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Abstract — We use a spatial harmonic analysis (SHA) method to homogenize optical metamaterials with a negative refractive index; the method provides a more general approach than other methods for estimating the effective index of materials arranged of cascaded elementary layers. The approach is validated for a single layer and a triple layer two dimensional metal grating.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The refractive index \( n = n' + in'' \) is the key parameter in the interaction of light with matter. While \( n' \) has generally been considered to be positive, the condition \( n' < 0 \) does not violate any fundamental physical law, and materials with negative index have some remarkable properties. Such materials are called negative-index materials (NIMs), and in these materials the phase velocity is directed against the flow of energy. There are no known naturally-occurring optical NIMs. Optical properties of such media have been considered in early papers by Mandel’shtam [1] and Veselago [2]. Proof-of-principle experiments [3] have shown that artificially designed materials (metamaterials) consisting of split ring resonators (SRRs) and metal wires can act as NIMs at microwave wavelengths. NIMs drew a large amount of attention after Pendry predicted that NIMs can act as a superlens allowing for an imaging resolution which is limited not by the wavelength but rather by material quality [4].

A. Homogenization of an Elementary Layer

A possible approach to designing negative index materials is a periodic array of elementary coupled metal-dielectric resonators. This work takes a closer look at approaches which simultaneously provide fast calculation of the field inside a given metamaterial arranged of elementary periodic layers and calculation of its effective parameters.

First we review an established approach to homogenization of a thin layer of NIM. For a given monochromatic incident light, it is possible to measure the complex reflectance and transmittance coefficients \( r \) and \( t \) and then unambiguously retrieve the refractive index of the NIM sample. This effective parameter can be conveniently obtained from the characteristic matrix of a homogeneous film at normal incidence [5]. Here we consider an effective layer of NIM over a homogeneous thick substrate with a refractive index \( n_2 \), as shown in Fig. 1. The conservation of the tangential electric and magnetic fields at the first interface gives the standard boundary conditions (BCs), \( H_0 = H_1 \), \( E_0 = E_1 \). Then, using the definitions of the complex reflection and transmission coefficients \( r_0 = E_{0r}/E_i \), \( r_1 = E_{1r}/E_i \), and \( t_0 = E_{0t}/E_i \), we have

\[
V \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ r_0 \end{bmatrix} = D_j V \begin{bmatrix} t_0 \\ t_1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( D_j \) is the characteristic matrix of the NIM layer.

Fig. 1. Simplified approach to the homogenization of a thin equivalent layer of NIM on top of a thick substrate with a refractive index \( n_2 \). The equivalent layer is characterized by the effective permittivity and permeability. Note that \( r_2 = 0 \), provided that the layer is not illuminated.
where \( V \) is a rotation matrix.

\[
V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

(2)

and

\[
D_i = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_i^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},
\]

(3)

where \( \eta_i = \sqrt{n_i / \varepsilon_i} \) is the effective impedance of the NIM layer with effective permeability \( \mu_i \) and effective permittivity \( \varepsilon_i \).

Then, using the scaled thickness of the layer, \( \delta_i = 2\pi \Delta_i / \lambda_i \), with the transport matrix

\[
A_i = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-\sigma_i \delta_i} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{\sigma_i \delta_i} \end{bmatrix},
\]

(4)

i.e., backpropagating \( \tau_i \) and propagating \( \bar{\tau}_i \) up to the second interface we arrive at the equation

\[
D_i V A_i^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\tau}_i \\ \tau_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n_2 \bar{\tau}_2 \\ \bar{\tau}_2 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(5)

Combining (1) and (5) gives the following form

\[
\begin{bmatrix} 1 - \tau_0 \\ 1 + \tau_0 \end{bmatrix} = D_i V A_i V^{-1} D_i^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} n_2 \bar{\tau}_2 \\ \bar{\tau}_2 \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(6)

From the above we have

\[
V^{-1} D_i^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \tau_0 \\ 1 + \tau_0 \end{bmatrix} = A_i V^{-1} D_i^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} n_2 \bar{\tau}_2 \\ \bar{\tau}_2 \end{bmatrix}
\]

(7)

or

\[
\begin{bmatrix} 1 + \tau_0 + (1 - \tau_0) \eta_i \\ 1 + \tau_0 - (1 - \tau_0) \eta_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\tau}_2 (1 + n_i \eta_i) \\ \bar{\tau}_2 (1 - n_i \eta_i) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} e^{-\sigma_i \delta_i} \\ e^{\sigma_i \delta_i} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

(8)

Then, multiplying the components of each vector from both sides we arrive at

\[
\bar{\eta}_i = \pm \sqrt{(1 + \tau_0)^2 - \bar{\tau}_2^2 / (1 - \tau_0)^2 - \bar{\tau}_2^2 n_i^2},
\]

(9)

while summing up the components and using (9) gives

\[
\cos \bar{\eta}_i \delta_i = \frac{1 - \pi_i^2 + n_i \bar{\tau}_2^2}{(1 + \tau_0^2) n_i + 1 - \pi_i \bar{\tau}_2^2}.
\]

(10)

Equation (6) can be written in another manner as

\[
Q_0 = M_i Q_2,
\]

(11)

using \( Q_0 = \left( \begin{array}{c} t_0 \\ r_0 \end{array} \right) \), \( Q_2 = \left( \begin{array}{c} t_2 \\ r_2 \end{array} \right) \), and \( M_i = S_i A_i S_i^{-1} \), where \( S_i \) is the symmetric matrix, \( S_i = V^{-1} D_i V \). Note that for a single layer on a substrate, \( r_2 = 0 \) and \( t_0 \) is the incident field.

**B. Nomenclature of Matrix Functions**

To simplify the notations (and further programming), nomenclature for matrix functions is defined in parallel with direct matrix notation. First, we introduce a general \( 2 \times 2 \) matrix partitioning function \( (w) \) with partitions comprised of four different \( m \times m \) square matrices \( (w_{0,0}, w_{0,1}, w_{1,0}, w_{1,1}) \):

\[
w \left( \begin{array}{c} w_{0,0}, w_{0,1}, w_{1,0}, w_{1,1} \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c} w_{0,0} & w_{0,1} \\ w_{1,0} & w_{1,1} \end{array} \right).
\]

(12)

Second, using (12) we add a partitioning function \( (s) \) for arranging four bi-diagonally symmetric partitions combined of two \( m \times m \) matrices \( (s_0, s_1) \):

\[
s \left( s_0, s_1 \right) = w \left( s_0, s_1, s_1, s_0 \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c} s_0 & s_1 \\ s_1 & s_0 \end{array} \right).
\]

(13)

Then, using (12) and a \( m \times m \) null matrix \( (o) \) we suggest to define another function \( (d) \) for making a diagonally partitioned matrix of two \( m \times m \) matrices \( (b_0, b_1) \) as

\[
d \left( b_0, b_1 \right) = w \left( b_0, o, a, b_1 \right) = \left( \begin{array}{c} b_0 & o \\ o & b_1 \end{array} \right).
\]

(14)

In addition, the following constant rotation matrix arranged of \( 2m \times 2m \) identity matrices \( (i) \) is used
Finally, a stacking function \( \mathbf{e} \) is defined for a stacked vector made of two equal vectors \( (v_1, v_2) \) with \( m \) components as

\[
\mathbf{e}(v_1, v_2) = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Thus for example, (2)-(4) and (11) can be rewritten using (12)-(16) for \( m = 1 \) as

\[
Q_0 = \mathbf{e}(t_0, r_0), \quad Q_2 = \mathbf{e}(t_2, r_2),
\]

\[
A_1 = \mathbf{d}(e^{-i\theta}, e^{i\phi}), \quad D_1 = \mathbf{d}(\eta_1^{-1}, 1), \quad \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{i}.
\]

\[\text{C. Basics of SHA in Cascaded NIM Layers}\]

Equations (9) and (10) provide an easy approach to the characterization of thin metamaterials. With this simple assumption it is thought that a cascaded bulk material can be arranged using a stack of \( q \) equivalent layers with an effective transformation matrix \( \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{SA}^{-1} \mathbf{S} \). In general, this straightforward approach assumes that the spatial harmonics of each layer interact only with the same harmonics of other layers in the stack. In essence, this loose assumption ignores any transformation of a given incident harmonic into the spatial harmonics of different order, which are either reflected or transmitted. To illustrate this issue, consider another approach to obtaining effective parameters of a multilayer NIM arranged of thin infinite elementary layers with periodic distribution of elementary materials. Essentially, the enhanced method follows the recipe for a classical case of stratified media (see for example, [6]-[11]).

We note that a variety of rigorous algorithms have been based on SHA for diffraction gratings. After the publications of Burckhardt [7], Kaspar [8], and Knop [9], a very similar method was introduced by Moharam and Gaylord [10]-[12]. Analytical approaches to the problem were shown by Botten and McPhedran [13]-[15]. An alternative to Botten’s method was discussed by Tayeb and Petit [16]-[18]. Due to space constrains, here we only give a brief list of early publication; a larger review will be published elsewhere.

We start with monochromatic Maxwell’s equations

\[
\nabla \times \mathbf{E} = i\omega \mathbf{B}, \quad \nabla \times \mathbf{H} = -i\omega \mathbf{D}
\]

arriving at

\[
k^2 n^2 \mathbf{H} = \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{H} - \nabla \ln \varepsilon \times \nabla \times \mathbf{H},
\]

\[
k^2 n^2 \mathbf{E} = \nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E} - \nabla \ln \mu \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E}.
\]

In addition, using \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} = 0 \) and \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D} = 0 \) we have

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{H} = -\nabla \ln \mu \cdot \mathbf{H},
\]

\[
\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} = -\nabla \ln \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{E},
\]

and finally

\[
k^2 n^2 \mathbf{H} + \nabla^2 \mathbf{H} = -\nabla \left[ \nabla \ln \mu \cdot \mathbf{H} \right]
\]

\[
-k^2 \nabla \mathbf{E} = -\nabla \left[ \nabla \ln \varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{E} \right]
\]

\[
-k^2 \nabla \mathbf{H} = \nabla \times \mathbf{E}.
\]

\[\text{D. Bloch-Floquet Waves in Cascaded 2D Layers}\]

A simpler 2D example is used here to illustrate the approach because derivations for the spatial harmonic analysis (SHA) in 2D are less difficult. Consider a single period \( l \) of an infinite interface of a free-space domain with the domain of a material characterized by a set of step-wise continuous permittivity values \( \varepsilon_{1,1}, \varepsilon_{2,1}, \ldots \), as shown in Fig. 2a.

Provided that a TM \( \mathbf{H} = \hat{z} \cdot \mathbf{h} \) boundary-value problem is taken, then only the tangential components of the H and E field distributions over \( l \) are required in this case. A local coordinate system is introduced, with a unit normal \( \hat{z} \), a unit transverse vector \( \hat{y} \) and a tangent unit vector \( \hat{x} \). Then, consider two scalar fields \( \mathbf{h} \) and \( \mathbf{d} \) as the distribution of the transverse magnetic field \( h = \hat{z} \cdot \mathbf{H} \) over \( l \) and the distribution the electric field \( d = \hat{y} \cdot \mathbf{E} \). A monochromatic Maxwell equation

\[
\hat{y} \cdot \left( \nabla \mathbf{h} \times \hat{z} \right) = -i\omega \mathbf{d}
\]

couples the fields

\[
d = (i\omega)^{-1} h',
\]

where the normal derivative of \( h \) is denoted

\[h' = \hat{z} \cdot \nabla h\].

The core of any SHA approach is the transformation of the fields from a physical space to spatial spectral space using available proper functions \( g'' \). Provided that \( h \) and \( g'' \) are sets of discrete values obtained at a uniform grid on \( l \), these sets are considered as two vec-
and the complex magnitudes of the reflected and transmitted fields \( (c_{r,1}^m \text{ and } c_{t,1}^m) \) can be taken as the components of two different \( \tilde{m} \) - dimensional vectors \( c_{r,1} \) and \( c_{t,1} \). Then, the magnetic field in matrix form is defined by \( \tilde{h}_l = g_{r,l}c_{r,1} + g_{t,l}c_{t,1} \).

The Bloch-Floquet theorem allows for the separation of variables, \( g_r = v_l u_l^1 \) and \( g_t = v_l u_l^{-1} \), where \( u_l \) is an \( \tilde{m} \times \tilde{m} \) matrix exponential, \( u_l = \exp i k_{\tilde{m}} l x \), of a proper values matrix, \( k_{\tilde{n}}^m \); and \( v_l \) is a \( \tilde{p} \times \tilde{m} \) matrix constructed of orthogonal vectors \( v_l^m \). For the free-space case, indices in \( u, v, \) and \( k_{\tilde{n}}^m \) are dropped, and the proper functions \( u \) are defined through \( k_{\tilde{n}}^m = \sqrt{1 - (k_{\tilde{n}}^m)^2} \), where \( k_{\tilde{n}}^m = m l^{-1} + \sin \phi_0 \) and \( \phi_0 \) is the angle of incidence (shown in Fig. 2b). The wavefront \( v^m = \tilde{p}^{-1/2} \exp i k_{\tilde{n}}^m k y \) is just an orthonormal Fourier component of the \( m \)th order.

1) Eigenvalue Problem

To obtain both \( k_{\tilde{n},1} \) and \( a_l \) for a given elementary layer, where the permittivity of elementary materials (a piece-wise continuous function \( \varepsilon_l \)) is periodic in the \( y \) direction but constant in the \( x \) direction, it is necessary to attain an eigenvalue problem formulation. In this case,

\[
k_l^2 \varepsilon_l h_l + \nabla^2 h_l - f_l \partial_y h_l = 0, \tag{23}
\]

where \( f_l \) is the logarithmic derivative, \( f_l = \partial_y \ln \varepsilon_l, \varepsilon_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_l^i \) are \( \tilde{p} \times \tilde{p} \) diagonal matrices, and \( k_l^2 \) is a scalar.

The above equation can then be rewritten using \( h_l = v_l (u_l c_{r,1} - u_l^{-1} c_{t,1}) \). Next, introducing \( a_{l} \) as an \( \tilde{m} \times \tilde{m} \) matrix mapping an orthogonal basis \( v_l \) into the free-space basis \( v, (v_l = v a_{l}) \), substituting \( i (v^{-1} f v) k_y \) with \( i (k_{\tilde{n},1} (v^{-1} v - v^{-1} v k_y)) v^{-1} v^{-1} k_y \) and using \( \gamma_1 \) for \( v^{-1} v, \gamma_l \) for \( v^{-1} v^{-1} v \) and \( i \) for the \( \tilde{m} \times \tilde{m} \) identity matrix, \((23)\) is further simplified as

\[
a_{l} k_{\tilde{n},1} a_{l}^{-1} = \gamma_l (1 - k_{\tilde{n},1} \gamma_l k_{\tilde{n},1}). \tag{24}
\]

The transform \( a_{l} \) is required because in contrast with the free-space case, each wavefront \( v_l^m \) in an elementary inhomogeneous layer is not a single Fourier co-

---

**Fig. 2.** (a) Interface of an elementary layer of NIM with free space; (b) an isolated elementary layer; (c) a cascaded multilayer NIM.
ponent anymore; however, as a ‘physical function’ it still can be expressed as a superposition of Fourier components. Note that equation (24) is written in an eigenvalue form since \( k_{x,i}^2 \) is a diagonal matrix. The equation can be solved either numerically or analytically for both \( k_{x,i}^2 \) and \( a_i \), provided that \( \gamma_1 \) and \( k_y \) are known.

2) Mixed Boundary-Value Problem

Transverse field continuity together with the conservation of the tangential electric field on \( l \) gives the standard boundary conditions (BCs), \( h_0 = h_1 \), \( \varepsilon h'_0 = h'_1 \), where the pairs \( h, h' \) represent the magnetic field and its normal derivative just before and after the interface; \( \varepsilon \) are the values of permittivity at the collocation points on \( l \).

After using the definitions of the fields \( h_0 = u(uc_{i,0} - u^{-1}c_{i,0}), h_1 = v a_i (u c_{i,1} - u^{-1} c_{i,1}) \) and taking the normal derivatives, a spectral form of the BC is

\[
c_0 = s_i c_i .
\]

(25)

Here,

\[
c_0 = d(u, u^{-1}) e(c_{i,0}, c_{i,0}), c_i = d(u_i, u_i^{-1}) e(c_{i,1}, c_{i,1}),
\]

and \( s_i = i d(a_i k_x^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1} a_b k_{x,i}) \).

At the second interface (as shown in Fig. 2b), the equation for the elementary layer is given by

\[
b_i c_{i,1} = s_i^{-1} c_{i,2} .
\]

(26)

where \( b_i = d(\beta_i, \beta_i^{-1}) \); the matrix exponential \( \beta_i = \exp ik_x \delta_i \) adjusts the phases for the scaled thickness of the layer (\( \delta_i = 2\pi \Delta_i / \lambda \)).

Combining (25) and (26) gives the following form

\[
c_0 = s_i b_i^{-1} s_i^{-1} c_2 .
\]

(27)

Since \( k_y \) is given as a common matrix for all layers, a possible alternative is to employ a normalization \( (c_0 = i c_0 \) and \( c_2 = i c_2 \), where the upper and lower partitions of \( c_0 \) and \( c_2 \) correspond to a magnetic component and a normalized electric component, respectively. These Fourier components are both continuous across any interlayer interface and form the basis for wave matching. Then, (27) is simplified to

\[
c_0 = d_i b_i^{-1} d_i^{-1} c_2 ,
\]

(28)

where the linear operators \( d_i = d(a_i k_x^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1} a_b k_{x,i}) \) and \( b_i = i b_i^{-1} \) are unique for each layer with a given distribution of elementary materials (\( \gamma_1 \)), defined matrices of the proper values \( k_{x,i} \) and the proper vectors \( a_i \).

For the trivial case of a uniform slab with a permittivity \( \varepsilon_i \), \( a_i = i, \gamma_1 = \varepsilon_i \) and a generalized analog of (6) is

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_0 \\
\tilde{h}_0'
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
i & 0 \\
0 & \eta_1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\beta_1^{-1} & 0 \\
0 & \beta_1
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
i & 0 \\
0 & \eta_1^{-1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_2 \\
\tilde{h}_2'
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(29)

where the tangential fields are the corresponding matrices of the Fourier transforms, \( \tilde{h} = v^{-1} h \), \( \tilde{h}' = (k v^{-1}) \tilde{h}' \); \( \eta_1 = \text{diag}(\varepsilon_i^{-1} k_y^m) \) (from (24), \( k_{x,i}^2 = \varepsilon_i - k_y^2 \), and \( k_y^m = \sqrt{\varepsilon_i - (k_y^m)^2} \)). Then for example, validation of (29) for a plane wave at normal incidence gives a familiar result, shown earlier in (11).

From (28) we also note that in general, the following identity holds

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_0 \\
\tilde{h}_0'
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
a_i & 0 \\
0 & k_x^{-1} \gamma_1^{-1} a_b k_{x,i}
\end{pmatrix}
\times
\begin{pmatrix}
\cos k_{x,i} \delta_i & -i \sin k_{x,i} \delta_i \\
-i \sin k_{x,i} \delta_i & \cos k_{x,i} \delta_i
\end{pmatrix}
\times
\begin{pmatrix}
a_i^{-1} & 0 \\
0 & k_x^{-1} a_b^{-1} \gamma_1 k_{x,i}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\tilde{h}_2 \\
\tilde{h}_2'
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(30)

with \( \cos k_{x,i} \delta_i \) and \( \sin k_{x,i} \delta_i \) being arranged of adequate matrix exponentials.

II. SHA IN BI-PERIODIC NIM LAYERS

As yet there has been no mention of how to handle bi-periodic structures with generally different periods in \( z \) and \( y \) directions (denoted here as \( l_y \) and \( l_y \) respectively, as shown in Fig. 3). In contrast to the previous example, essentially there are two difficulties to overcome. First, there are a dramatically larger number of spatial harmonics (\( m^2 \) in bi-periodic structures, versus \( m \) in the single-periodic NIMs of Fig. 2a). This volume could be quite demanding for pure numerical solvers. On top of that, the already large number of basis spatial

*i.e., a piecewise continuous function with a limited variation on \( l \).*
harmonics in which the fields is expressed should be increased even further to ensure convergence of the eigenvalues. A simple example of a bi-periodic layer of a binary material is shown in Fig. 3, where the layer is arranged of a metallic rectangular block which is immersed in a dielectric host. Certainly in real life applications each elementary layer (cross-section) could be much more involved. The electromagnetic field components inside a bi-periodic structure also should be bi-periodic with periods being the same as the length ($l_y$) and width ($l_z$) of the unit cell.

Then, each field component (e.g., $\vec{H} = (h_x, h_y, h_z)$) can be expressed as

$$h_i = \tilde{v}_i \tilde{u}_c, \quad i = x, y, z,$$

where each field component is written as the product of a cell periodic part $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(y,z)$ and a wavelike part $\tilde{u} = \exp(i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r})$, as a consequence of Bloch's theorem.

As usual, we start with Maxwell’s equations $\nabla \times \vec{E} = \omega \vec{B}$, $\nabla \times \vec{H} = -\omega \vec{D}$, and since $\nabla \cdot \vec{H} = 0$, i.e. $\nabla \times \nabla \times \vec{H} = -\nabla^2 \vec{H}$, we arrive at

$$-\nabla^2 \vec{H} = e^{-i} \nabla e_x \times (\nabla \times \vec{H}) + k^2 \vec{e}_z \vec{H}.$$  

Introducing a tangent field $\tilde{h}_i = \hat{y} h_y + \hat{z} h_z$, we note that

$$-\nabla^2 \tilde{h}_i = \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \tilde{h}_i + e^{-i} \left\{ \hat{y} \partial_x \varepsilon \left( \partial_y h_x - \partial_z h_y \right) \right\}.$$  

After splitting the components of $\tilde{h}_i$, (33) yields

$$-\nabla^2 h_y = \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu h_y + e^{-i} \partial_x \varepsilon \left( \partial_y h_x - \partial_z h_y \right),$$

$$-\nabla^2 h_z = \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu h_z + e^{-i} \partial_y \varepsilon \left( \partial_x h_y - \partial_z h_z \right).$$  

Then, using separation of variables (31) in matrix form, $\tilde{h}_i = \tilde{v} u \tilde{c}$, where $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(x,y)$, $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(z)$, the above is rewritten as

$$\begin{align*}
(a_i k_i^2 a_i^{-1}) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i &= \left( \frac{\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu - (k_x^2 + k_y^2)}{-\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_x k_i + \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_y k_i} \right) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i \\
&+ \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_y k_i a_i \tilde{v} \tilde{c}_i,
\end{align*}$$

$$\begin{align*}
(a_i k_i^2 a_i^{-1}) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i &= \left( \frac{\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu - (k_x^2 + k_y^2)}{-\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_y k_i + \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_z k_i} \right) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i \\
&+ \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_z k_i a_i \tilde{v} \tilde{c}_i,
\end{align*}$$

where $k_i = \alpha_i + i \text{diag} \left[m_i \lambda / l_i \right]$, $k_y = \alpha_y + i \text{diag} \left[m_y \lambda / l_y \right]$, $\alpha_y + \alpha_z = \vec{k}_0 - \vec{k}$, and $\vec{k}_0 = \vec{k} / |\vec{k}|$ is a unit vector defined by the wavevector $(\vec{k})$ of the incident field.

The latter is further simplified with the aid of the following identities for the partial logarithmic derivatives

$$\begin{align*}
\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_x \varepsilon &= \gamma k_y \gamma^{-1} - k_x, \\
\omega^2 \varepsilon \mu \partial_y \varepsilon &= \gamma k_x \gamma^{-1} - k_y,
\end{align*}$$

where $\gamma = \omega^2 \varepsilon \mu$. Then we arrive at

$$\begin{align*}
(a_i k_i^2 a_i^{-1}) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i &= \left( \gamma - k_x^2 - \gamma k_y \gamma^{-1} k_x \right) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i \\
&+ \left( \gamma k_y \gamma^{-1} k_y - k_x \right) a_i \tilde{u} \tilde{c}_i,
\end{align*}$$

The second term in the right side of both equations in (37) corresponds to the cross polarization. For a symmetric grating we can show that both $(\gamma k_x \gamma^{-1} k_y - k_x k_y)$ and $(\gamma - k_x^2 - \gamma k_y \gamma^{-1} k_x)$ are equal to zero and consequently we have no cross polarization for symmetric gratings. This simplification yields two decoupled eigenvalue equations as shown below

$$\begin{align*}
a_i k_i^2 a_i^{-1} &= \gamma \left( 1 - k_y \gamma^{-1} k_y \right) - k_x^2 \\
a_i k_i^2 a_i^{-1} &= \gamma \left( 1 - k_x \gamma^{-1} k_x \right) - k_y^2.
\end{align*}$$

For an asymmetric grating the two eigenvalue equations would be coupled via the cross polarizations term. A 2D TM case ($c_y = k_x = 0$, i.e. the structure is periodic in the $y$ direction only, there is no magnetic field...
along the direction of periodicity gives

\[ \gamma_y = v^{-1} \varepsilon_y (y) v \]

\[ a_k^2 z^{-1} = \gamma_z \left( 1 - k_y \gamma_y^{-1} k_y \right), \tag{39} \]

while a 2D TE case \( c_y = k_y = \alpha \), i.e. the structure is periodic in z-direction only, there is no electric field along the direction of periodicity and \( \gamma_z = v^{-1} \varepsilon (z) v \) is

\[ a_k^2 z^{-1} = \gamma_z - k_z^2. \tag{40} \]

Note that equations (39)-(40) also provide a solution for structures with interleaving single-period layers with 90-degree rotation of their periodicity directions.

## III. CASCADING THE ELEMENTARY LAYERS

Cascading a set of \( q \) elementary layers (depicted in Fig. 2c) gives

\[ c_0 = w_0 c_1. \tag{41} \]

Here, \( w_1 = \prod_{\nu=1}^{q} \bar{w}_\nu \) and \( \bar{w}_\nu = s_\nu b_\nu^{-1} s_\nu^{-1} \) is an elementary transform due to \( \nu \)-th layer.

Provided that each subset of \( q \) elementary layers is again stacked \( m \) times, then the matrix power \( w_m = [w_0]^m \) is used with the following transformation

\[ c_0 = w_0^m c_1. \tag{42} \]

Transformations equivalent to (27) - (42) can be written as

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
  c_i \\
  c_i
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
  w_{0,0} & w_{0,1} \\
  w_{1,0} & w_{1,1}
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
  c_i \\
  0
\end{pmatrix},
\tag{43}
\]

where \( c_i \) are the spatial harmonic coefficients of the source, \( c_i \) is a set of the spatial harmonic coefficients of reflected light, and \( c_i \) are the harmonic coefficients of transmitted light.

### A. Reflection and Transmission Coefficients

The major work-load in the above method falls on the calculation of the proper values and vectors \( (k_{\nu,\nu} \) and \( a_\nu \)) for each elementary layer. Once the values are obtained, the characteristic matrices of each layer are arranged as \( s_\nu b_\nu^{-1} s_\nu^{-1} \).

Introducing the transformations \( \rho_\nu c_\nu = c_\nu, \tau_\nu c_\nu = c_\nu \) (with initial values given by \( \tau_0 = i, \rho_0 = 0 \)), the matrices of spatial spectral reflectance and transmittance are defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau_{\nu-1} &= \left( w_{\nu,0} + w_{\nu,1} \rho_\nu \right) \left( w_{\nu,0}^* + w_{\nu,1}^* \rho_\nu \right)^{-1}, \\
\rho_{\nu-1} &= \tau_\nu \left( w_{\nu,0} + w_{\nu,1} \rho_\nu \right)^{-1},
\end{align*}
\tag{44}
\]

where the characteristic matrix is partitioned as \( \bar{w}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} w_{\nu,0} & w_{\nu,0}^* \\ w_{\nu,1}^* & w_{\nu,1} \end{pmatrix} \). The partitions are calculated using \( s_\nu \), which is a matrix with symmetrical partitions, \( s_\nu = s \begin{pmatrix} s_\nu \alpha, s_\nu \beta \end{pmatrix} \) with \( s_\nu \alpha = \frac{1}{2} (k_y^{-1} \gamma_y a_k k_{\nu,\nu} + a_\nu) \) and \( s_\nu \beta = \frac{1}{2} (k_y^{-1} \gamma_y a_k k_{\nu,\nu} - a_\nu) \) and a similar matrix \( s_\nu^{-1} = s \begin{pmatrix} s_\nu \alpha, s_\nu \beta \end{pmatrix} \) with \( s_\nu \alpha = \frac{1}{2} (k_y^{-1} a_k k_{\nu,\nu} + a_\nu^{-1}) \) and \( s_\nu \beta = \frac{1}{2} (k_y^{-1} a_k k_{\nu,\nu} - a_\nu^{-1}) \), then

\[
\begin{align*}
w_{\nu,0} &= s_{\nu,0} \beta_{\nu,0}^{-1} s_{\nu,0}^{-1} + s_{\nu,1} \beta_{\nu,1} s_{\nu,1}^{-1}, \\
w_{\nu,1} &= s_{\nu,1} \beta_{\nu,0}^{-1} s_{\nu,1}^{-1} + s_{\nu,0} \beta_{\nu,1} s_{\nu,0}^{-1}, \quad \text{and}
\end{align*}
\tag{45}
\]

Thus, for example, a single-layer structure is calculated as follows: \( \tau_0 = \left( w_{1,0} \right)^{-1}, \rho_0 = w_{1,0} \left( w_{1,0} \right)^{-1} \).

Then, the transmitted and reflected Bloch-Floquet waves are

\[ c_{1,1} = \tau_0 c_1, \quad c_{r,0} = \rho_0 c_1. \tag{46} \]

### B. A Simple Validation Test

A simplified 2D single-layer model for validating the simulation method is shown in Fig. 4a. The sample structure is intentionally made of a very thin metallic grating (with 10-nm thickness). The grating is arranged of 400-nm gold strips separated by narrow strips of silica, the period of the structure is 480 nm. The large aspect ratio of the metallic strips and a large electric resonance at a wavelength of about 1.2 micron are among the main challenges of the test model. To obtain a good set of reference data, the structure was simulated using a commercial software package with 5th-order finite elements. The validity of the FEM solution was verified by using the same model with different levels of additional meshing refinement and an adaptive solver. The results were stable upon the use of 41,000 degrees of freedom (field variables), where the bulk of the resources had been spent for the free-space buffer, non-reflecting lay-
ers and adequate meshing at the corners.

In contrast to FEM, the spatial harmonic analysis method appeared much more efficient. The problem was stabilized after the use of 11 eigenvalues with a calculation time of about 100 times less versus the FEM solver with the same number of wavelength points and the same computational hardware. It should be noted that the amount of simulation time using SHA is approximately proportional to the total number of elementary layers and scales approximately as the square (or cube) of the total number of eigenvalues in 2D (or 3D) problems, while the performance of FEM solvers decreases very moderately with increasing layers. Both models appeared to be quite sensitive to the material properties of the metal. In both cases, the interpolated complex refractive index was based on the experimental table of Johnson and Christy [19]. In addition to simple validation of the modeling approach, the test model of Fig. 4a reveals all typical features of the periodic structures with localized plasmonic resonances, e.g. at the same wavelength the electric resonance is always accompanied by a satellite magnetic antiresonance and vice versa.

As has been discussed in [5] and shown in equations (10) and (11), the effective refractive index $\pi_1$ and its effective impedance $\eta_1$ of a given elementary layer can be uniquely determined either experimentally or from simulations. Rewriting (10) as

$$\pi_1 = \frac{1}{\delta_1} \left\{ \arccos \frac{1 - \tau^2 + n_2 T^2}{1 + n_2 - (1 - n_2) \rho_t^2} \right\},$$

we can determine $\pi_1$, where $n_2$ is the refractive index of the thick substrate beyond the elementary layer, and $\tau$ and $T$ are the complex reflection and transmission coefficients of the propagating plane wave mode. In simulations $\tau$ and $T$ can be obtained from

$$\bar{\tau} = \langle \rho_0 \rangle_{\pi, \theta}, \quad \bar{T} = \langle \rho_0 \rangle_{\eta, \theta},$$

i.e., in essence by taking only the central terms of the transmission and reflection matrices. Then, the effective permittivity and the effective permeability are given by

$$\bar{\pi_1} = \pi_1 \eta_1, \quad \bar{\eta_1} = \pi_1 / \eta_1.$$

### C. Implementation Details for the 2D Case

Although the process of solving (24) is relatively simple for dielectric sub-wavelength gratings, a direct treatment of metallic sub-wavelength gratings is more difficult because of the much higher contrast in permittivity within the optical wavelength range.

The following steps are taken to alleviate the problem:
1) The Fourier transform of inverted permittivity

First, we take the following modification of (23)

\[ k^2 h_i + \varepsilon^{-1}_i \partial_y^2 h_i + \partial_y (\varepsilon^{-1}_i \partial_y h_i) = 0. \] (50)

Using \( h_i = v_0 (u_i c_{1,1} - u_i c_{1,1}) \) and \( \varepsilon^{-1}_i = w \gamma_i v^{-1} \)
we have

\[ v - v \gamma_i a_k^2 a_i^{-1} + (\partial_y v) \nu \gamma_i k_x = 0, \] (51)

or

\[ i - k \gamma_i k_y = \gamma_i a_k^2 a_i^{-1}. \] (52)

Finally, we can use the following version of (24)

\[ a_k^2 a_i^{-1} = \gamma_i^{-1} \left( i - k \gamma_i k_y \right), \] (53)

which provides stable convergence in the presence of metallic elements.

Moreover, in accord with (53) the Fourier transform of the inverted permittivity \( \gamma_i \) and its inverse \( \gamma_i^{-1} \) is used respectively in (28) and (30) instead of \( \gamma_i^{-1} \) and \( \gamma_i \).

2) Analytical calculation of the Fourier transform

In addition, along with the use of the inverted permittivity, the Fourier transformation \( \gamma_i \) in (25) is calculated analytically provided that \( \varepsilon_i (y) \) over the period \( l \) is a combination of homogeneous segments. Indeed, for any \( m > 0 \)

\[ \int e^{-ikm} dy = \frac{1}{ikm}, \]

thus for example, a term \( \gamma_i^{p,m} \) (at row \( p \) and column \( m \)) of the square matrix \( \gamma_i \) for the elementary layer in Fig. 4a, is given by

\[ (\varepsilon^{-1}_i + \varepsilon^{-1}_s) \frac{\sin [\kappa \pi (p - m)]}{\pi (p - m)} \text{ if } p \neq m, \]

\[ \kappa \varepsilon^{-1}_s + (1 - \kappa) \varepsilon^{-1}_s \text{ otherwise}, \] (54)

where \( \kappa = w/l \) is the metal filling factor and \( \varepsilon_s \) and \( \varepsilon_i \) is the permittivity of gold and silica, respectively.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

Both remedies built on (53) and (54) work well with metallic structures. For example, Fig. 5 shows the real and imaginary parts of the effective refractive index that is restored using the complex transmission and reflection coefficients at normal incidence [5]. (The geometry of the layer has been already shown in Fig. 4a.) Both real and imaginary parts of the refractive index are converging rapidly. Small features around 650 nm are suppressed only for \( m_{\text{max}} = 1 \), and both curves are quickly converging to their limits; starting from \( m_{\text{max}} = 9 \) the corresponding curves with larger \( m_{\text{max}} \) are overlapping.

In contrast, a direct application of the initial formulation (24) is of limited utility to the problem. We note that the transmission and reflection spectra demonstrate much slower convergence and substantial artifacts. For example, Fig. 6 depicts the results obtained from the problem of Fig. 4a using the initial eigenvalue formulation (24).

It is important to note that a convergence control should be implemented for the entire multilayer structure; otherwise insignificant modes of an elementary layer could be considerably enhanced due to additional resonances of coupled elementary layers.

Consider for example the real part of the refractive index, \( n' \), shown in Fig. 7a. The values of \( n' \) are restored from \( \pi \) and \( T \), which are calculated for a single layer depicted in the inset of Fig. 7a. There is no resonance within the selected 300-nm wavelength segment,
and the values of \( n' \) converge quickly starting from \( m_{\text{max}} = 6 \).

Now we take a triple-layer structure arranged of two identical elementary layers of Fig. 7a separated by a uniform 100-nm layer of silica. The structure exhibits an additional magnetic resonance within the selected wavelength range. As expected, this resonance, which appears due to additional near-field coupling between the metallic strips, requires taking into account an increased number of modes. The same level of relative error is now achieved starting from \( m_{\text{max}} > 10 \).

As a result, additional care is required for the accurate calculation of stacked substructures arranged of elementary layers and cascaded materials integrating different or identical multilayer substructures. It also follows from the analysis of equations (27)-(45) that:

(i) None of asymmetric multilayer composites can be effectively described either by the simplified homogenization approach (9)-(11), or through its generalized analog (30). (A multilayer composite is asymmetric if it contains an odd number of elementary layers and the layers are not mirror-symmetric relative to the central layer; all structures with an even number of distinct layers are always asymmetric).

(ii) Effective optical parameters (including an effective negative refractive index) obtained in a single symmetric sub-set of elementary layers may not guarantee the same effective parameters in a bulk material arranged of identical subsets, not merely because of absorptive losses but also due to new interactions of near-field waves introduced by the use of cascading.

Fig. 6. Real and imaginary part of the refractive index \((n' \text{ and } n'')\) vs. wavelength calculated using (24) for \( m_{\text{max}} = 61, 71, 81 \). Starting only from \( m_{\text{max}} = 71 \) the difference in the results are converging well to the asymptotic curves obtained using (53).

Fig. 7. The real part of the refractive index \((n')\) vs. wavelength. (a) \( n' \) calculated for a single layer structure shown in the inset for \( m_{\text{max}} = 1, 2 \ldots 10 \). Starting from \( m_{\text{max}} = 6 \) there is almost no difference in the curves, (b) \( n' \) calculated for a triple layer structure arranged from two identical layers of diagram (a) separated by a 100-nm uniform layer of silica. The inset depicts the triple-layer structure. Convergence to the same level of error begins starting from \( m_{\text{max}} = 10 \). Slower convergence is caused by an additional resonance due to strong near-field coupling between the layers.
To illustrate (i) consider a classical example of a sub-
structure with two homogeneous lossless layers
[[20], p. 72]. The characteristic matrix of two layers
with thicknesses \( \Delta_1 \) and \( \Delta_2 \), and indices \( n_i \) and \( \eta_i \), is computed as \( \mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_2 \), with \( \mathbf{w}_i = \mathbf{d}_i \mathbf{b}_i \mathbf{d}_i^{-1} \) and \( \mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{d}_2 \mathbf{b}_2 \mathbf{d}_2^{-1} \). The effective characteristic matrix
(\( \mathbf{w}_{\text{eff}} \)) of an equivalent single layer, which is defined as

\[
\mathbf{w}_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{w}^0_{\text{eff}} & \mathbf{w}^1_{\text{eff}} \\
\mathbf{w}^2_{\text{eff}} & \mathbf{w}^3_{\text{eff}}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
= \begin{pmatrix}
\cos n_{\text{eff}} k \delta & -\iota n_{\text{eff}} \sin n_{\text{eff}} k \delta \\
-\iota n_{\text{eff}} \sin n_{\text{eff}} k \delta & \cos n_{\text{eff}} k \delta
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(\( \mathbf{w}_{\text{eff}} \), \( \mathbf{w}^0_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{w}^3_{\text{eff}} \)) in (55). This is true
only if the product commutes, i.e. \( \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_i \), leav-
ing the only trivial case of \( n_1 = n_2 \) possible. Therefore,
even a simple stack of two distinct lossless films cannot
be adequately modeled by a single effective layer.

Now to exemplify (ii) consider a cascaded structure
arranged of identical symmetric substructures, then
\( \mathbf{w}_3 = \mathbf{d}_1 (\mathbf{b}_1^{-1} \mathbf{d}_2 \mathbf{b}_2^{-1} \mathbf{d}_2^{-1} \mathbf{b}_1^{-1}) \mathbf{d}_1^{-1} \) is not very simple even
for the structure with homogeneous elementary layers.

Now to exemplify (ii) consider a cascaded structure
arranged of identical symmetric substructures, then
\( \mathbf{w}_3 = s_{\text{eff}} \mathbf{b}_{\text{eff}} \mathbf{s}_{\text{eff}}^{-1} \), where \( \mathbf{b}_{\text{eff}} \) is a diagonal matrix of effective
eigenvalues and \( \mathbf{s}_{\text{eff}} \) is a matrix of effective eigenvectors.
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