

The Physics Behind Entropy

Jozsef Garai

jozsef.garai@fiu.edu

Abstract

The dynamic equilibrium between two phases at phase boundaries clearly indicates that in nature spontaneous changes do not necessarily proceed towards higher disorder. This observation is discrepant with the fundamental assumption of the microscopic explanation of entropy. From this discrepancy and from other experimental results which also oppose the increase of disorder the microscopic explanation of entropy is dubious.

Reinvestigating the different thermodynamic functions, related to entropy, it has been found that the expression of entropy can be extracted from the equations of internal energy and work. Thus, the physical parameters of these equations should fully explain the physics of entropy.

The calculation of the internal energy change of a system or the conversion of thermal and mechanical energies require the same mathematical formula as the expression of entropy. It is most likely this mathematical need was the reason why the expression of entropy had been invented.

PACS codes: 05; 05.70.-a; 51.30

Keywords: entropy, thermodynamics, theory, Boltzmann's model

The macroscopic determination of entropy first was expressed by Clausius in 1865. He postulated that the entropy [S] change between two equilibrium states could be determined by the transferred reversible heat [Q] and the absolute temperature [T] as:

$$dS = \frac{dQ}{T} \quad (1)$$

The symbol d is used for the infinitesimal changes of heat and work eventough these physical parameters do not have an exact differential.

Employing statistical mechanics in 1877 Boltzmann suggested a microscopic explanation for entropy. He stated that every spontaneous change in nature tends to occur in the direction of higher disorder, and entropy is the measure of that disorder. From the size of disorder entropy can be calculated as:

$$S = k_B \ln W \quad (2)$$

where W is the number of microstates permissible at the same energy level, k_B is the Boltzmann constant. The modification of the Boltzmann's expression has been proposed recently by Tsallis for non equilibrium systems [1-3]. The conventional entropy expression can be applied when a system is in thermal equilibrium; however, for nonextensive systems the following expression is proposed.

$$S_{\text{Tsallis}} = k_B \frac{W^{1-q} - 1}{1 - q} \quad (3)$$

When parameter q goes to 1 then equation 3 gives equation 2, which is the Boltzmann solution [4].

The microscopic explanation of entropy has never been fully accepted [5-7] since there is incomplete proof for equation 2 and there are counter examples where the increase of disorder cannot be justified. Among these counter examples the spontaneous crystallization of a super-cooled melt [8] and the crystallization of a supersaturated solution [9] are the most prominent challenges for the Boltzmann's model. If a super-cooled melt is allowed to crystallize under adiabatic conditions then the entropy of the system increases. In a supersaturated solution there is a possibility of the deposition of crystalline solute. The deposition of crystalline solute is a spontaneous process with an increase of entropy. A crystallization of a liquid or a deposition of a crystalline solute does not imply any increase in disorder.

An investigation of the different thermodynamic processes and the microscopic explanation of entropy yield additional empirical evidences contrary to Boltzmann's microscopic explanation. At constant pressure and temperature a dynamic equilibrium develops at the boundary of two phases. This equilibrium means that the number of molecules moving from phase one to phase two are the same as the number of molecules moving from phase two to phase one. The continuous exchange of the molecules at the phase

boundary does not require work therefore the process is a spontaneous one. When a solid sublimates or a liquid evaporates the level of disorder at the boundary of these contacting phases is extremely different; however, preferred movements of the molecules toward higher disorder have never been observed. The dynamic equilibrium between different phases is contrary to the fundamental assumption of the Boltzmann's model.

Investigating the standard entropy values of the different substances it can be seen that many solids has higher entropy values than gases. In order to support this statement the standard molar entropy of few minerals are listed in table 1. All of the chosen minerals are in solid phase and their standard entropy is higher than $300 \text{ JK}^{-1}\text{mol}^{-1}$. The standard entropy of hydrogen [H_2] is $130.68 \text{ JK}^{-1}\text{mol}^{-1}$ [16]. The listed solids have minimum of twice as high entropy values as hydrogen indicating that the disorder in these solids should be at least twice as high as the disorder of hydrogen. This conclusion is against any common sense. It is impossible that molecules in solid phase can be more disordered than molecules in gas phase.

The dynamic equilibrium at phase boundaries, the higher entropy values for solids contrarily to gases along with other experimental results which also oppose the increase of disorder indicates that the microscopic explanation of entropy is dubious.

Reexamining the physical explanation of entropy one possible alternative is proposed here.

The internal energy [U] of a system is equivalent with the total kinetic and potential energy of the molecules in the system. Using the assumptions of the kinetic gas theory it can be shown that for a monoatomic gas, where only translational energies are present the internal energy can be calculated as:

$$E_{\text{transl}} = U = \frac{3}{2} n N_A k_B T = \frac{3}{2} n R T \quad (4)$$

where N_A is Avogadro's number, n is the number of moles, and R is the universal gas constant. If heat is transferred to the system and the volume kept constant then the change in the internal energy of the system is:

$$dE_{\text{transl}} = dU_v = \frac{3}{2} n R dT \quad (5)$$

Substituting R with $\frac{pV}{nT}$ from the equation of state [EoS]:

$$dE_{\text{transl}} = dU_v = \frac{3}{2} pV \frac{dT}{T} \quad (6)$$

where V is volume and p is the pressure. Integrating the equation:

$$\Delta E_{\text{transl}} = \Delta U_v = \frac{3}{2} pV \int_i^f \frac{dT}{T} = \frac{3}{2} pV \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) \quad (7)$$

where subscript i represent the initial conditions while f represents the final conditions. From EoS $pV = nRT$ therefore:

$$\Delta E_{\text{transl}} = \Delta U_v = \frac{3}{2} nRT \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) \quad (8)$$

For general case, when rotational and vibrational energies are also present, the internal energy change can be written as:

$$\Delta E_{\text{thermal}} = \Delta U_v = nc_v T \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) \quad (9)$$

where c_v is the heat capacity for a mol quantity at constant volume. This equation contains the expression of entropy for constant volume.

$$\Delta S_v = nc_v \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) \quad (10)$$

It has been shown that the expression of entropy at constant volume is equivalent with a part of the equation of the internal energy. This part is extracted from the internal energy equation and substituted with entropy. The internal energy change of the system therefore can be written as:

$$\Delta U_v = T \Delta S_v \quad (11)$$

The first law of thermodynamics states that the internal energy of a system can be changed either by heating the system or by doing work on it.

$$\Delta U = q + w \quad (12)$$

where q is the energy from heat while w is the work done on the system. The effect of heat on the internal energy has already been investigated at constant volume. Now the effect of work will be analyzed at constant temperature and pressure. Under these conditions the work can be calculated as:

$$dU_T = dw = -pdV \quad (13)$$

Because:

$$p = \frac{nRT}{V} \quad (14)$$

we can write:

$$dU_T = dw = -nRT \frac{dV}{V} \quad (15)$$

Integrating the equation:

$$\Delta U_T = \Delta w = -nRT \int_i^f \frac{dV}{V} = -nRT \ln \left(\frac{V_f}{V_i} \right) \quad (16)$$

Part of this equation is equivalent with the well known expression of entropy for constant temperature.

$$\Delta S_T = nR \ln \left(\frac{V_f}{V_i} \right) \quad (17)$$

Manipulating the expression of work led to the expression of entropy at constant temperature.

Substituting entropy gives:

$$\Delta U_T = \Delta w = -T\Delta S_T \quad (18)$$

Allowing the thermal and the mechanical energies to change at the same time the change in the internal energy of a system is:

$$\Delta U = \Delta U_V + \Delta U_T = q_V + w = T\Delta S_V - T\Delta S_T = T(\Delta S_V - \Delta S_T) \quad (19)$$

The sign of ΔS_T is the matter of convention. According to the original equation of Clausius the work done by the system has positive sign. If someone wants to determine the heat Q which has to be supplied to the system for the thermal and mechanical energies then:

$$Q = \Delta U_V - \Delta U_T = q - w \quad (20)$$

This equation can be written as:

$$Q = T\Delta S_V - (-T\Delta S_T) = T(\Delta S_V + \Delta S_T) \quad (21)$$

Combining the two parts of the entropy changes:

$$\Delta S = \Delta S_V + \Delta S_T \quad (22)$$

where

$$\Delta S = n \left[c_V \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) + R \ln \left(\frac{V_f}{V_i} \right) \right] \quad (23)$$

The required heat for the energy changes is:

$$Q = T\Delta S \quad (24)$$

For infinitesimal changes:

$$dQ = TdS \quad (25)$$

Expressing the change of entropy:

$$dS = \frac{dQ}{T} \quad (26)$$

gives the same equation as equation 2 proposed by Clausius. Deriving entropy from existing thermodynamical expressions suggest that entropy is not a new independent physical parameter. Thus the original parameters of the manipulated expressions should fully explain the physics of entropy.

What makes the expression of entropy so powerful and immiscible for thermodynamic calculations? This question will be considered in detail. The change of the internal energy of a system at constant volume can be determined by integrating the equation:

$$dU = nc_v dT \quad (27)$$

However there is a hidden problem here. Heat capacity is not an independent physical parameter because it contains the variable T as it can be seen from the heat capacity of monoatomic gases.

$$c_v = \frac{3}{2}R = \frac{3}{2} \frac{pV}{T} \quad (28)$$

The simplest mathematical solution to naturalize T inside c_v is the multiplication of heat capacity with T. This way the temperature inside heat capacity will cancelled out.

Multiplying the numerator and the denominator by T leads to:

$$dU = nc_v dT = \frac{3}{2} nT \frac{pV}{T} \frac{\Delta T}{T} = Tnc_v \frac{\Delta T}{T} \quad (29)$$

The value of the multiplication of temperature and heat capacity is constant. Integration of equation 29 can be done easily now and the result is the same as equation 9. It can be seen that the expression of entropy allows us to integrate and determine the change in the internal energy of a system in a convenient way.

The other mathematical trick what the expression of entropy allows is to convert the heat and mechanical energies into each other. Let's have an ideal gas system described by the EoS as:

$$nRT = pV \quad (30)$$

Changing the temperature of the gas at constant pressure will induce a volume change, which can be written as:

$$nRdT = pdV \quad (31)$$

Dividing this equation with the original expression of EoS given in equation 30 leads to:

$$\frac{dT}{T} = \frac{dV}{V} \quad (32)$$

This equality allows converting the volume changes to the temperature changes and vice versa. Entropy incorporates this expression which allows calculating the internal energy change of a system induced by both temperature and volume changes.

$$\Delta U = T(\Delta S_V - \Delta S_T) = T \left(\int_i^f nc_v \frac{dT}{T} - \int_i^f nR \frac{dV}{V} \right) = nT \left[c_v \ln \left(\frac{T_f}{T_i} \right) - R \ln \left(\frac{V_f}{V_i} \right) \right] \quad (33)$$

In conclusion it suggested that entropy is a variable representing an expression extracted from the equations of internal energy and work. The physical parameters contained in these expressions should fully explain the physics of entropy. It has been shown that the expression of entropy allows a simple mathematical way to calculate the changes in the internal energy of a system and to convert the thermal and mechanical energies into each other. It is suggested that most likely these mathematical advantages led to the introduction of the formula of entropy.

References

- [1] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. 52 (1988) 479
- [2] E.M.F. Curado and C. Tsallis, J. Phys. A 24 (1991) L69
- [3] For complete references, <http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.html>
- [4] A. Cho, Science 297 (2002) 1268
- [5] P. G. Wright, Contemp. Phys., 11 (1970) 581.
- [6] H. Dingle, Bull. Inst. Phys., 10 (1959) 218.
- [7] A. I. Khinchin, Mathematical Foundations of Statistical Mechanics, (English translation, New York) 1949

- [8] P. W. Bridgman, The Nature of Thermodynamics, Cambridge, Mass., 1941
- [9] M. L. McGlashan, J. Chem. Educ., 43 (1966) 226
- [10] S.K. Saxena, N. Chatterjee, Y. Fei, G. Shen, Thermodynamic Data on Oxides and Silicates, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1993
- [11] R.A. Robie, B.S. Hemingway, and J.R. Fisher, US Geol. Survey Bull., 1452 (1978) 456
- [12] N. Chatterjee, An internally consistent thermodynamic database of minerals: applications to the earth's crust and upper mantle, PhD Thesis, City Univ. of New York, 1989
- [13] Holland, T. and Powell, R., J. Metam. Geol. 8 (1990) 84
- [14] C.T. Herzberg, Contr. Mineral. Petrol., 84 (1983) 84
- [15] R.A. Robie and B.S. Hemingway, Am. Mineral., 69 (1984) 858
- [16] I. Barin, Thermodynamical Data of Pure Substances, VCH Publishers, New York, 1989

Table 1.

Name of the Mineral	Composition	Standard Entropy [JK ⁻¹ mol ⁻¹]	Citation
Almandine	[Fe ₃ Al ₂ Si ₃ O ₁₂]	336.00	[10]
Andradite	[Ca ₃ Fe ₂ Si ₃ O ₁₂]	316.35	[11]
Annite	[KFe ₃ AlSi ₃ O ₁₀ (OH) ₂]	440.91	[12]
Anthophyllite	[Mg ₇ Si ₈ O ₂₂ (OH) ₂]	535.19	[12]
Antigorite	[Mg ₄₈ Si ₃₄ O ₈₅ (OH) ₆₂]	3672.80	[12]
Clinochlorite	[Mg ₅ Al ₂ Si ₃ O ₁₀ (OH) ₈]	421.00	[13]
Cordierite	[Mg ₂ Al ₄ Si ₅ O ₁₈]	410.88	[11; 14]
Cummingtonite	[Mg ₇ Si ₈ O ₂₂ (OH) ₂]	483.06	[12]
Ferrocordierite	[Fe ₂ Al ₄ Si ₅ O ₁₈]	410.88	[12]
Glaucophane	[Na ₂ Mg ₃ Al ₂ Si ₈ O ₂₂ (OH) ₂]	535.00	[13]
Grunerite	[Fe ₇ Si ₈ O ₂₂ (OH) ₂]	714.60	[12]
Muscovite	[KAl ₂ (AlSi ₃ O ₁₀)(OH) ₂]	306.40	[11]
Phlogopite	[KMg ₃ AlSi ₃ O ₁₀ (OH) ₂]	334.60	[15]
Tremolite	[Ca ₂ Mg ₅ Si ₈ O ₂₂ (OH) ₂]	550.00	[13]