

# Non-equilibrium work relations.

Jorge Kurchan

*PMMH-ESPCI, CNRS UMR 7636, 10 rue Vauquelin, 75005 Paris, FRANCE*

## Abstract

This is a brief review of recently derived relations describing the behaviour of systems far from equilibrium. They include the Fluctuation Theorem, Jarzynski's and Crooks' equalities, and an extended form of the Second Principle for general steady states. They are very general and their proofs are, in most cases, disconcertingly simple.

# 1 Introduction

In the last few years, a group of relations were derived involving the distribution of work done on a system by non-conservative and/or time-dependent forces [1, 2, 3] (for reviews, see [4]). It seems they have not been noticed before the nineties [5], even though in most cases the proofs require techniques that have been around for many decades. I shall discuss them here in the context of systems that are purely Hamiltonian, or, when a thermostat is needed, in contact with a stochastic thermal bath [6, 7]. In order to stress their similarity, before going to the actual proofs, I shall list and comment them:

- *‘Transient’ Fluctuation Relation [1]*: starting from a configuration chosen randomly with the Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution at temperature  $T = \beta^{-1}$ , and applying non-conservative forces the work done  $W$  is a random <sup>1</sup> variable distributed according to a law  $P(W)$ , which clearly depends upon the process. We have then the relation, independent of both model and process:

$$\ln P(W) - \ln P(-W) = \beta W \quad (1.1)$$

An equivalent, and sometimes more direct form is obtained by multiplying the exponential of (1.1) by  $e^{-\lambda W}$  and integrating. For . real  $\lambda$ :

$$\langle e^{\lambda W} \rangle_{equil} = \langle e^{-(\beta+\lambda)W} \rangle_{equil} \quad (1.2)$$

where  $\langle \bullet \rangle_{equil}$  denotes average over trajectories starting from thermal equilibrium.

- *Stationary state Fluctuation Relation [2, 8, 6, 7]*: In this version, we consider a driven stationary system. We compute the work over a period of time  $t$  starting from different initial configurations chosen with the stationary, (in general non-Gibbsean) distribution. A formula like (1.1) also holds, but this time only for large  $t$ , when we can write that  $P(W)$  converges to a large-deviation form:

$$\ln P(W) \sim t\zeta\left(\frac{W}{t}\right) + \text{smaller orders in } t \quad (1.3)$$

- *Jarzynski equality [3]*: Starting from an equilibrium configuration, we vary some parameter  $\alpha$  (e.g. magnetic field, volume,...) of the system from  $\alpha_1$  to  $\alpha_N$  at an arbitrary rate, and record the work done  $W$ . Averaging over several individual realisations, we have that:

$$\langle e^{-\beta W} \rangle_{\alpha_1} = e^{-\beta[F(\alpha_N) - F(\alpha_1)]} \quad (1.4)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Even if the dynamics are deterministic, since the initial condition is itself random.

Note the puzzling appearance of the *equilibrium* free energy at the final value  $\alpha_N$  of the parameter, even though the system is not assumed to equilibrate at that value!

Clearly, the Jarzynski relation implies the second principle

$$\langle \beta W \rangle \geq \beta [F(\alpha_N) - F(\alpha_1)] \quad (1.5)$$

through Jensen's inequality  $\ln \langle A \rangle \geq \langle \ln A \rangle$ .

- *Extended Second Law for transitions between non-equilibrium stationary states* [9]  
Consider a driven system with dynamic variables  $\mathbf{x}$  and external fields  $\alpha$  (e.g. shear rate, temperature gradient, etc) that admits non-equilibrium steady states with distribution  $\rho_{SS}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha) = e^{-\phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)}$ . We now take a stationary state at  $\alpha = \alpha_1$  and at arbitrary speed make a transition from  $\alpha_1$  to  $\alpha_N$  in such a way that stationarity is achieved at  $\alpha_N$ , but *not* necessarily at all the intermediate values. Repeating the experiment with many initial conditions, the following equality holds:

$$\left\langle e^{-\int dt \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \dot{\alpha}} \right\rangle = 1 \quad (1.6)$$

Again, using Jensen's inequality we obtain:

$$\left\langle \int \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha \right\rangle \geq 0 \quad (1.7)$$

The content of this inequality is that for a process  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_N$  there is a bound on a functional of the trajectories whose form is given entirely by the values  $\alpha$  traversed. The analogy with the second law is completed by showing that the equality holds for a process that can be considered to be in the stationary distribution at all times, since then:

$$\left\langle \int \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} d\alpha \right\rangle = \int d\mathbf{x} d\alpha e^{-\phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)} \frac{\partial \phi(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)}{\partial \alpha} = \int d\mathbf{x} [\rho(\mathbf{x}; \alpha_N) - \rho(\mathbf{x}; \alpha_1)] = 0 \quad (1.8)$$

These processes play the role of reversible processes for non-driven systems.

In the particular case in which the stationary states for all  $\alpha$  are equilibrium states, we have that

$$\rho_{SS}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha) = \frac{e^{-\beta E(\mathbf{x}, \alpha)}}{e^{-\beta F(\alpha)}} \quad \phi_{SS}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha) = \beta(E(\mathbf{x}, \alpha) - F(\alpha)) \quad (1.9)$$

and (1.6) and (1.7) reduce to a form of the Jarzynski equality and the second law, respectively.

## NOTES:

- The fluctuation relations are statements about the asymmetry of the distribution of work *around zero, and not around the maximum*. They involve negative work tails which are usually very rare: heat flowing from cold to hot reservoirs, fluids forcing rheometers to move faster, etc. These events become all the more rare in macroscopic systems, since their probability is exponentially small in the size. This has spurred from the beginning the search (with some success, see [10]) of ‘local’ versions of the fluctuation relation involving the work on a subsystem, whose fluctuations are more easily observable.

- Similarly, the average in Jarzynski’s equality Eq. (1.4) is dominated by trajectories having a very low value of  $W$  which occur with extremely low probability – exponentially small in the system size. This is in strict analogy with ‘annealed’ averages in disordered systems, which are dominated by very rare samples with unusually low free energy.

- That the transient fluctuation relation and the Jarzynski equality are closed relatives can already be seen by considering a process where initial and final external fields coincide  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_N$ . In that case  $F(\alpha_N) - F(\alpha_1) = 0$ , and the Jarzynski relation is a consequence of the fluctuation relation, since:

$$\langle e^{-\beta W} \rangle = \int dW P(W) e^{-\beta W} = \int dW P(-W) = 1 \quad (1.10)$$

One can also deduce Jarzynski’s relation from the Transient Fluctuation Theorem by considering the distribution of work done by a *conservative* force switched on at  $t = 0$ , and using the fact that the initial distribution is Gibbsian.

A more general connection has been given by Crooks [11], who derived a formula that contains both. For a system with a time-dependent energy, starting in equilibrium:

$$\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_{forward} = \langle \mathcal{F}_r e^{-\beta W_d} \rangle_{reversed} \quad (1.11)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_r$  are any functional of a trajectory and its time-reversed, and  $W_d$  is the ‘dissipative’ work –the extra work with respect to a reversible, process. We obtain the transient fluctuation theorem and the Jarzynski inequalities putting  $\mathcal{F} = \delta\{W - W_d[\mathbf{x}]\}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = 1$ , respectively.

- The fluctuation theorem can also be extended to cases where the system is driven by the contact with two thermal baths at different temperatures, rather than by mechanical work [12].

- The inequality (1.8) is remarkable in that it says that there is a bound on a quantity for a process that is taken from one stationary non-equilibrium state to another, thus generalising the second law. The trouble is that, while for the second law we have an explicit expression (and a measurement protocol) for the work and free energy, we do not have that for general  $\phi(x, \alpha)$ .

- In general, these relations are of two different kinds: those in which the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution of the initial configuration is assumed (transient fluctuation and Jarzynski's relations), and those where it is not (stationary fluctuation relation, generalised second law). It turns out that the former are always simple to prove, while the latter, though simple for stochastic dynamics, turn out to require more sophisticated tools in deterministic cases. The reason is clear: since we do not assume equilibration at the outset, some assumption of ergodicity becomes necessary, and this is trivial in systems in contact with stochastic, but not in with deterministic baths. In fact, the stationary fluctuation 'Gallavotti-Cohen' theorem[2] (valid for a class of deterministic thermostats) is quite a technical feat, and the Hatano-Sasa generalisation of the second law for driven systems has not, to my knowledge, been extended yet to the deterministic case.

- By construction, for the Langevin systems we shall use here, we can consider that the heat entering the bath is immediately shared by all of it. This will not be the case with a true (e.g. water) bath, so that during the process the bath itself falls out of equilibrium, and in particular has an ill-defined temperature. The Jarzynski relation is however still valid, but one has to include in  $\delta F$  also the contribution coming from the bath-system interaction terms. See [13] for a discussion.

- The fluctuation relation is also valid for periodically driven systems with symmetric cycles, both in the transient and in the stationary forms, as can be easily seen from Crooks' relation. Here measurements are taken at the end of an integer number of cycles, and 'stationary' in fact means 'periodic'.

- The extension of these results to Quantum systems is rather straightforward [15]. In order to avoid the problem of introducing non-conservative forces in Shroedinger's equation, it is sometimes conceptually easier to consider periodic, time-dependent gradient forces.

## 2 Probability distributions of symmetry-breaking terms.

As a warming up exercise, let us see what is the effect on the probability distribution of a broken discrete symmetry [14, 16]. Consider a classical system with variables  $s_1, \dots, s_N$  and energy  $E_o(\mathbf{s}) - \frac{h}{2}M(\mathbf{s})$  with  $E_o$  having the discrete symmetry  $E_o(\mathbf{s}) = E_o(-\mathbf{s})$  and  $M(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_i s_i$  so that

$$E(-\mathbf{s}) = E(\mathbf{s}) + hM(\mathbf{s}) \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$M(-\mathbf{s}) = -M(\mathbf{s}) \quad (2.13)$$

If  $h = 0$ , the total energy is symmetric, and this implies, amongst other things, the vanishing of all odd correlation functions.

Can we conclude something in the presence of  $h \neq 0$ , when the symmetry is broken? Indeed, we can: consider the distribution of the symmetry-breaking term

$$P [M(\mathbf{s}) = -M] = \int d\mathbf{s} \delta [M(\mathbf{s}) + M] e^{-\beta(E_o - \frac{h}{2}M)} \quad (2.14)$$

Changing variables  $\mathbf{s} \rightarrow -\mathbf{s}$ , and using the symmetry of  $E_o$ :

$$P [M(\mathbf{s}) = -M] = \int d\mathbf{s} \delta [-M(\mathbf{s}) + M] e^{-\beta(E_o + \frac{h}{2}M)} = e^{-\beta h M} P [M(\mathbf{s}) = M] \quad (2.15)$$

or

$$\ln P [M(\mathbf{s}) = M] - \ln P [M(\mathbf{s}) = -M] = \beta h M \quad (2.16)$$

Note that we have said nothing about  $E$  apart from the fact that its symmetry-violating term is  $hM$ . An alternative way to state (2.16) is to say that for any  $\lambda$ ,

$$\langle e^{\lambda M} \rangle = \langle e^{-(\lambda + \beta h)M} \rangle \quad (2.17)$$

where here  $\langle \bullet \rangle$  stands for equilibrium average.

This relation is clearly valid for the Ising ferromagnet in a field in any dimension. It tells us something about the relation between the probability of observing a given magnetisation and the reversed one, but note that in the thermodynamic limit one of the two probabilities is vanishingly small.

The formal similarity with the fluctuation relation is obvious.

### 3 Langevin and Kramers Equations

We will consider the Langevin dynamics [18]

$$m\ddot{q}_i + \gamma\dot{q}_i + \partial_{q_i}U(q) + f_i = \Gamma_i, \quad (3.18)$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .  $\Gamma_i$  is a delta-correlated white noise with variance  $2\gamma T$ . The  $f_i$  are velocity-independent forces that do not necessarily derive from a potential. The limit  $\gamma = 0$  corresponds to Hamiltonian dynamics. We shall not consider here the over-damped  $m = 0$  case, as it brings about the Ito vs. Stratonovitch convention complications, which add nothing conceptually.

If  $m \neq 0$  the probability distribution at time  $t$  for the process (3.18) is expressed in terms of the phase-space variables  $\mathbf{x} \equiv (\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v})$  and is given by

$$\rho(q, v, t) = e^{-tH} \rho(q, v, 0) \quad (3.19)$$

where  $H$  is the Kramers operator [18]:

$$H = \partial_{q_i} v_i - \frac{1}{m} \partial_{v_i} \left( \gamma v_i + (\partial_{q_i} U(q)) + f_i + \gamma \frac{T}{m} \partial_{v_i} \right) = H^c - \frac{1}{m} \partial_{v_i} f_i, \quad (3.20)$$

and  $\partial_{q_i}$  and  $\partial_{v_i}$  denote derivatives, and on the r.h.s. we have explicitated the conservative and driven parts. Denoting  $|- \rangle$  with  $\langle \mathbf{x} | - \rangle = 1$  the flat distribution, probability conservation is guaranteed by

$$\langle - | H = 0 \quad (3.21)$$

A stationary state satisfies:

$$H|\rho_{SS}\rangle = 0 \quad ; \quad \langle - | \rho_{SS}\rangle = 1 \quad (3.22)$$

In the absence of driving forces:

$$\langle x | \rho_{SS}\rangle = e^{-\beta(E(x)-F)} \quad (3.23)$$

where  $F$  is the free energy at that temperature.

The evolution operator for a dynamics that does not depend explicitly on time is:  $U = e^{-tH}$ . For a Langevin process depending upon time through a parameter (say)  $\alpha(t)$ , it can be written as a product by dividing  $t$  into a large number  $M$  of time-intervals:

$$U = e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_1)} \quad (3.24)$$

Given an observable  $A(\mathbf{x}; \alpha)$ , we can compute an average over trajectories, starting from the equilibrium state corresponding to  $\alpha_1$ :

$$\langle x | \alpha_1 \rangle = \exp\{-\beta(E(\mathbf{x}; \alpha_1) - F(\alpha_1))\} \quad (3.25)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle e^{\int_0^t dt' A(\mathbf{x}, \alpha(t'))} \right\rangle_{\alpha_1} &= \langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_2)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_1)} | \alpha_1 \rangle \\
&\sim \langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_M) + A(\alpha_M))} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_2) + A(\alpha_2))} e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_1) + A(\alpha_1))} | \alpha_1 \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

In the particular case in which  $\alpha$  is time-independent:

$$\left\langle e^{\int_0^t dt' A(\mathbf{x}, \alpha(t'))} \right\rangle_{\alpha} = \langle - | e^{-t(H(\alpha) + A)} | \alpha \rangle \tag{3.27}$$

### 3.1 Second Law and reversibility in the stochastic case

A non-increasing functional of the distribution  $\rho(x)$  can be defined as [19]

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \int dx \rho(x) (T \ln \rho(x) + E(x)) \tag{3.28}$$

and may be interpreted as an out of equilibrium generalised free-energy. If the energy depends on time via a parameter  $\alpha$ , a short calculation using (3.20) gives:

$$\dot{\mathcal{H}} = \int d\mathbf{x} \left[ \left( \frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha} \dot{\alpha} - f \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) \rho + \gamma \sum_i \int d\mathbf{q} d\mathbf{v} \frac{(mv_i \rho - T \partial_{v_i} \rho)^2}{m^2 \rho} \right] \tag{3.29}$$

We have, for a closed cycle

$$\begin{aligned}
&\oint dt \left[ \int d\mathbf{x} \left( \int d\mathbf{x} \frac{\partial E}{\partial \alpha} \dot{\alpha} - f \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) \rho(x) \right] \\
&= \gamma \oint dt \sum_i \int d\mathbf{q} d\mathbf{v} \frac{(mv_i \rho - T \partial_{v_i} \rho)^2}{m^2 \rho} \geq 0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

i.e. the ‘second law’ for these systems.

A reversible process is defined here as *one in which  $\rho(\mathbf{x})$  can be considered to be at all times Maxwellian in the velocities, so that the r.h.s. vanishes*<sup>2</sup>. To the extent that Maxwellian distribution of velocities implies the Gibbs-Boltzmann distribution in all phase-space variables at all times, we have that the variation in  $\mathcal{H}$  indeed coincides with the equilibrium free-energy difference.

---

<sup>2</sup>In the pure Hamiltonian  $\gamma = 0$  case the equality is satisfied at all times, a consequence of Liouville’s theorem.



## 3.2 Time-reversal and work

The evolution of the system satisfies in the absence of non-conservative forces a form of detailed balance:

$$\langle q', v' | e^{-tH^c} | q, v \rangle e^{-\beta E(q, v)} = \langle q, -v | e^{-tH^c} | q', -v' \rangle e^{-\beta E(q', -v')} \quad (3.31)$$

where the total energy is  $E(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i m v_i^2 + U(q)$ . This leads to a symmetry property, which in operator notation reads:

$$Q^{-1} H^c Q = H^{c \dagger} \quad (3.32)$$

where the operator  $Q$  is defined by:

$$Q | q, v \rangle \equiv e^{-\beta E(x)} | q, -v \rangle \quad (3.33)$$

In the presence of arbitrary forces  $f_i$ , equation (3.32) is modified to:

$$Q^{-1} H Q = H^\dagger + \beta f_i v_i \equiv H^\dagger - S^\dagger \quad ; \quad Q^{-1} (H - S) Q = H^\dagger \quad (3.34)$$

The operator  $S$  is the power done on the system divided by the temperature

$$S^\dagger = -\beta f \cdot v \quad (3.35)$$

We also have:

$$Q^{-1} S Q = -S^\dagger \quad (3.36)$$

Eqs. (3.34) and (3.36) are the analogues of equations (2.12) and (2.13) above, with time-reversal playing the role of spin-flip, and  $S$  the role of the magnetisation. It should come as no surprise that a relation for the large deviations of  $S$  is at hand!

Before closing this section, let us see what the implications of (3.34) and (3.36) are for a time-dependent evolution. We start with a product as in (3.26)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_2)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_1)} \right]^\dagger \\ &= e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H^\dagger(\alpha_1) + A(\alpha_1))} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H^\dagger(\alpha_{M-1}) + A(\alpha_2))} e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H^\dagger(\alpha_M) + A(\alpha_M))} \end{aligned} \quad (3.37)$$

For each factor, we now use (3.34) to transform the exponents according to:

$$H^\dagger(\alpha_l) + A = Q^{-1}(\alpha_l) [H(\alpha_l) - S(\alpha_l) + A_r(\alpha_l)] Q(\alpha_l) \quad (3.38)$$

where we had to specify the dependence of  $Q(\alpha)$  on  $\alpha$  coming from the dependence of  $Q$  on the energy (Eq. (3.33)), and we have defined  $A_r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}; \alpha) \equiv A(\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{v}, \alpha)$ . We hence get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_2)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M} A(\alpha_1)} \right]^\dagger \\ &= Q^{-1}(\alpha_1) e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_1) - S(\alpha_1) + A_r(\alpha_1))} Q(\alpha_1) \dots \\ & \quad Q^{-1}(\alpha_{M-1}) e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_{M-1}) - S(\alpha_{M-1}) + A_r(\alpha_{M-1}))} Q(\alpha_{M-1}) \\ & \quad Q^{-1}(\alpha_M) e^{-\frac{t}{M} (H(\alpha_M) - S(\alpha_M) + A_r(\alpha_M))} Q(\alpha_M) \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

Now,

$$Q^{-1}(\alpha_l)Q(\alpha_{l+1}) = e^{-\beta(E(\alpha_{l+1})-E(\alpha_l))} \quad (3.40)$$

and we finally obtain, for large  $M$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_2)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_1)} \right]^\dagger \\ &= Q^{-1}(\alpha_1) e^{-\frac{t}{M}(H(\alpha_1)+B(\alpha_1))} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}(H(\alpha_{M-1})+B(\alpha_{M-1}))} e^{-\frac{t}{N}(H(\alpha_M)+B(\alpha_M))} Q(\alpha_M) \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

where we have defined:

$$B(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}; \alpha_l) = A_r(\alpha_l) - \beta[S(\alpha_l) - (E(\alpha_l) - E(\alpha_{l-1}))] \quad (3.42)$$

This is the general formula for time-reversal, and is in fact two steps away from both the Fluctuation Theorems and Jarzynski's equality.

## 4 Relations

### *Crooks' Relation*

Let us compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle e^{\int_0^t dt' A(\mathbf{x}, \alpha(t'))} \right\rangle_{\alpha_1} &= \langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_1)} | \alpha_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle \alpha_1 | \left[ e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_1)} \right]^\dagger | - \rangle \\ &= \langle \alpha_1 | Q^{-1}(\alpha_1) e^{-\frac{t}{M}(H(\alpha_1)+B(\alpha_1))} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{N}(H(\alpha_M)+B(\alpha_M))} Q(\alpha_M) | - \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

where we have used (3.41). Now, from Eq. (3.33):

$$Q(\alpha_M) | - \rangle = |\alpha_M \rangle e^{\beta F(\alpha_M)} \quad \langle \alpha_1 | Q^{-1}(\alpha_1) = e^{-\beta F(\alpha_1)} \langle - | \quad (4.44)$$

so that we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle e^{\int_0^t dt' A(\mathbf{x}, \alpha(t'))} \right\rangle_{\alpha_1} &= \langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_M)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_M)} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{M}H(\alpha_1)} e^{\frac{t}{M}A(\alpha_1)} | \alpha_1 \rangle \\ &= e^{-\beta(F(\alpha_M)-F(\alpha_1))} \langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M}(H(\alpha_1)+B(\alpha_1))} \dots e^{-\frac{t}{N}(H(\alpha_M)+B(\alpha_M))} | \alpha_M \rangle \\ &= \left\langle e^{\int_0^t dt' A_r(\mathbf{x}, \alpha(t')) - \beta W_d} \right\rangle_{\alpha_M} \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

where

$$W_d = F(\alpha_M) - F(\alpha_1) - \int dt \left( f \cdot \mathbf{v} - \frac{\partial E}{\partial t} \right) \quad (4.46)$$

This is Crooks' equality, which relates averages over two groups of trajectories, starting from equilibrium at  $\alpha_1$  and at  $\alpha_M$ , respectively.

*Jarzynski's Relation*

Putting  $A = 0$  we immediately get Jarzynski's relation, for a process starting in equilibrium for  $\alpha_M$ :

$$1 = \left\langle e^{-\beta W_d} \right\rangle_{\alpha_M} \quad (4.47)$$

*Transient Fluctuation Theorem.*

To obtain the transient fluctuation theorem for a system with time-independent parameters  $\dot{\alpha} = 0$  we set:

$$A = \lambda \left( f \cdot \mathbf{v} - \frac{\partial E}{\partial t} \right) \quad (4.48)$$

so that  $\int dt A = -\int dt A_r = W_d$ , and Eq. (4.45) becomes, in this case:

$$\left\langle e^{\lambda W_d} \right\rangle_{\alpha} = \left\langle e^{-(\lambda+\beta)W_d} \right\rangle_{\alpha} \quad (4.49)$$

which is the transient Fluctuation Theorem in the form (1.2). Multiplying both sides by  $e^{-\lambda W}$  ( $W$  a constant) and integrating both sides over  $\lambda$  we obtain a representation of the  $\delta$ -function, and we thus have:

$$\langle \delta(W_d - W) \rangle_{\alpha} = \langle \delta(W_d + W) \rangle_{\alpha} e^{\beta W} \quad ; \quad P(W_d = W) = P(W_d = -W) e^{\beta W} \quad (4.50)$$

i.e., Eq. (1.1).

*Generalised Second Law: the Hatano-Sasa derivation.*

Hatano and Sasa have given a truly simple derivation of a generalisation of the Second Law, valid for transitions between non-equilibrium steady states. Let us denote the steady states associated with a fixed (time-independent) value of the parameter  $\alpha$  as  $|\rho(\alpha)\rangle$  (and  $\rho_{SS}(\alpha_a) = \langle \mathbf{x} | \rho(\alpha_a) \rangle$ ):

$$H(\alpha_a) |\rho(\alpha_a)\rangle = 0 \quad (4.51)$$

Let us compute for small time steps:

$$\langle - | e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_M)} \frac{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_M)}{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_{M-1})} \dots \frac{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_3)}{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_2)} e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_2)} \frac{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_2)}{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_1)} e^{-\frac{t}{M} H(\alpha_1)} | \rho(\alpha_1) \rangle = 1 \quad (4.52)$$

which can be proved just by going from left to right step by step. Defining:

$$\phi_{SS}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha_a) = -\ln \rho_{SS}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha_a) \quad (4.53)$$

we have that:

$$\left\langle e^{-\int dt \phi_{ss}(\mathbf{x}; \alpha) \dot{\alpha}} \right\rangle_{\rho_{SS}(\alpha_1)} = 1 \quad (4.54)$$

i.e. Eq. (1.6).

### *The Stationary Fluctuation Theorem*

Consider again the transient fluctuation theorem for a system with time-independent parameters  $\dot{\alpha} = 0$ . In looking for a stationary version of the fluctuation relation, we shall need to consider the power over long times. In preparation for this, let us rescale the quantities in (4.50) in a natural way. Denoting  $t$  the total time, define  $w = W/t$  as the work per unit time,  $\pi(w) = tP(wt)$  the corresponding probability distribution, and

$$\zeta(w) \equiv \frac{\ln \pi(w)}{t} \quad (4.55)$$

the logarithm of the probability. We have then that (4.50) becomes:

$$\zeta_\alpha(w) - \zeta_\alpha(-w) = \beta t w \quad (4.56)$$

where we have added the subindex  $\alpha$  to remind that the relation is valid at all times starting from the equilibrium corresponding to  $\alpha$ .

If we now prove the (very reasonable) result that the distribution of work per unit times becomes, for large time-intervals, independent of the initial situation, then this last relation will apply to all cases. In other words, if we prove that:

$$\zeta_{any}(w) - \zeta_\alpha(w) = \text{order smaller than } t \quad (4.57)$$

then we shall have

$$\zeta(w) - \zeta(-w) = \beta t w + \text{order smaller than } t \quad (4.58)$$

for any initial configuration, in particular one obtained from the stationary (non-Gibbsean) distribution. *Note that the difficulties we might encounter are the usual ones with ergodicity issues, and we are not to blame the Fluctuation Relation itself.* Here is where the approach with a stochastic bath becomes simpler than the one with a deterministic bath: ergodicity in the former is automatic, though of course put by hand.

Let us start by writing:

$$P(W) = \langle \delta(W_d - wt) \rangle_{init} = \int d\lambda \langle e^{\lambda(W_d - wt)} \rangle_{init} = \int d\lambda \langle -|e^{(H+\lambda S)}|_{init} \rangle e^{-t\lambda w} \quad (4.59)$$

where we have used (3.27), starting from the distribution  $|init\rangle$ .

Introducing the right and left eigenvectors:

$$(H + \lambda S)|\psi_a^R(\lambda)\rangle = \mu_a(\lambda)|\psi_a^R(\lambda)\rangle \quad ; \quad \langle\psi_a^L(\lambda)|(H + \lambda S) = \mu_a(\lambda)\langle\psi_a^L(\lambda)| \quad (4.60)$$

we have:

$$e^{t\zeta_{init}(w)} = t \int_{-i\infty}^{+i\infty} d\lambda \sum_a \langle -|\psi_a^R(\lambda)\rangle \langle\psi_a^L(\lambda)|init\rangle e^{-t(\mu_a(\lambda)-\lambda w)} \quad (4.61)$$

Denoting  $\mu_0(\lambda)$  the eigenvalue with lowest real part and the corresponding left and right eigenvectors  $|\psi_0^R(\lambda)\rangle$  and  $|\psi_0^L(\lambda)\rangle$  and assuming that the eigenvalue  $\mu_0(\lambda)$  is non-degenerate, the integral over  $\lambda$  will be dominated for large  $t$  by the saddle point value:

$$\zeta(w) = \mu_0(\lambda_{sp}) - \lambda_{sp}w \quad (4.62)$$

where the saddle point  $\lambda_{sp}$  is a function of  $w$  determined by:

$$\frac{d\mu_0}{d\lambda}(\lambda_{sp}) = w \quad (4.63)$$

*We have shown that the dependence upon the initial distribution is sub-dominant for large  $t$ , which is all we needed.* In doing these last steps, we have assumed that the initial state has non-zero overlap with the lowest eigenvalue, and that the limit  $t \rightarrow \infty$  is taken before any other *including the pure Hamiltonian*  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$  one. All these assumptions are just ways of saying that we are assuming that the system reaches the same steady state in finite times, a fact of which we are guaranteed for a finite, non-zero temperature stochastic system with bounded potentials.

## 5 Deterministic versus Stochastic Dynamics

The results derived in these sections fall in two classes: those that do not need (but may have) a thermostat and those for which thermostating is unavoidable.

The first class includes Crooks' relation and its consequences the Transient Fluctuation and the Jarzynski relations. These relations hold under the hypothesis that the system starts from the Gibbs-Boltzmann measure. The derivations are equally valid in the purely deterministic  $\gamma = 0$  case. On the contrary, the stationary Fluctuation Theorem and the Hatano-Sasa derivation involve stationary driven states, and this requires thermostating (in particular, we can not set  $\gamma = 0$  in this case).

We have avoided all potential difficulties by working with a stochastic Langevin bath, thanks to which the properties of thermostatted steady states are extremely

simple. Had we chosen to work instead with a deterministic thermostat, we would have to face all the difficulties associated with a fractal stationary measure, and the question of chaoticity of the dynamics would also become important. This is what makes the stationary fluctuation Gallavotti-Cohen [2] theorem quite more involved than anything we have attempted here.

Is the extra effort of working with deterministic thermostats worth it? From the point of view of understanding irreversibility and ergodicity in general, the answer is clearly yes. A very convincing way to see this is to consider the derivation leading to ‘second principle’ for systems with Langevin baths Eq. (3.30): its two-line simplicity is appealing, but it teaches us very little about how irreversibility arises in real Hamiltonian systems.

There is however a context in which a stochastic approach is very convenient. The Stationary Fluctuation Relation has been checked in a number of experiments [4]. The thermostating mechanism in such cases is never of the (deterministic, time-reversible) kind assumed in the Gallavotti-Cohen theorem, and we do not know whether the chaoticity properties assumed in that theorem hold. Indeed, the experiment is sometimes presented as a test of whether those assumptions are reasonable (if perhaps not literally true) for the system in question. It is sometimes argued on physical grounds that since the thermostat is ‘far away’ from the relevant part of system, its exact nature is irrelevant. Clearly, if it is true that the details of a remote thermostat become irrelevant, it is much more convenient to consider a stochastic thermostat, for which the Stationary Fluctuation Relation is trivially and generally valid, without any assumptions on the system itself.

## 6 Conclusions

This review addresses a literature with several hundred articles in a few pages, so it is naturally very incomplete. The most serious omission is the experimental work, and the possible practical applications – the reader may find this in the reviews [4].

The literature is quite divided on the role of these relations. In order of decreasing optimism, whether they really teach us something deep about irreversibility, or are a practical tool for measuring properties of medium scale systems, or are interesting simply because ‘there is not much else’ that is known far from equilibrium. It seems fair to say that, whatever the final conclusion, these equalities give us a more complete perspective of the Second Law.

## References

- [1] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 71, 2401 (1993);  
D. J. Evans and D. J. Searles, *Phys. Rev. E* 50, 1645 (1994).
- [2] G. Gallavotti and E.G.D. Cohen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74, 2694-2697 (1995);  
*J. Stat. Phys.* 80, 931-970 (1995).
- [3] C. Jarzynski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2690 (1997); *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 5018 (1997).
- [4] A broad review with an emphasis in experimental results and applications is:  
F. Ritort, Séminaire Poincare (6 Dec 2003), p.63 and cond-mat/0401311,  
a more technical one specialized in the Fluctuation Relation is: D. Evans and  
D. Searles, *Adv. Phys.* **51**, 1529 (2002),  
See the corresponding chapter of: G. Gallavotti, *Statistical Mechanics A Short  
Treatise* Series Texts and Monographs in Physics, Springer Verlag (1999) avail-  
able in <http://ipparco.roma1.infn.it/pagine/libri.html>.
- [5] Some precedents: T. Yamada and K. Kawasaki, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* 38, 1031  
(1967),  
G.N. Bochkov and Yu.E. Kuzovlev, *Sov. Phys. JETP*, 45, 125 (1977);  
G.N. Bochkov and Yu.E. Kuzovlev, *Sov. Phys. JETP*, 49, 543 (1979);  
G.N. Bochkov and Yu.E. Kuzovlev, *Physica A* 106, 443 (1981).
- [6] J. Kurchan, *J. Phys. A (Math. Gen.)* **31**, 3719 (1998); this is a place to point  
out the unfair (but involuntary) omission of the work of Evans et. al. in the  
references there.
- [7] J. L. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, *J. Stat. Phys.* 95, 333 (1999)
- [8] A comparison between the stationary and the transient situation can be found  
in: E. G. D. Cohen, G. Gallavotti, *J. Stat. Phys.* 96 (5-6): 1343-1349 (1999)
- [9] This was done for Langevin systems by Hatano T, Sasa S, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86  
(16): 3463 (2001),  
in an effort to better understand the approach by Paniconi and Oono: Y. Oono,  
and M. Paniconi, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* 130, 29-44 (1998), see Shin-ichi  
Sasa, Hal Tasaki, cond-mat/0411052
- [10] A very incomplete list: Giovanni Gallavotti, Fabio Perroni, cond-mat/9909007,  
Ayton G, Evans DJ, Searles DJ, *J. Chem. Phys.* 115 (5): 2033-2037 AUG 1  
2001,

- C. Maes, F. Redig and M. Verschuere, *Moscow Mathematical Journal* 1. 421-438 (2001), cond-mat/0106639,  
 Bonetto F, Lebowitz JL *Phys. Rev. E* 64 (5) 056129 Part 2, (2001).
- [11] G. E. Crooks, *J. Stat. Phys.* **90**, 1481 (1998);  
 G. E. Crooks, *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, 2361 (2000).
- [12] Eckmann JP, Pillet CA, Rey-Bellet L *J. Stat. Phys.* 95 (1-2): 305 (1999) Rey-Bellet L, Thomas LE, *Ann. Henri Poincare* 3 (3): 483 (2002).
- [13] E.G.D. Cohen and D. Mauzerall, *J. Stat. Mech.* P07006 (2004); and the reply : C. Jarzynski, *J. Stat. Mech: Theor. Exp.* P09005 (2004)
- [14] Bonetto F, Gallavotti G, Garrido PL *PHYSICA D* 105 (4): 226 1997
- [15] See for the quantum fluctuation theorem: J. Kurchan, cond-mat/0007360;  
 T. Monnai and S. Tasaki, cond-mat/0308337;  
 W. De Roeck and C. Maes, cond-mat/0309498.  
 A.E. Allahverdyan, Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, cond-mat/0408697. and for the corresponding Jarzynski equality: S. Yukawa, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* 69, 2370 (2000) eprint cond-mat/0007456.,  
 S. Mukamel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90, 170604 (2003);  
 C. Jarzynski and D. K. Wojcik *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92, 230602 (2004).
- [16] C. Maes, *J. Stat. Phys.* 95, 367 (1999).
- [17] G. Gallavotti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** 4334 (1996).
- [18] H. Risken; *The Fokker-Planck equation*, Springer-Verlag, 1984.
- [19] R. Kubo, M. Toda and N. Hashitume; *Statistical Physics II. Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics*, Springer-Verlag, 1992  
 S. R. De Groot and P. Mazur; *Non-equilibrium thermodynamics*, Dover Pub., New York, 1984.