

## BRIEF COMMENT ON W. S. WARREN ET AL II: OPTICAL NMR AND THE $B^{(3)}$ FIELD.

M. W. Evans<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Alpha Institute of Advanced Studies  
Institute of Physics  
Budapest, Hungary

<sup>2</sup>J.R.F., 1975  
Wolfson College  
Oxford, United Kingdom

Received 3 September 1998

It is pointed out that the only possible artifact, free optical *NMR* (*ONMR*) shift of up to 0.1 Hz reported by Warren *et al.* [1] is the same precisely, 0.1 Hz, as that predicted by  $B^{(3)}$  theory. However, the great majority of the data by Warren *et al.* are almost completely artifactual and cannot be used to discriminate between different *ONMR* mechanisms with any objectivity. Some references to  $B^{(3)}$  theory and recent *ONMR* data uncited by Warren *et al.* are pointed out, data which show that the Warren group's failure to see very well known [2,3] polarization-dependent effects of irradiation in *NMR* is a major design failure, not one of theory.

Key words:  $B^{(3)}$  theory, *ONMR* shifts, *ONMR* in quantum dots.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Recently Warren *et al.* [1] reported possible laser-induced shifts in optical *NMR* (*ONMR*) of up to 0.1 Hz in very noisy data at extreme instrumental limits. They claim erroneously that these data prove the non-existence of the  $B^{(3)}$  field and arbitrarily interpret what is probably an artifactual series of experiments through a mechanism by Harris and Tinoco [2], which produces shifts six orders of magnitude *smaller* than 0.1 Hz. In this Note these claims by Warren *et al.* are shown to be based on a lack of knowledge of both *ONMR*

shift theory and of *ONMR* experiments in semiconductors [3]. The data do not support the claim that the  $B^{(3)}$  field does not exist.

## 2. *ONMR* SHIFTS PREDICTED BY $B^{(3)}$ THEORY

It was argued in Ref. 4 (forwarded by mail to the Warren group some 18 months ago) that the  $B^{(3)}$  theory produces the following equation for proton resonance in circularly polarized radiation of power density  $I$  and angular frequency  $\omega$ :

$$\omega_{(\text{resonance})} = 1.532 \times 10^{25} \frac{I}{\omega^2} \quad (1)$$

(Eq. (135) of Ref. 4, uncited by Warren *et al.* [1]). Under the conditions of Ref. 1 (three argon ion laser frequencies at 10 watts per square centimetre), the following *ONMR* shifts in hertz are obtained from Eq. (1): 0.12, 0.10, and 0.098 *Hz* at, respectively, 528.7, 488, and 476.5 *nm* in the visible [5].

The experimentally reported *residual shift* [1] is possibly up to 0.1 *Hz*, within 95% confidence limits, agreeing well with the  $B^{(3)}$  field theoretical predictions.

These authors were apparently unable to see a dependence on circular polarization of the applied laser field. The latter type of dependence has been well known, however, for about a quarter century, and recently Brown *et al.* [3] have demonstrated very high sensitivity *ONMR* in single quantum dots using this mechanism. If preferred, it is not necessary to invoke  $B^{(3)}$  theory to arrive at Eq. (1), it can be shown to be a straightforward result of the Schrödinger equation [5] for a spin-half particle, as discussed by Sakurai [6]. It has been shown recently to exist at all levels from classical to quantum electrodynamics [5], yet none of the work in Ref. 4, made available to Warren *et al.* by mail, is cited. In the original Ref. [4], Eq. (1) is derived from the Dirac equation, and a preprint was made available to the Warren group well before the publication of Ref. 1.

## 3. DISCUSSION

Warren *et al.* [1] claim that they cannot see a laser polarization dependence in their data, but at the same time appear to attempt to use a polarization-dependent off resonance theory of the *ONMR* chemical shift by Harris and Tinoco [2] which under their conditions produces a shift of about  $10^{-7}$  *Hz* [2], six orders of magnitude smaller than the claimed shift of 0.1 *Hz* [1], as given by  $B^{(3)}$  theory [4,5].

At 488 nm, the absorption of the laser by the sample is very small, as reported in the recent work by Warren *et al.* [7]. Therefore, the correct mechanism to use, surely, is that which is described by Harris and Tinoco as the *single photon off-resonance population* [2], by far the largest off-resonant mechanism in their calculation. Astonishingly, Warren *et al.* [1] use what appears to be a very strong resonant mechanism at 488 nm (which is very far from resonance) to produce a shift from the same Harris and Tinoco paper [2] of 270 Hz for protons and no less than 630 Hz for carbon thirteen. The claimed empirically measurable shift is in the range 0.57 to 1.06 Hz, again compatible with  $B^{(3)}$  theory [4,5] but wholly *incompatible* with a Harris and Tinoco theory of any kind. Yet this shift is attributed [1] to the Harris and Tinoco theory [2]!

It is not made clear why a mechanism which gives rise to a shift of  $10^{-7}$  Hz according to Harris and Tinoco themselves [2] should give rise to a shift of more than 600 Hz as interpreted by Warren *et al.* [1] from the same paper [2]. The single photon off-resonance mechanism which surely should be used at 488 nm, where there is practically no absorption [1,7], has the *same* circular polarization and  $I/\omega^2$  dependence as  $B^{(3)}$  theory; in fact it is simply the chemical shift of the main resonance of  $B^{(3)}$  theory, but this fact is either overlooked by Warren *et al.* [1] or ignored.

The motivation behind this paper [1], which essentially appears to republish reference [7] using much the same data, is asserted to be doubts about the  $B^{(3)}$  theory. The present author is asserted to have to *taken to calling* the  $B^{(3)}$  field the Evans-Vigier field. Others accept this appellation by now. In their Ref. 7, reproduced as our reference [8] in this Note, Warren *et al.* cite critical papers [8] on  $B^{(3)}$  but cite *none of the replies* [9]. This is lamentable scholarship. No preprint of Ref. 1 was sent to the present author and no preprint was received from the Editors, despite the rather wild claims being made [1] that  $B^{(3)}$  does not exist. No citation of recent work on  $B^{(3)}$  appears in Ref. 1, despite the fact that the present author was the intellectual originator of the work by Warren *et al.* [7,10].

#### 4. SUMMARY

The data in these series of experiments [1] are very noisy, but it can be stated objectively that the possible residual shift of up to 0.1 Hz observed empirically [1] is the same *precisely* (0.1 Hz) as that given by  $B^{(3)}$  theory [4,5] and utterly incompatible with the Harris and Tinoco mechanism [2] under far off-resonant conditions at 488 nm. The reason why no polarization dependence was observed [1] is not

known, but in view of the well-known polarization-dependent data in Ref. 3, it is probably due to choosing completely unfavorable conditions under which to observe *ONMR*, in other words, a major design fault.

**Acknowledgments.** Approximately one hundred colleagues worldwide are thanked for ongoing e-mail discussions over the past three years in this subject area.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. S. Warren, D. Goswami, and S. Mayr, *Mol. Phys.* **93**, 371 (1998).
- [2] R. A. Harris and I. Tinoco Jr., *Science* **259**, 836 (1993); *J. Chem. Phys.* **101**, 9289 (1994).
- [3] S. W. Brown, T. A. Kennedy, D. Gammon, and E. S. Snow, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, R17 339 (1996).
- [4] M. W. Evans, J.-P. Vigier, S. Roy, and S. Jeffers, *The Enigmatic Photon, Vol. 3: Theory and Practice of the  $B^{(3)}$*  (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1996), Chap. 2.
- [5] M. W. Evans, J.-P. Vigier, and M. Meszaros, eds., *The Enigmatic Photon, Vol. 5* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1999), Chap. 3. M. W. Evans, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, submitted for publication.
- [6] J. J. Sakurai, *Advanced Quantum Mechanics*, 11th printing (Addison-Wesley, New York, 1967), Chap. 3.2.
- [7] W. S. Warren, D. Goswami, D. Mayr, and A. P. West Jr., *Science* **255**, 1683 (1992).
- [8] L. D. Barron, *Physica B* **190**, 307 (1993). A. Lakhtakia, *Physica B* **191**, 362 (1993). D. M. Grimes, *ibid.*, p. 367. S. J. van Enk, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **9**, 183 (1996). E. Comay, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **261**, 601 (1996). E. Comay, *Physica B* **222**, 150 (1996). G. L. J. A. Rikken, *Opt. Lett.* **20**, 846 (1995). M. Y. A. Raja, W. N. Yousaf, and D. Allen, *Appl. Phys. B* **64**, 79 (1997).
- [9] M. W. Evans, *Physica B* **190**, 319 (1993). *Found. Phys. Lett.* **8**, 563 (1995); **9**, 191 (1996). M. W. Evans and S. Jeffers, *ibid.*, **9**, 587 (1996). M. W. Evans, **10**, 403 (1997). M. W. Evans, J.-P. Vigier, S. Roy, and G. Hunter, *The Enigmatic Photon, Vol. 4: New Directions* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997) Appendix. M. W. Evans, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **9**, 61 (1996). M. W. Evans and L. B. Crowell, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **11**, 595 (1998); *Apeiron* **4**, 80 (1997).
- [10] M. W. Evans, *J. Phys. Chem.* **95**, 2256 (1991).