

# Consistent expansion of the Langevin propagator with application to entropy production

Benjamin Sorkin,<sup>1</sup> Gil Ariel,<sup>2</sup> and Tomer Markovich<sup>3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*School of Chemistry and Center for Physics and Chemistry of Living Systems, Tel Aviv University, 69978 Tel Aviv, Israel*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, 52000 Ramat Gan, Israel*

<sup>3</sup>*School of Mechanical Engineering and Center for Physics and Chemistry of Living Systems, Tel Aviv University, 69978 Tel Aviv, Israel*

Stochastic thermodynamics is a developing theory for systems out of thermal equilibrium. It allows to formulate a wealth of nontrivial relations among thermodynamic quantities such as heat dissipation, excess work, and entropy production in generic nonequilibrium stochastic processes. A key quantity for the derivation of these relations is the propagator — the probability to observe a transition from one point in phase space to another after a given time. Here, applying stochastic Taylor expansions, we devise a formal expansion procedure for the propagator of overdamped Langevin dynamics. The three leading orders are obtained explicitly. The technique resolves the shortcomings of the current mathematical machinery for the calculation of the propagator. For the evaluation of the first two displacement cumulants, the leading order Gaussian propagator is sufficient. However, some functionals of the propagator — such as the entropy production — which we refer to as “first derivatives of the trajectory”, need to be evaluated to a previously-unrecognized higher order. The method presented here can be extended to arbitrarily higher orders in order to accurately compute any other functional of the propagator.

## CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
A. Motivation	2
B. Plan and main results	2
C. Paper outline	5
II. Model	5
A. Constructing the Fokker-Planck equation	5
B. Constructing the Langevin equation	6
C. The Itô dilemma	7
III. Stochastic Taylor expansions	8
A. The Euler-Maruyama method	8
B. The Milstein method	9
C. Higher-order methods	9
D. Multiple stochastic integrals	9
IV. Consistent Propagator expansion	10
A. The leading-order propagator	10
B. Computing the propagator	10
C. Euler-Maruyama propagator	12
D. Milstein propagator	13
E. Higher-order propagator	14
F. Entropy production	15
V. Non-Itô Stochastic Taylor expansions	18
A. Intuitive non-Itô Euler-Maruyama expansion	18
B. Rigorous non-Itô Milstein expansion	18
C. Comparison between the rigorous and intuitive non-Itô expansions	19
D. Non-Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator	19
E. Moments of the non-Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator	20
F. Entropy production using complementary Euler-Maruyama propagators	20
G. Toy functionals	21

---

\* [tmarkovich@tauex.tau.ac.il](mailto:tmarkovich@tauex.tau.ac.il)

VI. Summary	22
Acknowledgments	23
A. Geometric Brownian Motion	23
References	25

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Motivation

The theory of stochastic thermodynamics aims to find general relations among the statistics of thermodynamic quantities within microscopic (fluctuating) systems that are out of equilibrium, such as motor proteins, living system, and swarming agents [1]. It has seen many exciting developments in recent years. Notably, the Jarzynski relation [2, 3] extends the second law of thermodynamics to such mesoscopic systems by establishing an equality between work statistics and the change in free energy in nonequilibrium transformations. Its extension, the Crooks relation [4], supplies additional information as to the probability of work realizations. Theorems of this sort are often termed fluctuation relations, and could be unified by considering the statistics of the entropy production [5–7]. The entropy production quantifies the extent to which a trajectory breaks time-reversal symmetry [1, 5, 8] (or, colloquially, detailed balance). It has been shown that it coincides with the non-negative dissipated heat for vastly many scenarios [1, 9] (but excluding cases where the Einstein relation is invalid). Thus, combined with trajectory-wise energy conservation proven by Sekimoto [10], one obtains the laws of classical thermodynamic by considering the stochastic trajectories in completely generic stochastic processes. Evidently, the estimation of entropy production and resolving the statistics of trajectories in nonequilibrium systems is a challenge worth resolving [8, 9, 11–17].

A key quantity for the resolution of path statistics is the propagator [18] — the probability distribution to obtain a particular displacement during some time duration. For Markov dynamics, it encodes the complete information of the system’s evolution. For continuous-time systems (such as the overdamped Langevin equation considered here [19]), particularly important is the short-time expansions of the propagator due to the following reasons. (i) It suffices for the derivation of the Fokker-Planck equation corresponding to the Langevin equation based on its Kramers-Moyal expansion [20]. (ii) One is rarely capable of computing analytically or sampling experimentally the complete propagator for multidimensional systems with position- and time-dependent drift and diffusivity. Instead, one may utilize the available arsenal of short-time expansion methods [21].<sup>1</sup> (iii) In order to integrate properties over longer times, one may employ the path integral approach [19] and its various useful approximation methods inspired by quantum mechanics [18], which consists of convolving many short-time propagators. Indeed, the Jarzynski equality [3] and its generalizations (e.g., the Hatano-Sasa relation [7]) can be derived using path integral approaches.

The aim of the present paper is to present a consistent expansion of the short-time propagator to arbitrary orders. We apply the expansion to obtain the entropy production rate in overdamped Langevin systems. The expansion resolves mathematical inconsistencies that are present in the current literature [9, 18, 23]. Prior to delving into the derivation, we outline and summarize the main results.

### B. Plan and main results

The estimation of entropy production as well as the proof of fluctuation relations is facilitated by knowing the probability distribution to obtain a detailed trajectory. It is defined as follows. Consider the finely-discretized ( $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ ) trajectory of a continuous-time stochastic system,  $\vec{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{M-1}, \mathbf{x}_M)$ , where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is the microstate of the system at time  $i\Delta t$ , between times 0 and  $T = M\Delta t$ . The value of the forces (and other interventions into the system) is dictated by a time-varying deterministic protocol  $\lambda(t)$ , whose discrete sequence of values is  $\vec{\lambda} = (\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{M-1}, \lambda_M)$ . Denote the probability to obtain the discretized trajectory  $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$  under the effect of the protocol sequence  $\vec{\lambda}$  as  $\text{Pr}[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}]$ .

The probability to obtain a trajectory  $\text{Pr}[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}]$  is a model-free quantity. Namely, it is defined and determined by the observed dynamics. In principle, one is capable of directly sampling it via experimental observations (usually, its marginals [11, 14, 17]). Mathematically, it is a  $M + 1$ -dimensional marginal for the continuous-time dynamics. In particular, it must not depend on how we choose to represent, approximate, or discretize the dynamics, which can be done in a number of equivalent ways. For example, in this paper we consider Langevin systems which we present in Sec. II. These processes can be modelled via a

<sup>1</sup> In the opposite limit of late times, one may employ methods from large deviation theory [22].

Fokker-Planck equation or a stochastic differential equation (SDE), which itself can be expressed using the Itô or Stratanovich conventions [18, 24]; see details in Sec. II C. These conventions are equivalent in the sense that any SDE written using the Itô convention can be transferred into a different equation using the Stratanovich convention, and vice-versa, such that the two processes are the same (all finite dimensional marginals have the same distribution [25]). The functional  $\Pr[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}]$  must not depend on the choice of convention.

To compute the entropy production, we aim to measure the breaking of time-reversal symmetry. Consider the time-reversed trajectory,  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_M, \mathbf{x}_{M-1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_0)$ . We ask how likely is it to obtain this trajectory under the reversed protocol,  $\overleftarrow{\lambda} = (\lambda_M, \lambda_{M-1}, \dots, \lambda_1, \lambda_0)$ . Other than the reversal of the protocol  $\overleftarrow{\lambda}$ , the probabilistic laws of motion are the same: Simply put—time still runs forward. Therefore, the probability for this reversed trajectory is given by the same functional  $\Pr$  above, but with the entries appearing in a reversed order,  $\Pr[\overleftarrow{\mathbf{x}}, \overleftarrow{\lambda}]$ ; see Sec. IV F for details.<sup>2</sup>

The entropy production is a trajectory-dependent stochastic quantity measuring time-reversal symmetry breaking by the final time  $T$ , defined according to [1, 8, 9]

$$\Sigma_T[\vec{\mathbf{x}}] = \ln \frac{\Pr[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}]}{\Pr[\overleftarrow{\mathbf{x}}, \overleftarrow{\lambda}]}, \quad (1)$$

with  $\Sigma_0 = 0$ . The mean entropy production is

$$\langle \Sigma_T \rangle = \int d\vec{\mathbf{x}} \Pr[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}] \ln \frac{\Pr[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}]}{\Pr[\overleftarrow{\mathbf{x}}, \overleftarrow{\lambda}]}. \quad (2)$$

As a corollary, it is the Kullback-Liebler divergence [27] from the distribution to sample a trajectory  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{x}}$  (with protocol  $\overleftarrow{\lambda}$ ) to the distribution to sample a trajectory  $\vec{\mathbf{x}}$  (with protocol  $\vec{\lambda}$ ). The average entropy production is therefore non-negative, where zero is only obtained for time-reversal-symmetric dynamics—those that are equally likely to undergo a particular path under a given forcing, and its reversed one.

In this paper, we deal with diffusion processes that are orchestrated by the Langevin equation. Their path probabilities can be expressed via a Markov decomposition,  $\Pr[\vec{\mathbf{x}}, \vec{\lambda}] = p(\mathbf{x}_0, 0) \prod_{i=1}^M P(\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, \lambda_{i-1})$ . In this expression,  $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is the instantaneous probability to obtain a microstate  $\mathbf{x}$  at time  $t$  and  $P(\mathbf{x}', \lambda' | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  is the propagator we wish to compute, evaluated at vanishingly-short times  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ . The Markov property allows us to introduce the following separation of the entropy production rate at time instant  $t = i\Delta t$ ,

$$\dot{\Sigma}_t = \dot{S}_t + \dot{\Omega}_t, \quad \dot{\Omega}_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \ln \frac{P(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta \lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i)}{P(\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta \lambda_i)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $S_t = -\ln p(\mathbf{x}_i, t)$  is the instantaneous stochastic Shannon entropy [8]. We will henceforth refer to  $\dot{\Omega}_t$  as the informatic heat rate (due to its coincidence with the heat in many scenarios mentioned above [9]). In Eq. (3), we defined  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i+1} - \mathbf{x}_i$  (which is  $\sim \Delta t^{1/2}$  for diffusion processes), and  $\Delta \lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i$  (which is of order  $\Delta t$  since the protocol is deterministic and set externally). The definition of the protocol is convenient to see the reversal of the forcing; during the derivation, without loss of generality,  $\lambda_i = i\Delta t$ .

Equation (3) shows why the short-time propagator is the sought-after quantity. Clearly it is required in order to compute the entropy production rate at a given instant, which then could be integrated over to find the accumulated entropy production during the entire continuous-time Markov process. Additionally, convolving many short-time propagators resolves the entire trajectory statistics. It is once again important to stress that the propagator is a physical quantity which in principle can be sampled directly from experimental or numerical data. Once it is known (analytically or from sampling), Eq. (3), in a sense, requires to extrapolate it to the short time limit. It, therefore, does not contain any discretization and must not depend on  $\Delta t$  or the chosen approximation scheme. Since the propagator is analytically tractable only under rare circumstances (see Appendix A for one example, where we then extract the short-time limit from a known propagator for comparison), we have no choice but to find it from a consistent short-time expansion.

The main result of this paper is Eq. (44)—a general expression for the propagator of Langevin equations, correct to arbitrary  $\Delta t$ . At the same time, it can directly be Taylor-expanded for small  $\Delta t$ ; see details in Sec. IV. There, to order  $\Delta t$ , we arrive at an expansion which takes the form

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda) = P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda) \times \left[ 1 + \Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}, \lambda \right) + \Delta t \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}, \lambda \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right]. \quad (4)$$

<sup>2</sup> Upon considering, say, the underdamped Langevin equation, phase space includes both positions and momenta,  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p})$ . Then, considering the reversed process, the momenta must invert sign: if  $(\vec{\mathbf{r}}, \vec{\mathbf{p}})$  describes the forward process, then  $(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{r}}, -\overleftarrow{\mathbf{p}})$  describes the reversed process. A similar parity issue appears when inverting magnetic forces, in which case the magnetic force due to protocol reversal must invert sign as well [26].

Here,  $P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  is the leading-order Gaussian propagator of diffusive systems; Eq. (35) below. (The subscript 1/2 will be explained in Sec. IV C.) The expressions  $\Phi(\mathbf{K} | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  and  $\Psi(\mathbf{K} | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  are (currently unspecified) functions, which we find to be polynomial in the rank-two tensor  $\mathbf{K} = \Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x}/\Delta t$  and are of order 1. We provide their explicit form in Eq. (57) for  $\Phi$  and Eq. (69) for  $\Psi$ . Clearly, the propagator is not Gaussian in general.

Typical dynamical averages, such as correlation functions or response functions, require only the leading-order propagator,  $P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$  [18]. However, the entropy production [Eq. (3)] is a “first derivative of the trajectory” — a difference between two quantities that vary by  $\Delta\mathbf{x} \sim \Delta t^{1/2}$  and  $\Delta t$ , divided by  $\Delta t$ . This division brings forth terms that would have been negligible otherwise in typical averages. This is evident by inserting Eq. (4) into Eq. (3) (once with  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda = \lambda_i, \Delta\mathbf{x} = \Delta\mathbf{x}_i$ , and  $\Delta\lambda = \Delta\lambda_i$ , and for the reversed path with  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda = \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i, \Delta\mathbf{x} = -\Delta\mathbf{x}_i$ , and  $\Delta\lambda = -\Delta\lambda_i$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Omega}_t = & \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \ln \frac{P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i)}{P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i)} \\ & + \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \cdot \left[ \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i \right) + \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i \right) \right] \\ & - \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{2\Delta t} : \left[ \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i \right) \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i \right) \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i \right) \right] \\ & + \left[ \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i \right) - \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta\mathbf{x}_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we used the shorthand notation for the inner products  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} = \nabla^\mu a^\mu$  and  $\nabla \nabla : \mathbf{D} = \nabla^\mu \nabla^\nu D^{\mu\nu}$ , and the Einstein notation is implied.<sup>3</sup> First, the leading order propagators in each direction are equal to leading order,  $P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i) / P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i | \mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i, \lambda_i + \Delta\lambda_i) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})$ , such that division by  $\Delta t$  requires including more minute difference in them. The corrections  $\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi$  and  $\Delta t \Psi$ , appearing from higher-order integration methods of the Langevin equation are respectively of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$  and  $\Delta t$ , and hence cannot be neglected *a priori* — they carry order-1 [last three rows of Eq. (5)] and even order- $\Delta t^{-1/2}$  [second row of Eq. (5)] contributions to the entropy production. This also shows why we may stop at the first three leading orders — the rest bear a negligible contribution of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ .

Previous approaches [9, 18, 23, 28–30] have approximated the short-time propagator for Langevin processes using a convention-dependent representation of the leading-order  $P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ , on which we elaborate in Sec. V. There we show that these approximations are missing the sought-after higher-order terms. The expansion scheme we derive for the propagator carries several consequences and advantages in this regard.

- With the propagator in hand, it is natural to consider the first two cumulants of the displacement  $\Delta\mathbf{x}$  [18]. We show that these moments, found from any of the above-mentioned representations of the leading-order propagator are all correct to the same leading order,  $\Delta t$ . Thus, they carry no advantage with respect to the simplest (Itô) representation of the leading-order propagator, and they all converge to the complete expression as  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ .
- Previous derivations of the entropy production (see, for example, Ref. [9]) again used only the leading-order Gaussian propagator  $P_{1/2}$  and assumed specific conventions for the forward and backward trajectories. As discussed above, this is not consistent with the understanding that both the propagator and the entropy production, Eq. (3), are discretization-free quantities. Below, we show that their result is correct due to a surprising cancellation of wrongfully-neglected terms. This cancellation is due to symmetries that are specific to the entropy production, as we elaborate in Sec. V G.
- For all functionals which are first derivatives of trajectories (such as the entropy production) — functionals consisting of a difference among two path-dependent quantities that only differ by  $\Delta\mathbf{x}$  and  $\Delta t$ , divided by  $\Delta t$  — the order- $\Delta t$  term in (4) vanishes *a posteriori* in the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ . As a result, only the next-order corrections to the leading-order propagator ( $\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi$ ) must be considered. For identical reasons, “second derivatives” of trajectories will require this term again, along with the higher-order corrections to the propagator.
- To illustrate the importance of consistent propagator expansions, in Sec. V G we suggest toy examples which are first derivatives of the trajectory, in which the convention applied in Ref. [9] may yield erroneous results.

<sup>3</sup> We will only use the double-dot notation in quadratic forms to avoid ambiguity.

### C. Paper outline

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present our model dynamics — the Langevin equation of motion corresponding to a given Fokker-Planck equation. We explain how it is constructed [19, 20], remind how to resolve the Itô dilemma [18, 20] (there is, in fact, no dilemma), and introduce our notation. In Sec. III, we recall how to consistently find short-time expansions beyond the leading-order [21]. Section IV is the heart of the paper: We present a consistent expansion scheme for the short-time propagator in overdamped Langevin systems which directly shows what order it is correct to. We do so by writing its Fourier-transform, employ the introduced stochastic Taylor expansions, and carry out the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation [31, 32]. In Sec. IV F, we show a consistent calculation for the entropy production. We make an extensive comparison between the present scheme and the shortcomings of previous methods, the redundancy of the discretization-dependent propagators, and the insufficiently-high order calculation of the entropy production in Sec. V. We conclude with a summary of our findings and perspectives in Sec. VI. Appendix A shows the coincidence of our results with expansions of an exactly solvable, one-dimensional model.

## II. MODEL

The aim of this section is two-fold. First, to connect the commonly-found physical notations and intuition regarding diffusion processes to the ones of the literature on SDEs. Second, to resolve the Itô dilemma prior to proceeding deeper into the derivation. This is only presented for completeness and review purposes. Reference [19] presents a comprehensive analysis of the mathematical aspects underlying stochastic processes in physics.

### A. Constructing the Fokker-Planck equation

We consider a system which is characterized by  $N$  arbitrary random variables (degrees of freedom) at time  $t$ , denoted as  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_t^1, X_t^2, \dots, X_t^N)$ . For example, these may be the positions of  $N/d$  particles in  $d$  dimensions. We assume that these degrees of freedom undergo some Markovian diffusion process. Thus, the probability density function  $\Pr(\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x}) \equiv p(\mathbf{x}, t)$  follows a Fokker-Planck equation [20]

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)p(\mathbf{x}, t)] + \nabla \nabla : [\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)p(\mathbf{x}, t)], \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}$  is the drift and  $\mathbf{D}$  is the diffusivity. A given system is characterized by unique  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{D}$  which must be specified *a priori*. We may write Eq. (6) as probability conservation equation by identifying the probability flux  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ ,

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)p(\mathbf{x}, t) - \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)p(\mathbf{x}, t)]. \quad (7)$$

To illustrate the applicability of Eq. (6) in physics, we consider a few limits of increasing complexity. First, suppose the motion of the particle arises from some Hamiltonian,  $H(\mathbf{x})$ . Assuming the drift responds linearly to its gradient via a constant mobility scalar  $\mu$ ,  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \mu[-\nabla H(\mathbf{x})]$ , and the diffusivity is also a constant scalar,  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t) = D\mathbf{I}$ , we arrive at the equation

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \mu \nabla \cdot [\nabla H(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}, t)] + D \nabla^2 p(\mathbf{x}, t). \quad (8)$$

Evidently, the steady-state distribution is the Boltzmann factor,  $p(\mathbf{x}, t \rightarrow \infty) \sim e^{-\beta H(\mathbf{x})}$ , where  $\beta = \mu/D$  is the inverse temperature. The latter is the Einstein relation.

Next, we generalize the system to have non-scalar position-dependent diffusivity  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})$  and mobility  $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x})$  tensors. To obtain the Boltzmann factor  $p(\mathbf{x}, t \rightarrow \infty) \sim e^{-\beta H(\mathbf{x})}$  at steady-state (equilibrium), where the Einstein relation now reads  $\beta \mathbf{I} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$  (that is,  $\beta$  is still a scalar), the diffusivity tensor must appear in between the gradient and divergence. The diffusion equation thus takes the form:

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla H(\mathbf{x})p(\mathbf{x}, t)] + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t)]. \quad (9)$$

This means that in addition to the potential gradient, there is another so-called ‘spurious’ contribution to the drift, such that in total  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot [-\nabla H(\mathbf{x})] + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x})$  [18, 24]. This extra term changes the order of derivatives in Eq. (6) from  $\nabla \nabla : (\mathbf{D}p)$  to  $\nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D} \cdot \nabla p)$ . This order of derivatives agrees with Fick’s law of diffusion: in the absence of drift,  $\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)/\partial t = -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  with  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) = -\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t)$ ,

Lastly, a straightforward generalization is to cases where the forces  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  have both conservative and nonconservative contributions, so  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t) \neq -\nabla H(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , and the mobility and diffusivity are now time dependent. Equation (9) becomes

$$\frac{\partial p(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot [\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t)p(\mathbf{x}, t)] + \nabla \cdot [\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \nabla p(\mathbf{x}, t)]. \quad (10)$$

In this case,  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, t) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ .

We conclude this section by noting that a particular system will follow a single Fokker-Planck equation, with specified drift  $\mathbf{a}$  and diffusivity  $\mathbf{D}$  that can be constructed in a similar manner to the above. In the context of the upcoming Itô dilemma, it is key to understand that there is no ambiguity as to the drift one has in a given scenario. Likewise (under some sufficient technical assumptions [19, 25], which in this manuscript will always be assumed to hold), there exists a unique solution  $p(\mathbf{x}, t)$  of Eq. (6) under a given initial condition  $p(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ . As a consequence, the propagator  $\Pr(\mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t} = \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x}) \equiv P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$  of Eq. (6) [with initial conditions  $P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \delta(\Delta \mathbf{x})$ ] also exists and is unique.

## B. Constructing the Langevin equation

There are a wealth of tools allowing to solve the Fokker-Planck equation [20]. For example, many operator-identities motivated by quantum mechanics allow to find the propagator operator of a given equation. Another approach is the Feynmann-Kac formula [19, 20, 33], expressing expectation values via a path integral. As mentioned in Sec. I, the path integral approach has proven useful in stochastic thermodynamics. We will draw motivation from this approach, and resolve the transition statistics at short times. For that purpose, we construct the Langevin equation. Instead of writing the partial differential equation for the microstates instantaneous probability density function, the Langevin equation is a SDE for the random evolution of the microstate itself.

Using either the Kramers-Moyal expansion or the aforementioned path-integral formulation, it is possible to show that that the stochastic integral equation corresponding to the Fokker-Planck equation [Eq. (6)] is

$$\mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t} - \mathbf{X}_t = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{t'}. \quad (11)$$

In this expression,  $\mathbf{b}$  is the noise amplitude matrix, obeying  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{b}^T / 2$ . Additionally,  $\mathbf{W}_t$  is a Wiener process, meaning that the increments  $\mathbf{W}_{t'} - \mathbf{W}_t$  ( $t' > t$ ) are normal distributed with variance tensor  $(t' - t)\mathbf{I}$  and zero mean, and are independent of past realizations [19]. The dot product among  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $d\mathbf{W}_{t'}$  is interpreted in the Itô convention; see Sec. II C below.

The integral Eq. (11) is commonly abbreviated as the SDE

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)dt + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (12)$$

This is not a numerical approximation, rather, a differential notation for an integral expression. Thus, we have not chosen a discretization of  $dt \rightarrow \Delta t$  or approximated the integrals via the Euler-Maruyama method (see Sec. III below); it is a shorthand, exact notation. In order to obtain short time-scales expansion ( $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ ), one should properly Taylor expand Eq. (11); this is done in Sec. III below.

One typically finds the following notation in the physical literature for the Langevin equation [19],

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X}_t, t), \quad (13)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  is a Gaussian white noise, having variance  $\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) | \mathbf{X}_t \rangle = 2\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \delta(t' - t)$  ( $t' > t$ ). It is equivalent to Eqs. (11) and (12) upon replacing the noise as  $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{x}, t)dt = \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t$ . However, one must specify the noise interpretation so Eq. (13) will be well-defined; see Sec. II C.

The drift appearing in these stochastic equations is exactly as in the examples of Sec. II A so as to reproduce the correct Fokker-Planck equation (also called the Kolmogorov forward equation associated to the SDE [25]). For example, the Langevin equation describing the motion under a conservative force within a medium of constant and scalar mobility and diffusivity reads

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = -\mu \nabla H(\mathbf{X}_t)dt + \sqrt{2D}d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (14)$$

While there are no special complications due to position-dependent mobility tensors,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x})$ , a tensor diffusivity means that one should find a noise amplitude  $\mathbf{b}$  such that  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{b}^T / 2$ . Moreover, position-dependent diffusivity gives rise to the spurious drift  $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}$  discussed above,

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = [-\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_t) \cdot \nabla H(\mathbf{X}_t) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_t)]dt + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t) \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (15)$$

Introducing time-dependent mobility and diffusivity and nonconservative forces does not give rise to new terms,

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = [\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)]dt + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (16)$$

The point we wish to emphasize here is that there is a single stochastic differential equation corresponding to the single Fokker-Planck equation describing the evolution of a system. In the examples seen here, Eq. (14) gives rise to Eq. (8), Eq. (15) to Eq. (9), Eq. (16) to Eq. (10) and, in general, Eq. (12) gives rise to Eq. (6).

### C. The Itô dilemma

We recall that the second term in Eq. (11) is interpreted in the Itô convention. The meaning of this is best understood through discretization. Denoting the discrete time step  $\delta t$ , the first integral in Eq. (11) can be simply interpreted as a Riemann sum. However, since  $d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \sim dt^{1/2}$ , the position  $\mathbf{X}_{t'}$  at which  $\mathbf{b}$  is evaluated is not arbitrary. Namely, an integral involving the Itô convention [as in Eq. (11)] is finely-discretized as [19]

$$\mathcal{I}_0 \equiv \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{t'} = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}, t + (i-1)\delta t) \cdot [\mathbf{W}_{t+i\delta t} - \mathbf{W}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}], \quad (17)$$

i.e., the function  $\mathbf{b}$  is specifically evaluated at the starting point of each interval, which leads to a Markovian process.

If one wishes to evaluate  $\mathbf{b}$  at some other intermediate point,  $\mathbf{X}_{t+(i+\alpha-1)\delta t} = \alpha\mathbf{X}_{t+i\delta t} + (1-\alpha)\mathbf{X}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}$ , the corresponding integral reads instead [19]

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha \equiv \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \overset{\alpha}{\circ} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t+(i+\alpha-1)\delta t}, t + (i-1)\delta t) \cdot [\mathbf{W}_{t+i\delta t} - \mathbf{W}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}]. \quad (18)$$

In order to compare this with Eq. (17), we Taylor-expand  $\mathbf{b}$  around  $\mathbf{X}_t$  for small  $\delta\mathbf{X}_t$ . Since there are  $\sim 1/\delta t$  summands, we should compute each summand to order  $\delta t$  and neglect corrections of order  $\delta t^{3/2}$ . Combined with Eq. (11), this yields a correction relative to  $\mathcal{I}_0$  that does not vanish as  $\delta t \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_\alpha^\mu &= \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} b^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}, t + (i-1)\delta t) [W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu] \\ &\quad + \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} [\alpha b^{\sigma\rho}(\nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu})](\mathbf{X}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}, t + (i-1)\delta t) [W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu] [W_{t+i\delta t}^\rho - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\rho] \\ &= \mathcal{I}_0^\mu + \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} [\alpha b^{\sigma\nu}(\nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu})](\mathbf{X}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}, t + (i-1)\delta t) \delta t, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we used  $(W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu)(W_{t+i\delta t}^\rho - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\rho) = \delta^{\nu\rho} \delta t + \mathcal{O}(\delta t^{3/2})$ . Were we to evaluate  $\mathbf{b}$  also at  $t + (i+\alpha-1)\delta t$ , the corrections relative to  $\mathcal{I}_0$  would be of order  $\delta t^{3/2}$  and hence negligible.

With that, we recapped the root of the Itô dilemma. Namely, given a stochastic equation with position-dependent diffusivity [e.g., Eq. (11)], without specifying the convention  $\alpha$  adopted within the product acting among  $\mathbf{b}$  and the differential increment  $d\mathbf{W}_{t'}$ , the equation is meaningless.  $\alpha = 0$  is called the Itô convention,  $\alpha = 1/2$  is called the Stratonovich convention, and  $\alpha = 1$  is often called the Hänggi convention [18, 24]. For brevity, we will use the usual conventions for denoting the Itô and Stratonovich integrals,  $\mathbf{b} \overset{0}{\circ} d\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{b} \cdot d\mathbf{W}$  and  $\mathbf{b} \overset{1/2}{\circ} d\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{b} \circ d\mathbf{W}$ .

Now the question is, therefore, how to reproduce the right Fokker-Planck equation. Through Eq. (19), we see that Eq. (11) can be rewritten in a different convention as

$$\mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t} - \mathbf{X}_t = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \overset{\alpha}{\circ} d\mathbf{W}_{t'}, \quad (20)$$

where  $a_\alpha^\mu = a^\mu - \alpha b^{\sigma\nu} \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{a}$ . In other words, there are infinitely many representations, characterized by  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , which are all equivalent so long as one introduces the right convention-dependent drift term [9, 18]. This implies that they describe the *same* stochastic process (in the sense that all finite dimensional marginals are the same [25]). In particular, they all correspond to the *same* Fokker-Planck equation [Eq. (6)]. Therefore, the propagator must be identical for all conventions. The

latter realization has not been the consensus so far [9, 18, 23, 28–30], and the aim of the paper is to correct the mathematical shortcomings that led to it.

To summarize, although there appear to be infinitely many equations depending on the convention  $\alpha$ , the drift must be constructed such that all equations would characterize the *same* stochastic process. Thus, there is no dilemma—once one has picked a convention for the product, the appropriate drift must be included so to get the correct Fokker-Planck equation. Most importantly, if one observes a dependence on the discretization scheme, it implies that some terms were not included.

### III. STOCHASTIC TAYLOR EXPANSIONS

We recall the general strategy of stochastic Taylor expansions. Throughout this section, we apply the methods outlined in Ref. [21]. We comment that the focus of Ref. [21] is the construction of high-order numerical integration schemes for the a given SDE. Our goal is to write analytic approximations to the propagator of the exact SDE which. The two goals are not too different, however, as we will show below, the former requires including an extra term which for our purposes will be negligible.

The starting point is the integral formulation for the displacement, Eq. (11), which is exact. This formulation shows that the full distribution of  $\Delta\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t} - \mathbf{X}_t$ , i.e., to all orders in  $\Delta t$ , depends on the entire Wiener process  $\{\mathbf{W}_s\}_{s=t}^{t+\Delta t}$ . Note that according to the Markov property, the entire past before time  $t$  is summarised in the initial condition  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . Below, the expansions are applied to write the displacements, as a function of noise realizations, up to high orders in  $\Delta t$ , which is assumed to be small. The derivation will be carried with the Itô convention for the product; the equivalence among conventions at this level of stochastic expansions is discussed in Sec. V.

The expansion consists of the following steps:

1. Write the exact displacement  $\mathbf{X}_s = \mathbf{X}_t + \int_t^s d\mathbf{X}_{s'}$  for  $t \leq s \leq t + \Delta t$  around the startpoint  $s = t$ .
2. Expand every function  $g(\mathbf{X}_s, \Lambda_s)$  which may appear within the integrals of Eq. (11) in a Taylor series. Remembering that  $d\mathbf{X}_t \sim dt^{1/2}$ , we obtain, e.g., up to order  $\Delta t$ ,

$$g(\mathbf{X}_s, s) = g(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + \nabla g(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot \int_t^s d\mathbf{X}_{s'} + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \nabla g(\mathbf{X}_t, t) : \int_t^s d\mathbf{X}_{s'} \int_t^s d\mathbf{X}_{s''} + \frac{\partial g(\mathbf{X}_t, t)}{\partial t} \int_t^s ds' + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (21)$$

3. Apply the Itô lemma: each time  $d\mathbf{X}_t$  appears, we insert Eq. (12). For example, the second term in Eq. (21) contains

$$\int_t^s d\mathbf{X}_{s'} = \int_t^s \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{s'}, s') ds' + \int_t^s \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{s'}, s') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{s'}. \quad (22)$$

Once again the integrands contain a function which we should expand in small  $\mathbf{X}_{s'} - \mathbf{X}_t$  and  $s' - t$ .

This prescription is repeated until the desired order of convergence for  $\Delta\mathbf{X}_t$  is achieved. We now present the first three orders, which will play a role later in the text.

#### A. The Euler-Maruyama method

Trivially, the lowest-order expansion, being of order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  [21], is obtained by keeping the leading order terms from the integrals of Eq. (11),

$$\Delta\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{a}\Delta t + \mathbf{b} \cdot \Delta\mathbf{W}_t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t), \quad (23)$$

where  $\Delta\mathbf{W}_t = \mathbf{W}_{t+\Delta t} - \mathbf{W}_t$  and, henceforth, unless specified, the expansion coefficients are evaluate at the startpoint  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$ . Equation (23) is called the Euler-Maruyama method.

The current literature on stochastic thermodynamics, e.g., Refs. [9, 18, 23, 28–30], have regarded Eq. (12) already as the discretized equation (With  $dt \rightarrow \Delta t$ ). As we briefly show in Sec. IV A, their propagator has been derived from this expression. While Eq. (23) agrees with Eq. (11) up to and including order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ , quantities requiring higher-orders estimated with either will not agree. The entropy production is one such quantity; see Sec. IV F.

As we explained above, the first term of Eq. (23),  $\mathbf{a}\Delta t$ , cannot be discarded if one wants the numerical integration to produce the drift to the right order [21]. Removing it will results in a numerical SDE approximation scheme that has global order-0, i.e., the accumulated error after taking  $\sim 1/\Delta t$  steps will be  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . In other words, Ref. [21] “overshoots” and keeps an order- $\Delta t$  term that cannot be approximated to fractional orders for correct convergence to order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$ . Since we are not after a consistently-converging approximation of the SDE, rather, after a high-order Taylor expansion of the propagator so to evaluate the entropy production, we will discard the analogous “overshoot” term in the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  approximation below. (We keep the one of Eq. (23) since it is low-order.)



## B. The Milstein method

Going forward, we briefly demonstrate the above procedure and derive the order- $\Delta t$  stochastic expansion [21]. The first term of Eq. (11) is already of order  $\Delta t$  so, as before

$$\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (24)$$

Now, the second term of Eq. (11) is of leading-order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ , hence we should keep the next-order term. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') &= \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + [\nabla^\rho \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)] \int_t^{t'} dX_{t''}^\rho + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) \\ &= \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + [\nabla^\rho \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)] \int_t^{t'} b^{\rho\sigma}(\mathbf{X}_{t''}, t'') \cdot dW_{t''}^\sigma + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) \\ &= \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) + [b^{\rho\sigma}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \nabla^\rho \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)] \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Inserting this result in Eq. (11), one finds the order- $\Delta t$  expansion,

$$\Delta X_t^\mu = a^\mu \Delta t + b^{\mu\nu} \Delta W_t^\nu + F^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}), \quad (26)$$

where, for brevity, we defined  $F^{\mu\nu\sigma} = b^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho b^{\mu\nu}$  and  $\Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma$ ; the latter is of order  $\Delta t$ . As before, the coefficients  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{F}$  are evaluated at the startpoint  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$ . Equation (26) is also called the Milstein method [21]. The advantage of these stochastic Taylor expansion is that, to order  $\Delta t$ , one does not need to consider the full continuous-time Brownian trajectory  $\{\mathbf{W}_s\}_{s=t}^{t+\Delta t}$ . Instead, it is sufficient to consider only two random variables,  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  and  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_t$ , derived from it. However, they are not independent and  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_t$  is not Gaussian.

## C. Higher-order methods

Lastly, repeating the above procedure while keeping higher-order terms, one may obtain the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  expansion [21]

$$\Delta X_t^\mu = a^\mu \Delta t + b^{\mu\nu} \Delta W_t^\nu + F^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} + \rho^{\mu\nu} \Delta R_t^\nu + \lambda^{\mu\nu} \Delta L_t^\nu + C^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} \Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho} + \tau^\mu \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), \quad (27)$$

where  $\Delta R_t^\nu = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt' \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\nu$ ,  $\Delta L_t^\nu = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dt''$ , and  $\Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho} = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma \cdot \int_t^{t''} dW_{t'''}^\rho$  are random variables of order  $\Delta t^{3/2}$ , which too are correlated among themselves and  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  and  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_t$ , of which  $\Delta \mathbf{Z}_t$  is also not Gaussian. In Eq. (27), we know the order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  and  $-\Delta t$  expansion coefficients from the previous, lower-order expansions [Eqs. (23) and (26)]. The higher-order coefficients are  $\rho^{\mu\nu} = b^{\sigma\nu} \nabla^\sigma a^\mu$ ,  $\lambda^{\mu\nu} = [\partial/\partial t + a^\sigma \nabla^\sigma + D^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma \nabla^\rho] b^{\mu\nu}$ ,  $C^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} = b^{\xi\rho} \nabla^\xi [b^{\xi\sigma} \nabla^\xi b^{\mu\nu}]$ , and  $\tau^\mu = (1/2)[\partial/\partial t + a^\sigma \nabla^\sigma + D^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma \nabla^\rho] a^\mu$ . All the seven coefficients are evaluated, as always, at the startpoint  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$ . As before, the order- $\Delta t^2$  term is included for proper global convergence [21], and hence can be dropped if one is after the Taylor expansion of the propagator rather than consistent approximations of the SDE. We note that surprisingly, as will be shown below, the last four terms happen to cancel out in particular case of entropy production.

## D. Multiple stochastic integrals

Overall, the above expressions show that starting already from the order- $\Delta t$  expansion, the displacements  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  depend on a finite set of correlated random variables, all of which are integrals of the full, continuous-time Wiener process that defines the SDE,  $\{\mathbf{W}_s\}_{s=t}^{t+\Delta t}$ . This can be seen directly from the discretized view of the above stochastic integrals:

$$\Delta W_t^\nu = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta W_i^\nu, \quad (28)$$

where  $\delta \mathbf{W}_i \equiv \mathbf{W}_{t+i\delta t} - \mathbf{W}_{t+(i-1)\delta t}$  and  $K = \Delta t/\delta t$  throughout;

$$\Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta W_i^\nu \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta W_j^\sigma. \quad (29)$$

where we used the Itô product among differentials; and

$$\Delta R_t^\nu = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta t \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta W_j^\nu, \quad (30)$$

$$\Delta L_t^\nu = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta W_i^\nu \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta t, \quad (31)$$

$$\Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho} = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^K \delta W_i^\nu \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta W_j^\sigma \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \delta W_k^\rho. \quad (32)$$

Note that the means of all these five integrals (sums) are zero [21], since the inner sums over time stop before they reach the the Wiener increment of the outer sum's time increment, so they are independent and  $\langle \delta \mathbf{W}_i \rangle = \mathbf{0}$ . The aim of these multiple stochastic integrals is then to convert  $K \rightarrow \infty$  integrals over  $\lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \{\delta \mathbf{W}_i\}_{i=1}^K$  to a few integrals over these parameters, whose moments could be computed from these discretized expressions.

#### IV. CONSISTENT PROPAGATOR EXPANSION

In this Section, we present the approach we propose to consistently find high-order propagators. It utilizes the setup and notation of Sec. II, and the method of stochastic Taylor expansions of Sec. III.

##### A. The leading-order propagator

Prior to going into the detailed derivation of the propagator expansion to any order, we recall the simplest propagator. It is obtained by a naïve replacement of  $dt \rightarrow \Delta t$  in Eq. (12),

$$\Delta \mathbf{X}_t \simeq \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{W}_t. \quad (33)$$

Here, we replaced  $d\mathbf{W}_t \rightarrow \Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  as well (a Wiener increment of variance  $\mathbf{I}\Delta t$ ). As we saw in Sec. III, it corresponds to the lowest-order approximation of the SDE called the Euler-Maruyama scheme [Eq. (23)].

With this replacement,  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  only depends on  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  (as opposed to the Milstein and higher-order schemes). Thus, we can invert the relation between them, and express the noise magnitude  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  that should have acted at point  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$  to obtain the displacement  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$ , solely in terms of the latter,

$$\Delta \mathbf{W}_t \simeq \mathbf{b}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot [\Delta \mathbf{X}_t - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t]. \quad (34)$$

Equation (34) is no more than just a change of variables from a random variable  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  to a random variable  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$ .

This inversion is useful since we may now utilize the exactly-normal distribution of  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$ . Since only  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t$  dictates the displacement  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  given the initial state  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$  in the Euler-Maruyama approximation, via probability conservation, we write  $P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) d\Delta \mathbf{x} = \Pr(\Delta \mathbf{W}_t = \Delta \mathbf{w}) d\Delta \mathbf{w}$ , where  $\Pr(\Delta \mathbf{W}_t = \Delta \mathbf{w}) = (2\pi\Delta t)^{-N/2} \exp[-|\Delta \mathbf{w}|^2 / (2\Delta t)]$  and  $\Delta \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{b}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot [\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta t]$ . With the Jacobian  $d\Delta \mathbf{w} / d\Delta \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , we find the order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  propagator, or the PDF describing the Euler-Maruyama scheme below [19],

$$P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t]}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t][\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t] \right\}. \quad (35)$$

By ‘‘order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  propagator’’, we mean that the dynamics generated by Eq. (35) agree with trajectories of the exact SDE Eq. (11) to this order.

##### B. Computing the propagator

Were we to know the complete expression for  $p(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$ , we would have performed Taylor expansions in small  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \sim \Delta t^{1/2}$  (as we do in Appendix A). The leading order has to be Eq. (35). As we explained in Sec. III D,  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  is a function of more than one random (and even correlated) variables for any scheme beyond leading order. Thus, we follow an alternative route to Sec. IV A.

The propagator after any arbitrarily (long or short) time duration  $\Delta t$ , by definition, is given by

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \left\langle \delta \left[ \Delta \mathbf{x} - \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' - \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \right] \middle| \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x} \right\rangle. \quad (36)$$

The delta function imposes the stochastic equation of motion [Eq. (11)] upon the realization of the random displacement  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t = \Delta \mathbf{x}$ , given the initial condition  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x}$ . We Fourier-transform to get its characteristic function,  $\tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \int d\Delta \mathbf{x} e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x}} P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$ , which becomes

$$\tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \left\langle \exp \left\{ i\mathbf{q} \cdot \left[ \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \right] \right\} \middle| \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x} \right\rangle. \quad (37)$$

The ensemble average in both Eqs. (36) and (37) is over all noise realizations,  $\{\delta \mathbf{W}_s\}_{s=t}^{t+\Delta t}$  (that is, we do not average over the startpoint  $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{x}$ ). So far, both equations are exact.

Another exact construction we may introduce is the Wiener discrete path integral [19], namely, the probability distribution to obtain a collection of noise realizations,  $\{\delta \mathbf{W}_i\}$ . It is given by the following product of  $K$  Gaussians,

$$\Pr [\{\delta \mathbf{W}_i = \delta \mathbf{w}_i\}_{i=1}^K] = \prod_{i=1}^K \left[ \frac{1}{(2\pi\delta t)^{N/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{|\delta \mathbf{w}_i|^2}{2\delta t} \right) \right]. \quad (38)$$

Note that the increments of the Wiener process are normal-distributed, so this construction would remain exact even if  $\delta t \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, while we aim to reconstruct the path integral for the positions  $\mathbf{X}_t$  while paying close attention to whether we kept sufficient high-order correction, Eq. (38) is formal and always exact [19]. The ensemble averages appearing in Eqs. (36) and (37) are defined by the integration using the probability distribution of Eq. (38).

We define the following functionals of the Wiener process, conditioned on the initial conditions,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \mathcal{D}_t &= \Delta \mathbf{X}_t [\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}_{t'=t}^{t+\Delta t} | \mathbf{X}_t, t] - \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{W}_t \\ \Delta \mathcal{E}_t &= \Delta \mathcal{D}_t - \langle \Delta \mathcal{D}_t | \mathbf{X}_t, t \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In Eq. (39),  $\Delta \mathcal{D}_t$  measures the difference between the exact  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  [Eq. (11)] and the Euler-Maruyama approximation [Eq. (23)], and  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  is its centered difference. Explicitly,  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  is given by

$$\Delta \mathcal{E}_t [\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}_{t'=t}^{t+\Delta t} | \mathbf{X}_t, t] = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt' + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{W}_{t'} - \langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{X}_t, t \rangle - \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{W}_t. \quad (40)$$

The notation stresses that  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  is defined on the probability space of the increments of the Wiener process  $\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}_{t'=t}^{t+\Delta t}$  and is conditioned on  $\mathbf{X}_t$ .

If  $\Delta t$  is indeed small, then according to Eq. (26),  $\Delta \mathcal{D}_t = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ . From (23),  $\langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{X}_t \rangle = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ , and therefore also  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ . More concretely, using Eq. (26),  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t^\mu = F^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$ . Adding the next order terms, Eq. (27) indicates that  $\langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{X}_t \rangle = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t + \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$ , so  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t^\mu = F^{\mu\nu\sigma} \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma} + \rho^{\mu\nu} \Delta R_t^\nu + \lambda^{\mu\nu} \Delta L_t^\nu + C^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} \Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ . Thus, for short  $\Delta t$ ,  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  can be brought to depend explicitly on  $\{\mathbf{W}_s\}_{s=t}^{t+\Delta t}$  via the multiple stochastic integrals (arising from the expansion schemes of Sec. III and beyond [21]) and on the initial position  $\mathbf{X}_t$ .

Combining Eqs. (37), (38), (40), and (28), we arrive at the  $\delta t$ -discretized path integral,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) &= \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \prod_{i=1}^K \left[ \int \frac{d\delta \mathbf{w}_i}{(2\pi\delta t)^{N/2}} \right] \\ &\times \exp \left\{ -\sum_{j=1}^K \frac{|\delta \mathbf{w}_j|^2}{2\delta t} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \left[ \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\delta \mathbf{w}_i\} | \mathbf{x}, t] + \langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}, t \rangle + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^K \delta \mathbf{w}_j \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Completing the square,

$$\frac{|\delta \mathbf{w}_j|^2}{2\delta t} - i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b} \cdot \delta \mathbf{w}_j = \frac{|\delta \mathbf{w}_j - i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b} \delta t|^2}{2\delta t} + \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{q} \delta t, \quad (42)$$

with  $\sum_{i=1}^K \delta t = \Delta t$ , we get the expression,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) &= e^{-\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{q} \Delta t + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}, t \rangle} \\ &\times \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \prod_{i=1}^K \left[ \int \frac{d\delta \mathbf{w}_i}{(2\pi\delta t)^{N/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{|\delta \mathbf{w}_i - i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) \delta t|^2}{2\delta t} \right) \right] e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\delta \mathbf{w}_i\} | \mathbf{x}, t]}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

This is the average of  $e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathcal{E}_t}$  for a Langevin process whose Wiener increments have nonzero means. Changing variables  $\delta\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_j = \delta\mathbf{w}_j - i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{b}\delta t$  to return to the usual (zero-mean) Wiener process, we find the basis for the incoming expansions,

$$\tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)\cdot\mathbf{q}\Delta t + i\mathbf{q}\cdot\langle\Delta\mathbf{X}_t|\mathbf{x}, t\rangle} \langle e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t)t'\}|\mathbf{x}, t]}\rangle, \quad (44)$$

where the expectation is once again over the standard measure of Wiener process, and  $\Delta\mathcal{E}$  has absorbed the offset. Note that  $\mathbf{b}$  is evaluated at time  $t$  and not  $t'$  and hence the offset is a constant within the SDE, because this term comes from the Euler-Maruyama approximation. This is the first central result of this paper, and is completely exact so far. In fact, there is no discretization at all in Eq. (44).

We now proceed to consider small  $\Delta t$ , which allows systematic expansions. From the Gaussian form in Eq. (44), we see that the mass of  $\mathbf{q}$  is concentrated at  $\mathbf{q} \sim \Delta t^{-1/2}$ . Combined with  $\Delta\mathcal{E}_t \sim \Delta t$  [see discussion below Eq. (40)], we see that  $\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathcal{E}_t \sim \Delta t^{1/2}$  is a small quantity, so we may (stochastic) Taylor-expand the exponential within the ensemble average in Eq. (44) for small  $\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathcal{E}_t$ .

### C. Euler-Maruyama propagator

We begin by obtaining the leading-order propagator based upon the Euler-Maruyama (order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$ ) method, Eq. (23). By definition [Eq. (40)], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\Delta\mathbf{X}_t|\mathbf{x}, t\rangle &= \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), \\ \Delta\mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}|\mathbf{x}, t] &= \mathcal{O}(\Delta t). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Thus,  $\langle e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{b}t'\}|\mathbf{x}, t]}\rangle = 1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})$ . To leading order we are left with,

$$\tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{D}\cdot\mathbf{q}\Delta t + i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{a}\Delta t}[1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})], \quad (46)$$

which is a Fourier transform of a Gaussian. Upon inverting it,  $P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t) = (2\pi)^{-N} \int d\mathbf{q} e^{-i\mathbf{q}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{x}} \tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t)$ , we reobtain Eq. (35),

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t) = P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t|\mathbf{x}, t)[1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})]. \quad (47)$$

However, now we explicitly know the discrepancy among the approximate propagator of Eq. (23) and the exact propagator of Eq. (11). In general, the error term may be a convolution with  $P_{1/2}$  which one may factor out, leaving an overall  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})$  remainder.

As we mentioned numerous times, the literature on stochastic Taylor expansions [21] aims to obtain numerical integration methods of SDEs and their accuracy, rather than express the errors of the propagator expansion as we do in Eq. (47). This is done for a good reason — it obscures the so-called strong approximation error [21], which is the ‘true’ error resulting from using the Euler-Maruyama method, Eq. (23), and its corresponding propagator, Eq. (47), instead of the exact (unknown) propagator  $P$ , for approximately sampling trajectories from the SDE. This is best understood as follows. Consider  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ , where the Euler-Maruyama propagator converges to the leading-order Euler approximation for the ordinary differential equation  $\dot{\mathbf{X}}(t) = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}(t), t)$ . The Euler approximation is correct to order  $\Delta t^2$  (called the local truncation order). Taking  $\sim \Delta t^{-1}$  steps builds up to a global error of order  $\Delta t$ , which is why the Euler method for ordinary differential equations is referred to as order  $\Delta t$ . Going back to the Euler-Maruyama method, upon subtracting the sufficiently accurate drift, the error in the trajectory is  $\Delta\mathcal{E}_t$ , which has zero mean and variance  $\Delta t^2$ . Hence, the error in the variance is  $\Delta t^2$ . Owing to the Markov property, the errors of subsequent steps in the Langevin process are independent, building up to a global error which once again has variance of order  $\Delta t$ . The error in the trajectory is proportional to the standard deviation, which is therefore  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})$ . This is why the Euler-Maruyama approximation is referred to a numerical scheme of (strong) order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ .

In this paper, we are interested in obtaining expansions of the propagator to prescribed orders in  $\Delta t$ , to which end the notation in Eq. (47) is convenient as it separates the leading-order propagator  $P_{1/2}$  and the next order terms, which are smaller by factors of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ . This difference between our efforts and the mathematical literature manifests in the expression for the entropy production, which requires substituting trajectories  $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}$  (that were already samples elsewhere) into the (unknown) explicit functional of the propagator. The accuracy of the expression for the propagator, albeit important to stochastic thermodynamics, is a new issue in the context of solving stochastic differential equations, and thus is not present in the discussion regarding numerical schemes [21].

### D. Milstein propagator

We proceed to evaluate the first nontrivial propagator, representing the Milstein (order- $\Delta t$ ) method, Eq. (26). Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}, t \rangle &= \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), \\ \Delta \mathcal{E}_t^\mu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\} | \mathbf{x}, t] &= F^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}).\end{aligned}\quad (48)$$

We Taylor expand in small  $\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  to include the first order term,

$$e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\} | \mathbf{x}, t]} = 1 + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\} | \mathbf{x}, t] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t). \quad (49)$$

Thus, we should compute  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$  to the required accuracy (48), with a Wiener process whose increments are offset,  $d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \rightarrow d\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) dt'$ . The expression for  $\Delta Y$  for the offset process is obtained through Eq. (29),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] &= \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma + (iq^\xi) b^{\xi\nu} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt' \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma \\ &\quad + (iq^\zeta) b^{\zeta\sigma} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t''}^\nu \int_t^{t'} dt'' + \frac{1}{2} (iq^\xi)(iq^\zeta) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\zeta\sigma} \Delta t^2.\end{aligned}\quad (50)$$

According to Eq. (50) [remembering the zero mean of Eqs. (29), (30), and (31)], we have,

$$\langle \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (iq^\xi)(iq^\zeta) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\zeta\sigma} \Delta t^2. \quad (51)$$

Now, recalling that  $F^{\mu\nu\sigma} = b^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho b^{\mu\nu}$  (see Eq. (26)), we find,

$$\tilde{P}(\mathbf{q}, \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = e^{-\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{q} \Delta t + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{a} \Delta t} [1 + (iq^\mu)(iq^\xi)(iq^\zeta) b^{\xi\nu} D^{\rho\zeta} \nabla^\rho b^{\mu\nu} \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)]. \quad (52)$$

We get the leading order Gaussian, and also a cubic term in  $\mathbf{q}$ . Note that after summing over  $\mu$  and  $\xi$ , only the symmetric part in  $\mu \leftrightarrow \xi$  survives within the coefficient,  $q^\mu q^\xi b^{\xi\nu} \nabla b^{\mu\nu} = (1/2) q^\mu q^\xi [b^{\xi\nu} \nabla b^{\mu\nu} + b^{\mu\nu} \nabla b^{\xi\nu}] = q^\mu q^\xi \nabla D^{\mu\xi}$ . With that, using the inverse Fourier transform  $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow \Delta \mathbf{x}$  and  $i\mathbf{q} \rightarrow (-\partial/\partial \Delta \mathbf{x})$ , we get

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \left[ 1 - D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} \Delta t^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\sigma} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) \right] P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t). \quad (53)$$

Equation (53) can be written out explicitly by taking the three derivatives of the Gaussian Eq. (35), and keeping only order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  terms (i.e., out of each  $\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a} \Delta t$ , we only leave  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$ ). Since this involves several derivatives of a Gaussian, it is convenient to work with the multidimensional generalization of the Hermite polynomials. Based upon the Rodrigues formula [34], we define

$$\mathbf{H}_n(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{M}) = (-1)^n e^{\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{M}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{y} / 2} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \mathbf{y}^n} e^{-\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{M}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{y} / 2} = \left( \mathbf{M}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{y} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^n \cdot 1 \quad (54)$$

for some vector  $\mathbf{y}$  and a constant scaling tensor  $\mathbf{M}$ . The  $n$ th hermite polynomial here is a rank- $n$  tensor. In terms of  $\mathbf{H}_n$ , the propagator reads,

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) [1 + D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} H_3^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D} \Delta t) \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)]. \quad (55)$$

We note that  $\mathbf{H}_n(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D} \Delta t) \sim \Delta t^{-n/2}$ , and indeed we only included  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$  (rather than  $\Delta \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a} \Delta t$ ). Explicitly, the propagator reads,

$$\begin{aligned}P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) &= P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) \\ &\quad \times \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{8} \nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu} \left( 2D^{\mu\nu} \Delta x^\sigma + 4D^{\nu\sigma} \Delta x^\mu - \frac{\Delta x^\mu \Delta x^\nu \Delta x^\sigma}{\Delta t} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) \right],\end{aligned}\quad (56)$$

where we used the identity  $\nabla(\mathbf{D}^{-1}) = -\mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot \nabla \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}$  and the symmetry of  $\mathbf{D}$  to replace  $\nabla(\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu} (D^{\mu\sigma} \Delta x^\nu + D^{\nu\sigma} \Delta x^\mu) = 2\nabla(\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu} D^{\nu\sigma} \Delta x^\mu$ . In Eqs. (53), Eq. (55), and (56), all  $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{b}^T / 2$  are evaluated at  $(\mathbf{x}, t)$ , while the dependence on  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$  appears explicitly.

Equation (56) is the first, beyond-Gaussian propagator that one can find via the scheme we propose. Since all expansions were performed consistently, there is no dependence on discretization. In the notation of Eq. (4), we identify

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^\rho(\mathbf{K} | \mathbf{x}, t) &= -\frac{1}{4} [\nabla^\rho (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)] D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) - \frac{1}{2} [\nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)] D^{\nu\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{24} [\nabla^\rho (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)] K^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{12} [\nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\rho\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)] K^{\sigma\nu},\end{aligned}\quad (57)$$

with  $\mathbf{K} = \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t$ . For now, to order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ ,  $\Psi(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ .

### E. Higher-order propagator

We finish by showing an even higher-order propagator, representing the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  method, Eq. (27). It will require a higher power of  $\Delta \mathcal{E}_t$ , which will involve a more elaborate calculation. First, combining Eqs. (40) and (27), we identify

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{x}, t \rangle &= \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta t + \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3), \\ \Delta \mathcal{E}_t^\mu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\} | \mathbf{x}, t] &= F^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}] + \rho^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta R_t^\nu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}] + \lambda^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta L_t^\nu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}] \\ &\quad + C^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'}\}] + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Next,

$$e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\} | \mathbf{x}, t]} = 1 + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\} | \mathbf{x}, t] + \frac{1}{2} \{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \Delta \mathcal{E}_t[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\} | \mathbf{x}, t]\}^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}), \quad (59)$$

where only  $\Delta \mathbf{Y} \Delta \mathbf{Y}$  in the quadratic term contributes to the required order. Offsetting the Wiener process's increments by  $d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \rightarrow d\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}, t) dt'$  in Eqs. (30), (31), and (32), we find the ensemble averages

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta R_t^\nu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (iq^\xi) b^{\xi\nu} \Delta t^2, \\ \langle \Delta L_t^\nu[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (iq^\xi) b^{\xi\nu} \Delta t^2, \\ \langle \Delta Z_t^{\nu\sigma\rho}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \rangle &= \frac{1}{6} (iq^\xi) (iq^\zeta) (iq^\kappa) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\zeta\sigma} b^{\kappa\rho} \Delta t^3. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

From Eq. (50),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta Y_t^{\nu\sigma}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \Delta Y_t^{\nu'\sigma'}[\{\mathbf{W}_{t'} + i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{b}t'\}] \rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \delta^{\nu\nu'} \delta^{\sigma\sigma'} \Delta t^2 \\ &\quad + \left[ \frac{1}{3} (iq^\xi) (iq^{\xi'}) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\xi'\nu'} \delta^{\sigma\sigma'} + \frac{1}{3} (iq^\zeta) (iq^{\zeta'}) b^{\zeta\sigma} b^{\zeta'\sigma'} \delta^{\nu\nu'} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{6} (iq^\xi) (iq^{\zeta'}) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\zeta'\sigma'} \delta^{\sigma\nu'} + \frac{1}{6} (iq^\zeta) (iq^{\xi'}) b^{\zeta\sigma} b^{\xi'\nu'} \delta^{\nu\sigma'} \right] \Delta t^3 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} (iq^\xi) (iq^{\xi'}) (iq^\zeta) (iq^{\zeta'}) b^{\xi\nu} b^{\xi'\nu'} b^{\zeta\sigma} b^{\zeta'\sigma'} \Delta t^4, \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where only terms with even powers of  $\mathbf{W}_{t'}$  survived the average.

It total, keeping only symmetric terms for repeating powers of  $\mathbf{q}$ , and taking the inverse Fourier-transform, we find

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) &= \left[ 1 - D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} \Delta t^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\sigma} \right. \\ &\quad + \psi_2^{\mu\nu} \Delta t^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\nu} + \psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} \Delta t^3 \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\sigma} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\rho} \\ &\quad \left. + \psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} \Delta t^4 \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\sigma} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\zeta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Delta x^\xi} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right] \times \\ &\quad \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi \mathbf{D} \Delta t]}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a} \Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau} \Delta t^2] [\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a} \Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau} \Delta t^2] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where

$$\psi_2^{\mu\nu} = D^{\nu\sigma} \nabla^\sigma a^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial D^{\mu\nu}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} a^\sigma \nabla^\sigma D^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} D^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu}, \quad (63)$$

$$\psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} = \frac{2}{3} D^{\zeta\rho} \nabla^\zeta (D^{\xi\sigma} \nabla^\xi D^{\mu\nu}) + \frac{1}{3} D^{\xi\zeta} (\nabla^\xi D^{\mu\sigma}) (\nabla^\zeta D^{\nu\rho}), \quad (64)$$

$$\psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} = \frac{1}{2} D^{\xi\chi} (\nabla^\chi D^{\nu\rho}) D^{\zeta\kappa} (\nabla^\kappa D^{\mu\sigma}). \quad (65)$$

Note that the Gaussian part of Eq. (62) includes the order- $\Delta t^2$  ‘‘overshoot’’ contribution to the mean which does not appear in Eq. (35). It allows for the mean drift to be accurately computed to order- $\Delta t^2$ , that is, to get exactly  $\langle \Delta \mathbf{X} \rangle = \mathbf{a} \Delta t + \boldsymbol{\tau} \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$ ; see Eq. (27) and discussion below Eq. (47) on strong convergence.

The next step again involves expressing the derivatives using the multidimensional Hermite tensors, Eq. (54). If in Eq. (56) we have dropped  $\mathbf{a}\Delta t$  from the results of the derivatives in  $\mathbf{H}_3$ , we must keep it now for the right-order convergence. The propagator reads now

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi\mathbf{D}\Delta t]}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2][\Delta\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2] \right\} \\ \times \left[ 1 + D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} H_3^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\Delta\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\Delta t, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^2 + \psi_2^{\mu\nu} H_2^{\mu\nu}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^2 \right. \\ \left. + \psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} H_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^3 + \psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} H_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^4 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right] \quad (66)$$

The additional offset  $\mathbf{a}\Delta t$  translates into another order- $\Delta t$  term of the form  $\mathbf{H}_2\Delta t^2(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)$ , while the order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  term is the same as in Eq. (55),

$$P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi\mathbf{D}\Delta t]}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2][\Delta\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}\Delta t - \boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2] \right\} \\ \times \left[ 1 + D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} H_3^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^2 + \tilde{\psi}_2^{\mu\nu} H_2^{\mu\nu}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^2 \right. \\ \left. + \psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} H_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^3 + \psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} H_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^4 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right] \quad (67)$$

where

$$\tilde{\psi}_2^{\mu\nu} = D^{\mu\zeta} D^{\nu\sigma} \nabla^\sigma [(D^{-1})^{\zeta\rho} a^\rho] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial D^{\mu\nu}}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2} D^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu}. \quad (68)$$

Equation (67) has the overshoot order- $\Delta t^2$  term in the mean of the Gaussian, which is included for proper order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  strong convergence. However, for the purpose of computing the entropy production (and other first-order derivatives of the trajectory) we wish to expand the propagator itself to order  $\Delta t$ . Thus, we shall drop  $\boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2$ , and obtain of the form we suggested in Eq. (4), where  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$  is given in Eq. (57), and

$$\Psi(\mathbf{K} | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{8} \left[ a^\sigma \nabla^\sigma (D^{-1})^{\xi\zeta} + 2a^\mu \nabla^\xi (D^{-1})^{\mu\nu} + 2\psi_2^{\mu\zeta} (D^{-1})^{\mu\xi} (D^{-1})^{\nu\zeta} \right] (K^{\xi\zeta} - 2D^{\xi\zeta}) \\ + \psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} H_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^2 + \psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} H_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi}(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t)\Delta t^3, \quad (69)$$

where all the coefficients  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $\mathbf{D}$ ,  $\psi_2$ ,  $\psi_4$ , and  $\psi_6$  were computed at  $\mathbf{x}, t$ , and we have kept the the fourth and sixth Hermite polynomial implicit for compactness. This demonstrates the central contribution of this paper — the ability to write a propagator of any order in a consistent fashion. Indeed, we see that the propagator (to order  $\Delta t$ ) takes the form of Eq. (4). The calculation for higher-order propagators will become increasingly cumbersome.

We conclude this section with a technical remark. The approximations Eqs. (55) and (56) for order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ , or (66) and (67) for order  $\Delta t$ , provide an explicit expression for the propagator as a function of  $\Delta\mathbf{x}$ . They may be useful for computing short-time functionals of the propagator. However, Eqs. (53) and (62), which include the derivative, may be more convenient when computing moments. This is because, upon integration by parts, one is left with an average of lower-order polynomials with respect to just the leading-order propagator, Eq. (35).

## F. Entropy production

We proceed to compute the entropy production [Eq. (1)] for the Langevin equation and its Fokker Planck equation of Sec. II. To highlight the importance of the corrections presented here, we start with the naïve leading-order ( $\Delta t^{1/2}$ ) propagator, Eq. (35). For that purpose, Eq. (3) requires knowing the propagator in the “reversed” process, which is exactly

$$P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda | \mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)\Delta t]}} \\ \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)\Delta t][\Delta\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)\Delta t] \right\}. \quad (70)$$

In this expression, we brought back the protocol  $\lambda$  (instead of just  $t$ ) so the trajectory reversal will be clearer. Essentially, we replaced  $(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  with  $(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)$  as the points where all the coefficients are evaluated (as the latter is now the startpoint

for the reversed process), and we replaced  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$  with  $-\Delta \mathbf{x}$  (as we need a displacement  $-\Delta \mathbf{x}$  to arrive from  $\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{x}$ ). With this, we revert back to  $\lambda = t$ .

We begin by computing the ratio of normalizations,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\det[\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t)]}{\det[\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)]} &= -\frac{1}{2} D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \Delta x^\sigma \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \frac{\partial (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} \Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where we have used Jacoby's formula  $d \ln[\det(\mathbf{D})] = \text{tr}[\ln(\mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot d\mathbf{D})]$  and  $\mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot d\mathbf{D} = -d(\mathbf{D}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{D}$ . As preparation for later, we have also written  $[\cdot](\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) = [\cdot](\mathbf{x}, t) + (1/2)\Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla[\cdot](\mathbf{x}, t) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$ ; we will repeat this replacement in the remaining contributions to the entropy production as well. For now, we insert Eq. (71) to compute the log-ratio of the leading-order propagators,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)}{P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t)} &= \frac{1}{4} \nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \left[ \frac{\Delta x^\mu \Delta x^\nu \Delta x^\sigma}{\Delta t} - 2D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \Delta x^\sigma \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} [\Delta x^\mu \Delta x^\nu - 2D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, t) \Delta x^\sigma] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Note that the leading order should have been  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t \sim 1$  (the scaling of pure Brownian motion) but it has cancelled out. Hence the reference to these quantities as ‘‘first derivatives of trajectories’’. Then, the division by  $\Delta t$  within the exponent brings out the higher orders. We eventually wish to take the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ , meaning that the fluctuations in the second row are negligible and we may replace it by its average [19], which is zero. No such operation can be done for the rest of the terms, which are of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ . Additionally, the term  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}$  cannot be replaced with another term of them form  $[\cdot] \Delta t + [\cdot] \Delta \mathbf{x}$  and even more so to be brought to the form of the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  multiple stochastic integrals (see Sec. III D). Hence, one cannot write the above as a continuous-time stochastic differential quantity.

We now utilize the corrections we have found in this paper, of the form of Eq. (4), to correct the above expression for the entropy production. These additional contributions are seen in Eq. (5). We know that the propagator is expanded as Eq. (4); e.g., repeating Eq. (57),

$$\Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x}, \lambda \right) = \frac{1}{8} \nabla^\sigma (\mathbf{D}^{-1})^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) \left[ 2D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) \Delta x^\sigma + 4D^{\nu\sigma}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) \Delta x^\mu - \frac{\Delta x^\mu \Delta x^\nu \Delta x^\sigma}{\Delta t} \right]. \quad (73)$$

with the explicit protocol value  $\lambda$ . Namely, if in Eq. (4) we evaluated the coefficients within the polynomials  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  at  $(\mathbf{x}, t)$  [that is, at  $(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ ], the propagator to obtain the reversed trajectory  $\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \mathbf{x}$  under  $\lambda + \Delta \lambda \rightarrow \lambda$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{x}, \lambda | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda) &= P_{1/2}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda) \\ &\quad \times \left[ 1 - \Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda \right) + \Delta t \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where the leading order reversed propagator is given in Eq. (70). In Eq. (5), we have included all the terms that must be included. However, note that upon computing the log-ratio of the corrections and using the tools we presented throughout the paper,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{1 + \Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi(\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) + \Delta t \Psi(\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})}{1 - \Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi(\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t) + \Delta t \Psi(\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})} \\ = 2\Delta \mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} \middle| \mathbf{x} + \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x}}{2}, t \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

all the order- $\Delta t$  correction terms of Eq. (67) cancel out to order  $\Delta t$  [namely, the distinction among evaluating them at  $(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta \lambda)$  instead of  $(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$  is of negligibly-high order]. Thus, it appears *a posteriori* that the Milstein propagator [Eq. (56)] suffices for the calculation of entropy production.

Finally, we insert Eq. (73) in Eq. (75), replace  $\mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot d\mathbf{D} = -d(\mathbf{D}^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{D}$ , and combine the incomplete Eq. (72) to obtain

$$\ln \frac{P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)}{P(\mathbf{x}, t | \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t)} = [\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t)] \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}/2, t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (76)$$

Here,  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}$  has reassuringly cancelled out. Now that the calculation has been completed and all order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  and  $-\Delta t$  terms were included, we may now take the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x}$  and its analogues have cancelled out, we see that we can



make Eq. (76) a continuous-time stochastic quantity. With the definitions of Sec. IIC, the informatic heat [Eq. (3)] obeys the equation

$$\Omega_t = \int_0^t \{[\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')] \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')\} \circ d\mathbf{X}_{t'}. \quad (77)$$

We now examine the physical scenarios presented in Secs. IIA and IIB. With the drift  $\mathbf{a} = \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{f} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}$  constructed in Eqs. (10) and (16), we find

$$\Omega_t = \int_0^t \{[\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')] \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')\} \circ d\mathbf{X}_{t'}. \quad (78)$$

With a valid Einstein relation  $\mathbf{D} = k_B T \boldsymbol{\mu}$ , the informatic heat coincides with the heat [9],

$$-k_B T \Omega_t = - \int_0^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \circ d\mathbf{X}_{t'}. \quad (79)$$

In particular for conservative forces  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') = -\nabla H(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')$ , using the stochastic chain rule [25], the informatic heat coincides with the change in energy along a trajectory [9],

$$-k_B T \Omega_t = H(\mathbf{X}_t, t) - H(\mathbf{X}_0, 0). \quad (80)$$

We attempt to explain the underlying cancellation of errors of the past [9] that allowed to obtain the right result despite insufficient high-order calculation in Sec. V. This stroke of luck will not persist in quantities that do not have the time-reversal symmetry properties of the entropy production.

For completeness, we compute the expression for the entropy production. First, we compute the change in entropy,  $S_t = -\ln p(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$ , which also appears in Eq. (3). This is a function of the microstate, and hence its change can be computed explicitly using the stochastic chain rule [25],

$$dS_t = -\frac{\nabla p(\mathbf{X}_t, t)}{p(\mathbf{X}_t, t)} \circ d\mathbf{X}_t - \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{X}_t, t)} \frac{\partial p(\mathbf{X}_t, t)}{\partial t} dt \quad (81)$$

In the following expressions for  $dS_t$ ,  $d\Omega_t$ , and  $d\Sigma_t$  we will not write  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$  for brevity. Converting the Stratonovich product into Itô product [19],  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \circ d\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) \cdot d\mathbf{X}_t + \mathbf{D} : \nabla \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{X}_t, t) dt$ , inserting Eq. (12) in  $d\mathbf{X}_t$ , and inserting Eq. (6) in  $\partial p / \partial t$ , we arrive at

$$dS_t = \left[ \nabla \cdot \left( \frac{\mathbf{J}}{p} \right) - \frac{1}{p} \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{D} \nabla p) \right] dt - \left[ \frac{\nabla p}{p} \cdot \mathbf{b} \right] \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t \quad (82)$$

where  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t)$  is the probability flux of the Fokker-Planck equation, Eq. (7). Converting the Stratonovich product into Itô in Eq. (77) and inserting Eq. (12), we get an analogous expression for the informatic heat

$$d\Omega_t = [(\mathbf{a} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot (\mathbf{a} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}) + \nabla \cdot (\mathbf{a} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D})] dt + [(\mathbf{a} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{D}) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{b}] \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (83)$$

Combining both equations, we find the entropy production of the process of Sec. IIB,

$$d\Sigma_t = \left[ \frac{\mathbf{J}}{p} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{J}}{p} + \frac{2}{p} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J} \right] dt + \left[ \frac{\mathbf{J}}{p} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{b} \right] \cdot d\mathbf{W}_t. \quad (84)$$

Assuming probability is conserved [that is, there is no change in phase-space volume, so  $\int d\mathbf{x} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) = \oint d\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0$ ], indeed the average over noise ( $\langle d\mathbf{W}_t \rangle_{\mathbf{W}} = \mathbf{0}$ ) and ensemble ( $\langle [\cdot](\mathbf{X}_t, t) \rangle_{\mathbf{x}} = \int d\mathbf{x} p(\mathbf{x}, t) [\cdot](\mathbf{x}, t)$ ) is nonnegative quadratic form [8],

$$\langle \dot{\Sigma}_t \rangle_{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{x}} = \int d\mathbf{x} \frac{\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t) \cdot \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{p(\mathbf{x}, t)}. \quad (85)$$

This is true since the average entropy production [Eq. (1)] is a Kullback-Leibler divergence. With that, we demonstrated the underlying tools for computing the time-reversal symmetry breaking (the entropy production) of arbitrary Fokker-Planck equations.

## V. NON-ITÔ STOCHASTIC TAYLOR EXPANSIONS

In this section, we present an extensive comparison with previous methods for evaluating the propagators [18, 23, 28, 29] and their application to entropy production [1, 9]. The goal is to resolve previous technical inconsistencies and explain why, unknowingly, the calculation of the entropy production in [18, 23, 28, 29] turned out to be correct.

### A. Intuitive non-Itô Euler-Maruyama expansion

The transition from Eq. (11) to the simple Euler-Maruyama approximation, Eq. (33), motivated [18] a similar approximation for the more general Eq. (20):

$$\Delta \mathbf{X}_t \simeq \mathbf{a}_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_t + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t + \alpha \Delta \Lambda_t) \Delta t + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}_t + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t + \alpha \Delta \Lambda_t) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{W}_t. \quad (86)$$

In other words, if one chose the  $\alpha$ th convention (with the corresponding drift  $a_\alpha^\mu = a^\mu - \alpha b^{\sigma\nu} \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}$ ), they should write the Euler-Maruyama approximation with the coefficients evaluated at the appropriate point,  $(\mathbf{X}_{t+\alpha\Delta t}, \Lambda_{t+\alpha\Delta t}) = (\mathbf{X}_t + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t + \alpha \Delta \Lambda_t)$ . For example,  $\alpha = 0$  corresponds to the Itô convention and  $\alpha = 1/2$  to Stratanovich. While Eq. (86) may seem like a natural extension of the Euler-Maruyama method to arbitrary convention  $\alpha$ , the mathematically-consistent machinery for obtaining short-time expansions is rather different (Sec. III based upon Ref. [21]). Particularly, as seen below, this scheme is only correct to order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  still. As a result, the point at which the amplitude  $\mathbf{b}$  is evaluated introduces a shift in the higher-order terms and the ‘overshot’ drift should be evaluated to order  $\Delta t$  as well. Specifying a particular intermediate point in a also corresponds to a shift in the higher-order corrections. As we hope to show now, it is needlessly-complicated to use non-Itô conventions, especially for the leading-order propagator.

### B. Rigorous non-Itô Milstein expansion

We follow the steps presented in Sec. III, but now for Eq. (20) with the general convention  $\alpha$ . The differences between the upcoming formal expansion and Eq. (86) will already appear within the order- $\Delta t$  expansion. Expanding Eq. (20) to order  $\Delta t$ ,

$$\Delta X_t^\mu = a_\alpha^\mu(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta t + b^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta W_t^\nu + [b^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}](\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \overset{\alpha}{\circ} \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\rho + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (87)$$

Notice that now, each time the differential  $d\mathbf{W}_t$  appears, it multiplies the functions as  $\overset{\alpha}{\circ}$ . For example, trivially,  $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_t \overset{\alpha}{\circ} 1 = \Delta \mathbf{W}_t$ . In order to transition from the double stochastic integral within the  $\alpha$ -convention to the Itô one [Eq. (26)], we finely discretize

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \overset{\alpha}{\circ} \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\rho &= \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} (W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu) [W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\rho + \alpha (W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu) - W_t^\rho] \\ &= \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} (W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu) (W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\rho - W_t^\rho) \\ &\quad + \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^{\Delta t/\delta t} \alpha (W_{t+i\delta t}^\nu - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\nu) (W_{t+i\delta t}^\rho - W_{t+(i-1)\delta t}^\rho) \\ &= \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\rho + \alpha \delta^{\nu\rho} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt'. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Using  $a_\alpha^\mu + \alpha b^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu} \delta^{\nu\rho} = a^\mu$ , we notice that Eq. (87) coincides *exactly* with Eq. (26), as it must. This suggests that both expansion were done consistently, and all relevant terms were included. Indeed, *there is no dependence on convention and discretization*.

### C. Comparison between the rigorous and intuitive non-Itô expansions

We proceed to understand if there is any benefit in writing the extended Euler-Maruyama approximation for general  $\alpha$ , Eq. (86). We change it to the Itô form, Eq. (23), by once again expanding the coefficients around  $\mathbf{X}_t$ ,

$$\Delta X_t^\mu \simeq a_\alpha^\mu(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta t + b^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta W_t^\nu + \alpha \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta W_t^\nu \Delta X_t^\sigma + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \quad (89)$$

$$\simeq a^\mu(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta t + b^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) \Delta W_t^\nu + \alpha [b^{\sigma\rho} \nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}](\mathbf{X}_t, \Lambda_t) (\Delta W_t^\nu \Delta W_t^\rho - \delta^{\nu\rho} \Delta t) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (90)$$

In this expression, we see that the first two terms agree with the rigorous Euler-Maruyama method expansion, Eq. (23). However, the last term of order  $\Delta t$ ,  $\alpha[\Delta W_t^\nu \Delta W_t^\rho - \delta^{\nu\rho} \Delta t]$ , differs from the last term in the rigorous Eq. (26),  $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\rho$ . For example, while both have mean 0, their variances are different:  $\alpha^2 \langle [\Delta W_t^\mu \Delta W_t^\sigma - \delta^{\mu\sigma} \Delta t] [\Delta W_t^\nu \Delta W_t^\rho - \delta^{\nu\rho} \Delta t] \rangle = (\alpha^2 \Delta t^2) [\delta^{\mu\nu} \delta^{\sigma\rho} + \delta^{\mu\rho} \delta^{\sigma\nu}]$  while  $\langle [\int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\mu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\sigma] [\int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{s'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{s'} dW_{s''}^\rho] \rangle = (\Delta t^2 / 2) \delta^{\mu\nu} \delta^{\sigma\rho}$ . These two terms happen to agree only for  $\alpha = 1/2$  (Stratonovich) and only in one dimension, since then, using the Itô lemma [25],

$$\int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \cdot \int_t^{t'} dW_{t''}^\rho = \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dW_{t'}^\nu \circ (W_{t'} - W_t) - \frac{1}{2} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} dt' = \frac{1}{2} [\Delta W_t^2 - \Delta t]. \quad (91)$$

We conclude that the generalized approximation adopted in the literature [18], Eq. (86), is no more useful than the standard Euler-Maruyama method, Eq. (23), except in the very particular case of one-dimensional Stratonovich convention. This also ignores the additional terms in the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  expansions, Eq. (27), that may be needed for various functionals of the propagator. A similar order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  expansion as Eq. (87) for a non-Itô convention can be found in the literature [21].

### D. Non-Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator

We have presented the Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator in Eq. (35). For time-independent Langevin (i.e.,  $t$ -independent  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ ), the non-Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator can be found in the literature [9, 18],

$$P_{1/2}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(4\pi\Delta t)^d \det \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x})}} \exp[-\mathbb{L}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}) \Delta t]. \quad (92)$$

Here,  $\mathbb{L}^\alpha$  is often called ‘‘dynamical Lagrangian’’ for the  $\alpha$ th convention,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}) = & \left\{ \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} - [\mathbf{a}_\alpha - \alpha \mathbf{b} \cdot (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{b})](\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}) \right\} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x})}{4} \cdot \left\{ \frac{\Delta \mathbf{x}}{\Delta t} - [\mathbf{a}_\alpha - \alpha \mathbf{b} \cdot (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{b})](\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}) \right\} \\ & + \alpha \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}_\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}) + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} [(\nabla^\nu b^{\mu\sigma})(\nabla^\mu b^{\nu\sigma}) - (\nabla^\mu b^{\mu\sigma})(\nabla^\nu b^{\nu\sigma})](\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

which depends on the displacement  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$ , and all functions within it are evaluated at  $\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}$ . The propagator can then be used to, e.g., obtain the Fokker-Planck equation or compute moments [18, 19, 28]. With the Lagrangian in hand, using the Markov property of Eq. (11), it is common to represent the probability distribution to obtain a trajectory  $(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M)$ ,  $T = M \Delta t$ , for example, as appearing in Eq. (1), using the action [1, 18],

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}[\vec{\mathbf{x}}] &= Z^{-1} p(\mathbf{x}_0, 0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^{t_{\text{final}}} dt \mathbb{L}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + d\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}) \right] \\ &\sim p(x_0, 0) \prod_{i=1}^M P_{1/2}^\alpha(\mathbf{x}_i, i\Delta t | \mathbf{x}_{i-1}, (i-1)\Delta t), \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

where  $Z$  is a normalization constant.

The notation above facilitates adaptation of tools from quantum mechanics to treat diffusion processes [18]. The path integral representation is possible by identifying  $\Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t$  as  $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ , so  $\Delta \mathbf{x}$  can be converted to  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} dt$ ,  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t$  to  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} dt$  [18]. We remark that due to terms such as  $\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t$ , a path integral representation of the exact high-order Eq. (66) [and also Eq. (55)] is impossible, as there is just a single integration over time. We elaborate on this point in Sec. VI.

### E. Moments of the non-Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator

We show how the Euler-Maruyama expansion, Eq. (23), suffices for computing moments, and that its “intuitive” analogue, Eq. (86), is not more accurate or useful. Since there is only one Fokker-Planck equation and thus a single stochastic differential equation (see sec. II C), the propagators must be identical for all  $\alpha$  up to the order they are correct to. Thus, upon expanding  $\mathbf{a}_\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \alpha\Delta\mathbf{x})$  and  $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x} + \alpha\Delta\mathbf{x})$  (as appearing in  $P_{1/2}^\alpha$ ) around  $\mathbf{x}$  must give back  $P_{1/2}^0 \equiv P_{1/2}$ , Eq. (35). In order to have a fair comparison with our results, e.g., Eq. (67), we shall expand  $P_{1/2}^\alpha$  to order  $\Delta t$ .

To this end, one should write the expansion  $[\cdot](\mathbf{x} + \alpha\Delta\mathbf{x}) = [\cdot](\mathbf{x}) + \Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \nabla[\cdot](\mathbf{x}) + (1/2)\Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x} : \nabla\nabla[\cdot](\mathbf{x})$  for  $a_\alpha^\mu = a^\mu - \alpha b^{\sigma\nu}\nabla^\sigma b^{\mu\nu}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ , and keep terms to the required order. For the ease of demonstration, we show the result for the simple  $d = 1$  case,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{1/2}^\alpha(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t|x, t) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi D(x + \alpha\Delta x)\Delta t}} \times \\ &\times \exp\left\{-\frac{[\Delta x - a_\alpha(x + \alpha\Delta x)\Delta t + \alpha D'(x + \alpha\Delta x)\Delta t]^2}{4D(x + \alpha\Delta x)\Delta t} - \alpha a'_\alpha(x + \alpha\Delta x)\Delta t\right\} \\ &= P_{1/2}^0(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t|x, t) \left[1 - \frac{\alpha D'(x)}{4D^2(x)} \left(6D(x)\Delta x - \frac{\Delta x^3}{\Delta t}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})\right], \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

which required using  $\Delta x^2 = 2D(x)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$ ,  $\Delta x^4/\Delta t = 12D(x)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$ , and  $\Delta x^6/\Delta t^2 = 120D(x)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$ , and we abbreviated  $\partial[\cdot]/\partial x = [\cdot]'$ . Observe the consistency of the expansions performed in this paper: In these one-dimensional expressions, only the Stratonovich propagator [ $\alpha = 1/2$  in Eq. (95)] agrees with the Milstein propagator, Eq. (56), as we predicted in Sec. V C.

Another verification we can make is that the normalization and the first two conditional moments using the  $\alpha$  propagator are indeed correct and  $\alpha$ -independent to the appropriate order,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Delta x^n | x \rangle_\alpha &\equiv \int d\Delta x P_{1/2}^\alpha(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t|x, t) \Delta x^n \\ &= \langle \Delta x^n | x \rangle_0 - \frac{\alpha D'(x)}{4D^2(x)} \left(6D(x)\langle \Delta x^{n+1} | x \rangle_0 - \frac{\langle \Delta x^{n+3} | x \rangle_0}{\Delta t}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), & n = 0, \\ a(x)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), & n = 1, \\ 2D(x)\Delta t + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), & n = 2, \\ \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2), & n \geq 3, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where we used  $\langle \Delta x | x \rangle = a(x)\Delta t$ ,  $\langle \Delta x^3 | x \rangle / \Delta t = 6D(x)a(x)\Delta t$ , and  $\langle \Delta x^{n \geq 3} | x \rangle$ ,  $\langle \Delta x^{n \geq 5} | x \rangle / \Delta t \sim \Delta t^2$ . Therefore, the moments and the Fokker-Planck equation (given by its Kramers-Moyal expansion [20]), as calculated for example in [19], are accurately reproduced from the Euler-Maruyama methods, Eqs. (23) and (86).

We conclude that there is no reason to use the complicated  $\alpha$  convention, Eq. (92), as it does not provide any improved accuracy compared over the usual Itô Euler-Maruyama propagator, Eq. (47). If one observes a dependence on discretization while using different choices of  $\alpha$  in Eq. (92), it means that a higher-order propagator is needed, e.g., Eq. (56) or even Eq. (67), rather than having to pick a different non-Itô propagator. Instead, if needed, Eqs. (53) and Eq. (62) could be used to compute moments, as following integration by part one will obtain lower-order polynomials, averaged over the leading-order Gaussian propagator.

### F. Entropy production using complementary Euler-Maruyama propagators

It has been argued in Ref. [9] that using the generalized Euler-Maruyama expression, Eq. (86), the correct discretized expression for the informatic heat is obtained by inserting the propagator of the complementary interpretation for the inverted propagator,

$$\dot{\Omega}_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \ln \frac{P_{1/2}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda|\mathbf{x}, \lambda)}{P_{1/2}^{1-\alpha}(\mathbf{x}, \lambda|\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda)}. \quad (97)$$

(Observe the  $\alpha$  convention used in the numerator, in contrast to  $1 - \alpha$  in the denominator.) The motivation for this discretization comes from the observation that using such complementary conventions, the random Wiener noise is samples at the same points

in both directions [9]. While intuitive, there is no mathematical basis why this is a sufficient or even necessary condition for such computations. Moreover, as discussed in Sec. II C, *this cannot not be true*: All  $\alpha$  conventions must give identical statistics and FPE, and thus all the propagators must be identical if the correct order was kept. Upon taking the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  consistently, there cannot be an explicit dependence on the discretization method  $\alpha$ . Since a “wrong” result would have been obtained for non-complementary conventions for the “forward” ( $\alpha$ ) and “backward” (inverted,  $1 - \alpha$ ) propagators, this suggests that the small- $\Delta t$  discretization of Eq. (86) was kept to an insufficiently-high order, as terms that would have cancelled convention dependent corrections are absent. This is evident in Eq. (5) — as we established there, the propagator must include the next two orders beyond the leading order Eq. (86).

There has not been any dependency on the choice of discretization in our complete derivation in Sec. IV, rather, we used stochastic Taylor expansions to compute the corrections from the discrepancy function, Eq. (40). With our rigorous results, we see why propagators of “complementary” conventions are sufficient for  $\hat{\Omega}_t$ : First, the order- $\Delta t$  terms (coming from the order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  expansion) vanish as seen in Eq. (75). Second, the order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  terms (coming from the Milstein expansion) arise from  $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \int_t^{t'} d\mathbf{W}_{t''}$ . For the reverse propagator, we should have computed  $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \int_{t'}^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t''} = [\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \int_t^{t'} d\mathbf{W}_{t''}]^T$ . Summing the two gives  $\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \int_t^{t'} d\mathbf{W}_{t''} + [\int_t^{t+\Delta t} d\mathbf{W}_{t'} \int_t^{t'} d\mathbf{W}_{t''}]^T = \Delta \mathbf{W}_t \Delta \mathbf{W}_t - \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') dt'$  (the second term is a consequence of the Itô product within the double stochastic integral). Were we to have used complementary conventions from Eq. (86), in light of Eq. (90), we would have had  $\alpha[\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} - D(\mathbf{x} + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda)]$  and  $(1 - \alpha)[\Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} - D(\mathbf{x} + (1 - \alpha) \Delta \mathbf{x}, \lambda)]$  for the forward and backward propagators. Their sum is, to order  $\Delta t$ , also  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_t \Delta \mathbf{W}_t - \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t/2}, t) \Delta t$ , which agrees with the exact results to order  $\Delta t$ . Thus, we have two separate cancellation of errors, specific for the informatic heat, that allowed one to use apparently lower-order propagators than necessary. It is important to stress that, although intuitive, it is impossible to deduce this cancellation without actually performing the expansion.

### G. Toy functionals

In order to demonstrate that a combination of  $\alpha$  and  $1 - \alpha$  conventions does not always work, we consider a toy functional, which is a first derivative of the trajectory. As a motivation, assume that all forces are conservative and central,  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = -\nabla H(|\mathbf{x}|)$ . We also assume that the Einstein relation holds,  $\beta \mathbf{I} = \boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ . Then, the steady-state distribution is given by the isotropic Boltzmann factor  $p(\mathbf{x}, t \rightarrow \infty) \sim e^{-\beta H(\mathbf{x})}$ . Now, assuming that the particle of interest is charged, suppose one applies a concentric magnetic field. This will not change the steady state,  $p(\mathbf{x}, t \rightarrow \infty) \sim e^{-\beta H(\mathbf{x})}$ , as a magnetic field will only lead to rotations of the charged particles around the center. As a result, it is impossible to distinguish among the two systems via the steady-state distribution. However, the underlying dynamics are clearly different. A natural way to quantify the difference between the two dynamics is to compute the Kullback-Liebler divergence from the statistics of trajectories with the magnetic field to the one without it. Accordingly, the toy functional of choice is

$$\dot{\mathbb{I}}_t^{12} = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \ln \frac{P^1(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)}{P^2(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)}, \quad (98)$$

where  $P^i(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$  denotes the propagator with drift  $\mathbf{a}^i$ . This detects the difference in biases that resulted from different drifts that are imposed upon a system.

We thus need to compute the log ratio among the propagator of Eq. (11) [or, equivalently, Eq. (6)], with two different drift terms,  $\mathbf{a}^1$  and  $\mathbf{a}^2$ . Each of these propagators are given by Eq. (67), with the appropriate drift. Namely,

$$P^i(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = P_{1/2}^i\{\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t\} \left[ 1 + D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu} H_3^{\mu\nu\sigma}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) \Delta t^2 + \tilde{\psi}_2^{i,\mu\nu} H_2^{\mu\nu}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) \Delta t^2 + \psi_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} H_4^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) \Delta t^3 + \psi_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi} H_6^{\mu\nu\sigma\rho\zeta\xi}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) \Delta t^4 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right], \quad (99)$$

where

$$P_{1/2}^i(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det[4\pi\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t]}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t)}{4\Delta t} : [\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}^i(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t][\Delta \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}^i(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t] \right\}, \quad (100)$$

$\tilde{\psi}_2^1, \tilde{\psi}_2^2$  also depend on  $\mathbf{a}$  as well as  $\mathbf{D}$  [see Eq. (68)], while  $D^{\rho\sigma} \nabla^\rho D^{\mu\nu}$ ,  $\psi_4$ , and  $\psi_6$  do not depend on  $\mathbf{a}$  (only on  $\mathbf{D}$ ) and hence are the same to both propagators.

Substituting into (98), to order- $\Delta t$  the log-ratio is

$$\ln \frac{P^1(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)}{P^2(\mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)} = \frac{1}{4} \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{x}, t) : \left\{ 2 [\mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{x}, t)] \Delta \mathbf{x} - [\mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{x}, t) \mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{x}, t) - \mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{x}, t) \mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{x}, t)] \Delta t \right\} + (\tilde{\psi}_2^{1,\mu\nu} - \tilde{\psi}_2^{2,\mu\nu}) H_2^{\mu\nu}(\Delta \mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) \Delta t^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (101)$$

Since the last term is already of order  $\Delta t$ , the fluctuations in  $\mathbf{H}_2(\Delta\mathbf{x}, 2\mathbf{D}\Delta t) = \Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x} - 2\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}, t)\Delta t$  are negligible for  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ . Thus, we can insert its mean, which is zero. Overall, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_t = & \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t [\mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') - \mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')] \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') \cdot d\mathbf{X}_{t'} \\ & - \frac{1}{4} \int_0^t \mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') : [\mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')\mathbf{a}^1(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t') - \mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')\mathbf{a}^2(\mathbf{X}_{t'}, t')] dt'. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

Similar to the case with entropy production, it is possible to bypass the rigorous calculation above using similar reasoning as in Ref. [9]. Since, again, the order-3/2 terms vanish, we need to “engineer” propagator conventions that give the right Milstein corrections. Computing entropy production required taking complementary conventions to recreate the symmetric part of the Milstein correction terms. For the toy example at hand, Eq. (98), we need to use the same convention for both processes. Namely, one can show that indeed,

$$\dot{\Pi}_t = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \ln \frac{P_{1/2}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)}{P_{1/2}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda)}. \quad (103)$$

With this combination, the Milstein correction terms cancel. Were one to take “complementary” conventions here, the wrong expression would have been obtained.

Another functional, now with a different symmetry than the above, is a lagged functional of the form

$$\ln[P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda) / P(\mathbf{x} + (1 + \beta)\Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + (1 + \beta)\Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x} + \beta\Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \beta\Delta\lambda)]. \quad (104)$$

An appropriate choice for a low-order convention-dependent propagators would be  $\ln[P_{1/2}^{\alpha+\beta}(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x}, \lambda) / P_{1/2}^\alpha(\mathbf{x} + (1 + \beta)\Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + (1 + \beta)\Delta\lambda | \mathbf{x} + \beta\Delta\mathbf{x}, \lambda + \beta\Delta\lambda)]$ .

With that, we notice that computing any functional of  $P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$  to order  $\Delta t$  always leads to the disappearance of the order- $\Delta t$  terms in Eq. (44). Namely, suppose one computes the arbitrary functional  $\Delta t^{-1} \mathcal{F}[P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)]$ . We Taylor expand

$$\mathcal{F}[P] = \mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}] + \frac{\delta\mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}]}{\delta P} \Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi + \frac{\delta\mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}]}{\delta P} \Delta t \Psi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}]}{\delta P^2} (\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (105)$$

Due to normalization, we know that the means of both  $\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi$  and  $\Delta t \Psi$  are necessarily zero. Since the former is of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ , we may not replace it with its mean. However,  $(\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi)^2$  can be replaced by its mean, which is not nonzero (rather, it is the fluctuations of  $\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi$ ). However, since  $\Delta t \Psi$  is already of order  $\Delta t$ , to order  $\Delta t$ , we replace it with its mean which is zero. Overall, we get,

$$\mathcal{F}[P] = \mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}] + \frac{\delta\mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}]}{\delta P} \Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{F}[P_{1/2}]}{\delta P^2} \langle (\Delta\mathbf{x} \cdot \Phi)^2 | \mathbf{X}_t, t \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \quad (106)$$

Thus, the Milstein propagator suffices for computing first derivatives of the trajectory, so long as they only contain the propagator. However, if one is after a more elaborate functional, mixing among the propagator and  $\Delta\mathbf{x}$ , the order- $\Delta t$  corrections of Eq. (67) would resurface. One such arbitrary example would be  $(\Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x}/\Delta t) \cdot \mathcal{F}[P(\mathbf{x} + \Delta\mathbf{x}, t + \Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)]$ , as now the mean of  $\Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x}\Psi(\Delta\mathbf{x}\Delta\mathbf{x}/\Delta t | \mathbf{x}, t)$  is not zero.

To conclude, when considering general functionals, one can use, robustly, the Milstein propagator of Eq. (56). If, instead, one insists upon using the convention-dependant Euler-Maruyama propagators of Ref. [9], as before, one must carefully choose the conventions that cook up the correct Milstein corrections. The working choice can oftentimes be found using symmetries in the dynamics. This idea is demonstrated for both the entropy production and the toy functionals we considered.

## VI. SUMMARY

In this paper, we have studied the short-time evolution properties of an arbitrary diffusion process, given by either the overdamped Langevin equation, Eq. (11), or its corresponding Fokker-Planck equation, Eq. (6). We have proposed a consistent methodology for obtaining short-time expansions of the propagators. To leading order, the propagator is Gaussian. Higher order corrections, written in the form (4), are polynomials of the displacement, where the first two corrections are computed explicitly.

The approximate propagator is used to compute the entropy production, Eq. (3)—the extent to which a particular stochastic trajectory breaks time-reversal symmetry. It is a key quantity in modern nonequilibrium thermodynamics [1]; with the Einstein

relation, it is related to thermodynamic heat dissipation [9]. Reassuringly, our precise derivation method has given the result that can be found in the literature [9], in spite of previous inaccuracies. We describe, via several toy functionals, how other functionals of the propagators can be evaluated, and what orders of expansions should be kept.

The consistent method with which we derived the propagator expansion pinpoints the mathematical inconsistencies that occurred in previous approaches to derive an analytical expression for the entropy production [1, 9, 18, 23, 28–30]. They originate from the apparent dependence on noise convention. Since the propagator and entropy production are continuous-time properties, they cannot depend on convention, discretization method, or representation of the physical stochastic process. Extensive technical comparisons were detailed in Sec. V. Since the convention-dependent propagators are not of better accuracy compared to the most straightforward Itô propagator, we argue that it is redundant to use any Euler-Maruyama propagator which is not the simplest Itô one. Instead, we suggest to resort, rather, to consistent derivations of the propagator to order  $\Delta t$ , instead of the meticulous construction of a low-order convention-dependent propagator that is chosen to obey the same symmetries as the first derivative of the trajectory at question.

We comment that the path integral approach [18] used, for example, to prove fluctuation theorems and compute entropy production, may occasionally also be inconsistent. While one is able to make the replacements  $\sum \Delta \mathbf{x} \rightarrow \int \dot{\mathbf{x}} dt$  and  $\sum \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t \rightarrow \int \dot{\mathbf{x}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} dt$ , there is no analogue for  $\sum \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} \Delta \mathbf{x} / \Delta t$ . This term already appears in the first correction of the leading-order propagator [the Milstein propagator, Eq. (56)] whenever the diffusivity is position dependent. Thus, on the one hand, to compute “standard” averages such as correlation and response functions, the path-integral approach and its consequential perturbation techniques [18, 35] are still useful since the leading-order propagator suffices. At the same time, since all convention-dependent leading-order propagators are true to the same (leading) order, it is instructive to use the simplest Itô propagator. On the other hand, to compute first derivatives of the trajectory, such as the entropy production, it is formally impossible to convert the convolution of propagators into a path integral (as done, e.g., in Ref. [9]). This is because, as we emphasized during this paper, the first two corrections for the propagator must be included in these cases. The inadequacy of the path integral approach for the calculation of entropy production suggests that the Markov decomposition of Eq. (3) is the more convenient and accurate route for computing the entropy production accumulated over an entire path.

We suggest another application for the above expansions of the propagator as a high-order numerical scheme for SDEs. Since the multiple stochastic integrals of Sec. III D are all correlated and some are non-Gaussian, an implementation of high-order Brownian simulations of  $\mathbf{X}_t$  by approximating Eq. (11) via Eq. (26) or Eq. (27) is not trivial [21]. Namely, it requires expressing  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_t$ ,  $\Delta \mathbf{Z}_t$ ,  $\Delta \mathbf{K}_t$ , and  $\Delta \mathbf{L}_t$  in terms of infinitely-many uncorrelated normal-distributed random variables, which of course is impossible and hence one approximately only finitely-many such variables are taken [21]. Here, on the other hand, we find a simpler alternative to finding averages over Brownian variables based upon the importance sampling Monte-Carlo method [36]. Note that the propagators were based on stochastic schemes with the same strong-order convergence [21], where we have kept the “overshot” drifts  $\mathbf{a}\Delta t$  and  $\boldsymbol{\tau}\Delta t^2$  in the Gaussians of Eqs. (47) and (67), respectively. Thus, at every timestep starting from  $(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$ , respectively to emulate the Euler-Maruyama, Milstein, and order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  methods, pick the displacements  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  from a normal distribution with mean  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)\Delta t$ , *ibid.*, and  $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)\Delta t + \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)\Delta t^2$ , and variance  $2\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X}, t)\Delta t$  in all. Then, perform the weighed average of the quantity of interest, with the weight function  $1$ ,  $1 + \Delta \mathbf{X}_t \cdot \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\Delta \mathbf{X}_t \Delta \mathbf{X}_t / \Delta t | \mathbf{X}_t, t)$ , and  $1 + \Delta \mathbf{X}_t \cdot \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\Delta \mathbf{X}_t \Delta \mathbf{X}_t / \Delta t | \mathbf{X}_t, t) + \Delta t \Psi(\Delta \mathbf{X}_t \Delta \mathbf{X}_t / \Delta t | \mathbf{X}_t, t)$ . This allows computing averages over noise realizations with just a single variable  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$ , by effectively sampling  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_t$  from Eqs. (47), (56), and (67), which correspond to the approximations appearing in Eqs. (23), (26), and (27). Note, however, that the resulting scheme only converges in a weak sense (that is, only on average).

We hope that the role of high-order propagator expansions in stochastic thermodynamics will be further studied, especially when considering functionals or expectation values that do not satisfy known special symmetries.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Haim Diamant for extensive and helpful discussions. T.M. acknowledges funding from the Israel Science Foundation (Grant No. 1356/22).

## Appendix A: Geometric Brownian Motion

We briefly demonstrate our results for the particular example of geometric Brownian motion (GBM). The GBM is a one-dimensional, exactly-solvable stochastic differential equation. It is particularly useful in mathematical finance, where it is used to mimic the time evolution of option prices in the Black–Scholes model [25]. It is given by,

$$dX_t = \mu X_t dt + \sigma X_t dW_t, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where, as usual,  $W_t$  is the Wiener process. The diffusion coefficient here is  $D(x) = \sigma^2 x^2 / 2$  and the drift is  $a(x) = \mu x$ .

In this example, the complete propagator can be obtained exactly. First, the stochastic chain rule [25] yields  $d \ln X_t = (1/X_t)dX_t + (\sigma^2 X_t^2/2)(-1/X_t^2)dt$ . Substituting in Eq. (A1), we find  $d \ln X_t = (\mu + \sigma^2/2)dt + \sigma dW_t$ . Integrating from  $t$  to  $t + \Delta t$  gives the explicit solution of the SDE for any time duration  $\Delta t$  (short or long),

$$\ln X_{t+\Delta t} - \ln X_t = \left( \mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right) \Delta t + \sigma \Delta W_t. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Much like Sec. IV A, we have written the stochastic process  $X_t$  in terms of  $\Delta W_t$  only. Using the normal distribution of  $\Delta W_t$  and the Jacobian  $\partial \Delta W_t / \partial X_t = 1/(\sigma X_t)$ , we find the exact probability to jump from  $X_t = x$  to  $X_{t+\Delta t} = x + \Delta x$  after arbitrary time  $\Delta t$  [25],

$$P(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\Delta t}} \frac{1}{x + \Delta x} \exp \left\{ -\frac{[\ln(x + \Delta x) - \ln x - (\mu - \sigma^2/2)\Delta t]^2}{2\sigma^2\Delta t} \right\}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Note that the exact propagator is not Gaussian.

Once equipped with the exact propagator, we can expand it directly up to order  $\Delta t$ . The leading order reads,

$$P_{1/2}(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\Delta t}} \frac{1}{x} \exp \left[ -\frac{(\Delta x - \mu x \Delta t)^2}{2\sigma^2 x^2 \Delta t} \right]. \quad (\text{A4})$$

It is Gaussian in  $\Delta x$  and has standard deviation of order  $\Delta t^{1/2}$ . Hence, it corresponds to an  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{1/2})$  displacement. We proceed to obtain the first two corrections to this expression which we derived in general during the text. Expanding formally in  $\Delta x$ ,  $1/(1 + \Delta x/x) = 1 - \Delta x/x + \Delta x^2/x^2 + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$  and  $\ln(1 + \Delta x/x) = \Delta x/x - \Delta x^2/(2x^2) + \Delta x^3/(3x^3) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t)}{P_{1/2}(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t)} &= 1 + \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 x^3} \left( \frac{\Delta x^3}{\Delta t} - 3\sigma^2 x^2 \Delta x \right) - \frac{\mu - \sigma^2/2}{2\sigma^2 x^2} (\Delta x^2 - \sigma^2 x^2 \Delta t) \\ &+ \frac{2}{3\sigma^2 x^4} \left( \frac{\Delta x^4}{\Delta t} - 6\sigma^2 x^2 \Delta x^2 + 3\sigma^4 x^4 \Delta t \right) + \frac{1}{8\sigma^4 x^6} \left( \frac{\Delta x^6}{\Delta t^2} - 15\sigma^2 x^2 \frac{\Delta x^4}{\Delta t} + 45\sigma^4 x^4 \Delta x^2 - 15\sigma^6 x^6 \Delta t \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where we have written out explicitly the Hermite polynomials. Indeed, this coincides with our order- $\Delta t^{3/2}$  propagator, Eq. (67), upon inserting  $a(x) = \mu x$  and  $D(x) = \sigma^2 x^2/2$  in Eqs. (63), (64), and (65). Note also that the order- $\Delta t^{1/2}$  term is exactly the correction that appears in the Stratonovich ( $\alpha = 1/2$ ) version of the Euler-Maruyama propagator, Eq. (95). This is expected as in one dimension, the Stratonovich convention coincides with the Milstein propagator. Equation (A5) can be brought to the general form, Eq. (4), with the explicit expressions for the polynomials  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  of  $y = \Delta x^2/\Delta t$ ,

$$P(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t) = P_{1/2}(x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t | x, t) \left[ 1 + \Delta x \Phi \left( \frac{\Delta x^2}{\Delta t} \middle| x, t \right) + \Delta t \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta x^2}{\Delta t} \middle| x, t \right) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) \right] \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\Phi(y | x, t) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2 x^3} y - \frac{3}{2x}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\Psi(y | x, t) = \frac{1}{8\sigma^4 x^6} y^3 - \frac{29}{24\sigma^2 x^4} y^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{15}{4x^2} - \mu \right) y + \frac{1}{2} \left( \mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{4} \right). \quad (\text{A8})$$

With the exact propagator, Eq. (A3), we can compute various functions, including the log-ratio of forward and backward propagators for arbitrary  $\Delta t$ . Dividing by  $\Delta t$  and taking the limit  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$  gives the informatic heat rate. In GBM, the drift and diffusivity are time (protocol) independent, so

$$P(x, t | x + \Delta x, t + \Delta t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2\Delta t}} \frac{1}{x} \exp \left\{ -\frac{[\ln x - \ln(x + \Delta x) - (\mu - \sigma^2/2)\Delta t]^2}{2\sigma^2\Delta t} \right\}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Thus, we have

$$\ln \frac{P(X_t + \Delta X_t, t + \Delta t | X_t, t)}{P(X_t, t | X_t + \Delta X_t, t + \Delta t)} = \frac{2(\mu - \sigma^2)}{\sigma^2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{\Delta X_t}{X_t} \right). \quad (\text{A10})$$

Upon expanding  $\ln(1 + \Delta X_t/X_t) = \Delta X_t/X_t - \Delta X_t^2/(2X_t^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2}) = \dot{X}_t \Delta t / X_t - (\sigma X_t)^2 \Delta t / (2X_t^2) + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^{3/2})$ , we find by definition, Eq. (3),

$$\dot{\Omega}_t = \frac{2(\mu - \sigma^2)}{\sigma^2 X_t} \dot{X}_t - \mu + \sigma^2. \quad (\text{A11})$$



This coincides with Eq. (77),  $d\Omega_t = \{[a(X_t) - D'(X_t)]/D(X_t)\} \cdot dX_t + \{[a(X_t) - D'(X_t)]/D(X_t)\}' D(X_t)dt$ , where  $a(x) = \mu x$ ,  $D(x) = \sigma^2 x^2/2$ , and  $[\cdot]' = (d/dx)[\cdot]$ .

- 
- [1] L. Peliti and S. Pigolotti, *Stochastic Thermodynamics* (Princeton University Press, 2021).
- [2] C. Jarzynski, Nonequilibrium equality for free energy differences, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2690 (1997).
- [3] C. Jarzynski, Equilibrium free-energy differences from nonequilibrium measurements: A master-equation approach, *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 5018 (1997).
- [4] G. E. Crooks, Entropy production fluctuation theorem and the nonequilibrium work relation for free energy differences, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 2721 (1999).
- [5] U. Seifert, Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 126001 (2012).
- [6] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, Three detailed fluctuation theorems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 090601 (2010).
- [7] T. Hatano and S. Sasa, Steady-state thermodynamics of langevin systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 3463 (2001).
- [8] U. Seifert, Entropy production along a stochastic trajectory and an integral fluctuation theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 040602 (2005).
- [9] M. E. Cates, E. Fodor, T. Markovich, C. Nardini, and E. Tjhung, Stochastic hydrodynamics of complex fluids: Discretisation and entropy production, *Entropy* **24**, 254 (2022).
- [10] K. Sekimoto, Langevin Equation and Thermodynamics, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **130**, 17 (1998).
- [11] G. Bisker, M. Polettini, T. R. Gingrich, and J. M. Horowitz, Hierarchical bounds on entropy production inferred from partial information, *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp.* (2017), 093210.
- [12] I. A. Martínez, G. Bisker, J. M. Horowitz, and J. M. R. Parrondo, Inferring broken detailed balance in the absence of observable currents, *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 3542 (2019).
- [13] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, Dissipation bounds all steady-state current fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 120601 (2016).
- [14] D. J. Skinner and J. Dunkel, Estimating entropy production from waiting time distributions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 198101 (2021).
- [15] É. Fodor, C. Nardini, M. E. Cates, J. Tailleur, P. Visco, and F. Van Wijland, How far from equilibrium is active matter?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 038103 (2016).
- [16] R. Kawai, J. M. R. Parrondo, and C. V. den Broeck, Dissipation: The phase-space perspective, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 080602 (2007).
- [17] A. Gomez-Marin, J. M. R. Parrondo, and C. Van den Broeck, Lower bounds on dissipation upon coarse graining, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 011107 (2008).
- [18] A. W. C. Lau and T. C. Lubensky, State-dependent diffusion: Thermodynamic consistency and its path integral formulation, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 011123 (2007).
- [19] Z. Schuss, *Theory and Applications of Stochastic Processes* (Springer, New York, 2010).
- [20] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation* (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1996).
- [21] P. E. Kloeden and E. Platen, *Numerical Solution of Stochastic Differential Equations*, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992).
- [22] H. Touchette, The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics, *Phys. Rep.* **478**, 1 (2009).
- [23] L. F. Cugliandolo and V. Lecomte, Rules of calculus in the path integral representation of white noise langevin equations: the on-sager-machlup approach, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **50**, 345001 (2017).
- [24] I. M. Sokolov, Itô, Stratonovich, Hänggi and all the rest: The thermodynamics of interpretation, *Chem. Phys.* **375**, 359 (2010).
- [25] B. Øksendal, *Stochastic Differential Equations* (Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003).
- [26] L. Onsager, Reciprocal relations in irreversible processes. i., *Phys. Rev.* **37**, 405 (1931).
- [27] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of information theory*, 2nd ed. (Wiley-Interscience, 2006).
- [28] T. A. de Pirey, L. F. Cugliandolo, V. Lecomte, and F. van Wijland, Path integrals and stochastic calculus, *Adv. Phys.* **71**, 1 (2022).
- [29] L. F. Cugliandolo, V. Lecomte, and F. van Wijland, Building a path-integral calculus: a covariant discretization approach, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **52**, 50LT01 (2019).
- [30] L. Onsager and S. Machlup, Fluctuations and irreversible processes, *Phys. Rev.* **91**, 1505 (1953).
- [31] J. Hubbard, Calculation of partition functions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **3**, 77 (1959).
- [32] R. L. Stratonovich, On a method of calculating quantum distribution functions, *Doklady Akad. Nauk S.S.S.R.* **115**, 1097 (1957).
- [33] M. Kac, On distributions of certain wiener functionals, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **65**, 1 (1949).
- [34] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal polynomials* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1975).
- [35] D. Martin, J. O'Byrne, M. E. Cates, E. Fodor, C. Nardini, J. Tailleur, and F. van Wijland, Statistical mechanics of active ornstein-uhlenbeck particles, *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, 032607 (2021).
- [36] M. P. Allen and T. J. Tildesley, *Computer simulation of liquids*, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2017).