

# Reply to Comment on “Quantum Force in a Superconductor”

A. V. Nikulov

*Institute of Microelectronics Technology and High Purity Materials, Russian Academy of Sciences, 142432 Chernogolovka, Moscow District, RUSSIA*

A reply is made to Comment by D.P.Sheehan in which he takes notice that the quantum force introduced in my earlier paper A.V.Nikulov, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 012505 (2001) challenges to the absolute status of the second law of thermodynamics. It is shown that the introduction of the quantum force explains only an experimental challenge to the second law. The observation of the persistent current at non-zero resistance  $R > 0$  is experimental evidence of violation of the postulate saving the second law in the beginning of the 20 century. According to this postulate any Brownian motion is absolutely random whereas the persistent current at  $R > 0$  is a regulated Brownian motion.

PACS numbers: 74.20.De, 73.23.Ra, 64.70.-p

D.P.Sheehan writes in the Comment [1] that some statements of [2] would seem to pit some of the central predictions of quantum mechanics against the absolute status of the second law of thermodynamics. He has paid heed that “the combination of the persistent currents and voltages in the presence of dissipation, particularly if they are driven by thermal fluctuations, is troublesome since it would appear to allow for the performance of work solely at the expense of heat energy under equilibrium conditions”. These remarks are correct.

Indeed the combination of the persistent currents and voltages is the persistent power (i.e. the dc power in the equilibrium state). It is written in [2] that the inhomogeneous superconducting loop with a nonzero persistent voltage  $V_{p.v.} \neq 0$  is an electric circuit in which the  $l_a$  segment with higher  $T_c$  is a power source and the  $l_b$  segment with lower  $T_c$  is a load. The existence of such persistent power source threatens the second law although its violation can not be without any external load, when all power induced in the  $l_a$  segment is dissipated in the  $l_b$  segment. Real violation of the second law will take place when an external load with a resistance  $R_l$  is linked up the  $l_a$  segment and the power  $W_l = V_{p.v.}^2 R_l / (R_l + R_b)^2$  can be used for an useful work.  $R_b$  is the resistance of the  $l_b$  segment.

If the external load is an electricmotor then violation of the Thomson’s formulation takes place, if it is a resistance at higher temperature then the Clausius’s formulation is broken. The total entropy might be systematically reduced, contrary to the second law, when the power  $W_l$  is transformed to an ordered energy, for example when an electricmotor turns a fly-wheel. In this process the chaotic energy of thermal fluctuations, i.e. the heat energy  $Q$ , is transformed in the ordered energy of the revolving fly-wheel, i.e. the total heat energy is systematically reduced with the velocity  $dQ/dt = -W_l$  (for the ideal case) and the total entropy is reduced with the velocity  $dS/dt = -W_l/T$ .

In order to solve the found contradictions of [2] with the second law of thermodynamics D.P. Sheehan proposes two alternatives: 1) the theoretical description of quantum force system published in Phys.Rev.B [2] is incomplete, or 2) either our tradition understanding of

quantum mechanics is incomplete or the second law is violable. Because of the predominant belief in the inviolability of the second law and of the strong internal consistency and experimental support for traditional quantum mechanics D.P.Sheehan has chosen the (1) alternative and implies the existence of a compensating counterforce which exactly offsets the quantum force introduced in [2].

Any theoretical description may be incomplete and/or incorrect. And if a description contradicts to the second law almost everyone decides without any reflection that it can not be correct. Arthur Eddington wrote in 1948 [3]: *The second law of thermodynamics holds, I think, the supreme position among the laws of Nature. If someone points out to you that your pet theory of the universe is in disagreement with Maxwell’s equations - then so much the worse for Maxwell’s equations. If it is found to be contradicted by observation, well, these experimentalists do bungle things sometimes. But if your theory is found to be against the second law of thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but collapse in deepest humiliation.* Nevertheless I propose to do not conclude without a careful investigation of the problem.

Even if we pass a resolution that the theoretical description published in Phys.Rev.B [2] is incomplete or incorrect the challenge to the second law could not be removed. D.P.Sheehan writes that the dissipation of the  $I^2 R$  power during indefinite time threatens the absolute status of the second law. It is correct statement. Indeed, any power dissipation during indefinite time can not exist without a power source with  $W_s = I^2 R$ . The existence of such power source is the real challenge to the second law if the current  $I$  is not chaotic. The persistent current is not chaotic and it is observed at  $R > 0$  according to the Little-Parks experiment [4].

Thus the initial challenge to the second law is the Little-Parks experiment [4]. According to the universally recognized explanation [5] of this experiment the resistance oscillations are observed [6] because of the oscillations of the persistent current. The work [2] explains only why the persistent current can be observed in a loop [6] at non-zero resistance  $R > 0$  and zero Faraday’s voltage  $d\Phi/dt = 0$ . The Little-Parks experiment is not only experimental evidence of the persistent current at  $R > 0$ .

The persistent current at  $R > 0$  was predicted [7] and observed [8] also in normal metal mesoscopic loops. But the Little-Parks experiment is first and most reliable evidence.

The quantum force  $F_q$  introduced in [2] takes the place of the Faraday's voltage  $-(1/c)d\Phi/dt$  which maintains the screening current in a conventional loop with  $R > 0$ . The current  $j$  is stationary  $dj/dt = 0$  in a conventional loop if the electric force  $F_e = eE = -(e/c)d\Phi/dt$  offsets the dissipation force  $F_e = eE = -F_{dis} = e\rho j$ . Because the dissipation force should act at  $\rho > 0$  and  $j \neq 0$  the persistent current can exist only if a force offsets the dissipation force. Therefore the introduction of the quantum force in [2] is well-grounded. D.P.Sheehan assumes the existence of a compensating counterforce which exactly offsets the quantum force. This compensating counterforce can be only the dissipation force. In the opposed case the balance of the forces would be broken. If an other compensating counterforce exactly offsets the quantum force then we should introduce an additional force in order to explain the observation of the persistent current at  $R > 0$ .

According to [2] the persistent current  $j_{p.c.}$  does not go out slowly at  $R > 0$  and  $d\Phi/dt = 0$  since the momentum circulation of superconducting pairs  $\oint_l dl p = \oint_l dl(2mv_s + (2e/c)A)$  should change at each closing of the superconducting state in the loop from  $(2e/c)\Phi$  to  $n2\pi\hbar$  because of the quantization. The velocity of the momentum change equals a force inducing this change. Therefore the circulation of the quantum force  $\oint_l dl F_q = 2\pi\hbar(n - \Phi/\Phi_0)\omega_{sw}$ , where  $\Phi_0 = \pi\hbar c/e$  is the flux quantum;  $\omega_{sw}$  is the average frequency of switching of the loop between superconducting states with different connectivity.

The quantum force is not connected somehow with the  $T_c$ -inhomogeneity. It can act in both inhomogeneous and homogeneous loops. But the persistent voltage can be observed only in an inhomogeneous loop. The possibility of the persistent voltage predicted in [2] is obvious from an analogy with a conventional inhomogeneous loop. According to the Ohm's law  $\rho j = E = -\nabla V - (1/c)dA/dt = -\nabla V - (1/c)d\Phi/dt$  the potential difference  $V = (\langle \rho \rangle_{l_s} - \langle \rho \rangle_l)l_s j$  should be observed on a segment  $l_s$  of an inhomogeneous loop at  $j \neq 0$  if the average resistivity along this segment  $\langle \rho \rangle_{l_s} = \int_{l_s} dl \rho / l_s$  differs from the one along the loop  $\langle \rho \rangle_l = \oint_l dl \rho / l$ . Therefore the existence of the persistent current implies a possibility of the persistent voltage which can be observed on segments of an inhomogeneous loop. The value and sign of this voltage, as well as of the persistent current, should depend in a periodic way on a magnetic flux  $\Phi$  inside the loop:  $V(\Phi/\Phi_0)$ . Such voltage oscillations were measured recently on segments of an asymmetric Al loop [9]. This experimental result corroborate that the quantum force as well as the Faraday's voltage is distributed uniformly among the loop and can not be localized in any loop segment [2].

D.P.Sheehan proposes the interesting comparison with

the case of semiconductor diodes, which from time to time have been invoked in possible scenarios for second law violation [10]. Indeed, what difference is between the loop with the persistent current at  $R > 0$  and an conventional electric circuit with semiconductor diodes. It is well known that any resistance at nonzero temperature is the power source of the thermally induced voltage called the Nyquist's (or Johnson's) noise. This phenomenon was described theoretically by Nyquist [11] and was observed by Johnson [12] as long ago as 1928 year. The Nyquist's noise is a dynamic phenomenon in the equilibrium state at nonzero dissipation. Such phenomena are called Brownian motion [13].

The persistent current at  $R > 0$  is also a dynamic phenomenon in the equilibrium state at nonzero dissipation. Therefore it is natural that the maximum power of the persistent current  $(k_B T)^2/\hbar$  [2] is close to the total power of the Nyquist's noise. But there is an important difference between these two Brownian motions. The power of the Nyquist's noise is chaotic. In the classical limit  $\hbar\omega \ll k_B T$  it is "spread" on all frequencies  $\omega$ ,  $W_{Nyq} = k_B T \Delta\omega$  [14], is proportional to the frequency band  $\Delta\omega$  and  $W_{Nyq} = 0$  at  $\Delta\omega = 0$ . As opposed to this the power of the persistent current is not chaotic. It is not equal zero  $0 < W_{p.c.} \leq (k_B T)^2/\hbar$  at  $\omega = 0$ . Because of this difference the persistent current at  $R > 0$  is the challenge to the second law whereas the Nyquist's noise is not the one.

The investigations of the Brownian motion in the beginning of the 20 century were very important for the history of physics. Thanks to these investigations the atomistic-kinetic ideology has prevailed once and for all the thermodynamic-energetic one prevailing in 19 century [15]. The Brownian motion is clear and monosemantic evidence of the perpetual motion which was considered as impossible according to the interpretation of the second law prevailing in 19 century. It ought be emphasized that the Brownian motion is evidence not only of the perpetual motion but also of a perpetual driving force because no motion is possible without a driving force at non-zero friction. Therefore this phenomenon was interpreted as the challenge to the second law in the beginning of 20 century [15].

The second law was rescued in that time by the postulate of absolute randomness of any Brownian motion and it has become the law of chaos increase. According to the belief prevailing during 20 century the perpetual motion exists but it is random and therefore can not be used for an useful work. In order any Brownian motion (for example the Nyquist's noise) can be used it should be put in a order (for example to be rectified). The possibility of the Nyquist's noise rectification has been considered in [10] referred by D.P.Sheehan and in other works [16]. Electric diodes can rectify the Nyquist's noise only if a temperature difference is in the electric circuit [17]. The rectified Nyquist's noise can be used to perform work. But this is not the challenge to the second law because the work is extracted owing to a temperature difference

as well as in any other existing heat engine [17].

The rectification of the Nyquist's noise [10,16] appertains to the numerous challenges to the second law authors of which consider any possibility to put in a order the chaotic Brownian motion [17]. The best known one - the Maxwell's demon was posed by Maxwell in 1867. As opposed to these known challenges the persistent current at  $R > 0$  is already regulated Brownian motion and therefore can be used to perform work without any rectification. This phenomenon is possible since the postulate of absolute randomness of any Brownian motion is not correct according to the quantum mechanics. According to the classical mechanics the average velocity of any Brownian motion equals zero: if spectrum of permitted states is continuous then for any state with a velocity  $v$  a permitted state with opposite velocity  $-v$  and the same probability  $P(v^2)$  exists, therefore  $\bar{v} = \sum_{per.st.} vP(v^2) + (-v)P(v^2) \equiv 0$ . But according to the quantum mechanics no all states are permitted. Therefore the average velocity of some quantum Brownian motion can be non-zero  $\bar{v} \neq 0$ .

The introduction of the quantum force in [2] for the description of the persistent current at  $R > 0$  is reminiscent the introduction of the Langevin force  $F_{Lan}$  for the description of the classical Brownian motion. The quantum force induced by the fluctuations is the Langevin force with non-zero average value. The latter is very important. The Langevin equation

$$m \frac{dv}{dt} + \gamma v = F_{Lan} \quad (1)$$

can be used for the description both of the Brownian motion and the motion of an automobile. The only qualitative difference consists in the character of the driving force: the average force driving an automobile should be non-zero, whereas it was postulated that the Langevin force  $F_{Lan}$  is absolutely random and its average value equals zero  $\overline{F_{Lan}} = 0$  in all cases. But if  $\overline{F_{Lan}} \neq 0$  then the Brownian motion does not differ qualitatively from the motion of an automobile and it can be used in order to drive the automobile in violation of the second law.

The quantum force induced by the fluctuations as well as any Langevin force is the balancing counterforce to the dissipation force  $F_{dis} = -\gamma v$ :  $\overline{F_{Lan}} = -\overline{F_{dis}} = \overline{\gamma v}$ . This balance differs qualitatively from the one of the electrostatic and "diffusive" forces in the p-n junction of semiconductor diodes considered in [1]. The first balance is dynamic  $\bar{v} \neq 0$  and consequently both  $\overline{F_{Lan}}$  and  $\overline{F_{dis}}$  perform the work whereas the second balance is static and the work is not performed. As it is well known the work performed by the dissipation force  $\overline{F_{dis}}$  increases the entropy. Consequently the work performed by its counterforce  $\overline{F_{Lan}} \neq 0$  decreases the entropy in violation of the second law.

In summary, D.P.Sheehan raises the correct and important question. Some statements published in Phys.Rev.B [2] contradict definitely to the second law of thermodynamics. But it is not correct to conclude without careful

consideration that the analysis made in [2] is incomplete. The main threat for the absolute status of the second law is the experimental observation of the nonchaotic Brownian motion. There is repeated the situation which was in the beginning of 20 century when the classical Brownian motion was interpreted as the challenge to the second law. The quantum force is introduced [2] in order to explain the observation of the persistent current at  $R > 0$  just as the Langevin force was introduced in order to explain the observation of the motion of the Brownian particles under equilibrium conditions. In order to save the second law from the new appearing threat an alternative (to [2]) explanation of the persistent current at  $R > 0$  should be proposed.

- 
- [1] D.P.Sheehan, Comment, Phys. Rev. B
  - [2] A.V.Nikulov, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 012505 (2001).
  - [3] A.S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, (Macmillan, New York, 1948), p. 74.
  - [4] W.A.Little and R.D.Parks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **9**, 9 (1962); *Phys. Rev.* **133**, A97 (1964).
  - [5] M.Tinkham, *Introduction to Superconductivity*. McGraw-Hill Book Company (1975).
  - [6] H.Vloeberghs et al. *Phys. Rev.Lett.* **69**,1268 (1992).
  - [7] I.O.Kulik, *Pisma Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz.* **11**, 407 (1970) (*JETP Lett* **11**, 275 (1970)).
  - [8] E.M.Q.Jariwala et al. *Phys. Rev.Lett.* **86**, 1594 (2001); V.Chandrasekhar et al. *Phys.Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3578 (1991); L.P.Levy et al. *Phys. Rev.Lett.* **64**, 2074 (1990).
  - [9] S.V. Dubonos, V.I.Kuznetsov and A.V. Nikulov, submitted to *Phys.Rev.B*; in *Proceedings of 10th International Symposium "NANOSTRUCTURES: Physics and Technology"* St Petersburg: Ioffe Institute, 2002, p. 350; physics/0105059.
  - [10] R. McFee, Amer. J. Phys., **39**, 814 (1971).
  - [11] H.Nyquist, *Phys.Rev.* **32**, 110 (1928).
  - [12] J.B.Johnson, *Phys.Rev.* **32**, 97 (1928)
  - [13] R.P.Feynman, R.B.Leighton, M.Sands, *The Feynman Lectures on Physics*, Vol.1, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts, 1963.
  - [14] C.Kittel, *Thermal Physics*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1972.
  - [15] M.Smoluchowski, "Gultigkeitsgrenzen des zweiten Hauptsatzes der Warmetheorie", in *Vortrage uber kinetische Theorie der Materie und der Elektrizitat (Mathematische Vorlesungen an der Universitat Gotingen, VI)*. Leipzig und Berlin, B.G.Teubner, p.87 (1914).
  - [16] L.Brillouin, *Phys.Rev.* **78**, 627 (1950); R.E.Burgess, editor, *Fluctuation Phenomena in Solids*, Academic, NY, 1965; J.C.Yater, *Phys.Rev. A* **10**, 1361 (1974); E.P.EerNisse, *Phys.Rev. A* **18**, 767 (1978).
  - [17] J.Berger, *Physics Essays* **7**, 281 (1994).