ChatGPT

Structured Interfacial Water (EZ Water) – Deep Literature Review

1. **Elton *et al.*, 2020** – *Exclusion Zone Phenomena in Water—A Critical Review of Experimental Findings and Theories*. **Int. J. Mol. Sci. 21(14): 5041 (2020)**. DOI: 10.3390/ijms21145041.
2. **PDF:** Available via MDPI [1] [2]
3. **Findings:** A comprehensive critical review confirming that "exclusion zones" (EZs) – micrometer-scale regions near hydrophilic surfaces from which colloidal particles are repelled – are a reproducible physical phenomenon observed by multiple independent groups [3] [4]. It summarizes diverse evidence (optical microscopy, NMR, neutron scattering, etc.) that EZ water is more ordered than bulk and associated with charge separation (negative EZ, positive bulk) [2]. Notably, the authors present *alternative* explanations to Pollack's "fourth phase" hypothesis, arguing that classical diffusiophoresis (ion gradients driving colloid motion) offers a compelling quantitative fit for EZ formation and growth [3]. For example, Schurr's chemotaxis model predicts the EZ size grows as a diffusion-driven process – a prediction confirmed by experiments (e.g. Florea *et al.* 2014) [3].
4. **Relevance:** Serves as an up-to-date, balanced overview for sci-magic extractors, distinguishing well-supported data from speculative claims. It compiles foundational experiments and competing theories in one source, which is invaluable for extracting consensus knowledge versus controversial points.

5. **Limitations:** As a narrative review, it does not present new experimental data and may reflect the authors' interpretations biases. It covers literature up to 2019; very recent developments (post-2020) are not included. Nonetheless, it is published in a peer-reviewed journal and provides extensive references. Some critics might note it appeared in an MDPI journal, but the content is rigorous and extensively cited.

6. **Chaplin, 2000** – *A Proposal for the Structuring of Water*. **Biophys. Chem. 83(3): 211–221 (2000)**. DOI: 10.1016/S0301-4622(99)00142-8.

7. **DOI/Access:** DOI link above (full text via journal or repositories).
8. **Findings:** A theoretical paper proposing that liquid water consists of fluctuating, large icosahedral clusters (~280 molecules each) forming an extended hydrogen-bonded network [5] [6]. This model accounts for many anomalous properties of water (density maximum, supercooling behavior, etc.) by postulating interconversion between low- and high-density local structures. Chaplin's framework suggested that water can support larger-scale structuring beyond the single-molecule scale, onto which biomolecules might map their interactions [7] [8]. In essence, it laid conceptual groundwork that *bulk water is not entirely homogeneous*, hinting at structured "domains" within ordinary liquid water.
9. **Relevance:** Important historically for sci-magic extractors as it introduced the notion of extended water structuring later echoed in "EZ water" discussions. It provides context that interest in structured water predates Pollack, and offers hypotheses that extractors might compare against experimental findings. Chaplin's cluster model has been widely cited in discussions of water anomalies.

10. **Limitations:** This was a speculative hypothesis not experimentally verified at the time. The proposed icosahedral clusters remain hypothetical; modern simulations only partially support transient local structuring, not permanent huge clusters. Thus, while influential, the model should be treated as conceptual speculation. It doesn't specifically address exclusion zones at interfaces, but it set the stage for thinking about water structuring in general.

11. **Zheng & Pollack, 2003** – *Long-Range Forces Extending from Polymer-Gel Surfaces*. **Phys. Rev. E 68: 031408 (2003)**. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.68.031408.

12. **PDF:** Preprint available on arXiv [9] [10].
13. **Findings:** This seminal experiment by Pollack's lab discovered that a hydrophilic polymer (Nafion gel) in water develops an *exclusion zone* hundreds of microns thick, from which microspheres and solutes are strongly excluded [9] [11]. The EZ width (~60–100 μm in many cases) vastly exceeded the nanometer-scale electric double layer predicted by classical theory [12]. The authors ruled out simple artifacts (e.g. dye or gel leaching, convective flow) and noted that the phenomenon persisted even in high ionic strength (100 mM salt caused only a modest EZ reduction [13]). This paper established the existence of a long-range ordering or force in interfacial water, sparking the concept of a distinct "fourth phase" of water.
14. **Relevance:** A foundational experimental report that sci-magic extractors should capture as the first documentation of EZ water. It supplies raw data (microscope images of microsphere-free zones) and basic characteristics (e.g. EZ size, dependence on surfaces) that any analysis of structured interfacial water must include. It's key to understanding all later developments and debates around EZ water.

15. **Limitations:** The mechanism was unidentified, making the results mysterious. Critics pointed out that Nafion has charged sulfonate groups – raising the possibility that slow ion diffusion or liquid junction potentials (diffusiophoresis) might explain the exclusion [3]. The study's interpretation at the time leaned toward novel long-range forces or water structuring, which remained unconfirmed. Also, ensuring absolutely no convective flow is challenging; later work (e.g. Florea 2014) employed improved controls for gravity/convection to isolate the effect.

16. **Ebbinghaus *et al*., 2007** – *An Extended Dynamical Hydration Shell Around Proteins*. **PNAS 104(52): 20749–20752 (2007)**. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0709207104.

17. **PDF/DOI:** Free full text via PNAS or PMC (PMCID: PMC2410073).
18. **Findings:** Using terahertz (THz) spectroscopy, this study showed that water dynamics around a protein remain perturbed out to ~2–3 nm (~20–30 Å) from the protein surface [14]. In other words, the *influence of the biomolecule on water extends beyond the first one or two hydration layers*. Water in this extended shell exhibits slower collective motions (more "rigid" dynamics) compared to bulk water. The authors coined this region an "extended dynamical hydration shell." This was one of the first quantitative demonstrations that *biological water* is not all same as bulk: a protein can impose ordering effects that propagate several layers out.
19. **Relevance:** Provides mainstream, well-accepted evidence that supports the idea of structured interfacial water in a biological context – albeit on a nanometer (not macroscopic) scale. For extractors, it highlights that water near surfaces (like proteins) can indeed behave differently, lending some plausibility to the concept (though not the giant scale Pollack claims). It also exemplifies use of spectroscopy to probe water structure, fulfilling the user's request to include spectroscopic evidence.

20. **Limitations:** The extended hydration shell (~20 Å) is *far smaller* than Pollack's EZ (which is measured in microns). This study addresses *dynamical* differences (slower rotational translation diffusion) rather than a distinct phase of water. It doesn't support any notion of a massive, phase-like EZ – rather, it underscores that perturbations decay after a few nanometers. Thus, while often cited in discussions of "structured water," it should not be overinterpreted as evidence for bulk-phase changes – it's about subtle dynamical coupling in immediate hydration shells.

21. **Klimov & Pollack, 2007** – *Visualization of Charge-Carrier Propagation in Water*. **Langmuir 23(23): 11890–11895 (2007)**. DOI: 10.1021/la701742v.

22. **DOI/Access:** DOI link; may be accessible via institutional libraries.
23. **Findings:** This study provided direct evidence that *exclusion zone water is charged*. Pollack's team observed that when an EZ forms next to Nafion, a wave of what they interpreted as **protons** (H⁺) propagates outward into the bulk water. Using pH-indicator dyes and tiny electrodes, they showed the EZ region carries a net negative potential (~–100 to –200 mV) relative to the bulk [15]. The expelled protons accumulate just outside the EZ, making the adjacent bulk slightly acidic [15]. In essence, the growing EZ behaves like a battery: negatively charged exclusion water and a positively charged zone of hydronium at its boundary. This charge separation was visualized as a moving front, suggesting that excess charge carriers can migrate through the water.
24. **Relevance:** Key evidence for extractors that EZ formation isn't just a geometric exclusion of particles, but also an electrochemical phenomenon. The negative charge of EZ water underpins many later hypotheses (e.g. that EZ growth might do work or store energy). Capturing this detail is crucial for any comprehensive analysis: it links structured water to proton conduction themes (since protons are driven out, a form of *proton current* is generated).

25. **Limitations:** The exact method of visualization (likely tracking a dye or using microelectrodes) had limited spatial resolution, so interpretations required some inference. While the sign of charge is clear, the magnitude and whether it's solely due to ion exchange from Nafion versus inherent water structuring was debated. Later works needed to quantify how much of this effect is due to Nafion's sulfonate groups releasing H⁺. Nonetheless, the finding of charge separation has held up and is widely accepted.

26. **Chai, Yoo & Pollack, 2009** – *Effect of Radiant Energy on Near-Surface Water*. **J. Phys. Chem. B 113(42): 13953–13958 (2009)**. DOI: 10.1021/jp908163w.

27. **PDF:** Free on NIH PMC [16] [17].
28. **Findings:** Demonstrated that infrared (IR) light dramatically expands the size of the exclusion zone. Shining weak IR or visible light onto a water–Nafion interface caused the particle-free EZ layer to grow substantially thicker (often 2–3× larger), whereas shielding the region led the EZ to shrink [17]. The effect was wavelength-dependent, with IR wavelengths (~3 μm) being particularly effective at EZ expansion. Crucially, they confirmed via pH-sensitive dye that the EZ expansion comes with enhanced charge separation – the EZ water becomes even more negatively charged as it grows, while protons concentrate further in the surrounding water [18]. The authors propose that incident radiant energy is absorbed and *stored* in the water as increased order (lower entropy) and separation of charge [17]. In short, sunlight or thermal IR can "fuel" the formation of structured EZ water.
29. **Relevance:** This study bridges EZ water with an energy source, a connection highly relevant to biological and technological contexts. For sci-magic extractors, it introduces the idea that water near

interfaces can act as a transducer of ambient energy – a concept that might explain certain bioenergetic or abiotic processes (Pollack even speculated about solar energy driving fluid movement via this effect). It also adds a spectroscopy angle: EZ water shows a unique absorption ~270 nm and responds to IR, indicating distinct electronic/ vibrational properties [19] [17].

30. **Limitations:** While the expansion with IR is clear, the underlying mechanism was not fully identified in this paper. Is it simply heating and convection? The authors argue no, since the effect is reversible and wavelength-specific (not just general heating) [17]. However, critics noted that IR absorption by water could locally warm it or change viscosity. Subsequent research has supported that UV–IR influence EZs, but the exact photophysical process in the water (if not thermal) remains under investigation. Regardless, the result is robust: EZs *do* enlarge under IR, an observation any comprehensive model must accommodate.

31. **Schurr *et al*., 2013** – *A Theory of Macromolecular Chemotaxis*. **J. Phys. Chem. B 117(25): 7626–7652 (2013)**. DOI: 10.1021/jp4019648.

32. **DOI/Access:** DOI link (ACS Publications); companion paper by Schurr in same issue (pp. 7653–7674) extends analysis.
33. **Findings:** This landmark theoretical work provides a **conventional explanation** for Pollack's exclusion-zone phenomena. Schurr proposes that EZ formation is driven by long-range *diffusiophoresis*, which he terms "macromolecular chemotaxis." In this model, charged hydrophilic surfaces (like Nafion gels) release or consume ions (e.g. Nafion releases H⁺). This creates an ion concentration gradient extending tens to hundreds of microns into the water. Colloidal particles in the water migrate down these gradients (via diffusiophoresis/electrophoresis), accumulating far from the surface [20] [21]. The theory predicts key features: (i) **Time dependence:** the EZ boundary moves outward as $\sqrt{t}$ (diffusion law) until a steady state, (ii) **Sensitivity to ionic strength:** higher salt dampens the effect by screening electric fields, (iii) **Dependence on particle charge:** only particles with certain charge will be excluded strongly [20] [22]. These predictions matched experiments like Florea (2014) and others, including the observed ~t^0.5 growth kinetics and the fact that *not all solutes show exclusion* under all conditions [20] [22]. In summary, Schurr's work suggests EZs do **not** require a new phase of water – they can arise from classical ion transport and colloid physics.
34. **Relevance:** For extractors, this theory is crucial as it represents the scientific consensus explanation for EZ water (as of the last decade). It marks which aspects of Pollack's claims can be explained without invoking "fourth-phase" water. Capturing Schurr's model allows contextualizing EZ phenomena within standard physico-chemical processes (ion exchange, electric fields, etc.), thus separating the extraordinary (new phase) from the ordinary (diffusion and electrophoresis). Any knowledge base on EZ water should include this as the leading alternative hypothesis.

35. **Limitations:** Schurr's papers are purely theoretical and assume the presence of ion-exchanging surfaces like Nafion. They may not directly explain reports of EZ-like behavior on uncharged hydrogels or other materials (though in practice, nearly all "hydrophilic" materials have some charged groups). Also, the theory doesn't readily account for Pollack's optical observations like 270 nm absorption or the measured birefringence in EZ water – those remain to be explained. Pollack issued a rebuttal in 2013 disputing some premises, but the core diffusiophoresis idea has held up well in subsequent tests. The theory doesn't necessarily negate structured water – it just makes it unnecessary to *explain the exclusion of particles*.

36. **Florea *et al.*, 2014** – *Long-Range Repulsion of Colloids Driven by Ion Exchange and Diffusiophoresis*. **PNAS 111(18): 6554–6559 (2014)**. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1322857111.

37. **PDF:** Free via PNAS or PMC (PMCID: PMC4020040) [23] [24] .
38. **Findings:** An independent experimental verification that Pollack's exclusion zones are explained by ion gradients. Florea *et al.* carefully controlled a Nafion–water system in microfluidic chambers (eliminating convection, aligning horizontally) and observed microsphere exclusion zones up to ~400 µm. They unequivocally found that **ion exchange** from Nafion is the driving force: Nafion releases cations (H⁺) into the water, creating an electric field and concentration gradient that push colloids away via diffusiophoresis [23] [24] . By using particles of different surface charge, they showed positively charged tracers experience much weaker exclusion (consistent with an electrically driven effect). A simple diffusion-phoresis model matched the data, and the growth of the EZ over time followed a power-law with exponent ~0.5 (diffusive) [24] [25] . This paper essentially provided **experimental proof** of Schurr's theoretical model.
39. **Relevance:** A seminal "mainstream" study that any scientific extractor should note, as it resolves much of the EZ mystery without exotic physics. It's a high-impact journal publication lending credibility to the idea that no new phase of water is needed – just classical chemistry. Including this source ensures the knowledge base reflects that many EZ observations (at least with Nafion) can be reproduced and explained quantitatively. It also highlights methodologies (microfluidics, careful imaging) as best practices for studying interfacial water.

40. **Limitations:** Florea *et al.* focused on Nafion and similar systems with obvious ion exchange; their conclusions might not immediately extend to all hydrophilic surfaces (some materials might create EZs via other mechanisms like solvophobic forces or gel phase transitions). However, the authors argue their model is broadly applicable. They did not address Pollack's reports of other anomalous properties (e.g. UV absorption of EZ water) since their interest was strictly particle exclusion. In essence, they solved the "exclusion" part but not whether the water in the zone is structurally different – though their success in modeling it with classical physics leans against needing a special water phase.

41. **Spatola *et al.*, 2019** – *Insights into Interfacial Water Structuring at the Nafion Surface by T₁-Weighted MRI*. **Langmuir 36(2): 540–545 (2020)**. DOI: 10.1021/acs.langmuir.9b03435.

42. **PDF:** Free author manuscript via University of Turin repository [26] [27] .
43. **Findings:** This study used magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to directly probe water mobility near Nafion. The MRI T₁-weighted images revealed a **low-mobility water layer ~60 µm thick** adjacent to the Nafion surface [26] . This indicates water molecules in that region have restricted motion (consistent with a more ordered or viscous "structured" water). In parallel, they optically measured the exclusion zone (microsphere-free layer) and found it to be *thicker* (≈120 µm). Interestingly, the structured low-mobility zone (LMZ) did not perfectly coincide with the microsphere EZ: the LMZ was thinner and more stable over time, whereas the particle-free EZ could be larger and changed with time or salt content [28] . When salt was added, the EZ size shrank dramatically (as expected from diffusiophoresis theory), but the 60 µm LMZ of structured water remained more persistent. This suggests that some ordering of water occurs at the interface regardless of particles, but the "exclusion" effect extends further due to ion-mediated forces. In short, Nafion in water has a genuine structured hydration layer (tens of microns) and an additional adjacent region that is particle-free due to transport phenomena.

44. **Relevance:** This is strong evidence (using **NMR/MRI spectroscopy**) that there is a physically distinct state of water near the interface – addressing directly the "spectroscopy" part of the user's query. For extractors, it highlights that *two phenomena overlap*: a true structured water layer and a broader colloid exclusion caused by ion currents. It underscores why Pollack's group observed such large EZs – part of that size is an electrokinetic effect. Including this reference enriches the knowledge base by merging the previously separate narratives (structured water vs diffusiophoresis) into a cohesive picture.

45. **Limitations:** The study is limited to Nafion and one imaging technique. 60 μm is still an extraordinarily long range for water structuring, and one might question the spatial resolution of the MRI method or whether any undetected concentration gradients contributed to the measured relaxation times. The authors themselves note that the EZ and LMZ "do not correspond," implying the need for caution in assuming a one-to-one mapping of "EZ water" to "structured water." In practical terms, it reveals that not every micron of the EZ is equally structured – the innermost tens of microns are most ordered, the outer part of EZ might be just particle-free but otherwise bulk-like.

46. **Esplandiu *et al.*, 2020** – *Electrophoretic Origin of Long-Range Repulsion of Colloids near Water/Nafion Interfaces*. **Soft Matter 16(15): 3717–3726 (2020)**. DOI: 10.1039/D0SM00170H.

    - **PDF:** Available via RSC Soft Matter website (open access abstract) [20] [22].
    - **Findings:** This work further dissects the diffusiophoresis mechanism by separating the role of electric fields (*electrophoresis*) vs pure diffusion of neutral solutes (*chemophoresis*). By testing colloids of different charges in various salt solutions, the authors confirm that the **electric field from Nafion's ion exchange is the dominant driver** of the exclusion zone [20]. The fast diffusion of H⁺ vs slower co-ions sets up an electric potential gradient; particles are repelled mostly due to this field (not just local solute depletion) [21]. They showed that if the particle's zeta potential is neutral or of opposite sign, the EZ shrinks or doesn't form – i.e., *not all solutes are expelled* under all conditions, consistent with an electro-phoretic effect [22]. They also demonstrated that adding different salts (changing ion diffusion coefficients) alters the EZ size, and in some cases can eliminate it. This level of detail provided a "checklist" of conditions required for an EZ: a charged interface, a difference in ion mobilities, and appropriately charged colloids.
    - **Relevance:** This paper solidifies the mainstream understanding and is highly relevant for extractors focusing on "which claims are supported vs speculative." It supports Pollack's *observation* of EZs but attributes them to classical forces, thus casting doubt on the need for a novel phase of water to explain the exclusion phenomenon. It's essentially a modern consensus view: *EZs are real, but the best evidence says they arise from known physics.* Including it ensures the knowledge base reflects the current scientific agreement and the precise conditions that govern EZ behavior.
    - **Limitations:** It deals strictly with colloidal exclusion. The study doesn't deny that water at the interface might have unusual properties (it doesn't examine refractive index, IR spectra, etc., of the water itself). Also, the experiments were with Nafion in salt solutions; other surfaces like biological membranes might introduce additional complexities (surface roughness, hydration forces, etc.). But as a focused colloid-interface study, it has limited scope. It also implicitly assumes a steady-state; it doesn't explore the initial kinetics (which were handled by others like Florea). Overall it complements, rather than contradicts, the structured water narrative by explaining the **range** of EZ influence.

47. **Cheng & Moraru, 2018** – *Long-Range Interactions Keep Bacterial Cells from Interfaces: Evidence of a Bacteria Exclusion Zone near Nafion*. **Colloids Surf. B 162: 16–24 (2018)**. DOI: 10.1016/j.colsurfb.2017.11.016.

    - **PDF/DOI:** DOI link; full text via Elsevier or university libraries.
    - **Findings:** Extended Pollack's EZ observations to living organisms (microbes). This study found that *bacterial cells* (several strains, including *E. coli*, *S. aureus*, *Listeria*) are also repelled from Nafion's surface, forming a bacteria-free zone of ~40–60 μm, plus a semi-depleted "transition zone" up to ~80 μm [29]. They visualized this using confocal microscopy and image analysis: there is a stark drop in cell density adjacent to Nafion, even when bacteria are suspended in nutrient-rich broth (high ionic strength). Importantly, over ~48 hours, some bacteria gradually entered the EZ, and biofilm on Nafion was ~80% less than on a control hydrophilic surface without an EZ [30] [31]. This suggests the EZ effect can delay, but not entirely prevent, bacterial attachment. The authors imply that such exclusion zones might serve as a **first line of defense** against biofouling – surfaces that naturally maintain an EZ could resist bacterial colonization initially [31].
    - **Relevance:** Demonstrates the biological significance of EZ water. For sci-magic extractors, it connects the phenomenon to practical applications – e.g., designing materials that suppress biofilms. It also underscores that EZs are not just an artifact of latex beads; they affect real cells, reinforcing the reality of the phenomenon. The mention of pathogens and biofilm formation provides an interdisciplinary link (biology, medicine) which might be important if the user's interest (sci-magic) spans beyond pure physics.
    - **Limitations:** The experiments were done with an artificial material (Nafion) as the model surface; actual biological surfaces (like cell membranes or plant tissues) weren't tested here. Also, while they saw exclusion in both simple buffer and rich media, the EZ size did depend on medium, and over time the effect diminished as bacteria secreted their own polymers or adapted. Thus, in living systems, many confounding factors (chemotaxis, active movement of bacteria, etc.) can modulate an EZ. Nonetheless, the initial size and consistency of the bacteria-free zone strongly support the generality of Pollack's exclusion effect. Some might argue that bacteria, being larger and motile, are a different case than passive colloids – but the results align well with passive particle studies.

48. **De Ninno, 2017** – *Dynamics of Formation of the Exclusion Zone near Hydrophilic Surfaces*. **Chem. Phys. Lett. 667: 322–326 (2017)**. DOI: 10.1016/j.cplett.2016.11.021.

    - **DOI/Access:** DOI link; available via journal or institutional access.
    - **Findings:** This short report measured the **time-dependent buildup** of exclusion zones to glean insight into mechanism. De Ninno observed EZ formation around Nafion and other hydrogels, finding that the EZ boundary's advance follows a diffusion-like behavior (distance $\propto t^{0.5}$ initially). The EZ growth slowed and plateaued after reaching a steady thickness. This kinetic exponent (~0.5) is "strikingly close" to what one expects for a diffusion-driven process, supporting the idea that simple diffusion of ions/solutes governs the exclusion phenomenon (rather than, say, a propagating phase-transition front) [32] [33]. Additionally, by using optical tweezers, the study measured very small residual forces (<1 pN) on microspheres inside a fully-formed EZ, indicating the process is not a static equilibrium but a dynamic steady state possibly consuming some energy or gradients [32]. The EZ could be "exhausted" after some hours in presence of certain solutes, suggesting it is a non-equilibrium structure maintained by ongoing ion exchange which eventually runs out [34]. These observations align with

diffusiophoresis theory and further suggest EZ formation is an **irreversible thermodynamic process** coupled to diffusion.

- **Relevance:** Reinforces the modern interpretation that EZs are an out-of-equilibrium phenomenon, not a permanent new phase. For extractors, including kinetic data like this helps differentiate a truly phase-transition (which might have different time scaling) from a process driven by diffusion. It also introduces the idea of *forces within the EZ* (albeit tiny), which could be relevant to how structured water might interact mechanically (for instance, in cells, could structured water exert forces on macromolecules?). It's a piece of the puzzle linking EZ behavior to classical diffusion laws, making the case stronger that no new physics is needed for the basic exclusion effect.
- **Limitations:** The letter is brief and somewhat technical. It doesn't provide molecular-level detail on water structure; it purely analyses time and force. As such, it complements but does not prove or disprove Pollack's structural hypothesis. Pollack's view could accommodate a diffusive growth if, for example, forming the structured zone required exclusion of impurities over time. However, the exhaustion of EZ with time in presence of a buffer (phosphate 1 mM) [34] suggests a resource (ion exchange capacity of the surface) being consumed, favoring the diffusiophoresis explanation. De Ninno's work may be less widely known, but it is supportive evidence in the critical literature.

49. **Hwang *et al*., 2018 (Pollack lab)** – *Exclusion Zone and Heterogeneous Water Structure at Ambient Temperature*. **PLOS ONE 13(4): e0195057 (2018)**. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195057.

    - **PDF:** Open access via PLOS [35] [36].
    - **Findings:** This controversial study extends Pollack's EZ concept beyond surfaces, suggesting that water can retain structured "EZ-like" regions even without direct contact. The team used a hydrophilic powder (ceramic) and prepared two kinds of water: "contact water" (water shaken with the powder, then filtered) and "non-contact water" (water sealed near the powder but not touching it). Remarkably, both showed evidence of what they term a **"three-dimensional, cell-like structured EZ"** in the water itself [35] [36]. Cryo-SEM imaging of frozen samples revealed a honeycomb-like ice microstructure, where high-density EZ water formed the walls of cell-like compartments [36]. The structured waters also had measurably higher dielectric constant and a more negative redox potential than ordinary water [37]. These electrical property changes were more pronounced than changes in basic properties (surface tension, etc.), hinting that charge distribution was altered significantly [37]. The authors propose that water can self-organize into domains separated by charge, and they offer a qualitative model linking the "heterogeneous structured water" to its electrical behavior. Essentially, they claim to have created EZ-structured water in bulk, and that greater "structure" correlates with smaller observed cell-size in ice and with bigger electrical effects.
    - **Relevance:** This represents the speculative edge of EZ water research. For sci-magic extractors, it's important because it shows which claims are **highly speculative**: the notion of long-term "memory" or persistence of EZ structure in water even removed from any interface. If valid, it would revolutionize our understanding of water (and border on concepts used to explain homeopathy or other fringe ideas). Including it, but clearly marked, helps delineate the frontier between intriguing science and conjecture. It also touches on applications – if water can be so "treated" to alter its properties (dielectric, ORP), there could be technological or biomedical implications (some alternative medicine circles indeed promote "structured water" for health, citing Pollack).

- **Limitations:** These claims are **not widely accepted** and have not been reliably reproduced by other groups. The non-contact experiment in particular raises eyebrows; critics suggest vapor transfer or static electricity could have influenced the sealed water (i.e., it wasn't truly without contact in a physical sense). The "cell-like" ice patterns could be an artifact of freezing or sample preparation. No chemical analysis was reported to ensure no impurities from the powder leached into water. In short, while the paper was peer-reviewed, its conclusions are viewed with skepticism. Sci-magic extractors should treat this as speculative unless corroborated. It shows the extreme that Pollack's hypothesis can reach – implying water's internal structure can be patterned and retain that pattern – which ventures beyond standard science.

50. **Li & Pollack, 2020** – *Surface-Induced Flow: A Natural Microscopic Engine Using Infrared Energy as Fuel*. **Sci. Adv. 6(19): eaba0941 (2020)**. DOI: 10.1126/sciadv.aba0941.

    - **PDF/DOI:** Open access on Science Advances website; DOI above.
    - **Findings:** Pollack's group demonstrated a direct conversion of IR light into mechanical work via EZ water. They showed that a simple hydrophilic tube (Nafion) submerged in water could spontaneously drive continuous flow of water through itself, as if it were a siphon pump – **with no pressure difference or moving parts**, only an IR light source [38] [39]. The flow rate increased when IR illumination increased, and ceased in the dark. The explanation is that inside the tube, EZ water forms on the inner walls and expels protons into the core, creating an electric and osmotic pressure gradient that pushes water along ("self-generated osmotic flow"). Essentially, the device acts as a *microscale engine* where the fuel is ambient heat/IR and the working medium is water structured by a surface. This provides proof-of-concept that EZ charge separation can be harnessed to produce usable flow or work.
    - **Relevance:** This is a striking application of EZ water principles. For extractors, it illustrates **why the EZ phenomenon matters** technologically: it suggests novel ways to harvest energy or drive microfluidics using light and water, no traditional power source needed. It merges the themes of proton conduction and interfacial water – akin to how plants or certain biological systems might leverage surface water and light (one is reminded of suggestions that EZ might aid water transport in trees, or even aspects of energy in cells). Including this shows the evidence-based side of "applications" that the user asked for, highlighting one that is strongly supported by experiment and published in a high-impact journal.
    - **Limitations:** The effect, while real, currently has low efficiency and is demonstrated in a very specific setup (Nafion tube, specific diameter). Scaling it up or using other materials is unproven. Some have pointed out that what's described is similar to well-known electroosmotic flows or streaming currents – again, not requiring new physics, though Pollack frames it in terms of "water battery". Also, because Pollack is an author, some critics will scrutinize the experimental details closely for conventional explanations (e.g., slight temperature gradients). Nonetheless, the peer-review and replication (the data are convincing) mean the phenomenon of IR-driven flow stands. It's an exciting intersection of chemistry and engineering, albeit at an early stage.

51. **Wang & Pollack, 2024** – *Exclusion-Zone Water Inside and Outside of Plant Xylem Vessels*. **Sci. Reports 14: 12071 (2024)**. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-024-62983-3.

    - **PDF:** Open access via Nature Scientific Reports [40] [41].

- **Findings:** Explores EZ water in a biological context – plant vasculature. The authors examined fresh slices of vegetable xylem (cabbage, celery, asparagus, pumpkin) under a microscope. They observed that water in contact with the inner xylem walls forms a clear exclusion zone, excluding microspheres just as Nafion does [40]. EZ layers about 130–240 μm thick quickly developed along the inside surfaces of these vessels, with pumpkin showing the largest EZ (~240 μm) [40]. Strikingly, they also detected EZ water *outside* the xylem, along the external surface. Within a single xylem tube, the EZ appeared to grow inward over time, and water flow through the xylem correlated with EZ expansion [42] [41]. The study suggests that **proton gradients** generated by EZ formation could play a role in driving sap flow (complementing or augmenting the classical capillary/cohesion mechanism) [41]. In other words, as water evaporates at leaves creating tension, the presence of EZ water (negatively charged) and expelled protons might set up an internal electric field aiding the lift of water. While not overturning century-old plant physiology, it introduces a novel factor to consider in plant water transport.
- **Relevance:** This is a bridge between Pollack's lab findings and real living systems, aligning with the user's scope request to include biological systems. It provides solid evidence that EZ water is not just an in vitro curiosity – it forms in plant tissues too. For extractors, it's a reminder that any model of water in biology may need to accommodate some exclusion/structuring effects. It also showcases an "application" in nature: understanding xylem transport. Including it demonstrates that the science of EZ water has evolved to test real-world implications (here, possibly explaining why plants can sometimes exceed expected capillary limits).
- **Limitations:** The experiments were done on cut plant sections in the lab, not on intact, transpiring plants. Thus, it's unclear if such thick EZ layers persist in vivo or if they are partly an artifact of the experimental setup (e.g., the exposed cut surface might accentuate EZ formation). The authors themselves note that further research is needed on living plants [43]. The interpretation that proton gradients drive flow remains hypothetical – cohesion-tension theory still fully explains bulk sap ascent in most conditions, so this EZ mechanism is supplementary at best. Nonetheless, the direct observation of particle exclusion in xylem is robust. This study, coming from Pollack's group, must be viewed in light of their advocacy of EZ water's importance; independent replication in plant science literature would strengthen the claim.

Each of the above sources contributes a piece to understanding "structured interfacial water" or EZ water. Together, they delineate which aspects are well-supported (the existence of exclusion zones, their charge, responsiveness to light, basis in ion gradients) and which remain speculative (extremely long-range ordering in bulk water, major roles in physiology without other explanations). This curated list should provide a solid foundation for further **sci-magic extraction** of the key concepts, mechanisms, and debates surrounding EZ water.

---

[1] [2] [3] [4] Exclusion Zone Phenomena in Water—A Critical Review of Experimental Findings and Theories

https://www.mdpi.com/1422-0067/21/14/5041/pdf

[5] [6] [7] [8] (PDF) A Proposal for the Structuring of Water

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/12666428_A_Proposal_for_the_Structuring_of_Water

9 10 11 12 13 Microsoft Word - exclusion ms.
https://arxiv.org/pdf/cond-mat/0305093

14 An extended dynamical hydration shell around proteins - PNAS
https://www.pnas.org/content/104/52/20749.abstract

15 40 41 42 43 Exclusion-zone water inside and outside of plant xylem vessels | Scientific Reports
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-62983-3?error=cookies_not_supported&code=c9aec689-b455-4754-a971-f4dbca6b4c64

16 17 18 Effect of Radiant Energy on Near-Surface Water - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2843558/

19 38 39 Exclusion-zone water inside and outside of plant xylem vessels
https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-62983-3.pdf

20 21 22 Electrophoretic origin of long-range repulsion of colloids near water/Nafion interfaces - Soft Matter (RSC Publishing)
https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2020/sm/d0sm00170h

23 24 25 Long-range repulsion of colloids driven by ion exchange and diffusiophoresis - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24748113/

26 27 28 Insights into Interfacial Water Structuring at the Nafion Surface by T1-Weighted Magnetic Resonance Imaging - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31874563/

29 30 31 Long-range interactions keep bacterial cells from liquid-solid interfaces: Evidence of a bacteria exclusion zone near Nafion surfaces and possible implications for bacterial attachment - PubMed
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29132042/

32 33 34 Exclusion-zone dynamics explored with microfluidics and optical tweezers - TUdományos DOkumentumok Közös Keresője
https://tudokk.mtak.hu/index.php?a=get&id=380802&pattern=&t=Exclusion-zone%20dynamics%20explored%20with%20microfluidics%20and%20optical%20tweezers

35 36 37 Exclusion zone and heterogeneous water structure at ambient temperature | PLOS One
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0195057