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More than forty years ago, Barash published a calculation of the full retarded Casimir-Lifshitz torque for planar media with arbitrary degrees of anisotropy. An independent theoretical confirmation has been lacking since. We report a systematic and transparent derivation of the torque between two media with both electric and magnetic birefringence. Our approach, based on an eigenmode decomposition of Maxwell’s equations, generalizes Barash’s result for electrically birefringent materials. This formalism can be generalized to a wide range of anisotropic materials and finite thickness effects.

Casimir-Lifshitz forces are dispersion interactions between macroscopic bodies that arise from quantum mechanical and thermal fluctuations in the electromagnetic field. These forces, which can be considered a generalization of van der Waals forces to include finite light speed, depend on the electric and magnetic susceptibilities of the materials involved (cf. also Ref. [3] for a review). Several decades after its first theoretical prediction, measuring the Casimir force directly became technologically feasible [4]. Since this interaction is mediated by virtual and thermal photons, the frequency of which cannot be controlled directly, the Casimir force is a broadband phenomenon. In particular, as a consequence of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, the frequency ranges where the susceptibilities change significantly actually provide a dominant contribution to the Casimir force.

From a fundamental viewpoint, the Casimir force plays a role in micron range gravitation experiments, and the search for deviations from Newtonian gravitation due to hypothetical new forces [5]. This fuels the desire to come to precise comparisons between theoretical predictions and experimental data [6]. More practically, Casimir interactions affect the actuation dynamics of nano- and micro-mechanical systems, such as switches, cantilevers, and actuators at a sub-micrometer length scale [7–14].

In order to calculate the Casimir potential, the Maxwell equations must be solved for the given geometry [2]. Here we focus on the case of planar media where this can be done analytically. Anisotropy in the plane of reflection creates a dielectric contrast in the azimuthal direction, which gives rise to a Casimir torque [15] (see Fig. 1). Several experimental setups to detect the torque have been proposed [16–19], but only recently has this phenomenon been observed experimentally [20].

An exact analytical description for two planar birefringent half spaces was derived more than forty years ago [15]. More recently, an alternative calculation has been presented [21], the result of which looks symbolically different but appears to be numerically equivalent. In either case, the results are algebraically complicated with very little hope of simplification. Recently, a formula was proposed without derivation [22].

FIG. 1. Two half spaces with both electric and magnetic birefringence. The optic axes of both media are indicated by the solid arrows. The dash-dotted arrows show the projection of the optic axis of the other medium. The $x$-$y$-plane refers to the laboratory’s coordinates.
still been lacking. The recent development of the experimental observation of the Casimir torque \cite{20} will instigate more investigations on this phenomenon, which necessitates a systematic and transparent formalism to describe it theoretically. The main obstacle is the failure of the usual decomposition into perpendicular s-polarized (or transverse electric) and p- polarized (transverse magnetic) modes. The reason for this failure is the fact that these are not the solutions of the Maxwell equations. Therefore it stands to reason to determine what actually are instead. This can be done by formulating the Maxwell equations as an eigenvalue problem. The Maxwell eigenmode formalism is a well-established method in electrical and electronic engineering \cite{23, 24} that has been designed specifically to tackle the problem of scattering electromagnetic waves on anisotropic media. Note that the s- and p-mode decomposition actually does work if the plane of anisotropy is perpendicular to the plane of reflectance (cf., e.g., Ref. \cite{23}). However, in such a case the Casimir torque vanishes.

Some limiting cases simplify the result of Ref. \cite{15} considerably. For example, the limit of weak anisotropy, or more generally, the limit of relatively small deviations from in-plane anisotropy, is a popular approximation \cite{20–29}. This is valid for certain natural anisotropic materials such as calcite or quartz, but there is no reason to assume this must hold generally. Examples of materials that are not weakly anisotropic include, but are not limited to, to cuprate superconductors, \cite{30} liquid crystals, \cite{31} anisotropic metamaterials, \cite{32} and multiferroic materials. \cite{33}. Another common simplifying assumption is the non-retarded limit of van der Waals forces \cite{34, 35}. Depending on the material(s), this approximation should work at separation distances of the order of 10 nm. However, even at such short distances this approximation can fail \cite{28}. Here, we would like to make the case that such approximations are unnecessary by presenting an exact and transparent generalization of the calculation in Ref. \cite{15}.

The approach that we present is subject to the same assumptions underlying the original Lifshitz theory. Firstly, it relies on a continuous medium approximation, which is valid for wavelengths larger than the interatomic distance. A second assumption is that the medium exhibits linear dielectric response. Indeed, conventional Lifshitz theory does not extend to media with nonlinear dielectric response behavior. Such an extension requires a non-trivial generalization of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, which is based on linear response theory \cite{36}.

**Maxwell eigenmodes** - In the case of birefringent media, one can distinguish the so-called ‘ordinary’ and ‘extraordinary’ waves. The former propagates as if the medium were isotropic, whereas the propagation of the latter depends on the medium’s orientation \cite{37}.

Let the material slab be oriented in such a way that the anisotropic plane is facing the surface, which is defined as the $x$-$y$-plane in laboratory coordinate system. Furthermore, the magnetic and electric anisotropy axes are assumed to be identical. Hence the electric permittivity and the magnetic permeability are given by the following tensors:

$\begin{equation}
\begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon_1 \cos^2 \theta + \varepsilon_{1y} \sin^2 \theta & (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) \sin \theta \cos \theta & 0 \\
(\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) \sin \theta \cos \theta & \varepsilon_{1x} \sin^2 \theta + \varepsilon_{1y} \cos^2 \theta & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \varepsilon_{1y}
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}$

$\begin{equation}
\begin{pmatrix}
\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta & (\mu_{1x} - \mu_{1y}) \sin \theta \cos \theta & 0 \\
(\mu_{1x} - \mu_{1y}) \sin \theta \cos \theta & \mu_{1x} \sin^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \cos^2 \theta & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \mu_{1y}
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}$

where $\theta$ denotes the angle between material’s optic axis and the $z$-axis of laboratory’s coordinate system (cf. Fig. \ref{fig}). It must be stressed that the entries of both $\varepsilon$ and $\mu$ depend on frequency, but that the argument will be suppressed from now on.

The vectorial Maxwell equations in Fourier space are given by

$\begin{equation}
k \times E = \frac{\omega}{c} B, \quad k \times H = -\frac{\omega}{c} D
\end{equation}$

where $B = \mu \cdot H$ and $D = \varepsilon \cdot E$. Eq. \ref{eq:1} is a system of six linear equations with six unknowns, four of which are independent. This leads to the following $4 \times 4$ matrix equation:

$\begin{equation}
q \begin{pmatrix}
E_x \\
E_y \\
H_x \\
H_y
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & M_a & 0 \\
M_b & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix}
E_x \\
E_y \\
H_x \\
H_y
\end{pmatrix},
\end{equation}$

where the non-zero quadrants are given by

$M_a = \begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \cos \theta (\mu_{1x} - \mu_{1y}) & -k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & \frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} & \frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} \\
\varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \cos \theta (\mu_{1x} - \mu_{1y}) & \frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} & -k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & \frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} \\
0 & 0 & \mu_{1y} & -\frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} \\
0 & 0 & -\frac{\mu_{1x} \cos^2 \theta + \mu_{1y} \sin^2 \theta}{\varepsilon_{1y}} & \mu_{1y}
\end{pmatrix}$

and

$M_b = \begin{pmatrix}
\varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) & -k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) & \frac{\varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y})}{\varepsilon_{1y}} \\
\varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) & \frac{\varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y})}{\varepsilon_{1y}} & -k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y}) \\
k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1y} & -\frac{\varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \cos \theta (\varepsilon_{1x} - \varepsilon_{1y})}{\varepsilon_{1y}} \\
\varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1y} & \varepsilon_{1y}
\end{pmatrix}$

The (extra)ordinary mode eigenvectors of Eq. \ref{eq:2}, characterized by the respective subscripts $e$ ad $o$, are

$\psi_o = N_o^{-1} \begin{pmatrix}
\mu_{1y} q_{1x} \varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \\
\mu_{1y} q_{1x} \varepsilon_1 \cos \theta \\
-k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1x} \sin \theta \\
-k_{1x}^2 \varepsilon_{1x} \cos \theta
\end{pmatrix},$

$\psi_e = N_e^{-1} \begin{pmatrix}
k_{1y}^2 \varepsilon_1 \cos \theta \\
\varepsilon_{1x} \mu_{1y} \varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \\
\varepsilon_{1y} q_{1x} \varepsilon_1 \sin \theta \\
\varepsilon_{1y} q_{1x} \varepsilon_1 \cos \theta
\end{pmatrix}.$
where \( N_{o,e} \) denote normalisation constants, \( q_{1o} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{1y} \mu_{1x} \omega^2 / c^2 - (\mu_{1x}/\mu_{1y}) \kappa_{o}^2 \cos^2 \theta - \kappa_{p}^2 \sin^2 \theta} \) and \( q_{1e} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{1x} \mu_{1y} \omega^2 / c^2 - (\varepsilon_{1x}/\varepsilon_{1y}) \kappa_{p}^2 \cos^2 \theta - \kappa_{p}^2 \sin^2 \theta} \) are the respective eigenvalues, and we use the shorthand notation \( \kappa_{o}^2 \equiv \varepsilon_{1y} \mu_{1x} \omega^2 / c^2 - \kappa_{p}^2 \). As expected, the first two components of each eigenvector in Eq. (3) match Eq. (27) from Ref. \[38\] for \( \mu_{1y} = 1 = \mu_{1x} \). Note that only forward propagating modes are considered here, characterized by a positive real part, because only a single interface is taken into account for simplicity. The eigenvectors Eq. (3) determine the ratio between the electromagnetic field components inside the anisotropic medium. They will be required to obtain the Fresnel reflection coefficients. We emphasize that Eq. (3) should not be conflated with the s- and p-polarized modes.

**Fresnel Reflection Coefficients** - The anisotropic planar medium is faced with vacuum. As in any isotropic medium, in vacuum the electromagnetic waves can be written as a linear combination of s-polarized and p-polarized modes. This applies to both the incoming and the reflected waves. Inside the anisotropic medium, the fields can be written as a linear combination of the ordinary and extraordinary waves. The coefficients of these linear combinations are the Fresnel reflection and transmission coefficients. The condition of continuity of the tangential electromagnetic field components ensures that these coefficients are uniquely determined.

First, let the incoming wave be an s-wave, \( \psi_{is} \). Then this wave will be reflected as a linear combination between s- and p-modes, denoted by \( \psi_{ip} \). Hence the total wave in the isotropic media is \( \psi_{is} + \psi_{ip} \). The first term is associated with an eigenvalue with a positive real part, whereas the eigenvalue of the latter mode has a negative real part.

Inside the anisotropic crystal, the electromagnetic wave can be written as a linear combination of ordinary and extraordinary waves. The ratio between the electromagnetic field components is fixed and the only degree of freedom is the proportionality constant for each mode. These constants are the transmission coefficients that couple the s-polarized wave to the ordinary and extraordinary waves: \( \psi_{ts} = E_{yz}(t_{so} \psi_{so} + t_{se} \psi_{sc}) \) where the eigenvectors \( \psi_{so,sc} \) are given by Eqs. (3), and the amplitude of the incoming wave \( E_{yz} > 0 \). Here the subscript \( ts \) denotes the transmitted wave, that originates from an incoming s-wave, but is in itself not an s-wave.

The condition of continuity of the tangential electromagnetic field components at the interface implies that fields must be equal on both sides of the interface \( \psi_{is} + \psi_{ip} = \psi_{ts} \), which leads to a system of four equations with four unknowns. The relevant solutions are denoted by \( r_{so} = \frac{r_{ts}}{r_{ip}} \) and \( r_{sp} = \frac{r_{ts}}{r_{ip}} \) and they can be obtained in terms of the eigenvector components \( \psi_{sk} \) and \( \psi_{ck} \). The procedure is now repeated for an incoming p-polarized wave. This leads to another system of four equations with four unknowns. The relevant solutions of this system are denoted by \( r_{pp} = \frac{r_{pp'}}{r_{ip}} \) and \( r_{pp'} = \frac{r_{pp}}{r_{ip}} \). This leads to the following entries of Fresnel reflection matrix:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{c}
 r_{1o9,N} = k_0^2 (\psi_{c2}(\psi_{o4} - \psi_{c4}\psi_0)) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c1}(\psi_{o2} + \psi_{c2}\psi_0) - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o4} + \psi_{o4}\psi_0) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c3}\psi_{o3} - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o3})
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
 r_{1p9,N} = k_0^2 (\psi_{c2}(\psi_{o4} - \psi_{c4}\psi_0)) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c1}(\psi_{o2} + \psi_{c2}\psi_0) - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o4} + \psi_{o4}\psi_0) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c3}\psi_{o3} - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o3})
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
 r_{1oD} = k_0^2 (\psi_{c2}\psi_{o4} - \psi_{c4}\psi_0) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c1}(\psi_{o2} + \psi_{c2}\psi_0) - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o4} + \psi_{o4}\psi_0) + \\
 k_0^2 (\psi_{c3}\psi_{o3} - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o3})
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( k_0 = \sqrt{\omega^2 / c^2 - \kappa_{p}^2} \) denotes the z-component of the wavevector in vacuum. Note that the reflection coefficients in terms of the Maxwell eigenvector components, Eq. (3), are not restricted to uniaxial materials, but are valid for biaxial half spaces as well. Of course, the explicit form of the eigenvector components will change in the biaxial case. In particular we note that the reflection matrix is symmetric if and only if \( \psi_{c1}\psi_{o4} - \psi_{c4}\psi_{o1} = \psi_{c2}\psi_{o3} - \psi_{c3}\psi_{o2} \), which holds in the uniaxial case. Also note that the normalization constants cancel out of the reflection matrix.

Inserting the components of the eigenvectors Eq. (3) into Eq. (4) leads to explicit expressions of the reflection matrix elements in terms of the frequency and wavevector components. For the non-magnetic case, where \( \mu_{1y} = 1 = \mu_{1x} \), these expressions match Eqs. (34) and (42) of Ref. \[38\].

The equivalent reflection coefficients for a non-identical second medium can be easily obtained by transforming the combination of Eq. (3) and Eq. (4) as follows: \( q_{1o} \rightarrow q_{2c}, q_{1o} \rightarrow q_{2o}, k_{1z} \rightarrow k_{2z}, \varepsilon_{1y} \rightarrow \varepsilon_{2y}, \mu_{1y} \rightarrow \mu_{2y} \), and \( \theta \rightarrow \theta + \varphi \), where \( k_{2z}, q_{2c,o}, \varepsilon_{2y}, \mu_{2y} \) represent the equivalents of \( q_{1c,o}, k_{1z}, \varepsilon_{1y}, \mu_{1y} \), respectively for medium 2, and \( \varphi \) represents the angle between the optic axes of the media. (See Fig. 1). Next, the transformed eigenvectors must be inserted into Eq. (4). In general one must take into account the different propagation directions for each medium, but in this case, but in this case the reflection matrix is invariant under \( k \rightarrow -k \). Now we are in a position to determine the Casimir torque.

**Casimir Energy and Torque** - The Casimir energy per unit area is given by the Lifshitz formula \[32\]:

\[
\frac{E_{Cas}(a, \varphi)}{A} = \frac{k_b T}{4 \pi} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{n,0}) \times
\int_{0}^{\infty} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \log(D_n(a, k, \theta, \varphi, i\zeta_n))dkd\theta
\]

(5)
with
\[
D_n(a, k, \theta, \varphi, i\zeta_n) = \det \left( \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{L}_n(k, \theta, i\zeta_n) \cdot \mathbf{L}_n(k, \theta + \varphi, i\zeta_n)e^{-2k_0a} \right)
\]
(6)

where \(\mathbf{1}\) denotes the 2×2 identity matrix and \(\mathbf{L}_n\), \(j = 1, 2\) represent the reflection matrices given by \(\mathbf{L}_n = \frac{1}{T_{j,n}} \left( T_{j+1,n} T_{j+n,N} T_{j+1-n,N} \right)\), the elements of which are given by Eq. (4) for \(j = 1\), and they should be transformed from medium 1 to 2 for \(j = 2\). For numerical convergence, all quantities are evaluated at the imaginary Matsubara frequencies \(\zeta_n = \frac{2\pi nk_0T}{h}\) at finite temperature \(T\). The Casimir torque is
\[
\tau(a, \varphi) = -A \frac{\partial E_{\text{Cas}}}{\partial \varphi}.
\]
(7)

Next we will compare this result for \(\mu_{1x} = 1 = \mu_{1y}\) to that of Ref. [15].

Proof of Barash’s formula - We contend that Eq. (7) for non-magnetic materials is identical to Eq. (27) of Ref. [15]. This was claimed in Ref. [22] without proof. For a detailed proof of this statement, we refer to the supplemental material. Here we will give a brief summary. Essentially, the proof can be simplified by splitting it up into simpler, smaller independent parts. That is, the argument of the logarithm in the Lifshitz formula \(D_n\) is a polynomial in \(\exp(-2k_0a)\): \(D_n(k, \varphi, a) = 1 + P_n(k, \varphi) \exp(-2k_0a) + Q_n(k, \varphi) \exp(-4k_0a)\). The coefficients \(P_n\) and \(Q_n\) are in turn multivariate polynomials in \(q_{1e} - q_{1o}\) and \(q_{2e} - q_{2o}\). (See Fig. 2 for a schematic overview.) Most of the coefficients of these multivariate polynomials can be determined with the simplifying assumptions \(q_{1e} = q_{1o}\) and \(q_{2e} = q_{2o}\). In this way, the coefficients according to Barash and Eq. (10) can be compared. It turns out that they do indeed match, if the eigenvalue conditions \(q_{ji} = \varepsilon_{ji}(k_{ji}^2 - k_0^2)\), \(j = 1, 2\) are taken into account. To our knowledge, this is the first independent proof of the result of Ref. [15].

Summary - We have derived an exact and general expression for the Casimir torque between two half-spaces that exhibit both electric and magnetic birefringence. Ours is the first transparent and independent derivation of the Casimir torque that does not depend on approximations such as weak anisotropy or neglecting retardation effects, in the more than forty intervening years since the publication of the results of Ref. [15].

Our approach can be generalized to other types of media, such as metamaterials [32], multiferroics [33], topological matter [40], biaxial materials [29], and non-reciprocal materials [41]. The recently reported measurements of the Casimir torque [20] should instigate further investigations for which this result is of considerable importance.

\[
D_n(k, \varphi, a) = 1 + P_n(k, \varphi) \exp(-2k_0a) + Q_n(k, \varphi) \exp(-4k_0a)
\]

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Number of independent nonzero coefficients: 3 & Number of independent nonzero coefficients: 6 & & \\
\hline
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig2.png}
\caption{Overview of the proof of Barash’s formula. The coefficients \(P_n\) and \(Q_n\) can be written as \(P_n = p_0 + p_1(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + p_2(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + p_3(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o})\) and \(Q_n = q_0 + q_1(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + q_2(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_3(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_4(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 + q_5(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + q_6(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + q_7(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_8(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2\). The subscripts \(b\) and \(L\) denote result from Ref. [15] and from this work, respectively. Symmetry between the labels of the media reduces the number of independent coefficients.}
\end{figure}
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COMPARISON TO BARASH’S RESULT

1. Introduction

The aim of this supplemental material is to prove that the result obtained by Barash, Eq (21) in [15], is identical to the combination of the Lifshitz formula [39] with Lekner’s reflection coefficients [38], i.e. Eq. (6) from the main paper for the case \( \mu_x = 1 = \mu_y \). To this end, it suffices to compare the argument of the logarithm in Eq. (6) from the main paper, which Barash calls ‘dispersion equation’, denoted here by \( D \). [15] After all, both results are written in the same form and the only thing that could be different is \( D \).

Since the expression for \( D \) very complicated in both cases, it helps to split them into smaller, simpler parts. Firstly, note that it is a quadratic function of \( \exp(-2k_0a) \): \( D(\kappa, \varphi, \alpha) = 1 + P(\kappa, \varphi) \exp(-2k_0a) + Q(\kappa, \varphi) \exp(-4k_0a) \). (Part of this supplemental material will be dedicated to showing that the constant term of Barash’s result equals unity indeed.) Next, the proof takes advantage of the fact that both \( P \) and \( Q \) are both polynomials in the two variables \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \) and \( q_{2e} - q_{2o} \). The coefficients \( P \) and \( Q \) will be compared, by comparing the coefficients of these polynomials.

The notation of Ref. [15] is rather unconventional. For reference we have included a table (Table I) to clarify how it compares to our notation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. [15]</th>
<th>This document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( u = r \cos \varphi )</td>
<td>( k_x = k_\rho \cos \theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( v = r \sin \varphi )</td>
<td>( k_y = k_\rho \sin \theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
<td>( \theta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( k_\rho )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta )</td>
<td>( \varphi )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_1 )</td>
<td>( iq_{1o} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_2 )</td>
<td>( iq_{2o} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_3 )</td>
<td>( iq_{1e}(\varphi) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_4(\theta) )</td>
<td>( iq_{2e}(\varphi) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_5 )</td>
<td>( ik_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{11} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{12} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{1y} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{111} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{2x} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{112} )</td>
<td>( \varepsilon_{2y} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_3 )</td>
<td>( 1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l )</td>
<td>( a )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Comparison between the conventions of this document and those of Ref. [15]. Unlike Ref. [15] we do not include the possibility of a liquid gap. On the other hand, we allow the option of magnetic anisotropy. Hence it is assumed here that \( \mu_x = 1 = \mu_y \). The \( z \)-components of the wave vector are purely imaginary since they are evaluated at imaginary frequencies.

The supplemental material is organized as follows. After the introduction, both results will simply be given. Then it will be shown that Barash’s version of \( D \) tends to one at sufficiently large distances. Next, the symmetry of between the coefficients will be discussed, thereby reducing the number of independent coefficients. Finally, the coefficients of both \( P \) and \( Q \) will be compared.

2. Barash vs. Lifshitz-Lekner’s result

In the notation of this document, Barash’s result is

\[
D_b = \frac{\varepsilon_{2y}(iq_{2o} - iq_{2o})(Bk_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + C - E(2k_\rho^2 \sin(\theta) \cos(\varphi) \sin(\theta + \varphi) - k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\varphi)))}{-k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) - q_{2o}^2} \gamma
\]  

(8)

where the subscript \( b \) denotes that this is a result by Barash. The coefficients are given by

\[
A_1 = ((ik_0 + iq_{2o})(ik_0 + iq_{1o}) - e^{-2ak_0}(iq_{2o} - ik_0)(iq_{1o} - ik_0)) \times
\]

\[( (ik_0 \varepsilon_2y + iq_{2o})(ik_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + iq_{1o}) - e^{-2ak_0}(iq_{2o} - ik_0 \varepsilon_2y)(iq_{1o} - ik_0 \varepsilon_{1y}) )
\]
The reflection matrix is

\[
E = \frac{1}{-k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2} \left( \varepsilon_{1y}(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o}) (2(\varepsilon_{2y} - 1)e^{-2a_k^2}(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)(i k_0 q_{2o} + i k_p^2 q_{1o})
- i k_0^2 q_{1o}(-2k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + k_p^2 - q_{2o} q_{1o})) + e^{-4a_k^2}(i q_{2o} - i k_0)(i q_{1o} - i k_0)(i q_{2o} - i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y}) \times
\right.
\]
\[
(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - k_0 q_{1o}) + (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + i q_{2o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 q_{2o})
\]
\[
+ e^{-4a_k^2}(i q_{2o} - i k_0)(i q_{1o} - i k_0)(i q_{2o} - i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y}) + (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i q_{2o} \varepsilon_{1y} + i q_{1o}),
\]
\[
C = \frac{1}{k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2} \left[ k_0 q_{2o} \varepsilon_{1y}(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o}) (2i k_0 e^{-2a_k^2}( -i k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)(i q_{1o} - i q_{2o}) - i q_2 q_{1o}^2)
- e^{-4a_k^2}(i q_{2o} - i k_0)(i q_{1o} - i k_0)(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - k_0 q_{1o}) + (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 q_{2o})
\right.
\]
\[
\left. - k_0 q_{2o}(2i k_0(\varepsilon_{1y} - 1)e^{-2a_k^2}(k_p^2 + q_{2o} q_{1o}) + e^{-4a_k^2}(i q_{2o} - i k_0)(i q_{1o} - i k_0)(i q_{1o} - i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y})
+ (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(-i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} - i q_{1o}),
\right\}
\]
\[
E = \frac{4k_0^2 q_{2o} \varepsilon_{1y} e^{-2a_k^2}(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o})}{-k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2},
\]
and
\[
\gamma = (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o}) \left( -\varepsilon_{2y}(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)) - k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2 \right) + i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + i q_{2o} \times
\]
\[
\left( -\varepsilon_{2y}(i q_{2o} - i q_{2o})(k_0 q_{2o} + (k_p \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi) + k_p \cos(\theta) \sin(\phi))^2) - k_p \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi) + k_p \cos(\theta) \sin(\phi)) \right)^2 - q_{2o}^2 \right) + i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + i q_{2o}
\]

The argument of the logarithm in Lifshitz’ formula Eq. (6) from the main paper in terms of the entries of the reflection matrix is

\[
D_L = \frac{e^{-4a_k^2}}{r_{D_1} r_{D_2}} \left( r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2} - r_{ppN1} r_{psN2} r_{spN2} r_{ssN1}
- r_{ppN2} r_{psN1} r_{spN1} r_{ssN2} + r_{psN1} r_{psN2} r_{spN1} r_{spN2} \right)
\]
\[ \frac{e^{-2ak_0}}{r_{D1} r_{D2}} \left( r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} + r_{psN1} r_{spN2} + r_{psN2} r_{spN1} + r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2} \right) + 1, \]

where the subscript \( L \) denotes that this is a combination of results by Lifshitz and Lekner. The entries of the reflection matrix from Eq. (7) from the main paper for \( \mu_y = 1 \) and \( k_z = q_{1o} \) are rewritten as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{R}_{ssN1} & = \sin^2(\theta)( (k_0 - q_{1e})(k_p^2 + q_{1o}^2)(k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}) - q_{1o}(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2) + q_{1o}(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2)) \\
\mathcal{R}_{ppN1} & = \sin^2(\theta)(-(k_0 + q_{1e})(k_p^2 + q_{1o}^2)(k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} - q_{1o}) - q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o})(q_{1o}^2 - k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y}) + q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o})(q_{1o}^2 - k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y})) \\
\mathcal{R}_{spN1} & = k_0 q_{1o} \varepsilon_{1y} \sin(2\theta) \sqrt{k_p^2 + k_p^2(q_{1o} - q_{1o})} = r_{psN1}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
r_{D1} = \sin^2(\theta)( (k_0 + q_{1e})(k_p^2 + q_{1o}^2)(k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}) - q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2) + q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2)),
\]

where we have used the relations \( k_0 = \sqrt{\omega^2/c^2 - k_p^2} \) and \( q_{1o} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{1y} \omega^2/c^2 - k_p^2} \), the latter of which holds only in the non-magnetic case. To obtain the analogous expressions for the second medium, the substitutions from one medium to the other must be performed.

### 3. Barash’s result in the limit of large distances

At sufficiently large distances, the exponentially decreasing terms vanish and only the constant term remains. The coefficients \( A \) to \( C \) in Eq. (8) are in this limit

\[
\begin{align*}
A_{\lim} & = (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + i q_{2o})(i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + i q_{1o}) \\
& - k_0 \varepsilon_{1y}(i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o})(i k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + i q_{2o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)) \\
& - k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2 \\
B_{\lim} & = \varepsilon_{1y}(i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o})(-k_0 q_{1o} - k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)) \\
& - k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2 + (i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + i q_{1o}) \\
C_{\lim} & = -k_0 q_{2o} \varepsilon_{1y}(i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(i q_{1e} - i q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)) \\
& - k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2 \\
& - k_0 q_{2o}(i k_0 + i q_{2o})(i k_0 + i q_{1o})(-i k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} - i q_{1o}),
\end{align*}
\]

while \( E_{\lim} = 0 \).

Now the numerator of \( D_b \) for \( k_0a \gg 1 \) is:

\[
\begin{align*}
A_{\lim} & = \frac{-2k_0}{q_{2o}}(B_{\lim} k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + C_{\lim}) \\
& = \frac{(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{1o})}{(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)} \left( -k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)(q_{1o}(\varepsilon_{1y} - 1) - \varepsilon_{1y}(k_0 + q_{1e})) + k_0 q_{1e} q_{1o} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^3 \right) \times
\end{align*}
\]
\[ (-k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(q_{2\varphi}(\varepsilon_{2y} - 1) - \varepsilon_{2y}(k_0 + q_{2o})) + k_0 q_{2c} q_{2o} \varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o}^3) \]

To obtain \( D_b \) in this limit, this quantity must be divided by \( \gamma \) from Eq. (9), which does not depend on \( a \). It can be seen that this numerator is actually the same as \( \gamma \), hence

\[
\lim_{a \to \infty} D_b = 1.
\]

Since \( D_b \) is the argument of the logarithm in the Lifshitz formula Eq. (6) from the main paper the Casimir energy tends to zero as \( a \) goes to infinity.

4. Symmetry relations between coefficients

We take advantage of the fact that \( P_b \) is a second degree polynomial in \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \) and \( q_{2e} - q_{2o} \), and that \( Q_b \) is a fourth degree polynomial in the same variables. Generally a polynomial of degree \( d \) with \( n \) variables has \( \binom{n+d}{d} \) coefficients. Hence in our case \( P_b \) has 6 coefficients and \( Q_b \) has 15. However, the number of nonzero coefficients are 4 and 9 respectively. Moreover, these coefficients are not independent of each other. Note that the labels 1 and 2 of the media are arbitrary, so switching them should not affect the torque. The constant term does not contribute to the torque and it can be ignored. Since medium 1 is associated with an optic axis with angle \( \theta \) and medium 2 is associated with \( \theta + \varphi \), these angles must be interchanged as well. Hence we define the following transformation

\[
T : \{ P(\theta, \theta + \varphi), Q(\theta, \theta + \varphi) \} \rightarrow \{ P(1 \leftrightarrow 2, \theta \leftrightarrow \theta + \varphi), Q(1 \leftrightarrow 2, \theta \leftrightarrow \theta + \varphi) \}
\]

where ‘1 \leftrightarrow 2’ denotes that the subscript 1 needs to be replaced by 2 and vice versa. In other words, the transformations of from one medium to the other and their reverse have to be performed simultaneously. The condition that the torque must not change leads to

\[
P(1 \leftrightarrow 2, \theta \leftrightarrow \theta + \varphi) = P(\theta, \theta + \varphi)
\]

\[
Q(1 \leftrightarrow 2, \theta \leftrightarrow \theta + \varphi) = Q(\theta, \theta + \varphi)
\]

Now let

\[
P(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = p_0(\theta, \theta + \varphi) + p_1(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + p_2(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + p_3(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o})
\]

Then we come to the following symmetry relations for the coefficients of \( P \):

\[
p_0(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = p_0(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]

\[
p_1(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = p_2(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]

\[
p_3(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = p_3(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]

And similarly for \( Q \):

\[
Q(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_0(\theta, \theta + \varphi) + q_1(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + q_2(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_3(\theta, \theta + \varphi)(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o})
\]
Next, let us focus on the part of \( D \) where
\[
q_4(\theta, \theta + \varphi) (q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 + q_5(\theta, \theta + \varphi) (q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + q_6(\theta, \theta + \varphi) (q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 (q_{2e} - q_{2o})
\]
\[+ q_7(\theta, \theta + \varphi) (q_{1e} - q_{1o}) (q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + q_8(\theta, \theta + \varphi) (q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 (q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2
\]
we have
\[
q_0(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_0(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]
\[
q_1(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_2(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]
\[
q_3(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_3(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]
\[
q_4(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_5(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]
\[
q_6(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_7(\theta + \varphi, \theta)
\]
\[
q_8(\theta, \theta + \varphi) = q_8(\theta + \varphi, \theta).
\]
The symmetry relations should be valid for both the Barash and the Lifshitz-Lekner versions of these coefficients. In the latter case, this is immediately seen from Eqs. (13) and (23).

In the former case it is not so obvious that this symmetry holds. Therefore this needs to be checked. Switching the labels on Barash’s version of \( D \) yields:
\[
A' = \frac{1}{\gamma'} (2k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + C' - E' (2k_p^2 \sin(\varphi) \cos(\theta + \varphi) - k_0^2 \sin^2(\varphi)))
\]
where the primed quantities denote the transformed version of the unprimed quantities. In order to have \( D' = D \) we require \( \gamma' = \gamma \), which is relatively easily seen to hold.

Of course we are especially interested in symmetry relations between coefficients with different subscripts, because these could simplify some of the calculations. In particular we note that they reduce the number of independent coefficients from 4 to 3 for \( P \) and from 9 to 6 for \( Q \).

5. The coefficient \( P \)

Next, let us focus on the part of \( D_L \) that is proportional to \( \exp(-2k_0 a) \), denoted by \( P_L \):
\[
P_L \equiv -\frac{1}{r_{D1} r_{D2}} \left( r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} + r_{psN1} r_{spN2} + r_{psN2} r_{spN1} + r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2} \right)
\]
where \( r_{psN1} r_{spN2} + r_{psN2} r_{spN1} \) can be simplified to \( 2r_{spN1} r_{spN2} \). Barash’s equivalent of this coefficient is
\[
P_b = \frac{P_A}{\gamma} + i \varepsilon_{2y} (q_{2e} - q_{2o}) (\gamma (k_p^2 \sin^2(\varphi) + q_{2o}))
\]
where \( P_A \) to \( P_E \) denote the respective parts of \( A_1 \) to \( E \) proportional to \( \exp(-20a) \).

First we will concentrate on the denominators of both expressions. The denominator of \( P_L \) is
\[
r_{D1} r_{D2} = \left( \sin^2(\theta) ((k_0 + q_{1e})(q_{1e}^2 + q_{1o}^2))(k_0 - q_{1e} - q_{1o}) - q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o}) (k_0 q_{1e} + q_{1o})^2 + q_{1o}^2 \right)
\]
\[ q_{1o}(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{2o}^2) \left( \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) \right) \]
\[ - q_{2o}(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 q_{2e} \varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o}^2) + q_{2o}(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 q_{2e} \varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o}^2) \] 

In order to compare this to Barash’s expression, the numerator and denominator of the latter must be multiplied by \( q \) which is identical to (16) due to the eigenvalues. Other terms are identical in the previous paragraph. Hence we are left with

\[ \gamma(q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)(q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi)) = \]
\[ \frac{1}{2}(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_p^2 \cos(2\theta)(q_{1o}(\varepsilon_{1y} - 1) - \varepsilon_{1y}(k_0 + q_{1e}))) + \]
\[ k_p^2(\varepsilon_{1y}(k_0 + q_{1e}) - \varepsilon_{1y}q_{1o} + q_{1o}) + 2(k_0 q_{1e} q_{1o} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2)(k_p^2 \cos(2(\theta + \varphi))(q_{2o}(\varepsilon_{2y} - 1) - \varepsilon_{2y}(k_0 + q_{2e}))) \]
\[ + k_p^2(\varepsilon_{2y}(k_0 + q_{2e}) - \varepsilon_{2y}q_{2o} + q_{2o}) + 2(k_0 q_{2e} q_{2o} \varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o}^2), \]

which is identical to (16) due to the eigenvalues

\[ q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 = \varepsilon_{1y}(k_0 + k_p^2) \]

\[ q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 = \varepsilon_{2y}(k_0 + k_p^2) \]

The numerator of Eq. (15) is far more complicated than its denominator. However it is considerably simplified by the assumptions \( q_{1e} = q_{1o} \) and \( q_{2e} = q_{2o} \). First we will prove that the numerator of Eq. (14) is identical to that of Eq. (15) multiplied by \( (q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)(q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi)) \) under these conditions. Later, these assumptions will be relaxed. If \( q_{1e} = q_{1o} \) and \( q_{2e} = q_{2o} \), the numerator of Eq. (15) will simplify to

\[ p_{0h} = (q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)(q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))P_A |_{q_{1e} = q_{1o}, q_{2e} = q_{2o}} = \]
\[ - \left( (q_{2o} - k_0)(q_{1o} - k_0)(k_0 \varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o})(k_0 \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}) - (k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(q_{2o} - k_0 \varepsilon_{2y})(q_{1o} - k_0 \varepsilon_{1y}) \right) \times \]
\[ (q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)(q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi)) \]

In this case the reflection matrices are both diagonal, hence the numerator of Eq. (14) becomes

\[ p_{rL} = - r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} - r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2} |_{q_{1e} = q_{1o}, q_{2e} = q_{2o}} = -2(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2) \times \]
\[ (k_0^2 \varepsilon_{2y} \varepsilon_{1y} - k_0^2(q_{2o} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{2o} q_{1o} \varepsilon_{2y} + \varepsilon_{1y} - \varepsilon_{1y} \varepsilon_{2y} - 1) + q_{1o}^2 \varepsilon_{2y}) + q_{2o}^2 q_{1o}^2, \]

which is equal to Eq. (18).

Now let \( q_{1e} \neq q_{1o} \), while \( q_{2o} = q_{2e} \). Now the numerator of \( P_h \) is

\[ (q_{1o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2 \theta)(q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))P_A. \]

In this case only the term proportional to \( (q_{1e} - q_{1o}) \) needs to be considered, since we have already shown that the other terms are identical in the previous paragraph. Hence we are left with

\[ - (q_{2o}^2 + k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi)) \times \]
\[ 2(\varepsilon_{2y} - 1) \varepsilon_{1y}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta)(k_0^2 q_{2o} + k_p^2 q_{1o}) - k_0^2 q_{1o}(-2k_p^2 \sin^2(\theta) + k_p^2 - q_{2o} q_{1o})). \]

Since \( q_{2o} = q_{2e} \), \( r_{spN2} = 0 = r_{psN2} \). Hence for \( P_L \) the relevant term is
\[-(r_{ppN1}r_{ppN2} - r_{ssN1}r_{ssN2})|_{q_{1e}=q_{2o}} =\]

\[2(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)(k_{\rho}^4\varepsilon_{2y}^2 + k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}^2q_{1o}(\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - \varepsilon_{1y}^2) - k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}^2(\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - 1) + q_{1o}^2q_{2o}^2) = k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2,\]

which can be simplified to

\[2(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)(\sin^2(\theta)(k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}(\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - 1) - k_{\rho}^4q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - q_{2o}^2q_{1o}))\]

\[+q_{1o}(k_{\rho}^4\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - q_{2o}^4)(k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{1y}^2 + k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - q_{2o}^2q_{1o})).\]

This expression is identical to Eq. (19) if Eq. (17) is taken into account.

Now let us make the reverse assumption, namely that \(q_{1e} = q_{1o}\), but \(q_{2o} \neq q_{2o}\). By the same token as before, we will focus on the term proportional to \(q_{2o} - q_{2o}, p_2(q_{2o} - q_{2o})\). Because of the symmetry relation Eq. (13) it follows that Barash’s and Lifshitz-Lekner’s versions of this expression should be identical as well. Nonetheless we will check this here:

\[i(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(q_{1o}^2 + k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta)\varepsilon_{2y}^2(k_{\rho}^2P_B\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + P_C)|_{q_{1e}=q_{1o}} =\]

\[2\varepsilon_{2y}^2(\varepsilon_{1y}^2 - 1)(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta) - q_{1o}^2)(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_{\rho}^2q_{2o} - q_{1o}) + k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}(q_{2o} - q_{1o}^2))\]

Here \(P_B\) is omitted since it is proportional to \((q_{1e} - q_{1o})\). Now for \(P_L\) we must evaluate

\[-(r_{ppN1}r_{ppN2} - r_{ssN1}r_{ssN2})|_{q_{1e}=q_{1o}, q_{2o}=q_{2e}} =\]

\[2(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)(\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}(k_{\rho}^2\varepsilon_{1y}^2 - q_{1o}) - k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{2y}^2(\varepsilon_{1y}^2 - 1)))\]

\[+q_{2o}(k_{\rho}^4\varepsilon_{2y}^2 - q_{2o}^4)(k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{2y}^2 + k_{\rho}^4q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y}^2(\varepsilon_{1y}^2 - 1) + q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{2y}^2)\]

which is identical to Eq. (20) under the conditions of Eq. (17). Note that the third factor in the second term of Eq. (24) of Ref. [13] should be \(r^2 + \rho_1\rho_2\), i.e. with a relative plus sign rather than a minus sign. This has been confirmed by Ref. [14], and now also here.

Finally, what remains is the term proportional to the product of the differences between the eigenvalues, \((q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2o} - q_{2o})\). According to Barash, this is

\[\varepsilon_{2y}(iq_{2e} - iq_{2o})(k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)(-P_E(2k_{\rho}^2\sin(\varphi)\cos(\varphi)\sin(\theta + \varphi)\]

\[-k_{\rho}^2\sin^2(\varphi)) + k_{\rho}^2P_B\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + P_C)|_{(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) =\]

\[-2\varepsilon_{2y}(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(k_{\rho}^2q_{1o}(2k_{\rho}^2 + q_{2o}q_{1o}) - 2k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}\sin^2(\varphi) - k_{\rho}^4(q_{2o} - q_{1o})^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi))\]

\[+4k_{\rho}^2k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}q_{1o}\sin(\theta)\cos(\varphi)\sin(\theta + \varphi) + \sin^2(\theta)(k_{\rho}^4\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_{\rho}^2 + q_{2o}q_{1o}) + k_{\rho}^2k_{\rho}^2q_{2o}(q_{2o} - q_{1o})))\]

The Lifshitz-Lekner equivalent of this expression is

\[-(r_{ppN1}r_{ppN2} + r_{psN1}r_{spN2} + r_{psN2}r_{spN1} + r_{ssN1}r_{ssN2}) -\]

\[-(r_{ppN1}r_{ppN2} - r_{ssN1}r_{ssN2})|_{q_{1e}=q_{1o}, q_{2o}=q_{2e}} -\]

\[\]
Hence in order to compare \( Q \) proportional to \( \exp(-\theta) \), which is identical to Eq. (21) if Eq. (17) is considered. This completes the proof that

\[ P_b = P_L \]  

(22)

6. The Coefficient \( Q \)

Finally we direct our attention towards the terms proportional to \( \exp(-4k_0a) \), denoted by \( Q_L \):

\[ Q_L = \frac{1}{r_{D1}^2 r_{D2}^2}\left( r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2} - r_{ppN1} r_{psN2} r_{spN2} r_{ssN1} \right) \]

\[ -r_{ppN2} r_{psN1} r_{spN1} r_{ssN2} + r_{psN1} r_{psN2} r_{spN1} r_{spN2} \]  

(23)

In analogy to the previous subsection, the same coefficient according to Barash is

\[ Q_b = \frac{Q_A}{\gamma} + \]

\[ \frac{i\varepsilon y(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(k_\rho^2 Q_b \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + Q_C)}{\gamma(k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)} \]  

(24)

where \( Q_A \) to \( Q_C \) denote the respective parts of \( A_1 \) to \( C \) proportional to \( \exp(-4k_0a) \). \( Q_E \) is omitted since \( E \) is proportional to \( \exp(-2k_0a) \) only.

The denominator of \( Q_L \) is actually the square of that of \( P_L \):

\[ r_{D1}^2 r_{D2}^2 = \gamma^2(q_{1o}^2 k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta)^2(q_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))^2 \]

Hence in order to compare \( Q_L \) to \( Q_b \), the numerator of the latter must be multiplied by a factor of \( \gamma(q_{1o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta)^2(q_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))^2 \). After all, the denominator of \( Q_b \) is simply \( \gamma \).

As before, we will start with the simplest case: \( q_{1e} = q_{1o}, q_{2e} = q_{2o} \). The numerator of \( Q_L \) will simplify to

\[ r_{ppN1} r_{ppN2} r_{ssN1} r_{ssN2}|_{q_{1e}=q_{1o}, q_{2e}=q_{2o}} = \]

\[ (q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2 \varepsilon y)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2 \varepsilon y)^2 + (k_\rho^2)^2 k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)^2, \]

of which Barash’s equivalent is

\[ Q_A \gamma(q_{1o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta)^2(q_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))^2|_{q_{1e}=q_{1o}, q_{2e}=q_{2o}} = \]

\[ (q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2 \varepsilon y)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2 \varepsilon y)^2 + (k_\rho^2)^2 k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)^2, \]
which is clearly identical to the Lifshitz-Lekner expression.

Next we will assume again that \( q_{2e} = q_{2o} \) and that \( q_{1e} \neq q_{1o} \). However, contrary to the previous subsection, now the numerator of \( Q \) is a quadratic function of \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \). In the previous paragraph, it has been shown that the constant term in this case is identical according to both Lifshitz-Lekner and Barash. The latter expression in this case is

\[
Q_A|_{q_{2e}=q_{2o}} = (q_{2o} - k_0)(q_{1o} - k_0)(q_{2o} - \varepsilon_2y k_0)(q_{1o} - \varepsilon_1y k_0) + \\
\frac{(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2o} - k_0)(q_{1o} - k_0)(q_{2o} - \varepsilon_2y k_0)(q_{1o} - \varepsilon_1y k_0)}{q_{1o}^2 + k_\rho \sin^2 \theta}
\]

which must be be multiplied by

\[
\gamma|_{q_{2e}=q_{2o}}(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{1o}^2)^2(q_{2o}^2 + \sin^2(\theta + \varphi))^2 = \\
(q_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2 \sin(\theta + \varphi))^2(q_{1o} + q_{2o})(q_{1o} + q_{2o})(q_{2o} + \varepsilon_2y k_0)(q_{1o} + \varepsilon_1y k_0)(q_{1o} + \varepsilon_1y k_0)(q_{1o} + \varepsilon_1y k_0)(q_{1o} + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta) \times \\
\left[ (q_{1o} + \varepsilon_1y k_0)(q_{1o} + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta) + (q_{1e} - q_{1o})\varepsilon_1y (k_0 q_{1o} + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta) \right].
\]

Here we are concerned only with the terms proportional to \( (q_{1e} - q_{1o}) \) and \( (q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 \) of the product between these expressions. The former is according to Barash:

\[
q_{1b} = \varepsilon_1y (k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(q_{2o} + k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(q_{1o}^2 + \varepsilon_2y k_0)(q_{1o} + \varepsilon_2y k_0)(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{1o}^2)((k_0 \varepsilon_1y + q_{1o}) \times \\
(k_0 q_{1o} - k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta) - (k_0 q_{1o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_1y)(k_0 q_{1o} + k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta)(k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)^2),
\]

which can be simplified to

\[
q_{1b} = -\frac{1}{4}q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y (k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_0 \varepsilon_2y - q_{2o})(k_0 \varepsilon_2y + q_{2o}) \times
\]

\[
(-k_\rho^2 \cos(2\theta) + k_\rho^2 + 2q_{1o}^2)(2k_\rho^2 \varepsilon_1y + k_\rho^2 \cos(2\theta) - k_\rho^2)(-k_\rho^2 \cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) + k_\rho^2 + 2q_{2o}^2)^2,
\]

and the latter is

\[
q_{4b} = \varepsilon_1y^2 (q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta - k_0 q_{1o})(k_0 q_{1o} + k_\rho \sin^2 \theta)((k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{2o}^2)^2 \\
= (q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2)(q_{2o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(q_{1o}^2 - k_\rho \varepsilon_1y)(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{1o}^2)^2(k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + q_{2o}^2)^2.
\]

The equivalent expressions according to Lifshitz-Lekner can be obtained by simplifying the factors \( r_{ppNN1}r_{ppNN2} \), \( r_{ssN1}r_{ssN2} \), \( r_{spNN1}r_{spNN2} \), and \(-r_{ppNN2}^*r_{psNN1}\) first. From this we gather the terms proportional to \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \):

\[
q_{1L} = (k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(q_{1o} - q_{1e})(k_0 \varepsilon_2y + q_{2o})(q_{2o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(q_{1o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_1y)(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{1o}^2) \times
\]

\[
(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{2o}^2)(\sin^2(\theta)(k_\rho^2 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y + k_\rho^2 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y + q_{1o}^3) + k_0 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y (q_{1o} - k_0)) +
\]

\[
(k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(k_0 \varepsilon_2y + q_{2o})(q_{2o} - k_\rho \varepsilon_2y)(k_0 \varepsilon_1y + q_{1o})(k_\rho^2 \sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^4) \times
\]

\[
(k_\rho^2 \sin^2 \theta + q_{2o}^2)(\sin^2(\theta)(k_\rho^2 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y + k_\rho^2 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y + q_{1o}^3) - k_0 q_{1o} \varepsilon_1y (k_0 + q_{1o})),
\]
which is identical to Eq. (24) with the eigenvalues Eq. (17). So
\[ q_{1b} = q_{1L} \] (27)

The terms proportional to \((q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2\) are
\[ q_{4L} = -(k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(k_0\varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o})(q_{2o} - k_0\varepsilon_{2y}) \times \]
\[ (k_ρ^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + k_{2o}^2)(\sin^2(\theta)(k_0^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{1y} + k_ρ^2(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}) + q_{1o}^3) + k_0q_{1o}\varepsilon_{1y}(q_{1o} - k_0)) \times \]
\[ (\sin^2(\theta)(k_0^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{1y} + k_ρ^2(q_{1o} - k_0\varepsilon_{1y})) + q_{1o}^3) - k_0q_{1o}\varepsilon_{1y}(k_0 + q_{1o})) + \]
\[ k_0^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{1y}^2\sin^2(2\theta)(k_0^2 + k_ρ^2)(q_{2o} - k_0)(k_0 + q_{2o})(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(k_0\varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o})(q_{2o} - k_0\varepsilon_{2y})(k_ρ^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + k_{2o}^2)^2, \]
which is identical to Eq. (26) with the eigenvalues Eq. (17). Hence
\[ q_{4b} = q_{4L} \] (28)

We will now assume again that \(q_{1e} = q_{1o}\) and that \(q_{2e} \neq q_{2o}\), and focus on the terms proportional to \(q_{2e} - q_{2o}\) and \((q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2\). The term proportional to \((q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2\), according to Barash, can be simplified to
\[ q_{5b} = -\frac{1}{16\varepsilon_{2y}}(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2(k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} - q_{1o})(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}) \times \]
\[ (-k_ρ^2\cos(2\theta) + k_ρ^2 + 2q_{1o}^2)(2k_0q_{2o} - k_ρ^2\cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) + k_ρ^2)(2k_0q_{2o} + k_ρ^2\cos(2(\theta + \varphi))) - k_ρ^2) \] (29)

According to Lekner-Lifshitz this term is
\[ q_{5L} = \frac{1}{16\varepsilon_{2y}}(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o})(q_{1o} - k_0\varepsilon_{1y})(k_ρ^2\sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)^2 \times \]
\[ (\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_0^2q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y} + k_ρ^2(k_0\varepsilon_{2y} + q_{2o}) + q_{2o}^3) + k_0q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y}(q_{2o} - k_0)))(\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) \times \]
\[ (k_0^2q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y} + k_ρ^2(q_{2o} - k_0\varepsilon_{2y}) + q_{2o}^3) - k_0q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y}(k_0 + q_{2o})) + \]
\[ k_0^2q_{2o}\varepsilon_{2y}(k_0^2 + k_ρ^2)(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(q_{2o} - q_{2o})^2\sin^2(2(\theta + \varphi))(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} - q_{1o})(k_0\varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o})(k_ρ^2\sin^2(\theta) + q_{1o}^2)^2, \]
which is the same as Eq. (28) with the eigenvalue relations Eq. (17). In other words
\[ q_{5b} = q_{5L} \] (30)

The symmetry relation Eq. (12) shows that the Lekner-Lifshitz version of the term proportional to \(q_{2o} - q_{2e}\) is identical to its Barash’s version:
\[ q_{2b} = q_{2L} \] (31)

Finally, we arrive at the mixed terms, i.e. those proportional to \((q_{1e} - q_{1o})^j(q_{2o} - q_{2e})^k\) with \(j, k \in \{1, 2\}\). There are in total four such terms, three of which are independent. First we will establish the Barash (denoted by subscript \(b\) and Lifshitz-Lekner (subscript \(L\)) variants of these coefficients independently.

Let us start with the Lifshitz variant. This has the advantage that each coefficient can be written as a product of terms associated with medium 1 and those associated with medium 2. This makes it possible to calculate only the terms associated with the first medium, and then multiply that with a similar expression corresponding to the other medium. The part of \(Q_L\) associated with medium 1, denoted by \(Q_{1L}\), can be written as follows:
\[ Q_{1L} = q_{1o}^2(k_0\varepsilon_{1y}^2\sin^2(2\theta))(k_0^2 + k_ρ^2)(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 + (k_0^2 - q_{1o}^2)(k_0^2q_{1e}\varepsilon_{1y}^2 - q_{1o}^4) \]
\[-2q_{10} \sin^2(\theta)(-k_0^4 q_{1e} \varepsilon_{1y}^2 (k_p^2 + q_{1o}(q_{1o} - q_{1e}))) \]

\[+ k_0^2 (k_p^2 q_{1o}(q_{1e}^2 \varepsilon_{1y}(\varepsilon_{1y} + 1) - 2q_{1e} q_{1o} \varepsilon_{1y} + q_{1o}^2(\varepsilon_{1y} + 1)) + q_{1o}^3 \varepsilon_{1y}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2) - k_p^2 q_{1e} q_{1o}^4 + q_{1o}^6 (q_{1o} - q_{1e}) \]

\[+ \sin^4(\theta)(k_0^4 \varepsilon_{1y}^2 (k_p^2 + q_{1o}(q_{1e} - q_{1o}))^2 - k_0^2 (k_p^4 (q_{1e}^2 \varepsilon_{1y}^2 + q_{1o}^2) - 2k_p^2 q_{1o}^2 \varepsilon_{1y}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 - 2q_{1o}^4 \varepsilon_{1y}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2) \]

\[+ (k_p^2 q_{1e} q_{1o} + q_{1o}^3(q_{1e} - q_{1o}))^2 \]

which has to multiplied with the same expression transformed to medium 2 to obtain the total \( Q_L \). From now on we will limit ourselves to the part of \( Q_L \) corresponding to medium 1 only. The goal is now to write this expression as a second order polynomial in \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \). Then the total \( Q_L \) is a product of this polynomial with the corresponding polynomial for medium 2. For this, we gather the coefficients \( q_{0L} \) to \( q_{8L} \). The first step is to expand \( Q_{1L} \) completely as a polynomial in \( q_{1e} \). This leads to the rather lengthy expression, so it is more insightful to write this implicitly in terms of the dummy variable coefficients \( q'_{1i} \), (where the first subscript labels the medium, and the second one the order) i.e.

\[ Q_{1L} = q'_{10} + q'_{11} q_{1e} + q'_{12} q_{1e}^2 \]

which can be transformed into a polynomial in \( q_{1e} - q_{1o} \) as

\[ Q_{1L} = q_{10} + q_{11}(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + q_{12}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2 \]

which leads to the following relations between the dummy coefficients:

\[ q_{12} = q'_{12} \]

\[ q_{11} = q'_{11} + 2q_{12} q_{1o} \]

\[ q_{10} = q'_{10} + q_{11} q_{1o} - q_{12} q_{1o}^2. \]

Now the same procedure is repeated for medium 2, leading to the analogous coefficients \( q_{20}, q_{21}, \) and \( q_{22} \). Then the total \( Q_L \) is written as

\[ Q_L = Q_{1L} Q_{2L} = (q_{10} + q_{11}(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + q_{12}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2)(q_{20} + q_{21}(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_{22}(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2) \]

which leads to the following relevant Lifshitz coefficients, now written explicitly:

\[ q_{3L} = q_{11} q_{21} = \]

\[ \frac{1}{4} q_{20} q_{1o} (k_p^2 (1 - \cos (2\theta)) + 2q_{1o}^2)(k_p^2 (1 - \cos (2(\theta + \varphi))) + 2q_{2o}^2) \times \]

\[ (k_p^2 (k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1y}^2 - q_{1o}^2) - \varepsilon_{1y}^2 k_0^4 + 2k_0^2 q_{1o}^2 \varepsilon_{1y}^2 + \cos (2\theta)(k_p^2 (q_{1o}^2 - k_0^4 \varepsilon_{1y}^2) - k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1y}^2 + 2q_{1o}^4) - q_{1o}^4) \times \]

\[ (k_p^2 (k_0^2 \varepsilon_{2y}^2 - q_{2o}^2) + 2k_0^2 q_{2o}^2 \varepsilon_{2y}^2 + \cos (2(\theta + \varphi))(k_p^2 (q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2 \varepsilon_{2y}^2) - \varepsilon_{2y}^2 k_0^4 + q_{2o}^4) - q_{2o}^4) \]

\[ q_{7L} = q_{11} q_{22} = \]

\[ \frac{1}{2} q_{1o} (k_p^2 (1 - \cos (2\theta)) + 2q_{1o}^2) \times \]
\[(k_\rho^2(q_{1o}^2 - q_{1o}^2)) - k_0^2(\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + 2k_0^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + \cos(2\theta))(k_\rho^2(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2) - k_0^4\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + q_{1o}^4) - q_{1o}^4)\times
\]

\[(k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2((k_0^2 + k_\rho^2)\sin^2(2(\theta + \varphi)) + k_0^2 - q_{2o}^2) - 2k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_0^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + k_\rho^2(\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + 1) + q_{2o}^2) + \sin^4(\theta + \varphi)(k_\rho^4(q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2) + 2k_\rho^2(k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + q_{2o}^4) + (k_0^2q_{2o}\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + q_{2o}^3)^2))\]

The reason why we consider \(q_{7L}\) and not \(q_{6L}\) will become apparent later.

\[q_{8L} = q_{12}q_{22} = (34)\]

\[(k_0^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2(\sin^2(2\theta)(k_0^2 + k_\rho^2) + k_0^2 - q_{1o}^2) - 2k_0^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2\sin^2(\theta)(k_0^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + k_\rho^2(\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + 1) + q_{1o}^2) + \sin^4(\theta)(k_\rho^4(q_{1o}^2 - k_0^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2) + 2k_\rho^2(k_0^2q_{1o}^2\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + q_{1o}^4) + (k_0^2q_{1o}\varepsilon_{y1}^2 + q_{1o}^3)^2))\times
\]

\[(k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2((k_0^2 + k_\rho^2)\sin^2(2(\theta + \varphi)) + k_0^2 - q_{2o}^2) - 2k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_0^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + k_\rho^2(\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + 1) + q_{2o}^2) + \sin^4(\theta + \varphi)(k_\rho^4(q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2) + 2k_\rho^2(k_0^2q_{2o}^2\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + q_{2o}^4) + (k_0^2q_{2o}\varepsilon_{y2}^2 + q_{2o}^3)^2))\]

Next we will move on to the Barash variant of these coefficients, i.e. \(q_{3b}\), \(q_{7b}\), and \(q_{8b}\). Unfortunately these are not so straightforwardly determined, since Barash’s result is not separated into a product of terms associated with medium 1 and medium 2. Rather, \(Q_b = Q_{1b} + Q_{2b}\) is split into two terms as in Eq. (24), where both terms contain a mixture of expressions depending on both media. The first term of Eq. (24) is a quadratic polynomial in \(q_{1e} - q_{1o}\) and \(q_{2e} - q_{2o}\):

\[Q_{1b} = Q_A\gamma(\varepsilon_{1o}^2 + k_\rho^2\sin^2\theta)^2(\varepsilon_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi))^2 =
\]

\[d_0 + d_1(q_{1e} - q_{1o}) + d_2(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + d_4(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + d_5(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2e} - q_{2o})\]

for some dummy coefficients \(d_i\). So this term contributes only to \(q_{3b}\) and \(q_{8b}\), and the other mixed terms must be extracted from the second term

\[Q_{2b} = (i\varepsilon_{2y}(q_{2e} - q_{2o})(k_\rho^2Q_B\sin^2(\theta + \varphi) + Q_C)\gamma(\varepsilon_{1o}^2 + k_\rho^2\sin^2\theta)^2(\varepsilon_{2o}^2 + k_\rho^2\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)) =
\]

\[d_5(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + d_6(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + d_7(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + d_8(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2e} - q_{2o}) + q_{7b}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2 + q_{8b}(q_{1e} - q_{1o})^2(q_{2e} - q_{2o})^2\]

Now it becomes apparent why we considered \(q_{7L}\) in Eq. (33) it is more convenient since \(q_{7b}\) is contained in one term, unlike \(q_{8b}\). The same applies to \(q_{8b}\), which is the most convenient to start with, as it is the highest order term. Simply multiplying the terms \((q_{1e} - q_{1o})\) and \((q_{2e} - q_{2o})\) within the parentheses yields

\[q_{8b} = \varepsilon_{2y}^2\varepsilon_{1y}^2(ik_0 + iq_{2o})(ik_0 + iq_{1o})(k_0q_{1o} + k_\rho^2\sin^2(\theta)) \times (35)
\]

\[(k_0q_{2o} + (k_\rho\sin(\theta)\cos(\varphi) + k_\rho\cos(\theta)\sin(\varphi))^2)(k_\rho^2(iq_{2o} - ik_0)(iq_{1o} - ik_0)\sin^2(\theta + \varphi)(k_\rho^2\sin^2(\theta) - k_0q_{1o})
\]

\[-k_0q_{2o}(iq_{2o} - ik_0)(iq_{1o} - ik_0)(k_\rho^2\sin^2(\theta) - k_0q_{1o})\]

which is identical to Eq. (33) under the condition of Eq. (17). Hence

\[q_{8b} = q_{8L}\]
Next we will direct our attention to the coefficient $q_{7b}$. This one is a bit harder to determine. It is useful to remember that $Q_{2b}$ is essentially a polynomial of the form

$$Q_{2b} = a_0 y(a_1 + a_2 x)(a_3 + a_4 y)(a_5 + a_6 x)$$

where $x = q_{1e} - q_{1o}$ and $y = q_{2e} - q_{2o}$ and the coefficients $a_i$ are complicated expressions. Here $q_{7b}$ would be the coefficient of this polynomial proportional to $x y^2$, which is

$$a_0 a_4 (a_2 a_5 + a_1 a_6).$$

More explicitly, in our case this coefficient is

$$q_{7b} = -\frac{1}{8} q_{1e} \varepsilon_{2 y} (k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_{\rho}^2(1 - \cos(2\theta)) + 2 q_{1o}^2)(2 k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1 y} + k_{\rho}^2(\cos(2\theta) - 1)) \times (37)$$

$$(2 k_0 q_{2o} + k_{\rho}^2(- \cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) + k_{\rho}^2(2 k_0 q_{2o} + k_{\rho}^2 \cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) - k_{\rho}^2),$$

which identical to Eq. (33) under the conditions of Eq. (17). Hence

$$q_{7b} = q_{7L} \text{ (38)}$$

Due to the symmetry relation Eq. (13) the same equality can be claimed for the sixth coefficients:

$$q_{6b} = q_{6L}. \text{ (39)}$$

Finally, we consider the most difficult coefficient to obtain, $q_{3b}$. In accordance with the previous analogy, we can write the total $Q_b$ as

$$Q_b = a_0 y(a_1 + a_2 x)(a_3 + a_4 y)(a_5 + a_6 x) + b_0(b_1 + b_2 x)(b_3 + b_4 y)(b_5 + b_6 y)$$

Here $q_{3b}$ would be the coefficient multiplied with $x y$, which is

$$a_0 a_1 a_3 a_6 + a_0 a_2 a_3 a_5 + b_0 b_1 b_3 b_6 + b_0 b_2 b_3 b_6$$

Explicitly $q_{3b}$ is then, after simplification,

$$q_{3b} = \frac{1}{4} q_{2o} q_{1o} \varepsilon_{2 y} \varepsilon_{1 y}(k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o})(k_{\rho}^2(1 - \cos(2\theta)) + 2 q_{1o}^2) \times (40)$$

$$(2 k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1 y} + k_{\rho}^2 \cos(2\theta) - k_{\rho}^2)(k_{\rho}^2(1 - \cos(2(\theta + \varphi))) + 2 q_{1o}^2)(2 k_0^2 \varepsilon_{2 y} + k_{\rho}^2 \cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) - k_{\rho}^2),$$

which is identical to Eq. (32) under conditions of Eq. (17). Hence

$$q_{3b} = q_{3L}. \text{ (41)}$$

In this subsection we have taken advantage of the symmetry relations Eq. (12) to obtain Eq. (31) and Eq. (13) to obtain Eq. (39). So the natural next step is to prove that Eqs. (12) and (13) hold indeed. This is simply a matter of determining the relevant coefficients, starting with

$$q_{2b} = \frac{1}{8} q_{2o} \varepsilon_{2 y}(q_{2o}^2 - k_0^2)(k_0^2 - q_{1o}^2)(k_0^2 \varepsilon_{1 y}^2 - q_{1o}^2) \times (42)$$

$$(k_{\rho}^2(1 - \cos(2\theta)) + 2 q_{1o}^2)(k_{\rho}^2(1 - \cos(2(\theta + \varphi))) + 2 q_{2o}^2)(2 k_0^2 \varepsilon_{2 y} + k_{\rho}^2 \cos(2(\theta + \varphi)) - k_{\rho}^2),$$

which is the transformed version of $q_{1b}$ from Eq. (26). Now finally we move on to the remaining coefficient

$$q_{6b} = -\frac{1}{8} q_{2o} \varepsilon_{2 y} \varepsilon_{1 y}(k_0 - q_{2o})(k_0 + q_{2o})(k_0 - q_{1o})(k_0 + q_{1o}) \times (43)$$
\[(2k_0q_{1o} + k_ρ^2(1 - \cos(2θ))(2k_0q_{1o} + k_ρ^2 \cos(2θ) - k_ρ^2)(k_ρ^2(1 - \cos(2(θ + ϕ))) + 2q_{2o}^2)\times\]
\[(2k_0^2ε_{2y} + k_ρ^2(\cos(2(θ + ϕ)) - 1)\),

which is Eq. (37) with the media swapped.

This completes the proof that

\[Q_L = Q_b\]  

(44)

Since \(P_b = P_L\) (see Appendix [5]) and the constant term of \(D_b\) equals unity (see Appendix [4]), this also proves that the result Eq. (6) from the main paper for \(μ_x = 1 = μ_y\) is identical to Eq. (21) of Ref. [15]. To our knowledge this is the first independent proof of this result.