Practical Limitation on Operation of Nonlinear Parity-Time Bragg Gratings
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Abstract

The paper analyses the operation of PT Bragg gratings when the dielectric material is considered to be both dispersive and nonlinear and gain and loss are saturable. The paper demonstrates the application of the nonlinear PT Bragg Grating as an optical logic gate and an optical switch.

1. Introduction

A Parity-Time (PT) structure is formed by balancing inherent loss in a medium by an equal gain in a certain design. The PT-symmetric structures mimic the PT-symmetric potential system in quantum physics which, under certain conditions, operates in a stable regime. As optical waveguides have inherent material loss, it is desirable to balance the loss with gain for optimal performance. This is one of the reasons why PT structures have become the subject of increased interest in photonics. Several kinds of PT-symmetric structures have been reported so far based on either grating [1–4], coupler [5–9], or lattice [10–12] structures with a range of applications including lasing and absorber cavities [2], switches [4,13] and memory [14]. PT-structures have been extensively modelled using coupled-mode theory [3,7], the transfer-matrix (T-matrix) method [1,14–16], Floquet-Bloch theory [11] and Fourier modal analysis [17,18]. The inclusion of material nonlinearity has also been reported with a speculation that nonlinearity combined with a PT structure will open a new range of functionalities [1,19–21]. However, all the reported models have assumed that gain and loss are frequency and intensity independent. The important question arises on how a nonlinear PT-symmetric device will perform in a practical situation where gain and loss are both dispersive and saturable, especially when medium nonlinearity is also taken into account.

To consider such a scenario we use a time-domain numerical technique, namely the Transmission Line Modelling (TLM) method [22,23]. The TLM method is based upon the analogy between the propagating electromagnetic field and voltage impulses travelling on an interconnected mesh of transmission lines. Successive repetitions of a scatter-propagate procedure provide an explicit and stable time-stepping-algorithm that mimics electromagnetic field behaviour to second order accuracy in both time and space [24,25]. It is important to note that the TLM method has been successfully implemented to model a dispersive and nonlinear dielectric material [22,23].

In principle any time-domain numerical method, including the Finite Difference Time Domain (FDTD) method could be used as a basis for the simulation undertaken.

In our previous work, we have validated the TLM method to model a linear PT Bragg Grating (PTBG) with non-dispersive gain and loss [4,26]. The impact of gain/loss saturation on the switching performance of a linear PTBG, has also been demonstrated [4]. In this paper we extend our model to include nonlinear and dispersive materials with saturable gain and loss. The Kerr nonlinearity is assumed in this paper and is controlled by a strong pump beam away from the Bragg frequency of the grating. The performance of the grating for different pump beam intensities and different saturation intensities is analysed. This is followed by studies of the applications of a nonlinear PTBG as an optical logic gate and a switch.

This paper is structured as follows: in the next section the model of the PTBG structure as implemented in the TLM method is given. Section 3 analyses the performance of the nonlinear PTBG for different input intensities and different intensity saturation levels. Section 4 demonstrates practical applications of the nonlinear PTBG and Section 5 outlines the main conclusions of the paper.

2. Structure and model

A Parity-Time symmetric material in optics requires a complex refractive index profile that satisfies \( \hat{n}(-z) = \hat{n}^*(z) \), where \( z \) denotes the spatial position of the grating and \( * \) denotes the complex conjugate. The schematic of a PT grating is shown in Fig. 1. The grating is embedded in a medium of background refractive index \( n_B \) as shown in Fig. 1(a), and is made of \( N \) periods. A single period, \( \Lambda \), of the PTBG is shown in Fig. 1(b) representing equal amounts of loss and gain per period and with the real refractive index varying in a piecewise constant manner between \( n_L \) and \( n_H \) (dashed line in Fig. 1(b)). The Bragg frequency \( f_B \) is related to the average refractive index \( \bar{n} \) of the structure by \( f_B = \frac{c}{2\Delta} \), where \( c \) is the speed of light in free space.
The refractive index profile of the nonlinear PT Bragg grating for one period \( n_g \) can be expressed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
    n_g(x, \omega, t, I) &= \begin{cases} 
        n(\omega) + A n(x) + n_f(x, t) + j \varepsilon_0 n(x, t), & z < \frac{\lambda}{2} \\
        n(\omega) - A n(x) + n_f(x, t) - j \varepsilon_0 n(x, t), & z > \frac{\lambda}{2}
    \end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]  

(1)

Here, \( n(\omega) \) is the base refractive index as a frequency dependent material, \( \Delta n(x) \) is the modulation of the real refractive index as a spatially dependent function, \( n_2 \) is the Kerr nonlinearity constant, \( I \) is the input intensity of the field and \( \varepsilon_0 n(x, t) \) denotes gain or loss in the grating which is dispersive and saturable. Equation (1) shows that Kerr nonlinearity also contributes to the overall real part of the refractive index.

The frequency and intensity dependent dielectric material is modelled in the TLM model using the Duffing equation of polarisation [27],

\[
\frac{\partial^2 P_D}{\partial t^2} + 2 \delta \frac{\partial P_D}{\partial t} + \omega_{pd}^2 P_D = \varepsilon_0 \chi_0 \varepsilon_0 \omega_0^2 E
\]  

(2)

where \( P_D \) and \( E \) denote the electric polarisation and field, \( \delta \) and \( \omega_{pd} \) denote the damping and dielectric resonant angular-frequency parameters of the medium respectively, and \( \chi_0 \) denotes the dielectric susceptibility at DC. The nonlinearity is implemented with the function \( f_D \) as [28],

\[
f_D = e^{j \phi_D},
\]  

(3)

where \( \phi_D = -\frac{n_2 \chi_0 \varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_0 \chi_0 + \varepsilon_0 \omega_0^2} I \), \( n_2 \) is the Kerr nonlinear constant, \( \chi_0 \) denotes the constant susceptibility at infinite frequency and \( \eta_0 \) is the free-space impedance. It is emphasised that when \( f_D = 1 \) the Duffing equation reduces to the linear model of optical material based on simple harmonic oscillator with a Lorentzian profile. In this case the refractive index at a given angular frequency \( \omega \) is calculated as,

\[
n^2 = (1 + \chi_0) + \frac{\chi_0 \omega_0^2}{2j\sigma_0 + (\omega - \omega_0)^2}
\]  

(4)

The implementation and validation of the Duffing equation to model a realistic dispersive and nonlinear optical dielectric has been reported in [28].

On the other hand, a dispersive and saturable gain/loss model with a Lorentzian profile is implemented as [29],

\[
|\alpha|_I(\omega, I) = \Omega(I) \left( \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + j(\omega - \omega_0)\tau} + \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + j(\omega + \omega_0)\tau} \right),
\]  

(5)

where the gain/loss parameter \( |\alpha|_I \) is related with the imaginary part of refractive index \( n_I \) by \( |\alpha|_I = \frac{n_I}{n_0} \), \( \omega_0 \) denotes the atomic transition angular-frequency, \( \tau \) is the dipole relaxation time parameter and \( n_0 \) is the peak value of the gain or loss at \( \omega_0 \). In order to quantify the saturation level, it is useful to introduce the saturation factor \( \Omega \) defined as,

\[
\Omega = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{I}{I_s}}
\]  

(6)

where \( I \) is the input beam intensity and \( I_s \) is the saturation intensity. For a fixed \( I_s \), the saturation factor \( \Omega \) varies over the interval \( 0 < \Omega < 1 \), with \( \Omega = 0 \) denoting a highly saturated state \( (\frac{I}{I_s} \rightarrow \infty) \) and \( \Omega = 1 \) denoting negligible saturation \( (\frac{I}{I_s} \rightarrow 0) \). It is emphasised that the model described in (2)-(6) satisfies the Kramers-Kronigs conditions which relates the real and imaginary part of a refractive index.

3. Results and Discussion

In this section, the performance of 200 periods of nonlinear PTBG based on GaAs material is analysed using the TLM method. The following material parameters are used throughout this paper, \( \chi_0 = 7.5 \), \( \omega_0 = 4614.4 \) rad/ps, and \( \delta = 0.0923 \) rad/ps [30], with the high and low refractive index, i.e. \( n_h \) and \( n_l \) obtained respectively from the high and low dielectric susceptibilities, \( \chi_0 = 2.8 \) and 2.5, which form the grating. The Kerr nonlinearity constant is \( n_2 = 2 \times 10^{-17} \) m²/W⁻¹ [31,32] throughout the structure. The gain and loss parameters are \( \tau = 0.1 \) ps and \( \omega_{pd} = 2116.5 \) rad/ps [29] while \( \alpha_0 \) depends on the gain/loss given. The periodicity of the PTBG is designed so that the Bragg frequency is at the atomic-transitional frequency, i.e. \( f_B = \frac{\omega_B}{2\pi} \), hence \( \Lambda = 122.7 \) nm. The background material is GaAs with \( n_B = 3.626 \) at the Bragg frequency \( f_B \). The unidirectional (U) operation of the PTBG occurs when the gain/loss in the PTBG satisfies \( |\alpha_0| = \frac{1}{2}(n_h - n_l) \) [4] which for the chosen material parameters, happens when the gain/loss coefficient \( |\alpha_0| = 1460.24 \) cm⁻¹.

The main characteristic of the linear PT Bragg grating is that transmission is the same regardless of whether the grating is excited from the left or right of the grating but the reflectances are different. The amount of gain/loss of the system also influences the operation of the grating in that above a certain threshold point the operation of gratings fails. Another characteristic of a linear PTBG is that the grating exhibits unidirectional invisibility – commonly referred to as the U point.

In the light of the refractive index profile given in (1), for the nonlinear PT Bragg grating, we consider a scenario where an input beam is comprised of two beams, namely a strong pump beam and a probe beam. The pump beam is a CW beam and is used to activate the Kerr nonlinearity. The frequency of the pump beam \( f_{pump} \) is set to be far from the Bragg frequency, i.e. \( f_{pump} = 200 \) THz. The probe signal is a Gaussian pulse modulated at the Bragg frequency \( f_B \) and is low in intensity, with its maximum intensity being 1% of
the pump beam intensity. Since the intensity of probe beam is very low compared to the strong pump beam, its effect can be seen as a perturbation of the pump beam and hence the pump beam can be considered as the input beam.

In order to investigate the effect of different saturation levels on the performance of a nonlinear PTBG the saturation intensity \( I_s \) is fixed to a certain level and the saturation factor \( \Omega \) is changed by changing the intensity of the pump beam.

Fig. 2 shows the frequency response of the nonlinear PTBG for a saturation intensity \( I_s = 5 \times 10^{10} \text{ Wm}^{-2} \) at the U-point. For a given level of saturation intensity, the effect of the Kerr nonlinearity is low since \( n_2 I_s = 1 \times 10^{-6} \). Four different intensities of the input beam \( I \) are considered so that the saturation factor \( \Omega \) varies from low to high saturation, i.e. \( \Omega = 0.99, 0.8, 0.01 \) and \( 2 \times 10^{-6} \). Fig. 2 compares results together with the analytical solution obtained using the T-matrix method [34]. It is emphasised here, that the T-matrix method models a linear and dispersive structure, i.e. no Kerr nonlinearity and no gain/loss saturation. With that in mind, the T-matrix method results are presented more as a reference than for a direct comparison. The response of the linear PTBG using the idealised model of gain/loss [1] is also included in Fig. 2 for comparison. The ideal gain/loss model here is implied to be frequency and intensity independent.

Fig. 3(a) shows the response of the nonlinear PTBG for high saturation intensity and different saturation factors \( \Omega \).

Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(d) show the reflectance for beams incident from the left, \( \Gamma_L \), and right, \( \Gamma_R \), side of the PTBG respectively. For the ideal linear PTBG the reflectance \( \Gamma_R \) is zero and \( \Gamma_L \) is amplified, showing the unidirectional behaviour at all frequencies. At low saturation levels \( \Omega = 0.99 \) the reflectance \( \Gamma_L \) has narrower bandwidth and the PTBG maintains the unidirectional behaviour around \( f_B \). Furthermore, at low saturation, \( \Omega = 0.99 \), the TLM results for \( \Gamma_L \) and \( \Gamma_R \) agree very well with results obtained using the T-matrix method due to the negligible effect of nonlinearity. Further increase in saturation level shifts the reflectance spectra to lower frequencies due to the dominant Kerr nonlinearity.

Fig. 3(a) shows the response of the nonlinear PTBG that in this case the change of refractive index and gain/loss in the PTBG induced by the Kerr nonlinearity and saturation respectively are negligible. It is noticeable that compared to the idealised case, the total transmission \( T = 1 \) occurs only at the Bragg frequency \( f_B \). This result confirms that material dispersion prohibits unidirectional behaviour at all frequencies as shown in the case of an ideal PTBG [4]. Furthermore, as the saturation factor \( \Omega \) decreases the transmittance becomes similar to that of the regular Bragg grating (RBG), i.e. it loses PT behaviour. This is shown in Fig. 2(a) where the response for \( \Omega = 0.01 \) overlaps with that of the RBG. By increasing the input beam intensity even further, \( \Omega = 2 \times 10^{-4} \), the band-gap is shifted to the lower frequency due to the fact that the dominant modulation mechanism becomes the Kerr nonlinearity.
under the condition of high saturation intensity, which if it was reached, produces high Kerr nonlinearity of $n_2 I_s = 0.5$. The grating is operated at the U point with $|a_0| = 1460.24$ cm$^{-1}$. Two different input intensities are considered so that gain/loss saturation is $\Omega = 0.99$ and 0.95, corresponding to low saturation. The induced Kerr modulation for given intensities is $n_2 f = 0.0051$ and 0.0263 respectively. The response of the linear structure (no Kerr nonlinearity and no gain/loss saturation) calculated using the T-matrix method is included for comparison. Fig. 3 shows that as the intensity and saturation increase the overall responses for $T$, $\Gamma_R$ and $\Gamma_L$ shift towards lower frequencies as the Kerr nonlinearity increases overall refractive index. It is observed that at the $f_B$ the unidirectional invisibility is preserved, $T \approx 1$ and $\Gamma_R \rightarrow 0$, whilst transmittance higher than 1 is observed for $f < f_B$. The reflectance for the left incident case, $\Gamma_L$, decreases and is shifted to a lower frequency. On the other hand, the $\Gamma_R$ increases as the input beam increases and negligible reflectance is observed for $f > f_B$.

Fig. 4 (a) Transmittance, (b) reflectance for left and (c) reflectance for right of PTBG at the U operation as a function of input intensity at $f = 336.85$ THz. The gain/loss has high saturation intensity $n_2 I_s = 0.5$. Results for the NBG($a_0 = 0$) at the Bragg frequency $f_B = 336.85$ THz are included for reference.

Fig. 4 shows the response of the nonlinear PTBG as a function of input beam intensity, when the gain/loss intensity saturation is high ($n_2 I_s = 0.5$). The grating is operated at the U point with $f = 336.85$ THz. The frequency $f = 336.85$ THz is the Bragg frequency of the linear grating. The response for the nonlinear Bragg grating (NBG) at $f = 336.85$ THz, with no gain and loss ($a_0 = 0$) is also included in Fig. 4(a) and shows that at low intensities the transmittance is very low but then switches to total transmittance at high intensity. This can be explained that by the fact that at high input intensity the band-gap of the nonlinear Bragg grating is shifted to the lower frequency so that $f = 336.85$ THz lies outside the band-gap. For the case of the nonlinear PTBG operating at $f = 336.85$ THz, the total transmission $T = 1$ is achieved regardless of the input beam intensity.

Since the NBG is orthogonal (reciprocal and lossless), i.e. $T + \Gamma = 1$, Fig. 4(b,c) show that at low input intensity the reflectance is close to 1, and it is very small at high input intensity. For the case of a nonlinear PTBG the reflectance, $\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R$ with $\Gamma_L > \Gamma_R$ at low input intensity, i.e. small Kerr effect, but as the input intensity increases the $\Gamma_L$ decreases to almost zero and fits with the response of the NBG. Fig. 4(a,b) show that at high input intensity and for high saturation intensity, total transmittance with both $\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R \rightarrow 0$ is observed corresponding to a bidirectionally transparent grating for frequencies $f > f_B$.

Fig. 5 (a) Transmittance, (b) reflectance for left and (c) reflectance for right incidence of PTBG at the U operation as a function of input intensity at $f = 336.85$ THz. The gain/loss has low saturation intensity $n_2 I_s = 0.0005$. Results for the NBG ($a_0 = 0$) at the Bragg frequency $f_B = 336.85$ THz are included for reference.

The impact of gain/loss saturation on the performance of the nonlinear PTBG as a function of input beam intensity is shown in Fig. 5. The grating is operated at $f = 336.85$ THz, similarly as in Fig. 4. The saturation intensity is low and set to $I_s = 2.5 \times 10^{13}$ Wm$^{-2}$, corresponding to a low Kerr nonlinearity of $n_2 I_s = 0.0005$. The PTBG operates at
the U point with \( |\alpha_0| = 1460.24 \text{ cm}^{-1} \). Fig. 5(a) shows almost total transmittance at low input intensity but it gradually decreases and fits with the response of the NBG as the input intensity is increased.

Fig. 5(b) and (c) depict the reflectance for the left \( \Gamma_{\text{L}} \) and right \( \Gamma_{\text{R}} \) incidence respectively. At low input intensity \( \Gamma_{\text{L}} > \Gamma_{\text{R}} \), but it gradually decreases and fits with the response of the NBG as the input intensity is increased. Fig. 5(a-c) show the impact of the gain/loss saturation, that it effectively reduces the gain/loss in the system to a negligible level at high input intensity, and hence inhibits the interplay of Kerr nonlinearity and PT behaviour as is observed in Fig. 4.

4. Applications

In this section two potential applications of a nonlinear PTBG based on GaAs are investigated, namely an optical logic gate and a switch. The input beam comprises of a probe beam and a strong pump beam. The probe beam is a CW operated at the Bragg frequency \( f_{\text{probe}} = 336.85 \text{ THz} \) and has a low intensity which is kept constant throughout the simulation with \( I = 1 \times 10^6 \text{ W m}^{-2} \). The pump beam is a CW signal operated far from the Bragg frequency at \( f_{\text{pump}} = 200 \text{ THz} \). The intensities of the pump beam are switched between two different values, i.e. \( I_1 = 1 \times 10^{14} \text{ W m}^{-2} \) and \( I_2 = 1 \times 10^{15} \text{ W m}^{-2} \) as marked in Fig. 5, where the pump beam intensity is shown against time. The pump beam is initially turned off and then turned on to intensity \( I_1 \) for a duration of 10 ps, followed by an increase to intensity \( I_2 \) for another 10 ps. The pattern is then repeated as seen in Fig. 6(a).

Fig. 6 compares the performance of the NBG and PTBG where Fig. 6(b) shows the transmitted probe beam of a NBG structure (\( \alpha_0 = 0 \)) when excited from the left side. The transmitted probe beam of the NBG is very low when the pump beam is turned off or operated at \( I = I_1 \). However, when the pump beam is switched to operate at \( I_2 \) total transmitted power is observed. On the other hand, Fig. 6(c) shows the output of the PTBG when the grating is excited from the left. It can be seen that when the pump beam is off the probe beam is totally transmitted \( T = 1 \). Increase in the pump beam intensity to \( I_1 \) reduces the transmitted probe beam intensity. A subsequent further increase of the pump beam to \( I_2 \) increases the transmitted probe beam to total transmittance. Although Fig. 6(b) and Fig. 6(c) show that NBG and PTBG have similar switching operation, the PTBG achieves switching at lower pump intensity with the default ON state for \( I = 0 \) and OFF state at \( I = I_1 \).

5. Conclusion

The performance of a nonlinear PT Bragg grating that has dispersive material and a saturable gain/loss model is analysed and compared with the performance of an idealised PT Bragg grating and a nonlinear Bragg grating with no gain/loss. It is shown that material dispersion limits the unidirectional behaviour of the PTBG to a narrowband region around the Bragg frequency. The interplay of saturation and nonlinearity is important as low saturation intensity can prohibit the impact of Kerr nonlinearity in a nonlinear PTBG. At high saturation intensity the impact of nonlinearity contributes to bidirectional invisibility for frequencies above the Bragg frequency. The operation of the PTBG as an optical switch and logic gate confirms that the switching operation can be achieved at lower pump intensities than is the case for the nonlinear Bragg grating with no gain and loss.
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