

On the mathematical description of combined PMD-PDL effects in optical communications and how their induced impairments can be minimized

CARLOS L. JANER

Departamento de Ingeniería Electrónica, Escuela Superior de Ingenieros,
Sevilla 41092, Spain
janer@us.es

August the 19th 2022

In this paper I show that the correct mathematical framework of combined PMD-PDL effects in optical fibers is the irreducible spinor representation of the Lorentz Group. Combined PMD-PDL effects are shown to be formally identical to Lorentz Transformations acting on spin $\frac{1}{2}$ zero mass particles. Since there are two different irreducible spinor representations of the restricted Lorentz group, there must also exist two kinds of states of polarizations (SOPs) that are relevant in the description of PMD-PDL effects. The optical process that allows to convert one kind into the other is identified as optical phase conjugation. Optical phase conjugation plays the same role as the time inversion operator in the Lorentz Group representation theory. A practical and very important example of utility of these ideas, a technique that very significantly reduces the PMD-PDL induced impairments, is presented.

The main purpose of this paper is to show that the mathematical formulation that correctly describes polarization issues in optical communication is the spinor irreducible representation theory of the Lorentz Group. Combined PMD and PDL effects can be interpreted as formal Lorentz transformations acting on zero rest mass spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles. The time reversal operator is identified with optical phase conjugation. A very simple technique that very significantly reduces the impairments imposed by combined PMD-PDL effects is proposed.

1. PMD AND PDL IN OPTICAL COMMUNICATIONS

In this section, for the sake of clarity, a very sketchy introduction of polarization dependent penalties in Optical Communications will be made. This section introduces the mathematical notation that will be used in subsequent sections. For a more detailed introduction to PMD and PDL effects in optical fibers the reader is referred to Ref. [1]-[2]

There always exists an orthogonal pair of polarization states at the output of a lossless concatenation of birefringent elements which are stationary to first order in frequency. These two states are called the Principal States of Polarization (PSPs). A differential delay exists between signals launched along one PSP and its orthogonal complement. The pointing direction of the PMD vector is aligned to the slow PSP, the PSP that imparts more delay than the other. The length of the PMD vector is the differential-group delay between the slow and fast PSP's. The traceless Hermitian operator (or matrix) whose eigenvectors define the PSPs is:

$$H_r = jU_\omega U^\dagger = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \quad (1)$$

where U is the 2x2 unitary matrix that defines the birefringence of the fiber. The equation that describes how the output SOPs change with frequency is:

$$|t\rangle_\omega = \exp[-\frac{j}{2} (\vec{\tau} \cdot \vec{\sigma})\omega] |t\rangle_0 \quad (2)$$

The eigenvalue-eigenvector equation of (1) states that the output polarization rotates about the principal-state of the fiber even if very slight changes in the optical frequency are considered. Only if the output state is aligned along one of the PSPs its state will not change with frequency. The rotation angle depends on the value of excursion frequency as: $\vec{\varphi} = \omega \vec{\tau}$ and the Unitary $SU(2)$ rotation matrix can be obtained from the traceless 2x2 Hermitian matrix (1) by the exponential map Ref. [3] as expressed in (2). From this point of view, the PMD vector generates rotations of the output polarization states and, if we choose to use Jones vectors to describe polarization states, we can regard these transformations as rotations of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles, Ref. [1].

The resulting polarization effects of combined PMD and PDL are more complicated. The principal states of polarization still exist but they are not orthogonal to one another and the output polarization state does not follow a simple rotational motion around the PSPs as a function of frequency, Ref. [2]. The PSPs are defined as the eigenstates of the following operator (matrix), that is traceless, but not Hermitian (H_r is Hermitian and jH_i is skew-Hermitian):

$$H_r + jH_i = jT_\omega T^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{\Omega}_r \cdot \vec{\sigma} + j\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}) \quad (3)$$

The vectors $\vec{\Omega}_r$ and $\vec{\Omega}_i$ are real Stokes vectors (whose components are the six free parameters that characterize the polarization properties of the fiber) that relate to the system birefringence and differential attenuation, but not in a straightforward way, Ref. [2]. In this analysis I am assuming that there are no isotropic effects, that is to say, no common gain or loss or, at least, the optical amplifiers exactly compensate for the SOP independent loss.

The complex eigenvalues of this operator are of equal module and opposite signs as a direct consequence of it having a zero trace. If we denote the eigenvalues as: $\lambda = \pm(\tau + j\eta)$, then the real part τ is the familiar differential-group delay magnitude; the imaginary part η is the differential-attenuation slope (DAS), which is the frequency derivative of the differential attenuation along the two eigenvectors, Ref. [2]. In the presence of PDL, the PSP's are not orthogonal due to the complex value of the eigenvectors, Ref. [2]. The equation that describes how the output SOPs change with frequency is:

$$|t\rangle_\omega = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}j (\vec{\Omega}_r \cdot \vec{\sigma} + j\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma})\omega\right]|t\rangle_0 \quad (4)$$

This equation describes the combined rotation and Lorentz boost (a proper Lorentz transformation) of a zero mass spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particle. So, the evolution of the SOPs at the fiber output is formally the Lorentz transformation of a two component spinor. Only if the output state is aligned along one of the PSPs its state will not change with frequency. The Lorentz angle depends on the value of excursion frequency as: $\vec{\varphi} = \frac{1}{2} [(\omega\vec{\Omega}_r + j\omega\vec{\Omega}_i) \cdot \vec{\sigma}]$ and the Lorentz transformation can be obtained from the traceless 2x2 matrix (3) by the exponential map as shown in (4). From this point of view, the combined PMD and PDL vector generates a restricted Lorentz transformation of the output polarization states and, if we choose to use Jones vectors to describe polarization states, we can regard these as a proper Lorentz transformations of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles Ref. [4].

The reader should bear in mind that the previous observation is almost trivial. The polarization properties of an optical fiber are described by a very general group of matrices, those 2x2 complex valued matrices whose determinants are equal to 1 that are known in Group Theory Ref. [3] as the rank 2 complex special linear group of matrices, $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$. Since there is a close relationship between the proper Lorentz group, $SO^+(1,3)$, and $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ ($SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ is the double cover of $SO^+(1,3)$) this could be just a mathematical curiosity devoid of any practical interest. In the following sections I will show why this is not the case.

2. IRREDUCIBLE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE LORENTZ GROUP

Equations (3) and (4) show that the six free parameters that define the combined PMD and PDL properties of a fiber are formally equivalent to the six parameters that define a proper Lorentz transformation of a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particle. The Representation Theory of the proper Lorentz Group is of common knowledge in the field of Particle Physics, Ref. [4]. This theory shows that there are two irreducible representations of dimension 2, IRs, which are not equivalent that are denoted as $\mathbf{D}^{(1/2,0)}$ and $\mathbf{D}^{(0,1/2)}$. This can be traced back to the fact that a matrix belonging to the $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ group and its complex conjugate, A and A^* are not equivalent in the full group (they are only in the $SU(2)$ subgroup) because one cannot find a similarity transformation relating them. These matrices constitute two nonequivalent irreducible representations of the restricted Lorentz Group and from these two any other higher order representation (either spinor or tensor) can be built. With this respect, the spinor IR's are more fundamental than the tensor IR's. From the mathematical point of view, it makes little sense to use Stokes space, $\mathbf{D}^{(1/2,1/2)} = \mathbf{D}^{(1/2,0)} \oplus \mathbf{D}^{(0,1/2)}$ in representation theory, to describe combined PMD and PDL issues in optical communications without any explicit mention to the two IRs, $\mathbf{D}^{(1/2,0)}$ and $\mathbf{D}^{(0,1/2)}$, upon which it is built. We have then two nonequivalent bases, and, in general, two kind of spinors (spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles) denoted by ξ and ξ^* that transform according to following transformation matrices:

$$A = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}j (\vec{\Omega}_r \cdot \vec{\sigma} + j\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma})\right] \quad (5)$$

and the representation provided by A^* is equivalent to:

$$B = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}j (\vec{\Omega}_r \cdot \vec{\sigma} - j\vec{\Omega}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma})\right] \quad (6)$$

The irreducible representations of the Lorentz Group can be obtained from the restricted Lorentz Group by inclusion of the discrete symmetries I_s (parity inversion), I_t (temporal inversion) and $I_c = I_{st}$ (inversion symmetry), Ref. [4]. These discrete symmetries are very important because they transform one kind of spinor into the other and the optical processes implementing them should be identified.

2.1. TIME INVERSION

The time inversion symmetry affects the spinors in the following way, Ref. [4]: $I_t: \xi \rightarrow \eta^\dagger$ and $I_t: \eta^\dagger \rightarrow -\xi$. It transforms the regular contravariant spinor ξ into the conjugate covariant spinor η^\dagger . If a contravariant spinor ξ transforms as $A\xi$ then its covariant spinor η transforms as $\eta(A^{-1})^T$ (this follows the standard notation in which covariant spinors are represented by row vectors acting on the left of matrices) so time inversion conjugates the spinor and changes "variance" (from either contravariant to covariant or from covariant to contravariant). In optical links that use EDFAs to compensate for the fiber attenuation, covariant spinors would not

be allowed to propagate along the whole fiber due to the presence of the isolators placed at both ends of the optical amplifiers (these isolators are placed to prevent these amplifiers from lasing). However, since the time inversion symmetry relates covariant to contravariant spinors and vice-versa, and time inversion is a symmetry that can be optically implemented, this difficulty can be ignored.

The covariant spinor η associated to ξ is given by the expression, Ref. [4]: $\eta^T = C\xi$ (or $\eta = \xi^T C$) where C is the antisymmetric matrix:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The optical process that implements this discrete symmetry is optical phase conjugation, Ref. [5]. Optical phase conjugation would reverse, in counter-propagation, the polarization distortion introduced by the combined effect of PMD and PDL if it were not for the presence of isolators. An optical conjugator, therefore, implements the polarization transformation:

$$\xi = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 \\ \xi_2 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \eta^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_2^* \\ -\xi_1^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Please, notice that the original and transformed SOPs are mutually orthogonal, that is, $\langle \eta | \xi \rangle = 0$ all along the fiber. In the representation theory of the Lorentz Group it is well known (Ref. [4]) that $\langle \eta^* | \xi^* \rangle + \langle \eta | \xi \rangle$ and $\langle \eta^* | \xi^* \rangle - \langle \eta | \xi \rangle$ behave as scalars (or pseudo-scalar) invariants of the group, depending on the considered discrete symmetry.

2.2. FRAME INVERSION

The frame inversion transforms spinors in the following way, Ref. [4]: $I_{ST}: \xi \rightarrow j\xi$ and $I_{ST}: \eta^\dagger \rightarrow -j\eta^\dagger$ would not change the SOP and, therefore, would be very difficult to detect. Although it is tempting to speculate and try to assign physical relevance to the “ j ” factor, it would probably be unjustified. The frame inversion operator is very probably the identity.

2.3. PARITY INVERSION

The parity inversion transforms the spinors as follows: $I_S: \xi \rightarrow j\eta^\dagger$ and $I_S: \eta^\dagger \rightarrow j\xi$, Ref. [4]. Since the frame inversion operator is the identity, the optical process that implements parity inversion is optical phase conjugation.

3. APPLICATION: IMPROVED TRANSMITTED SYMBOL ESTIMATION

The purpose of this paper is to show that the natural mathematical framework that describes polarization issues in optical communications is the irreducible spinor representation of the Lorentz Group. Since it is a mathematically complex matter, the only convincing way to prove its need is to either solve some kind of problem or

propose something new and useful based on it. It is now straightforward to do so.

At the receiver end of the optical link the received spinor, ξ_R , is used to estimate what the transmitted spinor was, ξ_T . The combined PMD and PDL effects and noise make this estimation process very difficult. The previous sections make it clear that we can perform a time inversion on the received spinor by means of optical phase conjugation to obtain η_R^\dagger . If this spinor could counter-propagate along the fiber, it would end at the other end as ξ_T . However, this spinor can also be considered as the SOP of a propagated wave. Our mathematical framework allows us to identify it with the unique input SOP perpendicular to ξ_T . Please, notice that perpendicular spinors belong to conjugated representations.

Both spinors, ξ_R and η_R^\dagger can and should be used to estimate the transmitted information and that is exactly what this paper proposes. In this restricted sense, it is as if we had two received two different spinors that can be used to estimate the information of a single transmitted symbol and, therefore, significantly improving the estimation process.

η_R^\dagger is the spinor that would be measured at the receiver end, if the “orthogonal to ξ_T ” spinor had been transmitted instead of ξ_T .

Acknowledgments. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Vicente Baena of the University of Seville and Prof. Michael Connolly of the University of Limerick for the many discussions held in the last fifteen years in seemingly disparate topics of Communication Engineering, Physics and Mathematics.

Disclosures. The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

- 1 J. P. Gordon Lamont and H. Kogelnik, “PMD fundamentals: Polarization mode dispersion in optical fibers,” PNAS vol. 97, no 9, 4541-4550 (2000).
- 2 J. N. Damask, “Polarization Optics in Telecommunications,” Springer, (2005).
- 3 A. Zee, “Group Theory in a Nutshell for Physicists”, Princeton University Press, (2016).
- 4 G. Costa and G. Fogli, “Symmetries and Group Theory in Particle Physics”, Springer, (2012).
- 5 C. L. Janer and M. J. Connolly, “Optical phase conjugation technique using four-wave mixing in semiconductor optical amplifier”, El. Lett., vol. 47, Issue 12, (2011)