

**Titre:** Can photonic heterostructures provably outperform single-material geometries?. Supplément  
Title:

**Auteurs:** Alessio Amaolo, Pengning Chao, Thomas J. Maldonado, Sean Molesky, & Alejandro W. Rodríguez  
Authors:

**Date:** 2024

**Type:** Article de revue / Article

**Référence:** Amaolo, A., Chao, P., Maldonado, T. J., Molesky, S., & Rodríguez, A. W. (2024). Can photonic heterostructures provably outperform single-material geometries? Nanophotonics, 13(3), 283-288. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nanoph-2023-0606>  
Citation:

 **Document en libre accès dans PolyPublie**  
Open Access document in PolyPublie

**URL de PolyPublie:** <https://publications.polymtl.ca/57336/>  
PolyPublie URL:

**Version:** Matériel supplémentaire / Supplementary material  
Révisé par les pairs / Refereed

**Conditions d'utilisation:** Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY)  
Terms of Use:

 **Document publié chez l'éditeur officiel**  
Document issued by the official publisher

**Titre de la revue:** Nanophotonics (vol. 13, no. 3)  
Journal Title:

**Maison d'édition:** De Gruyter  
Publisher:

**URL officiel:** <https://doi.org/10.1515/nanoph-2023-0606>  
Official URL:

**Mention légale:** © 2024 the author(s), published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.  
Legal notice:

# Supplemental Material for “Can photonic heterostructures provably outperform single-material geometries?”

Alessio Amaolo,<sup>1</sup> Pengning Chao,<sup>2</sup> Thomas J. Maldonado,<sup>3</sup> Sean Molesky,<sup>4</sup> and Alejandro W. Rodriguez<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,*

*Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Engineering Physics, Polytechnique Montréal, Montréal, Québec H3T 1J4, Canada*

(Dated: December 13, 2023)

## COMPUTING THE LAGRANGE DUAL OF THE MANY-MATERIAL PROBLEM

The primal optimization problem takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{T_{k,m}\}} \quad & f(\{|T_{k,m}\rangle\}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_m \left( \langle S_k | \mathbb{P}_j | T_{k',m} \rangle - \langle T_{k,m} | \chi_{k,m}^{-\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j | T_{k',m} \rangle - \sum_{m'} \langle T_{k,m} | -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j | T_{k',m'} \rangle \right) = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', \\ & \langle T_{k,m} | \mathbb{P}_j | T_{k',m'} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', m \neq m'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S1})$$

This notation differs from the main text via  $\psi_{k,m} \rightarrow T_{k,m}$ . As in the main text,  $|S_k\rangle$  is a source  $k$ , the polarization current due to source  $k$  is  $|T_k\rangle = \sum_m |T_{k,m}\rangle$  with  $|T_{k,m}\rangle$  the polarization current due to source  $k$  and material  $m$  and is defined in the design region  $V$ .  $\chi_{k,m}$  is the susceptibility of material  $m$  at  $\omega_k$ , and  $\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)}$  is the corresponding vacuum propagator acting on sources to yield their corresponding fields in vacuum—namely, via convolution of the vacuum Green’s function  $G_0^{(k)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_k)$  satisfying  $\frac{c^2}{\omega_k^2} \nabla \times \nabla \times G_0^{(k)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_k) - G_0^{(k)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}', \omega_k) = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ .  $\mathbb{I}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_j$  represent spatial projections onto either the full or a subset  $V_j \in V$  of the design region  $V$ , respectively. Lastly,  $f$  is a quadratic function of the polarization currents  $|T_{k,m}\rangle$ .

For the first constraint, we will take the real and imaginary parts and write the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to a given  $j, k, k'$  as  $\lambda_{R/I}^{j,k,k'}$  (symmetric and asymmetric constraints respectively). For the second, we will use Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda_{SO/AO}^{k,k',m,m'}$  (symmetric/asymmetric orthogonal constraint). Now we can write

$$\mathcal{L}(T, S) = [\langle T_{opt} | \quad \langle S |] \begin{bmatrix} -Z^{TT}(\lambda) & Z^{TS}(\lambda) \\ Z^{ST}(\lambda) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |T_{opt}\rangle \\ |S\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{S2})$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the Lagrangian,  $|T_{opt}\rangle = [|T_{1,1}\rangle \quad |T_{1,2}\rangle \quad \dots \quad |T_{1,m}\rangle \quad \dots \quad |T_{2,1}\rangle \quad \dots \quad |T_{n_s,m}\rangle]^T$  for  $n_s$  sources and  $m$  materials,  $|S\rangle = [|S_1\rangle \quad \dots \quad |S_{n_s}\rangle]^T$ , and  $Z^{TT}$  and  $Z^{TS} = Z^{ST\dagger}$  matrices represent the quadratic and linear parts of the Lagrangian, respectively. We also denote  $N$  the numerical length of a single  $|T_{k,m}\rangle$  vector.

Writing out the constraints we find

$$Z^{TS} = \mathbb{O}_{lin} + \sum_j \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_R^{j,1,1} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_R^{j,n_s,1} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_R^{j,1,1} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_R^{j,n_s,1} \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_R^{j,1,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_R^{j,n_s,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_R^{j,1,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_R^{j,n_s,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} - \sum_j \frac{1}{2i} \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_I^{j,1,1} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_I^{j,n_s,1} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_I^{j,1,1} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_I^{j,n_s,1} \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} \\ \vdots \\ \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_I^{j,1,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_I^{j,n_s,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_I^{j,1,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & \lambda_I^{j,n_s,n_s} \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (S3)$$

$$Z^{ST} = Z^{TS\dagger}, \quad (S4)$$

where  $\mathbb{O}_{lin}$  is the linear part of the objective.

$$Z^{TT} = \mathbb{O}_{quad} + \sum_j \begin{bmatrix} R_{1,1}^j & \dots & R_{1,n_s}^j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ R_{n_s,1}^j & \dots & R_{n_s,n_s}^j \end{bmatrix} + \sum_j \begin{bmatrix} I_{1,1}^j & \dots & I_{1,n_s}^j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ I_{n_s,1}^j & \dots & I_{n_s,n_s}^j \end{bmatrix} + \sum_j \begin{bmatrix} S_{1,1}^j + A_{1,1}^j & \dots & S_{1,n_s}^j + A_{1,n_s}^j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ S_{n_s,1}^j + A_{n_s,1}^j & \dots & S_{n_s,n_s}^j + A_{n_s,n_s}^j \end{bmatrix}, \quad (S5)$$

with

$$R_{k,k'}^j = R_{k',k}^{j\dagger} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_R^{j,k,k'} \begin{bmatrix} (\chi_{k,1}^{-1\dagger} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}) \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & (\chi_{k,m}^{-1\dagger} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}) \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_R^{j,k',k} \begin{bmatrix} (\chi_{k',1}^{-1} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')}) \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & (\chi_{k',m}^{-1} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')}) \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix}, \quad (S6a)$$

$$I_{k,k'}^j = I_{k',k}^{j\dagger} = \frac{1}{2i} \lambda_I^{j,k,k'} \begin{bmatrix} (\chi_{k,1}^{-1\dagger} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}) \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & (\chi_{k,m}^{-1\dagger} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}) \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{2i} \lambda_I^{j,k',k} \begin{bmatrix} (\chi_{k',1}^{-1} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')}) \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} \mathbb{P}_j \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} \mathbb{P}_j & \dots & (\chi_{k',m}^{-1} \mathbb{I} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')}) \mathbb{P}_j \end{bmatrix}, \quad (S6b)$$

with  $-\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}\mathbb{P}_j$  or  $-\mathbb{G}_0^{(k')}\mathbb{P}_j$  present in every off-diagonal element. Furthermore,

$$S_{k,k'}^j = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{SO}^{j,k,k',1,2} & \dots & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{SO}^{j,k,k',1,m} \\ \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{SO}^{j,k,k',1,2} & 0 & \dots & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{SO}^{j,k,k',2,m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',1,m} & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{SO}^{j,k,k',2,m} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} = S_{k,k'}^{jT} = S_{k',k}^j, \quad (\text{S7a})$$

$$A_{k,k'}^j = \frac{1}{2i} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',1,2} & \dots & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',1,m} \\ -\mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',1,2} & 0 & \dots & \mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',2,m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',1,m} & -\mathbb{P}_j \lambda_{AO}^{j,k,k',2,m} & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix} = A_{k,k'}^{j\dagger} = -A_{k',k}^j. \quad (\text{S7b})$$

$$(\text{S7c})$$

$\mathbb{O}_{quad}$  is the quadratic part of the objective and all  $R, I, S, A$  are  $m \times m$  block matrices of  $N \times N$  matrices. We can compute the dual function  $\mathcal{G}$ :

$$\mathcal{G}(\lambda) = \sup_{|T\rangle} \mathcal{L}(\lambda, T). \quad (\text{S8})$$

We find the stationary point  $|T^*\rangle$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  by solving the relation

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \langle T^*|} = 0, \quad (\text{S9})$$

which leads to the linear system

$$Z^{TT} |T^*\rangle = Z^{TS} |S\rangle. \quad (\text{S10})$$

In order for the dual to be finite,  $Z^{TT}$  must be positive definite, so this linear system is invertible, leading to

$$|T^*\rangle = Z^{TT^{-1}} Z^{TS} |S\rangle, \quad (\text{S11})$$

$$\mathcal{G}(\lambda) = \langle S | Z^{ST} Z^{TT^{-1}} Z^{TS} | S \rangle. \quad (\text{S12})$$

Finally,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{G}}{\partial \lambda_i} = 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \langle T^* | \frac{\partial Z^{TS}}{\partial \lambda_i} | S \rangle \right\} - \langle T^* | \frac{\partial Z^{TT}}{\partial \lambda_i} | T^* \rangle. \quad (\text{S13})$$

In the specific case of maximizing absorption,  $\mathbb{O}_{lin} = 0$ . Absorbed power is

$$\sum_{k,m} \frac{Zc}{2\omega_k} \langle T_{k,m} | \frac{\operatorname{Im} \chi_{k,m}}{|\chi_{k,m}|^2} | T_{k,m} \rangle, \quad (\text{S14})$$

with  $Z$  the vacuum impedance, giving us  $\mathbb{O}_{quad}$  (being careful of the negative sign in Eq. (S2)). Each term can be normalized as desired by the incident or total power.

## SOLVING THE DUAL PROBLEM

In order to solve the convex dual problem using an interior point method, we must first find an initial feasible point. This requires choosing  $\lambda$  such that  $Z^{TT}$  is positive definite, thereby ensuring that  $Z^{TT}$  is invertible and therefore that the dual is well defined. This can be done reliably by leveraging the fact that the imaginary part of the Maxwell Green's function,  $\operatorname{Im} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)}$ , is positive semidefinite [4]. Take  $\mathbb{P}_{j=0} = \mathbb{I}$  to be the projector corresponding to global constraints, which is always enforced in our implementation. By setting all Lagrange multipliers  $\lambda = 0$  except  $\lambda_I^{j=0,k,k}$

for all  $k$ , we set  $R_{k,k'}^j = S_{k,k'}^j = A_{k,k'}^j = 0$  for all  $k, k', j$ . This also sets  $I_{k,k'}^j = 0$  for all  $j, k \neq k'$  and, although not necessary, for all  $j \neq 0, k = k'$ . The quadratic part of  $\mathcal{L}$  becomes

$$Z^{TT} = \mathbb{O}_{quad} + \begin{bmatrix} I_{1,1}^0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & I_{n_s, n_s}^0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{S15})$$

with  $I_{k,k}^0$  taking the following block diagonal form:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{k,k}^0 &= \lambda_I^{0,k,k} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Asym} \left( \mathbb{I} \chi_{k,1}^{-1\dagger} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \right) & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \text{Asym} \left( \mathbb{I} \chi_{k,m}^{-1\dagger} - \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \right) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \lambda_I^{0,k,k} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} \frac{\text{Im} \chi_{k,1}}{|\chi_{k,1}|^2} + \text{Asym} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \mathbb{I} \frac{\text{Im} \chi_{k,m}}{|\chi_{k,m}|^2} + \text{Asym} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S16})$$

which is positive definite for  $\text{Im} \chi_{k,m} > 0$ . Therefore, as long as all materials have some loss (as they do in the main text), we can simply increase  $\lambda_I^{0,k,k}$  for all  $k$  to make  $Z^{TT}(\lambda)$  positive definite for any finite  $\mathbb{O}_{quad}$ . We initialize all bounds calculations in the main text (where  $n_s = 1$ ) by setting  $\lambda_I^{0,k,k} = 1 \quad \forall k$ . When  $\text{Im} \chi_{k,m} = 0$ , we may be able to generalize the technique utilized in Ref [1] (Supporting Information, Section 11).

## DESIGN REGIONS WITH NON-VACUUM BACKGROUNDS

The calculations in the previous section assumed the design region has vacuum background. However, the scattering theory can be readily modified to include non-vacuum backgrounds. We define  $\chi_b$  as the background susceptibility,  $\Delta \chi_{k,m} \equiv \chi_{k,m} - \chi_b$ , and write the total field at frequency  $k$  as  $E_{k,tot}$ . We also define the difference in polarization  $|\Delta T_{k,m}\rangle \equiv |T_{k,m}\rangle - |T_b\rangle \sim \Delta \chi_{k,m} E_{k,tot}$  where  $|T_b\rangle$  is the polarization of the background. The Green's function including the background  $\mathbb{G}_b^{(k)}$  is defined to map a difference in polarization to its resulting field:  $\mathbb{G}_b^{(k)} |\Delta T_{k,m}\rangle$  is the scattered field due to the additional polarization. Lastly, assuming  $|S_k\rangle$  is sourced by some current  $J_{vac}$ , we replace  $|S_k\rangle \rightarrow |S_{k,b}\rangle$  by the field sourced by the same  $J_{vac}$  in the presence of the background design region. Overall, the scattering theory is defined by the relations  $|E_{k,tot}\rangle \sim |S_{k,b}\rangle + \sum_m \mathbb{G}_b^{(k)} |\Delta T_{k,m}\rangle$ . The new optimization problem can be written

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\{\Delta T_{k,m}\}} & f(\{|T_b\rangle, |\Delta T_{k,m}\rangle\}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_m \left( \langle S_{k,b} | \mathbb{P}_j | \Delta T_{k',m} \rangle - \langle \Delta T_{k,m} | \Delta \chi_{k,m}^{-\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j | \Delta T_{k',m} \rangle - \sum_{m'} \langle \Delta T_{k,m} | -\mathbb{G}_b^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j | \Delta T_{k',m'} \rangle \right) = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', \\ & \langle \Delta T_{k,m} | \mathbb{P}_j | \Delta T_{k',m'} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', m \neq m'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S17})$$

where  $f$  must be modified accordingly by replacement of  $|T_{k,m}\rangle \rightarrow \Delta T_{k,m} + |T_b\rangle$ .

## NUMERICAL DETAILS: SPARSE FORMULATION

The optimization problem described in Eq. S1 contains a very large number of constraints, making the calculation of  $Z^{TT}$  computationally expensive. However, noting that  $\mathbb{G}_0$  is proportional to the inverse of the sparse Maxwell

operator  $\mathbb{M}$ , we can rewrite the constraints in Eq. S1

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_m \left( \langle S_k | \mathbb{P}_j \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k')} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} | T_{k',m} \rangle - \langle T_{k,m} | \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j \chi_{k,m}^{-\dagger} \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k')} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} | T_{k',m} \rangle \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{m'} \langle T_{k,m} | \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k)\dagger} (-\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger}) \mathbb{P}_j \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k')} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} | T_{k',m'} \rangle \right) = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', \\ & \langle T_{k,m} | \mathbb{G}_0^{(k)\dagger} \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k)\dagger} \mathbb{P}_j \mathbb{G}_0^{-(k')} \mathbb{G}_0^{(k')} | T_{k',m'} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j, k, k', m \neq m'. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S18})$$

Now, taking  $\mathbb{G}_0^{(k)} | T_{k,m} \rangle$  as the new optimization vector and cancelling inverses, all constraints can be represented using sparse matrices.  $\mathbb{G}_0^{-1}$  can be calculated using Woodbury inversion of known Maxwell operators.

## INVERSE DESIGN DETAILS

All calculations were run at increasing resolutions until converged. Multiple material topology optimization was done by writing  $\epsilon = \epsilon_2 + (\epsilon_1 + (\epsilon_{\text{background}} - \epsilon_1)\rho_2 - \epsilon_2)\rho_1$  for  $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in [0, 1]$  and optimizing over the continuous variables  $\rho_1, \rho_2$ . The derivatives of the objective with respect to modifications in  $\rho_1, \rho_2$  were computed with Ceviche [2]. The resulting optimization problem was solved with NLOpt [3].

Inverse designs are often binarized to reflect realistic devices. In the multi-material case, we define a binarized design as one where each pixel is exclusively one of the available materials. To better compare with bounds (which at high enough resolutions mimic the behavior of non-binarized devices), inverse designs were not deliberately binarized **with the exception of when vacuum is not available in the optimization problem. In these examples shown, binarization only marginally affected performance.**

- 
- [1] Pengning Chao, Rodrick Kuate Defo, Sean Molesky, and Alejandro Rodriguez. Maximum electromagnetic local density of states via material structuring. *Nanophotonics*, 12(3):549–557, 2 2023.
  - [2] Tyler W Hughes, Ian AD Williamson, Momchil Minkov, and Shanhui Fan. Forward-mode differentiation of maxwell’s equations. *ACS Photonics*, 6(11):3010–3016, 2019.
  - [3] Steven G. Johnson. The NLOpt nonlinear-optimization package. <https://github.com/stevengj/nlopt>, 2007.
  - [4] Leung Tsang, Jin Au Kong, and Kung-Hau Ding. *Scattering of Electromagnetic Waves: Theories and Applications*, volume 27. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.