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Dispersion management has proven to be an important technique for designing lightwave communication systems as it can be used to lower the average dispersion of a fiber link even though the group-velocity dispersion is kept relatively large locally for suppressing four-wave mixing. The performance of modern dispersion-managed lightwave systems depends on a large number of factors. Gordon-Haus timing jitter, arising from the presence of amplified spontaneous emission noise, happens to be one of the major limiting factors for long-haul systems, especially at high bit rates exceeding 10 Gb/s. In this thesis, we analyze the role of distributed amplification in controlling timing jitter in dispersion-managed systems. We derive analytical expressions for the timing jitter at any position within the fiber link in the cases of ideal distributed and lumped amplifications and show the possibility of reducing timing jitter by up to 40% using Raman or erbium-based distributed amplification.

It has become apparent in recent years that the dispersion of an optical fiber, designed to have a fixed value, can vary over a considerable range because of unavoidable variations in the core diameter along the fiber length. Even though
such axial variations are static, they can impact the system performance because of the nonlinear nature of the pulse propagation problem. Although dispersion fluctuations rarely impact a 10-Gb/s system, their role on the system performance must be considered for 40-Gb/s lightwave systems for which dispersion tolerance is relatively tight. In this thesis, we present the results of extensive numerical simulations performed to identify the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the performance of 40-Gb/s dispersion-managed lightwave systems, designed using either the chirped-return-to-zero or the soliton format and employing distributed Raman amplification.

We consider also the design of dispersion-managed soliton systems. We use the variational approach to derive approximate analytic expressions for the input pulse parameters and show the existence of a limiting bit rate, which depends only on the dispersion-map configuration. Finally, the design rules are proposed that allow the minimization of the intrachannel pulse interactions in a dispersion-managed soliton system.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The choice of single-mode silica fibers over copper coaxial cable for designing telecommunication systems was assured by the mid-1980s, and it tremendously improved their performance, reliability, transmission capacity, and cost-effectiveness [1]–[4]. Such systems are nowadays referred to as lightwave systems as they employ an optical carrier in place of a microwave one. Any lightwave system is composed of an optical transmitter, a communication channel, and an optical receiver [1]. The optical transmitter converts an electrical signal into optical pulses and launches the resulting optical signal into an optical fiber. The receiver converts the optical signal back into the original electrical signal at the output end. The transmitter consists of an optical source, a modulator and a channel coupler. Semiconductor lasers or light-emitting diodes are usually used as optical sources, and optical signal is generated by modulating the optical carrier wave [1]. The communication channel provides signal propagation while ensuring
a high signal-to noise ratio (SNR) at the receiver end. Modern optical lightwave systems employ a low-loss, usually single-mode, fiber for signal transmission [2].

Although the amount of loss that an optical fiber possesses is quite small (usually around 0.2 dB/km near 1.55 µm) [2], losses accumulate over long distances, so that signal has to be periodically amplified during propagation [1]–[4]. Prior to the advent of optical amplifiers, electronic regenerators were employed to cope with the attenuation of signal along the fiber span. Such regenerators usually include a photodetector to detect the weak incoming light, electronic amplifiers, timing circuitry to maintain the timing of the signals, and a laser along with its driver to launch the signal along the next span [4]. The regenerators raised the cost and limited the transmission capacity of lightwave systems since each channel had to be separately, first, detected, which required a high-speed electronic circuitry, and then regenerated. After erbium-doped fiber amplifiers (EDFAs) were developed around 1990 for travelling-wave amplification near 1.5 µm (the wavelength region in which the fiber losses are minimal), optical amplifiers have been widely used for signal amplification in lightwave systems [4]. The employment of optical amplifiers had a tremendous impact on long-haul networks. It allowed to reduce system cost by eliminating the need to convert an optical signal into electrical domain and back at each regeneration stage. Besides that, optical amplifiers increased dramatically system capacity due to the possibility of amplifying
simultaneously several frequency channels, which enabled the development of the wavelength-division multiplexing (WDM) technique.

The advent of WDM technique has transformed the technology behind modern optical networks. A 1999 book says: “in less than 10 years, the capacity of a single optical fiber equipped with commercial transmission equipment has increased from a single signal, transmitting at a rate of 2.488 Gb/s, to 160 signals, totaling 1600 Gb/s, a factor of close to 1000” [4]. In the latest experiments, long-haul transmission at up to 6.3 Tb/s [5]–[14] and short-haul transmission at up to 10.2 Tb/s [15]–[18] have been achieved employing the WDM technology. While a single-channel rate of 10 Gb/s has been used commercially, higher bit rates of 40 Gb/s [6], [8]–[11], [14]–[19], and up to 320 Gb/s [20], [21] have been used in the laboratory experiments. Transmission of high data rate channels over unregenerated links with lengths of 1000 to 5000 km poses major challenges on WDM technology. Foremost among these problems are the distortion due to transmission effects (including chromatic dispersion, polarization-mode dispersion, and optical nonlinearities), as well as the accumulation of spontaneous emission noise and power nonuniformity arising from optical amplification.

Chromatic dispersion in optical fibers is due to the frequency-dependent nature of the propagation characteristics of light in both the material (the refractive index of glass) and the waveguide structure [1]. Different spectral components of the modulated data travel at different speeds along the fiber. Hence, chromatic
dispersion leads to pulse broadening, which in turn limits the maximum data rate at which information can be transmitted through an optical fiber. The effect of chromatic dispersion is cumulative and increases linearly with transmission distance. Although it is possible to manufacture fibers that induce zero chromatic dispersion [22]– [24], such fibers are incompatible with the deployment of WDM systems since harmful nonlinear effects would be easily generated in this case. For example, zero dispersion creates favorable conditions for phase matching of the four-wave mixing (FWM) [25] process, leading to energy transfer among channels [26]– [34]. Also, nonlinear effects such as self-phase modulation (SPM) and cross-phase modulation (XPM) [25] induce a frequency chirp on optical pulses, which enhances pulse broadening. This chirp could be compensated if a system had an overall small, but nonzero, negative dispersion. Moreover, a dispersion value as small as few ps/(nm km) is sufficient to make XPM and FWM negligible [29] since the different wavelength channels are not phase matched and “walk-off” from each other quickly, thus ensuring that they interact with each other only over relatively short distances.

It turns out that, as long as the WDM technique is implemented in practice, optical fiber used in the system must possess a nonzero amount of chromatic dispersion, while overall dispersion must be compensated. If a system were perfectly linear, it would be irrelevant as to whether the accumulated dispersion along a path is small or large, as long as the overall dispersion is compensated at the
end. However, this is not the case in a real system that possesses some amount of nonlinearity. If too much chromatic dispersion is allowed to accumulate, the data bits will evolve into odd shapes, potentially creating narrow spikes of very high peak power. This will enhance the nonlinear effects and prevent the possibility of restoring data bits at the system output, even though total accumulated dispersion is compensated at the end. The sensitivity with respect to nonlinear effects and chromatic dispersion increases even more at high bit rates (10 Gb/s and larger) because pulse separation in time domain becomes relatively small, while signal power levels required for transmission are large. WDM systems with large number of channels, dense channel spacing, as well as EDFAs that produce large output powers, also lead to the enhancement of the nonlinear effects.

A simple and elegant solution is to create a dispersion map, in which fiber sections with positive and negative dispersion are alternated. In this way, at each point along the fiber link local dispersion has some nonzero value, effectively eliminating FWM and XPM, but the total accumulated dispersion at the end of the link is zero or has a fixed small value, so that minimal pulse broadening is induced. This technique is called dispersion management.

Many issues are involved in designing dispersion-managed (DM) systems. One is the choice of the dispersion map. Traditionally, dispersion-compensating fiber (DCF) [35]–[37] has been used inside dispersion-compensation modules. Other more recent techniques include chirped fiber-Bragg gratings (FBGs) [38,39],
higher-order-mode DCFs [40,41], and electronic compensation circuitry [42,43]. Besides periodic dispersion compensation, additional compensation modules can be added at the beginning and at the end of the fiber link, providing pre- and post-compensation. The performance of the system can be considerably improved by fine-tuning these end-point modules [44]. With proper dispersion management, even ultra-high bit rate signals can be transmitted through the fiber. As an example, a 640-Gb/s optical time division multiplexed signal was successfully transmitted over the 92-km zero-dispersion-flattened transmission line [45].

The transmission line consisted of single-mode fiber, dispersion-shifted fiber, and reverse-dispersion fiber. Fiber-based dispersion compensation was employed in several recent WDM transmission experiments, which provided total transmission capacity of up to 1.5 Tb/s over transoceanic distances with 40-Gb/s per-channel bit rate [8,9]. Using a fiber-Bragg-grating-based compensator, a 16-channel WDM transmission over nonzero dispersion-shifted fiber was demonstrated at a per-channel rate of 20 Gb/s over 400 km [39]. Tunable dispersion-slope compensation using broadband chirped FBGs [46,47], as well as the employment of higher-order-mode fiber [40] have been shown to provide good dispersion compensation in system demonstrations at 40 Gb/s.

The other important question in designing DM lightwave system is the choice of the kind of amplification scheme one can employ. EDFAs are known to have a very good efficiency, meaning several decibels of gain can be achieved per milliwatt of
power [2]. After the development of efficient, high-power pump sources [48]–[55], there have been a rebirth of interest in Raman amplification in optical fibers [5]–[7], [9]–[11], [56]–[69]. Raman amplification employs the process of inelastic scattering of light through which a photon downshifted in frequency is produced (Stokes wave) together with a vibrating molecule when a pump photon is scattered by silica glass. The advent of high pump power sources has diminished the disadvantage of relatively poor efficiency of Raman amplification in comparison with erbium amplification, while Raman amplifiers do offer several attractive advantages over EDFAs. One very important feature of Raman amplifiers, which makes them attractive for lightwave systems, is their capability of providing gain at any wavelength. In addition to that, Raman amplifiers offer improved noise performance because of several reasons. First, the effective inversion parameter [4] for the Raman scattering process is quite small, close to its quantum-limited value of 1 at room temperature [70]–[72]. Second, accumulated noise power is smaller with distributed amplification [73]. Since Raman process is highly suitable to provide distributed amplification, the signal-to-noise ratio in this distributed amplifier is improved over lumped amplification. Besides the capability of providing gain at arbitrary wavelengths and an improved noise performance, the nonlinear effects in the system can be reduced by using Raman amplification, since the improved SNR allows one to use smaller signal powers [2].

The choice of data propagating format is the next important step in dispersion-
managed system design. Several propagation formats can be used for data transmission in a DM system, including non-return-to-zero (NRZ) [1], chirped return-to-zero (CRZ) [74,75], DM-soliton [76]–[81], and differential phase-shift keying (DPSK) formats [6], [82]–[89]. The return-to-zero (RZ) format is more susceptible to chromatic dispersion than NRZ, but is more robust to nonlinear effects [90]. The CRZ format, in which optical pulses are first prechirped by propagating them thorough a piece of fiber with anomalous dispersion, helps to deal with chromatic dispersion, while keeping the robustness to nonlinear effects that RZ transmission possesses [91]–[93]. DM solitons have an advantage over the CRZ format as they can balance the nonlinear and dispersive effects during pulse propagation. The use of DM solitons also provides a number of other advantages over the conventional solitons occurring in constant-group-velocity-dispersion fibers [1]. However, the design of DM soliton systems requires a careful choice of input parameters (such as the pulse energy, width, and chirp) to ensure that each soliton recovers its input state after each amplification period. A variational technique is commonly used to find the periodic solutions of a dispersion map [94]–[99]. However, its use still requires a numerical approach.

Another important aspect of system design is to ensure the system stability and to optimize the system with respect to parameter variations. It has become apparent in recent years that the dispersion of an optical fiber, designed to have a fixed value, can vary over a considerable range because of unavoidable variations
in the core diameter along the fiber length [100]– [104]. Even though such axial variations are static, they can impact the system performance because of the nonlinear nature of the pulse propagation problem. Another source of dispersion fluctuations is related to environmental changes. For example, if the temperature fluctuates at a given location, the local dispersion would also change in a random fashion. Such dynamic fluctuations can also degrade the system performance. Although dispersion fluctuations rarely impact a 10-Gb/s system, their role on the system performance must be considered for 40-Gb/s lightwave systems for which dispersion tolerance is relatively tight.

The performance of modern DM lightwave systems depends on a large number of other factors, the most important being the noise added by optical amplifiers [1]. Amplified spontaneous emission (ASE) in optical amplifiers introduces random fluctuations in pulse position, pulse phase, and pulse amplitude. While random fluctuations of the latter quantity degrade the SNR, fluctuations in pulse position and phase eventually lead to the Gordon-Haus timing jitter [105,106], which happens to be one of the major limiting factors for long-haul optical communication systems, especially at high bit rates exceeding 10 Gb/s [105]– [113]. A general approach for calculating timing jitter in DM systems was developed by Grigoryan et al. in 1999 [108]. In the past, attention was mostly paid to estimating timing jitter in lightwave systems with lumped amplifiers placed periodically along the DM link [109]– [111]. Although the effect of distributed amplification on timing
jitter has been studied for uniform-dispersion fibers [112,113], the combination of distributed amplification and dispersion management was not yet investigated until our research results were published.

This thesis analyzes several aspects of dispersion-managed systems design. The research work is organized as follows. In Chapter 2, the design of DM soliton systems is considered. We derive analytical expressions for the input parameters that ensure a periodic propagation of DM solitons and analyze how those parameters and the dispersion map can be optimized to increase the possible bit rate in a DM soliton system. Based on the results, simple design rules are proposed that can be quite beneficial in practice. In Chapter 3, the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the performance of 40-Gb/s DM lightwave systems having different modulation formats is investigated. Although dispersion fluctuations have been considered in some recent papers [114]– [119], the emphasis was mostly on the broadening of a single pulse transmitted through the fiber link. In contrast, we model a realistic lightwave system in which a data-coded pulse train consisting of 0 and 1 bits is transmitted through a periodically amplified, dispersion-managed fiber link. The system performance is quantified by the well-known Q parameter that is related to the bit-error rate in a simple way. My emphasis is on identifying how the nonlinear effects are affected by dispersion fluctuations and how the local value of average dispersion affects the interplay among the nonlinear effects and dispersion fluctuations. In Chapter 4, we consider the role of distributed amplifi-
cation in controlling timing jitter in DM systems. We use the approach developed in Ref. [108] to derive analytical expressions for timing jitter in DM systems with ideal distributed and lumped amplifications and compare the two cases. This results, as well as numerical simulations, are then employed to analyze how timing jitter can be reduced using erbium-based distributed, Raman, and hybrid Raman amplification. The main results of this thesis are summarized in Chapter 5.
Chapter 2

Design Rules for Soliton Systems

2.1 Introduction

In this section we consider the DM soliton system design. We introduce basic notation used throughout the text and describe the techniques that are usually used to find the input parameters that ensure periodical pulse propagation in the system. One of these techniques, variational analysis, is then employed to find approximate analytical expressions for the input parameters. The expressions show a good agreement with numerical solutions of variational equations and reveal several interesting results used for designing DM soliton systems. Finally, a system design that allows minimization of intrachannel pulse interactions is described.
2.2 Dispersion Management

The principal scheme of a dispersion map used in a DM lightwave system is shown in Fig. 2.1. Each map period $L_m$ is composed of two fiber sections with opposite dispersion signs, and each amplification period $L_A$ can contain one or more map periods. When the amplification period contains more than one map period, the system is called dense dispersion-managed system. Dispersion maps composed of alternating-group-velocity-dispersion fibers are attractive for WDM data transmission because their use lowers the average dispersion of the whole system while keeping the group velocity dispersion (GVD) of each section large enough that the four-wave mixing effects remain negligible.

One of the parameters used for characterizing a DM system is the map strength, defined for a two-fiber-section dispersion map as

$$S_{map} = \frac{(\beta_{21} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_1 - (\beta_{22} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_2}{T_{min}^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

where $\beta_{2i}$ and $l_i$ are the dispersion and the length of the $i^{th}$ fiber section ($i = 1,2$), respectively, $T_{\text{min}}$ is the full width at half maximum (FWHM) of the pulse at the

![Figure 2.1: Schematic of dispersion map with the notations used](image)
Figure 2.2: Propagation of a DM soliton over one map period (left). Pulse shape and spectrum of a DM soliton while propagating over 100 amplification periods (right).

chirp-free point inside the fiber section, and $\bar{\beta}_2$ is the average dispersion in the system defined as $\bar{\beta}_2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N} \beta_{2i} l_i / \sum_{i=1}^{N} l_i$, $N$ being the number of fiber sections within the amplification period.

Examples of pulse propagation over one map period of 10 km and over a distance of 8000 km (in the absence of noise) are shown in Fig. 2.2. The graphs on the right represent the pulse shape and spectrum at the output of every amplifier. One can see that, while pulse oscillates noticeably within each fiber section, it almost regains its shape and energy after each amplifier for quite a long propagation distance, so that pulse propagation resembles very much that of a soliton.

A DM system having $\beta_{2i} = \pm 4$ ps$^2$/km, $l_1 \approx l_2 = 5$ km, $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01$ ps$^2$/km, $L_A = 8L_m = 80$ km, and fiber losses of 0.25 dB/km is used for constructing Fig. 2.2. The Gaussian pulse shape was used at the input and the initial pulse...
parameters, ensuring periodical pulse propagation, were found numerically using
the variational analysis described in section 2.4.

2.3 Nonlinear Schrödinger equation

Pulse propagation in a DM lightwave system is generally described by the
nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation. In this section, we outline the derivation
of this equation and point out the approximations implied [25].

Similar to all electromagnetic phenomena, the propagation of light in optical
fiber is governed by Maxwell’s equations, that can be written in SI units as follow:

\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t}, \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.2) \\
\[ \nabla \times \mathbf{H} = \mathbf{J}_f + \frac{\partial \mathbf{D}}{\partial t}, \] \hspace{1cm} (2.3) \\
\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = \rho_f, \] \hspace{1cm} (2.4) \\
\[ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0, \] \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

where \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{H} \) are, respectively, the electric and magnetic field vectors, \( \mathbf{D} \) and
\( \mathbf{B} \) are the corresponding electric and magnetic flux densities, and \( \mathbf{J}_f \) and \( \rho_f \) are,
respectively, the current density vector and the charge density. Both the last two
quantities vanish in the absence of free charges in a medium such as optical fibers.

In a dielectric medium, the flux densities \( \mathbf{D} \) and \( \mathbf{B} \) are related to the electric
and magnetic fields as

\[ \mathbf{D} = \varepsilon_0 \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{P}, \] \hspace{1cm} (2.6)
\[ B = \mu_0 H + M, \quad (2.7) \]

where \( \varepsilon_0 \) and \( \mu_0 \) are, respectively, the vacuum permittivity and permeability, while \( P \) and \( M \) are the induced electric and magnetic polarizations (note that \( M = 0 \) for a nonmagnetic media such as an optical fiber).

In a nonlinear medium, electric polarization \( P \) can be represented as a sum of its linear part \( P_L \) and nonlinear part \( P_{NL} \):

\[ P (r, t) = P_L (r, t) + P_{NL} (r, t), \quad (2.8) \]

Using the electric-dipole approximation such that the medium response is local, including only the third-order nonlinear effects governed by the third-order susceptibility \( \chi^{(3)} \) (noticing that the second order susceptibility \( \chi^{(2)} \) vanishes for an isotropic medium like silica glass [25,120]), the linear and nonlinear parts of the induced polarization can be related to the electric field by the general relations [25,121]

\[ P_L (r, t) = \varepsilon_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi^{(1)} (t - t') \cdot E (r, t') dt', \quad (2.9) \]

\[ P_{NL} (r, t) = \varepsilon_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi^{(3)} (t - t_1, t - t_2, t - t_3) \cdot E (r, t_1) E (r, t_2) E (r, t_3) dt_1 dt_2 dt_3, \quad (2.10) \]

where we assumed also that the optical frequency of the electromagnetic field is far from any resonances of the medium.
Taking curl of Eq. (2.2) and using Eqs. (2.3), (2.4), (2.6), (2.7), and (2.8), we obtain the wave equation

\[
\nabla^2 E - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial t^2} = -\mu_0 \frac{\partial^2 P_L}{\partial t^2} - \mu_0 \frac{\partial^2 P_{NL}}{\partial t^2},
\]

(2.11)

where \( c \) is the velocity of light in vacuum and \( 1/c^2 = \mu_0 \varepsilon_0 \). In deriving Eq (2.11) we assumed that the nonlinear polarization \( P_{NL} \) is a small perturbation to the total induced polarization and that the dielectric constant \( \varepsilon \), defined as

\[
\varepsilon(\omega) \equiv 1 + \tilde{\chi}^{(1)}(\omega) + \varepsilon_{NL},
\]

(2.12)

is independent of the spatial coordinates for both core and cladding so that the equation \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = \varepsilon \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = 0 \) can be used, leading to the relation \( \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E} = \nabla (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}) - \nabla^2 \mathbf{E} = -\nabla^2 \mathbf{E} \). In Eq. (2.12), \( \varepsilon_{NL} \) represents the contribution to the dielectric constant from the nonlinear polarization: \( \varepsilon_{NL} \equiv \frac{3}{4} \chi^{(3)} \left| E(\mathbf{r},t) \right|^2 \) [25] and is much less than \( 1 + \tilde{\chi}^{(1)} \). Also, \( \tilde{\chi}^{(1)}(\omega) \) is related to \( \chi^{(1)}(t) \) by a Fourier transform.

Several simplifying assumptions are made in order to solve the wave equation (2.11) [25]. First, as it was mentioned, \( P_{NL} \) is a small perturbation to \( P_L \). Second, the optical field is assumed to maintain its polarization along the fiber length so that a scalar approach is valid. Third, the optical field is assumed to be quasi-monochromatic, meaning that its spectrum, centered at \( \omega_0 \), has a spectral width \( \Delta \omega \) such that \( \Delta \omega/\omega_0 \ll 1 \). For \( \omega_0 \sim 10^{15} \text{ s}^{-1} \) the last assumption is valid for pulses whose width is \( \geq 0.1 \text{ ps} \) (\( \Delta \omega \leq 10^{13} \text{ s}^{-1} \)). We use now the slowly varying
envelope approximation to separate the rapidly varying part of the electric field by writing it in the form

\[ E(r, t) = 0.5 \hat{x} [E(r, t) \exp(-i\omega_0 t) + \text{c.c.}], \quad (2.13) \]

where c.c. stands for complex conjugate, \( \hat{x} \) is the polarization unit vector of the light assumed to be linearly polarized along the \( x \) axis, and \( E(r, t) \) is a slowly varying function of time (relative to the optical period). The polarization components \( P_L \) and \( P_{NL} \) are then expressed in a similar way. Using those expressions in Eqs. (2.9) and (2.10) and making a further simplification assuming that a medium nonlinear response is instantaneous, the Fourier transform \( \tilde{E}(r, \omega - \omega_0) \) of \( E(r, t) \) is found to satisfy [25]

\[ \nabla^2 \tilde{E} + \varepsilon(\omega) k_0^2 \tilde{E} = 0, \quad (2.14) \]

where \( k_0 = \omega/c, \varepsilon(\omega) \) is given by Eq. (2.12) and \( \varepsilon_{NL} \) is assumed to be constant while performing the Fourier transform. We note that by assuming the instantaneous nonlinear response, we neglect the contribution of molecular vibrations to \( \chi^{(3)} \), i.e. neglect the Raman effect. The generalized NLS equation that includes this effect can be found in [25].

Equation (2.14) is solved using the method of separation of variables. We assume the solution of the form

\[ \tilde{E}(r, \omega - \omega_0) = F(x, y) \tilde{A}(z, \omega - \omega_0) \exp(-i\beta_0 z), \quad (2.15) \]

where \( \tilde{A}(z, \omega) \) is a slowly varying function of \( z \) and \( \beta_0 \) is the wavenumber de-
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termined later. We use this solution in Eq. (2.14) and obtain the following two
equations for $F(x, y)$ and $\tilde{A}(z, \omega)$:

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial y^2} + \left[ \varepsilon(\omega) k_0^2 - \beta^2 \right] F = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

$$2i\beta_0 \frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial z} + \left( \tilde{\beta}^2 - \beta_0^2 \right) \tilde{A} = 0. \quad (2.17)$$

In deriving Eq. (2.17) the second derivative $\partial^2 A/\partial z^2$ is neglected, since $\tilde{A}(z, \omega)$
is assumed to be a slowly varying function of $z$.

As a next step, $\varepsilon(\omega)$ in equation (2.16) is represented as a sum of two parts:

$$\varepsilon = n^2 + 2n\Delta n,$$

where $n$ represents the (linear) refractive index and $\Delta n$ is a small
perturbation that includes contributions from the intensity-dependent portion of
refractive index and from absorption loss $\alpha$, $\Delta n = n_2 |E|^2 + \frac{i\alpha}{2k_0}$

We then solve the wave equation (2.16), first, assuming $\Delta n = 0$ to obtain the
modal distribution $F(x, y)$ and the wavenumber $\beta(\omega)$. After that, the first-order
perturbation theory is used to include the effect of $\Delta n$. As a result, the eigenvalue
$\tilde{\beta}$ can be represented as

$$\tilde{\beta}(\omega) = \beta(\omega) + \Delta \beta, \quad (2.18)$$

where $\Delta \beta$ represents the part of the eigenvalue affected by $\Delta n$ and is expressed
in terms of $\Delta n$ and $F(x, y)$ [25].

With the expression (2.18) for the eigenvalue, Eq. (2.17) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial z} = i \left[ \beta(\omega) + \Delta \beta - \beta_0 \right] \tilde{A}, \quad (2.19)$$

where an approximation $2\beta_0(\tilde{\beta} - \beta_0)$ is used for $\tilde{\beta}^2 - \beta_0^2$. 
We now expand $\beta(\omega)$ in a Taylor series, neglecting the terms of the third and higher orders (which is consistent with the requirement $\Delta \omega \ll \omega_0$), and perform an inverse Fourier transform in Eq. (2.14). Using the relation between the $\Delta \beta$ and $\Delta n$ [25], we finally arrive at the following equation for the propagation of $A(z, t)$:

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial z} = -\beta_1 \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} - \frac{i}{2} \beta_2 \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial t^2} + i \gamma_0 |A|^2 A - \frac{\alpha}{2} A,$$  

(2.20)

where $\beta_i$ is the $i^{th}$ derivative of $\beta(\omega)$ with respect to $\omega$ taken at $\omega = \omega_0$, and the nonlinearity coefficient $\gamma_0$ is defined by

$$\gamma_0 \equiv \frac{n_2 \omega_0}{c A_{\text{eff}}},$$  

(2.21)

with the effective core area $A_{\text{eff}} = \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F(x, y)|^2 \, dx \, dy \right)^2 / \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F(x, y)|^4 \, dx \, dy \right)$. For a single-mode fiber, if the fundamental mode is approximated by a Gaussian shape as $F(x, y) = \exp\left[ -\left( x^2 + y^2 \right)/w^2 \right]$, $A_{\text{eff}}$ is evaluated to be $A_{\text{eff}} = \pi w^2$ [25].

We note that if the units of $m^2/W$ are used for $n_2$ in Eq. (2.21), then the pulse amplitude $A$ in this equation is assumed to be normalized so that $|A|^2$ represents the optical power.

Equation (2.20) is the final equation that is generally used to describe propagation of optical pulses in single-mode fibers. It is often referred as the NLS equation since it can be reduced to that equation under certain conditions [25]. In the way it is presented in Eq. (2.20), it includes the effects of fiber losses through $\alpha$, of fiber nonlinearity through $\gamma_0$, and of chromatic dispersion through $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$. Describing in short the physical significance of $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$, we say that the
pulse envelope moves at the group velocity \( v_g = 1/\beta_1 \), while GVD is accounted for by \( \beta_2 \). The effects of higher-order dispersion can be included in the equation by keeping the higher-order terms in the Taylor expansion of \( \beta(\omega) \), keeping in mind that the condition of narrow spectral width should be satisfied.

## 2.4 Variational Analysis

As discussed in the previous section, pulse propagation in a DM lightwave system can be described by the following NLS equation:

\[
i \frac{\partial A}{\partial z} - \frac{\beta_2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial t^2} + \gamma_0 |A|^2 A = \frac{i}{2} (g - \alpha) A, \tag{2.22}
\]

where we performed a change of variables \( t \to t - z/v_g \) to eliminate the \( \beta_1 \) term in Eq. (2.20), which is equivalent to working in a coordinate frame propagating with the pulse. We also assume that, besides the loss \( \alpha \), the system possesses a gain \( g \), which may be either distributed or lumped. All the parameters \( A, \beta_2, \gamma_0, g, \) and \( \alpha \) are periodic functions of \( z \) for a DM system.

Several approaches exist to find the input pulse parameters that provide periodic pulse propagation in the system. One is to solve the NLS equation (2.22) approximately using a Hermite-Gaussian expansion of pulse amplitude \( A(z, t) \) [80]. Another approach solves the equation in the spectral domain using perturbation theory [133]–[135]. A common technique implements the variational method [94]–[99], described below.
With a change of variable $A \equiv V \sqrt{G}$, where $G$ represents the cumulative net gain from 0 to $z$ and is given by

$$G(z) \equiv \exp \left( \int_0^z [g(z') - \alpha(z')] \, dz' \right),$$

(2.23)

Eq. (2.22) can be rewritten as

$$i \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} - \frac{\beta_2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial t^2} + \gamma(z) |V|^2 V = 0,$$

(2.24)

where $\gamma(z) \equiv \gamma_0 G(z)$. The variational method solves Eq. (2.24) using the Lagrangian density of the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{i}{2} \left[ V \frac{\partial V^*}{\partial z} - V^* \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \right] - \frac{\beta_2}{2} \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \right|^2 - \frac{\gamma(z)}{2} |V|^4$$

(2.25)

with the following Gaussian ansatz:

$$V(z,t) = \sqrt{\frac{E_0}{\sqrt{\pi T}}} \exp \left[ -(1 + iC) \frac{(t - t_p)^2}{2T^2} - i\Omega (t - t_p) + i\phi \right],$$

(2.26)

where $E_0$ is the input energy of the pulse, $t_p$ is peak position, $T$ is the width, $C$ is the chirp, $\Omega$ is the frequency shift, and $\phi$ is the phase of the pulse. The latter five parameters are periodic functions of $z$. In practice, $\Omega$ and $\phi$ can be chosen to be zero at $z = 0$. However, the input values $E_0$, $T_0$, and $C_0$ of the remaining three parameters need to be specified to ensure periodic propagation of the input pulse through the dispersion map.

The variational approach makes use of the fact that the NLS equation (2.24) is equivalent to the following Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V} - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V_t} \right) - \frac{d}{dz} \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial V_z} \right) = 0$$

(2.27)
which, in turn, results from the variational principle

$$\delta \int \int L(V, V^*, V_z, V_{z^*}, V_t, V_{t^*}) \, dz \, dt \equiv \delta \Lambda = 0,$$

(2.28)

where $\mathcal{L}$ in Eqs. (2.27) and (2.28) is given by Eq. (2.25) and a variable in a subscript denotes a partial derivative with respect to that variable [94,95]. In other words, the function $V(z, t)$ that is a solution of the NLS equation (2.24) is the one that provides a possible extremum to the Lagrangian $\Lambda$.

Using Eq. (2.26) for $V(z, t)$ in Lagrangian density (2.25), we can accomplish the integration over time in Eq. (2.28) and calculate the reduced Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{R} \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} L_G \, dt,$$

(2.29)

where $L_G$ denotes the result of inserting the Gaussian ansatz (2.26) in the Lagrangian density (2.25). The detailed derivation of $\mathcal{R}$ is provided in Appendix A and results in the following expression:

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} p^2 \left\{ 2\Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz} + 2T \varphi_z - \frac{C_T}{2} T z - \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2}} p^2 T - \frac{\beta_2}{2} \frac{1 + C^2}{T} - \beta_2 \Omega^2 T \right\},$$

(2.30)

where $p(z) \equiv \sqrt{E_0/\sqrt{\pi}T(z)}$ is the peak amplitude of the pulse.

The variational principle (2.28) converts then to the reduced variational problem

$$\delta \int \mathcal{R} \, dz = 0,$$

(2.31)

where the reduced lagrangian $\mathcal{R}$, after using the Gaussian ansatz in Lagrangian density, is a function of pulse amplitude $p$, width $T$, chirp $C$, phase $\varphi$, frequency $\Omega$.
shift \( \Omega \), position \( t_p \), and their derivatives with respect to \( z \), as it is seen from Eq. (2.30).

As it can be shown from the theory of variational analysis [95], the reduced variational principle (2.31) is equivalent to the set of following ordinary differential equations:

\[
\frac{\partial R}{\partial \eta} - \frac{d}{dz} \left( \frac{\partial R}{\partial \eta_z} \right) = 0, \tag{2.32}
\]

where parameter \( \eta \) takes values \( p, T, C, \varphi, t_p, \) and \( \Omega \). While the equation for \( \eta = \varphi \) leads to the energy conservation law

\[
\sqrt{\pi} T p^2 = \text{const}, \tag{2.33}
\]

the rest of the equations (2.32) can be used to obtain the following equations describing the evolution of the pulse width \( T(z) \), chirp \( C(z) \), and phase \( \varphi(z) \) in each fiber section of a DM system:

\[
\frac{dT}{dz} = \frac{\beta_2 C}{T}, \tag{2.34}
\]

\[
\frac{dC}{dz} = \frac{\gamma_0 E_0 G}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} + \frac{\beta_2 (1 + C^2)}{T^2}, \tag{2.35}
\]

\[
\frac{d\varphi}{dz} = \frac{5\gamma_0 E_0 G}{4\sqrt{2\pi T}} + \frac{\beta_2}{2T^2} - \frac{\beta_2 \Omega^2}{2}, \tag{2.36}
\]

\[
\frac{dt_p}{dz} = \beta_2 \Omega, \tag{2.37}
\]

\[
\frac{d\Omega}{dz} = 0. \tag{2.38}
\]

The detailed derivation of the Eqs. (2.33) – (2.38) is given in Appendix B.

Equation (2.36) for the phase \( \varphi \) is decoupled from Eqs. (2.34) and (2.35). We can ignore it if we are not interested in the phase of the optical pulse. Also,
Ω and \( t_p \) remain zero, if they vanish initially, in the absence of noise, as seen from Eqs. (2.37) and (2.38). Thus, solving Eqs. (2.34) and (2.35) for pulse width and chirp is enough for finding the input parameters that ensure periodical pulse propagation in the system. The DM soliton corresponds to a solution of Eqs. (2.34) and (2.35) with the periodic boundary conditions: \( T(0) = T(L_A) \) and \( C(0) = C(L_A) \), \( L_A \) being the amplification period in the system.

### 2.5 Numerical Results

Solving the variational equations (2.34) and (2.35) numerically, we find periodic solutions over a relatively large range of input energy \( E_0 \). For illustration purposes, we focus on two kinds of maps that are used commonly in practice. Each map is made of two types of fibers with dispersions \( \beta_{21} \) and \( \beta_{22} \) and lengths \( l_1 \) and \( l_2 \). The map A consists of dispersion-shifted and reverse-dispersion fibers of nearly equal length (\( l_1 \approx l_2 = 5 \) km) with \( \beta_{21} = -\beta_{22} = -4 \) ps\(^2\)/km. We focus on the case of dense dispersion management [126]–[129] in the case of map A and assume that the amplification period \( L_A \) includes 8 map periods \( L_m \): \( L_A = 8L_m = 80 \) km. The map B employs ordinary dispersion management and is made using standard (SMF) fiber of 65-km length (\( \beta_{21} = -22 \) ps\(^2\)/km) and dispersion-compensating fiber of about 14.3 km length (\( \beta_{22} = 100 \) ps\(^2\)/km). We adjust the average dispersion of both maps in the range \(-0.005 \) ps\(^2\)/km to \(-0.15 \) ps\(^2\)/km by changing the length \( l_2 \). Although the nonlinear parameter \( \gamma_0 \) is generally different for different
Figure 2.3: Input pulse width $T_0$ and corresponding minimum pulse width $T_m$ as a function of input energy $E_0$ for the map A with $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$. Solid curves are for the loss-less case ($\alpha = 0$), while $\alpha = 0.25 \text{ dB/km}$ for dashed. The inset shows the input chirp in the two cases.

This choice does not affect our conclusions.

Figure 2.3 shows the values of input pulse width as a function of $E_0$ for the dispersion map A with average dispersion $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$. The curves marked “$T_0$” represent the input width while the curves “$T_m$” correspond to the minimum pulse width occurring in the fiber section with anomalous GVD. The
inset shows the input chirp $C_0$ as a function of $E_0$. Solid curves in Fig. 2.3 represent the lossless case ($\alpha = 0$) and dashed curves correspond to a loss of 0.25 dB/km in each fiber section. We have verified that the input parameters shown on Fig. 2.3 lead to stable propagation of solitons over more that $10^5$ km (in the absence of noise) when Eq. 2.22 is solved numerically by using the split-step method. Examples of pulse peak power oscillations during single pulse propagation (in the absence of noise) is shown on Fig. 2.4. Figure represents pulse propagation in maps A and B, with $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01$ ps$^2$/km and $-0.05$ ps$^2$/km and with the input energy $E_0 = 0.032$ pJ and 0.016 pJ for maps A and B, respectively. We see that peak power variations for both maps A and B do not exceed few percent of its mean value for distances up to 40000 km. From Fig. 2.3 we can see that, for low pulse energies, both $T_0$ and $T_m$ decrease rapidly. Moreover, $T_0$ and $T_m$ values nearly coincide, indicating that in this region pulse width does not oscillate and remains nearly equal to $T_0$. An important feature is that at some value of $E_0 = E_c$ the curve $T_0(E_0)$ has a minimum value $T_0^{\text{min}}$. When $E_0$ exceeds $E_c$, $T_0$ and $T_m$ curves diverge from each other, and pulse width starts to oscillate more and more within each fiber section. The qualitative character of the curve $T_m(E_0)$ also changes around $E_c$ from a rapid to a relatively slow decrease, while $T_0$ slowly increases.

The qualitative features shown in Fig. 2.3 hold for any two-section dispersion map having a negative value of average dispersion.

Two parameters are especially important for DM solitons—the ratio
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Figure 2.4: Peak power variations during pulse propagation for maps A and B with $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01$ ps$^2$/km. Input energy $E_0 = 0.032$ pJ and 0.016 pJ for maps A and B, respectively.

$\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma_0$ [128] and the stretching factor $S_i$ [130]. In place of the stretching factor we introduce a new parameter

$$T_{\text{map}} \equiv \left| \frac{\beta_{21} \beta_{22} l_1 l_2}{\beta_{21} l_1 - \beta_{22} l_2} \right|^{1/2}, \quad (2.39)$$

which depends only on the map parameters $\beta_{2i}$ and $l_i$ and has units of time. The use of this parameter is justified later. Figure 2.5 shows variations of $T_0(E_0)$ and $T_m(E_0)$ for two values of the ratio $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma_0$ and two values of $T_{\text{map}}$. Dispersion maps A, for which $T_{\text{map}} = 3.16$ ps (solid curves), and B, with $T_{\text{map}} = 26.9$ ps (dashed curves), each with two different values of average dispersion ($\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01$
and $-0.15$ ps$^2$/km) are used in this calculation. We see from the figure that the solutions for both maps look similarly, only the whole set of curves for system with $T_{map} = 26.9$ ps is shifted up from the case of system with $T_{map} = 3.16$ ps. As we also see from the figure, the $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma$ ratio affects dramatically the energy, at which $T_0$ takes its minimum value $T_0^{min}$ (in agreement with the result of [128]), but it does not affect much the minimum value itself, or the range of pulse stretching from $T_0$ to $T_m$. In contrast, the value of $T_0^{min}$, as well as the asymptotic value of $T_m$ at large energies, depends only on the parameter $T_{map}$. These results show that for a given two-section map configuration, there exists a limiting bit rate that depends on the value of $T_{map}$, which will be discussed in details in section 2.8.2.

Considering a wide variety of dispersion maps with different values of $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma_0$ and $T_{map}$, we find that for the lossless case, the value of $T_0^{min}$ always corresponds to $C_0 = \pm 1$ (the choice of sign depends on whether $\beta_{21}$ is negative or positive, respectively). An important feature is that, in a large range of $\bar{\beta}_2$ values, not only the value of $T_0^{min}$, but also the whole curve $T_0(C_0)$ is invariant with respect to the ratio $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma_0$. In the next section we use this result and the qualitative features of Fig. 2.5 to find the dependence of $T_0$ on $C_0$ in an approximate analytic form.

### 2.6 Analytical Estimate of $T_0$

We obtain an approximate analytic formula for the input pulse width in the lossless case, setting $\alpha = 0$ in Eq. (2.35). This approach is justified because, as one
can see from Fig. 2.3, $T_0^{\text{min}}$ value and the range of pulse oscillations are almost the same in a DM system with no loss and in a DM system having 0.25 dB/km loss in each fiber section. This observation remains valid for systems with short-period dispersion maps, having any number of map periods within the amplification period. In such systems, $T_0^{\text{min}}$ also corresponds to $|C_0| \approx 1$ even in the presence of loss. This is the consequence of the fact that in short-period maps the chirp-free...
point is close to the middle of fiber segments even in the presence of losses (in the loss-less case it is exactly in the middle [131]). The importance of this observation will become clear from what follows. Equation (2.34) can be integrated formally to find

\[ T^2(z) = T^2_0(z) + 2 \int_0^z \beta_2(z') C(z') \, dz'. \quad (2.40) \]

Thus, \( T(z) \) can be determined if \( C(z) \) is known. Since a closed form expression for \( C(z) \) is not available, we follow an empirical method. Numerical simulations show that the chirp \( C \) can be represented, with an accuracy better than 0.1%, as a linear function of \( z \) in each fiber section for energy values in the range from 0 to about \( 5E_c \). Examples of chirp and pulse width variation within one map period, obtained by solving variational equations (2.34) and (2.35) numerically for the maps used in the previous section are shown on Figs. 2.6 and 2.7. Fig. 2.6 represents chirp and pulse width variation in maps A and B in the lossless case, with different values of input energy, while Fig. 2.7 assumes 0.25 dB/km losses in each fiber section. We see that chirp varies practically linearly in all cases, so that linear approximation is justified up to quite large values of energy. One can also note that a chirp-free point is located exactly in the middle of each section for all maps in the lossless case [131], as it was mentioned before, while in the presence of loss it is close to the middle of the section only in a dense dispersion map. Using the fact that chirp-free points are located in the middle of each section for \( \alpha = 0 \),
we approximate the chirp in each map period as

\[ C(z) = \begin{cases} 
C_0 \left( 1 - \frac{2}{l_1} z \right), & \text{if } 0 \leq z \leq l_1, \\
-C_0 \left( 1 - \frac{2}{l_2} \left( z - l_1 \right) \right), & \text{if } l_1 \leq z \leq L_m.
\end{cases} \]  

(2.41)

Using Eq. (2.41) in Eq. (2.40), we obtain the following approximate expression for pulse width:

\[ T^2(z) = \begin{cases} 
T^2_0 + 2\beta_21C_0 \left( 1 - \frac{z}{l_1} \right) z, & \text{if } 0 \leq z \leq l_1 \\
T^2_0 - 2\beta_22C_0 \left( 1 - \frac{(z-l_1)}{l_2} \right) \left( z - l_1 \right), & \text{if } l_1 \leq z \leq L_m.
\end{cases} \]  

(2.42)

In order to connect \( T_0 \) and \( C_0 \) values, we consider the ratio \((1 + C^2)/T^2\) because
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Figure 2.7: Variation of input chirp $C_0$ and input pulse width $T_0$ within one map period for maps A and B. Loss $\alpha = 0.25$ dB/km in each fiber section.

it represents the spectral width of a chirped pulse. In a linear system, this ratio remains constant and is equal to $1/T_0^2$. Numerical simulation show, that this ratio does not change much with propagation even in a DM system when the nonlinear length [25] is much larger than the local dispersion length. More specifically, it oscillates within each map period around its average value $(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2$ by less than 1%. Since the ratio $(1 + C^2)/T^2$ is almost constant during the propagation, the integral

$$I(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{1 + C^2(z')}{{T^2}(z')} \, dz' \approx \frac{1 + C_0^2}{T_0^2} \cdot z$$

(2.43)

grows almost linearly with $z$. We can estimate the error by calculating $I$ using Eqs. (2.41) and (2.42). We show a few steps in deriving the result. Consider first the interval $z \in [0, l_1]$. Making a change of variables $\xi \equiv l_1 - 2z$, noticing that $\xi$ changes from $l_1$ to $-l_1$ when $z \in [0, l_1]$, and using Eqs. (2.41) and (2.42), the ratio
(1 + C^2)/T^2 can be rewritten as

\[
\frac{1 + C^2}{T^2} = \frac{1 + (l_1 - 2z)^2 C_0^2}{l_1^2} - \frac{C_0^2}{l_1^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{T_0^2 - (l_1 + \xi)(l_1 - \xi) |\beta_{21} C_0|/2l_1}{1 + \xi^2 C_0^2/l_1^2}
\]

\[
= \frac{1 + a_1 \xi^2}{p_1 + q_1 \xi^2},
\]

(2.44)

where

\[
a_1 \equiv \frac{C_0^2}{l_1}, \quad p_1 \equiv T_0^2 - \frac{|\beta_{21} C_0| l_1}{2}, \quad q_1 \equiv \frac{|\beta_{21} C_0|}{2l_1}.
\]

(2.45)

In deriving Eq. (2.44), we used the fact that the sign of input chirp \(\text{sgn}(C_0)\) in a DM soliton system is always opposite to the sign of second-order dispersion in the first segment \(\text{sgn}(\beta_{21})\), since the pulse is supposed to be compressed in each fiber section, i.e. \(\beta_{21} C_0 = -|\beta_{21} C_0|\). Using Eq. (2.44), the integral \(I(z)\) in the first fiber segment can be found as

\[
I(z) \equiv \beta_{21} \int_0^{z \leq t_1} \frac{1 + C^2 (z')}{T^2 (z')} dz'
\]

\[
= \beta_{21} \int_{\xi \geq -l_1}^{l_1} \frac{1 + a_1 \xi^2}{p_1 + q_1 \xi^2} d\xi'
\]

\[
= 0.5 \beta_{21} \left\{ (p_1 q_1)^{-0.5} \tan^{-1} \left( \xi \sqrt{q_1/p_1} \right) \right|_{\xi \geq -l_1}
\]

\[
+ \left[ a_1 \xi / q_1 - a_1 \sqrt{p_1 q_1} \tan^{-1} \left( \xi \sqrt{q_1/p_1} \right) \right]_{\xi \geq -l_1}
\]

\[
= \frac{\beta_{21}}{2} \left( \frac{a_1 l_1}{q_1} - \frac{a_1 \xi}{q_1} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{\beta_{21} q_1 - a_1 p_1}{2 \sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}} \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{q_1/l_1} \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{q_1/p_1} \xi \right)
\]

(2.46)

Going back to the \(z\) variable and using again the relation \(\beta_{21} C_0 = -|\beta_{21} C_0|\), the
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The integral $I(z)$ in the first fiber segment is found to be

$$I(z) = \frac{1}{2} a_1 \left( l_1 - (l_1 - 2z) \right) + \frac{1}{2} q_1 - a_1 p_1 \frac{\tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} l_1 \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} (l_1 - 2z) \right)}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}}$$

$$= \frac{a_1}{q_1} z + \frac{1}{2} q_1 - a_1 p_1 \frac{\tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} l_1 \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} (l_1 - 2z) \right)}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}}$$

$$= \frac{2C_0^2 z}{|\beta_{21} C_0|} + \frac{1}{2} q_1 - a_1 p_1 \frac{\tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} l_1 \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} (l_1 - 2z) \right)}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}}$$

$$= - \frac{2C_0}{\beta_{21} l_1} z + \frac{1}{2} q_1 - a_1 p_1 \frac{\tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} l_1 \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{p_1}} (l_1 - 2z) \right)}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}}.$$

(2.47)

where $z \in [0, l_1]$.

Similarly, considering the second fiber section $z \in [l_1, L_m = l_1 + l_2]$, using the change of variables $\zeta \equiv l_2 - 2(z - l_1)$, and noticing that in this section $\beta_{22} C_0 = |\beta_{22} C_0|$, the ratio $(1 + C^2)/T^2$ can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1 + C^2}{T^2} = \frac{1 + a_2 \zeta^2}{p_2 + q_2 \zeta^2},$$

(2.48)

where

$$a_2 \equiv \frac{C_0^2}{l_2}, \quad p_2 \equiv T_0^2 - \frac{|\beta_{22} C_0| l_2}{2}, \quad q_2 \equiv \frac{|\beta_{22} C_0|}{2l_2}. \quad (2.49)$$

The integral $I(z)$ in the second fiber section is then equal to

$$I(z) = I(l_1) + \int_{l_1}^{z \leq l_1 + l_2} \frac{1 + C^2 (z')}{T^2 (z')} dz'$$

$$= I(l_1) + \frac{2C_0}{\beta_{22} l_2} (z - l_1)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} q_2 - a_2 p_2 \frac{\tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_2}{p_2}} l_2 \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_2}{p_2}} [l_2 - 2(z - l_1)] \right)}{\sqrt{p_2 q_2^3}}.$$

(2.50)
Summarizing the result, the integral over one map period is found to be

\[ I(z) = \begin{cases} 
-\frac{2C_0}{\beta_{21}l_1} z + \varepsilon_1(z), & 0 \leq z \leq l_1, \\
I(l_1) + \frac{2C_0}{\beta_{22}l_2} (z - l_1) + \varepsilon_2(z - l_1), & l_1 \leq z \leq L_m,
\end{cases} \tag{2.51} \]

where \( \varepsilon_i(z) \) \((i = 1, 2)\) is defined as

\[ \varepsilon_i(z) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \frac{q_i - a_ip_i}{q_i^3p_i} \left[ \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_i}{p_i}} (l_i) \right) - \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{q_i}{p_i}} (l_i - 2z) \right) \right], \tag{2.52} \]

and \( a_i, p_i, q_i \) are given by

\[ a_i \equiv \frac{C_0^2}{l_i^2}, \quad p_i \equiv T_0^2 - \frac{\beta_{21}C_0}{2} l_i, \quad q_i \equiv \frac{\beta_{22}C_0}{2l_i}. \tag{2.53} \]

For all practical maps, \( \varepsilon_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_2 \) are found to be negligible. Numerical simulations also confirm that the error in Eq. (2.43) does not exceed 0.2%. Neglecting \( \varepsilon_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_2 \) in Eq. (2.51), we notice that \( I(z) \) varies linearly with \( z \) but with different slopes. Assuming that the average dispersion is relatively small, we find the average slope and equate it to \((1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2\) from Eq. (2.43):

\[ \frac{1}{2} \left[ -\frac{2C_0}{\beta_{21}l_1} + \frac{2C_0}{\beta_{22}l_2} \right] = \frac{1 + C_0^2}{T_0^2}. \tag{2.54} \]

We then obtain the following expression for the input pulse width in terms of \( C_0 \) and dispersion map parameters:

\[ T_0 = T_{map} \sqrt{\frac{1 + C_0^2}{|C_0|}}. \tag{2.55} \]

Note the appearance of a single map parameter \( T_{map} \) defined as in Eq. (2.39). This parameter has units of time and plays an important role in the following discussion.
The dependence of input pulse width on the input chirp $C_0$ for the four DM systems of Fig. 2.5 is shown in Fig. 2.8. Open circles represent the values of input pulse width $T_0$ calculated using Eq. (2.55), while solid lines show the results obtained by solving variational equations (2.34) and (2.35) numerically. We find a very good agreement up to chirp values of $|C_0| = 3$. Although four dispersion maps are used for in Fig. 2.8, only two curves appear on this figure because, as was
mentioned before, the dependence of $T_0(C_0)$ curve on the ratio $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma$ is negligible when the average dispersion is much smaller than the local dispersion value. For that reason, the curves for $\bar{\beta}_2/\gamma = -0.004$ and $-0.06 \text{ ps}^2\text{W}$ are indistinguishable in Fig. 2.8.

Equation (2.55) can be used to find the minimum pulse width. Noticing that the chirp is zero at the location of the minimum pulse width point and using the fact that $(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2 \approx 1/T_m^2$, the minimum pulse width is given by

$$T_m = \frac{T_{map}}{\sqrt{|C_0|}}. \quad (2.56)$$

Equation (2.56) provides the average value of minimum pulse width in sections with positive and negative dispersions, but these values do not differ much in the region around $|C_0| \approx 1$. A comparison with numerical solutions shows that Eq. (2.56) is accurate to within 2% up to the values of input chirp $|C_0| \approx 3$. The examples of the comparison of numerical and analytical results will be shown in the next section.

Several interesting conclusions can be drawn from Eq. (2.55) and (2.56). First, Eq. (2.56) shows that the qualitative change of the $T_m(E_0)$ curve in Figs. 2.3 and 2.5 from a very rapid to a very slow decrease is due to $1/|C_0|$ dependence of the minimum pulse width. This results from the fact that, as seen in the inset of Fig. 2.3, the value of $|C_0|$ increases rapidly with increased energies. Second, the minimum value of the input pulse width from Eq. (2.55) indeed occurs for $|C_0| = 1$, as also found numerically. Third, when $|C_0| = 1$, $T_m$ is just equal to
the map parameter $T_{map}$. The input pulse width in this case is $T_0 = \sqrt{2}T_{map}$, showing that pulse width is stretched by the factor of $\sqrt{2}$ within each fiber link when input pulse width corresponds to its minimum width allowed for a given dispersion map. This indicates that the map parameter $T_{map}$ is an important design parameter for system characterization, since $\sqrt{2}T_{map}$ and $T_{map}$ describe, respectively, the minimum possible input width and the corresponding shortest pulse width in the fiber link for a given dispersion map.

2.7 Input energy estimation

Equation (2.55) provides the input pulse width corresponding to a given input chirp, while the full set of input parameters also includes the value of input energy $E_0$. In this section we estimate $E_0$ with the help of the approximate solution given in Eqs. (2.41) and (2.42). Setting $\alpha = 0$ in Eq. (2.35), integrating it over one map period and using the periodicity condition $C(0) = C(L_m)$ we obtain

$$
\int_0^{L_m} \frac{\gamma_0 E_0}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} + \int_0^{L_m} \beta_2 \frac{1 + C^2}{T^2} dz = 0. \tag{2.57}
$$

From Eq. (2.57) the input energy can be found as

$$
E_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{I_3 + I_4}} \left( I_1 + I_2 \right), \tag{2.58}
$$

where

$$
I_1 = -\beta_{21} \int_0^{L_m} \frac{1 + C^2(z)}{T^2(z)} dz, \tag{2.59}
$$
2.7. INPUT ENERGY ESTIMATION

\[ I_2 \equiv -\beta_{22} \int_{l_1}^{L_m} \frac{1 + C^2(z)}{T^2(z)} \, dz, \quad (2.60) \]

\[ I_3 \equiv \gamma_{01} \int_0^{l_1} \frac{dz}{T(z)}, \quad (2.61) \]

\[ I_4 \equiv \gamma_{02} \int_{l_2}^{L_m} \frac{dz}{T(z)}, \quad (2.62) \]

and \( \gamma_{0i} \) is the nonlinear coefficient in the \( i^{th} \) fiber section.

Using the result of Eq. (2.51), we can calculate the first two integrals in Eq. (2.58) as

\[ I_1 = -\beta_{21} I(l_1) = 2C_0 - \beta_{21} \varepsilon_1(l_1), \quad (2.63) \]

and

\[ I_2 = -\beta_{22} [I(l_1 + l_2) - I(l_1)] = -2C_0 - \beta_{22} \varepsilon_2(l_2). \quad (2.64) \]

Using Eq. (2.42) with the change of variables \( \xi \equiv l_2 - 2z \) for \( z \in [0, l_1] \) and \( \zeta \equiv l_2 - 2(z - l_1) \) for \( z \in [l_1, L_m = l_1 + l_2] \), the rest of the integrals in Eq. (2.58) can be found as follows:

\[ I_3 \equiv \frac{\gamma_{01}}{2} \int_{-l_1}^{l_1} \left[ \frac{T_0^2 + \frac{\beta_{21} C_0}{2l_1} (l_1^2 - \xi^2)}{\sqrt{p_1 + q_1 \xi^2}} \right]^{-1/2} \, d\xi \]

\[ \begin{align*}
&= \frac{\gamma_{01}}{2} \int_{-l_1}^{l_1} \frac{d\xi}{\sqrt{p_1 + q_1 \xi^2}} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_{01}}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{q_1}} \ln \frac{\sqrt{p_1 + q_1 l_1^2} + \sqrt{q_1 l_1}}{\sqrt{p_1 + q_1 l_1^2} - \sqrt{q_1 l_1}} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_{01}}{2 \sqrt{q_1}} \ln \frac{T_0 + l_1 \sqrt{q_1}}{T_0 - l_1 \sqrt{q_1}} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_{01}}{2 \sqrt{q_1}} \ln \frac{T_0 + \sqrt{\beta_{21} C_0} l_1 / 2}{T_0 - \sqrt{\beta_{21} C_0} l_1 / 2}, \quad (2.65)
\]
2.7. INPUT ENERGY ESTIMATION

where Eq. (2.53) is used for \( q_i \) and \( p_i \) and the relation \( \beta_{21} C_0 = -|\beta_{21} C_0| \) was employed. Similarly,

\[
I_4 = \frac{\gamma_0}{2} \int_{-l_2}^{l_2} \left[ T_0^2 - \frac{\beta_{22} C_0}{2l_2} \left( l_2^2 - \zeta^2 \right) \right]^{-1/2} d\zeta
\]

\[
= \frac{\gamma_0}{2 \sqrt{q_2}} \ln \frac{T_0 + l_2 \sqrt{q_2}}{T_0 - l_2 \sqrt{q_2}}
\]

\[
= \frac{\gamma_0}{2 \sqrt{q_2}} \ln \frac{T_0 + \sqrt{|\beta_{22} C_0| l_2}}{T_0 - \sqrt{|\beta_{22} C_0| l_2}}.
\] (2.66)

Using Eqs. (2.63)-(2.66) in Eq. (2.58), we arrive at the following expression for the input energy:

\[
E_0 = 2\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\beta_{21} \varepsilon_1 (l_1) + \beta_{22} \varepsilon_2 (l_2)}{(\gamma_0 \sqrt{q_1}) \ln r_1 + (\gamma_0 \sqrt{q_2}) \ln r_2},
\] (2.67)

where

\[
r_i = \frac{T_0 - l_i \sqrt{q_i}}{T_0 + l_i \sqrt{q_i}}
\]

\[
= \frac{T_0 - \sqrt{|\beta_{2i} C_0| l_i}}{T_0 + \sqrt{|\beta_{2i} C_0| l_i}},
\] (2.68)

and \( \varepsilon_i \) and \( q_i \) are given by Eqs. (2.52) and (2.53), respectively. Note that, from Eq. (2.52), \( \varepsilon_i (l_i) \) are equal to:

\[
\varepsilon_1 (l_1) = \frac{q_1 - a_1 p_1}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{q_1} l_1}{p_1} \right),
\]

\[
\varepsilon_2 (l_2) = \frac{q_2 - a_2 p_2}{\sqrt{p_2 q_2^3}} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\sqrt{q_2} l_2}{p_2} \right),
\] (2.69)

so that Eq. (2.67) can be expressed as

\[
E_0 = 2\sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\beta_{21} \frac{q_1 - a_1 p_1}{\sqrt{p_1 q_1^3}} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{l_1 \sqrt{q_1}}{p_1} \right) + \beta_{22} \frac{q_2 - a_2 p_2}{\sqrt{p_2 q_2^3}} \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{l_2 \sqrt{q_2}}{p_2} \right)}{(\gamma_0 \sqrt{q_1}) \ln r_1 + (\gamma_0 \sqrt{q_2}) \ln r_2}.
\] (2.70)
A comparison of numerical and analytical results is represented in Figs. 2.9–2.11. Figs. 2.9 and 2.10 show the comparison in the case of no loss for two of the systems used in Fig. 2.5: for the dense DM system with $T_{\text{map}} = 3.16\text{ ps}$ (map A) and for ordinary DM system with $T_{\text{map}} = 26.9\text{ ps}$ (map B). Solid lines represent the numerical solution while circles show analytical results. The inserts show pulse width and energy as functions of input chirp, as suggested by the analytical solution (2.55),(2.56), and (2.67), while the larger graphs are the same kind of

Figure 2.9: Comparison of numerical and analytical results for dense DM system with no loss and with $T_{\text{map}} = 3.16\text{ ps}$. 

![Diagram showing pulse width and energy as functions of input chirp.](image-url)
Figure 2.10: Comparison of numerical and analytical results for ordinary DM system with no loss and with $T_{map} = 26.9$ ps.

curves considered in Figs. 2.3 and 2.5. In all cases we see an excellent agreement for input and minimum pulse width results, for all values of input chirp, and we see a good agreement for the energy up to chirp values of about 1.5. The energy values obtained from Eqs. (2.67) or (2.70) differ by at most 5% from numerically obtained values in the region around $|C_0| = 1$, while the difference becomes about 10% for $|C_0| \approx 1.25$. 

Note that Eqs. (2.67) and (2.70) are derived for a lossless system or for systems with distributed amplification. The effect of periodic gain/loss variation can be included by increasing $E_0$ by a factor of

$$k = \left\{ \frac{1}{L_A} \int_0^{L_A} \exp \left[ \int_0^z \left( g(z') - \alpha_s(z') \right) dz' \right] dz \right\}^{-1}$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{no loss} \\ \frac{\text{GlnG/}(G - 1)}{1}, & \text{lumped amplification} \\ \left\{ \frac{1}{L_A} \int_0^{L_A} \exp \left[ \int_0^z \left( g(z') - \alpha_s(z') \right) dz' \right] dz \right\}^{-1}, & \text{Raman} \end{cases}$$

where $G$ represents the cumulative net gain from 0 to $L_A$ and $g(z)$ is the local gain in the case of distributed amplification. This is the same factor as it is required for a classical soliton to maintain itself over long fiber length (satisfying $L \ll L_{NL}$) in the average sense in the presence of loss and lumped amplification [25]. This scaling is valid for values of $S_m$ up to 4 for DM systems with short fiber sections.

The comparison of the results for system with losses is shown in Fig. 2.11. The same dense DM system with $T_{map} = 3.16$ ps as in Fig. 2.9 is considered here, except that 0.25-dB/km losses are included. Dashed lines and open circles show the results from Fig. 2.9 for the lossless case. We see again an excellent agreement for input and minimum pulse width for all values of input chirp, and a good agreement for energy for chirp values up to 1.5. We see also that the set of curves for system with losses is shifted from the lossless case to the larger values of energy in accordance with the scaling factor (2.71). We have verified that energy values obtained using Eq. (2.67) give a stable pulse propagation up to
Figure 2.11: Comparison of numerical and analytical results for dense DM system with 0.25 dB/km loss in each fiber section ($T_{map} = 3.16$ ps.)

about 40,000 km. Although the error in $E_0$ leads to larger peak power oscillations during propagation, the amplitude of such oscillations does not exceed ±5% of the average peak power.

Summarizing the results of Figs. 2.9–2.11, we can conclude that for ideal distributed amplification which is, basically, the lossless case, there is a good agreement of results for arbitrary DM system and for system with losses and lumped amplification, there is a good agreement in the case of dense dispersion
management. The reason that, in the case of lumped amplification, Eqs. (2.55), (2.56), and (2.67) work only for dense DM system comes from the fact that the assumption of chirp free point location to be in the center of fiber section, used in the derivation [see Eq. (2.41)], is strictly valid only for a lossless system, and is approximately valid in system with losses only in the case of short map periods, as it was mentioned in the beginning of section 2.6.

We can also see from Eqs. (2.67) and (2.70), that the input energy increases for larger value of the ratio $\beta_2/\gamma_0$, in accordance with Fig. 2.5 and with the results of [130], and in analogy with the classical soliton behavior.

2.8 Design Rules

2.8.1 Optimum chirp values

Eqs. (2.55) and (2.67) provide the values of input pulse width and energy as functions of input chirp. We now consider which range of input chirp values should be used to obtain the best pulse sequence propagation. From Figs. 2.3, 2.5, and 2.9-2.11 we note that just after $T_0$ takes its minimum value, $T_m$ continues to decrease while $T_0$ is relatively constant. We expect the longest propagation distance, as well as a highest bit rate for a given distance, to occur in this region ($|C_0| \approx 1$, $E_0 \approx E_c$). For energies smaller than $E_c$, the bit rate is limited by the large values of $T_0$ and $T_m$ and for energies much larger than $E_c$ it would be
limited by pulse interactions because of increased pulse stretching and higher pulse energies. This is confirmed in Fig. 2.12, where we show the maximum propagation length as a function of input chirp $C_0$ for pseudorandom bit sequence at 80 and 160 Gb/s. The figure represents the results of numerical simulations, not including noise in the system, so that propagation was limited only by pulse interactions. As the criterion for figure construction, the requirement was used that timing jitter
because of pulse interactions is less than 8% of the bit slot and an eye closing is not more than 5%. The map with $\beta_{21} = 4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ and $\beta_{22} = -4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ is used in this calculation by choosing $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.01$ and $-0.005 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ for 80 and 160 Gb/s systems, respectively. We also reduce the section length to $l_1 = 0.6 \text{ km}$, for 160 Gb/s system, and use $l_1 = 3 \text{ km}$ for 80 Gb/s systems. The solid curves represent the results when losses are neglected and the dashed curves include 0.25 dB/km loss in each fiber section and assume 80 km amplifier spacing. Two points are noteworthy. First, maximum distance can exceed 6000 km even at a bit rate of 160-Gb/s when dense DM is used [132]. Second, in all cases the maximum occurs in the region $1.1 < |C_0| < 1.2$.

### 2.8.2 Limiting bit rate

Using this optimum region of chirp values, we can estimate, from Eq. (2.55) and (2.56), the maximum possible bit rate for a given map configuration. For example, consider a dispersion map made using 70 km of standard fiber ($\beta_{21} = -22 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$) and 15.3 km of DCF ($\beta_{22} = 100 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$). The average dispersion for this map is $\bar{\beta}_2 \approx -0.1 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$, while $T_{\text{map}} = 27.7 \text{ ps}$. From Eqs. (2.55) and (2.56), $T_0$ is about 39.3 ps and $T_m \approx 26.4 \text{ ps}$ for $|C_0| = 1.1$, the chirp value within the optimum range. Since the shortest pulse width that can propagate as a DM soliton is 26.4 ps, such a map configuration can never provide a bit rate of 40 Gb/s for which the bit slot is only 25 ps.
2.8. DESIGN RULES

To increase the bit rate, according to Eqs (2.55) and (2.56), one needs to reduce the value of the map parameter $T_{\text{map}}$. From Eq. (2.39) this is possible by reducing either the dispersion or the length of fiber segments. Consider the design of a 160 Gb/s system. Since the bit slot is only 6.25 ps wide, the map parameter $T_{\text{map}}$ should not exceed 1.06 ps to avoid soliton interaction. For $(\beta_{2i} - \bar{\beta}_2) = \pm 1 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ ($i = 1$ and 2 in the first and second fiber sections, respectively), according to Eq. (2.39), we need to take $l_i \approx 2.24 \text{ km}$. Moreover, the section lengths reduce to only $l_i \approx 0.6 \text{ km}$ if it is necessary to use larger local dispersion values of $\pm 4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ to avoid four-wave mixing in WDM applications. This result explains why dense dispersion management is a necessity for designing systems at bit rates $> 40 \text{ Gb/s}$ [126]–[129].

2.8.3 Optimum map strength values

We now discuss the range of map strength [130] $S_m$ corresponding to the values of input chirp $1.1 < |C_0| < 1.2$. The map strength parameter in our notation can be written as

$$S_m = \left| \frac{1}{1.665 T_{\text{map}}} \left( (\beta_{21} - \bar{\beta}_2) l_1 - (\beta_{22} - \bar{\beta}_2) l_2 \right) \right| |C_0|,$$

(2.72)

where the factor of 1.665 results from using the full width at half maximum. For small average dispersion values, $|\beta_{21} l_1| \approx |\beta_{22} l_2|$, and Eq. (2.72) can be approximated as $S_m \approx 1.443 |C_0|$. As discussed above, pulse interactions are minimized for value of input chirp $|C_0|$ between 1.1 and 1.2. Using those values,
we find that using chirp values from the optimum region is equivalent to having a system with map strength of $1.59 < S_m < 1.73$. This explains the previously known empirical result that the least interactions occur for $S_m$ values around 1.65 [125].

### 2.8.4 Optimum fiber section length

Eq. (2.55) together with the fact that optimum chirp values are around 1.1 also suggests that an optimum fiber section length exists. For a small average dispersion value, we can approximate Eq. (2.55) as $T_0^2 \approx |\beta_{21}l_1| (1 + C_0^2)/(2 |C_0|)$. Using $C_0 \approx 1.1$ and $L_D \equiv T_0^2 / |\beta_{21}|$, the configuration giving the map strength of about 1.65 corresponds to the map for which the length of each fiber segment is approximately equal to the local dispersion length $L_D$.

Although Eq. (2.55) and 2.56) appear similar to those obtained for a linear system, the presence of nonlinearity is critical for DM solitons. In fact, a periodic solution of Eqs. (2.34) and (2.35) does not exist in the linear case ($\gamma_0 = 0$) unless the average dispersion $\bar{\beta}_2$ is zero. We have verified through numerical simulations that Eq. (2.55) remains valid in the region $1 < |C_0| < 1.5$ with an accuracy better than 1% as long as the value of $\bar{\beta}_2 L_m$ does not exceed $\approx 12\%$ of $(\beta_{2i} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_i$ in the $i^{th}$ section ($i = 1, 2$). This relation gives, for example, average dispersion as large as $\bar{\beta}_2 = -0.5$ ps$^2$/km for $(\beta_{2i} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_i = 20$ ps$^2$ and $\bar{\beta}_2 \approx -2$ ps$^2$/km for $(\beta_{2i} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_i = 1500$ ps$^2$. 
2.9 Conclusions

In this chapter, using the approximate analytic solutions of the variational equations (2.35) and (2.34), we derived analytical expressions for input pulse parameters that ensure a periodical pulse propagation in a two-fiber-section dispersion map. The expressions are explicit and relatively simple. We compared the approximate values of the input chirp, width, and energy with numerical solutions of the variational equations and found a very good agreement with the numerical results. The derived analytical expressions also show several interesting facts about a DM soliton system design; these which can be summarized as follow.

- There exists a minimum input pulse width $T_{0}^{\text{min}}$, and this value limits the bit rate for a given map configuration.

- A new map parameter is introduced that allows the estimation of the limiting bit rate and explains the need of dense DM at high bit rates.

- The expressions provide simple suggestions on how to design a system so that intrachannel pulse interactions are minimized.

- The optimal input chirp value is around 1.1. This optimum explains the previously known empirical result that pulse interactions are minimized for the map strength of 1.65 [125].

- Expressions also show that this optimal design corresponds to the case when fiber section length is approximately equal to the local dispersion length.
Chapter 3

Impact of dispersion fluctuations

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter we present the results of extensive numerical simulations performed to identify the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the performance of 40-Gb/s dispersion-managed lightwave systems with several different modulation formats. The emphasis in this analysis is on identifying how the nonlinear effects degrade the system performance in the presence of dispersion fluctuations. The chapter is organized as follow. In Section 3.2 we discuss the numerical approach. Section 3.3 focuses on non-soliton systems based on the CRZ format and employing backward-pumped distributed Raman amplification. We start by considering a perfectly linear system and study how the presence of nonlinearity aggravates the extent of system degradation induced by dispersion fluctuations. We then discuss the ways to improve system tolerance to dispersion fluctuations. In Section 3.4, we consider DM soliton systems. We first address the questions of the
optimization of input parameters for a given dispersion map and then investigate the influence of dispersion fluctuations on the system performance. The main conclusions of the paper are summarized in Section 3.5.

3.2 Numerical approach

Accounting for the presence of noise and dispersion fluctuations, the NLS equation (2.22), describing propagation of pulses on optical fiber, can be modified as follow:

\[
\frac{\partial A}{\partial z} = -i \tilde{\beta}_2 \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial t^2} + i \gamma_0 |A|^2 A + \frac{1}{2} (g - \alpha) A + f_n(z, t),
\]

(3.1)

where \( \tilde{\beta}_2(z) \) is a fluctuating second-order dispersion parameter and \( f_n(z, t) \) represents the contribution of noise along the fiber length.

In this section, we assume that distributed Raman amplification is employed for the gain \( g(z) \) in Eq. (3.1). This technique of amplification is used for simulations because it provides a better SNR compared with lumped EDFAs and is rapidly being adopted in practice.

We solve Eq. (3.1) numerically using the split-step Fourier method [25]. This method obtains an approximate solution of the NLS equation (3.1) by assuming that in propagating the optical field over a small distance \( h \), the dispersive and nonlinear effects can be pretended to act independently. In short, propagation from \( z \) to \( z + h \) is carried out in two steps. In the first step, fiber is assumed to be nondispersive, so that nonlinearity acts alone and a pulse just acquires a nonlinear
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phase shift during propagation. In the second step, the system is assumed to be linear, so that the equation can be solved in the Fourier domain. Mathematically, Eq. (3.1) can be formally written in the form [25]

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial z} = (\hat{D} + \hat{N})A,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

where \( \hat{D} \) is a differential operator that accounts for dispersion, absorption, and noise in a linear medium and \( \hat{N} \) is a nonlinear operator that governs the effect of fiber nonlinearities on pulse propagation. Propagation from \( z \) to \( z + h \) is then calculated as

$$A(z + h, T) \approx \exp(h\hat{D})\exp(h\hat{N})A(z, T),$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

where the execution of the exponential operator \( \exp(h\hat{D}) \) is carried out in the Fourier domain by using the prescription

$$\exp(h\hat{D})B(z, T) = F^{-1}\exp[h\hat{D}(i\omega)]FB(z, T).$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

In the last equation, \( F \) denotes the Fourier-transform operation and \( \hat{D}(i\omega) \) is obtained from \( \hat{D} \) by replacing the differential operator \( \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \) by \( i\omega \), \( \omega \) being the frequency in the Fourier domain. The discussion of the accuracy of this method and the ways to achieve the best accuracy can be found in [25].

We model dispersion fluctuations as

$$\tilde{\beta}_2(z) = \beta_2(z) + \delta\beta_2(z),$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

where \( \beta_2(z) \) is the average value of local dispersion and \( \delta\beta_2(z) \) is a small random variable assumed to have a Gaussian distribution with zero mean. In numerical
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simulations, $\delta \beta_2$ is changed every step (0.3 km) along the fiber length using a Gaussian random variable with zero mean and with standard deviation of up to $0.2 \beta_2(z)$. We use 15 different realizations of this stochastic Gaussian process, representing 15 different fiber links.

To account for the ASE noise for each of the 15 links, the $Q$ parameter (defined later) is evaluated by averaging over an ensemble of 1280 pulses, realized by repeated propagation of a 64-bit pseudorandom bit sequence with 20 different ASE noise realizations. As it was mentioned in chapter 1, there are two main sources of dispersion fluctuations. One of them is the variation of the material and waveguide portions of the refractive index along the fiber length. Such variation introduces static dispersion fluctuations. Another source comes from environmental changes and leads to varying in time, or dynamic, dispersion fluctuations. Since time-dependent dispersion fluctuations happen on quite a long time scale ($> 1$ ms), there are no dynamic fluctuations during a single run for a bit stream of 128 bits or less. Assuming static and dynamic dispersion fluctuations to be independent events, the impact of both types of fluctuations can be treated by considering the results of propagation of the same bit stream over multiple fiber links with different realizations of dispersion fluctuations.

For numerical simulations, we use two dispersion maps. Each map consists of two fiber sections of nearly equal length (5 km) with opposite signs of the dispersion parameter (but the same absolute value). For map 1, $\beta_2 = \pm 4$ ps$^2$/km,
while for map 2 $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km. In both cases, the average dispersion $\bar{\beta}_2$ is $-0.01$ ps$^2$/km and $L_A = 8L_m = 80$ km, $L_A$ and $L_m$ being the amplification and the map periods, respectively. We adopt the dense DM technique ($L_m \ll L_A$) because, according to the results of Chapter 2, its use improves the performance of 40-Gb/s systems especially when DM solitons are used. Fiber losses are included using $\alpha_s = 0.2$ and $\alpha_p = 0.27$ dB/km in each fiber section, $\alpha_p$ being pump power losses at the pump wavelength. We employ the technique of Raman distributed amplification with backward pumping for compensating fiber losses. The gain profile $g(z)$ is obtained by solving the appropriate equations for the Raman amplification process [3]. In particular, in the case of distributed Raman amplification, gain $g(z)$ in Eq. (3.1) can be shown to be expressed as [25]

$$g(z) = g_s |A_p(z)|^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

where $g_s$ is related to the peak Raman gain $g_R$ as $g_s = g_R/A_{eff}$. Raman gain $g_R$ is, in turn, related to the cross section of spontaneous Raman scattering [121,120] and is a measurable quantity [25,136,137]. In the expression for $g(z)$, $|A_p(z)|^2$ is the pump power. In the case of continuous-wave backward pumping and with the undepleted pump approximation, pump power $I_p \equiv |A_p(z)|^2$ can be approximated as $I_p = I_{p0} \exp[-\alpha_p(L_A - z)]$, where $I_{p0} \equiv |A_p(L)|^2$ is the peak pump power at $z = L_A$ and pump power losses are assumed to be constant throughout the fiber link. We choose the input peak power $I_{p0}$ at $z = L_A$ from the condition of complete loss compensation, such that $\int_0^{L_A} g(z)dz = \alpha_s L_A$. Using the expression (3.6) for
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\[ g(z), \text{ we find } I_{p0} = \alpha_p \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{s_i} l_i / \left( g_s \left[ 1 - \exp^{-\alpha_p L_A} \right] \right), \]

where \( N \) is the number of fiber sections within the amplification period. At the input, we use 6-ps input pulses with the input chirp \( C_0 = 0.3 \). We also use optical filters with 400 GHz bandwidth separated by \( L_A \).

The system performance is quantified by the well-known \( Q \) parameter that is related to the bit-error rate in a simple way [1]. We calculate the \( Q \) parameter in two ways. The first measure \( Q_1 \) uses the detector current filtered with a Butterworth filter of 35 GHz (\( \Delta f = 0.875 \) B) bandwidth at the receiver. More specifically, \( Q_1 \) is calculated using [1]

\[ Q_1 = \frac{I_1 - I_0}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_0}, \] (3.7)

where \( I_1 \) and \( I_0 \) are the average values for 1 and 0 bits at the center of the bit slot, and \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_0 \) are the corresponding standard deviations. In this approach, \( I_1 \) and \( I_0 \) correspond to the peak power of the optical pulse (assuming that the timing jitter introduced by Raman amplification is negligible).

In the second approach we calculate the optical \( Q \) parameter by using the pulse energy obtained by integrating over the entire bit slot and define \( Q \) as

\[ Q_2 = \frac{E_1 - E_0}{\sigma_1 + \sigma_0}, \] (3.8)

where \( E_1 \) and \( E_0 \) are the average energies for 1 and 0 bits and \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_0 \) are the corresponding standard deviations.
3.3 CRZ systems

We start by considering a perfectly linear 40-Gb/s system. For this case, nonlinearity is set to zero ($\gamma_0 = 0$) temporarily in Eq. (3.1). For the 15 fiber links, we find the $Q$ parameter (averaged over 1280 pulses for each fiber link) as a function of propagation distance for several values of the standard deviation of local dispersion. As an example, Figure 3.1 shows the $Q_1$ parameter for all 15 fiber links for the map with $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km with 5% of dispersion fluctuations, which

![Figure 3.1: Influence of dispersion fluctuations in a linear 40-Gb/s CRZ DM system with $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km. The $Q_1$ parameter is shown as a function of distance for 15 fiber links with 5% dispersion fluctuations (standard deviation $\sigma_D = 0.4$ ps$^2$/km). The insert shows $Q_1$ in the absence of fluctuations.](image)
corresponds to the standard deviation $\sigma_D$ of local dispersion of 0.4 ps$^2$/km for this map. The input peak power of each pulse is $P_0 = 2$ mW, which corresponds to an average power of 0.42 mW for the pseudorandom bit sequence. The insert shows the $Q_1$ parameter in the absence of fluctuations.

We see that, in the linear case, the $Q$ parameter does not change much in the presence of fluctuations for all 15 fiber links used. The reason for small difference in $Q$ along the distance for 15 fiber links comes from additional accumulated dispersion $d_r = \int_0^L \delta \beta_2(z) dz$ that varies randomly for different fibers. This additional contribution broadens the pulse even more during signal propagation [114,115]. The value and the sign of this additional broadening depend on $d_r$ [115]. This random broadening leads to a change in the $Q$ value. For the 15 fiber links used, $d_r$ at 2400 km ranged from $-12.6$ ps$^2$ to $22.8$ ps$^2$ when 5% of dispersion fluctuations were introduced, while the deterministic value of accumulated dispersion at this distance is $-24$ ps$^2$.

We consider now the worst-case $Q$-parameter at 2400 km. Figure 3.2 shows the dependence of the worst-case $Q$ for the two maps on the standard deviation of dispersion fluctuations. The levels of fluctuations used correspond to the standard deviation $\sigma_D$ ranging from 0 to 20% of the local dispersion value. For each value of standard deviation, the same 15 sequences of random numbers, scaled accordingly, were used, and the fiber link with the worst value of $Q$ at 2400 km was then considered.
Figure 3.2: The worst-case $Q$ parameter at 2400 km for two linear 40-Gb/s CRZ DM systems. Dispersion map is such that (a) $\beta_2 = \pm 4$ ps$^2$/km and (b) $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km. Solid and dashed lines show $Q_1$ and $Q_2$ calculated using peak powers and pulse energies, respectively.
As seen in Fig. 3.2, the $Q$ parameter decreases in all cases even in a purely linear system as the standard deviation of dispersion fluctuations increases. Although this decrease is relatively slow, eventually $Q$ becomes small enough that the system will be limited by dispersion fluctuations. The decrease of $Q$ parameter with increased $\beta_2$ fluctuations even for a linear system is due to the larger values of $d_r$ for larger amounts of fluctuations. The results indicate that, for a given fiber link, $Q$ can be improved by post-compensating or periodically compensating the accumulated random dispersion.

We note from Fig. 3.2 that $Q_1$ is up to 1.1 dB larger than $Q_2$. The reason is related to the fact that $Q_1$ samples the pulse power at the bit center while $Q_2$ measures the pulse energy spread over the entire bit. As a result, $Q_1$ parameter is much more sensitive to timing jitter than $Q_2$. This result suggests that the use of a receiver that integrates the signal over the bit slot rather than makes a measurement at one point would improve the system performance. Since most receivers currently sample the signal at the bit center, we use the $Q_1$ parameter for system characterization in this thesis.

The results shown in Fig. 3.2 were obtained by turning off the nonlinear term in Eq. (3.1) by setting $\gamma_0 = 0$. However, the nonlinearity is inherent in any real system. In the presence of nonlinearity, the pulse propagation is affected by the interplay between the local dispersion and nonlinearity (rather than being dependent only on the total accumulated dispersion). We consider next how the
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Figure 3.3: Influence of dispersion fluctuations in the presence of nonlinearity for the same 40-Gb/s CRZ system shown in Fig. 3.1. The inserts show $Q_1$ in the absence of fluctuations. The input peak powers are (a) 1 mW and (b) 2 mW.

$\sigma_D = 0.4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
$\beta_2 = \pm 8 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
$\gamma_0 = 2.5 \text{ W}^{-1}/\text{km}$
$P_0 = 1 \text{ mW}$

$\sigma_D = 0.4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
$\beta_2 = \pm 8 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
$\gamma_0 = 2.5 \text{ W}^{-1}/\text{km}$
$P_0 = 2 \text{ mW}$
impact of dispersion fluctuations is changed when the nonlinear effects are taken into account by choosing $\gamma_0 = 2.5 \text{ W}^{-1}/\text{km}$ in all fiber sections.

Figure 3.3 shows the $Q_1$ parameter as a function of distance for the 15 fiber links for the DM system with $\beta_2 = \pm 8 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ using $P_0 = 1$ and 2 mW. For both peak power levels the standard deviation of local dispersion is 5% (0.4 ps$^2$/km). The inserts show $Q_1$ in the absence of fluctuations. We see that, as nonlinear effects become stronger, the impact of dispersion fluctuations on system performance becomes much more noticeable. While the decrease in $Q_1$ at 2400 km is at most 0.46 dB for 1 mW peak power, it becomes 1.8 dB at 2 mW.

For any peak power, larger fluctuations lead to more degradation. As an example, the worst-case $Q_1$ parameter at a peak power of 1.5 mW is shown on Fig. 3.4 for several levels of $\sigma_D$. We see that fluctuations with $\sigma_D = 1.6 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$ can lead to about 6.5 dB degradation of the $Q$ parameter. We note also that, for all fiber links considered, the worst case $Q$ at 2400 km for CRZ systems is usually obtained in the fiber which has the largest random accumulated dispersion $d_r$ at 2400 km.

The results of Figs. 3.3 and 3.4 are summarized in Fig. 3.5 which shows the worst-case $Q_1$ at 2400 km for several values of input peak power as a function of $\sigma_D$. Comparing to Fig. 3.2, we see that in all cases the $Q$ parameter degrades much faster with increasing dispersion fluctuations than in a linear system. The rate of
Figure 3.4: Dependence of the worst-case $Q_1$ parameter on transmission distance for several values of $\sigma_D$. Dispersion maps are such that (a) $\beta_2 = \pm 4$ ps$^2$/km and (b) $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km.
Figure 3.5: Effect of dispersion fluctuations on $Q_1$ at several peak power levels for the same two systems shown in Fig. 3.2 except that the nonlinear effects are turned on by setting $\gamma_0 = 2.5 \text{ W}^{-1}/\text{km}$. 
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Figure 3.6: Dependence of the worst-case $Q_1$ parameter on the input peak power for the same 40-Gb/s system shown in Fig. 3.5(b) for several levels of dispersion fluctuations.

degradation increases when the nonlinear effects are intensified using larger input powers.

For any CRZ system, an optimum input power exists that provides the best system performance for a certain propagation distance [138]. For input powers smaller than the optimum, the CRZ system becomes limited by noise added by amplifiers, while for larger input powers it is limited by the increased nonlinear
effects. An example of such a behavior at a distance of 2400 km for the 40 Gb/s system designed with $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km, is shown on Fig. 3.6, where we plot $Q_1$ as a function of input power. The optimum peak power in the absence of dispersion fluctuations is about 2 mW. Even 5% dispersion fluctuations (standard deviation 0.4 ps$^2$/km) reduce the optimum peak power to near 1.3 mW while lowering the value of $Q$ by about 26%. Larger values of fluctuations make the situation worse. To increase the system tolerance to dispersion fluctuations it may be better, according to figs. 3.5 and 3.6, to use input peak powers slightly less than the optimum value predicted in the absence of fluctuations.

3.4 DM soliton systems

A natural question is how the impact of dispersion fluctuations on system performance is affected when DM solitons are used as bits. In this section we answer this question. Since DM soliton systems require a balance between the dispersive and nonlinear effects, the presence of dispersion fluctuations might break this balance and degrade the system performance even more. We study how much the rate of degradation increases when the input power and, hence, the nonlinear effects in DM soliton system become larger.

The new feature of DM solitons is that the system is designed such that the pulse in each bit slot recovers its width, chirp, and energy after each amplification period. Thus, all pulse parameters vary periodically during the propagation with
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a period equal to $L_A$. As discussed in Chapter II, the periodicity can be ensured only if the input pulse parameters have specific values for a given dispersion map. As shown in the previous chapter, the input width of a chirped pulse $T_0$ and the input energy $E_0$ can be found as functions of input chirp using Eqs. (2.55) and (2.67). The input parameters for chirp values ranging from 0.03 to 3 is shown in Fig. 3.7 for the same two maps used in CRZ case.

As it is shown in Chapter 2, in the absence of noise but accounting for intrachannel pulse interactions, the best pulse propagation occurs near this region $|C_0| \approx 1$, $E_0 \approx E_c$, $E_c$ being the value of input energy corresponding to $|C_0| = 1$. In this section we consider several input parameters sets, with the energies ranging from $E_c$ to $\approx 5E_c$, where the nonlinear effects become quite strong. The sets of input parameters used are shown with arrows in Fig. 3.7. For comparison purposes, we employ same two dispersion maps used earlier for CRZ systems. We note from Eq.(2.39) that reducing the length of fiber segments decreases the $T_{map}$ parameter, which helps to increase the possible bit rate of a DM soliton system. For that reason, dense dispersion management is used in this chapter. The map parameter is $T_{map} = 3.17$ ps and $T_{map} = 4.47$ ps for systems with $\beta_2 = \pm 4$ and $\pm 8$ ps$^2$/km, respectively.

We consider the same 15 fiber links with random dispersion fluctuations as in the CRZ case. Figure 3.8 shows the $Q_1$ parameter as a function of distance for the map $\beta_2 = \pm 8$ ps$^2$/km for input parameters sets corresponding to $C_0 = -1.2$
Figure 3.7: Input pulse width $T_0$ and corresponding minimum pulse width $T_m$ at the chirp-free point for a DM soliton system plotted as functions of the input pulse energy. The arrows indicate the input pulse parameters used in Figs. 3.8 and 3.9 simulations.
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Figure 3.8: Effect of dispersion fluctuations on $Q_1$ parameter for a DM soliton system for the same map used in Fig. 3.3. The input parameters are obtained from Fig. 3.7 for (a) $C_0 = -1.2$ and (b) $C_0 = -2.0$. 

- $\sigma_0 = 0.4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
- $\beta_2 = \pm 8 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
- $C_0 = -1.2$

- $\sigma_0 = 0.4 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
- $\beta_2 = \pm 8 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$
- $C_0 = -2.0$
and $-2$. The level of fluctuations is 5% ($\sigma_D = 0.4$ ps$^2$/km) for both sets of input parameters. The inserts show $Q_1$ in the absence of fluctuations.

Since the input energy is increased for $C_0 = -2$, the nonlinear effects are much stronger in this case and the $Q$ parameter is affected much more by dispersion fluctuations than in system with $C_0 = -1.2$. We have chosen to label the graphs with the input chirp $C_0$ because, as described before, the optimization of this parameter will apply to almost any dispersion map while the optimum value of pulse energy is map dependent.

The dependence of the worst case $Q_1$ parameter on the standard deviation of $\beta_2$ at a distance of 2400 km is shown on Fig. 3.9 for several input parameters sets. The $\sigma_D$ values are in the range from 0 to 20% of the local dispersion for each map. Similarly to the CRZ case, the use of higher energy pulses (and higher average power at the input end) decreases the system tolerance to dispersion fluctuations. This behavior is the same for both maps. In the absence of both noise and dispersion fluctuations ($\langle \delta \beta_2^2 \rangle = 0$) the optimum value of the $Q$ parameter is obtained for input chirp values near 1.1, as discussed in Chapter 2. According to Fig. 3.9, in the presence of noise but without dispersion fluctuations, $Q$ increases for larger values of $C_0$ because the use of higher-energy pulses improves the SNR while the nonlinear effects are balanced by the use of DM solitons. However, dispersion fluctuations change this behavior because they perturb the balance between the dispersive and nonlinear effects. For example, in the presence of
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Figure 3.9: Effect of dispersion fluctuations on $Q_1$ parameter in DM soliton systems for the same two dispersion maps used in Fig. 3.5.
10% dispersion fluctuations, it is better to reduce the pulse energy by lowering the chirp in the neighborhood of $C_0 = 1.2$. We conclude that while accounting for both noise and dispersion fluctuations, the optimum input parameters should remain in the region around $C_0 \approx 1.2$. Comparing DM solitons with the CRZ case, we note that $Q_1$ decreases with increasing $\beta_2$ fluctuations in nearly the same manner, suggesting that the impact of dispersion fluctuations does not depend on the use of solitons as long as the RZ format is employed.

### 3.5 Conclusions

In this chapter we investigated numerically the influence of second-order dispersion fluctuations on the performance of 40 Gb/s systems designed with distributed Raman amplification. We have considered both the CRZ and DM soliton formats and used the $Q$ parameter for judging the system performance.

We have shown that dispersion fluctuations can lead to performance degradation even in a linear system when the change in the total accumulated dispersion, introduced by fluctuations, is not completely compensated. The presence of nonlinearity aggravates the extent of system degradation induced by dispersion fluctuations for both CRZ and DM soliton systems. We show that this degradation increases fast when the nonlinear effects in the system are made stronger by using higher-energy pulses. The system tolerance to dispersion fluctuations can be improved by employing a receiver that integrates the signal over some portion
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of the bit slot, rather than making a measurement at the center of the bit slot. We discuss the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the optimum input parameters and show that, for CRZ systems, one should use the input peak powers slightly smaller than the optimum values predicted in the absence of fluctuations.

For DM soliton systems, accounting for both noise and the presence of dispersion fluctuations, the optimum input pulse width and pulse energy should be calculated from Eqs. (2.55) and (2.67) by choosing $|C_0| \approx 1.2$. For such values of $C_0$, the map strength is about 1.65, and the effects of intrapulse interaction are also minimized, as it is discussed in Section 2.8. Although we have focused here on a single-channel system, the preceding discussion should apply even for WDM systems.

In our simulations, dispersion values were changed after every step, in effect making the correlation length of dispersion fluctuations equal to the step size (0.3 km). The correlation length $l_c$ in actual fibers may vary over a considerable range and is not often known precisely. Our results can be used for other values of $l_c$ by noting that the product $\sigma_D^2 l_c$ determines the extent of pulse broadening for long link lengths [115], where $\sigma_D^2$ is the variance of dispersion fluctuations. Thus, one should scale $\sigma_D$ with $l_c$ such that $\sigma_D^2 l_c$ remains constant.

Finally, we note that the fluctuations of the second-order dispersion $\beta_2$ result from the static or dynamic fluctuations in the frequency-dependent refractive index. This implies that fluctuations are present in all orders of dispersion. When
the refractive index fluctuations are dynamic, including the first-order dispersion fluctuations results in the presence of one more fluctuating term in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation that depends on fluctuations in the group velocity and can lead to a new source of timing jitter. However, if dynamic fluctuations happen on a sufficiently long time scale, the effect of fluctuations in the group velocity may be compensated electronically.
Chapter 4
Timing jitter

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we use the approach developed in Ref [108] to compare the ASE-induced timing jitter in DM systems for the cases of lumped, distributed, and hybrid Raman amplification. In Section 4.2 we extend the theory of [108] to the case of distributed amplification. In Section 4.3 we derive an analytic expression for the timing jitter at any position within the fiber link in the case of ideal distributed amplification for which losses are compensated by gain perfectly at every point. We also derive an analytical expression for the timing jitter induced by lumped amplifiers and compare the two cases. In Section 4.4 we investigate timing jitter in DM systems for the case of erbium-based distributed amplification, realized when the transmission fiber itself is lightly doped with erbium ions. We show that timing jitter can be reduced by about 40% with proper system design and is quite close to the ideal case. In Section 4.5 we consider timing jitter in DM
4.2 General formalism

We give in this section a short description of the moment method for calculating timing jitter [108] and extend the method for the case of distributed amplification. Optical pulse propagation in any lightwave system, accounting for the presence of noise and neglecting for now dispersion fluctuations, is governed by the NLS equation, similar to the one used in Chapter 3 [25]

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial z} = -i\beta_2 \frac{\partial^2 A}{\partial t^2} + i\gamma_0 |A|^2 A + \frac{1}{2} (g - \alpha) A + f_n(z,t),$$ (4.1)

where $\beta_2$ is now a fixed quantity within each fiber section and $f_n(z,t)$ represents the contribution of noise (distributed or lumped) along the fiber length. The ASE noise contribution vanishes on average, i.e. $\langle f_n(z,t) \rangle = 0$, but has a correlation function of the form [3,106]

$$\langle f_n(z,t)f_n^*(z',t') \rangle = g(z)n_{sp}(z)h\nu_0 \delta(z - z')\delta(t - t'),$$ (4.2)

where $n_{sp}(z)$ is the spontaneous emission factor, $h\nu_0$ is the photon energy at the central frequency $\nu_0$, and $\delta$ represents Dirac’s delta function. Both $n_{sp}(z)$ and
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\( g(z) \) are nonzero only within the amplifier in the case of lumped amplification, but vary with \( z \) continuously in the case of distributed amplification.

As in Chapter 2, with a change of variables \( A \equiv V \sqrt{G} \), where \( G \) represents the cumulative net gain from 0 to \( z \) and is given by Eq. (2.23), Eq. (4.1) can be rewritten as

\[
\frac{\partial V}{\partial z} = -i \frac{\beta_2}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial t^2} + i \gamma_0 \left| V \right|^2 V + f_n(z, t) / \sqrt{G},
\] (4.3)

In the moment method [122], the central position \( t_p \) and the central frequency \( \Omega \) of an optical pulse are defined as

\[
t_p(z) = \frac{1}{E_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} t \left| V \right|^2 dt,
\] (4.4)

\[
\Omega(z) = \frac{1}{2iE_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (V^*_t V - V_t V^*) dt,
\] (4.5)

where \( V_t \) stands for the time derivative of \( V \) and

\[
E_0 \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| V^2(z, t) \right| dt
\] (4.6)

is the input energy of the pulse.

In order to calculate the timing jitter, it is necessary to know how \( t_p \) and \( \Omega \) evolve with \( z \). Following [108], Eqs. (4.4) and (4.5) for \( t_p \) and \( \Omega \) are differentiated with respect to \( z \) and Eq. (4.3) is used to eliminate \( V(z) \). We then obtain the following two differential equations:

\[
\frac{dt_p}{dz} = \beta_2 \Omega + \frac{i}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p) \left[ f_n^* V - f_n V^* \right] dt,
\] (4.7)

\[
\frac{d\Omega}{dz} = \frac{i \Omega}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (f_n V^* - f_n^* V) dt - \frac{1}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (f_n V_t^* - f_n^* V_t) dt.
\] (4.8)
Introducing a new variable \( q \equiv \exp(i\Omega(t - t_p)) \), which has a meaning of eliminating a shift from the carrier frequency, equations (4.7) and (4.8) can be rewritten as

\[
\frac{dt_p}{dz} = \beta_2 \Omega + i \frac{E_0}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p) \left[ q f_n^* e^{-i\Omega(t-t_p)} - q^* f_n e^{i\Omega(t-t_p)} \right] dt, \quad (4.9)
\]

\[
\frac{d\Omega}{dz} = \frac{1}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( q f_n e^{i\Omega(t-t_p)} - q^* f_n e^{-i\Omega(t-t_p)} \right) dt. \quad (4.10)
\]

One can integrate the Eqs. (4.9) and (4.10) and introduce the random time shift \( \delta t_p \equiv t_p - \langle t_p \rangle \), which is found to vary with \( z \) as

\[
\delta t_p(z) = F(z) + S(z), \quad (4.11)
\]

where \( F \) and \( S \) represent the contributions to \( \delta t_p \) from frequency and position fluctuations, occurring because of ASE noise along the fiber link. Their explicit expressions are

\[
F(z) \equiv \int_0^z \beta_2 (z') \delta \Omega(z') dz', \quad (4.12)
\]

\[
S(z) = i \int_0^z \left\{ \frac{1}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p) \left[ q f_n^* e^{-i\Omega(t-t_p)} - q^* f_n e^{i\Omega(t-t_p)} \right] dt \right\} dz', \quad (4.13)
\]

where \( \delta \Omega \) is defined as

\[
\delta \Omega(z) \equiv \int_0^z \left\{ \frac{1}{E_0 \sqrt{G}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ q f_n e^{-i\Omega(t-t_p)} + q^* f_n e^{i\Omega(t-t_p)} \right] dt \right\} dz' \quad (4.14)
\]

As discussed in Ref. [108], Eqs. (4.12) and (4.13) are linearized with respect to the noise term \( f_n \), meaning that \( q \) and \( G \) in those equations correspond to the deterministic solution of Eq. (4.3), obtained after setting \( f_n = 0 \). Following Ref. [108],
linearized equations (4.11)–(4.14) are used to calculate the timing jitter $\sigma$ defined as $\sigma^2 = \langle \delta t_p^2 \rangle$ and given by

$$\sigma^2 = \langle F^2 \rangle + 2\langle FS \rangle + \langle S^2 \rangle. \quad (4.15)$$

Since all quantities, except for $f_n$, are deterministic after linearization of Eqs. (4.12)–(4.14), the correlation $\langle F^2 \rangle$ can be expressed in terms of the correlation of $\delta \Omega$, as it is seen from Eq. (4.12). The correlation $\delta \Omega$, in turn, can be found using noise correlation function (4.2). Similarly, equation (4.2) is used to obtain the expressions for $\langle FS \rangle$ and $\langle S^2 \rangle$ terms. The complete derivation of the $\langle F^2 \rangle$, $\langle FS \rangle$, and $\langle S^2 \rangle$ terms is provided in Appendix C and results in the following expressions, which are valid for arbitrary pulse shape:

$$\langle F^2 \rangle = \frac{4h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^z \beta_2(z_1)dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} \beta_2(z_2)dz_2 \int_0^{z_2} g(z')n_{sp}(z')G^{-1}(z') \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |q_t|^2 dt dz',$$

$$\langle FS \rangle = \frac{i h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^z \beta_2(z_1)dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} g(z')n_{sp}(z')G^{-1}(z') \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t-t_p) [q_t q^* - q^*_t q] d z',$$

$$\langle S^2 \rangle = \frac{2 h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^z g(z')n_{sp}(z')G^{-1}(z') \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t-t_p)^2 |q|^2 dt dz'.$$

We apply those expressions to a chirped Gaussian pulse of the form:

$$V(z, t) = V_0 \exp \left( -\frac{(1 + iC)(t-t_p)^2}{2T^2} - i\Omega(t-t_p) + i\phi \right),$$

or, according to the definition of $q$,

$$q(z, t) = q_0 \exp \left( -\frac{(1 + iC)(t-t_p)^2}{2T^2} + i\phi \right).$$
where $C$ is chirp, $T$ is the pulse width at 1/e point, $q_0 = V_0$ is the peak amplitude of the pulse, and $\varphi$ is the phase, all those variables been functions of $z$. Using Eq. (4.20) in Eqs. (4.16)–(4.18), we obtain the following expressions:

$$
\langle F^2 \rangle = \frac{2\hbar \nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^z \beta_2(z_1) dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} \beta_2(z_2) dz_2 \int_0^{z_2} g(z') n_{sp}(z') \frac{1 + C^2(z')}{G(z')T^2(z')} dz',
$$

$$
\langle FS \rangle = \frac{\hbar \nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^z \beta_2(z_1) dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} g(z') n_{sp}(z') G^{-1}(z') C(z') dz',
$$

$$
\langle S^2 \rangle = \frac{\hbar \nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^z g(z') n_{sp}(z') G^{-1}(z') T^2(z') dz'.
$$

Equations (4.15) and (4.21)–(4.23) provide semi-analytical expressions for the timing jitter. They can be used for any amplification scheme, whether lumped, distributed, or hybrid. The only assumption made is that we use a chirped Gaussian shape for pulses propagating inside a DM system. Analysis based on the variational and Hermite-Gauss-expansion methods have shown [123,124] that numerically calculated pulse shapes are close to Gaussian (except in the pulse wings).

In the next section, we justify this approximation by comparing timing jitter calculated using the actual pulse shape (taken from a NLS-based propagation code) and the pulse shape given by Eq. (4.19).

### 4.3 Analytical treatment

In this section we use Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) to calculate variances and cross-correlation of $F$ and $S$ for a DM soliton communication system and calculate timing jitter for lumped and distributed amplification scheme. We focus on the
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case of ideal distributed amplification first. We consider a DM system in which each map period $L_m$ consists of two fiber sections with dispersion parameters $\beta_{21}$ and $\beta_{22}$, respectively, and the local gain $g(z) \equiv \alpha$ at every point, so that $G(z) = 1$ in (4.21)–(4.23). We assume for simplicity that both fiber sections have the same value of losses $\alpha$. The results can be generalized later to the case of an arbitrary loss profile. The variables $G(z)$, $g(z)$, and $n_{sp}(z)$ are now constants in Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23). Using the variational equation for the pulse width (2.34) in Eq. (4.22), we can express the variance of $S$ in terms of cross-correlation of $F$ and $S$ as

$$\langle S^2 \rangle = 2\langle FS \rangle + Q_d T_0^2 z/L_m,$$

(4.24)

where

$$Q_d \equiv h\nu_0 n_{sp} g L_m / E_0$$

(4.25)

is a dimensionless parameter.

To calculate the variance of $F$ and cross-correlation of $F$ and $S$, we need to calculate in Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) the integrals like

$$I_1(z) \equiv \int_0^z \frac{1 + C^2(z)}{T^2(z)} dz,$$

(4.26)

$$I_2(z) \equiv \int_0^z C(z) dz.$$

(4.27)

Performing the first integral numerically, we find that $I_1$ grows with $z$ almost linearly (with an accuracy of about 0.01%) as $I_1(z) \approx (1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2$, where $C_0$ and $T_0$ are the input values of chirp and pulse width, respectively. This result has a physical basis since the ratio represents spectral width of a chirped pulse. The
spectral width remains constant for a linear system and does not change much if the nonlinear length of the system is much larger than the local dispersion length. Even numerical solutions of the nonlinear variational equations show that the ratio oscillates around its input value within each map period with a negligible amplitude. To estimate the integral in Eq. (4.27), we approximate $C(z)$ by a linear function of $z$ in each fiber section as in Eq. (2.41), making use of the fact that, for ideal loss compensation ($g = a$), chirp-free point is located in the middle of each fiber section [131].

Using Eq. (4.24) in Eq. (4.21), we perform the remaining two integrations for calculating $\langle F^2 \rangle$ using a geometrical approach. In short, noting that $\beta_2(z_2)I_1(z_2)$ is a piecewise continuous function, we carry out the integration over $z_2$. We then repeat the same process for integrating over $z_1$ and completing the integration in Eqs. (4.22) and (4.23). Using the notation $z = mL_m + x$, where $m$ is the number of complete map periods up to the distance $z$ and $x$ is a fractional distance in the next map period ($0 \leq x \leq Lm$), the final result for timing jitter is given as:

$$
\sigma^2_d(m, x) = Q_d \frac{1+C_0^2}{T_0^2} \left[ b_0^2 m (m-1) (2m-1)/6 + b_0 b_1 m (m-1)/2 + \Delta_0 m/3 
+ b(x) b_0 m (m-1) + b^2(x) m + b(x) b_1 m + \Delta (x)/3 \right] 
+ Q_d 4 C_0 \left[ \varepsilon_0 m + \varepsilon(x) \right] + Q_d T_0^2 \left[ m + x/L_m \right],
$$

(4.28)

where $b(x)$ is the dispersion accumulated over a distance $x$:

$$
b(x) \equiv \int_0^x \beta_2(x') \, dx',
$$

(4.29)
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so that \( b_0 \equiv b(L_m) = \beta_{21}l_1 + \beta_{22}l_2 = \bar{\beta}_2L_m \), \( \bar{\beta}_2 \) being the average dispersion of the map. Further, \( b_1 \equiv b_0 + (\beta_{22} - \bar{\beta}_2)l_2 \), and the functions \( \Delta(x) \) and \( \varepsilon(x) \) are defined as

\[
\Delta(x) \equiv \begin{cases} 
xb^2(x)/L_m, & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq l_1, \\
\left[ l_1b(x) \left[ b(x) + \beta_{22}(x - l_1) \right] \right]/L_m, & \text{if } l_1 \leq x \leq L_m,
\end{cases}
\]

(4.30)

where \( \Delta_0 \equiv \Delta(L_m) \), \( \varepsilon_0 \equiv \varepsilon(L_m) \) in Eq. (4.28).

Before discussing this analytic result, we derive a similar formula for the lumped amplification case, for which both \( n_{sp}(z) \) and \( g(z) \) are nonzero only within each amplifier whose length is quite short (\( \sim 10 \) m). Using \( G_l = \exp(\alpha L_A) \) for the amplifier gain, where \( L_A \) is the amplifier spacing, the integrals in Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) can be performed analytically as

\[
\frac{h\nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^{z_2} g(z_2) n_{sp}(z_2) \left[ \frac{1 + C(z_2)^2}{G(z_2)T(z_2)^2} \right] dz_2 = Q_l \frac{1 + C_0^2}{T_0^2} N_l(z_2),
\]

(4.31)

\[
\frac{h\nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^{z_1} g(z_1) n_{sp}(z_1) G^{-1}(z_1) C(z_1) dz_1 = Q_l C_0 N_l(z_1),
\]

(4.32)

\[
\frac{h\nu_0}{E_0} \int_0^z g(z') n_{sp}(z') G^{-1}(z') T_0^2(z') dz' = Q_l T_0^2 N_l(z),
\]

(4.33)

where \( N_l(z_i) \) is a staircase function representing the number of amplifiers up to the coordinate \( z_i \), and

\[
Q_l \equiv \frac{h\nu_0 n_{sp}(G_l - 1)}{E_0}.
\]

(4.34)

Using expressions (4.31)–(4.33) we complete the integrations in Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23), employing the same geometrical approach described earlier. The final result for
the variance of timing jitter at a distance $z = nL_A + x$ in system for an arbitrary
dispersion map within each amplification period is given as

$$
\sigma^2_i(n, x) = Q_i \frac{1 + C_0^2}{T_0^2} \left[ b_0^2 n (n - 1) (2n - 1) / 6 + b(x) b_0 n (n - 1) + b^2(x) n \right] 
+ Q iT_0 C_0 \left[ b_0 n (n - 1) + 2b(x) n \right] + Q iT_0^2 n,
$$

(4.35)

where $n$ is the number of amplifiers up to the distance $z$ and $x$ is the fractional
distance in the next amplification period ($0 \leq x \leq L_A$). We keep different no-
tations for amplification period $L_A$ and map period $L_m$ since Eq. (4.35) applies
to the case of dense DM in which each amplification period contains several map
periods.

From Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35) we note that the largest contribution to timing jit-
ter comes from the first term resulting from frequency fluctuations and increasing
with distance as $z^3$. If we use Eq. (4.14), the variance of frequency fluctuations
$\langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle$, accumulated within one map period (or amplification period in the case of
lumped amplifiers) is given by:

$$
\langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle_{d,l} = Q_{d,l} \frac{1 + C_0^2}{T_0^2},
$$

(4.36)

where the subscripts “$d$” and “$l$” stand for distributed and lumped amplification,
respectively. In (4.28) and (4.35), the term in the first square brackets represents
the variance $\langle F^2 \rangle$. For constant-dispersion fibers ($\beta_{21} = \beta_{22} \equiv \beta_2$) and for lumped
amplification, $\langle F^2 \rangle$ term with $x = 0$ converts to the standard Gordon-Haus for-
mula [105,107] $\langle F^2 \rangle = \langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle_l \beta_2^2 L_A^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} (n - i)^2$. We have also verified that, for
constant dispersion, \( \langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle \) reduces to the equivalent expression in Refs. [105,107] when a hyperbolic secant pulse shape is used instead of a Gaussian shape in Eq. (4.1).

We now focus on the effect of distributed amplification on timing jitter. Consider first the timing jitter at the end of a map period by setting \( x = 0 \). Several differences are apparent from Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35). In the case of lumped amplification, the \( \langle F^2 \rangle \) term depends only on the average dispersion irrespective of the actual map configuration, while this is not the case for ideal distributed amplification. The \( \langle F_S^2 \rangle \) term grows as \( z^2 \) for lumped amplification, but only linearly with \( z \) in Eq. (4.28), indicating that cross-correlation is less important in the case of distributed amplification. For lumped amplification, the variance \( \langle S^2 \rangle \), representing direct temporal shift of a soliton by ASE, does not depend on dispersion, but this is not so for distributed amplification, as seen from Eq. (4.24). This is the consequence of the fact that such position fluctuations happen only when noise is added. For lumped amplification, noise is not added outside amplifiers, while noise is added all along the fiber length in the case of distributed amplification.

Consider now the timing jitter inside a map period so that \( x \neq 0 \). As seen from Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35), the \( x \)-dependent terms provide additional contribution to timing jitter within each map period, which depends on the accumulated dispersion \( b(x) \) over the fractional distance \( x \) within each map period \( L_m \) (or the amplification period \( L_A \)). Since \( b(x) \) is periodic, we expect timing jitter to exhibit
oscillatory behavior. As seen from Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35), the amplitude of such oscillations grows as $z^2$ with distance, while the first term in Eq. (4.28) and in Eq. (4.35) grows as $z^3$. This means that jitter never oscillates down to zero as $z$ increases and the relative contribution of the oscillating terms to the total timing jitter decreases as $1/z$. For long distances such that $L \gg L_m$, taking the limit $m \gg 1$ and $n \gg 1$ in $x$-dependent terms in Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35), we note that this additional contribution is positive or negative depending on the sign of the product $b(x)b_0$. For example, for the system with even number of fiber sections within the map period, this contribution is negative if the sign of $\beta_{21}$ is opposite to the sign of average dispersion $\bar{\beta}_2$.

An important question is how much timing jitter can be reduced by using distributed amplification. To answer this question, we consider a long-haul light-wave system such that the number of map periods $L_m$ (or amplifies in the case of lumped amplification) is very large. Taking the limit $m \gg 1$ and $n \gg 1$ in Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35), the timing jitter is reduced for distributed amplification by the factor

$$f_r \equiv \frac{\sigma_d^2}{\sigma_l^2} \approx \frac{\langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle_d}{\langle \delta \Omega^2 \rangle_l} = \frac{\alpha L_A n_{sp}^d E_0^d}{(G_l - 1) n_{sp}^l E_0^l} \frac{[(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2]_d}{[(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2]_l}. \quad (4.37)$$

In the most cases of practical interest $[(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2]_l \gg [(1 + C_0^2)/T_0^2]_d$ when the system is designed to have the same value of the minimum pulse width. The energy ratio $E_0^d/E_0^l > 1$ under such conditions, increasing $f_r$. However, this increase, being of the order of $G_l \ln G_l/(G_l - 1)$, does not overcome the reduction
in timing jitter due to the ratio $\alpha L_A/(G_l - 1)$. The net result is that timing jitter can be reduced by using distributed amplification. Physically, the possibility of timing jitter reduction with distributed amplification comes from the fact of the smaller power spectral density of noise in the case of distributed amplification.

Figure 4.1 shows timing jitter for lumped and distributed amplification schemes calculated at the end of each amplifier (each map period in the distributed case) using Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35) based on the Gaussian shape ansatz (solid curves). To estimate the error introduced by this ansatz, circles show the results when the exact pulse shape obtained by solving the NLS equation is used in Eqs. (4.16)–(4.18). In the lumped case, we consider a dense DM system with an amplifier spacing of 80 km and assume 8 map periods within one amplifier period. Each map period has 5 km of fiber with $\beta_{21} = 3.9$ ps$^2$/km and 5 km of fiber with $\beta_{22} = -4.1$ ps$^2$/km, resulting in the average dispersion of $-0.1$ ps$^2$/km. Losses in each fiber section are 0.2 dB/km, and the value of nonlinearity is $\gamma_0 = 2.5$ W$^{-1}$km$^{-1}$. The input pulse parameters (width $T$, chirp $C$, and energy $E_0$) are obtained by solving the variational equations (2.35) and (2.34) numerically. The minimum value $T_{\text{min}}$ of pulse width is kept fixed at 3.11 ps [FWHM 5.18 ps] in all cases to ensure a 40 Gb/s bit rate. For lumped amplification, the input parameters are $T_0 = 4.94$ ps, $C = -1.2$, $E_0 = 0.22$ pJ, while for ideal distributed amplification $T_0 = 4.47$ ps, $C = -1.0$, and $E_0 = 0.0597$ pJ. The map
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Figure 4.1: Comparison of timing jitter as a function of transmission distance for lumped and ideal distributed amplification schemes for dispersion maps with $S_{map} = 1.49$ (solid lines) and $S_{map} = 3.73$ (dashed lines). Circles represent results obtained using the numerical pulse shape.

The strength of this system, defined as in Eq. (2.1), where $T_{FWHM} \approx 1.665T_{min}$ is the FWHM of the pulse at the minimum pulse width point, is equal to $S_{map} \approx 1.49$.

Since the deviation of pulse shape from Gaussian ansatz increases with map strength, we consider a similar system with a map strength of $S_{map} \approx 3.73$. To increase the map strength we keep same geometry but increase dispersion values
in both fiber sections to $\beta_{21} = 9.9 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$, $\beta_{22} = -10.1 \text{ ps}^2/\text{km}$. The input parameters in this case are $T_0 = 8.61 \text{ ps}$, $C = -2.31$, $E_0 = 0.729 \text{ pJ}$ for lumped amplification and $T_0 = 8.29 \text{ ps}$, $C = -2.31$, $E_0 = 0.270 \text{ pJ}$ in the ideal distributed amplification case. In all cases we use $n_{sp} = 1.5$ for lumped amplifiers (corresponds to a noise figure of 4.8 dB) and $n_{sp} = 1$ for ideal distributed amplification.

Several conclusions can be drawn from Fig. 4.1. Timing jitter increases with transmission distance $L$ as $L^3$ in all cases, as expected for the Gordon-Haus jitter. However, it is smaller by about a factor of 2 when distributed amplification is used. The approximations made in deriving Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35) lead to the 0.02% error in comparison with the result of Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) and are not noticeable at the scale of Figure 4.1. The curves calculated using the exact pulse shape (obtained by solving the NLS equation) show that the error in timing jitter values by using a Gaussian pulse shape is less than 2% and nearly vanish for smaller values of $S_{map}$.

To see how well Eq. (4.37) for the reduction factor works, we compare its predictions with the results shown in Figure 4.1. We find that the error in the reduction factor given by Eq. (4.37), in comparison with the similar factor calculated using full analytical theory [Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35)] reduces to below 10% after about 7 amplification periods. Moreover, at the distances larger than 14 amplification periods the error becomes less than 5%. We have also verified that these error values do not change much with the map strength.
Figure 4.2 shows how timing jitter oscillates within each map period for lumped and distributed amplification schemes. In the lumped case (Figure 4.2a), no jitter occurs until first amplifier is encountered at a distance of 80 km. Since in the map considered the sign of $\beta_{21}$ is opposite to the sign of average dispersion, jitter is reduced within each map period in comparison with its values in the ends of the periods. The value in the end of each period increases with distance as $L^3$. For long distances such that $L \gg L_m$, eventually the oscillations in timing jitter within each period become small in comparison with its average value, so that the oscillations are important at short propagation distances. In the distributed amplification case (Figure 4.2b), similar behavior occurs, except that jitter starts to grow from $L = 0$ and has overall smaller values.

In the following two sections, we calculate timing jitter accounting for local gain variations which occur invariably in real DM systems. In section 4.4, we consider the case in which gain is provided by erbium ions distributed throughout the fiber link and take into account pump absorption and depletion [$g(z) \neq \alpha$] for the bidirectional pumping scheme. In section 4.5 we focus on the case of Raman amplification.

### 4.4 Erbium-based distributed amplification

To calculate the actual variations of the gain $g(z)$ along the fiber, we use the two-level model of Ref. [4]. We solve numerically the multiple rate equations,
Figure 4.2: Timing jitter variations within each map period for lumped and distributed amplification for the map with $S_{map} = 1.49$. 
accounting for gain saturation and pump depletion and assuming a bidirectional pumping scheme at 1480 nm. The inversion factor $n_{sp}$ is obtained using

$$n_{sp} = \frac{\sigma_e N_2}{(\sigma_e N_2 - \sigma_a N_1)}, \quad (4.38)$$

where $N_2$ and $N_1$ are the ion densities of the upper and lower energy levels participating in stimulated emission, respectively, and $\sigma_e$ and $\sigma_a$ are the emission and absorption cross-sections for the signal wavelength, respectively. The distributed gain can be written as $g(z) = \Gamma(\sigma_e N_2 - \sigma_a N_1)$, where $\Gamma$ is the overlap factor between the doped region and the fiber mode. Neglecting the population $N_3$ of the third and higher levels, the total dopant density is $N_t = N_1 + N_2$. The parameter $n_{sp}$ is then related to the gain as

$$n_{sp} = \frac{\sigma_e}{\sigma_e + \sigma_a} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sigma_a \Gamma N_t}{g(z)} \right]. \quad (4.39)$$

We take $\sigma_e = 3.9 \times 10^{-21}$ cm$^2$, $\sigma_a = 3.5 \times 10^{-21}$ cm$^2$ and $\Gamma = 0.4$, the values appropriate for a Ge-Er-doped silica fiber at 1550 nm [139]. From the noise standpoint of view, $N_t$ should be as small as possible. However, pump power increases as $N_t$ approaches its minimum possible value [140,141]. As a compromise, we choose $N_t = 5.5 \times 10^{14}$ cm$^{-3}$, a value that requires pump power of about 100 mW for a 80-km pump-station spacing. We also consider a larger density value of $N_t = 9 \times 10^{14}$ cm$^{-3}$ with a reduced pump power of about 50 mW. Such values are normally used for distributed erbium-doped fibers [140]. For each density value, we calculate timing jitter numerically using Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) with
the actual gain profile and using Eq. (4.28) obtained for ideal loss compensation \([g(z) = \alpha]\). In both cases, inversion parameter \(n_{sp}\) is calculated from Eq. (4.39). For perfect loss compensation \(n_{sp}\) is constant with values of 1.41 and 1.97 for the \(N_t\) values given above.

Figure 4.3 shows the timing jitter calculated at the end of each amplifier. Solid curves represent timing jitter with the actual gain profile and dotted curves
represent timing jitter assuming $g = \alpha$. Timing jitter for the case of lumped amplification with $n_{sp} = 1.5$ is also shown for comparison (dashed curve). The input parameters in each case are calculated by solving the variational equations numerically and are close to the parameters used in section 4.3. In order to verify, how much the soliton interaction itself would limit the transmission distance, the three cases shown in Fig. 4.3 were checked for propagation of a 40 Gb/s pseudorandom pulse train by solving Eq. (4.1) numerically with the split-step method. As an example, we solve Eq. (4.1) using $V(0, t) = \sum b_n V_n(0, t)$, where $b_n$ is a binary random variable with values 0 and 1, and $V_n(0, t)$ is given by Eq. (4.19). In the case of distributed amplification with $N_t = 5.5 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, using $T_0 = 4.48 \text{ ps}$, $C = -1.0$, and $E_0 = 0.0593 \text{ pJ}$ (parameters, corresponding to $3.11 \text{ ps}$ minimum pulse width, accounting for the actual gain profile), we obtain the contour map shown in Fig. 4.4. These results were obtained without including amplifier noise and show that interaction among solitons does not affect the pulse train at distances as large as 10,000 km. The results for the other two cases from Figure 4.3 look similarly.

Figure 4.3 shows that it is possible to achieve about 40% jitter reduction using distributed amplification with bidirectional pumping. Assuming Gaussian statistics for timing jitter $\sigma$, the bit error rate (BER) can be found as

$$\text{BER} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \int_{T_B/2}^{\infty} \exp \left( -\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2} \right) dt = \text{erfc} \left( \frac{T_B}{2\sqrt{2}\sigma} \right) \approx \frac{4\sigma}{\sqrt{2\pi}T_B} \exp \left( -\frac{T_B^2}{8\sigma^2} \right),$$

(4.40)
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Figure 4.4: Contour map of the bit sequence over 10000 km for the 40-Gb/s system employing erbium-based distributed amplification with bidirectional pumping

where $T_B$ is the bit slot and $\text{erfc}(x) \equiv (2/\sqrt{\pi}) \int_x^\infty \exp(-y^2)dy$. According to Eq. (4.40), for a BER of less than $10^{-9}$, timing jitter should be less than 8% of bit slot [107]. This value can be increased to 12% by using a forward-error correction technique that can tolerate a BER of $10^{-4}$. In the following discussion, we use the 8% criteria, which gives a value of 2 ps for the limiting timing jitter at 40 Gb/s. Dashed line in Figure 4.3 shows that transmission distance is limited to about 2900 km in the case of lumped amplification, but can be increased up to 4300 km using the distributed amplification scheme. The dotted lines in Figure 4.3 show that timing jitter is well approximated by the analytical result in Eq. (4.28),
especially for relatively low dopant concentration values. The reason for better agreement for lower $N_t$ values is that gain variations become smaller as $N_t$ is reduced. Note that even for larger values of $N_t$, Eq. (4.28) is accurate to within a few percent.

4.5 Distributed Raman amplification

In this section we consider the distributed Raman amplification (DRA) scheme for the same dispersion map used earlier. The input parameters, corresponding to the 3.11-ps minimum pulse width, are $T_0 = 4.737$ ps, $C = -1.1$, and $E_0 = 0.0494$ pJ for Raman amplification with bidirectional pumping, and $T_0 = 4.696$ ps, $C = -1.08$, and $E_0 = 0.192$ pJ for backward pumping. These parameters were obtained by solving the variational equations (2.34), (2.35) and were checked numerically for the 40 Gb/s propagation over long distance. For both pumping schemes we use $n_{sp} = [1 - \exp(-h\nu/kT)]^{-1} \approx 1.13$ at room temperature. Gain variations $g(z)$ for Raman amplification are calculated analytically using the condition of full loss compensation and neglecting pump depletion [3].

Figure 4.5 shows timing jitter at the end of each amplifier as a function of transmission distance for bidirectional and backward pumping schemes. The limiting cases of lumped and ideal distributed amplification are shown for comparison. Considerable reduction occurs for both bidirectional and backward pumping schemes although the bidirectional pumping scheme gives smaller jitter values.
4.5. DISTRIBUTED RAMAN AMPLIFICATION

Figure 4.5: Timing jitter at the end of each map period for distributed Raman amplification (solid lines) with bidirectional and backward pumping schemes. For the same DM system, lumped amplification ($n_{sp} = 1.5$) and ideal distributed amplification ($n_{sp} = 1$) are also shown for comparison (dashed lines).

The horizontal dashed line in Figure 4.5 shows that transmission distance can be increased up to about 4200 km using a bidirectional Raman amplification scheme whereas it would be limited to 2900 km for lumped amplifiers. Larger jitter values for a backward pumping scheme result from larger gain variations along the fiber. According to Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23), timing jitter is proportional to $n_{sp}$ and is inversely proportional to the input energy of the pulse. Although the $n_{sp}$ parameter
for Raman amplification is almost the same as for ideal distributed amplification, timing jitter is larger for Raman amplification. This is the consequence of larger gain variations along the fiber when Raman amplification is used. Comparing Figures 4.3 and 4.5 we note that jitter values are within 10% of each other for Raman and erbium-based distributed amplification although gain variations are larger in the Raman case. This is due to larger $n_{sp}$ values for erbium dopants.

We consider now the practical case of hybrid amplification, in which a coded pulse train is amplified periodically using a module consisting of a lumped fiber amplifier and a Raman-pump laser injected backward into the fiber to provide the DRA. In this hybrid scheme, total fiber losses $G_{tot}$ are compensated using the combination of lumped and Raman amplification such that $G_R + G_L = G_{tot}$, or, equivalently,

$$\exp \left( \int_0^{L_A} g_R(z)dz \right) + G_L = \exp \left( \int_0^{L_A} \alpha(z)dz \right),$$

(4.41)

where $g_R$ and $G_R$ are, respectively, local and accumulated Raman gain, $G_L$ is the gain of lumped amplifier, and $L_A$ is the amplifier spacing. The same dispersion map is used and input parameters are also comparable to those given earlier. Figure 4.6 shows timing jitter after each amplifier as a function of transmission distance for several values of the Raman gain. While the smallest value of jitter occurs when 100% of losses are compensated using DRA, considerable reduction occurs even when losses are only partially compensated by the Raman gain.

We consider the question whether distributed amplification can allow a longer
amplifier spacing. Figure 4.7 shows timing jitter after 3100 km as a function of the Raman gain for 40-Gb/s systems employing a hybrid amplification scheme with amplifier spacings of 60, 80, and 100 km. The systems have 6, 8, and 10 map periods within each amplifier spacing, respectively, while the other parameters are the same as before. In each case, jitter is reduced by up to 40% by using DRA. More importantly, the use of lumped amplifiers alone leads to limiting jitter in excess of 2 ps when $L_A$ exceeds 70 km. In contrast, amplifiers can be placed as
much as 100 km apart when an hybrid amplification scheme is employed. The required Raman gain is only 2 dB for 80-km spacing but becomes 10 dB when amplifiers are 100 km apart.

Finally, we investigate timing jitter dependence on the map strength of the system. To change the map strength, we vary the values of the second order dispersion $\beta_{21}$ and $\beta_{22}$ while keeping the average dispersion $\beta_2$ and minimum
pulse width $T_{\text{min}}$ constant. Figure 4.8(a) shows timing jitter dependence on the map strength at a distance of 4000 km for systems with lumped amplifiers and bidirectionally pumped DRAs. The $n_{sp}$ parameter values used are the same as in Figure 4.5. Solid curves correspond to $T_{\text{min}} = 3.11$ ps and are suitable for a 40-Gb/s system while dashed curves with $T_{\text{min}} = 8$ ps are appropriate for a 10-15 Gb/s system. In each case, timing jitter decreases as map strength is increased. The reason for this decrease is that larger values of the map strength require higher values of input pulse energy in order to keep the pulse width fixed. Since timing jitter is inversely proportional to the pulse energy, the jitter decreases as map strength increases. Input pulse energies for each value of the map strength are shown on Figure 4.8(b) and support this conclusion. Note, however, that pulse breathing increases significantly for large map strengths, and the system may be limited by soliton interaction.

Figure 4.8a also shows that timing jitter values are larger for shorter pulse widths although shorter pulse widths require larger pulse energies. We have verified that this behavior holds for erbium distributed amplification as well. The reason for this can be understood from Eqs. (4.28) and (4.35), which show that the term growing as $z^3$ with distance $z$ is proportional to the ratio $(1 + C_0^2)/(T_0^2 E_0)$. Numerical solutions of the variational equations show, that this ratio increases for smaller $T_0$ values, thus giving rise to a larger timing jitter.
Figure 4.8: (a) Timing jitter after 4000 km as a function of the map strength in DM systems with lumped and bidirectionally pumped Raman amplification. Minimum pulse width remains fixed at 3.11 ps (solid lines) and at 8 ps (dashed lines). Corresponding input energy values are shown in Figure 4.8(b).
4.6 Conclusions

We have compared the ASE-induced timing jitter in dispersion-managed systems for the cases of lumped, distributed, and hybrid Raman amplification schemes. We show that, while the erbium-based distributed amplification gives the smallest timing jitter value, considerable reduction occurs when bidirectional, backward, or even partial Raman amplification is employed. We have derived an analytical expression for the timing jitter at any position within the fiber link in the case of ideal distributed amplification for which losses are exactly compensated by gain at every point. We show that in the case of a low erbium-dopant density timing jitter is well approximated by this formula. We also derive an analytical expression for the timing jitter for lumped amplifiers and compare it to the case of distributed amplification. Finally, we show that timing jitter decreases for stronger maps at a given bit rate (fixed minimum pulse width).
Chapter 5

Conclusions

In this thesis, we have considered different aspects of DM systems design. We started by considering a DM soliton system design and derived approximate analytic expressions for the input pulse parameters that provide periodical pulse propagation in such a system. The expressions showed a good agreement with the numerically found values of input parameters and revealed several interesting features in the DM soliton system design. In particular, they showed that there exists a minimum input pulse width, and this fact limits the bit rate for a given map configuration. We introduced a new map parameter that allowed the estimation of the limiting bit rate. The way in which this parameter depends on the map configuration explains the need of dense DM at high bit rates. The expressions provided also simple suggestions on how to design a system so that intrachannel pulse interactions are minimized. In particular, optimal input chirp values are found to be around ±1.1. This value was expected based on the expressions and was confirmed by the numerical analysis of pseudorandom bit sequence propaga-
tion in the absence of noise and parameters fluctuations. This optimum explains the previously known empirical result that pulse interactions are minimized for the map strength of 1.65 \[125\]. Expressions also showed that this optimal design corresponds to the case when fiber section length is approximately equal to the local dispersion length.

In a real system, practically any parameter, designed to have a fixed value, usually deviates more or less from that value in a random fashion. In particular, the dispersion of an optical fiber can vary over a considerable range because of unavoidable variations in the core diameter along the fiber length, as well as because of the environmental changes. We investigated numerically the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the performance of 40-Gb/s DM lightwave systems designed with distributed Raman amplification. We have considered both the CRZ and DM soliton formats and used the $Q$ parameter for judging the system performance. The analysis showed that dispersion fluctuations can lead to performance degradation even in a linear system when the change in the total accumulated dispersion, introduced by fluctuations, is not completely compensated. The presence of nonlinearity aggravates the extent of system degradation induced by dispersion fluctuations for both CRZ and DM soliton systems. We have shown that this degradation increases fast when the nonlinear effects in the system are made stronger by using higher-energy pulses. The system tolerance to dispersion fluctuations can be improved by employing a receiver that integrates the signal
over some portion of the bit slot, rather than making a measurement at the center of the bit slot.

Discussing the impact of dispersion fluctuations on the optimum input parameters we showed that, for CRZ systems, one should use the input peak powers slightly smaller than the optimum values predicted in the absence of fluctuations. For DM soliton systems, in the absence of both noise and dispersion fluctuations the optimum value of the $Q$ parameter is obtained for input chirp values near $\pm 1.1$, as discussed before. In the presence of noise but without dispersion fluctuations, $Q$ increases for larger values of $C_0$ because the use of higher-energy pulses improves the SNR while the nonlinear effects are balanced by the use of DM solitons. However, dispersion fluctuations change this behavior because they perturb the balance between the dispersive and nonlinear effects. As a result, while accounting for both noise and dispersion fluctuations, the optimum input parameters should remain in the region around $|C_0| \approx 1.2$.

The fluctuations of the second-order dispersion $\beta_2$ result from the static or dynamic fluctuations in the frequency-dependent refractive index, which implies that fluctuations are present in all orders of dispersion. When the refractive index fluctuations are dynamic, including the first-order dispersion fluctuations results in the presence of one more fluctuating term in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation that depends on fluctuations in the group velocity and can lead to a new source of timing jitter. However, if dynamic fluctuations happen on a sufficiently long
time scale, the effect of fluctuations in the group velocity may be compensated by electronically.

Finally, we analyzed the role of distributed amplification in controlling ASE-induced timing jitter in DM systems. We have derived an analytical expression for the timing jitter at any position within the fiber link in the case of ideal distributed amplification for which losses are exactly compensated by gain at every point. We showed that in the case of a low erbium-dopant density timing jitter is well approximated by this formula. We also derived an analytical expression for the timing jitter for lumped amplifiers and compare it to the case of distributed amplification. The comparison have shown that timing jitter is reduced by about 50% in a system with ideal distributed amplification, having an inversion parameter equal to its quantum limit of 1.

As a next step, we calculated timing jitter accounting for local gain variations which occur invariably in real DM systems, and considering the actual values of the inversion parameter. The ASE-induced timing jitter in dispersion-managed systems has been compared for the cases of lumped, distributed, and hybrid Raman amplification schemes. We have shown that while the erbium-based distributed amplification gives the smallest timing jitter value, considerable reduction occurs when bidirectional, backward, or even partial Raman amplification is employed.
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Appendix A

Reduced Lagrangian

In this appendix, we derive the reduced lagrangian (2.30) used in variational analysis of chapter 2.4. Representing Gaussian function (2.26) as

\[ V(z,t) = p(z) \exp\left[-(1 + iC) \frac{(t - t_p)^2}{2T^2} - i\Omega(t - t_p) + i\phi\right] \]

\[ \equiv \nu \exp(i\Phi), \quad (A.1) \]

where \( p(z) \equiv \sqrt{E_0/\sqrt{\pi T}(z)} \) is a peak amplitude, and \( \nu \) and \( \Phi \) are the modulus and the phase of the complex quantity \( V(z,t) \):

\[ \nu \equiv p(z) \exp\left(-\frac{[t - t_p(z)]^2}{2T^2}\right), \quad (A.2) \]

\[ \Phi \equiv -\frac{C(t - t_p)^2}{2T^2} - \Omega(z) [t - t_p(z)] + \varphi(z), \quad (A.3) \]

we can write the first term in Lagrangian density (2.25) as

\[ \frac{i}{2} \left[ V \frac{\partial V^*}{\partial z} - V^* \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \right] = \frac{i}{2} \left[ \nu e^{i\Phi} (\nu_z - i\nu\Phi_z) e^{-i\Phi} - \nu e^{-i\Phi} (\nu_z + i\nu\Phi_z) e^{i\Phi} \right] \]
\[ = -\frac{i}{2} \left[ \nu \nu_z + i\nu^2 \Phi_z - \nu \nu_z + i\nu^2 \Phi_z \right] \]

\[ = \nu^2 \Phi_z \quad (A.4) \]

Using Eq. (A.4), this first term can be integrated as

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{i}{2} \left[ V \frac{\partial V^*}{\partial z} - V^* \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} \right] dt =
\]

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 e^{-\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2}} \left[ \varphi_z - (t-t_p)^2 \left( \frac{C}{2T^2} \right) \varphi_z + \frac{C}{T^2} \frac{dt_p}{dz} (t-t_p) - (t-t_p) \Omega_z + \Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz} \right] dt
\]

\[ = p^2 \left[ \varphi_z + \Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz} \right] T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} dx
\]

\[ + p^2 \left[ \frac{C}{T^2} \frac{dt_p}{dz} - \Omega_z \right] T^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} xe^{-x^2} dx
\]

\[ - p^2 \left( \frac{C}{2T^2} \right)_z T^3 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x^2} dx
\]

\[ = \sqrt{\pi} p^2 T \left[ \varphi_z + \Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz} - \frac{T^2}{2} \left( \frac{C}{2T^2} \right)_z \right]. \quad (A.5) \]

We follow the same procedure for integrating the rest of the terms in Eq. (2.25).

For example,

\[ -\frac{\beta_2}{2} \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \right|^2 =
\]

\[ -\frac{\beta_2}{2} \left| p e^{-i\varphi - i\Omega (t-t_p)} \left( \frac{1}{T^2} (1 + iC) (t-t_p) - i\Omega \right) \exp \left[ -\frac{(1 + iC) (t-t_p)^2}{2T^2} \right] \right|^2 \]

\[ = -\frac{\beta_2}{2} p^2 \left[ \frac{(1 + C^2) (t-t_p)^2}{T^4} + \frac{2\Omega C (t-t_p)}{T^2} + \Omega^2 \right] \exp \left[ -\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2} \right]. \quad (A.6) \]

We can now perform integration to obtain

\[ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} -\frac{\beta_2}{2} \left| \frac{\partial V}{\partial t} \right|^2 dt = \]
\[- \frac{\beta_2}{2} p^2 \left[ (1 + C^2) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2}} \frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^4} dt \right. \\
+ 2\Omega C \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(t-t_p)}{T^2} e^{-\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2}} dt + \Omega^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2}} dt \left. \right]\]

\[= - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \beta_2}{2} p^2 \left[ \frac{(1 + C^2)}{T} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^2 e^{-x^2} dx \right. \\
+ 2\Omega C \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x e^{-x^2} dx + \Omega^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} dx \left. \right]\]

\[= - \sqrt{\pi} \frac{\beta_2}{2} p^2 \left[ \frac{(1 + C^2)}{T} \right. \\
\left. + 2\Omega^2 T \right], \quad (A.7)\]

Similarly, using

\[- \frac{\gamma}{2} V^4 = - \frac{1}{2} \gamma p^4 e^{-2\frac{(t-t_p)^2}{T^2}}, \quad (A.8)\]

\[= - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} 1}{2} \gamma p^4 T. \quad (A.9)\]

Using the Eqs. (A.5), (A.7), and (A.9) in Eq. (2.29), we arrive at the following expression for the reduced Lagrangian $\mathcal{R}$:

\[\mathcal{R} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} p^2 \left\{ 2\Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz} + 2T \varphi_z - \frac{C_T T}{2} + CT - \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{2}} p^2 T - \frac{\beta_2 1 + C^2}{T} - \beta_2 \Omega^2 T \right\}. \quad (A.10)\]
Appendix B

Variational equations

We present here in detail the derivation of variational equations (2.33)-(2.36).
Let $\eta = \varphi$ in Eq. (2.32). Using Eq. (2.29) in Eq. (2.32) for $R$, we receive in this case
\[
0 = \mathcal{R}_\varphi - \frac{d}{dz} \mathcal{R}_\varphi = \frac{d}{dz} (T p^2), \tag{B.1}
\]
which leads to the energy conservation law
\[
E_0 \equiv \sqrt{\pi} T p^2 = \text{const.} \tag{B.2}
\]
Similarly, for $\eta = p$ in Eq. (2.32), noticing that $2p \neq 0$, and $T \neq 0$, we obtain:
\[
0 = C T_z - \frac{C_z T}{2} + 2T \varphi_z - \sqrt{2} \gamma T p^2 - \beta_2 \frac{1 + C^2}{2T} - \beta_2 \Omega^2 T + 2\Omega T \frac{dt_p}{dz}, \tag{B.3}
\]
or
\[
2\varphi_z = \frac{C_z}{2} - \frac{C T_z}{T} + \sqrt{2} \gamma p^2 + \beta_2 \frac{1 + C^2}{2T^2} + \beta_2 \Omega^2 - 2\Omega \frac{dt_p}{dz}. \tag{B.4}
\]
Let now \( \eta = T \) in Eq. (2.32). We have

\[
0 = 2\Omega p^2 \frac{dp}{dz} + 2p^2 \varphi_z - \frac{p^2 C_z}{2} - \frac{\gamma p^4}{\sqrt{2}} + \beta_2 \frac{1 + C^2}{2T^2} p^2 - \beta_2 \Omega^2 p^2 - \frac{d}{dz} \left( p^2 C \right). \tag{B.5}
\]

Using Eq. (B.2), we can write

\[
\frac{d}{dz} \left( p^2 C \right) = \frac{d}{dz} \left( p^2 T C \right) = p^2 C_z - \frac{C p^2 T_z}{T}. \tag{B.6}
\]

Using Eq. (B.6) in Eq. (B.5) and noticing that \( p^2 \neq 0 \), we receive

\[
2\varphi_z = \frac{C_z}{2} - \frac{CT_z}{T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \gamma p^2 - \beta_2 \frac{(1 + C^2)}{2T^2} + \beta_2 \Omega^2 - \frac{2\Omega}{dz} \left( p^2 C \right) + C_z. \tag{B.7}
\]

Comparing (B.4) and (B.7), we find

\[
\frac{dC}{dz} = \frac{\gamma p^2}{\sqrt{2}} + \beta_2 \frac{1 + C^2}{T^2}, \tag{B.8}
\]

and, noticing that \( p^2 = E_0/\sqrt{\pi T} \) and \( \gamma \equiv \gamma_0 G \), we arrive at the following expression describing evolution of the pulse chirp \( C(z) \) in each fiber section of a DM system:

\[
\frac{dC}{dz} = \frac{\gamma_0 E_0 G}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} + \frac{\beta_2 (1 + C^2)}{T^2}. \tag{B.9}
\]

Using now \( \eta = C \) in Eq. (2.32), we have

\[
0 = T_z p^2 - \frac{\beta_2 p^2}{T} C - \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dz} \left( p^2 T \right). \tag{B.10}
\]

Using Eq. (B.2) in (B.10) and noticing that \( p^2 \neq 0 \), we obtain the following equation for pulse width evolution in each fiber section

\[
\frac{dT}{dz} = \frac{\beta_2 C}{T}. \tag{B.11}
\]
Similarly, considering \( \eta = \Omega \) and \( \eta = t_p \), we receive:

\[
0 = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} p^2 T \left[ 2 \frac{dt_p}{dz} - 2 \beta_2 \Omega \right], \tag{B.12}
\]

and

\[
0 = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} p^2 T \left[ - 2 \frac{d\Omega}{dz} \right]. \tag{B.13}
\]

Noticing that \( \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} p^2 T \neq 0 \), we obtain the following equations for the pulse position \( t_p \) and for the central frequency shift \( \Omega \):

\[
\frac{dt_p}{dz} = \beta_2 \Omega, \tag{B.14}
\]

\[
\frac{d\Omega}{dz} = 0. \tag{B.15}
\]

Finally, using Eqs. (B.11) and (B.9) in Eq. (B.4), we have

\[
2\varphi_z = \frac{\gamma p^2}{2\sqrt{2}} + \beta_2 \frac{(1 + C^2)}{2 T^2} - C \left( \frac{\beta_2 C}{T} \right) + \frac{2\gamma p^2}{\sqrt{2}} + \beta_2 \frac{(1 + C^2)}{2 T^2} + \beta_2 \Omega^2 - 2 \beta_2 \Omega^2, \tag{B.16}
\]

and we obtain the following expression for pulse phase evolution in each fiber section

\[
\frac{d\varphi}{dz} = \frac{5\gamma p^2}{4\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\beta_2}{2 T^2} - \frac{1}{2} \beta_2 \Omega^2, \tag{B.17}
\]

which can be rewritten in terms of the input energy \( E_0 \equiv \sqrt{\pi} p^2 T \) and of the nonlinear parameter \( \gamma_0 \equiv \gamma/G \) as

\[
\frac{d\varphi}{dz} = \frac{5\gamma_0 E_0 G}{4\sqrt{2\pi} T} + \frac{\beta_2}{2 T^2} - \frac{\beta_2}{2} \Omega^2. \tag{B.18}
\]

Eqs. (B.2), (B.9), (B.11), (B.14), (B.15), and (B.18) are the final variational equation describing the evolution of pulse parameters within each fiber section.
Appendix C

Details of timing jitter calculation

We derive here the correlation terms \( \langle F^2 \rangle \), \( \langle FS \rangle \), and \( \langle S^2 \rangle \) used in Eq. (4.15) for timing jitter. According to Eq. (4.12), since we assume here the dispersion \( \beta_2 \) to have a deterministic value, correlation \( \langle F^2 \rangle \) can be expressed as

\[
\langle F^2 \rangle = \int_{0}^{\zeta} \int_{0}^{\zeta} \beta_2 (z_1) \beta_2 (z_2) \langle \delta \Omega (z_1) \delta \Omega^* (z_2) \rangle dz_1 dz_2.
\] (C.1)

We first find the correlation \( \langle \delta \Omega (z_1) \delta \Omega^* (z_2) \rangle \). Noticing that all the quantities in Eq.(4.14) are deterministic except for \( f_n \), we can represent this correlation as

\[
\langle \delta \Omega (z_1) \delta \Omega^* (z_2) \rangle = \frac{1}{E_0^2} (a + a^*),
\] (C.2)

where

\[
a \equiv \int_{0}^{\zeta_1} \int_{0}^{\zeta_2} \frac{dz_1' dz_2'}{\sqrt{G(z_1')} G(z_2')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^* (z_1', t') q_t (z_2', t'') \langle f_n (z_1', t') f_n (z_2', t'') \rangle e^{-i \Omega (t'' - t')} dt' dt''
\]
Using Eq. (4.2) and noticing that integration limits over time are infinite for both $t'$ and $t''$ in Eq. (C.3), we have for the $a$ term:

\[
\begin{align*}
  a & \equiv \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2} \frac{dz'_1dz'_2}{G(z'_1)G(z'_2)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ q_t^* (z'_1, t') q_t (z'_2, t'') g (z'_1) h\nu_0 \\
  & \quad \times \delta (z'_1 - z'_2) \delta (t' - t'') e^{-i\Omega (t'' - t')} \right\} dt' dt'' \\
  & = \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2} \frac{dz'_1dz'_2}{G(z'_1)G(z'_2)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} q_t^* (z'_1, t) q_t (z'_2, t) g (z'_1) n_{sp} (z'_1) h\nu_0 \delta (z'_1 - z'_2) dt.
\end{align*}
\]

(C.4)

Care should be taken in integrating over the $\delta$-function $\delta (z'_1 - z'_2)$ since the result depends on the relative values of $z_1$ and $z_2$, both of which vary between 0 and $z$.

Let us define

\[
\theta (z'_1, z'_2, t) \equiv \frac{q_t^* (z'_1, t) q_t (z'_2, t) g (z'_1) n_{sp} (z'_1) h\nu_0}{G(z'_1)G(z'_2)},
\]

(C.5)

so that Eq. (C.4) can be written as

\[
a = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2} \theta (z'_1, z'_2, t) \delta (z'_1 - z'_2) dz'_1 dz'_2 \right\} dt.
\]

(C.6)

One can show that

\[
\int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2} \theta (z'_1, z'_2, t) \delta (z'_1 - z'_2) dz'_1 dz'_2 = \int_0^{\min (z_1, z_2)} \theta (z'', t) dz'',
\]

(C.7)

where $\min (x, y)$ denotes the minimal of the values $x$ and $y$. The proof of Eq. (C.7) is straightforward. We can represent the integral in Eq. (C.7) as

\[
\int_0^{z_1} \int_0^{z_2} \theta (z'_1, z'_2, t) \delta (z'_1 - z'_2) dz'_1 dz'_2 = \int_0^{z_2} \bar{\theta} (z'_2, z_1, t) dz'_2,
\]

(C.8)
where
\[
\tilde{\theta} (z_2', z_1, t) \equiv \int_0^{z_1} \theta (z_1', z_2', t) \delta (z_1' - z_2') dz_1'.
\] (C.9)

The integral in Eq. (C.9) can be easily shown to be
\[
\tilde{\theta} (z_2', z_1, t) = \begin{cases} 
\theta (z_2', t), & \text{if } z_2' \in [0, z_1] \\
0, & \text{if } z_2' \notin [0, z_1].
\end{cases}
\] (C.10)

For simplicity of discussion, we do not consider the boundary point \( z_1 = z_2' \); taking it into account does not change the final result. Using the result of Eq. (C.10) and noticing that \( z_2' \) always varies from 0 to \( z_2 \), the integral in Eq. (C.8) is found to be
\[
\int_0^{z_2} \tilde{\theta} (z_2', z_1, t) dz_2' = \begin{cases} 
\int_0^{z_1} \theta (z_2', t) dz_2', & \text{if } z_2 > z_1 \\
\int_0^{z_2} \theta (z_2', t) dz_2', & \text{if } z_2 < z_1
\end{cases}
\] (C.11)
which proves Eq. (C.7). Using Eqs. (C.6), (C.7), and (C.5), the \( a \) term is found to be
\[
a = \hbar \nu_0 \int_0^{\min(z_1, z_2)} \int_0^{\infty} |q_t (z'', t)|^2 g (z'') n_{sp} (z'') G^{-1} (z'') dtdz''.
\] (C.12)

Using the result (C.12) in Eq. (C.2), the whole correlation in Eq. (C.2) is then equal to
\[
\langle \delta \Omega (z_1) \delta \Omega^* (z_1) \rangle = \frac{2 \hbar \nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^{\min(z_1, z_2)} \int_0^{\infty} |q_t (z'', t)|^2 g (z'') n_{sp} (z'') G^{-1} (z'') dtdz''
\equiv f (z_1, z_2).
\] (C.13)
Using this result in Eq. (C.1), we have

\[
\langle F^2 \rangle = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \beta_2(z_1) \beta_2(z_2) f(z_1, z_2) \, dz_1 \, dz_2,
\]  

(C.14)

where \( f(z_1, z_2) \) is defined in Eq. (C.13). Since both \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \) take arbitrary (positive) values on the plane \((z_1, z_2)\), while \( f(z_1, z_2) \) depends on the relative values of \( z_1 \) and \( z_2 \), we need to consider separately the regions \( z_1 < z_2 \) and \( z_1 > z_2 \). We can represent the \( \langle F^2 \rangle \) term as a sum of two integrals, \( \langle F^2 \rangle = I_1 + I_2 \), where the integration in \( I_1 \) and \( I_2 \) is considered on the half-planes \( z_1 < z_2 \) and \( z_1 > z_2 \), respectively. Consider the half-plane \( z_1 < z_2 \). In this region, \( z_2 \) varies from 0 to \( z \), while \( z_1 \) changes from 0 to \( z_2 \), and \( \min(z_1, z_2) = z_1 \), so that \( f(z_1, z_2) \), according to the definition (C.13), is equal to

\[
f(z_1, z_2) = \frac{2h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^\infty |q_t(z', t)|^2 g(z'') n_{sp}(z'') G^{-1}(z'') \, dt \, dz''.
\]  

(C.15)

The integral \( I_1 \) is then found to be

\[
I_1 = \frac{2h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^{z_2} \beta_2(z_2) \, dz_2 \int_0^{z_2} \beta_2(z_1) \, dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} \int_0^\infty |q_t(z', t)|^2 g(z') n_{sp}(z') G^{-1}(z') \, dt \, dz'.
\]  

(C.16)

Similarly, for \( I_2 \) we have

\[
I_2 = \frac{2h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^{z_1} \beta_2(z_1) \, dz_1 \int_0^{z_2} \beta_2(z_2) \, dz_2 \int_0^{z_2} \int_0^\infty |q_t(z', t)|^2 g(z') n_{sp}(z') G^{-1}(z') \, dt \, dz'.
\]  

(C.17)

We see that integration in the regions \( z_1 < z_2 \) and \( z_1 > z_2 \) produces the same result, i.e. \( I_1 = I_2 \), and we have the following final expression for \( \langle F^2 \rangle \):

\[
\langle F^2 \rangle = I_1 + I_2
\]
Consider now the cross-correlation term \( \langle FS \rangle \). Using Eqs. (4.12, (4.13), and (4.14), and using again the fact that all the quantities are deterministic except for \( f_n \), we can write:

\[
\langle FS \rangle = \frac{i}{E_0^2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \beta_2 (z_1) dz_1 \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz'}{G (z')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \langle q_t^* (z', t') f_n (z', t') e^{i\Omega (\tau - t_p)} \right) \\
+ q_t (z', t') f_n^* (z', t') e^{-i\Omega (\tau - t_p)} dt' \\
\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz_2}{G (z_2)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t'' - t_p) \left( q (z_2, t'') f_n^* (z_2, t'') e^{-i\Omega (\tau' - t_p)} \\
- q_n^* (z_2, t'') f_n (z_2, t'') e^{i\Omega (\tau' - t_p)} \right) dt'' \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{i}{E_0^2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \beta_2 (z_1) dz_1 \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz_2}{G (z_2)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz'}{G (z')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \langle q_t^* (z', t') q (z_2, t'') e^{-i\Omega (\tau' - \tau')} \\
- q_t (z', t') q_n^* (z_2, t'') e^{i\Omega (\tau' - \tau')} \right) \langle f_n^* (z', t') f_n (z_2, t'') \rangle dt' dt'' \}
\]

\[
= \frac{i h\nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \beta_2 (z_1) dz_1 \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz_2}{G (z_2)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz'}{G (z')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \langle t'' - t_p \rangle \left[ q_t^* (z', t') q (z_2, t'') e^{-i\Omega (\tau' - \tau')} \\
- q_t (z', t') q_n^* (z_2, t'') e^{i\Omega (\tau' - \tau')} \right] g (z') n_{sp} (z') \delta (z' - z_2) \delta (t' - t'') \right) dt' dt'' \]  

(C.19)

where we used the fact that \( \langle f_n (z', t') f_n^* (z_2, t'') \rangle = \langle f_n^* (z', t') f_n (z_2, t'') \rangle \). Noticing that the integration over both \( t' \) and \( t'' \) is in the same infinite limits, we can accomplish the integration over time to obtain:

\[
\langle FS \rangle = \frac{i}{E_0^2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \beta_2 (z_1) dz_1 \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz_2}{G (z_2)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{dz'}{G (z')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ (t - t_p) \\
\times (q_t^* (z', t) q (z_2, t) - q_t (z', t) q^* (z_2, t)) \delta (z' - z_2) \right\} dt.
\]

(C.20)
We proceed further by considering, first, the integration over \( z' \). Let us define
\[
f (z', z_2) \equiv \frac{1}{G(z')} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p) (q_t^* (z', t) q (z_2, t) - q_t (z', t) q^* (z_2, t)) \, dt,
\] (C.21)
and
\[
\bar{f} (z_2, z_1) \equiv \int_0^{z_1} dz' f (z', z_2) \delta (z' - z_2).
\] (C.22)

Integrating Eq. (C.22) over \( z' \), we obtain
\[
\bar{f} (z_2, z_1) = \begin{cases} f (z_2), & \text{if } z_2 \in [0, z_1] \\ 0, & \text{if } z_2 \notin [0, z_1] \end{cases}
\] (C.23)

Since we always have \( z_1 \leq z \), we can represent the integral over \( z_2 \) in Eq. (C.20) as a sum of two integrals: from 0 to \( z_1 \) and from \( z_1 \) to \( z \). Using the result of Eq. (C.23), we have
\[
\int_0^z dz_2 \bar{f} (z_2, z_1) = \int_0^{z_1} \bar{f} (z_2, z_1) \, dz_2 + \int_{z_1}^z \bar{f} (z_2, z_1) \, dz_2 = \int_0^{z_1} f (z_2) \, dz_2.
\] (C.24)

Note that the same result one could obtain considering, first, integration over \( z_2 \).

With the result of Eq. (C.24), the final expression for the cross-correlation \( \langle FS \rangle \) is found to be
\[
\langle FS \rangle = \frac{i \hbar \nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^z \beta_2 (z_1) dz_1 \int_0^{z_1} g(z') n_{sp} (z') G^{-1} (z') \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p) [q_t q^* - q_t^* q] \, dt \, dz'.
\] (C.25)

Similarly, we calculate the expression for the \( \langle S^2 \rangle \) term:
\[
\langle S^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{E_0^2} \int_0^z \int_0^z \frac{dz_1 dz_2}{\sqrt{G(z_1) G(z_2)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ (t_1 - t_p) (t_2 - t_p) [q (z_1, t_1) q^* (z_2, t_2) e^{-i \Omega (t_1 - t_2)} + q^* (z_1, t_1) q (z_2, t_2) e^{i \Omega (t_1 - t_2)}] \langle f_n (z_1, t_1) f_n^* (z_2, t_2) \rangle \right\} \, dt_1 dt_2
+ \frac{2 \hbar \nu_0}{E_0^2} \int_0^z g (z') n_{sp} (z') G^{-1} (z') \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (t - t_p)^2 [q (z', t)]^2 \, dt \, dz'.
\] (C.26)
Equations (C.18), (C.25), and (C.26) provide the final expressions for the three terms composing the timing jitter in Eq. (4.15).
Appendix D

List of abbreviations

ASE  Amplified spontaneous emission
BER  Bit error rate
CRZ  Chirped return to zero
DCF  Dispersion compensating fiber
DM   Dispersion managed
DPSK Differential phase shift keying
DRA  Distributed Raman amplification
EDFAs Erbium-doped fiber amplifiers
FBGs Fiber Bragg gratings
FWHM Full width at half maximum
FWM  Four wave mixing
GVD  Group velocity dispersion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Nonlinear Schrödinger equation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRZ</td>
<td>Non-return to zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZ</td>
<td>Return-to zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMF</td>
<td>Single mode fiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNR</td>
<td>Signal-to-noise ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPM</td>
<td>Self-phase modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDM</td>
<td>Wavelength division multiplexing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPM</td>
<td>Cross-phase modulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>