Comment on “Inclusion of the backaction term in the total optical force exerted upon Rayleigh particles in nonresonant structures”
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Abstract – The authors of [Phys. Rev. A 98, 013806 (2018)] investigate discrepancy between the trapping force ($\tilde{F}_T$) exerted on a small dielectric particle and the gradient force ($\tilde{F}_G$) calculated within the conventional dipole approximation. In the case of resonant optical trapping, which is called ‘self-induced back-action trapping’ in the literature, they imply that $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G$ is due to a difference between the effective polarizability ($\alpha_{\text{eff}}$) and conventional polarizability ($\alpha$) of the particle. In the case of nonresonant trapping, they present two numerical examples, and attribute $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G$ to the gradient of the scattering Green’s function ($\nabla \tilde{G}_s$) of the material bodies surrounding the particle. In the case of resonant trapping, I rectify some of their statements, and clear up some common misconceptions in the literature. In the case of nonresonant trapping, which is their main concern, I show that their numerical examples are inconclusive. More importantly, I show that there are nonresonant trapping schemes for which it is impossible to explain $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G$ by $\nabla \tilde{G}_s$ (or even by $\alpha_{\text{eff}}$). Finally, I point out that finding $\nabla \tilde{G}_s$ (or $\alpha_{\text{eff}}$) is in principle as hard as finding $\tilde{F}_T$.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Conventional dipole approximation
The time-averaged EM force (which is usually shortened to EM force) exerted on a particle can be written as the integral of the time-averaged Maxwell stress tensor over any surface enclosing only the particle [1]. The conventional dipole approximation (CDA) assumes that the EM fields radiated by a small particle (in the presence of the material bodies surrounding it) are almost equal to the EM fields radiated by a point-like electric dipole in free space (viz., in the absence of any material bodies) [2,3]. By applying the CDA to the Maxwell stress tensor, the $i$ component of the EM force can be written as $F_{CDA,i} = 0.5 \text{Re}(\hat{p}_{CDA} \cdot \partial \vec{E}_0^* / \partial \vec{r})$, where $\text{Re}(e^{-i\omega t} \hat{p}_{CDA})$ is the electric dipole moment of the particle, $\text{Re}(e^{-i\omega t} \vec{E}_0)$ is the incident electric field (viz., the electric field in the absence of the particle, but in the presence of the material bodies surrounding it), and the derivative is evaluated at the position of the particle center ($\vec{r}_p$) [4]. The electric dipole moment, which is found self-consistently, can be written as $\text{Re}(e^{-i\omega t} \alpha \vec{E}_0)$, where $\alpha$ is a coefficient called the electric polarizability of the particle [2,3]. The polarizability for a spherical dielectric particle of radius $R$ and relative permittivity $\varepsilon$ reads $\alpha = \alpha_0 / [1 - i k_0^3 \alpha_0 / (6 \pi \varepsilon_0)]$, where $\alpha_0$ denotes $4 \pi \varepsilon_0 R^3 (\varepsilon - 1) / (\varepsilon + 2)$, and $k_L = 2 \pi / \lambda_L = \omega_L / c$ is the wavenumber of the driving laser in free space [2,3]. It should be noted that Eq. (13) in [5], which describes $\alpha_0$, is incorrect. The force component $F_{CDA,i}$ can be rewritten as the sum of $F_{G,i} = 0.25 \text{Re}(\alpha) \partial \vec{E}_0 \cdot \vec{E}_0^* / \partial \vec{r}$ and $F_{R,i} = 0.5 \text{Im}(\alpha) \text{Im}[\vec{E}_0^* \cdot \partial \vec{E}_0 / \partial \vec{r}]$, where $F_{G,i}$ and $F_{R,i}$ are the $i$ components of the so-called gradient force and radiation pressure, respectively. The former comes from the dependence of the EM energy on the position of the particle, while the latter comes from the initial momentum of the photons absorbed or scattered by the particle. Absorption leads to $\text{Im}(\varepsilon)$ in $\alpha_0$, while scattering leads to $-i k_0^3 \alpha_0 / (6 \pi \varepsilon_0)$ in the denominator of $\alpha$. For the sake of simplicity, I ignore $\text{Im}(\varepsilon)$ and $k_0^3 \alpha_0 / (6 \pi \varepsilon_0)$, and assume that $\alpha \approx \alpha_0$. 
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B. Failure of CDA

Self-induced trapping, which was introduced in 2006 [6] and later called self-induced back-action trapping (SIBA) [7-11], is defined as optical trapping of a particle by a resonator whose resonance frequency ($\omega_r$) as a function of the position of the particle ($\vec{r}_p$) meets the condition $A \equiv \omega_r(\infty) - \omega_r(0) \gg \kappa$, where $\vec{r}_p = 0$ is defined as the trapping point, and $\kappa$ denotes the linewidth (full width at half maximum) of the spectral density of the energy stored by the resonator. It is evident that such a large $A$ necessitates detuning the angular frequency of the driving laser ($\omega_L$) from $\omega_r(\infty)$ by an amount $\Delta < 0$. In contrast to the statement made in [5], it should be noted that SIBA (viz., the existence of a large resonance frequency shift, and the necessity of a detuning) does not lead to an enhancement of the trapping force [12]. More precisely, the trapping force (normalized to the volume of the particle) in the presence of a resonance frequency shift and detuning is smaller than or equal to the trapping force (normalized to the volume of the particle) in the absence of any resonance frequency shift and detuning. However, by choosing an optimum value for $\Delta$, one can increase the width of the trapping potential [11], but it comes at the expense of a decrease in the depth of the trapping potential [12]. I will return to this point later. Also, I believe that SIBA is a misnomer, because $\omega_r$ is always sensitive to $\vec{r}_p$ (viz., $\partial \omega_r / \partial \vec{r}_p$ is always non-negligible) whenever the resonant EM mode corresponding to $\omega_r$ contributes to the exerted force on the particle. Moreover, the exerted force on an object is always self-induced and thanks to the EM fields radiated by the object even if the object is in free space (viz., even if no material bodies surround the object). Such an object in free space may be modeled by an electric dipole, a combination of an electric dipole and a magnetic dipole [4], a combination of two electric dipoles [13], etc.
It is evident that SIBA is one of the cases for which there is a discrepancy between the actual trapping force ($F_T$) and the gradient force ($F_G$) calculated within the CDA, because the presence of the particle significantly changes the amplitude of the resonant EM mode interacting with the particle. However, it should be noted that SIBA is merely the case where the presence of the particle has a significant effect only on one resonant EM mode. There are cases where the presence of the particle has a significant effect on nonresonant EM modes while it has no significant effect on any resonant EM modes [12].

C. Modified dipole approximation

Abbassi and Mehrany present a modified dipole approximation (MDA) in [5]. The MDA replaces the particle with a point-like dipole which radiates in the presence of the material bodies surrounding the particle. Therefore, the electric field is written as the sum of the incident electric field, the electric field radiated by the dipole in free space, and an electric field

\[ \text{Re}[e^{-i\omega t} \tilde{G}_s(\vec{r}, \vec{r}_p) \vec{p}_{MDA}], \]

where \( \text{Re}(e^{-i\omega t} \vec{p}_{MDA}) \) is the electric dipole moment of the particle, \( \tilde{G}_s(\vec{r}, \vec{r}_p) \) is the scattering Green’s function of the material bodies surrounding the particle, \( \vec{r} \) denotes the observation point, and \( \vec{r}_p \) denotes the position of the particle center. Also, the \( i \) component of the EM force within the MDA (\( F_{MDA,i} \)) can be written as the sum of

\[ 0.5 \text{Re}(\vec{p}_{MDA} \cdot \partial \tilde{E}_o^* / \partial i) \] and \[ 0.5 \text{Re}[\vec{p}_{MDA} \cdot (\partial \tilde{G}_s^* / \partial i) \cdot \vec{p}_{MDA}^*], \]

where the derivatives are evaluated at \( \vec{r} = \vec{r}_p \). For the sake of simplicity, and in agreement with the examples presented in [5], I assume that \( \tilde{E}_o \) is approximately parallel to the \( x \) axis, viz., \( \tilde{E}_o \approx \hat{x}E_o \). Also, I ignore the non-diagonal elements of \( \tilde{G}_s \) for \( \vec{r} \approx \vec{r}_p \) (note that, according to the reciprocity theorem, \( \tilde{G}_s \) is symmetric for
\( \vec{r} \approx \vec{r}_p \). As a result, \( \vec{p}_{MDA} \) is approximately parallel to the \( x \) axis, viz., \( \vec{p}_{MDA} \approx \hat{x}p_{MDA} \). I will hereafter denote the \( xx \) element of \( \vec{G} \) for \( \vec{r} \approx \vec{r}_p \) by \( g(\vec{r}) \).

The first corollary of the MDA is that the force \( 0.5 \Re( p_{MDA} \partial E_0^* / \partial i ) \) is not equal to \( F_{CDA,j} = 0.5 \Re( p_{CDA} \partial E_0^* / \partial i ) \), because \( p_{MDA} \) and \( p_{CDA} \) are not equal. One may define a polarizability \( \alpha_{eff} \), which is now called the ‘effective polarizability’, and write \( p_{MDA} \) as \( \alpha_{eff} E_0 \). The term ‘effective polarizability’ was coined in atomic physics [14,15], and later used in classical optics [16]. The effective polarizability, which is found self-consistently, reads \( \alpha_0 / (1 - \alpha_0 g) \), where \( g \) is evaluated at \( \vec{r} = \vec{r}_p \). The second corollary of the MDA is the inclusion of the force \( 0.5 \Re( |p_{MDA}|^2 \partial g^* / \partial i ) \).

II. COMMENTS

From a computational viewpoint, it is noteworthy that finding \( g \) at some observation points in the vicinity of the particle is as hard as finding the Maxwell stress tensor at those points unless there exists an analytical solution to \( g \). In other words, finding the approximate EM force within the MDA is in principle as hard as finding the exact EM force.

Before discussing the results presented in [5], I must simplify \( 0.5 \Re( p_{MDA} \partial E_0^* / \partial i ) \) as the sum of the following two terms:

\[
F_{MG,i} \triangleq 0.25 \Re( \alpha_{eff} ) \partial |E_0|^2 / \partial i = 0.25 \alpha_0 \frac{1 - \alpha_0 g_r}{(1 - \alpha_0 g_r)^2 + (\alpha_0 g_i)^2} \partial |E_0|^2 / \partial i
\]

(1)

\[
F_{MR,i} \triangleq 0.5 \Im( \alpha_{eff} ) \Im[ E_0^* \partial E_0 / \partial i ] = 0.5 \alpha_0 \frac{\alpha_0 g_i}{(1 - \alpha_0 g_r)^2 + (\alpha_0 g_i)^2} \Im[ E_0^* \partial E_0 / \partial i ]
\]

(2)

and \( 0.5 \Re( |p_{MDA}|^2 \partial g^* / \partial i ) \) as:
where $g_r$ and $g_i$ denote the real and imaginary parts of $g$, respectively. I name the forces given by Eqs. (1), (2), and (3) ‘the modified gradient force’, ‘the modified radiation pressure’, and ‘the GGF force’, respectively. It should be noted that the second line of Eq. (16) in [5], which describes the modified radiation pressure, is incorrect.

**A. Resonant trapping**

When the particle interacts with only one resonant EM mode, $\alpha_0 g(\bar{r})$ can be written as

$$iAu(\bar{r})u^*(\bar{r}_p)/(\kappa/2-i\Delta)$$

in terms of the normalized electric field profile of the EM mode [viz., $u(\bar{r})$]. The definitions of $A$, $\kappa$, and $\Delta$ are the same as the definitions given in [5] and Background. Also, we assume that SIBA takes place, viz., $A \gg \kappa$.

The authors of [5] highlight the difference between $\alpha_{\text{eff}}$ and $\alpha_0$ with an emphasis on $\Delta = 0$. They state that for $\Delta = 0$, $\alpha_{\text{eff}}$ is pure imaginary, and reads $i\kappa\alpha_0/(2A|u(\bar{r}_p)|^2)$. This statement means that for $\Delta = 0$, $\text{Im}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})$ is very large when $u(\bar{r}_p)$ approaches zero (viz., when the particle approaches a node of the mode profile). This is incorrect because $\alpha_{\text{eff}}$ is pure real and equal to $\alpha_0$ when $u(\bar{r}_p)$ approaches zero, whether or not $\Delta$ is zero.

More importantly, from their statement, the implication is that $\text{Re}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})$ is non-negligible unless $\Delta$ is zero. However, $\text{Re}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})$ is in fact negligible in comparison with $\text{Im}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})$ if the conditions $-A \leq \Delta \ll 0$ and $\Delta \approx -A|u(\bar{r}_p)|^2$ are met. When these conditions are met, since $1-\alpha_0 g_r$ and $\alpha_0 g_i$ are very small, one might mistakenly think that $\text{Re}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})$ in Eq. (1) is very
large. However, it should be noted that when those conditions are met, \((\alpha_0 s_r)^2 / (1 - \alpha_0 s_r)\) is approximately unity, and therefore, \(\text{Re}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})\) is negligible in comparison with \(\text{Im}(\alpha_{\text{eff}})\), which is very large.

The authors of [5] state that SIBA leads to an ‘enhancement of the trapping force’. This statement, which is a common misconception, is incorrect. When the conditions \(-A \leq \Delta \ll 0\) and \(\Delta \approx -A |u(\vec{r}_p)|^2\) are met, the modified gradient force \((\vec{F}_{MG})\), which is equal to the gradient force \((\vec{F}_G)\), is negligible. However, the GGF force \((\vec{F}_{GGF})\) is non-negligible because a very large \(|\alpha_{\text{eff}}|^2\) compensates for a very small \(|E_0|^2\). The condition \(\Delta \approx -A |u(\vec{r}_p)|^2\) means that the detuning \(\Delta\) exactly compensates for (viz. is equal to) the resonance frequency shift \(\omega_r(\vec{r}_p) - \omega_r(\infty)\) caused by the presence of the particle at \(\vec{r}_p\). The detuning \(\Delta \approx -A |u(\vec{r}_p)|^2\) is the detuning which provides the maximum achievable trapping force when the particle is at \(\vec{r}_p\). However, the maximum achievable trapping force is equal to the trapping force in the absence of any resonance frequency shift and detuning. In other words, SIBA (viz., the existence of a large resonance frequency shift, and the necessity of a detuning) does not lead to an enhancement of the trapping force.

**B. Nonresonant trapping**

The authors of [5] present two examples of the structures for which the presence of the particle has no significant effect on any resonant EM modes. They conclude that the difference between the actual trapping force \((\vec{F}_T)\) and the gradient force \((\vec{F}_G)\) is approximately equal to the GGF force \((\vec{F}_{GGF})\).
The results of their first nonresonant example are inconclusive for the simple reason that it lacks the calculation of $\tilde{F}_T$. Their first example has been devised in a way that $\tilde{F}_{GGF}$ becomes comparable to $\tilde{F}_G$. To this end, they consider a particle of a large diameter 220 nm and a large refractive index 2.5 at $\lambda_L = 1064$ nm. However, the size of such a particle is larger than half the wavelength of the light inside it, and therefore, the missing calculation of $\tilde{F}_T$ may show that the particle cannot be replaced by a point-like dipole at all.

It is also noteworthy that their first nonresonant example is not a practical trapping scheme because, in an attempt to make $\tilde{F}_{GGF}$ comparable to $\tilde{F}_G$, they decrease $\tilde{F}_G$ by not allowing the structure surrounded the particle to see the laser light and contribute to the incident electric field ($E_0$). If there was no gap between the mirrors in their example (viz., if $\theta_0$ was zero), the structure would see the laser light and contribute to $E_0$. In such a case, not only would $\tilde{F}_G$ be multiplied by a factor of 4, but also the unwanted radiation pressure would be negligible.

The results of their second nonresonant example, which is considered as a resonant trapping scheme by other authors [7], are inconclusive for two reasons. First, it is true that $\tilde{F}_G + \tilde{F}_{GGF}$ is a better approximation than $\tilde{F}_G$, but their own numerical results show that $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G - \tilde{F}_{GGF}$ is considerable when $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G$ is considerable (according to their results, $\tilde{F}_{MG}$ and $\tilde{F}_G$ are approximately equal). Second, and more importantly, it is impossible to explain $\tilde{F}_T - \tilde{F}_G$ by $\tilde{F}_{GGF}$ in the nonresonant trapping schemes for which the sign of $F_{T,j} - F_{G,j}$ depends on the size of the particle, because the sign of $F_{GGF,j}$ is independent of the size of the particle. One example of such nonresonant trapping schemes is the one proposed in [12], in which $F_{G,j}$ overestimates
$F_{T,i}$ (viz., $F_{G,i}F_{T,i} > 0$ and $|F_{G,i}| > |F_{T,i}|$) with a large percent error for a very small particle whose
diameter is ten nanometers, while $F_{G,i}$ underestimates $F_{T,i}$ (viz., $F_{G,i}F_{T,i} > 0$ and $|F_{G,i}| < |F_{T,i}|$)
for a small particle whose diameter is a few tens of nanometers (note that $\lambda_L = 1550$ nm, and the
refractive index of the particles is 2). Interestingly, it is also impossible to explain $\vec{F}_T - \vec{F}_G$ by
$\vec{F}_{MG} - \vec{F}_G$, because $\text{Re}(\alpha_{eff})$ in Eq. (1) cannot be positive and smaller than $\alpha_0$ for a particle of a
certain size and refractive index, and be larger than $\alpha_0$ for a larger particle of the same refractive
index.
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