Analysis of optical waveguide structures by use of a combined finite-difference/finite-difference time-domain method
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We present a method for full-wave characterization of optical waveguide structures. The method computes mode-propagation constants and cross-sectional field profiles from a straightforward discretization of Maxwell’s equations. These modes are directly excited in a three-dimensional finite-difference time-domain simulation to obtain optical field transmission and reflection coefficients for arbitrary waveguide discontinuities. The implementation uses the perfectly-matched-layer technique to absorb both guided modes and radiated fields. A scattered-field formulation is also utilized to allow accurate determination of weak scattered-field strengths. Individual three-dimensional waveguide sections are cascaded by $S$-parameter analysis. A complete $10^4$-section Bragg resonator is successfully simulated with the method. © 2002 Optical Society of America
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1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to design complex optical devices is greatly enhanced by simulation tools that characterize wave propagation in arbitrary guiding structures. Complete electromagnetic characterization of such geometries requires two basic tools: (1) a two-dimensional simulation technique capable of finding propagation constants and mode profiles for arbitrary guiding structures, and (2), a three-dimensional (3D) electromagnetic analysis method to simulate mode propagation in the presence of waveguide transitions and discontinuities. For electrically large structures, limited computer memory and processing power often preclude a complete full-wave 3D analysis. In many cases, however, simulation efficiency can be greatly enhanced through appropriate application of network analysis.

Prior work in this area has focused on two-dimensional planar waveguide approximations,\textsuperscript{1,2} the approximate beam-propagation method,\textsuperscript{3,4} and finite-difference (FD) solutions for propagation constants and mode profiles.\textsuperscript{5,6} In this paper we employ a simple FD method based on a straightforward discretization of Maxwell’s equations to determine mode characteristics for waveguides of arbitrary cross-sectional geometry. The equations may be solved using sparse eigenvalue/eigenvector methods or iteratively by using a sparse linear-equation solver. These modes are used in a full-wave analysis of 3D structures with the finite-difference time-domain (FDTD) method\textsuperscript{7,8} with Berenger’s perfectly-matched-layer (PML) absorbing boundary condition.\textsuperscript{9} To characterize optically large waveguide devices, $S$-parameter analysis is employed to combine the response of individual 3D sections.

We demonstrate the three-step method by analyzing an electrically large buried heterostructure Bragg resonator employing a surface relief grating. The ability of the method to provide realistic results for this numerically sensitive problem provides evidence that the method may be applied to a wide variety of structures.

2. FINITE-DIFFERENCE MODE SOLUTION

Finite-difference methods based on discretizations of the time-harmonic Helmholtz equation have been successfully applied for vectorial-mode extraction.\textsuperscript{5} However, such methods often require special treatment of material boundaries, and the mode solutions obtained often deviate slightly from modes supported by other discretizations (FDTD, for example). Full vectorial-mode solutions have also been demonstrated by applying a Fourier transform to the FD-vector beam propagation method.\textsuperscript{6}

Here we employ a straightforward discretization of the time-harmonic form of Maxwell’s equations, using Yee’s discretization scheme. An obvious advantage is natural compatibility with subsequent 3D FDTD simulations. The method is free of spurious modes since the FDTD gridding scheme automatically satisfies Maxwell’s divergence relations. Also, if material parameters are specified for each FDTD cell, the gridding arrangement ensures satisfaction of appropriate field continuity conditions across material boundaries.

A. Discretization of Maxwell’s Equations

Assuming $\exp(j\omega t)$ time variation and $\exp(-j\beta z)$ longitudinal spatial variation for a propagating mode, we may write Maxwell’s equations for a nonmagnetic medium as

$$H_z = \frac{1}{k_0} \left( j \frac{\partial E_y}{\partial y} - \beta_E E_y \right),$$
\[ E_x = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( \beta_H H_y - j \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial y} \right), \]
\[ H_y = \frac{1}{k_0} \left( \beta E_x - j \frac{\partial E_y}{\partial x} \right), \]
\[ E_y = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( j \frac{\partial H_z}{\partial x} - \beta H_z \right), \]
\[ H_z = \frac{j}{k_0} \left( \frac{\partial E_y}{\partial x} - \frac{\partial E_x}{\partial y} \right), \]
\[ E_z = \frac{j}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( \frac{\partial H_y}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial H_x}{\partial x} \right), \]

where \( E \) denotes electric-field intensity, \( H \) represents magnetic-field intensity multiplied by the free-space intrinsic impedance \( \eta_0 \), and the subscripts \( x,y,z \) denote field component. Also, \( k_0 = \omega \sqrt{\mu_0 \varepsilon_0} \) is the free-space wave number and \( \varepsilon_r \) is the material relative permittivity. To discretize these equations, we use the standard Yee grid assignment collapsed onto a two-dimensional surface as shown in Fig. 1. After applying first-order central differences we obtain

\[ H_{y,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0} \left( \frac{E_{z,ij} - E_{z,i,j-1}}{\Delta y} - \beta_x E_{y,ij} \right), \]
\[ H_{y,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0} \left( \beta_x E_{x,ij} - j \frac{E_{y,ij} - E_{y,i,j-1}}{\Delta x} \right), \]
\[ jH_{z,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0} \left( \frac{E_{s,ij} - E_{s,i,j-1}}{\Delta y} - \frac{E_{y,ij} - E_{y,i,j-1}}{\Delta x} \right), \]
\[ E_{x,ij} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( \beta_H H_{y,ij} - j \frac{H_{z,i,j+1} - H_{z,ij}}{\Delta y} \right), \]

where \( \varepsilon_r \) now represents the relative permittivity averaged over one cell centered about the component on the left-hand side in each equation.

### B. Boundary Truncation Conditions

The FD method requires a truncation condition for the field components at the outer domain boundary. Simple Neumann or Dirichlet conditions are often employed. However, such nonphysical boundaries may induce unacceptable error when placed near the guiding structure. To develop an approach that more closely matches the true field behavior, we note that for a cylindrical waveguide the field profile for the HE11 mode decays outside of the core as \( H_1^1(\lambda \rho) \), where \( \alpha = (\beta_c^2 - \omega^2 \mu_1 \varepsilon_1)^{1/2} \). For \( \alpha \rho > 2 \), the function is approximately \( 1/(\lambda \rho) \exp(-\alpha \rho) \), which provides an approximate functional relationship between fields that lie on the boundary and those just inside the boundary. As shown in Subsection 2.E, use of this boundary condition significantly reduces the required size of the computational grid for a given level of accuracy. Similar localized boundary conditions have been employed in the finite-element method for open-boundary waveguides.

### C. Iterative Linear Method

One approach to solving Eq. (2) is to construct a vector of field components to obtain the matrix equation \( A \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}_0 \), where \( \mathbf{f} = \{ [H_{x,ij}] [H_{y,ij}] [E_{x,ij}] [E_{y,ij}] [E_{z,ij}] \}^T \) and \( \{ \} \) represents a stacking operation. Solving this equation using matrix inversion requires that the forcing vector \( \mathbf{f}_0 \) be nonzero and \( \beta_z \) be fixed. We can make the forcing vector nonzero by fixing one of the field components at a specific node. We then find the value of \( \beta_z \) that minimizes the vector norm \( \| A' (\beta_z) \mathbf{f} \| \), where \( A' \) is the coefficient matrix obtained when no forcing is in effect. The minimization is performed by optimization after specifying an initial guess for \( \beta_z \) from an approximate analytical solution or using the eigenvalue/eigenvector method outlined in Subsection 2.D.

The simulations were performed on a 700-MHz Pentium-based PC with 512 megabytes of memory. The SuperLU package was used to compute sparse linear matrix equation solutions. For a 60 \( \times \) 120 FD grid, each iteration required 15 s. Approximately 100 iterations were required to obtain \( 10^{-5} \) accuracy in the propagation constant.

### D. Eigenvalue/Eigenvector Method

Substituting the expressions for \( jH_z \) and \( jE_z \) in Eq. (2) into the remaining four equations and rearranging those equations produces the relations:  

\[ E_{y,ij} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( j \frac{H_{x,i+1,j} - H_{x,ij} - \beta_x H_{x,ij}}{\Delta x} \right), \]
\[ jE_{z,ij} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon_r k_0} \left( j \frac{H_{y,j+1,i} - H_{y,ij}}{\Delta y} - \frac{H_{x,i,j+1} - H_{x,ij}}{\Delta x} \right), \]
Table 1. Propagation Constant Value and Fractional Error for Various Sizes of the Simulation Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cells</th>
<th>Size (nm)</th>
<th>Zero Bound</th>
<th>Decay Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta \lambda_0$</td>
<td>Fractional Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_x$</td>
<td>$N_y$</td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>$y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>6720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>7680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>8640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Error in the mode $E_x$ field profile for the zero-field boundary condition. The dashed line gives the dimensions of the smallest domain for comparison.

Fig. 3. Error in the mode $E_y$ field profile for the decay boundary condition. The dashed line gives the dimensions of the smallest domain for comparison.

\[
\beta_x E_{x,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0 \Delta x} \left( \frac{H_{y,i+1,j} + H_{x,i+1,j} - H_{x,ij}}{\varepsilon_{r,ij} \Delta x} \right) + \frac{1}{k_0 \Delta y} \left( \frac{H_{y,i+1,j} + H_{x,i+1,j} - H_{x,ij}}{\varepsilon_{r,ij} \Delta y} \right) + \left[ k_0 - \frac{1}{k_0 (\Delta x)^2} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,ij}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,i-1,j}} \right) \right] H_{y,ij},
\]

\[
\beta_y H_{x,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0 \Delta x} \left( \frac{E_{x,i+1,j} - E_{x,i+1,j-1} - E_{x,ij} + E_{x,i,j-1}}{\Delta y} \right) + \frac{2}{k_0 (\Delta x)^2} \left[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,ij}} \right] E_{y,ij},
\]

\[
\beta_x E_{y,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0 \Delta y} \left( \frac{H_{y,i+1,j} + H_{x,i+1,j} - H_{x,ij}}{\varepsilon_{r,ij} \Delta y} \right) + \frac{1}{k_0 (\Delta y)^2} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,ij}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,i-1,j}} \right) - k_0 \left[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,ij}} \right] H_{y,ij},
\]

\[
\beta_y H_{y,ij} = \frac{1}{k_0 \Delta y} \left( \frac{E_{x,i+1,j} + E_{x,i,j-1}}{\Delta y} \right) + \frac{2}{k_0 (\Delta y)^2} \left[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon_{r,ij}} \right] E_{y,ij},
\]

(3)
where \( e_{r,ij}^{x,y,z} \) represents the relative permittivity averaged about the \( E_{x,ij} \), \( E_{y,ij} \), or \( E_{z,ij} \) component, respectively. For small cell sizes, the terms containing \((\Delta x)^2\) and \((\Delta y)^2\) lead to coefficient matrices that have poor numerical conditioning and consequently sparse eigenvalue solvers such as ARPACK have difficulty converging. For fine detail, the eigenvalue method may be used on a coarse grid to obtain an initial guess for \( \beta \), that subsequently may be refined with the linear method. This approach is presented in Ref. 11 for a cylindrical waveguide. In this paper, initial guesses for propagation constants were computed on a 30 \( \times \) 60 FD grid using ARPACK, requiring approximately one minute of computation.

### E. Accuracy of the Mode Solution

In this section the linear solution method is applied to a rectangular dielectric waveguide whose cross section matches the core of the Bragg resonator that will be analyzed in Subsection 2.F. Here, we assess the accuracy of the propagation constant and field shape for the propagating mode with respect to boundary-truncation type, domain size, and cell size. The basic geometry to be simulated is depicted in Fig. 1. Note that error in this section is quantified as the fractional deviation from the most accurate numerical solution obtained (largest-size domain/finest resolution).

1. **Domain Size Dependence**

Table 1 compares the fractional error in the propagation constant for various grid sizes with the zero-field boundary and decay boundary. The cell size is held constant for all computations. Figures 2 and 3 plot the error in the \( E_z \)-field component for the zero and the decay boundary conditions, respectively. This comparison shows that the error produced by the decay condition is an order of magnitude lower than that produced by the zero-truncation condition. The results also indicate that a modest domain size (4500 nm \( \times \) 4800 nm) gives reasonably small error in the propagation constant (\( 10^{-7} \)) and field profile (\( 10^{-3} \)). For all further computations, the decay-truncation approach will be used.

2. **Cell Size Dependence**

Table 2 lists the fractional error in the propagation constant for various cell sizes when the domain size is held constant. These values show that the propagation constant is more sensitive to the discretization than to the domain size. Figure 4 shows the error in the \( E_z \) component of the computed field profile for three of the cases considered.

### F. Bragg-Resonator Guided-Mode Solution

Figure 5 shows the Bragg-resonator geometry under consideration. This geometry is based on the buried heterostructure distributed feedback device cross section given in Ref. 12 with parameters specified at a physical temperature of \( T = 25^\circ \text{C} \) and a wavelength of \( \lambda = 1.55 \mu \text{m} \). The index of refraction \(^{13,14} \) for the cladding (InP) at this temperature is \( n_2 = 3.15 \). The core (Ga\(_{1-x}\)In\(_x\)As\(_y\)P\(_{1-y}\)) is assumed to be matched to the InP lattice with \( x = 0.2 \) and \( y = 0.43 \), giving \( n_1 = 3.35 \) (Ref. 15).

The refractive index in the grating \((n_3)\) is a function of longitudinal position. For the true physical geometry, the grating would have \( n_3 = n_1 = 3.35 \) and the height would be modulated (surface relief). However, modeling such fine detail significantly increases the memory required for simulation. Instead, we use alternate values for \( n_3 \) of 3.35 and 3.33 for our grating modulation, which corresponds to a 10\% modulation in the grating height when viewed in terms of an effective permittivity of the grating. Mode solutions are required only in the unmodulated region \((n_3 = 3.35)\).

The propagation constants and modal field profiles were computed at six different wavelengths by using the iterative linear method to refine the solution from the eigenvalue/eigenvector method. The wavelengths and propagation constants are given in Table 3. FDTD simulations required approximately 2 h to simulate 10 periods of modal oscillation.

### 3. THREE-DIMENSIONAL SIMULATIONS OF BRAGG-RESONATOR SECTION

The Bragg resonator can be divided into sections, each having the geometry depicted in Fig. 6. The section

### Table 2. Propagation Constant Value and Error for Various Simulation Cell Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( N_x )</th>
<th>( N_y )</th>
<th>( x )</th>
<th>( y )</th>
<th>( \beta \lambda_0 )</th>
<th>Fractional Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.95706883</td>
<td>-2.94 \times 10^{-4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.96163969</td>
<td>-6.47 \times 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.96245221</td>
<td>-2.40 \times 10^{-5}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.96273238</td>
<td>-9.92 \times 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.96286096</td>
<td>-3.48 \times 10^{-6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>4800</td>
<td>19.96293039</td>
<td>0.00 \times 10^{0}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Error in the mode \( E_z \) field profile for the decay boundary condition for various grid resolutions.
length of 120 nm was chosen since it is approximately $\lambda/4$ for the guided mode.

FDTD\cite{7,8} was chosen for simulating the 3D Bragg resonator because of its computational efficiency and ease of implementation. FDTD is generally well suited for free-space propagation and scattering problems. When applied to the Bragg resonator, important considerations include the following:

1. Wideband excitation may not be possible owing to wavelength-dependent mode profiles and propagation constants.
2. Discrete stepping in time and finite resolution in the propagation direction will lead to a mode slightly different from that given by Eq. (2), where exact derivatives have been assumed in time and propagation direction.
3. The fields scattered by the 3D geometry will be very weak compared to the incident wave, giving rise to large dynamic range requirements.
4. The error induced by the absorbing boundary condition must be acceptably low. This is particularly important, as the Bragg-resonator frequency response can be highly sensitive to errors in the computed fields.

A. Wideband and Sinusoidal Excitation

By employing an appropriate time-domain waveform, FDTD can obtain the wideband response of many important structures with a single simulation. Since mode profiles and propagation constants will change as a function of excitation wavelength, wideband excitation is not well suited for applications that are very sensitive to error. Thus in this paper separate simulations were run at discrete wavelengths to obtain the transmission and reflection of the Bragg section, and interpolation was applied to obtain results at intermediate wavelengths. Subsection 3.C explains how the guided mode at a single wavelength is sourced in an FDTD simulation.

B. Finite-Difference Approximation

FDTD approximates continuous derivatives in time and space with finite differences. In Eqs. (2) and (3), continuous derivatives are assumed in $z$ and time. To ensure complete compatibility of the mode shape, we must solve Eq. (1) with finite differences in time and space.

Assuming time-harmonic fields, the finite difference ($D_t$) of any field quantity ($F$) with respect to time is $D_t[F(x, y, z) exp(j \omega \Delta t)] = j \omega \sin(\omega \Delta t/2) F(x, y, z) \times \exp(j \omega \Delta t)$, where $\sin(x) = \sin(x)/x$. Thus $k_0$ in Eq. (2) must be replaced with $k_0 \sin(\omega \Delta t/2)$. Similarly, application of finite differences in the propagation direction requires replacement of $\beta_z$ with $\beta_z \sin(\beta_z \Delta z/2)$. These replacements will be used in Subsection 4.B to assess the accuracy of the complete Bragg solution.

C. Dynamic Range: Scattered-Field Formulation for Waveguides

For many waveguide geometries, such as a small section of a Bragg resonator, the field scattered by the obstacle may be significantly weaker than the incident field. In these situations, finite precision arithmetic may produce unacceptable error levels.

To minimize the dynamic range requirements as well as remove the need to absorb the strong incident field at the domain boundaries, we utilize the scattered-field formulation in the FDTD implementation. This approach, which has been used extensively to model electromagnetic scattering in free space, can also be applied to waveguide analysis. In this case, however, the incident field and corresponding geometry are the incident mode and the unperturbed waveguide structure, respectively, where the waveguide material parameters are represented by $\epsilon_i$, $\mu_i$, and $\sigma_i$.

If the actual (perturbed) waveguide geometry is characterized by material parameters $\epsilon$, $\mu$, and $\sigma$, we may write Maxwell’s equations for the scattered fields ($\mathbf{E}_s$ and $\mathbf{H}_s$) as

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E}_s = -\mu \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}_s}{\partial t} - (\mu - \mu_i) \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}^{inc}}{\partial t},$$

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{H}_s = \epsilon \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}_s}{\partial t} + \sigma \mathbf{E}_s + (\epsilon - \epsilon_i) \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}^{inc}}{\partial t}$$

+ $(\sigma - \sigma_i) \mathbf{E}^{inc}$,

where $\mathbf{E}^{inc}$ and $\mathbf{H}^{inc}$ represent the incident modal fields. These equations are identical to Maxwell’s equations for total field with the addition of source terms. For a non-conductive, nonmagnetic medium, we must include a source term only where $\epsilon \neq \epsilon_i$. To illustrate the excitation of the source in the FDTD code, the standard FDTD update equation for $E_s$ is given as

$$E_{s,i,j,k}^{n+1/2} = \frac{\Delta t}{\epsilon} \left( \frac{H_{z,i,j+1/2,k}^n - H_{z,i,j-1/2,k}^n}{\Delta y} ight)$$

$$- \frac{H_{y,i,j+1/2,k}^n - H_{y,i,j-1/2,k}^n}{\Delta z} + G_{s,i,j,k}^{n-1/2},$$

where $G$.
The incident/scattered field formulation introduces an additional term such that

\[ E_{x,ijk}^{inc} = G + \frac{(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \delta E_{x,ijk}^{inc} \bigg|_{t=n\Delta t} \]

\[ = G + \frac{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} (E_{x,ijk}^{inc,n+1/2} - E_{x,ijk}^{inc,n-1/2}), \]

where \( E^{inc} \) is specified by the known mode shape. The second equality employs a finite difference on the incident source to ensure compatibility of the mode in the discretized domain. After the FDTD simulation, scattered fields may be converted to physical total fields by adding the known incident mode shape at each simulation node.

D. Absorbing Boundary Condition: Berenger’s Perfectly Matched Layer for Waveguides

Several absorbing boundary conditions have been applied for waveguide termination: methods based on the one-way wave equation,16,17 PML techniques,18,19 modal eigenfunction expansion approaches,20 absorption based on discrete time-domain Green’s functions for the waveguide,21,22 and filter-bank methods.23 Our problem requires absorption of both guided modes and radiated fields, suggesting the use of robust PML-based methods. Berenger’s PML9 is well suited for free-space scattering problems. To apply the method to waveguide simulation, two different issues must be considered.

1. Propagation into the Perfectly Matched Layer

Past work has demonstrated that the PML technique may be applied to a dielectric waveguide by simply extending the waveguide into the PML and ensuring that the free-space scattering fields may be converted to physical total fields by adding the known incident mode shape. The first equality employs a finite difference on the incident source to ensure compatibility of the mode in the discretized domain. After the FDTD simulation, scattered fields may be converted to physical total fields by adding the known incident mode shape at each simulation node.

The incident/scattered field formulation introduces an additional term such that

\[ E_{x,ijk}^{inc,n+1/2} = G + \frac{(\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \delta E_{x,ijk}^{inc} \bigg|_{t=n\Delta t} \]

\[ = G + \frac{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} (E_{x,ijk}^{inc,n+1/2} - E_{x,ijk}^{inc,n-1/2}), \]

where \( E^{inc} \) is specified by the known mode shape. The second equality employs a finite difference on the incident source to ensure compatibility of the mode in the discretized domain. After the FDTD simulation, scattered fields may be converted to physical total fields by adding the known incident mode shape at each simulation node.
Thus the governing equation for propagation constants does not change across the normal/PML or PML/PML interfaces.

To show that the mode shape is also continuous across the boundary, we write Faraday’s law in the PML medium as

\[
\psi(x, y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} - \beta_z^2 + \omega^2 \mu \varepsilon \psi(x, y) = 0.
\]

(12)

where \(\nabla_T \times\) represents the transverse part of the curl operator \((\nabla = [\partial/\partial x]\hat{x} + [\partial/\partial y]\hat{y})\), and \(\times\) is the cross-product operator. Canceling the \(q_z\) terms leads to the same equation as in the non-PML medium. Repeating this analysis for Ampere’s law shows that the equations for the cross-sectional mode shape are identical in the PML and normal regions.

When applying the PML, a stepped \(n\)-order conductivity gradient is convenient, or \(\sigma(z) = \sigma_{\text{max}}(z/\Delta z)^n\), where \(\sigma_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum conductivity and \(\Delta z\) is the length of the PML. The decay rate at any point in the PML is \(\kappa(z) = \ln(\beta_0 [1 - j \sigma(z)/\omega \varepsilon])\), and the accompanying reflection for the complete PML is \(R = \exp(-2\sigma_{\text{max}} \beta_z \Delta z [\omega \varepsilon(n + 1)])\). To determine the conductivity in our FDTD simulation we compute

\[
\sigma_{\text{max}} = \frac{(n + 1) \ln R \epsilon_0 \omega}{2 \beta_z \Delta z},
\]

(14)

where \(R\) is the specified modal reflection. For each region of different \(\epsilon_r\) in the waveguide cross section, we will have a different \(\sigma_{\text{max}}\) according to Eq. (14). This condition is equivalent to that given in Ref. 24.

2. **Transverse Perfectly Matched Layer**

In order to absorb fields radiated from waveguide discontinuities, we place the PML on the transverse sides (\(\hat{x}\) and \(\hat{y}\)) of the simulation volume. The Helmholtz equation will not be the same in the normal and PML regions, leading to aberrations in the mode shape. However, if the field is weak in the PML region, we expect the effect to be small. To show this, consider the FDTD simulation volume depicted in Fig. 7. The Bragg-resonator waveguide geometry is the same as that shown in Fig. 5. The source for the simulations is an electric wall at the left side of the volume that is forced to the known mode. A ramp function of Gaussian shape and 99% rise time of 3T (3 periods) is applied to avoid initial transients. The steady-state fields are extracted by taking the fast Fourier transform (FFT) of a complete period after 10T and using the sample corresponding to the fundamental frequency. The results of these simulations have been compared with the solution given by an ideal one-dimensional (1D) FD simulation, where discretization applies only in the \(\hat{z}\) direction. The decay boundary condition is used in the FD solver on the transverse walls in order to ensure compatibility of the guided mode.

The results of the computations using the 1D and FDTD solutions were compared in terms of complex-field envelopes at the center of the simulation (on the line \(x = 0, y = 0\)) and on complex-mode envelopes using Eq. (15). The fractional difference between the ideal 1D solution and the FDTD solution was below 5 \(\times 10^{-4}\) and 1.5 \(\times 10^{-5}\) for the simulations with no transverse PML and simulations with transverse PML, respectively. These results indicate that the PML at the domain edges influences negligible error on the mode behavior.

E. **Mode Extraction**

Because of mode orthogonality, the complex envelope of the mode with shape \(M_{ij}\) can be extracted from the fundamental frequency component of the FDTD simulation \(E_{ij,z}\) by using the expression

\[
A_z = \frac{\sum_{ij} E_{ij,z} M_{ij}^*}{\sum_{ij} |M_{ij}|^2}.
\]

(15)

4. **BRAGG-RESONATOR RESPONSE**

FDTD simulations were run for the wavelengths given in Table 3 by using simulation volume dimensions nearly
identical to those of Fig. 7, the only differences being placement of PML in both the $+\hat{z}$ and $-\hat{z}$ directions, more cells in the $\hat{z}$ direction to accommodate the geometry shown in Fig. 6, and removal of the electric wall source.

A. Reflected and Transmitted Fields

To obtain the modal reflection and transmission coefficients for the Bragg section at each simulated wavelength, consider Fig. 6 with $\theta = \pi$ rad at $\lambda_0 = 1550$ nm.

To compute modal reflection, scattered fields are stored in the $xy$ plane at $z = 0$. A FFT is applied to obtain the fundamental frequency component, and the complex envelope ($A_0$) of the mode is computed with Eq. (15). Since the incident mode has unit amplitude and zero phase at the origin, $R_0 = A_0$ is the modal reflection coefficient at $z = 0$. The reflection at plane $A$ in Fig. 6 is then given as $R_A = A_0 \exp(j\beta_z l_0)$. To obtain the transmission coefficient, scattered fields are stored at $z = 120$ nm, yielding the complex modal envelope $A_{120}$. Addition of the incident mode at $z = 120$ nm gives the transmission coefficient from 0 to 120 nm, or $T_{0,120} = A_{120} + \exp(-j\beta_z l_0)$. The transmission coefficient from plane $A$ to plane $B$ is then given as $T_{A,B} = T_{0,120}\exp(j\beta_z (l_0 - l_1))$. Since computational investigations have indicated that $R_0$, $T_{0,120}$, and the propagation constant follow a linear trend versus excitation wavelength, linear interpolation is employed to obtain results at wavelengths between the simulated data points.

For a fixed wavelength, the Bragg response is computed with 1D transmission-line analysis. 26 The values of $R_0$ and $T_{0,120}$ at the six excitation wavelengths are interpolated, $R_A$ and $T_{A,B}$ are computed, and an $S$-parameter matrix is formed for the symmetric Bragg section. Next, the $ABCD$ matrix for the section is computed ($A_S$) and the $ABCD$ matrix for the complete resonator is $A_T = A_S^N$, where $N$ is the number of sections. After converting $A_T$ back to an $S$-parameter matrix, $S_{11}$ and $S_{22}$ give the complex modal reflection and transmission coefficients for the complete Bragg resonator. The response for $N = 10^4$ sections is given in Fig. 8.

B. Error Quantification

Small amounts of error in the single section response may cause more appreciable error in the complete Bragg response. Table 4 lists the primary sources of error and their estimated values. The numbers in boldface in the table represent error values that are most significant: increased mode amplitude due to finite FD grid resolution and an increase in $\beta_z$ due to finite FDTD resolution in the propagation direction. The effect of these sources of error is discussed below.

### Table 4. Sources of Error in the Bragg-Resonator Simulation and Approximate Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Source</th>
<th>$\beta_z$</th>
<th>Mode Shape</th>
<th>$R$ and $T$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD grid truncation</td>
<td>$6.1 \times 10^{-8}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD grid resolution</td>
<td>$-6.5 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML reflection (guided mode)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PML reflection (radiated fields)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite time step</td>
<td>$-1.7 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finite resolution in $\hat{z}$</td>
<td>$6.9 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Error Source: Increased Mode Amplitude**

The finite resolution of the FD method leads to a mode amplitude that is too high in the region of the waveguide discontinuity. Since we are applying the scattered-field
formulation and the error is nearly constant over the waveguide discontinuity, the scattered fields will increase linearly with the amount of error. To assess the impact of this effect, we reduced the magnitude of the complex-mode envelopes extracted from the FDTD simulations by 0.2% (as suggested in Table 4) and again plotted the response. The magnitude of fractional change in the reflection and transmission response was less than 2% and 1%, respectively.

2. Error Source: Increase in $b_z$

The FD-mode solver estimates values for $b_z$ that are too high (~0.07%). At the value of $b_z$ for $\lambda_0 = 1550$ nm, the amount of phase error over the discontinuity length of 120 nm is 0.06°. The resulting error in the phase of $A_0$ and $A_{120}$ is uncertain owing to the multiple reflections in the discontinuity. However, we may explore the effect of phase error by assuming independent distributions on the phase error for $A_0$ and $A_{120}$ and produce a number of Monte Carlo realizations. Plotting the response for several random values will provide an indication of the distribution of the error.

For simplicity we assume the phase shift for $A_0$ and $A_{120}$ to be uniform on [0°, −0.06°]. Figure 9 plots the mean value of transmission and phase of the Bragg resonator along with the response for each of 32 Monte Carlo realizations. The plots show that the most sensitive quantity is the phase of the reflection coefficient near resonances, where reflection is nearly zero. This is reasonable, since we expect numerical difficulty in the computing phase for a small value.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have outlined a method for simulating complex optical devices by applying three basic modeling tools: (1) a 2D FD mode solution technique for finding modes in arbitrary guiding structures, (2) 3D full-wave FDTD analysis of waveguide discontinuities, and (3) network analysis employing a 1D transmission line model. By using the method, we simulated a large (10^4 sections) Bragg resonator. Detailed error analysis indicated that very low error can be obtained for such a problem using this simulation approach. Natural extensions include the simulation of distributed feedback lasers by incorporating gain into the 3D full-wave FDTD simulator.
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