

# Ohm's law, Joule heat, and Planckian dissipation

Hiroyasu Koizumi

*<sup>a</sup>Center for Computational Sciences, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1  
Tennodai, Tsukuba, 305-8577, Ibaraki, Japan*

---

## Abstract

We will show that the Planckian dissipation observed in strange metals including cuprate superconductors can be attributed to the dissipation due to the gauge fluctuation of the Berry connection. In the due course, we revisit the well-studied dissipation problem, Joule heating by electric current in metallic wires. It is known that Poynting's theorem explains it in a strange manner: The energy for the Joule heat enters from the outside of the wire as radiation; and consumed in the wire. This explanation is rectified by considering the generation of the chemical potential gradient inside the wire by the battery connection. Then, the Joule heat is obtained as the energy of the emitted radiation from the wire with its energy supplied by the connected battery. We also examine discharging of a capacitor and supercurrent flow through the Josephson junction.

---

## 1. Introduction

The Berry connection from many-body wave functions provides additional forces on electrons in electromagnetic field beyond the Lorentz force with including many-body quantum effects [1]. One of them is the gradient of the chemical potential force; the chemical potential is originally introduced by Gibbs in the thermodynamics context [2], however, it arise as time-component of the Berry connection from many-body wave functions. The present work concerns roles played by this force in dissipation problems of electron conduction in metals. In particular, we examine the Planckian dissipation observed in strange metals including cuprate superconductors [3, 4, 5].

One of old and established physical laws for the electric conduction is Ohm's law discovered by Ohm [6] (unpublished materials indicate it was known before Ohm by Cavendish [7]): The electric current  $I$  generated by connecting a battery of voltage  $V$  to a metallic wire with resistance  $R$  is given by

$$I = \frac{V}{R} \quad (1)$$

The battery originally used by Ohm was an electric battery, where the electromotive force was generated by chemical reactions.

Joule found that the heat generated by a metallic wire of resistance  $R$  with current  $I$  is given by

$$RI^2 = IV \quad (2)$$

where the Ohm's law is used in the last equality [8]. This heat is equivalent to the work done by the battery, establishing that the heat is a kind of energy.

The conservation of the energy in systems composed of electromagnetic field and electric current was formulated by Poynting and called, 'Poynting's theorem' [9]. It states that the rate of the energy consumed by the current in the volume  $\mathcal{V}$  is given by  $\int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ , where  $\mathbf{j}$  and  $\mathbf{E}$  are the current density and electric field, respectively; and the rate of the energy leaves  $\mathcal{V}$  as radiation is given by  $\int_{\mathcal{S}} d\mathbf{S} \cdot (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H})$ , where  $\mathbf{B}$  is the magnetic field,  $\mathbf{H}$  is related to  $\mathbf{B}$  by  $\mathbf{H} = \mu_0^{-1}\mathbf{B}$  ( $\mu_0$  is the vacuum permeability) in a vacuum, and  $\mathcal{S}$  is the boundary surface of the volume  $\mathcal{V}$ . In short, the energy conservation is given by

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E} + \int_{\mathcal{S}} d\mathbf{S} \cdot (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r u \quad (3)$$

where  $u$  is the energy density of the electromagnetic field. The first term looks identical to Eq. (2); thus, it is often said that it expresses the Joule heat.

The Ohm's law was explained by Drude [10], and later by Lorentz [11, 12] and Bohr [13], assuming that the battery connected to the wire generates the electric field  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$  inside it. The law is expressed in a local field relation,

$$\mathbf{j} = \sigma \mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}} \quad (4)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the conductivity of the wire. Then,  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}$  in the first term in Eq. (3) is given by  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}} = \sigma^{-1}\mathbf{j}^2 > 0$ ; here, the plus sign indicates that it is the energy consumed.

The energy flow explained by the Poynting theorem for the above Joule heat generation is known to be rather odd [14]: The radiation enters into the wire from outside as expressed by the Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$  in Eq. (3), and supplies the energy for the Joule heat consumed in the wire. However, it is sensible to consider that the energy for the Joule heat is supplied by the battery through the current flows in the wire.

This problem was taken up by the present author, recently [1]. A sensible explanation is obtained by identifying that the gradient of the chemical potential force is the one accelerates electrons instead of the electric field  $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$ . In other words, the effect of the battery connection is to generate the chemical potential difference inside the wire.

During the time when Drude developed his theory, the chemical potential was unknown. However, it is sensible to consider that the effect of the battery connection is to generate the chemical potential gradient inside the wire since the voltage of the electric battery is the chemical potential difference generated by chemical reactions in the battery. Actually, this fact is also used in the Landauer-Büttiker theory [15, 16, 17], where the chemical potential appears

as the Fermi energy of the distribution function of the free-electron theory of conduction electrons. The chemical potential we concern in the present work originates from the neglected  $U(1)$  phase by Dirac [18, 19]. It includes quantum many-body effects, and the electric current is treated as the fluid flow with the velocity field  $\mathbf{v}$  given by

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{e}{m_e} \left( \mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi \right) \quad (5)$$

where  $-e$  is the charge of electron,  $\mathbf{A}$  is the electromagnetic vector potential,  $m_e$  is the electron mass, and  $\chi$  is an angular variable with period  $2\pi$  that can be attributed to the neglected  $U(1)$  phase.

A salient feature of the above  $\mathbf{v}$  is that the combination  $\mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi$  in it is gauge invariant; namely, the gauge ambiguity of  $\mathbf{A}$  for the same electric and magnetic fields  $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\varphi - \partial_t \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$ , respectively, is absorbed by the freedom in the choice of  $\nabla \chi$ , where  $\varphi$  is the electromagnetic scalar potential. Its time-component gauge invariant partner is  $\varphi + \frac{\hbar}{2e} \partial_t \chi$ . Then, we can identify it to the chemical potential,

$$\mu = e \left( \varphi + \frac{\hbar}{2e} \partial_t \chi \right) \quad (6)$$

since the gauge invariant quantity that appears in the same manner as the scalar potential multiplied by the charge in the Hamiltonian is the chemical potential. We use this form of the chemical potential in the present work. It has been shown that if we calculate the force acting on electrons by the formula,  $m_e \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt}$ , additional forces besides the Lorentz force arise [1]. One of them is the gradient of the chemical potential force given by  $-\nabla\mu$ .

The stable velocity field in Eq. (5) yields persistent current; thus, if such a velocity field is established, the system is superconducting. The stable  $\mathbf{v}$  means that the vector potential  $\mathbf{A}$  is a meaningful physical variable with accompanying  $-\frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi$ . In other words, the stability of  $\mathbf{v}$  with explicit dependency on  $\mathbf{A}$  is controlled by the force  $-\frac{\hbar}{2} \partial_t (\nabla \chi)$  [1]. If the fluctuation of it is strong enough,  $\mathbf{A}$  is excluded from physical variables. We will call this fluctuation, the ‘gauge fluctuation’. We will argue that this fluctuation explains the Planckian dissipation observed in anomalous metals such as high transition temperature cuprate superconductors [3, 4, 5].

The organization of the present work is as follows: First, we put forward a new criterion to differentiate the normal and superconducting states based on the stability of  $\mathbf{v}$  expressed in Eq. (5). Next, we consider the energy flow for a metallic wire connected to a battery; we argue that the battery connection generates  $-\nabla\mu$  inside the wire, and this is the force accelerates electrons. Then, we consider the energy flow during discharging of a capacitor through a resistive wire; in this case, the capacitor acts as the battery for the current generation. We will discuss the Josephson effect in superconductors, including the capacitor contribution. The Josephson junction inherently has a capacitor contribution due to its structure, but this capacitance effect is not included in the original

Josephson's work [20] or the textbook explanation [21]. The derivation with the capacitance contribution indicates that the electrons transfer singly across the junction, in contrast to the Josephson's derivation that assumes the pairwise transfer [20]. We also discuss the Planckian dissipation by considering the gauge fluctuation,  $-\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$ . Lastly, we conclude the present work by discussing implications of the present work.

## 2. Differentiation of normal and superconducting metals.

First, we consider a general case where the Berry connection from many-body wave functions is composed of contributions from a set of states  $\{\Psi_j\}$  whose occupation probability is given by the Boltzmann distribution,

$$\mathbf{A}^{\text{MB}} = \sum_j p_j \mathbf{A}_{\Psi_j}^{\text{MB}}, \quad p_j = \frac{e^{-\frac{E_j}{k_B T}}}{\sum_i e^{-\frac{E_i}{k_B T}}} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_{\Psi_j}^{\text{MB}}$  is the Berry connection from many-body wave functions for the wave function  $\Psi_j$  [22, 1], and  $k_B$  is Planck's constant. We rewrite  $\mathbf{A}^{\text{MB}}$  as

$$\mathbf{A}^{\text{MB}} = -\frac{1}{2}\nabla\chi \quad (8)$$

Here, we do not assume  $\chi$  to be an angular variable with period  $2\pi$  as in superconductors since it may be an average of  $\mathbf{A}_{\Psi_j}^{\text{MB}}$  from many  $\Psi_j$ 's. However, it may be an angular variable with period  $2\pi$  when only one  $\Psi_j$  is involved, which may be superconducting. Anyway, we express  $\mathbf{v}$  in the form given in Eq. (5), and  $\mu$  in Eq. (6).

The current density is given by

$$\mathbf{j} = -en\mathbf{v} = -\frac{e^2 n}{m_e} \left( \mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla\chi \right) \quad (9)$$

where  $n$  is the number density of electrons that flow with  $\mathbf{v}$ . Since  $\mathbf{v}$  is gauge invariant, we may choose  $\mathbf{A}$  in the gauge  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$ . Then, the conservation of the charge for the stationary case yields

$$\nabla^2\chi = 0 \quad (10)$$

where the spatial dependence of the electron number density  $n$  is neglected for simplicity. The solutions to the above equation are characterized by an integer called the 'winding number',

$$w[\chi]_C = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_C \nabla\chi \cdot d\mathbf{r} \quad (11)$$

where  $C$  is a loop in the space. If this number is non-zero, a persistent loop current flows. If a collection of such loop currents is stable, a macroscopic persistent current, 'supercurrent' will be realized. A new superconductivity theory

has been proposed with this view based on the Berry connection from many-body wave functions [18, 19]. This theory encompasses the BCS one, with preserving the experimentally verified results of the BCS theory. The supercurrent in Eq. (9) explains a number of characteristics observed in superconductors as follows:

1. Persistent current:  
Can be explained as due to the presence of  $\chi$  with stable non-zero  $w[\chi]_C$  [22].
2. Meissner effect:  
If  $\nabla \times$  is operated on the both sides of Eq. (9),  $\nabla^2 \mathbf{B} = \frac{e^2 n}{m_e} \mathbf{B}$  is obtained. This is the equation obtained by London for explaining the Meissner effect.
3. Flux quantization:  
If we take a loop  $C$  in Eq. (11) along a path inside a ring-shaped superconductor where  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{j} = 0$ , we obtain  $\oint_C \mathbf{A} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \frac{\hbar}{2e} w[\chi]_C$ . This explains the observed flux quantization.
4. London moment:  
Consider a rotating superconductor with an angular velocity  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ . The velocity field inside the superconductor is  $\mathbf{v} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \times \mathbf{r}$ . Substitute  $\mathbf{v}$  in Eq. (5) to this, and operate  $\nabla \times$  on the both sides of it, the relation  $2\boldsymbol{\omega} = \frac{e}{m_e} \mathbf{B}$  is obtained. This indicates that the magnetic field  $\mathbf{B} = \frac{2m_e}{e} \boldsymbol{\omega}$  is created inside the superconductor. This magnetic field is called the ‘London magnetic field’ and the magnetic moment associated by it is the ‘London moment’, which has been observed experimentally.

The pairing stabilization, which is explained by the BCS theory, exists in the new theory [18, 19].

The normal conductor is the one without non-trivial  $\chi$  that satisfies Eq. (10). In this case, the gauge ambiguity of  $\mathbf{A}$  in Eq. (9) is not absorbed by  $\chi$ . If  $\mathbf{j}$  is calculated as an average value over different  $\nabla \chi$ , it will result in zero.

In the following, we assume that the situation where fluctuating of  $\nabla \chi$  leads to zero  $\mathbf{j}$ . Such a fluctuation is expected if  $\{\Psi_j\}$  includes many states, and transitions between them occur, frequently. We use the following Langevin equation to take into account of it,

$$m_e \frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dt} = -\frac{m_e}{\tau} \mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\eta}, \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \partial_t (\nabla \chi) \quad (12)$$

where  $\tau$  is the relaxation time. The thermal average of the noise  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_i, \eta_2, \eta_3)$  satisfies the following relations,

$$\langle \eta_i(t) \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \eta_i(t) \eta_j(t') \rangle = \frac{2m_e k_B T}{\tau} \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t') \quad (13)$$

where  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant;  $k_B T$  arises from the assumption that the thermal average of velocity  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2} m \langle v_i^2(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} k_B T \quad (14)$$

according to the equipartition theorem [23].

The Langevin equation in Eq. (12) with an additional force  $\mathbf{F}$  on the right-hand-side has the solution,

$$\langle \mathbf{v}(t) \rangle = \frac{\tau}{m} \mathbf{F} (1 - e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}}) + \langle \mathbf{v}(0) \rangle e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}} \quad (15)$$

which yields

$$\langle \mathbf{v}(\infty) \rangle = \frac{\tau}{m} \mathbf{F} \quad (16)$$

This is the stationary velocity after the application of the perturbation  $\mathbf{F}$ . The situation relevant to the Ohm's law is the one where the above stationary current flows in a wire connected to a battery.

### 3. Energy flow for a metallic wire connected to a battery.




Figure 1: A part of a metallic wire connected to a battery. The electric current  $I$  flows in the wire, generating a circumferential magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  around the wire. In the Drude model, the battery connection gives rise to the electric field  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$  inside the wire. The Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}} \times \mathbf{B} / \mu_0$  points radially inwards to the wire, thus, radiation enters into the wire. The radiation energy entered is consumed as the Joule heat  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$  in the wire.

Let us consider a metallic wire connected to a battery. The standard theory consider that the effect of the battery connection is to generate the electric field  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$  inside the battery (see Fig. 1).

However, the Berry connection from many-body wave functions provides additional forces on electrons in electromagnetic field beyond [1]. The relevant forces we consider are

$$\mathbf{F}_{\text{wire}} = -e\mathbf{E} - \nabla\mu_b \quad (17)$$

where  $b$  in the chemical potential  $\mu_b$  indicates that it is the battery origin (see Fig. 2).




Figure 2: The same as in Fig. 1 but the battery connection gives rise to the chemical potential gradient  $-\nabla\mu_b$  inside the wire. An electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  is generated to counteract the force from the gradient of  $-\nabla\mu_b$ ; due to the balance of the two forces, the electrons perform uniform translational motion. The Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/\mu_0$  points radially outwards from the wire, thus, radiation is emitted. The radiation energy emitted is equal to the Joule heat  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}$ , which is the work done by the battery.

Since the voltage  $V$  in Eq. (1) arises from the chemical potential difference realized by some processes inside the battery, we express  $V$  as

$$V = e^{-1} \int_1^2 \nabla\mu_b \cdot d\mathbf{r} = e^{-1}(\mu_b(2) - \mu_b(1)) \quad (18)$$

where ‘1’ and ‘2’ denote the coordinates of the battery connecting points. We take  $-\nabla\mu_b$  as  $\mathbf{F}$  in Eq. (16) Then, the local version of the Ohm’s law is given by

$$\mathbf{j} = e^{-1}\sigma\nabla\mu_b \quad (19)$$

with replacing  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}}$  by  $e^{-1}\nabla\mu_b$ .

Using Eq. (16), the current density is now given by

$$\mathbf{j} = -en\langle\mathbf{v}(\infty)\rangle = -en\frac{\tau}{m}(-\nabla\mu_b) = \frac{en\tau}{m}\nabla\mu_b \quad (20)$$

Thus, the conductivity has the usual well-known form

$$\sigma = \frac{e^2n\tau}{m_e} \quad (21)$$

When the stationary current is established, the net force acting on conduction electrons should be zero. This means that the force balance  $\mathbf{F}_{\text{wire}} = 0$  should be satisfied. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{E} = -e^{-1}\nabla\mu_b \quad (22)$$

This electric field is generated as a response of conduction electrons and background ions in the wire to the battery connection. The origin of the electric field will be the rearrangement of the charge distribution by collisions among the electrons and those between the electrons and the background ions.

Since the direction of  $\mathbf{E}$  is opposite to the current direction, the direction of the Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{B}/\mu_0$  points radially outwards from the wire. Let us assume the part of the wire depicted is a cylindrical shape with circular cross sectional area of radius  $r$  and length  $\ell$ . Then, a magnetic field with the magnitude  $H = \frac{I}{2\pi r}$  exists at the surface of the wire. The magnitude of the Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$  is  $\frac{IE}{2\pi r}$ . By integrating it over the side surface of the cylinder, the total energy flow is obtained as

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} d\mathbf{S} \cdot (\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}) = IE\ell \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the surface of the cylinder; the Poynting vector goes out only through the side surface of the cylinder with area  $2\pi r\ell$ . Since  $\mathbf{E}$  points in the opposite direction to  $\mathbf{j}$ , we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E} = - \int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r jE = -IE\ell \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the volume of the cylinder, and relation  $I = j\pi r^2$  is used. Then, the relation in Eq. (3) is satisfied since the electromagnetic field energy in the wire is constant.

In the text textbook explanation, the Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}} \times \mathbf{H}$  points radially inwards to the wire, supplying energy for the Joule heat  $\mathbf{E}_{\text{Drude}} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \sigma^{-1}\mathbf{j}^2$  [14]. In the present explanation, the Poynting vector points radially outwards; the term with  $\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E}$  has the minus sign, indicating that it is the work done by the battery. Thus, the Poynting theorem now states that the energy for the emitted radiation is supplied by the battery through the wire. This emitted radiation is the Joule heat.

Note that the word ‘potential’ is used to refer to both the the potential from the voltage of the battery and the scalar potential of the electric field. They are physically different as is manifested in Eq. (6): The voltage from the battery is the chemical potential  $\mu$ , which is gauge invariant; on the other hand, the scalar potential  $\varphi$  for the electric field is gauge dependent, and can be made zero since the electric field can be expressed without using it by  $\mathbf{E} = -\partial_t \mathbf{A}$ . Note that the confusion between these two potentials are prevalent in textbooks and literatures.



#### 4. Energy flow during discharging of a capacitor




Figure 3: A capacitor of capacitance  $C$  with charge  $Q$  stored and a wire with resistance  $R$  that shunts the capacitor. During discharging  $Q$  is decreasing as  $Q(t) = Q_0 e^{-\frac{t}{RC}}$ , where  $Q_0$  is the initial charge at  $t = 0$ . The electric current  $I = \frac{dQ}{dt}$  flows after  $t = 0$ . We assume the balance of the voltage given in Eq. (25) is maintained in the quasi-stationary current situation. The electric field energy originally stored between the electrodes is  $\frac{Q_0^2}{2C}$ , which is emitted as the radiation from the wire.

Let us consider the discharging of a capacitor. In the beginning, the charges  $+Q_0$  and  $-Q_0$  are on each electrodes of the capacitor, respectively (see Fig. 3), and the chemical potential difference  $Q_0/C$  exists across the electrodes, where  $C$  is the capacitance of the capacitor. We may consider that this situation is realized first by connecting the capacitor to a battery of the voltage  $Q_0/C$ , and then, by disconnecting the battery after the charging that establishes the voltage balance between the battery and the capacitor.

The energy stored as the energy of the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  between the electrodes. The balance of the voltage between the chemical potential difference between the two electrodes and the electromagnetic field  $\mathbf{E}$  in the space between the electrodes is given by

$$V = - \int_1^2 \mathbf{E} \cdot d\ell = \frac{1}{-e} \int_1^2 \nabla \mu_c \cdot d\ell \quad (25)$$

where ‘1’ and ‘2’ indicate points in the electrodes; the subscript  $c$  in the chemical potential indicates that it is the capacitor origin.

Now, we shunt the capacitor by the connection of a resistive wire. We assume a quasi-stationary current flows. It flows due to the chemical potential difference between the electrodes. The capacitor acts as the battery that produces the gradient of the chemical potential  $\nabla \mu_c$ . The decrease of the electric field  $\mathbf{E}$  occurs due to the decrease of the charge stored on the capacitor, and the electric field energy stored is reduced. A typical textbook explanation is as follows: The variation of  $\mathbf{E}$  generates a magnetic field  $\mathbf{B}$  by the displacement current, and the Poynting vector  $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$  directing radially outwards from the capacitor is generated. The reduction of the electric field energy occurs due to the outward radiation from the space between the electrodes.

On the other hand, the present explanation is as follows:  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\varphi$  are fundamental physical quantities instead of  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ ; then,  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are two disguises of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\varphi$ . If we adopt the gauge  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} = 0$ , the vector potential is given by

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \int d^3r' \frac{\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{r}', t - |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|/c)}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \quad (26)$$

where  $c$  is the speed of light [24]. This indicates that only the true current  $\mathbf{j}$  generates  $\mathbf{A}$ ; thus, the generation of  $\mathbf{B}$  by the displacement current does not occur. The energy flow occurs through the wire by the current generated by the chemical potential gradient generated by the capacitor that acts as a battery. Applying Eq. (24) for the wire in Fig. 3 with neglecting the effect of bending of the wire, the rate of the work done by the capacitor is calculated as

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} d^3r \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{E} = I(t)V(t) \quad (27)$$

where  $V(t)$  is the voltage on the capacitor,  $I(t)$  is the current flowing in the wire, and now  $\mathcal{V}$  is the volume of the shunt wire. The total work done by the capacitor is obtained by integrating Eq. (27) in the time interval  $0 \leq t \leq \infty$  as

$$\int_0^\infty I(t)V(t)dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{dQ(t)}{dt} \frac{Q(t)}{C} dt = -\frac{Q_0^2}{C} \quad (28)$$

where  $Q(t) = Q_0 e^{-\frac{1}{\kappa C}t}$  is used. The total work capacitor done is equal to the energy stored originally as the electric field. As shown in Eq. (23), this energy is equal to the energy irradiated from the wire as the Joule heat.

## 5. Josephson junction




Figure 4: Josephson Junction composed of two superconducting electrodes ( $S_1$  and  $S_2$ ) and an insulator (gray region) between them. This structure inherently has a capacitor contribution due to the presence of two electrodes facing each other with the insulator between them.

Now we consider the supercurrent flow through the Josephson junction. The Josephson junction is schematically depicted in Fig. 4. The current through it is given by

$$I = I_c \sin \phi \quad (29)$$

where  $I_c$  is the critical current of the junction and  $\phi$  is the superconducting phase difference between the two superconductors [21]. When a finite voltage exists across the Josephson junction, the time variation of  $\phi$  given by

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{2eV}{\hbar} \quad (30)$$

occurs, where  $V$  is the voltage across the junction. This formula has been confirmed, experimentally [25]. This formula was first obtained by Josephson [20], and also derived by Feynman in his textbook [21]. By assuming the Cooper-pair tunneling,  $\phi$  is given by

$$\phi = \frac{2e}{\hbar} \int_1^2 \left( \mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi \right) \cdot d\mathbf{r} \quad (31)$$

where ‘1’ and ‘2’ are points in the two superconductors  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  of the junction, respectively. Note that  $(\mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi)$  is gauge invariant, and  $2e$  in the factor  $\frac{2e}{\hbar}$  is the Cooper-pair charge.




Figure 5: A Josephson junction composed of a capacitor with capacitance  $C_J$  and an electron transfer part with critical current  $I_c$ .

Note that a Josephson junction is composed of an electron transfer contribution and a capacitor contribution as depicted with circuit elements in Fig. 5. The capacitor contribution arises from the structure of two facing electrodes as seen in Fig. 4. The tunneling electron goes through the transfer part with experiencing the electric field between the superconducting electrodes giving rise to the capacitor contribution. This capacitor contribution is lacking in the Josephson’s and textbook derivations [20, 21].

Let us calculate the time derivative of Eq. (31) with including the capacitor contribution. The result is

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{2e}{\hbar} \int_1^2 \left( \partial_t \mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \partial_t \chi \right) \cdot d\mathbf{r}$$

$$= \frac{2e}{\hbar} \int_1^2 (-\mathbf{E} - e^{-1}\nabla\mu) \cdot d\mathbf{r} \quad (32)$$

where  $\mu$  in Eq. (6) and  $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla\varphi - \partial_t\mathbf{A}$  are used. The voltage balance between the gradient of the chemical potential part and the electric field part gives rise to the relation in Eq. (25). Then, we have  $\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{4eV}{\hbar}$ , which disagrees with Eq. (30). This discrepancy is resolved if we consider that the electron transfer occurs singly, not pair-wise. This indicates that the factor  $\frac{2e}{\hbar}$  in Eq. (31) is actually  $\frac{e}{\hbar}$ .

Since the pairing stabilization exists in superconductors, there are situations where subsequent single electron transfers observed as the pair-wise transfers. Thus, this result does not contradict experiment. It is noteworthy that it explains the so-called ‘quasiparticle poisoning problem’: In quantum electronic circuits with Josephson junctions, a large amount of excited single electrons in Josephson junctions is observed, with the observed ratio of their number to the Cooper pair number  $10^{-9} \sim 10^{-5}$  in disagreement with the standard theory ratio  $10^{-52}$ [26, 27]; this may be the consequence of abundant single-electron transfer.

## 6. Planckian dissipation

We consider another superconductivity related problem. It is so-called, the ‘Planckian dissipation’ problem. The dissipations with the relaxation time of the Planckian time (defined as  $\tau_{Pl} = \frac{\hbar}{k_B T}$ ) order have been observed in anomalous metals [3, 4, 5], including the high transition temperature cuprate superconductors. It is believed that the elucidation of it is the key to understand the cuprate superconductivity. We examine this problem with the fluctuation of  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = -\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$  in Eq. (12).

As Eq. (6) indicates, to have an average zero fluctuation for  $\mu$ , the fluctuation of  $-\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$  may be similar to that of  $-e\nabla\varphi$ ; i.e., it may be a longitudinal electric field type. Let us estimate  $\tau$  from Eq. (12) by replacing  $-\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$  with  $-e\nabla\varphi$ ,

$$\tau = \frac{2m_e k_B T}{e^2 \langle E_x(t) E_x(t') \rangle} \delta(t - t') \approx \frac{2m_e k_B T}{e^2 \langle E_x(t) E_x(t) \rangle} \frac{1}{\tau_E} \quad (33)$$

where  $E_x = -\partial\varphi$  is taken in the direction of the current assuming it is along the  $x$  axis; and the effect of the delta function is replaced by a temperature independent constant  $\tau_E$  with the dimension of time. We may express the electric field  $E_x(t)$  using the creation and annihilation operators for the photon with energy  $\hbar\omega_n$ ,  $\hat{a}_{k_n}^\dagger$  and  $\hat{a}_{k_n}$ , respectively:

$$E_x(t) = i \sum_n \sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_n}{2\epsilon_0 L_x L_y L_z}} \left( \hat{a}_{k_n} e^{-i(\omega_n t - k_n x)} - \hat{a}_{k_n}^\dagger e^{i(\omega_n t - k_n x)} \right) \quad (34)$$

$L_x L_y L_z$  is the volume of a rectangular cuboid with length  $L_x$  in the  $x$  direction, width  $L_y$  in the  $y$  direction, and height  $L_z$  in the  $z$  direction; the wave number

$k_n$  is given by  $k_n = \frac{2\pi}{L_x}n$ , ( $n$  is an integer), and  $\omega_n$  by  $\omega_n = c|k_n|$  where  $c$  is the speed of light.

Then,  $\langle E_x(t)E_x(t) \rangle$  is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned}\langle E_x(t)E_x(t) \rangle &= \sum_n \frac{\hbar\omega_n}{2\epsilon_0 L_x L_y L_z} \langle 2\hat{a}_{k_n}^\dagger \hat{a}_{k_n} + 1 \rangle \\ &\approx \frac{1}{\pi\epsilon_0 L_y L_z} \int_0^\infty dk \hbar ck e^{-\frac{\hbar ck}{k_B T}} \\ &= \frac{\hbar c}{\pi\epsilon_0 L_y L_z} \left( \frac{k_B T}{\hbar c} \right)^2\end{aligned}\quad (35)$$

where the sum  $\sum_n$  is replaced by  $\frac{L_x}{2\pi} \int dk$  and the approximation  $\langle 2\hat{a}_{k_n}^\dagger \hat{a}_{k_n} + 1 \rangle \approx 2e^{-\frac{\hbar c|k_n|}{k_B T}}$  is used, where  $e^{-\frac{\hbar c|k_n|}{k_B T}}$  is the Boltzmann factor. Then,  $\tau$  is given by

$$\tau \approx \frac{m_e L_y L_z}{2\alpha \hbar \tau_E} \frac{\hbar}{k_B T} \quad (36)$$

where  $\alpha \approx \frac{1}{137}$  is the fine structure constant. There are unknown parameters,  $L_y$ ,  $L_z$  and  $\tau_E$ , but  $\tau$  exhibits the dependence on  $\frac{\hbar}{k_B T}$ , a signature of the Planckian dissipation. Due to the presence of  $\alpha^{-1}$ , however, the above estimate is too large to explain the observed  $\tau \sim \frac{\hbar}{k_B T}$  relation if unknown parameters are in the order of 1 in the atomic units.

Let us now estimate  $\tau$  using the fluctuation of  $-\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$ , the ‘gauge fluctuation’ associated with the fluctuation of the winding number in Eq. (11). First, we write  $\tau$  as

$$\tau = \frac{2m_e k_B T}{\frac{\hbar^2}{4} \langle \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t') \rangle} \delta(t-t') \approx \frac{2m_e k_B T}{\frac{\hbar^2}{4} \langle \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \rangle} \frac{1}{\tau_\chi} \quad (37)$$

where the effect of the delta function is replaced by a temperature independent constant  $\tau_E$  with the dimension of time.

We also perform the following approximation

$$\partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \approx \frac{\partial_x \chi(t + \tau_\chi) - \partial_x \chi(t)}{\tau_\chi} \approx \frac{\partial_x \chi(t + \tau_\chi)}{\tau_\chi}, \text{ or } \frac{-\partial_x \chi(t)}{\tau_\chi} \quad (38)$$

This approximation is based on the assumption that the abrupt change of  $\partial_x \chi$  occurs in an average interval of  $\tau_\chi$ , and the abrupt change is due to the creation or annihilation of the vortices of  $\nabla\chi$  that is approximated as  $\partial_x \chi = 0$  in the before or in the after. We assume such abrupt change occurs as the consequence of the fluctuation of the winding number in Eq. (11).

Using the above approximation and assuming that the vortices exit in the  $xy$  plane, we have

$$\langle \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \partial_t \partial_x \chi(t) \rangle \approx \frac{1}{\tau_\chi^2} \langle \partial_x \chi(t) \partial_x \chi(t) \rangle \approx \frac{1}{2\tau_\chi^2} \langle (\nabla\chi(t))^2 \rangle \quad (39)$$

Next, we use the following approximation for the thermal average,

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{8m_e} \langle (\nabla\chi(t))^2 \rangle \approx 2 \frac{1}{\Delta E_\chi} \int_0^\infty dE_\chi E_\chi e^{-\frac{E_\chi}{k_B T}} = \frac{2}{\Delta E_\chi} (k_B T)^2 \quad (40)$$

where  $E_\chi = \frac{\hbar^2}{8m_e} (\nabla\chi(t))^2$  is used for the energy for the vortex of  $\chi$ ; it is the kinetic energy of mass  $m_e$  and the velocity  $\frac{\hbar}{2m_e} \nabla\chi$  given in Eq. (5) with neglecting  $\mathbf{A}$ .  $\Delta E_\chi$  is the typical energy fluctuation caused by the gauge fluctuation; and factor 2 takes into account the degeneracy due to the state with  $\nabla\chi$  and that with  $-\nabla\chi$ .

Overall,  $\tau$  is given by

$$\tau \approx \frac{\tau_\chi \Delta E_\chi}{k_B T} \approx \frac{\hbar}{k_B T} \quad (41)$$

where  $\tau_\chi \Delta E_\chi \approx \hbar$  is used in the last equality. This explains the Planckian time-scale.

The above Planckian time behavior was observed in the cuprate superconductor  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CuO}_{6+\delta}$  from the superconducting transition temperature  $T_c \approx 7$  up to 700 K [28]. The superconductivity in the cuprate occurs in the  $\text{CuO}_2$  plane [29, 30]; and an estimate of the transition temperature indicates it corresponds to the stabilization of nanometer-sized loop currents in that plane [31]. The BKT transition type superconducting transition temperature behavior in the cuprate also indicates it is related to the stabilization of loop currents [32]. A computer simulation for a model for loop currents in the cuprate exhibits that the superconducting transition temperature corresponds to the temperature where the fluctuation of  $-\frac{\hbar}{2} \partial_t (\nabla\chi)$  is suppressed [33]. Taking into account of all the results, it is sensible to consider that the Planckian time behavior of the relaxation time in the cuprate superconductivity is related to the superconducting mechanism of it, and the supercurrent is generated as a collection of stable loop currents of the nanometer size in the  $\text{CuO}_2$  plane.

## 7. Concluding remarks

In textbooks, the Ohm's law is explained by assuming that the effect of the battery connection is to generate electric field inside the metallic wire. During the development of the Drude theory, the force from the gradient of chemical potential was not known; thus, the forces used were the electric field force and the friction force. By considering the balance of them, the conductivity was obtained. Since the friction force causes the energy dissipation, the Joule heat was attributed to it. However, this theory is known to give an odd energy flow when the Poynting theorem is used [14]. We have rectified this oddness by including the gradient of the chemical potential force. Note that the Drude theory is applicable for the optical conductivity case, where the radiation enters from outside, and absorbed by the wire.

The chemical potential employed in this work is not the thermodynamical origin, in contrast to the one introduced by Gibbs [2]. In the electron gas theory by Sommerfeld [34], the chemical potential appears in the Fermi distribution function. In the more elaborated Boltzmann equation method, the spatial variation of the chemical potential is taken into account, and the chemical potential gradient force appears. However it starts from the free electron model, thus, cannot be applied to highly correlated electron systems. On the other hand, the present method starts from the many-body wave function, thus, the many-body effect is included from the beginning. This point is crucial to explain the Planckian dissipation problem.

For the explanation of the Planckian dissipation problem, ‘gauge fluctuation’, the fluctuation of  $-\frac{\hbar}{2}\partial_t(\nabla\chi)$ , is the key ingredient. If this fluctuation is suppressed ( $\mathbf{A} - \frac{\hbar}{2e}\nabla\chi$ ) becomes gauge invariant; then,  $\mathbf{v}$  that explicitly depends on  $\mathbf{A}$  is realized. Conversely, we may say that the reason for the gauge invariance in  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  in the classical electromagnetic theory is due to the fact that it deals with cases where the ‘gauge fluctuation’ is so large that physical variables are those survive the noise from it; and  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  are such variables.

In Maxwell’s equations,  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\varphi$  do not appear, although Maxwell used them to formulate the equations [35]. Feynman stated, ‘If we take away the scaffolding he used to build it, we find that Maxwell’s beautiful edifice stands on its own’ [36]. The present work indicates the need for the revision of this statement: What used to be considered as the scaffolding is actually part of the edifice; the noise from ‘gauge fluctuation’ blurs its appearance, and we have been mistakenly consider the part made of  $\mathbf{E}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$  exhibits the whole beauty of the edifice. If the noise is cleared, the true beauty of the edifice is revealed. It is made of  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\varphi$  with accompanying the Berry connection.

## References

- [1] H. Koizumi, Constrained hamiltonian dynamics for electrons in magnetic field and additional forces besides the lorentz force acting on electrons, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* 57 (2024) 435304.
- [2] J. W. Gibbs, On the equilibrium of heterogeneous substances. first part, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 3 (1876) 108–248.
- [3] S. Sachdev, J. Ye, Universal quantum-critical dynamics of two-dimensional antiferromagnets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 69 (1992) 2411–2414. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.2411.  
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.69.2411>
- [4] J. Zaanen, Planckian dissipation, minimal viscosity and the transport in cuprate strange metals, *SciPost Phys.* 6 (2019) 061. doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.6.5.061.  
URL <https://scipost.org/10.21468/SciPostPhys.6.5.061>

- [5] S. A. Hartnoll, A. P. Mackenzie, Colloquium: Planckian dissipation in metals, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 94 (2022) 041002. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.94.041002.  
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.94.041002>
- [6] G. S. Ohm, *Die galvanische Kette, mathematisch bearbeitet*, T. H. Riemann, Berlin, 1827.
- [7] J. C. Maxwell (Ed.), *The Electrical Researches of the Honourable Henry Cavendish, F.R.S., Written Between 1771 and 1781*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1879.
- [8] J. P. Joule, On the heat evolved by metallic conductors of electricity, and in the cells of a battery during electrolysis, *Philosophical Magazine* 19 (1841) 260.
- [9] J. H. Poynting, On the transfer of energy in the electromagnetic field, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* 175 (1884) 343—361.
- [10] P. Drude, Zur elektronentheorie der metalle, *Annalen der Physik* 306 (1900) 566—613.
- [11] H. A. Lorentz, Le mouvement des électros dans les métaux, *Ach. néerl.* 10 (1905) 336.
- [12] H. A. Lorentz, *The theory of electrons and its applications to the phenomena of light and radiant heat*, 2nd Edition, Dover, New York, 1952.
- [13] N. Bohr, *Studier over metallernes elektrontheori*, Thaning & Appel, Copenhagen, 1911.
- [14] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. II, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1963, Ch. 27-5.
- [15] R. Landauer, Spatial variation of currents and fields due to localized scatterers in metallic conduction, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* 1 (1957) 223.
- [16] M. Büttiker, Y. Imry, R. Landauer, S. Pinhas, Generalized many-channel conductance formula with application to small rings, *Phys. Rev. B* 31 (1985) 6207–6215. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.31.6207.  
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.31.6207>
- [17] S. Datta, *Electronic Transports in Mesoscopic Systems*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [18] H. Koizumi, Schrödinger representation of quantum mechanics, berry connection, and superconductivity, *Physics Letters A* 450 (2022) 128367. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physleta.2022.128367>.  
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0375960122004492>



- [19] H. Koizumi, Neglected  $u(1)$  phase in the schroedinger representation of quantum mechanics and particle number conserving formalisms for superconductivity, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 56 (2023) 455303.
- [20] B. D. Josephson, Possible new effects in superconductive tunneling, *Phys. Lett.* 1 (1962) 251.
- [21] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. III, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1963, Ch. 21-9.
- [22] H. Koizumi, Supercurrent and electromotive force generations by the berry connection from many-body wave functions, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 56 (18) (2023) 185301. doi:10.1088/1751-8121/acc858.  
URL <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/acc858>
- [23] C. Gardiner, P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise*, 3rd Edition, Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [24] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. II, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1963, Ch. 21-3.
- [25] S. Shapiro, Josephson currents in superconducting tunneling: the effect of microwaves and other observations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 11 (1963) 80.
- [26] J. Aumentado, G. Catelani, K. Serniak, Quasiparticle poisoning in superconducting quantum computers, *Physics Today* 76 (8) (2023) 34–39.
- [27] K. Serniak, Nonequilibrium quasiparticles in superconducting qubits, PhD thesis, Yale University (2019).
- [28] S. Martin, A. T. Fiory, R. M. Fleming, L. F. Schneemeyer, J. V. Waszczak, Normal-state transport properties of  $\text{Bi}_{2+x}\text{Sr}_{2-y}\text{CuO}_{6+\delta}$  crystals, *Phys. Rev. B* 41 (1990) 846–849. doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.41.846.  
URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevB.41.846>
- [29] D. Jiang, T. Hu, L. You, Q. Li, A. Li, H. Wang, G. Mu, Z. Chen, H. Zhang, G. Yu, J. Zhu, Q. Sun, C. Lin, H. Xiao, X. Xie, M. Jiang, High- $t_c$  superconductivity in ultrathin  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+x}$  down to half-unit-cell thickness by protection with graphene., *Nat Commun* 5 (2014) 5708. doi:10.1038/ncomms6708.
- [30] Y. Yu, L. Ma, P. Cai, R. Zhong, C. Ye, J. Shen, G. D. Gu, X. H. Chen, Y. Zhang, High-temperature superconductivity in monolayer  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ , *Nature* 575 (7781) (2019) 156–163. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1718-x.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1718-x>
- [31] V. J. Emery, S. A. Kivelson, Importance of phase fluctuation in superconductors with small superfluid density, *Nature* 374 (1995) 434.

- [32] L. Zhang, C. Kang, C. Liu, K. Wang, W. Zhang, Two-dimensional superconducting nature of  $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$  thin films revealed by BKT transition, *RSC Adv.* 13 (2023) 25797–25803. doi:10.1039/D3RA02701E.  
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/D3RA02701E>
- [33] A. Okazaki, H. Wakaura, H. Koizumi, M. A. Ghantous, M. Tachiki, Superconducting transition temperature of the hole-doped cuprate as the stabilization temperature of supercurrent loops generated by spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons, *J. Supercond. Nov. Magn.* 28 (2015) 3221–3233.
- [34] A. Sommerfeld, Zur elektronentheorie der metalle auf grund der fermischen statistik, *Zeitschrift für Physik* 47 (1) (1928) 1–32. doi:10.1007/BF01391052.  
URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01391052>
- [35] J. Maxwell, *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, 3rd Edition, Dover, 1954.
- [36] R. P. Feynman, R. B. Leighton, M. Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol. II, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1963, Ch. 18-1.