One–Loop Dominance in the Imaginary Part of the Polarizability: Application to Blackbody and Non–Contact van der Waals Friction
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Phenomenologically important quantum dissipative processes include black-body friction (an atom absorbs counterpropagating blue-shifted photons and spontaneously emits them in all directions, losing kinetic energy) and non-contact van der Waals friction (in the vicinity of a dielectric surface, the mirror charges of the constituent particles inside the surface experience drag, slowing the atom). The theoretical predictions for these processes are modified upon a rigorous quantum electrodynamic (QED) treatment, which shows that the one-loop “correction” yields the dominant contribution to the off-resonant, gauge-invariant, imaginary part of the atom’s polarizability at room temperature, for typical atom-surface interactions. The tree-level contribution to the polarizability dominates at high temperature.

PACS numbers: 31.30.jh, 12.20.Ds, 31.30.J-, 31.15.-p

Introduction.—Can a physical object experience friction effects, even if it is not in contact with a surface, i.e., even if the overlap of the wave function of the atom with the surface is negligible? This question has intrigued physicists for the last three decades, and the precise functional form of the non-contact friction of an atom-surface interaction has been discussed controversially in the literature [1–9]. Intuitively, if an ion moves parallel to a surface, at a distance a few (hundred) nanometers, then it is quite natural to assume that the motion of the mirror charge inside the material leads to Ohmic heating and thus, to a commensurate energy loss (friction force) acting on the atom flying by. The corresponding effect for a neutral atom is less obvious to analyze, but one may argue that the thermal fluctuations of the electric dipole moment of the atom may induce corresponding fluctuations of the mirror charge(s) of the constituent particles of the atom inside the material, again leading to Ohmic heating. The derivation relies heavily on the quantum statistical theory of thermal fluctuations of the electromagnetic field near a surface, and on the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [2,10,11]. For non-contact friction in the zero-temperature limit, even the existence of the effect still is subject to scientific debate [12–15]. Ultimately, non-contact friction effects limit the extent to which friction forces can be reduced in an experiment. These limits are important for three-dimensional atomic imaging [16], tests of gravitational interactions at small length scales [17], limits of magnetic resonance force microscopy [18], and they affect the behavior of micro-electro-mechanical systems (MEMS) at the nanometer scale [19].

Complementing the effect non-contact friction, the drag exerted by oncoming blue-shifted thermal black-body radiation on a moving atom has recently been analyzed for nonrelativistic neutral atoms as they travel through space [20]. Both the blackbody as well as the non-contact quantum (thermal) friction require as input the imaginary part of the atom’s polarizability, whose precise functional form for small driving frequencies is different depending on whether one uses (i) resonant Dirac-δ peaks [21], or the (ii) length-gauge or (iii) velocity-gauge expressions in the low-frequency limit (see Chap. XXI of Ref. [22] and Ref. [23]). Any theoretical prediction crucially depends on a resolution of the “gauge puzzle”, which is the subject of the current Letter. Quite surprisingly, a separation of the problem in terms of a rigorous quantum electrodynamic approach to the atom [24] leads to a natural separation of the resonant and the non-resonant (one-loop) effects. Perhaps even more surprisingly, the one-loop correction here dominates over the tree-level term, for typical materials and temperatures.

Imaginary Part of the Polarizability.—The calculation of the imaginary part of the polarizability relies on the following two observations. (i) One identifies the main contribution to the imaginary part of the polarizability with the imaginary part of an energy shift, namely, the

\[ \text{Imaginary Part of the Polarizability} \]

![Feynman diagram](image-url)
The imaginary part (cut of the diagram) is generated when the virtual photon becomes real, i.e., when the laser photon has the same energy as the spontaneously emitted photon.

The imaginary part is generated by one spontaneous emission photon, with $E$ denoting the laser photon, to a virtual state with the atomic reference state energy. However, when the absorption of a laser photon is accompanied by the spontaneous emission of another photon, then a transition to a final state $|\phi_f\rangle = |\phi, n_L - 1, 1_{k\lambda}\rangle$ becomes possible, where the laser fields retains $n_L - 1$ photons, while one photon is emitted into the mode $k\lambda$ (the state is $|1_{k\lambda}\rangle$ in the occupation number notation). The imaginary part of the ac Stark shift due to the diagrams in Fig. 2 is due to the dipole interaction $H_L$ ($z$-polarized laser) and the interaction Hamiltonian $H_I$ (other field modes),

$$\delta E^{(2)} = -\langle H_L G'(E_0) H_L \rangle = -\frac{I_L}{2c_0 c} \alpha(\omega_L),$$

$$\alpha(\omega_L) = e^2 \sum_\pm \langle \phi | z^\dagger G_A(E \pm \omega_L) z | \phi \rangle,$$

where $G'(z) = [1/(H_Q - z)]'$ is the reduced Green function for atom+field (with the reference state $|\phi_0\rangle$ excluded), while $G_A(z) = [1/(H_A - z - i\epsilon)]$ is the atomic Green function. The "reduction" of the Green function excludes the combined atom+field state $|\phi_0\rangle$ but not the atomic reference state $|\phi\rangle$. We assume that the atom’s reference state is spherically symmetric. The fourth-order energy shift leads to the diagrams shown in Fig. 2.

$$\delta E^{(4)} = -\langle H_I G'(E_0) H_L G'(E_0) H_L G'(E_0) H_I \rangle$$

$$-\langle H_L G'(E_0) H_I G'(E_0) H_I G'(E_0) H_L \rangle$$

$$-\langle H_I G'(E_0) H_L G'(E_0) H_I G'(E_0) H_L \rangle.$$

The three terms in Eq. (5) correspond to the diagrams in Fig. 2 (a), (b), (c), respectively. Let us consider the...
energy shift due to the diagram in Fig. 2(a),
\[\delta E_a = -e^4 \sum_{\ell,k} \frac{\hbar \omega_L}{2e_0 \epsilon_L} \left[ \left| \phi_0 \right| \langle \vec{\epsilon}_L \cdot \vec{r} \rangle (a_{\ell k}^L + a_{\ell k}^L) \right. \]
\[\times G'(E_0) z (a_{\ell k}^L + a_{\ell k}^L) G'(E_0) z (a_{\ell k}^L + a_{\ell k}^L) \left. \right| \phi_0 \rangle. \quad (6)\]
In order to calculate the imaginary part, one isolates the terms which correspond to the absorption from the laser field and emission into the spontaneous mode. Using the matching condition and summing over the polarizations of the spontaneously emitted photon, one obtains
\[\delta E_a \sim -e^4 \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{I_L}{2e_0} \frac{\hbar \omega_L}{2e_0} \left( \delta^{ij} - \frac{k^i k^j}{k^2} \right) \]
\[\times \langle \phi \left| z G_A(E - \omega_{\ell k}) x^i \right| G_A(E + \omega_L - \omega_{\ell k}) x^j \rangle. \quad (7)\]
The imaginary part due to the transition into the state $|\phi_j\rangle$ can be extracted from the relation $(1/x - i\epsilon) \rightarrow (P.V.) (1/x) + i\pi \delta(x)$, i.e., by projecting
\[G_A(E + \omega_L - \omega_{\ell k}) \rightarrow \frac{i}{\hbar} \delta(\omega_{\ell k} - \omega_L) |\phi\rangle \langle \phi|. \quad (8)\]
One finally obtains
\[\text{Im}(\delta E_a) = -\frac{I_L}{2e_0 \epsilon_L} \frac{\omega_L^2}{6\pi e_0 c^3} \left[ e^2 \left( \langle \phi \left| x^i G_A(E - \omega_L) x^j \right| \phi \rangle \right)^2 \right. \]
\[\left. \text{and after summing up the diagrams in Fig. 2(a), (b) and (c), the result is} \right. \]
\[\text{Im}(\delta E^{(4)}) = -\frac{I_L}{2e_0 \epsilon_L} \frac{\omega_L^2}{6\pi e_0 c^3} \left[ e^2 \left( \langle \phi \left| x^i G_A(E - \omega_L) x^j \right| \phi \rangle \right)^2 \right. \]
\[\left. + e^3 \left( \langle \phi \left| x^i G_A(E + \omega_L) x^j \right| \phi \rangle \right)^2 \right. \]
\[\text{so that Im}(\delta E^{(4)}) = -\frac{I_L}{2e_0 \epsilon_L} \frac{\omega_L^2}{6\pi e_0 c^3} |\alpha(\omega_L)|^2. \quad (9)\]
Matching with the second-order ac Stark shift given in Eq. 41, and adding the resonant contribution [Fig. 4(b)], one obtains
\[\text{Im}[\alpha(\omega_L)] = \text{Im}[\alpha_R(\omega_L)] + \frac{\omega_L^3}{6\pi e_0 c^3} |\alpha(\omega_L)|^2. \quad (10)\]
Here, $\text{Im}[\alpha_R(\omega_L)] = \text{Im}[\alpha_r(\omega_L)] - \text{Im}[\alpha_r(-\omega_L)]$ where
\[\text{Im}[\alpha_r(\omega_L)] = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{m} \frac{f_{mn}}{E_m - E} \delta(E_m - E + \hbar \omega_L) \quad (12)\]
is the resonant contribution. The dipole oscillator strength $f_{mn}$ reads as
\[f_{mn} = \frac{4}{3} e^2 (E_m - E) |\langle \phi | x^i \phi_m \rangle|^2 \quad (see Ref. 31). \]
The result (11) allows us to unify the formulas given in Eqs. (G2) and (G3) of Ref. 32, Eq. (49) of Ref. 33 and Eq. (15.83) of 34 into a single, compact result. Namely, the appearance of the square of the polarizability is otherwise ascribed to a radiative reaction force 32, 33, but finds a natural interpretation within a quantum electrodynamic (QED) formalism. The resonant contribution is the tree-level term in QED.

In velocity gauge, one replaces for the dipole coupling $-e \vec{r} \cdot \vec{E} \rightarrow -e \vec{r} \cdot \vec{A}/m_e$, where $m_e$ is the electron mass. From the diagrams in Fig. 2 one then obtains the energy shift given in Eq. 10, but with the replacement $\omega_L \rightarrow \omega_L$ in the prefactor, and $x^i \rightarrow p^i/m_e$ in the dipole matrix elements. The resulting expression is not identical to the length-gauge result (11) but there are additional diagrams to consider, given in Fig. 3 which involve the seagull Hamiltonian, proportional to the square of the vector potential. Using the commutator relation $p^i = i m_e [H - E + \omega_L, p^i]$ repeatedly, one can show that the additional terms from the diagrams in Fig. 3 restore the full gauge invariance of the result (11).

**Numerical Evaluation.**—We are concerned with the numerical evaluation of the blackbody friction integral (restoring SI mksA units)
\[\eta_{BB} = \frac{\beta \hbar^2}{12\pi^2 \kappa_0 c^4} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dw}{\sinh^2 \left( \frac{1}{2}\beta \hbar \omega \right)}, \quad (13)\]
which determines the blackbody radiation force $F = -\eta v$, and the non-contact friction integral (in SI mksA)
\[\eta_QF = \frac{3\beta \hbar^2}{32\pi^2 \kappa_0 Z^5} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dw}{\sinh^2 \left( \frac{1}{2}\beta \hbar \omega \right)} \left[ \frac{\epsilon(\omega) - 1}{\epsilon(\omega) + 1} \right], \quad (14)\]
for interactions with a dielectric. Here, $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$ is the Boltzmann factor, $Z$ is the distance to the wall, and $\kappa_0$ is the vacuum permittivity.

For low temperatures ($\beta \rightarrow \infty$), only small frequencies contribute to the friction forces and the imaginary part of the polarizability can be approximated as $\text{Im}[\alpha(\omega)] \approx \omega^3 |\alpha(0)|^2 / (6\pi e_0 c^3)$ Here, $\alpha(0)$ is the static polarizability of the atom, i.e., the low-frequency limit, where the resonant contribution in Eq. 11 can be neglected. Thus, the blackbody friction coefficient goes as $T^8$ for small temperatures,
\[\eta_{BB} \approx \frac{32 \pi^5}{135 \hbar^2 \alpha(0)^2} \frac{\alpha(0)}{m_e c^4} \approx \frac{512 \pi^7}{135 \alpha^6 \hbar m_e^6 c^{14}} \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha(0)^2}, \quad (15)\]
The subscript of the static polarizability indicates the system of units. In atomic units, the subscript a.u. indicates the reduced quantity, i.e., the “numerical value” 26, 35. The polarizability is normally given in atomic units in the literature 36, 38. Assuming that $\text{Im} [(\epsilon(\omega) - 1)/(\epsilon(\omega) + 1)] \sim \omega/\Omega_0$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$, where $\Omega_0$ is a characteristic frequency of the material, the van der Waals friction coefficient reads as
\[\eta_QF \approx \frac{\pi}{60 \hbar^3 \alpha^3} \frac{\alpha(0)^2}{\Omega_0^2 Z^5} = \frac{4 \pi^3 \hbar^3}{15 \alpha^6 m_e^3 c^3 \Omega_0^2 Z^5} \beta^4. \quad (16)\]
and thus is proportional to $T^4$ for low temperatures. For blackbody friction [Figs. 4(a)–(c)], numerical results are given in terms of the temperature-dependent attenuation time $\tau_{BB} = m_A/\eta_{BB}$, where $m_A$ is the mass of the atom (hydrogen or helium). The results for $\tau_{BB}$ are free from gauge ambiguities (cf. Figs. 2–4 of Ref. [24]). We also consider the CaF$_2$ van der Waals friction (for the temperature-dependent dielectric function, see Refs. [39, 40]). The numerical results can conveniently be expressed in terms of the damping constant $\gamma_0$, where

$$\frac{dv}{dt} = \frac{\eta_QF}{m_A} v, \quad \frac{\eta_QF}{m_A} = \gamma_0 \left( \frac{a_0}{\lambda} \right)^5,$$

and $a_0$ is the Bohr radius. A reference value at room temperature for metastable helium reads as $\gamma_0^{(He, 2^3S)}(298\text{K}) = 101.6\text{ s}^{-1}$, which is exclusively due to the one-loop contribution [second term in Eq. (11)]. The tree-level term given in Eq. (12) contributes $1.82 \times 10^{-5}\text{ s}^{-1}$ to $\gamma_0$ in the mentioned example.

Conclusions.—The imaginary part of the atomic polarizability can be formulated as the sum of a resonant tree-level, and a non-resonant one-loop contribution, which behaves as $\omega^3$ for small frequencies [see Eq. (11)]. This result holds for many-electron atoms; for transparency, the dipole coupling in the derivation outlined here is formulated for a single active electron. The one-loop dominance inverts the perturbative hierarchy of quantum electrodynamics. (The fine-structure constant, which is the perturbative coupling parameter of QED, remains ”hidden” in the square of the dynamic dipole polarizability, which is itself proportional to $e^2 = 4\pi\hbar\epsilon_0\alpha$.) The one-loop dominance is tied to the regime of low driving frequencies (on the scale of typical atomic transitions), which are commensurate with thermal photons at typical experimental conditions. It is surprising for a field theory with a small coupling parameter $\alpha \approx 1/137.036 \ll 1$.

Gauge-invariant results are calculated for the blackbody friction, and for CaF$_2$ van der Waals friction, for ground and selected excited states of hydrogen and helium (Fig. 4). These may be checked against future experimental results. The low-temperature limit of the blackbody and non-contact van der Waals friction is evaluated analytically in Eqs. (15) and (16). In this limit, the coefficients are proportional to the square of the static polarizability, and the friction coefficients are orders of magnitude larger for metastable $2^3S_1$ helium than ground-state helium. Our results finally clarify the gauge invariance of the imaginary part of the polarizability [25, 41]. The gauge-invariant formulation using asymptotic states confirms that the susceptibility of the atom, for small frequencies, is consistent with the length-gauge expression from Ref. [24] and Chap. XXI of Ref. [25].
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