DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF DIFFRACTIVE ASPHERIC NULLS

Steven M. Arnold Diffraction International, Minnetonka, MN

Diffraction International has developed a general methodology for designing diffractive aspheric null lenses. We use commercially available optical design software supplemented by proprietary extensions that automate the repetitive and laborious tasks.

The methodology is illustrated by three examples involving nulls for rotationally symmetric, off-axis and biconic aspheres. The methods are readily extendable to free form optics.

Null Wavefront from Snell's Law

We design using OSLOTM software because its menus and commands are readily customizable, although our methods are presumably applicable to other commercial optical design software.

We begin each null test design with the desired null wavefront—everywhere perpendicular to the aspheric surface. This null wavefront is most easily modeled by refracting from a fictitious zero-index glass into air at the aspheric surface boundary (Figure 1). The wavefront to the left of the aspheric surface is arbitrary, but a collimated wavefront is most convenient. The raytrace software does not permit the fictitious glass to have exactly zero index because that would make the reverse ray trace indeterminate. OLSOTM allows $n \ge 1E-20$ whereas ZEMAXTM allows $n \ge 1E-10$. The OPD error from assuming a non-zero index ε is on the order of ε S where S is the range of asphere surface sag.

Starting at the null wavefront avoids the ray aiming and pupil sampling issues that would result if we started from a spherical or collimated (stigmatic) source. A dense bundle of optimization rays can be readily defined to appropriately sample the asphere aperture. Aperture sampling and ray aiming are unaffected by subsequent optimization.

Our task is thus reduced to designing a refractive, reflective, diffractive or hybrid null that will bring this null wavefront to near perfect focus or collimation. Design constraints include mating the wavefront to an available interferometer objective while managing pupil distortion, alignment sensitivities, spurious diffraction orders and manufacturing concerns.





Example 1 — Rotationally Symmetric Concave Asphere

Our first example (Figure 2) is a concave, rotationally symmetric asphere with about 35 microns aspheric departure. We locate a CGH (*i.e.* diffractive) null in a converging F/1.5 wavefront and introduce a 2-mm decenter and a 2-mm field stop to block spurious diffraction orders.



Figure 2. Null test of rotationally symmetric asphere with imposed 2-mm decenter between asphere and interferometer axes. A rectangular grid of rays at the asphere undergoes barrel distortion in propagating to the CGH face. The binary "fringe" pattern is a coarse representation of the CGH grating—the actual spatial frequency is near 44 lpmm.

Table 1. Abbreviated listing of Figure 1 null test design. The CGH diffractive surface has been decomposed into a rotationally symmetric phase function "CGH Phase" centered on the asphere axis and a two-point-source phase function "CGH Carrier" centered on the CGH and interferometer axes; OSLO does not permit both types on a single surface. Phase functions on coincident surfaces add arithmetically. Lens units are inches.

*LENS DEMO C SRF OBJ AST 2 3	DATA CGH 	DIUS - 51000 92913	THICKNESS 1.0000e+20 0.100000 1.984252	APERT 1.00 0. 0.	URE RADIUS 00e+14 450000 AS 450000 450000 K	GLASS ZERO ZERO ZERO AIR	SPI * *	E NOTE Collimated Aperture Stop Dummy 1st Surf ASPHERIC
4		-		0.	039370 к	AIR	*	Field Stop
5 6 7		-	0.118110 1.228740	$ \begin{array}{ccc} 1. \\ 0. \\ 1. \end{array} $	000000 к 760000 к 000000 к	SILICA SILICA AIR	C * C * *	CGH Backside CGH Phase CGH Carrier
8	-4.7	72047	-4.772047	' 1.	592520 к	AIR	*	4-inch F/1.5
IMS		-		2.53	06e-07 S			Cat's Eye
*тті т <i>і</i>		FR ΠΔΤΔ						
5	DT	1	DCX		DCY	0.078740	DC7	5,429134
-	GC	3	TLA		TLB		TLC	
6	DT	1	DCX		DCY	-0.078740	DCZ	
			TLA		TLB		TLC	
7	DT	1	DCX		DCY	0.078740	DCZ	
			TLA		TLB		TLC	
*HOLOGRAPHIC OPTICAL ELEMENT DATA								
2	HOR	1	HWV	0.63282	0			
	HV1	1	HX1		HY1	-0.078740	HZ1	-3.543307
	HV2	1	HX2		HY2		HZ2	-3.543307

A double pass raytrace model is necessary to check for ghosting from unwanted diffraction orders and accurately model alignment sensitivities. Using OSLO's compiled command language (CCL), we have authored proprietary command extensions (macros) to reverse single pass raytrace models and convert them to double pass (Table 2) with two mouse clicks. This feature is invaluable when it becomes necessary to revise a single pass model.

*LENS DATA									
SRF OBJ	RADIUS		THICKNESS 4.772047	APERT 1.	URE RAI 000000	DIUS	GLASS SF AIR	PE NOTE Cat's Eye	
1	-4.772047			1.	592520	К	AIR 3	* 4-inch F/1.5	
AST 3 4	 	Ρ	-0.118110	$ \begin{array}{c} 1.\\ 0.\\ 1. \end{array} $	000000 760000 000000	AK K K	SILICA C SILICA C AIR	CGH Carrier CGH Phase CGH Backside	
5				0.	039370	К	AIR 3	* Field Stop	
RFS	1.692913			0.	450000	RK	REFLECT	* ASPHERIC	
7		Ρ		0.	039370	РК	AIR P	* Field Stop	
8 9 10	 	P P P		1. 0. 1.	000000 760000 000000	РК РК РК	SILICA P 3 SILICA P 3 AIR P 3	* CGH Backside * CGH Phase * CGH Carrier	
11	-4.772047	Ρ	-4.772047	P 1.	592520	РК	AIR P	* 4-inch F/1.5	
IMS				1.	000002	S		Cat's Eye	
*VERTEX	COORDINAT	ES	AND DIRECTIO	NS w.r. Y	t. CGH	FACE (mm,deg) TLA	TLB	TLC
Cat s 4-inc CGH C CGH F	5 Eye ch F/1.5 Carrier Phase Packside		 2	.000000	-90.0	210000			
Field	Stop STOP		2 2	.000000	-90.5 -140.9	500000			
*VERTEX COORDINATES AND DIRECTIONS w.r.t. ASPHERIC (inches,deg)									
Cat's 4-inc CGH C	s Eye ch F/1.5 Carrier		X 0 0	Y .078740 .078740 .078740	2.0 6.1 5.1	Z 003937 775984 547244	TLA 	TLB 	TLC
CGH F CGH E Field	ackside Sackside Stop		0 	.078740	5.4 5.4 1.9	947244 429134 984252			

Table 2. Double pass equivalent of Table 1. Surfaces 7 through 11 are defined by surface data and global coordinate pickups of surfaces 5 through 1 respectively.

Our ghost analysis consists of a composite spot diagram (Figure 3) produced by tracing all combinations of diffraction orders through the double pass model. For each combination of orders, the number of rays traced is proportional to the product of the expected diffraction efficiencies. Using proprietary OSLO CCL commands, this analysis is accomplished with two mouse clicks plus a few keystrokes.

We perform a detailed sensitivity analysis which consists of perturbing one physical parameter at a time while optimizing selected compensators (typically alignment of the asphere). The optimization merit function consists of RMS OPD for a dense bundle of rays. Ray failures are excluded from the RMS. To enforce the case of zero tilt fringes in the interferogram, we constrain one reference ray to return to the same field point coordinates. For each such perturbation, we compute interferogram PV, RMS and Zernike decomposition as well as compensator values. Using proprietary OSLO CCL commands, this is all accomplished with two mouse clicks plus a keystroke. We find OSLO's standard sensitivity analysis tools to be not very useful in this task.



Figure 3. Ghost diffraction spot diagram at virtual focal plane. The central circle contains the design diffraction order (well focused) and represents a 1.3 mm FOV (approximately ±500 tilt fringes).



Figure 4. CGH aperture layout.

This CGH incorporates a retro-reflecting, annular grating for alignment of CGH to Fizeau sphere and a vertex-focused alignment spot for visually centering the asphere and confirming its distance (a check on base radius).

Example 2 — Concave Off-Axis Biconic (IRMOS M4)

Our second example is the concave, highly off-axis, biconic M4 mirror of the James Webb Space Telescope/Infrared Multi-Object Spectrometer (IRMOS). This mirror measures 94 mm by 76 mm and is centered about 227 mm from the parent axis. The design was somewhat complicated by the need to work with the M4 mirror in a vacuum dewar and the CGH and interferometer. The design also needed to work for testing outside the dewar.

Disliking user-defined surfaces, we needed to first request that the biconic surface type be added to OSLO. Once that had been implemented, modeling of the null wavefront was no more difficult than for any rotationally symmetric asphere—it just followed from Snell's law.

Our design (Figures 5) is a bilaterally symmetric null test from center of curvature with the CGH null in a converging F/1.5 wavefront. We (belatedly) imposed a constraint that the M4 backside datum surface, the dewar window and the CGH all be parallel. The CGH has a maximum spatial frequency of about 42 lpmm. The pupil distortion is fairly minimal. The design was optimized for use outside the dewar. After adding the 22.55-mm thick dewar window, substituting vacuum for air inside and respacing the M4 mirror, the design residual (to be compensated by a software null) was only about 0.6 fringes.

This CGH null incorporates several alignment features (Figure 6). These include a retro alignment aperture, a collimated wavefront perpendicular to the M4 backside datum surface and two focused spots at the prescribed locations of fiducials on the datum surface. The focused spots were used to align marks against which the datum surface was later registered.



Figure 5. This null test of the highly off-axis biconic asphere IRMOS M4 begins with a datum surface that is the back side of the M4 mirror. Two parallel dummy surfaces represent a dewar window parallel to the CGH face. This design is optimized for use in air (without window), but can be respaced for testing in a vacuum dewar with only about 0.6 fringe of residual aberration.



Figure 6. IRMOS M4 CGH aperture layout includes a retro-reflection feature for alignment of CGH to interferometer, an autocollimation feature for defining orientation of the datum surface and dewar window, two annular apertures that focus onto fiducial marks at left and right edges of the asphere aperture and reticle marks to define the CGH coordinate system.

*LENS IRMOS	DATA M4 DWG	204598	7 parallel							
SRF	RADIUS		THICKNE	5S /	APERTU	RE RAI	DIUS	5 GLASS	SP	E NOTE
OBJ			1.0000e+	20	1.000	0e+14	• •	ZERO		Collimated
ASI			04 2010	00	127 4	22572	AS	ZERU	*	Aperture Stop
23	406 88	2900	94.2910	00	267 1	18693	KX		*	ASPHERTC
5	400.00	2300			207.1	10055	K/X	AIN		ASITIERIC
4			22.550000		76.200000			AIR	*	Dewar Window
5					76.200000			AIR	*	Dewar window
6					2.700000 X			AIR	*	Field Stop
7			3 0000	00	25 4	00000	к	STI ΤCΔ	с *	CGH Backside
8				50	17.0	00000	кх	SILICA	c *	CGH Phase
9			31.2100	00	25.4	00000	К	AIR	*	CGH Carrier
10	-121.21	.0000	-121.2100	00	40.4	50000	к	AIR	×	4-inch F/1.5
TMS					15 2	05612	s			Cat's Eve
100					19.2	00011	5			cut 5 Lyc
*TILT/	/DECENTE	R DATA								
2	DT	1	DCX	45.9	990000	DC	Y	-47.967000	DCZ	
2		1	TLA	45		TLE	3		TLC	
3	DI	T	DCX	-45.	990000	DCY	Y.	-180.706000	DCZ	
4	рт	1		-45	990000		5 V	47 967000		125 000000
7	GC	2	TLA	+ J		TLE	3		TIC	
6	DT	ī	DCX	-45.9	990000	DC	Y	48.771000	DCZ	402.300000
	GC	2	TLA			TLE	3		TLC	
7	DT	1	DCX	-45.9	990000	DC	Y	50.371000	DCZ	486.000000
	GC	2	TLA			TLE	3		TLC	

Table 3. Abbreviated single pass listing of IRMOS M4 null test design. Global coordinates reference all components to datum surface ABC.

Example 3 — Convex Off-Axis (IRMOS M1)

Our final example is the convex and off-axis IRMOS M1 mirror. This design is a hybrid null consisting of a symmetric biconvex BK7 singlet located near the M1 and a large CGH in a diverging F/3.3 wavefront. Once again, we found it advantageous to constrain the dewar window and CGH face to be parallel to the M1 backside datum surface. We further constrained the biconvex singlet axis to be perpendicular to the datum surface. The CGH is large so that it can be further from the focus, thereby reducing pupil distortion. The minimum grating spacing is about 37 lpmm.

The alignment feature are similar to those of the M4 mirror. An auxiliary CGH null was created to certify the BK7 singlet in a transmission configuration. The CGH null includes an alignment feature for the near surface of the biconvex singlet.



Figure 7. This null test of the IRMOS M1 mirror, like that of the IRMOS M4 mirror, includes constraints for parallelism between CGH, dewar window and M1 backside datum surface.

Reference/Acknowledgement

V. John Chambers, Ronald G. Mink, Raymond G. Ohl, Joseph A. Connelly, J. Eric Mentzell, Steven M. Arnold, Matthew A. Greenhouse, Robert S. Winsor, John W. MacKenty, "Optical testing of diamond machined, aspheric mirrors for ground-based, near-IR astronomy", in **Instrument Design and Performance for Optical/Infrared Ground-based Telescopes,** Masanori Iye, Alan F. M. Moorwood, Editors, *Proceedings of SPIE* Vol. 4841, 689-701 (2003).



Figure 8. Aperture layout of IRMOS M1 CGH null.