Variation of inter-element spacing along X-axis normalized to wavelength for 4×4 -element RSPA array obtained by proposed method.	194
Table 4-6:	Variation of inter-element spacing along X-axis normalized to wavelength for 8×8 -element RSPA array obtained by the proposed method.	197
Table 4-7:	Variation of inter-element spacing along Y-axis normalized to wavelength for 8×8 -element RSPA array obtained by the proposed method.	197
Table 4-8:	Numerically evaluated PSLs for the proposed 4×4 - and 8×8 -elements RSPA arrays.	200