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T. D. Wilkerson
Atmospheric Lidar Observatory
Institute for Physical Science and Technology
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-2431

ABSTRACT

Research is described on several aspects of stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) of 532 nm laser light in H$_2$, D$_2$, and CH$_4$. The goals of this work are: (1) to develop a more thorough understanding of nonlinear processes involving the Raman effect and four-wave mixing, and (2) to find the best way to generate radiation at several wavelengths simultaneously, for lidar applications. Issues addressed are conversion efficiency, optimization of operating conditions (gas pressure, confocal parameter, etc.) and the distribution of output pulse energy over three Stokes components, the first anti-Stokes component, and the zeroth order (pump) wavelength. The described research and results constitute another step in the development of SRS applications for NASA's atmospheric lidar program.

---

$^1$A report on research carried out under NCC 1-25 (E. V. Browell, Technical Monitor), sponsored by NASA-Langley Research Center, for the period ending July 31, 1990.
PROGRESS OF RESEARCH ON WATER VAPOR LIDAR

We report on the further study of stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) processes being conducted in College Park. As this program continues, a clearer picture emerges of the possibilities for SRS in atmospheric lidar applications. As a result, we are now able to carry out spectroscopy experiments, for example, at infrared wavelengths that were previously not accessible to most tunable lasers. This latter work, and plans for improved optical conversion efficiency into the near infrared, will be reported in the near future. These developments will have been made feasible, in part, by the research reported in the present document, because of the deeper understanding provided about SRS processes in general.

The work we report here was carried out until May 30, 1990, first submitted as a journal article to *Applied Optics* in August, 1980, and described at two conferences during 1990. (See Appendices A and B.) Appendix C contains the final version of the paper which will be published in *Applied Optics*.

The research consists of an in-depth study of a variety of SRS processes in H$_2$, D$_2$, and CH$_4$ for the input wavelength 532 nm (Nd:YAG,SHG). While this wavelength is intermediate between the near UV wavelengths of interest for ozone lidar specialists and the near IR region for meteorological lidar, it provided us ample energy to:

- Vary the experimental parameters over a wide range;
- Make quantitative observations on Raman components, in addition to the most prominent one (first Stokes); and
- Distinguish in some cases the roles of SRS and four-wave mixing.

Just by itself the latter is important for knowledgeable lidar applications that need to go beyond the simple issue of energy conversion efficiency, to address beam divergence, multiple Stokes interference, and spectral distribution of the output.
Results of this work are described in detail in the submitted article which appears here in Appendix C. The conclusions are reiterated here:

We have investigated the performance of a single-pass, multi-order Stokes generation system using hydrogen, deuterium and methane gases as Raman media. Among the three gases, CH₄ transfers very little energy to high order Stokes and anti-Stokes outputs; most of the energy is concentrated in the pump and first Stokes, especially at high pressures. Thus CH₄ is appropriate for generating first Stokes light, but not for multiple wavelength applications. For H₂ and D₂, energy is distributed over second Stokes as well as the first Stokes and the transmitted pump. Varying the hydrogen pressure in the range of 5 to 15 atm, and deuterium above 40 atm, is a suitable method for simultaneous generation of a variety of wavelengths with reasonable energy for lidar applications. D₂ is a suitable gas for producing radiation on the shorter wavelength side, and the optimum pressure for this is about 13 atm.

During the reporting period, presentations were made on research carried out under the Cooperative Agreement. Abstracts for these conference proceedings are reproduced in Appendices A and B. This completes our report on NCC 1-25 for the period ending July 31, 1990.
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ABSTRACT

We describe the optimization of the SRS techniques for efficiently generating eye-safe radiation in the near-IR, and multiwavelength radiation in visible and near-IR, for atmospheric aerosol measurements. The optimized results demonstrate the applicability of the SRS process.
OPTIMIZATION OF SRS TECHNIQUES FOR
REMOTE SENSING APPLICATIONS
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SUMMARY

This paper describes a specific new technique for optimizing a
Raman-shifted Nd:YAG laser system capable of generating 1.54 μm radiation in
the eye-safe infrared for cloud and aerosol studies. The existing lidar
systems are not eye-safe, in general, and pose potential risk of eye damage
especially in the case of downward pointing lidar systems. This laser system
can also be used to generate multiple wavelengths through SRS (stimulated
Raman scattering) to study the aerosol, whose sizes cover many order of
magnitude and whose scattering properties strongly depend on the incident
wavelength.

The experimental setup used for the studies reported here is shown in
Fig. 1. Eye-safe radiation at the first Stokes wavelength of 1.54 μm is
produced in the lower Raman cell when methane is used as Raman-active medium,
the pump source being a Nd:YAG laser at 1.064 μm. The technique used in this
study for optimizing the first Stokes generation involved retroreflecting the
backward-generated first Stokes light back into the Raman cell as a seed
Stokes beam which was then amplified in the temporal tail of the pump beam.
We will also discuss the optimization procedures and the limitations.
The advantages of using a seeded amplifier are quite evident in Fig. 2. Compared to the single pass self-generated SRS system, the energy conversion efficiency with this new method tripled and approached 18% at a pressure of 14 atm and a pump energy of 140 mJ at 10 Hz. The conversion efficiency was further improved by operating the system at lower repetition rate (e.g., 5 or 3 Hz). This SRS configuration is currently being used in a flight experiment on a NASA DC-8 aircraft to carry out aerosol lidar measurements as part of the GLObal Backscattering Experiment (GLOBE) project.

Multiwavelength generation by the SRS technique in different molecular gases (H₂, D₂, and CH₄) was studied using a frequency-doubled Nd:YAG laser at 532 nm as the pump source. The Raman cell on the top of Fig. 1 was used, where H₂ has been shown, for example, as a Raman-active medium. The study was focused on the redistribution of the pump energy primarily into four SRS components: fundamental, first Stokes, second Stokes, and first anti-Stokes. The pump energy was varied from 0-200 mJ and the gas pressure from 0-45 atm. Results indicated that among the three gases, CH₄ transfers very little energy to higher order Stokes and anti-Stokes radiation, and most of the energy is found in the undepleted pump and first Stokes, at high cell pressure. Thus it is appropriate for generating first Stokes but not suitable for multiwavelength purposes. For H₂ and D₂, pump energy is fairly well distributed in fundamental, first, and second Stokes. Keeping the hydrogen pressure in the range of 10-20 atm and deuterium above 40 atm, multiwavelength output can be generated with reasonable energy per pulse for aerosol lidar applications.
Optimization of SRS .......... Singh, Chu, and Wilkerson
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Experimental arrangement for generating multiwavelength and eye-safe radiation.

Fig. 2. Conversion efficiency of the amplified Stokes output (●) is shown as a function of pump energy for a methane gas pressure of 14 atm. For comparison, the conversion efficiency of the backward-generated Stokes seed (○) and the forward Stokes in the unseeded case (■) are also shown.
MULTIPLE WAVELENGTH GENERATION BY SRS
TECHNIQUE FOR AEROSOL MEASUREMENT

Z. CHU, U. N. SINGH, T. D. WILKERTON

University of Maryland
Institute for Physical Science and Technology
College Park, MD 20742-2431, USA

The atmosphere contains particles whose size distribution cover many orders of magnitude. Because the scattering properties of aerosol strongly depend on the incident wavelength [1], size distribution measurements require radiation at different wavelengths with reasonable energy [2]. Stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) is attractive for this purpose as its multiple Stokes shifts can provide radiations with considerable wavelength difference and reasonable energy.

Multiwavelength generation by SRS in different molecular gases (H₂, D₂ and CH₄) was studied using a frequency-doubled Nd:YAG laser at 532 nm as the pump source. The experimental setup is shown in Fig. 1. A single-pass Raman cell of one meter length was used. The study was focused on the redistribution of the pump energy primarily into four SRS components: fundamental S₀, first Stokes S₁, second Stokes S₂, and first anti-Stokes AS₁. The other higher order radiations were too weak to be considered for lidar applications and were thus neglected. The pump energy was varied from 0-200 mJ and the gas pressure from 0-45 atm. For optimization purposes, we also varied the pump power density at the center of Raman cell by using different focusing geometry. Stimulated Raman scattering characteristics for different gases are discussed and are compared for the purpose of multiple wavelength generation.

Figure 2 shows the energy conversion efficiency of the pump laser to S₀, S₁, S₂ and AS₁ for a range of pump energy in H₂, D₂ and CH₄ at pressure of 20 atm. To compare these results, the Raman gains in H₂, D₂ and CH₄ at pressure of 20 atm were predicted theoretically to be 2.72, 0.56 and 0.63 cm/GW, respectively. It can be seen that Raman gain values in H₂ are much larger than in D₂ and CH₄; the same trend prevails in our measurements shown in Figure 2. The minimum residual pump energy (smallest S₀) in H₂ corresponds to a largest Raman gain, while the maximum residual pump energy (largest S₀) in D₂ corresponds to a smallest Raman gain with an intermediate value for CH₄.
Higher Raman gain in H\textsubscript{2} also supports a strong competition between S\textsubscript{1} and S\textsubscript{2}, as evident in Fig. 2 (a). As soon as the pump laser energy exceeded the threshold level, both first Stokes (S\textsubscript{1}) and second Stokes (S\textsubscript{2}) energies rose rapidly. Each reached an energy conversion efficiency of 30% for a pump energy of 100 mJ. Second Stokes light was generated by cascade SRS excitation and four wave mixing. When the pump energy was increased further, the second Stokes conversion efficiency reached saturation while the first Stokes efficiency showed a slow decrease. Lower gain in D\textsubscript{2} supports a more uniform distribution of pump energy among S\textsubscript{0}, S\textsubscript{1}, S\textsubscript{2} and AS\textsubscript{1}, as seen in Fig. 2 (b). In the saturation regime S\textsubscript{0} is about 38%, S\textsubscript{1} is 22%, S\textsubscript{2} is 12% and AS\textsubscript{1} is 5%. In CH\textsubscript{4}, most of the scattered pump photons were converted to S\textsubscript{1}. The highest first Stokes energy conversion efficiency with lowest second Stokes indicates that in contrast to H\textsubscript{2} and D\textsubscript{2}, four wave mixing is not predominant in compressed CH\textsubscript{4} at 20 atm.

Figure 3 shows the SRS conversion efficiencies as a function of gas pressure (H\textsubscript{2}, D\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4}) for a pump energy of 150 mJ. Two important features are seen with SRS in H\textsubscript{2} (Fig. 3 (a)): (1) an almost constant residual pump energy S\textsubscript{0} in the pressure range of 15 to 50 atm, and (2) the appearance of a minimum in S\textsubscript{1} around 10 atm and a maximum in S\textsubscript{2} near 13 atm. The growth and competing behavior of S\textsubscript{1} and S\textsubscript{2} in low and high pressure regimes are directly related to their generation principle. In the low pressure regime, both the cascade SRS [3] and the four wave mixing effect [4] contribute to S\textsubscript{2} generation. Second Stokes suppression at high pressure is a result of the four wave mixing effect, since Raman gain is independent of pressure, and cascade SRS does not transfer the second Stokes photon to third Stokes radiation, as is evident from the decreasing trend of S\textsubscript{2} with pressure in Fig. 3 (a). Theoretical analysis also supports this experimental result that four wave mixing suppresses S\textsubscript{2} generation at high pressures.

In D\textsubscript{2}, the residual pump energy decreases gradually, up to a pressure of 45 atm. This is typical, because of the small Raman gain coefficient of D\textsubscript{2}. A steadily rising trend is observed in S\textsubscript{2} rather than suppression, reflecting that a smaller optical dispersion effect exists in D\textsubscript{2} than in H\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4}. At 45 atm, the measured S\textsubscript{0}, S\textsubscript{1} and S\textsubscript{2} conversion efficiencies are 25, 26 and 23% respectively which gives a rather uniform energy distribution.

The increase of S\textsubscript{0} with pressure in CH\textsubscript{4} above 7 atm is an outstanding feature, indicating that the Raman gain is decreasing with pressure. Another characteristic is that the energy conversion to S\textsubscript{1} dominated other SRS
components and was as high as 40% at 20 atm. \( S_2 \) appears notable only in a narrow range around 7 atm. The low pressure shift of the second Stokes maximum and its fast depletion compared to \( H_2 \) shows that the optical dispersion in methane is the most serious among the three gases.

In conclusion, we have investigated the performance of a single-pass SRS system, using hydrogen, deuterium and methane gases as Raman media. Results indicates that among the three gases, \( \text{CH}_4 \) transfers very little energy to higher order Stokes and anti-Stokes radiation, and most of the energy is found in the residual pump and first Stokes, at high cell pressure. Thus it is appropriate for generating first Stokes but not suitable for multiwavelength purposes. For \( H_2 \) and \( D_2 \), pump energy is fairly well distributed in fundamental, first, and second Stokes. Keeping the hydrogen pressure in the range of 10-20 atm and deuterium above 40 atm, multiwavelength output can be generated with reasonable energy per pulse for aerosol lidar applications.
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Figure 2. Conversion efficiency of pump energy to fundamental (●), first Stokes (▲), second Stokes (●) and first anti-Stokes (●) as a function of pump energy at pressure of 20 atm in (a) H₂, (b) D₂, (c) CH₄.

Figure 3. Energy Conversion efficiency to fundamental (●), first Stokes (▲), second Stokes (△), first anti-Stokes (●) and third Stokes (●) as a function of gas pressure at pump energy of 150 mJ in (a) H₂, (b) D₂, (c) CH₄.
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Abstract

We report experimental results of multiple Stokes generation of a frequency-doubled Nd:YAG laser in H₂, D₂ and CH₄ in a focusing geometry. The energies at four Stokes orders were measured as functions of pump energy and gas pressure. The characteristics of the Stokes radiation generated in these gases are compared for optical production of multiple wavelengths. The competition between Raman components is analyzed in terms of cascade Raman scattering and four-wave mixing. The results indicate the possibility of using these generation processes for atmospheric aerosol measurements by means of multiwavelength lidar systems. Also the results distinguish between the gases, as regards the tendency to produce several wavelengths (H₂, D₂) versus the preference to produce mainly first Stokes radiation (CH₄).

Key words

Stimulated Raman scattering, Multiwavelength generation, Aerosol lidar application, Lidar, Raman-shifting in molecular gases.
I. Introduction

The atmosphere contains particles whose sizes span many orders of magnitude. Since the scattering properties of aerosols are strongly dependent on the wavelength of the illuminating light,\(^1\) quantitative scattering measurements of aerosol type and size distributions requires the availability of light in different wavelength ranges with adequate energy.\(^2\) For this purpose Raman scattered radiation is attractive because of the potential for multiple Stokes shifts which can produce radiation over a considerable wavelength range and with a reasonable energy conversion.

A series of experiments has been done on the generation of Stokes orders using a frequency-doubled Nd:YAG pump laser at 532 nm in hydrogen, deuterium and methane and using a focused geometry. In addition to stimulated Raman scattering (SRS), four-wave mixing processes also generate light at the Stokes frequencies. A detailed investigation of the processes under a variety of conditions is necessary if a reasonably uniform distribution of energy among the Stokes components is required. In this paper, we report on the results of a study of multiple wavelength generation and the optimization techniques employed. We discuss the similarities and differences between the Stokes orders generated in the different molecular gases. We also analyze the characteristics of the multiple Stokes generation in considering the relative importance of the stimulated Raman and the four-wave mixing effects.

II. Experiment

A schematic of the experiment used for studying the properties of forward Stokes generation is shown in Fig. 1. The pump light is the output of a frequency doubled Nd:YAG laser at 532 nm, linearly polarized, with pulse width of 10 nsec, beam diameter of 6 mm, divergence of 0.6 mrad and repetition rate of 10 Hz. The
Raman cell was a 1 meter long, single-pass gas cell in which we varied the gas pressure up to 45 atm. Lens L_1 before the cell was used to control the confocal parameter of the pump laser beam. L_2 at the exit of the cell collimated the output beam from the Raman cell. A Pellin-Broca prism at the exit of the Raman cell separated the output into different Stokes orders which were monitored by means of energy meters. We measured the incident pump energy, the transmitted pump energy S_0, first Stokes energy S_1, second Stokes energy S_2, and first anti-Stokes energy AS_1. Third Stokes energy S_3 was measured only in H_2. Higher order Stokes components were too weak for ordinary lidar applications and were neglected in this study.

Three optimization techniques were used in this experiment for controlling the stimulated Raman outputs. The first was to vary the pump beam energy over the range of 0 – 200 mJ; the second was to vary the gas pressure from 0 to 45 atm; the third was to control the pump power density at the center of the cell by varying the confocal parameter of the focused pump beam.

III. Raman Gain and Wave-Vector Mismatch Calculations

When a gas cell at low pressure is pumped by a high intensity laser, both stimulated Raman and four-wave mixing processes will happen. The first Stokes radiation is produced by SRS. Since second Stokes may be produced by either four-wave mixing of the original pump and the generated Stokes, or cascade SRS excitation (the first Stokes radiation is strong enough to pump the second Stokes generation directly), it is important to identify the source of the second Stokes in the experiment. In this section some related parameters are calculated for the purpose of data analysis.
A. Raman Gain Coefficient Calculation

For gases, the plane wave, steady-state Raman gain coefficient $g_R$ can be calculated from: \(^3\)

$$ g_R = \frac{2 \lambda_s^2}{hc v_s} \frac{\Delta N}{\pi c \Delta v_s} \left( \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right) $$

where $\lambda_s$ is the Stokes wavelength in cm, $v_s$ is the Stokes frequency in cm$^{-1}$, $c$ is the speed of light in cm/sec, $h$ is Planck's constant $6.626 \times 10^{-34}$ J sec, $\Delta N$ is the difference in population between the initial and final states in cm$^{-3}$, $\Delta v_s$ is the Raman linewidth (FWHM) in cm$^{-1}$, and $d\sigma/d\Omega$ is the differential cross section for Raman scattering in cm$^2$/sr.

The Raman gain coefficient $g_R$ is calculated for $H_2$, $D_2$ and $CH_4$. The parameters used for the Raman gain calculation are listed in Table I. The wavelengths for the principal Stokes and anti-Stokes radiations are also given. The values used for $\Delta N$, $\Delta v_s$ and $d\sigma/d\Omega$ are essentially the same as those used by Hanna et al.,\(^4\) except that a more general formula is used for $\Delta v_s$ in the case of hydrogen,\(^5\) and the most recently published data have been used for deuterium.\(^6\) Clearly the Raman gain in Table I is much greater for $H_2$ than for $D_2$ and $CH_4$.

The pressure dependence of the Raman gain can be seen clearly from the simplified form of Eq. (1):

$$ g_R = A \frac{p}{\Delta v_s} $$

where $A$ is a constant dependent on the molecular medium. From substitution of $\Delta v_s$ (see Table I) for $H_2$, $D_2$ and $CH_4$, Fig. 2 shows the calculated Raman gain coefficients of three gases at different pressures. At low pressures, $g_R$ increases at different rates for different gases, where the rate for $D_2$ is the greatest and for $CH_4$ is the smallest. At high pressures, $g_R$ becomes saturated, the gain being the highest for
H₂ and the lowest for D₂. Both gain curves are essentially flat for p greater than 20 atm, but the gain for CH₄ is still increasing even at 100 atm. The pressure dependence of the Raman gain indicates that Raman effect does limit the second Stokes generation at low pressure, because of the finite Raman gain, but does not suppress the second Stokes in the high pressure region.

B. Wave-Vector Mismatch Calculation

For four-wave mixing, if we neglect the higher order Stokes contributions to second Stokes production and only consider the pump, first Stokes and first anti-Stokes, the mixing process can be either type I or type II:

I: \[ \omega_{S2} = \omega_{S0} + \omega_{S1} - \omega_{AS1} \]  
II: \[ \omega_{S2} = 2\omega_{S1} - \omega_{S0} \]

For a cell which is very long compared to the laser confocal parameter, assuming that only a lowest order Gaussian beam is produced, the second Stokes power, \( P \), generated by four-wave mixing is given by \(^8\)

\[ P = B p^2 \exp(-b|\Delta k|) \]  

where \( B \) is a constant, independent of pressure, \( b \) is the laser confocal parameter in cm and \( \Delta k \) is the wave vector mismatch caused by the dispersion of the medium; i.e.,

I: \[ \Delta k = k_{S2} - (k_{S0} + k_{S1} - k_{AS1}) \]  
II: \[ \Delta k = k_{S2} - (2k_{S1} - k_{S0}) \]

where \( k_i = 2\pi n_i / \lambda_i \) is the wave vector for the \( i \)th order Raman component and \( n_i \) is refractive index which is proportional \(^9\) to \( p \). The empirical refractive index formula at wavelength \( \lambda \) is used here to estimate the pressure effect, \(^10\)

\[ n = \frac{10^{-6} pr}{1 + \frac{T}{273}} + 1 \]  

\[ \Box \]
where $T$ is temperature in $^\circ$C, $p$ is pressure in atm, and $r$ is an optical dispersion parameter related to the refractive index at the pressure of 1 atm and temperature of 0 $^\circ$C, and is defined as, $^{10,11}$

$$r = 10^6 (n_{0^\circ\text{C},1\text{ atm}} - 1)$$

(7-a)

$$\left[\frac{3}{2} \frac{n_{0^\circ\text{C},1\text{ atm}}^2 - 1}{n_{0^\circ\text{C},1\text{ atm}}^2 + 2}\right] = \frac{a_1}{a_4 - \lambda^2} + \frac{a_2}{a_5 - \lambda^2} + \frac{a_3}{a_6 - \lambda^2}$$

(7-b)

where $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5$ and $a_6$ are constants, $^{11}$ and $\lambda$ is wavelength in cm. Inserting Eqs (5) and (6) into Eq. (4), we can write the wave vector mismatch and second Stokes power as

$$b |\Delta k| = C p$$

(8-a)

$$P = B p^2 \exp(\frac{-C p}{2})$$

(8-b)

where $C$ is a constant. Equation (8) shows that the wave vector mismatch is proportional to pressure. In this model, by using $dP/dp=0$ one can infer a maximum conversion to $S_2$ at some intermediate pressure $p^*$

$$p^* = \frac{2}{C}$$

(9)

From Eqs. (4), (5), and (6) we can calculate $C$ and $p^*$ for type I and type II,

**I:**

$$C = \frac{2\pi b 10^{-6}}{1 + \frac{T}{273}} \left( \frac{r_{S_2}}{\lambda_{S_2}} - \frac{r_{S_0}}{\lambda_{S_0}} - \frac{r_{S_1}}{\lambda_{S_1}} + \frac{r_{AS_1}}{\lambda_{AS_1}} \right)$$

(10-a)

**II:**

$$C = \frac{2\pi b 10^{-6}}{1 + \frac{T}{273}} \left( \frac{r_{S_2}}{\lambda_{S_2}} - \frac{2r_{S_1}}{\lambda_{S_1}} + \frac{r_{S_0}}{\lambda_{S_0}} \right)$$

(10-b)

**I:**

$$p^* = \frac{10^6}{\pi b} \left( 1 + \frac{T}{273} \right) \left( \frac{r_{S_2}}{\lambda_{S_2}} - \frac{r_{S_0}}{\lambda_{S_0}} - \frac{r_{S_1}}{\lambda_{S_1}} + \frac{r_{AS_1}}{\lambda_{AS_1}} \right)^{-1}$$

(11-a)

**II:**

$$p^* = \frac{10^6}{\pi b} \left( 1 + \frac{T}{273} \right) \left( \frac{r_{S_2}}{\lambda_{S_2}} - \frac{2r_{S_1}}{\lambda_{S_1}} + \frac{r_{S_0}}{\lambda_{S_0}} \right)^{-1}$$

(11-b)
where all wavelengths (at \( AS_1, S_0, S_1 \) and \( S_2 \)) are given in cm. Inserting the wavelengths in Table I, \( T=25 \, ^\circ C \) and \( b=3.76 \, \text{cm} \) (\( f_{L1} = 1 \, \text{m} \)) into Eq. (11), the optimization pressures and wave vector mismatches for types I and II in \( \text{H}_2, \text{D}_2 \) and \( \text{CH}_4 \) are calculated and listed in Table II. The optical dispersion quantity \( r \) is also given. Figure 3 shows the calculated wave vector mismatches of type II for three gases at different pressures, indicating the greatest \( \Delta k \) for \( \text{CH}_4 \) among the three gases.

Table II shows a common feature for three gases: type II four-wave mixing has a smaller wave vector mismatch than type I. From Eq. (4) we can infer that type II is the dominant mixing process in the second Stokes generation.

From the above Raman gain and wave vector mismatch calculations, we can conclude that four-wave mixing dominates the second Stokes generation at low pressures where the wave vector mismatch is small; the SRS contributes more as the gas pressure is increased and the contribution by four-wave mixing decreases.

IV. Experimental Results and Discussion

A. Stokes Orders versus Pump Energy

Figure 4 shows the output energies plotted against the pump energy and presented in terms of the conversion efficiency of the pump laser to \( S_0, S_1, S_2 \) and \( AS_1 \) at pressure of 20 atm. The energy distributions among the Raman orders are quite different for the different gases.

The greatest depletion of the pump energy occurs in \( \text{H}_2 \) (Fig. 4(a)) corresponding to its having the highest Raman gain (Fig. 2, Table I). When the pump energy was above 100 mJ, the transmitted pump energy \( S_0 \) was 10% or less and had a variation of only about 1% over a pump energy range of 100–200 mJ. Once the Raman effect produced \( S_1, S_2 \) followed rapidly. \( S_2 \) was as strong as \( S_1 \) when the pump energy was about 50 mJ and even exceeded \( S_1 \) at higher pump energies. This
was an important characteristic for H₂ compared to D₂ and CH₄. In the cascade Raman process, when first Stokes radiation is generated by SRS, more pump energy is needed to generate the second Stokes in cascade. The second Stokes generated in this way can never rise simultaneously with or exceed the first Stokes. In Fig. 4(a) the simultaneous generation and the nearly equal energy distribution of the first Stokes and second Stokes in the whole pump energy range indicates that a dominant contribution to the generation of second Stokes came from four-wave mixing. The anti-Stokes conversion (AS₁) was only 3%, i.e., about one order lower than S₁ and S₂.

Results of similar measurements for D₂ and CH₄ are shown in Figs. 4(b) and 4(c). In the saturation region there was about 5% more pump depletion in CH₄ than in D₂, which was consistent with the higher gain of methane (Table I). In D₂, one characteristic was the more even distribution of energy among S₀, S₁, S₂ and AS₁. In the pump energy range of 150 mJ, the transmitted pump energy was not strongly depleted. In the saturation region, S₀ was 38%, S₁ was 22%, S₂ was 12% and AS₁ was 5%. The anti-Stokes conversion in D₂ was comparable with that in H₂. In the case of CH₄, almost all of the scattered photons were converted to S₁, and S₂ is near zero. S₁ exceeded S₀ at the pump energy of 65 mJ and saturated around 40%. This reflected the fact that four-wave mixing was not prominent with CH₄ (in contrast to D₂) at 20 atm gas pressure, which agreed with the calculation of the greatest wave vector mismatch of CH₄ indicated in Table II and Fig. 3.

From Fig. 4 we see that there is one common feature for the Stokes generation processes in the three gases: once saturation is reached, the conversion efficiency ratios of the various Stokes components remain roughly fixed as the pump laser power is varied.

B. Pressure Effect in Multiple Stokes Generation

We investigated multiple Stokes generation by operating at the highest
pressure possible. Figure 5 shows the variations of conversion efficiency with gas pressure in H\textsubscript{2}, D\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4}.

We first discuss the results for H\textsubscript{2} (Fig. 5(a)). One feature is the relative constancy of the transmitted pump energy $S_0$ at high pressures. This energy varied by about 1% in the pressure range 20–50 atm, indicating that the Raman gain was constant above 20 atm and the depleted photons were shifted into different Stokes orders. The second feature is a minimum conversion to first Stokes radiation around 10 atm. We observed that a more favorable $S_1$ conversion occurred at pressures below 5 atm or above 30 atm. In contrast to $S_1$, there was a maximum in $S_2$ around 13 atm, and it dominated the Stokes conversion processes at that pressure. Our experimental result ( $p^*_{\text{exp}} = 13$ atm ) is closer to that of type II four-wave mixing (Table II) and agrees with the prior measurements by Loree et al.,\textsuperscript{12} which showed that the number of observed Raman lines was the greatest for $p \sim 10$ atm. The intensity distribution of the second Stokes was observed to evolve from the Gaussian structure to a circular ring pattern, and the ring diameter increased with pressure.

The third Stokes $S_3$ at 1.563 \textmu m was also generated in H\textsubscript{2} at low pressures, as shown in Figure 5(a). The energy in the third order Stokes was comparable to that in the anti–Stokes. $S_3$ decreased with pressure from 7.5 atm and upward, confirming that the high pressure drop in second Stokes energy was not caused by the third Stokes generation through cascade Raman process, but rather by four-wave mixing.

The experimental results in Fig. 5(a) also show that for optimizing just the $S_1$ output in H\textsubscript{2}, increasing the pressure to above 30 atm or decreasing the pressure to below 5 atm are good choices, but for maximizing the number of wavelengths having reasonable energies for lidar use, pressures in the range 5–15 atm are the most suitable. In consideration of the equal beam divergence requirement in lidar applications\textsuperscript{13}, the operating pressure should be chosen as low as possible in the above
range because of the second Stokes ring pattern.

Fig. 5(b) shows the variation of $S_n$ with pressure in $D_2$. The remaining pump energy steadily decreased over the pressure range 10 - 45 atm. This was identical with the smaller Raman gain coefficient of $D_2$. A peak value of 36% energy conversion to $S_1$ occurred at 7 atm; $S_1$ efficiency decreased at the expense of conversion to $S_2$ as pressure was increased from 7 to 15 atm, and then increased somewhat because of the SRS transfer from pump light as pressure was higher than 15 atm. It is noteworthy that $S_2$ increases steadily rather than dropping in the pressure range of 45 atm, which is consistent with its smallest $\Delta k$ and highest $p^*$ in the theoretical prediction of Table II. At 45 atm, the measured $S_0$, $S_1$ and $S_2$ conversion efficiencies were 25, 26 and 23% respectively, providing a relative uniform distribution of optical energy over these wavelengths.

Instead of the progressive pump depletion with increasing pressure in $H_2$ and $D_2$, the increase of $S_0$ with pressure in $CH_4$ when the pressure was above 7 atm was one notable characteristic. $S_1$ was as high as 40% at 20 atm pressure, and dropped at higher pressure. $S_2$ appeared noticeably only in a narrow range around 7 atm, and its maximum of 15% coincided with the minimum of $S_0$, which agrees with its lowest $p^*$ among the three gases as predicted in Table II. The decrease in Raman conversion at high pressure in $CH_4$ may be due to the competition from other nonlinear processes, such as stimulated Brillouin scattering.

The measured optimization pressures in these gases are all higher than the theoretical predictions. The discrepancy may be due to the interaction of four-wave mixing and cascade Raman scattering. Another possible reason for the discrepancy is the assumption of a single Gaussian mode made on Eq. (4). In general the wave generated by four-wave mixing has a multimode structure which will shift the optimization pressure to the higher side.8

In all three cases, indicated in Fig. 5, the anti-Stokes conversion was very low, and it peaked at low gas pressure. This is caused by four-wave mixing effects, which
are denoted here by types III and IV.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{III: } & \quad \omega_{AS1} = \omega_{S0} + \omega_{S1} - \omega_{S2} \\
\text{IV: } & \quad \omega_{AS1} = 2\omega_{S0} - \omega_{S1}
\end{align*}
\]  

(12-a) (12-b)

Equations (12) and (3) belong to the same general type of four-wave mixing. Equation (6) can then be used to estimate the pressure effect of anti-Stokes generation, which manifests a high pressure suppression effect similar to that of \( S_2 \). Table III lists the wave vector mismatch and peak pressures calculated for the anti-Stokes processes. The measured maximum conversion efficiencies for anti-Stokes radiation are 5.5% at 3.5 atm (\( H_2 \)), 6.5% at 13.5 atm (\( D_2 \)) and 2.2% at 6.8 atm (\( CH_4 \)). Comparing Table II and Table III, we see that the discrepancies between the calculations and experiments for anti-Stokes are smaller than those for second Stokes. We also see that the wave vector mismatch of type II for anti-Stokes is larger than that for second Stokes.

In order to achieve the high power density required by Stokes generation, we used lenses of different focal length (50, 75, 100, 150, 200 cm) at different cell pressures. When the lens focal length was greater than 100 cm, the power densities at the input and output windows exceeded the damage threshold. Thus we only used lenses having focal lengths less than 100 cm. Focusing dramatically altered the energy distribution between the Raman orders. The result of one such investigation is shown in Fig. 6, where lenses of focal length \( f_{L1} = 100 \) cm and \( f_{L1} = 50 \) cm were used with \( D_2 \) for a range of cell pressures. The 50 cm focal length gave the lower Raman conversion. In the case of very tight focusing (50 cm), we found that the total of the four Raman components deviated greatly from 100% at high pressure; this loss was proportional to the pump energy. This energy loss may have been caused by competing nonlinear processes arising from the higher local density of pump light near the focus and the simultaneous generation of higher order Raman components by four-wave mixing.

11
V. Conclusions

We have investigated the performance of a single-pass, multi-order Stokes generation system using hydrogen, deuterium and methane gases as Raman media. Among the three gases, CH$_4$ transfers very little energy to high order Stokes and anti-Stokes outputs; most of the energy is concentrated in the pump and first Stokes, especially at high pressures. Thus CH$_4$ is appropriate for generating first Stokes light, but not for multiple wavelength applications. For H$_2$ and D$_2$, energy is distributed over second Stokes as well as the first Stokes and the transmitted pump. Varying the hydrogen pressure in the range of 5 to 15 atm, and deuterium above 40 atm, is a suitable method for simultaneous generation of a variety of wavelengths with reasonable energy for lidar applications. D$_2$ is a suitable gas for producing radiation on the shorter wavelength side, and the optimum pressure for this is about 13 atm.
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Experimental setup for the multiple Stokes generation.

Figure 2. Calculated Raman Gain Coefficient $g_R$ as a function of gas pressure for $H_2$, $D_2$ and $CH_4$.

Figure 3. Calculated wave vector mismatch $\Delta k$ as a function of gas pressure for $H_2$, $D_2$ and $CH_4$.

Figure 4. Conversion efficiency of pump energy to transmitted pump (○), first Stokes (□), second Stokes (▲), third Stokes (△) and first anti-Stokes (○) as a function of pump energy in $H_2$ (a), $D_2$ (b) and $CH_4$ (c) at pressure of 20 atm.

Figure 5. Energy conversion efficiency as a function of gas pressure to transmitted pump (○), first Stokes (□), second Stokes (▲) and first anti-Stokes (○) in $H_2$ (a), $D_2$ (b) and $CH_4$ (c) for a constant pump energy of 150 mJ.

Figure 6. Conversion efficiency for the Stokes orders is shown as a function of gas pressure for two focusing geometries: transmitted pump with $f_{L_1} = 50$ cm (○); first Stokes with $f_{L_1} = 50$ cm (■); second Stokes with $f_{L_1} = 50$ cm (▲); transmitted pump with $f_{L_1} = 100$ cm (○); first Stokes with $f_{L_1} = 100$ cm (□); second Stokes with $f_{L_1} = 100$ cm (△).
TABLE CAPTIONS

Table I. Parameters used for the calculation of the Raman gain at a pressure of 20 atm and temperature of 25 °C.

Table II. Calculations of optimum pressure and wave vector mismatch for second Stokes at a pressure of 20 atm and temperature of 25 °C.

Table III. Calculations of optimization pressure and wave vector mismatch for anti-Stokes at a pressure of 20 atm and temperature of 25 °C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>$\lambda_{AS1, S0 (1,2)}$ (nm)</th>
<th>$\Delta N$ (cm$^{-3}$)</th>
<th>$\Delta \nu_a$ [10$^3$ cm$^{-1}$] &amp; p (atm)</th>
<th>$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}$ [10$^3$ cm$^2$/sr]</th>
<th>$g_R$ (cm/GW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{H}_2$ Q(1) (4155 cm$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>436 532 683 954</td>
<td>0.66 $N_{tot}$</td>
<td>$\frac{11.2}{p} + 1.58 \ p$</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{D}_2$ Q(2) (2987 cm$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>459 532 633 780</td>
<td>0.38 $N_{tot}$</td>
<td>$\frac{3.67}{p} + 3.58 \ p$</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{CH}_4$ Q (2917 cm$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>461 532 630 771</td>
<td>$N_{tot}$</td>
<td>320 + 12 \ p</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I: Applied Optics Chu, Singh & Wilkerson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>$r_{AS1, S0(1,2)}$</th>
<th>$p^*$ (atm)</th>
<th>$\Delta k$ (cm$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H$_2$ | 145.01  
142.98  
141.40  
140.24 | I: 2.26  
II: 5.27 | I: 4.71  
II: 2.02 |
| D$_2$ | 108.14  
107.43  
106.84  
106.35 | I: 8.47  
II: 18.73 | I: 1.26  
II: 0.57 |
| CH$_4$ | 448.42  
444.24  
440.73  
437.88 | I: 1.44  
II: 3.21 | I: 7.37  
II: 3.31 |

Table II

Applied Optics

Chu, Singh & Wilkerson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>$p^*$ (atm)</th>
<th>$\Delta k$ ($cm^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$</td>
<td>III: 2.26</td>
<td>III: 4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV: 3.95</td>
<td>IV: 2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_2$</td>
<td>III: 8.47</td>
<td>III: 1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV: 15.46</td>
<td>IV: 0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_4$</td>
<td>III: 1.44</td>
<td>III: 7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV: 2.62</td>
<td>IV: 4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III

*Applied Optics*  
Chu, Singh & Wilkerson
Figure 1 Chu, Singh and Wilkerson
Figure 2.

Chu, Singh, Wilkerson
Figure 3. Chu, Singh, Wilkerson
Figure 4. Chu, Singh, Wilkerson
Figure 5. Chu, Singh, Wilkerson
Figure 6. Chu, Singh, Wilkerson