

Comment on “Revisiting the divergent multipole expansion of atom-surface interactions: Hydrogen and positronium, α -quartz, and physisorption” (arXiv:2308.04656v3)

G.L.Klimchitskaya^{1,2}

¹Central Astronomical Observatory at Pulkovo of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint Petersburg, 196140, Russia

²Peter the Great Saint Petersburg Polytechnic University, Saint Petersburg, 195251, Russia

Recently U. D. Jentschura [Phys. Rev. A **109**, 012802 (2024)] rederived the multipole corrections to the dipole part of the atom-wall interaction described by the Lifshitz theory using the concept of volume dielectric permittivity. These corrections were computed for the hydrogen and positronium atoms in close proximity to the α -quartz wall and claimed to be numerically significant within the short-range regime. Here, it is shown that the application areas of the obtained expressions both in the short- and long-range asymptotic regimes are indicated incorrectly, in contradiction with those dictated by the Lifshitz theory. As a result, within the valid application areas, all multipole corrections to the Casimir-Polder dipole part of the atom-wall interaction turned out to be negligibly small.

Reference [1] recalculated the higher-order multipole corrections (quadrupole, octupole, and hexadecupole) to the Casimir-Polder dipole part of the atom-wall interaction energy described by the Lifshitz formula [2, 3]. According to Ref. [1], the obtained quadrupole correction is numerically significant for atom-surface interaction and modifies the van der Waals corrected values of adsorption energy obtained in the literature [4].

Below we show that the application areas of the short- and long-range regimes for the Casimir-Polder dipole part of atom-surface interaction and higher-order corrections to it are indicated in Ref. [1] incorrectly, in contradiction with the valid results established by the founders of the Lifshitz theory. As a consequence, the quadrupole and all other higher-order multipole corrections of Ref. [1], when computed in the proper areas of their validity, turn out to be negligibly small, as compared to the dipole part given by the Lifshitz formula.

The dipole part of the interaction energy $\mathcal{E}_1(z)$ between an atom and a wall separated by a distance z is given by the Lifshitz formula (Eqs. (24) and (25) of Ref. [1]). As to the quadrupole, $\mathcal{E}_2(z)$, octupole, $\mathcal{E}_3(z)$, and hexadecupole, $\mathcal{E}_4(z)$, corrections to it, they are given by Eqs. (34), (40), and (46) of Ref. [1], respectively. All the quantities $\mathcal{E}_l(z)$ with $l = 1, 2, 3$, and 4 are presented in the form of integrals along the imaginary frequency axis, where the integrands depend on the dipole, octupole, quadrupole, and hexadecupole atomic polarizabilities $\alpha_l(i\omega)$ and the dielectric permittivity of wall material $\varepsilon(i\omega)$.

According to Ref. [1], the short-range distance regime of the interaction energies $\mathcal{E}_l(z)$ holds at separations satisfying the conditions

$$a_0 \ll z \ll \frac{a_0}{\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$1 \text{ a.u. length} = a_0 = \frac{4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar^2}{e^2m_e} \approx 0.529 \text{ \AA} \quad (2)$$

is the Bohr radius, ε_0 is the permittivity of free space, e and m_e are the charge and mass of an electron, and $\alpha = e^2/(4\pi\varepsilon_0\hbar c) \approx 1/137$ is the fine structure constant.

From Eq. (1), one can conclude that, according to Ref. [1], the short-range regime holds for $z \geq 5 \text{ \AA} = 0.5 \text{ nm}$. In fact, by citing Ref. [5], Ref. [1] advocates that the short-range expressions are actually valid down to distance regions of a few angstroms away from the surface. The long-range regime, as stated in Ref. [1], holds at atom-wall distances

$$z \gg \frac{a_0}{\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

The analytic expressions for $\mathcal{E}_l(z)$ obtained in Ref. [1] in the short-range regime are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_l(z) \approx -\frac{C_{(2l+1)0}}{z^{2l+1}}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$C_{(2l+1)0} = -\frac{\hbar}{32\pi^2\varepsilon_0} \frac{l+1}{l} \int_0^\infty \alpha_l(i\omega) \frac{\varepsilon(i\omega) - 1}{\varepsilon(i\omega) + 1} d\omega. \quad (5)$$

The values of $C_{(2l+1)0}$ were computed for the atoms of hydrogen and positronium and the α -quartz wall using the multipole polarizabilities of these atoms and the improved formula for the dielectric permittivity of the wall material (see Tables II and III in Ref. [1]). To illustrate an importance of the quadrupole correction compared to the leading dipole term, Ref. [1] presents the ratio of \mathcal{E}_2 to \mathcal{E}_1 for a positronium atom at $z = 10 \text{ a.u.} = 0.529 \text{ nm}$ distance from the wall

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_2^{(\text{Ps})}(z = 10 \text{ a.u.})}{\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{Ps})}(z = 10 \text{ a.u.})} = \frac{C_{50}^{(\text{Ps})}}{C_{30}^{(\text{Ps})} \times 10^2} \approx 0.124. \quad (6)$$

For a hydrogen atom, Ref. [1] arrives at

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_2^{(\text{H})}(z = 10 \text{ a.u.})}{\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{H})}(z = 10 \text{ a.u.})} = \frac{C_{50}^{(\text{H})}}{C_{30}^{(\text{H})} \times 10^2} \approx 0.0296. \quad (7)$$

According to Ref. [1], the results obtained in the short-range and long-range limits of the Lifshitz formula for the Casimir-Polder energy \mathcal{E}_1 are consistent with those in Refs. [6–8]. The reader is not informed, however, that in Refs. [6–8] both the short- and long-range limits are understood in a completely different way than in Eqs. (1) and (3).

The point is that the Lifshitz theory is the semiclassical one. It describes the wall material as a continuous medium by means of the c -function, frequency-dependent volume dielectric permittivity, and only the fluctuating electromagnetic field is quantized. For this reason, already in the classical Lifshitz paper [9], it is stated that “We can however approach this problem in purely macroscopic fashion (since the distance between the bodies is assumed to be large compared to interatomic distances).” The same statement is repeated in the seminal paper [6]: “...one may approach the problem from a completely different and purely macroscopic point of view, in which the interacting bodies are considered as continuous media. This approach is valid because the distance between the two surfaces, although small, is large compared to the interatomic distances in the bodies.” The classical textbook [2], when discussing the allowed distances between the two plates or an atom and a plate in the Lifshitz theory, also states: “...this distance satisfying only the one condition that it is large compared with interatomic distances in the bodies.” This condition is necessary for a wall material to be described by the volume dielectric permittivity.

As to the upper bound of the short-range regime of the Lifshitz formula, Refs. [2, 3, 6–9] state that this regime extends to distances much shorter than the characteristic wavelength λ_0 in the absorption spectrum of the wall material. To summarize the above information, the originators of the Lifshitz theory found that the short-range regime of the Casimir-Polder interaction energy \mathcal{E}_1 holds not under the conditions of Eq. (1) used in Ref. [1] but under the inequalities

$$d \ll z \ll \lambda_0, \quad (8)$$

where d is an interatomic distance in the wall material. The same inequalities determine the short distance regime for all multipole corrections \mathcal{E}_l to \mathcal{E}_1 .

In contrast with Ref. [1], the long-range regime holds not under the condition (3) but at [2, 3, 6–9]

$$\lambda_0 \ll z \ll \frac{\hbar c}{k_B T} \approx 7.6 \mu\text{m}, \quad (9)$$

where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, T is the temperature and the room temperature value $T = 300\text{K}$ was used in the right-hand side of Eq. (9). At $T = 0$ the long-range regime extends from separations much larger than λ_0 to infinity.

The question arises what is the actual size of the quadrupole and higher-order multipole corrections to the dipole atom-wall interaction given by the Lifshitz theory? To answer this question, we consider the shortest

separation distance z_{\min} satisfying Eq. (8), where these corrections are the most pronounced. Keeping in mind that the lattice constants of α -quartz are approximately equal to 5 Å, we put $d = 0.5$ nm and choose z_{\min} equal to 4 nm = 75.61 a.u., i.e., by a factor of 8 larger than d .

Using the data of Table III in Ref. [1], we calculate the ratio of the quadrupole correction, \mathcal{E}_2 , to the main dipole part, \mathcal{E}_1 , for the atom of positronium separated by the distance z_{\min} from the wall made of α -quartz

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_2^{(\text{Ps})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})}{\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{Ps})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})} = \frac{C_{50}^{(\text{Ps})}}{C_{30}^{(\text{Ps})} \times (75.61)^2} \approx 2.2 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (10)$$

In a similar way, using the data of Table II in Ref. [1], for a hydrogen atom spaced at the same distance from the α -quartz wall one obtains

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_2^{(\text{H})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})}{\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{H})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})} = \frac{C_{50}^{(\text{H})}}{C_{30}^{(\text{H})} \times (75.61)^2} \approx 5.2 \times 10^{-4}. \quad (11)$$

Needless to say that all the higher-order multipole corrections are all the more insignificant. For instance, the ratio of $\mathcal{E}_3^{(\text{H})}$ to the main part $\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{H})}$ at the same minimum distance satisfying Eq. (8) is given by

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_3^{(\text{H})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})}{\mathcal{E}_1^{(\text{H})}(z = 75.61 \text{ a.u.})} = \frac{C_{70}^{(\text{H})}}{C_{30}^{(\text{H})} \times (75.61)^4} \approx 7.56 \times 10^{-7}. \quad (12)$$

It is necessary also to take into account that the optical data for a wall material used for calculating the dielectric permittivity along the imaginary frequency axis are measured with some error. This leads to approximately 0.5% error in the calculated values of $C_{(2l+1)0}$ [3]. One can conclude that, within the actual application area of the theory used for their calculation, all the higher-order multipole corrections to the main dipole part of the atom-wall interaction are negligibly small and their account is superfluous.

However, in order to support the application area (1) of the short-distance regime, Ref. [1] remarks that at $z = 0.5$ nm ≈ 10 a.u. the overlap between the wave functions of the ground-state hydrogen atom and the wall atoms is already negligibly small. In addition, Ref. [1] mentions the result [5] that at atom-wall separations down to 4–7 a.u. the interaction energy can be presented in the form

$$V(z) \approx -\frac{C_3}{(z - z_0)^3}, \quad (13)$$

where $C_3 = C_{(3)0}$ is defined in Eq. (5) with $l = 1$ and z_0 determines the position of the so-called reference plane locating the atom-wall separation. The value of z_0 in Eq. (13) was obtained from the sum of the Casimir-Polder energy \mathcal{E}_1 and the phenomenological correction to it of the form $-C_4/z^4$, which describes the lateral average potential with respect to positions of particles on the surface [4]. In so doing, the second-order perturbation

theory using the jellium model or the model of spherically symmetric nonoverlapping atoms was employed.

Both these remarks are in fact irrelevant to the application area (8) of the Lifshitz formula describing the atom-wall interaction, which makes it possible to consider the wall surface as a spatially homogeneous plane. Note that at the separation distances of 4 – 7 a.u. characteristic for a physisorption Ref. [5] also underlines the necessity for “a good treatment of the spatial variation of the interaction potential along the surface”, which is beyond the Lifshitz theory, and considers it as a problem to be solved in future. It should be taken into account that, although at such separations an overlap of the wave functions might be small, the adhesive forces play an important role. In any case, at separations below several interatomic distances d , the interaction energy should be calculated not semiclassically, but using, e.g., the methods of density-functional theory [10]. This conclusion remains unchanged when considering the generalization of the Lifshitz theory, which admits the spatially nonlocal dielectric permittivities. Although such permittivities take into account spatial information of the surface material, they can be introduced for only the model of continuous medium, i.e., the separation from the surface should be large enough to neglect the atomic structure. Thus, although Ref. [5] cannot be considered as an extension of the Lifshitz theory, it presents useful semiphenomenological method for a description of physisorption.

It is common knowledge that in the descriptions of complicated physical phenomena, such as physisorption, it is sometimes necessary to use the computational results obtained using different theoretical approaches outside of their application regions by joining them smoothly in the intermediate transition regions. Just this is the case when the results obtained by means of the density functional theory are combined with computations using

the Lifshitz theory. This does not mean, however, as erroneously made in Ref. [1], that the physically justified application region of the fundamental Lifshitz theory should be revised.

In addition to the interaction of an atom with a dielectric wall, Ref. [1] considers the dipole part of the atom-wall interaction for a perfectly conducting wall and the higher-order multipole corrections to it (see Eqs. (20)-(23) of Ref. [1]). It is stated that the short- and long-range regimes are again given by Eqs. (1) and (3), respectively. According to Ref. [1], the short-range expressions for $\mathcal{E}_l^{(H)}(z)$ and $\mathcal{E}_l^{(Ps)}(z)$ (Eqs. (54) and (55) of Ref. [1]) derived for a perfectly conducting wall “are actually valid down to distance regions of a few angstroms away from the surface.” This statement is, however, misleading because the walls made even of good conductors can be modelled by the perfect conductor only at atom-wall separations exceeding approximately $1 \mu\text{m}$ [3]. Therefore, the results of Ref. [1] obtained for a perfectly conducting wall in the limit of short separations are irrelevant to any physical system.

To conclude, the higher-order multipole corrections to the Casimir-Polder dipole part of the atom-wall interaction given by the Lifshitz theory are negligibly small. Relatively large values of the quadrupole correction indicated in Ref. [1] are explained by the fact that the obtained expressions were used outside the application area of the concept of volume dielectric permittivity.

Acknowledgments

This commentary was supported by the State assignment for basic research (project FSEG-2023-0016).

-
- [1] U. D. Jentschura, Revisiting the divergent multipole expansion of atom-surface interactions: Hydrogen and positronium, α -quartz, and physisorption, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 012802 (2024).
- [2] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics*, Pt. 2 (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1981).
- [3] M. Bordag, G. L. Klimchitskaya, U. Mohideen, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Advances in the Casimir Effect* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015).
- [4] J. Tao and A. M. Rappe, Physical Adsorption: Theory of van der Waals Interactions between Particles and Clean Surfaces, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 106101 (2014).
- [5] E. Zaremba and W. Kohn, Van der Waals interaction between an atom and a solid surface, *Phys. Rev. B* **13**, 2270 (1976).
- [6] I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, The general theory of van der Waals forces, *Usp. Fiz. Nauk* **73**, 381 (1961) [*Adv. Phys.* **10**, 165 (1961)].
- [7] V. B. Derjaguin, I. E. Dzyaloshinsky, M. M. Koptelova, and L. P. Pitayevsky, Molecular-Surface Forces in Binary Solutions. Discuss. Faraday Soc. **40**, 246 (1965).
- [8] M. Antezza, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Effect of the Casimir-Polder force on the collective oscillations of a trapped Bose-Einstein condensate, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 053619 (2004).
- [9] E. M. Lifshitz. The theory of molecular attractive forces between solids. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **29**, 94 (1955) [*Sov. Phys. JETP* **2**, 73 (1956)].
- [10] R. G. Parr and Y. Weitao, *Density-Functional Theory of Atoms and Molecules* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994).