

Foundations of Computational Materials Modeling
Professor. Narasimhan Swaminathan
Department of Mechanical Engineering,
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras.
Lecture 18
Introduction to Statistical Mechanics-3

(Refer Slide Time: 00:22)

$T_1 = T_2$
 $E^* = E_1 = E_2 \Rightarrow$
 $\Omega = \Omega^1(N_1, V_1, E_1) \times \Omega^2(N_2, V_2, E_2)$
 $\Omega = \Omega(N, V, E)$
 $S = k \ln \Omega$
 $\frac{\partial S}{\partial E} = \frac{1}{\beta T} = \text{constant (uniform)}$
 $\beta = \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial E} \right)_{N, V}$
 $\frac{1}{T} = \frac{1}{T_2} \text{ at Equilibrium} \Rightarrow \left(\frac{\partial S_1}{\partial E_1} \right)_{N_1, V_1} = \left(\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial E_2} \right)_{N_2, V_2} = \frac{1}{T}$

$E = \sum N_i E_i$
 $\# \text{ of particles with energy } E_i$
 macrostate (UVE)
 microstate

n_1	n_2	n_3	
2	2	2	1
1	3	2	←
2	3	1	←
3	1	2	←
3	2	1	←
1	2	3	←
2	1	3	←

$\left. \begin{matrix} 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 \end{matrix} \right\} \begin{matrix} \leftarrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{matrix}$

So, what did we do last class? Let us have a small recap of that, so we considered a system and we said that there is a thermal wall in between these two systems. N_1 , V_1 and E_1 are basically the number of particles, the volume and the corresponding energy of each of these two systems A_1 and A_2 and we talked about what is referred to as a complexion or a micro state which is basically the number of ways that this particular macro state can actually be reached by the system.

And I give you an example that, we had a box with say n different particles or three I think which we took an example of three different particles and we said that the total energy is six joules and we wrote down you know how many combinations or how many ways such an energy or such a macro state can actually be obtained. And so, what we saw was, there was only one way that this system could take the energy two to two, whereas there were six different ways where it could take the energy combinations one three and two.

So, each of these is actually a micro state, each of these is actually a micro state which corresponds to a certain given a macro state. That was basically to introduce the terminologies, micro state and macro state. Then, we went ahead and instead of trying to calculate what this number Ω is going to be for a typical system, we tried to understand in what way if you knew that, the thermodynamics of the system actually automatically falls out.

So, for that we actually consider this consider the system right here, and we said that if Ω_1 is the total number of ways you can have N_1 , V_1 , E_1 and Ω_2 is the total number of ways the system can be in N_2 , V_2 and E_2 , then we did a thought experiment where we said that this would be a thermal wall where the system is capable of exchanging energy, but not the particles or not the and it would not move, it is not a movable piston or anything like that, and we asked the question, at what point of time will this energy transfer stop?

So, from classical thermodynamics, all of you immediately told me that T_1 is equal to T_2 , but we do not want to do classical thermodynamics, we want to see how thermodynamics actually can fall out from the microscopic nature of the material that is there inside this, basically the gas or whatever you want to call it. So, and we said that this particular function becomes a maximum once equilibrium is reached, this Ω becomes a maximum.

So what the idea or the philosophy behind that is the following, any system left to itself, if you put up it and leave it, then naturally the system evolves in such a way that it wants to maximize the total number of ways it can actually reach such system, reach that micro state, that is its natural tendency. Its natural tendency to do that is to maximize the number of ways it can actually attain that particular macro state. That is the something that I am telling you without proof I am asking you to accept that. Without accepting that can be difficult for us to do anything in statistical mechanics.

So, we accept that at equilibrium the number of the system will be in such a state that the total number of micro states that it has is going to be the highest for a given macro state. Therefore, we maximize this, but we have to subject it to a constraint that $E_{\text{naught}} - E_1 - E_2$ is actually equal to 0 because this is actually a closed system, and during the process of exterminations, we derived a condition for this to happen as β_1 should be equal to β_2 , where β_1 or β is actually equal to $\frac{1}{k_B T}$ by keeping the number of species and the volume actually a constant.

And then we had to invoke classical thermodynamics to see what relationship this β maybe having to the real thermodynamic variables that we are acquainted with, and so we said that β_1 should be equal to β_2 or $\frac{1}{T_1}$ should be equal to $\frac{1}{T_2}$ at equilibrium, which from classical thermodynamics boil down to saying that $\frac{dS}{dE} = \frac{1}{T}$ at N_1, V_1 must be equal to $\frac{dS}{dE}$ at N_2, V_2 and looking at this expression right here, and this expression right here which is equal to $\frac{1}{T}$ or one this is equal to $\frac{1}{T_1}$ must be equal to $\frac{1}{T_2}$ at equilibrium.



So, looking at these two expressions right here, this one and this one, there was we wrote down $\frac{dS}{dE} = \frac{1}{T}$ must be equal to $\frac{1}{T}$ and that has to be a constant universal constant. So, this relationship essentially helps us write S which is one of the thermodynamic properties of the system, in terms of k_B which is constant the Boltzmann constant and ω , which is basically the number of ways the system can actually reach that particular state, S is equal to $k_B \log \omega$. So, we have derived S as a function of some micro state.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:50)

$\Omega = \Omega^1(N_1, V_1, E_1) \times \Omega^2(N_2, V_2, E_2)$ | $\bar{\Omega} = \Omega^1 \times \Omega^2 + \lambda_1 (E^1 - E_1 - E_2) + \lambda_2 (V^1 - V_1 - V_2)$

extremize the $E^1 = E_1 + E_2$
 $V^1 = V_1 + V_2$



$$\frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial E_1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial E_1} \Omega^2 - \lambda_1 = 0 \quad \left| \quad \frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial V_1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial V_1} \Omega^2 - \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial E_2} = \frac{\partial \Omega^2}{\partial E_2} \Omega^1 - \lambda_1 = 0 \quad \left| \quad \frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial V_2} = \frac{\partial \Omega^2}{\partial V_2} \Omega^1 - \lambda_2 = 0$$



$$\frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial E_1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial E_1} \Omega^2 - \lambda_1 = 0 \quad \left| \quad \frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial V_1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial V_1} \Omega^2 - \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial E_2} = \frac{\partial \Omega^2}{\partial E_2} \Omega^1 - \lambda_1 = 0 \quad \left| \quad \frac{\partial \bar{\Omega}}{\partial V_2} = \frac{\partial \Omega^2}{\partial V_2} \Omega^1 - \lambda_2 = 0$$

$$\beta_1 = \beta_2 \quad \left| \quad \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial E_1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial E_2} \frac{\Omega^2}{\Omega^1} \quad \frac{\partial \Omega^1}{\partial V_1 \Omega^1} = \frac{\partial \Omega^2}{\partial V_2 \Omega^2}$$

$$\beta_1 = \beta_2 \quad \left| \quad \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega^1}{\partial V_1} \right)_{N_1, E_1} = \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega^2}{\partial V_2} \right)_{N_2, E_2}$$



Next, we will see what now happens, instead of actually allowing this wall to be only thermal, only allowing the temperature to actually live for exchange of energy to take place. Let us see what happens when we also allow it to actually move. Let us see what happens when we allow it to move. So then when we allow it to move, we still have omega not equal to omega 1 N1, V1, E1 times omega 2, N2, V2, E2, but now we have to extremize this, subjecting it to the constraint that

and we have to extremize with respect to both the variables V and V_1 and V_2 also, because this piston can now move.

So, when we do this, what happens is the following. So, we get something that looks like maybe I will do it, so $d\omega_0$ by dE_1 ω bar because we need to find a composite function, so we will actually extremize a composite function ω_1 times ω_2 plus λ_1 times E_1 minus E_1 minus.

Student: Sir, you in your right side there are three mistakes.

Professor: I am very sorry. So, ω_1 times ω_2 minus λ_1 times E_1 minus E_1 minus E_2 minus λ_2 times V_1 minus V_2 . Now we have to extremise this function ω naught bar with respect to E_1 , E_2 , V_1 and V_2 . Consequently, when we do that what happens is...

Student: Sir does the sign of λ matters here plus or minus.

Professor: Does not matter, that sign can get absorbed into λ . So, if you want to put up plus here, and then will get a minus here equal to 0 and then now you need to still differentiated with respect to V_1 and V_2 and that will give you.

So, this aspect continues to tell you what, this one this condition here we will continue to tell you that β_1 should be equal to β_2 for equilibrium, this is that is what, are you able to follow that? From here how you get here, is nothing but you know $d\omega_1$ by ω_1 times or 1 by ω_1 or $d\omega_1$ by dE_1 equal to $d\omega_2$ by dE_2 into 1 by ω_2 which can be written in the terms log like I pointed out last class, which turns out to be β_1 is equal to β_2 .

This one turns out to be $d\omega_1$ by dV_1 times ω_1 is equal to $d\omega_2$. Now, this is again $d\log$ of ω_1 with respect to dV_2 , but this time clearly during the process of differentiation, you have kept the number of particles and the energy fixed.

(Refer Slide Time: 12:48)

$$\bar{\Omega} = \Omega^1 \times \Omega^2 + \lambda_1 (E^1 + E_2 - E) + \lambda_2 (N^1 + N_2 - N)$$

$$S = k \ln \Omega$$

$$dS = \frac{1}{T} dE + \frac{P}{T} dV + \frac{\mu_1}{T} dN_1 + \frac{\mu_2}{T} dN_2$$

$$d(\ln \Omega) = \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial E} \right)_{V, N} dE + \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial V} \right)_{E, N} dV + \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial N} \right)_{E, V} dN$$

$$\frac{1}{k} dS = \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial E} \right)_{V, N} dE + \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial V} \right)_{E, N} dV + \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial S}{\partial N} \right)_{E, V} dN$$

$$dE = T ds - p dV + \mu dN$$

$$dE + p dV - \mu dN = T ds$$

$$\frac{1}{T} dE + \frac{p}{T} dV - \frac{\mu}{T} dN = ds$$

This one, let us call it as some, so at equilibrium, if the pistons are allowed to move, then the condition that we must have at equilibrium is this μ_1 must be equal to μ_2 where μ_1 is basically $k \ln \Omega_1$ by $k \ln \Omega_2$. In a similar spirit, now let us not have the membrane, only exchange energy, it is allowed to move in addition to that I am going allow it to be permeable so that it can also exchange the species. That means that, two species gas N_1 , N_2 can actually intermix once the, so I remove this constraint also, the only constraint that was now present is that that is impermeable to the movement of the molecules.

Now, I remove that constraint also and we see what condition that brings about, and then later on just like all we related β_2 temperature, we will see what this μ_1 and μ_2 is going to be, so obviously it is going to be related to pressure and the chemical potential. So here what happens? You do exactly the same thing, I am not going to repeat the entire derivation. You do exactly the same thing with this as the composite function, obviously N is basically the total number of particles which should be fixed because it cannot move out of the box.

So, now you have to extremize this with respect to E_1 , E_2 , V_1 , V_2 , N_1 , N_2 . Now we already did with respect to E_1 , E_2 , V_1 , V_2 and we got the following results. So we should have β_1 should be equal to β_2 and we should have, say μ_1 must be equal to μ_2 and now this one will essentially have some C_1 equal to C_2 and as you can guess this C_1 is supposed to be $k \ln$

ω_1 by dN_1 keeping the volume and the energy fixed and V, C_2 is going to be $d \log \omega_2$ by dN_2, V_2, E_2 .

Now this suffix 1 or super fix 1, do not get confused, there is nothing to get confused there, so whether I write it below or above it just ω_1 , please do not I I find it hard to keep track of that I wrote the previous super fix so ω_1 is ω_1 whether 1 is appearing as a super fix or as a suffix.

So, now how do these things actually related relate to actual thermodynamics? So, in order to see that, let us now accept only one thing, we just say S is equal to K times \log of ω , this is known now, we showed that from the first exercise. Now let us write d of $\log \omega$, ω is now a function of N, V and E so this becomes $d \log \omega$ by dE into dE plus $d \log \omega$ by dV into dV plus $d \log \omega$ by dN into dN .

Obviously, here I am keeping the other two variables constant. So, if I am dE means I am going to keep the number and volume constant, here I am going to number and energy constant, here I am going to keep the volume and the energy constant. So, now so I know that S is equal to $K \log \omega$, so this actually can be written in terms of my entropy, so this is S over K so d of S over K is equal to this again. So, 1 over K dS by dE plus 1 over K times dS by dV plus dS by dN plus.

So, what was dS by dE from our initial analysis? dS by dE was $d \log \omega$ or $d \log \omega$, this one is what? dS by dV from classical thermodynamics? 1 by P , is it 1 by P isn't it minus $P dV$ by T , you will get a 1 by T over there also. Let us write down the expression and derived from that, so the dE is equal to $T ds$ minus $P dv$ plus μdn .

So you have the dE plus $P dv$ minus μdn is equal to $T ds$ or 1 by T into or 1 by T into dE plus P by T into dv minus μ by T into dN is equal to dS , which means dS by dE at constant N and V is actually equal to 1 by T and dS by dV at constant N and E is actually equal to P over T , is that right? And dS by dN at constant V comma E is actually equal to minus μ over T .

So, if you compare these expressions, if you compare these expressions to this and if you compare these expressions to your μ_1, μ_2 and C_1, C_2 what do you get? So, you get so dS

was so from here, let us take this expression here, which implies, so what is this? $\ln K$ into $\ln \Omega$ by $\ln V$ was what was actually our μ or μ was nothing but P divided by K times T .

So, if you have mechanical equilibrium, then you have μ_1 equal to μ_2 or P_1 by KT_1 equal to P_2 by KT_2 , but at equilibrium, we have already shown that T_1 is equal to T_2 which essentially implies P_1 is equal to P_2 . So, both the whole idea here is that both from the by considering Ω or by considering entropy, you are essentially getting the same results that the systems the same conditions that the system should satisfy in order to have equilibrium, that is the whole idea here.

In a similar spirit, if you do it for the other variable, you would get μ_1 equal to μ_2 or μ by KT is equal to μ by KT μ_1 by KT_1 should be equal to μ_2 by KT_2 , since T_1 is equal to T_2 you will have μ_1 is equal to μ_2 , is that clear? So, what follows from this whole exercise is, if you knew your Ω , the total number of complexions or how it is going to vary with the macro state specified for the system.

Then it is possible for you to derive the entire thermodynamics from it by just taking by doing S is equal to $K \ln \Omega$ and then taking the appropriate derivatives to get the pressure, to get the temperature and to get the chemical potential, but you should know how the Ω is as a function of N, V and E .

Right now, we are not yet seen how this Ω looks or what value it should have, but even without that, we were able to accept one basic postulate and derive the entire thermodynamic from it. So right now, do you have any questions? Are there any questions that you have? Is this clear?

This is a chemical potential μ , that is a a good point. So, what else, can we use all the chemical potential? Let us say μ dN , in this expression, μ is a chemical potential, but here this μ is not the chemical potential. It is just term here $\ln \Omega_1$ by $\ln V_1$, in fact it is closer more closely related to the pressure than the chemical potential, is that ok? Or is it? Maybe I can change it to α .

(Refer Slide Time: 24:15)

$$\frac{1}{k} d\Omega = \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial E} \right)_{N,V} dE + \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial V} \right)_{N,E} dV + \frac{1}{k} \left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial N} \right)_{V,E} dN$$

$$dE = T ds - p dV + \mu dN$$

$$dE + p dV - \mu dN = T ds$$

$$\frac{1}{k} dE + \frac{p}{k} dV - \frac{\mu}{k} dN = ds$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial E} \right)_{N,V} = -\frac{1}{T} \Rightarrow \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial V} \right)_{N,E} = \frac{P}{T}$$

$$k \left(\frac{\partial \ln \Omega}{\partial N} \right)_{V,E} = -\frac{\mu}{T}$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial E} \right)_{N,V} = -\frac{1}{T} \Rightarrow \left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial V} \right)_{N,E} = \frac{P}{T}$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial N} \right)_{V,E} = -\frac{\mu}{T}$$

$$k \alpha = \frac{P}{T}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{P}{kT}$$

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \Rightarrow \frac{P_1}{kT_1} = \frac{P_2}{kT_2} \Rightarrow P_1 \cdot T_2 = P_2 \cdot T_1$$

Alpha 1 is equal to alpha 2 and consequently here I will have a mu will be equal to PT and I should expect alpha 1 equal to alpha 2, this is ok this is fine.

For the chemical potential equivalence, you will get, is ok? Are there any doubts here? Anything, any step that is confusing or something that you want me to repeat? By comparing the expressions that arise from the microscopic details like the omega, we are able to actually draw a similarity between what happens there and what happens in the classical thermodynamic sense, that is the whole idea.

So, basically the recipe for statistical mechanics is, if you find this omega, then you are basically done, but apparently the determination of this omega is not a very easy thing. It is extremely complicated, and it is possible for us to obtain analytical solutions for omega only for very simple systems like ideal gas and things like that, we will do that also. We will do it for an ideal gas and show you how you can actually get the ideal gas law by finding of omega for the ideal gas.