

## Discrimination of buried targets via the singularity expansion

Carl E Baum

Phillips Laboratory/WSQW, 3550 Aberdeen Avenue SE, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM 87117-5776, USA

Received 21 February 1997

**Abstract.** A problem of recent interest is the identification of buried unexploded ordnance (including mines). This paper reviews recent progress in the use of the singularity expansion method for electromagnetic and acoustic/elastodynamic scattering for discriminating the various types (specific models with prescribed shapes and materials). Each type having an aspect-independent set of natural frequencies, these can be used as a set of target signatures in a library. Three different types of such natural frequencies (and associated pole residues) are discussed.

### 1. Introduction


A problem of significant current interest concerns the detection and identification of unexploded ordnance (UXO), whether mines or dud rounds [35]. These exist on many old battlefields around the world, and on many military bases (including those being converted to civilian use). While some UXOs may lie on the surface and are comparatively easy to identify (and remove or destroy), others may be buried out of sight under the ground or under water at various depths. This latter case presents a much more difficult problem.

A commonly used technique for detecting such buried UXOs is the measurement of the distortion of the earth's magnetic field by sensitive magnetometers (including gradiometers). However, this applies only to ferrous targets. Inductive metal detectors (continuous wave (CW) at some frequency, or pulsed) are also used and are sensitive to metal targets in general. As one can see, this generally leaves out plastic mines. Furthermore, detection is not the limiting problem. The above (and other) techniques primarily only detect the presence (and to some degree, location) of some 'targets' without indicating whether or not these are of significance for removal. In other words, the false-alarm rate is high, and this has important economic consequences for site clean-up (mitigation). What is needed is a technique for discriminating UXOs from other 'targets' such as shrapnel, pipes, rocks, tree roots, and other junk in general, before one digs up the object that has put some blip on our 'radar screen'.

One can consider this target-identification problem as a general problem in inverse scattering, but such a completely general approach is extremely difficult in the context of real-world soil and water. A related simpler approach relies on target signatures in which we have some finite library of such signatures for specific models of mortar shells, mines, etc [11, 14, 31, 32]. A signature is here meant as a set of parameters (not too large in number)

in a mathematical scattering model. There are various models of interest, for example, for identifying various types of aircraft via a transient (or multi-frequency) radar, different models being appropriate for various regimes of time and frequency.

For the buried UXO problem, we concentrate on the singularity expansion method (SEM) with its aspect-independent natural frequencies (pole locations) in the complex frequency plane. This is divided into three general types for present discussion. Electromagnetic singularity identification (EMSI) is concerned with metal and dielectric targets with wavelengths of the order of the target dimension in the surrounding medium (soil or water). This is appropriate for a special kind of ground-penetrating radar (GPR) operating in the general range of frequencies from approximately 100 MHz to 1 GHz. Magnetic singularity identification (MSI) is concerned with metal targets with diffusion depths in the metal of the order of the target dimensions (and is insensitive to a non-ferrous external medium). This is appropriate for a special kind of metal detector using coils for transmission and reception, but designed to analyse waveforms for natural frequencies corresponding to pure exponential decays with  $\mu\text{s}$  to  $\text{ms}$  time scales. Acoustic singularity identification (ASI) is like EMSI except that sound waves are employed with important frequencies now in the kHz range. Each of these has its own advantages and disadvantages, and are thus complementary. These are all discussed in detail in [17, 21–25].



**Figure 1.** Scattering of an incident wave by a target.

## 2. The singularity expansion method

As indicated in figure 1, let there be an incident plane wave of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(inc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= E_0 \tilde{f}(s) \mathbf{1}_p e^{-\tilde{\gamma}(s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(inc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \frac{E_0}{\tilde{Z}(s)} \tilde{f}(s) \mathbf{1}_p e^{-\tilde{\gamma}(s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}}\end{aligned}\quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_i &\equiv \text{direction of incidence} & \mathbf{1}_p &\equiv \text{polarization} \\ \tilde{\cdot} &\equiv \text{Laplace transform (two-sided) over time } t \\ s &\equiv \Omega + j\omega \equiv \text{Laplace - transform variable or complex frequency} \\ \tilde{\gamma}(s) &\equiv [s\mu_0(\sigma + s\varepsilon)]^{1/2} \equiv \text{propagation constant} \\ \tilde{Z}(s) &\equiv \left[\frac{s\mu_0}{\sigma + s\varepsilon}\right]^{1/2} \equiv \text{wave impedance} \\ \mu_0 &\equiv \text{permeability (free space)} \\ \varepsilon &\equiv \text{permittivity} \\ \sigma &\equiv \text{conductivity} \\ f(t) &\equiv \text{incident waveform.}\end{aligned}$$

In free space, or in a lossless dispersionless dielectric, the incident wave takes the simple form  $f(t - \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}[\mu_0\varepsilon]^{1/2})$ , but the above form allows for propagation in more general dispersive and lossy media where the constitutive parameters can even be allowed to be frequency dependent.

As a step in calculating the scattered field, one can calculate the current on a target via an integral equation of the general form

$$\langle \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_t(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s); \tilde{\mathbf{J}}_s(\mathbf{r}'_s, s) \rangle = \tilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(inc)}(\mathbf{r}_s, s). \quad (2.2)$$

The particular form here is that of the tangential field components (subscript  $t$ ) on the perfectly conducting body with surface  $S$  (the domain of integration over  $\mathbf{r}'_s$  in the symmetric product (no conjugation)). The kernel here is an impedance operator, simply related to the dyadic Green's function for the surrounding medium. The above form is generalizable to various other situations with volume current density (with integration over the volume  $V$ ). Also note that, assuming reciprocity for the target, the kernel is symmetric (equals its transpose).

The details of SEM are found in many references [1–20] summarized here. The natural frequencies satisfy

$$\left. \begin{aligned}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_t(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s); \tilde{\mathbf{j}}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}'_s) \rangle &= \mathbf{0} \\ (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{t_{n,m}}(s_\alpha))(j_{s_n})_\alpha &= (0_n) \\ \det(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{t_{n,m}}(s_\alpha)) &= 0\end{aligned}\right\} \text{numerical (matricized) form as in the moment method} \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}s_\alpha &\equiv \text{natural frequency} \\ j_{s_\alpha} &\equiv \text{natural mode.}\end{aligned}$$

In the numerical/matrix form we have a way of computing natural frequencies and modes. From the above we have immediately that  $s_\alpha$  and  $j_{s_\alpha}$  have *no* dependence on

incident-field parameters. This aspect independence of the  $s_\alpha$  is of great advantage in identifying that the target is of a particular type. Constructing the complete response (current) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{j}}_s(\mathbf{r}_s, s) = E_0 \sum_{\alpha} \tilde{f}(s_\alpha) n_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i, \mathbf{1}_p) \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_s) [s - s_\alpha]^{-1} e^{-(s-s_\alpha)t_0} \\ + \text{singularities of } \tilde{f}(s) + \text{possible entire function} \\ + \text{branch cuts (in dispersive external medium)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where only first-order poles have been included, but poles of higher order are possible in special circumstances. In time domain, the poles are replaced by  $e^{s_\alpha t} u(t - t_0)$ . Note the inclusion of a turn-on time  $t_0$  which can be chosen for convenience (say the time the wave first touches the target). The coupling coefficient is

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i, \mathbf{1}_p) = \frac{\mathbf{1}_i \langle e^{-\gamma_\alpha \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{r}'_s}; \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}'_s) \rangle}{\left\langle \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_s); \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \tilde{\tilde{Z}}_t(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s) \Big|_{s=s_\alpha}; \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}'_s) \right\rangle} \\ \gamma_\alpha \equiv \tilde{\gamma}(s_\alpha) \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

and here is where information concerning the incident wave is contained. The entire function (singularity at  $s = \infty$ ) is basically an early-time contribution in time domain. It is the late-time portions of the scattered fields in which the natural frequencies are most clearly visible. An important result for finite-size targets in free space (or similar dispersionless media) is the absence of branch-cut singularities. For lossy earth, however, such a term is present. Note that all the above terms occur in conjugate symmetric pairs (except for singularities on the real  $s$  axis where they are real) corresponding to the Laplace transform of real-valued temporal quantities.

Our concern is with the scattered field for which we have the far field

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}_f(\mathbf{r}, s) = \frac{e^{-\tilde{\gamma}(s)r}}{4\pi r} \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) \tilde{\mathbf{E}}^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) \\ r \equiv |\mathbf{r}| \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) = \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}^T(-\mathbf{1}_i, -\mathbf{1}_o; s) \text{ (reciprocity)} \\ \equiv \text{scattering dyadic} \\ \mathbf{1}_o \equiv \text{direction to observer.} \end{aligned}$$

For backscattering (monostatic) this reduces to

$$\mathbf{1}_o = -\mathbf{1}_i \quad \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}_b(\mathbf{1}_i, s) \equiv \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}(-\mathbf{1}_i, \mathbf{1}_i; s) = \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}^T(\mathbf{1}_i; s) \text{ (symmetric)}. \quad (2.7)$$

Applying this to the SEM form gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\tilde{\Lambda}}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) = \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha(-\mathbf{1}_o) c_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) + \text{entire function} \\ + \text{possible branch cuts} \\ c_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) = w_\alpha \langle \mathbf{1}_i e^{-\gamma_\alpha \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{r}'_s}; \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}'_s) \rangle \equiv \text{normalized coupling vector} \\ w_\alpha^2 = -s_\alpha \mu_0 \left\langle \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_s); \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \tilde{\tilde{Z}}_t(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s) \Big|_{s=s_\alpha}; \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}'_s) \right\rangle^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$\overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_i \equiv \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} - \mathbf{1}_i \mathbf{1}_i \quad \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} \equiv \mathbf{1}_x \mathbf{1}_x \equiv \mathbf{1}_y \mathbf{1}_y \equiv \mathbf{1}_z \mathbf{1}_z \equiv \text{identity.}$$

So, in addition to the natural frequencies, these coupling vectors can give some additional information about the target, specifically about its orientation (polarization). Note that there can be degeneracies in the case of symmetry, in which there are more than one  $c_\alpha$  with the same  $s_\alpha$ .

The above gives the basic form for SEM as appropriate to EMSI (used with a GPR) discussed in the next two sections. Later, when discussing acoustics/elastodynamics, a very similar form is obtained for ASI. For MSI, however, near fields and the magnetic-polarizability dyadic will give a different form, but one with natural frequencies (purely real) and vectors coming from the decomposition of the dyadic.

### 3. Perfectly conducting target in a lossy dielectric medium

Consider now the (relatively) simple case of a perfectly conducting target. Here, we observe from the form of the kernel

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_t(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s) &= -s\mu_0 \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) \cdot \tilde{G}_0(\mathbf{r}_s, \mathbf{r}'_s; s) \cdot \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_S(\mathbf{r}'_s) \\ &= -s\mu_0 \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) \cdot \{[-2\zeta^{-3} - 2\zeta^{-2}]e^{-\zeta} \mathbf{1}_R \mathbf{1}_R \\ &\quad + [\zeta^{-3} + \zeta^{-2} + \zeta^{-1}]e^{-\zeta} [\overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} - \mathbf{1}_R \mathbf{1}_R]\} \cdot \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_S(\mathbf{r}'_s) \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R &= |\mathbf{r}_s - \mathbf{r}'_s| \quad \mathbf{1}_R = \frac{\mathbf{r}_s - \mathbf{r}'_s}{R} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{r}_s \neq \mathbf{r}'_s \\ \zeta &= \tilde{\gamma}(s)R \quad \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) \equiv \overleftrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} - \mathbf{1}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) \mathbf{1}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) \equiv \text{transverse dyadic at } \mathbf{r}_s \\ \mathbf{1}_S(\mathbf{r}_s) &\equiv \text{unit surface normal at } \mathbf{r}_s \end{aligned}$$

involving the dyadic Green's function of the external uniform isotropic medium, that there is a special scaling relationship.

Summarizing from [17, 21], let

$$\tilde{\gamma}^{(0)}(s) = \frac{s^{(0)}}{c} = s^{(0)}[\mu_0 \varepsilon_0]^{-1/2} \equiv \text{propagation constant of free space} \quad (3.2)$$

and equate this to the propagation constant in the external medium of interest (e.g. soil). Applying this to the natural frequencies we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\alpha^{(0)} &= \frac{s_\alpha^{(0)}}{c} = [s_\alpha \mu_0 (\sigma + s_\alpha \varepsilon)]^{1/2} \equiv \gamma_\alpha \\ s_\alpha &= -\frac{\sigma}{2\varepsilon} + \left[ \left[ \frac{\sigma}{2\varepsilon} \right]^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0} s_\alpha^{(0)2} \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

This result comes from observing that the natural frequencies come from (2.3) in the form of particular  $\gamma_\alpha$ , as in (3.1). Changing the form that  $\tilde{\gamma}(s)$  takes changes the  $s_\alpha$ , not the  $\gamma_\alpha$ . Furthermore, note from (2.3) and (2.8) that the natural modes and coupling vectors are unchanged (since  $\gamma_\alpha$  does not change) which we indicate symbolically as

$$\mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_s) = \mathbf{j}_{s_\alpha}^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}_s) \quad \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) = \mathbf{c}_\alpha^{(0)}(\mathbf{1}_i) \quad (3.4)$$

noting, of course, that these are applied to the new (shifted) natural frequencies. With these scaling relationships it is not necessary to calculate the natural frequencies, say from a

discretized form of (2.3). One can measure these parameters, say in an anechoic chamber, and then use these scaling equations to scale to a lossy dielectric medium of interest.

For large  $s_\alpha^{(0)}$  compared with  $\sigma/\varepsilon$ , in what is called the high-frequency window [33], we have

$$s_\alpha = \left[ \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon} \right]^{1/2} s_\alpha^{(0)} - \frac{\sigma}{2\varepsilon} + O(s_\alpha^{(0)-1}) \quad \text{as } s_\alpha^{(0)} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.5)$$

For  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$  assumed independent of  $s$ , this is a simple affine transformation (dilation and translation) in the  $s$  plane. As such, the ‘pattern’ of the natural frequencies for a particular target is an aid in identification. As we can see from the dilation term, the natural frequencies will be reduced by a significant factor from their free-space values, and shifted slightly to the left (more damping) for typical  $\varepsilon/\varepsilon_0$  (say 10 or so) and  $\sigma(10^{-3}\text{--}10^{-2} \text{ S m}^{-1})$ .

As part of the design of a GPR to exploit the above results, one needs to propagate a signal from the ground surface to the target, and from the target (scattered signal) back to an antenna on or above the ground surface. There are various ways to design appropriate antennae [26–30] to transmit and receive appropriate pulses, perhaps using the Brewster angle for better transmission through the ground surface. Letting  $d$  be some distance of interest for propagation in this medium, we have the propagation factor

$$e^{-\tilde{\gamma}(s)d} = e^{-\frac{s}{v}d} e^{-\frac{\sigma Z_\infty d}{2}} [1 + O(s^{-1})] \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow \infty \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} v &= [\mu_0 \varepsilon]^{-1/2} \\ Z_\infty &= \left[ \frac{\mu_0}{\varepsilon} \right]^{1/2} \\ e^{-\frac{s}{v}d} &\equiv \text{delay (by time } d/v) \\ e^{-\frac{\sigma Z_\infty d}{2}} &\equiv \text{attenuation factor.} \end{aligned}$$

If  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$  can be approximated as frequency independent, then in this high-frequency window pulses are propagated with attenuation, but without dispersion. Propagation distances of a few metres are typically useful with acceptable attenuation. Expression (3.6), related for the electric and magnetic fields, can be readily expressed in a time domain (for delta- or step-function response) to give exact responses, including the low-frequency dispersion [17, 21].

There are various errors to contend with, such as those associated with inhomogeneities (rocks, etc) in the external medium as well as the ground/air interface. If these are close to the target (in units of target size) they can affect the  $s_\alpha$ . Furthermore,  $\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon$  can vary with frequency (in the range of interest). This can be partly compensated by measuring these constitutive parameters *in situ*, say by measuring the reflection of the incident wave (from the GPR, including appropriate variations of the direction of incidence and polarization) from the ground/air interface.

#### 4. Dielectric target in lossy dielectric medium

Let the target now be characterized as a simple dielectric with constant permittivity  $\varepsilon_2$  and permeability  $\mu_0$  with

$$\varepsilon_r \equiv \frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_1} \quad (4.1)$$

where now a subscript 1 will be used to designate parameters of the external medium. We now consider the case that  $\varepsilon_r$  is small compared to 1. With  $\varepsilon_2$  as about  $2\varepsilon_0$  or  $3\varepsilon_0$

(corresponding to a typical plastic explosive) and typical soil permittivities (in the 100 MHz range) as about  $10\varepsilon_0$  (or  $81\varepsilon_0$  in water), one can justify such an approximation. For later use we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0}{\varepsilon_1}} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sigma_1}{s\varepsilon_1} \right]^{-1/2} \equiv \text{wave impedance in external medium} \\ Z_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{\mu_0}{\varepsilon_2}} \equiv \text{wave impedance in target} \\ \tilde{\xi} &\equiv \frac{Z_2}{\tilde{Z}_1} = \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_1}{\tilde{\gamma}_2} = \varepsilon_r^{-1/2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sigma_1}{s\varepsilon_1} \right]^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

In the limit of small  $\varepsilon_r$  (or large  $\tilde{\xi}$ ) one can look at the properties of the external and internal resonances [17, 24]. For the external resonances we can think of the target surface,  $S$ , as a perfect magnetic conductor (infinite surface impedance) in the limit as  $\tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty$ . This lets one consider the dual problem in which  $S$  is a perfect conductor and the electric and magnetic fields are interchanged [13]. The  $s_\alpha$  then are the same as for a metal target as in the previous section, and the scaling relationships there can be applied from free-space measurements of a metal-coated dielectric target to obtain the  $s_\alpha$  in soil (or water). Of course, this procedure only gives the unperturbed external resonances, but this can be used as a starting point.

Leaving behind the external resonances, go on to the internal resonances which are, in general, more important due to their smaller damping (higher  $Q$ ). In this case the lower external wave impedance (large  $\tilde{\xi}$ ) allows one to consider the internal resonances as the usual cavity resonances with  $S$  considered as a perfect conductor in the first approximation. From an experimental point of view one can cover the dielectric target with metal and couple electromagnetic fields into the cavity through a small penetration (small wire coupling loop, etc) to determine the interior  $s_\alpha$  (on the  $j\omega$  axis for a lossless cavity). Then one considers the perturbation away from these  $s_\alpha$  into the left-half  $s$  plane due to the external medium. Write

$$\begin{aligned} s_\alpha &= s_\alpha^{(0)} + \Delta s_\alpha \\ s_\alpha^{(0)} &\equiv \text{natural frequency (unperturbed) for target as lossless cavity} \\ &\quad \text{with perfectly conducting boundary} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

$\Delta s_\alpha \equiv$  perturbation of natural frequency.

For the perturbation of the natural frequencies we can consider canonical problems to get some idea of what the perturbation from the cavity problem is. A simple canonical problem is a dielectric slab of thickness  $l$ . As an infinite slab, we constrain the direction of incidence to be perpendicular to the slab to make the natural frequencies unique and give a simple transmission-line problem. The reflection or backscattering coefficient is

$$\tilde{R}_0 = \frac{[\tilde{\xi}^2 - 1] \sinh(\tilde{\gamma}_2 l)}{2\tilde{\xi} \cosh(\tilde{\gamma}_2 l) + [\tilde{\xi}^2 + 1] \sinh(\tilde{\gamma}_2 l)}. \quad (4.4)$$

The poles are found from the zeros of the denominator as

$$0 = \frac{\tilde{\xi}^2(s_\alpha) + 1}{2\tilde{\xi}(s_\alpha)} + \coth(\tilde{\gamma}_2(s_\alpha)l). \quad (4.5)$$

Large  $\tilde{\xi}$  gives the limiting (unperturbed) form as

$$\begin{aligned} T_l &\equiv \sqrt{\mu_0 \varepsilon_2} l & s_\alpha^{(0)} &= j\omega_\alpha^{(0)} \\ 0 &= \sin(\omega_\alpha^{(0)} T_l) & \omega_\alpha^{(0)} T_l &= n\pi \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Continuing the expansion as in (4.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta s_\alpha T_l &= -\operatorname{arctanh} \left[ \frac{2\tilde{\xi}(s_\alpha)}{\tilde{\xi}^2(s_\alpha) + 1} \right] \\ &= -2\tilde{\xi}^{-1}(s_\alpha) + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-3}) \quad \text{as } \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty \\ \tilde{\xi}(s_\alpha) &= \tilde{\xi}(s_\alpha^{(0)})[1 + O(\Delta s_\alpha)] \quad \text{as } \Delta s_\alpha \rightarrow 0 \\ \Delta s_\alpha T_l &= -2\tilde{\xi}^{-1}(s_\alpha) + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-3}) \quad \text{as } \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

For a pure dielectric external medium ( $\sigma_1 = 0$ ) we have

$$\Delta s_\alpha T_l = -2\varepsilon_r^{1/2} + O(\varepsilon_r) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_r \rightarrow 0\tag{4.8}$$

which is a particularly simple result. Including a non-zero  $\sigma_1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta s_\alpha T_l &= -2\varepsilon_r^{1/2} \left[ 1 + \frac{j}{2} \frac{\sigma_1}{\omega_\alpha^{(0)} \varepsilon_1} + O\left(\left(\frac{\sigma_1}{\omega_\alpha^{(0)} \varepsilon_1}\right)^2\right) \right] + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-3}) \\ &\text{as } \frac{\sigma_1}{s_\alpha^{(0)} \varepsilon_1} \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty\end{aligned}\tag{4.9}$$

showing the leading effect in the high-frequency limit as a shift to the left in the  $s$  plane with a smaller shift of the imaginary part (toward the origin).

A second canonical problem is a dielectric sphere of radius  $a$ . Leaving behind the details of the spherical vector wavefunctions [17, 24], the exterior natural frequencies for  $\tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty$  are given as

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(1)} &\equiv \tilde{\gamma}_1 a = [s\mu_0(\sigma_1 + s\varepsilon_1)]^{1/2} a \\ [\Gamma_\alpha^{(1,H)} k_n(\Gamma_\alpha^{(1,H)})]' &= 0 \quad k_n(\Gamma_\alpha^{(1,E)}) = 0\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_\alpha^{(1,H)} &\equiv \text{roots for external } H \text{ (or TE) modes} \\ \Gamma_\alpha^{(1,E)} &\equiv \text{roots for external } E \text{ (or TM) modes}\end{aligned}$$

where an  $H$  mode has a radial (normal to the sphere surface) component of the magnetic field, and similarly for an  $E$  mode. The prime indicates differentiation with respect to the argument of the spherical Bessel function.

For the internal resonances we have for large  $\tilde{\xi}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(2)} &\equiv \tilde{\gamma}_2 a = s\sqrt{\mu_0\varepsilon_2} a \\ i_n(\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,H)}) &= 0 \quad [\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)} i_n(\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)})]' = 0\end{aligned}\tag{4.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,H)} &\equiv \text{roots for internal } H \text{ (or TE) modes} \\ \Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)} &\equiv \text{roots for internal } E \text{ (or TM) modes}\end{aligned}$$

these roots being purely imaginary. For the interior  $H$  modes we then have

$$\begin{aligned}T_\alpha &\equiv \sqrt{\mu_0\varepsilon_2} a \\ s_\alpha^{(2,H,0)} T_\alpha &\equiv \Gamma_\alpha^{(2,H)} \\ s_\alpha^{(2,H)} &\equiv s_\alpha^{(2,H,0)} + \Delta s_\alpha^{(2,H)}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

Performing the appropriate expansions leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta s_\alpha^{(2,H)} T_\alpha &= -\tilde{\xi}^{-1} + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-2}) \quad \text{as } \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty \\ &= -\varepsilon_r^{1/2} + O(\varepsilon_r) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_r \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \sigma_1 = 0\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$



which is very similar to the slab results. For the interior  $E$  modes we have

$$s_\alpha^{(2,E,0)} T_a \equiv \Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)} a \quad s_\alpha^{(2,E)} \equiv s_\alpha^{(2,E,0)} + \Delta s_\alpha^{(2,E)} \quad (4.14)$$

which are used to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta s_\alpha^{(2,E)} T_a &= -\tilde{\xi}^{-1} \frac{\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)^2}}{\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)^2} + n(n+1)} + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-2}) \quad \text{as } \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty \\ &= -\varepsilon_r^{1/2} \frac{\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)^2}}{\Gamma_\alpha^{(2,E)^2} + n(n+1)} + O(\varepsilon_r) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon_r \rightarrow 0 \text{ for } \sigma_1 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

This is also similar to the slab results, but slightly more complicated.

These results have the general form for the interior resonances

$$s_\alpha^{(2)} T = -C \tilde{\xi}^{-1} + O(\tilde{\xi}^{-2}) \quad \tilde{\xi} \rightarrow \infty \quad (4.16)$$

where

$C > 0$ ,  $C \equiv$  dimensionless parameter depending on mode and target shape

$T \equiv$  some characteristic time associated with propagation through

the target (in medium 2).

This is primarily a shift to the left in the  $s$  plane associated with  $\varepsilon_r^{1/2}$ , but there is a small imaginary part associated with  $\sigma_1$ .

### 5. Highly, but not perfectly, conducting targets

A recent technique [17, 22, 23] concerns the diffusive natural frequencies in metal targets (MSI). For this case one uses loops above the ground surface as transmitters and receivers of quasistatic magnetic fields, with wavelengths (or skin depths) in the external medium large compared with distances between loops and target. In this case, one is interested in the magnetic polarizability dyadic which gives the target an induced magnetic dipole moment as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}(s) = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(s) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(inc)}(s) \quad (5.1)$$

where

$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(inc)}(s) =$  incident magnetic field at target

$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}(s) =$  magnetic polarizability dyadic

$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}(s) =$  induced magnetic dipole moment.

The scattered magnetic field is then

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) = \frac{1}{4\pi r^3} [3\mathbf{1}_r \mathbf{1}_r - \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{1}}] \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(s) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{H}}^{(inc)}(s) \quad (5.2)$$

with the usual spherical coordinates centred on the target. The distance  $r$  to the observer is assumed large compared with target dimensions so that higher-order magnetic moments are not significant.

Summarizing, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(s) &= \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(\infty) + \sum_\alpha M_\alpha \mathbf{M}_\alpha \mathbf{M}_\alpha [s - s_\alpha]^{-1} \\ \frac{1}{s} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(s) &= \frac{1}{s} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}(0) + \sum_\alpha \frac{M_\alpha}{s_\alpha} \mathbf{M}_\alpha \mathbf{M}_\alpha [s - s_\alpha]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_\alpha \cdot M_\alpha &= 1 & M_\alpha &\equiv \text{real unit vector for } \alpha\text{th mode} \\
 M_\alpha &= \text{real scalar} & s_\alpha &< 0 \text{ (all negative real natural frequencies)} \\
 \tilde{M}(\infty) &= \sum_{\nu=1}^3 M_\nu^{(\infty)} M_\nu^{(\infty)} M_\nu^{(\infty)} \\
 M_\nu^{(\infty)} &\equiv \text{real eigenvectors (three)} \\
 M_{\nu_1}^{(\infty)} \cdot M_{\nu_2}^{(\infty)} &= 1_{\nu_1, \nu_2} \text{ (orthonormal)} \\
 M_\nu^{(\infty)} &\equiv \text{real eigenvalues (non-positive, not necessarily distinct)} \\
 \tilde{M}(0) &= \sum_{\nu=1}^3 M_\nu^{(0)} M_\nu^{(0)} M_\nu^{(0)} \\
 M_\nu^{(0)} &\equiv \text{real eigenvectors (three)} \\
 M_{\nu_1}^{(0)} \cdot M_{\nu_2}^{(0)} &= 1_{\nu_1, \nu_2} \text{ (orthonormal)} \\
 M_\nu^{(0)} &\equiv \text{real eigenvalues (non-negative, not necessarily distinct)} \\
 1_{\nu_1, \nu_2} &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } \nu_1 = \nu_2 \\ 0 & \text{for } \nu_1 \neq \nu_2. \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

Note the presence of only first-order poles; the entire function is a constant (delta function in time domain). Transit times across the target in the external medium are so short on the present time scale as to be neglected. Fundamental to the above results is the neglect of  $\omega\epsilon$  compared with  $\sigma$  in the target. (Note that in general in the target we can have dyadic (anisotropic) constitutive parameters  $\vec{\sigma}(\mathbf{r})$  and  $\vec{\mu}(\mathbf{r})$ .) From a discretized point of view the target can be viewed as a circuit comprised of inductors and resistors (LR) and appropriate circuit theorems applied, leading to only first-order poles with  $s_\alpha$  real and negative, corresponding to simple exponential decays in time domain. Inclusion of point symmetry (rotation and/or reflection) in the target further simplifies (5.3) by making the various unit vectors line up according to the planes and axes of symmetry.

This general form of the response is consistent with the well known examples of a metal sphere and a simple loop. However, one need not calculate the  $s_\alpha$  (and perhaps associated vectors) for each target type of interest. These can be measured to give the target-library entries. While my original thoughts concerning this technique were directed towards targets in the ground, it has become apparent that the same technique can be applied to security systems such as at airports [34]. One can think of this as a ‘smart’ metal detector.

## 6. Acoustic/elastic/elastic target discrimination

There is an analogue to the SEM representation for electromagnetic scattering in the case of acoustic/elastic/elastic scattering, this being important for the case of UXO in water or water-saturated soil. Going by the name of acoustic resonance scattering, various canonical problems having analytic solutions (based on circular-cylindrical and spherical shells) have been treated [12]. One thing needed here is a more general form of the scattering, applicable to general shapes of bodies that are passive, linear, and reciprocal. Recent results [17, 25] have found the general form of the scattering poles directly analogous to the form in section 2. For scalar p-wave scattering this consists in replacing the vector  $c_\alpha$  by scalar  $c_\alpha$ , and similarly dyadics by scalars. Including s-waves in the incident and scattered waves

complicates the problem significantly.

Summarizing from [17, 25], in terms of the displacement vector  $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{n,m,l,k}(s)) : \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, s) \equiv \text{stress tensor} \\
 (\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{n,m,l,k}(s)) &\equiv \text{stiffness tensor} \\
 C_{n,m,l,k} &= \tilde{l}_1(s) 1_{n,m} 1_{l,k} + \tilde{l}_2(s) [1_{n,l} 1_{m,k} + 1_{m,k} 1_{n,l}] \\
 \tilde{l}_1(s), \tilde{l}_2(s) &\equiv \text{Lame constants} \\
 \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \tilde{l}_1(s) [\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, s)] \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\mathbf{1}} + \tilde{l}_2(s) [\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, s) + [\nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{r}, s)]^T] \\
 &= \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}}(\mathbf{r}, s) \tag{6.1} \\
 \tilde{v}_p(s) &= \left[ \frac{\tilde{l}_1(s) + 2\tilde{l}_2(s)}{\rho_a} \right]^{-1/2} \equiv \text{p-wave speed (longitudinal, pressure)} \\
 \tilde{v}_s(s) &= \left[ \frac{\tilde{l}_2(s)}{\rho_a} \right]^{-1/2} \equiv \text{s-wave speed (transverse, shear)} \\
 \rho_a &\equiv \text{mass density.}
 \end{aligned}$$

For frequency-independent (and thereby real and positive) Lamé constants we have

$$v_p > v_s > 0. \tag{6.2}$$

The incident and scattered (far-field) waves both have  $p$  and  $s$  components in general with the forms

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}^{(inc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= e^{-\tilde{\gamma}_p(s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_p^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) + e^{-\tilde{\gamma}_s(s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \mathbf{r}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_s^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) \\
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_p^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_p^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) \mathbf{1}_i \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_s^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) \cdot \mathbf{1}_i = 0 \\
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_f^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_p}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_s}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) \quad \mathbf{r} = r \mathbf{1}_o \\
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_p}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_p}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) \mathbf{1}_o \quad \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_s}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) \cdot \mathbf{1}_o = 0 \\
 \tilde{\gamma}_p(s) &\equiv \frac{s}{\tilde{v}_p} \quad \tilde{\gamma}_s(s) \equiv \frac{s}{\tilde{v}_s}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

The incident and scattered fields are related by linearity as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_p}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \mathbf{1}_o \frac{e^{-\tilde{\gamma}_p(s)r}}{4\pi r} [\tilde{\Lambda}_{p,p}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_p^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) + \tilde{\Lambda}_{p,s}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_s^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s)] \\
 \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{f_s}^{(sc)}(\mathbf{r}, s) &= \frac{e^{-\tilde{\gamma}_s(s)r}}{4\pi r} [\tilde{\Lambda}_{s,p}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) \mathbf{1}_i \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_p^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s) + \tilde{\Lambda}_{s,s}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_s^{(inc)}(\mathbf{0}, s)]
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

giving four scattering coefficients (one scalar, two vector, one dyadic).

Expand these four scattering coefficients in terms of poles (here assumed first order) as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{\Lambda}_{p,p}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) &= \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_{\alpha}^{(p,p)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) [s - s_{\alpha}]^{-1} + \text{other singularity terms} \\
 \tilde{\Lambda}_{p,s}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) &= \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_{\alpha}^{(p,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) [s - s_{\alpha}]^{-1} + \text{other singularity terms} \\
 \tilde{\Lambda}_{s,p}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) &= \sum_{\alpha} \Lambda_{\alpha}^{(s,p)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) [s - s_{\alpha}]^{-1} + \text{other singularity terms} \\
 \tilde{\Lambda}_{s,s}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i; s) &= \sum_{\alpha} \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\Lambda}_{\alpha}^{(s,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) [s - s_{\alpha}]^{-1} + \text{other singularity terms.}
 \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

The elastodynamic reciprocity theorem, when applied to the pole residues, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\alpha^{(p,p)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= \Lambda_\alpha^{(p,p)}(-\mathbf{1}_i, -\mathbf{1}_o) \\ \Lambda_\alpha^{(p,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= -\frac{\tilde{v}_s^2(s_\alpha)}{\tilde{v}_p^2(s_\alpha)} \Lambda_\alpha^{(s,p)}(-\mathbf{1}_i, -\mathbf{1}_o) \\ \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\Lambda}_\alpha^{(s,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\Lambda}_\alpha^{(s,s)^T}(-\mathbf{1}_i, -\mathbf{1}_o). \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

Omitting the details, this is then used for non-degenerate natural modes to give a factored form for these scattering coefficients as

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_\alpha^{(p,p)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= c_\alpha(-\mathbf{1}_o)c_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) \\ \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\Lambda}_\alpha^{(s,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= \mathbf{c}_\alpha(-\mathbf{1}_o)\mathbf{c}_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) \\ \Lambda_\alpha^{(p,s)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= a_\alpha c_\alpha(-\mathbf{1}_o)c_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) \\ \Lambda_\alpha^{(s,p)}(\mathbf{1}_o, \mathbf{1}_i) &= a_\alpha^{-1} c_\alpha(-\mathbf{1}_o)c_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) \\ a_\alpha &= \pm j \frac{\tilde{v}_s(s_\alpha)}{\tilde{v}_p(s_\alpha)} \quad \mathbf{c}_\alpha(\mathbf{1}_i) \cdot \mathbf{1}_i = 0 \text{ (transverse)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

These four coefficients are then representable by products of one scalar  $c_\alpha$  and one vector  $\mathbf{c}_\alpha$  as functions of incoming and outgoing directions. These can be regarded as experimental observables which the factorization in (6.7) makes functions of only one angle (variable over  $4\pi$  steradians).

Comparing with the electromagnetic form in (2.8) we can see that (6.7) is a generalization including both transverse and longitudinal waves. While (2.8) has been derived from an integral equation representation of the scattering, (6.7) has been derived by the imposition of reciprocity on the general form of the scattering coefficients (a procedure which can be applied just as easily to electromagnetic scattering). While (6.5) and (6.7) give




Figure 2. SEM-based target identification.

the basic form for first-order elastodynamic poles, there is still much to be done to bring the knowledge of the SEM terms to the same level of sophistication as in the electromagnetic case. While the present results apply to the elastodynamic case, there are important cases in which the external medium only supports significant p-waves (e.g. air, water). Even though the target may support both p- and s-waves, only p-waves are present in the far-field scattering. In such cases only the scalar  $c_\alpha$  is needed to form the single scattering coefficient  $\Lambda_\alpha^{(p,p)}$ .

## 7. Concluding remarks

As this summary has discussed, there are two electromagnetic techniques (EMSI and MSI) and one acoustic/elastodynamic technique (ASI) for discriminating buried targets based on patterns of natural frequencies (and perhaps residue vectors as well) in some target library. Figure 2 gives a diagrammatic way of looking at these collectively. This has properties of a matrix and a Venn diagram (used in Boolean algebra). Here we can see how the different techniques overlap when considering different types of targets (metal, dielectric) embedded in different types of media (soil, water). Of course, this is a simplified view, and one can in principle, further subdivide the various domains for a more detailed evaluation of the various target/technique combinations. Note multiple techniques applicable to metal targets in both kinds of media. One would like to have more techniques for dielectric targets to fill out the diagram better, such as chemical (sniffer) and nuclear techniques, but these are beyond the scope of this paper.

## References

- [1] Baum C E 1976 The singularity expansion method *Transient Electromagnetic Fields* ed L B Felsen (Berlin: Springer) ch 3, pp 129–79
- [2] Baum C E 1976 Emerging technology for transient and broad-band analysis and synthesis of antennas and scatterers *Proc. IEEE* 1598–616
- [3] Dolph C L and Scott R A 1978 Recent developments in the use of complex singularities in electromagnetic theory and elastic wave propagation *Electromagnetic Scattering* ed P L E Uslenghi (New York: Academic) ch 14, pp 503–70
- [4] Baum C E 1978 Toward an engineering theory of electromagnetic scattering: the singularity and eigenmode expansion methods *Electromagnetic Scattering* ed P L E Uslenghi (New York: Academic) ch 15, pp 571–651
- [5] Pearson L W and Marin L 1981 Special issue on the singularity expansion method *Electromagnetics* 349–511
- [6] Baum C E 1986 The singularity expansion method: background and developments *IEEE Ant. Prop. Newsletter* 15–23
- [7] Baum C E 1987 *A priori* application of results of electromagnetic theory to the analysis of electromagnetic interaction data *Radio Sci.* 1127–36
- [8] Baum C E, Rothwell E J, Chen K-M and Nyquist D P 1991 The singularity expansion method and its application to target identification *Proc. IEEE* 1481–92
- [9] Baum C E 1992 SEM and EEM scattering matrices and time-domain scatterer polarization in the scattering residue matrix *Direct and Inverse Methods in Radar Polarimetry* ed W-M Boerner *et al* (Dordrecht: Kluwer) pp 427–86
- [10] Überall H (ed) 1992 *Acoustic Resonance Scattering* (London: Gordon and Breach)
- [11] Baum C E 1994 Signature-based target identification and pattern recognition *IEEE Ant. Prop. Magazine* 44–51
- [12] Überall H 1994 Fine resolution of radar targets *Radar Target Imaging* ed W-M Boerner and H Überall (Berlin: Springer) ch 3, pp 42–112
- [13] Baum C E and Kritikos H N (ed) 1995 *Electromagnetic Symmetry* (London: Taylor and Francis)
- [14] Baum C E 1995 Concepts in transient/broadband electromagnetic target identification *Ultra-wideband, Short-pulse Electromagnetics 2* ed L Carin and L B Felsen (New York: Plenum) pp 515–25

- [15] Baum C E 1997 Representation of surface current density and far scattering in EEM and SEM with entire functions *New Perspectives on Problems in Classical and Quantum Physics* ed P P Delsanto and A W Saenz (London: Gordon and Breach) in publication
- [16] Baum C E 1996 Properties of eigenterms of the impedance integral equation *Electromagnetic Wave Interactions* ed A Guran, R Mittra and P J Moser (Singapore: World Scientific)
- [17] Baum C E (ed) 1997 *Detection and Identification of Visually Obscured Targets* (London: Taylor and Francis) in publication
- [18] Baum C E 1971 On the singularity expansion method for the solution of electromagnetic interaction problems *Interaction Note 88* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [19] Marin L and Latham R 1972 Analytical properties of the field scattered by a perfectly conducting, finite body *Interaction Note 92* Air Force Phillips Laboratory  
Marin L 1973 Natural-mode representation of transient scattered fields *IEEE Trans. Ant. Prop.* 809–18
- [20] Tesche F M 1973 On the singularity expansion method as applied to electromagnetic scattering from thin-wires, *Interaction Note 102* Air Force Phillips Laboratory  
Tesche F M 1973 On the analysis of scattering and antenna problems using the singularity expansion technique *IEEE Trans. Ant. Prop.* 52–63
- [21] Baum C E 1993 The SEM representation of scattering from perfectly conducting targets in simple lossy media *Interaction Note 492* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [22] Baum C E 1993 Low-frequency near-field magnetic scattering from highly, but not perfectly, conducting bodies *Interaction Note 499* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [23] Baum C E 1994 The magnetic polarizability dyadic and point symmetry *Interaction Note 502* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [24] Baum C E 1994 Concerning the identification of buried dielectric targets *Interaction Note 504* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [25] Baum C E 1995 The SEM representation of acoustic and elastodynamic scattering *Interaction Note 512* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [26] Giri D V and Baum C E 1995 Reflector IRA design and boresight temporal waveforms *Sensor and Simulation Note 365* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [27] Baum C E 1994 Antennas for transmitting fast transients through an air/earth interface *Sensor and Simulation Note 375* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [28] Giri D V, Lackner H, Smith I D, Morton D W, Baum C E, Marek J, Scholfield D and Prather W D 1995 A reflector antenna for radiating impulse-like waveforms *Sensor and Simulation Note 382* Air Force Phillips Laboratory
- [29] Baum C E and Farr E G 1993 Impulse radiating antennas *Ultra-wideband, Short-pulse, Electromagnetics* ed H Bertoni *et al* (New York: Plenum)
- [30] Farr E G, Baum C E and Buchenauer C J 1995 Impulse radiating antennas, part II *Ultra-wideband, Short-pulse Electromagnetics 2* ed L Carin and L B Felsen (New York: Plenum)
- [31] Felsen L B 1993 Phase space issues in ultrawideband/short pulse wave modeling *Ultra-wideband, Short-pulse Electromagnetics* ed H Bertoni *et al* (New York: Plenum)
- [32] Dudley D G and Goodman D M 1986 Transient identification and object classification *Time-domain Measurements in Electromagnetics* ed E K Miller (New York: Van Nostrand)
- [33] Peters L J Jr and Young J D 1986 Applications of subsurface transient radar *Time-Domain Measurement in Electromagnetics* ed E K Miller (New York: Van Nostrand)
- [34] Sower G D and Cave S P 1995 Detection and identification of mines from natural magnetic and electromagnetic resonances *Detection Technologies for Mines and Minelike Targets (Proc. SPIE 2496)* (Philadelphia, PA: SIAM)
- [35] Westing A H (ed) 1985 *Explosive Remnants of War: Mitigating the Environmental Effects* (London: Taylor and Francis)