

**Comment on “Far-field microscopy with a nanometer-scale
resolution based on the in-plane image magnification by surface
plasmon polaritons”**

Aurélien Drezet,* Andreas Hohenau, and Joachim R. Krenn

Institute of Physics, Karl-Franzens University,

Universitätsplatz 5, A-8010 Graz, Austria

(Dated: October 29, 2018)

arXiv:1002.0750v1 [physics.optics] 3 Feb 2010

*Electronic address: aurelien.drezet@uni-graz.at

Recently, Smolyaninov *et al.* [1] reported the realization of a 2D sub-wavelength resolution microscope using surface plasmon polaritons (SPP) propagating on a gold film bounded by the glass substratum and a glycerin droplet [1-3]. The main idea of [1] is that SPPs should, for a laser wavelength λ_0 of 500 nm, have a very short wavelength of $\lambda_{\text{SPP}} \simeq 70$ nm which implies an ultimate resolution of $\lambda_{\text{SPP}}/2 \simeq 35$ nm. We disagree on the conclusions of [1] because the SPP wavelength is too large and their propagation length too small to enable the described in-plane imaging process. Indeed, the claims in [1] are based on the assumption that the SPP modes confined on a gold metal film are described by an effective Drude model (see Fig. 1 of [1,2]) requiring precise compensation of the imaginary parts in the denominator of Eq. 1 of [1] (Eq. 1 supposes $\lambda_{\text{SPP}} \ll \lambda_0$ and $\epsilon_{\text{gold}} \simeq -\epsilon_d$). However their analysis here is questionable since in a real metal (see [4]) losses modify fundamentally the ideal SPP dispersion relations considered in [1]. In order to show that we calculated numerically the dispersion relation for SPPs confined on a 50 nm thick film as used in [1,2,3]. Fig. 1 clearly reveals two bound SPP modes which are highly damped in the optical region $\lambda_0 \simeq 500$ nm. As visible in Fig. 1a the SPP wavelength ($= 2\pi/\text{Re}\{K_{\text{SPP}}\}$) at such λ_0 takes values centered at 250 nm to 300 nm while the propagation lengths ($L_{\text{SPP}} = 1/(2\text{Im}\{K_{\text{SPP}}\})$) reach values between 40 and 250 nm (see Fig. 1b). These values agree with similar theoretical [5,6] and experimental [7] analysis but disagree completely with the interpretation presented in [1]. Therefore the explanation of the image formation in Fig. 2 of [1] cannot be considered as correct. Furthermore one can easily see that with such a wavelength and propagation length SPPs can not be used to resolve nanoholes separated by 40 nm as claimed in [1] (see Figs. 3,4 of [1]). Reducing the film thickness could not solve the problem. Indeed, λ_{SPP} and L_{SPP} (of one given SPP mode) decrease in parallel monotonously (e. g., $\lambda_{\text{SPP}} = 150$ nm and $L_{\text{SPP}} = 20$ nm for 20 nm thick films) [6]. Such SPPs are clearly non-propagative ($L_{\text{SPP}} < \lambda_{\text{SPP}}$) and primarily represent a channel for ohmic losses and scattering. There is no hope in such conditions to justify high resolution by an hypothetical “mode coupling” mechanism [1,2] called to transfer the local information from SPPs to guided waves in the glycerin as L_{SPP} is simply too small. The additional high-resolution imaging mechanisms based on the properties of SPP Bloch waves with short wavelengths suggested in [2, 8] do not appear more convincing since i) it can not justify the result presented in Fig. 2 of [1] where only few holes are involved, and ii) it should imply an unjustified increase of L_{SPP} by 2 or 3 orders of magnitude necessary for the SPP to travel through the hole arrays of Figs. 3,4 of

[1]. Outside the array, the SPPs still follow the dispersion relation of the unperturbed film and therefore have to be excluded from the image formation, due to their low propagation length.



- [1] I. I. Smolyaninov, J. Elliott, A. Zayats, C. C. Davis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 057401 (2005).
- [2] I. I. Smolyaninov, J. Opt. **A7**, S165 (2005).
- [3] I. I. Smolyaninov, C. C. Davis, J. Elliott, A. Zayats, Opt. Lett. **30**, 382 (2005).
- [4] P. B. Johnson and R. W. Christy, Phys. Rev. **B6** 4370 (1972).
- [5] A. Hohenau *et al.* , Opt. Lett. **30**, 893 (2005).
- [6] J. J. Burke, G. I. Stegeman, T. Tamir, Phys. Rev. **B33** 5186 (1986).
- [7] J. T. van Wijngaarden *et al.*, Appl. Phys. Lett. **88**, 221111 (2006).
- [8] I. I. Smolyaninov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **B72**, 085442 (2005).




figure 1

Caption for figure1:

(color online) Dispersion relation for bound SPPs propagating on a 50 nm thick gold film (medium 1) surrounded by glass (medium 2) and glycerin (medium 0). (a) shows the dispersion for the real part of the SPP wavevectors while (b) shows the imaginary part. The red and blue curves correspond to the two bound modes (see inset in (b) for the tangential magnetic field profiles). The green and magenta curves show the dispersion for SPPs bound at single interfaces gold/glass and gold/glycerin, respectively. The horizontal black lines show the range of frequency used in [1,2,3]. The light lines for glass (continuous) and glycerin (dashed) are included in (a).