

Entropy production and currents for macroscopic friction laws

L. CERINO¹ and A. PUGLISI¹

¹ *Istituto dei Sistemi Complessi - CNR and Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma Sapienza, P.le Aldo Moro 2, 00185, Rome, Italy*

PACS 05.70.Ln – Thermodynamics, nonequilibrium

PACS 05.10.Gg – Stochastic models in statistical physics and nonlinear dynamics

Abstract – In macroscopic systems the pivotal role of dissipative forces is modelled through phenomenological friction laws $F(v)$ (e.g. viscous damping at the micro-scale or Coulomb friction and inelastic collisions at the macro-scale). Such forces conceal the complex mechanism of fast energy exchanges with a thermostat at the environment temperature T , ruled by a microscopic Hamiltonian H . The mapping $(H, T) \rightarrow F(v)$ - even if effective for many purposes - is misleading for the study of time-reversal symmetries and entropy production. An enlightening example is offered by recent macroscopic experiments where dissipation is dominated by solid-on-solid friction. We analyze the problem through an adaptation of the microscopic Prandtl-Tomlinson model, discovering one main “inconsistency” with the macroscopic Coulomb $F(v)$ typically used in the theory: the fluctuating entropy production (FEP) cannot be measured without accessing the microscopic degrees of freedom, which are invisible in the macroscopic description. We also notice that this problem cannot be cured by weighing the macroscopic time-reversed trajectories with a different auxiliary dynamics, as proposed in many theories for a generalised FEP.

Introduction. – Since its infancy, non-equilibrium statistical mechanics is based on models with coarse-grained forces [1, 2]. Indeed the origin of thermostats and non-conservative forces is a reduction of the description from a larger Hamiltonian system, where many degrees of freedom have been projected out [3].

Dissipation is an essential ingredient in non-equilibrium systems [4], consisting in a net - or average - transfer of energy from the degrees of freedom we are observing (i.e. the system), to a large and often hidden reservoir - the environment - which has a lower energy density. The large size of the system makes unlikely the transfers of energy in the opposite direction [5]. Mesoscopic systems, where such fluctuations are non-negligible, are the subject of stochastic thermodynamics (ST) whose study has received a great impulse in the last 20 years [6, 7]. A central issue in ST is relating fluctuations of current, such as energy flows, to the fluctuating entropy production (FEP) [8].

A major contribution of the present Letter is to provide a neat example where such dissipation-FEP connection dramatically depends upon the level of coarse-graining. We take into detailed consideration the force acting between two sliding solid bodies, that is the so-called dry friction, which in macroscopic systems (e.g. on scales larger than few millimetres) is well described by the law

of Coulomb friction [9]. It consists in a constant force acting in the direction opposite to the instantaneous relative sliding velocity, i.e. it does not depend upon the velocity’s modulus. This force has been the subject of many recent experiments and models, where its dissipation trend is balanced by other macroscopic forces injecting energy, in the form of vibrations or collisions with fluidized granular particles [10, 11]. The steady states which are obtained suggest a possible setup to verify macroscopically the predictions of ST. In our analysis it becomes clear that such an approach is virtually impossible, since the FEP can be measured only by observing relevant degrees of freedom at the molecular scale. In a nutshell, coarse-graining removes the largest contribution to the FEP [12, 13].

We wish to mention that coarse-graining does not only lead to dissipative forces: another interesting class of non-equilibrium systems is that of active fluids, i.e. fluids made of self-propelled particles [14]. Self propulsion, as a force injecting energy into the system, represents in a synthetic effective form more fundamental processes which involve hidden degrees of freedom.

Levels of coarse-graining and dissipation. – In the present paper we consider two levels of coarse-graining: C1 and C2. The first level, C1, is the widely adopted re-




Fig. 1: A: sketch of the generic model we discuss in the section “Levels of coarse-graining and dissipation”, Eqs. (1) and (2). B: sketch of the PT model discussed in the section “The Prandtl-Tomlinson Model”, Eq. (10).

duction of a large Hamiltonian system into a sub-system (the part of interest) plus a thermostat that obeys a much simpler dynamics [3]. The second, coarser, level C2 is useful to describe macroscopic physical systems, when the external perturbation acts on space-time scales much larger than the microscopic ones.

Figure 1A depicts a general scheme to discuss C1. A Hamiltonian system is composed by two interacting subsystems Σ and Θ : a point in the complete phase (“zero level”) space is $\Gamma_0 = (\Gamma_\Sigma, \Gamma_\Theta)$. In the limit where Θ is much larger than Σ , one can consider Θ as a “thermostat”, since its energy is barely affected by its interaction with Σ . If need be, an external perturbation is applied to some of the degrees of freedom of Σ : the nature and formal details of the perturbation are discussed later. In view of the many possible realizations of the dynamics occurring with different microscopic initial conditions, as well as of the possible realizations of the the external perturbation, we consider a probabilistic description where the phase space position Γ_0 is distributed with some probability density $P_0(\Gamma_0, t)$ at time t . This density obeys an equation of the kind

$$\frac{\partial P_0(\Gamma_0, t)}{\partial t} = [L_0(\Gamma_0) + L_{ext}(\Gamma_\Sigma, t)]P_0(\Gamma_0, t), \quad (1)$$

where L_0 is the Liouville operator associated with the total Hamiltonian $H_0(\Gamma_0)$ and L_{ext} represents the external perturbation, which can be deterministic, stochastic, time-dependent or not, etc. The first level of coarse-graining, C1, consists in focusing on $\Gamma_1 \equiv \Gamma_\Sigma$ alone, by replacing Eq. (1) with the following [3]:

$$\frac{\partial P_1(\Gamma_1, t)}{\partial t} = [L_1(\Gamma_1) + L_{ext}(\Gamma_1, t)]P_1(\Gamma_1, t), \quad (2a)$$

$$L_1(\Gamma_1) = L_H(\Gamma_1) + L_T(\Gamma_1). \quad (2b)$$

In Eq. (2), the L_H operator is the Liouville operator associated with the Hamiltonian $H(\Gamma_1)$ of the system Σ alone, i.e. the internal dynamics of the system of interest and L_T is the operator describing - in some simplified form

- its coupling to Θ . A common and convenient choice for L_T is a stochastic operator: for instance, if memory effects can be neglected, L_T takes the form of a Markovian master equation with transition rates that satisfy detailed balance with respect to the Gibbs measure defined by Hamiltonian H and temperature T .

It is instructive to recall a main difference between the original L_0 and its replacement L_1 : the first is a full Liouville operator, which is always invariant under time-reversal. The second is invariant under time-reversal only in a statistical sense (detailed balance) and only in the stationary state (with $L_{ext} = 0$).

A tool which has been widely used for a formal characterization of time-reversal invariance (or variance), at the level of single trajectories, is the so-called action functional [8]:

$$W_i(t) = \ln \frac{p(\{\Gamma_i(s)\}_0^t | \Gamma_i(0))}{p(\{\epsilon \Gamma_i(t-s)\}_0^t | \epsilon \Gamma_i(t))}, \quad (3)$$

where i can be 0 or 1 depending on the level of description. The numerator in (3) represents the probability, conditioned to the state at time 0, of a trajectory $\Gamma_i(s)$ with $s \in (0, t)$. The denominator is the probability, conditioned to the time-reversed final state, of the time-reversed trajectory: indeed ϵ is a diagonal operator which leaves unchanged all positions and changes sign to all velocities. It is meant, of course, that the conditional probability for the trajectory at level $i = 0$ ($i = 1$) is generated by Eq. (1) (Eq. (2)). When $L_{ext} = 0$ one has $W_0(t) \equiv 0$ and $W_1(t) = [H(\Gamma_1(0)) - H(\Gamma_1(t))]/k_B T$ (detailed balance). The cases where both L_{ext} and L_T are deterministic are usually discussed in the context of phase-space contraction [15]. Several physical examples have been given in the literature¹ where the action functional takes the form $\mathcal{W}_{ext}(t)/k_B T$, with $\mathcal{W}_{ext}(t)$ the work done by the non-conservative forces during the trajectory. Another situation commonly discussed is when L_{ext} represents the interactions with a second bath at a temperature $T' \neq T$: in that case the action functional takes the form $\mathcal{Q}(t) |\frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{T'}|$, with $\mathcal{Q}(t)$ the energy transferred from the external thermostats into the system during the trajectory. Both examples suggest a strong analogy between the action functional and thermodynamic entropy production, where the energy flowing to the thermostat, i.e. the dissipation, enters explicitly. In stochastic thermodynamics the formulation we choose in Eq. (3) is referred to as FEP of the medium [6].

When the external perturbation L_{ext} acts on space-time scales much larger than those dictated by L_H and L_T , it is convenient and common to scale up the description to a “macroscopic” level, what we call the C2 coarse-graining. This operation is usually achieved by phenomenological

¹The reader is warned that we do not intend to exhaust in a few sentences the huge field of FEP, our aim is to summarize a few basic observations. Those are made rigorous under more precise hypotheses, and, possibly, with the addition of the so-called “boundary terms” [16, 17]

considerations, cases where it can be rigorously carried on being rare. Only those degrees of freedom which are relevant at large scales, Γ_2 , are retained and the evolution of their probability takes the form

$$\frac{\partial P_2(\Gamma_2, t)}{\partial t} = [L_2(\Gamma_2) + L_{ext}(\Gamma_2, t)]P_2(\Gamma_2, t). \quad (4)$$

The L_2 operator represents the contraction of microscopic Hamiltonian (L_H) and thermostat (L_T) parts, and includes dissipative terms which are often non-linear. The aim of C2 is to get a fair description of the trajectories at a macroscopic resolution including their dissipated energy. However, in view of the huge difference of energy scales, the probability that the time-reversal of a typical trajectory is observed is exceedingly small: for this reason, in many common cases, L_2 does not describe properly those trajectories. The result is that L_2 fairly accounts for dissipation, but strongly twists the action functional.

Generalisations $\tilde{W}(t)$ of the action functional $W(t)$ have been proposed (see for instance [18, 19]) where the probability weighing the reversed trajectory, i.e. that appearing at the denominator of Eq. (3), is replaced by a different probability, generated by an *auxiliary dynamics*. Unfortunately this ad hoc prescription changes the physical meaning (and the accessibility in experiments) of the action functional and does not necessarily solves the discrepancy. In the next Sections we discuss in details a clear example to understand this scenario.

The case of Coulomb friction. – A particularly interesting macroscopic dissipative force (i.e. of the kind of L_2) is the so-called dry or solid-on-solid friction: it describes the force against relative sliding between two solid surfaces at contact [20]. In its simplest and oldest form, which is considered a fair approximation at the C2 level of coarse-graining, it reads

$$F_C(V) = \Delta\sigma(V), \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta = \mu F_N$ is a positive force proportional, through the (dynamical) friction coefficient μ to the normal force F_N , and $\sigma(v)$ is $+1, -1, 0$ if $v > 0, v < 0$ or $v = 0$ respectively. When the body is at rest also the static friction force should be considered: however its role is marginal in this context because the external driving typically gives strong impulsive forces to the sliding mass.

In the last decades the study of solid friction, taking also advantage of experimental techniques at the micro and nano scales, has refined dramatically the simple law in Eq. (5) [9]. It is known that it should be modified to take into account thermal effects, aging of contacts, dependence upon v , and much more. Notwithstanding those progresses, Eq. (5) remains useful in simple macroscopic situations. An example where it fairly describes experimental results is in [10, 21, 22]: a solid macroscopic rotator is in contact with a fluidized granular gas made of spherical beads of mass M_g and granular temperature T_g (see Eq. (7) below for an operative definition). The beads

hit the solid body and excite its rotation, which is then damped by solid friction in the ball bearings allowing rotation. In the following we also use the name “tracer” to indicate the rotator, and we use X and V to mean its (angular) position and velocity respectively. When the granular gas is dilute the collision are described by a non-continuous Markov process with transition rates dictated by the collisional kinetics [23]. The master-equation for $P(X, V, t)$ then is equivalent to Eq. (4) with $\Gamma_2 \equiv (X, V)$ and

$$L_2 \cdot = -\partial_X[V \cdot] - \partial_V \left[\frac{F_C(V)}{M} \cdot \right], \quad (6a)$$

$$L_{ext}P(X, V, t) = \int dU P(X, U, t)k(U \rightarrow V) - \int dU P(X, V, t)k(V \rightarrow U). \quad (6b)$$

A simplified form of the transition rates, used in some theoretical studies [24] and convenient for its simplicity, is the following

$$k(V \rightarrow V') = \tau^{-1} \left(\frac{M_g + M}{2M_g} \right) \frac{e^{-M_g u^2(V, V')/2(k_B T_g)}}{\sqrt{2\pi k_B T_g}}, \quad (7)$$

where T_g is the “temperature” of the granular gas and

$$u(V, V') = \frac{M_g + M}{2M_g}(V' - V) + V. \quad (8)$$

In the above transition rates we have not considered the inelasticity of collisions, which is indeed negligible with respect to the dissipation due to $F_C(v)$ when collisions are not too frequent (“rare collision limit”, discussed in [23]). To give an idea of the energy, space and time scales, it should be considered that in the experiments the mass of the rotator is ~ 5 g, the diameter of the beads is ~ 4 mm and their mass is $\sim 10^{-1}$ g, while their average speed is $\sim 10^2$ mm/s, that is an average kinetic energy of the order of $\sim 10^{-6}$ J, leading to a T_g of the order of $\sim 10^{17}$ K.

Other experiments have been performed where Coulomb force $F_C(v)$ is coupled to time-dependent external perturbations [25–27]. Those experiments have also triggered the interest of many theoreticians who studied the problem with different kinds of noise [28–30].

One of the less studied aspects of Eq. (6) is its behavior under time-reversal. There is an evident obstacle in doing that: if a trajectory $\{V(s)\}_0^t$ between times 0 and t solves Eq. (6) with a given noise realization, there is no way (by means of any other noise realization) that the time-reversed trajectory $\{-V(t-s)\}_0^t$ satisfies the same equation: indeed all the parts of the dynamics where only friction is acting (decreasing $|V|$) are mapped, by time-reversal, to trajectories taking energy (increasing $|V|$), which are forbidden by $F_C(v)$. A consequence of this observation is that the action functional Eq. (3) cannot be properly defined. Nonetheless, we can always empirically define the FEP of a system coupled to several reservoirs

as the sum of the energies that the system exchanges with each thermostat, divided by the temperature of the thermostat. Since our system is (apparently) coupled to a single thermostat (i.e. the granular gas) this definition leads to

$$\tilde{W}(t) = - \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \frac{\delta E_k}{k_B T_g}, \quad (9)$$

where N_c is the total number of collisions occurring in the interval $[0, t]$ and $\delta E_k = \frac{M}{2}(V_k'^2 - V_k^2)$ the energy gained in the k -th collision. Another possibility is to choose $\tilde{W}(t)$ by modifying the action functional (3), as suggested for instance in [18, 19]: the probability of the time-reversed trajectories is generated with an auxiliary dynamics obtained by inverting the sign in front of the Coulomb force. With this prescription the generalized action functional takes the exact form of Eq. (9) (see the analogous calculation in the next Section).

When $M_g \ll M$, it is possible [31] to approximate Eq. (6b) with $L_{ext} \cdot = M^{-1} \partial_V [\gamma_g V \cdot] + M^{-2} \gamma_g T_g \partial_V^2 [\cdot]$: in such a limit [32, 33] the paradox vanishes, because noise acts continuously and some noise realization that sustains the reversed trajectory can always be found (with different probability, of course). On the other hand, the limit is singular in the sense that Eq. (6) with white noise is a potential equation and satisfies detailed balance: the stationary state is an equilibrium state in which the action functional vanishes and the physical meaning of dissipation is totally lost [34]. Nevertheless, the generalized action functional obtained with the above ‘‘corrected’’ sign prescription takes the form, up to boundary terms, $\tilde{W}(t) = -\Delta \int_0^t dt' |V(t')|/T_g$, i.e. minus the work done by the friction force divided by the temperature of the thermostat. Since in the stationary state this work is on average equal to the energy exchanged with the thermostat, this quantity is in agreement with our intuitive definition of entropy and with Eq. (9). Despite of the apparent coherence of the above proposed solutions we will show, in the next Section, that the results are incomplete, mainly because the coarse graining is hiding a low temperature thermostat responsible for the largest part of the FEP. It should be noticed that measures of the fluctuations of these and other physical currents (e.g. angle spanned by the rotator in a time t) have been performed, finding interesting large deviations properties [35]. In order to understand the connection between measured macroscopic currents and the appropriate FEP, in the next Section we will resort to a more fundamental model, that is the kind discussed in Eq. (2) (C1 level).

The Prandtl-Tomlinson Model. – A good candidate reveals to be the so-called Prandtl-Tomlinson (PT) model, which is often considered as a prototype of microscopic mechanism for friction [36]. In the last decades it has been used in theoretical studies to interpret results from Friction Force Microscopy experiments. In PT equations the frictional force $F_C(v)$ acting on the tracer is re-

placed by a harmonic force $F_{PT} = -k(X - x)$ linking it to a virtual ‘‘effective’’ particle of mass m (whose position and velocity are denoted by x, v respectively) which moves on a corrugated surface and is in contact with the environmental thermostat, see Fig. 1B. In our case the probability $P(X, V, x, v, t)$ obeys Eq. (2) with $\Gamma_1 = (X, V, x, v)$ and

$$H = \frac{MV^2}{2} + \frac{mv^2}{2} - k \frac{(X - x)^2}{2} + U_0 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi x}{L}\right) \quad (10a)$$

$$L_T \cdot = \left(\frac{\gamma}{m}\right) \frac{\partial(v \cdot)}{\partial v} \cdot + \left(\frac{2\gamma T}{m^2}\right) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2}. \quad (10b)$$

and L_{ext} is the same appearing in Eq. (6), i.e. acting only on V through ‘‘granular’’ collisions. Note that here for the thermostat we use a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck force of the kind $-\gamma v + \sqrt{2\gamma T} \xi(t)$, with $\xi(t)$ a Gaussian white noise.

The PT force is usually studied in a different context where the first mass moves at constant velocity, i.e. $X(t) = X(0) + v_0 t$, reproducing experiments with uniform sliding [36]. In that case, provided that $k_B T \ll kL^2/2 < 2\pi^2 U_0$, the stationary state is a quasi-periodic stick slip motion where, in a range of velocity $v_0 \gg \sqrt{U_0/M}$, the average friction force $\langle F_{PT} \rangle$ has a negligible (logarithmic or smaller) dependence upon v_0 . In our model (10) the velocity of the first mass is not constant but feels the slowing effect of F_{PT} and, at random times, is instantaneously changed with probability rates given by Eq. (7), i.e. with a typical after-collision value of the order of $v_g = \sqrt{k_B T_g/M}$. In the model, therefore, it makes sense to choose $v_g \gg \sqrt{U_0/M}$, that is $k_B T_g \gg U_0$. When giving the parameters of simulations, we take as unit of mass M , unit of time τ and unit of length $\lambda = \sqrt{k_B T_g/M} \tau$ (that is unit of energy $k_B T_g$). In Figure 2 we compare the trajectories from a simulation of the macroscopic model (6) and a simulation of the microscopic one (10). The figure fairly demonstrates that the trajectories of the microscopic and macroscopic models look quite similar, if small details (as in the inset) are ignored.

Set the models, we now turn our attention to the FEP. The action functional Eq. (3) can be split in two contribution due, respectively, to the collisional and diffusional part of the dynamics $W(t) = W_{coll} + W_{diff}$. Given that in the time interval $[0, t]$ the tracer receives N_c collisions, we have

$$W_{coll} = \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \ln \frac{k(V_k \rightarrow V_k')}{k(V_k' \rightarrow V_k)} = - \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \frac{\delta E_k}{k_B T_g} \quad (11)$$

with $\delta E_k = \frac{M}{2}(v_k'^2 - v_k^2)$ the energy gain in the k -th collision. The term due to diffusion reads

$$W_{diff} = \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \left(- \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} ds \mathcal{A}(\Gamma(s)) + \int_{t_k}^{t_{k-1}} ds \mathcal{A}(\epsilon \Gamma(t_k - s)) \right), \quad (12)$$




Fig. 2: Comparison of trajectories from a simulation of the Coulomb model (above) and PT model (below). Adimensionalised parameters are: $M_g/M = 0.8$ (in both models), $m/M = 10^{-7}$, $\gamma\tau/M = 10^{-2}$, $T/T_g = 10^{-9}$, $U_0/(k_B T_g) = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-7}$, $k\lambda^2/(k_B T_g) = 10$, $L/\lambda = 10^{-5}$, which gives $kL^2/(4\pi^2 U_0) = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$. As macroscopic Coulomb force we have used $\Delta\tau^2/(M\lambda) = 0.05 \sim \langle F_{PT} \rangle$.

where

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{m}{4\gamma T} [m\dot{v} + \gamma v - F_{surf}(x) - F_{PT}(x - X)]^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2m}. \quad (13)$$

With some algebra one gets

$$W_{diff} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{N_c} \left[\Delta K_k + \Delta U_k - \int_{t_{k-1}}^{t_k} ds k(x - X)V \right],$$

where ΔK_k and ΔU_k are the changes of $K = mv^2/2$ and $U = U_0 \cos(2\pi x/L) + k(X - x)^2/2$, respectively, in the interval $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$. Let us note that, as expected for the unperturbed dynamics, the contribution W_{diff}^k to W_{diff} of a single flight between two collisions at times t_{k-1} and t_k satisfies detailed balance, i.e.

$$W_{diff}^k = -\frac{\delta H_k}{k_B T} \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{H[\Gamma(t_{k-1})] - H[\Gamma(t_k)]}{k_B T}. \quad (14)$$

A crucial comment is in order concerning the magnitude of the two contributions to FEP. In the steady state the energies δE_k exchanged in the collisions balance, on average, with the energies exchanged with the thermostat, i.e. $\langle \delta E_k \rangle = -\langle \delta H_k \rangle \geq 0$, however in granular experiments $T_g \gg T$. For such a reason, it is clear that $\langle W_{diff} \rangle \gg \langle W_{coll} \rangle$. Indeed numerical simulations in the steady state show a distribution for $W(t)$ strongly peaked around the average value, without appreciable fluctuations.

An interesting observation – and *caveat* – concerns the parity of the “friction” force under time-reversal: in the PT model, the force F_{PT} depends upon the *relative position* of the masses M and m . Such a relative position is not changed in the reversed trajectory, therefore F_{PT} does not change sign under time-reversal. At first sight, this may




Fig. 3: Comparison of probability distribution functions of W_1 integrated of a time-window of length 15τ , from a simulation of the PT model (blue data), and of the Coulomb model (red data). Adimensionalised parameters are $M_g/M = 0.8$, $m/M = 10^{-7}$, $\gamma\tau/M = 10^{-3}$, $T/T_g = 2 \cdot 10^{-9}$, $U_0/(k_B T_g) = 3.18 \cdot 10^{-7}$, $k\lambda^2/(k_B T_g) = 0.1$, $L/\lambda = 1.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$, which gives $kL^2/(4\pi^2 U_0) = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$. For the macroscopic Coulomb model we used $\Delta\tau^2/(M\lambda) = 0.0071 \sim \langle F_{PT} \rangle$.

seem equivalent to require that in the macroscopic formulation F_C does not change sign even when v is inverted, or equivalently that Δ changes sign under time-reversal. This could be viewed as an apparent justification for $\bar{W}(t)$ in Eq. (9), where an auxiliary dynamics with $\Delta \rightarrow -\Delta$ cures the divergence of the action functional in the macroscopic model. Nevertheless, it is evident that such a result is in contradiction with the microscopic calculation: the dominant contribution W_{diff} has disappeared. Said differently, the weight assigned by the auxiliary dynamics with $-\Delta$ is completely different by the one assigned by the correct microscopic dynamics. The main problem of the macroscopic description, therefore, is that the environmental thermostat at the temperature T has disappeared, and a huge contribution to the FEP has been cut out.

Leaving aside the problem of entropy production, which in this context looks somehow academical, it is still interesting to observe the fluctuations of W_{coll} which in principle can be studied in experiments. These are, apart from the constant $1/(k_B T_g)$ factor, the fluctuations of the energy flux going from the granular gas into the tracer. In Figure 3 we show the very good agreement of the distribution of these fluctuations in simulated steady states of the two models. Obtaining general relations for the fluctuations of W_{coll} remains an open problem: a starting point is offered by the known relations for the joint probability distribution of currents [37].

Conclusion. – In this Letter we have considered the effect of coarse-graining which is operated when dealing with out-of-equilibrium macroscopic systems, where the interaction with environmental thermostats is replaced by

effective (often phenomenological) dissipative forces. We have shown how the effect of coarse-graining drastically changes the properties of the model under time-reversal. In the case of Coulomb friction, the friction force itself originates from a configurational potential but is modelled as a velocity-dependent force, changing its time-reversal parity. Moreover, the Coulomb friction law is usually introduced without its conjugate fluctuations, therefore the dominant part of the FEP is lost.

The general idea, as always, is that coarse-graining is a loss of variables, or information. Such information is relevant or not, depending on the question one considers [12, 13]. Microscopic variables are not really relevant for many observables: for instance, in the above example, the correct fluctuations of W_{coll} are perfectly recovered even in the coarse-grained model. Other properties, which require a finer knowledge of the system, are lost.

A similar situation has been encountered, in the past, with inelastic collisions: the collisional dissipation is modelled as an instantaneous loss of velocity without thermal fluctuations [38]. The real FEP, therefore, cannot be accounted for by the measurement of the dissipated macroscopic energy in collisions. The dominant channel for entropy production is the transfer of such energy to the environment, whose fluctuations are quite difficult to be observed. This situation sometimes may be counter-intuitive, since the energy flux transferred to the environment is on average the same as that dissipated macroscopically. However the thermostats involved are totally different.

* * *

The authors acknowledge fruitful discussions with A. Sarracino and A. Vulpiani for a careful reading of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] MAZENKO G. F., *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley VCH) 2006.
- [2] CASTIGLIONE P., FALCIONI M., LESNE A. and VULPIANI A., *Chaos and coarse graining in statistical mechanics* (Cambridge University Press) 2008.
- [3] ZWANZIG R., *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Oxford University Press) 2001.
- [4] KUBO R., *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **29** (1966) 255.
- [5] LEBOWITZ J. L., *Physics Today*, (1993) 32.
- [6] SEIFERT U., *Physical Review Letters*, **95** (2005) 040602.
- [7] SEKIMOTO K., *Stochastic energetics* (Springer Verlag) 2010.
- [8] LEBOWITZ J. and SPOHN H., *Journal of Statistical Physics*, (1999) 333.
- [9] VANOSSI A., MANINI N., URBACH M., ZAPPERI S. and TOSATTI E., *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **85** (2013) 529.
- [10] GNOLI A., PUGLISI A. and TOUCHETTE H., *Europhys. Lett.*, **102** (2013) 14002.
- [11] MANACORDA A., PUGLISI A. and SARRACINO A., *Comm. Theor. Phys.*, **62** (2014) .
- [12] PUGLISI A., PIGOLOTTI S., RONDONI L. and VULPIANI A., *J. Stat. Mech.*, (2010) P05015.
- [13] CRISANTI A., PUGLISI A. and VILLAMAINA D., *Physical review. E, Statistical, nonlinear, and soft matter physics*, **85** (2012) 061127.
- [14] MARCHETTI M. C., JOANNY J.-F., RAMASWAMY S., LIVERPOOL T. B., PROST J., RAO M. and SIMHA R. A., *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **85** (2012) 1143.
- [15] GALLAVOTTI G. and COHEN E., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **74** (1995) 2694.
- [16] PUGLISI A., RONDONI L. and VULPIANI A., *J. Stat. Mech.*, (2006) P08010.
- [17] VAN ZON R. and COHEN E. G. D., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **91** (2003) 110601.
- [18] CHERNYAK V. Y., CHERTKOV M. and JARZYNSKI C., *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, **2006** (2006) P08001.
- [19] SPINNEY R. E. and FORD I. J., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **108** (2012) 170603.
- [20] PERSSON B. N. J., *Sliding friction: physical principles and applications* (Springer) 2000.
- [21] GNOLI A., PETRI A., DALTON F., GRADENIGO G., PONTUALE G., SARRACINO A. and PUGLISI A., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110** (2013) 120601.
- [22] GNOLI A., SARRACINO A., PUGLISI A. and PETRI A., *Phys. Rev. E*, **87** (2013) 052209.
- [23] TALBOT J., WILDMAN R. D. and VIOT P., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **107** (2011) 138001.
- [24] GRADENIGO G., MARCONI U. M. B., PUGLISI A. and SARRACINO A., *Phys. Rev. E*, **85** (2012) 031112.
- [25] MAHADEVAN L., DANIEL S. and CHAUDHURY M. K., *PNAS*, **101** (2004) 23.
- [26] DANIEL S., CHAUDHURY M. K. and DE GENNES P.-G., *Langmuir*, **21** (2005) 4240.
- [27] EGLIN M., ERIKSSON M. A. and CARPICK R. W., *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, **88** (2006) 091913.
- [28] BUGUIN A., BROCHARD F. and DE GENNES P.-G., *Eur. Phys. J. E*, **19** (2006) 31.
- [29] FLEISHMAN D., KLAFTER J., PORTO M. and URBACH M., *Nano Lett.*, **7** (2007) 837.
- [30] BAULE A. and SOLLICH P., *Europhys. Lett.*, **97** (2012) 20001.
- [31] VAN KAMPEN N., *Canad. J. Phys.*, **39** (1961) 551.
- [32] DE GENNES P.-G., *J. Stat. Phys.*, **119** (2005) 953.
- [33] HAYAKAWA H., *Physica D*, **205** (2005) 48.
- [34] BAULE A., TOUCHETTE H. and COHEN E. G. D., *Nonlinearity*, **24** (2011) 351.
- [35] SARRACINO A. and VILLAMAINA D., *Large deviations of brownian motors in Large Deviations in Physics*, edited by VULPIANI A., CECCONI F., CENCINI M., PUGLISI A. and VERGNI D., (Springer, Berlin) 2014 p. 221.
- [36] MÜSER M. H., *Phys. Rev. B*, **84** (2011) 125419.
- [37] D ANDRIEUX P. G., *Journal of Statistical Physics*, **127** (2007) 107.
- [38] PUGLISI A., VISCO P., BARRAT A., TRIZAC E. and VAN WIJLAND F., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **95** (2005) 110202.