

13 Refractive index sensing based on localized surface plasmon (LSPR) resonances is to become an
14 important method for the detection of very few or single molecules bound to a surface. It employs small
15 metal particles whose free electron plasma is excited resonantly and creates a tightly confined electrical
16 field near the surface of the particle. The resonance frequency is strongly dependent on the refractive
17 index within the modal volume of the particle. The latter, being 1000 times smaller than the diffraction
18 limit, provides the sensitivity for small dielectric objects down to single molecules. LSPR's have been
19 used to detect changes in bulk refractive index as well as growing dielectric layers on single particles [1-
20 3]. Overviews on their use in biosensing can be found in [4] and [5]. Despite the potential for label free
21 single molecule sensing, no experiments in this direction have been published yet. Single molecule
22 binding events have been detected by labeling molecules with metal particles to increase the refractive
23 index contrast [6].

24 To measure the performance of plasmonic resonators two quantities are mainly used. The first is the
25 sensitivity s defined as the frequency shift $\Delta\omega$ upon a change in the bulk refractive index around the
26 resonator Δn .

$$27 \quad s = \Delta\omega/\Delta n \quad (1)$$

28 To reach the highest possible sensitivity optimization of particle size and shape has to be done. Many
29 experimental studies have been devoted to this goal, e.g.[7-9]. To compare the sensing capabilities of
30 different resonators, a second measure for the performance, the figure of merit (FOM) was introduced by
31 Sherry et al. given as the sensitivity upon a bulk refractive index change divided by the line width of the
32 resonance Γ [9].

$$33 \quad FOM_{Classic} = s/\Gamma \quad (2)$$

34 Compared to the wealth of experimental studies how to optimize the sensitivity or the FOM only few
35 results exist on the theoretical side. Miller and Lazarides [10] developed a theory for the sensitivity of
36 plasmonic resonators to bulk refractive index changes, based on a quasistatic approximation and a

37 linearization of the permittivity function. They find that the sensitivity is linearly increasing with the
 38 wavelength of the resonance. Otte et. al. speculated from numerical simulations and experiments that the
 39 FOM coincides with the ratio of real part to imaginary part of the metals dielectric function [11]. In our
 40 previous work [12] we showed that a more general FOM can be derived directly from an expression of
 41 the detectability of a change in refractive index from a noisy signal. It contains the classical FOM_{Classisc}
 42 by Sherry et. al. as a special case for a specific experimental situation and analyte. Starting from this
 43 FOM it is natural to ask for limits of optimization. It is the purpose of this paper to elaborate these limits
 44 in a closed form and to investigate their origin. The paper is structured as follows: First the sensitivity in
 45 the quasistatic case is derived from first order perturbation theory. Then the limits of the sensitivity are
 46 discussed, using known relations [13], yielding remarkably simple expressions. The results are used to
 47 derive the general FOM in the quasistatic case. The following discussion reveals that the classical FOM
 48 of Sherry et. al. is solely determined by the resonance wavelength of the resonator. The case of single
 49 molecule detection is investigated next. Optimum resonance wavelength and resonator shape are derived
 50 from the general FOM.

51 In [12] we derived a perturbative expression for the sensitivity s of a plasmonic resonator:

$$52 \quad s = \frac{\Delta\omega}{\Delta n} = -\frac{\omega}{n} C \quad (3)$$

53 Here the confinement factor C is given by

$$54 \quad C = \frac{\int \epsilon \vec{E}^2 dV}{\int_{AllSpace} \epsilon \vec{E}^2 dV} \quad (4)$$

55 Where \vec{E} is the electrical field, ϵ the permittivity as a function of position and the upper integral is
 56 carried out over the volume of the refractive index change while the integral in the denominator is
 57 carried out over all space. In the nondissipative, nondispersive and nonradiating case, C can be
 58 interpreted as the energy confinement to the analyte volume. This gives an intuitive view on the
 59 sensitivity: the relative frequency shift equals the relative refractive index contrast times the fraction of

60 the total energy contained within the analyte volume. The assumption of a nondispersive medium
 61 however does not hold in the visible. Here the frequency dependence of the permittivity of the resonator
 62 has to be taken into account in addition to the change induced by an external refractive index
 63 perturbation. This is especially important for quasi-static resonances, where the resonance condition is
 64 intimately connected to the resonators permittivity (see [14] denominator of equation 5.32):

$$65 \quad 3\varepsilon_A + L(\varepsilon_M - \varepsilon_A) = 0 \quad (5)$$

66 Here ε_A is the permittivity of the ambient ε_M the permittivity of the metal and L is a shape parameter
 67 which is 1/3 for a sphere. This case can be covered by perturbation theory as well. To do so, a
 68 permittivity perturbation which accounts for both the change of the permittivity upon binding of an
 69 analyte and the change of permittivity of the resonator upon frequency changes is used:

$$70 \quad \Delta\tilde{\varepsilon} = \Delta\varepsilon + \frac{\partial\varepsilon}{\partial\omega}\Delta\omega \quad (6)$$

71 Some algebraic manipulation then leads to the expression for the sensitivity

$$72 \quad s = \frac{\Delta\omega}{\Delta n} = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} \frac{\int_{V_s} \varepsilon \vec{E}^2 dV}{\int_{AllSpace} \varepsilon \vec{E}^2 dV + \int_{AllSpace} \frac{\partial\omega\varepsilon}{\partial\omega} \vec{E}^2 dV} = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} \tilde{C} \quad (7)$$

73 with has a similar form as the previous expression eq. (3) but the C in is replaced by \tilde{C} which contains
 74 now also the resonators dispersion and an additional factor 2. The case of a nondispersive resonator is
 75 contained as a special case in this equation.

76 Now we consider a quasistatic resonance. In this case it was shown[13] that $\int_{AllSpace} \varepsilon \vec{E}^2 dV = 0$ and eq. (7)

77 simplifies to

$$78 \quad s_{Static} = \frac{\Delta\tilde{\omega}_{Static}}{\Delta n} = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} \frac{\int_{V_s} \varepsilon \vec{E}^2 dV}{\int_{AllSpace} \frac{\partial\omega\varepsilon}{\partial\omega} \vec{E}^2 dV} = -2 \frac{\Delta n}{n} C_{static} \quad (8)$$

79 Since in the quasistatic approximation all fields have the same phase $\vec{E}^2 = \vec{E}\vec{E}^*$ and C_{static} is an
80 expression for the ratio of energy stored in the analyte volume to energy stored in the entire near field .
81 The expression in the integral in the denominator of (8) is the energy density in a dispersive medium
82 [15]. In contrast to the energy interpretation of eq. (4) the quasi-static frequency shift of a dispersive
83 resonator is a factor of two stronger. This effect can be understood as a positive feedback from the
84 resonators dispersion. When the frequency decreases, the permittivity of the resonator decreases as well
85 and thus the electric field is pushed out of the resonator which leads to an additional shift.
86 The quasistatic sensitivity s_{Static} from Eq. (8) can now be expressed as the sensitivity for a bulk change in
87 refractive index times a weighting factor f .

$$88 \quad s_{\text{Static}} = s_{\text{Bulk}} f(\vec{r}_A, V_A) = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} C_{\text{Bulk}} f(\vec{r}_A, V_A) \quad (9)$$

89 where $0 < f < 1$, and f is a function of analyte position and analyte volume given by

$$90 \quad f = \frac{\int_{V_a} \epsilon \vec{E}^2 dV}{\int_{\text{Dielectric}} \epsilon \vec{E}^2 dV} \quad (10)$$

91 With this expression two effects can be separated. First the previous results for bulk changes in
92 refractive index are contained for $f = 1$. Second the effect of different non-bulk analytes is separated and
93 contained only in f . For s_{Bulk} remarkably simple expressions hold and will be derived now.

94 We denote the energy in the dielectric U_d and the energy in the metal U_m . Since C_{bulk} is an expression
95 for the ratio of energy U_d stored in the dielectric to the energy stored in the whole nearfield it can be cast
96 to

$$97 \quad C_{\text{bulk}} = \frac{U_d}{U_m + U_d} = \frac{1}{1 + U_m / U_d} \quad (11)$$

98 For their ratio U_m / U_d an analytical result was derived in[13]:

$$99 \quad U_m / U_d = - \frac{d(\omega \epsilon')}{d\omega} \bigg/ \epsilon' \quad (12)$$

100 where ϵ' is the real part of the permittivity of the metal. it is known that this ratio is always greater than
 101 one [13]. With this result the quasistatic sensitivity can be finally written as

$$102 \quad s_{Static} = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} C_{Bulk} f(\vec{r}_A, V_A) = -2 \frac{\omega}{n} \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon' - \frac{d(\omega\epsilon')}{d\omega}} f(\vec{r}_A, V_A) \quad (13)$$

103 This expression can be compared to the results of Miller and Lazarides [10]. Inserting their linear
 104 approximation for the metal permittivity into (13) gives the same result as they obtained (equation 18 in
 105 [10]), which shows that their theory is contained in ours as a special case.

106 Since U_m/U_d is always greater than one, a limit on the bulk sensitivity is found

$$107 \quad |s_{Static}| \ll \frac{\omega}{n} \quad (14)$$

108 Since f is always smaller than one, this is an inherent limit for the sensitivity of a quasistatic resonator
 109 and the derivation clearly shows its origin: the sensitivity is a function of the ratio of energy stored in the
 110 analyte volume to the energy stored in the metal resonator and this ratio is limited to values smaller than
 111 one. Interestingly the same limit applies to nondispersive, e.g. Fabry Perot resonators. Here C can in
 112 principle be one if the volume of the whole resonator is accessible for refractive index changes but due
 113 to the absence of dispersion the sensitivity is only half which leads to the same limit.

114 Now that we have an expression for the sensitivity we can continue to find an expression for the FOM
 115 which reflects the true ability to detect a binding event. The general FOM for resonator optimization as
 116 derived in our previous work [12] is the ratio of frequency shift induced by a binding event and the
 117 uncertainty with which this shift can be measured. It is given by

$$118 \quad FOM = \frac{s}{\Gamma} \sigma^\alpha = \frac{\omega}{\Gamma} C \sigma^\alpha = QC \sigma^\alpha \quad (15)$$

119 It does contain not only the sensitivity. but also an expression how accurate frequency shifts can be
 120 measured. From this expression the line width Γ and the cross section σ enter the FOM. The expression
 121 ω/Γ is identified as the quality factor Q which is given by [16]. The influence of the scattering or
 122 absorption cross section σ depends on the dominating type of noise in the instrument, yielding different

123 values for α in each case ($0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$). Q in the quasistatic approximation can be expressed solely in
124 terms of the permittivity of the metal at resonance [13]

$$125 \quad Q_{Static} = \frac{\omega \partial \epsilon' / \partial \omega}{2\epsilon''} \quad (16)$$

126 Inserting this expression and the expression for C_{Static} , equation (13) into eq (15) the FOM in the
127 quasistatic limit becomes

$$128 \quad FOM_{Static} = -\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon''} f(\vec{r}_A, V_A) \sigma^\alpha \quad (17)$$

129 The classical FOM of Sherry et al. which is often used to compare different resonators [9] is obtained by
130 $f=1$ and $\alpha=0$. In this case we obtain the simple result

$$131 \quad FOM_{Classical} = -\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon''} \quad (18)$$

132 This is one of the most important results of this paper. It shows that in the quasistatic limit and for bulk
133 changes in refractive index the FOM is already given when the resonance wavelength of the resonator
134 and the material is chosen. It has been argued before based on results from numerical simulations that
135 the ratio of real part to imaginary part of the metal permittivity has the same spectral dependence than
136 the FOM [11]. This is put on a solid ground here and our result shows that it completely determines the
137 FOM in this special case. One could now ask how the FOM behaves when deviations from the
138 quasistatic regime occur. Since the sensing happens in the nearfield and the nearfield is always
139 quasistatic[16] deviations will first appear as additional radiation damping which lowers Q . As a result
140 equation (18) can be regarded as an upper limit for the FOM. This might be different for hybrid modes
141 which are not confined to the metal surface but since these modes are photonic in nature they will be
142 governed by the diffraction limit. As a consequence they might be superior for sensing of changes in
143 bulk refractive index, but not for the sensing of events that happen at the surface of the metal resonator
144 since their spatial confinement to the surface will be poor.


145 Our derivation shows that for bulk changes in refractive index no further optimisation beside choosing
146 for each metal the optimum resonance frequency is possible. For smaller analytes it is still possible to

147 optimize s and the FOM by changing the size of the resonator relative to the analyte size. It was shown
 148 in our previous work, that the scaling and optimization of the FOM with resonator size depends on the
 149 type of noise in the optical instrument and the size and shape of the analyte. The scaling is now given by
 150 the geometric scaling of f and σ and all previously derived scaling laws are still true. Generally the FOM
 151 scales with a linear size of the resonator r_R as

$$152 \quad FOM(r_R) \propto f(r_R)\sigma(r_R) \propto r^\beta \quad (19)$$

153 The exponent β is given from table 1 in [12].

154 One of the most interesting sensing cases is the detection of a single molecule binding to the surface of
 155 the resonator. It will now be discussed which optimization options remain for this case. We assume that
 156 by a suitable light source in the experimental setup the signal can be made large enough to neglect
 157 background noise and scattering is measured. The remaining noise sources [12] are then signal noise, i.e.
 158 noise associated with the counting statistics of the detection process and instrument noise, i.e. random
 159 fluctuations of the resonance spectrum. The latter gives a $\beta = -3$ while the former gives $\beta = 0$. This
 160 means that in the signal noise regime the FOM is independent of the resonator size and otherwise it is
 161 advantageous to make the resonator as small as possible (provided one never reaches the background
 162 noise level). Additionally the confinement factor f can be increased by introducing a sharp tip to the
 163 resonator where the field is concentrated.



164

165 Fig. 1. The classical FOM and the wavelength dependent part of the FOM for signal noise and scattering
166 measurements (FOM_I) as a function of wavelength. Since FOM_I depends on the cross section it is scaled
167 to make it comparable with the classical FOM.

168 As was shown in eq. (17) the wavelength dependence of the FOM is determined by the permittivity of
169 the metal times the scaling of the cross section with wavelength. For instrument noise the cross section
170 does not enter the expression because only the maximum achievable resonance shift matters, and the
171 wavelength scaling reduces to eq. (18) For the signal noise case an additional factor λ^{-2} enters the
172 wavelength scaling since the scattering cross section scales with λ^{-4} . These two functions are shown in
173 Fig. 1 for a gold resonator. A maximum around $\lambda = 700nm$ is observed for both cases, while in the
174 instrument noise regime an additional maximum around $\lambda = 900nm$ is found. This result suggests to
175 choose a resonator with resonance wavelength of $\lambda = 700nm$ and a sharp corner where the field is
176 concentrated. Possible candidates with this properties are gold pyramids with a round base or gold rods
177 with an aspect ratio of roughly 3.5 [14].

178 In summary we have extended our previously introduced sensing theory to the case of strongly
179 dispersive resonators. Based on this theory analytical expressions for the energy confinement and quality
180 factor of localized plasmons were then used to find simple but general expressions for the sensitivity as
181 well as for the FOM in the quasistatic limit. It turned out that the classical FOM in this limit is solely
182 determined by the ratio of real to imaginary part of the resonators permittivity at the resonance
183 frequency. It therefore is fixed once the resonance frequency is determined. Moreover it was shown that
184 the sensitivity as well as the FOM have upper limits which are caused by a limited quality factor and
185 energy confinement to the sensing volume. The analytical expressions for the FOM were then used to
186 determine the optimum resonance wavelength of a plasmonic resonator which turned out to be around
187 700 nm for gold. For analytes that do not completely fill the modal volume of the resonance the field
188 confinement to the analyte can still be optimized by optimizing the shape of the resonator. It is
189 suggested that particles with sharp tips, like pyramids should be used to detect single molecules.

- 191 [1] A. D. McFarland and R. P. Van Duyne, *Nano Lett.* **3**, 1057 (2003).
192 [2] J. J. Mock, D. R. Smith, and S. Schultz, *Nano Lett.* **3**, 485 (2003).
193 [3] G. Raschke, S. Kowarik, T. Franzl, et al., *Nano Lett.* **3**, 935 (2003).
194 [4] J. N. Anker, W. P. Hall, O. Lyandres, et al., *Nat. Mater.* **7**, 442 (2008).
195 [5] K. A. Willets and R. P. Van Duyne, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **58**, 267 (2007).
196 [6] T. Sannomiya, C. Hafner, and J. Voros, *Nano Lett.* **8**, 3450 (2008).
197 [7] N. L. Bocchio, A. Unger, M. Alvarez, et al., *J. Phys. Chem. C* **112**, 14355 (2008).
198 [8] R. Bukasov and J. S. Shumaker-Parry, *Nano Lett.* **7**, 1113 (2007).
199 [9] L. J. Sherry, S. H. Chang, G. C. Schatz, et al., *Nano Lett.* **5**, 2034 (2005).
200 [10] M. M. Miller and A. A. Lazarides, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 21556 (2005).
201 [11] M. A. Otte, B. Sepulveda, W. H. Ni, et al., *Acs Nano* **4**, 349.
202 [12] A. Unger and M. Kreiter, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **113**, 12243 (2009).
203 [13] F. Wang and Y. R. Shen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006).
204 [14] C. F. Bohren and D. R. Huffman, *Absorption and Scattering of Light by Small Particles* (Wiley-
205 VCH, Berlin, 1998).
206 [15] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Lehrbuch der theoretischen Physik VIII Elektrodynamik der*
207 *Kontinua* (Akademie Verlag Berlin, 1985).
208 [16] J. D. Jackson, 1998), Vol. 2009.
209
210