

Molecular kinetic analysis of a finite-time Carnot cycle

Y. IZUMIDA^(a) AND K. OKUDA^(b)

Division of Physics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan

PACS 05.70.Ln – Nonequilibrium and irreversible thermodynamics

Abstract. - We study the efficiency at the maximal power η_{\max} of a finite-time Carnot cycle of a weakly interacting gas which we can regard as a nearly ideal gas. In several systems interacting with the hot and cold reservoirs of the temperatures T_h and T_c , respectively, it is known that $\eta_{\max} = 1 - \sqrt{T_c/T_h}$ which is often called the Curzon-Ahlborn (CA) efficiency η_{CA} . For the first time numerical experiments to verify the validity of η_{CA} are performed by means of molecular dynamics simulations and reveal that our η_{\max} does not always agree with η_{CA} , but approaches η_{CA} in the limit of $T_c \rightarrow T_h$. Our molecular kinetic analysis explains the above facts theoretically by using only elementary arithmetic.

Introduction. – Recently global warming has been a worldwide problem. Developing more efficient engines may help to solve such a problem. In physics, the efficiency of heat engines has been treated as a basic subject of thermodynamics. One of the most important results is the discovery of the Carnot efficiency which gives the upper limit of efficiency: $\eta_C = 1 - T_c/T_h$, where T_h and T_c are the temperatures of the hot and cold heat reservoirs, respectively. In spite of the high efficiency, η_C is usually realized only in the quasistatic limit. This means that the Carnot heat engine is useless as a real engine because the power defined as output work per unit time is 0. Real engines should work for a finite time and produce a finite power. Therefore, the finite-time extension of the quasistatic heat engines is an important subject of thermodynamics. Curzon and Ahlborn [1,2] (see also [3]) considered such an extension of the Carnot cycle and derived a simple and beautiful result: the efficiency at the maximal power output is given by

$$\eta_{CA} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{T_c}{T_h}} \quad (\text{CA efficiency}). \quad (1)$$

Several theoretical studies [4–9], ranging from the heat engine working in the linear response regime [6–8] to the heat engine working by a quantum mechanism [9] support the validity of Eq. (1). This implies that η_{CA} has some sort of universality independent of the model details.

In spite of its importance, to our knowledge, no experiments have been carried out to verify the validity of

Eq. (1). Moreover, though in [1] the temperature differences between the reservoirs and the working substance are taken as the parameters to maximize the power, they do not seem easily controllable. Thus, the CA efficiency Eq. (1) is, in our opinion, still controversial in these respects.

In this paper, we consider a more natural extension of the quasistatic Carnot cycle as a model system by using a weakly interacting gas which we can regard as a nearly ideal gas. By means of molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, numerical experiments to verify the validity of the CA efficiency are performed for the first time. Our model also accepts theoretical analysis by using only elementary arithmetic. As shown later, we can reveal the validity and the limitation of the CA efficiency from that analysis.

Model and simulations. – We consider the quasistatic Carnot cycle of an ideal gas first and then its finite-time extension. For simplicity, we here use the two-dimensional model. The usual quasistatic Carnot cycle of an ideal gas consists of four processes: (A): isothermal expansion process ($V_1 \rightarrow V_2$), (B): adiabatic expansion process ($V_2 \rightarrow V_3$), (C): isothermal compression process ($V_3 \rightarrow V_4$), (D): adiabatic compression process ($V_4 \rightarrow V_1$), where V_i 's are the volumes of the cylinder at which we switch each of four processes (Fig. 1(a)). When we fix T_h, T_c, V_1 and V_2 , we can easily determine the volumes V_3 and V_4 since we assume an ideal gas as the working substance. In fact, they are given by $V_3 = (T_h/T_c)V_2$ and $V_4 = (T_h/T_c)V_1$ for the two-dimensional case. In the case of a finite-time cycle, we assume that the right wall of the cylinder is a piston and moves back and forth at a constant

^(a)E-mail: izumida@statphys.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

^(b)E-mail: okuda@statphys.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

speed u . In our model, this u is taken as a unique parameter to maximize the power, which is controllable unlike the parameters in [1]. We also assume that each process is switched at the same volume as in the quasistatic case.

We have performed the two-dimensional event-driven MD simulations [10] as follows. We assume that N hard-disc particles with diameter d and mass m are confined into the two-dimensional cylinder with rectangular geometry and the collisions between hard-disc particles are perfectly elastic. Defining (x, y) coordinates as in Fig. 1(b), we let the piston move along the x -axis at a finite constant speed u . Here, we express the x -length and the y -length of the cylinder as l and L , respectively. Then, the volume V_i ($i = 1, \dots, 4$) of the cylinder at which we switch each of the four processes (Fig. 1(a)) becomes $V_i = Ll_i$, where l_i is the x -length of the cylinder at the switching volume V_i . If the process (A) begins at time $t = 0$, the volume $V(t)$ of the cylinder at time t is given as $V(t) = Ll(t) = L(ut + l_1)$ ($0 \leq t \leq (l_3 - l_1)/u$) in the expansion processes (A) and (B). $V(t)$ in the compression processes (C) and (D) is also given as $V(t) = L(-ut + 2l_3 - l_1)$ ($(l_3 - l_1)/u \leq t \leq 2(l_3 - l_1)/u$). When a particle with the velocity $\mathbf{v} = (v_x, v_y)$ collides with the piston whose x -velocity is $\pm u$, its velocity changes to $\mathbf{v}' = (-v_x \pm 2u, v_y)$. Therefore, the particle gives microscopic work $m(|\mathbf{v}|^2 - |\mathbf{v}'|^2)/2 = 2m(\pm uv_x - u^2)$ against the piston. In the isothermal processes, to simulate the heat reservoirs, we set the thermalizing wall with the length S at the left bottom of the cylinder (see Fig. 1(b)). The thermalizing wall has the following feature [11, 12]: When a particle collides with the thermalizing wall, its velocity stochastically changes to the value governed by the distribution function

$$f(\mathbf{v}, T_i) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{m}{k_B T_i} \right)^{3/2} v_y \exp\left(-\frac{m\mathbf{v}^2}{2k_B T_i}\right), \quad (2)$$

($-\infty < v_x < +\infty, 0 < v_y < +\infty, T_i$ ($i = h$ in (A), c in (C))), where k_B is Boltzmann constant. This thermalizing wall may be understood as follows. Imagine a large particle reservoir thermalized at the temperature T_i ($i = h$ or c) instead of the thermalizing wall and assume that if a particle in the cylinder goes out into the particle reservoir, another particle in the particle reservoir comes into the cylinder. From this consideration, we can see that the particles coming into the cylinder from the particle reservoir obey the velocity distribution function proportional to the Boltzmann factor multiplied by v_y . By normalizing, we can obtain the distribution function Eq.(2). As easily seen, this thermalizing wall guarantees that the particle velocities in the static system are governed by Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution with temperature T_i :

$$f_{\text{MB}}(\mathbf{v}, T_i) \equiv \frac{m}{2\pi k_B T_i} \exp\left(-\frac{m}{2k_B T_i} \mathbf{v}^2\right). \quad (3)$$

The heat flowing from the thermalizing wall into the system can microscopically be calculated by the difference be-

tween the kinetic energies before and after the collision on the thermalizing wall. We sum up the above microscopic heat during the simulation as well as the microscopic work. At the walls except the piston and the thermalizing wall, we adopt the reflecting boundary conditions for colliding particles. We have used $N = 100$ particles with $d = 0.01$ and $m = 1$ in the system with $L = 1, l_1 = 1, l_2 = 1.5, T_h = 1, T_c = 0.7, k_B = 1$ and $S = 0.5$. These parameters except T_c are fixed in our all simulations and analysis below. As time progresses, thermodynamic variables should




Fig. 1: Schematic illustration of the model. (a) Pressure-volume (p - V) diagram of the quasistatic Carnot cycle for an ideal gas. (b) The piston moves at a finite constant speed u and the thermalizing wall with the temperature T_i ($i = h, c$) and the length S is set on the left bottom of the cylinder only in the isothermal processes.

draw a steady cycle independent of initial states. Fig. 2 shows the temperature-volume diagram for the steady cycle at $u = 0.01$ and $u = 0.001$, where $k_B T$ is determined as the kinetic energy per particle, assuming the principle of equipartition. From this figure, we can see that in the isothermal expansion (compression) process the temperature approaches a steady value lower (higher) than T_h (T_c) at $u = 0.01$. This result can easily be understood: If a heat engine is working at a finite u , heat should flow into the system at a finite rate to maintain the steady cycle. Therefore, the finite difference of the temperatures




Fig. 2: Temperature-volume (T - V) diagram for the steady cycle at $u = 0.01$ and $u = 0.001$. The data were obtained by averaging over 1000 cycles after transient 50 cycles in the MD simulations. The solid line is the quasistatic Carnot cycle of an ideal gas. We can see that as u becomes larger, the cycle obviously deviates from the quasistatic cycle.

between the system and the heat reservoir is necessary. The cycle for $u = 0.001$ almost agrees with the quasistatic Carnot cycle of an ideal gas. This implies that our system of the hard-disc particles closely approximates an ideal gas system.

We have also calculated the efficiency $\eta = W_{\text{total}}/Q_{\text{h,total}}$ and the power $P = W_{\text{total}}/\tau$, where W_{total} is the total work against the piston, $Q_{\text{h,total}}$ is the total heat flowing into the system from the hot heat reservoir and τ is the total time for the simulation. Fig. 3 shows η and P at various u . We have found that the maximal power is realized at $u \approx 0.015$. The corresponding efficiency η_{max} (the efficiency at the maximal power) is about 0.18, which is close to the CA efficiency $\eta_{\text{CA}} = 0.163$.

Theoretical analysis. – To explain the above MD data, we construct the theoretical model using the elementary molecular kinetic theory as below. We assume that even in a finite-time cycle, the gas relaxes to the uniform equilibrium state with a well-defined temperature T very fast and the particle velocity \mathbf{v} is governed by Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution $f_{\text{MB}}(\mathbf{v}, T)$. We would like to derive the time-evolution equation of T . The energy U of a two-dimensional equilibrium ideal gas is given by $U = Nk_{\text{B}}T$. In the series of cycles, U can be changed by two factors: particle collisions with the thermalizing wall and the piston. Our strategy to derive the time-evolution equation of T is very simple: Counting the number of the particles colliding with the thermalizing wall and the piston and calculating the heat and the work from the difference between the kinetic energies before and after the collisions. Firstly, we consider the effect of the thermalizing wall. Since the number n_{T} of the particles with the velocity \mathbf{v} ($v_y < 0$) colliding with the thermalizing wall per unit time is given by $n_{\text{T}} = f_{\text{MB}}(\mathbf{v}, T)S(-v_y)N/V$, the total number C of the particles colliding with the thermal-




Fig. 3: u dependence of the efficiency η and the power P . The bold dots are the values calculated by the MD simulations and the solid line is the values calculated by solving Eq. (9) numerically. The MD data were obtained by the simulations for 100-2000 cycles after 35-50 transient cycles. In the limit of $u \rightarrow 0$, the Carnot efficiency ($\eta_{\text{C}} = 0.3$) is realized and P vanishes.

izing wall per unit time is calculated as

$$C = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv_x \int_{-\infty}^0 dv_y n_{\text{T}} = \frac{SN}{2\pi V} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_{\text{B}}T}{m}}. \quad (4)$$

The total energy of these colliding particles before the collisions is also given by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv_x \int_{-\infty}^0 dv_y n_{\text{T}} \frac{m}{2} \mathbf{v}^2 = \frac{3SNk_{\text{B}}T}{4\pi V} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_{\text{B}}T}{m}}. \quad (5)$$

Because the number of the reflecting particles is equal to the number of the colliding particles, the total energy of the particles after the collisions is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} & C \int_0^{+\infty} dv_y \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dv_x f(\mathbf{v}, T_i) \frac{m}{2} \mathbf{v}^2 \\ &= \frac{3SNk_{\text{B}}T_i}{4\pi V} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_{\text{B}}T}{m}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

using Eq. (2). Therefore, the net energy transfer, namely the heat $q_i(t, T)$ flowing into the system per unit time in the isothermal processes ($i = \text{h}$ in (A), c in (C)) is given

by

$$q_i(t, T) = \frac{3SNk_B(T_i - T)}{4\pi V(t)} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_B T}{m}}. \quad (7)$$

Next, we derive the work against the piston by the colliding particles in the expansion processes. To calculate the number of particles colliding with the piston, we consider the velocity distribution $f_{\text{MB}}(\tilde{v}_x, v_y, T)$ in the frame of the piston, where $\tilde{v}_x \equiv v_x - u$ and $\tilde{f}_{\text{MB}}(\tilde{v}_x, v_y, T) \equiv f_{\text{MB}}(\tilde{v}_x + u, v_y, T)$. The number n_M of the particles with the velocity (\tilde{v}_x, v_y) colliding on the piston per unit time is $n_M = \tilde{f}_{\text{MB}}(\tilde{v}_x, v_y, T) L \tilde{v}_x N / V = \tilde{f}_{\text{MB}}(\tilde{v}_x, v_y, T) \tilde{v}_x N / l$. Since a particle gives the work $2mu(v_x - u) = 2mu\tilde{v}_x$ against the piston, the total work $w_e(t, T)$ against the piston per unit time in the expansion processes becomes

$$\begin{aligned} w_e(t, T) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dv_y \int_0^{+\infty} d\tilde{v}_x 2mu\tilde{v}_x n_M \\ &= \frac{2muN}{l(t)} \left\{ \frac{A^2 T}{4} - Am^{3/2} \sqrt{\frac{T}{\pi}} u + \frac{u^2}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_0^{\frac{u}{A\sqrt{\pi}}} dv_x \left(A\sqrt{T}v_x - u \right)^2 \frac{e^{-v_x^2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right\}, \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

where $A \equiv \sqrt{2k_B/m}$. The work $w_c(t, T)$ for the unit time in the compression processes is also obtained by changing $u \rightarrow -u$ in Eq. (8).

By the energy conservation law, the time evolution of T for each of four processes (A)-(D) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A)} : Nk_B \frac{dT}{dt} &= q_h - w_e, & \text{(B)} : Nk_B \frac{dT}{dt} &= -w_e, \\ \text{(C)} : Nk_B \frac{dT}{dt} &= q_c - w_c, & \text{(D)} : Nk_B \frac{dT}{dt} &= -w_c. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, we have numerically solved the above Eq. (9) for the entire cycle. By using the final temperature of each process as the initial temperature of the next process repeatedly, we can obtain the steady cycle of this heat engine. After reaching the steady cycle, we numerically calculate the efficiency $\eta(u) = W(u)/Q_h(u)$ and the power $P(u) = W(u)u/(2(l_3 - l_1))$, where $Q_h(u)$ is the heat transfer from the hot reservoir to the system, $W(u)$ is the work output and $2(l_3 - l_1)/u$ is the time for one steady cycle. In Fig. 3, we plot the u dependence of η and P at the same parameters as in the MD simulations. From this figure, we can see that the correspondence between the MD data and the line calculated by solving Eq. (9) numerically is established qualitatively. This implies that our assumption of fast relaxation to the equilibrium state is not so bad¹. In

¹Though one may see a discrepancy between the theory and the MD simulations in Fig. 3, we can see that a smaller S gives better agreement. This is because the speed giving the maximal power u_{max} becomes small at a small S , which means that the gas is close to equilibrium and therefore meets our theoretical assumption that the gas always stays in the equilibrium state. This behavior of u_{max} will be confirmed in our analysis Eq. (17).




Fig. 4: The efficiency at the maximal power η_{max} . The bold dots are the MD data, the solid line is the theoretical line calculated by solving Eq. (9) numerically, the dashed line is the analytic expression Eq. (18) and the dotted line is the CA efficiency Eq. (1).

Fig. 4, we compare the efficiency at the maximal power $\eta_{\text{max}} = \eta(u_{\text{max}})$, where u_{max} is the speed giving the maximal power, with the CA efficiency Eq. (1) at $T_h = 1$ and various T_c . We have found that our η_{max} does not always agree with η_{CA} but tends to approach η_{CA} as $T_c \rightarrow T_h$ for both of the MD data and the numerical line. We have confirmed that this η_{max} behavior is common to the systems with various parameters V_1, V_2, S , etc., though the data are not shown here. To explain this η_{max} behavior, we try to obtain the analytic form of η_{max} by solving the evolution equation of T in the following.

As seen in Fig. 2, we can expect that T approaches a steady value T_h^{st} in the isothermal expansion process (A). Then, T_h^{st} is obtained as a solution of the equation $dT/dt = 0$ in Eq. (9A). Because $T_h^{\text{st}} = T_h$ is realized in the quasistatic limit $u \rightarrow 0$, we can expand T_h^{st} by u as $T_h^{\text{st}} = T_h + T_h^{(1)}u + T_h^{(2)}u^2 + \mathcal{O}(u^3)$. Substituting T_h^{st} into Eq. (9A), we can determine $T_h^{(1)}$ and $T_h^{(2)}$ and obtain T_h^{st} up to $\mathcal{O}(u^2)$ as

$$T_h^{\text{st}} = T_h - \frac{4Lu}{3S} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\pi T_h}}{A} + \frac{mu}{k_B} \left(2 + \frac{\pi L}{3S} \right) \right\}. \quad (10)$$

If we assume that the relaxation to T_h^{st} is very fast, the heat flowing into the system during $T(t) = T_h^{\text{st}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_h^{\text{st}} &= \int_0^{(l_2 - l_1)/u} q_h(t, T_h^{\text{st}}) dt \\ &= Q_h^{\text{qs}} - 2mNA\sqrt{T_h\pi} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{L}{3S} \right) u \ln \frac{V_2}{V_1}, \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

using Eq. (7), where the quasistatic heat for ideal gas in the isothermal expansion process is defined as $Q_h^{\text{qs}} \equiv Nk_B T_h \ln(V_2/V_1)$. Note that $Q_h^{\text{st}} \rightarrow Q_h^{\text{qs}}$ when we consider the quasistatic limit $u \rightarrow 0$. T_c^{st} and Q_c^{st} of the isothermal compression process (C) can be obtained by replacing

T_h, u, V_1 and V_2 in Eqs. (10) and (11) with $T_c, -u, V_3$ and V_4 , respectively. Firstly, we try to calculate η_{\max} by using Q_h^{st} and Q_c^{st} above. By defining the work of one cycle W as $W = Q_h^{\text{st}} + Q_c^{\text{st}}$, we can calculate the efficiency $\eta = W/Q_h^{\text{st}}$ and the power $P = Wu/(2(l_3 - l_1))$. The maximal power is realized at $u = u_{\max}$ defined as a solution of $\partial P/\partial u = 0$. Since u_{\max} is given by

$$u_{\max} = \frac{k_B(T_h - T_c)}{4m\left(\frac{1}{\pi} + \frac{L}{3S}\right)\sqrt{\frac{2\pi k_B}{m}(\sqrt{T_h} + \sqrt{T_c})}}, \quad (12)$$

Q_h^{st} and W at u_{\max} are obtained as

$$Q_h^{\text{st}}(u_{\max}) = \frac{N}{2}k_B\sqrt{T_h}(\sqrt{T_h} + \sqrt{T_c})\ln\frac{V_2}{V_1}, \quad (13)$$

$$W(u_{\max}) = \frac{N}{2}k_B(T_h - T_c)\ln\frac{V_2}{V_1}. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, $\eta_{\max} \equiv \eta(u_{\max})$ is calculated as

$$\eta_{\max} = \frac{W(u_{\max})}{Q_h^{\text{st}}(u_{\max})} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{T_c}{T_h}}. \quad (15)$$

This is equal to the CA efficiency Eq. (1) though we neglect $\mathcal{O}(u^2)$ in the calculation of Q_h^{st} and Q_c^{st} . Therefore, we may regard that this result gives a natural and microscopic foundation of the original derivation of the CA efficiency Eq. (1).

As seen in Fig. 4, however, the CA efficiency deviates from the MD data and the numerically calculated line. This is because there exists the heat transfer other than Q_h^{st} and Q_c^{st} , which may be missed in the original derivation of Eq. (1) [1]. As seen in Fig. 2, the initial temperatures of isothermal processes are different from the steady values. This implies the existence of the additional heat transfer Q_h^{add} and Q_c^{add} during the fast relaxation to the steady temperatures. Next, we repeat the similar derivation of Eq. (15) by considering the effect of these additional heat transfers Q_h^{add} and Q_c^{add} . We define the total heat as $Q_h = Q_h^{\text{st}} + Q_h^{\text{add}}$ and $Q_c = Q_c^{\text{st}} + Q_c^{\text{add}}$. Since we assume that the relaxation to the steady temperature is very fast, we can approximate the additional heat transfers as $Q_h^{\text{add}} = Nk_B(T_h^{\text{st}} - \tilde{T}_h)$ and $Q_c^{\text{add}} = Nk_B(T_c^{\text{st}} - \tilde{T}_c)$, where \tilde{T}_h and \tilde{T}_c are the initial temperatures of the isothermal processes (A) and (C), respectively. If we assume that adiabatic processes satisfy the relations $\tilde{T}_h = (V_4/V_1)T_c^{\text{st}}$ and $\tilde{T}_c = (V_2/V_3)T_h^{\text{st}}$ which are the same as in the quasistatic case, we can obtain

$$Q_h^{\text{add}} = -Nk_B\frac{4L\sqrt{\pi T_h}}{3SA}\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{T_h}{T_c}}\right)u \quad (16)$$

up to $\mathcal{O}(u)$. Q_c^{add} is given by changing $T_h \leftrightarrow T_c$ and $u \rightarrow -u$ in Eq. (16). The work of one cycle W is defined as $W = Q_h^{\text{st}} + Q_c^{\text{st}} + Q_h^{\text{add}} + Q_c^{\text{add}}$. By defining u_{\max} as a solution of $\partial P/\partial u = 0$, we can obtain

$$u_{\max} = \frac{k_B(T_h - T_c)}{\sqrt{\pi}}\left\{4mA\left(\frac{L}{3S} + \frac{1}{\pi}\right)\right.$$

$$\times (\sqrt{T_h} + \sqrt{T_c})\ln\frac{V_2}{V_1} + \frac{8Lk_B}{3SA\sqrt{T_h}} \\ \times (T_h - T_c)\left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{T_h}{T_c}}\right)\left.\right\}^{-1}\ln\frac{V_2}{V_1}, \quad (17)$$

$$\eta_{\max} \equiv \eta(u_{\max}) = \frac{\frac{N}{2}k_B(T_h - T_c)\ln\frac{V_2}{V_1}}{Q_h^{\text{st}}(u_{\max}) + Q_h^{\text{add}}(u_{\max})}. \quad (18)$$

From Fig. 4, we can see that Eq. (18) agrees with the MD data and the numerically calculated result very well due to the effect of the additional heat Q_h^{add} and Q_c^{add} . To obtain the efficiency in the $T_c \rightarrow T_h$ limit, we set $T_c = T_h - \Delta T$ ($\Delta T \ll 1$). Then, η_{\max} is given by $\eta_{\max} = \Delta T/(2T_h) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta T^2)$ which is the same as the CA efficiency up to ΔT order. This result explains why our η_{\max} approaches η_{CA} when $T_c \rightarrow T_h$. Very recently, similar η_{\max} behavior has been observed also in the other types of the heat engines [13, 14]. In the equilibrium limit of $T_c \rightarrow T_h$, the system may be regarded as being in the linear response regime. Therefore, our result is consistent with the CA efficiency proved by using the linear response theory [6].

Summary. – In this paper, we have studied the efficiency at the maximal power η_{\max} of a finite-time Carnot cycle of a weakly interacting gas which we can regard as a nearly ideal gas. Our model is a natural extension of the quasistatic Carnot cycle and has a piston moving back and forth at a constant speed u in the cylinder. We have used this u as a unique parameter to maximize the power. Since u is easily controllable, this model seems more natural than the original Curzon-Ahlborn's model [1]. We have performed numerical experiments of this model by means of MD simulations to verify the validity of the Curzon-Ahlborn (CA) efficiency η_{CA} for the first time and have found that our η_{\max} does not always agree with η_{CA} , but approaches η_{CA} in the limit of $T_c \rightarrow T_h$. Our molecular kinetic analysis can explain the above facts theoretically by using only elementary arithmetic. Especially, we have revealed that the difference between η_{CA} and our η_{\max} is due to the additional heat transfers which may be missed in the original derivation of η_{CA} [1]. Though it is restricted in the equilibrium limit of $T_c \rightarrow T_h$, these results strongly support the validity of the CA efficiency from both of the experimental and theoretical points of view. We expect that our analysis in this paper will shed light on the microscopic aspects of the finite-time extension of thermodynamics.

We thank K. Nemoto and T. Nogawa for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] CURZON F. L. and AHLBORN B., *Am. J. Phys.*, **43** (1975) 22.

- [2] CALLEN H., *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, 2nd edition (Wiley, New York) 1985, Chapt. 4.
- [3] NOVIKOV I. I., *J. Nucl. Energy*, **7**, issues No. 1-2 (1958) 125.
- [4] BEJAN A., *J. Appl. Phys.*, **79** (1996) 1191.
- [5] LANDSBERG P. T. and LEFF H., *J. Phys.*, **22** (1989) 4019.
- [6] VAN DEN BROECK C., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **95** (2005) 190602.
- [7] GOMEZ-MARIN A. and SANCHO J. M., *Phys. Rev. E*, **74** (2006) 062102.
- [8] JIMÉNEZ DE CISNEROS B. and HERNÁNDEZ A. C., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98** (2007) 130602.
- [9] KOSLOFF R., *J. Chem. Phys.*, **80** (1984) 1625.
- [10] ALDER B. J. and WAINRIGHT T. E., *J. Chem. Phys.*, **27** (1957) 1208.
- [11] YUGE T., ITO N. and SHIMIZU A., *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.*, **74** (2005) 1895.
- [12] HONDOU T., *Europhys. Lett.*, **80** (2007) 50001.
- [13] SCHMIEDL T. and SEIFERT U., *Europhys. Lett.*, **81** (2008) 20003.
- [14] ALLAHVERDYAN A. E., JOHAL R. S. and MAHLER G., *Phys. Rev. E*, **77** (2008) 041118.