## arXiv:2504.04788v1 [physics.optics] 7 Apr 2025

## Parametrically driven Kerr temporal soliton crystals

Yifan Sun,<sup>1,\*</sup> Clément Dupont,<sup>1</sup> Edem Kossi Akakpo,<sup>1</sup> Francesco De

Lucia,<sup>1</sup> Georges Semaan,<sup>1</sup> Simon-Pierre Gorza,<sup>1</sup> and François Leo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Service OPERA-Photonique, Université libre de Bruxelles, 50 Av. F. D. Roosevelt, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

We theoretically investigate the excitation, dynamics of parametrically driven soliton crystals and their resulting frequency combs in doubly resonant cavities with quadratic and cubic nonlinearities. We demonstrate that soliton crystal states act as strong attractors, where pump depletion and pump phase play crucial roles in their stabilization by ensuring equal soliton spacing and coherence. The number of solitons is primarily determined by driving strength. Additionally, we identify a novel nonlinear state in parametric soliton crystals in which circulating solitons periodically alternate their intensities and group velocities, a phenomenon we term the *soliton-pursuing* states. Furthermore, due to the phase-selective nature of the optical parametric process, we show how different configurations of soliton phases influence the optical frequency combs, which may enable generating *odd harmonic* combs.

Introduction. Self-organized patterns [1] in coupled dynamical systems underpin emergent behaviors across diverse disciplines, from social networks [2] and biological cells [3] to bacterial colonies [4] and topological materials [5]. These systems exhibit emergent patterns often driven by nonlinear interactions among individual components [6]. Self-organization also occurs in optical systems, where nonlinear wave interactions give rise to a wide range of complex states [7]. Cavity solitons (CS) [8–10], a special class of dissipative solitons [11], arise from optical cavities due to the balances where nonlinearity counteracts dispersion, while coherent driving compensates for dissipation [8, 12]. Their robustness and stability make optical cavities compelling platforms for exploring nonlinear many-body interactions [13, 14]. CS form optical frequency combs (OFC), which have revolutionized modern photonics, driving advancements in high-speed communications [15], low-noise radiofrequency generation [16], and precision distance ranging [17]. Investigations into soliton stability and dynamics have revealed a variety of solitonic states, including breather solitons [18-20], bound soliton molecules [21, 22], and localized chaotic soliton interactions [23–25]. Beyond individual solitons, nonlinear optical cavities can support soliton crystals (SC), which are periodic arrays of soliton within a cavity. SC provide new opportunities for enhancing the power efficiency and tunability of OFC while preserving coherence [26-32].

To date, CS have been extensively studied in Kerr-type cavities, where cubic ( $\chi_3$ ) nonlinearity dominates their formation. However, recent advancements have focused on quadratic ( $\chi_2$ ) nonlinear systems, which expand solitonic OFC generation through processes such as second-harmonic generation (SHG) [33–42] and optical parametric oscillation (OPO) [43–48]. In degenerate OPO,  $\chi_2$  nonlinearity enables the conversion of pump photons at  $2\omega$  into signal and idler photons at  $\omega$ , allowing CS at  $\omega$  to be sustained by parametric pumping at  $2\omega$ . These solitons, known as parametrically driven cavity solitons (PDCS) [48], can exist in either an in-phase or outof-phase state. PDCS have been experimentally observed in both fiber ring cavities [48] and microcavities [49]. Depending on whether the pump field is resonant within the cavity, these systems are classified as singly resonant (only the signal resonates) [42] or doubly resonant [50]. Additionally, PDCS have been demonstrated in pure-Kerr systems through dual-wave pumping [51]. Despite recent advances, the formation and dynamics of PDCS, particularly the emergence of complex multi-soliton states, remain largely unexplored.

In this Letter, we theoretically investigate parametrically driven soliton crystals (PDSC) in doubly resonant cavities with both quadratic and cubic nonlinearities [see Fig. 1(a)], revealing unique dynamical properties of PDSC in such systems. Using bifurcation analysis and numerical simulations, we demonstrate that PDSC states act as strong attractors, stabilized by pump depletion and pump phase. These mechanisms ensure equal soliton spacing and coherence, with the number of solitons primarily determined by the driving strength. Additionally, we identify a novel soliton-pursuing state, distinct from conventional breathing states, where solitons in SC periodically alternate their intensities and group velocities. Furthermore, due to the phase-selective nature of OPO, we explore how different soliton phase configurations shape the harmonic structure of the resulting OFC, uncovering an odd harmonic OFC. Finally, all the mode combs can be expressed as a discrete Fourier transform of the soliton phase sequence of PDSC, modulated by soliton spectrum profiles.

*Model.* To explore the system dynamics, the model [49, 50] governing the dynamics of PDSC can be normalized as [see normalization and physical parameters in Appendix]:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\partial A}{\partial T} &= \left[ -1 - i\delta + i\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \right] A + i \left[ (|A|^2 + 2|B|^2)A + gBA^* \right], \\ \frac{\partial B}{\partial T} &= \left[ -r_1 - i(2\delta + \delta_0) - d\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + ir_g\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \right] B \\ &+ i \left[ r_n (|B|^2 + 2|A|^2)B + g_0 A^2 \right] + P, \end{split}$$

where *A* and *B* represent the amplitudes of the signal and pump waves, which are resonant at  $\omega$  and  $2\omega$ , respectively. The parameters are defined as follows: *P* is the coherent driving at  $2\omega$ ;  $\delta$  is the frequency detuning;  $\delta_0$  and *d* represent phase and group velocity mismatches, respectively; *g* is the quadratic nonlinearity coefficient; and  $r_1$ ,  $r_g$ , and  $r_n$  are the




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of a soliton crystal in a cavity with  $\chi_2$  and  $\chi_3$  nonlinearities. (b,c) Evolution of |A(t,T)| and |B(t,T)| over time, along with the final profile |A(t,T = 1000)|, for driving strengths P = 2.5 in (b) and P = 6.5 in (c). The detuning parameter  $\delta$  is linearly scanned from -2 to 2 over the interval T = 0 to T = 100.

ratios of loss, group velocity dispersion, and nonlinearity between the pump and signal. Taking the physical values of AlN microcavities in Ref. [50] [see details in Appendix], the normalized cavity values are: d = -699,  $g_0 = 12.2$ ,  $\delta_0 = 0$ ,  $r_1 = 4$ ,  $r_g = -1$ , and  $r_n = 2$ . We can retrieve three important scaling parameters:  $t_s = 41.8$  fs (time),  $|A_s| = 4.365$  W<sup>1/2</sup> (amplitude), and  $T_s/T_R = 175$  (round trips). In other words, one normalized unit in fast time *t*, amplitudes *A* (and *B*), and slow time *T* corresponds to the respective physical values as defined above. The roundtrip time is  $T_R/t_s \approx 66.36$ . To better capture the generality of PDSC dynamics, all parameters and values in this paper are expressed in their normalized form.

Excitation. Figures 1(b,c) present two examples of PDSC formation in the cavity for P = 2.5 and P = 6.5. Starting from a white noise field with a maximum amplitude of 0.01, the detuning  $\delta$  is linearly scanned from -2 to 2 over T = 100 and then held constant For P = 2.5, the temporal evolution of |A|(Fig. 1(b).1) and |B| (Fig. 1(b).2) [52] initially exhibits chaotic behavior for 0 < T < 100 before stabilizing into two solitons. At T = 1000, the steady-state fields |A| and |B| are shown in Fig. 1(b).3, where the pump exhibits a sawtooth profile, while the solitons adopt sech shapes, aligning with the sharp edges of the pump. For a higher driving P = 6.5, five PDSC emerge, as depicted in Fig. 1(c). In both cases, these solitons initially appear at irregular intervals but eventually stabilize into an evenly spaced configuration with uniform intensity. As we will demonstrate later, the driving strength P crucially determines the number of CS, while the pump field governs their self-organization.

Bifurcation and phase diagrams. To better understand the

system's dynamics, we performed path continuation using pde2path[53], by varying *P* while fixing  $\delta = 2$ . The results, shown in Fig. 2(a), depict the maximum field amplitudes max(|A|) and max(|B|) as functions of *P*. For small *P*, only the homogeneous solution (HS) is stable, with |B| increasing linearly with *P* while |A| = 0. Beyond the bifurcation point B<sub>1</sub> at  $P \approx 1$ , the HS becomes unstable, giving rise to new branches of localized soliton states.

On branch (i), a single CS state bifurcates from the HS at  $B_1$ , with its amplitude increasing significantly. The CS stabilizes after crossing fold bifurcation  $F_1$  but loses stability upon reaching  $F_2$ . To compare state transitions, Figs. 2(i,ii) show the real parts of the amplitudes Re(A) (red) and Re(B) (blue), for the solutions marked on branches (i) and (ii). After  $F_2$ , a side peak with opposite phase appears at the soliton's leading edge [see Fig. 2(ii)]. As the states on branch (ii) approach  $B_1$ , the anti-phase peak gradually moves farther apart with decreasing amplitudes. Near  $B_1$ , a fold bifurcation forms equally spaced, out-of-phase solitons. Along




FIG. 2. (a) Bifurcation diagram showing max(|A|) (black and red curves) and max(|B|) (blue curves), as the driving *P* is varied, when  $\delta = 2$ . Stable (unstable) states are represented by solid (dashed) curves. The branches (i–vii) correspond to PDSC with different soliton numbers. To illustrate soliton phase relationships in diagrams, only the real part of the amplitude is plotted for each branch [See Movie III]. (b) Phase diagram of stable PDSC as a function of driving *P* and detuning  $\delta$ .

branch (iii), their amplitudes grow with increasing *P* but remain unstable until reaching the Hopf bifurcation H<sub>1</sub>. As *P* increases, the two solitons undergo similar bifurcations, forming branch (iv), where anti-phase peaks appear ahead of their leading edges [see Fig. 2(iv)]. At fold F<sub>5</sub>, the branch transitions to a four-soliton state [see Fig. 2(vi)], with two adjacent solitons in-phase and the other two in anti-phase. According to these branches, increasing *P* doubles soliton number, but can PDSC with an odd number of solitons exist? Applying similar detuning scan from Fig. 1(b,c), we obtain PDSC with three (*P* = 4) and five (*P* = 6.5) solitons. Using path continuation, we obtain the corresponding branches in Fig. 2(v,vii). Numerical simulations confirm these branches by initializing six-soliton crystal, with each dropping out as the pump gradually decreases [see Fig. 6 in Appendix and Movie IV].

Notably, due to the phase-selective nature of PDCS, each soliton can be either in-phase or out-of-phase. Thus, in all cases shown in Fig. 2(i–vii), solitons can adopt either phase state during excitation without affecting PDSC stability. Consequently, the branches in Fig. 2(a) encompass all possible PDSC phase configurations, whose impact will be discussed later in this Letter.

We have examined the case of  $\delta = 2$ , but how do the formation and stability of PDSC change for different values of  $\delta$ ? Figure 2(b) presents a phase diagram of PDSC as a function of *P* and  $\delta$ . For clarity, we highlight only the region where stable PDSC exist, with more details on fold and Hopf bifurcations provided in the supplementary document. PDSC occupy the regions corresponding to different soliton numbers, with




FIG. 3. (a) Field evolution of |A| in (a).1,  $\phi_A$  in (a).2, |B| in (a).3, and  $\phi_B$  in (a).4 for the PDSC on branch (iii) in Fig. 2(a), as the driving *P* is varied with fixed  $\delta = 2$ . (b) Time evolution of the corresponding fields in the four subfigures, initialized from the solution marked as P<sub>1</sub> at *P* = 2.2 in (b.4). Temporal evolution of the soliton peaks and their separation  $\Delta t/T_R$  are shown in (b).5. Dashed curves in (a,b) indicate the positions of the two soliton peaks.

higher soliton counts requiring larger pump strengths. Some regions overlap, indicating bistability in PDSC. Notably, most soliton crystals are confined to regions where  $\delta < 4$ . This limitation arises because, for a fixed driving *P*, increasing  $\delta$  amplifies PDSC peak intensities, leading to greater energy transfer from the pump to the signal. Consequently, the pump becomes more depleted, leaving insufficient energy to sustain PDSC at higher detuning. The maximum number of solitons is constrained by the cavity round-trip time and soliton duration, allowing up to six solitons in the current configuration. Therefore, extending the cavity length *L* increases the roundtrip time  $T_{\rm R}$ , enabling the formation of more solitons.

*Pump field.* PDSC deplete the pump field consistently across all configurations. The evolution of the peak pump field  $\max(|B|)$  is shown by the blue or grav curves in Fig. 2(a). Unlike the unstable HS, where max(|B|) (gray curve) increases with P, stable PDSC deplete B, confining it within 0.15 <|B| < 0.2. This indicates that although increasing P raises the peak values of PDSC, the pump field reaches a threshold beyond which additional side peaks emerge leading side of each soliton due to excess OPO gain from the intensified pump. Consequently, this gain limitation regulates PDSC formation, with higher driving P enabling the formation of PDSC with a greater number of solitons. Pump depletion drives soliton motion, similar to gain depletion in harmonic mode-locking (HML) lasers [54–58], where it induces pulse repulsion for stability. However, unlike in HML, the pump phase in PDSC plays a crucial role in maintaining uniform soliton spacing. Simulations confirm this: enforcing a flattened phase in a stable PDSC with a fixed pump profile leads to rapid collapse. Furthermore, as shown next, different pump phase states distinctly determine PDSC stability.

Figure. 3(a) plots the temporal amplitude and phase distributions of the signal and pump fields for the solutions on branch (iii) of Fig. 2(a). The amplitude |A| increases with driving *P* [see Fig. 3(a).1], while the phases  $\phi_A$  at CS center remain nearly unchanged, maintaining an anti-phase relationship [see Fig. 3(a).2]. At the soliton positions, the pump distribution |B| exhibits a characteristic sharp decrease in its trailing edge [see Fig. 3(a).3], while the phase  $\phi_B$  undergoes distinct shape transitions, separated by the Hopf bifurcation H<sub>1</sub> [dashed line in Fig. 3(a).4]. Below this bifurcation line, PDSC are unstable. Notably, this line also marks a transition in pump phase behavior: for *P* above this threshold, the pump phase undergoes a steep drop in the soliton's peak position, whereas for lower *P*, it rises instead. This behavior emphasizes the critical role of the pump phase in stabilizing PDSC.

Conventional cavity solitons are attracted by higher phase modulation of the background [24, 25, 59, 60], amplitudes and phases in driving [61–63]. Likewise, the phase of pump *B* plays a crucial role in stabilizing PDSC. In the stable region, the pump phase attracts solitons to positions with higher pump fields where they experience enhanced OPO gain. This interplay between amplitude and phase ensures equalized soliton spacing, a critical condition for stable PDSC. Otherwise, solitons in PDSC may bifurcate into different states.




FIG. 4. Simulations of PDSC with various phase configurations and their corresponding frequency combs. (a) Two CS with phase configurations PP (both positive) and PN (one positive, one negative). (b) Three CS with configurations PPP and PPN. (c) Four CS with configurations PPPP, PNPN, PPNN, and PPPN. (d) Five CS with configurations PPPPP, PNPNP, PPPNN, and PPPPN.

To illustrate this, we use the solution when P = 2.2 at  $P_1$ (dashed line in Fig. 3(a).4) as the initial condition and simulate its time evolution. The temporal dynamics are shown in Fig. 3(b). Initially, the solitons evolve symmetrically [Fig. 3(b).1] with an anti-phase relationship [Fig. 3(b).2], while the pump amplitude [Fig. 3(b).3] and phase [Fig. 3(b).4] remain unchanged in regime (1). The peak amplitudes of solitons S1 and S2, along with their temporal spacing  $\Delta T$ , are plotted in Fig. 3(b).5. At  $T \approx 25$ , symmetry breaking occurs in process (0), leading to process (1) [marked in Fig. 3(b).4 and (b).5]: S1 abruptly decreases in amplitude, while S2 undergoes amplification [see also Movie V]. Simultaneously, the pump phase shifts, lowering the phase-in region (1.2) and increasing the relative phase in region (1). This causes S1 to decelerate (larger group delay) while S2 accelerates, reducing  $\Delta T$  [see Fig. 3(b).5]. As the solitons move closer, S1 undergoes amplification while S2 experiences attenuation. By  $T \approx 200$ , they exchange intensities, transitioning to process (2): the pump phase flips, forcing the solitons to move apart [see Fig. 3(b).4].

This periodic alternation persists throughout propagation, a unique phenomenon we term the *soliton-pursuing* state, where solitons periodically exchange intensities and group velocities. Notably, due to the cavity's circular nature, the divergence (1) and convergence (2) processes are equivalent. Increasing the driving *P* stabilizes these interactions by flipping phases [see Fig. 3(b).4], while decreasing *P* extends the periodic cycles [see examples in Movie VI, VII and three pursuing solitons in Movie VIII].

Soliton phases and corresponding combs. OFC formed by conventional SC can be influenced by defects [26, 32], such as missing solitons or quasi-periodicity within the crystal. In our case, PDSC are defect-free, as soliton temporal spacing is equalized by the pump fields. However, due to the phaseselective nature of OPOs, each soliton within PDSC branches (i–vii) can exist in two phase states. We now examine how these soliton phases affect the resulting OFC.

In the single-soliton case, the phase can be either positive (P) or negative (N), which does not affect the OFC. However, as the number of solitons increases, the structure of OFC becomes more diverse. Figure 4 summarizes OFC formed by PDSC states (of Fig. 2(i–vi)) with different soliton numbers and phases. For two solitons [Fig. 4(a)], there are two possible scenarios after excitations: PP (both positive) and PN (one positive, one negative). Since PN and NP are degenerate states, we consider only one. While both produce signal combs with double the FSR and a sech<sup>2</sup> envelope, their harmonic structures differ: PP generates only even harmonics (even number mode ticks), suppressing odd components, while PN suppresses the even harmonics. The pump field, however, maintains a fixed temporal shape and phase relation, producing only even harmonics.

For three solitons [Fig. 4(b)], there are only two degenerated cases: PPP and PPN. In PPN, the components at  $3n\Omega$ are reduced by 3 dB. Interestingly, *n* solitons in PDSC do not always generate combs with *n* FSR. In the four-soliton case, harmonic comb structures vary: 4 FSR for even (PPPP) or odd (PNPN) harmonics, 2 FSR odd harmonics for PPNN, and 1 FSR for PPPN. For a fixed soliton energy, PPPN exhibits four times the intensity of a single soliton, offering a potential method for generating high-intensity combs. More complex cases, such as the five-soliton scenario, are shown in Fig. 4(d).

By categorizing, for an *N*-soliton crystal, the number of possible degenerate comb patterns is  $M = 2^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor}$ . The generalized spectrum is related to the discrete Fourier transform of  $\{(-1)^{p_n}\}$ , where  $p_n$  is the *n*-th soliton phase [see details in Appendix]. This indicates that an odd-harmonic comb (Fig. 4) requires equal numbers of P and N solitons in a PDSC.

*Conclusion.* We have conducted a theoretical investigation of PDSC in doubly resonant cavities featuring both quadratic

and cubic nonlinearities. Our findings reveal that PDSC states are inherently stable attractors, with their formation and coherence governed by the interplay of pump depletion and pump phase. These stabilization mechanisms ensure uniform soliton spacing, while the driving strength primarily determines the number of solitons. We also identify a new dynamical regime, termed the soliton-pursuing state, characterized by solitons that periodically exchange intensities and group velocities, setting it apart from conventional breathing states. Moreover, the phase-selective nature of OPO solitons is shown to significantly influence the harmonic structure of the resulting OFC, enabling the generation of *odd harmonic* OFC. Finally, we demonstrate that the comb structures can be represented as the discrete Fourier transform of the soliton phase sequence in a PDSC, modulated by their spectral profiles.

This work was supported by Marie Sklodowska-Curie Actions (101149506, 101150387); F.R.S.-FNRS Chargé de recherches (40010332, 40031259); FWO and F.R.S.-FNRS under the Excellence of Science (EOS, 40007560).

\* yifan.sun@ulb.be

- M. C. Cross and P. C. Hohenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. 65, 851 (1993).
- [2] M. S. Mariani, F. Battiston, E.-A. Horvat, G. Livan, F. Musciotto, and D. Wang, Nat. Commun. 15, 10701 (2024).
- [3] K. Kawaguchi, R. Kageyama, and M. Sano, Nature 545, 327 (2017).
- [4] A. Sokolov, I. S. Aranson, J. O. Kessler, and R. E. Goldstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 158102 (2007).
- [5] Q. Li, V. A. Stoica, M. Paściak, Y. Zhu, Y. Yuan, T. Yang, M. R. McCarter, S. Das, A. K. Yadav, S. Park, C. Dai, H. J. Lee, Y. Ahn, S. D. Marks, S. Yu, C. Kadlec, T. Sato, M. C. Hoffmann, M. Chollet, M. E. Kozina, S. Nelson, D. Zhu, D. A. Walko, A. M. Lindenberg, P. G. Evans, L.-Q. Chen, R. Ramesh, L. W. Martin, V. Gopalan, J. W. Freeland, J. Hlinka, and H. Wen, Nature **592**, 376 (2021).
- [6] J. Casadiego, M. Nitzan, S. Hallerberg, and M. Timme, Nat. Commun. 8, 2192 (2017).
- [7] J. M. Dudley, F. Dias, M. Erkintalo, and G. Genty, Nat. Photonics 8, 755 (2014).
- [8] S. Wabnitz, Opt. Lett. 18, 601 (1993).
- [9] F. Leo, S. Coen, P. Kockaert, S. P. Gorza, P. Emplit, and M. Haelterman, Nat. Photonics 4, 471 (2010).
- [10] T. Herr, V. Brasch, J. D. Jost, C. Y. Wang, N. M. Kondratiev, M. L. Gorodetsky, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Photonics 8, 145 (2014).
- [11] P. Grelu and N. Akhmediev, Nat. Photonics 6, 84 (2012).
- [12] M. Haelterman, S. Trillo, and S. Wabnitz, Opt. Commun. 91, 401 (1992).
- [13] C. Rotschild, B. Alfassi, O. Cohen, and M. Segev, Nat. Phys. 2, 769 (2006).
- [14] A. Peleg, Q. M. Nguyen, and P. Glenn, Phys. Rev. E 89, 43201 (2014).
- [15] P. Marin-Palomo, J. N. Kemal, M. Karpov, A. Kordts, J. Pfeifle, M. H. Pfeiffer, P. Trocha, S. Wolf, V. Brasch, M. H. Anderson, R. Rosenberger, K. Vijayan, W. Freude, T. J. Kippenberg, and C. Koos, Nature **546**, 274 (2017), arXiv:1610.01484.

- [16] E. Lucas, P. Brochard, R. Bouchand, S. Schilt, T. Südmeyer, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Commun. 11, 374 (2020).
- [17] P. Trocha, M. Karpov, D. Ganin, M. H. Pfeiffer, A. Kordts, S. Wolf, J. Krockenberger, P. Marin-Palomo, C. Weimann, S. Randel, W. Freude, T. J. Kippenberg, and C. Koos, Science 359, 887 (2018).
- [18] H. Guo, E. Lucas, M. H. Pfeiffer, M. Karpov, M. Anderson, J. Liu, M. Geiselmann, J. D. Jost, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. X 7, 10.1103/PhysRevX.7.041055 (2017).
- [19] M. Yu, J. K. Jang, Y. Okawachi, A. G. Griffith, K. Luke, S. A. Miller, X. Ji, M. Lipson, and A. L. Gaeta, Nat. Commun. 8, 14569 (2017).
- [20] E. Lucas, M. Karpov, H. Guo, M. L. Gorodetsky, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Commun. 8, 736 (2017).
- [21] Y. Liu, S. Huang, Z. Li, H. Liu, Y. Sun, R. Xia, L. Yan, Y. Luo, H. Liu, G. Xu, Q. Sun, X. Tang, and P. P. Shum, Light: Sci. Appl. **12**, 123 (2023).
- [22] W. Weng, R. Bouchand, E. Lucas, E. Obrzud, T. Herr, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Commun. 11, 2402 (2020).
- [23] A. U. Nielsen, Y. Xu, C. Todd, M. Ferré, M. G. Clerc, S. Coen, S. G. Murdoch, and M. Erkintalo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 123901 (2021).
- [24] Y. Sun, P. Parra-Rivas, M. Ferraro, F. Mangini, M. Zitelli, R. Jauberteau, F. R. Talenti, and S. Wabnitz, Opt. Lett. 47, 6353 (2022).
- [25] Y. Sun, P. Parra-Rivas, M. Ferraro, F. Mangini, and S. Wabnitz, Chaos Solitons Fractals 176, 114064 (2023).
- [26] D. C. Cole, E. S. Lamb, P. Del'Haye, S. A. Diddams, and S. B. Papp, Nature Photon **11**, 671 (2017).
- [27] M. Karpov, M. H. P. Pfeiffer, H. Guo, W. Weng, J. Liu, and T. J. Kippenberg, Nat. Phys. 15, 1071 (2019), arXiv:1903.07122.
- [28] Y. He, J. Ling, M. Li, and Q. Lin, Laser Photonics Rev. 14, 1900339 (2020).
- [29] Z. Lu, H.-J. Chen, W. Wang, L. Yao, Y. Wang, Y. Yu, B. E. Little, S. T. Chu, Q. Gong, W. Zhao, X. Yi, Y.-F. Xiao, and W. Zhang, Nat. Commun. **12**, 3179 (2021).
- [30] H. Taheri, A. B. Matsko, L. Maleki, and K. Sacha, Nat. Commun. 13, 848 (2022).
- [31] M. A. Guidry, D. M. Lukin, K. Y. Yang, and J. Vučković, Optica 10, 694 (2023).
- [32] F. Hu, A. K. Vinod, W. Wang, H.-H. Chin, J. F. McMillan, Z. Zhan, Y. Meng, M. Gong, and C. W. Wong, Light: Sci. Appl. 13, 251 (2024).
- [33] F. Leo, T. Hansson, I. Ricciardi, M. De Rosa, S. Coen, S. Wabnitz, and M. Erkintalo, Phys. Rev. A 93, 043831 (2016), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [34] F. Leo, T. Hansson, I. Ricciardi, M. De Rosa, S. Coen, S. Wabnitz, and M. Erkintalo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 033901 (2016), arXiv:1510.04261.
- [35] T. Hansson, F. Leo, M. Erkintalo, S. Coen, I. Ricciardi, M. De Rosa, and S. Wabnitz, Phys. Rev. A 95, 13805 (2017).
- [36] X. Xue, F. Leo, Y. Xuan, J. A. Jaramillo-Villegas, P. H. Wang, D. E. Leaird, M. Erkintalo, M. Qi, and A. M. Weiner, Light: Science and Applications 6, 10.1038/lsa.2016.253 (2017), arXiv:1607.02711.
- [37] X. Xue, X. Zheng, and B. Zhou, Photonics Res. 6, 948 (2018).
- [38] A. Villois and D. V. Skryabin, Opt. Express 27, 7098 (2019).
- [39] C. Mas Arabí, P. Parra-Rivas, C. Ciret, S. P. Gorza, and F. Leo, Phys. Rev. A 101, 43818 (2020).
- [40] C. M. Arabí, P. Parra-Rivas, T. Hansson, L. Gelens, S. Wabnitz, and F. Leo, Opt. Lett. 45, 5856 (2020).
- [41] P. Parra-Rivas, C. M. Arabí, and F. Leo, Phys. Rev. A 104, 63502 (2021).
- [42] C. Mas Arabí, N. Englebert, P. Parra-Rivas, S.-P. Gorza, and

F. Leo, Opt. Lett. 48, 1950 (2023), publisher: Optica Publishing Group.

- [43] S. Longhi, Phys. Rev. E 53, 5520 (1996).
- [44] N. Amiune, D. N. Puzyrev, V. V. Pankratov, D. V. Skryabin, K. Buse, and I. Breunig, Opt. Express 29, 41378 (2021).
- [45] A. Villois, N. Kondratiev, I. Breunig, D. N. Puzyrev, and D. V. Skryabin, Opt. Lett. 44, 4443 (2019).
- [46] M. Jankowski, A. Marandi, C. R. Phillips, R. Hamerly, K. A. Ingold, R. L. Byer, and M. M. Fejer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 053904 (2018).
- [47] A. Roy, R. Nehra, S. Jahani, L. Ledezma, C. Langrock, M. Fejer, and A. Marandi, Nat. Photonics 16, 162 (2021), arXiv:2108.05491.
- [48] N. Englebert, F. De Lucia, P. Parra-Rivas, C. M. Arabí, P.-J. Sazio, S.-P. Gorza, and F. Leo, Nat. Photonics 15, 857 (2021).
- [49] A. W. Bruch, X. Liu, Z. Gong, J. B. Surya, M. Li, C. L. Zou, and H. X. Tang, Nat. Photonics 15, 21 (2021), 2004.07708.
- [50] Y. Ding, Z. Wei, Y. Wang, C. Yang, and C. Bao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 132, 013801 (2024).
- [51] G. Moille, M. Leonhardt, D. Paligora, N. Englebert, F. Leo, J. Fatome, K. Srinivasan, and M. Erkintalo, Nat. Photonics 18, 617 (2024).
- [52] In calculations, we introduced an additional group delay  $d_c$  in the reference frame for both fields [see Appendix]. The goal of adjustment keeps the soliton field nearly centered in the frame, allowing better visualization and tracking of group velocity variations, without affecting the underlying results. The reference frame delays are  $d_c = -0.415$  in Fig. 1(b) and  $d_c = -0.352$  in Fig. 1(c). The buildup process of five solitons is shown in Movie I and Movie II.
- [53] H. Uecker, D. Wetzel, and J. D. Rademacher, Numerical Mathematics: Theory, Methods and Applications 7, 58 (2014).
- [54] J. Kutz, B. Collings, K. Bergman, and W. Knox, IEEE J. Quantum Electron. 34, 1749 (1998).
- [55] M. Horowitz, C. Menyuk, T. Carruthers, and I. Duling, IEEE Photon. Technol. Lett. 12, 266 (2000).
- [56] R. V. Gumenyuk, D. A. Korobko, and I. O. Zolotovskii, Opt. Lett. 45, 184 (2020).
- [57] X. Liu and M. Pang, Laser Photonics Rev. 13, 1800333 (2019).
- [58] V. A. Ribenek, D. A. Stoliarov, D. A. Korobko, and A. A. Fotiadi, Opt. Lett. 46, 5747 (2021).
- [59] Y. Sun, S. Wabnitz, and P. Parra-Rivas, Opt. Lett. 48, 5403 (2023).
- [60] N. Englebert, C. Simon, C. M. Arabí, F. Leo, and S.-P. Gorza, Manipulation and control of temporal cavity solitons with trapping potential (2024), arXiv:2406.12848 [physics].
- [61] J. K. Jang, M. Erkintalo, S. Coen, and S. G. Murdoch, Nat. Commun. 6, 10.1038/ncomms8370 (2015).
- [62] M. Erkintalo, S. G. Murdoch, and S. Coen, J. R. Soc. N. Z. 52, 149 (2022).
- [63] F. R. Talenti, Y. Sun, P. Parra-Rivas, T. Hansson, and S. Wabnitz, Opt. Commun. 546, 129773 (2023).

## APPENDIX

*Model Normalization.* The governing equations with physical units are:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial \tilde{T}} + \frac{\beta_{c}L}{T_{R}} \frac{\partial \tilde{A}}{\partial \tilde{t}} = \left[ -\frac{\alpha_{1}}{2} - i\tilde{\delta} - i\frac{\beta_{21}L}{2T_{R}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \tilde{t}^{2}} \right] \tilde{A} 
+ i\frac{L}{T_{R}} \left[ (\gamma_{1}|\tilde{A}|^{2} + 2\gamma_{1}|\tilde{B}|^{2})\tilde{A} + \tilde{g}\tilde{B}\tilde{A}^{*} \right],$$
(1)

TABLE I. Normalization for fields and physical parameters.

| $eta_1=rac{T_R}{L}$   | $r_{ m g}=rac{eta_{22}}{eta_{21}}$  |
|--|--|
| $A_{\rm s} = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{\rm l} T_{\rm R}}{2L\gamma_{\rm l}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_{\rm l} \beta_{\rm l}}{2\gamma_{\rm l}}}$ | $r_1 = \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}$  |
| $t_{\rm S} = \sqrt{\frac{ \beta_{21} L}{\alpha_1 T_R}} = \sqrt{\frac{ \beta_{21} }{\alpha_1 \beta_1}}$                               | $r_{\mathrm{n}}=rac{\gamma_{\mathrm{2}}}{\gamma_{\mathrm{1}}}$  |
| $T_{\rm s} = \frac{2}{\alpha_1}$   | $\delta = 	ilde{\delta} rac{2}{lpha_1} = 	ilde{\delta} T_{ m s}$  |
| $A = rac{	ilde{A}}{A_{ m s}}$   | $\delta_0 = \Delta \tilde{eta}_0 rac{2L}{lpha_1 T_R} = \Delta \tilde{eta}_0 rac{1}{\gamma_1 A_s^2}$  |
| $B=rac{	ilde{B}}{A_{ m s}}$   | $d = \sqrt{\frac{4L(\Delta\tilde{\beta}_1)^2}{\alpha_1 \beta_{21} T_R}} = \Delta\tilde{\beta}_1 \frac{2t_s}{ \beta_{21} }$                     |
| $T = rac{	ilde{T}}{T_{ m s}}$   | $d_c = \beta_c \frac{2t_s}{ \beta_{21} }$  |
| $t = \frac{\tilde{t}}{t_{\rm s}}$  | $g = \tilde{g}\sqrt{\frac{2L}{\alpha_1\gamma_1 T_R}} = \tilde{g}\frac{1}{\gamma_1 A_s}$  |
|  | $P = \tilde{B_{\text{in}}} \sqrt{\frac{8L\kappa\gamma_1}{\alpha_1^3 T_R^2}} = \tilde{B_{\text{in}}} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{T_R}} \frac{T_s}{A_s}$ |

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{B}}{\partial \tilde{T}} + \frac{\beta_{c}L}{T_{R}} \frac{\partial \tilde{B}}{\partial \tilde{t}} = \left[ -\frac{\alpha_{2}}{2} - i\left(2\tilde{\delta} + \frac{\Delta\tilde{\beta}_{0}L}{T_{R}}\right) - i\frac{\beta_{22}L}{2T_{R}} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \tilde{t}^{2}} \right] \tilde{B}$$
$$-\frac{\Delta\tilde{\beta}_{1}L}{T_{R}} \frac{\partial \tilde{B}}{\partial \tilde{t}} + i\frac{L}{T_{R}} \left[ (\gamma_{2}|\tilde{B}|^{2} + 2\gamma_{2}|\tilde{A}|^{2})\tilde{B} + \tilde{g}\tilde{A}^{2} \right] + \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{T_{R}}} B_{\mathrm{in}},$$
(2)

where  $\tilde{T}$  and  $\tilde{t}$  are slow and fast times, respectively;  $T_R$  is the cavity roundtrip time;  $\tilde{\delta}$  is the detuning;  $\Delta \tilde{\beta}_0$  is the phase mismatch;  $\beta_{21}$  and  $\beta_{22}$  are the group velocity dispersions for signal and pump;  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  represent signal and pump losses;  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are the nonlinear coefficients for signal and pump;  $\tilde{g}$  is the quadratic coefficient; L is the cavity length;  $\kappa$  is the coupling rate; and  $B_{in}$  is the driving field. To improve visualization and analysis, we add a group delay term  $\frac{\beta_c L}{T_R} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{t}}$  in the moving reference frame for both fields, which does not affect the underlying results.

For clarity, notations with a tilde represent physical quantities, while the same notations without a tilde correspond to their dimensionless, normalized counterparts. The normalized equations are:

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial T} + d_c \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} = \left[ -1 - i\delta + i\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} \right] A + i \left[ (|A|^2 + 2|B|^2)A + gBA^* \right],$$
(3)

$$\frac{\partial B}{\partial T} + d_c \frac{\partial B}{\partial t} = \left[ -r_1 - i(2\delta + \delta_0) + ir_g \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - d \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right] B + i \left[ r_n (|B|^2 + 2|A|^2)B + gA^2 \right] + P,$$
(4)

where the normalized parameters are summarized in Tab. I. Using physical parameters L = 0.4 mm,  $T_R = 2.8 \text{ ps}$ ,  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2/4 = \kappa/2 = 2\pi \times 0.65 \text{ GHz}$ ,  $\tilde{g} = 40 \text{ W}^{-1/2} \text{ m}^{-1}$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 0.75 \text{ (Wm)}^{-1}$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 1.5 \text{ (Wm)}^{-1}$ ,  $\beta_{21} = -50 \text{ fs}^2/\text{ mm}$ ,  $\beta_{22} = 50 \text{ fs}^2/\text{ mm}$ ,  $\Delta\beta_1 = 0.4 \text{ ps}/\text{ mm}$ , and  $B_{\text{in}}^2 = 50 \text{ mW}$ , the normalized values are derived as shown in the Letter.

*Moving Frame Delay.* Here, in Fig. 5, we show the evolution of the moving frame delay corresponding to each branch

in Fig. 2(a). For each branch, as the driving strength P increases, the moving frame delay  $d_c$  increases, indicating a reduction in the soliton crystal's group velocity. This reduction becomes more pronounced as the number of solitons increases.

This behavior aligns with the larger walk-off between the pump and signal, characterized by  $d_1 = -699$ , where the negative value indicates the pump propagates faster than the signal. As the driving strength increases, the signal power and soliton number grow, while the background remains nearly unchanged, collectively slowing down the soliton crystal's velocity.

*Parametric Soliton Crystal Frequency Combs.* Here we derive the frequency comb patterns of soliton crystal with different soliton phases. We consider *N* equally spaced pulses within one period *T*, arranged in the interval  $\left[-\frac{T}{2}, \frac{T}{2}\right]$ . Each pulse is located at  $t_n = \left[-\frac{N-1}{2N} + \frac{n}{N}\right]T$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ . The free spectral range (FSR) is defined as  $\Omega = \frac{2\pi}{T}$ . Due to the phase-selective nature of OPO, each pulse has a phase  $\phi_n$  restricted to 0 or  $\pi$ , denoted as P (in-phase) or N (out-of-phase), respectively.

Scanning driving strength. To verify the existence of the states in Fig. 2(a), we gradually reduce the driving from a 6-soliton crystal state, when P = 7.5,  $\delta = 2$ . Other parameters are the same as Fig. 2(a). The temporal evolution of |A| is shown in Fig. 2(a), while the peak amplitude max(|A|) and driving strength P are plotted in Fig. 2(b). As the pump decreases, the soliton number drops stepwise in each cycle. The corresponding pump values are approximately close to the Hopf bifurcation predicted by linear stability analysis shown in Fig. 2(a). Notably, this is not a stability test of the crystal states, as minor instabilities arise in long-term simulations with fixed parameters.

*Parametrically Driven Soliton Crystal Combs.* We express the electric field of a PDSC as




FIG. 5. Bifurcation diagram showing the moving frame delay  $d_c$  for the soliton crystal, with black and red curves representing stable and unstable solutions, respectively, as a function of driving strength *P*. Negative values here indicate that the stable soliton crystal propagates faster than the moving frame with no frame delay, due to the collective contribution from larger group velocity of field *B*.




FIG. 6. Temporal evolution of |A| in (a), while scanning the driving strength *P*, when  $\delta = 2$ . The peak amplitude max(|A|) and driving strength *P* are in (b). Other parameters are the same as Fig. 2(a) [see Movie IV].

where A(t) is the complex envelope of each soliton, and  $e^{i\phi_n}$  represents the two possible phases allowed by the OPO process. The convolution with  $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t-kT)$  enforces periodicity with period *T*.

Since the global phase does not affect the relative phase relationships, we factor out an arbitrary initial phase  $e^{i\phi_{in}}$  and redefine

$$e^{i\phi_n}=e^{i\phi'_n}e^{i\phi_{
m in}}$$

The relative phase  $e^{i\phi'_n}$  then takes discrete values, either +1 (for in-phase, P) or -1 (for out-of-phase, N). Thus, we set

$$e^{i\phi'_n} = (-1)^{p_n}, \quad p_n = \begin{cases} 0, & (P, \text{ in-phase}), \\ 1, & (N, \text{ out-of-phase}). \end{cases}$$

Taking the Fourier transform of E(t) and evaluating at  $\omega = k\Omega = k\frac{2\pi}{T}$  gives

$$E(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \Omega A(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (-1)^{p_n} e^{-i \, \boldsymbol{\omega} t_n} \right] \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(\boldsymbol{\omega} - k \Omega).$$

Hence the field amplitude is nonzero only at discrete frequencies  $\omega = k\Omega$ . A straightforward substitution

$$e^{-i\omega t_n} = e^{-i\left(k\frac{2\pi}{T}\right)\left(-\frac{N-1}{2N}+\frac{n}{N}\right)T} = e^{i\pi k\frac{N-1}{N}}e^{-i\frac{2\pi kn}{N}}$$

allows us to factor out a global phase and an *n*-dependent term. As a result, the final field in the frequency domain is

$$E(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \Omega A(\boldsymbol{\omega}) e^{i\pi k \frac{N-1}{N}} \left[ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} (-1)^{p_n} e^{-i \frac{2\pi k n}{N}} \right] \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(\boldsymbol{\omega} - k\Omega)$$

Surprisingly, the term in brackets represents the discrete Fourier transform (DFT) of the sequence  $\{(-1)^{p_n}\}$ , which represents one minimal period of comb lines. This formulation provides valuable insights into the comb structure. For instance, to generate an odd-harmonic comb, as shown in Fig. 4, PDSC must have an equal number of P and N solitons.