

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN OPTIMIZATION

Slawomir Koziel
Stanislav Ogurtsov

Antenna Design by Simulation- Driven Optimization



Springer

SpringerBriefs in Optimization

Series Editors

Panos M. Pardalos

János D. Pintér

Stephen M. Robinson

Tamás Terlaky

My T. Thai

SpringerBriefs in Optimization showcases algorithmic and theoretical techniques, case studies, and applications within the broad-based field of optimization. Manuscripts related to the ever-growing applications of optimization in applied mathematics, engineering, medicine, economics, and other applied sciences are encouraged.

For further volumes:

<http://www.springer.com/series/8918>

Slawomir Koziel • Stanislav Ogurtsov

Antenna Design by Simulation-Driven Optimization

 Springer

Slawomir Koziel
School of Science and Engineering
Reykjavik University Engineering
Optimization & Modeling Center
Reykjavik, Iceland

Stanislav Ogurtsov
School of Science and Engineering
Reykjavik University Engineering
Optimization & Modeling Center
Reykjavik, Iceland

ISSN 2190-8354

ISBN 978-3-319-04366-1

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04367-8

Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

ISSN 2191-575X (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-04367-8 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013958383

© Slawomir Koziel and Stanislav Ogurtsov 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

Design of contemporary antenna structures heavily relies on electromagnetic (EM) simulations. Accurate reflection and radiation responses of many antenna geometries can be obtained only with discrete full-wave EM simulation. On the other hand, the direct use of high-fidelity EM simulation in the design process, particularly for automated parameter optimization, results in high computational costs, often prohibitive. Other issues, such as the presence of numerical noise, may result in a failure of optimization using conventional (e.g., gradient-based) methods. In this book, we demonstrate that numerically efficient design of antennas can be realized using surrogate-based optimization (SBO) methodologies. The essence of SBO techniques resides in shifting the optimization burden to a fast surrogate of the antenna structure and the use of coarse-discretization EM models to configure the surrogate. A properly created and handled surrogate serves as a reliable prediction tool so that satisfactory designs can be found at the costs of a limited number of simulations of the high-fidelity EM antenna model. The specific SBO techniques covered here include space mapping combined with response surface approximation, shape-preserving response prediction (SPRP), adaptive response correction (ARC), adaptively adjusted design specification (AADS), variable-fidelity simulation-driven optimization (VFSDO), and surrogate-based optimization enhanced by the use of adjoint sensitivities. Multi-objective design of antennas is also covered to some extent. Moreover, we discuss practical issues such as the effect of the coarse-discretization model fidelity on the final design quality and the computational cost of the optimization process. Our considerations are illustrated using numerous application examples. Recommendations concerning application of specific SBO techniques to antenna design are also presented.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Antenna Design Using Electromagnetic Simulations	5
2.1	Antenna Design Task as an Optimization Problem.....	5
2.2	Gradient-Based Optimization Methods	7
2.3	Derivative-Free Optimization Methods	9
2.4	Metaheuristics and Global Optimization	10
2.5	Challenges of Conventional Optimization Toward Design Using Surrogate Models	12
3	Surrogate-Based Optimization	13
3.1	Surrogate-Based Optimization Basics	13
3.2	Surrogate Model Construction: Function Approximation and Physics-Based Surrogates	15
3.2.1	Approximation-Based Surrogate Models.....	16
3.2.2	Physics-Based Surrogate Models.....	20
3.3	Exploration Versus Exploitation	23
4	Methodologies for Variable-Fidelity Optimization of Antenna Structures	25
4.1	Antenna-Specific Challenges of Surrogate-Based Optimization	25
4.2	Space Mapping.....	26
4.2.1	Space Mapping Concept	26
4.2.2	Aggressive Space Mapping.....	27
4.2.3	Parametric Space Mapping	28
4.2.4	Space Mapping with Response Surface Approximations.....	30
4.3	Shape-Preserving Response Prediction.....	31
4.3.1	SPRP Concept	31
4.3.2	SPRP Formulation.....	32
4.3.3	Illustration Example.....	33
4.3.4	Practical Issues.....	34

4.4	Adaptive Response Correction.....	35
4.5	Manifold Mapping	37
4.6	Adaptively Adjusted Design Specifications	39
4.7	Multi-fidelity Design Optimization.....	41
5	Low-Fidelity Antenna Models	45
5.1	Low-Fidelity Models in Simulation-Driven Optimization	45
5.2	Coarse-Discretization Antenna Models as a Basis for Low-Fidelity Antenna Models	47
5.3	Additional Simplifications of Low-Fidelity Antenna Models.....	49
5.4	Need for Automated Selection of Model Fidelity.....	52
6	Simulation-Based UWB Antenna Design.....	53
6.1	UWB Monopole Matching with Manifold Mapping and Kriging.....	53
6.2	UWB Dipole	55
6.3	UWB Vivaldi Antenna	56
6.4	Discussion	59
7	Optimization of Dielectric Resonator Antennas	61
7.1	DRA with a Substrate-Integrated Cavity	61
7.2	Suspended Brick DRA.....	66
7.3	Optimization of DRA for Two Installation Scenarios.....	68
7.4	Conclusions.....	72
8	Surrogate-Based Optimization of Microstrip Broadband Antennas	73
8.1	Wideband Microstrip Antenna	73
8.2	Double-Ring Antenna	76
8.3	Microstrip Antenna with U-Shape Parasitic Patches	79
8.4	Conclusions.....	80
9	Simulation-Driven Antenna Array Optimization	83
9.1	5×5 Antenna Array	83
9.2	Optimization of a 7×7 Array Using Analytical and Discrete Models	87
9.3	Discussion and Conclusion	90
10	Antenna Optimization with Surrogates and Adjoint Sensitivities	93
10.1	Surrogate-Based Optimization with Adjoint Sensitivity.....	94
10.1.1	Generic Surrogate-Based Optimization Algorithm	94
10.1.2	Robustness of the SBO Process.....	94
10.2	SBO with First-Order Taylor Model and Trust Regions.....	95
10.2.1	Planar Inverted-F Antenna (PIFA).....	96
10.2.2	Wideband Hybrid Antenna	98
10.3	SBO with Space Mapping and Manifold Mapping.....	99
10.3.1	Surrogate Construction Using SM and Sensitivity Data.....	99

10.3.2	Surrogate Construction Using MM and Sensitivity Data.....	100
10.3.3	Fast Parameter Extraction and Surrogate Model Optimization.....	101
10.3.4	UWB Monopole Optimization Using SM and MM Surrogates	101
10.4	SPRP with Adjoint Sensitivity	103
10.5	Discussion and Conclusion	104
11	Simulation-Based Multi-objective Antenna Optimization with Surrogate Models.....	105
11.1	Multi-objective Antenna Design Using Surrogate Modeling and Evolutionary Algorithms.....	106
11.1.1	Multi-objective Antenna Design Problem	106
11.1.2	Optimization Algorithm.....	106
11.2	Application: A UWB Monopole.....	108
11.2.1	UWB Monopole: Geometry and Problem Statement	108
11.2.2	UWB Monopole: Results.....	108
11.3	Application: A Planar Yagi Antenna.....	112
11.3.1	Planar Yagi Antenna: Geometry, Models, and Problem Statement	112
11.3.2	Planar Yagi Antenna: Surrogate Models	113
11.3.3	Planar Yagi Antenna: Results.....	115
11.4	Summary	115
12	Practical Aspects of Surrogate-Based Antenna Design: Selecting Model Fidelity	119
12.1	Selecting Model Fidelity: Speed Versus Accuracy Trade-Offs.....	119
12.2	Case Study 1: Design of Broadband Slot Antenna Using Output Space Mapping.....	120
12.3	Case Study 2: Model Management for Hybrid DRA.....	121
12.4	Discussion and Recommendations	123
13	Discussion and Recommendations.....	125
13.1	SBO Methods Highlights.....	125
13.2	Discussion and Recommendations	128
13.3	Prospective Look	129
	References.....	131
	Index.....	139

Chapter 1

Introduction

Design of modern antennas is undoubtedly a challenging task. An important part of the design process is the adjustment of geometry and material parameters to ensure that the antenna response satisfies prescribed performance specifications with respect to certain characteristics such as input impedance, radiation pattern, antenna efficiency, etc. (Volakis 2007; Schantz 2005; Petosa 2007; Balanis 2005). In this context, computationally inexpensive analytical models can only be used—in most cases—to obtain an initial estimate of the optimum design. This is particularly the case when certain interactions within the antenna itself and with the antenna environment (e.g., housing, installation fixture, feeding circuit, connectors) have to be taken into account. For these reasons, full-wave electromagnetic (EM) simulation plays an essential role in the design closure. Contemporary computational techniques—implemented in commercial simulation packages—are capable to adequately evaluate antenna reflection and radiation responses. On the other hand, full-wave simulations of realistic and finely discretized antenna models are computationally expensive: evaluation for a single combination of design parameters may take up to several hours. While this cost is acceptable from the design validation standpoint, it is usually prohibitive for design optimization that normally requires a large number of EM simulations of the antenna structure of interest.

Automation of the antenna design process can be realized by formulating the antenna parameter adjustment task as an optimization problem with the objective function supplied by an EM solver (Special issue, IEEE APS 2007). Unfortunately, most of the conventional optimization techniques, including gradient-based (Nocedal and Wright 2000), e.g., conjugate-gradient, quasi-Newton, sequential quadratic programming, etc., and derivative-free (Kolda et al. 2003) methods, e.g., Nelder-Mead and pattern search techniques, require a large number of objective function evaluations to converge to a satisfactory design. For many realistic EM antenna models, where evaluation time per design reaches a few hours with contemporary computing facilities, the cost of such an optimization process may be unacceptably high. Another practical problem of conventional optimization techniques is numerical noise, which is partially a result of adaptive meshing techniques used

by most contemporary EM solvers: even a small change of design variables may result in a change of the mesh topology and, consequently, discontinuity of the EM-simulated antenna responses as a function of designable parameters. The noise is particularly an issue for gradient-based methods that normally require smoothness of the objective function.

The aforementioned challenges result in a situation where the most common approach to simulation-driven antenna design is based on repetitive parameter sweeps (usually, one parameter at a time). This approach is usually more reliable than a brute-force optimization using built-in optimization capabilities of commercial simulation tools; however, it is also very laborious, time-consuming, and demanding significant designer supervision. Moreover, such a parameter-sweep-based optimization process does not guarantee optimum results because only a limited number of parameters can be handled that way. It is also difficult to utilize correlations between the parameters properly. Finally, optimal values of the designable variables can be quite counterintuitive.

In recent years, population-based search methods (also referred to as metaheuristics) (Yang 2010) have gained considerable popularity. This group of methods includes, among others, genetic algorithms (GA) (Back et al. 2000), particle swarm optimizers (PSO) (Kennedy 1997), differential evolution (DE) (Storn and Price 1997), and ant colony optimization (Dorigo and Gambardella 1997). Most of metaheuristics are biologically inspired systems designed to alleviate certain difficulties of the conventional optimization methods, in particular, handling problems with multiple local optima (Yang 2010). Probably the most successful application of the metaheuristic algorithms in antenna design resided so far in array optimization problems (e.g., Ares-Pena et al. 1999; Haupt 2007; Jin and Rahmat-Samii 2007, 2008; Petko and Werner 2007; Bevelacqua and Balanis 2007; Grimaccia et al. 2007; Pantoja et al. 2007; Selleri et al. 2008; Li et al. 2008; Rajo-Iglesias and Quevedo-Teruel 2007; Roy et al. 2011). In these problems, the cost of evaluating the single element response is not of the primary concern or the response of a single element is already available, e.g., with a preassigned array element. However, application of metaheuristics to EM-simulation-driven antenna design is not practical because corresponding computational costs would be tremendous: typical GA, PSO, or DE algorithm requires hundreds, thousands, or even tens of thousands of objective function evaluations to yield a solution (Ares-Pena et al. 1999; Haupt 2007; Jin and Rahmat-Samii 2007, 2008; Petko and Werner 2007; Bevelacqua and Balanis 2007; Grimaccia et al. 2007; Pantoja et al. 2007; Selleri et al. 2008; Li et al. 2008; Rajo-Iglesias and Quevedo-Teruel 2007; Roy et al. 2011).

The problem of high computational cost of conventional EM-based antenna optimization can be alleviated to some extent by the use of adjoint sensitivity (Director and Rohrer 1969), which is a computationally cheap way to obtain derivatives of the system response with respect to its design parameters. Adjoint sensitivities can substantially speed up microwave design optimization while using gradient-based algorithms (Bandler and Seviara 1972; Chung et al. 2001). This technology was also demonstrated for antenna optimization (Jacobson and Rylander 2010; Toivanen et al. 2009; Zhang et al. 2012). It should be mentioned, however, that

adjoint sensitivities are not yet widespread in commercial EM solvers. Only CST (CST Microwave Studio 2011) and HFSS (HFSS 2010) have recently implemented this feature. Also, the use of adjoint sensitivities is limited by numerical noise of the EM-simulated response (Koziel et al. 2012c).

One of the most recent and yet most promising ways to realize computationally efficient simulation-driven antenna design is surrogate-based optimization (SBO) (Koziel and Ogurtsov 2011a, b; Forrester and Keane 2009; Queipo et al. 2005). The SBO main idea is to shift the computational burden of the optimization process to a surrogate model which is a cheap representation of the optimized antenna (Bandler et al. 2004a, b; Queipo et al. 2005; Koziel et al. 2006; Koziel and Ogurtsov 2011a). In a typical setting, the surrogate model is used as a prediction tool to find approximate location of the original (high-fidelity or fine) antenna model. After evaluating the high-fidelity model at this predicted optimum, the surrogate is updated in order to improve its local accuracy (Koziel et al. 2011c). The key prerequisite of the SBO paradigm is that the surrogate is much faster than the high-fidelity model. Also, in many SBO algorithms, the high-fidelity model is only evaluated once per iteration. Therefore, the computational cost of the design process with a well working SBO algorithm may be significantly lower than those with most of conventional optimization methods.

There are two major types of surrogate models. The first one comprises function-approximation models constructed from sampled high-fidelity simulation data (Simpson et al. 2001). A number of approximation (and interpolation) techniques are available, including artificial neural networks (Haykin 1998), radial basis functions (Gutmann 2001; Wild et al. 2008), kriging (Forrester and Keane 2009), support vector machines (Smola and Schölkopf 2004), Gaussian process regression (Angiulli et al. 2007; Jacobs 2012), or multidimensional rational approximation (Shaker et al. 2009). If the design space is sampled with sufficient density, the resulting model becomes reliable so that the optimal antenna design can be found just by optimizing the surrogate. In fact, approximation methods are usually used to create multiple-use library models of specific components. The computational overhead related to such models may be very high. Depending on the number of designable parameters, the number of training samples necessary to ensure decent accuracy might be hundreds, thousands, or even tens of thousands. Moreover, the number of samples quickly grows with the dimensionality of the problem (so-called curse of dimensionality). As a consequence, globally accurate approximation modeling is not suitable for ad hoc (one-time) antenna optimization. Iteratively improved approximation surrogates are becoming popular for global optimization (Couckuyt 2013). Various ways of incorporating new training points into the model (so-called infill criteria) exist, including exploitative models (i.e., models oriented toward improving the design in the vicinity of the current one), explorative models (i.e., models aiming at improving global accuracy), as well as model with balanced exploration and exploitation (Jones et al. 1998; Forrester and Keane 2009).

Another type of surrogates, so-called physics-based surrogates, is constructed from underlying low-fidelity (or coarse) models or the respective structures. Because the low-fidelity models inherit some knowledge of the system under consideration,

usually a small number of high-fidelity simulations are sufficient to configure a reliable surrogate. The most popular SBO approaches using physics-based surrogates that proved to be successful in microwave engineering are space mapping (SM) (Bandler et al. 2004a, b), tuning, tuning SM (Koziel et al. 2009a; Cheng et al. 2010), as well as various response correction methods (Echeverria and Hemker 2005; Koziel et al. 2009b; Koziel 2010a). To ensure computational efficiency, it is important that the low-fidelity model is considerably faster than the high-fidelity model. For that reason, circuit equivalents or models based on analytical formulas are preferred (Bandler et al. 2004a, b). The aforementioned methods (particularly space mapping) were mostly used to design filters or transmission-line-based components such as impedance transformers (Amari et al. 2006; Wu et al. 2004; Bandler et al. 2004a, b). Unfortunately, in case of antennas, reliable circuit equivalents are rarely available. For antennas, a universal way of obtaining low-fidelity models is through coarse-discretization EM simulations. Such models are relatively expensive, which poses additional challenges in terms of optimization.

The topic of this book is surrogate-based optimization methods for simulation-driven antenna design with the focus on surrogate-based techniques exploiting variable-fidelity EM simulations and physics-based surrogates. We begin, in Chap. 2, by formulating the antenna design task as an optimization problem. We also briefly discuss conventional numerical optimization techniques, including both gradient-based and derivative-free methods but also metaheuristics. In Chap. 3, surrogate-based optimization is introduced. In the same chapter, the SBO design workflow as well as various aspects of surrogate-based optimization is presented on a generic level. Chapter 4 is an exposition of the specific state-of-the-art physics-based SBO techniques that are suitable for antenna design optimization. The emphasis is put on methods that aim at minimizing the number of both high- and low-fidelity EM simulations of the antenna under design and thus reducing the overall design cost. Chapters 6–9 present applications of the methods discussed in Chap. 4 for the design of specific antenna structures. Variable-fidelity design exploiting adjoint sensitivity is presented in Chap. 10. Chapter 11 discusses multi-objective antenna design using surrogate models. Chapter 12 provides a discussion of open issues related to SBO antenna design with special focus on selecting simulation model fidelity and its impact on the performance and computational efficiency of the optimization process. The book is concluded in Chap. 13. Here, we formulate recommendations for the readers interested in applying presented algorithm and techniques in their antenna design and discuss possible future developments concerning mostly automation of simulation-driven antenna design.

Chapter 2

Antenna Design Using Electromagnetic Simulations

In this chapter, we formulate the antenna design task as a nonlinear minimization problem. We introduce necessary notation, discuss typical objectives and constraints, and give a brief overview of conventional optimization techniques, including gradient-based and derivative-free methods, as well as metaheuristics. We also introduce the concept of the surrogate-based optimization (SBO) and discuss it on a generic level. More detailed exposition of SBO and SBO-related design techniques will be given in Chaps. 3 and 4.

2.1 Antenna Design Task as an Optimization Problem

Let $\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x})$ denote a response of a high-fidelity (or fine) model of the antenna under design. For the rest of this book, we will assume that \mathbf{R}_f is obtained using accurate full-wave electromagnetic (EM) simulation. Typically, \mathbf{R}_f will represent evaluation of performance characteristics, e.g., reflection $|S_{11}|$ or gain over certain frequency band of interest. Vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_n]^T$ represents designable parameters to be adjusted (e.g., geometry and/or material ones).

In some situations, individual components of the vector $\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x})$ will be considered, and we will use the notation $\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x}) = [R_f(\mathbf{x}, f_1) \ R_f(\mathbf{x}, f_2) \ \dots \ R_f(\mathbf{x}, f_m)]^T$, where $R_f(\mathbf{x}, f_k)$ is the evaluation of the high-fidelity model at a frequency f_k , whereas f_1 through f_m represent the entire discrete set of frequencies at which the model is evaluated.

The antenna design task can be formulated as the following nonlinear minimization problem (Koziel and Ogurtsov 2011a):

$$\mathbf{x}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} U(\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x})) \tag{2.1}$$

where U is the scalar merit function encoding the design specifications, whereas \mathbf{x}^* is the optimum design to be found. The composition $U(\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x}))$ will be referred to as the objective function. The function U is implemented so that a better design \mathbf{x} corresponds to a smaller value of $U(\mathbf{R}_f(\mathbf{x}))$. In antenna design, U is most often