to renormalize the $N \times N$ network to the 50-Ω system. This implies that each S_{ij} with $i \neq j$ is measured $(N-2)!/((M-2)!(N-M)!)$ times (only once for the classical two-port network analyzer $(NA)(M=2)$), and each $S_{ii}(N-1)!/((M-1)!(N-M)!)$ times (or $(N-1)$ for the two-port NA). For the classical case of the two-port NA, the discussion about efficiency seems futile because one or two inversions of a 2×2 matrix will not make a large difference in computation time. However, for the renormalization to the 50-Ω system, the matrix size is $N \times N$.

The proof of (8) and (9) in the reply from the authors [1] is carried out in the same way as the simplified formulas (4) and (6) are derived from (1) and (3), but those formulas are only useful for simulation purposes.

Reply[2] by J. C. Tippet and R. A. Speciale[3]

The authors of the original paper[1] agree with Van Lil's proof of equivalence and with his analysis of the relative computational efficiencies of the four known forms of the generalized scattering matrix renormalization transform. Among these four forms, given by Van Lil as expressions (2), (5), (6), and (7), the first three were found by Speciale and the fourth by Dropkin.

For the record, Dropkin must be credited with providing the inspiration that stimulated the derivation of (6) from (5) and for delivering, already in December 1982, a direct proof of equivalence of (6) to (7). We are reporting this proof in full at the end of this reply, as it is, to our knowledge, still unpublished. The proof of equivalence of (2) to (5) delivered by Van Lil is, however, original, and he must be credited for that.

We are, however, sorry to have to disagree with Van Lil's conclusions relating to the minimum number of partial scattering measurements required to fully characterize an N-port network on an M-port network analyzer. Our disagreement is motivated by the following counter-example: Only three partial measurements are required to fully characterize a 6-port network on a 4-port network analyzer. One possible strategy is to use the port-combinations (1, 2, 3, 4), (1, 2, 5, 6), and (3, 4, 5, 6) in which case three 4×4 preliminary renormalizations are required prior to the final 6×6 renormalization. Also, each S_{ii} is measured twice while all S_{ij} are measured once except for the S_{12}, S_{21}, S_{34}, S_{43}, S_{56}, and S_{65} entries which are measured twice. This example supports the conjecture, stated in a footnote of our paper[1] that $N(2N-M)/M^2$ is the minimum number of required partial measurements, not $N!/(M!(N-M)!)$ as stated by Van Lil.

The above conjecture only applies to a situation where M is even and N is a multiple of $M/2$. It would be interesting to find a proof of this conjecture and possibly an expression applicable to arbitrary N and M values. Another interesting aspect of this problem is to find a formal method for selecting which sets of port-combinations attain the minimum number of partial measurements. Indeed, even in the above counter-example, there are various alternate sets that attain full characterization of a 6-port network in the minimum number of three partial measurements.

Finally, we would like to observe that the application of the generalized renormalization transform to the measurement problem described in [1] is not the only one. Another interesting application is the prediction of the true scattering response of a multiport network in its intended system environment, where the impedances seen by the various ports are, in general, far from the nominal impedance used in basic design and testing. In fact, we envisage some kind of "reverse-design" procedure where multiport system components would be designed to meet given scattering response specifications in a specified, non-nominal, external port-impedance environment, rather than in a nominal-impedance environment. System components would thus be designed to fit very specific "niches" and would be tested against substantially different reference scattering responses, normalized to nominal external port-impedances at all ports. Such reference responses would obviously be specified through renormalization of the required response from the true-environment impedances to the nominal impedances.

The direct proof of equivalence of (6) to (7) delivered by Dropkin in December 1982 was formulated as follows:

$$S_1' = S - (I+S)\Gamma(I-S\Gamma)^{-1}(I-S)$$

is the same as the alternate form

$$S_2' = (I+\Gamma)S(I-\Gamma S)^{-1}(I-\Gamma) - \Gamma.$$

Note first that $S(I-\Gamma S)^{-1} = (I-S\Gamma)^{-1}S$ and that if we set $A = (I-S\Gamma)^{-1}$, then $(S\Gamma)$ commutes with A

$$\begin{aligned} S_1' - S_2' &= S - (I+S)\Gamma A(I-S) - (I+\Gamma)AS(I-\Gamma) + \Gamma \\ &= S + \Gamma - \underset{(1)}{\Gamma A} - \underset{(2)}{S\Gamma A} + \underset{(3)}{\Gamma AS} + \underset{(4)}{S\Gamma AS} - \underset{(5)}{AS} \\ &\quad + \underset{(6)}{AS\Gamma} - \underset{(7)}{\Gamma AS} + \underset{(8)}{\Gamma AS\Gamma} \end{aligned}$$

$$3+7=0$$

$$1+8 = -\Gamma A + \Gamma AS\Gamma = -\Gamma A(I-S\Gamma) = -\Gamma$$

$$4+5 = S\Gamma AS - AS = (S\Gamma - I)AS = -S$$

$$2+6 = -S\Gamma A + AS\Gamma = 0 \text{ since } A \text{ commutes with } S\Gamma$$

$$S_1' - S_2' = 0$$

$$S_1' = S_2'.$$

REFERENCES

[1] H. Dropkin, "Comments on 'A rigorous technique for measuring the scattering matrix of a multi-port device with a two-port network analyzer'," *IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory Tech.*, vol. MTT-31, pp. 79–81, Jan. 1983.

[2] Manuscript received September 26, 1984

[3] The authors are with TRW Defense Systems Group, One Space Park, Redondo Beach, CA 90287.

Corrections to "High-Temperature Microwave Characterization of Dielectric Rods"

JOSE C. ARANETA, MORRIS E. BRODWIN, AND GREGORY A. KRIEGSMANN

In the above paper,[1] the fourth and fifth sentences in the third paragraph from the bottom of the right-half of p. 1332, should read:

"The bisection method is used twice; once to find the roots of $G(\beta)$, and secondly to find the roots of $F(\beta)$. In

Manuscript received November 1, 1984.

J. C. Araneta is presently with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

M. E. Brodwin and G. A. Kriegsmann are with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60201

[1] J. C. Araneta, M. E. Brodwin, and G. A. Kriegsmann, *IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory Tech.*, vol MTT-32, pp. 1328–1335, Oct. 1984.

looking for the roots of $F(\beta)$, the real part of the numerical value of $y_c - y_m$ is monitored."

In the caption for Fig. 7, the symbols next to the dot should be 1×1, instead of $|\times|$.

The letter "c" in the expression for $\pi\Gamma'(0,0)$, shown in the Appendix, should be capitalized, for consistency with (9).

Corrections to "Accurate Wide-Range Design Equations for the Frequency-Dependent Characteristics of Parallel Coupled Microstrip Lines"

M. KIRSCHNING AND ROLF H. JANSEN, MEMBER, IEEE

In the above paper,[1] the following misprints have to be corrected.

Manuscript received October 24, 1984.

M. Kirschning is with Honeywell GmbH, P.O. Box 1109, D-6457, Maintal, West Germany.

R. H. Jansen is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Duisburg, D-4100, Duisburg 1, West Germany.

[1] M. Kirschning and R. H. Jansen, IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory Tech., vol. MTT-32, pp. 83–90, Jan. 1984.

1) In the last line of the second column on page 84, the expression for the static even-mode value of the effective dielectric constant of coupled microstrip reads

$$\epsilon_{\text{eff}_e}(0) = 0.5\cdot(\epsilon_r + 1) + 0.5(\epsilon_r - 1)\cdot(1 + 10/v)^{-a_e(v) b_e(\epsilon_r)}$$

i.e., the term $-a_e \cdot b_e$ is in the exponent of the term $(1+10/v)$.

2) In the first line of (4) on page 85, read $-\epsilon_{\text{eff}}(0)$ instead of $+\epsilon_{\text{eff}}(0)$.

3) For the quantity Q_{10} of (9) on page 86, the closing parenthesis on the right side of the expression has to be added, which results in

$$Q_{10} = Q_2^{-1}\cdot\left(Q_2 Q_4 - Q_5 \cdot \exp\left(\ln(u)\cdot Q_6 \cdot u^{-Q_9}\right)\right).$$

4) In the denominator of the expression describing the frequency dependent even-mode coupled microstrip characteristic impedance $Z_{L_e}(f_n)$, i.e., in the second line of (10) on page 86, the appropriate term is

$$\epsilon_{\text{eff}}(0)^{C_e} \text{ instead of } \epsilon_{\text{eff}}(f_n)^{C_e}$$

to give the correct frequency dependence.