

University of Groningen

On the alleged breakdown of the Kirchhoff theory in the case of diffraction and interference by a two-dimensional array

Bronsveld, Paulus; Hoenders, B.J.

Published in:
Journal of Physics E%3A Scientific Instruments

DOI:
[10.1088/0022-3735/11/8/032](https://doi.org/10.1088/0022-3735/11/8/032)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1978

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Bronsveld, P. M., & Hoenders, B. J. (1978). On the alleged breakdown of the Kirchhoff theory in the case of diffraction and interference by a two-dimensional array. *Journal of Physics E%3A Scientific Instruments*, 11(8). DOI: 10.1088/0022-3735/11/8/032

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Letters to the Editor

On the alleged breakdown of the Kirchhoff theory in the case of diffraction and interference by a two-dimensional array

By treating a two-dimensional diffraction array Chapman and Butland (1977) encounter the following problem with respect to application of the standard result to the measurement of wire-cloth screens. In many cases sieve screens are so constructed that the filaments are smaller than the widths of the apertures.

Confusion may arise as to whether the filament or the aperture dimensions determine the diffraction pattern. The authors then state that this uncertainty points out a major defect in the Kirchhoff integral approach to interference-diffraction problems.

Although we agree with their final results we should like to correct their statements about an alleged breakdown of the Kirchhoff theory. According to the Babinet principle we have in the Kirchhoff approximation

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(ikx \sin \alpha) H_1(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp(ikx \sin \alpha) (1 - H_1(x)) dx = \delta(k \sin \alpha), \quad (1)$$

where $H_1(x)$ denotes the transmission function of the grating multiplied by the incoming plane wave. The first integral on the left-hand side of (1) leads to the following interference-diffraction pattern of a grating with an aperture of width b_x , a filament of width w_x and a pitch p_x :

$$I_x(\alpha) = \left(\frac{b_x \sin \beta_x \sin N\delta_x}{\beta_x \sin \delta_x} \right)^2 \quad (2)$$

with

$$\beta_x = (b_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha, \\ \delta_x = (p_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha$$

and

$$p_x = b_x + w_x.$$

The second integral on the left-hand side of (1) denotes the interference-diffraction pattern of the complementary grating with apertures where the other grating has opaque areas and vice versa. The Babinet principle therefore shows that the interference-diffraction patterns of a grating and the complementary grating add up to the image of the incoming plane wave.

We now compare equation (2) for the two complementary arrays. This simplifies to a comparison between $\sin [(b_x \pi / \lambda) \times \sin \alpha]$ and $\sin [(w_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha]$ or between

$$\sin [(b_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] \quad (3)$$

and

$$\sin [(p_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] \cos [(b_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] - \cos [(p_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] \sin [(b_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha]. \quad (4)$$

Only for $\sin [(p_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] = 0$ and $\cos [(p_x \pi / \lambda) \sin \alpha] = 1$ are both diffraction patterns identical and that is just the condition for a principal interference maximum, or the locations in the diffraction pattern where there is a non-zero intensity for large N .

However, this means that one cannot distinguish the diffraction patterns of the two complementary arrays, either for $b_x = w_x$, or for $b_x < w_x$ or $b_x > w_x$.

This ambiguity can be removed by taking into consideration the fact that for $k \sin \alpha = 0$ Babinet's principle still holds but results in a different value for the zeroth order in the two complementary arrays. We use the expressions given in the original paper for the m th order of interference in the normal array,

$$I_m(\alpha) = [(b_x N \sin \beta_m) / \beta_m]^2 \text{ with } \beta_m = b_x \pi m / p_x \quad (5)$$

and in the complementary array,

$$I_m(\alpha) = [(w_x N \sin \beta_m) / \beta_m]^2 \text{ with } \beta_m = w_x \pi m / p_x. \quad (6)$$

We then divide equations (5) and (6) by the zeroth order of the normal array,

$$I_0(0) = (b_x N)^2, \quad (7)$$

resulting in the two ratios

$$(\sin \beta_m / \beta_m)^2 \text{ and } [\sin \beta_m / (m\pi - \beta_m)]^2.$$

When plotted they produce figure 3 of the original paper implying a unique relation between the measured intensity ratio and b_x , w_x and p_x .

This has nothing to do with the alleged breakdown of the Kirchhoff theory because all the formulae used satisfy this theory.

Technical Physics Laboratory
University of Groningen
Groningen
The Netherlands
12 April 1978

P M Bronsveld
B J Hoenders

Reference

Chapman G D and Butland R 1977 A Fourier transform method for the verification of wire screens for standard sieves
J. Phys. E: Sci. Instrum. **10** 621-6