

# Derivation of Lang-Kobayashi Equations: The coupling rates

Hans-Jürgen Wünsche

Institute of Physics, Humboldt University in Berlin, Invalidenstrasse 110, 10115 Berlin

February 13, 2005

## Abstract

This is an addition to the pamphlet "Derivation of Lang-Kobayashi Equations" from July 7, 2000. I correct some sign errors and express the coupling rate in terms of the derivation of the inverse reflectivity of the solitary laser with respect to  $\omega$ .

I start with Eq. (12) of the old paper:

$$-i\dot{f} = -v_g\beta'nf + iv_g\Phi_0^+(0)a(t). \quad \text{I corrected the sign of the } \beta' \text{-term and introduced } v_g \text{ to have correct dimensions.} \quad (\text{old 12})$$

Now, I consider reflection of a harmonic wave. I set  $\Psi^-(0, t) = a(t) = a_{\text{in}}e^{i\Omega t}$  for the input field and regard  $n$  as a constant. Then, the reflected amplitude will oscillate in the same manner,  $\Psi^+(0, t) = f(t)\Phi_0^+(0) = a_{\text{out}}e^{i\Omega t}$ . Inserting  $\dot{f} = i\Omega f$  into (old 12), multiplying with  $\Phi_0^+(0)$ , dividing by  $a_{\text{out}}e^{i\Omega t}$ , yields

$$\Omega + v_g\beta'n = iv_g\Phi_0^+(0)^2 \frac{a_{\text{in}}}{a_{\text{out}}} \quad \text{bzw.} \quad \frac{a_{\text{out}}}{a_{\text{in}}} = \boxed{r(\Omega, n) = \frac{iv_g\Phi_0^+(0)^2}{\Omega + v_g\beta'n}} \quad \text{reflectivity of the DFB in this single-mode approximation.} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Consequence: } iv_g\Phi_0^+(0)^2 = \left(\frac{\partial q}{\partial \omega}\right)^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where  $q = 1/r$  is the inverse of the DFB reflectivity in the given approximation.

Next I turn to delayed feedback by setting  $a(t) = K\Psi^+(0, t - \tau) = K\Phi_0^+(0)f(t - \tau)$  in Eq. (old 12). Multiplying with  $i$  and using the equations derived before, one gets immediately

$$\dot{f} = -iv_g\beta'nf + \eta f(t - \tau) \quad \text{with} \quad \boxed{\eta = \frac{iK}{\partial_\omega q}} \quad (3)$$

Up to the factor  $i$ , this is the LK coupling coefficient which we already used in the coupled laser paper. Is the  $i$  correct or not?