

Reply to “Comment on ‘Temperature dependence of the Casimir force for lossy bulk media’”

V. A. Yampol'skii,^{1,2} Sergey Savel'ev,^{1,3} Z. A. Maizelis,^{1,2} S. S. Apostolov,^{1,2} and Franco Nori^{1,4}¹Advanced Science Institute, RIKEN, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan²A. Ya. Usikov Institute for Radiophysics and Electronics, NASU, 61085 Kharkov, Ukraine³Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom⁴Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA

(Received 8 May 2011; published 13 September 2011)

Here, we present an estimate of the characteristic wavelengths of the evanescent modes, which define the main contribution to the thermal part of the Casimir force. This estimate is more precise than the one in the preceding Comment by Bimonte *et al.* [*Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 036501 (2011)]. The wavelengths we derive are indeed smaller than the sizes of the interacting bodies. We also discuss the results of several experiments on the thermal effects in the Casimir force.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.84.036502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.036502)

PACS number(s): 31.30.jh, 11.10.Wx, 73.61.At

The authors of the Comment [1] on our paper [2] claim that the main contribution to the radiation term in the Casimir force comes from the TE evanescent waves if the material is described by the Drude model. They also claim that these waves provide about 99.7% of the thermal correction for the experimental separation of $l = 162$ nm, plasma frequency $\hbar\omega_p = 9$ eV, and relaxation frequency $\nu = 5.32 \times 10^{13}$ rad/s.

In our paper [2], we took these waves into account exactly and derived the difference ΔF_{rad} between the contributions to the Casimir force from thermal fluctuations in the cases of $\nu = 0$ and $\nu \rightarrow 0$ (see Eqs. (3)–(7) in Ref. [2]). It is important to note that our calculations are correct, and that the Comment [1] does not discredit them. Therefore, we do not understand why they wrote equivalent calculations [see Eqs. (1)–(8) in the Comment]. These formulas add nothing to ours.

The authors of the Comment [1] also pointed out that the main contribution to the integral in Eq. (7) in our paper comes from evanescent modes with wavelengths about or less than the separation l ; that is, smaller than the size of the sample. We agree with this estimation only for the case of large separations, when $l \gg c/\omega_p$. For the opposite case, when $l \ll c/\omega_p$, a simple analysis of the integral in Eq. (7) in our paper shows that the main contribution to this integral comes from $x \sim l\omega_p/c$, which corresponds to wavelengths on the order of $c/\omega_p \gg l$. However, even for this case, the characteristic values of the wavelengths are much smaller than the size of the sample.

The conclusion of the Comment [1] claims that: “...the problem of the disagreement between the experimental data of several experiments and the theoretical prediction of the thermal effect in the Casimir force, obtained by using Lifshitz theory in combination with the Drude model, remains unsolved”. In particular, in several previous papers, the authors of the Comment interpreted the measurements made in Ref. [3] as being in contradiction with the Drude model and in agreement with the so-called plasma model.

Unfortunately, these measurements were terminated arbitrarily at a maximum separation of 750 nm, which is the region where the $1/l$ force, due to expected patch potential effect, starts to become significant compared to the Casimir force. At such small separations, the relative difference between the predictions of the Drude and plasma models is very small, and it is hard to unambiguously judge the applicability of one of these models, based on those experimental results. In addition, the measurement technique relied on driving a mechanical oscillator, and the finite-amplitude motion caused a correction, which was impossible to assess based on the information in Ref. [3]. So, the work made in Ref. [3] can safely be considered to be incomplete. Recently, Sushkov *et al.* [4] have corrected for observed systematic effects due to the $1/l$ patch potential and position fluctuations of the plates, both of which were measured. Contrary to Ref. [3], the newer and more systematic experiments [4] included measurements made at room temperature $T = 300$ K and for large separations $l \sim 3 \mu\text{m}$, when the thermal force dominated over the force induced by quantum fluctuations. The results of the experiments [3] and [4] agree in the region where they overlap. The additional measurements made in Ref. [4], away from this common region, namely, for large distances, are in excellent agreement with the Casimir force calculated using the Drude model. Therefore, we expect that the experiments of Decca *et al.* [3], after a complete systematic study including measurements at larger distances, would also support the applicability of the Lifshitz theory in combination with the Drude model.

F.N. acknowledges partial support from the NSA, LPS, ARO, DARPA, AFOSR, NSF Grant No. 0726909, JSPS-RFBR Contract No. 09-02-92114, Kakenhi (S), MEXT, and the JSPS-FIRST program. S.S. acknowledges partial support from the EPSRC via Grant Nos. EP/D072581/1, EP/F005482/1, and the ESF AQDJJ network programme.

[1] G. Bimonte, G. L. Klimchitskaya, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 036501 (2011).[2] V. A. Yampol'skii, S. Savel'ev, Z. A. Maizelis, S. S. Apostolov, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 032511 (2010).[3] R. S. Decca, D. Lopez, E. Fischbach, G. L. Klimchitskaya, D. E. Krause, and V. M. Mostepanenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 077101 (2007).[4] A. O. Sushkov, W. J. Kim, D. A. R. Dalvit, and S. K. Lamoreaux, *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 230 (2011).