





By applying a bias to the graphene across the aluminum oxide, the graphene can be charged and its Fermi level can be modulated. To find the distribution of the electric field in the waveguide a finite difference eigenmode solver was used. The horizontal electric field forms the majority of the energy in the mode. The interaction of the light with the graphene is strongest when the electric field is parallel to the graphene because it is treated as a surface conductivity. We operate the ring in quasi TE-mode and in this way the graphene on top of the waveguide has more influence than the graphene on the side of the waveguide. Applying a voltage bias to the graphene changes its optical properties; however the overall distribution of the light in the waveguide changes very little. We approximate the optical energy distribution in the waveguide to be constant with changing Fermi level of graphene. Voltage bias does change the effective refractive index and these effects are captured in the next section as perturbations. We obtain the unperturbed effective refractive index,  $n_{\text{eff},0}$ , from the eigenmode solver when the Fermi level is 0.1 eV. This Fermi level was chosen because the optical behavior of graphene is relatively constant there.

### 3 The numerical model

**Table 2:** Simulation parameters.

Symbol	Value	Definition
$Q$	E	Intrinsic quality factor
$Q_e$	E	External quality factor
$P_{\text{pump}}$	mW	Input power
$\lambda$	nm	Resonant wavelength
$\delta$	$-\omega$	Frequency detuning
$\tau_{\text{car}}$	ps	Free carrier lifetime
$n$	.	Unperturbed effective refractive index
$\beta_{\text{Si}}$	. E – m/W	TPA coefficient for silicon
$n_{\text{Si}}$	. E – m /W	Kerr coefficient for silicon
$\Gamma$	meV	Graphene relaxation rate
$W_{\text{sat}}$	. pJ	Saturation cavity energy
$\sigma_{\text{FCA}}$	. E – m	Free carrier absorption coefficient
$\sigma_e$	. E – m	Electron dispersion coefficient
$\sigma_h$	. E –	





0      5      10      15  
Tim





