

Joule versus Meissner effect in superconductors

Nicolas Sandeau

Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, Centrale Marseille, Institut Fresnel, F-13013 Marseille, France

(Dated: March 12, 2020)

It has been argued³ recently that the Joule effect, induced as a by-product of the Meissner effect in superconductors, contradicts the conventional theory⁵. Conversely we show that this rationale is actually mistaken in several respects, in particular because it is at loggerheads with all experimental results regarding the normal to superconducting transition.

A superconducting sample, taken initially at temperature $T(t=0) = T_1$ (T_c, t stand for critical temperature and time, respectively; there is $T_1 < T_c$ in Refs.^{1,2} but inversely $T_1 > T_c$ in Ref.³), is cooled¹⁻³, in a constant magnetic field H_0 , down to $T(t_0 > 0) = T_2 < T_c$. Thence the superconducting phase grows for $T < T_c$ at the expense of the normal one, which should give rise to eddy currents thanks to the Meissner effect. It is concluded that the associated Joule effect contradicts the BCS theory^{4,5}.

However, the whole analysis¹⁻³ relies on the two-fluid model⁶⁻¹⁰, for which the conduction electrons comprise a homogeneous mixture of superconducting and independent electrons. Thus, since the BCS model is known to be characterised^{4,5} by a many-body variational state at thermal equilibrium with Bogolyubov-Valatin excitations which are complex entities, quite unrelated to independent electrons, Refs.¹⁻³ are seen to be irrelevant to the BCS theory. Likewise, several additional issues are questionable.

I. MEISSNER EFFECT

Although the author¹⁻³ has long favored an interpretation of the Meissner effect, based on *quantum pressure*¹¹, now he embraces quite unrelated an explanation⁶⁻⁸. In this novel view, the Meissner effect is ascribed to the susceptibility χ , going from paramagnetic ($\chi_n > 0$) in the normal ($T > T_c$) state to diamagnetic ($\chi_s < 0$) in the superconducting ($T < T_c$) one. Despite H_0 remaining constant all over the cooling process, the magnetic induction B is indeed altered because of $\chi_s - \chi_n \neq 0 \Rightarrow \frac{dB}{dt} \neq 0$, which gives rise to eddy currents inside the boundary separating the normal phase from the superconducting one, owing to the Faraday-Maxwell equation. Due to the finite conductivity in the superconducting state⁶⁻⁸, there is $\lambda_M \gg \lambda_L$ with λ_M, λ_L being the width of the boundary and London's length, respectively.

This argument is tentatively applied^{1,2} in order to ascribe $\frac{d\chi}{dt}(T < T_c) \neq 0$ to $\lambda_L(T(t))$. However, such a claim runs afoul⁷ at $\chi_s \propto \left(\frac{\lambda_L}{\lambda_M}\right)^2$ being T independent and thence t independent too. This inconsistency has been corrected in Ref.³ but the width of the boundary has been assigned mistakenly to λ_L instead of $\lambda_M \gg \lambda_L$.

II. JOULE EFFECT

The discussion of the Joule effect, presented in Refs.^{1,2}, is found to contradict repeatedly that of Ref.³, as illustrated below:

- the conductivity of superconducting electrons is assumed to be *finite* in Refs.^{1,2}, but conversely *infinite* in Ref.³. Likewise the Joule effect is assumed to take place in the *superconducting* phase in Refs.^{1,2}, but solely in the *normal* one in Ref.³. Despite those contradictions, Ref.³ is purported to lead to the *same* conclusion as Refs.^{1,2};
- the thermal balance, supposed to account for $T(t)$ in Ref.¹, reads (see¹ Eq.(12)) $Q = \int_{T_2}^{T_1} dTC(T)$, with $Q, C(T)$ being the heat exchanged with the reservoir at $T = T_2$ and the electronic heat capacity of the sample (since a superconductor of type I with very low T_c is considered¹, the specific heat is dominated by the conduction electrons). The right-handed term is correct but unhelpful, because $C(T)$ depends¹⁰ on the superconducting current and is furthermore spatially inhomogeneous due to the Meissner effect^{7,10}. However, the left-handed term *violates* the first law of thermodynamics, because it does not include the heat released through the Joule effect;
- the thermal balance, describing the reversible normal to superconducting transition in Ref.³, involves a *latent* heat (see³ Eq.(1)), although *no* latent heat has ever been reported in countless experiments^{4,5}. Actually, as shown elsewhere¹⁰, the normal to superconducting transition differs from usual first order transitions, such as ice melting into water, because a latent *work*, depending from the difference between the Fermi energy and the chemical potential of superconducting electrons, plays the role of the latent heat.

Therefore a clarification is needed. The heat Q_J , released through the Joule effect in a superconductor, has been shown elsewhere⁹ to read $Q_J = \int_0^{t_0} j_s^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_s} + \frac{1}{\sigma_J} \right) dt$, with j_s, σ_s standing for the density of the supercurrent and the *finite* conductivity, associated with superconducting electrons, whereas $\sigma_J < 0$ characterises the anomalous Joule effect, typical of superconductors.

In summary, contrarily to what is purported in refs.¹⁻³, the theories of the Meissner⁶⁻⁸ and Joule⁹ effects are seen to be consistent with that of the normal to superconducting transition¹⁰ and the laws of thermodynamics¹².

¹ J.E. Hirsch, arXiv : 1907.11273

² J.E. Hirsch, arXiv : 1909.12786

³ J.E. Hirsch, arXiv : 2001.07509

⁴ R.D. Parks, Superconductivity, ed. CRC Press (1969)

⁵ M. Tinkham, Introduction to Superconductivity, ed. Dover Books (2004)

⁶ J. Szeftel et al., Phys.Lett.A, 381, 1525 (2017)

⁷ J. Szeftel et al., Prog.In.Electro.Res.M, 69, 69 (2018)

⁸ J. Szeftel et al., Prog.In.Electro.Res.L, 81, 1 (2019)

⁹ J. Szeftel et al., Eur.Phys.J.B, 92, 67 (2019)

¹⁰ J. Szeftel et al., J.Supercond.Nov.Mag, DOI: 10.1007/s10948-019-05393-1

¹¹ J.E. Hirsch, J.Supercond.Nov.Magn. 23, 309 (2010)

¹² L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Statistical Physics, ed. Pergamon Press, London, 1959.