## **Tailor-Made Metasurface Camouflage**

M. Tsukerman<sup>1</sup>, K. Grotov<sup>1</sup>, A. Mikhailovskaya<sup>1\*</sup>, P. Bezrukov<sup>1</sup>, S. Geyman<sup>1</sup>, A. Kharchevskii<sup>1</sup>, A.Maximenko<sup>1</sup>, V. Bobrovs<sup>1</sup>, and P. Ginzburg<sup>1</sup>

> <sup>1</sup>Institute of Telecommunications, Riga Technical University, Riga, 1048, Latvia \*Corresponding author. Email: <u>mikhailovskaya1994@gmail.com</u>

**Abstract:** Reducing electromagnetic scattering from an object has always been a task, inspiring efforts across disciplines such as materials science and electromagnetic theory. The pursuit of electromagnetic cloaking significantly advanced the field of metamaterials, yet achieving broadband, conformal cloaking for complex, non-trivial objects remains an unresolved challenge. Here, we introduce the concept of 'tailor-made metasurfaces' — machine-designed aperiodic structures optimized to suppress scattering from arbitrary objects by accounting for their layout, including resonant or large-scale features. Specifically, we demonstrated a wideband ~20% fractional bandwidth scattering suppression of more than 20-30 dB for various generic test objects, including randomly distributed wire meshes, spheres, and polygons. The demonstrated evolutionary optimization marks a leap forward in electromagnetic design, enabling the development of high-performance structures to meet complex technological demands.

Main Text: The manipulation of electromagnetic wave propagation, facilitated by structured media, has long been a core focus of fundamental and applied research. To expand the available degrees of freedom within structured media, the concept of metamaterials was introduced (1-6), followed by their two-dimensional counterparts, metasurfaces, which address additional aspects and constraints such as reduced form factor, fabrication simplicity, and others (7–9). One peculiarity introduced by the field of metamaterials is the negative refractive index (10-13), which was later proposed as a method for achieving electromagnetic cloaking (3, 14, 15). This concept, aimed at rendering objects invisible to electromagnetic systems such as radars, has been proposed and demonstrated in various configurations and spectral ranges. The pioneering demonstration in the GHz frequency band was done with a cloaking device composed of an array of electric and magnetic resonances (14). This arrangement creates an effective negative index metamaterial that guides electromagnetic waves around objects, preventing target-specific interactions and rendering them invisible. While this groundbreaking experiment marked a significant milestone in the field, it also revealed the inherent fundamental limitations of the approach. The primary limitations include the inherently narrow bandwidth, resulting from the resonant nature of the effect, and the bulky implementation, stemming from the need to achieve a propagation phase. These challenges are critical considerations in advancing the practicality and efficiency of metamaterial-based cloaking technologies. However, in many applications, a weaker property of scattering suppression provides a reasonable compromise between reliable performance and practicality. For example, Mantle cloaking utilizes a specially designed thin layer to cover an object. This layer cancels out the waves scattered by the target by interfering destructively with them, thus reducing the object's visibility (16). However, the primary efforts in this direction concentrate on relatively simple shapes (e.g., flat surfaces, cylinders, and spheres), thus optimizing periodic arrays of resonators (metasurfaces) comes as a reasonable solution. However, in practical applications, objects targeted for scattering suppression often have complex shapes and are made from diverse materials, including metals and dielectrics. The varied shapes and material properties pose significant challenges compared to simpler geometries, inspiring the development of universal or adaptable scattering suppression solutions. An additional factor to consider is the bandwidth, the angle of incidence, and polarization. The bandwidth aspects become primarily challenging in the context of resonant structures. Considering all those aspects, the problem of scattering suppression from an arbitrary object becomes a subject of multi-objective optimization in a relatively large search space. It is worth briefly mentioning the field of absorbing materials, widely employed as radar countermeasures in stealth technologies (17). Despite their exceptional performance, this approach requires substantial wave propagation in the absorber, making it inherently bulky. Moreover, addressing resonant interaction regimes, especially when object features are wavelength-comparable, can be challenging with such methods, potentially limiting their universality.

Here, we present the concept of a tailor-made metasurface cover, engineered using an evolutionary algorithm to suppress electromagnetic scattering from arbitrarily shaped objects across a broad frequency range. Instead of following the conventional approach of designing periodic structures and applying homogenization strategies to either effective material parameters or surface impedances, we address the scattering suppression problem by considering both the metasurface cover and the object behind it simultaneously. This approach represents an inverse problem (*18–23*), beginning with a defined objective - broadband scattering suppression - and systematically determining the configurations needed to achieve it.

#### The Scattering Suppression Problem

Consider an arbitrary electromagnetic object subjected to scattering cancellation, such as the one depicted in Fig. 1a, illustrating Winnie-the-Pooh attempting to evade the surveillance of bees (24). A typical airborne target may exhibit a substantial scattering cross section due to its geometry with large-scale features exceeding the wavelength, resonant properties, or a combination of both, with the latter being the most challenging case to address. While our approach is scalable and applicable across any spectral domain, we focus on the C-band (4-8 GHz) as a specific yet versatile example, given its widespread use in radar traffic control, 5G networks, and satellite communications and monitoring. As test objects, we selected a randomly assembled polyhedron with sides composed of metal wires, a large random array of metal wires, and a wire mesh sphere. These structures, which span several wavelengths, exhibit both resonant and specular reflections. Here, we focus on the polyhedron (Fig. 1b), while additional configurations are detailed in the Supplementary Materials (SM), demonstrating versatility and comparable performance, also addressing the case of the X-band (8-12GHz). The operational bandwidth is targeted at 1-1.5 GHz, aligning with widely accepted wireless communication standards, which typically involve about 10% fractional bandwidth for radar systems. In practical terms, a 30 dB reduction in scattering corresponds to the difference between a 5 m<sup>2</sup> and 0.005 m<sup>2</sup> featuring the gap between conventional and stealth aircraft (25). Therefore, a 30 dB reduction, which is the target of our optimization, serves as a benchmark.

#### Metasurface Optimization Search Space

The architecture of the metasurface consists of an array of electric and magnetic resonators, specifically wires and square split resonators, respectively. This configuration utilizes interactions with both fields, offering an additional layer of flexibility (26). A specific architecture consists of a square metasurface  $(12 \times 12 \text{ cm})$  divided into nine equal cells, where each cell represents a virtual sphere encompassing a resonator. The resonator's parameters, including its overall size and spatial orientation (defined by Euler angles), are subject to optimization. The search space in this case comprises 4 continuous spatial variables and 1 discrete parameter (either electric or magnetic resonator) per cell. Consequently, the optimization effort increases substantially with the growth of array dimensions. The metasurface is positioned at a variable distance, an additional parameter, ranging from 40 mm to 200 mm below the object. Fig. 1a illustrates the layout.

#### **Evolutionary Optimization - Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy**

Optimization algorithms can be divided into two categories: gradient-based (27) and gradient-free methods (22), (28), (29), (30). In electromagnetic design, multi-resonant structures exhibit rapid fluctuations in their backscattering cross-section due to numerous local extrema, causing instability in traditional optimization methods like grid search, steepest descent, or conjugate gradient (31). These methods often converge to local extrema rather than the global one. Additionally, gradient-based methods are ineffective for problems with discrete components, such as here with wires and SRRs mixtures, requiring combinational approaches. Gradient-free algorithms, such as evolutionary methods, rely on principles of natural selection, crossover, and mutation (32–34). Starting with a random population, configurations undergo crossover and mutation to form new populations - Fig. 2a. The most adapted individuals, showing the highest objective function, are selected for the next generation. While these methods don't guarantee finding the global maximum, heuristic principles make them effective. Among these, the covariance matrix adaptation evolution strategy (CMA-ES) (35) stands out for handling high-dimensional, multi-modal problems. Unlike traditional genetic algorithms, CMA-ES efficiently explores irregular optimization landscapes, offering faster convergence and requiring minimal parameter tuning. Its data-driven mutation and implicit crossover make it particularly suitable for complex electromagnetic problems. Specific settings and further discussions are detailed in the SM.

Given the large search space, the number of iterations needed to converge on a solution typically ranges from 200 to 400, depending on the object's complexity, primarily influenced by its internal resonances. Consequently, a fast-forward solver is required. Here, we employ the 'Method of Moments' (MoM), specifically implemented to address configurations composed of metal wires (*36*), (*37*). In this case, calculating the cost function takes about 10–30 seconds on an Intel® Xeon® CPU E3-1230 v6 @ 3.50 GHz, enabling extensive optimization. In comparison, a similar routine would take approximately 100 times longer using commercial software such as CST Microwave Studio.

#### **Broadband Scattering Suppression, Examples**

To demonstrate the principle, we have selected several representative objects (also in SM). The first (main) object is a polyhedron with a strong scattering resonance at 7.5 GHz. This target spans three wavelengths across, representing a relatively large resonant case. The second object is a virtual cube containing 27 randomly oriented dipoles, with resonances within the range of interest. This scenario represents an unpredictable structure that may be sensitive to the introduction of additional resonant elements of the metasurface due to strong near-field coupling between all the elements. The third scenario involves a mesh wire sphere, which is typically used as a radar calibration target. This target exhibits the largest scattering cross-section among all examples.

The algorithm's outcomes are object-specific  $3\times3$  arrays, with the layouts provided in the SM. Fig. 1b, along with Figs. 2b and 2c, summarize the backscattering spectra for the three targets, both covered and uncovered. The comparison highlights the scattering suppression achieved by tailor-made metasurfaces. Scattering spectra calculated with MoM as the forward solver in fast optimization agree with results from the Finite Element Method implemented in CST Microwave Studio, which takes into account the wires' material parameters. The discrepancies highlight the resonant nature of the approach and, to some extent, reflect the challenges associated with the superscattering problem, where strong near-field accumulation within the structure increases sensitivity to material losses and fabrication imperfections (*38– 42*). All three custom metasurfaces achieve approximately 30 dB of scattering suppression (MoM model), with the suppression reaching 40 dB for the sphere, which inherently has the highest scattering. Notably, the bare metasurface itself exhibits significant scattering, emphasizing its strong interaction with the target. Consequently, the suppression effect arises from destructive interference. Further evaluations can be conducted. For example, the straightforward approach of using a tilted reflector, as employed in first-generation stealth technologies to ensure that an incident wave never returns thereby reducing the monostatic radar cross section is ineffective, as detailed in the SM.

While evolutionary algorithms can optimize the physical layout of designs, they often do not offer insights into the underlying physical principles that drive performance. To reveal the operational principles, 3D scattering diagrams for both the uncovered and covered polyhedron are presented in Fig. 1c, illustrating the physical concept of the effect: the suppression of the backscattering lobe in favor of enhanced forward scattering. Thus, the operational principle can be partially associated with first-generation stealth technology. However, unlike stealth methods based on geometrical optics, which cannot be applied to resonant objects comparable to the wavelength, our approach is multi-resonant. Furthermore, in our case, most of the energy is scattered forward, making the approach resilient to multistatic radar interrogation.

#### **Experimental Realization**

Since the scattering suppression depends on multiple resonances, the experimental realization requires to use of low-loss material platforms for resonator fabrication and accurate methods for their 3D alignment. In the initial stage, the resonators forming the array were fabricated using standard lithography methods. Thin low-loss substrates were selected to minimize losses. Due to the complex spatial orientation and the need for precise positioning (see Fig. 3 for a sample view), a specialized holder was developed. The structure is fabricated in multiple steps. First, an inverse preform was 3D-printed and used as a template for a silicone mold. The mold is then filled with liquid polyurethane foam, which expands and solidifies (cures). After curing, the preform is removed, and the resonators are mounted on the freestanding foam pillars, which are transparent to GHz waves (see SM). To emphasize the need for precise positioning, several experiments addressing misalignments that led to performance degradation were conducted and summarized in the SM.

Scattering measurements were conducted in an anechoic chamber, enabling accurate retrieval of absolute scattering cross-section values. Fig. 3a illustrates the experimental setup in the chamber (details provided in the SM). The backscattering cross-section was quantified using a calibration target (disc) with known parameters (43). Fig. 3b summarizes the experimental results for three samples: the uncovered polyhedron, the standalone metasurface, and the concealed target. Absolute values from both the experiment and modeling agree

quantitatively for the polyhedron. The concealed target also closely follows the CST model, with a slight underperformance at 8 GHz, highlighting the challenges of implementing a multiresonant approach. The dip at 7 GHz exceeds expectations and demonstrates a 35 dB suppression, indicating a slight shift in resonance interference to lower frequencies.

#### Conclusion

Here, we introduced the concept of evolutionary-designed metasurfaces to address the longstanding challenge of broadband scattering suppression for complex-shaped bodies. The most demanding scenario, requiring consideration of multiple resonant multipolar contributions to scattering, involves a target spanning several wavelengths. Practically, this relates to air surveillance in lower frequency bands, which are used for long-range and over-the-horizon integration. The demonstrated family of magneto-electric metasurfaces consists of aperiodically distributed rings and wires, primarily interacting with the magnetic and electric field components of the incident wave. Several test structures were analyzed, and in all cases, substantial scattering suppression over a wide fractional bandwidth was achieved, demonstrating the method's versatility. The realm of forthcoming challenges in wireless applications in dense environments calls for developing new approaches to electromagnetic design. Considering multiple scattering events (multipath), complex shapes of geometries, and encompassing metal and dielectric materials with different electromagnetic properties makes optimization problems particularly difficult on pathways to find close to optimal solutions. Acknowledging these challenges, the established concepts of metamaterials and metasurfaces with periodic unit cells warrant reconsideration in favor of tailor-made aperiodic structures optimized for specific functions.

#### **References:**

- 1. N. I. Zheludev, Y. S. Kivshar, From metamaterials to metadevices. *Nat. Mater.* **11**, 917–924 (2012).
- 2. N. Engheta, R. W. Ziolkowski, *Metamaterials: Physics and Engineering Explorations* (Wiley-IEEE Press; 2006).
- 3. J. B. Pendry, D. Schurig, D. R. Smith, Controlling Electromagnetic Fields. *Science* **312**, 1780–1782 (2006).
- 4. H. Chen, C. T. Chan, P. Sheng, Transformation optics and metamaterials. *Nat. Mater.* **9**, 387–396 (2010).
- 5. V. M. Shalaev, Optical negative-index metamaterials. *Nat. Photonics* 1, 41–48 (2007).
- 6. J. Valentine, S. Zhang, T. Zentgraf, E. Ulin-Avila, D. A. Genov, G. Bartal, X. Zhang, Threedimensional optical metamaterial with a negative refractive index. *Nature* **455**, 376–379 (2008).
- 7. A. V. Kildishev, A. Boltasseva, V. M. Shalaev, Planar Photonics with Metasurfaces. *Science* **339**, 1232009 (2013).
- 8. N. Yu, P. Genevet, M. A. Kats, F. Aieta, J.-P. Tetienne, F. Capasso, Z. Gaburro, Light Propagation with Phase Discontinuities: Generalized Laws of Reflection and Refraction. *Science* **334**, 333–337 (2011).
- 9. L. Li, H. Zhao, C. Liu, L. Li, T. J. Cui, Intelligent metasurfaces: control, communication and computing. *eLight* **2**, 7 (2022).
- 10. W. J. Padilla, D. N. Basov, D. R. Smith, Negative refractive index metamaterials. *Mater. Today* 9, 28–35 (2006).
- 11. D. R. Smith, W. J. Padilla, D. C. Vier, S. C. Nemat-Nasser, S. Schultz, Composite Medium with Simultaneously Negative Permeability and Permittivity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4184–4187 (2000).
- 12. R. A. Shelby, D. R. Smith, S. Schultz, Experimental Verification of a Negative Index of Refraction. *Science* **292**, 77–79 (2001).
- 13. V. G. Veselago, The Electrodynamics Of Substances With Simultaneously Negative Values Of And μ. *Sov. Phys. Uspekhi* **10**, 509 (1968).
- 14. D. Schurig, J. J. Mock, B. J. Justice, S. A. Cummer, J. B. Pendry, A. F. Starr, D. R. Smith, Metamaterial Electromagnetic Cloak at Microwave Frequencies. *Science* **314**, 977–980 (2006).
- 15. P. Alitalo, S. Tretyakov, Electromagnetic cloaking with metamaterials. *Mater. Today* **12**, 22–29 (2009).
- 16. P.-Y. Chen, A. Alù, Mantle cloaking using thin patterned metasurfaces. *Phys. Rev. B* 84, 205110 (2011).
- 17. G. A. Rao, S. P. Mahulikar, Integrated review of stealth technology and its role in airpower. *Aeronaut. J.* **106**, 629–642 (2002).
- S. So, J. Mun, J. Rho, Simultaneous Inverse Design of Materials and Structures via Deep Learning: Demonstration of Dipole Resonance Engineering Using Core–Shell Nanoparticles. ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 11, 24264–24268 (2019).
- 19. P. R. Wiecha, A. Arbouet, C. Girard, O. L. Muskens, Deep learning in nano-photonics: inverse design and beyond. *Photonics Res.* **9**, B182–B200 (2021).
- 20. S. Ren, A. Mahendra, O. Khatib, Y. Deng, W. J. Padilla, J. M. Malof, Inverse deep learning methods and benchmarks for artificial electromagnetic material design. *Nanoscale* **14**, 3958–3969 (2022).
- 21. M. Capek, L. Jelinek, P. Kadlec, M. Gustafsson, Optimal Inverse Design Based on Memetic Algorithms—Part I: Theory and Implementation. *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.* **71**, 8806–8816 (2023).
- 22. B. Lou, J. A. Rodriguez, B. Wang, M. Cappelli, S. Fan, Inverse Design of Optical Switch Based on Bilevel Optimization Inspired by Meta-Learning. *ACS Photonics* **10**, 1806–1812 (2023).
- 23. Y. Augenstein, C. Rockstuhl, Inverse Design of Nanophotonic Devices with Structural Integrity. *ACS Photonics* 7, 2190–2196 (2020).
- 24. A. A. Milne, Winnie-the-Pooh (E.P. Dutton & Company, New York, 1926).
- 25. The B-2 at 30: Improving with Age | Air & Space Forces Magazine. https://www.airandspaceforces.com/article/the-b-2-at-30-improving-with-age/.

- 26. A. Mikhailovskaya, K. Grotov, D. Vovchuk, D. Dobrykh, C. Rockstuhl, P. Ginzburg, Superradiant Broadband Magneto-electric Arrays Empowered by Meta-learning, *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.*, 1–1 (2025).
- M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. G. Colmenarejo, M. W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, B. Shillingford, N. de Freitas, in *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 2016) *NIPS'16*, pp. 3988–3996.
- 28. S. L. Ho, Shiyou Yang, Guangzheng Ni, H. C. Wong, A particle swarm optimization method with enhanced global search ability for design optimizations of electromagnetic devices. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **42**, 1107–1110 (2006).
- 29. G. F. Uler, O. A. Mohammed, C.-S. Koh, Design optimization of electrical machines using genetic algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **31**, 2008–2011 (1995).
- Y. Li, G. Lei, G. Bramerdorfer, S. Peng, X. Sun, J. Zhu, Machine Learning for Design Optimization of Electromagnetic Devices: Recent Developments and Future Directions. *Appl. Sci.* 11, 1627 (2021).
- 31. J. I. Myung, D. R. Cavagnaro, M. A. Pitt, A Tutorial on Adaptive Design Optimization. *J. Math. Psychol.* **57**, 53–67 (2013).
- A. N. Sloss, S. Gustafson, "2019 Evolutionary Algorithms Review" in *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVII*, W. Banzhaf, E. Goodman, L. Sheneman, L. Trujillo, B. Worzel, Eds. (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020), pp. 307–344.
- 33. A. Boag, A. Boag, E. Michielssen, R. Mittra, Design of electrically loaded wire antennas using genetic algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.* 44, 687- (1996).
- 34. Y. Rahmat-Samii, E. Michelssen, *Electromagnetic Optimization by Genetic Algorithms* (Wiley Series in Microwave and Optical Engineering, 1999).
- 35. S. Ravi, H. Larochelle, "Optimization as a Model for Few-Shot Learning" in *ICLR 2017 Conference Track* [2017; https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJY0-Kcll].
- 36. T. Rylander, P. Ingelström, A. Bondeson, *Computational Electromagnetics*, *Texts in Applied Mathematics* (Springer New York, NY, 2013).
- 37. T. Molteno, 2025 python-necpp: Antenna simulation in python. GitHub repository https://github.com/tmolteno/python-necpp.
- 38. R. C. Hansen, R. E. Collin, *Small Antenna Handbook* (Wiley-IEEE Press, Hoboken, NJ, 1st edition., 2011).
- Z. Ruan, S. Fan, Superscattering of Light from Subwavelength Nanostructures. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 105, 013901 (2010).
- K. Grotov, D. Vovchuk, S. Kosulnikov, I. Gorbenko, L. Shaposhnikov, K. Ladutenko, P. Belov, P. Ginzburg, Genetically Designed Wire Bundle Superscatterers. *IEEE Trans. Antennas Propag.* 70, 9621–9629 (2022).
- 41. A. Canós Valero, H. K. Shamkhi, A. S. Kupriianov, T. Weiss, A. A. Pavlov, D. Redka, V. Bobrovs, Y. Kivshar, A. S. Shalin, Superscattering emerging from the physics of bound states in the continuum. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 4689 (2023).
- 42. A. W. Powell, M. Mrnka, A. P. Hibbins, J. R. Sambles, Superscattering and Directive Antennas via Mode Superposition in Subwavelength Core-Shell Meta-Atoms. *Photonics* **9**, 6 (2022).
- 43. D. W. Hess, "Introduction to RCS measurements" in 2008 Loughborough Antennas and Propagation Conference (2008), pp. 37–44.
- M. Andrychowicz, M. Denil, S. Gomez, M. W. Hoffman, D. Pfau, T. Schaul, B. Shillingford, N. de Freitas, Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. arXiv arXiv:1606.04474 [Preprint] (2016). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1606.04474.
- 45. S. L. Ho, Shiyou Yang, Guangzheng Ni, H. C. Wong, A particle swarm optimization method with enhanced global search ability for design optimizations of electromagnetic devices. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **42**, 1107–1110 (2006).
- 46. G. F. Uler, O. A. Mohammed, C.-S. Koh, Design optimization of electrical machines using genetic algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Magn.* **31**, 2008–2011 (1995).
- Y. Li, G. Lei, G. Bramerdorfer, S. Peng, X. Sun, J. Zhu, Machine Learning for Design Optimization of Electromagnetic Devices: Recent Developments and Future Directions. *Appl. Sci.* 11, 1627 (2021).

- 48. J. I. Myung, D. R. Cavagnaro, M. A. Pitt, A tutorial on adaptive design optimization. *J. Math. Psychol.* **57**, 53–67 (2013).
- 49. T. Bäck, H.-P. Schwefel, An Overview of Evolutionary Algorithms for Parameter Optimization. *Evol. Comput.* **1**, 1–23 (1993).
- 50. A. N. Sloss, S. Gustafson, "2019 Evolutionary Algorithms Review" W. Banzhaf, E. Goodman, L. Sheneman, L. Trujillo, B. Worzel, Eds. (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020; http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-39958-0\_16)*Genetic* and Evolutionary Computation, pp. 307–344.
- 51. O. S. Ajani, A. Kumar, R. Mallipeddi, Covariance matrix adaptation evolution strategy based on correlated evolution paths with application to reinforcement learning. *Expert Syst Appl* **246** (2024).
- 52. Y. Akimoto, N. Hansen, "CMA-ES and advanced adaptation mechanisms" in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion* (ACM, Kyoto Japan, 2018; https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3205651.3207854), pp. 720–744.
- 53. A. Krasnok, D. Baranov, H. Li, M.-A. Miri, F. Monticone, A. Alú, Anomalies in light scattering. *Adv. Opt. Photonics* **11**, 892–951 (2019).
- 54. T. Rylander, P. Ingelström, A. Bondeson, "Computational Electromagnetics" (Springer New York, New York, NY, 2013; http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4614-5351-2)*Texts in Applied Mathematics*.
- 55. S. J. Orfanidis, *Electromagnetic Waves and Antennas* (ECE Department, 2002).
- 56. T. Molteno, tmolteno/python-necpp, (2025); https://github.com/tmolteno/python-necpp.
- 57. R. E. C. R. C. Hassen, Small Antenna Handbook (2011; http://archive.org/details/sm\_an\_han).
- 58. A. Mikhailovskaya, K. Grotov, D. Vovchuk, A. Machnev, D. Dobrykh, R. E. Noskov, K. Ladutenko, P. Belov, P. Ginzburg, Superradiant Scattering Limit for Arrays of Subwavelength Scatterers. *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **18**, 054063 (2022).
- D. Filonov, S. Kolen, A. Shmidt, Y. Shacham-Diamand, A. Boag, P. Ginzburg, Volumetric 3D-Printed Antennas, Manufactured via Selective Polymer Metallization. *Phys. Status Solidi RRL – Rapid Res. Lett.* 13, pssr.201800668 (2019).
- M. Khobzei, V. Tkach, D. Vovchuk, A. Mikhailovskaya, S. Haliuk, A. Samila, J. Porins, T. Salgals, V. Bobrovs, P. Ginzburg, Deformable time-modulated wire media resonators. *Photonics Nanostructures Fundam. Appl.* 63, 101343 (2025).
- 61. E. F. Knott, Radar Cross Section Measurements (SciTech Publishing, 2006).
- 62. B. Tremain, C. J. Durrant, I. E. Carter, A. P. Hibbins, J. R. Sambles, The Effect of Rotational Disorder on the Microwave Transmission of Checkerboard Metal Square Arrays. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 16608 (2015).
- 63. O. Dietz, U. Kuhl, H.-J. Stoeckmann, N. M. Makarov, F. M. Izrailev, Microwave realization of quasi one-dimensional systems with correlated disorder. *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 134203 (2011).
- 64. E. E. Maslova, M. V. Rybin, A. A. Bogdanov, Z. F. Sadrieva, Bound states in the continuum in periodic structures with structural disorder. *Nanophotonics* **10**, 4313–4321 (2021).

# Acknowledgments TBD

# Funding

TBD

# **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

# Data and materials availability

All data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials.

# **Supplementary Materials**

Supplementary Text Figs. S1-S4, S6-S9 References 44-64 Movie S5.



**Figure 1.** Tilor-made metasurface camouflage concept and performance. (A) Illustration of scattering suppression, metaphorically depicted by Winnie the Pooh counteracting surveillance radar, used by 'wrong bees'. Insets demonstrate the tailor-made metasurface and its individual elements, subject to optimization. (B) The geometry of a specific problem: a wire mesh polyhedron with a scattering suppression cover metasurface in front. The backscattering cross-section spectra are shown for the initial object with a light blue dashed line, the concealed object using numerical finite element modeling with a blue solid line, and the method of moments modeling, which serves as the fast forward solver for the optimization algorithm, shown with a red solid line. The green shadowed area represents the fractional bandwidth where the optimization has been performed. (C) Far-field scattering diagrams from the polyhedron target standalone and the target concealed by the metasurface. The modeling is done at representative frequencies as indicated on the plots.



Figure 2. Tailor-made Metasurface Optimization. (A) Layout of the genetic algorithm with the main steps indicated. (B, C) Scattering suppression for two representative objects: a wire mesh sphere and an assembly of random dipoles. Curve legends are provided as in Fig. 1b.



Figure 3. Experimental Demonstration of Tailor-Made Metasurface Camouflage. (A) Photograph of the measurement facility: an anechoic chamber with a zoom into the fabricated sample. (B) Backscattering spectra: the uncovered polyhedron (blue), the standalone metasurface (dashed green), and the concealed target (red).

# Supplementary Materials for

## **Tailor-Made Metasurface Camouflage**

M. Tsukerman<sup>1</sup>, K. Grotov<sup>1</sup>, A. Mikhailovskaya<sup>1,\*</sup>, P. Bezrukov<sup>1</sup>, S. Geyman<sup>1</sup>, A. Kharchevskii<sup>1</sup>, A.Maximenko<sup>1</sup>, V. Bobrovs<sup>1</sup>, and P. Ginzburg<sup>1</sup>

> <sup>1</sup>Institute of Photonics, Electronics and Telecommunications, Riga 1048, Latvia \*Corresponding author. Email: <u>mikhailovskaya1994@gmail.com</u>

#### The PDF file includes:

Supplementary Text Figs. S1 to S4, S6 to S9

#### Other Supplementary Materials for this manuscript include the following:

Movies S5

#### **Supplementary Text**

#### The algorithm – CMA-ES Evolution strategy

#### The Choice of the Algorithm

Optimization algorithms for designing electromagnetic structures are typically classified into two categories: those that rely on objective function gradients (44) and those that do not (45), (46), (47). The selection of an appropriate algorithm depends on the specific problem details. Here, we investigate the electromagnetic performance of multi-resonant structures, which are highly sensitive to perturbations. Our objective function, defined as the backscattering cross-section minimized over an extended frequency band, contains numerous local extrema that vary rapidly, causing significant fluctuations in its derivatives. Due to these complexities, classical optimization methods such as grid search, the steepest descent method, or the conjugate gradient method (48) are prone to instabilities and may converge to only one of many local extrema, which may not necessarily be close to the global optimum. Additionally, gradient-based optimization cannot be fully applied to the problem, as the unit cell of the metasurface contains either a wire or a split-square resonator (SSR), making the system only partially continuous. To address those challenges, evolutionary methods, based on natural selection principles, can be employed (49). Evolutionary optimization consists of three key stages: selection, crossover, and mutation (50). Initially, a random set of individuals (here, a set of resonators forming an array) is generated. These configurations undergo crossover and mutations, forming a new population. Crossover generates new candidates by reconfiguring the best-fitted solutions from the previous iteration. The mutation step helps avoid local minima by randomly altering different parameters of existing members in the population, as illustrated in Figure S1. At the end of each iteration, the most adapted candidates, those with the highest objective function values, are chosen to form the initial group. This population is then expanded to the required size through mutation and crossover for the next step. While this approach does not guarantee finding the global maximum, heuristic justifications suggest it converges toward it.

#### The Cost Function (Fitness Function)

The objective function considered here is the mean backward scattering cross-section from an object covered by a metasurface, sampled at several frequencies spanning the bandwidth. For clarity, the following mathematical formulation of the fitness function  $F(\theta_j, \varphi_i, R_k, \Delta_l)$ , which is to be maximized, is presented, Eq. S1:

$$F(\theta_j, R_k, \Delta_l) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{m=1}^N \sigma(\omega_m).$$
 Eq. S1

Here  $\theta_j$  is a set of Euler angles of all resonators in metasurface,  $R_k$  – a set of size scales, representing both lengths of wires and edge lengths of SSRs,  $\Delta_l = \{1, 0\}^9$  – a set, representing a type of resonator in each virtual sphere, and  $\sigma(\omega_m)$  – value of backward scattering cross-section on  $\omega_m$  frequency. The number of frequencies (*N*), where the optimized scattering is calculated, is set manually to reach the best suppression value. At each step of our algorithm, the fitness function was evaluated for each individual in the current population, and the resulting value was assigned to that entity (Figure 1). After this, all individuals were ranked from the best one with the highest fitness value to the worst, the least adopted one. Then, the top half of the current population advanced to the next iteration, while the rest were eliminated.

#### CMA-ES Algorithm

A covariance matrix adaptation evolution strategy (CMA-ES) (51) was used. Unlike traditional genetic algorithms (GAs), particle swarm optimization (PSO), differential evolution (DE), or simulated annealing (SA), CMA-ES is particularly well-suited for high-dimensional, multi-modal optimization problems without requiring extensive tuning. Its adaptive covariance matrix allows efficient search space exploration and faster convergence. With its data-driven mutation and implicit crossover, CMA-ES is ideal for complex electromagnetic problems where the objective function landscape is highly irregular.

CMA-ES (Covariance Matrix Adaptation Evolution Strategy) is a gradient-free evolutionary algorithm that utilizes the covariance matrix of the individual distribution to enhance the likelihood of finding the global minimum of a given task. The strategy is effective in solving non-convex and non-smooth optimization tasks. The concept of the designed algorithm is the following (52). Firstly, we create an initial population of metasurfaces that are represented as 45-dimensional vectors, as in the initialization step in Figure S1. The initial and each following population has its basis in Normal Gaussian Distribution, with which individuals are created:

$$x[i] = m[i] + \sigma N(0, C[i]).$$
 Eq. S2

Equation S2 represents the way of generating individuals. Here [i] is the i<sup>th</sup> iteration, x[i] is the individual in the population, m is the center of the population on the current i<sup>th</sup> iteration,  $\sigma$  is the "step size" (in our algorithm, it equals 1.3), and C is the current (i<sup>th</sup> iteration) covariance matrix of the metasurfaces distribution. The calculation of m[i] is shown in Equation S2. It is essential to mention that binary vectors are also generated from the normal distribution—if the value P(**x**<**a**) that is the probability of the random value **x** being less than the generated number **a**, ranging from 0 to 1, exceeds 0.5, the corresponding value in the vector is 1; otherwise, it is 0. The selection process takes place after generating the initial population, as shown in Figure 1. The fitness values for each metasurface are calculated. After ranking, the metasurfaces with the half-most adopted (with the highest fitness values) are selected. The selected part calculates new ([i+1]th iteration) m,  $\sigma$ , and C. In Equation S2, the calculation of m and C can be found. In both distribution components, the previous value of the

component (m or C) and the "new" or selected part are considered, with the help of which the evolution process goes. In the calculations of the C matrix, coefficients were implemented: 0.8 and 0.2 because of the plethora of local minimums. The second part of the equation for C represents itself as the tensor product between averaged selected vectors.

$$m[i+1] = m[i] + \sigma \sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{1}{M} x_{j,selected}^{[i]},$$
 Eq. S3  
$$C[i+1] = 0.8 * C[i] + 0.2 * (\sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{1}{M} x_{j,selected}^{[i]}) \otimes (\sum_{j=1}^{M} \frac{1}{M} x_{j,selected}^{[i]})^{T}.$$

Here, M is the number of the top-performing metasurfaces selected for the next iteration,  $x_{i \, selected}^{[i]}$  – selected in the i<sup>th</sup> iteration metasurfaces. After calculating the new mean and covariance matrix, the next iteration of the algorithm begins, generating a new population based on the updated parameters. The process then repeats: selecting half of the most adopted individuals with the highest fitness function values, recalculating the mean and covariance matrix, and proceeding to the next iteration. To visualize our algorithm's ability to find global minima, we created an arbitrary test function that possesses multiple extrema. The function has two variables for the sake of visualization. Specifically, the local minima were placed randomly, while the global minimum was manually introduced into the landscape (dark-blue region). On top of that, to further increase complexity, random numbers were added at randomly chosen grid points. This makes the fitness function non-differentiable. The result appears in Figure S2a. Figures S2b and S2c illustrate the initialization of the algorithm and the result after 10 iterations, clearly demonstrating convergence to the region of the global minimum. The covariance matrix in CMA-ES defines the shape, size, and orientation of the ellipse that encloses the sampling distribution of the population. The direction where the ellipse is most elongated is where the algorithm is searching most intensively, suggesting either that the solution space is less wellexplored or more promising (higher variability in fitness outcomes) in that direction. As the optimization progresses, if the algorithm is converging, the ellipse gradually shrinks and becomes more aligned in certain directions. This indicates areas of the search space that are leading to better optimizations.

Consequently, in this example, despite the complexity of the landscape, the algorithm efficiently converged to the minimum. It is worth emphasizing that a similar graphical representation of convergence in the 45-dimensional metasurface space is not feasible. Therefore, convergence properties and comparisons will be presented through specific examples hereinafter.

#### Statistical analysis of the designed algorithm

To assess the impact of optimization on electromagnetic performance, we compared the tailormade metasurface with a random set of possible realizations. In this study, we used a resonant dipole as the target for scattering suppression. Such a simplified target was chosen to save the runtime and thus collect larger statistics.

Two sets of structures were generated as follows:

#### (i) Random Set

This set consists of randomly selected arrays that comply with the search space's constraints. Nine randomly distributed resonators have not undergone any optimization. In total, 1,000 numerical experiments were conducted to collect statistical data. The realizations follow the following distribution: resonators are centered at the nodes of the symmetric array, and Euler angles are uniformly distributed. The probability of populating a cell with either a wire or a split-square resonator was 0.5. The resonator centers are attached to the cell centers and do not change.

#### (ii) Optimized Set

For comparison, the same number (1000) of optimization experiments were conducted. These were obtained using 1000 seeds to select the initial points in the search space for algorithm initialization (a seed example is white points in Figure S2b). The seeds were picked randomly. The number of algorithm iterations in these experiments was constant and equalled 100. Thereafter, the two datasets were compared in terms of their scattering suppression capabilities based on the fitness function. The results, summarized in a histogram, are presented in Figure S3a. Several assessments can be made based on different figures of merit. First, the means of the distributions can be evaluated. Both datasets exhibit distributions close to Gaussian, with the two bright vertical lines in Figure S3a representing their respective means. The optimized metasurface exhibited a scattering suppression of 20 dB compared to the random set under this peak-to-peak assessment. However, a more relevant comparison is made by considering the best individuals in both sets. In this case, a 30–40 dB advantage is observed in favor of the optimized structure. Moreover, the best individual from the random set did not outperform the worst realization of the optimized surface. The immediate conclusions are that (i) intensive optimization is necessary and (ii) a large set of seeds should be considered in the optimization strategy. The variation in seeds can result in differences of 20 dB or more.

To further emphasize the comparison, the backscattering spectra were plotted in Figure S3b. All realizations from the random set were plotted and blurred to create the blue area in the plot. The blue solid line represents the mean. The red solid curve shows the result of the best seed in the optimization. The sky-blue dashed line represents the backscattering from the initial (uncovered) dipole. The green semi-transparent bar indicates the frequency band where the optimization was performed. While CMA-ES successfully optimized the metamaterial geometry for the dipole, the random structures not only failed to suppress scattering but also increased it at the resonant dipole. Additionally, despite the significant broadband scattering suppression, new scattering peaks emerge outside the optimized region, a phenomenon that appears to be quite universal (*53*).

#### **Electromagnetic Analysis**

#### Forward Solver for Optimization

Solving complex electromagnetic scattering problems in volumetric structures can be approached using various methods, including the Finite Difference Time Domain (FDTD) and Finite Element Method (FEM) (54). Both require intensive 3D meshing, resulting in high computational demands. Consequently, utilizing commercial software that implements these methods involves significant computational time. It restricts optimization capabilities, as thousands of iterations with a forward solver are required to achieve an optimized solution (e.g. 100 iterations until the termination times the number of seeds). However, scattering on shaped thin metal wires can be addressed using the Hallén integral formulation, which reformulates the problem, significantly reducing its dimensionality (55). The method employs the Method of Moments (MoM), where wires are discretized into segments, each serving as a basis function. The integral equations governing the system are converted into a set of matrix equations. Solving these equations provides the current distribution along the wires, enabling the computation of the resulting scattered fields. This approach is computationally efficient for analyzing scattering on curved wires, offering significantly faster runtimes. The improvement can be by orders of magnitude compared to FEM and FDTD, implemented in commercial software. The PyNEC Python package (56), which is based on NEC-2, has been utilized as a method implementation.

To make the scattering calculations more efficient, we implemented parallel computation at each iteration of the CMA-ES evolutionary algorithm. In this implementation, the scattering calculations for individuals in the population are distributed across available CPU processes. This parallelization enables simultaneous evaluation of the scattering for multiple structures, significantly speeding up the computation. Specifically, the approach achieves a theoretical speedup of N-fold, where N is the number of available CPU processes, as each process handles one individual's scattering computation independently.

#### Validation with Full Wave Modelling

While the previously mentioned methods, being very fast, were used for optimization purposes, the final results were verified numerically using the frequency domain solver (FEM) in a commercial software package (CST Microwave Studio 2024). To eliminate unphysical reflections at the simulation domain boundaries, Perfectly Matched Layer (PML) boundary conditions were applied to absorb outgoing waves. The number of mesh cells is approximately  $(1-2)\times10^6$  for all models. A plane wave was used as the excitation source, with its polarization oriented along the y-axis and the wave vector directed along the z-axis, as outlined in Figure S5. The CST modelling aligns with the MoM analysis, confirming the validity of using MoM as a forward solver for optimization, as appears in the main report (Figure S6)

#### Scattering Suppression Assessment in the Context of Scattering Diagrams

Among the set of samples, the polyhedron was selected for detailed analysis. A study on other shapes will follow. Figure S4A presents backscattering spectra calculated for various scenarios to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed scattering suppression approach. The blue solid line represents scattering from the initial (uncovered) target, where the polyhedron exhibits backward scattering in the 6.5–8.7 GHz frequency range. The red solid line represents the target's response concealed with the optimized metasurface. Scattering suppression of up to 30 dB is observed over a broad GHz-scale frequency range, verifying the approach's effectiveness.

After obtaining a result from brute-force optimization, the fundamental physical mechanism underlying the phenomenon can be revealed. The first generation of stealth aircraft can be an analogy for our approach. These structures were carefully designed to reflect waves away from the interrogating antenna, thereby minimizing the monostatic RCS. Figure S4B illustrates the concept of backscattering suppression through scattering diagrams. In the case of a target concealed by the metasurface, scattering is predominantly directed forward rather than in other directions, making it an effective countermeasure even against multistatic radar configurations. Recall that first-generation stealth technology lacked this capability and was countered by a chain of ground-based radars, making it less effective compared to the demonstrated methodology. Recall that all the discussed scenarios were analyzed at three representative frequencies, as indicated in the plots

The metasurface response standalone is shown as a green dashed line in Figure S4A. The metasurface also exhibits a significant RCS on its own. Thus, the effect is achieved only through the combination of the target and the metasurface. This precisely illustrates the concept of a tailor-made cover, which operates in strong coupling with the target. The notion of strong coupling in this context should not be confused with the similar terminology used in quantum mechanics, as it has a completely different meaning here.

Finally, to further assess our approach and compare it with the first generation of stealth, we positioned a metal (perfect electric conductor, PEC) plate in front of the target, tilted at 35° relative to the incident wave. The resulting response is shown as the purple line in Figure S4A. This method does not work and fails for two main reasons. First, since the overall structure is wavelength-comparable, the PEC plane, having finite dimensions, does not act as a perfect mirror but instead introduces its own size-dependent resonances. Second, scattering from the edges contributes to the overall RCS. Due to these factors, edge treatment and diffraction control are critically important in stealth approaches, often

making concealing covers bulky. This limitation makes the approach less suitable for our use case, further justifying the need for tailor-made metasurfaces.

Figure S5 (animated GIF, available online) presents full-wave dynamic modelling. The animations illustrate the interactions, particularly the strong coupling between the target and the metasurface, which cancels backscattering. The origin of the strong backscattering from the target with the PEC plane in front is also evident.

#### **Other Targets**

To demonstrate that the concealing metasurface can be tailored for different targets, several additional cases were analyzed. Figures S6A, C summarize the results for the wire sphere (It is made of hexagons made of wires), while Figures S6B, D present the results for randomly distributed wires (it is a virtual cube divided into nine mini-cubes, in each mini-cube a wire with random length, but no more than the side of mini-cube, is randomly placed: random polar and azimuthal angle, but the center is aligned with the center of the mini-cube and does not move). In these plots, the numerical results from CST and MoM are compared, demonstrating good agreement. Note that multi-resonant structures with small RCS values are susceptible to numerical noise. In terms of performance, broadband scattering suppression at a level of 30–40 dB is observed. It is important to note that a fair assessment should be made against MoM, as it was used as the forward solver in the optimization, while CST serves as a validation tool, accounting for the finite thickness of wires. Figure S6E presents scattering diagrams that demonstrate a similar phenomenon to that observed for the polyhedron—the scattering is predominantly redistributed to the forward direction.

#### Fabrication

Given the highly resonant nature of the phenomenon, both material losses and fabrication imperfections in alignment must be minimized. Similar challenges arise in the design of superdirective antennas, where precise multipolar interference must be maintained (57), (58). The fabrication process consisted of two steps: (i) manufacturing individual resonators and (ii) spatially positioning the resonators in 3D space.

#### The target

The Polyhedron Scatterer is an axisymmetric pyramidal structure, specifically a convex prism with a triangular base. It is constructed from enamel-coated copper wires with a diameter of 1 mm (including an insulation thickness of 0.05 mm). The corresponding wire lengths are 40 mm and 60 mm. The wires forming the structure are soldered at the nodes to ensure electrical conductivity. Figure S8 includes a photograph of the sample.

#### Individual resonators

Individual scatterers forming the metasurface were fabricated on a thin (0.15 mm) foil-clad laminate using photolithography with a photoresist and a pre-prepared mask, followed by chemical etching in a sodium tetrachlorocuprate solution. The substrate (Astra MT77,  $\varepsilon_r$ =3, tan( $\delta$ )=0.0017) was chosen to minimize the impact of permittivity on the resonant response. Following the design, a 3×3 array was fabricated on a thin substrate and then cut into nine pieces, each containing an individual scatterer - Figure S7A.

#### RF-Transparent Holder for 3D Arrangement of Scatterers

The main challenge in fabricating the sample is the precise alignment of resonators in space, requiring accurate tuning of three Euler angles and the height above the target for each resonator.

Additionally, the material used for the holder must be transparent to GHz waves. Following these constraints, foam pillars were fabricated using the following main steps:

- 1. **Model Creation:** A digital model of the pillar structure was designed based on the CST simulation, and an STL file was extracted.
- 2. **3D Printing:** The pillars were initially implemented by 3D printing using PLA plastic. However, 3D-printed plastic pillars cannot serve as holders, as the material itself has a background refractive index with losses (59), which would degrade performance.
- 3. **Silicone Mold Fabrication:** An inverted silicone mold was created using silicone rubber (Smooth-On, USA). The 3D-printed form was placed inside a box, which was then filled with silicone. Once the silicone dried, the 3D-printed structure was removed, leaving a stretchable mold.
- 4. **Foam Casting:** The silicone mold was lubricated with silicone grease and filled with polyurethane foam. After the foaming, expansion, and hardening processes, the holder was carefully removed from the template. Electromagnetic scattering tests confirmed its transparency, comparable to Styrofoam (60).
- 5. **Final Assembly:** The cut resonators were glued (PVA glue) onto the foam pillars, completing the metasurface assembly

Figure S7B demonstrates the main steps and Figure S7C is the photograph of the metasurface.

#### **Experiment - RCS Measurements**

The measurements were conducted in an anechoic chamber. The experimental setup included one (fig.S8) broadband horn antenna (NATO IDPH-2018) for transmission (Tx) and reception (Rx), certified for the 2–18 GHz frequency range. The antenna was connected to a PNA Vector Network Analyzer (N5253B), and complex-valued S-parameters were recorded. The backscattering crosssections of all samples were quantified using a calibration target (disc) with known parameters. This approach follows a well-established and widely recognized RCS measurement technique (*61*).

Three types of resonators were investigated: two based on printed circuit boards (PCBs) using thin dielectric substrates (Isola IS680 and Astra MT77), and a third consisting of manually shaped copper wires with a diameter of 0.8 mm (Figure S9A). Removing the substrate eliminates losses and prevents resonance shifts, although it compromises the precision of the geometry. In cases of strongly resonant structures, rigorous design considerations are crucial. Specifically, all nine elements in the array must interact with correct relative amplitudes and phases, making precise tuning of individual resonances and accurate alignment between elements essential.

Another critical factor in the experimental investigation is the presence of structural disorder within the system of scatterers. Structural disorder in sensitive resonant structures can give rise to new, unexpected phenomena, which we aim to avoid (62–64). In the fabricated holder (Figure S7C), each element retains three degrees of freedom: rotation and displacements along two axes within the plane of the holder. To minimize structural disorder, the scattering from each element was analyzed sequentially. The first element was finely positioned until its RCS matched the simulation results. Then a second element was added to it and the process continued. As a result, RCS in the backward direction was obtained for a single metasurface and a system consisting of a polyhedron combined with a metasurface. While the main report outlines the results of a successful experiment, it is crucial to revise failure trials to emphasize the need for precise tuning. It is worth noting that similar challenges arise in studies of superscatters and other strongly resonant devices. Given these limitations, the proposed tuning technique could be considered transformative.

The results for arrays based on resonators etched on different substrates and assembled without stepwise positioning are shown in Figure S9A. The blue curves and related samples are elaborated in legends. It is evident that narrowband suppression has been achieved, and when comparing the two

curves, it has been achieved at different spectral positions. This indicates that in these two unsuccessful implementations, several resonators did not contribute effectively to scattering. Recall the operational principle of the device—it involves resonance cascading, where each part of the spectrum is covered by different elements within the array.

Another significant challenge is the proper positioning of the metasurface relative to the polyhedron target. To address this, the angle between them was varied within a small range, as shown in Figure S9B. The resonance structure changes quite significantly, further highlighting the need for accurate alignment.



**Figure S1.** The concept of an evolutionary algorithm is used in the process of designing metasurfaces. Here, the X set is a searching space of possible metasurfaces;  $B^9$  – is the space of 9-dimensional binary vectors, which describe the type of the resonator in each virtual sphere (wire or SSR);  $R^{36}$  – is the space of 36-dimensional continuous vectors, which represent the Euler angles of each resonator and its size (wires' lengths or squares' sides' lengths); Y – the continuous 1-dimensional space of fitness values, which are assigned to metasurfaces, and with which they are ranked.



**Figure S2.** An example of our CMA-ES algorithm's operation in a 3D space. (A) A multi-extrema, nondifferentiable fitness function landscape, with the blue region representing the global minimum. (B, C) Steps of the CMA-ES algorithm demonstrated on the function landscape colormap; (B) – initialization, (C) – step 10. White dots – individuals in the population, red dot – the mean of the population. An optimization process is shown by the red ellipse, which shows the direction of evolution of our population. Ellipse is set by the equation  $(x - m)^T C^{-1} (x - m) = \text{const}$ , where const=5.991, 95% quantile of the distribution.



**Figure S3.** Statistical assessment of the CMA-ES optimization algorithm for suppressing scattering from a dipole. (A) Comparison between two datasets: distribution of the fitness function for optimized metasurfaces and randomly created metasurfaces. (B) Backscattering spectra for the scenarios indicated in the legend.



**Figure S4.** Scattering analysis of four different structures: (i) a bare polyhedron (i.e., target), (ii) the metasurface alone, (iii) a target with a PEC plate tilted at 35° in front, and (iv) a camouflaged polyhedron. (A) Scattering spectra. (B) Far-field scattering patterns for all scenarios at representative frequencies, as shown in the insets.



Figure S5. Animated images of scattering scenarios, as indicated in the insets. The frequency of the incident wave is 8 GHz.



**Figure S6.** Scattering analysis for different targets. (A) Wire sphere. (B) Randomly distributed dipoles. Layouts of the target (blue) and tailor-made metasurfaces (green). (C), (D) Scattering spectra for the corresponding cases. Light blue dashed curve – target; red curve – camouflaged target (MoM analysis); blue solid curve – camouflaged target (CST analysis). Far-field scattering patterns for (E) wire sphere and (F) random distributed dipoles scenario at representative frequencies, as shown in the insets.



**Figure S7.** Metasurface Fabrication. (A) Resonators forming the array. (B) Photographed the main steps of the holder fabrication process. (C) Photograph of the assembled metasurface.



**Figure S8.** Anechoic chamber: experimental setup for radar scattering cross-section measurement. Scatter and metasurface base without resonators.



**Figure S9.** The fabricated scatterers and their backward scattering (A): (i) Isola IS680, (ii) Astra MT77, (iii) Wires with holder, and (iv) a single polyhedron. (B) Dependence of backward scattering on the angle of rotation of the holder with the metasurface.







Camouflaged Polyhedron Metasurface

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Metasurface

SO

nn

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

# Polyhedron

2

80 mm

![](_page_36_Figure_0.jpeg)