



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**FAST FINITE DIFFERENCE TIME DOMAIN ALGORITHMS FOR  
SOLVING ANTENNA APPLICATION PROBLEM**

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

**FSKTM 2008 5**



**FAST FINITE DIFFERENCE TIME DOMAIN  
ALGORITHMS FOR SOLVING ANTENNA  
APPLICATION PROBLEM**

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**2008**



**FAST FINITE DIFFERENCE TIME DOMAIN ALGORITHMS FOR SOLVING  
ANTENNA APPLICATION PROBLEM**

**By**

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in  
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**March 2008**



**DEDICATION**

To My Mother, Aishah Arshaad, My Late Father, Hasan Salleh, My Wife, Rini Roslina Amir, To ALL My Brothers and Sisters, My Mother-in-law, Bahia Samion, My Father-in-law, Amir Husin and My Grandfather, Samingon...Thank You for everything



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**FAST FINITE DIFFERENCE TIME DOMAIN ALGORITHMS FOR  
SOLVING ANTENNA APPLICATION PROBLEM**

By

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

March 2008

**Chairman: Associate Professor Mohamed bin Othman, PhD**

**Faculty: Computer Science and Information Technology**

This thesis describes the implementations of new parallel and sequential algorithms for electromagnetic wave propagation from a monopole antenna. Existing method, known as FDTD needs a very long processing time to solve this problem. The objective of the thesis is to develop new sequential and parallel algorithms that are faster than the standard Finite Difference Time Domain method. In this thesis, a SMP machine, the Sun Fire V1280 using six existing processors is used to solve 1D and 2D free space Maxwell equations with perfectly conducting boundary and absorbing boundary conditions. Complexity reduction approach concept is used to develop these algorithms. This approach split the solution domain into  $\frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$  compartments in 1D case and  $\frac{1}{9}$  and  $\frac{8}{9}$  compartments in 2D cases. Only  $\frac{1}{3}$  and  $\frac{1}{9}$  parts of the solution domain are solved in the main looping construct for problem in 1D and 2D, while the remaining points are solved outside the loop. The

solutions to both parts are discussed in details in this thesis. These new parallel and sequential finite difference time domain (FDTD) algorithms yield from  $O(h^2)$ , ordinary  $O(h^4)$  and weighted average  $O(h^4)$  centered difference discretization using direct-domain and temporary-domain are used to solve problems mentioned above. In parallel implementation, techniques such as static scheduling, data decomposition and load balancing is used. Based on experimental results and complexity analysis, these new sequential and parallel algorithms are compared with the standard sequential and parallel FDTD algorithms, respectively. Results show that these new sequential and parallel algorithms run faster than the standard sequential and parallel FDTD algorithms. Beside that, formulation of a new higher accuracy second order method, which is called improved high speed low order finite difference time domain (IHSLO-FDTD) with direct-domain and temporary-domain are also proposed to solve the same problem are also described. Results show that, the IHSLO-FDTD with direct-domain and temporary-domain approaches are more efficient and economical. In general, almost all new proposed methods are more economical and run faster (except the Weighted Average High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain (WAHSHO-FDTD) in direct-domain and temporary-domain for 1D case) compared to the standard FDTD method for 1D and 2D case especially for IHSLO-FDTD.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**ALGORITMA-ALGORITMA DOMAIN MASA BEZA TERHINGGA  
PANTAS UNTUK MENYELESAIKAN MASALAH APLIKASI  
ANTENA**

Oleh

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

Mac 2008

**Pengerusi: Profesor Madya Mohamed bin Othman, PhD**

**Fakulti: Sains Komputer dan Teknologi Maklumat**

Tesis ini menerangkan tentang implementasi beberapa algoritma selari dan berjujukan terbaru khususnya untuk menyelesaikan masalah perambatan gelombang elektromagnet dari sebuah antena monopol. Kaedah sedia ada yang dikenali sebagai Domain Masa Beza Terhingga (DMBT) memerlukan masa yang panjang untuk menyelesaikan masalah yang dinyatakan tadi. Objektif tesis ini adalah untuk menghasilkan algoritma berjujukan dan selari terbaru yang lebih pantas dari algoritma DMBT piawai. Dalam tesis ini, Sistem komputer multipemproses simetri, Sun Fire V1280 menggunakan enam buah pemproses sedia ada untuk menyelesaikan persamaan Maxwell ruangan bebas satu dan dua dimensi dengan syarat sempadan pengkonduksi sempurna dan sempadan menyerap. Pendekatan pengurangan kompleksiti digunakan di dalam pembinaan algoritma-algoritma ini. Pendekatan ini memisahkan sebahagian penyelesaian kepada  $\frac{1}{3}$  dan  $\frac{2}{3}$  dalam do-

main penyelesaian 1D, manakala  $\frac{1}{9}$  dan  $\frac{8}{9}$  dalam domain penyelesaian 2D . Hanya  $\frac{1}{3}$  dan  $\frac{1}{9}$  bahagian penyelesaian diselesaikan di dalam gegelung penyelesaian utama masing-masing untuk masalah 1D dan 2D, dan yang selebih bahagian penyelesaian diselesaikan diluar dari gegelung penyelesaian utama tersebut. Kaedah penyelesaian bagi kedua-dua bahagian ada dibincangkan dengan terperinci di dalam tesis ini. Beberapa algoritma selari dan berjujukan DMBT terbaru hasil dari pendiskretan beza pusatan dengan peringkat pangkas  $O(h^2)$ ,  $O(h^4)$  biasa dan  $O(h^4)$  purata berpemberat menggunakan pendekatan domain-terus dan domain- sementara diimplementasi dalam menyelesaikan masalah yang diterangkan tadi. Pada implementasi secara selari, beberapa teknik seperti penskedulan statik, pempartisian data dan pengimbang beban digunakan. Berasaskan kepada keputusan eksperimen termasuk kompleksiti pengiraan, beberapa algoritma berjujukan dan selari DMBT terbaru dibandingkan dengan algoritma berjujukan dan selari DMBT piawai. Perumusan satu kaedah peringkat dua yang lebih jitu terbaru Peringkat Rendah Berkelajuan Tinggi Domain Masa Beza Terhingga yang diperbaiki (PRBT-DMBT diperbaiki) dengan pendekatan domain-terus dan domain- sementara juga diperkenalkan dan digunakan untuk menyelesaikan persamaan Maxwell yang sama juga diterangkan. Keputusan eksperimen menunjukkan bahawa kaedah PRBT-DMBT diperbaiki adalah lebih berkesan dan ekonomi berbanding kaedah-kaedah yang sebelumnya. Keputusan ini disokong oleh analisis kekompleksan pengiraannya. Secara keseluruhan, dapatlah dikatakan bahawa hampir kesemua kaedah terbaru adalah lebih ekonomi (kecuali kaedah Purata Berpemberat Peringkat Tinggi Berkelajuan Tinggi Domain Masa Beza Terhingga (PBPTBT-DMBT) domain-terus dan domain- sementara bagi masalah 1D) berbanding kaedah DMBT bagi kes 1D dan 2D terutamanya kaedah PRBT-DMBT diperbaiki.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the most beneficent and merciful

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere and deepest gratitude to the Chairman of the Supervisory Committee, Associate Professor Dr. Mohamed Othman for his guidance, advice and encouragement throughout my Ph.D. study.

I am also very grateful to Dr. Zulkifylly Abbas, Associate Professor Dr. Jumat Sulaiman and Associate Professor Dr. Fatimah Ahmad who are also the member of the Supervisory Committee for their advice and motivation. I am also indebted to Dr. Rozita Johari and Dr. Jalil Md. Desa for their consultation.

I am also very grateful to Associate Professor Dr. Ishak bin Hashim and Dr. Eddie Shahril Ismail for consulting the proving of stability and convergence theorem for proposed methods in this thesis. I am also indebted to Dr. Tengku Nor Rizan from Faculty of Language study, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and Mrs. Salwa from Selangor International Islamic University College for the help in checking the grammatical error in this thesis.

I also acknowledge INSPEM (Institute Penyelidikan Matematik) UPM for permission of using Sun Fire V1280 machine and the assistant of Department of Public Administration, Malaysian Government for the SLAB Scholarship. To Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, thank you very much for the study leave.

My special thanks and deepest appreciation goes to my wife, my parents for their understanding, caring, everlasting love and patience. All this ingredient help me to focus at my Ph.D. study and a good recipe to the completion of this thesis.

Last but not least I would like to convey my thanks to my friends at Faculty of



Information Science and Technology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology, Universiti Putra Malaysia for their assistance.



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

**Mohamed Othman, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Zulkifly Abbas, PhD**

Lecturer  
Faculty of Science  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**Jumat Sulaiman, PhD**

Associate Professor  
School of Science and Technology  
Universiti Malaysia Sabah  
(Member)

**Fatimah Dato'Ahmad, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Computer Science and Information Technology  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

---

**AINI IDERIS, PhD**

Professor and Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 8 Mei 2008



## DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work, except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Universiti Putra Malaysia or at any other institution.

---

**MOHAMMAD KHATIM BIN HASAN**

Date: 7 APRIL 2008

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1 Sun Fire V1280 Hardware Specification	23
3.1 Comparison of algorithms arithmetic complexity	102
3.2 Comparison of algorithms complexity using $\theta$ notation	103
4.1 Parallel algorithm arithmetic complexity for 1D methods	161
4.2 Parallel algorithm arithmetic complexity for 2D methods	162
4.3 Parallel algorithms complexity using $\theta$ notation	162
4.4 Comparison of parallel algorithms $C_e$ ratio	164
5.1 Comparison of IHSLO-FDTD (DD), IHSLO-FDTD (TD), UIHSLO-FDTD(DD) and UIHSLO-FDTD (TD) algorithms complexity using $\theta$ notation	198
5.2 Comparison of IHSLO-FDTD (DD), IHSLO-FDTD (TD), UIHSLO-FDTD(DD) and UIHSLO-FDTD (TD) arithmetic complexity for 1D methods	198
5.3 Comparison of IHSLO-FDTD (DD), IHSLO-FDTD (TD), UIHSLO-FDTD(DD) and UIHSLO-FDTD (TD) arithmetic complexity for 2D methods	199

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1.1 (a) PEC boundary (b) ABC boundary	7
1.2 Scope of research	8
1.3 Overview of thesis research	9
1.4 Flow chart for sequential algorithms with PEC boundary	11
1.5 Flow chart for sequential algorithms with ABC boundary	12
1.6 Flow chart for parallel algorithms with PEC boundary	13
1.7 Flow chart for parallel algorithms with ABC boundary	14
2.1 View of monopole antenna mounted on a ceiling of a room from below	21
2.2 Spread of energy from a point source	21
3.1 1D HSLO – FDTD (DD) solution domain	50
3.2 1D HSLO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule (a) to update electric fields and (b) to update magnetic fields	50
3.3 Distribution of electric point after main loop in HSLO – FDTD (DD) algorithm	52
3.4 RPA method computational molecule	54
3.5 Solution domain with $\bullet$ , $\circ$ , $\odot$ and $\square$ nodes for $T$ time steps	54
3.6 1D HSHO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule (a) to update electric fields and (b) to update magnetic fields	57
3.7 1D WAHSHO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule (a) to update electric fields and (b) to update magnetic fields	60
3.8 2D HSLO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule to update (a) $H_z$ (b) $E_x$ (c) $E_y$ fields	63
3.9 2D HSLO – FDTD (DD) solution domain	64

3.10	2D solution domain with known, ● and unknown, ○ nodes	xvii 65
3.11	2D solution domain after approximating $x$ -direction remaining node points	66
3.12	2D HSHO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule to update (a) $H_z$ (b) $E_x$ (c) $E_y$ fields	69
3.13	2D WAHSHO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule to update (a) $H_z$ (b) $E_x$ (c) $E_y$ fields	72
3.14	Transformation of actual solution domain to temporary solution domain for (a) 1D (b) 2D	75
3.15	Mapping of $S$ to $S_1$ , $S_2$ and $S_3$	75
3.16	1D HSLO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule to update (a) $E_x$ (b) $H_y$ fields	77
3.17	Solution domain with ● and ○ nodes for $T$ time steps	77
3.18	1D HSHO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule to update (a) $E_x$ (b) $H_y$ fields	79
3.19	1D WAHSHO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule to update (a) $E_x$ (b) $H_y$ fields	81
3.20	2D HSLO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule	84
3.21	2D HSLO – FDTD (TD) solution domain	85
3.22	2D HSHO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule	87
3.23	2D WAHSHO – FDTD (TD) computational molecule	90
3.24	Log of global error for 1D problem with PEC boundary	104
3.25	Log of global error for 1D problem with ABC boundary	104
3.26	Execution time for 1D problem with PEC boundary	106
3.27	Execution time for 1D problem with ABC boundary	107
3.28	Execution time for 2D problem with PEC boundary	109
3.29	Execution time for 2D problem with ABC boundary	109
3.30	Log of global error for 2D problem with PEC boundary	111

		xviii
3.31	Log of global error for 2D problem with ABC boundary	111
4.1	Decomposition of solution domain	119
4.2	Decomposition of solution domain (with $\bullet$ , $\circ$ , $\odot$ and $\square$ nodes for $T$ time steps) into two sub-domain and mapped into processors $P_0$ and $P_1$	123
4.3	Overlapping sub-domain strategy and data routing for 2D UHSLO – FDTD (DD) method	132
4.4	Decomposition of solution domain (with $\bullet$ and $\odot$ nodes for $T$ time steps) into two sub-domain and mapped into processors $P_0$ and $P_1$	142
4.5	Overlapping sub-domain strategy and data routing for 2D UHSLO – FDTD (TD) method	151
4.6	Execution time for 1D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.5M)	166
4.7	Execution time for 1D methods with ABC boundary (sample size 0.5M)	166
4.8	Speed-up for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.3M)	166
4.9	Speed-up for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.5M)	167
4.10	Efficiency for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.3M)	167
4.11	Efficiency for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.5M)	167
4.12	Execution time for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	169
4.13	Speed-up for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	169
4.14	Efficiency for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	170
4.15	Execution time for 2D methods with ABC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	170
4.16	Speed-up for 2D methods with ABC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	170
4.17	Efficiency for 2D methods with ABC boundary (sample size 0.36M)	171
4.18	Execution time for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.18M)	172
4.19	Speed-up for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.18M)	172
4.20	Efficiency for 2D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.18M)	172



	xix	
5.1	1D IHSLO – FDTD (DD) computational molecule	181
5.2	Accuracy for 1D method with PEC boundary	201
5.3	Accuracy for 1D method with ABC boundary	201
5.4	Execution time for sequential 1D methods with PEC boundary	201
5.5	Execution time for sequential 1D methods with ABC boundary	202
5.6	Execution time for parallel 1D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.3M)	202
5.7	Execution time for parallel 1D methods with PEC boundary (sample size 0.5M)	203
5.8	Execution time for 1D parallel algorithms with ABC boundary (sample size 0.3M)	203
5.9	Speed-up for 1D parallel algorithms with PEC boundary (sample size 0.3M)	204
5.10	Speed-up for 1D parallel algorithms with PEC boundary (sample size 0.5M)	204
5.11	Efficiency for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.3M)	204
5.12	Efficiency for 1D parallel algorithms (sample size 0.5M)	204
5.13	Accuracy for 2D methods with PEC boundary	205
5.14	Accuracy for 2D methods with ABC boundary	206
5.15	Execution time for sequential 2D methods with PEC boundary	206
5.16	Execution time for sequential 2D methods with ABC boundary	206
5.17	Execution time for parallel 2D methods with PEC boundary	207
5.18	Execution time for parallel 2D methods with ABC boundary	207
5.19	Speed-up for 2D methods with PEC boundary	208
5.20	Speed-up for 2D methods with ABC boundary	208
5.21	Efficiency for 2D methods with PEC boundary	208
5.22	Efficiency for 2D methods with ABC boundary	208
A.1	Mapping from S to S <sub>1</sub> and S <sub>2</sub>	231

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

$O(h^m)$	Truncation error of order $m$
$\varepsilon$	Electric permittivity
$\mu$	Magnetic permeability
$\varepsilon_0$	Electric permittivity for free space
$\mu_0$	Magnetic permeability for free space
$\rho_v$	Conductivity
$E$	Electric field
$B$	Magnetic flux
$H$	Magnetic field
$c$	Velocity of light
$\omega$	Angular frequency
$f$	Wave frequency
$k$	Wave number
$\zeta$	Weighted Average parameter
$\Im$	Imaginary part of a complex number
$P$	Processor
SIMD	Single instruction multiple data
MIMD	Multiple instruction multiple data
FDTD	Finite Difference Time Domain
P-FDTD	Parallel implementation of Finite Difference Time Domain
HO-FDTD	High Order Finite Difference Time Domain

PHO-FDTD	Parallel implementation of High Order Finite Difference Time Domain
HSLO-FDTD (DD)	High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
IHSLO-FDTD (DD)	Improved High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
HSHO-FDTD (DD)	High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
WAHSHO-FDTD (DD)	Weighted Average High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
HSLO-FDTD (TD)	High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
IHSLO-FDTD (TD)	Improved High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
HSHO-FDTD (TD)	High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
WAHSHO-FDTD (TD)	Weighted Average High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
UHSLO-FDTD (DD)	Ultra High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
UIHSLO-FDTD (DD)	Ultra Improved High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
UHSHO-FDTD (DD)	Ultra High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
WAUHSHO-FDTD (DD)	Weighted Average Ultra High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using direct domain approach
UHSLO-FDTD (TD)	Ultra High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
UIHSLO-FDTD (TD)	Ultra Improved High Speed Low Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach

UHSHO-FDTD (TD)	Ultra High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
WAUHSHO-FDTD (TD)	Weighted Average Ultra High Speed High Order Finite Difference Time Domain using temporary domain approach
RPA	Remaining Point Approximation



# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview

Many advanced technologies rely on electromagnetic fields. The fields contribute a lot to a modern lifestyle of living. The transmission of electrical power for the purpose of communication is carried out by means of electromagnetic waves. The electrical power may be transmitted via free space or guiding conductors. When a quantity of electromagnetic wave is generated in unbounded space, it cannot remain at rest, but must travel as a wave until the energy is dissipated.

Advancement in computer technology has revolutionized the design of pilot products from “classical trial and error” method to “soft” and low-cost method, which is popularly known as the computer simulation method (Rice, 1995). This scenario has highlighted the importance of numerical simulation in most research and development in the area of science and technology.

Most physical phenomenon can be simulated via differential equation. The differential equation can be classified into two groups, which are Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) and Partial Differential Equations (PDEs). Analytical solutions to these equations are sometimes hard or impossible to determine. Therefore, numerical solution is the best alternative to approximate the solutions.

Electromagnetic wave propagation can be simulated via Maxwell equations. The equations consist of two components that exist alternately; namely the magnetic and electric fields. The computer simulation of electromagnetic field problems often requires powerful numerical solver due to the geometrical and physical complexities. The availability of fast and efficient solvers is crucial especially in such cases.

A well-known numerical solver that uses second order central difference approximation of Taylor series as the main ingredient has been proposed by Yee (1996), which is now popularly known as Finite Difference Time Domain (FDTD) method (Taflove, 1995). The method derives the “king crab couple” of Maxwell equations into the most simple form of approximate equation. These equations clearly exhibit a low “discrete” complexity characteristic of its algorithm. This scenario awards the method as the most practical method to be used in approximating Maxwell equations (Taflove & Hagness, 2005). However, the method needs a long processing time to produce results.

Over the last few decades, increasing number of various types of multiprocessor technology machines have been developed. With such systems, it is possible to design and develop algorithm that exploits the advantage of multiprocessor architecture (Rozita, 1994). User of such system tends to solve large problems, with the ambition to speed-up the program execution time but still produces accurate results.

To exploit such powerful machine, more researches are done to develop parallel algorithms that are suitable for such architecture. Following that scenario, existing serial algorithms are continuously converted into parallel algorithms. This conversion creates new researchable issues that do not exist previously in single processor machine architecture. This is because the conversion from serial algorithm to parallel algorithm is not always straightforward and in some cases the efficient parallel algorithms are completely different from the best serial algorithms for the same problems.

This computing paradigm has been used by several researchers on multiprocessor machines to develop parallel FDTD algorithm (Araujo *et al.*, 2003; Fijany *et al.*, 1995; Nguyen *et al.*, 1994; Perlik *et al.*, 1984; Varadarajan & Mitra, 1994; Zhenghui *et al.*, 2002). This action has off course succeeded in speeding up the FDTD computational speed.

In recent decade, some researchers in finite difference area of research proposed some complexity reduction approach focusing mainly to speed-up the computational execution time, such as the Reduced Iterative Alternating Decomposition Explicit (RIADE) method (Sahimi & Khatim, 2001). The method succeeds in speeding up the Iterative Alternating Decomposition Explicit (IADE) method to solve heat conduction equation. Since then, RIADE method have been implemented in various applications (Mohammad Khatim *et al.*, 2001; Mohammad Khatim *et al.*, 2003; Mohammad Khatim & Bahari, 2003).

Meanwhile, another extraordinary simple concept which also uses complexity reduction approach has been widely used to speed-up computational speed of various finite difference and finite element methods through half and quarter sweep approaches. These approaches have improved the computational speed of the methods. The motivation of developing the half and quarter sweep has been inspired by Abdullah (1991) with his Explicit Decouple Group (EDG) method. The extension of this method, is however, developed by Othman and Abdullah (2000) via their Modified Explicit Group (MEG) method. Both EDG and MEG methods have successfully speeded-up the computational speed since they have reduced the complexity of the original methods by half and three-quarter, respectively. Since then, various half and quarter sweep methods have arose in numerical fields of research (Jumat & Abdul Rahman, 1999; Mohamed, 1999; Sulaiman *et al.*, 2004).

Inspired by these findings, and since the objective of this research is to develop efficient (fast with tolerable accuracy) algorithms for free space electromagnetic wave propagation, some sequential algorithms utilizing the quarter sweep concept will be developed. Besides developing new sequential algorithms that are fast in computing, the opportunity to utilize the computing power offered by multiprocessor technology should also be taken to further enhance the speed of the new algorithms.

## 1.2 Problem Statement

Most problems in free space radio wave data transmission cannot be solved analytically and require a numerical solution. This is because the solution of the

