



## Tunable Casimir Repulsion with 3D Topological Insulators



Adolfo G. Grushin NGSCES Santiago 2011



http://focus.aps.org/story/v27/stl

A. G. G., A. Cortijo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 020403 (2011)

A. G. G., P. Rodriguez-Lopez, A. Cortijo, arXiv: 1102. 0455 Phys. Rev. B in press

# OUTLINE

- Introduction
- Optical properties of TI's
- Repulsion! but where?
- A comment for real materials
- Conclusions



Casimir effect



• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:



 $\mathcal{H} = \sum \hbar \omega(\mathbf{k}) (a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2})$ H.B.G. Casimir, Proc. K. Ned. Akad. Wet. 51, 793 (1948).

• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:





• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:



 $\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hbar \omega(\mathbf{k}) (a_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2})$  $\mathcal{H}_{vac} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hbar \omega(\mathbf{k}) \quad \omega(\mathbf{k}) = c|\mathbf{k}|$ 

• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:



• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:



• Casimir (1948): Two uncharged metallic plates attract due to fluctuations of the zero point energy of the EM vacuum:



#### Maritime Analogy

 The effect is analogous to the attraction of two ships in the sea

#### Maritime Analogy

 The effect is analogous to the attraction of two ships in the sea





Fig. 1. Two ships roll heavily on a long swell and there is no more wind to damp their rolling. In this situation a strange force, "une certaine force attractive," will pull the two ships toward each other. From P. C. Causseé: "the Mariners Album," early 19th century.

P. C. Caussé (1836) : "...une certaine force attractive."

#### GENERALIZATION TO DIELECTRICS:

• Extension of the Casimir eff. to dielectric materials (1961):

$$\frac{E_c(d)}{A\hbar} = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\xi}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}}{(2\pi)^2} \log \det \left[1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \cdot \mathbf{R}_2 e^{-2k_3 d}\right]$$

I.E. Dzyaloshinskii, E.M. Lifshitz & L.P. Pitaevskii Adv. in Phys. 10, 38, (1961) Rahi *et al.* Phys. Rev. D 80, 085021 (2009)

> Reflection coefficients relate different components of the Electric field:



$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{s,s}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) & R_{s,p}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) \\ R_{p,s}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) & R_{p,p}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) \end{bmatrix}$$

Dielectric:

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{bmatrix} R_{s,s}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) & 0\\ 0 & R_{p,p}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}) \end{bmatrix}$$

• Lifshitz realized that to get repulsion:



## Repulsion if: $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_2$

• Lifshitz realized that to get repulsion:  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_2$ 



Proven experimentally! a b Net repulsive 100 Gold force ε 10-Bromobenzene Silica 1015 1016 2 it (rad s-1)

Munday et al. Nature 457, 170-173 (2009)

• Lifshitz realized that to get repulsion:  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_2$ 





Munday et al. Nature **457**, 170-173 (2009)

 However there are several theorems prohibiting repulsion in vacuum

Symmetric situations attract!



• Lifshitz realized that to get repulsion:  $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_2$ 



Proven experimentally! a b Net repulsive 100 Gold force ε 10-Bromobenzene Silica 1015 1016 2 it (rad s-1)

Munday et al. Nature **457**, 170-173 (2009)

 However there are several theorems prohibiting repulsion in vacuum

Restrictive constraints to stable equilibria: not accessible for dielectrics in vacuum



Rahi, S. J., Kardar, M. & Emig, T. Phys. Rev. Lett. 105, 070404 (2010).

#### WHY REPULSION?

 Fundamental question: Can we achieve a repulsive Casimir force in vacuum?

 Nanostiction and nanofriction: Reverting the Casimir force can be useful for MEMS and NEMS applications.

#### WHY REPULSION?

 Fundamental question: Can we achieve a repulsive Casimir force in vacuum?

 Nanostiction and nanofriction: Reverting the Casimir force can be useful for MEMS and NEMS applications.

• And people can be very enthusiastic about it...



• Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948



Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948

## 1948 Casimir proposes that two metallic plates attract each other due to fluctuating EM zero point energy E

Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948



Dzyaloshinskii et al. extension to dielectrics: Repulsion under certain conditions. No repulsion in vacuum



 $\varepsilon_1 > \varepsilon_3 > \varepsilon_2$ 

I.E. Dzyaloshinskii, E.M. Lifshitz & L.P. Pitaevskii Adv. in Phys. 10, 38, (1961)

Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948

## 1948 1961 1974



Timothy H. Boyer of the City University of New Y (Received 17 December 1973)

T. H. Boyer calculated the Casimir force for a perfect metallic plate and a "perfect" (  $\mu \to \infty$ ) magnetic plate: he found Repulsion!

Boyer, Phys. Rev. A 9, 2078 (1974)

UU d  $E_B(d) = -\frac{7}{8}E_c(d)$ 

Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948



Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948



Magnetoelectric materials are excluded from the theorems. Are they helpful to obtain repulsion in vacuum?

Less than 10 proposals for repulsion since 1948



#### 3D TOPOLOGICAL INSULATORS

- The two key ideas behind TI (both 2D and 3D):
  - 1) Strong spin orbit coupling
  - 2) Time reversal symmetry

Kane, Hasan Rev. Mod. Phys, 82 3045 (2010) Qi, Zhang arXiv:1008.2026 (2010)

#### 3D TOPOLOGICAL INSULATORS

• The two key ideas behind TI (both 2D and 3D):

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

Qi, Zhang arXiv:1008.2026 (2010)

 Start with a 3D T-invariant fermionic action describing an insulator:

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not\!\!D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$

 Start with a 3D T-invariant fermionic action describing an insulator:

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not\!\!D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$

• Perform a chiral transformation:  $\Psi=e^{i heta\gamma_5/2}\Psi'$ 

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not{\!\!D} - m e^{i\theta\gamma_5}) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$
$$m e^{i\theta\gamma_5} = m(\cos\theta + i\gamma_5\sin\theta)$$

 Start with a 3D T-invariant fermionic action describing an insulator:

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not\!\!D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$

• Perform a chiral transformation:  $\Psi = e^{i heta\gamma_5/2}\Psi'$ 

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not{D} - me^{i\theta\gamma_5}) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$
$$me^{i\theta\gamma_5} = m(\cos\theta + i\gamma_5\sin\theta)$$

This term breaks T unless:  $heta=0,\pi$ 

 Start with a 3D T-invariant fermionic action describing an insulator:

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not\!\!D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$

• Perform a chiral transformation:  $\Psi=e^{i heta\gamma_5/2}\Psi'$ 

$$S = \int dx^3 dt \bar{\Psi} (\not{D} - me^{i\theta\gamma_5}) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}$$
$$me^{i\theta\gamma_5} = m(\cos\theta + i\gamma_5\sin\theta)$$

This term breaks T unless:  $\theta = 0, \pi$   $\leftarrow$   $\theta = (2n+1)\pi$  TI  $\theta = 0$  Trivial

Theta classifies 3D TI

Theta classifies 3D TI

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_3.jpeg)

Theta classifies 3D TI

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

### $\theta = (2n+1)\pi \longrightarrow \text{Topological Insulator}$

![](_page_32_Picture_4.jpeg)

Theta classifies 3D TI

![](_page_33_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_4.jpeg)

 Fujikawa realized that the path integral measure is not invariant under a chiral transformation:

 $D\Psi^{\dagger}D\Psi = e^{i\int dx^{3}dt\theta \frac{e^{2}}{8\pi h}F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}}D\Psi^{'\dagger}D\Psi' \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F_{\rho\sigma}$ 

*Fujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**: 1195 (1979) Hosur et al. PRB 81, 045120 (2010)

 Fujikawa realized that the path integral measure is not invariant under a chiral transformation:

$$D\Psi^{\dagger}D\Psi = e^{i\int dx^{3}dt\theta \frac{e^{2}}{8\pi h}F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}}D\Psi^{'\dagger}D\Psi' \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F_{\rho\sigma}$$

*Fujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**: 1195 (1979) Hosur et al. PRB 81, 045120 (2010)

• So the action for a T-invariant TI is finally:

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \Psi^{\dagger} (\not D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \theta \frac{e^2}{8\pi h} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$$

 Fujikawa realized that the path integral measure is not invariant under a chiral transformation:

$$D\Psi^{\dagger}D\Psi = e^{i\int dx^{3}dt\theta \frac{e^{2}}{8\pi h}F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}}D\Psi^{'\dagger}D\Psi' \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F_{\rho\sigma}$$

*Fujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**: 1195 (1979) Hosur et al. PRB 81, 045120 (2010)

• So the action for a T-invariant TI is finally:

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \Psi^{\dagger} (\not D - m) \Psi + F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \theta \frac{e^2}{8\pi h} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$$

• and the EM response is (integrating out fermions):

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

• This action is valid inside the bulk crystal

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

This action is valid inside the bulk crystal

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

But...the theta term implies a QHE on the boundary:

$$S_{\theta} = \int dx^{3} dt \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \int dx^{3} dt \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \partial_{\mu} \left( A_{\nu} \partial_{\rho} A_{\sigma} \right)$$

This action is valid inside the bulk crystal

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

But...the theta term implies a QHE on the boundary:

$$S_{\theta} = \int dx^{3} dt \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \int dx^{3} dt \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \partial_{\mu} \left( A_{\nu} \partial_{\rho} A_{\sigma} \right)$$

QHE: 
$$S_H = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{2} \int dx^2 dt \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho \longrightarrow \sigma_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^2}{h}$$

• This action is valid inside the bulk crystal

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$

But...the theta term implies a QHE on the boundary:

$$S_{\theta} = \int dx^{3} dt \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = \int dx^{3} dt \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \frac{\theta}{8\pi h} \partial_{\mu} \left( A_{\nu} \partial_{\rho} A_{\sigma} \right)$$

QHE: 
$$S_H = \frac{\sigma_{xy}}{2} \int dx^2 dt \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho \longrightarrow \sigma_{xy} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{e^2}{h}$$

Hence the axion term is a description of both the bulk and the boundary only when T is broken at the boundary (more on that later).

 This action changes the optical response of the TI with respect to ordinary dielectrics:

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$
$$= \int dx^3 dt \left(\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D} + \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{H}\right)$$

 This action changes the optical response of the TI with respect to ordinary dielectrics:

$$S_{TI} = \int dx^3 dt \left(\varepsilon \mathbf{E}^2 + \mu^{-1} \mathbf{B}^2\right) + \theta \frac{e^2}{2\pi h} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{B}$$
$$= \int dx^3 dt \left(\mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D} + \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{H}\right)$$

 Maxwell's equations still valid but with different constitutive relations:

F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1799 (1987).

Crazy consequences of axionic physics:

![](_page_43_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_4.jpeg)

Maciejko et al. PRL (2010), Tse et al. PRL (2010)

![](_page_43_Figure_6.jpeg)

Qi et al. Science (2009)

1) Integrate maxwell equations to find boundary conditions:

conserved normal component: D and B conserved tangential component: H and  $\mathbf{E}$ 

2) Find reflection coefficients:

![](_page_44_Figure_4.jpeg)

Chang et al. Phys. Rev. B 80, 113304 (2009)

• Can we prove analytically that there will be repulsion?

$$\frac{E_c(d)}{A\hbar} = \int_0^\infty \frac{d\xi}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^2 \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}}{(2\pi)^2} \log \det \left[1 - \mathbf{R}_1 \cdot \mathbf{R}_2 e^{-2k_3 d}\right]$$

Consider the case:

 $\theta_1 = -\theta_2 \equiv \theta$ 

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_{+} \\ \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{I}} \quad \varepsilon \ \theta \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_{-} \\ \varepsilon \ -\theta \quad \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{I}} \end{array}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\pm} = \begin{bmatrix} r_s(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}, \theta^2) & \pm r_{sp}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}, |\theta|) \\ \pm r_{sp}(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}, |\theta|) & r_p(i\xi, \mathbf{k}_{\parallel}, \theta^2) \end{bmatrix}$$

Integrand of the Lifshitz formula at long and short distances:

$$I \approx \frac{1}{d^3} \log \left[ 1 + e^{-2k_3^{(r)}} \left( 2r_{sp}^2 - r_p^2 - r_s^2 \right) \right], \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_+ \\ \varepsilon \theta \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_- \\ \varepsilon \theta \end{array}$$

Integrand of the Lifshitz formula at long and short distances:

![](_page_47_Figure_2.jpeg)

Attraction!

Integrand of the Lifshitz formula at long and short distances:

 $I \approx \frac{1}{d^3} \log \left[ 1 + e^{-2k_3^{(r)}} \left( 2r_{sp}^2 - r_p^2 - r_s^2 \right) \right], \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_+\\ \varepsilon \ \theta \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \ \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \mathbf{R}_-\\ \varepsilon \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{R}_-\\ \mathbf{R}_-\\ \mathbf{R$ 

$$\frac{d \to 0}{E} \qquad r_{sp} > r_p \qquad I \approx \frac{1}{d^3} \log \left[ 1 + B'^2 \right] > 0$$

$$E \qquad \text{the integrand goes to infinity from positive values} \qquad Repulsion!$$

#### NUMERICAL INTEGRATION:

Analytical analysis confirmed by numerics:

![](_page_49_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Figure_3.jpeg)

Opposite signs for  $\theta$ terms generate repulsion at short distances

At short distances, the magnetoelectric coupling wins, while at large distances, it is the ordinary dielectric response.

#### NUMERICAL INTEGRATION:

#### Dependency on the parameters:

![](_page_50_Figure_3.jpeg)

Low  $\varepsilon(0)$  favors repulsion at lower distances.

High  $\theta$  favors repulsion at lower distances

#### WHAT ABOUT REAL MATERIALS?

Real TI are anisotropic (all uniaxial for the moment)

$$\varepsilon(\omega)_{ij} = \operatorname{diag}(\varepsilon_{\perp}, \varepsilon_{\perp}, \varepsilon_{\parallel})$$

![](_page_51_Figure_3.jpeg)

Anisotropy can enhance repulsion if  $\mathcal{E}_{\parallel} > \mathcal{E}_{\perp}$  for a wide range of frequencies

![](_page_51_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### WHAT ABOUT REAL MATERIALS?

T must be broken at the surface: Insulating ferromagnet opens a gap through Zeeman coupling at the surface.

![](_page_52_Picture_2.jpeg)

Effective surface hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_s = \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot |\mathbf{k}| + M\sigma_z$$
$$\sigma_{xy} = \operatorname{sign}(M) \frac{e^2}{2h}$$

#### WHAT ABOUT REAL MATERIALS?

T must be broken at the surface: Insulating ferromagnet opens a gap through Zeeman coupling at the surface.

![](_page_53_Picture_2.jpeg)

Effective surface hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{H}_s = \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot |\mathbf{k}| + M\sigma_z$$
$$\sigma_{xy} = \operatorname{sign}(M) \frac{e^2}{2h}$$

The sign of the magnetization controls the QHE of the surface and thus the sign of theta.

Controlling M controls the Casimir response!

![](_page_53_Figure_7.jpeg)

#### WHAT ABOUT TEMPERATURE?

#### Temperature plays against repulsion:

![](_page_54_Figure_2.jpeg)

Finite T

#### CONCLUSIONS:

Casimir effect with TI is very unusual and could be in principle even tunable with external parameters

Anisotropy can be used to enhance the effect, but temperature plays against repulsion

Magnetoelectric materials still remain an unexplored area in Casimir physics, and could be used to achieve repulsion in vacuum.

http://focus.aps.org/story/v27/stl

![](_page_55_Picture_5.jpeg)

A. G. G., A. Cortijo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 020403 (2011)A. G. G., P. Rodriguez-Lopez, A. Cortijo, arXiv: 1102. 0455 Phys. Rev. B in press