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Recent theoretical work which employs the classical magneto-ionic theory for a special model of the ionosphere applicable to transmission via the ionosphere at or close to grazing incidence is employed to analyze LF propagation data. The results of the analysis illustrate a practical model of the ionosphere by a detailed study of transmission via the first time-mode in particular.

1. Introduction

Recent contributions and extensions to the classical geometric-optical theory of propagation [Wait and Conda, 1958; Wait, 1960a; Johler and Walters, 1960, 1961] of LF waves about the earth provide a valuable analysis tool for the interpretation of various experimental data. This paper summarizes the mathematical formulas required to predict the field with particular emphasis on a type analysis most suitable for large scale electronic computers. Attention is focused on certain available experimental data and the results of the analysis are detailed with emphasis on technique. However, the physical phenomena which can be deduced as a result of the analysis of these data are given considerable attention to emphasize the value of the technique.

2. Mathematical Theory

A geometric-optical theory [Bremmer, 1949] can be employed with the aid of a sharply bounded model ionosphere [Johler and Walters, 1960, 1961] emplaced at various altitudes \( h \) above a spherical earth to describe the \( \text{cw} \) field, \( E(\omega, d) \), radiated from a dipole source current moment, \( I_d \). It is common engineering practice at LF to relate the amplitude of the field, \( |E(\omega, d)| \), to the well known concept of radiated power [Ballentine, 1924], neglecting earth losses,

\[
P_r = 1.6 \times 10^{13} \times \omega^2 (I_d)^2 / Z_0,
\]

where \( Z_0 \approx 120 \pi \), a constant. Such a field, \( E(\omega, d) \), implies a similar Hertzian dipole receiver (vertical polarization). The total field, \( E(\omega, d) \), is the sum of \( j+1 \) reflected ionospheric waves, \( j=0, 1, 2, 3 \ldots \),

\[
E(\omega, d) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} E_j(\omega, d),
\]

in which the zero order \( (j=0) \) reflection, \( E_0(\omega, d) \) is the groundwave. Each skywave reflection, \( j=1, 2, 3 \ldots \), using the positive time function, \( \exp (i\omega t) \), can be written,

\[
E_j(\omega, d) = i\omega d D_j^{-1} C \exp (i\omega t_j) G_j G_j^* \alpha_j F_j C_j,
\]

where [Johler, Kellar, and Walters, 1956],

\[
E_0(\omega, d) = [E_0(\omega, d)] \exp [-(\omega b + \phi_d)],
\]

and where,

\[
C = I_d b^5/4\pi kd^3 = (10^{-7})/d, (I_d = 1).
\]

The local time \(^1\) for the groundwave, \( t_0 \) is,

\[
t_0 = t - b,
\]

\[
b = \eta d/c,
\]

\(^1\) The notion of local time was apparently introduced by Lorentz [1906, p. 57].
where \( c \) is the speed of light, \( c \sim 3 \times 10^8 \) m/sec, and \( \eta_1 \) is the index of refraction of air, \( \eta_1 \sim 1 \). Similarly, the local skywave time, or skywave delay, \( t'_j, (j=1, 2, 3 \ldots) \) is,

\[
t'_j = t - b_j
\]

\[
b_j = \eta_1 D_j/c, \ (j=1, 2, 3 \ldots).
\]

The quantity, \( b_j - b \), is frequently called the relative skywave delay, figure 1 (relative to the groundwave). The physical length of the ray, \( D_j \), can be evaluated geometrically for a reflection at an altitude, \( h \), above the surface of the earth of radius, \( a \),

\[
D_j = 2j [(a + h) \cos \phi_j - a \cos \tau_j],
\]

where, figures 2, 3, \( \phi_j \) is the angle of incidence of the "ray" on the ionosphere and \( \tau_j \) is the
corresponding angle of incidence on the earth and the subscript "j" reminds the reader that the
equation refers to the particular ionospheric reflection under consideration. The angles
$\phi_i$ and $\tau_j$ are evaluated quite simply from the geometry,
\begin{align}
\sin \phi_i &= \Delta_j^{-1} a \sin \frac{\theta}{2j}, \\
\cos \phi_i &= \Delta_j^{-1} [a(1-\cos \theta/2j)+h], \\
\sin \tau_j &= \Delta_j^{-1} (a+h) \sin \theta/2j, \\
\cos \tau_j &= \Delta_j^{-1} [a(\cos \theta/2j-1)+h \cos \theta/2j], \\
\Delta_j &= [2a(a+h)(1-\cos \theta/2j)+h^2],
\end{align}

where $\theta$ is the angle at the center of the earth subtended by the distance, $d$, along the surface
of a spherical earth, or, simply,
\begin{equation}
d = a \theta.
\end{equation}

The factors, $G_j'$ and $G_j''$, refer to the transmitter and receiver complex antenna patterns
respectively, and again the subscript, "j", is employed to designate the particular time-mode
under consideration. The vertically polarized Hertzian dipoles considered in this paper reduce
to, $G_j' = G_j'' = \sin \tau_j$. Of course, other antenna complex pattern factors can be introduced.

Since plane reflection coefficients are employed in this analysis, the convergence-divergence
coefficient, $\alpha_j$, is necessary to convert the plane reflection coefficients to spherical reflection
coefficients or from the viewpoint of "ray theory" it is necessary to take account of ray focusing
by the ionosphere and a corresponding defocusing of rays by the earth. The "classical" conver-
gence-divergence is modified by a "convergence correction" [Wait, 1950], $A_j$, in this paper,
since the values of the first time-mode studied are at distances close to the "caustic" of rays or
geometric-optical horizon, and hence the complete expression, $\alpha_j$,
\begin{equation}
\alpha_j = (1+h/a)((2j \sin \theta/2j)/\sin \theta)^{1/2} \times ([a(1-\cos \theta/2j)+h]/((a+h) \cos \theta/2j-a))^{1/2} A_j,
\end{equation}
in which $A_j$ can be evaluated from the cylindrical Hankel function of order, $n=1/2$, of the second
kind,
\begin{equation}
A_j \sim \left[ \frac{\pi}{2k_0} \frac{a \cos \theta}{3 \sin \theta} \tau_j \right]^{1/2} H^{(2)}_n \left[ k_0 a \cos \theta \tau_j/3 \sin \theta \right] \times \exp \left\{ -i \left[ 5\pi/12 - k_0 a \cos \theta \tau_j/3 \sin \theta \right] \right\},
\end{equation}
The factor, $A_j$, approaches unity ($A_j \sim 1$) at shorter distances, ($\tau_j \ll \pi/2$). Near the geometric-
optical-horizon, $\tau_j \sim \pi/2$, and beyond, the correction becomes quite appreciable. The Hankel
functions, $H^{(2)}_n(z)$ can be readily evaluated on an electronic computer by a consideration of the
integral form,
\begin{equation}
H^{(2)}_n(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \exp (-iz \sin \rho + i\rho \rho) d\rho - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \exp (-z \sin \rho) \{ \exp n\rho + \exp (-n\rho + i\pi) \} d\rho,
\end{equation}
where the order, $n = 1/2$, and the argument, $z = k_0 a \cos \theta \tau_j/3 \sin \theta$, in which the wave number,
k_0 = \omega_0 c \sim \omega/c$, for the case under consideration are real numbers. Nevertheless, it is inter-
esting to note that the method is also applicable to complex argument, $z$, and complex order,
n, provided the multiple branches of the Hankel function are carefully considered. The follow-
ing substitution is made,
\begin{equation}
\beta = \exp (-\rho),
\end{equation}
and a resultant expression for the Hankel function.
\[ H_n^{(2)}(z) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \exp (-i z \sin \rho + i n \rho) \, d\rho - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \left[ \beta^{-n-1} + \beta^{n-1} \exp (i n \pi) \right] \exp \left[ -\frac{z}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\beta} - \beta \right) \right] \, d\beta, \]

or,

\[ H_n^{(2)}(z) = \int_0^\pi f(z, \rho, n) \, d\rho - \int_0^\pi f(z, \beta, n) \, d\beta, \]

is found to comprise integrals with finite limits. These integrals can then be evaluated in terms of Gaussian quadrature,\(^2\)

\[ H_n^{(2)}(z) = \sum_{m=1}^M W_m [\text{Re} f(z, \rho_m, n) + i \text{Im} f(z, \rho_m, n)] - \sum_{m=1}^M W_m [\text{Re} f(z, \beta_m, n) + i \text{Im} f(z, \beta_m, n)] + \epsilon(M) \]

\[ m = 1, 2, 3 \ldots M, \]

where,\( \epsilon(M) \) can be made arbitrarily small by increasing \( M \),

\[ W_m = \pi H_m / 2, \]

\[ W_m = H_m / 2, \]

\[ \rho_m = \pi x_m / 2 + \pi / 2, \]

\[ \beta_m = x_m / 2 + 1 / 2, \]

and the constants, \( x_m \), of the theory of Gaussian quadrature can be evaluated as the roots of the Legendre polynomials defined by,

\[ \frac{d^M}{dx^M} (x^2 - 1)^M - 2^M M! P_M(x) = 0, \]

or,

\[ P_0(x) = 1, \]

\[ P_1(x) = x, \]

\[ P_2(x) = \frac{3}{2} x^2 - \frac{1}{2}, \]

\[ P_3(x) = \frac{5}{2} x^3 - \frac{3}{2} x, \]

\[ P_4(x) = \frac{35}{8} x^4 - \frac{15}{4} x^2 + \frac{3}{8}, \]

\[ \ldots, \]

where polynomials of higher degree are determined by the use of the recursion formula,

\[ (M+1)P_{M+1}(x) + MP_{M-1}(x) - (2M+1) x P_M(x) = 0. \]

The weight coefficients, \( H_m \), are evaluated from the roots, \( x_m \),

\[ H_m = 2 / (1 - x_m^2) [P'_M(x_m)]^2. \]

\[ (M+1) \]

The factor, \( F_r \), accounts for the presence of the earth at the transmitter (source) and receiver. If it can be assumed that the "ray" reflected by the earth is not too close or beyond the geometric-optical horizon, the Fresnel approximation of the ground reflection coefficient suffices to determine \( F_r \), or,

\[ F_r \sim [1 + R_1^e(\tau_1)][1 + R_1^e(\tau_1)], \]

\[ \quad \frac{\text{This type analysis has been used extensively by the author in previous papers to evaluate Fourier integrals}}{\text{[Johler and Walters, 1999].}} \]
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where the superscripts, $t$ and $r$, refer to the transmitter and receiver respectively and the subscript, $e$, refers to vertical polarization, and,
\[
R_e(\tau_j) = \{ k_2^2 \cos \tau_j/k_1^2 - [k_2^2/k_1^2 - \sin^2 \tau_j] \} / \{ k_2^2 \cos \tau_j/k_1^2 + [k_2^2/k_1^2 - \sin^2 \tau_j] \},
\]
(27)

or for horizontal polarization,
\[
R_n(\tau_j) = \{ \cos \tau_j - [k_2^2/k_1^2 - \sin^2 \tau_j] \} / \{ \cos \tau_j + [k_2^2/k_1^2 - \sin^2 \tau_j] \},
\]
(28)
where,
\[
k_2 = \frac{\omega}{c} \left[ \epsilon_2 - \frac{\sigma \mu_0 \omega^2}{c} \right]^{1/2}
\]
(29)
and $\epsilon_2$ is the dielectric constant of the earth ($\epsilon_2 \sim 15$) and $\sigma$ is the conductivity of the earth ($\sigma \sim 0.005$ for land). Since the examples considered in this paper involve distances which, for the first time-mode, were close to the geometric-optical horizon, it was found necessary to replace the Fresnel reflection coefficients with a more rigorous treatment.

Close to the geometric-optical horizon a calculation of $F_j = F_j^t F_j^r$ can be accomplished by a numerical evaluation of the contour integral, [Wait and Conda, 1958],
\[
F_j^t - i \frac{\pi}{3} \exp \left[ -ik_1 a \theta' \right] \int_{\text{contour}} \exp \left[ -i(k_1 a/2)\theta' \rho \right] W_t(\rho) - qW_r(\rho) \, d\rho,
\]
(30)
where $\theta' = (d - d_1)/a$, where $d_1$ is the distance from the transmitter to the geometric-optical horizon ($\tau_j \sim \pi/2$) and,
\[
q = -i \left( \frac{k_1 a}{2} \right)^{1/2} k_1 \sqrt{1 - \frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2}}
\]
(31)
in which $\sigma = \sigma_2$ is the ground conductivity at either transmitter $F_j^t$ or receiver $F_j^r$ and $\epsilon_2$ is the corresponding dielectric constants (relative to a vacuum), and,
\[
W_t(\rho) = \exp \left[ -2\pi i / 3 \right] \left( -\rho \right)^{1/2} H_1^{(2)}(2/3)(-\rho)^{1/2},
\]
(32)
\[
W_r(\rho) = \exp \left[ -2\pi i / 3 \right] \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^{1/2} H_1^{(2)}(2/3)(-\rho)^{1/2},
\]
(33)
\[
H_1^{(2)}(Z) = \frac{d}{dZ} H_1^{(2)}(Z) = \exp \left[ -i2\pi / 3 \right] H_1^{(2)}(Z) - \frac{1}{3} Z H_1^{(2)}(Z).
\]
(34)
The Hankel functions $H_1^{(2)}(Z)$ can be calculated by previously described quadrature methods (20–27). The contour integral can be written [Wait, 1960b],
\[
F_j^t - i \frac{\pi}{3} \exp \left[ -ik_1 a \theta' \right] \left\{ \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp \left[ -i(k_1 a/2)\theta' \rho \right]}{W_t(\rho)} - \frac{q}{W_r(\rho)} \right\} d\rho - \int_0^\infty \frac{\exp \left[ -i(k_1 a/2)\theta' \rho \right]}{W_t(\rho')} - \frac{q}{W_r(\rho')} \right\} d\rho',
\]
(35)
\[
\alpha' = \alpha \exp (-i2\pi/3).
\]
These integrals can then be evaluated with a Gaussian quadrature.

Close to but beyond the geometric-optical horizon ($\tau_j \sim \pi/2$) [Wait and Conda, 1958], a calculation can be performed as a residue series summation,
\[
F_j^t - i \frac{\pi}{3} \exp \left[ -ik_1 (d - d_1) \right] \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{\exp \left[ -i(k_1 a/2)\theta' \rho \right]}{(2\pi)^n} W_t(2\pi \rho),
\]
(36)
\[a \sim 6.367 (10^9) \text{ m}.
\]
where the complex conjugate $\tau_*$ of $\tau^*$ comprises the special roots of the differential equation of Riccati tabulated by Johler, Walters, and Lilley [1959], employing the time function, \( \exp(-i\omega t) \),

$$
d\delta_{s}/d\tau_{s} - 2\tau_{s}\delta_{s}^{2} + 1 = 0,
$$

(37)

where

$$
\delta_{s} = \frac{i k_{z}^{2} \alpha_{l} \hbar_{l}^{l}}{(k_{1}a)^{4}} \left[ \frac{k_{z}^{2}}{k_{l}^{2}} - 1 \right]^{1/2} \sim i \frac{Z_{0}}{(k_{1}a)^{4}} \left[ \frac{-i \mu \alpha_{l} \hbar_{l}^{l}}{\sigma - i \omega} \right]^{1/2}
$$

(38)

and, $k_{1} = \frac{\omega}{c} \eta_{1} \sim \frac{\omega}{c} k_{2}^{*}$, implies the complex conjugate of $k_{2}$, (3), and the limiting roots are found from the equations,

$$
H_{1}^{(1)} \left[ \frac{1}{3} (-2\tau_{s})^{i} \right] = 0, \quad \delta_{s} = \infty,
$$

$$
H_{1}^{(1)} \left[ \frac{1}{3} (-2\tau_{s})^{i} \right] = 0, \quad \delta_{s} = 0,
$$

(39)

$s = 0, 1, 2, 3 \ldots$

Finally, the effective reflection coefficient of geometric-optics, $C_{j}$, can be evaluated for vertical polarization,

$$
C_{j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{d^{j}}{d\xi^{j}} \left[ \frac{1 + A_{1} x}{1 - A_{2} x - A_{3} x^{2}} \right]_{x = 3},
$$

where

$$
A_{1} = -R_{m} T_{mm},
$$

$$
A_{2} = R_{e} T_{ee} + R_{m} T_{mm},
$$

$$
A_{3} = -R_{m} [T_{ee} T_{mm} + T_{em} T_{me}],
$$

(40)

Thus, the essential nature of the propagation about the earth via the ionosphere can be described in terms of four reflection coefficients, $T_{ee}$, $T_{em}$, $T_{me}$, and $T_{mm}$. The reflection coefficient, $T_{ce}$, refers to the vertical electric polarization of the incident plane wave and a similar vertical electric polarization of the reflected wave. The coefficient, $T_{em}$, describes the generation of the abnormal component by the incident vertical polarization (reflected horizontal polarization for vertical excitation). Similarly, $T_{mm}$ refers to the incident horizontal electric polarization and the corresponding reflected horizontal electric polarization. Also, the abnormal component generated by the horizontal electric polarization (reflected vertical polarization for horizontal excitation) is described by the coefficient, $T_{me}$. Thus, figure 3,

$$
T_{ee} = E_{e}^{s} / E_{e}^{t}, \quad T_{em} = E_{e}^{t} / E_{e}^{t}, \quad T_{em} = E_{e}^{t} / E_{e}^{t}, \quad T_{me} = E_{e}^{t} / E_{e}^{t},
$$

(41)

where the subscripts $i$ and $r$ refer to incident and reflected wave respectively at the ionosphere boundary. The calculation of these reflection coefficients has been previously described in detail and the results of various computations have been tabulated [Johler and Walters, 1960].

The reflection coefficients are completely specified by the angle of incidence, $\phi_{i}$, figures 2, 3, electron density $N(El/cm^{3})$, figure 4, collision frequency $\nu(c/s)$, figure 5, magnetic field intensity $H_{m}$ (gauss), magnetic dip $I$ and magnetic azimuth $\phi_{o}$. The effective reflection coefficients, $C_{j}$, can then be written in terms of the ionosphere reflection coefficients, $T$, and the ground reflection coefficients, $R$, for each local ionosphere or ground reflection,

$$
C_{1} = C_{1}(\tau_{1}) = T_{ee},
$$

$$
C_{2} = C_{2}(\tau_{2}) = T_{ee} R_{1} + R_{m} T_{em} T_{me2},
$$

$$
C_{3} = C_{3}(\tau_{3}) = R_{e2} R_{m} T_{ee} T_{em1} T_{me3} + R_{e1} R_{m} T_{ee} T_{em1} T_{me1} T_{em3} + R_{m} R_{me2} T_{em3} T_{me1},
$$

(42)
Figure 4. Electron density-altitude, N(h), profiles of the lower ionosphere deduced from various radio and rocket measurements.

\[ C_4 = C_4(r_4) = R_{e1}R_{e2}R_{e3}T_{ee4}T_{ee3}T_{ee2}T_{ee1} + R_{e1}R_{e2}R_{m3}T_{me4}T_{me3}T_{me2}T_{me1} + R_{e1}R_{m2}R_{e3}T_{ee4}T_{em3}T_{em2}T_{ee1} + R_{m1}R_{e2}R_{m3}T_{me4}T_{me3}T_{me2}T_{em1} + R_{m1}R_{e2}R_{m3}T_{ee4}T_{em3}T_{em2}T_{ee1} \]
\[ + R_{m1}R_{m2}R_{e3}T_{ee4}T_{em3}T_{em2}T_{ee1} + R_{e1}R_{e2}R_{e3}T_{ee4}T_{ee3}T_{ee2}T_{ee1} + R_{m1}R_{m2}R_{e3}T_{ee4}T_{em3}T_{em2}T_{ee1} + R_{m1}R_{m2}R_{m3}T_{me4}T_{me3}T_{me2}T_{em1} + R_{m1}R_{m2}R_{m3}T_{ee4}T_{em3}T_{em2}T_{em1} \]  

where the subscripts 1, 2, 3, 4 . . . refer to the first, second, third, fourth, etc., reflection regions of the ionosphere with corresponding separate values for electron density, N, collision frequency, v, and the intensity and direction of the earth's magnetic field vector, $\overline{H}$, or, for the ground, refer to the separate values of conductivity, $\sigma$, and dielectric constant, $\varepsilon_2$.

For a homogeneous ionosphere and ground with a single set of values, $N$, $v$, $\overline{H}$, $\sigma$, and $\varepsilon_2$, the effective reflection coefficients, $C_j$, reduce as follows:

\[ C_1 = T_{ee} \]
\[ C_2 = T_{ee}^2R_e + R_mT_{me}T_{me} \]
\[ C_3 = 2R_eR_mT_{ee}T_{em}T_{me} + R_e^2T_{ee}^3 + R_mT_{mm}T_{em}T_{me} \]
\[ C_4 = R_eR_m^2T_{ee}^2T_{me}^2 + 3R_eR_mT_{ee}^2T_{me}T_{ee} + 2R_eR_m^2T_{ee}T_{mm}T_{em}T_{me} + R_m^2T_{mm}T_{ee}^2T_{me} + R_e^2T_{ee}^4 \]

\[ \ldots \]  (44)

The wave number of the ionosphere propagation medium,

\[ k_3 = \frac{\omega}{c} \eta_0, \]  
\[ \Rightarrow \frac{\omega}{c} \eta_e, \]  (45)

implies two upgoing waves excited in the model ionosphere with index of refraction, $\eta_0$, for
the “ordinary” wave and index of refraction, \( n_o \), for the “extraordinary” wave. The value of the reflection coefficients, \( T \), are related to the \( n_0 \) and \( n_e \).

The rate of attenuation and phase lag of the wave, \( E_i \), transmitted into the ionosphere can be deduced by an interpretation of the transmitted wave in terms of the complex index of refraction, \( n = n_0 + i n_e \).

\[
E_i = |E_i| \exp \left\{ i \left[ \omega t - \frac{\omega}{c} \eta D \right] \right\},
\]

(46)

The amplitude is as follows:

\[
\exp \left\{ \frac{\omega}{c} \text{Im} \; \eta D \right\}, \exp \{ \text{nepers} \},
\]

(47)

or the amplitude change is,

\[
\exp \left\{ \frac{\omega}{c} \text{Im} \; \eta 10^3 \right\}, \exp \{ \text{nepers/km} \},
\]

(48)

or, \( 8.686 \frac{\omega}{c} \text{Im} \; \eta 10^3 \), decibels,

(49)

or, \( 8.686 \frac{\omega}{c} \text{Im} \; \eta 10^3 \), db/km,

(50)

where \( D \) (meters) is the penetration distance into the ionosphere. The corresponding phase lag is,

\[
\frac{\omega}{c} \text{Re} \; \eta D \text{ radians},
\]

(51)

or,

\[
\frac{\omega}{c} \text{Re} \; \eta (10^3) \text{ radians/km}.
\]

(52)

3. Analysis of Experimental Data

Although there is a tendency in LF propagation studies to separate arctic-auroral phenomena from those phenomena observed at LF in temperate latitudes, the mechanism of propagation seems to differ only in the degree and frequency of the so-called disturbed and blackout conditions which characterize the arctic regions. Certain data on propagation at LF in both the arctic-auroral regions and the temperate regions are analyzed in this paper to demonstrate principle rather than deduce comprehensive engineering conclusions. A theoretical investigation and analysis is therefore attempted to gain some insight into LF propagation phenomena for Loran-C system evaluation.

Ionosphere electron density-altitude profiles \( N(h) \), figure 4, and collision frequency-altitude profiles \( \nu(h) \), figure 5, have recently been deduced with the aid of a theoretical method and an experimental HF signal transmitted through the ionosphere from rockets. Waynick [1957] reported the “Houston composite,” figure 4 \( N(h) \) profile, and Seddon and Jackson [1958] have reported “NRL 50” and “NRL 47” profiles. Seddon and Jackson have also reported “NN3.08F” \( \nu(h) \) profile, figure 5. Other \( \nu(h) \) data are shown from Crompton et al. [1953], Gardner and Pawsey [1953], Fejer [1955], and Nicolet [1958].

The “Houston composite” \( N(h) \) profile implies an interesting low electron density region at the 65 to 70 km altitudes of the lower ionosphere with values between \( N=10 \) and \( N=100 \) El/cm\(^2\), figure 4. Such a profile seemed to persist in the propagation data examined and profoundly influenced the daytime ionospheric propagation. However, it does not appear to exist in the “NRL 50” data which seems to give rise to great electron densities quite abruptly. Unfortunately, as a result of rocket drag considerations, the HF antennas were not extended until the rocket attained an altitude of about 55 km, and measurements of electron densities in this region are not very detailed. This lack of data below 60 km is more apparent in the “NRL 47” data, observed in the auroral zone at Churchill, Canada, which illustrate a very large enhancement of the electron density during auroral “blackout” conditions. A “mean of the
composite and blackout” profiles was employed as an intermediate “disturbed” model ionosphere.

Various collision frequency-altitude profiles, \( v(h) \), are shown in figure 5. The “Nicolet/3” curve was used for all model ionospheres employed in this analysis. This is a theoretical curve substantiated with experimental rocket data. This theoretical curve is also consistent with other findings [Ratcliffe, 1959].

Theoretical field intensities, figures 6 to 9, were calculated for comparison with available data on LF transmission from Adak to Nome and Kodiak, Alaska. The independent variable

---

Figure 6. Total theoretical field \( E(\omega, d) \) for various fixed heights, \( h \), of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Kodiak, Alaska.

(See figures 4 and 5 for electron density \( N \ldots \).)

---

*The data employed in this analysis is treated somewhat differently from previous authors. The authors wish to thank A. D. Watt and J. E. Bickel for the use of their original data. See also Bickel [1959] and Watt et al. [1969].*
of the calculations was the altitude, \( h \), of the assumed sharply bounded model ionosphere. This implies a variation of the electron density according to the \( N(h) \) profile as the variable \( h \) is changed. Also, small adjustments in the angle of incidence, \( \phi \), are implied.

Geophysical data on the ionosphere employed in the calculation are shown, tables 1, 2. The magnetic data, shown in table 2, were scaled from Magnetic Charts [1954, 1957]. Apparently a nominal intensity value \( H_m = 0.5 \) gauss (table 2) is an adequate assumption for many practical cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( h ) in km</th>
<th>( v )</th>
<th>( N_0 )</th>
<th>( N_d )</th>
<th>( N_b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Magnetic field, \( H_m \) data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection number</th>
<th>( H_m )</th>
<th>( I )</th>
<th>( \phi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>0.5157</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2st</td>
<td>0.9995</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3st</td>
<td>0.5329</td>
<td>71.82</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4st</td>
<td>0.4592</td>
<td>61.82</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5st</td>
<td>0.5187</td>
<td>68.68</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6st</td>
<td>0.5388</td>
<td>72.46</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adak-Kodiak, \( d = 1064.1 \) statute miles (1,670 km)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection number</th>
<th>( H_m )</th>
<th>( I )</th>
<th>( \phi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>0.5008</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>51.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2st</td>
<td>0.4590</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>52.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3st</td>
<td>0.5170</td>
<td>69.04</td>
<td>49.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4st</td>
<td>0.4932</td>
<td>64.42</td>
<td>53.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5st</td>
<td>0.5033</td>
<td>67.18</td>
<td>51.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6st</td>
<td>0.5202</td>
<td>69.64</td>
<td>49.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modal (skywave time-mode) and the total (including the groundwave) calculated fields (amplitude and phase) for quiescent, disturbed, and blackout conditions of the ionosphere are presented, figures 6 to 9. The effect of the ionosphere focusing corrections, \( A_\phi \), is also illustrated, and, indeed, was found to be appreciable, both for the total field, \( E(\omega, d) \), and the first modal field, \( E_j(\omega, d), j=1 \). The diffraction correction \( F_j \) was also modified from the classical Fresnel reflection coefficient as discussed with the aid of calculated data of Wait and Conda [1958] which was installed in the electronic memory of a small computer.\(^6\)

The ground wave, \( E_g(\omega, d) \), which was calculated with the classical Bremmer-van der Pol theory [Johler, Kellar, and Walters, 1956] and corrected for land-sea boundaries with the aid of the Millington [1949] method is not shown alone graphically, since the groundwave is not a function of the emplacement altitude, \( h \), but can be summarized as follows:

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \omega, d )</th>
<th>( \theta, d )</th>
<th>( \phi, d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( I_d = 1 )</td>
<td>( I_d = 2930 )</td>
<td>Radiant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7.56 ( 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>1.35 ( 10^{-5} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>1.64 ( 10^{-4} )</td>
<td>9.51 ( 10^{-5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) IBM-650.
All computations were made with the assumption of a dipole current moment, $I_d=1$. The total radiated power, $P_r=1.3$ kw, for the arctic data considered was found to correspond to a dipole current moment, $I_d=2050$ amp-m; therefore, the calculated field amplitude, $|E'(\omega, d)|$, or $[E_i(\omega, d)]$, has been increased by this factor for comparison with the data.

**Figure 7.** Disturbed-blackout theoretical field $E(\omega, d)$ for various fixed heights, $h$, of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Kodiak, Alaska.
Figure 8. Total theoretical field $E(\omega, d)$ for various fixed heights, $h$, of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Kodiak, Alaska.
Figure 9. Disturbed-blackout theoretical field $E(\omega, d)$ for various fixed heights, $h$, of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Kodiak, Alaska.
Figure 10. Comparison of quiescent and disturbed-blackout conditions of theoretical reflection coefficient, $T$, for various fixed heights, $h$, of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Kodiak, Alaska.

$H_m=0.5035$, $\phi_m=51.0^\circ$, $I=67.18^\circ$
In addition to the total field, $E(\omega, d)$, and the modal field, $E_j(\omega, d)$, figures 6 to 9, the reflection coefficients, $T$, (horizontal and vertical polarization; normal and abnormal components), figures 10 to 11, and the transmission data of the ordinary and extraordinary upgoing

Figure 11. Comparison of quiescent and disturbed-blackout conditions of theoretical reflection coefficient, $T$, ($j = 1$), for various fixed heights, $h$, of sharply bounded model ionosphere for LF transmissions from Adak to Nome, Alaska. $H_m = 0.5157, \phi = 12.22^\circ, I = 68.66^\circ$. 521
Figure 12. Attenuation rate and phase lag rate at various emplacement altitudes, $h$, for upgoing "ordinary" and "extraordinary" waves excited in the model ionosphere by Adak to Kodiak, Alaska transmissions during quiescent and disturbed-blackout conditions.
First time-mode: $H_m = 0.5035$, $\phi_m = 51.68^\circ$, $I = 67.18^\circ$.

Figure 13. Attenuation rate and phase lag rate at various emplacement altitudes, $h$, for upgoing "ordinary" and "extraordinary" waves excited in the model ionosphere by Adak to Nome, Alaska transmissions during quiescent and disturbed-blackout conditions.
First time-mode: $H_m = 0.5187$, $\phi_m = 12.27^\circ$, $I = 68.68^\circ$. 
waves excited in the ionosphere by the reflection process, figures 12, 13, were evaluated. The unabsorbed modal field, \( E_0/(\omega d)/C_p \), and the effective reflection coefficients, \( C_f \), are separately illustrated, figures 14 and 15, respectively.

The emplacement height, \( h \), of the model ionosphere was deduced by comparison of the computed field strength, \( E(\omega, d) \), with the measured value. The corresponding four reflection coefficients, \( T_{em}, T_{cm}, T_{mm}, T_{me} \), (amplitude and phase) were then evaluated from the theory. The results of this process which were readily scaled from graphs such as illustrated, figures 10, 11, are presented in table 4, and the reflection coefficients deduced for the first time-mode only are presented.

The higher order time-mode, \( j=2, 3 \), reflection coefficients are obviously quite numerous since a separate set exists for each ionosphere reflecting region. These reflection coefficients are determined by the analysis by reference to the emplacement altitude, \( h \), table 5, deduced from the field, \( E(\omega, d) \).

![Figure 14. Unabsorbed modal field, \( E_0/(\omega d)/C_p \) at various model ionosphere altitude emplacements, \( h \), for Adak to Nome and Kodiak, Alaska transmissions \( L_d=1 \) ampere-meter.](image)

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season and year</th>
<th>Observed [E(\omega, d)]</th>
<th>( h )</th>
<th>( \arg E(\omega, d) )</th>
<th>( \arg E_0 (\omega, d) )</th>
<th>( \arg T_{em} )</th>
<th>( \arg T_{cm} )</th>
<th>( \arg T_{mm} )</th>
<th>( \arg T_{me} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1953-54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1954...</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1954...</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adak-Kodiak (Daytime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1953-54</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1954...</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1954...</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adak-Nome (Daytime)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 1953-54</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 1954...</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1954...</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt;65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>&lt;3.0</td>
<td>&lt;2.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>&lt;1.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 15. Effective reflection coefficient, $c_1$, for Adak to Nome and Kodiak, Alaska, transmissions under quiescent ionosphere conditions.
It is interesting to note emplacement altitudes, $h$, less than 65 km under quiescent conditions. Indeed, the highest altitude for these daytime values was 69 km (winter 1954). A good nominal daytime emplacement altitude is 67.5 km. The low value ($|T| < 0.1$) reflection coefficients are also quite interesting. Note the highest value, $|T| \sim 0.27$. Note also, the median value at Nom (1954 equinox), $|T_{re}| = 0.08$. A low value $|T| < 0.1$, and “black”, $|T| \sim 0$ appearance of the ionosphere indicates a low level absorbing region in the lower ionosphere at grazing incidence. A region of low electron density, $N = 10^{-100}$ El/cm$^3$, is indicated by the model employed, figure 4. The transmission into such a region at grazing incidence, $\phi_t \sim 80^\circ$, figures 11, 12, indicates almost complete absorption of both the “ordinary” and the “extraordinary” rays if a “virtual height,” $h + \Delta h$, is assumed of the order of 70 km. The transmission curves, figures 11, 12, demonstrate that the “extraordinary” ray is very highly attenuated such that it is necessary to consider only the “ordinary” ray. Assuming 1 db/km, for example, figures 11, 12, and a virtual height, $h + \Delta h$, of 70 km, noting that appreciable attenuation rate begins at 65 km, the total attenuation can be estimated; total decibels $\sim 2 \Delta h / \cos \phi_t \sim 57$ db. This, of course, neglects a reflection absorption at the 70 km virtual height plus the transmission absorption back into the region below the ionosphere. The values, $\Delta h$, can be decreased and a corresponding decrease in the attenuation noted. But a repetition of the process leads to the interesting conclusion that most of the ray reflection must occur in a fraction of a kilometer, and, hence, the sharply bounded model can be reasonably applied under these conditions to predict the LF field, $E(\omega, d)$. A similar examination of the second and third time-modes leads to an almost similar reflecting region since the angle of incidence, $\phi_t$, figure 2, does not change rapidly until the distance, $d/j$, is sufficiently short. It is, nevertheless, conceivable that the amplitude of the skywave reflections, $j = 4, 5, 6, \ldots$ at shorter distances could become quite large as a result of reflection from a high level “virtual height,” $h + \Delta h = 70$ to 85 km. Under these conditions, however, the sharply bounded model would not be valid and it would be necessary to develop theoretical techniques for a diffusely bounded model ionosphere.

Information on the lower ionosphere $N(h)$ profile during nighttime conditions is quite sparse and hence the theoretician can only speculate on its nature. However, under certain reasonable assumptions, a possible explanation of the increase in field strength experienced at night may be deduced from the daytime model ionosphere employed.

Despite the seeming “evaporation” of the lower regions of the ionosphere at night with a corresponding abrupt increase in the electron density to a large finite value, it seems reasonable to assume that this abrupt increase does not occur within $\lambda/10$ or 0.22 km at 135.6 kc/s. This makes it possible to utilize the present sharply bounded model ionosphere, if it is emplaced at a higher level. Recent work [Ellyett and Watts, 1959] indicates a height of 80 to 85 km is not unreasonable.

Since the change of the angle of incidence, $\phi_t$, figure 2, with ionosphere height, $h$, is not great at this range, we may neglect its effect on the field strength, figures 6 to 9, and the effective reflection coefficients, figure 15. The only factor changed, therefore, is the unabsorbed field, figure 14. It therefore seems reasonable to expect the first time mode, $|E_1(\omega, d)|$, to increase on the order of at least twice, whereas, reference to the Arctic data and figure 16, “Battle Lake data” (to be discussed below), indicates an increase of perhaps 4 to 10 times. This could easily be explained by a slight change of slope in the $N(h)$ profile employed as evidenced by the steep slope of the $C_i$ curves ($j = 1$), figure 15, in the region involved. On this basis, it is reasonable to expect a nighttime reflection coefficient, $|T| \sim 0.3, 0.4$. Indeed, at temperate latitude, these values are confirmed [Ross, 1959].
It is not surprising that a large phase change could be expected during the sunset-sunrise transition periods, figures 6 and 8. Indeed, such phase changes were described at 100 kc/s by Doherty [1957], while operating the Loran-C on the first time-mode of the skywave.

The behavior of the LF propagation during disturbed and blackout conditions which are especially frequent in the arctic-auroral region is not quite so clear. Figures 7 and 9 illustrate disturbed-blackout conditions based on the geophysical measurements of electron density profiles, N(h), of the lower ionosphere, figure 4. The corresponding reflection coefficients, figures 10, 11, and the transmission of upgoing ordinary and extraordinary waves excited by the reflection process are also illustrated, figures 12, 13. The disturbance of the earth's magnetic field during extreme blackout conditions is negligible since the total field, H_m~0.5 gauss and the fluctuations are of the order of 0.001 gauss [Chapman, 1940]. The most significant change in the propagation is caused by the drastic change in the electron density profile, N(h), figure 4. Unfortunately, the shape of the lower levels, < 60 km, of the "blackout" N(h) profile is unknown. Since the analysis under quiescent conditions indicates low-electron density reflections, the curve, figure 4, was extrapolated, and the corresponding field, E(ω, d), calculated for Adak to Nome transmission. The results are tabulated in table 5.

Note the j=1 mode for a region of N=1000 El/cm^3 has undergone a 26 db decrease and the total field is therefore almost entirely groundwave. Appreciable as the decrease is, it is still well within the range of observations of arctic data. Notice, figure 16 "Battle Lake data" (to be discussed below), that the range of observations in temperate latitudes is approximately 18 db. The additional fluctuation may then, reasonably, be attributed to the change in electron density of the extreme lower ionosphere. If this change were to be so abrupt as to reach N=1000 El/cm^3 in, say, λ/10 km, the field strength would show a considerable increase, instead of decrease. It is reasonable to expect that a more realistic value of somewhat less than N=1000 El/cm^2 would also produce an increase in the received field strength. The shape of the N(h) profile, thus, becomes quite important.

Figure 16. Amplitude of theoretical total field |E(ω, d)| as a function of distance, d, from the source illustrating a comparison of experimental pulse amplitude measurements with theoretical first time-mode in the diffraction zone beyond the geometrical-optical horizon.

Figure 17. Phase of theoretical field arg E(ω, d) as a function of distance.
The calculation of the amplitude and phase of the total field, $E(\omega, d)$ as a function of distance is illustrated in figures 16 and 17. The corresponding reflection coefficient $T_e$ (vertical polarization, normal component) is illustrated in figure 18.

Amplitude measurements during the day which illustrate the diffraction of the first time-mode ($j=1$) near and beyond the geometric-optical horizon are illustrated in figure 16. The agreement with the theoretical curve $j=1$ appears to be quite close except at the range of 1,800 miles. It is interesting to note the apparent decrease in the range of amplitude observations in the daytime, indicating greater amplitude stability with range in the diffraction zone.

4. Conclusion

The analysis of these data demonstrates the application of propagation theory together with a suitable model for the ionosphere to the prediction of LF phenomena. The precision of the model for the case of transmission via the ionosphere at or close to grazing incidence is considered to be adequate upon considering the state of knowledge of the many parameters which influence such propagation. Nevertheless, the absence of an abundance of specific information does not deter the author from certain general conclusions which can be made as a result of this research.

At oblique incidence on the ionosphere, a condition which is certainly met under most practical situations, the reflection of LF waves during the daytime occurs in a region of very low electron density and high absorption, with corresponding low values of reflection coefficients, $|T| < 0.1$. The dominant skywave time-mode is, in general, the first; however, the second, third and higher order time-modes may offer appreciable contribution to the total field as the angle of incidence decreases as a result of reflection from higher levels and shorter transit distance in the ionized medium.

Periods of ionospheric disturbance (blackout) can produce a decrease in the field as a result of a reduction in the amplitude of the ionospheric time-modes. However, it is equally possible for the skywave mode to be incremented. This phenomenon is dependent upon the slope of

---

*From the author's personal notes on the 1933-1934 testing of the Loran-C (Cytac) System.*
the electron density-altitude profile, $N(h)$ h. However, if ordinary communication is an engineering objective, LF seem to be quite reliable since the characteristic high absorption of HF waves does not appear to exist.

Since the writing of this paper the extensive theoretical work of Barron [1961] and the extensive experimental and engineering work of Belrose et al., [1959] have come to the attention of the author. It is interesting to note quite good agreement, figure 18, between the reflection coefficients deduced from the sharply bounded model presented in this paper and those presented as a result of Barron's full wave computations. Barron's data does, however, indicate, as might be expected, higher attenuation at the higher frequencies (>150 kc/s).

It should be noted in conclusion that the adequacy of the sharply bounded model is subject to severe limitations, especially at the higher frequencies and the results of this paper suggest also the introduction into this geometric optical analysis of more rigorous or flexible models for the reflection coefficient which would treat a more diffuse ionosphere lower boundary.
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