

Impossibility of Determining the Electric Field Strength of Electromagnetic Wave. Correction of Energy Density Equation

Mykhailo V. Bondarchuk*

Photochemistry Department, Bowling Green State University, Ridge St, Bowling Green, USA

*** Corresponding Author**

Mykhailo V. Bondarchuk, Photochemistry Department, Bowling Green State University, Ridge St, Bowling Green, USA.

Submitted: 2024, May 17; Accepted: 2024, Jul 22; Published: 2024, Jul 29

Citation: Bondarchuk, M. V. (2024). Impossibility of Determining the Electric Field Strength of Electromagnetic Wave. Correction of Energy Density Equation. *Adv Theo Comp Phy, 7*(3), 01-05. $\textcolor{red}{\mathbf{on}}$: Bondarchuk, M. V. (2024). Impossibility of Determining the Ele

Abstract Despite significant achievements in the fields of photonics, optics, photophysics and quantum computing, our

This article addresses and corrects a major misconception about the energy density of electromagnetic wave that has become prevalent in electromagnetic wave theory. The author derives and proves the correct formula for energy density *based on principles of energy conservation and the corpuscular theory of radiation. The article also demonstrates the* impossibility of determining the electric field strength of electromagnetic radiation without first determining the area of *individual photons.* ustract remains incomplete. Various models have been developed to developed to describe light α its article adaresses ana corrects a major misconception about the energy aensity of electromagnetic wa α is formed, and its interactions with matter. Understanding these characteristics is constant for advancing the α

Keywords: Electromagnetic Wave Theory, Energy Density, Electric Field Strength, Photon, Electromagnetic Wave rust moderation theory, the

1. Introduction

Electromagnetic (EM) radiation is a fundamental form of practical applications in communication technologies an energy that pervades various aspects of life and technology. EM radiation can be perceived either as electromagnetic waves or as individual particles of energy (photons), as manifests due to the particle-wave duality of matter.

Despite significant achievements in the fields of photonics, optics, Despite significant active venteries in the relation photointes, optics, photophysics and quantum computing, our understanding of light remains incomplete. Various models have been developed to describe light [1,2], yet most are either incomplete or fail to consistently align with experimental data. Consequently, a comprehensive and universally accepted model of light has yet an EM wave. to be established. The primary objective of this paper is to demonstrate the input light [1,2], yet most are either incomplete or fail The primary objective of this paper is to demonstrate the

One of the most pressing questions in the field of photonics is the nature of the photon itself: its shape and size [3], how it is formed, and its interactions with matter. Understanding these characteristics is crucial for advancing our knowledge of light,

impacting broad areas ranging from fundamental physics to practical applications in communication technologies and optics.

In this paper, I focus on the Electric field strength (E_0) property of EM waves and single photons. I will show the challenges and issues related to this model of describing light, aiming to contribute to the broader understanding of electromagnetic radiation and its fundamental properties.

2. State of Problem

impossibility of determining the electric field strength (E_0) of an EM wave.

equations, i.e., i.e. in a most commonic and generally accepted representation of Γ The most common and generally accepted representation of light, as a possible solution to Maxwell's equations, involves sinusoidal, orthogonal in-phase (harmonic) oscillations of electric and magnetic fields [4] (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Most Common Presentation of **EM Radiation as Sinusoidal EM Wave.**

Such a description of light highlights a major feature: its sinusoidal nature, which leads to phenomena such as interference and defines the wavelength of radiation.

The energy density of EM wave in such model is determined by Equation (1) [4]:

$$
u_{EM} = \varepsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) \tag{1}
$$

where E_0 is the amplitude of the electric field strength, ε_0 is the and Its Soli permittivity of free space, w is radial frequency of EM wave, t is μ and μ , μ is the set of $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ $T_{\rm eff}$ flow of such EM radiation is characterized by the Poynting vector $\frac{1}{2}$

The energy flow of such EM radiation is characterized by the Poynting vector $[4, 5]$: = ∗ (2)

$$
S = u_{EM} * k \tag{2}
$$

Although this concept is highly visual and useful, I have found out that it is not possible to determine the electric field strength for coherent $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{z})]$ (E_0) of such oscillations in an EM wave. wave point Although this concept is highly visual and useful, I have found operate out that it is not possible to determine the electric f electric field strength (*E*0) of such oscillations in an EM wave. electric field strength (*E*0) of such oscillations in an EM wave.

Indeed, there is no data or literature that provides the electric field multiplied strength for different types of EM radiation across the spectrum. moeed, there is no data or itterature that provides the electric field multiplied that I_n is no data or literature that provides the electric field strength for different types of EM r field strength (*E*0), which is the fundamental property of such model.

It is peculiar that this widely used representation lacks specific quantities and values of Electric field strength (E_0) , which is the fundamental property of such model.

Initially, I was both surprised and intrigued by this discrepancy. However, I eventually discovered the underlying reason. This article aims to explain it.

3. Problem of Energy Density of Electromagnetic Radiation and Its Solution

The only way to determine the electric field strength (E_0) of an EM wave is by using the concept of energy density. As mentioned before, the energy density of an EM wave is determined by Equation (1).

To highlight and prove that this equation is incomplete, let $S = u_{EM} * k$ (2) us examine the energy density for EM radiation from two perspectives: wave and particle. Suppose we are working with two coherent photons. Since photons are bosons, from the EM wave point of view, the model will appear to us as identical EM wave (phase and wavelength), but with the field vectors multiplied by a factor of two (Figure 2).

$F = G \cdot U = F \cdot G \cdot U = P \cdot U \cdot G \cdot D \cdot U$ consistent from continuous consistent from consistent from continuous consistent from continuous continuous consistent from continuous continuous continuous continuous continuous continuous Figure 2: a) EM Wave Consistent From Continuous Radiation of Single Photons. b) EM Wave Consistent from Continuous **Radiation of Coherent Two Photons** Fig. 2. a) EM wave consistent from continuous radiation of single photons. b) EM wave consistent from continuous **Radiation of Coherent Two Photons**radiation of coherent two photons.

Photons are coherent, and electric and magnetic field vectors are We see, that incr additive, so: Photons are coherent, and electric and magnetic field vectors are additive, so: Photons are coherent, and electric and magnetic field vectors are additive, so: Photons and magnetic and magnetic and magnetic field vectors are additive, so: 2 Exercis, and electric and magnetic field vectors are the sect, that mere

$$
\overline{E}_2 = 2\overline{E}_1 \tag{3}
$$

According to the standard Equation (1), the energy densities of (because we are working with 2 coheren EM waves for one and two photons should be equal: $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ According to the standard Equation (1), the energy densities of (because we are working with 2 coherent photor

single photon: $\sin \alpha$ lo $\sin \alpha$ to the energy density of EM waves for α

$$
u_{EM1} = \varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) \tag{4}
$$

 $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{h}$ two coherent photons:

$$
u_{EM1} = 1\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)
$$

\n
$$
u_{EM2} = \varepsilon_0 (E_2)^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) = \varepsilon_0 (2E_1)^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)
$$

\n
$$
u_{EM2} = 2\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)
$$

\n
$$
u_{EM2} = 2\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)
$$

3

$$
= 4\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) = 4u_{EM1} \tag{5}
$$

We see, that increasing energy of EM wave by factor of 2, standard **Equation (1)** leads in increase of energy density of $\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}$ factor of 4. This discrepancy is inconsistent with theoretical $\overline{E}_2 = 2\overline{E}_1$ (3) expectations. If we consider particle point of view, energy density of such EM wave should just increase by factor of 2 f (because we are working with 2 coherent photons instead of just $(2, 2)$). one): ϵ (because we are working with 2 coherent photons instead of inst

$$
E_2 = 2E_1 \tag{6}
$$

$$
u_{EM2} = 2u_{EM1}
$$
 (7)

$$
u_{EM1} = 1\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) \tag{8}
$$

$$
u_{EM2} = 2\varepsilon_0 E_1^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) \tag{9}
$$

3

Now if we compare both Equation (8) and (9) , we see that the where N is ame equality is only possible, if we introduce a factor of 2 (some N) $S^{equating}$ is only possible, if we introduce a factor of 2 (some N) sateligated in \ln Equation (1), the factor of a $\frac{1}{2}$ Compare both Eq. (8), we have the equality is only possible, if we introduce a factor of 2 (8) $\ln L$ qu

where N is amount of photon in EM wave, and E_0 is electric field strength of individual photon.

$$
u_{EM} = N\varepsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) \tag{10}
$$

Another way to represent energy density is depicted in Figure 3. Area of square in case a represents energy density of individual $E_M = N \varepsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)$ (10) There is equal in this amount of photon in EM wave, and $E_M = N \varepsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)$ density, depicted in case b.

Figure 3: Simplified Presentation of Energy Density of EM Wave Containing: a) One Photon. b) Two Coherent Photons. c) **Four Coherent Photons**

In other words, we have discovered that the energy density of 4. Impossibility ff Determination of Electric an EM wave is actually the sum of the energies of individual of Electromagnetic Radiation photons that share the same volume and each have its own Now we address the main problem: how can or electric field strength (E_0) . In such case of matter, it is pointless the electric field strength (E_0) of an EM wave? to work with electric field strength of EM wave as entity of EM wave is described through the energy de photons. Whenever someone measures energy density, they are given by 1 of entire radiation. This is a novel finding that has not been Suppose that photons are located erved. actually measuring the sum of the energy densities of individual photons that constitute the radiation, rather than energy density previously reported or observed.

4. Impossibility ff Determination of Electric Field Strength of Electromagnetic Radiation

Now we are mainly the main problem: how can one find and derive the electric field strength (*E*) of an EM strength (*C*) of an EM strength S and C y in an early space. Now we address the main problem: how can one find and derive the electric field strength (E_0) of an EM wave? The energy in an EM wave is described through the energy density concept, as given by Equation (1). Energy density has the units of energy per volume $(J/m³)$. We need to define the volume in which a packet of individual radiation is stored (the volume of a photon). Suppose that photons are located in a cylindrical volume with a length equal to the wavelength and a cross-sectional area corresponding to the circular area of the photon (**Figure 4**). Photons are bosons, allowing any number of them to occupy the

Fig. 4. Supposed volume of individual photon. **Figure 4: Supposed Volume of Individual Photon**

In this case, from derived Equation 10 we can obtain the following equations:

$$
\frac{Energy}{Volume} = u_{EM} = N\varepsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx)
$$

$$
= \frac{Nhv}{Volume} = \frac{Nhv}{Area * \lambda} = \frac{Nhv^2}{Area * c}
$$
(11)

Volume Area *
$$
\lambda
$$
 Area * c
\n
$$
c\epsilon_0 E_0^2 \cos^2(wt - kx) = \frac{hv^2}{Area}
$$
\n(12)

From which we can find E_0 :

$$
E_0 = \sqrt{\frac{hv^2}{Area * c\epsilon_0 \cos^2(wt - kx)}}
$$
\n
$$
= \sqrt{\frac{hv^2}{Area * c\epsilon_0 \cos^2(wt - kx)}}
$$
\n
$$
(13)
$$
\nLet's suppose we have a rectangular beam

We see, that to determine the electric field strength (E_0) of EM wave, the missing parameter is the area of the photons (*Area*, time (Figure 5). Equation (13)). Until we find a way to determine the shape and p photons (p) , which are allowed a definitive understanding of the photon of t We see, that to determine the electric field strength (*E*0) of EM wave, the missing parameter is the area of the We see, that to determine the electric field strength (E_0) of EM intensity photons (*A_R* (*ARR*). Until we find a way to determine determine *E*0 for any EM wave or photon. determine *E*0 for any EM wave or photon.

area of photons, it is impossible to determine E_0 for any EM wave or photon.

One obvious point is that shorter wavelength photons should carry more energy, encapsulated in a shorter path. However, carry more energy, encapsulated in a shorter path. However, the function of the area of these photons remains unknown. It is still possible that shorter wavelength photons have a larger area. Without a definitive understanding of the photon's area and shape, determination of the electric field strength (E_0) remains unresolved.

One might think that the simplest experiment to determine
the electric field strength and area of a photon would involve the electric field strength and area of a photon would involve recording a beam profile using a laser pulse of known power and

> Let's suppose we have a rectangular beam profile with the same intensity across the detector, for simplicity, not varying with time (Figure 5).

6 6 6 **Figure 5: Supposed Beam Profile Experiment for Determining** *Ahv* $F = \frac{1}{2}$ suppose the determining for determining for determining $F = \frac{1}{2}$

The detector measures the number of photons (N) that hit each pixel area across the detector (Equation 14). Intensity is constant of an individual photor across the detector for our model, so we can write next: is constant action for $ac₁$

$$
I = \frac{Nhv}{Area} = \frac{N_1hv}{A_{hv}} = \frac{N_2hv}{A_{pixel}} = \frac{Nhv}{A_{detector}}
$$
 (14)

Area A_{hv} A_{pixel} $A_{detector}$
The detector counts the number of photons per pixel, not per area of photon [6]. Both the area of an individual photon (A_{hv}) and 5. Conclusion the number of photons per that area (N_1) are unknown values. In summary, through photons. The area of measuring the area of measuring the area of an individual photon underscores the difference the differences the di photons.

This fundamental challenge of measuring the area of an considering photon char individual photon underscores the difficulty in pinpointing the the electric field strength (E_0) of EM radiation is impossible electric field strength and area of single photons. The result is without determining clear: to obtain values of E_0 , one must find a way to determine a convenient n electric field strength and area of single photons. The result is without determining the area of individual photons. Offices find a way to determine the shape and area of μ to determining the area of an individual photons. However, determining the area of an individual photon, determining the area of an individual photon, and μ

s the number of photons (N) that hit each the shape and area of photons. However, determining the area of an individual photon, which should be precisely located in across the detector for our model, so we can write next: space and time, presents a formidable task. Most experiments involving light entail working with a high number of particles. Nevertheless, there remains hope that someone will develop a method to overcome this challenge, leading to a breakthrough in determining the electric field strength of individual photons.

5. Conclusion \mathcal{L}^{max}

Consequently, the area of a single photon cannot be determined of determining the electric field strength of individual photons. from such an experiment when working with a collection of I started by employing the commonly accepted sinusoidal
photons per electric In summary, through this investigation, I explored the feasibility of determining the electric field strength of individual photons. I started by employing the commonly accepted sinusoidal representation of light, which lacked specific values for electric photons.

Feresentation of light, which facked specific values for electric

field strength. Despite conducting theoretical analysis and considering photon characteristics, I concluded that determining the electric field strength (E_0) of EM radiation is impossible without determining the area of individual photons. Unless

photons is developed, the values of electric field strength (E_{0}) of EM radiation remain unknown.

6. Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Dr. Alexander Tarnovsky for his mentorship and for reviewing this article. I also thank Bowling Green State University for providing the graduate student position and the opportunity to conduct this research.

References

1. Panagopoulos, D. J. (2015). Considering photons as spatially confined wave-packets. *Horizons in world physics. New York, NY, USA: Nova Science Publishers, 285.*

- 2. Kidd, R., Ardini, J., & Anton, A. (1989). Evolution of the modern photon. *American Journal of Physics, 57*(1), 27-35.
- 3. Andrews, S. S. (2023). Light and Waves, A Conceptual Exploration of Physics. Springer Nature, 346-347.
- 4. Hecht, E., Zając, A. (1974). Optics, 2nd Ed. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, USA.
- 5. Slepian, J. (1942). Energy and energy flow in the electromagnetic field. *Journal of Applied Physics, 13*(8), 512-518.
- 6. Sibata, C. H., Mota, H. C., Bedder, A. S., Higgins, P. D., & Shin, K. H. (1991). Influence of detector size in photon beam profile measurements. *Physics in medicine & biology, 36*(5), 621.