

Controllable multiple beam splitting in Hermitian and non-Hermitian symmetric coupled waveguide systems

Fu-Quan Dou,* Ya-Ting Wei, Min-Peng Han, and Jian-An Sun

College of Physics and Electronic Engineering, Northwest Normal University, Lanzhou, 730070, China

We investigate high-fidelity multiple beam splitting in Hermitian and non-Hermitian symmetric coupled waveguides with one input and $2N$ output waveguide channels. In Hermitian systems, we realize adiabatically light splitting in resonant case based on the stimulated Raman adiabatic passage (STIRAP) and arbitrary proportion from the middle waveguide to outer waveguides in propagation coefficients mismatch case using shortcuts to adiabaticity (STA) technique. In non-Hermitian systems with even waveguides being dissipative, the compact and robust beam splitting can be achieved by eliminating the non-adiabatic coupling via the non-Hermitian STA method. We further verify the feasibility of our theoretical predictions by means of the beam propagation method (BPM). The suggested multiple beam splitters open new opportunities for the realization of on-chip high-bandwidth photonics with high fidelity in short distances.

I. INTRODUCTION

The beam splitter is an essential element in integrated optics which has attracted considerable attention for a wide range of applications such as power transfer between waveguides, quantum communication, magneto-optic data storage and many other practical fields [1–4]. Beam splitters are devices in which the optical signal is input in one waveguide and then output to two or more waveguides with the same or different intensities. To our knowledge the simplest and most advantageous is 1×2 beam splitter created by Y-branch [5, 6] and T-branch junctions [7–9]. However, mainly motivated by the development of on-chip high-bandwidth photonics which requires a larger number of output ports. The multiway beam splitters form the basic building blocks in wavelength division multiplexing systems and in fibre to home networks [10], and are critically essential for the implementation of quantum logic gates in future quantum computers [11, 12]. There has been a growing trend in the realization of multiple waveguides ($1 \times N$) [10, 13–16] or from multiple to multiple channels ($N \times N$) [17].

The analogy between quantum mechanics and waveguide optics has led to proposal of many protocols based on quantum techniques to manipulate light in waveguide arrays [18–21]. Specifically, the one related to quantum process of stimulated Raman adiabatic passage (STIRAP) [18–24] is a powerful tool for achieving complete and stable power transfer in waveguide optics. Various types of STIRAP-like optical devices have been presented, and hence they could enjoy the same advantages as STIRAP in terms of efficiency and robustness against variations of the experimental parameters, such as the waveguides couplings, the distance between the waveguides and their geometry [25–28]. On the contrary, conventional integrated beam splitters (for instance based on resonant coupling) are designed for the energy that changes periodically. Only those at a specific position

can obtain the perfect energy output. Despite the advantages, adiabatic beam-splitting usually requires a sufficiently long distance or large coupling constant or both, which are undesirable in many experimental applications. To speed up the adiabatic process and design higher fidelity devices [28–33], shortcut to adiabaticity (STA) was employed to the coupled waveguide systems [34–39].

In practice, when considering the realistic propagation of light in the waveguide, the propagation loss may be unavoidable [40–43]. This dissipative effect has, in many case, a negative impact on shaping the optical beams. However, it also causes a problem about the stability of such waveguide structures [44–47]. Recent work has also pointed out that a simple model of three parallel waveguides with the central one being dissipative can exhibit an ultra-broadband power splitting associated with an overall half power loss [43]. It is worth noting that when taking account of external control parameters such as gain or loss (i.e., imaginary refractive index) or both, one will obtain a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian [47–51] for the description of the waveguide system. Models based on non-Hermitian Hamiltonian could offer a range of surprising and potentially useful phenomena for shaping the optical beams [52–54] in contrast to traditional conservative or low-loss structures. Especially in the context of PT-symmetric systems [55, 56], they could produce a faster evolution than a Hermitian one while keeping the eigen energy difference fixed [57]. Moreover, drawing inspiration from STA to Hermitian situations, it has been successfully extended to non-Hermitian Hamiltonian as well [49, 52, 58–63].

In this paper, we propose adiabatic optical beam splitters with one input and $2N(N \geq 2)$ output waveguides and observe the evolution of the system both for the Hermitian and non-Hermitian cases. The adiabatically light splitting in resonant case based on STIRAP and the arbitrary proportion from the middle waveguides to outer waveguides in propagation coefficients mismatch case using STA technique are achieved. In addition, the compact and robust beam splitting is also achieved via the non-Hermitian STA method in non-Hermitian systems with

* doufq@nwnu.edu.cn

the even waveguides being dissipative. Furthermore, we verify the feasibility of our theoretical predictions by using beam propagation method (BPM) [64].

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the multiple beam splitting optical model and its Hamiltonian of symmetric coupled waveguides. In Sec. III, we firstly present a simplest case, where there is no detuning between these waveguides and dissipation. We apply STIRAP to design 1×2 beam splitter. Secondly, we consider the phase mismatch coupling model with which we can achieve arbitrary proportional beam splitting via STA. Finally we consider the effects of the detuning and dissipation on the conversion process. By using the non-Hermitian-STA we further design short and robust 1×2 beam splitters. Numerical calculations are also verified by optical simulations based on BPM in Sec. IV. Finally, the conclusions are given in Sec. V.

II. MODEL AND HAMILTONIAN

The waveguide (WG) structure leading to the multiple beam splitting is shown in Fig. 1. Output waveguides are characterized by some specific curved structures, and the middle waveguide is in straight structure. For a system of one input and $2N$ output waveguides, the evolution of the wave amplitude with nearest-neighbor evanescent coupling is accurately described by a set of $2N+1$ coupled differential equations (in matrix form),

$$i \frac{d}{dz} \mathbf{a}(z) = H(z) \mathbf{a}(z), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{a}(z) = [a_1(z), a_2(z), \dots, a_{2N+1}(z)]^T$ is the light amplitude in the individual waveguides and the Hamiltonian in the rotating-wave approximation reads as

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ C_1 & \Delta - i\Gamma & \ddots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & C_N & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & C_N & \Delta - i\Gamma & C_N & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & C_N & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \Delta - i\Gamma & C_1 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & C_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where the C_k ($k = 1, 2, 3 \dots N$) is the z -dependent coupling coefficient corresponding to the physical parameters of waveguides and the waveguide spacing. In our cases, the symmetrical form of waveguides insures that, C_k is the coupling coefficients of the k -th to $(k+1)$ -th waveguide, and of the $(2N+1-k)$ -th to $(2N+2-k)$ -th waveguide. We assume the odd waveguides are identical and lossless, while the even waveguides are dissipative. The related loss is denoted by the constant Γ which allows a relatively easy implementation of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in waveguide optics. This non-Hermitian term can also be realized conveniently in the experiments.

Recent experiment has proposed the loss rate can be controlled by the number of Fe^{2+} in LiNbO_3 optical waveguides [65]. Nevertheless, the even waveguides may also differ from the other waveguides in terms of geometrical dimensions and refractive index contrast, leading to the propagation constant mismatch Δ which is linearly dependent on the width difference. In addition, at the central position of the structure, the adjacent waveguides have minimum distances and correspond to maximum couplings. Theoretically, the waveguide lengths in Fig. 1 are supposed to be infinitely long. Therefore, the couplings at the inputs and outputs of the waveguides can be safely ignored [26].




FIG. 1. Schematic of the waveguide structure for multiple splitting of light. Here a Gaussian-shaped light beam is injected initially in the central waveguide $N+1$.

III. CONTROLLABLE MULTIPLE BEAM SPLITTING FOR ARRAY OF WAVEGUIDES

For the sake of simplicity, we now present an example for the splitting of light in adiabatic Hermitian and non-Hermitian five-waveguide systems. In the non-Hermitian case, the two outermost waveguides (WG1 and WG5) and the central one (WG3) are supposed to be identical and lossless, while the two outer waveguides (WG2 and WG4) are dissipative. As we mentioned above, we are interested in the case where the light is initially launched in the middle waveguide (WG3), and then export to the outer waveguides with the Hamiltonian given by

$$H(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ C_1 & \Delta - i\Gamma & C_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & 0 & C_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_2 & \Delta - i\Gamma & C_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & C_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

As we all know, it is quite an helpful treatment to predict the the dynamics in optical waveguides by analyzing the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian. For this reason, in the following three cases, we are to calculate the eigenstates

of corresponding Hamiltonian to discuss the evolution of light in optical waveguides. In all the cases, we consider Gaussian coupling coefficients C_1 and C_2 ,

$$C_{1,2} = C_0 \exp[-\alpha(z - z_{1,2})^2]. \quad (4)$$

A. Case 1: $\Delta = 0, \Gamma = 0$

In the first example, we consider the simplest case that the waveguides are resonant ($\Delta = 0$) and lossless ($\Gamma = 0$). Thus, we can quantify the original Hamiltonian and its corresponding eigenvalues

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= 0, \\ E_{2,4} &= \pm C_1, \\ E_{3,5} &= \pm \sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The quantities C_1 and C_2 are similar to the Rabi frequencies for the Pump and Stokes pulses in the STIRAP process in quantum physics. For an odd number of waveguides in the array, the eigenvector corresponding to the zero eigenvalue is the so-called dark state and we choose this state as our instantaneous eigenstate:

$$|\Phi_1(z)\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sin(\theta)|1\rangle - \cos(\theta)|3\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sin(\theta)|5\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where the mixing angle $\theta = \theta(z)$ is defined as

$$\tan(\theta) = \frac{2\sqrt{C_2}}{C_1}. \quad (7)$$

The adiabatic Hamiltonian can be derived as

$$H_a(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\frac{i\dot{\theta}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{i\dot{\theta}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2} & 0 & \frac{i\dot{\theta}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -C_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{i\dot{\theta}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

In the normal adiabatic evolution (i.e., STIRAP), there are no transitions between adiabatic states when the adiabatic conditions is well fulfilled. That is, the difference between the diagonal elements of $H_a(z)$ must be much larger than the off-diagonal elements. This occurs when

$$|\dot{\theta}| \ll |C_1|, |\dot{\theta}| \ll |\sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2}| \quad (9)$$

which requires that C_1 and C_2 vary smoothly with z . We note that in relation to coupled waveguide devices the adiabatic condition entails long device lengths for the realization of high fidelity adiabatic light transfer.

We assume the input as $\mathbf{a}(z_i) = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0]^T$, for the following initial and final conditions:

$$\theta_i = 0, \theta_f = \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (10)$$

which leads to the following final light field distributions among waveguides: $\mathbf{a}(z_f) = [\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}]^T$ as shown in Fig. 2. When the adiabatic condition is satisfied, a one-to-two beam splitting can be achieved, from the middle waveguide WG3 to the outermost waveguides WG1 and WG5 with the same intensity ($P_{1,5} = 0.5$) after propagation, as described by the dark state $|\Phi_1(z)\rangle$. This is due to the fact that the outer waveguides WG2 and WG4 are almost unpopulated during evolution. Indeed, we can also manipulate the ratio of beam splitting at will depending on the single parameter θ .




FIG. 2. (a) Coupling coefficients C_1 and C_2 with shapes as in Eq. (4). (b) Spatial evolution of the powers P_3 (solid red lines), $P_{1,5}$ (double dotted blue lines), and $P_{2,4}$ (dashed black lines) in the five waveguides upon injection in WG3. Parameters: $C_0 = 200\text{mm}^{-1}$, $\alpha = 45$, $z_1 = 1.4$ mm and $z_2 = 1.6$ mm.

B. Case 2: $\Delta \neq 0, \Gamma = 0$

Next, we analyze the more complex case where there is propagation constant mismatch between the even and odd waveguides ($\Delta \neq 0$) and the waveguides are lossless ($\Gamma = 0$). Apparently, similar to the Case 1, the eigenval-




FIG. 3. Variable beam splitting between the middle waveguide and outer waveguides for (a)-(c) without the STA (upper row) and (d)-(e) the STA (lower row). Parameters: (a) and (d): $P_3 = 0, P_{1,5} = P_{2,4} = 0.25$ for $\Delta = -\frac{800}{3}z + 400 (0 < z \leq 1.5)$ and $\Delta = 0 (1.5 < z \leq 3)$. (b) and (e) : $P_3 = 0, P_{1,5} = 0, P_{2,4} = 0.5$ for $\Delta = -120z + 180$. (c) and (f) : $P_3 = 0, P_{1,5} = 0.5, P_{2,4} = 0$ for $\Delta = 1000$ with $z_1 = 1.6, z_2 = 1.4$ and $C_0 = 150\text{mm}^{-1}$ in all cases.

ues

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= 0, \\ E_{2,4} &= \frac{\Delta}{2} \mp \frac{\sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4C_1^2}}{2}, \\ E_{3,5} &= \frac{\Delta}{2} \mp \frac{\sqrt{\Delta^2 + 4C_1^2 + 8C_2^2}}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and we can also derive the instantaneous eigenstate corresponding to the eigenvalues E_4 :

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_4(z)\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{2} \cos(\theta) \cos(\varphi)}{2\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}} |1\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sin(\varphi) |2\rangle \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{2} \sin(\theta) \cos(\varphi)}{2\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}} |3\rangle - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \sin(\varphi) |4\rangle \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{2} \cos(\theta) \cos(\varphi)}{2\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}} |5\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the mixing angles are respectively defined as:

$$\tan(\theta) = \frac{C_2}{C_1}, \tan(2\varphi) = \frac{2\sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2}}{\Delta}. \quad (13)$$

In the following, we utilize the STA protocol to design robust and shorter optical splitting devices to speed up the evolution process. Indeed, the evolution is never perfectly adiabatic, and some nonadiabatic coupling are always present, which limits the efficiency of the STIRAP. In the STA scheme, an additional Hamiltonian $H_{cd}(z) =$

$i\hbar \sum_n |\partial_z \Phi_n(z)\rangle \langle \Phi_n(z)|$, where $|\Phi_n(z)\rangle (n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ is added to our original Hamiltonian $H(z)$ and the total Hamiltonian $H_{total}(z) = H(z) + H_{cd}(z)$. Now we can continue to predict the dynamics of light propagation in waveguides which obeys the following adiabatic state $|\Phi_4(z)\rangle$. It is clear that if the coupling constants and the detuning between the waveguides in the array are not the same, different distributions of the intensities can be achieved. Therefore, we can observe variable beam splitting in the waveguide structure under different choices of the detuning as shown in Fig. 3. The results display the evolution of population with different proportions, such as: $\mathbf{a}(z_f) = [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^T$, $\mathbf{a}(z_f) = [0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0]^T$ and $\mathbf{a}(z_f) = [\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}]^T$. To demonstrate the advantages of STA protocol for accelerating adiabatic evolution, we set the same coupling coefficient and detuning as shown in Fig. 3. Moreover, as to the case of the large detuning between the propagation constants of the even and odd waveguides in Fig. 3 (c) and (f), the five-waveguide system can be reduced to an effective two-waveguide system, which is known as adiabatic elimination [21].

C. Case 3: $\Delta \neq 0, \Gamma \neq 0$

In the subsection we consider the case where both the detuning and the dissipation exist. In this case, the system should be described by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian, and the calculation becomes much more complicated. Nevertheless, we can still obtain the eigenvalues

with analytical expressions written as

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= 0 \\ E_{2,4} &= \frac{\Delta - i\Gamma}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(\Delta - i\Gamma)^2 + 4C_1^2}}{2} \\ E_{3,5} &= \frac{\Delta - i\Gamma}{2C_1} \mp \frac{\sqrt{(\Delta - i\Gamma)^2 + 4C_1^2 + 8C_2^2}}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

There is, however, an essential distinction between the eigenvalues of the Hermitian and non-Hermitian method. While in the Hermitian case the norm of the eigenvalues remains real during the entire evolution, in the non-Hermitian (NH) case, as seen from Eq. (14), the eigenvalues can be real or complex. Likewise, we also follow the steps of case1 to choose the eigenstate with zero eigenvalue as the instantaneous eigenstate which given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_1(z)\rangle &= \frac{\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}}|1\rangle - \frac{\cos(\theta)}{\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}}|3\rangle \\ &+ \frac{\sin(\theta)}{\sqrt{1 + \sin^2(\theta)}}|5\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the mixing angles are respectively defined as:

$$\tan(\theta) = \frac{C_2}{C_1}, \tan(2\varphi) = \frac{2\sqrt{C_1^2 + 2C_2^2}}{\Delta - i\Gamma}. \quad (16)$$

However, perfectly adiabatic evolution is hard to realize, and in a realistic physical circumstance the adiabatic criterion usually cannot be fulfilled, that is, complete beam splitting from WG3→WG1 (WG5) does not occur due to the effect of the non-adiabatic coupling between adiabatic states. Therefore, the loss of light energy is very large by manipulating STIRAP, which is harmful to the fabrication of an integrated optical device. To overcome this detriment of STIRAP, we exploit NH-STA to make beam splitters more efficient and small in dimension. This method is performed by introducing a series of redesigned supplementary Hamiltonians to nullify the specified non-adiabatic couplings and the system is subject to the total Hamiltonian $H_{total}(z)$ with the correction

$$H_{cd}(z) = i\hbar \sum_{m \neq n} \sum \frac{\Pi_m \dot{H}(z) \Pi_n}{E_n(z) - E_m(z)}, \quad (17)$$

where $\Pi_m = |\Phi_m(z)\rangle\langle\Phi_m(z)|$ and $\Pi_n = |\Phi_n(z)\rangle\langle\Phi_n(z)|$, $|\Phi_m(z)\rangle$ and $|\Phi_n(z)\rangle$ ($m, n = 1, 2, 3 \dots, 5$) are defined as the eigenstates of $H(z)$ and $H^\dagger(z)$ respectively.

We consider the input as $\mathbf{a}(z_i) = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0]^T$ again, for the following initial and final conditions in Eq. (10) and the following final light field distributions among waveguide: $\mathbf{a}(z_f) = [\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, 0, 0, 0, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}]^T$ (ideally). In Fig. 4, we compare the evolution of the populations and for the one with the NH-STA. Through the results as without the NH-STA, we can conclude that if the second waveguide WG2 and the fourth waveguide WG4 are not populated during the evolution, the loss rate of these two




FIG. 4. Efficiency of beam splitting without the NH-STA (a) and (b) the NH-STA. Parameters: $C_0 = 100\text{mm}^{-1}$, $\Delta = 200\text{mm}^{-1}$, $\Gamma = 200\text{mm}^{-1}$, $z_1 = 1.4\text{mm}$ and $z_2 = 1.6\text{mm}$.

waveguides have a little effect on the evolution of the system. However, since the existence of detuning and dissipation violates the adiabatic condition, the system no longer completely follows the dark state. It should be noted here that, since the Hamiltonian is non-Hermitian that the loss has to be included, the norm of the state vector does not need to be conserved during the evolution. Contrastively, it can be seen that in the case of NH-STA the population transfer strongly outperforms the original Hermitian by achieving complete population transfer which are robust against the propagation loss of outer waveguides and perturbation of waveguide parameters including the inter-layer spacing and refractive index. In this way, the light is split equally between two outermost waveguides, which are helpful to design robust waveguide splitters, while without the NH-STA we have only $P_{1,5} \approx 0.36$ for the same values of C_0 and z . Furthermore, to compare the performance of the proposed NH-STA waveguide coupler with the original one, we show the contour plots of the light intensity at the end of the device at WG5 (WG1) as a function of C_0 and Γ in Fig. 5. We note that the fidelity of the light transfer for the NH-STA coupler is robust against variations in both C_0 and Γ .




FIG. 5. Contour-color plot of the output power $P_{1,5}$ as obtained from an integration of Eq. (1) as a function of C_0 and Γ without the NH-STA (top) and the NH-STA (bottom) with $\Delta = 200 \text{ mm}^{-1}$.

IV. EXAMPLES, SPECTRAL BEHAVIOR

In the following, we give three concrete examples employing a split-step Fourier beam propagation method (BPM) [64], which has been widely used to design optical beam splitters and predict the light evolution in waveguides without further assumption. During the optical simulations, the refractive index of the substrate is chosen as $n_s = 1.5$. In the nearly symmetric waveguide, the coupling coefficient C and the waveguide separation D are well fitted by the following exponential relation: $C = C_0 \exp[-\gamma(D - D_0)]$ [66]. We choose that all waveguides have the same width $W = 3 \mu\text{m}$ and $\Delta n = 0.0116$. As to the space-dependent detuning Δ , they can be approximately realized by linearly modifying the width difference δW and the refractive index contrast difference δn of the waveguides [67].

In Fig. 6 (a)-(c), we demonstrate the light propagation in symmetric five waveguides for 1×2 beam splitters. The corresponding evolution of the standard STIRAP process in Fig. 2 (b) for which five waveguides have the same index profile and thus $\Delta = 0$ is shown in Fig. 6 (a). Since the adiabatic conditions of Eq. (9) are satisfied, in this case, we can find that the outer waveguides WG2 and WG4 are almost not excited during the optical evolution. As seen in Fig. 6 (b), when the WG2 and WG4 are detuned with odd ones, there is a small energy population on the WG2 and WG4 due to the presence of non-adiabatic coupling. And when the WG2 and WG4




FIG. 6. Light wave evolution in a five-waveguide structure for 1×2 beam splitters calculated by the BPM method for light injected into the WG3 and output to the WG1 and WG5 for the case 1-3, respectively. Here $L = 3 \text{ mm}$ and $\lambda = 1550 \text{ nm}$. During the optical simulations, for (b) $\Delta n_2 = \Delta n_4 = 0.012$ and (c) $\Delta n_2 = \Delta n_4 = 0.0119$ and $\Gamma = 9.02 \text{ mm}^{-1}$.

are detuned with odd ones and are dissipative as in Fig. 4 (a), we can also find that the output power in each of the outermost WGs is slightly less than 50% at $z = L$ in Fig. 6 (c).

V. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have theoretically proposed various short and robust multiple beam splitters in Hermitian and non-Hermitian symmetric waveguides. In Hermitian systems, we have analyzed resonant and phase mismatch coupling models. In resonant case, we have achieved a one-to-two beam splitting by STIRAP. In the propagation constants mismatch case, we have designed three proportions of light splitting couplers via STA technique to eliminate the nonadiabatic coupling in evolution process. In a non-Hermitian system with the even waveguides being dissipative, we have also investigated the controllable multiple beam splitting by using NH-STA scheme. These results have showed that our devices are robust against the fluctuation of parameters, as the fidelity is still unity for a wide range of C_0 and Γ , and the even waveguides being dissipative has little effect on the adiabatic beam splitting in the waveguides systems. It is noted that the splitters of the arbitrary power ra-

dio between the middle waveguides and outer waveguides can also be obtained by selecting appropriate coupling coefficient and detuning. The proposed device not only can reduce significantly the device length of the couplers, but also can keep an ultra-high fidelity compared with the regular waveguide couplers, which is interesting and valuable for studying the high-fidelity controllable mul-

tipple beam splitting in integrated optics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12075193).

-
- [1] W. Sorin and D. Baney, *IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett.* **4**, 1404 (1992).
- [2] X. Sun, H.-C. Liu, and A. Yariv, *Opt. Lett.* **34**, 280 (2009).
- [3] G. M. Nikolopoulos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 200502 (2008).
- [4] M. R. Watts, H. A. Haus, and E. P. Ippen, *Opt. Lett.* **30**, 967 (2005).
- [5] J.-O. J. Wesström, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2564 (1999).
- [6] L. H. Frandsen, P. I. Borel, Y. X. Zhuang, A. Harpøth, M. Thorhauge, M. Kristensen, W. Bogaerts, P. Dumon, R. Baets, V. Wiaux, J. Wouters, and S. Beckx, *Opt. Lett.* **29**, 1623 (2004).
- [7] S. Fan, S. G. Johnson, J. D. Joannopoulos, C. Manolatou, and H. A. Haus, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **18**, 162 (2001).
- [8] S. Boscolo, M. Midrio, and T. F. Krauss, *Opt. Lett.* **27**, 1001 (2002).
- [9] L. Hong, S. Xiao, X. Deng, R. Pu, and L. Shen, *J. Opt.* **20**, 125002 (2018).
- [10] T. Yu, H. Zhou, Z. Gong, J. Yang, X. Jiang, and M. Wang, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **41**, 095101 (2008).
- [11] J. L. O'Brien, G. J. Pryde, A. G. White, T. C. Ralph, and D. Branning, *Nature* **426**, 264 (2003).
- [12] C. Li, X. Zhang, J. Li, T. Fang, and X. Dong, *PhotonIX* **2**, 20 (2021).
- [13] A. Hosseini, D. Kwong, C.-Y. Lin, B. S. Lee, and R. T. Chen, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* **16**, 61 (2010).
- [14] A. Hosseini, D. N. Kwong, Y. Zhang, H. Subbaraman, X. Xu, and R. T. Chen, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* **17**, 510 (2011).
- [15] A. A. Rangelov and N. V. Vitanov, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 055803 (2012).
- [16] S.-Y. Tseng and M.-C. Wu, *J. Lightwave Technol.* **28**, 3529 (2010).
- [17] J. Leuthold and C. W. Joyner, *J. Lightwave Technol.* **19**, 700 (2001).
- [18] S. Longhi, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 065801 (2005).
- [19] Y. Lahini, F. Pozzi, M. Sorel, R. Morandotti, D. N. Christodoulides, and Y. Silberberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 193901 (2008).
- [20] A. A. Sukhorukov, Z. Xu, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 043818 (2010).
- [21] H. Oukraou, V. Coda, A. A. Rangelov, and G. Montemezzani, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 023811 (2018).
- [22] P. A. Ivanov, N. V. Vitanov, and K. Bergmann, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 063409 (2004).
- [23] S. Longhi, *Laser Photon. Rev.* **3**, 243 (2009).
- [24] N. V. Vitanov, A. A. Rangelov, B. W. Shore, and K. Bergmann, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015006 (2017).
- [25] H. S. Hristova, A. A. Rangelov, G. Montemezzani, and N. V. Vitanov, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 033802 (2016).
- [26] C. Ciret, V. Coda, A. A. Rangelov, D. N. Neshev, and G. Montemezzani, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 013806 (2013).
- [27] C. Ciret, V. Coda, A. A. Rangelov, D. N. Neshev, and G. Montemezzani, *Opt. Lett.* **37**, 3789 (2012).
- [28] F.-Q. Dou, Z.-M. Yan, X.-Q. Liu, W.-Y. Wang, and C.-C. Shu, *Optik* **210**, 164516 (2020).
- [29] F. Q. Dou, L. B. Fu, and J. Liu, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 012123 (2014).
- [30] F.-Q. Dou, H. Cao, J. Liu, and L.-B. Fu, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 043419 (2016).
- [31] F.-Q. Dou, J. Liu, and L.-B. Fu, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 022102 (2018).
- [32] F.-Q. Dou, J. Liu, and L.-B. Fu, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **116**, 60014 (2016).
- [33] P. Aashna and K. Thyagarajan, *J. Opt.* **19**, 065805 (2017).
- [34] S.-Y. Tseng, *Opt. Lett.* **39**, 6600 (2014).
- [35] C.-P. Ho and S.-Y. Tseng, *Opt. Lett.* **40**, 4831 (2015).
- [36] F. Dreisow, A. Szameit, M. Heinrich, S. Nolte, A. Tünnermann, M. Ornigotti, and S. Longhi, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 055802 (2009).
- [37] W. Huang, L.-K. Ang, and E. Kyoseva, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **53**, 035104 (2019).
- [38] S. Martínez-Garaot, J. G. Muga, and S.-Y. Tseng, *Opt. Express* **25**, 159 (2017).
- [39] X. Chen, R.-D. Wen, and S.-Y. Tseng, *Opt. Express* **24**, 18322 (2016).
- [40] S. Olivier, H. Benisty, C. Weisbuch, C. J. M. Smith, T. F. Krauss, and R. Houdré, *Opt. Express* **11**, 1490 (2003).
- [41] R. Iliew, C. Etrich, T. Pertsch, and F. Lederer, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 035123 (2009).
- [42] S. Ibáñez, S. Martínez-Garaot, X. Chen, E. Torrontegui, and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 023415 (2011).
- [43] R. Alrifai, V. Coda, J. Peltier, A. A. Rangelov, and G. Montemezzani, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 023527 (2021).
- [44] L. O'Faolain, S. A. Schulz, D. M. Beggs, T. P. White, M. Spasenović, L. Kuipers, F. Morichetti, A. Melloni, S. Mazoyer, J. P. Hugonin, P. Lalanne, and T. F. Krauss, *Opt. Express* **18**, 27627 (2010).
- [45] Q.-C. Wu, Y.-H. Chen, B.-H. Huang, J. Song, Y. Xia, and S.-B. Zheng, *Opt. Express* **24**, 22847 (2016).
- [46] K. Chung, T. J. Karle, M. Rab, A. D. Greentree, and S. Tomljenovic-Hanic, *Opt. Express* **20**, 23108 (2012).
- [47] A. J. Martínez, M. I. Molina, S. K. Turitsyn, and Y. S. Kivshar, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 023822 (2015).
- [48] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, *Opt. Lett.* **32**, 2632 (2007).
- [49] B. T. Torosov, G. Della Valle, and S. Longhi, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 063412 (2014).
- [50] Y.-X. Wang and A. A. Clerk, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 063834 (2019).

- [51] Y.-H. Chen, Q.-C. Wu, B.-H. Huang, J. Song, Y. Xia, and S.-B. Zheng, *Ann. Phys-Berlin* **530**, 1700247.
- [52] B. T. Torosov, G. Della Valle, and S. Longhi, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 052502 (2013).
- [53] S. Ke, D. Zhao, Q. Liu, and W. Liu, *Opt. Quantum Electron.* **50**, 393 (2018).
- [54] S. Savoia, G. Castaldi, and V. Galdi, *J. Opt.* **18**, 044027 (2016).
- [55] D. Zhao, W.-W. Liu, S.-L. Ke, and Q.-J. Liu, *Opt. Quantum Electron.* **50**, 323 (2018).
- [56] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, M. Khajavikhan, Z. H. Musslimani, S. Rotter, and D. N. Christodoulides, *Nature Phys.* **14**, 11 (2018).
- [57] R. Uzdin, U. Günther, S. Rahav, and N. Moiseyev, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **45**, 415304 (2012).
- [58] G.-Q. Li, G.-D. Chen, P. Peng, and W. Qi, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **71**, 14 (2017).
- [59] S. Ibáñez and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 033403 (2014).
- [60] J.-H. Zhang and F.-Q. Dou, *New J. Phys.* **23**, 063001 (2021).
- [61] H. Li, H. Z. Shen, S. L. Wu, and X. X. Yi, *Opt. Express* **25**, 30135 (2017).
- [62] K. Tang, Z. Hu, X. Chen, and C. Liu, *J Eur Opt. Soc-Rapid* **16**, 18 (2020).
- [63] H. Li, S.-Q. Zhang, M.-X. Li, M. Guo, and L.-J. Song, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **58**, 2692 (2019).
- [64] K. Kawano and T. Kitoh, *Introduction to Optical Waveguide Analysis: Solving Maxwell's Equation and the Schrödinger Equation* (Wiley, 2004).
- [65] C. E. Rüter, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, D. N. Christodoulides, M. Segev, and D. Kip, *Nature Phys.* **6**, 192 (2010).
- [66] X. Chen, R.-D. Wen, J.-L. Shi, and S.-Y. Tseng, *J. Opt.* **20**, 045804 (2018).
- [67] A. Syahriar, V. Schneider, and S. Al-Bader, *J. Lightwave Technol.* **16**, 1907 (1998).