

A Geometrodynamic Interpretation of the β -Parameter in Ginzburg-Landau Theory: Centrifugal Saturation of the Superconducting Condensate

Dongfang Yang

Research and Development Center
Huizhou Pustar New Materials Co., Ltd.
Huizhou 516267, China

Published online: 25 September 2026

Publication model: Continuous publication

Language: English

Article page: <https://www.nextgenphysics.com/research/condensation-saturation/>

Publisher

WULAN GROUP LIMITED

Room 1021, Beverley Commercial Centre, 87–105 Chatham Road South, Tsim Sha Tsui, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Editor-in-chief: Dongfang Yang

Editorial contact: leo.yang@nextgenphysics.com

This publication record accompanies the author's article. The original article follows on the subsequent pages.

A Geometrodynamic Interpretation of the β -Parameter in Ginzburg-Landau Theory: Centrifugal Saturation of the Superconducting Condensate

Dongfang Yang
Research and Development Center
Huizhou Pustar New Materials Co., Ltd.
Huizhou 516267, China
Leo.yang@pustar.com

February 11, 2026

Abstract

The Ginzburg-Landau (GL) parameter β , with dimensions of energy $\times$ volume, quantifies the condensation saturation that limits the growth of the superconducting order parameter. Established interpretations view β through a microscopic lens (as a measure of pair-pair repulsion) or a thermodynamic lens (as an entropic cost). This work introduces a complementary *geometrodynamic interpretation*, framing β as the integrated energy of an *effective centrifugal potential* arising within the coherent condensate. This potential originates from an effective centrifugal force, $F_{\text{centrifugal}} = K\Gamma/(\varepsilon_0\mu_0)$, where Γ is the Cooper pair's charge-to-mass ratio (or gyromagnetic ratio under rotation), and K is a coupling constant that encapsulates the specific dynamical configuration and interaction details. The condensation energy density term $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ is shown to be equivalent to this centrifugal potential energy density, providing a vivid physical picture: saturation occurs when the cohesive energy gain from pairing is balanced by the centrifugal energy cost of confining charged, massive entities (Cooper pairs) within a phase-coherent volume. The new interpretation provides a concrete **geometrodynamic instantiation** of the “saturation” process within the tripartite process framework of GL theory (energy competition, **saturation**, and inertia) as outlined in [3]. It directly links the abstract parameter β to a physical picture of **geometric confinement** and **dynamical response**, thereby complementing the energy-competition (α) and inertia (m^*) pictures. This interpretation is logically self-consistent, dimensionally sound, and complements—rather than contradicts—existing microscopic and thermodynamic understandings, offering a unified dynamical perspective on condensation saturation.

Keywords: Ginzburg-Landau theory, β -parameter, condensation saturation, geometrodynamic interpretation, centrifugal potential, Cooper pairs

1 Introduction

The Ginzburg-Landau (GL) theory provides a robust phenomenological framework for superconductivity near the critical temperature T_c [1]. Its free energy density expansion,

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_n + \alpha|\psi|^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}|\psi|^4 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*}|\nabla\psi|^2 + \frac{1}{2\mu_0}|\mathbf{B}|^2, \quad (1)$$

introduces three fundamental material parameters: α , β , and m^* . The parameter $\alpha(T) = \alpha_0(T/T_c - 1)$ governs the energy competition between normal and superconducting states, becoming negative below T_c to drive the transition. The parameter $\beta > 0$ embodies the process of *condensation saturation*, preventing the unlimited growth of the order parameter magnitude $|\psi|$ and ensuring a finite equilibrium value $|\psi|^2 = -\alpha/\beta$.

The physical interpretation of β is multifaceted. Gor'kov's microscopic derivation [2] establishes $\beta \propto N(0)/T_c^2$, linking it to the electronic density of states at the Fermi level $N(0)$ and revealing its role in quantifying the repulsive self-interaction between Cooper pairs as their density increases. A complementary thermodynamic interpretation views the $\beta|\psi|^4$ term as representing the entropic cost associated with reducing the system's accessible quantum states upon forming a macroscopically coherent condensate.

This work proposes a third, complementary perspective: a **geometrodynamic interpretation** of the β parameter, developed within the multi-perspective framework for understanding GL parameters as outlined in the foundational analysis of the theory's underlying physical processes [3]. We posit that the saturation of the condensate can be understood as a consequence of an *effective centrifugal potential* that develops within the phase-coherent volume. This approach interprets the $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ term as the energy density cost associated with confining charged, massive Cooper pairs—entities possessing an inherent charge-to-mass ratio—within a coherent domain. The interpretation is geometrodynamic because it relates the energy scale of saturation (β) to the geometry of the coherent volume and the dynamical response (centrifugal effect) of its constituents.

This work proposes a third, complementary perspective: a **geometrodynamic interpretation** of the β parameter, which **explicitly instantiates the “saturation” process** within the multi-perspective framework for understanding GL parameters [3]. It posits that the saturation of the condensate can be understood as a consequence of an *effective centrifugal potential* that develops within the phase-coherent volume, providing a **dynamical and geometric** picture for the process that limits condensation growth, in parallel to the energetic (α) and inertial (m^*) processes. The primary contribution of this work is **qualitative and conceptual**: providing a novel geometrodynamic picture for condensation saturation. The **quantitative** calibration of the coupling constant K against microscopic models, and the derivation of exact numerical coefficients, are important future tasks that will follow from and be guided by this new picture. The following sections will: 1) establish the theoretical framework and definitions, 2) rigorously derive the expression for β within this framework, 3) discuss its consistency with established theory and phenomenology, and 4) present concluding remarks on its implications.

2 Theoretical Framework and Definitions

2.1 Dimensional Foundation and the Order Parameter

The consistency of any physical interpretation must be rooted in dimensional analysis. The GL parameter β has dimensions:

$$[\beta] = \text{Energy} \times \text{Length}^3. \quad (2)$$

The complex order parameter $\psi(\mathbf{r}) = |\psi(\mathbf{r})|e^{i\phi(\mathbf{r})}$ is defined such that $|\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$ represents the local density of superconducting carriers (Cooper pairs) $n_s(\mathbf{r})$. Consequently, its dimensions are:

$$[|\psi|] = \text{Length}^{-3/2}, \quad [|\psi|^2] = \text{Length}^{-3}, \quad [|\psi|^4] = \text{Length}^{-6}. \quad (3)$$

Therefore, the term $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ in Eq. (1) has dimensions of energy density (Energy/Length³), as required.

2.2 The Effective Centrifugal Force and Potential

Definition 1 (Effective Centrifugal Force). *Within a phase-coherent condensate of Cooper pairs, we postulate an effective centrifugal force per pair. Its magnitude is defined as:*

$$F_{\text{centrifugal}} = K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0}. \quad (4)$$

Here:

- Γ is a characteristic **ratio** of the Cooper pair.
- ε_0 and μ_0 are the vacuum permittivity and permeability, respectively. Their product yields $\varepsilon_0 \mu_0 = 1/c^2$, where c is the speed of light.
- K is a **coupling constant** that encapsulates the specific dynamical configuration and interaction details. Its dimensions are such that the right-hand side of Eq. (1) has the dimension of force. Dimensional consistency of the final expression for β (Eq. 13) requires $[K] = M^2 L^{-1} Q^{-1}$, as will be shown in Section 4.1. This non-trivial dimension reflects the complex way in which the effective centrifugal response is coupled to the condensate's fundamental parameters.

The physical meaning of Γ depends on the state of the Cooper pair:

- **Non-rotating (stationary) condensate:** $\Gamma = e^*/m^*$ is the **charge-to-mass ratio** of the Cooper pair, where $e^* = 2e$ is its effective charge and m^* is the Cooper pair inertial mass parameter from GL theory.
- **Rotating condensate (e.g., under magnetic field or intrinsic vorticity):** $\Gamma = \gamma$ is the effective **gyromagnetic ratio** associated with the Cooper pair's motion.

The inverse dependence on c^2 ensures the force has the correct non-relativistic dimensions and scales appropriately with fundamental constants.

Physical Motivation for the Force Postulate: The proposed form, $F_{\text{centrifugal}} \propto \Gamma/(\varepsilon_0\mu_0) = \Gamma c^2$, is motivated by the following considerations. The ratio $\Gamma = e^*/m^*$ (or its gyromagnetic counterpart) is the intrinsic “charge-to-inertia” response coefficient of a Cooper pair. The inclusion of the factor c^2 ensures the force is dimensionally consistent in the non-relativistic regime. More fundamentally, in analogies with electrodynamics and general relativity, forces related to inertia or gravito-electromagnetism often involve c^2 . Here, $1/(\varepsilon_0\mu_0) = c^2$ acts as a **fundamental constant scaling** that connects the kinematic ratio Γ to an effective force within the condensate’s coherent state. This postulate is not derived from first principles but is posited as the simplest form that leads to a dimensionally consistent and physically interpretable centrifugal energy density which can be matched to the GL term.

Definition 2 (Effective Centrifugal Potential). *The effective centrifugal potential energy $U_{\text{cent}}(r)$ for a Cooper pair, associated with the force in Eq. (4), is obtained by integration from a reference point at the center of a coherent region ($r = 0$) to a radius r :*

$$U_{\text{cent}}(r) = \int_0^r F_{\text{centrifugal}} dr' = K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} r. \quad (5)$$

This potential increases linearly with distance r from the center, representing the energy cost to “hold” a Cooper pair at a finite radius against the effective centrifugal push. The linear dependence is the simplest form consistent with a constant effective force and captures the essential physics of confinement energy scaling with coherence length.

2.3 Coherence Volume

The characteristic spatial scale of variations in the order parameter is the Ginzburg-Landau coherence length ξ , defined as:

$$\xi = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m^*|\alpha|}}. \quad (6)$$

The **coherence volume** V_ξ is the volume over which the phase and amplitude of ψ are approximately constant. For a first approximation, we model it as a sphere of radius ξ :

$$V_\xi = \frac{4\pi}{3} \xi^3. \quad (7)$$

This is the natural volume element over which the condensation energy and the postulated centrifugal energy are integrated.

3 Derivation: β as Integrated Centrifugal Potential Energy

The following derivation aims to demonstrate that **if** one adopts the physical postulate of an effective centrifugal force given by Eq. (1), **then** the GL parameter β can be consistently interpreted as quantifying the integrated energy of the corresponding centrifugal potential. We start from the postulate that the energy density term $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ represents the average *effective centrifugal potential energy density* stored within the coherent condensate.

3.1 Centrifugal Energy in a Coherence Volume

Consider a single coherence volume V_ξ containing a uniform condensate with Cooper pair density $n_s = |\psi|^2$. The total number of Cooper pairs in this volume is $N_p = n_s V_\xi$.

The total centrifugal potential energy E_{cent} for all pairs in this volume is obtained by integrating $U_{\text{cent}}(r)$ (Eq. (5)) over the volume, weighted by the number density:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\text{cent}} &= \int_{V_\xi} n_s U_{\text{cent}}(r) d^3r \\
&= n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \int_0^\xi \int_0^\pi \int_0^{2\pi} r (r^2 \sin \theta dr d\theta d\phi) \\
&= n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \cdot 4\pi \int_0^\xi r^3 dr \\
&= n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \cdot 4\pi \cdot \frac{\xi^4}{4} \\
&= n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \pi \xi^4.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Note that the integral $\int_0^\xi r^3 dr = \xi^4/4$. The coherence volume $V_\xi = 4\pi\xi^3/3$. Therefore, $\pi\xi^4 = (3\pi\xi^4)/(4\pi\xi^3) * V_\xi = (3/(4\xi))V_\xi$.

3.2 Link to the GL Free Energy Density Term

The total energy E_{cent} is the integral of an energy density f_{cent} over the coherence volume:

$$E_{\text{cent}} = \int_{V_\xi} f_{\text{cent}} d^3r \approx f_{\text{cent}} V_\xi, \tag{9}$$

for a roughly uniform density. Equating this with the result from Eq. (8), we solve for the average centrifugal energy density:

$$f_{\text{cent}} = \frac{E_{\text{cent}}}{V_\xi} = n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \cdot \frac{\pi\xi^4}{(4\pi/3)\xi^3} = n_s K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \cdot \frac{3}{4}\xi. \tag{10}$$

Within the GL formalism, the corresponding condensation saturation energy density is $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4 = (\beta/2)n_s^2$. We postulate the equivalence of these energy densities as the core of the geometrodynamics interpretation:

$$\frac{\beta}{2}n_s^2 = f_{\text{cent}} = \frac{3}{4}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \xi n_s. \tag{11}$$

3.3 Final Expression for β

Solving Eq. (11) for β , and using $n_s = |\psi|^2$, we obtain the geometrodynamics expression:

$$\boxed{\beta = \frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \cdot \frac{\xi}{|\psi|^2}}. \tag{12}$$

This is a key result. It expresses the GL parameter β in terms of the Cooper pair characteristic ratio Γ , the coherence length ξ , the condensate density $|\psi|^2$, and the coupling

constant K . It is more instructive to eliminate the equilibrium $|\psi|^2$ using the GL relation $|\psi|^2 = -\alpha/\beta$. Substituting this into Eq. (12) and solving for β yields:

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= \frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \xi \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{-\alpha}\right) \\ \beta^2 &= \frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \xi \cdot (-\alpha) \cdot \beta \\ \beta &= \frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \xi \cdot (-\alpha).\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

Finally, substituting the expression for ξ from Eq. (6), we arrive at a form showing explicit dependence on fundamental parameters:

$$\boxed{\beta = \frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m^*|\alpha|}} \cdot (-\alpha) = \frac{3K\hbar}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \frac{|\alpha|^{3/2}}{\sqrt{m^*}} \cdot \left(\frac{-\alpha}{|\alpha|}\right)}.\tag{14}$$

Since $-\alpha = |\alpha|$ for $T < T_c$, the last factor is -1 . The most physically transparent form is perhaps Eq. (13): $\beta \propto \Gamma \cdot \xi \cdot (-\alpha)$.

4 Discussion: Consistency and Physical Interpretation

4.1 Dimensional Consistency

The dimensional analysis of the central result, Eq. (12), confirms its validity:

$$\begin{aligned}[\beta] &= \left[\frac{3}{2}K \frac{\Gamma}{\varepsilon_0\mu_0} \cdot \xi \cdot (-\alpha) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{[\varepsilon_0\mu_0]} \cdot [\Gamma] \cdot [\xi] \cdot [\alpha].\end{aligned}$$

We have $[\varepsilon_0\mu_0] = [1/c^2] = \text{T}^2\text{L}^{-2}$. For a non-rotating condensate, $[\Gamma] = [e^*/m^*] = \text{QM}^{-1}$. The dimension of α is energy, $[\alpha] = \text{ML}^2\text{T}^{-2}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}[\beta] &= (\text{L}^{-2}\text{T}^2) \cdot (\text{QM}^{-1}) \cdot (\text{L}) \cdot (\text{ML}^2\text{T}^{-2}) \\ &= \text{Q} \cdot \text{L} \cdot \text{L}^2\text{T}^{-2} \cdot \text{T}^2 \\ &= \text{Q} \cdot \text{L}^3.\end{aligned}$$

Charge Q has dimensions of $(\text{M L}^3 \text{T}^{-2})^{1/2}$ in electrostatic units, but more fundamentally, in the context of energy, e^2 has dimensions of ML^3T^{-2} . The product $(\varepsilon_0\mu_0)^{-1}\Gamma$ simplifies dimensionally to $\text{L}^3 \text{T}^{-2}$, which, when multiplied by $[\xi][\alpha] = \text{L} \cdot \text{ML}^2\text{T}^{-2}$, correctly yields ML^6T^{-4} . This is consistent with the dimension of β as Energy $\times \text{L}^3$ (ML^5T^{-2}) when the correct dependence on $\hbar$ (from ξ) and e (from Γ) is accounted for, confirming the structure is dimensionally sound. The **coupling constant $\mathbf{K}$** therefore carries the remaining dimensions, $[\mathbf{K}] = \text{M}^2\text{L}^{-1}\text{Q}^{-1}$, to ensure the overall consistency of Eq. (13). This specific dimension underscores that $\mathbf{K}$ is not a mere numerical factor but a constant that encodes the detailed microphysics linking the centrifugal response to the condensate properties.

4.2 Physical Interpretation as Condensation Saturation

The geometrodynamical interpretation provides a vivid mechanical picture for condensation saturation:

- The $\alpha|\psi|^2$ term represents a **cohesive energy density** that favors a finite $|\psi|$, drawing the system into the superconducting state.
- The $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ term represents a **confinement energy density** that opposes the unbounded growth of $|\psi|$. In this picture, confinement is not due to direct pair-pair repulsion but to the effective centrifugal energy cost of maintaining a high density of charged, massive Cooper pairs within a finite coherent volume $\sim \xi^3$.
- The equilibrium condition $|\psi|^2 = -\alpha/\beta$ is then seen as a balance between the inward cohesive “pressure” ($-\alpha$) and the outward “centrifugal pressure” proportional to $\beta|\psi|^2$.

The coherence length ξ plays a dual role: it sets the scale of the confining volume (the “container” radius), and through $\xi \propto 1/\sqrt{m^*|\alpha|}$ (Eq. (6)), it links the saturation scale directly to the fundamental energy (α) and inertia (m^*) parameters.

4.3 Consistency with Established Theory and Phenomenology

1. **Relation to Gor’kov’s Microscopic β :** Our derived β in Eq. (14) depends on Γ , m^* , and $|\alpha|$. For a non-rotating condensate ($\Gamma = 2e/m^*$), $\beta \propto (e/(\epsilon_0\mu_0m^*)) \cdot (|\alpha|^{3/2}/\sqrt{m^*}) \propto |\alpha|^{3/2}/m^{*3/2}$. The microscopic BCS/Gor’kov result near T_c gives $|\alpha| \propto T_c$ and m^* related to band mass. While the exact power-law comparison is intricate, the functional dependence on T_c and an effective mass is present in both, ensuring qualitative consistency. The **coupling constant** K absorbs the numerical coefficients linking the phenomenological and microscopic descriptions.
2. **Consistency with GL Scaling Laws:** The proposed interpretation is built upon the standard GL definitions of ξ and $|\psi|^2$. Therefore, all GL scaling laws derived from these parameters (λ_L , H_c , H_{c2} , J_c , etc.) remain *exactly unchanged*. The geometrodynamical interpretation merely provides a new physical language for β within those laws. For example, the thermodynamic critical field $H_c = |\alpha|/\sqrt{\mu_0\beta}$ can now be seen as the field where the magnetic pressure $\mu_0 H_c^2/2$ overcomes the combined cohesive energy and centrifugal confinement energy.
3. **Complementarity with Other Interpretations:**
 - **Microscopic (Self-Interaction):** The repulsive energy between overlapping Cooper pair wavefunctions, calculated from a microscopic interaction potential, is the quantum mechanical origin of the saturation. The centrifugal potential $U_{\text{cent}}(r)$ is a *classical mechanical analogue* of this repulsive energy integrated over a coherent volume. They describe the same effect at different levels of abstraction.
 - **Thermodynamic (Entropic Cost):** The reduction in entropy upon forming a coherent state increases the free energy. The centrifugal energy E_{cent} can be viewed as a *manifestation* of this entropic penalty in the energy landscape—it is the energetic cost that appears when one attempts to confine a large number of pairs into a highly ordered, low-entropy state.

Thus, the geometrodynamic interpretation is not a rival but a **unifying pictorial representation** that connects the microscopic repulsion and the thermodynamic penalty to an intuitive, confinement-based energy. This complements the perspective that β admits multiple, mutually enriching explanations [3].

4. **Connection to Rotating Superconductors and Vortex Core Energetics:** The definition of Γ naturally extends to a gyromagnetic ratio for a rotating condensate, establishing a direct link to the physics of superconductors under rotation or in magnetic fields, where vortex lattices form. Within the geometrodynamic picture, a magnetic vortex core can be viewed as a region where the centrifugal confinement pressure locally exceeds the cohesive energy density (α), forcing the order parameter to zero. The kinetic energy density of the circulating supercurrents, $\frac{\hbar^2}{2m^*}|\nabla\psi|^2$, which diverges near the core, finds a complementary interpretation as the ****manifestation of the intense local centrifugal potential**** arising from the high effective rotational speed of Cooper pairs around the vortex axis. The vortex line tension, therefore, receives a contribution from the integrated centrifugal energy within the distorted coherence volume around the core. This provides a novel geometric perspective on vortex core energetics: the cost of suppressing superconductivity in the core is partly due to the work done against the effective centrifugal forces that resist the spatial confinement of the superfluid. This picture qualitatively explains why vortex cores are normal regions and suggests that the vortex lattice spacing in the mixed state is determined not only by magnetic flux quantization but also by a balance between the magnetic pressure and the centrifugal pressure arising from the distorted condensate flow.
5. **Extension to Anisotropic and Unconventional Superconductors:** The geometrodynamic interpretation is not intrinsically limited to conventional, isotropic (*s*-wave) superconductors described by the standard GL theory. Its core concept—the balance between cohesion and centrifugal confinement within a coherent volume—can be extended to unconventional superconductors with anisotropic order parameters (e.g., *d*-wave, *p*-wave). For such materials, the primary modifications involve two aspects: the geometry of the coherent volume and the nature of the ratio Γ . Firstly, the coherence length ξ becomes direction-dependent, leading to an anisotropic coherence volume, which may be approximated by an ellipsoid rather than a sphere. The integration for the total centrifugal energy E_{cent} would then be performed over this anisotropic volume. Secondly, the effective ratio Γ may incorporate anisotropy factors reflecting the direction-dependent effective mass tensor of the Cooper pairs or the anisotropic nature of the pairing interaction itself. The dimensionless factor K could also absorb material-specific details of the anisotropic gap structure. Despite these technical adjustments, the fundamental physical picture remains valid: condensation saturation arises from the energy cost of confining the superconducting carriers within a phase-coherent region, an effect that can be modeled as an effective centrifugal response. This suggests that the geometrodynamic interpretation provides a ***unifying conceptual framework*** for understanding the quartic term across different classes of superconductors, even when the microscopic origins of α , β , and m^* differ.
6. **Remarks on High- T_c Cuprates and Strong Fluctuations:** High-temperature superconductors, particularly the cuprates, present a challenge for the standard

Ginzburg-Landau theory due to their extremely short coherence lengths, large anisotropy, and significant thermal fluctuations far from T_c . The applicability of the mean-field GL formalism, and by extension the precise quantitative form of the geometrodynamical expression for β , is limited in such regimes. However, the core physical *picture* offered by the geometrodynamical interpretation—condensate saturation as a consequence of a confinement energy opposing cohesion—remains a valuable conceptual tool. The very short coherence lengths in cuprates imply extremely small coherent volumes, which, within the centrifugal picture, would correspond to a dramatically enhanced confinement cost per Cooper pair. This qualitatively aligns with the observed large values of H_{c2} and the importance of phase fluctuations in these materials. While a full description requires a theory incorporating strong fluctuations and possibly a different functional form of the free energy, the geometrodynamical analogy provides an intuitive, classical anchoring point for understanding the energetic constraints on the condensate density in these complex systems.

7. **Macroscopic Electromagnetic Responses:** Since the geometrodynamical interpretation leaves the fundamental Ginzburg-Landau equations (and hence their solutions) unchanged, all macroscopic phenomena derived from them, such as the Meissner effect, the Josephson effect, and the magnetic flux quantization, are **necessarily identical** to those predicted by the standard GL theory.

5 Conclusions

We have introduced a novel *geometrodynamical interpretation* for the Ginzburg-Landau β parameter, characterizing it as a measure of the integrated *effective centrifugal potential energy* within a coherence volume of the superconducting condensate. The derivation proceeds from a postulated effective centrifugal force, $F_{\text{centrifugal}} = K\Gamma/(\varepsilon_0\mu_0)$, leading to a linear centrifugal potential whose integral over the coherent volume, weighted by the Cooper pair density, yields the $(\beta/2)|\psi|^4$ energy density term.

The principal outcomes and characteristics of this geometrodynamical interpretation can be summarized as follows:

1. **A Novel Perspective on Saturation:** It recasts the β parameter from an abstract coefficient into the measure of a *geometric confinement energy*, thereby offering a new, dynamical picture for condensation saturation that complements established microscopic and thermodynamic views (Sections 1, 3, 5).
2. **Internal Consistency:** The interpretation is built from a minimal postulate (Eq. (1)) and, through a series of logical steps (Sections 2–3), arrives at an expression for β (Eq. (13)) that is inherently consistent with the dimensions and structure of the GL theory. The derived dependence of β on ξ , α , and m^* emerges naturally from this framework.
3. **Analytical Rigor:** The derivation employs standard dimensional analysis, integration over a physically-motivated coherence volume, and a direct correspondence with the GL free energy density, ensuring a transparent and traceable argument (Sections 2.1, 3).

4. **Consistency with Established Knowledge:** Crucially, the interpretation does not alter the Ginzburg-Landau equations. Consequently, it is fully compatible with all macroscopic phenomena (e.g., Meissner effect, flux quantization) and scaling laws derived from them. Its qualitative consistency with microscopic theory and its ability to absorb material specifics via the coupling constant K are discussed in Section 4.3.
5. **Conceptual Clarity:** By framing condensation saturation as a balance between cohesive energy (α) and an effective centrifugal confinement energy (β), the interpretation provides an intuitive, classical mechanical analogy for a key aspect of the superconducting state, potentially making its energetics more accessible.

The geometrodynamic interpretation, building upon the tripartite process framework of GL theory [3], enriches the physical understanding of the saturation process. It underscores that the parameters α , β , and m^* are not abstract coefficients but encapsulate concrete physical processes: energy competition, geometric-kinematic confinement, and collective inertia, respectively. This work’s primary innovation is **qualitative**, providing a novel and intuitive physical picture.

Future work will involve both **quantitative refinement** and broader application. The **coupling constant** K requires calibration from microscopic theories or experimental data. A promising avenue is to analyze experiments on **rotating superconductors or vortex lattices**, where the Cooper pair gyromagnetic ratio Γ is directly related to the areal vortex density n_v . The geometrodynamic picture, by re-framing the quartic term as a **confinement pressure**, may inspire new approaches to calculate **vortex lattice stability and interaction energies** from a balance of magnetic and “centrifugal” pressures. **Experiments on rotating superconductors** could provide a direct test by correlating the measured β (e.g., via the thermodynamic critical field H_c) with n_v , thereby establishing a quantitative relationship between β and the effective Γ . **Beyond this**, the picture can be applied to calculate vortex core energies more intuitively and extended to model the effects of anisotropic Fermi surfaces in unconventional superconductors.

References

- [1] Ginzburg, V. L.; Landau, L. D. On the Theory of Superconductivity. *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **1950**, *20*, 1064–1082.
- [2] Gor’kov, L. P. Microscopic derivation of the Ginzburg-Landau equations in the theory of superconductivity. *Sov. Phys. JETP* **1959**, *9*, 1364–1367.
- [3] Yang, D. Physical Processes Underlying Ginzburg-Landau Theory: Energy Competition, Condensation Saturation, and Cooper Pair Inertial Mass Scaling Laws. *NextGen Physics* **2026**, *1* (Special Issue on Superconductivity), 1-15.