

Evidence & Insight Questions

1. How did you validate the accuracy of your simulations against the exact solution?
2. What metrics did you use to compare FDTD, RLC ladder, and AWE methods? Why RMSE and computational time?
3. Can you explain the trade-offs between discretization granularity and computational efficiency in FDTD?
4. How did you handle the numerical instability in AWE when modeling THz frequencies?
5. What evidence supports the claim that RLC ladder networks with ode23 are more efficient than FDTD?
6. How did you address the challenge of integrating frequency-dependent resistance into time-domain models?
7. What criteria did you use to select expansion points in Complex Frequency Hopping (CFH)?
8. How did the inclusion of R_s (source resistance) affect damping and RMSE in your results?
9. Why does the exact solution show a 60V peak in the open-circuit simulation (Figure 4.3)?
10. How did you ensure the stability of poles in AWE during rational approximation?

Technical Understanding & Articulation

11. Explain the Telegrapher's equations and their role in transmission line modeling.
12. How does the FDTD method discretize voltage and current in space and time?
13. What is the significance of L-stability in the NILT method?
14. Describe the state-space formulation of an RLC ladder network.
15. How does AWE reduce high-order systems to low-order approximations?
16. What is the role of moments in AWE, and how are they calculated?
17. How does recursive convolution avoid storing the entire history of inputs?
18. Explain the skin effect's impact on resistance at THz frequencies.
19. Why is Vector Fitting (VF/MVF) better than AWE for THz modeling?
20. How does the trapezoidal pulse input test transient response accuracy?

Methodology & Implementation

21. Why did you choose MATLAB for implementation, and how scalable are your methods to other tools?
22. How did you derive the exact solution using the lumped element model?
23. What modifications were made to FDTD to account for lossy lines (Equations 95a–95c)?
24. How did you validate the impulse and step responses of AWE against theoretical models?
25. Describe the iterative curve-fitting process for frequency-domain measurements.
26. How did you generate the rational approximation for $R(\omega)$ in Figure 4.14?
27. What adaptive strategies did ode23 use to optimize RLC ladder simulations?
28. How does Complex Frequency Hopping (CFH) improve pole selection?
29. Why did you use a trapezoidal pulse instead of a square wave for testing?
30. How did you handle non-conjugate pole pairs in high-frequency AWE models?

Challenges & Problem-Solving

31. What were the key challenges in simulating THz transmission lines?
32. How did you address numerical instability during moment calculations in AWE?
33. Why did integrating frequency-dependent resistance into FDTD/RLC fail initially?
34. How did you resolve discrepancies between rational approximations and exact solutions?
35. What limitations did you encounter with CFH at THz frequencies?
36. How did you ensure convergence in the Vector Fitting algorithm?
37. What caused oscillations in the exact solution (Figure 4.4), and how were they mitigated?
38. Why did the RLC method outperform FDTD in computational efficiency despite similar accuracy?
39. How did you validate the stability of poles in the final AWE/VF-MVF models?
40. What steps did you take to prune redundant poles in post-processing?

Applications & Broader Impact

41. What real-world applications benefit from accurate THz transmission line modeling?
42. How do your findings address the gap between theoretical and practical THz deployment?
43. Why are 6G networks and biomedical imaging highlighted as key use cases?
44. How might your models influence the design of future wireless data centers?
45. What are the implications of your work for standardizing THz measurement methods?

Ethical & Professional Considerations

46. How did you comply with the IEEE Code of Ethics in your research?
47. Why is using licensed software critical for reproducibility and accuracy?
48. How did you ensure transparency in reporting RMSE and computational costs?
49. What ethical considerations arise when modeling high-frequency technologies?

Future Work & Extensions

50. How would you extend AWE to handle multi-conductor transmission lines?
51. What improvements would you make to CFH for THz applications?
52. How could machine learning optimize pole selection in AWE/VF-MVF?
53. What experiments would validate your models against physical THz components?
54. How would you integrate your models into industry-standard EDA tools?

Bonus Questions

55. If computational resources were unlimited, which method would you prioritize?
56. How does your work compare to recent advancements in THz modeling (post-2023)?
57. What advice would you give to someone starting a similar project?

Possible Q?

Here are concise answers to each of your 50+ questions, referencing key sections of your report for clarity:

Evidence & Insight

1. **Validation:** Compared FDTD/RLC/AWE against the exact NILT solution (Fig 4.4, §4.3). RMSE quantified deviations.
2. **Metrics:** RMSE measured accuracy; CPU time assessed efficiency. Trade-offs in Table 3 (§4.3.2).
3. **FDTD Trade-offs:** More sections improve accuracy but increase runtime (Table 1, §4.1). Small Δt is computationally expensive.
4. **AWE Stability:** Used 1st-order rational approximations for THz (§4.6.1) and enforced conjugate pole symmetry (§4.6.3).
5. **RLC Efficiency:** ode23's adaptive time-stepping reduced computations vs. FDTD's fixed Δt (Table 2, §4.2).
6. **Frequency-Dependent R:** Modeled as $R = R_0 + R_s \sqrt{s} \sqrt{2}$ (Eq. 83) but faced integration challenges (§4.4.7).
7. **CFH Points:** Binary search along imaginary axis, prioritizing dominant poles (Fig 3.4, §3.5.2).
8. **Rs Impact:** Added damping, reducing oscillations and RMSE (Fig 4.5–4.6, §4.4.2).
9. **60V Peak:** Open-circuit reflection caused $V^+ + V^- = 2 \times 30V$ superposition (Fig 4.3, §4.3.1).
10. **Pole Stability:** Discarded right-half-plane poles and validated via residual error (Eq. 71, §3.4.1).

Technical Understanding

11. **Telegrapher's Eqs:** PDEs governing voltage/current propagation (Eq. 1a–b, §2). Derived from Maxwell's equations.
12. **FDTD Discretization:** Staggered grid: voltages at nodes, currents at midpoints (Fig 2.2, §2.1).
13. **L-Stability:** Ensures error damping with large Δt in NILT (Eq. 3d, §2.2). Critical for stiff systems.
14. **RLC State-Space:** Matrices built from inductor/capacitor rows (Eq. 35–39, §3.2.1). Code 6 implements this.
15. **AWE Reduction:** Dominant poles/residues approximate high-order systems via Pade approximation (§2.4).
16. **Moments:** Taylor series coefficients of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ (Eq. 13d). Calculated as $m_k = -C^T A^{-(k+1)} B$ (Eq. 51d).
17. **Recursive Convolution:** Updates output using prior state (Eq. 62), avoiding full history storage (§3.3).
18. **Skin Effect:** $R \propto \sqrt{f}$ increases conductor loss at THz (Eq. 79, §3.6). Ignoring it skews results (Fig 4.14).
19. **VF/MVF Superiority:** Iterative pole relocation achieved lower RMSE with fewer poles than AWE (Fig 4.22, §4.7.3).
20. **Trapezoidal Pulse:** Tests transient response to sharp edges (rise/fall = 1 ps). Reveals dispersion artifacts (Fig 4.21).

Methodology & Implementation

21. **MATLAB Choice:** Leveraged built-in ODE solvers (ode23) and NILTcv for stability. Methods are language-agnostic (§1.2).
22. **Exact Solution:** Derived from hyperbolic functions (Eq. 29) via impedance/admittance (Eq. 30a–f, §3.1.2).
23. **FDTD Modifications:** Added \mathcal{R}_s and \mathcal{G} terms to update equations (Eq. 95a–96, §4.4.1). Code 7 implements this.
24. **AWE Validation:** Compared impulse/step responses to theoretical $Ce^{At}B$ (Fig 4.15–4.16, §4.5).

25. **Iterative Fitting:** Residual error minimized by adding correction models block-by-block (Eq. 75, §3.4.1).
26. **Rational $R(\omega)$:** Fit $\mathcal{R}(f)$ data to pole-residue form (Fig 4.14) but time-domain integration failed (§4.4.7).
27. **ode23 Adaptation:** Used 2nd/3rd-order Runge-Kutta with dynamic Δt (Eq. 86–93, §4.2).
28. **CFH Strategy:** Multi-point moment-matching with binary search for dominant poles (§3.5.2).
29. **Trapezoidal vs. Square:** Better mimics real-world signals with finite rise/fall times (Eq. 97, §4.4.4).
30. **Non-Conjugate Poles:** Enforced symmetry manually but limited at THz (§4.6.3).

Challenges & Problem-Solving

31. **THz Challenges:** Frequency-dependent \mathcal{R} , numerical instability, and sparse pole overlap (§4.6.3).
32. **Moment Instability:** Reduced approximation order for ill-conditioned matrices (§4.6.1).
33. **$R(\omega)$ Integration:** Time-domain $\mathcal{R}(t)$ (Eq. 102c) caused artifacts; VF/MVF bypassed this (§4.7.3).
34. **Rational Approx. Errors:** Validated against exact $\mathcal{R}(f)$ and pruned unstable poles (Fig 4.14, §4.4.7).
35. **CFH Limits:** Broad THz range led to non-overlapping poles; required ad hoc fixes (§3.5).
36. **VF Convergence:** Relaxed $\sigma(s) \rightarrow 1$ constraint to improve pole relocation (Eq. 117, §4.7.2).
37. **Oscillations:** Caused by reflections in lossless lines; adding \mathcal{R}_s damped them (Fig 4.5, §4.4.2).
38. **RLC Advantage:** ode23's adaptive Δt avoided FDTD's rigid CFL condition (§4.2).
39. **Pole Validation:** Ensured $\text{Re}(p_i) < 0$ and matched frequency-response peaks (Fig 4.18).
40. **Pole Pruning:** Removed residues with negligible contributions ($|k_i/p_i| < \text{tolerance}$).

***Applications & Ethics**

41. ****Applications:**** 6G backhaul, wireless data centers, biomedical imaging (§1).
42. ****Theory-Practice Gap:**** Hardware-aware models address attenuation/dispersion in real systems (§1).
43. ****6G/Biomedical:**** THz offers high bandwidth for imaging and ultra-fast comms (§1, [1]).
44. ****Data Centers:**** Optimizes interconnects for 100+ Gbit/s links (§Abstract).
45. ****Standardization:**** Provides validated frameworks for future measurements (§6).
46. ****IEEE Ethics:**** Avoided plagiarism, cited sources, and used licensed software (§5).
47. ****Licensed Software:**** Ensured reproducibility and compliance with academic integrity (§5.3).
48. ****Transparency:**** Reported RMSE/CPU time for all methods (Tables 1–6).
49. ****Ethical Risks:**** THz radiation safety; emphasized accurate modeling to prevent harm (§5.1).

...

***Future Work**

50. ****Multi-Conductor AWE:**** Extend state-space to coupled lines (e.g., PEEC models).
51. ****CFH Enhancements:**** Adaptive moment generation for THz-specific poles.
52. ****ML Optimization:**** Train models to predict optimal poles from frequency data.
53. ****Experimental Validation:**** Fabricate THz lines and compare to simulations.
54. ****EDA Integration:**** Export VF/MVF models to SPICE or ADS.

*** **Bonus Answers**

55. ****Unlimited Resources:**** FDTD with ultra-fine discretization for max accuracy.
56. ****Recent Advances:**** Compare to [1]’s photonic approaches for THz hardware.
57. ****Advice:**** Start with exact models (NILT) to benchmark approximations.

.....

- ❑ Can you provide a brief summary of your FYP on THz transmission lines?
- ❑ What motivated you to select THz transmission lines as your project topic?
- ❑ How do THz frequencies differ from conventional microwave frequencies, and why are they important for future communications?
- ❑ What are the main challenges in modeling THz transmission lines?
- ❑ How do the Telegrapher's equations underpin your work on transmission lines?
- ❑ What numerical methods did you compare in your project, and why?
- ❑ Could you explain the Finite-Difference Time-Domain (FDTD) method and its application in your simulations?
- ❑ What are the main advantages and limitations of using the FDTD method for high-frequency simulations?
- ❑ How did you implement the RLC ladder network approximation in your models?
- ❑ What are the key benefits of using RLC ladder approximations for transmission line modeling?
- ❑ Can you describe the Asymptotic Waveform Evaluation (AWE) technique and its role in your research?
- ❑ How does AWE reduce the complexity of simulating large-scale linear systems?
- ❑ What is the concept of 'moments' in AWE, and how are they computed?
- ❑ How did you determine the dominant poles and residues using AWE?
- ❑ What are Y-parameters, and why are they significant in your transmission line analysis?
- ❑ How did you convert frequency-domain measurements into a time-domain model in your project?
- ❑ Can you explain the process of obtaining a state-space representation from your transmission line models?
- ❑ How did you validate the accuracy of your simulation models?
- ❑ What role did the Numerical Inverse Laplace Transform (NILT) play in your work?
- ❑ How do the simulation results from FDTD, RLC ladder, and AWE compare with each other?
- ❑ What is the impact of frequency-dependent resistance on THz transmission line performance?
- ❑ How did you integrate frequency-dependent parameters into your models?
- ❑ Can you discuss the trade-offs between discretization granularity and computational efficiency in your simulations?
- ❑ What software tools (e.g., MATLAB) did you use, and how did they facilitate your research?

- ❑ How did you design your experimental tests (unit step, sine wave, and trapezoidal pulse) for the simulation models?
- ❑ What were the key findings from the unit step response tests in your simulations?
- ❑ How did your model perform under sinusoidal and trapezoidal input conditions?
- ❑ What challenges did you face when incorporating frequency-dependent resistance, and how did you overcome them?
- ❑ How did the use of adaptive ode23 solvers improve the performance of your RLC ladder approach?
- ❑ What insights did you gain by comparing the exact solution obtained via NILT with the approximate methods?
- ❑ Can you explain the concept and benefits of complex frequency hopping in your AWE implementation?
- ❑ How does pole relocation contribute to the accuracy of VF/MVF methods in your research?
- ❑ What are the limitations of the simulation methods you used, and how could they be improved?
- ❑ How do you balance simulation accuracy with computational cost in your models?
- ❑ What future enhancements do you propose for THz transmission line modeling?
- ❑ How could your simulation framework be adapted for applications in 6G networks?
- ❑ In what ways could your research benefit advancements in wireless data centers?
- ❑ How might your work be applied to biomedical imaging or remote sensing applications?
- ❑ What impact does high attenuation and dispersion at THz frequencies have on your simulation results?
- ❑ Can you elaborate on the significance of using state-space models in your analysis?
- ❑ How does the cascaded RLC ladder network help in approximating distributed transmission lines?
- ❑ What are the primary differences between lumped element models and distributed parameter models in your study?
- ❑ How did you ensure numerical stability in your transient simulations?
- ❑ What were the most critical parameters to control in your simulation models?
- ❑ How do you interpret the trade-offs between model simplicity and simulation fidelity?
- ❑ Can you describe the process of converting rational functions into state-space form in your FYP?
- ❑ What ethical considerations did you take into account during your research?

❑ How do your findings contribute to the current state-of-the-art in THz transmission line modeling?

❑ What challenges did you encounter during the simulation process, and how did you address them?

❑ How would you explain the overall impact of your research to someone not specialized in THz communications?

❑ What are the main lessons you learned from this project, and how will they influence your future work?

❑ How do you see your research evolving in the context of emerging technologies such as the Internet of Things (IoT)?

1. ❑ My project focused on simulating and analyzing THz transmission lines using several numerical methods to predict signal behavior, optimize performance, and address challenges such as frequency-dependent losses.
2. ❑ I chose this topic because THz frequencies offer enormous bandwidth for future high-speed communications, yet they bring modeling challenges that need innovative solutions.
3. ❑ THz frequencies offer wider bandwidths and higher data rates than microwave frequencies but suffer from greater attenuation and dispersion, making them crucial for 6G and beyond.
4. ❑ Key challenges include modeling frequency-dependent losses, dispersion effects, and ensuring numerical stability and computational efficiency.
5. ❑ The Telegrapher's equations provide the fundamental relationship between voltage and current along a transmission line, forming the basis for all simulation models.
6. ❑ I compared FDTD, RLC ladder approximations, and AWE to balance accuracy, computational load, and the ability to handle high-frequency and frequency-dependent effects.
7. ❑ FDTD discretizes the transmission line into small segments and solves the time-domain Maxwell's equations iteratively, allowing for a detailed transient analysis.
8. ❑ FDTD is very accurate and directly simulates the time response; however, it requires significant computational resources and fine discretization.
9. ❑ I modeled the line as a cascade of lumped R, L, and C elements (a ladder network), which approximates the continuous nature of the transmission line while keeping the problem tractable.
10. ❑ The RLC ladder approach simplifies the analysis and reduces computation time while still capturing the essential behavior of the transmission line.
11. ❑ AWE approximates the transient response by extracting dominant poles and residues from the system, thus reducing the order of the model and speeding up simulations.
12. ❑ By focusing on the most significant poles, AWE condenses the high-order system into a lower-order model that still accurately reflects the essential dynamics.
13. ❑ In AWE, 'moments' are coefficients from the series expansion of the transfer function (typically around $s = 0$) and are calculated using integrals of the impulse response.
14. ❑ Dominant poles and their residues are determined by matching the moments of the system; iterative methods and Padé approximations help refine these values.

15. [?] Y-parameters are admittance parameters that relate currents and voltages at the ports of a network; they're essential for characterizing transmission lines in both the frequency and time domains.
16. [?] I converted frequency-domain measurements to the time domain using numerical inverse Laplace transforms and state-space representations.
17. [?] The process involves rewriting the differential equations or transfer function into matrix form (A, B, C, D) to allow efficient numerical simulation and analysis.
18. [?] I validated my models by comparing the simulation results from different methods (FDTD, RLC ladder, AWE) against exact solutions obtained via NILT and experimental test cases.
19. [?] NILT provided a benchmark by converting the exact s-domain solution into the time domain, against which the approximate methods were compared.
20. [?] FDTD offered high accuracy at a high computational cost, the RLC ladder provided a good balance, and AWE delivered efficient simulations especially for frequency-dependent responses.
21. [?] Frequency-dependent resistance significantly increases attenuation and affects dispersion, so it must be accurately modeled to predict realistic THz line behavior.
22. [?] I integrated frequency-dependent parameters directly into the impedance and admittance formulas and adjusted the simulation algorithms to account for these variations.
23. [?] Finer discretization increases accuracy but raises computational cost; a balance is achieved by choosing a discretization that captures key dynamics without unnecessary detail.
24. [?] MATLAB was used extensively for coding, numerical analysis, and visualization, providing built-in functions that facilitated matrix operations and differential equation solvers.
25. [?] I designed tests with unit step, sine wave, and trapezoidal pulse inputs to assess both transient and steady-state responses under realistic signal conditions.
26. [?] The unit step response tests showed that incorporating frequency-dependent effects leads to transient behaviors closely matching theoretical predictions.
27. [?] Under sinusoidal and trapezoidal inputs, the model reliably reproduced expected waveforms, confirming its capability to simulate various signal conditions.
28. [?] Incorporating frequency-dependent resistance introduced complexity and stability challenges, which I managed by refining the numerical methods and using adaptive solvers.
29. [?] Adaptive ode23 solvers improved efficiency by automatically adjusting time steps, ensuring accurate results without excessive computation.
30. [?] Comparing the exact NILT solution with the approximate methods helped verify that the approximations were valid and highlighted trade-offs in accuracy versus computational cost.
31. [?] Complex frequency hopping involves varying the frequency parameter during analysis to improve the convergence and stability of the AWE method.
32. [?] Pole relocation in VF/MVF methods refines the model by iteratively updating the pole positions, which enhances the accuracy of the rational function approximation.
33. [?] Limitations include high computational demands (FDTD) and potential numerical instability (AWE); future work may focus on improved algorithms and adaptive methods.

34. [?] I balanced accuracy and cost by selecting appropriate discretization levels and using efficient numerical solvers that adapt to the system's dynamics.
35. [?] Future enhancements might include real-time simulation capabilities, refined material models, and adaptive mesh techniques to further improve modeling accuracy.
36. [?] The framework can be adapted to 6G by tailoring the model parameters to specific channel conditions and integrating advanced modulation and coding schemes.
37. [?] Improved THz line models can enhance the design of wireless interconnects in data centers, potentially reducing latency and increasing throughput.
38. [?] In biomedical imaging and remote sensing, accurate THz simulations can lead to better system designs with improved resolution and penetration depth.
39. [?] High attenuation and dispersion at THz frequencies can distort signals; accurate modeling of these effects is critical to predict performance and design compensating strategies.
40. [?] State-space models are significant because they allow a systematic representation of complex systems, making numerical analysis and control more tractable.
41. [?] Cascading an RLC ladder network discretizes the continuous transmission line into manageable segments while maintaining the key dynamics of the distributed system.
42. [?] Lumped element models simplify the system into discrete components, while distributed parameter models capture continuous variations; each has trade-offs in complexity and realism.
43. [?] Numerical stability was ensured by using L-stable methods in NILT and adaptive time-stepping in FDTD, as well as carefully selecting discretization parameters.
44. [?] The most critical parameters were the discretization step size, the accuracy of frequency-dependent resistance modeling, and the number of RLC sections used.
45. [?] There is always a trade-off: simpler models run faster but may miss detailed dynamics, while more complex models provide higher fidelity at the expense of computation time.
46. [?] Converting rational functions into state-space form involved polynomial division and using standard realization techniques to derive the corresponding A, B, C, and D matrices.
47. [?] I maintained ethical standards by rigorously citing all sources, following academic integrity policies, and using licensed software responsibly.
48. [?] My findings provide a validated, efficient framework for THz transmission line simulation that can be directly applied to next-generation communication systems.
49. [?] I encountered challenges such as numerical instability and high computation time, which I addressed by optimizing algorithms and using adaptive solvers.
50. [?] For a non-specialist, my research improves the simulation of ultra-high-speed signals, which is key to developing faster and more reliable wireless communication systems.
51. [?] I learned the importance of balancing detailed modeling with computational efficiency; this lesson will guide my future projects by encouraging practical yet accurate approaches.
52. [?] As IoT networks expand, the simulation techniques from my research could help optimize signal integrity and connectivity among a massive number of devices.
- 53.