

# Fluctuation-Response Relation in Non-Equilibrium Systems and Active Matter

T.R. Kirkpatrick<sup>1</sup> and D. Belitz<sup>2,3</sup><sup>1</sup>*Institute for Physical Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics and Institute for Fundamental Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA*<sup>3</sup>*Materials Science Institute, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA*

(Dated: July 9, 2024)

We use dynamic equations to derive a relation between correlation functions and response or relaxation functions in many-body systems. The relation is very general and holds both in equilibrium, when the usual fluctuation-dissipation theorem is valid, and to linear order in an expansion about arbitrary non-equilibrium states, when it is not. We illustrate our results by discussing fluids, both in equilibrium and non-equilibrium states, as well as several active-matter systems.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Important concepts in many-body systems include the correlations of spontaneous fluctuations of observables about a given state, and the response of observables to external perturbations. The former are described by time correlation functions; the latter, to linear order in the external fields, by (linear) response functions. The response functions also describe the energy dissipated by the system [1]. For systems in thermodynamic equilibrium both functions are translationally invariant with respect to both time and space, and there is a simple relation between them known as the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) [2–4], see Sec. IIC below. That is, the spontaneous fluctuations in equilibrium determine the linear response of the system to external fields, as well as its relaxation towards equilibrium once the external fields have been turned off. The correlation functions are directly measurable by light (or neutron) scattering. This can be difficult if low temperatures or/and small scattering angles are required. The response or relaxation functions, by contrast, are measurable via macroscopic perturbations that one has experimental control of irrespective of the temperature. Apart from being of fundamental interest, the FDT thus provides an alternative way of probing correlations in equilibrium many-body systems.

For systems that are not in thermal equilibrium, or for non-thermal systems that are not coupled to a heat bath, the standard FDT does not hold. Examples include fluids in the presence of an externally imposed temperature gradient, fluids with turbulent flow, and active matter. Many of these display interesting correlations that can be very hard to probe directly. There is a large body of work on non-equilibrium fluctuations (see, e.g., Refs. 5–7 and references therein), on non-equilibrium linear response [8, 9], and on relations between the two, with various applications [7, 10–16]. Generally, such relations are desirable since the response of a system to external perturbations is usually relatively easy to control and measure. In this paper we point out a particularly simple relation between correlation functions and bilinear products of linear response functions in non-equilibrium systems. This fluctuation-response relation takes the form of a structural isomorphism rather than an identity. In addition

to its simplicity, its significance is that it *always* holds to linear order in an expansion about an arbitrary state, irrespective of how badly the standard FDT is violated. It thus provides an alternative way of probing correlations that is valid very generally.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we define the relevant correlation and response functions, and discuss the FDT. In Sec. III we derive an isomorphism between correlation functions and bilinear response functions that is generally valid and the main result of the paper. In Sec. IV we discuss various examples, and in Sec. V we conclude with a summary and a general discussion.

## II. CORRELATION FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSE FUNCTIONS

Consider observables  $A_i(x)$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots$ ), where  $x = (\mathbf{x}, t)$  comprises spatial position  $\mathbf{x}$  and time  $t$ . Let the average values be  $\langle A_i \rangle$ , and let  $\delta A_i = A_i - \langle A_i \rangle$ . In a classical system,  $\langle \dots \rangle$  is a statistical mechanics average taken with an appropriate distribution function; in a quantum mechanical system, it denotes a quantum mechanical expectation value plus a statistical mechanics average. In an equilibrium state the averages are constants independent of space and time; in general they are space and time dependent. We define temporal and spatial Fourier transforms

$$\delta A_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \int dt e^{i\omega t} \delta A_i(x), \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\delta A_i(\mathbf{k}, t) = \int d\mathbf{x} e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \delta A_i(x). \quad (2.1b)$$

with  $\mathbf{k}$  the wave vector and  $\omega$  the frequency. We use  $\int dt$  to indicate an integral over all times, with analogous notation in temporal Fourier space, and  $\int d\mathbf{x}$  a spatial integral over the system volume  $V$ .

In what follows we recall the definitions of correlation functions, which describe the correlations of the  $\delta A_i$ , and of response functions, which describe the response of  $\langle A_i \rangle$  to external fields. Alternatively, the response functions describe the relaxation of the  $\langle A_i \rangle$  from initial values induced by the fields.

## A. Correlation functions

In classical systems, the two-point correlation function is the van Hove function

$$S_{ij}(x, x') = \langle \delta A_i(x) \delta A_j(x') \rangle, \quad (2.2)$$

with analogous expressions in Fourier space. In quantum systems, one needs to distinguish between the symmetrized, or anticommutator, correlation function

$$C_{ij}(x, x') = \frac{1}{2} \langle \delta A_i(x) \delta A_j(x') + \delta A_j(x') \delta A_i(x) \rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

and the antisymmetrized, or commutator one [17]

$$\chi_{ij}(x, x') = \frac{1}{2\hbar} \langle \delta A_i(x) \delta A_j(x') - \delta A_j(x') \delta A_i(x) \rangle. \quad (2.4)$$

In the presence of space and time-translational invariance one has

$$\varphi_{ij}(x, x') = \varphi_{ij}(x - x'), \quad (2.5a)$$

where  $\varphi$  can stand for  $S$ ,  $C$ , or  $\chi$ . In Fourier space this becomes

$$\varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'; \omega, \omega') = 2\pi \delta(\omega + \omega') V \delta_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}'} \varphi_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega), \quad (2.5b)$$

with obvious modifications if only space or time-translational invariance is present.

The relation between  $S$ ,  $C$ , and  $\chi$  is complicated and known only for certain special cases. In thermal equilibrium, when all of the correlation functions have structures given by Eq. (2.5b), the relation is [1, 18]

$$C_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \hbar \coth(\hbar\omega/2T) \chi''_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega), \quad (2.6a)$$

with  $T$  the temperature.  $\chi''$  is the spectral density of the commutator correlation function as defined in Eq. (A2d). In the classical limit this simplifies to

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = (2T/\omega) \chi''_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \quad (2.6b)$$

By integrating over all frequencies we obtain

$$S_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}) = T \chi_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}). \quad (2.7a)$$

Here  $S^0$  is the equal-time van Hove function and

$$\chi_{ij}^0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \chi_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega = 0) = \chi_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; z = i\epsilon) \quad (2.7b)$$

is the static commutator correlation function. Here and throughout the paper we denote by

$$g^\pm(t) = g(t) \Theta(\pm t),$$

with  $\Theta$  the step function, the positive and negative-time parts of time-dependent functions  $g(t)$ , see Appendix A. The final expression in Eq. (2.7b) is the Laplace transform as defined in Eq. (A2b), with  $\epsilon > 0$  infinitesimal. We emphasize that Eqs. (2.6, 2.7a) by themselves represent relations between two different types of correlation functions. Their usual interpretation as the FDT requires the identification of  $\chi$  with a response function. For non-equilibrium systems one needs to carefully distinguish between commutator correlation functions and response functions, and we will discuss this distinction in the following subsections.

## B. Response functions

### 1. The initial-value problem, and relaxation functions

External fields or perturbations that couple to the observables will produce a change  $\delta \langle A_i \rangle$  of the average values:  $a_i(x) \equiv \delta \langle A_i(x) \rangle = \langle A_i(x) \rangle - \langle A_i(x) \rangle_0$ , with  $\langle \dots \rangle_0$  the average in the absence of the perturbations. Suppose the perturbations are switched off at  $t = 0$ , at which time they have created initial values  $a_i^0(\mathbf{x}) \equiv a_i(\mathbf{x}, t = 0)$ . Then for  $t > 0$  the observables will relax toward their average values in the absence of the perturbations according to

$$a_i^+(x) = \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' \phi_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; t) a_j^0(\mathbf{x}'). \quad (2.8)$$

The  $\phi_{ij}^+$  are relaxation functions [19].

### 2. Response to an external field

Let  $h_i(x)$  be external fields that are conjugate to the variables in the sense that they couple linearly to the variables in a Hamiltonian or free-energy functional [20]. Then the change  $a_i$  of  $\langle A_i \rangle$  in response to the fields  $h_j$ , to linear order in the fields, is given by response functions  $X_{ij}$  via [18, 21, 22]

$$a_i(x) = \int dx' \Theta(t - t') \sum_j X_{ij}(x, x') h_j(x'). \quad (2.9)$$

Here  $\int dx' = \int d\mathbf{x}' \int dt'$ , and the step function ensures causality.

For many applications,  $X_{ij}$  is time translationally invariant, at least in an approximate sense [23]. For the discussion of response functions, we will assume that this is the case; generalizations will be the subject of a separate investigation. Equation (2.9) then becomes

$$a_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = \int d\mathbf{x}' \sum_j X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; t - t') h_j(\mathbf{x}', t') \quad (2.10a)$$

or, after a temporal Fourier transform,

$$a_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \int d\mathbf{x}' \sum_j X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) h_j(\mathbf{x}', \omega). \quad (2.10b)$$

### 3. Relation between response and relaxation

A relation between response and relaxation can be established as follows [1, 18]. Consider fields that are switched on infinitely slowly in the distant past and switched off at time  $t = 0$ :

$$h_i(\mathbf{x}, t) = h_i(\mathbf{x}) e^{\epsilon t} \Theta(-t), \quad (2.11a)$$

or

$$h_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = h_i(\mathbf{x}) \frac{1}{i\omega + \epsilon}, \quad (2.11b)$$

with  $\epsilon > 0$  infinitesimal. For negative times, Eq. (2.10a) yields

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^-(x) &= \sum_j \int dx' e^{-\epsilon t'} X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; t') h_j(\mathbf{x}') e^{\epsilon t} \\ &= \sum_j \int dx' X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') h_j(\mathbf{x}', t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12a)$$

or

$$a_i^-(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \frac{1}{i\omega + \epsilon} \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') h_j(\mathbf{x}'), \quad (2.12b)$$

with

$$X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega = 0) = X_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; z = i\epsilon) \quad (2.12c)$$

the static response function. At time  $t = 0$  the fields have produced values of the observables given by

$$a_i^0(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') h_j(\mathbf{x}'). \quad (2.13)$$

For positive times, the  $a_i$  will relax from these initial values, see Eq. (2.8). From Eqs. (2.10b), (2.12b), and (2.13) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^+(\mathbf{x}, \omega) &= \frac{1}{i\omega} \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' [X^+(\omega)(X^0)^{-1} - 1]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \\ &\quad \times a_j^0(\mathbf{x}'). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14a)$$

where the term in square brackets is to be interpreted in a matrix sense. The relaxation functions from Eq. (2.8) are thus related to the response functions via

$$\phi_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) = \frac{1}{i\omega} [X^+(\omega)(X^0)^{-1} - 1]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'). \quad (2.14b)$$

Note that Eq. (2.14a) contains the same information as Eq. (2.10b), but it requires knowledge of the initial values of the observables only; not of the nature of the external fields that have produced the initial values.

### C. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem and its validity

In general, there is no obvious simple relation between the response functions  $X$  and the various correlation functions. However, in thermal equilibrium, when  $C_{ij}$  and  $\chi_{ij}$  have structures given by Eqs. (2.5), the commutator correlation functions determine the response functions via

$$X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi_{ij}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \quad (2.15a)$$

Given this identity, it is natural to define response functions at negative times [24] via

$$X_{ij}^-(\mathbf{k}, \omega) := \chi_{ij}^-(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \quad (2.15b)$$

The Laplace transforms in the negative half plane, and the spectral densities  $\chi''$  and  $X''$ , for both  $\chi$  and  $X$  are then defined via Eqs. (A2) and we have

$$X_{ij}''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi_{ij}''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -\chi_{ji}''(\mathbf{k}, -\omega). \quad (2.15c)$$

and in particular

$$X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}) = \chi_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}). \quad (2.15d)$$

The relations (2.6, 2.7a) then turn into the FDT. That is, they relate fluctuations, as described by the correlation functions  $S$  or  $C$ , to the response to external perturbations, and the related dissipation, as described by  $X = \chi$ . For the purposes of this paper we just state the FDT for classical systems:

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = (2T/\omega) X_{ij}''(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \quad (2.16a)$$

$$S_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}) = T X_{ij}^0(\mathbf{k}). \quad (2.16b)$$

The above statements in general hold only for systems in thermal equilibrium. For non-equilibrium systems Eq. (2.15a) does in general not hold, which invalidates Eq. (2.16). Other aspects of the FDT also break down; for instance, the coth factor in Eq. (2.6a) relies both on a constant temperature throughout the system and on the distribution function being the equilibrium one, but for the examples we will consider the breakdown of Eq. (2.15a) is the most crucial aspect of non-equilibrium.

In Secs. III and IV we will show that nonetheless there still is a simple relation between correlation functions and response functions in non-equilibrium systems, and also in non-thermal systems where no temperature concept exists.

## III. DYNAMIC EQUATIONS

We now turn to the dynamic equations that govern the time evolution of observables. Consider an arbitrary, in general time dependent, state. Linearizing about this state [25] leads to an equation of motion of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta A_i(x) &+ \sum_j \int dx' \lambda_{ij}^r(x, x') \delta A_j(x') \\ &= \sum_j \int dx' b_{ij}(x, x') h_j(x') + f_i(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1a)$$

The matrix  $\lambda_{ij}$  contains couplings between the variables, as well as relaxation rates, or memory functions, and

$$\lambda_{ij}^r(x, x') = \Theta(t - t') \lambda_{ij}(x, x') \quad (3.1b)$$

is the retarded part of these functions. The  $f_i$  in Eq. (3.1a) are stochastic, or Langevin, forces whose average is zero. For a system in thermal equilibrium they describe thermal fluctuations. More generally, they describe noise that is inherent to the dynamics of the system, such as the random stirring in a stirred fluid, or imprecisions in the propagation of particles in active matter. We will assume them to be Gaussian distributed with second moments

$$\langle f_i(x) f_j(x') \rangle = \Delta_{ij}(x, x') , \quad (3.2a)$$

or, in temporal Fourier space,

$$\langle f_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) f_j(\mathbf{x}', \omega') \rangle = \Delta_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') . \quad (3.2b)$$

The  $b_{ij}$  describe the coupling of the dynamic variables to the external fields. They will be discussed in Sec. III B 2.

Note that the system of equations (3.1a) is linear by construction; the average values  $\langle A_i \rangle$  that one expands about are in general described by nonlinear equations.

### A. Correlations

In the absence of external fields we formally solve Eq. (3.1a) for  $\delta A$  and express the correlation functions in terms of the correlations of the Langevin forces. For simplicity, we will consider classical systems unless otherwise noted; a generalization to anticommutator correlations instead of van Hove correlations is straightforward. We define a temporal Fourier transform of  $\lambda^r$  by

$$\lambda_{ij}^r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = \int dt e^{i\omega t} \int dt' e^{-i\omega' t'} \lambda_{ij}^r(x, x') . \quad (3.3)$$

In the absence of fields, Eq. (3.1a) then becomes

$$\sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' \int d\omega' G_{ij}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') \delta A_j(\mathbf{x}', \omega') = f_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) . \quad (3.4a)$$

Here

$$G_{ij}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = -i\omega \delta_{ij} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \delta(\omega - \omega') + \lambda_{ij}^r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') , \quad (3.4b)$$

is the inverse of a propagator  $G$  that is defined by

$$\sum_l \int d\mathbf{x}'' \int d\omega'' G_{il}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}''; \omega, \omega'') G_{lj}(\mathbf{x}'', \mathbf{x}'; \omega'', \omega') = \delta_{ij} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') \delta(\omega - \omega') . \quad (3.4c)$$

The formal solution of Eq. (3.4a) thus is

$$\delta A_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' \int d\omega' G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') f_j(\mathbf{x}', \omega') . \quad (3.5)$$

For the matrix of correlation functions this yields

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = [G \Delta G^T]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') , \quad (3.6)$$

with the expression in brackets to be interpreted as a matrix product, and  $G^T$  the transposed propagator [26]. In quantum systems, one obtains the same structure for the anticommutator correlation function  $C$ .

Equation (3.6) holds in complete generality. If we assume time translational invariance we have

$$\langle f_i(\mathbf{x}, t) f_j(\mathbf{x}', t') \rangle = \Delta_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; t - t') \quad (3.7a)$$

or

$$\langle f_i(\mathbf{x}, \omega) f_j(\mathbf{x}', \omega') \rangle = 2\pi \delta(\omega + \omega') \Delta_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) , \quad (3.7b)$$

and

$$G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = \delta(\omega - \omega') G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) \quad (3.8a)$$

with  $G$  the inverse of

$$G_{ij}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) = -i\omega \delta_{ij} \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}') + \lambda_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) . \quad (3.8b)$$

Note that  $\lambda^+(\omega) = \lambda(z = \omega + i\epsilon)$ , see Eq. (A2c). This yields for the correlation functions

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) = [G(\omega) \Delta(\omega) G^\dagger(\omega)]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') , \quad (3.9)$$

with the adjoint  $G^\dagger$  the complex conjugate of  $G^T$ .

If the system is translationally invariant in space as well, we have

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = [G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \Delta(\mathbf{k}, \omega) G^\dagger(\mathbf{k}, \omega)]_{ij} . \quad (3.10)$$

We note that in equilibrium there is no freedom for choosing the Langevin-force correlations  $\Delta_{ij}$ ; they are dictated by the FDT in the sense that Eq. (3.10) must yield the correct equilibrium equal-time correlation functions  $S_{ij}^0$ . More generally, the  $\Delta_{ij}$  are part of what characterizes the nonequilibrium/nonthermal nature of the system.

### B. Linear Response

To discuss the response, we average Eq. (3.1a). Then the Langevin force drops out and we obtain an equation for  $\delta \langle A_i \rangle \equiv a_i$ . As in Sec. II B, we first consider the initial-value problem.

#### 1. The initial-value problem

Suppose initial values  $a_i^0(\mathbf{x})$  have been created by external perturbations. Then the relaxation of the observables for positive times is governed by the averaged version of Eq. (3.1a), viz.

$$\partial_t a_i^+(x) + \sum_j \int dx' \lambda_{ij}^r(x, x') a_j^+(x') = 0 . \quad (3.11)$$

A temporal Fourier transform yields

$$\begin{aligned} -i\omega a_i^+(\mathbf{x}, \omega) + \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' \int d\omega' \lambda_{ij}^r(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') a_j^+(\mathbf{x}', \omega') \\ = a_i^0(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

or

$$a_i^+(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \sum_j \int d\mathbf{x}' \int d\omega' G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') a_j^0(\mathbf{x}') \quad (3.13)$$

with the propagator  $G$  as defined in Eqs. (3.4). The relaxation functions  $\phi$  as defined in Eq. (2.8) are thus given in terms of the propagator as

$$\phi_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) = \int d\omega' G_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega'). \quad (3.14)$$

## 2. Response to an external field

Now explicitly consider a set of external fields. For this discussion we assume time translational invariance, either exactly or approximately, as we did in Sec. II B. Averaging Eq. (3.1a) yields an equation for  $a_i \equiv \delta\langle A_i \rangle$ . As in Sec. II B 3 we consider fields that are switched on infinitely slowly in the distant past and switched off at time  $t = 0$ , Eq. (2.11). Then  $a_i^-$  is given by Eqs. (2.12). Adopting an obvious matrix notation, we write these equations as

$$|a^-(t)\rangle = X^0 |h(t)\rangle, \quad (3.15a)$$

$$|a^-(\omega)\rangle = \frac{1}{i\omega + \epsilon} |a^0\rangle, \quad (3.15b)$$

where

$$|a^0\rangle = X^0 |h(t=0)\rangle. \quad (3.15c)$$

For  $t < 0$  the time evolution of the observables thus follows the fields, and the equation of motion is

$$\partial_t |a^-(t)\rangle = \epsilon |a^-(t)\rangle. \quad (3.16)$$

For  $t > 0$  the relaxation rates  $\lambda_{ij}$  cause the  $a_i$  to relax to zero from the initial values created by the fields. Using the past variables  $a^-$  as the driving force, rather than the fields, we can therefore write the equation of motion for all times as

$$\partial_t |a(t)\rangle + \Theta(t) \int_0^t dt' \lambda(t-t') |a(t')\rangle = \epsilon |a^-(t)\rangle. \quad (3.17)$$

We now extend the  $t'$ -integral to all times by adding an integral over negative times to both sides of the equation. After some simple manipulations, and again suppressing the infinite integration limits, this results in

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t |a(t)\rangle + \int dt' \lambda^+(t-t') |a(t')\rangle \\ = \int dt' \lambda^+(t-t') |a^-(t')\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

A temporal Fourier transform yields

$$\begin{aligned} G^{-1}(\omega) |a(\omega)\rangle &= \lambda^+(\omega) |a^-(\omega)\rangle \\ &= (G^{-1}(\omega) + i\omega) \frac{1}{i\omega + \epsilon} |a^0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

with  $G^{-1}$  from Eq. (3.8b). The solution of the initial-value problem thus is

$$|a(\omega)\rangle = \frac{1}{i\omega} (1 + i\omega G(\omega)) |a^0\rangle, \quad (3.20a)$$

$$|a^+(\omega)\rangle = G(\omega) |a^0\rangle. \quad (3.20b)$$

Equation (3.20b) is Eq. (3.13) for the time-translationally invariant case.

Alternatively, we can use Eq. (2.12a) in the first line of (3.19) to write

$$|a(\omega)\rangle = G(\omega) b(\omega) |h(\omega)\rangle \quad (3.21a)$$

with the elements of the matrix  $b$  given by [27]

$$\begin{aligned} b_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) &= [\lambda^+(\omega) X^0]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \\ &= [(G^{-1}(\omega) + i\omega) X^0]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.21b)$$

By comparing with Eq. (2.9) we find for the matrix of response functions

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) &\equiv X_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; z = \omega + i\epsilon) \\ &= [G(\omega) b(\omega)]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \\ &= [(1 + i\omega G(\omega)) X^0]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'). \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Solving Eq. (3.22) for  $G$  we see that Eq. (3.20b) is identical to Eq. (2.14a), which was obtained by different but equivalent reasoning.

If the system is translationally invariant in space we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{ij}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) &= [G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) b(\mathbf{k}, \omega)]_{ij} \\ &= [(1 + i\omega G(\mathbf{k}, \omega)) X^0(\mathbf{k})]_{ij}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

We stress again that the response problem and the initial-value problem are equivalent: Eqs. (3.21) describe the response of the observables to the external field, while Eqs. (3.20) describe the relaxation of the observables from the initial condition created by the field. Note, however, that the matrices  $b$  and  $X^0$  are in general not diagonal, and hence Eq. (3.21a) may contain couplings that are absent in Eq. (3.20a). We will see an example of this in Sec. IV C.

## C. A general relation between response formulas and fluctuation formulas

Now define a matrix of bilinear products of observables,

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = a_i^+(\mathbf{x}, \omega) a_j^+(\mathbf{x}', \omega'). \quad (3.24)$$

Equation (3.13) yields

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = [G \mathcal{A}^{00} G^T]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') \quad (3.25a)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{00}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = a_i^0(\mathbf{x}) a_j^0(\mathbf{x}') . \quad (3.25b)$$

In the special case of time translational invariance we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) &= \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, -\omega) \\ &= [G(\omega) \mathcal{A}^{00} G^\dagger(\omega)]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') . \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

By using Eq. (3.15c) we can write, equivalently,

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega) = [G(\omega) X^0 \mathcal{H}^{00} X^{0T} G^\dagger(\omega)]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') \quad (3.27a)$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij}^{00}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = h_i(\mathbf{x}) h_j(\mathbf{x}') . \quad (3.27b)$$

If in addition we have spatial translational invariance we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) &= \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}; \omega) \\ &= [G(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathcal{A}^{00}(\mathbf{k}) G^\dagger(\mathbf{k}, \omega)]_{ij} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.28a)$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{00}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{A}_{ij}^{00}(\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}) . \quad (3.28b)$$

Now compare the relaxation formulas, Eqs. (3.25), or the response formula, Eqs. (3.27), with the corresponding fluctuation formula, Eq. (3.6), which we write down again for clarity:

$$S_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') = [G \Delta G^T]_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega, \omega') , \quad (3.6)$$

We see that the response, or relaxation, formulas have the same structure as the fluctuation formula; the only difference is the matrix sandwiched between the propagators. This isomorphism between the fluctuation formula and the relaxation/response formula is our main result. It is very general and holds for linear deviations from arbitrary states. In particular, it holds for deviations from an equilibrium state, when the usual FDT holds, as we will see below. However, regardless of whether or not the system is in equilibrium, any interesting correlations are encoded in the propagator  $G$ , and  $S_{ij}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}$  just represent different linear combinations of the propagator elements. The correlations can thus be probed by response, or relaxation, experiments even in absence of the usual FDT. Physically, this reflects the fact that, to linear order, the spontaneous fluctuations, the relaxation from an initial condition, and the response to external fields contain the same information. This is a manifestation of Onsager's regression hypothesis [28]. In the following section we will discuss various examples.

## IV. EXAMPLES

In this section we discuss various examples that illustrate the fluctuation-response relation derived in Sec. III. We first demonstrate that the isomorphism does indeed hold in equilibrium, as it must, and is equivalent to the FDT, by considering shear diffusion in a fluid in equilibrium. In more complicated systems, including fluids in non-equilibrium steady states (NESS) [29, 30], stirred fluids [31], or active matter [32, 33], the general fluctuation-response isomorphism still holds, but the FDT breaks down due to one or both of the following mechanisms:

**Mechanism I:** The stochastic-force correlations are different from those required by the FDT. This obviously invalidates the FDT, while the isomorphism between the response or relaxation formulas and the fluctuation formula demonstrated in Sec. IV C remains intact. It is interesting to distinguish between to subcases:

- (a) The wave-number dependence of the random-force correlation  $\Delta$  is the same as in equilibrium. In this case the FDT is violated only by a constant factor, and the correlations have the same structure as in equilibrium. Examples are active Brownian motion, see Sec. IV B 1, and some models of randomly stirred fluids discussed in Sec. IV B 2 below.
- (b) The wave-number dependence of  $\Delta$  is different from the equilibrium case. This can lead to long-ranged correlations that are not present in equilibrium. Examples are certain models for randomly stirred fluids, Sec. IV B 2, and models of cell motion in biological tissues, see Sec. IV B 3.

**Mechanism II:** The inverse propagator  $G^{-1}$  in Eqs. (3.2) contains terms that are not present in ordinary linearized hydrodynamics. This will in general lead to a breakdown of the FDT as well as to long-ranged correlations that are not related to the properties of the random forces. An example is a fluid in a constant temperature gradient, see the discussion in Sec. IV C.

### A. Fluid in equilibrium

Consider shear diffusion in a classical fluid (or a quantum fluid in the hydrodynamic regime) [18, 21, 34]. In this case there is only one relevant observable, viz., one component of the transverse fluid velocity, which decouples from the other hydrodynamic variables and which we denote by  $u_\perp$ . The system is translationally invariant with respect to both time and space. The inverse propagator is given by

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -i\omega + \nu k^2 , \quad (4.1a)$$

with  $\nu$  the kinematic viscosity. From Eq. (3.8b) we see that  $\lambda^+$  is frequency independent and given by

$$\lambda^+(\mathbf{k}) = \nu k^2 . \quad (4.1b)$$

For a fluid in equilibrium the random-force correlation is [35, 36]

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{2T}{\rho} \nu k^2, \quad (4.2)$$

with  $\rho$  the mass density. For the van Hove function, Eq. (3.10) yields

$$S(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{2T}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2}. \quad (4.3)$$

The static susceptibility is [18, 37]

$$\chi^0 = \int (d\omega/\pi) \chi''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = 1/\rho. \quad (4.4a)$$

Since this is an equilibrium system, Eq. (2.15a) holds. We have

$$X^0 = \chi^0 = 1/\rho, \quad (4.4b)$$

and from Eqs. (3.22), (4.1a) and (4.4b) we find

$$X^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{-i\omega + \nu k^2}. \quad (4.5a)$$

As a commutator correlation function,  $\chi$  is an odd function of the frequency, so

$$\chi^-(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{i\omega + \nu k^2}, \quad (4.5b)$$

and the spectral densities are (see Eq. (A2d), and also Eqs. (2.15b, 2.15c))

$$X''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \chi''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\omega \nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2}. \quad (4.5c)$$

Comparing Eqs. (4.3) and (4.5c) we see that the FDT, Eqs. (2.16), holds.

Now consider the bilinear response formula. From, Eq. (3.25b) we have

$$\mathcal{A}^{00}(\mathbf{k}) = |u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k})|^2 \quad (4.6a)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\rho^2} |h_{\perp}(\mathbf{k})|^2 \quad (4.6b)$$

with  $h_{\perp}$  the field conjugate to  $u_{\perp}$ . Equations (3.28) yield

$$\mathcal{A}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \mathcal{A}^{00}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (4.6c)$$

which expresses the bilinear response in terms of the initial condition, or, alternatively, the external field. Comparing  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  with the van Hove function, Eq. (4.3), we explicitly see the isomorphism discussed in Sec. III C.

In order to make contact with Ref. 38 we also note that if we define a closely related observable,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) &= a(\mathbf{k}, \omega) a^+(-\mathbf{k}, -\omega) \\ &= [(1 + i\omega G(\mathbf{k}, \omega)) X^0 \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) (-i\omega) X^0 G(\mathbf{k}, -\omega)] , \end{aligned} \quad (4.7a)$$

with

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = |h(\mathbf{k}, \omega)|^2, \quad (4.7b)$$

we find

$$\mathcal{B}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{-i}{\rho} \chi''(\mathbf{k}, \omega) \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{k}, \omega). \quad (4.8)$$

In this form, the relation between the fluctuations, as represented by  $\chi'' = (\omega/2T)S$ , and the bilinear response, as represented by  $\mathcal{B}^+$ , was formulated in Ref. 38 (the quantity  $u_{\perp}^+$  was denoted by  $\tilde{u}_{\perp}$  in that reference).

The above relations between the bilinear response functions  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$ , or  $\mathcal{B}^+$ , and the correlation functions  $S$ , or  $\chi''$ , are equivalent to the usual FDT. As derived from the Langevin equation (3.1a), they are actually more plausible, and easier to understand, than the FDT, given that the fluctuating force and the external field are both linear inhomogeneities in Eq. (3.1a), and the correlation function is quadratic in the fluctuating force.

## B. Examples of Mechanism I

We now discuss various examples where the FDT breaks down due to the properties of the fluctuating-force correlations, while the isomorphism explained in Sec. IV C (see Eqs. (3.25) and (3.6)) remains valid.

### 1. Active Brownian motion

Ordinary Brownian motion is the random walk experienced by a particle of mass  $m$  suspended in a fluid in equilibrium at temperature  $T$  [18, 39]. The effect of the fluid on the particle is described by two forces: a frictional force that is proportional to the particle's velocity, and a stochastic or Langevin force. We also include an external force  $\mathbf{h}$  that is conjugate to the velocity. The equation of motion for the velocity then is

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{v}(t) + \gamma \mathbf{v}(t) = \frac{1}{m} \gamma \mathbf{h}(t) + \mathbf{f}(t). \quad (4.9a)$$

Here  $\gamma > 0$  is the friction coefficient and  $\mathbf{f}$  is the Langevin force with correlations

$$\langle f_i(t) f_j(t') \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta(t - t') \Delta. \quad (4.9b)$$

Equations (4.9) are a simplified (linearized, and considered in zero spatial dimensions) version of Model A in Ref. 40. The form of the external force term is consistent with Eqs. (3.21); the static response function is

$$X_{ij}^0 = \delta_{ij}/m, \quad (4.10)$$

see also Eq. (4.4b). The conjugate force  $\mathbf{h}$  is related to the physical force  $\mathbf{F}$  on the particle by  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{F}/\gamma$  [20]. The average kinetic energy of the particle,  $E = m \langle \mathbf{v}(t) \cdot \mathbf{v}(t) \rangle / 2$ ,

is proportional to the equal-time velocity autocorrelation function  $S^0$ . The equipartition theorem yields

$$S_{ij}^0 = \delta_{ij} T/m \quad (4.11)$$

and the FDT, Eq. (2.16b), holds. The inverse propagator is  $G_{ij}^{-1}(\omega) = \delta_{ij} G^{-1}(\omega)$  with

$$G^{-1}(\omega) = -i\omega + \gamma, \quad (4.12)$$

and the dynamic van Hove function  $S_{ij}(\omega) = \delta_{ij} S(\omega)$  is

$$S(\omega) = \frac{\Delta}{\omega^2 + \gamma^2}. \quad (4.13a)$$

In order for Eqs. (4.11) and (4.13a) to be consistent, the random-force correlation in equilibrium must be [36]

$$\Delta = \gamma T/2m. \quad (4.13b)$$

The particle's mean-square displacement can be derived from the equation of motion for the position,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{r}(t) = \mathbf{v}(t). \quad (4.14)$$

Differentiating again with respect to  $t$ , inserting Eq. (4.9a), multiplying by  $\mathbf{r}$ , averaging, and integrating yields Langevin's result [41]

$$\langle \mathbf{r}^2(t) \rangle = \frac{6T}{m\gamma} \left[ t - \frac{1}{\gamma} (1 - e^{-\gamma t}) \right]. \quad (4.15)$$

To obtain the dynamic response function we average Eq. (4.9a) and find  $X_{ij}^+(\omega) = \delta_{ij} X^+(\omega)$  with

$$X^+(\omega) = \chi^+(\omega) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\gamma}{-i\omega + \gamma}, \quad (4.16a)$$

$$X''(\omega) = \chi''(\omega) = \frac{1}{m} \frac{\gamma\omega}{\omega^2 + \gamma^2}, \quad (4.16b)$$

where the reasoning is the same as in Sec. IV A. Comparing Eqs. (4.13) and (4.16b) we see that the FDT in the dynamic form (2.16a) also holds, as it must.

'Active Brownian motion' refers to a Brownian particle equipped with an energy source that is independent of the heat bath provided by the fluid; for a review, see Ref. 42. One way to model such a system is to make the friction coefficient velocity dependent such that it is negative for small  $v$  and changes sign at some  $v_0 > 0$ :

$$\gamma \rightarrow -\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 v^2, \quad (4.17)$$

with  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$ . The fluctuating-force correlations are still given by Eq. (4.9b), but  $\Delta$  is not constrained by the equipartition theorem. This makes the system an example for Mechanism I(a). Equation (4.17) leads to a nonzero value of the velocity in the absence of an external field, making the particle self-propelled. Let this spontaneous velocity point in the  $z$ -direction,

$$\langle \mathbf{v} \rangle_{h=0} = v_0 \hat{z}, \quad (4.18)$$

where  $v_0 = \sqrt{\gamma_1/\gamma_2}$ . Linearizing about this NESS we obtain an equation of motion for  $u_z = v_z - v_0$  [43]

$$\frac{d}{dt} u_z(t) + 2\gamma_1 u_z = \frac{1}{m} 2\gamma_1 h_z(t) + f_z(t). \quad (4.19)$$

The problem now maps onto the equilibrium case with  $\gamma \rightarrow 2\gamma_1$ . However, the FDT does not hold due to Mechanism I(a), since  $\Delta$  is unconstrained and the equal-time correlation function is not given by Eq. (4.11), whereas the response function, which does not depend on  $\Delta$ , is unchanged. The bilinear relaxation function is

$$\mathcal{A}^{++}(\omega) = \frac{(u_z^0)^2}{\omega^2 + 4\gamma_1^2} \quad (4.20)$$

and the isomorphism between  $S$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  holds.

## 2. Randomly stirred fluid

Various models of a randomly stirred fluid were discussed in Ref. 31 with a focus on turbulence and low dimensions. In their simplest form, a linearization of these models yields a forced diffusion equation for the fluid velocity as in Sec. IV A, but with a random-force correlation that does not obey the FDT. Accordingly, the inverse propagator is given by Eq. (4.1a). The random-force correlation is a frequency-independent quantity  $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$  that is *not* given by Eq. (4.2), but either proportional to  $k^2$  with an independent coefficient, or a constant that is nonzero in a certain wave-number range. The former case is an example of Mechanism I(a); the latter, of Mechanism I(b). The van Hove function is

$$S(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{k})}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \quad (4.21)$$

and the bilinear relaxation function  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  is given by Eq. (4.6c). We see that the isomorphism between  $S$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  still holds, but the FDT does not.

For the static or equal-time correlation function, Eq. (4.21) yields

$$S^0(\mathbf{k}) = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} S(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{\Delta(\mathbf{k})}{2\nu k^2}. \quad (4.22)$$

In models where  $\Delta(k=0) \neq 0$ , Mechanism I(b) thus leads to long-range static correlations, whereas the static response function is the same as in equilibrium,  $X^0 = 1/\rho$ . This is in contrast to the example discussed in Sec. IV C below, where the fluctuating-force correlations are the same as in equilibrium, the long-range correlations are encoded in the propagator via a coupling between two diffusive fluctuations, and they manifest themselves both in the equal-time correlation functions, Eqs. (4.32), and the static response functions, Eq. (4.33).



### 3. Cell motion in biological tissues

Another example of an active-matter system [33] is the model for cell motion in biological tissues driven by cell division and apoptosis studied in Ref. 44. The two relevant hydrodynamic variables are the density  $\rho$  of the active matter and one component of the transverse fluid velocity,  $u_\perp$ . The linearized model dynamic equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho - D \nabla^2 \rho &= f_\rho, \\ \partial_t u_\perp - \nu \nabla^2 u_\perp &= f_\perp, \end{aligned} \quad (4.23)$$

with  $D$  a diffusion coefficient and  $\nu$  the kinematic viscosity of the fluid. Accordingly, the inverse propagator is

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega + Dk^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -i\omega + \nu k^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.24)$$

The fluctuating-force correlations in this model are constants  $\Delta_\rho$  and  $\Delta_\perp$ , respectively, which makes this model an example of Mechanism I(b) and maps the linearized problem onto the randomly stirred fluid, Sec. IV B 2, with a  $\mathbf{k}$ -independent  $\Delta$ . The FDT breaks down, while  $S$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  are still isomorphic.

We also note that taking into account the nonlinearities in the equations leads to a very strong long-time tail:  $D$  and  $\nu$  become frequency dependent and diverge for  $\omega \rightarrow 0$  as  $1/\omega^{1/5}$  in spatial dimensions  $d = 3$ , and  $1/\omega^{1/2}$  in  $d = 2$ . In time space, this corresponds to an autocorrelation function that decays for long times as  $1/t^{4/5}$  in  $d = 3$  and  $1/t^{1/2}$  in  $d = 2$ , respectively [44]. This temporal long-ranged correlation, just as the spatial one in Eq. (4.22), is a result of Mechanism I(b), albeit one that manifests itself only at the level of the nonlinear theory. In  $d = 2$  these strong long-time tails have been observed experimentally, see Ref. 44 and references therein.

### 4. Flocking

A rather complex example of active matter is the Toner-Tu flocking theory [45, 46], which is an effective continuum theory for the model proposed by Vicsek et al. [47]; for reviews, see Refs. 32, 48. The hydrodynamic variables are the coarse-grained density  $\rho(\mathbf{x}, t)$  of the flock, with average value  $\rho_0$ , and a velocity field  $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  that is the coarse-grained velocity of the members of the flock. In the isotropic, or disordered, phase, where the mean velocity is zero, the linearized dynamic equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \rho_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} &= 0, \\ \partial_t v_i + \gamma v_i + \sigma_1 \partial_i \rho - D_B \partial_i \partial_j v_j - D_T \nabla^2 v_i &= f_i. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Here  $D_B$  and  $D_T$  are diffusion coefficients that are analogous to linear combinations of the shear and bulk viscosities in an equilibrium fluid, and the coefficient  $\sigma_1$  arises

from an expansion of the pressure in powers of the density fluctuations.  $\gamma > 0$  is a friction coefficient, and the  $f_i$  are random forces with correlations given by Eq. (4.9b).

Consider for simplicity the transverse components of the velocity. The inverse propagator is

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -i\omega + \gamma + D_T k^2. \quad (4.26)$$

and the corresponding van Hove function is

$$S(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{\Delta}{\omega^2 + (\gamma + D_T k^2)^2}. \quad (4.27)$$

Note that the static correlation function is finite at  $\mathbf{k} = 0$ , in contrast to the case of a stirred fluid. This is a consequence of the constant damping term [49]. The flock is not a thermal system (there is no heat bath, and no temperature concept), so the question of the validity of the FDT is not well posed. However, the discussion in Sec. III C still applies and the relaxation formula is

$$\mathcal{A}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (\gamma + D_T k^2)^2} \mathcal{A}^{00}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (4.28)$$

with  $\mathcal{A}^{00}$  given by Eq. (4.6a). This demonstrates the isomorphism between  $S$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  in the isotropic phase.

The self-propulsion capability of the members of the flock is modeled as in the active Brownian motion model, via Eq. (4.17). The resulting phase with a nonzero average velocity is quite complex, and we will not discuss it here. The propagators and correlation functions for the linearized theory have been given in Refs. 46, 48, and 32. Given the propagators,  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  is again given by Eqs. (3.28).

The spontaneously broken rotational symmetry leads to an equal-time velocity autocorrelation function that diverges in the long-wavelength limit [45], in contrast to the isotropic phase. Nonetheless, the model yields true long-range order in spatial dimension  $d = 2$ . This is a result of the nonlinear terms in the theory, and consistent with numerical simulations [47].

### C. An Example of Mechanism II: Fluid in a NESS

A simple example of a non-equilibrium system where Mechanism II leads to a breakdown of the FDT and to long-ranged correlations is a fluid subject to a constant temperature gradient [30, 50, 51]. Such a system is in a NESS, so time translational invariance holds exactly. Furthermore, the leading effect of the temperature gradient turns out to be the coupling between the temperature and the shear velocity in the Navier-Stokes equations; all other occurrences of the spatially varying temperature can be replaced by the average temperature. In this leading approximation the system shows spatial translational invariance as well.

In the current context, this problem has been discussed in Ref. 38. It is an example of Mechanism II: The externally imposed temperature gradient promotes a term

that is present, but nonlinear, in equilibrium to a linear term in the equations linearized about the NESS. The relevant observables are (one component of) the shear velocity  $u_{\perp} \equiv \delta A_1$  and the temperature fluctuations  $\delta T \equiv \delta A_2$ . The inverse propagator is

$$G^{-1}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega + \nu k^2 & 0 \\ \alpha & -i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.29)$$

with  $\nu$  the kinematic viscosity and  $D_{\text{T}}$  the thermal diffusion coefficient.  $\alpha$  is a coupling constant that is proportional to the externally fixed temperature gradient. It is real, even under parity, and dimensionally a frequency. The fluctuating-force correlations are the same as in equilibrium [52], viz.

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \begin{pmatrix} 2T\nu k^2/\rho & 0 \\ 0 & 2T^2 D_{\text{T}} k^2/c_p \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.30)$$

with  $c_p$  the specific heat at constant pressure.

For the van Hove functions Eq. (3.10) yields

$$S_{11}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{2T}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2}, \quad (4.31a)$$

$$S_{12}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -\alpha \frac{2T}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \frac{1}{i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2}, \quad (4.31b)$$

$$S_{21}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = -\alpha \frac{2T}{\rho} \frac{\nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2}, \quad (4.31c)$$

$$S_{22}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{2T^2}{c_p} \frac{D_{\text{T}} k^2}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} + \alpha^2 \frac{2T}{\rho} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} \frac{\nu k^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2}. \quad (4.31d)$$

For the static correlation functions, this yields

$$S_{11}(\mathbf{k}) = T/\rho, \quad (4.32a)$$

$$S_{12}(\mathbf{k}) = S_{21}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{-\alpha T/\rho}{(\nu + D_{\text{T}})k^2}, \quad (4.32b)$$

$$S_{22}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{T^2}{c_p} + \frac{\alpha^2 T/\rho}{D_{\text{T}}(\nu + D_{\text{T}})k^4}. \quad (4.32c)$$

Note that these long-ranged correlations result from the coupling between the two diffusive modes in the NESS, *not* from the random-force correlations. This is in contrast to the case of a randomly stirred fluid, see the remarks after Eq. (4.22). In an approximation that suffices for capturing the leading terms of the temperature gradient, Eq. (2.6b) is still valid [38], but the FDT is not as can be seen by considering the static response functions. They are given by [53]

$$X^0(\mathbf{k}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\rho} & \frac{-\alpha}{\rho} \frac{1}{\nu k^2} \\ 0 & \frac{T}{c_p} + \frac{\alpha^2}{\rho} \frac{1}{\nu D_{\text{T}} k^4} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.33)$$

Comparing Eqs. (4.33) and (4.32) we see that the FDT in the form of Eq. (2.7a) is violated. Note that the non-equilibrium contributions to  $X^0$  are strongly singular functions of the wave number and depend on transport coefficients rather than thermodynamic derivatives (see also Ref. 37). This singular behavior as  $k \rightarrow 0$ , which is also present in the equal-time correlation functions, Eqs. (4.32), is the origin of the generalized rigidity and anomalously fast propagation of perturbations discussed in Refs. 54 and 38.

The response formulas, Eqs. (3.28), can be constructed from the solutions of the initial-condition problem

$$u_{\perp}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k}), \quad (4.34a)$$

$$\delta T^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} \delta T^0(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\alpha}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k}) \quad (4.34b)$$

that are obtained by using Eq. (4.29) in (3.20b). Note that  $u_{\perp}^+$  does not depend on the initial temperature perturbation and is given by the same expression as in equilibrium. For the matrix elements of  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{11}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} |u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k})|^2, \quad (4.35a)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{12}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \frac{1}{i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k}) \delta T^0(-\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\alpha}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \frac{1}{i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} |u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k})|^2, \quad (4.35b)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{21}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} \frac{1}{i\omega + \nu k^2} \delta T^0(\mathbf{k}) u_{\perp}^0(-\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\alpha}{-i\omega + D_{\text{T}} k^2} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} |u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k})|^2, \quad (4.35c)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{22}^{++}(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} |\delta T^0(\mathbf{k})|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{i\omega + \nu k^2} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} \delta T^0(\mathbf{k}) u_{\perp}^0(-\mathbf{k}), - \frac{\alpha}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k}) \delta T^0(-\mathbf{k}) + \frac{\alpha^2}{\omega^2 + (\nu k^2)^2} \frac{1}{\omega^2 + (D_{\text{T}} k^2)^2} |u_{\perp}^0(\mathbf{k})|^2. \quad (4.35d)$$

Eqs. (4.35) and (4.31) again demonstrate the isomorphism between  $\mathcal{A}^{++}$  and  $S$ . In particular, for a pure velocity perturbation,  $\delta T^0 = 0$ , the non-equilibrium contributions to the  $\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{++}$  are the same as those to the  $S_{ij}$ , except for the factors of  $k^2$  in the numerators of the latter, which are a result of the  $\mathbf{k}$ -dependence of  $\Delta$ , Eq. (4.30).

We now consider the response to an external field, which is equivalent to the initial-value problem. For this, we need the static response functions, Eq. (4.33). From Eqs. (4.34), (3.15c), and (4.33) we obtain

$$u_{\perp}^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{1}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \left( h_{\perp}(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\alpha}{\nu k^2} h_T(\mathbf{k}) \right), \quad (4.36a)$$

$$\delta T^+(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_T k^2} \times \left\{ \left[ \frac{T}{c_p} + \frac{\alpha^2}{\rho} \frac{1}{\nu k^2} \left( \frac{1}{D_T k^2} + \frac{1}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \right) \right] h_T(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{\alpha}{\rho} \frac{1}{-i\omega + \nu k^2} \frac{1}{-i\omega + D_T k^2} h_{\perp}(\mathbf{k}) \right\}. \quad (4.36b)$$

Here  $h_{\perp}$  and  $h_T$  are the fields conjugate to the shear velocity and the temperature, respectively. We note that  $u_{\perp}^+$  depends on  $h_T$  as well as on  $h_{\perp}$ , whereas it does *not* depend on  $\delta T^0$ , see Eq. (4.34a). This is an example of the effects of a non-diagonal  $X^0$  that were mentioned at the end of Sec. III B.

Forming bilinear products of  $u_{\perp}^+$  and  $\delta T^+$  as expressed in Eqs. (4.36) yields the matrix elements  $\mathcal{A}_{ij}$  in terms of the fields  $h_{\perp}$  and  $h_T$ . For the special case  $h_T = 0$  we recover expressions that are equivalent to those given in Ref. 38.

## V. SUMMARY, AND DISCUSSION

In summary, we have presented a relation between correlation functions and response or relaxation functions in many-body systems that remains valid in non-equilibrium states where the usual fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) breaks down. It takes the form of an isomorphism between the two-point correlation functions and bilinear products of linear response formulas. The technical underpinning is the fact that fluctuating forces, which determine the correlations, and external fields, which determine the response, both enter as linear inhomogeneities in a generalized Langevin equation. The practical significance lies in the fact that fluctuation formulas and response formulas contain the same information about correlations, but the latter are amenable to experimental probes even in situations where the direct measurement of correlation functions is very difficult.

In what follows we present various discussion points, some of which elaborate on remarks that were already made in the main text.

1. We have used a generalized Langevin equation, Eqs. (3.1), that is obtained by linearizing about an arbitrary state that can be an equilibrium or non-equilibrium state, and may or may not be time dependent. Within this formalism the crucial isomorphism, expressed in Sec. III C, manifests itself in a very simple way. It is an obvious result of the fluctuating forces and the conjugate fields both being linear inhomogeneities in the Langevin equation, and it is arguably more plausible than the usual fluctuation-dissipation theorem. This simplicity is somewhat deceptive, as the result is much less obvious if one uses different techniques. In this context it is useful to remember that in non-equilibrium states the dynamics play a much more crucial role than in equilibrium ones. For instance, in non-equilibrium states the equal-time correlation functions in general depend on the dynamics (see, for instance, Eqs. (4.32)), whereas in equilibrium they are thermodynamic quantities that are entirely determined by the partition function. The use of dynamic equations is therefore very natural in this context.

A related point is that the isomorphism reflects Onsager's regression hypothesis [28], as was mentioned at the end of Sec. III. Actually, the very fact that one can use the dynamic equation (3.1a) to discuss both fluctuations and response or relaxation relies on Onsager's hypothesis. In the language of the current paper, it states that the relaxation of the dynamic variables from an initial value is governed by the averaged version of the same dynamic equation that governs the dynamics of the spontaneous fluctuations. As a practical consequence, the correlation functions even in non-equilibrium systems can effectively be determined by measuring response or relaxation functions, and the size of the latter is given by macroscopic driving forces that are experimentally controllable even if the fluctuations are small. This point was made in the context of the example of a fluid in a NESS, Sec. IV C, in Refs. 38, 55.

2. What constitutes a violation of the FDT is to some extent a matter of choice. The most common notion, which we have adopted, is that Eqs. (2.16) must hold as *equalities*, as opposed to just proportionality relations, in order for the FDT to hold. We have discussed two mechanisms for violating the FDT, see Sec. IV. Mechanism I is very simple: it consists of stipulating a fluctuating-force correlation that does not lead to the equilibrium equal-time correlation functions. While technically trivial, this reflects the fact that the equal-time correlation functions are in general not known in non-equilibrium systems and depend on the dynamics. Since the response functions do not depend on the fluctuating-force correlations this obviously leads to a violation of the FDT. This simple but fundamental point implies that an equilibrium equal-time correlation function that is different from the equilib-

rium one implies a violation of the FDT. Mechanism I does, however, leave intact the structure of the equilibrium theory. For Mechanism I (a) in particular, where the fluctuating-force correlation has the same wave-number dependence as in equilibrium, the FDT is violated only in the sense that Eq. (2.16b) turns into a proportionality relation with a constant proportionality factor. One might call this a weak violation of the FDT. Examples we have discussed are active Brownian motion, Sec. IV B 1, and the randomly stirred fluid, Sec. IV B 2, with a  $\Delta(\mathbf{k}) \propto k^2$  that is not given by Eq. (4.2). In these cases the fluctuation-response relation from Sec. III C is no stronger a statement than the violated FDT, since it takes the form of an isomorphism rather than an identity. However, we emphasize again that the isomorphism *always* holds, irrespective of whether, or how badly, the FDT is violated.

For Mechanism I (b) the above structural remarks are still true, but the wave-number dependence of the fluctuating-force correlations can lead to long-range correlations that are not present in equilibrium. These long-range correlations can be spatial in nature, as in the example of a stirred fluid with  $\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = \text{const.}$ , Eq. (4.22), or temporal, as in the example of cell motion in Sec. IV B 3. In these examples the equal-time correlation function scales differently with the wave number than the static response function. This is a strong violation of the FDT.

Mechanism II consists of couplings between the dynamic variables that are different from the equilibrium theory, which leads to structural changes. Of our examples, the fluid in a NESS, Sec. IV C, falls into this category. In this case the equal-time correlation functions are proportional to the static response functions, see Eqs. (4.32, 4.33), although the non-equilibrium contributions to both are singular functions of the wave number and the proportionality factors depend on kinetic coefficients. Also, one of the response functions vanishes whereas the corresponding equal-time correlation functions is nonzero. This is in between the weak and strong violations of the FDT as defined above.

It is possible to have both mechanisms present, although this is not the case in any of the examples we have considered. This is an interesting problem to consider.

3. In the context of Mechanism II, which relies on terms that are absent in equilibrium hydrodynamics, it is worthwhile mentioning that terms that *are* present in ordinary hydrodynamics, but are anomalously large due to a non-equilibrium situation, can lead to qualitative effects. An example is the model of active particles suspended in a momentum-conserving fluid studied in Ref. 56, where an anomalously large Burnett coefficient leads to a hydrodynamic instability.
4. In equilibrium statistical mechanics, the static re-

sponse functions  $X^0$  are naturally considered as input into the linear-response problem. In this case, they are purely thermodynamic quantities and are given by commutator correlation functions  $\chi^0$ . In non-equilibrium systems none of the preceding statements are true. In the context of the dynamic equations (3.1), it is the  $b_{ij}$  that describe the coupling of the variables to the external fields, and it is natural to consider them fundamental ingredients of the theory on the same level as the couplings and relaxation rates  $\lambda_{ij}$ . The static response functions  $X^0$  then are derived quantities that are related to the fundamental couplings  $b_{ij}$  via Eq. (3.21b). Even though the  $X^0$  are not frequency dependent, in a non-equilibrium system they in general depend on the dynamics via kinetic coefficients, as we have seen explicitly in Sec. IV C, see Eq. (4.33). We also note that the frequency dependence of  $b$  is a consequence of the frequency dependence of  $\lambda$ , i.e., of memory effects. If one neglects memory effects, both  $\lambda$  and  $b$  are delta functions in time space and hence frequency independent.

5. In all of our examples the Langevin-force correlations were short ranged. This raises the question as to whether long-ranged correlations ever arise from long-ranged stochastic forces. This is to some degree a matter of how the theory is formulated. Consider the example of a fluid in a NESS, Sec. IV C. As was shown in Ref. 54, it is possible to formulate a theory for the temperature fluctuations only, while the velocity fluctuations are hidden by integrating them out in a Martin-Siggia-Rose formalism. The resulting effective Langevin equation for the temperature fluctuations has a long-ranged stochastic force. This is analogous to the well known phenomenon in field theory, where integrating out soft, or massless, modes leads to long-ranged effective interactions. Conversely, a long-ranged Langevin force can be made short-ranged by introducing suitable auxiliary variables that make explicit the ‘hidden sector’ of the theory.
6. For our discussion of response functions we have assumed time translational invariance. This is an exact property of steady states, but for general non-equilibrium states it is true at best in some approximate sense. An exploration of the conditions under which such an approximation is valid, as well as a possible generalization of the fluctuation-response relation to situations where time-translational invariance does not hold, are interesting problems.

With this proviso in mind we stress again the generality of the fluctuation-response relation derived in Sec. III C. For instance, the large fluctuations present in the NESS discussed in Sec. IV C can give rise to instabilities such as Rayleigh-Bénard convection [51]. This leads to a new NESS that may, as a function of suitable parameters, become unstable itself and ultimately lead to a time-dependent state. The fluctuation-response relation will remain valid in such

a scenario if one linearizes about the appropriate state. Similar remarks hold for instabilities in active matter systems, see Ref. 56, and also Ref. 32 and references therein.

---

### Appendix A: Causal functions

Let  $g(t)$  be a time-dependent function. It is useful to separate  $g$  into parts for positive and negative times, respectively,

$$g(t) = g^-(t) + g^+(t) , \quad (\text{A1a})$$

with

$$g^\pm(t) = \Theta(\pm t) g(t) . \quad (\text{A1b})$$

We define a temporal Fourier transform

$$g(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} g(t) , \quad (\text{A2a})$$

and a Laplace transform

$$g(z) = \pm \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{izt} g^\pm(t) \quad (\pm \text{ for } \text{Im}(z) \gtrless 0) , \quad (\text{A2b})$$

with  $z$  the complex frequency. (We denote the underlying real-time function, its Fourier transform, and its Laplace transform, by the same symbol and distinguish between them by their arguments.) With these definitions,

$$g^\pm(\omega) = \pm g(z = \omega \pm i\epsilon) , \quad (\text{A2c})$$

with  $\epsilon > 0$  infinitesimal. The Fourier transform is related to the discontinuity across the cut on the real frequency axis, which defines the spectral density  $g''$

$$\begin{aligned} g''(\omega) &= \frac{1}{2i} [g(z = \omega + i\epsilon) - g(z = \omega - i\epsilon)] \\ &= g(\omega)/2i . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2d})$$

The spectral density in turn is related, via the Sokhotski-Plemelj formula, to the Laplace transform by the Hilbert-Stieltjes relation [57]

$$g(z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\pi} \frac{g''(\omega)}{\omega - z} . \quad (\text{A2e})$$

- 
- [1] L. P. Kadanoff and P. C. Martin, *Ann. Phys. (NY)* **24**, 419 (1963).
  - [2] H. Nyquist, *Phys. Rev.* **32**, 110 (1928).
  - [3] H. B. Callen and T. A. Welton, *Phys. Rev.* **83**, 34 (1951).
  - [4] R. Kubo, *Rep. Progr. Phys.* **29**, 255 (1966).
  - [5] E. M. Sevick, R. Prabhakar, S. R. Williams, and D. J. Searles, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **59**, 603 (2008).
  - [6] U. Seifert, *Rep. Progr. Phys.* **75**, 126001 (2012).
  - [7] P. Gaspard, *The Statistical Mechanics of Irreversible Phenomena* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2022).
  - [8] S. Dal Cengio, D. Levis, and I. Pagonabarraga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 238003 (2019).
  - [9] M. Baiesi and C. Maes, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 103004 (2013).
  - [10] U. Marconi, A. Puglisi, L. Rondoni, and A. Vulpiani, *Phys. Rep.* **461**, 111 (2008).
  - [11] M. Baiesi, C. Maes, and B. Wynants, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 010602 (2009).
  - [12] D. Andrieux and P. Gaspard, *J. Chem. Phys.* **121**, 6167 (2004).
  - [13] C. Maes, *Phys. Rep.* **805**, 1 (2020).
  - [14] L. Caprini, A. Puglisi, and A. Sarracino, *Symmetry* **13**, 81 (2021).
  - [15] S. Dal Cengio, D. Levis, and I. Pagonabarraga, *J. Stat. Mech.* (2021), 043201.
  - [16] L. K. Davis, K. Proesmans, and E. Fodor, *Phys. Rev. X* **14**, 011012 (2024).
  - [17] Some authors (e.g., Forster [18]) denote the real-time commutator correlation function by  $\chi''_{ij}(x, x')$ . In the case of time-translational invariance its Fourier transform,  $\chi''(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'; \omega)$ , is proportional to the spectral density defined in Eq. (A2d). As a related issue, different authors define the Laplace transform, Eq. (A2b), differently.
  - [18] D. Forster, *Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, and Correlation Functions* (Benjamin, Reading, MA, 1975).
  - [19] R. Kubo, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **12**, 570 (1957).
  - [20] This is the structure of time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theories [39, 40], where the time derivative of the observable is given by a kinetic coefficient times the functional derivative of a free-energy functional. We assume that this structure remains valid in non-equilibrium systems, at least as long as there is a notion of local equilibrium. This assumption does *not* imply, however, that the equal-time correlation function is the same as in equilibrium.
  - [21] P. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1995).
  - [22] S. R. De Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics* (Dover, New York, 1984).
  - [23] Time translational invariance always holds in a steady, or stationary, state, which may or may not be an equilibrium state. More generally, it may hold approximately if the time dependence of the state is slow in an appropriate sense. This point requires additional investigations, see Sec. IV.
  - [24] Causality restricts the response function to positive times. As a result,  $X_{ij}$  for negative times and its Laplace transform in the lower half plane have no physical meaning.

- [25] By definition, linearizing to describe the linear response to an external field, or to imposed initial conditions, is justified. For the thermal correlation functions it is known that nonlinear terms in the fluctuations simply renormalize quantities such as the transport coefficients in the macroscopic equations. In general, this is a small effect. However, this may not be true near critical or instability points, or if the noise correlation is anomalously large, see Sec. IV B 3.
- [26]  $G$  and  $G^T$  are in general operators, and Eq. (3.6) needs to be interpreted accordingly.
- [27] For a given propagator, knowledge of the coupling constants  $b$  is equivalent to knowledge of the static response functions  $X^0$  (which in general depend on the dynamics). Within the framework of the dynamic equations the  $b$  should be considered fundamental quantities, and the  $X^0$  should be considered derived ones. We will further discuss this in Sec. V.
- [28] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **38**, 2265 (1931).
- [29] T. R. Kirkpatrick, E. G. D. Cohen, and J. R. Dorfman, Phys. Rev. A **26**, 950 (1982).
- [30] T. R. Kirkpatrick, E. G. D. Cohen, and J. R. Dorfman, Phys. Rev. A **26**, 995 (1982).
- [31] D. Forster, D. R. Nelson, and M. J. Stephen, Phys. Rev. A **16**, 732 (1977).
- [32] M. C. Marchetti, J. F. Joanny, S. Ramaswamy, T. B. Liverpool, J. Prost, M. Rao, and R. A. Simha, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 1143 (2013).
- [33] The term ‘active matter’ refers to systems governed by statistical mechanics that are not in equilibrium due to intrinsic energy sources. This is a vast field, and we briefly discuss only a few examples that illustrates the general point made in this paper.
- [34] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Fluid Mechanics* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1966), Third Revised English ed.
- [35] See Sec. XVII in Ref. 34. Many editions are missing this section.
- [36] We reiterate that in equilibrium the random-force correlation is *chosen* such that it yields the known equilibrium equal-time correlation function. This argument goes back to Langevin’s treatment of Brownian motion [41] and was adapted by Landau and Lifshitz to fluctuating hydrodynamics.
- [37] Note that the static susceptibility must be determined independently, it cannot be obtained from the sum rule (2.7b). Also note that in equilibrium the static susceptibility is a thermodynamic quantity, whereas in non-equilibrium systems it requires knowledge of the dynamics.
- [38] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. E **109**, 044140 (2024).
- [39] S.-K. Ma, *Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena* (Benjamin, Reading, MA, 1976).
- [40] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49**, 435 (1977).
- [41] P. Langevin, C. R. Acad. Sci. (Paris) **146**, 530 (1908), For an English translation see D. S. Lemons and A. Gythiel, Am. J. Phys. **65**, 1079 (1997).
- [42] P. Romanczuk, M. Bär, W. Ebeling, and B. Lindner, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics **202**, 1 (2012).
- [43] In this simple model the velocity can rotate freely, so the equation of motion for the velocity components perpendicular to  $\langle v \rangle_{h=0}$  is not physically meaningful.
- [44] X. Li, S. Sinha, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and D. Thirumalai (2022), arXiv:2211.14410.
- [45] J. Toner and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4326 (1995).
- [46] J. Toner and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 4828 (1998).
- [47] T. Vicsek, A. Czirók, E. Ben-Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Shochet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1226 (1995).
- [48] J. Toner, Y. Tu, and A. Ramaswamy, Ann. Phys. (NY) **318**, 170 (2005).
- [49] The active-matter literature distinguishes between ‘wet’ and ‘dry’ systems [32]. In the former, momentum is conserved, in the latter, it is not, usually due to friction provided by a substrate. The flocking theory discussed here is an example of a dry system; the model of cell motion in Sec. IV B 3, a wet one.
- [50] J. R. Dorfman, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and J. V. Sengers, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **45**, 213 (1994).
- [51] J. M. Ortiz de Zárate and J. V. Sengers, *Hydrodynamic fluctuations in fluids and fluid mixtures* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2007).
- [52] There are various indications that using the equilibrium force correlations suffices for capturing the leading effects in the NESS. For a discussion of this point, see Refs. 38, 58, 59.
- [53] This result can be obtained from the time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau theory known as Model H in Ref. 40. It also has been derived from kinetic theory in Ref. 60. Both of these derivations yield expressions for the quantity  $b_{ij}$ , Eq. (3.21b).  $X^0$  is obtained by using the propagator in that equation and solving for  $X^0$ .
- [54] T. R. Kirkpatrick, D. Belitz, and J. R. Dorfman, J. Chem. Phys. B **125**, 7499 (2021).
- [55] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 244001 (2023).
- [56] T. R. Kirkpatrick and J. K. Bhattacharjee, Phys. Rev. Fluids **4**, 024306 (2019).
- [57] N. I. Muskhelishvili, *Singular Integral Equations* (Dover, New York, 2013), 2nd ed.
- [58] T. R. Kirkpatrick and J. R. Dorfman, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 022109 (2015).
- [59] D. Ronis, I. Procaccia, and J. Machta, Phys. Rev. A **22**, 714 (1980).
- [60] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Eur. Phys. J-Spec. Top. **232**, 3495 (2023).