

Steady state vs non-Markovian dynamics in systems connected to multiple thermal reservoirs

Vaibhav Wasnik*
Indian Institute of Technology, Goa

In literature on stochastic thermodynamics it is stated that for a system connected to multiple thermal reservoirs, the transition rates between two energy levels equals the sum of transition rates corresponding to each thermal bath the system is connected to. We show that this assumption leads to an impossibility of the system attaining a steady state by considering a system connected to two thermal baths. As an alternative we suggest splitting up the system into subsystems with one subsystem connected to one thermal bath and another subsystem connected to a second bath, and the rest exchanging energy with these two. We show that the collective evolution of the system as a whole is non-Markovian.

* wasnik@iitgoa.ac.in

I. Introduction

Traditionally thermodynamics has concerned itself with the behaviour of equilibrium and close to equilibrium macroscopic systems. The microscopic origin of these thermodynamic laws has been achieved using the tools of equilibrium statistical mechanics. Over the past few decades progress has been made towards extending the concepts of traditional thermodynamics to mesoscopic systems, which has led to understanding the far from equilibrium behavior of these systems [1]-[8]. The second law of thermodynamics finds itself extended to fluctuation theorems that are concerned with individual trajectories traversed by the systems as they exchange energy with the surroundings.

Majority of works in the field are concerned with systems that evolve in a Markovian fashion. The master equation for probabilistic evolution of such a system that can take energy values labelled by ϵ_j is given by

$$\frac{dP(\epsilon_i)}{dt} = \sum_{\epsilon_j} W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P(\epsilon_j) - \sum_j W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P(\epsilon_i) \quad (1)$$

where $P(\epsilon_i)$ is the probability of the system to be in a state of energy ϵ_i and $W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}$ is the rate at which transitions happen from state of energy ϵ_j to ϵ_i . For systems connected to a single thermal reservoir at temperature T , the transition rates obey detailed balance condition

$$W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} e^{-\beta \epsilon_j} = W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} e^{-\beta \epsilon_i} \quad (2)$$

where $\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}$. Systems in contact with multiple thermal reservoirs are not only important theoretically where they evolve to non-equilibrium steady states, but are also important from a practical viewpoint since most applications such as engines, pumps etc involve systems connected to multiple reservoirs. Many works on the subject, [1], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], of a system in contact with n thermal reservoirs at temperatures T_k with $k \in [1, n]$ make an assumption that

$$W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = \sum_{k=1, n} W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k \quad (3)$$

where $W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k$ is the rate at which transitions happen between states of energy ϵ_j to ϵ_i if the system was only in contact with a reservoir at temperature T_k .

Eq.3 seems to work well as an equation because it even to lead to the second law of thermodynamics as is jotted in Appendix B. However is this reason enough for validity of Eq.3? The way such a formula is justified is following. Imagine we have a system as shown in Fig.1, where one part of the system is connected to a bath temperature T_1 and another to a bath at temperature T_2 . If one assumes the system can have energy levels ϵ_i where $i \in [1, N]$, then in time dt the system can make a jump starting from energy level ϵ_i to ϵ_j , if it exchanges energy either with reservoir at temperature T_1 or reservoir T_2 . The probability this happens is $W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^1 dt$ and $W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^2 dt$ respectively. Note that the probability of a simultaneous exchange of energy from both reservoirs goes as dt^2 and can be neglected. Hence the probability to make a jump $P(\epsilon_i \rightarrow \epsilon_j)dt$ is

$$P(\epsilon_i \rightarrow \epsilon_j)dt = (W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^1 + W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^2)P(\epsilon_i)dt = W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P(\epsilon_i)dt \quad (4)$$

where $P(\epsilon_i)$ is the probability the system is in energy ϵ_i . This leads to the equation

$$W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^1 + W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^2 \quad (5)$$

which is of the form of Eq.3. The W 's are supposed to obey a local detailed balance equation

$$\frac{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^{1,2}}{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^{1,2}} = e^{-\beta^{1,2}(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} \quad (6)$$

However, now consider the limit $T_1 = T_2 = T$. In this limit, you have the system is in contact with a thermal reservoir at temperature T and the L.H.S in Eq.5 is then simply the transition rate for a system in contact with a reservoir at temperature T . But because $T_1 = T_2 = T$, we should also have that $W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^1 = W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^2$. This leads to a contradiction in Eq.5. What has gone wrong here? A question to ask is whether the fact that the system is also in




FIG. 1

contact with the bath at temperature T_2 , not affect the rate at which the system loses energy to bath at temperature T_1 ? Eq.5 can only be justified if the system being in contact with reservoir at temperature T_2 not affect the rate at which system loses energy to reservoir at temperature T_1 and vice versa. We note, that bath at temperature T_1 would be connected to a part of the system and the bath at temperature T_2 would be connected to another part of the system, since both baths cannot be connected at the same point in the system. So, the change in energy because of interaction with bath T_1 , will affect the region attached to bath T_1 in time dt , which would then exchange energy with other parts of the system including the part connected to the bath at temperature T_2 , during further intervals of time. Under such a case, saying the system as a whole changes energy when interacting with the bath at temperature T_1 , which was used to derive Eq.5 leads to a sort of coarse graining, while ignoring the details of how energy is actually absorbed by the system through exchanges between subsystems making up the system. This could also be a reason behind why we noticed a contradiction in the limit $T_1 = T_2 = T$ above. In the section II, we show more evidence of something not being right. We show that assuming Eq.5 and assuming a steady state exists, leads to extra constraints on the transition rates, implying a steady state generically is not possible. In section III, we try to understand energy exchange of the system with the reservoirs, having one subsystem connected to a the thermal bath at temperature T_1 and another subsystem connected to bath at temperature T_2 , and the rest of subsystems exchange energies with these two subsystems. With such a construction we show that the evolution of the system as a whole is not Markovian in section III, implying possibilities for new research, such as understanding of fluctuation theorems etc for these systems.

II. $W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^1 + W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^2$ and existence of steady state leads to a contradiction.

Consider a system that can have three possible energies labelled as ϵ_i with $i \in [1, 2, 3]$. We also assume that system follows a Markovian evolution given by Eq.1 Let us assume that the system is in contact with two thermal reservoirs with temperatures T_1 and T_2 and as quoted in literature let us assume that the transition rate obeys

$$W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^1 + W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^2. \quad (7)$$

Next, assume the local detailed balance below, along with the fact that the steady state exists, i.e. Eq.9 is true for any T_1, T_2 . Then doing some algebra after Eq.9 we arrive at equation Eq.18, where the LHS depends on temperature T_1 and the RHS on temperature T_2 , implying these have to be constant. This implies an extra constraint on the W 's other than a local detailed balance, which is inconsistent.

After summarizing how the proof goes in paragraph above, let us go through the actual proof. The local detailed balance relationships are

$$\frac{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^{1,2}}{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^{1,2}} = e^{-\beta^{1,2}(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} \quad (8)$$

we can hence write in the steady state

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_j \neq \epsilon_i} [W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^1 e^{-\beta^1(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} + W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^2 e^{-\beta^2(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)}] P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) \\ &= \sum_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_j \neq \epsilon_i} [W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^1 + W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^2] P_{steady}(\epsilon_i). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

If we write $W^{1,2}$ as a column matrix

$$W^{1,2} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}^{1,2} \\ W_{\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3}^{1,2} \\ W_{\epsilon_3, \epsilon_1}^{1,2} \end{bmatrix},$$

the above equation in the matrix form becomes

$$M(\beta_1, \beta_2)W^1 + M(\beta_2, \beta_1)W^2 = 0. \quad (10)$$

Here $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is a 3×3 matrix and $M(\beta_2, \beta_1)$ is obtained from $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ by interchanging β_1 and β_2 . We note that the dependence of matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ on both β_1, β_2 is because the P_{steady} 's are dependent on both β_1, β_2 .

We next note that the matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is a continuous function of β_1, β_2 and in the limit $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$

$$M(\beta, \beta) = 0. \quad (11)$$

This is because when $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$, the steady state is the thermal equilibrium state and $P(\epsilon_i) \propto e^{-\beta\epsilon_i}$.

For $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2$ we get from Eq.10

$$W^1 = A(\beta_1, \beta_2)W^2 \quad (12)$$

where

$$A(\beta_1, \beta_2) = M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^{-1}M(\beta_2, \beta_1). \quad (13)$$

The above equation assumes existence of the inverse of matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$. This requires the matrix to be of full rank. To show this, we will assume the matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is not of full rank and show it leads to a contradiction. Since, $\sum_i P_{steady}(\epsilon_i) = 1$, one of the probabilities can be expressed in terms of other two. Assume that we express $P_{steady}(\epsilon_1)$ in terms of $P_{steady}(\epsilon_2)$ and $P_{steady}(\epsilon_3)$. If the matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is not full rank, it implies that the determinant of $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ equals zero. However since $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ depends on both $P_{steady}(\epsilon_2)$ and $P_{steady}(\epsilon_3)$ by construction, it would imply a constraint between $P_{steady}(\epsilon_2)$ and $P_{steady}(\epsilon_3)$. This constraint would be independent of the W 's, as the matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is itself independent of the W 's. This would then imply that $P_{steady}(\epsilon_2)$ and $P_{steady}(\epsilon_3)$ are related to each other through a relationship independent of the W 's (and hence the system under consideration) which is not possible for generic values of W 's. We have hence proven that the matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is of full rank and hence Eq.13 is consistent.

Now Eq.12 is an algebraic relationship, true for any values of the β 's. Hence if a system was in contact with two thermal reservoirs at temperatures T_2, T_3 we would have

$$W^2 = A(\beta_2, \beta_3)W^3. \quad (14)$$

Hence,

$$A(\beta_1, \beta_2)A(\beta_2, \beta_3) = A(\beta_1, \beta_3). \quad (15)$$

Only way to get such a relationship for generic values of $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ is if

$$A(\beta_1, \beta_2) = e^{F(\beta_1)}e^{-F(\beta_2)} \quad (16)$$

where $F(\beta)$ is a 3×3 matrix, or substituting in Eq.12 we get

$$W^1 = e^{F(\beta_1)}e^{-F(\beta_2)}W^2 \quad (17)$$

or

$$e^{-F(\beta_1)}W^1 = e^{-F(\beta_2)}W^2 \quad (18)$$

Since, β_1, β_2 can be chosen to be arbitrarily, we get that $e^{-F(\beta_1)}W^1$ is a constant matrix independent of the value of β_1 , implying an extra constraint on the $W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k$'s in addition to detailed balance, which is inconsistent. This hence proves the inconsistency of Eq.3 in case of a system with three energy levels.

If we instead consider a system with more than three energy levels with $m > 3$, we can extend the above proof to show the inconsistency of Eq.3. Using

$$\frac{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^{1,2}}{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^{1,2}} = e^{-\beta^{1,2}(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)}, \quad i, j \in [1, m] \quad (19)$$

we get the dimension of the corresponding vector $W^{1,2}$ would $\frac{m^2-m}{2}$. At the steady state we similarly have

$$M(\beta_1, \beta_2)W^1 + M(\beta_2, \beta_1)W^2 = 0 \quad (20)$$

where $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is a $m \times \frac{m^2-m}{2}$ matrix and $M(\beta_2, \beta_1)$ is obtained from $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ by interchanging β_1 and β_2 . If and only if the square matrix $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is full rank then multiplying both sides by the right inverse $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T (M(\beta_1, \beta_2) M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T)^{-1}$, we get

$$W^1 = A(\beta_1, \beta_2)W^2 \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A(\beta_1, \beta_2) &= -[M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T (M(\beta_1, \beta_2) M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T)^{-1}] M(\beta_2, \beta_1) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$


Now, following the arguments after Eq.12 we see that a contradiction is reached. This observation is only true if $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)^T M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ is full rank. This is dependent on $M(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ being full rank and as we have stated above, if this was not the case then we would have the $P(\epsilon)$'s would be related to each through a constraint that is independent of the W 's (and hence the system under consideration) which is inconsistent.

The reason we reach a contradiction if steady state is assumed to exist, is because of reaching an equation like Eq.18 in our calculations, where L.H.S depends on one temperature and R.H.S on another temperature. This happens because rate of energy exchanges between the system and a particular reservoir at temperature T_1/T_2 is assumed to only depend on temperature T_1/T_2 respectively. Instead of saying the full system exchanges energy with the baths, a better way out would be to instead consider the system to be made up of multiple subsystems, with one subsystem in contact with thermal reservoir at temperature T_1 and another subsystem in contact with the the thermal reservoir at temperature T_2 and rest of the subsystems exchanging energy with these two subsystems. We illustrate this in the section below and find that this results in the evolution of the entire system as a whole being non Markovian.

III. Two thermal reservoirs connected to an extended body

In this section we will show that for a system connected to multiple thermal reservoirs the evolution of the system as a whole is non-Markovian. We note that if we have two thermal reservoirs at different temperatures in contact with the system, they cannot be in contact with the system at the same point. At the bare minimum there should exist two separate points in the system which are in contact with the two thermal reservoirs. Consider the simplest case where our system is made up of just two points, where in our paper a point is an object connected to a thermal reservoir at a particular temperature. One point is in contact with a thermal reservoir at temperature T_1 , the other at temperature T_2 . The two systems are non-interacting but can exchange energies through a thermal contact. Each of these two points evolve in a Markovian fashion and the question is whether generically, the system as a whole evolves in a Markovian fashion or not? To address this question, consider an illustive example system shown in Fig.2, where the energy at points 1 and 2 take only the following values $0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, 3\epsilon, 4\epsilon$. The systems can exchange energy but are non-interacting ¹. In calculations below the probabilities are assumed to be dependent on time.

¹ It should be noted that this assumption is done in statistical mechanics to prove that two systems exchanging energy without interaction, reach a thermal equilibrium when both are at constant temperature. See for example Sec 4.1 in [17]



Each point can take energies
 $0, \epsilon, 2\epsilon, 3\epsilon, 4\epsilon$

FIG. 2: The two point system made up of two points at different temperatures, which is studied in the 'Illustrative Example' section below.

To move forward let us first assume that the evolution as a whole is Markovian for all values of T_1, T_2 . All probabilities are assumed to be time dependent in the presentation below. The probability for the whole system to make a jump from total energy 5ϵ to 3ϵ in time dt is

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(5\epsilon \rightarrow 3\epsilon)dt &= [w_{\epsilon,3\epsilon}^1 + w_{0,2\epsilon}^2]dtp^1(3\epsilon)p^2(2\epsilon) \\
 &+ [w_{\epsilon,3\epsilon}^2 + w_{0,2\epsilon}^1]dtp^1(2\epsilon)p^2(3\epsilon) \\
 &+ w_{2\epsilon,4\epsilon}^1 dtp^1(4\epsilon)p^2(\epsilon) + w_{2\epsilon,4\epsilon}^2 dtp^1(\epsilon)p^2(4\epsilon) \\
 &+ w_{3\epsilon,5\epsilon}^1 dtp^1(5\epsilon)p^2(0) + w_{3\epsilon,5\epsilon}^2 dtp^1(0)p^2(5\epsilon) \\
 &= WW_{3\epsilon,5\epsilon}^{1,2} P(5\epsilon)dt
 \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Also the probability to make the reverse jump from total energy 3ϵ to 5ϵ assuming a Markovian evolution is

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(3\epsilon \rightarrow 5\epsilon)dt &= [w_{3\epsilon,\epsilon}^2 + w_{4\epsilon,2\epsilon}^1]dtp^1(2\epsilon)p^2(\epsilon) \\
 &+ [w_{3\epsilon,\epsilon}^1 + w_{4\epsilon,2\epsilon}^2]dtp^1(\epsilon)p^2(2\epsilon) \\
 &+ [w_{2\epsilon,0}^2 + w_{5\epsilon,3\epsilon}^1]dtp^1(3\epsilon)p^2(0) \\
 &+ [w_{2\epsilon,0}^1 + w_{5\epsilon,3\epsilon}^2]dtp^1(0)p^2(3\epsilon) \\
 &= WW_{5\epsilon,3\epsilon}^{1,2} P(3\epsilon)dt
 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

1. $T_1 = T_2 = T$

Now consider the case where both points are at the same temperature, i.e. $T_1 = T_2 = T$. We note that, since, the system as a whole is at constant temperature T , the evolution has to be Markovian, so that an thermal equilibrium is reached. We have that $w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}^1 = w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}^2 = w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}$, $WW_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}^{1,2} = WW_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}$, both dependent on T and $p^1(\epsilon) = p^2(\epsilon) = p(\epsilon)$. We note that the $p^1(\epsilon), p^2(\epsilon)$ are generically dependent on time and their equality is guaranteed on grounds of symmetry. Then substituting $P(3\epsilon) = 2[p(3\epsilon)p(0) + p(2\epsilon)p(\epsilon)]$ and $P(5\epsilon) = 2[p(5\epsilon)p(0) + p(4\epsilon)p(\epsilon) + p(3\epsilon)p(2\epsilon)]$ in above two equations and demanding L.H.S = R.H.S for the full course of time evolution, implies we should have that

- $w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}$ has to be a function of $\epsilon - \epsilon'$, so that Eq.24 is satisfied, or

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'} &= f(\epsilon - \epsilon') \\
 &\text{if } \epsilon > \epsilon'
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

But in order to get Eq.23 to be satisfied we need the additional relationship that

-

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{\epsilon,\epsilon'} &= f(\epsilon - \epsilon') \\
 &\text{if } \epsilon' > \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \epsilon' - \epsilon < E - \epsilon' \\
w_{\epsilon, \epsilon'} &= 2f(\epsilon - \epsilon') \\
& \text{if } \epsilon' > \epsilon \\
& \epsilon' - \epsilon > E - \epsilon'.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Here, E is the total energy of the system before making a transition.

The above two conditions give us

$$WW_{E, E'} = 2f(E - E') \tag{27}$$

Since the entire system is exchanging energy with a a single thermal reservoir, detailed balance has to be obeyed. We get

$$\frac{f(E - E')}{f(E' - E)} = \frac{P_{eq}(E)}{P_{eq}(E')} = e^{-\beta(E - E')}. \tag{28}$$

2. $T_1 \neq T_2$

Now, let us use what was derived above to analyze the case when $T_1 \neq T_2$. Using Eq.24 we get,

$$P(3\epsilon \rightarrow 5\epsilon)dt = [f^1(2\epsilon) + f^2(2\epsilon)]dtP(3\epsilon), \tag{29}$$

however using Eq.23 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(5\epsilon \rightarrow 3\epsilon)dt &= [f^1(-2\epsilon) + f^2(-2\epsilon)]dtp^1(3\epsilon)p^2(2\epsilon) \\
&+ [f^1(-2\epsilon) + f^2(-2\epsilon)]dtp^1(2\epsilon)p^2(3\epsilon) \\
&+ 2f^1(-2\epsilon)dtp^1(4\epsilon)p^2(\epsilon) + 2f^2(-2\epsilon)dtp^1(\epsilon)p^2(4\epsilon) \\
&+ 2f^1(-2\epsilon)dtp^1(5\epsilon)p^2(0) + 2f^2(-2\epsilon)dtp^1(0)p^2(5\epsilon) \\
&= [f^1(-2\epsilon) + f^2(-2\epsilon)]dtP(5\epsilon) \\
&+ [f^1(-2\epsilon) - f^2(-2\epsilon)]dt[p^1(4\epsilon)p^2(\epsilon) - p^1(\epsilon)p^2(4\epsilon)] \\
&+ [f^1(-2\epsilon) - f^2(-2\epsilon)]dt[p^1(5\epsilon)p^2(0) - p^1(0)p^2(5\epsilon)] \\
&< 2[f^1(-2\epsilon) + f^2(-2\epsilon)]dtP(5\epsilon)
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

implying $P(5\epsilon \rightarrow 3\epsilon)dt$ cannot be written in a form $WW^{1,2}(3\epsilon, 5\epsilon)dtP(5\epsilon)$, implying the system as a whole cannot evolve in a Markovian fashion. We hence see that rightly assuming Markovian evolution when $T_1 = T_2$, directly leads to non Markovian dynamics for $T_1 \neq T_2$.

We generalize this observation and claim that if the minimum value of energy at a particular site is ϵ_{min} , then if $E > E'$ and $E - E' > \epsilon_{min}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
P(E \rightarrow E')dt &< 2[f^1(E' - E) + f^2(E' - E)]dtP(E) \\
P(E' \rightarrow E)dt &= [f^1(E - E') + f^2(E - E')]dtP(E')
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

A. Extended body

We can model an extended body by considering points 1 and 2 in contact with other points we label as a, b, c, \dots etc that are themselves not in contact with a thermal reservoir. Then the probability of the system having energy E is

$$P(E) = \sum_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_a, \dots} p^1(\epsilon_1)p^2(\epsilon_2)p^a(\epsilon_a)\dots\delta_{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_a + \dots, E}. \tag{32}$$

Since energy exchanges with the environment still happen at points 1 and 2, the evaluations of $P(E \rightarrow E')$ in this case also follow everything said up until Eq.31, implying a non-Markovian evolution.

B. Issues with deriving Second Law.

We now begin to understand the difficulty in deriving a second law of thermodynamics using $S_{system} = -k_B \sum_E P(E) \ln P(E)$ for this problem. For any E, E' such that $E > E'$ we could atleast write

$$P(E' \rightarrow E)dt = [w_{E,E'}^1 + w_{E,E'}^2]dtP(E'), \quad (33)$$

while for $E < E'$ we get an inequality Eq.31. However, the only inequality that would have guaranteed the second law is instead

$$P(E' \rightarrow E)dt \geq [w_{E,E'}^1 + w_{E,E'}^2]dtP(E'), \quad \text{if } E < E' \quad (34)$$

along with $\frac{w_{E,E'}}{w_{E',E}} = e^{-\beta(E-E')}$ as should be obvious by looking at derivation in Eq.B1. However Eq.26 and Eq.28 tells us that $\frac{w_{E,E'}}{w_{E',E}}$ need not equal $e^{-\beta(E-E')}$.

To understand why $S_{system} = -k_B \sum_E P(E) \ln P(E)$ is not the 'right' entropy for a second law calculation, note that at first

$$\begin{aligned} S_{system} &= -k_B \sum_E P(E) \ln P(E) \\ &= -k_B \sum_E \sum_{\epsilon} p^1(E-\epsilon) p^2(\epsilon) \ln \sum_{\epsilon'} p^1(E-\epsilon') p^2(\epsilon') \\ &< -k_B \sum_{E,\epsilon} p^1(E-\epsilon) p^2(\epsilon) \ln p^1(E-\epsilon) p^2(\epsilon) \\ &= S_{point 1} + S_{point 2} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where $S_{point 1}, S_{point 2}$ are entropies of points 1 and 2 respectively. Looking from the lens of information theory, this implies that S_{system} doesn't contain the total information content of points 1 and 2.

Now, consider a system of N particles in contact with a thermal bath at temperature T . Let us say the number of particles having energy ϵ_i is n_i . Then the total number of ways of realizing this arrangement is given by $\frac{N!}{\prod_i n_i!}$ which in limit of large N is $e^{-N \sum_i \frac{n_i}{N} \ln \frac{n_i}{N}} = e^{-N \sum_i p_i \ln p_i}$, where $p_i = \frac{n_i}{N}$ is the probability of finding particles with energy ϵ_i . Since $-k_B \sum_i p_i \ln p_i$ is the entropy per particle we have that $S_{particles} = -k_B N \sum_i p_i \ln p_i$ is the total entropy of the particles. If this changes in time evolution by $\Delta S_{particles}$ and since $\Delta S_{environment} = \frac{\Delta Q}{T}$ is the change in the entropy of the environment, where ΔQ is heat gained by the environment, then the second law stating that $\Delta S_{particles} + \Delta S_{environment} > 0$ is the statement that the system plus the environment evolves in to a macrostate that has maximum possible realizations. Hence, since all particles are independent of each other the relation $\frac{\Delta S_{particles} + \Delta S_{environment}}{N} > 0$, says that total change in entropy per particle and the entropy change in environment because of heat released by this particle on an average should be greater than zero. For Markovian systems this is mathematically realized in the derivation in Eq.B1. Second law hence argues that the environment plus the system moves towards the macrostate which has maximum possible realizations. It is because the number of ways of realizing a macrostate is of relevance to the second law, that the relevant entropy of composite system of points 1 and 2 should be $S_{point 1} + S_{point 2}$ and not S_{system} . $S_{point 1} + S_{point 2} + S_{environment}$ will be increasing with time as each point is in contact with a thermal bath and the entropy change of each point plus the energy it releases into the environment increases as per arguments in this paragraph and by the derivation in Eq. B1 considering k to take only one value. Hence, $S_{system} = -k_B \sum_E P(E) \ln P(E)$ is not the 'right' entropy for a second law calculation.

IV. Discussion

The Markovian master equation in Eq.1 has a unique steady state solution $P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)$ such that

$$\sum_{\epsilon_j} W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) - \sum_{\epsilon_j} W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P_{steady}(\epsilon_i) = 0$$

(36)

The uniqueness of $P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)$ is guaranteed by the linearity of the above set of equations. The entropy production rate is written as [15]

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} [W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) - W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)] \\ & \times \ln \frac{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j)}{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

We know that in case the system is connected to a single thermal reservoir, the steady state corresponds to the equilibrium state that obeys detailed balance and hence the entropy production at equilibrium is zero. For a system connected to multiple reservoirs, be it thermal or particle reservoirs etc, if a Markovian evolution is assumed the above entropy production is greater than zero at the steady state and this is used to derive thermodynamic uncertainty relations [14], [15], [16] What we have shown in our work is that atleast for systems connected to multiple thermal reservoirs we cannot use Eq.3 to evaluate the rate of entropy production. We have also shown that the evolution of such systems may not be Markovian hence Eq.37 is not the rate of entropy production in the steady state. Because of non-Markovian evolution one cannot extend known ideas such as fluctuation theorems to such systems as a whole, despite the fact that parts of the system can individually satisfy fluctuation theorems. Since S_{system} is not relevant to the second law, the question naturally arises if any other entropy definition that is dependent on probability distribution of the system as a whole could be used to construct a second law. We also note that the environment for a particular point also includes the other point and hence the $S_{environment}$ as discussed in the above calculation does not consider just the energy exchanged by the composite system of points 1 and 2 with the environment, which is the universe minus the points 1 and 2, but also the energy exchanged by points 1 and 2 with each other. It is however, the universe minus the points 1 and 2 which would be of relevance if we were to frame a second law by constructing an entropy definition that only utilized $P(E)$. How to accomplish this is an open question and would require further research.

A.

Eq.7 can be written as or

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_j \neq \epsilon_i} [W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^1 [e^{-\beta^1(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) - P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)] \\ & + \sum_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_j \neq \epsilon_i} W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^2 [e^{-\beta^2(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) - P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

$$M(\beta_1, \beta_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} e^{\beta_1(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)} & a_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_3} e^{\beta_1(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_3)} \\ a_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2} & 0 & a_{\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3} e^{\beta_1(\epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3)} \\ a_{\epsilon_3, \epsilon_1} & a_{\epsilon_3, \epsilon_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ where}$$

$$a_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} = [e^{-\beta^1(\epsilon_i - \epsilon_j)} P_{steady}(\epsilon_j) - P_{steady}(\epsilon_i)] \quad (A2)$$

We can see that $\det(M)$ is not equal to zero.

B.

To see this note that the rate of change of the system entropy is

$$\dot{S}_{system} = \frac{d}{dt} [-k_B \sum_{\epsilon_i} P(\epsilon_i) \ln P(\epsilon_i)] = -k_B \sum_{\epsilon_i} \frac{dP(\epsilon_i)}{dt} \ln P(\epsilon_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -k_B \sum_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} [W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P(\epsilon_j) - W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P(\epsilon_i)] \ln P(\epsilon_i) \\
&= \frac{k_B}{2} \sum_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} [W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} P(\epsilon_j) - W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i} P(\epsilon_i)] \ln \frac{P(\epsilon_j)}{P(\epsilon_i)} \\
&= \frac{k_B}{2} \underbrace{\sum_{k=1, n} \sum_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} [W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k P(\epsilon_j) - W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^k P(\epsilon_i)] \ln \frac{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k P(\epsilon_j)}{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^k P(\epsilon_i)}}_{\geq 0} \\
&+ \frac{k_B}{2} \underbrace{\sum_{k=1, n} \sum_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j} [W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k P(\epsilon_j) - W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^k P(\epsilon_i)] \ln \frac{W_{\epsilon_j, \epsilon_i}^k}{W_{\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j}^k}}_{=\sum_{k=1, n} \frac{\dot{Q}^k}{T^k} = -\dot{S}_{environment}}
\end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

Hence, we see that using Eq.3 we get the second law of thermodynamics $\dot{S}_{system} + \dot{S}_{environment} > 0$. The above argument is taken from [1].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Karsten Kruse for comments on the manuscript, Ranjan Mukhopadhyay for discussions on statistical thermodynamics and for comments on the manuscript, M. Bhaskaran and Abitosh Upadhyay for going over the proof in section II.

Data Availability

There is no data associated with this research.

Conflict of Interest

There are no conflict of interests in this research as Vaibhav Wasnik is the sole author of this paper.

-
- [1] C. Van den Broeck and M. Esposito, Ensemble and trajectory thermodynamics: A brief introduction, *Physica (Amsterdam)* 418A, 6 (2015) DOI: 10.1016/j.physa.2014.04.035
 - [2] C. Jarzynski, Equilibrium free-energy differences from nonequilibrium measurements: A master-equation approach, *Phys. Rev. E* 56, 5018 (1997). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.56.5018>
 - [3] G. E. Crooks, Entropy production fluctuation theorem and the nonequilibrium work relation for free energy differences, *Phys. Rev. E* 60, 2721 (1999). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.60.2721>
 - [4] C. Jarzynski, Equalities and inequalities: Irreversibility and the second law of thermodynamics at the nanoscale, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* 2, 329 (2011). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-062910-140506>
 - [5] G. E. Crooks, Nonequilibrium measurements of free energy differences for microscopically reversible Markovian systems, *J. Stat. Phys.* 90, 1481 (1998). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023208217925>
 - [6] U. Seifert, Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* 75, 126001 (2012). doi:10.1088/0034-4885/75/12/126001
 - [7] C. Maes, On the origin and the use of fluctuation relations for the entropy, *Semin. Poincaré* 2, 29 (2003).
 - [8] K. Sekimoto, *Stochastic Energetics* (Springer, Berlin, Germany, 2010). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-05411-2.
 - [9] Strasberg, P., Schaller, G., Brandes, T., & Esposito, M. (2013). Thermodynamics of a physical model implementing a Maxwell demon. *Physical review letters*, 110(4), 040601. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.040601>
 - [10] Esposito, M., & Schaller, G. (2012). Stochastic thermodynamics for “Maxwell demon” feedbacks. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 99(3), 30003. DOI: 10.1209/0295-5075/99/30003
 - [11] Barato, A. C., & Seifert, U. (2014). Stochastic thermodynamics with information reservoirs. *Physical Review E*, 90(4), 042150. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.90.042150>

- [12] Esposito, M. (2012). Stochastic thermodynamics under coarse graining. *Physical Review E*, 85(4), 041125. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.85.041125>
- [13] Proesmans, K., & Fiore, C. E. (2019). General linear thermodynamics for periodically driven systems with multiple reservoirs. *Physical Review E*, 100(2), 022141. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.100.022141>
- [14] Barato, A. C., & Seifert, U. (2015). Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for biomolecular processes. *Physical review letters*, 114(15), 158101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.158101>
- [15] Seifert, U. (2018). Stochastic thermodynamics: From principles to the cost of precision. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 504, 176-191. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2017.10.024>
- [16] Horowitz, J. M., & Gingrich, T. R. (2020). Thermodynamic uncertainty relations constrain non-equilibrium fluctuations. *Nature Physics*, 16(1), 15-20. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-019-0702-6>
- [17] Kardar, M. (2007). *Statistical physics of particles*. Cambridge University Press.