

Relativistic spin hydrodynamics revisited with general rotation by entropy-current analysis

Lixin Yang^{1,*} and Li Yan^{1,†}

¹*Institute of Modern Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

(Dated: October 11, 2024)

Abstract

We revisit the canonical formulation of spin hydrodynamics for Dirac fermions with a general thermal vorticity. The orders of the general thermal vorticity and the corresponding spin variables are considered independently from those of the conventional hydrodynamic variables and their perturbative gradients. Assuming a totally antisymmetric spin current of Dirac fermions, the entropy-current analysis with a general spin potential indicates that the constitutive relations of the stress-energy tensor have to involve spin variables, particularly those linked to boost symmetry, to adhere to the entropy principle. In the presence of the degree of freedom associated with boost symmetry, we choose the constitutive relations of the canonical formulation to be connected to those of the phenomenological formulation through pseudogauge transformation. Subsequently, a linear-mode analysis is conducted using the resulting spin hydrodynamic equations. It is observed that the spin and hydrodynamic modes in this canonical formulation display different characteristics compared to those in the phenomenological formulation up to the second order of gradient.

arXiv:2410.07583v1 [nucl-th] 10 Oct 2024

* yanglixin@fudan.edu.cn

† cliyan@fudan.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Relativistic hydrodynamics, as an effective theory in terms of the IR variables, has proven highly successful in describing the macroscopic behavior of various many-body systems, spanning from astrophysics to relativistic heavy-ion collisions. Spin-orbit coupling plays a significant role in relativistic fluids with spinful constituents, leading to spin polarization, particularly in the presence of substantial angular momentum and/or strong vorticity. The polarization phenomena have been intensively studied in heavy-ion collisions since long [1–6], and its occurrence has been confirmed through experimental measurements of hyperon polarization [7–9] and vector-meson spin alignment [10–12]. The global polarization of Λ hyperons has been effectively captured by relativistic hydrodynamic models incorporating thermalized spin degrees of freedom [5, 13–20]. However, theoretical calculations [21, 22] concerning the azimuthal-angle dependence of hyperon polarization have yielded results with opposite signs compared to the experimental data [23, 24]. This discrepancy, known as the “sign problem” in explaining local spin polarization, has also been addressed in related reviews [25–28].

Relativistic spin hydrodynamics is a promising framework for understanding the sign problem, which has been advancing rapidly through various approaches in a significant body of research [29–61]. Essentially, relativistic spin hydrodynamics is constructed by introducing the spin modes linked to Lorentz symmetry as additional IR variables, alongside the conventional hydrodynamic variables related to relativistic translation invariance. The spin variables can typically be categorized into rotation and boost components based on the subgroups of the Lorentz transformation. The former characterizes the spin polarization in the fluid, while the role of the latter remains unclear. An entropy-current analysis approach to spin hydrodynamics was introduced in [34] with the canonical spin current being antisymmetric only in its last two indices, referred to as the phenomenological formulation. The same approach is also implemented in the canonical formulations [46, 55] where the canonical spin current of Dirac fermions is totally anti-symmetric. It is noteworthy that the canonical formulations in [46, 55] are developed without considering the degree of freedom associated with boost symmetry. In contrast, another canonical formulation incorporating boost variables is presented in [56], which is connected to the phenomenological formulation through a pseudogauge transformation. It is meaningful to explore the inclusion of boost variables in a general relativistic framework, since boost symmetry, along with rotation, is a fundamental aspect of Lorentz covariant hydrodynamics. Furthermore, hydrodynamics

with varying approaches to the treatment of boost modes may exhibit distinct behavior when subjected to spin-orbit coupling.

In this paper, we investigate the canonical formulation of spin hydrodynamics by considering its applicability to spinful fluids across a broad range of thermal vorticity intensities. In this scenario, the spin potential is presumed to be a general antisymmetric tensor in order to coincide with the thermal vorticity in equilibrium. Moreover, the magnitudes of both the thermal vorticity and the spin potential are assessed without regard to perturbative gradients. In the case of general spinful fluids, the entropy-current analysis suggests that the entropy principle cannot be fulfilled unless spin variables are included in the constitutive relations of the stress-energy tensor, with these spin variables needing to account for the degree of freedom linked to boost symmetry. The constitutive relations in the presence of boost variables have not yet been definitively determined. For simplicity, we opt to connect the canonical formulation of spin hydrodynamics to the phenomenological approach through pseudogauge transformation. The linear-mode analysis using the resulting spin hydrodynamic equations reveals that the spin and hydrodynamic modes in this canonical formulation exhibit distinct dispersion relations compared to the phenomenological formulation up to the second order of gradients.

Throughout this paper, we adopt the mostly plus Minkowski metric $\eta^{\mu\nu} \equiv \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$. For the Levi-Civita symbol, we use the convention $\epsilon^{0123} = -\epsilon_{0123} = 1$ and $\epsilon^{123} = \epsilon_{123} = 1$. We also define the notations $X^{(\mu\nu)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(X^{\mu\nu} + X^{\nu\mu})$ and $X^{[\mu\nu]} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(X^{\mu\nu} - X^{\nu\mu})$.

II. SPIN HYDRODYNAMICS FOR DIRAC FERMIONS

The conservation equations of the Noether's currents from the relativistic translation and Lorentz symmetry are

$$\partial_\mu \Theta^{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$\partial_\alpha J^{\alpha\mu\nu} = \partial_\alpha \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu} + \Theta^{\mu\nu} - \Theta^{\nu\mu} = 0, \tag{2}$$

where the total angular momentum is $J^{\alpha\mu\nu} \equiv \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu} + x^\mu \Theta^{\alpha\nu} - x^\nu \Theta^{\alpha\mu}$ with $\Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu}$ being the spin tensor. The canonical stress-energy tensor $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ is asymmetric in its two indices, comprising both symmetric and antisymmetric components, while the total angular momentum density $J^{\alpha\mu\nu}$ is antisymmetric in its last two indices.

In classical physics, the hydrodynamics of the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) is formulated with IR variables while the details at a microscopic level are averaged out. For

simplicity, we consider spin hydrodynamics without conserved charges. We follow [46] to assume that the coarse-grained spin tensor in hydrodynamics retains the entire antisymmetry of its corresponding quantum operator. Employing the fluid four-velocity u^μ with $u^\mu u_\mu = -1$, the spin density is introduced as $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} \equiv -u_\alpha \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu}$ with $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} = -\mathcal{R}^{\nu\mu}$. The resulting spin density satisfies $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} u_\nu = 0$ due to the total antisymmetry of $\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha}$. As a result, $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ is fully saturated with only three independent components associated with the spatial rotation symmetry, while the remaining three attached to the boost symmetry are absent in the spin tensor $\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha}$ [62]. In such condition, it is yet to be determined whether the spin variables, especially the boost ones, can be generally absent in the coarse-grained stress-energy tensor. To this end, we perform an entropy-current analysis to constrain the presence of spin variables in hydrodynamics with the entropy principle.

The totally antisymmetric spin tensor can be decomposed into longitudinal and transverse parts as

$$\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha} = u^\mu \mathcal{S}^{\nu\alpha} + u^\nu \mathcal{S}^{\alpha\mu} + u^\alpha \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} + \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} u_\sigma \overset{\circ}{\Sigma},$$

where the antisymmetric component $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ can be further decomposed as

$$\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \mathcal{R}_\rho u_\sigma + 2u^{[\mu} \mathcal{B}^{\nu]},$$

with $\mathcal{R}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} u^\sigma$ and $\mathcal{B}^\mu = \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} u_\nu$. Noting the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} \mathcal{R}_\sigma &= (u^\mu \epsilon^{\nu\alpha\rho\sigma} + u^\nu \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\rho\sigma} + u^\alpha \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}) \mathcal{R}_\rho u_\sigma, \\ 0 &= u^\mu u^{[\nu} \mathcal{B}^{\alpha]} + u^\nu u^{[\alpha} \mathcal{B}^{\mu]} + u^\alpha u^{[\mu} \mathcal{B}^{\nu]}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

one readily writes the spin tensor into

$$\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} \left(\mathcal{R}_\sigma + u_\sigma \overset{\circ}{\Sigma} \right), \quad (4)$$

which immediately gives $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \mathcal{R}_\rho u_\sigma$. Since \mathcal{R}_ρ captures all the three independent components of $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ in a covariant form, $\overset{\circ}{\Sigma}$ is automatically left as corrections out of equilibrium to be constrained by the entropy principle. Given $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ representing the rotation components of the spin modes $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu} = 2u^{[\mu} \mathcal{B}^{\nu]}$ as the rest part naturally denotes the boost modes where \mathcal{B}^μ contains all the three independent components related to the boost symmetry.

The local thermodynamic relations generalized with spin variables are

$$Ts = \varepsilon + p - \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (5)$$

$$Tds = d\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu}d\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (6)$$

$$sdT = dp - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}d\omega_{\mu\nu}, \quad (7)$$

where T , s , ε , p and $\omega_{\mu\nu} = -\omega_{\nu\mu}$ denoting the local temperature, entropy density, energy density, pressure and spin potential respectively. An important point to note is that the local thermodynamic relations do not generally hold in the quantum-statistical description of a relativistic fluid [61], where the thermodynamic quantities, such as temperature, thermal velocity and spin potential can be unambiguously defined at the local thermodynamic equilibrium (LTE) [63]. In this work, we adhere to the traditional hydrodynamics viewpoint [64, 65] and assume that it is always possible to establish the local thermodynamic relations with a proper redefinition of the thermodynamic quantities in a state near equilibrium. Although the thermodynamic quantities defined in the two frameworks may share different values, they should approach the same values as the fluid evolves to the global thermodynamic equilibrium (GTE).

Additionally, we take a general antisymmetric spin potential $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ without the requirement $\omega_{\mu\nu}u^\nu = 0$ even when it is conjugate to $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ in the local thermodynamic relations, as is case in the phenomenological formulation of spin hydrodynamics[34, 39, 47, 48, 56, 60]. One can also separate $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ into rotation and boost parts as $\omega_{\mu\nu} = r_{\mu\nu} + b_{\mu\nu}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mu\nu} &= \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}r^\rho u^\sigma, & b_{\mu\nu} &= 2b_{[\mu}u_{\nu]} \\ r^\sigma &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\sigma\rho\mu\nu}u_\rho r_{\mu\nu}, & b_\nu &= u^\mu b_{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned}$$

The conjugations in (5)-(7) differ from the canonical formulations in [46, 55] where the boost variables are absence and the spin potential is chosen as $r_{\mu\nu}$ with $r_{\mu\nu}u^\nu = 0$. This difference is nontrivial. Although the Gibbs energy density g from (5), i.e.,

$$g = \varepsilon + p - Ts = \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(r_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} + b_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) = r_\mu\mathcal{R}^\mu + b_\mu\mathcal{B}^\mu, \quad (8)$$

gets no contributions from $b_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} = r_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu} = 0$, the conjugations in (6) and (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu}d\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} &= r_\mu d\mathcal{R}^\mu + b_\mu u_\nu \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\mathcal{R}_\rho du_\sigma + b_\mu d\mathcal{B}^\mu + \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}r^\rho u^\nu \mathcal{B}^\nu du^\mu, \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}d\omega_{\mu\nu} &= \mathcal{R}^\mu dr_\mu - b_\mu u_\nu \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\mathcal{R}_\rho du_\sigma + \mathcal{B}^\mu db_\mu - \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}r^\rho u^\nu \mathcal{B}^\nu du^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

give b - \mathcal{R} and r - \mathcal{B} conjugations which are generally nonvanishing in the presence of vorticity where the non-inertial motion of fluid evolves along with the spin variables. It may seem

that the non-inertial $b\mathcal{R}$ and $r\mathcal{B}$ terms are not well defined contributions to thermodynamic potentials. Actually, the velocity dependence is just an artifact from the introducing of rotation \mathcal{R}^μ and boost \mathcal{B}^μ vectors orthogonal to four-velocity as thermodynamic quantities into the generalized local thermodynamic relations. The general antisymmetric $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ is more physically appropriate than $r_{\mu\nu}$ with $r_{\mu\nu}u^\mu = 0$, in the sense that $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ can smoothly transition into the GTE to coincide with the general thermal vorticity $\varpi_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_{[\mu}\beta_{\nu]}$ which may not necessarily be orthogonal to u_μ . Especially, when the acceleration part $u^\mu\varpi_{\mu\nu}$ is as strong as the spatial part $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\sigma\rho\mu\nu}u_\rho\varpi_{\mu\nu}$, we will see in the entropy-current analysis that the entropy principle with a general antisymmetric $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ necessarily requires the presence of \mathcal{B} in the constitutive relations.

We start with a general tensor decomposition in spin hydrodynamics as follows,

$$\Theta^{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon u^\mu u^\nu + p\Delta^{\mu\nu} + \mathring{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (10)$$

$$\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} \left(\mathcal{R}_\sigma + \mathring{\Sigma} u_\sigma \right), \quad (11)$$

$$s^\mu = s u^\mu + \mathring{s}^\mu, \quad (12)$$

where $\Delta^{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} + u^\mu u^\nu$ is the transverse projection operator and the constitutive relations of the components with a circle are to be constrained by the entropy principle. To perform the entropy-current analysis, we derive the entropy production rate as follows. Taking the notations $\beta \equiv 1/T$, $\beta_\mu \equiv \beta u_\mu$, $D \equiv u^\nu \partial_\nu$ and $\theta \equiv \partial_\nu u^\nu$, we have

$$\partial_\mu s^\mu = \partial_\mu (s u^\mu + \mathring{s}^\mu) = D s + s \theta + \partial_\mu \mathring{s}^\mu. \quad (13)$$

We replace the first term in the above expression using (6) to get

$$\partial_\mu s^\mu = \beta \left[D\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu} D(\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) \right] + s \theta + \partial_\mu \mathring{s}^\mu. \quad (14)$$

The two terms $D\varepsilon$ and $-\frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu} D\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ in the square brackets can be substituted by the components $\mathring{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathring{\Sigma}$ that are to be determined by the entropy principle. To proceed, we contract (1) and (2) with u_ν and $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ respectively to get

$$\begin{aligned} D\varepsilon &= -(\varepsilon + p)\theta + u_\nu \partial_\mu \mathring{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}, \\ -\frac{1}{2}\omega_{\mu\nu} D\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} &= \omega_{\mu\nu} \left[\frac{1}{2}\theta\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) \right] + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma}\omega_{\mu\nu}\partial_\alpha (\mathring{\Sigma}u_\sigma) + \omega_{\mu\nu}\mathring{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

We then obtain the entropy production rate as

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_\mu s^\mu = & \left[s - \beta \left(\varepsilon + p - \frac{1}{2} \omega_{\mu\nu} (\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) \right) \right] \theta + \partial_\mu \left(\dot{s}^\mu + \dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu} \beta_\nu + \frac{1}{2} \dot{\Sigma} \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\nu\sigma} \beta \omega_{\alpha\nu} u_\sigma \right) \\
& - \dot{\Theta}^{(\mu\nu)} \partial_\mu \beta_\nu - \dot{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]} (\partial_\mu \beta_\nu - \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{2} \dot{\Sigma} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\alpha (\beta \omega_{\mu\nu}) u_\sigma \\
& + \left[\partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha (u^\alpha \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) \right] \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In the absence of \mathcal{B} and b , (16) agrees with [46, 55], irrespective of the specific power counting scheme. The entropy principle requires that (16) is not only semipositive in general, but also zero in the GTE where thermal vorticity $\varpi_{\mu\nu}$ becomes a constant anti-symmetric tensor and

$$\beta_\mu = c_\mu + \varpi_{\mu\nu} x^\nu, \quad \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} = \varpi_{\mu\nu}, \tag{17}$$

with c_μ being a constant four-vector.

To explicitly seek the semipositivity of (16) to the second order of gradient, we adopt a general power counting scheme where perturbation expansion of spin variables are independent of the conventional hydrodynamic variables and their gradients,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon \sim p \sim \beta \sim u^\mu \sim O(\partial^0), \quad \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} \sim O(\delta), \\
\omega_{\mu\nu} \sim \varpi_{\mu\nu} \sim O(\varpi), \quad \varpi_{\mu\nu} - \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} \sim O(\partial),
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $O(\delta)$ could be $O(\hbar\varpi)$ if the spin susceptibility is $O(\hbar\partial^0)$. In general, $O(\varpi)$ could range from $O(\partial)$ for hydrodynamics with an isotropy background to $O(\partial^0)$ for gyrohydrodynamics [55] with an anisotropic background. We count $O(\delta)$ and $O(\varpi)$ independently of $O(\partial)$ so that the formulation of the spin hydrodynamics is applicable to a broad scale of the thermal vorticity instead of subject to a specific power counting scheme of it.

We aim to determine the constitutive relations of $\dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$, $\dot{\Sigma}$ and \dot{s}^μ to $O(\partial)$ where (16) should be semipositive to $O(\partial^2)$. In the precedent set by [46], the entropy production rate is ensured to be semipositive to $O(\partial^2)$ under a specific power counting scheme with $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} \sim \omega_{\mu\nu} \sim O(\partial)$ and without the presence of $\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}$, where the non-semipositive terms $\dot{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]} u_\nu (\partial_\mu \beta_\sigma - \beta \omega_{\mu\sigma}) u^\sigma$ and $\beta \omega_{\mu\nu} \partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu})$ in (16) can be neglected as $O(\partial^3)$. However, in a broad scale of the thermal vorticity, these non-semipositive terms are of $O(\partial\varpi\delta)$ which are generally non-ignorable and therefore have to be cancelled out. By noting (5), we drop the first term in the first line of (16). Taking the GTE limit (17) in (16), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = \partial_\mu s_{\text{GTE}}^\mu = & \partial_\mu \left(\dot{s}_{\text{GTE}}^\mu + \dot{\Theta}_{\text{GTE}}^{\mu\nu} \beta_\nu + \frac{1}{2} \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{GTE}} \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\nu\sigma} \varpi_{\alpha\nu} u_\sigma \right) \\
& + \left[\partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha (u^\alpha \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) \right] \varpi_{\mu\nu}.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Noting the nonvanishing terms in the last brackets of (19), it is evident that $\dot{s}^\mu \neq -\dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}\beta_\nu - \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Sigma}^{\circ}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\nu\sigma}\varpi_{\alpha\nu}u_\sigma$ in general. Therefore, terms involving \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} must be present in either $\dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$, \dot{s}^μ or $\dot{\Sigma}^{\circ}$ to offset the above nonvanishing terms. Note that, in the vicinity of GTE, these nonvanishing terms arise from the leading-order term $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma}\mathcal{R}_\sigma$ in the spin current (11). As pointed out in [34], the entropy production rate from the leading-order of the spin current is zero if spin and orbital angular momentum are separately conserved[66]. At the lowest order of the non-conservation equation (2) of the spin current, the dissipation of spin only stem from the source/absorption term $\dot{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]}$.

We separate the non-dissipative parts from the dissipative parts by marking the former with subscript δ and the latter with tick, i.e., $\dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu} = \Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} + \check{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$, $\dot{\Sigma}^{\circ} = \Sigma_\delta + \check{\Sigma}$ and $\dot{s}^\mu = s_\delta^\mu + \check{s}^\mu$. At this stage, we manifest the assumption that the constitutive relations of $\dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$, \dot{s}^μ and $\dot{\Sigma}^{\circ}$, as expressions in terms of the spin hydrodynamic variables β , u^μ , $\omega^{\mu\nu}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$, consistently satisfy the entropy principle, i.e.,

$$\exists \dot{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}, \dot{s}^\mu, \dot{\Sigma}^{\circ} \text{ as functions of } \beta, u^\mu, \omega^{\mu\nu} \text{ and } \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} \forall \beta, u^\mu, \omega^{\mu\nu} \text{ and } \mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu} : \partial_\mu s^\mu \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

Here the $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ dependent parts of the constitutive relations are to cancel out the non-semipositive terms in (16) where we take $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ as extra free variables besides β, u^μ and $\omega^{\mu\nu}$ [67]. The entropy production rate is written as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu s^\mu &= \partial_\mu \left[\check{s}^\mu - \check{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}\beta_\nu + \frac{1}{2}\check{\Sigma}^{\circ}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\nu\sigma}\beta\omega_{\alpha\nu}u_\sigma \right] \\ &\quad - \check{\Theta}^{(\mu\nu)}\partial_\mu\beta_\nu - \check{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]}(\partial_\mu\beta_\nu - \beta\omega_{\mu\nu}) - \frac{1}{2}\check{\Sigma}^{\circ}\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma}\partial_\alpha(\beta\omega_{\mu\nu})u_\sigma \\ &\quad + \partial_\mu s_\delta^\mu + \partial_\mu\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu}\beta_\nu + \left[\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\alpha(u^\nu\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\alpha(u^\alpha\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma}\partial_\alpha(\Sigma_\delta u_\sigma) \right] \beta\omega_{\mu\nu}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The dissipative part $\check{\Theta}^{\mu\nu}$ can be decomposed into the irreducible tensor basis [34, 39, 56](see also [68–70]) as follows,

$$\check{\Theta}^{(\mu\nu)} = 2u^{(\mu}h^{\nu)} + \tau^{\mu\nu}, \quad \check{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]} = 2u^{[\mu}q^{\nu]} + \phi^{\mu\nu}, \quad (22)$$

where the dissipative currents satisfy $\tau^{\mu\nu} = \tau^{\nu\mu}$, $\phi^{\mu\nu} = -\phi^{\nu\mu}$, $u_\mu h^\mu = u_\mu q^\mu = u_\mu \tau^{\mu\nu} = u_\mu \phi^{\mu\nu} = 0$. We have $u_\mu \check{\Theta}^{\mu\nu} u_\nu = \varepsilon$ while $u_\mu \Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} u_\nu$ is not necessarily zero. Moreover, in contrast to [59], we do not require $u_\mu \dot{s}^\mu \leq 0$. This is because we assume that the local thermodynamic relations (5)-(6) hold near LTE, where all the thermodynamic variables, including the entropy density s , are extended to be applicable out of equilibrium. Therefore, a general entropy density s evolving towards equilibrium is not identically equal to the maximum value that is to be reached in equilibrium.

In addition to the dissipative parts in the entropy production rate, we have collected all the non-dissipative components into the last line of (21). Explicitly, the entropy principle requires that the sum of the non-dissipative terms gives zero entropy production rate

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_\mu s_\delta^\mu + \partial_\mu \Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} \beta_\nu \\ & + \left[\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha (u^\alpha \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\alpha (\Sigma_\delta u_\sigma) \right] \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

We consider the non-dissipative constitutive relations of $\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu}$, s_δ^μ and Σ_δ to all orders as solutions to (23). For this purpose, we explicitly write $\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu}$ and s_δ^μ into the terms of $O(\partial^0 \omega^0 \delta)$, $O(\partial^0 \omega \delta)$, $O(\partial \omega^0 \delta)$ and higher orders in a general form as

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_\delta^{\alpha\sigma} &= \Theta_0^{\alpha\sigma} + \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} \omega_{\mu\nu} + \Theta_\partial^{\alpha\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\sigma\nu} \partial_\mu (\Sigma_\delta u_\nu) + O(\partial \omega \delta), \\ s_\delta^\alpha &= s_0^\alpha + s_\omega^{\alpha\mu\nu} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} + s_\partial^\alpha + O(\partial \omega \delta), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the $O(\partial^0 \omega^0 \delta)$ components $\Theta_{0,\omega}$, $s_{0,\omega}$ and $O(\partial \omega^0 \delta)$ components $\Theta_\partial, s_\partial$ are expressions in terms of β, u^μ and $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$. Now we collect the terms involving $\beta \omega_{\mu\nu}$, $\partial_\alpha (\beta \omega_{\mu\nu})$ and $\beta \omega_{\alpha\sigma} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}$ into

$$X^{\mu\nu} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} + Y^{\alpha\mu\nu} \partial_\alpha (\beta \omega_{\mu\nu}) + \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} T \beta \omega_{\alpha\sigma} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}, \quad (25)$$

where $X^{\mu\nu}$ and $Y^{\alpha\mu\nu}$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} X^{\mu\nu} &\equiv \partial_\alpha s_\omega^{\alpha\mu\nu} + \partial_\alpha (\Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} T) \beta_\sigma + \Theta_\partial^{\mu\nu} + \partial_\alpha \left(u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu} - \frac{1}{2} u^\alpha \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu} \right), \\ Y^{\alpha\mu\nu} &\equiv s_\omega^{\alpha\mu\nu} + \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} u_\sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The two parts must vanish for any values of $\beta \omega_{\mu\nu}$ and $\partial_\alpha (\beta \omega_{\mu\nu})$, resulting in the constraints

$$X^{[\mu\nu]} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Y^{\alpha[\mu\nu]} = 0. \quad (27)$$

Likewise, to ensure the term $\Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} \beta \omega_{\alpha\sigma} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes for arbitrary values of $\beta \omega_{\alpha\sigma} \beta \omega_{\mu\nu}$ in (25), $\Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu}$ can run through several switches as follows

$$\Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_\omega^{[\alpha\sigma]\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} = -\Theta_\omega^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} = -\Theta_\omega^{\nu\mu\sigma\alpha}. \quad (28)$$

We then combine (27) and (28) to constrain the solutions to (23). As a straightforward application of these constraints, one can readily confirm that

$$\Theta_\partial^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_\omega^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (27) \rightarrow s_\omega^{\alpha[\mu\nu]} = 0 \rightarrow \partial_\alpha \left(\mathcal{R}^{\alpha[\mu} u^{\nu]} - \frac{1}{2} u^\alpha \mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu} \right) = 0, \quad (29)$$

leading to a contradiction as the left-hand side of the final equation is not identically zero. This implies that the stress-energy tensor must depend on $S^{\mu\nu}$ at $O(\partial\delta)$ or $O(\omega\delta)$. In general, one can analyze the terms to all orders in (23) to obtain a complete constraint for the solution. Nevertheless, given that (23) must hold order by order, we concentrate exclusively on the constraints related to the $O(\partial\delta)$ and $O(\omega\delta)$ terms. It will become apparent in the next section that the components dependent on ω within these orders are sufficient to illustrate the difficulties in upholding the entropy principle in the absence of boost variables.

III. ENTROPY PRINCIPLE IN THE ABSENCE OF BOOST VARIABLES

We now investigate the framework in the absence of the degree of freedom related to the boost symmetry where there are only seven independent dynamical variables with four from relativistic translation symmetry and three from rotation symmetry. In such circumstances, it is necessary to select three out of the ten equations in (1)-(2) as redundant in order to avoid overdetermination. As pointed out in [46], the physically meaningful choice is to consider the three equations ensuing from the boost symmetry in (2) as redundant identities since the boost variables are vanishing. The identities in the local rest frame are obtained by setting $\mu = 0, \nu = i$ or $\mu = i, \nu = 0$ in (2), while the covariant form is manifested by projecting (2) onto u_ν as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\partial_\alpha \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu} + 2\Theta^{[\mu\nu]} \right) u_\nu = 0 \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_\nu \partial_\alpha (\mathcal{R}_\sigma + \Sigma_\delta u_\sigma) + \Theta_\delta^{[\mu\nu]} u_\nu + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_\nu \check{\Sigma} \partial_\alpha u_\sigma + q^\mu = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Noting that q^μ at $O(\partial\delta)$ and $\check{\Sigma}$ at $O(\delta)$ are both zero to ensure the semipositivity of the dissipative parts in (21), we isolate the $O(\partial\delta)$ terms from the other parts in the above identity,

$$q^\mu = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_\nu \check{\Sigma} \partial_\alpha u_\sigma, \quad (31)$$

$$\Theta_\delta^{[\mu\nu]} u_\nu = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_\nu \partial_\alpha (\mathcal{R}_\sigma + \Sigma_\delta u_\sigma), \quad (32)$$

where the identity at $O(\partial\delta)$ in (32) should hold for arbitrary \mathcal{R} . Utilizing the identities (31)-(32) as the result of the vanishing boost variables, we can demonstrate that it is not possible to cancel out the non-semipositive term $\partial_\alpha (u^\nu \mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}) \beta_{\mu\nu}$ in (23).

For the \mathcal{R} dependent parts, we further collect the $O(\partial\omega^0\delta)$ and $O(\partial^0\omega\delta)$ terms in

(32) to obtain the extra constraints from the vanishing of \mathcal{B} as

$$\Theta_{\partial}^{[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_{\nu} \partial_{\alpha} \mathcal{R}_{\sigma}, \quad (33)$$

$$\Theta_{\omega}^{[\mu\nu]\alpha\sigma} u_{\nu} \omega_{\alpha\sigma} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{[\mu\nu][\alpha\sigma]} u_{\nu} = 0. \quad (34)$$

We now examine the combined constraints on Θ_{ω} in (27)-(28) and (33)-(34). For the first switch in (28), one has

$$\Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Y^{\alpha[\mu\nu]} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad s_{\omega}^{\alpha[\mu\nu]} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad X^{[\mu\nu]} = \Theta_{\partial}^{[\mu\nu]} + \partial_{\alpha} \left(\mathcal{R}^{\alpha[\mu} u^{\nu]} \right) = 0, \quad (35)$$

which obviously contradicts the identity (33). Thus, we get $\Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} \neq 0$.

For the rest three switches in (28), using (33) in (27) while noting $u \cdot u = -1$ and $u \cdot \mathcal{R} = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} u_{\sigma} \partial_{\alpha} \ln \beta + \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} \partial_{\alpha} u_{\sigma} - W_1^{\alpha\mu\nu} \mathcal{R}_{\nu} \partial_{\alpha} (u \cdot u) - W_2^{\alpha\mu} \partial_{\alpha} (u \cdot \mathcal{R}) \\ & = \partial_{\alpha} \mathcal{R}^{\alpha[\mu} u^{\nu]} u_{\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} u_{\nu} \partial_{\alpha} \mathcal{R}_{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{\alpha} (u^{\alpha} \mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}) u_{\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} u^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda} u_{\nu} \partial_{\alpha} u_{\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where W_1 and W_2 could be any dimensionless tensors as expressions in terms of β, u^{μ} and \mathcal{R}^{μ} . We have used the first identity of (3) in the second equality. Given that the above equation holds for arbitrary $\partial_{\alpha} \ln \beta, \partial_{\alpha} \mathcal{R}_{\sigma}$ and $\partial_{\alpha} u_{\sigma}$, we have the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} & \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} u_{\sigma} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad W_2^{\alpha\mu} u^{\sigma} = 0 \\ & \text{and} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} - W_1^{\alpha\mu\nu} \mathcal{R}_{\nu} u^{\sigma} - W_2^{\alpha\mu} \mathcal{R}^{\sigma} - W_3^{\alpha\mu} a^{\sigma} = -\frac{1}{2} u^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda} u_{\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

which renders

$$\begin{aligned} 0 & = \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} u_{\sigma} = -W_1^{\alpha\mu\nu} \mathcal{R}_{\nu} \quad \rightarrow \quad W_1^{\alpha\mu\nu} = 0 \\ & \text{and} \quad W_2^{\alpha\mu} u^{\sigma} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad W_2^{\alpha\mu} = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} u^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda} u_{\nu} \\ & \rightarrow \Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma][\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} = -\frac{1}{2} u^{[\alpha} \epsilon^{\sigma]\mu\nu\lambda} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda} u_{\nu} \neq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

This excludes the second switch in (28), i.e., $\Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma]\mu\nu} \neq 0$.

The last two switches in (28) combined with (34) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma} \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma\mu\nu} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{\nu\mu\sigma\alpha}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma][\mu\nu]} u_{\sigma} = 0 \\ & \rightarrow \left(\Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{[\mu\nu]\alpha\sigma} \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{\alpha\sigma[\mu\nu]} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{[\nu\mu]\sigma\alpha} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma][\mu\nu]} u_{\sigma} = 0 \\ & \rightarrow \Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma][\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{[\mu\nu][\alpha\sigma]} u_{\nu} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \Theta_{\omega}^{[\alpha\sigma][\mu\nu]} u_{\nu} = -\Theta_{\omega}^{[\nu\mu][\sigma\alpha]} u_{\nu} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

which is also ruled out by (38). Hence, there is no consistent result for Θ_{ω} to ensure the vanishing of the $O(\partial\omega\delta)$ and $O(\partial^0\omega^2\delta)$ parts in (23). In other words, with a general

antisymmetric spin potential $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ and vanishing boost variables $\mathcal{B}^{\mu\nu}$, it is generally not possible for the constitutive relations of spin hydrodynamics to satisfy the entropy principle. Note that (27)-(28) and (34) are constraints resulting from a general antisymmetric spin potential $\omega_{\mu\nu}$. A meaningful complement would be to apply the entropy-current analysis presented in this study to the case of a special spin potential $r_{\mu\nu}$ with $r_{\mu\nu}u^\nu = 0$, as utilized in [46, 55], to investigate the existence of a solution for Θ_δ and s_δ . We will not attempt to address this issue here.

IV. CONSISTENT FIRST-ORDER SPIN HYDRODYNAMICS

The challenge in adhering to the entropy principle arises from the lack of degree of freedom associated with boost symmetry. Therefore, it is inevitable to activate the boost variables so that the canonical formulation of spin hydrodynamics aligns with the entropy principle. In this scenario, the boost components of the conservation law (2) are independent equations, rather than being fixed as identities like in (31)-(32). The semipositivity of the dissipative parts is ensured by adopting the constitutive relations that are basically the same as those in [34, 39, 56],

$$\begin{aligned}
h^\mu &= -Th^{\mu\nu\alpha}\partial_\alpha\beta_\nu, & q^\mu &= -Tq^{\mu\nu\alpha}(\partial_\alpha\beta_\nu - \beta\omega_{\alpha\nu}), \\
\tau^{\mu\nu} &= -T\tau^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma}\partial_\alpha\beta_\sigma, & \phi^{\mu\nu} &= -T\phi^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma}(\partial_\alpha\beta_\sigma - \beta\omega_{\alpha\sigma}), \\
\check{\Sigma} &= -\frac{1}{2}T\xi\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\sigma}u_\sigma\partial_\alpha(\beta\omega_{\mu\nu}), & \check{s}^\mu &= \beta h^\mu - \beta q^\mu - \frac{1}{2}\check{\Sigma}\epsilon^{\mu\alpha\nu\sigma}\beta\omega_{\alpha\nu}u_\sigma,
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{\mu\nu\alpha} &\equiv \kappa\Delta^{\mu(\nu}u^{\alpha)}, & q^{\mu\nu\alpha} &\equiv \kappa_s\Delta^{\mu[\nu}u^{\alpha]}, \\
\tau^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} &\equiv 2\eta\left[\frac{1}{2}(\Delta^{\mu\alpha}\Delta^{\nu\beta} + \Delta^{\mu\beta}\Delta^{\nu\alpha}) - \frac{1}{3}\Delta^{\mu\nu}\Delta^{\alpha\beta}\right] + \zeta\Delta^{\mu\nu}\Delta^{\alpha\beta}, \\
\phi^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} &\equiv \frac{1}{2}\eta_s(\Delta^{\mu\alpha}\Delta^{\nu\beta} - \Delta^{\mu\beta}\Delta^{\nu\alpha}),
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

with positive coefficients κ , κ_s , η , ζ , η_s and ξ . In the case $O(\varpi) \sim O(\partial^0)$, the dissipative currents in (40) can be further decomposed according to the anisotropy in gyrohydrodynamics [55].

As regards the non-dissipative terms in (23), it is known that there is a solution corresponding to a pseudogauge transformation from the phenomenological formulation of spin hydrodynamics[56],

$$\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} = -\partial_\alpha(\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu}u^\nu + \mathcal{B}^{\alpha\mu}u^\nu), \quad s_\delta^\mu = 0, \quad \Sigma_\delta = 0. \tag{42}$$

Actually, it has been point out in [34] that given a formulation of spin hydrodynamics with (Θ, Σ) that satisfies entropy principle, a pseudogauge transformation always renders another consistent formulation (Θ', Σ') since the entropy production rate in the entropy-current analysis remains unchanged, though different pairs (Θ, Σ) and (Θ', Σ') are generally thermodynamically inequivalent [71, 72]. Therefore, a general pseudogauge-transforming solution is

$$\Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} = -\partial_\alpha (\mathcal{R}^{\alpha\mu} u^\nu + \mathcal{B}^{\alpha\mu} u^\nu) - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\alpha (\Sigma_\delta u_\sigma), \quad s_\delta^\mu = 0, \quad \Sigma_\delta(\beta, u, \omega, \mathcal{S}), \quad (43)$$

where Σ_δ can be any possible scalar expression in terms of β, u, ω and \mathcal{S} with $\Sigma_\delta(\beta, u, \omega = 0, \mathcal{S} = 0) = 0$ so that Σ_δ vanishes in spinless limit. In addition, the entropy-gauge transformation [61] $s_\delta^\mu = \partial_\alpha A^{\alpha\mu}$ with $A^{\alpha\mu} = -A^{\mu\alpha}$ gives an extra general solution where $A^{\alpha\mu}$ could be any possible antisymmetric tensor expression in terms of β, u, ω and \mathcal{S} . It remains to be seen whether there are non-dissipative solutions $\Theta'_\delta, s'_\delta$ and Σ'_δ beyond the pseudogauge and the entropy-gauge transformations. Concretely, such solutions are constrained by the entropy principle as

$$\partial_\mu s_\delta^\mu + \partial_\mu \Theta_\delta^{\mu\nu} \beta_\nu + \left[\Theta_\delta^{\prime\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\sigma} \partial_\alpha (\Sigma'_\delta u_\sigma) \right] \beta \omega_{\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (44)$$

Especially, with nonvanishing Θ'_δ which may significantly modify the dynamical equations of hydrodynamics and bring in extra ambiguity besides pseudogauge and entropy-gauge. For simplicity, we verify in Appendix (A) that the non-dissipative solution of $O(\partial^0)$ is unique, which is essentially the leading-order solution in (10)-(12). It could be interesting to figure out if there are extra non-dissipative solution to $O(\partial)$. We leave it for future work.

One can easily verify that the constitutive relations in (40) give zero entropy production rate in the GTE limit (17). Moreover, keeping only the lowest-order terms in (15) and taking the separate conservation limits

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\Theta}^{[\mu\nu]} &= 0, \\ \partial_\alpha \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu} + 2\Theta_\delta^{[\mu\nu]} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

in (16), we readily confirm that $\partial_\mu (s u^\mu) = 0$. It turns out that the orbital angular momentum conservation in the first equation of (45) contains only the dissipative component of the stress-energy tensor while the spin angular momentum conservation in the second equation have to include the divergence term $\Theta_\delta^{[\mu\nu]}$.

V. LINEAR-MODE ANALYSIS

We perform the linear-mode analysis of the spin hydrodynamic equations (1)-(2) using the constitutive relations (40) and (43). For simplicity, we consider the isotropy background with $O(\varpi) \sim O(\partial)$. The fluctuations, counted as $O(\Delta)$, are near GTE without background spin density,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(x) &= \bar{\varepsilon} + \underline{\varepsilon}(x), & p(x) &= \bar{p} + \underline{p}(x), & T(x) &= \bar{T} + \underline{T}(x), \\ v^i(x) &= 0 + \underline{v}^i(x), & \mathcal{R}^i(x) &= 0 + \underline{\mathcal{R}}^i(x), & \mathcal{B}^i(x) &= 0 + \underline{\mathcal{B}}^i(x), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

with overbar denoting background and underbar denoting fluctuations, where v^i is the fluid three-velocity with $u^\mu = (1, v^i) + O(v^2)$. Noting $\Sigma_\delta = O(\Delta^2)$ and using

$$(5)(7) \quad \rightarrow \quad \underline{T} = \frac{\bar{T}\underline{p}}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}} + O(\Delta^2), \quad (47)$$

we expand (1) to $O(\partial^2\Delta)$ and (2) to $O(\partial\Delta)$ as

$$(\partial_0 - c_s^2 \kappa'_s \partial_i \partial^i) \underline{\pi}^0 + (1 + \kappa'_s \partial_0) \partial_i \underline{\pi}^i - (\partial_0 + \Gamma_b) \partial_i \underline{\mathcal{B}}^i = 0, \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_0 \underline{\pi}^i + c_s^2 \partial^i \left(\underline{\pi}^0 - \partial_k \underline{\mathcal{B}}^k \right) - \gamma_{\parallel} \partial^i \partial_k \underline{\pi}^k - (\gamma_{\perp} + \gamma_s) (\delta_k^i \partial_j \partial^j - \partial^i \partial_k) \underline{\pi}^k \\ - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} \Gamma_r \partial_j \underline{\mathcal{R}}_k = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$(\partial_0 + \Gamma_b) \underline{\mathcal{B}}^i + \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_k \underline{\mathcal{R}}_j + c_s^2 \kappa'_s \partial^i \underline{\pi}^0 - \kappa'_s \partial_0 \underline{\pi}^i = 0, \quad (50)$$

$$\partial_0 \underline{\mathcal{R}}^i + \Gamma_r \underline{\mathcal{R}}^i - 2\gamma_s \epsilon^{ijk} \partial_j \underline{\pi}_k = 0, \quad (51)$$

where we have introduced the hydrodynamic and spin modes as

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\pi}^0 &\equiv \Theta^{00} = \underline{\varepsilon} + \partial_i \underline{\mathcal{B}}^i + O(\partial^2) + O(\Delta^2), \\ \underline{\pi}^i &\equiv \Theta^{0i} = (\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}) \underline{v}^i - \frac{1}{2} (\kappa + \kappa_s) \partial_0 \underline{v}^i - \frac{1}{2} (\kappa' - \kappa'_s) c_s^2 \partial^i \underline{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_b \underline{\mathcal{B}}^i + O(\partial^2) + O(\Delta^2), \\ \underline{\Sigma}^{0ij} &= \mathcal{S}^{ij} + O(\partial^2) + O(\Delta^2) = \epsilon^{ijk} \underline{\mathcal{R}}_k + O(\partial^2) + O(\Delta^2), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and the constants as

$$\begin{aligned} c_s^2 &= \frac{\partial p}{\partial \varepsilon}, & \gamma_{\parallel} &= \frac{1}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}} \left(\zeta + \frac{4}{3} \eta \right), & \gamma_{\perp} &= \frac{\eta}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}}, & 2\gamma_s &= \frac{\eta_s}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}}, & \kappa' &= \frac{\kappa}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}}, \\ \chi_r \delta_j^i &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}^i}{\partial r^j}, & \Gamma_r &= \frac{2\eta_s}{\chi_r}, & \chi_b \delta_j^i &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{B}^i}{\partial b^j}, & \Gamma_b &= \frac{2\kappa_s}{\chi_b}, & \kappa'_s &= \frac{\kappa_s}{\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Note that $\underline{\pi}^0$, $\underline{\pi}^i$ and $\underline{\Sigma}^{0ij}$ are invariant components of $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ and $\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha}$ under frame choice [64, 65], where $\underline{\Sigma}^{0ij}$ can be replaced by $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_k$ within linear approximation. The boost modes $\underline{\mathcal{B}}^i$ are embedded in the divergence terms of $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ and can not be defined as the invariant

components of spin current since Σ^{00i} vanish for totally antisymmetric $\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha}$. We have counted $\Gamma_r \sim \Gamma_b \sim 1/\chi_r \sim 1/\chi_b \sim O(\partial)$ in the above linear expansion and neglected the anisotropy in $\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial r}$, $\frac{\partial \varepsilon}{\partial b}$, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial b}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathcal{B}}{\partial r}$. For simplicity, we have taken the speed of sound c_s , the susceptibilities χ_r, χ_b and all the kinetic coefficients as constants.

In the Fourier space with $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \int d^4x e^{i\omega t - i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \mathcal{O}(x)$ and $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0, k)$, one finds the block diagonal form of the linearized hydrodynamic equations,

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{\parallel}^{4\times 4} & O & O & O \\ O & A_{\perp, \mathcal{B}}^{2\times 2} & A_{+}^{2\times 2} & A_{-}^{2\times 2} \\ O & O & A_{\perp, +}^{2\times 2} & O \\ O & O & O & A_{\perp, -}^{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix} \vec{y} = 0, \quad (54)$$

with $\vec{y} = (\pi_0, \pi_z, \mathcal{B}_z, \mathcal{R}_z, \mathcal{B}_x, \mathcal{B}_y, \pi_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \pi_y, \mathcal{R}_x)^T$, where the blocks are

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\parallel}^{4\times 4} &= \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega + c_s^2 \kappa'_s \mathbf{k}^2 & i|\mathbf{k}| + \kappa'_s \omega |\mathbf{k}| & i(i\omega - \Gamma_b) |\mathbf{k}| & 0 \\ ic_s^2 |\mathbf{k}| & -i\omega + \gamma_{\parallel} \mathbf{k}^2 & c_s^2 \mathbf{k}^2 & 0 \\ ic_s^2 \kappa'_s |\mathbf{k}| & i\kappa'_s \omega & -i\omega + \Gamma_b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -i\omega + \Gamma_r \end{pmatrix}, \\ A_{\perp, \mathcal{B}}^{2\times 2} &= \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega + \Gamma_b & 0 \\ 0 & -i\omega + \Gamma_b \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{\perp, \pm}^{2\times 2} = \begin{pmatrix} -i\omega + (\gamma_{\perp} + \gamma_s) \mathbf{k}^2 & \pm \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_r |\mathbf{k}| \\ \mp 2i\gamma_s |\mathbf{k}| & -i\omega + \Gamma_r \end{pmatrix}, \\ A_{+}^{2\times 2} &= \begin{pmatrix} i\kappa'_s \omega & i|\mathbf{k}| \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{-}^{2\times 2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ i\kappa'_s \omega & -i|\mathbf{k}| \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Note that ω denotes frequency in this section, not to be confused with spin potential $\omega_{\mu\nu}$. The power counting in Fourier space is $\Gamma_r \sim \Gamma_b \sim \omega \sim O(\mathbf{k})$ where (48)-(49) are exact to $O(\mathbf{k}^2)$ while (50)-(51) are accurate to $O(\mathbf{k})$. Solving the characteristic equations, $\det A_{\parallel}^{4\times 4} = 0$ and $\det A_{\perp}^{2\times 2} = 0$, we obtain the dispersion relations,

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \blacklozenge \text{ One pair of sound modes: } \omega_{\text{sound}}(\mathbf{k}) &= \pm c_s |\mathbf{k}| - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_{\parallel} \mathbf{k}^2 \mp c_s^3 \kappa'_s \frac{\mathbf{k}^3}{\Gamma_b} + O(\mathbf{k}^3), \\ \blacklozenge \text{ One longitudinal spin-boost mode: } \omega_{\text{spin, b, } \parallel} &= -i\Gamma_b - ic_s^2 \kappa'_s \mathbf{k}^2 + O(\mathbf{k}^2), \\ \blacklozenge \text{ One longitudinal spin-rotation mode: } \omega_{\text{spin, r, } \parallel} &= -i\Gamma_r + O(\mathbf{k}^2), \end{aligned} \right. \quad (56)$$

$$\blacklozenge \text{ Two transverse spin-boost modes: } \omega_{\text{spin, b, } \perp} = -i\Gamma_b + O(\mathbf{k}^2), \quad (57)$$

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \blacklozenge \text{ Two shear modes: } \omega_{\text{shear}}(\mathbf{k}) &= -i\gamma_{\perp} \mathbf{k}^2 + O(\mathbf{k}^3), \\ \blacklozenge \text{ Two transverse spin-rotation modes: } \omega_{\text{spin, r, } \perp} &= -i\Gamma_r - i\gamma_s \mathbf{k}^2 + O(\mathbf{k}^2). \end{aligned} \right. \quad (58)$$

The dispersion relations of both the hydrodynamic modes and spin modes happen to be the same as the phenomenological formulation[34] to $O(\mathbf{k})$. However, to $O(\mathbf{k}^2)$ the dispersion

relations of sound modes and longitudinal spin-boost mode are different. As a comparison to (56), we give the results of the phenomenological formulation as follows

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \blacklozenge \text{ One pair of sound modes: } \omega_{\text{sound}}(\mathbf{k}) = \pm c_s |\mathbf{k}| - \frac{i}{2} \gamma_{\parallel} \mathbf{k}^2 \mp 2c_s^3 \kappa'_s \frac{k^3}{\Gamma_b} + O(\mathbf{k}^3), \\ \blacklozenge \text{ One longitudinal spin-boost mode: } \omega_{\text{spin,b,}\parallel} = -i\Gamma_b - 3ic_s^2 \kappa'_s \mathbf{k}^2 + O(\mathbf{k}^2). \end{array} \right.$$

This implies that if one introduces the hydrodynamic and spin modes based on the frame-invariant components of $\Theta^{\mu\nu}$ and $\Sigma^{\mu\nu\alpha}$, the dispersion relations will typically differ depending on the specific formulation of spin hydrodynamics.

VI. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

We have shown that in the canonical formulation of spin hydrodynamics for Dirac fermions featuring a completely antisymmetric spin tensor and a generic spin potential, the stress-energy tensor must be influenced by spin variables at the first order of gradient. Additionally, the inclusion of boost variables is necessary to uphold the entropy principle.

When boost variables are included, we conduct a linear-mode analysis utilizing the spin hydrodynamic equations derived from the canonical formulation. Upon comparison with the phenomenological formulation, we observe that the dispersion relations of the sound modes and the longitudinal spin-boost mode differ at the second order of gradient.

The violation of the entropy principle in the absence of boost variables is demonstrated with a general antisymmetric spin potential. It is yet to be determined if spin hydrodynamics can be developed solely using the spatial component $r_{\mu\nu}$ of the spin potential $\omega_{\mu\nu}$ for general rotational fluids with finite thermal vorticity. Furthermore, in the presence of boost variables, instead of opting the constitutive relations of canonical formulation to be related to the pseudogauge transformation of the phenomenological formulation, it would be intriguing to explore if there exist alternative non-dissipative constitutive relations constrained by (44), and how such constitutive relations would impact the behavior of the hydrodynamic and spin modes. These aspects are left for future investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Xu-Guang Huang for stimulating discussions in several stages of this work. L.X.Y thanks Shi Pu for useful discussions at a workshop, "The 15th QCD Phase Transition and Relativistic Heavy Ion Physics", on Dec.15-19, 2023. L.X.Y is supported by the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation 2023M730707.

Appendix A: Completeness of First-Order spin hydrodynamics

For completeness, we confirm that there is no $O(\partial^0\delta)$ non-dissipative solution to (23). To this end, we consider the leading-order terms Θ_0 and s_0 in (24). We define

$$\Theta_0^{\alpha\sigma} \equiv T \sum_{\delta=\mathcal{R},\mathcal{B}} \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} \delta_\nu, \quad s_0^\alpha \equiv \sum_{\delta=\mathcal{R},\mathcal{B}} s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\Theta_{\delta 0}$ and $s_{\delta 0}$ are $O(\partial^0\omega^0\delta^0)$ coefficients of δ_ν as expressions in terms of β and u^μ . Here we have excluded the dependence on δ in $\Theta_{\delta 0}$ and $s_{\delta 0}$ since the linear dependence on δ^ν has been factored out[73]. The single $O(\partial^0\omega\delta)$ term $\Theta_0^{\alpha\sigma}\omega_{\alpha\sigma}$ in (23) should be vanishing for any value of $\omega_{\alpha\sigma}$. This gives the constraint

$$\Theta_{\delta 0}^{[\alpha\sigma]\nu} \delta_\nu = 0. \quad (\text{A2})$$

The $O(\partial\omega^0\delta)$ terms in (21) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\alpha s_0^\alpha + \partial_\alpha \Theta_0^{\alpha\sigma} \beta_\sigma &= \sum_{\delta=\mathcal{R},\mathcal{B}} \partial_\alpha (s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu) + \partial_\alpha (T \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} \delta_\nu) \beta_\sigma \\ &= \sum_{\delta=\mathcal{R},\mathcal{B}} N_{\delta 1}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu \beta \partial_\alpha \ln \beta + N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu \partial_\alpha u_\mu + N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \partial_\alpha \delta_\nu + N_{\delta 4}^{\alpha\nu\mu\sigma} \delta_\nu \partial_\alpha \omega_{\mu\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\delta 1}^{\alpha\nu} &\equiv s_{\delta 0,\beta}^{\alpha\nu} + (T \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu})_{,\beta} \beta_\sigma, & N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} &\equiv s_{\delta 0,u}^{\alpha\nu,\mu} + \Theta_{\delta 0,u}^{\alpha\sigma\nu,\mu} u_\sigma, \\ N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} &\equiv s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} + \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} u_\sigma, & N_{\delta 4}^{\alpha\nu\mu\sigma} &\equiv s_{\delta 0,\omega}^{\alpha\nu,\mu\sigma} + T \Theta_{\delta 0,\omega}^{\alpha\rho\nu,\mu\sigma} \beta_\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

with notations $A_{,\beta} \equiv \partial A / \partial \beta$, $A_{,u}^\mu \equiv \partial A / \partial u_\mu$ and $A_{,\omega}^{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial A / \partial \omega_{\mu\nu}$. Noting $u \cdot u = -1$ and $u \cdot \delta = 0$, (A3) should be identically zero in groups as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\delta 1}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu \beta \partial_\alpha \ln \beta &= 0, \\ N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu \partial_\alpha u_\mu + N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \partial_\alpha \delta_\nu &= 0 = M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu \partial_\alpha (u \cdot u) + M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \partial_\alpha (u \cdot \delta), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where the constraints can be written as

$$N_{\delta 1}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}_{\delta 4}^{\alpha\nu[\mu\sigma]} \delta_\nu = 0, \quad (\text{A6})$$

with

$$\mathcal{N}_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \equiv N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} - 2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} u^\mu - M_{\delta 2}^\alpha g^{\nu\mu}, \quad \mathcal{N}_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \equiv N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} - M_{\delta 2}^\alpha u^\nu. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Using the above constraints we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} = 0 &\rightarrow 0 = \mathcal{N}_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu = N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu \rightarrow 0 = (N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu)_{,u}^\mu = (N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} + \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu}) \delta_\nu, \\
\mathcal{N}_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu = 0 &\rightarrow 0 = (\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} + 2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} u^\mu + M_{\delta 2}^\alpha g^{\nu\mu}) \delta_\nu \rightarrow 0 = (\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} u_\mu - 2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu}) \delta_\nu, \\
0 = (N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu)_{,\beta} &= (N_{\delta 1}^{\alpha\nu} + T\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} u_\sigma) \delta_\nu = T\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} u_\sigma \delta_\nu \rightarrow \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} u_\sigma \delta_\nu = 0, \\
0 = N_{\delta 3}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu &= (s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} + \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} u_\sigma) \delta_\nu \rightarrow s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu = 0, \\
\mathcal{N}_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu u_\mu = 0 &\rightarrow 0 = (\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} u_\mu - 2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu}) \delta_\nu = -2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu \rightarrow M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu = 0, \\
0 = (\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} &+ 2M_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} u^\mu + M_{\delta 2}^\alpha g^{\nu\mu}) \delta_\nu = \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} \delta_\nu + M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \delta^\mu \rightarrow \Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\mu\nu} \delta_\nu = -M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \delta^\mu. \\
\mathcal{N}_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu = 0 &\rightarrow 0 = N_{\delta 2}^{\alpha\nu\mu} \delta_\nu - M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \delta^\mu = (s_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\nu} \delta_\nu)_{,u}^\mu + (\Theta_{\delta 0}^{\alpha\sigma\nu} \delta_\nu)_{,u}^\mu u_\sigma - M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \delta^\mu = -M_{\delta 2}^\alpha \delta^\mu,
\end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

which gives $M_{\delta 2}^\alpha = 0$. Consequently, the combined constraints from (A2) and (A6) lead to $s_0^\alpha = 0$ and $\Theta_0^{\alpha\sigma} = 0$. This means that there are no other zeroth-order non-dissipative terms in (10)-(12).

-
- [1] Zuo-Tang Liang and Xin-Nian Wang. Globally polarized quark-gluon plasma in non-central A+A collisions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 94:102301, 2005. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 96, 039901 (2006)].
 - [2] Zuo-Tang Liang and Xin-Nian Wang. Spin alignment of vector mesons in non-central A+A collisions. *Phys. Lett. B*, 629:20–26, 2005.
 - [3] Sergei A. Voloshin. Polarized secondary particles in unpolarized high energy hadron-hadron collisions? 10 2004.
 - [4] Barbara Betz, Miklos Gyulassy, and Giorgio Torrieri. Polarization probes of vorticity in heavy ion collisions. *Phys. Rev. C*, 76:044901, 2007.
 - [5] F. Becattini, F. Piccinini, and J. Rizzo. Angular momentum conservation in heavy ion collisions at very high energy. *Phys. Rev. C*, 77:024906, 2008.
 - [6] Xu-Guang Huang, Pasi Huovinen, and Xin-Nian Wang. Quark Polarization in a Viscous Quark-Gluon Plasma. *Phys. Rev. C*, 84:054910, 2011.
 - [7] L. Adamczyk et al. Global Λ hyperon polarization in nuclear collisions: evidence for the most vortical fluid. *Nature*, 548:62–65, 2017.
 - [8] Jaroslav Adam et al. Global polarization of Λ hyperons in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV. *Phys. Rev. C*, 98:014910, 2018.
 - [9] J. Adam et al. Global Polarization of Ξ and Ω Hyperons in Au+Au Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126(16):162301, 2021. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 131, 089901 (2023)].
 - [10] Shreyasi Acharya et al. Evidence of Spin-Orbital Angular Momentum Interactions in Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collisions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 125(1):012301, 2020.

- [11] M. S. Abdallah et al. Pattern of global spin alignment of ϕ and K^{*0} mesons in heavy-ion collisions. *Nature*, 614(7947):244–248, 2023.
- [12] Shreyasi Acharya et al. Measurement of the J/ψ Polarization with Respect to the Event Plane in Pb-Pb Collisions at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 131(4):042303, 2023.
- [13] F. Becattini and F. Piccinini. The Ideal relativistic spinning gas: Polarization and spectra. *Annals Phys.*, 323:2452–2473, 2008.
- [14] F. Becattini, L. Csernai, and D. J. Wang. Λ polarization in peripheral heavy ion collisions. *Phys. Rev. C*, 88(3):034905, 2013. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.C* 93, 069901 (2016)].
- [15] F. Becattini, V. Chandra, L. Del Zanna, and E. Grossi. Relativistic distribution function for particles with spin at local thermodynamical equilibrium. *Annals Phys.*, 338:32–49, 2013.
- [16] F. Becattini, G. Inghirami, V. Rolando, A. Beraudo, L. Del Zanna, A. De Pace, M. Nardi, G. Pagliara, and V. Chandra. A study of vorticity formation in high energy nuclear collisions. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 75(9):406, 2015. [Erratum: *Eur.Phys.J.C* 78, 354 (2018)].
- [17] F. Becattini, I. Karpenko, M. Lisa, I. Upsal, and S. Voloshin. Global hyperon polarization at local thermodynamic equilibrium with vorticity, magnetic field and feed-down. *Phys. Rev. C*, 95(5):054902, 2017.
- [18] I. Karpenko and F. Becattini. Study of Λ polarization in relativistic nuclear collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 7.7 - 200$ GeV. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 77(4):213, 2017.
- [19] Long-Gang Pang, Hannah Petersen, Qun Wang, and Xin-Nian Wang. Vortical Fluid and Λ Spin Correlations in High-Energy Heavy-Ion Collisions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 117(19):192301, 2016.
- [20] Yilong Xie, Dujuan Wang, and László P. Csernai. Global Λ polarization in high energy collisions. *Phys. Rev. C*, 95(3):031901, 2017.
- [21] F. Becattini and Iu. Karpenko. Collective Longitudinal Polarization in Relativistic Heavy-Ion Collisions at Very High Energy. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 120(1):012302, 2018.
- [22] Francesco Becattini and Michael A. Lisa. Polarization and Vorticity in the Quark–Gluon Plasma. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 70:395–423, 2020.
- [23] Takafumi Niida. Global and local polarization of Λ hyperons in Au+Au collisions at 200 GeV from STAR. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 982:511–514, 2019.
- [24] Jaroslav Adam et al. Polarization of Λ ($\bar{\Lambda}$) hyperons along the beam direction in Au+Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123(13):132301, 2019.
- [25] Yu-Chen Liu and Xu-Guang Huang. Anomalous chiral transports and spin polarization in heavy-ion collisions. *Nucl. Sci. Tech.*, 31(6):56, 2020.
- [26] Jian-Hua Gao, Guo-Liang Ma, Shi Pu, and Qun Wang. Recent developments in chiral and spin polarization effects in heavy-ion collisions. *Nucl. Sci. Tech.*, 31(9):90, 2020.
- [27] Xu-Guang Huang. Vorticity and Spin Polarization — A Theoretical Perspective. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 1005:121752, 2021.
- [28] Francesco Becattini. Spin and polarization: a new direction in relativistic heavy ion physics. *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 85(12):122301, 2022.

- [29] David Montenegro, Leonardo Tinti, and Giorgio Torrieri. Ideal relativistic fluid limit for a medium with polarization. *Phys. Rev. D*, 96(5):056012, 2017. [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.D* 96, 079901 (2017)].
- [30] David Montenegro, Leonardo Tinti, and Giorgio Torrieri. Sound waves and vortices in a polarized relativistic fluid. *Phys. Rev. D*, 96(7):076016, 2017.
- [31] Wojciech Florkowski, Bengt Friman, Amaresh Jaiswal, and Enrico Speranza. Relativistic fluid dynamics with spin. *Phys. Rev. C*, 97(4):041901, 2018.
- [32] Wojciech Florkowski, Avdhesh Kumar, and Radoslaw Ryblewski. Relativistic hydrodynamics for spin-polarized fluids. *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, 108:103709, 2019.
- [33] David Montenegro and Giorgio Torrieri. Causality and dissipation in relativistic polarizable fluids. *Phys. Rev. D*, 100(5):056011, 2019.
- [34] Koichi Hattori, Masaru Hongo, Xu-Guang Huang, Mamoru Matsuo, and Hidetoshi Taya. Fate of spin polarization in a relativistic fluid: An entropy-current analysis. *Phys. Lett. B*, 795:100–106, 2019.
- [35] Shiyong Li and Ho-Ung Yee. Quantum Kinetic Theory of Spin Polarization of Massive Quarks in Perturbative QCD: Leading Log. *Phys. Rev. D*, 100(5):056022, 2019.
- [36] David Montenegro and Giorgio Torrieri. Linear response theory and effective action of relativistic hydrodynamics with spin. *Phys. Rev. D*, 102(3):036007, 2020.
- [37] Markus Garbisio and Matthias Kaminski. Hydrodynamics of simply spinning black holes & hydrodynamics for spinning quantum fluids. *JHEP*, 12:112, 2020.
- [38] A. D. Gallegos and U. Gürsoy. Holographic spin liquids and Lovelock Chern-Simons gravity. *JHEP*, 11:151, 2020.
- [39] Kenji Fukushima and Shi Pu. Spin hydrodynamics and symmetric energy-momentum tensors – A current induced by the spin vorticity –. *Phys. Lett. B*, 817:136346, 2021.
- [40] Samapan Bhadury, Wojciech Florkowski, Amaresh Jaiswal, Avdhesh Kumar, and Radoslaw Ryblewski. Relativistic dissipative spin dynamics in the relaxation time approximation. *Phys. Lett. B*, 814:136096, 2021.
- [41] Shiyong Li, Mikhail A. Stephanov, and Ho-Ung Yee. Nondissipative Second-Order Transport, Spin, and Pseudogauge Transformations in Hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127(8):082302, 2021.
- [42] Shuzhe Shi, Charles Gale, and Sangyong Jeon. From chiral kinetic theory to relativistic viscous spin hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. C*, 103(4):044906, 2021.
- [43] Jin Hu. Kubo formulae for first-order spin hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(11):116015, 2021.
- [44] A. D. Gallegos, U. Gürsoy, and A. Yarom. Hydrodynamics of spin currents. *SciPost Phys.*, 11:041, 2021.
- [45] Hao-Hao Peng, Jun-Jie Zhang, Xin-Li Sheng, and Qun Wang. Ideal Spin Hydrodynamics from the Wigner Function Approach. *Chin. Phys. Lett.*, 38(11):116701, 2021.
- [46] Masaru Hongo, Xu-Guang Huang, Matthias Kaminski, Mikhail Stephanov, and Ho-Ung Yee. Relativistic spin hydrodynamics with torsion and linear response theory for spin relaxation.

- JHEP*, 11:150, 2021.
- [47] Dong-Lin Wang, Shuo Fang, and Shi Pu. Analytic solutions of relativistic dissipative spin hydrodynamics with Bjorken expansion. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(11):114043, 2021.
 - [48] Dong-Lin Wang, Xin-Qing Xie, Shuo Fang, and Shi Pu. Analytic solutions of relativistic dissipative spin hydrodynamics with radial expansion in Gubser flow. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(11):114050, 2022.
 - [49] Duan She, Anping Huang, Defu Hou, and Jinfeng Liao. Relativistic viscous hydrodynamics with angular momentum. *Sci. Bull.*, 67:2265–2268, 2022.
 - [50] Jin Hu. Relativistic first-order spin hydrodynamics via the Chapman-Enskog expansion. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(7):076009, 2022.
 - [51] Casey Cartwright, Markus Garbiso Amano, Matthias Kaminski, Jorge Noronha, and Enrico Speranza. Convergence of hydrodynamics in a rotating strongly coupled plasma. *Phys. Rev. D*, 108(4):046014, 2023.
 - [52] Masaru Hongo, Xu-Guang Huang, Matthias Kaminski, Mikhail Stephanov, and Ho-Ung Yee. Spin relaxation rate for heavy quarks in weakly coupled QCD plasma. *JHEP*, 08:263, 2022.
 - [53] Nora Weickgenannt, David Wagner, Enrico Speranza, and Dirk H. Rischke. Relativistic second-order dissipative spin hydrodynamics from the method of moments. *Phys. Rev. D*, 106(9):096014, 2022.
 - [54] Samapan Bhadury, Wojciech Florkowski, Amaresh Jaiswal, Avdhesh Kumar, and Radoslaw Ryblewski. Relativistic Spin Magnetohydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129(19):192301, 2022.
 - [55] Zheng Cao, Koichi Hattori, Masaru Hongo, Xu-Guang Huang, and Hidetoshi Taya. Gyrohydrodynamics: Relativistic spinful fluid with strong vorticity. *PTEP*, 2022(7):071D01, 2022.
 - [56] Asaad Daher, Arpan Das, Wojciech Florkowski, and Radoslaw Ryblewski. Canonical and phenomenological formulations of spin hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. C*, 108(2):024902, 2023.
 - [57] Rajeev Singh, Masoud Shokri, and S. M. A. Tabatabaee Mehr. Relativistic hydrodynamics with spin in the presence of electromagnetic fields. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 1035:122656, 2023.
 - [58] A. D. Gallegos, U. Gursoy, and A. Yarom. Hydrodynamics, spin currents and torsion. *JHEP*, 05:139, 2023.
 - [59] Rajesh Biswas, Asaad Daher, Arpan Das, Wojciech Florkowski, and Radoslaw Ryblewski. Relativistic second-order spin hydrodynamics: An entropy-current analysis. *Phys. Rev. D*, 108(1):014024, 2023.
 - [60] Xin-Qing Xie, Dong-Lin Wang, Chen Yang, and Shi Pu. Causality and stability analysis for the minimal causal spin hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 108(9):094031, 2023.
 - [61] Francesco Becattini, Asaad Daher, and Xin-Li Sheng. Entropy current and entropy production in relativistic spin hydrodynamics. *Phys. Lett. B*, 850:138533, 2024.
 - [62] In general, a totally antisymmetric rank-3 tensor $\Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu}$ can contain, at most, four independent components, of which only three can be present in $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}$ by the definition $\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu} \equiv -u_\alpha \Sigma^{\alpha\mu\nu}$. In any case, the totally antisymmetric spin tensor cannot encompass all six independent components associated with Lorentz symmetry.

- [63] F. Becattini, L. Bucciattini, E. Grossi, and L. Tinti. Local thermodynamical equilibrium and the beta frame for a quantum relativistic fluid. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 75(5):191, 2015.
- [64] Jyotirmoy Bhattacharya, Sayantani Bhattacharyya, Shiraz Minwalla, and Amos Yarom. A Theory of first order dissipative superfluid dynamics. *JHEP*, 05:147, 2014.
- [65] Pavel Kovtun. Lectures on hydrodynamic fluctuations in relativistic theories. *J. Phys. A*, 45:473001, 2012.
- [66] Although there are no additional symmetries beyond the Lorentz group that would allow for individual conservation laws in field theory, and ideal spin hydrodynamics does not exist, we can establish an ad hoc criterion for formulating spin hydrodynamics, which suggests that a hydrodynamic framework should be non-dissipative at the leading order in the conservation limit of the currents involved.
- [67] Note that $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ is free in the sense that the dependence of $\mathcal{S}^{\mu\nu}$ on β, u^μ and $\omega^{\mu\nu}$ could vary with specific type of fluid and physical regime while the constitutive relations should satisfy the entropy principle in general.
- [68] Rudolf Baier, Paul Romatschke, Dam Thanh Son, Andrei O. Starinets, and Mikhail A. Stephanov. Relativistic viscous hydrodynamics, conformal invariance, and holography. *JHEP*, 04:100, 2008.
- [69] G. S. Denicol, H. Niemi, E. Molnar, and D. H. Rischke. Derivation of transient relativistic fluid dynamics from the Boltzmann equation. *Phys. Rev. D*, 85:114047, 2012. [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 91, 039902 (2015)].
- [70] E. Molnár, H. Niemi, G. S. Denicol, and D. H. Rischke. Relative importance of second-order terms in relativistic dissipative fluid dynamics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89(7):074010, 2014.
- [71] F. Becattini and L. Tinti. Thermodynamical inequivalence of quantum stress-energy and spin tensors. *Phys. Rev. D*, 84:025013, 2011.
- [72] F. Becattini and L. Tinti. Nonequilibrium Thermodynamical Inequivalence of Quantum Stress-energy and Spin Tensors. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(2):025029, 2013.
- [73] We expect that the leading-order constitutive relations should exhibit linearity that is homogeneous in both the magnitude and direction of δ^μ , akin to the behavior in thermodynamic relations where extensive quantities and their corresponding density quantities are linearly homogeneous. Therefore, the only viable covariant linear factor of δ^μ is in the form of a four-vector, while the coefficients of δ^μ do not depend on its magnitude or direction.