Optimality of optical forces and torques on nanoparticles via illumination/scattering channels
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A universal property of resonant subwavelength scatterers is that their optical cross-sections are proportional to a square wavelength, \(\lambda^2\), regardless of whether they are plasmonic nanoparticles, two-level quantum systems, or RF antennas. The maximum cross-section is an intrinsic property of the incident field: plane waves, with infinite power, can be decomposed into multipolar orders with finite powers proportional to \(\lambda^2\). In this Letter, we identify \(\lambda^2/c\) and \(\lambda^2/c\) as analogous to \(\lambda^2/c\) and \(\lambda^2/c\), respectively (for wavelength \(\lambda\) and speed of light \(c\)), for scatterers of any size, analogous to the well-known \(\sim \lambda^2\) cross-section of a small scatterer [6–11]. Spheres, cylinders, and helices can approach the various bounds, which often require a complex interplay between scattering channels. With modern progress in spatial light modulators [12–14] and other beam-shaping techniques [15–17], the "reverse" problem of shaping the incident field for a fixed geometry is increasingly important. Our quadratic-form framework naturally yields globally optimal illumination fields as extremal eigenvectors of Hermitian matrices. For a generic scattering problem, we show that optimized incident fields can achieve sizable enhancements (20–40\%\) to optically induced force and torque, offering orders-of-magnitude enhancements over conventional beams.

Optically induced forces and torques offer precise mechanical control of nanoparticles [1–5], yet a basic understanding of what is possible has been limited by the inherent complexity in the optical response of a nanoparticle of any size, shape, and material. Here we show that a general scattering-channel decomposition embeds optical-response functions into matrix quadratic forms that, in tandem with a convex passivity constraint, readily yield analytical upper bounds for scatterers under arbitrary illumination. For plane waves, the force and torque bounds are proportional to \(\lambda^2/c\) and \(\lambda^2/c\), respectively (for wavelength \(\lambda\) and speed of light \(c\)), for scatterers of any size, analogous to the well-known \(\sim \lambda^2\) cross-section of a small scatterer [6–11]. Spheres, cylinders, and helices can approach the various bounds, which often require a complex interplay between scattering channels. With modern progress in spatial light modulators [12–14] and other beam-shaping techniques [15–17], the "reverse" problem of shaping the incident field for a fixed geometry is increasingly important. Our quadratic-form framework naturally yields globally optimal illumination fields as extremal eigenvectors of Hermitian matrices. For a generic scattering problem, we show that optimized incident fields can achieve sizable enhancements (20–40\%\) to optically induced force and torque, offering orders-of-magnitude enhancements over conventional beams.

Mechanical forces induced by light are the foundation for optical trapping and manipulation—versatile tools with applications ranging from laser cooling [18] and nanoparticle guidance [5, 19–25] to biomolecular sensing [26–28]. In the limit of dipolar response, analytical expressions for force and torque are known, as are associated concepts such as "gradient" forces [29–31] and optical "chirality" [32–34]. At wavelength size scales and larger, the only structures for which analytical bounds or semianalytical response expressions are known are ray-optical [31, 35] or spherical [36]. The forces and torques on nonspherical scatterers generally require simulation of Maxwell’s equations [37–41], providing numerical results but little insight. "Holographic" optical force and torque generation [42–46] faces a similar challenge: finding optimal illumination fields typically requires iterative computational optimization schemes [42, 47, 48] which may not converge to a global optimum. Recent work has identified the potential of quadratic forms for phase optimization [48], "absorption"-like energy-exchange quantities [49], or "optical eigenmodes" [50]: the framework here shows more generally how quadratic frameworks enable global optimization for any power quantity.

Analytical bounds—The scattering properties of a body are uniquely determined by the incoming and outgoing fields on any bounding surface [51]. For a fixed frequency \(\omega\) (time-dependence \(e^{-i\omega t}\)), if we denote \(V_+\) and \(V_-\) as basis states (i.e., "channels" or "ports" [52, 53]) for the incoming and outgoing waves, respectively, then we can decompose the 6-vector fields into basis-coefficient vectors \(c_{\text{in}}\) and \(c_{\text{out}}\):

\[
\psi_{\text{in}}(x) = V_- (x) c_{\text{in}}, \quad (1a)
\]
\[
\psi_{\text{out}}(x) = V_+ (x) c_{\text{out}}, \quad (1b)
\]

where \(\psi = \begin{pmatrix} E \\ H \end{pmatrix}\). For a lossless background, the incoming and outgoing channels can be chosen to be time-reversal pairs, only a finite number \(N\) of which couple to the scatterer. We take the bounding surface to enclose all scatterers, such that all channels are non-evanescent and carry a fixed power. For linear materials (considered hereafter), the basis coefficients \(c_{\text{in}}\) and \(c_{\text{out}}\) are related by \(c_{\text{out}} = S c_{\text{in}}\), where \(S\) is the scattering matrix.

By virtue of linearity, any quantity describing energy and momentum transfer can be written [41, 54] as a quadratic form of the fields on the bounding surface \(S\). If...
the quantity is a surface integral of, e.g., Poynting flux or the stress tensor, then the evaluation of the quantity in the in/out channel basis will be determined by matrices of the form $\int_S V^+ Q V_-$, where $Q$ is a $6 \times 6$ tensor field (see SM). We normalize $V^+,-$ to have unit power in each channel, such that absorption is simply

$$P_{\text{abs}} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}},$$

i.e., incoming minus outgoing power. Similarly, the force or torque on any scatterer, in some direction $i$, is:

$$F_i = \frac{1}{c} \left[ c_{\text{in}}^\dagger P_i c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger P_i c_{\text{out}} \right],$$

$$\tau_i = \frac{1}{\omega} \left[ c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_i c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger J_i c_{\text{out}} \right],$$

where $c$ is the speed of light, and $P_i$ and $J_i$ are dimensionless-matrix measures of linear and angular momentum, given by overlap integrals (described above) involving the stress tensor (SM). In the SM we verify that there are no in/out cross terms in Eqs. (2–4) for time-reversed bases of propagating states. Eqs. (2–4) compactly represent energy/momentum flow in an intuitive basis. We can derive general bounds by adding a single constraint: passivity.

Passivity requires that induced currents do no work [55]; as a consequence, absorption and scattered power are nonnegative. In a recent series of papers [56–61], we have identified passivity-based quadratic constraints to the currents induced within a medium, and applied them to find material-dictated bounds to a variety of optical-response functions. Here, we apply such constraints to the scattering channels themselves. Nonnegative absorption, i.e. $P_{\text{abs}} > 0$, translates Eq. (2) to a quadratic photon-conservation constraint on $c_{\text{out}}$:

$$c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}} \leq c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.$$  (5)

The largest force or torque that can be exerted on a nanoparticle can thus be formulated as the maximum of Eqs. (3,4) subject to passivity, i.e. Eq. (5). Eqs. (3–5) represent a particularly straightforward quadratic optimization with quadratic constraints. Of the two terms each in Eqs. (3,4), the first are fixed by the incident field, while the second are the variable ones to be bounded. For simplicity, we assume the standard case in which channels have equal positive- and negative-momentum eigenstates, such that the eigenvalues come in positive/negative pairs and $\max |c_{\text{out}}^\dagger (Q) c_{\text{out}}| = \max |c_{\text{in}}^\dagger (Q) c_{\text{in}}|$ (it is straightforward to generalize the results for alternative bases). Then the Rayleigh quotient [62] in tandem with the passivity constraint, Eq. (5), bounds the second terms of Eqs. (3,4) by $c_{\text{out}}^\dagger (Q) c_{\text{out}} \leq (c_{\text{in}}^\dagger (Q) c_{\text{in}}) \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q)$, for $Q = P_i, J_i$. Denoting the incoming power, momentum flow, and angular momentum flow by $W_{\text{in}} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}, P_{\text{in},i} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger P_i c_{\text{in}}/c$, and $J_{\text{in},i} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_i c_{\text{in}}/\omega$, respectively, the maximum force and torque are given by

$$F_i \leq P_{\text{in},i} + \frac{W_{\text{in}}}{c} \lambda_{\text{max}}(P_i),$$

$$\tau_i \leq J_{\text{in},i} + \frac{W_{\text{in}}}{\omega} \lambda_{\text{max}}(J_i).$$  (7)

Eqs. (6,7) are general bounds to the force or torque that can be exerted on any scatterer, given only the incident-field properties and the power and momentum properties of the relevant scattering channels. Intuitively, Eq. (6) predicts an optimal force for nanoparticles that absorb all of the momentum of the incoming waves, and generate outgoing waves of equal power and large, negative momentum. The eigenvalue encodes the relative difficulty in any set of scattering channels of generating such momentum transfer. The analogous interpretation applies to Eq. (7) in terms of angular momentum.

Natural scattering channels for wavelength-scale nanoparticles are the vector spherical waves (VSWs), $M_{\ell,m}^+(\text{TE})$ and $N_{\ell,m}^+(\text{TM})$, where $\ell$ and $m$ are the angular and projected quantum numbers, respectively. Farsund and Felderhof [63] have derived analytical expressions for the integrals defining the matrices $P_i$ and $J_i$ (see SM). As shown in Fig. 1, $J_z$ is diagonal, since the VSWs are pure angular momentum states. Conversely, $P_z$ has nonzero entries only off the diagonal. In the SM we derive bounds on the largest eigenvalues of $P_i$ and $J_i$: $\lambda_{\text{max}}(P_i) \leq 1$, and $\lambda_{\text{max}}(J_i) = \ell_{\text{max}}$, where $\ell_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum $\ell$ among the scattering channels. We can further simplify Eqs. (6,7) for prototypical plane-wave incident fields. Within channels up to $\ell_{\text{max}}$, a plane wave with amplitude $E_0$ and wavevector $k$ carries power $c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}} = \pi (\ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}}) |E_0|^2 k_0^2$ (SM). Its linear momentum per time is $P_{\text{in},i} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger P_i c_{\text{in}}/c = \frac{\omega}{\ell_{\text{max}} + 1} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}$, where $\beta_i = k \cdot \hat{i}$ is the fraction of the incident wave’s momentum in direction $i$. Its angular momentum per time is $J_{\text{in},i} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_i c_{\text{in}}/\omega = (\beta_i \gamma_i/\omega) c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}$, where $\gamma_i$ is the degree of right circular polarization for the wave projected into direction $i$. Both $\beta_i$ and $\gamma_i$ have a range

FIG. 1. The power, force, or torque imparted to any structure (or collection thereof) can be encoded in matrix quadratic forms $Q$ that are amenable to analytical bounds and quadratic optimization. In a vector-spherical-wave (VSW) basis, the force $\langle Q \rightarrow P_i \rangle$ and torque $\langle Q \rightarrow J_i \rangle$ matrices have nonzero values as shown on the right.

$P, F, T = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger Q c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger Q c_{\text{out}}$
The force bounds of Eqs. (6,8) require strong and highly directional scattering. Core-shell structures with aligned resonances show strong scattering and imperfect but good directionality. Optimized Si–SiO₂ structures \(r_1 = 0.1a, r_2 = 0.9a\) experience a force approaching the \(\ell_{\text{max}} = 3\) bound, with negligible scattering in higher channels.

Equations (8,9) bound the largest forces/torques that can be generated from incident plane waves. (Eqs. (6,7) provide bounds for more general incident waves.) The quantities \(\lambda^2/c\) and \(\lambda^3/c\) naturally emerge as force/torque analogs of the \(\lambda^2\) scattering cross-sections. Such proportionalities can be argued by dimensional analysis, while the quadratic framework leading to Eqs. (8,9) provides exact, quantitative upper bounds.

Figures 2 and 3 show examples of designed nanoparticles that can approach the plane-wave bounds. For Fig. 2, the inner radii of core-shell Si–SiO₂ structures were optimized (over a length scale \(a\)) to exhibit aligned resonances (“super-scattering” [7]). Such resonances can effectively scatter light in the backwards direction, enhancing a large force in the forward direction. For the three channels excited, nearly 65% of the total bound can be achieved, while nearly saturating the force due to the \(\ell = 1, 2\) channels. By contrast, spheres cannot approach the torque bounds, which require coupling positive- and negative-angular-momentum channels. Helices are excellent nanoswimmers [64], and we find that illuminating a helix (refractive index 3.5, structural details in SM) normal to its rotation axis generates counter-rotating outgoing waves and a large net torque perpendicular to its rotation axis. Figure 3 shows that an optimized helix can closely approach the \(\ell_{\text{max}} = 1\) bound.

Optimal illumination fields—The quadratic framework lends itself readily to the reverse problem: given a fixed scatterer, what incident field generates maximal force/torque? Significant interest in this problem has led to a variety of iterative optimization methods, which often converge to suboptimal local extrema [47]. Yet equating the outgoing coefficients \(c_{\text{out}}\) with \(SC_{\text{in}}\), where \(S\) is the scattering matrix transforms Eqs. (3,4) to describe forces and torques as Hermitian quadratic forms of the \(c_{\text{in}}\):

\[
F_i, \tau_i = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger (Q_i - S^\dagger QS) c_{\text{in}}. \tag{10}
\]

where \(Q_i\) represents \(P_i/c, J_i/\omega\), or any quantity of interest. Constraining the total power contained in the incoming wave, over some spatial region or set of channels, yields a constraint \(c_{\text{in}}^\dagger \Lambda c_{\text{in}} \leq 1\) for a Hermitian positive-definite matrix \(\Lambda\) (e.g., \(\Lambda\) is the identity matrix for a unity-average-power constraint in the scattering channels). The optimal coefficient vector \(c_{\text{in}(\text{opt})}\) that maximizes Eq. (10) subject to this constraint solves the generalized eigenproblem

\[
(Q_i - S^\dagger QS) c_{\text{in}}^{(\text{opt})} = \lambda_{\text{max}} \Lambda c_{\text{in}}^{(\text{opt})}, \tag{11}
\]

where \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) is the largest eigenvalue. The extremal eigenfunction solving Eq. (11) is the globally optimal incident field. Intuitively, it is sensible that the scattering matrix \(S\) determines the optimal incident field, since \(S\) encodes the response for any incoming wave. A key feature of Eq. (11) is that for the wavelength-scale scatterers in many optical force experiments, only a small to moderate number of VSWs are typically excited. Hence \(S\) has relatively few degrees of freedom, enabling rapid computation of the optimal incident field.
FIG. 4. Global optimization of an illumination field can be achieved in a single eigenvector computation per Eq. (11). Here we optimize force and torque on a silver cube (200 nm edge length) for illumination fields decomposed into VSW and Bessel-beam (BB) bases, with circularly polarized plane waves (CP PWs) as a standard for comparison (left). (a) Despite the seemingly large torque generated on resonance ($\lambda = 525$ nm) by a RCP PW (black line and inset), optimal VSW and BB incident fields offer $>40 \times$ and $>20 \times$ improvements, respectively, for a fixed field intensity. The scattered fields (right) for the optimal BB show an outgoing radiation pattern carrying angular momentum, primarily in the $\ell = 2, m = \pm 2$ channels. (c) Plane waves generate no in-plane forces ($F_x, F_y$) on such a cube. VSW and BB incident fields optimized for maximum $|F_z|$ generate in-plane forces larger than the $F_z$ of a plane wave. The scattered fields (right) for the optimal BB show the highly asymmetric radiation pattern. (b,d) Optimized VSW and BB field coefficients, alongside field patterns in the plane of the cube (insets).

Figure 4 demonstrates the capability for Eq. (11) to generate orders-of-magnitude increases in force/torque through wavefront shaping. We consider a 200 nm silver nanocube. The nanocube supports a strongly scattering quadrupole resonance at wavelength $\lambda = 525$ nm that already generates a significant force along the direction of an incoming plane wave. For a right circularly polarized (RCP) wave, absorption in the silver transfers the $m = 1$ angular momentum of the wave to the cube and generates a commensurate torque (a, inset). Yet through wavefront shaping, the torque can be dramatically enhanced, without increasing the intensity of the incident field. We consider two incident-field bases: VSWs, with quantum numbers $\ell, m,$ and $s$ (where $s$ denotes polarization), and vector Bessel beams (BBs) [65], diffraction-free cylindrical beams with an angular order $m$ and a polarization $s$. Note that Bessel beams are a subset of VSWs, so VSWs can exhibit superior performance, though BBs are more practical for experimental implementations [31]. One could similarly optimize plane waves coming from within a given solid angle. After solving for the scattering matrix with a free-software implementation [66] of the boundary element method [67], solution of Eq. (11) yielded the optimal VSW and BB fields. As shown in Fig. 4(a,b), isolation and optimization of the dominant scattering channels yields $20–40 \times$ increases in the torque. The field patterns (right) indicate the angular momentum carried away by the scattered fields. In contrast to the torque case, the nanocube already feels large forces in plane-wave interactions, as seen in Fig. 4(c) (black dashed line), simply through the momentum carried in forward-scattered and backscattered waves (i.e., along $z$). However, the force in a lateral direction is necessarily zero by symmetry. With the same nanocube scattering matrix, we thus optimized Eq. (11) for the $x$-directed force [Fig. 4(c)]. The optimal field coefficients, shown in Fig. 4(d), generate lateral forces even larger than the normally directed force under plane-wave excitation. The field patterns (right, red) show the highly asymmetric scattering that is responsible for the large lateral force.

The quadratic-optimization approach developed here can be applied across the landscape of optical force and torque generation. The analytical bounds of Eqs. (6–9) predict optimal response for a fixed incident field, while the optimal-eigenvector approach of Eq. (11) determines optimal incident fields for a fixed structure. Looking forward, incorporation of temporal dynamics and associated effects (e.g., back-action [68]) may lead to robust and efficient methods for producing even larger effects, towards optimal dynamical control at the nanoscale.

We thank Chia-Wei Hsu and Ognjen Ilic for helpful discussions. Y.L. and O.D.M. were supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under award number FA9550-17-1-0093. L.F. was supported by a Shanyuan Overseas scholarship from the Hong Kong Shanyuan foundation at Nanjing University. S.G.J was supported in part by the Army Research Office under contract number W911NF-13-D-0001. N.F. was supported by the Air
Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) Multidisciplinary Research Program of the University Research Initiative (MURI), and from KAUST-MIT agreement #2950.


Supplementary Materials: Optimal nanoparticle forces, torques, and illumination fields via scattering-channel decompositions

Yuxiang Liu,1 Lingling Fan,1, 2 Eunnie Lee,3 Nicholas Fang,3 Steven G. Johnson,4 and Owen D. Miller1
1Department of Applied Physics and Energy Sciences Institute, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511
2School of Physics and National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
3Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
4Departments of Mathematics and Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139
(Dated: May 30, 2018)

CONTENTS

I. Scattering-channel framework 1
   A. Power-orthogonal incoming channels 2
   B. Outgoing channels 2
   C. Orthogonality of in/out channels for energy/momentum quantities 3

II. Quadratic forms: power, force, and torque 4
    A. Absorbed power 4
    B. Force 4
    C. Torque 5

III. Vector spherical waves: definitions and quadratic forms 5
     A. Torque matrices 6
     B. Force matrices 8

IV. Bounds on eigenvalues of \( P_i \) and \( J_i \) in the VSW basis 10

V. Plane-wave power and momentum in the VSW basis 11

VI. Force bound when \( \ell_{\text{max}} = 1 \) 13

VII. Helix: structural details 13

VIII. Cross-section bounds rederived 14

References 15

I. SCATTERING-CHANNEL FRAMEWORK

In this section we specify the nature of the scattering channels that are used throughout the main text. The “scattering channels” are basis sets on a bounding surface of all scatterers in a given problem; equivalently, they are the “ports” commonly used in temporal coupled-mode theory [1]. The primary assumptions we make are that they enclose all scatterers (such that all channels are radiative or far-field in nature), whereby evanescent channels do not carry energy or momentum, and that the background is lossless, so that each channel carry fixed and position-independent energy and momenta.

We represent all electromagnetic fields in six-dimensional tensors, e.g.

\[
\psi = \begin{pmatrix} E \\ H \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(S1)

We start by considering some basis of \( N \) “incoming” channels, represented by basis states \( \varphi_{1-} \) through \( \varphi_{N-} \) in a tensor \( \mathbb{V}_- \):

\[
\mathbb{V}_- = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{1-}(x) & \varphi_{2-}(x) & \ldots & \varphi_{N-}(x) \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(S2)
From here, we want to show that such a basis can generally be “power-orthogonal,” that a time-reversed outgoing basis can be constructed, and that for generic energy/momentum quantities there will be no overlap between the incoming and outgoing basis states.

A. Power-orthogonal incoming channels

First, we consider power flow. The power flowing into a surface $S$ with outward normal $\hat{n}$ is given by

$$ P_{\text{abs}} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \int_S \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H} \cdot \hat{n} $$

$$ = -\frac{1}{4} \int_S \psi^\dagger \Theta \psi, $$

where $\Theta$ is the real-symmetric matrix

$$ \Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{n} \times & -\hat{n} \times \end{pmatrix}. $$

Although in temporal coupled-mode theory it is typically simply assumed that channels are power-orthonormal, here we discuss how such a condition can arise. Suppose we have a basis $V_-$ of incoming waves, linearly independent but not necessarily orthonormal. If we represent some incoming field in this basis as $\psi_{\text{in}} = V_- c_{\text{in}}$, then the incoming power would be

$$ c_{\text{in}} \left[ \int_S V_-^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_- \right] c_{\text{in}}. $$

Now we use the physical knowledge that $V_-$ comprises only incoming states (with nonzero power) to assert that $-\Theta/4$ is positive-definite over all states of interest. Since $-\Theta/4$ is definite, it can be used to define a modified inner product, and then one can use e.g. the Gram-Schmidt process to orthonormalize our $V_-$ basis in this quadratic form, giving:

$$ \int_S V_-^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_- = \mathcal{I}. $$

(Note that if the ambient medium is periodic, the surface $S$ needs to be replaced by a volume that is one unit cell thick. The Bloch waves in a periodic medium will not be linearly independent on a single cross-section.)

B. Outgoing channels

For the outgoing channels, we can simply choose the time-reversed incoming channels. If we denote the outgoing channels as $V_+$, then they are given by

$$ V_+ = \mathcal{P} V_-, $$

where overline denotes complex conjugation and the matrix $\mathcal{P}$ accounts for the different time-reversal properties of electric ($\mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}$) and magnetic ($\mathbf{H} \rightarrow -\mathbf{H}$) fields:

$$ \mathcal{P} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I} & \mathcal{L} \\ -\mathcal{L} & \mathcal{I} \end{pmatrix}. $$

These states are also power-orthogonalized, with the opposite normalization (because the power is flowing in the opposite direction): $\int_S V_+^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_+ = \int_S V_-^\dagger \mathcal{P} \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) \mathcal{P} V_- = -\int_S V_-^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_- = -\int_S V_-^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_- = -\mathcal{I}$, where we used the fact that $\mathcal{P} \Theta \mathcal{P} = -\Theta$, as can be verified by direct substitution. Thus,

$$ \int_S V_+^\dagger \left( -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \right) V_+ = -\mathcal{I}. $$

(S10)
C. Orthogonality of in/out channels for energy/momentum quantities

Energy/momentum-transfer quantities of interest, such as absorbed power, force, or torque, can generally be written as quadratic forms

\[ Q = \int_S \psi^\dagger Q \psi, \]  

where \( Q \) is a Hermitian operator determined by the Poyting vector or the electromagnetic stress tensor. (Note that other scattering quantities, such as scattered power or extinction, require additional quadratic and linear terms.) We will show that such quantities can be decomposed separately into their incoming and outgoing energy/momenta, without cross terms. First, we use the fact that \( Q \) represents energy or momentum flow to assert that \( Q \) must satisfy the general time-reversal expression.

Consider a total field that is purely outgoing: \( \psi = V_+ c \). Then \( Q \) would be given by

\[ Q = c^\dagger \left( \int_S V_+^\dagger \hat{S} V_+^\dagger \right) c \]  

(S12)

If we time-reverse the fields, \( V_+ \rightarrow V_- = P V_+ \), then the quantity \( Q \) must go to its negative (energy/momentum flows in the opposite direction):

\[ -Q = c^\dagger \left( \int_S V_+^\dagger P \hat{S} V_-^\dagger \right) c \]  

(S13)

Since Eq. (S12) and Eq. (S13) apply for any \( c \) and any \( V_+/\cdot \), we have the relation

\[ Q = -P Q^T P. \]  

(S14)

From Eq. (S14), it is straightforward to show that, as expected, incoming/outgoing channels carry equal and opposite energy/momentum:

\[ \int_S V_+^\dagger Q V_+ = -\int_S V_-^\dagger Q V_- . \]  

(S15)

To show orthogonality between the incoming and outgoing waves, we now consider a “zero-absorption” scenario (in distinction to the perfect-absorbed scenario used in Sec. 1A). The total field is given by the incoming and outgoing fields

\[ \psi = \psi_{\text{in}} + \psi_{\text{out}} = V_- c_{\text{in}} + V_+ c_{\text{out}}. \]  

(S16)

For non-evanescent, constant-power channels, there is no net power/momentum flow through \( S \) in the perfect-reflection scenario: all incoming power/momentum is reflected into outgoing power/momentum. If we consider the evaluation of the power/momentum quantity by the total field on the surface \( S \), we find

\[ Q = \int_S \left[ \psi_{\text{in}}^\dagger Q \psi_{\text{in}} + \psi_{\text{out}}^\dagger Q \psi_{\text{out}} + 2 \text{Re} \psi_{\text{in}}^\dagger Q \psi_{\text{out}} \right] \]  

\[ = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger \left( \int_S V_-^\dagger Q V_- \right) c_{\text{in}} + c_{\text{out}}^\dagger \left( \int_S V_+^\dagger Q V_+ \right) c_{\text{out}} + 2 \text{Re} \left[ c_{\text{in}}^\dagger \left( \int_S V_-^\dagger Q V_+ \right) c_{\text{out}} \right] . \]  

(S17)

By Eq. (S14), the first two terms in Eq. (S17) add to zero. Thus we are left only with the third term, and we know the total sum \( Q \) has to equal zero, leaving

\[ \text{Re} \int_S V_-^\dagger Q V_+ = 0. \]  

(S18)

This is a kind of power-orthogonality relationship between time-reversed pairs of incoming and outgoing waves.
II. QUADRATIC FORMS: POWER, FORCE, AND TORQUE

Armed with the identities of Eq. (S15) and Eq. (S18), we can simplify the quadratic form of Eq. (S17). If we define the matrix

\[
Q = \int_S \psi^\dagger Q \psi, \tag{S19}
\]

then the general quadratic form is simply

\[
Q = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger Q c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger Q c_{\text{out}}, \tag{S20}
\]

clearly denoting the transfer of force/torque/quadratic-form quantity as the difference between the energy/momentum of the incoming and outgoing waves.

Now we can make a list of the relevant quadratic forms and matrices for absorbed power, force, and torque.

A. Absorbed power

Absorbed power can be written in the form of Eq. (S11). Assuming an outward normal \( \mathbf{n} \) on some bounding surface \( S \), absorption is given by

\[
P_{\text{abs}} = -\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left[ \int_S \mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right]
= -\frac{1}{4} \left[ \int_S \psi^\dagger \Theta \psi \right]. \tag{S21}
\]

Hence the tensor field \( Q \) is given by \( Q = -\frac{1}{4} \Theta \), and the matrix \( Q \) is

\[
Q_{\text{abs}} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_S \psi^\dagger \Theta \psi. \tag{S22}
\]

As noted in the main text and in Sec. I A, it is convenient to normalize \( V \) such that \( Q_{\text{abs}} \) is the identity matrix.

B. Force

The force is determined by a surface integral of the Maxwell stress tensor, which is

\[
\mathbf{\sigma} = \left[ \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I} \left( \mathbf{E}^\dagger \mathbf{E} \right) \right] + \left[ \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I} \left( \mathbf{H}^\dagger \mathbf{H} \right) \right] \quad \text{(for } \varepsilon_0 = \mu_0 = 1). \]

The force directed in a given direction, denoted \( \mathbf{x} \), is given by

\[
F \cdot \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left[ \int_S \mathbf{E} \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right]
= \frac{1}{4} \left[ \int_S \psi^\dagger \Theta \psi \right] \mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{n}. \tag{S23}
\]

If we define the nonsquare, \( 6 \times 2 \) matrices \( \mathbf{X} \) and \( \mathbf{N} \),

\[
\mathbf{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{n} \\ \mathbf{n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{S24}
\]

then we can alternatively write the force as

\[
F \cdot \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \left[ \int_S \mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{N} \right]
= \frac{1}{4} \left[ \int_S \psi^\dagger \Theta \psi \mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{N} \right]. \tag{S25}
\]

By straightforward trace manipulations, we can rewrite this as

\[
F \cdot \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{4} \left[ \int_S \psi^\dagger \left( \mathbf{N} \mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{X} \mathbf{N}^\dagger \mathbf{X} - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^\dagger \mathbf{N}) \right) \right] \psi, \tag{S26}
\]

which is precisely of the form of Eq. (S11), with one-fourth times the term in square brackets denoting the operator \( Q \).
C. Torque

The torque integrand is similar to the force, with the replacement $\vec{\sigma} \rightarrow r \times \vec{\sigma}$. In the direction $\hat{x}$, the torque (around the origin) takes the form

$$\mathbf{T} \cdot \hat{x} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \int_S (\hat{x} \times \mathbf{r}) \cdot \left\{ \left[ \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} (\mathbf{E} \mathbf{E}^\dagger) \right] + \left[ \mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} (\mathbf{H} \mathbf{H}^\dagger) \right] \right\} \hat{n}.$$  

(S28)

Clearly the torque is identical to the force, with the replacement $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow r \times \mathbf{x}$. Thus, if we define

$$\mathbb{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{x} \\ r \times \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix},$$

(S29)

we can directly write the torque analog of Eq. (S27):

$$\mathbf{T} \cdot \hat{x} = \frac{1}{4} \int_S \psi^\dagger \left\{ \mathbb{U} \psi + \mathbb{U}^\dagger \psi - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left( \mathbb{U} \mathbb{U}^\dagger \right) \right\} \psi,$$

(S30)

again with one-fourth times the term in square brackets denoting $Q$, and the matrix $Q_{\text{torque}}$ following from Eq. (S19).

III. VECTOR SPHERICAL WAVES: DEFINITIONS AND QUADRATIC FORMS

There are many possible conventions for vector spherical waves (VSWs), with different coefficient and sign conventions, and thus for clarity we include our convention here in detail (our convention is the same as that of Ref. [2]), and we also include the force and torque matrices $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{J}$ in the VSW basis.

First, we note that in addition to the in/out basis used throughout, one could instead use an incident-field/scattered-field separation. Which separation is used determines which types of spherical Bessel functions are used in the VSWs:

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{inc}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{V}^{\text{reg}}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{c}_{\text{inc}}$$

(S31a)

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{scat}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{V}^+(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{c}_{\text{scat}}$$

(S31b)

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{V}^-(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{c}_{\text{in}}$$

(S31c)

$$\mathbf{E}_{\text{out}}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbb{V}^+(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{c}_{\text{out}},$$

(S31d)

where the “reg” subscript denotes “regular” (i.e. well-behaved spherical Bessel functions at the origin), the “+” superscript denotes outgoing waves, and the “−” superscript denotes incoming waves. (In the main text it was clearer to use subscripts, to avoid conjugate-transpose symbol clashes, but here we use superscripts to avoid index symbol clashes.) The tensors $\mathbb{V}^{\text{reg/+−}}$ comprise the vector spherical waves as columns:

$$\mathbb{V}^{\text{reg/+−}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} \cdots \mathbb{N}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x}) , \mathbb{M}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots \end{bmatrix},$$

(S32)

with $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_{\max}$, $-\ell \leq m \leq \ell$.

The vectors $\mathbb{N}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x})$ denote $e$-polarized waves while $\mathbb{M}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x})$ denote $h$-polarized waves. $\ell$ is the angular momentum “quantum number” while $m$ is the projected (angular momentum) quantum number. The magnetic fields are given by the same equations as the electric fields, with $\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{N} \rightarrow -\mathbf{M}$.

Our vector-spherical-wave convention is

$$\mathbb{N}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{k} \nabla \times \left[ \nabla \times \left( \mathbf{x} \; z^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(kr) \mathbf{Y}_{\ell,m}(\theta, \phi) \right) \right]$$

(S33)

$$\mathbb{M}^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(\mathbf{x}) = \nabla \times \left( \mathbf{x} \; z^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}(kr) \mathbf{Y}_{\ell,m}(\theta, \phi) \right) ,$$

(S34)

where $z^{\text{reg/+−}}_{\ell,m}$ represents the three spherical Bessel functions $j_{\ell}, h^1_{\ell}$ and $h^2_{\ell}$ respectively (also see [3, Eqs. (4.9)–(4.14)]). The spherical harmonics $\mathbf{Y}_{\ell,m}$ are defined as

$$\mathbf{Y}_{\ell,m}(\theta, \phi) = \sqrt{\frac{2\ell + 1}{4\pi\ell(\ell + 1)}} \frac{(\ell - m)!}{(\ell + m)!} P^m_\ell(\cos \theta) e^{im\phi} .$$

(S35)
Our definition of the vector spherical waves are the same as that in [2, Eqs. (1.4.56,1.4.57)]. Note that the spherical harmonics defined in Eq. (S35) for different \( \ell \)'s and \( m \)'s are orthogonal but not unit-normalized, as

\[
\int Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) * Y_{\ell' m'}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} \delta_{\ell \ell'} \delta_{mm'} .
\]  

(S36)

Applying the curl operator in Eqs. (S33,S34) becomes [3]

\[
N_{\ell m}^{\text{reg}+/−}(x) = \sqrt{2\ell + 1} \frac{(\ell - m)!}{4\pi \ell(\ell + 1) (\ell + m)!} \left( \frac{z_{\ell}^{\text{reg}+/−}(\rho)}{\rho} e^{\im \phi} \rho (\cos \theta) \hat{e}_r + e^{\im \phi} \frac{dP_{\ell}^m(\cos \theta)}{d\theta} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} \left[ \rho z_{\ell}^{\text{reg}+/−}(\rho) \right] \hat{e}_\theta + (\im m) e^{\im \phi} \frac{P_{\ell}^m(\cos \theta)}{\sin \theta} \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{d}{d\rho} \left[ \rho z_{\ell}^{\text{reg}+/−}(\rho) \right] \hat{e}_\phi \right) ,
\]

\[
M_{\ell m}^{\text{reg}+/−}(x) = \sqrt{2\ell + 1} \frac{(\ell - m)!}{4\pi \ell(\ell + 1) (\ell + m)!} \left( \frac{\im m e^{\im \phi}}{\sin \theta} P_{\ell}^m(\cos \theta) z_{\ell}^{\text{reg}+/−}(\rho) \hat{e}_r - e^{\im \phi} \frac{dP_{\ell}^m(\cos \theta)}{d\theta} \frac{1}{\rho} z_{\ell}^{\text{reg}+/−}(\rho) \hat{e}_\phi \right) ,
\]

(S37)

where \( \rho = kr \).

As we will discuss in the next subsection, Farsund and Felderhof [4] worked out overlap integrals of the Maxwell stress tensor for vector spherical waves of different orders, which determine the values of the force and torque matrices whose eigenvalues we bound. We use a slightly different VSW convention from Farsund and Felderhof, which we delineate here:

1. In Ref. [4], they define \( Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) \) to be

\[
Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) = \sqrt{\frac{2\ell + 1}{4\pi} \frac{(\ell - m)!}{(\ell + m)!} P_{\ell}^m(\cos \theta) e^{\im \phi} .
\]

In this definition, \( Y_{\ell m}(\theta, \phi) \) is orthonormal. Therefore, we have a factor \( \sqrt{\ell(\ell + 1)} \) difference.

2. Their definition of \( V_{\text{reg}+/−} \) has an extra factor \( k \).

3. Their definition of \( M_{\text{reg}+/−} \) has an extra factor \( \im \).

Therefore, the conversion between our coefficients \( c \) and the Farsund–Felderhof coefficients \( c^{\text{FF}} \) is

\[
c_{\ell m} = k \sqrt{\ell(\ell + 1)} c^{\text{FF}}_{\ell m} ,
\]

(S39)

\[
c_{h m} = i k \sqrt{\ell(\ell + 1)} c^{\text{FF}}_{h m} .
\]

(S40)

A. Torque matrices

As shown in Sec. II, the matrices \( P_i \) and \( J_i \), for force and torque in the \( i \) direction, respectively, are determined by overlap integrals \( \int_S \overline{V}_i \cdot \overline{Q} \), involving the basis tensor \( \overline{V} \) and a tensor \( \overline{Q} \) defined by the particular integral quantity (stress tensor, Poynting flow, etc.). In this subsection we write out the torque matrix \( J_i \) (translating the results of Ref. [4]), while the next subsection contains the force matrix \( P_i \).

The torque matrix \( J_i \) accounts for nonzero integrals (over the spherical bounding surface) of VSWs of order \( \{ \ell, m, s \} \) with VSWs of order \( \{ \ell', m', s' \} \). Farsund and Felderhof show that it is simpler to work with a variable \( q \in \{0, \pm 1\} \) instead of \( i \), where \( q = 0 \) corresponds to \( i = z \) and \( q = \pm 1 \) are linear combinations of the \( x \) and \( y \) directions. For a given \( q \), it is helpful to define a term \( L_q(\ell m') \) as follows:

\[
L_q(\ell m') = (-1)^{\ell + m + 1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell + 1) (2\ell + 1)} \binom{\ell}{\ell - m} \frac{1}{m'} q ,
\]

\( q \in \{-1,0,1\} \).
where the last term of the above equation is the Wigner-3j symbol [4]. For any \( q \) (and \( i \)), the torque matrix is block-diagonal in \( \ell \), as there is no coupling between \( \ell \) and \( \ell' \) waves when \( \ell \neq \ell' \). In terms of \( L_q \), the \( \ell \) blocks of the torque matrices are:

\[
J^z_{\ell}(mm') = L_0(\ell mm') \tag{S41}
\]
\[
J^x_{\ell}(mm') = \frac{L_{+1}(\ell mm') - L_{-1}(\ell mm')}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{S42}
\]
\[
J^y_{\ell}(mm') = -i \frac{L_{+1}(\ell mm') + L_{-1}(\ell mm')}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{S43}
\]

Now, we want to write down the matrices \( J^x_{\ell}, J^y_{\ell} \) and \( J^z_{\ell} \) explicitly and try to get the eigenvalues analytically. First, we have

\[
L_0(\ell mm') = (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \ell & 1 \\ -m & m' & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{S44}
\]
\[
= (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \cdot (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \frac{m}{\sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)}} \delta_{mm'} \tag{S45}
\]
\[
= m \delta_{mm'} \tag{S46}
\]

Therefore we have

\[
J^z_{\ell} = \begin{bmatrix} -\ell & -\ell + 1 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \ell - 1 & \ell \end{bmatrix} \tag{S47}
\]

It is clear that the eigenvalues of \( J^z_{\ell} \) are \(-\ell, -\ell + 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, \ell - 1, \ell\).

\[
L_1(\ell mm') = (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \ell & 1 \\ -m & m' & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{S48}
\]
\[
= (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \cdot (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \frac{(\ell + m)(\ell - m + 1)}{2\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \delta_{m',m-1} \tag{S49}
\]
\[
= -\sqrt{\frac{(\ell + m)(\ell - m + 1)}{2}} \delta_{m',m-1} \tag{S50}
\]

If we want to write it explicitly, it is

\[
L^1_{\ell} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1-2\ell}{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & -\sqrt{\frac{2(2\ell-1)}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ & & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} \tag{S51}
\]

\[
L_{-1}(\ell mm') = (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \ell & 1 \\ -m & m' & -1 \end{pmatrix} \tag{S52}
\]
\[
= (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \cdot (-1)^{\ell+m+1} \frac{(\ell - m)(\ell + m + 1)}{2\ell(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)} \delta_{m',m+1} \tag{S53}
\]
\[
= \sqrt{\frac{(\ell - m)(\ell + m + 1)}{2}} \delta_{m',m+1} \tag{S54}
\]
If we want to write it explicitly, it is
\[
L_{\ell - 1} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (2\ell)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \sqrt{\frac{2}{2} (2\ell - 1)} & 0 & 0 \\
& & \ddots & & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\frac{2(2\ell - 1)}{2}} & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]  
(S55)

We have
\[
J_{\ell x} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (2\ell)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \sqrt{\frac{2}{2} (2\ell - 1)} & 0 & 0 \\
& & \ddots & & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\frac{2(2\ell - 1)}{2}} & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
\[
J_{\ell y} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & i \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (2\ell)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-i \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} (2\ell)} & 0 & i \sqrt{\frac{2}{2} (2\ell - 1)} & 0 & 0 \\
& & \ddots & & 0 \\
& & & \ddots & 0 \\
& & & & -i \sqrt{\frac{2(2\ell - 1)}{2}} & 0 & i \sqrt{\frac{2\ell - 1}{2}} \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Although it is not analytically obvious how to derive the eigenvalues of \( J_{\ell x} \) or \( J_{\ell y} \), it is straightforward to show numerically that their eigenvalues are also \(-\ell, -\ell + 1, \ldots, \ell - 1, \ell\). This can also be argued by symmetry: absent an incident field, there is no preferred direction in space, and thus the angular momentum “available” in any direction should be identical.

B. Force matrices

The force matrices are more complex than the torque matrices. For any \( q \), we can decompose the force matrices into two parts:
\[
F_q = F_q^d + F_q^e, \quad q \in \{-1, 0, 1\},
\]
where \( F_q^d \) denotes the interaction for waves of the same polarization, but different \( \ell \)'s, whereas \( F_q^e \) is the interaction matrix for the same \( \ell \)'s but different polarizations (\( e-h \)).

Again, following Ref. [4] while noting the different normalizations,
\[
F_q^d(\ell m, \ell' m') = \text{Re} \left[ \frac{1}{\ell' (\ell' + 1)} \cdot i^{\ell - \ell'} (\ell^2 + \ell' - 1) R_q(\ell m, \ell' m') \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell' (\ell' + 1)}} \right], \quad (S56)
\]
where the term \( R_q(\ell m, \ell' m') \) is a product of two Wigner 3j-symbols,
\[
R_q(\ell m, \ell' m') = (-1)^m \sqrt{(2\ell + 1)(2\ell' + 1)} \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \ell' & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \ell & \ell' & 1 \\ -m & m' & q \end{pmatrix}. \quad (S57)
\]
In the expression for $R_q$, the first Wigner 3j-symbol can be simplified:

$$(\ell \ell' 1) \begin{cases} 
(1)^\ell \sqrt{\frac{\ell^2}{(2\ell-1)(2\ell+1)}} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
(1)^\ell+1 \sqrt{\frac{(\ell+1)^2}{(\ell+1)(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S58}$$

Therefore, we have the following

$${R_q(\ell m, \ell' m')} = \begin{cases} 
(1)^{\ell+m} \sqrt{(2\ell+1)(2\ell-1)} \sqrt{\frac{\ell^2}{(2\ell-1)(2\ell+1)}} \left( \frac{\ell}{m} \frac{\ell - 1}{m'} \frac{1}{q} \right) , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
(1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)} \sqrt{\frac{(\ell+1)^2}{(l+1)(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \left( \frac{\ell}{m} \frac{\ell + 1}{m'} \frac{1}{q} \right) , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S59}$$

$${R_q(\ell m, \ell' m')} = \begin{cases} 
(1)^{\ell+m} \sqrt{1} \left( \frac{\ell}{-m} \frac{\ell - 1}{m'} \frac{1}{q} \right) , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
(1)^{\ell+m+1} \sqrt{\ell+1} \left( \frac{\ell}{-m} \frac{\ell + 1}{m'} \frac{1}{q} \right) , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S60}$$

We then have:

- When $q = 1$,

$${R_q(\ell m, \ell' m')} = \begin{cases} 
\sqrt{\frac{(\ell+m+1)(\ell+m)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', -m-1} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
-\sqrt{\frac{(\ell+m+1)(\ell-m+2)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', -m-1} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S61}$$

- When $q = 0$,

$${R_q(\ell m, \ell' m')} = \begin{cases} 
\sqrt{\frac{(\ell+m+1)(\ell-m)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', m} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
\sqrt{\frac{(\ell+m+1)(\ell-m-1)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', m} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S62}$$

- When $q = -1$,

$${R_q(\ell m, \ell' m')} = \begin{cases} 
\sqrt{\frac{(\ell-m+1)(\ell-m)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', m+1} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell - 1 , \\
0 , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell , \\
-\sqrt{\frac{(\ell+m+1)(\ell-m+2)}{2(2\ell+1)(2\ell+3)}} \delta_{m', m+1} , & \text{if } \ell' = \ell + 1 .
\end{cases} \tag{S63}$$

Then, because we take the real part when we calculate the force, the force matrix is

$$\mathbb{P}_q^d = \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}_q^d} + (\mathbb{P}_q^d)^\dagger}{2} ,$$

Note that we have the same block for $e - e$ and $h - h$ polarization. So for each pair of $\ell$ and $\ell'$, we need to have 2 copies of the matrix.

Now, let us focus on the $\mathbb{P}_q^c$. From [4, Eqs. (7.19,7.20)], we have

$$\mathbb{P}_q^c(\ell mm') = \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} L_q(\ell mm') \tag{S64}$$
FIG. S1. The structure of the force matrix $P_z$

Note that this term is not along the diagonal since it is the $e$-$h$ interaction. $P_q^{c'}$ has the same form for both $e$-$h$ and $h$-$e$ blocks. Again, there is a real operator for the force calculation, and therefore

$$P_q^c = \frac{P_q^{c'} + (P_q^{c'})^\dagger}{2}. \quad (S65)$$

Finally, $P_q = P_q^d + P_q^c$. Using the same $q \to i$ conversion as for the torque case,

$$P_z = P_0 \quad (S66)$$

$$P_x = \frac{P_{+1} - P_{-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (S67)$$

$$P_y = -i \frac{P_{+1} + P_{-1}}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (S68)$$

$P_z$, for example, has the structure shown in Fig. S1.

**IV. BOUNDS ON EIGENVALUES OF $P_i$ AND $J_i$ IN THE VSW BASIS**

As we saw in Sec. III A, the eigenvalues of the $J_i$, for any $i$, are simply the diagonal entries of $J_z$:

$$-\ell, -\ell + 1, \ldots, \ell - 1, \ell,$$

and thus the maximum eigenvalue is

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(J_z) = \ell_{\text{max}}. \quad (S69)$$

For the force matrices $P_i$, the off-diagonal components make it impossible (as far as we can tell) to solve for the eigenvalues analytically. The Gershgorin circle theorem [5] can be used to get within about a factor of 1.5 of the largest eigenvalue, but it turns out that a simple physical argument yields a tighter bound.

Consider some set of incoming waves given by a set of coefficients $c_{in}$. The momentum per time carried by those waves is given by $\frac{1}{\hbar} c_{in}^\dagger P_i c_{in}$. The maximum momentum that could be carried by those waves is given by the number of photons per unit time multiplied by $\hbar k$, i.e. the total momentum is less than or equal to the sum of $\hbar k = \hbar \omega/c$.
for each photon. The number of photons per unit time is given by $c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}} / \hbar \omega$, since $c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}}$ is the incoming power. Following these arguments mathematically, we can write:

$$\frac{1}{c} c^\dagger_{\text{in}} P_i c_{\text{in}} \leq \hbar k \frac{dN}{dt}$$

$$= \hbar k c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}} / \hbar \omega$$

$$= \frac{1}{c} c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}}.$$  

We can rewrite the final expression without the speed of light,

$$c^\dagger_{\text{in}} P_i c_{\text{in}} \leq c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S70)

which applies for any $c_{\text{in}}$ vector, implying that

$$\lambda_{\text{max}}(P_i) \leq 1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S71)

Fig. S2 shows that the largest eigenvalue of $P_i$ in a VSW basis converges to the bound as $\ell_{\text{max}} \to \infty$. Note that the eigenvalue bound itself does not rely on any property of VSWs and must be true for any basis.

![Fig. S2. Largest eigenvalue of $P_i$ as a function of $\ell_{\text{max}}$, converging to the bound of 1.](image)

**V. PLANE-WAVE POWER AND MOMENTUM IN THE VSW BASIS**

In this section we derive the quantities $c^\dagger_{\text{in}} c_{\text{in}}$, $c^\dagger_{\text{in}} P_i c_{\text{in}}$, and $c^\dagger_{\text{in}} J_i c_{\text{in}}$ in the case that $c_{\text{in}}$ represents the VSW coefficients for a plane wave propagating in the $z$ direction. We can start from the plane-wave expansions in Ref. [3] and convert to our VSW basis to find the incoming-wave coefficients. Plane waves have nonzero coefficients only for $m = \pm 1$; taking $m = 1$ below, the coefficients for linear polarization are

$$c^{\text{Lin}}_{\ell m} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi (2\ell - 1)} \ell^{\ell - 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S72a)

$$c^{\text{Lin}}_{\ell - m} = -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi (2\ell - 1)} \ell^{\ell - 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S72b)

$$c^{\text{Lin}}_{h \ell m} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi (2\ell + 1)} \ell^{\ell - 1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (S72c)

$$c^{\text{Lin}}_{h \ell - m} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\pi (2\ell + 1)} \ell^{\ell - 1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S72d)
for right circular polarization they are

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{c}_{RCP}^{\ell m} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell - 1)i^{\ell - 1}}, \\
\mathbf{c}_{hRCP}^{\ell m} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell + 1)i^{\ell - 1}},
\end{align*}
\]

(S73a)

(S73b)

and for left circular polarization they are

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{c}_{LCP}^{\ell m - \ell} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell - 1)i^{\ell - 1}}, \\
\mathbf{c}_{hLCP}^{\ell m - \ell} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell + 1)i^{\ell - 1}}.
\end{align*}
\]

(S74a)

(S74b)

The value of \( \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{c}_{in} \) is the same for any polarization (since the power is not affected by polarization). It is simplest to compute the power for circular polarization, in which case it is the sum \( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}} 2\pi (2\ell + 1) \). At this point we rescale our coefficients by the value \( \frac{|E_0|}{k\sqrt{Z_0}} \), where \( E_0 \) is the plane-wave amplitude, \( k \) the wavenumber, and \( Z_0 \) the impedance of free space (to ultimately yield a power-normalized \( \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{c}_{in} \)). Then,

\[
\mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{c}_{in} = \frac{\pi |E_0|^2}{k^2 Z_0} \left( \ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}} \right).
\]

(S75)

All of the following quantities will ultimately be written in terms of \( \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{c}_{in} \), so we drop the scale factor \( |E_0|/k\sqrt{Z_0} \) hereafter.

Now we consider the momentum flowing in direction \( i \). The momentum per time is given by \( (\hat{\mathbf{z}} \cdot \mathbf{i})\mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c}_{in}/c = \beta_i \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c}_{in}/c \), since there is no \( x \)- or \( y \)-directed momentum. (It can be verified that \( \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P} \mathbf{c}_{in} = \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P}_{x} \mathbf{c}_{in} = 0 \).) From Sec. III B, we know that \( \mathbf{P}_z = \mathbf{P}^{x} + \mathbf{P}^{y} \). We saw that

\[
\mathbf{P}_z^{\ell} (\ell m') = \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} L_0 (\ell m'),
\]

which means that

\[
\mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P}_z^{\ell} \mathbf{c}_{in} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}} \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} \mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{c}_{\ell}
\]

\[
= \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}} \frac{2\ell + 1}{\ell(\ell + 1)}
\]

(S76)

where we used the fact that \( \mathbf{c}_{in} \) has nonzero coefficients only for \( m = 1 \), for which \( L_0 (\ell m') = \delta_{mm'} \). From Eq. (S56), the \( \mathbf{P}^d_z \) contribution is

\[
\mathbf{c}_{in}^\dagger \mathbf{P}^d_z \mathbf{c}_{in} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}} - 1} \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\ell^2 + \ell - 1) + (\ell + 1)^2 + \ell + 1 - 1 \right]
\]

\[
\cdot \sqrt{\frac{(\ell + 2)\ell}{(2\ell + 1)(2\ell + 3)}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{(\ell + 1)(\ell + 2)}}
\]

\[
\cdot \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell + 1)} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi(2\ell + 3)}
\]

\[
= \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}} - 1} \frac{2\ell(\ell + 2)}{(\ell + 1)^2}
\]

(S77)

The first line of the above equation is the summation of the \( \{\ell, (\ell + 1)\} \) and \( \{ (\ell + 1), \ell \} \) interaction. For both interactions, \( R_q (\ell m, \ell' m') \) is the same. We vary \( \ell \) from 1 to \( \ell_{\text{max}} - 1 \) since the interaction only comes into play when \( \ell_{\text{max}} \geq 2 \). The first term of the second line includes \( R_q (\ell m, \ell' m') \). The third line incorporates the values of \( \mathbf{c}_{in} \) for
channels $\ell$ and $\ell + 1$. So the sum of the contributions from $P_{z}^c$ and $P_{z}^d$ is

$$c_{\text{in}}^\dagger P_{z}^c c_{\text{in}} = \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}-1} \frac{2\ell + 1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} + \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}-1} \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} + \pi \frac{2\ell_{\text{max}} + 1}{\ell_{\text{max}}(\ell_{\text{max}} + 1)}$$

$$= \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}-1} \frac{2\ell(\ell + 1)^2}{\ell(\ell + 1)} + \pi \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_{\text{max}}-1} \frac{1}{\ell(\ell + 1)} + \pi \frac{2\ell_{\text{max}} + 1}{\ell_{\text{max}}(\ell_{\text{max}} + 1)}$$

$$= \pi \left( \ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}} - 2 + \frac{\ell_{\text{max}} - 1}{\ell_{\text{max}}(\ell_{\text{max}} + 1)} \right)$$

$$= \frac{\ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}}}{\ell_{\text{max}} + 1}$$

$$= \frac{\ell_{\text{max}}^2}{\ell_{\text{max}} + 1} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.$$  \hfill (S78)

And thus the momentum flow per time in direction $i$, denoted $P_{\text{in},i}$ in the main text, is

$$P_{\text{in},i} = \frac{\beta_{i}}{c} \frac{\ell_{\text{max}}}{\ell_{\text{max}} + 1} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.$$  \hfill (S79)

Finally, for the angular momentum, we separately consider the RCP and LCP waves, and at the end show that the total angular momentum is proportional to the degree of right circular polarization. Again, one can show for any $c_{\text{in}}$ that $c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{y} c_{\text{in}} = 0$, such that the angular momentum in direction $i$ is determined by the $z$-directed fraction,

$$c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}} = \beta_{i} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}}.$$  \hfill (S80)

For an RCP plane wave, the coefficients of $c_{\text{in}}$ are nonzero only for $m = 1$, for which the diagonal entries of $J_{z}$ are 1, such that $c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}}$. Conversely, for an LCP plane wave the coefficients of $c_{\text{in}}$ are nonzero only for $m = -1$, for which the diagonal entries of $J_{z}$ are $-1$, such that $c_{\text{in}}^\dagger J_{z} c_{\text{in}} = -c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}$, the negative of the RCP case. Thus is we define $\gamma_{i}$ as the degree of right circular polarization of any incoming wave, the angular momentum per unit time is

$$J_{\text{in},i} = \frac{\beta_{i} \gamma_{i}}{\omega} c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.$$  \hfill (S81)

VI. FORCE BOUND WHEN $\ell_{\text{max}} = 1$

In the main text, we derived force and torque bounds in a VSW basis for plane-wave incidence for any $\ell_{\text{max}}$, using the eigenvalue bound $\lambda_{\text{max}}(P_{z}) = 1$. Here, we consider the case $\ell_{\text{max}} = 1$. In this case, analysis of the matrices in Sec. III B shows that $\lambda_{\text{max}}(P_{z}) = 1/2$. Carrying this factor of $1/2$ through the bound derivation, one finds that the force in the $i$ direction normalized by the incident-wave intensity is bounded above by

$$\frac{F_{i}}{I_{\text{inc}}} \leq \frac{3\lambda^{2}}{4\pi c},$$  \hfill (S82)

about a factor of $1/3$ tighter than the bound in the main text, for this special case.

VII. HELIX: STRUCTURAL DETAILS

The line running along the center of a helix wrapping around the $z$ axis has a simple parametrization:

$$r(t) = (R \cos(t), R \sin(t), ht),$$  \hfill (S83)
where $R$ controls the radius of that center line as it wraps, and $h$ scales the rate at which the height along $z$ changes. The parameter $t$ controls how many rotations of the helix occur, e.g. $[0, 4\pi]$ means two circles. For a three-dimensional helical structure, we need two unit vectors at each point along the center line, to create the circular surface slice of the helix. Starting with the tangent vector (by differentiation),

$$t(t) = (-R \sin(t), R \cos(t), h),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S84)

one can get the local normal vector as

$$n(t) = (-\cos(t), -\sin(t), 0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S85)

The second local basis vector is the “binormal,”

$$b(t) = t \times n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{R^2 + h^2}} (h \sin(t), -h \cos(t), R).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S86)

To create the 3D helix, we thus use a vector $S$ that is the sum of $r(t)$ with two new parameters and the two basis vectors. We use a parameter $u$ which ranges from 0 to $2\pi$, to create the circular surfaces around the helical line, and a second parameter $a$ that represents the radius of the circle that wraps around the center line (not the radius of the circle formed by the center line itself, which is $R$).

$$S(u, t) = r(t) + an(t) \cos(u) + ab(t) \sin(u).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S87)

For the structure simulated in the main text, we used the values $R = 0.9$, $a = 0.45$, and $h = 0.3$.

VIII. CROSS-SECTION BOUNDS REDERIVED

In this final section we derive VSW bounds on scattering, absorption, and extinction cross-sections for plane-wave illumination, and verify that the resulting bounds agree with previous results from the literature [6–10]. To examine scattered power and extinction, we will need to connect the incoming-field/outgoing-field separation to the common incident-field/scattered-field separation. For VSWs, it is generally true for any incident field that half of the field must be incoming and the other half must be outgoing (to have a continuous field at the origin, where incoming/outgoing fields have singularities) [11]. The scattered field must be purely outgoing. Thus, the relationship between the in/out coefficients $c_{\text{in}}$ and $c_{\text{out}}$, and the inc/scat coefficients $c_{\text{inc}}$ and $c_{\text{scat}}$ must be:

$$c_{\text{in}} = \frac{1}{2} c_{\text{inc}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (S88)

$$c_{\text{out}} = c_{\text{scat}} + \frac{1}{2} c_{\text{inc}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S89)

We start with absorption, the bound for which is particularly simple. Absorption is given by $c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}}$, and thus maximum absorption satisfies

$$\text{maximize } c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}}$$
$$\text{subject to } c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}} \leq c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S90)

Maximum absorption occurs when $c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}} = 0$ (all power is incoming and absorbed), such that

$$P_{\text{abs}}^{(\text{max})} = c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}} = \frac{\pi |E_0|^2}{2k^2Z_0} \left( \ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (S91)

The absorption cross-section is the absorbed power divided by the incident intensity, $I_{\text{inc}} = |E_0|^2/2Z_0$. Then the maximum absorption cross-section is

$$\sigma_{\text{abs}}^{(\text{max})} = \frac{\pi}{k^2} \left( \ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{4\pi} \left( \ell_{\text{max}}^2 + 2\ell_{\text{max}} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S92)
Scattered power is the outgoing power in the scattered fields, and hence is given by $c_{\text{scat}}^\dagger c_{\text{scat}}$. By Eqs. (S88,S89), $c_{\text{scat}} = c_{\text{out}} - c_{\text{in}}$, such that maximum scattered power is the solution to the optimization problem

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad (c_{\text{out}} - c_{\text{in}})^\dagger (c_{\text{out}} - c_{\text{in}}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}} \leq c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.
\end{align*}
$$

(S93)

Lagrangian multipliers confirm the intuition that the optimal $c_{\text{out}}$ is the negative of $c_{\text{in}}$: $c_{\text{out}} = -c_{\text{in}}$. Then the scattered power will be $4c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}$, i.e. 4 times the maximum absorbed power, and the maximum scattering cross-section is

$$
\sigma_{\text{scat}}^{(\text{max})} = \frac{4\pi}{k^2} \left( \ell_{\max}^2 + 2\ell_{\max} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\pi} \left( \ell_{\max}^2 + 2\ell_{\max} \right).
$$

(S94)

Extinction is the sum of the absorbed and scattered powers, and thus equals $2\Re c_{\text{in}}^\dagger (c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}})$ (which equals the more intuitive expression $\Re c_{\text{inc}}^\dagger c_{\text{scat}}$). Then the maximum extinction satisfies

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad 2\Re c_{\text{in}}^\dagger (c_{\text{in}} - c_{\text{out}}) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad c_{\text{out}}^\dagger c_{\text{out}} \leq c_{\text{in}}^\dagger c_{\text{in}}.
\end{align*}
$$

(S95)

The maximum is achieved at the maximum-scattering condition, $c_{\text{out}} = -c_{\text{in}}$, meaning the extinction cross-section has the same upper bound as the scattering cross-section:

$$
\sigma_{\text{ext}}^{(\text{max})} = \frac{4\pi}{k^2} \left( \ell_{\max}^2 + 2\ell_{\max} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2}{\pi} \left( \ell_{\max}^2 + 2\ell_{\max} \right).
$$

(S96)