



HAL
open science

A Plane Wave Scattering Dedicated Integral Equation

Benjamin Alzaix, Luc Giraud, Bastiaan Michielsen, Jean-René Poirier

► **To cite this version:**

Benjamin Alzaix, Luc Giraud, Bastiaan Michielsen, Jean-René Poirier. A Plane Wave Scattering Dedicated Integral Equation. 2020. hal-02448907v1

HAL Id: hal-02448907

<https://hal.science/hal-02448907v1>

Preprint submitted on 22 Jan 2020 (v1), last revised 12 Feb 2020 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A Plane Wave Scattering Dedicated Integral Equation

B. Alzaix, L. Giraud, B.L. Michielsens, J.-R. Poirier

Abstract—We present a variant of a boundary integral equation proposed by M. Herberthson in 2008-2010 for high-frequency plane wave scattering by perfectly conducting obstacles which is entirely dedicated to one chosen direction of incidence. The solution of this new integral equation is a “pseudo-current” being the physical current distribution multiplied by the complex conjugate of the incident plane wave’s phase function.

The major advantage of this new integral equation is that the pseudo current has small total variation on large parts of many scattering obstacles and, hence, requires much less degrees of freedom to obtain a correct approximation. Restoring the physical current distribution is a trivial and numerically cheap operation.

The price to pay is that, since the operator of this integral equation depends on the propagation direction of the incident plane wave, a new Galerkin matrix must be computed for each direction of incidence. In this paper, we show how this re-computation can be done very efficiently by making an explicit representation of the difference between the operator of the new integral equation and a conventional EFIE. This leads to a performance gain with respect to the EFIE even for multi-incidence problems.

Keywords—Plane Wave Scattering, Boundary Integral Equations, Model Reduction

I. INTRODUCTION

THE scattering of a plane wave by an impenetrable obstacle can be studied numerically using universal methods like boundary integral equations (Electric Field Integral Equation (EFIE) or Magnetic Field Integral Equation (MFIE)). In this paper, we follow a different strategy in which the computational technique is completely dedicated to the scattering of a given incident plane wave. This has the disadvantage that if the plane wave changes, one needs to reconstruct the model. However, it has the possible advantage that the dedicated model leads to more efficient computations. Such “goal-oriented” approaches to plane wave scattering have been developed before, in particular, with high-frequency scattering problems in mind. The work of Abboud, Nédélec and Zhou (see [1], [2], [3]) published in 1995, is one of the first boundary integral equations where a physical optics approximation is combined with the EFIE. These authors modified the edge element discretisation by multiplying the edge elements with the phase function of the incident wave. In a certain way, this makes solving the EFIE to compute a correction with respect to the physical optics approximation. Later work by Darrigrand

(see [4]) extended this approach to an alternative integral equation method proposed by B. Després. In these earlier publications, error estimates, based on asymptotic expansions of the solution in the transition to the shadow region, showed that, for convex obstacles, the phase regularisation method is warranted to be efficient at high frequencies because the required mesh size decreases in the order of only $\lambda^{1/3}$.

In 2008, Herberthson followed a different track with the same purpose of improving the EFIE performance at high frequencies (see [5], [6], [7]). In his formulation, the incident wave’s phase function was incorporated in the kernel distribution of the integral equation, thereby obtaining an integral equation for a pseudo-current defined as the product of the complex conjugate of the incident plane wave’s phase function and the physical current distribution. He observed that multiplying both sides of the integral equation with this conjugate phase function yields an exact gradient in the right-hand side. He exploited this further to reduce the conventional EFIE to a system of coupled integral equations for two scalar potentials. Where the previous method was applicable to convex scatterers, Herberthson’s version is based on specific topologies (with genus equal to 0) such that the Helmholtz decomposition holds. Roughly speaking, the two points of view lead to increased performance for nearly the same type of geometries.

In this paper, we study a variant of Herberthson’s version of the EFIE in order to overcome the restriction to obstacles with special topology. As with the previously mentioned work, the integral equation is specific for plane wave scattering with one chosen direction of incidence. However, representing the operator as an additive perturbation of the conventional one, the perturbation part, which is the only part depending on the phase function of the incident plane wave, can be computed very efficiently.

This splitting allows for the design of a new Galerkin system relaxing the usual constraint of the EFIE with regards to the mesh size and offers the possibility to reduce the number of degrees of freedom required to get an accurate solution of the problem. Considering the conventional equation, and the diffraction of a plane wave with a frequency f_0 , a good approximation of the surface current requires the edges of the mesh to have a maximum size h , smaller than $\lambda_0/7$. Working with the pseudo-current and this perturbation splitting, it will be shown that we can effectively work mesh sizes of the order of $\lambda_0/4$.

When considering several directions of incidence, the re-computation of only the perturbation operator leads to a rather low computational overhead.

B. Alzaix is with DCNS, Toulon, France

L. Giraud is with INRIA, 200 Avenue de la vieille tour, 33405 Talence, France.

B.L. Michielsens is with Onera/DEMR, Université de Toulouse, 31055 Toulouse France, Tel. (+33)(0)5 62 25 26 77, E-mail: Bastiaan.Michielsens@Onera.fr

J.-R. Poirier is with LAPLACE/ENSEEIH, 2 rue Charles Camichel, 31400 Toulouse France.

II. HERBERTHSON'S WORK AND A NEW FORMULATION

In this section, we present Herberthson's modified version for the EFIE. Most of the development can be found in [5], [6], [7]. To set the notations, we assume that an incoming plane wave, with radian frequency ω , illuminates a surface Γ . The plane wave electric field is given in Cartesian coordinates, $r \in \mathbb{R}^3$, by $\mathbf{E}^{\text{inc}}(r) = e\psi(r)$ where $\psi(r) = e^{-jk\theta \cdot r}$ (we write r for the vector representation of the coordinates r) is the phase function of the wave with θ the unit vector in the direction of propagation and $k = \frac{\omega}{c}$ the wavenumber. The polarisation given by e is transverse to the propagation direction, $\theta \cdot e = 0$. The associated magnetic field is given by $\mathbf{H}^{\text{inc}}(r) = Y_0 \theta \times e\psi(r)$ ($Y_0 = \frac{1}{\mu_0 c}$). We let \mathbf{J} denote the surface current. With these notations, the EFIE reads

$$\forall r \in \Gamma \quad \text{tr} \left[\left(\zeta \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\eta} \nabla \nabla \cdot \right) \mathbf{A}_J \right] (r) = \text{tr}(e\psi)(r), \quad (1)$$

where $\zeta = j\omega\mu_0$, $\eta = j\omega\epsilon_0$ and the vector potential, \mathbf{A}_J , is defined by

$$\mathbf{A}_J(r) = \int_{r' \in \Gamma} G(R(r, r')) \mathbf{J}(r') \mathcal{A}(r').$$

Here $G(R)$ is the Green function of the Helmholtz operator defined by

$$G(R) = \frac{e^{-jkR}}{4\pi R},$$

with

$$R : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \ni (r, r') \mapsto \|r - r'\| \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

the Euclidian distance function. For a vector-valued function X on \mathbb{R}^3 , we note $\text{tr}(X)(r) \equiv X|_{T_r\Gamma}$ the restriction of X to the tangent spaces at any r in Γ . Finally, $\mathcal{A}(r')$ denotes the area element on Γ which, in a local parameterisation $\mu : \mathbb{R}^2 \supset U \ni (x, y) \mapsto \mu(x, y) \in \Gamma$ takes the form $\mathcal{A}(\mu(x, y)) = \det|\mu'(x, y)| dx dy$. In the rest of this paper, we shall leave these area elements implicit in the definition of the integral over Γ and use $\int_{\Gamma} f \equiv \int_{\Gamma} f \mathcal{A} = \int_{r \in \Gamma} f(r) \mathcal{A}(r)$.

Now, Herberthson observed that, modulo the phase function ψ , the right-hand side of (1) is the gradient of a scalar function, $e = \nabla(e \cdot r)$. By multiplying both sides of (1) with the complex conjugate of the phase function of the incident plane wave, $\tilde{\psi}$, he obtained the following equation,

$$\text{tr} \left[\tilde{\psi} \left(\zeta \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\eta} \nabla \nabla \cdot \right) \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{\mathcal{J}}} \right] (r) = -e|_{T_r\Gamma}, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{\mathcal{J}}}(r) = \int_{r' \in \Gamma} G(R(r, r')) \tilde{\psi}(r') \hat{\mathcal{J}}(r') \mathcal{A}(r')$$

for a new unknown, $\hat{\mathcal{J}}(r') = \tilde{\psi}(r') \mathbf{J}(r')$, which we refer to as the pseudo-current.

The second element introduced by Herberthson, is the Helmholtz decomposition. For the special case that Γ is a closed surface diffeomorphic to a sphere, every vector field

\mathbf{J} on Γ can be decomposed as the sum of a gradient and a co-gradient,

$$\mathbf{J} = \nabla_s \Phi + \mathbf{n} \times \nabla_s \Psi, \quad (3)$$

where Φ and Ψ are two scalar functions. In this way, the integral equation (2) can be further transformed into a system of two coupled equations for the scalar potentials Φ and Ψ . In the Galerkin discretisation of this system of equations a natural 2×2 block structure appears according to the two potentials and in the right-hand side the terms corresponding to Φ have the value zero.

At this point, our development differs from the one chosen by Herberthson. We remain with the pseudo current vector distribution as the fundamental unknown on an arbitrary surface Γ . The resulting integral equation can, of course, also be seen as a system of coupled equations for the two components of the vector distribution. In that formulation, we can use a special case of the Hodge decomposition which splits off $\ker(\text{div})$. This also gives zero values in the right-hand side corresponding to the testing with $\ker(\text{div})$ functions (with the usual edge finite elements for surface current distributions one can identify a conformal subspace of divergence free functions). Because we have, as yet, not obtained any numerical advantages of using such a decomposition, this aspect will not be further developed here.

III. ALGEBRAIC PROPERTIES

A. Algebraic equivalence between conventional and modified equations

The modified integral equation (2) and the conventional EFIE (1), are actually algebraically equivalent. To show this, we give a description of the two operators \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{H} which define the two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} : \quad & \mathbf{H}_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\text{rot}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \\ & u \longmapsto \text{tr} \left[\left(\zeta \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\eta} \nabla \nabla \cdot \right) A_u \right] \\ \mathcal{H} : \quad & \mathbf{H}_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\text{rot}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma), \\ & v \longmapsto \text{tr} \left[\tilde{\psi} \left(\zeta \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{\eta} \nabla \nabla \cdot \right) \tilde{A}_v \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\text{rot}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ are two spaces of distributions on Γ defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\text{div}}^s(\Gamma) &= \{u \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Gamma) \mid \text{div}(u) \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Gamma)\}, \\ \mathbf{H}_{\text{rot}}^s(\Gamma) &= \{u \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Gamma) \mid \text{rot}(u) \in \mathbf{H}^s(\Gamma)\}. \end{aligned}$$

With these notations, the conventional EFIE reads

$$\mathcal{E}u = -\text{tr}(E^{\text{inc}}),$$

whereas the new formulation can be written as:

$$\mathcal{H}v = -\text{tr}(\tilde{\psi}E^{\text{inc}}). \quad (4)$$

Then, if we introduce the operator Ψ to denote the multiplication by the Γ -trace of the analytic phase function and Ψ^{-1} its

conjugate and inverse, the system (4) can easily be re-written as:

$$\mathcal{H}v = [\Psi^{-1} \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \Psi]v = -\Psi^{-1} \text{tr}(E^i). \quad (5)$$

Because ψ is a nowhere vanishing C^∞ function, the operator Ψ is a homeomorphism in $H^s(\Gamma)$ for any s . For the domain of div or the domain of rot , we have the following. For any $u \in H_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$,

$$\text{div}(\psi u) = \nabla \cdot (\psi u) = (\nabla \psi) \cdot u + \psi (\nabla \cdot u)$$

is also in $H_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, because $(\nabla \psi) \cdot u$ is a sum of $H^{-1/2}$ coefficients multiplied by C^∞ functions, and $\psi (\nabla \cdot u)$ is the product of a C^∞ function and a $H^{-1/2}$ function, by the definition of u . Similarly, for any $u \in H_{\text{rot}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$,

$$\text{rot}(\psi u) = \nabla \cdot (\psi u \times n) = (\nabla \psi) \cdot (u \times n) + \psi \nabla \cdot (u \times n),$$

where, again, the first term of the right-hand side is a linear combination of components of $u \times n$ which are in $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ whereas the second term on the right-hand side is in $H^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$ by definition of u and the regularity of ψ .

We conclude that the conventional EFIE and the modified EFIE are algebraically equivalent. This means that if the EFIE has a unique solution the modified EFIE also has a unique solution and vice versa. We know that on closed surfaces at discrete frequencies of internal resonance, non-radiating surface currents of undetermined amplitude destroy the uniqueness of the EFIE solution. The algebraic equivalence means that the modified integral EFIE on such closed surfaces has the same non-uniqueness problem at the same set of discrete frequencies. The way these uniqueness problems do actually appear in the discretised integral equation depends on the specific implementation and on the way the resulting linear systems are solved approximately.

IV. GALERKIN DISCRETISATION OF THE EQUATIONS

Approximate solutions for the integral equations can be obtained by a Galerkin finite element discretisation of the variational formulation.

A. Discretisation of the conventional equations

The variational formulation for the conventional EFIE is:

Find \mathbf{J} such that for all \mathbf{J}' the following equality is satisfied:

$$\zeta a_E(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \phi_E(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = -\langle \mathbf{J}', \mathbf{e} \rangle,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard distribution evaluation and the bilinear forms in the left-hand side are defined by

$$a_E(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} G(R(r,r')) \mathbf{J}'(r) \cdot \mathbf{J}(r')$$

and

$$\phi_E(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} G(R(r,r')) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J})(r'),$$

respectively. A conformal finite element discretisation follows by restricting \mathbf{J} and \mathbf{J}' to a finite dimensional subspace of $H_{\text{div}}^{-1/2}(\Gamma)$, such as the usual edge element spaces on triangulations.

B. Discretisation of the modified equations

The weak formulation of the modified EFIE:

Find \mathbf{J} , such that for any tangent vector distribution \mathbf{J}' on Γ ,

$$\zeta a_H(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) + \frac{1}{\eta} \phi_H(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = -\langle \mathbf{J}', \mathbf{e} \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where

$$a_H(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H(r,r') \mathbf{J}'(r) \cdot \mathbf{J}(r'),$$

$$\phi_H(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{J}) = \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} \nabla \cdot (\tilde{\psi} \mathbf{J}')(r) G(R(r,r')) \nabla \cdot (\psi \mathbf{J})(r')$$

and where we introduced the kernel

$$H : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \ni (r, r') \mapsto H(r, r') = \tilde{\psi}(r) G(R(r, r')) \psi(r').$$

C. The modified EFIE as a perturbation of the EFIE

If we describe the operator \mathcal{H} as the sum of the conventional EFIE operator, \mathcal{E} , and a perturbation, \mathcal{K} , defined by

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} - \mathcal{E}, \quad (7)$$

we have isolated the part of \mathcal{H} which depends on the plane wave's direction of incidence. This will appear to be an essential feature of the modified formulations.

For the corresponding bilinear forms $a_K = a_H - a_E$ and $\phi_K = \phi_H - \phi_E$ of the perturbation, we obtain

$$a_K(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{J}') = \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H_1(r,r') \mathbf{J}'(r) \cdot \mathbf{J}(r'),$$

with

$$H_1(r, r') = H(r, r') - G(R(r, r')),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_K(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{J}') = & \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} G(R(r,r')) (\nabla \cdot (\tilde{\psi} \mathbf{J}'))(r) (\nabla \cdot (\psi \mathbf{J}))(r') \\ & - (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J})(r'), \end{aligned}$$

which we split into four terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_K(\mathbf{J}, \mathbf{J}') = & \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H_1(r,r') (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J})(r') \\ & + k^2 \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H(r,r') (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{J})(r') \\ & + jk \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H(r,r') (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J})(r') \\ & - jk \iint_{(r,r') \in \Gamma^2} H(r,r') (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}')(r) (\boldsymbol{\theta} \cdot \mathbf{J})(r'). \end{aligned}$$

The integrals involved in a_K and ϕ_K are regular enough to be evaluated numerically since they present no real singularities. This regularity can be shown regarding the kernel's behaviour for $r \rightarrow r'$. The smoothness of the phase function implies that the kernel H has the same regularity as the Green function of the Helmholtz operator. This means that the numerical evaluation of the bilinear forms in finite element discretisations can be done with the same techniques as used in the implementations of the conventional EFIE. The kernel H_1 is more regular than the Green function of the Helmholtz operator. Indeed, we have

$$H_1(r, r') \approx -jk\theta \cdot \eta(r, r') + O(\|r - r'\|) \quad r \rightarrow r',$$

with

$$\eta(r, r') = \frac{(r - r')}{\|r - r'\|},$$

which is a bounded function (albeit with an undefined value in $r = r'$). This implies that we can numerically compute the internal integrals of a_K and ϕ_K (with Gaussian integration) by applying a specific treatment to the kernel which accounts for this asymptotic behaviour when r is close to r' .

In the end, the computation of the perturbation only involves numerical integrations (with Gauss' methods, for example) and a few integrals of singular expressions that are also present in the EFIE and for which efficient implementations have already been found (see, for example, [8, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1] for a summary of such techniques and further references).

We give in Table I an overview of the floating-point operation count of the computation of H regarding this choice of implementation.

Table I. FLOATING-POINT OPERATION COUNT FOR THE COMPUTATION OF E AND ADDITIONAL COST FOR THE COMPUTATION OF THE MATRIX H .

N_G	Operation count for E		Additional cost for K	
3	$\sim 2.600 F^2$	$\sim 1.150 N^2$	$\sim 1.482 F^2$	$\sim 659 N^2$
7	$\sim 13.200 F^2$	$\sim 5.850 N^2$	$\sim 5.694 F^2$	$\sim 2.531 N^2$

(F : number of faces, N : number of internal edges, N_G : number of Gauss points considered).

V. REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF DEGREES OF FREEDOM

A. Ideas and motivations

In the previous section, we have presented, the formulation of the modified integral equation. However, we did not yet show how to take benefit from its potential advantages. With the modified integral equations, we are solving for a pseudo-current \hat{J} , which is less oscillating than the physical current J on large parts of the surface (see [1]). Fig. 1 illustrates this, with the exact current and pseudo-currents, for the case of plane wave scattering by a perfectly conducting sphere.

Even though the pseudo current distribution can be accurately discretised on a rather coarse triangulation, the Galerkin coefficients require integration against a kernel function with




Figure 1. Comparing the oscillations in the physical surface current (on the left) and the pseudo-current (on the right) induced on a unit sphere by a plane wave at 1GHz ($k = k\theta$). The curves represent, in standard spherical coordinates, the real parts of J_ϑ and $\tilde{\psi}J_\vartheta$ as a function of ϑ for $\varphi \equiv 0$

possibly great oscillations. On the triangles of a coarse mesh this would require integration rules of much higher order than those usually associated with finite elements. As has already been demonstrated in [1], this makes that the modified EFIE suffers from the same constraint as the conventional EFIE. In the following paragraphs, we elaborate a technique to deal with this problem.




Figure 2. On the left, a fine mesh satisfying the constraints for the EFIE at a given frequency $f = f_0$. On the right, coarse mesh on which we could expect the modified EFIE to give correct results at the same frequency.

B. Macro elements and reduced system

In order to cope with the computational problem observed above, we consider two meshes: a fine mesh satisfying, $h < \lambda_0/7$ (see Fig. 2 on the left), well adapted to work with the EFIE at given frequency f_0 and allowing proper computations of the Galerkin coefficients, and a coarse mesh, on which we want to discretise the pseudo-currents in the modified equation and which does not necessarily comply with the constraint $h < \lambda_0/7$ (see Fig. 2 on the right).

To avoid ambiguities in the interpretation of the comparisons, we consider the polyhedron of the coarse mesh to be

the true geometry. In this way, the finite element spaces in which the modified integral equations are discretised are true subspaces of finite element spaces over a finer mesh. This contrasts to practical applications, where one should use the fine mesh to get a better geometric approximation to the actual boundary surface of the scattering object (For example, by slightly re-distributing the vertices on the actual surface). We shall from now on speak of macro edge elements on macro cells even though the two finite element spaces are more tightly related.

For practical reasons, we start with the coarse mesh and derive the fine mesh from it. For this, we divide each triangle of the coarse mesh into four small triangles by adding a new vertex on the middle of each edge. In this way, starting from a coarse mesh with V_c vertices, E_c edges and F_c faces, we end up with a finer mesh with $V_f = V_c + E_c$ vertices, $E_f = 2E_c + 3F_c$ edges and $F_f = 4F_c$ faces. For a closed surface where $3F = 2E$, we also have $E_f = 4E_c$, such that the dimension of the edge element space on the fine mesh equals four times the dimension of the edge element space on the coarse mesh. The given refinement divides the mesh size by two.

The set of edges of the fine mesh can be partitioned using the macro edges and macro triangles containing them,

$$E_f = \left\{ \bigcup_{\Gamma \in E_c} E_f^\Gamma \right\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{T \in F_c} E_f^T \right\},$$

where

$$E_f^\Gamma = \{\Gamma^-, \Gamma^+\}$$

the pair of micro edges arising from the subdivision of the macro edge Γ and

$$E_f^T = \{\gamma_0^T, \gamma_1^T, \gamma_2^T\}.$$

the triplet of micro edges in the interior of macro triangle T .




Figure 3. Relation between edge basis functions defined on the coarse mesh and edge basis functions defined on the fine mesh.

The above relations allow us, to construct the Galerkin coefficients of a reduced system over the coarse mesh, using the computations as for the micro elements on the fine mesh, in an update algorithm. Let H_{RED} be the Galerkin matrix over the coarse mesh and H_{FIN} the Galerkin matrix over the fine mesh. As can be inferred from Fig. 3, each macro edge carries a degree of freedom (DoF) which is a linear combination of

8 micro DoF's. We can therefore express the matrix reduction as

$$H_{\text{RED}}^{\Gamma', \Gamma} = \sum_{\gamma' \in e^{\Gamma'}} \sum_{\gamma \in e^\Gamma} c_{\gamma'}^{\Gamma'} c_{\gamma}^{\Gamma} H_{\text{FIN}}^{\gamma', \gamma}.$$

using e^Γ for the set of 8 micro edges carrying the micro DoF's contributing to the macro DoF on Γ . The eight coefficients c_{γ}^{Γ} have the values $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\pm\frac{1}{4}$ (see the appendix for the details).

Because the kernel of the perturbation operator is more regular than the original kernel of the H operator, we propose an alternative discretization,

$$H_{\text{RED,alt}} = E_{\text{RED}} + K_{\text{COA}},$$

where K_{COA} is the Galerkin matrix of the perturbation operator K , computed directly in the macro element space, whereas E_{RED} is the reduced EFIE Galerkin matrix defined in the same way as H_{RED} . Again, the coefficients of H_{RED} and E_{RED} can be updated ‘‘on the fly’’ from the computation of the coefficients of H_{FIN} and E_{FIN} , respectively, which themselves do not need to be stored (except when we want to use the EFIE on the fine mesh for comparison purposes, of course).

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we evaluate the modified EFIE with respect to the accuracy of the current distribution on a scattering obstacle and the accuracy of radar cross-section coefficients.

A. Accuracy of the current distribution

In this section, we can compare the results of a conventional EFIE solution on the fine mesh to the solution obtained via the modified EFIE on the coarse mesh. For that purpose, the pseudo-current distribution multiplied by the phase function of the incident wave is represented on the fine mesh. Taking the EFIE result as the reference the relative error is computed via L^2 norms on the fine mesh,

$$\text{Error}(\mathbf{J}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{J} - \mathbf{J}_{\text{FIN}}\|_{L^2}}{\|\mathbf{J}_{\text{FIN}}\|_{L^2}}.$$

1) *The sphere*: The first example concerns a perfectly conducting sphere. However, the coarse mesh is again used as the reference geometry and the new vertices of the fine mesh are not displaced to lie on the sphere. In Fig. 4, we show $\text{Error}(\mathbf{J})$ as a function of frequency where 0.2 GHz is the frequency where the mesh size of the coarse mesh equals $\lambda/10$.

We observe that H_{RED} and $H_{\text{RED,alt}}$ are very close with a slowly increasing error up to 0.4 GHz ($\lambda/5$). Beyond 0.4 GHz, the error increases more rapidly. The error associated with the regular EFIE based on the coarse mesh is significantly larger and deteriorates rapidly already from 0.05 GHz. From these results, we conclude that $H_{\text{RED,alt}}$ offers the best trade-off between accuracy and computational cost.




Figure 4. Evolution of the relative error in the sphere surface current for each of the proposed discretisations (E , $H_{RED,alt}$ and H_{RED}).




Figure 5. The geometry of the rough plate test case

2) *A flat plate with added surface roughness:* We further investigate the accuracy of the various methods on the example of a rectangular plate, with and without, surface roughness (see Fig. 5). The relative errors in the surface current distributions on those two objects obtained via the various techniques are shown in Fig. 6. The observations made for the case of the sphere also apply to these examples. It can be seen that the error jump is significant for the regular EFIE for frequencies larger than 0.5 GHz ($\lambda/6$).




Figure 6. Evolution of the relative error in the rough plate surface current for each of the proposed discretisations E , $H_{RED,alt}$ and H_{RED} .

The results obtained for the plate and the rough plate lead to observations similar to those for the sphere. Nevertheless we can note here that a stronger increase of the error is observed when the mesh size on the rough plate exceeds the value $\lambda/10$ (0.3 GHz). This may be due to the fact that, on this far-from-convex surface, the total variation of the pseudo-current and true surface current are comparable on a large part of the

surface.

B. Accuracy of Radar Cross Section coefficients

We further investigate the accuracy of results obtained with the modified EFIE, but this time weakly, in Radar Cross Section computation which amounts to evaluating the current distributions on plane waves. For the perfectly conducting sphere, we compare with the analytic solution computed with the Mie series. For the flat plate and the rough plate example, we will use the solution computed with the regular EFIE on the fine mesh as the reference. Because, it appeared as the most promising alternative in the previous section, we only report on experiments with the $H_{RED,alt}$ version.

1) *The sphere:* Fig. 7 and 8 show a bistatic RCS coefficient computed, for various mesh sizes, with the EFIE and the modified EFIE, respectively. As we are no longer comparing different versions of the modified EFIE, we now place the vertices of the fine meshes on the sphere, which is what one would do in applications of the method.




Figure 7. Representation of the bistatic RCS obtained from the various meshes with the EFIE at $f = 0.6$ GHz.




Figure 8. Representation of the bistatic RCS obtained from the various meshes with the modified EFIE system using $H_{RED,alt}$ at $f = 0.6$ GHz.

In Fig. 7, it can be observed that a fairly accurate solution is obtained with the EFIE for a mesh size of $\lambda/7$. This is in good agreement with the classical rule of thumb $\lambda/10$. Similarly, in Fig. 8, we can see that a comparable solution can be obtained with the modified EFIE already for mesh sizes $\lambda/3$ or $\lambda/4$.

These experiments illustrate that the new method allows us to relax the mesh size constraint while preserving the same level of accuracy.

2) *A flat plate with added surface roughness:* For the RCS of a plate with and without surface roughness, we come to the same conclusions as for the example of the sphere (see Fig. 9 and Fig. 10).




Figure 9. Representation of the bistatic RCS of the flat plate, obtained from the various meshes at $f = 1 \text{ GHz}$.




Figure 10. Representation of the bistatic RCS of a rough plate obtained from the various meshes at $f = 1 \text{ GHz}$.

C. Performance comparison

In this section, we compare the performances of the modified EFIE and the conventional EFIE with respect to memory and CPU time requirements, for a given desired accuracy. For both the EFIE and the modified EFIE, we use a GMRES (Generalized Minimal RESidual) iterative solution algorithm, and we include the GMRES stopping criterion, ϵ_{GMRES} , as a parameter.

The modified EFIE has clear advantages from a memory point of view because, as we have seen, it requires about 4 times less degrees of freedom than the conventional EFIE for a given accuracy. With a given amount of available memory, this allows one to handle objects of larger size relative to the wavelength than is possible with the EFIE. This is illustrated in Fig. 11, where one observes that for a given available




Figure 11. Accuracy versus memory requirements

memory, the modified EFIE can reach better precision than the conventional EFIE.

In Fig. 12, we show, for the EFIE and the modified EFIE, at a given required accuracy, the total execution time, i.e., the sum of the time needed to construct the linear system and the time to obtain the solution.




Figure 12. Computation times.

In both Fig. 11 and Fig. 12, we observe that the two methods have roughly the same performance. The total solution time with the modified EFIE depends less on the stopping criterion, ϵ_{GMRES} , than with the conventional EFIE. This is because the system construction time in the examples dominates the total execution time. The fact that for better accuracies the EFIE results are absent is due to the fact that the EFIE memory requirements exceeded the available memory on the computer used.

VII. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

We have presented a modified version of the electric field integral dedicated to plane wave scattering problems. This formulation allows one to escape from certain limitations of the conventional EFIE in terms of discretisation dimensions at high frequencies. The results of various comparisons shown in this paper lead to the conclusion that the new formulation is clearly advantageous. This is, above all, due to the fact that,

for comparable accuracy at identical problems, roughly 4 times less unknowns are needed than with the conventional EFIE. According to previous work, this ratio will be more and more in favour of the modified EFIE when the frequency increases.

Although the numerical results obtained are promising, a more exhaustive study deserves to be undertaken. In particular, comparisons should be performed with numerical implementations accommodating compression techniques such as FMM or hierarchical matrix calculations. It can also be noticed that the new integral equation has an advantage in terms of system solving time, when using a GMRES iterative method. This lets us expect to obtain advantageous performance for multiple right-hand sides (multiple incidence directions) where the gain in solving time outweighs the additional cost needed to construct the incidence direction dependent perturbation matrix ($K = H - E$) which can be done on a rather coarse mesh.

However, these perspectives need to be confirmed by a numerical study for objects of larger size. This work will include the elaboration of acceleration techniques like FMM, ACA or HCA with H-Matrix calculations. The HCA techniques (see [10], [11]) will be our most favorable candidates because they allow us to work directly on the optimization of the numerical integration rules.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bin Zhou. *Méthode des équations intégrales pour la résolution des problèmes de diffraction à hautes fréquences*. PhD thesis, Paris 11, 1995.
- [2] T. Abboud, J.-C. Nédélec and B. Zhou. Méthodes des équations intégrales pour les hautes fréquences. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, (318):165–170, 1994.
- [3] T. Abboud, J.-C. Nédélec and B. Zhou. Improvement of the integral equation method for high frequency problems. *Third International Conference on Mathematical and Numerical Aspects of Wave Propagation*, pages 178–187, 1995.
- [4] Eric Darrigrand. *Couplage Méthodes Multipôles - Discrétisation Microlocale pour les Equations Intégrales de l'Electromagnetisme*. PhD Thesis, Université Sciences et Technologies - Bordeaux I, Sep 2002.
- [5] M. Herberthson. Validation of the Potential Method ; Comparing measurements of a dihedral with calculations . *Scientific Computing in Electrical Engineering conference, Zurich*, 2012.
- [6] Magnus Herberthson. EM Scattering Calculations Using Potentials. *Scientific Computing in Electrical Engineering SCEE 2008*, pages 375–382, 2010.
- [7] Magnus Herberthson. Application of the Potential Method to the Combined Field Integral Equation. *Scientific Computing in Electrical Engineering SCEE 2010 (Abstract book)*, pages 103–104, 2012.
- [8] Eric Darve. *Méthodes multipôles rapides : résolution des équations de Maxwell par formulations intégrales*. PhD thesis, Paris 6, 1999.
- [9] S. Rao, D. Wilton and A. Glisson. Electromagnetic scattering by surfaces of arbitrary shape. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, 30(3):409–418, May 1982.
- [10] Steffen Börm and Lars Grasedyck. Hybrid cross approximation of integral operators. *Numerische Mathematik*, 101:221–249, 2005.
- [11] Jonathan Siau, Olivier Chadebec, Ronan Perrussel, and Jean-René Poirier. Hybrid Cross Approximation for a Magnetostatic Formulation. *IEEE Transactions on Magnetics*, 51, 2015.
- [12] R. Hiptmair and C. Schwab. Natural Boundary Element Methods for the Electric Field Integral Equation on Polyhedra. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 40(1):66–86, January 2002.
- [13] A. Buffa, M. Costabel and D. Sheen. On traces for $H(\text{curl}, \Omega)$ in Lipschitz domains. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 276(2):845 – 867, 2002.
- [14] F.P. Andriulli. Loop-Star and Loop-Tree Decompositions: Analysis and Efficient Algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, 60(5):2347–2356, May 2012.
- [15] Jin-Fa Lee, R. Lee and R. J. Burkholder. Loop star basis functions and a robust preconditioner for EFIE scattering problems. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, 51(8):1855–1863, Aug 2003.
- [16] Benjamin Alzaix. *Mathematical and numerical analysis of the Herberthson integral equation dedicated to electromagnetic plane wave scattering*. PhD thesis, Université de Bordeaux, Avril 2017.

APPENDIX

DETAILS OF THE MODEL REDUCTION

In this appendix, we present the details of the reduction of the edge element Galerkin matrix on the fine mesh to one on the coarse mesh. Fixing the ordering of the added edges makes it easier to handle the relation between the edge element spaces on the coarse and the fine mesh. Here, we choose to order the edges added in the interior of a triangle of the coarse mesh according to the positive orientation of this triangle (see Fig. 3). Each macro edge Γ , corresponds to an ordered pair of two micro edges $\Gamma = (\Gamma_-, \Gamma_+)$ oriented consistently with the orientation of Γ .

For the degree of freedom (DoF) associated with the macro edge $\partial_p T$, we have two micro DoF's associated with the two micro edges contained by the macro edge, and three micro-DoF's on the micro-edges, γ_p^T , $p \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, internal to each of the two macro-triangles, $T = \partial^{*+}\Gamma$ and $T = \partial^{*-}\Gamma$, adjacent to the macro-edge Γ (only one of these macro-triangles, $\partial^{*+}\Gamma$, is shown in Fig. 3).

We write

$$e^\Gamma = E_f^\Gamma \oplus E_f^{\partial^{*-}\Gamma} \oplus E_f^{\partial^{*+}\Gamma}$$

for the ordered octuple of micro-edges associated with Γ .

Let basis functions of an edge finite element space be labeled by the edge fixing the degree of freedom. We write J^Γ for a macro basis function associated with a macro edge Γ and j^γ for a micro basis function associated with a micro edge γ .

The macro basis function, J^Γ , can be written generically as a sum

$$J^\Gamma = \sum_{\gamma \in e^\Gamma} c_\gamma^\Gamma j^\gamma.$$

The coefficients are defined as follows:

$$c_\gamma^\Gamma = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \gamma \in \{\Gamma_-, \Gamma_+\} \\ \mp \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } \gamma = \gamma_p^T \text{ and } \Gamma = \pm \partial_p T \\ \pm \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } \gamma = \gamma_p^T \text{ and } \Gamma = \pm \partial_q T \text{ with } p \neq q. \end{cases}$$

The value $\frac{1}{2}$, is obtained because of the subdivision of any macro edge in two equal halves. The 4 sub triangles of a triangle T , have equal area, $\frac{|T|}{4}$, because they are spanned by edges which are parallel to and exactly half the size of two macro edges. As the edge elements have constant divergence, each flow entering a micro triangle should leave it with a flow $\frac{1}{4}$ smaller. The specific distribution of signs follows from the

choice of orientation of the micro edges and the orientation of the macro edge relative to the positive orientation of the macro triangle. These must be taken as they come with the coarse mesh (we cannot suppose any specific rule here).

It should be clear that all the mappings and associated data structures can be defined while constructing the refinement by sweeping through the coarse mesh for which the boundary operator and all DoF administration is already available (See [16] for more details and [14] for alternative methods).