Transition to strong coupling regime in hybrid plasmonic systems: Exciton-induced transparency and Fano interference
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We present a microscopic model describing the transition to strong coupling regime for an emitter resonantly coupled to a surface plasmon in a metal-dielectric structure. We obtain the effective optical polarizability of such a hybrid system with the coupling parameter expressed in terms of energy transfer rates. In the weak coupling regime, the scattering spectra exhibit exciton-induced transparency minimum caused by energy exchange imbalance between the emitter and plasmon in a narrow frequency interval. We demonstrate that Fano interference, which emerges from the interactions of plasmon dipole and plasmon-induced emitter dipole with the radiation field in the final state of optical transition, can strongly affect the overall shape of scattering spectra leading to inversion of the asymmetry pattern as the system transitions to strong coupling regime.

I. INTRODUCTION

Strong coupling between surface plasmons in metal-dielectric structures and excitons in semiconductors or dye molecules has recently attracted intense interest driven to a large extent by possible applications in ultrafast reversible switching [1-8], quantum computing [4-8], and light harvesting [6]. In the strong coupling regime, coherent energy exchange between excitons and plasmons [7] leads to the emergence of mixed polaritonic states with energy bands separated by an anticrossing gap (Rabi splitting) [8]. For excitons coupled to cavity modes in microcavities, the Rabi splitting magnitudes are relatively small on the scale of several meV [9-11]. However, in hybrid plasmonic systems, in which surface plasmons are coupled to excitons in J-aggregates [12-22], in various dye molecules [23-27] or in semiconductor nanostructures [28-31], the Rabi splittings can be much greater even reaching hundreds meV. For single excitons, however, achieving a strong exciton-plasmon coupling is a challenging task as it requires extremely large plasmon local density of states (LDOS) at the exciton position that can mainly be achieved in nanogaps [32-34].

At the same time, the scattering spectra of hybrid plasmonic systems, such as excitons in J-aggregates or colloidal QDs coupled to gap plasmons in nanoparticle-on-metal (NoM) systems [35-38] or those in two-dimensional atomic crystals conjugated with Ag or Au nanostructures [39-44], exhibit a narrow minimum even before reaching the strong coupling transition point. The emergence of such a minimum in the weak coupling regime is referred to as exciton-induced transparency (ExIT) [45-47], in analogy to electromagnetically-induced transparency (EIT) in pumped three-level atomic systems that is attributed to Fano interference between different excitation pathways. Recently, we have shown that in the linear regime (i.e., in the absence of pump), the emergence of such a minimum in scattering spectra of hybrid plasmonic systems is due to imbalance of energy exchange between the emitter and plasmon in a narrow frequency interval [48]. Typically, the plasmon plasmon optical dipole moment significantly (by $\sim 10^3$) exceeds that of an exciton in a semiconductor quantum dot and so the emitter’s direct interaction with the radiation field is relatively weak [49]. In this case, the ExIT minimum in scattering spectra is described, with a reasonably good accuracy, by the classical model of two coupled oscillators (CO), only one of them (corresponding to the plasmon) interacting with the radiation field [47]. Within CO model, the scattering spectra show a narrow ExIT minimum on top of a much wider plasmon peak while the overall spectral weight is shifted towards higher frequency region [38-47].

On the other hand, in hybrid plasmonic systems, the optical interference between an exciton and a plasmon can arise from indirect coupling of exciton to the radiation field. Namely, if the incident light frequency is tuned to the plasmon resonance, the exciton dipole moment $induced$ by the plasmon near field is not necessarily small and so it can contribute to the final state of optical transition. In this case, the Fano interference between the plasmon and plasmon-induced exciton dipoles can significantly affect the overall shape of optical spectra. While this process is not accounted for in the CO model [38-47], it is still mediated by resonant plasmon mode, so we will refer to the amended model as plasmonic antenna (PA) model. As we show in this paper, such Fano interference effects can lead to inversion of spectral asymmetry that has recently been observed for excitons coupled to localized plasmon modes [22,39,40].

In this paper, we present a microscopic model for linear optical response of a single exciton resonantly coupled to a plasmon mode in a metal-dielectric structure which accounts for both ExIT and Fano interference effects as the system transitions to strong coupling regime. We obtain the effective polarizability of hybrid system for the case when it is dominated by plasmonic enhancement, i.e., plasmon-enhanced exciton dipole moment is much larger than the direct one, while the exciton-plasmon coupling and optical transition matrix elements are calculated from the local fields rather than being ad hoc phenomenological constants. We further show that while the ExIT minimum results from the energy exchange imbalance in a narrow frequency interval, the overall spectral shape of scattering spectra is strongly affected by the Fano interference between radiating plasmon and plasmon-induced exciton dipoles. Specifically, we demonstrate that Fano interference can lead to an inversion of spectral asymmetry, consistent with the experiment [22,39,40].
II. QUANTUM EMITTER NEAR A PLASMONIC STRUCTURE

A. Optical polarizability of a plasmonic structure

We consider a metal-dielectric structure characterized by a complex dielectric function $\epsilon'(\omega, r) + i\epsilon''(\omega, r)$ that supports localized plasmon modes with frequencies $\omega_m$. For characteristic system size smaller than the radiation wavelength, the plasmon modes are determined by the Gauss’s law \[ \nabla \cdot \epsilon'(\omega_m, r) \nabla \Phi_m(r) = 0, \] where $\Phi_m(r)$ is the mode potential that defines the mode field $E_m(r) = -\nabla \Phi_m(r)$, which we choose to be real. To determine the plasmon dipole moment for optical transitions, we recast the Gauss’s law as $\nabla \cdot [E_m(r) + 4\pi P_m(r)] = 0$, where $P_m(r) = \chi'(\omega_m, r)E_m(r)$ is the electric polarization vector and $\chi = (\epsilon - 1)/4\pi$ is the plasmonic system susceptibility. The plasmon dipole moment has the form

$$ p_m = \int dV P_m = \int dV \chi'(\omega_m, r) E_m(r). \tag{1} $$

The Gauss’s equation does not determine the overall field normalization \[ \text{50}, \] but the later can be found by matching the plasmon radiative decay rate and that of a localized dipole with excitation energy $\hbar \omega_m$. The plasmon radiative decay rate has the form \[ \text{51}, \] $\gamma_m = \frac{W_m}{U_m}$, where

$$ U_m = \frac{1}{16\pi} \int dV \frac{\partial \omega_m e'(\omega_m, r)}{\partial \omega_m} E_m^2(r), \tag{2} $$

is the plasmon mode energy \[ \text{52, 53} \] and

$$ W_m = \frac{\mu_m^2 \omega_m^4}{3c^3}, \tag{3} $$

is the radiated power (c is the speed of light) \[ \text{54} \]. The normalized modes $\tilde{E}_m(r)$ are thus determined by setting $\gamma_m = 4\mu_m^2 \omega_m^3/3\hbar c^3$, where $\mu_m$ is the mode optical transition matrix element. We then find the relation

$$ \tilde{E}_m(r) = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_m}{U_m}}} E_m(r), \tag{4} $$

and, accordingly, $\mu_m = \int dV \chi' e'(\omega_m, r) \tilde{E}_m(r)$ (the factor 1/2 reflects positive-frequency contribution). Unless noted, we will use the normalized modes in the following.

The response of plasmonic structure to an external field $\delta e^{i\omega t}$, where $\delta e = \delta \epsilon$ is the field slow envelope that is uniform on the system scale and $\epsilon$ is the field polarization, is characterized by the polarizability tensor \[ \text{51} \] $\alpha_p l = \sum \alpha_m$, where

$$ \alpha_m(\omega) = \frac{\mu_m^2}{\hbar} \frac{n_m n_m}{\omega_m - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_m}, \tag{5} $$

is plasmon mode polarizability near the resonance and $n_m$ is the mode polarization. Here, $\gamma_m = \gamma_m^r + \gamma_m^\alpha$ is the plasmon decay rate that includes the radiative rate $\gamma_m^r$ and non-radiative rate $\gamma_m^\alpha = 2\epsilon''(\omega_m)/[\partial \epsilon''(\omega_m)/\partial \omega_m]$ due to the Ohmic losses. The plasmon scattering cross-section $\sigma_m^e$ is obtained \[ \text{55} \] by normalizing the power $W_m = (\omega_m^3/3c^3)|P_m(\omega)|^2$, radiated by the induced dipole $P_m(\omega) = \alpha_m(\omega)\delta\epsilon$, with the incident flux $S = (c/8\pi)\delta\epsilon^2$,

$$ \sigma_m^e(\omega) = \frac{8\pi \omega_m^4}{3\hbar c^4} \frac{\mu_m^2 (\epsilon \cdot \mu_m)^2}{(\omega_m - \omega)^2 + \gamma_m^2/4}. \tag{6} $$

B. Effective optical polarizability of a hybrid plasmonic system

Let us now consider an emitter at a position $r_e$ near a plasmonic structure. The optical response of a hybrid system can be described in terms of effective polarizability $\alpha_e(\omega)$ that includes emitter-plasmon optical interactions. Here we consider the weak coupling regime and treat plasmons classically. Typically, the emitter optical transition matrix element $\mu_e = \mu_e n_e$, where $n_e$ is the dipole orientation, is much smaller (by several orders) than $\mu_m$ and, therefore, direct emitter’s interaction with the radiation field are relatively weak and can be neglected \[ \text{38, 47} \]. Instead, the emitters are excited indirectly by the local field $\tilde{E}_m(r_e)$ of resonantly-excited plasmon mode. The plasmon-induced emitter’s dipole moment has the form

$$ p_e = \alpha_e(\omega) \tilde{E}_m(r_e), \tag{7} $$

where $\alpha_e(\omega) = \alpha_e(\omega) n_e n_e$ is emitter’s optical polarizability tensor. In this case, the effective polarizability of a hybrid system can be obtained, within the dressed plasmon picture, by appropriately modifying the plasmon polarizability \[ \text{56} \]. First, the back-interaction of plasmon-induced emitter’s dipole is described by the plasmon self-energy

$$ \hbar \Sigma_m(\omega) = -\mu_e \tilde{E}_m(r_e) = -\alpha_e(\omega) n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e) n_e, \tag{8} $$

which should be added to the plasmon energy $\hbar \omega_m$. Second, the system’s dipole moment contributing to the final state of optical transition takes the form

$$ \mu_s = \mu_m + \mu_e n_m + \alpha_e(\omega) n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e) n_e. \tag{9} $$

Finally, to ensure the consistency with optical theorem, the plasmon radiative decay rate $\gamma_m^r$, contributing to $\gamma_m$, should be replaced with the radiative decay rate of hybrid system $\gamma_s = 4\mu_s^2 \omega_m^3/3\hbar c^3$.

Thus, near the resonance, the hybrid system’s effective polarizability tensor has the form:

$$ \alpha_e(\omega) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\mu_s \mu^2}{\omega_m + \Sigma_m(\omega) - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_m}. \tag{10} $$

To specify the plasmon self-energy, we assume that the emitter excitation frequency $\omega_e$ is close to the plasmon frequency $\omega_m$, and therefore, near the resonance, adopt a classical polarizability \[ \text{8} \]

$$ \alpha_e(\omega) = \frac{\mu_e^2}{\hbar} \frac{2\omega_e}{\omega_e^2 - i\omega_e \gamma_e} \approx \frac{\mu_e^2}{\hbar} \frac{1}{\omega_e - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e}. \tag{11} $$
where $\gamma_e$ is emitter’s spectral linewidth assumed here to be much smaller than the plasmon one, $\gamma_e \ll \gamma_m$. Using Eq. (11), the plasmon self-energy (3) takes the form

$$\Sigma_m(\omega) = -\frac{g^2}{\omega_e - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e},$$

(12)

where $\hbar g = -\mu_e \cdot \vec{E}_m(r_e)$ is the emitter-plasmon coupling parameter, and we finally obtain

$$\alpha_s(\omega) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\mu_s \mu_s^* (\omega_e - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e)}{(\omega_m - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_m)(\omega_e - \omega - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e) - g^2}.$$  

(13)

The scattering cross-section is obtained by normalizing the radiated power $W_s = (\omega^4/3c^3)|P_s(\omega)|^2$, where $P_s(\omega) = \alpha_s(\omega)\delta$ is the hybrid system’s induced dipole moment, with the incident flux $S = (\epsilon/c)^2$.

$$\sigma_{sc}^m(\omega) = \frac{8\pi\omega^4|\mu_s|^2}{3\hbar^2 c^4} \frac{\epsilon \mu_s (\Omega_e - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e)}{(\Omega_m - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_m)(\Omega_e - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_e) - g^2}^2,$$

(14)

where $\Omega_e = \omega_e - \omega$ and $\Omega_m = \omega_m - \omega$.

C. Emitter-plasmon coupling and energy transfer rate

The emitter-plasmon coupling $g$ can be related to the emitter-plasmon energy (ET) rate at resonance frequency [7]. Namely, the rate $\gamma_{e\rightarrow m}(\omega)$ of transferring the energy $\hbar \omega$ from the emitter to plasmon has the form

$$\gamma_{e\rightarrow m}(\omega) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\mu_e \cdot \vec{E}_m(r_e)|^2 f_m(\omega),$$

(15)

where

$$f_m(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_m}{(\omega - \omega_m)^2 + \gamma_m^2/4}},$$

(16)

is plasmon spectral function normalized as $\int d\omega f_m(\omega) = 1$. Using the relation $g = \mu_e \cdot \vec{E}_m(r_e)/\hbar$, the frequency-dependent emitter-plasmon ET rate takes the form

$$\gamma_{e\rightarrow m}(\omega) = \frac{g^2 \gamma_m}{(\omega - \omega_m)^2 + \gamma_m^2/4}.$$  

(17)

At resonance frequency ($\omega = \omega_m$), we obtain the relation

$$g^2 = \frac{1}{4} \frac{\gamma_m \gamma_{e\rightarrow m}}{\gamma_m},$$

(18)

where hereafter we use the notations $\gamma_{e\rightarrow m} = \gamma_{e\rightarrow m}(\omega_m)$.

In terms of original (not normalized) plasmon mode fields [4], we obtain a cavity-like expression for the emitter-plasmon coupling [7]

$$g^2 = \frac{2\pi \mu_s^2 \omega_m}{\hbar \gamma_f} = \frac{1}{\gamma_f} \frac{2|\mu_e \cdot \vec{E}_m(r_e)|^2}{\int dV \frac{\partial (\omega_m \cdot \vec{E}_m)}{\partial \omega_m} |\vec{E}_m|^2},$$

(19)

where $\gamma_f$ is projected plasmon mode volume characterizing plasmon field confinement at the emitter position $r_e$ along its dipole orientation $n_e$ [51, 53, 54]. Comparing to Eq. (19), the emitter-plasmon ET rate can be expressed as

$$\gamma_{e\rightarrow m} = \frac{8\pi \mu_s^2 Q_m}{h \gamma_f},$$

(20)

where $Q_m = \omega_m/\gamma_m$ is plasmon quality factor. Recalling that the Purcell factor is $F_p = \gamma_{e\rightarrow m}/\gamma_e$, where $\gamma_e = 4\mu_s^2 \omega_e^3/3\hbar c^3$ is the emitter’s radiative decay rate, we obtain a cavity-like expression for the Purcell factor in terms of plasmon mode volume: $F_p = 6\pi c^3 Q_m/\omega^3 \gamma_f$.

III. EXCITON-INDUCED TRANSPARENCY AND ENERGY EXCHANGE

In this section, we elucidate the underlying mechanism of ExIT by means of energy exchange between the emitter and plasmon mode which involves no optical phase [48]. Therefore, we ignore for now the emitter’s interaction with the radiation field in the transition final state by setting the matrix element $\mu_s = \mu_m$ in the effective polarization (13) and scattering cross-section (14). This is equivalent to the CO model traditionally used for classical description of the ExIT phenomena [47], but with coupling $g$ now related to the emitter-plasmon ET rate via Eq. (18).

A. ExIT and energy transfer imbalance between an emitter and a plasmon

In the steady state, the overall back and forth ET rates between an emitter and a plasmon coincide. However, for significantly different rates, $\gamma_e \ll \gamma_m$, the balance between back and forth ET no longer holds in a narrow frequency interval $\sim \gamma_e$, giving rise to distinct spectral features. To illustrate it, note that the frequency-dependent emitter-plasmon ET rate (17) is proportional to the acceptor (i.e., plasmon) absorption spectrum $\alpha_m^p(\omega)$ [8]. On the other hand, the reverse plasmon-emitter ET rate is obtained from the plasmon self-energy (12) as

$$\gamma_{m\rightarrow e}(\omega) = -2\Sigma^p_m(\omega) = \frac{g^2 \gamma_e}{(\omega - \omega_e)^2 + \gamma_e^2/4},$$

(21)

which is also defined by the acceptor (i.e., exciton) absorption spectrum $\alpha_m^p(\omega)$ [see Eq. (11)]. The full plasmon-emitter ET rate $\Gamma_{m\rightarrow e}$ is obtained by integrating the frequency-dependent rate $\gamma_{m\rightarrow e}(\omega)$ with the normalized plasmon spectral function $f_m(\omega)$, given by Eq. (16), over entire frequency interval:

$$\Gamma_{m\rightarrow e} = \int d\omega f_m(\omega) \gamma_{m\rightarrow e}(\omega).$$

(22)

Similarly, the full emitter-plasmon ET rate $\Gamma_{e\rightarrow m}$ is obtained by integrating the frequency-dependent rate (17) with the analogous normalized emitter spectral function. Both rates are easily evaluated and we obtain

$$\Gamma_{m\rightarrow e} = \frac{g^2(\gamma_m + \gamma_e)}{(\omega_m - \omega_e)^2 + (\gamma_m + \gamma_e)^2/4},$$

(23)
implying an overall energy exchange balance.

At the same time, near the resonance, the frequency-dependent plasmon-emitter ET rate Eq. (21) is much greater than the emitter-plasmon ET rate Eq. (17). Indeed, for \( \omega = \omega_m = \omega_c \), we have

\[
\frac{\gamma_{m-e}}{\gamma_{e-m}} = \frac{\gamma_m}{\gamma_c} \gg 1, \tag{24}
\]

indicating a significant ET imbalance in a narrow frequency interval. Such imbalance between the near-resonance ET rates gives rise to a minimum in the dressed plasmon spectrum as the hybrid system's states are redistributed between its interacting components. Since the incident light mainly couples to the plasmon, an emitter-induced minimum in the dressed plasmon's spectral band results in an enhanced light transmission (ExIT).

To describe the appearance of ExIT minimum in scattering spectra, we relate the CO scattering cross-section \( \sigma_{sc}^{\nu} \), given by Eq. (14) with \( \mu_m \) instead of \( \mu_s \), to the corresponding plasmon cross-section Eq. (6) as

\[
\sigma_{sc}^{\nu}(\omega) = \sigma_{sc}^{\nu}(\omega)R(\omega), \tag{25}
\]

where

\[
R(\omega) = \left( \frac{\omega_m - \omega - i\gamma_m}{\omega_m - \omega - i\gamma_e} \left( \frac{\omega_m - \omega - i\gamma_e}{\omega_m - \omega - i\gamma_e} - \frac{\gamma_m}{\gamma_c} \right)^2 \right)^2. \tag{26}
\]

In the frequency interval \( |\omega_m - \omega|/\gamma_m \ll 1 \), using the relation (18), the function \( R(\omega) \) reduces to

\[
E(\omega) = \frac{\varepsilon^2 + 1}{\varepsilon^2 + (1 + p)^2}, \tag{27}
\]

where \( \varepsilon = 2(\omega - \omega_c)/\gamma_e \), while the parameter

\[
p = \frac{\gamma_{e-m}}{\gamma_c} = \frac{\gamma_{m-e}}{\gamma_m} \tag{28}
\]

characterizes the ExIT minimum depth. The ExIT function \( E(\omega) \) describes the spectral minimum that arises due to excessively large plasmon-emitter ET rate in the frequency interval \( \sim \gamma_e \). Specifically, in the weak coupling regime, the dressed plasmon decay rate has the form \( \gamma_{m}^{\nu}(\omega) = \gamma_m + \gamma_{m-e}(\omega) \). Using Eq. (21) and the relation (18), we obtain

\[
\gamma_{m}^{\nu}(\omega) = \gamma_m \left( 1 + \frac{p}{\varepsilon^2 + 1} \right), \tag{29}
\]

indicating the linewidth increase by factor \( (1 + p) \) in the frequency interval \( |\omega - \omega_c| \sim \gamma_e \) which, in turn, leads to the ExIT minimum in the dressed plasmon spectrum.

### B. Numerical example: an emitter near the tip of a gold nanorod

Below we present the results of numerical calculations for an emitter situated at a distance \( d \) from the tip of an Au nanorod in water. The nanorod was modeled by a prolate spheroid with semi-major and semi-minor axes \( a \) and \( b \), respectively (see Fig. 1), the emitter’s dipole orientation was chosen along the nanorod symmetry axis, and the Au experimental dielectric function was used in all calculations [55].

The emitter spectral linewidth \( \gamma_e \) is much smaller than the plasmon one, \( \gamma_e/\gamma_m = 0.1 \), and its radiative decay time is chosen \( \tau_r = 10 \text{ ns} \), which are typical values for excitons in quantum dots. Note that the emitter’s radiative decay rate \( \gamma_e \) is much smaller than its spectral linewidth: for our system we have \( \gamma_e/\gamma_c \sim 10^{-5} \).

In Fig. 1 we plot the ExIT parameter \( p = \gamma_{e-m}/\gamma_e = F_p \gamma_e/\gamma_c \) against the emitter’s distance to nanorod tip for several values of aspect ratio \( a/b \). Note that the Purcell factor near the tip of elongated particle (\( a/b = 3.0 \)) is much greater that for a nanosphere (\( a/b = 1.0 \)), so that \( p \sim 1 \) in the former case and is negligibly small in the latter case. Away from the tip, \( p \) sharply decreases to \( p < 0.1 \) at \( d = 0.5a \). However, even for small values of \( p \), the dressed plasmon’s decay rate Eq. (27) still shows a maximum at the emitter’s frequency, which develops into a pronounced peak with reducing \( d \) [see Fig. 2(a)]. This rise of the dressed plasmon decay rate in a narrow frequency region originates from the difference between the emitter-plasmon and plasmon-emitter (back and forth) ET rates in that region [see Eq. (24)]. The same effect defines the shape of function \( R(\omega) \), given by Eq. (26), which modulates the plasmon spectrum [see Fig. 2(b)]. In order to highlight the role of ExIT parameter \( p \), we show the calculated ExIT function \( E(\omega) \), given by Eq. (27), for each value of emitter-nanorod distance \( d \) (dotted lines). Clearly, in the weak coupling regime (small \( p \)), the ExIT function \( E(\omega) \) accurately describes the spectral minimum (blue curves), while for larger \( p \) (i.e., closer to the tip) the spectrum develops “wings” outside the minimum region as the system undergoes strong coupling transition. We stress that the ExIT function \( E(\omega) \) accurately reproduces the central part of ExIT minimum for any distance \( d \).

![FIG. 1. The ExIT parameter \( p \) for an emitter near a tip of gold nanorod in water is plotted against the distance to the tip for several values of nanorod aspect ratio. Inset: Schematics of an emitter near Au nanorod tip.](image-url)
modulated by the ExIT function regime, the spectrum represents the plasmon resonance peak minimum at the emitter’s frequency \( \omega \).

In Fig. 2 we show the calculated normalized scattering cross section for several values of \( d \). In the weak coupling regime, the spectrum represents the plasmon resonance peak modulated by the ExIT function \( E(\omega) \) and exhibits a narrow minimum at the emitter’s frequency \( \omega_e \). Note that the emergence of ExIT window is not characterized by any clear onset, implying the absence of a distinct "intermediate" coupling phase. We stress that the ExIT minimum always occurs at the emitter’s frequency, whether it is tuned exactly at plasmon resonance [see Fig. 2(a)] or slightly blueshifted [see Fig. 2(b)], which is consistent with the energy exchange mechanism of ExIT.

In Fig. 3, we show the calculated normalized scattering cross section at the emitter frequency (a) in resonance with the plasmon frequency \( \omega_p = \omega_m \) and (b) blueshifted from the plasmon frequency \( \omega_p = 1.01 \omega_m \) is shown for several values of \( d \).

IV. FANO INTERFERENCE AND THE SHAPE OF SCATTERING SPECTRA

In this section, we discuss the effect of Fano interference on optical spectra of a hybrid system caused by emitter’s interaction with the radiation field in the final state of optical transition. This effect is described by dressed plasmon’s optical transition matrix element \( \mu_e \) in the polarizability \( \alpha_p \) and scattering cross-section (14) which incorporates both the plasmon and plasmon-induced dipoles. Although the Fano interference between the two dipoles does not appreciably affect the ExIT minimum, it does lead to a significant changes in the overall spectral shape. In particular, as we show below, for an emitter placed in a plasmonic hot spot, the Fano interference can lead to inversion of spectral asymmetry that is inherently present in the CO model, as it is clearly seen in Fig. 4, by instead enhancing the lower frequency domain of scattering spectrum.
A. Optical transition matrix elements and scattering cross-section

The dressed plasmon’s optical transition matrix element \( \mu_s = \mu_m + p_e \) includes contributions from the plasmon dipole \( \mu_m = \mu_m n_m \) and the plasmon-induced QE dipole \( p_e = \alpha_e(\omega)|n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e)|n_e \) [see Eq. (29)]. To relate \( \mu_s \) back to \( \mu_m \), we decompose it into parallel and normal (relative to \( n_m \)) components as \( \mu_s = \mu_s^\parallel n_m + \mu_s^\perp \), where

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu_s^\parallel &= \mu_m + \alpha_e(\omega)|n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e)|n_e \cdot n_m, \\
\mu_s^\perp &= \alpha_e(\omega)|n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e)|(n_m \times n_e) \times n_m,
\end{align*}
\]

so that \( |\mu_s|^2 = |\mu_s^\parallel|^2 + |\mu_s^\perp|^2 \). Then, it is straightforward to obtain the following relations between the plasmon and dressed plasmon optical transition matrix elements:

\[
|\varepsilon \cdot \mu_s|^2 = (\varepsilon \cdot \mu_m)^2 F_1(\omega), \quad |\mu_s|^2 = \mu_m^2 F_2(\omega),
\]

where \( F_i(\omega) \) (with \( i = 1, 2 \)) is the Fano function,

\[
F_i(\omega) = \frac{(\varepsilon - q_i)^2 + b_i}{\varepsilon^2 + 1},
\]

with \( \varepsilon = 2(\omega - \omega_e)/\gamma_e \). The Fano parameters \( q_i \) and \( b_i \) are obtained as

\[
q_1 = -\frac{2g\mu_e n_e}{\gamma_e \mu_m \varepsilon n_m}, \quad b_1 = 1,
\]

and

\[
q_2 = -\frac{2g\mu_e (n_e \cdot n_m)}{\gamma_e \mu_m}, \quad b_2 = 1 + \left( \frac{2g\mu_e}{\gamma_e \mu_m} \right)^2 \left[ 1 - (n_e \cdot n_m)^2 \right],
\]

where we used Eq. (11) for the QE polarizability along with the relation \( g = -\mu_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e)/\hbar \). With help of Eq. (32), the hybrid system’s scattering cross-section \( \sigma_s^{\text{sc}}(\omega) = (8\pi \omega^4/3\epsilon^4) [\varepsilon \alpha_s(\omega) \alpha_s^*(\omega)]^2 \) is obtained as

\[
\sigma_s^{\text{sc}}(\omega) = \frac{8\pi \omega^4}{3\hbar^2} \mu_m^2 (\varepsilon \cdot \mu_m)^2 F_1(\omega) F_2(\omega)
\times \left| \frac{\Omega_e - i\gamma_e}{(\Omega_m - i\gamma_m \Omega_e - i\gamma_e) - \gamma_e^2} \right|^2.
\]

B. The Fano function and Purcell factor

The scattering cross-section (47) are distinct from that obtained within the CO model [47] due to the presence of Fano functions characterizing interference optical between the plasmon dipole and plasmon-induced emitter dipole during the excitation \( (F_1) \) and re-emission \( (F_2) \). The Fano asymmetry parameters \( q_i \), which define this interference, are highly sensitive to the mutual orientation of plasmon and emitter dipole moments and the incident field polarization. The maximal effect is achieved when all three orientations coincide, i.e., \( \varepsilon = n_m = n_e \). In this case, \( F_1 = F_2 = F \), where

\[
F(\omega) = \frac{(\varepsilon - q)^2 + 1}{\varepsilon^2 + 1},
\]

with the Fano parameter given by

\[
q = -\frac{2\gamma_e}{\gamma_e \mu_m} = \frac{2\mu_m^2}{\hbar \gamma_e \mu_m} n_e \cdot \tilde{E}_m(r_e).
\]

The Fano function has asymmetric shape that depends on the sign of parameter \( q \). For an emitter situated near the system symmetry axis, shown in Fig. (4) inset, we have \( q > 0 \) and, in this case, the Fano function is depressed for \( \varepsilon > q \), leading, as we show below, to the inversion of spectral asymmetry present in Fig. (3) a). The magnitude of \( q \) can be expressed via the Purcell factor using the relation \( g^2 = F_p \gamma_m / \gamma_e \), yielding

\[
|q| = \frac{\gamma_e}{\gamma_m} \sqrt{\frac{F_p}{\eta_m}}.
\]

where \( \eta_m = \gamma_m^e/\gamma_m \) is the plasmon radiation efficiency. Although the ratio \( \gamma_e/\gamma_m \) is typically very small (\( \sim 10^{-5} \)) due to the broadening of spectral linewidth \( \gamma_e \) by phonons or vibrons, for small nanostructures we have \( F_p \gg 1 \) and \( \eta_m \ll 1 \), implying that, in a plasmonic hot spot, the actual value of \( q \) can be appreciable. This is illustrated in Fig. (4) where the Fano parameter \( q \) is plotted against the distance to the tip of an Au nanorod for several values of its size.

Turning to the Fano interference effect on optical spectra, the hybrid system’s scattering cross-section can be presented as [compare to Eq. (25)]

\[
\sigma_s^{\text{sc}}(\omega) = \sigma_s^{\text{co}}(\omega) R(\omega) F(\omega)^2 = \sigma_s^{\text{co}}(\omega) F(\omega)^2,
\]

where we used Eq. (25). While the position and amplitude of ExIT minimum are described with good accuracy by \( \sigma_s^{\text{co}}(\omega) \)
and that emitter and plasmon frequencies are in resonance for an emitter situated at several distances from the tip. A slight asymmetry with the lower frequency domain can be seen in Fig. 4, so that the Fano function exhibits only a small deviation from unity still stays within several percent points [see Fig. 3(a)]. In this case, the Fano function asymmetry is insufficient to significantly alter the inherent spectral asymmetry due to overall frequency dependence of the scattering cross-section $\sigma^{sc} \propto \omega^4$ that favors enhancement of the higher frequency domain. Therefore, the scattering spectra in Fig. 5(b) still exhibit some enhancement on the higher frequency side similar, albeit weaker, to the CO model [compare to Fig. 3(a)].

With decreasing overall nanorod size, the emitter-plasmon coupling increases and so does the Fano parameter $q$ [see Eq. (39)] due to the reduction of plasmon mode volume at the emitter’s position $\mathbf{r}$. In Fig. 6, we show the Fano function and the scattering spectra for the same system parameters but with overall nanorod size $2a = 20$ nm. Although the deviation of Fano function from unity still stays within several percent points [see Fig. 3(a)], it is now sufficient to overcompensate for the inherent asymmetry of scattering spectra, leading to asymmetry inversion [see Fig. 6(b)]. The asymmetry inversion effect is more pronounced for smaller nanorods with overall size $2a = 10$ nm, shown in Fig. 7 characterized by a stronger coupling parameter $g$, as the Fano function variation increases up to 30% resulting in a significant enhancement of the lower frequency peak. Note that at smallest $d$, the system transitions to the strong coupling regime as the double-peak structure no longer fits within the plasmon resonance envelope and so the ExIT minimum turns into the Rabi

C. Fano interference and inversion of spectral asymmetry

In Fig. 5 we plot the Fano function and scattering spectra for an emitter situated at several distances from the tip of Au nanorod with aspect ratio $a/b = 3.0$ and overall size $2a = 40$ nm. We assume that emitter’s dipole moment is oriented along plasmon field polarization, so that $q$ is positive, and that emitter and plasmon frequencies are in resonance ($\omega_e = \omega_p$). For such a nanorod, the parameter $q$ is small, as can be seen in Fig. 4, and the Fano function exhibits only a slight asymmetry with the lower frequency domain $\epsilon < q$ somewhat enhanced relative to the higher frequency domain $\epsilon > q$ [see Fig. 3(a)]. In this case, the Fano function asymmetry is insufficient to significantly alter the inherent spectral asymmetry due to overall frequency dependence of the scattering cross-section $\sigma^{sc} \propto \omega^4$ that favors enhancement of the

within the CO model, as we discussed in the previous section, the presence of Fano function $F(\omega)$ in the system full scattering cross-section $\sigma^{sc}$ significantly affects the overall spectral shape, as we show in the numerical calculations below.

FIG. 5. The Fano function (a) and normalized scattering cross-section (b) are shown for several values of QE distance $d$ to the Au nanorod tip at nanorod overall size $2a = 40$ nm.

FIG. 6. The Fano function (a) and normalized scattering cross-section (b) are shown for several values of QE distance $d$ to the Au nanorod tip at nanorod overall size $2a = 20$ nm.
FIG. 7. The Fano function (a) and normalized scattering cross-section (b) are shown for several values of QE distance d to the Au nanorod tip at nanorod overall size 2a = 10 nm.

splitting. We stress that the asymmetry inversion takes place in the weak coupling regime and can be viewed as a redistribution of spectral weight caused by Fano interference in the narrow frequency interval of the ExIT window.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we developed a model for exciton-induced transparency in hybrid plasmonic systems comprised of a single emitter resonantly coupled to a surface plasmon in a metal-dielectric structure. We have shown that the spectral shape of scattering spectra is determined by two distinct mechanisms. First is near-field coupling between the emitter and plasmon that defines the energy spectrum of hybrid system. This mechanism relies upon ET between the system components and gives rise to the ExIT minimum in scattering spectra and, in the strong coupling regime, to the Rabi splitting of polaritonic bands. The second mechanism is the Fano interference between the plasmon and the plasmon-induced emitter’s dipoles as the system interacts with the radiation field. Although the Fano interference does not significantly affect the position or magnitude of spectral minimum, it determines the overall spectral shape. Specifically, Fano interference leads to the inversion of spectral asymmetry, relative to that in CO model, that was recently reported in the experiment [22][39][40].
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