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ABSTRACT

User equipment (UE) is required to comply with the relevant radio frequency (RF) electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure limits, which are of relevance to establish the maximum permissible transmitted power and the maximum equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP). Recently, international RF EMF exposure guidelines, such as those published by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) as well as by the IEEE, have been updated. In this paper, the implications of the revised incident power density limits are investigated in terms of maximum permissible transmitted power and the maximum EIRP for devices operating in close proximity of the user. A similar analysis is conducted according to the US Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulation on RF exposure. EMF compliance of UE is studied by means of numerical modelling of patch antenna arrays of different array sizes taking into consideration of possible beam-steering operations, at frequencies ranging from 10 GHz to 100 GHz. The results are compared with the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) requirements on the total radiated power (TRP) and EIRP levels. The present implications of the incident power density limits for 5G millimeter-wave UE will give valuable insights to mobile equipment manufacturers, network operators, and standardization bodies.

INDEX TERMS 5G, antenna array, beam-steering, EIRP, incident power density, maximum permissible transmitted power, millimeter wave, RF EMF exposure, user equipment.

I. INTRODUCTION

The fifth-generation (5G) mobile communication technology, i.e., New Radio (NR), utilizes millimeter-wave (mmWave) frequencies as well as part of the frequency spectrum below 6 GHz [1], [2]. Since mmWave is characterized by larger free-space path loss than the sub-6 GHz bands [3], antenna arrays are employed to achieve higher antenna gain and narrow directional beams. To ensure spatial coverage, beam-steering techniques are used by controlling the phase of each antenna element in the user equipment (UE) [4]–[11].
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The radio frequency (RF) electromagnetic field (EMF) exposure from UE is required to comply with the relevant RF EMF exposure limits. In October 2019, the IEEE published IEEE Std C95.1TM [12] based on the revisions of [13] (2005) and [14] (2002). In April 2020, the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) published the revised guidelines to limit EMF exposure in the frequency range 100 kHz to 300 GHz [15]. This document updates the RF EMF part of the ICNIRP guidelines of 1998 [16], and the 100 kHz to 10 MHz part of the ICNIRP low frequency guidelines [17] from 2010. Although the limits specified in the new guidelines are, to a large extent, the same as those previously available, both the IEEE and the ICNIRP include some changes in the RF EMF exposure limits above 6 GHz,
for which the implications on 5G UE compliance are investigated in this work. In the US, the RF exposure limits set by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) apply and are also addressed in the paper.

In addition to practical factors that limit the maximum output power of UE, such as power amplifiers and battery life, the maximum permissible transmitted power, $P_{\text{MPT}}$, and the maximum equivalent isotropically radiated power, $EIRP_{\text{max}}$, should ensure that RF EMF exposure of UE is in compliance with the relevant exposure limits. At the same time, the total radiated power (TRP) and EIRP of the UE should also meet the 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP) requirements to support sufficient coverage and limit interference [18].

Previous studies investigated the implications of the exposure limits on $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels. In [19], dipole arrays of different sizes ranging from $2 \times 2$ to $10 \times 10$ elements in the frequency range 10 GHz to 60 GHz, were analyzed. In [20], RF EMF exposure and $P_{\text{MPT}}$ were addressed for UE antenna arrays of 15 GHz and 28 GHz. Recently, the impacts of the UE antenna casing on EMF compliance were studied [21] for 28 GHz and 39 GHz UE. However, since existing studies were conducted before IEEE and ICNIRP published their revised limits, some of the conclusions previously drawn need to be reassessed.

In this paper, we use patch arrays with different sizes and operating frequencies ranging from 10 GHz to 100 GHz to estimate $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels of UE in order to comply with the latest EMF exposure standards and regulations. These values are then compared with relevant requirements from 3GPP applicable for 5G mmWave UE. The provided $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels can be used when manufactures and operators plan for 5G mmWave products and standardization bodies make specifications on UE power levels.

II. MODEL AND METHOD

A. RF EMF EXPOSURE LIMITS ABOVE 6 GHz

RF EMF exposure limits from 10 MHz to 300 GHz are set to protect people from established adverse health effects associated with body core temperature rise and excessive localized heating. RF EMF exposure metrics limiting local exposure are considered of relevance to UE. Above 6 GHz, ICNIRP basic restrictions [15] and IEEE dosimetric reference limits (DRLs) [12] for local exposure are defined in terms of absorbed and epithelial power density, respectively. The absorbed power density is defined as the spatial-average Poynting vector projected in the direction normal to the averaging area on the body surface. The epithelial power density is defined as the power flow through the epithelium per unit area directly under the body surface. Although expressed with different terms, absorbed and epithelial power density represent the same quantity. As basic restrictions/DRLs cannot be easily assessed, IEEE and ICNIRP provide additional limits, i.e., reference levels or exposure reference limits (ERLs) using quantities that are more practical to evaluate. Above 6 GHz, reference levels/ERLs, as well as the RF exposure limits specified by the FCC, are defined in terms of incident power density. Compliance assessment of UE based on such metric has been extensively studied, e.g., [22]–[29].

In the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines, the incident power density limits for general public are $55 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ W/m² in the frequency range 6–300 GHz ($f_{G}$ is the frequency in the unit of GHz). The incident power density averaged over 4 cm² of the body surface in the shape of a square should not exceed the limit values. In addition, above 30 GHz, the incident power density averaged over a square 1 cm² should not exceed twice that of the 4 cm² restrictions, i.e., $110 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ W/m².

IEEE Std C95.1TM-2019 also has the same 4 cm² spatial-averaging restrictions as the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines. Above 30 GHz, if the area of the $−3$ dB contour relative to the peak spatial incident power density is less than 1 cm², the incident power density averaged over 1 cm² should not exceed twice the 4 cm² limits, either.

The Maximum Permissible Exposure (MPE) limits for incident power density set by the FCC is 10 W/m² for the general population [30]. According to the current FCC compliance assessment procedures applicable for mmWave handsets, this is intended to be averaged over 4 cm² [31], [32]. In the following, we refer to such requirements as ‘FCC (current)’. While this limit value is derived from the MPE applicable for whole-body exposure, FCC rules do not yet specify a spatial maximum power density limit for local exposure above 6 GHz. Therefore, for local exposure, the FCC has recently proposed a general local power density limit of 40 W/m² averaged over 1 cm² above 6 GHz [33]. In the following, we refer to them as ‘FCC (proposed)’. Table 1 summaries the recently updated ICNIRP and IEEE incident power density limits, and the restrictions currently in use and recently proposed by the FCC.

| TABLE 1. Localized Incident Power Density Limits set by ICNIRP, IEEE, and FCC for General Public above 6 GHz. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | $f_{G}$ (GHz) | $S_{\text{lim.}}$ (W/m²) |
| ICNIRP 2020 [15] | 6–300 | $55 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ |
| | 30–300 | $110 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ |
| IEEE C95.1TM-2019 [12] | 6–300 | $55 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ |
| | 30–300 | $110 f_{G}^{-0.177}$ |
| FCC (current) [30]–[32] | 6×100 | 4 |
| FCC (proposed) [33] | 6×3000 | 10 |

* According to IEEE C95.1TM-2019, 1 cm² averaging is required only when the area of the $−3$ dB contours relative to the peak spatial incident power density is less than 1 cm².

Fig. 1 shows an example of the incident power density calculation over an averaging area $A$ at a distance $d$, where the surface of interest is chosen parallel to the array in this paper. For a progressive phase shift difference of $\beta$, between adjacent elements in the $x$-direction, the spatial-average incident power density, according to IEEE Std C95.1TM-2019 and
the ICNIRP 2020 guidelines,\(^1\) can be expressed as:

\[
S_{\text{inc}}(A, d, \beta_x) = \frac{1}{A} \int_A \text{Re}[E(d, \beta_x) \times H^*(d, \beta_x)] \cdot \hat{n} \, ds,
\]

(1)

where \(E\) and \(H\) are the root-mean-square (rms) complex electric field and the rms complex magnetic field, respectively, superscript * denotes the complex conjugation, and \(\hat{n}\) is the unit vector normal to the averaging area.

The FCC currently requires three orthogonal components of the Poynting vector to determine compliance \([34]\) against the incident power density limits, which can be expressed as:

\[
S_{\text{inc}}^m(A, d, \beta_x) = \frac{1}{A} \int_A \left| \text{Re}[E(d, \beta_x) \times H^*(d, \beta_x)] \right| \, ds.
\]

(2)

For brief exposure intervals, the ICNIRP and IEEE Std C95.1\(^{\text{TM}}\) 2019 specify reference levels (or ERLs) also in terms of incident energy density. As in this paper, exposure assessment is conducted assuming the UE constantly transmitting at the maximum output power, compliance with the incident energy density limits is inherently met by complying with the incident power density limits.

B. ARRAY CONFIGURATION AND TOPOLOGY

Patch antenna arrays and other patch-antenna-based designs are popular choices for 5G UE above 6 GHz (e.g., [9]–[11]), as they are compatible with the printed circuit board (PCB) and packaging technologies. As the number of antenna elements is usually with the power of two in practice, we select the array sizes of \(2 \times 2, 4 \times 1, 4 \times 2, 4 \times 4, 8 \times 1, 8 \times 2, 8 \times 4, 8 \times 8, 16 \times 8, \text{ and } 16 \times 16\) in this paper. Fig. 2 shows the dimensions of the \(4 \times 2\) patch antenna array as an example. The dimensions of antenna elements and the distances of element spacing are the same in wavelength for different frequencies and array sizes. Each patch antenna is excited by a coaxial probe feed, of which the position is indicated by the red spot in Fig. 2. The operating frequencies are chosen from 10 GHz to 100 GHz for every 5 GHz.

For brief exposure intervals, the ICNIRP and IEEE Std C95.1\(^{\text{TM}}\) 2019 specify reference levels (or ERLs) also in terms of incident energy density. As in this paper, exposure assessment is conducted assuming the UE constantly transmitting at the maximum output power, compliance with the incident energy density limits is inherently met by complying with the incident power density limits.

C. MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE TRANSMITTED POWER DUE TO INCIDENT POWER DENSITY LIMITS

For large array antennas, the maximum exposure may occur at some distance away from the face of the antenna, as suggested in Appendix A. When the \(P_{\text{MPT}}\) and \(\text{EIRP}_{\text{max}}\) results are presented for a certain distance \(d\), it is understood that compliance is ensured for all distances larger or equal to this distance. Therefore, the compliance with the incident power density limits is assessed considering the distances ranging from 5 mm to 50 cm for \(2 \times 2, 4 \times 1, 4 \times 2, 4 \times 4, 8 \times 1, 8 \times 2, 8 \times 4, \text{ and } 8 \times 8\) arrays and from 5 mm to 90 cm for \(16 \times 8\) and \(16 \times 16\) arrays. The areas for spatial averaging are chosen parallel to the face of the antenna array, and the distance between them is the evaluation distance \(d\) (see Fig. 1). The \(P_{\text{MPT}}\) level for \(d\) is determined by the maximum peak spatial-average incident power density for \(d' \geq d\) and all \(\beta_x\). For the incident power density limits, \(S_{\text{lim}}\), in Table 1, \(P_{\text{MPT}}\) could be expressed as

\[
P_{\text{MPT}} = \max_{A, d' \geq d, \beta_x} \frac{P_f S_{\text{lim}}}{S_{\text{inc}}(A, d', \beta_x)}.
\]

(3)

where \(P_f\) is the total forward power in simulation, i.e., the generated power of the RF front end.\( S_{\text{inc}}\) in (3) may be replaced with that in (2) when determining \(P_{\text{MPT}}\) for the FCC requirements. Note that \(P_{\text{MPT}}\) in (3) is not considered for the restrictions of EIRP and TRP discussed below, and it is the
sum of accepted power and reflected power of the antenna array. The total efficiency for the arrays as \( \beta_x \) varies can be found in Appendix B, which can be used to scale \( P_{MPT} \) to the total accepted power.

The results are presented particularly for \( d \) of 5 mm and 20 cm from the antenna surface. For UE intended to be operating in close proximity to individuals, the FCC has different RF exposure evaluation requirements on two classes of equipment, namely the portable devices [35] and mobile devices [36]. A portable device, such as a mobile handset, is defined as a transmitting device designed to be used so that the radiating structure(s) of the device is/are within 20 cm of the body of the user [35]. A mobile device, such as customer-premises equipment (CPE), is defined as a transmitting device designed for use in other than fixed locations and generally in such a way that a separation distance of at least 20 cm is normally maintained between the antennas and exposed individuals [36]. The UE categorized as a mobile device can still have a larger compliance distance than 20 cm, and the \( EIRP_{\text{max}} \) levels can be higher than what is suggested in Appendix D but may still need to comply with the relevant FCC limits in the US.

\section*{D. EIRP Restrictions}

Using (3), the maximum EIRP for the beam-steering antenna array is calculated with

\[
EIRP_{\text{max}} = P_{MPT} \times \max_{\beta_x} (G(\beta_x)) \tag{4}
\]

where \( G \) is the realized antenna array gain, as \( P_{MPT} \) is derived from the forward power.

In the current deployed 5G NR frequency range 2 (FR2) (including bands n257, n258, n260, and n261), 3GPP specifies the minimum peak EIRP, maximum EIRP, and maximum TRP levels on different UE power classes, see Table 2 [18]. 5G UE should fulfill both the 3GPP requirements and the EMF exposure restrictions in terms of \( P_{MPT} \). The UE power class 3 is for handheld UE, for which \( d = 5 \text{ mm} \) is assumed in this paper. The UE power classes 2 and 4 are for vehicular UE and high-power non-handheld UE, respectively. \( d = 20 \text{ cm} \) is considered for them to be aligned with minimum requirement of the FCC mobile devices. In this paper, it is assumed that the limits identified as ‘FCC (proposed)’ will apply, if adopted, to UE relevant for power class 3 as well as classes 2 and 4. Power class 1 is for fixed wireless access UE, which does not typically operate in close proximity of the body and are therefore outside the scope of this paper.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{3GPP Requirements of Minimum Peak EIRP, Maximum EIRP, and Maximum TRP for Different UE Power Classes (3GPP TS 38.101-2 v15.9.1 [18]).}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
3GPP UE Power Class & Frequency & Minimum Peak EIRP & Maximum TRP & Maximum EIRP \\
\hline
Power Class 1  
(Fixed wireless access UE) & 24.25–29.5 GHz (n257, n258, n261)  
37–40 GHz (n260) & 40 dBm  
38 dBm & 35 dBm  
55 dBm & \\
\hline
Power Class 2  
(Vehicular UE) & 24.25–29.5 GHz (n257, n258, n261) & 29 dBm & 23 dBm & 43 dBm & \\
\hline
Power Class 3  
(Handheld UE) & 24.25–29.5 GHz (n257, n258, n261)  
37–40 GHz (n260) & 22.4 dBm  
20.6 dBm & 23 dBm  
43 dBm & \\
\hline
Power Class 4  
(High power non-handheld UE) & 24.25–29.5 GHz (n257, n258, n261)  
37–40 GHz (n260) & 34 dBm  
31 dBm & 23 dBm  
43 dBm & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\section*{E. Simulation Scheme}

The full-wave simulations are conducted using CST Suite Studio [38] with the time domain solver (T-solver) based on the finite integration technique (FIT), the asymptotic solver (A-solver) based on the shooting and bouncing rays (SBR), and the integral equation solver (I-solver) based on the method of moments (MoM). The fields and incident power density of interest are up to a distance of 90 cm, and such distance is \( 30\lambda_0 \) at 10 GHz and \( 300\lambda_0 \) at 100 GHz. If only using the T-solver to compute the fields, the requirements on hardware will be very demanding, and the simulation tasks will be extremely time-consuming. For \( P_{MPT} \) and \( EIRP_{\text{max}} \) calculations, only the information regarding the maximum peak spatial-average incident power density, rather than the entire field distribution, is needed. To capture the peak spatial-average incident power density, a simulation scheme is developed to accelerate the simulation process, see the flow chart in Fig. 3. The control flow and post-processing of the field results are performed in MATLAB [39].

For each frequency, each array size, and each beam, the T-solver is used to compute the far-field beam patterns and the equivalent field sources over a closed box with a \( \lambda_0/4 \) distance surrounding the array. The equivalent field sources are then imported into the A-solver, and the incident power density is computed using the I-solver with the equivalent field sources in a limited volume to reduce simulation time. In the distance range of \( d \in (\lambda_0, 50 \text{ cm}) \) for \( 2 \times 2, 4 \times 1, 4 \times 2, 4 \times 4, 8 \times 1, 8 \times 2, 8 \times 4, \) and \( 8 \times 8 \) arrays and \( d \in (\lambda_0, 90 \text{ cm}) \) for \( 16 \times 8 \) and \( 16 \times 16 \) arrays. Due to the relatively large uncertainty of the A-solver, the incident power density computed in the A-solver is only used to locate the approximate position of the peak spatial-average incident power density. More accurate results around the approximate position are computed using the I-solver with the equivalent field sources.
aperture. The field sampling interval is no larger than the minimum between 1 mm and $\lambda_0/8$ for $d \in [5\text{ mm}, \lambda_0]$, and no larger than the minimum between 2 mm and $\lambda_0/2$ for $d > \lambda_0$. At those frequencies with $\lambda_0/4 \geq 5\text{ mm}$, the field data in the range of $d \in [5\text{ mm}, \lambda_0/4]$ is supplemented by the T-solver results. The comparison of the peak spatial-average incident power density directly computed in the T-solver and that computed in the I-solver with the equivalent field sources can be found in Appendix C.

III. RESULTS
A. AVERAGING AREA SIZE DETERMINING COMPLIANCE FOR ICNIRP AND IEEE LIMITS
Both the ICNIRP and the IEEE specify power density limits above 30 GHz intended to be averaged over $1\text{ cm}^2$ and $4\text{ cm}^2$. The limit value applicable to $1\text{ cm}^2$ is twice of that provided for $4\text{ cm}^2$ and is therefore relevant only for small exposure areas. The IEEE provides a criterion to identify very localized exposure, for which an averaging area of $1\text{ cm}^2$ is relevant (in addition to $4\text{ cm}^2$) based on the $-3\text{ dB}$ contour area of the incident power density. An example is given in Fig. 4.

For the investigated antenna arrays, the averaging area that determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and the resultant $\text{EIRP}_{\text{max}}$ levels are found no difference between the ICNIRP and IEEE requirements. Fig. 5 shows the averaging area size that determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for $d = 5\text{ mm}$. In general, above 30 GHz, the $1\text{ cm}^2$ requirement determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for small size arrays. As the array size increases and the transmitted power is spread over a larger area, the $4\text{ cm}^2$ requirement determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ in the relatively low frequency range. For $d = 20\text{ cm}$, the $4\text{ cm}^2$ requirement determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for both the ICNIRP and IEEE requirements and for all arrays and frequencies investigated in this paper, as the field distribution is nearly uniform within an averaging area.

B. MAXIMUM PERMISSIBLE TRANSMITTED POWER
Fig. 6 shows $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for $d = 5\text{ mm}$ to be compliant with the ICNIRP, IEEE, current FCC, and proposed FCC limits. As found in the previous work [19], for the same array topology, $P_{\text{MPT}}$ declines with the increasing frequency. This is because the power is more focused at short distances as the physical size of the array is reduced. At the same frequency, $P_{\text{MPT}}$ is higher for a larger array size, as the power is more spread in space. The same trend can also be found in this paper as shown in Fig. 6. However, comparing the results between the $4 \times 1$ and $4 \times 2$ array, and between the $8 \times 1$ and $8 \times 2$ array, the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels for the $4 \times 1$ and $8 \times 1$ arrays are higher than those for the $4 \times 2$ and $8 \times 2$ arrays, respectively. This is because the one-dimensional linear array only has constructive field superposition in one direction, while the two-dimensional array with constructive field superposition in two orthogonal directions results in more enhanced field strength at close distances.
The $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels for $d = 20$ cm are shown in Fig. 7. At a relatively far distance even still within the radiating near field, the peak incident power density can be well characterized by the far-field pattern [40], [41]. This means, particularly for small arrays, the maximum exposure that determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for $d = 20$ cm is approximately inversely proportional to the
antenna gain, which is frequency-independent for the same array topology. Therefore, for small arrays, the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ level is less relevant to the frequency. For large arrays such as the $16 \times 8$ and $16 \times 16$ arrays, the distance where the peak incident power density can be well approximated by the far-field pattern may be far beyond $d = 20$ cm as shown in Fig. 10 in Appendix A, and thus the results show a frequency-dependent behavior. In addition, the location of maximum exposure of large arrays, which determines $P_{\text{MPT}}$, is farther than 20 cm at low frequencies. This results in similar $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels between $d = 20$ cm and $d = 5$ mm for large arrays. The $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels for the ICNIRP and IEEE limits are identical, as suggested in the above section.

C. MAXIMUM EQUIVALENT ISOTROPICALLY RADIATED POWER

The $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels due to the RF EMF exposure restrictions are compared with the 3GPP UE power requirements in FR2, as shown in Fig. 8. The results of 25 GHz and 40 GHz are selected for the bands 24.25–29.5 GHz and 37–40 GHz, respectively. In comparison, the total efficiency of antenna arrays is assumed to equal to 1 when comparing $P_{\text{MPT}}$ with the TRP limits.

For UE power class 3, at both 25 GHz and 40 GHz, the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels of small arrays ($2 \times 2$, $4 \times 1$, and $4 \times 2$) are close to the 3GPP minimum peak EIRP requirements. The $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels of very large arrays ($16 \times 8$ and $16 \times 16$) may
surpass the 3GPP maximum EIRP limits if the antenna arrays transmit with $P_{\text{MPT}}$.

For power class 4 at both 25 GHz and 40 GHz, $P_{\text{MPT}}$ of the array sizes smaller than $8 \times 4$ is likely to exceed the 3GPP maximum TRP limits. If scaling down the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels of those arrays to meet the 3GPP TRP limits, the resultant $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ values will still locate within the required 3GPP peak EIRP range. This suggests that once the 3GPP requirements on maximum TRP, minimum peak EIRP, and maximum EIRP levels are fulfilled, the RF EMF exposure compliance may not be the limiting factor for the power levels of UE power classes 2 and 4 for $d = 20$ cm.

Using the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ results in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ results for the entire 10 GHz to 100 GHz range are provided in Fig. 13 and Fig. 14 in Appendix D. As 3GPP currently only specifies TRP and EIRP requirements in FR2 while it has not specified them yet in other parts of the spectrum above 6 GHz, the provided $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels are only used as indicators for coverage and link budget analysis. If new TRP and EIRP limits are specified or readers want to impose the FCC EIRP limits for other frequencies, a similar analysis can be performed using the data provided in Figs. 6, 7, 13, and 14.

**IV. DISCUSSION**

In Fig. 8(a) and (b), the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for the $2 \times 2$ and $4 \times 1$ arrays are a few dB below the 3GPP minimum EIRP limits. However, there are a few factors, which can affect the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for RF EMF compliance given the same antenna array model. As in [19], the RF EMF exposure assessment in this paper is made under the assumption of 100 % uplink duty cycle. If the UE employs time division duplex (TDD), the TDD downlink/uplink ratio must be considered when evaluating the time-averaged RF EMF exposure. For example, $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ in Fig. 8 should be scaled up by 3 dB if a 50 % uplink duty cycle is applied, and 6 dB if a 25 % uplink duty cycle is applied. The higher $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels can also be achieved if UE can dynamically control the time-averaged radiated power, but this needs further study also with respect to the energy density limits (averaging time $\leq 6$ minutes). It is pointed out in [21] that in a realistic product environment, a higher $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ can also be expected because a realistic antenna integration environment will guide and scatter the electromagnetic energy to unwanted directions (therefore lowering the spatial-average power density) and also cause a higher loss in materials. It also shows in [21] that a larger element spacing can reduce the maximum peak spatial-average incident power density at close distances, though grating lobes might appear. By taking the aforementioned factors into consideration, it is expected that both $2 \times 2$
and 4 × 1 antenna arrays can meet EMF exposure requirements and 3GPP power/EIRP requirements simultaneously for UE power class 3.

A comparison between the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels obtained in this paper and the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels obtained using the antenna model in [19] is shown in Fig. 9. $P_{\text{MPT}}$ for the reflector-based dipole array with 0.50λ₀ element spacing was recalculated according to the revised ICNIRP power density limits for $d = 5$ mm and $d = 20$ cm, and for $2 \times 2$, $4 \times 4$, and $8 \times 8$ arrays. The comparison between the results of two works using different antenna elements, element spacing, and software tools suggest that the $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels are to a larger extent determined by the array topology, if other conditions are the same (see blue lines and red dash-dotted lines). In Fig. 9, the results computed in [19] for the incident power density limits according to the ICNIRP 1998 guidelines [16] (i.e., the incident power density averaged over 20 cm$^2$ should not exceed 10 W/m$^2$ for general public) are also presented for comparison (see black dashed lines). For $d = 5$ mm, slightly higher $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels towards the transition frequency, at which the relevant exposure quantity changes from the specific absorption rate (SAR) to power density, go in the right direction to resolve the discontinuity in $P_{\text{MPT}}$ previously described in literature. Slightly lower $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels are observed at higher frequencies due to reduction in the averaging area. For $d = 20$ cm, as the fields around the peak are more or less uniform, the peak spatial-average incident power density is largely determined by the limit values $\left(55_{G}^{0.177} \text{W/m}^2 \text{versus} \ 10 \text{W/m}^2\right)$ rather than the size of averaging area. Thus, the revised ICNIRP limits imply slightly higher $P_{\text{MPT}}$ levels for $d = 20$ cm.

When comparing array configurations with the same number of elements (e.g., $2 \times 2$ with $4 \times 1$), the one-dimensional arrays allow for a larger $P_{\text{MPT}}$ of few dB as shown in Fig. 6.

The analysis in this paper has been conducted for UE operating within a single band at mmWave frequencies. If the UE is capable of transmitting with different bands simultaneously, for example above and below 6 GHz, the cumulative EMF exposure for all bands needs to be addressed by the compliance testing (see e.g., [42]).

V. CONCLUSION

The $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for different typical sizes of antenna arrays ranging from $2 \times 2$ to $16 \times 16$ have been assessed for 5G UE in the frequency range from 10 GHz to 100 GHz, according to the recently revised incident power density limits specified by the ICNIRP and the IEEE. A similar analysis has been conducted considering the current and proposed FCC limits. Compared to the previous works, the latest available information regarding the incident power density limits, the wider frequency range, and a variety of antenna array topologies have been considered in this work, and a fast simulation scheme has been developed. The obtained $P_{\text{MPT}}$ and $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ have also been compared with 3GPP TRP and EIRP requirements on UE within the NR FR2 bands. For 3GPP FR2 UE power class 3 (handheld UE), the results and discussion suggest that investigated array topologies can meet both RF EMF exposure compliance requirements and 3GPP TRP/EIRP requirements. For 3GPP FR2 UE power class 2 (vehicular UE) and power class 4 (high power non-handheld UE) with $d = 20$ cm, once the 3GPP maximum TRP and maximum EIRP requirements are met, the RF EMF exposure restrictions may not be a limiting factor for the power levels. The presented results provide valuable input about 5G NR to manufacturers, network operators, and standardization bodies.

APPENDIX A

Fig. 10 shows the peak 1 cm$^2$ spatial-average incident power density changing with distance, calculated by the A-solver for $2 \times 2$ and $16 \times 16$ arrays at 10 GHz, 50 GHz, and 100 GHz. The RF EMF exposure of the $2 \times 2$ array shows a frequency-independent behavior at 20 cm, while for the $16 \times 16$ array, the maximum exposure occurs at different distances and clearly, it shows a frequency-dependent behavior at 20 cm.

APPENDIX B

Although the dimension of the patch element is reused for all sizes of arrays, the impedance match conditions are different when putting in different array environments. Fig. 11 shows the range of total efficiency of different arrays as progressive phase difference $\beta_s$ varies within $[0, \pi]$. The results can be used in an approximate way when $P_{\text{MPT}}$ is needed to scale down to TRP.
**APPENDIX C**

Fig. 12 shows the distribution of the relative difference between $S_{inc}$ calculated by the T-solver and that by the I-solver within $\lambda_0/4 < d < \lambda_0$. The maximum relative difference for the maximum peak $S_{inc}$ averaged over 1 cm$^2$ and 4 cm$^2$ is 11.2 % and 5.6 %, respectively. The mean value of the relative difference for maximum peak $S_{inc}$ averaged over 1 cm$^2$ and 4 cm$^2$ is 3.3 % and 2.0 %, respectively. Thus, the results from the I-solver using the equivalent field...

**FIGURE 13.** $EIRP_{max}$ levels for $d = 5$ mm to comply with the RF EMF exposure limits of ICNIRP, IEEE, FCC (current), and FCC (proposed).

**FIGURE 14.** $EIRP_{max}$ levels for $d = 20$ cm to comply with the RF EMF exposure limits of ICNIRP, IEEE, FCC (current), and FCC (proposed).
Fig. 13 shows the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for $d = 5$ mm to be comparable to the results directly computed from the T-solver.

**APPENDIX D**

Fig. 13 shows the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for $d = 20$ cm. These figures are useful for link budget and coverage analysis for 5G mmWave UE. Note the obtained $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ is not considered with the 3GPP maximum EIRP restrictions.
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**APPENDIX D**

Fig. 13 shows the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for $d = 5$ mm to be compliant with the updated RF EMF exposure limits of ICNIRP, IEEE, FCC (current), and FCC (proposed), respectively. Fig. 14 shows the $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ levels for $d = 20$ cm. These figures are useful for link budget and coverage analysis for 5G mmWave UE. Note the obtained $EIRP_{\text{max}}$ is not considered with the 3GPP maximum EIRP restrictions.
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