3+1D GNLSE Solver Documentation

This code is currently suitable for forward simulation of pulses and CW propagation. While the code is autodifferentiable (written in JAX), and theoretically can be plugged into optimizers, this current distribution of the code contains no additional infrastructure for doing so. This code solves a version of the Unidirectional Pulse Propagation Equation (UPPE), a (3+1)D Generalized Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation (GNLSE):

$$egin{aligned} rac{\partial A(x,y,z,\omega)}{\partial z} = &rac{1}{2eta_{eff}(\omega)}
abla_{\perp}^2 A + \hat{D_{\omega}}(\omega)A + irac{eta_{eff}(\omega)}{2}((rac{n(x,y,\omega)}{n_{eff}(\omega)})^2 - 1)A \ &+ \mathcal{F}_t\{irac{n_2\omega_0}{c}(1+rac{i}{\omega_0}rac{\partial}{\partial t})\{(1-f_R)|A|^2A + f_RA[h*|A|^2]\}\} \end{aligned}$$

The RHS terms describe, from left to right, *diffraction*, *dispersion*, *waveguiding*, and finally nonlinear effects including *Kerr nonlinearity* and *Raman scattering* (tuned between with the *Raman fraction* $f_R \in [0,1]$), and self-steepening. Other mechanisms implemented in code (but not indicated in the above equation) include *gain*, a *saturation intensity*, and perfectly matched layers (PMLs) that prevent undesired back-reflections at simulation boundaries.

Waveguiding, diffraction, dispersion, Kerr nonlinearity, and PMLs have been tested and appear to operate reliably; other effects (e.g., self-steepening, Raman scattering, gain, etc.) have not been thoroughly tested--use at your own risk (or else report anything fishy to me).

Quick Guide to Turning off Effects:

Setting arguments/flags to exactly these values not only ensures they have zero magnitude, but also signals to the code to completely skip those calculations (and speed up sim) where possible.

• Raman Scattering off: turn $f_R=0.0$.

To construct and run a simulation requires specification of the following:

- Source: An initial field of the form A(x, y, t), launched at the z = 0 plane of the propagation medium.
- Medium: defined by the refractive index profile $n(x,y,\omega)$, nonlinear coefficient n_2 , and material dispersion parameters (β_1,β_2) . (Note: β_0 is determined by the source wavelength and the refractive index.) Additional effects might include Raman response (parameterized by t_1 and t_2 , turned "off" by setting), self-steepening effects

gnlse_solver.py: Runs the simulation. The only user-facing function should be

- GNLSE3D_propagate(args, A0, *, event_fn=None, event_payload=None, stop_on_event=True, event_check_every: int=1) → dict(field, dt, dx, seconds, **meta)
 - args: a dictionary containing all physical information about the simulation, including:
 - "Lx", "Ly", "Lz", "Lt": Physical dimensions [m], [s].
 - "Nx", "Ny", "Nt": Grid sizes, ints.
 - "deltaZ", "deltaZ NL": Linear and nonlinear step-sizes [m].
 - "save_at" : Array of z-locations to save A(x, y, t).
 - "lambda0" : Central wavelength of pulse or CW source in free space $[m^{-1}]$.
 - "n2" : Nonlinear coefficient
 - "beta0", "beta1", "beta2": Dispersion coefficients.
 - "gain_coeff", "gain_fwhm": Gain parameters (set coeff to 0.0 to turn off).
 - "t1", "t2":
 - "n_xyomega": Refractive index profile, specified for each frequency.
 - "pml_thickness" : depth of PMLs, in [m].
 - "pml_Wmax" : maximum damping exponent of the PML, in [W/m].
 - "m_nl_substeps" : Number of substeps used in the nonlinear step of integration.
 - "A0" : The initial field at z= , A(x,y,t) . Has dimensions $\, {\sf Nx} \times {\sf Ny} \times {\sf Nz} \,$.

gnlse_medium.py: Contains functions for creating the refractive index profile $n(x, y, \omega)$.

Refractive index profiles:

- make_space(Lx, Nx, Ly, Ny) \rightarrow X, Y
 - Lx , Ly : spatial x/y dimensions of sim.
 - Nx , Ny : spatial x/y grid sizes.
 - X , Y : arrays of physical distances along axes.
 - dim(X)= Nx , dim(Y)= Ny .
 - Use the outputs of make_space as inputs X, Y of the below functions.
- make_polynomial_n(X, Y, n_core, n_clad, r_core, alpha = 2) $\rightarrow n(x,y)$:
 - Returns $n(x,y)=n_{\mathrm{core}}\sqrt{1-2\delta[rac{x^2+y^2}{r_{\mathrm{core}}}]^{lpha}}$ inside core radius, and n_{clad} without.
 - n(x,y) is an $N_x imes N_y$ dimensional array.
 - $\delta = \frac{n_{
 m core} n_{
 m clad}}{n_{
 m core}}$
 - E.g., use $\alpha=2$ for GRIN fiber.

- make_supergauss_n(X, Y, n_core, n_clad, r_core, m=20) ightarrow n(x,y) n(x,y)=1+ -
- make_bulk_n(X, Y, n) $\rightarrow n(x,y)$: Unwritten, will wrap n * jnp.ones((len(X),len(Y)))
- bend_n(n_xy, Lz, a) ightarrow n(x,y,z): Unwritten
- gaussian disorder n: Unwritten.

gnlse_source.py: Contains functions for building transverse and temporal field profiles.

Generating Modes:

- f
- Accessing Modes:

Generating Temporal Profiles:

gnlse_visualizations.py: Contains functions for plotting simulation outputs. These are heavily GPT'ed since they're pretty trivial matplotlib tasks. Presumably the user will DIY most of their own plotting.

gnlse_events.py: Contains functions for implementing event handling in simulations (e.g., halting simulation at onset of self-focusing collapse).

Ziyu recommended a Basler ace camera (this one seems suitable:

https://www.baslerweb.com/en/shop/aca3088-57um/) and a pco.edge 4.2 camera, if we want higher resolution or lower noise: https://www.excelitas.com/product/pcoedge-42-usb-scmos-camera. I think the Basler camera seems adequate for what we're doing, but we can discuss. The Basler ace A3088-57um has:

- 7.41 mm x 4.95 mm sensor area.
- 3088 x 2064 (6 MP) resolution.
- 2.4 micron x 2.4 micron pixel size.
- 59 fps framerate.

Ziyu said he's using a 600×800 pixel Basler, which I think has higher framerate, but (discussed below), I'm not sure (a) we need a framerate higher than what we expect the SLM's to be and (b) I think we have a premium on spatial resolution since we're looking at fine features of the transverse field.

My intuition for specs is probably a little skewed, since my experience is with applications requiring single-photon resolution. That being said, my assumptions for our use-case are as

follows:

- Pixel pitch: two options for reference are either the scale of the SLM pixels (which, I think, are ~ 10s of microns), or (more demandingly) the order of 2-4 times the grid used in simulation (since the pixel-scale features in simulation are somewhat unreliable anyway). So I think higher spatial resolution is actually something to prioritize here, especially as some of our optimization (or Novelty Search) targets may involve "shrinking" feature sizes.
- Quantum efficiency of visible spectrum cameras at 1064 nm is nonzero, but low--but I can't imagine we are at a shortage of photons here.
- I do not have a good sense of how noise works for these high power cases; I don't think we're doing anything so subtle that I can imagine it being a big consideration here, but the pco.edge 4.2 is an option if it's important.
- Assuming our worst-case-scenario output profile dimensions are simply those of ~10 cm linear propagation (diffraction) of a 3 mm diameter, 1064 nm beam, the broadening is effectively negligible. Any sensor of dimensions >= 3 mm by 3mm should be fine--probably at least 5mm by 5mm (without sacrificing resolution) would make life easier.
- The nonlinear propagation distance required will depend on the wedge/block material. Dongjin and I are going to run some bulk media propagation demos for his presentation, so we can double check this 10 cm estimate quickly. However, I strongly doubt it will change this beambroadening estimate drastically.
- Unless I am misunderstanding, I don't think sub-pulse duration-resolving framerates are reasonable or expected here. I imagine our intention is to send one-shape-of-pulse-per-frame, limited by the slower of either the framerate or SLM speed. SLM framerate (from Thorlabs, as reference) is ~ 60 Hz. So we can probably get away with a low framerate on the camera. It seems like we'd want $r_{slm} >= r_{cam}$ anyway, for things to be easily synchronized.