

# Problem 1

The penetration depth is calculated using the next expression:

$$\delta_m = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{\epsilon'_m + \epsilon_d}{\epsilon_m^2} \right|} \quad \text{for metals}$$

$$\delta_d = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{\epsilon'_m + \epsilon_d}{\epsilon_d^2} \right|} \quad \text{for dielectrics}$$

In the case of gold:

$$\delta_{\text{gold}} = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{\epsilon'_{\text{gold}} + \epsilon_{\text{air}}}{\epsilon_{\text{air}}^2} \right|} = \frac{1064}{2\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{-43,8 + 1}{(-43,8)^2} \right|} = \frac{532}{\pi} \cdot 0,1494$$

$$\delta_{\text{gold}} = 25,30 \text{ nm}$$

In the case of air:

$$\delta_{\text{air}} = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{\epsilon'_{\text{gold}} + \epsilon_{\text{air}}}{\epsilon_{\text{air}}^2} \right|} = \frac{532}{\pi} \sqrt{\left| \frac{-43,8 + 1}{1^2} \right|} = \frac{532}{\pi} \cdot 6,5422$$

$$\delta_{\text{air}} = 11078,86 \text{ nm}$$

Secondly, to excite the gold-air surface plasmon the SP wave has to match with:  $k_0 n_d \sin(\theta_i) \pm \frac{2\pi m}{\Lambda}$

So:

$$k_0 n_{sp} = k_0 n_d \sin(\theta_i) \pm \frac{2\pi m}{\Lambda}$$

•) Normal incidence:  $\theta_i = 0 \Rightarrow \sin(\theta_i) = 0$

$$\bullet) n_{sp} = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon' \epsilon_d}{\epsilon' + \epsilon_d}} = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon'_{gold} \cdot \epsilon_{air}}{\epsilon'_{gold} + \epsilon_{air}}} = \sqrt{\frac{-43,8 \cdot 1}{-43,8 + 1}} = \sqrt{\frac{43,8}{42,8}}$$

$$\boxed{n_{sp} = 1,01161}$$

•) First order grating:  $m=1$

Using everything we get:

$$k_0 n_{sp} = \frac{2\pi}{\Lambda} \Rightarrow \Lambda = \frac{2\pi}{k_0 n_{sp}} = \frac{2\pi}{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda} \cdot n_{sp}} = \frac{\lambda}{n_{sp}} = \frac{1064}{1,01161}$$

$$\boxed{\Lambda = 1051,8 \text{ nm}}$$

# 1 Problem 2

## 1.1 Maxwell Garnett

Used for media with *small inclusions* dispersed in a *continuous host medium*. The grains of guest material's relative permittivity is  $\epsilon_i$  and they are hosted in a continuous medium with relative permittivity  $\epsilon_h$ . If grains are small enough we can assume quasi-static approximation. Also, if there is no information about the shape of the grains, a small sphere shape is assumed.

### Limits of validity

- If  $\epsilon_i > 0$  particle size should be  $< \frac{1}{10}\lambda_{eff}$
- If  $\epsilon_i < 0$  the limits of validity are stricter

Modelling first step:

In quasi-static approximation external electric field  $E_{ext}$  is considered constant for each sphere. Also, each sphere behaves like a point source with electric dipole moment proportional to  $E_{ext}$ .

$$P_h = \epsilon_0 \epsilon_h \alpha E_{ext} \quad (1)$$

The field inside sphere  $E_i$  is uniform and parallel to  $E_{ext}$ . Polarizability is isotropic.

Modelling second step:

Create the model for a distribution of small spheres. First, several electric point dipoles radiating and influencing each other:

$$\langle D \rangle = \epsilon_0 \epsilon_{MG} \langle E \rangle \quad (2)$$

Then, the average medium response can be written as:

$$\langle D \rangle = \epsilon_0 \epsilon_h \langle E \rangle + \langle P \rangle \quad (3)$$

The average dipole response can be calculated using a model of a sphere with a charge density in the surface:

$$\langle P \rangle = \frac{3N\alpha\epsilon_0\epsilon_h}{3 - N\alpha} \langle E \rangle \quad (4)$$

Finally, the expression for the effective permittivity is:

$$\epsilon_{MG} = \epsilon_h \left( 1 + \frac{N\alpha}{1 - \frac{N\alpha}{3}} \right) \quad (5)$$

For diluted media  $1 - \frac{N\alpha}{3} \approx 1$  so we get  $\epsilon_{MG} = \epsilon_h(1 + N\alpha)$ . Also, introducing the parameter  $f$  which relates the volume fraction of the inclusions gives the next expression:

$$\epsilon_{MG} = \epsilon_h \left[ 1 + 3f \frac{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_h}{\epsilon_i + 2\epsilon_h - f(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_h)} \right] \quad (6)$$

### **The limitations of the model**

- Values of  $f$  higher than 0.5 make predictions questionable, because the interparticle distances decrease and trigger high-order multipole effects.
- This approach only can be used in a quasi-static state with dipole approximation. Higher-order terms are excluded.
- The role of the host and guests particles cannot be exchanged. If there is not a clear distinction, the validity of the formula cannot be ensured.

## **1.2 Bruggeman Theory**

This theory is used when the medium is aggregate mixture with random distributions. Statistical formulation theories are used to model it.

In the Bruggeman theory the mixture is modeled as a continuous medium hosting a distribution of small spherical inclusions. Both, host medium and spherical inclusions, have different dielectric permittivities. Because of the fact that it is a statistical formulation based theory, the probabilities of finding spheres with permittivity  $\epsilon_i$  and  $\epsilon_h$  are assigned as  $f$  and  $1-f$  respectively.

Assuming quasi-static approximation we get the formula:

$$f \frac{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{Br}}{\epsilon_i + 2\epsilon_{Br}} + (1-f) \frac{\epsilon_h - \epsilon_{Br}}{\epsilon_h + 2\epsilon_{Br}} = 0 \quad (7)$$

Where  $\epsilon_{Br}$  is the unknown permittivity.

This formula is symmetric so the roles of inclusions and host are exchangeable. It can be also be extended to multi-phase aggregates just adding more terms:

$$\sum_M^{m=1} f_m \frac{\epsilon_m - \epsilon_{Br}}{\epsilon_m + 2\epsilon_{Br}} = 0 \quad (8)$$

In this theory, shape effects can be included, such as ellipsoidal inclusions.

### **1.3 Differences between Maxwell Garnett and Bruggeman theories**

- For situations with large inclusions' fill factor, Bruggeman formula gives a better modelling approach.
- Bruggeman theory provides a more realistic description when the mixture has large difference in the permittivities of the constituents.
- In the Bruggeman theory the roles of the host and inclusions are exchangeable, whereas, they are not in Maxwell Garnett.
- Maxwell Garnett theory suits better when there is a clear distinction between the host and inclusions.

### Problem 3

The expression of optimal thickness for antireflection is:

$$d_{AR} = \frac{\lambda_{eff}}{4}$$

Developing it:

$$d_{AR} = \frac{\lambda_{eff}}{4} = \frac{\lambda_0}{4 \cdot n_{CR}} = \frac{500}{4 \cdot 1,3} \Rightarrow \boxed{d_{AR} = 96,15 \text{ nm}}$$