The Effects of Interchannel Interference on Optical FSK Systems Influenced by Phase Noise

D. Milić, M. Stefanović

Abstract:- **Moments approach is generally considered a systematic way to perform analysis of coherent optical systems. In this paper, we extend the method to a wider class of systems to include the cases where interchannel interference may be significant. We derive essential equations in matrix form and compare the moments approach with numerical simulation and Fokker-Planck approach. To illustrate the results, we apply the moments method to two-channel optical heterodyne FSK system with dual-filter receiver structure, and evaluate required channel spacing to have less than 1 dB penalty due to crosstalk.**

Keywords:- **Phase noise, optical communication, envelope detection, interchannel interference, frequency shift keying**

I. INTRODUCTION

Considerable efforts have been devoted to theoretical description of coherent optical systems, in order to account accurately for the influence of laser phase noise on the system performance. During the past decade, several solutions to the problem have been presented in the literature [1-5]. Among the solutions, the most widely used are the results of Taylor expansion method [1] and the moments approach [3, 4].

There have been previous attempts to include the impact of interchannel interference on the FSK system performance, using the moments approach [6, 7]. However, potentials of the moments approach were not used to the maximum, and the results are mostly qualitatively valid. In most cases, the effects of time shift between the interfering channels were neglected, and only the systems with ideally synchronized channels were considered. A comprehensive worst-case analysis of ASK systems, which includes the aforementioned effects is outlined in [8]. However, the proposed method uses the leading order Taylor expansion to account for the phase noise influence, together with an approach based on the inverse Fourier transform to compute the bit-error rate, as opposed to conditional error probability approach [7] which is generally more accurate. In this paper, we outline a procedure that combines the good sides of both the approaches -the worst-case analysis of [8], and the conditional error probability approach [7]- to yield the results that should be in closer agreement with the real system performance. We apply the procedure to heterodyne dual-filter FSK receiver, and calculate the required channel separation for a two-channel system.

The authors are with the Faculty of Electronic Engineering, A Medvedeva 14, 18000 Nis, Serbia and Montenegro. E-mail: milko, misa@elfak.ni.ac.yu

II. MOMENTS EVALUATION

Analysis of coherent optical system performance, including the effects of interchannel crosstalk, requires the knowledge of probability density function (pdf) of the following random variable:

$$\frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau \left(e^{j\varphi(t)} + e^{j(\theta+2\pi d_{el}t+\phi(t))}\right)dt\,, \tag{1}$$

or -in envelope detection schemes- its squared modulus. Random phase processes $\varphi(t)$ and $\phi(t)$ are considered independent [3] Brownian motions [1] with diffusion constants $2\pi\Delta\nu$, d_{el} is channel separation and θ is interference offset phase - constant over the one bit duration. Using Taylor expansion of the interference, the leading asymptotic behavior is obtained as [6, 8]:

$$\frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau e^{j\varphi(t)}dt + je^{j\theta}\,\frac{1-e^{j2\pi d_{el}\tau}}{2\pi d_{el}\tau} + e^{j\theta}\,\frac{\phi(\tau)e^{j2\pi d_{el}\tau}-\phi(0)}{2\pi d_{el}\tau} \tag{2}$$

In the above equation, it is convenient to identify the interference as a Gaussian random variable with mean r, and variance $\dfrac{\Delta\nu\tau}{2\pi(d_{el}\tau)^2}$. Therefore, it is possible to include the last term of the previous equation with other Gaussian noise contributions, such as shot and receiver noises [6, 7]. However, the deterministic interference term r is more complicated to account for.

Let the moments $\hat{\mu}_{m,n}$ of X be defined as

$$\hat{\mu}_{m,n} = E\left[X^m \overline{X}^n\right]. \tag{3}$$

where the overbar stands for complex conjugation. Exact moments $\mu_{i,j}$, of the filtered phase-noisy signal without the influence of interference, are known in symbolic form [2, 3, 4], and they can be used to express $\hat{\mu}_{m,n}$, as we will show.

By introducing the notation $X = r + z$, where

$$r = e^{j(\theta+\pi d_{el}\tau)}\,\frac{\sin(\pi d_{el}\tau)}{\pi d_{el}\tau}\,, \tag{4}$$

$$z = \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau e^{j\varphi(t)}dt\,, \tag{5}$$

according to Eq. (2), the moments $\hat{\mu}_{m,n}$ are written as:



(a) (b)

Fig. 1. Probability density functions of the envelope detector output, with and without deterministic interference. Curves are reconstructed from the first 12 moments using maximum entropy approach.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_{m,n} &= E\left\{(r+z)^m(\bar{r}+\bar{z})^n\right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{m}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\binom{m}{i}\binom{n}{j}\mu_{i,j}\, r^{m-i}\,\bar{r}^{\,n-i}\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It is convenient to write the equation in the matrix form:

$$\hat{\mu}_{m,n} = \langle\bar{\rho}\rangle_{m+1}\langle M\rangle_{n+1,m+1}\langle\rho\rangle_{n+1}^T \tag{7}$$

where $\langle M\rangle_{n,m}$ denotes the moment-matrix of the random variable z, namely:

$$\langle M\rangle_{n,m} = [\![\mu_{i-1,j-1}]\!]_{\substack{i=1,2,\ldots,n\\ j=1,2,\ldots,m}}, \tag{8}$$

The row-vector $\langle\rho\rangle_k$ is defined as $\langle\rho\rangle_k = [r_i]_{i=1,2,\ldots,k}$, where r_i are given by:

$$r_i = \binom{k-1}{i-1}r^{k-i}. \tag{9}$$

The moments $\hat{\mu}_{k,k}$ are in fact moments of random variable $|X|^2$ and they are relevant in performance analysis, since the dual-filter FSK receiver uses envelope detection.

Described procedure may be generalized to yield the following result:

$$\left\langle\hat{M}\right\rangle_{k,k} = \langle\bar{R}\rangle_{k,k}\langle M\rangle_{k,k}\langle R\rangle_{k,k}^T \tag{10}$$

where the matrix $\langle R\rangle_{k,k}$ is defined as

$$\langle R\rangle_{k,k} = [\![r_{i,j}]\!]_{i,j=1,2,\ldots,k} \tag{11}$$

and the $r_{i,j}$ are given by

$$r_{i,j} = \begin{cases}\binom{i-1}{j-1}r^{i-j} & , \quad j\le i\\ 0 & , \quad j>i\end{cases}. \tag{12}$$

The moment-matrix $\left\langle\hat{M}\right\rangle$ of the random variable X may not be real, as this is obvious from Eqs. (4) and (6). However, the moments on the main diagonal, which represent moments of the random variable $|X|^2$, are real. Figs. 1 and 2 illustrate the results and their validity.

Define: $\xi_m = \sum_{i=1}^{m}|X_i|^2$, and $\eta_{m+1} = |X_{m+1}|^2$. Moments of the sum of $m+1$ independent variables $|X_i|^2$ may be obtained by the following recurrence approach:

$$\zeta_n^{\Sigma(m)} = E\left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}|X_i|^2\right)^n\right\} = E\left\{\xi_m^n\right\} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_n^{\Sigma(m+1)} &= E\left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}|X_i|^2 + |X_{m+1}|^2\right)^n\right\} = E\left\{(\xi_m+\eta_{m+1})^n\right\}\\ &= E\left\{\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}\xi_m^{n-k}\eta_{m+1}^k\right\} = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{n}{k}\zeta_{n-k}^{\Sigma(m)}\hat{\mu}_k^{(m+1)}\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Again, the matrix formulation is convenient because the recursion process can be replaced by the multiplication of m matrices. The matrix equation is expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle\zeta^{\Sigma(m+1)}\right\rangle_k &= \left\langle\zeta^{\Sigma(m)}\right\rangle_k\cdot\langle W_{m+1}\rangle_{k,k}\\ &= \left\langle\zeta^{\Sigma(m-1)}\right\rangle_k\cdot\langle W_m\rangle_{k,k}\cdot\langle W_{m+1}\rangle_{k,k}\\ &= \ldots = \left\langle\mu^{(1)}\right\rangle_k\cdot\prod_{i=2}^{m+1}\langle W_i\rangle_{k,k}\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\left\langle\zeta^{\Sigma(m)}\right\rangle_k$ denotes the moment row-vector of the sum of m variables, defined as:

$$\left\langle\zeta^{\Sigma(m)}\right\rangle_k = \left[\zeta_{i-1}^{\Sigma(m)}\right]_{i=1,2,\ldots,k}, \tag{16}$$

$\left\langle\hat{\mu}^{(i)}\right\rangle_k$ is the moment row-vector of a single variable $|X_i|^2$, and the matrix $\langle W_n\rangle_{k,k}$ is defined as

$$\langle W_n\rangle_{k,k} = [\![w_{i,j}(n)]\!]_{i,j=1,2,\ldots,k} \tag{17}$$



Fig. 2. Pdf of the envelope detector output with "best" and "worst" case interference, in logarithmic scale. Curves: full - Fokker-Planck approach, dashed - numerical simulation of the random variable *X*.



Fig. 3. (a) Block diagram of a FSK receiver model and (b) the schematic of channels after balanced detection

with elements

$$w_{i,j}(n) = \begin{cases} \binom{i-1}{i-j} \hat{\mu}_{i-j}^{(n)} & , \quad j \le i \\ 0 & , \quad j > i \end{cases} . \quad (18)$$

By proceeding one step further from Eq. (15), it is easy to identify that the moment vector $\langle \zeta^{\Sigma(m)} \rangle$ equals the first row of the matrix $\prod_{i=1}^{m} \langle W_i \rangle$.

III. Application to FSK System

The moments may be used in a detailed performance analysis, as we will show on the FSK system example. We consider a receiver model shown in Fig. 3. It is a heterodyne polarization control receiver with dual-filter structure. Frequency deviation of the incoming FSK signal is considered large and the correlation effects between the two receiver branches are neglected. IF filtering is performed using equivalent integrate-and-dump filters with central frequencies tuned to the FSK signal frequencies, and with integration time τ. Postdetection filter is a summation device that averages *Md* consecutive detected samples during the bit interval. Shot noise is considered the dominant Gaussian noise factor; other Gaussian noise contributions can also be easily included in the analysis. Under these conditions, the error probability is computed as derived in [7] or [9].

We consider a two-channel heterodyne model with low intermediate frequency and ideal envelope detection. Interchannel interference is therefore the crosstalk from the other channel which is separated in the electrical domain by the spacing d_{el}. The crosstalk has different influence during the transmission of binary "0" and "1". When binary "0" is transmitted, the crosstalk can never be constructive since its squared modulus in the other branch impairs the decision variable; hence the interference phase is irrelevant. The amount of crosstalk changes with channel spacing and with time shift between the data, as explained in [8]. During the transmission of binary "1", the effect of crosstalk additionally depends on the relative signal phase in the interfering channel. Depending on the interference phase, the crosstalk can be either constructive or destructive (see Fig. 1).

For the given system model, worst-case error probability is:

$$P_e = \frac{1}{2} P(0/1) + \frac{1}{2} P(1/0) \quad (19)$$

where $P(0/1)$ is the worst-case probability of detecting "0" when binary "1" is transmitted, and vice-versa for $P(1/0)$. The probabilities are computed based on the results of [7], which have been modified to reflect the differences in system models and to include the more accurate statistics of phase-noisy signal with crosstalk. Worst-cases are then found by numerical search over the crosstalk time and phase shifts.

The following steps outline the procedure of performance evaluation of the FSK receiver:

1) Compute the error probability for the single-channel system as in [7]. Optimize the integration time and the number of samples to obtain the best performance for the given total laser linewidth.
2) With *Md* optimized in the previous step, and for the given channel spacing, compute $P(1/0)$ for the worst-case time shift $\tau_2 = 1/(2d_{el})$ [8], during the last sample.
3) Compute $P(0/1)$ for arbitrary time shift, initial phase and transition sample, taking into account the interference phase shift over each sample [8]. For this purpose, use Eqs. (10) and (15) to compute the appropriate moments. Using the computer search over the variables, find the worst-case performance.
4) Using Eq. (19) and two previous steps, find the sensitivity penalty relative to the ideal single-channel case with no phase noise.

Step 3 requires the use of derived matrix equations to describe the sumation of signal samples with appropriate crosstalk phase shift during each of *Md* samples. Once the appropriate moments are calculated, a Gaussian quadrature rule can be constructed in order to compute the performance [7]. The procedure is also applicable to step 2, with simpler conditions of no interference in the signal branch, i.e. all W_i are equal.



Fig. 4. Worst-case sensitivity penalty for FSK receiver. Curves: full - non-synchronized channels; dashed - synchronized channels.

IV. Numerical Results and Discussion

In Fig. 1, we compare the pdf's at the square-law envelope detector output, with, as well as without interference. The curves are reconstructed using maximum entropy method and first 12 moments. We have also obtained the densities using the Fokker-Planck equation [1, 2] to find the joint density of real and imaginary parts of z, and then numerically computed the densities of $|X|^2$ for the same r values. In Fig. 2, we show the pdf resulting form Fokker-Planck approach compared to the results of numerical simulation of variable X. The agreement is apparent and general behavior of the pdf curves is close to Fig. 1.

Fig. 4. shows sensitivity penalty of the FSK receiver due to phase noise and interchannel crosstalk. Penalties are calculated relatively to the sensitivity of the single channel receiver without phase noise, which is 40 photons per bit. In the limit of no phase noise, the two-channel system requires channel separation d_{el} of 2.7 times the bit rate in order to operate within 1 dB penalty. Phase noise generated by the lasers with total linewidth of 8% of the bit rate causes further sensitivity degradation. Wider bandwidths are required to contain the signals and the best single-channel sensitivity is obtained for Md=2, resulting in about 0.6 dB penalty without any crosstalk. Additional penalty due to crosstalk from the second channel is under 1 dB when the channel separation is above 3.6 times the bit rate. However, if the two channels are operated with exactly the same bit rate, and are synchronized, it should allow closer channel separation of about 2 times the bit rate. The situation is also beneficial for a system without phase noise, where channel spacing equal to the bit rate would suffice (not shown in Fig. 4).

When total linewidth equals 26% of the bit rate, optimum Md value is 3 and required channel spacing is about 5.5 times the bit rate. In this case, the synchronization of the channels can not reduce the required channel separation, although somewhat smaller penalties are expected. For linewidth equal to the bit rate, optimum Md is 7 and required channel separation rises to about 12, while the effects of synchronization are less noticeable. Therefore, synchronization may enable closer channel separation only when laser linewidths are relatively small. When the linewidths are close or even larger than the bit rate, the difference between synchronized and non-synchronized systems becomes negligible.

System performance are computed asymptotically accurate as long as local laser and neighboring channel transmitting laser have negligible linewidths with respect to the transmitting laser. Moreover, if the neighboring channel transmitter linewidth is not negligible, yet small, the leading order asymptotic description of interference is expected to be valid. However, in a real system, all lasers are expected to have same linewidths, and the results of this paper should be considered approximate. Nevertheless, this is a reasonable degree of accuracy, somewhat better than in other aproaches.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a procedure that enables the use of moments approach in detailed analysis of coherent optical systems impaired by phase noise and interchannel interference. Furthermore, we have set up a model of a heterodyne FSK receiver and applied the procedure to performance evaluation of the two-channel system. We have found that the required channel spacing for 1 dB crosstalk penalty is about 2.7 times the bit rate in the worst-case situation without any influence of phase noise. When total laser linewidth equals the bit rate, the required channel spacing rises to at least 12 times the bit rate. Somewhat closer channel spacing may be achieved by synchronizing the two channels, but the operation is expected to yield significant results only if the laser linewidths are relatively small.

References

[1] G. J. Foschini and G. Vannucci, “Characterizing Filtered Light Waves Corrupted by Phase Noise”, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory.*, vol. 34, pp. 1437-1448, Nov. 1988.

[2] I. Garret, D. J. Bond, J. B. Waite, D. S. L. Lettis and G. Jacobsen, "Impact of Phase Noise in Weakly Coherent Optical Systems: A New and Accurate Approach", *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 8, pp 329-337, Mar. 1990.

[3] G. L. Pierobon, L. Tomba, "Moment characterization of Phase Noise in Coherent Optical Systems", *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 9, pp 996-1005, Aug. 1991.

[4] I. T. Monroy and G. Hooghiemstra “On a Recursive Formula for the Moments of Phase Noise”, *IEEE Trans. Communications.*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 917-920, June 2000.

[5] M. Stefanovic, D. Milic, "An Approximation of Filtered Signal Envelope with Phase Noise in Coherent Optical Systems", *IEEE J.Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 19, pp. 1685-1690, Nov. 2001.

[6] R. Corvaja, L. Tomba, "Crosstalk Interference in FSK Coherent Optical Systems", *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 12, pp 670-677, Apr. 1994.

[7] M.-J. Hao and S. B. Wicker, “The effect of error control coding in multichannel FSK coherent lightwave communication system influenced by laser phase noise”, *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 14, pp. 2648-2656, Dec. 1996.

[8] G. Jacobsen and I. Garret, “The Effect of Crosstalk and Phase Noise in Multichannel Coherent Optical ASK Systems”, *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 9, no. 8, pp. 1006-1018, Aug. 1991.

[9] M. Stefanovic, D. Milic, N. Stojanovic, "Evaluation of Optimal Bandwidth in Optical FSK System Influenced by Laser Phase Noise", *IEEE J. Lightwave Technol.*, vol. 16, pp 772-777, May 1998