

Quantum thermodynamic cycles and quantum heat engines (II)

H. T. Quan

Theoretical Division, MS B213, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, 87545, U.S.A.

We study the quantum mechanical generalization of force or pressure, and then we extend the classical thermodynamic isobaric process to quantum mechanical systems. Based on these efforts, we are able to study the quantum version of thermodynamic cycles that consist of quantum isobaric process, such as quantum Brayton cycle and quantum Diesel cycle. We also consider the implementation of quantum Brayton cycle and quantum Diesel cycle with some model systems, such as single particle in 1D box and single-mode radiation field in a cavity. These studies lay the microscopic (quantum mechanical) foundation for Szilard-Zurek single molecule engine.

PACS numbers: 05.90.+m, 05.70.-a, 03.65.-w, 51.30.+i

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum thermodynamics is the study of heat and work dynamics in quantum mechanical systems [1]. In the extreme limit of small systems with only a few degrees of freedom, both the finite-size effect and quantum effects influence the thermodynamic properties of the system dramatically [2, 3, 4]. The traditional thermodynamic theory based on classical systems of macroscopic size does not apply any more, and the quantum mechanical generalization of thermodynamics becomes necessary. The interplay between thermodynamics and quantum physics has been an interesting research topic since 1950s [5]. In recent years, with the developments of nanotechnology and quantum information processing, the study of the interface between quantum physics and thermodynamics begins to attract more and more attention [7]. Studies of quantum thermodynamics not only promise important potential applications in nanotechnology and quantum information processing, but also bring new insights to some fundamental problems of thermodynamics, such as Maxwell's demon and the universality of the second law [6]. Among all the studies about quantum thermodynamics, a central concern is to make quantum mechanical extension of classical thermodynamic processes and cycles [8].

It is well known that in classical thermodynamics there are four basic thermodynamic processes: adiabatic process, isothermal processes, isochoric process, and isobaric process [9]. These four processes correspond to constant entropy, constant temperature, constant volume, and constant pressure, respectively. From these four basic thermodynamic processes, we can construct all kinds of thermodynamic cycles, such as Carnot cycle, Otto cycle, Brayton cycle, et al [10]. Among all the four kinds of basic thermodynamic processes, adiabatic process has been extended to quantum domain, and has been extensively studied ever since the born of quantum mechanics. Nevertheless no attention was paid to the quantum mechanical generalization of the remaining three basic thermodynamic processes until most recently. In a recent paper [8], along with our collaborators, we systematically study the quantum mechanical generalization of the isothermal and the isochoric process. Based on these studies, the properties of quantum Carnot cycle and quantum Otto cycle are clarified.

Meanwhile in recent years, numerous studies on other quantum thermodynamic cycles are also reported [11]. However, as to our best knowledge, the quantum mechanical generalization of isobaric process (constant pressure) has not been studied systematically so far. Possibly the lack of the consideration of quantum isobaric process is due to the fact that “pressure” (force) [12] is not a well defined observable in a quantum mechanical system. Because of the short of a well defined quantum isobaric process, the properties of quantum thermodynamic cycles that consist of quantum isobaric process, such as quantum Brayton cycle and quantum Diesel cycle [9, 10] cannot be clarified. We notice that some discussions about quantum Brayton cycle have been reported [13]. Nevertheless, their definitions of quantum isobaric process and quantum Brayton cycle are ambiguous, and even in contradiction. As a result, in their studies they cannot bridge the quantum and classical thermodynamic cycles.

In this paper, along with our previous effort [8], we will focus on the study of the quantum isobaric process [10] and its related quantum thermodynamic cycles. We begin with the definition of “pressure” for an arbitrary quantum system, and then generalize the isobaric process to quantum mechanical systems. Based on this and our previous [8] generalizations of thermodynamic processes, we are able to study an arbitrary quantum thermodynamic cycle constructed by any of these four quantum thermodynamic processes. As an example, we will discuss the quantum Brayton cycle and the quantum Diesel cycle and compare their properties with their classical counterpart. Comparisons between these quantum thermodynamic cycles and their classical counterparts enable us to extend our understanding about the thermodynamics at the interface of classical and quantum physics. This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we define microscopically “pressure” for an arbitrary quantum mechanical system and study the quantum mechanical generalization of isobaric process; in Sec. III, we study quantum Brayton cycle and study how the efficiency of Brayton cycle bridges quantum and classical thermodynamic cycles; in Sec. IV we study quantum Diesel cycle in comparison with their classical counterpart; Sec. V is the remarks and conclusion.

II. QUANTUM ISOBARIC PROCESS

A. Pressure in quantum-mechanical system

In order to study the quantum isobaric process, we must first study pressure in an arbitrary quantum mechanical system. Let us recall that in some previous work [8, 14], heat and work have been extended to quantum mechanical systems and expressed as functions of the eigenenergies E_n and probability distributions P_n . The first law of thermodynamics has also been generalized to quantum mechanical systems:

$$\begin{aligned} dQ &= \sum_n E_n dP_n, \\ dW &= \sum_n P_n dE_n, \\ dU &= dQ + dW = \sum_n (E_n dP_n + P_n dE_n), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where E_n is the n th eigenenergy of the quantum mechanical system with the Hamiltonian $H = \sum_n E_n |n\rangle \langle n|$ under consideration; P_n is the occupation probability in the n th eigenstate; $|n\rangle$ is the n th eigenstate of the Hamiltonian. The density matrix of the system can be written as $\rho = \sum_n P_n |n\rangle \langle n|$. dQ and dW depict the heat exchange and work done respectively during a thermodynamic process. From classical thermodynamics we know that the first law can be expressed as $dU = dQ + dW = TdS + \sum_n Y_n dy_n$. Here, T and S refer to temperature and the thermodynamic entropy; Y_n is the generalized force, and y_n is generalized coordinate corresponding to Y_n (dy_n is the generalized displacement) [15]. Inversely, the generalized force for a classical system can be expressed as

$$Y_n = -\frac{dW}{dy_n}. \quad (2)$$

For example, when the generalized coordinate is chosen to be the volume V , we have its corresponding generalized force – pressure $P = -dW/dV$. Motivated by the definition of the generalized force for a classical system, we define analogously the force (for 1D system, force is the same as pressure) for a quantum mechanical system

$$F = -\frac{dW}{dL} = -\sum_n P_n \frac{dE_n}{dL}, \quad (3)$$

where L is the generalized coordinate corresponding to the force F . For a single particle in a 1D box (1DB) [16] (see Fig. 1), the generalized coordinate is the width of the potential. We know that the eigenenergies for such a system depend on the generalized coordinate $E_n(L) = (\pi\hbar m)^2/(2mL^2)$, and we obtain the derivative of $E_n(L)$ over L accordingly $\frac{dE_n}{dL} = -2\frac{E_n(L)}{L}$. When the system is in thermal equilibrium with heat bath at temperature β , the force exerting on either wall of the potential can be calculated by substituting $\frac{dE_n}{dL}$ and the Boltzmann factor $P_n = \frac{1}{Z}e^{-\beta E_n}$ into Eq. (3). Here $Z = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n}$ is the partition function, and m is the mass

of the particle. Alternatively, the expression of force (3) in a quantum mechanical system can be obtained in a statistical-mechanical way [17].

$$\begin{aligned} F &= -\left(\frac{\partial \mathbb{F}}{\partial L}\right)_T = kT \left(\frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial L}\right)_T = kT \frac{1}{Z} \frac{\partial}{\partial L} \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n} \\ &= -\sum_n \left(\frac{e^{-\beta E_n}}{Z}\right) \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial L} = -\sum_n P_n \frac{dE_n}{dL}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbb{F} = -kT \ln Z$ is the free energy of the quantum system. It should be pointed out that Eq. (3) is more general than Eq. (4) because Eq. (3) stands no matter the system is in equilibrium or not. When P_n in Eq. (3) satisfy Gibbs distribution $P_n = \frac{1}{Z}e^{-\beta E_n}$, or the system is in thermal equilibrium, the expectation value F of Eq. (3) reproduce the usual force in classical thermodynamics.

Another model example is the single particle in a 1D harmonic oscillator potential (1DH) (see Fig. 2). Its Hamiltonian is the same as the Hamiltonian of a single-mode radiation field in a cavity [3]. For such 1DH, we will see later that the definition of force (3) for 1DH agrees with the radiation pressure (4) of a single mode radiation field. We would like to mention that the definition of force in (3) is a further step in quantum thermodynamics after the definitions of heat and work (1). We will see all these definitions of work, heat and pressure, for a quantum mechanical system are self-consistent, and consistent with classical thermodynamics.

B. Quantum isobaric process

Having clarified force for a quantum mechanical system, in the following we study how to extend classical isobaric process to a quantum mechanical system. Classical isobaric process is a quasi-static thermodynamic process, in which the pressure of the system remains a constant [9, 10]. The time scale of relaxation of the system with the heat bath is much shorter than the time scale of controlling the volume of the system [18]. In a classical isobaric process, in order to achieve a constant pressure, we must carefully control the temperature of the system, i.e., carefully control the temperature of the heat bath, when we change the volume of the classical system [10]. For example, for the classical idea gas with the equation of state $P = Nk_B \frac{T}{V}$, the temperature of the system in the isobaric process is required to be proportional to the volume ($T \propto V$) of the gas. For a quantum mechanical system, however, the change of the temperature of the heat bath with the generalized coordinate may not be so obvious as the classical ideal gas. Let us consider the quantum isobaric process based on 1DB (see Fig. 1). For such a quantum mechanical system, the pressure on the wall can be obtained from Eq. (3)

$$F = -\sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta E_n}}{Z} \frac{dE_n(L)}{dL} = \frac{1}{L\beta(L)}, \quad (5)$$

Eq. (5) means that if we want to keep the pressure F as a constant, we must control the temperature of the system to be




FIG. 1: Schematic diagram of pressure in quantum mechanical system (single particle in 1D box). One wall (A) of the square well is fixed, while the other one (B) is movable. The force acting on the wall B by the quantum system constrained in the wall can be calculated from Eq. (3)

proportional to the width of the potential well ($\beta(L) \propto \frac{1}{L}$) when the system inside the box pushes one of the walls to perform work. It should be mentioned that the temperature function $\beta(L)$ of the “volume” in a quantum isobaric process is system-dependent. I.e., for different quantum systems, the function of the temperature over the “volume” in the quantum isobaric process differs from one to another. In the following we consider the quantum isobaric process based on a single mode radiation field in a cavity, which was first proposed as the working substance for a quantum heat engine in Ref. [3]. We assume that the cavity of length L and cross-section A can support only a single mode of the field $\omega = \frac{s\pi c}{L}$, where s is an integer. The Hamiltonian reads

$$H = \sum_n (n + \frac{1}{2}) \hbar \omega |n\rangle \langle n|, \quad (6)$$

where $|n\rangle$ is the Fock state of the radiation field. From Eq. (3) we obtain the radiation force F as a function of the temperature β and the length of the cavity L

$$F = - \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta(L)E_n(L)} dE_n(L)}{Z(L)} \frac{dE_n(L)}{dL} \quad (7)$$

$$= \left[\frac{\hbar \frac{s\pi c}{L}}{e^{\beta(L)\hbar \frac{s\pi c}{L}} - 1} + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \frac{s\pi c}{L} \right] \frac{1}{L}.$$

From Eq. (7) it can be inferred that in order to achieve a constant force, we must carefully control the temperature of the




FIG. 2: Quantum isobaric process based on single-mode radiation field (a quantum harmonic oscillator). Here the width of the potential $L \propto \frac{1}{\omega}$. $E_n(L_\alpha) = \frac{s\pi c}{L_\alpha}$, $\alpha = A, B$ are the n th eigenenergy of the single mode radiation field with the potential width equals to L_α .

heat bath in the following way

$$\beta(L) = \frac{L}{\hbar s \pi c} \ln \frac{2FL^2 + \hbar s \pi c}{2FL^2 - \hbar s \pi c}. \quad (8)$$

It can be seen that in a quantum isobaric process, the temperature function (8) for the single-mode radiation field is much more complicated than ($\beta(L) \propto \frac{1}{L}$) of 1D box system.

For the convenience of later analysis, we would also like to calculate the entropy and the internal energy of the two systems in a quantum isobaric process. First we consider the 1DB. The entropy expression can be obtained from the above Eq. (1) [8].

$$S(L) = k_B \left[\frac{1}{2} + \ln \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2mL^2}{\pi \hbar^2 \beta(L)}} \right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

Comparing with the entropy of classical ideal gas [9, 10], we find that the entropy of classical idea gas reproduces the entropy (9) of 1DB if we choose the molecule number of the classical ideal gas to be $N = 1$. We plot the entropy-temperature curve (9) of a quantum isobaric process in Fig. 4. The internal energy of the 1DB during the isobaric process can also be obtained analytically (the temperature of the heat bath is time-dependent).

$$U(L) = - \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta E_n}}{Z} E_n(L) = \frac{1}{2\beta(L)}. \quad (10)$$

This expression of internal energy verifies the equipartition theorem [9], and justifies the result in Ref. [8] again: the internal energy of the 1DB depends only on the temperature. From Eqs. (9) and (10) we see that both the entropy and the internal energy of 1DB have the same form as that of the classical

ideal gas [9, 10]. Moreover, from Eq. (5) we know that 1DB has the same equation of state as that of the classical ideal gas $PV = Nk_B T$. Thus we conclude that 1DB is the quantum mechanical counterpart of the classical ideal gas. We would like to mention that in the study of the single-molecule engine by Szilard and Zurek [16], they simply employ the equation of state for the classical ideal gas $PV = Nk_B T$ and choose $N = 1$. Nevertheless, this treatment may be questionable because the equation of state $PV = Nk_B T$ stands in the macroscopic and classical case. When we come to the extreme limit of small system with only a few degrees of freedom, we must use the quantum mechanical treatment as we present here. Fortunately, all the treatments of the single molecule engine [16] by Szilard and Zurek is in accordance with our quantum mechanical treatments. Thus we say that our discussions lay the foundation for Szilard-Zurek single molecule engine [16].

As to the single-mode radiation field, the entropy and the internal energy can be calculated as that in Ref. [3]

$$S(L) = \frac{\langle n \rangle \hbar \omega}{T} + k \ln(\langle n \rangle + 1) \quad (11)$$

$$U(L) = \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta n \hbar \omega}}{Z(L)} (n + \frac{1}{2}) \hbar \omega = (\langle n \rangle + \frac{1}{2}) \hbar \omega \quad (12)$$

where $\langle n \rangle = [\exp(\hbar \omega / kT) - 1]^{-1}$ is the mean photon number.

It is easy to see that the entropy (11) and the internal energy (12) of a single mode radiation field have different forms from that of 1DB (9-10), and thus from the classical ideal gas. The internal energy (12) of single mode radiation field depends on both the temperature β and the width L of the potential well, while the internal energy of 1DB (10) depends on β only. In addition, the equation of state (7) of the single-mode radiation field differs from that (5) of 1DB, and thus from the classical ideal gas. Based on these observations, we say that the single mode radiation field has totally different thermodynamic properties from that classical ideal gas. It can be inferred that quantum heat engine based on single mode radiation field can give us new results beyond that of classical ideal gas. As we mentioned before, the Hamiltonian of the single-mode radiation field is the same as that of 1DH. Thus all the result about single mode radiation field is the same as that for 1DH. Alternatively, we can say that 1DH is the quantum counterpart of single-mode photon gas, in analogous to the fact that 1DB is the quantum counterpart of classical ideal gas. In the following we will alternatively use 1DH and single-mode photon gas.

In addition to our previous studies [8], up to now we have extended all four basic thermodynamic processes to quantum mechanical domain. For a comparison of quantum thermodynamics processes and their classical counterparts see Table I.

III. QUANTUM BRAYTON CYCLE

In the preceding section, we extend the classical isobaric process to quantum mechanical systems based on the defini-




FIG. 3: Force-Displacement $F - L$ diagram of a quantum Brayton cycle based on a single particle in 1DB. $A \rightarrow B$ represents an isobaric expansion process with a constant force F_1 ; $B \rightarrow C$ represents an adiabatic expansion process with constant entropy S_1 ; $C \rightarrow D$ represents an isobaric compression process with constant pressure F_0 ; $D \rightarrow A$ is another adiabatic compression process with constant entropy S_0 .




FIG. 4: Temperature-Entropy $T - S$ diagram of a quantum Brayton cycle (see Fig. 3) based on 1DB. In two adiabatic processes, $B \rightarrow C$ and $D \rightarrow A$ the entropy remains a constant.

tion of pressure (3). In this section and the next section, we study two kinds of thermodynamic cycles consisting of the quantum isobaric process, and compare them with their classical counterparts. We first consider the quantum Brayton cycle based on 1DB. A quantum Brayton cycle is a quantum mechanical analogue of the classical Brayton cycle [9, 10], which consists of two quantum isobaric processes and two quantum

TABLE I: Basic classical thermodynamic processes and their quantum counterparts. Here the classical thermodynamic processes are based on classical ideal gas, while the quantum thermodynamic processes are based on the 1DBSP. We illustrate the equations of state for the four basic thermodynamic processes, and we also indicate the invariant or varying variables in these processes. Here, we use ‘‘VRA’’ to indicate the invariance of a thermodynamic quantity and ‘‘VAR’’ to indicate it varies or changes.

	Isothermal ($T \equiv T_0$)	Isochoric ($V \equiv V_0$ or $L \equiv L_0$)	Isobaric ($P \equiv P_0$ or $F \equiv F_0$)	Adiabatic ($S \equiv S_0$)
Classical	$P(V)V = \text{const};$ VRA: S, V, P; INV: T	$\frac{P(T)}{T} = \text{const};$ VRA: S, T, P; INV: V	$\frac{V(T)}{T} = \text{const};$ VRA: S, T, V; INV: P	$P(T)V^3(T) = \text{const};$ VRA: V, T P; INV: S
Quantum	$F(L)L = \text{const};$ VRA: E_n, P_n ; INV: T	$\frac{F(T)}{T} = \text{const};$ VRA: T, P_n ; INV: E_n	$\frac{L(T)}{T} = \text{const};$ VRA: T, E_n, P_n ;	$F(T)L^3(T) = \text{const};$ VRA: E_n, T ; INV: $, P_n$

adiabatic processes. Similar to our previous work [8], we give a Temperature-Entropy $T - S$ diagram of the quantum Brayton cycle (See Fig. 4). According to the definition of heat exchange (1) in the quantum mechanical system, we obtain the heat absorbed by the system from a time-dependent heat bath during the quantum isobaric expansion process $A \rightarrow B$ (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4)

$$dQ_{AB} = \int_{L_A}^{L_B} \left[\sum_n E_n(L) \frac{dP_n(L)}{dL} \right] dL = \frac{3}{2} F_1 (L_B - L_A). \quad (13)$$

In obtaining the above result we have used Eq. (5) and Eq. (10). Similarly, we obtain the heat released to the time-dependent entropy sink

$$dQ_{CD} = \frac{3}{2} F_0 (L_C - L_D). \quad (14)$$

Hence, the efficiency of the quantum Brayton cycle based on a 1DB can be expressed as

$$\eta_{\text{Brayton}} = 1 - \frac{F_0(L_C - L_D)}{F_1(L_B - L_A)}. \quad (15)$$

Due to the equation of motion (5) and the expression of the internal energy (10), we have $F_1 \times L_B/2 = U(L_B)$, $F_0 \times L_C/2 = U(L_C)$. In addition to the relation of the internal energies in the quantum adiabatic process $B \rightarrow C$

$$\frac{U(L_B)}{U(L_C)} = \left(\frac{L_C}{L_B} \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

we have

$$\frac{F_1}{F_0} = \left(\frac{L_C}{L_B} \right)^3 \quad (17)$$

for the quantum adiabatic process $B \rightarrow C$. Through a similar analysis we obtain

$$\frac{F_1}{F_0} = \left(\frac{L_D}{L_A} \right)^3 \quad (18)$$

for another quantum adiabatic process $D \rightarrow A$. Based on all the above results (15), (17), and (18), we obtain the efficiency

of the quantum Brayton cycle based on the 1DB

$$\eta_{\text{Brayton}} = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (19)$$

We would like to compare this efficiency of the quantum Brayton cycle (19) with its classical counterpart. From Eq. (9) we know that in quantum adiabatic process ($S = \text{const}$), we have $TL^2 = \text{const}$. As a result the adiabatic exponent $\gamma = 3$ is obtained through comparison with $TL^{\gamma-1} = \text{const}$ for adiabatic process. Let us recall that the efficiency of a classical Brayton cycle is $\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$ [10], where γ is the classical adiabatic exponent. Thus our result (19) bridges the quantum Brayton cycle and classical Brayton cycle. Hence this also justify that the definition of pressure (3) for a quantum mechanical system is self-consistent.

In the following we consider a quantum Brayton cycle based on 1DH. Similar to the above analysis, we calculate the heat absorbed by the system during the quantum isobaric expansion process $A \rightarrow B$ (see Fig. 3)

$$dQ_{AB} = \int_{L_A}^{L_B} \left[\sum_n E_n(L) \frac{dP_n(L)}{dL} \right] dL = F_1 (L_B - L_A), \quad (20)$$

where we have used the relations (7) and (12) in the quantum isobaric process ($A \rightarrow B$). Similarly, we obtain the heat released to the entropy sink in another quantum isobaric process $C \rightarrow D$

$$dQ_{CD} = F_0 (L_C - L_D). \quad (21)$$

The efficiency of the quantum Brayton cycle based on a 1DH can be expressed as

$$\eta'_{\text{Brayton}} = 1 - \frac{F_0(L_C - L_D)}{F_1(L_B - L_A)}. \quad (22)$$

From Eqs. (7) and (12) we have $F_1 \times L_B = U(L_B)$ and $F_0 \times L_C = U(L_C)$. In addition to the relation of internal energy in the quantum adiabatic process

$$\frac{U(L_B)}{U(L_C)} = \frac{L_C}{L_B}, \quad (23)$$

we have

$$\frac{F_1}{F_0} = \left(\frac{L_C}{L_B} \right)^2. \quad (24)$$

Hence, from Eqs. (22) and (25) we obtain the efficiency of a quantum Brayton cycle based on 1DH

$$\eta'_{\text{Brayton}} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{F_0}{F_1}}. \quad (25)$$

From Eq. (11) we know that in a quantum adiabatic process $TL = \text{const}$. Thus $\gamma = 2$ for 1DH is obtained. It can be seen that the efficiency of a quantum Brayton cycle obtained here (26) is the same as that of a classical Brayton cycle. Through the discussion of quantum Brayton cycles based on two model systems 1DH and 1DB, we will see that the definition of pressure (3) for quantum systems has clear physical implication, and our study bridges the thermodynamic cycles based on quantum and classical systems.

IV. QUANTUM DIESEL CYCLE

Except for the above thermodynamic cycles consisting of two pair of basic thermodynamic processes, there are some interesting thermodynamic cycles consisting of more than two kinds of thermodynamic processes, such as Diesel cycle. The Diesel cycle consists of two adiabatic processes, one isobaric processes and one isochoric process [10] (see Fig. 5). In




FIG. 5: Force-Displacement $F - L$ diagram of a quantum Diesel cycle based on 1DB and single mode radiation field. $A \rightarrow B$ represents an isobaric expansion process with a constant pressure F_1 ; $B \rightarrow C$ represents an adiabatic expansion process with constant entropy; $C \rightarrow D$ represents an isochoric compression process with constant volume L_1 ; $D \rightarrow A$ is another adiabatic compression process.

the following we will consider implementing quantum Diesel cycle in 1DB and in 1DH. First we consider the 1DB. The

input energy in the quantum isobaric process and the output energy in the quantum isochoric process can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{in} &= C_P(T_B - T_A), \\ Q_{out} &= C_V(T_C - T_D), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where C_P and C_V are the heat capacity at constant pressure and constant volume respectively; T_A , T_B , T_C , and T_D are the temperatures of the system at different points (see Fig. 5). Thus the efficiency of the quantum Diesel cycle can be expressed in terms of heat capacities and temperatures

$$\eta = \frac{Q_{in} - Q_{out}}{Q_{in}} = 1 - \frac{C_V(T_C - T_D)}{C_P(T_B - T_A)}. \quad (27)$$

It is convenient to express this efficiency (27) in terms of compression ratio $r_C \equiv \frac{L_2}{L_1}$ (see Fig. 5) and the expansion ratio $r_E \equiv \frac{L_3}{L_1}$ (see Fig. 5) of the volumes. Now using the equation of state $FL = kT$ (5) and $\frac{C_P}{C_V} = \gamma = 3$ for 1DB, the efficiency (27) can be rewritten as

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{(F_C L_C - F_D L_D)}{(F_B L_B - F_A L_A)}. \quad (28)$$

By utilizing the facts $L_C = L_D = L_1$ and $F_A = F_B = F_1$ (see Fig. 5), we further simplify the Eq. (29) to

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{L_1(F_C - F_D)}{F_1(L_B - L_A)} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{(\frac{F_C}{F_1} - \frac{F_D}{F_1})}{(r_E - r_C)}. \quad (29)$$

Finally by making use of the adiabatic condition $FL^3 = \text{const}$ for 1DB in the quantum adiabatic process, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_C}{F_1} &= \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1} \right)^3 = r_E^3, \\ \frac{F_D}{F_1} &= \left(\frac{L_2}{L_1} \right)^3 = r_C^3. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Substituting Eq. (30) into Eq. (29), the efficiency can be written as

$$\eta_{\text{Diesel}} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{r_E^3 - r_C^3}{r_E - r_C} = 1 - \frac{1}{3} (r_E^2 + r_C r_E + r_C^2). \quad (31)$$

This efficiency for a quantum Diesel cycle based on 1DB agrees with that of a classical Diesel cycle, too. Through a similar analysis we obtain the efficiency for a quantum Diesel cycle based on 1DH with the only change of γ from 3 in Eq. (31) to 2

$$\eta'_{\text{Diesel}} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{r_E^2 - r_C^2}{r_E - r_C} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} (r_E + r_C). \quad (32)$$

Before concluding this section, we would like to mention that we can also discuss the quantum Brayton cycle and the quantum Diesel cycle based on an arbitrary quantum system, such as the 3D black body radiation field or a spin-1/2 in an external magnetic field with the Hamiltonian $H = \frac{1}{2} B \sigma_z$. Here σ_z is the Pauli matrix and B is the external magnetic

TABLE II: Working efficiency of typical classical thermodynamic cycles and their quantum counterparts. It can be seen that 1) except the Carnot cycle, the efficiencies of all the thermodynamic cycles are working substance-dependent, and 2) both quantum thermodynamic cycles and classical thermodynamic cycles have the same efficiency. Adiabatic exponent for monoatomic, diatomic, and polyatomic classical idea gas can be found in [20]. Here T_C and T_H are the temperatures of the cold and hot reservoirs; V_0 (L_0 , S_0) and V_1 (L_1 , S_1) are the volume (length, area) of the working substance in two isochoric processes; P_0 (F_0) and P_1 (F_1) are the pressure (force) of the working substance in the two isobaric processes.

		Carnot (two isothermal + two adiabatic) $\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	Otto (two isochoric+ two adiabatic) $\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\gamma-1}$	Brayton (two isobaric + two adiabatic) $\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{\gamma}}$	Diesel (isochoric + isobaric + two isobaric) $\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^\gamma - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^\gamma}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
Classical	Monoatomic classical idea gas ($\gamma = \frac{5}{3}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{5}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{3}{5} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
	Diatomic classical idea gas ($\gamma = \frac{7}{5}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{5}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{7}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{5}{7} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{7}{5}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{7}{5}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
	Polyatomic classical idea gas ($\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
Quantum	Single particle in 1D box ($\gamma = 3$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{L_0}{L_1}\right)^2$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^3 - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)^3}{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right) - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)}$
	Single particle in 2D box ($\gamma = 2$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{S_0}{S_1}\right)^1$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\frac{S_2}{S_1}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{S_3}{S_1}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{S_2}{S_1}\right) - \left(\frac{S_3}{S_1}\right)}$
	Single particle in 3D box ($\gamma = \frac{5}{3}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{5}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{3}{5} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{5}{3}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
	1D Single mode photon field ($\gamma = 2$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{L_0}{L_1}\right)^1$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right) - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)}$
	3D Black body radiation field ($\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
	1D harmonic oscillator ($\gamma = 2$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{L_0}{L_1}\right)^1$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right) - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)}$
	2D harmonic oscillator ($\gamma = \frac{3}{2}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{S_0}{S_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{\left(\frac{S_2}{S_1}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} - \left(\frac{S_3}{S_1}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left(\frac{S_2}{S_1}\right) - \left(\frac{S_3}{S_1}\right)}$
	3D harmonic oscillator ($\gamma = \frac{4}{3}$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{V_0}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{P_0}{P_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{3}{4} \frac{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}}{\left(\frac{V_2}{V_1}\right) - \left(\frac{V_3}{V_1}\right)}$
	spin-1/2 (2-level system) ($\gamma = 2$)	$\eta = 1 - \frac{T_C}{T_H}$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{L_0}{L_1}\right)^1$	$\eta = 1 - \left(\frac{F_0}{F_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\eta = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{L_2}{L_1}\right) - \left(\frac{L_3}{L_1}\right)}$

field. Different from the Carnot cycle, the efficiencies of Otto Cycle, Brayton cycle and Diesel cycle are working substance-dependent (see Table II). More specifically, they depend on the adiabatic exponent γ of the working substance. As long as we get the adiabatic exponent γ , we obtain the explicit expression of the efficiencies of the quantum thermodynamic cycles by substituting γ with their adiabatic exponent. For a spin-1/2, we choose the inverse of the magnetic field strength as the generalized coordinate $L = \frac{1}{B}$. Then it can be found that the adiabatic exponent for such a system is $\gamma = 2$. As a result, the efficiencies of a quantum Brayton cycle and a quantum Diesel cycle based on a spin-1/2 are the same as that based on 1DH (25), (32). Similarly, the efficiency for Brayton cycle and Diesel cycle based on 3D radiation field can be obtained straightforwardly by substituting γ with the adiabatic exponent $\frac{4}{3}$ [9, 10]. In Table II we list the working efficiencies for several typical thermodynamic cycles based on different kinds

of classical and quantum working substance.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

In summary, in this paper, we study the quantum mechanical analogue of the classical isobaric process based on a microscopic definition of force, and make quantum mechanical extension of some typical thermodynamic cycles based on quantum isobaric processes. The properties of these quantum thermodynamic processes and cycles are clarified. In studying the thermodynamic properties of a small quantum system, we use P_n and E_n instead of thermodynamic variables P and V . The general expression of force for an arbitrary quantum system $F = -\sum_n P_n \frac{dE_n(L)}{dL}$ is found. It can be checked that this expression is in accordance with the force $F = -\left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial L}\right)_T$ in thermodynamics. The definitions of force and work for a

single-particle quantum system may have important application in the experimental exploration of nonequilibrium thermodynamics in small quantum systems, such as quantum Jarzynski equality and quantum Crooks Fluctuation Theorem [2]. The quantum heat engines and their classical counterparts have the same efficiencies as long as their working substance has the same adiabatic exponent. Though the working substance of quantum heat engines deviates from thermodynamic limit, we reproduce the efficiency of classical heat engines. Hence our study lay the concrete foundation for Szilard-Zurek single molecule engine. In addition, we found the close relation between classical ideal gas and 1DB, and between single-mode photon gas and 1DH.

Before concluding this paper, we would like to mention that in our current study we focus on the quantum single-particle system, and its related quantum mechanical generalization of heat, work, pressure, and we regain the result of classical thermodynamic processes and cycles. We also notice some studies about quantum heat engines with quantum many body system as the working substance [19]. For quantum many body

system, e.g., ideal bosonic gas or ideal fermionic gas, the mechanical variable, such as heat work, pressure, are well defined and their equation of state as well as their expression of internal energy [17] deviate from that of the classical ideal gas. As a result, the properties of quantum thermodynamic cycles based on the quantum many-body system deviate from that of classical ideal gas due to quantum degeneracy. Finally, similar to the discussion about finite-power Carnot engine [21], we can discuss about finite-time quantum Brayton cycle and quantum Diesel cycle. Finite-power analysis of Brayton cycle and Diesel cycle will be given later

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by U.S. Department of Energy through the LANL/LDRD Program. I thanks Prof. J. Q. You for the hospitality extended to me during my visit to Fudan university.

-
- [1] J. Gemmer, M. Michel, and G. Mahler, *Quantum Thermodynamics*, Springer, Berlin, (2004), and references therein.
- [2] C. Bustamante, J. Liphardt, and F. Ritort, *Phys. Today*, **54**, (7) 43 (2005); M. Haw, *Phys. World*, **20**, (11) 25, (2007).
- [3] M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050602 (2002); M. O. Scully, M. Suhail Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, *Science* **299**, 862 (2003); M. O. Scully, in *Quantum limits to the second law: first international Conference*, D.P. Sheehan Ed. (American institute of physics, Melville, NY, 2002), pp. 83-91; M. S. Zubairy, in *Quantum limits to the second law: first international Conference*, D.P. Sheehan Ed. (American institute of physics, Melville, NY, 2002), pp. 92-97.
- [4] H. T. Quan, P. Zhang, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. E*, **73**, 036122 (2006).
- [5] H. E. D. Scovil and E. O. Schulz-DuBois, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2**, 262 (1959); J. E. Geusic, E. O. Schulz-DuBois, and H. E. D. Scovil, *Phys. Rev.* **156**, 343 (1967).
- [6] M. O. Scully *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 220601 (2001); M. O. Scully, Y. Rostovtsev, Z. E. Sariyanni, and M. S. Zubairy, *Physica E* **29**, 29 (2005); Y. Rostovtsev, Z. E. Sariyanni, M. S. Zubairy, and M. O. Scully, *ibid.* **29**, 40 (2005); Z. E. Sariyanni, Y. Rostovtsev, M. S. Zubairy, and M. O. Scully, *ibid.* **29**, 47 (2005); H. T. Quan, Y. D. Wang, Yu-xi Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 180402 (2006).
- [7] E. Geva and R. Kosloff, *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 3054 (1992); E. Geva and R. Kosloff, *J. Chem. Phys.* **97**, 4398 (1992); Y. Rezek and R. Kosloff, *New J. Phys.* **8**, 83 (2006); T. Feldmann, E. Geva, and R. Kosloff, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 485 (1996); C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, B. K. Meister, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **458**, 1519 (2002); C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody, and B. K. Meister, *J. Phys. A* **33**, 4427 (2000); K. Bhattacharyya and S. Mukhopadhyay, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 1529 (2001); M. H. Lee, *Am. J. Phys.* **69**, 874 (2001); Y. V. Rostovtsev, A. B. Matsko, N. Nayak, M. S. Zubairy, and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 053811 (2003); T. Opatrny and M. O. Scully, *Fortschr. Physik.* **50**, 657 (2002); S. Li, H. Wang, Y. D. Sun, X. X. Yi, *J. Phys. A* **40**, 8655, (2007); A. O. Niskanen, Y. Nakamura, J. P. Pekola, *Phys. Rev. B*, **76**, 174532 (2007); K. Maruyama, F. Nori, and V. Verdral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, in press (2008); M. Grajcar, S. Ashhab, J. R. Johansson, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. B*, **78**, 035406 (2008); T. Jahnke, J. Birjukov, G. Mahler, *Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics*, **151**, 167 (2007); J. Birjukov, T. Jahnke, G. Mahler, *Eur. Phys. J. B*, **64**, 105 (2008).
- [8] H. T. Quan, Yu-xi Liu, C. P. Sun, and Franco Nori, *Phys. Rev. E*, **76**, 031105 (2007) and references therein.
- [9] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1985); C. Kittel and H. Kroemer, *Thermal Physics*, 2nd ed. (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1980).
- [10] P. Perrot, *A to Z of Thermodynamics*, (Oxford university press, Oxford, 1998).
- [11] A. E. Allahverdyan, R. S. Gracia, and T. Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 046106 (2005); J. Arnaud, L. Chusseau, and F. Philippe, *Eur. J. Phys.* **23**, 489 (2002); J. Arnaud, L. Chusseau, and F. Philippe, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 061102 (2008); F. Tonner, G. Mahler, *Fortschr. Physik.* **54**, 939 (2006); F. Tonner, G. Mahler, *Phys. Rev. E*, **72**, 066118 (2005); T. Feldmann and R. Kosloff, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 106101 (2003); H. T. Quan, P. Zhang, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 056110 (2005); T. Zhang, W.-T. Liu, P.-X. Chen, C.-Z. Li, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 062102 (2007); D. Janzing, *J. Stat. Phys.*, **122**, 531 (2006); A. E. Allahverdyan, R. S. Johal, and G. Mahler, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 041118 (2008).
- [12] P. Borowski, J. Gemmer and G. Mahler, *Europhys. Lett.*, **62**, 629 (2003).
- [13] Bihong Lin, and Jincan Chen, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **38**, 69 (2005); F. Wu, L. Chen, F. Sun, C. Wu, and Q. Li, *Phys. Rev. E*, **73**, 016103 (2006).
- [14] T. D. Kieu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93**, 140403 (2004); T. D. Kieu, *Eur. J. Phys. D* **39**, 115 (2006);
- [15] E. Schrodinger, *Statistical Thermodynamics*, (Dover, New York, 1989); D. V. Schroeder, *Thermal Physics*, (Addison Wesley Longman, San Francisco, 2000).
- [16] L. Szilard, *Z. Phys.* **53**, 840 (1929); W. H. Zurek, quant-ph/0301076.
- [17] R. P. Pathria, *Statistical mechanics*, (Pergamon, Oxford, 1972).
- [18] G. Lindblad, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976); U. Weiss,

- quantum dissipative systems*, 2nd ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999); M. Orszag, *Quantum Optics* (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
- [19] G. G. Potter, G. Muller, and M. Karbach, *Phys. Rev. E*, **75**, 061120 (2007); A. Sisman, and H. Saygin, *Appl. Energy*, **68**, 367 (2001); A. Sisman, and H. Saygin, *Phys. Scr.* **64**, 108 (2001); F. Wu, L. Chen, F. Sun, C. Wu, F. Guo, and Q. Li, *Energy Convers. Manage.* **47**, 3008 (2006); *Open Sys. Information Dyn.*, **13**, 55 (2006); F. Wu, L. Chen, F. Sun, C. Wu, and Y. Zhu, *Energy Convers. Manage.* **39**, 773 (1998); A. Sisman, and H. Saygin, *Phys. Scr.* **63**, 263 (2001); H. Saygin, and A. Sisman, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **90**, 3086 (2001); H. Saygin, and A. Sisman, *Appl. Energy*, **69**, 77 (2001); F. Wu, L. Chen, F. Sun, C. Wu, and F. Guo, *Phys. Scr.* **73**, 452 (2006); A. Sisman, and H. Saygin, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **32**, 664 (1999); Bihong Lin, Jizhou He, and Jincan Chen, *J. Non-Equilib. Thermodyn.*, **28**, 221 (2003); B. Lin, and J. Chen, *Phys. Scr.*, **77**, 055005 (2008).
- [20] P. M. Bellan, *Am. J. Phys.*, **72**, 679 (2004).
- [21] F. L. Curzon, and B. Ahlborn, *Am. J. Phys.* **43**, 22 (1975); J. He, J. Chen, and B. Hua, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 036145 (2002); B. Lin, and J. Chen, *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 046105 (2003).