

Size Matters: Lorentz Boosted Casimir Effect

Yu-Song Cao^{*1,2}, YanXia Liu^{†1}, Ding-Fang Zeng^{‡2}

¹School of Physics and Astronomy, Yunnan University, Kunming 650091, PR China

²School of Physics and Optoelectronic Engineering, Beijing University of Technology, Beijing, China

Abstract

Many evidences appear in the past decades and show that the negativity of Casimir energy is responsible for exotic mechanical and gravitational effects. We study in this work the Lorentz boost of a Casimir cavity, on which little attention is paid to its momentum in historical works. We find that the vacuum energy and momentum carried by the cavity transform differently from those of point particles due to the cavity's extension feature. However, the mass-shell condition of the two are identical as long as the cavity is finite along the moving direction only.

1 Introduction

Casimir effect is a manifestation of quantum fluctuations so that even two neutral conductors get attracted to each other when placed in vacuum [1, 2]. This attraction arises from the vacuum energy's change, which is negative, and the positivity of such change's derivative with respect to the two conductors' separation

$$\frac{E}{A} = -\frac{\pi^2 \hbar c}{720a^3}, \quad \frac{dE}{da} > 0. \quad (1)$$

Since in special relativity, negative energy means negative mass, the negativity of Casimir energy is presumed responsible for many exotics such as mechanical instability [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], repelling gravitation forces [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17] and supporting of traversable wormholes [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24].

In references[3, 4, 5], an elegant method was introduced to calculate the Casimir energy of a rotating Casimir ring in the non-relativistic limit. By this method, the Klein-Gordon equation was first written down in the lab frame with time dependent boundary condition. After that, a Galileo transformation brings the system into the co-moving frame of the cavity so that the mode function and vacuum energy can be obtained with no difficulty. Finally an inverse Galileo transformation brings the mode function back into the lab frame, with which the Casimir energy can be calculated. This way, the author observes the expected mechanical instability of the Casimir

*caoyusong15@mails.ucas.ac.cn

†yxliu-china@ynu.edu.cn

‡dfzeng@bjut.edu.cn

effect. However, this operation cannot be done the other way because the Klein-Gordon equation is not invariant under the non-inertial transformation between the static and rotating frames.

In this work we will apply this method to a uniformly moving Casimir cavity. This question was previously studied in [25, 26, 27] and recently in [28], where interests were focused on local quantities such as the energy-momentum tensor and field correlations. In [29, 30], the inertia of the Casimir cavity is defined as the motional force against acceleration, which is accompanied by particle creation. This way, the inertia of the Casimir cavity can not be identified as the static Casimir energy aprior. As we will see, our results indicates the similar. Our objective in this work is the transformation property of the Casimir energy and momentum of the Casimir cavity, both are non-local quantities. Because both the lab and co-moving frames are inertial, we expect the the method of [3, 4, 5] can be done in either ways. That is, we can take the Klein-Gordon equation in co-moving frame as prior and modify the field equation in lab frame in non-relativistic limit and vice versa. However, we find that the two ways produce inequivalent results! To understand this inconsistency, we analyse the system exactly in the framework of special relativity without Galileo approximation. We find that it is the non-relativistic approximation, not the method itself that causes the inconsistency. We notice that the Lorentz contraction of the cavity plays a crucial role in obtaining the correct result. The Casimir energy and momentum of the cavity transform differently from that of point particles but their combination still satisfies the mass-shell condition as long as the cavity is finitely extended along the moving direction only.

Our paper is organised as follows: In Sec.2, we calculate the Casimir energy and momentum of one dimensional cavities in the non-relativistic limit following the routine of [3, 4, 5] and the other way around. We show the results obtained from the two directions contradict with each other and cannot be resolved without tampering the whole calculation process. In Sec.3, we present the self-consistent calculation under full relativistic treatment, which is the main content of the work. Some discussions will be given there accordingly. In Sec.4, we show that our calculation can be done on cavities with more general geometries in higher dimension and present a working example. In Sec.5, we draw our conclusion and give some discussions.

Throughout this work the mass of the cavity walls are neglected and the units will be chosen so that $\hbar = c = 1$.

2 Non-relativistic calculation

2.1 Standard treatment

Following the working line of [3, 4, 5], in $(1 + 1)$ dimension, the field equation of a Casimir cavity uniformly moving in the lab frame S is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right)\phi(t, x) &= 0, \\ \phi(t, vt) &= \phi(t, vt + L), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $v \ll 1$ is the velocity at which the cavity is moving and L is the cavity length. By applying Galileo coordinate transformation from the lab frame S to co-moving frame S'

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t'} - v \frac{\partial}{\partial x'}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x'} \tag{3}$$

the field equation in S' -frame becomes

$$\begin{aligned} [(\frac{\partial}{\partial t'} - v\frac{\partial}{\partial x'})^2 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^2}]\phi(t', x') &= 0, \\ \phi(t', 0) = \phi(t', L) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Solutions of Eq.(4) can be mode expanded as

$$\phi(t', x') = \sum_n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega'_n}} (a_n e^{-i\omega'_n t'} f_n(x') + h.c.), \quad (5)$$

where $f_n(x')$ are the spatial mode function. Substituting this mode expansion into Eq.(4), we will have

$$(1 - v^2)f''_n - 2iv\omega'_n f'_n + (\omega'_n)^2 f_n = 0, \quad (6)$$

as results

$$f_n(x') = e^{\frac{iv\omega'_n}{1-v^2}x'} \sin \frac{n\pi x'}{L}, \quad (7)$$

The orthogonality of this mode function set can be verified

$$\int_0^L dx f_n(x) f_m^*(x) = \delta_{n,m}. \quad (8)$$

Eq.(6) gives rise to the corresponding spectra

$$\omega'_n = (1 - v^2) \frac{n\pi}{L}. \quad (9)$$

So the vacuum energy in S' -frame can be written as

$$E_m = (1 - v^2)m_0, \quad (10)$$

where m_0 is the Casimir energy of a static cavity

$$m_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \frac{n\pi}{L} = -\frac{\pi}{24L} < 0. \quad (11)$$

Note here the Casimir energy of the cavity is $E_m = (1 - v^2)m_0$ instead of m_0 , which is not expected. However, this does not concern because the variation is of $\mathcal{O}(v^2)$ and it would be cancelled by corrections of special relativity.

Applying the coordinate transformation to the mode function in Eq.(7), we will get the mode function in S -frame

$$f_n(x) = e^{iv\omega_n(x-vt)} \sin(\omega_n(x - vt)), \quad (12)$$

where $\omega_n = \frac{n\pi}{L}$ and the orthogonality relation now takes the form

$$\int_{vt}^{vt+L} dx f_n(x) f_m^*(x) = \delta_{n,m}. \quad (13)$$

The Casimir energy of the cavity in S -frame can be calculated in terms of the energy-momentum tensor

$$E_s = \int_{vt}^{vt+L} dx \langle 0 | T^{00} | 0 \rangle = (1 + 2v^2 + v^4)m_0, \quad (14)$$




Figure 1: Velocity dependent of Casimir energy. We use Klein-Gordon equation in (a) lab frame and (b) co-moving frame. Here we set $m_0 = 1$.

which is obviously but importantly, time independent, as shown in Fig.1(a). The figure tells us that the Casimir cavity is mechanically unstable. The momentum of the cavity can be calculated with similar manners

$$P_s = \int_{vt}^{vt+L} dx \langle 0 | T^{01} | 0 \rangle = m_0(v + v^3). \quad (14')$$

2.2 The other way around

What would happen if we start with the Klein-Gordon equation in S' -frame?

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t'^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^2} \right) \phi(t', x') &= 0, \\ \phi(t', 0) &= \phi(t', L) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Obviously the Casimir energy in S' -frame would be $E_m = m_0$. When transforming into S -frame, the Klein-Gordon equation will become

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + v \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right)^2 - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \right] \phi(t, x) &= 0, \\ \phi(t, vt) &= \phi(t, vt + L). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

While the mode functions read

$$g_n(t, x) = e^{-i\omega_n t} \sin[\omega_n(x - vt)], \quad (17)$$

whose orthogonality can be verified similarly. Integrating the energy-momentum tensor we obtain the Casimir energy and momentum in S -frame as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt+L} dx \langle 0|T^{00}|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \omega_n \left(1 + \frac{v^2}{2}\right) = m_0 \left(1 + \frac{v^2}{2}\right), \\ P_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt+L} dx \langle 0|T^{01}|0\rangle = m_0 v. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Comparing Eqs.(18) and (14)-(14'), we see that the momentum calculated from the two roads match to their lowest order in $\mathcal{O}(v)$. But the energy calculated does not at their lowest order $\mathcal{O}(v^2)$. This discrepancy forbids us to ascribe the mismatch to the correction of relativity effects. This puts the results above as well as those given in references [3, 4, 5] in danger and makes their validity questionable. A full relativistic treatment of the problem is needed.

3 Relativistic calculation

The mismatch between the two results above arises from the improper use of Galileo transformation on the scalar field equation and boundary conditions. Remarks from here are ambiguous. Our strategy in this section is to take the non-relativistic approximation off the table and make sure all calculations be done relativistically. To start with, we know that the first line of Eq.(15) holds. Since the Klein-Gordon equation is Lorentz invariant, its first line experiences no changes in the S -frame. When the boundary condition is concerned, the Lorentz contraction of the cavity must be considered, as sketched in Fig.(2). In S -frame, the field equation and boundary conditions become

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\right)\phi(t, x) &= 0, \\ \phi(t, vt) &= \phi\left(t, vt + \frac{L}{\gamma}\right) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where L is the proper length of the cavity and $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v^2}}$ is the Lorentz contraction factor.

The Casimir energy in S' -frame is simply $E_m = m_0$. Following the identical procedure as previous section, the mode function in S frame can be written as

$$\phi_n(t, x) = e^{-i\omega_n \gamma(t - \beta x)} \sin(\omega_n \gamma(x - \beta t)), \tag{20}$$

where $\beta = v$. This mode functions are compatible with the boundary condition in Eq.(19). The orthogonality is preserved only when we take the Lorentz contraction of the cavity into account

$$\int_{vt}^{vt + \frac{L}{\gamma}} dx \phi_n(t, x) \phi_m^*(t, x) = \delta_{n,m}. \tag{21}$$

While in S -frame, the Casimir energy and momentum of the cavity can thus be calculated

$$\begin{aligned} E_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt + \frac{L}{\gamma}} dx \langle 0|T^{00}|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \sum_n \omega_n \gamma^2 (1 + v^2) = m_0 \frac{1 + v^2}{1 - v^2}, \\ P_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt + \frac{L}{\gamma}} dx \langle 0|T^{01}|0\rangle = \sum_n \omega_n \gamma^2 v = 2m_0 \frac{v}{1 - v^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$




Figure 2: Spacetime diagram of the Casimir cavity. Note that we used orthogonal coordinate to illustrate the Lorentz contraction factor, which does not precisely resemble the Lorentz spacetime. The red line is the world line of the right wall of the cavity while that of the left wall is coincide with the t' axis. The dashed line represents the cavity length measured in S' frame.

Eq.(22) suggests the energy and momentum do not obey the usual transform rule of Lorentz boost. The key to understand this fact lies in the non-triviality of the boundary condition of Eq.(19), especially in its velocity dependence. The form of the mode functions in Eq.(20) suggests that the boundary condition not only squeezes the eigen-modes with a Lorentz contraction factor, but also introduce mixes between the time and spatial component. This is a feature does not appear in calculations with static configuration. The denominator $1 - v^2$ suggests that the energy and momentum blows up as the speed of the cavity approaches that of the light $v \rightarrow 1$. This is obviously what is expected in a relativistic theory. In Fig.(3) we compare the velocity dependence of a relativistic point particle's energy with negative mass and that of an Casimir cavity with finite extension.

When non-relativistic approximation is made on Eq.(22), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} E_s &= m_0(1 + 2v^2), \\ P_s &= 2m_0v, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

This suggests that the Casimir cavity should not be treated as point particles in any circumstances. Researchers focus on the energy expression may conclude that the inertia of the cavity is four times to its energy, while those focus on the momentum expression may argue that the inertia is two times of the Casimir energy. This implies that the definition of inertia of Casimir cavity need be carefully examined.

Even though the Casimir energy and momentum has their own ways of transformation under boost, their combination still satisfy the mass-shell condition,

$$E_s^2 - P_s^2 = m_0^2. \tag{24}$$




Figure 3: The yellow line represents velocity dependence of the energy of a negative mass particle obeying Lorentz transformation while the blue line represents that of Casimir cavity.

This is somewhat surprising! It should be noted that Eq.(24) is also valid for configurations in higher dimensions, as long as the the cavity geometry is infinitely extended on directions perpendicular to its moving direction, as sketched in Fig.(4).

4 Higher dimensions

The calculations conducted here can be shifted to cavities in higher dimensions routinely. Here we show calculations for the (2 + 1) dimensional rectangular cavity, which sets the tone for general cases.

In S' -frame, the field equation reads

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t'^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x'^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y'^2} \right) \phi(t, x', y') &= 0, \\ \phi(t', 0, y') = \phi(t', a, y') = \phi(t', x', 0) &= \phi(t', x', b) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where a and b is the proper length of the cavity along x and y axis, respectively. The Casimir energy in this frame can be derived straightforwardly [5]

$$E_m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n,m} \omega_{n,m} = \frac{\pi}{48} - \frac{\zeta(3)b}{16\pi a^2} + \frac{\pi}{a} G\left(\frac{b}{a}\right), \quad (26)$$

where $\omega_{n,m} = \sqrt{k_n^2 + p_m^2}$, $k_n = \frac{n\pi}{a}$, $p_m = \frac{m\pi}{b}$ and the function $G(x)$ is defined in [5].

In S frame, our field equation and boundary condition become

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \right) \phi(t, x, y) &= 0 \\ \phi(t, vt, y') = \phi(t, vt + \frac{a}{\gamma}, y') = \phi(t, x', 0) &= \phi(t, x', b) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

so the mode expansion functions read

$$\phi_{n,m}(t, x, y) = e^{-i\omega_{n,m}\gamma(t-\beta x)} \sin(k_n\gamma(x-\beta t)) \sin(p_m y), \quad (28)$$




Figure 4: Configuration finite (a) only and (b) not only along moving direction.

whose orthogonal relation can be verified similarly. By the calculation logic of (20)-(22), the Casimir energy and momentum in S -frame can be obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt + \frac{a}{\gamma}} dx \int_0^b dy \langle 0 | T^{00} | 0 \rangle = \gamma^2 (1 + \beta^2) \sum_{n,m} \left(\frac{\omega_{n,m}}{2} + \frac{k_n^2}{2\omega_{n,m}} \right), \\
 P_s &= \int_{vt}^{vt + \frac{a}{\gamma}} dx \int_0^b dy \langle 0 | T^{01} | 0 \rangle = \gamma^2 \beta \sum_{n,m} \left(\frac{\omega_{n,m}}{2} - \frac{k_n^2}{2\omega_{n,m}} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Obviously this has no similar and simple form as that in Eq.(22). The mass-shell condition also becomes hard to verify if it is still the same as that of point particles. However, if such a condition is imposed as necessary, then we will get a highly non-trivial subtraction or regularisation rule for the infinite summation in (29).

5 Conclusion and discussion

In this work we showed that applying the method of references [3, 4, 5] to the calculation of Casimir energy and momentum of uniformly moving cavities under non-relativistic limit will lead to conflicting results and demonstrated the way to fix this inconsistency. We find that the Casimir energy and momentum transform differently from that of usual particles under Lorentz boost. However, the mass-shell condition of the two remains identical. We showed that our calculations can be generalised to higher dimensional Casimir cavities and yield non-trivial subtraction or regularisation rules for the infinite summation involved in the vacuum energy definition.

The most dramatic feature in our result is that the Casimir energy and momentum transform according to Eq.(22) instead of the usual Lorentz boost rule. This is somewhat counterintuitive as one may expect that the renormalised energy-momentum tensor in the presence of finite boundary obey Lorentz transformation rule

$T^{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \Lambda_{\rho}^{\mu} \Lambda_{\sigma}^{\nu} T^{\rho\sigma}$ as derived in [28]. Thus the energy density will receive a factor γ^2 under Lorentz boost, where one of them will be cancelled by the Lorentz contraction factor of the cavity so that the final expression has Lorentz transformation rules the same as usual point particles. We note that the boundary condition of Eq.(19) affects solutions of the field equation non-trivially, as we explained above. Here we make a more detailed pass over this issue. Comparing Eq.(19) with Eq.(15) we can see that although the Klein-Gordon equation is invariant under Lorentz boost, the boundary condition is not. Since the solution of partial differential equations is very sensitive to the boundary condition, we expect the solution of Eq.(19) and Eq.(15) to be very different. Therefore, more concern should be taken when dealing with the field equation in the presence of boundaries.

In [5], the author addressed his concern on the applicability of regularisation schemes in non-inertial frame. In this work since we are working in the inertial frames the whole time, thus there is no concern for us on this issue. However, in this work, as well as in [3, 4, 5], we assumed the applicability of the regularisation schemes on the time-space mixed mode functions as prior. We think further study is required on this issue.

Nevertheless, we believe that our work provides insight on the topic of the regularisation of quantum fluctuations with moving boundaries, which is to be further studied. In the meantime, our results suggests that due the finite size feature the Casimir cavity cannot be treated as relativistic particles with negative mass. This may stimulate further directions on the gravitational effects of Casimir energy.

Acknowledgements

Y.-S. Cao gives his sincere thanks to A. Flachi and M. Edmonds for helpful discussion and suggestions. This research was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11875082 and No. 12204406 .

References

- [1] H. B. G. Casimir, On the attraction between two perfectly conducting plates. *Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet.*, **51**, 793 (1948).
- [2] S. Sparnaay, J. Physica, Measurements of attractive forces between flat plates. **24**, 751 (1958).
- [3] M. N. Chernodub, Rotating Casimir systems: Magnetic-field-enhanced perpetual motion, possible realization in doped nanotubes, and laws of thermodynamics. *Phys. Rev. D*, **87**, 025021 (2013).
- [4] A. Flachi and M. Edmonds, Quantum vacuum, rotation, and nonlinear fields. *Phys. Rev. D*, **107**, 025008 (2023).
- [5] M. N. Chernodub, Permanently rotating devices: extracting rotation from quantum vacuum uctuations? [arXiv:1203.6588](https://arxiv.org/abs/1203.6588).
- [6] M. Schaden, Quantization and Renormalization and the Casimir Energy of a Scalar Field Interacting with a Rotating Ring. [arXiv:1211.2740](https://arxiv.org/abs/1211.2740).
- [7] O. Corradini, A. Flachi, G. Marmorini, M. Muratori, and V. Vitagliano, Bosons on a rotating ring with free boundary conditions. *J. Phys. A*, **54**, 405401 (2021).

- [8] S. A. Fulling, K. A. Milton, P. Parashar, A. Romeo, K. V. Shajesh and J. Wagner, How does Casimir energy fall? *Phys. Rev. D*, **76**, 025004 (2007).
- [9] K. A. Milton, P. Parashar, K. V. Shajesh and J. Wagner, How does Casimir energy fall? II. Gravitational acceleration of quantum vacuum energy. arXiv:0705.2611.
- [10] K. V. Shajesh, K. A. Milton, P. Parashar and J. Wagner, How does Casimir energy fall? III. Inertial forces on vacuum energy. arXiv:0711.1206.
- [11] K. A. Milton, K. V. Shajesh, S. A. Fulling and P. Parashar, How does Casimir energy fall? IV. Gravitational interaction of regularized quantum vacuum energy. *Phys. Rev. D*, **89**, 064027 (2014).
- [12] F. Sorge and J. H. Wilson, Casimir effect in free fall towards a Schwarzschild black hole. *Phys. Rev. D*, **100**, 105007 (2019).
- [13] G. Bimonte, E. Calloni, G. Esposito and L. Rosa, Energy-momentum tensor for a Casimir apparatus in a weak gravitational field. *Phys. Rev. D*, **74**, 085011 (2006).
- [14] F. Sorge, Casimir effect in a weak gravitational field: Schwinger's approach. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, **36**, 235006 (2019).
- [15] F. Sorge, Casimir effect in a weak gravitational field. *Class. Quantum Grav.*, **22**, 5109-5119 (2005).
- [16] M. Karim, A. H Bokhari and B. J Ahmedov, The Casimir force in the Schwarzschild metric. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17**, 2459-2462 (2000).
- [17] E. Calloni, L. D. Fioreb, G. Esposito, L. Milanoa and L. Rosa, Vacuum fluctuation force on a rigid Casimir cavity in a gravitational field. *Phys. Lett. A*, **297** 328-333 (2002).
- [18] R. Garattini, Casimir wormholes. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 951 (2019).
- [19] A. C. L. Santos, R. V. Maluf and C. R. Muniz, Generating 4-dimensional Wormholes with Yang-Mills Casimir Sources. arXiv:2405.08774.
- [20] P. K. F. Kuhfittig, Noncommutative-geometry wormholes based on the Casimir effect. *JHEP Grav. Cosmol.* **9**, 295-300 (2023).
- [21] R. Garattini and A. G. Tzikas, Traversable Wormholes induced by Stress Energy Conservation: combining Casimir Energy with a scalar field. arXiv:2312.16736.
- [22] A. K. Mishra, Shweta and U. K. Sharma, Yukawa-Casimir Wormholes in $f(Q)$ Gravity. *Universe*, **9**, 161 (2023).
- [23] Z. Hassan, S. Ghosh, P. K. Sahoo and K. Bamba, Casimir wormholes in modified symmetric teleparallel gravity. *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 1116 (2022).
- [24] Z. Hassan, S. Ghosh, P. K. Sahoo and V. Sree Hari Rao, GUP corrected Casimir wormholes in $f(Q)$ gravity. *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **55**, 90 (2023).
- [25] M. Bordag, F.-M. Dittes, and D. Robaschik, Casimir effect with uniformly moving mirrors, Technical Report, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 1985.
- [26] J. Ambjörn and S. Wolfram, Properties of the Vacuum. I. Mechanical and Thermodynamic. *Ann. Phys.* **147**, 1-32 (1983).
- [27] M. Bordag, F.-M. Dittes and D. Robaschik, Casimir Effect With Uniformly Moving Mirrors. *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **43**, 1034 (1986).
- [28] M. J. Gorban, W. D. Julius and G. B. Cleaver, Lorentz boosted parallel plate Casimir cavity. *Phys. Rev. D*, **109**, 065007 (2024).

- [29] M. T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, Inertia of Casimir energy. *J. Phys. I (France)* **3**, 1093-1104 (1993).
- [30] M. T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, Motional Casimir force. *J. Phys. I (France)* **2**, 149 (1992).