

List of Tables

S. No.	Table	Page No.
1	Table 1.1. Comparison between different feeding technique (Balanis 2016)	6
2	Table 2.1. Patch Antenna Design	33
3	Table 2.2. Patch Antennas Impedance	33
4	Table 2.3. Patch Antennas RLC Values Shown in Figure 2.8	35
5	Table 2.4. Performance comparison of L-band patch antennas	41
6	Table 2.5. X-band Patch Antennas Design	43
7	Table 2.6. Performance comparison of X-band antennas	47
8	Table 3.1. Values of Lumped Elements of Equivalent Circuit Model	77
9	Table 3.2. Values of Parameters Used in Three Antenna Designs	91
10	Table 4.1. Values of lumped elements of equivalent circuit model of A3	111
11	Table 4.2. Calculated values of lumped elements of loop AMC with $p_u = 18.5$ mm, $s_2 = 5$ mm, $h = 1.5$ mm and $p_u = 18.5$ mm, at $\epsilon_r = 4.4$, $\epsilon_{eff} = 2.7$ and $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	121
12	Table 4.3. Calculated values of lumped elements of loop AMC with $g = 0.5$ mm, $l_u = 18$ mm, $h = 1.5$ mm and $p_u = 18.5$ mm, at $\epsilon_r = 4.4$, $\epsilon_{eff} = 2.7$ and $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	122
13	Table 4.4. Calculated values of lumped elements of loop AMC with $p_u = 18.5$ mm, $s_l = 1.5$ mm, $h = 1.5$ mm, at $\epsilon_r = 4.4$, $\epsilon_{corr} = 2.08$ and $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	124
14	Table 4.5. Calculated values of lumped elements of loop AMC with $g = 0.5$ mm, $l_u = 18$ mm, $h = 1.5$ mm and $p_u = 18.5$ mm, at $\epsilon_r = 4.4$, and $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	125
15	Table 5.1. Wireless communication systems frequencies covered by the S-band antennas	136
16	Table 5.2. Comparison of f_l of various monopole antenna configuration.	154
17	Table 5.3. Comparison of f_l of various monopole antenna configurations using modified formula.	156
18	Table 5.4. Comparison of f_l of proposed probe fed monopole antenna configurations using proposed formula.	158
19	Table 5.5. Gain comparison of antennas backed by reflectors in reported literature	167

List of Figures

S. No.	Figure	Page No.
1	Figure 2.1. (a) Geometry of the proposed pentagonal-shaped patch antenna with the feed points indicated (b) Side view.	27
2	Figure 2.2. (a) Geometry of the proposed hexagonal-shaped patch antenna with the feed points indicated (b) Side view.	28
3	Figure 2.3. Simulated reflection coefficient with different probe feeding positions for pentagonal-shaped patch.	29
4	Figure 2.4. Simulated reflection coefficient with different probe feeding positions for hexagonal-shaped patch.	29
5	Figure 2.5. Simulated impedance matrix with different polygonal patch.	30
6	Figure 2.6. Simulated Gain (in dB) with different polygonal patch.	30
7	Figure 2.7. Schematic of (a) Antenna:A ₁ (b) Antenna:A ₂ (c) Antenna:A ₃ (d) Antenna:A ₄ (e) Antenna:A ₅	32
8	Figure 2.8. Equivalent Circuit model of the antennas at $f = 1.5$ GHz for (a) A ₁ (b) A ₂ (c) A ₃ (d) A ₄ (e) A ₅ .	34
9	Figure 2.9. SC of A ₁ compared with the results of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ using Equivalent circuit model.	36
10	Figure 2.10. The S ₁₁ (in dB) of A ₁ compared with the S ₁₁ of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	37
11	Figure 2.11. The Z ₁₁ of A ₁ compared with the Z ₁₁ of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	38
12	Figure 2.12. The SC of A ₁ compared with the SC of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	39
13	Figure 2.13. The farfield gain of A ₁ compared with the gain of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	40
14	Figure 2.14. The farfield directivity of A ₁ compared with the results of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ , A ₅ .	41
15	Figure 2.15. Schematic of (a) Antenna:A ₁ (b) Antenna:A ₂ (c) Antenna:A ₃ (d) Antenna:A ₄ (e) Antenna:A ₅	42
16	Figure 2.16. The S ₁₁ (in dB) of A ₁ compared with the S ₁₁ of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	43
17	Figure 2.17. The Z ₁₁ of A ₁ compared with the Z ₁₁ of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	44
18	Figure 2.18. The SC of A ₁ compared with the SC of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	45
19	Figure 2.19. The farfield gain of A ₁ compared with the gain of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	45
20	Figure 2.20. The farfield radiation pattern of A ₁ compared with the results of A ₂ , A ₃ , A ₄ and A ₅ .	46
21	Figure 2.21. Pentagon to pentagram schematic.	48
22	Figure 2.22. Hexagon to hexagram schematic.	49
23	Figure 2.23. Simulated reflection coefficient (in dB) for pentagon to pentagram.	52
24	Figure 2.24. Simulated reflection coefficient (in dB) for hexagon to hexagram.	50
25	Figure 2.25. Simulated impedance vs. frequency matrix.	51
26	Figure 2.26. Simulated farfield Gain vs. frequency.	52
27	Figure 2.27. Simulated farfield Gain at 17 GHz for pentagon to pentagram.	53
28	Figure 2.28. Schematic of (a) Pentagonal shaped patch antenna with pentagonal slot (Antenna:A ₁) (b) Hexagonal shaped patch	55
29	Figure 2.29. Simulated reflection coefficient (in dB) for antennas with different values of R ₂ (a) A ₁ (b) A ₂ .	57
30	Figure 2.30. Simulated impedance vs. frequency matrix for antennas with different values of R ₂ .	58

31	Figure 2.31. Simulated farfield gain vs. frequency for antennas with different values of R2.	59
32	Figure 2.32. Simulated surface current distribution of A1 with radial distance of 15 mm for the frequency (a) 18 GHz (b) 19 GHz (c) 20 GHz	60
33	Figure 2.33. Simulated surface current distribution of A2 with radial distance of 16 mm for the frequency (a) 18 GHz (b) 19 GHz (c) 20 GHz	60
34	Figure 2.34. Simulated farfield directivity at frequencies 18 GHz, 19 GHz and 20 GHz for (a) A1 of 15 mm radial distance (b) A2 of 15 mm radial distance	61
35	Figure 3.1. Schematic of the proposed hexagonal shaped patch antenna with hexagonal slot and reduced ground.	67
36	Figure 3.2. Effect of varying r_{cut} and G_p .	68
37	Figure 3.3. Equivalent Circuit model of the proposed antenna.	69
38	Figure 3.4. Photograph of the fabricated antenna (a) Front (b) Back.	71
39	Figure 3.5. Measured Reflection coefficient (in dB) (S_{11}).	72
40	Figure 3.6. Measured Impedance Real and Imaginary part (Z_{11}).	73
41	Figure 3.7. Smith Chart for proposed antenna using (a) CST (b) Equivalent Circuit Model (c) VNA.	74
42	Figure 3.8. Hexagonal patch antenna structure (a) Layout with dimension (b) Side view.	75
43	Figure 3.9. Equivalent circuit model of the designed antenna.	76
44	Figure 3.10. Picture of the designed antenna (a) Front (b) Back.	78
45	Figure 3.11. Scattering parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB)	79
46	Figure 3.12. Variation of the input impedance of the proposed antenna on Smith Chart.	80
47	Figure 3.13. Surface current density of the designed antenna at 5 GHz at different phase of excitation signal (a) 0° (b) 90° (c) 180° (d) 270°	88
48	Figure 3.14. Schematic of the proposed hexagonal shaped patch antenna with reduced ground.	82
49	Figure 3.15. Simulated Reflection coefficients (S_{11}) for different values of G_p when feed point is at 10 mm.	83
50	Figure 3.16. Simulated $Re(Z_{11})$ for different values of G_p when feed point is at 10 mm.	83
51	Figure 3.17. Simulated $Im(Z_{11})$ for different values of G_p when feed point is at 10 mm.	84
52	Figure 3.18. Equivalent Circuit model of the hexagonal shaped patch antenna with its probe feeding network.	85
53	Figure 3.19. Photograph of the fabricated hexagonal shaped patch antenna with reduced ground (a) Front (b) Back	86
54	Figure 3.20. Measured Reflection coefficient (in dB) (S_{11}).	87
55	Figure 3.21. Measured Impedance Real and Imaginary part (Z_{11}).	88
56	Figure 3.22. Smith Chart for Hexagonal patch antenna using (a) CST (b) Equivalent circuit model (c) VNA.	89
57	Figure 3.23. Proposed vertex fed hexagonal antenna with reduced ground (a) Schematic (b) Cross sectional view.	90
58	Figure 3.24. Antenna 1 Reflection coefficient, S_{11} (dB)	92
59	Figure 3.25. Antenna 2 Reflection coefficient, S_{11} (dB)	93
60	Figure 3.26. Antenna 3 Reflection coefficient, S_{11} (dB)	93
61	Figure 3.27. Magnetic mode field of the antennas.	94
62	Figure 3.28. Antenna 1- 3 prototypes (a) Front (b) Back.	95

63	Figure 3.29. Measured Return loss, S_{11} (in dB)	96
64	Figure 3.30. Variation of the input impedance of the proposed antennas (a) Real part (b) Imaginary part.	97
65	Figure 3.31. Experimental measurement setup [BITS-Pilani].	98
66	Figure 3.32. Measured Co- and Cross-polar patterns.	100
67	Figure 4.1. Structure of Proposed slotted hexagonal antenna with PPC (a) Layout with dimension (b) Side view.	106
68	Figure 4.2. Measured Reflection coefficient (in dB) (S_{11}) of different antenna ($A_1 - A_3$) configurations.	108
69	Figure 4.3. Measured Impedance (Z_{11}) of different antenna ($A_1 - A_3$) configurations (a) Real Impedance ($\text{Re}(Z_{11})$) (b) Imaginary Impedance ($\text{Im}(Z_{11})$).	109
70	Figure 4.4. Picture of the developed antenna, A_3 (a) Front (b) Back.	110
71	Figure 4.5. Equivalent circuit model of antenna radiating at f_n , A_3 (where $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$)	110
72	Figure 4.6. Measured Reflection coefficient (in dB) (S_{11}) of antenna with and without PPC compared with equivalent circuit model.	113
73	Figure 4.7. Measured Impedance (Z_{11}) of antenna with and without PPC compared with equivalent circuit model (a) Real Impedance ($\text{Re}(Z_{11})$) (b) Imaginary Impedance ($\text{Im}(Z_{11})$).	114
74	Figure 4.8. Calculated Reflection coefficient (magnitude) (S_{11}) of the compensation capacitor (C_p), where h_c varies from 1.5 to 0.5 mm.	115
75	Figure 4.9. Magnetic mode field of the proposed antenna (A_3) at three frequencies 2.4 GHz, 4.2 GHz and 5.4 GHz at two different phase of excitation signal 90° and 270° .	116
76	Figure 4.10. Measurement Setup [Transmitting and Receiving Antenna in Inset].	117
77	Figure 4.11. Antenna gain (dB) (Co- and Cross-polar) at 2.4 GHz (a) E-plane (b) H-plane.	118
78	Figure 4.12. Loop AMC (a) Design with dimension (b) CM.	119
79	Figure 4.13. Influence of l_u parameter on loop AMC unit cell frequency response, with $s_2 = 5$ mm, and $p_u = 18.5$ mm at $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	121
80	Figure 4.14. Influence of s_2 parameter on loop AMC unit cell frequency response, with $l_u = 18$ mm and $g = 0.5$ mm at $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	122
81	Figure 4.15. Comparison of loop AMC unit cell S_{21} (dB) CM result with CST results.	123
82	Figure 4.16. Influence of l_u parameter on loop AMC unit cell frequency response, with $s_1 = 1.5$ mm, and $p_u = 18.5$ mm at $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	124
83	Figure 4.17. Influence of s_1 parameter on loop AMC unit cell frequency response, with $l_u = 18$ mm and $g = 0.5$ mm at $\theta_i = 0^\circ$.	125
84	Figure 4.18. Comparison of loop AMC unit cell S_{21} (dB) CM result with CST results.	126
85	Figure 4.19. (a) Assembly of probe compensated AMC integrated hexagonal antenna and photograph in Inset. (b) Cross sectional view of AMC integrated hexagonal antenna.	127
86	Figure 4.20. Reflection phase versus frequency of the AMC.	128
87	Figure 4.21. Measured results of the antenna 1 with AMC array and air as dielectric ($h_{air} = 3$ mm) (a) S_{11} (dB) (b) Z_{11} (Ω).	129
88	Figure 4.22. Measured results of the antenna 2 without AMC array and FR-4 as	131

	dielectric ($h = 7.5$ mm) (a) S_{11} (dB) (b) Z_{11} (Ω).	
89	Figure 4.23. Measured results of the antenna 3 with AMC array and FR-4 as dielectric ($h = 4.5$ mm) (a) S_{11} (dB) (b) Z_{11} (Ω).	132
90	Figure 4.24. Measured Farfield Gain (dB) (Co and Cross Polar) of the antenna integrated with AMC at 2.4 GHz (a) E-plane (b) H-plane.	134
91	Figure 5.1. Evolution of the Proposed Design (a) Hexagon (b) Slotted Hexagon (c) Ground used for (a) and (b) (d) Reduced Ground with (b) (e) Reduced ground with half ellipse (f) Proposed modified ground.	141
92	Figure 5.2. S_{11} (dB) analysis of Evolution of the proposed design.	142
93	Figure 5.3. Gain analysis of Evolution of the proposed design (a) Boresight Gain (b) Peak Gain.	143
94	Figure 5.4. Reflection coefficients (S_{11}) for different values of h/r .	144
95	Figure 5.5. S_{11} (dB) performance of S-Band antenna versus ϵ_r .	145
96	Figure 5.6. Gain performance of S-Band antenna versus ϵ_r (a) Boresight Gain (b) Peak Gain.	145
97	Figure 5.7. S_{11} (dB) performance of S-band antenna versus $slot_{gl}$ and $slot_{gw}$.	146
98	Figure 5.8. Gain performance of S-Band antenna versus $slot_{gl}$ and $slot_{gw}$ (a) Boresight Gain (b) Peak Gain.	147
99	Figure 5.9. Scattering Parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB) for probe fed hexagonal UWB antenna.	148
100	Figure 5.10. Reflection coefficients (S_{11}) for different values of G_p , when feed point is at 17.5 mm and r_{cut} is 3 mm.	149
101	Figure 5.11. Reflection coefficients (S_{11}) for different values of slotwidth ($slot_{gw}$) when slot length ($slot_{gl}$) is 2 mm, feed point (f_r) is at 17 mm and r_{cut} is 3 mm.	150
102	Figure 5.12. Proposed UWB Hexagonal antenna (a) Layout with dimension (b) Side view	150
103	Figure 5.13. Scattering Parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB) for probe fed hexagonal monopole UWB antenna. inset [Picture of the designed antenna (a) Front (b) Back]	151
104	Figure 5.14. Measured farfield gains (dB) for proposed antenna.	153
105	Figure 5.15. Scattering Parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB) of different monopole antenna configurations [Inset: Pictures of antennas].	159
106	Figure 5.16. Scattering Parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB) for probe fed hexagonal monopole antenna [Inset: Picture of the fabricated probe fed hexagonal monopole antenna].	160
107	Figure 5.17. Proposed multilayered antenna structure with dimensions (a) Sectional view, zoomed out view of AMC unit cell in the inset, (b) Side view.	161
108	Figure 5.18. Comparison of loop AMC unit cell S_{11} (dB) and S_{21} (dB) CM result with CST results.	162
109	Figure 5.19. Images of the developed antenna with AMC.	163
110	Figure 5.20. Scattering Parameter, $ S_{11} $ (in dB) for probe-fed hexagonal monopole UWB antenna.	164
111	Figure 5.21. Measured Boresight gain, Gain (in dB) for probe-fed hexagonal monopole UWB antenna.	165
112	Figure 5.22. Measured Peak Gain (in dB) for probe-fed hexagonal monopole UWB antenna.	166
113	Figure 5.23. Antenna with AMC and without AMC in anechoic environment.	168
114	Figure 5.24. Measured radiation patterns of antenna in XOZ-plane and YOZ-	170

	plane with/without AMC at different frequencies (in GHz) (a) 3.3 (b) 4.1 (c) 6.2 (d) 8.4 (e) 9.5.	
--	---	--

List of Acronyms

S. No.	Acronyms	Definition
1	AMC	Artificial Magnetic Conductor
2	ANN	Artificial Neural Network
3	AR	Axial Ratio
4	CP	Circularly Polarized
5	CPW	Coplanar Waveguide
6	CSRR	Complementary Split-Ring Resonator
7	CST MWS	Computer Simulation Technology Microwave Studio
8	CW	Continuous Wave
9	DGS	Defected Ground Structure
10	EBG	Electromagnetic Band Gap
11	ECM	Equivalent Circuit Model
12	FCC	Federal Communications Commission
13	FDD	Frequency-Division Duplex
14	FDTD	Finite Difference Time Domain
15	FR-4	Flame Retardant grade 4
16	GPS	Global Positioning System
17	GSM	Global System for Mobile Communications
18	IE3D	Integral Equation Three Dimensional
19	IoT	Internet of Things
20	LCP	Liquid-Crystal Polymer
21	LHCP	Left-Hand Circular Polarization
22	LTE	Long Term Evolution
23	MATLAB	MATrix LABoratory
24	MIMO	Multiple Input Multiple Output
25	MPHA	Multi-Layered Polygonal Helix Antenna
26	PCB	Printed Circuit Board
27	PEC	Perfect Electric Conductor
28	PPC	Parallel Plate Capacitor
29	PMC	Perfect Magnetic Conductor
30	RF	Radio Frequency
31	RGP	Reduced Ground Plane
32	SC	Smith Chart
33	SMA	Sub Miniature version A
34	SRR	Split-Ring Resonator
35	TD	Time Division
36	TE	Transverse Electric
37	TLM	Transmission Line model
38	TM	Transverse Magnetic
39	UHF	Ultra High Frequency
40	UMTS	Universal Mobile Telecommunications System
41	UNII-1	Unlicensed National Information Infrastructure
42	UWB	Ultra Wide Band

43	VHMA	Vertex fed Hexagonal Monopole Antenna
44	VNA	Vector Network Analyzer
45	WiMAX	Worldwide interoperability for microwave access
46	WBAN	Wireless body area network
47	WLAN	Wireless local area network
48	WSN	Wireless Sensor Network