

Fluctuation theorems in general stochastic processes with odd-parity variables

Hyun Keun Lee,¹ Chulan Kwon,² and Hyunggyu Park³

¹*Department of Physics, University of Seoul, Seoul 130-743, Korea*

²*Department of Physics, Myongji University, Yongin, Gyeonggi-Do 449-728, Korea*

³*School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

(Dated: May 10, 2021)

We show that the total entropy production in stochastic processes with odd-parity variables (under time reversal) is separated into three parts, only two of which satisfy the integral fluctuation theorems in general. One is the usual excess entropy production, which can appear only transiently and is called nonadiabatic. Another one is attributed solely to the breakage of detailed balance. The last part not satisfying the fluctuation theorem comes from the steady-state distribution asymmetry for odd-parity variables, which is activated in a non-transient manner. The latter two contributions combine together as the house-keeping (adiabatic) entropy production, whose positivity is not guaranteed except when the excess entropy production completely vanishes.

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 02.50.-r, 05.40.-a

The (integral) *fluctuation theorem* (FT) [1–5] can be stated for a variable \mathcal{R}_r (or \mathcal{R} in brief) assigned to a random sequence of states (or event) r [6] as

$$\langle e^{-\mathcal{R}} \rangle \equiv \sum_r \mathcal{P}_r e^{-\mathcal{R}} = 1, \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{P}_r is the probability of a sequence r . As a corollary, the Jensen's inequality guarantees $\langle \mathcal{R} \rangle \geq 0$. Consider r as a path or trajectory in state space, generated during a time interval by a stochastic dynamics. In case when its *functional* \mathcal{R} [7] represents the total entropy production during the process, the FT has been derived for various nonequilibrium(NEQ) processes, and the thermodynamic 2nd law $\langle \Delta S_{\text{tot}} \rangle \geq 0$ automatically follows [3, 4, 8].

More recently, Hatano and Sasa found that a part of the total entropy production (excess entropy), ΔS_{ex} , also satisfies the FT, which represents the entropy production associated with transitions between steady states [9, 10]. Later, Speck and Seifert showed that the remaining part (house-keeping entropy), ΔS_{hk} , also satisfies the FT, which is required to maintain the NEQ steady state (NESS) [11, 12]. In case of (quasi-static) reversible processes, the system stays at equilibrium almost always during the process, then the house-keeping entropy production vanishes, $\Delta S_{\text{hk}}^{\text{eq}} = 0$. Most recently, Esposito *et. al.* [6] interpreted the house-keeping entropy as an adiabatic part and the excess entropy as a nonadiabatic part of the total entropy production, through a time-scale argument.

Most of findings about the FTs so far hold only when all state variables have even parity under time reversal, such as position variables. A typical example is the driven Brownian motion in the over-damped limit. Including odd-parity variables, such as momentum, the mathematical description becomes more complicated in particular for NEQ processes. Recently, Spinney and Ford suggested a separation of the total entropy pro-

duction into three terms for the stochastic system with odd-parity variables [13]. The excess entropy production can be cleanly separated out (in fact, exactly the same as in the case with even-parity variables only) and it satisfies the FT. However, the house-keeping part composes of two different terms and only one term satisfies the FT. Especially, the other term not satisfying the FT turns out to be *transient*, which seems inconsistent with the usual adiabatic feature of the house-keeping entropy. Thus, it was concluded that the physical interpretation of separated entropies is not as clear as in the even-variable only case (adiabatic vs nonadiabatic), which needs further unraveling.

In this Letter, we present a new scheme of separation for the total entropy production when odd-parity variables are included. In our scheme, the total entropy production is separated into the house-keeping and excess contributions, which correspond to the adiabatic and nonadiabatic ones, respectively. The house-keeping (adiabatic) contribution is composed of two *non-transient* characteristic terms, ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} , representing precisely the detailed balance (DB) breakage and the steady state distribution (SSD) asymmetry for odd-parity variables, respectively. It is clear that each term is adiabatic with different physical origins. For reversible processes, it is necessary to require both the DB and the SSD symmetry. Violation of either one brings about non-vanishing house-keeping entropy production and the processes become irreversible even in the steady state. The first term ΔS_{bDB} obeys the FT, while does neither the second ΔS_{as} nor their sum $\Delta S_{\text{hk}} = \Delta S_{\text{bDB}} + \Delta S_{\text{as}}$. The nonadiabatic (excess) part ΔS_{ex} is the same as in the even-variable only case, which satisfies the FT and so does the total entropy $\Delta S_{\text{tot}} = \Delta S_{\text{hk}} + \Delta S_{\text{ex}}$.

A stochastic process can be described by the master equation

$$\dot{p}_x(t) = \sum_y \omega_{x,y}(\lambda(t)) p_y(t), \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: Schematic of a sample path $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and its time-reversed path $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\tau - t)$. The horizontal axis represents time t with $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{N+1} = \tau$. The vertical represents state x in the upper and time-reversed state ϵx in the lower. There are two time indices. Index i is used for N jumping processes between different states at times $\{t_1, \dots, t_N\}$. j is used for the time-discretized version such as $t = j\Delta t$ ($j = 1, \dots, M$) with $\tau = (M + 1)\Delta t$ in the $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ limit. Note that x_i is the state kept unchanged during a time interval from t_i to t_{i+1} .

where $p_x(t)$ is the probability distribution of state x at time t , and $\omega_{x,y}$ is the transition rate from y to x for $x \neq y$ with $\omega_{y,y} = -\sum_{x \neq y} \omega_{x,y} (< 0)$. x represents a state vector (s_1, s_2, \dots) where each component s_k represents a state variable with a definite parity, $\epsilon_k = 1$ (even) or $\epsilon_k = -1$ (odd) under time reversal. The time-reversed state is given by $\epsilon x = (\epsilon_1 s_1, \epsilon_2 s_2, \dots)$. $\lambda(t)$ denotes a time-dependent protocol as a set of external control parameters.

Figure 1 shows a path $\mathbf{x}(t)$ generated by the master equation with the transition rate matrix $\omega = \{\omega_{x,y}\}$ during $t = 0$ to τ , and its time-reversed path $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ defined as $\epsilon \mathbf{x}(\tau - t)$. We assume that there are N jumping processes between different states at times $\{t_1, \dots, t_N\}$. Then the probability functional of the “forward” path $\mathbf{x}(t)$ reads

$$\mathcal{P}_\omega[\mathbf{x}] \propto p_{x_0} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} e^{\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt \omega_{x_i, x_i}(\lambda(t))} \omega_{x_{i+1}, x_i}(\lambda_{i+1}) \right) \times e^{\int_{t_N}^{\tau} dt \omega_{x_N, x_N}(\lambda(t))} \quad (3)$$

where p_{x_0} is the probability distribution of initial state x_0 , x_i is the state for $t_i < t < t_{i+1}$, and $\lambda_i = \lambda(t_i)$. The time-reversed process is considered under the protocol changes of $\lambda(t) \rightarrow \lambda(\tau - t)$, and the initial probability is chosen as the final probability of the forward process, p_{x_N} . After a proper rearrangement (see Ref. [6, 13] for details), the probability functional of the “reverse” path

$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ reads

$$\mathcal{P}_\omega[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}] \propto p_{x_N} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{N-1} e^{\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt \omega_{\epsilon x_i, \epsilon x_i}(\lambda(t))} \omega_{\epsilon x_i, \epsilon x_{i+1}}(\lambda_{i+1}) \right) \times e^{\int_{t_N}^{\tau} dt \omega_{\epsilon x_N, \epsilon x_N}(\lambda(t))} \quad (4)$$

We remark that Eqs. (3) and (4) have the same normalization factor since both include the same number of jumping processes.

The path-dependent total entropy production, $\Delta S_{\text{tot}}[\mathbf{x}]$, is the measure of the irreversibility of a path \mathbf{x} with respect to its time-reversed path $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$, which can be defined as the associated path probability ratio [11, 12]:

$$\Delta S_{\text{tot}}[\mathbf{x}] = \ln \frac{\mathcal{P}_\omega[\mathbf{x}]}{\mathcal{P}_\omega[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}]} \quad (5)$$

Note that ΔS_{tot} is a FT functional since it satisfies Eq. (1); $\langle e^{-\Delta S_{\text{tot}}} \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{P}_\omega[\mathbf{x}] e^{-\Delta S_{\text{tot}}} = \sum_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} \mathcal{P}_\omega[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}] = 1$ (Jacobian $|\partial \tilde{\mathbf{x}} / \partial \mathbf{x}| = 1$). If there are only even-parity variables (all $\epsilon_k = 1$), the exponential factors of staying probabilities in Eqs. (3) and (4) are identical. These factors are completely canceled out in the probability ratio, and thus only transition rates matter in ΔS_{tot} . However, it does not work in that way when odd-parity variables are included, and this is a main source of mathematical difficulty and also different physical origins.

It is convenient to express the path probability by the conditional probability for transition from y to x during discretized unit time Δt (Fig. 1), given as

$$\Gamma_{x,y}(\lambda(t)) = \delta_{x,y} + \omega_{x,y}(\lambda(t))\Delta t \quad (6)$$

where $\delta_{x,y}$ is the Kronecker delta valued 1 for $x = y$ or 0 otherwise. Δt is chosen small enough to maintain $\Gamma_{x,x} > 0$. Then the two path probabilities can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{P}_\Gamma[\mathbf{x}] = p_{x_0} \prod_{j=1}^M \Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}(\lambda_j) , \\ \mathcal{P}_\Gamma[\tilde{\mathbf{x}}] = p_{x_N} \prod_{j=1}^M \Gamma_{\epsilon x_j^-, \epsilon x_j^+}(\lambda_j) , \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where x_j^+ and x_j^- represent states just after and before time $t = j\Delta t$ respectively and $\lambda_j = \lambda(j\Delta t)$. Note that the product therein includes the staying processes of $x_j^+ = x_j^-$ as well as the jumping processes. Using Eq. (7), one simply writes ΔS_{tot} as

$$\Delta S_{\text{tot}} = \Delta S + \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \frac{\Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}(\lambda_j)}{\Gamma_{\epsilon x_j^-, \epsilon x_j^+}(\lambda_j)} \quad (8)$$

where $\Delta S = -\ln(p_{x_N}/p_{x_0})$ is the entropy change of the system for the forward path. We will later take the $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ limit to come back to the original problem. The explicit path dependence of the entropy production is dropped just for simplicity.

The breakage of the DB is an essential characteristics of nonequilibrium processes, which leads to entropy production even in the NESS. Thus, it would be useful to search for a separation scheme to isolate the entropy production due to the DB breakage only. The generalized (instantaneous) DB condition at time t for stochastic processes with odd-parity variables is given as $\omega_{x,y}(\lambda(t))p_y^s(\lambda(t)) = \omega_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}(\lambda(t))p_{\epsilon x}^s(\lambda(t))$ for $x \neq y$ where $p_x^s(\lambda(t))$ is the SSD of state x for a constant protocol λ , whose value is given by $\lambda(t)$, satisfying the steady state equation $\sum_x \omega_{y,x}(\lambda)p_x^s(\lambda) = 0$. This condition guarantees no physical average currents between states in the steady state and also yields a relation regarding to the diagonal elements as $\omega_{x,x}(\lambda(t))p_x^s(\lambda(t)) = \omega_{\epsilon x, \epsilon x}(\lambda(t))p_{\epsilon x}^s(\lambda(t))$, using $\omega_{x,x} = -\sum_{y \neq x} \omega_{y,x}$. In terms of the conditional probabilities, the generalized DB condition thus reads as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{x,y}(\lambda(t)) &= \Gamma_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}(\lambda(t)) \frac{p_{\epsilon x}^s(\lambda(t))}{p_y^s(\lambda(t))} + \left[1 - \frac{p_{\epsilon x}^s(\lambda(t))}{p_x^s(\lambda(t))} \right] \delta_{x,y}, \\ &= \delta_{x,y} + \omega_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}(\lambda(t)) \frac{p_{\epsilon x}^s(\lambda(t))}{p_y^s(\lambda(t))} \Delta t \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We propose the *adjoint* stochastic process with $\Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger$ that can be used to provide a precise measure of the broken DB as

$$\Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger(\lambda(t)) = \delta_{x,y} + \omega_{x,y}^\dagger(\lambda(t)) \Delta t \quad (10)$$

with

$$\omega_{x,y}^\dagger = \omega_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x} \frac{p_{\epsilon x}^s}{p_y^s}. \quad (11)$$

It is trivial to show that Γ^\dagger is *stochastic* with sufficiently small Δt [14]: $\sum_x \Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger = 1$ and $\Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger \geq 0$ for all x, y .

When $\Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger = \Gamma_{x,y}$, the DB is satisfied. The entropy production due to the DB breakage, ΔS_{dDB} , can be defined as

$$\Delta S_{\text{bDB}} = \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \frac{\Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}(\lambda_j)}{\Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}^\dagger(\lambda_j)} = \ln \frac{\mathcal{P}_\Gamma[\mathbf{x}]}{\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\dagger}[\mathbf{x}]}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^\dagger}[\mathbf{x}] = p_{x_0} \prod_{j=1}^M \Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}^\dagger(\lambda_j)$ is the probability of the forward path \mathbf{x} by the adjoint dynamics. ΔS_{bDB} is a FT functional by itself, satisfying the integral FT and must belong to the house-keeping entropy production, since it contributes even in the steady state. It also satisfies the detailed FT: $P(R)/P^\dagger(-R) = e^R$, where $P(R)$ is the probability that $\Delta S_{\text{bDB}} = R$ in the original process while P^\dagger is its counterpart in the adjoint process. This is because the mapping to the adjoint dynamics is *involution* ($\Gamma^{\dagger\dagger} = \Gamma$) [6], since both the original and adjoint dynamics share the same SSD ($p_x^s = p_x^{\dagger s}$).

Now subtracting ΔS_{bDB} from ΔS_{tot} , one can write the remaining part, $\Delta S' = \Delta S_{\text{tot}} - \Delta S_{\text{bDB}}$ as

$$\Delta S' = \ln \frac{p_{x_0}}{p_{x_N}} + \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \frac{\Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}^\dagger(\lambda_j)}{\Gamma_{\epsilon x_j^-, \epsilon x_j^+}(\lambda_j)}, \quad (13)$$

which is not a FT functional in general, because it is not guaranteed to write down $\Delta S' = \ln \mathcal{P}_\Gamma[\mathbf{x}]/\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma'}[\mathbf{x}']$ for the probability functional $\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma'}[\mathbf{x}']$ of (reverse) path \mathbf{x}' in a stochastic dynamics with a certain conditional probability Γ' . One can find the stochastic condition for $\Gamma'_{y,x} = \Gamma_{x,y} \Gamma_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x} / \Gamma_{x,y}^\dagger$ as

$$\sum_y \Gamma'_{y,x} = 1 + \left(\frac{p_x^s - p_{\epsilon x}^s}{p_{\epsilon x}^s} \right) \left(\frac{\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger - \Gamma_{x,x}}{\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger} \right). \quad (14)$$

This shows that Γ' is in general not stochastic due to ϵ mismatch (note that $\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger$ also includes ϵ). Exceptions when $p_x^s = p_{\epsilon x}^s$ or $\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger = \Gamma_{x,x}$ will be revisited later.

We can instead extract the excess entropy part by introducing another stochastic process with $\Gamma_{x,y}^*$ (exactly the same one as in the even-variable only case) as

$$\Gamma_{x,y}^*(\lambda(t)) = \delta_{x,y} + \omega_{x,y}^*(\lambda(t)) \Delta t \quad (15)$$

with

$$\omega_{x,y}^* = \omega_{y,x} \frac{p_x^s}{p_y^s}. \quad (16)$$

Now, we define the excess entropy production, ΔS_{ex} , as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{\text{ex}} &= \ln \frac{p_{x_0}}{p_{x_N}} + \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \frac{\Gamma_{x_j^+, x_j^-}(\lambda_j)}{\Gamma_{x_j^-, x_j^+}^*(\lambda_j)} = \ln \frac{\mathcal{P}_\Gamma[\mathbf{x}]}{\mathcal{P}_{\Gamma^*}[\hat{\mathbf{x}}]} \\ &= \Delta S + \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \frac{p_{x_j^+}^s}{p_{x_j^-}^s}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the path for the Γ^* process is given by $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{x}(\tau-t)$ (time-reversed without parity change). Of course, ΔS_{ex} is again a FT functional, satisfying the integral FT.

The remaining part, $\Delta S_{\text{as}} = \Delta S_{\text{tot}} - \Delta S_{\text{bDB}} - \Delta S_{\text{ex}}$, can be written as

$$\Delta S_{\text{as}} = \sum_{j=1}^M \ln \left[\frac{p_{\epsilon x_j^+}^s}{p_{x_j^+}^s} + \delta_{x_j^+, x_j^-} \frac{p_{x_j^+}^s - p_{\epsilon x_j^+}^s}{p_{x_j^+}^s \Gamma_{\epsilon x_j^+, \epsilon x_j^+}^s} \right]. \quad (18)$$

One can show easily that this part does not satisfy the FT except vanishing when there is a SSD symmetry as

$$p_{\epsilon x}^s = p_x^s \quad (19)$$

between *mirror* (opposite-parity) states. This *asymmetric* entropy production term is present even in the absence of external driving $\lambda(t)$ and also in the NESS

(clearly not transient), so must belong to the house-keeping entropy production. It therefore follows

$$\Delta S_{\text{tot}} = \Delta S_{\text{ex}} + \Delta S_{\text{hk}} \quad (20)$$

with $\Delta S_{\text{hk}} = \Delta S_{\text{bDB}} + \Delta S_{\text{as}}$, identified as the total house-keeping entropy production, which does not obey the FT in general.

The house-keeping entropy production should vanish in the reversible (equilibrium) processes, which implies that the equilibrium (EQ) condition requires not only the DB but also the symmetry between the SSD of the mirror states, when odd-parity variables are involved. These two conditions are independent, and our two house-keeping contributions, ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} , measure precisely the violation of these two EQ conditions, respectively.

It is worthy of noting that ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} steadily contribute to ΔS_{tot} in the adiabatic process (or even at $\lambda = 0$) where the time scale of $\lambda(t)$ -change is much larger than the relaxation time. This time scale argument is the reasoning behind the classification of adiabatic and non-adiabatic contributions in ΔS_{tot} , proposed in Ref. [6]. In this criterion, both ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} are the adiabatic contributions while ΔS_{ex} is the non-adiabatic one. So the total house-keeping entropy production comprising of ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} is the only and full adiabatic contribution to the total entropy production.

In the $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ (i.e., $M \rightarrow \infty$) limit, one can obtain

$$\Delta S_{\text{ex}} = \ln \frac{p_{x_0}}{p_{x_N}} + \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{p_{x_i}^s(\lambda(t_i))}{p_{x_{i-1}}^s(\lambda(t_i))}, \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{\text{hk}} &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt (\omega_{x_i, x_i}(\lambda(t)) - \omega_{\epsilon x_i, \epsilon x_i}(\lambda(t))) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{\omega_{x_i, x_{i-1}}(\lambda(t_i)) p_{x_{i-1}}^s}{\omega_{\epsilon x_i, \epsilon x_{i-1}}(\lambda(t_i)) p_{x_i}^s} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{\text{bDB}} &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt (\omega_{x_i, x_i}(\lambda(t)) - \omega_{x_i, x_i}^\dagger(\lambda(t))) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{\omega_{x_i, x_{i-1}}(\lambda(t_i))}{\omega_{x_i, x_{i-1}}^\dagger(\lambda(t_i))}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta S_{\text{as}} &= \sum_{i=0}^N \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt \omega_{\epsilon x_i, \epsilon x_i}(\lambda(t)) \left(\frac{p_{\epsilon x_i}^s(\lambda(t))}{p_{x_i}^s(\lambda(t))} - 1 \right) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{p_{\epsilon x_i}^s(\lambda(t_i))}{p_{x_i}^s(\lambda(t_i))}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

ΔS_{bDB} represents the contribution solely responsible for the DB breakage, which is the total house-keeping entropy in the absence of odd-parity variables. While a similar contribution was found by Spinney and Ford [13], their term contains what is not directly related to the broken DB. In the meantime, ΔS_{as} is an odd-variable specific term. It characterizes the asymmetry in the SSD

for mirror states. Thus, the asymmetric entropy production serves as another important quantity to measure the irreversibility of nonequilibrium processes that has not been deeply investigated in the literature. Its importance has recently been recognized by Spinney and Ford [13], but their term only exists transiently. In our work, ΔS_{as} is shown to exist steadily even for $\lambda = 0$.

We briefly mention on the exceptional cases observed in Eq. (14), where the total entropy production can be divided into two terms, each of which satisfies the FT. Particularly we consider the case in which $\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger = \Gamma_{x,x}$ (the other case of $p_{\epsilon x}^s = p_x^s$ leads to the conventional separation by $\Delta S_{\text{as}} = 0$). The condition gives a new stochastic process $\Gamma'_{y,x}$, distinct from $\Gamma_{y,x}^*$ in Eq. (15). Then, one readily finds a new separation as

$$\Delta S_{\text{tot}} = \Delta S_{\text{bDB}} + \Delta S_{\text{mix}} \quad (25)$$

where $\Delta S_{\text{mix}} = \Delta S_{\text{ex}} + \Delta S_{\text{as}}$ also satisfies the FT. In the light of physical origin, ΔS_{as} belongs to the adiabatic entropy production. From the mathematical point of view, however, it operates with nonadiabatic ΔS_{ex} . Moreover, in the adiabatic limit, we have ΔS_{hk} only, which can be cleanly separated into two FT functionals. It will be an interesting study to find an example of this exception.

Finally, we comment on the intriguing feature of Γ^\dagger in Eq. (10). This is the generalization of the adjoint process in the even-variable only dynamics [6, 10, 11]. However, $\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger = 1 + \omega_{\epsilon x, \epsilon x}(\Delta t) p_{\epsilon x}^s / p_x^s$ may become negative for a finite Δt when $p_{\epsilon x}^s \neq p_x^s$. This situation may be realized when a finite Δt is used as a model parameter or in numerical study of continuous-time models. In this case, Δt smaller than that used to introduce the original Γ is required to make Γ^\dagger be a stochastic process. If not fulfilled, ΔS_{hk} (or ΔS_a) can not be divided into ΔS_{bDB} and ΔS_{as} . There thus exists an upper bound of Δt to generate such an entropy production that is generic to the system of interest. The related implication needs further study.

This work was supported by Mid-career Researcher Program through NRF grant (No. 2010-0026627) funded by the MEST.

-
- [1] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2401 (1993).
 - [2] G. Gallavotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4334 (1996).
 - [3] G. E. Crooks, J. Stat. Phys. **90**, 1481 (1998).
 - [4] J. Kurchan, J. Phys. A **31**, 3719 (1998).
 - [5] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, J. Stat. Phys. **95**, 333 (1999).
 - [6] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 090601 (2010).
 - [7] L. Onsager and S. Machlup, Phys. Rev. **91**, 1505 (1953); S. Machlup and L. Onsager, *ibid.* **91**, 1512 (1953).
 - [8] C. Jarzynski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2690 (1997).
 - [9] Y. Oono and M. Paniconi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **130**, 29 (1998).

- [10] T. Hatano and S. I. Sasa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3463 (2001).
- [11] T. Speck and U. Seifert, J. Phys. A **38**, L581 (2005).
- [12] U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 040602 (2005).
- [13] R. E. Spinney and I. J. Ford, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 170603 (2012).
- [14] $\Gamma_{x,x}^\dagger \geq 0$ is not guaranteed unless time is continuous. We will briefly visit this issue in the end.