

# INVERSE PROBLEMS WITH HYBRID LENSES

I. AMRO, F. FNEISH, R. KANSOH, A. SABRA, AND W. TABBARA

**ABSTRACT.** We design lenses composed of a combination of standard freeform refracting surface and flat metasurface refracting an arbitrary incident field into a collimated beam with a fixed direction. In the near-field case, we study the existence of such lenses refracting a bright object into a predefined image at the target.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries: Snell's laws of refraction	4
2.1. The standard Snell's law	5
2.2. The generalized Snell's law	5
3. Uniform Refraction of a general incident field	6
3.1. Problem setup	6
3.2. Necessary condition	8
3.3. Sufficient condition.	9
3.4. The case of a vertical incident field.	11
4. A near-field imaging problem	14
4.1. Problem setup	14
4.2. Existence of $\rho$	15
4.3. Existence of $\phi$	19
4.4. Examples	22
4.5. The two-dimensional case	23
References	25

---

*Key words and phrases.* System of Partial Differential Equations, Geometric Optics, metamaterial, inverse problems.

MSC Classification Codes: 34A55, 35F61, 35Q60, 78A05, 26B10.

The authors were partially supported by the CAMS summer research program from the American University of Beirut. A. S. was partially supported by the University Research Board, Grant 104107 from the American University of Beirut.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Snell's law of refraction [7, Chapter 1] describes the trajectory of a ray when passing from one medium to another. The interface separating both media creates a discontinuity in the refractive index causing a change in the direction of the propagating radiation. Due to recent technological advances, metasurfaces were introduced in optical designs. These are ultra-thin artificially engineered materials composed of nano-structures that introduce abrupt phase shifts along the optical path to bend light in non-standard ways [1]. The corresponding generalized Snell's law was derived and verified in multiple papers in optical engineering for example [41] and [42] in two dimensions. The three-dimensional corresponding law is proved in [21] using the Fermat principle and in [22] from the distributional Maxwell system.

In this paper, we study two inverse problems in Geometric Optics involving hybrid lenses composed of a standard refracting surface and a flat metasurface. We first study the existence of such a lens refracting a variable incident field of directions emitted from a planar source into a predefined constant direction, see Figure 1. We assume that the face closer to the source is a given conventional refracting surface and that the other face of the lens is the flat metasurface. The goal is to analyze the existence of a phase discontinuity in a neighborhood of every point on the metasurface so that all rays leave the lens along a given constant direction. To do this, we use the standard and the generalized Snell's laws to reduce the problem into a system of partial differential equations and show that the incident field must satisfy a curl condition (3.2.1). Assuming (3.2.1), we employ the implicit function theorem and the notion of envelop to find a sufficient condition on the lower face of the lens and the incident field so that the required phase discontinuity exists. The considered model in this part is a non-imaging far-field inverse problem where we are not interested in creating an image but rather in the direction of the rays leaving the lens.

Using the far-field analysis, we next consider the following imaging problem in the near-field case. Given a bijective map  $T$  between a planar source and a planar target, our goal is to find a hybrid lens that achieves  $T$ . In other words, every point in the source emits a ray that is refracted by the lens into its corresponding image defined by  $T$ . The rays entering and leaving the lens are assumed vertical see Figure 2. In this model, we show that the lower face of the lens satisfies a system of semilinear partial differential equations (4.2.2) and find in Theorem 4.2 conditions on  $T$  so that a solution exists. Once the lower face is found, the existence of the phase discontinuity will be deduced from the far-field analysis requiring additional conditions on the map  $T$ , see Theorem 4.7. We apply this analysis in Section 4.4 to several examples in particular when  $T$  is a magnification/contraction, and when  $|T - I|$  is constant.<sup>x</sup>

We put our results in perspective both from the mathematical and optical points of view. The design of a two-dimensional convex, analytic standard lens focusing light rays

emitted from one point source into a point image was first solved in [12] using a fixed point type argument. The result was later generalized to three dimensions in [13] where the author constructed freeform lenses refracting rays emitted from a point source into a constant direction or a point image. The case of a general field was later studied in [19] and necessary and sufficient conditions were found for the existence of  $C^2$  lenses in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  refracting an arbitrary incident field into a collimated beam. Reflective models and combinations of refracting and reflecting surfaces are studied in [18]. Illumination problems with one reflective or refractive surface are addressed in [31], [40], [15], [29], [28] for the point source case and in [11] and [23] for the planar source case. Illumination models involving a single lens (2 surfaces) are considered in [35], and [20].

The standard refracting surfaces involved in the models of this paper are not assumed to be convex or concave. The use and design of such freeform surfaces became possible with the technological advances in manufacturing design, ultra-precision cutting, grinding, and polishing [6], [35]. Their unconstrained geometry presents a unique opportunity to achieve optical tasks that are not attainable with traditional concave/convex surfaces [38], [26]. Though revolutionary, freeform surfaces have their limitations as their potentially complicated geometry makes them costly to manufacture [34] and could result in ray obstruction [20]. Recent advances in nanotechnology have further expanded the possibilities to include Metamaterial in optics. This is an accelerating field of research with promising applications in commercial industries such as smartphone cameras [30], antennas [8], and medical imaging devices [3]. Their applicability gained public interest for their efficiency in eliminating chromatic aberration [2], [39]. Mathematically, such claims were investigated in [21], where the authors also studied the existence of single-element metasurfaces refracting collimated incident field into an arbitrary field direction. Corresponding illumination problems and connections with optimal transport are explored in [17], [16]. Hybrid combination of standard lenses and metasurfaces also appears in the literature with several applications to image corrections [9], [36].

Within this evolving landscape of optical physics, our paper takes root. We develop mathematical tools to study two inverse problems in geometric optics involving freeform refractors and metasurfaces. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the standard and the generalized Snell's laws. In Section 3, we precisely state and solve the far-field problem while finding necessary conditions on the incident field in Section 3.2, and sufficient conditions on the incident field and lower face of the hybrid lens in Section 3.3 for a solution to exist. Section 3.4 considers the case when the field entering and leaving the lens is vertical and formulates the corresponding sufficient conditions in Theorem 3.6. In Section 4, we study the near-field imaging problem and formulate the corresponding system of PDEs in Proposition 4.1 that must be satisfied by the lower face of the desired lens. We find in Theorem 4.2 necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of local solution, and then apply in Section 4.3 the analysis of Section 3.3 to find

additional conditions on the map  $T$  so that a phase discontinuity exists in a neighborhood of the metasurface. Our paper concludes with a few examples of allowable maps  $T$  in three dimensions, Section 4.4, and in two dimensions, Section 4.5.

**List of Notations.** Before embarking on our analysis we introduce some notation that will be used throughout the paper.

- All vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are assumed to be row vectors.
- If  $A$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix and  $B$  is an  $m \times p$  matrix then  $A \otimes B = A^t B$ .
- For  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_\perp = (-a_2, a_1)$ .
- For  $\mathbf{F}(x) = (F_1(x), \dots, F_m(x))$  a  $C^1$  field in a domain in  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , the derivative  $D\mathbf{F}(x)$  is the  $m \times n$  matrix

$$D\mathbf{F}(x) = \left( \frac{\partial F_k}{\partial x_i} \right)_{1 \leq k \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq n}.$$

- The scalar curl of a two dimensional  $C^1$  vector field  $\mathbf{a}(x) = (a_1(x), a_2(x))$  is

$$\nabla \times \mathbf{a}(x) = (a_2(x))_{x_1} - (a_1(x))_{x_2}$$

- The scalar cross product of two dimensional vectors  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2)$  is

$$\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} = \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ b_1 & b_2 \end{vmatrix}.$$

- The cross product of three dimensional vectors  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$  and  $\mathbf{v}' = (v'_1, v'_2, v'_3)$  is

$$\mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{v}' = \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{k} \\ v_1 & v_2 & v_3 \\ v'_1 & v'_2 & v'_3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

## 2. PRELIMINARIES: SNELL'S LAWS OF REFRACTION

The refractive index of a material corresponding to an electromagnetic wave with angular frequency  $\omega$  is given by  $n = \frac{c}{v}$  with  $c$  the speed of the wave in a vacuum and  $v$  its apparent velocity in the medium. The wave number  $k = \frac{\omega}{v}$  is defined as the number of wave cycles per unit distance in the medium. Denoting by  $k_0 = \frac{\omega}{c}$  the wave number in vacuum, we get that  $n = \frac{k}{k_0}$ . The refractive index  $n$  depends on both the medium and the propagating wave, see [25, Chapter 3] for a more in-depth interpretation of the involved parameters.

This section provides a brief review of the standard and the generalized Snell's laws and lays down the primary formulations needed for solving the inverse problems posed in this paper.

**2.1. The standard Snell's law.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a  $C^1$  surface in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  separating two homogeneous and isotropic media I and II. Upon striking  $\Gamma$  at a point  $P$ , a light wave with angular frequency  $\omega$  propagating along the unit direction  $\mathbf{x}$  in I refracts along the unit direction  $\mathbf{m}$  in II abiding the Snell's law of refraction

$$n_1(\mathbf{x} \times \nu) = n_2(\mathbf{m} \times \nu). \quad (2.1.1)$$

$n_1$  and  $n_2$  are respectively the refractive indices of media I and II corresponding to  $\omega$ , and  $\nu$  the unit normal to  $\Gamma$  at  $P$  toward medium II, that is  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu \geq 0$ .

Setting  $\kappa = \frac{n_2}{n_1}$ , (2.1.1) yields the existence of  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  so that

$$\mathbf{x} - \kappa \mathbf{m} = \lambda \nu. \quad (2.1.2)$$

In fact, from the calculations in [14]

$$\lambda = \mathbf{x} \cdot \nu - \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 1 + (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)^2} = \frac{1 - \kappa^2}{\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu + \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 1 + (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)^2}}. \quad (2.1.3)$$

Notice the following

- If  $\kappa > 1$ , the term under the square root in (2.1.3) is always positive, and  $\lambda < 0$ . In this case, refraction into medium II occurs for all incident directions.
- If  $\kappa < 1$ , refraction occurs if and only if  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu \geq \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2}$ , and for such incident directions  $\lambda > 0$ .

The dot product  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m}$  corresponds to the deviation between the incident and the refracted directions. Dotting (2.1.2) with  $\mathbf{x}$ , and using (2.1.3) results in

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{\kappa} (1 - \lambda \mathbf{x} \cdot \nu) = \frac{1}{\kappa} \left( 1 - \frac{(1 - \kappa^2)(\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)}{\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu + \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 1 + (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)^2}} \right) = \frac{1}{\kappa} (1 - (1 - \kappa^2)\psi(\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)),$$

with  $\psi(t) = \frac{t}{t + \sqrt{\kappa^2 - 1 + t^2}}$ . Hence

- For  $\kappa > 1$ ,  $\psi$  is increasing for  $t \in [0, 1]$ , so

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m} \geq \frac{1}{\kappa}.$$

- For  $\kappa < 1$ ,  $\psi$  is decreasing for  $t \in [\sqrt{1 - \kappa^2}, 1]$ , so

$$\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{m} \geq \kappa.$$

**2.2. The generalized Snell's law.** Denote by  $(\Gamma, \phi)$  the metasurface with  $\Gamma$  a  $C^1$  surface separating media I and II and  $\phi$  a  $C^1$  function representing the phase discontinuity defined on a neighborhood of every point of  $\Gamma$ . An electromagnetic wave with frequency  $\omega$  propagating in medium I with unit direction  $\mathbf{x}$  is refracted by the metasurface  $(\Gamma, \phi)$  at the point of incidence  $P$  along the unit direction  $\mathbf{m}$  into II according to the generalized Snell's law of refraction

$$n_1 \left( \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi \right) \times \nu = n_2 \mathbf{m} \times \nu. \quad (2.2.1)$$

$n_1$  and  $n_2$  are respectively the refractive indices of media I and II corresponding to  $\omega$ ,  $\nabla\phi$  denotes the gradient of  $\phi$  at  $P$ ,  $k$  is the wave number corresponding to  $\omega$  in medium I, and  $\nu$  the unit normal at  $P$  toward medium II. In this case, media I and II could be identical.

Letting  $\kappa = \frac{n_2}{n_1}$ , then from (2.2.1)

$$\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi - \kappa\mathbf{m} = \mu\nu \quad (2.2.2)$$

with, from [21],

$$\mu = \left(\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right) \cdot \nu - \sqrt{\kappa^2 - \left|\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right|^2 + \left[\left(\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right) \cdot \nu\right]^2}. \quad (2.2.3)$$

For refraction to occur, it is required that

$$\left[\left(\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right) \cdot \nu\right]^2 \geq \left|\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right|^2 - \kappa^2. \quad (2.2.4)$$

It's conventional in metalens design to have a tangential phase discontinuity [32], that is,  $\nabla\phi \cdot \nu = 0$  at the point of incidence  $P$ . In this case,

$$\mu = \mathbf{x} \cdot \nu - \sqrt{\kappa^2 - \left|\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right|^2 + (\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)^2}, \quad (2.2.5)$$

and the condition for refraction (2.2.4) becomes

$$(\mathbf{x} \cdot \nu)^2 \geq \left|\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{k}\nabla\phi\right|^2 - \kappa^2.$$

Notice that in the case of the absence of phase discontinuity,  $\nabla\phi = 0$ , we recover the formulae for standard refracting surfaces obtained in Section 2.1.

### 3. UNIFORM REFRACTION OF A GENERAL INCIDENT FIELD

**3.1. Problem setup.** We are given an open and connected domain  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ , a  $C^1$  unit vector field  $\mathbf{e}(x) = (e_1(x), e_2(x), e_3(x)) := (e'(x), e_3(x))$  defined on  $\Omega$ , with  $e'(x) = (e_1(x), e_2(x))$  and  $e_3(x) > 0$ , and a  $C^2$  conventional refracting surface  $\sigma_1$  above the horizontal plane  $\{x_3 = 0\}$ , and below the plane  $\{x_3 = a\}$  with  $a > 0$ . Denote by  $n_1$  the refractive index of medium I below  $\sigma_1$  and  $n_2$  the refractive index of medium II between  $\sigma_1$  and  $\{x_3 = a\}$ .

Monochromatic radiation with frequency  $\omega$  are issued from  $(x, 0)$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$ , with direction  $\mathbf{e}(x)$  and strike  $\sigma_1$  at the point  $P(x)$ . Let  $\rho(x) = |P(x) - (x, 0)|$  be the length of the trajectory traversed by the ray with direction  $\mathbf{e}(x)$  in medium I. Assume that medium II is denser than medium I, i.e.  $n_2 > n_1$ . Letting  $\kappa_1 = \frac{n_2}{n_1}$ ,  $\kappa_1 > 1$ , then from Subsection 2.1, refraction occurs at  $P(x)$ . The refracted ray propagates into medium II along the unit direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  given by the Snell's law (2.1.2)

$$\mathbf{m}(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{e}(x) - \lambda\nu) := (m_1(x), m_2(x), m_3(x)) \quad (3.1.1)$$

with  $\nu$  the unit normal to  $\sigma_1$  at  $P(x)$  toward medium II, and  $\lambda = \mathbf{e}(x) \cdot \nu - \sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1 + (\mathbf{e}(x) \cdot \nu)^2}$ . Since  $\kappa_1 > 1$ , then from Subsection 2.1,  $\lambda < 0$ . We assume that  $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3)$  with  $\nu_3 > 0$ , then since  $e_3(x) > 0$  it follows from (3.1.1) that  $m_3(x) > 0$ . The refracted ray with direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  strikes a flat horizontal metasurface  $(\sigma_2, \phi)$ , with  $\sigma_2 \subset \{x_3 = a\}$ , at the point  $(Q(x), a) := (Q_1(x), Q_2(x), a)$ . Let  $d(x) = |(Q(x), a) - P(x)|$  be the length of the trajectory traversed by the ray with direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  in medium II. Having that  $\mathbf{m}$  is unit we parametrize  $\sigma_2$  as follows

$$(Q(x), a) = P(x) + d(x)\mathbf{m}(x) = (x, 0) + \rho(x)\mathbf{e}(x) + d(x)\mathbf{m}(x). \quad (3.1.2)$$

Equating the vertical components in (3.1.2) yields the following formula for  $d$

$$d(x) = \frac{a - \rho(x)e_3(x)}{m_3(x)}. \quad (3.1.3)$$

Let  $n_3$  be the refractive index of the medium above the plane  $\{x_3 = a\}$ , referred to as medium III.




FIGURE 1

With the above setting, see Figure 1, our goal is to study the existence of a  $C^1$  phase discontinuity  $\phi := \phi(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  defined on a neighborhood of every point of  $\sigma_2$ , so that at  $(Q(x), a)$ , the ray with direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  is refracted into medium III along the vertical

direction  $\mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$ . We denote by  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  the lens with lower face the standard refracting surface  $\sigma_1$  and upper face the planar metasurface  $(\sigma_2, \phi)$ .

**3.2. Necessary condition.** We start by proving a necessary condition for the existence of a solution to the problem introduced in Section 3.1.

**Proposition 3.1.** *If a lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  refracting the  $C^1$  field  $\mathbf{e}(x) = (e'(x), e_3(x))$  into  $\mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$  exists then  $e' = \nabla h$  for some  $C^2$  function  $h$ , and so*

$$\nabla \times e'(x) = 0 \quad (3.2.1)$$

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists a phase discontinuity  $\phi := \phi(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  defined on a neighborhood of every point of  $\sigma_2$  so that the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  refracts all the rays of direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  given by (3.1.1) into the direction  $\mathbf{w}$ . The generalized Snell's law (2.2.2) applied to the incident direction  $\mathbf{m}(x)$ , the refracted direction  $\mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$ , and the normal  $(0, 0, 1)$  to the horizontal metasurface  $\sigma_2$  implies that

$$\mathbf{m}(x) - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi(Q(x), a) - \kappa_2(0, 0, 1) = \mu(0, 0, 1)$$

with  $\kappa_2 = \frac{n_3}{n_2}$  and from (2.2.3)

$$\mu = m_3(x) - \frac{1}{k} \phi_{u_3}(Q(x), a) - \sqrt{\kappa_2^2 - \left| \mathbf{m}(x) - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi(Q(x), a) \right|^2 + \left[ m_3(x) - \frac{1}{k} \phi_{u_3}(Q(x), a) \right]^2}.$$

This is equivalent to the following system

$$m_i(x) = \frac{1}{k} \phi_{u_i}(Q(x), a), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (3.2.2)$$

Let  $f(x) = \frac{1}{k} \phi(Q(x), a)$ , from the chain rule and (3.2.2)

$$f_{x_i}(x) = \frac{1}{k} (Q_1)_{x_i} \phi_{u_1}(Q(x), a) + \frac{1}{k} (Q_2)_{x_i} \phi_{u_2}(Q(x), a) = (Q_{x_i}, 0) \cdot \mathbf{m}$$

Recall that  $|\mathbf{m}(x)| = 1$ . Differentiating (3.1.2) with respect to  $x_i$  and dotting with  $\mathbf{m}$  we obtain

$$f_{x_i}(x) = P_{x_i}(x) \cdot \mathbf{m}(x) + d_{x_i}(x).$$

From Snell's law (2.1.2) at  $P(x) = (x, 0) + \rho(x)\mathbf{e}(x)$ , the vector  $\mathbf{e}(x) - \kappa_1 \mathbf{m}(x)$  is parallel to the normal at  $P$ , and then since  $|\mathbf{e}(x)| = 1$

$$P_{x_i}(x) \cdot \mathbf{m}(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} P_{x_i}(x) \cdot \mathbf{e}(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} e_i(x) + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \rho_{x_i}(x). \quad (3.2.3)$$

We conclude that

$$f_{x_i} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} e_i + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \rho_{x_i} + d_{x_i}.$$

Hence

$$e_i = (\kappa_1 f - \rho - \kappa_1 d)_{x_i} \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Since  $e_i \in C^1$ , then  $\kappa_1 f - \rho - \kappa_1 d \in C^2$ . By the mixed derivative theorem, we obtain (3.2.1).  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** The necessary condition of Proposition 3.1 is satisfied for collimated incident fields, that is,  $\mathbf{e}(x) = (e_1, e_2, e_3)$  is constant.

The curl condition is also satisfied when rays are emitted from a point source  $R$  toward the surface  $\sigma_1$  above  $R$ . In this case, we view  $\Omega$  as the intersection of the rays with a virtual plane between  $R$  and  $\sigma_1$ . With an appropriate choice of coordinates, the incident rays can be described by the field  $\mathbf{e}(x) = \frac{(x, 0) - R}{|(x, 0) - R|}$ . Here,  $e'(x) = \nabla|(x, 0) - R|$ .

**Remark 3.3.** If  $\phi$  solves (3.2.2), then the internal reflection condition (2.2.4) follows. In fact, for such  $\phi$

$$\left| \mathbf{m}(x) - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi \right|^2 - \kappa_2^2 < \left| \mathbf{m}(x) - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi \right|^2 = \left( m_3 - \frac{1}{k} \phi_{u_3} \right)^2 = \left[ \left( \mathbf{m}(x) - \frac{1}{k} \nabla \phi \right) \cdot (0, 0, 1) \right]^2.$$

**3.3. Sufficient condition.** Given an incident field satisfying the necessary condition in Proposition 3.1, and assuming that  $\mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{m}$  are  $C^2$ , we use the implicit function theorem to find a sufficient condition for the existence of  $\phi$  solving the system (3.2.2).

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that the unit field  $\mathbf{e}(x) = (e'(x), e_3(x))$  is in  $C^2(\Omega)$  with  $e' = \nabla h$  for some function  $h$ , and  $e_3 > 0$ . Assume, moreover, that  $\mathbf{m}(x)$  given in (3.1.1) is in  $C^2(\Omega)$ . If*

$$\det(D^2 h + (1 - \kappa_1 \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m}) D^2 \rho - \kappa_1 (D\rho \otimes (\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) + (\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) \otimes D\rho) - \kappa_1 \rho (D(\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) - D\mathbf{e} \otimes D\mathbf{m}) + \kappa_1 d D\mathbf{m} \otimes D\mathbf{m}) \neq 0 \quad (3.3.1)$$

at  $x_0 \in \Omega$  then there exists a neighborhood  $U \subseteq \Omega$  of  $x_0$  and a  $C^1$  tangential phase discontinuity  $\phi$  defined in a neighborhood of  $(Q(x_0), a) \in \sigma_2$  such that for every  $x \in U$ , the field  $\mathbf{e}(x)$  is refracted by the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  into the vertical direction  $\mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\rho$  and  $\mathbf{e}$  are in  $C^2(\Omega)$  then so is  $P$ . Also, from (3.1.3) and the facts that  $\mathbf{m} \in C^2$  and  $m_3 > 0$  it follows that  $d \in C^2(\Omega)$ , and therefore  $Q \in C^2(\Omega)$ .

From (3.2.3), for  $i = 1, 2$

$$(Q_{x_i}(x), 0) \cdot \mathbf{m}(x) = (Q(x), a)_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}(x) = P_{x_i}(x) \cdot \mathbf{m}(x) + d_{x_i}(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} h_{x_i}(x) + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \rho_{x_i}(x) + d_{x_i}(x).$$

Define the following maps in  $C^2(\Omega)$

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} h(x) + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \rho(x) + d(x), \quad H(x) = (Q(x), f(x)), \quad N(x) = (m_1(x), m_2(x), -1).$$

Notice that for  $i = 1, 2$

$$H_{x_i} \cdot N = Q_{x_i} \cdot (m_1, m_2) - f_{x_i} = (Q_{x_i}, 0) \cdot \mathbf{m} - f_{x_i} = 0. \quad (3.3.2)$$

For  $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , and  $x \in \Omega$ , define the  $C^2$  function  $F(u, x) = (u - H(x)) \cdot N(x)$ , and the  $C^1$  map  $G : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$  given by  $G(u, x) = (F(u, x), F_{x_1}(u, x), F_{x_2}(u, x))$ . We consider the system

$$G(u, x) = (0, 0, 0). \quad (3.3.3)$$

Fix  $x_0 \in \Omega$ . From the formula of  $F$  and (3.3.2),  $(H(x_0), x_0) = (Q(x_0), f(x_0), x_0)$  solves (3.3.3). Assume that

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial(u_3, x_1, x_2)}(H(x_0), x_0)\right) \neq 0, \quad (3.3.4)$$

then by the implicit function theorem there exists an open neighborhood  $O \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  of  $Q(x_0)$ , an open neighborhood  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$  of  $(f(x_0), x_0)$ , and unique functions  $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in C^1(O)$  such that for  $(u_1, u_2) \in O$

$$G(u_1, u_2, g_1(u_1, u_2), g_2(u_1, u_2), g_3(u_1, u_2)) = (0, 0, 0). \quad (3.3.5)$$

Since  $f$  and  $Q$  are continuous then there exists a neighborhood  $U \subseteq \Omega$  of  $x_0$  such that for each  $x$  in that neighborhood  $(f(x), x) \in W$ , and  $Q(x) \in O$ . For such  $x$ ,  $(H(x), x) = (Q(x), f(x), x)$  solves (3.3.3). Therefore, by the uniqueness of  $g_1, g_2$ , and  $g_3$ , it follows that for every  $x \in U$ ,

$$g_1(Q(x)) = f(x), g_2(Q(x)) = x_1, g_3(Q(x)) = x_2. \quad (3.3.6)$$

We prove that the function  $\phi : O \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  defined as follows

$$\phi(u_1, u_2, u_3) = kg_1(u_1, u_2),$$

is our desired phase discontinuity. It's obvious that  $\phi$  is tangential to the metasurface since  $\nabla\phi \cdot (0, 0, 1) = k(g_1)_{u_3} = 0$ . It remains to show that  $\phi$  solves the system (3.2.2) for every  $x \in U$ . From the formula of  $G$  and (3.3.5),  $F(u_1, u_2, g_1(u_1, u_2), g_2(u_1, u_2), g_3(u_1, u_2)) = 0$ , for every  $(u_1, u_2) \in O$ . Differentiating with respect to  $u_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and using (3.3.5) again, yields

$$0 = F_{u_i} + F_{u_3}(g_1)_{u_i} + F_{x_1}(g_2)_{u_i} + F_{x_2}(g_3)_{u_i} = F_{u_i} + F_{u_3}(g_1)_{u_i}.$$

Particularly, for  $(u_1, u_2) = Q(x)$ ,  $x \in U$ , from (3.3.6)

$$0 = F_{u_i}(Q(x), f(x), x) + F_{u_3}(Q(x), f(x), x)(g_1)_{u_i}(Q(x)) = m_i(x) - \frac{1}{k}\phi_{u_i}(Q(x), a),$$

concluding that  $\phi$  satisfies the system (3.2.2).

It remains to simplify the expression of the Jacobian determinant in (3.3.4). From (3.3.2),

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial G}{\partial(u_3, x_1, x_2)}(H(x_0), x_0)\right) = \begin{vmatrix} F_{u_3} & F_{x_1} & F_{x_2} \\ F_{x_1 u_3} & F_{x_1 x_1} & F_{x_1 x_2} \\ F_{x_2 u_3} & F_{x_2 x_1} & F_{x_2 x_2} \end{vmatrix} (H(x_0), x_0) = \begin{vmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -H_{x_1} \cdot N_{x_1} & -H_{x_2} \cdot N_{x_1} \\ 0 & -H_{x_1} \cdot N_{x_2} & -H_{x_2} \cdot N_{x_2} \end{vmatrix} (x_0).$$

Hence (3.3.4) is equivalent to  $\det((H_{x_i} \cdot N_{x_j})_{i,j=1,2}) \neq 0$  at  $x_0$ .

For  $i, j = 1, 2$

$$H_{x_i} \cdot N_{x_j} = (Q_{x_i}, f_{x_i}) \cdot ((m_1)_{x_j}, (m_2)_{x_j}, 0) = (Q, a)_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} = (P + d\mathbf{m})_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} = P_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} + d\mathbf{m}_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j}.$$

From (3.2.3), and the fact that  $e' = \nabla h$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} &= (P_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m})_{x_j} - P_{x_i x_j} \cdot \mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} h_{x_i x_j} + \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \rho_{x_i x_j} - (\rho \mathbf{e})_{x_i x_j} \cdot \mathbf{m} \\ &= \frac{1}{\kappa_1} h_{x_i x_j} + \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_1} - \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m}\right) \rho_{x_i x_j} - (\rho_{x_i} \mathbf{e}_{x_j} + \rho_{x_j} \mathbf{e}_{x_i}) \cdot \mathbf{m} - \rho((\mathbf{e}_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m})_{x_j} - \mathbf{e}_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j}) \end{aligned}$$

Concluding that

$$(H_{x_i} \cdot N_{x_j})_{i,j=1,2} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} D^2 h + \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_1} - \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m} \right) D^2 \rho - (D\rho \otimes (\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) + (\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) \otimes D\rho) - \rho (D(\mathbf{m} D\mathbf{e}) - D\mathbf{e} \otimes D\mathbf{m}) + d D\mathbf{m} \otimes D\mathbf{m}.$$

Multiplying above by  $\kappa_1$ , we obtain the sufficient condition (3.3.1).  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** Assume that the field  $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, e_3)$  is constant, with  $e_3 > 0$ . From Remark 3.2, the necessary condition is satisfied. The sufficient condition (3.3.1) reduces to

$$\det\left((1 - \kappa_1 \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m}) D^2 \rho + \kappa_1 d D\mathbf{m} \otimes D\mathbf{m}\right) \neq 0 \quad (3.3.7)$$

at  $x_0 \in \Omega$ .

In this case, if  $\mathbf{e} \cdot \nu > 0$  and  $D^2 \rho$  is negative definite then (3.3.7) follows at every point. In fact, from Section 2.1, since  $\kappa_1 > 1$  then  $\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m} \geq \frac{1}{\kappa_1}$  with equality if and only if  $\mathbf{e} \cdot \nu = 0$ . Therefore if  $\mathbf{e} \cdot \nu > 0$  and  $D^2 \rho < 0$ , then the matrix  $(1 - \kappa_1 \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m}) D^2 \rho$  is positive definite. On the other hand,  $d > 0$  and  $D\mathbf{m} \otimes D\mathbf{m}$  is positive semi-definite, hence our claim follows.

From Theorem 3.4, for all such surfaces  $\sigma_1$ , for every  $x_0 \in \Omega$  there exists a  $C^1$  phase discontinuity  $\phi$  in a neighborhood of  $(Q(x_0), a) \in \sigma_2$  so that the collimated constant field  $\mathbf{e}$  emitted from  $(x, 0)$  with  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , is refracted by the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  into the vertical direction  $\mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$ .

**3.4. The case of a vertical incident field.** We assume in this section that the incident field emitted from  $\Omega$  is vertical, i.e.  $\mathbf{e}(x) = \mathbf{w} = (0, 0, 1)$  for every  $x \in \Omega$ . In this case,  $P(x) = (x, \rho(x))$ , and so  $\sigma_1$  is the graph of the function  $\rho$ . The normal vector at each point  $P(x)$  is then given by  $\nu(x) = \frac{(-D\rho(x), 1)}{\sqrt{1 + |D\rho(x)|^2}}$ .

We simplify the formulas for  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $d$  given respectively in (3.1.1) and (3.1.3). Denoting

$$\Delta(x) = \sqrt{\kappa_1^2 + (\kappa_1^2 - 1)|D\rho(x)|^2}, \quad (3.4.1)$$

(2.1.3) yields

$$\lambda = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{(0, 0, 1) \cdot \nu + \sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1 + ((0, 0, 1) \cdot \nu)^2}} = \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2) \sqrt{1 + |D\rho|^2}}{1 + \Delta},$$

and so replacing in (3.1.1)

$$\mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \left( (0, 0, 1) - \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} (-D\rho, 1) \right) = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \left( \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} D\rho, 1 + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{1 + \Delta} \right). \quad (3.4.2)$$

Therefore from (3.1.3)

$$d(x) = \frac{\kappa_1(a - \rho(x))(1 + \Delta(x))}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta(x)}. \quad (3.4.3)$$

Since, in Theorem 3.4, we need  $\mathbf{m}$  to be  $C^2$ , we assume that  $\rho$  is  $C^3$  and prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Given  $\rho \in C^3(\Omega)$ , and  $\mathbf{e}(x) = (0, 0, 1)$ , then condition (3.3.1) is satisfied at  $x_0$  if and only if  $\det D^2\rho \neq 0$  and*

$$\det \left( I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho + \frac{(a - \rho)(1 - \kappa_1^2)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} D^2\rho \right) \neq 0 \quad (3.4.4)$$

at  $x_0$ .

*Proof.* The objective is to simplify (3.3.7). First, from (3.4.2)

$$1 - \kappa_1 \mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{m} = 1 - \kappa_1 m_3 = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta}. \quad (3.4.5)$$

Second, differentiating (3.4.2) with respect to  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$  yields

$$\mathbf{m}_{x_i} = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{\kappa_1(1 + \Delta)} \left( (D\rho_{x_i}, 0) + \frac{\Delta_{x_i}}{1 + \Delta} (-D\rho, 1) \right).$$

From (3.4.1),  $\Delta_{x_i} = \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)}{\Delta} D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho$ , and so

$$\mathbf{m}_{x_i} = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{\kappa_1(1 + \Delta)} \left[ (D\rho_{x_i}, 0) + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1) D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho}{\Delta(1 + \Delta)} (-D\rho, 1) \right].$$

For  $i, j = 1, 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} &= \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2}{\kappa_1^2(1 + \Delta)^2} \left[ D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho_{x_j} - 2 \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)}{\Delta(1 + \Delta)} (D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho)(D\rho_{x_j} \cdot D\rho) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2 (D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho)(D\rho_{x_j} \cdot D\rho)}{\Delta^2(1 + \Delta)^2} (1 + |D\rho|^2) \right] \\ &= \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2}{\kappa_1^2(1 + \Delta)^2} \left[ D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho_{x_j} + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta(1 + \Delta)} (D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho)(D\rho_{x_j} \cdot D\rho) \left( \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)(1 + |D\rho|^2)}{\Delta(1 + \Delta)} - 2 \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

From (3.4.1),  $(\kappa_1^2 - 1)|D\rho|^2 = \Delta^2 - \kappa_1^2$ , and hence

$$\mathbf{m}_{x_i} \cdot \mathbf{m}_{x_j} = \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2}{\kappa_1^2(1 + \Delta)^2} \left[ D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho_{x_j} - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} (D\rho_{x_i} \cdot D\rho)(D\rho_{x_j} \cdot D\rho) \right].$$

Therefore

$$D\mathbf{m} \otimes D\mathbf{m} = \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2}{\kappa_1^2(1 + \Delta)^2} \left[ (D^2\rho)^2 - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} D^2\rho (D\rho \otimes D\rho) D^2\rho \right] = \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2}{\kappa_1^2(1 + \Delta)^2} D^2\rho \left[ I - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho \right] D^2\rho \quad (3.4.6)$$

Replacing (3.4.3), (3.4.5), and (3.4.6) in (3.3.7), the sufficient condition becomes

$$0 \neq (\det D^2\rho) \det \left( \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} I + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2 (a - \rho)}{(1 + \Delta)(\kappa_1^2 + \Delta)} \left[ I - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho \right] D^2\rho \right).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} I + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)^2(a - \rho)}{(1 + \Delta)(\kappa_1^2 + \Delta)} \left[ I - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho \right] D^2\rho,$$

then (3.3.7) is satisfied for  $\mathbf{e} = (0, 0, 1)$  if and only if at  $x = x_0$ ,  $D^2\rho$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are invertible.

We simplify  $\det \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\mathcal{W} = I - \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\Delta^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho$ , the matrix determinant Lemma [10, Lemma 1.1] and (3.4.1) imply that

$$\det \mathcal{W} = 1 - \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)|D\rho|^2}{\Delta^2} = \frac{\kappa_1^2}{\Delta^2},$$

then  $\mathcal{W}$  is invertible and by the Sherman-Morrison formula [37, Chapter III.1]

$$\mathcal{W}^{-1} = I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} \left( I + \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} \mathcal{W} D^2\rho \right) = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} \mathcal{W} \left( I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho + \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} D^2\rho \right).$$

We conclude that  $\mathcal{M}$  is invertible at  $x_0$  if and only if (3.4.4) is satisfied, completing hence the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

From Remark 3.5,  $D^2\rho(x_0) < 0$  is sufficient for existence of a lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$  refracting a collimated field into the vertical direction. However, from Theorem 3.6, this condition can be relaxed in the case when  $\mathbf{e} = (0, 0, 1)$  allowing a larger family of lower faces  $\sigma_1$ , as summarized in the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.7.** *Assume  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible, and  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  its corresponding non-zero eigenvalues with  $\Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_2$ . If*

$$\Lambda_2 > \frac{\Delta^2(x_0)(\kappa_1^2 + \Delta(x_0))}{\kappa_1^2(\kappa_1^2 - 1)(a - \rho(x_0))}, \quad \text{or} \quad \Lambda_1 < \frac{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta(x_0)}{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)(a - \rho(x_0))}. \quad (3.4.7)$$

then (3.4.4) is satisfied at  $x_0$ .

*Proof.* We denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the matrix in (3.4.4), i.e.

$$\mathcal{A} = I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho + \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} D^2\rho, \quad (3.4.8)$$

and let  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  be its corresponding eigenvalues with  $\mu_1 \geq \mu_2$ . Condition 3.4.4 is satisfied if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  is invertible i.e.  $\mu_1, \mu_2 \neq 0$ .

The eigenvalues of the matrix  $I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} D\rho \otimes D\rho$  are in decreasing order  $\frac{\Delta^2}{\kappa_1^2}$  and 1. Since  $\kappa_1 > 1$ ,  $a - \rho > 0$ , and  $\Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_2$  then the eigenvalues of  $\frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1(1 + \Delta)} D^2\rho$  are in decreasing order  $\frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} \Lambda_2$  and  $\frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} \Lambda_1$ .

Hence, from Weyl's inequality

$$1 + \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} \Lambda_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \mu_1 \leq \frac{\Delta^2}{\kappa_1^2} + \frac{(1 - \kappa_1^2)(a - \rho)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta} \Lambda_2.$$

Therefore, inequalities 3.4.7 imply that  $\mathcal{A}$  is invertible.  $\square$

**Remark 3.8.** The first inequality in (3.4.7) implies that  $\Lambda_1 \geq \Lambda_2 > 0$  and so  $\rho$  is strictly convex in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ . The second inequality in (3.4.7) allows cases where  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is positive definite or negative definite or indefinite.

#### 4. A NEAR-FIELD IMAGING PROBLEM

**4.1. Problem setup.** We are given  $\Omega, \Omega^* \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  open and simply connected domains, a  $C^1$  bijective map  $T : \Omega \mapsto \Omega^*$ , positive real numbers  $a$  and  $c$  with  $c > a$ . Monochromatic




FIGURE 2

radiation with frequency  $\omega$  are issued from  $(x, 0)$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$ , with vertical direction

$\mathbf{e} = (0, 0, 1)$ . Our goal is to construct a lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  with lower face  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}_{x \in \Omega}$  a conventional  $C^2$  refracting surface between the planes  $\{x_3 = 0\}$  and  $\{x_3 = a\}$ ; and upper face  $(\sigma_2, \phi)$  a planar metasurface with  $\sigma_2 \subseteq \{x_3 = a\}$  and  $\phi := \phi(u_1, u_2, u_3)$  a tangential phase discontinuity defined in a neighborhood of every point of  $\sigma_2$ , such that:

- (1) the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  refracts every incident vertical ray emitted from  $(x, 0)$ ,  $x \in \Omega$ , into the point  $(Tx, c)$ ;
- (2) all the rays leave  $(\sigma_2, \phi)$  with the vertical direction.

The lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  projects an image  $\Omega^* = T(\Omega)$  on the target plane  $\{x_3 = c\}$ , see Figure 2.

We assume that  $n_1, n_2$  and  $n_3$  with  $n_2 > n_1$  are the refractive indices of the media I, II and III corresponding to the regions below, enclosed by, and above the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  respectively.

To do this, we first investigate the existence of  $\rho$  positive and  $C^2$  such that for every  $x \in \Omega$  the surface  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}_{x \in \Omega}$  refracts the incident vertical ray emitted from  $(x, 0)$  into the point  $(Tx, a)$  on  $\sigma_2$ , and then verify whether  $\rho$  satisfies the conditions in Theorem 3.6 when it exists.

Throughout this section, denote  $\kappa_1 = \frac{n_2}{n_1}$  and  $Sx = Tx - x$ .

#### 4.2. Existence of $\rho$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *A  $C^2$  surface  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}_{x \in \Omega}$ , separating media I and II, and refracting vertical rays emitted from  $(x, 0)$  in medium I into  $(Tx, a)$  in medium II exists if and only if*

$$a > a - \rho(x) > \frac{|Sx|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}} \quad (4.2.1)$$

for every  $x \in \Omega$ , and  $\rho$  satisfies the following system of PDEs

$$D\rho(x) = \frac{\kappa_1 Sx}{\sqrt{|Sx|^2 + (a - \rho(x))^2 - \kappa_1(a - \rho(x))}}. \quad (4.2.2)$$

*Proof.* Assume for each  $x \in \Omega$  the ray with vertical direction  $\mathbf{e} = (0, 0, 1)$  is refracted at  $(x, \rho(x))$  into the point  $(Tx, a)$ , then trivially  $\sigma_1$  is between the plane  $\{x_3 = 0\}$  and  $\{x_3 = a\}$  and so  $0 < a - \rho < a$ . The unit direction of the refracted ray is then

$$\mathbf{m}(x) = \frac{(Tx, a) - (x, \rho(x))}{|(Tx, a) - (x, \rho(x))|} = \frac{(Sx, a - \rho(x))}{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|}.$$

Therefore, from (3.4.2)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{Sx}{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} = \frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{\kappa_1(1 + \Delta)} D\rho(x) \\ \frac{a - \rho(x)}{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} = \frac{1}{\kappa_1} \left( 1 + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{1 + \Delta} \right) \end{cases} \quad (4.2.3)$$

with  $\Delta$  given in (3.4.1).

From the second equation of system (4.2.3),  $\frac{a - \rho(x)}{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} > \frac{1}{\kappa_1}$ . Squaring both sides and solving for  $a - \rho$  yields the right inequality in (4.2.1). Further, this same equation gives

$$\frac{1 - \kappa_1^2}{1 + \Delta} = \frac{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))| - \kappa_1(a - \rho(x))}{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|}, \quad (4.2.4)$$

and so replacing (4.2.4) in the first equation of the system (4.2.3) and solving for  $D\rho$  we obtain (4.2.2).

Conversely, assume  $\rho$  satisfies (4.2.1), and (4.2.2). From (4.2.1),  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}$  is between the plane  $\{x_3 = 0\}$  and  $\{x_3 = a\}$ , and since  $S \in C^1(\Omega)$  then from (4.2.2)  $\rho \in C^2(\Omega)$ . We show that  $\rho$  verifies the system (4.2.3), which implies from (3.4.2) that the vertical ray emitted from  $(x, 0)$  is refracted at  $(x, \rho(x))$  into  $(Tx, a)$ .

In fact, from (4.2.1), the denominator in (4.2.2) is negative, so replacing (4.2.2) in (3.4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \sqrt{\kappa_1^2 + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)\kappa_1^2|Sx|^2}{(|(Sx, a - \rho(x))| - \kappa_1(a - \rho(x)))^2}} \\ &= \frac{\kappa_1 \sqrt{|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|^2 + \kappa_1^2(a - \rho(x))^2 - 2\kappa_1|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|(a - \rho(x)) + (\kappa_1^2 - 1)|Sx|^2}}{\kappa_1(a - \rho(x)) - |(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} \\ &= \frac{\kappa_1 \sqrt{\kappa_1^2|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|^2 - 2\kappa_1|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|(a - \rho(x)) + (a - \rho(x))^2}}{\kappa_1(a - \rho(x)) - |(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\kappa_1 > 1$ , then  $\kappa_1|(Sx, a - \rho(x))| \geq a - \rho(x)$ , and so

$$\Delta(x) = \frac{\kappa_1^2|(Sx, a - \rho(x))| - \kappa_1(a - \rho(x))}{\kappa_1(a - \rho(x)) - |(Sx, a - \rho(x))|} = -1 + \frac{(\kappa_1^2 - 1)|(Sx, a - \rho(x))|}{\kappa_1(a - \rho(x)) - |(Sx, a - \rho(x))|}. \quad (4.2.5)$$

We then obtain (4.2.4) and so together with (4.2.2), the system (4.2.3) follows.  $\square$

From Inequality (4.2.9), given the map  $T$ ,  $Sx = Tx - x$ , the plane  $\{x_3 = a\}$  should be chosen so that

$$a > \frac{|Sx|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}} \quad (4.2.6)$$

for every  $x$ , this gives a condition on the thickness of our objective lens. In that case, finding the lower face  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}_{x \in \Omega}$  of the lens solution to the imaging problem in Section 4.1 reduces to finding positive solutions to the system (4.2.2) satisfying the

inequality (4.2.1). Notice that (4.2.2) can be written as follows

$$D(a - \rho(x)) = \frac{\kappa_1 \frac{Sx}{a - \rho(x)}}{\kappa_1 - \sqrt{\left| \frac{Sx}{a - \rho(x)} \right|^2 + 1}} := V(x, a - \rho(x)) \quad (4.2.7)$$

with  $V(x, z) := (V_1(x, z), V_2(x, z)) = \frac{\kappa_1 \frac{Sx}{z}}{\kappa_1 - \sqrt{\left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 + 1}}$ ,  $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$ , and  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$a > z > \frac{|Sx|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}$ . Writing (4.2.2) in the form (4.2.7) allows us to use the theory in [24,

Chapter 6] to find necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of local solutions  $\rho$ . In fact, since  $S$  is  $C^1$  then a solution  $\rho$  to (4.2.7) is  $C^2$  and by the mixed derivative theorem  $\rho_{x_1 x_2} = \rho_{x_2 x_1}$ . Hence,

$$\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial x_2} + \frac{\partial V_1}{\partial z} V_2 = \frac{\partial V_2}{\partial x_1} + \frac{\partial V_2}{\partial z} V_1. \quad (4.2.8)$$

**Theorem 4.2.** *Given  $x_0 \in \Omega$  satisfying (4.2.6) and  $z_0$  such that*

$$a > z_0 > \frac{|Sx_0|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}, \quad (4.2.9)$$

(4.2.8) is satisfied in an open neighborhood  $U \subseteq \left\{ (x, z) : x \in \Omega, a > z > \frac{|Sx|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}} \right\}$  of  $(x_0, z_0)$  if and only if for every  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$

$$\nabla \times S = 0 \quad (4.2.10)$$

$$S \times D|S|^2 = 0. \quad (4.2.11)$$

*Proof.* Write  $S = (S_1, S_2)$ , and  $V_i(x, z) = \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) \frac{S_i x}{z}$ , with

$$\varphi(y) = \frac{\kappa_1}{\kappa_1 - \sqrt{y + 1}} \quad (4.2.12)$$

defined for  $y \in [0, \kappa_1^2 - 1)$ . Notice that  $\varphi$  is positive, increasing and

$$\varphi'(y) = \frac{\kappa_1}{2\sqrt{y+1}(\kappa_1 - \sqrt{y+1})^2} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_1\sqrt{y+1}}\varphi^2(y). \quad (4.2.13)$$

Therefore for  $i, j = 1, 2$

$$\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_j} = 2 \frac{S_i x}{z^3} (S \cdot S_{x_j}) \varphi' \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{z} \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) \frac{\partial S_i}{\partial x_j} \quad (4.2.14)$$

$$\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial z} = -\frac{2|Sx|^2}{z^4} \varphi' \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) S_i x - \frac{1}{z^2} \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) S_i x. \quad (4.2.15)$$

Notice that  $\frac{\partial V_1}{\partial z} V_2 = \frac{\partial V_2}{\partial z} V_1$ , and hence (4.2.8) becomes

$$2 \frac{S_1 x}{z^3} (S \cdot S_{x_2}) \varphi' \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{z} \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) (S_1)_{x_2} = 2 \frac{S_2 x}{z^3} (S \cdot S_{x_1}) \varphi' \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) + \frac{1}{z} \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) (S_2)_{x_1},$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{z^2} (S \times D|S|^2) \varphi' \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) - (\nabla \times S) \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) = 0. \quad (4.2.16)$$

Clearly (4.2.10), and (4.2.11) implies (4.2.16).

Conversely, assume (4.2.16) is satisfied for every  $x$  in a neighborhood  $U_{x_0}$  of  $x_0$  in  $\Omega$  and  $z$  in a neighborhood  $V_{z_0}$  of  $z_0$  such that  $a > z > \frac{|Sx|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}$  for every  $x \in U_{x_0}$  and  $z \in V_{z_0}$ .

We show that (4.2.10) and (4.2.11) then follow for every  $x \in U_{x_0}$ . In fact, from (4.2.13), and the fact that  $\varphi > 0$ , (4.2.16) can be written as follows

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa_1 z^2 \sqrt{1 + \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2}} (S \times D|S|^2) \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) - \nabla \times S = 0.$$

Fixing  $x \in U_{x_0}$ , and differentiating with respect to  $z$  yields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \frac{1}{2\kappa_1 z^2 \sqrt{1 + \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2}} \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx}{z} \right|^2 \right) \right) (S \times D|S|^2) = 0 \quad \forall z \in V_{z_0}.$$

Since the term in large parenthesis above is not constant in  $z$  then  $(S \times D|S|^2)(x) = 0$ , and therefore from (4.2.16), since  $\varphi > 0$ ,  $\nabla \times S(x) = 0$ .

□

Consequently Theorem 4.2 and [24, Chapter 6] implies the following result.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Given  $x_0 \in \Omega$  satisfying (4.2.6) and  $z_0$  verifying (4.2.9), if (4.2.10) and (4.2.11) hold for every  $x$  in an open set containing  $x_0$ , then the system of PDEs (4.2.2) has a unique positive  $C^2$  solution  $\rho$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$  satisfying (4.2.1) with  $a - \rho(x_0) = z_0$ .*

**Remark 4.4.** Condition (4.2.10) is equivalent to say that  $DS$  is a symmetric matrix. Condition (4.2.11) is equivalent to say that  $(DS)(S^t)$  is parallel to  $S^t$ . Hence if  $Sx \neq (0, 0)$ ,  $S^t x$  is an eigenvector of  $DS(x)$ . In this case, by the spectral theorem  $S^t_{\perp} x = \begin{pmatrix} -S_2 x \\ S_1 x \end{pmatrix}$  is also an eigenvector of  $DS(x)$ . This fact will be needed later in Theorem 4.7.

**Remark 4.5.** Since  $\Omega$  is simply connected, (4.2.10) implies the existence of a real-valued  $C^2$  function  $s$  such that  $Ds = S$ . Replacing in (4.2.11) yields  $Ds \times (DsD^2s) = 0$  and so  $s$  solves the following quasilinear PDE

$$\left(s_{x_1}^2 - s_{x_2}^2\right) s_{x_1 x_2} + s_{x_1} s_{x_2} (s_{x_2 x_2} - s_{x_1 x_1}) = 0,$$

which using Cauchy Kowalevski Theorem, [27], has a unique local solution for a large class of initial data.

We list interesting admissible maps where conditions (4.2.10) and (4.2.11) can be easily verified.

- $Tx = (1 + \alpha)x$  with  $\alpha \neq -1$ . In this case,  $Sx = \alpha x = D\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}|x|^2\right)$ . These maps  $T$  correspond to dilations when  $\alpha > 0$ , and to contractions when  $-1 < \alpha < 0$ . The case when  $\alpha = -1$  is avoided since in that case, we get  $T = 0$  which is not injective.
- $Tx = (h(x_1), x_2)$ , with  $h$  a  $C^1$  injective one variable real function. In this case,  $Sx = (h(x_1) - x_1, 0)$ . These maps  $T$  correspond to a transformation only in the horizontal variable. Similarly, transformations in the vertical direction  $Tx = (x_1, h(x_2))$  are admissible maps.
- Let  $s$  be a  $C^2$  function satisfying the Eikonal equation  $|Ds| = C$  for some  $C > 0$ , and  $S = Ds$ .  $S$  is the gradient of a function and with constant length then it clearly verifies (4.2.10) and (4.2.11). Assume moreover that  $DSx_0 + I \neq 0$  at some  $x_0$ , then by the inverse function theorem  $Tx = Sx + x$  is injective in a neighborhood of  $x_0$  and is hence an admissible map in that neighborhood.

An interesting connection can be noticed between the admissible maps  $S$  and the infinity Laplacian operator [5]. In fact if  $S = Ds$  for a  $C^2$  function and  $S$  satisfies (4.2.11) then there exists a function  $t(x)$  such that  $(D^2s(x))(Ds(x))^t = t(x)(Ds(x))^t$  and hence dotting both sides with  $(Ds)^t$ , we conclude that  $s$  satisfies the following inhomogeneous infinity Laplacian equation

$$\frac{1}{|Ds|^2} \langle Ds D^2s, Ds \rangle = t,$$

which is studied in [4], and [33].

**4.3. Existence of  $\phi$ .** Having found in Section 4.2 conditions on the map  $T$  so that there exists a  $C^2$  surface  $\sigma_1$  that refracts vertical rays emitted from  $(x, 0)$ , with  $x$  in a neighborhood of a point  $x_0$  in  $\Omega$ , into the point  $(Tx, a)$ , we next use the analysis of Section 3 to study the existence of a phase discontinuity  $\phi$  defined in a neighborhood of every point  $(Tx, a)$  so

that the rays leave the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  vertically into the point  $(Tx, c)$ , refer to Figure 2 and to Section 4.1.

More specifically, from Theorem 3.6, it is sufficient to find conditions on the map  $S$  so that the solution  $\rho$  to (4.2.2) is  $C^3$ , and the matrices  $D^2\rho$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  given in (3.4.8) are invertible at  $x_0$ .

Before stating the main result of this section, we need the following Lemma.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $\varphi$  be the function given in (4.2.12), then for every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $|\mathbf{y}| < \sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}$*

$$I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} \varphi^2(|\mathbf{y}|^2)(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) = \left( I + \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) \right) \left( I + 2 \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{y}|^2)}{\varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)} \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y} \right)$$

*Proof.* (4.2.12), (4.2.13), and the fact that  $(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y})^2 = |\mathbf{y}|^2(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y})$ , yields the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &:= I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} \varphi^2(|\mathbf{y}|^2)(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) - \left( I + \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) \right) \left( I + 2 \frac{\varphi'(|\mathbf{y}|^2)}{\varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)} \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y} \right) \\ &= (\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2) \left( \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2) - \frac{1}{\kappa_1 \sqrt{|\mathbf{y}|^2 + 1}} - 1 - \frac{\varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)}{\kappa_1 \sqrt{|\mathbf{y}|^2 + 1}} |\mathbf{y}|^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{y}) \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2)}{\kappa_1^2 \sqrt{|\mathbf{y}|^2 + 1}} \left( \varphi(|\mathbf{y}|^2) \left( (\kappa_1^2 - 1) \sqrt{|\mathbf{y}|^2 + 1} - \kappa_1 |\mathbf{y}|^2 \right) - \kappa_1 \left( 1 + \kappa_1 \sqrt{|\mathbf{y}|^2 + 1} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Noticing that for every  $\tau \in [0, \kappa_1^2 - 1)$

$$(\kappa_1^2 - 1) \sqrt{\tau + 1} - \kappa_1 \tau = (\kappa_1 - \sqrt{\tau + 1}) (\kappa_1 \sqrt{\tau + 1} + 1) = \frac{\kappa_1}{\varphi(\tau)} (\kappa_1 \sqrt{\tau + 1} + 1),$$

we conclude that  $\mathcal{D} = 0$ . □

**Theorem 4.7.** *Given  $x_0 \in \Omega$ ,  $T$  a  $C^1$  map, with  $Sx = Tx - x$  satisfying (4.2.10), (4.2.11) in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ ,  $a > 0$  verifying (4.2.6) at  $x_0$ , let  $\rho$  be a positive  $C^2$  solution to (4.2.7) with  $a - \rho(x_0) = z_0$  such that  $z_0$  satisfies (4.2.9), then at  $x = x_0$*

$$D^2\rho = \frac{\varphi}{z_0} \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} (S \otimes S) \right) \left( \frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} (S \otimes S) - DS \right) \quad (4.3.1)$$

$$\mathcal{A} = \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} (S \otimes S) \right) (I + DS) \quad (4.3.2)$$

with  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi'$  given in (4.2.12) and (4.2.13) are evaluated at  $\left| \frac{Sx_0}{z_0} \right|^2$ ,  $S$  and  $DS$  are evaluated at  $x_0$ .

Therefore,  $\mathcal{A}$  is invertible at  $x_0$  if and only if  $DT = I + DS$  is invertible i.e.  $T$  is a diffeomorphism in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ . Moreover,

- (1) If  $Sx_0 = (0, 0)$ , i.e.  $x_0$  is a fixed point of  $T$ , then  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $DS(x_0)$  is invertible.

(2) If  $Sx_0 \neq (0,0)$  then denoting by  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta_\perp$  the eigenvalues of  $DS$  corresponding to the eigenvectors  $S^t$  and  $S_\perp^t$ , we get that  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $\zeta \neq \frac{|Sx_0|^2}{z_0^2}\varphi\left(\left|\frac{Sx_0}{z_0}\right|^2\right)$  and  $\zeta_\perp \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Recall from (4.2.7) that  $\rho_{x_i}(x) = -V_i(x, a - \rho(x))$ . Letting  $z(x) = a - \rho(x)$ , then (4.2.7), (4.2.14), (4.2.15), and the formula for  $V$  yield

$$\rho_{x_i x_j} = -\frac{\partial V_i}{\partial x_j} - V_j \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial z} = -2\frac{S_i}{z^3}(S \cdot S_{x_j})\varphi' - \frac{1}{z}\varphi(S_i)_{x_j} - \varphi \frac{S_j}{z} \left( -\frac{2|S|^2}{z^4}\varphi' S_i - \frac{1}{z^2}\varphi S_i \right),$$

and so

$$D^2\rho(x_0) = -\frac{2}{z_0^3}\varphi'(S \otimes S)DS - \frac{1}{z_0}\varphi DS + \left( \frac{2|S|^2}{z_0^5}\varphi\varphi' + \frac{1}{z_0^3}\varphi^2 \right) (S \otimes S),$$

with  $S, DS$  evaluated at  $x_0$ , and  $\varphi, \varphi'$  at  $\left|\frac{Sx_0}{z_0}\right|^2$ .

Since  $(S \otimes S)^2 = |S|^2(S \otimes S)$ , then simplifying the above expression

$$\begin{aligned} D^2\rho(x_0) &= -\frac{\varphi}{z_0} \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) DS + \frac{2(S \otimes S)^2}{z_0^5} \varphi\varphi' + \frac{1}{z_0^3} \varphi^2 (S \otimes S) \\ &= -\frac{\varphi}{z_0} \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) DS + \frac{\varphi^2}{z_0^3} \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) S \otimes S \\ &= \frac{\varphi}{z_0} \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) \left( \frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} S \otimes S - DS \right), \end{aligned}$$

hence obtaining (4.3.1). Since  $\varphi, \varphi' > 0$ , and  $S \otimes S$  is positive semidefinite, we deduce that  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $\frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} S \otimes S - DS$  is invertible. We consider the two cases:

- If  $Sx_0 = (0,0)$  then  $\frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} S \otimes S - DS = -DS$ , and so  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $DS(x_0)$  is invertible.
- If  $Sx_0 \neq (0,0)$ . We have that  $S^t x_0$  and  $S_\perp^t x_0$  are eigenvectors of  $S \otimes S$  with corresponding eigenvalues  $|Sx_0|^2$  and 0. Also, from Remark 4.5,  $S^t x_0$  and  $S_\perp^t x_0$  are eigenvectors of  $DS(x_0)$  with corresponding eigenvalues denoted by  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta_\perp$ . Hence  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $\varphi\left(\left|\frac{Sx_0}{z_0}\right|^2\right) \frac{|Sx_0|^2}{z_0^2} - \zeta \neq 0$  and  $\zeta_\perp \neq 0$ .

Next, we simplify the matrix  $\mathcal{A}$  given in (3.4.8). From (4.2.7)

$$D\rho(x_0) \otimes D\rho(x_0) = \varphi^2 \left( \left| \frac{Sx_0}{z_0} \right|^2 \right) \frac{Sx_0 \otimes Sx_0}{z_0^2}. \quad (4.3.3)$$

From (4.2.5) and (4.2.12)

$$\kappa_1^2 + \Delta(x_0) = \kappa_1^2 + \frac{\kappa_1^2 |(Sx_0, z_0)| - \kappa_1 z_0}{\kappa_1 z_0 - |(Sx_0, z_0)|} = \frac{\kappa_1^3 - \kappa_1}{\kappa_1 - \sqrt{\left|\frac{Sx_0}{z_0}\right|^2} + 1} = (\kappa_1^2 - 1) \varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx_0}{z_0} \right|^2 \right),$$

and so

$$\frac{(a - \rho(x_0))(1 - \kappa_1^2)}{\kappa_1^2 + \Delta(x_0)} = -\frac{z_0}{\varphi \left( \left| \frac{Sx_0}{z_0} \right|^2 \right)}. \quad (4.3.4)$$

Replacing (4.3.1), (4.3.3), and (4.3.4) in the expression of  $\mathcal{A}$  in (3.4.8), we get

$$\mathcal{A} = I + \frac{\kappa_1^2 - 1}{\kappa_1^2} \frac{\varphi^2}{z_0^2} S \otimes S - \frac{z_0}{\varphi} D^2 \rho.$$

Hence from Lemma 4.6 applied to  $\mathbf{y} = \frac{Sx_0}{z_0}$  and (4.3.1)

$$\mathcal{A} = \left( I + \frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} S \otimes S \right) \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) - \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) \left( \frac{\varphi}{z_0^2} S \otimes S - DS \right) = \left( I + \frac{2}{z_0^2} \frac{\varphi'}{\varphi} S \otimes S \right) (I + DS).$$

Hence, since  $\varphi, \varphi' > 0$  and  $S \otimes S$  is positive semidefinite, we conclude that  $\mathcal{A}(x_0)$  is invertible if and only if  $I + DS(x_0)$  is invertible.  $\square$

Theorem 4.7 concludes our analysis of the imaging problem in Section 4.1 which can be summarized as follows. Given  $\Omega$  open, and simply connected domain,  $a > 0$ ,  $T : \Omega \mapsto \Omega^*$  a  $C^2$  bijective map, define  $Sx = Tx - x$ . Let  $x_0 \in \Omega$ , and assume  $a$  and  $Sx_0$  are such that  $a > \frac{|Sx_0|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}$ . Assume moreover  $S$  satisfies (4.2.10) and (4.2.11) in a neighborhood

of  $x_0$ . Then, from Corollary 4.3, for every  $z_0$  satisfying inequality (4.2.9), there exists  $\rho$  positive solution to (4.2.2) such that  $a - \rho(x_0) = z_0$ . Since  $S$  is  $C^2$  then the solution  $\rho$  is  $C^3$ . Letting  $\sigma_1 = \{(x, \rho(x))\}$  separating media I and II,  $\sigma_1$  refracts the vertical rays emitted from  $(x, 0)$ ,  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , into the  $(Tx, a)$ . Letting  $c > a$ , if moreover,  $T$  is a diffeomorphism in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , and  $S$  satisfies cases (1), or (2) of Theorem 4.7 then, from Theorem 3.6, there exists a  $C^1$  phase discontinuity  $\phi$  defined in a neighborhood of every point  $(Tx, a) \in \sigma_2$ ,  $x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$ , such that the ray at  $(Tx, a)$  is refracted by the metasurface  $(\sigma_2, \phi)$  into the point  $(Tx, c)$ .

**4.4. Examples.** This section elaborates on the examples of admissible maps  $T$  mentioned in Remark 4.5, and examines whether they satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.7.

**Example 1.** Consider the maps  $Tx = (1 + \alpha)x$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0 = (0, 0)$  with  $\alpha \neq -1$ .

$T$  is clearly a diffeomorphism and so from Theorem 4.7 the corresponding matrix  $\mathcal{A}(x_0)$  is invertible. Also,  $Sx_0 = \alpha x_0 = 0$  and  $DS(x_0) = \alpha I$ . So from Theorem 4.7 (case (1)) if  $\alpha \neq 0$  then  $D^2\rho$  is invertible, and hence for every  $a > z_0 > 0$  the imaging problem has a local solution in a neighborhood of  $x_0 = (0, 0)$  with  $a - \rho(x_0) = z_0$ .

In the case of  $\alpha = 0$ , we cannot apply Theorem 3.6 since  $DS = 0$  and hence  $D^2\rho$  is not invertible, however, notice that in this case  $T$  is the identity map, then letting  $\sigma_1$  be a horizontal plane below the plane  $\{x_3 = a\}$ , i.e.  $\rho$  is constant, and  $\varphi = 0$ , then the incident vertical rays are not deviated by the lens  $(\sigma_1, (\sigma_2, \phi))$  and so the map  $T$  can still be achieved in this case.

**Example 2.** Assume  $T$  only changes one of the coordinates, say for example  $Tx = (h(x_1), x_2)$  with  $h \in C^2$  and injective, and let  $x_0 = (0, 0)$ . Notice that in this case  $Sx = (h(x_1) - x_1, 0)$ ,

$$DS(x) = \begin{pmatrix} h'(x_1) - 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If  $h(0) = 0$ , then  $Sx_0 = (0, 0)$  but since  $DS(x_0)$  is singular so from Theorem 4.7 (case (1))  $D^2\rho$  is singular at  $x_0$  and the existence of phase discontinuity  $\phi$ , in this case, cannot be deduced from Theorem 3.6.

If  $h(0) \neq 0$ , then  $Sx_0 \neq (0, 0)$ . In this case  $\zeta_{\perp} = 0$  is the eigenvalue of  $DS(x_0)$  corresponding to  $S_{\perp}^t x_0$  and hence again by Theorem 4.7 (case (2))  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  is singular and the existence of phase discontinuity  $\phi$  cannot be deduced from Theorem 3.6.

**Example 3.** Consider a function  $s$  on  $\Omega$  solution to the Eikonal equation  $|Ds| = C$  for some  $C > 0$ , and  $S = Ds$ . Let  $x_0 = (0, 0)$ , notice that since  $|Sx_0| = C > 0$  then  $S^t x_0 \neq (0, 0)$ . Squaring then differentiating the Eikonal equation we get that  $D^2s(x_0) = DS(x_0)$  has an eigenvalue equal to 0 corresponding to the eigenvector  $S^t x_0$ . From Theorem 4.7,  $D^2\rho(x_0)$  and  $\mathcal{A}(x_0)$  are invertible if and only if the eigenvalue  $\zeta_{\perp}$  of  $DS$  corresponding to  $S_{\perp}^t$  is different than 0 and  $-1$ .

For example, let  $s(x) = |x - \gamma|$ , with  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \neq (0, 0)$  solving  $|Ds| = 1$ . In this case,  $Sx = \frac{x - \gamma}{|x - \gamma|}$  and

$$DS = D^2s = \frac{1}{|x - \gamma|} I - \frac{(x - \gamma) \otimes (x - \gamma)}{|x - \gamma|^3}.$$

At  $x_0 = (0, 0)$ , the eigenvalues of  $DS$  are  $\zeta = 0$  corresponding to  $S^t(x_0)$  and  $\zeta_{\perp} = \frac{1}{|\gamma|}$  corresponding to  $S_{\perp}^t(x_0)$ , hence from Theorem 4.7 the matrix  $D^2\rho$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are invertible at  $x_0$  and a solution to the imaging problem exists in a neighborhood of  $(0, 0)$ .

**4.5. The two-dimensional case.** We end the paper by providing an easier presentation of the existence results in the two-dimensional case. Here,  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \{(t, \rho(t))\}_{t \in \Omega}$  with  $\rho$  to be calculated, and  $\sigma_2$  is contained in the horizontal line  $y = a$  with  $a > 0$  and phase discontinuity  $\phi := \phi(u_1, u_2)$  to be found. For simplicity, using an appropriate system of coordinates, we solve in a neighborhood of  $t_0 = 0$ .

Given a  $C^2$  bijective map  $T$  defined on the interval  $(-\tau, \tau)$ , and letting  $S = Tx - x$ , from Section 4.2, assume  $a > \frac{|S(0)|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}$ , and  $a > z_0 > \frac{|S(0)|}{\sqrt{\kappa_1^2 - 1}}$  we are interested in finding positive solution to the IVP

$$\begin{cases} \rho'(t) = \frac{\kappa_1 S(t)}{\sqrt{|S(t)|^2 + (a - \rho(t))^2} - \kappa_1(a - \rho(t))} \\ a - \rho(0) = z_0 \end{cases} \quad (4.5.1)$$

By Picard's Theorem such a system has a unique local solution for every  $C^2$  map  $S$ . In the




FIGURE 3

particular case when  $T(t) = (1 + \alpha)t$ , we have  $S(t) = \alpha t$ , and using the notation  $\tilde{\rho} = a - \rho$  (4.5.1) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\tilde{\rho}}{dt} = \frac{\frac{\alpha t}{\tilde{\rho}(t)}}{\kappa_1 - \sqrt{\frac{\alpha^2 t^2}{(\tilde{\rho}(t))^2} + 1}} \\ \tilde{\rho}(0) = z_0 \end{cases} \quad .$$

The ODE in this case is homogeneous of the form  $\tilde{\rho}' = F\left(\frac{t}{\tilde{\rho}}\right)$  that can be solved explicitly using the substitution  $v(t) = \frac{t}{\tilde{\rho}(t)}$ , See Figure 3 for the graph of solutions corresponding to different values of  $\alpha$ , and  $z_0 = 70$ .

In the more general case, given a map  $T$ , and  $\rho$  a positive local solution to (4.5.1) satisfying (4.2.1). The curve  $\sigma_1$  refracts rays emitted from  $(t, 0)$  with  $t$  in a neighborhood to  $t_0 = 0$  into the point  $(Tx, a)$ . For the existence of a phase discontinuity in a neighborhood of every point in  $\sigma_2$  so that rays are refracted by  $\sigma_2$  with vertical direction, we need, from Theorems 3.6, and 4.7, that  $S'(0) \neq \varphi\left(\frac{|S(0)|^2}{z_0^2}\right)\frac{S(0)^2}{z_0}$ , and  $S'(0) \neq -1$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Achouri and C. Caloz, *Electromagnetic Metasurfaces: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
- [2] F. Aieta, P. Genevet, M. Kats, and F. Capasso, "Aberrations of flat lenses and aplanatic metasurfaces," *Opt. Express*, vol. 21, no. 25, pp. 31 530–31 539, Dec 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/oe/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-21-25-31530>
- [3] M. Alibakhshikenari, B. S. Virdee, P. Shukla, N. O. Parchin, L. Azpilicueta, C. H. See, R. A. Abd-Alhameed, F. Falcone, I. Huynen, T. A. Denidni, and E. Limiti, "Metamaterial-inspired antenna array for application in microwave breast imaging systems for tumor detection," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 174 667–174 678, 2020.
- [4] G. Aronsson, "Extension of functions satisfying lipschitz conditions," *Arkiv för Matematik*, vol. 6, pp. 551–561, 1967.
- [5] E. N. Barron, L. C. Evans, and R. Jensen, "The infinity laplacian, aronsson's equation and their generalizations," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 360, no. 1, pp. 77–101, 2008.
- [6] T. Blalock, K. Medicus, and J. D. Nelson, "Fabrication of freeform optics," in *Optical Manufacturing and Testing XI*, vol. 9575, International Society for Optics and Photonics. SPIE, 2015, p. 95750H. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2188523>
- [7] M. Born and E. Wolf, *Principles of optics: electromagnetic theory of propagation, interference and diffraction of light*. Elsevier, 2013.
- [8] J. Canet-Ferrer, *Metamaterials and Metasurfaces*. IntechOpen, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=oC-RDwAAQBAJ>
- [9] W. T. Chen, J. A. Paulson, A. Y. Zhu, J. Sisler, Y.-W. Huang, K. M. A. Yousef, E. Lee, C.-W. Qiu, and F. Capasso, "Broadband achromatic metasurface-refractive optics broadband achromatic metasurface-refractive optics," *Nano letters*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 7801–7808, Nov 2013.
- [10] J. Ding and A. Zhou, "Eigenvalues of rank-one updated matrices with some applications," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 20, no. 12, pp. 1223–1226, 2007. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893965907000614>
- [11] L. L. Doskolovich, D. A. Bykov, E. S. Andreev, E. A. Bezus, and V. Oliker, "Designing double freeform surfaces for collimated beam shaping with optimal mass transportation and linear assignment problems," *Opt. Express*, vol. 26, no. 19, pp. 24 602–24 613, Sep 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/oe/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-26-19-24602>
- [12] A. Friedman and B. McLeod, "Optimal design of an optical lens," *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 99, no. 2, pp. 147–164, 1987. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00275875>

- [13] C. E. Gutiérrez, “Aspherical lens design,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 30, no. 9, pp. 1719–1726, Sep 2013. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/josaa/abstract.cfm?URI=josaa-30-9-1719>
- [14] C. E. Gutiérrez and Q. Huang, “The near field refractor,” in *Geometric Methods in PDE’s*, vol. 7, 2008, pp. 175–188.
- [15] —, “The near field refractor,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 655–684, 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0294144913000838>
- [16] C. E. Gutiérrez, Q. Huang, Q. Mérigot, and B. Thibert, “Metasurfaces and optimal transport,” *The SMAI Journal of computational mathematics*, vol. 8, pp. 201–224, 2022.
- [17] C. E. Gutiérrez and L. Pallucchini, “Reflection and refraction problems for metasurfaces related to monge ampère equations,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 35, no. 9, pp. 1523–1531, Sep 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/josaa/abstract.cfm?URI=josaa-35-9-1523>
- [18] C. E. Gutiérrez and A. Sabra, “Design of pairs of reflectors,” *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 891–899, Apr 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/josaa/abstract.cfm?URI=josaa-31-4-891>
- [19] —, “Aspherical lens design and imaging,” *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 386–411, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1030807>
- [20] C. E. Gutiérrez and A. Sabra, “Freeform lens design for scattering data with general radiant fields,” *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 228, no. 2, pp. 341–399, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00205-017-1196-y>
- [21] —, “Chromatic aberration in metalenses,” *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, vol. 124, p. 102134, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196885820301378>
- [22] —, “Maxwell equations in distributional sense and applications,” 2023, preprint ArXiv 2305.01081.
- [23] C. E. Gutiérrez and F. Tournier, “Regularity for the near field parallel refractor and reflector problems,” *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 917–949, Dec 2015.
- [24] P. Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations: Second Edition*, ser. Classics in Applied Mathematics. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2002. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=v0z4ckZbuhMC>
- [25] E. Hecht, *Optics*. Addison-Wesley, 2001, no. 4th edition.
- [26] R. A. Hicks, “Reflective surface producing a non-reversed, undistorted, perspective view,” U.S. Patent 8,979,287, Mar 2015.
- [27] F. John, *Partial differential equations and applications*, 4th ed. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
- [28] A. Karakhanyan and X.-J. Wang, “On the reflector shape design,” *Journal of Differential Geometry*, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 561 – 610, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1279114301>
- [29] A. L. Karakhanyan and A. Sabra, “Refractor surfaces determined by near-field data,” *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 269, no. 2, pp. 1278–1318, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039620300024>
- [30] M. Khorasaninejad and F. Capasso, “Metalenses: Versatile multifunctional photonic components,” *Science*, vol. 358, no. 6367, p. eaam8100, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.aam8100>
- [31] S. A. Kochengin, V. I. Oliner, and O. von Tempiski, “On the design of reflectors with prespecified distribution of virtual sources and intensities,” *Inverse Problems*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 661, 1998.
- [32] Y. Lee and J. Wu, “Control of optical spin hall shift in phase-discontinuity metasurface by weak value measurement post-selection,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 14900, 2015.
- [33] F. Liu and X.-P. Yang, “Solutions to an inhomogeneous equation involving infinity laplacian,” *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 75, no. 14, pp. 5693–5701, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0362546X12002155>

- [34] D. Pellis, M. Kilian, H. Wang, C. Jiang, C. Müller, and H. Pottmann, "Architectural freeform surfaces designed for cost-effective paneling through mold re-use," in *Advances in Architectural Geometry*, 05 2021, pp. 2–16.
- [35] J. P. Rolland, M. A. Davies, T. J. Suleski, C. Evans, A. Bauer, J. C. Lambropoulos, and K. Falaggis, "Freeform optics for imaging," *Optica*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 161–176, Feb 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/optica/abstract.cfm?URI=optica-8-2-161>
- [36] K.-H. Shih and C. K. Renshaw, "Broadband metasurface aberration correctors for hybrid meta/refractive mwir lenses," *Opt. Express*, vol. 30, no. 16, pp. 28 438–28 453, Aug 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://opg.optica.org/oe/abstract.cfm?URI=oe-30-16-28438>
- [37] G. Strang, *Linear Algebra and Learning from Data*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press, 2019. [Online]. Available: [https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=L0Y\\_wQEACAAJ](https://books.google.com.lb/books?id=L0Y_wQEACAAJ)
- [38] K. P. Thompson and J. P. Rolland, "Freeform optical surfaces: A revolution in imaging optical design," *Opt. Photon. News*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 30–35, Jun 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://www.optica-opn.org/abstract.cfm?URI=opn-23-6-30>
- [39] W. C. Ting, A. Y. Zhu, V. Sanjeev, M. Khorasaninejad, E. L. Zhujun Shi, and F. Capasso, "A broadband achromatic metalens for focusing and imaging in the visible," *Nature Nanotechnology*, vol. 13, pp. 220–226, 2018.
- [40] X. Wang, "On the design of reflector antenna ii," *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 329–341, 2004.
- [41] N. Yu, P. Genevet, M. A. Kats, F. Aieta, J.-P. Tetienne, F. Capasso, and Z. Gaburro, "Light propagation with phase discontinuities: Generalized laws of reflection and refraction," *Science*, vol. 334, no. 6054, pp. 333–337, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.1210713>
- [42] L. Zheng and Y. Zhao, "Generalized snell's law and its verification by metasurface," in *Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing*, L. Barolli, A. Poniszewska-Maranda, and H. Park, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 364–372.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CENTER OF ADVANCED MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT, BEIRUT

Email address: iza04@mail.aub.edu, faf21@mail.aub.edu, rak104@mail.aub.edu, asabra@aub.edu.lb, wkt00@mail.aub.edu