OKHEP-96-05

Comment on "Sonoluminescence as Quantum Vacuum Radiation"

Kimball A. Milton*
Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019-0225

(October 21, 2018)

78.60.Mq, 42.50.Lc, 12.20.Ds, 03.70.+k

In a recent Letter [1] Eberlein proposed that the dynamical Casimir effect [2] or perhaps more properly the Unruh effect [3] could be responsible for the remarkable light emission during single-bubble sonoluminescence [4]. However, I believe that the effect proposed is far too small to account for the observation of something like a million optical photons per bubble collapse. This is supported by detailed calculations which will appear elsewhere [5]. Moreover, even the model profile given in [1], although implying supraluminal velocities, yields an energy output orders of magnitude too small. Although technical objections to [1] are given in [5], having to do with the force on a dielectric surface, I will concentrate here on the insufficiency of the energy radiated in such a model.

One would expect that the relevant time scales for a macroscopic, collapsing bubble to be much longer than the period of visible light, $t \sim 10^{-15}$ s. Indeed, the observed collapse time for sonoluminescing bubbles is $\sim 10^{-6}$ s, while the duration of the flash is $\lesssim 10^{-11}$ s. If that is the case, then an adiabatic approximation should be highly accurate. Statically, the quantum Casimir energy of electromagnetic field fluctuations in a bubble of radius $a \sim 10^{-4}$–10^{-3} cm in a liquid should be of order

$$E_c \sim \frac{\hbar c}{a} \sim 10^{-1}\mathrm{eV}, \tag{1}$$

some 8 orders of magnitude too small to be relevant. In fact, putting in the numbers [5] reduces the energy by another 3 orders of magnitude. It should be emphasized that formally divergent results which are therefore highly sensitive to cutoffs [2,6] are not physically plausible.

A reliable estimate for the power radiated should be obtainable from the Larmor formula,

$$P = \frac{2}{3}\frac{(\ddot{d})^2}{c^3}, \tag{2}$$

where d is the dipole moment. A reasonable estimate for the latter is $d \sim ea$ (in fact, the short-wavelength limit given in [1] is equivalent to $d \approx ea\dot{a}/c$), so we would expect that the energy emitted during a flash of duration τ to be roughly

$$E \sim \alpha\hbar c\frac{a^2}{c^3\tau^3} \sim 10^{-44}\mathrm{eVs}^3/\tau^3. \tag{3}$$

Even for τ as short as a femtosecond, only 10 eV of energy is radiated. An extraordinarily short time scale, $\tau \sim 10^{-17}$ s, is required to liberate 10^7 eV.

One would think such a time scale would imply supraluminal velocities, $a/\tau \sim 10^{13}$ cm/s. Indeed, the specific model proposed by [1] has precisely this feature, and even so yields only 10^3 eV of energy. But, it is possible to imagine that velocities could remain nonrelativistic while the acceleration, or the derivative thereof, becomes very large. Precisely such phenomena occur during the formation of a shock. Classical shock models of sonoluminescence have been proposed [7]. In this case, the radiation is supposed to be emitted by bremsstrahlung after ionization of the air in the bubble. Whether or not such a picture is viable, it is apparent that it has nothing to do with quantum radiation.

This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy. I thank C. Bender, C. Eberlein, J. Ng, and D. Sciama for useful conversations.

---

* E-mail: kmilton@ou.edu

[1] C. Eberlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3842 (1996). See also C. Eberlein, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2772 (1996).
[2] J. Schwinger, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **90**, 958, 2105, 4505, 7285 (1993); **91**, 6473 (1994).
[3] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).
[4] R. A. Hiller and S. J. Putterman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3549 (1995) and references therein.
[5] K. A. Milton and Y. J. Ng, OKHEP-96-04, hep-th/9607186, submitted to Phys. Rev. D.
[6] A. Chodos, hep-ph/9604368, to appear in the Proceedings of Orbis Scientiae 1996, Miami Beach, FL, January 25–28, 1996.
[7] H. P. Greenspan and A. Nadim, Phys. Fluids A **5**, 1065 (1993), C. C. Wu and P. H. Roberts, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3424 (1993).