

Predictive statistical mechanics and macroscopic time evolution II. Hydrodynamics and entropy production

Domagoj Kuć*

University of Split, Faculty of Science, N. Tesle 12, 21000 Split, Croatia

(Dated: August 7th, 2015)

Abstract

In the previous paper [1], it was demonstrated that applying the principle of maximum information entropy by maximizing the conditional information entropy, subject to the constraint given by the Liouville equation averaged over the phase space, leads to a definition of the rate of entropy change for closed Hamiltonian systems without any additional assumptions. Here, we generalize this basic model and, with the introduction of the additional constraints which are equivalent to the hydrodynamic continuity equations, show that the results obtained are consistent with the known results from the nonequilibrium statistical mechanics and thermodynamics of irreversible processes. In this way, as a part of the approach developed in this paper, the rate of entropy change and entropy production density for the classical Hamiltonian fluid are obtained. The results obtained suggest the general applicability of the principles of predictive statistical mechanics and their importance for the theory of irreversibility.

PACS numbers:

Keywords: maximum entropy principle, statistical mechanics, nonequilibrium theory, Hamiltonian dynamics, hydrodynamics, thermodynamics of irreversible processes, entropy production

*Electronic address: dkuic@pmfst.hr

I. INTRODUCTION

Here we continue the study which we started in the previous paper [1] of the application of predictive statistical mechanics to the problem of predicting the macroscopic time evolution of systems with Hamiltonian dynamics, in the case when the information about the microscopic dynamics is not complete. For this purpose, in [2] and in our previous paper [1] we have developed the basic theoretical model for closed systems with Hamiltonian dynamics. Furthermore, in the previous paper [1], we also gave a brief introduction about Shannon's concept of information entropy as the measure of uncertainty represented by the probability distribution [3], and also on the principles of maximum information entropy and macroscopic reproducibility, which are the foundational principles of predictive statistical mechanics formulated by E. T. Jaynes [4–11]. Here we only mention that the principle of maximum information entropy represents the general criterion for the construction of probability distribution when the available information is not sufficient its unique determination [4, 5]. Information entropy of the probability distribution is the uncertainty related to missing information. Maximization of the information entropy subject to given constraints is an algorithm of the construction of the probability distribution (MaxEnt), such that only the information represented by these constraints is included in the probability distribution. If, by controlling certain macroscopic quantities, the same macroscopic behavior is reproduced in the experiment, then, according to the principle of macroscopic reproducibility, the information about the values of those quantities is relevant for the prediction of that macroscopic phenomena.

In the interpretation which is given by Jaynes, irreversibility of physical processes reflects only our inability to follow the exact state of the system during the process, and can be considered a consequence of the associated loss of information as to the state of the system [5]. In our previous paper [1] we have demonstrated that such interpretation has a clear mathematical formulation in the concepts of maximization of the conditional information entropy and its relation with the information entropy. For the microstates in the phase space we have defined the conditional probability distribution under the condition of the specified phase space path. The values of the conditional information entropy and information entropy always satisfy the inequality relation from the Shannon's information theory [3], where the information entropy is the upper bound for the conditional information entropy (see Section IV of the previous paper [1] and, in particular, relations (34) and (35)). By maximizing the conditional information entropy subject to the constraint given by the Liouville equation averaged over the phase space, that relation between the information entropies

becomes an equality. Equality between the conditional information entropy and information entropy is equivalent to the statistical independence between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. Logical consequence of the statistical independence is the total loss of correlation between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. Logically correct interpretation of the loss of correlation requires also a definition of the characteristic time which is required for the loss of correlation. The key element of the approach by which the described loss of correlation was introduced in the basic model was the introduction of the Liouville equation for the conditional probability distribution as a macroscopic constraint given by averaging this equation in the integral over the available phase space. This loss of correlation is related to the loss of information about possible microstates of the system, which is brought in connection with the entropy change of the system. In the basic model presented in our previous paper [1], this results in a definition of the entropy change and the rate of entropy change for a closed Hamiltonian system without any additional assumptions.

This paper is devoted to the generalization of the approach developed in the basic theoretical model introduced in the previous paper [1]. The analysis of the results obtained is given briefly in Section II. Through the comparison with the reduced description of nonequilibrium systems from reference [12], it is concluded that for such generalization, the data about the quantities relevant for the prediction on the specified time scales should be included in the basic theoretical model. We have selected the hydrodynamic time scale for the first step in the generalization of the approach, where for the description of nonequilibrium system less detailed information about microscopic dynamics is required in comparison to the other time scales. Since the hydrodynamic continuity equations represent the basic element of the reduced description on the hydrodynamic time scale, in Section III they are taken as the relevant information that, as additional constraints on the maximization of the conditional information entropy, should be included in our initial model. The equivalent form of these equations, which is suitable for the use in the variational calculation is also derived. In Section IV conditions are verified under which that equivalence holds. Predictions that follow from the maximization of the conditional information entropy, subject to the constraint given by the Liouville equation averaged over the available phase space, and additional constraints that are equivalent to the hydrodynamic continuity equations, are derived in Section V. There we show that this generalized approach results in the microstate probability distribution which is identical in form to the relevant distribution for the classical fluid in local equilibrium known from the literature [12]. Furthermore, the expression for the rate of entropy change is obtained in accordance with the corresponding expression known from the thermodynamics of irreversible

processes [13, 29]. This allows us to define the density of entropy production consistently with the postulates of the thermodynamics of irreversible processes. In Section VI the same results are obtained for the classical fluid with external forcing. By further generalization of the approach developed here, open systems in contact with particle reservoirs will be discussed, and the transport coefficients for the classical fluid will be derived accordingly in the further paper.

II. REDUCED DESCRIPTION AND THE GENERALIZATION OF THE APPROACH

In the previous paper [1] it was demonstrated that MaxEnt algorithm allows us to replace the problem of solving the extremely complicated Liouville equation with the much simpler variational problem of finding the maximum of the conditional information entropy subject to the reduced set of macroscopic constraints. That certainly reduces the ability to predict the time evolution, and in the particular case, this means that we can not give reliable predictions for the time intervals for which the condition $t_a - t_0 \gg \tau$ is not satisfied. Here, t_0 and t_a are the initial and final times, respectively, and τ is the characteristic time required for the loss of correlation between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. This is a general characteristic of our approach. Outside these restrictions we expect that our predictions for the macroscopic quantities agree well with the exact solutions obtained by solving the Liouville equation. In the predictive statistical mechanics this reduced approach is based on the principle macroscopic reproducibility, according to which, for predicting reproducible phenomena it is sufficient to know the values of the relevant macroscopic data [10, 14]. This is possible since some macroscopic phenomena is reproducible just because the overwhelming majority of microscopic realizations of that phenomena is characterized by the same macroscopic behavior. Sharp, definite predictions of macroscopic behavior are possible only because certain behavior is characteristic of each of the overwhelming majority of microstates compatible with data and therefore, this is just the behavior that is reproduced experimentally under those constraints.

That was confirmed by the conclusions reached in the framework of MaxEnt formalism by Grandy [15–18]. By generalizing the Liouville-von Neumann equation for the density matrix and developing the MaxEnt model of probabilities for macroscopic systems with time dependent constraints [15, 16], Grandy has given a description of typical processes in nonequilibrium thermodynamics and hydrodynamics [17, 18] consistent with the standard nonequilibrium theory. Here we compare our approach with the reduced description of nonequilibrium systems developed by Zubarev and his coworkers [12]. Other methods that use the reduced descriptions of nonequilibrium

states along with the quantum or classical Liouville equations are also known from the literature [19–23]. According to [12], if we are interested in the behavior of the system for time intervals that are not too small in the specified sense, the details of the initial state become unimportant and the number of parameters necessary for the description of the state of the system is reduced. In [12] generalized Gibbsian ensembles are constructed by applying the principle of maximum information entropy, and they are closely related to the thermodynamic description of nonequilibrium systems, when the observable macroscopic quantities depend on time. The difference from the standard MaxEnt approach is in the viewpoint [12] that in this way obtained relevant statistical distributions, however, are not yet the required nonequilibrium distributions because, in general, they do not satisfy the Liouville equation, but they serve as auxiliary distributions to select special solutions of the Liouville equation that describe irreversible macroscopic processes. Nonequilibrium ensembles [12] are constructed on the basis of the retarded solutions of the Liouville equation using the method of the nonequilibrium statistical operator, and depending on the choice of the set of relevant variables, this method allows the derivation of the kinetic, hydrodynamic and relaxation equations, describing the macroscopic evolution of the system on different time scales. The obtained nonequilibrium distribution [12] is at any time the result of time averaging the Liouville evolved initial relevant distributions over all initial moments of the time interval that is sufficiently large for the formation of necessary correlations in the system and for forgetting the details of the initial state that are nonrelevant after some microscopic time τ which is characteristic for a given system. In our approach, this would correspond to time τ , which is characteristic for the loss of correlations between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. Furthermore, the conditional probability distributions obtained in our MaxEnt approach do not satisfy the Liouville equation, because that would exclude the statistical independence between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. The exact solutions of the Liouville equation would implicitly contain very detailed information about microscopic dynamics, which, by the principle of macroscopic reproducibility, is not always necessary in its entirety for the prediction of reproducible macroscopic time evolution. Therefore, MaxEnt solutions obtained in our approach are functions of effectively reduced information about microscopic dynamics, and contain only the information about macroscopic quantities that are relevant for the description of the nonequilibrium system on the particular time scale. The choice of the set of relevant quantities and the introduction of the corresponding set of constraints on the maximization of the conditional information entropy then allows, in the physical sense, a more precise definition of characteristic time τ .

For orientation, here we quote the example taken from the reference [12], where for a classical

dilute gas of N identical particles enclosed in a constant volume V , a hierarchy of time scales is introduced which, in this case, differentiates the three characteristic stages:

- *Dynamical stage* for the time intervals Δt smaller than the collision time $\Delta t \leq \tau_0$. For the description of time evolution on such short intervals, we need the complete N -particle distribution, that gives the most detailed statistical description of the system. No reduced description can be used at this stage.
- *Kinetic stage* for the time intervals that satisfy the condition $\tau_0 \ll \Delta t \ll \tau_r$, where τ_r is the time for the establishment of local equilibrium in a macroscopically small volume that contains a large number of particles. It is assumed that, after a time large compared to the duration of the collision, the system can be adequately described by the single-particle distribution function which determines the probability distribution for the coordinates and the momentum of a particle. The evolution of the gas in the kinetic stage is governed by the kinetic equation for the single-particle distribution function.
- *Hydrodynamic stage* for the time intervals that satisfy the condition $\tau_r \ll \Delta t \ll \tau_{eq}$, where τ_{eq} is the time necessary for the relaxation of the system to global equilibrium. On this scale the system has come to a state of local equilibrium. Local macroscopic quantities, such as the local particle-number density, the local momentum density and the local energy density are sufficient to describe the system.

Along with these characteristic times, the time between two successive collisions τ_f is also important. On the basis of elementary kinetic considerations, it can be shown that for dilute gases the condition $\tau_0 \ll \tau_f$ is satisfied. The local equilibrium results from many collisions and therefore $\tau_f \ll \tau_r$, while the inequality $\tau_r \ll \tau_{eq}$ is obvious. From these estimations [12] it follows that for dilute gases a hierarchy of basic relaxation times exists $\tau_0 \ll \tau_f \ll \tau_r \ll \tau_{eq}$, which allows us to say that the approach of a dilute gas to equilibrium proceeds in three stages. Dilute gases are chosen here only for illustration of the possibility of a reduced description of nonequilibrium macroscopic systems, and it should be emphasized that the time scales determined by this condition do not always exist. Some of the examples are given in [12].

An important element of the approach developed in the previous paper [1] is the incompleteness of our information about microscopic dynamics, introduced by maximizing the conditional infor-

mation entropy, subject to the constraints given by the normalization condition and the Liouville equation averaged over the available phase space. Therefore, it is natural to choose the hydrodynamic stage for the first step in the generalization of our approach, since this is the time scale where, for the reduced description of nonequilibrium macroscopic system, less detailed information about microscopic dynamics is necessary than is the case with the two other time scales.

III. HYDRODYNAMIC CONTINUITY EQUATIONS

As explained in the previous Section, for the time intervals longer than the time τ_r for the establishment of local equilibrium, local macroscopic quantities, such as the local particle-number density, the local momentum density and the local energy density, are sufficient to describe the nonequilibrium system. For the classical fluid of N identical particles, taken here as the basis for the analysis, the dynamical variables that correspond to these quantities are the particle-number density

$$n(\mathbf{r}) \equiv n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) , \quad (1)$$

momentum density

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{p}_i \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) , \quad (2)$$

and energy density

$$\begin{aligned} h(\mathbf{r}) &\equiv h(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \Phi(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) \right] \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i) . \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Classical fluid of N identical particles is described by the translationally and rotationally invariant Hamiltonian function:

$$H(x, p) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \Phi(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) \right] , \quad (4)$$

where $\Phi(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|)$ is the potential energy of the interaction of the particle pair with indices i, j . The notation (x, p) in equation (4) denotes the set $6N$ dynamical variables given by the coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_{3N}) = (x_1, y_1, z_1, \dots, x_N, y_N, z_N)$ and conjugate momenta $(p_1, \dots, p_{3N}) = (p_{1x}, p_{1y}, p_{1z}, \dots, p_{Nx}, p_{Ny}, p_{Nz})$. The set of variables (x, p) consists of the Cartesian components

of N position vectors $(\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N)$ and corresponding N momentum vectors $(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N)$. Time dependence of the variables (x, p) is determined by Hamilton's equations

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \quad \dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 3N, \quad (5)$$

The integral of the energy density (3) over the entire volume of the system is equal to the Hamiltonian function (4);

$$H(x, p) = \int h(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, it is easy to show that the integrals of the dynamical variables (1) i (2) over the entire volume of the system give the total particle number,

$$N = \int n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N) d^3\mathbf{r}, \quad (7)$$

and the total momentum of the system of particles

$$\mathbf{P}_{tot} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{p}_i = \int \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (8)$$

Local values of the macroscopic quantities that describe the classical fluid of identical particles are obtained by averaging the dynamical variables $n(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$ i $h(\mathbf{r})$ over the microstate probability density function $f(x, p, t)$ at time t :

$$\langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t = \int_M f(x, p, t) n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N) d\Gamma, \quad (9)$$

$$\langle \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t = \int_M f(x, p, t) \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d\Gamma, \quad (10)$$

$$\langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t = \int_M f(x, p, t) h(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d\Gamma, \quad (11)$$

where $d\Gamma = dx_1 \dots dx_{3N} dp_1 \dots dp_{3N}$ is the volume element of the $6N$ -dimensional phase space Γ . Averages over $f(x, p, t)$ are given by the integrals over the set $M \subset \Gamma$ which corresponds to all possible microstates, and by definition this set is taken here to be invariant to the Hamiltonian motion determined by (5). The microstate probability density function $f(x, p, t)$ of the system of N identical particles is normalized in accordance with the definition of microstates in the phase space that follows in the classical limit of quantum statistical mechanics [12, 24].

By integrating the local particle-number density $\langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t$, given by (9), over the entire volume of the system, and using (1) and the normalization condition of $f(x, p, t)$, we obtain

$$N = \int \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (12)$$

The values obtained by (7) i (12) are equal; the total number of particles in the system is fixed and equal to N . The Hamiltonian function $H(x, p)$ is time independent; in the case of translationally invariant Hamiltonian function (4) the same is true for the total momentum \mathbf{P}_{tot} , given by (8). That can be expressed in terms of Poisson brackets:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{P}_{tot}}{dt} = \{\mathbf{P}_{tot}, H\} = 0 , \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{dH}{dt} = \{H, H\} = 0 . \quad (14)$$

where for any two functions $\varphi_1(x, p)$ and $\varphi_2(x, p)$ the Poisson bracket is defined by

$$\{\varphi_1, \varphi_2\} = \sum_{i=1}^{3N} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial \varphi_2}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial \varphi_1}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial \varphi_2}{\partial x_i} \right) . \quad (15)$$

As shown above, the local dynamical variables $n(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$ and $h(\mathbf{r})$ are densities of the corresponding conserved quantities N , \mathbf{P}_{tot} i $H(x, p)$. The equations of motion of these dynamical variables can therefore be written in the form of the local microscopic conservation laws [12],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dn(\mathbf{r})}{dt} &= \{n(\mathbf{r}), H\} = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) , \\ \frac{dP_\alpha(\mathbf{r})}{dt} &= \{P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}), H\} = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) , \\ \frac{dh(\mathbf{r})}{dt} &= \{h(\mathbf{r}), H\} = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_h(\mathbf{r}) . \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The Cartesian components of the momentum density vector $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$ are denoted by $P_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$, $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$. The dynamical variables $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathbf{J}_h(\mathbf{r})$ are flux densities of the corresponding conserved quantities whose densities are $n(\mathbf{r})$, $P_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ i $h(\mathbf{r})$. Equations (16) are standard expressions; derivations of explicit expressions for the flux densities are found in the literature [12, 13, 18, 25].

The average value of the time derivative of any dynamical variable A is equal to the time derivative of the average value $\langle A \rangle_t = \int_M A f d\Gamma$ of the same variable:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \frac{dA}{dt} \right\rangle_t &= \int_M \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} f + \{A, H\} f \right) d\Gamma \\ &= \int_M \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} f - A \{f, H\} \right) d\Gamma \\ &= \int_M \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} f + A \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \right) d\Gamma \\ &= \frac{d\langle A \rangle_t}{dt} . \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The derivation of equation (17) uses: the equation of motion for the dynamical variable A ,

$$\frac{dA}{dt} = \frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \{A, H\} , \quad (18)$$

the Liouville equation for the microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$,

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \{f, H\} = 0 , \quad (19)$$

and the n -dimensional generalization of the divergence theorem [26], the application of which along with the vanishing of the contribution of the boundary of the invariant set M (the explanation is analogous to that given for (45)) gives the second line of (17).

By averaging (16) over the microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$, due to (17) one obtains the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} &= \langle \{n(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t , \\ \frac{\partial \langle P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} &= \langle \{P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t , \\ \frac{\partial \langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} &= \langle \{h(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t . \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Time derivatives in (20) are denoted as partial derivatives because the densities and their average values depend also on the position vector \mathbf{r} . These equations are the local macroscopic conservation laws, which serve as a basis for the derivation of the hydrodynamic equations [12, 13, 18, 25].

An important step in the derivation of equality (17) for an arbitrary dynamical variable A , and then also in the derivation of (20), was the use of the Liouville equation (19). For the system that satisfies the local microscopic conservation laws in the form (16), the condition that the microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$ satisfies the Liouville equation (19) is sufficient but it is not necessary for the equalities (20).

That can be shown in the following way. If an arbitrary dynamical variable A in the equality (17) is replaced with the densities $n(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$ and $h(\mathbf{r})$, the corresponding equalities (17) will still be valid if it is satisfied that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M n(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \{f, H\} \right) d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \{f, H\} \right) d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M h(\mathbf{r}) \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \{f, H\} \right) d\Gamma &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Equations (21) do not represent such a strict condition on the microstate probability density function $f(x, p, t)$ as the Liouville equation (19).

Furthermore, it can be shown directly that the equations (21) are equivalent to the local macroscopic conservation laws (20). By using the divergence theorem in expressions (21) along with the

vanishing of the contribution of the boundary of the set M , in the way described in the derivation of (17), and then using the right hand side of (16), we obtain the equivalent expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} n(\mathbf{r}) + f \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \right) d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) + f \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) \right) d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} h(\mathbf{r}) + f \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_h(\mathbf{r}) \right) d\Gamma &= 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

These expressions are the local macroscopic conservation laws (20).

IV. MACROSCOPIC REPRODUCIBILITY AND THE HYDRODYNAMIC TIME SCALE

Let us assume that, along with the Hamiltonian function $H(x, p)$ given by (4), the total Hamiltonian function $H_{tot}(x, p, t)$ includes also an additional term $H_{ni}(x, p, t)$, about which we do not have any prior information,

$$H_{tot}(x, p, t) = H(x, p) + H_{ni}(x, p, t) . \quad (23)$$

Let us assume now that some microstate probability density function $\tilde{f}(x, p, t)$ really satisfies “the total” Liouville equation

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial t} + \{\tilde{f}, H_{tot}\} = \frac{\partial \tilde{f}}{\partial t} + \{\tilde{f}, H\} + \{\tilde{f}, H_{ni}\} = 0 . \quad (24)$$

As an addition, let us assume that the invariant set M of all possible microstates in the phase space, is invariant also on the time evolution described by the total Hamiltonian function $H_{tot}(x, p, t)$. This situation can be imagined in a case that the set of dynamical variables exists that are constants of motion for both Hamiltonian functions, $H(x, p)$ and $H_{tot}(x, p, t)$. If such an assumption is unrealistic, we can assume instead the much simpler possibility that the invariant set M is the entire phase space $M = \Gamma$.

Under these three assumptions the following statements are true. If the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M \tilde{f} \{n(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M \tilde{f} \{P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} d\Gamma &= 0 , \\ \int_M \tilde{f} \{h(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} d\Gamma &= 0 , \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

are satisfied then the local macroscopic conservation laws are valid in the form which is identical to (20).

If the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\{n(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} &= 0, \\
\{P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} &= 0, \\
\{h(\mathbf{r}), H_{ni}\} &= 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}$$

are satisfied then the local microscopic conservation laws are valid in the form which is identical to (16). The condition (26) is more restrictive for $H_{ni}(x, p, t)$ than (25); if the condition (26) is satisfied then also the condition (25) is satisfied.

Previous statements can essentially be summarized in the following way. If the total Liouville equation (24) is valid, and if the condition (26) or condition (25) is satisfied, then the local macroscopic conservation laws are still valid in the same form (20), which is equivalent to equations (21).

It is important also that (25) and (26) can not be used in predictions with the help of the maximum entropy principle, because we do not have prior information about the term $H_{ni}(x, p, t)$ of the total Hamiltonian function $H_{tot}(x, p, t)$. It is also important to note the following: if some function $\tilde{f}(x, p, t)$ satisfies the total Liouville equation (24) and equations (25), then this function also satisfies the equations (21). The logical converse is not valid.

Equations (25) and (26) can be interpreted in the following way. Equations (26) are statements that the missing information about the microscopic dynamics is not relevant for the description of the time evolution of the local dynamical variables $n(\mathbf{r})$, $P_\alpha(\mathbf{r})$ and $h(\mathbf{r})$. Equations (25) are statements that the missing information about microscopic dynamics is not relevant for the description of the time evolution of the local macroscopic quantities $\langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t$, $\langle P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t$ and $\langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t$. Both statements are in accordance with the assumption that the reduced description of nonequilibrium macroscopic systems is possible on the specified time scales, as was discussed in detail in the previous section. That assumption can be accepted as the consequence of the foundational principle of macroscopic reproducibility.

Thus, condition (25) or (26) is verified under which equations (21) are equivalent in form to the macroscopic continuity equations (20). It is explained why these conditions are important for the reduced description of the system. The hydrodynamic continuity equations allow a further derivation of the hydrodynamic equations; they are the basic elements of the reduced description of the macroscopic time evolution on the hydrodynamic time scale.

V. MAXENT AND HYDRODYNAMIC IRREVERSIBLE TIME EVOLUTION

In relation to the basic model developed in the previous paper [1], the macroscopic conservation laws (20) represent the relevant additional information that is foundational for the description of nonequilibrium system on the hydrodynamic time scale. In the basic model, the only constraints on the maximization of the conditional information entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} S_I^{DF}(t_a, t_0) &= - \int_{S_0(M)} \int_{\Gamma} DF \log D \, d\Gamma dS_0 \\ &= - \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int_{S_0(M)} \int_M \frac{\partial D}{\partial t} F \log D \, d\Gamma dS_0 dt + S_I^{DF}(t_0, t_0), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

were the normalization of the conditional probability density $D \equiv D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$,

$$\varphi_1((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t, D) = F \int_M D \, d\Gamma - F = 0, \quad (28)$$

and the Liouville equation for $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ averaged over the available phase space (i.e. over the set $M \subset \Gamma$ of all possible microstates which is invariant to the Hamiltonian motion),

$$\varphi_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t, D) = \int_M \left[\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^s \left(\frac{\partial D}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial D}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] F \, d\Gamma = 0. \quad (29)$$

The conditional probability density $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ corresponds to the conditional probability that at time t the point corresponding to the state of the system is in the element $d\Gamma$ around (x, p) , if at time t_0 it is anywhere along the paths passing through the infinitesimal surface element dS_0 around (x_0, p_0) on the surface $S_0(M)$. A phase space path is uniquely determined by the solution of Hamilton's equations (5). By definition, the surface $S_0(M)$ is perpendicular to all paths in the set $\Omega(M)$ of all phase space paths in M . The correspondence between points $(x_0, p_0)_\omega \in S_0(M)$ and paths $\omega \in \Omega(M)$ is one-to-one and the measure defined on the surface $S_0(M)$ is utilized as the measure on the set $\Omega(M)$ of all phase space paths in M . The conditional probability density $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ is defined by

$$D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) = \frac{G(x, p, t; (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)}{F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)}. \quad (30)$$

Here, $G(x, p, t; (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ is a joint probability density of two continuous multidimensional variables, (x, p) in Γ and $(x_0, p_0)_\omega$ in $S_0(M)$. Path probability density $F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ is given by the integral

$$F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) = \int_{\Gamma} G(x, p, t; (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) d\Gamma, \quad (31)$$

Similarly, the microstate probability density is given by

$$f(x, p, t) = \int_{S_0(M)} G(x, p, t; (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) dS_0. \quad (32)$$

If the Hamilton's equations are time dependent then phase space paths are time dependent objects. Therefore, as was explained in the previous paper [1], the interpretation given to the function $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ is in the case of time dependent Hamilton's equations taken by the conditional probability density $B(x, p, t|x_0, p_0, t_0)$ defined by

$$B(x, p, t|x_0, p_0, t_0) = \frac{\mathcal{F}(x, p, t; x_0, p_0, t_0)}{f(x_0, p_0, t_0)}. \quad (33)$$

Here, $\mathcal{F}(x, p, t; x_0, p_0, t_0)$ is the probability density function defined on the $4s$ -dimensional space $\Gamma \times \Gamma$. The conditional information entropy $S_I^{Bf}(t, t_0)$ is obtained by replacement of the symbols with corresponding meanings in (27) as was explained in the previous paper [1]: replace $G(x, p, t; (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ with $\mathcal{F}(x, p, t; x_0, p_0, t_0)$, $F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ with $f(x_0, p_0, t_0)$, $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ with $B(x, p, t|x_0, p_0, t_0)$, M and $S_0(M)$ with Γ , and dS_0 with $d\Gamma_0$. With these replacements applied to (28) and (29) we obtain the normalization condition and the Liouville equation for $B(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ averaged over the available phase space, respectively.

The generalization of our approach from the previous paper [1] that will be exposed here includes both constraints (28) and (29). The only difference with respect to the basic model are the additional constraints (21) written here in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n(\mathbf{r}, t, D) &= \\ &= \int_M \int_{S_0(M)} n(\mathbf{r}) \left[\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{3N} \left(\frac{\partial D}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial D}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] F dS_0 d\Gamma = 0, \\ \varphi_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t, D) &= \\ &= \int_M \int_{S_0(M)} P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \left[\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{3N} \left(\frac{\partial D}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial D}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] F dS_0 d\Gamma = 0, \\ \varphi_h(\mathbf{r}, t, D) &= \\ &= \int_M \int_{S_0(M)} h(\mathbf{r}) \left[\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{3N} \left(\frac{\partial D}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial D}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i} \right) \right] F dS_0 d\Gamma = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where the index $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ denotes the Cartesian components of the vector $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$. The results will therefore differ with respect to the results of the basic model only as a consequence of the

introduction of additional constraints (34). Here we will show that, along with the previously introduced constraints (28) and (29), the introduction of the additional constraints (34) on the maximization of the conditional information entropy $S_I^{DF}(t, t_0)$ is sufficient for predictions and the description of irreversibility on the hydrodynamic time scale.

In the variational problem the additional constraints (34) are introduced with the help of the corresponding additional Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $\lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $\lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and the appropriate functionals

$$\begin{aligned} C_n[D, \lambda_n] &= \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int \lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_n(\mathbf{r}, t, D) d^3\mathbf{r} dt, \\ C_{P_\alpha}[D, \lambda_{P_\alpha}] &= \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t, D) d^3\mathbf{r} dt, \\ C_h[D, \lambda_h] &= \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) \varphi_h(\mathbf{r}, t, D) d^3\mathbf{r} dt, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $\varphi_n(\mathbf{r}, t, D)$, $\varphi_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t, D)$ ($\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) and $\varphi_h(\mathbf{r}, t, D)$ are the constraints given by (34).

Similarly, constraints (28) and (29) are introduced using the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_1((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t)$ and $\lambda_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t)$ and the functionals:

$$C_1[D, \lambda_1] = \int_{S_0(M)} \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \lambda_1((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t) \varphi_1((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t, D) dt dS_0, \quad (36)$$

and

$$C_2[D, \lambda_2] = \int_{S_0(M)} \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \lambda_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t) \varphi_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t, D) dt dS_0. \quad (37)$$

It is suitable to form the following functional

$$J[D] = S_I^{DF}(t_a, t_0) - S_I^{DF}(t_0, t_0) = \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int_{S_0(M)} \int_M K(D, \partial_t D) d\Gamma dS_0 dt, \quad (38)$$

with the function $K(D, \partial_t D)$ given by

$$K(D, \partial_t D) = -\frac{\partial D}{\partial t} F \log D. \quad (39)$$

The functional $J[D]$ in (38) is rendered here stationary with respect to variations subject to the constraints (28), (29) and (34). As explained in the previous paper [1], the Euler equation for the constraint (29) is equal to zero, and we apply the most general multiplier rule for this type of problems from ref. [27] by introducing an additional constant Lagrange multiplier λ_0 for the function K ,

$$J[D, \lambda_0] = \int_{t_0}^{t_a} \int_{S_0(M)} \int_M \lambda_0 K(D, \partial_t D) d\Gamma dS_0 dt. \quad (40)$$

The functional $I[D, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_n, \lambda_{P_\alpha}, \lambda_h]$ is formed from (35), (36), (37) and (40):

$$\begin{aligned} I[D, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_n, \lambda_{P_\alpha}, \lambda_h] &= J[D, \lambda_0] - C_1[D, \lambda_1] - C_2[D, \lambda_2] \\ &\quad - C_n[D, \lambda_n] - \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 C_{P_\alpha}[D, \lambda_{P_\alpha}] - C_h[D, \lambda_h]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The existence of Lagrange multipliers $\lambda_0 \neq 0$, and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_n, \lambda_{P_\alpha}$ ($\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) and λ_h not all equal to zero, such that the variation of $I[D, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_n, \lambda_{P_\alpha}, \lambda_h]$ is stationary $\delta I = 0$, represents a proof that it is possible to make $J[D]$ in (38) stationary subject to constraints (28), (29) and (34).

For a function $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ to maximize $S_I^{DF}(t_a, t_0)$ subject to the constraints (28), (29) and (34), it is necessary that it satisfies the Euler equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_0 \left\{ \frac{\partial K}{\partial D} - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial(\partial_t D)} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{3N} \left[\frac{d}{dx_i} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial(\partial_{x_i} D)} \right) + \frac{d}{dp_i} \left(\frac{\partial K}{\partial(\partial_{p_i} D)} \right) \right] \right\} \\ &- F \lambda_1 + F \frac{\partial \lambda_2}{\partial t} + F \int \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_n}{\partial t} n + \frac{\partial \lambda_h}{\partial t} h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\partial \lambda_{P_\alpha}}{\partial t} P_\alpha \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \\ &+ F \int \left(\lambda_n \{n, H\} + \lambda_h \{h, H\} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \{P_\alpha, H\} \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The term multiplied by λ_0 in the Euler equation (42) is equal to zero, and from there it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \lambda_2}{\partial t} + \int \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_n}{\partial t} n + \frac{\partial \lambda_h}{\partial t} h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\partial \lambda_{P_\alpha}}{\partial t} P_\alpha \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \\ &+ \int \left(\lambda_n \{n, H\} + \lambda_h \{h, H\} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \{P_\alpha, H\} \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \\ &= \lambda_1. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

In this variational problem, the function $D(x, p, t|(x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ that renders $J[D]$ in (38) stationary subject to constraints (28), (29) and (34), is not required to take on prescribed values on a portion of the boundary of integration region $M \times (t_0, t_a)$ in (38) where $t \neq t_0$. Therefore, in addition to satisfying the Euler equation (42), it is also necessary that it satisfies the Euler boundary condition on the portion of the boundary of $M \times (t_0, t_a)$ where its values are not prescribed, ref. [27]. Accordingly, for all points on the portion of the boundary of $M \times (t_0, t_a)$ where $t = t_a$ the Euler boundary condition gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\frac{\partial K}{\partial(\partial_t D)} - F\lambda_2 - F \int \left(\lambda_n n + \lambda_h h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} P_\alpha \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \right]_{t=t_a} \\
&= -F \left[\log D + \lambda_2 + \int \left(\lambda_n n + \lambda_h h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} P_\alpha \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \right]_{t=t_a} \\
&= 0 .
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Furthermore, for all points on the portion of the boundary of $M \times (t_0, t_a)$ where time t is in the interval $t_0 < t < t_a$, the Euler boundary condition gives:

$$F \left\{ \left[\lambda_2 + \int \left(\lambda_n n + \lambda_h h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} P_\alpha \right) d^3 \mathbf{r} \right] \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} \right\}_{\text{at the boundary of } M} = 0. \tag{45}$$

In (45), $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n}$ is a scalar product of the velocity vector field $\mathbf{v}(x, p)$ of points in Γ (defined in the previous paper [1]) and the unit normal \mathbf{n} of the boundary surface of invariant set M , taken at the surface. Equation (45) is satisfied naturally due to Hamiltonian motion, since the set M is invariant to Hamiltonian motion by definition, and therefore $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0$ for all points on the boundary surface of the invariant set M .

For the reasons that were already explained in Section II, we take $t - t_0 \gg \tau$, unless explicitly stated otherwise. From (44) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& D(x, p, t | (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) = \exp[-\lambda_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t)] \times \\
& \times \exp \left\{ - \int \lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d^3 \mathbf{r} \right\} \times \\
& \times \exp \left\{ - \int \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) h(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) d^3 \mathbf{r} \right\} \times \\
& \times \exp \left\{ - \int \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N, \mathbf{p}_N) \right] d^3 \mathbf{r} \right\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

From the normalization condition (28) and equation (46) it follows that

$$\lambda_2((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t) = \lambda_2(t) . \tag{47}$$

From (46) and (47) it follows that the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda_2(t)$ is related to the normalization factor $Z(t)$ of the conditional probability density in the following way:

$$\lambda_2(t) = \log Z(t) = \log \left\{ \int_M d\Gamma \exp \left[- \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\lambda_n n + \lambda_h h + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} P_\alpha \right) \right] \right\} . \tag{48}$$

In standard MaxEnt formalism the normalization factor $Z(t)$ is called the partition function, and in this case, the partition functional because $Z(t) \equiv Z_t[\lambda_n, \lambda_h, \lambda_{P_\alpha}] \equiv Z_t$. Using (46), (47) and (48), MaxEnt conditional probability density can be written in the standard form

$$\begin{aligned}
D(x, p, t | (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) &= \frac{1}{Z_t} \times \\
&\times \exp \left\{ - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} [\lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) n(\mathbf{r}) + \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) h(\mathbf{r})] \right\} \times \\
&\times \exp \left\{ - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \right] \right\} . \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

From the MaxEnt conditional probability density (49) we obtain the microstate probability density:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x, p, t) &= \frac{1}{Z_t} \times \\
&\times \exp \left\{ - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} [\lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) n(\mathbf{r}) + \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) h(\mathbf{r})] \right\} \times \\
&\times \exp \left\{ - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \right] \right\} , \tag{50}
\end{aligned}$$

Equation (50) is obtained with the help of (32), using (30), (49) and the normalization condition of the path probability density $F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$. From (49) and (50) we notice immediately the following equality

$$D(x, p, t | (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0) = f(x, p, t) . \tag{51}$$

Also, from (49) and (50) it follows that at time t the information entropy $S_I^f(t)$,

$$S_I^f(t) = - \int_\Gamma f \log f \, d\Gamma, \tag{52}$$

and the conditional information entropy $S_I^{DF}(t, t_0)$ given by (27) are equal:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_I^f(t) &= S_I^{DF}(t, t_0) = \log Z_t \\
&+ \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t + \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) \langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) \langle P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t \right) . \tag{53}
\end{aligned}$$

From (51), or (53), it follows that the initial phase space paths at time t_0 and final microstates at time t are statistically independent, which as its logical consequence has a total loss of correlation. This result further confirms the validity of the condition $t - t_0 \gg \tau$, where τ represents the time

required for the loss of correlation between the initial phase space paths and final microstates. The reasons for the introduction of this condition were argued in detail in Section II.

The microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$ given by (50) is identical in form to the relevant distribution for the classical fluid in local equilibrium known from the literature [12]. With the assumption of local equilibrium, by simple comparison of the two distributions we obtain the following identifications of the Lagrange multipliers:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n(\mathbf{r}, t) &= -\beta(\mathbf{r}, t) \left(\mu(\mathbf{r}, t) - \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r}, t) \right) \\ \lambda_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) &= -\beta(\mathbf{r}, t) u_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) \\ \lambda_h(\mathbf{r}, t) &= \beta(\mathbf{r}, t) .\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

In the reference [12] it is shown that $k^{-1}\beta(\mathbf{r}, t)^{-1} = T(\mathbf{r}, t)$ has the role of local temperature, $\mu(\mathbf{r}, t)$ of the local chemical potential per particle, and that $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the velocity of the hydrodynamic motion. Because of the focus on the results to be displayed in this Section there is no need to reproduce that proof here. In accordance with the discussion from Section II, the assumption of local equilibrium gives a more precise physical definition of the condition $t - t_0 \gg \tau$; time τ required for the total loss of correlation between the initial phase space paths and final microstates is brought into relation with time τ_r required for the establishment of local equilibrium of the fluid with the relevant distribution given by (50) and (54).

Time derivative of the expression (48) for $\log Z_t$, where Z_t is the partition functional, gives

$$\frac{d \log Z_t}{dt} = \frac{1}{Z_t} \frac{dZ_t}{dt} = - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\frac{\partial \lambda_n}{\partial t} \langle n \rangle_t + \frac{\partial \lambda_h}{\partial t} \langle h \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\partial \lambda_{P_\alpha}}{\partial t} \langle P_\alpha \rangle_t \right) .\tag{55}$$

Time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ given by (53) is obtained with the help of (55), the constraints (34) and equations (20) which are equivalent to these constraints,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} &= \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\lambda_n \frac{\partial \langle n \rangle_t}{\partial t} + \lambda_h \frac{\partial \langle h \rangle_t}{\partial t} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \frac{\partial \langle P_\alpha \rangle_t}{\partial t} \right) \\ &= \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\lambda_n \langle \{n, H\} \rangle_t + \lambda_h \langle \{h, H\} \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \langle \{P_\alpha, H\} \rangle_t \right) \\ &= - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left(\lambda_n \nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J} \rangle_t + \lambda_h \nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_h \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha} \rangle_t \right) .\end{aligned}\tag{56}$$

From the last line of (56), we obtain that the time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ is equal

$$\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} = - \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \left[\nabla \cdot (\lambda_n \langle \mathbf{J} \rangle_t) + \nabla \cdot (\lambda_h \langle \mathbf{J}_h \rangle_t) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \nabla \cdot (\lambda_{P_\alpha} \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha} \rangle_t) \right]$$

$$+ \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\nabla(\lambda_n) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J} \rangle_t + \nabla(\lambda_h) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_h \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \nabla(\lambda_{P_\alpha}) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha} \rangle_t \right] . \quad (57)$$

By averaging the equation (43) over the microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$ and using (47), (48), (55) and (56), it is easily shown that the Lagrange multiplier λ_1 depends only on time and that it is equal to the time derivative of information entropy

$$\lambda_1((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0; t) = \lambda_1(t) = \frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} . \quad (58)$$

Equation (58) confirms the interpretation given to the Lagrange multiplier λ_1 in the basic model from the previous paper [1]. In the generalization of the approach, the introduction of additional constraints (34) equivalent to the hydrodynamic continuity equations (20) has determined precisely the rate of entropy change given by the Lagrange multiplier λ_1 ; it is determined by (57). It will now be shown that the obtained rate of entropy change (57) is equal to the corresponding standard expression from the thermodynamics of irreversible processes.

From the literature [13, 18], it is known that the current densities in the macroscopic conservation laws (20) can be written in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} m\langle \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) , \\ \langle J_{P_\alpha, \beta}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) u_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) u_\beta(\mathbf{r}, t) + T_{\beta\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) , \\ \langle J_{h, \alpha}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) e(\mathbf{r}, t) u_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t) + T_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}, t) u_\beta(\mathbf{r}, t) + J_{Q, \alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) . \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Here $\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the mass density. The fluid velocity $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the previously introduced velocity of hydrodynamic motion. In the second and third equation, $\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the pressure tensor with the components $T_{\beta\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. With the help of Einstein summation convention for the indices α, β introduced in the above equations, the pressure tensor is defined by the relation $dF_\alpha \equiv -dS_\beta T_{\beta\alpha}$, where dF_α is the Cartesian component of the force $d\mathbf{F}$ across an infinitesimal surface element $d\mathbf{S}$. The pressure tensor is the negative of the stress tensor. In the third equation, $\rho(\mathbf{r}, t)e(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the energy density, where $e(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the energy per unit mass. Heat current density is denoted by $\mathbf{J}_Q(\mathbf{r}, t)$.

Densities of particle number, momentum and energy, which have previously been introduced in the macroscopic conservation laws (20), are now analogously to (59) written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} m\langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) , \\ \langle \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) , \\ \langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \rho(\mathbf{r}, t) e(\mathbf{r}, t) . \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

The fluid velocity $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ can be consistently defined by the relation

$$\langle \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t = \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) . \quad (61)$$

Using the identifications of Lagrange multipliers (54) and relations (59) for the current densities, from the last line of (56) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} = & - \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left\{ -\beta \left(\mu - \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2 \right) \frac{1}{m} \nabla \cdot \rho \mathbf{u} \right. \\ & \left. + \beta [\nabla \cdot (\rho e \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q] - \beta [u_\alpha \nabla \cdot (\rho u_\alpha \mathbf{u}) + u_\alpha \partial_\beta T_{\beta\alpha}] \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Here, Einstein summation convention is implied, and using it we can write

$$\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{T} \cdot \mathbf{u}) = u_\alpha \partial_\beta T_{\beta\alpha} + T_{\beta\alpha} \partial_\beta u_\alpha, \quad (63)$$

Furthermore, it follows also that

$$u_\alpha \nabla \cdot (\rho u_\alpha \mathbf{u}) = \nabla \cdot \left(\rho \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^2 \mathbf{u} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^2 \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}). \quad (64)$$

Then, using (63) and (64), from (62) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} = & - \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left\{ -\beta \mu \frac{1}{m} \nabla \cdot \rho \mathbf{u} \right. \\ & \left. + \beta \left[\nabla \cdot \left(\left(\rho e - \frac{1}{2} \rho \mathbf{u}^2 \right) \mathbf{u} \right) + T_{\beta\alpha} \partial_\beta u_\alpha + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q \right] \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Following reference [13], the local thermodynamic internal energy density $U(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is obtained by removing the convective kinetic energy density from the total energy density:

$$U(\mathbf{r}, t) = \rho e(\mathbf{r}, t) - \frac{1}{2} \rho \mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r}, t). \quad (66)$$

Following [13], we also define the viscous pressure tensor $\mathbf{\Pi}$ as the nonequilibrium part of the pressure tensor

$$T_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}, t) = p(\mathbf{r}, t) \delta_{\alpha\beta} + \Pi(\mathbf{r}, t)_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (67)$$

where $p(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the local pressure which comes from the assumption that the equilibrium equation of state is valid locally. Then, using (66) and (67) in (65), it is easy to obtain

$$\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} = - \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left\{ \nabla \cdot (\beta U \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\beta p \mathbf{u}) - \nabla \cdot \left(\beta \mu \frac{1}{m} \rho \mathbf{u} \right) \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -U\nabla(\beta) \cdot \mathbf{u} - \nabla(\beta p) \cdot \mathbf{u} + \frac{1}{m}\rho\nabla(\beta\mu) \cdot \mathbf{u} \\
& + \beta [\Pi_{\beta\alpha}\partial_\beta u_\alpha + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q] \} .
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

From the Euler equation for entropy,

$$S = \beta E + \beta p V - \beta \mu N, \tag{69}$$

by applying it locally, using local extensive parameters E , V and N , and then taking the quantities per unit volume, it follows that the local entropy density $s(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is equal to

$$s(\mathbf{r}, t) = \beta(\mathbf{r}, t)U(\mathbf{r}, t) + \beta(\mathbf{r}, t)p(\mathbf{r}, t) - \beta(\mathbf{r}, t)\mu(\mathbf{r}, t)n(\mathbf{r}, t), \tag{70}$$

where $n(\mathbf{r}, t) = \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t = \rho(\mathbf{r}, t)/m$ is the local particle-number density. From the Gibbs-Duhem relation

$$Ed\beta + Vd(\beta p) - Nd(\beta\mu) = 0, \tag{71}$$

also applied locally and then written correspondingly for the local densities

$$Ud\beta + d(\beta p) - nd(\beta\mu) = 0, \tag{72}$$

it follows for the local time changes

$$U\frac{\partial\beta}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\beta p)}{\partial t} - n\frac{\partial(\beta\mu)}{\partial t} = 0. \tag{73}$$

Also, from (72) applied in the infinitesimal local system comoving with the fluid, it follows that

$$U\frac{\partial\beta}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial(\beta p)}{\partial t} - n\frac{\partial(\beta\mu)}{\partial t} + [U\nabla(\beta) + \nabla(\beta p) - n\nabla(\beta\mu)] \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0. \tag{74}$$

By comparing (73) and (74) we see that

$$[U\nabla(\beta) + \nabla(\beta p) - n\nabla(\beta\mu)] \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0. \tag{75}$$

So, from (68), using (70) and (75), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} &= - \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} [\nabla \cdot (s\mathbf{u} + \beta\mathbf{J}_Q)] \\
&+ \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} [\nabla(\beta) \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q - \beta\Pi_{\beta\alpha}\partial_\beta u_\alpha] .
\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

It is also interesting to note that, from the Euler equation (70), using the Gibbs-Duhem relation (72), we obtain for the local densities

$$ds = \beta dU - \beta \mu dn. \quad (77)$$

Relation (77) is in accordance with the approach developed by Callen [28], where the entropy in a nonequilibrium system is defined locally, assuming the same dependence on the local extensive parameters as in equilibrium.

Furthermore, the expression (76), when multiplied by the Boltzmann constant k , is consistent with the rate of entropy change for a single component classical fluid, that follows from the standard approach to nonequilibrium thermodynamics that assumes local equilibrium [13, 29]. By comparison with the references [13, 29], we recognize that the divergence integral in (76) is the sum of convective and diffusive entropy flows over the boundary surface of the volume, and that the last integral in (76) is identical with the volume integral of the density of entropy production.

To simplify the calculation and identification of the aforementioned quantities, we introduce the new variables (x', p') that are related with the old phase space variables (x, p) by a canonical transformation which has the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_k &= \mathbf{r}'_k, \\ \mathbf{p}_k &= \mathbf{p}'_k + m\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}'_k, t), \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

where $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}'_k, t)$ represents the fluid velocity at a position \mathbf{r}'_k . It is easily checked that the Jacobian of this transformation is equal to unity. By applying the change of variables given by (78), expressions (1), (2) and (3) are transformed in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} n(\mathbf{r}) &= n'(\mathbf{r}) \\ \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) &= \mathbf{P}'(\mathbf{r}) + m\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)n'(\mathbf{r}) \\ h(\mathbf{r}) &= h'(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) \cdot \mathbf{P}'(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r}, t)n'(\mathbf{r}). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Since the Jacobian of the transformation (78) is equal to unity, the microstate probability density which in the new variables (x', p') corresponds to the probability density (50), is obtained by a simple introduction of (78) and (79):

$$f'(x', p', t) = \frac{1}{Z_t} \exp \left\{ - \int d^3\mathbf{r} \beta(\mathbf{r}, t) [h'(\mathbf{r}) - \mu(\mathbf{r}, t)n'(\mathbf{r})] \right\}. \quad (80)$$

Since they are given by the integrals over the phase space, the information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ in (53) and the corresponding partition function (48) are invariant to the transformation (78) for which the

Jacobian of the transformation is equal to unity. With new coordinates (x', p') explicitly indicated, the information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ is given by the expression

$$S_I^f(t) = \log Z_t + \int d^3\mathbf{r} \beta(\mathbf{r}, t) [\langle h'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t - \mu(\mathbf{r}, t) \langle n'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t] , \quad (81)$$

while the partition function is given by the expression

$$\log Z_t = \log \left\{ \int_M d\Gamma' \exp \left[- \int d^3\mathbf{r} \beta(\mathbf{r}, t) [h'(\mathbf{r}) - \mu(\mathbf{r}, t) n'(\mathbf{r})] \right] \right\} . \quad (82)$$

By averaging the left side of (79) over the microstate probability density given by (50) and averaging the right side over the corresponding density (80), and then using (60), we obtain the following equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t \\ \langle \mathbf{P}'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \mathbf{0} \\ \langle h'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t &= \langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t - \frac{1}{2} m \mathbf{u}^2(\mathbf{r}, t) \langle n'(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t . \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

The last of equations (83) is nothing but an expression for the internal energy density $U(\mathbf{r}, t)$. Using the transformation (78), it is shown that the partition function (82), probability density (80) and the information entropy (81) do not depend on the fluid velocity $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$.¹ The time dependence in the expression for the information entropy (81) appears only through the quantities $\beta(\mathbf{r}, t)$ and $\mu(\mathbf{r}, t)$, in an explicit and implicit way. For that reason, the time derivatives of the information entropy (81) also do not depend on $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. Due to the invariance of the information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ on the transformation (78), the same must be true also for the corresponding expressions (53), (56) and (57). This means that, to simplify the calculations, everywhere in the expressions (53), (54), (56) and (57) we can safely take that $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{0}$.

When this is done in (57), using the expressions for the Lagrange multipliers (54) and the current densities (59), or directly in (76), one obtains the following expression for the time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$:

$$\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} = - \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \nabla \cdot (\beta \mathbf{J}_Q) + \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \nabla(\beta) \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q . \quad (84)$$

¹ It is assumed here that the available part of phase space, the invariant set M of all possible microstates, is invariant also on the transformation (78). For example, that assumption will be satisfied if the set M is given by the product $M = V \times \dots \times V \times (-\infty, \infty) \times \dots \times (-\infty, \infty)$, where the set V represents the volume of the system that limits the possible values of the coordinates of all N particles, and the possible values of the vector components of momenta of each of N particles are in the intervals $(-\infty, \infty)$.

By multiplying the expression (84) with the Boltzmann constant k and with the inclusion of $\beta(\mathbf{r}, t) = (kT(\mathbf{r}, t))^{-1}$ we obtain

$$\frac{dS(t)}{dt} = - \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \nabla \cdot \left(\frac{\mathbf{J}_Q(\mathbf{r}, t)}{T(\mathbf{r}, t)} \right) + \int_V d^3\mathbf{r} \nabla \left(\frac{1}{T(\mathbf{r}, t)} \right) \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q(\mathbf{r}, t) . \quad (85)$$

Equation (85) can also be recognized as the equation from the thermodynamics of irreversible processes that gives the *rate of change of entropy of the system*. The divergence integral in (85) is the change due to entropy exchanged through the boundary of the volume of the whole system, and accordingly, the sign in front of that term is negative. With regard to the initial assumption that the number of particles in the system is fixed, there is no exchange of particles with the environment; the given system is closed. Particles can not leave the volume of the system, so the fluid velocity vanishes at the boundary of the volume of the system; therefore entropy can not pass through this boundary by the streaming of the fluid. Also, it is easy to see why the divergence integral in (85) does not contain the contribution from the convective entropy flow present in (76); the convective entropy flow, if it is present within the closed system does not change the total entropy of the system, so its total contribution to the rate of entropy change is zero. Furthermore, we can also consider the limiting case in which the volume of the system is infinite. Then also there is no exchange of heat with the environment, so the divergence integral in (85) vanishes completely; that is the limit in which the system is isolated.

The second integral in (85) is the volume integral of the quantity known in the thermodynamics of irreversible processes as *the density of entropy production*, or alternatively, *entropy source strength*. One of the fundamental postulates of thermodynamics of irreversible processes [13, 29] is that this quantity always has the canonical form

$$\sigma = \sum_i \mathbf{X}_i \cdot \mathbf{J}_i . \quad (86)$$

This canonical form defines the thermodynamic fluxes \mathbf{J}_i and the conjugate thermodynamic forces \mathbf{X}_i denoted by the index i .

The comparison of (86) with the second integral in (85) indicates that it is possible, by following this fundamental postulate, to define the density of entropy production for the classical fluid of identical particles considered here, in the form

$$\sigma(\mathbf{r}, t) = \nabla \left(\frac{1}{T(\mathbf{r}, t)} \right) \cdot \mathbf{J}_Q(\mathbf{r}, t) . \quad (87)$$

Proper identifications of the thermodynamic forces and fluxes are easily noticeable. From the comparison of the volume integrals of the density of entropy production given in (76) and in (85),

it follows that for the closed system,

$$\int_V d^3\mathbf{r}(-T)^{-1}\partial_\alpha u_\beta \Pi_{\alpha\beta} = 0 , \quad (88)$$

where the Einstein summation convention for the components of the strain rate tensor $\partial_\alpha u_\beta$ and the viscous pressure tensor $\Pi_{\alpha\beta}$ is again implied. The entropy balance equation (85) is valid also for a small volume comoving with the fluid with the local fluid velocity $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t)$. Therefore, the entropy production density is given only by (87), and this means that locally

$$(-T)^{-1}\partial_\alpha u_\beta \Pi_{\alpha\beta} = 0 . \quad (89)$$

It is clear from the above arguments that (89) follows essentially from the requirement of local invariance of the entropy production density to the Galilean transformations, which is the standard requirement known from the literature [29].

VI. CLOSED SYSTEMS WITH EXTERNAL FORCING

The results in the previous Section were obtained in the setting applicable to the class of closed systems described by the Hamiltonian function that does not depend on time. This is applicable for the systems that can exchange energy in the form of heat but can not exchange work and particles with the environment. The classical fluid of N identical particles which is described by the Hamiltonian function (4) is such a system. Further generalization to systems with time dependent Hamiltonian function is straightforward. It was explained in Sections III B, IV and V of the previous paper [1] and in Section V of this paper. For example, if the Hamiltonian function (4) also includes an additional term about which we have prior information that describes the external time dependent potential field $\Phi_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$,

$$H(x, p, t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \Phi(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^N \Phi_e(\mathbf{r}_i, t) , \quad (90)$$

then it describes the classical fluid of N identical particles with the time dependent external force $\mathbf{F}_e(\mathbf{r}, t) = -\nabla\Phi_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$ applied on it. This force may include also the effect of the walls of container confining the system of N particles, if it can be described in such a way. Since the external potential $\Phi_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is time dependent, for such a system of N particles the total energy and momentum are not conserved and the local macroscopic conservation laws (20) must be modified to include the effect of the external force $\mathbf{F}_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$:

$$\frac{\partial \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} = \langle \{n(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t ,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \langle P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} &= \langle \{P_\alpha(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha}(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t + \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t F_{e, \alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t), \\
\frac{\partial \langle h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t}{\partial t} &= \langle \{h(\mathbf{r}), H\} \rangle_t = -\nabla \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_h(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t + \langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{r}, t) \cdot \mathbf{F}_e(\mathbf{r}, t).
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

Here $\langle n(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_t \mathbf{F}_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$ is the external force times the local particle-number density, i.e. the external force density.

The right hand sides of (91) including the external force terms are obtained from the Poisson brackets of the local dynamical variables $n(\mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r})$ and $h(\mathbf{r})$ with the time dependent Hamiltonian function (90), averaged over the microstate probability density $f(x, p, t)$. Therefore, as shown in Sections III and V, if the conditional probability density $D(x, p, t | (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ is replaced by the conditional probability density $B(x, p, t | x_0, p_0, t_0)$, path probability density $F((x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ with the microstate probability density $f(x_0, p_0, t_0)$, M and $S_0(M)$ replaced by Γ , and dS_0 replaced by $d\Gamma$, as is appropriate in the case of time dependent Hamiltonian function $H(x, p, t)$, then with all these replacements the constraints (34) are equivalent to (91). Accordingly, as explained in Section V, the same replacements are also done in the constraints (28) and (29), and the conditional information entropy $S_I^{DF}(t, t_0)$ is replaced by the conditional information entropy $S_I^{Bf}(t, t_0)$.

With all these replacements, and by applying the analogous maximization procedure to $S_I^{Bf}(t, t_0)$ as was applied to $S_I^{DF}(t, t_0)$ in Section V, we obtain the MaxEnt conditional probability density $B(x, p, t | x_0, p_0, t_0)$ which is analogous and of the same form as (49) obtained for $D(x, p, t | (x_0, p_0)_\omega, t_0)$ in Section V. The only difference is with respect to the expressions for time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ in (56) and (57). Using (56), (57) and (91) it is easy to see that the time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$ is given here by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dS_I^f(t)}{dt} &= - \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\nabla \cdot (\lambda_n \langle \mathbf{J} \rangle_t) + \nabla \cdot (\lambda_h \langle \mathbf{J}_h \rangle_t) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \nabla \cdot (\lambda_{P_\alpha} \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha} \rangle_t) \right] \\
&+ \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\nabla(\lambda_n) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J} \rangle_t + \nabla(\lambda_h) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_h \rangle_t + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \nabla(\lambda_{P_\alpha}) \cdot \langle \mathbf{J}_{P_\alpha} \rangle_t \right] \\
&+ \int d^3\mathbf{r} \left[\lambda_h \langle n \rangle_t \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{F}_e + \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \lambda_{P_\alpha} \langle n \rangle_t F_{e, \alpha} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

The last line in (92) is the contribution from the external force terms present in (91). With the assumption of local equilibrium used here as in Section V, all local thermodynamic identities used in Section V are valid also here. The only difference is that along with the chemical part $\mu_c(\mathbf{r}, t)$, the local chemical potential now also includes the external potential, i.e. $\mu(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mu_c(\mathbf{r}, t) + \Phi_e(\mathbf{r}, t)$. Using the identification of Lagrange multipliers (54) and by following the same procedure as in

Section V, here we also obtain the expression (76) for the time derivative of information entropy $S_I^f(t)$. Furthermore, in analogous way as in Section V, we also obtain relations (84), (85), (87), (88) and (89). Further generalization to open systems is also straightforward and along with the derivation of the transport coefficients for the classical fluid it will be the subject of the further paper.

VII. CONCLUSION

The construction of the probability distribution using the principle of maximum information entropy, i.e. by maximizing the information entropy subject to given constraints, includes in the probability distribution only the information which is represented by these constraints. The predictions derived from such probability distribution are the best predictions possible on the basis of available information, without the introduction of additional, uncertain assumptions. If controlling certain macroscopic quantities reproduces some macroscopic phenomena in the experiment, then in accordance with the foundational principle of macroscopic reproducibility, the information about the values of these quantities is relevant for prediction of that macroscopic phenomena.

Therefore, it can be said that consideration of the relevance of available information about the system for prediction and reproducibility of the macroscopic time evolution, is essential for a better understanding of the appearance of irreversibility. On the example of closed Hamiltonian system, it is shown that elementary description of irreversible macroscopic time evolution can be given, if the relevant information for the description of nonequilibrium system is included in the probability distribution by introducing it with corresponding additional constraints on the maximization of the conditional information entropy. In this way, in the generalized approach developed in this paper, by introducing the hydrodynamic continuity equations as the relevant information on the hydrodynamic time scale, the rate of entropy change and the density of entropy production are obtained for the classical fluid of identical particles. The obtained expressions are in accordance with the definitions that these quantities have in the thermodynamics of irreversible processes. If we consider that the predictive statistical mechanics is a general form of inference from the available information, without additional assumptions, the obtained results suggest the importance of its

basic principles for the theory of irreversibility.

- [1] Kuić, D: Predictive statistical mechanics and macroscopic time evolution I. A model for closed Hamiltonian systems. Accessible via <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.02622>
- [2] Kuić, D., Županović, P., Juretić, D.: Macroscopic time evolution and MaxEnt inference for closed systems with Hamiltonian dynamics. *Found. Phys.* 42, 319–339 (2012)
- [3] Shannon, C.E.: A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell Syst. Tech. J.* 27, 379–423, 623–656 (1948). Reprinted In: Shannon C.E., Weaver, W.: *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana (1949)
- [4] Jaynes, E.T.: Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Phys. Rev.* 106, 620–630 (1957)
- [5] Jaynes, E.T.: Information theory and statistical mechanics. II. *Phys. Rev.* 108, 171–190 (1957)
- [6] Jaynes, E.T.: Information theory and statistical mechanics. In: Ford, K.W. (ed.) *1962 Brandeis Lectures in Theoretical Physics*, vol. 3, pp. 181–218. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York (1963)
- [7] Jaynes, E.T.: Where do we stand on maximum entropy? In: Levine, R.D., Tribus, M. (eds.) *The Maximum Entropy Formalism*, pp. 15–118. MIT Press, Cambridge (1979)
- [8] Jaynes, E.T.: Gibbs vs Boltzmann entropies. *Am. J. Phys.* 33, 391–398 (1965)
- [9] Jaynes, E.T.: The minimum entropy production principle. *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* 31, 579–601 (1980)
- [10] Jaynes, E.T.: Macroscopic prediction. In: Haken, H. (ed.) *Complex Systems – Operational Approaches in Neurobiology, Physics, and Computers*, pp. 254–269. Springer, Berlin (1985)
- [11] Jaynes, E.T.: The second law as physical fact and as human inference. Unpublished manuscript (1990). <http://bayes.wustl.edu/etj/node2.html>
- [12] Zubarev, D., Morozov, V., Röpke, G.: *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibrium Processes, Vol. 1: Basic Concepts, Kinetic Theory*. Akademie Verlag (1996)
- [13] Evans, D.J., Morriss, G.: *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibrium Liquids*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2008)
- [14] Grandy, W.T.: Principle of maximum entropy and irreversible processes. *Phys. Rep.* 62, 175–266 (1980)
- [15] Grandy, W.T.: Time evolution in macroscopic systems. I. Equations of motion. *Found. Phys.* 34, 1–20 (2004)
- [16] Grandy, W.T.: Time evolution in macroscopic systems. II. The entropy. *Found. Phys.* 34, 21–57 (2004)
- [17] Grandy, W.T.: Time evolution in macroscopic systems. III. Selected applications. *Found. Phys.* 34, 771–813 (2004)
- [18] Grandy, W.T.: *Entropy and the Time Evolution of Macroscopic Systems*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2008)
- [19] Zwanzig, R.: Ensemble method in the theory of irreversibility. *J. Chem. Phys.* 33, 1338–1341 (1960)
- [20] Zwanzig, R.: On the identity of three generalized master equations. *Physica* 30, 1109–1123 (1964)

- [21] Robertson, B.: Equations of motion in nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. *Phys. Rev.* 144, 151–161 (1966)
- [22] Robertson, B.: Application of maximum entropy to nonequilibrium statistical mechanics. In: Levine, R.D., Tribus, M. (eds.) *The Maximum Entropy Formalism*. MIT Press, Cambridge (1979)
- [23] Zubarev, D.N., Kalashnikov, V.P: Equivalence of various methods in the statistical mechanics of irreversible processes. *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.* 7, 372–394 (1971)
- [24] Kittel, C.: *Elementary Statistical Physics*. Wiley, New York (1958)
- [25] Balian, R.: *From Microphysics to Macrophysics, Vol. 2: Methods and Applications of Statistical Physics*. Springer, Berlin (2007)
- [26] Divergence theorem. L.D. Kudryavtsev (originator), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*. URL: <http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/>
- [27] Wan, F.Y.M.: *Introduction to the Calculus of Variations and Its Applications*. Chapman & Hall, New York (1995)
- [28] Callen, H.B.: *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*, 2nd edn. Wiley, New York (1985)
- [29] de Groot, S.R., Mazur, P.: *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics*. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1962)