

# Losses for microwave transmission in metamaterials for producing left-handed materials: The strip wires.

E.V. Ponizovskaya<sup>1</sup>, M. Nieto-Vesperinas<sup>2</sup> and N. Garcia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratorio de Física de Sistemas Pequeños y Nanotecnología,  
C.S.I.C., c/Serrano 144, 28006 Madrid

<sup>2</sup> Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Madrid, Consejo  
Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,  
Campus de Cantoblanco Madrid 28049, Spain

March 22, 2024

## Abstract

This paper shows that the effective dielectric permittivity for the metamaterials used so far to obtain left-handed materials, with strip wires 0.003cm thick, is dominated by the imaginary part at 10.6–11.5 GHz frequencies, where the band pass filter is, and therefore there is not propagation and the wave is inhomogeneous inside the medium. This is shown from finite-difference time-domain calculations using the real permittivity values for the Cu wires. For thicker wires the losses are reduced and the negative part of the permittivity dominates. As the thickness of the wires is critical for the realization of a good transparent left-handed material we propose that the strip wires should have thickness of 0.07–0.1cm and the split ring resonators 0.015–0.03cm thick.

The subject of left-handed materials (LHM) is at present a prominent field in optics and physics, due to the intriguing possibility of performing negative refraction [1]. Both claims using metamaterials [2], and disclaims [3], of observation of a negative refraction index have been done. The disclaims were based on the fact that losses are important in the structures so far built to observe negative refraction, and therefore the electromagnetic waves are inhomogeneous in those metamaterials. Hence, for experiments with a wedge-shaped geometry, there is a problem of correctly interpreting the transmission measurements due to the non uniform absorption in such a sample.

This letter points that the losses, for transmission of waves in metamaterials, are critically depending of the thickness of the wires and of the permittivity of the

wires used. This is done by performing finite-differences time-domain (FDTD) simulations. By using strip wires thicker than those used in [2] of 0.003 cm thick, one can still have a negative effective refractive index in the structure, like claimed in [2], but much smaller losses than in their structure employed in the experiment of [2] obtaining a good transparent LHM.

To show our line of argument, we point out first an error in calculations by Shelby et al. [4]. More specifically Fig. 5 of [4] is off by ten orders of magnitude. We also conclude that the value of the damping constant  $g$  of the magnetic permeability and dielectric permittivity that sets attenuation of the wave propagation, is not 1 GHz at the band pass frequencies: 10.6–11.5 GHz of the experiments of [4]. In fact the authors of [4] argue "To match the measured attenuation of the propagation band we set  $g = 1$  GHz, suggesting this structure has relatively large losses". The value of their calculation is given from Fig. 5 of ref. 4 in Fig. 1a. However this is in error as we have checked. Our calculation in the homogeneous materials approximation that the authors of ref. 4 point out to be valid (and we agree with this), by using Eq. (4) of our work [3], gives the result shown in Fig. 1b. This, as can be seen, is ten orders of magnitude smaller than that given in Ref. 4. There is no question that the correct result using the permeabilities, permittivities and the parameters of Ref. 4 is that of Fig. 1b. This corrects Fig. 5 of [4]. Fig. 1b also proves that the correctly calculated transmitted intensities are extremely small, and below the experimental detection threshold (−55 dB). Therefore, this disagreement with the experiments of [4] forces  $g$  to have to be much smaller than 1 GHz as reported there.

Interestingly, the same authors claim in the paper where they report to observe negative refraction [2], that the value of  $g = 0.01$  GHz. However, the metamaterial is the same as in [4]. So how can  $g$  be a factor of 100 different between both publications, being the same material? Further, in another recent paper [5] the same authors claim  $g = 2$  GHz from a fitting through transfer matrix method simulations. This value does not fit, however, the experiments of [4]. Nevertheless, the simulations of [5] do not have much connection with the experiment of [2] and [4] because the proper value for the permittivity of copper wires:  $2000 + (10^6 - 10^7)i$  is not used in the structure of the metamaterial of those simulations. Neither the proper thickness of the strip wires ( $d$ ) or the split rings resonator (SRR) of the experiment of [2] and [4]: (0.003 cm) is employed in [5]. The value used in [5] for the thickness is 0.025–0.033 cm (ten times larger than [2] and [4]). Also, whereas the experimental strip wires used are 0.03 mm thick, those of the simulation in [5] are 1 mm. The reason is that, as they argue in [5], they cannot calculate for the experimental wire size yet.

The above remarked confusion in the values of the damping constant  $g$  is due to two facts: (i) the expression used for the permittivity in [4] has nothing to do with reality, and should be ruled out as has brilliantly been proved by a recent comment by Walser et al. in [6] (see also the full FDTD calculations for the effective permittivity in Fig. 2), and (ii) estimations from the wires thickness indicate that  $g \sim 0.2 - 0.5$  GHz. Thus,

for modelling metamaterial structures that behave like a left-handed material, one should:

- (1) Study the effective permittivity of the structure as a function of both the frequency and of the strip wire thickness.
- (2) Carry out a similar study for the behaviour of the split ring resonators.
- (3) Combine the study for the strip wires and the resonators together.

We stress that the proper permittivity, and not approximations, of the metallic elements is required. We next show how the thickness of the wires is crucial to obtain a good transparent left-handed material.

Fig. 2(a) shows the effective permittivity versus frequency  $\omega$  of the incident microwave, for an array of copper wire strips ( $\epsilon_{cu} = 2000 + i10^6$ ) of square section with size 0.003 cm, (size of unit cell 0.5 cm), obtained through an FDTD calculation. This is the size of the strip wires of the experiments of [2] and [4]. As seen, the imaginary part of  $\epsilon$  is up to 1.5 for  $\omega < 5$  GHz, and is positive, about 0.5 near the microwave frequencies of interest around 11 GHz. On the other hand, the real part of  $\epsilon$  is small and practically zero for  $\omega$  around 11 GHz. So that clearly the permittivity at 11 GHz is dominated by its imaginary part and the real part is practically zero.

The absorption of the transmitted wave, shown in Fig 2(b) is rather large: -5dB near the frequency of the experiments, whereas at that same frequency the transmittivity is -15dB. This is for three rows of cylinders as the number of rows increases the transmittivity decreases. On the other hand, if the thickness of the wires is larger, 0.1 cm, as shown in Fig.3(a), the effective permittivity  $\epsilon$  of the structure now has a practically zero imaginary part, whereas its real part is now negative and large. Accordingly, the corresponding absorption and transmittivity are now -20 and -60dB respectively (Fig.3(b)). Note however, that the important feature in these curves is the absorption distribution, which is large for the thin wires, and small for the thicker wires. Analogous things happen for  $\mu$  that has a negative real part and zero imaginary part for the thicker SSRs, the product  $\epsilon\mu$  now becomes positive and the structure becomes dielectric with low losses.

In other words, in a structure where the imaginary part of  $\epsilon$  is large, like in the thin wires, the absorption will remain large for the whole wires plus SSR structure, the SSRs also being thin, produce a  $\mu$  that now has a negative real part and a not negligible imaginary part. Then the product  $\epsilon\mu$  being a complex number with a negative real part and a rather large negative imaginary part, therefore the effective refractive index  $n = (\epsilon\mu)^{1/2}$  having therefore a large imaginary component. Whereas for the thicker strip wires and thicker SSRs  $\mu$  has a negative real part and a negligible imaginary part, and then the structure has an effective product  $\epsilon\mu$  that is positive and the refractive index  $n = (\epsilon\mu)^{1/2}$  is a negative real number, the material behaving now like a transparent dielectric.

>From all these calculations we infer therefore that, in order to obtain a structure with low absorption and thus a transparent LHM with an effective

refractive index that is practically real and negative, one should make an array of SSRs and strip wires whose thickness are between 0.015–0.03cm, sometimes bigger than in [2] and [4] for the SSRs, and about 0.07 – 0.1cm for the strip wires.

This work has been supported by the Spanish DGICYT.

#### REFERENCES.

1. V.G. Veselago, Sov. Phys. Usp. 10, 509 (1968).
2. R.A. Shelby, D.R. Smith and S. Schultz, Science 292, 77 (2001).
3. N. Garcia and M. Nieto, Optics Lett. 27, 885 (2002).
4. R.A. Shelby, D.R. Smith, S.C. Nemat-Nasser and S. Schultz, Appl. Phys. Lett. 78, 489 (2001)
5. D.R. Smith, S. Schultz, P. Markos and C.M. Soukoulis, Phys. Rev. B 65, 195103 (2002)
6. R.M. Walser, A.P. Valanju and P.M. Valanju, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 119701-1 (2001).

#### FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig.1 (a) Calculation of ref. 4, Fig.5 using a value of  $\omega = 1\text{GHz}$  and the homogeneous medium approximation. This result is only ten orders of magnitude. The good calculation is presented in Fig. 1b.

Fig.2. (a) Real and imaginary part for the effective permittivity of a squared array of  $d = 0.003\text{cm}$  thick strip wires of Cu as used in the metamaterials [2,4]. The results are practically the same for two or three rows of wires. The calculation is for s-polarization, i.e. electric field parallel to the wires. The imaginary part dominates and the real part is practically zero at 12.1 GHz where the experiment shows the band pass. (b) shows the FDTD calculations (dots and rhombus) for the reactivity and transmittivity of the structure of wires. The lines are the fitting that give the values of  $\epsilon$  in (a) using the homogeneous medium approximation.

Fig.3(a) The same as in Fig.2a for wires  $d = 0.1\text{cm}$  thick. Now the real part is negative and dominates over the imaginary part. These data are obtained from the FDTD calculations in (b) by fitting the simulations data (dots and rhombus) using the homogeneous




Fig.1




Fig.2




Fig.3