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Abstract—A new vectorial finite-element method (FEM) free of spurious modes is proposed for analyzing optical waveguides with sharp corners in the cross section. The method is formulated in terms of the transverse field components $\mathbf{H}_x$ and $\mathbf{H}_y$, or $\mathbf{E}_x$ and $\mathbf{E}_y$ and it explicitly shows the relationships between the semivectorial and the full-vectorial wave equations. In this method, we introduce the distribution concept and an inhomogeneous element to describe the field across the dielectric interface, and the error in the numerical solution caused by the dielectric discontinuity is reduced. We show how the width of such inhomogeneous elements and the number of nodes would affect the numerical result and its convergent rate using the dielectric-loaded rectangular waveguide, the channel waveguide, and the rib waveguide as analysis examples. For the dielectric-loaded rectangular waveguide, we compare our results with the exact solutions. For the rib waveguide, we compare our results with previously published data based on other methods. Also, field convergence near the corners is discussed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Dielectric waveguides have been fundamental structures in optoelectronic, microwave, and millimeter-wave devices. With the rapid advance of semiconductor technology, these waveguide structures can be easily integrated onto a single substrate. Various complicated waveguide structures are continuously proposed, such as directional couplers, polarizers, nonlinear optical switches, optical sensors, etc. The design of these waveguide components and the analysis of their propagation characteristics, such as birefringence and dispersion, demand highly accurate numerical methods. To meet this need, many forms of the vectorial finite-element method (VFEM) have been developed [1]–[15]. It is well known that the longitudinal $E_z$-$H_z$ formulation contains mathematical singularities [1], [2]. In early years, Konrad [3] proposed a vectorial finite-element formulation in terms of all three components of the magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$, which can accurately analyze the propagation characteristics of a waveguide with an arbitrary cross section. The most serious difficulty in applying the FEM to three-dimensional (3-D) inhomogeneous dielectric waveguides is the appearance of spurious solutions [4], [5]. These unphysical solutions do not satisfy the divergence-free relation $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = 0$. To solve the spurious solution problem, there have been several methods proposed over the past 20 years [6]–[12]. The penalty function method [6]–[9] used to solve this problem can eliminate the spurious modes. At the same time, however, it causes the accuracy of solutions to be precariously dependent on the magnitude of the penalty coefficient. Some authors [10]–[12] proposed formulations in terms of transverse magnetic or electric fields by explicitly or implicitly enforcing the continuity of the tangential components of the transverse fields at the interfaces. Because most finite-element formulations utilize $C^0$ continuous elements to describe the fields, the added constraints would alter the optimum condition [16]. Another serious problem is that the fields near the corners could not be easily described, and the formulation is too sensitive to the type of element that we choose. A completely different way of avoiding spurious solutions using “edge elements” has also been proposed, and more generalized “tangential elements” have been developed [13]–[15]. In this formulation, usually two components of the field are expressed in terms of the edge elements and the third component is described by the node-based elements. However, in the formulations of [13] and [15], the sparsity of the matrices is lost.

In this paper, we derive in detail a highly efficient node-based full-vectorial finite-element formulation based on the transverse fields by adding inhomogeneous elements and applying the distribution concept, which are used to analyze dielectric waveguides with step dielectric discontinuities in the transverse plane. We study, by adjusting the size of the added inhomogeneous elements and the number of nodes, to what extent the interface affects the numerical result. The characteristics of this formulation include the following.

1) The numerical efficiency can be optimized since the formulation only uses the two transverse components of the field.
2) The spurious solution problem is solved since the divergence-free relation for the magnetic field, $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = 0$, is included in the formulation.
3) The final eigenvalue problem preserves the sparsity of the matrices.
4) The permittivity of the dielectric material is always continuous across any interelement interfaces.
5) The distribution of the abrupt dielectric interfaces is taken into account in the added inhomogeneous elements and, thus, corner singularities and interface singularities can be dealt with.

Moreover, $C^4$ continuous elements can also be utilized under this formulation for faster convergence [16].

Formulation of the present method is described in Sections II and III. Numerical results are presented in Section IV. The accuracy of the proposed method is examined and compared with previous results using other methods by using the dielectric-loaded rectangular waveguide, the channel waveguide, and the rib waveguide as examples. The conclusions are in Section V.

II. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

We consider a wave with $\exp[j(\omega t - \beta z)]$ dependence propagating in the $z$-direction along a dielectric waveguide, where $\beta$ is the propagation constant. Maxwell's curl equations for the wave are

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = -j\omega \varepsilon_0 \mathbf{H}$$

and

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{H} = j\omega \mu_0 (\mathbf{E} + \eta(x, y)\mathbf{E})$$

where $\varepsilon_0$ and $\mu_0$ are the permittivity and permeability of free space, respectively, and $\eta(x, y)$ is the refractive-index distribution of the waveguide. From (1) and (2), we can derive a wave equation for the transverse magnetic field component

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \left( \nabla^2 \mathbf{H}_t - \beta^2 \mathbf{H}_t \right) + k_0^2 \mathbf{H}_t = -\nabla_t \times \mathbf{E}_t = 0$$

where $\nabla_t$ is the del operator in the transverse plane and $k_0$ is the wavenumber in free space. Note that the relation $H_z = (\nabla_t \cdot \mathbf{H}_t) / j\beta$ has been included in (3) and hence the spurious modes will not be present in the solution. Similarly, we can also obtain a nonhomogeneous wave equation for the transverse electric field component

$$\nabla^2 \mathbf{E}_t + (k_0^2 n^2 - \beta^2) \mathbf{E}_t + \nabla_t \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbf{E}_t \cdot \nabla \mathbf{E}_t \right) = 0.$$

III. THE INHOMOGENEOUS EIGHT-NODE ELEMENT

Fig. 1(a)–(c) shows a conventional element division scheme for a waveguide at a dielectric discontinuity corner, the calculated field $\mathbf{F}$ along $y = y_h$, and its derivative $\partial \mathbf{F} / \partial x$, respectively. We can see that the refractive index $\eta(x, y)$ is piecewise continuous within each element. Equations (3) and (4) become

$$\nabla^2 \mathbf{H}_t + k_0^2 n^2 \mathbf{H}_t = -\beta^2 \mathbf{H}_t$$

and

$$\nabla^2 \mathbf{E}_t + k_0^2 n^2 \mathbf{E}_t = -\beta^2 \mathbf{E}_t.$$

For $C^0$ elements, although the field function $\mathbf{F}(x, y)$ is always continuous across the interfaces, its derivatives, for example, $\partial \mathbf{F} / \partial x$, will not be continuous. Therefore, if we enforce the continuity of the field components $H_z$ and $E_z$ across the dielectric interfaces, the added constraints would alter the optimum condition. Especially at the corner, the continuity conditions for $H_z$ and $E_z$ cannot be fulfilled simultaneously. Unlike the conventional element division scheme, we divide the waveguide cross section as shown in Fig. 2. The dielectric interface is enclosed within an inhomogeneous element, and thus the dielectric constant across any interelement interface will be continuous, which implies that $E_z$ and $H_z$ can automatically satisfy a convergent continuity condition. If we want to ensure that $H_z$ and $E_z$ will be always continuous across the dielectric interfaces, we can apply the $C^4$ continuous elements to do the analysis. However, under the new formulation we propose, the 2-D $C^0$ eight-node quadratic node-based elements would be sufficient, as shown in the later numerical examples. The reason why we...
employ eight-node quadratic node-based elements is for their simplicity in theoretically describing the field distributions for waveguides with right-angle corners. If the corners are not of right-angle, the formulation could be modified using other co-ordinate transformation techniques [17].

We show in the following discussion that the dielectric interfaces will play an important role in determining the propagation characteristics. Consider an inhomogeneous element as depicted in Fig. 3, where the coordinate of the center is \((x_c, y_c)\). We then arrange the dielectric interfaces to lie along the middle lines and use the eight-node \(C^0\) quadratic element to describe the magnetic field components \(H_x\) and \(H_y\). Within the element, the field components \(H_x(e)\) and \(H_y(e)\) could be expressed as

\[
\hat{H}_x(e)(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} h_{x,i} \phi_i(e)(x, y) \\
\hat{H}_y(e)(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{8} h_{y,i} \phi_i(e)(x, y)
\]

where \(\phi_j(e) (j = 1, \ldots, 8)\) represents the bases of the element. Using Galerkin’s method, we multiply (3) with \(\phi_i(e)\) \((i = 1, \ldots, 8)\), and integrate through the element \(S(e)\) to obtain

\[
\iint_{C(e)} \frac{\phi_i(e)}{n^2} \nabla_t H_u \cdot \hat{n} \, dl + \sum_{e=1}^{N_e} \int_{S(e)} \left[ -\frac{1}{n^2} \nabla_t \phi_i(e) \cdot \nabla_t H_u + \phi_i(e) \nabla_t \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right) \cdot \frac{\partial H_t}{\partial n} \\
+ \left( k_0^2 - \frac{\beta^2}{n^2} \right) H_u \phi_i(e) \right] \, dx \, dy = 0
\]

where \(u = x\) or \(y\). \(C(e)\) is the computational boundary, and \(N_e\) is the number of elements. For \(u = x\), we first calculate the third term, and the following coefficients are defined:

\[
q_{xx, ij} \equiv - \int_{S(e)} \frac{\partial (1/n^2)}{\partial x} \phi_i(e) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial x} \, dx \, dy
\]

and

\[
q_{yy, ij} \equiv - \int_{S(e)} \frac{\partial (1/n^2)}{\partial y} \phi_i(e) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial y} \, dx \, dy.
\]

In order to deal with the corner singularities or the abrupt interface singularities, we introduce the distribution concept, i.e.,

\[
\frac{\partial (1/n^2)}{\partial x} = \left( \frac{1}{n^2(x_c^+, y)} - \frac{1}{n^2(x_c^-, y)} \right) \delta(x - x_c)
\]

and

\[
\frac{\partial (1/n^2)}{\partial y} = \left( \frac{1}{n^2(x, y_c^+)} - \frac{1}{n^2(x, y_c^-)} \right) \delta(y - y_c)
\]

and

\[
\int_{u} f(u) \delta(u - u_c) \, du = f(u_c)
\]

where \(\delta(\cdot)\) is the Dirac delta function. Substituting (13) into (11), (11) becomes

\[
q_{xx, ij} = - \int_{y_c - L_y/2}^{y_c + L_y/2} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{n_3^2} \right) \phi_i(e)(x_c, y) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial x} \bigg|_{x = x_c} \, dy
\]

and

\[
q_{yy, ij} = - \int_{x_c - L_c/2}^{x_c + L_c/2} \left( \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{1}{n_3^2} \right) \phi_i(e)(x_c, y) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial y} \bigg|_{x = x_c} \, dy.
\]
By assuming that $\xi = 2(x - x_c)/L_x$ and $\eta = 2(y - y_c)/L_y$, where $L_x$ and $L_y$ are the width and height of the element, respectively, (16) can be written as

$$q_{ux,ij} = \frac{L_y}{L_x} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n_2^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{-1}^{0} + \left( \frac{1}{n_3^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{0}^{1} \right] \cdot \phi_i(e)(\xi = 0, \eta) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{\xi=0} d\eta.$$  

Similarly, we can derive the expression for $p_{uy,ij}$ as

$$p_{uy,ij} = -\left[ \left( \frac{1}{n_4^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{-1}^{0} + \left( \frac{1}{n_3^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{0}^{1} \right] \cdot \phi_j(e)(\xi = 0, \eta) \frac{\partial \phi_i(e)}{\partial \xi} \bigg|_{\eta=0} d\xi.$$  

The coefficient $q_{ux,ij}$ exists only when $n_1 \neq n_2$ or $n_3 \neq n_4$; that is, the dielectric discontinuity in the $x$ direction mainly contributes to $q_{ux,ij}$. From (17), we observe that $q_{ux,ij}$ will be very large when $L_x$ becomes small, implying that the weighting of the element containing the dielectric interface along the $y$ direction can be very large and should not be neglected. We therefore predict that the effect on the effective index caused by the dielectric discontinuities will be very significant. Similarly, the coefficient $p_{uy,ij} \neq 0$ when $n_1 \neq n_4$ or $n_2 \neq n_3$. In the semivectorial formulation, $p_{uy,ij}$ is assumed to be zero; it can be negligible only when the waveguide is weakly guiding and the operating frequency is far away from the cutoff frequency.

We rewrite the second integral of (9) for $u = x$ as the following matrix equation:

$$([K]+[Q_{xx}]) \{h_x\} + [P_{xy}] \{h_y\} = \beta^2 [M] \{h_x\}$$  

where

$$[K]_{ij} = \int_{S(e)} \frac{1}{n_x^2} \nabla \phi_i(e) \cdot \nabla \phi_j(e) \, dx \, dy + \frac{\mu_0}{n_x^2} \phi_i(e) \phi_j(e) \, dx \, dy$$  

$$[M]_{ij} = \int_{S(e)} \frac{1}{n_x^2} \phi_i(e) \phi_j(e) \, dx \, dy$$  

$$[Q_{xx}]_{ij} = q_{ux,ij}$$  

$$[P_{xy}]_{ij} = p_{uy,ij}$$  

and $\{h_x\}$ and $\{h_y\}$ are vectors composed of the $x$ and $y$ components, respectively, of the magnetic fields at the nodal points within the element. Similarly, for $u = y$ in (9), we can obtain

$$[P_{xy}]_{ij} \{h_x\} + ([K]+[Q_{yy}]) \{h_y\} = \beta^2 [M] \{h_y\}$$  

where

$$[Q_{yy}]_{ij} = \frac{L_x}{L_y} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n_4^2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2} \right) \int_{-1}^{0} + \left( \frac{1}{n_3^2} - \frac{1}{n_2^2} \right) \int_{0}^{1} \right] \cdot \phi_i(e)(\xi = 0, \eta) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial \eta} \bigg|_{\eta=0} d\xi.$$  

By assembling all the element equations, we obtain

$$[K + Q_{xx}] P_{xy} + [Q_{xy}] h_x = \beta^2 M \begin{bmatrix} M' & 0 \\ 0 & M'' \end{bmatrix} 2N \times 2N \begin{bmatrix} h_x \\ h_y \end{bmatrix}$$

(27)

where $N$ is the number of nodes. For the first term of (10), the computational boundary $C$ may be a perfect electric conductor (PEC), a Dirichlet boundary, a Neumann boundary, or an infinite element boundary. After adding the contribution of the computational boundary condition, (27) can be rewritten as

$$[K' + Q_{xx}] P_{xy} + [Q_{xy}] h_x = \beta^2 M' \begin{bmatrix} M' & 0 \\ 0 & M'' \end{bmatrix} 2N \times 2N \begin{bmatrix} h_x \\ h_y \end{bmatrix}.$$  

(28)

For the semivectorial FEM formulation, $P_{xy} = P_{yx} = 0$, and (28) becomes

$$[K''(\eta)]_{N \times N} [h_\eta] = \beta^2 M''(\eta)_{N \times N} [h_\eta]$$

(29)

where $u = x$ or $y$, corresponding to different polarized modes, and the prime (double prime) corresponds to $u = x(y)$. We can also derive the electric field formulation from (4) and follow the same procedure as proposed above for the magnetic field to obtain a linear equation similar to (10)

$$\int_C \phi_i(e) \nabla E_u \cdot d\vec{n} + \sum_{e=1}^{N_e} \int_{S(e)} \phi_i(e) \nabla^2 \phi_i(e) = 0.$$  

(30)

Although there would be field singularities at the waveguide corners, it will be shown in the next section that (30) is sufficiently accurate to calculate effective indexes and field distributions.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In order to check the effectiveness of the full-vectorial FEM with eight-node inhomogeneous elements, we present in this section some numerical examples, including dielectric-loaded metallic rectangular waveguides, channel waveguides, and rib waveguides.

A. Dielectric-Loaded Metallic Rectangular Waveguide

Fig. 4(a) shows the cross section of a half-filled dielectric waveguide. For the fundamental LSE$_{10}$ mode in this waveguide, the field component $H_y = 0$; hence, the field can be

$$P_{xy,ij} = \left[ \left( \frac{1}{n_2^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{-1}^{0} + \left( \frac{1}{n_3^2} - \frac{1}{n_1^2} \right) \int_{0}^{1} \right] \cdot \phi_i(e)(\xi = 0, \eta) \frac{\partial \phi_j(e)}{\partial \eta} \bigg|_{\eta=0} d\eta,$$  

(26)
approximated by one-dimensional (1-D) quadratic elements. Fig. 4(b) shows the 1-D element division scheme. To check the accuracy of our two-dimensional (2-D) full-vectorial formulation, we also use square 2-D eight-node quadratic elements with $L_x = L_y$ combined with the added inhomogeneous elements to approximate the field. Fig. 4(c) shows the 2-D element division scheme, where $W_i$ is the width of the inhomogeneous element. The refractive indexes of the loaded dielectric and the vacuum are $n_1 = 1.5$ and $n_2 = 1.0$, respectively, and $k_0 b = 3.0$. Fig. 5 shows the relative error of the computed propagation constant $\beta$ for the LSE_{10} mode using different formulations (1-D and 2-D FEMs) with different $W_i$s ranging from $2 \cdot 10^{-4} b$ to $2 \cdot 10^{-7} b$. As in [15], the relative error is defined as $(\beta_{\text{exact}} - \beta_{\text{FEM}})/\beta_{\text{exact}}$, where $\beta_{\text{exact}}$ and $\beta_{\text{FEM}}$ are the exact and the calculated values, respectively. The exact effective index for the LSE_{10} mode considered is $n_{\text{eff}} = \beta_{\text{exact}}/k_0 = 1.2757555$. For a mesh of $83 \times 41$ with $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-4} b$, the calculated effective index
Fig. 8. (a) Effective index for the fundamental mode of the channel waveguide obtained using our $H$ and $E$ formulations with different $W_i$’s and (b) examination of convergence of the FEM solutions for the $H$ formulation.

Fig. 9. Minor magnetic field profiles ($H_y$) along $y = 0.5t$ near the corner. Different curve represents numerical results obtained by using different division grids and different $W_i$’s.

is $n_{\text{eff}} = 1.27755552$. Compared with the exact value, the difference is on the order of $10^{-8}$. In Fig. 5, we also compare our results with those obtained by Koshiba et al. [15]. Koshiba et al. employed edge elements, while we utilize nodal elements to approximate the real fields and eliminate the spurious modes. It is seen in the results of [15] that the convergence rate of the formulation with high-order mixed-interpolation-type elements (triangle data points) is much faster than that with lower order elements (black circle data points). In our calculation, as the width of the added inhomogeneous element decreases and the number of the mesh points increases, the calculated results are seen to converge to the exact solution. Our formulations can give more accurate results. The computational efficiency can also be compared with edge element formulations [14] and [15]. For our formulation, the matrices storage is about $30N$, with $N$ being the number of total unknowns, which is easily obtained by checking the number of adjacent nodes of any given node. For the method using mixed elements proposed in [15] and the formulation in [14], the matrices storage is about $60N$. For the method in [15], the formulation contains inverse matrices and the sparsity of the matrices is lost, so the matrices storage is $K \cdot N^2$, where $1 < d < 2$ and $K$ is a constant. We can see that if the number of total unknowns is very large, the matrices storage of [15] will increase significantly.

B. Channel Waveguides

Fig. 6(a) shows the cross section of a square channel waveguide with width $t$ and the refractive indexes of the waveguide and the vacuum being $n_1 = 1.5$ and $n_2 = 1.0$, respectively. For calculation simplicity, let us assume that there is a PEC surrounding the waveguide and $t$. By making use of structure symmetry, the computational window is designed as shown in Fig. 6(b). For the normalized frequency $V = l_0t\sqrt{n_1^2 - n_2^2}/\pi = 2.0$, the contours of the computed field components $E_x$, $E_y$, $H_x$, and $H_y$ for the fundamental mode are shown in Fig. 7(a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively. Fig. 8(a) shows the effective index as a function of the total unknowns $N_x + N_y$ for different $W_i$’s and for different formulations. $N_x (= N_y)$ is the number of nodes. Seven division grids—$(7 \times 7)$, $(11 \times 11)$, $(15 \times 15)$, $(19 \times 19)$, $(23 \times 23)$, $(43 \times 43)$, and $(83 \times 83)$—were considered in the numerical computations, and the total unknowns are 80, 192, 352, 560, 816, 2816, and 10 416, respectively. We can see that as $W_i$ decreases, the computed results converge closer to the value 1.35638307 for the $H$ formulation and to the value 1.35638381 for the $E$ formulation, respectively, which are the calculated effective indexes using 83 $\times$ 83 grid (the number of unknowns $\approx 2 \times (83 \times 83 - 41 \times 41) \approx 10 416$) with the inhomogeneous element width $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-4}t$. The difference in the effective index for the $H$ and the $E$ formulations is about $7.4 \times 10^{-7}$. Fig. 8(b) shows the relative error of the propagation constant
for the fundamental mode for different $W_i$s and for the $H$ formulation. The relative error is defined as $(\beta_A - \beta_{cal})/\beta_A$, where $\beta_A = 1.356389307n_0$ and $\beta_{cal}$ is the calculated propagation constant. The convergent behavior is seen to be similar to that of Fig. 5.

Fig. 9 shows the minor field ($H_y$) along $y = 0.5R$ near the corner. Different curves represent numerical results obtained by using different divisions and different $W_i$s. The field converges as the number of grid points increases. We observe that the width $W_i$ does not significantly affect the field profile although it does affect the effective index, and that the field profile is mainly decided by the number of the grid points. From Figs. 8 and 9, although the fields have already converged with larger $W_i$, the effective index still varies. We observe that in this case the magnetic field singularity does not exist, so the effects caused by the corner on the effective index and the field convergence are quite small.

In order to check the field convergence of the electric fields, we consider another square channel waveguide proposed in [19]—a square waveguide in the free space having a 1-$\mu$m width and a core refractive index $n_4 = 1.5$ operating at wavelength $\lambda = 1.5 \mu$m. We performed the calculation with different division grids and different $W_i$s using the electric field formulation. Fig. 10(a) shows the major field component $E_x$ along the diagonal of the waveguide near a corner, i.e., along $\psi = 45^\circ$ in Fig. 6(a), where four different curves represent results obtained using different division grids ($79 \times 79$, $43 \times 43$, and $23 \times 23$) and $W_i = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ $\mu$m or $2 \times 10^{-6}$ $\mu$m. The data points correspond to the positions of the grid points, and the corner is at the origin. Fig. 10(b) shows the corresponding minor field component $E_y$. We observe that as the grid spacing is reduced with $W_i$ fixed at $2 \times 10^{-6}$ $\mu$m, the peak field value increases, while the field away from the corner has converged to some fixed value, demonstrating the divergence nature of the singularity. In the two calculations using the same division grid ($79 \times 79$) but different widths of the inhomogeneous element, we find that the electric field component profiles are coincident everywhere with each other except near the corner. As $W_i$ is reduced, the peak field value increases, showing that $W_i$ plays an important role in the present formulation. By comparing our results with those shown in [20, Fig. 5], it can be seen that our field values at positions away from the corner converge much faster with respect to the grid spacing.

C. Semiconductor Rib Waveguides

Fig. 11(a) shows the cross section of a typical rib waveguide structure. Fig. 11(b) sketches the element division scheme when utilizing our formulation, where symmetry conditions are used.

Fig. 10. Electric field profiles along the diagonal of the waveguide near a corner obtained from using different division grids and different $W_i$s. (a) $E_x$. (b) $E_y$.
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D (μm)</th>
<th>VFEM</th>
<th>FDM</th>
<th>SV-FDM</th>
<th>TFEM</th>
<th>Edge-FEM</th>
<th>SV-FEM-I</th>
<th>FV-FEM-I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.41210</td>
<td>3.41200</td>
<td>3.41188</td>
<td>3.40970</td>
<td>3.41194</td>
<td>3.411987</td>
<td>3.411991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.41220</td>
<td>3.41211</td>
<td>3.41200</td>
<td>3.40971</td>
<td>3.41209</td>
<td>3.412088</td>
<td>3.412094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.41235</td>
<td>3.41226</td>
<td>3.41217</td>
<td>3.41003</td>
<td>3.41224</td>
<td>3.412237</td>
<td>3.412246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.41255</td>
<td>3.41247</td>
<td>3.41240</td>
<td>3.41025</td>
<td>3.41247</td>
<td>3.412439</td>
<td>3.412449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.41285</td>
<td>3.41275</td>
<td>3.41271</td>
<td>3.41057</td>
<td>3.41278</td>
<td>3.412725</td>
<td>3.412737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.41315</td>
<td>3.41311</td>
<td>3.41310</td>
<td>3.41097</td>
<td>3.41312</td>
<td>3.413086</td>
<td>3.413098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.41355</td>
<td>3.41355</td>
<td>3.41358</td>
<td>3.41148</td>
<td>3.41358</td>
<td>3.413526</td>
<td>3.413539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.41410</td>
<td>3.41408</td>
<td>3.41415</td>
<td>3.41210</td>
<td>3.41414</td>
<td>3.414058</td>
<td>3.414069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.41475</td>
<td>3.41472</td>
<td>3.41484</td>
<td>3.41298</td>
<td>3.41480</td>
<td>3.414713</td>
<td>3.414721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.41560</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.41568</td>
<td>3.41446</td>
<td>3.41568</td>
<td>3.415608</td>
<td>3.415611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 12. Differences in the effective refractive index between other methods and the present method.

We have analyzed two well-studied semiconductor rib waveguide structures in order to compare our results with those obtained by other methods. For the first case, the operating wavelength $\lambda = 1.15 \, \mu m$, rib width $W = 3.0 \, \mu m$, and $H + D = 1.0 \, \mu m$. The outer slab depth $D$ varies from 0 to 0.9 $\mu m$. The refractive indexes of the cover, the guiding layer, and the substrate are $n_C = 1.0$, $n_G = 3.44$, and $n_S = 3.4$, respectively. The parameters for the computational window are $R = 2.952 \, \mu m$, $C = 1.025 \, \mu m$, and $S = 5.025 \, \mu m$. We present in the last two columns of Table I the computed effective index of the lowest order $H_{11}^y$ mode obtained by our semivectorial (SV) and full-vectorial (FV) FEMs with inhomogeneous elements (FEM-I) and with $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-3} \mu m$. Calculations were performed using the $H$ formulation under a mesh of $19 \times 33$ with infinite elements being used. The number of elements is $9 \times 16 = 144$, and the number of nodes is $(19 \times 33 - 9 \times 16) = 483$. Table I also provides values obtained by previous authors using different methods: the VFEM with Aitken extrapolation [21], the iterative finite-difference method (IFDM) [22], the semivectorial FDM (SV-FDM) [23], the transverse field VFEM with continuity of $E_x$ and $H_z$ imposed (TFEM) [11], and the VFEM with high-order mixed-interpolation-type elements (Edge-FEM) [15].

We have also used $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-4} \mu m$ and $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-5} \mu m$ and a finer grid mesh $33 \times 53$ to analyze the same waveguide. The effective indexes for different $D$’s are shown in Table II, and the process of convergence in the calculated results is observed as the value of $W_i$ is reduced and finer grid mesh is used. In fact, a calculation with $W_i = 2 \cdot 10^{-6} \mu m$ and a grid
TABLE II

Effective Index for the Rib Waveguides, Shown in Fig. 11, with Different $D$s Obtained Using the Full-Vectorial Finite-Element Formulations With Inhomogeneous Elements with Different $W_z$ and Meshes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$D$ (µm)</th>
<th>Grid = 19 × 33</th>
<th>19 × 33</th>
<th>33 × 53</th>
<th>33 × 53</th>
<th>45 × 53 (H)</th>
<th>45 × 53 (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$W_z = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ µm</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-4}$ µm</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-5}$ µm</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-6}$ µm</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-7}$ µm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.412063</td>
<td>3.412004</td>
<td>3.412009</td>
<td>3.412010</td>
<td>3.412011</td>
<td>3.412011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.412105</td>
<td>3.412107</td>
<td>3.412113</td>
<td>3.412114</td>
<td>3.412115</td>
<td>3.412115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.412257</td>
<td>3.412258</td>
<td>3.412265</td>
<td>3.412267</td>
<td>3.412268</td>
<td>3.412268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.412460</td>
<td>3.412461</td>
<td>3.412478</td>
<td>3.412479</td>
<td>3.412481</td>
<td>3.412481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.412749</td>
<td>3.412750</td>
<td>3.412761</td>
<td>3.412762</td>
<td>3.412764</td>
<td>3.412764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.413110</td>
<td>3.413111</td>
<td>3.413119</td>
<td>3.413120</td>
<td>3.413122</td>
<td>3.413122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.413551</td>
<td>3.413552</td>
<td>3.413557</td>
<td>3.413558</td>
<td>3.413561</td>
<td>3.413561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.414080</td>
<td>3.414082</td>
<td>3.414088</td>
<td>3.414089</td>
<td>3.414091</td>
<td>3.414092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.414733</td>
<td>3.414734</td>
<td>3.414739</td>
<td>3.414740</td>
<td>3.414742</td>
<td>3.414742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.415622</td>
<td>3.415623</td>
<td>3.415627</td>
<td>3.415628</td>
<td>3.415631</td>
<td>3.415631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 14. Minor magnetic field profiles ($H_x$) along (a) $x = 1.5$ µm and (b) $y = 0.5$ µm, with different division grids and different $W_z$.

mesh 63 × 81 has also been performed, and further change in the effective index appears to be smaller than $1 \times 10^{-6}$. Fig. 12 examines the differences between the results obtained by other methods and the present method. The difference is calculated as $\frac{\beta_{\text{other}} - \beta_{\text{FEM-E}}}{\beta_{\text{FEM-E}}}$, where $\beta_{\text{other}}$ is the propagation constant obtained by other methods and $\beta_{\text{FEM-E}}$ is that obtained by the present full-vectorial formulation with grid mesh 33 × 53 and $W_z = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ µm. We observe that the results given by Hadley and Smith [22] using the FDM is uniformly closest to ours. We also show in this figure the difference between the result obtained by the semivectorial FEM-I with grid mesh 19 × 33 and $W_z = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ µm and the above full-vectorial result. It is clear that, in this case, we can obtain an accurate result by the semivectorial FEM-I. Fig. 13(a)–(d) shows the field contours of the field components $E_x$, $E_y$, $H_x$, and $H_y$, respectively, for $D = 0.5$ µm. Although the contours of the fields are shown, we have to check the field convergence around the waveguide corners. Fig. 14(a) and (b) shows the minor field profiles ($H_x$) along $x = 1.5$ µm and $y = 0.5$ µm, respectively. From Fig. 14(a), it seems that the field has converged for the rough division 19 × 33, while Fig. 14(b) shows that the field has not yet converged. The other division grids 45 × 53 and 57 × 77 are designed that the grid spacings near the waveguide corners are small. The effective indexes for the division grid 45 × 53 are shown in the last two columns of Table II for the $H$ and the $E$ formulations, respectively. The effective indexes obtained by the $H$ formulation coincide well with those obtained by the $E$ formulation. From the discussion above, we conclude that, to generally obtain the accurate effective index, we first use some rough division grid with larger $W_z$ to locate the possible singularities. We then add some dense grid points near the field singularities to obtain convergent fields, and finally reduce the width $W_z$ to obtain the accurate effective indexes.

The second case is another rib waveguide with the rib width $W = 2.0$ µm, the outer slab thickness $D = 0.2$ µm, and $D + H = 1.3$ µm. The refractive indexes of the cover, the guiding layer, and the substrate are $n_C = 1.0$, $n_C = 3.44$, and $n_S = 3.34$, respectively. The operating wavelength is $\lambda = 1.55$ µm. The parameters for the computational window are $R = 3.0$ µm, $C = 1.7$ µm, and $S = 3.0$ µm. We used a mesh of 35 × 49 (the number of nodes = 35 × 49 − 17 × 24 = 1307) to calculate the propagation constant. As in the case discussed above, infinite elements were used. The effective indexes and normalized propagation constants for the $H_{11}$ and
TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Nodes</th>
<th>$H_{\text{T}}^\parallel$</th>
<th>$H_{\text{T}}^\perp$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VM [24]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.388408</td>
<td>0.4804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SIM [25]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.388774</td>
<td>0.4837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SV-BPM [26]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.388711</td>
<td>0.4834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MFM [27]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.388690</td>
<td>0.4832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SFDM [28]</td>
<td>1280 × 1280</td>
<td>3.388658</td>
<td>0.4829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FDM [29]</td>
<td>508 × 304</td>
<td>3.388687</td>
<td>0.4831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FEM-I (H), $W_1 = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ μm</td>
<td>35 × 49 − 17 × 24</td>
<td>3.388655</td>
<td>0.4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FEM-I (H), $W_1 = 2 \times 10^{-4}$ μm</td>
<td>35 × 49 − 17 × 24</td>
<td>3.388684</td>
<td>0.4836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FEM-I (H), $W_1 = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ μm</td>
<td>35 × 49 − 17 × 24</td>
<td>3.388687</td>
<td>0.4831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FEM-I (H), $W_1 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ μm</td>
<td>35 × 49 − 17 × 24</td>
<td>3.388687</td>
<td>0.4831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FEM-I (E), $W_1 = 2 \times 10^{-6}$ μm</td>
<td>35 × 49 − 17 × 24</td>
<td>3.388687</td>
<td>0.4831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$H_{\text{T}}^\parallel$ modes using the variational method (VM) [24], the spectral index method (SIM) [25], the semivectorial beam propagation method (SV-BPM) [26], the mode-matching method (MFM) [27], the semivectorial FDM (SFDM) [28], the FDM [29], and the present method with different width $W_1$s are summarized in Table III, where the normalized propagation constant $\beta$ is defined as $(n_{\text{cl}}^2 - n_{\text{sd}}^2) / (n_{\text{cl}}^2 - n_{\text{sd}}^2)$. From Table III, we can see in the last few rows that the computed results converge as we reduce the width $W_1$ by $2 \times 10^{-3}$ μm to $2 \times 10^{-6}$ μm. Compared with those obtained by the semivectorial FDM or the full-vectorial FDM, the dimensions of the matrices in (28) are much smaller; therefore, (28) can be easily solved using personal computers.

V. CONCLUSION

A highly efficient full-vectorial node-based finite-element method for the analysis of dielectric waveguides with corners in the cross section have been proposed. We have demonstrated the convergence in the calculation of the effective index. By using the transverse field formulations and applying the distribution concept to treating the dielectric discontinuity, we have successfully analyzed structures with abrupt dielectric discontinuities and corner singularities and have successfully obtained field contributions around the dielectric interfaces. Spurious modes are totally eliminated by adding the divergence-free condition $\nabla \cdot \vec{H} = 0$ into the formulation. In Section III, we have discussed the corresponding relationship between the FEM formulations for the semi- and the full-vectorial analyzes. Compared with the conventional approaches, such as the finite-difference method, the number of nodes needed in our method is greatly reduced. The accuracy of our algorithm has been examined through several numerical examples by comparing our results with either the exact solution or the results obtained by other methods. The comparison with the edge-element method has also been made. The accuracy and efficiency of the present method are better than the edge-element method. It is shown in Section IV that, for accurately determining the propagation constant, we first locate the field singularities and then modify the formulation by adding denser grid points around the singularities to obtain the convergent fields. Lastly, we adjust the width $W_1$ to obtain a convergent effective index. This approach can be used to analyze waveguides with inhomogeneous and/or anisotropic media and is suitable for analyzing dielectric waveguides with multilayer structure, such as multiple-quantum-well waveguides. We conclude that this method is highly efficient and accurate.
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