

Comment on “Thermal Lifshitz force between an atom and a conductor with a small density of carriers”

The application of the Lifshitz theory to describe the thermal Casimir force in real materials leads to problems connected with the violation of Nernst’s theorem and contradictions with experiment [1]. The Letter [2] proposes a generalization of the Lifshitz theory taking into account the penetration of the static component of the fluctuating electric field into a conductor to a depth of the Debye-Hückel radius. We show that the proposed generalization is thermodynamically and experimentally inconsistent. The possible cause for this is indicated.

It was shown [3] that the proposed theory violates Nernst’s theorem for the fluctuating field in the case of dielectric plates made of semiconductors with the concentration of charge carriers, n , below critical, some semimetals, and solids with ionic conductivity. For these materials, n does not go to zero when temperature vanishes, but the conductivity σ goes to zero due to the vanishing mobility μ . The Letter [2] notes that “it is difficult to estimate the number of ions which are effective in mobility and screening” in SiO₂ glass. However, ionic charge carrier concentration can be obtained by the method [4] which allows measuring the concentration of just those charges which produce the screening effect. Then the T -dependence of μ is determined from the T -dependence of σ using $\sigma = |e|\mu n$. Because of this, it is incorrect to transfer the T -dependence from μ to n , as done in [5] to avoid the violation of Nernst’s theorem in [2, 5] for this class of materials.

The theory of [2] is also in disagreement with measurements of the difference Casimir force ΔF between an Au sphere and a Si plate in the presence and in the absence of laser light [6]. In Fig. 1 the dots labeled 1 show the quantity $\Delta F^{\text{theor}} - \langle \Delta F^{\text{expt}} \rangle$ (for absorbed power 4.7 mW) where ΔF^{theor} was computed using the standard Lifshitz theory with the conductivity of Si neglected in the dark phase. In the presence of light, charge carriers were taken into account by means of the plasma model. For dots labeled 2, ΔF^{theor} was computed using the theory of [2]. From Fig. 1 it follows that the theory of [2] is experimentally excluded at a 70% confidence level (the opposite conclusion obtained in [5] is based on an incorrect comparison of the experimental and theoretical results at different confidence levels).

According to [2], for SiO₂ the relaxation time is $\tau \sim 917$ hours and “at a such slow relaxation, the carriers mobility can hardly be important in any experiments”. This conclusion is in conflict with the formalism of [2] and in fact favors the prescription of [1] that for

dielectrics the dc conductivity should be disregarded. Physically, the theory of [2] includes the effect of screening, i.e., the formation of nonzero gradients of n . This situation is out of thermal equilibrium which is the basic applicability condition of the formalism of [2]. The violation of thermal equilibrium is the reason why the suggested theory is experimentally and thermodynamically inconsistent. For metals, the theory of [2], generalized in [5, 7], leads to the same results as the standard Drude model approach. These results are in violation of the Nernst theorem for metals with perfect crystal lattices [1] and are excluded by experiment at a 99.9% confidence level [8]. Therefore it would be premature to believe that the proposed theory, considering the static component of a fluctuating electromagnetic field as a classical external field with nonzero magnitude, leads to the resolution of existing problems.

B. Geyer,¹ G. L. Klimchitskaya,¹ U. Mohideen,² and V. M. Mostepanenko¹

¹Institute for Theoretical Physics, Leipzig University, D-04009, Leipzig, Germany

²Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

PACS numbers: 34.35.+a, 42.50.Nn, 12.20.-m

[1] G. L. Klimchitskaya and B. Geyer, *J. Phys. A* **41**, 164032 (2008).

[2] L. P. Pitaevskii, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 163202 (2008).

[3] G. L. Klimchitskaya *et al.*, *J. Phys. A* **41**, 432001 (2008).

[4] M. Tomazawa and D.-W. Shin, *J. Non-Cryst. Sol.* **241**, 140 (1998).

[5] V. B. Svetovoy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 163603 (2008).

[6] F. Chen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 035338 (2007).

[7] D. A. R. Dalvit and S. K. Lamoreaux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 163203 (2008).

[8] R. S. Decca *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 077101 (2007).




FIG. 1: Theoretical minus mean experimental differences of the Casimir force for the Lifshitz theory (label 1) and the theory of [2] (label 2) are shown as dots versus separation. The solid lines indicate 70% confidence intervals including all experimental and theoretical errors.