

Reply to the Comment [arXiv:0810.3247v1] by G. L. Klimchitskaya et al. on "Application of the Lifshitz theory to poor conductors"

Vitaly B. Svetovoy

MESA+ Research Institute, University of Twente, PO 217, 7500 AE Enschede, The Netherlands

(Dated: December 6, 2018)

It is shown that the claims expressed in the Comment arXiv:0810.3247v1 against my paper Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 163603 (2008) are obviously wrong or not essential.

The authors of the Comment [1] on my Letter [2] put forward a number of points, which they consider as erroneous. To my opinion the Comment does not appear to be scientifically valid. Below it is shown that the claims are obviously wrong or not essential to my Letter.

Before going into details let me enumerate the blames expressed in the Comment to summarize the statements and for the convenience of the following references.

1. (i) Spatial dispersion is taken into account approximately; (ii) one can define the nonlocal dielectric function only for infinite medium; (iii) specular reflection is not a good approximation.
2. Uncertainty in n , $\Delta n = 0.4 \times 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, was determined in [3] at 95% confidence level, but the author of the Letter did not indicated it.
3. Nonlocal approach does not agree with the force measured in [4].
4. Temperature dependence of the charge concentration for ionic conductors is incorrect. As the result the Nernst theorem is broken for ionic conductors.

The claim 4. is equally applied to Refs. [5, 6].

1. (i) Any physical theory can describe the nature only approximately. Indeed, the random phase approximation gives only approximate expression for the dielectric function, which works well at the wave numbers $k \ll k_F$, where k_F is the Fermi wave number. In the Casimir problem typical wave numbers are $k \sim 1/a \ll k_F$, where a is the distance between bodies. All that was explained in the Letter and the authors of the Comment did not propose anything to overturn my argumentation.

(ii) The nonlocal dielectric function can be easily defined for infinite medium but in reality all bodies have boundaries. This is true in general for all problems where spatial dispersion is important. The nonlocal response for infinite medium can be used to build a correct solution for semi-infinite body using methods developed in the theory of anomalous skin effect.

(iii) In the Letter I have chosen the specular reflection of electrons on the body surfaces as the most simple boundary condition. Diffusive and partly specular conditions were discussed in the literature. The preferable condition depend on the quality of the surface. If de Broglie wavelength of electrons is large in comparison with the

root-mean-square roughness of the surface then the electron reflection can be considered as specular. This condition is true for semiconductors used in microtechnology and for metallic films with low roughness ($\lesssim 1 \text{ nm}$). The fact that the Debye screening was successfully reproduced in the Letter also shows that this boundary condition is reliable. It was demonstrated many times in the literature that for partly specular or diffusive boundary conditions the qualitative conclusions will be the same. For example, the impedance of anomalous skin effect varies only 10% when the boundary condition continuously changes from specular to diffusive [7].

In the Comment we find: "for spatially dispersive materials the scattering of charge carriers is neither specular nor diffuse [8]." The authors of the Comment give wrong interpretation of the paper [8], where scattering of electrons was not even discussed. The paper was devoted to a macroscopic approach to spatial dispersion that is justified at some specific conditions. This approach is less general than the microscopic approach (scattering of electrons).

2. In the Letter I did not indicate that in the expression [3] $n = (2.1 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{19} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, the error was determined at 95% confidence level (CL). I could not even do this because it was not mentioned anywhere in Ref. [3]. Equation (16) in this paper was used to estimate the error. The input values of τ and w for this equation were defined with one standard deviation error, 1σ (68% CL). In equation (17), above it, below it, or anywhere else it was not indicated that the error is not standard. The paper [3] is a document which I cannot change.

Anyway it is clear from Fig. 1(a) of the Comment that deviation of the nonlocal theory from the experiment is hardly convincing. Even smaller deviations realized for the exciting power $P = 8.5 \text{ mW}$ as one can estimate from Fig. 1(b) in the Letter reducing the width of the gray stripe. Deviation of a physical theory from experiments on the level of 1σ cannot be considered seriously.

3. For good metals at room temperature the nonlocal effects are negligible. It is clear from Eq. (13) and Ref. [16] in the Letter. This is because the Thomas-Fermi screening length for good metals is very short, $k_D^{-1} \sim 1 \text{ \AA}$. That is why the gray stripe shown in Fig. 1(b) of the Comment has nothing to do with the spatial dispersion effect. Moreover, the reference to the experiment [4] is irrelevant at all since in this experiment the optical properties of used Au films were not measured. The force was calculated for some imaginary material (perfect sin-

gle crystal in far infrared (IR) and some film in IR and higher frequencies) and then compared with the experiment. Recently it was shown experimentally that this procedure is wrong [9]: optical properties of different Au samples are significantly different.

4. The authors of the Comment state that density of charges for ionic conductors does not depend on the temperature. They refer to the paper [10] where the opposite is stated (see the last paragraph in Sec. 5): "... the conductivity change with temperature is accompa-

nied by the change in the charge carrier concentration." It is clear from general physical consideration that at low temperature the density of charges must disappear exponentially. The charges in an ionic conductor appear due to dissociation of neutral molecules. At finite T at equilibrium the charge density $\sim e^{-E_a/T}$. When T decreases these charges are neutralized by the same exponential law if one follows the equilibrium state. In absence of equilibrium the entropy can stay finite at $T = 0$.

-
- [1] G. L. Klimchitskaya, U. Mohideen, V. M. Mostepanenko, arXiv: 0810.3247v1.
- [2] V.B. Svetovoy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 163603 (2008).
- [3] F Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 035338 (2007).
- [4] R. S. Decca *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **51**, 963 (2007).
- [5] L. P. Pitaevskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 163202 (2008).
- [6] D. A. R. Dalwit and S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 163203 (2008).
- [7] L. E. Hartmann and J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **151**, 430 (1966).
- [8] J. T. Foley and A. J. Devaney, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3104 (1975).
- [9] V.B. Svetovoy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 035439 (2008).
- [10] M. Tomozawa and D-W Shin, J. Non-Cryst. Sol. **241**, 140 (1998).