

Technical Note

Measured and Predicted Beam Widths are Different

“When you can measure what you are speaking about, and express it in numbers, you know something about it; but when you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meagre and unsatisfactory kind; it may be the beginning of knowledge, but you have scarcely, in your thoughts, advanced to the stage of science, what ever the matter may be.”

Lord Kelvin

Possible Reasons Measured and Predicted Beam Widths Do Not Match

Photon Inc. has been supplying highly accurate instruments¹ for more than a decade. Facing many challenges on accuracy, we have often seen the difference explained by one of the following:

Mathematical Model for Spot Size

- ◆ Model uses beam radius, instrument measures beam width.
- ◆ Model predicts beam width by one method (pin hole, slit, encircled energy, moment method), instrument measures by another.
- ◆ Beam is gaussian, model is for geometrical beam size prediction.²
- ◆ Beam is truncated entering focusing lens; model does not assume truncation.
- ◆ Predicted and measured beam width clip levels are different ($1/e^2$ vs. FWHM).

Beyond Instrument Capability

- ◆ Slit too large for measured beam (spot should be at least 3-4 times larger than slit width).
- ◆ Too few pixels or data points under the measured beam (need 12-20 pixels under the profile).
- ◆ Power too high, instrument saturated (flat top profile).
- ◆ Instrument is for CW source; laser is a pulsed source or on a low duty cycle.

- ◆ Beam light level is too low.
- ◆ Slit profiler with silicon detector should be used at $\lambda < 950$ nm.

Experimental

- ◆ Laser not what you believe. Is it operating multi-mode? Data sheet wrong? $M^2 > 1.0$
- ◆ Instrument axis not aligned to beam major or minor axis; especially important with extremely elliptic beams.
- ◆ Laser beam is on top of a pump beam light; i.e. both are being measured (pedestal).
- ◆ Lenses or other optics are not sufficient quality; spots smaller than $15 \mu\text{m}$ usually require much better optics (typical R.M.S wavefront better than $1/10^{\text{th}}$ wave).
- ◆ Optical system is poorly aligned. Lenses/mirrors of extremely high quality do not perform well when mis-aligned.
- ◆ Lens not designed for use at wavelength being used (visible microscope objective used in the infrared).
- ◆ Lens focal length quoted at different wavelength than that being used.
- ◆ Lens focal length not what is marked on the package.
- ◆ Attenuators³ are thermal lensing—translate filter, if spot size changes (possible thermal lensing).

- ◆ Finding the exact spot where a beam smaller than $7\ \mu\text{m}$ is focused requires an extremely high quality focus mechanism as well as a high quality mechanical stage. Routine lab stages are seldom capable of positioning to better than $\pm 25\ \mu\text{m}$. A $5\ \mu\text{m}$ spot has a depth of focus (spot grow to 1.4 times the minimum waist) of $25\ \mu\text{m}$.
- ◆ Instrument not calibrated (if this is an option).
- ◆ Instrument damaged; slit punctured, CCD burned; micrometer causing focus does not have resolution.
- ◆ Instrument not at smallest waist.
- ◆ System vibrates (a vibrating beam can be measured larger than it really is).
- ◆ If the system requires a collimated source, the degree of collimation becomes very important for spots less than $8\ \text{mm}$.⁴

General Comments

It is our experience that unless you can use the source shape as it arrives (a collimated LD or HeNe laser), it's important to develop a good understanding of gaussian optics. We suggest you read Professor O'Shea's book² and consider the purchase of Photon's Model LAB-EXP⁵, which is a set of experiments written by Professor O'Shea for Photon. Call, email, or visit our website for a data sheet.

References

- ¹T.F. Johnston, Jr., and John M. Fleischer, *Applied Optics*, Vol. 35, No. 10, pp. 1719-34 (April 1, 1994)
- ² D.C. O'Shea, *Elements of Modern Optical Design*, John Wiley & Sons (1985)
- ³ J.M. Fleischer, ATP; *Continuously Variable Attenuator for True Laser Profiles*, Proceedings SPIE Reprint Vol. 1834, pp. 33-40, Laser Energy Distribution Profiles (1992)
- ⁴ Photon inc. Application Note #220, Measure Divergence and Collimate Lasers
- ⁵ Photon inc. Data Sheet, *Model LAB-EXP Guide to Understanding Gaussian Laser Optics*