

Maximum entropy production from d'Alembert's separation of direct and inertial forces

Steven A. Frank¹

*Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine,
CA 92697-2525 USA*

d'Alembert's principle describes the balance between two opposing forces. Directly applied forces change a system with respect to a fixed frame of reference. Inertial forces alter the frame of reference so that a system appears to be unchanged. In addition, the forces of constraint limit the possible changes that the system may follow. I show that the direct forces move a system along a path that maximizes the gain in entropy. That maximum entropy production principle can only be understood in the context of d'Alembert's special separation between direct, inertial, and constraining forces. The maximum entropy production principle unifies aspects of mechanics, thermodynamics, natural selection, statistical inference, and probability theory. Although maximum entropy production is a general principle, a purely geometric interpretation provides a more fundamental and universal perspective than does entropy. In particular, the conservation of total probability imposes strong geometric symmetry and constraint on d'Alembert's separation of direct and inertial forces. Maximum entropy production is a useful but sometimes unnatural way of expressing those fundamental geometric principles. I also show that maximum entropy production and maximum gain in Fisher information are equivalent ways of describing the underlying geometric principles^a.

Keywords: maximum entropy; information theory; Fisher information; information geometry; theoretical biology; theoretical physics

1 INTRODUCTION

Probability distributions can be read as expressions of constraining forces. For example, a Gaussian distribution expresses a constraint on the average distance of observations from the mean value. If one constrains that average distance of fluctuations from the mean, then the Gaussian distribution arises by maximizing the entropy subject to that constraint. Maximizing entropy is roughly equivalent to minimizing information or maximizing randomness.

Jaynes' maximum entropy describes an equilibrium condition¹⁻³. The idea is that entropy increase is a ubiquitous force. Increasing entropy plus constraining forces together define the form of the equilibrium distribution.

The increase of entropy toward an equilibrium leaves open the problem of the dynamical path followed from initial condition to final equilibrium state. What characterizes the increments along that path? One possibility is that each increment follows the direction that maximizes the increase in entropy—the path of maximum entropy production (MEP).

Some authors have proposed MEP as a fundamental principle similar to the principle of least action^{4,5}. By that view, essentially all realized paths of motion maximize the production of entropy. Other authors have suggested that MEP is only an approximate description of dynamics⁵. By that view, certain special systems follow MEP exactly, whereas many other systems follow MEP approximately or not at all.

The logical status of MEP as a principle and its usefulness in analysis remain open problems. The interpretation of MEP is important, because that interpretation reflects our general understanding of diverse subjects and the relations between those subjects. Potentially related subjects include physical mechanics and thermodynamics, biological evolution via natural selection, paths of updated inference in statistics, and the relation of stochastic process to the form of probability distributions.

I show that MEP is an exact statement about dynamics when interpreted in the context of d'Alembert's principle. d'Alembert defined a balance between direct and inertial forces⁶. Direct forces change a system with respect to a fixed frame of reference. Inertial forces alter the frame of reference so that a system appears to be unchanged. Constraining forces limit possible changes. MEP is an exact description of the change caused by d'Alembert's direct forces.

Although MEP is a valid principle, I argue that a purely geometric interpretation provides a more fundamental and universal perspective than does the entropy perspective of MEP. In particular, the conservation of total probability imposes strong geometric symmetry and constraint on d'Alembert's separation of direct and inertial forces⁷. Maximum entropy production is a useful but often unnecessarily complicated way of expressing those fundamental geometric principles.

2 CONSERVATION OF TOTAL PROBABILITY

To analyze entropy, one must have a notion of a system in terms of frequency or probability. Change in entropy arises from change in probabilities between two popula-

^a)mail: safrank@uci.edu, web: <http://stevefrank.org>

tions. I emphasize the way in which the conservation of total probability influences the abstract structure of change between populations⁷.

Consider a first population with a vector of positive probabilities \mathbf{q} , such that $\sum q_i = 1$. A second population has positive probabilities \mathbf{q}' that also sum to one.

One can use various rules for the relations between q_i and q'_i , allowing a wide variety of different perspectives on the transformations that relate the two populations⁸. For our purposes, we can operate abstractly and not worry about the particular rules. Our only restriction is that we can map the index i between the two populations.

Define

$$m_i = \log \frac{q'_i}{q_i} = \Delta \log q_i$$

to express the ratio of frequencies between the two populations associated with i . We can think of m_i/τ as the average force acting along the path that moves the system from q_i to q'_i with respect to total path length, $\tau = \Delta s^2$, in the parametric length scale, s . Thus, m_i is the total force in the i th dimension along the path of change. For our purposes, we can treat s as a nondimensional scale and τ as a constant, thus m_i is proportional to the nondimensional force.

The above expression is equivalent to exponential growth driven by m_i as

$$q'_i = q_i e^{m_i}.$$

We can take m_i as a given total force of growth and derive q'_i , or we can take the outcome q'_i as given, and derive the effective force, m_i , that is consistent with the outcome.

For simplicity, I assume that changes $\dot{q}_i = q'_i - q_i$ are small. We could extend the analysis to larger differences, composed of the sum of small differences along a path connecting the endpoints. For small changes, we may write

$$m_i = \frac{\dot{q}_i}{q_i} = \log \dot{q}_i.$$

When changes are small, the total force averaged over the different dimensions, $\bar{m} = \sum q_i m_i$, is constrained to be zero by the conservation of total probability, because $\bar{m} = \sum \dot{q}_i = 0$. Thus, the change in the average force is always zero, $\dot{\bar{m}} = 0$. We can partition the total change in the average force into two components by applying the chain rule as

$$\dot{\bar{m}} = \dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{m}} = 0. \quad (1)$$

The terms $\dot{m}_i = m'_i - m_i$ can be defined in any way that remains consistent with the conservation of total probability. To interpret this expression, we must analyze it by d'Alembert's principle⁷.

3 D'ALEMBERT'S PRINCIPLE

We may write d'Alembert's principle⁶ as

$$(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = 0.$$

All terms are vectors, and the dot product distributes over the parentheses. The vector \mathbf{q} locates the system, and $\dot{\mathbf{q}}$ is a virtual displacement of the system from its current location to a nearby location. A virtual displacement is like an imaginary displacement, in which the system is held fixed in its current state in relation to its frame of reference, and then one moves its location without changing anything else. All forces and the frame of reference for measurement are held constant.

A virtual displacement must be consistent with all forces of constraint. A primary force of constraint on a virtual displacement, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}$, is that the sum of the frequencies is one. Thus, $\sum \dot{q}_i = 0$ expresses the force of constraint set by the conservation of total frequency or probability. Because a virtual displacement must be consistent with the forces of constraint, we need only analyze those forces that are in addition to the forces of constraint. In particular, we need to track the direct forces, \mathbf{F} , and inertial forces, \mathbf{I} .

To transform the expression for the conservation of total probability in eqn 1 into an expression of d'Alembert's principle, note that

$$\mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{m}} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{q}}{\dot{\mathbf{q}}} \odot \dot{\mathbf{m}} \right) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = \left(\frac{\dot{\mathbf{m}}}{\mathbf{m}} \right) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = \log \dot{\mathbf{m}} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{q}},$$

The symbol " \odot " denotes element-wise multiplication of vectors, the ratio denotes element-wise division, and dot products distribute over parentheses. We can now write eqn 1 in terms of d'Alembert's principle, $(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = 0$, as

$$(\mathbf{m} + \log \dot{\mathbf{m}}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = 0. \quad (2)$$

We equate this expression with d'Alembert by interpreting $\mathbf{m} \equiv \mathbf{F}$ as the force of growth or, more generally, the direct forces acting on frequency change. We interpret $\log \dot{\mathbf{m}} \equiv \mathbf{I}$ as the inertial forces, which typically are described in terms of acceleration with respect to the frame of reference⁷.

Virtual displacements, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}$, must be consistent with the constraint $\sum \dot{q}_i = 0$ for the conservation of total probability. The term \mathbf{m} describes all direct forces acting on frequencies that are in addition to the force of constraint imposed by the conservation of total probability.

4 GIVEN FORCES

I have defined $m_i = \log q'_i/q_i = \dot{q}_i/q_i$ as proportional to the force acting along the infinitesimal change $\dot{q}_i = q'_i - q_i$. These expressions describe a consistency relation between force and frequency change. Often, we wish to consider how extrinsic or given forces cause change, rather than simply express consistency.

Suppose, for example, that we have a given force vector acting at the point in frequency space, \mathbf{q} . The given force is proportional to the nondimensional vector

$$\hat{\phi} = \log \frac{\dot{\mathbf{q}}}{\mathbf{q}}. \quad (3)$$

Given the location, \mathbf{q} , and the force vector, $\hat{\phi}$, the vector $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ provides an alternative way to express the intensity of the force vector as $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}}/\mathbf{q}$. As with \mathbf{m} , we can write the total nondimensional force as a description of an exponential growth process

$$\hat{q}_i = q_i e^{\hat{\phi}_i},$$

in which \hat{q}_i is the endpoint of the exponential growth process that began at q_i . Thus, the location \mathbf{q} and the “target” location $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ are sufficient to describe the given force vector.

It is common in classical mechanics to define force, $\hat{\phi}_i$, in relation to coordinates, q_i , by the negative gradient of a potential function Φ as

$$\hat{\phi}_i = -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial q_i} = \log \frac{\hat{q}_i}{q_i}.$$

We can use the potential function

$$\Phi = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{q}||\hat{\mathbf{q}}) - \left(\sum q_i - 1 \right), \quad (4)$$

in which \mathcal{D} is the Kullback-Leibler divergence, or relative entropy, defined as

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{q}||\hat{\mathbf{q}}) = \mathbf{q} \cdot \log \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\hat{\mathbf{q}}}, \quad (5)$$

in which the ratio of vectors describes element-wise division. The second term in eqn 4 expresses the constraint on total probability, so that the resulting force includes that force of constraint. The average force, $\bar{\phi} = \mathbf{q} \cdot \hat{\phi} = -\mathcal{D}$, is also a relative entropy expression.

We could use relative entropy as a primary focus for analysis, leading to a minimum relative entropy production principle. However, relative entropy hides the most important aspect: how should we interpret the $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ that define the forces? To analyze that question, I isolate $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ from the entropy component.

5 EXTREME ACTION AND FREQUENCY DYNAMICS

The given forces and the conservation of total probability do not by themselves tell us what frequency changes occur. In the study of frequency changes, the simplest variational approach finds the extremum (maximum or minimum) of a Lagrangian subject to a constraint. In our case, we may write

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i \hat{q}_i \hat{\phi}_i - \frac{1}{2\kappa} \left(\sum_i \frac{\hat{q}_i^2}{q_i} - C^2 \right) - \xi \left(\sum_i \hat{q}_i - 0 \right), \quad (6)$$

in which we take as given the direct force in each dimension, $\hat{\phi}_i$. We constrain the total change caused by the direct forces by measuring total change with $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{m} = \sum \hat{q}_i m_i = \sum \hat{q}_i^2/q_i$. That expression comes from d’Alembert’s form for the conservation of total probability in eqn 2. The term $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{m}$ is d’Alembert’s virtual

work of the direct forces, in which work is distance times force (ignoring mass). Geometrically, we can think of this constraint as fixing the total path length moved in frequency space⁹, in which $\sum \hat{q}_i^2/q_i$ measures distance by the Fisher information metric for infinitesimal displacements, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. The final term constrains total probability to remain constant.

The constraints of $\sum \hat{q}_i^2/q_i = C^2$ and $\sum \hat{q}_i = 0$ do not by themselves determine which frequency changes actually occur. Many different frequency vectors, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, satisfy those two constraints. I assume that C^2 is chosen so that a solution exists that satisfies the constraints.

Given these forces and constraints, what actual path do the dynamics follow? In other words, what is the realized vector $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$? We can think of the first term in the Lagrangian as the action, and extremize the action subject to the given constraints. That action term is $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \hat{\phi}$, the product of the displacement times the given force, which is the virtual work. In this case, maximizing the virtual work in the Lagrangian finds the displacement $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ aligned with the direct and constraining forces.

To find the extreme action path, we evaluate $\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \hat{q}_i = 0$, which yields

$$\hat{q}_i = \kappa q_i \hat{\phi}_i^*, \quad (7)$$

in which $\hat{\phi}_i^* = \hat{\phi}_i - \bar{\phi}$ is the excess force relative to the average, and $\xi = \bar{\phi} = \sum q_i \hat{\phi}_i$ follows from satisfying the conservation of total probability and the assumption that the virtual displacements are small. The constant of proportionality

$$\kappa = \frac{C}{\sigma_{\hat{\phi}}} \quad (8)$$

satisfies the constraint on total path length, in which $\sigma_{\hat{\phi}}$ is the standard deviation of the direct forces.

Here, we have deduced a fundamental expression for frequency dynamics by the principle of extreme action. We can rewrite the expression for frequency dynamics as

$$m_i = \frac{\hat{q}_i}{q_i} = \kappa \hat{\phi}_i^*, \quad (9)$$

which shows that the forces, m_i , may be arrived at inductively by consistency with given changes, \hat{q}_i/q_i . This expression also shows that the forces described by \mathbf{m} are related by affine transformation to a vector of given forces, $\hat{\phi}$, from which one may deduce the actual frequency changes.

6 DIRECT FORCES AND CONSTRAINING FORCES

The distinction between direct and constraining forces is arbitrary. In the mathematical expression of d’Alembert’s principle, we may choose to describe a force by its constraint on allowable virtual displacements, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, or by its inclusion in the direct forces, \mathbf{F} .

The d'Alembert expression for frequency change in eqn 2 includes only the conservation of total probability as a constraining force on $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. All other forces on frequency change are summarized by $\mathbf{F} \equiv \mathbf{m}$ or, as in eqn 9, $\mathbf{F} \equiv \kappa \hat{\phi}^*$.

The Lagrangian in eqn 6 defines the action to be extremized as the work done along the path, which is the total displacement, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, times the direct component of force, $\mathbf{F} \equiv \hat{\phi}$. We can use $\hat{\phi}$ rather than $\hat{\phi}^* = \hat{\phi} - \bar{\phi}$ for force, because we can ignore the constant, κ , and $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \bar{\phi} = 0$.

The constraining forces in the Lagrangian of eqn 6 are the fixed path length, $\sum \hat{q}_i^2/q_i = C^2$, and the conservation of total probability, $\sum \hat{q}_i = 0$.

We are free to relabel a component of the direct force as a constraining force⁶. In d'Alembert's expression, we continue to have $(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I})\hat{\mathbf{q}} = 0$. However, we may interpret \mathbf{F} to contain a different set of component forces and, consequently, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ must obey the matching change in the set of constraining forces. The inertial forces, \mathbf{I} , that balance the direct forces, \mathbf{F} , will also change with a relabeling of direct and constraining forces.

In practice, deriving the altered Lagrangian provides an easier way to see how the changed labeling of direct and constraining forces enters into the analysis. Consider the direct forces as defined in eqn 3 as

$$\hat{\phi} = \log \frac{\hat{\mathbf{q}}}{\mathbf{q}} = \log \hat{\mathbf{q}} - \log \mathbf{q}.$$

We can think of this expression as the sum of two component forces, $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}}$ and $\log \mathbf{q}$. The virtual work term of the direct forces becomes

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \hat{\phi} = \hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \hat{\mathbf{q}} - \hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}, \quad (10)$$

in which $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \hat{\mathbf{q}}$ is now associated with the forces of constraint, and $-\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}$ becomes the virtual work associated with the direct forces.

7 CONSERVED SYSTEM QUANTITIES AS THE PRIMARY FORCES OF CONSTRAINT

In relabeling $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}}$ as a constraining force, it is useful to write

$$\log \hat{\mathbf{q}} = \log k - \lambda \mathbf{z}, \quad (11)$$

in which k is chosen so that $\sum \hat{q}_i = 1$ obeys the conservation of total probability, the term λ is a positive constant, and $z_i > 0$ is chosen to make the equality hold. Thus, we can express the force associated with \hat{q}_i by using z_i . The constraining force now becomes associated with the component

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \hat{\mathbf{q}} = -\lambda (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z}). \quad (12)$$

The advantage of using \mathbf{z} is that we may define the force of constraint directly in terms of any system quantity that we may associate with \mathbf{z} . Each z_i is, in this

analysis, a given value associated with a subset i of the population. We can use any quantity for \mathbf{z} , including energy or momentum or monetary wealth.

Often, underlying quantities of a system, x_i , become transformed by various processes before we evaluate the final quantity of the outcome, z_i . We may, in general, consider $z_i = T(x_i)$, in which x_i is an intrinsic quantitative value associated with the subset i , and $T(x_i)$ is a transformation that defines a scaling relation between the intrinsic x_i values and the constraining force, z_i . The analysis of pattern often reduces to understanding the processes that set the scaling relation¹⁰, T .

Because we can define $z_i = T(x_i)$ in any way, the quantity $\bar{z} = \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ can represent almost any sort of functional on the system. This expression for \bar{z} is also the average value of \mathbf{z} . It is often useful to consider changes in \bar{z} , with infinitesimal change as

$$\dot{\bar{z}} = \hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{z}}, \quad (13)$$

which we obtain by a simple chain rule expansion of the differential. In the study of populations, we interpret \mathbf{q} as a frequency vector, in which case this expression is often called the Price equation^{7,8,11}.

If $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ is constrained, then that constraint defines the constraint on $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ in eqn 12. For example, the total system quantity \bar{z} may be conserved, which means that $\dot{\bar{z}} = 0$. If the \mathbf{z} quantities do not themselves change, then $\mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{z}} = 0$, and consequently we have the constraint on the given forces $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} = 0$. We may also consider other ways in which $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ is constrained, thereby defining the given forces $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ that determine dynamics.

8 MAXIMUM ENTROPY PRODUCTION

With the split between direct and constraining forces in eqn 10, and the expression of the constraining forces in terms of \mathbf{z} in eqn 12, we can write a new Lagrangian that is equivalent to the Lagrangian in eqn 6, using dot product notation

$$\mathcal{L} = -\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q} - \frac{1}{2\kappa} (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{m} - C^2) - \xi (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{1} - 0) - \lambda (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} - B). \quad (14)$$

The first term is the total action to be maximized, which is the virtual work of the direct forces, $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{F} = -\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}$. The other terms describe the constraints on the path that $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ may follow. I assume that C^2 and B are chosen such that a solution exists.

The classical definition of entropy in each dimension is $-\log q_i$. Thus, the path $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ that maximizes $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{F} = -\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}$, subject to the constraints on $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, is the path that maximizes the production of entropy subject to the constraints. In terms of d'Alembert's principle, we have

$$(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I})\hat{\mathbf{q}} = (-\log \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{I})\hat{\mathbf{q}} = 0.$$

This expression describes the maximum entropy production principle. The idea is that, in terms of d'Alembert's

principle, the most likely path is the one that maximizes the virtual work of the direct forces, $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{F} = -\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}$, subject to the constraints on $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. To achieve this expression, one must include in the forces of constraint all forces that determine the location of $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}} = \log k - \lambda \mathbf{z}$.

The maximum entropy production principle is always true, in the sense that one can always split the total direct forces, $\hat{\phi}$, into a constraining component, $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}}$, and a direct component, $-\log \mathbf{q}$. The extent to which maximum entropy production is meaningful depends on two questions. First, how meaningful is it to treat $\log \hat{\mathbf{q}} = \log k - \lambda \mathbf{z}$ as a constraint? Second, how meaningful is it to consider paths of change in the context of d'Alembert's principle?

In order to answer those questions about maximum entropy production, the next section analyzes dynamics with respect to \mathbf{z} as a constraint. The following section discusses the Jaynesian theory of maximum entropy in relation to equilibrium thermodynamic expressions for common probability distributions. After those two sections, I return to the broader question of how to interpret the maximum entropy production principle in terms of d'Alembert's principle.

9 MAXIMUM ENTROPY PATH SUBJECT TO CONSTRAINT

To interpret the meaning of \mathbf{z} as a constraint, we return to the Lagrangian in eqn 14, repeated here

$$\mathcal{L} = -\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q} - \frac{1}{2\kappa} (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{m} - C^2) - \xi (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{1} - 0) - \lambda (\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} - B).$$

This Lagrangian is equivalent to the form in eqn 6, thus solving $\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial \hat{q}_i = 0$ yields a solution equivalent to eqn 7, which we can expand to emphasize alternative interpretations

$$\hat{q}_i = \kappa q_i \hat{\phi}_i^* = \kappa q_i (\mathcal{E}_i^* - \lambda z_i^*),$$

with deviations from average values $z_i^* = z_i - \bar{z}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_i^* = \mathcal{E}_i - \mathcal{E} = -\log q_i + \overline{\log q_i},$$

in which $\mathcal{E} = -\overline{\log q_i} = -\sum q_i \log q_i$ is the traditional definition of average system entropy. Thus, \mathcal{E}_i^* is the deviation of the entropy in the i th dimension from the average system entropy. The constant $\xi = \mathcal{E} - \lambda \bar{z}$ is absorbed by expressing \mathcal{E}_i^* and z_i^* as deviations from their average values. The constant κ is given by eqn 8, in which $\sigma_{\hat{\phi}}$ is the standard deviation of the forces, $\hat{\phi}_i^* = \mathcal{E}_i^* - \lambda z_i^*$.

The constraint $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} = B$ implies

$$\lambda = \beta_{\varepsilon z} - \frac{B}{\kappa \sigma_z^2}.$$

The term $\beta_{\varepsilon z}$ is the regression coefficient of \mathcal{E}_i on z_i , which transforms the scale for the forces of constraint imposed by \mathbf{z} to be on a common scale with the direct forces of entropy, $-\log \mathbf{q}$. The term $B/\kappa \sigma_z^2$ describes the

required force of constraint on frequency changes so that the new frequencies move \bar{z} by the amount $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} = B$. The term σ_z^2 is the variance in \mathbf{z} .

When the \mathbf{z} values change, the changing frame of reference with respect to \mathbf{z} follows from eqn 13 as $\mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{z}} = \dot{\bar{z}} - B$. When \bar{z} is a conserved quantity and the \mathbf{z} values remain constant such that $\mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{z}} = 0$, then $\dot{\bar{z}} = B = 0$. When $B = 0$, the force of constraint for the conserved quantity is expressed simply by $\lambda = \beta_{\varepsilon z}$.

10 EQUILIBRIUM THERMODYNAMICS AND PROBABILITY

This section analyzes how the direct force causing maximum increase in entropy and the constraining forces imposed by \mathbf{z} set the system equilibrium. That equilibrium can be interpreted as the maximum entropy probability distribution.

The dynamics are expressed in eqn 7 as $\dot{q}_i = \kappa q_i \hat{\phi}_i^*$. Equilibrium requires that the forces be constant in each dimension, thus $\hat{\phi}_i^* = 0$. We can take that condition as the forces in each dimension given by

$$\hat{\phi}_i = \log \frac{\hat{q}_i}{q_i} = 0,$$

which means that the equilibrium condition can be written as $\log q_i = \log \hat{q}_i$. We can express \hat{q}_i in terms of the system quantities, \mathbf{z} , that set the forces of constraint. From eqn 11, we write the equilibrium condition as $\log q_i = \log k - \lambda z_i$, or

$$q_i = k e^{-\lambda z_i}.$$

That probability distribution is the classic Jaynesian thermodynamic equilibrium¹⁻³ that arises by maximizing entropy subject to a constraint on \bar{z} . That constraint is usually interpreted as a conserved quantity, such that $\dot{\bar{z}} = 0$, and $\hat{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{q} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{z}} = 0$. We can use multiple constraints on a set of system values \bar{z}_j , and replace λz_i by $\sum_j \lambda_j z_{ij}$. For simplicity, I focus on a single constraint.

Suppose we want to find a Lagrangian that leads to the Jaynesian equilibrium, in which the defined forces $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$ arise from a constraint on a conserved system quantity, $\bar{z} = \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{z} = \mu$. The following Jaynesian Lagrangian does the job

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{E} + \tilde{k} \left(\sum q_i - 1 \right) - \lambda \left(\sum q_i z_i - \mu \right), \quad (15)$$

in which $\mathcal{E} = -\sum q_i \log q_i$, is the classical expression for entropy defined earlier. This Lagrangian is simply the entropy, \mathcal{E} , subject to two constraints. First, the total probability must be one. Second, the system quantity $\bar{z} = \sum q_i z_i$ is conserved and equal to μ . The terms \tilde{k} and λ are the Lagrangian multipliers that adjust to guarantee that the constraints are satisfied.

Maximum entropy subject to the constraints requires $\partial \mathcal{L} / \partial q_i = 0$, which yields the maximum entropy probability distribution

$$q_i = k e^{-\lambda z_i},$$

in which $\log k = \tilde{k} - 1$, and $\lambda = 1/\mu$.

Two conclusions follow. First, equilibrium probability distributions at maximum entropy express the force of constraint on total probability and the forces of constraint on total system quantities. The point of maximum entropy occurs at the minimum relative entropy, $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{q}||\hat{\mathbf{q}})$, which is achieved as $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{q}}$.

Second, pattern follows from the values of \mathbf{z} that set the forces of constraint and thus the magnitudes of $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. How the \mathbf{z} values arise has not been specified. Thus, the study of pattern often reduces to the study of how various processes set \mathbf{z} .

11 INTERPRETATION OF MAXIMUM INFORMATION AND ENTROPY PATH

The previous sections analyzed forces in terms of d'Alembert's partition of direct and constraining forces. In d'Alembert's principle, $(\mathbf{F} + \mathbf{I}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = 0$, the virtual work associated with the direct and constraining forces is $\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{F}$. The forces of constraint are included in the potential set of virtual displacements, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, and the direct forces are in \mathbf{F} .

The direct forces are interpreted with regard to a fixed frame of reference. There exists a change in frame of reference by inertial forces, \mathbf{I} , such that the virtual work of the inertial change in frame of reference, $\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{I}$, balances the virtual work of the direct and constraining forces.

We may interpret the partition of direct and constraining forces in different ways, to match the interpretation of different problems. In this article, I split the total direct forces into a direct force that increases entropy, $\mathbf{F} = -\log \mathbf{q}$, and a set of potential virtual displacements, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, that obey the forces of constraint defined by conservation of a functional, \bar{z} , of the system quantities, \mathbf{z} , where one can think of each z_i as a function on the subset, i , of the population.

In particular, I defined the total direct forces by $\hat{\phi} = \log \hat{\mathbf{q}}/\mathbf{q}$, and then split those forces as

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \hat{\phi} = -\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q} + \dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \hat{\mathbf{q}} = -\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q} - \lambda \dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{z}.$$

If we take $\hat{\phi}$ as the direct forces, then the frequency changes can be obtained from the Lagrangian in eqn 6 that maximizes the action $\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \hat{\phi}$, which is equivalent to minimizing the change relative entropy, $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{q}||\hat{\mathbf{q}})$.

If we take $-\log \mathbf{q}$ as the direct forces, then the frequency changes can be obtained from the Lagrangian in eqn 14 that maximizes the action $-\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \log \mathbf{q}$, which is equivalent to maximizing the gain in entropy, \mathcal{E} .

In other words, the realized path maximizes the production of entropy, thus the maximum entropy production principle. That conclusion holds only in the context of d'Alembert's principle, in which all direct forces except entropy production become constraining forces on the possible virtual displacements, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$. In addition, the changes in frame of reference that typically arise from

change in location, $\hat{\mathbf{q}}$, are separated by d'Alembert's principle into the consequences of the virtual work of inertial forces, $\dot{\mathbf{q}} \cdot \mathbf{I}$.

Maximum entropy production only holds for the partial change from the direct forces, when separating all direct forces other than entropy into the constraints, and when ignoring changes in the frame of reference associated with the inertial forces.

Does it make sense to follow this particular partition of forces into d'Alembert components? There is no correct answer to that question. The principle exists. The interpretations of usefulness and meaning will always have a strongly subjective aspect.

I follow Lanczos⁶ in the claim that d'Alembert's principle is the great unifying perspective in the study of forces. In many systems, it makes sense to describe most of the applied forces in terms of the constraining forces of conserved system quantities. Often, all that remains is the only truly universal force, the increase of entropy, which completes the description of the total direct forces acting on a system.

In some cases, it may make sense to use a different partition of applied forces into direct and constraining component forces. When the remaining direct component of force differs from entropy alone, then it would appear that the system does not follow the maximum entropy production principle. However, it is better to say that the maximum entropy production principle always holds, but alternative expressions may provide a more meaningful perspective for particular problems.

12 GEOMETRY AND THE FISHER INFORMATION METRIC

The conservation of total probability allows us to express a special case of d'Alembert's principle⁷ in eqn 2, repeated here

$$(\mathbf{m} + \log \dot{\mathbf{m}}) \dot{\mathbf{q}} = 0,$$

in which $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{F}$ and $\log \dot{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{I}$, with $m_i = \dot{q}_i/q_i$. If we write the dot products as explicit sums, the balance of d'Alembert's direct and inertial forces becomes

$$\sum \frac{\dot{q}_i^2}{q_i} - \sum \frac{\dot{q}_i^2}{q_i} = \mathcal{J}_F - \mathcal{J}_I = 0,$$

in which $\mathcal{J} = \sum \dot{q}_i^2/q_i$ is the Fisher information metric, and the subscripts denote the direct and inertial components. The Fisher information metric arises in many applications^{12,13}. For example, Frieden¹⁴ has emphasized that this Fisher information partition subsumes nearly all of the key results of theoretical physics. Similarly, the subject of information geometry subsumes nearly all of the classical aspects of statistical inference through a Riemannian geometry based on the Fisher information metric⁹.

From the general perspective of d'Alembert's principle, the partition into Fisher information components arises

as a special case⁷. In that special case, one does not separate the forces of constraint from the other directly applied forces. Instead, all directly applied and constraining forces combine into a single quantity that describes the path, in which that path has a natural geometric expression in terms of the Fisher information metric. That geometry is very useful in many applications. But it is important to recognize the more general perspective of d'Alembert, which allows a deeper conceptual understanding of the different roles played by directly applied forces, constraining forces, and inertial forces.

One can think of the maximum entropy production principle in terms of Fisher information geometry. The universal direct force that increases entropy is always present. In addition to that universal direct force, various additional constraining forces combine to influence the curvature of the space of allowable virtual displacements.

13 CONCLUSIONS

d'Alembert's principle leads to a strong conclusion: there is no universal law about the total change of a system. The interpretation of total change always depends on how the frame of reference has changed. There is no law to tell us exactly how the frame of reference changes in all cases. Thus, there is no universal law of total change.

d'Alembert's principle emphasizes the only certainty: for reversible virtual displacements, there exist inertial forces that change the frame of reference so that it would appear as if the total work is zero⁶. The inertial forces are sometimes called fictitious forces, because they may exist only in fiction as forces that would exactly balance the virtual work of the direct forces.

One may think that d'Alembert's principle, because it relies on a force that may be fictitious, is in fact not a true principle. But that negative view misses the point.

d'Alembert's principle emphasizes that there can be no universally exact claim about the total observed change. That change must depend on the changing frame of reference. In many cases, it is difficult or impossible to specify exactly how the frame of reference changes.

Given the impossibility of an absolute statement about total change, d'Alembert's principle clarifies the most that can be said with certainty. The most that can be said is that there exists a balance between the virtual

work of the direct forces and the virtual work associated with some change in the frame of reference.

More importantly, the notion of virtual displacements allows one to partition the direct forces into components of directly applied forces and constraining forces. One can make that partition in a variety of ways according to the interpretation of a particular system. That emphasis on forces helps greatly in understanding the causes of change. As Lanczos⁶ states: *d'Alembert's principle focuses attention on the forces, not on the moving body*. The maximum entropy production principle can only be understood from d'Alembert's perspective. Entropy acts as a universal direct force such that paths of change maximize the increase in entropy, interpreting all other forces as constraining or inertial forces.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

National Science Foundation grant DEB-1251035 supports my research. I did this work while on fellowship at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin.

- ¹E. T. Jaynes, "Information theory and statistical mechanics," *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620–630 (1957).
- ²E. T. Jaynes, "Information theory and statistical mechanics. II," *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 171–190 (1957).
- ³E. T. Jaynes, *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2003).
- ⁴R. C. Dewar, "Maximum entropy production and the fluctuation theorem," *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **38**, L371–L381 (2005).
- ⁵R. C. Dewar, C. H. Lineweaver, R. K. Niven, and K. Regenauer-Lieb, eds., *Beyond the Second Law: Entropy Production and Non-equilibrium Systems* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2014).
- ⁶C. Lanczos, *The Variational Principles of Mechanics*, 4th ed. (Dover Publications, New York, 1986).
- ⁷S. A. Frank, "d'Alembert's direct and inertial forces acting on populations: The Price equation and the fundamental theorem of natural selection," Unpublished (2015).
- ⁸S. A. Frank, "Natural selection. IV. The Price equation," *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **25**, 1002–1019 (2012).
- ⁹S. Amari and H. Nagaoka, *Methods of Information Geometry* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2000).
- ¹⁰S. A. Frank, "How to read probability distributions as statements about process," *Entropy* **16**, 6059–6098 (2014).
- ¹¹G. R. Price, "Extension of covariance selection mathematics," *Annals of Human Genetics* **35**, 485–490 (1972).
- ¹²S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics* (Wiley, New York, 1959).
- ¹³T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory* (Wiley, New York, 1991).
- ¹⁴B. R. Frieden, *Science from Fisher Information: A Unification* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004).