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Abstract

The reverse perturbation method [Phys. Rev. E 59, 4894 (1999)] for shearing simple liquids and measuring their viscosity is extended to systems of self-propelled particles with time-discrete stochastic dynamics. For verification, this method is first applied to Multi-Particle Collision Dynamics (MPCD) [J. Chem. Phys. 110, 8605 (1999)], a momentum-conserving solvent. An extension to the Vicsek-model (VM) of self-propelled particles [Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1226 (1995)] shows a phenomenon that is similar to the skin effect of an alternating electric current: momentum that is fed into the boundaries of a layer decays mostly exponentially towards the center of the layer. It is shown how two transport coefficients, i.e. the shear viscosity $\nu$ and the momentum amplification coefficient $\lambda$, can be obtained by fitting this decay with an analytical solution of the hydrodynamic equations for the VM. As for the MPCD case, the viscosity of the VM consists of two parts, the kinetic and the collisional viscosity. An analytical expression for the collisional part is derived by an Enskog-like kinetic theory. In the following paper (Part II), reasonable quantitative agreement between agent-based simulations and predictions by kinetic theory is observed. In Part II, transverse current correlations and a Green-Kubo relation are used to obtain $\lambda$ and $\nu$, in excellent agreement with the reverse perturbation results.
I. INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades, there has been a large interest in active matter systems, such as bird flocks \cite{1}, swarming bacteria \cite{2, 3}, active colloids \cite{4, 5}, microtubule mixtures \cite{6} and actin networks \cite{7} driven by molecular motors. These systems display interesting behaviors such as pattern formation, collective motion and non-equilibrium phase transitions \cite{8, 9}. Some of these features already occur in one of the simplest models for active matter, the Vicsek-model (VM) of self-propelled particles \cite{10, 11} and its variants \cite{13, 20}. Because of the simplicity of its interaction rules and the existence of a non-standard transition to a collective state of polar order, the VM became an archetype of active matter.

Due to the many degrees of freedom, theoretical studies of active matter systems are often based on coarse-grained macroscopic transport equations for the slow variables such as density or momentum. Originally, the general forms of these equations were postulated by symmetry and renormalization group arguments, such as in the seminal Toner-Tu theory \cite{21, 22, 23} for polar active matter. However, this approach leaves the coefficients of the terms in the transport equation largely undetermined. Furthermore, memory and other nonlocal terms are usually not considered, although for particular models there is evidence on their relevance \cite{24}. These shortcomings motivated many researchers to derive macroscopic transport equations directly from the microscopic interactions and to obtain explicit expressions for the occurring coefficients \cite{25, 37}. Even though most of these coarse-graining approaches are based on some type of mean-field assumption, they can still be rather involved and, in addition, rely on further approximations such as time scale separation, the thermodynamic limit or the irrelevance of higher order spatial gradients.

In principle, different kinetic theory approaches for the same microscopic model can lead to different macroscopic expressions, see for example Ref. \cite{38}. Thus, the validity of the derived transport coefficients and of the macroscopic description in general is often questionable and has led to debates \cite{14, 39, 42}. To the best of our knowledge, so far there has been no comprehensive work on the verification of transport coefficients in polar active matter. In this set of papers, we start filling this void, at least for two transport coefficients of the standard and the metric-free (or topological) VM. In particular, we perform extensive
agent-based simulations of the VM, measure the kinematic viscosity, \( \nu \), and the momentum amplification coefficient, \( \lambda \), by means of several complementary methods and compare to predictions from kinetic theory. We employ a non-equilibrium approach and measure the response to shear, generated through the reverse perturbation (RP) method \[43\]. In addition, we use other methods which do not rely on external influences such as forces or Maxwell demons, namely a Green-Kubo (GK) approach \[44–47\] and the method of transverse current fluctuations (TC) \[48\].

To test our numerical tools, we first perform measurements on a momentum-conserving, particle-based model for computational fluid dynamics, called Multi-Particle Collision Dynamics (MPCD) fluid \[49–54\] (for numerical details, see Part II of this series of papers). This model is well-understood theoretically, and its transport properties had been verified with high precision by several groups \[55–58\]. During the viscosity measurements of the VM, it became apparent that an essential contribution, the so-called collisional viscosity, \( \nu_{\text{coll}} \), was missing in previous theories of the VM. Therefore, we improve the previous derivation of hydrodynamic equations from Ref. \[29, 60\] and present an explicit expression of \( \nu_{\text{coll}} \).

The main results of this part of our series of papers are (i) the derivation of the collisional contribution to the viscosity of the VM by kinetic theory, \textit{i.e.} Eqs. \(38\) - \(40\), (ii) the extension of the RP method to systems of self-propelled particles with time-discrete stochastic dynamics, and (iii) the derivation of a hydrodynamic theory about how to infer transport coefficients for the VM from the shear setup.

II. AGENT-BASED MODELS

A. The standard Vicsek model

The VM \[10–12\] consists of \( N \) point particles at global number density \( \rho_0 \), which move at constant speed \( v_0 \) in two dimensions. The positions and velocities of the particles at time \( t \) are given by \( x_i(t) \) and \( v_i(t) \), respectively. In the VM, the particles are propagated \textit{via} sequential streaming and collision steps with time step \( \tau \). (The term “collision” should not to be taken literally, but instead it just denotes any action that changes the momentum of a particle.) During the streaming step, the particles move ballistically,

\[
x_i(t + \tau) = x_i(t) + \tau v_i(t).
\]
Because the speeds of the particles stay the same at all times, the velocities are parameterized by the “flying” angles, $\theta_i$, i.e. $\mathbf{v}_i = v_0(\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i)$.

In the collision step, the directions $\theta_i$ are changed so that the particles align with their neighbors within a fixed distance $R$ plus some external noise. In practice, a circle of radius $R$ is drawn around the focal particle $i$, and the average direction $\Phi_i$ of motion of the particles within the circle is determined according to

$$\Phi_i = \text{Arg} \left( \sum_{\{j\}} e^{i\theta_j} \right)$$

where the sum goes over all particles within the interaction range $R$ (including particle $i$). Once all average directions $\Phi_i$ are known, the new directions follow as

$$\theta_i(t + \tau) = \Phi_i + \xi_i$$

where $\xi_i$ is the so-called angular noise. The random numbers $\xi_i$ are uniformly distributed in the interval $[-\eta/2, \eta/2]$, with noise strength $\eta$. The model uses parallel updating, and in this paper we will also assume the so-called standard VM which uses a forward-updating rule. Thus, the already updated positions $\mathbf{x}_i(t + \tau)$ are used for determining the average directions $\Phi_i$ at time $t$.

Another relevant model parameter is the average particle number $M$ that can be found inside a circle of radius $R$, i.e. $M = \rho_0 \pi R^2$ with the global number density $\rho_0$. The dimensionless parameter $M$ measures the ratio of the interaction range $R$ to the average particle distance $1/\sqrt{\rho_0}$. By increasing $M$ and/or decreasing the noise $\eta$, the VM can be driven from a disordered phase to a phase of collective motion. Assuming a spatially homogeneous system, the threshold condition for this non-equilibrium phase transition can be calculated within the mean-field kinetic theory of Sec. III. For sufficiently small $M \ll 1$, the threshold noise $\eta_c$ is predicted as

$$\eta_c = \sqrt{48M \left( \frac{2}{\pi} - \frac{1}{2} \right)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

For parameters where the molecular chaos assumption is strongly violated, $\eta_C$ can be much lower than this theoretical prediction, sometimes by a factor between two and three. For more details on the calculations and for a discussion of this transition, see Refs. 29, 39, 60, 62.
B. The Vicsek model with topological interactions

Recent experiments by Ballerini et al. \cite{63, 64} on flocks of starlings indicated that a Vicsek-like interaction rule with a fixed interaction range might not be appropriate for animal flocks. Instead, a statistical analysis revealed that, on average, each bird interacts with a fixed number of neighbors, typically six to seven. This constitutes a topological or metric-free interaction because the metric distance is not relevant; rather, it is a question of who the closest neighbors are. Ballerini et al. argued further that, due to evolutionary pressure, the main goal of interaction among individuals is to maintain cohesion. By comparing simulations with the regular VM and a modified VM with metric-free interactions, they found that flocks, when facing predators, kept cohesion much better in the metric-free model. These observations inspired several other groups to study versions of the VM with topological interactions.

In this paper we will focus on a simple modification of the VM, which was suggested by one of us \cite{18}, because it allows an analytical description by a similar Enskog-like kinetic theory as the one outlined in Sec. III. In this model, the alignment rule of the regular VM, Eqs. (2) and (3), is slightly modified such that the number of particles in every collision circle is kept constant and equal to $M$ at all times by locally adjusting the interaction radius. Thus, only the $M-1$ closest neighbors together with particle $i$ itself are included in the calculation of the average angle $\Phi_i$ of a particular particle $i$. This procedure leads to large interaction ranges $R$ in areas with sparse populations, whereas the interaction radius $R$ becomes small at locations with a high particle number density.

In the regular VM, a larger local particle density leads to more robust alignment and stronger local order. This behavior can be seen in the phase diagram of the VM, for example Fig. 1 in Ref. \cite{29}. This coupling between density and order is the main reason behind the occurrence of soliton-like density waves near the order/disorder threshold in the regular VM \cite{39}. In the topological VM, however, density and order are decoupled because it is always the same number of particles that participate in the alignment interaction. Therefore, the long-wave length instability of the regular VM as well as the density waves are absent in the topological VM \cite{18, 65}. 
C. Multi-Particle Collision Dynamics

The MPCD algorithm is a particle-based solver of the Navier-Stokes equation, where the fluid particles are modeled as point-like particles with mass $m$, which move in continuous space with a continuous distribution of velocities. The MPCD method became quite popular in the soft matter community within the last two decades because it treats both hydrodynamic interactions and thermal fluctuations in complex liquids in a thermodynamically consistent way [49–54]. Similar as in the VM, the motion of the MPCD particles is governed by alternating streaming and collision steps. During the streaming step, the velocities of all fluid particles are updated according to Eq. (1). In the collision step, the fluid particles undergo stochastic collisions with particles in the same (quadratic) collision cell, where the edge length of these cells, $a$, dictates the spatial resolution of the hydrodynamic interactions [66]. In this work, we employed both the stochastic rotation dynamics (SRD) [49] and the Andersen thermostat (AT) collision scheme [67].

In the SRD scheme, the collision step consists of a random rotation of the relative velocities

$$\mathbf{v}_i(t+\tau) = \mathbf{u}(t) + \omega(\alpha) \circ (\mathbf{v}_i(t) - \mathbf{u}(t))$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the average velocity of particles of the corresponding cell, and $\alpha$ denotes the (fixed) rotation angle. All particles in the cell are subject to the same rotation, but the rotations in different cells and at different times are statistically independent. In two dimensions, $\omega(\alpha)$ typically is a rotation by an angle $\pm \alpha$, with probability $1/2$ for either direction. Note that the SRD collision scheme conserves linear momentum and energy, since the rotation $\omega(\alpha)$ is norm-conserving. To achieve isothermal conditions, a Monte Carlo style thermostat was applied [51, 68], which correctly conserves the local momentum in each cell and reproduces the desired Maxwell velocity distribution.

In the AT variant of the MPCD algorithm, a random velocity $\delta\mathbf{v}_i$ consistent with the Gaussian distribution of velocities at the desired temperature $T$ is chosen for each particle in a cell, and the velocities are updated by

$$\mathbf{v}_i(t+\tau) = \mathbf{u}(t) + \delta\mathbf{v}_i - \frac{1}{N_c} \sum_{j=1}^{N_c} \delta\mathbf{v}_j$$ \hspace{1cm} (6)

where the sum is taken over the particles $j$ in the cell. The last term in Eq. (6) enforces conservation of linear momentum. Note that the AT collision scheme implicitly generates
isothermal conditions, and hence energy is not conserved.

Malevanets and Kapral \cite{49} have shown that the equilibrium distribution of velocities is Maxwellian, and that the algorithm corresponds to the correct hydrodynamic equations with an ideal-gas equation of state. In contrast to the VM, linear momentum is conserved and the modulus of the particle velocities changes during the collision step. In its original form \cite{49, 50}, the MPCD algorithm was not Galilean invariant due to the spatial discretization into collision cells. This deficiency is most pronounced at low temperatures or small time steps, where the mean free path, \( \tau \sqrt{\frac{k_B T}{m}} \), is smaller than the cell size \( a \). However, Galilean invariance can be restored by applying a random shift of the collision cells before every collision step \cite{69}. This procedure is also used in this work.

III. KINETIC THEORY FOR THE VICSEK MODEL

A. Introduction to Enskog-like kinetic theory

In the VM, a given particle \( i \) is described by its location \( x_i \) and the angle \( \theta_i \) of its velocity vector. Hence, the microstate of a system of \( N \) particles corresponds to a point in \( 3N \)-dimensional phase space. The time-evolution of the VM in this phase space is Markovian, since information about microstates from earlier times is irrelevant for further evolution. Hence, we can write down an exact evolution equation for the \( N \)-particle probability density \( P \) of the corresponding Markov chain,

\[
P(B, t + \tau) = \int P(A, t) \, W_{AB} \, dA, \tag{7}
\]

which describes the transition from microscopic state \( A \) to state \( B \) during one time step with transition probability \( W_{AB} \). The state of the system at time \( t + \tau \) is given by the vector, \( B \equiv (\theta^{(N)}, X^{(N)}) \), where \( \theta^{(N)} \equiv (\theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots, \theta_N) \) contains the flying directions of all \( N \) particles, and \( X^{(N)} \equiv (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N) \) describes all particle positions. The initial microscopic state at time \( t \) is denoted as \( A \equiv (\tilde{\theta}^{(N)}, \tilde{X}^{(N)}) \). The integral over the initial state translates to \( \int dA \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{N} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\tilde{\theta}_i \int d\tilde{x}_i \), where pre-collisional angles and positions are given by \( \tilde{\theta}_i \) and \( \tilde{x}_i \), respectively. The transition probability \( W_{AB} \) encodes the microscopic collision rules,

\[
W_{AB} = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \delta(\tilde{x}_i - x_i + \tau v_i) \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \, w_n(\xi_i) \, \delta(\theta_i - \xi_i - \Phi_i) \, d\xi_i, \tag{8}
\]
and consists of two parts: the first $\delta$-function describes the streaming step which changes particle positions. The second part contains the periodically continued delta function, $\hat{\delta}(x) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(x + 2\pi m)$, which accounts for the modification of angles in the collision step. The particle velocities $V^{(N)} \equiv (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N)$, are given in terms of angular variables $\theta_i$, 

$$v_i = (e_x, e_y) = v_0 (\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i).$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

For the standard VM, the noise distribution $w_n$ is given by

$$w_n(\xi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } -\frac{\eta}{2} \leq \xi \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere} \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

with noise strength $\eta$. Solving Eq. (7) is intractable without major simplification. The common way to proceed is to use Boltzmann’s molecular chaos approximation by assuming that the particles are uncorrelated just prior to every microscopic interaction \hspace{1cm} (70). This approximation amounts to a factorization of the $N$-particle probability into a product of one-particle probabilities, i.e. $P(\theta^{(N)}, X^{(N)}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} P_1(\theta_i, x_i)$ on the right hand side of Eq. (7). Because molecular chaos neglects pre-collisional correlations, the resulting theory has a mean-field nature. By integrating out all particles except one – the so-called focal particle – in Eq. (7), an Enskog-like equation for the distribution function $f = NP_1$ is obtained,

$$f(x + \tau v, \theta, t + \tau) = C \circ f(x, \theta, t),$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $C$ is an Enskog collision operator for multi-particle collisions. In the thermodynamic limit, $N \to \infty$, $L \to \infty$, and $\rho_0 = NL^2 = \text{const.}$, this operator is given by

$$C \circ f(x, \theta, t) = \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{-\eta/2}^{\eta/2} d\xi \left\langle \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-M}}{n!} n \times f(x, \tilde{\theta}, t) \hat{\delta}(\theta - \xi - \Phi_1) \prod_{i=2}^{n} f(x_i, \tilde{\theta}_i, t) \right\rangle_{\tilde{\theta}} \right\rangle_x.$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

Here, $\langle \ldots \rangle_x = \int_0 \ldots \int_2 dx_2 dx_3 \ldots dx_n$ denotes the integration over all positions of the particles 2, 3, ..., $n$ inside the collision circle, and $\langle \ldots \rangle_{\tilde{\theta}} = \int_0^{2\pi} \ldots d\tilde{\theta}_1 d\tilde{\theta}_2 \ldots d\tilde{\theta}_n$ refers to the integration over the pre-collisional angles of all $n$ particles inside the circle. The average angle of the focal particle $i = 1$, $\Phi_1$ is defined in Eq. (2) and is a function of both the pre-collisional angles and the positions of all particles. For more details on the derivation of Eq. (11) and a discussion of the molecular chaos assumption, see Refs. 35 and 60.
B. The collisional viscosity $\nu_{\text{coll}}$

It has been shown by several groups \cite{51, 57–59}, that the kinematic shear viscosity of particle-based models, which consist of subsequent streaming and collision steps, is a sum of two terms, namely the kinetic part, $\nu_{\text{kin}}$, and the collisional part, $\nu_{\text{coll}}$.

$$\nu = \nu_{\text{kin}} + \nu_{\text{coll}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

Thus, it is plausible that such a decomposition is also valid for the VM. The kinetic part is due to the momentum that is carried by a particle moving ballistically and can, for example, be calculated by a Boltzmann-like kinetic equation. For the standard VM, this calculation has been done in Refs. 29 and 60, resulting in

$$\nu_{\text{kin}} = \frac{v_0^2 \tau}{8} \frac{1 + p}{1 - p}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

The auxiliary quantity $p$ involves an infinite sum,

$$p = \frac{4}{\eta} \sin \eta \sum_{n=1}^{N} e^{-M} \frac{n^2 M^{n-1}}{n!} K_{2c}^{11}(n),$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where the coefficients $K_{2c}^{11}$ are given in Table I of Ref. 60. Expression (15) can be evaluated approximately at small and large partner number $M$. For small density, $M \ll 1$, a good approximation is

$$p \approx \frac{\sin \eta}{\eta} \left[ 1 + 0.327M^2 + 0.072M^3 \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

In the opposite limit, $M \gg 1$, one finds to leading order:

$$p \approx \frac{\sin \eta}{2 \eta}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

In Ref. 60 it was demonstrated that, like in regular fluids, the same expression for $\nu_{\text{kin}}$ can be obtained by evaluating a simple Green-Kubo relation by means of the molecular chaos approximation.

The collisional contribution, $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ in Eq. (13), stems from collisional transfer of momentum across the finite interaction range $R$, and is therefore outside the scope of Boltzmann-like equations. In contrast, the Enskog-like theory of Sec. III should be able to capture this contribution. However, in previous calculations \cite{29, 60}, a large mean-free path $\Lambda = v_0 \tau \gg R$ was assumed, where $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ becomes negligible. In this section, we show how to calculate $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ for
the standard VM within mean-field kinetic theory. Note, that Boltzmann approaches such as those of Refs. [25] and [71] are unable to obtain this important contribution to the viscosity. By dimensional analysis, it is clear that in the typical regime of the VM, such as originally used by Vicsek et al. [10], the collisional part dominates the viscosity, because $\Lambda \ll R$. This is because $\nu_{\text{kin}}$ scales with time step $\tau$ and the effective temperature, $k_B T/m \sim \nu_0^2/2$, whereas $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ is proportional to $R^2/\tau$, thus $\nu_{\text{coll}}/\nu_{\text{kin}} \propto (R/\Lambda)^2$.

### C. Calculation of the collisional viscosity $\nu_{\text{coll}}$

To calculate the collisional viscosity, we will heavily rely on the notations and equations presented in Ref. [60], which are too lengthy to be repeated here in full detail [72]. There, a Chapman-Enskog expansion (CE) [73-75], which is basically an elaborated gradient expansion, was constructed to obtain hydrodynamic equations of the VM. To systematically account for gradients in the hydrodynamic fields, a dimensionless ordering parameter $\epsilon$ had been introduced, which was set to unity at the end of the calculation. As a “byproduct” of the CE, expressions for the transport coefficients and the equation of state in terms of microscopic parameters were obtained.

The non-standard CE procedure of Ref. [60] starts with a Taylor expansion of the left hand side of Eq. (11), in which spatial gradients are scaled as $\partial_{\alpha} \rightarrow \epsilon \partial_{\alpha}$, and multiple time scales $t_i$ are introduced in the temporal gradients,

$$\partial_t \equiv \partial_{\alpha} + \epsilon \partial_{t_1} + \epsilon^2 \partial_{t_2} + \epsilon^3 \partial_{t_3}$$

(18)

In addition, the distribution function $f$ and the collision integral, e.g. the right hand side of Eq. (11), are expanded in powers of $\epsilon$,

$$f = f_0 + \epsilon f_1 + \epsilon^2 f_2 + \epsilon^3 f_3$$

$$C \circ f = C_0 + \epsilon C_1 + \epsilon^2 C_2 + \epsilon^3 C_3$$

(19)

In Ref. [60] it was shown that the expansion of the distribution function $f$ in Eq. (19) can be identified as an angular Fourier series,

$$f_0(x,t) = \frac{\rho(x,t)}{2\pi}$$

(20)

$$f_n(x,\theta,t) = \frac{1}{\pi \nu_0} \left[ a_n(x,t) \cos (n\theta) + b_n(x,t) \sin (n\theta) \right] \text{ for } n > 0$$

(21)
with Fourier coefficients $a_i$ and $b_i$. Thus, the reference state $f_0$ of the CE, that is, the leading order contribution to $f$, coincides with the zero mode of the Fourier series.

To obtain Toner-Tu-like equations, the CE expansion has to be performed up to third order in $\epsilon$, given the chosen scaling of Eqs. (18) and (19). Collecting terms in orders of $\epsilon$ leads to a hierarchy of coupled equations for the temporal evolution of $f_i$, which are given by Eqs. (22-25) in Ref. 60. These equations contain the microscopic velocity vector, given in Eq. (9).

The goal is to obtain macroscopic equations for the first two moments of $f$, namely the particle density $\rho$ and the momentum density vector $\mathbf{w} = (w_x, w_y)$, which are the “slow” fields in this problem,

$$\rho = \int_0^{2\pi} f \, d\theta$$

$$w_x = \rho u_x = \int_0^{2\pi} e_x f \, d\theta = \int_0^{2\pi} v_0 \cos \theta f \, d\theta$$

$$w_y = \rho u_y = \int_0^{2\pi} e_y f \, d\theta = \int_0^{2\pi} v_0 \sin \theta f \, d\theta.$$  

(22)

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_x, u_y) = \mathbf{w}/\rho$ denotes the macroscopic flow velocity. To proceed, velocity moments of the hierarchy equations are taken, that is, they are multiplied by products of $e_x$ and $e_y$ and integrated over the angle $\theta$. This calculation leads to evolution equations for density and momentum, however, split up for the different time scales. For example, there are separate equations for $\partial_t \rho$ and for $\partial_x \rho$. Successively inserting and partially solving the equations, and finally adding all pieces together, for example like $\partial_t \rho = \partial_t \rho + \partial_x \rho + \partial_y \rho + \ldots$ ($\epsilon$ has been set to one at this stage) leads to the desired hydrodynamic equations, Eqs. (94) and (130) in Ref. 60.

The microscopic collision rules enter this procedure through the velocity moments of the collision integral $C$, i.e. through quantities like $\langle e_x C_1 \rangle$ or $\langle e_x e_y C_2 \rangle$ with $\langle \ldots \rangle \equiv \int_0^{2\pi} \ldots d\theta$. For example, the former quantity is the $O(\epsilon)$ contribution of the following moment,

$$\langle e_x (C \circ f) \rangle = \langle v_0 \cos \theta (C \circ f) \rangle = \frac{2v_0}{\eta} \sin \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-M}}{(n-1)!} \int d\tilde{\theta}_1 \ldots d\tilde{\theta}_n$$

$$\int \bigcirc dx_2 \ldots dx_n \cos \Phi_1 [f_0 + \epsilon f_1(x, \tilde{\theta}_1) + \epsilon^2 f_2(x, \tilde{\theta}_1)] [f_0 + \epsilon f_1(x_2, \tilde{\theta}_2) + \epsilon^2 f_2(x_2, \tilde{\theta}_2)] \ldots$$

$$\times [f_0 + \epsilon f_1(x_n, \tilde{\theta}_n) + \epsilon^2 f_2(x_n, \tilde{\theta}_n)] + O(\epsilon^3)$$

(23)

and is defined as

$$\langle e_x C_1 \rangle = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \langle e_x (C \circ f) \rangle$$

(24)
In these moments of $C \circ f$, a crucial approximation was made in Refs. 29, 35 and 60, that led to the formal absence of collisional contributions to the transport coefficients. This approximation consists of neglecting spatial variations of the distribution $f$ across the interaction circle. This issue comes up because the Enskog-like collision term $C \circ f$ involves integrals with products of $f$ over the collision circle. Here, we abandon this approximation which is not justified if the interaction radius is of the same order or larger than the mean free path, i.e. $R \gtrsim \Lambda$.

Comparing Eqs. (20) and (21) with (22) leads to the identification of the Fourier coefficients $a_1$ and $b_1$ with the components of the momentum density, $w = (a_1, b_1)$. Now, inserting $f_0$ and $f_1$ from Eqs. (20) and (21) into Eq. (23), and performing the integrations yields

$$\langle e_x (C \circ f) = \epsilon - \sin \frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-M}}{(n-1)!} K_n^1(n) \right] + O(\epsilon^2)$$

with

$$K_n^1(n) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d\tilde{\theta}_1 \ldots d\tilde{\theta}_n \cos \Phi_1(\tilde{\theta}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\theta}_n) \cos \tilde{\theta}_1$$

The $n$-dimensional angular integral, $K_n^1$, has been evaluated before, see table I in Ref. 60.

Expanding the density and the $x$-component of the momentum density around $x$ and decorating every spatial gradient with a power of $\epsilon$ gives

$$\rho(x_2) = [1 + \epsilon(x_{2,\alpha} - x_{\alpha}) \partial_\alpha + \epsilon^2(x_{2,\alpha} - x_{\alpha})(x_{2,\beta} - x_{\beta}) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta + \ldots] \rho(x)$$

$$w_x(x_2) = [1 + \epsilon(x_{2,\alpha} - x_{\alpha}) \partial_\alpha + \epsilon^2(x_{2,\alpha} - x_{\alpha})(x_{2,\beta} - x_{\beta}) \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta + \ldots] w_x(x)$$

Only the first term from Eq. (28) will contribute to $\langle e_x C_1 \rangle$ since the gradient terms are higher order in $\epsilon$. Thus, we can replace $\int_\circ d\mathbf{x}_2 w_x(x_2)$ by $A w_x(x)$ where $A = \pi R^2$ is the area of the collision circle. Inserting the expansion (27) into the defining equation for $M$,

$$M(x) = \int_\circ \rho(x_2) d\mathbf{x}_2$$

one finds $M(x) = A \rho(x) + O(\epsilon^2)$. Thus, $\rho(x)$ can be approximated by $M/A$ in Eq. (25) if one only cares about the first order contribution $\langle e_x C_1 \rangle$. This result is identical to Eqs. (38) and (39) in Ref. 60:

$$\langle e_x C_1 \rangle = \lambda w_x(x)$$
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with the factor $\lambda$

$$\lambda \equiv \frac{4}{\eta} \sin \frac{\eta}{2} e^{-M} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{M^{n-1} \eta}{(n-1)!} K_1^1(n).$$

(31)

This factor was discussed in detail in Ref. 60 and it describes the ensemble-averaged amplification of the momentum density. The threshold condition for the transition to collective motion is given by $\lambda = 1$ (assuming molecular chaos and a spatially homogeneous system).

For $M \gg 1$, Eq. (31) can be approximated as

$$\lambda \approx \frac{1}{\eta} \sin \left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right) \sqrt{M \pi},$$

(32)

whereas for $M \ll 1$ one finds

$$\lambda \approx \frac{2}{\eta} \sin \left(\frac{\eta}{2}\right) \frac{1 + 4M/\pi + 0.7872M^2 + 0.3M^3}{1 + M + M^2/2 + M^3/6}.$$

(33)

Similar to the calculation above, we recalculated moments of the collision operator in second order in $\epsilon$ such as $\langle e_x^2 C_2 \rangle$ and $\langle e_x e_y C_2 \rangle$ without the approximation of large mean free path and again did not see any difference to previous results. Thus, we conclude that, at least at a mean-field level, previous calculations of transport coefficients that depend solely on moments of $C \circ f$ in linear and quadratic order in $\epsilon$ remain correct at small mean free paths. However, in third order in $\epsilon$, additional terms arise that were neglected previously in the large mean free path approximation. Consider the third order contribution to the moment from Eq. (25),

$$\langle e_x C_3 \rangle = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{3!} \frac{\partial^3}{\partial \epsilon^3} \langle e_x (C \circ f) \rangle$$

(34)

which, according to Eq. (25) contains an integration of the momentum density over the collision circle, $\int_{\circ} d\mathbf{x}_2 w_x(\mathbf{x}_2)$ where the expansion (28) is inserted, and the integration over the collision circle can be performed explicitly in every term of the series. This calculation gives

$$\int_{\circ} d\mathbf{x}_2 w_x(\mathbf{x}_2) = A w_x(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} \int_0^R r^3 dr \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha \hat{n}_\alpha \hat{n}_\beta = A \left[ 1 + \frac{\epsilon^2 R^2}{8} \nabla^2 + O(\epsilon^4) \right] w_x(\mathbf{x})$$

(35)

where $\hat{n} = (\hat{n}_x, \hat{n}_y) = (\cos \alpha, \sin \alpha)$ is the radial unit vector. Terms with odd powers of $\epsilon$ disappear because of the symmetric (circular) shape of the collision area.

Inserting Eq. (35) into Eq. (25) leads together with Eq. (34) to

$$\langle e_x C_3 \rangle = \Gamma w_x w^2 + S(w_x a_2 + w_y b_2) + H \nabla^2 w_x$$

(36)
where the coefficients $\Gamma$ and $S$ are given in Eqs. (61) and (62) of Ref. 60, and $a_2$ and $b_2$ are Fourier coefficients defined in Eq. (21). The new result of the current paper is the third term whose coefficient $H$ is,

$$H = \frac{R^2 \sin (\eta/2)}{2\eta} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-M}}{(n-1)!} M^n K^1_C(n+1)$$

We checked that relaxing the previous restriction on the mean free path only affects the moment $\langle e^\beta C_3 \rangle$ and does not impact other relevant moments, at least in a third-order CE expansion. In order to obtain improved transport coefficients, it therefore suffices to formally replace all occurrences of $\Gamma w_\beta w^2$ by $\Gamma w_\beta w^2 + H \nabla^2 w_\beta$ in the calculations of Ref. 60 after Eq. (111) of that paper. As a result of this straightforward but technical exercise, we observed that, at least up to third order in $\epsilon$, all transport coefficients except the viscosity remain unchanged. In particular, we found the novel collisional contribution to the kinematic viscosity, Eq. (13), as

$$\nu_{\text{coll}} = \frac{MR^2 \sin (\eta/2)}{\tau 2\eta} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-M}}{(n-1)!} M^n K^1_C(n+1)$$

which has been neglected before in previous publications.

For $M \gg 1$, Eq. (38) can be approximated as

$$\nu_{\text{coll}} \approx \frac{MR^2 \sin (\eta/2)}{\tau 8\eta} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{M+2}} \left[ 1 + \frac{3M}{8(M+2)^2} \frac{1}{\pi} \right]$$

by means of a saddle point expansion inside the infinite sum of Eq. (38). In the opposite limit $M \ll 1$, we keep only the first terms in the sum and find

$$\nu_{\text{coll}} \approx \frac{MR^2 \sin (\eta/2)}{\tau 2\eta} \left[ \frac{1/\pi + 0.2624M + 0.11245M^2 + 0.03347M^3}{1 + M + M^2/2 + M^3/6} \right]$$

Figure 1 shows the predicted collisional viscosity, Eq. (38), as a function of $M$ in comparison to the two approximations, Eqs. (39) and (40). Interestingly, it turns out that the asymptotic expansion, Eq. (39), is not only excellent for $M \geq 1$ but remains a very good approximation for $M < 1$ with an error of around one to two percent. In contrast, the approximative expression Eq. (40) which was obtained by truncating an infinite series becomes very accurate at small $M$ but should not be used for $M > 1$.

Figures 2 and 3 show both (kinetic and collisional) contributions to the viscosity as a function of noise, $\eta$, and $M$. The kinetic contribution is largest at both small noise and
Coll. viscosity $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ given by Eq. (38) (solid black line) vs. the normalized density, $M$. The blue dashed line shows the low density approximation, Eq. (40), whereas the high density expression, Eq. (39), is given by the dashed red line. Parameters: $\eta = 3.2$, $\tau = 0.2$, $R = v_0 = 1$.

small density, whereas the collisional contribution increases with density and decreases with noise. Figure 4 shows the total viscosity $\nu = \nu_{\text{kin}} + \nu_{\text{coll}}$ for two particular sets of parameters in comparison with $\nu_{\text{kin}}$. Clearly, for these parameters, neglecting the collisional part leads to a large error.

Finally, we consider the system used in Vicsek’s original paper, Ref. 10. Translating the parameters from their Fig. 2(a) into our notation leads to $M = 12.57$, $R = 1$, and $\Lambda = v_0 \tau = 0.03$. Choosing $\eta = 3.5$, which is slightly above $\eta_c$, and applying expressions (14) and (38), we predict $\nu_{\text{coll}} = 1.7$ and $\nu_{\text{kin}} = 5.4 \times 10^{-5}$. This finding confirms the expectation that the kinetic part of the viscosity is negligible here. Of course, these are predictions within the mean-field approximation which is not expected to be valid at this small ratio $\Lambda/R = 0.03$. For improved results, pre-collisional correlations as discussed in Ref. 76 need to be taken into account.
FIG. 2. (a) Kinetic part of the kinematic shear viscosity, $\nu_{\text{kin}}$, given by Eq. (14) and divided by $v_0^2 \tau$ vs. the noise, $\eta$, for various dimensionless densities, $M$. In (b) the dimensionless collisional part of the viscosity, $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ from Eq. (38) is given as a function of noise.

IV. REVERSE NONEQUILIBRIUM MOLECULAR DYNAMICS

We performed non-equilibrium simulations to compute the shear viscosity from the simulations. These approaches often provide significantly better signal to noise ratios compared to equilibrium methods, such as the GK relation [44–47]. To generate shear flow in our system, we employed the RP method [43], where the external stress on the system is imposed, leading to the emergence of a velocity gradient. The shear stress is imposed onto the system by generating a momentum flux through a slab perpendicular to the flow direction. This
FIG. 3. (a) Kinetic part of the kinematic shear viscosity, $\nu_{\text{kin}}$, given by Eq. (14) and divided by $v_0^2 \tau$ vs. the dimensionless density, $M$, for various values of the noise, $\eta$. (b) the dimensionless collisional part of the viscosity, $\nu_{\text{coll}}$ from Eq. (38) versus $M$.

flux is achieved by swapping the particle velocities in the following way: first, the periodic simulation box is subdivided into equally sized slabs with thickness $a$ along the gradient direction of the flow ($y$). Then, particle $i$ in the $y = 0$ slab with the largest positive $e_x$ value and particle $j$ with the largest negative $e_x$ value are identified, and their velocities are swapped. This swapping procedure artificially generates a momentum flux, which gives rise to a physical flow.

If both particles have the same mass, as is the case in all our models, swapping conserves both the linear momentum and the global kinetic energy. In our implementation, momentum
FIG. 4. (a) Total shear viscosity, $\nu = \nu_{\text{kin}} + \nu_{\text{coll}}$ (solid line) given by Eqs. (14) and (38) vs. noise, $\eta$, for (a) $M = 0.2$, $\tau = 0.1$, and (b) $M = 5$, $\tau = 0.5$. The dashed blue and red lines show the kinetic and collisional parts, $\nu_{\text{kin}}$ and $\nu_{\text{coll}}$, respectively, for comparison. Other parameters: $R = 1$, $v_0 = 1$.

swaps were applied to the system with equal probability either before or after the collision step. Note, that when using the RP method for the VM, it is crucial to also swap $e_y$ of the particle pair so that the particle speed $v_0$ is conserved. We verified that this additional swapping does not introduce an unwanted momentum flux in the $x$ direction.

The imposed shear stress can be controlled by the amount of momentum swaps in one step and by the time between swaps, $\Delta t$. For the chosen geometry of our two-dimensional
systems, the average shear stress can be computed as:

\[ \langle \sigma \rangle = \frac{\langle \Delta p_x \rangle}{2\Delta t L_x}, \]  

(41)

where \( \langle \Delta p_x \rangle \) is the average total \( x \) component of momentum exchanged during one time step. Figure 5 shows a schematic view of the shear procedure and the emerging flow profile.

Part II of this series of papers contains the applications of our approach to the MPCD solvent and to the regular as well as the topological VM.

V. HYDRODYNAMIC THEORY FOR VICSEK-LIKE MODELS

There is shared belief, that on a macroscopic level, polar active systems are described by a minimal set of equations for mass and momentum density – the well-known Toner-Tu equations [21,23]. These equation were first postulated on the basis of symmetry and renormalization group arguments. Within the mean-field assumption of molecular chaos, they have also been derived from first principles, for a VM-like model with binary collisions by Bertin et al. [25,28], and by Ihle [29,35] for the standard VM with discrete time evolution as considered here. In the latter approach, additional nonlinear gradient terms which were not part of the original Toner-Tu theory, were found [60].

We would like to apply the Toner-Tu theory to the shear set-up given in Fig. 5 in order to extract the values of several transport coefficients from simulation data. For numerical
details, see Part II of this series of papers. The data are obtained in the stationary state, and thus, all time derivatives in the hydrodynamic equations are set to zero. The stationary state is established by feeding a small amount of $x$-momentum into the top layer of the channel, and by extracting $x$-momentum from the layer in the middle. This procedure leads to a shear flow of small size at not too low noise $\eta$. Therefore, we can neglect most nonlinear terms in the flow velocity. Furthermore, there is no pressure gradient in the $x$-direction. Hence, we assume translational invariance for that direction and neglect all spatial derivatives with respect to $x$. Because of the particular way particle velocities are swapped, no net $y$-momentum is transferred between the feeding layers. Analyzing the continuity equation, $\partial_t \rho + \partial_y (\rho u_y) = 0$, under the previous assumptions shows that the transversal derivative, $\partial_y w_y$ of the $y$-component of the momentum density, $w = \rho u = (w_x, w_y)$, should be zero. In shear flow of a regular Newtonian fluid, the density is constant and the transversal velocity vanishes, $u_y = 0$. This is not quite the case for the active fluid considered here. Instead, due to a lack of Galilean invariance, there are additional convective terms which prevent such a simple shear solution. Nevertheless, agent-based simulations of the VM (see Part II) showed that the density variations across the channel are less than one percent, at least outside the parameter range where the well-known density instability of the regular VM occurs \cite{25, 29, 39}. Therefore, density gradients will be ignored in our theory.

Under these circumstances, the Toner-Tu equations for the components of the macroscopic velocity $u = (u_x, u_y)$ take a simplified form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu_1 u_y \partial_y u_x + \mu_2 u_x \partial_y u_y & \approx (\nu \partial_y^2 - \kappa - qu^2) u_x \\
(\mu_1 + \mu_2 + 2\mu_3) u_y \partial_y u_x + 2\mu_3 u_x \partial_y u_x & \approx (\nu \partial_y^2 - \kappa - qu^2) u_y,
\end{align*}
\]

(42) \hspace{1cm} (43)

\[
\kappa \equiv \frac{1 - \lambda}{\tau}.
\]

The kinematic viscosity $\nu$, the coefficients of the convective terms, $\mu_1$, $\mu_2$, $\mu_3$, and the strength of the cubic nonlinearity $q$ depend on the time step $\tau$, density $\rho$, noise $\eta$ and the interaction radius $R$. The main difference to a regular fluid is the linear term in $u$ which results from the violation of momentum conservation. The coefficient $\lambda$ describes, whether on average, momentum is lost or gained in a collision. The cubic term, $\propto u^2 u$, becomes relevant below the threshold noise $\eta_c$, where $\lambda > 1$. The threshold noise is defined by the condition $\lambda(\eta_c) = 1$. 
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A. Analysis for the disordered state, $\lambda < 1$

In the disordered state, $\eta > \eta_c$, the momentum amplification factor $\lambda$ is smaller than one, which means that, on average, momentum is lost in collisions. If momentum is “fed” into the boundary layer, it can only penetrate into the bulk of the channel within a certain distance $l_S$ due to the interplay of momentum-diffusion and “-evaporation”. Since this behavior appears to be similar to the skin effect in electrodynamics, $l_S$ will be called skin depth. In this scenario, we can neglect the cubic term in Eq. (42). Since at $\eta > \eta_c$ there is no spontaneous symmetry breaking, we also neglect the transversal component $u_y$. Both assumptions have been justified numerically, and they allow us to obtain an analytical solution for the velocity profile across the channel:

$$u_x = d_0 \sinh(d_1 y), \quad (44)$$

where $u_x$ is the $x$-component of the macroscopic velocity. This profile is to be applied to the upper (or lower) half of the channel with the $y$-coordinate set to zero in the middle of the considered half-channel. The coefficient $d_1$ is given by

$$d_1 = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\lambda}{\nu \tau}} \quad (45)$$

As shown in Part II of this paper, velocity profiles from agent-based simulations which were averaged in time and over the length of the channel, show excellent agreement with this sinh profile. Fitting data to this profile enables the determination of the constants $d_0$ and $d_1$.

To recover both transport coefficients $\lambda$ and $\nu$, an additional quantity – the momentum flux – is needed. The momentum flux $\sigma$ is determined by measuring the amount of momentum which is fed into the top layer per time and length in the simulations. This flux is linked to the velocity gradient by

$$\sigma = \nu \rho_m \frac{\partial u_x}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=L_y/4} \quad (46)$$

where $\rho_m$ is the mass density, and the gradient is to be evaluated at the top of the channel, at $y = L_y/4$ ($y = 0$ is defined in the middle of the upper half-channel, see Fig. 5). Inserting the solution, Eq. (44) into Eq. (46) gives an equation for the viscosity $\nu$:

$$\nu = \frac{\sigma}{\rho_m d_0 d_1 \cosh(d_1 L_y/4)} \quad (47)$$
Note, that using the coefficients $d_0$ and $d_1$ from a fit of the velocity profile, instead of applying Eq. (46) directly, circumvents the problem of numerically evaluating a velocity gradient in the fluctuating top layer of the channel. Once $\nu$ has been determined, it can be inserted in the relation for $d_1$, Eq. (45), yielding an expression for the coefficient $1 - \lambda$:

$$1 - \lambda = \tau d_1^2 \nu \quad (48)$$

It is possible to formally integrate Eq. (42) with $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$ but with the cubic nonlinearity on the right hand side included. However, fitting this solution to numerically obtained velocity profiles failed, in the sense, that it did not give reliable estimates for the coefficient $q$. The reason is that the averaged velocities in our simulation data were too small for the nonlinearity to be relevant. This was verified independently by using the mean-field prediction for this coefficient from Refs. [29, 60], evaluating the cubic term by hand and observing that it is negligible compared to the linear terms.

**B. Analysis for the ordered state, $\lambda > 1$**

The situation in the ordered state is more complicated than the one at $\lambda < 1$ because, (i) at noise values slightly below the threshold noise, soliton-like density waves occur in the regular VM [25, 39, 77]. That means, density gradients are large and derivatives with respect to $x$ cannot be neglected, and (ii) spontaneous symmetry breaking occurs; the resulting macroscopic velocity can be large and is not necessarily parallel to the walls of the channel.

The former issue will be ignored, because there are models such as the metric-free VM [17, 18, 64] or the incompressible active liquid [78], where such density waves do not occur. Thus, for simplicity, in our analysis we still omit density gradients. The latter issue means that nonlinear terms are relevant and that, depending on the situation, the transversal component of the velocity $u_y$ could be larger than $u_x$. Here, as a first step, we assume to be close to the threshold, $\lambda - 1 \ll 1$. Furthermore, assuming small velocity gradients and small momentum transfer rates, we still ignore the convective nonlinearities but keep the cubic nonlinear term with coefficient $q$ to stabilize the solution. Eqs. (42) and (43) now become,

$$\nu u_x'' - (\kappa + qu^2)u_x = 0 \quad (49)$$

$$\nu u_y'' - (\kappa + qu^2)u_y = 0, \quad (50)$$
where the definition $u'_\alpha \equiv \frac{\partial u_\alpha}{\partial y}$ was used. Multiplying the first equation (49) by $u'_x$, the second by $u'_y$, and adding both equations yields:

$$0 = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ -\frac{\kappa}{2} u^2 - \frac{q}{4} u^4 + \nu \left( \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} \right)^2 \right]$$

(51)

We define the flow velocity of a homogeneous ordered state, $u_0 = \sqrt{|\kappa|/q}$, and the normal vector $\hat{n}$ for its flow direction. Near the threshold to collective motion, $\lambda - 1 \ll 1$, and for a particular constant direction $\hat{n}$, using Eq. (51), we expand the solution around the homogeneous ordered state, and obtain the approximate result,

$$\mathbf{u} \approx u_0 \hat{n} + A \hat{t} \sinh(d_1 y) \quad \text{with}$$

$$d_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2(\lambda - 1)}{\tau \nu}} ,$$

(53)

where the unit vector $\hat{t}$ and the constant $A$ are arbitrary. In finite, not too large systems, both directions $\hat{n}$ and $\hat{t}$ fluctuate over time. Because our simulation data are time-averaged, such an average is also performed over Eq. (52). For the $x$-component of the flow velocity, one obtains

$$\langle u_x \rangle = d_2 + d_0 \sinh(d_1 y)$$

(54)

Apart from the constant $d_2$, the solution has the same form as the one in the disordered state. Note, however, that the coefficients $d_0$ and $d_2$ originate from the time-average of the fluctuating unit vectors, $d_0 \equiv \langle A t_x \rangle$, $d_2 \equiv \langle u_0 n_x \rangle$, and therefore strongly depend on the system parameters and the details of the time-average. Thus, for example, it is possible to observe an averaged flow profile with $d_2 \approx 0$ which deceivingly looks like the one found in the disordered phase, even though particles have strong orientational order at any given time. The procedures and formulas to obtain the viscosity, Eq. (47), for both the ordered and the disordered phase are identical. However, there is a difference between Eqs. (53) and (55) for the fit parameter $d_1$. Because of that, for $\eta < \eta_C$ one finds,

$$\lambda - 1 = \frac{\tau d_1^2 \nu}{2} .$$

(55)

In Part II of this series of papers, the theory developed in this chapter will be applied to agent-based simulations of the regular VM and the metric-free VM.
VI. SUMMARY

By now, one can find many derivations of hydrodynamic equations from the microscopic interactions of active particle systems in the literature. These derivations are often complicated and involve several more or less severe approximations. Therefore, the validity of the obtained expressions is not \textit{a priori} clear, and it would be useful to verify them. In this series of papers we perform agent-based simulations and measure two transport coefficients, namely the shear viscosity, $\nu$, and the momentum amplification coefficient, $\lambda$, for the standard Vicsek-model of self-propelled particles. While we explore a variety of methods to extract those coefficients, our focus is on Müller-Plathe’s reverse perturbation method. It is shown how to adapt this method to the Vicsek-model - a generalized fluid whose dynamics is time-discrete and stochastic. Feeding momentum into the boundaries of a channel filled with self-propelled particles leads to an almost exponential decay of the flow speed towards the center of the channel due to the lack of momentum conservation. We show how fitting this decay with an analytical solution of the hydrodynamic equations for the VM allows extracting the two transport coefficients. In order to compare with existing kinetic theories, an improvement of a previous derivation of the viscosity from an Enskog-like kinetic theory was required. This results in a new explicit formula for the missing contribution – the collisional part of the viscosity. For a typical choice of parameters from Vicsek’s original paper, we show that this collisional contribution is larger by a factor of $\approx 10^4$ than the previous prediction for the viscosity.

In the following paper (Part II), the results of the numerical evaluations are presented. In general, we find reasonable quantitative agreement between agent-based simulations and predictions by Enskog-kinetic theory for $\nu$ and $\lambda$. However, the deviations between theory and simulations are much higher for active models with velocity alignment, such as the Vicsek-model, than for models with passive particles, such as Multi-particle collision dynamics. Furthermore, in Part II, we present measurements using transverse current correlations and Green-Kubo relations to verify the results of the non-equilibrium reverse perturbation approach. Excellent agreement is observed among these complementary methods.
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[70] A kinetic theory that goes beyond the mean field assumption of molecular chaos can be found in Ref. [76](#).


[72] An alternative calculation of the viscosity be means of a nonequilibrium method will be presented in T. Ihle, A. Unruh, and A. Nikoubashman, *Calculating shear viscosities in active


