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The effect of the refractive index of the substrate together with the incident polarization on the optimization of sawtooth surface-relief gratings (SRGs) is investigated. The global optimum diffraction efficiencies of the $-1$st forward-diffracted order of sawtooth SRGs are $63.3\%$ occurring at $n_2 = 1.47$ for TE polarization and $73.8\%$ occurring at $n_2 = 2.88$ for TM polarization. Incident TE polarization has higher optimum diffraction efficiency than TM polarization for all $n_2 < 1.85$. In contrast, TM polarization has higher optimum diffraction efficiency than TE polarization for all $n_2 > 1.85$. A polymer ($n_2 = 1.5$) optimum sawtooth SRG exhibits $62.6\%$ efficiency for TE polarization. A silicon ($n_2 = 3.475$) optimum sawtooth SRG exhibits $68.6\%$ efficiency for TM polarization. These sawtooth SRGs are compared to right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs. It is found that the optimum profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs have only very slightly increased efficiencies over sawtooth SRGs ($0.04\%$ for TE and $0.55\%$ for TM).

1. Introduction

Surface-relief gratings (SRGs) are of great interest owing to their various applications such as disk pickup heads, optical sensors, guided-mode resonant filters, beam splitters, reflectors, and couplers for optical interconnects. SRGs can be fabricated in photoresist using optical interferometry in conjunction with reactive-ion etching, fabricated with a silicon (Si) mold using nanoimprint lithography, or fabricated with direct-writing electron-beam lithography. In order to utilize these technologies to fabricate SRGs in demanding applications, the optimization of SRGs is critically important.

For the optimum design of SRGs, Moharam and Gaylord used the rigorous coupled-wave analysis (RCWA) to investigate the diffraction characteristics of sinusoidal, square-wave, triangular, and sawtooth SRGs with respect to groove depths for TE polarization incident at a first Bragg angle of 30 degrees. The optimum groove depths for various SRG profiles were presented. Yokomori applied a differential method to investigate the diffraction characteristics, and therefore, to determine the optimum groove depths of sinusoidal, rectangular, and triangular SRGs for both TE and TM polarizations incident at a first Bragg angle of 45 degrees. Gupta and Peng presented both theoretical analyses (based on the modal method) and experimental results of the optimum designs of groove depths for rectangular SRGs. Furthermore, Gerritsen and Jepsen used the RCWA to determine the optimum filling factors and the corresponding optimum groove depths of rectangular SRGs for randomly polarized light incident at first Bragg angles of 30, 37.5, and 45 degrees. In all of these designs, the optimum profiles of SRGs were determined by varying one grating parameter and fixing the others instead of optimizing all grating parameters simultaneously. Furthermore, the substrates used in these analyses were focused on polymers whose refractive indices ranged from $n_2 = 1.2$ to $n_2 = 2.0$.

Recently, Wu et al. applied the simulated annealing (SA) algorithm in conjunction with the RCWA to optimize simultaneously the groove depth $d$, the top filling factor $F_1$, and the bottom filling factor $F_2$ of anisotropically etched Si SRGs ($n_2 = 3.475$) normally illuminated by both TE-polarized and TM-polarized light to provide a 45-degree diffracted angle of the $-1$st forward-diffracted order. A number of results emerged from this investigation. For example, the TE-optimized profile has a pointed top and a flat bottom. In contrast, the TM-optimized profile has a
flat top and a pointed bottom. In addition, the optimum diffraction efficiency of TM polarization is 67.1%, which is much higher than that of TE polarization (37.3%). However, the effects of substrate index and polarization taken together are not well understood. In this paper, the optimum groove depths and the corresponding diffraction efficiencies of sawtooth SRGs [i.e., \( F_1 = 0 \) and \( F_2 = 1 \) in Fig. 1(a)] with respect to the refractive indices of substrates for both TE and TM polarizations are determined by applying the RCWA. Furthermore, the optimum profiles of sawtooth SRGs are compared to those of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs [i.e., \( F_1, F_2, \) and \( \phi \) are varied in Fig. 1(b)], which is determined by using the SA algorithm in conjunction with the RCWA, both in polymer (\( n_2 = 1.5 \)) and in Si (\( n_2 = 3.475 \)).

### 2. Sawtooth Grating Diffraction

The general right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG, characterized by the grating period \( \Lambda \), the groove depth \( d \), the top filling factor \( F_1 \), the bottom filling factor \( F_2 \), and the slant angle \( \phi \), is shown in Fig. 1(b). It is noted that a sawtooth SRG shown in Fig. 1(a) is a special case of the right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG with \( F_1 = 0 \) and \( F_2 = 1 \). As shown in Fig. 1, a plane wave with free space wavelength \( \lambda_0 = 1.55 \, \mu m \) in air with refractive index \( n_1 = 1.0 \) is normally incident upon the SRG with refractive index \( n_2 \) producing both forward-diffracted and backward-diffracted waves. The substrate material also has a refractive index of \( n_2 \). The grating period is designed to provide 45-degree forward-diffracted angle of the \(-1\)st propagation order and is given by \( \Lambda = \lambda_0/n_2 \sin 45^\circ \). Normal incidence and diffraction at a 45-degree forward-diffracted angle represents a canonical configuration used for substrate-mode optical interconnects and similar applications. Thus, in this work, the angle of diffraction remains fixed. Therefore the period varies inversely with \( n_2 \). Therefore, there are three forward-diffracted orders (the \(-1\)st, the \(0\)th, and the \(+1\)st orders). However, depending on the refractive index of the substrate, there are three backward-diffracted orders (the \(-1\)st, the \(0\)th, and the \(+1\)st orders) if \( n_2 < \sqrt{2} \), and only the \(0\)th backward-diffracted order exists (i.e., the \(+1\)st backward-diffracted orders are cut off) if \( n_2 \geq \sqrt{2} \).

For the optimization of a sawtooth SRG, since the grating parameters of \( \Lambda = \lambda_0/n_2 \sin 45^\circ, F_1 = 0, \) and \( F_2 = 1 \) are specified, the RCWA is utilized to determine the optimum groove depth \( d_{\text{opt}} \) by varying the groove depth, and therefore, to obtain the corresponding optimum slant angle \( \phi_{\text{opt}} = \tan^{-1}(d_{\text{opt}}/\Lambda) \). On the other hand, for the optimization of a right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG in a polymer (\( n_2 = 1.5 \)) or in Si (\( n_2 = 3.475 \)), the SA in conjunction with the RCWA is applied to optimize the grating parameters of \( d, F_1, F_2, \) and \( \phi \) systematically and simultaneously.

### 3. Optimized Surface-Relief Gratings

**A. Sawtooth Surface-Relief Gratings**

Figure 2 shows the optimum diffraction efficiencies of the \(-1\)st forward-diffracted order \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}} \) of a sawtooth SRG (\( F_1 = 0 \) and \( F_2 = 1 \)) for both TE and TM polarizations as a function of the refractive index of the substrate \( n_2 \). The corresponding characteristics of optimum diffraction efficiencies for a volume grating (VG) (with planar parallel surfaces) as a function of the average refractive index of the VG(\( n_2 \)) are also presented in Fig. 2. Similar to the sawtooth SRG,
the VG is designed to provide 45-degree forward-diffracted angle of the $-1$st propagation order. The refractive-index modulation of the VG is assumed to be $\Delta n = 0.01 n_2$.

As shown in Fig. 2, the optimum diffraction efficiencies of a VG for both TE and TM polarizations are very close to each other and decrease monotonically as the average refractive index of the VG($n_2$) increases. The behaviors of $DE_{-1,opt}$ of a VG for both TE and TM polarizations can be approximated by $DE_{-1,opt} = (1 - R) \times 100\%$, where $R = [(1 - n_2)/(1 + n_2)]^2$ is the fraction of power reflected (reflectance) for a planar interface comprised of air (with refractive index 1.0) and a VG (with average refractive index $n_2$). As a result, the optimum diffraction efficiencies of a VG for both TE and TM polarizations can achieve $DE_{-1,opt}^T = DE_{-1,opt}^TM = 99.99\%$, which are close to 100\%, as $n_3$ decreases to 1.0. Although not treated here, an appropriate anti-reflection coating can be added to a VG, allowing the diffraction efficiency to approach 100\% for any given substrate index $n_2$. However, in contrast to a VG, $DE_{-1,opt}^T$ of a sawtooth SRG for TE polarization increases as $n_2$ increases and reaches the maximum of $DE_{-1,opt,max}^T = 63.32\%$ at $n_2 = 1.47$, where the corresponding $DE_{-1,opt}^T$ for TM polarization is $DE_{-1,opt}^TM = 31.38\%$, and decreases monotonically as $n_2$ increases further ($n_2 > 1.47$). On the other hand, $DE_{-1,opt}$ of a sawtooth SRG for TM polarization increases at a slow rate as $n_2$ increases and reaches the maximum of $DE_{-1,opt,max}^T = 73.76\%$ at $n_2 = 2.88$, where the corresponding $DE_{-1,opt}^T$ for TE polarization is $DE_{-1,opt}^T = 50.60\%$, and decreases monotonically as $n_2$ increases further ($n_2 > 2.88$). It is noted that there is a local minimum of $DE_{-1,opt}^T$ at $n_2 = 1.85$. This occurs due to the $\pm 1$st backward-diffracted orders being cut off at $n_2 = 1.85$. In addition, the maximum difference between $DE_{-1,opt}^T$ and $DE_{-1,opt}^TM$ is (DE$_{-1,opt}^T$ - DE$_{-1,opt}^TM$)$_{max} = 33.19\%$ at $n_2 = 1.45$ and (DE$_{-1,opt}^T$ - DE$_{-1,opt}^TM$)$_{max} = 23.44\%$ at $n_2 = 3.00$. Consequently, for sawtooth SRGs with small refractive indices ($n_2 < 1.85$) such as polymer sawtooth SRGs, the optimum performance of TE polarization is better than that of TM polarization. However, for sawtooth SRGs with high refractive indices ($n_2 > 1.85$) such as semiconductor sawtooth SRGs, the optimum performance of TM polarization is better than that of TE polarization. Finally, for both TE and TM polarizations, the optimum diffraction efficiencies of a sawtooth SRG approach those of a VG as $n_2 \gg 1.0$. For example, for $n_2 = 10$, the optimum diffraction efficiencies of a sawtooth SRG for both TE and TM polarizations are $DE_{-1,opt}^T = 27.67\%$ and $DE_{-1,opt}^TM = 32.14\%$, respectively, and these are close to those of a VG with $DE_{-1,opt}^T = DE_{-1,opt}^TM = 33.06\%$.

Figures 3 and 4 show the interrelated normalized optimum thickness $d_{opt}/\lambda_0$ and the optimum slant angle $\phi_{opt}$ of a sawtooth SRG as a function of $n_2$. As shown in Fig. 3, for TE polarization, $d_{opt}/\lambda_0$ decreases monotonically as $n_2$ increases. However, for TM polarization, $d_{opt}/\lambda_0$ decreases as $n_2$ increases from $n_2 = 1.0$ to $n_2 = 1.85$, increases slightly as $n_2$ increases from $n_2 = 1.47$ to $n_2 = 1.42$ owing to the cutoff of the $\pm 1$st backward-diffracted orders, and then decreases.
monotonically as \( n_2 \) increases further \((n_2 > 1.42)\). On the other hand, \( \phi_{\text{opt}} \) for TE polarization decreases as \( n_2 \) increases (shown in Fig. 4). By comparison, \( \phi_{\text{opt}} \) for TM polarization decreases slowly as \( n_2 \) increases. For both TE and TM polarizations, the normalized optimum thicknesses and optimum slant angles approach \( d_{\text{opt}}/\lambda_0 = 0 \) and \( \phi_{\text{opt}} = 45^\circ \), respectively, as \( n_2 \rightarrow 1.0 \). It is worth mentioning that the normalized optimum thicknesses of VGs are almost constants and are in the ranges of 41.94 < \( d_{\text{opt}}/\lambda_0 \) < 42.14 for TE polarization and 59.37 < \( d_{\text{opt}}/\lambda_0 \) < 59.55 for TM polarization. Furthermore, the slant angles of VGs are fixed to be \( \phi = 67.5^\circ \).

### B. Right-Angle-Face Trapezoidal Surface-Relief Gratings

Table 1 summarizes the optimized grating parameters of both sawtooth SRGs \((F_1 = 0 \text{ and } F_2 = 1)\) and right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs \((F_1, F_2, \text{ and } \phi)\) are varied) both in polymers \((n_2 = 1.5)\) and in Si \((n_2 = 3.475)\) for both TE and TM polarizations. The corresponding \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T} \) of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs in \( n_2 = 1.5 \) and in \( n_2 = 3.475 \) for both TE polarization (denoted by solid circles) and TM polarization (denoted by solid squares) are also represented in Fig. 2. As shown in Table 1, for TE polarization, the optimum filling factors of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs for both TE and TM polarizations, the optimum filling factors of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs for polymers are \( F_{1,\text{opt}} = 0.040 \) and \( F_{2,\text{opt}} = 0.998 \) and for Si are \( F_{1,\text{opt}} = 0.000 \) and \( F_{2,\text{opt}} = 0.992 \), and both are close to those of sawtooth SRGs \((F_1 = 0 \text{ and } F_1 = 1)\). In other words, the optimum grating profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs closely resemble those of sawtooth SRGs for TE polarization. However, for TM polarization, the optimum filling factors of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs for polymers are \( F_{1,\text{opt}} = 0.271 \) and \( F_{2,\text{opt}} = 0.901 \) and for Si are \( F_{1,\text{opt}} = 0.517 \) and \( F_{2,\text{opt}} = 0.889 \), which are quite different from those of sawtooth SRGs. Therefore, due to these nonzero \( F_{1,\text{opt}} \), the optimum grating profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs for TM polarization possess flat tops, higher slant angles, and smaller groove depths with respect to those of sawtooth SRGs. Furthermore, for \( n_2 = 1.5 \) (polymer SRGs), the optimum diffraction efficiencies for TE polarization are \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TE} = 62.57\% \) for a sawtooth SRG and \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TE} = 62.61\% \) for a right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG. These are much higher than those of TM polarization for which \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TM} = 33.94\% \) for a sawtooth SRG and \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TM} = 35.68\% \) for a right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG. However, for \( n_2 = 3.475 \) (Si SRGs), the optimum diffraction efficiencies of TM polarization are \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TM} = 68.55\% \) for a sawtooth SRG and \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TM} = 69.09\% \) for a right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG. These diffraction efficiencies are much higher than those of TE polarization for which \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TE} = 47.87\% \) for a sawtooth SRG and \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T,TE} = 47.87\% \) for a right-angle-face trapezoidal SRG.

### 4. Summary and Discussion

In this paper, the effects of the substrate refractive index \((n_2)\) and the incident polarization on the optimization of sawtooth SRGs were investigated and compared with VGs and right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs. The global optimum diffraction efficiencies for sawtooth SRGs are \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt,max}}^\text{T,TE} = 63.32\% \) occurring at \( n_2 = 1.47 \) for TE polarization and are \( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt,max}}^\text{T,TM} = 73.76\% \) occurring at \( n_2 = 2.88 \) for TM polarization. For all \( n_2 < 1.85 \), the optimum diffraction efficiency of TE polarization is higher than that of TM polarization. However, the optimum dif-

---

**Table 1. Optimization of both Sawtooth SRGs and Right-Angle-Face Trapezoidal SRGs in Polymers \((n_2 = 1.5)\) and in Si \((n_2 = 3.475)\) for TE and TM Polarizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Polymers ((n_2 = 1.5))</th>
<th>Si ((n_2 = 3.475))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( d_{\text{opt}} ) (µm)</td>
<td>1.913 2.710</td>
<td>0.606 0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_{\text{opt}} ) (deg)</td>
<td>52.624 61.664</td>
<td>43.851 48.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T} ) (%)</td>
<td>62.573 33.944</td>
<td>47.867 68.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Polymers ((n_2 = 1.5))</th>
<th>Si ((n_2 = 3.475))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( d_{\text{opt}} ) (µm)</td>
<td>1.848 2.006</td>
<td>0.601 0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \phi_{\text{opt}} ) (deg)</td>
<td>52.863 65.345</td>
<td>43.888 64.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_{1,\text{opt}} )</td>
<td>0.040 0.271</td>
<td>0.000 0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_{2,\text{opt}} )</td>
<td>0.998 0.901</td>
<td>0.992 0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{DE}_{-1,\text{opt}}^\text{T} ) (%)</td>
<td>62.612 35.682</td>
<td>47.869 69.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fraction efficiency of TM polarization is higher than that of TE polarization for all $n_2 > 1.85$. Consequently, TE polarization is suggested to be used for the optimization of polymer SRGs (such as DuPont OmniDex photopolymers with $n_2 = 1.5$), and TM polarization is suggested to be used for the optimization of semiconductor SRGs (such as Si with $n_2 = 3.475$). Furthermore, for a large $n_2$, the optimum diffraction efficiencies of sawtooth SRGs for both TE and TM polarizations approach that of VGs, which is accurately predicted to be $(1 - R) \times 100\%$, where $R$ is the reflectance of a single planar interface. On the other hand, the optimum profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs in polymers with $n_2 = 1.5$ and in Si with $n_2 = 3.475$ determined by the SA in conjunction with the RCWA were compared to those of sawtooth SRGs. For TE polarization, the optimum profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs resemble those of sawtooth SRGs, i.e., the optimum top filling factors and the optimum bottom filling factors of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs are close to $F_{1,\text{opt}} = 0$ and $F_{2,\text{opt}} = 1$, respectively. In contrast to TE polarization, the optimum profiles of right-angle-face trapezoidal SRGs for TM polarization possess flat tops (i.e., the optimum top filling factors are $F_{1,\text{opt}} > 0$).
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