

Comment on "Photonic Band Gaps: Noncommuting limit and the 'Acoustic Band'"

Didier Felbacq

LASMEA UMR-CNRS 6602

Complexe des Cézeaux

63177 Aubière Cedex, France

(November 13, 2018)

This comment concerns the homogenization of 2D dielectric photonic crystals, and the fact that the limits $k \rightarrow 0$ (k is the Bloch vector) and $\varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty$ do not commute for p -polarized waves (it is so for s -polarized waves, which is a straightforward case). This result has been claimed to be true by Nicorovici & al. in a series of paper [1–3] and it has been claimed to be false by Krokhin & al. in a comment [4]. The point of this note is to make the situation clear one for all, that is to give a mathematically clean derivation of the result by Nicorovici and to prove that it is right. The first point is to use a clear definition of a homogenization process: rather than letting tend the Bloch vector to zero it is in my opinion clearer to deal with a finite-size photonic crystal, contained in a bounded domain Ω , with period η (the period is a contracted cell ηY , where $Y = [0, 1]^2$ and θ is the filling ratio in Y see fig. 1 for notations) and a fixed wavenumber k_0 , in which case for an incident field u^i the total field u_η satisfies in p -polarization $\text{div}(\varepsilon_\eta^{-1} \nabla u_\eta) + k_0^2 u_\eta = 0$, where ε_η represents the relative permittivity of the rods which are homogeneous circular cross-section rods, the permittivity of one rod being equal to ε_s . Then we study the limit of u_η when $\eta \rightarrow 0$ (in case of an infinite crystal with no incident field, this amounts to let k tend to zero for a Bloch wave). I have shown in a previous paper [5] that u_η tends to u_0 satisfying $\text{div}(\varepsilon_{\text{hom}}^{-1} \nabla u_0) + k_0^2 u_0 = 0$ where

$$\varepsilon_{\text{hom}} = \begin{cases} (1 + \theta(\varepsilon_s^{-1} - 1) + \phi_\varepsilon)^{-1} & \text{in } \Omega \\ 1 & \text{outside } \Omega \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

and ϕ_ε is a term defined in [5]. If we let formally tend ε_s to infinity we get $\varepsilon_{\text{hom}} \rightarrow (1 - \theta + \phi_\infty)^{-1}$ where $\phi_\infty = \left\langle \frac{\partial w}{\partial y_1} \right\rangle_Y$, w being the unique Y -periodic solution, with null mean, of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w = 0 & \text{in } Y \setminus P \\ \frac{\partial w}{\partial n} = -\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 & \text{on } \partial P \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and $\langle \cdot \rangle_Y$ denotes averaging over Y .

Now let us deal directly with the infinitely conducting crystal. At step η the field satisfies $\Delta u_\eta + k_0^2 u_\eta = 0$ in the complementary of the rods, which are denoted by T_η , and $\frac{\partial u_\eta}{\partial n} = 0$ on ∂T_η . Our result is

Theorem

When η tends to 0, u_η tends to u_0 satisfying $\text{div}(\varepsilon_\infty^{-1}\nabla u_0) + k_0^2 u_0 = 0$ where

$$\varepsilon_\infty = \begin{cases} (1 - \theta)(1 - \theta + \phi_\infty)^{-1} & \text{in } \Omega \\ 1 & \text{outside } \Omega \end{cases}$$

A simple comparison with (1) leads to the evident conclusion that

Corollary

The limits $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow +\infty$ do not commute.

Proof

The field u_η is null inside the rods but we can define a function \tilde{u}_η such that $u_\eta = \tilde{u}_\eta$ outside T_η and \tilde{u}_η is in the Sobolev space $H_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, so that $(1 - 1_{T_\eta})\tilde{u}_\eta = u_\eta$. Using now a test function ϕ in the Schwartz space $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)$, we find

$$- \int_{\Omega} \nabla \tilde{u}_\eta \nabla \phi \, d^2x + k_0^2 \int_{\Omega} (1 - 1_{T_\eta}) \tilde{u}_\eta \phi \, d^2x = 0$$

Assuming that (u_η) is bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$ it can easily be shown that (\tilde{u}_η) is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$ because it satisfies a standard Helmholtz equation $\Delta \tilde{u}_\eta + k_0^2(1 - 1_{T_\eta})\tilde{u}_\eta = 0$. Then, up to the extraction of a subsequence we have $\tilde{u}_\eta \rightarrow \tilde{u}_0$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$, $u_0 = (1 - \theta)\tilde{u}_0$ and $\chi_\eta = \nabla \tilde{u}_\eta \rightharpoonup \chi_0$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$ so that: $-\int_{\Omega} \chi_0 \nabla \phi \, d^2x + k_0^2 \int_{\Omega} u_0 \phi \, d^2x = 0$ meaning that

$$\text{div}(\chi_0) + k_0^2 u_0 = 0.$$

We then have to find an expression for χ_0 . We set $w_i = w_\eta + x_i$, where $w_\eta = w\left(\frac{x}{\eta}\right)$ (note that $w_i \xrightarrow{L^2} x_i$), we have $-\int_{\Omega} \nabla \tilde{u}_\eta \nabla (\phi w_i) \, d^2x + k_0^2 \int_{\Omega} u_\eta \phi w_i \, d^2x = -\int_{\Omega} \chi_\eta \nabla \phi w_i \, d^2x + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi \nabla w_i \tilde{u}_\eta \, d^2x + k_0^2 \int_{\Omega} u_\eta \phi w_i \, d^2x = 0$. Then letting η tend to 0, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} [-\chi_0 x_i + \langle \nabla w_i \rangle_Y \cdot \mathbf{e}_i \tilde{u}_0] \nabla \phi \, d^2x + k_0^2 \int_{\Omega} u_0 \phi x_i \, d^2x = 0$$

this shows that $\chi_0 \cdot \mathbf{e}_i = (\langle \nabla w \rangle_Y + (1 - \theta) \mathbf{e}_i) \nabla \tilde{u}_0$. The theorem and corollary follow by the rotational invariance of the problem.

As a conclusion, we might suggest that a good mathematical background should make it possible to avoid any polemical discussions over these issues.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. A. Nicorovici, R. C. McPhedran, and L. C. Botten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1507 (1995).
- [2] N. A. Nicorovici, R. C. McPhedran, and L. C. Botten, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 1135 (1995).
- [3] R. C. McPhedran, N. A. Nicorovici, and L. C. Botten, J. Electromagnetic Waves and Appl. **11**, 981 (1997)
- [4] P. Halevi, A. A. Krokhin, and J. Arriaga, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3211 (2001).
- [5] D. Felbacq, G. Bouchitté, Waves in Random Media **7**, 245 (1997).

