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Abstract- Wireless local area network applications may include the use of bodyworn or handportable terminals. For the first time, this paper compares measurements and simulations of a narrowband 5.2 GHz radio channel incorporating a fixed transmitter and a mobile bodyworn receiver. Two indoor environments were considered, an 18 m long corridor and a 42 m² office. The modeling technique was a site-specific ray-tracing simulator incorporating the radiation pattern of the bodyworn receiver. In the corridor, the measured body-shadowing effect was 5.4 dB, while it was 15.7 dB in the office. First and second order small-scale fading statistics for the measured and simulated results are presented and compared with theoretical Rayleigh and lognormal distributions. The RMS error in the cumulative distributions for the simulated results was less than 0.74 % for line-of-sight conditions and less than 1.4 % for non-line-of-sight conditions.

Index Terms: Channel characterization, ray tracing, radio propagation, bodyworn antennas, FDTD.

Corresponding Author: Dr. W. G. Scanlon, School of Electrical & Electronic Engineering, Queen’s University, Belfast. Stranmillis Road, Belfast, BT9 5AH, UK. e-mail: w.scanlon@ee.qub.ac.uk, Tel: +44 2890974519, Fax: +44 2890974787
I. INTRODUCTION

Wireless local area networking systems such as HiperLAN type 2 and IEEE 802.11a operate at 5 GHz and provide high bandwidth services within the indoor environment. Although most terminal equipment will be designed for stationary use, future applications will include bodyworn or handportable devices. Under these close proximity conditions the terminal’s radiation pattern is significantly distorted by coupling to the user’s body and additional signal attenuation may occur. These effects are not only frequency dependent but will vary with the design of the terminal, its antenna and the exact positioning with respect to the body surface [1]. Under the multipath conditions present in the indoor environment, the distorted radiation pattern of the bodyworn terminal can be considered as a form of spatial filter.

Several multipath models have been suggested to explain the observed statistical nature of the mobile channel. Many researchers have also evaluated electromagnetic interactions between the human body and handset antennas or portable devices [2–3]. In [3], Toftgard et al. show the effect of the human body on the performance of antennas for hand-held portable telephones. They suggest that an average system loss of 3–4 dB should be considered in the link budget and point out that there is considerable fading when users move around in a natural manner. This work compares measurements and ray-tracing simulations in a narrowband indoor propagation channel at 5.2 GHz for a bodyworn terminal moving at a moderate walking speed of 0.5 m/s. Practical signal-level results were obtained using a bodyworn power-measurement receiver and datalogger.

II. MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

The transmitter (TX) consisted of an R&S SMIQ03B signal generator, a GaAs frequency doubler (Hittite HMC189MS8), a GaAs InGaP power amplifier (Hittite HMC406MS8G), and a sleeve dipole antenna (+2.2 dBi, Mobile Mark model PSTN3-5250). The transmitter was adjusted to deliver +15 dBm to the antenna’s input port, taking account of cable losses. The radiating system was placed on a wheeled cart to facilitate movement around the selected measurement locations. The transmit antenna was vertically polarized and mounted 1.35 m above floor level on a wooden support. The bodyworn module (RX)
consisted of a custom 5.2 GHz measurement receiver (RX), a 12-bit analogue to digital converter (ADC) and a notebook PC for data recording. The receive antenna was a sleeve dipole identical to that used at the TX. The RX unit was built as a portable device enclosed in a 150 x 80 x 50 mm conducting box; it delivered an output voltage linear with input power measured in dBm. The specification and measured RF performance parameters are given in Table 1. The received power indication from the receiver was sampled at 10-ms intervals using the 12-bit ADC and the results stored on the notebook PC.

Two indoor scenarios were considered, both situated on the fifth floor of a university building. Location 1 was a 1.3 m x 18 m corridor, and location 2 was a 6 m x 7 m rectangular office (Figure 1). The measurement environments were relatively complex, i.e., metallic ducting and lockers set into the corridor walls and fluorescent lighting in the office. For convenience, however, the ray-tracing simulations assumed a regular geometric structure with the following material parameters: walls, relative permittivity 4.0, conductivity 0.001 S/m; for the floor and ceilings, relative permittivity 2.7 and conductivity 0.005 S/m.

Measurements were performed by fixing the transmitter as shown in Figure 1 and recording received power using the measurement receiver described above. The RX unit was positioned towards the front of the user’s body at the hip (see Figure 2), while the ADC circuitry and notebook PC were carried in a backpack. Two types of measurement were recorded in both locations: LOS, where the user was walking towards the transmitter, and NLOS, with the user walking away. In all scenarios the user walked along the trajectories shown in Figure 1, at approximately 0.5 m/s. Therefore, the selected sampling interval of 10 ms corresponds to a spatial resolution of better than $\lambda/11$.

III. SIMULATION MODEL

A three-dimensional image-based propagation prediction technique [4] was used; although this is capable of modeling the effect of pedestrian movement within the indoor environment, pedestrians were excluded from the present study. Human body proximity effects were included in the simulation as the receiver’s polar pattern was obtained from Finite-Difference Time-Domain (FDTD) modeling of the complete bodyworn system. The FDTD model was composed of a human body phantom, conducting box
(representing the receiver) and a thin-wire dipole antenna (Figure 2). The overall FDTD grid was 499 x 93 x 154 with cubic 3.6 mm voxels. The body phantom was for a 1.75 m tall adult male and incorporated 21 tissue types. The sleeve-dipole antenna was modeled as a centre-fed 25.2 mm (0.36 mm radius) thin-wire element with a minimum antenna-body spacing of 14.4 mm. Body losses were relatively low, with an FDTD-computed radiation efficiency of 83.3 % at 5.2 GHz. Figure 2 also shows the calculated azimuthal pattern for vertical polarization ($E_\theta$). The entire 3D radiation pattern was generated for 5° intervals of both azimuth and vertical angles.

IV. RESULTS
A. General Observations

An example of the measured and received power profiles is given in Figure 3 for both LOS and NLOS conditions in location 1. The correlation between measurements and simulations for these results was better in the LOS case, with a correlation coefficient of 0.52, than for NLOS, where the corresponding value was 0.25. Table 2 compares the overall body-shadowing effect (the difference between mean LOS and NLOS powers) obtained through measurement and simulation for both locations. Body-shadowing is dominated by attenuation of the direct ray, caused by reduced antenna gain in the through-body direction. However, it is worthwhile noting that the measured body-shadowing effect (15.7 dB) was significantly more severe in location 2 than in location 1. The variation in body shadowing effect between locations suggests that the propagation channel is strongly influenced by the characteristics of the immediate environment.

There is a low correlation between the overall NLOS measured and simulated received power in both locations, although their mean values are similar. A potential cause of the discrepancy between measurements and simulations is the significant natural variability in the volunteer’s posture as he walked. This causes a quasi-random variation in the direct ray azimuth angle, leading to rapid fluctuations in ray attenuation. In contrast, the direct ray azimuth angle in the simulation model was constant throughout, with the vertical angle gradually increasing towards the end of the location. The effects of these natural variations in body posture become more significant in NLOS scenarios.
B. First Order Statistics

All of the statistical measures in this paper correspond to small-scale fading, and were calculated with reference to local mean values (determined by averaging received signal power over 460 samples, ≈ 40λ). The cumulative distribution function (CDF) was calculated for the simulated and measured data sets in both locations (Figure 4). The results were compared to theoretical Rayleigh and lognormal distributions, since it is generally accepted that the received envelope is Rayleigh distributed over a spatial distance of less than 100λ and lognormally distributed over larger areas.

In location 1, LOS measured and simulated CDFs were in good agreement (RMS error of 0.65 %) and both were lognormally distributed above the median, while below it they were Rayleigh distributed. However, measured and simulated NLOS results were in less agreement with an RMS error of 1.4 %. The simulated NLOS results were closer to Rayleigh because of the constant direct ray attenuation described earlier. There was good agreement between measurement and simulation in location 2, with an RMS error of 0.74 % for the LOS case and 0.87 % for the NLOS case, respectively. All measured and simulated CDFs in location 2 were lognormally distributed. Simulation and measurement results from both locations tend to be distributed following a mixture of Rayleigh and lognormal distributions. Some researchers [5–6] have compared cumulative distributions of experimental data and have suggested the Suzuki distribution, a mixture of the Rayleigh and lognormal distributions, to represent the statistics of mobile radio signals. However, a practical limitation to this distribution is that no closed form has been found to solve the CDF integral [7].

C. Second Order Statistics

Level-crossing rate (LCR) and average fade duration (AFD) were calculated for both simulated and measured data sets in location 1. Results were compared to theoretical Rayleigh and lognormal distributions with a maximum Doppler frequency, $f_m$, of 8.67 Hz, which corresponds to a receiver speed of 0.5 m/s.
Although measured and simulated LCR results had similar profiles (Figure 5), for LOS conditions the peak of the measured LCR curve was 53 % higher than that of the simulated curve. Both measured and simulated peak LCR values were significantly higher under NLOS conditions and were comparable to the theoretical Rayleigh maximum LCR. In particular, the simulated results were relatively well matched to the Rayleigh curve. Overall the LCR curves were more similar to Rayleigh than they were to lognormal. Inspection of the raw fading profiles confirmed that the measured results experienced significantly more fading than was predicted by the simulation tool. This suggests that the additional body movements associated with walking led to more rapid envelope variation. As only lateral movement is considered, the simulation tool was unable to faithfully represent these variations. The AFD results (Figure 5(c) and 5(d)) indicate that the predicted LOS fade duration was consistently longer than that measured. Again, variations in posture or walking speed during measurements may have contributed to these differences.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Measurement and simulation results for an indoor narrowband channel using a bodyworn receiver at 5.2 GHz have been presented: body shadowing caused 5–16 dB extra path loss across the locations considered. For small-scale fading, the 1st order channel statistics in the corridor tended to be Rayleigh distributed below the mean and lognormally distributed above it, while in the small room, 1st order statistics were all lognormally distributed. The 2nd order statistics in the corridor tended towards Rayleigh even for LOS conditions. The accuracy of the simulation tool used in this work was sufficient in LOS scenarios with an RMS error of 0.7 % or less in the cumulative distributions. However, it was not suitable for NLOS comparisons due to the inability of the tool to model natural variations in posture during walking. Overall, these results provide an insight into the characteristics of body shadowing for bodyworn terminals in wireless communication systems design at 5 GHz.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>915 MHz</td>
<td>Single conversion (25 MHz bandwidth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front end gain</td>
<td>20.2 dB</td>
<td>Includes loss for bandpass filters and mixer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated NF</td>
<td>4 dB</td>
<td>Effective noise floor of –96 dBm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Detector type</td>
<td>Logarithmic</td>
<td>Analog Devices AD8313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of P&lt;sub&gt;in&lt;/sub&gt; for linear output</td>
<td>–23 dBm to –88 dBm</td>
<td>65 dB dynamic range (+/– 1 dB error)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output sensitivity</td>
<td>46 mV/dB</td>
<td>V&lt;sub&gt;out&lt;/sub&gt;: 1.2 V to 4.6 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output jitter</td>
<td>+/- 2 mV</td>
<td>Equivalent to 0.04 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Specification and Measured RF Performance of Custom Receiver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient Measurement-Simulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS Mean (dBm)</td>
<td>–44.6</td>
<td>–39.7</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLOS Mean (dBm)</td>
<td>–50.0</td>
<td>–49.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-shadowing (dB)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS Mean (dBm)</td>
<td>–34.7</td>
<td>–39.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLOS Mean (dBm)</td>
<td>–50.4</td>
<td>–45.5</td>
<td>–0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-shadowing (dB)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of simulated and measured received power and body-shadowing effect.
Figure 1. Measurement locations: a) location 1 (corridor), and b) location 2 (small room). Trajectories are shown dotted.

Figure 2: FDTD computational model and calculated azimuthal radiation pattern ($E_\theta$).
Figure 3: Measured and simulated received power for location 1 under LOS and NLOS conditions
Figure 4: Small-scale fading CDFs; (a) location 1 LOS, (b) location 1 NLOS, (c) location 2 LOS, (d) location 2 NLOS.

Figure 5: Second Order Statistics for location 1; (a) LOS level crossing rate, (b) NLOS level crossing rate, (c) LOS average fade duration, (d) NLOS average fade duration.