The method of adiabatic frequency conversion, in analogy with a two-level atomic system, has been put forward recently and verified experimentally to achieve robust frequency mixing processes such as sum and difference frequency generation. Here a comparative study of efficient frequency mixing using various techniques of shortcuts to adiabaticity such as counter-diabatic driving and invariant-based inverse engineering is presented. It is shown here that it is possible to perform sum frequency generation by properly designing the poling structure of a periodically poled crystal and the coupling between the input lights and the crystal. The required crystal length for frequency conversion significantly decreases beyond the adiabatic limit. This approach significantly improves the robustness of the process against the variation in temperature as well as the signal frequency. By introducing a single parameter control technique with constant coupling and combining with the inverse engineering, perturbation theory, and optimal control, it is shown that the phase mismatch can be further optimized with respect to the fluctuations of input wavelength and crystal temperature that results into a novel experimentally realizable mixing scheme.

1. Introduction

In the field of nonlinear optics, the nonlinear frequency conversion via three wave mixing process is a fundamental concept,[1] in which light of two colors is mixed in a nonlinear crystal, resulting in sum frequency or difference frequency generation (SFG or DFG) with a third color. However, the conversion efficiency of standard frequency conversion, based on quasi-phase matching (QPM) technique, is not perfect especially for broad optical signal, since the three-wave mixing processes is sensitive to the input wavelength, crystal temperature, interaction length, and incidence angle. Remarkably, the analogy of different quantum-optical phenomena, including rapid adiabatic passage (RAP) and even stimulated Raman adiabatic passage (STIRAP) in two- or three-level atomic systems, opens new exciting possibility to control dynamics in nonlinear optical media, see recent review.[2] In a specific simplification, the coupled wave equations of SFG and DFG processes in the undepleted pump approximation is analogous to time-dependent Schrödinger equation of the interaction of light with two-level atom. Therefore, RAP with Landau–Zener scheme in frequency conversion has been suggested and also realized experimentally in aperiodically poled potassium titanyl phosphate (APPKTP) device, with high efficiency over a wide bandwidth.[3–7] In addition, the extension of STIRAP to two-process frequency conversion has been discussed in the depleted pump regime.[8] Apart from adiabatic process, composite pulses are proposed to achieve efficient and broadband sum frequency.[9] However, both processes require long interaction length, which shows the downside.

In the past decade, shortcuts to adiabaticity (STA)[10,11] have been developed to speed up the adiabatic processes in various quantum systems.[12] Among them, counter-diabatic (CD) driving[13,14] (or equivalently quantum transitionless driving[15]) and Lewis–Riesenfeld (LR) invariant based inverse engineering[16,17] provides efficient ways to design the interactions that drives the system along a desired instantaneous eigenstate of the reference Hamiltonian. This approach has been extensively studied and implemented in different contemporary fields, including atomic physics,[18,19] spintronics,[20,21] quantum computation,[22] and many-body state dynamics[23,24]. Based on the analogy between the Schrödinger equation and the coupled wave equation,[25] the STA techniques has been also exploited in optical waveguide devices, including mode conversion, directional coupler, and beam splitting.[26,27] Furthermore, the optimization of STA[28] can be further applied for designing high coupling efficiency, robust, and short-length coupled-waveguide
devices. Regarding the frequency process, the conventional CD field, one of the STA techniques, has been also first envisaged to improve the SFG process. In this paper, we study extensively the shortcuts to adiabatic frequency conversion in a nonlinear aperiodically poled crystal structure by focusing on ingredients of robustness and optimality. In order to compare, we design the couplings and the phase mismatch inside the crystal using both, the CD driving and the adiabatic SFG method followed by developing CD driving for SFG in Section 3. Section 4 provides the LR invariant-based engineering of CD field, one of the STA techniques, has been also first envisaged to improve the SFG process. In Section 6.

Figure 1. Schematic of controlled aperiodic structure of a poled crystal with designed continuous variation of phase mismatch $\Delta K(z)$ along the direction of propagation for realizing shortcuts to adiabatic sum frequency conversion, where $\omega_1$, $\omega_2$ are the signal and pump frequencies, respectively, whereas $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3$ represents the idler frequency.

where $\tilde{A}_1$ and $\tilde{A}_3$ are the normalized signal and idler amplitudes respectively, given by

$$\tilde{A}_1 = \frac{c}{4\omega_1} \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{\pi X(\omega_1^2)}} A_1, \quad \tilde{A}_3 = \frac{c}{4\omega_1} \sqrt{\frac{k_1}{\pi X(\omega_3^2)}} A_3$$

The coupling coefficient, $q$ is $z$-dependent with $\omega$ being the propagation distance, being represented as

$$q(z) = \frac{4\pi \omega_1 \omega_3}{\sqrt{k_1 k_2 c^2}} \chi(2) A_2$$

where, $A_2$ is the pump amplitude which is strong compared to signal and the idler so that the undepleted pump approximation can be assumed, $\omega_1$, $\omega_2$ are the signal and pump frequencies respectively whereas $\omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3$ represents the idler frequency, corresponding wave numbers characterizes the phase mismatch $\Delta k = k_1 + k_2 - k_3$ and $\chi(2)$ represents the nonlinear susceptibility of the medium.

Note that Equation (1) is analogous to a resonant two-level quantum system coupled by complex field $q(z) = Q(z) e^{i\phi(z)}$, where $Q(z) = |q(z)|$ mimics the Rabi frequency and $\phi(z)$ being the chirping parameter. To study the adiabatic evolution of such a system, we introduce a unitary transformation as follows,

$$\tilde{A}_1 = a_1 e^{-(\Delta k - \phi(z)) z/2}, \quad \tilde{A}_3 = a_3 e^{i(\Delta k - \phi(z)) z/2}$$

which turns into a rotating wave approximated Schrödinger like equation,

$$i \frac{d}{dz} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta k - \phi(z) & 2Q(z) \\ 2Q(z) & \Delta k - \phi(z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ a_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the Hamiltonian of the system being

$$H(z) = \frac{\Delta K(z)}{2} \sigma_z + Q(z) \sigma_z$$

where, $\sigma_x, \sigma_z$ represents the well-known Pauli matrices. To achieve the adiabatic SFG, the most important parameter is $\Delta K(z)$. The sweeping process of QPM requires designing the crystal with appropriately structured poling period such that the sweeping occurs from $-\Delta_0$ to $\Delta_0$. Here we follow the traditional LZ model to choose the phase mismatch with constant coupling $Q = Q_0$ and $\Delta K(z) = \Delta_0 - az$. The spatial evolution of such a system is governed by the so called adiabatic condition which can be calculated by using the dressed state picture.

$$C_{ad} = \left| \frac{Q_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Delta K}{(Q_0^2 + \Delta K^2)^{1/2}} \right| \ll 1$$

Clearly, the adiabaticity of the evolution is dictated by the choice of the phase mismatch $\Delta K(z)$, which can be taken as

$$\Delta K(z) = \Delta K_0 + \delta K + \delta K_n(z)$$

$\Delta K_0 = k_1 + k_2 - k_3$ is the primary phase mismatch, $\delta K$ is the contribution due to group velocity mismatch. The last term characterizes QPM which can be expressed as $2\pi/\Lambda(z)$. Here $\Lambda(z)$
like all adiabatic processes, the adiabatic SFG is also slow as it requires relatively large crystal length as well as large pump intensity > 360 MW cm⁻² to achieve greater efficiency.

3. Counter-Diabatic Sum Frequency Generation

In this section, we focus on the CD driving for SFG, which has been developed in ref. [30]. The instantaneous eigenmodes of \( H(z) \) in Equation (6) can be written as \((|n_0(z)⟩, |n_\lambda(z)⟩)^T = U(\theta(z))(|0⟩, |1⟩)^T\), where \( U(\theta(z)) \) represents a unitary rotation with the mixing angle being \( \theta(z) = 2\tan^{-1}(2Q_0/\Delta K) \). And \((|0⟩, |1⟩)^T\) represents the basis modes characterizing \( a_i \) and \( a_\alpha \), respectively and the interaction Hamiltonian can be expressed in terms of \(|n_\lambda(z)⟩\) basis by using the unitary transformation,

\[
H_a(z) = U' (\theta(z)) H(z) U(\theta(z)) - i U' (\theta(z)) \dot{U}(\theta(z))
\]

According to the CD driving [13,14] (or the transitionless quantum driving [15]) it is always possible to construct a driving Hamiltonian, which cancels out the non-adiabatic part \( i U' (\theta(z)) U(\theta(z)) \). Addition of a driving term in \( H_a(z) \) drives the system exactly along the adiabatic path even beyond the adiabatic in Equation (7). The driving Hamiltonian, \( H_1(z) \) is constructed from the instantaneous eigenstates which is Hermitian and purely off-diagonal in nature, can be written in adiabatic basis as,

\[
H_1 = i \sum |2n_\lambda(z)⟩⟨n_\lambda(z)|
\]

from which for our system, the Hamiltonian \( H_1 \) finally takes the following form

\[
H_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\theta \\ -i\theta & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\]

In principle, the total Hamiltonian \( H_{eff} = H(z) + H_1 \) can transfer \( a_i \) to \( a_\alpha \) in a fast adiabatic-like way, which means the state evolves from \( a_i \) to \( a_\alpha \) along the instantaneous eigenstate of Hamiltonian \( H_0 \) within short propagating distance, not satisfying the adiabatic condition in Equation (7). Taking into account the physical implementation, we further simplify the total Hamiltonian \( H_{eff} = H(z) + H_1 \) by using the concept of multiple Schrödinger picture [29] and finally obtain

\[
H_{eff} = \left( \frac{\Delta K(z) - \varphi}{2} \right) - \frac{Q_{eff}}{2}\left( \Delta K(z) - \varphi \right)
\]

where \( \varphi(z) = \tan^{-1}(\theta/Q_0) \) and \( Q_{eff} = (\theta^2/4 + Q_0^2)^{1/2} \). This method promises that there is a possibility for achieving frequency conversion in very small crystal length. However that requires modification in both the phase mismatch and the coupling. This is evident from Figure 3a,b, which shows the required modification of \( \Delta K(z) \) and \( Q_0 \). It shows that the smaller the crystal size, the more drastic the modification is required to achieve complete mode transfer. But if the modifications are achieved, complete mode transfer is guaranteed in infinitesimally small crystal length. As show in Figure 3c, the mode
transfer is complete even for \( L = 2 \) mm and the Bloch vector in Figure 3d shows the required path is smaller compared to the adiabatic one which refers to the smaller crystal length. The results convincingly show that the CD approach for SFG is much superior when in terms of the crystal size and the coupling strength. However, the more we decrease the crystal length, the changes in the effective phase mismatch are more rapid. As the system consists of only a single APPKTP crystal, it could be challenging to design inside a very small crystal length with existing poling methods. Moreover, the amplitude of the effective coupling increases rapidly with the decreasing crystal length. This can be achieved using an applied external field along the energy transfer region of the crystal.\cite{30} Perhaps an alternative method would be to focus the pump to the center of the crystal, by designing or further optimizing the focused pump beam characteristics.\cite{14}

4. Optimal Sum Frequency Generation

In this section, we will opt for the LR invariant-based engineering for STA\cite{16,17} in SFG. Although the CD approach shows robust and fast SFG, from the implementation viewpoint it poses significant difficulties in practical implementation. In general, inverse engineering method is based on designing the coupling and the phase mismatch simultaneously from the imposed boundary conditions for dynamical modes of LR invariant. However, we aim to concentrate on an optimization of the phase mismatch with respect to a constant coupling, making it easier implementation by removing the requirement of additional coupling. To this end, one needs first to construct the LR invariant, which is generally chosen in a parameterized form, yielding:\cite{28,35}

\[
I(z) = \frac{I_0}{2} (\sin \zeta(z) \cos \beta(z) \sigma_x - \sin \zeta(z) \sin \beta(z) \sigma_y + \cos \zeta(z) \sigma_z)
\]

(13)

where \( I_0 \) is an arbitrary parameter and has the dimension of coupling coefficient. The invariant equation which is to be satisfied is given by:

\[
\frac{dI(z)}{dz} = i \frac{\partial H(z)}{\partial z} - [H(z), I(z)]
\]

(14)

Here \( H(z) \) is the original Hamiltonian. From above equations we obtain the following conditions for invariance

\[
\dot{\zeta}(z) = 2Q(z) \sin \beta(z)
\]

(15a)

\[
\dot{\beta}(z) = -\Delta K(z) + 2Q(z) \cot \zeta(z) \cos \beta(z)
\]

(15b)

The LR invariant possesses a different set of eigenmodes compared to the Hamiltonian which do not coincide in general. These eigenmodes can be written in parametric form as

\[
|\Phi^+\rangle = \left( \frac{\cos(\frac{\beta(z)}{2}) e^{-i\beta}}{\sin(\frac{\beta(z)}{2})} \right), \quad |\Phi^-\rangle = \left( \frac{\sin(\frac{\beta(z)}{2}) e^{i\beta}}{-\cos(\frac{\beta(z)}{2})} \right)
\]

(16)

In principle, the solution of model Equation (5), resembling Schrödinger equation, can be written as the superposition of eigenmodes of dynamical invariant, see below. And the instantaneous eigenmodes \(|\Psi_{\pm}(z)\rangle\) are related to \(|\Phi_{\pm}(z)\rangle\) by LR phase, given by \(|\Psi_{\pm}\rangle = |\Phi_{\pm}\rangle e^{\pm i \zeta(z)}\rangle\), with the LR phase being deduced as

\[
\dot{\zeta} = \pm \left( \beta + \frac{\theta \cot \beta}{\sin \theta} \right)
\]

(17)

4.1. Landau-Zener Optimization

To optimize the invariant-based shortcut according to the LZ scheme, we find an optimized profile for \( \Delta K_{opt} \) for a constant \( Q(z) \) in order to make it more feasible for practical situations. Considering \( Q(z) = Q_o \), and from Equations (15 a) and (15 b) we get:\cite{16}

\[
\Delta K_{opt} = - \frac{\xi(z)}{2Q_o \left( 1 - \frac{\zeta(z)^2}{4Q_o^2} \right)^2} + 2Q_o \cot \zeta(z) \left( 1 - \frac{\xi(z)^2}{4Q_o^2} \right)^2
\]

(18)

One should note that, from the above equation, with this choice an additional constraint comes to the system, thus it is obvious that \( \Delta K_{opt} \) only depends on \( \zeta \). For the optimization, we follow the perturbative approach for the systematic error:\cite{28,35} The error with respect to the signal wavelength \( \lambda_1 \) in the phase mismatch term from Equation (8) is \cite{37}

\[
\delta \lambda_1 \approx - \frac{2 \pi n \Delta \lambda_1}{\lambda_1^2}
\]

(19)
which presents the perturbative error, described by $H' = \delta_\epsilon \sigma_z / 2$. The probability for the system to be found in a particular mode $|\Phi^\prime\rangle$ can be written as:

$$P_m(z) = 1 - \left( \frac{\delta_\epsilon}{2} \right)^2 \left| \int_0^L \langle \Phi^\prime | \sigma_z | \Phi^\prime \rangle \, dz \right|^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

from which can define the error sensitivity as follows:

$$q_\epsilon = -\frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{\partial^2 P_m}{\partial \delta^2 \epsilon} \right|$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

Now $P_m$ has to be unity in order to maintain the system in $|\Phi^\prime\rangle$, which follows that

$$\int_0^L \, dz \, \sin^2(\zeta(z)) \exp(im\zeta) \rightarrow 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

where $m(z) = 2\Gamma_\epsilon - \beta$. To make the above integral we expand $m(z) \approx m(0)$ in terms of Fourier series:

$$m(0) = 2\zeta + c_1 \sin 2\zeta + \cdots + c_n \sin 2n\zeta + \cdots$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

It is straightforward to calculate that

$$\beta = \cot^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{2M \sin \zeta} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

with $M = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d m(z)}{d \zeta}$. Combining all Equations (15) and (24), we can obtain

$$Q_0 L = \int_0^\pi \sqrt{1 + 4M^2 \sin^2 \zeta} \, d\zeta \geq \pi$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

which sets the bound for crystal length with the maximum value of $Q_0$ allowed. It should be noted that with this optimization, unlike conventional invariant-based approach, we loose the freedom to design the parameters $\zeta$ and $\beta$ which characterizes the invariant itself. One can find $\zeta$ by solving Equation (15) using Equation (24) and design an optimal $\Delta K_{opt}$ from Equation (18). The only parameter one can chose are the Fourier coefficients in order to nullify the integral Equation (22). Accordingly we can also obtain the intensity of the pump field in order to maintain a constant $Q_0$, as follows

$$I_j(a_j) = \left( \frac{Q_0^2 c_{0m}}{32 \chi^3} \right) \lambda_1 \lambda_2 n_1 n_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Similar optimization can be made with respect to the other parameters as well. For instance, the temperature dependence of the wavelength can be studied by the optimization with respect to the refractive index along the extraordinary axis. In Figure 4a, we have plotted $\beta$ and $\zeta$ which are obtained by solving the Equations (15a) and (24). Like the conventional LR invariant method, where one has the freedom to design the coupling and the phase mismatch using the boundary conditions, the $\zeta$ shows similar behavior (varies from 0 to $\pi$), but $\beta$ changes drastically in order to maintain the constant coupling. Here we have used only one Fourier coefficient in Equation (23), that is, $c_1$ in order to find the optimal $\Delta K_{opt}$ as shown in Figure 4b. Moreover, as it turns out, the optimal length depends on the two parameters only which are basically $c_1$ and $Q_0$. Since in the LZ optimization, $Q_0$ is a constant with $I_2 = 360$ MW cm$^{-1}$, for a fixed crystal length of 2 mm the only degrees of freedom we have is the choice of $c_1$. In Figure 4c, we choose $c_1 = -1.47$ which results in a complete mode conversion along a fixed path, shown in the corresponding Bloch vector trajectory in Figure 4d. The product $Q_0 L$ is always constant, see Equation (25), for a particular value of $c_1$ and it approaches to $\pi$ when the higher order terms in Equation (23) are considered.

5. Efficiency

The robustness of the aforementioned STA inspired SFG methods can be demonstrated by studying the conversion efficiency against the variation of externally controllable parameters, where the efficiency is defined as $|a_j(L)|^2 / |a_j(0)|^2$. In Figures 5 and 6, we present a comparative study of the conversion efficiency with respect to the input signal wavelength and the crystal temperature for different peak pump amplitude and crystal length.

5.1. Dependence on the Wavelength

Figure 5 shows the efficiency of the SFG with respect to the variation of signal wavelength. For adiabatic case, it shows broadband nature and thereby robust against the wavelength variation. In Figure 5a variation of efficiency for different pump intensity for the adiabatic case is clarified. An efficiency value close to unity can be achieved when the pump intensity is more than...
Figure 5. Conversion efficiency of modes with respect to the variation of signal wavelength for different pump intensities with \( I_p = 10 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (blue dashed), \( I_p = 60 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (solid red), and \( I_p = 360 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (black dashed-dotted) in (a–c); and for different crystal length with pump intensity \( I_p = 360 \text{ MW cm}^{-2}, L = 2 \text{ mm} \) (blue dashed), \( L = 10 \text{ mm} \) (solid red), \( L = 20 \text{ mm} \) (black dashed-dotted) in (d–f), respectively. Here for comparison, (a,d) present adiabatic SFG, (b,e) presents CD driving, and (c,f) presents the optimal SFG designed by inverse engineering.

360 MW cm\(^{-2}\). It is also critically dependent on the crystal length for the same poling period variation. As shown in Figure 5d, the efficiency decreases with the decreasing crystal length with almost zero for \( L = 2 \text{ mm} \) even when pump intensity is around 360 MW cm\(^{-2}\).

In Figure 5b,e, we examine the efficiency when the SFG is assisted by the CD driving which also expectedly exhibit the broadband and even smoother efficiency curve. Unlike the adiabatic case, the efficiency profile is insensitive to the variation of the pump amplitude. This is mainly due to the fact that the additional coupling compensates for the requirement of the extra coupling strength for mode conversion. Moreover, the required strength of the additional coupling is higher for smaller crystal length which makes, as Figure 5e shown, the efficiency profile is constant with respect to different crystal length as well.

However in case of the LZ optimal SFG, one cannot directly compare the variation against the variation of signal wavelength and crystal length separately as \( Q_0 L \) constitutes a constant quantity. Figure 5c depicts variation for different pump intensities where the profile is broader as the pump intensity becomes stronger and crystal length (solid black) becomes smaller. Also in Figure 5f, efficiency is shown for two different \( c_1 \) values. For \( c_1 = -1.47 \), where we see the efficiency profile is broader compared to \( c_1 = -0.2 \) for \( I_p = 360 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \).

5.2. Dependence on the Temperature

The efficiency of the SFG also depends on the crystal temperature as the refractive index of birefringent crystals are highly dependent on temperature. Since the phase mismatch, see Equation (8), is a function of refractive index as well, the entire frequency conversion process becomes temperature dependent. Generally the refractive indices for a particular wavelength in the...
Figure 6. Conversion efficiency of modes with respect to the variation of temperature for different pump intensities with \( I_p = 10 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (blue dashed), \( I_p = 60 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (solid red), and \( I_p = 360 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \) (black dashed-dotted) in (a–c); and for different crystal length with pump intensity \( I_p = 360 \text{ MW cm}^{-2} \), \( L = 2 \text{ mm} \) (blue dashed), \( L = 10 \text{ mm} \) (solid red), \( L = 20 \text{ mm} \) (black dashed-dotted) in (d–f), respectively. Here for comparison, (a,d) present adiabatic SFG, (b,e) presents CD driving, and (c,f) presents the optimal SFG designed by inverse engineering.

APPKTP crystal is determined by the Sellmeier equation, given by [33]

\[
n^2 = A + \frac{B}{1 - C\lambda^2} - D\lambda^2
\]  

(27)

Constants \( A, B, C \), and \( D \) are taken from ref. [33]. The temperature dependence is obtained conventionally as (for KTP crystal)[38]

\[
\Delta n(\lambda, T) = n_1(\lambda)(T - 25 \degree C) + n_2(\lambda)(T - 25 \degree C)^2
\]

with

\[
n_{1,2}(\lambda) = \sum_{m=0}^{3} a_m^{1,2} / \lambda^m
\]

(29)

Here \( a_m^{1,2} \) are constants (see ref. [38]). The temperature dependence of the efficiency in Figure 6 also shows broadband feature, depending on the pump intensity and the crystal length.

For \( L = 20 \text{ mm} \) efficiency is higher for the higher pump intensity, see also Figure 6, but decreases when the crystal length as well as the pump intensity is decreased. For CD driving, however, these variations are eliminated and a smoother profile regardless of the crystal length and the pump intensity. Also for the LZ optimization, the variation in efficiency improved for higher pump amplitude and when \( c_1 = -1.47 \).

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, we have studied the SFG process in an APPKTP crystal using the STA methods. We have reviewed the adiabatic SFG scheme which is extremely robust with respect to the parameter variations. However it requires large crystal length and relatively strong pump pulse to achieve complete mode conversion. On the contrary, the STA based approaches such as the CD driving and LR invariant approach can obtain robust SFG in much shorter crystal dimensions. Application of CD driving requires modifications in the poling structure of the crystal which can be easily obtained using modern fabrication techniques for chirped
quasi phase matched crystals.[2,19–41] In principle using CD driving one can achieve SFG in crystals with infinitesimally small length. Although in reality this may be limited due to the requirement of extremely large additional coupling. For instance, to achieve the mode conversion in 0.2 mm, the additional coupling strength is around 140 mm−1, for which the required intensity would be very high compared to APPKTP crystals damage threshold of 500 MW cm−2. However, this could be remedied by using external field along the energy conversion region of the crystal.[10]

Although robust, the CD driving may pose significant difficulties regarding the implementation as it requires spatial modification of both the coupling and the phase mismatch simultaneously. As a potential solution, we further propose LZ optimization, by combining LR invariant and perturbation theory, for designing experimentation in this direction may provide more insights to the SFG process and improve understanding of the nonlinear frequency mixing process. For instance, the variation in temperature changes the refractive index of the crystal according to the Sellmeier equation which in turn changes the phase mismatch condition itself. Therefore, it is also possible to achieve control over the phase mismatch for the STA based frequency mixing using a suitable temperature profile.[42] Moreover, one can combine the optimally robust STA in nonlinear quantum systems to the case beyond depleted pump regime.[2,7] Regarding the physical implementation, one can optimize the focused pump beam with respect to beam characteristics, that is, focusing parameter and spatial pattern, which is also worthwhile to pursue in the future work.
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