

Comment on “Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for time-delayed Langevin systems”

M.L. Rosinberg¹ and G. Tarjus¹

¹*Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Laboratoire de Physique Théorique de la Matière Condensée, LPTMC, F-75005 Paris, France**

An extension of the thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) to time-delayed Langevin systems has been recently proposed in [1]. Here we show that the derivation is erroneous.

An important recent development in the field of stochastic thermodynamics has been the discovery of the so-called thermodynamic uncertainty relations (TURs) that provide general lower bounds on the fluctuations of time-integrated currents in nonequilibrium systems (see e.g. [2] and references therein). Such relations have been so far established for Markov processes only but in a recent work [1] Vu and Hasegawa have presented an extension to time-delayed Langevin systems in a steady state. If correct, this would be an interesting result since delays are ubiquitous in real-world processes, for instance in biology. Unfortunately, the arguments in [1] are incorrect, as we show in the present comment.

The steady-state TUR for a general Markovian dynamics is expressed as

$$\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T}) \equiv \frac{\langle \Theta^2 \rangle - \langle \Theta \rangle^2}{\langle \Theta \rangle^2} \geq \frac{2}{\langle \Sigma \rangle}, \quad (1)$$

where Θ is an arbitrary current integrated over some observation time \mathcal{T} and $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is the total entropy production accumulated by \mathcal{T} (in units where Boltzmann’s constant is set to $k_B = 1$). According to [1], this relation remains valid for a time-delayed Langevin dynamics provided $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is replaced by a “generalized” dissipation $\langle \Sigma_g \rangle$ (defined by Eq. (13) in [1] or Eq. (6) below). This is an intriguing result, but we here show that it follows from an incorrect treatment of the non-Markovian nature of the dynamics. Specifically, the original Langevin equation for the N -dimensional random variable $\mathbf{x}(t)$ (cf. Eq. (2) in [1]),

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_\tau) + \sqrt{2D}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (2)$$

where τ is the delay, $\mathbf{x}_\tau \equiv \mathbf{x}(t - \tau)$, $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_\tau)$ is a drift force, and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is a Gaussian white noise, has been mistakenly replaced by

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x}) + \sqrt{2D}\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x})$ is the (instantaneous) effective force defined by $\bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x})P^{ss}(\mathbf{x}) = \int \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_\tau)P^{ss}(\mathbf{x}, t; \mathbf{x}_\tau, t - \tau) d\mathbf{x}_\tau$ (here, $P^{ss}(\mathbf{x})$ and $P^{ss}(\mathbf{x}, t; \mathbf{x}_\tau, t - \tau)$ are the steady-state one time and two-time probability distributions, respectively). This replacement allows Vu and Hasegawa to

express the probability density of a stochastic trajectory as $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma) \propto \exp[-(1/4D) \int_0^\mathcal{T} \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}_t - \bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x}_t)\|^2 dt]$ and to obtain a lower bound on $\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T})$ by repeating the derivation performed in [3] for a Markovian Langevin dynamics. The point we want to stress is that $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$ is *not* the probability of observing a trajectory generated by the non-Markovian dynamics described by Eq. (2) in a steady state, despite the fact that Eq. (3) leads to the same probability distribution $P^{ss}(\mathbf{x})$ as Eq. (2). The same mistake was made in Ref. [4] and signaled in [5] where $\mathcal{P}(\Gamma)$ as given above was shown to differ from the *exact* path probability computed for a linear time-delayed Langevin equation (in the case $\mathcal{T} \leq \tau$). In other words, we argue that the inequality derived in [1] applies to an effective stochastic dynamics that is not the true one. For the same reason, and contrary to the claim in Ref. [4], which is repeated in [1], the quantity ΔS_g^{tot} (cf. Eq. (9) in [1]) does *not* satisfy an integral fluctuation theorem (IFT) with the actual dynamics described by (2). In fact, as shown in [5], there is another candidate for the entropy production in time-delayed systems, which is obtained from time inversion and satisfies a proper IFT.

To illustrate our point, we explicitly show that $2/\langle \Sigma_g \rangle$ is *not* a lower bound on the squared relative uncertainty $\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T})$. To this aim, we consider a two-dimensional version of Eq. (2) with

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} -a_{11}x_1 - a_{12}x_{2,\tau} \\ -a_{21}x_{1,\tau} - a_{22}x_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and we choose $\Theta = -\int_0^\mathcal{T} \{[a_{11}x_1(t) + a_{12}x_2(t)] \circ \dot{x}_1(t) + [a_{12}(t)x_1(t) + a_{22}x_2(t)] \circ \dot{x}_2(t)\} dt$ as the current, where \circ denotes the Stratonovich product. The model studied in section IV.C of [1] corresponds to the symmetric case $a_{11} = a_{22}$ and $a_{12} = -a_{21}$. We here focus on the model recently studied in [6] in which there is no feedback from 1 to 2. Specifically, we take $a_{11} = a$, $a_{22} = b$, $a_{12} = -c$, and $a_{21} = 0$. Note that these models are exactly solvable in a steady state due to the linearity of the force $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}_\tau)$ and the Gaussian character of the white noise, which makes all probability distributions Gaussian. Therefore, there is no need to restrict the study to the small- τ limit, as done in [1].

In particular, using the same method as [7], one can easily compute the steady-state correlation functions $\phi_{ij}(t) \equiv \langle x_i(0)x_j(t) \rangle$ for $0 \leq t \leq \tau$. For instance, we

*Electronic address: mlr@lptmc.jussieu.fr

find $\phi_{21}(t) = Dc/[b(a+b)]e^{b(t-\tau)}$, from which we get

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}}\langle\Theta\rangle = c\dot{\phi}_{21}(0) = D\frac{c^2}{a+b}e^{-b\tau}. \quad (5)$$

The calculation of $\langle\Sigma_g\rangle$, defined in Ref. [1] as

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{T}}\langle\Sigma_g\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{D}\langle\bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x}_t) \circ \dot{\mathbf{x}}_t\rangle, \quad (6)$$

is also quite easy because the effective force is linear, i.e., $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_1 = -K_{11}x_1 - K_{12}x_2$, $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_2 = F_2 = -ax_2$, and the unknown coefficients K_{11} and K_{12} can be readily obtained by solving the steady-state Fokker-Planck equation $\sum_{i=1,2}\partial_{x_i}[-\bar{F}_i(\mathbf{x})P^{ss}(\mathbf{x}) + D\partial_{x_i}P^{ss}(\mathbf{x})] = 0$ where $P^{ss}(\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp[-(1/2)\mathbf{x}^T\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1}\mathbf{x}]$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the covariance matrix with elements $\sigma_{ij} \equiv \phi_{ij}(0)$. K_{11} and K_{12} are then expressed in terms of the σ_{ij} 's. This eventually yields $K_{11} = ab[(a+b)^2e^{b\tau} + c^2e^{-b\tau}]/[(ab+b^2+c^2)(a+b)e^{b\tau} - ac^2e^{-b\tau}]$, $K_{12} = -bc[(a+b)^2 + c^2]/[(ab+b^2+c^2)(a+b)e^{b\tau} - ac^2e^{-b\tau}]$, and in turn

$$\langle\Sigma_g\rangle/\mathcal{T} = \frac{bc^2[(a+b)^2 + c^2]e^{-b\tau}}{(a+b)[(ab+b^2+c^2)(a+b)e^{b\tau} - ac^2e^{-b\tau}]} . \quad (7)$$

In the more general case of the force defined by Eq. (4), solving the Fokker-Planck equation does not fully determine $\bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x})$, but one can then use the expression of the transition probability of Gaussian stationary processes in terms of the correlation functions (see Eq. (A1) in [6]). (In passing, we also note that $\bar{\mathbf{F}}(\mathbf{x})$ at the order τ is not obtained by simply taking the $\tau = 0$ limit of the transition probability, as defined in Eq. (30) in [1]. For instance, in the model considered in section IV.C of [1], the exact calculation shows that the coefficient of x_1 in $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_1$, and of x_2 in $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_2$, is $-a + b^2\tau + \mathcal{O}(\tau^2)$. Accordingly, one should have $A = a - b^2\tau$ in the expression (43) of $P^{ss}(\mathbf{x})$, implying that the variance of x_1 and x_2 increases with τ instead of decreasing. This error suggests that the small- τ limit is also incorrect in the two other examples considered in [1]. However, this may be undetectable at the scale of the figures displayed in [1].)

Finally, we compute the variance of Θ , and for simplicity we focus on the long-time limit. Then $\lim_{\mathcal{T}\rightarrow\infty}\mathcal{T}^{-1}[\langle\Theta^2\rangle - \langle\Theta\rangle^2] = \chi''_{\Theta}(0)$ where $\chi_{\Theta}(k)$ is the scaled cumulant generating function defined by

$\chi_{\Theta}(k) = \lim_{\mathcal{T}\rightarrow\infty}\mathcal{T}^{-1}\ln\langle e^{k\Theta}\rangle$. A standard calculation using discrete Fourier series (see e.g. [8]) yields $\chi_{\Theta}(k) = -1/(2\pi)\int_0^{\infty}d\omega\ln[1 - F_k(\omega)]$ with $F_k(\omega) = 4kDc^2\omega[a\sin(\omega\tau) + \omega\cos(\omega\tau) + kD\omega]/[(a^2 + \omega^2)(b^2 + \omega^2)]$. This leads to

$$\chi''_{\Theta}(0) = D^2\frac{c^2}{b(a+b)^3}\left[(a+b)(2ab + 2b^2 + c^2) + c^2[b(1 + 2b\tau) - a(1 - 2b\tau)]e^{-2b\tau}\right]. \quad (8)$$

An example of the behavior of the quantity $R_{\Theta} \equiv \lim_{\mathcal{T}\rightarrow\infty}\mathcal{T}[\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T}) - 2/\langle\Sigma_g\rangle]$ as a function of τ is shown in Fig. 1. We observe that R_{Θ} becomes negative for large values of τ , thus invalidating the TUR derived in [1] (more generally, the parabolic lower bound (25) on $\chi_{\Theta}(k)$ is invalid). On the other hand, as expected, R_{Θ} is always positive if $\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T})$ is calculated with the effective stochastic dynamics defined by Eq. (3). We have confirmed these results by performing numerical simulations of the two dynamics.




FIG. 1: (Color on line) $R_{\Theta} \equiv \lim_{\mathcal{T}\rightarrow\infty}\mathcal{T}[\epsilon^2(\mathcal{T}) - 2/\langle\Sigma_g\rangle]$ as a function of τ calculated with the original time-delayed dynamics [Eq. (2)] (solid black line) and the effective Markovian dynamics [Eq. (3)](dashed red line). The model parameters are $a = 1$, $b = 0.2$, $c = 0.5$.

In conclusion, the extension of the TUR to time-delayed Langevin systems is still an open problem. Whether or not the connection between TUR and Fisher information recently discussed in [9–11] offers a possible solution remains to be seen.

[1] T. V. Vu and Y. Hasegawa, arXiv:1809.06610v2.

[2] U. Seifert, Physica A **504**, 176 (2018).

[3] A. Dechant and S. Sasa, J. Stat. Mech., 063209 (2018).

[4] H. Jiang, T. Xiao, and Z. Hou, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 061144 (2011).

[5] M. L. Rosinberg, T. Munakata, and G. Tarjus, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 042114 (2015).

[6] M. L. Rosinberg, G. Tarjus, and T. Munakata, Phys.

Rev. E **98**, 032130 (2018).

[7] T. D. Franck, P. J. Beek, and R. Friedrich, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 021912 (2003).

[8] M. L. Rosinberg and J. M. Horowitz, Euro. Phys. Lett. **116**, 10007 (2016).

[9] Y. Hasegawa and T. V. Vu, arXiv:1809.03292.

[10] A. Dechant, arXiv:1809.10414.

[11] S. Ito and A. Dechant, arXiv:1810.06832.