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Abstract — Global navigation satellite system reflectometry is a microwave remote sensing technique which can be used to derive information about the composition or properties of ground surfaces. The received power of the GPS signals reflected by the ground is proportional to the magnitude of the reflection Fresnel coefficients. In particular, it depends on the incidence angle \( \theta \) and on the ground’s permittivity \( \varepsilon \). The knowledge of \( \varepsilon \) is important for determining various conditions and characteristics of the surface (for example, soil moisture, salinity, freeze-thaw transitions). The value of \( \varepsilon \) can be found from the Fresnel reflection coefficients, for a given incidence angle \( \theta \). For dispersive media, \( \varepsilon \) is a complex quantity; we present explicit formulas which express both \( \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon) \) and \( \mathbb{I}(\varepsilon) \) as a function of the incident angle \( \theta \) and the magnitude of the linearly polarized Fresnel reflection coefficients.

1. Introduction

Global navigation satellite system reflectometry (GNSS-R) is a technique for sensing the Earth’s surface, whereby GNSS signals reflected off the ground are detected and processed to monitor its properties remotely [1]. Important applications of this technique include ocean observation [2], ice [3,4] and land remote sensing [5–7], altimetry [8,9], and climate modeling and weather prediction [10]. This technique uses a passive bistatic radar configuration, which requires no transmitters except GNSS satellites, thus enabling the system to be light and compact [11,12]. The signal-to-noise-ratio (SNR) data recorded by GNSS receivers are related to the direct signals and those reflected by the ground; if the surface is assumed flat, and the receiving antenna is either vertically or horizontally polarized, the SNR is related to the Fresnel reflection coefficients for vertical and horizontal polarization, which are functions of the relative permittivity \( \varepsilon \) of the soil and of the incident angle \( \theta \). The knowledge of \( \varepsilon \) allows for the determination of the soil moisture, by means of several well-established models (see for example the semiempirical models of [13,14]), which may be useful for monitoring a field of known characteristics in terms of sand, clay percentage, and so on. In more general cases—that is, for non-flat surfaces—more powerful techniques of inverse scattering should be used [15]. We are interested in solving the inverse problem, consisting of finding the value of \( \varepsilon \) from the available measured values of the Fresnel reflection coefficients, for a given incidence angle \( \theta \). For nondispersive media, such as dry soil, the imaginary part of \( \varepsilon \) can be neglected, and it is sufficient to determine its real part. In contrast, for dispersive media, such as moist soils or sea salinity, it is important to also determine the imaginary part of \( \varepsilon \). To our knowledge, the real and imaginary parts of \( \varepsilon \) have been determined only with empirical models, or by solving the Fresnel coefficient equations numerically.

In this work, we present formulas which express both \( \mathbb{R}(\varepsilon) \) and \( \mathbb{I}(\varepsilon) \) as explicit functions of the incident angle \( \theta \) and the magnitude of the linearly polarized Fresnel reflection coefficients defined at the boundary between two dielectric media. Section 2 contains a detailed formulation of the problem; in section 3 the explicit formulas for the evaluation of \( \varepsilon \) are provided; in section 4 some tests confirming the validity of these formulas are indicated; and finally, section 5 contains some conclusions.

2. Statement of the Problem

A standard GNSS-R system collects the direct signals coming from the satellites (right-hand circularly polarized) with an up-looking antenna and the signals after reflection from the ground (left-hand circularly polarized) with a down-looking antenna [13] (see Figure 1). Even if most systems work with circular polarized antennas, measurements can also be carried out with linear polarized antennas (vertical and horizontal). The total electromagnetic field received by the down-looking antenna scattered by the Earth’s surface is determined by coherent and incoherent components [16]. If the surface is approximately smooth, the noncoherent component is negligible, and the total power received by the antenna can be approximated by the coherent part only [5], which is given by

\[
P_{\text{pol,coh}} = R_{\text{pol}} \frac{P_G G_r \lambda^2}{(4\pi)^2 (r_1 + r_2)^2} \tag{1}
\]

where the product \( P_G G_r \) is the equivalent isotropic radiated power of the transmitted signal; \( G_r \) is the receiver antenna gain and \( \lambda \) is the wavelength \( (\lambda = 19.042 \text{ cm for GPS L1 signal}) \); \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are, respectively, the distance between the receiver and the specular point and that between the specular point and the satellite; and
3. Complex Permittivity Solutions

We consider an incident plane wave in medium 1. Given the incident angle $\theta$ and the perpendicular and parallel polarization coefficients $\gamma_n := |\Gamma_n|$ and $\gamma_p := |\Gamma_p|$, with $0 \leq \theta < \pi$ and $0 < \gamma_p < \gamma_n < 1$, the complex permittivity $\varepsilon$ of medium 2 can be determined by solving (3) and (4), interpreted as a nonlinear algebraic system in the unknowns $\Re(\varepsilon)$ and $\Im(\varepsilon)$.

The solution to the system (3) + (4), in the form $\varepsilon = x + iy$ ($y^2 = -1$; we recall that $\varepsilon = x - iy$ is a solution if and only if its conjugate $\varepsilon = x + iy$ is also a solution), is given by

$$x := \Re(\varepsilon) = 2a^2 - 2b_n u \cos \theta + 1$$

$$y := \Im(\varepsilon) = 2u|v|$$

where

$$(2c_{np} \cos \theta)u = (b_n - b_p) \cos(2\theta)$$

$$v^2 = -u^2 + 2b_n u \cos \theta - \cos^2 \theta$$

and

$$c_{np} := (b_n^2 - 1) \cos^2 \theta - (b_n b_p - 1)$$

$${b}_n := \frac{1 + \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n}, \quad {b}_p := \frac{1 + \gamma_p}{1 - \gamma_p}$$

$${a}_n := \frac{1 + \gamma_n}{1 - \gamma_n}, \quad {a}_p := \frac{1 + \gamma_p}{1 - \gamma_p}$$

Note that $a_n > a_p > 1$, $b_n > b_p > 1$, $a_n > b_n$, and $a_p > b_p$.

The existence of a physically relevant solution—that is, with $\Re(\varepsilon) > 1$—requires that the right side of (8) be nonnegative (so that $v$, and hence $y$ of (6), is defined), and that, in the right side of (5), $u > b_n \cos \theta$. In turn, these requirements translate into the double-inequality condition

$$b_n \cos \theta < u < a_n \cos \theta$$

which will be satisfied by the values of $\gamma_n$ and $\gamma_p$ measured at a given incidence angle $\theta$ (see Figure 2).

We further note that the right side of (8) is nonnegative also if

$$\frac{\cos \theta}{a_n} < u \leq b_n \cos \theta$$

but in this case $\Re(\varepsilon) \leq 1$, and the solution is not physically relevant.

3.1 Special Cases

The cases $\theta = 0$, $\pi/4$, $\pi/2$ require extra considerations.

When $\theta = 0$, (3) and (4) collapse into the single equation

$$R_{\text{pol}} = |\Gamma_{\text{pol}}|^2$$

where $\Gamma_{\text{pol}}$ is the Fresnel reflection coefficient. We consider the reflection at the boundary between air ($\varepsilon_{\text{air}} = 1$) and a dispersive medium with complex relative permittivity ($\varepsilon_{\text{med}}$). Then, in the case of normal (or horizontal, or TE) polarization $n$ and parallel (or vertical, or TM) polarization $p$, the corresponding Fresnel reflection coefficients can be written, respectively, as

$$\gamma_n := |\Gamma_n| = \left| \frac{\cos \theta - \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta}}{\cos \theta + \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta}} \right|$$

and

$$\gamma_p := |\Gamma_p| = \left| \frac{\sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta} - \cos \theta}{\sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \theta} + \cos \theta} \right|$$

where $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{med}} / \varepsilon_{\text{air}}$. Our goal is to solve the inverse problem, consisting of determining $\varepsilon$ explicitly as a function of $\theta$, $\gamma_n$, and $\gamma_p$ from the Fresnel reflection coefficients.
\[
\frac{1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} = \gamma_n = \gamma_p =: \gamma \tag{14}
\]

thus it is no longer possible to determine \(\varepsilon\) uniquely. In fact, if \(\gamma = 1\), any negative real number would be a solution to (14), which confirms that this case has no physical meaning. If instead \(\gamma < 1\), (5)–(7) yield a physically relevant solution for all \(u \in [b, a]\), where \(b = (1 + \gamma^2)/(1 - \gamma^2)\) and \(a = (1 + \gamma)/(1 - \gamma)\).

When \(\theta = \pi/4\), we distinguish two cases. If \(\gamma_n^2 = \gamma_p^2\), (3) and (4) reduce to the single equation

\[
2 \left| \varepsilon - 2 - 1 \right|^2 = \left| 1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon - 1} \right|^2 \tag{15}
\]

and again it is not possible to determine \(\varepsilon\) uniquely. In fact, in this case \(e_{mp} = 0\), so that both sides of (7) vanish, independently of \(u\). As a consequence, any \(u \in [b_n/\sqrt{2}, a_n/\sqrt{2}]\) yields a physically relevant solution. If instead \(\gamma_n^2 \neq \gamma_p^2\), then \(e_{mp} \neq 0\); thus, from (7), \(u = 0\), so that \(y = 0\), and \(\varepsilon = x = 1\).

In the limit case \(\theta = \pi/2\), (3) and (4) reduce to

\[
- \sqrt{\varepsilon - 1} + \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{\varepsilon - 1}} = \gamma_n = \gamma_p \tag{16}
\]

and thus \(\gamma_n = \gamma_p = 1\) (again, this has no physical meaning), and \(a_n, a_p, b_n, b_p\) are not defined. Still, any complex number \(\varepsilon = 1\) is obviously a trivial solution to (16).

### 3.2 Real Case

In some cases (for example, for nondispersive media), the imaginary part of \(\varepsilon\) can be neglected, and \(\varepsilon\) can be assumed to be a real number [17,18]. In this case, \(\varepsilon\) still can be found from either of (3) or (4), as long as the angle \(\theta\) and the coefficients \(\gamma_n\) and \(\gamma_p\) satisfy a mutual compatibility condition, which can be checked explicitly and ensures that the corresponding two solutions coincide. In [19], explicit equivalent formulas for \(\Re(\varepsilon)\) were given, assuming that \(\Im(\varepsilon) = 0\). This solution corresponds to the limit case \(u = a_n \cos \theta\); indeed, in this case, \(y = 0\) and

\[
\varepsilon = x = 1 + \frac{4 \gamma_n \cos^2 \theta}{(1 - \gamma_n)^2} \tag{17}
\]

Thus \(\varepsilon\) is a real number, \(\varepsilon > 1\), and \(\varepsilon\) coincides with the real solution \(\varepsilon_n\) found in [19]. (In the other limit case \(u = b_n \cos \theta\) of (12), \(\Re(\varepsilon) = 1\), as expected.)

### 3.3 Nondispersive and Dispersive Media

For nondispersive media, it is usual to consider, instead of (3) and (4), their versions without moduli—that is, with \(\gamma_n\) and \(\gamma_p\) replaced, respectively, by \(\Gamma_n\) and \(\Gamma_p\), where \(-1 < \Gamma_n < \Gamma_p < 1\) (see, e.g., [20–22]). These versions of the equations are derived under the assumption that \(\varepsilon\) is a real number (that is, for nondispersive soils); in fact, the corresponding explicit solutions are real. In particular, the solution of the analogue of (3) is

\[
\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n = 1 - \frac{4 \Gamma_n \cos^2 \theta}{(1 + \Gamma_n)^2} \tag{18}
\]

and \(\varepsilon > 1\) if and only if \(\Gamma_n < 0\). In this case, (18) coincides with the real solution (17) of (3) found in [19], because \(\gamma_n = |\Gamma_n|\). Similarly, the analogue of (4) has two real algebraic solutions \(\varepsilon_n\) and \(\varepsilon_p\), with \(\varepsilon_n < 1 < \varepsilon_p\) if \(\Gamma_p < 0\). More importantly, if, as should be expected on physical grounds, the two equations have a common solution \(\varepsilon_c\), then necessarily

\[
\varepsilon_c = \frac{(1 - \Gamma_n)(1 - \Gamma_p)}{(1 + \Gamma_n)(1 + \Gamma_p)} \tag{19}
\]

In particular, the dependence of \(\varepsilon_c\) on \(\theta\) is only through \(\Gamma_n\) and \(\Gamma_p\). Requiring that \(\varepsilon_c\) be equal to either \(\varepsilon_n\) or \(\varepsilon_p\), \(\varepsilon_p\) introduces additional compatibility restrictions on the values of \(\theta, \Gamma_n\), and \(\Gamma_p\). Note also that \(\varepsilon_c > 1\) if and only if \(\Gamma_p < 0\); if \(\Gamma_p = 0\), then \(\varepsilon_c = 1\), in which case also \(\Gamma_n = 0\). (We recall that if \(\varepsilon\) is real and positive and \(\varepsilon = 1\), the \(\Gamma_p\) also vanishes at the so-called Brewster angle \(\theta_B = \arctan(\sqrt{\varepsilon});\) this angle is not defined if \(\varepsilon\) is complex not real.)

### 4. Examples

The expressions (5) and (6) for the real and imaginary parts of \(\varepsilon\) were verified as inverse formulas of the Fresnel coefficient equations (3) and (4) with some tests. For example, for \(\theta = \pi/6\) and \(\varepsilon = 2 + j3\), (3) and (4) yield \(\gamma_n = 0.4503\), and \(\gamma_p = 0.3442\). If we use these values of \(\theta, \gamma_n\), and \(\gamma_p\) in (5) and (6), we obtain \(x = 1.9946\) and \(y = 2.9985\). In Figure 2 the value of the variable \(u\) and its lower and upper limits given in (12) are shown as a function of the real and imaginary parts of \(\varepsilon\). As another example, for \(\theta = \pi/3\) and \(\varepsilon = 2 + j1.28\), (3) and (4) yield \(\gamma_n = 0.4990\) and \(\gamma_p = 0.0999\). If we use these values of \(\theta, \gamma_n\), and \(\gamma_p\) in (5) and (6), we obtain \(x = 2.0794\) and \(y = 1.2799\). Finally, for \(\theta = \pi/4\), \(\gamma_n = 0.5\), and \(\gamma_p = 0.2\), so that \(\gamma_n^2 > \gamma_p^2\), we find \(y = 0\) and \(\varepsilon = x = 1\), in accord with the discussion of Section 3.1.

### 5. Conclusions

In GNSS-R soil applications, it is important to determine the permittivity \(\varepsilon\) of the soil from the measured received coherent power. This requires solving the Fresnel coefficient equations (3) and (4) in terms of the complex permittivity \(\varepsilon\). For soil moisture or sea salinity applications (dispersive media), the imaginary part of \(\varepsilon\) cannot be assumed to be negligible. In the literature, the real and the imaginary parts of \(\varepsilon\) are mostly found numerically; but, in fact, (3) and (4) can be explicitly solved. We determine complex solutions with \(\Re(\varepsilon) > 1\), for all angles \(\theta \in [0, \pi/2]\) and all measurements \(\gamma_n, \gamma_p \in [0, 1]\), with \(\gamma_p \leq \gamma_n\), which satisfy the admisibility condition (12) and can be explicitly verified.
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