

Efficiency fluctuations in cyclic machines

Marc Suñé* and Alberto Imparato†

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Aarhus University, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

(Dated: July 23, 2018)

We study the statistics of the efficiency in a class of isothermal cyclic machines with realistic coupling between the internal degrees of freedom. We derive, under fairly general assumptions, the probability distribution function for the efficiency. We find that the macroscopic efficiency is always equal to the most likely efficiency, and it lies in an interval whose boundaries are universal as they only depend on the input and output thermodynamic forces, and not on the details of the machine. The machine achieves the upper boundary of such an interval only in the limit of tight coupling. Furthermore, we find that the tight coupling limit is a necessary, yet not sufficient, condition for the engine to perform close to the reversible efficiency. The reversible efficiency is the least likely regardless of the coupling strength, in agreement with previous studies. By using a large deviation formalism we derive a fluctuation relation for the efficiency which holds for any number of internal degrees of freedom in the system.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the dawn of thermodynamics, the capacity of a machine to convert available sources of energy into useful work has been an ubiquitous subject of investigation. As a matter of fact, the second law of thermodynamics sets a limit on a thermal machine's performance. In particular, the maximum efficiency of an isothermal machine, as given by the ratio of work performed by the machine to the energy used, is 1. The lossless limit in which energy conversion into work is performed with efficiency 1 is nonetheless attained in the reversible quasi-static limit, in which the machine operates infinitely slowly. A machine in this reversible quasi-static regime delivers zero output power, and so it is useless for practical purposes. Accordingly, many efforts have been devoted to the study of the condition for finite non-zero, possibly maximal, power production. One of the first discussions on this topic is attributed to Moritz von Jacobi already around 1840 [1].

The blossoming of experimental techniques aimed at investigating the fluctuations of thermodynamic quantities in microscopic systems [2] has paved the way to the extension of the laws of thermodynamics to address the stochastic properties of quantities such as work, heat or entropy production [3]. According to this revised version of thermodynamics, the efficiency itself is a fluctuating quantity [4] as it is given by the ratio of two fluctuating quantities: the entropy production rates σ_i associated to the output ($i = 2$) and input ($i = 1$) currents along a single stochastic trajectory

$$\eta = -\frac{\sigma_2}{\sigma_1}. \quad (1)$$

As such, the trajectory dependent efficiency of a microscopic machine performing at the energy scale of the thermal fluctuations ($k_B T$) [4] can indeed surpass the reversible limit (or the Carnot limit for thermal motors). Furthermore, collective effects such as synchronization in arrays of N interacting microscopic motors can decrease the energy dissipation [5] and possibly increase the thermodynamic efficiency with respect to the single motor case [6–10], and even beat the Carnot limit at finite entropy production rate [11]. The study of the statistical properties of the stochastic efficiency is thus of crucial importance in order to characterize the performance of microscopic machines operating in out-of-equilibrium conditions.

In this paper we derive via stochastic thermodynamics the statistics of the efficiency for a class of cyclic isothermal energy transducers [12, 13], whose internal degrees of freedom are coupled with realistic physical interactions described by a many-body potential. Starting from the simplest case of a machine consisting of two degrees of freedom and concluding with the N -particle system, we are able to derive the full probability density function (PDF) of the efficiency under fairly general assumptions. The efficiency PDF is known to exhibit power law long tails [14, 15], and as such finite moments of any order cannot be calculated. However, our approach allows us to identify the macroscopic efficiency with the most likely value, i.e. the maximum of the efficiency PDF. Furthermore, the mechanistic description used here allows us to derive the exact expression of the machine response as a function of the force intensity: this in

* msune@phys.au.dk

† imparato@phys.au.dk

turn allows us to accurately study the weak and tight coupling limits, and the large input/output force regime, so as our investigation is not limited to the linear regime.

As far as the least likely efficiency is concerned, we find that it corresponds to the reversible efficiency, in accordance with the findings of Ref. [4]. In that reference the fluctuation theorem for the entropy production [3, 16, 17] was used to prove this result on the least likely efficiency. Here we take one step further, and show that the fluctuation theorem for the energy currents [18–21] implies a fluctuation relation for the efficiency itself: the PDF of η turns out to show a symmetry which resembles those obtained previously for, e.g., the work or the heat PDFs [3, 17, 22–25]. While we initially assume that the input and output energy currents are Gaussian distributed as, e.g., in [15, 26], we provide solid evidence that the fluctuation relation for the efficiency holds beyond the linear regime, and for a general interaction potential.

The paper is organized in the following manner. In section II we review a few useful results on the Brownian particle in a tilted periodic potential, which will be used in the following discussion in the paper. In section III we consider the minimal model for an isothermal cyclic energy transducer, namely a system with two degrees of freedom and a periodic interaction potential. We then derive the efficiency PDF, discuss its extremal points, and introduce the fluctuation relation for η . In section IV we generalize our results to the case of a machine with N degrees of freedom. In section V we summarize our results.

II. SINGLE OSCILLATOR

A Brownian particle in a one-dimensional periodic ring potential $U_0(y)$ and driven by a force f is the minimal model for the study of isothermal systems driven into a non-equilibrium steady state [27–32]. Furthermore, its properties are relevant for the study of a system with many degrees of freedom, interacting through periodic potentials, as we argue in the following sections. We thus review some of its features and include a few novel results as well in this section.

The trajectory $y(t)$ of an overdamped Brownian particle in a periodic potential $U_0(y)$ with period L and subject to a constant drift force f is generated by the Langevin equation

$$\dot{y} = f - U_0'(y) + \zeta(t), \quad (2)$$

where the friction coefficient is set to unity $\Gamma = 1$, and a dot and a prime indicate time and space derivatives, respectively. The quantity $\zeta(t)$ is a stochastic force with a Gaussian distribution and correlations given by the fluctuation–dissipation relation

$$\langle \zeta(t) \zeta(t') \rangle = 2T\delta(t - t'), \quad (3)$$

that accounts for thermal fluctuations due to energy exchange between the system and the surrounding medium at temperature T . The Boltzmann constant k_B is set to unity throughout this paper.

Furthermore, in the following the quantity k will express the typical amplitude of the periodic potential corrugations, the simplest example being $U_0(y) = -k \cos y$. We will not assume any specific for $U_0(y)$, unless differently stated.

The equation for the time evolution of the probability distribution function (PDF) of the phase y reads

$$\partial_t P(y, t) = \mathcal{L}_y P(y, t), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the Fokker–Planck (FP) differential operator

$$\mathcal{L}_y = -\partial_y (f - U_0'(y) - T\partial_y). \quad (5)$$

The PDF in the steady state is thus [9, 33, 34]

$$P(y) = \mathcal{N} \beta e^{\beta(-U_0(y) + fy)} \left[\frac{I(L)}{1 - \exp(-\beta Lf)} - I(y) \right], \quad (6)$$

where $I(y) = \int_0^y dy' \exp[-\beta(-U_0(y') + fy')]$, $\beta = 1/T$, and \mathcal{N} is a normalization constant that depends implicitly on β , k and f , and which is fixed by the normalization condition

$$\int_0^L P(y) dy = 1. \quad (7)$$

The steady-state PDF as given by Eq. (6) has the same periodicity as the potential $U_0(y)$. The steady-state velocity of the dynamical variable y reads [9, 29]

$$\bar{v}_y(k, f) = L\mathcal{N}, \quad (8)$$

in which the dependency on the temperature is implicit. This is an exact result that holds for any potential strength k . The velocity \bar{v}_y depends in particular on the form of the potential $U_0(y)$. However, the asymptotic behaviors can be predicted by using some physical arguments: a) in the limit of large corrugation amplitude ($k \gg T, f$) the particle is effectively trapped in a potential well, and so $\bar{v}_y \rightarrow 0$; b) in the opposite limit ($k \ll T, f$) the potential is flattened by the tilting force, hence $\bar{v}_y \rightarrow f$. We can thus express the steady-state velocity in terms of a function $c(k, f)$,

$$\bar{v}_y(k, f) = f[1 - c(k, f)], \quad (9)$$

such that $0 \leq c(k, f) \leq 1$, $c(0, f) = 0$ and $c(\infty, f) = 1$. Finally, we notice that the integrals contained in the expression for the normalization constant Eqs. (6)-(7) typically do not have an analytic solution, though the steady-state velocity can be expanded in power series of k [9].

A. Stochastic work

The total work done on the particle along individual trajectory is defined by the functional [35, 36]

$$w_y[y(\tau)] = \int_0^t f \dot{y}(\tau) d\tau = f \cdot (Y_t - Y_0). \quad (10)$$

Here we have introduced a second coordinate Y to account for the total traveled distance: such coordinate is unbounded ($-\infty < Y < \infty$) in contrast to the bounded periodic coordinate y . The stochastic processes for y and Y (and hence w_y) are characterized by the same Langevin equation Eq. (2), the only difference being that the former coordinate is periodic while the latter is unbounded. In particular both coordinates have the same velocity in the steady-state $\langle \dot{Y} \rangle = \langle \dot{y} \rangle$.

The coordinate Y represents a time integrated current for the Brownian particle, and the study of its fluctuations is propaedeutic to the subsequent study of the efficiency fluctuations. In particular, we notice that the time evolution of its PDF is governed by the analogous evolution operator to that for the variable y Eq. (5): $\partial_t P(Y, t) = \mathcal{L}_Y P(Y, t)$.

B. Fluctuations of Y

In view of studying the fluctuations of the variable Y , it is convenient to introduce the evolution operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ for the joint probability $P(y, Y, t)$ that reads [19, 20, 37-39]

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}} = -\partial_y(f - U'_0(y)) - \partial_Y(f - U'_0(y)) + T(\partial_y^2 + \partial_Y^2 + 2\partial_y\partial_Y). \quad (11)$$

Because of the specific symmetry exhibited by the Fokker-Planck operator (11) [19, 20], the steady state PDF $P(Y) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} P(Y, t)$ exhibits a long time fluctuation relation

$$P(Y) = P(-Y)e^{\beta f Y}. \quad (12)$$

As a consequence, the scaling cumulant generating function defined as [40]

$$\mu_0(\lambda) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \langle e^{\lambda Y} \rangle}{t}, \quad (13)$$

that corresponds to the largest eigenvalues of the operator (11), exhibits the following symmetry [19, 20]

$$\mu_0(\lambda) = \mu_0(-\lambda - f/T). \quad (14)$$

We next introduce the generating function

$$\Psi(y, \lambda, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dY \exp(\lambda Y) P(y, Y, t), \quad (15)$$

whose time evolution $\partial_t \Psi = \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda \Psi$ is governed by the differential operator

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda = -\partial_y (f - U'_0(y) - T\partial_y) + (f - U'_0(y))\lambda + T\lambda^2 - 2T\lambda\partial_y, \quad (16)$$

which is a simplified version of the operator (11) as discussed in Ref. [41]. Considering the separation ansatz for $\Psi(y, \lambda, t)$ (Sec. 5.4 in [34]),

$$\Psi(y, \lambda, t) = \varphi(y, \lambda)e^{\mu(\lambda)t}, \quad (17)$$

one obtains

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda \varphi_n(y, \lambda) = \mu_n(\lambda) \varphi_n(y, \lambda), \quad (18)$$

where $\varphi_n(y, \lambda)$ and $\mu_n(\lambda)$ are the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the Fokker–Planck operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$, respectively. To solve Eq. (18) we express the operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$ Eq. (16) in matrix form, hence we need a complete and orthonormal basis, $\langle j|l\rangle = \delta_{jl}$. Because of the periodic nature of the system, a suitable choice for the basis is [39]

$$\langle j|y\rangle = \frac{e^{-ijy}}{\sqrt{L}}, \quad \langle y|j\rangle = \frac{e^{ijy}}{\sqrt{L}}. \quad (19)$$

Expanding the eigenfunctions $\varphi_n(y, \lambda)$ into the chosen basis

$$\varphi_n(y, \lambda) = \langle y|\varphi_n(\lambda)\rangle = \langle y|\sum_l c_l^{(n)}(\lambda)|l\rangle = \sum_l c_l^{(n)}(\lambda)\langle y|l\rangle, \quad (20)$$

equation (18) for the eigenvalue n reads

$$\sum_j L_{lj} c_j^{(n)}(\lambda) = \mu_n(\lambda) c_l^{(n)}(\lambda), \quad (21)$$

with $L_{lj} \equiv \langle l|\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda|j\rangle = \int_0^L dy \langle l|y\rangle \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda \langle y|j\rangle$.

Considering a cosine potential $U_0(y) = -k \cos y$ the matrix turns out to be tridiagonal with elements

$$L_{jj} = -T(j + i\lambda)^2 - if(j + i\lambda), \quad \text{if } j=l; \quad (22)$$

$$L_{j,j\pm 1} = \mp \frac{k}{2} (j + i\lambda), \quad \text{if } j-l = \pm 1; \quad (23)$$

$$L_{jl} = 0, \quad \text{if } j \neq l \text{ and } j - l \neq \pm 1. \quad (24)$$

C. Perturbative approach

In its matrix form, the operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$ Eq. (16) is an infinite matrix, whose size can be truncated to some finite value in order to solve the linear system Eq. (21). We write $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$ as the sum of a diagonal matrix and another one including the upper and the lower diagonals, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda = \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(0)} + k \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(1)}$. The latter turns out to be proportional to the potential strength k , and therefore a perturbation theory can be used to obtain the eigenvalues as series expansions in terms of k : $\mu_n(\lambda) = \mu_n(\lambda) + k\mu_n^{(1)}(\lambda) + k^2\mu_n^{(2)}(\lambda) + k^3\mu_n^{(3)}(\lambda) + k^4\mu_n^{(4)}(\lambda) + O(k^5)$.

However, the perturbation theory employed in quantum mechanics to solve, e.g., the Schrödinger equation, cannot be used here since neither the operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$ of the Fokker–Planck equation nor the unperturbed operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(0)}$ are Hermitian. Therefore, there is no set of functions to form a complete orthonormal basis for $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(0)}$, and so the corrections to the eigenvectors cannot be calculated.

One possible way to proceed in order to avoid this limitation is to recast the equation for the characteristic polynomial into the following form

$$\det [\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda - \mu(\lambda)\mathbb{1}] = 0 \Rightarrow \det [\mathbf{M}] \det \left[\left(\mathbb{1} + k \mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(1)} \right) \right] = 0, \quad (25)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(0)}$ is a diagonal matrix with entries L_{jj} , $\mathbf{M} = \hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda^{(0)} - \mu(\lambda)\mathbb{1}$, and where we have employed the property that the determinant for the product of matrices is the product of their determinants. The matrix \mathbf{M} is diagonal and thus its determinant reduces to the product of its entries: it depends on $\mu(\lambda)$ and can thus be easily expanded in powers of k . The expansion of the second determinant in Eq. (25) requires additional analysis that is included in Appendix A.

D. Largest eigenvalue

According to Eq. (17), the long-time limit behavior of the generating function $\Psi(y, \lambda, t)$ is dominated by the largest eigenvalue of the operator $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_\lambda$, which corresponds to the cumulant generating function $\mu_0(\lambda)$ introduced in Eq. (13), and so we can write the generating function for Y as

$$\psi(\lambda, t) = \int_0^L dy \Psi(y, \lambda, t) \sim \exp[\mu_0(\lambda) t]. \quad (26)$$

Thus, starting from the zeroth order, we apply the perturbative approach described above for the largest eigenvalue (labeled by $n = 0$) to obtain the expansion for the largest eigenvalue up to fourth order,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(\lambda) \approx & \lambda(f + T\lambda) \left[1 - \frac{k^2}{2} \frac{1}{T^2 + (f + 2T\lambda)^2} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{k^4 - f^4 - 3f^3T\lambda + f^2T^2(4 + \lambda^2) + fT^3\lambda(9 + 8\lambda^2) + T^4(5 + 9\lambda^2 + 4\lambda^4)}{8(T^2 + (f + 2T\lambda)^2)^3(4T^2 + (f + 2T\lambda)^2)} \right] + \mathcal{O}[k^6]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We recall that this last result is specific for the cosine potential $U_0(y) = -k \cos y$.

It is worth noting that by substituting the leading contribution of the generating function Eq. (26) into Eq. (15), deriving with respect to λ , and evaluating the result at $\lambda = 0$, we obtain the following identity

$$\partial_\lambda \mu_0(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0} = \frac{\langle Y \rangle}{t} = \bar{v}_y. \quad (28)$$

The last equation, together with Eq. (27), provides thus an expansion of the steady-state velocity \bar{v}_y in powers of k . An identical result for \bar{v}_y is obtained by considering Eq. (8) and expanding the normalization constant, as given by Eqs. (6) and (7), in powers of k [9].

Further, the diffusion coefficient can be computed from $\mu_0(\lambda)$,

$$D = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle Y^2 \rangle - \langle Y \rangle^2}{2t} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\lambda^2 \mu_0(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0}. \quad (29)$$

For small k , Fig. 1, there is a good agreement between the diffusion coefficient as given by Eqs. (27) and (29), and the analytic result calculated for the overdamped Brownian motion in a tilted periodic potential as obtained in [42].

III. TWO COUPLED OSCILLATORS

A minimal model for a machine with an input and an output energy current consists of two overdamped Brownian particles with coordinates x_1 and x_2 coupled through a periodic potential $U_0(x_1 - x_2)$ of strength k [5, 29]. Each particle is subject to a constant tilting force of opposite sign, so that one injects energy into the system $f_1 > 0$, whereas the other extracts energy, $f_2 < 0$. The two particles will be termed the producer and the user, respectively. In the limit of weak coupling (k small) the two particles tend to move independently, each one at its own “natural frequency” f_i , while strengthening k will increasingly synchronize their motion. The dynamic equations for the two coupled oscillators read,

$$\dot{x}_1 = f_1 - \partial_{x_1} U_0(x_1 - x_2) + \zeta_1(t), \quad (30)$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = f_2 - \partial_{x_2} U_0(x_2 - x_1) + \zeta_2(t). \quad (31)$$

We assume uncorrelated Gaussian white noises, $\langle \zeta_i(t) \zeta_j(t') \rangle = 2T \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t')$, $i, j = 1, 2$. The efficiency Eq. (1) for a single trajectory of this isothermal engine is the rate between the work Eq. (10) extracted by the user along an individual trajectory and the work injected by the producer along the same trajectory

$$\eta = -\frac{w_2}{w_1} = -\frac{f_2 X_2}{f_1 X_1}. \quad (32)$$

We employ the same notation as in Sec. II A to distinguish the unbounded coordinates, X_i , from the bounded periodic ones x_i . The PDF of the efficiency is then [43],

$$P(\eta, t) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dX_1 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dX_2 P(X_1, X_2, t) \delta\left(\eta + \frac{f_2 X_2}{f_1 X_1}\right). \quad (33)$$




Figure 1. Diffusion coefficient D versus the tilt force f for the single particle in the potential $U_0(y) = -k \cos y$. Full symbols: D as given by Eqs. (27) and (29). Lines: the analytic prediction as given in [42]. The system parameters are $T = 1$, and $k = 0.25$ (black circles), $k = 0.5$ (red diamonds), $k = 1$ (blue squares). $D_0 = T$.

We need thus to evaluate the joint PDF $P(X_1, X_2, t)$ for the unbounded coordinates, that amounts to find the steady state solution to the FP equation corresponding to the Langevin equations (30)-(31). To simplify the question, we introduce a coordinate transformation to recast the problem into the center of mass (CM) and the relative coordinate motion

$$x \equiv \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}, \quad y \equiv \frac{x_1 - x_2}{2}, \quad (34)$$

so that the dynamic equations (30)-(31) decouple into

$$\dot{x} = f_x + \zeta_x(t), \quad (35)$$

$$\dot{y} = f_y - \partial_y U_0(2y)/2 + \zeta_y(t), \quad (36)$$

where $f_x \equiv (f_1 + f_2)/2$, $f_y \equiv (f_1 - f_2)/2$, and $\langle \zeta_\alpha(t) \zeta_\beta(t') \rangle = T \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta(t - t')$.

The Langevin equation for the CM Eq. (35) describes unidimensional overdamped Brownian motion subject to a constant force f_x . Its PDF is hence a Gaussian centered at $f_x t$ (Eq. (5.20) [34])

$$P(X, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T t}} \exp\left(-\frac{(X - f_x t)^2}{2T t}\right), \quad (37)$$

where for consistency with our previous notation we have introduced the coordinate X to remark that it is an unbounded degree of freedom. On the other hand, the Langevin equation for the relative coordinate Eq. (36) is analogous to Eq. (2) introduced in Sec. II to discuss the single oscillator. Thus we will exploit the results contained in that section to evaluate the PDF for the unbounded relative coordinate $P(Y, t)$. Unless otherwise indicated, we will assume the long-time limit, so that y and Y are uncorrelated, and we can make use of the separation ansatz Eq. (17). In the following we will discuss different scenarios and approximations to obtain the PDF $P(Y, t)$.

However, before proceeding to analyze the PDF $P(Y, t)$, we consider the PDF of the efficiency Eq. (33), and discuss a few simplifications. According to the transformation Eq. (34), we have that $P(X_1, X_2, t) \propto P(X, t)P(Y, t)$ up to a constant given by the Jacobian of the coordinate transformation, hence the PDF of the efficiency Eq. (33) reads

$$P(\eta, t) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dX \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dY P(X, t) P(Y, t) \delta\left(\eta + \frac{f_2(X - Y)}{f_1(X + Y)}\right). \quad (38)$$

Let us introduce the rescaled trajectory dependent efficiency $\hat{\eta} = -f_1 \eta / f_2$, and the new variable

$$\xi = \frac{X}{Y} = \frac{1 + \hat{\eta}}{1 - \hat{\eta}}. \quad (39)$$

Its PDF $\Phi(\xi, t)$ is such that the following general relation between the two probability distributions holds,

$$P(\eta, t) = \left| \frac{d\xi}{d\eta} \right| P(\xi, t) = \left| \frac{f_1}{f_2} \right| \frac{2}{(1 - \hat{\eta})^2} \Phi(\xi, t). \quad (40)$$

Eq. (40) is a central result as it indicates that any large deviation contribution to $P(\eta, t)$ will arise from $\Phi(\xi, t)$. The PDF of the new variable ξ reads thus

$$\Phi(\xi, t) = \int dX dY \delta \left(\xi - \frac{X}{Y} \right) P(X, t) P(Y, t) = \int dY \frac{|Y|}{\sqrt{2\pi T t}} e^{-\frac{t(J_Y \xi - f_x)^2}{2T}} P(Y, t), \quad (41)$$

where the rhs of the equation is obtained by substituting the PDF for X Eq. (37), and by introducing the rescaled variable $J_Y \equiv Y/t$, corresponding to the current associated to Y .

A. Efficiency distribution with Gaussian approximation for the variable Y

The first case we consider is when $P(Y, t)$ is a Gaussian distribution. The assumption that the fluxes are normally distributed is commonly made when studying the thermodynamic properties of microscopic devices in the linear regime [4, 15, 26, 44]. As argued below, the Gaussian approximation is accurate in the limit of small f_y . Given the definition of $f_y = (f_1 - f_2)/2$, this translates into the requirement that the system is close to equilibrium, since the two forces f_1 and f_2 need to have opposite sign in order to constitute a duo of input/output power sources.

Taking $P(Y, t)$ to be Gaussian corresponds to truncate the cumulant generating function $\mu_0(\lambda)$ to second order in λ . While the first order coefficient is fixed by the average value of the velocity, Eq. (28), the second order coefficient is dictated by the symmetry imposed by the fluctuation relation $\mu_0(\lambda) = \mu_0(-\lambda - f_y/T_y)$ Eq. (14), with $T_y = T/2$ because of the coordinate change in Eq. (34). The cumulant generating function of Y for the Gaussian approximation thus reads

$$\mu_0(\lambda) = \bar{v}_y(k, f_y) \lambda (1 + \lambda T_y / f_y), \quad (42)$$

where $\bar{v}_y(k, f_y) = \langle \dot{Y} \rangle$ is given by Eq. (8). The expression (42) for $\mu_0(\lambda)$ sets a constraint on the diffusion coefficient in the Gaussian distribution $P(Y, t)$ that reads

$$P(Y, t) = \exp \left[-\frac{f_y (Y - \bar{v}_y t)^2}{2tT\bar{v}_y} \right] \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi tT\bar{v}_y/f_y}}, \quad (43)$$

where we have dropped the dependency of \bar{v}_y on k and f_y to simplify the notation. The same result is obtained if one imposes directly the fluctuation relation Eq. (12) on a Gaussian distribution with average $\bar{v}_y t$. In order to check the accuracy of the Gaussian approximation Eq. (43), we compare the diffusion coefficient as given by our approximation for the PDF Eq. (43),

$$D = \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{2t} = \frac{T\bar{v}_y(k, f_y)}{2f_y}, \quad (44)$$

with the exact result obtained in [42]. In the limit of small force f_y the diffusion coefficient D Eq. (44) obtained with the Gaussian approximation agrees with the analytic expression as obtained in [42], see Fig. 2, and in particular its insets. Yet the diffusion coefficient in Eq. (44) does not exhibit the peak near the ‘‘critical tilt’’. Besides, the degree of agreement is improved in the weak coupling regime, notice the different scales employed in the vertical axes of the inset plots in Fig. 2.

We now proceed to calculate the PDF $P(\eta, t)$. Plugging the expression for $P(Y, t)$ Eq. (43) into Eq. (41), integrating over Y , and inverting the change of variables Eq. (39), we obtain

$$P(\eta, t) = e^{-\frac{t(f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y)}{2T}} \frac{4f_y T h(\eta)^2}{(f_x + f_y) \pi \sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y} (\eta - 1)^2 |f_x - f_y|} \left[1 + \sqrt{\pi t} h(\eta) e^{t h(\eta)^2} \operatorname{erf} \left(\sqrt{t} h(\eta) \right) \right], \quad (45)$$

where $h(\eta) = (f_x^2 - f_y^2)(\eta - 1) \sqrt{\bar{v}_y} \left((f_y(\eta - 1) + f_x(\eta + 1)) \sqrt{2T \left(f_y + \frac{\bar{v}_y (f_x(\eta - 1) + f_y(\eta + 1))^2}{(f_y(\eta - 1) + f_x(\eta + 1))^2} \right)} \right)^{-1}$, see Appendix B for the details. Finally, in the long time limit the leading terms of the efficiency’s PDF are

$$P(\eta, t) = e^{-\frac{t(f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y)}{2T}} \frac{4f_y T h(\eta)^2}{(f_x + f_y) \pi \sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y} (\eta - 1)^2 |f_x - f_y|} \left[1 - \frac{h(\eta)}{|h(\eta)|} + \sqrt{\pi t} |h(\eta)| e^{t h(\eta)^2} \right], \quad (46)$$




Figure 2. Diffusion coefficient D of the relative coordinate Y versus the tilt force f_y for the interaction potential $U_0(y) = -2k \cos y$. Left panel: weak coupling with $D_0 = T = 1$ and $k = 0.25$. Right panel: larger coupling with $D_0 = T = 1$ and $k = 1$. Blue circles: D as obtained by Eq. (44) (Gaussian approximation). Red squares: exact result as obtained in [42]. Full black line: analytic approximation $D = Td\langle \dot{y} \rangle / df_y$ as obtained in [45].

and they exhibit a good agreement with the exact expression Eq. (45), see Fig. 3. The long time approximation Eq. (46) exhibits a discontinuity at $\eta = 1$ that fades when $\sqrt{t\bar{v}_y}$ is large. As such it can be observed in the tight coupling regime, i.e., when \bar{v}_y is small, even at a large time, see Fig. 3 rightmost panel.

The efficiency distribution in Fig. 3 exhibits a maximum and a minimum, which correspond to the large deviation function's extremal points, as detailed below. The super-Carnot local maximum found in [15] belongs to a subdominant decay mode, and thus it does not appear in the plot ranges of Fig. 3 as it is displaced towards infinity in the long time limit. From Eq. (46) one obtains the large deviation function of the PDF of the efficiency

$$J(\eta) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln P_t(\eta), \quad (47)$$

that has two extremal points

$$\eta_+ = \frac{f_2(c(k, f_1 - f_2) + 2f_2)}{f_1(c(k, f_1 - f_2) - 2f_1)}; \quad \eta_- = 1; \quad (48)$$

which are a maximum and a minimum, respectively; where we have written the velocity \bar{v}_y in the form of Eq. (9) in Sec. II. The minimum $\eta_- = 1$, corresponding to the reversible efficiency, is in accordance with the findings of [4] on the least likely efficiency in stochastic machines, and is a direct consequence of the fluctuation relation Eq. (12). Furthermore, we find that the most likely value of the efficiency η_+ is always equal to the macroscopic efficiency $\bar{\eta}$

$$\eta_+ = \bar{\eta} = -\frac{f_2 \langle X_2 \rangle}{f_1 \langle X_1 \rangle}, \quad (49)$$

which, differently from the minimum, depends on the coupling strength k and on the forces. We will now consider the limiting cases of weak and tight coupling and of large forces. In this analysis we will avail ourselves of the results on the single oscillator velocity discussed in Sec. II.

For $k = 0$, we have $\bar{v}_y(0, f_y) = f_y$ and thus

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \eta_+ = -\left(\frac{f_2}{f_1}\right)^2. \quad (50)$$

The same result is obtained in the limit $f_y \rightarrow \infty$; indeed, in Sec. II we have found

$$\lim_{f_y \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}_y(k, f_y) = f_y, \quad \forall k < \infty, \quad (51)$$




Figure 3. PDF of the efficiency for weak coupling ($k = 0.25$, left panel), moderate coupling ($k = 1$, middle panel), and tight coupling ($k = 4$, right panel). Red symbols: exact expression for $P(\eta, t)$ Eq. (45). Blue line: long time approximation for $P(\eta, t)$ Eq. (46). Vertical black lines: extremal points of $P(\eta, t)$ Eq. (48), Eq. (50) (left panel), Eq. (54) (right panel). Parameters choice: $T = 1$, $f_x = 0.05$, $f_y = 0.1$, $t = 10^5$. The average velocity \bar{v}_y appearing in Eqs. (45) and (46) is calculated through the exact expression (8), for the interaction potential $U_0(y) = -2k \cos y$.

and recalling that $f_y = (f_1 - f_2)/2$, one finds

$$\lim_{f_y \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_+ = \lim_{f_1 \rightarrow +\infty} \eta_+ = \lim_{f_2 \rightarrow -\infty} \eta_+ = -\left(\frac{f_2}{f_1}\right)^2. \quad (52)$$

Thus we find that a large applied force renormalizes the interaction potential, leading to a non-interacting system with negative macroscopic efficiency. It is worth noting that the minimum Eq. (48) and the weak coupling maximum Eq. (50) of the large deviation function $J(\eta)$ match the extremal points of the efficiency distribution as shown in Fig. 3 (left panel) for a particular choice of the system parameters.

In the limit of tight coupling $k \rightarrow \infty$ the variable Y becomes confined, and one has

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}_y(k, f_y) = 0, \quad \forall f_y < \infty, \quad (53)$$

thus

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta_+ = -\frac{f_2}{f_1}. \quad (54)$$

This tight coupling limit can be seen in Fig. 3 (right panel). We now argue that the values given in Eq. (50) and Eq. (54) are respectively the lower and the upper bounds for the most likely and thus for the macroscopic efficiency Eq. (49). Indeed, one finds that

$$\partial_k \eta_+ = \frac{2f_2 f_x}{f_1 (f_x + \bar{v}_y(k, f_y))^2} \partial_k \bar{v}_y(k, f_y) > 0, \quad (55)$$

where we have used the fact that $\partial_k \bar{v}_y(k, f_y) < 0$ for $f_y > 0$, and we have assumed that $f_1 > 0$, $f_2 < 0$, with $|f_1| > |f_2|$. Furthermore, $-(f_2/f_1)^2 < -f_2/f_1$, and so η_+ is restricted in this interval of values. Thus we conclude that i) the optimal maximal/macroscopic efficiency is always obtained in the limit of tight coupling, where the relative coordinate Y and its fluctuations are suppressed [9], and ii) the only way that the maximal/macroscopic efficiency can reach the reversible value 1 is in the limit $f_2 \rightarrow -f_1$ for which the total entropy production in the environment vanishes. The latter result is relevant in connection with the argument raised in [44], where it was argued that a machine at diverging power output can achieve the reversible efficiency limit. On the one hand, our results show clearly that,

for finite coupling strength k , taking diverging f_i gives the lower bound Eq. (52). On the other hand, by taking first the tight coupling limit, $k \rightarrow \infty$, and then f_1 and f_2 large but with $f_i \ll k$, the machine can achieve a large power output ($f_2 \langle \dot{x}_2 \rangle$), but at the expenses of a large power input ($f_1 \langle \dot{x}_1 \rangle$), given that $\bar{v}_y(k \rightarrow \infty, f_y) \rightarrow 0$ (Eq. (53)) and thus $\langle \dot{x}_2 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \dot{x}_1 \rangle$. Therefore, the macroscopic efficiency 1 can only be achieved close to the stall condition $f_2 \rightarrow -f_1$, making the machine a dud.

The thermodynamic uncertainty relation [46, 47] sets an upper bound for the thermodynamic efficiency, which reads [48],

$$\bar{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{1 + 2 \langle \dot{w}_2 \rangle T / \Delta_2}, \quad (56)$$

where $\langle \dot{w}_2 \rangle$ is the average output power and Δ_2 its fluctuations,

$$\langle \dot{w}_2 \rangle = \frac{-f_2 \langle X_2 \rangle}{t}, \quad \Delta_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\dot{w}_2(t) - \langle \dot{w}_2 \rangle)^2 \rangle t. \quad (57)$$

By virtue of the coordinate transformation Eq. (34) and given the distribution of X Eq. (37), the mean power and its fluctuations read,

$$\langle \dot{w}_2 \rangle = -f_2 \left(\frac{f_1 + f_2}{2} - \bar{v}_y \right), \quad \Delta_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f_2^2}{t} (Tt + \Delta_Y). \quad (58)$$

The steady-state mean velocity \bar{v}_y has already been discussed in Sec. II (Eq. (9)), whereas the fluctuations of Y decrease from $\Delta_Y = tT$ in the weak coupling limit ($k \rightarrow 0$) to $\Delta_Y = 0$ in the tight coupling limit ($k \rightarrow \infty$, when the two oscillators are fully coupled and so the relative coordinate vanishes). We therefore find that, for decreasing k ,

$$0 \leq \Delta_Y \leq tT. \quad (59)$$

According to this argument, the upper bound for the macroscopic efficiency ($f_1 \neq -f_2$), as given by Eq. (56), takes the values

$$\bar{\eta} \leq \infty, \quad \text{for } k \rightarrow 0, \quad (60)$$

$$\bar{\eta} \leq \frac{-f_2}{f_1}, \quad \text{for } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (61)$$

Comparing these results with the asymptotic behaviors of the most likely efficiency Eqs. (50) and (54), we notice that the upper bound Eq. (56) turns out to overestimate by far the macroscopic efficiency in the weak coupling, whereas for in the tight coupling we prove that the upper bound corresponds to the actual value for the macroscopic efficiency.

B. Saddle-point approach

We now calculate the probability distribution $\Phi(\xi, t)$, Eq.(41), and the most and the least probable value of the efficiency without making any assumption on the relative coordinate distribution. Recalling that $\mu_0(\lambda)$ introduced in Eq. (13) is the cumulant generating function of Y , we have that in the long time limit

$$P(Y, t) \sim \int d\lambda e^{t[\mu_0(\lambda) - \lambda J_Y]} \propto e^{t[\mu_0(\lambda^*(J_Y)) - \lambda^*(J_Y) J_Y]}, \quad (62)$$

where λ^* is implicitly defined by the saddle-point condition

$$\partial_\lambda \mu_0(\lambda)|_{\lambda^*} = J_Y. \quad (63)$$

The integral in Eq. (41) is dominated by the saddle point J_Y^{**} defined implicitly by

$$\lambda^*(J_Y^{**}) = -\frac{\xi}{T} (J_Y^{**} \xi - f_x), \quad (64)$$

where Eq. (63) is exploited to simplify the last expression. Thus one obtains

$$\Phi(\xi, t) \sim e^{tG(\xi)} = e^{-t[(J_Y^{**} \xi - f_x)^2 / 2T - (\mu_0(\lambda^{**}) - \lambda^{**} J_Y^{**})]}, \quad (65)$$

with $\lambda^{**} = \lambda^*(J_Y^{**})$. Let us now find the stationary points of $G(\xi(\eta))$. We first notice that

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial \eta} = \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial \eta} \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi} = -\frac{f_1}{f_2} \frac{1}{2} (1 + \xi)^2 \frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi}. \quad (66)$$

Exploiting equations (63)-(64), a straightforward calculation leads to the expression for the stationary points

$$\frac{\partial G}{\partial \xi} = \frac{\lambda^{**} J_Y^{**}}{\xi} = 0. \quad (67)$$

Thus, we are left with the two equations,

$$\lambda^{**} = 0; \quad J_Y^{**} = 0. \quad (68)$$

The first equation together with Eq. (64) gives

$$0 = \xi(J_Y^{**} \xi - f_x). \quad (69)$$

The solution $\xi = 0$ must be discarded, because ξ appears in the denominator of Eq. (67), so we have

$$\xi_+ = f_x / \bar{v}_y \Rightarrow \eta_+ = \frac{f_2(\bar{v}_y - f_x)}{f_1(f_x + \bar{v}_y)}, \quad (70)$$

where we have used Eq. (63) and the fact that when $\lambda^{**} = 0$,

$$J_Y^{**} = \partial_\lambda \mu_0(\lambda)|_{\lambda^{**}=0} = \bar{v}_y. \quad (71)$$

The other solution of Eq. (67), $J_Y^{**} = 0$, implies

$$\partial_\lambda \mu_0(\lambda)|_{\lambda^{**}} = 0, \quad (72)$$

so λ^{**} in this case is the minimum of $\mu_0(\lambda)$, which is a convex function. Since the fluctuation relation for the FP equation with operator given by Eq. (16) implies $\mu_0(\lambda) = \mu_0(-\lambda - 2f_y/T)$ [19], and thus $\mu_0(\lambda)$ is symmetric around $\lambda = -f_y/T$, we have that the minimum is exactly at this symmetry point. Hence, $\lambda^{**} = -f_y/T$, and thus exploiting Eq. (63) the least likely ξ and η are

$$\xi_- = -f_y/f_x \Rightarrow \eta_- = 1. \quad (73)$$

Therefore, the solutions for η_+ , η_- are the same as those in Eq. (48), obtained with the Gaussian approximation for the current J_Y .

C. Linear regime and singular coupling

After the usual coordinate transformation into the CM and the relative coordinate Eq. (34), the average velocities for the two oscillators read

$$\bar{v}_1 = \langle \dot{x}_1 \rangle = \langle \dot{X} \rangle + \langle \dot{Y} \rangle = f_x + \bar{v}_y(f_y, k), \quad (74)$$

$$\bar{v}_2 = \langle \dot{x}_2 \rangle = \langle \dot{X} \rangle - \langle \dot{Y} \rangle = f_x - \bar{v}_y(f_y, k), \quad (75)$$

with $f_{x,y} = (f_1 \pm f_2)/2$, and where we notice that in order for the machine to extract work from the input source of power, the two forces must be of opposite sign as discussed above. We consider the linear regime between fluxes (particle velocities) and thermodynamic forces f_1 and f_2 ,

$$\bar{v}_i = L_{ij} f_j, \quad (76)$$

where the linear response matrix is

$$\mathbf{L} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 + b(k) & 1 - b(k) \\ 1 - b(k) & 1 + b(k) \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$b(k) = \left. \frac{\partial \bar{v}_y}{\partial f_y} \right|_{f_y=0} = I_0^{-2}(k), \quad (77)$$

is the partial derivative of the steady state velocity Eq. (8) calculated at $f_y = 0$; $I_0(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} dy \exp(2\beta k \cos y)$ is the zeroth order modified Bessel function of the first kind. In deriving the expression for \mathbf{L} we have assumed that since f_1 and f_2 are both small, their difference $2f_y$ is small as well, and the interacting potential $U_0(y) = -2k \cos y$.

The function $b(k)$ is monotonically decreasing from $b(0) = 1$ to $b(k \rightarrow \infty) \rightarrow 0$. Thus, in the linear regime the macroscopic efficiency $\bar{\eta}$ achieves the reversible limit 1 only in the limit of tight coupling $k \rightarrow \infty$. This result is in agreement with the analysis we discussed in Sec. III A for the general case of arbitrary forces f_1 and f_2 in the tight coupling limit, as summarized by Eq. (54). In the same section we derived the range of values for the macroscopic efficiency by using a general argument. Obviously, the values of the macroscopic efficiency are limited in that range in the linear regime too. It is however interesting to investigate whether in the linear regime one can attain the condition called *singular coupling* in [15], where the reversible efficiency can be achieved when the linear response matrix tends to the inverse of a degenerate matrix. The entries of the inverse matrix of \mathbf{L} are

$$L_{ii}^{-1} = \frac{1}{b(k)} L_{ii}; \quad (78)$$

$$L_{ij}^{-1} = -\frac{1}{b(k)} L_{ij}, \quad i \neq j. \quad (79)$$

Such a matrix becomes degenerate in the limit $b(k) \rightarrow \infty$, which is not a physically meaningful limit: the response of a current (in our case the derivative of \bar{v}_y , i.e. the particle current) cannot be infinite for any finite value of the corresponding thermodynamic force (in our case f_y). Therefore, when one considers a physical model for an engine, with realistic physical interaction between the thermodynamic forces, and thus between the corresponding energy currents, the necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the engine to operate at a macroscopic efficiency near the reversible (Carnot efficiency) is that the coupling between the input and output currents is tight.

D. Fluctuation Theorem for the efficiency PDF

The PDF of the position of the single particle described by Eq. (2) exhibits the long time fluctuation relation as given by Eq. (12). We now explore whether the PDF of the efficiency $P(\eta, t)$ exhibits any fluctuation symmetry: according to Eq. (40) any symmetry in $P(\eta, t)$ must correspond to a symmetry in $\Phi(\xi, t)$ as given by Eq. (41). Thus we would like to find a transformation $g(\xi)$, such that

$$\Phi(\xi, t) \propto \Phi(g(\xi), t) = \int dY |Y| / (\sqrt{2\pi T t}) \exp \left[-\frac{t(J_Y g(\xi) - f_x)^2}{2T} \right] P(Y, t), \quad (80)$$

where we have set again $J_Y \equiv Y/t$. Assuming a Gaussian distribution for $P(Y, t)$ Eq. (43), changing variable $J_Y = \alpha J'_Y$, and setting

$$g(\xi) = \frac{2f_y f_x - \xi(f_y \bar{v}_y - f_x^2)}{f_y \bar{v}_y - f_x^2 + 2\xi f_x \bar{v}_y}, \quad (81)$$

$$\alpha(\xi) = \left| \frac{-f_y \bar{v}_y + f_x^2 - 2\xi f_x \bar{v}_y}{f_y \bar{v}_y + f_x^2} \right|, \quad (82)$$

we find that the fluctuation relation for the stochastic variable ξ reads

$$\Phi(\xi, t) = \Phi(g(\xi), t) e^{-R(\xi)}, \quad (83)$$

with $R(\xi) = \ln \alpha^2(\xi)$. This symmetry turns out to be analogous to the fluctuation relations of the work or the heat PDFs [3, 17, 22–25]. One finds that for any value of f_x , f_y and \bar{v}_y , $\partial_\xi g(\xi) < 0$, $\forall \xi \neq f_x^2 / (2f_y \bar{v}_y) - 1/2$ where the function $g(\xi)$ has a vertical asymptote. Thus the function $g(\xi)$ is biunivocal: for any value of ξ there is one and only one corresponding value $g(\xi)$. Interestingly, if we take the two stationary points Eqs. (70) and (73) we find $g(\xi_\pm) = \xi_\pm$ and $\alpha(\xi_\pm) = 1$, i.e., the maximum and the minimum of $\Phi(\xi, t)$ are mapped into themselves. Recalling the definition of $\xi = X/Y$, the quantity $R(\xi)$ can be seen as a measure of the deviation of a given trajectory from the typical trajectories leading to the extremal values of the efficiency ξ_\pm (or η_\pm). While $R(\xi)$ vanishes at such points, it diverges

in the limit $\xi \rightarrow \pm\infty$. By taking into account the relation between η and ξ , Eq. (39), and the relation between their PDFs, Eq. (40), we obtain the somewhat convoluted fluctuation relation for $P(\eta, t)$,

$$P(\eta, t) = \left| \frac{f_1}{f_2} \right| \frac{2}{(1 - \hat{\eta})^2} \Phi(\xi(\eta), t) = \left| \frac{f_1}{f_2} \right| \frac{2}{(1 - \hat{\eta})^2} e^{-R(\xi(\eta))} \Phi(g(\xi(\eta), t)), \quad (84)$$

which can be recast in the simpler form,

$$P(\eta, t) = \frac{(1 - \hat{\eta}')^2}{(1 - \hat{\eta})^2} e^{-R(\xi(\eta))} P(\eta', t), \quad (85)$$

with η' implicitly defined by the equation

$$\xi(\eta') = g(\xi(\eta)). \quad (86)$$

This fluctuation symmetry for $P(\eta, t)$ is depicted in the left panel of Fig. 4. The relation between η and η' is depicted in Fig. 4 (right panel).




Figure 4. Left panel: fluctuation symmetry for the efficiency PDF. Red symbols: exact expression for $P(\eta, t)$ Eq. (45). The average velocity \bar{v}_y , appearing in Eqs. (45) is calculated through the exact expression (8), for the interaction potential $U_0(y) = -2k \cos y$. Blue full line: transformation of $P(\eta, t)$ according to the fluctuation relation Eq. (85). Vertical black lines: extremal points of $P(\eta, t)$ Eq. (48) and Eq. (50). Right panel, full line: η' as a function of η as given by Eq. (86); the dashed line is the horizontal asymptote predicted by Eq. (86). Parameter choice for both panels: $T = 1$, $f_x = 0.05$, $f_y = 0.1$, $k = 0.25$, $t = 10^5$.

The fluctuation relations for the variables ξ and η discussed above were obtained under the assumption that the PDF of the relative variable Y is the Gaussian function in Eq. (43). As we argued above, Sec. III A, this approximation holds in the limit of small force f_y , Fig. 2. However one might wonder whether the fluctuation relations Eqs. (83) and (85) still hold when one drops the assumption that Y is Gaussian distributed. To check this hypothesis we can exploit our result for the cumulant generating function up to the fourth order in k Eq. (27), obtained for the cosine potential, so as $P(Y, t)$ can be obtained through the saddle-point approximation Eq. (62). The PDF $\Phi(\xi, t)$ and $\Phi(g(\xi), t)$ can then be obtained by numerical integration of equations (41)-(80), respectively. The results for three different parameter sets are shown in Fig. 5: we find that the symmetry Eq. (83) holds over several orders of magnitude. As previously discussed in this paper, the Gaussian approximation for the current J_Y holds as long as the force f_y is small. Given that our proof of the fluctuation relation Eq. (83) relies on this approximation, we expect a deviation from such a relation as we increase the force. This is indeed what we observe by inspecting the panels in Fig. 5 from the leftmost to the rightmost one: for large values of ξ there is an increasing discrepancy from the behavior predicted by Eq. (83).




Figure 5. Fluctuation symmetry for $\Phi(\xi, t)$ Eq. (83). Black line: exact expression for $\Phi(\xi, t)$ (see Appendix B) assuming a Gaussian distribution for Y Eq. (43). Red crosses: $\Phi(\xi, t)$ as obtained by the numeric integration of Eq. (41) with $P(Y, t)$ computed from the generating function Eq. (26), and with the largest eigenvalue $\mu_0(\lambda)$ given by Eq. (27). The mean velocity \bar{v}_y is given by Eq. (28). Blue circles: transformed $\Phi(\xi, t)$, right hand side of Eq. (83), as obtained with the Gaussian assumption for $P(Y, t)$. Dashed black lines: extremal points of $\Phi(\xi, t)$ Eqs. (70) and (73). Parameter choice (the numbers in parentheses refer to the values for each panel from left to right): $T = 1$, $f_x = (0.05, 0.1, 1.0)$, $f_y = (0.1, 0.25, 1.5)$, $k = 0.25$, $t = 10^5$ (left, middle), 100 (right panel).

IV. N COUPLED OSCILLATORS

We extend the model for a two particle machine described in Sec. III and consider a system made up of N overdamped Brownian particles coupled through a periodic potential $U_0(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \sum_{i,j} k_{i,j} u_0(x_i - x_j)$. The dynamic equation for the i -th particle reads

$$\dot{x}_i = f_i - \sum_j k_{i,j} \partial_{x_i} u_0(x_i - x_j) + \zeta_i(t). \quad (87)$$

We assume uncorrelated Gaussian white noises, $\langle \zeta_i(t) \zeta_j(t') \rangle = 2T \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t')$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$. The case in which $k_{ij} = k$, $\forall i, j$, and $u_0(x) = -\cos(x)$ was first introduced by Sakaguchi [49] as an extension of the Kuramoto model [50, 51]. However, in the following we will not make any assumption on the specific form of the potential U_0 . As in the previous section, Sec. III, depending on the force sign, each oscillator can be considered either an energy producer ($f_i > 0$) or an energy user ($f_i < 0$). The single trajectory efficiency Eq. (1) of this isothermal engine is then the rate between the work extracted by the users (u) and the work injected by the producers (p) along a single trajectory,

$$\eta = -\frac{\sum_j^u f_j X_j}{\sum_i^p f_i X_i}, \quad (88)$$

where we retain the notation as in the previous sections, and the capital letters indicate the unbounded coordinates. The superscripts appearing in the sum at the numerator and denominator of Eq. (88) indicate that the sum is restricted to the users or producers, respectively. Accordingly, the PDF of the efficiency reads

$$P(\eta, t) = \int dX_1 \dots dX_N \delta\left(\eta + \frac{\sum_j^u f_j X_j}{\sum_i^p f_i X_i}\right) P(X_1, \dots, X_N, t), \quad (89)$$

where the PDF $P(X_1, \dots, X_N, t)$ depends implicitly on the forces f_1, \dots, f_N . Analogously to the unidimensional case Eq. (26), we introduce the multidimensional version of the generating function

$$\psi(\underline{\lambda}, t) = \int dX_1 \dots dX_N e^{\lambda_i X_i} P(X_1, \dots, X_N, t), \quad (90)$$

where underlined symbols represent vectors, and Einstein convention for the summation of repeated indexes is adopted. The generating function is dominated by the largest eigenvalue $\mu_0(\underline{\lambda})$ of the multidimensional FP operator corresponding to the single coordinate operator Eq. (16),

$$\psi(\underline{\lambda}, t) \sim e^{t\mu_0(\underline{\lambda})}. \quad (91)$$

The fluctuation relation for the multidimensional PDF $P(X_1, \dots, X_N, t)$ implies the symmetry for the largest eigenvalue [19],

$$\mu_0(\underline{\lambda}) = \mu_0(\{-\lambda_i - \beta f_i\}), \quad \forall \underline{\lambda}. \quad (92)$$

In the following subsections we will explore the statistical properties of the efficiency for two different choices of the constant forces applied to the particles.

A. Two terminals

In the first case that we consider the system has two terminals, one where energy is injected and the other where it is extracted. We consider $f_1 > 0$ the input force and $f_N < 0$ the output force, with $f_1 > -f_N$, $f_i = 0$, $i \neq 1, N$. Then, the system of Langevin equations (87) reads

$$\dot{x}_i = (\delta_{i,1} + \delta_{i,N})f_i - \sum_j k_{i,j} \partial_{x_i} u_0(x_i - x_j) + \zeta_i(t). \quad (93)$$

Thus, the stochastic efficiency Eq. (88) reduces to

$$\eta = -\frac{f_N X_N}{f_1 X_1}; \quad (94)$$

we introduce the rescaled efficiency

$$\hat{\eta} \equiv -\frac{f_1}{f_N} \eta = \frac{X_N}{X_1}, \quad (95)$$

whose PDF reads

$$P(\hat{\eta}) = \int \int dX_1 dX_N \delta\left(\hat{\eta} - \frac{X_N}{X_1}\right) \bar{P}(X_1, X_N, t), \quad (96)$$

$$\bar{P}(X_1, X_N, t) = \int dX_2 \cdots dX_{N-1} P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{N-1}, X_N, t),$$

and $P(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{N-1}, X_N, t)$ is the solution of the FP equation associated to the Langevin equations (93).

In the long time limit, the dominant term of $\bar{P}(X_1, X_N, t)$ can be obtained through saddle-point integration of the generating function,

$$P(\underline{X}, t) \sim \int d\underline{\lambda} e^{\lambda_i X_i} e^{t\mu_0(\underline{\lambda})}. \quad (97)$$

Hence

$$\bar{P}(X_1, X_N, t) \propto e^{t(\bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - J_1 \lambda_1^* - J_N \lambda_N^*)}, \quad (98)$$

with the saddle points implicitly defined by

$$\partial_{\lambda_1} \bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N) \Big|_{\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*} = J_1, \quad (99)$$

$$\partial_{\lambda_N} \bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N) \Big|_{\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*} = J_N, \quad (100)$$

and where $J_1 \equiv X_1/t$, $J_N \equiv X_N/t$, and $\bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N)$ is the cumulant generating function of $\bar{P}(X_1, X_N, t)$,

$$\bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N) = \mu_0(\lambda_1, 0, \dots, 0, \lambda_N). \quad (101)$$

The details of the calculations are given in Appendix C. Plugging Eq. (98) into Eq. (96), and rearranging the terms in the integral, the PDF for the rescaled efficiency reads

$$P(\hat{\eta}) \sim \int \int dX_1 dX_N \delta(X_N - X_1 \hat{\eta}) |X_1| e^{t(\bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - J_1 \lambda_1^* - J_N \lambda_N^*)}. \quad (102)$$

1. Extremal points

The extremal points of the efficiency's PDF correspond to the most likely efficiency,

$$\eta_+ = -\frac{f_N \langle J_N \rangle}{f_1 \langle J_1 \rangle}, \quad (103)$$

and the least likely efficiency,

$$\eta_- = 1, \quad (104)$$

see Appendix C.

Thus we conclude that the study of the extremal points for the PDF of the efficiency of this machine made of N all-to-all interacting oscillators with two terminals of input and output energy leads to the same efficiency features as for the two coupled oscillators machine studied in Sec. III B, namely the most likely efficiency is the macroscopic efficiency, whereas the least likely corresponds to the efficiency of the machine performing reversibly.

2. Gaussian assumption

In order to obtain an expression for the PDF of the efficiency Eq. (102) we need to assume a certain distribution for the variables X_1 and X_N . We assume thus a Gaussian distribution, that according to Eq. (42) implies the following expression for the cumulant generating function,

$$\bar{\mu}_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N) = \bar{v}_1 \lambda_1 (1 + \lambda_1 T / f_1) + \bar{v}_N \lambda_N (1 + \lambda_N T / f_N), \quad (105)$$

so as to fulfill the fluctuation relation Eq. (92), and where $\bar{v}_i = \langle \dot{X}_i \rangle$, ($i = 1, N$). Hence, $P(\eta, \tau)$ reads

$$P(\eta, \tau) = \frac{e^{-\tau/4}}{\pi a(\eta) \sqrt{|C|}} \{1 + \sqrt{\pi \tau} h(\eta) e^{\tau h^2(\eta)} \operatorname{erf}(\sqrt{\tau} h(\eta))\}, \quad (106)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= t \frac{f_N \bar{v}_N + f_1 \bar{v}_1}{T}, \\ a(\eta) &= (1 - \eta)^2 + \frac{1}{|C|} \left(\frac{\eta - \bar{\eta}}{1 - \bar{\eta}} \right)^2, \\ h(\eta) &= \frac{1 - \eta}{2\sqrt{a(\eta)}}, \\ C &= \frac{1}{f_N \bar{v}_N + f_1 \bar{v}_1} \begin{bmatrix} f_N \bar{v}_N & 0 \\ 0 & f_1 \bar{v}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

and $\bar{\eta} = -f_N \bar{v}_N / (f_1 \bar{v}_1)$. The expression for $P(\eta, \tau)$ is the analogous of the one obtained in [15] for two coupled currents in the linear regime.

Retracing the steps in Sec. III D, we exploit the fluctuation symmetry for $\mu_0(\underline{\lambda})$ Eq. (92) and find that the transformations

$$g(\eta) = -\frac{\eta + (\eta - 2)\bar{\eta}}{1 - 2\eta + \bar{\eta}}, \quad (108)$$

$$\alpha(\eta) = \pm \left| \frac{1 - 2\eta + \bar{\eta}}{-1 + \bar{\eta}} \right|, \quad (109)$$

give the fluctuation relation

$$P(\eta, \tau) = P(g(\eta), \tau) e^{-R(\eta)}, \quad (110)$$

with $R(\eta) = \ln \alpha^2(\eta)$. This relation is graphically checked in Fig. 6, where we also show the extremal points Eqs. (103)–(104), for a particular choice of the parameters.

The fluctuation relation for the efficiency has been derived for an isothermal motor, with two energy currents coupled through a general potential. However, our results remain valid for other types of systems, for example the heat engine considered in [4], as long as the energy currents obey a fluctuation relation of the same type as Eq. (92), where the term βf_i is replaced by the corresponding generalized thermodynamic force associated with the current J_i .




Figure 6. PDF of the efficiency for a machine made of N coupled oscillators with two terminals, whose currents are Gaussian distributed, and its fluctuation symmetry. Red symbols: $P(\eta, \tau)$ Eq. (106). Blue line: transformation of $P(\eta, \tau)$ according to the fluctuation relation Eq. (110). Vertical black lines: extremal points of $P(\eta, \tau)$ Eqs. (103),(104). Parameters choice: $T = 1$, $f_1 = 1.0$, $f_N = -0.2$, $\bar{v}_1 = 0.8$, $\bar{v}_N = 0.4$, $\tau = 1000$.

B. Distribution of forces

As a second case we consider a machine in which every oscillator is subject to a biasing force, so that we have a certain quenched distribution of input ($f_i > 0$) and output forces ($f_i < 0$). The system of Langevin equations is the same as in Eq. (87). Analogously to what we did in Sec. III A for the relative coordinate, we assume a N -dimensional Gaussian PDF for $P(X_1, \dots, X_N, t)$, the cumulant generating function reads

$$\mu_0(\underline{\lambda}) = \lambda_i \bar{v}_i + \alpha_{ij} \lambda_i \lambda_j, \quad (111)$$

where $\bar{v}_i \equiv \langle \dot{x}_i \rangle$, and $\alpha_{ij} = \delta_{ij} \bar{v}_i T / f_i$ due to the symmetry imposed by the fluctuation relation Eq. (92). As discussed in Sec. III A we expect such a Gaussian approximation to hold in the limit of small forces.

We define the input and output stochastic work as $W_{\text{out}} = \sum_j^u f_j X_j$, $W_{\text{in}} = \sum_i^p f_i X_i$.

Accordingly, the PDF of the efficiency Eq. (89) reads

$$P(\eta, t) = \int \int dW_{\text{out}} dW_{\text{in}} \delta\left(\eta + \frac{W_{\text{out}}}{W_{\text{in}}}\right) P(W_{\text{out}}, W_{\text{in}}, t). \quad (112)$$

Given Eq.(111) one can easily check that the joint PDF on the right hand side of the last equation factorizes, $P(W_{\text{out}}, W_{\text{in}}, t) = P(W_{\text{out}}, t)P(W_{\text{in}}, t)$ with

$$P(W_{\text{out(in)}}, t) = \int d\lambda e^{t\lambda [P_{\text{out(in)}} - (1-\lambda T)\bar{P}_{\text{out(in)}}]}, \quad (113)$$

and where $\bar{P}_{\text{out(in)}} = \sum_j^{u(p)} f_j \bar{v}_j$ are the output (input) power, averaged over the force distribution. One thus obtains the bidimensional Gaussian distribution

$$P(W_{\text{out}}, W_{\text{in}}, t) = \frac{1}{4\pi t T} (|\bar{P}_{\text{out}} \bar{P}_{\text{in}}|)^{-1/2} \exp\left[-\frac{t}{4T} \left(\frac{(P_{\text{out}} - \bar{P}_{\text{out}})^2}{\bar{P}_{\text{out}}} + \frac{(P_{\text{in}} - \bar{P}_{\text{in}})^2}{\bar{P}_{\text{in}}}\right)\right]. \quad (114)$$

Therefore, the efficiency PDF Eq. (112) will be analogous to Eqs.(106),(107), with

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \frac{t(\bar{P}_{\text{out}} + \bar{P}_{\text{in}})}{T}, \\ C &= \frac{1}{\bar{P}_{\text{out}} + \bar{P}_{\text{in}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{P}_{\text{out}} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{P}_{\text{in}} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

and $\bar{\eta} = -\overline{P}_{\text{out}}/\overline{P}_{\text{in}}$. Accordingly, the fluctuation relation for the PDF of the efficiency is given by Eq. (110), with the transformation Eqs. (108) and (109).

The statistical features of the efficiency of an isothermal engine made up of N -coupled oscillators, that are either producers or users according to a given distribution, are thus analogous to the statistical features of the efficiency in a device that couples two thermodynamic currents that fluctuate with normal law [15]. However, differently from [15], our system is not linear, the features of the non-linear interacting potential being hidden in the average velocities \bar{v}_i that appear in Eq. (111).

We end up this section by studying the extremal points of the PDF η_{\pm} . They can be obtained by requiring that the transformation Eq. (108) maps each of them into itself, such that

$$g(\eta_{\pm}) = \eta_{\pm}, \quad (116)$$

with $\alpha(\eta_{\pm}) = 1$. According to this condition, the extremal points of the PDF Eq. (106) are $\eta_+ = \bar{\eta}$ and $\eta_- = 1$, which correspond again to the macroscopic efficiency and the reversible efficiency, respectively.

However, we do not obtain the second maximum in the super-Carnot efficiency region $\eta \geq \eta_-$ obtained in [15] in the intermediate time regime. This is due to the fact that the long-time limit is already implicit in the derivation of the PDF $P(W_{\text{out}}, W_{\text{in}}, t)$ Eq. (106).

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the statistics of the efficiency in isothermal cyclic machines with realistic interactions between the internal degrees of freedom. Such a realistic potential interaction has the advantage that we can consider explicitly the weak and the tight coupling limits as well as the small and large force limits.

We first investigate a minimal model consisting of two coupled degrees of freedom. By separating the center of mass and the relative coordinate motion, we are able to express the PDF of the efficiency as an integral of a closed form. Besides, we derive an analytic solution for the efficiency PDF in the limit of weak coupling and small forces.

The study of the extremal points of the efficiency PDF reveals that the most likely efficiency is always the macroscopic efficiency, whereas the least likely is the reversible efficiency. The macroscopic efficiency, which depends on the interaction strength, is bounded between a minimal value obtained for weak coupling or strong forces, and a maximal value achieved in the tight coupling limit. These boundaries turn out to be universal in the sense that they depend only on the thermodynamic forces, and not on the details of the interaction potential.

We investigate the condition under which the machine operates close to the macroscopic reversible efficiency, and we conclude that the tight coupling limit between the input and output currents is a necessary, yet not sufficient, condition for achieving the lossless limit. As a matter of fact, given the realistic physical interaction between the thermodynamic forces, the reversible macroscopic efficiency is attained in the tight coupling limit and close to the stall condition, in which the difference between the input and the output forces vanishes, thus making the machine useless.

Assuming a normal distribution for the relative coordinate current, the long time fluctuation relation for the input and output currents implies a fluctuation relation for the efficiency, that resembles the long time relations previously obtained for other stochastic thermodynamic quantities. Even though this relation is derived under the conjecture of Gaussian distributed currents, whose range of validity is limited to the range of small forces and weak coupling, we provide numerical evidence that it holds for a wide range of forces, and hence beyond the linear regime.

We finally explore the case where the machine consists of N degrees of freedom, and show that the efficiency fluctuations can be studied by focusing on the input and the output energy currents alone, i.e. mapping the N body model into a model with two coupled fluctuating currents. Thus we find that the results obtained for the minimal model hold true for an arbitrary number of degrees of freedom.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Danish Council for Independent Research and of the Villum Foundation.

Appendix A: Determinant near identity

The expansion of the second determinant in Eq. (25) is

$$\det \left[\left(\mathbb{1} + k \mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)} \right) \right] = \left[1 + k f_1(\mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)}) + k^2 f_2(\mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)}) + k^3 f_3(\mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)}) + k^4 f_4(\mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)}) + \mathcal{O}(k^5) \right], \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the series expansion terms of the determinant near identity can be derived from the Jacobi's formula [52, 53], and by setting $\mathbf{A} \equiv \mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\mathbf{A}) &= \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}], \\ f_2(\mathbf{A}) &= \frac{\text{Tr}^2[\mathbf{A}] - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}^2]}{2}, \\ f_3(\mathbf{A}) &= \frac{1}{3!}(\text{Tr}^3(\mathbf{A}) - 3\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A})\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^2) + 2\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^3)), \\ f_4(\mathbf{A}) &= \frac{1}{4!}\text{Tr}^4(\mathbf{A}) - \frac{1}{4}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^4) + \frac{1}{8}\text{Tr}^2(\mathbf{A}^2) + \frac{1}{3}\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A})\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^3) - \frac{1}{4}\text{Tr}^2(\mathbf{A})\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^2). \end{aligned}$$

The matrix \mathbf{M}^{-1} depends on $\mu(\lambda)$ too, and thus the terms $f_i(\mathbf{M}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_{\lambda}^{(1)})$ have to be expanded in powers of k as well, so as to take into account all the contributions for each in k .

Appendix B: PDF of the efficiency for the Gaussian approximation

We assume a normal distribution for the relative coordinate Y , $P(Y, t)$ Eq. (43). After integrating Eq. (41), the PDF of ξ reads

$$\Phi(\xi, t) = \exp \left[-t \left(\frac{f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y}{2T} \right) \right] \frac{\sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y}}{\pi(f_y + \bar{v}_y \xi^2)} \left(1 + e^{t \hat{h}(\xi)^2} \sqrt{\pi t} \hat{h}(\xi) \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{t} \hat{h}(\xi) \right) \right), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\hat{h}(\xi) = (f_y + f_x \xi) (2T(f_y + \bar{v}_y \xi^2) / \bar{v}_y)^{-1/2}$. In the long time limit the error function can be expanded $\text{erf}(\sqrt{t} \hat{h}(\xi)) \sim 1 - e^{-t \hat{h}(\xi)^2} / (\sqrt{\pi t} |\hat{h}(\xi)|)$ [54]; taking into account that the $\text{erf}(\sqrt{t} \hat{h}(\xi))$ change sign at $\hat{h}(\xi) = 0$, the long time limit of $\Phi(\xi, t)$ Eq. (B1) reads

$$\Phi(\xi, t) = \exp \left[-t \left(\frac{f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y}{2T} \right) \right] \frac{\sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y}}{\pi(f_y + \bar{v}_y \xi^2)} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{h}(\xi)}{|\hat{h}(\xi)|} + \sqrt{\pi t} |\hat{h}(\xi)| e^{t \hat{h}(\xi)^2} \right). \quad (\text{B2})$$

We obtain the PDF of η after inverting the change of variables Eq. (39),

$$P(\eta, t) = \exp \left[-t \left(\frac{f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y}{2T} \right) \right] \frac{4f_y T h(\eta)^2}{(f_x + f_y) \pi \sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y} (\eta - 1)^2 |f_x - f_y|} \left(1 + \sqrt{\pi t} h(\eta) e^{t h(\eta)^2} \text{erf} \left(\sqrt{t} h(\eta) \right) \right), \quad (\text{B3})$$

where $h(\eta) = (f_x^2 - f_y^2)(\eta - 1) \sqrt{\bar{v}_y} \left((f_y(\eta - 1) + f_x(\eta + 1)) \sqrt{2T \left(f_y + \frac{\bar{v}_y (f_x(\eta - 1) + f_y(\eta + 1))^2}{(f_y(\eta - 1) + f_x(\eta + 1))^2} \right)} \right)^{-1}$. Applying the former expansion for the error function, the long time limit PDF of the efficiency reads

$$P(\eta, t) = \exp \left[-t \left(\frac{f_x^2 + f_y \bar{v}_y}{2T} \right) \right] \frac{4f_y T h(\eta)^2}{(f_x + f_y) \pi \sqrt{f_y \bar{v}_y} (\eta - 1)^2 |f_x - f_y|} \left(1 - \frac{h(\eta)}{|h(\eta)|} + \sqrt{\pi t} |h(\eta)| e^{t h(\eta)^2} \right). \quad (\text{B4})$$

Appendix C: PDF of the efficiency for two terminals and its extremal points

The leading term of the integral in Eq. (102) is

$$g(\hat{\eta}) = \int \int \int ds dX_1 dX_N e^{t[\mu_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - J_1 \lambda_1^* - J_N \lambda_N^* + i s (J_N - J_1 \hat{\eta})]}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where we have used the integral expression for the Dirac delta,

$$\delta(X_N - X_1 \hat{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int ds e^{ist(J_N - J_1 \hat{\eta})}. \quad (\text{C2})$$

Integrating over X_1 and X_N by the saddle-point approximation we obtain

$$g(\hat{\eta}) = \int ds e^{t[\mu_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - J_1^* \lambda_1^* - J_N^* \lambda_N^* + is(J_N^* - J_1^* \hat{\eta})]}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

with J_1^{**} and J_1^{***} implicitly defined by the equations

$$\partial_{J_1} [\mu_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - \lambda_1^* J_1 - \lambda_N^* J_N + is(J_N - J_1 \hat{\eta})] \Big|_{J_1^{**}, J_N^{**}} = 0, \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\partial_{J_N} [\mu_0(\lambda_1^*, \lambda_N^*) - \lambda_1^* J_1 - \lambda_N^* J_N + is(J_N - J_1 \hat{\eta})] \Big|_{J_1^{**}, J_N^{**}} = 0. \quad (\text{C5})$$

By employing the conditions that define λ_1^* Eq. (99) and λ_N^* Eq. (100), and labeling $\lambda_1^{**} \equiv \lambda_1^*(J_1^{**}, J_N^{**})$ and $\lambda_N^{**} \equiv \lambda_N^*(J_1^{**}, J_N^{**})$, the equations that define J_1^{**} and J_N^{**} are

$$-\lambda_1^{**} - is\hat{\eta} = 0, \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$-\lambda_N^{**} + is = 0. \quad (\text{C7})$$

The integral over s in Eq. (C3) can be solved by a saddle-point approximation as well

$$g(\hat{\eta}) = e^{t[\mu_0(\lambda_1^{***}, \lambda_N^{***}) - J_1^{***} \lambda_1^{***} - J_N^{***} \lambda_N^{***} + is^{***}(J_N^{***} - J_1^{***} \hat{\eta})]}, \quad (\text{C8})$$

$$\partial_s [\mu_0(\lambda_1^{***}, \lambda_N^{***}) - \lambda_1^{***} J_1^{***} - \lambda_N^{***} J_N^{***} + is^{***}(J_N^{***} - J_1^{***} \hat{\eta})] \Big|_{s^{***}} = 0. \quad (\text{C9})$$

Taking into account Eqs. (99), (100), (C6), and (C7), the condition for s^{***} can be rewritten after some algebraic manipulation as

$$J_N^{***} - J_1^{***} \hat{\eta} = 0. \quad (\text{C10})$$

The extremal points of the efficiency's PDF will be given by those of $g(\hat{\eta})$ Eq. (C8), that is, the solution of

$$\partial_{\hat{\eta}} [\mu_0(\lambda_1^{***}, \lambda_N^{***}) - \lambda_1^{***} J_1^{***} - \lambda_N^{***} J_N^{***} + is^{***}(J_N^{***} - J_1^{***} \hat{\eta})] \Big|_{\hat{\eta}^{***}} = 0, \quad (\text{C11})$$

that simplifies into

$$s^{***} J_1^{***} = 0, \quad (\text{C12})$$

after applying Eqs. (99), (100), (C6), (C7), and (C10). The two solutions of Eq. (C12) are

$$s^{***} = 0, \quad J_1^{***} = 0. \quad (\text{C13})$$

When $s^{***} = 0$, then $\lambda_1^{***} = \lambda_N^{***} = 0$ Eqs. (C6), (C7). Plugging Eq. (91) into Eq. (90), deriving with respect to λ_i and evaluating at $\lambda_1 = \lambda_N = 0$, we obtain the identity (analogous to Eq. (28))

$$\partial_{\lambda_i} \mu_0(\underline{\lambda}) \Big|_{\lambda_1 = \lambda_N = 0} = \frac{\langle X_i \rangle}{t} = \langle J_i \rangle. \quad (\text{C14})$$

Exploiting Eq. (C14), we can compute J_1^{***} and J_N^{***} appearing in Eq. (C10) from Eqs. (99), (100). Then we can solve Eq. (C10) for $\hat{\eta}$ and we find that the most likely efficiency is,

$$\hat{\eta}_+ = \frac{\langle J_N \rangle}{\langle J_1 \rangle} \Rightarrow \eta_+ = \frac{-f_N \langle J_N \rangle}{f_1 \langle J_1 \rangle}, \quad (\text{C15})$$

where the transformation in Eq. (95) has been taken into account.

Considering the second solution $J_1^{***} = 0$, then $J_N^{***} = 0$ because of Eq. (C10). Bearing in mind that the largest eigenvalue is a convex function, then $(\lambda_1^{***}, \lambda_N^{***})$ are the coordinates of its minimum, for $J_i^{***} = 0$ implies that

$\partial_{\lambda_i} \mu_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_N) \Big|_{\lambda_1^{***}, \lambda_N^{***}} = 0$ according to Eqs. (99), (100). Then the symmetry imposed by the fluctuation relation Eq. (92) is such that the symmetry point, i.e. the minimum, is located at $(-f_1/2T, -f_N/2T)$. Thus the least likely efficiency is,

$$\eta_- = 1; \quad (\text{C16})$$

where the definitions of J_1^{**} Eq. (C6) and J_N^{**} Eq. (C7) have been employed, together with Eq. (95).

-
- [1] W. Sturgeon, Annals of Electricity, Magnetism, and Chemistry: And Guardian of Experimental Science, v. 1 (Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper., 1837).
- [2] S. Ciliberto, *Phys. Rev. X* **7**, 021051 (2017).
- [3] U. Seifert, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **75**, 126001 (2012).
- [4] G. Verley, M. Esposito, T. Willaert, and C. Van den Broeck, *Nat. Comm.* **5**, 4721 EP (2014), article.
- [5] Y. Izumida, H. Kori, and U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 052221 (2016).
- [6] N. Golubeva and A. Imparato, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 190602 (2012).
- [7] N. Golubeva and A. Imparato, *Phys. Rev. E* **88**, 012114 (2013).
- [8] N. Golubeva and A. Imparato, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 062118 (2014).
- [9] A. Imparato, *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 125004 (2015).
- [10] H. Vroylandt, M. Esposito, and G. Verley, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **120**, 30009 (2017).
- [11] M. Campisi and R. Fazio, *Nat. Comm.* **7**, 11895 EP (2016), article.
- [12] M. ZEMANSKY, Heat And Thermodynamics (Tata McGraw Hill Education Private Limited, 2011).
- [13] H. Callen, THERMODYNAMICS & AN INTRO. TO THERMOSTATISTICS, Student Edition (Wiley India Pvt. Limited, 2006).
- [14] K. Proesmans, B. Cleuren, and C. V. den Broeck, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **109**, 20004 (2015).
- [15] M. Poletini, G. Verley, and M. Esposito, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 050601 (2015).
- [16] U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 040602 (2005).
- [17] A. Imparato and L. Peliti, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 026106 (2006).
- [18] A. Imparato and L. Peliti, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, L02001 (2007).
- [19] H. C. Fogedby and A. Imparato, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2012**, P04005 (2012).
- [20] H. C. Fogedby and A. Imparato, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2014**, P11011 (2014).
- [21] G. Bulnes Cuetara, M. Esposito, and A. Imparato, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 052119 (2014).
- [22] S. Ciliberto, A. Imparato, A. Naert, and M. Tanase, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 180601 (2013).
- [23] S. Ciliberto, A. Imparato, A. Naert, and M. Tanase, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2013**, P12014 (2013).
- [24] A. Bérut, A. Imparato, A. Petrosyan, and S. Ciliberto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 068301 (2016).
- [25] A. Bérut, A. Imparato, A. Petrosyan, and S. Ciliberto, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 052148 (2016).
- [26] K. Proesmans, Y. Dreher, M. c. v. Gavrilov, J. Bechhoefer, and C. Van den Broeck, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041010 (2016).
- [27] Speck, T. and Seifert, U., *Europhys. Lett.* **74**, 391 (2006).
- [28] V. Blickle, T. Speck, C. Lutz, U. Seifert, and C. Bechinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 210601 (2007).
- [29] N. Golubeva, A. Imparato, and L. Peliti, *Europhys. Lett.* **97**, 60005 (2012).
- [30] C. Van den Broeck, N. Kumar, and K. Lindenberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 210602 (2012).
- [31] T. Speck, A. Engel, and U. Seifert, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2012**, P12001 (2012).
- [32] P. Tsobgni Nyawo and H. Touchette, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 032101 (2016).
- [33] N. G. van Kampen, Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981).
- [34] H. Risken, The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solution and Applications, Springer Series in Synergetics (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996).
- [35] K. Sekimoto, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **66**, 1234 (1997), <https://doi.org/10.1143/JPSJ.66.1234>.
- [36] K. Sekimoto, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **130**, 17 (1998).
- [37] A. Imparato, L. Peliti, G. Pesce, G. Rusciano, and A. Sasso, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 050101 (2007).
- [38] A. Imparato, P. Jop, A. Petrosyan, and S. Ciliberto, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2008**, P10017 (2008).
- [39] J. Mehl, T. Speck, and U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 011123 (2008).
- [40] H. Touchette, *Physics Reports* **478**, 1 (2009).
- [41] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **95**, 333 (1999).
- [42] P. Reimann, C. Van den Broeck, H. Linke, P. Hänggi, J. M. Rubi, and A. Pérez-Madrid, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 010602 (2001).
- [43] G. Verley, T. Willaert, C. Van den Broeck, and M. Esposito, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 052145 (2014).
- [44] M. Poletini and M. Esposito, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **118**, 40003 (2017).
- [45] G. Costantini and F. Marchesoni, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **48**, 491 (1999).
- [46] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [47] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 120601 (2016).

- [48] P. Pietzonka and U. Seifert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 190602 (2018).
- [49] H. Sakaguchi, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **79**, 39 (1988), <http://ptp.oxfordjournals.org/content/79/1/39.full.pdf+html>.
- [50] Y. Kuramoto, International Symposium on Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics - Lecture Notes in Physics No. 30, p. 420 (Springer, New York, 1974).
- [51] Y. Kuramoto, Chemical Oscillations, Waves, and Turbulence, 1st ed. (Dover Publications, New York, 2003).
- [52] R. Bellman, Introduction to matrix analysis, Introduction to Matrix Analysis No. parts 1-10 (McGraw-Hill, 1970).
- [53] J. Magnus and H. Neudecker, Matrix differential calculus with applications in statistics and econometrics: 3rd. ed (John Wiley & Sons, Limited, 2007).
- [54] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables (Dover, New York, 1965).