

# Retraction: “Fabry–Perot-cavity-based refractometry without influence of mirror penetration depth” [J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B 39, 065001 (2021)]

Cite as: J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B 40, 037001 (2022); <https://doi.org/10.1116/6.0001829>

Submitted: 25 February 2022 • Accepted: 28 February 2022 • Published Online: 29 March 2022

 C. Forssén,  I. Silander,  J. Zakrisson, et al.



View Online



Export Citation





CrossMark

## ARTICLES YOU MAY BE INTERESTED IN

**Fabry–Perot-cavity-based refractometry without influence of mirror penetration depth**  
Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B 39, 065001 (2021); <https://doi.org/10.1116/6.0001501>

**Procedure for robust assessment of cavity deformation in Fabry–Pérot based refractometers**  
Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B 38, 054202 (2020); <https://doi.org/10.1116/6.0000375>

**Optical realization of the pascal–Characterization of two gas modulated refractometers**  
Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B 39, 044201 (2021); <https://doi.org/10.1116/6.0001042>

## Instruments for Advanced Science

- Knowledge,
- Experience,
- Expertise

**Click to view our product catalogue**

Contact Hiden Analytical for further details:  
[www.HidenAnalytical.com](http://www.HidenAnalytical.com)  
[info@hideninc.com](mailto:info@hideninc.com)

### Gas Analysis

- dynamic measurement of reaction gas streams
- catalysis and thermal analysis
- molecular beam studies
- dissolved species probes
- fermentation, environmental and ecological studies

### Surface Science

- UHVTPD
- SIMS
- end point detection in ion beam etch
- elemental imaging - surface mapping

### Plasma Diagnostics

- plasma source characterization
- etch and deposition process reaction kinetic studies
- analysis of neutral and radical species

### Vacuum Analysis

- partial pressure measurement and control of process gases
- reactive sputter process control
- vacuum diagnostics
- vacuum coating process monitoring

# Retraction: “Fabry–Perot-cavity-based refractometry without influence of mirror penetration depth” [J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B 39, 065001 (2021)]

Cite as: J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B 40, 037001 (2022); doi: 10.1116/6.0001829

Submitted: 25 February 2022 · Accepted: 28 February 2022 ·

Published Online: 29 March 2022



C. Forssén,<sup>1,a)</sup> I. Silander,<sup>1</sup> J. Zakrisson,<sup>1</sup> M. Zelan,<sup>2</sup> and O. Axner<sup>1,b)</sup>

## AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

<sup>2</sup>Measurement Science and Technology, RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, SE-501 15 Borås, Sweden

<sup>a)</sup>Also at: Measurement Science and Technology, RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, SE-501 15 Borås, Sweden.

<sup>b)</sup>Electronic mail: ove.axner@umu.se

<https://doi.org/10.1116/6.0001829>

The authors of the referenced paper<sup>1</sup> have unanimously agreed to retract it since it contains a flaw that invalidates its conclusions.

The paper presents an expression that predicts that Fabry–Pérot (FP) cavity based refractometry can be performed without any influence of mirror penetration depth if the mirror coating comprises a quarter wave stack (QWS) of type H (for which the outermost layer has a higher index of refraction than the subsequent one). However, it has been found that the derivation of the expression that serves as a basis for this statement contains a fallacy. This implies that the conclusions mediated by the paper are incorrect.

The derivation of the expression for the refractivity is based on the difference between the cavity frequencies in the absence and presence of gas,  $\nu_0$  and  $\nu_g$ , respectively.

Appendix A1 in the referenced paper provides, based on a phase condition, a derivation of an expression for the empty mode cavity frequency of an FP cavity comprising high-reflection coated mirrors that (in the absence of Gouy phase and group delay dispersion) reads

$$\nu_0 = \frac{[m_0 - 2\phi_{des}/2\pi + 2T_g^0\nu_{des}]c}{2(L_0 + cT_g^0)} = \frac{q_0c}{2(L_0 + 2L_{pd}^0)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $m_0$  is the mode number,  $\phi_{des}$  is the phase shift experienced by the light at the surface of the mirrors at the design wavelength,  $T_g^0$  is the group delay of the mirrors for an empty cavity,<sup>2,3</sup> and  $\nu_{des}$  is the design wavelength. In the last step, we have introduced  $q_0$  as

a shorthand notation for  $m_0 - 2\phi_{des}/2\pi + 2T_g^0\nu_{des}$  and used  $L_{pd}^0$ , representing the frequency penetration depth, to denote  $cT_g^0/2$ .

It is claimed in the referenced paper that, for the case with a cavity comprising mirrors with QWS reflection coatings of type H, the cavity mode frequency in the presence of gas is given by Eq. (10). However, this expression is unfortunately not fully adequate.

The correct expression can be derived from the corresponding general expression for the cavity frequency from a cavity comprising gas, which reads

$$\nu_g = \frac{[m_0 + \Delta m - 2\phi_{des}/2\pi + 2T_g(n)\nu_{des}]c}{2[nL_0 + n\delta L + cT_g(n)]}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta m$  is the number of mode jumps the laser makes,  $T_g(n)$  is the group delay of the mirrors in the presence of gas with an index of refraction of  $n$ , and  $\delta L$  represents the physical deformation of the cavity due to the presence of the gas.

As has been recently shown by Koks and van Exter,<sup>4</sup> for the case with a cavity comprising mirrors with QWS reflection coatings of type H,  $T_g(n)$  is given by  $nT_g^0$ . This implies that Eq. (2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_g &= \frac{[m_0 + \Delta m - 2\phi_{des}/2\pi + n\gamma]c}{2n(L_0 + \delta L + cT_g^0)} \\ &= \frac{[q_0 + \Delta q + (n-1)\gamma]c}{2n(L_0 + \delta L + 2L_{pd}^0)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we, for simplicity, have introduced  $\gamma$  as a shorthand notation for  $2T_g^0 v_{des}$  since it represents a fully material-based parameter of the mirrors, for mirrors with QWS reflection, the coating of type H is given by  $(n_H - n_L)^{-1}$ , where  $n_H$  and  $n_L$  are the indices of refraction of the two materials making up the QWS, respectively. For simplicity, here, we have also made use of the definition of  $q_0$  from above and denoted  $\Delta m$  by  $\Delta q$ .

A comparison with Eq. (10) in the referenced paper<sup>1</sup> shows that the two expressions differ by the  $(n - 1)\gamma$  term; since this term is typically nine orders of magnitude smaller than the leading term within the brackets in the nominator,<sup>5</sup> it was inadvertently left out in Eq. (10) in the referenced paper.

This implies that Eq. (A11) in the referenced paper, which is the basis for the derivation of the expression for the refractivity of the gas assessed by a cavity comprising mirrors with QWS reflection coatings of type H, which, in turn, is given by Eqs. (A16) and (11), is incorrect.<sup>6</sup> A re-derivation of the expression for the refractivity, based on the correct expression for  $v_g$ , given by Eq. (3) above, shows that it, for all practical purposes, agrees with Eq. (4) in the referenced paper, which, in turn, agrees with the expressions used by Egan and Stone<sup>7</sup> and Zakrisson *et al.*<sup>8</sup> previously given in the literature.<sup>9</sup>

This implies that the main conclusions mediated by the paper are incorrect; FP cavity based refractometry *cannot* be performed without any influence of mirror penetration depth by using mirror coatings comprising a QWS of type H.

Since the referenced paper was published only a few months ago (December 1, 2021), it has so far, to the authors knowledge, neither been used as a basis for any scientific work nor been cited by any other publication. We, therefore, believe that it has had a minimal impetus on the scientific community.

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup>C. Forssén, I. Silander, J. Zakrisson, M. Zelan, and O. Axner, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B* **39**, 065001 (2021).
- <sup>2</sup>R. Paschotta, see [https://www.rp-photonics.com/group\\_delay.html](https://www.rp-photonics.com/group_delay.html) for article on “group delay” in the RP photonics encyclopedia; accessed 22 September 2021.
- <sup>3</sup>Denoted  $T_g$  in the referenced paper, but here, for clarity, denoted  $T_g^0$ .
- <sup>4</sup>C. Koks and M. P. van Exter, *Opt. Express* **29**, 6879 (2021).
- <sup>5</sup>For the case with nitrogen under atmospheric pressure, for which  $n - 1$  is ca.  $3 \times 10^{-4}$ , with  $n_H - n_L$  being in the order of unity, and  $q_0$  typically taking a value of  $2 \times 10^5$ ,  $(n - 1)\gamma$  is ca.  $1.5 \times 10^{-9}$  times smaller than  $q_0$ .
- <sup>6</sup>Incorrect Eqs. (A16) and (11) provide an adequate expression for the refractivity assessed by FP-based refractometry in the absence of penetration depth.
- <sup>7</sup>P. F. Egan and J. A. Stone, *Appl. Opt.* **50**, 3076 (2011).
- <sup>8</sup>J. Zakrisson, I. Silander, C. Forssén, M. Zelan, and O. Axner, *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B* **38**, 054202 (2020).
- <sup>9</sup>Equations (A16) and (11) differ from Eq. (4) by an amount given by the relative penetration depth,  $2\overline{L}_{pd}^0$ , which is given by  $(c\gamma)/(2L_0 v_{des})$ . For the case with  $\gamma$ ,  $L_0$ , and  $v_{des}$  being 1, 0.15 m and  $2 \times 10^{14}$  Hz, respectively,  $2\overline{L}_{pd}^0$  takes a value of  $5 \times 10^{-6}$ .