

[Music] [Applause] welcome to the lecture module on optics we are now discussing wave optics in the last lecture we discussed the Huygens principle. Christian Huygens introduced the wave picture for light propagation. However, as we have seen, although he could explain the reflection and refraction of light at interfaces, there were certain questions which he did not have an answer to. Huygens' wave theory did not have an answer, but as we discussed that in 1801 Thomas Young presented the Young's interference experiment which was a convincing proof that light is a wave.

So today we will discuss the Young's experiment in some more detail.

So Young's experiment. Young's interference experiment. First of all, interference in optics generally, interference refers to two beam or two wave interference which results in some perceptible and sustained fringe pattern. We will discuss about the fringe pattern. What is this fringe pattern in the later part of the lecture.

So we generally refer to two beam or two wave interference which results in a perceptible and sustained fringe pattern. A fringe pattern refers to the light intensity pattern comprising of alternate bright and dark regions in the form of lines or rings. For example, let me show a typical fringe pattern.

So here is a fringe pattern which is a linear fringe pattern.

So this is the kind of pattern which we would get in a Young's experiment or it could also be a circular fringe pattern. These are of course computer generated fringes.

So it could be a circular fringe pattern as in the case of Newton rings and we will discuss the formation of these fringes in the next few minutes. The formation of fringes can be explained in terms of superposition of the two waves.

So first let us look at there are certain requirements, although to get a sustained fringe pattern and let us look at the requirements to obtain a sustained fringe pattern.

So here the requirements of interference. What are the requirements of interference to be able to see a sustained fringe pattern? The two waves interfering must have the same frequency or wavelength and there should be a constant phase difference between the two waves. This property is called coherence. The two waves must be coherent.

So there should be a constant phase difference between the two waves. We will discuss these issues towards the end of the lecture or in the subsequent lecture and understand this more clearly.

So let us come back to the Young's schematic of the Young's experimental setup.

So here is the Young's experimental setup.

So first we see here that the experimental setup comprises of a source. There is a small hole in this. There is an opaque screen in which there is a small hole or aperture and then there is a second screen. There is a second plate or screen or a cardboard where you have two small holes, S_1 and S_2 , two small apertures.

So that's why it's called Young's two hole experiment.

So there are two holes which act like point sources and then we have a screen here on which the interference pattern will be observed.

So we will discuss the formation of interference pattern.

So the coordinate system that we consider is the z axis. Light is propagating in the z axis here.

So this is the z axis and the obstacles here or the apertures here are on a plane which is perpendicular to the z axis and the screen is in the $x-y$ axis here.

So $x-y$ axis, the $x-y$ plane lies on the screen.

So this is the experimental arrangement. Now if we see a longitudinal cross section along the $x-z$ plane.

So $x-z$ plane.

So this is the x and this is the z direction.

So if we see a longitudinal cross section of the $x-z$ plane it would look like this.

So here it is.

So the source is here.

So we are looking at a cross section.

So source S is shown here. There is a small hole which acts like a point source from which spherical wave fronts are emerging. Then there are two other small holes which act like point sources again.

So the wave, the spherical wave reaches here and as we know from the Huygens principle that each point on this wave acts as a secondary source of secondary wavelets.

So these two points or these two small apertures act like point sources and here is the screen.

So again is shown here that the x axis is here and we have shown a cross section a longitudinal cross section the separation between the two holes here and the screen is capital d and the aperture the separation between the two holes here is small d and at any point p the resultant intensity can be determined by considering the superposition of waves superposition of waves occur at each point on the screen at each point first we will consider the superposition of waves on the x axis and then we will take a general point an arbitrary point anywhere on the screen

So first a point p is a point an arbitrary point on the x axis here on the x axis So superposition of waves occur at each point p and d is the distance between the source s one and s two s one s s s one s two are small holes in an opaque screen ok

So we will now discuss the superposition of waves to determine the interference pattern So lets look at the superposition of waves here

So at an arbitrary point p these are the two point sources s one and s two at a point p here which the distance is r one from s 1 p is r 1 and s 2 p is r 2 and we can see that the point source s 1 can be represented by psi 1 equal to the disturbance due to s 1 the wave due to s 1 at the point p can be written as a 1 dash by r 1 cos k r 1 minus omega t and due to the point source at s 2 psi 2 is equal to a 2 dash by r 2 cos k r 2 omega t if we denote this a 1 dash by r 1 as a 1 and a 2 dash r 2 by r 2 as a 2 then we have the resultant at the point p is the super position which means we sum it psi one plus psi two psi resultant at the point p is equal to psi one plus psi two

So that is a one cos k r one omega minus omega t plus a two cos k r two minus omega t which can be opened up

So now we can open cos a minus b is equal to cos a cos b plus sin a sin b we can use that formula and

So therefore we have this term has cos k r 1 cos omega t plus sin k r 1 sin omega t and the second term a 2 is equal to cos k r 2 cos omega t plus sin k r 2 sin omega t using the trigonometric identity now the superposition of two ways

So let us calculate the resultant due to these two waves

So let me continue with the resultant calculation of the resultant

So the psi resultant is equal to cos omega t

So we have taken cos terms which are common

So in this expression here we had cos omega t here and cos omega t here

So we are taking common terms and sine omega t and sin omega t here

So this can be written as cos omega t into a 1 cos k r 1 plus a 2 cos k r 2 plus sin omega t into a 1 sin k r 1 plus a 2 sine k r now we set a 1 cos k r 1 plus a 2 cos k r 2 that is this term here as a cos phi and a 1 sin k r 1 plus a 2 sin k r 2 as a sin phi where phi is given by the phi the angle phi such that this holds good is given by tan phi is equal to a one sine k r one that is we simply divide this by this we see that dividing the second equation by the first equation we get tan phi is equal to a 1 sine k r 1 plus a 2 sine k r 2 divided by a 1 cos k r 1 plus a 2 cos k r and therefore the resultant psi now

So this term is a cos phi and this term is a sin phi

So the resultant is a cos omega t cos y plus a sine omega t sin phi in other words that is nothing but psi resultant is equal to a cos omega t minus phi at the point p now with a is equal to a square cos square phi plus a square sin square phi why we have to the power half why we have written this because a will come from this a will be determined from this square of this and square of this and square root a square cos square phi plus So that is given by a is given by this and phi is determined by this equation

So we have the resultant disturbance or resultant function or the resultant wave at the point p as a cos omega t minus phi lets find out what would be the corresponding intensity distribution

So the intensity distribution is given by ah mod psi square and therefore we write that the intensity at the point p is equal to

So intensity at the point p is equal to mod psi resultant square which is equal to a square cos square omega t minus phi now cos square omega t minus phi because omega is a very large number

So we are determining the intensity omega is a very large number

So what is omega

So lets just discuss this here

So omega is equal to 2 pi into nu where nu is the frequency of like corresponding to light

So ν is typically of the order of 10^{14} to 10^{15} hertz for light depending on whether we are at the blue end or whether we are at the red end

So this is a very large frequency and therefore $\cos \omega t$

So \cos^2

So we have $\cos^2 \omega t - \phi$

So this is what we have to determine this quantity is varying extremely rapidly with the time

So we have a \cos^2 function

So \cos^2 we know varies from 0 to 1 \cos^2 it is therefore it varies from zero to one this is time axis

So with the time this is varying extremely rapidly very very rapidly and this time difference here is of the order of 10^{-15} seconds because the frequency is of the order of 10^{15} hertz which means the corresponding period is 2π by f which is t is equal to 2π by f the frequency and that is of the order of 10^{-15} second which is extremely rapidly varying

So neither i nor any high speed detector can detect such high frequency variations and therefore what we will detect is an average value that is why we take an average value this has been probably discussed in an earlier chapter that $\cos^2 \omega t - \phi$ is a rapidly varying function

So whenever we determine the intensity the rapidly varying function has to be average

So these brackets refer to time average

So the time average is equal to half because the maximum is one minimum is 0 it is varying rapidly between 1 and 0 and therefore on an average we see that the function varies the value of this $\cos^2 \omega t$ time average is half using this we come back to the super position of waves

So we get the intensity variation here is $\cos^2 \omega t$ time average using this equal to half we have i is equal to a^2 by 2 a^2 divide into half

So a^2 by 2 if only the source s_1 was present for example

So if we had

So this is resultant due to both the sources s_1 and s_2 . if only the source s_1 was present let us say s_2 was not there then we would have got intensity at the point p equal to $\cos^2 \phi$ which is equal to here of course we have taken all real quantities

So we even need not write mod

So $a^2 \cos^2 k r_1 - \omega t$ because there is only one source

So $k r_1 - \omega t$ gives us the phase term and therefore we will get a a^2 by two the intensity due to source s_1 is a^2 by two and similarly intensity at point p due to only s_2 that is if s_1 were not there then we would get i_2 is equal to a^2 by two now let's continue further and see what is the resultant therefore

So the resultant here now is a^2 is equal to remember we had written $a^2 \cos^2 \phi + a^2 \sin^2 \phi$

So this is $a^2 \cos^2 \phi$ and therefore a^2 is equal to this square plus this square

So recall the expression we had written here

So a^2 is equal to $a^2 \cos^2 \phi + a^2 \sin^2 \phi$ where $a^2 \cos^2 \phi$ was this term and $a^2 \sin^2 \phi$ was this term

So now we are using this to determine a^2

So a^2 is equal to square of this and therefore a^2 is equal to square of this plus square of this which gives a^2 plus a^2

So we can square and add them this gives $\cos^2 k r_1 - \omega t + \sin^2 k r_1 - \omega t$ therefore we will get 1 term as a^2 another term as a^2 and the term the mixed term as $2 a^2 \cos k r_1 - \omega t \sin k r_2 - \omega t$ that is $2 a^2 \cos \delta$ we have just now shown that a^2 is equal to $2 a^2$

So we have just now shown that i is equal to a^2 or a^2 is equal to $2 a^2$

So a^2 is equal to $2 a^2$ is equal to $2 a^2$ one plus $2 a^2$ two plus $2 a^2$ one is square root of $2 a^2$ one into $2 a^2$ two into $\cos \delta$ we are calling this as δ where δ is equal to $k r_2 - k r_1$ that is the phase difference between the 2 waves at p this is the phase difference between the two waves because ωt is common

So we had one wave with $\cos k r_1 - \omega t$ and the other term with $\cos k r_2 - \omega t$

$k r_2$ therefore the phase difference is $k r_1$ minus $k r_2$ Δ is equal to $k r_2$ minus r_1 is the phase difference between the two waves interfering at the point p now r_2 minus r_1 is the path difference r_2 is this distance s_2 r_1 is this distance therefore r_2 minus r_1 is the path difference between the two waves path difference multiplied by the phase constant gives us the phase difference Δ therefore using this as Δ we have

So 2 cancels throughout we have I is equal to I_1 plus I_2 plus $2 \sqrt{I_1 I_2} \cos \Delta$ this is called the interference equation the interference equation now we will determine the intensity distribution as a function of Δ Δ depends on r_2 minus r_1 which means at different positions p on the x axis we will have different path differences and therefore different phase differences and therefore different intensities So we will determine the intensity distribution along the x axis

So the intensity distribution here on the screen here on the x axis is given by

So here we are

So this is the interference equation for Δ is equal to 0 plus minus 2π plus minus 4π etcetera directly looking at the mathematical formula here

So Δ is equal to this we have I is equal to I_{\max} because this $\cos \Delta$ is 1 and therefore this term is simply square root of I_1 plus I_2 the whole square I_{\max} and for Δ is equal to plus minus π plus minus 3π and

So on we will get I is equal to we will get a negative sign here $\cos \Delta$ being minus one and therefore we have I will be equal to minimum which is equal to square root of I_1 minus I_2 minus square root of I_2 the whole square

So this is the maximum intensity and minimum intensity depending on the value of Δ which as we see that it will depend on the position of the point p because Δ will have take different values depending on the position of the point p and therefore if a_1 is equal to a_2 as is the case here we can see that s_1 and s_2 are drawn from the same wave front if we look at the for if we recall the diagram here that s_1 and s_2 are drawn from the same wave front and therefore they have the same amplitude and they are in phase at this point we will discuss more about the phase and phase differences in a later lecture a_1 is equal to a_2 and therefore I_1 is equal to I_2 is equal to I_0 let us call it as I_0 then I_{\max} will be equal to 4 times I_0 because this will be I_0 this will be I_0

So it will be two times square root of I_0 square gives us four times I_0 for Δ is equal to zero plus minus 2π and

So on and I_{\min} I_1 is equal to I_2 therefore I_{\min} will be equal to zero and the I the intensity here given by this for the case of I_1 is equal to I_2 that is a_1 is equal to a_2 will be I is equal to $2 I_0$ into $1 + \cos \Delta$ here $1 + \cos \Delta$ and this can be written as $4 I_0 \cos^2 \frac{\Delta}{2}$ by two So the intensity distribution on the x axis depending on Δ will be given by this expression $4 I_0 \cos^2 \frac{\Delta}{2}$

So we can see what how does the intensity vary

So we can plot intensity as a function of Δ

So if we plot the intensity variation as a function of Δ here its shown here I of Δ is equal to $4 I_0 \cos^2 \frac{\Delta}{2}$ and Δ here is given by

So let us look at the diagram first

So Δ is equal to k times r_2 minus r_1 and for this is Δ versus intensity we can see that whenever it becomes an integral multiple of 2π intensity becomes maximum and whenever it is an integral multiple that is odd integral multiple of π such as minus π minus 3π π 3π 4π we have the intensity going to minima

So this is the intensity variation as a function of Δ now Δ is equal to this therefore k being constant k is 2π by λ therefore it is the path difference which will determine the intensity distribution

So let us calculate the path difference for a point p on the x axis here r_2 minus r_1 is nothing but s_2 p minus s_1 p s_2 p minus s_1 p

So if we see the coordinates here s_2 p

So this hypotenuse of this right angle triangle

So s_2 p square is equal to d square plus this square this is x coordinate x plus this small difference here

So this is d by 2 because d is the separation between this and therefore half of it

So o is on the perpendicular bisector between this s_1 and s_2 therefore each one is a half here

So d by two as shown here d by two and d by two

So we have $s_2^2 - p^2$ is equal to $d^2 + x^2 + d^2$ and $s_1^2 - p^2$ is equal to same $d^2 + x^2 - d^2$ and therefore $s_2^2 - p^2$ minus $s_1^2 - p^2$ is simply equal to $2xd$ or $s_2^2 - s_1^2$ is equal to $2xd$ divided by $s_2 + s_1$ we have not made any x approximation

So far

So there is no approximation and we have got the expression for path difference

So we will discuss how the path difference determines the intensity but let us have a look at the practical situation now

So the path difference here $r_2 - r_1$ is $2xd / (s_1 + s_2)$ in a practical setup one can determine this accurately but in a practical setup we want to make a practical approximation typically the d the separation between the source plane and the screen here is 50 to 100 centimeter when we do experiments in a lab and the separation between s_1 and s_2 the 2 holes here are separated by a very small separation typically between 0.1 and 1 mm we will see some numericals and we will see that this d is generally about 0.3 mm 0.4 mm and

So on

So we want to get a feel for the numbers now

So the separation is of this order d is much larger

So this is 500 to 1000 millimeter and this is d is very small and the screen on which we see here is typically few millimeters to few centimeter distance only where the fringes are formed and because of various reasons as we will discuss a little later and therefore i have deliberately drawn this setup to get a feel earlier we have discussed showing this setup now i have shown tried to show in a real scale although this is not exactly to scale d is much larger compared to d and the x the point p that we are look the position of the point p is also much smaller compared to d

So noting that x comma d are much smaller than this then we can write $s_1 + p$ plus $s_2 + p$ that is $s_1 + p$ here and $s_2 + p$ here as $2d$ we are approximating $s_1 + p$ equal to d and $s_2 + p$ equal to d this approximate this is an approximation but it is a very good approximation later on we will see that if we put some numbers the error that we will make is extremely small much smaller than point zero one percent or

So and therefore this is a very good approximation in practice and using this approximation therefore we can write the path difference $r_2 - r_1$

So we are substituting $2d$ for this two capital d is equal to xd/d in other words the path difference $r_2 - r_1$ is proportional to x the position coordinate of p here p is a point on the x axis and we have already seen that the phase difference is proportional to $r_2 - r_1$ because Δ is equal to k into $r_2 - r_1$ now let us see what is the corresponding fringe pattern how would how would we see the intensity distribution we are determining the intensity distribution and through estimation of the path difference and therefore the intensity maxima and minima are now given by

So recall lets determine the intensity maxima and minimum I is equal to $I_0 \cos^2 \Delta/2$ and the intensity maxima are given by phase differences Δ is equal to 2π by λ into $r_2 - r_1$ equal to plus minus n times 2π where n is equal to 0 1 2 etcetera that is the path difference

So we can see here $2\pi/2\pi$ cancels λ goes here and we have $r_2 - r_1$ is equal to plus minus $n\lambda$ n is called the order of the maxima similarly the intensity minima are given by phase difference is equal to plus minus $n + 1/2$ into 2π

So we can put numbers n here

So n equal to 0 1 2

So if you put n equal to 0 we get Δ equal to π if we put n is equal to 1

So this is 3 by 2 2 2 cancels

So it is 3π and

So on

So with n is equal to 0 1 2 etcetera and or the path reference $r_2 - r_1$ is equal to plus minus $n + 1/2 \lambda$ the plus sign gives position of maxima on one side of the point Δ is equal to zero

So let me keep the diagram here at the point o r_1 will be equal to r_2 and therefore Δ is equal to 0 path reference is equal to 0 on one side the path difference is positive and on the other side the path reference is negative because when r_2 for a point p here r_2 will be smaller than r_1 and therefore path difference is negative and

accordingly we will have the phase difference negative on this side phase difference positive on this side therefore the conditions here the plus sign in this expression here gives position of maxima on one side of the point delta is equal to zero while the negative sign gives on the other side of the point o is equal to of the point o or delta is equal to zero

So let us see the position of maxima and minima we have seen the condition for maxima and minima now let us see the position x for maxima and minima

So position of maxima and minima

So at the point o

So lets see the diagram here at the point o which is on the perpendicular bisector here s_1 is equal to s_2 r_1 is equal to r_2 means r_1 is equal to r_2 therefore we have the phase difference equal to zero that corresponds to n equal to zero and this is a point of maximum intensity because n is equal to 0 corresponds to 0 phase difference and that is a point of maximum intensity and it is called the zeroth order maxima we will get maxima and minima here because we have already seen the intensity varies with the delta and delta is sinusoidally that is the cost square variation and delta is proportional to x or x is proportional to delta and therefore we have the same cos square variation with x and at the point o we have phase difference is equal to 0 and that corresponds to the condition here

So the phase difference is equal to 0 means n is equal to 0 we have the condition for maxima and therefore this point will be maximum in fact this is called the central maxima it is the central maxima central maxima is defined as the point at which the path difference is zero it is not it may not be at the point o always depending on the the correct definition would be the central maxima corresponds to the point of 0 phase difference or zero path difference we will see later on that due to insertion of a glass slide or due to some phase change the central maxima may not be at o it may appear at a different point therefore the central maxima is defined as the point at which the phase difference is zero now the next maxima

So here the next maxima occurs when $r_2 - r_1$ is equal to $n\lambda$ that is 1 λ which means $r_2 - r_1$ we have already derived the expression for the

So we have just now derived the expression that $r_2 - r_1$ is equal to $x d / d$ and when $r_2 - r_1$ becomes equal to λ that is n equal to 1 we call that as x_1 the position of the first maxima is $x_1 d / d$ is equal to λ or the position of the first order maxima x_1 is equal to d / d into λ exactly in general for different values of n

So x_n the position of the nth order maxima is given by x_n is equal to n times d / d into λ and therefore we can determine the separation between adjacent maxima and therefore the separation between adjacent maxima is $x_{n+1} - x_n$ which is denoted as β β is equal to $(n+1) d / d \lambda - n d / d \lambda$ equal to d / d into λ we will discuss about this β in subsequently but note that the β is proportional to d and it is inversely proportional to the small d which means at any given wavelength and therefore the separation between the maxima will be large if d is small and the separation will again be large if d is large that is why although it is multiplied by λ which is a very small number

So this is maybe 600 nanometer 500 nanometer which is a very small number however if it is multiplied by a large ratio that is by making d small and d large we can have significant separation β we will discuss this with more numbers but let me take a typical number here d is equal to hundred centimeter d small d is equal to point three millimeter and λ is equal to six hundred nanometer is about the orange color or in light then we can calculate β which is the separation between adjacent maxima separation between adjacent maxima as two millimeter which can be seen by i because its a two millimeter separate the intensity peaks are separated by two millimeter

So similarly the position of minima are given by $r_2 - r_1$ is equal to $x m / d$ So now instead of n i have used m because this is for minima m standing for minima positions of minima x_m / d is equal to x_m into d / d is equal to plus minus m plus half λ you could as well use n but i have just used m to make a difference between the intensity maxima positions of the maxima and minima

So m is equal to 0 1 2 etcetera thus x_m that is the position of the maxima minima is given by m plus half d / d into λ there is no central minima because the central the 0th order is maxima as we know as we have just seen and therefore when m is equal to 0 there is a path difference which is $\lambda / 2$ and therefore m equal to 0 gives

position of the first minima m equal to 1 gives the position of the second minima and so on

So in this formula we have m is the position of the minima but m equal to 0 gives position of the first minima and

So on now we have determined

So what we have determined

So far is the intensity distribution on the x axis

So on the x axis we have a \cos^2 intensity variation at different points on the x axis with maxima at the point o and maxima and minima on both sides of the point o but we want to see in general what would be the intensity distribution on the entire screen

So this is ok on the x axis we have determined how to determine the intensity distribution on the screen

So we have to consider an arbitrary point q anywhere on the x y plane and therefore let us do that and find out what is the intensity distribution on the plane now we have got intensity distribution on the line along the x axis but now we want to determine the intensity distribution on the whole screen

So let us consider an arbitrary point q

So let me show the diagram again for

So here

So this is the young's double hole interference experimental setup but now instead of taking a point on the x axis here I am taking an arbitrary point q

So s_1 s_2 a point q here

So the point q will have coordinate x y and z the point s_1 the coordinate of point s_1 please see that it is x y z

So the o is x equal to zero y equal to zero and z equal to zero therefore the corresponding coordinates of s_1 and s_2 are s_1 $d/2$ as before because its the total separation is d

So it is $d/2$ here and minus $d/2$ this is in the reverse direction therefore it is minus $d/2$ the separation is d therefore the coordinate z coordinate is minus t similarly s_2 is minus $d/2$ because it is in the lower x axis in the x axis below zero and therefore the coordinate here is minus $d/2$ 0 and minus t and the path difference we have to determine the path difference r_2 minus r_1 which is shown here s_2 q minus s_1 q

So once we know the coordinates of the points we know how to determine the distance between the two points

So we will determine the path difference

So let us determine the path difference at any arbitrary point q

So here

So the path difference at the point q

So let's here

So is s_2 q minus s_1 q let us call it as Δ say Δ is given by this one

So here

So this is s_2 q is x

So it is x_2 minus x_1 whole square plus y_2 minus y_1 whole square plus z_2 minus z_1 whole square if the two points have coordinates x_1 y_1 z_1 and x_2 y_2 z_2

So that is the formula which has been used here

So we have x plus $d/2$ the whole square plus y square plus d square because although it is minus $d/2$ but it is square therefore it is d square is eq to the power half

So this is s_2 q and this is s_1 q

So s_2 q minus s_1 q is equal to Δ

So we take this to the other side and write and square it

So that we have this x plus $d/2$ whole square plus y square plus d square we have squared this term this has gone to the other side is equal to Δ plus this to the power half and whole square this can be simplified

So I would not derive the simplification steps we can easily simplify this and to get an expression that d square minus Δ square into x square minus Δ square into y square is equal to this term here for a fixed value of Δ that is Δ is what is Δ is the path difference for a fixed value of Δ that is if you choose a point q then it has a path difference Δ

So for a fixed value of Δ the above equation is of the form

So we can divide by this on this side then we will have it is of the form x square by a

square minus y square by b square b square is simply delta square divided by all of this
So delta square delta square cancels

So this in the denominator is b square is equal to one

So this is an equation of parabola note that these are positive constant see d is much larger than delta delta takes values of lambda 2 lambda 3 lambda a few lambdas and d takes values which are of the order of millimeter or point two millimeter point five millimeter this is of the order of micrometer typical values of d

So we can put what is d d is

So d is i have already said that this is typically from this to 1 mm what is delta delta is the path reference

So we are interested in finding the fringes where path difference can be lambda 2 lambda 3 lambda of course intermediate values also but they are a few lambdas

So few lambda this is few mm lambda is 600 nanometer which implies it is 0.6 micrometer

So few lambda is therefore of the order of micrometers micrometers and here it is of the order of millimeter d is of the order of millimeter that is a factor of ten power three

So micrometer is ten power minus six millimeter is ten power minus three meters and therefore d is much larger than delta much larger than delta and therefore this quantity here d square minus delta square here is always a positive quantity and therefore x square by a square a positive quantity minus y square by b square which is the equation of a hyperbola where a and b are constant for different values of delta different if we put delta is a constant but if i take different values of delta we get different hyperbole that is the locus of all points with the constant path reference are hyperbolic
So let me explain this

So this is the equation of an hyperbola for a given value of delta because this is of this form a and b are constants fixed constants for a fixed value of delta because d is fixed for the given experimental setup capital d the separation is also fixed it is only delta which will vary from point to point as we change the point q but for a fixed value of delta if we assume delta is equal to lambda for example delta is equal to lambda then this is a fixed constant and we have a particular hyperbola

So let me draw this hyperbola here

So this is the x axis and this is y axis

So we will have for one particular value of delta we will have hyperbola like this

So this is for a particular value of delta now delta 1 let me go if i take a different value of delta then i will get another curve here

So delta

So depending on the value of delta we will get a family of hyperbole here

So what we will have

So this is delta delta 2 delta three for different values of delta we will get different hyperbole for example if delta one is equal to lambda then we know that the path difference lambda would correspond to a bright point its a bright point or intensity maxima and therefore if for delta one equal to lambda if this were the curve then it will simply tell that this is a locus of all points which are bright points

So this is bright points

So all the points along this are bright because delta 1 is equal to lambda path difference is equal to lambda if this curve here

So delta 2 here is equal to let us say 3 by 2 lambda 3 by 2 lambda then this points will correspond to dark points this is the locus of all dark points this is the locus of all bright points in other words what we will see are bright and dark hyperbole alternatively because delta will continuously increase in this direction therefore alternatively we will get bright and dark hyperbole and these are nothing but the fringes

So what i have shown here is therefore

So let me put again for different values of delta we get different hyperbole the locus of all points with constant path differences are hyperbole this means that we get we get bright and dark fringes

So let me show you a some fringe system here

So interference fringes

So let us discuss the interference fingers as i have discussed if delta is equal to n lambda then the hyperbola would comprise of all points whenever delta is an integral multiple of lambda then the hyperbola that particular hyperbola would comprise of all points with the intensity maxima and if delta is n plus half lambda then that hyperbola would comprise of all points with intensity minima this implies we will see alternate

bright and dark hyperbole on a screen these are called the interference fringes
 So the first time we are introducing interference fringes and the pattern on the screen is called a fringe pattern
 So i had shown earlier that i did not show a hyperbolic pattern here but
 So what we have is a linear fringe pattern
 So we can see alternately bright and dark fringes i will show a hyperbolic fringe pattern at a later time
 So this it could be now if the locus of all points with a constant path difference in this case the case that i had discussed it happens to be hyperbole constant path difference but in a particular setup in a particular setup if the locus of all the points with the constant path difference happens to be circles then we will get circular fringes and we will get circular fringes like this
 So the circular fringes that i had showed you here is because the locus of constant path reference are circles in this case and if they the bright fringes correspond to $n\lambda$ whenever path difference is $n\lambda$ and the dark fringes correspond to path difference $n + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$
 So that is how we get the fringe system in a interference setup
 So we have discussed the formation of interference fringes here and now we come back to the interference fringes in the young setup in the young's experimental setup
 So this formula we have derived we have just now showed that let me put this here
 So we just now showed this that d^2
 So this is the equation of the hyperbola interference fringes in young's experiment now or x is equal to
 So we take this to the other side and then we will have Δ^2 multiplied by this and then divide by this here and take square root to get x is equal to Δ divided by this into this in practice i already discussed that y is much smaller than d y is few millimeter why is the distance on the screen
 So this is the screen x y axis and we are talking of this area which has dimensions of few millimeters to few centimeters only and therefore whereas d is of the order of hundred centimeters and therefore y is much smaller than d why a few millimeter to centimeter and d is of the order of hundred centimeter and therefore y^2 can be neglected in comparison to d^2 in the case of the young's experimental arrangement
 So we had just seen that i had showed you a practical arrangement where the distances are very large
 So we can see here d is much larger compared to x and y the x and y which are here on the screen is much smaller compared to this and therefore we can neglect y^2 compared to this d^2 this is millimeter square this is hundred centimeter square and therefore we can write x is equal to approximately equal to is a very good approximation but approximately equal to this now for a given Δ for a fixed value of Δ right hand side is a constant right hand side is a constant what it means is that the that is x is equal to constant for each fixed value of Δ this implies locus of constant path difference are straight lines parallel to the y axis x equal to constant x equal to constant are straight lines unlike this hyperbole this is hyperbola is the exact solution but if y x and y are much smaller than d then this will turn out to be a straight line
 So x equal to constant for each fixed value of Δ this is a very valid approximation here there is no approximation but here there is a valid approximation and these therefore this leads to straight line interference fringes
 So the interference fringes in young's experiment are straight line interference fringes
 So that is what i had shown earlier that we get straight line interference fringes
 So the fringe system would look like this
 So along the x axis x equal to constant the locus of constant path difference are x equal to con they are straight lines parallel to the y axis or perpendicular to the x axis
 So this is the type of fringe system that we will see and the separation between these bright bright lines is called the fringe width β β is the separation between the bright points now i have shown here in this diagram the point p which is on the x axis and an arbitrary point q here if p is a bright line bright point or intensity maxima then all along that line intensity will be maximum intensity will be maximum because we have just seen that x equal to constant corresponds to the locus of all points with bright or dark depending on the Δ value therefore if we determine the separation between the intensity maxima along the x axis then we it is nothing but the fringe width that is the separation between the two bright fringes the separation between two bright fringes is

called the fringe width which is also nothing but the separation between two adjacent maxima

So this is what we had discussed earlier and here I come to the last part that is fringe width the separation between the adjacent bright or dark fringes is called the fringe width recall that β is equal to $\frac{d \sin \theta}{\lambda}$ here $d \sin \theta$ is the separation between maxima on the x axis just now we have derived that x is equal to this expression for x is this but I have mentioned I have explained that Δ the path difference Δ is much smaller than d which is much smaller than d and therefore this term here this Δ can be neglected with respect to this d but this d itself is negligible the d^2 here is negligible compared to the d square here again let me repeat that this is of the order of hundred centimeter

So hundred centimeter square whereas this is of the order of one millimeter square extremely small compared to this and therefore this term can be neglected and similarly with respect to $d \Delta$ e is negligible almost one thousand times smaller and therefore we can neglect this which means we get x is equal to $\frac{\Delta d}{\lambda}$ x is equal to $\frac{\Delta d}{\lambda}$ for Δ is equal to 0 that is 0 path difference we get the position x equal to 0 which is a constant x equal to constant gives us the fringes the constant in this case is 0 for Δ is equal to 0 x is equal to 0 which is equal to constant the fringe is given by x equal to constant and x equal to value the value of x being 0 which means it is the y axis is the locus of all bright points that is the central fringe y axis is the locus of all bright points when the path difference is 0 Δ is equal to 0 path difference is 0 and that is called the central fringe

So in this case y axis the bright fringe in along the y axis is the central fringe if Δ is equal to λ substituting this Δ is equal to λ then we get x_1 the position of the next bright fringe as $\frac{\lambda d}{\lambda}$ if Δ is equal to two λ path difference equal to n times λ we get the position x_2 is equal to two λ two λ into d by d that is the second bright fringe and therefore the fringe width therefore the fringe width is given by x_2 minus x_1 is equal to λ into d by d as before

So this is the fringe width that this is the difference between the maxima on the x axis which we had determined earlier but it is the same difference that we get for the fringe width

So to determine the fringe width one can as well consider the points along the x axis we will put some numbers and discuss this more carefully in the next lecture thanks you