The role of zero point energy in inducing nucleation of ice in a spherical drop of water
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We demonstrate that the Lifshitz interaction energy (excluding the self-energies of the inner and outer spherical regions) for three concentric spherical dielectric media can be evaluated easily using the immense computation power in recent processors relative to those of a few decades ago. As a prototype, we compute the Lifshitz interaction energy for a spherical shell of water immersed in water vapor of infinite extent while enclosing a spherical ball of ice inside the shell, such that two concentric spherical interfaces are formed: one between solid ice and liquid water and the other between liquid water and gaseous vapor. We evaluate the Lifshitz interaction energy for the above configuration at the triple point of water when the solid, liquid, and gaseous states of water coexist, and, thus, extend the analysis of Elbaum and Schick in Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 1713 to spherical configurations. We find that, when the Lifshitz energy contributes dominantly to the total energy of this system, which is often the case when electrostatic interactions are absent, a drop of water surrounded by vapor of infinite extent is not stable at the triple point. This instability, that is a manifestation of the quantum fluctuations in the medium, will induce nucleation of ice in water, which will then grow in size indefinitely. This is a consequence of the finding here that the Lifshitz energy is minimized for large (micrometer size) radius of the ice ball and small (nanometer size) thickness of the water shell surrounding the ice. These results might be relevant to the formation of hail in thunderclouds. These results are tentative in that the self-energies are omitted.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term Casimir effect is often used to refer to the entire phenomena associated with quantum fluctuations. Other closely related terminologies are quantum vacuum energy, zero point energy, Lifshitz energy, London dispersion forces, and van der Waals interactions. The ideas governing the van der Waals interactions [1] and London dispersion forces [2–4] originated in attempts to understand the interactions of neutral, but polarizable, molecules of gases that deviated in their characteristics from the ideal gas law. Casimir and Polder [5] later generalized these calculations to include retardation effects. The concept of zero point energy on the other hand originated in the 1910’s in works of Refs. [6–8] where the focus was to understand the blackbody radiation [9] in the limit of zero temperature. A priori it was not expected that the theory of radiation would have anything to do with inter-atomic forces. However, the astonishing feat of Casimir [10] was in showing that London dispersion forces, or the van der Waals interactions, were manifestations of the zero point energy.

Casimir evaluated the energy of a planar cavity with perfectly conducting walls, an overly idealized system, that is obtained from the configuration of Fig. 1 when the regions labeled as \( \varepsilon_1 \) and \( \varepsilon_2 \) are perfect electrical conductors that are separated by vacuum in the background region labeled \( \varepsilon_3 \). Lifshitz [11] generalized Casimir’s result by evaluating the energy for a configuration of Fig. 1 consisting of two dielectric media of infinite extent separated by vacuum. The Lifshitz energy leads to the Casimir energy in the perfect conducting limit of the dielectric functions for the outer media. Dzyaloshinskii, Lifshitz, and Pitaevskii (DLP) [12] extended these considerations for the case when the background region in the planar configuration of Fig. 1 is another uniform dielectric medium. The main idea underlying these groundbreaking works is that quantum fluctuations of fields in the media can be manifested in physical phenomena involving dielectrics. Among these, we point out that the configurations considered by Casimir and Lifshitz always lead to an attractive pressure (tending to decrease the thickness of the intervening medium). In contrast, the configurations considered by DLP allows for the pressure to be attrac-
allows the decomposition $E = E_3 + \Delta E_1 + \Delta E_2 + E_{12}$.

Here $E$ is the total energy; $E_3$ is the total energy when both interfaces are moved infinitely far away from each other to infinity, such that all space is filled with medium $\varepsilon_3$; $\Delta E_1 = E_1 - E_3$ and $\Delta E_2 = E_2 - E_3$ are self-energies required to create systems with single interfaces when the other interface is moved to $\pm \infty$ respectively; $E_{12}$ is the interaction energy between media $\varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_2$. The interaction energy $E_{12}$ is the only contribution to the total energy that depends on the position and orientation of both media and determines the forces between them. This decomposition is generic, irrespective of $\varepsilon_3$ being vacuum or another medium. The importance of the decomposition of energy in Eq. (1) is the fact that the interaction energy $E_{12}$ is unambiguously finite by construction if media $\varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_2$ are disjoint, even while the self-energies $\Delta E_1$, $\Delta E_2$, and $E_3$ remain divergent. Of considerable importance is the fact that self-energies may include the surface energies leading to surface tensions in the interfaces, however, due to the lack of predictive power in the face of divergences we will not discuss these terms in this article. The interaction energy $E_{12}$ is called the Lifshitz energy and this part of energy will be the subject matter of this article. The lack of a complete understanding to date of the divergent expressions in energy and omission of the associated contributions to energy all together here will remain a limitation of our analysis here.

Elbaum and Schick’s conclusion that quantum fluctuations induce the formation of a thin layer of liquid water at the interface of solid ice and gaseous vapor is valid for planar configurations. It is, then, of interest to inquire if these considerations change for curved geometries. In this article we extend the analysis of Elbaum and Schick to spherical concentric interfaces of solid ice, liquid water, and water vapor. We conclude that a spherical drop of water immersed inside gaseous vapor of infinite extent is unstable at the triple point of water. Quantum fluctuations induce nucleation of solid ice inside the drop of liquid water, which will then grow in size indefinitely. Once the solid ice has grown sufficiently large its surface can be approximated to that of a plane and in this limit the results of the planar configuration apply and the liquid water attains a thickness of 3.56 nm at equilibrium. The phenomena of quantum fluctuations inducing nucleation of ice in water, to our knowledge, has not been reported or mentioned in the literature before. This is expected to prompt a plethora of applications and studies associated to this phenomena, few of which we mention in the last section and hope to explore in future publications.

Even though the expressions for Lifshitz energy reported in this article are sufficiently general, we will con-
sistantly use solid ice for region 1 described by $\varepsilon_1$, liquid water for the background region $\varepsilon_3$, and gaseous water vapor for region 2 described by $\varepsilon_2$. The discussions in this article will be confined to the temperature and pressure associated with the triple point of water, 273.16 K and 611.657 Pa, when solid ice, liquid water, and water vapor, can coexist.

II. ELBAUM-SCHICK EFFECT

The Lifshitz interaction energy per unit area for the planar configuration of Fig. 1, consisting of three dielectric media with negligible magnetic permeabilities, $\mu_i = 1$, such that the sandwiched medium has thickness $d_i$, is given by,

$$\mathcal{E}(d) = \frac{\hbar c}{4\pi^2 a_0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^\infty k dk \left[ 1 - r^E_{ij} r^{E\ast}_{ij} e^{-2\kappa_{ij} d_i} \right]$$

where the reflection coefficients for the transverse electric (E) and transverse magnetic (H) modes are given by

$$r^E_{ij} = \left( \frac{\kappa_i - \kappa_j}{\kappa_i + \kappa_j} \right), \quad r^H_{ij} = \left( \frac{\varepsilon_j \kappa_i - \varepsilon_i \kappa_j}{\varepsilon_j \kappa_i + \varepsilon_i \kappa_j} \right),$$

respectively, in terms of the effective refractive index

$$\kappa_i = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{n_i^2}{a_0^2} \varepsilon_i}, \quad i = 1, 3, 2.$$

The prime on the summation symbol in Eq. (2) indicates that the $n = 0$ term is to be multiplied by a factor of 1/2. We have defined the constant

$$a_0 = \frac{\hbar c}{2\pi k_B T}$$

with dimensions of length, which introduces a natural scale for distance in the discussion. The corresponding scale for energy is set by the coefficient $\hbar c/(4\pi^2 a_0) = k_B T/(2\pi)$ in Eq. (2). For typical dielectric materials at room temperature this distance $a_0$ is in the micrometer range corresponding to an energy in milli electron-volts. At the triple point of water the distance $a_0$ in Eq. (5) is evaluated to be

$$a_0 = 1.3342 \mu m.$$

and the energy $\hbar c/(4\pi^2 a_0) = k_B T/(2\pi)$ in Eq. (2) equals 3.7463 meV.

A. Dielectric function

The permittivities $\varepsilon_i$ in Eqs. (3) and (4) are functions of the discrete imaginary frequency, the Matsubara frequency, $\hbar \omega/a_0$,

$$\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_j \left( \frac{\hbar \omega}{a_0} \right), \quad j = 1, 3, 2.$$

The prime on the summation symbol in Eq. (2) indicates that the $n = 0$ term is to be multiplied by a factor of 1/2. We have defined the constant

$$a_0 = \frac{\hbar c}{2\pi k_B T}$$

with dimensions of length, which introduces a natural scale for distance in the discussion. The corresponding scale for energy is set by the coefficient $\hbar c/(4\pi^2 a_0) = k_B T/(2\pi)$ in Eq. (2). For typical dielectric materials at room temperature this distance $a_0$ is in the micrometer range corresponding to an energy in milli electron-volts. At the triple point of water the distance $a_0$ in Eq. (5) is evaluated to be

$$a_0 = 1.3342 \mu m.$$

and the energy $\hbar c/(4\pi^2 a_0) = k_B T/(2\pi)$ in Eq. (2) equals 3.7463 meV.

FIG. 2. Dielectric functions of solid ice and liquid water, obtained using the fitting parameters used by Elbaum and Schick in Ref. [13], plotted with respect to the Matsubara mode number $n$ ranging from 1 to 3700. The discrete frequency is $\hbar \omega/a_0$, where $c/a_0 = 2.4740 \times 10^{14}$ rad/s. The dielectric function at zero frequency $(n = 0)$ is huge and only sketched out for illustration, because it is hard to capture it on the same scale. The dielectric functions of solid ice and liquid water when extrapolated as a smooth line, even though they are actually discrete points, intersect at two points, first at $n_{c1}$ between $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, and then again at $n_{c2}$ between $n = 71$ and $n = 72$. The difference in the dielectric functions of solid ice and liquid water is plotted in the inset, where, again, the $n = 0$ contribution is illustrated as a cartoon.

The dielectric functions for $j = 1, 3, 2$, for solid ice, liquid water, and gaseous water vapor, respectively, are generated using the damped oscillator model for the dielectric response, following Elbaum and Schick [13],

$$\varepsilon(\omega) = 1 + \sum_j \frac{f_j}{\varepsilon_j - i\hbar \omega g_j - (\hbar \omega)^2},$$

where $\varepsilon_j$, $f_j$, and $g_j$ are given by the values listed in Table 1 of Ref. [13]. The dielectric response at zero frequency for solid ice and liquid water are

$$\varepsilon_{\text{ice}}(0) = 91.5,$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{water}}(0) = 88.2,$$

respectively. Data for dielectric functions were generated for $n$ spanning 0 to 3700, which were sufficient for convergence of the Lifshitz interaction energy in the regime of interest. The plots of these dielectric functions as a function of the Matsubara mode number $n$ are presented in Fig. 2. The dielectric function at zero frequency $(n = 0)$ for both ice and water is huge and could not be captured on the same scale, but, we sketched the intersection as a cartoon to illustrate the point. These plots, for solid ice and liquid water, intersect at two points, first at $n_{c1}$ between $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, and then again at $n_{c2}$ between

$$\varepsilon_{\text{ice}}(0) = 91.5,$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{water}}(0) = 88.2,$$

respectively. Data for dielectric functions were generated for $n$ spanning 0 to 3700, which were sufficient for convergence of the Lifshitz interaction energy in the regime of interest. The plots of these dielectric functions as a function of the Matsubara mode number $n$ are presented in Fig. 2. The dielectric function at zero frequency $(n = 0)$ for both ice and water is huge and could not be captured on the same scale, but, we sketched the intersection as a cartoon to illustrate the point. These plots, for solid ice and liquid water, intersect at two points, first at $n_{c1}$ between $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, and then again at $n_{c2}$ between

$$\varepsilon_{\text{ice}}(0) = 91.5,$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{water}}(0) = 88.2,$$

respectively. Data for dielectric functions were generated for $n$ spanning 0 to 3700, which were sufficient for convergence of the Lifshitz interaction energy in the regime of interest. The plots of these dielectric functions as a function of the Matsubara mode number $n$ are presented in Fig. 2. The dielectric function at zero frequency $(n = 0)$ for both ice and water is huge and could not be captured on the same scale, but, we sketched the intersection as a cartoon to illustrate the point. These plots, for solid ice and liquid water, intersect at two points, first at $n_{c1}$ between $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, and then again at $n_{c2}$ between

$$\varepsilon_{\text{ice}}(0) = 91.5,$$

$$\varepsilon_{\text{water}}(0) = 88.2,$$

respectively. Data for dielectric functions were generated for $n$ spanning 0 to 3700, which were sufficient for convergence of the Lifshitz interaction energy in the regime of interest. The plots of these dielectric functions as a function of the Matsubara mode number $n$ are presented in Fig. 2. The dielectric function at zero frequency $(n = 0)$ for both ice and water is huge and could not be captured on the same scale, but, we sketched the intersection as a cartoon to illustrate the point. These plots, for solid ice and liquid water, intersect at two points, first at $n_{c1}$ between $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, and then again at $n_{c2}$ between
The Lifshitz energy has a minimum at $d = 3.56 \text{ nm}$. The Lifshitz energy also has a maximum at $d = 0.37 \mu\text{m}$, which is shown in the inset-plot. The Lifshitz energy tends to zero from the positive side for large thickness, and goes to positive infinity for zero thickness.

$n = 71$ and $n = 72$. The difference in the dielectric functions of solid ice and liquid water, which plays a central role in our discussion, is plotted in the inset. Note, in particular, how the $n = 0$ contribution for ice and water dwarfs the contribution from non-zero values.

C. Lifshitz energy for planar geometry

Using the model for the dielectric response in Eq. (8) for the fitting parameters used by Elbaum and Schick [13], plotted in Fig. 2, the Lifshitz energy per unit area as a function of thickness $d$ of liquid water layer is plotted in Fig. 3. The Lifshitz energy diverges to positive infinity for zero thickness $d$ of liquid water, implying an instability of such an interface. That is, quantum fluctuations will induce the formation of a thin layer of liquid water at the interface of solid ice and gaseous vapor. The Lifshitz energy associated with two bodies, say two dielectric media separated by vacuum, diverges to negative infinity when the two media come in contact. Additionally, the Lifshitz energy goes to (positive) zero for large thickness. For intermediate distances the Lifshitz energy has a negative minimum for $d \sim 0.00267a_0 \approx 3.56 \text{ nm}$. The existence of this minimum implies that at the triple point of water it is energetically favorable to form a layer of water at the interface of ice and vapor. In other words, an interface of solid ice and gaseous vapor is highly unstable because of the positive infinite energy associated with zero thickness of water in Fig. 3. At equilibrium the thickness of water formed at the interface is 3.56 nm.

The Lifshitz energy has a local maximum (positive) value of 0.0131$\varepsilon_0$ when the thickness of water layer is $d \sim 0.275a_0 \approx 0.37 \mu\text{m}$, which is shown in the inset of Fig. 3. Thus, it is implied that the Lifshitz energy approaches zero from positive values of energy for large thickness of the water layer. This is consistent with the fact that at large distances the Lifshitz energy is completely characterized by the $n = 0$ contribution. This observation, in principle, implies that complete melting of ice is possible if the water layer is thicker than 0.37$\mu\text{m}$ initially. However, the Lifshitz energy peaks here with a very tiny positive value of 0.0130$\varepsilon_0$, which is very small relative to $\varepsilon_0 = k_BT/(2\pi/a_0^3)$. Thus, complete melting is unlikely due to disturbances in energy from the surroundings.

Thus the Lifshitz energy has two extrema, a minimum at $d = 3.56 \text{ nm}$, and a maximum at $d = 0.37 \mu\text{m}$. These extremum points are roughly numerically estimated in terms of the two intersection points, $n_{c1} \sim 0.99$ and $n_{c2} = 71$, in the plots of the dielectric functions of solid ice and liquid water in Fig. 2. We crudely estimated $n_{c1} \sim 0.99$ by assuming a linear interpolation between the data points at $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ in Fig. 2. The two intersection points in Fig. 2 correspond to frequencies

$$\omega_{ci} = n_{ci} \frac{c}{a_0}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

which leads to

$$\omega_{c1} = 1.80 \times 10^{14} \text{ rad/s}, \quad (11a)$$
$$\omega_{c2} = 1.60 \times 10^{15} \text{ rad/s}. \quad (11b)$$

In terms of these critical frequencies a rough numerical estimate of the extremum values for the thickness of wa-
ter layer is obtained using [17]

\[ d_i \sim \frac{c}{\omega_{ci}} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon_i(i\omega_{ci})}} \quad i = 1, 2. \] (12)

This expression leads to \( d_1 \approx 0.41 \mu m \) and \( d_2 \approx 7.83 \text{nm} \), which are in the right ballpark of 0.37 \( \mu m \) and 3.56\text{nm}, respectively. We have been unable to find a more accurate analytical estimate, because we are dealing with a discrete function of the Matsubara mode numbers \( n \), in addition to the fact that the zero mode behaves significantly differently from other modes [17].

D. Incomplete surface melting

Melting of a solid into liquid at melting point \( T_m \) is typically explained as a phase transition in thermodynamics. Another explanation proposed by Weyl in 1951 [18] and theorized by Fletcher in 1968 [19] rests on a microscopic theory in which onset of melting happens at temperatures less than \( T_m \). The proposal is that the energy of the ice or water surface is lowered when the dipole moments of the water molecules orient in assembly. This leads to the formation of an electric double layer at surfaces of water and ice. The electrostatic interactions of such surfaces, neglecting dispersion forces completely, led to a power law behavior of \( d \sim t^{-1/3} \), where \( t = 1 - (T/T_m) \), \( T < T_m \), for the thickness \( d \) of liquid water formed on the surface of ice at temperatures slightly below the melting point. Thus, as the temperature approaches the melting point a thin layer of liquid water is formed at the surface which then grows to infinite thickness as the temperature approaches the melting point. These conclusions remain mostly the same even when non-retarded dispersion interactions are taken in account. This is called (complete) surface melting and seems to be a well studied microscopic explanation of melting. However, data from different experiments are not in concord with the specific power law behavior mentioned above [20–22].

The implication of Elbaum and Schick’s results in Ref. [13] is that the surface melting for ice is incomplete. That is, the thickness of water layer remains finite as the temperature approaches the melting point. It was hard to confirm this accurately in the experiment by Elbaum et al. [23]. The challenge seems to be with determining the triple point of water precisely, and the formation of patches of water drops [21] which probably could be associated with an unevenly flat surface of ice. We will explore the curvature dependence of Elbaum and Schick’s results in Sec. VI. Experimental confirmation of incomplete surface melting remains open [22].

III. LIFSHITZ ENERGY FOR CONCENTRIC SPHERICAL GEOMETRY

The Casimir energy for a perfectly conducting spherical shell was first calculated by Boyer in 1968, which surprisingly had the opposite sign relative to the Casimir energy of two parallel plates [24, 25]. The calculation was attempted for a dielectric ball in Ref. [26]. However, irrespective of the particular regularization procedures used in the calculation, the \( \varepsilon_2 \) heat kernel coefficient is nonzero, which seems to suggest that there is no way to make the Casimir energy of a dielectric ball finite, except for isorefractive cases (\( \varepsilon\mu = 1 \)) [27]. The understanding of this divergent phenomena associated with a single spherical interface is generally accepted to be unsatisfactory [26, 28]. These calculations evaluated the term \( \Delta E_1 \) in Eq. (1) for a spherical interface, with the background region chosen to be a homogeneous medium, which we pointed out give a divergent contribution. Here we calculate the interaction energy \( E_{12} \) in Eq. (1) for the concentric spherical configuration in Fig. 4. The interaction energy \( E_{12} \), by construction, is devoid of divergences and thus can be evaluated unambiguously. The concentric spherical configuration of Fig. 4, for the case when the inner and outer regions consist of identical material and the intervening region is vacuum, \( \varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 \) and \( \varepsilon_3 = 1 \), was studied first, and to our knowledge the only time in literature, by Brevik et al. [29–31]. However, the numerical estimates reported there were not satisfactory probably because the necessary convergence was not achievable with the computational power in the computers of those days. Our expression for the interaction energy here is a straightforward generalization of that in Refs. [29–31], obtained by keeping all three regions in Fig. 4 distinct. In addition we report comprehensive numerical estimates for the interaction energy for the particular example of ice, water, and vapor, which can be easily reproduced for other cases using the methods prescribed here. In Ref. [32], the interaction energy for concentric spherical configurations constructed from \( \delta \)-function spheres were reported, which is different from the study here. We emphasize that we are not including the self-energies of the interior and exterior regions, which leads to an unknown systematic error.

For the spherical geometry of Fig. 4 with interfaces at radii \( a \) and \( b \) the Lifshitz energy \( E(a, b) \) is given by
\[ E(a, b) = k_B T \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l + 1) \times \ln \left[ 1 - r_{31}^E(a) r_{32}^E(b) \right] \left[ 1 - r_{31}^H(a) r_{32}^H(b) \right], \tag{13} \]

where the various scattering coefficients are given by

\[ r_{31}^E(a) = \frac{\zeta_a i(\zeta_a) i(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 \tilde{i}(\zeta_3 a) i(\zeta_a)}{\zeta_3 i(\zeta_3 a) k_1(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 \tilde{i}(\zeta_3 a) k_1(\zeta_a)}, \tag{14a} \]

\[ r_{31}^H(a) = \frac{\zeta_3 \tilde{i}(\zeta_3 a) i(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 \tilde{i}(\zeta_3 a) i(\zeta_a)}{\zeta_3 i(\zeta_3 a) k_1(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 \tilde{i}(\zeta_3 a) k_1(\zeta_a)}, \tag{14b} \]

\[ r_{32}^E(b) = \frac{\zeta_2 k_1(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b) - \zeta_2 \tilde{k}_1(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b)}{\zeta_2 i(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b) - \zeta_2 \tilde{i}(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b)}, \tag{14c} \]

\[ r_{32}^H(b) = \frac{\zeta_2 i(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b) - \zeta_2 \tilde{i}(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b)}{\zeta_2 i(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b) - \zeta_2 \tilde{i}(\zeta_2 b) k_1(\zeta_2 b)}, \tag{14d} \]

in terms of the shorthand notation

\[ \zeta_i = \frac{n}{a_0} \sqrt{\varepsilon_i} \left( \frac{\pi n c}{a_0} \right), \quad i = 1, 3, 2. \tag{15} \]

The temperature dependent constant \( a_0 \) that appears in Eq. (15) was introduced in Eq. (5). The reflection coefficients are expressed in terms of the modified spherical Bessel functions \( i_l(t) \) and \( k_l(t) \) that are related to the modified Bessel functions by the relations

\[ i_l(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2l}} I_{l+\frac{1}{2}}(t), \tag{16a} \]

\[ k_l(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2l}} K_{l+\frac{1}{2}}(t). \tag{16b} \]

In particular \( i_l(t) = i_l'(t) \), the modified spherical Bessel function of the first kind, together with \( k_l(t) \) are a suitable pair of solutions in the right half of the complex plane [34, 35]. The respective functions with a bar are the generalized derivatives of the modified spherical Bessel functions given by

\[ \tilde{i}_l(t) = \left( \frac{1}{l} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) i_l(t), \tag{17a} \]

\[ \tilde{k}_l(t) = \left( \frac{1}{l} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) k_l(t). \tag{17b} \]

Using the Wronskian for the modified spherical Bessel functions,

\[ k_l i_l' - i_l k_l' = \frac{\pi}{2l^2}, \tag{18} \]

where primes denote differentiation, we have the relation

\[ k_l \tilde{i}_l - i_l \tilde{k}_l = \frac{\pi}{2l^2}. \tag{19} \]

The reflection coefficients are frequently expressed in terms of the modified Riccati-Bessel functions,

\[ s_l(t) = t i_l(t), \tag{20a} \]

\[ e_l(t) = \frac{2l}{\pi} k_l(t). \tag{20b} \]

In Fig. 5, Contour plot of fractional error \( f \) in estimating modified spherical Bessel function \( i_l(t) \) using uniform asymptotic expansions. The errors are less than one percent for \( l < 2 \) and \( t < 3 \), however, these errors add up when we sum many terms.

\[ f = 1 - \frac{i_l^{AE}(t)}{i_l(t)} \]

For completeness we have provided the derivation of the Lifshitz energy for concentric spherical configurations, given in Eq. (13), in the Appendix.

### IV. Asymptotic Expansions

Consider the scenario in which we know the dielectric functions in Eq. (7), for the three media in Fig. 4, as a function of Matsubara mode number \( n \) to a reasonable accuracy. The computation of the interaction energy in Eq. (13) then, in principle, involves the evaluation of the sums over the Matsubara mode number \( n \) and the angular momentum mode number \( l \). Both these sums contribute negligibly for large values of \( n \) and \( l \). However, the reflection coefficients in Eqs. (14) involve ratios of differences, and these differences get exceedingly small for larger values of \( l \). Thus, one has to keep an excessive number of significant digits in the evaluation of the Bessel functions, which is computationally expensive. This difficulty is avoided by expressing the modified Bessel functions using (uniform) asymptotic expansions for large order [34, 35].

The uniform asymptotic expansions for the modified spherical Bessel functions are written using the defini-
\begin{equation}
\nu = l + \frac{1}{2}, \quad z = \frac{t}{\nu}, \quad p(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + z^2}},
\end{equation}

and
\begin{equation}
\eta(z) = \sqrt{1 + z^2} + \ln\left(\frac{z}{1 + \sqrt{1 + z^2}}\right),
\end{equation}
such that
\begin{align*}
\bar{u}(t) &\sim \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{z}} \frac{e^{\nu\eta(z)}}{2\nu} A_{\nu}(p), \\
\bar{r}(t) &\sim \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{z}} \frac{e^{-\nu\eta(z)}}{2\nu} B_{\nu}(p), \\
\bar{\eta}(t) &\sim \frac{1}{p^2} \frac{e^{\nu\eta(z)}}{2\nu} C_{\nu}(p), \\
\bar{\kappa}(t) &\sim -\pi \frac{1}{p^3} \frac{e^{-\nu\eta(z)}}{2\nu} D_{\nu}(p),
\end{align*}

where
\begin{align*}
A_{\nu}(p) &\sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{u_k(p)}{\nu^k}, \\
B_{\nu}(p) &\sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{u_k(p)}{\nu^k}, \\
C_{\nu}(p) &\sim \frac{v_k(p)}{\nu^k} + \frac{p}{2\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{u_k(p)}{\nu^k}, \\
D_{\nu}(p) &\sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{v_k(p)}{\nu^k} + \frac{p}{2\nu} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{u_k(p)}{\nu^k},
\end{align*}

are expressed in terms of polynomials generated by
\begin{equation}
u_{k+1}(p) = \frac{p^2(1 - p^2)}{2} u_k'(p) + \int_0^p dq \frac{1 - 5q^2}{8} u_k(q),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
u_{k+1}(p) = u_{k+1}(p) + p(p^2 - 1) \left[ \frac{u_k(p)}{2} + pu_k'(p) \right],
\end{equation}

with \( u_0(p) = 1 \) and \( v_0(p) = 1 \). The use of \( \sim \) in place of equal sign in the equations suggest that these involve asymptotic series and the sums do not converge. The fractional error associated with using the uniform asymptotic expansions for the modified spherical Bessel functions in Eqs. (24) is plotted in Fig. 5 for order \( t \) and argument \( t \). The fractional errors are small and the largest error is only a percent for \( l < 2 \) and \( t < 3 \). Nevertheless, these errors could add up to significant levels in the computation of energy. This accumulation of error can be avoided in some cases by keeping more terms in inverse powers of \( \nu \) in the sum on \( k \), which is again computationally expensive.

Using the uniform asymptotic expansions for the modified spherical Bessel functions in Eqs. (24) we derive the corresponding expansions for the reflection coefficients in Eqs. (14) to be

\begin{align*}
\left. r_{31}^E(a) \right|_{n=0} &= 0, \\
\left. r_{31}^H(a) r_{32}^E(b) \right|_{n=0} &= -l(l+1) \left( \frac{a}{b} \right)^{2l+1} \frac{[\varepsilon_1(0) - \varepsilon_3(0)]}{[\varepsilon_1(0) + (l+1)\varepsilon_3(0)]} \frac{[\varepsilon_3(0) - \varepsilon_2(0)]}{[\varepsilon_2(0) + (l+1)\varepsilon_2(0)]}.
\end{align*}
modes in Eqs. (27) and the explicit evaluation of the zero Matsubara mode in Eq. (28), in the expression for Lifshitz energy in Eq. (13), we successfully circumvent the difficulty posed with numerically evaluating quantities that involve very small numbers.

V. NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

The series in \( l \) and \( m \) are slowly converging even after employing uniform asymptotic expansions. We do not use any existing algorithms to speed up this slow convergence. We simply sum the terms. Nevertheless, we report the procedure in detail here for the sake of reproducibility. The numerical work presented here is not state of the art, and can be improved.

Our primary purpose in this article is to demonstrate that the Lifshitz energy for concentric spherical configurations can be computed easily. To this end, as an illustrative example, we consider a configuration consisting of solid ice inside liquid water inside water vapor in the configuration of Fig. 4.

To compute the numerical value for the Lifshitz energy in Eq. (13) we use the uniform asymptotic expansions for the reflection coefficients given in Eqs. (27), instead of the exact expressions for the reflection coefficients in Eqs. (14). This involves a sum on the Matsubara mode \( n \), a sum on the angular momentum mode \( l \), and multiple sums on \( k \) to generate the energy. All these sums run from 0 to infinity, but only an optimal number of terms are to be included to avoid the unavoidable divergence associated with these asymptotic series. Further, numerical computation cannot sum infinite terms, and dropping terms after an upper limit in the sums introduces only an acceptable error. In this article we shall obtain convergence and confidence in the numerical estimate up to three significant digits.

We shall globally at the outset set an upper limit in sums on \( k \) of inverse powers of \( \nu = l + 1/2 \) for the asymptotic expansions to be \( k_{\text{max}} = 3 \). It will be convenient to similarly set a global upper limit for the sums on the Matsubara mode number \( n \), a sum on the angular momentum mode \( l \), and for the sum on the angular momentum mode \( l_{\text{max}} \). However, we learned that the required upper limit varies widely for the different combinations of the radii \( a \) and \( b \). For example, for the case when the inner radius of the sphere is large and the difference in the outer and inner radii is small, the sums on \( n \) and \( l \) in the interaction energy of Eq. (13) need to be evaluated at least until \( n_{\text{max}} = 2000 \) and \( l_{\text{max}} = 6000 \) to obtain convergence and confidence in the data up to three significant digits. Computationally this amounts to adding \( n_{\text{max}} \times l_{\text{max}} = 12 \times 10^6 \) terms in Eq. (13). To be specific, we used a computer with processor Intel Core i7-4700MQ CPU @ 2.40 GHz × 8, memory of 7.6 GB, which amounts to about 100 GFLOPS, and used Wolfram Mathematica [36] for evaluation. Mathematica was preferred over other programs because of the convenience to invoke libraries of special functions. Thus, it takes a total of three hours to evaluate the energy for one particular configuration. The estimate for this time reduces by half if the demand in accuracy is brought down to two significant digits. To study the dependence of the energy in the two radii one needs to at least compute the energy on a \( 10 \times 10 \) array in the two radii. This amounts to three hundred hours of computation. Though it is not impractical to proceed ahead, such long computation hours makes the analysis tedious and inconvenient. Nevertheless, the difficulty in calculating the energy for a particular configuration is not as arduous as portrayed above. One makes the observation that the computational burden is considerably lower because the values of \( n_{\text{max}} \) and \( l_{\text{max}} \) needed for the necessary accuracy are significantly smaller for spherical configurations of smaller radii.

Our strategy was to catalogue the \( n_{\text{max}} \) and \( l_{\text{max}} \) for all possible combinations of the radii. This involves multiple runs to verify the convergence. However, once catalogued it helps the analysis tremendously, because only a small sector in the array is expensive on computational power. The catalogue for the ice-water-vapor configuration has been prepared in Table I. We observe that the time taken to evaluate the energy for a particular configuration is most often negligible. It is only when the inner radii is large and difference in the radii is small that the time is painstakingly long. The energies in Table I are reported in units of \( E_0 = k_B T/(2\pi) = \hbar c/(4\pi^2 a_0) \) which is about 3.7463 meV at the triple point of water, \( T = 273.16 \) K.

We illustrate the convergence of the energy for a particular values of \( a \) and \( d \) as a function of the choice in \( l_{\text{max}} \) in Fig. 6. The convergence in energy is computationally expensive in the bottom right corner of the chart in Table I.

\[ f(a, d) = 1 - \frac{E(a, b; l_{\text{max}})}{E(a, b)} \]
TABLE I. Numerical data for the Lifshitz interaction energy $E(a, b)$ in Eq. (13), in units of $E_0 = k_B T/(2\pi) = \hbar c/(4\pi^2a_0)$, for three concentric dielectric regions, demarcated by radii $a$ and $b = a + d$, are catalogued with the respective $l_{\text{max}}$ and $n_{\text{max}}$ to obtain convergence and confidence in the necessary significant digits. Here $a_0 = \hbar c/(2\pi k_B T)$, which at $T = 273.16\text{ K}$ yields $a_0 \approx 1.3342\mu\text{m}$ and $E_0 = k_B T/(2\pi) \approx 6.0023 \times 10^{-22}\text{ J} \approx 3.7463\text{ meV}$. The numbers displayed in the tiny font in each box denote ($l_{\text{max}}, n_{\text{max}},$ time, significant digits), for ice-water-vapor configuration. The maximum values for $l$ and $n$ are the values needed for the energy values to converge to the required significant digits. The time displayed is that for a typical personal computer.

We made checks on the energies evaluated using uniform asymptotic expansions for the modified spherical Bessel functions by comparing it with values for energy obtained using the Bessel functions defined in Mathematica. Remarkably, to within three significant digits, the two results are identical for the parameter space used in this study. We verified this extensively for most of the parameter space, except for the few cases with large radii of ice and small thickness of water for which case the uniform asymptotic expansions fares very well.

It should be emphasized that the $l_{\text{max}}$ and $n_{\text{max}}$ presented in Table I is specific to the ice-water-vapor geometry. We expect the specific numbers to be different for another set of dielectric materials. However, we expect the pattern to be similar. That is, for all materials larger inner radii and small difference in radii will require the most computational effort.

VI. ELBAUM-SCHICK EFFECT IN SPHERICAL GEOMETRY

In Sec. II we summarized how Elbaum and Schick in Ref. [13] showed that at the triple point of water, at equilibrium, it is energetically favorable to form a $3.6\text{ nm}$ thick layer of liquid water at a planar interface of solid ice and water vapor. We shall use $d_{\text{min}}(\infty)$ to denote this thickness. This is a delicate effect due to the fine differences in the frequency dependent polarizabilities of ice and water and their interplay in the presence of quantum fluctuations. It is also a relativistic effect in the sense that the effect is washed out if the analysis does not accommodate retardation. We inquire if the formation of a
the smallest radius of the ball of ice we also mark the energies for visual assistance. For most part this curve remains constant in $d$ in the scale of Fig. 8 and starts diverging for small radii of ice. Slices in the three dimensional plot of Fig. 8 representing fixed $a$ are energy plots whose minima are $d_{\text{min}}(a)$.

A. Nucleation of ice in water

In Fig. 8 it is clear that the configuration of minimum energy is for large radius of ice with a water layer having a thickness $d_{\text{min}}(\infty)$. We also conclude that a spherical drop of water inside an infinite extent of vapor with no ice inside the water has zero interaction energy, which can be concluded by extrapolating the energies on the curve in Fig. 7. This verifies that the Lifshitz interaction energy of Eq. (13) is zero for $a = 0$, or for $d \to \infty$. Thus, a drop of water surrounded by vapor at the triple of water is not stable. It will nucleate ice, which will then grow in size indefinitely with the water layer thickness approaching $d_{\text{min}}(\infty)$. This is a remarkable proposition, because the common wisdom is that ice nucleation requires an impurity like dust or soot or bacteria. Our analysis suggests that quantum fluctuations will induce nucleation of ice even in the absence of impurities.

B. Superheating and supercooling

Superheating of solids is the suspension of melting above the melting point. Stranski in 1942 [37] argued that since superheating of solids is rarely observed the surface of solids must be wetted by its liquid phase. This argument is consistent with the idea of surface melting.

Supercooling of liquids is the absence of freezing below the melting point. In striking contrast supercooling of liquids is very common. It is well known that supercooled water can exist as small droplets in clouds. This seems to be inconsistent with the conclusion that zero point energy alone is sufficient to induce nucleation of ice in a water drop. However, this nucleation is more pronounced for a big drop of water because of the large binding energy in Fig. 8, while for small drops of water of 10 nm and below the binding energy is too low and less than the quantum
of energy available in the surrounding heat bath. Thus, it seems it should be easier to supercool small droplets of water and harder to supercool big drops of water, which is consistent with the observations.

C. Proximity force approximation

It is often convenient to approximate the Lifshitz energy for the configuration of concentric spheres with the corresponding Lifshitz energy for planar configuration scaled with a suitable area. This is often called the proximity force approximation, and is usually a good approximation when the thickness of the intermediate medium is small compared to the radii of the inner and outer spheres. In Fig. 9 we plot the fractional error in using this approximation. This error is small for large radii of ice and small thickness of water, and the error gets significant for small radii of ice and large thickness of water layer.

VII. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this article, we successfully demonstrated that the Lifshitz energy for concentric spherical configurations in Fig. 4 can be computed with relative ease. As an application we considered the case of solid ice enclosed by liquid water inside water vapor at the triple point of water, and thereby extended the analysis of Elbaum and Schick in Ref. [13] to spherical interfaces. Our study shows that a drop of water surrounded by vapor, with no ice inside the water, is unstable, and quantum fluctuations induce nucleation of ice in the drop of water at the triple point of water. It is energetically favorable for the ice to grow indefinitely inside the drop of water while a 3.6 nm thick layer of water encircles the ball of ice. These conclusions ignore self-energies of the interior and exterior spherical regions, which are not uniquely defined. Some of these effects may be subsumed into surface tension, but this omission, unavoidable at this stage of our understanding, renders our conclusions tentative.

In a following paper we will investigate the configuration of water inside ice inside vapor. That is, is it energetically favorable for ice to form at the interface of water and vapor, and once formed will it grow inwards? This is of interest because in Ref. [38] it was found that no ice is formed on a planar water surface based on Lifshitz theory. This is expected to hold for water drops of large radii. In addition, now, we have in the present work found, surprisingly, that purely quantum fluctuations induce freezing from within water droplets instead of freezing from outside.

As an application of the results found here, that ice grows inside water at the triple point of water, we would like to investigate the relevance of this effect to the predictions for liquid water on distant planets and their moons. In presence of a silica surface we have predicted that ice can form in water based on Lifshitz theory [17]. Boström et al. further proposed that Lifshitz forces could lead to ice formation on some specific gas hydrate surfaces in water [39]. On some hypothesized ice coated oceans on the moons Enceladus and Europa such ice films growing on CO$_2$ gas hydrate clusters could, if present, induce a size dependent buoyancy for nanosized hydrate clusters [39].

Understanding the charging process of atmospheric ice particles [40] is expected to be a relevant application of the results here. Another application will involve studying ice formation in pores, especially inside rocks and plants, in light of our results here. In some situations double layer interaction energy be significant in comparison to the Lifshitz energy as was discussed in Ref. [41], which could be extended to the spherical geometry.
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Appendix: Lifshitz interaction energy for concentric spheres

In this appendix we use $\hbar = 1$ and $c = 1$ for typographic brevity. This can be undone by replacing $\zeta \to \zeta/c$ and introducing $\hbar$ in equations for energy. In the multiple scattering formalism the Lifshitz interaction energy for the configuration of concentric spheres is given by

$$E_{12}(a, b) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\zeta}{2\pi} \ln \left[ 1 - \Gamma_a V_a \cdot \Gamma_b V_b \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)

where

$$V_a = (\varepsilon_3 - 1) + (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_3) \theta(a-r),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.2a)

$$V_b = (\varepsilon_3 - 1) + (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3) \theta(r-b),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.2b)

each describe concentric spherical regions with a single interface, obtained by letting $b \to \infty$ and $a \to 0$, respectively, in Fig. 4. The interaction energy of Eq. (A.1) corresponds to the third term in the decomposition of energy in Eq. (1) for the system in Fig. 4, which is finite by construction. In Eq. (A.1) we used symbolic notation,

$$\Gamma_a V_a \cdot \Gamma_b V_b = \int d^3r \, \Gamma_a(r, \bar{r}) V_a(\bar{r}) \cdot \Gamma_b(\bar{r}, r') V_b(r').$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.3)

Thus, the argument of the logarithm in Eq. (A.1) is a dyadic, or a matrix, with elements constituting integral kernels. The trace in Eq. (A.1) is over the matrix indices and on the kernel coordinates $r$ and $r'$. The Green dyadics $\Gamma_a(r, r')$ and $\Gamma_b(r, r')$ can be suitably expressed in the basis of spherical vector eigenfunctions [33]

$$X_{lm}^{(u)}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{i k_\perp} \nabla_\perp Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.4a)

$$X_{lm}^{(v)}(\theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{i k_\perp} \hat{r} \times \nabla_\perp Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.4b)

$$X_{lm}^{(w)}(\theta, \phi) = \hat{r} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi),$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.4c)

expressed in terms of spherical harmonics $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$, as

$$\Gamma_a(r, r') = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} X_{lm}^{(i)}(\theta, \phi) \gamma_{lm, \alpha}(r, r') X_{lm}^{(j)*}(\theta', \phi') \hspace{1cm} (A.5)$$

$\alpha = a, b$, where $0/1$ for the initial value of index $l$ means that the sum over $l$ runs from 0 to $\infty$ for terms involving $X_{lm}^{(a)}$, but $l$ runs from 1 to $\infty$ for terms involving $X_{lm}^{(a)}$ and $X_{lm}^{(b)}$. The matrices $\gamma_{lm, \alpha}(r, r')$ are the components of the Green dyadics in the basis of spherical vector eigenfunctions given by

$$\gamma_{lm, \alpha}(r, r') = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{D}{\varepsilon_a(r)} \frac{r'}{r} & \frac{i k_r}{\varepsilon_a(r)} \frac{r'}{r} g_{H}^{(r)}(r, r') \\
0 & 0 & -\zeta^2 g_{E}^{(r)}(r, r') \\
-\frac{i k_r}{\varepsilon_a(r)} & \frac{D'}{\varepsilon_a(r)} & \frac{r'}{r} g_{H}^{(r)}(r, r')
\end{pmatrix},$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

where

$$\varepsilon_a(r) = \begin{cases}
\varepsilon_1, & r < a, \\
\varepsilon_3, & a < r,
\end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.7)

and

$$\varepsilon_b(r) = \begin{cases}
\varepsilon_3, & r < b, \\
\varepsilon_2, & b < r,
\end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.8)

with shorthand notations

$$k_\perp^2 = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2}, \hspace{1cm} k_\perp^2 = \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2},$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.9)

and

$$D = \left( 1 + \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right) = \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r,$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.10)

and similarly for $D'$ with primed coordinates. We have omitted a term containing a $\delta$-function in Eq. (A.6), which does not contribute to interaction energies between disjoint bodies. The transverse magnetic and transverse electric spherical Green’s functions in Eq. (A.6) satisfy the differential equations

$$\begin{align}
-D \frac{1}{\varepsilon_a(r)} D + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2 \varepsilon_a(r)} + \zeta^2 g_{H}^{(r)}(r, r') &= \frac{\delta(r-r')}{r^2}, \\
-D^2 + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} + 2 \varepsilon_a(r) \cdot g_{E}^{(r)}(r, r') &= \frac{\delta(r-r')}{r^2}
\end{align}$$ \hspace{1cm} (A.11a, b)

$\alpha = a, b$, and have solutions
\[ g_{l,b}(r',r) = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{a (\zeta_1 a)} \left[ \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r') - \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r') \right], \]  
\[ g_{l,b}^{E}(r',r) = \frac{\varepsilon_2}{b (\zeta_2 b)} \left[ \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r') - \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r') \right], \]  
\[ g_{l,a}^{E}(r',r) = \frac{1}{a (\zeta_1 a)} \left[ \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) \right], \]  
\[ g_{l,b}^{E}(r',r) = \frac{1}{b (\zeta_2 b)} \left[ \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 i(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) \right]. \]

To evaluate the Lifshitz interaction energy we begin by processing the dyadic in Eq. (A.3). We use the expressions for the Green dyadics in Eq. (A.5) and using the orthogonality relations for the spherical vector eigenfunctions,

\[ \int_0^{\pi} \sin \theta d\theta \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \mathbf{X}_l^{(i)}(\theta, \phi) \mathbf{X}_l^{(j)}(\phi, \theta) = \delta_{lj} \delta_{mm'} \delta_{ij}, \]

for the angular part of coordinate \( \mathbf{r} \), we obtain

\[ \mathbf{I}_a V_a \cdot \mathbf{I}_b V_b = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} \mathbf{X}_l^{(i)}(\theta, \phi) \mathbf{X}_l^{(k)}(\theta', \phi') \]

\[ \times \int r^2 d\gamma_{l,m,a}(r, \mathbf{r}) V_a(r, \mathbf{r}) \gamma_{l,m,b}(r, \mathbf{r}') V_b(r'). \]

We observe the separation of the angular coordinates in this form, which is attributable to the spherical symmetry of the configuration of concentric sphere geometry. Using this feature as a cornerstone, we expand the logarithm as a series. In each term of the series the angular terms separate after repeated use of orthogonality relations for the spherical vector eigenfunctions. This allows for the separation of the angular coordinates completely and in conjunction with the trace in the equation the angular coordinates drop out of the equation, leaving a sum over \( l \) and a factor of \( (2l + 1) \) from the sum over \( m \). The leftover series involves integrals in radial coordinates, which, remarkably, allows for the series to be resummed. These manipulations, which are mostly formal rearrangement of integrals, are crucial part of the calculation and leads to the expression

\[ E_{12}(a,b) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\zeta}{2\pi} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l + 1) \ln \left[ 1 - K_{l}^{E}(a,b) \right] \left[ 1 - K_{l}^{H}(a,b) \right], \]

where

\[ K_{l}^{E}(a,b) = \zeta^2 (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2) (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3) \int_{0}^{a} r^2 dr \int_{b}^{\infty} r'^2 dr' \]

\[ \times g_{l,a}^{E}(r',r) g_{l,a}^{E}(r,r') \]

\[ K_{l}^{H}(a,b) = \zeta^2 (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_3) (\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3) \int_{0}^{a} r^2 dr \int_{b}^{\infty} r'^2 dr' \]

\[ \times g_{l,a}^{H}(r',r) g_{l,a}^{H}(r,r'). \]
where the integrals appearing in the numerators can be similarly factorized into

\[ K^H_k(a, b) = r^H_{31}(a)r^H_{32}(b), \quad (A.22) \]

where \( r^H_{ij} \) are the scattering coefficients for the transverse magnetic mode of an electromagnetic wave incident on interfaces \( a \) or \( b \). The transverse magnetic scattering coefficients can be expressed as

\[

c_{ij} = \frac{1}{a^2} (\zeta^2_1 - \zeta^2_3) \\
\times \int_0^a r^2 \, dr \left[ \frac{i_l(\zeta_1 r)\zeta_1 r + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} i_l(\zeta_1 r)i_l(\zeta_3 r)}{[\zeta_1 i_l(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_3 i_l(\zeta_1 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a)]} \right], \quad (A.23a) \\

r^H_{32}(b) = \frac{1}{b^2} (\zeta^2_2 - \zeta^2_3) \\
\times \int_b^\infty r^2 \, dr \left[ \frac{\zeta_1 i_l(\zeta_3 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r) + \frac{l(l+1)}{r^2} \zeta_1 i_l(\zeta_2 r)k_l(\zeta_3 r)}{[\zeta_3 i_l(\zeta_3 a)k_l(\zeta_3 a) - \zeta_2 i_l(\zeta_3 a)k_l(\zeta_2 a)]} \right], \quad (A.23b)
\]

where the integrals appearing in the numerators can be evaluated using the identities [36, 42]

\[

\int_x^\infty y^2 \, dy \left[ \frac{i_l(py)\zeta_l(qy) + \frac{l(l+1)}{y^2} p_i(p)q_i(q)}{(p^2 - q^2)} \right], \quad (A.24a)
\]

\[

\int_x^\infty y^2 \, dy \left[ \frac{q_i(p)\zeta_l(qy) + \frac{l(l+1)}{y^2} k_i(p)q_i(q)}{(p^2 - q^2)} \right], \quad (A.24b)
\]

which leads to the expression for the transverse magnetic scattering coefficients in Eqs. (14). Thus, we obtain the expression for the Lifshitz interaction energy in terms of scattering coefficients to be

\[
E_{12}(a, b) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\zeta}{2\pi} \sum_{l=0}^\infty (2l+1) \ln [1 - \zeta^2_3 r_{31}(a)r_{32}(b)] \frac{\zeta_i\zeta_3 a}{\zeta_i\zeta_3 a}, \quad (A.25)
\]

This expression for Lifshitz interaction energy is for zero temperature. The interaction energy for nonzero temperature in Eq. (13) is obtained from the above expression by the replacement

\[
\frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{d\zeta}{2\pi} \to \frac{\hbar^2}{2\pi a_0} \sum_{n=0}^\infty r^2, \quad (A.26)
\]