

Generating precision nonlinear FM chirp waveforms

A. W. Doerry^a

Sandia National Laboratories

ABSTRACT

It is well-known that Non-Linear FM (NLFM) chirp modulation can advantageously shape the transmitted signal's Power Spectral Density such that the autocorrelation function (i.e. matched filter output) exhibits substantially reduced sidelobes from its Linear FM (LFM) counterpart. Consequently, no additional filtering is required and maximum Signal-to-Noise Ratio (SNR) performance is preserved. This yields a 1-2 dB advantage in SNR over the output of a LFM waveform with equivalent sidelobe filtering. However precision NLFM chirps are more difficult to design, produce, and process.

This paper presents design and implementation techniques for Nonlinear FM waveforms. A simple iterative design procedure is presented that yields a NLFM phase/frequency function with the desired inherent sidelobe response. We propose to then generate the NLFM waveform by using a cascaded integrator/accumulator structure. Several specific architectures are examined to meet target performance criteria, including bandwidth constraints and sidelobe reduction goals. We first examine a fixed parameter set to generate a fixed polynomial phase function. Polynomial coefficients are selected to be constant during the pulse.

Alternatively, a NLFM waveform can be generated via integrating a stepped parameter set, whereby parameters are constant over specific intervals, with the pulse width encompassing multiple intervals. The parameter changes in steps during the course of the pulse as a function of time. Alternatively yet, the parameter steps can be made a function of the pulse's instantaneous frequency.

Keywords: SAR, radar, nonlinear, chirp, waveform

1 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

It is well known that when a signal is input to a Matched Filter (matched to the input signal) then the output of the filter is the autocorrelation function of the signal. Also well known is that the autocorrelation function is the Fourier Transform of the signal's Power Spectral Density (PSD). A Matched Filter provides optimum (maximum) Signal to Noise Ratio (SNR) at the peak of its autocorrelation function, and is consequently optimum for detecting the signal in noise.

A very common radar waveform is the Linear FM (LFM) chirp signal. Its utility is that it is fairly readily generated by a variety of technologies, and is easily processed by a variety of techniques that ultimately implement a Matched Filter, or nearly so. However, since a LFM chirp waveform has nearly a rectangular PSD, its autocorrelation function exhibits a sinc() function shape, with its attendant problematic sidelobe structure. Reducing the sidelobes of the Matched Filter output (actually increasing the peak to sidelobe ratio) is typically accomplished by linear filtering the output, most often by applying window functions or data tapering. This additional filtering perturbs the Matched Filter result to reduce sidelobes as desired. However, since the cumulative filtering is no longer precisely matched to the signal, it necessarily reduces output SNR as well, typically by 1-2 dB (depending on the filtering or weighting function used).¹

It is well-known that Non-Linear FM (NLFM) chirp modulation can advantageously shape the PSD such that the autocorrelation function exhibits substantially reduced sidelobes from its LFM counterpart. Consequently, no additional

^a awdoerr@sandia.gov; phone 1 505 845-8165; <http://www.sandia.gov/radar>; PO Box 5800, MS 1330, Albuquerque, NM 87185

filtering is required and maximum SNR performance is preserved. However precision NLFM chirps are more difficult to design, produce, and process.

Alternatives to NLFM modulation for the purpose of shaping the PSD, such as amplitude tapering the transmitted signal, are not viable since typically efficient power amplification of the waveform necessitates operating the hardware in a nonlinear manner, e.g. operating the amplifiers in compression. This substantially reduces the ability to maintain precision amplitude tapering. Waveform phase remains unaffected by operating amplifiers in compression.

What is desired by a radar designer is then a NLFM waveform that is 1) easily produced, 2) easily processed, and 3) easily designed to meet target performance criteria, including bandwidth constraints and sidelobe reduction goals.

The progress of technology now offers the possibility of addressing the first two points, namely easily producing and processing the NLFM waveform. The advent of high-speed Digital-to-Analog Converters (DACs) and high-speed large-scale Field Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs) currently facilitate generating high-performance precision digital LFM chirp waveforms.^{2,3} This suggest that more exotic waveforms might now be within the realm of possibilities. These same FPGAs and high-speed Analog-to-Digital Converters (ADCs) allow directly sampling fairly wide bandwidth signals. Modern high-speed processors allow more complex filtering and detection algorithms to be employed.

Johnston and Fairhead⁴ review the existing literature on NLFM waveforms circa 1986, and then proceed to outline a waveform design technique. They also discuss the Doppler sensitivity of these waveforms. Keel, et al.,⁵ discuss a step frequency waveform employing nonlinear frequency steps. Griffiths and Vinagre⁶ provide one procedure for designing a piecewise linear NLFM chirp waveform. DeWitte and Griffiths⁷ later extend this to continuous NLFM waveforms. Varshney and Thomas⁸ explore several techniques for sidelobe reduction and conclude “[o]verall, NLFM has better detection rate characteristics and is more accurate in range determination than LFM” as well as the other techniques studied. Cook, et al.,⁹ discuss matched filter responses to NLFM waveforms. Butler¹⁰ discusses NLFM chirp waveform generation with Surface Acoustic Wave (SAW) dispersive filters. Collins and Atkins¹¹ discuss NLFM waveforms applied to active sonar signals.

However, connecting the NLFM radar waveform that is designed to one that is easily produced seems generally overlooked.

2 OVERVIEW & SUMMARY

We propose to generate a NLFM waveform by using a cascaded integrator/accumulator structure. Several specific architectures are examined to meet target performance criteria, including bandwidth constraints and sidelobe reduction goals. We first examine a fixed parameter set to generate a fixed polynomial phase function. Polynomial coefficients are selected to be constant during the pulse. Alternatively, a NLFM waveform can be generated via integrating a stepped parameter set, whereby parameters are constant over specific intervals, with the pulse width encompassing multiple intervals. The parameter changes in steps during the course of the pulse as a function of time. Alternatively yet, the parameter steps can be made a function of the pulse’s instantaneous frequency.

3 DETAILED ANALYSIS

3.1 General principles of NLFM chirps

To facilitate a comparison, consider first a conventional Linear FM (LFM) chirp with characteristics in Figure 1. Note that the frequency ramp is linear, and the spectrum is flat-topped with steep sides, nearly a rectangle. Note also that the Impulse Response (IPR) is expected to be nearly a sinc() function with -13 dB sidelobes.

Now consider the Non-linear FM (NLFM) chirp with characteristics in Figure 2. Note here that the frequency ramp is non-linear, with steeper slope at the beginning and at the end of the pulse. The corresponding spectrum is tapered with lower magnitude at its edges. This spectral shaping results in the autocorrelation function exhibiting attenuated sidelobes, limited to less than -35 dB. Furthermore these characteristics are achieved without any SNR-robbing sidelobe filtering or window functions.




Figure 1. Example LFM chirp with (a) frequency vs. time, (b) magnitude spectrum, and (c) time autocorrelation function.




Figure 2. Example NLFM chirp with (a) frequency vs. time, (b) magnitude spectrum, and (c) time autocorrelation function.

3.2 Finding desired chirp rate function of time

We limit our investigation to signals with large time-bandwidth products, which are typical for high-performance radar systems. Rayleigh energy criteria infer that for a LFM chirp of a constant bandwidth, that PSD must be proportional to pulse width. Consequently, under conditions of constant bandwidth, the PSD must be inversely proportional to chirp rate. Furthermore, the principle of stationary phase infers that “the major contribution to the spectrum at any frequency ω is made by that part of the signal which has instantaneous frequency ω .” This means that for a NLFM chirp, that the PSD at a particular frequency is inversely proportional to the chirp rate at that particular frequency.¹¹ We begin by defining a generic radar waveform, perhaps an FM chirp, as

$$X(t) = \text{rect}\left(\frac{t}{T}\right) \exp j\Phi(t) \quad (1)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \text{time,} \\ T &= \text{pulse width,} \\ \text{rect}(z) &= \begin{cases} 1 & |z| \leq 1/2 \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The instantaneous frequency is related to phase as

$$\omega(t) = \frac{d}{dt}\Phi(t), \quad (3)$$

and the instantaneous chirp rate is related to frequency as

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{d\omega(t)}{dt}. \quad (4)$$

For a generic chirp signal, the phase becomes

$$\Phi(t) = c_0 + \omega_0 t + \int \int \gamma(t) dt dt \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \text{reference phase, and} \\ \omega_0 &= \text{reference frequency.} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We note that $\gamma(t)$ is the component of $\Phi(t)$ that makes it a chirp. Furthermore, if $\gamma(t) = \gamma_0$ for some constant γ_0 then this reduces to the LFM case. For the NLFM case we expect useful $\gamma(t)$ to be predominantly “U” shaped, indicating greater chirp rates at the start and end of a pulse compared to that at the middle. This will in turn cause a tapering of the PSD at the band edges. We also expect that a symmetric PSD will require a symmetric $\gamma(t)$.

Based on the foregoing analysis, we now identify the relationship of chirp rate to instantaneous frequency as $\gamma_\omega(\omega)$ and relate it to a specific window or taper function as

$$\gamma_\omega(\omega - \omega_0) = \frac{\gamma_\omega(0)}{W(\omega - \omega_0)} \quad \text{for } -\frac{\Omega}{2} \leq (\omega - \omega_0) \leq \frac{\Omega}{2} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_0 &= \text{the chirp center reference frequency,} \\ W(\omega) &= \text{the desired taper function for the PSD, and} \\ \Omega &= \text{the chirp bandwidth of interest.} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We reiterate that $\gamma(t)$ is a function of time, whereas $\gamma_\omega(\omega)$ is the chirp rate at a particular frequency ω . We note that under these conditions $W(0)=1$, and we typically expect $W(\omega)$ to be symmetric about its center. The task now becomes to find a specific $\Phi(t)$ that yields the desired $\gamma_\omega(\omega-\omega_0)$. More specifically, the task now becomes to find a specific $\gamma(t)$ that yields the desired $\gamma_\omega(\omega-\omega_0)$. We also identify at this time from symmetry considerations that $\omega(0)=\omega_0$. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\omega(0) &= \gamma(0), \\ \gamma_\omega\left(\frac{\Omega}{2}\right) &= \gamma\left(\frac{T}{2}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

and more generally

$$\gamma_\omega(\omega(t)-\omega_0) = \gamma(t).\tag{10}$$

Consequently we need to solve

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{\gamma(0)}{W(\omega(t)-\omega_0)}\tag{11}$$

with the constraint

$$\int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \gamma(t) dt = \Omega.\tag{12}$$

This suggests the following iterative procedure for finding $\gamma(t)$.

1. select an initial $\gamma(t)$ consistent with a LFM chirp, i.e. $\gamma(t)=\Omega/T$.
2. Integrate $\gamma(t)$ to calculate $\omega(t)$.
3. Adjust $\gamma(t)$ and $\omega(t)$ to meet the Ω constraint.
4. Calculate $W(\omega(t)-\omega_0)$, and then a new $\gamma(t)$.
5. Repeat steps 2-5 until convergence.

This procedure was successfully used to design the NLFM chirp of Figure 2, using a -35 dB Taylor window.

Bandwidth

From communications theory, the well-known Carson's rule states that the bandwidth of a FM modulated signal is approximately twice the sum of the maximum frequency deviation from the carrier plus the modulating frequency.¹² Consequently, since $\gamma(t)$ itself is typically expected to be low-frequency in nature, then the transmitted signal bandwidth of the NLFM chirp is expected to be approximately the chirp bandwidth

$$\Omega_T \approx \Omega = \omega(T/2) - \omega(-T/2) = 2[\omega(T/2) - \omega_0].\tag{13}$$

As with LFM chirps, we expect this to be most accurate for signals with large time-bandwidth products. It is expected that the bandwidth increase over that of a LFM chirp will be fractional for a comparable autocorrelation width, similar to that of amplitude tapering.

Doppler tolerance

Several papers suggest that an issue for NLFM waveforms is their tolerance to Doppler shifts, i.e., maintaining their desirable sidelobe properties when Doppler shifted. We will not explore this aspect any further in this paper, but refer the reader to Reference 13 for analysis and processing techniques to accommodate this.

3.3 Polynomial-phase chirps

A conventional LFM chirp signal can be described with quadratic phase function

$$\Phi(t) = c_0 + c_1 t + \frac{c_2}{2} t^2 \quad (14)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \text{reference phase,} \\ c_1 &= \text{reference frequency,} \\ c_2 &= \text{nominal constant chirp rate.} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

This signal phase is easily generated parametrically with a double integration. That is

$$\left[c_0 + c_1 t + \frac{c_2}{2} t^2 \right] = c_0 + \int \left[c_1 + \int c_2 dt \right] dt. \quad (16)$$

The digital hardware counterpart to an analog integrator is an accumulator. The resulting phase is translated to an amplitude via a trigonometric lookup-table and applied to a DAC. The resulting analog signal is filtered and utilized. We examine now an extension of this concept to a higher-order polynomial phase function. Specifically we examine a NLFM chirp signal that can be described with phase function

$$\Phi(t) = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{c_n}{n!} t^n. \quad (17)$$

When $c_n = 0$ for $n > 2$, this reduces to the LFM chirp. We also note that for the PSD tapering to be symmetrical, in this formulation $c_n = 0$ for odd $n > 2$, that is, for $n = 3, 5, 7, \dots$

As with the LMF chirp, this signal has the desirable attribute in that it can be generated parametrically with cascaded integrations or accumulations, the number of accumulators being equal to the order N of the polynomial. An architecture for this is shown in Figure 3.

We note that the instantaneous frequency for this signal is

$$\omega(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{c_n}{n!} t^n \right\} = \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{c_n}{(n-1)!} t^{n-1}. \quad (18)$$

Consequently, the bandwidth of the polynomial-phase NLFM chirp is expected to be approximately

$$\Omega \approx 2 \left[\sum_{n=0}^N \frac{c_n}{(n-1)!} \left(\frac{T}{2} \right)^{n-1} - c_1 \right]. \quad (19)$$

The chirp rate is then

$$\gamma(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \omega(t) = \sum_{n=2}^N \frac{c_n}{(n-2)!} t^{n-2}. \quad (20)$$

Clearly, for a phase polynomial of order N , we need a chirp rate polynomial of order $(N-2)$. Some discussion of low-order polynomial phase functions can be found in the paper by Cook, et al.




Figure 3. Cascaded integrator architecture for implementing polynomial phase function.

Determining phase polynomial coefficients

The task is to find phase polynomial coefficients that provide the desired sidelobe reduction. One seemingly reasonable approach would be to find phase polynomial coefficients that allow acceptable approximation to a known amplitude weighting (window) function. It is desired to accomplish this for a minimal polynomial order N . We would expect too high an order N leading to conditioning problems in coefficient calculations. Too low an order N will inadequately model the chirp rate, and hence cause unwanted sidelobe artifacts in the waveform autocorrelation function. Recall that for a LFM chirp $N = 2$.

Figure 4 shows the chirp rate function and waveform autocorrelation function for a phase polynomial of order 12 fitted to achieve a Taylor weighting with -35 dB sidelobes and $\bar{n} = 4$. Note the slightly elevated sidelobes. Sidelobes will generally elevate as the order of the polynomial decreases, although the degree that they become worse depends on the window function we are trying to approximate. For example, matching a Gaussian weighting can be done reasonably well for many applications with a phase polynomial of order as small as 4.

We do acknowledge that any implementation of this architecture must contend with problematic aspects of integration and accumulation, including effects of finite precision and accumulation of errors.




Figure 4. (a) chirp rate function, and (b) autocorrelation function, for NLFM chirp with an order 12 polynomial phase fitted to achieve a Taylor weighting with -35 dB sidelobes and $\bar{n} = 4$. Dotted lines are ideal, solid lines are actual.

A question remains, however, “How well can we do with polynomial phase of order N if we don’t necessarily try to match a specific weighting function?” This begs the question of whether and how some ‘optimum’ polynomial can be found for a phase function to generate minimum sidelobe energy in a manner similar to the technique for weighting functions presented by Dickey, et al.¹⁴ The answer to this question, regardless of how interesting it might be, is however beyond the scope of this report.

3.4 Stepped-Parameter Chirps

Consider first a phase function that is described by a polynomial of order N . This implies that the N th time derivative of this phase is a constant over the entire pulse width of the waveform. Necessarily, the $(N-1)$ th time derivative is linear. Now consider the additional degree of freedom of allowing the N th time derivative to be not a single constant, but rather a sequence of constants, each constant being over some finite interval within the pulse width T . That is

$$\frac{d^N}{dt^N} \Phi(t) = \sum_{m=1}^M b_m \text{rect}\left(\frac{t-t_m}{\tau_m}\right) \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \text{interval index with } 1 \leq m \leq M, \\ t_m &= \text{center reference time of the } m\text{th interval,} \\ \tau_m &= \text{the width of the } m\text{th interval, and} \\ b_m &= \text{the sequence of constants.} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

We require the intervals to be non-overlapping and span the pulse width,

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \tau_m = T. \quad (23)$$

We note that the $(N-1)$ th time derivative of $\Phi(t)$ is piece-wise linear. The case $M = 1$ degenerates into the polynomial phase function previously discussed. The case where M equals the total number of waveform samples degenerates into an arbitrary phase generator, or more precisely an arbitrary phase-derivative generator. Consequently, of interest are values of M between these extremes. We would expect that this degree of freedom would allow fewer cascaded integrators to be needed to generate a waveform of acceptable fidelity. A more general architecture of cascaded integrators and stepped parameters is illustrated in Figure 5.




Figure 5. Cascaded integrator architecture for generating stepped parameter chirp waveforms.

Values for b_m would be chosen as some function of the desired values of the N th derivative of $\Phi(t)$ over their respective intervals. A representative sample might be used, or perhaps a mean value of all samples within the interval. Constant interval widths τ_m are also expected to offer some convenience for implementation. The case for $N = 1$ yields the stepped-frequency waveform discussed by Keel, et al. The case for $N = 2$ yields the stepped-chirp (piecewise linear frequency) waveform discussed by Griffiths and Vinagre.

Figure 6 shows the case for $N = 3$ with $M = 40$, such that the chirp rate is piece-wise linear. Note that there is very good match between mainlobes and both near and far sidelobes. For this window, moving the steps one integrator closer to the phase ($N = 2$) still allows good near-in sidelobe performance, but far-out sidelobes are significantly degraded. Reducing the number of steps would additionally degrade near-in sidelobes. Fewer steps and integrators may be required for other window functions, depending on fidelity requirements.




Figure 6. (a) chirp rate function, (b) zoomed autocorrelation function, and (c) expanded autocorrelation function for NLFM chirp with $N=3$ and $M=40$ to achieve a Taylor weighting with -35 dB sidelobes and $\bar{n} = 4$. Dotted lines are ideal, solid lines are actual.

3.5 Stepped-Parameter Chirps with Frequency Feedback

In the previous section we presented analysis of stepped-parameter chirps. We now extend this to the case where t_m and τ_m are chosen as a function of instantaneous frequency $\omega(t)$. The driving concept is to adjust parameters more often when parameters are changing more and/or quicker. Since frequency changes faster at beginning and end of the pulse, this seems to be a useful indicator. Consequently, the stepped parameter model becomes

$$\frac{d^N}{dt^N} \Phi(t) = \sum_{m=1}^M b_m \text{rect} \left(\frac{\omega(t) - \omega_m}{\Omega_m} \right), \quad (24)$$

where

m = interval index with $1 \leq m \leq M$,
 ω_m = center reference frequency of the m th interval,

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_m &= \text{the bandwidth of the } m\text{th interval, and} \\ b_m &= \text{the sequence of constants.}\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

We require the intervals to be non-overlapping in frequency but span the bandwidth,

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \Omega_m = \Omega. \tag{26}$$

This architecture is illustrated in Figure 7. We note that to be meaningful we require $N \geq 2$.




Figure 7. Cascaded integrator architecture for generating stepped parameter chirp waveforms using frequency feedback.

As before, values for b_m would be chosen as some function of the desired values for the N th derivative of $\Phi(t)$ but now over their respective frequency intervals. Some representative sample might be used, or perhaps a mean value of all samples within the interval. Constant interval widths Ω_m are also expected to offer some convenience for implementation.

Figure 8 illustrates the example $N = 3$ with $M = 40$, such that the chirp rate is now piece-wise linear. Note that there is very good match between mainlobes and both near and far sidelobes. Reducing the number of steps and/or integrators has similar effect to the case of equal time-steps. However, employing equal frequency intervals imparts a periodic structure to the PSD, thereby raising specific sidelobes more noticeably. This in turn manifests itself as elevated specific time sidelobes in the autocorrelation function.

3.6 Other Architectures

In the most general sense, whereas a LFM waveform needs a constant but non-zero chirp rate, a NLFM waveform needs a non-constant chirp rate. Consequently, some mechanism for adjusting chirp rate as a function of time is required. Since instantaneous frequency is also a function of time, and typically in a monotonic fashion, the chirp rate could be effectively adjusted as some function of instantaneous frequency either instead of, or in addition to time. These observations are captured in the general phase-function generating architecture illustrated in Figure 9.

The chirp-rate generating function may be either linear or nonlinear, continuous or discontinuous, with derivatives that may exist or not. Earlier examples in this report showed a polynomial function, parameters that stepped with time, and parameters that stepped with instantaneous frequency. Indeed, Collins and Atkins discuss generating an instantaneous frequency with $\tan()$ or $\sinh()$ functions, although no architecture was illustrated or addressed for accomplishing this.

In any case, the simplest technique for creating arbitrary functions in hardware is to use lookup tables. Accumulators functioning as integrators are also rather simple to implement. As the sophistication of hardware resources such as Field

Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs) increases, then other more exotic functional calculation blocks become available to a designer, offering more options for practical chirp-rate generating functions.




Figure 8. (a) chirp rate function, (b) zoomed autocorrelation function, and (c) expanded autocorrelation function for NLFM chirp with $N=3$ and $M=40$ to achieve a Taylor weighting with -35 dB sidelobes and $\bar{n} = 4$. Dotted lines are ideal, solid lines are actual.




Figure 9. Generalized architecture for NLFM phase generating function. The chirp rate is some function of time and/or instantaneous frequency.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The following principal conclusions should be drawn from this report.

- Nonlinear-FM (NLFM) waveforms offer substantial advantages over their Linear-FM (LFM) counterparts. Generally any practical range sidelobe filtering that can be accomplished with window functions, can also be accomplished by selecting a corresponding NLFM waveform. Matched filter output results will be indistinguishable, except for an increase in SNR using the NLFM waveform.
- The design procedure for a NLFM waveform is straight-forward and presented herein.
- Hardware architectures for generating suitable NLFM waveforms are also straight-forward, with several options presented herein.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by the DOE NNSA NA-22 Proliferation Detection Program Office, Advanced Radar Systems project. Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000.

REFERENCES

- ¹ A. W. Doerry, "Performance Limits for Synthetic Aperture Radar – second edition", Sandia Report SAND2006-0821, Unlimited Release, February 2006.
- ² P. A. Dudley, B. L. Tise, "Multiplexed chirp waveform synthesizer", U.S. Patent 6,614,813, September 2, 2003.
- ³ D. F. Dubbert, "A High Speed Quadrature Error Corrected Chirp Synthesizer Module for SAR Application", Workshop on Synthetic Aperture Radar Technology", Redstone Arsenal, AL, October 16 & 17, 2002.
- ⁴ J. A. Johnston, A. C. Fairhead, "Waveform design and Doppler sensitivity analysis for nonlinear FM chirp pulses", IEE Proceedings F (Communications, Radar and Signal Processing), Vol. 133, No. 2, p. 163-175, April 1986.
- ⁵ Byron M. Keel, Jay A. Saffold, Mark R. Walbridge, John Chadwick, "Non-linear stepped chirp waveforms with sub-pulse processing for range sidelobe suppression", Proceedings of the SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering Conference on Radar Sensor Technology III, Orlando, Florida, USA, Vol. 3395, p. 87-98, 16 April 1998.
- ⁶ H. D. Griffiths, L. Vinagre, "Design of low-sidelobe pulse compression waveforms", Electron. Lett., vol. 30, no. 12, p. 1004–1005, 1994.
- ⁷ E. De Witte, H. D. Griffiths, "Improved ultra-low range sidelobe pulse compression waveform design", Electronics Letters, vol. 40, no. 22, p. 1448-50, 28 Oct. 2004.
- ⁸ Lav R. Varshney, Daniel Thomas, "Sidelobe Reduction for Matched Filter Range Processing", Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE Radar Conference, Huntsville, AL, USA, p. 446-451, 5-8 May 2003.
- ⁹ C. E. Cook, M. Bernfeld, C. A. Palmieri, "Matched filtering, pulse compression and waveform design – IV", Microwave Journal, vol.8, no.1, p. 73-88, Jan. 1965.
- ¹⁰ M. B. N. Butler, "Radar applications of s.a.w. dispersive filters", IEE Proceedings F (Communications, Radar and Signal Processing) vol.127, no.2, p. 118-24, April 1980.
- ¹¹ T. Collins, P. Atkins, "Nonlinear frequency modulation chirps for active sonar", IEE Proceedings on Radar, Sonar, and Navigation, Vol. 146, No. 6, p. 312-316, December 1999.
- ¹² R. E. Ziemer, W. H. Tranter, *Principles of Communications – Systems, Modulation, and Noise, Fourth Edition*, ISBN 0-471-12496-6, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1995.
- ¹³ Armin W. Doerry, "SAR Processing with Non-Linear FM Chirp Waveforms", Sandia Report SAND2006-7729, Unlimited Release, December 2006.
- ¹⁴ Fred M. Dickey, Louis A. Romero, Armin W. Doerry, "SAR Window Functions: A Review and Analysis of the Notched Spectrum Problem", Sandia Report SAND2002-2949, September 2002.