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Abstract

The throughput of submarine transport cables is approaching fundamental limits imposed by amplifier noise and Kerr nonlinearity. Energy constraints in ultra-long submarine links exacerbate this problem, as the throughput per fiber is further limited by the electrical power available to the undersea optical amplifiers. Recent works have studied how employing more spatial dimensions can mitigate these limitations. In this paper, we address the fundamental question of how to optimally use each spatial dimension. Specifically, we discuss how to optimize the channel power allocation in order to maximize the information-theoretic capacity under an electrical power constraint. Our formulation accounts for amplifier physics, Kerr nonlinearity, and power feed constraints. We show that the optimized channel power allocation nearly doubles the capacity of submarine links compared to recently published works. Our solutions also provide new insights on the optimal number of spatial dimensions, amplifier operation, and nonlinear regime operation.

1 Introduction

Submarine transport cables interconnect countries and continents, forming the backbone of the global Internet. Over the past three decades, pivotal technologies such as erbium-doped fiber amplifiers (EDFAs), wavelength-division multiplexing (WDM), and coherent detection employing digital compensation of fiber impairments have enabled the throughput per cable to jump from a few gigabits per second to tens of terabits per second, fueling the explosive growth of the information age.

Scaling the throughput of submarine links is a challenging technical problem that has repeatedly demanded innovative and exceptional solutions. This intense technical effort has exploited a recurring strategy: to force ever-larger amounts of information over a small number of single-mode fibers (SMFs) [1]. This strategy is reaching its limits, however, as the amount of information that can be practically transmitted per fiber approaches fundamental limits imposed by amplifier noise and Kerr nonlinearity [2,3]. In submarine cables longer than about 5,000 km, this strategy faces another fundamental limit imposed by energy constraints, as the electrical power available to the undersea amplifiers ultimately restricts the optical power and throughput per fiber.

Insight from Shannon’s capacity offers a different strategy: employ more spatial dimensions (fibers or modes), while transmitting less data in each [4]. In fact, numerous recent works have studied how this new strategy improves the capacity and power efficiency of ultra-long submarine links [5,6]. But a fundamental question remained unanswered: what is the optimal way of utilizing each spatial dimension? Formally, what is the channel power allocation that maximizes the information-theoretic capacity per spatial dimension given a constraint in the total electrical power? In this paper, we formulate this problem mathematically and demonstrate how to solve it. Our formulation accounts for amplifier physics, Kerr nonlinearity, and power feed constraints. Modeling amplifier physics is critical for translating energy constraints into parameters that govern the channel capacity such as amplification bandwidth, noise, and optical power.

Although the resulting optimization problem is not convex, the solutions are robust, i.e., they do not seem to depend on initial conditions. This suggests that the optimization reaches the global minimum or is consistently trapped in an inescapable local minimum. In either case, the solutions are very promising. The optimized power allocation nearly doubles the capacity per fiber compared to recently published results that employ spatial-division multiplexing (SDM) and flat power allocation. This improvement in capacity is achieved without modifying the submerged plant and only requires altering the terminal equipment.

The optimization also provides new insights into optical link design that challenge long-standing design practices. For instance, we show that the optimal number of spatial dimensions is larger than originally thought [5,7].
2 Problem formulation

A submarine transport cable employs $S$ spatial dimensions, which could be modes in a multimode fiber, cores of a multi-core fiber, or simply multiple SMFs. Throughout this paper, we assume that each spatial dimension is a SMF, since this is the prevailing scenario in today’s submarine systems. Each of those fibers can be represented by the equivalent diagram shown in Fig. 1.

The link has a total length $L$, and it is divided into $M$ spans, each of length $l = L/M$. An optical amplifier with gain $G(\lambda)$ compensates for the fiber attenuation $A(\lambda) = e^{\alpha_{\text{SMF}}(\lambda)l}$ of each span, and a gain-flattening filter (GFF) with transfer function $0 < F(\lambda) < 1$ ensures that the amplifier gain matches the span attenuation, so that at each span we have $G(\lambda)F(\lambda)A^{-1}(\lambda) \approx 1$. In practice, this condition has to be satisfied almost perfectly, as a mismatch of just a tenth of a dB would accumulate to tens of dBs after a chain of hundreds of amplifiers. As a result, in addition to GFF per span, periodic power rebalancing after every five or six spans corrects for any residual mismatches.

The input signal consists of $N$ potential WDM channels spaced in frequency by $\Delta f$, so that the channel at wavelength $\lambda_n$ has power $P_n$. Our goal is to find the power allocation $P_1, \ldots, P_N$ that maximizes the information-theoretic capacity per fiber. We do not make any prior assumptions about the amplifier bandwidth, hence the optimization may result in some channels not being used i.e., $P_n = 0$ for some $n$.

Due to GFFs and periodic power rebalancing, the output signal power remains approximately the same. But the signal at each WDM channel is corrupted by amplifier noise $P_{\text{ASE},n}$ and nonlinear noise $NL_n$. Thus, the SNR of the $n$th channel is given by

$$\text{SNR}_n = \begin{cases} \frac{P_n}{P_{\text{ASE},n} + NL_n}, & G(\lambda_n) > A(\lambda_n) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Note that only channels for which the amplifier gain is greater than the span attenuation can be used to transmit information, i.e., $P_n \neq 0$ only if $G(\lambda_n) > A(\lambda_n)$.

The optical amplifiers for submarine links generally consist of single-stage EDfas with redundant forward-propagating pump lasers operating near 980 nm. In ultralong links, the pump power is limited by feed voltage constraints at the shores. From the maximum power transfer theorem, the total electrical power available to all undersea amplifiers is at most $P = V^2/(2L\rho)$, where $V = 12–15$ kV is the feed voltage, and $\rho \sim \Omega/km$ is the cable resistance. To translate this constraint on the total electrical power into a constraint on the optical pump power $P_p$ per amplifier, we use an affine model similar to the one used in [5,6]:

$$P_p = \eta \left( \frac{P}{2SM} - P_o \right),$$

where $\eta$ is an efficiency constant that translates electrical power into optical pump power, and $P_o$ accounts for electrical power spent in operations not directly related to optical amplification such as pump laser lasing threshold, monitoring, and control. The factor of two appears because there are $S$ spatial dimensions in each direction.

This constraint on the pump power limits the EDFA output optical power and bandwidth, thus imposing a hard constraint on the fiber throughput. As an example, increasing $P_n$ may improve the SNR and spectral efficiency of some WDM channels, but increasing $P_n$ also depletes the EDF and reduces the amplifier overall gain. As a result, the gain of some channels may drop below the span attenuation, thus reducing the amplifier bandwidth and the number of WDM channels that can be transmitted. Further increasing $P_n$ may reduce the SNR, as the nonlinear noise power becomes significant. These considerations illustrate how forcing more power per fiber is an ineffective strategy in improving the capacity per fiber of power-limited submarine cables.

For a given pump power $P_p$ and input power profile $P_1, \ldots, P_N$, we can compute the amplifier gain at each wavelength using the semi-analytical model given in Appendix A. To compute the amplifier noise $P_{\text{ASE},n}$ in a bandwidth $\Delta f$ after a chain of $M$ amplifiers, we use the analytical noise model discussed in Appendix A:

$$P_{\text{ASE},n} = MNF_n h\nu_n \Delta f,$$

where $h$ is Planck’s constant, $\nu_n$ is the channel frequency, and $NF_n$ is the amplifier noise figure at wavelength $\lambda_n$. For amplifiers pumped at 980 nm, the noise figure is approximately gain-and-wavelength independent, and it can be computed from theory or measured experimentally.
Although we focus on end-pumped single-mode EDFAs, similar models exist for multicore EDFAs [8].

To account for Kerr nonlinearity, we use Poggiolini’s additive Gaussian noise (GN) model, which establishes that the Kerr nonlinearity in dispersion-uncompensated fiber systems is well modeled as an additive zero-mean Gaussian noise whose power at the $n$th fiber system is given by

$$\text{NL}_n = \sum_{n_1=1}^{N} \sum_{n_2=1}^{N} \sum_{q=-1}^{1} P_{n_1} P_{n_2} P_{n_1+n_2-n+q} D^{(M \text{ spans})}(n_1, n_2, n),$$

for $1 \leq n_1 + n_2 - n + q \leq N$. $D^{(M \text{ spans})}(n_1, n_2, n)$ is the set of SMF-specific nonlinear coefficients that determine the strength of the four-wave mixing component that falls on channel $n$, generated by channels $n_1, n_2$, and $n_1 + n_2 - n + q$. Here, $q = 0$ describes the dominant nonlinear terms, while the coefficients $q = \pm 1$ describe corner contributions. These coefficients were computed in [9] and are detailed in Appendix B.

We do not include stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) in our modeling for two reasons. First, long-haul submarine cables employ large-effective-area fibers, which reduces SRS intensity. Second, the optimized amplifier bandwidth is not larger than 45 nm, while the Raman efficiency peaks when the wavelength difference is $\sim 100$ nm.

Using equations (1), (2), (3), (4), we can compute Shannon’s capacity per fiber by adding the capacities of the individual WDM channels:

$$C = 2\Delta f \sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{G}(\lambda_n) \geq A(\lambda_n)\} \log_2(1 + \text{GSNR}_n),$$

where $0 < \Gamma < 1$ is the coding gap to capacity and $\mathcal{G}(\lambda_n), A(\lambda_n)$ denote, respectively, the amplifier gain and span attenuation in dB units. The indicator function $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ is one when the condition in its argument is true, and zero otherwise. As we do not know a priori which channels contribute to capacity ($P_n \neq 0$), we sum over all channels and let the indicator function indicate which channels have gain above the span attenuation.

Since the indicator function is non-differentiable, it is convenient to approximate it by a differentiable sigmoid function such as

$$\mathbb{1}\{x \geq 0\} \approx 0.5(\tanh(Dx) + 1),$$

where $D > 0$ controls the sharpness of the sigmoid approximation. Although making $D$ large better approximates the indicator function, it results in vanishing gradients, which retards the optimization process.

Hence, the optimization problem of maximizing the capacity per fiber given an energy constraint that limits the amplifier pump power $P_p$ can be stated as

$$\maximize_{L_{\text{EDF}}, P_1, \ldots, P_N} C$$

$$\text{given } P_p$$

In addition to the power allocation $P_1, \ldots, P_N$ in dBm units, we optimize over the EDF length $L_{\text{EDF}}$, resulting in a $(N + 1)$-dimensional non-convex optimization problem. $L_{\text{EDF}}$ may be removed from the optimization if its value is predefined. It is convenient to optimize over the signal power in dBm units, as the logarithmic scale enhances the range of signal power that can be covered by taking small adaptation steps. Even if we assumed binary power allocation, i.e., $P_n \in \{0, \bar{P}\}$, it is not easy to determine the value of $\bar{P}$ that will maximize the amplification bandwidth for which the gain is larger than the span attenuation.

Note that if we did not have the pump power constraint and the amplifier gain did not change with the power allocation $P_1, \ldots, P_N$, the optimization problem in (7) would reduce to the convex problem solved in [9]. Therefore, we can argue that to within a small $\Delta P_n$ that does not change the conditions in the argument of the indicator function, the objective (5) is locally convex.

Nevertheless the optimization problem in (7) is not convex, and therefore we must employ global optimization techniques. In this paper, we use the particle swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm [10]. The PSO randomly initializes $R$ particles $X = \{L_{\text{EDF}}, P_1, \ldots, P_N\}^T$. As the optimization progresses, the direction and velocity of each particle is influenced by its best known position and also by the best known position found by other particles in the swarm. The PSO algorithm was shown to outperform other global optimization algorithms such as the genetic algorithm in a broad class of problems [11]. Further details of the PSO are given in Appendix C.

When nonlinear noise is negligible, the solutions found through PSO are robust. That is, they do not depend on the initial conditions. When nonlinear noise is significant, different particle initializations lead to the same overall solution, but these solutions differ by small random variations. To overcome this problem, once the PSO algorithm stops, we continue the optimization using the saddle-free Newton’s (SFN) method [12]. This variant of Newton’s method is suited to non-convex problems, as it is not attracted to saddle points. It requires knowledge of the Hessian matrix, which can be computed analytically or through finite differences of the gradient. Further details of the SFN method are given in Appendix C.

### 3 Results

We now apply our proposed optimization procedure to the reference system with parameters listed in Table 1. These parameters are consistent with recently published experimental demonstration of high-capacity systems employing SDM [7]. We consider $M = 287$ spans of $l = 50$
Figure 2: Optimized power allocation $P_n$ for several values of pump power $P_p$. Kerr nonlinearity is disregarded in (a) and included in (b). Their corresponding achievable spectral efficiency is shown in (c) and (d). Note that $P_n$ corresponds to the input power to the amplifier. The launched power is $P_{\text{launch},n} = G_n P_n P = A_n P_n$. Thus, the launch power is 9.5 dB above the values shown in these graphs.

Table 1: Simulation parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Link length ($L$)</td>
<td>14,350</td>
<td>km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span length ($l$)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of amplifiers per fiber ($M$)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First channel ($\lambda_1$)</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last channel ($\lambda_M$)</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel spacing ($\Delta\lambda$)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum number of WDM channels ($N$)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF attenuation coefficient ($\alpha_{\text{SMF}}(\lambda)$)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>dB km$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF dispersion coefficient ($D(\lambda)$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ps nm$^{-1}$ km$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF nonlinear coefficient ($\gamma$)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>W$^{-1}$ km$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF additional loss (margin)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span attenuation ($A(\lambda)$)</td>
<td>$8 + 1.5 = 9.5$</td>
<td>dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonlinear noise power scaling ($\varepsilon$)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coding gap ($\Gamma$)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmoid sharpness ($D$)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise figure (NF$_n$)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

km of low-loss large-effective area SMF, resulting in a total link length of $L = 14,350$ km. The span attenuation is $A(\lambda) = 9.5$ dB, where 8 dB is due to fiber loss, and the additional 1.5 dB is added as margin. For the capacity calculations we assume a coding gap of $\Gamma = 0.79$ (−1 dB).

Fig. 2 shows the optimized power allocations obtained when Kerr nonlinearity is (a) disregarded and (b) included. The corresponding achievable spectral efficiency of each WDM channel is shown in Fig. 2(c) and (d). For small pump powers, the optimized power profile is limited by the amplifier, and thus there is a small difference between the two scenarios. As the pump power increases and the amplifier delivers more output power, Kerr nonlinearity becomes the limiting factor of the channel power. Interestingly, the optimized power allocation in the nonlinear regime exhibits large oscillations at the extremities because the nonlinear noise is smaller at those channels. Although the optimization was performed for 150 possible channels from 1522 nm to 1582 nm, not all of these WDM channels are utilized, and the useful bandwidth is restricted to $\sim 1525$ nm to $\sim 1570$ nm. The amplifier bandwidth does not change significantly because it is fundamentally limited by the absorption and gain coefficients of the EDF, which depend only on the EDF design and co-dopants. The optimized EDF length does not vary significantly, and it was generally in the range of 7 to 9 m.

The solid lines in Fig. 2(c) and (d) were obtained from (5) by using exact models for the amplifier gain and noise, while the dashed lines were computed by making approximations to allow (semi-)analytical calculation of amplifier gain and noise (see Appendix A), and speed up the optimization process. Fig. 2(c) and (d) shows that these approximations only cause negligible errors.
Fig. 3(a) shows the total capacity per fiber as a function of the pump power. Below about 50 mW of pump power, the system operates in the linear regime. At higher pump powers, the amplifier can deliver higher optical power, but Kerr nonlinearity becomes significant and detains the capacity. This illustrates the diminishing returns of forcing more power over a single spatial dimension. The red circle corresponds to the capacity per fiber calculated according to (5) for the system described in [7] with flat power allocation. In their experimental setup, Sinkin et al achieved 8.2 Tb s$^{-1}$ per spatial dimension.

Fig. 3(b) shows the capacity per fiber as a function of the span length for a fixed power budget. The span attenuation for all cases was calculated as $A = \alpha_{\text{SMF}}l + 1.5$, where the 1.5 dB of additional attenuation is added as a margin. The total pump power per fiber was assumed $P_{p,\text{total}} = 287 \times 50 = 14350$ mW. Hence, making the span length shorter reduces the pump per amplifier. The optimal span length is achieved for 45–50 km, resulting in a span attenuation of 8.7–9.5 dB.

The optimal strategy is therefore to employ more spatial dimensions while transmitting less power in each one. The optimal number of spatial dimensions depends on the available electrical power budget. As an example, Fig. 4 shows the capacity improvement with respect to using just one spatial dimension for several values of overhead power $P_o$. We consider the feed voltage $V = 12$ kV, cable resistivity $\rho = 1$ $\Omega$ km$^{-1}$, efficiency $\eta = 0.4$, and the reference link of Table 1. With these parameters we can compute the pump power per amplifier, and obtain the capacity per fiber from Fig. 3(a).

The optimal number of spatial dimensions decreases as the overhead power increases. For small values of $P_o$, the optimal number of spatial dimensions is very large, illustrating the benefits of employing more spatial dimensions.

An important practical consideration for submarine systems is their ability to recover when the input power drops significantly due to faulty components or pump failure. Thus, submarine amplifiers are designed to operate in high gain compression, so that the power level can recover from these events after a few spans. We show that the optimized input power profile and ampli-
Ampifier operation can still recover from such events. Fig. 5 illustrates the power variation with respect to the optimized power profile when one of the two pump lasers in an amplification module fails. The failure occurs at the span indexed by zero. The amplifier operates with redundant pumps resulting in $P_p = 50 \text{ mW}$, and in the event of a single-pump failure the power drops to $P_p = 25 \text{ mW}$. The signal power in the channels at the extremities of the spectrum are restored with just two spans. Capacity is not significantly affected by a single-pump failure, since the amplifier noise increases by less than 0.5 dB in all channels. Although the power levels could still be restored in the event that the two pump lasers fail, the total amplifier noise power would be about 10 dB higher in some channels.

4 Conclusion

We have demonstrated how to maximize the information-theoretic capacity of ultra-long submarine systems by optimizing the channel power allocation in each spatial dimension. Our models account for EDFA physics, Kerr nonlinearity, and power feed limitations. Modeling EDFA physics is paramount to understanding the effects of energy limitations on amplification bandwidth, noise, and optical power, which intimately govern the system capacity. We show that this optimization nearly doubles the capacity of recently proposed high-capacity systems. Our optimization also provides new insights on the optical power, which intimately govern the system capacity. We show that this optimization nearly doubles the capacity of recently proposed high-capacity systems. Our proposed technique could be used in existing systems, and also to design future systems leveraging SDM.

Figure 5: Difference in signal power with respect to correct power allocation in the event of a single pump failure at the span indexed by zero. After about two spans the power levels are restored to their correct values.

Figure 6: Absorption and gain coefficients for the EDF used in this paper. C-band is highlighted. For the pump at 980 nm, $\alpha_p = 0.96 \text{ m}^{-1}$, and $g_k^* = 0 \text{ m}^{-1}$. Other relevant parameters are $r_{Er}^2 = 1.38 \mu\text{m}$, $\bar{n}_t = 5.51 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^3$.

A Amplifier physics

The steady-state pump and signal power evolution along an EDF of length $L_{EDF}$ is well modeled by the standard confined-doping (SCD) model [13], which for a two-level system is described by a set of coupled first-order differential equations:

$$
\frac{d}{dz} P_k(z) = u_k(\alpha_k + g_k^*) \frac{\bar{n}_2}{\bar{n}_t} P_k(z) - u_k \alpha_k P_k(z) + 2u_k g_k^* \frac{\bar{n}_2}{\bar{n}_t} \bar{n}_t \hbar \nu_k \Delta f \quad (8)
$$

$$
\frac{\bar{n}_2}{\bar{n}_t} = \sum_k \frac{P_k(z) \lambda_k}{\hbar \nu_k \zeta} \frac{\bar{n}_t}{\hbar \nu_k \zeta} \sum_k \frac{P_k(z) \lambda_k (\alpha_k + g_k^*)}{\hbar \nu_k \zeta} \quad (9)
$$

where the subindex $k$ indexes both signal and pump i.e., $k \in \{p, 1, \ldots, N\}$, $z$ is the position along the EDF, and $\mu_k = 1$ for beams that move in the forward direction i.e., increasing $z$, and $\mu_k = -1$ otherwise. $\alpha_k$ is the absorption coefficient, $g_k^*$ is the gain coefficient, and $\bar{n}_2/\bar{n}_t$ denotes the population of the second metastable level normalized by the Er ion density $\bar{n}_t$. $\zeta = \pi r_{Er}^2 \bar{n}_t / \tau$ is the saturation parameter, where $r_{Er}$ is the Er-doping radius, and $\tau \approx 10 \text{ ms}$ is the metastable lifetime. According to this model, the amplifier characteristics are fully described by three macroscopic parameters, namely $\alpha_k$, $g_k^*$, and $\zeta$. Fig. 6 shows $\alpha_k$ and $g_k^*$ for the EDF used in our simulations for this paper. The first term of (8) corresponds to the medium gain, the second term accounts for absorption, and the third term accounts for amplified spontaneous emission (ASE) noise.
To compute the amplifier gain and noise using \(\mathbf{8}\), we must solve the boundary value problem (BVP) of \(N + 1 + 2N\) coupled equations, where we have \(N\) equations for the signals, one for the pump, and the noise at the signals’ wavelengths is broken into \(2N\) equations: \(N\) for the forward ASE, and \(N\) for the backward ASE.

Although \(\mathbf{8}\) is very accurate, the optimizations require evaluation of the objective function hundreds of thousands of times, which would require solving the BVP in \(\mathbf{8}\) that many times. Hence, approximations for the gain and noise are necessary.

By assuming that the amplifier is not saturated by ASE, equation \(\mathbf{8}\) reduces to a single-variable implicit equation \(\mathbf{14}\), which can be easily solved numerically. According to this model, the amplifier gain is given by

\[
G_k = \exp \left( \frac{\alpha_k + g_k^*}{\zeta} (Q_k^{in} - Q_k^{out}) - \alpha_k L_{EDF} \right) \tag{10}
\]

where \(Q_k^{in} = \frac{P_k}{\hbar \nu_k}\) is the photon flux in the \(k\)th channel, and \(Q_k^{in} = \sum_k Q_k^{in}\) is the total input photon flux. The output photon flux \(Q_k^{out}\) is given by the implicit equation:

\[
Q_k^{out} = \sum_k Q_k^{in} \exp \left( \frac{\alpha_k + g_k^*}{\zeta} (Q_k^{in} - Q_k^{out}) - \alpha_k L_{EDF} \right) \tag{11}
\]

Therefore, to compute the amplifier gain using the semi-analytical model, we must first solve (11) numerically for \(Q_k^{out}\), and then compute the gain using (10). This procedure is much faster than solving \(\mathbf{8}\).

The semi-analytical model is useful to compute the gain, but it does not give us any information about the noise power. Thus, we must use a further simplification. By assuming that the amplifier is inverted uniformly, equation \(\mathbf{8}\) can be solved analytically resulting in the well-known expression for ASE power in a bandwidth \(\Delta f\) for a single amplifier:

\[
P_{ASE,n} = 2n_{sp,n} (G_n - 1) \hbar \nu_n \Delta f \tag{12}
\]

where \(n_{sp}\) is the excess noise factor \([13, \text{equation (32)}]\]. The excess noise factor is related to the noise figure \(NF_n = 2n_{sp,n} \frac{G_n - 1}{G_n\lambda_n - 1}\), where the commonly used high-gain approximation \(\frac{G_n\lambda_n - 1}{G_n\lambda_n - 1} \approx 1\) may be replaced by the more accurate approximation \(\frac{G_n\lambda_n - 1}{G_n\lambda_n - 1} \approx 1 - e^{-\alpha_{SMF} L}\), since in submarine systems the amplifier gain is approximately equal to the span attenuation, which is on the order of 10 dB. This approximation conveniently makes the amplifier noise figure independent of the amplifier gain.

\[D_q^{(1 span)}(n_1, n_2, n) = \frac{16}{27 \gamma^2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \rho(x + n_1) \Delta f, (y + n_2) \Delta f, (z + n) \Delta f \cdot \text{rect}(x + y - z + q) dx dy dz, \tag{13}\]

\[
\rho(f_1, f_2, f) = \left| 1 - \exp(-\alpha_l + j 4 \pi^2 \beta_2 (f_1 - f)(f_2 - f)) \right|^2, \tag{14}\]

where \(\text{rect}(\omega) = 1\) for \(|\omega| \leq 1/2\), and \(\text{rect}(\omega) = 0\) otherwise. Equation (13) assumes that all channels have a rectangular spectral pulse shape.

Computing \(D_q^{(1 span)}(n_1, n_2, n)\) is computationally less intensive than \(D_q^{(M spans)}(n_1, n_2, n)\), since the highly oscillatory term \(\chi(f_1, f_2, f)\) in \(D_q^{(M spans)}(n_1, n_2, n)\) is constant and equal to one in \(D_q^{(1 span)}(n_1, n_2, n)\). The nonlinear coefficients for \(M\) spans can be computed by following the nonlinear power scaling given in \([15]\):

\[
D_q^{(M spans)}(n_1, n_2, n) = M^{1+\epsilon} D_q^{(1 span)}(n_1, n_2, n), \tag{15}\]

where the parameter \(\epsilon\) controls the nonlinear noise scaling over multiple spans, and for bandwidth of \(\sim 40\) nm (e.g., 100 channels spaced by 50 GHz), it is approximately equal to 0.06 \([15]\). The parameter \(\epsilon\) may also be computed from the approximation \([15, \text{eq. (23)}]\).

\section{Optimization algorithms}

The particle swarm algorithm (PSO) randomly initializes \(R\) particles \(X = [L_{EDF}, P_1, \ldots, P_N]^T\). As the optimization progresses, the direction and velocity of the ith particle is influenced by the its best known position and also by the best known position found by other particles in the swarm:

\[v_i \leftarrow w v_i + \mu_1 a_i (p_{i,best} - X_i) + \mu_2 b_i (s_{best} - X_i) \tag{velocity}\]

\[X_i \leftarrow X_i + v_i \tag{location}\]

where \(w\) is an inertial constant chosen uniformly at random in the interval \([0.1, 1.1]\), \(\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1.49\) are the adaptation constants, \(a_i, b_i \sim U[0, 1]\) are uniformly distributed random variables, \(p_{i,best}\) is the best position visited by the ith particle, and \(s_{best}\) is the best position visited by the swarm.

To speed up convergence and avoid local minima, it is critical to initialize the particles \(X = [L_{EDF}, P_1, \ldots, P_N]\) to within close range of the optimal solution. From the nature of the problem, we can limit the particles to a very narrow range. The EDF length is limited from 0
to 20 m. Since the amplifier gain will be relatively close to the span attenuation $A(\lambda) = e^{\alpha_{SMF}}$, we can compute the maximum input power to the amplifier that will allow this gain for a given pump power $P_p$. This follows from conservation of energy [16, eq. 5.3]:

$$P_n < \frac{1}{N} \frac{\lambda_p P_p}{\lambda_n A(\lambda)}$$

(16)

where $\lambda_p$ is the pump wavelength, $\lambda_n$ is the signal wavelength, and $N$ is the expected number of WDM channels that will be transmitted. The minimum power is assumed to be 10 dB below this maximum value.

When nonlinear noise power is small, the solution found by the PSO does not change for different particle initializations. However, the solutions found by PSO when nonlinear noise is not negligible exhibit some small and undesired variability. To overcome this problem, after the PSO converges, we continue the optimization using the saddle-free Newton’s method [12]. According to this algorithm, the adaptation step $X \leftarrow X + \Delta X$ is given by

$$\Delta X = -\mu |H|^{-1} \nabla C,$$

(17)

where $\mu$ is the adaptation constant, $\nabla C$ is the gradient of the capacity in [5] with respect to $X$, and $H$ is the Hessian matrix, i.e., the matrix of second derivatives of $C$ with respect to $X$. The absolute value notation in $|H|$ means that $|H|$ is obtained by replacing the eigenvalues of $H$ with their absolute values.

Both the gradient and the Hessian can be derived analytically by using the semi-analytical model given in equations (10) and (11). However, we compute the gradient analytically and compute the Hessian numerically using finite differences of the gradient.
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