Abstract—In this paper, we present a closed form formulation for the output signals of one-to-\( N \) multimode interference coupler under symmetric excitation. We derive the output ports phases and show that the output phase has a quadratic dependence on the output port number. Using beam propagation simulations, we compare the analytical phase profile with the simulation results for different waveguiding structures. In the case of Si/SiO\(_2\) structures, our formulation predicts the output phase profile with errors not more than about \( 1^{\circ} \). Finally, we show that nonideal effects, such as limited number of guided modes, modal phase errors, and extension of the field profile into the cladding layers have minimal effects on the phase profile in comparison with the output amplitudes. These results can be used in variety of optoelectronic applications, where the knowledge of the phase profile is crucial, such as optical phased arrays.
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I. INTRODUCTION

MULTIMODE interference (MMI) based devices have been widely used in photonic integrated circuits (PICs) as compact-size passive power splitters [1], [2], 90° hybrid couplers [3], and mode-matching stages [4]. MMI-based active devices such as optical switches [5], [6] and phased-array multiplexers [7] have been theoretically studied and experimentally demonstrated. The interest in MMI-based devices stems from properties, such as compact size, low power imbalance, stable power splitting ratio, low cross talk, large optical bandwidth, and high tolerance to fabrication process errors [2], [8], which render such devices suitable for integration in PICs with complex passive networks including power splitters and signal routing. Compared to Y-branches, MMI splitters are smaller and benefit from scalability as the number of the output ports grow large.

Several studies investigated the quality of the output signals in MMI couplers based on power uniformity [3], [9] and image resolution [10]. Also, several techniques have been proposed to improve the signal quality, such as tapered multimode waveguide [11], graded-index waveguides [12], and deeply etched air trenches at the boundary of the multimode section [2].

In addition to being used as power splitters, MMI couplers can be also used in more complex photonic components, where the phase of the output signal is also important, such as 90° hybrid couplers [3] and in high-speed phased-array optical beam steerers [13]. Despite the effort in investigating the power profile at the MMI output ports, the studies of phase profile are much more limited. Bachmann et al. [14] presented general phase relations derived for \( N \times N \) MMI couplers, based on the assumption of the superposition of self-images of equal amplitudes.

In general, the knowledge of the MMI output phase profile is essential, when the phase differences between the signals of different output arms determine the performance of the compact optoelectronic devices that employ a multimode waveguide region to generate several channels, such as optical spatial quantized analog-to-digital converters [15], optical beam steerers [13], and phased-arrayed photonic switches [16]. For example, generalizing a two-channel optical switch based on the phased-array optical beam steering [13] to more than two channel systems is not possible without necessary compensation of the MMI output phase profile.

Symmetrically excited \( 1 \times N \) MMI couplers are the most commonly used power splitters in photonic circuitries, where the number of output ports has been reported from 2 to as large as 64 [17]. In this paper, starting from the field profile at the MMI coupler input, we derive the complex field profile at \( N \)-fold imaging length for symmetrically excited \( 1 \times N \) MMIs, without the assumptions of \( N \)-fold image superposition at the output. The equal power distribution in the ideal case assumed here, where the phase errors at imaging lengths are neglected, is a result of our derivations. Analytical expressions for the output phases are presented based on the derived complex output field profile. Our results confirm the general phase relations predicted in [14] for the case of symmetrically excited \( 1 \times N \) MMI couplers. We compare the results with the beam propagation simulations and examine the source of the output phase errors with respect to the analytical model. Our analysis is most accurate for high-index contrast waveguides. However, image enhancing techniques, such as etched air trenches introduced to define the edges of the MMI coupler [2], make the presented analysis applicable to low-index contrast waveguides, such as polymer-based structures. Finally, we discuss the effect of this technique on the output phase profile, which determine the controllability of the output phased array.

II. MMI COUPLERS

Self-imaging is a phenomenon in multimode waveguides by which an input field profile is reproduced in single or multiple
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images at periodic intervals along the propagation direction of the guide [3]. This effect has been exploited in different MMI-based structures. Several MMI coupler structures have been theoretically studied and experimentally demonstrated [1]–[3], [9], [10], and [17]. In Fig. 1, the multimode waveguide section consists of a W-wide core of refractive index $n_c$, embedded in between cladding layers of $n_0$. In the case of 3-D waveguides, an equivalent 2-D representation can be made by techniques such as the effective index method or the spectral index method [3]. The multimode section can support maximum $M + 1$ number of modes. For each mode $p$, the dispersion relation is given as

$$
\beta_p^2 + \kappa_{yp}^2 = \left( \frac{2\pi n_c}{\lambda_0} \right)^2
$$

(1)

where $\beta_p$ is the propagation constant of the $p$th mode, $\lambda_0$ is a free-space wavelength, and $\kappa_{yp}$ is the lateral wavenumber of the $p$th mode, given as $\kappa_{yp} = (p + 1)\pi/W_c$, where $W_c$ is the effective width for mode $m$ including the penetration depth due to the Goose–Hahnchen shift [2]. The propagation constant $\beta_p$ can be approximated as

$$
\beta_p \simeq \beta_0 - \frac{p(p + 2)\pi}{3L_\pi}
$$

(2)

where $L_\pi = \pi/(\beta_0 - \beta_1) \approx 4n_cW_c^2/3\lambda_0$ [3]. Given the orthogonality of the propagating modes, any input field profile at $z = 0$ can be written as a linear combination of the propagating modes

$$
\Phi(y, Z = 0) = \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \phi_p(y)
$$

(3)

where $c_p$ is the excitation coefficient of the $p$th mode by the given input field profile calculated as the overlap integrals of the $p$th mode and the input field profile [3]. Each excited mode accumulates phase shifts according to its own propagation constant, and therefore, the field profile at any $z = L$ can be represented by

$$
\exp(-j\beta_0 L) \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \phi_p(y) \exp(-j(\beta_p - \beta_0)L)
$$

$$
\approx \exp(-j\beta_0 L) \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \phi_p(y) \exp \left( \frac{j(p+1)\pi}{3L_\pi} \right).
$$

(4)

At $L = 3rL_\pi$ with $r = 1, 2, \ldots$, all the exponential terms in (4) become in-phase with one another and a single image of the input field profile is formed. Generally, an $N$-fold image of the input field profile is formed at $L = 3L_\pi/N$. In the case of symmetric excitation, $\Phi(-y, Z = 0) = \Phi(y, Z = 0)$, only the even modes $p = 2m$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ are excited. We will use this fact in Section III to simplify the field expression at the imaging lengths.

This type of excitation can be realized by a symmetric input field profile fed to the center of the multimode waveguide as demonstrated by Fig. 1. This has been known to result in short $1 \times N$ couplers, where $N$ is the number of output ports [3]. The required length for such a coupler is given as $L = 3rL_\pi/4N$, which is four times shorter than the general case.

In the case of $1 \times N$ couplers, the output power is ideally divided among the output ports, and therefore, the field amplitude at the output ports is $1/\sqrt{N}$. In reality, however, the approximation in (2) becomes inaccurate, especially for the higher order modes in low-refractive-index contrast waveguides. Therefore, the Goose–Hahnchen effect becomes mode dependent and the accumulated phase shift of each mode is different from the ideal case by an error of

$$
\Delta \psi_p \approx \frac{\lambda_0^3(p+1)\pi}{2Nn_c^2W_c^2} \left[ \frac{1}{8} - \frac{\lambda_0n_c^2}{6\pi n_c(n_c^2 - n_0^2)^{1/2}} \right]
$$

(5)

for the $N$-fold imaging length $L = 3rL_\pi/N$ [9]. The existence of these modal phase errors is inherent in the dispersion law of the dielectric slab waveguides. Additional phase errors occur, when the observation plane is shifted away from the paraxial plane [10]. In the case of the symmetric excitation, the accumulated phase error at the $N$-fold imaging length is $\Delta \psi_p/4$. This error would result in nonuniformity in the output power distribution. In the next section, we derive a closed form formula for the output field profile.

### III. Symmetric MMI Coupler Output Phase Profile

Consider the $1 \times N$ MMI coupler shown in Fig. 1. In order to analyze the output properties, such as image resolution, contrast, etc., Ulrich and Kamiya approximated the multimode waveguide propagating modes field profiles with cosine
functions

\[ \phi_p(y) = \cos \kappa_{yp} y \]  

which allowed them to apply the Fourier transform properties to the field presentation in [10]. We adopt the same technique to take the position (in the y-direction) of the images formed into account. In general, nonspurious radiation modes as well as other discrete modes should be considered to fully satisfy the energy conservation law in the vicinity of discontinuity [18]. In our analysis, we ignore such modes for simplicity.

Consider one of the N images of the input field at an N-fold imaging length and shifted in the y-direction to \( y = y_q \). Based on (3), this image can be presented as \( B \phi(y - y_q, z = 0) = B \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \phi_p(y - y_q) \), where \( B = e^{i \phi_q} / \sqrt{N} \), assuming uniform power distribution. \( \theta_q \) is the phase shift at ports that correspond to \( q \) in Fig. 1 with respect to the input signal at \( z = 0 \). Our goal is to derive an analytical expression for the \( \theta_q \) value. Note that the assumption of N-fold image formation and uniform power distribution in the case of symmetric MMI coupler intuitively bridge the derivations in the Appendixes A and B to the analytical expressions of the total field profile at \( L = 3r L_e / N \). However, such assumptions are not crucial at this point but are the results of the derivations. As shown in Fig. 1(a) and (b) for the N images formed at the output ports the lateral shifts of the position with respect to the input image are \( y_q = \pm W_r / 2N, \pm 3W_r / 2N, \ldots, \pm (N - 1) W_r / 2N \), for even \( N \), and \( y_q = 0, \pm W_r / N, \pm 2W_r / N, \pm (N - 1) W_r / 2N \), for odd \( N \). Therefore, at an N-fold imaging length \( (L_0) \) the field profile \( \Phi(y, L_0) \) is

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{q=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(j \theta_q) \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \left\{ \cos \left[ \kappa_{yp}(y + \frac{(2q+1)W_r}{2N}) \right] + \cos \left[ \kappa_{yp}(y + \frac{(2q+1)W_r}{2N}) \right] \right\} \\
+ \cos \left[ \kappa_{yp}(y + \frac{(2q+1)W_r}{2N}) \right] \right\}
\end{align*}
\]

for even \( N \), and

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{q=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(j \theta_q) \sum_{p=0}^{M} c_p \left\{ \cos \left[ \kappa_{yp}(y - \frac{qW_r}{N}) \right] + \cos \left[ \kappa_{yp}(y - \frac{qW_r}{N}) \right] \right\}
\end{align*}
\]

for odd \( N \). In (7) and (8), the symmetry of the structure have been taken into account by letting \( \theta_{-q} = \theta_q \). We can simplify (7) and (8), using the trigonometric identity \( \cos(a \pm b) = \cos(a) \cos(b) \mp \sin(a) \sin(b) \). We also noted that when the multimode waveguide is symmetrically excited, only the even modes of the multimode region are excited, and therefore, \( c_p = 0 \), for odd \( p \) values. Using \( \kappa_{yp}(y) = \kappa_{yp}(2m) y = ((2m + 1)/W_r) \pi \), we can rewrite (7) and (8) with \( c_p = c_{2m} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{q=0}^{N/2-1} \exp(j \theta_q) \\
\times \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \cos \left( \kappa_{y(2m)} y \right) \cos \left[ \frac{(2m + 1)(2q + 1) \pi}{2N} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

for even \( N \), and

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{q=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(j \theta_q) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{q=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(j \theta_q) \\
\times \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \cos \left( \kappa_{y(2m)} y \right) \cos \left[ \frac{(2m + 1)q \pi}{N} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

for odd \( N \). Note that \( M \) is even, and thus, \( M/2 \) is an integer. We can also rewrite the field profile from (4) at a symmetric N-fold imaging length, \( L_0 = 3L_e / 4N \), considering \( p = 2m \)

\[
\Phi(y, L_0) = \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) \exp \left( \frac{j(m(m+1) \pi)}{N} \right).
\]

Note that we have dropped the common factor \( \exp(-j \beta_0 L_0) \) for simplicity, but we will add it back later. In the Appendix A, we have proved that in the case of even \( N \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) \exp \left( \frac{j(m(m+1) \pi)}{N} \right)
= 2e^{j((N-2)/4N) \pi} \sum_{m=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(-j \frac{q(q+1) \pi}{N}) \cos \left[ \frac{(2m + 1)(2q + 1) \pi}{2N} \right].
\end{align*}
\]

Comparing (12) and (9), one can conclude that

\[
\exp(j \theta_q) = \exp \left( j \frac{N - 2}{4N} \pi \right) \times \exp \left( -j \frac{q(q+1) \pi}{N} \right).
\]

Taking the common factor, \( \exp(-j \beta_0 L_0) \), into account

\[
\theta_q = -\beta_0 L_0 + \frac{N - 2 - 4q(q+1) \pi}{4N}
\]

for \( q = 0, 1, \ldots, N/2 - 1 \), where \( q \) is assigned to the output ports as shown in Fig. 1(a). Note that the phase profile is symmetric with respect to the line \( y = 0 \). We can identify that the phase profile has a propagation accumulated phase term, a constant term depending on the number of output channels, which is the same for all the channels, and a term that quadratically depends on the channel number (starting from the middle of the waveguide).
In the case of odd $N$, one can show (see Appendix B)
\[
\sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) \exp \left( j \frac{m(m+1)}{N} \pi \right) = e^{j((N-1)/4N) \pi} \frac{M/2}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} c_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) 
\times \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{q=1}^{(N-1)/2} \exp \left( -j \frac{q^2}{N} \pi \right) \cos \left( \frac{2m+1}{N} q \pi \right) \right). 
\]
\[
\text{(15)}
\]
Similarly, in the case of odd $N$, comparing (15) and (10), one can conclude that
\[
\theta_q = -\beta_0 L_0 + \frac{N - 1 - 4q^2}{4N} \pi 
\]
for $q = 0, 1, \ldots, (N - 1)/2$, where the $q$ values are assigned to the output ports as shown in Fig. 1(b). Again, the phase profile is symmetric with respect to the line $y = 0$. Equations (14) and (16) confirm the general phase relations predicted in [14] for the case of symmetrically excited $1 \times N$ MMI couplers.

**IV. SIMULATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In order to investigate the MMI structure output phase, we performed 3-D semivectorial beam propagation method (SVBPM) simulations using the BeamPROP module in RSoft CAD. In the beam propagation method, the field expression is separated into a slow-varying envelop and a fast-varying phase term. It is also assumed that the propagation is primarily along the propagation direction ($z$-direction). Since boundary conditions of $x$ or $y$ polarization can be incorporated into the finite-difference equation, BPM can be semivectorial [19]. SVBPM simulators can be implemented to reduce the computational expenses when compared to full-field simulators, such as finite-difference time domain. However, BPM simulations cannot handle beams propagating at a large angle to the $z$-axis or backward reflections. In the case of the MMI structures in this paper, we are neither concerned about the backward reflections nor wide angle propagations, thus, we can use SVBPM to find the output phase profile.

Fig. 2(a) shows the field propagation profile of a $1 \times 6$ Si/SiO$_2$ MMI coupler. The refractive indexes of the core and the cladding layers are $n_c = n_{\text{Si}} = 3.47$ and $n_0 = n_{\text{SiO}_2} = 1.45$, respectively. A cross section diagram of the multimode waveguide is shown in the inset of Fig. 2(c). The input and output ports consist of waveguides with $2.5 \, \mu\text{m} \times h$ cross sections, where $h = 0.25 \, \mu\text{m}$ is the thickness of the multimode waveguide [see Fig. 2(c) inset]. In order to compare the BPM simulation results with the analytical formula derived in the Section III, we take one of the middle output ports (for even $N$) [port number 3 in Fig. 2(a)] to be the phase reference, for which the phase is set to zero. Fig. 2(c) compares the output phase profile from the BPM simulations with that calculated using (14).

Note that the high core/cladding layers refractive index contrast in the Si/SiO$_2$ MMI coupler results in well-defined edges along the length of the multimode waveguide. In order to examine the sources of the phase errors and to investigate the validity of the analytical model for phase profile in the case of low-refractive-index contrast, we simulated a polymer waveguide structure composed of ZPU12-RI series polymer materials from ChemOptics [2], where the core and the cladding layers are ZPU12-460 ($n_c = 1.46$) and (ZPU12-450) ($n_0 = 1.45$), respectively. For this MMI structure, input and output waveguides of $5 \, \mu\text{m} \times h$ cross section and $h = 5 \, \mu\text{m}$ are assumed. This MMI structure is adopted from [2] with no air trench along the multimode waveguide. Fig. 2(b) shows the field propagation profile of the ZPU12-RI MMI coupler and Fig. 2(c) compares the simulated output phase profile with the analytical calculations derived in Section III.

Table I compares the BPM simulation results with the analytical calculations for several Si/SiO$_2$ and ZPU12-RI MMIs with the number of output ports varying from $N = 3$ to 12. In the case of Si/SiO$_2$ MMIs, the MMI width $W = N \times 5 \, \mu\text{m}$ and the MMI height $h = 0.25 \, \mu\text{m}$. In the case of the ZPU12-RI MMIs, $W = N \times 10 \, \mu\text{m}$ and $h = 5 \, \mu\text{m}$. In all cases, the MMI length is $L = 3L_{\text{eff}}/4N$, and the input waveguide is excited by a TE-polarized mode. $\lambda_0 = 1600 \, \text{nm}$ and $\Delta x = \Delta \phi = \Delta z = \lambda_0 / 20n_{\text{core}}$. The output ports that correspond to $q = 0$ are taken as the reference, for which the phase is zero ($\theta_0 = 0$). According to Fig. 1, for the middle output port in the case of odd $N$ values
and for the two equivalent output ports in the middle in the case of even $N$ values $q$ is 0.

In the case of the Si/SiO$_2$ MMIs, the output phase values are within about $1^\circ$ of the calculated values from the analytical models in (14) and (16). In the case of the ZPU12-RI MMIs, the average phase profile error with respect to the analytical models is about $5^\circ$. This error can be attributed to modal phase errors expressed in (5), and also the deviation of the modal field profiles $[\phi_p(y)]$ from the cosine-shape functions as the penetration of the evanescent field into the cladding layers is more in lower refractive index contrast waveguides. The modal phase errors are the main cause of nonuniformity in the output amplitudes [9], [10]. Table I indicates that the output phase deviates more from the ideal self-imaging guide analytical model as the output port is shifted away from the paraxial plane ($y = 0$). Therefore, the main source of errors in the phase profile is the deviation of the modal field profiles from the cosine-shape functions. In fact, for large $N$, the output phase values for the ports in the middle of the MMI structure are almost the same as those in the Si/SiO$_2$ MMIs and ZPU12-RI MMIs.

Wang and Chen showed that etching deep air trenches along the multimode waveguide to define the edges of the MMI coupler substantially reduced the lateral penetration depth into the cladding in the case of low-contrast refractive index structures [2]. Therefore, the effective width of all the guided modes is approximately the same as the actual width of the MMI coupler. Hence, the presence of air trenches improves image quality.

In order to investigate the effect of the such air trenches on the output phase profile, we simulated the same ZPU12-RI MMI structures but with air trenches along the multimode waveguide sides. The resulted output phase values are presented in Table I. Introducing the air trenches specially improves the modal field profiles away from the paraxial plane, and therefore, correction in the output phase values is more significant in the outer ports (large $q$) compared to that of the ports in the middle (small $q$) of the MMI structure.

![Fig. 3. The average output phase profile error of the Si/SiO$_2$ MMIs, ZPU12-RI MMIs without air trenches and ZPU12-RI MMIs with air trenches with respect to the analytical model.](image)

### Table I

**Closed-Form Analytical Formulation Results Versus BPM Simulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_4$</th>
<th>$\theta_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-190</td>
<td>-230.4</td>
<td>-270</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-320</td>
<td>-360</td>
<td>-261.8</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-409.1</td>
<td>-450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-65.5</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>-147.3</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-261.8</td>
<td>-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-146.9</td>
<td>-180</td>
<td>-261.3</td>
<td>-299.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-144.6</td>
<td>-177.3</td>
<td>-254.8</td>
<td>-293.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Si/SiO$_2$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_4$</th>
<th>$\theta_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-58.8</td>
<td>-36.6</td>
<td>-25.5</td>
<td>-44.4</td>
<td>-19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-91.1</td>
<td>-89.1</td>
<td>-59.5</td>
<td>-79.7</td>
<td>-131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-123.7</td>
<td>-147.7</td>
<td>-102.3</td>
<td>-123.3</td>
<td>-131.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-230.7</td>
<td>-270.0</td>
<td>-179.6</td>
<td>-215.5</td>
<td>-146.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-319.1</td>
<td>-359.2</td>
<td>-19.8</td>
<td>-254.8</td>
<td>-293.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-408.5</td>
<td>-449.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZPU12-RI (W/ Air Trench)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_4$</th>
<th>$\theta_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-55.9</td>
<td>-34.7</td>
<td>-57.1</td>
<td>-44.1</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-84.8</td>
<td>-25.3</td>
<td>-35.8</td>
<td>-35.8</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-138.6</td>
<td>-131.3</td>
<td>-105.6</td>
<td>-105.6</td>
<td>-64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-172.3</td>
<td>-79.6</td>
<td>-144.6</td>
<td>-144.6</td>
<td>-89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-225.3</td>
<td>-261.4</td>
<td>-209.8</td>
<td>-177.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-321.8</td>
<td>-349.4</td>
<td>-254.8</td>
<td>-293.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-399.9</td>
<td>-442.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZPU12-RI (W/O Air Trench)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta_1$</th>
<th>$\theta_2$</th>
<th>$\theta_3$</th>
<th>$\theta_4$</th>
<th>$\theta_5$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-57.4</td>
<td>-35.3</td>
<td>-57.1</td>
<td>-43.1</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87.0</td>
<td>-25.4</td>
<td>-35.7</td>
<td>-35.7</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-142.2</td>
<td>-101.0</td>
<td>-108.5</td>
<td>-108.5</td>
<td>-65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-176.5</td>
<td>-132.2</td>
<td>-148.0</td>
<td>-148.0</td>
<td>-89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-227.8</td>
<td>-266.2</td>
<td>-180.1</td>
<td>-179.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-317.8</td>
<td>-359.0</td>
<td>-262.3</td>
<td>-299.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-407.0</td>
<td>-448.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the numbers are in degree.
case of the PU12-RI MMIs with air trenches, the output phase of the middle ports are close to the ideal values at large $N$ values, similar to that of the PU12-RI MMIs with air trenches. Therefore, the correction of the output phase of the outer ports by introducing the air trench, results in a smaller average output phase profile error as the $N$ increases.

V. CONCLUSION

We derive analytical formulations for the output phase profile of symmetrically excited one-to-$N$ MMI couplers. The output phase increases quadratically from the middle of the MMI waveguide, which needs to be taken into account for phase-dependent applications, such as optical phased arrays. We compare the analytical calculations with the results of beam propagation simulations for different MMI structures and find that the effect of the penetration of the field into the cladding layers at the side walls is more than the modal phase errors on the output phase profile. However, even in the case of low-refractive-index contrast of $\Delta n = 0.01$, the output phase values are within the $10^\circ$ intervals from the predicted values.

APPENDIX A

PROOF FOR EVEN $N$

In the case of $N = 2K$, $K \in \mathbb{Z}$, we need to show

$$\frac{2e^{j((N-2)/4N)\pi}}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} C_{2m}\phi_{2m}(y)$$

$$\times \sum_{q=0}^{(N/2)-1} \exp(-j\frac{q(q+1)}{N}\pi) \cos\left(\frac{(2m+1)(q+1)\pi}{2N}\right) \times \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} C_{2m}\phi_{2m}(y) \exp\left(\frac{j(m(m+1))\pi}{N}\right) \quad (17)$$

Note that $y$ in (17) is an independent variable. Therefore, in order to prove (17), we need to show that for every $m$, the coefficients of $C_{2m}\phi_{2m}(y)$ on the left and right sides of (17) are equal. Thus, we need to prove

$$\frac{2e^{j((2K-2)/8K)\pi}}{\sqrt{2K}} \sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{q(q+1)}{2K}\pi\right) \times \cos\left(\frac{(2m+1)(q+1)\pi}{4K}\right) = \exp\left(\frac{j(m(m+1))\pi}{2K}\right) \quad (18)$$

which simplifies to

$$\frac{2e^{j((N-2)/4N)\pi}}{\sqrt{2K}} \sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{q(q+1)+m(m+1)}{2K}\pi\right) \times \cos\left(\frac{(2m+1)(q+1)\pi}{4K}\right) = 1. \quad (19)$$

Let us simplify the left side of (19)

$$\frac{e^{j((K-1)/4K)\pi}}{\sqrt{2K}} \times \left\{ \sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{2q(q+1)+2m(m+1)-(2m+1)(2q+1)\pi}{4K}\right) \right. \quad (20)$$

which further simplifies to

$$\frac{e^{j(1/4)\pi}}{\sqrt{2K}} \sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{m-q)^2}{2K}\pi\right) + \exp\left(-j\frac{(m+q+1)^2}{2K}\pi\right). \quad (21)$$

Now, note that

$$\sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{m-q)^2}{2K}\pi\right) + \exp\left(-j\frac{(m+q+1)^2}{2K}\pi\right) = \sum_{q=m+1-K}^{-m+K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right). \quad (22)$$

Consider a set of integer numbers $\{m - K, m - K + 1, m - K + 2, \ldots, m + K\}$. Regardless of $m$, this set modules $2K$ is exactly the same as $\{0, 1, \ldots, 2K-1\}$mod($2K$). It can be easily shown that if $a \equiv b$mod($2K$), then $a^2 \equiv b^2$ mod($4K$), hence $\exp(-j2\pi a^2/4K) = \exp(-j2\pi b^2/4K)$ or $\exp(-j\pi a^2/2K) = \exp(-j\pi b^2/2K)$. Therefore, the expression in (19) is independent from $m$ as follows:

$$\sum_{q=m+1-K}^{-m+K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right) = \sum_{q=0}^{2K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right). \quad (23)$$

From the above-mentioned statements, we can also conclude

$$\sum_{q=0}^{2K-1} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right) = \sum_{q=1}^{2K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right) = \sum_{q=0}^{4K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right). \quad (24)$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{q=m+1-K}^{-m+K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=1}^{4K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}\pi\right). \quad (25)$$

Using the reciprocity law for quadratic Gauss, sums defined as

$$G(N; M) = \sum_{q=1}^{M} \exp(j2\pi Nq^2/M) \quad (26)$$
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we can write the results as follows:

\[ G(N = 1, M) = \sum_{q=1}^{M} \exp(j2\pi q^2 / M) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{M} (1 + j)(1 + e^{-j\pi M/2}) \quad (27) \]

which is equal to \((1 + j)\sqrt{M}\) if \(M \equiv 0 \mod(4)\). Comparing (25) and (27), we can conclude

\[ \sum_{q=m+1-K}^{m+K} \exp(-j \frac{q^2}{2K}) = \frac{1}{2} G^*(1, 4K) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - j) \sqrt{4K} \]

\[ = (1 - j) \sqrt{K} = \exp(-j\pi/4) \sqrt{2K} \quad (28) \]

where \(G^*\) is the complex conjugate of \(G\). Considering (19), (22), (23), and (28), we can write

\[ 2e^{j((N-2)/4N)\pi} \sum_{q=0}^{K-1} \exp(-j\frac{q(q+1) + m(m+1)}{2K}) \]

\[ \times \cos\left(\frac{(2m+1)(2q+1)\pi}{4K}\right) = e^{j(1/4)\pi} \sum_{q=0}^{2K-1} \exp(-j\frac{q^2}{2K}) \]

\[ = e^{j(1/4)\pi} \sqrt{2K} \times \exp(-j\pi/4) \sqrt{2K} = 1. \quad (29) \]

Therefore, we have proved (18) and consequently (17).

**APPENDIX B**

**PROOF FOR ODD \(N\)**

In the case of \(N = 2K + 1\), \(K \in \mathbb{Z}\), we need to prove

\[ \frac{e^{j((N-1)/4N)\pi}}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} C_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) \]

\[ \times \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{q=1}^{(N-1)/2} \exp(-j\frac{q^2}{N} \pi) \cos\left(\frac{2m + 1}{N} \right) q \pi \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{m=0}^{M/2} C_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y) \exp\left(j \frac{m(m+1)}{N} \pi \right) . \quad (30) \]

Similar to the case of even \(N\), since \(y\) in (17) is an independent variable, in order to prove (30), we need to show that for every \(m\), the coefficients of \(C_{2m} \phi_{2m}(y)\) on the left and right sides of (30) are equal. Thus, we need to prove

\[ \frac{e^{j((N-1)/4N)\pi}}{\sqrt{N}} \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{q=1}^{(N-1)/2} \exp(-j\frac{q^2}{N} \pi) \cos\left(\frac{2m + 1}{N} \right) q \pi \right) \]

\[ \times \exp\left(j \frac{m(m+1)}{N} \pi \right) \quad (31) \]

or equivalently

\[ \frac{e^{j((2K)/4(2K+1))\pi}}{\sqrt{2K+1}} \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

\[ + 2 \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2+m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \cos\left(\frac{2m+1}{2K+1} q \pi \right) \right\} = 1 . \quad (32) \]

Consider the left-hand side of (32)

\[ \frac{e^{j((K/2)(2K+1))\pi}}{\sqrt{2K+1}} \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

\[ + \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2+m(m+1)-(2m+1)q\pi}{2K+1} \right) \]

\[ + \exp\left(-j\frac{q^2+m(m+1)+(2m+1)q\pi}{2K+1} \right) \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

which simplifies to

\[ \frac{e^{j((K/2)(2K+1))\pi}}{\sqrt{2K+1}} \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

\[ + \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{(q-m-1/2)^2-1/4}{2K+1} \pi \right) \]

\[ + \exp\left(-j\frac{(q+m+1/2)^2-1/4}{2K+1} \pi \right) \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

and further simplifies to

\[ \frac{e^{j(\pi/4)}}{\sqrt{2K+1}} \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{(m+1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} \]

\[ + \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{(q-m-1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) \]

\[ + \exp\left(-j\frac{(q+m+1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) \left\{ \exp\left(-j \frac{m(m+1)}{2K+1} \pi \right) \right\} . \quad (35) \]

Note that

\[ \exp\left(-j \frac{(m+1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) + \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{(q-m-1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) \]

\[ + \exp\left(-j\frac{(q+m+1/2)^2}{2K+1} \pi \right) \]

\[ = \sum_{q=-K}^{K} \exp\left(-j\frac{(2q+2m+1)^2}{4(2K+1)} \pi \right) . \quad (36) \]

Consider \(q = n(2K+1) + r\), \(-K \leq q \leq K\) and \(0 \leq r \leq 2K\). Then, \(\{q + m\} \mod(2K+1) \equiv \{q\} \mod(2K+1)\) with the same set of residuals \(\{r\}\), for every integer \(m\). In addition,
\( \{2m + 2q + 1\} \mod(2K + 1) \) is the set \( \{2r + 1\} \). Therefore, \( \forall m \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( \forall q \in \{q\}, \exists r \in \{q\} \) so that \( 2m + 2q + 1 = 2p(2K + 1) + (2r + 1) \) for some integer \( p \). We can write

\[
(2m + 2q + 1)^2 = 4p(2K + 1) \left[p(2K + 1) + (2r + 1)^2\right].
\]

(37)

Also note that \( p \left[p(2K + 1) + (2r + 1)\right] \) is always even. Thus, \( (2m + 2q + 1)^2 = 8s(2K + 1) + (2r + 1)^2, \) for some integer \( s \), and

\[
\sum_{q=-K}^{K} \exp \left(-j \frac{(2q + 2m)^2}{4(2K + 1)} \pi \right) = \sum_{r=0}^{2K} \exp \left(-j \frac{(2r + 1)^2}{4(2K + 1)} \pi \right) = \exp \frac{-j\pi}{4(2K + 1)} \sum_{r=0}^{2K} \frac{r^2 + r}{2K + 1}. \tag{38}
\]

Now consider the Gauss quadratic reciprocity law, \( \forall a, b, c, z \in \mathbb{Z}, ac \neq 0 \) and \( ac + b \) even

\[
\sum_{z=0}^{|c|-1} \exp \left(j \pi \frac{az^2 + bz}{c} \right) = \sqrt{|c/a|} \exp \left(j \pi \frac{|ac| - b^2}{4ac} \right) \sum_{|a|-1} \exp \left(j \pi \frac{cz^2 + bz}{a} \right). \tag{39}
\]

Let \( a, b = 1, z = r, \) and \( c = 2K + 1 \), we can see that \( ac + b = 2K + 2 \) is even, therefore, we can use the Gauss quadratic reciprocity law

\[
\exp \frac{-j\pi}{4(2K + 1)} \frac{2K}{2K + 1} \pi = \exp \frac{-j\pi}{4(2K + 1)} \times \sqrt{2K + 1} \exp \left(-j \frac{2K}{4(2K + 1)} \pi \right) = \sqrt{2K + 1} \exp \left(-j \frac{2K}{4} \pi \right). \tag{40}
\]

From (35) and (40)

\[
\frac{e^{j(\pi/4)}}{\sqrt{2K + 1}} \left\{ \exp \left(-j \frac{(m + 1)^2}{2K + 1} \right) \right. + \sum_{q=1}^{K} \exp \left(-j \frac{(q - m - 1)^2}{2K + 1} \right) \left. + \exp \left(-j \frac{(q + m - 1)^2}{2K + 1} \right) \right\} = \frac{e^{j(\pi/4)}}{\sqrt{2K + 1}} \times \sqrt{2K + 1} \exp \left(-j \frac{\pi}{4} \right) = 1. \tag{41}
\]

Therefore, we have proved (31) and consequently (30).
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