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ABSTRACT

A net communications system frequently has many users, for each of whom only a low-duty-factor need exists. Random access discrete address (RADA) communications systems are particularly suited to this type of communications environment. A RADA system is a co-channel pulse communication system, in which each transmitter, by proper coding of its radiated pulse groups, may address a target receiver. Mutual interference and cross talk among various transceivers in the net are undesirable consequences of this co-channel operation.

This dissertation is an overall analytical study of RADA (random access discrete address) communications systems. In this study, the factors influencing system performance are embodied in mathematical models which in turn are used to determine, analytically, the quantitative effects of these factors on system performance. In pursuing this approach, several different aspects of the systems have been investigated. The investigations include the following. An analytical study of the mutual-interference-power density at a receiver in a general co-channel RADA net environment is carried out. This study is used to determine a lower bound for the probability that a "useful signal" is available at the input terminals of a particular receiver in the net. Mutual interference among the co-channel RADA transceivers produces an error process at the
receiver output. An approximate model of the mutual interference process is used to obtain theoretical expressions for the pertinent statistics of this error process. The effects of the error process on two generic types of modulations are evaluated analytically. This analysis is performed for three receiver types, the simplest of which utilizes delay devices and an AND gate in the video processing. The second and third receiver types are characterized by gating and sampling, respectively, of the AND gate output. A method of choosing system parameters to minimize the receiver output error probability when the system bandwidth is specified is determined. An expression is derived for the information rate of a RADA transmission in terms of the statistics of the error process. Finally, a particular type of RADA receiver, a sampling RADA receiver, is proposed for use with clocked binary modulation. A theoretical expression is determined for the error probability at the receiver output. And, the error probability minimization technique is used to specify an optimum choice of parameters for systems using this type of receiver. Also, analytic expressions are derived for the information rate for both the case in which parameters are chosen freely, and for the case in which parameters are constrained by the error minimization process.

General considerations in the design of RADA systems are given. Examples are worked out which illustrate the use of the analytical results
obtained in this report. Also, some of the existing prototypes of RADA systems are described in an appendix.
FOREWARD

This report is in two volumes, which are bound separately. In Volume I, "Study and Analysis," some of the fundamental aspects of RADA system design are investigated. Volume I, which is unclassified, is essentially the same as the dissertation "A Study of RADA (Random Access Discrete Address) Communications Systems" submitted in partial fulfillment of the degree Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Michigan. Volume II, "Vulnerability Considerations," is a study of countermeasures aspects of RADA systems, and it has a Confidential security classification.

Volume I of this report takes a theoretical approach in evaluating RADA system performance. Along with the advantages of such an approach in indicating the basic dependence on certain parameters, there are disadvantages. In particular, the assumptions required to develop a tractable theoretical system model are somewhat idealized, and tend to yield an upper bound of system performance. The most important of these assumptions are described briefly here.

In modeling the placement of transceivers in the net area (Chapter II), an inequality is given for the probability of a "useful" received signal in terms of the receiver dynamic range, and the ratio of the distance between the transceivers, and the minimum transceiver separation for the net. This inequality is based upon the assumption of a uniform distribution of transceivers in the net area. The results can readily be extended to the case where clustering occurs, as discussed in Chapter II (p. 45).
In modeling the interference pulse process (Chapter III), it is assumed that the received pulses are rectangular (pulses of other shape are assigned an "effective rectangular width"—Chapter V) and of equal width. The amplitude of the received pulses vary widely, and when these pulses are clipped at a low level, their widths vary considerably. Pulse stretching due to multipath and receiver recovery from large pulses also produce pulses of unequal width. Further, in modeling the receiver, it was assumed on intuitive grounds that pulse cancellation does not occur when the clipping level is low. Recent experimental results indicate that roughly 10 percent of the transmitted pulses are cancelled, leading to two counter-acting effects; the number of message pulses is reduced, as well as the number of interference pulses. It is expected that the former result will more than counterbalance the latter, so that the model tends to provide an upper bound of system performance.

Finally, some of the illustrative problems were worked before complete information was available concerning source coding characteristics and military system requirements. The results of these problems are therefore optimistic. The assumed value of the maximum error rate of 10 percent (page 78) is higher than that which is actually permissible with PPM. Five percent is more typical. The assumed maximum error rate of 20-30 percent (page 79) for delta modulation is also high. Five percent is again more realistic. With regard to the parameters assumed for an example
net environment, distances of as little as 3 to 5 feet are characteristic of an actual military net environment, whereas a value of 100 feet is used (Chapter II).
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

1.1 Objectives and Organization

This dissertation is an overall, analytical study of RADA (random access discrete address) communications systems. In this study, the factors influencing system performance are embodied in mathematical models which in turn are used to determine, analytically, the quantitative effects of these factors on system performance. In pursuing this approach, several different aspects of the systems have been investigated. The overall study as well as these particular investigations are the original contributions of this dissertation. The investigations include the following. An analytical study of the mutual-interference-power density at a receiver in a general co-channel RADA net environment is carried out. This study is used to determine a lower bound for the probability that a "useful signal" is available at the input terminals of a particular receiver in the net. Assuming that a useful signal is present, mutual interference among the co-channel RADA transceivers produces an error process at the receiver output. An approximate model of the mutual interference process is used to obtain theoretical expressions for the pertinent statistics of this error process. The effects of the error process on two generic types of modulation, pulse position modulation
and clocked binary modulation, are evaluated analytically. In pulse position modulation, the information is modulated in the shifts of the pulses of a clocked binary pulse train from their clocked positions. In clocked binary modulation, information pulses gate the occurrence of pulses of a clocked binary pulse train. The choice of system parameter values to minimize the receiver output error rate is also studied. The effects of the error process on several generic types of modulation and receivers are evaluated. An expression is derived for the information rate of a RADA transmission in terms of the statistics of the error process. General considerations in the design of RADA systems are described. Several examples are worked out, illustrating the use of the analytical results obtained in this report. Finally, some of the existing prototypes of RADA systems are described in an appendix.

The work of these studies is original work. The analytical work was completed before any other corresponding work was published. However, prior to the publication of this dissertation, a paper containing some material similar to that contained here was published by other authors. In particular, the work of Ref. 16 makes use of the same general method, although it employs slightly differing analytical tools, in determining some of the same statistics of the error process. Studies of the same problems have been undertaken by others, using differing approaches; much of this work has been described in Section 1.5 (Review of the Literature), and the corresponding publications are listed in the
Lists of References.*

The organization of this dissertation is as follows. Chapter I introduces RADA net communications systems. In particular, a generalized RADA system is described, and the terms used in this work are defined. In Chapter II, the assumptions and theoretical results of the chapter, concerning the mutual-interference power density at a RADA receiver in a net environment, are first summarized and then presented in detail. More specifically, the mean and variance of the interference power density at a receiver in a RADA net are determined analytically as a function of the significant parameters. Chebyshev-type inequalities, which contain the mean and variance, delimit the fraction of the time that a "useful signal" is available at a target receiver within the net. The significant statistics of errors caused by mutual interference among RADA systems are summarized at the beginning of Chapter III; analytical details supporting the conclusions therein are then presented. Example calculations for several sets of system parameter values are given in Chapter IV using results of Chapter III. In particular, some current prototype RADA systems, of which the appendix is descriptive, are evaluated.

*For the purpose of giving appropriate credit to all available sources, an "Auxiliary List of References" has been included in this dissertation for material which is pertinent to RADA systems, and which has not been published in the open literature. Publications contained in the List of References are simply enumerated, whereas those in the Auxiliary List of References are enumerated with the prefix 1.
Specific considerations in the design of RADA systems are treated in Chapter V. The influences on system performance of differences in power levels of received signals, and of receiver synchronization are described, as are the effects of variations of such parameters as bandwidth and mutual interference. A method of determining the number of RADA frequencies, and the number of pulses on each frequency, which minimizes the system bandwidth at a specified error rate, or minimizes the error rate at a specified bandwidth is also described.

In Chapter VI, the results of Chapter III and Chapter V are used to determine an optimum choice of parameters for a RADA system using a sampling receiver. Expressions for information transmission rates are determined for the optimum system and for a practical suboptimum system.

Conclusions and recommendations for the direction of future efforts are presented in Chapter VII.

1.2 Description of RADA (Random Access Discrete Address) Coding

A communications net, as defined in this dissertation, is a group of fixed or mobile individuals, within line-of-sight range, equipped with radio transceivers. Each net member can communicate directly to each other net member, without using intervening switching apparatus, by transmitting a radio signal which is properly addressed or coded. A common frequency band, or channel, is utilized for these transmissions.
This study is concerned with the performance characteristics of a communications net in which a particular type of (transmission) coding, referred to as RADA coding, is used throughout. The block diagram of a typical system for use with pulse information is shown in Fig. 1.1. When analog information is transmitted, it must first be source-encoded by using some form of pulse modulation.¹ Pulse modulated analog voice signals are of primary concern in this dissertation. In Fig. 1.1, RADA encoding of a signal for multiplex transmission over a wireless channel is illustrated. The same techniques may be used in a wire channel.

When applying the RADA principle, all information signals are first converted to a pulse signal form. Each "information pulse" is then coded into a group of pulses (a "time-frequency code frame," or "frame") which is "matched" to the receiver addressed. The coding scheme is chosen so that the RADA decoder in a particular receiver produces an output "message" pulse when a properly addressed frame is received, and (ideally) produces no output pulse when an improperly addressed frame is received.

Mutual interference among transceivers produces "error pulses" at the output of the RADA decoder because the frames from several transmitters can combine randomly to produce frames which are coded

¹Source encoding will be referred to herein as "modulating", permitting its clear distinction from the subsequent (RADA) transmission "coding."
Fig. 1.1. Block diagram of a RADA system for transmission of pulse information.
for a particular receiver, even though the frames of the individual transmitters are not so coded.

RADA coding can be used with delta modulation, pulse-position modulation (PPM), pulse code modulation (PCM) (in which case the receiver must be time-synchronized with the transmitter), and with other types of pulse modulation.

An example of RADA coding of an information pulse train is shown in Fig. 1.2. Figure 1.2(a) shows a (binary) pulse train fed to the RADA coder of a transmitter. Figure 1.2(b) illustrates how each binary pulse is coded in a "time-frequency code frame." The delays, $t_1$, $t_2$, $t_3$, of pulses of carrier signals at frequencies $f_1$, $f_2$, $f_3$, respectively, constitute the address of a net user. The maximum delay in a frame is generally chosen to be less than, or equal to, the minimum time between information pulses. In general, the number of system frequencies and the number of pulses per frame on each frequency are parameters of a RADA system.

A representative implementation of a RADA system for transmitting (analog) voice information is shown in Fig. 1.3. A voice signal produces the information train of position-modulated pulses shown in Fig. 1.2(a) at the transmitter modulator output. Each information pulse is addressed in the RADA coder in the manner described above.

At the receiver to which the frame is addressed, the pulses of carrier signals at frequencies $f_1$, $f_2$, $f_3$ are delayed by $(32 - t_1)$, $(32 - t_2)$,
Fig. 1.2a. Transmitter information source output voltage.

Fig. 1.2b. RADA coder output voltage.
Fig. 1.3(a). Block diagram of a typical RADA transmitter.
Fig. 3b. Block diagram of a typical RADA receiver.
(32 - t₂) microseconds, respectively, as shown in Fig. 1.3(b). These delay values are complements of the delays used in the transmitter to address each information pulse. Each frame coded for the receiver produces three coincident input pulses at the AND gate, causing an AND gate output message pulse. Demodulation of the AND gate output message pulse train reconstitutes the coded voice signal, i.e., the train of position-modulated pulses. A common RF stage for all frequency channels is shown in Fig. 1.3(b); alternately, separate RF stages [Fig. 1.4(c)] tend to minimize interference effects among frequency channels. Automatic gain control (AGC) and limiting are employed in processing the received signals to accommodate the wide range of the amplitude levels of these signals (Section 1.4.5).

Thus, the RADA coder encodes an information-bearing pulse train for multiplex transmission over the channel; the RADA decoder recovers the information-bearing pulse train. The use of a common frequency band by the RADA transmitters means that there is mutual interference among net users. The interference results in spurious, or error, pulses at the output of the AND gate of the receiver decoder. As discussed in Section 1.4.3, the effect of these error pulses on the receiver output depends upon the type of demodulation employed.

1.3 Applications of RADA Coding

RADA (random access discrete address) coding was devised for use in a radio pulse communication system to provide net communications
characterized by a large number of net-user addresses, immediate, non-synchronous user access to the channel (random access), and relatively efficient use of bandwidth when the net communications system use factor is small. RADA coding principles are applicable to various modes of communication including: multiplexed signals in wire communications systems, multiplexed signals through active and passive earth satellite repeaters, multiplexed transmissions from air-to-air and ground-to-ground, as well as multiplexed communications between air and ground. The problems involved in multiplexing depend upon the communications mode considered. The primary concern in this study is with line-of-sight propagation over the ground. The use of transponders in this application is projected in several studies (Refs. 1.19, 1.24 and 1.28), although their use has not been investigated in this dissertation.

The U. S. Army Electronics Command has supported studies of the applicability of RADA techniques to communications within an Army division.

It is worthwhile to compare multiplexing using RADA and using alternative principles. Previously, addressing within the net was usually accomplished by assignment of fixed frequency slots to net users in a frequency-division multiplex (FDM) scheme. An alternative method of addressing is by assignment of fixed time slots in a time-division multiplex (TDM) system, although this method is not normally employed in net applications because the transmitter synchronization which is
necessary is not always feasible. For FDM and TDM systems, which employ a fixed assignment of addresses to frequency and time slots, respectively, the total number of addresses determines the system bandwidth requirement, even though the system use factor is small. Thus, a low use factor of the frequency or time slot addresses results in inefficient utilization of system bandwidth.

In contrast to FDM and TDM signals, RADA signals are transmitted over a common frequency channel, i.e., RADA systems are "co-channel" systems. RADA techniques permit specification of addresses for a large number of subscribers, or potential users. However, the bandwidth of a RADA system is determined by the average quality specified for the received signal and, in contradistinction to FDM and TDM systems, by the number of active system users.\(^2\) However, with a specified quality and system bandwidth, a greater number of active users can be accommodated by using a channel assignment scheme in conjunction with FDM or TDM than by using RADA. (These factors suggest the use of RADA techniques for addressing and channel assignment in conjunction with FDM to achieve efficiency in certain information transmission systems.\(^3\) However, this approach has merit only when

---

\(^2\) The bandwidth is influenced by the number of system addresses, or potential users, when this number is unusually large.

\(^3\) For example, recent prototypes of the Martin Company "RADA" System (Refs. 1.19 - 1.23).
the bandwidth needed for addressing and assignment operations is a small fraction of the overall bandwidth requirement.

In RADA systems, transmissions are not synchronized. Such systems are frequently called "asynchronous," or "nonsynchronous" systems. Performance of a target RADA receiver can usually be improved by time synchronization with the transmitter addressing it, and this technique has been exploited in extant systems.

1.4 Problems in RADA System Design

Many parameters must be specified in the design of communications systems using RADA encoding. Among these parameters are the system subscriber address capacity and use factor; the associated quality or error rate; modulation parameters such as basic modulation clock rate and modulator-output-pulse duty factor; and code frame parameters such as the number of system frequencies and the number of pulses per frame on each frequency. Some systematic procedure is needed for determining an optimal choice of parameters for a particular application.

Considerations in the design of RADA systems can usefully be classified in two areas--factors associated with modulation and RADA coding, and factors associated with the physical environment during a communication. These factors are listed separately in this section although they are in fact interrelated, which complicates the design of an optimum RADA system. A near-optimal design can be found by considering aspects of the problem separately and by compromising judiciously for overall system design.
1.4.1 Modulation (Source Coding) Problems. The information signals handled by RADA systems may be continuous or discrete in level and may be continuous or quantized in time. For a given number of users, the quality of a RADA receiver output depends on the modulation-demodulation methods employed. Therefore, modulation (source coding) methods should be employed which minimize the effect of errors on overall system performance. Efficient modulation schemes tend to be characterized by a low (binary) pulse rate, so that mutual interference and therefore, the number of errors at the demodulator input is small. These modulation schemes should also tend to minimize the receiver output distortion caused by a demodulator input error.

1.4.2 RADA Coding Problems. RADA code sets are needed which produce, for a particular modulation scheme and parameters, the "highest quality" signals at the receiver demodulator output. Two extremes in choosing code sets are their generation by a systematic procedure and their generation randomly, with provision for discarding codes which have undesirable properties. In either case, the digital computer is a useful tool. Since RADA transmissions are asynchronous, the codes chosen should have "good properties" at all relative timings among transmissions.

1.4.3 Mutual Interference. The mutual interference problem is related in a complicated way to problems discussed previously. A description of the error rate at the output of the RADA decoder is
required for specific choices of modulation parameters and RADA code sets. Such a description involves a characterization of the statistics of the error process at the receiver decoder output.

Various measures can be used for evaluating RADA system performance. Error rate and information transmission rate are conventional measures of digital system performance, and are useful for evaluation of RADA links driven by digital information sources. Such evaluations usually can be based directly on the statistics of the RADA decoder output errors.

Demodulator output signal-to-noise ratio is a conventional measure of analog system performance. It is useful for evaluation of RADA links driven by analog information sources. The demodulator output signal usually contains one noise component because of quantization, and another which arises because of errors at the demodulator input.

Some measure of the subjective property "quality" of the demodulated signal is needed for RADA links driven by voice sources. The quality of the demodulated signal is closely related to the error rate at the demodulator input. The relationship between error statistics and quality must be studied through listening tests.

For any of these types of information source, mutual interference effects can be evaluated experimentally by observing the demodulator output in the presence of either actual interference, or in a simulated error process with the appropriate statistics. It is apparent that the
error rate at the RADA decoder output is a useful specific measure of RADA system performance.

1.4.4 RADA Receiver Time-Synchronization. Error pulses at the output of the receiver AND gate sometimes occur between message pulses. These may be partially gated out based on estimates of timing between message pulses. A gate placed at the AND gate output for this purpose is called a "post gate" in this dissertation. Receivers with and without post gates will be referred to as gated and ungated receivers, respectively. In a given communication, a gated RADA receiver operates in time (clock) synchronization with a particular transmitter.

1.4.5 Environmental Problems. A significant parameter of a RADA net is the ratio of range extremes, \( r_{2\text{max}} / r_0 \) -- the ratio of the maximum to the minimum distance separating RADA transceivers in the net. Since line-of-sight paths in a ground based net exhibit approximately an inverse fourth power attenuation characteristic (Ref. 1); the ratio of the attenuation of transmissions (signals as well as mutual interference), traveling the shortest and longest paths \( (r_{2\text{max}} / r_0)^4 \), increases rapidly with this distance ratio. As a result, when this ratio is large, both the signal power density and the total interference power density vary over extremely wide limits. Because of these wide limits, and because the signal power density may fall anywhere within these limits, it follows that the dynamic range of the receiver must be extremely large so that the receiver will be able to detect and process received RF pulses even in the presence of pulses of much larger amplitude.
In addition to the extreme level of variation of the target and the direct mutual interference signals which result from the inverse fourth power attenuation characteristic of the ground based net environment, this environment also imposes other problems. Line-of-sight propagation over the ground at VHF and UHF is subject to multipath and scatter effects. RF energy arrives at a given receiver along a direct path from a transmitter, as well as after single and multiple reflections from hills, trees, shrubs, personnel, vehicles, and other objects. Reflected pulses delayed, with respect to the direct pulse, by a small fraction of a pulsewidth tend to distort the pulse envelope. When the reflected pulse delay is of the order of a pulsewidth, the reflected pulse tends to stretch the direct pulse. When the reflected pulse delay exceeds the pulsewidth, two distinct pulses are received. In a typical situation involving line-of-sight propagation over the ground there are many reflections; a received pulse exhibits all three types of multipath effects, particularly when short pulses are transmitted. "Residual interference" is another class of interference which does not originate within the environment, but which has the same effect as the multipath interference. The short pulses typically used in RADA systems tend to produce crosstalk among frequency channels in the RADA receiver. In particular, decreases of pulse duration tend to increase both capacitive and inductive coupling among RF frequency channels, as well as increasing radiation within the receiver. As a result, such practical problems as coupling
through ground loops, pick-up of interfering signals radiated within the receiver itself, and construction of RF and IF filters with sufficiently large skirt rejection, are enhanced. These problems are especially severe in small portable units. Thus, in addition to direct mutual interference, a RADA receiver is also subject to multipath and residual interference. Further, the extreme variation in the levels of the receiver input signals causes variation of the widths of the detected pulses, particularly as a result of the limiting which is employed in processing received signals.

1.4.6 Problems in Military Applications of RADA. Desirable attributes of a division-level military communications system are reliability, mobility, random-access capability, and efficiency of the bandwidth utilization in a high-signal-density environment. The mobility attribute implies a small, light, wireless system. The use of a switching center, an "Achilles' heel" exposed to direct enemy action, is undesirable.

Because of the wide amplitude range of received signals resulting from geometric and propagation characteristics, a RADA receiver must be highly insensitive to signal amplitude. Therefore, RADA coding should not be used with amplitude modulation. When other types of modulation are used, separation of the desired signal from undesired signals at the receiver is feasible even though the power of the desired signal may be much smaller than that of the interfering signals. An advantage of RADA
systems for division communications is that their receivers can be made both sensitive to the timing of received pulses and relatively insensitive to their amplitude.

In the communications system sought, the receiver output signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio should be highly independent of receiver input signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio. Thus, those "bandspreading" systems, proposed for use in a co-channel environment (Ref. 2), which exchange bandwidth of the transmitted signal for signal-to-noise ratio enhancement should not be considered for this application. For such systems, the receiver input and output signal-to-noise ratios are related by (1.1).

\[
(S/N)_{\text{OUT}} = 2WT(S/N)_{\text{IN}} \tag{1.1}
\]

where \( W \) is the receiver input bandwidth and \( T \) is the effective receiver output integration time. Because of the extremely small signal-to-mutual-interference power ratios typically encountered in a ground based net environment, it follows from (1.1) that the bandwidth expansion factor \( TW \) required to produce a usable value of \( (S/N)_{\text{OUT}} \) is excessive. In addition to this inefficiency in the use of bandwidth, the required bandwidth expansion factor, \( 2TW \), is well beyond the "state-of-the-art."
1.5 Review of the Literature

1.5.1 Co-Channel Systems, General. The possibility of co-channel operation of communications systems is implicit in Shannon's epochal work on information theory (Ref. 3).

Various coding and modulation techniques for co-channel communications were proposed and studied before 1958. In 1958, Taylor studied the problems of multiplexing information over a common wide-band channel, for both continuous and binary signals (Ref. 1.1). Employing information theory concepts, he obtained channel-capacity expressions for an asynchronous co-channel system which uses a noise-like waveform for receiver "coding"; and, for a general class of systems called "channel-synchronized-asynchronous" systems.

Using a "coding theory" approach, he also investigated two specific multiplexing schemes: one based on recognition of binary signals chosen for their correlation properties, and the other based on recognition of randomly generated binary signals.

The merits of co-channel systems were becoming apparent when, in 1959, Costas pointed out the fallacy of the traditional instinctive approach of reducing bandwidth and data rate to reduce the error rate of a received signal. Costas indicated some of the advantages of co-channel systems over an FDM system with fixed-address frequency channels and the advantages over a system in which the total bandwidth is used randomly by unsupervised narrowband channels (Ref. 2).
In 1960, Hamsher described some aspects of applications of RADA methods to a net communication system, including the extension of range coverage by using single and multiple transponders (Ref. 4).

Spogen, Reading, and Latorre suggested the use of an adaptive, channelized system, and also the use of two RADA type systems in low-use-factor communications applications which require a large number of addresses (Ref. 1.2). One of these RADA systems uses a two-pulse address on a single frequency, and the other system uses a k-pulse address with one pulse on each of k frequencies. The RADA systems described employ amplitude modulation of the transmitted pulses.

Spogen, Reading, and Latorre also presented analyses for error-pulse generation, system bandwidth, and subscriber capacity.

In 1961, Fulton, Jr. applied concepts of information theory to show that when the use factor of a net communication system is sufficiently small, it is possible to transmit information more efficiently on a co-channel basis than by either time-division multiplexing (TDM) or frequency division multiplexing (FDM) (Ref. 1.3). More explicitly, he assumed a bandlimited channel with additive Gaussian noise and showed that it is possible to select a set of nonorthogonal waveforms to code an arbitrary number of signals for co-channel transmission with an arbitrarily small error. The maximum number of active transmissions the channel can accommodate is equal to the number of channels of an FDM system of equal bandwidth. The powers of any subset of transmitters
using the channel must be appropriate for the transmitted information rate. The increase in power over that required for FDM or TDM is moderate, so that a reasonable power-bandwidth trade-off is possible.

In 1961, Harris discussed the greater channel capacity of a wideband co-channel system. He compared it with an unsupervised FDM system of equal bandwidth, when the system use factor is small (Refs. 1, 4 and 5). He suggested that advances in coding techniques would be needed before the required trade-off between bandwidth and signal-to-noise ratio could be achieved in co-channel systems. He determined channel capacity for wideband systems with transmitters of equal power, assuming the received signal power from randomly placed transmitters varies inversely with the square of distance.

Chesler proposes (Ref. 30) an m-ary RADA system in which each receiver is addressed by any one of a set of m coded groups of k pulses. These groups are selected from N time and frequency cells. The relation among the system parameter values which minimizes the probability of a false k-fold coincidence of at least one of the m receiver addresses is determined, and is used to define an optimal m-ary RADA system. The probability of a false coincidence of at least one address for an optimal m = 2 system is compared with the probability of a false alarm for a binary RADA system in which the two signaling symbols are a coded pulse group. In addition, the "channel utilization" of an m-ary RADA system is compared with that of an m-ary co-channel multiplexing
system which employs pseudo-noise addressing sequences.

Einarsson (Ref. 33) also compared the probability of false coincidence for an \( m = 2 \), \( m \)-ary, RADA system with that of a binary RADA system.

Recently, the applicability of RADA techniques to satellite communications has been investigated (for example, see Refs. 1.34 and 1.35).

Various multiplexing methods have been proposed and studied (for example, see Refs. 6, 7 and 8). Dawson gives a good general discussion of co-channel systems, and includes an annotated bibliography describing the work done in this area (Ref. 9). Included in Refs. 1.19 through 1.33 is a thorough description of the theoretical and experimental aspects of design of particular systems.

1.5.2 RADA Systems. One of the first applications of the RADA concept was in the work of Pierce and Hopper of the Bell Telephone Laboratories (Ref. 10). In this work, a RADA-like system using a code of two pulses per frame on a single frequency, one positive and one negative in phase, was constructed and analyzed. Random samples of voice were transmitted by amplitude-modulating the pulses of the frame.

The Bendix Radio Division of the Bendix Corporation proposed the CAPRI (coded-address, private radio intercom) system, a RADA system in which the amplitude of periodic information samples is used
to frequency-modulate the pulses of a frame (See appendix and Ref. 1.5)

The Martin Company, Orlando Division, has developed RADA systems using the acronyms RACEP (random access and correlation for extended performance) and "RADA." Initial prototype RACEP systems employed RADA coding in conjunction with pulse position modulation (See appendix and Refs. 11-13 and 1.6-1.8). RADA coding was also employed in conjunction with modifications of delta modulation (Ref. 14).

Most recently, the acronym "RADA" has been applied to a Martin net communications system in which the information is modulated in pulse-position modulation and transmitted in adaptive frequency-division multiplex after a search for a vacant frequency channel ( Refs. 1.19-1.23). RADA techniques are employed for both the vacant channel search and for other supervisory functions. The system, not described in this dissertation, is a complex one which is characterized by many special functions.

The Motorola Corporation developed the RADEM (random access-delta modulation) system (See appendix and Refs. 11-13, 15, 1.9, 1.10 and 1.28-1.33) which uses delta modulation.

The extent of U. S. Army Electronics Command's interest in RADA techniques, including foreseen applications, is indicated by the scope of the RADA work which they have sponsored. In 1963, USAEC supported three concurrent studies of the feasibility of using RADA systems for Army divisional communications (Ref. 11). Some early
aspects of this work (Refs. 14, 16 - 19) were summarized in papers presented at the 1964 International Convention of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. More recent and complete results of these extensive studies are presented in Refs. 1.19 through 1.33.

1.5.2.1 Modulation Methods. Studies of optimum modulation methods applicable to RADA systems have concentrated on two techniques for sampling voice: namely, DATEC (digital adaptive technique for efficient communications) (Ref. 14), and "extremal sampling" (Refs. 20, 21 and 1.11 through 1.18). Both modulation methods have been used with RADA techniques because the required transmission rate of samples is lower than the Nyquist rate. Initial results obtained for extremal sampling indicate that because of the low level of information redundancy, the received signal is quite sensitive to the occurrence of false samples. This factor may reduce the utility of this modulation technique in RADA systems (Ref. 1.15).

1.5.2.2 Coding. Selection of RADA vocabularies and characterization of the mutual interference characteristics of RADA code vocabularies are an important aspect of the study of RADA systems. Gilbert (Ref. 32) investigates the coding of pulses on a single frequency channel. He shows how to construct lists of N digit \( N = \Lambda_l \) code words so that the weight (number of "ones", or pulses) of each word is less than a specified upper limit. The lists are also constructed so that the Hamming distance of any given word from all N shifts of all other words
is greater than a specified minimum value. Einarsson (Ref. 33) defines a RADA system in which a frame consists of M pulses placed in a frame of K frequency channels and A time cells, with at least one pulse in the first time cell. For such a code frame, he specifies the size of the code vocabulary as the number of ways of placing the M pulses in the KA cells conditional on a pulse being in the first time cell. A study of a code using a frame consisting of a single pulse on each of three frequencies is reported in Ref. 1.8. Several coding methods for RADA systems are described in Ref. 1.23.

1.5.2.3 Mutual Interference. The statistics of the RADA decoder output error process, their suitable approximation, and their use in evaluating RADA system performance have been a primary concern of several studies. Spogen and associates (in Ref. 1.15) use a particular model and set of assumptions to investigate the error process in RADA systems. They also make comparisons of the error rates of RADA systems using pulse position modulation with those of systems using extremal sampling (Refs. 1.11 - 1.18, 20 and 21).

Sommer (Ref. 31) and Einarsson (Ref. 33) defined RADA systems in which the code frames consist of n pulses randomly distributed among p frequencies and in j time cells. Employing slightly differing analyses, both authors determined the probability of a false receiver output signal at a given time instant (equivalent to the duty factor determined in this dissertation). They also determined the relationship among
the parameter values which minimizes the probability of a false receiver output signal.

Einarsson also investigated and compared the effects of false receiver output signals on pulse position modulation, pulse code modulation, and delta modulation. A model of a RADA system is developed by Dawson and Sklar (Ref. 16) and independently in this study which is based on the assumption that the times of occurrence of mutual interference pulses at the different receiver AND gate inputs are independent Poisson processes. The work of Dawson and Sklar, and that of this author, employ similar methods in determining a duty factor of the error process, the distribution function of the duration of an error pulse, and the average error pulse rate. Other statistics, including the autocorrelation function of the error process are also obtained in Ref. 16.

Evaluation of the effect of the error pulse process on the intelligibility of a demodulated signal has been the subject of several studies. Psycho-acoustic testing was undertaken by Diaz and Norvell, who determined, for three kinds of pulse modulation, the effect of commissive and omission modulator input pulse errors on the intelligibility of the demodulated voice (Ref. 17). The effects of errors on demodulated PPM and "DATEC" signals is investigated experimentally and theoretically in Ref. 1.23. We also note the investigation by Spogen and associates of the effect of omission and commissive errors on extremal amplitude sampling (Ref. 1.16).
1.5.2.4 RADA Receiver Time Synchronization. RADA receiver time synchronization has essentially been considered in various other contexts, for example, in studies of synchronization of the early and late range-tracking gates in radar. In addition, some effort has been directed specifically at the problem of receiver synchronization in RADA systems which use pulse position modulation (Ref. 22).

1.5.2.5 Environmental Problems. An experimental study was made to determine the effects of propagation (over the ground) phenomena on RADA systems (Ref. 18). Path attenuation, variation in the level of pulses in a frame, and pulse stretching because of multipath were measured. For a ground-based net in which transmitters are randomly distributed with a fixed probability per unit area, Einarsson (Ref. 33) theoretically determined the distribution of the number of interfering signals which exceeds a threshold within the target receiver. Using both this result and an analysis of the probability of error at the output of a RADA receiver in the presence of a given number of interfering signals, he determined the net reliability (i.e., the probability that the number of interfering signals which exceeds the receiver threshold is less than the number for which the RADA system is designed).

Heffner used a theoretical backscatter model to predict pulse-stretch effects in a pulse communication system using line-of-sight propagation over the ground (Ref. 19).

In a study conducted by the Martin Corporation (Ref. 1.23), a
computer simulation is used to determine the probability distribution of the envelope of the mutual interference for a particular net configuration. This distribution, in turn, is used to determine the probability that a signal from a transmitter at a particular range is not within the dynamic range of the receiver.

Similarly, in this dissertation, the probability of a "useful" receiver signal at a target receiver imbedded within a RADA net is defined as the probability that the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio at the target receiver terminals exceeds the reciprocal of the receiver dynamic range. A lower bound is determined for the probability distribution of the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio as a function of the distance separating the given transmitter, target receiver, and the basic net parameters.

There are no known theoretical results which account for the effects on the RADA receiver output of the fluctuation of detected pulse-widths resulting from the wide range of variation in power level of received pulses described in Section 1.4.5. However, a computer simulation of RADA systems has included the effects of variation of the widths of detected pulses (Ref. 23).

1.6 The Basic RADA System

The following definition of a "basic RADA system," having certain essential features, unifies subsequent discussion and analysis. These essential features are common to current prototype RADA
systems (described in the appendix) which differ considerably, however, in implementation details.

The transmitter, transmitted waveform, and receiver of this "basic RADA system" are shown in Figs. 1.4(a), 1.4(b), and 1.4(c). In the transmitter of Fig. 1.4(a), the information is subject to some type of pulse modulation (source-encoding). Subsequently, each modulator output pulse causes the transmission, through RADA encoding, of a group of pulses (termed a "frame") coded within a "matrix of time-frequency cells" (or simply matrix) which occupy a time interval $T_d$ seconds long and a frequency band $W$ cycles per second wide centered at the nominal RADA system center frequency. Further, the matrix contains $\Lambda_t$ equal "time slots" within the time interval of length $T_d$ and $\Lambda_f$ equal "frequency channels" within the frequency band (of width $W$). In each frame, pulses are transmitted in $\lambda_t$ out of the $\Lambda_t$ "time slots" within $\lambda_f$ out of the $\Lambda_f$ "frequency channels." Addressing to particular receivers is accomplished by the choice of time-frequency cells in which pulses are transmitted. A representative frame has the form indicated in Fig. 1.4(c).

To prevent overlapping of successive frames, a frame duration $T_d$ is chosen which is less than or equal to the minimum interval between modulator output pulses. To minimize system bandwidth, the frame duration is usually chosen to equal the minimum interval between modulator output pulses. The average number $\gamma$ of interfering
Fig. 14(b). Basic RADA system transmitted signal (1 code frame).
Fig. 1.4(c). Basic RADAR system receiver.
pulses which occur per second on each frequency channel is an important parameter for the description of RADA system performance. In (1.2), $\gamma$ is expressed in terms of $\Lambda_f$, $\lambda_f$, $\lambda_t$; in terms of $m$, the number of active transmitters; and, $\bar{T}$, the average time interval between successive transmitted frames.

$$\gamma = \frac{m \lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f \bar{T}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)

In a RADA system which uses clocked binary modulation, information pulses gate the occurrence of pulses of a clocked binary pulse train. For such a system, the frame duration $T_d$ is usually chosen to equal the clock period $T_c$. When the average fraction of on-modulated pulses is $k$, the mean number of frames which occurs per second is,

$$\frac{1}{\bar{T}} = \frac{k}{T_c}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.3)

Substituting Eq. 1.3 into Eq. 1.2, $\gamma$ is determined for clocked binary modulations with clock period $T_c$ and parameter $k$,

$$\gamma = \frac{m k \lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f T_c}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

Whenever a group of pulses with the proper timing occurs at a receiver input, the receiver AND gate produces an output pulse. The major effect of mutual interference in this type of system is the
production of error pulses at the output of the receiver AND gate. This gate output has been indicated by an x in Fig. 1.4(c). When the times at which the AND gate might be triggered by a message pulse can be predicted from the reception of previous message pulses, a receiver "post gate" may be used to gate some of the interference from the AND gate output. The post gate is characterized by the time interval $T_p$ (the "gate interval") that it remains open. The use of a post gate implies receiver time synchronization, since the gate interval must be synchronized with the times at which there are AND gate output message pulses. Post gates will be further considered in Section 1.6.2.

1.6.1 Definitions and Parameters. The following list of terms will facilitate future discussion.

**Definition of Terms**

**Frame** - Abbreviation for time-frequency code frame. A group of pulses within a matrix of time frequency cells.

**Epoch** - The epoch of a pulse is the leading edge of the pulse.

**Message Frame** - A received signal frame [Fig. 1.4(b)] at the antenna terminals of a particular receiver which has been properly coded for that receiver by a given transmitter.
Error Frame - A received signal frame present at the receiver antenna terminals which causes an AND gate output as a result of a chance correct phase relationship of frames of signals coded for other receivers.

Message Pulse - A pulse at the AND gate output which is caused by a message frame. The corresponding pulse at the post gate output when the post gate is specified.

Error Pulse - An AND gate output pulse caused by an error frame. The corresponding pulse (if any) at the post gate output, when the post gate is specified.

Gated Receiver - A RADA receiver with a post gate is referred to as a gated receiver.

Ungated Receiver - A RADA receiver with no post gate.

Synchronism - A gated target receiver is time synchronized with its given transmitter when the receiver post gate intervals are centered on message pulses from the given transmitter.

**Definition of Parameters**

\[ T_d \]  
Frame Duration. The time interval measured between the beginning of the first time cell of a frame and the end of the last time cell.
\( \overline{T} \)  
Frame Interval. The average time interval between successive transmitted frames.

\( T_c \)  
Clock Period. For a system using clocked binary modulation, \( T_c \) is the modulator clock period.

\( \Lambda_t \)  
The number of time slots in a frame.

\( \lambda_t \)  
For any transmitter, the number of pulses transmitted per frame on each frequency channel. \( \lambda_t \leq \Lambda_t \).

\( \Lambda_f \)  
The total number of frequency channels used by a RADA system.

\( \lambda_f \)  
For any transmitter, the number of frequencies on which pulses are transmitted. \( \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \).

\( \Delta_t \)  
Width of rectangular pulses transmitted by a modeled RADA system. Also, the equivalent rectangular width of non-rectangular transmitted pulses, as defined in Section 5.3.

\( k \)  
In a system using clocked binary modulation, \( k \) is the average fraction of on-modulated clock pulses.

\( m \)  
The number of wideband RADA transmitters which interfere with a particular RADA receiver at a particular time. Numerical results are obtained in terms of \( m \).
\( \gamma \)  The average number of interfering pulses per second on each of the \( \lambda_f \) frequency channels. In general, \( \gamma = \frac{m \lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f T} \).

For systems using clocked binary modulation, \( \gamma \) can also be expressed as \( \gamma = \frac{m k \lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f T_c} \).

\( T_p \)  Gate Interval. For a gated receiver, the period of time when the post gate is open.

1.6.2 The Post Gate. RADA receiver performance can usually be improved by gating interference from the AND gate output by means of a post gate. Different types of post gates will be described in this section.

When frames are transmitted with random intervals, the position of a message pulse cannot be used to predict the position of the following message pulse. No interference gating method is effective. For example, in the Pierce-Hopper system (Ref. 10) a voice waveform is sampled randomly at a sufficient rate to convey the voice intelligence. Each sample is coded into a frame and transmitted. Because of the random sampling process, there is no clocking rate associated with the transmitted waveform. The position of a sample cannot be predicted from the position of the preceding sample, and, therefore, a post gate cannot be used with this system.

When it is possible to predict a range of possible positions of the next message pulse from a given message pulse, a post gate can
be used to gate out some of the error pulses which occur between message pulses. The post gate is synchronized as long as the post gate timing is based on message pulses. If error pulses occur in the interval between the opening of the post gate and the epoch of the message pulse in several successive frames, the post gate may lose synchronization and gate out runs of message pulses. The average length of runs will depend on the amount of interference, the gate parameters, and the signal parameters. A post gate of the type just described uses a pulse-to-pulse type of post gate synchronization, which is somewhat unreliable in moderate or heavy interference.

If a message pulse train is derived from a clocked waveform, as in pulse position and delta modulation, a more reliable type of post gate synchronization can be used. For example, by use of gating circuitry analogous to the early and late range tracking gates used in RADAR, the clock rate and phase of a message pulse train may be determined even in moderate or heavy interference. A clocked gating waveform derived from the early and late gating circuitry can then be used to gate the AND gate output. In future discussion of gated receivers, receiver synchronization will be assumed. That is, it will be assumed that the post gate uses a clocked gating waveform with a gate interval $T_p$ which is centered on the expected positions of message pulses.

The types of post gate errors which are significant depend on
the kind of modulation which is used. In the case of a position-modulated signal, it is assumed that the message pulse is the first pulse which occurs in the gate interval in that frame (the other pulses are gated out). If the first pulse is a message pulse, the frame information is correct; if the first pulse is an error pulse, the frame information is erroneous. This error event is referred to as a "type one false alarm."

In a system using clocked binary modulation (e.g., PCM,Δ modulation), it is assumed that the gate interval is centered at the times when a message pulse might occur. Errors ("type two false alarms") occur when at least one error pulse occurs in a gate interval Tp in which there is no message pulse. Errors of both types will be investigated in Chapter III.
CHAPTER II
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Introduction

In a ground based RADA net with transceivers within line-of-sight range, the power density of the field associated with a transmission falls off approximately as the inverse fourth power of distance from the transmitter. Since the ratio of the maximum to minimum separation of receivers from transmitters may be as large as 1000, both the receiver signal power and the mutual interference power at a given instant may differ greatly (±150 db) among the receivers. To enable signal detection of these highly variable signal levels in an interference background, the RADA receiver is typically constructed with a large dynamic range. The dynamic range is defined here as the maximum value of the ratio of interference power to the power of a detectable receiver input signal. The dynamic range is thus defined in an average sense which depends upon both the number of interfering signals and upon their power. There are multipath and residual interference effects, described in Section 1.4.5, that limit the maximum value of dynamic range which can be used to advantage. A receiver with this maximum value of dynamic range, can detect signals which cause a receiver input signal power which is greater than the mutual interference
power divided by \( y \). Given a receiver with dynamic range \( y \), it follows, approximately, that the probability of a "useful" received signal equals the probability that the receiver input signal to mutual interference power ratio exceeds \( 1/y \). The probability of a useful signal depends, then, upon the probability distribution of the receiver input signal to mutual interference power ratio. In this chapter, the probability distribution function is defined with respect to an ensemble of equally likely sets of \( m \) transceivers which are "uniformly distributed" in the net area. The use of this ensemble distribution function has the advantage that analytical results can be obtained in terms of a small number of basic parameters which characterize the net. From a practical point of view, the ensemble distribution of the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio is the fraction of random nets, constructed according to a particular set of rules and assumptions, for which the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio exceeds a given value. The assumptions upon which the results are derived are presented in Section 2.2. They include the assumption that there are \( m \) interfering transmitters in the net; that all transceivers are separated at least by a distance \( r_0 \); and that a distance \( r_2 \) separates the given transmitter and target receiver. If the probability of a useful signal is small, it can be concluded that the other net constraints are too severe for the particular values of \( m \), \( r_0 \), and \( r_2 \) which are used, and that they must be relaxed.

Theoretical determination of the ensemble probability
distribution of the mutual interference power is difficult.\footnote{For example, a good approximation to the distribution results from determining the total interference power as the sum of the interference power from all of the \( m \) interfering transmitters, as follows. Each of the transmitters is assumed situated at a point which is randomly positioned within an annular area centered at the target receiver. The radius, \( r_0 \), of the inner boundary of the annulus is the minimum distance separating transceivers in the net area. As a first order approximation, the outer boundary is assumed at a radius \( r_T = 2r_0 \) as subsequent results (Section 2.3, 4) indicate that the major contribution to the interference power is from transmitters within this radius. The probability that each transmitter is positioned at any point within the annular area is assumed constant throughout the area. With these assumptions, it can be shown that the probability density \( p(P) \) of the interference power \( P \) from a single transmitter is}

However, a theoretical lower bound of the distribution is determined in this chapter which in turn gives a lower bound of the probability of a useful signal. It turns out that because the primary source of interference power is from transmitters which are relatively close to the

\[
p(P) = \frac{c}{P^{1.5}}; \quad P_{\text{min}} \leq P \leq P_{\text{max}}
\]

\[
0; \quad \text{otherwise}
\]

where

\[
P_{\text{min}} = \frac{cP}{r_1^4}; \quad P_{\text{max}} = \frac{cP}{r_0^4}
\]

and where \( c \) is the propagation constant, and \( P \) is the transmitted power (Section 2.3). The probability density of the total interference power is then assumed to equal the sum of the power received from \( m \) transmitters, the power from each being distributed as \( p(P) \). This assumption does neglect the statistical dependence of the power from the various transmitters. The dependence exists because, when a number of transmitters are distributed within the net area, the remaining transmitters cannot be independently placed within the area; but must be placed in such a way that the transmitters are separated by a distance greater than \( r_0 \) from those which are already within the area. The assumption of independent transceiver locations, and independent distributions of power from each interfering transmitter yields accurate results with the typically small density of packing of transmitters within the net area.

The probability density of the total interference power \( P \) from the \( m \) transmitters is the \( m \) fold convolution of the density \( p(P) \). The evaluation of this convolution either directly, or by utilizing characteristic functions is difficult, and the results are in an unwieldy series form.
target receiver, the lower bound of the probability distribution is essentially independent of the position of the target receiver in the net area, and independent of the shape of the net area. The bound depends only upon the density of "packing" of transmitters in the net area, and the ratio of the transmitter-receiver distance $r_2$ to the minimum allowable distance $r_0$ between the transceivers.\footnote{The lower bound for the probability of a useful received signal is based upon the assumption of a (random) uniform placement of transceivers in the net area. When clustering occurs, the inequality for the probability of a "useful" received signal at a transceiver within a cluster is determined by the active transceiver "packing density," $q_1q_2$, for the cluster area (with no clustering, $q_1q_2$ is specified as the average for the net area). This simple extension of results to the clustered situations is possible because nearby transmitters (within the cluster area) are the primary source of interference power in all practical situations.} The objective of this chapter then, is to obtain a theoretical lower bound for the probability of a useful signal at a target receiver within a RADA net. In Chapter III, the interaction of the message process and the error process at the receiver output is investigated theoretically, under the assumption that there is a useful receiver input signal.

There is intuitive justification for considering that the probability distribution, defined for an ensemble containing nets with $m$ transceivers, is equivalent to other probability distributions. The ensemble probability distribution also approximately equals the fraction of receivers in a given net, at a given time, which receive useful signals.
When the transceivers are mobile, but in such a way that the assumptions are always satisfied, the probability distribution can be given both of the preceding interpretations, and can also be interpreted as the probability distribution of signal-to-mutual interference power, in time, at a particular target receiver.

For the readers' convenience, the results of this chapter are summarized in Section 2.2, and then derived in Section 2.3. The definitions and assumptions which apply to the most general model developed in Section 2.3 are given in Section 2.2.

2.2 Problem Characterization and Results for Mutual Interference Power Analysis

In the previous section, it was indicated that for a given packing density of transmitters in the net area, a given receiver dynamic range \( y \), and a given ratio of transmitter-receiver separation to minimum specified distance between transceivers, and for other prescribed conditions; a lower bound is determined for the probability that the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio exceeds \( 1/y \). This lower bound is also a lower bound on the probability that a given transmitter radiates a signal which is useful at its target receiver.

The objectives in this section are to characterize a model for estimating the distribution of the ratio of signal-to-interference power in a RADA net, and to summarize the results of its analysis detailed in Section 2.3. The idealized net geometry assumed for this analysis
is depicted in Fig. 2.1. The m transmitters which interfere with a
target receiver, the given transmitter, and the target receiver itself
are contained in the "simply connected" net area A. Within the area,
the given transmitter and the target receiver are at particular posi-
tions, and the interfering transmitters are positioned randomly under
the conditions imposed below. The minimum distance separating
transceivers is \( r_o \) so that each transceiver can be thought of as occup-
ying a circle of radius \( r_o / 2 \) which does not overlap the circle cor-
responding to any other transceiver. The a-priori probability that any
interfering transmitter is placed at any position in the net (which
does not overlap the given transmitter or target receiver) is the same
throughout the net area. When a fraction of the m transceivers have
already been placed in the area, the conditional probability that any
one of the remaining receivers is placed at any point in the remaining
area is the same throughout the remaining area. The previous con-
straints define interfering transmitters which are "uniformly distribu-
ted" over the net area.

The following definitions and assumptions further define the
model and delimit the applicability of results:

1. The transceivers of a net are uniformly distributed over
an arbitrary area A.

2. All antennas are omnidirectional in a horizontal plane.

3. Equal power is radiated by each transmitter of the net.
1. The target receiver is a distance $r_2$ from the given transmitter.

2. The target receiver is within the area $A$, and further than a distance $2r_0$ from the boundary of $A$ (i.e., the target receiver cannot be within the crosshatched area).

3. The minimum distance between transceivers is $r_0$.

Fig. 2.1. Geometry for determination of the ratio $P_s/E(P_i)$ of signal power to mutual interference power at a receiver within the net environment.
4. The interference power at any given receiver in the net is the sum of the powers received from all active interfering transmitters (co-channel operation).

5. $r_2$ is the distance between a particular transmitter and a particular receiver of the net, these being a given transmitter and a target receiver. Radiations from $m$ other active transmitters of the net interfere with communication between the given transmitter and its target receiver.

6. $r_0$ is the minimum separation of transceivers.

7. $M$ is the number of transceivers which could be placed in the area $A$ at this minimum separation $r_0$, excluding the given transmitter and its target receiver, which is given by (2.15).

$$M = 0.3612 \left( \frac{A}{\pi r_0^2} - 2 \right) \quad (2.15)$$

8. For the results to apply, the target receiver must be at least a distance $2r_0$ from the boundary of the area $A$.

9. Let $r_{2\text{max}}$ be defined as the greatest separation of transceivers in the net so that the results of Section 2.3 apply for a transmitter and receiver separated by at most a distance $r_{2\text{max}} - 2r_0$ (see Fig. 2, 2). Then the minimum value of signal-to-mean-mutual interference power ratio for which the results apply occurs for $r_2 = r_{2\text{max}} - 2r_0$. When $r_{2\text{max}} \gg 2r_0$, this minimum value approximately equals
Transceivers with the minimum allowable distance \( r_o \) separating them

\[ \text{net area } A \]

\[ \oplus \text{ interfering transmitter enclosed in a circle with radius } r_o/2 \]

\[ \square \text{ given transmitter} \]

\[ \bullet \text{ target receiver} \]

1. The target receiver a distance \( r_2 = (r_{2\text{max}} - 2r_o) \) from the given transmitter.

2. The target receiver is within the area \( A \), and further than a distance \( 2r_0 \) from the boundary of \( A \) (i.e., the target receiver cannot be within the crosshatched area.

3. The minimum distance separating transceivers is \( r_o \).

---

Fig. 2.2 Geometry for determination of the minimum value, \( P_s/E(P_i) \), of the ratio of signal power to mutual interference power at a receiver within a net environment.
the value of the ratio calculated for $r_2 = r_{2\max}$. This value of the ratio is used in "worst case" calculations of the distribution of the signal-to-mean mutual interference power ratio.

10. $q_1(q_1 \leq 1)$ is an (area) packing density for net transceivers. The quantity $q_1$ is the ratio of the actual number of transceivers in an area A to the maximum number M of transceivers which can be placed in the area A at the minimum separation $r_0$.

11. $q_2(q_2 \leq 1)$ is the instantaneous fraction of the number $Mq_1$ of transceivers which are transmitting and contributing to the interference power.

12. m is the number of active transceivers which are interfering with communications between the given transmitter and the target receiver, so that

$$m = q_1q_2M$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

13. The randomness of the interference power is due to the probabilistic character of the positioning of the sets of m interfering transmitters in the area A.

14. $P_s$ is the signal power density at the target receiver which is produced by the given transmitter.

15. $P_I$ is the mutual interference power density at the target receiver.

16. E is an operator denoting ensemble average. The
members of the ensemble of interest are sets of \( m \) transceivers. Each different set corresponds to a different, equally likely placement of the \( m \) transceivers in the area \( A \).

17. \( E(P_i) \) is the expected value of the mutual interference power at the target receiver input terminals, under an ensemble average.

18. \( \sigma(P_i) \) is the standard deviation of the distribution of \( P_i \) resulting from an ensemble average.

To reiterate, the objective of this section is to characterize a model for determining a lower bound of the distribution of the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio, and to summarize this primary result which is detailed in Section 2.3. The major steps in obtaining the result are as follows. The ratio \( P_s/E(P_i) \) of received signal power \( P_s \) to average interference power \( E(P_i) \) is determined analytically as a function of the known packing density \( q_1 q_2 \) of receivers in the net area, and as a function of the known ratio \( r_2/r_0 \) of transmitter-receiver separation \( r_2 \) to minimum permissible separation \( r_0 \). The quantity \( P_s/E(P_i) \) indicates the signal-to-interference power ratio to be expected at a receiver as a function of the use factor of the communication system; \( P_s/E(P_i) \) is plotted in Fig. 2.3. The ratio \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \) of standard deviation \( \sigma(P_i) \) of the received interference power to the mean \( E(P_i) \) of the interference power is determined as a function of the known packing factor \( q_1 q_2 \). The quantity \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \) indicates the relative
\[
\frac{P_s}{E(P_1)} = 10 \log_{10} \frac{P_s}{E(P_1)} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi q_1 q_2 \left( \frac{r_1}{r_2} \right)^4} \right)
\]

where:

- \( r_1 \geq 2r_o \)

**Fig. 2.3.** Signal-to-mean interference power ratio, \( \frac{P_s}{E(P_1)} \), vs. range ratio \( \frac{r_2}{r_o} \).

- \( r_o \): minimum distance between transceivers
- \( r_2 \): distance between intended transmitter and receiver
- \( q_1 q_2 \): fraction of M transmitters which are active \((q_1 q_2 \leq 1)\)
fluctuation which can be expected in the signal-to-interference power ratio because of random placement of a given number of transceivers in a prescribed area, as a function of the ratio of the transmitter-receiver distance and the minimum distance \( r_0 \) between transceivers; \( \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \) is plotted in Fig. 2.4 as a function of the system use factor, \( q_1 q_2 \).

Using Chebychev-type inequalities (specifically here, the Chebychev and Markov inequalities (Ref. 24), \(^2\) lower bounds for the probability distribution function \( P\left(\frac{P_s}{P_i} > x\right) \) of the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio can be expressed analytically in terms of \( P_s/E(P_i) \) and \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \). It is noted that for values of \( P(P_s/P_i > x) \) in the range of interest, .50 to .90, the inequalities are usually close enough to the true distribution so that they may be employed as first order approximations for design purposes. Their use is realistic in view of the approximations which must be made in developing any tractable analytical model. The errors in approximations using the normal distribution, which are justified for sufficiently large \( m \) by the central limit theorem, are not known. Results obtained using a normal approximation typically indicate a significant probability of negative mutual interference power \( P_i \) so that this distribution appears to be a poor approximation to the true one.

\(^2\)There are stronger inequalities which are also applicable here, in particular, for example, those due to Guttman (Ref. 35, p. 935) and Bernstein (Ref. 35, p. 936). However, the use of these inequalities is not as convenient as the use of the Chebychev and Markov inequalities.
\[ \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} |_{\text{db}} = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \right) = 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{q_1 q_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \]

\[ r_1 > 2r_o \]

\( q_1 q_2 \) fraction of \( M \) transmitters
which are active \((q_1 q_2 \leq 1)\)

---

**Fig. 2.4.** Approximate ratio of standard deviation-to-mean interference power \( \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \) \( \text{db} \) vs. fraction of active transmitters \( q_1 q_2 \).
When the receiver dynamic range is \( y \), then the probability of a useful received signal is given by (2.2), where \( P(a) \) is the probability of the event \( a \).

\[
P \left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > \frac{1}{y} \right) \tag{2.2}
\]

In Section 2.3.5, when the fraction of active transmitters, \( q_1 q_2 \), satisfies the inequality \( q_1 q_2 < .1 \), the Chebychev inequality is expressed as

\[
P \left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) \begin{cases} 
1 - \frac{x^2}{\lambda^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{x}{\frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)}} \right]^2 & \leq 1 \\
\geq 0 & \text{otherwise} \tag{2.32}
\end{cases}
\]

where the parameter \( \lambda \) is defined by (2.29).

\[
\lambda = \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \tag{2.29}
\]

The Markov inequality is given by

\[
P \left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) \begin{cases} 
1 - x \frac{E(P_i)}{P_s} & \leq 1 \\
\geq 0 & \text{otherwise} \tag{2.34}
\end{cases}
\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Alternately, higher order moments than the second can be employed in a generalized form of Chebychev's inequality (Ref. 36).}\]
A numerical example of the application of these results is given in Section 2.3.7, the results of which are presented here. In this example, \( Mq_1 = 2000 \) transceivers are distributed nearly uniformly over an area \( A = 100 \) square miles; \( m = Mq_1 q_2 = 200 \) of them are active. The maximum distance, between transceivers in the area \( A \) is \( r_{2\text{max}} = 15 \) miles. The minimum distance is \( r_0 = 100 \) feet. The receiver dynamic range is 60 db.

Using Figs. 2.3 and 2.4 for a transmitter receiver pair with the maximum range separation, \( r_{2\text{max}} \),

\[
\frac{P_S}{E(P_i)}|_{\text{db}} = -96 \text{ db}
\]

\[
\frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)}|_{\text{db}} = 7 \text{ db}
\]

Chebychev's and Markov's inequalities specify lower bounds of the probabilities. In this case, the lower bound is zero so that the inequalities provide no information; this particular result does not assure that a useful received signal is available in a net with the given parameters. More precisely, the result indicates that either the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio is seldom more positive than -60 db, or that the inequalities are too weak to provide useful information in this case.

\[1\] This example merely illustrates the use of the derived results and is not necessarily typical of an actual ground-based communication net.
For the same net, using Markov's inequality, it was found that when $r_2 = 8000$ feet, the signal-to-mutual interference power ratio exceeds -60 db at least 50 percent of the time. Thus, the received signals in at least 50 percent of the nets constructed with the parameters specified above will be useful, and these parameters would be a good starting point for initial specification of the net parameters.

2.3 Derivation of Results for Mutual Interference Power Analysis

In the remainder of this chapter, approximate analytical expressions will be obtained for the ratio of standard deviation-to-mean of interference power, for the signal-to-mean-interference power ratio at a target receiver, and for related quantities. Both of these ratios will be used to evaluate Chebychev-type inequalities which provide a lower bound for the probability distribution function of the ratio of signal power to interference power at a target receiver, when a given number of transmitters are interfering. As a starting point of the following development, assume a circular net area $A$ of radius $r_1$ (refer to Fig. 2.5). In addition to the definitions and assumptions previously given in Section 2.2, the following definitions and assumptions also apply:

\[ r_1 \] The radius of the circle which includes all transceivers. The target receiver is at the center of the circle.
Transceiver with the minimum allowable distance $r_0$ separating them

Boundary including all transceivers - Probability density of a transmitter being at any point within the annulus defined by $r_0$, $r_1$ is constant

- Interfering transmitter enclosed in a circle with radius $r_0/2$
- Target receiver

Fig. 2.5. Initial geometric model of transceiver placement in the net area.
$P_t$ The transmitter power. $P_t$ is assumed to be the same for all active transmitters.

c A propagation constant which depends on the terrain, on the antenna polarization, and on the antenna height.

The restriction to circular geometry is the least realistic of these assumptions. It will be seen that, with small error, this assumption can be relaxed considerably so that the results apply to general and realistic situations. In the preceding definitions, $M$, $q_1$, $q_2$ are defined with respect to sets of transceivers which exclude the given transmitter and its target receiver. As a result, $q_1 q_2$ has a direct interpretation as the fraction of the $M$ transceivers which are interfering with the target receiver.

2.3.1 Maximum Transmitter "Packing", Circular Boundary.

Since the target receiver is at the center of the circular area, $M$ is the maximum number of interfering transmitters which can be placed in the annular area of Fig. 2.5 with at least a distance $r_o$ separating them. The type of packing which allows this maximum number is shown in Fig. 2.6. Boundary effects at the perimeter of the circle are ignored. The efficiency of packing transceivers in the circle with radius $r_1$ can be determined by dividing the area in the three sectors in any equilateral triangle in Fig. 2.6 by the total area of the triangle. It is
Fig. 2.6. Circles of radius \( r_o/2 \) arranged for maximum packing in circle of radius \( r_1 \).
$$3 \times \frac{1}{6} \pi \left( \frac{r_o}{2} \right)^2 \left/ \frac{1}{2} \right. \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \, r_o x \, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \, r_o = \frac{\pi}{2 \sqrt{3}}$$

(2.3)

Hence, for a circular area $A$,

$$M = \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{(r_1^2 - 2r_o^2)}{r_o^2}$$

(2.4)

2.3.2 Mean Interference Power, Annular Boundary. The interfering power $P_i$ at the receiver terminals for the geometry of Fig. 2.5 is given by (2.5).

$$P_i = P_t \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{c}{r_i^4}$$

(2.5)

Neglecting the slight tendency of the given transmitter to reduce the probability of interfering transmitters at radius $r_2$, the mean interfering power is given by (2.6),

$$E(P_i) = c \, P_t \sum_{i=1}^{m} E(1/r_i^4) = c \, P_t \, m \, E(1/r^4)$$

(2.6)

where $E(1/r^4)$ is given by (2.7).

$$E(1/r^4) = \int_{r_o}^{r_1} \frac{2\pi r}{\pi (r_1^2 - r_o^2)} (1/r^4) \, dr = \frac{1}{r_o^2 r_1^2}$$

(2.7)
Substituting (2.4) into (2.1), (2.1) into (2.6), and using (2.7); \( E(P_i) \)

is determined by (2.8) as

\[
E(P_i) \equiv \frac{c P_t q_1 q_2}{r_o^2 r_1^2} x \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{(r_1^2 - 2r_0^2)}{r_o^2} \tag{2.8}
\]

2.3.3 Approximation to the Variance of the Interference Power,

Annular Boundary. Using the same method as was used in Section 2.3.2 to obtain the second moment,

\[
E(P_i^2) = E \left[ c P_t \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{r_i^4} \right]^2 = P_t^2 c^2 E \left[ \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{r_i^4} \right]^2
\]

\[
= P_t^2 c^2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} E \left( \frac{1}{r_i^4} \frac{1}{r_j^4} \right) \tag{2.9}
\]

Now it is noted that \( 1/r_i^4 \) is not statistically independent of \( 1/r_j^4 \). That is, if transmitter \( i \) is at a position at radius \( r_i \), the total number of transmitters allowable at this radius is reduced. Hence, the probability of other transmitters at radius \( r_j = r_i \) is reduced, which makes the dependence of the two probabilities clear. For low values of \( q_1 q_2 \), that is, a low-packing density in the annulus, conditions of statistical independence are approached. Hence, an approximate expression for \( E(P_i^2) \) based on the assumption of statistical independence can be used. In many practical situations, the packing density will be low.
The variance of the interference power is approximated below, but no information is given concerning the size of errors resulting from assumptions of statistical independence. From (2.9)

\[
E(P_i^2) \approx P_t^2 c^2 \left\{ m E\left(\frac{1}{r^8}\right) + m(m-1) \left[ E\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right]^2 \right\} \quad (2.10)
\]

Also,

\[
\sigma^2(P_i) = E(P_i^2) - [E(P_i)]^2 \quad (2.11)
\]

Substituting (2.1) and (2.4) into (2.10) and (2.8), and (2.10 into (2.11),

\[
\sigma^2(P_i) \approx P_t^2 c^2 \left\{ q_1 q_2 M E\left(\frac{1}{r^8}\right) + q_1 q_2 M(q_1 q_2 M - 1) \left[ E\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right]^2 \right\} - c^2 P_t^2 q_1^2 q_2^2 M^2 \left[ E\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right]^2
\]

\[
= \frac{2 \pi P_t^2 c^2 q_1 q_2 (r_1^2 - 2r_0^2)}{3 r_0^2} \left\{ E\left(\frac{1}{r^8}\right) - \left[ E\left(\frac{1}{r^4}\right)\right]^2 \right\} \quad (2.12)
\]

Neglecting the presence of the given transmitter at radius \( r_2 \leq r_1 \),

\[
E\left(\frac{1}{r^8}\right) = \int_{r_0}^{r_1} \frac{2\pi r}{\pi(r_1^2 - r_0^2)} \frac{1}{r^8} \, dr = \frac{r_1^6 - r_0^6}{3 r_1^6 r_0^6 (r_1^2 - r_0^2)} \quad (2.13)
\]
Substituting (2.7) and (2.13) into (2.12) gives (2.14).

\[
\sigma^2(P_i) \approx \frac{2\pi P_t^2 c^2 q_1q_2}{3\sqrt{3} r_0^8} \left\{ \frac{r_1^2 - 2r_0^2}{r_1^2 - r_0^2} \right\} 
\]

\[
\times \left\{ 1 - \left( \frac{r_0}{r_1} \right)^6 - 3\left( \frac{r_0}{r_1} \right)^2 \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{r_0}{r_1} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \tag{2.14}
\]

for \( q_1q_2 \) small. The variance results from the different possible distributions of a given number of transmitting transceivers within the circular area.

2.3.4 Extension of Results to General Net Areas. In this section, it is shown that the expressions previously obtained for \( E(P_i) \) and \( \sigma(P_i) \), obtained by assuming circular geometry, can be extended to apply within a general, simply connected net of area \( A \). Approximate expressions will also be obtained for \( P_s/E(P_i) \), for \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \), and for \( \mathbb{P}\left[ \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right] \) at a target receiver within the general net area \( A \). In addition to the other assumptions upon which these expressions were obtained, the following assumption also applies. The target receiver is within the area \( A \), and is farther than a distance \( 2r_0 \) from all points of the boundary of \( A \). The target transmitter may be at any point within the area \( A \), subject to the following restriction. All transceivers must be separated by at least a distance \( r_0 \), as initially indicated in the assumptions of Section 2.2. The maximum number \( M \) of transceivers,
excluding the given transmitter and target receiver, which can be placed in the general area $A$ with at least a distance $r_o$ separating them is given by (2.15).

$$M = 0.3612 \left( \frac{A}{\pi r_o^2} - 2 \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

Expression 2.15 is obtained in the same way as (2.4).

Assume, then, that a target receiver within the net area $A$ which is farther than a distance $2r_o$ from all points of the boundary of $A$, as indicated in Fig. 2.7. A circular net area of radius $r_1 = 2r_o$ centered at the target receiver is completely enclosed within the net area $A$, and a circular net area with radius $r_1 = \infty$ completely encloses the net area. It follows that the number of transceivers which contribute to the mutual interference at a target receiver in the actual net area $A$ is intermediate between the number which contribute in a circular net area with radius $r_1 = 2r_o$ and in a circular net area with radius $r_1 = \infty$. Since the expected value of interference power is a monotonically increasing function of the number of interfering transmitters, it follows that the expected value of interference power $E(P_i)$ for the area $A$ is bounded below by the expected value of interference power in a circular net area with radius $r_1 = 2r_o$, and is bounded above by the expected value of interference power in a circular area with radius $r_1 = \infty$. That is, using (2.8), the expected value $E(P_i)$ of
\( 2r_0 \)

- given transmitter
- target receiver
- interfering transmitter enclosed in a circle with radius \( r_0/2 \).

Fig. 2.7. Distribution of transmitters and receiver within a particular boundary.
interference power in a general net area \( A \) satisfies inequality (2.16).

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{c P_t q_1 q_2}{r_O^4} \right) \leq E(P_i) \leq \left( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{c P_t q_1 q_2}{r_O^4} \right)
\]  

(2.16)

An approximation for \( E(P_i) \) which is within +3 db of the correct value is given by (2.17).

\[
E(P_i) \approx \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{c P_t q_1 q_2}{r_O^4}
\]  

(2.17)

An argument similar to the preceding one applies for \( \sigma(P_i) \), and using (2.14) it can be shown in the same way that for any simply connected area \( A \), \( \sigma(P_i) \) satisfies (2.18).

\[
\sqrt{\frac{9}{32}} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi c^2 P_t^2 q_1 q_2}{3 \sqrt{3} r_O^8}} \leq \sigma(P_i) \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\pi c^2 P_t^2 q_1 q_2}{3 \sqrt{3} r_O^8}}
\]  

(2.18)

Equation 2.19 is an approximation for \( \sigma(P_i) \) which is within +3 db of the correct value

\[
\sigma(P_i) \approx \sqrt{\frac{2\pi c^2 P_t^2 q_1 q_2}{3 \sqrt{3} r_O^8}}
\]  

(2.19)
The inequalities (2.16) and (2.18) for $E(P_i)$ and $\sigma(P_i)$ will now be used to obtain bounds and approximations for $P_s/E(P_i)$ and for $\sigma(P_i)/E(P_i)$. The signal power $P_s$ at the target receiver input terminals produced by the given transmitter is given by (2.20).

$$P_s = \frac{c P_t}{r_2^4} \quad \text{(2.20)}$$

The inequality (2.21) for $P_s/E(P_i)$ follows from (2.16) and (2.20).

$$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi q_1 q_2} \left( \frac{r_0}{r_2} \right)^4 \leq \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \leq \frac{2 \sqrt{3}}{2\pi q_1 q_2} \left( \frac{r_0}{r_2} \right)^4 \quad \text{(2.21)}$$

It also follows that within -3 dB of the correct value,

$$\frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \approx \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi q_1 q_2} \left( \frac{r_0}{r_2} \right)^4 \quad \text{(2.22)}$$

Also,

$$\left| \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \right|_{\text{db}} \approx 10 \log_{10} \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi q_1 q_2} \left( \frac{r_0}{r_2} \right)^4 \quad \text{(2.23)}$$

Similarly, from (2.16) and (2.18), $\sigma(P_i)/E(P_i)$ satisfies (2.24) and (2.25).

$$\frac{\sqrt{\frac{9}{32}}}{2\pi \sqrt{3} q_1 q_2} \leq \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \leq 2 \left( \frac{1}{2\pi \sqrt{3} q_1 q_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{(2.24)}$$
Within ±3 db,

\[ \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \approx \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\pi \cdot 3 \cdot q_1 q_2}} \]  

(2.25)

Also,

\[ \frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \bigg|_{\text{db}} \approx 10 \log_{10} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi \cdot 3 \cdot q_1 q_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \]  

(2.26)

The quantities \( P_s/E(P_i) \) and \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \) given by (2.23) and (2.26) are plotted in Fig. 2.3 and Fig. 2.4.

A case of particular interest occurs when the distance separating the given transmitter and target receiver is the longest chord, \( r_{2\text{max}} \), which spans the net area \( A \). On the average, the smallest value of signal-to-mutual-interference power occurs for this particular link, and it follows that if the net parameters are chosen to provide, for this link, a useful received signal with an acceptable probability, then the probability of a useful received signal is acceptable for all other links. Because the assumptions require that the target receiver be within the area \( A \), and farther than a distance \( 2r_o \) from the boundary of \( A \), the longest value of \( r_2 \) for which the assumptions apply is actually given by

\[ r_2 = r_{2\text{max}} - 2r_o \]  

(2.27)
However in typical cases, \( r_{2_{\text{max}}} \gg 2r_0 \) so that a negligible error results from using \( r_2 = r_{2_{\text{max}}} \) in the calculations.

2.3.5 Chebychev Type Inequalities. It was indicated in Section 2.1 that it is difficult to analytically determine the probability distribution function \( P\left(\frac{P_s}{P_i} > x\right) \) in a particular situation. For this reason, Chebychev-type inequalities are used to bound the probability distribution function (Ref. 24). The two inequalities which are used are the Chebychev and Markov inequalities. The interest here is in the determination of lower bounds for the probability distribution function of the signal-to-interference power ratio at the terminals of the target receiver. The distance \( r_2 \) separating the intended transmitter is a parameter of the result (i.e., intended transmitter range is not a random variable). The transmitters which produce the mutual interference are uniformly distributed over the area \( A \) in accordance with the assumptions of Section 2.2. Inequalities for the distribution function of signal-to-interference power ratio are developed as follows.

\[
P\left(\frac{P_s}{P_i} > x\right) = P\left(P_i < \frac{P_s}{x}\right)
\]

\[
= P\left(P_i < \left[\frac{1}{x} \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)}\right] \sigma(P_i)\right) \quad (2.28)
\]
Define:

\[ \lambda = \frac{P_s}{\sigma(P_i)} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.29)

Then from (2.28) and (2.29),

\[ P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) = P \left[ P_i - E(P_i) < \frac{\lambda}{x} \sigma(P_i) - E(P_i) \right] \]

\[ = P \left\{ P_i - E(P_i) < \sigma(P_i) \left[ 1 - \frac{\lambda}{x} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right] \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.30)

In many typical net situations, the fraction of active transceivers, \( q_1 q_2 \), satisfies the inequality \( q_1 q_2 < .1 \); and it follows from Fig. 2.4 that \( E(P_i) \) is less than \( \sigma(P_i) \) in these situations. When \( E(P_i) \) is less than \( \sigma(P_i) \), and when in addition \( \frac{\lambda}{x} \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right) \geq 1 \), it follows from (2.30) that

\[ P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) = P \left\{ |P_i - E(P_i)| < \sigma(P_i) \left[ 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right] \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.31)

Application of Chebychev's inequality (Ref. 24) to the right hand side of (2.31) yields,

\[ P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) \begin{cases} \geq 1 - \frac{x^2}{\lambda^2 \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right)^2} ; & \frac{x^2}{\lambda^2 \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right)^2} \leq 1 \\ \geq 0 ; & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.32)

A good approximation to \( P_s/E(P_i) \), expressed in decibels, is given by (2.23), which is plotted in Fig. 2.3. A good approximation to \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \), expressed in decibels, is given by (2.26), which is plotted in Fig. 2.4. By using
Fig. 2.3, Fig. 2.4, (2.29), and (2.32), a Chebyshev inequality for
\[ P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) \]
is obtained.

Application of Markov's inequality (Ref. 24) to the right side of
(2.30) gives,

\[
\begin{align*}
P\left[ P_i < \frac{\lambda}{x} \sigma(P_i) \right] &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\geq 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} &; \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \leq 1 \\
\geq 0 &; \text{otherwise}
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]

(2.33)

Substituting (2.29) and (2.30) into (2.33),

\[
\begin{align*}
P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) &= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\geq 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{P_s} &; \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{P_s} \leq 1 \\
\geq 0 &; \text{otherwise}
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]

(2.34)

By using Fig. 2.3 and (2.34), a Markov inequality for
\[ P\left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > x \right) \]
is obtained. The stronger of the equalities of (2.32) and (2.34) for a
given choice of parameters is the one which has the larger right hand
side.

2.3.6 Effect of Changes in Geometry. A change in geometry by a constant scale factor results in a new geometry for which the
same Chebyshev and Markov inequalities apply as in the original geo-
metry. Therefore, the same lower bound for the probability distribution of \( P_s/P_i \) applies to all sets of geometry which are related by a
constant scale factor. The change in scale factor is defined so that
$r_1$, $r_2$, and $\sqrt{A}$ are increased by a constant factor, and $m$ remains constant. This definition implies that $q_1q_2$ remains constant when the scale factor is changed. These relations may readily be shown as follows. For $A >> \pi r_0^2$, a constant scale factor increase in $\sqrt{A}/r_0$ results, according to (2.15) in the same value of $M$. Allowing the number $m$ of transmitters in the expanded area to remain the same as in the original area, it follows from (2.1) that $q_1q_2$ remains constant through the expansion. It follows directly from (2.25) that $\sigma(P_i)/E(P_i)$ remains constant in the expansion. Since $r_0/r_2$ remains constant in the expansion, it follows from (2.22) that $P_s/E(P_i)$ also remains constant. Since $\sigma(P_i)/E(P_i)$ and $P_s/E(P_i)$ remain constant in the expansion, it follows from (2.29), (2.32), and (2.34) that the same Chebychev and Markov inequalities apply after the expansion as before it.

2.3.7 Application of Results. As an example of the use of the foregoing results, consider the following situation. $Mq_1 = 2000$ transceivers are distributed nearly uniformly over an area $A = 100$ square miles. A number $Mq_1q_2 = 200$ of them are interfering with the target receiver. The maximum distance separating transceivers in the area $A$ is $r_{2\text{max}} = 15$ miles. The minimum distance $r_0 = 100$ feet. The receiver dynamic range is 60 db, that is, the receiver can detect signals for which the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio is more positive than -60 db. Using Chebychev's and Markov's inequalities,
the following will be determined:

1. Whether it is likely that the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio at a receiver operating at maximum range from a transmitter in the net \( r_{2\text{max}} = 15 \) miles will exceed the -60 db level.

2. The range \( r_2 \) between transmitter and receiver corresponding to a signal-to-interference power level which is greater than -60 db with a probability of greater than .50.

For the first situation, using (2.15)

\[
M = 0.3612 \left( \frac{A}{\pi r_o^2} - 2 \right) = 3.22 \times 10^4
\]

From (2.1),

\[
q_1 q_2 = \frac{200}{M} = 6.21 \times 10^{-3}
\]

\[
\frac{r_{2\text{max}}}{r_o} = \frac{(15)(5280)}{100} = 793
\]

From Fig. 2.3,

\[
\frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} \bigg|_{\text{min}} = -96 \text{ db}
\]

From Fig. 2.4,

\[
\sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \bigg|_{\text{db}} \approx 7 \text{ db}
\]
From (2.29),

$$
\lambda = 10^{-10.3} = 5 \times 10^{-11}
$$

Using Chebychev's inequality, (2.32), with $x = 10^{-6}$,

$$
\frac{x^2}{\lambda^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right]^2}
$$

is greater than one, and therefore $P\left(\frac{P_s}{P_i} > x\right) \geq 0$. Using Markov's inequality, (2.34),

$$
x \frac{E(P_i)}{P_s}
$$

is greater than one, and therefore again, $P\left(\frac{P_s}{P_i} > x\right) \geq 0$. These results indicate that either the inequalities are too weak to provide useful information in this case, or that the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio is seldom more positive than -60 db. For the second situation, again,

$$
M = 3.22 \times 10^4
$$

$$
q_1 q_2 = 6.21 \times 10^{-3}
$$

$$
\frac{\sigma(P_i)}{E(P_i)} \bigg|_{db} \approx 7 \text{ db}
$$
Using Chebychev's inequality in the form of (2.32), it is required that

\[ 1 - \frac{x^2}{\lambda^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right]^2} = .50 \]

or that

\[ \frac{x^2}{\lambda^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{x}{\lambda} \frac{E(P_i)}{\sigma(P_i)} \right]^2} = .50 \]

Rearranging, and substituting \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \) and the value of \( x \),

\[ \lambda = 1.61 \times 10^{-6} \]

Substituting \( \lambda \), and, \( \sigma(P_i)/E(P_i) \) into (2.29) and rearranging

\[ \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} = (1.61)(10^{-6})(5) = 8.05 \times 10^{-6} = -50.94 \text{ db} \]

From Fig. 2.3

\[ r_2/r_0 = 60 \]

hence \( r_2 \approx 6000 \) feet. Therefore, using Chebychev's inequality when \( r_2 = 6000 \) feet, \( P_s/P_i \) exceeds -60 db at least 50 percent of the time.

Using Markov's inequality in the form of (2.34), it is required that
\[ P \left( \frac{P_s}{P_i} > 10^{-6} \right) > 1 - 10^{-6} \frac{E(P_i)}{P_s} = .50 \]

Thus,

\[ \frac{P_s}{E(P_i)} = 2 \times 10^{-6} = -57 \text{ dB} \]

From Fig. 2.3

\[ \frac{r_2}{r_0} = 80 \]

\[ r_2 = (80)(100) = 8000 \text{ feet} \]

Therefore, using Markov's inequality with \( r_2 = 8000 \text{ feet} \), \( \frac{P_s}{P_i} \) exceeds -60 dB at least 50 percent of the time. It is seen that in this case, Markov's inequality is stronger than Chebychev's. The results of Section 2.3.6 can, of course, be used to extend the applicability of this result.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF A RADA SYSTEM MODEL

3.1 Introduction

In Chapter I, the principles of RADA systems were described, and in particular, a "basic RADA system" was characterized in Section 1.6. The terms and definitions of Section 1.6 constitute the background for this chapter. A lower bound of the probability of a "useful signal" at the input terminals of a target receiver within a RADA net was determined analytically in Chapter II, as a function of the net parameters. In this chapter, a model of a RADA system is presented and analyzed. It is assumed that in modeling the system, at the input terminals of the target receiver, an RF pulse from one transmitter is never canceled by an RF pulse from another. It is further assumed that the individual detected and delayed RF pulses, the AND gate video input pulses, are all rectangular pulses of equal amplitude and of the same duration $\Delta_t$ as a transmitted pulse; except when the overlapping of several video pulses on a particular frequency results in a composite rectangular video pulse of duration longer than $\Delta_t$. These assumptions are explained in greater detail, and additional ones are presented in Section 3.2.

In the process of evaluating the performance of a target RADA
receiver, consider the case where both message frames and mutual interference constitute the receiver input. Because of the AND operation, and because pulse cancellation does not occur, the receiver AND gate output voltage at any instant is the logical union of the voltage which would be produced by the signal alone and that which would be produced by the mutual interference alone. That is, the receiver AND gate output voltage waveform is the binary waveform obtained by superimposing the error process on the message process. It is, therefore, convenient to use a two-step procedure in evaluating RADA system performance. First the statistics of the error process are determined theoretically (Section 3.3). Then, assuming a useful signal is present at the target receiver input terminals, measures of system performance are evaluated by considering the interaction of the error process with the message process (Section 3.4). These measures apply to systems which use pulse position modulation and clocked binary modulation, respectively, and to systems which employ ungated and gated receivers, respectively. Performance measures are also developed which apply to systems using clocked binary modulation and a "sampling" receiver.

The basic concern of this dissertation is with voice communications systems. At best, the measures which result from analysis are error rates and information rates for samples of received information. "Quality" and "intelligibility", which are preferable measures
for voice, can be related to the error rates and information rates by
listening tests. The work of this dissertation is restricted to the
determination of error rates, information rates, and similar analy-
tically determined measures; no subjective tests have been performed.
For purposes of discussion, it is considered that a maximum error
rate of about .1 error pulse per frame causes the maximum permiss-
sible distortion for a system which codes each sample into pulse
position or frequency (assuming the sampling rate equals the Nyquist
rate--about 8000 samples per second for voice). For an integrating
system, such as delta modulation, it is considered that the maximum
permissible distortion occurs at a higher error rate--perhaps .2-.3
error pulses per frame. These values will be used in numerical cal-
culations in Chapter IV which require specification of maximum per-
missible error rates. Data relating error rates of a pulse modulated
waveform to the quality and intelligibility of the demodulated waveform,
have recently become available (Refs. 14, 17, 1.16, and 1.23).

A more detailed summary of the content of the remainder of
this chapter is presented now. In particular, a description of the use-
ful results is stressed. In Section 3.2, the model of a RADA system
is presented, and the differences between the modeled system and an
actual system are discussed. The statistics of the error process are
determined theoretically in Section 3.3; the following results are in-
cluded. The duty factor, $P_m$, of the error process is determined in
Section 3.3.1, and is plotted in Fig. 3.1 as a function of the "mutual interference parameter," $\gamma \Delta_t^\gamma$ with $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ as a parameter. The quantity $\gamma \Delta_t^\gamma$ is the average number of detected mutual interference pulses which occur at each AND gate input in a time interval $\Delta_t$ corresponding to the duration of a transmitted pulse; the quantity $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ equals the number of receiver AND gate input connections from the delay devices. Physically, the duty factor $P_m$ of the error process is the fraction of the time that the AND gate output produces an error pulse (or, equivalently, is in the "one" state) when only mutual interference is present at the receiver input terminals. The quantity $P_m$ increases monotonically with $\gamma \Delta_t^\gamma$, and with fixed system parameters ($\lambda_f$, $\lambda_t$, $\Delta_t$, $\Lambda_f$, $T_f$), $\gamma \Delta_t^\gamma$ increases linearly with the number of interfering transmitters, $m$; it follows that, as would be expected, the duty factor of the error process increases as the number of interfering transmitters increases.

Although it is an important statistic of the error process, $P_m$ is an incomplete statistic; it determines what fraction of the time error pulses are present, but gives no idea of the duration of these pulses. The probability distribution function $H(t)$ of the duration, $t$, of an error pulse is determined in Section 3.3.2. The normalized distribution is specified by (3.29), (3.33), and (3.39), and is plotted in Fig. 3.5a through Fig. 3.5i as a function of the normalized argument $t/\Delta_t$. In each figure, $\gamma \Delta_t$ is a parameter; different figures (figures having a different alphabetic index in the set a through i) correspond to systems
having a differing number \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) of receiver AND gate inputs. The distributions follow trends which would be expected intuitively. In a given figure (for a given value of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \)), the error pulse duration tends to increase as the mutual interference parameter \( \gamma \Delta_t \) increases. This tendency results because, with a higher mutual interference pulse rate at the AND gate input, more interference pulses are available to sustain the duration of an error pulse. A trend of the distribution of the duration of an error pulse is that as the number \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) of AND gate inputs increases, with other parameters remaining constant, the duration of the error pulses tends to decrease. This effect would also be expected intuitively since, given an error pulse, this pulse terminates as soon as one of the AND gate input pulses terminates. The probability that at least one AND gate input pulse terminates before any specified time increases as the number of AND gate inputs, and hence input pulses, increases. The distributions of Fig. 3.5a through Fig. 3.5i have a discontinuity at \( t = \Delta_t \) which can be explained as follows. A discontinuity in the distribution function corresponds to an impulse in the probability density function, which in turn implies that there is a finite probability that the error pulse will end at time \( t = \Delta_t \). To complete the explanation, it must be shown why there is a finite probability that the error pulse will terminate at time \( t = \Delta_t \). An error pulse starts at time zero, if mutual interference pulses are present at all but one of the AND gate inputs at time 0, and if a mutual
interference pulse (the "turn-on pulse") occurs at the remaining input at time zero. The error pulse ends when any one of the interference pulses (including the turn-on pulse) terminates. There is a finite probability that all pulses except the turn-on pulse are extended past \( \Delta_t \) by overlapping interference pulses and that the turn-on pulse terminates at time \( \Delta_t \). This finite probability accounts for the discontinuity in the distributions of the error pulse duration. It is noted that for a given value of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \), the amplitude of the discontinuity decreases as \( \gamma \Delta_t \) increases. This trend occurs because the probability that another pulse overlaps the turn-on pulse increases as \( \gamma \Delta_t \) increases, which decreases the probability that the turn-on pulse terminates at time \( \Delta_t \), which in turn reduces the amplitude of the discontinuity in the distribution \( H(t) \). The mean value, \( \overline{t} \), of the duration of an error pulse is expressed in terms of \( H(t) \) in (3.41) of Section 3.3.2. Two approximations, \( \tilde{t} \) and \( \tilde{t} \), for \( \overline{t} \) are presented in (3.43) and (3.52) of Section 3.3.3.

The average error pulse rate is an important statistic of the error process. This average rate, \( \overline{N} \), is shown in (3.55) of Section 3.3.4 to equal to quotient of \( P_m \) and \( \overline{t} \). A normalized plot of \( \overline{N} \Delta_t \), the average number of error pulses which occur in a time duration \( \Delta_t \), is presented in Fig. 3.6 as a function of \( \gamma \Delta_t \), with \( \lambda_t \lambda_t \) as a parameter. For a fixed value of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \), and for increasing \( \gamma \Delta_t \), the error rate at first increases, reflecting the tendency of an increased interference
pulse rate to increase the error rate. With further increases of $\gamma \Delta_t$, the error rate levels off, then decreases. Values of $\gamma \Delta_t$ in the region to the right of the peak appear to be of little practical interest. In this region, the error pulses tend to become longer and fewer in number, until in the limit, $\gamma \Delta_t \to \infty$, and there is a single error pulse of infinite duration, corresponding to an error rate of zero, and no reception is possible. Another point of view is that the region to the left of the peak is the region where $P_m$ increases more rapidly with $\gamma \Delta_t$ than does $\bar{t}$. However, as $\gamma \Delta_t$ increases, $P_m$ is bounded above by unity and $\bar{t}$ is bounded above by infinity. It follows that for some value of $\gamma \Delta_t$, the quotient, $\bar{N}$, of $P_m$ and $\bar{t}$ will first level off, then decrease. Typically the system parameters will always be chosen so that with the mutual interference levels anticipated, $P_m$ will be less than 0.1, and the receiver operation will be to the left of the peak of the appropriate curve of $\bar{N} \Delta_t$ vs. $\gamma \Delta_t$.

Finally, using the previously determined error process statistics, $P_m$, $\bar{t}$, and $\bar{N}$, two additional statistics, $P_m(\tau)$ and $P_e(\tau)$ are investigated in Section 3.3.5 and Section 3.3.6, respectively. The quantity $P_m(\tau)$ is the probability that an error pulse starts in a time interval $\tau$. An approximation $\tilde{P}_m(\tau)$ for $P_m(\tau)$ is given by (3.58) and (3.60). The quantity $P_e(\tau)$, which is determined by using $P_m(\tau)$, is the probability that an error pulse, or part of an error pulse, is contained in the interval $\tau$. This probability is a crucial one in
evaluating the performance of RADA systems which use gated receivers. An approximation $\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e)$ and a lower bound $\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e)$ for $P_e(\tau_e)$ are given by (3.62) and (3.65). This completes the discussion of the investigation of the statistics of the error pulse process.

Measures of system performance are presented in Section 3.4. The measures which are reasonable in a particular case depend upon both the modulation process and the receiver type which are being considered. For ungated receivers using either pulse position modulation or clocked binary modulation, the duty factor $P_m$ and the error rate $\bar{N}$ are suitable measures of system performance. That is, it is expected that the intelligibility and quality of signals observed in listening tests are correlated with the duty factor, and even more highly correlated with the error pulse rate $\bar{N}$. When gated receivers are considered, the gate is assumed to be synchronized with the message pulses. The measure of performance of a system using pulse position modulation and a gated receiver is taken as the probability that at least one error pulse precedes the message pulse in a gate interval (Section 3.4.3). The occurrence of an error pulse within the gate and prior to the message pulse is defined as a type one false alarm, and the corresponding probability is denoted by $P_{1FA}$. The measure of performance of systems which use clocked binary modulation and a gated receiver is the probability that at least one error pulse occurs in a gate interval in which there is no message pulse (Section 3.4.4). This event is
called a type two false alarm, and its probability is designated by $P_{2\text{FA}}$. Analogously, the measure of the performance of systems using clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver is the probability that an error sample occurs at a sampling time when there is no message sample (Section 3.4.5). The corresponding event is called a sample false alarm, and its probability is denoted by $P_{\text{SFA}}$. In addition to these measures, the information transmission rate is determined for systems which use clocked binary modulation, and either a gated or a sampling receiver (Section 3.4.6).

3.2 Model of a RADA System

In this section, a model of a RADA system is presented which embodies the essential features of the system, and which allows tractable analytical results. The model, and the error process statistics $P_m$, $H(t)$, and $\bar{N}$ obtained by analyzing it are essentially the same as those of Ref. 16, although the results herein were obtained independently using slightly different mathematical techniques prior to publication of the reference. The definition of a "basic RADA system" which was given in Section 1.6 is a required background for this section. The model of a RADA system will be obtained by making the following assumptions. First, only direct transmissions from RADA transmitters which are addressing other RADA receivers cause mutual interference at the target receiver. Second, at the target receiver input terminals, the mutual interference from a given transmitter causes
spurious receiver input pulses; it does not cause cancellation of the message pulses, or of the spurious pulses from any other interfering transmitter. Third, all received RF pulses produce (rectangular) video AND gate input pulses of equal amplitude and of duration $\Delta_t$ seconds. The overlapping of several video pulses results in a composite pulse which has the same amplitude as the video pulse, and which is of longer duration than $\Delta_t$ seconds. Fourth, defining the epoch of a pulse as the leading edge of the pulse, it is assumed that the time of occurrence of the epochs of the mutual interference pulses at the different AND gate inputs are independent Poisson processes. Fifth, when gated receivers are considered, it is assumed that the target receiver is synchronized with its given transmitter.

The assumption that the primary source of degradation of receiver performance results from direct mutual interference neglects the effects of multipath and residual interference as discussed in Section 1.4.5. This assumption, therefore, tends to produce a model which gives an upper bound of system performance.

The extreme variations in the level of received RADA signals was pointed out in Section 1.4.5. Because of this variation, there is only a small probability that the timing, phase, and amplitude relationships of a group of received RF pulses will result in sufficient cancellation among pulses so that some of them will not be detected. Although the probability of pulse cancellation is small, degradation of
receiver performance will occur in those cases in which a message
pulse is cancelled. For this reason, results obtained which neglect
pulse cancellation tend to give an upper bound of RADA system per-
formance.

In Section 1.4.5, it was shown that the widths of the RF pulses,
and therefore of the video AND gate input pulses, vary with the nearer
transmitters tending to produce wider pulses. The wider video pul-
eses tend to be more effective in producing error pulses than the
pulses having the nominal system pulse width, $\Delta_t$. The assumption of
rectangular video pulses of width $\Delta_t$ equal to the nominal RADA sys-
tem transmitted pulse width tends to give analytical results which are
an upper bound of RADA system performance.

For systems in which only a single pulse is transmitted on
each frequency of a frame ($\lambda_t = 1$), the assumption that the pulse
epoch process on each channel is a Poisson process is a valid assump-
tion. For systems with $\lambda_t > 1$ which transmit more than one pulse on
each frequency in a frame, the pulse process on each frequency chan-
nel is no longer strictly Poisson. For systems using $\lambda_f > 1$, the
pulse epoch process on each frequency channel is not strictly inde-
dependent of the pulse epoch process on each other frequency channel.
The assumed condition of independent Poisson processes on each fre-
quency channel is approached as the number of system users, $m$, is
increased.
Since a receiver which is maintained in synchronization will always open the post gate, or sample, at the correct time instant, receiver performance calculations predicted on a synchronized post gate provide an upper bound of RADA system performance.

In summary, performance measures calculated for the modeled system tend to be an upper bound of the actual receiver performance (e.g., the modeled system has a smaller duty factor $P_m$, and a smaller error rate $\bar{N}$ than an actual system).

3.3 Mutual Interference Statistics of the Basic RADA Receiver Output

In this section, theoretical expressions are obtained for the statistics of the error process at the RADA receiver AND gate output. In deriving these statistics, it is assumed that the probability of a pulse epoch at a particular AND gate input in an incremental time interval $dt$ equals $\gamma dt$. This probability is assumed to be independent of the epochs of the pulses at the other $(\lambda_t, \lambda_t - 1)$ AND gate inputs.

In Section 3.3.1, a duty factor $P_m$ of the RADA receiver AND gate output is determined. In Section 3.3.2 the probability distribution function $H(t)$ of the duration of a RADA receiver AND gate output error pulse is determined. An expression is also determined for the mean duration $\bar{t}$ of an error pulse in terms of the distribution function $H(t)$. Approximations $\tilde{t}$ and $\hat{t}$ for $\bar{t}$ are determined in Section 3.3.3. The quantities $\bar{t}$ and $P_m$ are used to determine $\bar{N}$, which is the average
number of error pulses per second at the RADA receiver AND gate output in Section 3.3.4. An approximate expression $\tilde{P}_e(\tau)$, and a lower bound $\tilde{P}_e(\tau)$ are determined for $P_e(\tau)$, which is the probability that there is at least one receiver AND gate output error pulse in time $\tau$, in Section 3.3.6.

Using the results of Sections 3.3.1 - 3.3.6, various measures of RADA system performance are specified in Section 3.4. For RADA systems using PPM or clocked binary modulation, and an ungated receiver, the duty factor $P_m$ and the average number $\bar{N}$ of receiver AND gate output error pulses are used as measures of system performance. Probability of a false alarm is used as a measure of performance of RADA systems using gated and sampling receivers, respectively. Information transmission rate is used as a measure of performance of RADA systems using clocked binary modulation and a gated or sampling receiver.

3.3.1 Receiver AND Gate Output Error Pulse Duty Factor.

When no message pulses are received, $P_m$ is the duty factor of the error pulse process at the RADA receiver AND gate output. The quantity $P_m$ equals the fraction of the time that an error pulse is present at the AND gate output. Equivalently, $P_m$ is the fraction of the time that the AND gate output is a binary ONE, when mutual interference is the only receiver input. The probability that a ONE occurs at a particular AND gate input at a time $t_o$ equals the probability that at least
one input pulse epoch occurs in the interval \([t_o - \Delta_t, t_o]\). The probability of this occurrence is \(\left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}\right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t}\). The probability of a \textbf{ONE} at all \(\lambda_f \lambda_t\) AND gate inputs at time \(t_o\) is, therefore, given by (3.1).

\[
P_m = \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}\right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t}
\]  

(3.1)

The quantity \(P_m\) is plotted in Fig. 3.1 as a function of \(\gamma\) and the parameter \(\lambda_f \lambda_t\).

\textbf{3.3.2 Relating to the Distribution of the Duration of an Error Pulse.} In this section, the characteristic function of the duration of the pulses at each AND gate input will be determined. The characteristic function will be used to obtain the probability density function and the probability distribution function of the duration of pulses at the AND gate input. This distribution function, and a closely related distribution function will then be used to determine the distribution function of the duration of error pulses. The mean error pulse duration will then be determined.

The method by which pulses are generated at the output of each delay line tap by overlapping is shown in Fig. 3.2. Pulses of width \(\Delta_t\) overlap to produce wider "composite" pulses as shown. A composite pulse of \(n\) pulses is referred to as an \(n\)-pulse. For an \(n\)-pulse to occur, given the first pulse (i.e., given there is a composite pulse), \(n-1\) successive pulses must overlap, and the following pulse
Fig. 3.1. RADA receiver AND gate output error pulse duty factor $P_m$ vs. mutual interference parameter, $\gamma \Delta t$. 

$$\gamma \Delta t = \frac{m \lambda \Delta t}{\Delta t^2}$$

Mutual Interference Parameter, $\gamma \Delta t$
Fig. 3.2. Illustration of the formation of composite pulses.

(a) Pulse overlapping at each AND gate input.

(b) Composite pulses resulting from pulse overlapping in (a).
must not overlap. A number of probability functions will be defined now and will be used to determine the probability distribution function of the duration of a composite pulse. In much of the development which follows, it will be convenient to make use of characteristic functions. The characteristic function \( \mathcal{C}_t(\xi) \) of a random variable \( t \) having a probability density function \( p(t) \) is given by (3.2).

\[
\mathcal{C}_t(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(t) e^{i \xi t} \, dt
\]  

(3.2)

Conversely, when the characteristic function \( \mathcal{C}_t(\xi) \) is known, the probability density function \( p(t) \) of the random variable \( t \) is given by

\[
p(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_t(\xi) e^{-i \xi t} \, d\xi
\]  

(3.3)

Let \( t_1 \) be defined as the time between epochs of successive pulses of a composite pulse, as shown in Fig. 3.3a. The probability density function \( p_1(t_1) \) of \( t_1 \) is given by the truncated exponential function in (3.4).

\[
p_1(t_1) = \frac{\gamma e^{-\gamma t_1}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} ; \quad 0 \leq t_1 \leq \Delta_t
\]

(3.4)

\[
p_1(t_1) = 0 \quad ; \quad t_1 < 0
\]

\[
t_1 > \Delta_t
\]
(a) Relationship between $t_1$, $t_2$, $t_5$ and $\Delta t$.

(b) Relationship between $t_5$, $t_6$ and $t_7$.

Fig. 3.3. Illustration of the time relationships within a composite pulse.
The characteristic function of \( t_1 \) is given by (3.5).

\[
Ch_{t_1}(\xi) = \frac{\gamma}{-\gamma \Delta t} \int_0^{\Delta t} e^{-\gamma t} (i\xi - \gamma) dt = \frac{\gamma}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}} \left[ e^{\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{i\xi - \gamma}} - 1 \right]
\]

(3.5)

Given an \( n \) pulse, the time \( t_2 \) from the epoch of the first pulse to the epoch of the last pulse of the \( n \)-pulse is the sum of the \( (n-1) \) independent time intervals \( t_1 \) between epochs of successive pulses as shown in Fig. 3.3a. Therefore, the characteristic function \( Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) \) of the time \( t_2 \), given an \( n \)-pulse is the \( (n-1) \) fold product of the characteristic function of \( t_1 \), as given in (3.6).

\[
Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) = \left[ Ch_{t_1}(\xi) \right]^{n-1}
\]

(3.6)

Substituting (3.5) into (3.6) yields (3.7).

\[
Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) = \left( \frac{\gamma}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}} \right)^{n-1} \left[ e^{\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{i\xi - \gamma}} - 1 \right]^{n-1}
\]

(3.7)

It follows from (3.3) that the conditional probability density \( p_2(t_2|n) \) of the time \( t_2 \), given an \( n \)-pulse, is given by (3.8).

\[
p_2(t_2|n) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) e^{-i\xi t_2} d\xi
\]

(3.8)
Let \( P_3(n) \) be the conditional probability of an \( n \)-pulse, given that there is a composite pulse. The probability density function \( p_2(t_2) \) of the time \( t_2 \) between the epochs of the first and last pulses of an \( n \)-pulse is obtained by averaging \( p_2(t_2|n) \) over \( n \) as in (3.9).

\[
p_2(t_2) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_3(n) \, p_2(t_2|n) \quad (3.9)
\]

The characteristic function of \( t_2 \) is obtained by substituting (3.9) into (3.3), and is given by (3.10).

\[
Ch_{t_2}(\xi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_3(n) \, Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) \quad (3.10)
\]

To determine \( Ch_{t_2}(\xi) \), it is only necessary to determine \( P_3(n) \), since \( Ch_{t_2|n}(\xi) \) has already been determined in (3.7). For an \( n \)-pulse to occur, given the first pulse, each of \((n-1)\) successive pulses must overlap the previous pulse, and the \( n \)th pulse must not overlap the \((n-1)\)st pulse. The probability of a pulse overlapping the previous pulse equals the probability of a new pulse epoch within \( \Delta_t \) seconds after the previous pulse epoch. This probability, \( P_4 \), is given in (3.11).

\[
P_4 = \int_0^{\Delta_t} \gamma e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \, dt = \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}\right) \quad (3.11)
\]

The probability \( P_3(n) \) is the probability that \((n-1)\) pulses start before the preceding pulses end, and that no pulse starts before the \((n-1)\)th
pulse ends.

\[ P_3(n) = P_4^{n-1} e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)

Substituting (3.11) into (3.12) yields (3.13).

\[ P_3(n) = \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}\right)^{n-1} e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

Now, substituting (3.7) and (3.13) into (3.10), we obtain \( C_{t_2}(\xi) \) in (3.14).

\[
C_{t_2}(\xi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}\right)^{n-1} \left(\frac{\gamma}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}}\right)^{n-1} \left[\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{e^{i\xi - \gamma} - 1}\right]^{n-1}
\]

\[
= e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\gamma}{i\xi - \gamma}\right)^{n-1} \left[\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{e^{i\xi - \gamma} - 1}\right]^{n-1}
\]

\[
= e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\gamma}{i\xi - \gamma}\right)^{n} \left[\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{e^{i\xi - \gamma} - 1}\right]^{n}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.14)

\[
= \frac{e^{-\gamma \Delta t}}{1 - \frac{\gamma}{i\xi - \gamma} \left[\frac{(i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}{e^{i\xi - \gamma} - 1}\right]}
\]

\[
= \frac{(i\xi - \gamma) e^{-\gamma \Delta t}}{i\xi - \gamma - (i\xi - \gamma) \Delta t}
\]
In Fig. 3.3a, it is seen that the total duration, \( t_5 \), of a composite pulse is given by (3.15).

\[
t_5 = t_2 + \Delta_t
\]  

(3.15)

The characteristic function of \( t_5 \) is thus given by (3.16),

\[
Ch_{t_5}(\xi) = e^{i\xi \Delta_t} Ch_{t_2}(\xi) = \frac{e^{(i\xi - \gamma)\Delta_t}}{i\xi - \gamma} e^{(i\xi - \gamma)\Delta_t}
\]  

(3.16)

and from (3.4), the density function of the duration \( t_5 \) of a composite pulse is given by (3.17).

\[
p_5(t_5) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} Ch_{t_5}(\xi) e^{-i\xi t} \, d\xi
\]  

(3.17)

A closed form expression for \( p_5(t_5) \) does not exist. The density \( p_5(t_5) \) must be represented as a series of singularity functions.

In review, composite pulses are generated randomly by the overlapping of pulses at each AND gate input. An AND gate output voltage results whenever there is a composite pulse at all \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) AND gate inputs.

Information about the distribution of the AND gate error pulse duration will now be found. Consider that there is an AND gate output error pulse epoch. The error pulse epoch occurs when there are composite pulses at \( (\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1) \) AND gate inputs and a composite pulse (the "turn-on pulse") epoch occurs at the \( (\lambda_f \lambda_t) \)th AND gate input.
The AND gate output ceases when any one of the $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ composite pulses turns off.

The probability density of the duration of the turn-on pulse is known. It is just the density $p_5(t_5)$ of the duration of a composite pulse. The turn-on pulse epoch occurs at $t = 0$, and defines the reference time origin. As shown in Fig. 3.3b, for each of the $(\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1)$ composite pulses, let $t_6$ denote the time to the (negative) epoch of the first pulse in the composite pulse which occurs in the time interval $-\Delta_t \leq t_6 \leq 0$. Given that there is a composite pulse, the density function $p_6(t_6)$ is a truncated exponential density function with time origin at $-\Delta_t$.

$$p_6(t_6) = \begin{cases} \frac{-\gamma(t_6 + \Delta_t)}{\gamma e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} & ; \quad -\Delta_t \leq t_6 \leq 0 \\ 0 & ; \quad t < -\Delta_t \\ 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} & ; \quad t > 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.18)$$

The characteristic function of $p_6(t_6)$ is,

$$Ch_{t_6}(\xi) = \frac{\gamma}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} \frac{1}{i \xi - \gamma} \left( e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} - e^{-i \xi \Delta_t} \right) \quad (3.19)$$

From Fig. 3.3b, it is seen that the time $t_7$ to the end of each of the $\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1$ pulses is given by (3.20).
\[ t_7 = t_5 + t_6 \]  

(3.20)

The probability density function \( p_7(t_7) \) of the duration \( t_7 \) of each of the \((\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1)\) pulses is the convolution of the density functions \( p_5(t_5) \) and \( p_6(t_6) \). In terms of characteristic functions,

\[ Ch_{t_7}(\xi) = Ch_{t_5}(\xi) \cdot Ch_{t_6}(\xi) \]  

(3.21)

From (3.16), (3.19), and (3.21)

\[ Ch_{t_7}(\xi) = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma^{\Delta t} - 1} \left[ \frac{e^{(i\xi - \gamma)\Delta t} - 1}{(i\xi - \gamma)e^{(i\xi - \gamma)\Delta t}} \right] \]  

(3.22)

The probability density functions of \( p_5(t_5) \) and \( p_7(t_7) \) can be determined by inverting the transforms \( Ch_{t_5}(\xi), Ch_{t_7}(\xi) \). To put the transforms in a more familiar form, the characteristic function will be changed to a one sided Laplace transform [both density functions \( p_5(t_5), p_7(t_7) \) are zero for negative time] by making the change of variable

\[ s = -i\xi \]  

(3.23)

Substituting (3.23) into (3.16) there results,
\[ Ch_{t_5}(s) = \frac{(s+\gamma) e^{-(s+\gamma)\Delta t}}{s+\gamma e^{-(s+\gamma)\Delta t}} \]

\[ = (1 + \frac{\gamma}{s}) e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \frac{1}{1 + \left( e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \right) \frac{e^{-s\Delta t}}{s}} \tag{3.24} \]

\[ = e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-\gamma)^n e^{-\gamma n \Delta t} \left( 1 + \frac{\gamma}{s} \right) \frac{e^{-s n \Delta t}}{s^n} \]

\[ = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-\gamma)^n e^{-\gamma (n+1) \Delta t} \left( \frac{-s(n+1) \Delta t}{s^n} + \frac{\gamma e^{-s(n+1) \Delta t}}{s^{n+1}} \right) \]

Substituting (3.23) into (3.22),

\[ Ch_{t_7}(s) = \frac{\gamma}{\gamma \Delta t e^{\gamma \Delta t} - 1} \frac{-e^{-s \gamma \Delta t}}{s+\gamma e^{-s \gamma \Delta t}} \]

\[ = \frac{\gamma}{e^{\gamma \Delta t} - 1} \frac{1 - e^{-s \gamma \Delta t}}{s \left( 1 + \gamma e^{-s \gamma \Delta t} \frac{e^{-s \Delta t}}{s} \right)} \tag{3.25} \]

\[ = \frac{\gamma}{e^{\gamma \Delta t} - 1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-\gamma)^n e^{-\gamma n \Delta t} \left( 1 - e^{-s \gamma \Delta t} \right) \frac{e^{-s \Delta t}}{s^n} \]
Denoting an impulse function, and a unit step function at the origin by \(\delta(t)\), \(u(t)\) respectively, and taking the inverse transform of \(C_{t_5}^s(r)\), there results,

\[
p_{t_5}(t) = 0; \quad t_5 < 0
\]

\[
p_{t_5}(t) = e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \left[ \delta(t_5 - \Delta_t) + \gamma u(t_5 - \Delta_t) \right] + \gamma \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} e^{-\gamma(n+1) \Delta_t} \left\{ \frac{\gamma \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]}{(n-1)!} \right\}^{n-1} + \left\{ \frac{\gamma \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]}{n!} \right\}^{n}
\]

\[
u \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]; \quad t_5 \geq 0.
\]

(3.26)

The distribution function \(P_{t_5}(t_5)\) is determined by

\[
P_{t_5}(t_5) = \int_0^{t_5} p_{t_5}(t) \, dt
\]

(3.27)

Substituting (3.26) into (3.27),

\[
P_{t_5}(t_5) = 0; \quad t_5 < \Delta_t
\]

\[
P_{t_5}(t_5) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} e^{-\gamma(n+1) \Delta_t} \left\{ \frac{\gamma \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]}{(n-1)!} \right\}^{n-1} + \left\{ \frac{\gamma \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]}{n!} \right\}^{n}
\]

\[
u \left[ t_5 - (n+1) \Delta_t \right]; \quad t_5 \geq \Delta_t
\]

(3.28)
Equation (3.28) can be expressed more compactly by expressing the argument in normalized form and eliminating the unit step function by restricting the range of the sum index. Denoting the "largest integer in x" by \([x]\), \(P_5(t_5)\) is given by (3.29).

\[
P_5(t_5) = 0; \quad t_5 < \Delta_t
\]

\[
P_5(t_5) = \sum_{n=0}^{\left[\frac{t_5}{\Delta_t}\right] - 1} (-\gamma \Delta_t)^n e^{-\gamma(n+1)\Delta_t} \left\{ \frac{\left[\frac{t_5}{\Delta_t} - (n+1)\right]^n}{n!} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\gamma \Delta_t \left[\frac{t_5}{\Delta_t} - (n+1)\right]^{n+1} \\
\frac{\gamma \Delta_t}{(n+1)!}
\end{array} \right\}; \quad t_5 \geq \Delta_t
\]

(3.29)

Similarly, inverting (3.25),

\[
p_7(t_7) = 0; \quad t_7 < 0
\]

\[
p_7(t_7) = \frac{\gamma e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} + \frac{\gamma e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n e^{-\gamma n \Delta_t}
\]

\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\left[\gamma (t_7 - n \Delta_t)\right]^n \\
\frac{n!}{(n-1)!}
\end{array} \right\} u(t_7 - n \Delta_t); \quad t_7 \geq 0
\]

(3.30)
The distribution function $P_\gamma(t_\gamma)$ is determined by

$$P_\gamma(t_\gamma) = \int_0^{t_\gamma} p_\gamma(t) \, dt . \quad (3.31)$$

Substituting (3.30) into (3.31),

$$P_\gamma(t_\gamma) = 0 ; \quad t_\gamma < 0$$

$$P_\gamma(t_\gamma) = \frac{\gamma t_\gamma e^{-\gamma t_\gamma}}{1 - e^{-\gamma t}} + \frac{e^{-\gamma t_\gamma}}{1 - e^{-\gamma t}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n e^{-\gamma n t_\gamma}$$

$$\left\{ \frac{[\gamma(t_\gamma - n t)]^n}{n!} + \frac{[\gamma(t_\gamma - n t)]^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \right\} u(t_\gamma - n t_\gamma); \quad t_\gamma \geq 0$$

Normalization and rearranging the terms of the sum,

$$P_\gamma(t_\gamma) = 0 ; \quad t_\gamma < 0$$

$$P_\gamma(t_\gamma) = \frac{-e^{-\gamma t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma t}} + \frac{e^{-\gamma t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma t}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-\gamma t)^n e^{-\gamma n t_\gamma}$$

$$\left\{ \frac{(t_\gamma - n)^n}{n!} + \frac{\gamma t_\gamma (t_\gamma - n)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \right\} ; \quad t_\gamma \geq 0 \quad (3.33)$$
Using $P_5(t_5)$ and $P_7(t_7)$, the probability distribution function $H(t)$ of the duration of an error pulse will now be determined. The time reference used is the epoch of the turn-on pulse which corresponds to the error pulse.

Define:

(i) - the event a turn-on pulse occurs at AND gate input $i$.

$t(i)$ - the event the duration of a pulse at the $i$th AND gate input is greater than $t$.

$F(a, b, c---)$ - the joint probability of events $a$, $b$, $c$, $---$.

$F(a, b, c---|u, v, w---)$ - the joint probability of events $a$, $b$, $c$ given events $u$, $v$, $w$ $---$.

Then

$$1 - H(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda_t \lambda_t} F[(i), t(1), t(2), -- t(i), --t(\lambda_t \lambda_i)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda_t \lambda_t} F[t(i), (i)] F[t(1), t(2), --t(i-1), t(i+1)--t(\lambda_t \lambda_i)|t(i), (i)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda_t \lambda_t} F(i) F[t(i)|(i)] F[t(1), t(2)--t(i-1), t(i+1), --t(\lambda_t \lambda_i)|t(i), (i)].$$

(3.34)

Since a turn-on pulse is as likely to occur at any AND gate input,

$$F(i) = 1/\lambda_t \lambda_t$$

(3.35)
By definition

\[ F[t(i) \mid (i)] = 1 - P_5(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.36)

Since the processes at the AND gate inputs are assumed to be independent processes,

\[ F[t(1), t(2), \ldots , t(\lambda_f \cdot \lambda_t)] = F[t(1), t(2), \ldots , t(\lambda_f \cdot \lambda_t)] = [1 - P_7(t)]^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.37)

Substituting (3.35), (3.36), and (3.37) into (3.34)

\[ 1 - H(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda_f \cdot \lambda_t} \frac{1}{\lambda_f \cdot \lambda_t} [1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)]^{-1} \]  

\[ = [1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)]^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.38)

Rearranging,

\[ H(t) = 1 - \left\{ [1 - P_5(t)][1 - P_7(t)]^{-1} \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.39)

The function H(t) is the probability distribution of the duration of error pulses at the RADA receiver AND gate output.

The fractions \( P_5(t) \), \( P_7(t) \), \( H(t) \) are plotted in Fig. 3.4 to illustrate their form and relationship. Parameter values are:
Fig. 3.4. Representative distribution function $H(t)$ of the duration $t$ of an error pulse, and associated functions $P_5(t)$, $P_7(t)$, vs. $t$. 

\[ 1 - H(t) = [1 - P_5(t)] \times [1 - P_7(t)]^\lambda t \lambda_t^{-1} \]

\[ \lambda_f = 3 \]
\[ \Lambda_f = 3 \]
\[ \lambda_t = 1 \]
\[ \Delta_t = 10 \text{ microseconds} \]
\[ \bar{T} = 125 \text{ microseconds} \]
\[ m = 10 \]
\[ (\gamma \Delta_t = .80) \]
\[ \lambda_f = 3 \quad \bar{T} = 125 \text{ microseconds} \]
\[ \Lambda_f = 3 \quad m = 10 \]
\[ \lambda_t = 1 \]
\[ \Delta_t = 10 \text{ microseconds} \]

The function \( H(t) \) is plotted in terms of \( t/\Delta_t \) with \( \gamma \Delta_t \) and \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) as parameters in Fig. 3.5a through Fig. 3.5i.

The mean, \( \bar{t} \) corresponding to the distribution function \( H(t) \) will be required for future results; \( \bar{t} \) is determined by the following theorem.

**Theorem:** Let \( t \) be a real random variable with distribution function \( H(t) \) such that \( t \) is "one sided." [\( H(t) \) exists only for \( t \geq 0 \) here.]

Then if

\[ E(t^k) \text{ exists}, \]

for every \( t_o \) such that \( H(t_o) = 0 \)

\[
\int_{t_o}^{\infty} k t^{k-1} \left[ 1 - H(t) \right] dt = E(t^k) - t_o^k \tag{3.40}
\]

This theorem can readily be proved by using integration by parts (see Ref. 25). It follows from the theorem that, with \( t_o = 0 \), and with the one-sided distribution of \( H(t) \) that

\[
\bar{t} = E(t) = \int_{0}^{\infty} \left[ 1 - H(t) \right] dt . \tag{3.41}
\]
Fig. 3.5(a). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta_t)$ of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta_t$, $\lambda_1\lambda_t = 2$. Use lower scale for dashed lines.
Fig. 3.5(b). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta_t)$ of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration $t'/\Delta_t$, $\lambda_f\lambda_t = 3$. Use lower scale for dashed lines.
Fig. 3.5(c). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta_t)$ of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta_t$. $\lambda_1 \Delta_t = 4$. Use lower scale for dashed lines.
Fig. 3.5(d). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta_t)$ of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta_t$. $\lambda t = 8$. Use lower scale for dashed lines.
Fig. 3.5(f). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta t)$ of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta t$. $\lambda_1 \lambda_t = 32$. 

Use lower scale for dashed lines.

t/\Delta t - Normalized Error Pulse Duration

\[
\gamma \Delta t = \frac{m \lambda_1 \lambda_1 \Delta t}{\Delta t T}
\]
Fig. 3.5(h). Distribution function $H(t/\Delta_t)$ of normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta_t$ vs. normalized error pulse duration $t/\Delta_t$. $\lambda_f^\lambda_f = 128$. Use lower scale for dashed line.
\[ \lambda \gamma \frac{\Delta}{\tau} = 256 \]

\[ \gamma \Delta = \frac{m \lambda \gamma \frac{\Delta}{\tau}}{\Lambda \frac{\tau}{\tau}} \]

Use lower scale for dashed lines

\[ t/\Delta - \text{Normalized Error Pulse Duration} \]

Fig. 3.5(i). Distribution function \( H(t/\Delta) \) of normalized error pulse duration vs. normalized error pulse duration \( t/\Delta \). \( \lambda \gamma \lambda = 256 \).
Or, substituting (3.38) into (3.41)

\[ \bar{t} = \int_{0}^{\infty} \left[ 1 - P_5(t) \right] \left[ 1 - P_7(t) \right] \lambda_f \lambda_t^{-1} dt \]  

(3.42)

Let the \( t \) axis be partitioned in \( n \) successive intervals of duration \( \Delta_t \). For \( t \) in any interval, \( P_5(t) \), \( P_7(t) \) can be described by a finite series of functions using (3.29) and (3.35). In any interval, \( [1 - P_7(t)] \lambda_f \lambda_t^{-1} \) can be expressed by a multinomial expansion, and the terms in the product \( [1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)] \lambda_f \lambda_t^{-1} \) can be determined. If (3.42) is evaluated by integrating the terms in the product \( [1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)] \lambda_f \lambda_t^{-1} \) in successive intervals of duration \( \Delta_t \), practical difficulties are encountered because for \( t \to \infty \) the number of terms becomes infinite. These difficulties are bypassed in the approximations for \( \bar{t} \) which are given in Section 3.3.3.

3.3.3 Approximations for the Mean Duration, \( \bar{t} \), of an Error Pulse. Although, as was pointed out in Section 3.3.2, an infinite number of terms is required to determine \( \bar{t} \) exactly, only a finite number of terms is required to approximate \( \bar{t} \) to any desired degree of accuracy. Two approximations, \( \bar{t} \) and \( \tilde{t} \), for \( \bar{t} \) will be given in this section.

A practical method of approximating \( \bar{t} \) of (3.42), using machine computation, is to evaluate \( \tilde{t} \), which is defined by
\[ \tilde{t} \cong \tilde{t} = \int_{0}^{a} \frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t}{[1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)]} \lambda_t^{-1} \, dt \quad (3.43) \]

Using (3.43), numerical values of \( \tilde{t} \) have been determined with an IBM 7090 computer; these numerical computations are used in Section 3.3.4.

The value of \( a \) is such that \( 1 - H(a) = .02 \); it is expected that the error in \( \tilde{t} \) resulting from this approximation is of the order of one percent for all values of the parameters.

A second approximation for \( \tilde{t} \) is determined now. \(^1\) Approximate but quite accurate results can be obtained for \( \tilde{t} \) for \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \) and for \( \gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0 \). Note in Figs. 3.5a through 3.5i that for \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \) and \( \gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0 \), \( H(t) \cong 1 \) for \( t \geq \Delta_t \). It follows that

\[
1 - H(t) \cong 0 ; \quad t \geq \Delta_t \\
\lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \\
\gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0
\quad (3.44)
\]

Therefore from (3.41),

\[
\tilde{t} = \int_{0}^{\infty} [1 - H(t)] \, dt = \int_{0}^{\Delta_t} [1 - H(t)] \, dt + \int_{\Delta_t}^{\infty} [1 - H(t)] \, dt .
\quad (3.45)
\]

\(^1\)This method of approximation is taken from Ref. 16.
Define

\[ \tilde{t} = \int_0^{\Delta_t} [1 - H(t)] \, dt. \quad (3.46) \]

Substituting (3.46) into (3.45),

\[ \tilde{t} = \tilde{t} + \int_{\Delta_t}^{\infty} [1 - H(t)] \, dt \quad (3.47) \]

Substituting (3.44) into (3.47)

\[ \tilde{t} \sim \tilde{t} = \int_0^{\Delta_t} [1 - H(t)] \, dt; \quad \lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \]

\[ \gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0 \quad (3.48) \]

From (3.38)

\[ 1 - H(t) = [1 - P_5(t)] [1 - P_7(t)]^{\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1} \quad (3.38) \]

For \( t \) in the range \( 0 \leq t \leq \Delta_t \), (3.29) can be written as (3.49).

\[ 1 - P_5(t) = 1; \quad t \leq \Delta_t \quad (3.49) \]

Similarly, (3.33) can be written as (3.50).

\[ 1 - P_7(t) = 1; \quad t < 0 \]
$$1 - P_{\gamma}(t) = 1 - \frac{e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} (\gamma t); \quad 0 \leq t < \Delta_t \quad (3.50)$$

Substituting (3.49) and (3.50) in (3.38)

$$1 - H(t) = 1; \quad t < 0$$

$$1 - H(t) = \left[ 1 - \frac{e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} (\gamma t) \right]^\frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t}{2} - 1 \quad ; \quad 0 \leq t < \Delta_t \quad (3.51)$$

From (3.44),

$$1 - H(t) \approx 0; \quad t \geq \Delta_t$$

Substituting (3.51) into (3.48), and integrating,

$$\bar{t} = \frac{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{\gamma \lambda_f \lambda_t e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} \left\{ 1 - \left[ 1 - \frac{(\gamma \Delta_t) e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}} \right]^\frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t}{2} \right\}; \quad \lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \quad \gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0 \quad (3.52)$$

3.3.4 Determination of the Error Rate at the AND Gate Output.

In this section, an expression will be determined for the average number of error pulses per second at the output of a RADA receiver AND gate.

Consider the ensemble of AND gate error pulse trains of
duration \( \tau \) produced by \( m \) interfering RADA transmitters; \( \tau \) is chosen sufficiently large that truncation of error pulses at the extremes of the interval does not significantly affect the average duration of error pulses in the interval. Let there be \( K(K \rightarrow \infty) \) ensemble members of duration \( \tau \), each denoted by the index \( k \). Different ensemble members are generated by different groups of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) statistically independent Poisson pulse epoch processes at the \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) AND gate inputs.

Define:

- \( t^{(k)}_n \) the duration of the \( n \)th error pulse of the \( k \)th ensemble member.
- \( n^{(k)}_n \) enumerator of the \( n \)th error pulse in the \( k \)th ensemble member.
- \( N^{(k)}(\tau) \) number of error pulses in the \( k \)th ensemble member.
- \( \bar{N} \) the expected number of error pulses per second.
- \( r \) let a single error pulse process be formed by placing successive ensemble members "end to end" so that the end of the \( \tau \) second duration of the \( k \)th ensemble member corresponds to the beginning of the \( \tau \) second duration of the \( (k+1) \)st ensemble member. The quantity \( r \) is the index of successive error pulses of this error pulse process.
- \( t^r \) the duration of the error pulse which corresponds to the index value \( r \).
\[ \bar{t} \]  the mean of \( t_n^{(k)} \).

The duty factor \( P_m^{(k)} \) of the kth ensemble member is,

\[
P_m^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{n^{(k)} = 1}^{N^{(k)}(\tau)} t_n^{(k)} \tag{3.53}
\]

The expected duty factor is,

\[
P_m = \mathbb{E} \left[ P_m^{(k)} \right] = \lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^{K} P_m^{(k)}
\]

\[= \lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \left( \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{n^{(k)}} t_n^{(k)} \right) \tag{3.54}
\]

\[= \lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \left( \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{r=1}^{K} t_r \right) = \lim_{K \to \infty} \frac{1}{K} \left( \frac{K \tau \bar{N}}{\sum_{r=1}^{K} t_r} \right) = \bar{N} \bar{t}
\]

Thus,

\[
\bar{N} = \frac{P_m}{\bar{t}} \tag{3.55}
\]
The average number of AND gate output pulses in a frame period is \( \bar{\bar{N}} \bar{T} \). The average number of AND gate output pulses per second is \( \bar{N} \).

An approximate computer solution for \( \bar{N} \) has been obtained by substituting \( \bar{t} \) of (3.43) into (3.53). The approximation \( \bar{t} \) for \( \bar{t} \) is determined using a value of \( a \) determined by \( 1 - H(a) = .02 \). It is expected that the error in \( \bar{t} \), corresponding to this value of \( a \), is of the order of one percent, for all values of the parameters. In Ref. 16, an approximate solution for \( \bar{N} \) is obtained by substituting \( \bar{t} \) of (3.52) into (3.55); this solution gives an accurate approximation for \( \bar{N} \) for \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \geq 4 \) and \( \gamma \Delta_t \leq 1.0 \).

The quantity \( \bar{N} \Delta_t \) is plotted in Fig. 3.6 as a function of \( \gamma \Delta_t \) with \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) as parameter. \( \bar{N} \bar{T} \) is plotted in Fig. 3.7 as a function of \( m \frac{\lambda_f}{\Lambda_f} \) with \( \Delta_t \) as parameter, and with \( \lambda_f = 3, \lambda_t = 1, \bar{T} = 125 \) microseconds; these parameter values correspond to those of prototype RACEP systems (Appendix A). The quantity \( N T_c \) is plotted in Fig. 3.8 as a function of \( m k \frac{\lambda_f}{\Lambda_f} \) with \( \Delta_t \) as parameter, and with \( \lambda_f = 3, \lambda_t = 1, T_c = 26 \) microseconds; these parameter values correspond to those of prototype RADEM systems.

3.3.5 Properties of the Error Pulse Process at the Receiver

AND Gate Output. In this section, a new approximation will be obtained for the probability distribution function of the time to the epoch of an error pulse, given that no error pulse is present initially. This result will be used in Section 3.3.6 to determine the probability that at least
Fig. 3.6. Average number of error pulses per pulse duration $S_{\Delta} y_{\Delta}$ vs. mutual interference parameter, $y_{\Delta}$. 

$y_{\Delta} = \frac{m_{i} \lambda_{i} \Delta_{\lambda}}{\lambda_{\Delta} T}$

Mutual Interference Parameter
Fig. 3.7. Average number of error pulses per information pulse $N \bar{T}$ vs. $m \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_r}$, $T = 125$ microseconds, $\lambda_r = 3$, $\lambda_r = 1$. 

$T = 125$ microseconds

$\lambda_r = 3$

$\lambda_r = 1$
Fig. 3.8. Average number of error pulses per information pulse $S_T$ vs.

$$m_{\lambda_f}^\lambda_T$$

$T_c = 26$ microseconds, $\lambda_f = 3$, $\lambda_T = 1$. 
one error pulse occurs in a given time interval.

The quantities $H(t)$ and $\bar{t}$ provide a fairly complete description of the error process at the AND gate output. The process has three distinct states, an ON state, a transition state, and an OFF state. After an error pulse epoch, the process is in the ON state and is described by the distribution function $H(t)$. The transition state begins when the error pulse output stops, and ends when either an error pulse appears or $\Delta_t$ seconds elapse, whichever occurs first. If $\Delta_t$ seconds elapse first, the process is in the OFF state and is described, approximately, by Poisson statistics and the parameter $\bar{N}$.

The significance of the transition state is that within $\Delta_t$ seconds of the last occurrence of an error pulse, the probability of the epoch of an error pulse in a time interval $\Delta_t$ is dependent upon the fact that an error pulse occurred within the last $\Delta_t$ seconds. Assuming that the transition state ends after $\Delta_t$ seconds (there is no error pulse epoch in the $\Delta_t$ second transition period) the process goes to the OFF state. In the OFF state, the probability of occurrence of an error pulse epoch in any small time interval of $\Delta_t$ seconds duration is constant. The distribution of the time to the epoch of an error pulse, measured from any time instant in the OFF state is, therefore, exponential.

As an approximation, assume that the OFF state begins when the error pulse ceases, and that there is no transition state. With this assumption, the mean time $1/\gamma'$ from the beginning of the OFF state to
the epoch of the next error pulse is equal to the difference in the mean interval, $1/\bar{N}$ between error pulse epochs and the mean error pulse duration $\bar{t}$. That is

$$\frac{1}{\gamma'} = \frac{1}{\bar{N}} - \bar{t} \quad (3.56)$$

or

$$\gamma' = \frac{\bar{N}}{1 - \bar{N} \bar{t}} \quad (3.57)$$

Substituting (3.55) into (3.57),

$$\gamma' = \frac{\bar{N}}{1 - \bar{P}_m} \quad (3.58)$$

When the duty factor $P_m$ is much smaller than unity, as will frequently be true,

$$\gamma' \cong \bar{N}; \quad P_m << 1 \quad (3.59)$$

Let $P_m(\tau)$ be the probability distribution of the time, $\tau$, to the epoch of an error pulse, measured from any time instant in the OFF state. Then

$$P_m(\tau) = 0 \quad ; \quad \tau < 0$$

$$P_m(\tau) \cong \tilde{P}_m(\tau) = 1 - e^{-\gamma'\tau} \quad ; \quad \tau \geq 0 \quad (3.60)$$
By definition, $P_m(\tau)$ is also the probability that there is at least one error pulse epoch in the time interval $\tau$. The probability distribution function $\tilde{P}_m(\tau)$ is used in Section 3.3.6.

3.3.6 Approximation and Lower Bound for the Probability of an Error Pulse in a Time Interval. In this section, the approximate distribution of the duration of the AND gate output OFF-state process described in Section 3.3.5 is used to determine approximations, $\tilde{p}_e(\tau_e)$ and $\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e)$, for the probability density and distribution functions $p_e(\tau_e)$, $P_e(\tau_e)$ which will be employed in Section 3.4 to evaluate the performance of gated receivers.

Let $\tau_e$ be the time from the opening of the post gate to the first occurrence of an error pulse; $\tau_e = 0$ if there is an error pulse at the AND gate output when the post gate opens; otherwise $\tau_e$ is the time from the opening of the post gate to the epoch of the first error pulse.

The probability distribution function of $\tau_e$ equals the probability that either there is an error pulse at the AND gate output when the post gate opens, or there is no error pulse then, and at least one error pulse epoch occurs within $\tau_e$ seconds of the opening of the post gate.

The probability distribution of $\tau_e$ is,

$$P_e(\tau_e) = 0 ; \quad \tau_e < 0$$

$$P_e(\tau_e) = P_m + (1 - P_m) P_m(\tau_e) ; \quad \tau_e \geq 0$$

(3.61)
Substituting the approximation \( \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(\tau_e) \) for \( P_m(\tau_e) \) in (3.61) gives an approximation \( \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) \) for \( P_e(\tau_e) \).

\[
\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) = 0 \quad ; \quad \tau_e < 0
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) = P_m + (1 - P_m) \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_m(\tau_e) ; \quad \tau_e \geq 0
\]  

(3.62)

Substituting (3.60) into (3.62) and differentiating, an approximation \( \tilde{p}_e(\tau_e) \) is determined for the density function \( p_e(\tau_e) \) of \( \tau_e \).

\[
p_e(\tau_e) \approx \tilde{p}_e(\tau_e) = 0 ; \quad \tau_e < 0
\]

\[
p_e(\tau_e) \approx \tilde{p}_e(\tau_e) = P_m \delta(\tau_e) + (1 - P_m) \gamma' e^{-\gamma' \tau_e}
\]  

(3.63)

A lower bound \( \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) \) for \( P_e(\tau_e) \) will be determined now which applies when \( \Delta_t \) divides \( \tau_e \). Let the AND gate output be sampled once every \( \Delta_t \) seconds in the closed \( \tau_e \) second interval. There are \( \frac{\tau_e + \Delta_t}{\Delta_t} \) samples in the interval. The quantity \( \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) \) is the probability that at least one sample is an error pulse sample.

\[
\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_e(\tau_e) = 1 - (1 - P_m)^{\frac{\tau_e + \Delta_t}{\Delta_t}}
\]  

(3.64)

Substituting (3.1) into (3.63)
\[
\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e) = 1 - \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t} \right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t} \right]^{\frac{\tau_e + \Delta t}{\Delta t}} \tag{3.65}
\]

If at least one of the samples is an error pulse sample, then there must be at least one error pulse in the interval \(\tau_e\), whereas the converse is not true. It follows that

\[
\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e) < P_e(\tau_e). \tag{3.66}
\]

Future results will indicate that, in the range of \(m\) for which mutual interference is not excessive, the average width of error pulses will be somewhat less than \(\Delta_t\), so that error pulses will frequently occur between samples. It follows that \(\tilde{P}_e(\tau)\) is not a close lower bound for \(P_e(\tau)\).

It follows from (3.62), that \(P_m\) is also a lower bound for \(P_e(\tau_e)\). It follows from (3.64) that \(P_m \leq \tilde{P}_e(\tau_e)\) and, hence, that \(P_m\) is a lower bound of \(P_e(\tau_e)\) than is \(\tilde{P}_e(\tau_e)\). Summarizing,

\[
P_m < \tilde{P}_e(\tau_e) < P_e(\tau_e) \approx \tilde{P}_e(\tau_e) \tag{3.67}
\]

The lower bounds for \(P_e(\tau_e)\) are useful in making quick, coarse approximations for \(P_e(\tau_e)\).
3.4 Measures of RADA System Performance

Several different measures of RADA system performance will be described in this section. Different measures will be required depending on the type of modulation and the type of receiver to be used in the system. Pulse position modulation and clocked binary modulation; ungated and synchronized gated and sampling receivers will be considered.

3.4.1 Duty Factor of Error Pulses at the AND Gate Output of an Ungated Receiver. In a RADA system using PPM or clocked binary modulation, and in ungated receivers, the duty factor $P_m$ of the error pulses at the output of the receiver AND gate is a measure of the severity of the mutual interference.

$$
P_m = \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta t}\right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t} \quad (3.1)
$$

Because the effect of error pulse interference depends on the duration and number of error pulses as well as on the duty factor, $P_m$ is not a precise measure of the mutual interference.

At the present time, data are not available which relate the quality and intelligibility of voice directly to the duty factor of error pulses for various types of modulation.

The quantity $P_m$ is plotted as a function of $\gamma \Delta t$ with $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ as a parameter in Fig. 3.1.
3.4.2 Number of Error Pulses at the Output of an Ungated Receiver. The average number $\bar{N} \bar{T}$ of error pulses per message pulse, or $\bar{N}$ per second, is a measure of performance for RADA systems using either pulse position or clocked binary modulation and an ungated receiver. For $\bar{N} \bar{T}$ to have a concrete meaning it is necessary to convert the error pulse rate into some measure of intelligibility of the demodulated information signal as discussed in Section 3.1.

An expression for $\bar{N}$ is given by (3.55), along with (3.1) and (3.43) or (3.52). $\bar{N} \Delta_t$ is plotted as a function of $\gamma \Delta_t$ and parameters $\lambda_1 \lambda_t$ in Fig. 3.6.

3.4.3 False Alarm Probability and Rate for a RADA System Using Pulse Position Modulation with a Synchronized Gated Receiver. Assume a RADA system using pulse position modulation. The receiver is synchronized and uses a gate of width $T_p$. A type one false alarm occurs when there is at least one error pulse in the interval between the opening of the post gate and the epoch of the message pulse (see Section 3.1). Let the expected epoch of a message pulse be used as the time reference and assume the gate interval is centered on the expected center position of a message pulse. With respect to this time reference, a particular gate interval begins at time $\frac{-T_p + \Delta_t}{2}$ and ends at time $\frac{T_p + \Delta_t}{2}$. For a message pulse to be completely within the gate interval, the epoch of the message pulse must be within the closed interval $\left[\frac{-T_p - \Delta_t}{2}, \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2}\right]$. 
Let $\tau_r$ be the time of the epoch of the message pulse. Let the probability density of $\tau_r$ be $p_r(\tau_r)$.

Let $\tau_e$ be the time from the opening of the post gate to the first occurrence of an error pulse; $\tau_e = 0$ if there is an error pulse at the AND gate output when the post gate opens, otherwise $\tau_e$ is the time from the opening of the post gate to the epoch of the first error pulse. The probability density and distribution functions of $\tau_e$ are $p_e(\tau_e)$ and $P_e(\tau_e)$.

Let $[\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_n]$ be the joint event $\omega_1$ occurs and $\omega_2$ occurs---and $\omega_n$ occurs. (Although the same notation is used for a closed interval, the application of the notation will be clear in each case.)

The event a type one false alarm is the union of events, as

$$\Delta \tau_r \rightarrow 0;$$

$$\left[\frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_r < \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \Delta \tau_r, \quad \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_e \leq \tau_r \right] \cup$$

$$\left[\frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \Delta \tau_r \leq \tau_r < \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + 2\Delta \tau_r, \quad \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_e \leq \tau_r \right]$$

$$\left[\frac{T_p - \Delta t}{2} - \Delta \tau_r \leq \tau_r \leq \frac{T_p - \Delta t}{2}, \quad \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_e \leq \tau_r \right].$$

(3.68)

The bracketed events are mutually exclusive since the epoch $\tau_r$ of the position modulated message pulse will occur in just one of the intervals.
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2}, & \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \Delta r
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \Delta r, & \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + 2\Delta r
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3.69)

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\frac{T_p - \Delta t}{2} - \Delta r, & \frac{T_p - \Delta t}{2}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

It follows that the probability of a type one false alarm is the sum of the probabilities of the bracketed events in expression (3.68)

\[
P_{1FA}(T_p) = \lim_{\Delta r \to 0} \sum_{\ell=0}^{T_p - \Delta t} \left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \leq \tau \leq \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + (\ell + 1) \Delta r \right] + (\ell + 1) \Delta r, \quad \frac{T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_e \leq \tau_r
\]

(3.70)

Since

\[
P\left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \leq \tau \leq \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + (\ell + 1) \Delta r \right],
\]

is the joint probability of two independent events, it can be written as the product of the probabilities of the individual events.
\[
P\left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \leq r < \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + (\ell + 1) \Delta r, \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq r \leq \tau_r \right] \\
= P\left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \leq \tau_r < \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + (\ell + 1) \Delta r \right] \\
P\left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \leq \tau_e \leq \tau_r \right]. \tag{3.71}
\]

Substituting (3.71) into (3.70) and evaluating the limit there results,

\[
P_{1PA}(T_p) = \lim_{\Delta r \to 0} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\frac{T_p - \Delta t}{\Delta r}} P\left[ \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \leq \tau_r < \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + (\ell + 1) \Delta r \right] \\
= \lim_{\Delta r \to 0} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\frac{T_p - \Delta t}{\Delta r}} p_r\left( \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} + \ell \Delta r \right) \Delta r \int_{0}^{\tau_r - \left( \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \right)} p_e(\tau_e) \, d\tau_e \\
= \int_{-\frac{T_p + \Delta t}{2}}^{\frac{T_p - \Delta t}{2}} p_r(\tau_r) \, d\tau_r \int_{0}^{\tau_r - \left( \frac{-T_p + \Delta t}{2} \right)} p_e(\tau_e) \, d\tau_e \tag{3.72}
\]
From (3.72), it is apparent that both $p_e(\tau_e)$, the density function of the time to the epoch of an error pulse and $p_r(\tau_r)$ the density function of the epoch of the position modulated message pulses must be known.

Subject to the assumptions of (3.63)

$$p_e(\tau_e) \approx \tilde{p}_e(\tau_e) = P_m \delta(\tau_e) + (1 - P_m) \gamma' e^{-\gamma' \tau_e}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.63)$$

where

$$\gamma' = \frac{\bar{N}}{1 - P_m} \hspace{1cm} (3.58)$$

Substituting (3.63) into the second integral on the right hand side of (3.72)

$$\int_0^{\tau_r - \left(-\frac{T_p + \Delta_t}{2}\right)} p_e(\tau_e) \, d\tau_e \approx \int_0^{\tau_r - \left(-\frac{T_p + \Delta_t}{2}\right)} \left[ P_m \delta(\tau_e) \\
+ (1 - P_m) \gamma' e^{-\gamma' \tau_e} \right] \, d\tau_e$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.73)$$

$$= P_m + (1 - P_m) \left[ 1 - e^{-\gamma' \left(\tau_r + \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2}\right)} \right]$$

Substituting (3.73) into (3.72)
$$P_{1\text{FA}}(T_p) \approx \int_{-T_p + \Delta_t \over 2}^{T_p - \Delta_t \over 2} p_r(\tau_r) \left\{ P_m + (1 - P_m) \right\}$$

$$\left[ 1 - e^{-\gamma' \left( \tau_r + \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \right] d\tau_r$$

(3.74)

Since it is assumed that the position-modulated message pulse will always fall in the gate interval,

$$P_{1\text{FA}}(T_p) \approx 1 - (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \int_{-T_p + \Delta_t \over 2}^{T_p - \Delta_t \over 2} e^{-\gamma' \tau_r} p_r(\tau_r) d\tau_r$$

(3.75)

When $p_r(\tau_r)$ is known exactly, (3.75) can be used to determine $P_{1\text{FA}}$. If $p_r(\tau_r)$ is not known, but some moments are known, or if the integral cannot be evaluated in a convenient form, an approximate expression for (3.75) may be used which is obtained by expanding the exponential in the integral.

$$P_{1\text{FA}}(T_p) \approx 1 - (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \left[ 1 - \gamma' \tau_r + \frac{(\gamma')^2}{2!} \tau_r^2 \right.$$  

$$- \frac{(\gamma')^3}{3!} \tau_r^3 + \ldots + (-1)^n \frac{(\gamma')^n}{n!} \tau_r^n \right]$$

(3.76)
where \( \tau_r^n \) is the nth moment of the density of \( \tau_r \). Above, \( \tau_r = 0 \) because of the way in which the time origin for \( \tau_r \) has been defined.

Thus,

\[
P_{1FA}(T_p) \propto \left[ 1 - (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \right] - \left[ (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \right] \times \left[ \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{(\gamma')^n}{n!} \tau_r^n \right] \quad (3.77)
\]

Alternately, from (3.72)

\[
P_{1FA}(T_p) = \int_{-T_p + \Delta_t / 2}^{T_p - \Delta_t / 2} p_r(\tau_r) P_e \left( \tau_r + \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right) d\tau_r \quad (3.78)
\]

The type one false alarm rate is given by

\[
R_{1FA}(T_p) = \frac{P_{1FA}(T_p)}{T} \quad (3.79)
\]

3.4.4 False Alarm Probability and Rate for a RADA System

Using Clocked Binary Modulation, with a Synchronized, Gated Receiver.

Assume a RADA system using clocked, binary (pulse or no pulse) modulation. Let \( k \) be the average fraction of on-modulated pulses. The
receiver uses a post gate with a gate interval $T_p$ seconds, which is synchronized. If there is at least one post gate output pulse in the interval $T_p$, the receiver demodulator will assume a message pulse was present in that interval. The only type of error which this receiver can commit is a "type two false alarm" which occurs when there is no message pulse in the gate interval and when there is at least one error pulse in the gate interval.

Let $P_e(T_p)$ be the probability that there is at least one error pulse in the post gate interval. Then the probability $P_{2\text{FA}}(T_p)$ of a type two false alarm is,

$$P_{2\text{FA}}(T_p) = (1 - k) P_e(T_p).$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.80)

The type two false alarm rate $R_{2\text{FA}}(T_p)$ is defined by

$$R_{2\text{FA}}(T_p) = \frac{P_{2\text{FA}}(T_p)}{T_c}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.81)

### 3.4.5 False Alarm Probability and Rate of a Synchronized Sampling RADA Receiver, Clocked Binary Modulation

Assume for a RADA system using clocked binary modulation that a message is received and interference is present. The receiver is synchronized to the message pulse train by some method, perhaps as suggested in Section 1.6.2. A new type of receiver is proposed which samples the AND gate output synchronously with the times at which message pulses might occur. The quantity $k$ is the fraction of on-modulated pulses in the
clocked binary pulse train. Since the probability of pulse cancellation is assumed negligible and the receiver is assumed synchronized, false alarms are the only kind of errors which can occur in reception.

The probability of a false alarm, \( P_{SFA} \) is

\[
P_{SFA} = (1-k) P_m
\]  
(3.82)

and the false alarm rate is

\[
R_{SFA} = \frac{P_{SFA}}{T_c} = \frac{1-k}{T_c} P_m
\]  
(3.83)

The sampling receiver is a practical type of receiver. The false alarm probability of this receiver is a lower bound of the false alarm rate of the clocked binary modulation RADA system using a synchronized gated receiver. This is apparent heuristically since the sampling procedure can be interpreted as using a gate interval \( T_p \to 0 \), and since a small gate interval is the most effective in gating interference. It is also apparent from (3.62), (3.67), and (3.80) and since

\[
\lim_{T_p \to 0} P_e(T_p) = P_m
\]  
(3.84)

3.4.6 Information Rate of a RADA System Using Clocked Binary Modulation and a Gated or Sampling Receiver. In this section, the rate of transmission of information will be determined for a RADA
system using clocked binary modulation and a gated or sampling receiver.

Let $i$ be an index for the state of the RADA system transmitter output in a particular clock period. If no frame is transmitted in that clock period $i = 0$. If a frame is transmitted $i = 1$. Let $j$ be an index of the state of the receiver post gate or sampler output corresponding to the same clock period. If the post gate or sampler output is zero volts in the frame period, $j = 0$. If the post gate or sampler output is a received pulse or pulse sample, or an error pulse or pulse sample, $j = 1$. The quantities

$$P(i), P(j), P(j|i)$$

are respectively the probability of: transmitter state $i$; receiver state $j$; receiver state $j$ given transmitter state $i$. These probabilities will also be designated more specifically as $P(i=0)$, $P(i=1)$, and so forth.

The expressions for the entropies which will be required are:

$$H(j) = - \sum_{j=0,1} P(j) \log_2 P(j)$$

(3.85)

$$H(j|i) = - \sum_{i=0,1} P(i) \sum_{j=0,1} P(j|i) \log_2 P(j|i)$$

(3.86)

Since

$$P(j) = \sum_{i=0,1} P(j|i) P(i)$$

(3.87)
\[ H(j) = \sum_{j=0,1} \left\{ \sum_{i=0,1} \left[ \frac{P(j|i) \cdot P(i)}{\sum_{i=0,1} P(j|i) \cdot P(i)} \right] \log_2 \left[ \frac{P(j|i) \cdot P(i)}{\sum_{i=0,1} P(j|i) \cdot P(i)} \right] \right\} \]

\[ = - \left\{ [P(j=0|i=0) \cdot P(i=0) + P(j=0|i=1) \cdot P(i=1)] \log_2 \right. \]

\[ \left. [P(j=0|i=0) \cdot P(i=0) + P(j=0|i=1) \cdot P(i=1)] \right\} \]

\[ + [P(j=1|i=0) \cdot P(i=0) + P(j=1|i=1) \cdot P(i=1)] \log_2 [P(j=1|i=0) \cdot P(i=0) \]

\[ + P(j=1|i=1) \cdot P(i=1)] \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.88)

\[ H(j|i) = - \sum_{i=0,1} P(i) \sum_{j=0,1} P(j|i) \log_2 P(j|i) \]

\[ = - \left\{ P(i=0) \left[ P(j=0|i=0) \log_2 P(j=0|i=0) + P(j=1|i=0) \log_2 P(j=1|i=0) \right] \right. \]

\[ \left. + P(i=1) \left[ P(j=0|i=1) \log_2 P(j=0|i=1) + P(j=1|i=1) \log_2 P(j=1|i=1) \right] \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.89)

Let \( \rho = \mathbb{P}_e(T_p) \) for the gated receiver. Let \( \rho = \mathbb{P}_m \) for the sampling receiver. The probabilities are explicitly:

\[ P(i=0) = 1 - k \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.90)

\[ P(i=1) = k \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.91)

\[ P(j=0|i=0) = 1 - \rho \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.92)

\[ P(j=1|i=0) = \rho \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.93)

\[ P(j=0|i=1) = 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.94)

\[ P(j=1|i=1) = 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.95)
The expression for the rate $R$, per clock period, at which information is transmitted by the system is given by Ref. 3.

$$R = H(j) - H(j | i) \text{ bits per clock period} \quad (3.96)$$

Substituting the probabilities (3.90) through (3.95) into the entropy expressions (3.88) and (3.89) and the entropy expressions into (3.96)

$$R = - \left\{ \left[ (1 - \rho)(1 - k) \right] \log_2 \left[ (1 - \rho)(1 - k) \right] \\
+ \left[ \rho(1 - k) + k \right] \log_2 \left[ \rho(1 - k) + k \right] \right\} \quad (3.97)$$

$$+ (1 - k) \left[ \rho \log_2 (1 - \rho) + \rho \log_2 \rho \right] \text{ bits per clock period.}$$

In terms of the function

$$\mathcal{F}(P) = -[P \log_2 P + (1 - P) \log_2 (1 - P)] \quad (3.98)$$

$$R = \mathcal{F}[(1 - \rho)(1 - k)] - (1 - k) \mathcal{F}(\rho) \text{ bits per clock period} \quad (3.99)$$

Equations (3.97) and (3.99) are expressions for the rate at which information is transmitted by a RADA system using clocked binary modulation and a gated or sampling receiver; in general, when $k = 0.5$, and when there is little mutual interference, the rate approaches its maximum value of 0.5 bit per clock period. The rate $R$ is not referred to as the channel capacity of a RADA system since it is assumed here that the source is not necessarily matched to the channel. This assumption is thus consistent with the usual practice of using the direct transmitter
modulator output (without first coding it to maximize the information rate) to drive the transmitter RADA coder. Matching of the source and channel can be achieved either by properly coding the modulated signal prior to RADA coding, or by employing optimal modulations. It appears that coding of the modulator output, prior to RADA coding, would defeat the current simplicity of RADA equipment. Numerical values for the information rate of a RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver are obtained in Section 6.6.
CHAPTER IV
EXAMPLES OF RADA SYSTEM PERFORMANCE

4.1 Examples

In this chapter, the results given in Chapter III will be applied to the evaluation of the performance of three specific RADA systems. The three systems will be designated System One, System Two, and System Three. System One employs pulse position modulation, while System Two and System Three employ clocked binary modulation. Ungated and gated receivers, respectively, are assumed for System One and System Two. System Three employs a sampling receiver.

System One--A system using pulse position modulation

An ungated receiver is assumed in Examples 1(a) through 1(e). Then a gated receiver is assumed in Example 1(f).

System One Parameter Values

\[ \lambda_f = 3 \quad \Delta_t = 1.5 \text{ microseconds} \]
\[ \Lambda_f = 3 \quad T = 125 \text{ microseconds} \]
\[ \lambda_t = 1 \]
Ungated Receiver in Examples 1(a) Through 1(e)

**Example 1(a).** Determine the number $m$ of transmitting transceivers which produce an average error pulse rate of .1 error pulse per frame interval, i.e., given the parameter values above, determine $m$ when $\overline{N \frac{T}{}} = .1$.

**Solution 1(a).** From the data given for Example 1(a)

$$\overline{N \frac{T}{}} = \overline{N \Delta_t \frac{T}{\Delta_t}} = .10$$

Hence

$$\overline{N \Delta_t} = .10 \frac{\Delta_t}{\overline{T}} = 1.20 \times 10^{-3}$$

Using the $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3$ curve in Fig. 3.7, the abscissa corresponding to the ordinate $\overline{N \frac{T}{}} = .1$ is $m \lambda_f / \Lambda_f = m = 6.50 \approx 7$.

$$\gamma \Delta_t = \frac{m \lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f \overline{T}} = 7.80 \times 10^{-2}$$

Alternately, using the normalized curves of Fig. 3.6, for $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3$, the abscissa corresponding to the ordinate $\overline{N \Delta_t} = 1.20 \times 10^{-3}$ is $\gamma \Delta_t = 7.80 \times 10^{-2}$. Hence $m = 6.50 \approx 7$.

**Example 1(b).** Determine the receiver output error pulse duty factor $P_m$ when there are $m$ transmitting transceivers, $m$ given by Solution 1(a).
Solution 1(b). From Solution 1(a), $\gamma\Delta_t = 7.80 \times 10^{-2}$. The curve in Fig. 3.1 for $\lambda t = 3$ is used. The ordinate of this curve corresponding to the abscissa $\gamma\Delta_t = 7.80 \times 10^{-2}$ is $P_m = 4.20 \times 10^{-4}$, which is the duty factor of the error pulses at the RADA receiver AND gate output.

Example 1(c). Determine the probability distribution function of the width of error pulses at the receiver output for $m$ given in Solution 1(a).

Solution 1(c). Interpolate a curve for $\gamma\Delta_t = 7.80 \times 10^{-2}$ between the $\gamma\Delta_t = 10^{-1}$ and $\gamma\Delta_t = 10^{-3}$ curves of Fig. 3.5(b). The interpolated curve is approximately the same as the curve for $\gamma\Delta_t = 10^{-3}$, and is the desired probability distribution function in normalized form.

Example 1(d). Assume that a receiver output network prevents error pulses of width less than $.3\Delta_t$ from entering the receiver demodulator. Using the probability distribution function found in Solution 1(c), determine the average number of error pulses which enter the receiver demodulator in a frame interval [$m$ is given by Solution 1(a)].

Solution 1(d). Using the curve determined in 1(c), the ordinate corresponding to $t/\Delta_t = .3$ is $H(.3\Delta_t) = .51$. Since 51 percent of the error pulses are of a width less than $.3\Delta_t$, the number of error pulses which enter the receiver demodulator per frame interval is

$$[1 - H(t)] N \bar{T} = (.49) (.1) = .049$$
Example 1(e). Determine the mean width of error pulses at the AND gate output for \( m \) given by Solution 1(a).

\[
\text{Solution 1(e). From (3.55), } \bar{t} = \frac{P}{N} \frac{m}{T}. \quad \text{From Solution 1(b),} \quad P_m = 4.20 \times 10^{-4}, \quad \text{hence } \bar{t} = 0.525 \text{ microsecond.}
\]

Gated Receiver (e.g., RACEP)

Example 1(f). Consider now a RADA system which has the same parameter values as System One, and which uses gated receivers. Assume that the gate interval \( T_p \) is 60 microseconds, and that the probability density function \( p_r(\tau_r) \) of message pulse positions with respect to the expected positions of message pulses is normal with a standard deviation of 10 microseconds. Determine, approximately, the probability of a type one false alarm \( P_{1FA}(T_p) \) and the false alarm rate \( R_{1FA}(T_p) \) when \( m = 15 \).

\[
\text{Solution 1(f).}
\]

\[
\gamma \Delta_t = \frac{m \lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} = 1.5 \frac{\Delta_t}{T} = 1.80 \times 10^{-1}
\]

From Fig. 3.1,

\[
P_m = 4.40 \times 10^{-3}
\]

From Fig. 3.6,

\[
\bar{N} \Delta_t = 1.20 \times 10^{-2}
\]
Hence,

\[ \bar{N} = 8.34 \times 10^3 \]

From (3.58),

\[ \gamma' = \frac{\bar{N}}{1 - \frac{P}{P_m}} \]

\[ \gamma' = \frac{8.35 \times 10^3}{1 - 4.40 \times 10^3} \approx 8.35 \times 10^3 \]

The nth (even) moment of \( p_r(\tau_r) \) when \( \tau_r \) is normally distributed is

\[ \tau_r^n = 1 \cdot 3 \cdots (n-1) \left( \tau_r^2 \right)^{n/2} \]

Substituting the moment expression into (3.77)

\[
P_{1\text{FA}}(T_p) = \left[ 1 - (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \right] - \left[ (1 - P_m) e^{-\gamma' \left( \frac{T_p - \Delta_t}{2} \right)} \right]
\]

\[
\left\{ \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n/2)!} \left[ \frac{(\gamma')^2 \tau_r^2}{2} \right]^{n/2} \right\}
\]

\[ \tau_r^2 = (10^{-5})^2 = 10^{-10} \]
\[ P_{1FA}(T_p) \approx (1 - e^{-0.246}) - e^{-0.246} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n/2)!} (3.5 \times 10^{-3})^{n/2} \]

The sum converges rapidly to a small value so that

\[ P_{1FA}(T_p) \approx (1 - e^{-0.246}) \approx 0.22 \]

The false alarm rate \( R_{1FA}(T_p) \) given by Eq. 3.79 is

\[ R_{1FA}(T_p) = \frac{P_{1FA}(T_p)}{T} = 1760 \text{ false alarms/second} \]

which is 22 percent of the 8,000 pulse per second message pulse rate.

System Two---A system using clocked binary modulation

An ungated receiver is assumed in Examples 2(a) through 2(e).

A gated receiver is assumed in Example 2(f).

System Two Parameters:

\[ \begin{align*}
  k &= 0.5 \\
  \lambda_t &= 1 \\
  \lambda_f &= 3 \\
  \Delta_t &= 0.5 \text{ microsecond} \\
  \Lambda_f &= 5 \\
  T_c &= 26 \text{ microseconds}
\end{align*} \]

Ungated Receiver in Examples 2(a) Through 2(e)

Give corresponding solutions to 1(a) through 1(e) above for the parameter values of System Two when the average error pulse rate is
.2 error pulse per frame interval, i.e., when \( \bar{N} \frac{T_c}{k} = .2 \)

**Solution 2(a).**

\[ \bar{N} \frac{T_c}{c} = \bar{N} \Delta_t \frac{T_c}{\Delta_t} = .1 \]

Hence \( \bar{N} \Delta_t = .1 \frac{\Delta_t}{T_c} = 1.925 \times 10^{-3} \).

Using the normalized curve of Fig. 3.6, the abscissa on the \( \lambda_f \lambda_t = 3 \) curve corresponding to the ordinate \( \bar{N} \Delta_t = 1.925 \times 10^{-3} \) is \( \gamma \Delta_t = 9.2 \times 10^{-2} \). Hence \( m = 15.9 \approx 16 \). Alternately, using the \( \Delta_t = .5 \) curve in Fig. 3.8, the abscissa corresponding to the ordinate \( \bar{N} \bar{T} = .1 \) is \( m k \lambda_f / \Lambda_f = 4.77 \) and \( m = 15.9 \).

**Solution 2(b).** From Solution 2(a), \( \gamma \Delta_t = 9.2 \times 10^{-2} \). From the curve for \( \lambda_f \lambda_t = 3 \) in Fig. 3.1 the ordinate corresponding to the abscissa \( \gamma \Delta_t = 9.2 \times 10^{-2} \) is \( P_m = 6.6 \times 10^{-4} \) which is the duty factor of the error pulses at the RADA receiver AND gate output.

**Solution 2(c).** Interpolate a curve for \( \gamma \Delta_t = 9.2 \times 10^{-2} \) between the curves of Fig. 3.5(b) for \( \gamma \Delta_t = .001 \) and \( \gamma \Delta_t = .10 \). The interpolated curve is approximately the same as the curve for \( \gamma \Delta_t = .10 \), and is the desired distribution function in normalized form.

**Solution 2(d).** From the curve determined in Solution 2(c), \( H(.3 \Delta_t) = .490 \). The number of error pulses which enter the receiver demodulator per frame interval is
\[ [1 - H(t)] \frac{N T_c}{k} = (.51) (.2) = .102 \]

**Solution 2(e).** From (3.55),

\[
\bar{t} = \frac{P_m}{N}
\]

Hence \( \bar{t} = .171 \) microsecond.

**Example 2(f).** Gated Receiver (e.g., RADEM). Consider a RADA system with the parameters given for System Two, using a gated receiver. Assume that the gate interval \( T_p \) is 1 microsecond. Determine the approximate probability of a type two false alarm \( P_{2FA}(T_p) \), and the type two false alarm rate \( R_{2FA}(T_p) \) when \( m = 80 \).

**Solution 2(f).**

\[
P_{2FA}(T_p) = (1 - k) P_e(T_p)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.80)

\[
R_{2FA}(T_p) = \frac{P_{2FA}(T_p)}{T_c}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.81)

where

\[
P_e(T_p) \approx P_m + (1 - P_m) \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma' T_p} \right)
\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.58)

\[
(3.60)
\]

\[
\gamma' = \frac{N}{1 - \frac{P_m}{1}}
\]

\[
(3.62)
\]
From Fig. 3.6

\[ \bar{N} \Delta_t = 1.20 \times 10^{-1}; \quad \bar{N} = 2.4 \times 10^5 \]

From Fig. 3.1

\[ P_m = 5.0 \times 10^{-2} \]

\[ \gamma' = 2.4 \times 10^5; \quad \gamma' T_p = 2.4 \times 10^{-1} \]

\[ 1 - e^{-\gamma'T_p} = 1 - e^{-0.24} = 0.214 \]

From (3.58), (3.60), and (3.62),

\[ P_e(T_p) \cong 0.253 \]

\[ P_{2FA}(T_p) \cong 0.126 \]

\[ R_{2FA}(T_p) \cong 4.85 \times 10^3, \text{ which is 25.3 percent of the } 19.2 \times 10^3 \text{ pps message pulse rate.} \]

**System Three--A system using clocked binary modulation.**

The system uses a sampling RADA receiver.

**System Three Parameters**

\[ k = 0.125 \quad \lambda_t = 1 \]

\[ \lambda_f = 3 \quad \Delta_t = 0.5 \mu \text{sec} \]

\[ \Lambda_f = 5 \quad T_c = 26 \mu \text{sec} \]
Example 3(a). Determine the system three false alarm probability $P_{SFA}$ and false alarm rate $R_{SFA}$ when $m = 80$.

Solution 3(a).

\[ P_{SFA} = (1 - k) P_m \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.82)

\[ R_{SFA} = \frac{P_{SFA}}{T_c} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.83)

\[ \gamma_{\Delta t} = \frac{mk\lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T_c} = 1.15 \times 10^{-1} \]

From (3.9),

\[ P_m = 1.30 \times 10^{-3} \]

From (3.82) and (3.83),

\[ P_{SFA} = 1.14 \times 10^{-3} \]

\[ R_{SFA} = 43.9 \text{ false alarms per second, which is } 0.912 \text{ percent of the } 4813 \text{ pps message pulse rate of System Three.} \]

4.2 Conclusions

The performance characteristics of the three systems described in Section 4.1, as well as those of two other systems, which employ sampling receivers, are presented in Table 4.1. Included in the table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Values</th>
<th>SYSTEM ONE</th>
<th>SYSTEM TWO</th>
<th>SAMPLING SYSTEM ONE</th>
<th>SAMPLING SYSTEM TWO</th>
<th>SAMPLING SYSTEM THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta t = 1.5 \mu s$</td>
<td>$\Delta t = 5 \mu s$</td>
<td>$\Delta t = 1.5 \mu s$</td>
<td>$\Delta t = 5 \mu s$</td>
<td>$\Delta t = 5 \mu s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 3$</td>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 5$</td>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 3$</td>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 5$</td>
<td>$\lambda_1 = 5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\lambda_2 = 3$</td>
<td>$\lambda_2 = 1$</td>
<td>$\lambda_2 = 3$</td>
<td>$\lambda_2 = 1$</td>
<td>$\lambda_2 = 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$T = 125 \mu s$</td>
<td>$T = 26 \mu s$</td>
<td>$T = 125 \mu s$</td>
<td>$T = 26 \mu s$</td>
<td>$T = 26 \mu s$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modulation</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>GATED</th>
<th>UNGATED</th>
<th>GATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w = 2 \lambda_1/\Delta t$</td>
<td>2.56 Mc</td>
<td>12.8 Mc</td>
<td>12.8 Mc</td>
<td>2.56 Mc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sampling</td>
<td>8 x $10^3$/sec</td>
<td>3.85 x $10^4$/sec</td>
<td>3.85 x $10^4$/sec</td>
<td>3.85 x $10^4$/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate, 1/T or 1/Tc</td>
<td>8 x $10^3$/sec</td>
<td>8 x $10^3$/sec</td>
<td>1.925 x $10^4$/sec</td>
<td>1.925 x $10^4$/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Pulse</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate, k/T or k/Tc</td>
<td>1 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>1.80 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>9.2 x $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>6.2 x $10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^a \lambda_1$</td>
<td>1.80 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>9.2 x $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>9 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>4.62 x $10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^b \lambda_1$</td>
<td>10^{-1}</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^c \lambda_1$</td>
<td>4.20 x $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>4.40 x $10^{-3}$</td>
<td>6.6 x $10^{-4}$</td>
<td>5.0 x $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^d \lambda_1$</td>
<td>.525 $\mu s$</td>
<td>.551 $\mu s$</td>
<td>.171 $\mu s$</td>
<td>.208 $\mu s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Alarm</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.2 x $10^{-1}$/sample</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.26 x $10^{-1}$/sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.26 x $10^{-1}$/sample</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.75 x $10^{-2}$/sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>$R_{FAR} = 1.76 x 10^3$/sec</td>
<td>$R_{FAR} = 4.45 x 10^{-3}$/sec</td>
<td>$R_{FAR} = 220$/sec</td>
<td>$R_{FAR} = 9.61 x 10^{-3}$/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.2 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.53 x $10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Pulse</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.53 x $10^{-1}$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.50 x $10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.00 x $10^{-2}$</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9.12 x $10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Comparison of Systems One, Two, Three.
are values of $\Delta_t$, the width of the rectangular pulses, and $W_n$, the system bandwidth. The nominal width of pulses of arbitrary shape is defined, and related to the "equivalent rectangular width," $\Delta_t$, of a pulse in Section 5.3. In particular, it is shown in that section, that the "equivalent rectangular width" of a Gaussian pulse approximately equals the width of the pulse measured between the half voltage points of the pulse envelope. The system bandwidth $W_n$ is related to the equivalent rectangular pulsewidth $\Delta_t$ in Section 5.4 by

$$W_n = 1.28 \frac{\Lambda_f}{\Delta_t}. \quad (5.22)$$

This expression for bandwidth is based upon the assumption of Gaussian transmitted pulses, and upon other assumptions as discussed in Section 5.4.

System One uses pulse position modulation; clocked 8 kc Nyquist samples of the voice waveform position-modulate the pulses of an 8 kc pulse train. The system bandwidth is $W_n = 2.56$ Mc. With $m = 7$ transmitters interfering, $\bar{N} \bar{T} = .1$, so that on the average one error pulse occurs for every ten message pulses. Thus, the system provides fair receiver output voice quality (see Section 3.1) with as many as 7 interfering transmitters.

Let System One now be modified to include a post gate which gates an interval of $\pm 30$ microseconds on either side of the expected position of a message pulse. The standard deviation of the positions of
the message pulses about their expected positions in 10 microseconds. --the message pulses almost always occur within the post gate interval. With fifteen interfering transmitters \((m = 15)\), \(P_{1FA} = .22\) for the gated receiver, so that there is approximately one false alarm, on the average, for every five post gate output message pulses. Thus, this system can accommodate 16 transmitters (including the target transmitter), but with poor quality receiver output voice signals.

Within the transmitter of System Two, delta modulation characterizes the voice information as a clocked 38.5 kc digit stream with a duty factor \(k = .5\) (an average of \(19.25 \times 10^4\) pulses per second).

System Two requires five times as much bandwidth \((W_n = 12.8 \text{ Mc})\) as System One. With \(m = 16\) interfering transmitters, and when ungated receivers are considered \(\bar{N} \bar{T} = .20\) for System Two. Although with ungated receivers, the value of \(\bar{N} \bar{T}\) is larger for System Two \((\bar{N} \bar{T} = .20)\) with \(m = 16\) than for System One \((\bar{N} \bar{T} = .10)\) with \(m = 7\), the receiver output signal quality will be approximately the same in both cases as a result of the integration of message samples in the System Two receiver. Thus, System Two can accommodate more than twice as many subscribers \((m = 16)\) as System One \((m = 7)\) with roughly equivalent quality, when ungated receivers are used in both cases.

Use of gated receivers with System Two considerably improves the system performance. With gated receivers five times as many transmitters \((m = 80)\) can be accommodated as with ungated receivers,
in the same bandwidth \( W_n = 12.8 \text{ Mc} \), and with approximately the same ratio of error pulses to message pulses in both cases (ungated, \( \bar{N} \bar{T} = .20 \); gated, \( \frac{\text{false alarm rate}}{\text{message pulse rate}} = .253 \)). The greater effectiveness of the post gate in improving system performance in this case relative to its effectiveness in improving the performance of System One results from the shorter post gate interval used with System Two.

The parameter values of the first system in Table 4.1 which employs clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver, Sampling System One, are tabulated in column five. The parameter values of this system \( T_C = 125 \text{ microseconds, } k = .5 \) would result in excessive quantization noise if applied to the representation of voice by any of the clocked binary modulations; for example, these values would apply to the characterization of voice by 8 kc samples of clipped voice, a characterization with excessive distortion caused by the coarse quantization. The parameter values of Sampling System One were chosen to allow a direct comparison with System One. The sampling system samples the information at the same rate (8 kc) as System One (although System One is not constrained to transmit clocked samples) and requires the same bandwidth \( W_n = 2.56 \text{ Mc} \). With more than five times as many users \( m = 80 \) as System One \( m = 15 \), and when both systems employ sampling receivers, the sampling system has a smaller ratio of error pulses to message pulses \( (5.5 \times 10^{-2}) \) than System One \( (2.2 \times 10^{-1}) \). Despite this smaller ratio quality of the sampling system, the receiver voice
signals will be poor as a result of the distortion introduced by coarse quantization.

The parameters of a second system using clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver, Sampling System Two, are tabulated in column 6. This system employs the same data sampling rate \((3.85 \times 10^4\) samples/second) and the same bandwidth \((W_n = 12.8\text{ Mc})\) as System Two using a gated receiver and accommodates the same number of active users \((m = 80)\). However, the ratio of error pulses to message pulses of this system is smaller \((5.00 \times 10^{-2})\) than that of System Two \((2.53 \times 10^{-1})\). The superior performance of Sampling System Two in comparison to System Two is a manifestation of the fact that it is less probable that an error pulse will be sampled than it is that the pulse will occur within the post gate interval \(T_p\).

The parameters of Sampling System Three, which uses clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver are tabulated in Table 4.1, column seven. This system is **System Three** of Section 4.1. With the exception of the value of \(k\), the parameter values of System Three are the same as those of System Two and those of the Sampling System Two; the data sampling rate \((3.85 \times 10^4\) samples per second), the system bandwidth \((W_n = 12.8\text{ Mc})\), and the number of system users \((m = 80)\) are also the same. The duty factor \(k = .125\) of the transmitter modulator output information pulse train corresponds to an average of 4813 information pulses per second. This pulse rate, which is smaller than that
used in System Two and in Sampling System Two, is consistent with the rates which have been achieved with the most recent modulation methods (Ref. 14). As a result of this reduced pulse rate, the ratio of error pulses to message pulses \((9.12 \times 10^{-3})\) is smaller than the ratios for both System Two \((2.53 \times 10^{-1})\) and for Sampling System Two \((5.00 \times 10^{-2})\).

Four fundamental points are illustrated by the preceding examples. First, clocked binary modulation is preferable to position modulation because it permits the use of post gates with short gate intervals, which results usually in superior performance.

Second, the performance of the sampling receiver is superior to that of the gated receiver for detecting signals with clocked binary modulation, provided the gated receiver doesn't employ pulse width discrimination or filtering and thresholding (Section 5.6).

Third, for good RADA system performance in heavy mutual interference situations, it is best to transmit samples of the information at the lowest rate \(1/\overline{T}\) which provides a suitable quality demodulated signal. A given increase in \(1/\overline{T}\) typically increases the false alarm rate of the receiver samples more than enough to offset the decrease in signal-to-noise ratio which results from integrating the message samples.

Fourth, RADA system performance generally improves with bandwidth.
CHAPTER V

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter III, an idealized model of a RADA communications system was developed and analyzed. The detected RF pulses were assumed to be rectangular in the model. In this chapter, the results of Chapter III are extended to apply to general pulse shapes. In addition, several considerations in the application and design of RADA systems are investigated. First, the duration and bandwidth of a pulse are defined, and the relation between them is presented. Next, using these results, the "effective rectangular width" of a pulse is defined for pulses of general shape; this definition allows application of the results of Chapter III when general pulse shapes are studied. The factors which influence system bandwidth are examined, and the system bandwidth is defined. Then the effects of variation of system parameters, and the choice of parameter values to optimize system performance are studied. Finally, practical problems, including reduction of the error pulse rate at the RADA receiver output terminals and synchronization of target RADA receivers to their given transmitters, are investigated.
5.2 Relations Between Duration and Bandwidth of a Pulse

The "nominal bandwidth" $B$ and "nominal duration" $T$ of a single transmitted pulse will now be defined and related. The RADA system bandwidth will then be expressed in terms of the nominal pulse bandwidth. The synonymous terms "width" and "duration" of a pulse were defined in Chapter III for rectangular pulses. To permit a clear distinction of the definitions of the width and duration of a pulse as defined in Chapter III from the definitions used in this chapter, the terms "nominal width" and "nominal duration" of a pulse are defined here. The term "nominal bandwidth" of a pulse is also employed in this chapter in the interests of consistency. The basic concepts involved in the definitions of the nominal duration and nominal bandwidth of a pulse are described in detail in Ref. 26. In defining these terms, some preliminary definitions are required first. Assume an RF pulse with an envelope $p(t)$, a carrier frequency $f_0$, and a phase $\theta$. The voltage waveform of the pulse is specified by (5.1).

$$e(t) = p(t) \cos(2\pi f_0 t + \theta) \quad (5.1)$$

The Fourier transform $F_p(f)$ of the envelope $p(t)$ is given by (5.2)

$$F_p(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p(t) e^{-j2\pi ft} \, dt \quad (5.2)$$

and that of $e(t)$ by (5.3).
\[ F_e(f) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(t) e^{-j2\pi ft} dt \] (5.3)

The energy spectra \( W_p(f) \) and \( W_e(f) \) of \( p(t) \) and \( e(t) \), respectively, are presented in (5.4) and (5.5), in which \( \psi^* \) of a complex function \( \psi \) denotes the complex conjugate of the function \( \psi \), and where \( |y| \) of a function \( y \) denotes the absolute value of \( y \).

\[ W_p(f) = F_p(f) F_p^*(f) = |F_p(f)|^2 \] (5.4)

\[ W_e(f) = F_e(f) F_e^*(f) = |F_e(f)|^2 \] (5.5)

Except for an amplitude scale factor, the energy spectrum \( W_e(f) \) is just a translation of the spectrum \( W_p(f) \) from a symmetric spectrum centered at zero frequency to a symmetric spectrum centered at frequency \( f_0 \); it is emphasized that the spectrum \( W_p(f) \) which is translated is the two sided or symmetric spectrum centered at zero frequency. Thus, it is only necessary to determine the nominal bandwidth of this symmetric spectrum of the pulse envelope \( p(t) \) to define the bandwidth of the pulse \( e(t) \). The total energy \( E_p \) of the pulse envelope \( p(t) \) [which is twice the energy of the actual RF pulse \( e(t) \)] is used to normalize the instantaneous pulse envelope energy and the pulse envelope energy spectrum.

\[ E_p = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2(t) dt = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F_p(f)|^2 df = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} W_p(f) df \] (5.6)
The center \( c_p \) of the pulse \( p(t) \) is defined by (5.7).
\[
c_p = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t \frac{p^2(t)}{E_p} \, dt
\]  
(5.7)

The nominal pulse width \( T \), in seconds, is defined as
\[
T = 2 \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - c_p)^2 \frac{p^2(t)}{E_p} \, dt}
\]  
(5.8)

and the nominal bandwidth \( B \) of the pulse, in cycles per second, is defined by (5.9).
\[
B = 2 \sqrt{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^2 \left| \frac{F_p(f)}{E_p} \right|^2 \, df}
\]  
(5.9)

For any particular pulse envelope \( p(t) \), the nominal pulse width \( T \) and the nominal bandwidth \( B \) are related by (5.10)
\[
B = \frac{b}{T}; \quad b \geq \frac{1}{\pi}
\]  
(5.10)

where the constant \( b \) is a function of the envelope shape \( p(t) \) which is determined by substituting (5.8) and (5.9) into (5.10). It is emphasized here that the pulsewidth and bandwidth are defined in terms of the standard deviation of the pulse envelope \( p(t) \) squared and the magnitude of the complex spectrum \( |F(f)| \) squared.

Equation (5.10) is satisfied by \( b = 1/\pi \), if and only if, the pulse envelope is Gaussian. Thus, the nominal bandwidth \( B \) of a
Gaussian pulse of nominal width \( T \) is less than the nominal bandwidth of a pulse of any other shape which is also of nominal width \( T \). Since the bandwidth of a RADA system decreases as the bandwidth of the transmitted pulses decreases, it follows that where there is interest in minimal system bandwidth, RF pulses with Gaussian-shaped envelopes will usually be employed. The utility of Gaussian pulses in the design of minimal bandwidth RADA systems warrants a further description of their characteristics. In terms of the standard deviation \( \sigma_1 \) of the Gaussian pulse envelope voltage \( p(t) \), the nominal pulse width \( T \) is given by (5.11).

\[
T = \sqrt{2} \sigma_1
\]  

(5.11)

Similarly, in terms of the standard deviation, \( \sigma_2 \), of the amplitude of the complex spectrum, the nominal bandwidth is given by

\[
B = \sqrt{2} \sigma_2
\]  

(5.12)

It follows from (5.11) and (5.12) that the nominal pulse duration \( T \) of a Gaussian pulse is measured between the positions of the pulse which are .776 of the peak pulse amplitude; the nominal bandwidth is measured between points on the complex spectrum \( F_p(f) \) which are .776 of the peak of the spectrum, or between points of the energy spectrum \( W_p(f) \) which are .607 of the peak of the energy spectrum. Since pulse widths are frequently measured between points on the envelope of the
pulse which are 50 percent of the envelope peak, the pulse width $T_{.50}$ measured between these points is, here, related to the nominal width of the pulse. For a Gaussian pulse

$$T_{.50} = 1.665 T$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.13)

### 5.3 Equivalent Rectangular Width of a Pulse

To apply the results of Chapter III, which were derived for the special case of rectangular transmitted pulses, to the general case in which pulse shapes are chosen freely; it is assumed that all pulses of nominal duration $T$ have the same effect on RADA system performance as rectangular pulses, of nominal duration $T$. This assumption is reasonable in an average sense, since most of the receiver input pulses are from distant transmitters (transmitters separated from the receiver by distances of from 25 percent to 100 percent of the maximum receiver range). The average width of these pulses is typically of the order of the equivalent rectangular width of the transmitted pulses. The nominal duration $T$ of a rectangular pulse of width $\Delta t$ is, using (5.8), $T = \Delta t/\sqrt{3}$. It follows, then, from these assumptions, that all pulses of nominal duration $T$ are equivalent in their effect on RADA systems to rectangular pulses of width

$$\Delta t = \sqrt{3} T.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.14)
From (5.13) and (5.14), the equivalent rectangular width of a Gaussian pulse is related to the width $T_{.50}$ by (5.15).

$$\Delta_t = 1.04 \ T_{.50}$$  (5.15)

Thus, the equivalent rectangular width of a Gaussian pulse approximately equals the width of the pulse measured between the half-voltage points of the pulse envelope.

5.4 Bandwidth of a RADA System

A basic requirement of RADA receivers is that a target receiver detects signal pulses from a distant given transmitter even in the presence of strong interference from local interfering transmitters. In such a situation, as discussed in Section 1.4.5, the large interference pulses on a particular system frequency will enter the target receiver RF stage at that frequency and also, through the skirts of the RF filters, the RF stages at adjacent frequencies. Further, the interference effects of the large pulses will tend to be enhanced by the stretching of these pulses caused by receiver sensitivity, and their blocking effect caused by receiver recovery characteristics. These undesirable effects are reduced by properly shaping the transmitted pulses and the receiver RF and IF filters, and by allocating sufficient guardband width between the system frequencies to provide adequate RF and IF filter skirt rejection. Since the net parameters determine the guardband
width, they also influence the total system bandwidth requirement. Thus, the net parameters, transmitted pulse shape, and receiver filter characteristics are among the factors which determine the system bandwidth. Because the system bandwidth does depend upon a variety of factors, it is best determined empirically. To facilitate this, an analytic definition of bandwidth, in which the effects of the net characteristics are isolated, will be presented in this section.

In the definition, it is assumed that the shape of the individual transmitted pulses determines the bandwidth of the pulse transmissions on each frequency. This assumption is correct for systems which radiate at most a single pulse on each frequency of a frame (systems for which \( \lambda_t = 1 \)); although the assumption is not strictly correct for RADA systems which radiate more than one pulse, \( \lambda_t > 1 \), it will also be used to obtain approximations for the bandwidth of these systems.

The nominal bandwidth of the individual transmitted pulses was defined in Section 5.2. This bandwidth will be used now in defining the bandwidth of a RADA system. To reduce the mutual interference between pulses which occur in the same time slot and on adjacent system frequencies, a guardband \( B_g \) is allowed between the system frequencies. The guardband width is determined by the net parameters. The total RADA system bandwidth is given by (5.16).

\[
W = \Lambda_f(B + B_g) \tag{5.16}
\]
or, substituting (5.10) into (5.16), by (5.17).

\[ W = \Lambda_f \left( \frac{b}{T} + B_g \right); \quad b \geq \frac{1}{\pi} \quad (5.17) \]

For use with the results of Chapter III, it is more convenient to express (5.17) in terms of the equivalent rectangular pulsewidth which provides a specified level of performance, by substituting (5.14) into (5.17).

\[ W = \Lambda_f \left( \sqrt{3} \frac{b}{\Delta_t} + B_g \right); \quad b \geq \frac{1}{\pi} \quad (5.18) \]

When Gaussian pulses are used, an estimate of the system bandwidth \( W = W_n \) can be determined as follows. Assuming that the power spectrum of a pulse on a given system frequency is 60 db down at the adjacent system frequencies, then

\[ B_g = 1.33 \ B. \quad (5.19) \]

Substituting \( b = \frac{1}{\pi} \) and (5.19) into (5.16),

\[ W_n = .741 \frac{\Lambda_f}{T}. \quad (5.20) \]

In terms of the pulse duration between 50 percent points on the pulse voltage envelope,

\[ W_n = 1.24 \frac{\Lambda_f}{T}.50 \quad (5.21) \]
or in terms of the equivalent rectangular pulsewidth,

\[ W_n = 1.28 \frac{\Lambda_f}{\Delta t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.22)

Equation (5.22) relates the system bandwidth to the parameters of the model of Chapter III. The bandwidth \( W_n \) is the bandwidth of the system spectrum between points which are 60 db below the peak of the spectrum. Equation (5.22) will be used in the bandwidth calculations of Chapter VI.

The bandwidth \( W_m \) of one of the prototype systems (Ref. 1.8, p. 50), measured between 6 db points of the power spectrum, is given by

\[ W_m = 1.5 \frac{\Lambda_f}{T_{.50}} ; \quad \Lambda_f = 3 , \]

\[ T_{.50} = 1.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ second} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.23)

The wider bandwidth of this system compared with a system using Gaussian pulses appeared to result directly from the (non-Gaussian) shape of the transmitted pulses.

5.5 The Effects of Parameter Variations on System Performance, and the Optimization of RADA System Performance

In this section, the effect on RADA system performance of differential variations of the values of the system parameters is investigated. This investigation leads to methods of optimizing the
performance of RADA systems; these methods, in general, necessitate complicating the system or increasing the system bandwidth. Although some of the parameters can only assume discrete values, useful information is nevertheless obtained about the system by investigating the effects of differential changes of the parameter values.

Consider that the measure of system performance is $P_{FA}$, which may be $P_{1FA}(T_p)$, or $P_{2FA}(T_p)$ for gated receivers, $P_{SFA}$ for sampling receivers, and $P_m$ or $\overline{N}\Delta_t$ for ungated receivers. When $\overline{N}\Delta_t$ is the measure, the region of the positive slope of the plot of $\overline{N}\Delta_t$ vs. $\gamma\Delta_t$ is of interest. Typically, these measures, $P_{FA}$, of system performance are functions of both $\gamma\Delta_t$ and $\lambda_t\lambda_t$ so that

$$P_{FA} = P_{FA}(\gamma\Delta_t, \lambda_t\lambda_t). \quad (5.24)$$

System performance is improved by differential changes in parameter values when these changes cause a negative differential $dP_{FA}$ (reduce $P_{FA}$). In the following paragraphs, the requirements for a negative differential are investigated. Because it is already known that in the case of gated receivers, a decrease of gate width $T_p$ decreases $P_{FA}$, the effects of differential variations of $T_p$ are not studied. Similarly, since it can readily be shown that a decrease in the number $m$ of interfering transmitters always decreases $P_{FA}$, and since in addition $m$ is a parameter which is not subject to control in normal RADA system operation, it is assumed that $m$ is constant when
the effect of differential parameter variations is studied. Again, be-
cause \( m \) is not normally subject to control, it is also assumed constant
when parameter values are selected to optimize system performance.

In writing equations for systems which use clocked binary modulation,
\( T \) can be replaced by \( T_c / k \) [see (1.4)] wherever it appears; in this
section, \( T \) is employed in the equations for clocked binary modulation
as well as in those for pulse position modulation to avoid duplication of
the equations. When \( \Lambda_f \) is specified, differential increments of \( \lambda_f \) are
only meaningful when \( \lambda_f \) is not a function of \( \Lambda_f \) \( \lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f) \). A similar
problem does not normally arise with respect to \( \lambda_t \) and \( \Lambda_t \) since in the
cases which are typically considered, \( \lambda_t \) is not constrained by \( \Lambda_t \), ex-
cept that \( \lambda_t < \Lambda_t \).

The total differential of \( P_{FA} \) is expressed in terms of differ-
tential changes of \( (\gamma \Delta_t) \) and \( (\lambda_f \lambda_t) \) in (5.25)

\[
dP_{FA} = \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d(\gamma \Delta_t) + \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)
\]  

(5.25)

In a particular situation, the partials of \( P_{FA} \) with respect to \( \gamma \Delta_t \) and
with respect to \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) can be determined from the graph of the appropri-
ate measure \( P_{FA} \), which is plotted in Chapter III. This is the reason
for expressing \( P_{FA} \) in the particular form of (5.24). The differential
\( d(\gamma \Delta_t) \) is a function of the differential \( d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) \); it is therefore prefer-
able to rewrite (5.25), including the functional dependence of
\[ d(\gamma \Delta_t) \text{ on } d(\lambda_f \lambda_t). \] Using (1.2),

\[ d(\gamma \Delta_t) = \frac{m \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) + m \lambda_f \lambda_t d \left( \frac{\Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.26)

Substituting (5.26) into (5.25),

\[ dP_{FA} = \left[ \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} + \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} \right] d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) \]

\[ + \left[ m \lambda_f \lambda_t \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} \right] d \left( \frac{\Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.27)

For all of the measures \( P_{FA} \), including the measure \( \bar{N} \Delta_t \) when only the region of positive slope of the curve of \( \bar{N} \Delta_t \) vs. \( \gamma \Delta_t \) is of interest,

\[ \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} \leq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.28)

\[ \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} \geq 0 \]  \hspace{1cm} (5.29)

Equations (5.27), (5.28), and (5.29) are useful in deducing the effects of parameter variations.

5.5.1 The Effect of Differential Changes of Bandwidth, Modulation Efficiency, and of the Number of AND Gate Inputs on the Measure \( P_{FA} ; \lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f) \). The effect of the various parameters on system performance can be determined by examining (5.27) with
cognizance of (5.28) and (5.29). In preference to using the terms positive and negative differential in discussing changes in the parameter values and in the value of $P_{FA}$, the terms increase and decrease are primarily used. An increase in $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ has two opposite effects which are indicated by the two terms in the bracketed coefficient of $d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ in (5.27). First, increasing the number, $\lambda_t$, of pulses transmitted on the frequencies of a frame or increasing the number, $\lambda_f$, of frequencies on which pulses are transmitted both tend to increase the mutual interference and, thereby, to increase $P_{FA}$. Second, increasing the number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of AND gate inputs tends to decrease $dP_{FA}$. Whether or not an increase in $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ tends to increase or decrease $P_{FA}$ depends upon the relative size of the two terms of the bracketed coefficient of $d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$. It also follows from (5.27) that a decrease in $(\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T})$ always tends to decrease $P_{FA}$; that is, increasing the bandwidth $(\Lambda_f/\Delta_t)$ or increasing the modulation efficiency $\bar{T}$ always tend to improve system performance. The net change in $dP_{FA}$ which results from changes in both $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ and $(\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T})$ depends upon the relative sizes of the bracketed terms in (5.26), and upon the size of the changes.

5.5.2 The Effect of Differential Changes of System Bandwidth

and Modulation Efficiency on the False Alarm Probability $P_{FA}$, for a Fixed Number, $\lambda_f \lambda_t$, of AND Gate Inputs; $\lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f)$. The effect on the measure $P_{FA}$ of differential changes in the product $\Delta_t/\Lambda_t \bar{T}$, of bandwidth and modulation efficiency, when $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is constant, is
expressed by the partial differential of $P_{FA}$ with respect to $\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T}$, which is obtained by equating $d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ to zero in (5.26).

$$d(\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T}) P_{FA} = m \lambda_f \lambda_t \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\gamma \Delta_t)} d\left(\frac{\Delta_t}{\Lambda_f \bar{T}}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.30)

Equation (5.30) shows that when $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ is constant, $P_{FA}$ can only be decreased by increasing bandwidth $(\Lambda_f/\Delta_t)$ or increasing modulation efficiency $\bar{T}$.

### 5.5.3 Determination of the Number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of AND Gate Inputs which Minimizes $P_{FA}$, when the Product $(\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T})$ of Bandwidth and Modulation Efficiency is Fixed; $\lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f)$. When $(\Delta_t/\Lambda_f \bar{T})$ is constant, (the product of system bandwidth and modulation efficiency is fixed), the effect of differential changes in $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ is expressed by the partial differential of $P_{FA}$ with respect to $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$.

$$d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) P_{FA} = \left[\left(\frac{m \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f \bar{T}}\right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\gamma \Delta_t)} + \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\lambda_f \lambda_t)}\right] d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.31)

The right hand side of (5.31) is identical with the first bracketed term of (5.27), and the comments concerning that term also apply to (5.31). Namely, an increase in $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ tends to increase $P_{FA}$ as a result of the increased number $\lambda_t$ of interference pulses transmitted on each frequency of a frame, or the increased number, $\lambda_f$, of frequencies on which these pulses are transmitted; both changes tend to increase the number of interfering pulses radiated by each transmitter. An increase
in the number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of AND gate inputs tends to decrease $P_{FA}$. The net result is that increases in $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ decrease $P_{FA}$ when

$$- \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} > \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)}$$

(5.32)

When the left hand side of (5.32) is larger than the right, $P_{FA}$ can usually be decreased by increasing $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$, assuming all other parameters remain constant. As $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is increased, $\gamma \Delta_t$ increases; typically, as $\gamma \Delta_t$ increases, $- \left[ \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} \right]$ tends to decrease monotonically and $\frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)}$ tends to increase monotonically. When $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ is increased beyond a particular value, (5.32) is no longer satisfied and $P_{FA}$ tends to increase. That is, when $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is increased beyond a certain value, the degradation in system performance which results from increasing the number of interfering pulses radiated on each frequency of a frame or from increasing the number of frequencies on which these interference pulses occur exceeds the enhancement of system performance which results from increasing the number of AND gate inputs. Thus, there is an optimum value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ which minimizes $P_{FA}$ when all system parameters except $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ are fixed. Equivalently, since the product $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ does not influence system bandwidth, for a given bandwidth, and number $m$ of users, there is a value of $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ which minimizes $P_{FA}$. One method of determining this minimum value is simply to fix all system parameters and increase $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ until
the minimum is found. Another method is to determine the generally nonrealizable, noninteger value of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) which satisfies (5.32) with an equality [assuming all system parameter values except \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) are fixed].

\[
- \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} = \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f \pi T} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} \tag{5.33}
\]

Then, of the two integer values of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) which are adjacent to the non-integer value, the integer value \( \lambda_f \lambda_t = s \) which corresponds to the smaller value of \( P_{FA} \) optimizes system performance. The values of \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) are then selected, subject only to (5.34).

\[
\lambda_f \lambda_t = s ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \tag{5.34}
\]

In some cases, rather than choose an optimum value \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \), a near optimal value provides nearly equivalent performance and allows a more convenient choice of the values of \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \).

5.5.4 The Effect of Differential Changes of System Parameters on the Measure \( P_{FA} \); \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \). Depending upon how the RADA system is defined, increments in \( \lambda_f \) and \( \Lambda_f \) may be functionally related. When this is the case, it is preferable to define the total differential of \( P_{FA} \) by (5.35).
\[ dP_{\text{FA}} = \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right) \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d\left( \frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f} \right) + \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) \]

\[ + \left( m \frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t}{\Lambda_f} \right) \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d\left( \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right); \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \] (5.35)

As an example of the application of (5.35), consider a system which is defined with \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \); that is, each transmitter radiates pulses on all of the system frequencies. For such a system, the total differential of \( P_{\text{FA}} \) is given by (5.36).

\[ dP_{\text{FA}} = \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right) \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d\lambda_t + \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) \]

\[ + \left( m \lambda_t \right) \frac{\partial P_{\text{FA}}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d\left( \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right); \quad \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \] (5.36)

Interpreted in conjunction with (5.28) and (5.29), (5.36) can be explained as follows. The first term of (5.36) shows that when the number \( \lambda_t \) of pulses on the frequencies of a frame increases, \( P_{\text{FA}} \) tends to increase. The second term illustrates the tendency of an increase in the number \( (\lambda_f \lambda_t) \) of AND gate inputs to decrease \( P_{\text{FA}} \). Finally, the last term of (5.36) shows that increased pulse width and increased modulation efficiency \( \bar{T} \) tend to decrease \( P_{\text{FA}} \). If it is apparent from the first two terms of (5.36) that an increase in \( \lambda_f \) is more effective in decreasing \( dP_{\text{FA}} \) than a corresponding increase \( d\lambda_t \).

(Strictly, "corresponding" increases of \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) must satisfy
\( \lambda_f \, d \lambda_t = \lambda_t \, d \lambda_f \); the idea here is more precisely that when \( \lambda_t \) is increased, the first term tends to increase \( P_{FA} \), whereas there is no corresponding term which increases when \( \lambda_f \) increases. This greater effectiveness of \( \lambda_f \) in improving system performance did not occur in the situation associated with (5.27), for which \( \lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f) \). The reason for the difference is that in the case of (5.27), increasing \( \lambda_f \), \( \lambda_f \neq F(\Lambda_f) \) increases the number \( \lambda_f \) out of the available number \( \Lambda_f \) of system frequencies on which each transmitter radiates, and thus increases the mutual interference on these frequencies. By contrast, in the case of (5.36), \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \) so that increasing \( \lambda_f \) increases the total number of available frequencies on which all transmitters radiate.

The partial differentials of \( P_{FA} \) with respect to \( (\Delta_t/\bar{T}) \) and with respect to \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) will be written to isolate the influence of these parameters.

\[
d(\Delta_t/\bar{T}) \, P_{FA} = m \lambda_t \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\gamma \Delta_t)} \left( \frac{\Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right) ; \quad \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \quad (5.37)
\]

It follows from (5.29) and (5.37) that when the values of all parameters except \( \Delta_t \) and \( \bar{T} \) are constant, decreased pulse width \( \Delta_t \) or increased modulation efficiency (\( \bar{T} \)) decrease \( P_{FA} \):

\[
d(\Delta_t/\bar{T}) \, P_{FA} = \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{\bar{T}} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\gamma \Delta_t)} \, d \lambda_t + \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial(\lambda_f \lambda_t)} \, d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) ; \quad \lambda_f = \Lambda_f
\]

\[
(5.38)
\]
From (5.28), (5.29), and (5.38), it follows that when the values of all parameters except \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) are constant, \( P_{FA} \) decreases when,

\[
- \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)} d(\lambda_f \lambda_t) > \left( \frac{m \Delta t}{T} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta t)} d \lambda_t ; \quad \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \quad (5.39)
\]

that is, when the improvement in performance resulting from the increased number \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) of AND gate inputs exceeds the degradation which results from increasing the number \( \lambda_t \) of interference pulses radiated on each frequency of a frame. When \( d \lambda_t = 0 \), an increase in \( \lambda_f \) always decreases \( P_{FA} \). However, since \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \), increasing \( \lambda_f \) increases the system bandwidth, and thus the improvement in performance costs bandwidth. With \( d \lambda_f = 0 \), an increase in \( \lambda_t \) requires no increase in bandwidth, but this increase only decreases \( P_{FA} \) when (5.39) is satisfied.

5.5.5 Determination of the Value of the Parameter \( \lambda_t \) which Minimizes \( P_{FA} \) when Other Parameters are Fixed. In this section, the value of \( \lambda_t \) is determined which minimizes \( P_{FA} \) when the other parameter values are fixed. In a way similar to that described in connection with (5.32),

\[
- \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\lambda_f \lambda_t)}
\]

generally decreases monotonically with increases in \( \lambda_t \), while

\[
\frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta t)}
\]
generally decreases monotonically. Thus when all other system parameters are fixed, it follows from (5.36) that increases in $\lambda_t$ beyond a particular value tend to increase $P_{FA}$. It follows that there is a value of $\lambda_t$ which optimizes system performance when the other parameters are fixed. That is, when the bandwidth and the number $m$ of users are fixed, and the system parameters other than $\lambda_t$ are fixed, there is a value of $\lambda_t$ which minimizes $P_{FA}$. One method of finding this minimum is simply to determine $P_{FA}$ for progressively larger values of $\lambda_t$ until the minimum is found. Alternately, $P_{FA}$ can be minimized by first determining the (generally noninteger) value of $\lambda_t$ which satisfies (5.40).

$$\frac{-\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\hat{\lambda}_t \lambda_t)} d(\hat{\lambda}_t \lambda_t) = \left( \frac{m \Delta_t}{T} \right) \frac{\partial P_{FA}}{\partial (\gamma \Delta_t)} d \lambda_t \quad (5.40)$$

As previously described in connection with (5.33), of the two adjacent integer values of $\lambda_t$, the value of $\lambda_t$ which results in a smaller value of $P_{FA}$ is the one which optimizes system performance.

Examples of the application of some of the results of this section to a system which employs clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver are given in Chapter VI.

5.6 Mutual Interference Reduction

Direct mutual interference is a primary limiting factor in RADA system performance. The mutual interference and its effects
are characterized by the receiver input RF interference pulse rate and by the receiver output error pulse rate. Techniques which reduce the effective interference pulse rate or the error pulse rate tend to improve receiver performance. Using an appropriate receiver implementation, the interference pulse rate is reduced by discriminating against pulses of different amplitude than the signal pulses, using either an amplitude level discriminator or a cumulative amplitude level discriminator in the receiver video stages (Schmitt trigger). Before a signal is detected, the discriminator searches, say, from high to low pulse amplitude levels for properly coded signals. Efficient modulations, modulations which tend to reduce the average rate at which frames are transmitted, reduce the interference pulse rate. Since the voltage corresponding to a voice waveform is near zero a larger fraction of the time, the interference pulse rate can be reduced by using efficient, voice activated modulations which produce a modulated signal only when there is a significant voice input.

Extremal Sampling (Refs. 1. 11 - 1. 18) and "DATEC" modulation (Ref. 14), a modification of delta modulation, are such voice-actuated modulations. Similarly, a squelch circuit will reduce the interference pulse rate when employed with modulations which are not voice-actuated; the squelch circuit must not distort the demodulated signal, however. Station discipline—prohibition of transmitter use except when necessary—also tends to reduce the interference pulse rate.
Techniques which are effective in reducing the demodulator input error pulse rate will now be presented. The post gate (Section 1.6.2) is effective in reducing the demodulator input error pulse rate. In addition, the results of Chapter III show that in typical situations the duration of error pulses will be significantly shorter than that of the message pulses (see Fig. 3.5, a normalized plot of the duration of error pulses); pulse width discrimination is, therefore, effective in reducing the demodulator input (AND gate output) error pulse rate. This discrimination can be achieved by using either a pulse width discriminator, or by using a filter and a threshold circuit. Examples 1d and 2d of Chapter III illustrate the effectiveness of pulse width discrimination in reducing the error pulse rate. Pulse width discrimination can be employed with both ungated receivers and gated receivers.

5.7 Synchronization

Throughout the preceding chapters, it has been assumed that after initial synchronization the receiver continuously maintains time synchronization with the transmitter during each message transmission. This is a realistic assumption for a RADA system, using a modulation method such as delta modulation, in which frames are transmitted during the pauses in voice.
With the clock stabilities anticipated for small, portable transceivers, and for a system in which no frames are transmitted during pauses in voice, the given receiver may have to time-synchronize to its target transmitter after each voice pause. In this case, synchronization will have to be obtained quickly (say in less than .1 second) to prevent excessive distortion caused by information loss before synchronization is achieved.
CHAPTER VI

OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE OF A RADA SYSTEM
EMPLOYING SAMPLING RECEIVERS

6.1 Introduction

The process by which mutual interference among RADA transmissions generates receiver output errors was described and studied analytically in Chapter III. The bandwidth of RADA systems, the effects of differential changes in the values of the system parameters, and the choice of system parameter values to optimize system performance were investigated in Chapter V. In this chapter, some of the results of Chapter V are illustrated in optimizing the performance and determining the bandwidth of a RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers; the receiver output error characteristics of such a system were described in Section 3.4.5. This particular type of system is utilized to illustrate the results of Chapter V for several reasons. The system is of both practical and theoretical interest because its error rate is a lower bound of the error rates of the systems studied in Chapter III, when the same parameter values are used, and when these systems do not employ pulsewidth discrimination or output filtering and thresholding (see Section 5.6). Further, the analytical expression for the error probability of systems employing
clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers is of a simple form which can readily be optimized.

In this chapter then, the system parameter values are chosen analytically to "optimize" system performance; the theoretical system bandwidth which corresponds to a specified false alarm rate is determined; a method of designing a practical optimum system is described; analytical expressions are given for the rate of information transmission for an "optimum" system and for a "practical" optimum system. Examples are included.

6.2 Optimization of the Performance of a RADA System Employing Clocked Binary Modulation and Sampling Receivers

From (3.1) and (3.82), the false alarm rate of a system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers is given by (6.1).

\[
P_{\text{SFA}} = (1 - k) \left(1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}\right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t}
\]  

(6.1)

System performance is now "optimized" by choosing the value of the product \(\lambda_f \lambda_t\) to minimize the value of \(P_{\text{SFA}}\) which corresponds to a given value of \(\frac{m k \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T_c}\); this optimization is discussed in general terms in Chapter V in connection with (5.31), (5.32), (5.33), and (5.34).

The rationale for fixing \(\frac{m k \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T_c}\) is that the optimum is based on the assumptions of a fixed number, \(m\), of users, a fixed system bandwidth
(proportional to $\lambda_f/\Delta_t$), and fixed modulation parameters, or modulation efficiency ($T_c/k$). The minimum is determined by equating the partial derivative of $P_{SFA}$ with respect to $(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$ to zero. This partial derivative is denoted here by $d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)P_{SFA}/d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$, and it is the derivative of $P_{SFA}$ which accounts for the direct dependence of $P_{SFA} = P_{SFA}(\gamma \Delta_t, \lambda_f, \lambda_t)$ on $(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$ as well as its implicit dependence on $\lambda_f, \lambda_t$ through $\gamma \Delta_t = \frac{m k \lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta_t}{\Lambda_f T_c}$. From (5.31),

$$d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)P_{SFA}/d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t) = (1 - k) \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1} \left[ -e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \ln e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} + \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \right) \ln \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \right) \right] ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \quad (6.2)$$

This derivative is distinguished from that partial derivative of $P_{SFA}$ with respect to $(\lambda_f, \lambda_t), \partial P_{SFA}/\partial (\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$, which does not account for the dependence of $(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$ on $(\gamma \Delta_t)$ (Ref. 27). Since the factor $(1 - k) \left( 1 - e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} \right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t - 1}$ is always positive, it does not affect the sign of $d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)P_{SFA}/d(\lambda_f, \lambda_t)$, and it is only necessary to examine the bracketed quantity in (6.2) to find minima of $P_{SFA}$. Making the substitutions

$$-\gamma \Delta_t = y \quad (6.3)$$

and

$$-\gamma \Delta_t = \ln y \quad (6.4)$$
the bracketed quantity of (6.2) then becomes

\[-y \ln y + (1-y) \ln (1-y) \ . \]

(6.5)

This function is plotted in Fig. 6.1. It is apparent that there is a single minimum of \( P_{SFA} \) at \( y = .5 \). Hence the requirement for a minimum of \( P_{SFA} \) is, from (6.3)

\[ e^{-\gamma \Delta_t} = .5 \ ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]

(6.6)
or, from (6.4)

\[ \gamma \Delta_t = .693 \ ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \ . \]

(6.7)
The value of the product \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) which minimizes \( P_{SFA} \) is, using (1.2),

\[ \lambda_f \lambda_t = .693 \ \frac{\Lambda_f T_c}{m k \Delta_t} \ ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]

(6.8a)
or, using (5.22)

\[ \lambda_f \lambda_t = .541 \ \frac{T_c W_n}{m k} \ ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]

(6.8b)

Substituting (6.2) and (6.8a) into (6.1) the minimum value of \( P_{SFA} \), \( P_{SFA} \) (min) under the constraint \( m k \Delta_t / \Lambda_f T_c = \text{constant} \) is then,
\[
\frac{1-e^{-\gamma \Delta_t}}{1-k} \left(1-\frac{(\lambda_f \lambda_t-1)}{d(\lambda_f \lambda_t)} \right)^{P_{SFA}} = -y \ln y + (1-y) \ln (1-y)
\]
\[ P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) = (1 - k) \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{\lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta t}{\Lambda_f T_c}} \right) \]

\[ \lambda_f \lambda_t = \frac{.693 \Lambda_f T_c}{m k \Delta t} \quad , \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]

or,

\[ P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) = (1 - k) (.5) ; \quad (\lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f) \] (6.9b)

or from (6.8b)

\[ P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) = (1 - k) (.5) ; \quad (\lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f) \] (6.9c)

It should be remembered that in real systems \( \Lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) are integers. If, when the values of the other parameters in (6.9b) are fixed, a specified value of \( P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) \) determines a noninteger value of \( \Lambda_f \), then the next larger integer value of \( \Lambda_f \) is used in order not to exceed the specified value of \( P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) \); that is, substituting the larger, integer value of \( \Lambda_f \) into (6.9b), results in a value of \( P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) \) which is less than the specified \( P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{min}) \). The bandwidth \( W_n \) for the integer value of \( \Lambda_f \) is greater than that specified for the noninteger \( \Lambda_f \). In real systems, the product \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) is also an integer. In general, \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) determined
by (6.8a), using the integer value of $\Lambda_f$, is not an integer. With the
values of all other parameters fixed, it is apparent from Fig. 7.1
that, exclusively, either the high or low integer value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ adjacent
to the noninteger value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ results in the minimum $P_{SFA}$ which can
be obtained with an integer value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$. As mentioned in connection
with (5.34), the value of the $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ product chosen in designing a par-
ticular system is determined by its practical convenience as well as
by the desire to minimize $P_{SFA}$. If the integer value of $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ which
minimizes $P_{SFA}$ is impractical, the convenience of the next smaller
and next larger integer values is investigated, and so on. For each
value of $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$, $P_{SFA}$ must be examined to determine whether the spe-
cified minimum is achieved; if it is not achieved for a particular
integer value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$, then it will not be achieved with the remaining
integer values of $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ which are also on the same side (less than or
greater than) of the noninteger values of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$. If the possible choices
of $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ which correspond to the initial integer value of $\Lambda_f$ have been
exhausted; then the next larger integer value of $\Lambda_f$ is selected; the corre-
spanding noninteger value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is determined; and the process of
searching for suitable integer values of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is repeated. The use of
integer values of $\Lambda_f$ which are larger than the initial integer values
requires additional system bandwidth, so that the convenience of vari-
ous choices of $\Lambda_f$ and $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ must be weighed against the corresponding
bandwidth cost.
In the remainder of this chapter, \( \Lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) are assumed to be continuous variables to simplify the discussion; determination of the corresponding integer values of \( \Lambda_f \), \( \lambda_f \), \( \lambda_t \) which minimize \( P_{SFA} \) is apparent in particular cases. The value of \( P_{SFA} \) (min) which corresponds to continuous values of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) is a lower bound of the value of \( P_{SFA} \) (min) which corresponds to integer values of \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \), a lower bound which is attained in those cases when continuous \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) has an integer value. Correspondingly, the information rates defined for continuous \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) are an upper bound.

6.2.1 Optimization of Receiver Performance when \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) are Bounded. Assume that \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) have practical upper bounds, say \( \lambda_f \leq \lambda_f' \), \( \lambda_t < \lambda_t' \), which are such that

\[
\lambda_f' \lambda_t' < 0.693 \frac{\Lambda_f T_c}{mk \Delta_t} .
\]  

(6.10)

Then it follows from Fig. 6.1 (or from Eq. 5.32) that since \( P_{SFA} \) decreases monotonically with \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \),

\[
\lambda_f \lambda_t < 0.693 \frac{\Lambda_f T_c}{mk \Delta_t} \]  

(6.11)

\( P_{SFA} \) can be minimized by choosing \( \lambda_f = \lambda_f' \), \( \lambda_t = \lambda_t' \). Generally, it is more practical to decrease \( P_{SFA} \) a given amount by increasing \( \lambda_t \) than by increasing \( \lambda_f \).
6.2.2 Optimization of Receiver Performance when \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \)

When \( \lambda_f = \Lambda_f \) and \( \Lambda_f \) is permitted to vary, then from (6.8a), (6.12) determines the value of \( \lambda_t \) which minimizes \( P_{SFA} \).

\[
\lambda_t = 0.693 \frac{T_c}{m k \Delta_t} \quad (6.12)
\]

From (6.1) and (6.12),

\[
P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})} = (1-k) \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{m k \lambda_t \Delta_t}{T_c}} \right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t} \quad (6.13a)
\]

\[
\lambda_t = \frac{0.693 T_c}{m k \Delta_t}, \quad \lambda_f = \Lambda_f
\]

or,

\[
P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})} = (1-k) \left( \frac{0.693 T_c}{m k \Delta_t} \right)^{\lambda_f \lambda_t} \quad (6.13b)
\]

or using (5.22),

\[
P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})} = (1-k) \left( \frac{0.541}{m k} \frac{T_c W_n}{m k} \right) \quad (6.13c)
\]

It is apparent from a comparison of the functional forms of (6.9a) and (6.13a) that unlike the case where \( \lambda_f < \Lambda_f \), \( P_{SFA} \) is not symmetric.
with respect to $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ when $\lambda_f = \Lambda_f$; when $\lambda_f = \Lambda_f$, $P_{SFA}$ always decreases monotonically with $\lambda_f$, and decreases monotonically with $\lambda_t$ to a minimum at

$$\lambda_t = 0.693 \frac{T_c}{m k \Delta t} . \quad (6.12)$$

The physical basis for the forms of the dependence of $P_{SFA}$ on $\lambda_f$ and $\lambda_t$ when $\lambda_f < \Lambda_f$, and when $\lambda_f = \Lambda_f$ is apparent. When $\lambda_f < \Lambda_f$, and $\Lambda_f$ is fixed, a given fractional increase in $\lambda_f$ or in $\lambda_t$ has the same effect -- a given fractional increase in the number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of AND gate inputs and a given fractional increase in the number $\frac{m k \lambda_f \lambda_t \Delta t}{\Lambda_f T_c}$ of interference pulses per second on each frequency channel. The first effect tends to decrease $P_{SFA}$, the second to increase it. When the mutual interference parameter $\gamma \Delta t < 0.693$, the decrease is greater than the increase and there is a net reduction in $P_{SFA}$ for increases of $\lambda_f$ or $\lambda_t$ (or both). The value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 0.693 \frac{T_c}{m k \Delta t}$ is the choice of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ which optimizes system performance. When $\lambda_f = \Lambda_f$ and $\lambda_f$ varies, a given fractional increase in $\lambda_f$ increases the number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of AND gate inputs, which decreases $P_{SFA}$; the increase in $\lambda_f$ also increases the system bandwidth. There is no increase in the number of interference pulses on each frequency channel as there is when $\lambda_f < \Lambda_f$, and $\Lambda_f$ is fixed. On the other hand, a given fractional increase in $\lambda_t$ tends to increase the number of gate inputs, decreasing $P_{SFA}$, and also tends to increase
the number of interference pulses on each channel, increasing $P_{SFA}$. A given fractional increase in $\lambda_t$ is therefore less effective than the same fractional increase in $\lambda_f$ in decreasing $P_{SFA}$, and will increase $P_{SFA}$ (when $\lambda_t > 0.693 \frac{T_c}{m k \Delta t}$).

Without regard to practical considerations, the optimum RADA receiver is an "adaptive" receiver which increases $\lambda_f$ and $\lambda_t$ with decreasing $m$ to satisfy (6.8) or (6.12) at all times.

6.3 Bandwidth of Optimum RADA Systems Employing Clocked Binary Modulation and Sampling Receivers

The bandwidth of an optimum RADA system which employs clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers is readily determined by using the results of Section 6.2. Taking the logarithm of (6.9a) or (6.13c) and rearranging, there results

$$\frac{W_n}{m} = -2.67 \frac{k}{T_c} \ln \left[ \frac{P_{SFA}(\text{min})}{1-k} \right] ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \quad (6.14)$$

$W_n/m$ is the bandwidth (as defined in Section 5.4) per subscriber of a RADA system which uses the value of $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ which minimizes the false alarm probability. The quantity $W_n/m$ is plotted in Fig. 6.2 in normalized form as a function of $P_{SFA}(\text{min})/(1-k)$ with $k/T_c$ as a parameter. Thus, for example, assuming $k = 0.5$, $P_{SFA}(\text{min}) = 10^{-3}$, $T_c = 50$ microseconds, then $W_n/m = 1.66 \times 10^5$ cycles per second per user.
Let $m$ in (6.14) equal $M_q_1$ where $M_q_1$ is the design maximum RADA system active subscriber capacity corresponding to a specified false alarm rate $P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}$. Then for specified modulation parameters $k$ and $T_c$, the RADA system bandwidth is now given by

$$W_n = -2.67 \cdot (M_q_1) \cdot \frac{k}{T_c} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}}{1 - k} \right] ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \quad (6.15)$$

$W_n$ increases linearly with the maximum RADA system subscriber capacity, $M_q_1$.

### 6.4 Design of RADA Systems Using a Sampling Receiver

In practical design situations, $P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}$, $k$, $T_c$, $(M_q_1)$ are typically chosen beforehand. A minimum value of $\Delta_t$ is specified by synchronization problems, circuit problems, and propagation effects.

The system bandwidth, $W_n'$, is determined from (6.15). The number $\Lambda_f$ of system frequencies $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ is determined by (6.9b) rearranged as (6.16a) for convenience. The number $(\lambda_f \lambda_t)$ of AND gate inputs is determined from (6.8a) and (6.16a).

$$\frac{\Lambda_f \cdot T_c}{(M_q_1) \cdot k \cdot \Delta_t} = -2.08 \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}}{1 - k} \right] ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \quad (6.16a)$$

$$\lambda_f \lambda_t = -1.44 \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}}{1 - k} \right] ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \quad (6.16b)$$
Equation 6.16a specifies the optimal noninteger value of $\Lambda_f$ and, 
(6.16b) specifies the optimal noninteger value of the product $\lambda_f \lambda_t$.
The decision on what integer values of $\Lambda_f$, $\lambda_f (\lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f)$, and $\lambda_t$ to use is then left to the designer. Generally, if a sufficiently large code vocabulary is available, the choice of large $\lambda_t$, small $\lambda_f$ will reduce system complexity.

It is not practical to change the number $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ of receiver AND gate inputs to match the interference level of the channel at each time instant. Accordingly, a practical design procedure is to design a system (determine $\Lambda_f$, $\lambda_f$, and $\lambda_t$) for a specified maximum design number of active subscribers $Mq_1$ as was just done using (6.16). Assume a system has been designed for $Mq_1$ subscribers, and that the system parameters are then held constant. Let $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m)$ denote the false alarm probability of a system, minimized with respect to $\lambda_f \lambda_t$ for $Mq_1$ subscribers, when there are $m$ subscribers using the system.
The designed false alarm probability, $P_{SFA}(\text{min}) = P_{SFA}(Mq_1, Mq_1)$.

Substituting (6.8a) with $m = Mq_1$ into the exponential of (6.9a), and (6.8b) into the exponent of the bracketed factor of (6.9a),

$$P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m) = (1 - k) \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{.541 T_c W_n}{Mq_1 k} \frac{\text{-.693}}{Mq_1}} \right)$$

(6.17)
It is apparent that when $m < Mq_1$, $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m)$ is smaller than the design value, and the system will satisfy the designed false alarm specification. That is,

$$P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m) < P_{SFA}(Mq_1, Mq_1); \quad m < Mq_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.18)

When $m > Mq_1$,

$$P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m) > P_{SFA}(Mq_1, Mq_1); \quad m > Mq_1$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.19)

and the system will exceed the designed false alarm specification.

The quantity $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m)$ is plotted in Fig. 6.3 as a function of $m/Mq_1$, with $T_cW_n/Mq_1$ and $k$ as parameters. For an example of the use of Fig. 6.3, assume an optimal RADA system having a false alarm probability $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m) = 10^{-3}$ at its rated number of users. For this system, the value of $T_cW_n/Mq_1$ is determined in Fig. 6.3e from the curve which intersects the abscissa value $m/Mq_1 = 1$, and the ordinate value $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m) = 10^{-3}$. The interpolated value of $T_cW_n/Mq_1$ equals 8.3. When the system is loaded by half the rated number of users, the false alarm rate is determined from the same curve for an abscissa value $m/Mq_1 = .5$, and is, $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, .5 Mq_1) = 10^{-5}$. 
Fig. 6.3(a). False alarm probability, $P_{\text{SFA}}(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .1$. 

\[
\frac{T_c}{Mq_1} \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} = 1
\]
Fig. 6.3(b). False alarm probability, $P_{\text{SFA}}(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .2$. 

\[ \frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} = 1 \]
Fig. 6.3(c). False alarm probability, $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .3$. 

$$\frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} = 1$$
Fig. 6.3(d). False alarm probability, \( P_{\text{SFA}}(\text{Mq}_1, m) \), vs. normalized number of users, \( m/\text{Mq}_1 \), for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for \( \text{Mq}_1 \) users; \( k = .4 \).
Fig. 6.3(e). False alarm probability, $P_{SFA}(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = 0.5$. 

\[
\frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} = 1
\]
6.5 Examples of Design of a RADA System Using a Sampling Receiver

Example 1

The parameters to be used in a RADA system are $k = .5$, $T_c = 125$ microseconds, $P_{SFA} = .1$, $\Delta_t = 1$ microsecond, $Mq_1 = 100$. Determine the bandwidth $W_n$ of the RADA system with sampling receiver and the tradeoff between parameters $\lambda_f$, $\lambda_t$.

Solution 1

From (6.16a), $\Lambda_f = 1.34$. Use $\Lambda_f = 2$ to obtain the desired value of $P_{SFA}$. From (6.9b), the corresponding value of $P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})}$ is

$$P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})} = 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$$

The bandwidth $W_n$ is, from (6.15) or from Fig. 6.2

$$W_n = 2.58 \times 10^6 \text{ cps}$$

(This compares with $W_n = 1.72 \times 10^6 \text{ cps}$ when $\Lambda_f = 1.34$.) From (6.16b),

$$\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3.57$$

Substituting $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3$ and $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 4$ into (6.1),

$$\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3 \quad P_{SFA} = 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$$

$$\lambda_f \lambda_t = 4 \quad P_{SFA} = 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$$
Systems with $\Lambda_f = 2$, $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 3$ and $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 4$ have the same $P_{SFA}$, which is less than the specified value $P_{SFA} = .1$. The system for which $\lambda_f = 1$, $\lambda_t = 3$ would be the simplest to construct. However, the address codes of more than 100 subscribers would be highly dependent statistically, which might increase the value of $P_{SFA}$ significantly over the calculated value $P_{SFA} = .046$. The same comments apply, to a lesser extent to a system for which $\lambda_f = 1$, $\lambda_t = 4$. The system with $\lambda_f = 2$, $\lambda_t = 2$ would appear to be the best choice, if it can provide a suitable number of address codes which are relatively independent statistically.

The penalty paid for the use of the co-channel system is a false alarm probability $P_{SFA} = 4.6 \times 10^{-2}$.

The bandwidth $W_n = 2.58 \times 10^6$ cps is the least bandwidth which will provide a value of $P_{SFA}$ less than or equal the specified value $P_{SFA} = .1$ ($Mq_1$, $k$, $\Delta_t$, $T_c$ fixed; $\Lambda_f$, $\lambda_f$, $\lambda_t$ integers). The result neglects synchronization errors, the effects of statistical dependence of codes, random channel noise, pulse cancellation, multipath effects, cross coupling between frequency channels, effects of the large dynamic range of received signals, and so on. Under ideal conditions, the performance of this system would be approached:

**Example 2**

Solve Example 1 with $P_{SFA}(\text{min}) = .01$. 
Solution 2

From (6.16a) $\Lambda_f = 3.26$. Use $\Lambda_f = 4$. From (6.9b)

$$P_{SFA}^{(\text{min})} = 4.15 \times 10^{-3}$$

The bandwidth $W_n$ is, from (6.15) or from Fig. 6.2

$$W_n = 5.00 \times 10^6 \text{ cps}$$

From (6.16b)

$$\lambda_f \lambda_t = 6.73$$

Setting $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 7$ limits the choice to a $\lambda_f = 1, \lambda_t = 7$ system, which has practical disadvantages. A choice of $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 6$ or $\lambda_f \lambda_t = 8$ would permit a variety of practical systems which will satisfy the initial $P_{SFA}$ requirement. The tradeoff between $\lambda_f$ and $\lambda_t$ would be in the direction of larger $\lambda_f$ as the number of address codes required increases.

6.6 Information Rate of a RADA System Using Clocked Binary Modulation and a Sampling Receiver

Previous results of this chapter, and the results obtained in Section 3.4.6 will be used in this section to determine the rate at which information is transmitted by a RADA system using clocked binary modulation and a sampling receiver. The rate $R$ per clock period, $T_c$, at which the information is transmitted is given by (3.98) and (3.99).
\[ R = \mathcal{F} \left[ (1 - P_m) (1 - k) \right] - (1 - k) \mathcal{F} \left( P_m \right) \]  

(3.99)

where,

\[ \mathcal{F}(P) = -[P \log_2 P + (1 - P) \log_2 (1 - P)] \]  

(3.98)

A RADA system using a sampling receiver with \( \lambda_f \lambda_t \) chosen to minimize \( P_{SFA} \) can transmit information at a rate \( R_{\text{max}} \) which can be determined by substituting the value \( P_m(\text{min}) \) corresponding to \( P_{SFA}(\text{min}) \)

\[ P_m(\text{min}) = (.5) \cdot \frac{T_c W}{m k} \quad ; \quad \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]  

(6.20)

into (3.98).

\[ R_{\text{max}} = \mathcal{F} \left\{ \left[ 1 - (.5) \cdot \frac{T_c W}{m k} \right] (1 - k) \right\} \]

\[ - (1 - k) \mathcal{F} \left[ (.5) \cdot \frac{T_c W}{m k} \right] \lambda_f \leq \Lambda_f \]  

(6.21)

The rate \( R_{\text{max}} \) applies to an "adaptive" type of RADA receiver, one which continuously adjusts \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \) to minimize \( P_{SFA} \). The quantity \( R_{\text{max}} \) can be read from the curves of Fig. 6.4 for \( m/Mq_1 = 1 \).

For the "practical," nonadaptive receiver described in Section 6.4,
\[ R(Mq_1, m) = \mathcal{F} \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{m}{Mq_1}} \right) \left( \frac{0.541 T_c W_n}{Mq_1 k} \right) \right] \]

\[ - (1 - k) \mathcal{F} \left[ \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{m}{Mq_1}} \right) \left( \frac{0.541 T_c W_n}{Mq_1 k} \right) \right] \] (6.22)

Both (6.21) and (6.22) have been determined for continuous \( \Lambda_f \) and \( (\lambda_f, \lambda_t) \); the rates \( R_{\text{max}} \) and \( R(Mq_1, m) \) are, therefore, upper bounds on the rates which apply when \( \Lambda_f \) and \( (\lambda_f, \lambda_t) \) are integers. The method of determining the integer values which optimize system performance has been described in Section 6.2. The rate \( R(Mq_1, m) \) is the maximum rate, per clock period, of information transmission by a RADA system having a false alarm probability which is minimized with respect to \( \lambda_f \) and \( \lambda_t \), when the rated number \( Mq_1 \) of users load the system, and when \( m \) users are loading the system. This rate is only achieved for the theoretical case in which the transmitted signals are coded in infinitely long binary sequences which are uniquely distinguishable at the receiver. The rate \( R(Mq_1, m) \) is plotted in Fig. 6.4 as a function of the normalized number of users, \( m/Mq_1 \), with \( T_c W_n/Mq_1 \) and \( k \) as parameters. It is seen in the figures that for a given value of \( k \), the maximum rate equals the entropy of a binary process with probabilities \( k \) and \( (1 - k) \), as expected; thus, for \( k = 0.5 \), the maximum rate is one
Fig. 6. 4(a). Information rate, $R(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .1$. 

$T_c \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} \geq 3$

$T_c \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} = 2$

$T_c \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} = 1$

$k = .1$

Normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$
Fig. 6.4(b). Information rate, $R(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .2$. 

$$\frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} \geq 5$$

$$\frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} = 1$$
Fig. 6.4(c). Information rate, $R(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = 0.3$.  

\[ \frac{T_c W_n}{Md_1} \geq 8 \]

\[ \frac{T_c W_n}{Mq_1} = 1 \]

$k = 0.3$

Normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$
Fig. 6. 4(d). Information rate, $R(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .4$. 

\[ T_c \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} \geq 9 \]

\[ T_c \frac{W_n}{Mq_1} = 1 \]

Normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$
Fig. 6.4(e). Information rate, $R(Mq_1, m)$, vs. normalized number of users $m/Mq_1$, for an optimal RADA system employing clocked binary modulation and sampling receivers, and designed for $Mq_1$ users; $k = .5$. 

$T_c W_n \frac{m}{Mq_1} = 1$ 

Normalized number of users, $m/Mq_1$
bit per clock period, $T_c$. The rate decreases as the number of users increases because of the mutual interference among system users.

The information rate decreases at a faster rate for systems having a smaller ratio of bandwidth expansion, $T_c W_n'$ per design number of users, $M q_1$, which systems are less immune to interference. Consider, again, the example of Section 6.4 for which $k = .5$ and $T_c W_n'/M q_1 = 8.3$. When loaded at half capacity, $m/M q_1 = .5$, the rate $R(M q_1, .5 M q_1) \approx 1$ bit per clock period. At rated capacity, the rate $R(M q_1, M q_1) \approx .99$ bits per clock period. The relatively high information capacity of this system is also reflected by the small false alarm probabilities given for the example of Section 6.4; this high capacity results from the use of equiprobable symbols ($k = .5$) and from the relatively large bandwidth expansion per rated user, $T_c W_n'/M q_1$, which is employed.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The studies of this dissertation are focused upon the central problem of determining and minimizing the effects of mutual interference among RADA systems; isolating those effects which are caused by the power level of interfering signals; and isolating those effects which are caused by erroneous frames produced by these signals.

In analyzing those interference effects which are attributable to the interference power level (Chapter II), it is assumed that when the signal-to-mutual-interference power ratio of a received signal exceeds the reciprocal of the receiver dynamic range, then the signal power exceeds the power of the spurious interference and receiver noise. When this is true the signal is called a useful received signal. In Chapter II, a lower bound is determined for the probability of a useful received signal; this probability is defined over an ensemble of nets with particular net parameter values. This bound is defined in terms of the receiver's dynamic range, the density of packing of transmitters in the net area, and the ratio of the distance separating the given transmitter and target receiver to the minimum distance between transceivers in the net. Because it is a lower bound which is determined for the probability of a useful received signal, the
probability specified by this bound will, in general, be exceeded by nets with the corresponding parameter values. Equivalently, such nets will permit a more dense transceiver packing than specified, and will utilize more bandwidth than is necessary for a net with the particular parameter values.

In studying those interference effects which result from erroneous frames produced by the interfering signals (Chapter III), the error statistics are determined in terms of the actual number of interfering transmitters. It is considered that this result is more meaningful than an error rate obtained by averaging over an assumed distribution of users, particularly since this distribution may vary considerably. For example, the distribution of the number of users in a military communication system will differ considerably, in an emergency situation, from the distribution for ordinary non-emergency operations. Further, the statistics of emergency situations are generally unpredictable from one situation to the next. The number of active transmitters which must be accommodated in the worst case is used in system design for emergencies, rather than the number of transmitters which provides a certain average level of performance in normal operating conditions.

The best measures of system performance (Chapter III) which can be used for a particular system are those measures which correlate most highly with the subjective observations of receiver
output signal quality. For ungated receivers, this would be the error rate or error pulse duty factor. For gated receivers, this would be the false alarm probability.

The general optimization procedures of Chapter V are applicable to all of the performance measures which have been presented here. Since these measures have typically been plotted as a function of $g\Delta, \lambda, \lambda_t$, the optimization is performed in terms of these parameters. The specific optimization which is carried out in Chapter VI is for a system which employs a sampling receiver.

The analytical results of this dissertation are based on a number of assumptions. Relaxation of these assumptions provides a suggestion for reasonable areas of future study. In the RADA system model developed in Chapter III, fixed AND gate input pulsewidths are assumed, whereas in fact the pulsewidths are variable. A realistic, tractable model which accounts for the variation of pulsewidths would constitute a definite advancement in modeling of these systems. Another area of useful endeavor is to determine, using the results of references in this area (Section 1.5.2.2), the size of the RADA code vocabularies which correspond to various system coding parameters ($\lambda_f, \Lambda_f, \lambda_t, \Lambda_t$), to specify the number of users which a particular system can accommodate with a specified error rate. Also, it is desirable to investigate the tradeoff between system optimization and vocabulary size; optimization of system performance (by choosing an
optimal value of the product $\lambda_i \lambda_i^t$ tends to alter the number of available user addresses. Another problem of significance is the determination of a class of pulse modulations (source encodings) of the voice waveform which tend to optimize system performance. Although efforts have been devoted to this problem, as cited in Section 1.5.2.1, a continuous examination of the applicability of newly developed pulse modulations to RADA systems is worthwhile.
APPENDIX

PROTOTYPE RADA SYSTEMS

The general principles of RADA systems were described in Section 1.2; three prototype RADA systems are described in this appendix. Since RADA type systems are still in a state of evolution, the final versions of these systems may be somewhat different than those described here. The systems discussed in this appendix are the Martin RACEP system, the Motorola RADEM system, and the Bendix CAPRI system.

The Martin RACEP System (Random Access and Correlation for Extended Performance) (Refs. 11-14, 1.6-1.8)

The acronym, RACEP, is used by the Martin Company to classify several items of functionally similar prototype RADA equipment including: the Engineering Model Subscriber Set, the Model 660 Subscriber Set, the Transponder Unit, the Guard Band Monitor Unit, and the Multiple Subscriber Set. Disregarding special features, all of these RACEP prototype units are similar to the Engineering Model Subscriber Set with regard to the general method of transmission and reception of information. Recent characteristics (Ref. 1.8) of this prototype set are described in this appendix. Previous parameter values are indicated in Refs. 1.6 and 1.7. Most recently, the acronym "RADA"
has been applied to a Martin net communications system in which the information is modulated in pulse-position modulation and transmitted in frequency-division multiplex, after searching for a vacant frequency channel (Refs. 1.19-1.23); RADA techniques are employed for the vacant channel search, and for other supervisory functions. This system is a complex one which is characterized by many special functions, and it is not described in this appendix.

A block diagram of the RACEP prototype transmitter is shown in Fig. A.1(a), a representative message frame is shown in Fig. A.1(b), and a block diagram of a prototype receiver in Fig. A.1(c). The basic principles of RADA system operation were described in Section 1.2, and they will be recapitulated here for the RACEP system. To address a target receiver, the operator of the given transmitter sets the transmitter delay line taps so that the total delay of each modulator output pulse, in passing through the transmitter and receiver delay lines, is 32 microseconds. That is, the given transmitter addresses the target receiver by choosing the values of delay within the transmitter to complement those within the receiver with respect to the delay line length (32 microseconds). Within the transmitter, the voice input to the transmitter is sampled at an 8 kc rate, and each sample amplitude modulates the position of a pulse. With no voice modulation, the instantaneous modulator output pulse rate is 8000 pps. With voice modulation, the average output rate is 8000 pps, but the instantaneous rate
Fig. A.1(a). Functional Martin RACEP transmitter block diagram.
Fig. A. 1(b). Representative transmitted time-frequency code frame for Martin RACEP system.
Fig. A.1(c). Functional Martin RACEP receiver block diagram.
is larger or smaller. The maximum deviation in the position of the modulator output pulses is ±30 microseconds with respect to the noise, 8 kc pulse train. Each pulse at the output of the pulse-position modulator generates an addressed group of three pulses (a message frame). At the transmitter output, the frequency and delay of the pulses of the frame are determined by the oscillator frequencies and delay line tap settings. [Fig. A.1(a) and Fig. A.1(b)] The delay lines employed in prototype equipment have a total delay of 32 microseconds, and are tapped at 2 microsecond intervals. The duration of the transmitted pulses, measured between the half-voltage points of the pulse envelope, is 1.5 microseconds. The three pulses of the frame are transmitted on the three carrier frequencies, 140 Mc, 141 Mc, and 142 Mc. Peak pulse power is 1 kw. (Peak pulse power is readily adjustable in the prototypes.)

Within the receiver, the received signal is processed as follows. Pulses on the three RF frequencies are separated in tuned RF stages and then detected. Each detected pulse is then delayed by an amount which complements the transmitter delay; in this way, pulses transmitted in a frame are delayed, and appear at the output of the three receiver delay lines at the same time. These coincident pulses actuate an AND gate, producing an output pulse. In some prototype receivers, this pulse is the direct input to the receiver pulse-position demodulator. In other, more recent RACEP receivers (Ref. 1.8) the
AND gate output is the input to a "blanking circuit” shown in Fig. A. 1(c). This circuit gates pulses out of the receiver demodulator input which occur less than 80 microseconds after a receiver demodulator input pulse. If this pulse is a message pulse, the blanking circuit gates out the error pulses which occur before the following message pulse. Recent prototype RACEP receivers have an output filter (Ref. 1. 8) which limits the receiver bandwidth to 2000 - 2500 cps. The filter limits the useful receiver output bandwidth from 4 kc (corresponding to a sampling rate of 8 kc) to 2 - 2.5 kc. Some of the prototypes employ DATEC modulation, a modification of delta modulation which is reportedly a very efficient representation of voice (Ref. 14). Many of the experimental modifications which have been made on prototype RACEP systems are described in Ref. 1.7. Some of these may have been changed as of the writing of Ref. 1.8 and are not indicated here. Tables of RACEP parameters are presented in Ref. 1.6 - 1.8. Table A.1 is an abstract from Ref. 1.8 which indicates the system parameter values.

Features of the RACEP system (Refs. 1.6 - 1.8) include ringing circuitry, a "command override" function, a "double function alert," and a "net" mode of operation. The command override function permits sending a message to all RACEP subscribers simultaneously. When the coded command override message is sent, the following occurs:

(1) All transmitters in the command override network except the originating transmitter are temporarily disabled.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engineering Model Subscriber Set</th>
<th>Model 660 Subscriber Set</th>
<th>Transponder</th>
<th>Guard Band Monitor Unit</th>
<th>Multiple Subscriber Unit Master</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight (lbs.)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (in.)</td>
<td>17-11/16</td>
<td>13-1/3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (in.)</td>
<td>18-3/4</td>
<td>17-1/4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (in.)</td>
<td>12-1/2</td>
<td>10-1/8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (cu. in.)</td>
<td>4146</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Power (w)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Power (w)</td>
<td>1000*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandwidth (Mc)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Frequency (Mc)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse Width (μsec)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Pulse Deviation (μsec)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Input Power</td>
<td>24-32 volts dc</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Drain (amp)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Pulse Rate (kpps)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x Indicates same characteristic as Engineering Model Subscriber Set.

* These parameters are adjustable. The values shown are those found to be convenient at USAEPG (United States Army Electronics Proving Ground).

Table A.1. RACEP equipment characteristics.**

** Abstract from Ref. 1.8.
(2) All receivers in the network are automatically set to receive the command override message.

(3) Each transceiver is responsive only to the command override signal until reset by the operator at the completion of the command override signal.

The double function alert permits sending two distinct alert conditions to all stations. When a station receives the coded alert message, the following occurs:

1. One of two lights turns on to indicate the particular alert condition, a buzzer sounds.

2. The same alert signal is retransmitted.

3. A lockout is generated so the signal is accepted and is retransmitted only once.

In the "net" mode, subscribers use the same code for transmission and reception. Duplex-like conversation is possible in the net mode.

Field tests with prototype RACEP equipment indicate that signals received in the presence of 8-9 interfering user stations are acceptable (output signal-to-noise ratio greater than 10 db), even with interferers located within 50 feet of the test receiver while the given transmitter was located 16 miles from the test receiver. The results of these tests are explained in detail in Ref. 1.8.
The Motorola System RADEM (Random Access Delta Modulation)

(Refs. 11-13, 15, 1.9, 1.0 and 1.28 through 1.33)

Block diagrams of the RADEM transmitter and receiver are shown in Fig. A.2(a) and Fig. A.2(c). The form of the RADEM time frequency frame is shown in Fig. A.2(b). The block diagrams and time frequency frame show that there are four pulses in a RADEM frame. Actually, prototype RADEM transmitters radiate a single pulse on either three or four of the five RADEM system frequencies. There are 16 possible time positions for each .5 microsecond pulse in a 26 microsecond RADEM frame. Frequencies in the range 150-400 Mc are considered for RADEM (Ref. 1.9).

Three differences of RADEM and RACEP are that RADEM uses different parameter values (e.g., transmitted pulsewidth, total number of system frequencies), delta modulation, and digital delay instead of delay lines.

At the transmitter, voice information is coded in single digit two level delta modulation (Fig. A.2a).

By means of the delta modulation, the voice signal is coded into a binary "one" or a binary "zero" in successive 26 microsecond clock intervals, resulting in a 38.4 kc binary pulse train at the modulator output. When the modulator output is a binary "one" in a particular clock interval, a frame such as is shown in Fig. A.2(b) is transmitted in the interval. When the modulator output is a "zero", a frame is
Fig. A. 2(b). Representative transmitted time-frequency code frame for Motorola RADEM system.
Fig. A. 3(d). Motorola RADEM receiver block diagram.
not transmitted. The "Address Control" circuit and the "Address Time-Frequency Matrix" produce pulses which gate the four oscillator output voltages to produce the time frequency code frame. The specific implementation of a RADEM system has not been described in the literature. In the following paragraphs, conjecture is made about the implementation. Depending on the address of the target receiver, each of the pulses which gate the four oscillators must be positioned in one of 16 time slots in a 26 microsecond frame. Each gating pulse is generated in the following manner. In the Address Time-Frequency Matrix, a 614.4 kc (16 x 38.4 kc) clock pulse train is derived from the 38.4 kc clock by multiplying the clock rate by 16. The 614.4 kc clock drives a four-stage counter in the Address Time-Frequency Matrix. The counter counts from one to sixteen in each frame interval, resets, and counts to sixteen in the following frame, and so on. The four stage counter has eight outputs, one pair of outputs from each of the four counter stages. The Address Control circuit is used to connect four counter outputs, one output from each counter, to the inputs of an AND gate. By connecting the AND-gate inputs to the proper set of four counter outputs, a pulse can be generated in any one of the 16 time slots in a frame. A fifth AND-gate input is connected to the modulator output, and modulates the information on the oscillator gating pulse. Thus, a single five input AND gate generates each oscillator gating pulse. Since there are four pulses in a frame, four AND gates in the Address Time-
Frequency Matrix are connected to the counter by the Address Control circuit. The position of each pulse in a frame is conveniently changed by using a 16-position four-pole switch in the Address Control circuit. For each switch position, a different set of four counter outputs is connected to the AND gate input. Thus, by setting four switches in the proper positions, AND gate output pulses are generated in four selected time slots in each frame, and in no other time slots.

A block diagram of the RADEM receiver is shown in Fig. A.2(c). With the exception that information does not modulate the gating pulses, the Preset Time Frequency Address circuit and the Time Frequency Gates generate four gating pulses in each frame in the same way as the Address Control circuit and the Time-Frequency Matrix generate gating pulses in the RADEM transmitter. The relative timing of the pulses on the four frequencies is fixed, and constitutes the receiver address. Assuming that a correctly coded group of four pulses is present at the receiver input, the gating pulses are used to gate the mixer and the four local oscillator inputs at the proper time to allow detection of the four pulses. It is apparent that the RADEM receiver must be time synchronized with a correctly coded received pulse group if the four pulses are to be detected. Given that the RADEM receiver is synchronized to a received signal, RADEM receiver operation is as follows. At the end of each frame interval, the flip-flop is set to the "one" state if the three stage binary counter contains a four. Otherwise,
the flip-flop is set to the zero state. After a slight delay, the counter is reset to zero. In this way the flip-flop output voltage in each frame interval is modulated with the information received during the preceding frame interval. The flip-flop output voltage is integrated in an RC integrator to produce the RADEM receiver output.

Before a RADEM receiver has synchronized with a properly coded received signal, the clock of the RADEM transceiver in the receive mode is designed to run fast or slow relative to the clock of a RADEM transceiver in the transmit mode. In this way, the times of the opening of the receiver gates precess relative to the epochs of the pulses in a time-frequency code frame. The receiver will always precess to the correct gate timing within a few milliseconds after a properly coded signal appears at the receiver antenna terminals. Once correct phasing is obtained, the receiver clock locks to, and maintains synchronization with the received signal.

Assuming that spurious pulses seldom have the proper amplitude and phase to cancel a pulse in a received, properly coded time-frequency frame, the primary source of interference to a RADEM receiver results from groups of four pulses from different transmitters which happen to arrive at the receiver with the correct time-frequency pattern for detection in a clock interval when no properly coded time-frequency code frame is received. Each such pulse group causes the receiver flip-flop to be set in the wrong state in a 26 microsecond
interval, and results in an error voltage of two quantization levels at the end of the interval.

Analytic work of van de Weg (Ref. 28) describes the signal-to-quantizing-noise ratios to be expected for delta modulation; in Ref. 29, de Jager compares delta modulation with PCM. Generally, delta modulation is a more efficient scheme of encoding voice information than PCM. Particularly, for a 3.5 kc bandwidth voice signal, a 38.4 kc sampling rate, the signal-to-quantizing-noise ratio for delta modulation is 30 db. For comparison, a signal-to-quantizing-noise ratio of 33 db is available with 4 digit PCM, which requires four times as much bandwidth as delta modulation, even in the absence of synchronizing information.

Experimental results given in Ref. 1.10 indicate that a 4.2 percent error rate in delta modulation pulses results in a 20 db signal-to-noise ratio at the delta demodulator output. A 15 percent error rate results in a 13 db signal-to-noise ratio.

The Bendix CAPRI System (Coded Address Private Radio Intercom)

(Ref. 1.5)

A block diagram of the CAPRI transmitter is shown in Fig. A.3(a). This block diagram is this writer's implementation of a verbal description given in Ref. 1.5. The transmitter output signal is shown in Fig. A.3(b), a block diagram of the receiver is shown in Fig. A.3(c). The system description given here follows that of Ref. 1.5.
Fig. A. 3(a). Bendix CAPRI transmitter block diagram.
Fig. A. 3(b). Representative transmitted time-frequency code frame for Bendix CAPRI system.
Fig. A. 3(c). Bendix CAPRI receiver block diagram.
To transmit to a given receiver, the transmitter delay line taps are set to match (i.e., complement, modulo the delay line length) those of the receiver. The transmitter delay line is a 10 microsecond line with a tap at each one microsecond delay increment. The transmitted signal is coded by selection of a particular set of four taps.

The transmitter clock generates two trains of one microsecond pulses, with repetition rates of 2500 pps and 10,000 pps. The 10,000 pps pulse train is used to sample the voice information. The samples are stored successively in four capacitor storage units; the fifth sample replaces the first, and so on. After each fourth pulse of the 10,000 pps pulse train, a 1 microsecond, 2500 pps pulse is fed into the ten microsecond delay line. The four pulses at the output taps of the delay line are amplitude-modulated by the voltages stored in the four capacitor storage units. In the implementation described by Bendix, the four pulse-modulator output voltages are added and used to modulate a voltage-controlled oscillator. The oscillator is the input to an amplifier which is gated on by each of the four pulses at the delay line output as in Fig. A.3(a). The gating is not necessary if the voltage-controlled oscillator is designed to produce an output voltage only when there is an input amplitude-modulated pulse. The transmitter time-frequency diagram is shown in Fig. A.3(b).

In the receiver, the signal follows an address path and an information path. In the first, the signal envelope is detected and receives,
in the delay line, the four delays appropriate for the code. The four delay-line outputs drive an AND gate and produce a gate output pulse. Thus the gate output at point x [Fig. A.3(c)] is a train of 2500 one microsecond pulses per second. The output of the one-shot gate following the AND gate can have no pulses with a spacing of less than 380 microseconds between them. (The spacing between a correct pulse pair is 400 microseconds.) The 2500 pps pulse train is used to obtain a 10,000 pps pulse train which drives a four-stage counter. The four-counter outputs are used to gate voltages, stored on capacitors, which are proportional to the original samples of the signal at the transmitter. The smoothed sum of the samples is the desired output waveform.

The information stored in the capacitors is obtained as follows. The discriminator output is a pulse train with the pulse amplitude corresponding to the original sample amplitudes. These pulses are coded in time. A second delay line in the receiver removes the coding in time; the four signal samples occur at the delay-line taps at the same time that a coincidence pulse is generated by the first AND gate (unless the coincidence pulse is spurious). The coincidence pulse allows the samples to enter the storage units. As was described previously, the voltages in the four storage units are sampled sequentially at a 10 kc rate. The smoothed sum of the samples is the receiver output signal.
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An analytical study is made of RADA (random access discrete address) communications systems. The factors which influence system performance are embodied in mathematical models which are used to determine, analytically, the quantitative effects of these factors on system performance. The investigations include the following. An analytical study of the mutual-interference-power-density at a receiver in a general co-channel RADA net environment is carried out. A determination is made as to the probability that a useful signal is at the receiver. Theoretical expressions for the statistics of the error process on two types of modulation are evaluated. A method is determined of choosing system parameters to minimize receiver output error probability for a given bandwidth. An expression is derived for the information rate of a RADA transmission in terms of the statistics of the error process. Finally, a sampling RADA receiver is proposed for use with clocked binary modulation and optimum parameters are determined for systems using this type of receiver.
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