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Abstract—The simulation of low-observable targets requires high accuracy, both in the geometrical discretization as well as in the numerical solution of the electromagnetic problem. In this letter, we employ the well-known NASA almond, to illustrate the accuracy of the Leap-Frog Discontinuous Galerkin method, combined with a local time stepping algorithm, comparing it with the MoM and the (2,2) FDTD methods.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the electromagnetic scattering by low observable (LO) targets is a challenging problem for numerical solvers. Frequency Domain (FD) methods, like the Method of Moments (MoM) [1], are a common choice to accurately deal with these problems. However, MoM-FD methods become computationally inefficient for wideband computations, since each frequency needs a complete simulation. Time-domain (TD) methods are an attractive alternative, since they employ a marching-on-in-time algorithm that permits to find the whole FD behavior with a single simulation. Among TD methods, the Finite-Difference Time-Domain (FDTD) method [2] has become very popular for its versatility and power, though its staircased nature imposes a significant constraint on the discretization of arbitrary curvatures and intricate details. Finite Element Methods in TD (FEMTD) [3] permit to overcome these limitations, thanks to the use of unstructured meshes to handle geometrical details. Nevertheless, they are computationally intensive because of their implicit nature, which requires the solution of a sparse linear system of equations at each step of the time marching procedure. Explicit FEMTD algorithms have been proposed based on sparse approximate inverses, efficiently implemented on parallel machines [4].

The Discontinuous Galerkin Time Domain (DGTD) methods are currently attracting an increasing attention [5], for combining some of the advantages of FDTD and FEMTD methods. The main difference between DGTD and other FEMTD methods, is that the solution is allowed to be discontinuous across the boundaries between adjacent elements, which communicate by means of numerical fluxes. The result are computationally affordable and accurate TD algorithms.

In this letter, we apply a DGTD method [6], [7] based on the Leap-Frog (LF) time integration scheme (LFDG) and combined with a Local Time Stepping (LTS) strategy, to calculate the RCS of PEC and coated NASA almonds. This geometry has been chosen for being a challenging example of LO target used in the validation of numerical solvers [8]. Results show that the LTS-LFDG method can be competitive with MoM-FD, and the (2,2) FDTD, methods, in terms of accuracy vs. computational time.

II. LFDG FUNDAMENTALS

Let us begin by describing briefly the fundamentals of the DGTD method (further details of the implementation used by the authors can be found in [6], [7], [9], [10]). The DGTD method is based on a finite-element geometrical discretization of the space into $M$ non-overlapping elements $V_m$, where we define element-by-element a basis of local continuous vector test functions ($B^m = \{\Phi_1^m, \Phi_2^m, ..., \Phi_Q^m\}$), used both to expand the electromagnetic field, and as test functions to find a weak form of Maxwell curl equations (Galerkin procedure).

For lossless linear isotropic homogeneous media, we have

$$\left\langle \Phi_q^m, \mu_0 \nabla \times E^m + \sigma_m H^m \right\rangle_{V_m} = 0$$
$$\left\langle \Phi_q^m, \varepsilon_0 \nabla \times H^m + \sigma_e \varepsilon E^m \right\rangle_{V_m} = 0$$

with $E$, $H$, $\sigma_e$, $\sigma_m$, $\varepsilon$, $\mu$ being, respectively: the electric and magnetic field, the electric and magnetic conductivity, permittivity, and permeability. Applying the discontinuous Galerkin method [5] to Eqs. (1) and (2), we can formulate the following semi-discrete spatial algorithm:

$$\mu M d_z H^m + (\sigma_m M - \varepsilon \varepsilon_0 H^m H^m + \varepsilon_0 H^m H^m + \sigma_m H^m H^m - (\varepsilon \varepsilon_0 - S) E^m - F_{\mu e} E^m + F_{\mu e} E^m) \varepsilon M d_e E^m + (\sigma_e M - \varepsilon \varepsilon_0 H^m H^m + \varepsilon_0 H^m H^m + \sigma_e H^m H^m)$$

(3)

where $H^m$ and $E^m$ are column vectors with the degrees of freedom (dofs) at the element $m$, and $H^m +$ and $E^m +$ the dofs at the adjacent elements. $M$ is the mass matrix, $S$ is the stiffness matrix, and $F$ are the flux matrices [11]. The resulting method has a spatial error behaving as $O(h^{2p+1})$, with $h$ a measure of the size of the elements, and $p$ the order of the basis functions [6].

The time integration, can be performed in different manners [5]. In this paper, we use a 2nd-order Leap-Frog (LF) scheme,
which employs a centered approximation for the time derivatives \( \left( d_t U_n^m \approx \Delta t^{-1} \left( U_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m - U_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m \right) \right) \) in (3), to yield

\[
H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m = \alpha_n H_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m + \beta_n m^{-1} \left[ (S - \nabla \cdot \nabla F_n^m) E_n^m - \nabla \cdot F_n^e E_n^m + F_n^m \nabla H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m - \nabla H_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m - M_n^s + J_n^{sm} \right] + F_{n+1}^m \alpha_e E_n^m + \beta_e m^{-1} \left[ (S - \nabla \cdot \nabla F_n^m) E_n^m - \nabla \cdot F_n^e E_n^m + F_n^m \nabla H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m - \nabla H_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m - M_n^s + J_n^{sm} \right]
\]

(4)

where the expressions for the constants are

\[
\alpha_n = \frac{1 - \Delta t \sigma_n}{1 + \frac{\Delta t \sigma_n}{2 \mu}}, \quad \beta_n = \frac{\Delta t}{\mu \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t \sigma_n}{2 \mu} \right)} \quad (6)
\]

\[
\alpha_e = \frac{1 - \Delta t \sigma_e}{1 + \frac{\Delta t \sigma_e}{2 \varepsilon}}, \quad \beta_e = \frac{\Delta t}{\varepsilon \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta t \sigma_e}{2 \varepsilon} \right)} \quad (7)
\]

Local time-stepping strategies have been efficiently incorporated into the LF stepping procedure [12, 13] to alleviate the computational overload driven by the conditional stability of LF in real problems. Here, we use the LTS algorithm described in [9, 10], to arrange the mesh elements in different tiers, according to the maximum time step allowed for stability, so that different time steps can be used for each tier. An interpolation procedure is used at the interface between tiers.

III. MoM CCIE FUNDAMENTALS

The MoM used in this comparison is applied to the Current and Change Integral Equation (CCIE) [14], combined with a Multilevel Fast Multipole Method (MLFMM) [15] to efficiently perform the matrix-vector products. CCIE introduces electric and magnetic surface charges densities, apart from the surface current densities of the Poggio-Miller-Chan-Harrington-Wu-Tsai (PM-CHWT) method [16], and solves a system of four integral equations for all four unknowns. The resulting scheme is well conditioned and leads to fast convergences with iterative solvers on a wide frequency range. Let us briefly summarize its fundamentals.

The time-harmonic \( e^{j\omega t} \) total electric and magnetic fields can be expressed on the surface of a homogeneous body as a function of the electric and magnetic surface charges densities \((\rho_e, \rho_m)\), and the electric and magnetic surface charges densities \((\rho_e, \rho_m)\) as,

\[
E = E^{in} - j \omega \mu S(J) + \frac{\mu}{j \omega \varepsilon} N(\rho_e) - K(M) \quad (8a)
\]

\[
H = H^{in} - j \omega \varepsilon S(M) + \frac{\varepsilon}{j \omega \mu} N(\rho_m) + K(J) \quad (8b)
\]

with \(E^{in}\) and \(H^{in}\) being the incident fields, \(\hat{n}\) the inner unit normal of the surface, and \(S, N\) and \(K\) the surface integral operators,

\[
S(f)(r) = \int G(r, r') f(r') \, ds(r') \quad (9a)
\]

\[
N(f)(r) = \int \nabla G(r, r') f(r') \, ds(r') \quad (9b)
\]

\[
K(f)(r) = \nabla \times S(f)(r) \quad (9c)
\]

where

\[
G(r, r') = e^{-jkr / 2} R, \quad R = |r - r'|, \text{ is the usual free-space Green function, with } k = \omega \sqrt{\mu \varepsilon} \]

Considering the usual boundary conditions at the interface between two media (1 and 2),

\[
\hat{n}_2 \cdot (\varepsilon_2 E_2 - \varepsilon_1 E_1) = \rho_e, \quad \hat{n}_2 \cdot (\mu_2 H_2 - \mu_1 H_1) = \rho_m
\]

\[
\hat{n}_2 \times (H_2 - H_1) = J, \quad \hat{n}_2 \times (E_2 - E_1) = -M \quad (10a)
\]

four surface Fredholm integral equations of the second kind can be formulated for the tangential and normal components of the fields,

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon E_n^m \\
\mu H_n^m
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
I & 0 & j \omega \mu S_n \ & K_n \\
0 & I & - \varepsilon j \omega \varepsilon N_n & - K_n \\
\varepsilon j \omega \varepsilon N_t & - j \omega \mu S_t & K_t & 0 \\
- j \omega \mu S_t & - j \omega \mu S_t & 0 & J
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\rho_e \\
\rho_m
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon E_n^m \\
\mu H_n^m
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
J \\
M
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(11)

where \(F_n = \hat{n} \cdot F\) and \(F_t = \hat{n} \times F\). This set of equations together with the continuity conditions

\[
\nabla \cdot J + j \omega \rho_e = 0, \quad \nabla \cdot M + j \omega \rho_m = 0
\]

(12)

form the CCIE system, which can be numerically solved by making use of the MoM method. Similarly to the CFIE, which combines EFIE and MFIE, a combined form of the CCIE is formulated, resulting into the CCCIE described in [14]. The continuity equations are taken into account by directly adding a combination of the null (12) to \(\rho_e\) and \(\rho_m\) of (8). This combination is crucial for the accurate behavior of the scheme along the whole frequency range [14]. The final algorithm is found by expanding the scalar unknowns \((\rho_e, \rho_m)\) with pulse functions, and the vector unknowns \((J, M)\) with the classical Rao-Wilton-Glisson (RWG) basis functions. In the same manner, the equations of rows 1 and 2 are tested with pulse functions, and rows 3 and 4 with RWG ones.

IV. NASA ALMOND BENCHMARK

In this section, we find the Radar Cross-Section (RCS) of a typical LO target: the NASA almond. This geometry is a benchmark of the Electromagnetic Code Consortium, used for validation purposes [8]. The LTS-LFDG method [6], the MoM-MLFMM for CCIE (HPTESP-MAT Cassidavi tool, certified for RCS calculation by the Spanish Military Airworthiness Authority INTA [17]), and the well-known (2,2) FDTM method (UGRFDTD MPI/OpenMP parallel code [18], validated under the 7PM EU HIRF-SE project [19]), have been employed for this purpose.

---

1A backward approximation for the terms \(H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m \approx H_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m \) and \(E_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m \approx E_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m \), and an average approximation for the conductive terms \(H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m \approx \frac{1}{2} \left( H_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m + H_{n-\frac{1}{2}}^m \right) \) and \(E_{n+\frac{1}{2}}^m \approx \frac{1}{2} \left( E_{n+1}^m + E_{n}^m \right) \) are also used.
The NASA almond (Fig.1) is composed by

Half ellipsoid: \(-0.416667 < t < 0.0\) and \(-\pi < \psi < \pi\)

\[
\begin{align*}
  x &= d t, \\
  y &= 0.193333 d \left(\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{t}{0.416667}\right)^2}\right) \cos \psi, \\
  z &= 0.064444 d \left(\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{t}{0.416667}\right)^2}\right) \sin \psi,
\end{align*}
\]

Half elliptic ogive: \(-0.0 < t < 0.583333\) and \(-\pi < \psi < \pi\)

\[
\begin{align*}
  x &= d t, \\
  y &= 4.833450 d \left(\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{t}{2.083330}\right)^2} - 0.96\right) \cos \psi, \\
  z &= 1.611148 d \left(\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{t}{2.083330}\right)^2} - 0.96\right) \sin \psi,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(d = 2.5\) m, is the length of the structure. Note that this is a complete double curvature geometry, where we can find, both smoothly and sharply curved zones, as well as a singular point, the ogive vertex. Apart from a PEC case, two different coated material cases have been studied: with a perfect dielectric, and with a Radar Absorber Material (RAM), proposed under JINA 2006 [20] (see Fig. 1 for details). For the LTS-LFDG method, we have discretized the surface with curvilinear 2\textsuperscript{nd}-order tetrahedrons. Care has been taken for the discretization close to the vertex by defining small elements (low value of \(h\)), as an \textit{a priori} level of \(h\)-refinement (see Fig. 2). Apart from the vertex, we have defined a maximum element size \(h\) during the mesh-generation process, corresponding to the value of \(\frac{h}{\lambda} = 0.4\) of the maximum frequency, which is efficient in terms of computational and required accuracy. Once we have generated the mesh, the order \(p\) in each element is chosen depending on the element size, assigning the minimum \(p\) that meets the required accuracy [10]. For instance, in the simplest case (PEC, bistatic RCS at 1 GHz), the mesh was composed of 2018928 elements: 785678 had \(p = 1\), 523786 had \(p = 2\), and 709464 had \(p = 3\), being the total number of unknowns \(187\) \(10^6\). We do not use orders \(p\) higher than 3 since have been found not to be optimum in terms of computational cost and accuracy [10].

The simulation region is divided into a total-field zone, holding the almond, and a scattered-field zone. The surface between both regions serve to excite the plane-wave by Huygens sources, through the flux terms in a weak way [11]. The same surface is used to compute the near-to-far-field transformation and to calculate the RCS. Conformal PMLs [7], [21] are used to truncate the whole domain.

The structures are illuminated with a horizontally-polarized plane wave, impinging on the almond at the vertex. The resulting copolar bistatic RCS at 1 GHz, computed with LTS-LFDG and compared with MoM, are shown in Fig. 3 for the three cases analyzed, with excellent agreement. The monostatic RCS from 500 MHz to 2 GHz is shown in Fig. 5. Excellent agreement is again found both for PEC and C2 (RAM material) cases. Minor differences are detected for the C1 (perfect dielectric) case. It is important to note that this is a challenging case for MoM, where the required number of iterations to solve iteratively the MoM linear system is quite high, and the number of unknowns cannot be too high in order to have a solution with affordable computational costs. Notice that the whole frequency band computation requires 301 runs. The minor differences found so far are, in our opinion, due to the use of a coarse mesh in the MoM computations.

In Fig. 4, we have also compared the PEC case with uniform-mesh FDTD simulations with a 1.5 mm cell length. A brute-force solution has been obtained with (2,2) FDTD just for comparison purposes (higher-order stencils, uneven meshing, subgridding or conformal techniques, combined with FDTD are not used here, though they are well-known to improve the results and reduce the computational costs). Both for FDTD and LTS-LFDG, we use a padding of half a wavelength at 1 GHz between the almond and the PML region, and we simulate 50 nsec of the transient response. The FDTD problem employs 750 MCells (6 \(10^9\) unknowns) and requires a CPU time of 24 hours in a 12 core Intel Xeon X5520 2.26GHz architecture, while the LTS-LFDG code only requires 18 hours. No computer resources are shown for the HPTESP-MAT, for industrial property rights protection. The reader is referred to [22] for typical figures of MoM methods. Results for the bistatic RCS at 1 GHz confirm, as also stated by the authors in [11], the superior accuracy of LTS-LFDG especially near the LO (monostatic) zone.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this letter, we have shown the application of three numerical solvers, based on the LTS-LFDG, MoM CCCIE and FDTD methods, to the prediction of the RCS of a typical
LO target: the NASA almond. The accuracy of the LTS-LFDG has been demonstrated to be in the range of that of the MoM CCIE method, outperforming the classical (uniform-mesh, second-order) FDTD method in terms of computational time vs. accuracy.
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