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This report describes a low-loss bandstop filter designed and developed for the Deep Space Network's 34-meter high-efficiency antennas. The filter is used for protection of the X-band traveling wave masers from the 20-kW transmitter signal. A combination of empirical and theoretical techniques was employed as well as computer simulations to verify the design before fabrication.

I. Introduction

The X-band preamplifier filter (XPF) is a bandstop filter used for protection of the traveling wave masers of the DSN 34-meter high-efficiency antennas from the high-power (20-kW) transmitter signal. The requirements are as follows:

- **Rejection** = 70 dB from 7.145 to 7.235 GHz
- **VSWR** = 1.05:1 from 8.4 to 8.5 GHz
- **Insertion loss** = 0.05 dB (0.03 dB goal) from 8.4 to 8.5 GHz.

During design and measurements, consideration was also given to the entire 8.2- to 8.6-GHz band in order to permit wideband VLBI without significant degradation compared to the present non-filtered (no transmitter) systems at DSS 15 and DSS 45.

The theory of passive microwave bandstop filters is well known and documented in numerous papers. It has also been compiled in a book by Matthaei et al. (Ref. 1). These filters are traditionally designed based on lumped-element prototype filters such as the one shown in Fig. 1. The component values are determined by considering either maximally flat or equi-ripple characteristics for the filter. At microwave frequencies and for waveguide filters, the resonant circuits are most often realized by cavities coupled to the top or the side wall of a waveguide through some irises. Over narrow frequency bands, these cavities behave very similarly to lumped-element resonant circuits such as the one shown in Fig. 1. The number of resonant circuits used is a function of the stopband rejection requirements. In practice, because of the physical size of waveguide cavities as well as for simplicity, either parallel or series resonant circuits are used and the adjacent cavities are spaced a multiple of quarter wavelength apart.

For the design requirement of 70-dB rejection over the stopband, figures 4.03-4 through 4.03-10 of Ref. 1 suggest that a four-cavity filter would be marginal. Therefore, it was decided to use five cavities. Additionally, since for our application the passband is well away from the stopband, designing the filter based on maximally flat or equi-ripple criteria would not be advantageous. Therefore, for ease of fabrication, all cavities were assumed to be identical. Finally, for better tuning of the passband as well as the stopband, the cavities were coupled to the side wall as shown in Fig. 2.
II. Design Procedure

For the filter of Fig. 2, values of $L_c$, $D_f$, and $D_c$ are to be determined. In order to model the cavity waveguide junction, the return loss and transmission loss of a one-cavity filter was measured for several values of $D_f$ and $L_c$. Typical curves for each value of $D_f$ and $L_c$ are shown in Figs. 3(a) and 3(b). By use of a simple computer code, these curves were fitted to the response of a series inductance and capacitance and the equivalent lumped inductance and capacitance for each cavity/waveguide junction was computed. These values were later used for simulation of multi-cavity filters. Additionally, a series of curves were obtained showing the variation of the resonant frequency as a function of $D_f$ and $L_c$ (Fig. 4). For the XPF, the stopband is centered at 7.190 GHz; however, the filter was designed for 7.240 GHz to allow for a 50-MHz tuning capability in the stopband. Figure 4 shows that an infinite number of $D_f$ and $L_c$ pairs yield the same resonant frequency. But, in selection of the optimum pair, it should be noted that the stopband transmission loss as well as the passband insertion loss is dependent on $D_f$. The larger $D_f$ is, the larger are the transmission and insertion losses. Therefore, the optimum $L_c$ and $D_f$ pair is the one with the smallest value for $D_f$ that will provide the required transmission loss over the stopband. This would guarantee the smallest possible insertion loss for the filter. The optimum pair of $D_f$ and $L_c$ was selected by use of the equivalent inductance and capacitance of cavity waveguide junction in a computer program that simulated the characteristics of a five-cavity filter. This computer program found the optimum value for cavity spacing $D_c$ (corresponding to highest transmission loss) for each pair of $D_f$ and $L_c$ by varying $D_c$ about three quarters of the guide wavelength, at 7.240 GHz. The optimum values for the filter were computed to be $L_c = 0.82$ in., $D_f = 0.78$ in., and $D_c = 1.58$ in. The computed stopband characteristic of the filter, after it is tuned to 7.190 GHz, is shown in Fig. 5. This figure shows a minimum transmission loss of approximately 72 dB from 7.145 to 7.235 GHz.

III. Test Results

The filter was fabricated from the standard WR125 stock with a tuning screw in each cavity (for the stopband) as well as waveguide/cavity junctions (for passband VSWR) as shown in Fig. 6. The filter was tested by the HP 8510 automatic network analyzer; its passband and stopband characteristics are shown in Figs. 7 through 9. The stopband transmission loss is better than what was computed, which is due to the fact that in the computer simulation the resistive loss of each cavity/waveguide junction was not taken into account. All other characteristics are better than the specification.
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**Fig. 1.** A bandstop prototype filter

**Fig. 2.** Five-cavity bandstop filter in waveguide

**Fig. 3(a).** Return loss for one-cavity bandstop filter  
(D = 0.7", L_c = 0.85")

**Fig. 3(b).** Transmission loss for one-cavity bandstop filter  
(D = 0.7", L_c × 0.85")

**Fig. 4.** Resonant frequency of one cavity coupled to waveguide  
through an iris of size D_i vs cavity length L_c
Fig. 5. Theoretical stopband transmission loss of the X-band preamplifier filter vs frequency

Fig. 6. X-band preamplifier filter: production unit

Fig. 7. Passband return loss of the X-band preamplifier filter vs frequency

Fig. 8. Passband insertion loss of the X-band preamplifier filter vs frequency

Fig. 9. Stopband transmission loss of the X-band preamplifier filter vs frequency