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Abstract—The causes for the saturation of both the continuous–wave and the pulsed output power of broad–area laser diodes driven at very high currents are investigated experimentally and theoretically. The decrease of the gain due to self–heating under continuous–wave operation and spectral holeburning and carrier heating under pulsed operation as well as hetero–barrier carrier leakage and longitudinal spatial holeburning are the dominating mechanisms limiting the maximum achievable output power.

I. INTRODUCTION

High–power laser diodes are the root source of optical energy in all high performance laser systems. Broad–area diode lasers (either as single emitters or in bars) are in wide–spread application in part because of their ease of fabrication. In recent years, their output power was driven to higher and higher values by steadily increasing the efficiency. In principle the maximum achievable power is limited by the damage threshold of the semiconductor crystal (catastrophic optical damage, COD), either within the laser cavity or at the facets. However, different measures like the reduction of the power density by broadening the optical waveguide [1], the improvement of the crystal quality [2] and special facet treatments [3] significantly extended the COD power. Thus increasingly physical effects like self–heating [4], carrier leakage [5] and gain compression [6] limit the achievable power. In this talk we will present results of two–dimensional simulations of the vertical carrier transport, heat flow, and waveguiding accounting for hetero–barrier leakage, longitudinal spatial holeburning (LSH) and spectral holeburning (SHB). Lateral effects like filamentation and thermal lensing were dropped. We will consider both continuous–wave operation and pulsed operation, where the self–heating of the lasers can be neglected, and compare the results to measurements.

II. MODEL

The simulations are based on the “Treat Power as a Parameter” (TPP) method as explained in [7] and [8]. In Fabry–Perot lasers as investigated here, the forward and backward propagating optical power $P^+$ and $P^-$ solve the equations

$$\pm \frac{dP^\pm}{dz} = \left\{ g_m(U,P) / [1 + P/P_s] - \alpha_0 \right\} P^\pm$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

subject to the boundary conditions

$$P^+(0) = R_0 P^-(0) \quad \text{and} \quad P^-(L) = R_L P^+(L),$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

and where

$$P(z) = P^+(z) + P^-(z)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

is the total power. The modal gain $g_m$ is twice the imaginary part of the propagation constant $\beta$ which is obtained as a solution of the vertical waveguide equation

$$\left[ \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda^2} \varepsilon(n, p, T, x) - \beta^2 \right] E(x) = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where

$$\varepsilon = \left[ n + i\lambda(g - \alpha)/(4\pi) \right]^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

with $n$ being the refractive index, $g$ the local gain and $\alpha$ the local absorption coefficient. The electron and hole densities $n$ and $p$ as well as the temperature distribution $T$ are solutions of the vertical drift–diffusion and heat–flow equations. For this, the simulation tool WIAS–TeSCA [9] is used. More details on material functions and boundary conditions will be given at the conference.

As result of the simulation in the vertical direction, $g_m$ is obtained as a function of the bias $U$ and the local power $P$. In Eq. (1) $\alpha_0$ comprises scattering and radiation losses

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Layer sequence, thicknesses and ionized doping densities of the structure under study}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
layer & compound & thickness & doping  \\
\hline
cladding & p-Al$_{0.25}$Ga$_{0.75}$As & 25 & -2.  \\
GRIN & GaAs $\rightarrow$ p-Al$_{0.25}$Ga$_{0.75}$As & 1500 & -0.1 $\rightarrow$ -2.  \\
confinement & p-GaAs & 800 & -0.05  \\
spacer & GaAs & 100 & -0.01  \\
QW & In$_{0.29}$Ga$_{0.71}$As & 7 &  \\
barrier & GaAs & 50 &  \\
QW & In$_{0.29}$Ga$_{0.71}$As & 7 &  \\
barrier & GaAs & 50 &  \\
QW & In$_{0.29}$Ga$_{0.71}$As & 7 &  \\
barrier & GaAs & 50 &  \\
QW & In$_{0.29}$Ga$_{0.71}$As & 7 &  \\
spacer & GaAs & 1300 & 0.01  \\
confinement & n-GaAs & 1000 & 0.1  \\
spacer & GaAs & 2000 & 0.2  \\
confinement & n-GaAs & 5000 & 0.5  \\
cladding & p-Al$_{0.25}$Ga$_{0.75}$As & 1300 & 0.5  \\
        &               & 100 & 1  \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
not contained in $\alpha$ and $P_s$ is a saturation power describing phenomenologically gain compression caused by spectral holeburning and carrier heating (denoted by SHB) \cite{10}. LSH is accounted for via the power dependence of $g_{in}$ in Eq. (1). If the term in the braces of Eq. (1) is evaluated at the average power in the cavity, the usual model neglecting LSH is recovered.

III. DEVICE PARAMETERS

The layer sequence, thicknesses and ionized doping densities of the structure under study are compiled in Tab. 1. The epitaxial layer structure was grown on a n–GaAs substrate. The emission wavelength is $\lambda \propto 1060$ nm. Cavity length and stripe width are $L = 4$ mm and $W = 100$ $\mu$m, respectively, and the facet reflectivities are $R_0 = 0.01$ and $R_L = 0.95$. For CW operation, the laser diode was mounted on a conductively cooled package.

IV. RESULTS

Figs. 1 and 2 show the measured and simulated power–current characteristics under CW and pulsed, respectively, operation of two laser diodes. Experimentally, a maximum CW output power of $P = 13$ W limited by thermal rollover and a maximum pulsed output power of $P = 90$ W limited by the current driver were achieved. Thermal rollover is caused by the decrease of the gain due to internal self–heating and increased hetero–barrier leakage. However, as Fig. 1 reveals, good agreement between measurement and simulation is achieved only if longitudinal spatial holeburning (LSH) is taken into account. Under operation with short current pulses (300 ns pulse width), self–heating can be almost neglected. Due to the high power reached now gain compression affects the power–current characteristics. Therefore, besides LSH, a finite saturation power $P_s = 300$ W has to be taken into account in order to obtain sufficiently good agreement between measurement and simulation (Fig. 2). This saturation power corresponds to a gain compression factor of approximately $10^{-23}$ m$^{-3}$, which is on the lower limit of the values given in \cite{10}. More insight into the physics and results for longer cavity lengths as well as other layer structures will be presented at the conference.
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