

Entropy production in nonequilibrium thermodynamics: a review

Giovanni Gallavotti

Rutgers Hill Center, I.N.F.N. Roma1, Fisica Roma1

(Dated: October 27, 2018)

Entropy might be a not well defined concept if the system can undergo transformations involving stationary nonequilibria. It might be analogous to the heat content (once called “caloric”) in transformations that are not isochoric (*i.e.* which involve mechanical work): it could be just a quantity that can be transferred or created, like heat in equilibrium. The text first reviews the philosophy behind a recently proposed definition of entropy production in nonequilibrium stationary systems. A detailed technical attempt at defining the entropy of a stationary states via their variational properties follows: the unsatisfactory aspects of the results add arguments in favor of the nonexistence of a function of state to be identified with entropy; at the same time new aspects and properties of the phase space contraction emerge.

PACS numbers: 47.52, 05.45, 47.70, 05.70.L, 05.20, 03.20

I. Thermostats and chaotic hypothesis.

In studying equilibrium and nonequilibrium thermodynamics the notion of *thermostat* plays an important role: it is usually defined empirically [1] as a physical system capable only of exchanging heat without changing temperature or performing work (hence it is ideally an infinite system).

However one can also envisage concrete mechanisms to keep a system in a stationary state, realized by a mechanical force of nonconservative nature. Here I want to consider mechanical systems which, in spite of being acted upon by nonconservative forces, are kept in a stationary state by other mechanical forces, and to study which relations, if any, can be established between the various stationary states, [2]. The transformations between the stationary states will be “*quasi static*” trasformations through intermediate stationary states.

I shall consider only systems consisting of many particles and I shall *not* consider systems that are modeled by continua: because the latter are more complex and can be regarded as an idealization in which several many particles systems are put together, *one per “volume element”*, and studied on time and space scales vastly different from the ones we consider for the evolution of the simple systems which we imagine to constitute the volume elements of the continuum, [3]. Continua can also be considered but one first must understand the thermodynamics of a simple system, [3].

A simple system will be described by a differential equation in its phase space: we write it as $\dot{x} = X_E(x)$ where $x = (\dot{q}, q) \in R^{6N} \equiv \Omega$ (*phase space*), $X_E(x) = (\underline{Y}_E(x), \underline{X}_E(x))$, N =number of particles, mass of the particles $m = 1$, with

$$\dot{q} = \underline{f}(q) + \underline{E} \cdot \underline{g}(q) - \vartheta \underline{E}(\dot{q}, q) = \underline{X}_E(x)$$

where $\underline{f}(q)$ describes the internal (conservative) forces (*e.g.* hard cores), $\underline{E} \cdot \underline{g}(q)$ represents the “external forces” (nonconservative) acting on the system, with \underline{E} being their “strength”: for definiteness we suppose that

they are locally conservative (like an electromotive force) but not globally such, and $\underline{\vartheta} \underline{E}$ is the force law which models the action exerted by the thermostat on the system to keep it from indefinitely acquiring energy: this is why I shall call it a *mechanical thermostat*. Linearity in \underline{E} does not mean that I am assuming the forces to be small (the theory of linear nonequilibrium is amply discussed in the literature, [4]): in any event the response curves of forces versus fluxes will be non linear even for the above model.

More generally the external forces could be velocity dependent and even periodically time dependent: we first restrict to positional forces for simplicity. Velocity dependent forces should also be considered as they are necessary to study heat conduction problems: this will be briefly discussed in Sec. VI.

Assumption (chaotic hypothesis, [5]): *The system evolution is assumed to be “as chaotic as possible”, i.e. it is assumed to be hyperbolic.*

Technically I mean that the system is supposed to be “a transitive Anosov system”, [3, 6].

We shall denote temperature by Θ to avoid confusion with time which will be often denoted T . Models of thermostats in the above sense can be very different even for the same macroscopic system; for instance (a list far from exhaustive)

(1) assuming the system to have hard cores one can suppose that the collisions are inelastic: the head-on component of the energy is decreased by a scale factor $\eta < 1$ upon each collision or, *alternatively*, the total energy of the two colliding particles is rescaled and assigned a given value $3k_B\Theta$. This kind of thermostat has been first introduced and applied in “Drude’s electrical conduction model” to model the thermostating effects of the collisions electron–phonon by Drude and, later, by Lorentz, [7]; or

(2) assuming that there is a background friction $\vartheta_i = -\nu\dot{q}_i$, $\nu > 0$, for all components of \dot{q}_j ; or

(3) assuming *least effort* to keep, say, the total kinetic energy or the total energy constant, (“*Gaussian thermo-*

stat”, [8]).

Stochastic thermostats could also be allowed (they just add degrees of freedom to the equations) but we do not consider them here, [9–12].

II. SRB statistics and nonequilibrium ensembles

Any initial state x , randomly chosen in phase space with a probability distribution which has a density in phase space (in jargon “absolutely continuous distribution with respect to Liouville measure”), *will admit a statistics* (under the above chaotic assumption): *i.e.* for all (smooth) observables F

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T F(S_t x) dt = \int_{\Omega} \mu_{\underline{E}}(dy) F(y) \quad (1)$$

where $\mu_{\underline{E}}$ is a stationary probability distribution on phase space, called the *SRB distribution* or *SRB statistics*, [3, 6, 13, 14].

Definition: A system in a microscopic state x which has SRB statistics $\mu_{\underline{E}}$ is said to be in the stationary state $\mu_{\underline{E}}$. The collection of all stationary states of a system that are constructed by varying the parameters (typically the volume V of the container, the particles number N , the external forces \underline{E} , etc) will be called a “nonequilibrium ensemble”.

Remark: Hence here an *ensemble* is a collection of probability distributions *although*, often, established terminology indicates an ensemble to be a *single element* of the collection: according to the above definition we would simply call, in equilibrium cases, “microcanonical ensemble” what with the usual terminology is called “the collection of the microcanonical ensembles as the parameters V, U vary”. The latter circumvolution being in my view too awkward I have adopted calling an ensemble already the whole collection of distributions (as the French word *ensemble* literally suggests).

The notion of nonequilibrium ensemble is wider than in equilibrium as it depends *also* on the equations of motion, hence on the thermostat model. Therefore one expects that, as it happens in equilibrium statistical mechanics, there should be “equivalent ensembles” corresponding to classes of different meaningful models for thermostats acting on a system, see [3, 6] and appended references.

Equilibrium is a special case of nonequilibrium: in such case $\underline{E} = \underline{0}$ and $\underline{\vartheta}_{\underline{E}} = \underline{0}$ and the chaotic hypothesis implies the validity of the ergodic hypothesis and the family of SRB distributions can be parameterized by total energy U and volume V and coincides with the microcanonical ensemble, [6].

We now want to consider which relations can be established in general between the properties of stationary states that can be transformed into one another by changing the external parameters.

If we limit ourselves to equilibrium states then it is well known since Boltzmann (in his papers in the period

1866–1884, see [15]) that if a transformation generates an energy variation dU and a volume variation dV when the pressure (defined microscopically) is p and the average kinetic energy is $\frac{3}{2}Nk_B\Theta$ then, [6],

$$\frac{dU + p dV}{\Theta} = \text{exact}$$

while $dU + p dV$ is not exact, *except* in the isochoric case (*i.e.* when $dV = 0$), and it is called the *heat transferred* from the reservoirs to the system. It makes no sense to talk of amount of heat contained in the system unless one limits oneself to studying isochoric transformations: there is no *caloric* (*i.e.* no *heat content*, see [16, 17]) unless one allows only the latter type of transformations in which the system performs no work (and in that case it is just another name for internal energy).

Defining *entropy* as a primitive of the exact differential $(dU + p dV)/\Theta$, the first immediate question is whether one can extend the notion of *entropy* content to non equilibrium states.

III. Entropy production and temperature.

The proposal that emerges from recent literature (mostly based on numerical experiments), [6, 8, 18, 19], is to define, if k_B is Boltzmann’s constant,

Definition: The entropy production rate s in a stationary state $\mu_{\underline{E}}$ is $s = k_B \sigma$ with

$$\sigma = \int_{\Omega} \mu_{\underline{E}}(dx) \sigma(x)$$

where $\sigma(x) = -\text{divergence of } X_{\underline{E}}(x)$ and $\mu_{\underline{E}}$ is the SRB statistics.

Note that σ is also the average value over time of the phase space contraction, by (1).

An important general theorem, [20], guarantees that $\sigma \geq 0$, and $\sigma = 0$ corresponds to the case in which the SRB distribution $\mu_{\underline{E}}$ admits a density on phase space, a case that one naturally identifies with an equilibrium state and which essentially happens only if $\underline{E} = \underline{0}$.

The above definition leads to a natural definition of temperature of the thermostating forces, [2, 21]: note that there is no universally accepted definition of temperature in systems out of equilibrium, even if stationary. Namely one sets

Definition: the effective temperature Θ of the thermostats equilibrating the external forces keeping a system in a stationary nonequilibrium state is

$$\Theta = \frac{W}{s}$$

where W is the work per unit time done on the system by the external forces and s is the entropy production rate.

A connection between temperature and entropy production has been already hinted and even used in the literature ([21, 22] and F. Bonetto) and alternative definitions have been proposed, see [23].

The above definition does not make sense as such in equilibrium because it becomes 0/0: however one can imagine introducing a small forcing and a corresponding thermostat. Then in the limit of vanishing forcing this yields a definition of Θ which by the “fluctuation dissipation theorem” would be correct, [22, 24–27].

A natural question is whether the above definition of temperature is related to heat transfer: does a heat current arise when two systems at different temperature in the above sense are thermally connected (*i.e.* are made to interact)? The question is difficult and an example in which the answer is affirmative is discussed in Section VI, along the lines of [24].

Adopting the above concepts leads naturally to giving up the possibility of defining entropy content of a system: in nonequilibrium thermodynamics entropy ends up to be undefined and one can speak only of “entropy production” or “transfer”: much as “caloric” or “heat content” is undefined in equilibrium thermodynamics. Should one insist in defining the entropy content of a dissipating (*i.e.* with $\sigma > 0$) stationary state one would be compelled to assign to it a value $-\infty$, because the system cedes entropy at a constant rate.

IV. H -functions.

The above is not in contradiction with the possibility of existence of a function which, given an initial state x , will evolve monotonically until reaching a maximum value, the same for almost all x in phase space, [28–30]: and this is not in contrast with microscopic reversibility. For instance in the case of the evolution of a rarefied gas we can imagine to divide the one particle phase space into cells C , “of appropriately chosen size $|C|$ ”, [28], and call $f_C(x)$ the occupation number of each cell by the particles in x . Then, if $t \rightarrow S_t x$ denotes the time evolution of the initial data x at time t ,

$$-k_B \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \sum_C f_C(S_\tau x) \log f_C(S_\tau x) dt$$

will converge, and for practical purposes monotonically after a short transient, as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to a limit which, if the Boltzmann equation holds within a good approximation, maximizes $-k_B \sum_C p_C \log p_C$, $p_C \geq 0$, (subject to the conservation constraints like $\sum_C p_C = N$, *etc.*, [28]) and the limit value is given by the entropy S of the equilibrium state associated with x . If Boltzmann’s equation is (unreasonably) dismissed then still the above quantity will converge to essentially the same limit but the time average will be important as the integrand will not “really converge” to S but it will show very rare large fluctuations which, however, are as a rule doomed to occur at time intervals larger than the age of the Uni-

verse, *i.e.* do not occur *at all* for “all” purposes (I suppose that the number of particles of the system is large, say $> 10^3$): neglecting such impossible events would in fact dispense from considering the time average in the above limit relation. However it is not clear that there should be a universal definition of such “*Lyapunov functions*” or “*H-functions*”. I think that they can certainly be defined on a case by case basis but not necessarily in a general universal way: for instance in fluids of higher density in the last formula one should use the Resibois H -function, [31]; and this is so, I think, essentially because one cannot define an entropy content for non equilibrium states: which is the quantity that would, otherwise, naturally play the role of a universal H -function.

Note however that other views are possible if entropy and heat are conceptually separated: this is discussed in Sect. V.

V. Coarse graining and counting phase space cells when volume is not conserved

Recently a quite general and universal definition has been proposed identifying the H -function with the logarithm of the volume occupied in phase space by the phase space points which are macroscopically indistinguishable (*i.e.* “defining the same *macrostate*”): this applies when the notion of macrostate is free of ambiguities (or at least one can resolve them), and it is certainly an interesting proposal which has already received support from numerical experiments, [30]. The value S of this quantity could be an interesting definition of entropy of the stationary state that is eventually achieved by the evolution of all phase space points that correspond to the same macrostate. Although S might be unrelated to the amounts of heat that are transferred in the transformations between stationary states, calling it “entropy” would be justified on the basis of its coincidence with entropy in the case of equilibrium states and of its nature as a Lyapunov function for the approach to stationarity. The question of the dependence on the notion of macrostate that is used is still somewhat incompletely understood, however.

The problem, and the difficulty, of defining entropy can be studied also from another viewpoint not unrelated to the latter one because it also tries to give a precise definition of *coarse grained* description of the phase space points: the attempt (whose outcome I do not consider satisfactory for the purpose of defining entropy of stationary states) is to identify entropy with the number of phase space cells “relevant” at given external parameters, taking advantage of a variational principle for the SRB statistics and interpreting it as an *equidistribution property* in phase space. The discussion will be performed at a level more technical than that of the previous sections for the purpose of examining the proposal in detail, following [32].

For simplicity I suppose a discrete time dynamics

described by a hyperbolic map S (with dense trajectories: *chaotic hypothesis*) on a bounded surface Ω (*phase space*). Briefly we call the dynamical system (Ω, S) an *Anosov map*; for a general discussion see [19]. As in the continuous time case this implies that, except for a volume zero set of initial data x , it will be $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{T-1} F(S^j x) = \int \mu_{SRB}(dy) F(y)$ for all continuous functions (*observables*) F on Ω .

The SRB distribution admits a rather simple representation which will be interpreted here in terms of “*coarse graining*” of the phase space. In fact given a partition of phase space into closed regions $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_m)$ with pairwise disjoint interiors, consider a point x in phase space which is not in the set \mathcal{B} of zero volume consisting of the points that in their evolution fall on the common boundary of two P_i 's. Then we can define the *history* of x on \mathcal{P} , *i.e.* a sequence $\underline{\xi}$ such that $S^k x \in P_{\xi_k}$. The sequence $\underline{\xi}$ must verify the property, called *compatibility*, that $Q_{\xi_k, \xi_{k+1}} = 1$ for all times k where the matrix Q is defined to be $Q_{\xi, \xi'} = 0$ unless there is an interior point in P_ξ whose image is in the interior of $P_{\xi'}$: in the latter case $Q_{\xi, \xi'} = 1$. The matrix Q just tells us which sets $P_{\xi'}$ can be reached from points in P_ξ in one time step. Then for Anosov maps one can find a partition (in fact infinitely many) of phase space $\mathcal{P} = (P_1, \dots, P_m)$ so that, [3, 6, 33–39],

- (1) if $\underline{\xi}$ is a compatible sequence then there is a point x such that $S^k x \in P_{\xi_k}$, see (for instance) Ch. 9 in [6], (“*compatibility*”). The points x outside the exceptional set \mathcal{B} (of zero volume) determine uniquely the corresponding sequence $\underline{\xi}$.
- (2) the diameter of the set of points $E(\xi_{-\frac{1}{2}T}, \dots, \xi_{\frac{1}{2}T})$ consisting of all points which between time $-\frac{1}{2}T$ and $\frac{1}{2}T$ visit, in their evolution, the sets P_{ξ_i} is bounded above by $c e^{-\kappa T}$ for some $c, \kappa > 0$ (*i.e.* the code $\underline{\xi} \rightarrow x$ determines x “*with exponential precision*”).
- (3) there is a power k of Q such that $Q_{\xi\xi'}^k > 0$ for all ξ, ξ' (“*transitivity*”).

Hence points x can be identified with sequences of symbols $\underline{\xi}$ verifying the compatibility property and the sequences of symbols determine with exponential rapidity the point x which they represent. The existence of \mathcal{P} is nontrivial and rests on the chaoticity of motions.

Given a finite string $\underline{\xi} = (\xi_a, \xi_{a+1}, \dots, \xi_b)$ we define, more generally, the set $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ to be the set of points x in phase space such that $S^j x \in P_{\xi_j}$ for $j = a, a+1, \dots, b$.

Given a point x the set of points whose history coincides with that of x for all $k > 0$ large enough determines uniquely a smooth invariant surface $\Sigma_s(x)$ through x called the *stable manifold* of x and likewise the set of points whose history coincides with that of x for all $-k$ large enough determines uniquely a smooth invariant surface $\Sigma_u(x)$ through x called the *unstable manifold* of x . Points $y \in \Sigma_s(x)$ have a behavior in the future very similar to that of x and in fact the distance between $S^k y$ and

$S^k x$ is bounded by $C e^{-\lambda k}$ for $C, \lambda > 0$ suitable. Likewise points $y \in \Sigma_u(x)$ have a behavior in the past very similar to that of x , the distance between $S^{-k} y$ and $S^{-k} x$ being bounded by $C e^{-\lambda k}$.

The expansion and contraction that take place near every point x can be captured by the matrices $\partial S_u(x)$, $\partial S_s(x)$ obtained by restricting the matrix (*Jacobian matrix*) $\partial S(x)$ of the derivatives of S to its action on the vectors tangent to the unstable and stable manifolds through x : S maps $\Sigma_u(x), \Sigma_s(x)$ to $\Sigma_u(Sx), \Sigma_s(Sx)$ and its derivative maps the tangent vectors at x into tangent vectors at Sx while $\partial S_u(x), \partial S_s(x)$ map tangent vectors to $\Sigma_u(x), \Sigma_s(x)$, respectively, to corresponding vectors tangent at Sx .

A quantitative expression of the expansion and contraction is given by the “local expansion” or “local contraction” exponents defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_u(x) &= \log |\det(\partial S)_u(x)|, \\ \Lambda_s(x) &= \log |\det(\partial S)_s(x)| \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Then the SRB probabilities and the normalized volume (or “normalized Liouville measure”) are measures on the sets $E \subset \Omega$ which are described in terms of the functions $\Lambda_u(x), \Lambda_s(x)$. Their description is quite simple.

The exponential contraction in the past or in the future along the unstable and stable manifolds, consequence of the hyperbolicity assumption, implies that the diameter of the phase space subsets $E_{\underline{\xi}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}}$ tends to zero exponentially fast (and uniformly in the choice the string $\underline{\xi}$) as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Given $T > 0$ the collection of the non empty sets $E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}}$ can be used to study the properties of a restricted class of observables, namely those which have essentially constant values on such small sets. Let T be a time such that the size of the (nonempty) sets of the form $E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}}$ is so small that the *few* physically interesting observables can be viewed as constant inside each $E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}} \equiv E_{\underline{\xi}}$. We define, if Q is the compatibility matrix,

Definition: (Coarse graining) *The sets of points of the form $E_{\underline{\xi}} = E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}}$ will be called the elements of a description of the microscopic states “coarse grained to scale γ ” if γ is the smallest linear dimension of the nonempty sets $E_{\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2}}$. The elements $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ of the “coarse grained partition of phase space” are labeled by a finite string*

$$\underline{\xi} \equiv (\xi_{-T/2}, \dots, \xi_{T/2})$$

with $\xi_i = 1, \dots, m$ and $Q_{\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}} \equiv 1$.

Define the *forward* and *backward* expansion and contraction rates as

$$U_{u, \pm}^{T/2}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\pm T/2} \Lambda_u(S^j x), \quad U_{s, \pm}^{T/2}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\pm T/2} \Lambda_s(S^j x)$$

and select a point $x(\underline{\xi}) \in E_{\underline{\xi}}$ for each $\underline{\xi}$. Then the SRB distribution μ_{SRB} and the volume distribution μ_L on the phase space Ω , which we suppose to have volume $\mathcal{W} = V(\Omega)$, attribute to the *nonempty* sets $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ the respective probabilities μ, μ_L

$$\mu(\underline{\xi}) \stackrel{def}{=} \mu_{SRB}(E_{\underline{\xi}}) \text{ and } \mu_L(\underline{\xi}) \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{V(E_{\underline{\xi}})}{\mathcal{W}} \quad (3)$$

if $V(E)$ denotes the Liouville volume of E . The distributions μ, μ_L are shown to be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\underline{\xi}) &= h_{u,u}^T(\underline{\xi}) \cdot e^{(-U_{u,-}^{T/2}(x(\underline{\xi})) - U_{u,+}^{T/2}(x(\underline{\xi})))} \\ \mu_L(\underline{\xi}) &= h_{s,u}^T(\underline{\xi}) \cdot e^{(U_{s,-}^{T/2}(x(\underline{\xi})) - U_{u,+}^{T/2}(x(\underline{\xi})))} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and $h_{u,u}^T(\underline{\xi}), h_{s,u}^T(\underline{\xi})$ are suitable functions of $\underline{\xi}$, *uniformly bounded as $\underline{\xi}, T$ vary*, which are mildly dependent on $\underline{\xi}$; so that they can be regarded as constants for the purpose of the present discussion, *cfr.* Ch. 9 in [6].

The (4) shows that the Liouville volume weights *asymmetrically* the past and the future while the SRB distribution weighs them *symmetrically*. One can say that the expansion and contraction rates Λ_u, Λ_s provide an “energy function” that assigns relative probabilistic weights to the coarse grained cells via (4).

The latter analogy provides the motivation for the name “*thermodynamic formalism*” that is often given to the mathematical theory of chaotic systems, [40].

As mentioned above we have in mind that the sets $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ represent macroscopic states, being small enough so that the physically interesting observables have a constant value within them; and we would like to think that they provide us with a model for a “*coarse grained*” description of the microscopic states. The notion of coarse graining given here is precise and, nevertheless, quite flexible because it contains a free “resolution parameter” γ . Should one decide that the resolution γ is not good enough because one wants to study the system with higher accuracy then one simply chooses a smaller γ (and correspondingly a larger T).

The phase space volume will generally contract with time: yet we want to describe the evolution in terms of evolution of microscopic states, with the aim of counting the microscopic states relevant for a given stationary state of the system.

Therefore we divide phase space into parallelepipedal cells Δ of side size $\varepsilon \ll \gamma$ and try to discuss time evolution in terms of them: we shall call such cells “microscopic” cells as we do not associate them with any particular observable; they represent the highest microscopic resolution.

One can think of the new microscopic cells as physical realizations of objects that arise in computer simulations: in the simulations cells Δ are the “digitally represented” points with coordinates given by a set of integers and

the evolution S is a *program* or *code* simulating the solution of equations of motion suitable for the model under study. The code operates *exactly* on the coordinates (the deterministic round offs should be considered part of the program). The simulation will produce (generically) a chaotic evolution “for all practical purposes”, *i.e.* if we only look at “macroscopic observables” which are constant on the coarse graining scale $\gamma = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}T}\ell_0$ of the partition \mathcal{P}^T , where ℓ_0 is the phase space size and $\bar{\lambda} > 0$ is the most contractive line element exponent (which therefore fixes the scale of the coarse graining, by the definition above).

A few words must be said about the precise meaning of “linear sizes”: in fact we are considering partitions of phase space into sets ignoring that the coordinates have a physical meaning. Some of them are momenta and others are positions hence they have different physical dimensions. Therefore, assuming that we consider N mass- m particles in a gas at average kinetic energy per particle $\frac{3}{2}k_B\Theta_0$ (note that Θ_0 will in general be different from the temperature Θ defined in Sec. III) and numerical density ρ , we imagine to measure such quantities in terms of units δq of length and δp of momentum fixed *a priori*, subject to the constraint that they should be (following the recurrence times estimate made by Boltzmann, p. 400 in [41], see also [6]) much smaller than, respectively, $\rho^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and $\sqrt{2mk_B\Theta_0}$. Then $\mathcal{W} = \ell_0^{6N}$ with ℓ_0 proportional to $(\rho^{-1/3}\sqrt{2mk_B\Theta_0}/\delta p\delta q)^{1/2}$: *i.e.* if $d = 6N$ is the phase space dimension, it is

$$\ell_0 = \mathcal{W}^{1/d}, \quad \ell_0 = \left(\frac{\rho^{-1/3}\sqrt{2mk_B\Theta_0}}{\delta p\delta q} \right)^{1/2}$$

The question we ask on general grounds is, see also [42]

Question: can we count the number of ways in which the asymptotic state of the system can be realized microscopically?

In equilibrium the (often) accepted answer is simple: the number is $\mathcal{N}_0 = \mathcal{W}/\varepsilon^d$, *i.e.* just the number of cells (“ergodic hypothesis”). This means that we think that motion will generate a one cycle permutation of the \mathcal{N}_0 cells Δ , each of which is therefore, representative of the equilibrium state. Average values of macroscopic observables will be obtained simply as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} F(S^j x) &= \\ = \mathcal{N}_0^{-1} \sum_{\Delta} F(\Delta) &= \int_{\Omega} F(y) \mu_L(dy) \end{aligned}$$

According to Boltzmann the quantity:

$$S_B \stackrel{def}{=} k_B \log(\mathcal{W}/\varepsilon^d)$$

is then, see [43], proportional to the *physical entropy* of our equilibrium system.

Can one extend the above view to stationary systems out of equilibrium? In such systems the volume will no longer be preserved by time evolution and, in fact, its contraction rate

$$\eta(x) = -\log |\det \partial S(x)|$$

not only does not vanish but, in general, will have a positive time average $\bar{\eta}$,

$$\bar{\eta} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \eta(S^j x) = \int_{\Omega} \eta(y) \mu_{SRB}(dy),$$

see [20]. If $\bar{\eta} > 0$ the volume will contract indefinitely (hence the system will be called *dissipative*).

Out of equilibrium we may imagine that a similar kind of “ergodicity” holds: namely that the cells that represent the stationary state form a subset of all the cells, on which evolution acts as a one cycle permutation.

If so the statistical properties of motions will be determined by the *equidistribution* among such cells, which therefore attributes probabilities $\rho(\Delta)$ which maximize the quantity $-\sum_{\Delta} \rho(\Delta) \log \rho(\Delta)$. Hence the above counting question can be related to a problem

... which necessarily follows from Boltmann’s train of thought, [and] has remained untouched. Consider an irreversible process which, with fixed outside constraints, is passing by itself from the nonstationary to the stationary state. Can we characterize in any sense the resulting distribution of states as the “relatively most probable distribution”, and can this be given in terms of the minimum of a function which can be regarded as the generalization..., [44], footnote 239, p.103.

Considering realizations, and even simulations, of a dissipative system we must recognize that *no representation of the evolution as a map of the phase space cells, nor any code in simulations, can be invertible*: it must happen (many times) that $S\Delta = S\Delta'$ with $\Delta \neq \Delta'$. Clearly if $S\Delta = S\Delta' = \tilde{\Delta}$ we can think that both Δ and Δ' are not really different and only one of the two should be taken as a representative of a microscopic state.

We can imagine “pruning” one after the other the “unnecessary” cells until the map S becomes invertible. More formally each cell Δ will have a motion that is *eventually* periodic and we discard as “transients” all cells whose evolution is not strictly periodic. We identify the remaining “non transient” cells as the cells which “are on the attracting set” and which form a discrete model of the attracting set for the motions. Correspondingly we say that a coarse grained cell $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ is “in the attracting set” if it contains non transient cells.

The question posed above becomes now a precise one: which is the number of left over cells? It will be only a fraction of the initial number \mathcal{N}_0 of cells: and we can attempt to estimate it.

However we must take into account that the time T is far smaller than the time necessary to resolve the phase space cells. Since the length of time necessary to resolve points in phase space with precision γ is T and since we assume that we shall be unable to see cells with a precision higher than γ then phase space contraction implies that the number \mathcal{N} of phase space cells necessary to describe the motions with an accuracy γ is

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0 e^{-T\bar{\eta}} \quad (5)$$

because in time T the phase space volume is reduced by a factor about $e^{-T\bar{\eta}}$ (here $\bar{\eta}$ which *should be identified with the infinite time average $\bar{\eta}$ of the phase space contraction rate* $-\log |\det \partial S(x)|$). In fact our observations require the phase space cells to maintain a well defined identity at least for a time duration T and they cannot be more than the r.h.s. of (5). This means that we imagine that if we make observations with precision γ only cells in a layer of width γ around the attracting set will be involved in the description of the motion: cells further apart are non recurrent (aperiodic).

We could from now on take $\gamma = \varepsilon$ and the analysis would be simpler: it is however interesting and important to consider also the cases $\gamma > \varepsilon$ because the extremely large size of the recurrence times on the microscopic scales makes it not physically meaningful to discuss phenomena occurring on the recurrence time scale.

The picture must hold for all Markovian pavements \mathcal{P} and for all T ’s such that $\gamma = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}T} \delta > \varepsilon$ if $\delta \simeq \ell_0$ is the typical size of an element of the partition \mathcal{P} : this induces to choose T to be of the order of $\bar{T} = 2\bar{\lambda}^{-1} \log \ell_0 / \gamma$. And, as in equilibrium, once that T is so chosen and the requirement $\gamma \geq \varepsilon$ is fulfilled, *we shall think that all cells evolve in time so that they visit all other \mathcal{N} cells.*

This is a kind of “ergodicity” assumption which is similar to the corresponding assumption that in equilibrium all cells are actually visited. Note that assuming that only a fraction of them is visited (hence $\mathcal{N} < \mathcal{N}_0 e^{-T\bar{\eta}}$) is also possible and, nevertheless, it would give the *same statistics* as long as the fraction is taken to be the same in each coarse grained volume, but it would give a different cell count: if we are unable to probe phase space with precision higher than γ and $\gamma > \varepsilon$ we cannot distinguish the two possibilities and taking the equal sign in (5) can only be a simplicity assumption which however comes with the warning that the cell count might be somewhat ambiguous *unless* $\gamma = \varepsilon$. The same ambiguity is also present in equilibrium cases.

Therefore the SRB distribution attributes the same weight to all cells Δ *on the attracting set* and therefore it verifies a variational property: namely if C is a generic cell and $n(C)$ is its probability in a statistical state of the system then $-\sum_C n(C) \log n(C)$ attains a maximum when $n(C) = \mathcal{N}^{-1}$.

It is interesting that the latter property can be identified with the variational principle for SRB distributions,

[42]. Indeed from the general theory of the SRB distributions, see [33, 34, 37, 45] and [6], Chap. 9, we know that the SRB distribution gives weight $e^{-U_{u,T}(\underline{\xi})}$, with $U_{u,T}(\underline{\xi}) = \sum_{j=-T/2}^{T/2} \log \Lambda_u(S^j x(\underline{\xi}))$, to the *collection of all cells* $\Delta \in E_{\underline{\xi}}$. Therefore the number of cells in the set $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ will be proportional to $\mathcal{N}e^{-U_{u,T}(\underline{\xi})}$: which implies that the equal weight distribution on the microscopic cells induces a weight $p_{\underline{\xi}}$ on the coarse grained sets $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ which maximizes

$$P_B \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\underline{\xi}} -p_{\underline{\xi}} (\log p_{\underline{\xi}} + U_{u,T}(x(\underline{\xi}))) \quad (6)$$

subject to $\sum_{\underline{\xi}} p_{\underline{\xi}} = 1, p_{\underline{\xi}} \geq 0$ and with the sums running over the $\underline{\xi}$'s. This is one of the characterizations of the SRB distribution (*variational principle* of Ruelle, [3, 6, 14]).

Coming back to the cell count we take $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0 e^{-\bar{\eta}T}$, see (5), *i.e.* we suppose that if we probe phase space with a precision γ then all cells closer than γ to the attracting set are visited by the motion. Call $-\lambda_i^-, \lambda_i^+$ the Lyapunov exponents, $\lambda_i^\alpha > 0$, so that $\bar{\lambda} = \max_{i,j}(\lambda_i^-, \lambda_j^+)$ and $\bar{\eta} = \sum_i (\lambda_i^- - \lambda_i^+)$. Keeping in mind that $\frac{\ell_0}{\varepsilon} = \mathcal{N}_0^{\frac{1}{d}}$ and (5) we define

$$\begin{aligned} S_{cells} &= k_B \log \mathcal{N} = k_B (\log \mathcal{N}_0 - \frac{2\bar{\eta}}{\lambda} \log \frac{\ell_0}{\gamma}) = \\ &= k_B (1 - \frac{2\bar{\eta}}{d\lambda}) \log \mathcal{N}_0 + \frac{2\bar{\eta}}{d\lambda} \log (\frac{\gamma}{\varepsilon})^d \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

(note that $\frac{1}{2}d\bar{\lambda} \geq \bar{\eta}$ is implied by the $S_{cells} \geq 0$ with $\varepsilon = \gamma$: this is an inequality which seems to be satisfied in the examples studied in the literature). The S_{cells} will change if ε/γ vary, as any choice (*e.g.* $\varepsilon = \gamma$) of the size of cells of the microscopic description is clearly arbitrary, and, *unlike the equilibrium case when $\bar{\eta} = 0$, the change will be nontrivial, i.e. it will not simply be an additive constant independent on the state of the system.* In fact $\bar{\eta}/\bar{\lambda}$ is a dynamical quantity and changing γ (*i.e.* changing the coarse graining resolution keeping ε fixed) will change S_{cells} as $\Delta S_{cells} = k_B d \frac{2\bar{\eta}}{d\lambda} \log \frac{\gamma}{\gamma'}$.

Given a precision γ the quantity S_{cells} measures how many “non transient” phase space cells must be used to obtain a *faithful* representation of the attracting set and of its statistical properties on scale γ . Here by “faithful” on scale γ we mean that all observables which are constant on such scale will show the correct statistical properties, *i.e.* that cells of size larger than γ will be visited with the correct SRB frequency.

Note that we are assuming that the system has a dense attractor (see the above “transitivity” property); so that the estimate in (7) holds only as long as this is a correct assumption: at high forcing the attracting set is likely (*i.e.* examples abound) to be no longer dense on phase space and the number \mathcal{N}_0 will have to be replaced by a

smaller power of ℓ_0 , affecting correspondingly the analysis leading to (7): we do not discuss this point here.

(i) Although eq. (7) gives the cell count it does not seem to deserve to be taken as a definition of entropy for stationary systems out of equilibrium, not even for systems considered here, *i.e.* simple enough to admit an Anosov map as a model for their evolution. It appears as a notion distinct from what has become known as the “Boltzmann entropy”, [28], see also [46, 47], because it depends on the value of γ, ε in a nontrivial way. The notion is also different from the Gibbs’ entropy, to which it is equivalent only in equilibrium: in nonequilibrium (dissipative) systems the Gibbs’ entropy can only be defined as $-\infty$ and perpetually decreasing; because *in such systems one can define the rate at which (Gibbs’) entropy is “created” (“ceded to the thermostats”) by the system* to be $\bar{\eta}$, *i.e.* to be the average phase space contraction $\bar{\eta}$, see [18, 19].

(ii) We also see, from the above analysis, that the variational principle that determines the SRB distribution can be identified with the one that *leads to equal probability of the phase space cells, cfr.* (6). The SRB distribution appears to be the equal probability distribution among the \mathcal{N} cells which are “not transient” or, as we say above, “are on the attracting set”. In equilibrium all cells are non transient (if ergodicity is assumed) and the SRB distribution coincides with the Liouville distribution.

(iii) If we could take $T \rightarrow \infty$ (hence, correspondingly, the resolution $\gamma \rightarrow 0$) then the distribution μ , which is uniform inside each $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ but which attributes a total weight to $E_{\underline{\xi}}$ equal to $N(\underline{\xi}) = \mu_{SRB}(E_{\underline{\xi}})\mathcal{N}$, would become the exact SRB distribution. However it seems conceptually more satisfactory, imitating Boltzmann, to suppose that γ is very small but > 0 so that T will be large but not infinite.

(iv) By construction the quantity P_B is a maximum as a function of the quantities $p_{\underline{\xi}}$ when they have the value of the SRB distribution, but it makes sense as a function defined on any probability distribution over the microscopic cells Δ . In particular if the initial state is a single cell one can define $p_{\underline{\xi}}(t)$ as the fraction of time the cell has spent in its evolution up to time t inside $E_{\underline{\xi}}$. Therefore the *r.h.s.* of (6) evaluated with $p_{\underline{\xi}} \equiv p_{\underline{\xi}}(t)$ tends in the average to a maximum and it can be regarded as another instance of an H -function in the sense of Section IV.

(v) By Pesin’s formula the leading term as $T \rightarrow \infty$ of P_B , (see (6)), is 0; hence the quantity P_B which makes sense for any probability distribution $p_{\underline{\xi}}$ will be a Lyapunov function for the approach of a probability distribution to the SRB distribution but its value can hardly be taken as a definition of a property of the stationary state.

(vi) Let $\varepsilon \ll \gamma$. If we identify a microscopic initial state with one of the phase space cells then we can consider the evolution of the probability distribution which attributes initial weight 0 to all cells but the ones C in the coarse grained region $E_{\underline{\xi}_0}$, and equal weight to the lat-

ter ones. Then calling $p_C(t)$ the fraction of time the cells initially in E_{ξ_0} spend in the cell C we see that the quantity $S(t) = -\sum_C p_C(t) \log p_C(t)$ tends to S_{cells} (because $p_C(t)$ tends to \mathcal{N}^{-1}). Therefore S is a general Lyapunov function, but it depends non trivially on arbitrary parameters (except in the equilibrium case). The (7) also shows that there is a direct relation between the number of phase space cells and the entropy production rate $\overline{\eta}$.

(vii) The analysis in terms of cells is reminiscent, in fact, of the methods employed to study Hausdorff dimension, the Hausdorff measure and Pesin's formula in general hyperbolic systems, [48]. A deeper understanding of the analysis appears to be linked to an important question, raised by Ruelle, asking whether (and how) one could possibly relate an entropy notion to the logarithm of the Hausdorff measure of the attractor (mathematically the attracting set is the closure of the attractor, and the latter is a set of smallest Hausdorff dimension but still with SRB probability 1). A pertinent possibility is that the Hausdorff measure on the attractor is absolutely continuous with respect to the SRB measure.

VI. Generalities on heat transfer.

More generally one is interested in cases in which the external forces depend also on velocities. This becomes necessary if one wants to study the details of heat transfer processes. Heat transfer might occur *even in situations in which the only forces acting are due to thermostats*. Therefore we extend the problems of the previous sections to more general cases in which forces may depend on velocities so that there is no longer an obvious distinction between external forces and thermostat forces and we are free to call certain forces active forces and others thermostat forces. Nevertheless in concrete cases it will be often natural to give such attributes to various terms into which forces can be decomposed.

In fact typically the external forces will be positional forces while the thermostats forces will be modeled so that they can be decomposed as sums

$$\underline{\vartheta}_i(\underline{q}, \underline{\dot{q}}) = \sum_{p=1}^2 \underline{\vartheta}_i^{(p)}(\underline{q}, \underline{\dot{q}}) \quad (8)$$

with $\vartheta_i^{(p)}(\underline{q}, \underline{\dot{q}}) \neq \underline{0}$ only if $\underline{q}_i \in \Lambda_p$ and $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$ are n disjoint spatial regions. The regions $\Lambda^{(p)}$ represent the regions where the system is in contact with the p -th thermostat.

The following model for a heat conducting and electrically conducting gas is a good example of the above general situations, [24, 25]. In a box $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ (its dimensions are arbitrary and the shape is drawn in the following figure), are enclosed N particles with mass $m = 1$, interacting via a rather general pair potential, like a hard core potential with a tail or via a Lennard Jones potential, and they are subject to a constant force field (*electric field*) $E \underline{u}$ in the x direction; the particles also collide with

fixed obstacles so arranged that no collisionless straight path can exist. The boundary conditions are periodic in the horizontal direction and reflecting in the vertical direction.

Adjacent to the box \mathcal{B} are located two boxes $\mathcal{R}_+, \mathcal{R}_-$ containing $N_+ = N_- = N$ particles interacting with each other via a hard core interaction, and with the particles in \mathcal{B} via a pair interaction with suitably long range (shorter than the distance between the two boxes), but are separated from the latter by a reflecting wall. The sizes and the location of the three boxes can be changed and they are fixed only for definiteness.




Fig.1: The horizontal container has periodic boundary conditions; the two additional containers enclose the thermostating systems. On the container act a constant force establishing a particles flow while the temperature difference of the thermostats induces a heat flow producing a situation in which Onsager reciprocity is expected to hold in the limits $E \rightarrow 0, \Theta_+ - \Theta_- \rightarrow 0$.

We imagine other forces to act on the system and enforcing the following constraints: the total kinetic energy in the "hot plate" \mathcal{R}_+ and in the "cold plate" \mathcal{R}_- are constrained to be $\frac{3}{2}Nk_B\Theta_+$ and, respectively, $\frac{3}{2}N_-k_B\Theta_-$ where Θ_- and $\Theta_+ = \Theta_- + \delta\Theta$, $\delta\Theta \geq 0$ are the *temperatures of the plates*: see Fig.1.

The equations of motion are, if \underline{F}_j are the impulsive forces due to the hard cores plus the interparticle forces between the particles in the regions \mathcal{R}_\pm and those in \mathcal{B} :

$$\ddot{\underline{q}}_j = \underline{F}_j + E\chi_{\mathcal{B}}(\underline{q}_j)\underline{u} - \alpha_+ + \chi_{\mathcal{R}_+}(\underline{q}_j)\underline{\dot{q}}_j - \alpha_- \chi_{\mathcal{R}_-}(\underline{q}_j)\underline{\dot{q}}_j \quad (9)$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{B}}, \chi_{\pm}$ are the characteristic functions of the regions $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{R}_\pm$ and $\alpha_+ \alpha_-$, are multipliers defined so that for some preassigned Θ_\pm :

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \chi_{\pm}(\underline{q}_j) \frac{\dot{\underline{q}}_j^2}{2} = \frac{3}{2}Nk_B\Theta_\pm, \quad (10)$$

are exact constants of motion.

Let $L_E, L_+, L_-, L_+^0, L_-^0$ denote, respectively, the work per unit time performed by the field E or by the particles in the thermostats $\mathcal{R}_+, \mathcal{R}_-$ on the gas in \mathcal{B} , or by the gas in \mathcal{B} on the thermostats $\mathcal{R}_+, \mathcal{R}_-$.

We suppose that the interaction between the particles in the thermostats \mathcal{R}_\pm and the ones in the main box \mathcal{B} are strong enough (compared to the field strength) so that

a stationary state is achieved and the chaotic hypothesis becomes, therefore, meaningful. In fact it would be interesting to find a proof that one can really build a model in which this happens: I think that the assumption should hold if E is small and the particles in \mathcal{R}_\pm have a sufficiently long range interaction with the particles in the box \mathcal{R} and sufficient strength; possibly even with no such extra condition in the cases $E = 0$ (pure heat conduction models). Otherwise in order to be sure that a stationary state is reached one should add some further constraint, *e.g.* impose that the total energy in the main box stays bounded: the discussion that follows would not change substantially, as discussed in detail in [24].

Let $\mathcal{L}_E, \mathcal{L}_+^0, \mathcal{L}_-^0, \mathcal{L}_+, \mathcal{L}_-$ be the time averages of the above works.

Let Q_\pm the work done per unit time by the thermostats forces in the regions \mathcal{R}_\pm and \mathcal{Q}_\pm their time averages. Then the imposed conservation laws give, *in a stationary state*,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_E + \mathcal{L}_+ + \mathcal{L}_- - \mathcal{L}_+^0 - \mathcal{L}_-^0 &= 0 \\ -\mathcal{Q}_+ + \mathcal{L}_+^0 - \mathcal{L}_+ &= 0, \quad -\mathcal{Q}_- + \mathcal{L}_-^0 - \mathcal{L}_- = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

so that one finds (by differentiating (10) with respect to time and by applying the equations of motion (9)) expressions for α_+, α_- :

$$\alpha_\pm = \frac{Q_\pm}{\sum \chi_\pm(\underline{q}_j) \underline{q}_j^2} \quad (12)$$

and the phase space contraction per unit time, *i.e.* k_B^{-1} times the *entropy production per unit time*, is:

$$\sigma(x) = (3N - 1)(\alpha_+ + \alpha_-)$$

in the configuration x with average (for large N 's)

$$\sigma = \frac{Q_+}{k_B \Theta_+} + \frac{Q_-}{k_B \Theta_-} > 0 \quad (13)$$

Note that $Q_+ + Q_- = 0$ if $E = 0$ (hence $\mathcal{L}_E = 0$) and $Q_+ > 0, Q_- < 0$.

The example shows that the considerations of the previous sections can be extended to the much more general cases considered above in which the forcing is due also to velocity dependent forces. They also give more grounds to the identification of the entropy production rate with the phase space contraction: see equation (13) when $E = 0$.

Remarks: (1) It is useful to stress that in the above model the SRB distribution is concentrated on a zero volume set in phase space: however if one looks at the restriction of the SRB distribution to the particles in the main box \mathcal{B} , *i.e.* to their statistical properties, then it should be given by a density in the restricted phase space: the basic mechanism for this has been discussed and clarified in an interesting class of models in [49].

(2) Note that according to the definitions of Sec. III if $E = 0$ there is no external positional force acting on the system and therefore the corresponding work W vanishes (and $W = Q_1 + Q_2 = 0$). So the effective temperature is 0: this is quite a surprising consequence of the definitions which may mean that the definition of temperature proposed in Sec. III is not appropriate. However this is effective temperature of the combined action of the two thermostats, a notion that is new. At the same time we see that the temperatures of the individual thermostats are naturally identified with Θ_+ and Θ_- if they are defined, as in Sec. III, by the ratio between the average work done by a thermostat force divided by its average contribution to the phase space contraction times k_B .

VII. Remarks.

(1) The above analysis, if accepted, allows us to define entropy as a notion related to heat exchanges only for the stationary states which are in the very special class of equilibrium states. It is however important and appropriate to mention one more study that has been made in the attempt of defining entropy as a function of nonequilibrium stationary states.

One can consider an evolution of a phase point under forces which up to time t_1 are constant and admit a stationary SRB distribution μ^1 , then the forces vary between t_1 and t_2 and become again constant after time t_2 : during the whole process we imagine to keep the thermostating force varying so that the “temperature” of the thermostats, as defined in Section III remains constant. If one *fixed* the forces $\underline{E}(t)$ at their value at any $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ then the dynamics would admit a SRB distribution. Therefore we can define for each t the stationary SRB distribution $\bar{\mu}_t$ corresponding to the “frozen” forces $\underline{E}(t)$ and, at the same time, the (different) probability distribution μ_t into which μ^1 evolves in the time interval $[t^1, t]$, and we can also define $\sigma(\tau) = \int \sigma_\tau(x) \mu_\tau(dx)$ and $\bar{\sigma}_\tau = \int \sigma_\tau(x) \bar{\mu}_\tau(dx)$.

Then a quantity which is possibly of interest is

$$I = k_B \int_{t_1}^{t_2} (\sigma(t) - \bar{\sigma}_t) dt$$

This is a quantity that does not really depend on how long a time the system dwells on a special value of the parameters since the integrand will go to zero fast if the interval is too long (because μ_t will approach $\bar{\mu}_t$).

Does I depend on the intermediate stationary states of the transformation? Some aspects of the question have been partially studied, [50], and I interpret them as *suggesting* that to first order in the variation of the force parameters (during the intermediate times) independence might hold (I stress that this is a conjecture). More precisely: if the variation of the forces vanishes rapidly at $-t_1, t_2 = +\infty$ (hence the evolving distribution μ_t returns to μ^1 and the system performs a cycle) then the value of I does not depend on the actual intermediate pattern of the variation of the forces, *to first order in the variations*. It is tempting to think that the quantity I could

be interpreted as entropy variation of the system in a transformation of the initial into the final state. However, the same work suggests that very likely this is no longer true already to second order: going in the direction of making difficult alternative attempts at defining entropy variations in stationary nonequilibria on the basis of the quantity I . This is a point that is likely to be clarified in the near future.

(2) Having defined the notion of entropy production rate one can define a “duality” between fluxes J_j and forces E_j using $\sigma(x)$ as a “generating function”:

$$J_j(\underline{E}) = k_B \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial E_j}$$

which, at $\underline{E} = \underline{0}$, leads to Onsager’s reciprocity and to Green–Kubo’s formulae for transport, [24–26].

(3) We have proposed a definition of entropy production rate and of temperature for a class of stationary states. But a new definition is really useful if it is associated with new results: I think that such new results may already be around and many cluster around the *fluctuation theorem*. I refer, on this point, to the literature, [2, 3, 5, 21, 51–55] confining myself here to recalling the theorem. This is a theorem that holds for systems mechanically thermostatted by a thermostat which is *time reversible*, *i.e.* such that there is an isometry map I of phase space such that $I^2 = \text{identity}$ and which anticommutes with the identity, namely $IS_t = S_{-t}I$.

For instance the model in Sect. VI is time reversible, and time reversal is simply $I(\underline{\dot{q}}, \underline{q}) = (-\underline{\dot{q}}, \underline{q})$.

Suppose that $\sigma > 0$ (see Section III) and let the average “dimensionless” entropy production rate over a time interval τ be $p_\tau(x) = \tau^{-1} \sigma^{-1} \int_0^\tau \sigma(S_t x) dt$. Then the SRB probability $\pi_\tau(p) dp$ that the dimensionless entropy production rate is $p_\tau(x) \in [p, p + dp]$ is related to the probability $\pi_\tau(-p) dp$ by the relation “FR”

$$\frac{\pi_\tau(p)}{\pi_\tau(-p)} = e^{\tau \sigma p + O}$$

where the error term O is uniformly bounded for all $\tau \rightarrow \infty$, and for all $|p|$ in a fixed closed interval contained in $[0, p^*)$, where $1 \leq p^* < \infty$ is a suitable constant. The constant p^* is a *non trivial dynamical quantity*, see [56] where it is defined; nevertheless it has sometimes, even recently, been confused with the maximum value of $\sigma(x)/\sigma$, with consequent misunderstandings: in general $\max |\sigma(x)|/\sigma > p^*$ and *it can be even much larger*, [57].

The FR can be more clearly formulated in terms of the function $\zeta(p) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tau^{-1} \log \pi_\tau(p)$ and it becomes

$$\zeta(-p) = \zeta(p) - \sigma p, \quad |p| < p^*$$

with no error term because this is a relation valid in the limit $\tau \rightarrow \infty$. It is important to note that while $\sigma(x)$

is not an intrinsic quantity, as it depends on the volume definition hence on the metric used on phase space, the σ as well as the function $\zeta(p)$ are independent on the metric used and are intrinsic quantities. If one changes the metric, say by altering it by a factor $\Phi(x)$, then the variation of $\sigma(x)$ is $\mathcal{L}\Phi(x)$ where \mathcal{L} is the Liouville operator: hence the quantity $\tau^{-1} \int_0^\tau \sigma(S_t x) dt$ changes by the variation $\tau^{-1}(\Phi(S_\tau x) - \Phi(x))$ which tends to 0 as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$.

In the latter form the FR relation can be also regarded as valid for *all* p if we imagine that for $|p| > p^*$ the function $\zeta(p)$ is defined to be equal to $-\infty$. Indeed it is natural to define $\zeta(p) = -\infty$ for $|p|$ too large, certainly for $|p| > \max_x |\sigma(x)|/\sigma$, because such values are impossible; the value of p^* above can in fact be determined, if one follows the details in [5, 56, 58], by the condition that $\zeta(p) > -\infty$ for $|p| < p^*$. The value of $\zeta(p)$ for $p = p^*$ is a delicate matter: one can only say that the function $\zeta(p)$ has to be convex, so that if it is well defined for $p = p^*$ it can have *a priori* any value between the $\lim_{p < p^*, p \rightarrow p^*} \zeta(p)$ and $-\infty$: it is likely that the answer is model dependent.

A way to interpret the FR for $\sigma = 0$ is to consider it for $\underline{E} \neq \underline{0}$ and to look at the limiting relations that it implies when the forcing $\underline{E} \rightarrow \underline{0}$, hence $\sigma \rightarrow 0$. As such it is very interesting, and properly interpreted leads to Onsager reciprocity and Green–Kubo formulae for transport coefficients in the limit of zero forcing: hence the FR can be interpreted, in reversibly thermostatted systems, as an extension to non zero forcing of Onsager reciprocity, [24].

As an example the fluctuation relation should hold for the models in Sec. VI: and it would imply the usual Onsager reciprocity and Green–Kubo relations in the limit in which $\Theta_+ - \Theta_-, E \rightarrow 0$ as discussed in [24].

One might be interested in seeing what the above relation becomes in the case of equilibrium states or more generally in the cases in which $\sigma = 0$. An answer would be that it makes no sense because the very definition of p involves division by 0.

A related question would be to ask which are the properties of the quantity $A(x) = \tau^{-1} \int_0^\tau \sigma(S_t x) dt$, *i.e.* of the dimensional entropy creation rate: *but it would be uninteresting* because one would just find that if we call $\tilde{\zeta}(A)$ the function analogous to ζ then $\tilde{\zeta}(-A) = \tilde{\zeta}(A)$ for $|A| = 0$ (which is of course trivially true, see also below).

Nevertheless one might think that the proof of the FR in the cases $\sigma > 0$ could be followed (in the case of Anosov systems) with minor adaptations to obtain some non trivial result even in the cases $\sigma = 0$, [57]. Closer examination of this point can be traced back to the remark that even in (Anosov) equilibrium systems one could have a $\sigma(x) \not\equiv 0$: in fact the value of $\sigma(x)$ is identically zero in equilibrium systems *only if one uses the natural metric on phase space*, whose volume element is the Liouville volume. If one used a different metric or if one imposed some constraint like constant kinetic energy then $\sigma(x)$ might be non zero: and it will be so in general. However

in such cases the phase space contraction would be only apparent: in fact one can show that $\sigma(x)$ would have the form $\sigma(x) = \mathcal{L}F(x)$ with \mathcal{L} the Liouville operator and F is a suitable function. Or, in the case of discrete time evolution S , the phase space contraction $\sigma(x)$ would take the form $\sigma(x) = F(Sx) - F(x)$, see proposition 6.4.3 in [14]. So that $A(x) = \tau^{-1} \int_0^\tau A(S_t x) d\tau = \tau^{-1}(F(S_\tau x) - F(x)) \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow \infty} 0$ and the FR would become trivial because the distribution of A becomes a delta function at the origin. If one follows the proof of the FR, [56], under the additional assumption $\sigma = 0$ and with the appropriate modifications one ends up, *if mistakes are avoided*, [57], with a trivial statement that FR holds for $p = 0$ only.

Forgetting or misinterpreting the restrictions of validity for the FR (*i.e.* $p < p^*$ or $|A| < p^*\sigma$) as well as

neglecting the problems arising in its interpretation for the distribution of A in the cases $\sigma = 0$ has led to a variety of mistakes, paradoxes and logical errors, [57]. In fact in applications taking the restrictions into account is essential, see for instance [59].

Acknowledgements: The above review has been stimulated by discussions held mostly at Rutgers University in the course of the last few years: involving F. Bonetto, O. Costin, S. Goldstein, J. Lebowitz, D. Ruelle, E. Speer, F. Zamponi. I am particularly indebted to A. Giuliani for his comments, corrections and suggestions and to E.G.D. Cohen for the ideas discussed in the three introductory sections (an expanded version of [60]).

-
- [1] M. Zemansky, *Heat and thermodynamics* (McGraw-Hill, New-York, 1957).
- [2] G. Gallavotti, *Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics ? Twentyseven comments*, Meteorological and geophysical fluid dynamics, ed. W. Schröder (Science, 2004).
- [3] G. Gallavotti, *Foundations of Fluid Dynamics* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2002).
- [4] S. de Groot and P. Mazur, *Non equilibrium thermodynamics* (Dover, Mineola, NY, 1984).
- [5] G. Gallavotti and E. Cohen, Physical Review Letters **74**, 2694 (1995).
- [6] G. Gallavotti, *Statistical Mechanics. A short treatise* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
- [7] R. Becker, *Electromagnetic fields and interactions* (Blaisdell, New-York, 1964).
- [8] D. Evans and G. Morriss, *Statistical Mechanics of Nonequilibrium Fluids* (Academic Press, New-York, 1990).
- [9] J. Kurchan, Journal of Physics A **31**, 3719 (1998).
- [10] J. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 333 (1999).
- [11] C. Maes, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 367 (1999).
- [12] M. Depken, cond-mat/0209284 pp. 1–10 (2003).
- [13] D. Ruelle, *Turbulence, strange attractors and chaos* (World Scientific, New-York, 1995).
- [14] G. Gallavotti, F. Bonetto, and G. Gentile, *Aspects of the ergodic, qualitative and statistical theory of motion* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2004).
- [15] L. Boltzmann, *Über die Eigenschaften monozyklischer und anderer damit verwandter Systeme*, vol. 3 of *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen* (Chelsea, New-York, 1968).
- [16] S. Brush, *History of modern physical sciences: The kinetic theory of gases* (Imperial College Press, London, 2003).
- [17] G. Gregory, *The existence of fire*, vol. 1 of *History of modern physical sciences: The kinetic theory of gases*, ed. S. Brush (Imperial College Press, London, 2003).
- [18] L. Andrej, Physics Letters **111A**, 45 (1982).
- [19] D. Ruelle, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 393 (1999).
- [20] D. Ruelle, Journal of Statistical Physics **85**, 1 (1996).
- [21] K. Feitosa and N. Menon, cond-mat/0308212 (2003).
- [22] L. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and L. Peliti, Physical Review E **55**, 3898 (1997).
- [23] L. Cugliandolo, cond-mat/0210312 (2002).
- [24] G. Gallavotti, Journal of Statistical Physics **84**, 899 (1996).
- [25] G. Gallavotti, Physical Review Letters **77**, 4334 (1996).
- [26] G. Gallavotti and D. Ruelle, Communications in Mathematical Physics **190**, 279 (1997).
- [27] F. Zamponi, G. Ruocco, and L. Angelani, cond-mat/0403579 (2004).
- [28] J. Lebowitz, Physics Today **September**, 32 (1993).
- [29] S. Goldstein and J. Lebowitz, cond-math/0306078 (2003).
- [30] P. Garrido, S. Goldstein, and J. Lebowitz, cond-math/0310575 (2003).
- [31] F. Resibois, Journal of Statistical Physics **19**, 593 (1978).
- [32] G. Gallavotti, Communication in Mathematical Physics **224**, 107 (2001).
- [33] Y. Sinai, Functional Analysis and Applications **2**, 64 (1968).
- [34] Y. Sinai, Functional analysis and Applications **2**, 70 (1968).
- [35] R. Bowen, American Journal of Mathematics **92**, 725 (1970).
- [36] R. Bowen, American Journal of Mathematics **92**, 907 (1970).
- [37] Y. Sinai, Russian Mathematical Surveys **27**, 21 (1972).
- [38] R. Bowen and D. Ruelle, Inventiones Mathematicae **29**, 181 (1975).
- [39] D. Ruelle, American Journal of Mathematics **98**, 619 (1976).
- [40] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic formalism* (Addison Wesley, Reading, 1978).
- [41] L. Boltzmann, *Reply to Zermelo's Remarks on the theory of heat*, vol. 1 of *History of modern physical sciences: The kinetic theory of gases*, ed. S. Brush (Imperial College Press, London, 2003).
- [42] G. Gallavotti, Journal of Statistical Physics **78**, 1571 (1995).
- [43] L. Boltzmann, *Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatze der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, respektive den Sätzen*

- über das Wärmegleichgewicht*, vol. 2 of *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, ed. F. Hasenöhr (Chelsea, New York, 1968).
- [44] P. Ehrenfest and T. Ehrenfest, *The conceptual foundations of the statistical approach in Mechanics* (Dover, New York, 1990).
- [45] Y. Sinai, *Lectures in ergodic theory*, Lecture notes in Mathematics (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1977).
- [46] E. Einstein, *Annalen der Physik* **69**, 241 (1922).
- [47] P. Epstein, *Zeitschrift für Physik* **54**, 710 (1923).
- [48] L. Young, in *Real and complex dynamical systems*, ed. B. Branner, P. Hjorth (1995).
- [49] F. Bonetto, A. Kupiainen, and J. Lebowitz, Preprint (2002).
- [50] D. Ruelle, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**, 30054 (2003).
- [51] D. Evans, E. Cohen, and G. Morriss, *Physical Review Letters* **70**, 2401 (1993).
- [52] F. Bonetto, G. Gallavotti, and P. Garrido, *Physica D* **105**, 226 (1997).
- [53] G. Gentile, *Forum Mathematicum* **10**, 89 (1998).
- [54] G. Gallavotti, L. Rondoni, and E. Segre, *Physica D* **187**, 358 (2004).
- [55] E. Cohen and G. Gallavotti, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **96**, 1343 (1999).
- [56] G. Gallavotti, *Mathematical Physics Electronic Journal (MPEJ)* **1**, 1 (1995).
- [57] G. Gallavotti, cond-mat 0402676 (2004).
- [58] G. Gallavotti and E. Cohen, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **80**, 931 (1995).
- [59] F. Zamponi, G. Ruocco, and L. Angelani, cond-mat/0311583 (2003).
- [60] G. Gallavotti and E. Cohen, *Physical Review E* **69**, 035104 (+4) (2004).

e-mail: giovanni.gallavotti@roma1.infn.it

web: <http://ipparco.roma1.infn.it>

Piscataway, NJ, November 2003

REVTeX