

Entropy production for coarse-grained dynamics

D. M. Busiello, J. Hidalgo and A. Maritan¹

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica ‘G. Galilei’, INFN, Università di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, Italy*
(Dated: September 11, 2022)

Systems out of equilibrium exhibit a net production of entropy. We study the dynamics of a stochastic system represented by a master equation that can be modeled by a Fokker-Planck equation in a coarse-grained, mesoscopic description. We show that the corresponding coarse-grained entropy production contains information on microscopic currents that are not captured by the Fokker-Planck equation and thus cannot be deduced by it. This result suggests that the definition of equilibrium in terms of entropy production relies on the details of our description and that this is much affected by a coarse-graining procedure. Our results are amenable of experimental verification, which would help to elucidate the physical meaning of the production of entropy in systems out of equilibrium.

PACS numbers:

Any physical system, and its characterizing processes, can be depicted by making use of different levels of description. Considering a microscopic spatial and temporal resolution, any evolution will appear purely reversible in time. Since most of the details of a system are usually unknown, they are neglected *a-priori*, thus requiring a mesoscopic description in terms of random variables and probabilities. The theory of stochastic thermodynamics relies on this assumption, i.e. on a temporal and spatial ‘coarse-graining’ [1]. Furthermore, within the possible mesoscopic descriptions, different levels of coarse-graining are allowed, and all the physical observables could be somehow affected by the information we are unaware of or deliberately ignored *a-priori*. Quantifying the influence of the coarse-graining on our prediction of the physical properties of a system is a long-standing problem, addressed by countless works in literature [2–7].

It is known [1] how the entropy balance is affected by performing a coarse-graining on the system ‘microstates’. The limit of instantaneous equilibration of the internal microscopic states makes the mathematical form of the theory independent of the level of description. Remarkably, this unravels the key assumption of the stochastic thermodynamics, that is the internal structure of each state may evolve in time, but always remaining at equilibrium. In [1] the effect of neglecting information is investigated in a Markovian discrete-state dynamics, which is one of the possible way to describe a stochastic system.

Among all the possible quantities that can be estimated in a system out of equilibrium, in this Letter we focus on the entropy production, a fingerprint of non-equilibrium conditions and a fundamental quantity in various fluctuation theorems [8–15]. These theoretical findings stimulated several experimental confirmations in the field of stochastic thermodynamics [16–18]. Moreover, the production of entropy has a leading role in building efficient engines [19, 20], since it can be understood as the ‘cost’ of performing a given task. For all these reasons it has been widely investigated both in discrete [21–23] and continuous systems [24–27].

We consider a system with a finite number, N , of accessible states whose dynamics is described by a Master Equation of the form:

$$\dot{P}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N (W_{ij}P_j(t) - W_{ji}P_i(t)) \quad (1)$$

where W_{ij} is the transition rate from the state j to the state i and $P_i(t)$ is the probability to be in the state i at time t . Following Schnakenberg’s formulation [21], the (average) entropy production is

$$\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}(t) = \sum_{ij} W_{ij}P_j(t) \log \left(\frac{W_{ij}P_j(t)}{W_{ji}P_i(t)} \right), \quad (2)$$

where the sum is performed over all non-zero transition rates (it is assumed that $W_{ij} > 0$ implies $W_{ji} > 0$). Eq. (2) was originally motivated from an information theory approach [21, 28], but it is thermodynamically consistent, as pointed out in [22, 29]. In what follows we refer to Eq. (2) as the *microscopic* entropy production.

Stochastic systems, under suitable conditions, can be also described in terms of continuous variables by means of a diffusive equation. The standard approach [30] consists of introducing a new variable $x = i\Delta x$, that represents for example the spatial position of a particle in the state i , which becomes continuous in the limit $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. By performing the Kramers-Moyal expansion on Eq. (1) [30], this procedure leads to the Fokker-Planck equation [30, 31]:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{P}(x, t) &= -\partial_x [A(x)P(x, t) - \partial_x (D(x)P(x, t))] \\ &\equiv -\partial_x [J(x, t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $P(x, t) = P_i(t)/\Delta x$ represents the probability density function to be in the state x at time t , $A(x) \equiv A(i\Delta x) = \sum_j (j - i)\Delta x W_{ji}$ the drift and $D(x) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_j ((j - i)\Delta x)^2 W_{ji}$ the diffusion coefficient, in the limit $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. This approach relies on the assumption that all the ‘pseudo-moments’ of the transition rates of order

higher than 2 vanish when Δx approaches 0 [32]. It is important to notice that the dynamics represented by Eq. (3) belongs to a different level of description with respect to the discrete-state dynamics, Eq. (1), and all the relevant information are now encoded in the coefficients $A(x)$ and $D(x)$.

In [24], Seifert calculated the mean entropy production for systems described by a Fokker-Planck equation starting from the entropy associated to each possible trajectory, leading to the following formula:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{FP}}(t) = \int \frac{J(x,t)^2}{D(x)P(x,t)} dx. \quad (4)$$

In this Letter we address the basic question on how equations (2) and (4) are related. The former is derived within a framework considering discrete states systems, whereas the latter arises directly in the continuum limit, where many microscopic details are ignored, i.e. after a suitable spatial and temporal coarse-graining. Since both formulas refer to the same quantity at two different levels of description, we naively expect that one can be obtained from the other. As we will show, this is true only for a specific choice of the transition rates. However, in general Eq. (4) does not fully capture the contribution to the entropy production stemming from the microscopic currents, which do not enter explicitly in the Fokker-Planck equation.

As an illustration of the idea we first consider a simple model of a one-dimensional random walk where a particle can jump in both directions with different step lengths $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ at any time (for simplicity in the formulation we skip the length scale at this point), as sketched in Fig. 1. Jump rates are:

$$W_{ij} = \begin{cases} W_{\pm k} \delta_{j, i \pm k}, & k = 1, \dots, n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

A description in terms of a Fokker-Planck equation, Eq. (3), can be guaranteed if we take the transition rates as

$$W_{\pm k} = \left(1 + \frac{\beta_k \pm \alpha_k}{2} \Delta x\right) \frac{w_k}{\Delta x^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $w_k \geq 0$ and $\beta_k \geq |\alpha_k|$ to ensure that $W_{\pm k} \geq 0$ for all Δx . In particular, Eq. (6) leads to $A = \sum_{k=1}^n k \alpha_k w_k$ and $D = \sum_{k=1}^n D_k$, where $D_k = k^2 w_k$ is the diffusion coefficient associated to the process involving only jumps of size k , and higher-order ‘pseudo-moments’ of the transition rates vanish when $\Delta x \rightarrow 0$. Note that in this simple case both coefficients are independent of x [38].

The microscopic entropy production, Eq. (2), in the continuum limit becomes:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\Delta x \rightarrow 0} = \sum_{k=1}^n \int dx \frac{\mathcal{J}^{(k)}(x,t)^2}{D_k P(x,t)}. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 1: *Panel a* - The microscopic dynamics of a n -step random walk is sketched: red and blue arrows indicate jumps to the right and left of size 1 and 2 with transition rates $W_{\pm 1}$ and $W_{\pm 2}$, respectively. *Panel b* - Microscopic currents at each node i can be associated to each jump size, $\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)}$, where $k = 1, 2$. The coarse-grained current, J_i , can be calculated considering all currents passing through a given node. This is the current appearing in the Fokker-Planck equation.

where we have defined the mesoscopic probability current associated to the step of size k as (see SI sec. I)

$$\mathcal{J}^{(k)}(x,t) = k w_k (\alpha_k P(x,t) - k \partial_x P(x,t)) \quad (8)$$

On the other hand the current entering in the Fokker-Planck equation is given by $J(x,t) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathcal{J}^{(k)}(x,t)$ (see SI sec. I) leading to the Seifert’s formula for the entropy production, Eq.(4):

$$\dot{S}_{\text{FP}} = \int dx \frac{(\sum_k \mathcal{J}^{(k)}(x,t))^2}{\sum_k D_k P(x,t)}, \quad (9)$$

As a consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see SI sec. I for details) we get

$$\dot{S}_{\text{FP}} \leq \dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\Delta x \rightarrow 0}, \quad (10)$$

It is interesting to note that Eq. (7) corresponds to the sum of the mesoscopic entropy production, as in Eq. (4), associated to each microscopic process, while the entropy production directly derived from a mesoscopic description involves an ‘integrated’ current and diffusion coefficient, leading to the inequality in Eq. (10).

We conclude that Seifert’s formula represents a lower bound for the production of entropy; instead, Eq. (7) gives a more accurate value as it captures all microscopic

currents hidden in the mesoscopic description, but contributing to the entropy production.

Intuitively, the discrepancy between the two formulas relies on having different ‘channels’ through which the particle can move, jumping to distant locations without necessarily going through the intermediate points (see Fig. 1). All the microscopic currents contribute to the production of entropy. When the system is coarse-grained they are simply added up and part of the information is lost if currents through different channels flow in opposite directions.

The multi-step random walk becomes very simple to solve if we impose periodic boundary conditions. The stationary solution to the master equation corresponds to the homogeneous state $P(x)^* = 1/L$, where L is the size of the system. Thus, the Seifert’s formula for the entropy production simplifies to:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{FP}}^* = \frac{(\sum_{k=1}^n k \alpha_k w_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n k^2 w_k} \quad (11)$$

whereas the actual value for the entropy production can be found by taking the continuum limit of the microscopic entropy production:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\Delta x \rightarrow 0, *} = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k^2 w_k = \dot{S}_{\text{FP}}^* + \quad (12)$$

$$+ \frac{\sum_{1 \leq k < k' \leq n} w_k w_{k'} (k \alpha_{k'} - k' \alpha_k)^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n k^2 w_k}. \quad (13)$$

Apart from the trivial case of $n = 1$ (just only one step jump), the equality holds if and only if $\alpha_k = \alpha k$, where α is a constant. This case leads to the stationary k -th current (see Eq. (8)) $\mathcal{J}^{(k)}(x)^* = \alpha D_k P^*$, which is independent of x .

Remarkably, notice that if $\mathcal{J}_i^{(k)} = 0$, that is the microscopic detailed balance condition is satisfied, then also detailed balance holds in the corresponding Fokker-Planck description, i.e. $J(x) = 0$ [30]. However, the vice versa does not necessarily holds, that is equilibrium

in the continuum description does not necessarily implies that the underlying microscopic dynamics is also at equilibrium. Indeed, if $\sum_{k=1}^n k \alpha_k w_k = 0$ we obtain $\dot{S}_{\text{FP}}^* = 0$ whereas $\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\Delta x \rightarrow 0, *} > 0$, as soon as α_k is not proportional to k . In other words, the system seems at equilibrium in the continuum description, while there is not detailed balance at the microscopic level.

Our results can be extended to a continuous-step model where the system can jump to *any* location according to a certain distribution. The continuous versions of Eqs (1) and (2) are [30]:

$$\dot{P}(x, t) = \int dr (W(x-r, r)P(x-r, t) - W(x, -r)P(x, t)) \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{S}_{\text{ME}}(t) = & \int dx \int dr W(x-r, r)P(x-r, t) \\ & \times \log \frac{W(x-r, r)P(x-r, t)}{W(x, -r)P(x, t)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $W(x, r)$ is the rate density of a jump of size r from location x . We now consider an infinite system and therefore integrals are performed between $-\infty$ and $+\infty$.

We take the following scaling form for the transition rates:

$$W(x, r) = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d(x)\epsilon}} e^{-f(z(x, r))}, \quad (16)$$

where f is a generic symmetric function [33] and $z(x, r) = (r - A(x)\epsilon)/\sqrt{d(x)\epsilon}$. Without loss of generality we have chosen $f(0)$ such that $\int dz e^{-f(z)} = 1$. We have introduced an expansion parameter ϵ in such a way to control the right scaling of $W(x, r)$ in the diffusive limit, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. The surviving terms in the Kramers-Moyal expansion lead to the Fokker-Planck equation, Eq. (3), with $D(x) = d(x) \int dz z^2 e^{-f(z)}/2$.

The entropy production, calculated in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, is (see SI sec. II-IV for the derivation):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \equiv \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \dot{S}_{\text{ME}}(t) = & \int dy \frac{(A(y)P(y) - \partial_y(D(y)P(y)))^2}{D(y)P(y)} + \\ & + (\langle z^2 \rangle \langle (\partial_z f(z))^2 \rangle - 1) \int dy \frac{A(y)^2}{D(y)} P(y) + \\ & + (3 - \langle z^2 (\partial_z f(z))^2 \rangle) \int dy \frac{A(y) \partial_y D(y)}{D(y)} P(y) + \\ & + \frac{1}{4} \left(-9 + \frac{\langle z^4 (\partial_z f(z))^2 \rangle}{\langle z^2 \rangle} \right) \int dy \frac{(\partial_y D(y))^2}{D(y)} P(y) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle = \int dz \cdot e^{-f(z)}$. Since this general formula is

quite cumbersome, in what follows we restrict our anal-

ysis to two simple cases of interest: the one with non-vanishing drift and constant diffusion rate, and the case with zero drift and space-dependent diffusion coefficient.

For constant diffusion coefficient ($D(x) = D$), we obtain:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} = \dot{S}_{\text{FP}} + (\langle z^2 \rangle \langle \partial_z f(z) \rangle - 1) \int dx \frac{A(x)^2}{D} \geq \dot{S}_{\text{FP}}, \quad (18)$$

where the inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see SI sec. IV-A). Eq. (18) emphasizes that Seifert's formula (4) needs to be corrected by a positive term, which takes into account information about the microscopic dynamics missing in the Fokker-Planck equation.

It is particularly interesting the choice of Gaussian transition rates, $f(z) = z^2 + \log \sqrt{\pi}$. This represents the limiting case, in this setting of constant diffusion, where there is no loss of information in the coarse-graining process, so that Eq. (18) holds as an equality (see SI sec. IV-A for details). This result agrees with the fact that, in order to consistently describe a microscopic dynamics as a Fokker-Planck equation, one needs to assume Gaussian transition rates, otherwise inconsistencies in non-equilibrium quantities may arise [34, 35].

On the other hand, when $A = 0$ and $D(x)$ is not constant, we obtain:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} = \int dx \frac{J(x)^2}{D(x)P(x)} + \gamma \int dx \frac{(\partial_x D(x))^2}{D(x)}, \quad (19)$$

where $\gamma = (-9 + \langle z^4 (\partial_z f(z))^2 \rangle / \langle z^2 \rangle) / 4$. Interestingly, this result corresponds to the expression reported by [25] for the entropy production of a system described by a one dimensional Fokker-Planck equation, i.e. an overdamped process, if one takes $\gamma = 0$. As shown in the SI (sec. IV-B), γ is always positive and thus the strict inequality $\dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} > \dot{S}_{\text{ME}}^{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}(\gamma = 0)$ holds.

Experimental analysis is needed to verify the corrections to Seifert's formula for the entropy production. However, our approach relies on knowing many microscopic details of the system –the transition rates– which are commonly unknown or not properly measurable. A simple experimental setup could be provided by a one-dimensional overdamped colloidal particle with a space-dependent diffusion and zero drift, similar to the one described in [25]. In this simple scenario, the corrections to the entropy production given by Eq. (19) do not vanish (even the simplest Gaussian case $f = z^2 + \log \sqrt{\pi}$ leads to $\gamma = 3/2$, see SI sec. IV-C), and therefore might become quantifiable by an experimental test.

It is well-known that a coarse-graining procedure, either in time or space, leads to an underestimation of the entropy production [1, 36, 37]. We have pointed out that the same applies when a mesoscopic description of the dynamics is adopted, i.e. when a coarse-graining is performed on time and space at the same time. We

have shown that the Fokker-Planck equation does not always captures the non-equilibrium nature of the system, as some important information could be neglected when taking the continuum limit. The present work might provide the basis for an accurate characterization of stochastic systems and a better understanding of the microscopic world hidden behind a coarse-grained description.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge C. Jarzynski, C. Maes, U. Seifert and S. Suweis for useful comments and discussions.

-
- [1] M. Esposito, *Physical Review E* **85**, 041125 (2012).
 - [2] E. L. Haseltine and J. B. Rawlings, *The Journal of chemical physics* **123**, 164115 (2005).
 - [3] S. Peleš, B. Munsky, and M. Khammash, *The Journal of chemical physics* **125**, 204104 (2006).
 - [4] S. Pigolotti and A. Vulpiani, *The Journal of chemical physics* **128**, 154114 (2008).
 - [5] M. Santillán and H. Qian, *Physical Review E* **83**, 041130 (2011).
 - [6] A. Gomez-Marin, J. Parrondo, and C. Van den Broeck, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **82**, 50002 (2008).
 - [7] K. Nocolis, *Physical Review E* **83**, 011112 (2011).
 - [8] K. Sekimoto, *Stochastic energetics*, vol. 799 (Springer, 2010).
 - [9] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **95**, 333 (1999).
 - [10] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, *Physical Review Letters* **74**, 2694 (1995).
 - [11] C. Maes, *Journal of statistical physics* **95**, 367 (1999).
 - [12] J. Kurchan, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **31**, 3719 (1998).
 - [13] C. Jarzynski, *Physical Review Letters* **78**, 2690 (1997).
 - [14] G. E. Crooks, *Physical Review E* **60**, 2721 (1999).
 - [15] U. Seifert, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **75**, 126001 (2012).
 - [16] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, *Physical review letters* **71**, 2401 (1993).
 - [17] D. Collin, F. Ritort, C. Jarzynski, S. B. Smith, I. Tinoco Jr, and C. Bustamante, *Nature* **437**, 231 (2005).
 - [18] S. Ciliberto and C. Laroche, *Le Journal de Physique IV* **8**, Pr6 (1998).
 - [19] J. Howard, *Nature* **389**, 561 (1997).
 - [20] W. R. Browne and B. L. Feringa, *Nature nanotechnology* **1**, 25 (2006).
 - [21] J. Schnakenberg, *Reviews of Modern physics* **48**, 571 (1976).
 - [22] D. M. Busiello, J. Hidalgo, and A. Maritan, *Physical Review E* **96**, 062110 (2017).
 - [23] O. Raz, Y. Subaşı, and C. Jarzynski, *Physical Review X* **6**, 021022 (2016).
 - [24] U. Seifert, *Physical review letters* **95**, 040602 (2005).
 - [25] A. Celani, S. Bo, R. Eichhorn, and E. Aurell, *Physical review letters* **109**, 260603 (2012).

- [26] S. Pigolotti, I. Neri, É. Roldán, and F. Jülicher, *Physical review letters* **119**, 140604 (2017).
- [27] D. M. Busiello, O. Raz, and C. Jarzynski, arXiv (2018).
- [28] C. E. Shannon, *The Bell System Technical Journal* **27**, 379 (1948).
- [29] T. Tomé and M. J. de Oliveira, *Physical review letters* **108**, 020601 (2012).
- [30] C. Gardiner, *Stochastic methods*, vol. 4 (springer Berlin, 2009).
- [31] P. L. Krapivsky, S. Redner, and E. Ben-Naim, *A kinetic view of statistical physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [32] We called them “pseudo-moments”, since $W(y, r)$ is not a distribution.
- [33] The symmetry condition on f ensures that $\langle z \rangle = 0$. This condition is necessary to have the drift coefficient $a^{(1)}$ of order 1. See Appendix E for additional explanations.
- [34] P. Mazur and D. Bedeaux, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **173**, 155 (1991).
- [35] P. Mazur, *Physical Review A* **45**, 8957 (1992).
- [36] R. Ziener, A. Maritan, and H. Hinrichsen, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2015**, P08014 (2015).
- [37] S. Bo and A. Celani, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **154**, 1325 (2014).
- [38] The generalization to A and D depending on the spatial position is straightforward.