

### 163(14)<sup>(3)</sup>: Theory of Diffraction and Electron Microscopy.

The usual theory of electron microscopy is based on a simplistic equation, which is the non-relativistic limit is:

$$E = eU = \frac{1}{2} m v^2 = \frac{p^2}{2m} \quad - (1)$$

where  $U$  is the electric potential. The momentum is defined by the de Broglie postulate:

$$p = \hbar \kappa \quad - (2)$$

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\hbar} (2m eU)^{1/2} \quad - (3)$$

so

$$eU = \frac{\hbar^2 \kappa^2}{2m} \quad - (4)$$

and

The electron wavelength is said incorrectly to be found by this method. What is actually found is  $\kappa$ , and the incorrect use of the kinetic energy.

The relativistic kinetic energy is then used incorrectly to adjust the result (4). The relativistic kinetic energy is

$$T = (\gamma - 1) m c^2 \quad - (5)$$

where  $E$  is the total energy and  $E_0$  the rest energy.

$$\text{Therefore: } T = (p^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4)^{1/2} - m c^2 \quad - (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Using eq. (2)} \\ T &= (\hbar^2 \kappa^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4)^{1/2} - m c^2 \\ &= eU \end{aligned} \quad - (7)$$

so:

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\hbar c} (e\tilde{U} (e\tilde{U} + 2mc^2))^{1/2} \quad - (8)$$

This is incorrect because the de Broglie postulate is

$$E = \hbar\omega = \gamma mc^2 \quad - (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So } e\tilde{U} &= (p^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4)^{1/2} \quad - (10) \\ &= (\hbar^2 \kappa^2 c^2 + m^2 c^4)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{So } \hbar^2 \kappa^2 c^2 = (e\tilde{U})^2 - m^2 c^4$$

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\hbar c} (e^2 \tilde{U}^2 - m^2 c^4)^{1/2} \quad - (11)$$

$$\boxed{\kappa = \frac{1}{\hbar c} (e\tilde{U} - E_0)^{1/2} (e\tilde{U} + E_0)^{1/2}} \quad - (12)$$

The relativistic momentum is :

$$\underline{p} = \gamma m \underline{v} \quad - (13)$$

and this momentum is always associated with any moving electron by definition. We have :

$$\begin{aligned} p^2 &= c^2 \gamma^2 m^2 \frac{v^2}{c^2} = c^2 \gamma^2 m^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^2}\right) \quad - (14) \\ &= \gamma^2 c^2 m^2 - c^2 m^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{So } E^2 = c^2 p^2 + E_0^2 \quad - (15)$$

$$\text{here } E = \gamma mc^2, E_0 = mc^2 \quad - (16)$$

2) The complete or total energy associated with the relativistic momentum is always  $E$ .

Define the four momentum by:

$$p^\mu p_\mu = m^2 c^2, \quad - (17)$$

i.e.

$$p^\mu = \left( \frac{E}{c}, \underline{p} \right), \quad p_\mu = \left( \frac{E}{c}, -\underline{p} \right) \quad - (18)$$

then eqs. (15) and (17) are the same. The four momentum is defined by the total energy. The minimal prescription is:

$$p^\mu \rightarrow p^\mu + e A^\mu \quad - (19)$$

where 
$$A^\mu = \left( \frac{\phi}{c}, \underline{A} \right) \quad - (20)$$

so 
$$E \rightarrow E + e \phi \quad - (21)$$

$$\underline{p} \rightarrow \underline{p} + e \underline{A} \quad - (22)$$

The potential  $U$  used in the theory of microscopy is

$$U = \phi \quad - (23)$$

so  $eU$  must be associated with the total energy, not with the kinetic energy  $T$ . The latter is

fixed by 
$$T = \int \underline{F} \cdot \underline{v} dt = \int \frac{d}{dt} (\gamma m \underline{v}) \cdot \underline{v} dt \quad - (24)$$

$$\boxed{E = \int \underline{F} \cdot \underline{v} dt + mc^2 = \hbar \omega} \quad - (25)$$

4) The usual classical kinetic energy  $T$  is the limit  
 $v \ll c$  - (26)

$$\begin{aligned} T &= (\gamma - 1)mc^2 \\ &= \left( \left( 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} \right)^{-1/2} - 1 \right) mc^2 \\ &\sim \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{v^2}{c^2} - 1 \right) mc^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} mv^2 \end{aligned} \quad - (27)$$

The simplistic association of  $e\phi$  (or  $eV$ ) with  
 $T$  in eq. (1) is incorrect.

Therefore the theory of electron microscopy is  
incorrect. Any theory based on eq. (1) is  
incorrect. Some unreliable wikipedia articles use  
eq. (1).

---