Effect of mask discretization on performance of silicon arrayed waveguide gratings


Abstract—We studied the impact of the lithography mask discretization on silicon arrayed waveguide grating performance. When we decreased the mask grid from 5nm to 1nm, we observed an experimental improvement in crosstalk of 2.7-6.0dB and cumulative crosstalk improvement of 1.2-5.0dB, depending on the wavelength channel spacing and the number of output channels. We demonstrate the effect for AWGs with 200GHz and 400GHz channel spacing, with 4, 8 and 16 output wavelength channels. With 1nm mask grid the average crosstalk is -26dB and -23dB for 400GHz and 200GHz devices, respectively. This is the lowest crosstalk for silicon AWGs reported to our knowledge. A simulation study is performed by looking specifically at phase errors due to mask grid snapping (ignoring other phase error sources), which shows an expected improvement in crosstalk of 12dB.

I. INTRODUCTION

Arrayed waveguide gratings (AWGs) are one of the commonly used photonics integrated components for wavelength de/multiplexing [1]. For WDM communication applications it is desirable to have an AWG with low loss and low crosstalk. This drives research interest to improve the performance of AWGs in various material systems for different wavelength ranges. Any material system imposes design restrictions and/or opportunities for AWGs, largely depending on the refractive index contrast of the waveguides. For instance, in silicon-on-insulator the high contrast waveguides allow sharp bends to reduce the device footprint but they are also extremely sensitive to phase errors, which reduces the margin of error of both the design and fabrication. On the other hand, lower contrast material platforms such as silica [2] and InP [3] are much more relaxed in terms of design and fabrication, but the devices become much larger which reduces the integration density. Other than phase errors, high contrast waveguides typically suffer from higher propagation losses. Despite the higher propagation losses in silicon waveguides, the overall insertion loss of an AWG can be kept reasonably low because of the compact device size. Still, the high phase error sensitivity will increase the overall crosstalk of the silicon AWG, being one of the key factors that limit AWG performance in this material system.

In general, the phase errors of a fabricated AWG are not determined by the design but by fabrication imperfections. The effects of fabrication imperfections on the performance of a silicon AWG can be partly reduced by engineering the design of the AWG [4]–[7]. Still, this works only to a certain extent, as fabrication imperfections are difficult to reduce or remove completely. For instance, mask discretization will inevitably introduce phase errors, as grid snapping will change the length of the waveguides. This mask discretization is entirely dependent on the available mask making technology. In this paper we demonstrate the effect of mask discretization on the performance of silicon AWGs, and experimentally show that a smaller mask grid can result in a dramatic improvement of the crosstalk.

II. PHASE ERRORS

The crosstalk in a silicon AWG is the combined effect of many mechanisms: the phase errors that are accumulated along the delay lines, reflections, defocusing in the free propagation regions (FPR), and cross-coupling in the array. It is not straightforward to separate the contributions of each of these mechanisms, although past experiments have already significantly reduced the contribution of some of these effects. E.g. the effect of reflection were reduced by using double-etched apertures [4].

The key contributor to crosstalk in recent silicon AWGs remain the phase errors [4]–[8]. When the distributed light in the waveguides recombines in the free propagation region...
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In operational conditions when all the input channels are active, the crosstalk of all channels (which is further referred to as the cumulative crosstalk) will be added linearly, which results in a much higher effective crosstalk. In Fig. 3 the conventional crosstalk and the cumulative crosstalk of the center channel are indicated: the conventional crosstalk is defined by the difference between the crosstalk floor and the peak power of the channel. We define the cumulative crosstalk as the difference between the peak power in the channel and the cumulative power coupled to the other channels, added up over the wavelength band of the channel. The cumulative crosstalk has two major contributions: at the edges of the wavelength band it is dominated by the slope of the nearest neighbor channel (further referred to as neighboring channel contributed crosstalk) and the center part which is mainly caused by phase errors (further referred to as phase error contributed cumulative crosstalk). The neighboring channel contributed crosstalk depends on the channel bandwidth, which can be decreased by increasing the number of waveguides used in the array [6].

To elaborate the effect of mask discretization on the performance of a SOI AWG we designed a set of AWGs with 4, 8 and 16 wavelength channels AWGs for both 200GHz and 400GHz channel spacings. The AWGs were designed for IMEC’s passive silicon photonics platform, using a 220nm thick silicon guiding layer on top of a 2μm oxide layer using a double etch process: a 220nm deep etch to define high contrast photonics wires and a 70nm etch to define grating couplers and low contrast waveguides (also referred as shallow etch). Patterns were defined using 193nm UV lithography. See [6], [7] for further design details of the SOI AWGs. We used the same design to generate two set of AWGs on the same mask with 1nm and 5nm grid snapping. Independent of channel spacing, for the same number of wavelength channels we used the same number of waveguides: 24, 40 and 72 waveguides for 4, 8 and 16 channels AWGs respectively. For an equal number of wavelength channels and an equal number of waveguides the delay length of the 200GHz device will be twice the delay length of the 400GHz device. This will increase the influence of phase errors due to the sidewall roughness.
IV. SIMULATION

The AWGs were simulated using a semi-analytical model [6] integrated in our design software (IPKISS) [9], [10]. As we want to illustrate the effect on the crosstalk due to the phase errors introduced by the grid snapping we didn’t include any stochastic phase error due to sidewall roughness in the simulation. Figure 5 shows the simulated spectral response of the 8th channel of the 16 × 400GHz AWG without grid snapping, and for 1nm and 5nm snapping. The simulation indicates, as expected, that the insertion loss will not be affected significantly while the crosstalk floor will increase due to the coarser mask grid. In the simulation we can see that the crosstalk is improved by 12dB as we change the grid from 5nm to 1nm.

V. EXPERIMENT

We fabricated those devices on a 200nm SOI wafer. They were discretized on a 1nm and 5nm grid, and positioned side by side on the same photomask and fabricated together in the same process. To characterize the AWGs the input and output channels are connected to 1D grating couplers and we normalize the transmission spectrum of the AWGs to that of a straight waveguide with the same type of grating couplers. The optical fibers are aligned to the grating couplers with an automated alignment setup, which uses a reproducible and wavelength-corrected algorithm to align with an accuracy of 0.01μm in X, Y, Z directions.

Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 show the measured spectral responses of 16 × 200GHz and 16 × 400GHz AWGs using 5nm and 1nm grid snapping. For the 16 × 400GHz AWGs the crosstalk floor drops from -21dB (for the 5nm grid) to -26dB (for the 1nm grid) [11]. For the 16 × 200GHz AWGs the crosstalk floor drops from -19.8dB (for the 5nm grid) to -22.5dB (for the 1nm grid). We see that the crosstalk is substantially higher than the simulated AWGs, because other crosstalk mechanisms are still present, mainly the phase error contribution of the sidewall roughness, which is also the reason behind the smaller improvement for the 200GHz device as the delay length is double that of the 400GHz AWGs: 21.86μm for 16 × 200GHz and 10.93μm for 16 × 400GHz AWGs.

The cumulative crosstalk is -17dB and -22 dB for 400GHz AWGs using the 5nm and 1nm grid, respectively. For 200GHz AWGs the cumulative crosstalk improves from -15dB for 5nm grid to -17dB for the 1nm grid. Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 show that for 5nm grid devices the neighboring channel contributed cumulative crosstalk is almost equal to the phase error contributed cumulative crosstalk as the channel overlap is minimal. For the 1nm grid the neighboring channel contributed cumulative crosstalk is dominating due to the reduction of the discretization induced phase errors. This neighboring channel
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>845×243</td>
<td>-1.9→2.3</td>
<td>-1.7→2.6</td>
<td>-18.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>468×237</td>
<td>-2.2→2.5</td>
<td>-1.8→2.2</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-20.3</td>
<td>-24.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>873×308</td>
<td>-1.5→2.7</td>
<td>-1.9→3.1</td>
<td>-20.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td>-19.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>490×307</td>
<td>-2.3→3.7</td>
<td>-1.3→2.7</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-21.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>920×446</td>
<td>-1.6→3.6</td>
<td>-2.0→3.7</td>
<td>-19.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>530×435</td>
<td>-1.5→3.5</td>
<td>-1.5→3.5</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 7. Experimental transmission spectrum of 16 × 400GHz AWG using 5nm and 1nm grid snapping. Black line indicates the cumulative power of the device.

VI. CONCLUSION

We demonstrate a significant improvement in silicon AWGs by going from a 5nm mask discretization to a 1nm mask grid. We see an experimental improvement of 2.7 to 6dB in crosstalk and 1.2 to 5.0dB in cumulative crosstalk due to snapping-related phase errors depending the channel spacing and number of output channel.
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