

Transmission of light through quasiperiodic arrays of subwavelength holes

J. Bravo-Abad,¹ F.J. García-Vidal,¹ and L. Martín-Moreno²

¹*Departamento de Física Teórica de la Materia Condensada, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, E-28049 Madrid, Spain*

²*Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada, ICMA-CSIC, Universidad de Zaragoza, E-50009 Zaragoza, Spain*

(Dated: November 4, 2019)

In this work, we demonstrate that the phenomenon of extraordinary transmission of light previously found in periodic arrays of subwavelength holes also appears for quasiperiodic arrangements. We show that the resonant behavior is due to the excitation of leaky surface modes, much in the same way as in the ordered case.

PACS numbers: 78.66.Bz, 42.25.Bs, 41.20.Jb, 73.20.Mf

The phenomenon of extraordinary optical transmission (EOT) through periodic two-dimensional (2D) arrays of subwavelength holes milled in a metallic film¹ has sparked a great deal of interest due to both its fundamental implications and its broad range of potential applications. Subsequent experimental and theoretical studies have shown that EOT phenomena also appears in one-dimensional (1D) periodic arrays of slits^{2,3}, single subwavelength apertures surrounded by periodic corrugations^{4,5,6,7} and 1D arrays of holes⁸.

In this paper it is shown that resonant EOT also appears in quasiperiodic distributions of subwavelength holes, a system without periodicity but with long-range order. A complete analysis is done by comparing the transmission properties of finite Penrose lattices of holes with the ones obtained for square arrays and for random arrangements of holes. The picture that emerges from this theoretical study is that, as in the case of periodic arrays^{9,10,11}, the physical origin of EOT in quasiperiodic structures relies on the excitation of surface modes decorating the metallic interfaces.

Throughout the paper the metal will be treated as perfect (i.e. with dielectric constant $\epsilon = -\infty$), which is a good approximation in both microwave and THz regimes. In the optical regime, it is found that this approximation still has a semi-quantitative value, provided that the penetration of the electromagnetic (EM) fields into the metal is taken into account by enlarging the radius of the holes^{12,13}. In all calculations presented here, the hole radius always has its nominal value so the results are applicable to different frequency regimes, just by scaling all length scales by the same factor. In order to calculate the scattering properties and EM field distributions, we use a formalism based on a modal expansion of the fields at the hole openings⁸, which allows treating efficiently large numbers of indentations, arbitrarily placed in a metal film.

Figure 1 shows the three different types of hole arrangements considered in this work. Left, center and right panels correspond to a periodic square lattice, a Penrose lattice and a random distribution of circular holes, respectively. In all cases rendered in Fig. 1 the number of holes is $N = 636$. The coordinates in the Penrose lattice were generated by the Dual Generalized




FIG. 1: (color on-line) (a-c) Structures considered in this work. Square (left), Penrose (center) and random lattices (right). (d) Transmission (T) spectra for: ordered case (broken line), Penrose lattice (continuous line) and a random configuration (dots). In all three cases, $a = 130$ nm, $h = 170$ nm and $N = 636$. T is normalized to the one obtained for N independent holes. The left inset shows the normalized-to-area transmission spectrum for a single hole. The right inset shows the dependence with N for T at resonant peaks $\lambda = 500$ nm (dots) and $\lambda = 585$ nm (squares).

Method^{14,15}, being the length of the rhombus side defining the structure $d = 600$ nm. The ordered structure is a circular portion of a square lattice, with lattice parameter $P = 562$ nm, chosen so that the external radius of the circular array is the same as in the quasiperiodic case. In the disordered case, N holes are placed in the same external radius, randomly but without allowing any interhole distance to be smaller than the minimum one found in

the quasiperiodic case.

Figure 1d shows the corresponding optical transmission spectra evaluated at normal incidence, for hole radius $a = 130\text{nm}$ and thickness of the metal film $h = 170\text{nm}$. These are typical values for experiments in the optical regime and will be used for all calculations presented here. The transmittance for the collection of N holes is normalized to N times the normalized-to-area transmission through a single circular hole T_0 (shown in the left inset of Fig. 1d), i.e., by the transmittance expected for a set of N independent holes. As expected for a sub-wavelength hole, T_0 is a smooth, strongly decreasing function of the wavelength. In the ordered case (broken curve), the transmittance spectra is also smooth, with values close to those of independent holes ($T/(NT_0) \approx 1$), except close to the resonant peak appearing at $\lambda = 575\text{nm}$, when T is enhanced by a factor of ≈ 13 . This is the canonical EOT peak, appearing at a resonant wavelength slightly larger than the lattice parameter. Remarkably, resonant transmission also appears when holes are arranged in a Penrose lattice (continuous curve in Fig. 1). In this case, transmission enhancements of about 3 and 5 are obtained at the resonant

wavelengths $\lambda = 500\text{nm}$ and $\lambda = 585\text{nm}$, respectively. However, EOT does not appear for any distribution with a large number of holes: the transmission spectra for the random array (dotted curve in Fig. 1) does not show any resonant feature. This is just a representative example of disordered arrays; we have generated several random configurations finding always the same non-resonant behavior.

The appearance of EOT can be related to the lattice structure in reciprocal space, extending arguments borrowed from the ordered case to different lattices, as follows. Following Ref. [8], the EM fields in all space can be expressed in terms of the modal amplitudes of the cavity modes right at the opening and the exit of the different holes ($E_\alpha(\mathbf{R})$ and $E'_\alpha(\mathbf{R})$, respectively, with \mathbf{R} referring to the 2D array locations and α running over the modes inside the holes). These quantities can, in turn, be obtained by solving a coupled system of equations. In order to find the link between EOT and the structure factor of a given set of holes, $S(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{R}} \exp(-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R})$, it is convenient to work with the Fourier components $E_\alpha(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{R}} \exp(-i\mathbf{q}\mathbf{R})E_\alpha(\mathbf{R})$, which satisfy,

$$\begin{aligned} -\epsilon_n E_n(\mathbf{q}) + \sum_m \int d\mathbf{k} G_{mn;\mathbf{k}} S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}) E_m(\mathbf{k}) - G_n^V E'_n(\mathbf{q}) &= I_n S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}_0) \\ -\epsilon_n E'_n(\mathbf{q}) + \sum_m \int d\mathbf{k} G_{mn;\mathbf{k}} S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}) E'_m(\mathbf{k}) - G_n^V E_n(\mathbf{q}) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The expression for the different quantities can be straightforwardly obtained from the ones given in Ref. [8]. Although their exact form is inessential here, the following points regarding their structure are relevant for the discussion. External illumination originates $I_n S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}_0)$, \mathbf{k}_0 being the in-plane component of the incident wavevector. The term ϵ_n is related to the bouncing back and forth of EM fields inside the hole while G_n^V couples the input and exit sides; these quantities show no dependence on parallel momentum, \mathbf{k} , as they do not couple modes in different holes. The integral $\int d\mathbf{k} G_{mn;\mathbf{k}} S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}) E_m(\mathbf{k})$ represents the scattering process that couples $E_n(\mathbf{q})$ to the continuum $E_m(\mathbf{k})$, the momentum difference being provided by the lattice through $S(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k})$. The amplitude of the process depends on $G_{mn;\mathbf{k}}$ which, apart from the overlap between cavity modes m and n , contains two terms: one arising from coupling to s-polarized modes in vacuum, proportional to $k_z(\vec{k}) = \sqrt{g^2 - |\vec{k}|^2}$ (with $g = \omega/c$) and another from the coupling to p-polarized modes, going as $1/k_z(\vec{k})$, therefore diverging whenever a diffraction wave goes glancing. An important property for what follows is that $G_{mn;\mathbf{k}}$ is a real number whenever \mathbf{k} corresponds to an evanescent

plane wave in vacuum and purely imaginary if it corresponds to a radiative mode. For subwavelength holes, ϵ_n and G_n^V are real quantities.

In order to illustrate the mathematics of the formation of surface modes, let us consider the simpler system of the same collection of holes but perforated on a semi-infinite structure. This system is governed by the first equation in (1), setting $G_n^V = 0$ (i.e. no coupling to the exit metal surface). Additionally, we consider normal incidence and assume that only one cavity mode couples directly to external to radiation (say mode $\alpha = 0$). Then, the amplitude for this mode is $E_0(0) = I_0 (G_{00;0} - \epsilon_0 - \Sigma_0)^{-1}$, where Σ_0 reflects the re-illumination onto the zero-order Fourier component after coupling with diffraction modes, being

$$\Sigma_0 = \sum_{\beta} \int d\mathbf{k} G_{0\beta;\mathbf{k}} G_{\beta 0;-\mathbf{k}} S(\mathbf{k}) S(-\mathbf{k}) / (G_{\beta\beta;\mathbf{k}} - \epsilon_{\beta}) \quad (2)$$

where the integral excludes $\mathbf{k} = 0$.

It is clear from Eq.(2) that Σ_0 is amplified at wavelengths such that the 2D-Fourier components with large structure factors go glancing, reflecting the fact that $G_{0\beta;\mathbf{k}}$ presents an (integrable) divergence. Correspond-




FIG. 2: (color) Structure factor of the three structures shown in Figs. 1(a)-(c). Panels (a),(b), and (c) correspond to the periodic, quasiperiodic and random cases, respectively. In (a) and (b), the vectors associated to the formation of the surface EM mode in the periodic and quasiperiodic arrangements are shown.

ingly, the field at the surface (i.e. $E_0(0)$) is very small. The crucial point is that, due to its rapid variation close to the divergences, at some wavelength slightly larger than the one corresponding to glancing angle, Σ_0 , a real quantity, cancels the term ϵ_0 , leading to a resonant behavior in $E_0(0)$. Notice that $G_{00;0}$ being a pure imaginary number is not canceled and sets the maximum enhancement attainable. In the usual way, this resonant denominator can be assigned to the excitation of a leaky surface mode. Importantly, this mode appears through the coupling to p-polarized modes, closely resembling the EM fields of surface plasmons in a real metal. Due to that, these modes are usually called *spoof* surface plasmons emerging when the surface of a perfect conductor is periodically corrugated^{16,17}. A more detailed analysis on the formation of these surface modes is given below.

The arguments presented above can be easily extended to the case of hole arrays drilled on a metal film. The main effect is that the presence of the term G_n^V now couples the surface modes present at both sides of the film, as has been analyzed in the case of ordered arrays^{8,9}. The conditions described before at for which $E_0(0)$ (and now $E'_0(0)$) is small correspond to deep minima in the transmittance (the Wood's anomalies observed in ordered arrays¹). The conditions for which $E_0(0)$ and $E'_0(0)$ are resonant, lead to resonant zero-order transmittance.

In the case of disordered arrays, and due to the coupling to the continuum of diffraction modes, no surface modes and correspondingly no transmission resonances are expected. However, for the Penrose lattice, resonant transmission is predicted at wavelengths slightly larger than those corresponding to the wavevectors \vec{b}_1 ($\lambda_1 = 566nm$) and \vec{b}_2 ($\lambda_2 = 483nm$), which is in full agreement with the transmission peaks found in Fig. 1. Notice that, in the quasiperiodic case, there is not a minimum wavevector for diffraction (i.e. the Fourier transform in Fig. 2b is non-zero for wavevectors with modulus smaller than $|\vec{b}_1|$). This results in diffraction onto ad-

ditional propagating modes in vacuum (other than the zero-order mode), which leads to resonant peaks smaller than those in the ordered case. This is also why system is more resonant close to λ_2 than to λ_1 . In the latter case, the diffraction order corresponding to \vec{b}_2 is a propagating one, decreasing the lifetime of the EM field in the resonant channel.

Work on the transmittance through quasiperiodic arrays of holes in *real* metals, and the role of surface plasmons could be of interest. However, the arguments and conclusions reported in this paper should also apply, realizing that, for a given wavelength, in real metals the divergence of $G_{mn\mathbf{k}}$ occurs not at $k_z = 0$ (as for perfect conductors) but for k -values satisfying the surface plasmon dispersion relation. This explains why *minima* in the transmission through periodic hole arrays occur at wavelengths dictated by the folding of the bands of surface plasmons of a *flat* surface (no holes), with resonant peaks appearing at slightly larger wavelengths¹¹.

Up to here we have considered the case of \mathbf{k}_0 corresponding to a radiative mode. But the same arguments can be applied to analyze the possible existence of non-radiative surface modes in periodic and non-periodic systems. For this we could consider illuminating the system with an evanescent wave with a 2D wavevector \mathbf{k}_{inc} . The argument would be as before, but replacing $G_{00;0}$ by $G_{00;\mathbf{k}_{inc}}$, which now would be a real number, as corresponds to an evanescent wave. Therefore, in ordered systems, Σ_0 can cancel the denominator defining $E_0(\mathbf{k}_{inc})$, leading to divergences in $E_0(\mathbf{k}_{inc})$ for infinitesimally small $I_0(\mathbf{k}_{inc})$. This signals the existence of non-radiative *spoof* surface plasmons in ordered arrays¹⁶. In the quasiperiodic case, the coupling with small \mathbf{k} diffraction waves will prevent the existence of pure surface modes, but still *spoof* plasmons with small leakage (long propagation length) are expected at wavelengths slightly larger than those corresponding to $2\pi/|\vec{b}_1|$.

The fact that surface modes are involved in EOT in




FIG. 3: (color) Transmission per hole (normalized to the single hole transmission) displayed in a color scale for (a) ordered case evaluated at $\lambda = 575\text{nm}$, (b) Penrose lattice at $\lambda = 500\text{nm}$ and (c) Penrose lattice at $\lambda = 585\text{nm}$. The number of holes for the two structures is 636 and the geometrical parameters are the same as in Figure 1.

quasiperiodic systems does not mean that the transmission per hole is uniform. This is illustrated in Fig. 3, which renders the transmission per hole in a Penrose lattice of $N = 636$ holes at the two resonant wavelengths ($\lambda = 500\text{nm}$ and $\lambda = 585\text{nm}$ in panels (b) and (c) of Figure 3, respectively). For comparison, panel (a) of Fig. 3 shows the corresponding distribution for the ordered array at the resonant wavelength 575nm . In all three cases, incident \mathbf{E} -field is pointing along the x -direction. In the ordered case, due to finite size effects, the maximum transmission is located at the center of the structure¹⁸. In the quasiperiodic arrangements, the transmission-per-hole distribution presents a completely different pattern: it is far from being uniform, showing the appearance of some holes with high transmission (*hot-spots*). Interestingly, in the Penrose lattice, for a given resonant wavelength hot spots show similar local environment. However, the existence of hot spots does not mean that EOT in quasiperiodic systems is dominated by very localized resonant configurations of holes. Calculations (not shown here) on finite clusters of holes centered at the hot spots

show an increase of transmittance as a function of number of neighbors included in the cluster. This point is reinforced by the fact that the resonant peaks observed in the transmission spectra of finite Penrose lattices do not saturate for small N values (see right inset of Fig. 1). Both these results are consistent with the interpretation based on extended leaky surface modes described above.

In conclusion, we have shown that resonant transmission of light can be found in quasiperiodic distributions of subwavelength holes in a metallic film. We have demonstrated that the resonant features observed in the transmission spectra can be explained in terms of the formation of surface EM modes at the interfaces of the metal film. Furthermore, we have linked the formation of these modes to the structure factor of the hole arrays, enabling the understanding of the appearance of extraordinary optical transmission in more general conditions.

Financial support by the Spanish MCyT under grant BES-2003-0374 and contract MAT2005-06608-C02, and the EC under project FP6-NMP4-CT-2003-505699 is gratefully acknowledged.

¹ T.W. Ebbesen *et al.*, Nature **391**, 667 (1998).

² U. Schroter and D. Heitmann, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 15419 (1998).

³ J.A. Porto, F.J. García-Vidal, and J.B. Pendry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2845 (1999).

⁴ H.J. Lezec *et al.*, Science **297**, 820 (2002).

⁵ A.P. Hibbins, J.R. Sambles, and C.R. Lawrence, Appl. Phys. Lett. **81**, 4661 (2002).

⁶ M.J. Lockyear *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **84**, 2040 (2004).

⁷ S.S. Akarca-Biyikli, I. Bulu, and E. Ozbay, Appl. Phys. Lett. **85** 1098 (2004).

⁸ J. Bravo-Abad, F.J. García-Vidal, and L. Martín-Moreno,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 227401 (2004).

⁹ L. Martín-Moreno *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1114 (2001).

¹⁰ W.L. Barnes *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 107401 (2004).

¹¹ P. Lalanne, J.C. Rodier, and J.P. Hugonin, J. Opt. A Pure and Appl. Opt. **8**, 422 (2005).

¹² L. Martín-Moreno and F.J. García-Vidal, Opt. Express **12**, 3619 (2004).

¹³ R. Gordon and A. Brolo, Opt. Express **13**, 1933 (2005).

¹⁴ D. Levine and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 596 (1986).

¹⁵ D. A. Rabson, N. D. Mermin, D. S. Rokhsar and D. C. Wright, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 699 (1991).

- ¹⁶ J. B. Pendry, L. Martín-Moreno, and F.J. García-Vidal, Science **305**, 847 (2004).
- ¹⁷ F.J. García-Vidal, L. Martín-Moreno, and J. B. Pendry, J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt. **7**, S97 (2005).
- ¹⁸ J. Bravo-Abad *et al.*, Nature Physics **2**, 120 (2006).