

Weighted average temperature as the effective temperature of a system in contact with two thermal baths

Z. C. Tu*

*School of Physics and Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China and
Key Laboratory of Multiscale Spin Physics (Ministry of Education),*

Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

(Dated: November 5, 2024)

We investigate the effective temperature of a harmonic chain whose two ends are coupled to two baths at different temperatures. We propose to take the weighted average temperature as the effective temperature of the system. The weight factors are related to the couplings between the system and two baths as well as the asymmetry of interactions between oscillators. We revisit the thermodynamics of nonequilibrium steady states based on the weighted average temperature. It is found that the fundamental thermodynamic relations in nonequilibrium steady states possess similar concise forms as those in equilibrium thermodynamics, provided that we replace the temperature in equilibrium with the weighted average temperature in steady states. We also illustrate the procedure to explicitly calculate the effective temperatures via three examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermodynamics was regarded as a universal theory by Einstein [1]: “It is the only physical theory of universal content, which I am convinced, that within the framework of applicability of its basic concepts will never be overthrown.” The whole theoretical system of thermodynamics is on the basis of four laws of thermodynamics. Temperature is a core concept for the zeroth law of thermodynamics, which characterizes an equilibrium state. However, this concept cannot be directly extended to general nonequilibrium states since the transitivity of thermal equilibrium is broken out of equilibrium. It is for this reason that has given rise to extensive discussions on the issue of temperature in nonequilibrium systems. McLennan stated: “Nonequilibrium temperature is introduced for theoretical convenience rather than to take advantage of a basic principle” [2]. Different terminologies of nonequilibrium temperatures such as kinetic temperature, local temperature, effective temperature have been proposed in various situations involving from passive to active, classical to quantum systems [3–22]. Analogy to kinetic temperature for thermal systems, “granular temperature” was also proposed for athermal systems such as granular materials, which is defined as the mean-square value of the random velocities of granular particles [23]. Although the application of granular temperature in granular gases and fluids has proven to be great successful [24–26], the concept of granular temperature still confronts much debate [27–41] due to the lack of energy equipartition in granular systems.

Here we will confine our treatment to a less controversial situation of steady-state thermal systems in contact with two thermal baths at different temperatures, where the effective temperature is believed to be well-defined. There are two main viewpoints on effective temperatures

of these systems in literature: (i) the mean temperature; (ii) the weighted average temperature. The mean temperature is a natural definition of effective temperature for a system in contact with two baths at different temperatures. Parrondo and Español considered an axle with vanes at both ends symmetrically coupled to two baths, and found that the steady state can be described as the Boltzmann canonical distribution with an effective temperature being the arithmetical mean of temperatures of two baths [42]. In recent work by Wu and Wang [43], the nonequilibrium equation of state of a harmonic chain coupled to two baths was established, which is divided into two parts: One has the form of the equilibrium equation of state with the equilibrium temperature replaced by the mean temperature of two baths; the other depends on the temperature difference between two baths. For a finite-size quantum system connected to two thermal and particle reservoirs, the nonequilibrium density matrix was derived by Ness, which is given by a generalized Gibbs-like ensemble with an effective reciprocal temperature being the mean of reciprocal temperatures of two baths [44].

If the system is asymmetrically coupled to two baths, the weighted average temperature may be regarded as a more reasonable definition of effective temperature. Van den Broeck *et al.* investigated the heat transfer by a shared piston simultaneously in contact with two baths at different temperatures [45]. They found that the steady state is described by a canonical distribution with an effective temperature being the weighted average of temperatures of two baths. The weight factors are related to frictional coefficients of the piston in both baths. The idea of weighted average temperature holds also for underdamped Langevin systems in contact with multiple reservoirs [46, 47] and quantum heat transfers at the nanoscale [48]. Sheng and the author in the present paper also suggested the weighted average reciprocal temperature as the inverse effective temperature of finite-time heat engines, the devices outputting work and absorbing heat simultaneously [49]. The weighted average tempera-

* Email: tuzc@bnu.edu.cn

tures mentioned above are introduced for simple systems with few degrees of freedom. We may ask: whether can we give a unified definition and calculation procedure of effective temperature in steady state via weighted average temperature for a system with multiple degrees of freedom? Can the fundamental relations in equilibrium thermodynamics be extended to nonequilibrium steady states? Do the extended relations possess the same forms as those in equilibrium thermodynamics?

Aiming at the questions mentioned above, we will develop the idea of weighted average temperature based on a model of harmonic chain coupled to two thermal baths. This model has been widely used in discussing heat conduction of low-dimensional systems. Rieder *et al.* discussed a stationary state of a homogeneous harmonic chain coupled symmetrically to two baths at different temperatures, and found that the kinetic temperature of the chain is almost the mean temperature of two baths, and that the heat flux is proportional to the global temperature difference of two baths but not the local temperature gradient in the chain [50]. Matsuda and Ishii considered an isotopically disordered harmonic chain with infinite length, and found that the heat flux depends on the square root of the number of oscillators in the chain [51]. Then the heat transport in low-dimensional systems becomes one of the most exciting topics in the field of statistical physics, and intense researches [52–77] are focused on the universality class of the divergence of thermal conductivity, the profile of local temperature in the chain, the role of disorder and localization in low-dimensional lattices. The reader may refer to four reviews [78–81] to gain a comprehensive survey on heat transport in low-dimensional systems. Here we will focus on another issue: Can we define the effective temperature for the whole system at steady state? This issue can be discussed independently of whether or not the thermal conductivity diverges, the local equilibrium holds, and normal modes are localized.

We will try to give a unified definition of effective temperature and then revisit thermodynamics of nonequilibrium steady states via the weighted average temperature. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present a minimal model which consists of a harmonic chain with its two ends coupled to two thermal baths at different temperatures. In Sec. III, we introduce the idea of weighted average temperature according to a decomposition of covariance matrix. In Sec. IV, we revisit thermodynamics of nonequilibrium steady states by taking the weighted average temperature as the effective temperature. In Sec. V, we discuss three examples and explicitly calculate the corresponding effective temperatures. The last section contains a brief summary and discussion.

II. MODEL SYSTEM: A HARMONIC CHAIN COUPLED TO TWO THERMAL BATHS

The model system that we considered is a harmonic chain coupled to two baths as shown in Fig. 1. The chain consists of N particles and $N + 1$ elastic springs. Particle 1 is coupled to a bath at temperature T_L , and particle N is in contact with a bath at temperature T_R . The equations of motion of particle i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$) may be expressed as the Langevin dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx_i}{dt} &= p_i, \\ \frac{dp_i}{dt} &= -\bar{k}_{i-1}x_{i-1} - k_i x_i - \bar{k}_i x_{i+1} \\ &\quad + [-\gamma_L p_1 + \xi_L(t)]\delta_{i1} + [-\gamma_R p_N + \xi_R(t)]\delta_{iN}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where x_i and p_i represent the coordinate and momentum of particle i , respectively. In Eq. (1), we have assumed that all particles are of the same mass which is set to be unity for simplicity. In Eq. (2), k_i and \bar{k}_i are related to the elastic constants of the springs. We have imposed $\bar{k}_0 = \bar{k}_N = 0$. δ_{i1} and δ_{iN} are the Kronecker delta notations. γ_L and γ_R represent frictional coefficients of particles 1 and N , respectively. $\xi_L(t)$ and $\xi_R(t)$ are white noises due to the thermal baths, which satisfy $\langle \xi_\alpha(t) \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \xi_\alpha(t)\xi_\alpha(t') \rangle = \gamma_\alpha k_B T_\alpha \delta(t-t')$ with $\alpha = L$ or R . k_B is the Boltzmann constant which is set to be unity in the following discussions.




FIG. 1. A harmonic chain with its two ends coupled to two thermal baths at different temperatures T_L and T_R .

Introduce position vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]^T$, momentum vector $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N]^T$, phase vector $\mathbf{z} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N, p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N]^T$, and noise vector $\boldsymbol{\xi} = [0, 0, \dots, 0, \xi_1, 0, \dots, 0, \xi_N]^T$. In the whole paper, the superindex T represents the transpose of a matrix. Introduce $N \times N$ -order elastic matrix

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & \bar{k}_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \bar{k}_1 & k_2 & \bar{k}_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{k}_2 & k_3 & \bar{k}_3 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \bar{k}_{N-2} & k_{N-1} & \bar{k}_{N-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & \bar{k}_{N-1} & k_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

and frictional matrix

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_L & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \gamma_R \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Then the equations of motion of the system may be transformed into a matrix form:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{z}}{dt} = -\mathbf{A}\mathbf{z} + \boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (5)$$

where coefficient matrix

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{\Gamma} \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

with $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{I} being $N \times N$ -order zero matrix and identity matrix, respectively.

Introduce steady-state covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx} = \langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^T \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xp} = \langle \mathbf{x}\mathbf{p}^T \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{px} = \langle \mathbf{p}\mathbf{x}^T \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp} = \langle \mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}^T \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty}$, and $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \langle \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^T \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xp} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{px} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp} \end{bmatrix}$. Covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is symmetrical, which implies $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx}^T = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp}^T = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xp}^T = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{px}$.

Since Eq. (5) describes an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, the covariance matrix satisfies the continuous-time Lyapunov equation [9, 43, 50, 82, 83]:

$$\mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}\mathbf{A}^T = 2\mathbf{D}_t, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{D}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$. \mathbf{D} is $N \times N$ -order diffusion matrix which is explicitly expressed as

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_L T_L & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \gamma_R T_R \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

III. WEIGHTED AVERAGE TEMPERATURE

In this section, we will introduce a parameter T_e with dimension of temperature via the weighted average of temperatures T_L and T_R . This parameter can be regarded as a candidate for the effective temperature of a system coupled to two baths at different temperatures.

If the two baths have the same temperature T , i.e., $T_L = T_R = T$, the system will reach an equilibrium state. The theorem of energy equipartition leads to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx}\mathbf{K} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp} = T\mathbf{I}$ where the Boltzmann constant has been set to be unity. With the consideration of this point, we introduce $\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix}$ and define revised covariance matrix

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx}\mathbf{K} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xp} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{px}\mathbf{K} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

such that equilibrium covariance matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{eq} = T\mathbf{I}_{2N}$ with \mathbf{I}_{2N} being $2N \times 2N$ -order identity matrix. This observation inspires us to make an ansatz that the revised covariance matrix for nonequilibrium steady states may be decomposed into a diagonal matrix plus a residual matrix. More specifically, we introduce a parameter T_e with dimension of temperature for nonequilibrium steady states such that

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = T_e\mathbf{I}_{2N} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^r, \quad (10)$$

where the residual matrix is traceless:

$$\text{Tr}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^r = 0. \quad (11)$$

Obviously, the above two equations hold for equilibrium states since $T_e = T$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^r = \mathbf{0}$ at equilibrium states.

Introducing

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \tilde{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\mathbf{K} \\ \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{\Gamma} \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

and considering Eqs. (7) and (10), we find that the residual matrix should satisfy the following equation:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^r + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^{rT}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D} - T_e\mathbf{\Gamma} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and \mathbf{D} are given by Eqs. (4) and (8), respectively. The detailed derivation of (13) is demonstrated in Appendix A. The above equation is linear, therefore its solution can be expressed as a linear combination of two bases $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_L$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_R$ which satisfy

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_\alpha + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_\alpha^T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{E}_\alpha \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\alpha = L \text{ or } R), \quad (14)$$

where \mathbf{E}_L and \mathbf{E}_R are two $N \times N$ -order matrix units. Their explicit forms are as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}_L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{E}_R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Once we obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_L$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_R$ from Eq. (14), the residual matrix may be expressed as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^r = \gamma_L(T_L - T_e)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_L + \gamma_R(T_R - T_e)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_R. \quad (16)$$

By taking the trace in the above equation and considering Eq. (11), we obtain

$$T_e = C_L T_L + C_R T_R, \quad (17)$$

where coefficients C_L and C_R satisfy

$$C_\alpha \equiv \frac{\gamma_\alpha \text{Tr}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_\alpha}{\gamma_L \text{Tr}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_L + \gamma_R \text{Tr}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_R}, \quad (\alpha = L \text{ or } R). \quad (18)$$

Since $C_L + C_R = 1$, temperature T_e is the weighted average of temperatures T_L and T_R . Thus T_e is named

weighted average temperature in this paper. Substituting Eqs. (17) and (18) into Eq. (16), we obtain the residual matrix

$$\tilde{\sigma}^r = \gamma_L \gamma_R \Delta T \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_L \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_R - \tilde{\sigma}_R \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_L}{\gamma_L \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_L + \gamma_R \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_R}, \quad (19)$$

which is proportional to the temperature difference $\Delta T \equiv T_L - T_R$.

We emphasize that the weighted average reciprocal temperature was also introduced as the inverse effective temperature for finite-time heat engines [49]. That is, $1/T_e \equiv s_L/T_L + s_R/T_R$ with $s_L + s_R = 1$. This definition is in fact equivalent to the weighted average temperature in the present work. Compared with Eq. (17), we can derive a duality relation between (C_L, C_R) and (s_L, s_R) which may be expressed as $C_L = s_L T_R / (s_L T_R + s_R T_L)$ and $C_R = s_R T_L / (s_L T_R + s_R T_L)$.

IV. THERMODYNAMICS OF NONEQUILIBRIUM STEADY STATES

In this section, we will revisit thermodynamics of nonequilibrium steady state of the harmonic chain coupled to two thermal baths by using the weighted average temperature. Several fundamental thermodynamic expressions that we obtained possess similar concise forms as those in equilibrium thermodynamics. In this sense, we propose to take the weighted average temperature as the effective temperature of the system.

A. Steady-state distribution

The stochastic dynamics (5) describes an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. The steady-state distribution is Gaussian distribution [50, 83]:

$$P(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{z} \right\} \quad (20)$$

where the partition function is

$$\mathcal{Z} = \sqrt{\det(2\pi\boldsymbol{\sigma})}. \quad (21)$$

Note that we have omitted the term related to the Planck constant in this work.

Considering Eqs. (9), (10), and (19), we may rewrite the steady-state distribution with inverse weighted average temperature $\beta_e = 1/T_e$, which reads

$$P(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \exp \{ -\beta_e (H + \Delta H) \}, \quad (22)$$

where the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{z}. \quad (23)$$

The additional Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta H &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{z}^T \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \left[(\mathbf{I} + \beta_e \tilde{\sigma}^r)^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \right] \mathbf{z} \\ &\approx \frac{\gamma_L \gamma_R \Delta T}{2T_e} \mathbf{z}^T \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \left[\frac{\tilde{\sigma}_L \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_R - \tilde{\sigma}_R \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_L}{\gamma_L \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_L + \gamma_R \text{Tr} \tilde{\sigma}_R} \right] \mathbf{z}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The approximation in the second line of the above equation holds for small temperature difference. The steady-state distribution function (22) and the linear dependence of ΔH on ΔT are consistent to those obtained in Refs. [44] and [48]. In addition, considering Eqs. (10) and (11), we can further derive the expression of partition function for small temperature difference, which reads

$$\mathcal{Z} = (2\pi T_e)^N + \mathcal{O}(\Delta T^2/T_e^2). \quad (25)$$

That is, there is no explicitly linear term of $\Delta T/T_e$ in the expression of partition function.

B. Internal energy

The steady-state internal energy is defined as an average of the Hamiltonian:

$$\mathcal{E} \equiv \langle H \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} \rangle. \quad (26)$$

Since $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N]^T$ is a column vector, $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p} = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i^2$ is a pure number, while $\mathbf{p} \mathbf{p}^T$ is a matrix with an element $p_i p_j$ at row i and column j . Thus we arrive at $\langle \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p} \rangle = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{p} \mathbf{p}^T) = \text{Tr} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp}$. Similarly, $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]^T$ is a column vector, $\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij} x_i x_j$ is also a pure number. Its average $\langle \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{K} \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N K_{ij} \langle x_i x_j \rangle = \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx} \mathbf{K})$. Substituting these relations into Eq. (26), we obtain the internal energy $\mathcal{E} \equiv \langle H \rangle = [\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{xx} \mathbf{K}) + \text{Tr} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp}] / 2 = \text{Tr} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} / 2$. With the consideration of Eqs. (10) and (11), we arrive at the internal energy

$$\mathcal{E} = N T_e. \quad (27)$$

This concise relation for nonequilibrium steady states keeps the same form in equilibrium states provided that we replace the temperature in equilibrium with the weighted average temperature T_e . In addition, we can further verify $T_e = \text{Tr} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp} / 2$ using the conclusion in Appendix B. That is, T_e reflects the average kinetic energy of the system. Therefore, we deduce that T_e has the meaning of effective temperature. In this sense, our proposal is consistent with the ideas of kinetic temperature or granular temperature in literature [3–7, 23–34].

C. Entropy and free energy

The steady-state entropy is defined as $\mathcal{S} = -\int d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{p} P \ln P = -\langle \ln P \rangle$. Substituting the steady-state distribution (20) into the above equation, we derive the entropy $\mathcal{S} = \langle \mathbf{z}^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{z} \rangle / 2 + \ln \mathcal{Z}$. It is not

hard to prove $\langle \mathbf{z}^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{z} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N [\sigma]_{ij}^{-1} \langle z_i z_j \rangle = \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}) = 2N$. Considering expression (27) of internal energy, we may derive

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{T_e} + \ln \mathcal{Z}. \quad (28)$$

Similar to the equilibrium state, we may define the steady-state free energy $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E} - T_e \mathcal{S}$. Thus Eq. (28) leads to

$$\mathcal{F} = -T_e \ln \mathcal{Z}. \quad (29)$$

This concise relation for nonequilibrium steady states keeps the same form in equilibrium states provided that we replace the temperature in equilibrium with the weighted average temperature. This is another fact that supports us to take the weighted average temperature T_e as the effective temperature of the system.

D. Heat transfer and entropy production

The rate of heat transfer from the baths at temperature T_L and T_R to the chain may be defined as [42, 43, 45, 50, 51]:

$$\dot{Q}_L = \gamma_L (T_L - \langle p_1^2 \rangle), \quad (30)$$

$$\dot{Q}_R = \gamma_R (T_R - \langle p_N^2 \rangle), \quad (31)$$

respectively. It is not hard to verify $\dot{Q}_L + \dot{Q}_R = 0$ since $\text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{pp}) = \text{Tr} \mathbf{D}$, which is consistent to energy conservation in steady states [43].

According to Eqs. (10) and (19), we find that both $\langle p_1^2 \rangle$ and $\langle p_N^2 \rangle$ are different from T_e in the linear order of ΔT . They are explicitly expressed as $\langle p_1^2 \rangle = T_e + u_L \Delta T$ and $\langle p_N^2 \rangle = T_e - u_R \Delta T$ with two constants u_L and u_R . Note that u_L and u_R are not independent of each other since $\dot{Q}_L + \dot{Q}_R = 0$. According to Eq. (17), the rate of heat transfer may be further expressed as

$$\dot{Q}_L = \gamma_L (C_R - u_L) \Delta T, \quad (32)$$

which implies that the rate of heat transfer is proportional to the temperature difference $\Delta T \equiv T_L - T_R$. In addition, if $\Delta T > 0$, then $\dot{Q}_L > 0$ which gives a constraint $C_R > u_L$.

The entropy production rate may be defined as

$$\dot{S}_p = - \left(\frac{\dot{Q}_L}{T_L} + \frac{\dot{Q}_R}{T_R} \right). \quad (33)$$

Considering $\dot{Q}_R = -\dot{Q}_L$ and Eq. (32), we obtain the entropy production rate:

$$\dot{S}_p = \frac{\gamma_L (C_R - u_L) \Delta T^2}{T_L T_R}. \quad (34)$$

That is, the entropy production rate is proportional to the quadratic order term of temperature difference for given values of T_L and T_R .

V. CASE STUDY FOR CALCULATION OF EFFECTIVE TEMPERATURES

In this section, we will illustrate the detailed procedure for explicit calculation of effective temperatures. The key step is to solve equation (14). Here we adopt a method similar to the work by Rieder, Lebowitz and Lieb [50]. The $2N \times 2N$ -order matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_\alpha$ may be expressed in block form:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_\alpha & \mathbf{J}_\alpha \\ \mathbf{F}_\alpha & \mathbf{G}_\alpha \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\alpha = L \text{ or } R), \quad (35)$$

where \mathbf{B}_α , \mathbf{J}_α , \mathbf{F}_α , and \mathbf{G}_α are four $N \times N$ -order matrices. Considering Eqs. (9) and (14), we derive six equations as follows:

$$\mathbf{G}_\alpha^T = \mathbf{G}_\alpha, \quad (36)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_\alpha^T = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}_\alpha, \quad (37)$$

$$(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{B}_\alpha)^T = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{B}_\alpha, \quad (38)$$

$$(\mathbf{K} \mathbf{F}_\alpha)^T = -\mathbf{K} \mathbf{F}_\alpha, \quad (39)$$

$$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{B}_\alpha + \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{F}_\alpha = \mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K}, \quad (40)$$

$$\mathbf{F}_\alpha + \mathbf{F}_\alpha^T + \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{G}_\alpha + \mathbf{G}_\alpha \boldsymbol{\Gamma} = 2\mathbf{E}_\alpha, \quad (41)$$

where $\alpha = L$ or R . Then the weight factors can be further expressed as

$$C_L = \frac{\gamma_L (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_L + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L)}{\gamma_L (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_L + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L) + \gamma_R (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_R + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R)} \quad (42)$$

and

$$C_R = \frac{\gamma_R (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_R + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R)}{\gamma_L (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_L + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L) + \gamma_R (\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_R + \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R)} \quad (43)$$

with the consideration of Eqs. (18) and (35).

Through tedious manipulations (as shown in Appendix B), we can prove $\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_L = \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L$ and $\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_R = \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R$. Then the above equations are further simplified as

$$C_L = \frac{\gamma_L \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L}{\gamma_L \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L + \gamma_R \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R} \quad (44)$$

and

$$C_R = \frac{\gamma_R \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R}{\gamma_L \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_L + \gamma_R \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_R}. \quad (45)$$

Now, we will discuss three examples: (A) Single harmonic oscillator simultaneously coupled to two baths; (B) Two harmonic oscillators coupled to two baths; (C) A chain of three harmonic oscillators with two ends coupled to two baths.

A. Single harmonic oscillator simultaneously coupled to two baths

Single harmonic oscillator simultaneously coupled to two baths as shown in Fig. 2 is the special case of model

system considered in Sec. II with $N = 1$. In this case, the elastic matrix, the frictional matrix and so on are degenerated into pure numbers. For example, $\mathbf{K} = k$, $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \gamma_L + \gamma_R$, $\mathbf{E}_L = \mathbf{E}_R = 1$. From Eqs. (36)-(41), we obtain

$$\mathbf{G}_L = \mathbf{G}_R = \frac{1}{\gamma_L + \gamma_R}. \quad (46)$$

Substituting the above equation into Eqs. (44) and (45), we arrive at

$$C_\alpha = \frac{\gamma_\alpha}{\gamma_L + \gamma_R}, \quad (\alpha = L \text{ or } R). \quad (47)$$

Substituting the above equation into (17), we obtain the effective temperature

$$T_e = C_L T_L + C_R T_R = \frac{\gamma_L T_L + \gamma_R T_R}{\gamma_L + \gamma_R}. \quad (48)$$

The above equation agrees with the result obtained by Van den Broeck *et al.* in Ref. [45]. In particular, $T_e = \bar{T} \equiv (T_L + T_R)/2$ if $\gamma_L = \gamma_R$, which degenerates into the result obtained by Parrondo and Español [42].




FIG. 2. Single harmonic oscillator simultaneously coupled to two baths at different temperatures T_L and T_R .

B. Two harmonic oscillators coupled to two baths

Two harmonic oscillators respectively coupled to two baths as shown in Fig. 3 is the special case of model system considered in Sec. II with $N = 2$. In this case, the elastic matrix and the frictional matrix are assumed to be $\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} k_1 & k \\ k & k_2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_L & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_R \end{bmatrix}$.




FIG. 3. Two harmonic oscillators coupled to two baths at different temperatures T_L and T_R .

Taking $\mathbf{E}_L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, from Eqs. (36)-(41), we can obtain the expression of \mathbf{G}_L . Here we only explicitly write

out its diagonal elements:

$$G_{L11} = \frac{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_R \Omega}{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + \gamma_L \gamma_R \Omega}, \quad (49)$$

$$G_{L22} = \frac{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)}{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + \gamma_L \gamma_R \Omega}, \quad (50)$$

where $\Omega \equiv (k_1 - k_2)^2 + (\gamma_L + \gamma_R)(k_1 \gamma_R + k_2 \gamma_L)$.

Similarly, taking $\mathbf{E}_R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, from Eqs. (36)-(41), we achieve the diagonal elements of \mathbf{B}_R :

$$G_{R11} = \frac{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)}{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + \gamma_L \gamma_R \Omega}, \quad (51)$$

$$G_{R22} = \frac{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_L \Omega}{\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + \gamma_L \gamma_R \Omega}. \quad (52)$$

With these diagonal elements, we can calculate C_L and C_R by using Eqs. (44) and (45). The corresponding expressions are as follows:

$$C_L = \frac{2\bar{k}^2\gamma_L(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}{2\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + 2\gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}, \quad (53)$$

$$C_R = \frac{2\bar{k}^2\gamma_R(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}{2\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + 2\gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}. \quad (54)$$

The corresponding effective temperature is

$$T_e = \frac{2\bar{k}^2\gamma_L(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}{2\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + 2\gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega} T_L \quad (55)$$

$$+ \frac{2\bar{k}^2\gamma_R(\gamma_L + \gamma_R) + \gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega}{2\bar{k}^2(\gamma_L + \gamma_R)^2 + 2\gamma_L\gamma_R\Omega} T_R. \quad (56)$$

In general, the weight factors C_L and C_R are unequal to each other. If $\gamma_L = \gamma_R$, the system is symmetrical coupling to both baths. In this situation, Eqs. (53) and (54) lead to $C_L = C_R = 1/2$ and then the effective temperature $T_e = \bar{T} \equiv (T_L + T_R)/2$, which is in good agreement with our intuition that the effective temperature of a harmonic chain equals to the mean temperature of two baths when the system simultaneously satisfies two symmetry conditions: (i) the interactions between oscillators in the chain are of left-right symmetry; (ii) two ends of the chain are symmetrically coupled to two baths. It is noted that the first condition holds automatically for a chain of two oscillators. Thus if and only if the second condition is satisfied, the effective temperature for a chain of two oscillators equals to the mean temperature of two baths.

C. A chain of three harmonic oscillators with two ends coupled to two baths

Let us consider a chain of three harmonic oscillators as shown in Fig. 4. Two ends of the chain are coupled to two baths at different temperatures T_L and T_R . The

elastic constants of four springs are k , $k(1+\varepsilon)$, $k(1-\varepsilon)$, and k , respectively. Here ε takes value in the domain between -1 and 1 , which represents the degree of left-right symmetry breaking in interactions between harmonic oscillators. In particular, $\varepsilon = 0$ corresponds to a uniform chain with left-right symmetry where four springs possess the same elastic constants.




FIG. 4. A chain of three harmonic oscillators with two ends coupled to two baths at different temperatures T_L and T_R . The elastic constants of four springs are k , $k(1+\varepsilon)$, $k(1-\varepsilon)$, and k , respectively.

The elastic matrix can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{K} = k \begin{bmatrix} 2 + \varepsilon & -(1 + \varepsilon) & 0 \\ -(1 + \varepsilon) & 2 & -(1 - \varepsilon) \\ 0 & -(1 - \varepsilon) & 2 - \varepsilon \end{bmatrix}. \quad (57)$$

For simplicity, the reference elastic constant k is set to be unity in the following discussions. The frictional matrix is taken as

$$\mathbf{\Gamma} = \gamma \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \delta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 - \delta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

where γ is the reference frictional constant which is set to be unity in the following discussions. The parameter δ takes value in the domain between -1 and 1 , which represents the degree of asymmetry of coupling between the chain and two baths. In particular, $\delta = 0$ corresponds to the situation of symmetric coupling between the chain and two baths. We will discuss the influences of ε and δ on the effective temperature in details.

Taking $\mathbf{E}_L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{E}_R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, we can

obtain the expressions of \mathbf{G}_L and \mathbf{G}_R respectively from Eqs. (36)-(41). Substituting the traces of \mathbf{G}_L and \mathbf{G}_R into Eqs. (44), we finally obtain the weight factor

$$C_L = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon)^2(1-4\delta-\delta^2)}{6\Delta(1-\delta^2)} + \frac{(u_{23}^2 - u_{22}u_{33})(1+\varepsilon)^2 + u_{12}u_{23}(1-\varepsilon^2)}{3\Delta}, \quad (59)$$

with $u_{11} = (1-\varepsilon)^2/2 + [\varepsilon^2 + (1+\varepsilon)^2]/(1+\delta) + 2(1+\delta)$, $u_{12} = (1-\varepsilon)[\varepsilon + \varepsilon/(1+\delta) - (1+\delta)]$, $u_{22} = 4 + 2\varepsilon^2 + (1+\varepsilon)^2/(1-\delta) - 2\varepsilon\delta + (1-\varepsilon)^2/(1+\delta)$, $u_{23} = -(1+\varepsilon)[\varepsilon + \varepsilon/(1-\delta) + (1-\delta)]$, $u_{33} = (1+\varepsilon)^2/2 + [(1-\varepsilon)^2 + \varepsilon^2]/(1-\delta) + 2(1-\delta)$, and $\Delta = [(u_{12}(1-\varepsilon) + u_{23}(1+\varepsilon))^2 - u_{22}[a_{11}(1-\varepsilon)^2 + u_{33}(1+\varepsilon)^2 - (1-\varepsilon^2)^2]$.

The expression of weight factor, Eq. (59), is too complicated to be seen clearly the dependence of C_L on ε and δ . We may gain an intuitive understanding on the behavior of C_L by presetting $\varepsilon = 0$ or $\delta = 0$. In the situation of $\varepsilon = 0$, the above equation (59) is reduced to

$$C_L = \frac{24 + 4\delta - 30\delta^2 + 2\delta^3 + 9\delta^4 - 3\delta^5}{48 - 60\delta^2 + 18\delta^4}. \quad (60)$$

The graph of function (60) is depicted as solid line in Fig. 5. We observe that $C_L = 0$ for $\delta = -1$ and $C_L = 1$ for $\delta = 1$, and that C_L monotonically increases with δ . These behaviors are consistent with our intuition. On the one hand, we can obtain $T_e = T_R$ from Eq. (17) with considering $C_L = 0$ and $C_R = 1 - C_L = 1$ for $\delta = -1$. On the other hand, frictional matrix (58) with $\delta = -1$ implies that the chain is strongly coupled with the bath at temperature T_R but decoupled with the bath at temperature T_L . Undoubtedly, the effective temperature should be equal to T_R . When the value of δ increases, the coupling between the chain and the bath at temperature T_L is enhanced, while the coupling between the chain and the bath at temperature T_R is weakened. Thus the weight of contribution of T_L in the effective temperature rises, which exactly corresponds to the monotonic increase of C_L with δ . When $\delta = 1$, the chain is strongly coupled with the bath at temperature T_L but decoupled with the bath at temperature T_R . Undoubtedly, the effective temperature should be equal to T_L which corresponds to $C_L = 1$.




FIG. 5. (Color online) Graph of functions (60) and (61).

Similarly, Eq. (59) is degenerated into

$$C_L = \frac{24 + 14\varepsilon + 33\varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon^3 - 27\varepsilon^4 - 2\varepsilon^5 + 12\varepsilon^6}{48 + 66\varepsilon^2 - 54\varepsilon^4 + 24\varepsilon^6} \quad (61)$$

when $\delta = 0$. The graph of function (61) is depicted as dashed line in Fig. 5. We find that $C_L = 1/3$ for $\varepsilon = -1$ and $C_L = 2/3$ for $\varepsilon = 1$, and that C_L monotonically increases with ε . These behaviors are also consistent with our intuition. On the one hand, we can

obtain $T_e = T_L/3 + 2T_R/3$ from Eq. (17) with considering $C_L = 1/3$ and $C_R = 1 - C_L = 2/3$ for $\varepsilon = -1$. On the other hand, elastic matrix (57) with $\varepsilon = -1$ implies that the interaction between oscillators 1 and 2 is vanishing. Thus oscillator 1 and the system consisting of oscillators 2 and 3 are two independent subsystems. These two subsystems are in equilibrium with the baths at temperatures T_L and T_R , respectively. Thus the weight of contribution of T_L in the effective temperature is $1/(1+2) = 1/3$. Similar interpretation holds for the situation of $\varepsilon = 1$. In addition, with the increase of ε , the interaction between oscillators 1 and 2 is enhanced, while interaction between oscillators 2 and 3 is weakened. Thus the weight of influence of T_L to the effective temperature rises, which corresponds to the monotonic increase of C_L with ε .




FIG. 6. (Color online) Contour plot of function (59). The thick solid line is the contour line corresponding to $C_L = 1/2$. This line can be approximately represented by a function $\delta \approx -7\varepsilon/(2 + 5|\varepsilon|)$ (Dots in the graph).

Furthermore, we draw a contour plot of function (59) in Fig. 6 to understand the complicated dependency behavior of C_L on ε and δ . At a glance, we see that the graph is invariant under rotating 180° around the centre $(0, 0)$ provided that replacing C_L with $C_R = 1 - C_L$. The underlying reason is that the system is in fact unchanged if we merely reassign labels 1, 2, and 3 of the oscillators as well as labels L and R of two baths. Detailed survey manifests a subtle difference between the behavior of δ -dependence of C_L for given ε and that of ε -dependence for given δ . For given ε , C_L is a monotonically increasing function of δ . However, C_L is not always a monotonically increasing function of ε for given δ . Only if $|\delta|$ is not too large, for example smaller than 0.4, C_L is a monotonically increasing function of ε . Otherwise, C_L is not a monotonic function of ε . It is easy to understand that C_L is a monotonically increasing function of δ . However, it is not straightforward for us to interpret the surprising nonmonotonic dependence of C_L on ε . The

root of this behavior might be a transition experienced by some oscillators from underdamping to overdamping.

Particularly, from Fig. 6 we observe that $C_L = 1/2$ when ε and δ are simultaneously vanishing, which is in good agreement with our intuition that the effective temperature of the harmonic chain equals to the mean temperature of two baths when the system simultaneously satisfies two symmetry conditions mentioned at the end of Sec. VB. We should point out that this two symmetry conditions are just sufficient conditions but not necessary conditions since the increasing of ε and decreasing of δ contribute the opposite effects in C_L . We specifically draw the contour line corresponding to $C_L = 1/2$, the thick solid line in Fig. 6. The explicit relation between ε and δ is too complicated, which may be approximately expressed as $\delta \approx -7\varepsilon/(2 + 5|\varepsilon|)$.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We have investigated the effective temperature at steady state of a harmonic chain coupled to two thermal baths at different temperatures. The key ansatz is that the revised covariance matrix may be decomposed into the diagonal matrix and traceless residual matrix [see Eqs. (10) and (11)]. We suggest taking the weighted average temperature [Eq. (17)] as the effective temperature of the system. The weight factors [Eq. (18)] are related to the coupling constants between the system and two baths as well as the asymmetry of interactions between oscillators. The residual matrix [Eq. (19)] depends linearly on the temperature difference between two thermal baths. The advantage of weighted average temperature lies in revisiting the thermodynamics of nonequilibrium steady states. The fundamental thermodynamic relations in nonequilibrium steady states such as internal energy [Eq. (27)], entropy [Eq. (28)], and free energy [Eq. (29)] possess similar concise forms as those in equilibrium thermodynamics. The minor difference is to replace the temperature in equilibrium with the weighted average temperature in steady states. The nonequilibrium character manifests in the heat transfer and entropy production. The heat transfer rate [Eq. (32)] is proportional to the temperature difference between two baths, while the entropy production rate [Eq. (34)] is proportional to the quadratic term of temperature difference. Finally, we also illustrate the procedure to calculate the effective temperatures via three examples.

Before ending this paper, we address several open issues which will be investigated in the future work.

1). The model that we employed is a linear system. If the equations of motion contain nonlinear forces, the steady-state distribution cannot directly be expressed with the covariance matrix. Therefore, our definition of effective temperature based on the decomposition of covariance matrix is inapplicable to a nonlinear system directly. A straightforward extension might be considering the linearization of the nonlinear system and then defin-

ing the effective temperature of the corresponding linearized system. The other challenging way might be extending the concept of covariance matrix to the nonlinear system. A candidate matrix might be $\langle \mathbf{z}(\partial H/\partial \mathbf{z}) \rangle_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ where $\mathbf{z} = [x_1, \dots, x_N, p_1, \dots, p_N]^T$ and H is the Hamiltonian of the nonlinear system. $\partial H/\partial \mathbf{z}$ is the abbreviation of $[\partial H/\partial x_1, \dots, \partial H/\partial x_N, \partial H/\partial p_1, \dots, \partial H/\partial p_N]$.

2). We have proposed to define the effective temperature via the weighted average temperature. For our model system, this definition is consistent to the kinetic temperature in literature (see also the discussion at the end of Sec. IV B). In fact, another typical proposal to define effective temperature for a system driven away from equilibrium under an external field (usually not a temperature difference) is based on the generalized linear fluctuation-dissipation relation [3, 4, 8–13]. It is unclear to make a connection between two kinds of definitions for a system coupled to two baths at different temperature. We expect that fluctuation-dissipation relation keeps its conventional form for small enough temperature difference $\Delta T \equiv T_L - T_R$. However, this is a trivial case $T_e \approx T_L \approx T_R$. We are more interested in the situation of large temperature difference where the fluctuation-dissipation relation should be replaced by the fluctuation theorem for heat exchange [84–87].

3). As case study, we have analytically investigated harmonic chains of $N = 1, 2, 3$ oscillators. In general, the chains is inhomogeneous when $N \geq 2$. The results support our conjecture that the effective temperature of a harmonic chain equals to the mean temperature of two baths when the system simultaneously satisfies two symmetry conditions: (i) the interactions between oscillators in the chain are of left-right symmetry; (ii) two ends of the chain are symmetrically coupled to two baths. Rieder *et al.* found that the kinetic temperature of a long homogeneous chain coupled symmetrically to two baths is almost the mean temperature of two baths [50], which is consistent with our conjecture. Kannan *et al.* investigated a harmonic crystal with alternating masses, and their numerical results reveal that the local kinetic temperature profile oscillates with period two in the bulk of the system [69]. In a special case of odd N , the local temperature in the bulk is found to have uniform profile with value $(T_L + T_R)/2$ [69]. This result also supports our conjecture since two symmetry conditions mentioned above hold exactly for this special case of odd N in their model. There seems no apparent obstacle to establishing an explicit connection between our definition of effective temperature and the profile of local temperature obtained by Kannan *et al.* in the absence of symmetry. In a more complicated case of disordered harmonic chain with infinite length [51], it might be a challenge to obtain an explicit expression of effective temperature.

4). Although we have merely confined our research object to a thermal system in contact with to two baths. The idea of weighted average temperature might provide some insight to athermal granular systems. Due to breakdown of energy equipartition, it is found that particles of

different mass have different granular temperatures in a multicomponent granular gas [27, 29, 31, 39]. Averaging these different granular temperatures with weight factors being the masses of different types of particles, one might be able to define an effective temperature to characterize the behavior of multicomponent granular gas. It should be noted that another definition of “temperature” (compactivity) for jammed granular packings was proposed by Edwards and co-workers [88, 89] who introduced a volume ensemble of equiprobable jammed states in analogy to equilibrium statistical physics. The Edwards temperature has attracted much attention by both theoretical and experimental physicists [90]. Particularly, recent experimental results not only support the validity of the Edwards volume ensemble, but also demonstrate the equivalence between the Edwards temperature and the temperature defined according to the fluctuation-dissipation relation [91, 92]. It is a difficult task to establish a connection between our definition of effective temperature and the Edwards temperature.

5). Our discussions are focused on classical thermodynamic systems. The quantum dissipative systems and steady-state transports have been discussed deeply [44, 48, 93–106]. We note that the covariance matrix has also been used to investigate the quantum transport in harmonic chains [103–106]. It should be straightforward for us to extend our discussions based on the covariance matrix from classical situation to quantum realm. We believe that the idea of weighted average temperature holds also for a quantum system coupled to two baths.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author thanks Jin Wang (Stony Brook University) who attracts the author’s attention to the present topic in this work. The author thanks Ning Xu (University of Science and Technology of China) and Yujie Wang (Shanghai Jiao Tong University, and Chengdu University of Technology) for their kind helps. The author is also grateful for the financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11975050).

Appendix A: Derivation of Eq. (13)

Here we will derive Eq. (13) in details.

Since both $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are symmetric matrices, then we have $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^T = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}\tilde{\mathbf{K}})^T = \tilde{\mathbf{K}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ which is in general unequal to $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Similarly, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = (\tilde{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{A})^T = \mathbf{A}^T\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$. Note that \mathbf{A} is usually not a symmetric matrix. Multiplying $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ left and right towards Eq. (7), we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}^T\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = 2\mathbf{D}_t, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where we have used the fact $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}\mathbf{D}_t\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = \mathbf{D}_t$ which can be directly confirmed by the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{K}}$ and \mathbf{D}_t .

In addition, we obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \Gamma \end{bmatrix}$ from Eq. (12). This relation implies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(T_e \mathbf{I}_{2N}) + (T_e \mathbf{I}_{2N})\tilde{\mathbf{A}}^T = 2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & T_e \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{A2})$$

since \mathbf{I}_{2N} is the identity matrix. Subtracting Eqs. (A1) and (A2), and considering Eq. (10), we will soon arrive at Eq. (13).

Appendix B: Traces of \mathbf{B}_α and \mathbf{G}_α

Here we will discuss the relationship between the traces of \mathbf{B}_α and \mathbf{G}_α .

First, we will prove $\mathbf{J}_\alpha^T = -\mathbf{J}_\alpha$. From Eq. (37), we have $\mathbf{J}_\alpha^T = \mathbf{F}_\alpha \mathbf{K}^{-1}$ and then $\mathbf{J}_\alpha = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_\alpha^T$ with the consideration of $\mathbf{K}^T = \mathbf{K}$. From Eq. (39), we have $\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{F}_\alpha^T = -\mathbf{F}_\alpha \mathbf{K}^{-1}$. It follows that \mathbf{J} is an antisymmetric matrix:

$$\mathbf{J}_\alpha^T = -\mathbf{J}_\alpha. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Second, we will prove $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = 0$. The antisymmetry (B1) implies $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = \text{Tr}(-\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha) = -\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha)$. Since a matrix and its transpose have the same traces, we obtain $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = \text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T)^T = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{J}_\alpha \Gamma_\alpha^T)$. Considering the symmetry of Γ_α and the commutativity of trace of matrix product, we further arrive at $\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = \text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha)$. Therefore, the only possible consequence is

$$\text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = 0. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Finally, we will prove $\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_\alpha = \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_\alpha$. From Eq. (40) we have $\mathbf{B}_\alpha = \mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}^{-1} \Gamma \mathbf{F}_\alpha$ which implies $\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_\alpha = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K}) - \text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \Gamma \mathbf{F}_\alpha)$. Since the trace of matrix product is invariant under commuting two matrices, we deduce $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K}) = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K} \mathbf{K}^{-1}) = \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_\alpha$ and $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \Gamma \mathbf{F}_\alpha) = \text{Tr}(\Gamma \mathbf{F}_\alpha \mathbf{K}^{-1})$. Considering $\mathbf{F}_\alpha \mathbf{K}^{-1} = \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T$ and Eq. (B2), we further obtain $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{K}^{-1} \Gamma \mathbf{F}_\alpha) = \text{Tr}(\Gamma_\alpha \mathbf{J}_\alpha^T) = 0$. Therefore, we find that the traces of \mathbf{B}_α and \mathbf{G}_α are identical:

$$\text{Tr} \mathbf{B}_\alpha = \text{Tr} \mathbf{G}_\alpha. \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\mathbf{U}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 2(1+\delta) & -(1-\varepsilon)(1+\delta) & 0 & 1+\varepsilon \\ -(1-\varepsilon)(1+\delta) & 4-2\varepsilon\delta & -(1+\varepsilon)(1-\delta) & 0 \\ 0 & -(1+\varepsilon)(1-\delta) & 2(1-\delta) & -1+\varepsilon \\ 1+\varepsilon & 0 & -1+\varepsilon & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{C7})$$

With these matrices, we can solve \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{g} from Eqs. (C3) and (C4). Their formal expressions are as follows:

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_2 \mathbf{w}_\alpha, \quad (\text{C8})$$

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{w}_\alpha - \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{U}_2 \mathbf{w}_\alpha. \quad (\text{C9})$$

Appendix C: Procedure to calculate C_L for the chain of three oscillators

It is technically involved to directly solve matrix equations (36)-(41) for an inhomogeneous chain consisting of $N > 2$ oscillators. Since our aim is to calculate C_L , here we may provide a relatively simplified procedure to obtain the elements of matrix \mathbf{B}_α for $N = 3$. Using this procedure, we may write the final expression of C_L in a compact form (59) that makes us not too dizzy.

From Eqs. (36)-(40), we derive

$$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{G}_\alpha - \mathbf{G}_\alpha \mathbf{K} = \Gamma \mathbf{J}_\alpha \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}_\alpha \Gamma, \quad (\text{C1})$$

and

$$\mathbf{K} \mathbf{J}_\alpha - \mathbf{J}_\alpha \mathbf{K} + \Gamma \mathbf{G}_\alpha + \mathbf{G}_\alpha \Gamma = 2\mathbf{E}_\alpha. \quad (\text{C2})$$

The independent elements of antisymmetric matrix \mathbf{J}_α and symmetric matrix \mathbf{G}_α are denoted as $J_{12}, J_{13}, J_{23}, G_{11}, G_{12}, G_{13}, G_{22}, G_{23}, G_{33}$, respectively. Introducing two vectors $\mathbf{v} = [J_{12}, J_{13}, J_{23}, G_{22}]^T$ and $\mathbf{g} = [G_{11}, G_{12}, G_{13}, G_{23}, G_{33}]^T$, from Eq. (C1) and (C2) we derive

$$\mathbf{U}_2 \mathbf{g} = \mathbf{U}_3 \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{w}_\alpha - \mathbf{U}_1 \mathbf{v}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

We have considered elastic matrix (57) and frictional matrix (58) in derivation of these two equations. Here three matrices $\mathbf{U}_1, \mathbf{U}_2$ and \mathbf{U}_3 are explicitly expressed as

$$\mathbf{U}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\delta} & \frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\delta} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} & \varepsilon & -\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\delta} & \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\delta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1-\delta} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$\mathbf{U}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1+\varepsilon & \varepsilon & 1-\varepsilon & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1-\varepsilon & 2\varepsilon & -1-\varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1-\varepsilon & \varepsilon & -1+\varepsilon \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{C6})$$

and

where $\mathbf{U} \equiv \mathbf{U}_2 \mathbf{U}_1 + \mathbf{U}_3$ is expressed in matrix form:

$$\mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & -\frac{1-\varepsilon^2}{2} & 1+\varepsilon \\ u_{12} & u_{22} & u_{23} & 0 \\ -\frac{1-\varepsilon^2}{2} & u_{23} & u_{33} & -(1-\varepsilon) \\ 1+\varepsilon & 0 & -(1-\varepsilon) & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

The elements u_{11} , u_{12} , u_{22} , u_{23} , u_{33} and the determinant of \mathbf{U} have been presented below Eqs. (59).

Vectors \mathbf{w}_α ($\alpha = L, R$) in Eqs. (C4), (C8) and (C9) depend on \mathbf{E}_α , which may be explicitly expressed as $\mathbf{w}_L = [1/(1+\delta), 0, 0, 0, 0]^T$ and $\mathbf{w}_R = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1/(1-\delta)]^T$. Substituting \mathbf{w}_L into Eqs. (C8) and (C9), we can obtain the diagonal elements of matrix \mathbf{G}_L :

$$G_{L11} = \frac{1}{1+\delta} + \frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{\Delta(1+\delta)^2} \quad (\text{C11})$$

$$G_{L22} = \frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{2\Delta(1+\delta)} + \frac{u_{12}u_{23}(1-\varepsilon^2)}{\Delta(1+\delta)} + \frac{(u_{23}^2 - u_{22}u_{33})(1+\varepsilon)^2}{\Delta(1+\delta)} \quad (\text{C12})$$

$$G_{L33} = -\frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{\Delta(1-\delta^2)} \quad (\text{C13})$$

Similarly, substituting \mathbf{w}_R into Eqs. (C8) and (C9), we can obtain the diagonal elements of matrix \mathbf{G}_R :

$$G_{R11} = -\frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{\Delta(1-\delta^2)} \quad (\text{C14})$$

$$G_{R22} = \frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{2\Delta(1-\delta)} + \frac{u_{12}u_{23}(1-\varepsilon^2)}{\Delta(1-\delta)} + \frac{(u_{12}^2 - u_{11}u_{22})(1-\varepsilon)^2}{\Delta(1-\delta)} \quad (\text{C15})$$

$$G_{R33} = \frac{1}{1-\delta} + \frac{u_{22}(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}{\Delta(1-\delta)^2} \quad (\text{C16})$$

Considering $\gamma_L = 1 + \delta$, $\gamma_R = 1 - \delta$, $\text{Tr}\mathbf{G}_L = G_{L11} + G_{L22} + G_{L33}$, $\text{Tr}\mathbf{G}_R = G_{R11} + G_{R22} + G_{R33}$, we can derive Eq. (59) from definition (44) of C_L .

Appendix D: Revisit the asymmetrical chain investigated by Wu and Wang

Let us consider a chain of three harmonic oscillators with two ends coupled to two baths. We adopt the same values of elastic matrix and frictional matrix as those in Ref. [43]. For $N = 3$, the elastic matrix is

$$\mathbf{K} = k \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 3 & -2 \\ 0 & -2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ where } k \text{ is the reference elastic}$$

constant which is set to be unity in the following discussions. The off-diagonal elements of \mathbf{K} are different from each other, which implies that interactions between harmonic oscillators are asymmetrical. The frictional matrix

$$\text{is } \mathbf{\Gamma} = \gamma \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ where } \gamma \text{ is the reference frictional}$$

constant which is set to be unity in the following discussions. Since two frictional constants are equal to each other, two ends of the chain are symmetrically coupled to two baths. We expect that the effective temperature should be different from the mean temperature of two baths since the first symmetry condition mentioned at the end of subsection VB is broken in this model.

Taking $\mathbf{E}_L = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, we can obtain the diagonal elements of \mathbf{G}_L :

$$G_{L11} = 313/385, G_{L22} = 1/5, G_{L33} = 72/385. \quad (\text{D1})$$

Similarly, with the consideration of $\mathbf{E}_R = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, we

can derive the diagonal elements of \mathbf{G}_R :

$$G_{R11} = 72/385, G_{R22} = 4/5, G_{R33} = 313/385. \quad (\text{D2})$$

Substituting these diagonal elements into Eqs. (44) and (45), we have

$$C_L = \frac{2}{5}, \text{ and } C_R = \frac{3}{5}. \quad (\text{D3})$$

Correspondingly, the effective temperature is

$$T_e = \frac{2T_L + 3T_R}{5}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

Just as we expect, the effective temperature is indeed different from the mean temperature $\bar{T} \equiv (T_L + T_R)/2$ since the first symmetry condition mentioned at the end of subsection VB is broken in this model.

With the consideration of Eq. (27), we derive the internal energy $\mathcal{E} = 3T_e = 3(2T_L + 3T_R)/5$. This result can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{E} = 3\bar{T} - \frac{3\Delta T}{10}, \quad (\text{D5})$$

which is identical to Eq. (95) obtained by Wu and Wang in Ref. [43]. In other words, the internal energy can be expressed in a concise form with the weighted average temperature, while still leads to the correct result.

-
- [1] M. J. Klein, Thermodynamics in Einstein's thought, Science **157**, 509 (1967).
 [2] J. A. McLennan, Introduction to Non-equilibrium Statistical Mechanics (Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1989)

- [3] J. Casas-Vázquez and D. Jou, Temperature in non-equilibrium states: a review of open problems and current proposals, Rep. Prog. Phys. **66**, 1937 (2003).
 [4] A. Puglisi, A. Sarracino, and A. Vulpiani, Temperature

- in and out of equilibrium: a review of concepts, tools and attempts, *Phys. Rep.* **709-710**, 1 (2017).
- [5] A. R. Abate and D. J. Durian, effective temperatures and activated dynamics for a two-dimensional air-driven granular system on two approaches to jamming, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 245701 (2008).
 - [6] B. Lander, U. Seifert, and T. Speck, Effective confinement as origin of the equivalence of kinetic temperature and fluctuation-dissipation ratio in a dense shear-driven suspension, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 021103 (2012).
 - [7] M. Zhang and G. Szamel, Effective temperatures of a driven, strongly anisotropic Brownian system, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 061407 (2011).
 - [8] L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and L. Peliti, Energy flow, partial equilibration, and effective temperatures in systems with slow dynamics, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3898 (1997).
 - [9] L. F. Cugliandolo, The effective temperature, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44**, 483001 (2011).
 - [10] D. Zhang, X. Zheng, and M. Di Ventra, Local temperatures out of equilibrium, *Phys. Rep.* **830**, 1 (2019).
 - [11] S. Fielding and P. Sollich, Observable dependence of fluctuation-dissipation relations and effective temperatures, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 050603 (2002).
 - [12] S. Jabbari-Farouji, D. Mizuno, D. Derks, G. H. Wegdam, F. C. MacKintosh, C. F. Schmidt, and D. Bonn, Effective temperatures from the fluctuation-dissipation measurements in soft glassy material, *EPL* **84**, 20006 (2008).
 - [13] E. Ben-Isaac, Y. Park, G. Popescu, F. L. H. Brown, N. S. Gov, and Y. Shokef, Effective temperature of red-blood-cell membrane fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 238103 (2011).
 - [14] K. Hayashi and S. Sasa, Effective temperature in nonequilibrium steady states of Langevin systems with a tilted periodic potential, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 066119 (2004).
 - [15] C. S. O'Hern, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel, Effective temperatures in driven systems: static versus time-dependent relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 165702 (2004).
 - [16] T. K. Haxton and A. J. Liu, Activated dynamics and effective temperature in a steady state sheared glass, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 195701 (2007).
 - [17] N. Xu and C. S. O'Hern, Effective temperature in athermal systems sheared at fixed normal load, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 055701 (2005).
 - [18] S. Joubaud, B. Percier, A. Petrosyan, and S. Ciliberto, Aging and effective temperatures near a critical point, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 130601 (2009).
 - [19] A. Caso, L. Arrachea, and G. S. Lozano, Local and effective temperatures of quantum driven systems, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 041301(R) (2010).
 - [20] L. Joly, S. Merabia, and J.-L. Barrat, Effective temperatures of a heated Brownian particle, *EPL* **94**, 50007 (2011).
 - [21] E. Dieterich, J. Camunas-Soler, M. Ribezzi-Crivellari, U. Seifert, and F. Ritort, Single-molecule measurement of the effective temperature in non-equilibrium steady states, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 971 (2015).
 - [22] J. S. Langer, Effective temperatures in nonequilibrium statistical physics, *Phys. Rev. E* **109**, 064139 (2024).
 - [23] S. Ogawa, Multitemperature theory of granular materials, *Proc. of the US-Japan Seminar on Continuum Mechanical and Statistical Approaches in the Mechanics of Granular Materials*, pp. 208–217 (Gakajutsu Bunken Fukyu-Kai, 1978).
 - [24] C. S. Campbell, Rapid granular flows, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **22**, 57 (1990).
 - [25] I. Goldhirsch, Rapid granular flows, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **35**, 267 (2003).
 - [26] I. Goldhirsch, Introduction to granular temperature, *Powder Technol.* **182**, 130 (2008).
 - [27] I. Ippolito, C. Annic, J. Lemaître, L. Oger, and D. Bideau, Granular temperature: Experimental analysis, *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, 2072 (1995).
 - [28] E. L. Grossman, T. Zhou, and E. Ben-Naim, Towards granular hydrodynamics in two dimensions, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 4200 (1997).
 - [29] W. Losert, D. G. W. Cooper, J. Delour, A. Kudrolli, and J. P. Gollub, Velocity statistics in excited granular media, *Chaos* **9**, 682 (1999).
 - [30] G. W. Baxter and J. S. Olafsen, The temperature of a vibrated granular gas, *Granul. Matter* **9**, 135 (2007).
 - [31] K. Feitosa and N. Menon, Breakdown of energy equipartition in a 2D binary vibrated granular gas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 198301 (2002).
 - [32] K. Suzuki and H. Hayakawa, Divergence of viscosity in jammed granular materials: a theoretical approach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 098001 (2015).
 - [33] Y. Shokef and D. Levine, Energy distribution and effective temperatures in a driven dissipative model, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 051111 (2006).
 - [34] K. To, Boltzmann distribution in a nonequilibrium steady state: Measuring local potential by granular Brownian particles, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 062111 (2014).
 - [35] J. S. Olafsen and J. S. Urbach, Velocity distributions and density fluctuations in a granular gas, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, R2468 (1999).
 - [36] W. Losert, L. Bocquet, T. C. Lubensky, and J. P. Gollub, Particle dynamics in sheared granular matter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1428 (2000).
 - [37] F. Rouyer and N. Menon, Velocity fluctuations in a homogeneous 2D granular gas in steady state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3676 (2000).
 - [38] O. Moriyama, N. Kuroiwa, M. Matsushita, and H. Hayakawa, 4/3 law of granular particles flowing through a vertical pipe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2833 (1998).
 - [39] H.-Q. Wang, G.-J. Jin, and Y.-Q. Ma, Simulation study on kinetic temperatures of vibrated binary granular mixtures, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 031301 (2003).
 - [40] H. A. Makse and J. Kurchan, Testing the thermodynamic approach to granular matter with a numerical model of a decisive experiment, *Nature* **415**, 614 (2002).
 - [41] Y. Cao, X. Zhang, B. Kou, X. Li, X. Xiao, K. Fezzaab, and Y. Wang, A dynamic synchrotron X-ray imaging study of effective temperature in a vibrated granular medium, *Soft Matter* **10**, 5398 (2014).
 - [42] J. M. R. Parrondo and P. Español, Criticism of Feynman's analysis of the ratchet as an engine, *Am. J. Phys.* **64**, 1125 (1996).
 - [43] W. Wu and J. Wang, Nonequilibrium equation of state for open Hamiltonian systems maintained in nonequilibrium steady states, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **126**, 7883 (2022).
 - [44] H. Ness, Nonequilibrium density matrix in quantum open systems: generalization for simultaneous heat and charge steady-state transport, *Phys. Rev. E* **90**, 062119 (2014).

- [45] C. Van den Broeck, E. Kestemont, and M. Malek Mansour, Heat conductivity by a shared piston, *Europhys. Lett.* **56**, 771 (2001).
- [46] Y. Murashita and M. Esposito, Overdamped stochastic thermodynamics with multiple reservoirs, *Phys. Rev. E* **94**, 062148 (2016).
- [47] J. S. Lee and H. Park, Additivity of multiple heat reservoirs in the Langevin equation, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 062135 (2018).
- [48] C. Y. Hsieh, J. Liu, C. Duan, and J. Cao, A nonequilibrium variational polaron theory to study quantum heat transport, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **123**, 17196 (2019).
- [49] S. Sheng and Z. C. Tu, Weighted reciprocal of temperature, weighted thermal flux, and their applications in finite-time thermodynamics, *Phys. Rev. E* **89**, 012129 (2014).
- [50] Z. Rieder, J. L. Lebowitz, and E. Lieb, Properties of a harmonic crystal in a stationary nonequilibrium state, *J. Math. Phys.* **8**, 1073 (1967).
- [51] H. Matsuda and K. Ishii, Localization of normal modes and energy transport in the disordered harmonic chain, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **45**, 56 (1970).
- [52] A. Casher and J. L. Lebowitz, Heat flow in regular and disordered harmonic chains, *J. Math. Phys.* **12**, 1701 (1971).
- [53] H. Spohn and J. L. Lebowitz, Stationary nonequilibrium states of infinite harmonic systems, *Commun. math. Phys.* **54**, 97 (1977).
- [54] C. Kipnis, C. Marchioro, and E. Presutti, Heat flow in an exactly solvable model, *J. Stat. Phys.* **27**, 65 (1982).
- [55] G. Casati, Energy transport and the Fourier heat law in classical systems, *Found. Phys.* **16**, 51 (1986).
- [56] S. Lepri, R. Livi, and A. Politi, Heat conduction in chains of nonlinear oscillators, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1896 (1997).
- [57] A. Dhar and D. Dhar, Absence of local thermal equilibrium in two models of heat conduction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 480 (1999).
- [58] T. Prosen and D. K. Campbell, Momentum conservation implies anomalous energy transport in 1D classical lattices, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2857 (2000).
- [59] B. Li, H. Zhao, and B. Hu, Can disorder induce a finite thermal conductivity in 1D lattices? *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 63 (2001).
- [60] A. Dhar, Heat conduction in a one-dimensional gas of elastically colliding particles of unequal masses, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3554 (2001).
- [61] A. V. Savin, G. P. Tsironis, and A. V. Zolotaryuk, Heat conduction in one dimensional systems with hard-point interparticle interactions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 154301 (2002).
- [62] X. Zhou, H. Chen, and M. Iwamoto, Nonunique steady states in the disordered harmonic chain, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 061202 (2002).
- [63] O. Narayan and S. Ramaswamy, Anomalous heat conduction in one dimensional momentum-conserving systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 200601 (2002).
- [64] B. Li and J. Wang, Anomalous heat conduction and anomalous diffusion in one-dimensional systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 044301 (2003).
- [65] G. Casati, Controlling the heat flow: Now it is possible, *Chaos* **15**, 015120 (2005).
- [66] H. Zhao, Identifying diffusion processes in one-dimensional lattices in thermal equilibrium, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 140602 (2006).
- [67] D. Roy and A. Dhar, Heat transport in ordered harmonic lattices, *J. Stat. Phys.* **131**, 535 (2008).
- [68] J. Ren and B. Li, Emergence and control of heat current from strict zero thermal bias, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 021111 (2010).
- [69] V. Kannan, A. Dhar, and J. L. Lebowitz, Nonequilibrium stationary state of a harmonic crystal with alternating masses, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 041118 (2012).
- [70] Y. Zhong, Y. Zhang, J. Wang, and H. Zhao, Normal heat conduction in one-dimensional momentum conserving lattices with asymmetric interactions, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 060102(R) (2012).
- [71] S. Liu, P. Hänggi, N. Li, J. Ren, and B. Li, Anomalous heat diffusion, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 040601 (2014).
- [72] D. Xiong, D. Saadatmand, and S. V. Dmitriev, Crossover from ballistic to normal heat transport in the ϕ^4 lattice: If nonconservation of momentum is the reason, what is the mechanism? *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 042109 (2017).
- [73] D. S. Sato, Universal scaling for recovery of Fourier's law in low-dimensional solids under momentum conservation, *Phys. Rev. E* **102**, 012111 (2020).
- [74] G. A. Weiderpass, G. M. Monteiro, and A. O. Caldeira, Exact solution for the heat conductance in harmonic chains, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 125401 (2020).
- [75] Z. Wang, W. Fu, Y. Zhang, and H. Zhao, Wave-turbulence origin of the instability of Anderson localization against many-body interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 186401 (2020).
- [76] F. De Vita, G. Dematteis, R. Mazzilli, D. Proment, Y. V. Lvov, and M. Onorato, Anomalous conduction in one-dimensional particle lattices: Wave-turbulence approach, *Phys. Rev. E* **106**, 034110 (2022).
- [77] Y. Sun and L. Wang, Heat transport in an angular-momentum-conserving lattice, *Phys. Rev. E* **109**, 034118 (2024).
- [78] S. Lepri, R. Livi, and A. Politi, Thermal conduction in classical low-dimensional lattices, *Phys. Rep.* **377**, 1 (2003).
- [79] A. Dhar, Heat transport in low-dimensional systems, *Adv. Phys.* **57**, 457 (2008).
- [80] X. Gu, Y. Wei, X. Yin, B. Li, and R. Yang, Colloquium: Phononic thermal properties of two-dimensional materials, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 041002 (2018).
- [81] R. Livi, Anomalous transport in low-dimensional systems: A pedagogical overview, *Physica A* **631**, 127779 (2023).
- [82] C. Gardiner, *Handbook of Stochastic Methods* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997).
- [83] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996).
- [84] C. Jarzynski, D. K. Wójcik, Classical and quantum fluctuation theorems for heat exchange, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 230602 (2004).
- [85] K. Saito and A. Dhar, Fluctuation theorem in quantum heat conduction, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 180601 (2007).
- [86] S. Lahiri, A.M. Jayannavar, Exchange fluctuation theorems for a chain of interacting particles in presence of two heat baths, *Euro. Phys. J. B* **87**, 141 (2014)
- [87] J. F. Chen and H. T. Quan, Hierarchical structure of fluctuation theorems for a driven system in contact with multiple heat reservoirs, *Phys. Rev. E* **107**, 024135 (2023).

- [88] S. F. Edwards and R. B. S. Oakeshott, Theory of powders, *Physica A* **157**, 1080 (1989).
- [89] A. Mehta and S. F. Edwards, Statistical mechanics of powder mixtures, *Physica A* **157**, 1091 (1989).
- [90] A. Baule, F. Morone, H. J. Herrmann, and H. A. Makse, Edwards statistical mechanics for jammed granular matter, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015006 (2018).
- [91] Ye Yuan, Yi Xing, Jie Zheng, Zhifeng Li, Houfei Yuan, Shuyang Zhang, Zhikun Zeng, Chengjie Xia, Hua Tong, Walter Kob, Jie Zhang, and Yujie Wang, Experimental test of the Edwards volume ensemble for tapped granular packings, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 018002 (2021).
- [92] Zhikun Zeng, Shuyang Zhang, Xu Zheng, Chengjie Xia, Walter Kob, Ye Yuan, and Yujie Wang, Equivalence of fluctuation-dissipation and Edwards' temperature in cyclically sheared granular systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 228004 (2022).
- [93] A. Caldeira and A. Leggett, Quantum tunnelling in a dissipative system, *Ann. Phys.* **149**, 374 (1983).
- [94] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative Systems*, 5th ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 2021).
- [95] A. O. Caldeira, *An Introduction to Macroscopic Quantum Phenomena and Quantum Dissipation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014).
- [96] Y.-A. Yan and J. Shao, Stochastic description of quantum Brownian dynamics, *Front. Phys.* **11**, 110309 (2016).
- [97] A. Dhar and B. Sriram Shastry, Quantum transport using the Ford-Kac-Mazur formalism, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 195405 (2003).
- [98] A. Asadian, D. Manzano, M. Tiersch, and H. J. Briegel, Heat transport through lattices of quantum harmonic oscillators in arbitrary dimensions, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 012109 (2013).
- [99] J.-T. Hsiang and B. L. Hu, Nonequilibrium steady state in open quantum systems: Influence action, stochastic equation and power balance, *Ann. Phys.* **362**, 139 (2015).
- [100] A. F. Neto, H. C. F. Lemos, and E. Pereira, Heat conduction in quantum harmonic chains with alternate masses and self-consistent thermal reservoirs, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 031116 (2007).
- [101] G. A. Weiderpass, Gustavo M. Monteiro, and A. O. Caldeira, Exact solution for the heat conductance in harmonic chains, *Phys. Rev. B* **102**, 125401 (2020).
- [102] Eric A. Carlen, David a. Huse, Joel L. Lebowitz, Stationary states of boundary driven quantum systems: some exact results, arXiv:2408.06887 [quant-ph] (2024).
- [103] U. Zürcher and P. Talkner, Quantum-mechanical harmonic chain attached to heat baths. II. Nonequilibrium properties, *Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 3278 (1990).
- [104] A. Dhar, K. Saito, and P. Hänggi, Nonequilibrium density-matrix description of steady-state quantum transport, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 011126 (2012).
- [105] M. J. de Oliveira, Heat transport along a chain of coupled quantum harmonic oscillators, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 042113 (2017).
- [106] G. T. Landi, D. Poletti, and G. Schaller, Nonequilibrium boundary-driven quantum systems: Models, methods, and properties, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 045006 (2022).