



Entropy as Noether charge for quasistatic gradient flow

Aaron Beyen ¹ and Christian Maes ¹

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, KU Leuven*

(Dated: June 28, 2024)

Entropy increase is fundamentally related to the breaking of time reversal symmetry. By adding the ‘extra dimension’ associated with thermodynamic forces, we extend that discrete symmetry to a continuous symmetry for the dynamical fluctuations around (nonlinear) gradient flow. The latter connects macroscopic equilibrium conditions upon introducing a quasistatic protocol of control parameters. The entropy state function becomes the Noether charge. As a result, and following ideas expressed by Shin-ichi Sasa and co-workers, the adiabatic invariance of the entropy, part of the Clausius heat theorem, gets connected with the Noether theorem.

I. Introduction

Traditionally, within the context of macroscopic physics, gradient flow describes the relaxation to equilibrium. It appears in a wide variety of contexts, ranging from kinetic theory and hydrodynamics, over Landau theory to machine learning. Generally speaking, gradient flow is a dynamics of steepest descent where a cost function (*e.g.* in the form of a thermodynamic potential) is decreased in updating a physical condition represented as a point on a differential manifold. *Quasistatic* gradient flow connects a sequence of equilibrium conditions by slow variation of external parameters (*e.g.* pressure or temperature) in the cost function. Associated with such a reversible evolution appears a state function, the entropy or, more generally, a free energy.

In particular, the change of entropy is null for a quasistatic adiabatic transformation, [1]. That statement is part of the Clausius heat theorem, [2]

Reflections on heat and entropy started with the work of Ludwig Boltzmann and Rudolf Clausius, motivated by the First Law and, to a large extent, by the bicentennial work of Sadi Carnot, [3–8]. An important ingredient is the (generalized) Helmholtz theorem, [2]. For more recent work shedding light on derivations of the (first part of the) Clausius heat theorem, we include the references [8–16]. Connecting that heat theorem to the Noether theorem first appeared in the context of black hole thermodynamics by Wald *et al.*, see [17–19]. In the present paper, we follow the footsteps of the publications [20–23] to understand this ‘conservation of entropy’ from Noether’s theorem, [24].

Note that we do not start here from microscopic considerations. In fact, our point of departure is the structure of dynamical large deviations around macroscopic evolutions of gradient type. There, following detailed balance, change of entropy appears as the source term of time reversal breaking in the “Lagrangian.” Our focus is on establishing a *continuous symmetry* for the quasistatic action and to have the entropy to appear as Noether charge.

New in our approach is to give a unifying structure for the above scenario within the context of (nonlinear) gradient flows, [25–29], which automatically includes aspects of *thermodynamic consistency*, [20]. In addition, it extends the analysis to the macroscopic dynamics of Markov jump models, which did not appear earlier for that relation between entropy and Noether charge. We add several examples to illustrate the main ideas, *e.g.*, with the well-known Curie-Weiss dynamics.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we review elements of (nonlinear) gradient flow dynamics and we discuss some simple examples. Section II A contains the simplest examples.

The full strategy and result of the paper are introduced with the Onsager example in Section III. The heart of the matter is the large deviation structure, which is recalled in Section IV. It exposes the canonical structure of the large deviation action for gradient flow, [27, 28]. Examples are provided in Section IV D.

Section V generalizes that discussion to gradient flow subject to quasistatic protocols in which control parameters are slowly changing in time. The corresponding zero-cost flow is a small perturbation of the instantaneous equilibrium solution.

Finally, Section VI deals with the continuous symmetry of the quasistatic large deviation action for which entropy is the Noether charge.

The Appendix A illustrates the procedure for the Curie-Weiss relaxational model, and Appendix B adds the structure for a generalized urn model.

II. Gradient flow

Gradient flow refers to a certain structure in the dynamics of relaxation to equilibrium, [25–28]. It is a dynamics of steepest descent where a cost function (or, free energy) is extremized. Gradient flow systems are numerous in physics, ranging from the Master equation for Markov jump processes to the spatially-homogeneous Boltzmann equation on the space of probability measures, [30]. We start with a couple of simple examples; see [31] for more.

A. Examples

1. Curie-Weiss dynamics

One realization of a Curie-Weiss relaxational dynamics of the magnetization $m_t \in [-1, 1]$ is given by

$$\dot{m}_t = 2\nu\sqrt{1 - m_t^2} \sinh(-\beta\mathcal{F}'(m_t)), \quad \beta\mathcal{F}(m) = -\beta\phi(m) - s(m) \quad (1)$$

for some rate $\nu > 0$, inverse temperature β , energy $-\phi(m)$, and mixing entropy

$$s(m) = -\left[\frac{1+m}{2} \log\left(\frac{1+m}{2}\right) + \frac{1-m}{2} \log\left(\frac{1-m}{2}\right)\right] \quad (2)$$

The prefactor $\chi(m) = 2\sqrt{1 - m^2} \geq 0$ decides the rate at which the Landau free energy function \mathcal{F} is decreasing in time:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt}(m_t) = \mathcal{F}'(m_t)\dot{m}_t = \nu \mathcal{F}'(m_t)\chi(m_t) \sinh(-\beta\mathcal{F}'(m_t)) \leq 0$$

For further reference, the evolution equation (1) has the form of a nonlinear gradient flow,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{m} &= \partial_f \psi^*(S'(m)/2; m) \quad \text{for} \\ \psi^*(f, m) &= \nu\sqrt{1 - m^2} (\cosh(2f) - 1) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with steepest ascent for the (macroscopic) state function $S(m) = -\beta\mathcal{F}(m)$.

That example stands for a larger class of mean-field systems; see *e.g.*, [32, 33]. We come back to it in Example IVD 1 and in Appendix A.

2. Type-B dynamics

A standard example of (linear) gradient flow for a scalar density $\rho(r, t)$, $r \in \Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, with fixed boundary conditions $\rho(r, t) = \bar{\rho}$, $r \in \partial\Lambda$, is given by

$$\dot{\rho}(r, t) = \nabla \cdot \left(\chi(\rho(r, t)) \nabla \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}[\rho]}{\delta\rho(r)} \right) \right) \quad (4)$$

in which the gradient structure is explicit.

Equation (4) is a continuity equation of the form

$$\dot{\rho} = -\nabla \cdot j_\rho \quad (5)$$

We say that this example is “linear” because the current is proportional to the thermodynamic force F ,

$$j_\rho(r) = \chi(\rho(r)) F(r), \quad F(r) = -\nabla \mu(r), \quad \mu(r) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}[\rho]}{\delta \rho(r)} \quad (6)$$

for local chemical potential μ which is the variational derivative of the free energy functional $\mathcal{F}[\rho]$.

That example includes the (even more linear) Smoluchowski equation when considering independent particles with position x subject to the overdamped dynamics

$$\dot{x}_t = -\gamma \nabla U(x_t) + \sqrt{2\gamma T} \xi_t$$

with confining potential U on \mathbb{R}^3 and for standard white noise ξ_t . Their density ρ (in the limit of N identical independent copies) satisfies the Smoluchowski equation

$$\dot{\rho} = -\nabla \cdot j_\rho, \quad j_\rho = -\gamma \nabla U \rho - \gamma T \nabla \rho \quad (7)$$

for $\chi(\rho(r)) = \gamma \rho(r)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\rho) = \int \rho(r) U(r) + T \int \rho(r) \log \rho(r)$ on some fixed connected volume.

B. General Setup

The notion of thermal equilibrium requires a physical coarse-graining in terms of a (set of physically well-chosen) macroscopic variable(s). We denote them by z (magnetization m in Example II A 1, matter densities ρ in II A 2, *etc.*) and represent them as points on a smooth manifold which we do not need to make explicit. We assume that z has even parity under time reversal.

To describe a generalized gradient flow, we start from a convex functional $f \mapsto \psi^*(f; z)$ where f stands for a thermodynamic force (cotangent vector), [27, 28, 34, 35]. Its (Fréchet) derivative with respect to f is denoted as $\partial_f \psi^*$ and will give a current.

Finally, we need a state function $S_\lambda(z)$ depending on a set of control parameters λ . Here, S_λ might be an entropy, minus a free energy or some other thermodynamic potential depending on the context, *etc.* We write dS_λ for the (possibly functional) derivative of S_λ with respect to z .

In these terms, the corresponding gradient flow for z is

$$\dot{z} = D j_z, \quad j_z = \partial_f \psi^*(D^\dagger dS_\lambda/2; z) \quad (8)$$

The operator D can be minus the divergence (for a density), the identity operator (for a non-conserved variable), or a stoichiometry matrix (for chemical reactive systems). The adjoint

D^\dagger is defined by the relation $a \cdot Db = b \cdot D^\dagger a$. In Example II A 1, the operators $D = D^\dagger$ are the identity, and the states z are the values of the magnetization $m \in [-1, +1]$ with $\psi^*(f, m) = \nu\sqrt{1-m^2}(\cosh(2f) - 1)$ in (3). The evolution (8) is an autonomous equation, but (later) it will become time-dependent when the control parameters $\lambda = \lambda_t$ become time-dependent.

The functional ψ^* should satisfy the following conditions to yield a meaningful gradient flow, [27, 28],

- $\min_f \psi^*(f; z) = \psi^*(0; z) = 0$
- $\psi^*(f; z)$ is differentiable and *strictly* convex in its first argument, *i.e.*,

$$\psi^*(tf + (1-t)g; z) < t\psi^*(f) + (1-t)\psi^*(g) \quad \forall f, g, \quad t \in (0, 1)$$

- ψ^* is symmetric in f , *i.e.* $\psi^*(-f; z) = \psi^*(f; z)$

It then follows that

$$\psi^*(f; z) \geq \psi^*(0; z) = 0 \quad \forall f, \quad \text{and} \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_f \psi^*(f; z) = 0 \iff f = 0 \quad (10)$$

i.e., $f = 0$ is the *unique* minimizer of $\psi^*(f; z)$. Moreover, as a consequence of (9), under the dynamics (8),

$$\dot{S} = dS \cdot \dot{z} = 2 D^\dagger dS/2 \cdot \partial_f \psi^*(D^\dagger dS/2; z) \geq 0, \quad (11)$$

which implies the monotonicity of $S(z)$ in time where the unique equilibrium state is obtained by maximizing S .

The linear version of (8) is

$$\dot{z} = M dS, \quad M = D X D^\dagger \quad (12)$$

where the essential simplification comes from the choice $\psi^*(f; z) = f \cdot X f$ such that $\partial_f \psi^*(f; z) = 2X f$ for a symmetric positive semi-definite operator X , called the mobility operator $X = X^T$. The descent is then measured in a metric provided by X . The evolution of the variable z in (12) can be summarized as

$$\dot{z} = D j_z, \quad j_z = X D^\dagger dS \quad (13)$$

In Example II A 2, the evolution equation (4) reproduces (12) with $M = -\nabla \cdot \chi \nabla$ and density-dependent mobility χ (being a 3×3 symmetric non-negative matrix). By comparing with (12)–(13), the operator $D = -\nabla \cdot$ is (minus) the divergence with respect to r so that $D^\dagger = \nabla$ is the gradient. The state function $S = -\mathcal{F}$ with \mathcal{F} the free energy functional. The current (6) has the form (13) with $X \rightarrow \chi$, $dS \rightarrow \delta_\rho \mathcal{F}$ and $\psi^*(f; z) = f \cdot \chi f$.

The monotonicity of S follows from

$$\dot{S} = dS \cdot \dot{z} = dS \cdot M dS \geq 0 \quad (14)$$

because M is positive semi-definite since X is.

This paper focuses on the nonlinear setup (8) since it is a great extension, *e.g.*, to include the context of Markov jump processes where the relation between force and current is indeed nonlinear (as in Example II A 1).

III. Onsager example

The original references for the above-sketched framework are [26–28]. A less trodden path is to consider gradient flow for quasistatic transformations between equilibrium conditions, to which we come in Section V. We already wish to introduce the main steps within the simplest possible Onsager and Onsager-Machlup setups, [34–36].

We have one macroscopic variable $z_t \in \mathbb{R}$ that is subject to a fluctuating relaxational dynamics for times $t \in [t_1, t_2]$,

$$\dot{z}_t = \gamma \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz} + \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma}{N}} \xi_t, \quad (15)$$

for “entropy” $S_\lambda(z)$ and Onsager coefficient $\gamma > 0$, and ξ_t is standard white noise. The fact that we call S_λ an entropy may refer to the case where z_t denotes a time-dependent volume with thermally isolated walls subject to a certain imposed pressure λ . That is then basically the example of [22]. Other scenarios are possible where S_λ would for instance stand for minus a free energy instead.

The initial value z_{t_1} gets sampled from the equilibrium distribution $\propto e^{S(z)}$. Moreover, since ξ_t has Gaussian statistics with unit variance, the probability of a trajectory $((z_t, \dot{z}_t), t \in [t_1, t_2])$ is

proportional to $e^{-N\mathcal{A}}$ with path-space action \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathcal{A} = -S(z_{t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt L(\dot{z}_t; z_t) \quad (16)$$

and ‘‘Lagrangian,’’

$$L(\dot{z}; z) = \frac{1}{4\gamma} \left(\dot{z} - \gamma \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}(z) \right)^2 \geq 0 \quad (17)$$

The Legendre transform of $L(z, \dot{z})$ is the ‘‘Hamiltonian,’’

$$H(f; z) = \gamma f^2 + \gamma f \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz} = \gamma f \left(f + \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz} \right)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} L(-\dot{z}; z) - L(\dot{z}; z) &= \frac{dS}{dz} \dot{z} = \frac{dS}{dt} \\ H(f; z) &= H\left(-f - \frac{dS}{dz}; z\right) \end{aligned}$$

which are expressions of *detailed balance*, [31].

Defining

$$\psi^*(f; z) := H\left(f - \frac{1}{2} \frac{dS}{dz}; z\right) + L(0; z) = \gamma f^2$$

we get $\partial_f \psi^*\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}; z\right) = \gamma \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}$ which reproduces the macroscopic equation (15) ($N \uparrow \infty$) via (8) with $D = \text{identity operator}$.

The Euler-Lagrange equation for (17) expresses the stationarity of the action,

$$\ddot{z}_t = \gamma^2 \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}(z_t) \frac{d^2 S_\lambda}{dz^2}(z_t) \quad (18)$$

with corresponding Hamilton’s equations of motion,

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial f} = \dot{z}_t = 2\gamma f_t + \gamma \frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}(z_t) \quad (19)$$

$$-\frac{\partial H}{\partial z} = \dot{f}_t = \gamma f_t \frac{d^2 S_\lambda}{dz^2}(z_t) \quad (20)$$

When minimizing the Lagrangian (17) at fixed z , we get the equation (15), and then also (18)–(19)–(20) are verified (for $f_t \equiv 0$), but not *vice versa*. The solution of $L(\dot{z}_t, z_t) = 0$ represents the zero-cost flow and dominates the trajectory probability $\propto e^{-N\mathcal{A}}$ in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

In macroscopic equilibrium (equation (15) for $N \uparrow \infty$), the state is the maximum z_λ^* of S_λ , $\frac{dS_\lambda}{dz}(z_\lambda^*) = 0$, with $z_t = z_\lambda^*$ and $\dot{z}_t^* = 0, f_t^* = 0$ in (19)–(20).

Next, we introduce a quasistatic time-dependence in the control parameter $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda(\varepsilon t) = \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t)$ for a small rate $\varepsilon > 0$. For simplicity of illustration, we put $t_1 = 0, t_2 = \tau/\varepsilon$, and we choose as ‘entropy’ function

$$S_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z) = -\frac{1}{2}(z - \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t))^2 \quad (21)$$

where the instantaneous equilibria follow

$$z_t^* = \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t)$$

Yet, we really need to solve the macroscopic equation

$$\dot{z}_t^{(\varepsilon)} = \gamma \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz}(z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) = -\gamma(z_t^{(\varepsilon)} - \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t)), \quad t \in [0, \tau/\varepsilon] \quad (22)$$

which we start from equilibrium $z^{(\varepsilon)}(0) = \lambda$, after which the solution of (22) slowly deviates from it. That solution is given by

$$z_t^{(\varepsilon)} = \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t) + \varepsilon \frac{\lambda}{\gamma} \sin(\varepsilon t) + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \dot{z}_t^{(\varepsilon)} = -\lambda \varepsilon \sin(\varepsilon t) + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

and it solves

$$L_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z, \dot{z}) = \frac{1}{4\gamma} [\dot{z} + \gamma(z - \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t))]^2 = 0$$

which expresses the quasistatic motion (22) as the zero-cost flow for the Lagrangian $L_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z, \dot{z})$ of the path-space action as introduced in (16)–(17).

Similarly, the ‘quasistatic Hamiltonian’ equals $H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f, z) = \gamma f^2 - \gamma f(z - \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t))$, and (22) combined with $f_t^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$ express the zero-cost flow in the corresponding Hamilton equations (19).

From substituting the zero-cost flow in (21), it immediately follows that

$$S_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) = -\varepsilon^2 \frac{\lambda^2}{2\gamma} \sin^2(\varepsilon t) + O(\varepsilon^3)$$

Therefore, trivially here, the entropy $S_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ is conserved, $S_t = S_{t_1} = 0 \quad \forall t \in [t_1, t_2]$, for the zero-cost flow in the quasistatic limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ where we start from equilibrium. There is no surprise here, but based on this observation, the question arises whether this ‘conservation of entropy’ can be derived from Noether’s theorem as well, and the answer is yes. We continue by indicating the argument for the same example:

In the Hamiltonian formalism, we consider a transformation

$$f_t \rightarrow f_t + \eta q^{(\varepsilon)}(z_t, t) \quad (23)$$

of the applied thermodynamic force at time t , depending on z_t . We want to see the change in the action to linear order in η to understand what function q leads to the entropy as Noether charge:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{A} &= \int_0^{\tau/\varepsilon} dt \left(\eta \dot{z} q^{(\varepsilon)} - \delta H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f; z) \right) \\ \delta H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f; z) &= H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f + \eta q^{(\varepsilon)}, z) - H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f, z) = \eta \gamma q^{(\varepsilon)}(2f - z + \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Substituting for (f, z) the zero-cost flow $z_t^{(\varepsilon)} = \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t) + \varepsilon \lambda / \gamma \sin(\varepsilon t) + O(\varepsilon^2)$, $f_t^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$, we get

$$\delta H_t^{(\varepsilon)} = -\eta \varepsilon \lambda \sin(\varepsilon t) q^{(\varepsilon)}(\lambda \cos(\varepsilon t), t) + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad t \in [0, \tau/\varepsilon]$$

The choice

$$q^{(\varepsilon)}(z, t) = -(z - \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t)) = \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz}(z, t)$$

makes $\delta H_t^{(\varepsilon)} = O(\varepsilon^2)$ for all $t \in [0, \tau/\varepsilon]$ which implies that the Hamiltonian and its time-integral over $[0, \tau/\varepsilon]$ in (24) are invariant in the quasistatic limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, the change in the action is given by a total derivative in the quasistatic limit

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_0^{\tau/\varepsilon} dt \left[\frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} + O(\varepsilon^2) \right] = \eta \left(S_{\lambda_f} - S_{\lambda_i} + O(\varepsilon) \right) \quad (25)$$

In other words, the change in the action under the continuous symmetry $f \rightarrow f + \eta \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz}$ gives the change in entropy. As we show more generally in Section VI, that implies that the entropy corresponds to the Noether charge of a shift in f by $\eta dS/dz$ when the variables are following the quasistatic zero-cost flow (22).

A similar procedure works in the Lagrangian formalism. We rewrite the Lagrangian (17) as

$$L_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z, \dot{z}) = \frac{\dot{z}^2}{4\gamma} - \frac{\dot{z}}{2} \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz}(z) - \frac{\gamma}{2} S_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z)$$

using the entropy $S_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ in (21). The relevant symmetry becomes a shift in the current $j = \dot{z}$, *i.e.*, $\dot{z}_t \rightarrow \dot{z}_t + \eta \delta \dot{z}_t$, without changing the macroscopic variable z , *i.e.* $\delta z_t = 0$. As such, the transformations of the generalized ‘velocities’ are not determined by those of the coordinates z and of the time t . This kind of transformation is typically not considered for Noether’s theorem, as it does not lead to a symmetry of the action. However, it has appeared in [37, 38] in describing

Noether's theorem for classical mechanical systems subject to non-conservative forces. Applying this idea to our setup, one finds to linear order in η

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\mathcal{A} &= \int_0^{\tau/\varepsilon} dt \delta L_t^{(\varepsilon)} \\ \delta L_t^{(\varepsilon)} &= L_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z, \dot{z} + \eta\delta\dot{z}) - L_t^{(\varepsilon)}(z, \dot{z}) = \eta \frac{\partial L_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{\partial \dot{z}} \delta\dot{z} \\ &= \frac{\eta}{2} \left(\frac{\dot{z}}{\gamma} - \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz} \right) \delta\dot{z}\end{aligned}$$

Upon choosing $\delta\dot{z} = -2\dot{z}$, this reduces to

$$\delta L_t^{(\varepsilon)} = \eta \left(\frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz} \dot{z} - \frac{\dot{z}^2}{\gamma} \right) = \eta \left(\frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dt} - \frac{\dot{z}^2}{\gamma} \right)$$

Substituting for (z, \dot{z}) the zero-cost flow $z_t^{(\varepsilon)} = \lambda \cos(\varepsilon t) + \varepsilon\lambda/\gamma \sin(\varepsilon t) + O(\varepsilon^2)$, $f_t^{(\varepsilon)} = 0$, we get

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_0^{\tau/\varepsilon} dt \left[\frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dt} + O(\varepsilon^2) \right] = \eta (S_{\lambda_f} - S_{\lambda_i} + O(\varepsilon))$$

which is the same result as the Hamiltonian case (25). Therefore, the entropy corresponds to the Noether charge of a shift in j by $\delta j = -2\eta \dot{z}$ when the variables are following the quasistatic zero-cost flow (22).

The f and j shifts, as used respectively for the Hamiltonian and the Lagrangian, are related because

$$f = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{z}} = \frac{\dot{z}}{2\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz} \implies \delta f = \frac{\delta\dot{z}}{2\gamma} = -\frac{\dot{z}}{\gamma} = \frac{dS_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{dz}$$

where we have used the macroscopic equation (22) in the last line.

IV. Path-space action

The structure of gradient flow (Section II) is intimately related to a structure in dynamical fluctuations, [27, 28]. Dynamical large deviations give the probabilities of trajectories for particle systems, [39]. More specifically, we have in mind a macroscopic system with a large parameter N such as its number of components or the size of the system in terms of a typical intercomponent distance. We connect with the gradient flow in Section II by considering all possible evolutions in a time-interval $[t_1, t_2]$ involving the macroscopic variable z and corresponding current variable j , which satisfy $\dot{z} = Dj$.

We start in equilibrium which implies that the initial probability is given by the entropy $S(z_{t_1})$.

The Lagrangian $L(j; z)$ of the system governs the path probabilities via

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\{z_t, j(t)\}_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} = \{\gamma(t)\}_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2}\right] \propto e^{-N\mathcal{A}(\gamma)}, \quad \mathcal{A}(\gamma) = -S(z_{t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt L(j(t); z_t) \quad (26)$$

in leading order for $N \uparrow \infty$. The functional $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)$ is often called the *action* but should be distinguished from the action in classical mechanics. As $N \uparrow \infty$, all paths γ are suppressed compared to those where $\mathcal{A}(\gamma) = 0$. Hence, putting $L(j; z) = 0$ should give a current to produce the macroscopic equation of motion with j_z given in (8). Since the Lagrangian L is convex, obtaining the ‘equations of motion’ of the system from $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)$ can be interpreted as an action minimization problem, which is similar to the least action principle in Lagrangian mechanics. Lastly, note that the Lagrangian depends on (j, z) and does not contain \dot{z} directly.

A. Lagrangian and Hamiltonian

The Lagrangian in (26) we are interested in is supposed to govern the dynamical large deviations with zero-cost flow given by (8) and that requires a minimum of properties; see also [27, 28]:

- $L(j; z) \geq 0$
- $L(j; z)$ is *strictly* convex in its first argument, *i.e.*,

$$L(cj + (1-c)j'; z) < cL(j; z) + (1-c)L(j'; z), \quad \forall j, j', \quad c \in (0, 1) \quad (27)$$

- L induces an evolution equation for z by requiring zero-cost :

$$L(j_z; z) = 0 \iff \dot{z} = Dj_z, \quad (28)$$

and we refer to calculations as “on shell” when j and \dot{z} are related in that way

Therefore, for every z , the Lagrangian has a unique minimum $L(j; z) = 0$ at $j = j_z$, inducing the gradient flow $\dot{z} = Dj_z$. This (first-order) evolution is a distinguished subclass of the more general Lagrangian flow, described by the (second-order) Euler-Lagrange equation

$$\partial_z L(z_t, j_z(t)) - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\partial_j L(z_t, j_z(t)) \right) = 0 \quad (29)$$

To see this, note that $L(z, j_z) = 0$, $\forall z$, (L is identically zero on shell), implies that

$$0 = \frac{d}{dz} \left(L(z, j_z) \right) = \partial_z L(z, j_z) + \partial_j L(z, j_z) \partial_z j_z \quad (30)$$

Since the Lagrangian is minimal at $j = j_z$, one has $\partial_j L(z, j_z) = 0$ such that (30) gives $\partial_z L(z, j_z) = 0$ on shell. As both terms are zero, it immediately follows that also the Euler-Lagrange equation (29) is satisfied. Hence, a solution of the gradient flow $\dot{z} = Dj_z$ solves the Euler-Lagrange equation as well.

The Lagrangian L is related to the Hamiltonian H through the usual Legendre transform,

$$H(f; z) = \sup_j \{j \cdot f - L(j; z)\}, \quad L(j; z) = \sup_f \{j \cdot f - H(f; z)\} \quad (31)$$

where f , the variable dual to the current j , represents a thermodynamic force.

The properties (27)–(28) of the Lagrangian translate into

- $L = 0$ at its minimum $\implies H(0; z) = \sup_j \{-L(j; z)\} = -\inf_j \{L(j; z)\} = 0$ (32)

- $H(f; z)$ is *strictly* convex in its first argument (33)

- $L(j_z; z) = 0 \implies \sup_f \{j_z \cdot f - H(f; z)\} = 0$ (34)

The last property can be further simplified by noting from (33) that $j_z \cdot f - H(f; z)$ is strictly concave in f and thus has at most one maximum. Since $j_z \cdot 0 - H(0; z) = 0$ due to (32), the supremum (34) is reached at $f = 0$ only. Remembering that j_z also satisfies $j = \partial_f H(f; z)$, it follows that the zero-cost flow becomes

$$\dot{z} = Dj_z \iff L(j_z; z) = 0 \iff j_z = \partial_f H(f; z) \text{ and } f = 0 \quad (35)$$

The equation $j_z = \partial_f H(f; z)$ is the analogue of the first Hamilton equation; the condition $f = 0$ is a subclass of the second Hamilton equation

$$\dot{f} = -\partial_z H(f; z)$$

since $\partial_z H(0; z) = 0$ as follows from (32). Summarizing, similar to how $L(j_z; z) = 0$ satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equations, the relations $j_z = \partial_f H(f; z)$ and $f = 0$ solve Hamilton's equations.

B. Detailed balance

Detailed balance plays an essential role in the Clausius heat theorem, which when combined with quasistatic changes, defines a *reversible* evolution. When z is invariant under kinematic time reversal, which we assume, detailed balance ensures that the probability of any trajectory is equal

to that of its time reversal:

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left[L(-j(t); z_t) - L(j(t); z_t) \right] = S(z_{t_2}) - S(z_{t_1}) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{dS}{dt}(z_t)$$

Since this is true for all times t_1, t_2 , detailed balance implies that

$$L(-j(t); z_t) - L(j(t); z_t) = \frac{dS}{dt}(z_t) = j(t) \cdot D^\dagger dS(z_t) \quad (36)$$

indicating that the Lagrangian only changes by a temporal boundary term under time reversal.

Taking the limit $j \rightarrow 0$, this relation indicates that the tangent to L at $j = 0$ is given by $-2D^\dagger dS$.

Similarly, in the Hamiltonian formalism, using (31), the detailed balance condition becomes

$$H(f; z) = H(-f - D^\dagger dS; z) \quad (37)$$

i.e., that the Hamiltonian is symmetric in f around the point $-D^\dagger dS/2$, as indicated in Fig. 1.

Moreover, it indicates that the discrete time reversal symmetry can be understood as a shift $f \rightarrow f - (2f + D^\dagger dS)$ in the thermodynamic force. That observation plays center stage in our application of (the Hamiltonian version of) Noether's theorem in Section V and has already appeared in Example III.




FIG. 1: Visualisation of the detailed balance condition (37) for the Onsager example III with $z = -8$. Note the symmetry around the dashed line $f = -D^\dagger dS/2$.

C. Canonical structure

As shown in [27, 28, 31], the path-space action generates the gradient descent dynamics (8) under the detailed balance condition (36) combined with the properties of the Lagrangian (28). We

briefly recall the argument.

It is the frenetic part in the path-space action (*i.e.*, the time-symmetric part, [40]) that determines the structure (8). To start, we write

$$\frac{L(j; z) + L(-j; z)}{2} = \psi(j; z) + \psi^*(D^\dagger dS/2; z) \quad (38)$$

where

$$\psi^*(f; z) = \sup_j [j \cdot f - \psi(j; z)] \quad (39)$$

is the Legendre transform of

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(j; z) &= \frac{1}{2} [L(-j; z) + L(j; z)] - L(0; z) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} j \cdot D^\dagger dS(z) + L(j; z) - L(0; z) \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

The second equality follows from detailed balance (36) and implies that $\psi(j; z)$ is convex in j . From the first line, we see that ψ is symmetric in $\pm j$ and vanishes at $j = 0$. It is therefore also positive, $\psi(j; z) \geq 0$. From the second line,

$$L(j; z) = -\frac{1}{2} j \cdot D^\dagger dS(z) + \psi(j; z) + \psi^*(D^\dagger dS/2; z) \quad (41)$$

which is (38).

Next, we show that ψ^* in (39) is the same function as appears in (8). By replacing ψ in (41) via (40) we find for (39) the convex

$$\psi^*(f; z) = H(f - D^\dagger dS/2; z) + L(0; z) \quad (42)$$

which is symmetric in $\pm f$, positive and vanishes only at $f = 0$. Following the Hamilton equation in (35), the zero-cost flow must satisfy

$$j_z = \partial_f H(f; z) = \partial_f \psi^*(f + D^\dagger dS/2; z) \quad \text{at } f = 0 \quad (43)$$

We conclude from (43) that the typical path $\dot{z} = Dj_z$ has indeed the generalized gradient flow structure (8).

D. Examples [continued]

1. Curie-Weiss dynamics II

We continue with Example II A 1. As derived in Appendix A, the Hamiltonian and Lagrangian are

$$H(f; m) = \sinh(2f) \left[(a(m) + mb(m)) \tanh(f) - (b(m) + ma(m)) \right]$$

$$L(j; m) = \frac{1}{2} \left[-\sqrt{j^2 + 4(1-m^2)(a^2 - b^2)} + j \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{j^2 + 4(1-m^2)(a^2 - b^2)} + j}{2(1-m)(a-b)} \right) + 2(a + bm) \right]$$

where we have introduced $a(m) := \nu \cosh(\beta\phi'(m))$ and $b(m) := -\nu \sinh(\beta\phi'(m))$. Moreover, the functions ψ, ψ^* are given by

$$\psi(f; z) = \quad \psi^*(f, m) = \nu \sqrt{1 - m^2} (\cosh(2f) - 1)$$

2. Type-B dynamics II

For the Example II A 2, we get a quadratic Lagrangian, as encountered in macroscopic fluctuation theory, more generally as diffusion limit of interacting particle systems,

$$L(j; \rho) = j \cdot \frac{\chi^{-1}}{4} j - \frac{dS}{2} \cdot \nabla \chi \nabla \frac{dS}{2} - \frac{1}{2} j \cdot \nabla dS \quad (44)$$

where χ^{-1} should be understood as a pseudo-inverse. The associated Hamiltonian is

$$H(f; \rho) = f \cdot \chi(f + \nabla dS) \quad (45)$$

It is straightforward to check that L and H verify all the properties discussed above, with functions

$$\psi(j; \rho) = j \cdot \frac{\chi^{-1}}{4} j \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^*(f; \rho) = f \cdot \chi f \quad (46)$$

V. Quasistatic analysis

We introduce an external protocol $\lambda_t^\varepsilon = \lambda_{\varepsilon t}$ for $t \in [t_1 = \frac{\tau_1}{\varepsilon}, t_2 = \frac{\tau_2}{\varepsilon}]$, which traces out a path in parameter space from an initial $\lambda_i = \lambda_{\tau_1}$ to the final $\lambda_f = \lambda_{\tau_2}$. The rate $\varepsilon > 0$ will go to zero in the quasistatic limit. More specifically, the entropy $S \rightarrow S_t^{(\varepsilon)} = S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}$ becomes time-dependent and, as a consequence, the Lagrangian and the Hamiltonian become time-dependent as well, to govern

the large deviation structure around the equation of motion,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_t &= Dj_{z_t, \lambda(\varepsilon t)} = D\partial_f \psi^* \left(D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}/2; z_t \right) \\ &\iff L_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(j_{z_t, \lambda(\varepsilon t)}, z_t) = 0 \iff j_{z_t, \lambda(\varepsilon t)} = \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f; z) \text{ and } f_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

We denote the solution to this equation as $z_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ with fixed initial condition $z_{t=t_1}^{(\varepsilon)} = z_{\lambda(\tau_1)}^*$ corresponding to equilibrium at control value $\lambda_{\tau_1} = \lambda_i$ at time $t_1 = \tau_1/\varepsilon$. We assume that everything is smooth in ε to expand the solution $z_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ of (47) around $\varepsilon = 0$,

$$z_t^{(\varepsilon)} = z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta z_t + O(\varepsilon^2) \quad (48)$$

which will be needed to evaluate the action on shell. The idea is to apply Noether's theorem for the path-space action for quasistatic gradient flow dynamics (47) and show that the entropy is a Noether charge in both the Lagrangian and Hamiltonian formalism.

The leading-order term $z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*$ corresponds to the reversible trajectory for control parameters $\lambda(\varepsilon t)$, *i.e.*, it is the instantaneous equilibrium condition:

$$0 = \dot{z}_\lambda^* = Dj_{z_\lambda^*} = D\partial_f \psi^*(D^\dagger dS_\lambda^*/2; z_\lambda^*) \iff L(j_{z_\lambda^*}, z_\lambda^*) = 0 \quad (49)$$

Hence, the current $j_{z_\lambda^*} = \text{constant}$. Detailed balance condition (36) further implies

$$L(-j_{z_\lambda^*}, z_\lambda^*) = L(j_{z_\lambda^*}, z_\lambda^*) + \dot{z}_\lambda^* dS_\lambda^* = L(j_{z_\lambda^*}, z_\lambda^*) = 0$$

Remembering that $L(j; z)$ has a unique minimum at $j = j_z$ it follows that $-j_{z_\lambda^*} = j_{z_\lambda^*}$ or $j_{z_\lambda^*} = 0$. Moreover,

$$0 = j_{z_\lambda^*} = \partial_f \psi^*(D^\dagger dS_\lambda^*/2; z_\lambda^*) \implies D^\dagger dS_\lambda^* = 0 \quad (50)$$

where the last line follows from (10).

The same result can also be obtained in the Hamiltonian formalism

$$0 = \dot{z}_\lambda^* = Dj_{z_\lambda^*} = D\partial_f H_\lambda(f_\lambda^*; z_\lambda^*), \quad f_\lambda^* = 0 \quad (51)$$

resulting in $j_{z_\lambda^*} = \partial_f H_\lambda(0; z_\lambda^*) = \text{constant}$.

We conclude that

$$j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} = 0, \quad D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) = 0$$

or, the leading-order solution for (48) is obtained by replacing $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda(\varepsilon t)$ in z_λ^* .

The system lags behind this instantaneous equilibrium state, as described by the higher-order terms in (48) with Δz_t being its first-order correction. We only require that Δz_t (the coefficient for the linear term in ε as defined in (48)) remains bounded uniformly as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. We refer to Appendix A and the explicit solutions (A14)–(A15) in the case of a quasistatic Curie-Weiss dynamics.

VI. Entropy as a Noether charge

A. Hamiltonian formalism

We start with the large deviation functional in terms of the Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{A} = -S(z_{t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt [f_t \cdot j(f_t; z_t) - H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f_t; z_t)] \quad (52)$$

where the thermodynamic force f and the macroscopic condition z are independent variables. We have inserted the quasistatic protocol through $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon t)$ for $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

We consider the *continuous* symmetry, exactly like in (23),

$$t \rightarrow t' = t, \quad z_t \rightarrow z'_t = z_t, \quad f_t \rightarrow f'_t = f_t + \eta D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_t) \quad (53)$$

with $S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}$ from (8). Under the shift (53), the action changes as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{A} &= \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt [j \cdot D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} - \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f; z) \cdot D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}] \\ &= \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt [Dj \cdot dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} - \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f; z) \cdot D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}] \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

On shell, $Dj_{z_t} = \dot{z}_t$, $z_t^\varepsilon = z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta z_{\varepsilon t} + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $f_t^\varepsilon = 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Dj_{z_t} \cdot dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} &= \dot{z}_t \cdot dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} = \frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} \\ \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f_t^\varepsilon; z_t^\varepsilon) &= \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(0; z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) + \varepsilon \left(\partial_z \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(0; z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) \Delta z_{\varepsilon t} \right) + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} + \varepsilon \left(\partial_z \partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(0; z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) \Delta z_{\varepsilon t} \right) + O(\varepsilon^2) = O(\varepsilon) \\ D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_t^\varepsilon) &= D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) + \varepsilon D^\dagger \left(d^2 S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) \Delta z_{\varepsilon t} \right) + O(\varepsilon^2) = O(\varepsilon) \end{aligned}$$

In the last two lines, we have used the condition (50) for the equilibrium solution $z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*$ to let the $O(\varepsilon^0)$ terms vanish. Moreover, we assume that $\Delta z_{\varepsilon t}$ and its prefactors (the second derivatives of H and S) remain bounded. Subsequently, the term $\partial_f H_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(f; z) \cdot D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} = O(\varepsilon^2)$ such that

the change in the action becomes

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left[\frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} + O(\varepsilon^2) \right] = \eta \left(S_{\lambda_f} - S_{\lambda_i} + O(\varepsilon) \right) \quad (55)$$

which in the quasistatic limit $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ reduces to

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} \quad (56)$$

That has the form of a quasisymmetry, [41]

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{d\psi}{dt}, \quad \psi = S_\lambda$$

On the other hand, under the coordinate transform $f \rightarrow f + \delta f, z \rightarrow z$, the action changes as

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \delta f (\dot{z} - \partial_f H) \quad (57)$$

Since (56) is equal to (57) for all $t_1 < t_2$, the integrands are equal

$$\frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} + O(\varepsilon^2) = \delta f (\dot{z} - \partial_f H)$$

Moreover, *on shell*, $\dot{z} = \partial_f H$, and hence, the entropy is conserved in the quasistatic limit $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$:

$$S_{\lambda_f} = S_{\lambda_i}$$

In summary, we have shown that the entropy function S is a constant of motion for the shift (53) in the quasistatic limit. Recall however that we have used the expression ‘entropy’ for more general thermodynamic potentials (free energies). Therefore, its invariance means different things depending on the actual physical situation and what variables are kept constant or not during the quasistatic evolution. For example, the state variable z can be the volume of a box with thermally isolated walls and containing a dilute gas in contact with a pressure bath. The protocol would then make a quasistatic change in the (external) pressure p and we would have $S_p(V)$ to represent the thermodynamic potential as a function of the enthalpy $H(V, p)$ and the pressure p . The result is then that $S_p(V)$ is a Noether charge. That was the example treated in [22].

B. Lagrangian formalism

We can also use the Lagrangian setup as the starting point for a continuous symmetry. We write the action

$$\mathcal{A} = -S(z_\lambda^*) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt L_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} \quad (58)$$

which is a function of the trajectory starting in equilibrium state z_λ^* . We introduce a quasistatic dynamics through $\lambda = \lambda(\varepsilon t)$ for some $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. We consider the *continuous* symmetry

$$t \rightarrow t' = t, \quad z \rightarrow z' = z, \quad j \rightarrow j' = j - 2\eta j \quad (59)$$

with $S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}$ from (8) and small η . Under the shift (59), the action changes as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\mathcal{A} &= -2\eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \, j \cdot \frac{\partial L_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{\partial j} \\ &= \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left(j \cdot D^\dagger dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z) - 2j \cdot \partial_j \psi(j, z) \right) \\ &= \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \left(\frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} - 2j \cdot \partial_j \psi(j, z) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (41) in the middle. Imposing the zero-cost flow $z_t^\varepsilon = z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta z_{\varepsilon t} + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $j_t^{(\varepsilon)} = j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} + \varepsilon \Delta j_t = 0 + O(\varepsilon)$, it follows that

$$-2j_t^{(\varepsilon)} \partial_j \psi(j_t^{(\varepsilon)}, z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) = \varepsilon \Delta j_t \partial_j \psi(0, z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) + O(\varepsilon^2)$$

Since ψ reaches its minimum at $j = 0$ and is strictly convex, it follows that $\partial_j \psi(0, z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) = 0$ and thus $2j_t^{(\varepsilon)} \partial_j \psi(j_t^{(\varepsilon)}, z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) = O(\varepsilon^2)$ in $\delta\mathcal{A}$, or,

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \frac{dS_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}{dt} + O(\varepsilon) \quad (60)$$

On the other hand, under the transform $j \rightarrow j + \delta j, z \rightarrow z$, the action changes as

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \eta \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \, \delta j \cdot \frac{\partial L}{\partial j} \quad (61)$$

which is zero on shell because $\frac{\partial L}{\partial j}(j_{z_t^{(\varepsilon)}}; z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) = 0$. Therefore, the Noether charge for the transformation (59) is just the entropy $Q = S_\lambda$ and it is conserved in the quasistatic limit $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$:

$$S_{\lambda_f} = S_{\lambda_i}$$

VII. Conclusion

We have extended the relation between the entropy change ΔS and the (discrete) time reversal transformation to a continuous symmetry for quasistatic gradient dynamics. That generalizes ideas and results first expressed and obtained by Sasa *et al.*, connecting the first part of the Clausius heat theorem with the Noether theorem.

The novelty of our approach is in considering the general large deviation structure for gradient flows, including the case of jump processes (leading to generalized gradient flow). That allows

us to extend the results to pure relaxational processes including spin-flip or (chemical) reaction dynamics. We have illustrated that with Curie-Weiss and urn models.

The large deviation approach also sheds new light on the continuous symmetry: in the Hamiltonian version of the Noether argument, it is the shift in thermodynamic force that realizes the symmetry. That suggests the picture where the probability of macroscopic trajectories is parametrized by the time-symmetric and the time-antisymmetric part in the action. That antisymmetric part is governed by a dissipation (or Onsager) functional and basically multiplies currents (fluxes) with (thermodynamic) forces. Time reversal is implemented by a change in the force while keeping the time-symmetric part unchanged. We suggest seeing it as the analogue of a rotation in the two-dimensional plane to implement reflection (on the one-dimensional axis).

We believe that the results may prove interesting for *unifying* classical and quantum mechanical, stochastic, and general relativistic arguments for the existence of entropy as exact differential in reversible transformation, invariant under adiabatic (*i.e.*, no heat) conditions. That has no relation however with the Second Law which here is even assumed from the outset in the framework of gradient flow for macroscopic systems.

Acknowledgement: The authors thank Shin-ichi Sasa for private correspondence.

A. Curie-Weiss dynamics III

As a final illustration, we continue with the kinetic Ising model on the complete graph, [42, 43].

1. The spin model

We consider a large (N) collection of spin variables $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_N)$, with $\sigma_i = \pm 1$. The energy of a spin configuration σ is

$$E(\sigma) := -N\phi(m^N(\sigma)) \tag{A1}$$

only depending on the magnetization (function),

$$m^N(\sigma) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i \tag{A2}$$

with $\phi(m)$ a smooth function whose exact form is irrelevant in what follows, but traditionally we think of $\phi(m) = Jm^2/2 + hm$ with coupling $J > 0$ and magnetic field h ; see [42, 43].

The (mesoscopic) dynamics follows a kinetic Ising model [44, 45], where the spin-flip rates satisfy detailed balance with respect to the potential (A1) for energy exchanges with a thermal bath at inverse temperature $\beta \geq 0$. The only allowed transitions are between $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_k, \dots, \sigma_N)$ and $\sigma^k = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, -\sigma_k, \dots, \sigma_N)$, for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, *i.e.*, one spin-flip at a time.

For a specific choice, we take the (finite) Curie-Weiss dynamics to be the Markov process on $K_N := \{-1, +1\}^N$ with rates $c(\sigma, k)$ for flipping $\sigma \rightarrow \sigma^k$, given by

$$c(\sigma, k) = \nu e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(E(\sigma) - E(\sigma^k))} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\nu = \nu(\beta)$ is a characteristic flip frequency possibly depending on β .

The backward generator \mathcal{L}^N of that Markov process is

$$\mathcal{L}^N f(\sigma) = \sum_{k=1}^N \left[a(m^N(\sigma)) + b(m^N(\sigma))\sigma_k \right] \left(f(\sigma^k) - f(\sigma) \right) \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$a(m^N(\sigma)) = \nu \cosh\left(\beta\phi'(m^N(\sigma))\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$b(m^N(\sigma)) = -\nu \sinh\left(\beta\phi'(m^N(\sigma))\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \quad (\text{A6})$$

To simplify the algebra, we use the (a, b) parameterization as long as possible, but we remain in the Curie-Weiss model at all times. Note in particular that $a(m) > b(m)$ for all m .

It is important to note that the process $m_t^{(N)}$ induced on the magnetizations (A2) is itself again Markovian and satisfies detailed balance with the equilibrium distribution

$$\rho_{\text{eq}}(m^N(\sigma) = m) \propto e^{-\beta N \mathcal{F}(m)}$$

for the free energy in (1). That is a huge simplification in the transition from mesoscopic to macroscopic descriptions and is typical for mean-field dynamics.

2. Dynamical fluctuations and zero-cost flow

For Section IV A we find that the Hamiltonian equals

$$H(m, f) = \sinh(2f) \left[(a(m) + mb(m)) \tanh(f) - (b(m) + ma(m)) \right] \quad (\text{A7})$$

See *e.g.* p109 in [46]. For the Lagrangian $L(m, \dot{m})$, we put $\dot{m} = j$, and we maximize $f\dot{m} - H(m, f)$,

$$0 = \dot{m} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial f} \implies f = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\pm \sqrt{\dot{m}^2 + 4(1-m^2)(a^2 - b^2)} + \dot{m}}{2(1-m)(a-b)} \right) \quad (\text{A8})$$

where we need the + sign to get a maximum since then

$$\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial f^2} = 2\sqrt{\dot{m}^2 + 4(1-m^2)(a^2 - b^2)} > 0$$

We have used that $-1 \leq m \leq 1$ and $a(m) > b(m)$; in fact $a^2 - b^2 = \nu^2$. The corresponding Lagrangian becomes

$$L(m, \dot{m}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[-\sqrt{\dot{m}^2 + 4(1-m^2)\nu^2} + \dot{m} \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{\dot{m}^2 + 4(1-m^2)\nu^2} + \dot{m}}{2(1-m)(a-b)} \right) + 2(a+bm) \right]$$

The macroscopic equation of motion is obtained from $L(m, \dot{m}) = 0$, demanding that the logarithmic term and the other terms cancel separately:

$$\dot{m} = G(m), \quad \text{for } G(m) = -2(b(m) + a(m)m) \quad (\text{A9})$$

which agrees with (1); see also [47]. The equilibrium solutions follow from $\dot{m}^* = 0$

$$G(m^*) = 0 \iff m^* = -\frac{b(m^*)}{a(m^*)} = \tanh(\beta\phi'(m^*)) \quad (\text{A10})$$

As in (36), for the free energy in (1), we have detailed balance

$$L(m, \dot{m}) - L(m, -\dot{m}) = \dot{m} \left(\operatorname{arctanh}(m) + \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{a+b}{a-b} \right) \right) = \dot{m} \partial_m \mathcal{F} = \frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt} \quad (\text{A11})$$

and \mathcal{F} solves the stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation,

$$H(m, \partial_m \mathcal{F}) = 0 \quad (\text{A12})$$

3. Quasistatic dynamics

As in Section V, we introduce a protocol $\lambda_t^\varepsilon = \lambda_{\varepsilon t}$ for $t \in [t_1, t_2] = [\frac{t_1}{\varepsilon}, \frac{t_2}{\varepsilon}]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, with $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ making the process quasistatic. To be specific, we take a slowly-varying energy function $\phi \rightarrow \phi_t^\varepsilon = \varphi_{\varepsilon t}$ or equivalently $a \rightarrow a_t^\varepsilon = a_{\varepsilon t}$, and $b \rightarrow b_t^\varepsilon = b_{\varepsilon t}$, *e.g.* due to a time-dependent magnetic field $h \rightarrow h_t^\varepsilon = h_{\varepsilon t}$. Then, the rates (A3) become time-dependent

$$c_{\varepsilon t}(\sigma, k) = \nu e^{\frac{\beta}{2}(E_{\varepsilon t}(\sigma) - E_{\varepsilon t}(\sigma^k))}$$

giving rise to the slowly varying Hamiltonian

$$H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f, m) = \sinh(2f) [(a_{\varepsilon t} + b_{\varepsilon t}m) \tanh(f) - (b_{\varepsilon t} + a_{\varepsilon t}m)] \quad (\text{A13})$$

with Hamilton equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{m}_t &= \frac{\partial H_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{\partial f} = 2 \sinh(2f)(a_{\varepsilon t} + mb_{\varepsilon t}) - 2 \cosh(2f)(b_{\varepsilon t} + ma_{\varepsilon t}) \\ \dot{f}_t &= -\frac{\partial H_t^{(\varepsilon)}}{\partial m} = \sinh(2f) [a_{\varepsilon t} + ma'_{\varepsilon t} + b'_{\varepsilon t} - \tanh(p)(b_{\varepsilon t} + a'_{\varepsilon t} + mb'_{\varepsilon t})] \end{aligned}$$

We denote the solutions to these equations as $m_t^{(\varepsilon)}, f_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ with initial conditions $m_{t=t_1}^{(\varepsilon)} = m_{\lambda_{\tau_1}}^*$ and $f_{t=t_1}^{(\varepsilon)} = f_{\lambda_{\tau_1}}^* = 0$. Perturbatively in ε ,

$$\begin{aligned} m_t^{(\varepsilon)} &= m_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta m_t + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ f_t^{(\varepsilon)} &= f_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta f_t + O(\varepsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

Here, the leading order term $O(\varepsilon^0)$ corresponds to the stationary distribution m^* but with λ replaced by $\lambda(\varepsilon t)$, *i.e.*, an instantaneous equilibrium state. Up to order $O(\varepsilon^2)$ we find

$$\Delta m_t = \frac{\dot{\lambda}(\tau) \partial_{\lambda} m_{\lambda(\tau)}^*}{\partial_m G(m_{\lambda(\tau)}^*)}, \quad \text{with } \partial_{\lambda} m^* = -\frac{\partial_{\lambda}(b/a)}{1 + \partial_m(b/a)} \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$\Delta f_t = 0 \quad (\text{A15})$$

with $G = G_{\lambda}$ from (A9) and we have used that $f_{\lambda}^* = 0$ and thus also $\partial_{\lambda} f_{\lambda}^* = 0$. Note that Δm_t remains bounded only when $\partial_m G_{\lambda}(m_{\lambda(\tau)}^*)$ does not diverge, which means we are not allowed to pass the critical point.

B. Generalized urn model

As a final illustration, we turn to the scheme of Kubo, Matsuo and Kitahara, [32].

Consider the Hamiltonian

$$H(f, z) = \int dr (e^{rf} - 1) a(z, r) e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}} = \int dr [e^{r[f + \frac{1}{2} d_z S]} - e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}}] a(z, r)$$

where $a(z, r) = a(z, -r)$ is symmetric. The case where $z \in [0, 1], r = \pm 1$ and $S(z) = z \log(2z) + (1 - z) \log(2(1 - z))$ corresponds to the Ehrenfest urn model.

There is detailed balance as in (37):

$$\begin{aligned} H(-f - d_z S_{\lambda}, z) &= \int dr [e^{-r[f + \frac{1}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}]} - e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}}] a(z, r) \\ &= \int dr e^{-r[f + \frac{1}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}]} a(z, r) - \int dr e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda}} a(z, r) \\ &= H(f, z) \end{aligned}$$

where we applied a change of variables $r \rightarrow -r$ on the first integral only and used the symmetry $a(z, r) = a(z, -r)$ in the last line.

For a quasistatic time-dependence in $S_\lambda \rightarrow S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}$, the Hamiltonian becomes explicitly time-dependent $H \rightarrow H_t^{(\varepsilon)}$, and for the shift $f \rightarrow f + \eta d_z S$

$$H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f + \eta d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}, z) - H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f, z) = \eta d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)} \int dr r e^{rf} a(z, r) e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}}$$

On shell, one then finds $f_t^{(\varepsilon)} = f_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* = 0$ and $z_t^{(\varepsilon)} = z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^* + \varepsilon \Delta z_t + O(\varepsilon^2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f_t^{(\varepsilon)} + \eta d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}, z) - H_t^{(\varepsilon)}(f_t^{(\varepsilon)}, z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) &= \eta d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_t^{(\varepsilon)}) \int dr r e^{rf_t^{(\varepsilon)}} a(z_t^{(\varepsilon)}, r) e^{\frac{r}{2} d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_t^{(\varepsilon)})} \\ &= \eta d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} \\ &+ \eta \varepsilon \left(d_z^2 S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) \Delta z_t j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} + d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) d_z j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} \Delta z_t \right) + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= O(\varepsilon^2) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $j_{z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*} = 0, d_z S_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}(z_{\lambda(\varepsilon t)}^*) = 0$ for the equilibrium on shell solution.

-
- [1] H.B. Callen. *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*. Wiley, 1991.
 - [2] M. Campisi and D.H. Kobe. Derivation of the Boltzmann principle. *American Journal of Physics*, 78(6):608–615, May 2010.
 - [3] L. Boltzmann. Über die mechanische Bedeutung des zweiten Hauptsatzes der Wärmetheorie. *Wiener Berichte*, 53:195–220, 1866.
 - [4] L. Boltzmann. Zur Priorität der Auffindung der Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und dem Prinzip der kleinsten Wirkung. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 143:211–230, 1871.
 - [5] R. Clausius. Über die Zurückführung des zweiten Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheories auf allgemeine mechanische Prinzipien. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 142:265–580, 1871.
 - [6] R. Clausius. Bemerkungen zu der Prioritätsreclamation des Hrn. Boltzmann. *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, 144:433–461, 1871.
 - [7] S. Carnot. *Réflexions sur la puissance motrice du feu et sur les machines propres à développer cette puissance*. Gauthier-Villars, 1824.
 - [8] G. Gallavotti. *Nonequilibrium and Irreversibility*. Springer International Publishing, 2014.
 - [9] G. Jona-Lasinio. On Clausius' approach to entropy and analogies in non-equilibrium. *Ensaïos Matemáticos*, 38, 01 2023.
 - [10] K. Saito and H. Tasaki. Extended Clausius Relation and Entropy for Nonequilibrium Steady States in Heat Conducting Quantum Systems. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 145(5):1275–1290, September 2011.
 - [11] R.J. Donnelly, R. Herman, and I. Prigogine. *Non-equilibrium Thermodynamics: Variational Techniques and Stability*. University of Chicago Press, 1966.

- [12] T. S. Komatsu, N. Nakagawa, S. Sasa, and H. Tasaki. Steady-State Thermodynamics for Heat Conduction: Microscopic Derivation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:230602, Jun 2008.
- [13] T. S. Komatsu, N. Nakagawa, S. Sasa, and H. Tasaki. Entropy and Nonlinear Nonequilibrium Thermodynamic Relation for Heat Conducting Steady States. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 142(1):127–153, November 2010.
- [14] L. Bertini, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim. Thermodynamic Transformations of Nonequilibrium States. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 149(5):773–802, November 2012.
- [15] L. Bertini, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim. Clausius Inequality and Optimality of Quasistatic Transformations for Nonequilibrium Stationary States. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:020601, Jan 2013.
- [16] C. Maes and K. Netočný. Revisiting the Glansdorff–Prigogine Criterion for Stability Within Irreversible Thermodynamics. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 159(6):1286–1299, March 2015.
- [17] R. M. Wald. Black hole entropy is the Noether charge. *Physical Review D*, 48(8):R3427–R3431, oct 1993.
- [18] V. Iyer and R.M. Wald. Some properties of the Noether charge and a proposal for dynamical black hole entropy. *Physical Review D*, 50(2):846–864, jul 1994.
- [19] G. Compère. *Advanced Lectures on General Relativity*. Lecture Notes in Physics. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [20] S. Sasa and Y. Yokokura. Thermodynamic Entropy as a Noether Invariant. *Physical Review Letters*, 116(14), apr 2016.
- [21] S. Sasa, S. Sugiura, and Y. Yokokura. Thermodynamical path integral and emergent symmetry. *Physical Review E*, 99(2), February 2019.
- [22] Y. Minami and S. Sasa. Thermodynamic entropy as a Noether invariant in a Langevin equation. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2020(1):013213, jan 2020.
- [23] A. Bravetti, M. Á. García-Ariza, and D. Tapias. Thermodynamic Entropy as a Noether Invariant from Contact Geometry. *Entropy*, 25(7), 2023.
- [24] E. Noether. Invariante Variationsprobleme. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, 1918:235–257, 1918.
- [25] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savare. *Gradient Flows: In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Lectures in Mathematics. ETH Zürich. Birkhäuser Basel, 2006.
- [26] H.C. Öttinger. *Beyond Equilibrium Thermodynamics*. Wiley, 2005.
- [27] A. Mielke, D. R. M. Renger, and M. A. Peletier. A Generalization of Onsager’s Reciprocity Relations to Gradient Flows with Nonlinear Mobility. *Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics*, 41(2):141–149, April 2016.
- [28] A. Mielke, M. A. Peletier, and D. R. M. Renger. On the Relation between Gradient Flows and the Large-Deviation Principle, with Applications to Markov Chains and Diffusion. *Potential Analysis*, 41(4):1293–1327, June 2014.

- [29] Robert I. A. Patterson, D. R. Michiel Renger, and Upanshu Sharma. Variational structures beyond gradient flows: a macroscopic fluctuation-theory perspective, 2023.
- [30] M. Erbar. A gradient flow approach to the Boltzmann equation, 2023.
- [31] R. Kraaij, A. Lazarescu, C. Maes, and M. Peletier. Deriving GENERIC from a Generalized Fluctuation Symmetry. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 170(3):492–508, December 2017.
- [32] R. Kubo, K. Matsuo, and K. Kitahara. Fluctuation and relaxation of macrovariables. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 9(1):51–96, September 1973.
- [33] F. Golse. *On the Dynamics of Large Particle Systems in the Mean Field Limit*, page 1–144. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [34] L. Onsager. Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes. I. *Phys. Rev.*, 37:405–426, Feb 1931.
- [35] L. Onsager. Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes. II. *Phys. Rev.*, 38:2265–2279, Dec 1931.
- [36] L. Onsager and S. Machlup. Fluctuations and Irreversible Processes. *Phys. Rev.*, 91:1505–1512, Sep 1953.
- [37] D.S. Djukic and B.D. Vujanovic. Noether’s theory in classical nonconservative mechanics. *Acta Mechanica*, 23(1-2):17–27, January 1975.
- [38] V. Vittal and A. N. Michel. A variational principle for nonconservative power systems. *Circuits, Systems and Signal Processing*, 7(3):413–424, Sep 1988.
- [39] J. Feng and T.G. Kurtz. *Large Deviations for Stochastic Processes*. Mathematical surveys and monographs. American Mathematical Society, 2006.
- [40] C. Maes. Frenetic Bounds on the Entropy Production. *Physical Review Letters*, 119(16), October 2017.
- [41] A. Trautman. Noether equations and conservation laws. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 6, 12 1967.
- [42] M. Kochmański, T. Paszkiewicz, and S. Wolski. Curie–Weiss magnet—a simple model of phase transition. *European Journal of Physics*, 34(6):1555–1573, oct 2013.
- [43] S. Friedli and Y. Velenik. *Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Systems: A Concrete Mathematical Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2017.
- [44] S. Dattagupta and S. Puri. *Dissipative Phenomena in Condensed Matter*. Springer Series in Materials Science. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [45] T.M. Liggett. *Interacting Particle Systems*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.
- [46] R. Kraaij. *Semigroup methods for large deviations of Markov processes*. PhD thesis, Delft University of Technology, 2016.
- [47] A. Beyen, C. Maes, and I. Maes. Phase Diagram and Specific Heat of a Nonequilibrium Curie–Weiss Model. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 191(5), May 2024.