We show that annihilation dynamics between oppositely charged optical vortex pairs can be manipulated by modifying only the initial size of the vortex cores. When sufficiently close together, vortices with strongly overlapped cores annihilate more quickly than vortices with smaller cores that must wait for diffraction to cause meaningful core overlap. We present numerical simulations and experimental measurements for vortices with hyperbolic tangent cores of various initial sizes. We also show that decreasing the core size of an annihilating pair can prevent the annihilation event.

Just as the phase gradients can be used to change the rate of annihilation between vortex pairs [12], it is reasonable to think that one could instead change the amplitude gradients in the system to alter the overall dynamics. For example, consider an oppositely charged vortex pair in a free-space, low power Gaussian beam with cores of varying size. The dynamics in the transverse plane are as shown in Fig. 1, where the vortex pairs have distinct trajectories that depend on the initial vortex size.

In this letter, we use this initial amplitude structure of the vortex cores to modify oppositely charged vortex pair dynamics within a linear optical fluid. In particular, because the amplitude gradient is an important mechanism for facilitating annihilation events, we specifically use this degree of freedom to control the annihilation rate and location of these vortex pairs. We first numerically propagate a variety of initial condition fields to predict the vortex motion as a function of propagation. We find that the linearly shaped (large) cores annihilate more quickly than the hyperbolic tangent cores with a small radius and attribute this to the position at which the vortices are able to access the amplitude gradient from its neighboring vortex via diffraction of the core. The change in annihilation distance based on the initial core size...

Fig. 1. (Top) Slices of the amplitude and phase for the evolving field of an oppositely charged vortex pair with linear ($\xi > x_0$) cores are shown. (Bottom) The trajectories in the $xy$-plane for multiple initial conditions are plotted. The core sizes range from linear to very small cores, and each point represents a successive, equal step in $z$. As core size decreases, the trajectories deviate more from the linear core trajectory and small core pairs take longer to annihilate.
is confirmed experimentally. We also numerically consider the annihilation condition based on initial separation and size of the cores. We find for vortices that are sufficiently close together, the vortices will always annihilate. However, linear core vortex pairs with a separation small enough that annihilation occurs can be modified to have a smaller core size, preventing the annihilation event from occurring. A phase diagram is constructed to demonstrate the regions of annihilation or non-annihilation based on the initial beam parameters.

To begin, we first consider an initial condition field given by the expression

\[ \psi(r, \phi, 0) = \psi_{\text{vortex}} \cdot \psi_{\text{host}} = A_\pm e^{-i\phi \cdot A_\pm e^{i\phi \cdot e^{-r^2/a_0^2}}}, \]

(1)

where the subscripts are related to the ±1 vortex charge, \( A_\pm \) denotes the vortex amplitude structure, \( \phi_\pm = \arctan (y/(x \mp x_0)) \) describes the phase of the each vortex, and \( a_0 \) is the host beam waist. In our two vortex system, the vortices are placed symmetrically along the x-axis at locations \( x = \pm x_0 \) such that the initial separation between the vortices is \( v_s = 2x_0 \), and the positively (negatively) charged vortex is on the right (left). For the amplitude structure, we use a hyperbolic tangent shaped core such that

\[ A_\pm (r, \phi) = \tanh \left( \frac{r \pm r_0}{c_r} \right). \]

(2)

We use the parameter, \( c_r \), to determine the effective size of the vortex core. The motivation for choosing the hyperbolic tangent function is that for very small values of \( c_r \), the core approaches a delta function or point-core amplitude and for large values of \( c_r \), the core approaches the large, linear core limit. This allows us to scale the initial overlap of the amplitudes of each vortex at the \( z = 0 \) initial condition.

To anticipate the trajectories, we numerically simulate the field propagation using the angular spectrum method where the propagated field as a function of \( z \) can be found via

\[ \psi(x, y, z) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \left\{ \mathcal{F} \{ \psi(x, y, 0) \} \ast H(f_x, f_y) \right\}, \]

(3)

where \( H(f_x, f_y) = e^{i\pi(z^2z^2 + f_x^2/f_y^2)} \) is the transfer function in the paraxial approximation [14]. With the propagated field, the real and imaginary zero intersections locate the vortices at each step which are then used to plot the vortex trajectories. The results of the simulation are depicted in Fig. 1.

The top row of Fig. 1 shows phase contours at increasing propagation distances up until the annihilation point for a vortex pair where the core size is very large compared to the vortex separation (i.e. \( c_r \gg x_0 \)). The result is a half circle trajectory in the transverse plane, consistent with prior work regarding linear core vortex pairs [7]. With this verification, we then consider pairs with decreasing core sizes. The trajectories are tracked up to the annihilation point and plotted in the bottom of Fig. 1. The core linear trajectory is plotted as a solid black line for comparison.

As the cores decrease in size, two observations from the plot can be made: (1) the trajectories increasingly deviate from the linear core half circle in the xy-plane and (2) the beam must propagate a farther distance before the vortices reach the point of annihilation, indicated by the larger number of z-steps. We can interpret these results using what is known about the impact of background phase and amplitude gradients on vortex motion. The phase gradient from the right, positive vortex at the location of the left vortex is initially downward via the right hand rule causing the left vortex to initially move downward. Similarly, the initial phase gradient from the left, negative vortex at the location of the right vortex is also in the downward direction, causing the right vortex to also move downward. This explains the initial vertical (\( -\hat{y} \)) motion of the vortices. In the presence of no amplitude gradients, the vortices would simply follow straight line trajectories, as expected for an incompressible fluid system [1]. For small cores with no initial overlap, we see this straight downward motion for small propagation distances which is consistent with prior work interpreting vortex motion as “fluid-like” in the region very near to \( z = 0 \) [13].

However, these small cores quickly diffract resulting in contributions to the vortex velocity from the background amplitude gradients. To conceptually understand the impact of these gradients on the vortex motion, we must look at the changes in the background field with \( z \). For our purposes, we use an approximation of the background field which consists of only one vortex in the Gaussian beam and compare that with the motion of the other vortex, as shown in Fig. 2. This will not be the true background field, since to find the background field at any given propagation distance one would need to divide out the vortex of interest, including its ellipticity, from the field. Additionally, we know that the evolving ellipticity of the vortex itself can influence the trajectories, as discussed in [11]. However, using this approximation at early propagation times where the vortices are expected to be mostly circular demonstrates the connection between the differing dynamics based on a different sized core. Particularly, the outward motion of a given vortex seen in Fig. 1 can be attributed to the arrival of the diffraction wave from the neighboring vortex.

In Fig. 2, we show the numerically propagated initial field, given the assumptions mentioned in the previous paragraph, and calculate the anticipated untilted vortex velocity of the right vortex. The background field is set with the same parameters as in the two vortex field, and field gradients are calculated using a two-point finite difference method [15]. In case (a), the diffraction mainly comes in one wave that pushes the vortex outward upon its arrival. In case (b) with the very small core, ringing in the diffraction field, also seen in [8], becomes stronger and successive waves create a temporary spiral-like motion of the vortex, followed by the outward motion from the last diffracting peak. In both cases, despite making the approximations mentioned, the calculated vortex velocity seems to do a decent job of predicting the vortex motion and shows the impact of the diffracting core on the neighboring vortex. In the case of the linear core, the absence of the outward motion can be seen as a result of there being no diffraction wave from the other vortex.

In addition to our simulations, we experimentally measured the trajectories for a few different cases. For the experiment, shown in Fig. 3, we use a HeNe laser that is incident onto a spatial light modulator that projects holograms that contain the encoded field superimposed with a diffraction grating. The gratings are modulated in both the amplitude and the phase to properly create the output beam, and including a Gaussian amplitude in addition to the vortex amplitudes within the grating improved the quality of the data. The light passing through the hologram generates the initial condition field given by Equation 1 in the first diffracted order of the beam. This is then spatially filtered at the focus of a 4-f imaging system by an aperture. All other diffracted orders are therefore blocked. The beam is then directed to a translation stage with a retroreflector that sends the beam to a Wincam LCM CCD. The CCD is placed at the imaging plane and the evolution of the field with propagation is
Fig. 2. (a) Simulated plots of amplitude with propagation of a single vortex in a Gaussian with initial parameters $w_0 = 1 \text{ mm}$, $x_0 = 0.30w_0$, and $c_r = 0.15w_0$ are shown with the marked location of the right vortex (black circle) from the measured two-vortex trajectory. (b) Plots of the highlighted regions from (a) along with red velocity vectors calculated via the untilted vortex velocity equation $\vec{v}_\text{vortex} = \nabla \rho_\text{bg} - \sigma_0 \log \rho_\text{bg}$ are shown. Black dots mark the prior vortex locations at each step for comparison of the actual trajectory with the velocity prediction. (c-d) show the same as in (a) and (b) with initial parameters $w_0 = 1 \text{ mm}$, $x_0 = 0.30w_0$, and $c_r = 0.005w_0$.

At each step in $z$, we use collinear phase shifting digital holography to measure the full complex field [16]. This process entails compiling five images recorded from each $z$-step: one intensity image and four images of the signal interfered with the reference beam at different phase steps used to calculate the phase. A signal power to reference power ratio of 0.95:0.05 is used in the holograms to obtain the cleanest field measurement at the very dark centers of the vortices. Additionally, we measure a single centered vortex (an $\ell = 1$ Laguerre Gaussian mode) to center and crop the data to remove the effects from any external drifts in the system. Once the experimental field is measured and calibrated, we use the same method of intersecting real and imaginary zeros to locate and track the vortices. With this, we are then ready to quantitatively analyze the trajectory data.

We use a 2D fitting routine, with Equation 1, on the amplitude of the field at the imaging plane to measure the initial condition parameters including the beam waist, initial vortex separation and core sizes which are then used in the simulation for comparison with the experimental measurement. In the bottom left of Fig. 4, we show a quantitative comparison of the separation between the vortices. The experimental vortex separation and the numerical simulation also show a very strong agreement between the experiment and simulation, including the fact that the vortices are pushed farther away from each other before moving toward each other and annihilating.

The vortices are not small enough to observe the small oscillations shown in the $c_r = 0.05 \text{ mm}$ case in Fig. 1 since the setup is limited by the numerical aperture of the system. It is possible to use lenses of smaller focal lengths, but the trade off was made by using longer focal length lenses to ease in alignment of the imaging system, reducing the likelihood of magnification errors, and therefore inaccurate vortex separation measurements, with beam propagation. Additionally, we experimentally measured vortex separation for three different core sizes, shown in the bottom right of Fig. 4, which confirm smaller annihilation distances for large cores and farther distances for small cores.

Last, we numerically consider a variety of initial conditions to map out regions of annihilation and non-annihilation based on initial beam parameters. As can be seen in the top row of Fig. 4, for vortices that annihilate, the dynamics resemble those found in Fig. 1. However, initial conditions can be found such that the trajectories instead move apart from each other, with a critical point in between where the vortices seem to be consistently spaced throughout the trajectory. This critical point is found for a variety of initial conditions, marked by red dots and plotted in Fig. 5, a phase diagram which shows two unique regions separated by the critical point line. For vortices with large cores that are spaced close together (moving up and to the left in the phase diagram), annihilation is certain to occur, matching the
intuition that highly overlapped cores annihilate more quickly. For vortices that are spaced far enough apart and that have small enough cores (moving down and to the right in the figure), one would expect that the vortices would not have a sufficient overlap before the background Gaussian gradients dominate the vortex motion and keeps them apart for the entirety of the propagation.

One can also imagine a specific separation, for example $x_0/w_0 = 0.48$, in which a linear core pair is expected to annihilate. By simply reducing the size of the core to be $c_r/w_0 < 2.7$ for that separation, the annihilation event can be prevented. We also explicitly note that there is a critical point at which even vortices with point cores annihilate. Though not immediately obvious, it makes intuitive sense that vortex pairs with sufficiently small separation will always annihilate, even with small cores, since the cores will need a much smaller propagation distance before fully overlapping. This point was measured as $x_0 = 0.355w_0$.

To summarize, we have shown that vortex pair annihilation in linear optical systems can be tuned by simply changing the initial overlap of the vortex core functions. These changes can either facilitate or prevent annihilation events. The work in this paper emphasizes the utility in the compressibility of light in vortex dynamics. One can use this simple concept to design systems where the location of the annihilation event is selected by using the appropriate parameters. Further insights could be gained in more complex, many vortex systems with non-uniform core shapes and sizes using the same principles.
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**Fig. 4.** (Top) Simulated and experimental slices of the field are shown for a set of propagation steps. (Bottom Left) Comparison of vortex separation as a function of propagation shows good agreement between simulation and experiment. (Bottom Right) A set of measurements for three different sized vortex cores using holograms such as those found in Fig. 3 verifies that larger cores annihilate more quickly than small cores.

**Fig. 5.** (Top) An example of vortex trajectories measured up to $z = 2.8w_0$ used to find critical points between initial conditions that produce annihilating vs. non-annihilating pairs are shown. (Bottom) Plotted are regions of annihilation and non-annihilation based on the initial beam parameters. The numerically determined data points are fit with a modified polynomial that has a vertical asymptote at $x_0 = 0.5w_0$ to match the diverging linear core pair expectations near $x_0 = 0.5w_0$ [7].
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