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Abstract

We revisit the supercurrent generation mechanism for the type of superconductors whose superconducting transition temperature is explained by the BCS theory (we call it the \textit{BCS superconductor}). This revisit is motivated by the reexamination of the ac Josephson effect [H. Koizumi, M. Tachiki, J. Supercond. Nov. Magn. (2015) 28:61] that indicates the charge on the charge carrier for the ac Josephson effect is \( q = -e \) (means the electromagnetic vector potential \( A^\text{em} \) couples to each electron in the pairing electrons, separately, as \( eA^\text{em} \)), which strongly suggests that the supercurrent generation mechanism is lacking in the BCS theory since the charge carrier in the BCS theory is the Cooper pair with \( q = -2e \) (means \( A^\text{em} \) couples to pairing electrons, together, as \( 2eA^\text{em} \)).

We put forward a possible new supercurrent generation mechanism in the BCS superconductor; we argue that the origin of the supercurrent generation is the emergence of Dirac strings with \( \pi \) flux (in the units of \( \hbar = 1, e = 1, c = 1 \)) inside (we call them \textit{\( \pi \)-flux Dirac strings}), where the Dirac string is a nodal singularities of the wave function. It appears if the Rashba spin-orbit interaction is added to the BCS model due to its stabilization of the spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons; then, the \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string is created as a string of spin-twisting centers. The \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string generates the cyclotron motion without external magnetic field, and produces topologically protected loop current. A macroscopic persistent current is generated as a collection of such loop currents.

The above current generation can be also attributed to the emergence of the \( U(1) \) instanton of the Berry connection given by \( A^\text{fic} = -\frac{\hbar}{2e}\nabla\chi, \varphi^\text{fic} = \frac{\hbar}{2e}\partial_t\chi \), where \( \chi \) is an angular variable of period \( 2\pi \). In other words, the supercurrent is a collective motion produced by the instanton that cannot be reduced to the single particle motion. Then, the appearance of the flux quantum \( \Phi_0 = \hbar/2e \) and the voltage quantum \( V_0 = hf/2e \) in the ac Josephson effect (\( f \) is the frequency of the radiation field) are explained as topological effects of this instanton. The phase of the macroscopic wave function for the Ginzburg-Landau theory or the phase of the pair potential of the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations is identified as \( \chi \).

Since the Rashba interaction is absent in the BCS theory, it may be regarded as a weak Rashba interaction limit of the present theory as far as the origin of the phase variable of the macroscopic superconducting wave function is concerned. If the phase variable is treated as a phenomenological parameter, the origin of it does not matter; then, the Ginzburg-Landau theory or the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations can be used without modification. However, the new origin requires the Rashba interaction; thus, the internal electric field for the Rashba interaction is necessary for the occurrence of superconductivity. This may explain the fact that ideal metals like sodium does not show superconductivity since the screening of the electric field is efficient.
in such materials, suppressing the internal electric field too weak to occur superconductivity.
I. INTRODUCTION

In the present work, we call the type of superconductors whose superconducting transition temperature is explained by the BCS theory the “BCS superconductor. In the BCS superconductor, the superconducting transition temperature is determined by an energy gap formation temperature, where the energy gap is created by the electron pairing due to an effective attractive interaction between electrons that arises from the virtual exchange of phonons. Through the success of the BCS theory, it is now widely-believed that the electron pair formation is the origin of superconductivity.

As to the practical calculation for phenomena involving supercurrents, the Ginzburg-Landau theory and the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations are usually used. In these theories, the supercurrent generation is due to the appearance of an angular variable $\phi$ with period $2\pi$ that makes the followings gauge invariant,

$$A^{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \phi; \quad \varphi^{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2e} \partial_t \phi$$

(1)

where $(\varphi^{em}, A^{em})$ is the electromagnetic gauge potential ($\varphi^{em}$ and $A^{em}$ are scalar and vector potentials, respectively), and the gauge invariance means that the above sums are not affected by the choice of the gauge in $\varphi^{em}$ and $A^{em}$ due to compensational changes in $\phi$. This mode (Nambu-Goldstone mode) was found by Nambu in an effort to rectify the gauge invariance problem of the original BCS paper using the generalized Ward-Takahashi identity. In the BCS superconductors, the required phase $\phi$ appears when the electron pairing is established. It is believe to describe a collective mode of charge $q = -2e$ ($e$ is the absolute value of the electron charge) particle flow, $2e$ in the flux quantum $\Phi_0 = \hbar/2e$ ($\hbar$ is Planck’s constant) and the voltage quantum $V_0 = \hbar f/2e$ across the Josephson junction in the presence of a radiation field with frequency $f$, are regarded as due to the pairing electron charge. It is also considered that $\phi$ is a variable conjugate to the Cooper pair number density $\rho/2\Omega$ ($\rho$ is the electron number density).

Although the origin of the superconductivity due to the electron pairing is believed to be established, the origin of $\phi$ is not. There are more than one theories for the origin of it. The most popular one is the gauge symmetry breaking origin (see for example, Table I and text around it in Ref.); another competing one is the phase of the Bose-Einstein condensate wave function origin (see for example, Section 2.4 in Ref.). The former uses a particle number non-conserving state as an essential ingredient; however, it suffers from the difficulty in application to fixed particle number systems such as isolated superconductors and nuclei in the superconducting states (see for example Ref.). On the other hand, the latter theory uses a particle number fixed formalism;
however, it does not explain the persistent current generation in a natural way, but relies on the topological stability of circular current (or loop current) as an additional requirement.\(^{12}\)

Now, superconductivity of a different type is known in cuprates.\(^{15}\) The cuprate superconductors show marked differences from the BCS ones. For example, the superconducting transition temperature is not given by the energy gap formation temperature, but corresponds to the stabilization temperature of coherent-length-sized loop currents for optimally doped samples;\(^{16}\) the coherence-length is in the order of the lattice constant, which is much smaller than that of the BCS superconductor; the normal state from which the superconducting state emerges is not an ordinary metallic state described by the Fermi liquid theory but a doped Mott insulator state; the local magnetic correlation that is a remnant of the parent Mott insulator still exists in the doped compound, giving rise to the hourglass-shaped magnetic excitation spectrum;\(^{17}\) actually, the magnetic excitations persist entire superconducting hole doping range, thus, a close relationship between the superconductivity and magnetism is strongly suggested. In spite of all the differences, \(\Phi_0 = \hbar/2e\) and \(V_0 = hf/2e\) are observed; thus, it is widely-believed that the origin of the cuprate superconductivity is still the electron pairing.

The above experiments seem to indicate that the elucidation of the cuprate superconductivity requires a drastic departure from the standard theory. The present author put forward a new theory of superconductivity that does not contain the pairing-electrons\(^{19-22}\) (however, it contains the bipolaron with a hole at each polaron;\(^{23}\) spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons occurs around each hole). In this theory, the third theory for the origin of \(\phi\) is proposed. It uses the Berry phase that was not known during the development of the BCS theory.\(^ {24}\) The phase \(\phi\) is argued to arise from the singularities of wave functions for spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons; the centers of spin-twisting creates Dirac strings with \(\pi\) flux (in the units of \(\hbar = 1, e = 1, c = 1\)) inside, and generate \(U(1)\) instanton of the Berry connection given by

\[
   A^{\text{fic}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi; \quad \varphi^{\text{fic}} = \frac{\hbar}{2e} \partial_t \chi \quad (2)
\]

where \(\chi\) is an angular variable of period \(2\pi\) that can be identified as \(\phi\). In this theory, \(\chi/2 = \phi/2\) is conjugate to the electron number density \(\rho\), which differs from the standard theory where \(\phi\) is a variable conjugate to the Cooper pair number density \(\rho/2\).\(^ {10}\)

In the presence of \(A^{\text{fic}}\), the effective vector potential for electrons becomes \(A^{\text{eff}} = A^{\text{em}} + A^{\text{fic}}\), where \(A^{\text{em}}\) is the electromagnetic vector potential. A macroscopic persistent current is generated as a collection of topologically protected spin-vortex-induced loop currents. The appearance of
FIG. 1. Schematic set-ups for the supercurrent and Josephson effect measurements. S and I indicate superconductor and insulator, respectively. Arrows indicate currents. a: Experimental set-up for supercurrent measurement. b: Experimental set-up for Josephson effect measurement. c: Set-up for Josephson effect assumed in the Josephson’s derivation.

The flux quantum $\Phi_0 = h/2e$ and the voltage quantum $V_0 = hf/2e$ are explained as topological effects of the $U(1)$ instanton given in Eq. (2). One of the advantages of the new theory is that it is formulated in a fixed-particle number formalism, thus, it can be applied to fixed particle number systems without difficulty. It also yields a spontaneous feeding current state, namely, the ground state with energy minima at nonzero values of external current feeding in the situation depicted in Fig. 1a:\textsuperscript{25} the value of the spontaneous current depends on the internal state of the superconductor (i.e., the distribution pattern of the spin-vortices and spin-vortex-induce loop currents), thus, the spontaneous feeding current changes flexibly depending on the boundary conditions. This state explains superconductivity, naturally, although such a state has not been obtained by the BCS theory so far. Actually, the inability to obtain such a state is one of the loose ends of the BCS theory\textsuperscript{26}.

The relevance of the idea presented in the above new theory, supercurrent generation without electron pairing, to the BCS theory needs to be examined since the origin of the phase variable that produces supercurrent is not settled in the BCS theory, and the Berry phase was not known during the development of the BCS theory. It is noteworthy that it plays a crucial role in explaining the persistent current flow in quantum Hall effects and topological insulators. Besides, a serious misfit was recently found in the predicted Josephson effect and experimentally observed one\textsuperscript{19,22}, which concerns the boundary conditions for the ac Josephson effect experiment. The boundary condition assumed in the Josephson’s predication\textsuperscript{27} and that employed in the real experiment are actually different (see Figs. 1b and c). It is also worth noting that the Josephson’s predication assumes a simple appearance of a dc voltage across the Josephson junction, however, a dc voltage does not appear by a simple application of a dc voltage; instead, when a dc voltage is applied, a dc Josephson effect takes over, resulting in a zero voltage across the junction\textsuperscript{28}. In the experimental situation where a finite voltage exists, there usually exist a radiation field in addition to a dc current.
feeding from the leads connected to the junction. Since this misfit is the major motivation of the present work, we shall explain it succinctly, below. The details will be revisited in Section IV.

If we employ the real experimental situation including the current feeding from the leads (the situation in Fig. 1b), an extra contribution to $\dot{\phi}_J$ (denoted by the dotted arrows in Fig. 1b) arises compared with the Josephson’s derivation (Fig. 1c), where $\phi_J$ is the difference of $\phi$ across the Josephson junction. The two contributions to $\phi_J$, one from the chemical potential difference between the leads connected to the junction (the dotted arrows in Fig. 1b) and the other from the electric field in the non-superconducting region between the two superconductors in the junction (the solid arrow in Fig. 1b) are equal due to the balance between the voltage from the electric field in the non-superconducting region and chemical potential difference between those of the two leads connected to the junction. Thus, the fact that $\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{2eV}{\hbar}$ is observed experimentally, leads to the conclusion that the carrier charge is $q = -e$ (if we use $q = -2e$ as in the Josephson’s prediction, we have $\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{4eV}{\hbar}$)\(^{19,22}\). Although Josephson’s predicted relation

$$\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{2eV}{\hbar}$$

is valid, it is not due to the electron-pair tunneling in the sense that $A^{em}$ couples to pairing electrons, together, as $2eA^{em}$. Each electron in the pair couples to $A^{em}$ as $eA^{em}$, and the phase $\phi$ should be attributed to each electron. In other words, instead of the standard theory in which $\phi$ is a variable conjugate to the Cooper pair number density $\rho/2$, we need to adopt the new one where $\phi/2$ is conjugate to the electron number density $\rho$.

Another experiment that suggests the attribution of the phase variable should be to each electron not to each electron-pair comes from the observation of the Josephson effect through the Andreev bound states in the tunneling region with a ring-shaped superconductor under the application of the magnetic field\(^{29}\). In this experiment, the supercurrent in the tunneling region are generated by electrons and holes instead of electron pairs, and it is indicated the phase factors $e^{-i\phi/2}$ and $e^{i\phi/2}$ should be attributed to each electron and each hole, respectively, including the contribution from the magnetic flux enclosed by the ring. This separate attribution is in accordance with the new theory in which an effective vector potential $A^{eff} = A^{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi$ is attributed to each charge carrier.

In the present work, we put forward a new supercurrent generation mechanism in the BCS superconductor. It is a similar one developed for the cuprate superconductivity by the present author. In this mechanism, electrons perform spin-twisting itinerant motion stabilized by the Rashba spin-orbit interaction; thus, in order to realize this mechanism, the Rashba spin-orbit interaction
needs to be added to the BCS model. Then, cyclotron motion occurs around the singularity of the spin-twisting and loop current produced by it becomes the current element of a macroscopic supercurrent. The line singularities located at the centers of the spin-twisting (they are also centers of the cyclotron motion) form the $\pi$-flux Dirac strings. The appearance of $\Phi_0 = h/2e$ and $V_0 = hf/2e$ are explained as topological effects of them.

Although the new supercurrent generation mechanism presented here is a drastic change from the currently-accepted one, it does not affect the theoretical calculations using the Ginzburg-Landau theory and the Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations if the Rashba interaction is much smaller than the pairing energy gap. In this case, major change is only the re-definition of the origin of $\phi$. However, the new theory predicts that superconductivity requires the Rashba interaction. This also means that the internal electric field for the itinerant electrons is needed. This may explain the fact that superconductivity does not occur in ideal metals like sodium; in ideal metals, the screening of the internal electric field is efficient, thus, the internal electric field is suppressed; as a consequence, the Rashba interaction is not strong enough to stabilize the spin-twisting itinerant motion.

The organization of the present work is as follows: in Section II, we show that when spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons is realized the Berry connection for many-body wave functions is needed in addition to the electron density to obtain the ground state wave function. We explain the way to obtain it in the three dimensional system by following the method developed for the two-dimensional case. It is also shown that from the knowledge of the Berry connection and electron density, the phenomenological macroscopic wave function is obtained. In Section III the effective gauge potential in materials, previously introduced, is re-examined for the use in subsequent sections. In Section IV the ac Josephson effect is revisited by considering the appearance of the Shapiro step; the argument starts with the situation where no applied radiation field is present, thus, no voltage across the junction exists; next, a radiation field is applied, and the chemical potential difference appears by the instanton formation. Finally, the establishment of the plateaus in the $I$-$V$ plot (i.e., the Shapiro step) is explained as the consequence of the charging of the junction by treating is as a capacitor. In Section V the wave packet dynamics of electrons under the influence of the Rashba spin-orbit interaction and magnetic field is studied. We show that the cyclotron motion occurs even without external magnetic field due to the presence of the $\pi$-flux Dirac string. In Section VI the gap equation for the new pairing under the influence of the Rashba spin-orbit interaction is considered by assuming that the Rashba interaction
is much smaller than the pairing energy gap. We take into account the influence of the Rashba spin-orbit interaction by modifying the pairing states from the original BCS pairing \((k, \uparrow) - (-k, \downarrow)\) to \((k_c, s_0(r_c)) - (-k_c, -s_0(r_c))\) pairing, where \(k_c\) and \(r_c\) are the centers of the wave packet in the momentum and coordinate spaces, respectively, and \(s_0(r_c)\) is the direction of spin at \(r_c\); \(s_0(r_c)\) twists along the cyclotron wave packet motion, realizing the spin-twisting cyclotron motion. In Section VII, the modification of the kinetic energy due to the Rashba interaction is derived and the London equation is obtained. It is shown that the state with the spin-twisting cyclotron motion pairing \((k_c, s_0(r_c)) - (-k_c, -s_0(r_c))\) is more stable than the ordinary pairing \((k, \uparrow) - (-k, \downarrow)\). In Section VIII, the problem of the gauge invariance in the BCS theory is revisited. Lastly, we conclude the present work in Section IX.

II. BERRY CONNECTION FOR MANY-BODY WAVE FUNCTIONS AND CONSTRAINT OF THE SINGLE-VALUED REQUIREMENT OF THE GROUND STATE WAVE FUNCTION

Let us consider the wave function of a system with \(N_e\) electrons,

\[
\Psi(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t)
\]

(4)

where \(x_j = (r_j, s_j)\) denotes the coordinate \(r_j\) and spin \(s_j\) of the \(j\)th electron.

We define a Berry connection associated with this wave function\(^{24}\). As will be seen, later, it serves as part of the \(U(1)\) gauge field that includes the electromagnetic field for the electrons (see Eqs. (44) and (45)).

First, we define the parameterized wave function \(|n_{\Psi}(r)\rangle\) with the parameter \(r\),

\[
\langle s, x_2, \cdots, x_{N_e} | n_{\Psi}(r, t) \rangle = \Psi(r, s, x_2, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t) \overline{|C(r, t)|^2}
\]

(5)

where \(|C(r, t)|\) is the normalization constant given by

\[
|C(r, t)| = \int dsdx_2 \cdots dx_{N_e} \Psi(r, s, x_2, \cdots)\Psi^*(x_s, x_2, \cdots)
\]

(6)

Using \(|n_{\Psi}\rangle\), the Berry Connection for Many-Body Wave Functions is defined as

\[
A^{MB}(r, t) = -i\langle n_{\Psi}(r, t) | \nabla_r | n_{\Psi}(r, t) \rangle
\]

(7)

Here, \(r\) is regarded as the parameter\(^{24}\). In the ordinary Hartree-Fock theory, the effect of the Coulomb and exchange interactions from the electron density are taken into account in an average
sense; here, we do the same thing for the interaction that affects the phase of the wave function by including the above Berry connection.

We only consider the case where the origin of $A^{MB}$ is not the ordinary magnetic field one; thus, we have

$$\nabla \times A^{MB} = 0$$

(8)

Then, it can be written in the pure gauge form,

$$A^{MB} = -\nabla \theta$$

(9)

where $\theta$ is a function which may be multi-valued.

The kinetic energy part of the Hamiltonian is given by

$$K_0 = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \left( \frac{\hbar}{i} \nabla_j \right)^2$$

(10)

where $m$ is the electron mass and $\nabla_j$ is the gradient operator with respect to the $j$th electron coordinate $r_j$.

Using $\Psi$ and $A^{MB}$, we can construct a currentless wave function $\Psi_0$ for the current operator associated with $K_0$

$$\Psi_0(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t) = \Psi(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t) \exp \left( -i \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \int_0^t A^{MB}(r_j', t) \cdot dr' \right)$$

(11)

In other words, $\Psi(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t)$ is expressed as

$$\Psi(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t) = \Psi_0(x_1, \cdots, x_{N_e}, t) \exp \left( -i \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \theta(r_j, t) \right)$$

(12)

using the currentless wave function $\Psi_0$.

Now consider the situation where the electromagnetic field $B^{em} = \nabla \times A^{em}$ ($A^{em}$ is the vector potential) is present. In this case, the kinetic energy operator is given by

$$K[A^{em}] = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{j=1}^{N_e} \left( \frac{\hbar}{i} \nabla_j - qA^{em}(r_j) \right)^2$$

(13)

where $q = -e$ is the charge of electron.

For a while, we consider the case where $A^{em} \to 0$. The kinetic energy is a functional of $A^{em}$ given by

$$E_{kin} = \langle \Psi | K[A^{em}] | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi_0 | K \left[ A^{em} + \frac{\hbar}{q} \nabla \theta \right] | \Psi_0 \rangle$$

(14)
In the right-most equation, the phase factor \( \exp(-i \sum_{j=1}^{N_r} \theta(r_j, t)) \) in \( \Psi \) is transferred to the Hamiltonian, retaining only \( \Psi_0 \) as the wave function.

The total energy is a functional of \( A^{em} \) and \( \varphi^{em} \) given by

\[
E_{tot} = \langle \Psi | H[A^{em}, \varphi^{em}] | \Psi \rangle = \langle \Psi | H \left[ A^{em} + \frac{\hbar}{q} \nabla \theta, \varphi^{em} \right] | \Psi \rangle
\]  

(15)

Now, we treat \( \nabla \theta \) as a parameter to be optimized. Let us optimize it by minimizing the total energy \( E_{tot} \). This yields

\[
0 = \frac{\delta E_{tot}}{\delta \nabla \theta} = \frac{\hbar}{q} \left. \frac{\delta E_{tot}}{\delta A^{em}} \right|_{A^{em}=0} = -\frac{\hbar}{q} j
\]  

(16)

where the relation

\[
j = -\frac{\delta E_{tot}}{\delta A^{em}}
\]  

(17)

between the current density \( j \) and the functional derivative of the total energy with respect to the vector potential is used.

The equation (16) indicates that the energy minimized state is currentless. Thus, if the optimized one is the exact one, it is actually \( \Psi_0 \) if the ground state is not degenerate. We assume this is the case in the present work. Then, \( \Psi_0 \) is obtained by the energy minimization. The fact that “the energy minimizing ground state is currentless” is sometimes called the Bloch theorem\(^{30}\). \( \Psi_0 \) satisfies this theorem. The theory of superconductivity needs to upset this theorem\(^{26}\) to have the current-carrying ground state.

The Bloch theorem can be upset if \( \Psi_0 \) is multi-valued since in this situation, \( \Psi_0 \) is not the legitimate wave function (the wave function has to be the single-valued function of the coordinates\(^{31}\)). If \( \Psi_0 \) is a real function, only possible multi-valuedness is the sign-change. We call a line of singularities that cause the sign change of the wave function the “\( \pi \)-flux Dirac string”, because a Dirac string is a line of singularities of the wave function considered by Dirac\(^{32}\) and the \( \pi \) flux through it (in the units of \( \hbar = 1, e = 1, c = 1 \)) causes the sign change due to the Aharonov-Bohm effect\(^{33}\).

Now we consider the reconstruction of \( \Psi \) using \( \Psi_0 \) that is obtained from the energy minimizing calculation. First, we note that \( \exp(-i\theta) \) must change sign around the \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string to have the single-valued function \( \Psi \). This condition can be rephrased using \( \chi \) related to \( \theta \),

\[
\theta = \frac{1}{2} \chi
\]  

(18)

that the winding number of \( \chi \) along path \( C \) around \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string

\[
w_C[\chi] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_C \nabla \chi \cdot d\mathbf{r}
\]  

(19)
is an odd integer.

On the other hand, if $C$ does not encircle the $\pi$-flux Dirac string, we should have

$$w_C[\chi] = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_C \nabla \chi \cdot d\mathbf{r} = 0 \quad (20)$$

We consider the case where the “$\pi$-flux Dirac string”, is created by spin-twisting itinerant motion of electrons. The twisting spin state is expressed using the two-component spin-function

$$e^{-\frac{i}{2}\tau} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\cos \frac{\xi}{2} \\
\sin \frac{\xi}{2}
\end{array} \right) \quad (21)$$

where $\xi$ and $\tau$ are the polar and azimuthal angles of the spin-direction, respectively, and $\tau$ is an angular variable that is introduced to make the spin-function single valued.

If the Berry connection arise only from this spin-function, we have

$$\mathbf{A}^{MB}_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla \tau - \frac{1}{2} \nabla \xi \cos \zeta \quad (22)$$

However, the spin function is that for the opposite spin

$$e^{-\frac{i}{2}\tau} \left( \begin{array}{c}
\cos \frac{\xi}{2} \\
\sin \frac{\xi}{2}
\end{array} \right) \quad (23)$$

we have

$$\mathbf{A}^{MB}_2 = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla \tau + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \xi \cos \zeta \quad (24)$$

Thus, if both spin states with $\mathbf{A}^{MB}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}^{MB}_2$ are occupied, the over all Berry connection becomes

$$\mathbf{A}^{MB} = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla \tau \quad (25)$$

Actually, the above Berry connection is also obtained in the case with $\zeta = \pi/2$ only from either $\mathbf{A}^{MB}_1$ or $\mathbf{A}^{MB}_2$, and we have considered this situation in the cuprate superconductivity\textsuperscript{19-22}. In any case, if we have $\mathbf{A}^{MB} = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla \tau$, we can identify $\tau$ as $\chi$, and we consider this case below.

Now the ground state wave function is equipped with the phase $\tau$. Then, we need to have $\tau$ to specify the ground state. The necessity to have $\tau$ to construct the ground state wave function can be viewed as an extension of the Hohenberg-Kohn theorem “the ground state energy is determined by the electron density alone\textsuperscript{34}”. This theorem does not take into account the presence of Dirac strings. If they exist, we need to know $\tau$ in addition.

We construct $\chi$ using the information on the winding number in Eqs. (19) and (20), and conservation of local charge as will be explained below. We first discretize the three-dimensional
continuous space as a cubic lattice of lattice constant $a$ (the volume of the unit cube is $a^3$), which is in the order of the lattice constant of the material or smaller. The electron density $\rho_j$’s and spin-density $S_j$’s at the cubic lattice points can be calculated with $\Psi_0$ using only one of the spin functions assuming the electron pair formation with opposite spin states. Here, we need to anticipate the spin-twisting that occurs in the ground state due to the Rashba spin-orbit interaction in obtaining $\Psi_0$. As will be shown later in Section VII, such a ground state is really possible. However, $\Psi_0$ is a currentless state, thus, the energy gain from the Rashba interaction is absent in $\Psi_0$ even though it exists in $\Psi$. To find an optimal spin-twisting is a non-trivial problem which we don’t know how to do it at present. We simply assume that we have an optimal spin-twisting in the following.

The system we consider occupies a region of $N_s$ sites (cubic lattice points) that are composed of $N_c$ cubes (the volume is $N_c a^3$). Each unit cube has 8 sites (or vertices), 6 faces (or plaquettes), and 12 bonds (or edges), and some of them are shared by other cubes surrounding it. To obtain $\chi$ means to obtain $\nabla \chi$ along all bonds. We denote the total number of bonds by $N_b$. The value of $\nabla \chi$ along the bond $k \leftarrow j$ is written as

$$\tau_{k\leftarrow j} = \chi_k - \chi_j$$

To obtain $\chi$, we need to know all $N_b$ values of $\tau_{k\leftarrow j}$’s. Taking $C$ as circumference of each face of the cube, the conditions in Eqs. (19) and (20) provide $N_f$ equations where $N_f$ is the number of faces of the cubes in the lattice.

Next, we consider the conditions arising from the conservation of the local charge. According to Eq. (16), the current through the bond $k \leftarrow j$ is given by

$$J_{k\leftarrow j} = \frac{2e}{\hbar} \frac{\partial E_{\text{tot}}}{\partial \tau_{j\leftarrow i}}$$

Thus, the conservation of charge at site $j$ is given by

$$0 = \sum_i \frac{2e}{\hbar} \frac{\partial E_{\text{tot}}}{\partial \tau_{j\leftarrow i}} + J_{j}^{\text{EX}}$$

where $J_{j}^{\text{EX}}$ is the current that is fed externally from the $j$th site. From Eq. (28), we have $(N_s - 1)$ equations, where $N_s$ is the number of sites in the lattice. The subtraction “1” comes from the fact that the total charge is conserved in the current formalism, thus, the requirement of the conservation at all sites makes one condition redundant.
We impose the condition that when a $\pi$-flux Dirac sting enters a unit cube, it enters through one of the faces of the cube and exits from another one. Then, we have the following equation

$$\nabla \cdot A^{MB} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

for each cube. This condition makes one of the face conditions is redundant for each cube; thus, the conditions from Eqs. (19) and (20) becomes $(N_f - N_c)$.

The total number of unknowns is that for $\tau_{k\rightarrow j}$'s of $N_b$ bonds. The equality between the unknowns and the known conditions is given by

$$N_b = (N_s - 1) + (N_f - N_c)$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

Actually, this relation coincides with the Euler’s theorem for a three dimensional object.

From the knowledge of the electron density at sites $\rho_j$'s and the Berry connection for bonds $\tau_{k\rightarrow j}$'s, the reduced density matrix of order one, $\Gamma^{(1)}(r, r', t)$, in the region $|r - r'| \rightarrow 0$ can be constructed. It is given in the continuous limit by

$$\Gamma^{(1)}(r, r', t) \approx \rho^{1/2}(r, t)\rho^{1/2}(r', t)\exp \left( \frac{i}{2} \int_{r}^{r'} \nabla \chi(r'', t) \cdot dr'' \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)$$

and yields the correct kinetic energy in Eq. (14) with substituting $q = -e$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2}\chi$.

Then the approximate density matrix can be expressed as

$$\Gamma^{(1)}(r, r', t) \approx \gamma_{el}(r, t)\gamma_{el}^*(r', t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)$$

where

$$\gamma_{el}(r, t) = \rho^{1/2}(r, t)\exp \left( -\frac{i}{2} \int_{0}^{r} \nabla \chi(r', t) \cdot dr' \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)$$

The above form of $\Gamma^{(1)}(r, r', t)$ is actually the form suggested by Penrose and Onsager for Bose-Einstein condensation systems with the condensate wave function $\gamma_{el}(r, t)$\textsuperscript{35}. Thus, the present system has the form of density matrix for a long-range off-diagonal order in the Penrose and Onsager’s sense although the region is restricted.

The wave function $\gamma_{el}(r, t)$ is multi-valued with respect to the coordinates, thus, will not be convenient for calculations. We can construct a single-valued one by considering the electron pair. The resulting wave function is given by

$$\gamma_{pair}(r, t) = \left( \frac{\rho(r, t)}{2} \right)^{1/2} \exp \left( -i \int_{0}^{r} \nabla \chi(r', t) \cdot dr' \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)$$
This may be identified as the macroscopic wave function in the Ginzburg-Landau formalism.

The current density is calculated with Eq. (31), using the kinetic operator Eq. (13)

\[
\mathbf{j} = -\frac{e^2 \rho(\mathbf{r})}{m} \left( \mathbf{A}^{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi \right)
\]

This is the London equation. If we take a loop \( C \) along which \( \mathbf{j} = 0 \), we have

\[
\oint_C \mathbf{A}^{em} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \frac{i \hbar}{2e} \oint_C \nabla \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \frac{h}{2e} w_C[\chi]
\]

This shows the flux quantization in \( \frac{h}{2e} \). We would like to emphasize that this results arise from the existence of the \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string, not from that of pairing electrons.

III. EFFECTIVE GAUGE POTENTIAL IN MATERIALS

Let us derive the equations of motion for \( \chi \) and \( \rho \). We assume that the angular variable \( \chi \) is related to the Berry connection as \( \mathbf{A}^{MB} = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla \chi \) without assuming the presence of Cooper pairs.

To obtain the conjugate momentum of \( \chi \), we use the time-dependent variational principle using the following Lagrangian

\[
L = \langle \Psi | i \hbar \partial_t - H[\mathbf{A}^{em}, \varphi^{em}] | \Psi \rangle = \int d\mathbf{r} \: \rho(\mathbf{r}) \frac{\hbar}{2} + i \hbar \langle \Psi_0 | \partial_t | \Psi_0 \rangle - E_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}^{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi, \varphi^{em} \right]
\]

where \( E_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}^{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi, \varphi^{em} \right] \) is given in Eq. (15). In this section, we assume the situation where only \( \chi \) and its conjugate variable are important dynamical variables.

From the above Lagrangian, the conjugate momentum of \( \chi \) is obtained as

\[
p_\chi = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\chi}} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \rho
\]

thus, \( \chi \) and \( \rho \) are canonical conjugate variables apart from some constant.

If we follow the canonical quantization procedure \( [p_\chi(\mathbf{r}, t), \chi(\mathbf{r}', t)] = -i \hbar \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \), we have

\[
\left[ \frac{\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)}{2}, \chi(\mathbf{r}', t) \right] = -i \hbar \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')
\]

In literatures, \( \frac{\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)}{2} \) is attributed to the Cooper pair number density, and \( \chi \) is regarded as the canonical conjugate variable to it. However, we do not assume the existence of Cooper pairs in this section; thus, the above relation should be considered as just a relation between a collective coordinate \( \chi \) and its conjugate variable \( \rho \) which is not related to the existence of the Cooper pairs.
Actually, we will re-express it as
\[
\left[ \rho(r, t), \frac{\chi(r', t)}{2} \right] = -i\delta(r - r')
\]  
(40)
and attribute the occurrence of superconductivity as due to the appearance of \(\chi/2\) conjugate to \(\rho\). As shown later, this interpretation is more in accordance with the ac Josephson effect.

For simplicity, we only consider the case where \(\langle \Psi_0 | \partial_t | \Psi_0 \rangle = 0\) (this will occur if \(|\Psi_0\rangle\) is time-independent or real) is satisfied, below.

By separating the Coulomb term that is proportional to \(\varphi_{em}\), we define \(\bar{H}\) as
\[
\bar{H} \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi \right] = H \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi, \varphi_{em} \right] - q \int d\mathbf{r} \rho \varphi_{em}
\]  
(41)

Then, we define \(\bar{E}_{tot}\) by
\[
\bar{E}_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi \right] = E_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi, \varphi_{em} \right] - q \int d\mathbf{r} \rho \varphi_{em}
\]  
(42)

Using \(\bar{E}_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi \right]\), \(\mathcal{L}\) is written as
\[
\mathcal{L} = -\bar{E}_{tot} \left[ \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi \right] - q \int d\mathbf{r} \rho \left( \varphi_{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \dot{\chi} \right)
\]  
(43)

The Lagrangian \(\mathcal{L}\) indicates that \(\mathbf{A}_{em}\) and \(\varphi_{em}\) always appear in the combinations,
\[
\mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{A}_{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi
\]  
(44)
and
\[
\varphi_{\text{eff}} = \varphi_{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \dot{\chi}
\]  
(45)
Thus, we may regard \((\varphi_{\text{eff}}, \mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}})\) as the basic field instead of \((\varphi_{em}, \mathbf{A}_{em})\). We call it the effective gauge potential in materials.

The Hamilton’s equations for \(\chi\) and \(\rho\) are obtained as
\[
\dot{\chi} = \frac{2}{\hbar} \frac{\delta \bar{E}_{tot}}{\delta \rho} = \frac{2}{\hbar} \left[ \frac{\delta \bar{E}_{tot}}{\delta \rho} + q \varphi_{em} \right]
\]  
(46)
\[
\dot{\rho} = \frac{2}{\hbar} \nabla \cdot \frac{\delta \bar{E}_{tot}}{\delta \nabla \chi} = \frac{2}{\hbar} \nabla \cdot \frac{\delta \bar{E}_{tot}}{\delta \nabla \chi}
\]  
(47)

The equation (47) describes the conservation of the charge
\[
q \dot{\rho} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{j} = 0
\]  
(48)
with the current density given by

$$j = -\frac{2q \delta \tilde{E}_{\text{tot}}}{\hbar \delta \nabla \chi} = -\frac{\delta E_{\text{tot}}}{\delta A_{\text{em}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (49)$$

This indicates that the current density is generated by $\nabla \chi$; in other words, $\chi$ is the collective coordinate that gives rise to supercurrent.

The equation (46) is rewritten as

$$q \varphi_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{\delta \tilde{E}_{\text{tot}}}{\delta \rho}$$  \hspace{1cm} (50)$$

This indicates that $-q \varphi_{\text{eff}} = e \varphi_{\text{eff}}$ plays the role of the chemical potential by taking $\tilde{E}_{\text{tot}}$ as the total energy.

For a stationary and isolated system, we have $\dot{\chi} = 0$ and $\dot{\rho} = 0$. From $\dot{\chi} = 0$ and Eq. (46), we have

$$\frac{\delta E_{\text{tot}}}{\delta \rho} = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (51)$$

This agrees with the condition for the ground state electron density in the density functional theory \(^3\text{4}\).

Let us consider the gauge invariance problem in $(\varphi_{\text{eff}}, A_{\text{eff}})$. In classical theory, the gauge invariance is the invariance for the electric field $E_{\text{em}}$ and the magnetic field $B_{\text{em}}$

$$E_{\text{em}} = -\partial_t A_{\text{em}} - \nabla \varphi_{\text{em}}; \quad B_{\text{em}} = \nabla \times A_{\text{em}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (52)$$

with respect to the following modifications,

$$A_{\text{em}} \rightarrow A_{\text{em}} - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \phi; \quad \varphi_{\text{em}} \rightarrow \varphi_{\text{em}} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \partial_t \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (53)$$

In quantum mechanics, the gauge transformation requires an additional change in the phase of the wave function for the material interacting with the electromagnetic field

$$\psi(x, t) \rightarrow e^{-i\varphi} \psi(x, t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (54)$$

This means that we need to adjust the $U(1)$ phase factor of the wave function in response to the change of the gauge. If this adjustment is not properly done, a surplus whole system motion appears since the $U(1)$ phase factor also describes a whole system motion.

In the present theory, the gauge invariant $A_{\text{eff}}$ is obtained from the single-valuedness of the wave function, and the conservation of the local charge. Then, by substituting $A_{\text{eff}}$ in Eq. (50), the gauge invariant $\varphi_{\text{eff}}$ is obtained. Here, the arbitrariness in gauge chosen for $\varphi_{\text{em}}$ is absorbed in
the arbitrariness of $\partial_t \chi$. Therefore, we can obtain the gauge invariant $(\phi^\text{eff}, A^\text{eff})$. This also means that if we stick to $(\phi^\text{eff}, A^\text{eff})$, the surplus whole system motion does not appear since the relation between the gauge of the gauge potential and the phase factor on the wave function is intact.

Let us see that the phase change in Eq. (54) in the wave function can be obtained as a particular case for the above mentioned evaluation of $\chi$ that satisfies the single-valuedness of the wave function, and the conservation of the local charge. First, we assume $\Psi_0$ in Eq. (12) is the exact solution for the first chosen $(\phi^\text{em}, A^\text{em})$. Then, the fact that $\Psi_0$ is optimized for the first chosen $(\phi^\text{em}, A^\text{em})$ means that, for the gauge transformation in Eq. (53), the solution $\chi$ evaluated by the single-valuedness of the wave function, and the conservation of the local charge yields $\chi = \phi$ within an arbitrary constant. This is because the gauge invariant $(\phi^\text{eff}, A^\text{eff})$ is obtained as

$$A^\text{eff} = A^\text{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi = A^\text{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \phi + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi \quad (55)$$

$$\phi^\text{eff} = \phi^\text{em} - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \partial_t \chi = \phi^\text{em} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \partial_t \phi - \frac{\hbar}{2q} \partial_t \chi \quad (56)$$

and $\Psi_0$ is optimized for $(\phi^\text{em}, A^\text{em})$ means $(\phi^\text{eff}, A^\text{eff}) = (\phi^\text{em}, A^\text{em})$; thus, we have $\nabla \phi = \nabla \chi$ and $\partial_t \phi = \partial_t \chi$.

IV. REVISITING AC JOSEPHSON EFFECT

We revisit the ac Josephson effect problem in this section. This is a modified and enlarged version of our previous work.\(^{22}\)

Let us denote two superconductors in the Josephson junctions as $S_L$ and $S_R$. The angular variable $\chi$ is assumed to be continuous along the line connecting $S_L$ and $S_R$ (we take it in the $x$-direction); values of $\chi$ on $S_L$ and $S_R$ are denoted as $\chi_L$ and $\chi_R$, respectively. Then, according to Eq. (17) the current-flow through the junction is a function of

$$\int_L^R A^\text{eff} \cdot dr = \int_L^R A^\text{em} \cdot dr + \frac{\hbar}{2q} (\chi_R - \chi_L) \quad (57)$$

This formula may be regarded as a sum of the phase due to the Peierls substitution of the transfer integral between $S_L$ and $S_R$, and the phase from the wave functions (Eq. (12) with $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \chi_L$ on $S_L$ and $\theta = \frac{1}{2} \chi_R$ on $S_R$). The important point is that the gauge invariant $A^\text{eff}$ appears instead of $A^\text{em}$.

Since the change of $\chi_R \rightarrow \chi_R + 4\pi n$ ($n$ is an integer) or $\chi_L \rightarrow \chi_L + 4\pi n$ ($n$ is an integer) does not change the wave functions on the superconductors, the current is a function of the angular variable

$$\phi_J = \frac{q}{\hbar} \int_L^R A^\text{eff} \cdot dr \quad (58)$$
with period $2\pi$. The current through the junction is often approximated as

$$J_{ac} = J_c \sin \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (59)

but we do not assume the above form in the following unless otherwise stated.\(^5\)

According to Eq. (50), the chemical potential $\mu$ is obtained as

$$\mu = -q\phi_{\text{eff}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (60)

It is assumed to be continuous along the junction.

From Eq. (45), the difference of the chemical potential on $S_L$ and on $S_R$ is given by

$$\int_L^R \nabla \mu \cdot d\mathbf{r} = -q \int_L^R \nabla \phi_{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r} + \frac{\hbar}{2} \int_L^R \nabla \chi \cdot d\mathbf{r} = \mu_R - \mu_L$$  \hspace{1cm} (61)

where $\mu_L$ and $\mu_R$ are chemical potentials of $S_L$ and $S_R$, respectively. When the radiation field is absent, we have $\mu_L = \mu_R$ and the dc Josephson effect occurs.

Let us apply a radiation field with frequency $f$. Then, $\nabla \phi_{\text{em}}$ arises from this radiation field, which oscillates with frequency $f$. Its time average over the interval $f^{-1}$ is zero. The current is dc, thus, from Eqs. (58) and (59), we have $\partial_t A_{\text{eff}} = 0$. Then, using $\partial_t A_{\text{eff}} = 0$ and the fact that $A_{\text{em}}$ oscillates with frequency $f$, the time average of $\partial_t \nabla \chi$ over the interval $f^{-1}$ is zero.

Then, using Eq. (61) and the fact that the time average of $\partial_t \nabla \chi$ over the interval $f^{-1}$ is zero, the chemical potential difference averaged over time interval $0 < t < f^{-1}$ is calculated as

$$\mu_R - \mu_L = \frac{\hbar f}{2} \int_0^{f^{-1}} dt \int_L^R \partial_s \partial_s \chi dx = \frac{\hbar f}{2} \int_0^{f^{-1}} dt \int_L^R (\partial_s \partial_t - \partial_t \partial_s) \chi dx = \frac{\hbar f}{2} n$$  \hspace{1cm} (62)

where $\partial_s \partial_s \chi$ is added in going from the left of the second equality to the right since its time-average is zero.

When a singularity of $\chi$ (“instanton”) is created, nonzero $n$ arises, where $n$ is

$$n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{f^{-1}} dt \int_L^R (\partial_s \partial_t - \partial_t \partial_s) \chi dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\partial([0,f^{-1}] \times [L,R])} d\chi$$  \hspace{1cm} (63)

the winding number of $\chi$ along boundary of integration. This indicates that the chemical potential difference $\frac{\hbar f}{2} n$ arises due to the creation of the “instanton”. This instanton may be viewed as a flow of a vortex in the interface region of the two superconductors.

Next we consider the situation where a chemical potential difference appears due to the instanton creation. Due to the fact that the junction is a capacitor, the chemical potential difference is balanced by the electric field $E_{\text{em}}$ in the insulator region generated by charging of the capacitor.
Let us calculate $\phi_J$ for this state. We take the time derivative of $\phi_J$ in Eq. (58),

$$
\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{q}{\hbar} \int_L^R \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r} - \frac{1}{2} \int_L^R \nabla \phi^{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}
$$

$$
= -\frac{q}{\hbar} \int_L^R \mathbf{E}^{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r} - \frac{q}{\hbar} \int_L^R \nabla \phi^{\text{eff}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}
$$

$$
= -\frac{q}{\hbar} \int_L^R \mathbf{E}^{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r} + \frac{\mu_R - \mu_L}{\hbar}
$$

(64)

where the relation $\mathbf{E}^{\text{em}} = -\partial_t \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}} - \nabla \phi^{\text{em}}$ is used.

The balance of the chemical potential difference and the electric field in the insulator region of the junction requires

$$
\mu_R - \mu_L = -q \int_L^R \mathbf{E}^{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r} = qV
$$

(65)

where $V$ is the voltage across the junction.

Thus, we have

$$
\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{2q}{\hbar} V = -\frac{2e}{\hbar} V
$$

(66)

using $q = -e$. This is the Josephson relation. Actually, $\mathbf{E}^{\text{em}}$ contains a contribution from the radiation field with frequency $f$; however, it does not change the average voltage $V$. Thus, this relation is valid in this averaged sense.

The fact that the Josephson relation is obtained using $q = -e$ means that $\mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$ couples to each electron in the pairing electrons, separately, as $e \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$. This contradicts the standard theory in which $\mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$ couples to pairing electrons, together, as $2e \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$. Note that, for the Bogoliubov quasiparticle, $q = -e$ means $\mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$ couples to the electron and hole parts of it as $e \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$ and $-e \mathbf{A}^{\text{em}}$, respectively. This smoothly connects to the coupling observed in the Andreev bound state in the tunneling region of the ring shaped Josephson junction.

The presence of the radiation field with frequency $f$ enables the flow of dc current if the resonance condition

$$
\frac{2e}{\hbar} V = 2\pi fn
$$

(67)

is satisfied, where $n$ is an integer. This relation is equal to the one in Eq. (62), and gives rise to the voltage quantization

$$
V = \frac{hf}{2e^n}
$$

(68)
observed as “Shapiro steps”\textsuperscript{28}.

Let us examine this Shapiro step problem by adopting the approximate current expression in Eq. (59). By setting $V$ in Eq. (66) as $V_0 + V_1 \cos \omega t$, $\omega = 2\pi f$, we have

$$\dot{\phi}_J = \frac{2qV_0}{\hbar} + \frac{2qV_1}{\hbar} \cos \omega t.$$  \hspace{1cm} (69)

Then, $\phi_J$ is calculated as

$$\phi_J = \frac{2qV_0}{\hbar} t + \frac{2qV_1}{\hbar \omega} \sin \omega t + \gamma$$  \hspace{1cm} (70)

Substituting the above $\phi_J$ in Eq. (59), we obtain the following well-known current expression

$$J_{ac} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} J_n \left( \frac{2qV_1}{\hbar \omega} \right) \sin \left( \frac{2qV_0}{\hbar} t + n\omega t + \gamma \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (71)

where $J_n(x)$ is the Bessel function.

The dc current $\bar{J}_{ac}$ flow occurs when the condition

$$\frac{2qV_0}{\hbar} + n\omega = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (72)

is fulfilled\textsuperscript{27}. This is equivalent to the condition in Eq. (67).

When an oscillating electric field with frequency $\omega = \frac{2qV_0}{\hbar n}$ ($n$ is an integer) is applied, the voltage

$$V_n = \frac{\hbar \omega}{2e} n = \frac{hf}{2e} n$$  \hspace{1cm} (73)

appears.

Let us consider the charging of the junction. We denote the capacitance of the junction as $C_J$. Then, the charge $\pm Q$ stored in the junction is given by

$$Q = C_J V_n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (74)

We consider the case where the junction is not a perfect capacitor. Then, the tunneling causes the discharging by the recombination of the opposite charges across the insulator. The equation for this process is described by

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = -\alpha_d Q.$$  \hspace{1cm} (75)

where $\alpha_d$ is the discharging rate. By including the current flow due to the tunneling $\bar{J}_{ac}$ and the current fed from the lead $I$, the conservation of the charge is given by

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = I - \bar{J}_{ac} - \alpha_d Q.$$  \hspace{1cm} (76)
From the stationary condition \( \frac{dQ}{dt} = 0 \) and Eqs. (71), (72), and (74) with \(-1 \leq \sin \gamma \leq 1\), we have

\[
\alpha_dC_jV_n - J_cJ_n\left(\frac{2eV}{\hbar \omega}\right) \leq I \leq \alpha_dC_jV_n + J_cJ_n\left(\frac{2eV}{\hbar \omega}\right),
\]

(77)

where \( n \geq 0 \) is assumed. The above \( I - V \) characteristic is the Shapiro step observed in the experiment.\(^{38}\)

Note that the applied radiation field actually plays two roles; one is the creation of the instanton that generate the chemical potential difference given in Eq. (62), and the other is the maintenance of the dc voltage by the resonance condition in Eq. (67).

V. WAVE-PACKET DYNAMICS OF BLOCH ELECTRONS IN THE PRESENCE OF RASHBA SPIN-ORBIT INTERACTION AND MAGNETIC FIELD

The normal state of the BCS superconductors is a band metal. It exhibits quantum oscillations when a magnetic field is applied. This oscillation is due to the reorganization of electronic states near the Fermi surface. In this section, we examine this reorganization in the presence of the weak Rashba spin-orbit coupling compared to the electron-pairing energy gap.

In order to include the effect of the magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}^\text{em} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}^\text{em} \) that gives rise to the cyclotron motion, we use the wave-packet dynamics formalism.\(^{39}\) We consider electrons in a single band and denote its Bloch wave as

\[
|\psi_q \rangle = e^{iq \cdot r}|u_q \rangle
\]

(78)

where \( \mathbf{q} \) is the wave vector and \( |u_q \rangle \) is the periodic part of the Bloch wave.

It satisfies the Schrödinger equation,

\[
H_0[\mathbf{q}]|u_q \rangle = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{q})|u_q \rangle,
\]

(79)

where \( H_0 \) is the zeroth order single-particle Hamiltonian for an electron in a periodic potential.

According to the wave packet dynamics formalism, \( H_0[\mathbf{q}] \) is modified as

\[
H_0[\mathbf{q}] \rightarrow H_0 \left[ \mathbf{q} + \frac{e}{\hbar} \mathbf{A}^\text{em}(\mathbf{r}) \right].
\]

(80)

in the presence of the magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}^\text{em} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}^\text{em} \).
Using the Bloch waves, a wave-packet centered at coordinate $r_c$ and with central wave vector $q_c$ is constructed as

$$
\langle r | (q_c, r_c) \rangle = \int d^3 q \ a(q, t) \langle \psi_q \rangle e^{-i \frac{1}{2} \chi(r)} \left( e^{i \frac{1}{2} \xi(r)} \sin \frac{\zeta(r)}{2} \right) \left( e^{-i \frac{1}{2} \xi(r)} \cos \frac{\zeta(r)}{2} \right)
$$

(81)

where $a(q)$ is a distribution function, and the spin function is the one given in Eq. (21). The wave packet with the spin function in Eq. (23) can be constructed, analogously.

The distribution function $a(q, t)$ satisfies the normalization

$$
\int d^3 q \ |a(q, t)|^2 = 1 \quad (82)
$$

and the localization condition in $k$ space,

$$
\int d^3 q \ q |a(q, t)|^2 = q_c \quad (83)
$$

The distribution of $|a(q, t)|^2$ is assumed to be narrow compared with the Brillouin zone size so that $q_c$ can be regarded as the central wave vector of the wave packet.

The wave packet is also localized in $r$ space around the central position $r_c$,

$$
q_c = \langle (q_c, r_c) | r_c \rangle \quad (84)
$$

The crucial ingredient for realizing the spin-twisting itinerant motion is the Rashba spin-orbit interaction. We include the following Rashba interaction term in the Hamiltonian

$$
H_{so} = \lambda(r) \cdot \frac{\hbar \sigma}{2} \times (\hat{p} - qA^{em}(r)),
$$

(85)

where $\lambda(r)$ is the spin-orbit coupling vector (its direction is the internal electric field direction), $r$ is the spatial coordinates, $\hat{p} = -i\hbar \nabla$ is the momentum operator, and $q = -e$ is electron charge.

Let us construct the Lagrangian $L'(r_c, \dot{r}_c, q_c, \dot{q}_c)$ using the time-dependent variational principle,

$$
L' = \langle (q_c, r_c) | i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H|(q_c, r_c) \rangle. \quad (86)
$$

For convenience sake, we introduce another Lagrangian $L$ that is related to $L'$ as

$$
L = L' - \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \left[ \gamma(q_c, t) - r_c \cdot q_c \right], \quad (87)
$$

where $\gamma$ is the phase of $a(q, t) = |a(q, t)| e^{-i\gamma(q,t)}$.
By following procedures for calculating expectation values for operators by the wave packet, $L$ is obtained as

$$L = -E(q_c + e A_{\text{eff}}(r_c)) + \hbar q_c \cdot \dot{r}_c + i\hbar \left( u_q \left| \frac{du_q}{dt} \right| \right) = -E(q_c + e A_{\text{eff}}(r_c)) + \hbar q_c \cdot \dot{r}_c + i\hbar \langle u_q | \partial u_q \partial q \rangle_{q=\lambda'} \tag{88}$$

where $s(r_c)$ is the expectation value of spin for the wave packet centered at $r_c$ given by

$$s(r_c) = \langle (q_c, r_c) | \sigma | (q_c, r_c) \rangle. \tag{89}$$

We introduce the following wave vector $k_c$,

$$k_c = q_c + e A_{\text{eff}}(r_c) \tag{90}$$

and change the dynamical variables from $q_c$, $\dot{q}_c$ to $k_c$, $\dot{k}_c$. Then, the Lagrangian with dynamical variables $r_c$, $\dot{r}_c$, $k_c$, $\dot{k}_c$ is given by

$$L(r_c, \dot{r}_c, k_c, \dot{k}_c) = -E(k_c) + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \cdot [s(r_c) \times k_c]$$

$$+ \hbar \left[ k_c - e A_{\text{eff}}(r_c) \right] \cdot \dot{r}_c + i\hbar \dot{k}_c \cdot \left( u_q \left| \frac{du_q}{dt} \right| \right)_{q=\lambda'} \tag{91}$$

Using the above Lagrangian $L$, the following equations of motion are obtained,

$$\dot{r}_c = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial E}{\partial k_c} + \lambda(r_c) \times s(r_c) - \dot{k}_c \times \Omega, \tag{92}$$

$$\dot{k}_c = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_c} \left[ \lambda(r_c) \times s(r_c) \cdot k_c \right] - \frac{e}{\hbar} \dot{r}_c \times B_{\text{eff}}, \tag{93}$$

where $\Omega$ is the Berry curvature in $k$ space defined by

$$\Omega = i\hbar \nabla_q \times \langle u_q | \nabla_q u_q \rangle \tag{94}$$

and $B_{\text{eff}}$ is the effective magnetic field,

$$B_{\text{eff}} = \nabla \times A_{\text{eff}} = B_{\text{em}} + \frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \times \nabla \chi \tag{95}$$

In the following, we consider the case where $\Omega = 0$. Then, Eq. (92) becomes

$$\dot{r}_c = \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial E(k_c)}{\partial k_c} + \lambda(r_c) \times s(r_c). \tag{96}$$

Using Eq. (96), and (93) becomes,

$$\dot{k}_c = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_c} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\hbar} \frac{\partial E(k_c)}{\partial k_c} \right) \cdot k_c \right] - \frac{e}{\hbar} \dot{r}_c \times B_{\text{eff}}$$

$$= -\frac{e}{\hbar} \dot{r}_c \times B_{\text{eff}} \tag{97}$$
Eqs. (96) and (97) indicate that the wave packet exhibits cyclotron motion for the electron in the band with energy

\[ \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{k}) + \hbar \lambda(\mathbf{r}) \times \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{k} \]  

(98)

By following the Onsager’s argument, let us quantize the cyclotron orbit. From Eq. (91), the Bohr-Sommerfeld relation becomes

\[ \oint_C (\hbar \mathbf{k}_c - e \mathbf{A}_{\text{eff}}) \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c = 2\pi \hbar \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \]  

(99)

where \( n \) is an integer and \( C \) is the closed loop that corresponds to the section of Fermi surface enclosed by the cyclotron motion.

From Eq. (97), we have

\[ \oint_C \hbar \mathbf{k}_c \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c = -e \oint_C d\mathbf{r}_c \cdot \mathbf{r}_c \times \mathbf{B}_{\text{eff}} = e \oint_C \mathbf{B}_{\text{eff}} \cdot \mathbf{r}_c \times d\mathbf{r}_c \]  

(100)

We consider the situation where a singularity of \( \chi \) exists within \( C \), and the magnetic field \( \mathbf{B}_{\text{em}} \) is uniform. Then, the above equation becomes

\[ \oint_C \hbar \mathbf{k}_c \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c = e \oint_C \mathbf{B}_{\text{em}} \cdot \mathbf{r}_c \times d\mathbf{r}_c = 2e \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c \]  

(101)

Thus, the l.h.s. of Eq. (99) is calculated as

\[ 2e \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c - e \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}} \cdot \mathbf{r}_c + \frac{\hbar}{2} \oint_C \nabla_c \chi \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c = e \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c + \hbar \pi w_C[\chi] \]  

(102)

This leads to the quantization of the cyclotron motion given by

\[ e \oint_C \mathbf{A}_{\text{em}} \cdot d\mathbf{r}_c + \hbar \pi w_C[\chi] = 2\pi \hbar \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \]  

(103)

The important point is that above condition is satisfied even the magnetic field is absent. In this case, the first term in the l.h.s. is zero; still, the relation holds for \( w_c[\chi] = 1, n = 0 \) and \( w_c[\chi] = -1, n = -1 \). This will be interpreted that the \( \pi \)-flux Dirac string provides a magnetic flux for the zero-point cyclotron motion.

VI. THE PAIRING ENERGY GAP

Instead of the pairing between single particle states \((\mathbf{k}, \uparrow)\) and \((-\mathbf{k}, \downarrow)\), we consider the pairing between \((\mathbf{k}_c, s_0(\mathbf{r}_c))\) and \((-\mathbf{k}_c, -s_0(\mathbf{r}_c))\). We will obtain the pairing energy gap at \( \mathbf{r}_c \) by treating the wave packets \((\mathbf{k}_c, \mathbf{r}_c)\) as basis states in each coarse-gained cell centered at \( \mathbf{r}_c \).
The single-particle energy for the states \((k_c, s_0(r_c))\) and \((-k_c, -s_0(r_c))\) are given by

\[
E_+(k_c, r_c) = E(k_c) + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)
\] (104)

where \(E(k_c) = E(-k_c)\) is assumed.

Another pairing of states \((k_c, -s_0(r_c))\) and \((-k_c, s_0(r_c))\) are possible. Their single-particle energy is

\[
E_-(k_c, r_c) = E(k_c) - \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)
\] (105)

Let us briefly review the BCS theory\(^1\) since we use some results from it. The model Hamiltonian is given by \(H_{\text{kin}} + H_{\text{int}}\), where \(H_{\text{kin}}\) is the kinetic energy given by

\[
H_{\text{kin}} = \sum_{k\sigma} \xi_0(k) c_{k\sigma}^\dagger c_{k\sigma}
\] (106)

\(\xi(k)\) is the energy measured from the Fermi energy \(E_F\) given by

\[
\xi_0(k) = E(k) - E_F
\] (107)

and \(H_{\text{int}}\) is the interaction energy given by

\[
H_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k\ell} V_{k\ell} c_{k\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-k\downarrow}^\dagger c_{-\ell\downarrow} c_{\ell\uparrow}.
\] (108)

The electron pairing occurs between electrons near the Fermi surface since attractive \(V_{k\ell}\) only exists in that region. In the BCS interaction, \(V_{k\ell}\) is nonzero \((V_{k\ell} = -g)\) only when \(|\xi_0(k)|, |\xi_0(\ell)| < \hbar \omega_D\) \((\omega_D\) is the Debye frequency) is satisfied. Then, \(\Delta_k\) becomes independent of \(k\), and we express it as \(\Delta\).

The superconducting state is given by the following state vector,

\[
|\text{BCS}\rangle = \prod_k (u_k + v_k c_{k\uparrow}^\dagger c_{-k\downarrow}^\dagger)|\text{vac}\rangle.
\] (109)

This state exploits the attractive interaction between electron pairs \((k \uparrow)\) and \((-k \downarrow)\) and the following energy gap equation is obtained,

\[
\Delta = g \sum_{|\xi_0(\ell)| < \hbar \omega_D} u_\ell v_\ell
\] (110)

and \(u_k\) and \(v_k\) are parameters given using \(\Delta\) and \(\xi(k)\) as

\[
u_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(1 + \frac{\xi_0(k)}{\sqrt{\xi_0^2(k) + \Delta^2}} \right)^{1/2}
\] (111)
and

\[ v_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi_0(k)}{\sqrt{\xi_0^2(k) + \Delta^2}} \right)^{1/2} \tag{112} \]

respectively.

The total energy by the formation of the energy gap is given by

\[ E_s^{\text{BCS}} = E_n^{\text{BCS}} - \frac{1}{2} N(0) \Delta^2 \tag{113} \]

where \( E_n^{\text{BCS}} \) is the normal state energy, and \( N(0) \) is the density of states at the Fermi energy.\(^1\)

Now, we come back to the pairing of \((k_c, s_0(r_c))\) and \((-k_c, -s_0(r_c))\), and also \((k_c, -s_0(r_c))\) and \((-k_c, s_0(r_c))\). The parameters for the pairing and energy gap are now functions of \(k_c\) and \(r_c\); \(u_k\) and \(v_k\) are replaced by \(u_\pm(k_c, r_c)\) and \(v_\pm(k_c, r_c)\) given by

\[ u_\pm(k_c, r_c) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( 1 + \frac{\xi_\pm(k_c, r_c)}{\sqrt{\xi_\pm^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{114} \]

\[ v_\pm(k_c, r_c) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( 1 - \frac{\xi_\pm(k_c, r_c)}{\sqrt{\xi_\pm^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{115} \]

where

\[ \xi_\pm(k) = E_\pm(k) - E_F = \xi_0(k_c) \pm \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c) \tag{116} \]

and the gap function \(\Delta(r_c)\) is the solution of the gap equation given by

\[ \Delta(r_c) = \frac{g}{2} \sum_{|k|,|l|<\hbar\omega_D} \left( u_+(l_c, r_c) v_+(l_c, r_c) + u_-(l_c, r_c) v_-(l_c, r_c) \right) \]

\[ = \frac{g\Delta(r_c)}{4} \sum_{|k|,|l|<\hbar\omega_D} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi_+^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\xi_-^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}} \right) \]

\[ \approx \frac{g\Delta(r_c)}{4} \sum_{|k|,|l|<\hbar\omega_D} \left( \frac{2}{\sqrt{\xi_0^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}} - \frac{\lambda^2}{\sqrt{\xi_0^2(k_c, r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c) + \Delta^2(r_c)}}^{3/2} \right) \]

\[ \approx \frac{g\Delta(r_c)N(0; r_c)}{4} \int_{-\hbar\omega_D}^{\hbar\omega_D} d\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2 + \Delta^2(r_c)} - \frac{\lambda^2}{(\varepsilon^2 + \Delta^2(r_c))^{3/2}} \right\} \]

\[ \approx g\Delta(r_c)N(0; r_c) \left\{ \log \frac{2\hbar\omega_D}{\Delta} - \frac{\lambda^2}{\Delta^2} \right\} \tag{117} \]

where \(N(0; r_c)\) is the density of states at the Fermi energy in the coarse grained cell of center \(r_c\).
From the above relation, we have
\[
\Delta(r_c) \approx 2\hbar\omega_D \exp\left(-\frac{1}{g N(0; r_c)} - \frac{\lambda^2}{\Delta^2_0}\right); \quad \Delta_0(r_c) = 2\hbar\omega_D \exp\left(-\frac{1}{g N(0; r_c)}\right) \tag{118}
\]
where we assume that \(\hbar\omega_D \gg \Delta\). The gap \(\Delta\) is reduced by the spin-orbit interaction, generally. If the spin-orbit interaction parameter \(\lambda\) is significantly smaller than \(\Delta_0\), the gap becomes the original one.

VII. THE KINETIC ENERGY WITH RASHBA INTERACTION AND LONDON EQUATION

The kinetic energy density including the Rashba interaction is given by
\[
2 \sum_k \xi_-(k, r) n_-(k, r) + 2 \sum_k \xi_+(k, r) n_+(k, r) \tag{119}
\]

For simplicity, we approximate it using the Fermi distribution functions \(f(\epsilon) = (1 + e^{\epsilon/k_B T})^{-1}\) \((k_B\) is Boltzmann’s constant) and density of states \(N(\epsilon; r_c)\) as
\[
\int \frac{N(\epsilon; r_c)}{2} \left[ (\epsilon + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) f(\epsilon + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) \\
+ (\epsilon - \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) f(\epsilon - \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) \right] d\epsilon
\approx \int \frac{N(\epsilon; r_c)}{2} \left[ \epsilon \left[ f(\epsilon + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) + f(\epsilon - \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) \right] \\
+ \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c) \left[ f(\epsilon + \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) - f(\epsilon - \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)) \right] \right] d\epsilon
\approx \int \frac{N(\epsilon; r_c)}{2} \left[ 2\epsilon f(\epsilon) + 2|\hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)|^2 \frac{\partial f(\epsilon)}{\partial \epsilon} \right] d\epsilon \tag{120}
\]

At temperature \(T = 0\), \(\frac{\partial f(\epsilon)}{\partial \epsilon} = -\delta(\epsilon)\); thus, the above becomes,
\[
\int d\epsilon N(\epsilon; r_c) f(\epsilon) \delta(\epsilon) - N(0; r_c) |\hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)|^2 \tag{121}
\]

The first term may be approximated as
\[
\int d\epsilon N(\epsilon; r_c) f(\epsilon) \approx \sum_{\xi_0(q) < 0} \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \left[ q + \frac{e}{\hbar} A_{\text{eff}} \right] \approx \sum_{q < q_{fr}} \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} q^2 + \frac{e^2 \rho(r_c)}{2m} |A_{\text{eff}}|^2 \tag{122}
\]
assuming that the term linear in \(q\) cancels out.

The second term may be approximated as
\[
-N(0; r_c) |\hbar \lambda(r_c) \times k_c \cdot s_0(r_c)|^2 \approx - \sum_{\xi_0(q) = 0} \left| \hbar \lambda(r_c) \times \left[ q + \frac{e}{\hbar} A_{\text{eff}} \right] \cdot s_0(r_c) \right|^2
\approx -\hbar^2 \sum_{\xi_0(q) = 0} |\lambda(r_c) \times q \cdot s_0(r_c)|^2 - e^2 N(0; r_c) \left| \lambda(r_c) \times s_0(r_c) \cdot A_{\text{eff}} \right|^2 \tag{123}
\]
assuming that the term linear in $\mathbf{q}$ cancels out.

To minimize the kinetic energy, $s_0$ is so chosen to satisfy

$$\lambda(\mathbf{r}) \times s_0(\mathbf{r}) \parallel \mathbf{A}^\text{eff}(\mathbf{r})$$

(124)

Then, the current density is given by

$$j_{\text{tot}}(\mathbf{r}) = -e^2 \left[ \frac{\rho(\mathbf{r})}{m} - N(0; \mathbf{r})|\lambda(\mathbf{r}) \times s_0(\mathbf{r})|^2 \right] \mathbf{A}^\text{eff}(\mathbf{r})$$

(125)

where the contribution from the energy gap term is neglected by assuming it is very small. This is the London equation, and the system should exhibit the Meissner effect.

When the magnetic field is absent we replace $\mathbf{A}^\text{eff}$ by $\frac{\hbar}{2q} \nabla \chi$. Then, the kinetic energy increase given in Eq. (122) is calculated as (taking the volume of the coarse-grained cell unity)

$$\int d^3 \mathbf{r} e^2 \rho(\mathbf{r}) |\mathbf{A}^\text{eff}|^2 \approx \frac{\hbar^2}{8m \rho_0} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} (\nabla \chi)^2 = \frac{\hbar^2 \rho_0}{8m} \int_{\text{Surface}} d\mathbf{S} \cdot (\chi \nabla \chi)$$

(126)

where we assume that $\rho$ is constant in the bulk ($\rho = \rho_0$), and the relation $\nabla^2 \chi = 0$ is used. This surface term is negligibly small compared to the bulk energy if the system is sufficiently large. The energy gain in Eq. (123) is in the order of $\lambda^2$ and the energy deficit from the decrease of the gap in Eq. (118) is in the order of $e^{-\lambda^2 \Delta^2}$, thus, the system gain energy by changing the electron pairing states. Actually, the creation of the lines of singularities costs the core energies. Therefore, the density of them will be determined by the competition between the energy gain by Eq. (123) and the energy cost by the creation of the singularities.

### VIII. CRITICAL LOOK AT THE GAUGE INVARIANCE PROBLEM IN THE BCS THEORY

In the original BCS calculation, the Meissner effect is explained as a linear response to an applied magnetic field by treating $\mathbf{A}^\text{em} \neq 0$ as a perturbation for the wave function obtained for the gauge $\mathbf{A}^\text{em} = 0$.

The BCS employed the following gauge,

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}^\text{em} = 0; \quad \mathbf{A}^\text{em} = 0 \text{ if the magnetic field is zero.}$$

(127)

The obtained current was not gauge invariant, and the validity of using the gauge $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A}^\text{em} = 0$ was intensively studied by a number of researchers\textsuperscript{42-47}, and believed to be solved. Most notably, Nambu using the Ward-Takahashi identity\textsuperscript{6} performed the gauge invariant Meissner effect calculation. This lead to discover the collective mode of paired-electrons that restores the gauge
invariance, and generates supercurrent. Actually, the Nambu’s argument depends on the existence of the BCS-type particle-number mixed state, thus, if such a state is not physically allowed, the gauge invariance in the Meissner effect must be explained, differently. The new theory indicates that the BCS-type particle-number mixed state should be considered to be a mathematical tool to facilitate the calculation involving the electron pairing; the true superconducting state is actually given as a particle number fixed state.

In this section, we reexamine the gauge invariance problem in the BCS theory from the viewpoint of the new theory. In the new theory, the gauge invariance in the Meissner effect is achieved by utilizing the gauge invariant gauge potential ($\varphi_{\text{eff}}, A_{\text{eff}}$).

First, we consider the gauge choice $\nabla \cdot A_{\text{em}} = 0$ in Eq. (127). In the new theory, the vector potential $A_{\text{eff}}$ appears in physical observables instead of $A_{\text{em}}$ and the choice of the gauge $\nabla \cdot A_{\text{em}} = 0$ is compensated by the choice of $\nabla \chi$ in $A_{\text{eff}}$, thus, this condition can be used in the new theory as well.

Second, we take up the assumption, ‘$A_{\text{em}} = 0$ if the magnetic field is zero’, in Eq. (127). This condition must be modified in the new theory since it is directly related to the observable current density. The condition $\nabla \cdot A_{\text{em}} = 0$ still leaves arbitrariness of the gauge for the zero magnetic field case. For example,

$$A_{\text{em}} = A_0 = \text{const.} \quad (128)$$

also fulfills the zero magnetic field and $\nabla \cdot A_{\text{em}} = 0$. However, if this vector potential is employed, it yields the Meissner current for zero magnetic field.

This problem is a very serious one in the calculation of the $q = 0$ Fourier component of the current density $j$. In the BCS theory, if $q \rightarrow 0$ limit is taken, we have the following $q = 0$ Fourier component of the current

$$i(0) = \Lambda a_{\text{em}}(0) \quad (129)$$

where $\Lambda$ is a parameter, and $i(0)$ and $a_{\text{em}}(0)$ are $q = 0$ Fourier components of $j$ and $A_{\text{em}}$, respectively. This corresponds to Eq. (5.26) in the BCS paper. If we use a different gauge, this $a_{\text{em}}(0)$ can be removed. Thus, this current carrying state becomes a currentless state.

The problem here is related to the fact that the gauge degree-of-freedom may provide with a surplus whole system motion if the relation of the gauge of the gauge potential and the phase factor on the wave function are not intact as give in Eqs. (53) and (54). If a surplus whole system motion
exists, the conservation of the local charge may be violated. The removal of the surplus whole
system motion is achieved in the process of obtaining $\nabla \chi$ in the new theory. On the other hand,
the Ward-Takahashi relation is utilized in the standard theory.

Actually, if the condition in Eq. (127) is replaced by

$$\nabla \cdot A_{em} = 0; \quad A_{\text{eff}} = 0 \text{ if the magnetic field is zero.} \quad (130)$$

the above-mentioned problem is lifted. In this case, the constant vector potential is removed by
adjusting $\chi$ as $\frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla \chi = -A_{em} = -A_0$.

A similar problem arises if we consider the situation where the magnetic flux quantization occurs. In this case, the vector potential in the magnetic field expelled region is given by

$$A_{em} = -\frac{\hbar}{2e} \nabla g \quad (131)$$

where $g$ is an angular variable with period $2\pi$. In this case, we have $\chi = -g$ from the condition $A_{\text{eff}} = 0$; thus, zero current is obtained in the magnetic field expelled region with non-zero pure
gauge.

IX. CONCLUDING REMARKS

When Schrödinger solved the Schrödinger equation for hydrogen atom, he required the wave
function to be a single-valued function of the electron coordinate. The single-valued requirement
of the wave function is a postulate that can be rephrased as the existence of the basis $\{ |r\rangle \}$ for the
coordinate operator $\hat{r}$ that satisfies

$$\hat{r} |r\rangle = r |r\rangle, \quad (132)$$

where $r$ is the eigenvalue uniquely determined by $|r\rangle$. With this basis, the wave function for a state
vector $|\varphi\rangle$ is given by $\langle r | \varphi \rangle$, which must be single-valued with respect to the coordinate since $r$ is
uniquely determined by $|r\rangle$.

Before the Schrödinger equation was put forward by Schrödinger, quantum mechanics was
formulated as the Matrix mechanics by Heisenberg. Schrödinger showed that his version of
quantum mechanics can be transformed into the Heisenberg’s Matrix version by expressing the
linear operators by matrices using the basis functions; then, the Schrödinger’s differential equation
can be transformed into the matrix equation or the integral equation if the indices of the matrix
elements are continuous.
However, von Neumann argued that these two forms are not equivalent; there are situations where differential equations cannot be simply transformed into integral equations, but require Dirac delta functions. In this respect, the $\pi$-flux Dirac string is such an object. Actually, Dirac noticed the possible appearance of a phase factor in the displacement operator, and also considered the possible appearance of the singular phase factor in the wave function. The Berry phase factor in the present work can be viewed as an example of such a phase factor.

Hohenberg and Kohn argued that the ground state can be obtained from the electron density alone. However, their argument tacitly assumes the absence of singularities that might arise from many-body interactions and affect the phase of the wave function. When such singularities exist, we need to specify how to handle them. We assume that the basis satisfying Eq. (132) exists, and require that the wave function to be a single-valued function around the singularities. Then, the situation arises where the ground state cannot be obtained solely by the electron density alone, but requires the Berry connection. The present work indicates that one way to obtain it is to require the conservation of the local charge in addition to the single-valuedness of the wave function. Then, the so-called ’Bloch theorem’ is violated, making it possible to generate supercurrent.

The BCS theory uses the particle-number mixed state. There have been conflicting views on the use of such a state. Some researchers argue that it is unphysical thus should be considered as a mathematical tool to facilitate the inclusion of the electron pairing effects; some consider that it is the essential ingredient of the theory to have the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry breaking. In the present theory, the superconducting state is given as the particle-number fixed state in accordance with the former view. It is worth noting that the relation in Eq. (30) contains the subtraction of “1”, which arises from the condition of the fixed total charge. This subtraction of “1” is also related to the topological structure of the real three dimensional space since the same relation holds as the Euler’s theorem for a three dimensional object. This may mean that the local charge conservation is the condition to be imposed under the fixed total-charge constraint. If this is the case, requiring the conservation of the local charge using the particle number non-fixed formalism, which is employed in the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry breaking theory of superconductivity, is invalid.

In the new theory, the $\pi$-flux Dirac string is the necessary ingredient for the supercurrent generation. This can be considered as the $U(1)$ instanton, $A^{\text{fc}} = -\frac{\hbar}{2e}\nabla\chi$, $\varphi^{\text{fc}} = \frac{\hbar}{2e}\partial_t\chi$, of Polyakov. In this respect, the superconductivity can be regarded as an instanton effect as in the chiral $U(1)$ gauge problem. In other words, the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry breaking in the standard theory is replaced by the appearance of the $U(1)$ instanton in the present theory.
There is a connection between the Berry phase considered in the present work and the change of the $U(1)$ phase factor on the wave function when the gauge transformation is performed. This change is conveniently incorporated by using the effective gauge potential in materials ($\varphi_{\text{eff}}, A_{\text{eff}}$) since it is gauge invariant with respect to the choice of the gauge adopted in ($\varphi_{\text{em}}, A_{\text{em}}$) due to the fact that the arbitrariness in the gauge is absorbed in the Berry connection. It is noteworthy that an explanation is given to the long-standing puzzling problem of the ‘flux rule’, the Faraday’s induction formula is consist of one of the Maxwell equations and the Lorentz force calculation by using the effective gauge potential in materials.
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