N.A.Kawakami¹ and M.C.Nemes²

D epartam ento de F sica, Instituto de Ciências Exatas, U niversidade Federal de M inas G erais, Caixa Postal 970, CEP 30161-970, Belo Horizonte, M inas G erais, B razil

Walter F.W reszinski³

Departamento de F sica Matematica, Instituto de F sica, Universidade de Sao Paulo, Caixa Postal 66318 - 05315-970 Sao Paulo - Brazil

Abstract | The Casim ir e ect for a massless scalar eld with D irichlet boundary conditions on in nite parallel plates is revisited. The energy per unit area is shown to be nite when surface renormalization counterterms, rst considered by Symanzik, are added to the original Ham iltonian density. The same result is obtained by Hadam and regularization of the original energy density. The energy per unit area is also proved to be independent of the regularization for a class of regularizing functions. Finally, we form ulate a general conjecture which points to a deep reason behind the results.

 $^{^1\,{\}rm supported}$ by FAPEM IG , kaw akam i@ sica ufm g br

² carolina@ sica.ufmg.br

³ supported in part by CNPQ, w reszins@ fm a.if.usp br

0. Introduction and Sum m ary

The Casim is pressure of the electrom agnetic eld enclosed by (in nitely thin) parallel plates, measured by Spaamay, is one of the most famous objects in quantum eld theory (and in quantum optics) [1], [2].

In spite of the well-known exact solution for the pressure ([1], [2]), the energy per unit area appeared to remain divergent, due to the (nonintegrable) divergence of the energy density at the boundaries { a phenom enon analyzed quite generally in the pioneering paper of D eutsch and C andelas [3] { until recent work by H.K uhn clari ed the situation, showing that the divergences due to the electric- eld and magnetic- eld components exactly cancel [4]. This argument does not, however, hold for other elds, which may play a role in C osm ology, particulary in the problem of dark energy ([5], [6], [7]). There, the energy density { the (tim e)-00 component of the energy-momentum tensor T_{00} (x) { is as in portant an observable as the pressure. If it diverges, or is ill-de ned, as in the case of general elds enclosed by parallel plates, the situation remains highly unsatisfactory from a conceptual point of view. In fact, this is the most elementary example of cuto – dependence of (in principle) observable quantities, which has been emphasized by H agen in more general situations [8].

In this paper we revisit the Casim ir e ect for a massless scalar eld with D irichlet boundary conditions (b.c.) on (in nitely thin) parallel plates. O ther b.c. (N eum ann or m ixed) m ay also be handled by the sam e m ethods, and yield analogous results, with the sam e value for the energy per unit area. The case of nonzero m ass will be left to a subsequent paper: it reveals additional aspects, such as logarithm ic divergences and a positive energy density (under suitable conditions on the m ass). Its treatment is, how ever, a great dealm ore subtle.

In section 1 we introduce the general fram ework and ideas, which go back to B.S.K ay [9] and L.M anzoni, G.Scharf and one of us (W.W reszinski) ([10], [11]). In section 2, we prove that upon addition of surface-regularization counterterms, rst introduced by Sym anzik [12], the energy per unit area becomes nite. In section 3 it is shown that the same result is obtained by H adam and regularization of the original energy density, and in section 4 cuto -independence of the latter, for a class of cuto -functions, is fully demonstrated, com pleting a proof only sketched in the second of references [11]. In section 5 we sum marize conclusions and open problem s.

M athem atically, two basic tools in asymptotic analysis, the Poisson summation formula [19] and the Euler-M aclaurin formula [22], seem to play a complementary role in the

2

theory of the Casim ir e ect, the rst one permitting to identify the dom inant terms in the density and the second one being instrum ental in the proof of regularization independence. We refer to [1], [2] and [20] for (part of) the immense literature on the Casim ir e ect.

1. GeneralFramework

We consider a massless scalar eld (x) on M inkowski space time x (x_0 ; x). The corresponding H am iltonian density h(x) is given by (~ = c = 1):

$$h(x) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta(x)}{\theta x_0}^2 + r(x)^2$$
(1:1)

We also wish to consider the free (massless scalar) eld restricted to the region K $_{d}$ between two (in nitely thin) parallel plates at z = 0 and z = d:

n

$$K_d = \mathbf{x} \quad (\mathbf{x}_k; \mathbf{z}); \text{ with } \mathbf{x}_k \quad (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \ 2 \ R^2 \text{ and } 0 \quad \mathbf{z} \quad d \quad (12)$$

with, for de niteness, D irichlet boundary conditions (b.c.) on the boundary M_d of K_d :

$${}^{n} {}^{o} (\mathbf{x}_{k}; 0) [(\mathbf{x}_{k}; d); \mathbf{x}_{k} 2 R^{2}$$
(1:3)

The density operator corresponding to (1.1) is given by

$$H(x) = :h(x):$$
 (1:4)

where the dots indicate norm al (or W ick) ordering. M easuring H (x) is a local operation which involves only a small neighborhood N (x) of the space-time point x. Since, however, the <u>state</u> S of the system on K_d is dimensional from the vacuum state ! of (in nite) space-time even restricted to N (x) (see [9], appendix, for a discussion), the question arises: with respect to which state is the norm all ordering (1.4)? In [9], the following renorm alization condition was in posed:

$$! (H (x)) = 0$$
 (1:5)

for all x in M inkowski space-time. This condition means that double dots refer to the in nite-space M inkowski vacuum state !, and was motivated in [10], [11] by the fact that real boundaries consist of electrons and ions, and the eld which interacts with them is quantized in in nite space, but one may also view (1.5) as an independent renormalization condition, as done by B.S.K ay in [9]. The assumptions of local quantum theory [13] yield now a rigorous formula for S (H (x)) (see, again, the appendix of [9]):

$$S(H(\mathbf{x})) = \lim_{\mathbf{x}_{1},\mathbf{x}_{2}! \times \mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \quad (e_{\mathbf{x}_{01}}e_{\mathbf{x}_{02}} + e_{\mathbf{x}_{1}}e_{\mathbf{x}_{2}})$$

$$h \qquad i$$

$$S((\mathbf{x}_{1}) (\mathbf{x}_{2})) \quad !((\mathbf{x}_{1}) (\mathbf{x}_{2})) \quad (1.6)$$

The scalar eld of zero mass, quantized in in nite space in p dimensions, may be formally written

$${}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2)^{p=2}} \sum_{k=1}^{Z} \frac{d^{p}k}{2!_{k}} a^{k}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + a^{k}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} = a^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) + a^{(p)}(\mathbf{x})$$
(1:7)

where x $(x_0;x);k x = kx_0 \tilde{k} x,$

$$k_0 = !_{\tilde{k}} = \tilde{k}j$$
 (1:8)

and ; + refer to the negative and positive-frequency parts in (1.7), i.e., those associated to a (resp. a^+), and satisfy

^h
$$(p)(x); (y) = \frac{1}{1} D_{0,p}^{(+)}(x - y):$$
 (1.9)

with

$$D_{0,p}^{(+)}(x) = \frac{1}{(2)^{p}} \left[\frac{d^{p}k}{2!_{\kappa}} e^{ik \cdot x} \right]$$
(1.10)

 a_p , a_p^+ are annihilation and creation operators de ned on symmetric Fock space over the (one-particle) H ilbert space H $_p = L^2 (\mathbb{R}^p)$, F $_s (\mathbb{H}_p)$, with a (f) antilinear, a^+ (g) linear, such that

h i
$$a_{p}(f);a_{p}^{+}(g) = (f;g)_{H_{p}}1$$
 (1:11a)

on a dense dom ain F₀ of nite-particle vectors (see, e.g., [14], p.208 .), where $(f;g)_{H_p}$ denotes the scalar product on H_p. The vacuum p is such that

$$a_{p}(f)_{p} = 0 \quad 8f \ 2 \quad H_{p}$$
 (1:11b)

The scalar $% \left({{{\rm{cl}}_{\rm{c}}}} \right)$ eld of zero m ass on the region K $_{\rm{d}}$ is form ally given by

$$_{K_{d}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2)^{2}} \int_{n=1}^{Z} d\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k} \prod_{n=1}^{X^{1}} \frac{1}{2!_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k,n}}} a(\mathbf{\tilde{k}};n) U_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k,n}}(\mathbf{x}) e^{i!_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k,n}}\mathbf{x}_{0}} + a^{+} (\mathbf{\tilde{k}};n) U_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k,n}}(\mathbf{x}) e^{i!_{\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k,n}}\mathbf{x}_{0}}$$
(1:12a)

where

$$U_{\tilde{k}_{k,n}}(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i\tilde{k}_{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{k}} U_{n}(\mathbf{z})$$
 (1:12b)

with

$$U_n(z) = \frac{r}{\frac{2}{d}} \sin \frac{n}{d} z$$
 $n = 1;2;:::$ (1:12c)

and \tilde{k}_k (k_x ; k_y), x_k (x; y),

"
$${}^{\#}_{1=2}$$

$$!_{\kappa_{k},n} \quad \tilde{\kappa}_{k} \stackrel{2}{j} + \frac{n}{d} \quad (1:12d)$$

Above, $U_{k_{k,n}}$ are (improper) eigenfunctions of (4)¹⁻², where 4 denotes the Laplacean:

$$(4)^{1=2} U_{\mathfrak{K}_{k,n}} (\mathbf{x}) = !_{\mathfrak{K}_{k,n}} U_{\mathfrak{K}_{k,n}}$$
(1:12e)

The a, $a^{\scriptscriptstyle +}\,$ in (1.12a) are operator-valued distributions on F $_{\rm S}$ (H), where

$$H = L^{2} (\mathbb{R}^{2}) \quad H_{1}$$
 (1:13a)

and

$$H_{1} = \int_{n=1}^{n} f(z) = \lim_{n=1}^{x^{1}} c_{n}U_{n}(z); \text{ with } \int_{n=1}^{x^{1}} c_{n}\int_{-\infty}^{0} c_{n}(1:13b)$$

where \lim : denotes the \lim it in the topology of $L^2(0;d)$, and such that

$$a(f);a^{+}(g) = (f;g)_{H} 1$$
 (1:14)

on F $_0$, where $(f;g)_H$ denotes the scalar product on H . The vacuum $_{K_d}$ is dened by

$$a(f)_{K_d} = 0 \quad 8f \ 2 \ H$$
 (1:15)

The eld $_{\rm K_{d}}$ has the two-point function

h

$$_{K_{d}}$$
 (x); $_{K_{d}}$ (x); $_{(K_{d})}$ $\stackrel{i}{=} \frac{1}{i} D_{K_{d}}^{(+)}$ (x;x[°]) (1:16)

where $D_{K_d}^{(+)}$ is the distribution

$$D_{K_{d}}^{(+)}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^{\circ}) = D_{K_{d}}^{(+)}(\mathbf{x}_{0} \quad \mathbf{x}_{0}^{\circ};\mathbf{x};\mathbf{x}^{\circ}) =$$

$$= i_{n=1}^{X^{1}} \frac{Z}{2!_{K_{k,n}}} e^{iK_{k}} (\mathbf{x}_{k} \times \mathbf{x}_{k}^{\circ}) U_{n}(\mathbf{z}) U_{n}(\mathbf{z}^{\circ})$$
(1:17)

Due to (1.16), (1.17), the canonical commutation relations (CCR) are altered with respect to their free eld values if f;g 2 S (R²) C_0^1 (0;d) S (R) (corresponding to the variables x_k , z and x_0), then

h i
$$_{K_{d}}(f); K_{d}(g) = 0$$
 (1:18)

not only when the points x $(\mathbf{x}_k; z; \mathbf{x}_0); \mathbf{x}^\circ$ $(\mathbf{x}_k^\circ; z^\circ; \mathbf{x}_0^\circ)$ in the supports of f and g are space-like to one another, but also whenever x is space-like to its m irror in age $(\mathbf{x}_k^\circ; 2d z^\circ; \mathbf{x}_0^\circ)$, i.e., $(\mathbf{x}_k \ \mathbf{x}_k^\circ)^2 + (z + z^\circ 2d)^2 \ (\mathbf{x}_0 \ \mathbf{x}_0^\circ)^2 > 0$, corresponding to connecting the points x and \mathbf{x}° both by a ray and by one which su ers a relection on the right plate (there is, of course, an in nity of other possibilities involving the left plate and multiple relections). This is valid only for D irichlet boundary conditions.

See also [15] for the commutation relations for the electrom agnetic eld in the C oulom b gauge and D irichlet b.c., and [16] for a general discussion of boundary conditions in quantum eld theory.

We need also regularized elds. Let C : R ! R be a smooth function (1.19a) satisfying

Ζ₁

$$C(0) = 1$$
 (1:19b)

$$C^{(k)}(x) dx < 1$$
 8 k = 1;2;::: (1:19c)

$$\lim_{x \le 1} C^{(k)}(x) = 0 \qquad 8 \ k = 1;2; \dots$$
(1:19d)

We introduce a class of regularizing functions C depending on a cuto with dimensions of length by

$$C(k) = C(!_{k})$$
 (1.20)

where $!_{\tilde{k}}$ is the frequency (1.8) (which in the case of $_{K_d}$, given by (1.12a), is given by (1.12d)). By (1.19a) and (1.20),

$$\lim_{t \to 0} C \quad (k) = 1 \tag{1.21}$$

The regularized elds $^{(\!p\!)}$ and $_{K_d};$ corresponding to the form al $^{(\!p\!)}$ and $_{K_d}$ are dened by

$${}^{(p)}(x) = (2)^{p=2} \frac{Z}{p} \frac{d^{p}k}{2!_{\kappa}} a_{p}(k)e^{ikx} + a_{p}^{+}(k)e^{ikx} C(k)$$
(1.22)

$$\kappa_{d}; (\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2)^{2}} \sum_{n=1}^{Z} d\tilde{k}_{n} \frac{\chi^{d}}{1} \underbrace{q \frac{1}{2!}}_{\kappa_{k,m}} a(\tilde{k};n) U_{\tilde{k}_{k,m}} (\mathbf{x}) e^{i! \kappa_{k,m} x_{0}} + i! \\ + a^{+} (\tilde{k};n) U_{\tilde{k}_{k,m}} (\mathbf{x}) e^{i! \kappa_{k,m} x_{0}} C(\tilde{k})$$
(1.23)

where C is given by (1.19), (1.20), and has the property (1.21), as well as a norm alization condition inherited from (1.19b).

For the free eld, we may, equivalently for (1.6), go from in nite space to a geometry with boundaries, by expressing the normal ordering (1.4) in con guration space by the point splitting technique which yields

$$: \frac{\theta}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} := \lim_{\mathbf{y} \le \mathbf{x}} : \frac{\theta}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} \frac{(\mathbf{x})}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} \frac{\theta}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} \frac{(\mathbf{y})}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} :=$$
$$= \lim_{\mathbf{y} \le \mathbf{x}} \frac{\theta}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} \frac{(\mathbf{x})}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} \frac{\theta}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}} + \frac{1}{\mathbf{i}} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}^{2}} D_{0;3}^{(+)} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$$
(1.24)

in the sense of operator-valued tem pered distributions, where, in (124),

Finally, from (1.1) and (1.3),

$$H(x) = \lim_{y! x} \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\theta(x))}{(\theta(x))} \frac{(\theta(y))}{(\theta(y))} + r(x) r(y) + \frac{1}{i} \frac{(\theta^2)}{(\theta(x))} D_{0/3}^{(+)}(x y)$$
(1.26)

which we take to be the H am iltonian density (operator) describing the eld, both free and with boundaries, in agreement with (1.5) and the discussion following it. In case we wish to describe the eld with boundaries, the rst three terms in (1.26) must be dened on symmetric Fock space on the adequate (one-particle) H ilbert space H, i.e., the concrete representation of the eld operator is dictated by the geometry. In the case of parallel plates, i.e., with the elds dened on K d, given by (1.2), with D irichlet b.c. on $@K_d$, given by (1.3), the eld is (formally) given by (1.12), on F S (H), given by (1.13).

Thus, (1.26) has to be an operator on F $_{\rm S}$ (H), and therefore must be represented in the form :

$$H_{K_{d}} := \frac{1}{2} : \frac{@(x)}{@x_{0}}^{2} : + \frac{1}{2} : r (x) r (x); + \frac{1}{i} \lim_{y' x} \frac{@^{2}}{@x_{0}^{2}} D_{0;3}^{(+)} (x y) D_{K_{d}}^{(+)} (x y)$$
(1.27)

where $D_{K_d}^{(+)}$ is given by (1.17) and the sem icolons in (1.27) denote normal ordering, with respect to the emission and absorption operators in (1.12a) (which satisfy (1.14)) and the vacuum K_d , dened by (1.15).

For two space-time dimensions, with the renormalization assumption (1.5) is powerful enough to yield a divergence-free theory [9]. This is a very special case, similar to the case of parallel plates with periodic b.c. [10]. O therwise, additional divergences arise, due to the sharpness of the surface, as remarked in the pioneering paper of D eutsch and C andelas [3]. The problem occurs whenever the attempt is made to impose b.c. on quantum elds (called \unnatural acts" by R.L.Ja e in [17]), i.e., to restrict quantum elds to sharp surfaces. A similar problem arises in the restriction to a causal surface (the horizon) in connection with the problem of localization entropy [18].

In the next section 2, we show that addition (in a properway) of \surface regularization counterterm s", proposed by Sym anzik [12] in a fram ework where the elds were considered in the Schrodinger picture, and also included interactions, yields the nite, correct energy per unit area, thus providing a rst analytic solution to the problem.

2. Sym anzik's surface renorm alization counterterm s

Taking into account (122), (123), we de ne the quantities corresponding to (1.1), (1.10) (in p dimensions), (1.27) and (1.17), denoting them by $h^{(p)}(x); D_{0;}^{(+)}; H_{;K_d}(x)$ and $D_{K_d}^{(+)}$, respectively. $H_{;K_d}$ represents the regularized H am iltonian density in a theory with boundary $(K_d$ given by (1.3).

Let, now, p = 2, and H_r (resp. H₁) denote two copies of L² (R²) corresponding to the right (resp. left) plates (components of (C_d) , F_s (H_r) and F_s (H₁) the related symmetric Fock spaces, with vacua r, s, satisfying (1.11b) (with p = 2). The related H am iltonian densities will be denoted by $h_{r}^{(2)}(x)$ and $h_{r}^{(2)}(x)$.

Further, let $r^{(2)}$, $r^{(2)}$ denote the delta-functions associated to the right and left plates (see [23], Ch.3, x 1, for delta-distributions and other singular functions associated to a regular surface).

Finally, let E^{vac} denote the vacuum energy density corresponding to H _{Kd}. By (1.27), it is (with _{Kd} dened by (1.15)):

$$E^{\text{vac}}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} K_{d}; H_{fK_{d}}(\mathbf{x}) & K_{d} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots & y & y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \lim_{y \in \mathbf{x}} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta \mathbf{x}_{0}^{2}} D_{0;3}^{(+)}; (\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}) & D_{K_{d}}^{(+)}; (\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \end{pmatrix}$$
(2:1)

We now de ne the (regularized) vacuum density with surface renormalization counterterm s by

"

$$\begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ E_{ren;}^{vac} & E_{ren;}^{vac}(x) + \frac{1}{4} & _{r}; h_{r}^{(2)} & _{r} & _{r}^{(2)}(x) + _{1}; h_{;1}^{(2)} \ 1 & _{1}^{(2)}(x) \end{array}$$

By (2.1) and (2.2), $E_{ren}^{vac}(x)$ is, for each e = 0, an operator valued distribution [24]. Consider, now , a compact subset K $_{\rm d}^{\rm A}$ of K $_{\rm d}$ de ned by

$$K_{d}^{A} = \mathbf{x} \quad (\mathbf{x}_{k}; z), \text{ with } \mathbf{x}_{k} (\mathbf{x}; y) 2 = \frac{L_{1}}{2}; \frac{L_{1}}{2} = \frac{L_{2}}{2}; \frac{L_{2}}{2} \text{ and } 0 = z \quad d \quad (2:3a)$$

with

$$L_1 L_2 = A \tag{2.3b}$$

Let $\binom{(n)}{K_d^A}$ (:) $_{n=1;2;...}$ be a sequence of sm ooth functions approaching, as n ! 1, the characteristic function of K $_{\rm d}^{\rm A}$, and such that

where K $_{\rm d}^{\rm A,O}$ denotes the interior of K $_{\rm d}^{\rm A}$.

W e de ne the vacuum energy E $^{\rm vac}$ (A) of the region K $^{\rm A}_{\rm d}$ by

$$\lim_{\substack{i \\ j \\ 0+ n!}} \lim_{\substack{n! \\ 1}} d^{3}x \quad {}_{K_{d}^{A}}^{(n)}(x) E_{ren}^{vac}(x_{0};x) \quad E^{vac}(A;d)$$
(2.5)

whenever the double-lim it on the lh.s. of (2.5) exists, is independent of the regularization (1.19), (1.20) and does not depend on x_0 . The vacuum energy per unit area "d { the basic observable quantity { is, then, de ned by

$$"_{d} \lim_{A \leq 1} \frac{E^{\text{vac}}(A;d)}{A}$$
 (2.6)

whenever the lim it on the r.h.s. of (2.6) exists.

The main result of this section is

Theorem 2.1

$$\mathbf{"}_{\rm d} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{720 {\rm d}^3} \tag{2:7}$$

with the possible exception of the independence on the regularization, which will be left to section 4.

<u>Proof</u>. W e use a special regularizer in (1.19a),

1

$$C(x) = e^{x} x 0; x 2 R$$
 (2:8)

which clearly satisfies (1.19b) and (1.19c); C is then given by (1.20), with $!_{R}$ given by (1.8).

Let, in correspondence to (2.5)

$$E^{\text{vac}} = \lim_{n \neq 1} d^3 x \xrightarrow{(n)}_{K^{A}_{d}} (x) E^{\text{vac}} (x_0; x)$$
(2:9)

assuming the above limit exists and does not depend on x_0 . By (2.1) and (2.9),

$$E^{\text{vac}} = \frac{A}{2(2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} & Z_1 \\ & 2d \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix} dk k^3 e^{-k} + \\ + 2 \begin{pmatrix} X^i & Z_1 \\ & n=1 \end{pmatrix} e^{-k^2} \begin{pmatrix} & x^i & Z_1 \\ & 0 \end{pmatrix} e^{-k^2} \begin{pmatrix} & x^i & x^i \\ & n=1 \end{pmatrix} e^{-k^2} \begin{pmatrix} & x^i & x^i \\ & n=1 \end{pmatrix} e^{-k^2} (2.10)$$

Perform ing the change of variable $k_n^0 = [(n = d)^2 + k^2]^{1=2}$ in the second integral on the rhs. of (2.10), we obtain

$$E^{\text{vac}} = \frac{Ad}{(2)^2} \qquad 6^4 + \frac{\theta^2}{\theta^2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{e^{-\frac{1}{d}}} \qquad (2:11)$$

W e now use the asymptotic expansion ([22], p.320) in

$$\frac{t}{e^{t} 1} = 1 \frac{1}{2}t + \sum_{k=1}^{X^{t}} (1)^{k} B_{k} \frac{t^{2k}}{(2k)!}$$
(2:12)

obtaining ($B_2 = 1=30$):

$$E^{vac} = \frac{A}{4^{3}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{{}^{2}A}{720d^{3}} + O({}^{2})$$
 (2:13a)

For a general cuto

$$E^{vac} = \frac{A}{8} \int_{0}^{2} du u^{2} C(u) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2^{2} A}{2 \cdot 720 d^{3}} + O(1^{2})$$
 (2:13b)

Let, now,

$$E_{\text{ren};}^{\text{vac}} = \lim_{n! \ 1} d^3 x \frac{{}^{(n)}_{K_{d}^{\text{A}}}}{K_{d}^{\text{A}}} (x) E_{\text{ren};}^{\text{vac}} (x_{0}; x)$$
(2:14)

By (1.10),

$$(r;h_{r}^{(2)})_{r} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{(2)^{2}} \int_{0}^{2} dk k^{2} e^{-k} = \frac{1}{2^{3}}$$
 (2:15)

Putting together now (2.2), (2.4), (2.13), (2.14) and (2.15), we obtain

$$E_{ren}^{vac} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{{}^{2}A}{720d^{3}} + O({}^{2})$$
 (2.16)

from which (2.7) follows by de nitions (2.5) and (2.6).

<u>Remark 2.1</u>: The surface term in (2.13) is absent for periodic b.c., because the latter allows for the n = 0 term in (2.10), which cancels it exactly. This explains the very special result of [10], which bears some similarity with the also very special model in [9].

<u>Remark 22</u>: The <u>external</u> C as in ir energy is zero, see [11], whose proof remains unaltered. Result (2.7) is one-half of the result for the electrom agnetic eld, due to sum mation over the two polarization states in the latter. Polarization does, however, play a major role in explaining the cancelation occurring in [4].

<u>Remark 2.3</u>: The series (2.13) is a <u>divergent</u> asymptotic series, by (2.11), (2.12), but the rest in (2.13) is { again by (2.11) and (2.12) { bounded by constant , so that its limit as ! 0+ exists and is zero.

<u>Remark 2.4</u>: The present approach also works for the inner problem for the cube, see [6].

<u>Remark 2.5</u>: The form of the divergent surface term in (2.13) gives the impression that this divergence is also an <u>ultraviolet</u> divergence. This is due to the use of regularized

elds (1.22), (1.23), because C in (1.20) simulates a dielectric constant with suitable behavior at high frequency which, e.g. in the electrom agnetic case, should characterize the surface, because any material is transparent to electrom agnetic radiation if the frequency is su ciently high. Thus, the use of an \improved" Ham iltonian density with surface renorm alization counterterms, but maintaining (\unphysical") sharp b.c. is seen to be equivalent to \soft" b.c. [17], which, however cannot be dealt with completely analytical fashion.

Remark 2.5 raises an interesting issue: is it possible to take the limit ! 0+ in the vacuum energy density, E^{vac}(x), given by (2.1)?

The use of the Poisson sum m ation form ula in the next section 3 shows that it is indeed possible, that the resulting limiting density is given by a function diverging at $\mathbb{Q}K_{d}^{A}$, in such a way that its integral over K_{d}^{A} does <u>not</u> exist. Thus, the limiting density is not locally integrable and does not de ne a (Schwartz) distribution, but it is also shown in section 3 that the Hadam and regularization [24] of the integral over K_{d}^{A} exists and yields (2.7).

The corresponding (Schwartz) distribution, Hadam and's pseudofunction [24], is the divergence remaining after renormalization (1.5) of the <u>density</u> is, in fact, <u>independent</u> of the ultraviolet cuto, as happens in the horizon problem in [18].

3. Poisson's summation formula and the Hadamard regularization of the Casim ir energy density

Using the expression (2.1) and considering a smooth function satisfying the conditions (1.19a), (1.19b) and (1.19c) we can assume a special regularizer like (2.8) for the calculation of the C asim ir energy density as follows

with, for the parallel plates,

$$U_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{r}{d} \frac{1}{d} \sin \frac{n}{d} z e^{i(k_x x + k_y y)}$$
 (32)

so we can write

$$E^{\text{vac}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{(2)^3} d^3 k \, \mathrm{ke}^{-k} + \frac{1}{(2)^2} \frac{2}{d} d^{2k} d$$

where $!_{n}^{2} = k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + \frac{n}{d}^{2}$ and $k = !_{n};k_{1};k_{2};\frac{n}{d}$.

The sum mation term in the energy density in (3.3) can be extended to accommodate negative terms in n, noticing that the parity of integrand is even and the term n = 0 yields zero. Let

$$I = \frac{1}{(2)^{2}} \frac{2}{d} \sum_{n=0}^{x^{1}} \frac{2}{dk_{1}} \frac{2}{dk_{2}} \sin^{2} \frac{n}{d} z e^{! n} = \frac{1}{(2)^{2}d} \sum_{n=1}^{x^{1}} \frac{2}{dk_{1}} \frac{2}{dk_{2}} \sin^{2} \frac{n}{d} z e^{! n}$$
(3.4)

Now, by Poisson's summation formula (PSF) (see, e.g., [19]),

$$\begin{array}{c} X^{1} \\ f(2 n) = \frac{1}{p - \frac{1}{2}} & \hat{X}^{1} \\ m = 1 \end{array} \qquad (3.5a)$$

where

$$\hat{f}(m) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{Z_{+1}} dk e^{im k} f(k). \qquad (3:5b)$$

and

$$f(2 n) \sin^2 \frac{n}{d} z e^{! n}$$
 (3.5c)

we obtain

$$I = \frac{1}{(2)^{3}d} \begin{bmatrix} x^{1} & z^{1} + 1 & z^{1} + 1 & z^{1} + 1 & x^{1} \\ dk_{1} & dk_{2} & dk_{3}^{0} & k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + \frac{k_{3}^{0}}{2d} \end{bmatrix}^{2}$$

$$sin^{2} \frac{k_{3}^{0}}{2d}z = \sqrt{k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + \frac{k_{3}^{0}}{2d}} e^{im k_{3}^{0}}$$
(3.6)

Perform ing a change of variable $k_3 = k_3^0 = 2d$ on (3.6) we get

$$I = I_1 + I_2$$
 (3:7)

$$I_{1} = \frac{1}{(2)^{3}} \begin{pmatrix} x^{1} & z_{+1} & z_{+1} & z_{+1} & q_{+1} & q_{+1$$

$$I_{2} = \frac{1}{(2)^{3}} \int_{m=1}^{X^{1}} \frac{dk_{1}}{dk_{1}} \frac{dk_{2}}{dk_{2}} \frac{dk_{3}}{dk_{3}} \frac{k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + k_{3}^{2}}{k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + k_{3}^{2}} = \frac{p_{1}}{k_{1}^{2} + k_{2}^{2} + k_{3}^{2}} e^{\frac{i2m}{k_{3}}}$$
(3:9)

By (3.3), (3.7), (3.8) and (3.9) we obtain

$$E^{\text{vac}}(z;d) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4}{(2)^{2}} \frac{(2z)^{2}}{[^{2} + (2z)^{2}]^{3}} - \frac{4}{(2)^{2}} \frac{X}{[^{2} + (2md)^{2}]^{3}} + \frac{2(md+z)^{2}}{[^{2} + (2md)^{2}]^{3}} + \frac{2(md+z)^{2}}{[^{2} + (2md+z)^{2}]^{3}} + \frac{2(md-z)^{2}}{[^{2} + (2md)^{2}]^{3}} + \frac{3}{(2md+z)^{2}} \frac{\#}{2} \right)$$
(3:10)

where the rst term above is the term with m = 0 in I_2 . The m = 0 term in I_1 cancels exactly the rst integral in (3.3). By (3.10),

$$E^{\text{vac}}(z;d) \qquad \lim_{i \to 0^{+}} E^{\text{vac}}_{i \to 0}(z;d) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{z^{4}} \right)^{2} \frac{1}{z^{4}} \frac{1}{2(2)^{2}} \frac{X^{4}}{z^{2}} \frac{1}{(\operatorname{m} d)^{4}} + \frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} \frac{X^{4}}{z^{2}} \frac{1}{(\operatorname{m} d + z)^{4}} + \frac{1}{(\operatorname{m} d - z)^{4}} \right)$$
(3.11)

The rst term in (3.11) diverges on the plate where z = 0, the last term (for m = 1) diverges on the other plate where z = d. These dom inant terms can be identified as stationary points in the PSF by (3.6):

stationary points in the PSF by (3.6): Indeed, writing $\sin^2 \frac{k_3^0}{2d}z = \frac{e^{i\frac{k_3^0}{2d^2}}e^{-i\frac{k_3^0}{2d}z}}{2i}^2$ in (3.6), these points correspond to $\frac{e}{ek_3^0}$ (m d z) $k_3^0 = 0$, which lead to z = 0 (form = 0) and z = d (form = 1).

A general m ethod combining the PSF with the stationary phase m ethod for obtaining asymptotic estimates was developed in [19] (see also [21]).

By (3.11), $E^{vac}(z;d)$ is not integrable over 0 z d d d z. d given by (2.3a).

Let P (:) denote the Hadam and regularization (or \partie nie") of a given integral (see [24],pp. 38-43). Then

Theorem 3.1

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ z; d \end{bmatrix} dz = "_{d}$$
(3:12)

where $"_d$ is given by (2.7).

<u>Proof</u>.

$$P \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{d}{dz} \frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{z^{4}} = \frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} \lim_{t \to 0}^{h^{Z}} \frac{d}{dz} \frac{1}{z^{4}} = \frac{1}{3^{3}} \frac{1}{z^{4}} = \frac{1}{12(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{d^{3}}$$
(3:13a)

$$P \int_{0}^{2} dz \frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{(d z)^{4}} = \frac{1}{12(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{d^{3}}$$
(3:13b)

which, inserted into (3.11), yields, after a simple calculation,

$$P \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} E^{vac}(z;d)dz = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2(2)^{2}d^{3}} \int_{m=1}^{X^{4}} \frac{1}{m^{4}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2(2)^{2}d^{3}} (3:14)$$

<u>Remark 3.1</u>: (3.11) shows that the divergence of the energy per unit area remaining after renorm alization (1.5) { i.e., after performing the cancelation between the rst integral in (3.3) with the m = 0 term in I_1 is independent of the ultraviolet cuto , being only due to the sharp nature of the surface, i.e., the use of D irichlet (or N eumann) b.c. on quantum elds. These are the \unnatural acts" referred to by R. Ja e in [17]. This is similar to the restriction of a quantum eld to a causal surface (the horizon) in the problem of area behavior of localizations entropy in [18], where, how ever, the divergence remains. In the C asim in problem this divergence is removed by H adam and regularization, as proved in Theorem 3.1, yielding the correct energy per unit area. Such was also the noding of E lizable in [20]: he showed that H adam and regularization yielded, in models treated in [17], the same result of introducing a \soft" surface, which, how ever, cannot be done analytically. In section 5 we attempt to nd a deeper explanation of this fact.

We have used a special regularizer (2.8) in the proof of Theorem 2.1, but, in the next section, we show that the result is the same for all regularizers satisfying (1.19) and (1.20).

4. The cuto independence in the Casim ir energy density

We now write (2.10), with a general cuto satisfying (1.19) and (1.20), as

$$E^{\text{vac}} = \frac{A}{2(2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ 2d \\ dk \\ k^3 \\ z_1 \\ k^2 \\ k^2 \\ k^2 \\ n=1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ r \\ \frac{n}{d} \\ k^2 \\ k^2 \\ r \\ \frac{n}{d} \\ k^2 \\ k^$$

Rewriting the second term of the r.h.s. in (4.1) with a change of variable we have

$$E^{\text{vac}} = A \qquad \frac{d}{(2)^2} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dk \, k^{3} C(k) + \frac{1}{8} \lim_{n \ge 1} \int_{m=1}^{X^{n}} g(m) \qquad (4.2)$$

with

$$g(m) = \begin{bmatrix} Z_{1} & r & \frac{m}{d} \\ du & u + \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2} C \qquad \begin{bmatrix} u + \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_{1} \\ u & \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2} = \begin{bmatrix} Z_{1} \\ u & \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ u & \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2} = \begin{bmatrix} U_{1} \\ u & \frac{m}{d} \end{bmatrix}^{2}$$
(4:3)

Now, we can introduce the Euler-Maclaurin sum formula, which yields ([22], p.326) under assumptions (1.19c) and (1.19d):

$$\sum_{m=1}^{X^{n}} g(m) = \frac{2d}{2} \sum_{0}^{Z} \frac{1}{2} dq q^{3}C(q) = \frac{1}{2}g(0)! k$$
(4.4)

where

$$_{k} = S_{k}(0) = \frac{1}{(2k+2)!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt _{2k+2}(t)g^{(2k+2)}(t), \quad k = 1;2; \dots (4.5)$$

with

$$S_{k}(0) = \int_{r=1}^{X^{k}} (1)^{r} \frac{B_{r}}{(2r)!} g^{(2r)}(0), \qquad (4.6)$$

and

$$_{k}$$
 (t) = $_{k}$ (t) m od 1 (4:7)

where k can be obtained as follows

$$x \frac{e^{xt}}{e^{x}} \frac{1}{1} = \sum_{n=1}^{X^{1}} k(t) \frac{x^{n}}{n!}.$$
 (4.8)

Theorem 4.1

Under assumptions (1.19c) and (1.19d), $_k$ (with k = 1;2;:::) is independent of k, i.e.

$$k = k+1$$
 8 k = 1;2;::: (4.9)

<u>Proof.</u> By (4.5)

$$_{k+1} = S_{k+1}(0) = \frac{1}{(2k+4)!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt _{2k+4}(t) g^{(2k+4)}(t)$$
 (4.10)

The rst term on the r.h.s. of (4.12) may be written

$$S_{k+1}(0) = \sum_{r=1}^{k+1} (1)^{r_1} \frac{B_r}{(2r)!} g^{(2r_1)}(0) =$$

$$= \sum_{r=1}^{k} (1)^{r_1} \frac{B_r}{(2r)!} g^{(2r_1)}(0) + (1)^k \frac{B_{k+1}}{[2(k+1)]!} g^{[2(k+1)]!}(0) =$$

$$= S_k(0) + (1)^k \frac{B_{k+1}}{(2k+2)!} g^{(2k+1)}(0). \qquad (4:11)$$

By (4.7) and (4.8) it follows that (see [22], pp.320-321)

$$_{k}(0) = 0,$$
 (4:12a)

$$_{2m 1}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{2m}^{0} (\mathbf{x})}{2m}$$
, (4:12b)

and

$$_{2}m(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\int_{2m+1}^{0} (\mathbf{x})}{2m+1} + (1)^{m} B_{m}$$
 (4:12c)

Rewriting the second term on the r.h.s. in (4.5) using (4.12c) with m = k + 1 and integrating by parts using (1.19d), we have:

$${}^{k+1} + S_{k+1}(0) = \frac{1}{(2k+2)!} {}^{m} \frac{1}{2k+3} {}^{Z_{1}}_{0} dt_{2k+3}(t) g^{(2k+3)}(t) +$$

$${}^{\#} + (1)^{k} B_{k+1} g^{(2k+1)}(0)$$

$$(4.13)$$

U sing (4.12b) above, with m = k + 2, and integrating by parts again we have

$$_{k+1} + S_{k+1}(0) = \frac{1}{(2k+4)!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt _{2k+4}(t) g^{(2k+4)}(t) + \frac{(1)^{k} B_{k+1} g^{(2k+1)}(0)}{(2k+2)!}$$
(4.14)

which yields

$$\sum_{k+1}^{k+1} + S_{k+1}(0) = \frac{1}{(2k+4)!} \sum_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt \sum_{2k+4}^{2k+4} (t)g^{(2k+4)}(t) =$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2k+2)!} \sum_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt \sum_{2k+2}^{2k+2} (t)g^{(2k+2)}(t) = \frac{(1)^{k}B_{k+1}g^{(2k+1)}(0)}{(2k+2)!}$$

$$(4.15)$$

Finally, putting (4.15) and (4.11) into (4.10), we nd

$$\sum_{k+1} = S_{k}(0) \qquad \frac{1}{(2k+2)!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt \sum_{2k+2} (t) g^{(2k+2)} =$$

$$= k \cdot$$

$$(4.16)$$

Theorem 42

Let in addition to (1.19c) and (1.19d), the norm alization condition (1.19b) hold. Then "_d, de ned by (2.6), equals the value (2.7), and thus Theorem 2.1 is independent of the regularizer, if the latter satis es (1.19).

<u>Proof.</u> By (4.2), (4.3), (4.4) and (4.16):

$$\frac{E^{\text{vac}}}{A} = \lim_{n! \ 1} \frac{1}{8} \int_{m=1}^{X^{1}} g(m) = \frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{2} g(0) + 2 \qquad (4:17)$$

where, by (4.5),

$$_{2} = \frac{B_{1}}{2}g^{(0)}(0) + \frac{B_{2}}{24}g^{(3)}(0) - \frac{1}{6!} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} f^{(6)}(t)dt$$
 (4:18)

By (4.3),

$$\frac{1}{2}g(0) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} du \frac{p}{uC} \left(\int_{u}^{p} \frac{1}{u} \right) = \frac{1}{3}\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} du u^{2}C (u)$$
(4:19)

Again, by (4.3),

$$\frac{d}{d}g^{(1)}(m) = 2 \frac{m}{d} C \frac{m}{d} (421a)$$

$$\frac{d}{d}g^{(3)}(m) = 4 \frac{d}{d}C \frac{m}{d}$$

$$8\frac{d}{d}\frac{m}{d} - \frac{d}{d}C^{(1)} \frac{m}{d} - 2\frac{m}{d}C^{(2)} \frac{m}{d} - (4.21b)$$

By (4.18), (4.19), (4.21) and (1.19b),

$$_{2} = \frac{B_{2}}{6} - \frac{3}{d} + O(2)$$
 (4.22)

Putting (4.19) and (4.22) into (4.17), we obtain ($B_2 = 1=30$):

$$\frac{E^{vac}}{A} = \frac{1}{8^{-3}} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} du \, u^{2} C(u) \quad "_{d} + O(2^{2})$$
(4.23)

Comparing (4.23) with (2.13b), we obtain the assertion of the theorem.

<u>Rem ark 4.1</u>: It is remarkable that in (4.4) the second term in the lh.s. is the vacuum term, and the third one, the surface term, appearing in a natural way as necessary subtractions in a purely mathematical context.

<u>Remark 4.2</u>: U sually the result is presented informally without the important last term in (4.5), and assuming that C satis es $C^{(k)}(0) = 0$ for all k 1 besides (1.19b), which is not satis ed by the special and important choice (2.8) ([26], p.138). See, however, ref. [27] for a much nicer approach to the subject.

<u>Remark 4.3</u>: $_{k}$ (k 1) is called the (R;0) sum of the (divergent) series $P_{m=1}^{1} g(m)$, where R refers to Ramanujan and 0 to the reference point (the origin in our case).

<u>Remark 4.4</u>: O ther classes of regularizers do not necessarily lead to regularization independence. See [4] for thorough discussion of several types of regularization. We believe the present class is \natural" from the physical point of view, because it simulates a dielectric constant with suitable behavior at high energies.

<u>Remark 4.5</u>: The idea of the proof of Theorem 4.2 appeared in the second reference under [11], Theorem p.319, but only an incomplete sketch was given there. More importantly, however, the term $\frac{1}{2}g(0)$ was (wrongly) asserted there to contribute only to the -independent term s, while it is precisely this term that yields the surface contribution.

5. Conclusion and a conjecture

We have presented in this paper a rigorous method to study the Casim ir energy density, and applied it to the massless scalar eld with Dirichlet b.c. on parallel plates. The massive case, as well as other geometries (like cube, sphere) may in principle be treated by this method, and independence of b.c. has been veried explicitly in each case (although no general theorem can be invoked). The basic assertion is that a nite theory may be constructed in two equivalent ways: 1) with the use of (ultraviolet regularizationdependent) Sym anzik surface-renorm alization counterterms (section 2), and 2) with no ultraviolet regularization, but applying H adam and regularization to the energy density at the singular surfaces (section 3). Finally, R I has been shown for a class of regularizers (section 4).

M ethod 2) was considered by E lizable in the models treated in [17] and shown to yield the same results as by the introduction [17] of \soft surfaces". Thus we may be condent that the present method is an elective way of introducing soft surfaces" in an analytical way.

There remains, however, a question: is there a more profound basic reason why this scheme works so well? Here we conjecture why this is so.

Form ula (1.6) has being arrived at by the assumptions of local quantum theory ([9], appendix), in particular the assumption that the states S and ! are locally quasi-equivalent ([13], pg.131). This may not be true everywhere, there may be singular points or surfaces (in our case in \mathbb{R}^3) in the neighborhood of which even such local quasi-equivalence fails to hold. Let $r^{(2)}_{r}$ and $r^{(2)}_{1}$ denote the delta functions at the right and left plates, as in section 2, and be a regularization of the elds. In the following, we shall suppose that the equal time-limit may be performed on the rhs. of (1.6), but that the limit x ! y does not exist, for the above-mentioned reason. It is possible, nevertheless, that

$$\lim_{\substack{i=0\\ i \neq 0}} \frac{1}{2} \left(e_{\mathbf{x}_{01}} e_{\mathbf{x}_{02}} + e_{\mathbf{x}_{1}} e_{\mathbf{x}_{2}} \right)^{h} S (\mathbf{x}_{01}; \mathbf{x}_{1}) (\mathbf{x}_{02}; \mathbf{x}_{2}) ! (\mathbf{x}_{01}; \mathbf{x}_{1}) (\mathbf{x}_{02}; \mathbf{x}_{2})^{i} C (\mathbf{x}_{1} + \mathbf{x}_{2})^{h} C (\mathbf{x}_{2} + \mathbf{x}_{2})^{h} C (\mathbf{x}_$$

where (5.1) is taken at (arbitrary) equal times $x_{01} = x_{02}$ and is independent of $x_{01} = x_{02}$, PF denotes the H adam and pseudofunction ([24], p.41), and

$$C (\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{4(2)^{2}} d\mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k} \mathbf{\tilde{j}}_{k} \mathbf{\tilde{j}} C (\mathbf{j} \mathbf{\tilde{k}}_{k} \mathbf{\tilde{j}}) e^{\mathbf{i} \mathbf{\tilde{k}} \mathbf{x}}$$
(5.2)

The limit $! 0^+$ on the lh.s. of (5.1) is assumed to be independent of the regularization (1.19). The \point" in (5.1) refers to the singular surfaces (z = 0 and z = d in our case). The \old H adam ard" form of the pseudofunction is (see, e.g., [28])

$$(!_2)_+ = \frac{1}{2^2} PF \xrightarrow{1=2} + v \ln + w$$
 (5:3)

where $^{1=2}$, v and w are certain sm ooth functions, and $=\frac{x_1+x_2}{2}$: is the distance (here unambiguously de ned) between the point $\frac{x_1+x_2}{2}$ and any one of the singular surfaces. The logarithm ic term does not appear in the present zero m ass case, but will be present for nonzero m ass [6].

We have proved in sections 2 and 3 that, replacing $\lim_{t \to 0^+} \lim_{t \to 0^+} \lim_{x_1! \to x_2} \inf_{x_2} \inf_$

A complete proof of (5.1) even in our case is complicated by the fact that are regularized in momentum space, and H adam ard's regularization operates in conguration space.

As form ulated, (5.1) has an obvious generalization to other geom etries, replacing $r^{(2)}$ and $r^{(2)}$ by delta distributions at the singular surfaces. The Sym anzik counterterm s, localized at these surfaces, besides destroying their \sharpness", accomplish the basic task of ascertaining that the resulting two-point distribution is of the H adam and form (5.3). See [29] for improved and more precise versions of (5.3).

We conjecture that this is the deep reason behind the results in the present paper, because a two-point function of the H adam and form is equivalent to the $\mbox{microlocal}$ spectrum condition", which replaces the spectral condition for quantum elds propagating on a curved space-time [30]. Viewing, as we do, the applications of the C asim ir e ect in cosm ology, even a slight deviation from atness would require a H adam and form, which is, thus, a fundam ental requirement. The proof of (5.1) in this and other m odels m ight thus explain the $\mbox{microlocs}$ properties of the (additional) H adam and regularization referred to by E lizable in his beautiful and stimulating review [20].

References

- [1] S.K. Lamoreaux | Am. J. Phys. 67, 850 (1999)
- [2] V M . Mostepanenko and N N . Trunov | The Casim ir E ect and its Applications { Oxford, Clarendon Press 1997; K. Kirsten | Spectral Functions in M athematics and Physics { London, Chapman and Hall 2001.
- [3] D.Deustch and P.Candelas Phys.Rev.D 20, 3063 (1979).
- [4] H. Kuhn | Thermische Observablen Gekoppelter Felder im Casimir E ekt { Diplomarbeit, Hamburg 6{1{2005.
- [5] W. Godlow ski and M. Szydlow ski | Towards Observational Constraints on Negative $(1 + z)^4$ -type Contribution in the Friedman Equation { astro-ph/060731.
- [6] W.F.W reszinski | Dark Energy: Casim ir E ect, Generalized Homogeneity and Axions { quant-ph/060326.
- [7] M ichael S. Turner | Sem inaire Poincare 1, 93 (2002).
- [8] C.R. Hagen | Eur. J. Phys. C19, 677 (2001).
- [9] B.S.Kay Phys.Rev.D 20, 3052 (1979).
- [10] G.Scharf and W.F.W reszinski Found. Phys. Lett. 5, 479 (1992).
- [11] L.A. Manzoniand W.F. W reszinski | Phys. Lett. A 292, 156 (2001); Eur. Phys.J.C 25, 315 (2002).
- [12] K.Symanzik { NuclPhys.B190 FS3]1 (1981).
- [13] R. Haag | Local Quantum Physics | Second Edition { Springer 1996.
- [14] M. Reed and B. Simon | Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics { Vol II { Fourier Analysis, Self Adjointness { A cadem ic Press 1975.
- [15] P.W. Milonni { Phys. Rev. A 25, 1315 (1982).
- [16] Christian Sommer { Algebraische Charakterisierung von Randbedingungen in der Quantenfeldtheorie, Diplom arbeit, Universitaet Hamburg, 10{01{2006.
- [17] R.L. Jaffe { Unnatural Acts: Unphysical Consequences of Imposing Boundary Conditions on Quantum Fields { Preprint hep-th/0307014 (2003).
- [18] B. Schroer Class. Quant. Gravity 23, 5227 (2006).
- [19] S.W. Graham and G. Kolesnik | Van der Corput s Method of Exponential Sum s | Cam bridge University Press 1991.
- [20] E.Elizalde { J.Phys.A 36, L567 (2003).
- [21] M.V.Berry and J.Goldberg Nonlinearity 1 (1988) 001-026.
- [22] G.H.Hardy Divergent Series { Clarendon, Oxford 1949.
- [23] IM. Guelfand et G.E. Chilov | Les Distributions { Tome 1 { Dunod, Paris 1962.

- [24] L. Schwartz | Theorie des Distributions { Herman, Paris 1966, pp.38-43.
- [25] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik | Table of Integrals, Series and Products { A cadem ic Press, New York 1965.
- [26] C. Itzykson and J.-B. Zuber | Quantum Field Theory { McGraw Hill, New York 1980.
- [27] G.Plunien, B.Muller and W.Greiner Phys. Rep. 134, 87 (1986).
- [28] M.J. Radzikowski | The Hadamard Condition and Kay's Conjecture in (axiomatic) quantum eld theory on curved space-time, PhD. thesis, Princeton University, October 1992.
- [29] B.S.Kay and R.M. Wald Phys. Rep. 209, 49 (1991).
- [30] R.Brunetti, K.Fredenhagen and M.Kohler | Comm.Math.Phys. 180, 633 (1996).