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Threshold Power of Canonical Antennas for Inducing SAR at Compliance Limits in the 300–3000 MHz Frequency Range
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Abstract—A study of the specific absorption rate (SAR) in an exposed body induced by canonical antennas is presented, with the aim of determining an upper bound for the antenna transmit power that demonstrates that a product is inherently compliant with internationally accepted radio frequency (RF) exposure limits. Starting from the fundamental limits in antenna quality factor (Q) and the corresponding bandwidth, several antenna sizes are selected, and their SAR distributions are computed using the method of moments (MoM) and finite-difference time domain (FDTD) method in the frequency range 300–3000 MHz. The threshold powers are then determined, below which the peak 1-g and 10-g averaged SAR would not exceed the limits specified in international exposure standards. From the data, simple expressions are derived to estimate the threshold power over a wide range of antenna sizes, frequencies, and distances from the body. It is demonstrated that the results presented in this paper are conservative in comparison with the measured SAR data of real products as well as other published data.

Index Terms—Antennas, electromagnetic fields, electromagnetic propagation in absorbing media, finite difference methods, moment methods.

I. INTRODUCTION

SPECIFIC absorption rate (SAR) is a metric of radio frequency (RF) energy exposure [1]. Proper evaluation of SAR for wireless transmitters is essential both in terms of compliance with RF exposure limits [2], [3] and antenna performance. SAR is measured using automated measurement systems in phantoms representing the human body [4], [5]. SAR can also be computed using various numerical electromagnetic modeling techniques, such as the finite-difference time domain (FDTD) method [6] and the method of moments (MoM) [7].

In the literature, there has been considerable research on mobile phone antennas and SAR [8]–[19]. Researchers have mainly been interested in the electromagnetic exposure of users from portable wireless devices and the influence of the user on the antenna performance in the 800–900 MHz and 1800–1900 MHz frequency bands. Most of the publications, to date, address different antenna types and their interaction with the human body, efficient numerical algorithms to compute SAR, and efficient antenna designs to reduce SAR. In contrast, this paper is an attempt to explore the relationship between SAR and antenna geometry for canonical antennas in the 300–3000 MHz frequency range with an aim to identify an upper bound of the transmitted power to meet a given SAR limit.

RF exposure standards address localized exposure to radio transmitters by limiting the peak mass-averaged SAR. For general public exposures at the head and torso, these limits are either 1.6 W/kg averaged over a 1-g mass (adopted in the United States of America, Bolivia, Canada, and South Korea) [2] or 2 W/kg averaged over a 10-g mass (adopted in 35 other countries, including Australia, Japan, and many European countries) [3]. The relationship between the peak SAR averaged over a mass m (denoted as SARm) and the root-mean-squared (rms) power transmitted by an antenna (Pt) can be described as

\[
\text{SAR}_m = \frac{P_m}{m} = \frac{1}{m} P_{\text{abs}} \frac{P_{\text{abs}}}{P_t} = \frac{1}{m} F_m (1 - \eta_{\text{rad}}) P_t \tag{1}
\]

where \(P_m\) is the rms power absorbed in mass \(m\), \(P_{\text{abs}}\) is the total rms power absorbed in the body, \(F_m = P_m / P_{\text{abs}}\) is an absorption factor representing the percentage of the absorbed power in the body that is dissipated in the averaging mass \(m\), and \(\eta_{\text{rad}} = 1 - P_{\text{abs}} / P_t\) is the radiation efficiency (i.e., the fraction of \(P_t\) that is not absorbed in the body).

The CENELEC EN 50371 standard provides a 20-mW threshold for the transmitted power above which SAR evaluation for compliance with the 2-W/kg SAR limit is needed [20]. Substituting \(P_t = 20\ \text{mW}, m = 10\ \text{g}, \) and \(\text{SAR}_{10\text{g}} = 2 \text{ W/kg}\) in (1), it is seen that this threshold is conservative, as it is based on the assumption that all the power transmitted by the antenna is absorbed in the body (i.e., \(\eta_{\text{rad}} = 0\)), making the device useless for communication, and all the absorbed power is concentrated in the 10-g mass (i.e., \(F_{10\text{g}} = 1\)). However, in reality, \(\eta_{\text{rad}} > 0\) and \(F_{10\text{g}} < 1\); thus, the threshold power should be higher than 20 mW. Similarly, the threshold power ought to be higher than 1.6 mW for compliance with the IEEE C95.1-1991 standard.

The main objective of this paper is to analyze the relationship between SAR and antenna geometry, frequency, and bandwidth to determine suitable threshold power levels above which SAR evaluation must be done. Another objective is to derive a simple expression from the data that accurately estimates the threshold power from these parameters. It is important that the threshold power is conservative so that there is a negligibly low probability.
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that a portable wireless device with a transmit power below the
threshold would induce a peak SAR exceeding the RF exposure
limit. Although there are myriad mobile device geometries and
body locations, we are interested in investigating relationships
and trends of a general nature. Therefore, we consider canonical
antennas (dipoles and loops) and a canonical body (a flat box
phantom) over the considered frequency range. It will be shown
that the phantom and antennas studied in this paper provide
conservatively high SAR values for a given amount of emitted
power compared to what would likely occur for a broad range of
antenna types and portable wireless devices. In fact, earlier work
by Okoniewski and Stuchly [9] showed that a flat phantom has
a significantly higher SAR than that of a spherical or a realistic
human head phantom. All considered antennas are lossless and
perfectly matched. This ensures 100% antenna efficiency, so
that the only losses are in the phantom, which also results in
higher SAR values. At the end of the paper, a comparison is
made between the results of this investigation and measured
data from real portable wireless devices. The antennas studied
can be regarded as representative of the radiation mechanisms
characterizing a large majority of portable wireless devices.
They may not be representative of highly directional antennas,
such as those frequently employed in indoor/outdoor fixed
transmitters, but such devices, which are not intended to operate
near the user’s head or body, are out of the scope of this paper.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Numerical Modeling

SAR computations were conducted using commercial elec-
tromagnetic simulation codes based on FDTD (XFDTD v
6.3, Remcom Inc., State College, PA) [21] and MoM (FEKO
Suite 4.3, EM Software & Systems-S.A. (Pty) Ltd., Stellen-
bosch, South Africa) [22]. Results using the two methods are
checked against each other and against the measured and pub-
lished data in Section III-A.

The setup used for all calculations consists of an antenna at
a fixed distance from a flat phantom (see Fig. 1). The flat phan-
tom consists of a lossy tissue equivalent material and a lossless
phantom shell having a relative permittivity of 3.7. The dielec-
tric parameters \((\varepsilon_r, \sigma)\) and minimum dimensions \((L, W, H)\)
of the phantom material and the thickness \(t\) of the phantom shell
meet the IEEE Std 1528-2003 specifications [4], which are re-
produced in Table I. The phantom dielectric parameters were
chosen to provide a conservatively high SAR in a homogeneous
head model when compared to the heterogeneous case of a real
person [4], [13]. The conservativeness of the phantom dielec-
tric parameters has been verified independently [23], [24]. In
addition, a current proposal [25] is to use these same dielectric
parameters for the rest of the body. Thus, the results of this paper
are applicable to both the head and the body of the user. The
antenna is oriented in a plane parallel to the phantom shell with
its center directly beneath the center of the phantom shell. The
dipole antenna feed point is located between equal arms along
the antenna axis. The antenna axis is spaced at a distance \(s\) from
the interface between the phantom material and the phantom
shell.

For the FDTD simulations, the voxel dimensions were kept
below \(\lambda/16\) in all directions and in all media. The uniform
voxel dimensions were 1 mm for frequencies of 900 MHz and
above and 1.5 mm for frequencies of 450 MHz and below. The
FDTD model was bounded by perfectly matched layer (PML)
absorbing boundaries with at least four layers. The absorbing
boundaries were at a minimum distance of \(\lambda_0/8\) from the model.

For the MoM simulations, Green’s functions for planar mul-
tilayer dielectric media were chosen for the integral equations.
To discretize and solve the integral equations, FEKO uses tri-
angular expansion and testing functions for the wire models.
The wire model segment length was less than \(\lambda/15\) and at least
3.3 times the wire diameter.

In all cases, SAR averaging was carried out as prescribed by
the IEEE Std C95.3-2002 [26].

B. Antenna Models

The purpose of this section is to define the antenna types and
an appropriate range of antenna sizes for the study. Antenna
sizes and types vary widely from one portable wireless device
to another. For mobile transmitters, antennas can be broadly
classified as external and internal antennas [27]. Examples of
external antennas include whip and helical monopole anten-
as, while internal antennas include planar inverted-F anten-
as (PIFAs) [28]–[33] and folded inverted conformal antennas
(FICAs) [34]. This study focuses on two canonical antenna types, thin-wire dipoles and loops. The advantage of studying canonical antenna types is that it limits the number of variables to be studied while also representing the fundamental radiation mechanisms that characterize several broad classes of portable wireless devices, such as mobile phones and two-way portable radios and pagers. For example, only length and radius are varied with thin-wire dipoles, whereas with PIFAs, the size and shape of the patch element, the ground contact location, the feed location, and the size of the ground plane would all be variables in the investigation space. The applicability of the canonical antenna results to real portable wireless devices is addressed in Section III-C.

Since antenna size has a significant effect on SAR, it is important to determine the antenna sizes to be studied. The length of the dipole antennas will be varied from $\lambda/2$ to a minimum length. Dipole antennas longer than $\lambda/2$ are not of interest because the current distribution on such antennas has multiple peaks, resulting in lower peak mass-averaged SAR values for a given transmit power. Given that antenna size is related to bandwidth and that antennas for portable wireless devices must meet bandwidth requirements, it makes sense to use bandwidth specifications as the rationale for choosing the minimum length to be studied. The relationship between the size of an antenna and its maximum bandwidth (or minimum quality factor $Q$) has been studied extensively [35]–[39]. According to McLean [38], the minimum radiation $Q$ of a lossless antenna that is contained within a sphere of radius $a$ is given by

$$Q_{\text{min}} = \frac{1}{(\beta a)^2} + \frac{1}{\beta a}$$

(2)

where $\beta = 2\pi/\lambda$. This equation is accurate for electrically small antennas, where $\beta a \leq 1$ [38]. For thin-wire dipole antennas, this corresponds to a length $l \approx 2a \leq \lambda/\pi$. The radiation $Q$ is the ratio of stored to radiated energy of an antenna, and when $Q$ is large, it is approximately equal to the inverse of the half-power bandwidth [40]. The half-power bandwidth corresponds approximately to a return loss of $|S_{11}| \leq -7 \text{ dB}$ [i.e., voltage standing wave ratio (VSWR) $\leq 2.6$] for impedance matched antennas at resonance [41]. This bandwidth is denoted as $BW_{\text{7dB}}$ in this paper. In general, $BW_{x, \text{dB}}$ will denote the fractional bandwidth over which $|S_{11}| \leq -x \text{ dB}$. Portable wireless devices are commonly designed to meet operating antenna bandwidths $BW_{x, \text{dB}} = 100\% - 2\%$ or $-6 \text{ dB}$ (corresponding to VSWR $\leq 2$ or 3, respectively) rather than $-7 \text{ dB}$.

The fractional bandwidth is equal to $100\% \times \Delta f/f_0$, where $\Delta f = f_{\text{max}} - f_{\text{min}}$ and $f_0 = (f_{\text{min}} + f_{\text{max}})/2$, and where $f_{\text{min}}$ and $f_{\text{max}}$ are the lowest and highest frequencies over the range at which $|S_{11}| \leq -x \text{ dB}$. The values of $Q_{\text{min}}$ and $BW_{\text{7dB}}$ are given in Table II for a range of $\beta a$ values.

In practice, there is no known antenna that achieves the upper bandwidth bounds in Table II, given the difficulty to utilize the spherical volume effectively [39]. Therefore, the bandwidths of practical antennas are significantly narrower than these bounds. Table III shows the fractional impedance bandwidths of dipole antennas calculated using MoM both in free space and near the flat phantom at three frequencies. None of these antennas are resonant by themselves, and thus, to calculate bandwidths, each antenna is made resonant by nullifying its reactance at the desired frequency (by inserting a lossless inductor in series with the capacitive reactance of the short antenna) and feeding it with a source matched to the antenna input resistance. Broadband matching networks can be used to achieve wider bandwidths at the expense of lower antenna efficiency due to circuit losses. For the results of Table III, the phantom parameters are as given in Table I, and the dipole antenna parameters are as shown in Table I. Results are shown at 300, 1450, and 3000 MHz, representing the lowest, middle, and highest frequencies studied.

The 7-dB bandwidths of the thin-wire dipoles in free space at 1450 MHz (see column 5 of Table III) can be compared with the McLean fundamental limits in Table II. The fractional bandwidths are about an order of magnitude narrower than those of the fundamental limits. As the dipoles are placed next to the phantom, the bandwidths increase significantly due to the introduction of losses in the near field that reduce the stored reactive energy of the antenna. At $s = 5 \text{ mm}$ (see column 6), $BW_{\text{7dB}}$ is approximately twice that for the same dipole antennas in free space. The other consequence of proximity to the phantom is degradation in antenna radiation efficiency. For instance, the radiation efficiency of the 1450-MHz dipole antenna with $s = 5 \text{ mm}$ and $l = \lambda/3.9$ is only 3%.

The fractional bandwidths are also shown at 1450 MHz for the practical cases of $|S_{11}| = -6 \text{ dB}$ and $-9.5 \text{ dB}$ (see columns 4 and 7 of Table III). The fractional bandwidths for $|S_{11}| = -6 \text{ dB}$ are also given at the lowest and highest frequencies studied for $s = 5 \text{ mm}$ (see columns 2 and 8 of Table III). The fractional bandwidth is widest at $f = 300 \text{ MHz}$ due to the fact that the antennas are electrically closest to the phantom, resulting in higher losses and lower radiation efficiency. Column 3 of Table III shows the influence of dipole diameter on bandwidth.

| Table I: Q and Bandwidth Limits for Electrically Small Antennas |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| $\alpha_d$ | $Q_{\text{min}}$ | $BW_{\text{7dB}}$ |
| 0.2 | $\lambda/15.7$ | 130 | 0.77% |
| 0.4 | $\lambda/7.8$ | 18 | 5.9% |
| 0.6 | $\lambda/5.2$ | 6.3 | 15.9% |
| 0.8 | $\lambda/3.9$ | 3.2 | 31.2% |
| 1.0 | $\lambda/\pi$ | 2 | 50.0% |

| Table II: Calculated Fractional Impedance Bandwidths of Dipoles Antennas |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| $f$ (MHz) | $s$ (mm) | $d$ (mm) | $|S_{11}|$ |
| 300 | 300 | 1450 | 1450 | 1450 | 3000 |
| 5 | 5 | 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 3.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| $\lambda/5.2$ | 1.9% | 6.5% | 2.4% | 0.3% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 0.6% |
| $\lambda/3.9$ | 4.0% | 14% | 2.4% | 0.9% | 2.1% | 1.5% | 1.6% |
| $\lambda/\pi$ | 7.2% | 26% | 4.7% | 2.1% | 4.1% | 2.9% | 3.5% |

1 A distance of $s = \infty$ means that the antenna is in free space (i.e., the phantom is not present).
TABLE IV
SOME TYPICAL FREQUENCY BANDS OF PORTABLE WIRELESS DEVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Band (MHz)</th>
<th>BW (MHz)</th>
<th>Example Air Interface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>824</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency band usage depends on the spectrum allocation of each country (e.g., 1429-1501 MHz is used in Japan, 2300-2400 MHz in South Korea). Also, some of the frequency bands support more than one air interface. The air interface given above is one example.

At a dipole diameter of $d = 3.6\,\text{mm}$ (from Table I), $BW_{6\,\text{dB}}$ for 300 MHz dipole antennas next to the phantom is three to four times wider than those of the same dipole antennas with $d = 0.2\,\text{mm}$. For this thicker dipole diameter, the tips of these dipole antennas do not fit completely inside the sphere of radius $2a$ described by McLean. This results in a slightly increased bandwidth, especially for the shorter antennas.

Finally, the operating bandwidths of the portable wireless devices operating at various frequency bands are listed in Table IV. Fractional bandwidths range from 3 to 17%. Since the bandwidths of the $\lambda/15.7$ dipole antennas in Table III are narrow compared to the bandwidths in Table IV, even when the antenna is as close as 5 mm from the lossy phantom material, it does not appear relevant to investigate the dipole antennas shorter than $\lambda/16$. Thus, our study focuses on studying the SAR resulting from canonical dipoles with lengths of $\lambda/16, \lambda/12, \lambda/8, \lambda/4,$ and $\lambda/2$.

III. RESULTS

A. Validation of Numerical Models for SAR

To verify the accuracy of the numerical models and to estimate the error of the results, the flat phantom and dipole antenna setup shown in Fig. 1 was simulated using MoM and FDTD. All SAR values are computed for an antenna transmit power of $P_t = 1\,\text{W}$. In Table V, the peak 1-g and 10-g averaged SAR values from the MoM and FDTD simulations are compared with the reference values of IEEE Std 1528 [4]. The geometric and dielectric parameters of the setup were set as shown in Table I. The reference values are shown as $\text{SAR}_m$ in units of Watts per kilogram, whereas the MoM and FDTD results are shown as $\Delta\text{SAR}_m$, which is the percent change in $\text{SAR}_m$ from the reference values. Table V also lists $\Delta\text{SAR}_m$ for measurements that were conducted at the Motorola Corporate EME Research Laboratory, Fort Lauderdale, FL, on the same setup (except at 1450 and 3000 MHz, where dipole antennas conforming to the IEEE Std 1528 specifications were not available) using the DASY4 system (Schmid & Partner Engineering AG, Zürich, Switzerland). The measured and simulated results are all within 8% of the reference values. Thus, the deviation of the measured values is always within the 11% measurement uncertainty (evaluated according to [4] for $k = 1$ standard deviations).

Table VI shows a comparison of MoM and FDTD results at 900 MHz using the setup of Fig. 1 and Table I, except that the antenna length is varied from $\lambda/2$ to $\lambda/16$, and a closer spacing of the dipole antenna axis to the liquid of $s = 5\,\text{mm}$ is used. The peak 1-g and 10-g averaged SAR values are given for the MoM results along with $\Delta\text{SAR}_m$, which is the percent difference of the FDTD results from the MoM results. The two methods compare very well with each other, with a maximum deviation of 10%. The last column of Table VI shows the MoM results for the identical setup of column 2, except that $d = 0.2\,\text{mm}$. The data show that changing the dipole diameter by more than an order of magnitude does not significantly affect the SAR, although, as discussed earlier, it does significantly affect the bandwidth. Therefore, the SAR results presented in the next section are expected to be stable over a wide range of practical wire radii (very thick dipole antennas could have different SAR values, but they are not of practical interest).

From the data in Tables V and VI, it is estimated that the maximum error of the calculations presented in this paper is of the order of 10%.

B. Threshold Power Results for Dipole Antennas

The SAR induced in a flat phantom by thin-wire dipole antennas was calculated using MoM with the setup of Fig. 1. The phantom dielectric parameters are specified in Table I across the
Fig. 2. Threshold power levels for $\text{SAR}_{\text{limit},1g} = 1.6 \text{ W/kg}$ at $s = 5 \text{ mm}$.

300–3000 MHz frequency range. The phantom shell thickness was fixed at 2 mm to allow the antennas to be spaced 5 mm from the phantom liquid. The dipole antennas have lengths of $l = \lambda/16, \lambda/12, \lambda/8, \lambda/4$, and $\lambda/2$ at each frequency and a constant diameter of $d = 0.2 \text{ mm}$ (i.e., not more than $\lambda/500$ at all frequencies). The segment length of the wire models was kept below $\lambda/100$. The dipole antenna was spaced away from the phantom at distances of $s = 5, 10, 15, 20$, and $25 \text{ mm}$, corresponding to the expected range of distances between the antenna of a portable wireless device and the user’s body. Due to the 2-mm thickness of the phantom shell, the thickness of the plastic housing of a typical portable wireless device, and the spacing of the antenna away from the side of the device facing the body, a minimum distance of 5 mm was deemed reasonable. The largest distance of 25 mm corresponds to the upper end of distances recommended by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission when evaluating portable wireless devices while carried next to the body using suitable accessories [42].

As indicated earlier, the parameter of interest is the threshold power $P_{\text{th,m}}$, which is the transmit power level at which $\text{SAR}_{m}$ evaluated at a transmit power of $P_t$ has reached the SAR limit $\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,m}}$. Thus

$$P_{\text{th,m}} = P_t \frac{\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,m}}}{\text{SAR}_m}. \quad (3)$$

Figs. 2 and 3 show the computed threshold power levels as functions of frequency at $s = 5 \text{ mm}$ for all dipole lengths under consideration (the $y$-axis of Figs. 2–5 uses a logarithmic scale). In Fig. 2, $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ is given for $\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,1g}} = 1.6 \text{ W/kg}$ [2], and in Fig. 3, $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ is given for $\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,10g}} = 2 \text{ W/kg}$ [3]. As expected, shorter antennas (i.e., narrower bandwidths) yield lower $P_{\text{th,m}}$. Also, $P_{\text{th,m}}$ decreases with increasing frequency partly due to the increase in tissue conductivity and partly due to the more localized energy loss for the shorter antennas. It is also observed that $P_{\text{th,m}}$ is generally more sensitive to antenna length at lower frequencies due to the shorter electrical distance between the antenna and the phantom, which results in increased antenna coupling.

In Figs. 4 and 5, the threshold power is plotted as a function of the antenna to phantom separation distance $s$ for all antenna lengths under consideration. In Fig. 4, $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ is given at 900 MHz for $\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,10g}} = 2 \text{ W/kg}$, as 900 MHz is a commonly used frequency for cellular telephone service in countries that follow the ICNIRP guidelines. Likewise, since the 1900 MHz band is commonly used in North America where IEEE C95.1-1991 guidelines are followed, $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ is given in Fig. 5. It can be seen from Figs. 4 and 5 that the logarithm
of \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) varies almost linearly with distance \( s \). Also, the relationship between \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) and \( l/\lambda \) is predominately linear at lower frequencies and logarithmic at higher frequencies. Thus, a simple mathematical relationship can be developed to estimate \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) from these two variables at a given frequency. For instance, an equation of the form

\[
\ln \hat{P}_{\text{th,m}} = As + B \ln(l/\lambda) + C(l/\lambda) + Ds \ln(l/\lambda) + E
\]

(4)
can be applied, where \( \hat{P}_{\text{th,m}} \) is an estimate of \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) (in milliwatts), \( s \) is expressed in millimeters, and \( A, B, C, D, \) and \( E \) are frequency-dependent parameters. Parameters \( A \) and \( D \) are in units of \( 1/m \) and \( B, C, \) and \( E \) are unitless. The fourth term in (4) accounts for the interaction between the first two terms, as can be seen in Figs. 4 and 5. A least-squares fit of (4) to the SAR\(_{\text{tg}} \) data yields values for \( A, B, C, D, \) and \( E \) that can be described by third-order polynomials of frequency, as shown in (5), where \( f \) is in gigahertz. The rms error of (4) and (5) to the SAR\(_{\text{tg}} \) data is 8.7%:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1000A & -9.67 & 43.9 & 1.49 & 4.48 \\
100B & -8.01 & 69.4 & -194 & 185 \\
10C & 3.18 & -23.6 & 52.7 & -11.6 \\
1000D & -2.47 & 10.8 & -8.63 & -21.2 \\
10E & -3.33 & 27.4 & -79.3 & 90.8 \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
f^3 \\
f^2 \\
f \\
1 \\
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(5)

For SAR\(_{\text{tg}} \), a least-squares solution of (4) with an rms error of 6.7% is given by

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1000A & -9.75 & 43.9 & -1.64 & 5.98 \\
100B & -6.38 & 55.9 & -155 & 133 \\
100C & 31.9 & -219 & 420 & -2.22 \\
1000D & -2.89 & 13.9 & -14.2 & -11.0 \\
10E & -3.25 & 26.1 & -70.8 & 88.1 \\
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
f^3 \\
f^2 \\
f \\
1 \\
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

(6)

Thus, simple and accurate formulas have been derived to determine the threshold power at any frequency, antenna length, and distance from the phantom within the ranges studied.

It is also interesting to observe how the absorption factor \( F_m \) and the radiation efficiency \( \eta_{\text{rad}} \) in (1) vary individually with the input variables and to see which behaviors dominate in determining \( P_{\text{th,m}} \). Combining (1) and (3) yields an expression for \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) as a function of \( \eta_{\text{rad}} \) and \( F_m \)

\[
P_{\text{th,m}} = P_t \frac{\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,m}}}{\text{SAR}_m} = m \frac{\text{SAR}_{\text{limit,m}}}{F_m(1 - \eta_{\text{rad}})}
\]

(7)

where the values of \( F_m \) and \( \eta_{\text{rad}} \) both lie between 0 and 1. As explained earlier, the CENELEC EN 50371 standard gives a value of \( F_{\text{10g}} = 20 \text{ mW} \) for SAR\(_{\text{limit,10g}} = 2 \text{ W/kg} \), which is based on the overly conservative assumption that \( F_{\text{10g}} = 1 \) and \( \eta_{\text{rad}} = 0 \). These choices of \( F_{\text{10g}} \) and \( \eta_{\text{rad}} \) give the minimum value for \( P_{\text{th,10g}} \), and it was seen in Figs. 3 and 4 that \( P_{\text{th,10g}} \) can be much higher than 20 mW in practice, particularly at lower frequencies and larger distances from the phantom. The variation of \( F_{\text{10g}} \) and \( 1 - \eta_{\text{rad}} \) with frequency and antenna length is shown in Fig. 6 for \( s = 5 \text{ mm} \) (the same case as in Fig. 3), whereas its variation with the separation distance and antenna length is reported in Fig. 7 for \( f = 900 \text{ MHz} \) (the same case as in Fig. 4). The values of \( 1 - \eta_{\text{rad}} = P_{\text{abs}}/P_t \) were calculated from radiated power \( P_{\text{rad}} = P_t - P_{\text{abs}} \) and transmit power \( P_t \), provided by the MoM simulations, and the values of \( F_{\text{10g}} \) were then calculated from (7), given that the other variables are known. For the dipole antenna setup studied in this paper, the SAR distributions have contour lines of equal SAR that are shaped like ellipses in the planes parallel to the phantom shell. The absorption factor \( F_m \) quantifies how concentrated the SAR distribution is about its peak (i.e., the spacing between the contour lines) with lower values of \( F_m \) corresponding to a more spread SAR distribution.

At lower frequencies, the radiation efficiency is very low, with nearly all of the transmitted power being absorbed in the phantom (see Fig. 6). This is due to the fact that the electrical distance of the antenna to the phantom \( s/\lambda \) is the smallest. However, \( F_{\text{10g}} \) is lowest at lower frequencies, resulting in higher \( P_{\text{th,m}} \) values. This is because the absorbed power is spread over a larger volume in the phantom, partly due to the larger antenna sizes, resulting in greater spreading of the currents on the antenna, and partly due to the lower conductivity of the phantom material resulting in larger penetration depth; thus, there is less absorption near the exposed phantom surface. As the frequency increases, the radiation efficiency increases, but energy dissipation becomes more concentrated in the 10-g mass.
The data show that the variation of $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ with frequency is predominantly influenced by $F_{10g}$ and that $F_{10g}$ and $1 - \eta_{\text{rad}}$ vary inversely with frequency. On the other hand, $F_{10g}$ and $1 - \eta_{\text{rad}}$ vary similarly with antenna length, with shorter antennas having the largest values, and therefore, lowest $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ values.

As the antenna is moved away from the phantom, the radiation efficiency improves, and the absorbed energy in the phantom becomes more spread, as expected (see Fig. 7). Both of these phenomena result in higher $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ values at larger distances.

Overall, the data show that the radiation efficiency data can, in some cases, approach the $\eta_{\text{rad}} = 0$ assumption in CENELEC EN 50371 (at least for the conservative setup used here; the results for other setups will be discussed in the next section), but the absorption factor is typically far from the $F_{10g} = 1$ assumption. Incidentally, $F_{10g}$ is significantly lower than $F_{10g}$. The lower values of $F_{10g}$ largely explain the higher $P_{\text{th,10g}}$ values above 20 mW.

### C. Comparison of Results With Other Findings

The objective of this section is to compare the results of the previous section with other findings in order to demonstrate that the results give conservative values for $P_{\text{th,m}}$, as discussed in Section I. This section consists of three parts:

1. a comparison of the radiation efficiency values discussed in the previous section with values found in the literature;
2. a comparison of the dipole results with the simulated results of a number of resonant antennas at 900 MHz;
3. a comparison of the dipole results with the measured results of portable wireless devices.

The radiation efficiencies for dipole antennas at 900 MHz in Fig. 7 range from 0.7 to 32%, with most values less than 20%. Okoniewski and Stuchly reported radiation efficiencies of a 915-MHz resonant monopole antenna on a box model of a portable wireless device next to different head models [9]. When a flat phantom was used, the radiation efficiency ranged from 16% at $s = 15$ mm to 40% at $s = 25$ mm. These results compare well with the radiation efficiency of the half-wavelength dipole in Fig. 7, which was 14–32% for same distances. The higher radiation efficiency of the monopole antenna may be due to the thickness of the box model that causes some currents on the device to be displaced away from the phantom. When two heterogeneous anatomical head models were used, Okoniewski and Stuchly reported radiation efficiencies ranging from 51% at $s = 15$ mm to 73% at $s = 25$ mm. These values are similar to the values for a homogeneous sphere reported by the same authors, and it was explained that the shape of the flat phantom is the main reason for it resulting in lower radiation efficiency, and thus, lower threshold power levels.

Others have also reported radiation efficiencies at 900 MHz for antennas mounted on a simple handset model and held against an anatomical head model. The reported radiation efficiencies are

- 22% and 29% for a meander monopole and a shorted patch, respectively [43];
- 19% and 25% for a helix and a monopole antenna, respectively [44];
- 44% and 54% for a monopole antenna and patch antenna, respectively (a hand model was also used to hold the device) [45];
- 47% and 32–52% for a monopole and three different PIFAs, respectively (a hand model was also used) [46].

Since the handset is placed directly against the head model in these cases, these radiation efficiencies are compared against the dipole data for $s = 5$ mm, which range from 0.7% to 3.2% for $l = \lambda/16$ to $\lambda/2$, respectively. This comparison indicates that the flat phantom and dipole antenna models used in this study give low values for radiation efficiency, resulting in conservative values for $P_{\text{th,m}}$.

To compare $P_{\text{th,m}}$ for 1-g and 10-g average SAR among other canonical antennas, we also considered three resonant antennas at 900 MHz: a strip dipole (1-mm wide strip infinitely thin and 155-mm long), a square-strip loop, and a meander dipole. The loop and meander dipole are shown in Fig. 8. All antennas are two-dimensional, which has the advantage that all parts of the antenna are at the same distance from the phantom. Computed impedance bandwidths of these three antennas at $s = 10$ mm are shown in Table VII. The return loss was obtained with reference to a 50-Ω source. Table VII shows that, as expected, the bandwidth of the meander antenna is slightly narrower than the relatively long strip dipole. The narrow bandwidth of the loop antenna is due to its high resistance at resonance (110 Ω).

Table VII compares the threshold powers, absorption factors, and radiation efficiencies for each of these antennas. When comparing between the strip and the meander dipoles, $P_{\text{th,m}}$ is clearly lower for the latter since its axial length is shorter (115 mm) than that of the strip dipole (155 mm). $P_{\text{th,m}}$ for the square-strip loop antenna is the highest among the three antennas because the SAR distribution from the loop has two separate
local maxima (see Fig. 9). For the meander dipole and square loop, the results are also shown next to data for linear dipoles with lengths that result in similar bandwidths. The threshold powers for the $\lambda/2.5$ dipole are very similar to the data for the meander dipole (within 6%), and the $\lambda/3.1$ dipole gives more conservative values for $P_{\text{th,rm}}$ than does the square loop. This supports the use of thin-wire dipole antennas for the main part of this study.

The computed results of this paper are also compared with data from the measured SAR of portable wireless devices. A total of 134 SAR measurements were taken from 54 products. The data are taken primarily from Motorola iDEN products, operating from 806 to 870 MHz, with an operating bandwidth requirement of 7.6%, as shown in Table IV. From Table III, it can be found that a dipole antenna of length no smaller than $\lambda/8$ will have a similar fractional bandwidth. We chose to examine the dipole antenna results for lengths of $\lambda/8, \lambda/4$, and $\lambda/2$. All measurements were taken with the devices held to the side of the head, so it makes sense to use a dipole antenna distance of $s = 5$ mm in the comparison. At a center frequency of 838 MHz, (4) and (5) yield $P_{\text{th,1g}} = 29, 54$, and 124 mW for $l = \lambda/8, \lambda/4$, and $\lambda/2$, respectively. For the measured data, a histogram of $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ of the portable wireless devices is shown in Fig. 10. The $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ data are obtained by applying (3) to scale the measured transmit power $P_t$ up by the ratio between SAR limits. However, the measured output power of the devices was typically 125 or 230 mW, both of which are less than the minimum of the $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ values of the measured data, which is 256 mW. The calculated $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ values for the three dipole antennas are significantly less than the measured $P_{\text{th,1g}}$ values of all 54 portable wireless devices, further demonstrating that the calculated values of the power thresholds are conservative.

### IV. Conclusion

The SAR characteristics of canonical antennas are investigated with the objective of estimating upper bounds for the transmit power of wireless communication devices demonstrating that the devices are inherently compliant with internationally accepted RF exposure limits. Simple expressions have been derived to estimate the threshold power levels over a wide range of dipole antenna lengths, frequencies, and distances from the phantom. Examples of meander and loop antennas are given to demonstrate the suitability of thin-wire dipole antennas in the study. Comparison of the simulated data with results from the literature and measurements of portable wireless devices has been used to demonstrate that the proposed approach gives conservative values for the threshold power. It is estimated that the maximum error of the calculations presented in this paper is on the order of 10%. Currently, further investigations are underway to extend this research to encompass other classes of antennas.

The cost and complexity of compliance protocols could be possibly reduced if reasonable power thresholds for requiring SAR testing could be defined. This is an attempt in such a direction.
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