The pioneering paper [13] analyzed the non-equilibrium statistical physics of a set of multiple interacting systems, \( \mathcal{S} \), whose joint discrete-time evolution is specified by a Bayesian network. The major result of [13] was an integral fluctuation theorem (IFT) governing the sum of two quantities: the entropy production (EP) of an arbitrary single one of the systems, \( v \in \mathcal{S} \), and the transfer entropy from \( v \) to the other systems. Here I extend the analysis in [13]. I derive several detailed fluctuation theorems (DFTs), concerning arbitrary subsets of all the systems (including the full set). I also derive several associated IFTs, concerning an arbitrary subset of the systems, thereby extending the IFT in [13]. In addition I derive “conditional” DFTs and IFTs, involving conditional probability distributions rather than (as in conventional fluctuation theorems) unconditioned distributions. I then derive thermodynamic uncertainty relations relating the total EP of the Bayes net to the set of all the precisions of probability currents within the individual systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been a lot of research in non-equilibrium statistical physics and stochastic thermodynamics that considers a single non-equilibrium system executing a specified discrete time evolution. Examples include analyses of a system undergoing bit erasure [28, 30], a system maintaining a non-equilibrium steady state [24], or more generally a system undergoing an arbitrary discrete-time dynamics [18, 27, 39]. There has also been some research on the thermodynamics of a pair of interacting systems [9], in some cases where the first system measures the second one [10, 31], or performs a sequence of measurements and manipulations of the second one [1, 17, 34]. In particular, there has been research on fluctuation theorems for systems under the feedback control of another system [12, 33].

[13] extended this line of research to analyze the non-equilibrium statistical physics of an arbitrary number of interacting systems whose joint discrete-time evolution is specified by a Bayesian network (BN [16, 19]). The major result of that paper was an integral fluctuation theorem (IFT) governing the sum of the entropy production (EP) of an arbitrary single one of the systems, \( v \) and the transfer entropy from \( v \) to the rest of the systems.

In this paper I also consider the thermodynamics of systems that implement BNs. I derive detailed fluctuation theorems (DFTs) for the entire trajectory of all the systems evolving according to the BN (rather than just a single system). One of these DFTs gives the ratio of the probability of a specified joint trajectory of all the systems under a forward protocol to the probability of the reverse trajectory under the reverse protocol. Another DFT gives the ratio of the probability of a specified vector of the entropy productions (EPs) of all the systems under a forward protocol to the probability of the negative of that vector under the reverse protocol. I also derive “conditional DFTs”. These relate the probability under the forward protocol of a specified vector of the EPs of some of the systems, conditioned on a specified vector of the EPs of the remaining systems, to the conditional probability of the negative of those vectors, under the reverse protocol. I also derive IFTs to go with all of these DFTs.

After analyzing the fluctuation theorems of BNs I derive thermodynamic uncertainty relations that (in some scenarios) relate the total EP incurred by running a BN to the precisions of currents defined separately for each of the systems in that BN. I then present a toy example to illustrate this uncertainty relation. I end by discussing extensions and directions for future research.

As a notational point, I write the Kronecker delta as \( \delta(\ldots) \), and the Dirac delta as \( \delta(\cdot) \). I assume the reader knows basic terminology concerning Bayesian networks, e.g., directed acyclic graphs (DAGs), their roots, leaves, children, parents, etc., [13, 16]. I indicate entropy of a distribution \( p(X) \) as \( S(p(X)) \), or just \( S(p) \) for short [3]. I write the mutual information of a distribution \( p(X;Y) \) as \( I_{p}(X;Y) \), or just \( I(X;Y) \) for short. More generally, I write the multi-information of a joint distribution over a set of random variables, \( p(X_1,X_2,...) \) by

\[
I(p) := \sum_{i} S(p(X_i)) - S(p(X))
\]  

(1)

Mutual information is the special case of multi-information where there are exactly two random variables. More generally, multi-information is a sum of mutual informations:

\[
I(p) = \left[ S(p(X_1)) + S(p(X_{>1})) - S(p(X)) \right] + \left[ S(p(X_2)) + S(p(X_{>2})) - S(p(X_{>1})) \right] + \ldots
\]

\[
= I(X_1;X_{>1}) + I(X_2;X_{>2}) + \ldots
\]  

(2)

where I define \( p(X_i) := p(X_i,X_{i+1},...) \) for all \( i \).

I will use “path” and “trajectory” interchangeably, to mean a function from time into a state space. In the
usual way, I use the argument list of a probability distribution to indicate what random variables have been marginalized, e.g., \( P(x) = \sum_y p(x,y) \). In addition, I write \(|A|\) for the cardinality of any set \( A \).

Although many of the results below are more general, to fix thinking the reader can presume that the entire set of interacting systems evolves according to a continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC), while in contact with a single heat bath with constant temperature \( T \), where I choose units so that \( k_B T = 1 \). I will sometimes use “(forward) protocol”, or “process”, to refer to a sequence of Hamiltonians and rate matrices in such a CTMC.

II. STOCHASTIC THERMODYNAMICS OF MULTI-SYSTEM BAYESIAN NETWORKS

The systems considered in [13] are extensions of Bayesian networks, with the added structure that subsets of the nodes in the Bayes net’s DAG are identified as states of the same physical system, evaluated at different moments in time. In order to analyze the joint thermodynamics of all the variables in such a system, we need to add yet more mathematical structure [20].

In the next subsection I formalize this extension of Bayesian networks, which are called “multi-system Bayesian networks” (MBNs). Then in the following two subsections I introduce two special types of physical process, which can be used to analyze the thermodynamics incurred by implementing the conditional distribution at any specific node in an MBN. I also calculate the EP generated by running those processes. In the last subsection I use these results to calculate the total EP generated by running an MBN.

A. Multi-system Bayesian networks

Suppose we have a finite set \( S \) of \(|S|\) physical systems that evolve together, with a set of associated finite state spaces \( \{X^1, X^2, \ldots, X^{|S|}\} \). Write the joint state space of all the systems as \( X = \times_{i \in S} X^i \), with elements written as \( x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{|S|}) \). We also have a DAG with a set of nodes \( V \), with non-root nodes \( V \subset V \), and root nodes \( R := V \setminus V \). We also have a function \( g : V \to S \) that maps each \( v \in V \) to one of the systems. I write \( p^0(x_{g(v)}) \) to indicate the joint distribution over the root nodes of the DAG. For convenience, I put no \( a \ priori \) restrictions on this joint distribution [21].

In addition we have a set of conditional distributions, \( \{\pi_v(x_{g(v)}|x_{\text{pa}(g(v))}) : v \in V\} \), each of which specifies how the system corresponding to some non-root node \( v \) evolves when it is “run”, given the values of the (states of the systems corresponding to) its parent nodes. To make this more precise, for each node \( v \in V \), write \( \text{Anc}(v) \) for the ancestor nodes of \( v \) that are not root nodes. Then I will refer to the distribution over \( X_{g(v)} \) “after \( v \) is run” as shorthand for

\[
\sum_{x_{g(R)}} p^0(x_{g(R)}) \left[ \sum_{x_{g(\text{Anc}(v))}} \prod_{v' \in \text{Anc}(v)} \pi_{v'}(x_{g(v')}|x_{\text{pa}(g(v'))}) \right] \pi_v(x_{g(v)}|x_{\text{pa}(g(v))})
\]  

(3)

For this description of the dynamics over \( X \) to be both complete and self-consistent, there must be exactly one root node \( v \) that corresponds to each subsystem, i.e., for all subsystems \( i \), \( g(v) = i \) for exactly one \( v \in R \). In addition, every non-root node in the DAG must represent an update of one of the state of one of the physical systems. Formally, this means that for each non-root node \( v \), there is one (and only one) parent of \( v \) in the DAG, \( v' \), such that \( g(v') = g(v) \); we interpret \( x_{g(v')} \) as the initial state of \( X_{g(v)} \) at the beginning of a process updating it, while \( x_{g(v)} \) is the state when that update has completed.

Except for relaxing the requirement that the distribution over the root nodes be a product distribution, this mathematical structure is the graphical model (implicitly) assumed in [13]. I refer to this structure as a multi-system Bayesian network (MBN). MBNs are similar to several graphical models in the literature, including non-stationary dynamic Bayesian networks [29], time-varying dynamic Bayesian networks [35], and non-homogeneous dynamic Bayesian networks [3], among others [22]. An important property that MBNs inherit from BNs is that any MBN can be implemented by executing the conditional distributions at the nodes of the associated DAG, in a sequence specified by a topological order of the underlying DAG. (This fact was central to the analysis in [13].)

Below I will often simply write \( X_v \) rather than \( X_{g(v)} \) when it is understood that \( v \) is a node, with the elements of \( X_v \) written as \( x_v \). I will also write the set of all trajectories through \( X \) (i.e., the set of all maps from time into \( X \)) as \( \mathbf{X} \), with elements written as \( \mathbf{x} \). Given any trajectory \( \mathbf{x} \), the associated trajectory of states of subsystem \( i \) is written as \( \mathbf{x}_i \), and its value at time \( t \) is \( \mathbf{x}^i_t \). (So for example, given any node \( v \) in the MBN, the trajectory of states of subsystem \( g(v) \) is written as \( x_{v,\cdot} \).) I will also sometimes use phrases like “the process updating node
$\nu$ as shorthand for “a stochastic thermodynamic process whose effect is to update the state of $g(\nu)$ based on the values of the subsystems $g(pa(\nu))$ according to the conditional distribution $\pi_{\nu_i}$.”

To avoid confusion, now on I will most often refer to any one of the elements in $S$ as a “subsystem”, with the full set $S$ being the “full” or “joint” system. Accordingly, I will use the term subsystem variable to refer to the state of a subsystem as it evolves over time. I will write $p_i^t$ for the marginal distribution for the subsystem variable $i$ at time $t$. I will sometimes talk about “running” a node, or “updating” it, as shorthand for implementing the process that changes $x_{g(\nu)}$ according to the conditional distribution $\pi_{\nu_i}(x_{pa(\nu)})$.

**B. Path-wise subsystem processes**

In order to analyze the thermodynamics of entire MBNs, we first need to understand the thermodynamics of systems whose subsystems evolve independently of one another. (For the moment, the discussion will not be limited to MBNs per se, but apply to any such set of co-evolving subsystems.)

Define a (path-wise) subsystem process as any process governing evolution over the joint state space $X$ during time interval $[t_0, t_1]$ where:

1. The subsystems evolve independently of one another, i.e., the discrete-time conditional distribution over the joint state space is

   \[ \pi(x^t|x^{t_0}) = \prod_{i \in S} \pi_i(x_i^t|x_i^{t_0}) \]  

2. There are $|S|$ functions, $Q_i(...)$, such that the entropy flow (EP) into the joint system during the process if the full system follows trajectory $x$ and the initial joint distribution is $p^{t_0}$ can be written as

   \[ Q(x, p^{t_0}) = \sum_{i \in S} Q_i(x_i, p_i^{t_0}) \]

   for all trajectories $x$ that have nonzero probability under the protocol for initial distribution $p^{t_0}$.

Intuitively, in a subsystem process the separate subsystems evolve in complete isolation from one another, with decoupled Hamiltonians and rate matrices. (See [41, 42] for explicit examples of CTMCs that implement subsystem processes, for the special case where there are two subsystems.)

As is conventional [34, 37], write the (path-wise, global) EP incurred if the system follows trajectory $x$ as

\[ \sigma(x, p) := \left[ \ln[p_i^{t_0}(x_i^{t_0})] - \ln[p_i^t(x_i^t)] \right] - Q_i(x, p_i^{t_0}) \]  

Also define the (path-wise) subsystem EP for subsystem $i$ as

\[ \sigma_i(x, p_i) := \left[ \ln[p_i^{t_0}(x_i^{t_0})] - \ln[p_i^t(x_i^t)] \right] - Q_i(x_i, p_i^{t_0}) \]  

I use the term (path-wise, subsystem) Landauer loss to refer to the extra EP generated by implementing the protocol due to the fact that we do so with a subsystem process:

\[ \mathcal{L}(x, p) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_i(x_i, p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \ln[p_i^{t_0}(x_i^{t_0})] - \ln[p_i^t(x_i^t)] \right] - \Delta \mathcal{I}_p(x_i) \]  

where the second line uses condition (2) of path-wise subsystem processes to cancel the EPs.

(Expected) subsystem EP is always non-negative. Therefore if the expected multi-information among the subsystems decreases in a subsystem process, the Landauer loss must be strictly positive — and so the joint system EP must be strictly positive. This is true no matter how thermodynamically efficiently the individual subsystems evolve. One way to understand this intuitively is to note that in general the Shannon information stored in the initial statistical coupling among the subsystems will diminish (and maybe disappear entirely) as the process runs. So the contribution to the joint entropy from the statistical coupling among the subsystems grows as the joint system evolves. However, for each subsystem $i$ the rate matrix governing how $x_i$ evolves cannot depend on the states of the rest of the subsystems, $x_{-i}$, due to condition (2) of subsystem processes. So that rate matrix cannot exploit the information in the statistical coupling between the initial states of the subsystems to reduce the amount of entropy that is produced as that information dissipates. (See [41, 42].)

**C. Path-wise solitary processes**

I will use the term semi-fixed process to refer to any process involving two subsystems where subsystem 2 never changes its state. Sometimes I will refer to subsystems 1 and 2 of a semi-fixed process as the evolving and fixed subsystems, respectively. Some of the first investigations of the thermodynamics of semi-fixed processes were [11, 32, 33].

An important special type of a semi-fixed process is one which is also a subsystem process, and so obeys conditions (1) and (2) above. I refer to this kind of semi-fixed process as a (path-wise) solitary process. The system-wide EP in a solitary process is

\[ \sigma(x, p) = \sigma_1(x_1, p_1) - \Delta I(x_1; x_2) \]  

Due to the data-processing inequality [3], in a solitary process the expected drop in mutual information, $\Delta I(X_1;X_2) = \int d\mathbf{x} P(\mathbf{x}) \Delta I(\mathbf{x}_1;\mathbf{x}_2)$, is non-positive.

The analysis in [13] was based on the fact that Eq. (9) holds for an arbitrary semi-fixed process, not just solitary processes, so long as one replaces $\sigma_1(\mathbf{x}_1,p_1)$ in that equation with

$$\mathbf{T}_1(\mathbf{x},p_1) := \left( \ln[p_i(x_i^0)] - \ln[p_i(x_i^1)] \right) - Q(x,p)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Intuitively, this replacement amounts to redefining the “entropy production” of subsystem I to involve the EF generated by running the entire system, not just the EF due to running subsystem 1. (Note that $\mathbf{T}_1$ depends on all of $\mathbf{x}$, including the trajectory of the fixed subsystem, whereas $\sigma_1$ depends only on the trajectory of the evolving subsystem, $\mathbf{x}_1$.)

Eq. (10) means that semi-fixed processes in general incur (a version of) Landauer loss, just like solitary processes. Nonetheless, there are important differences between semi-fixed processes and solitary processes. Consider a process involving three subsystems, A, B, and C. Only subsystem A changes its state in this process, and the dynamics of subsystem $A$ depends on the state of subsystem $B$, but not on the state of subsystem $C$. We can formulate this process as a solitary process by identifying the joint system $AB$ as the evolving subsystem, and identifying the subsystem $C$ as the fixed subsystem. Note that the expectation of the associated subsystem EP is non-negative, i.e., $\langle \sigma_{AB} \rangle \geq 0$.

However, in general we cannot instead identify subsystem $A$ as the evolving subsystem of a solitary process, with the joint subsystem $BC$ being the fixed subsystem. (The reason is that because the evolution of subsystem $A$ depends on the state of subsystem $B$, we cannot express the total EF as a function just of the starting value of subsystem $A$, as required by condition (2).) On the other hand, we are free to identify subsystem $A$ as the evolving subsystem of a semi-fixed process, with the joint subsystem $BC$ as the associated fixed subsystem. Crucially though, if we do this then the expectation of the associated subsystem EP can be negative, i.e., it may be that $\langle \mathbf{T}_A \rangle < 0$.

To give physical meaning to these considerations, suppose we are interested in the minimal amount of work it would take to return the joint system $ABC$ from its ending distribution to its starting one. This minimal amount of extra work (sometimes called the “dissipated” work) is given by the subsystem EP if the dynamics is a solitary process. However, it does not equal the subsystem EP in semi-fixed processes, in general. Similarly, the expected EP of the evolving subsystem in a solitary process bounds the precision of any current defined over the state of the subsystem, in the usual way given by thermodynamic uncertainty relations [7]. However, the expected EP of the evolving subsystem in a semi-fixed process does not have so simple a relationship with the current in that subsystem in general.

Since subsystem EP has these physical meanings in solitary processes but not in semi-fixed processes, I mostly focus on solitary processes in the analysis below.

D. Entropy production in multi-system Bayesian networks

As mentioned above, [13] assumes that any MBN under consideration represents a physical system that runs a discrete-time Markov chain over $X$ that implements the conditional distributions of those nodes one at a time, in a sequence specified by a topological order of the DAG of the MBN. (Without loss of generality we can assume that all root nodes occur first in the topological order, and I make that assumption from now on.) This means that whenever some node $v$ in the MBN is being updated, none of the other nodes in the MBN are allowed to change their state. In addition, [13] implicitly assumes that the conditional distribution for any node $v$ with parents $pa(v)$ is implemented by a rate matrix that only couples the variables corresponding to the nodes $\{v\} \cup pa(v)$. So using the terminology introduced above, [13] formulates the physical process implementing the MBN as a sequence of semi-fixed processes, one for each node in the MBN, where the evolving subsystem is $g(v)$ when node $v$ is run.

Here I modify this model by allowing the subsystems to have their initial states set in parallel, by sampling the joint distribution $p^0$ over the root nodes, rather than requiring that those nodes be sampled independently, one after the other [23]. Moreover, for the reasons given above, rather than formulate the dynamics of the non-root nodes as a sequence of semi-fixed processes, I formulate it as a sequence of solitary processes, where the evolving subsystem when node $v$ is run is the joint system $(g(v), g(pa(v)))$.

Index the nodes by their (integer-valued) position in the topological order, $v \in \{1, 2, \ldots, |V|\}$. For any non-root node $v > 0$, write the distribution over all systems after node $v$ has run as $p_v^*$ [23]. Assume that the process sampling $p^0$ transpires in the time interval $[-|R|, 0]$, and that each remaining node $v \in V$ is run during the time interval $[v - 1, v]$. Write $\mathbf{x}$ to indicate the trajectory of joint states of the subsystems starting at time 0, after the root nodes have been jointly sampled. Introduce the shorthand that for any $v \in V$, $\mathbf{x}^v$ is that segment of $\mathbf{x}$ corresponding to the time interval when node $v$ is run. Given that in each of the successive solitary processes I identify the evolving subsystem as the combination of a node and its parents, it will be useful to introduce the shorthand that for any $V' \subset V$, $\mathbf{x}^{V'}(v)$ is the full trajectory of the components of $\mathbf{x}$ specified by $g(V')$, i.e., $\mathbf{x}^{V'}(v) = \mathbf{x}_{g(v)=v}^{V'}(v)$. (So for example, $P(\mathbf{x}^{V'}(v)) = \int d\mathbf{x} P(\mathbf{x}) \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^{V'}(v)) |_{v \in pa(v)} \delta(\mathbf{x}^{V'} - \mathbf{x}^{V'}(v))$. Similarly, define $\mathbf{x}^{V'}(v) := \mathbf{x} \setminus \mathbf{V}^{V'}(v)$.) Since EP is cumulative over time, by repeated application of Eq. (9), once for each node in the MBN, we see...
that the global EP incurred by running all nodes in the MBN if the joint system follows trajectory $\mathbf{x}$ is

$$
\sigma(\mathbf{x}, \pi, p^{0}) = \sum_{v=1}^{|V|} \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}, \pi_{v}, p^{v-1}) + \left(I_{p^{v-1}}(\mathbf{x}^{v}; \mathbf{x}_{-v}) - I_{p^{v}}(\mathbf{x}^{v}; \mathbf{x}_{-v})\right)
$$

Eq. (11) is the starting point for many of the results in this paper. I will sometimes shorten it to

$$
\sigma(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{v=1}^{|V|} \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}) - \Delta I_{v}(\mathbf{x})
$$

leaving the distributions $\pi_{v}$ and $p^{v-1}$ implicit.

As a final, technical note, in general it is not possible to implement an arbitrary conditional distribution $\pi_{v}$ with a CTMC, without introducing some “hidden” dynamics. However, this does not actually affect the applicability of the results in this paper; see Appendix A.

### III. Fluctuation Theorems for Multi-System Bayesian Networks

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ indicate the time-reversal of the trajectory $\mathbf{x}$. (For simplicity, I restrict attention to spaces $X_{i}$ whose elements are invariant under time-reversal.) Let $P(\mathbf{x})$ indicate the probability (density) of $\mathbf{x}$ under the forward protocol running the entire MBN. Let $\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x})$ indicate the probability of the same trajectory if we run the protocol in time-reversed order. So the ending distribution over $X$ under $P$ is the same as the starting distribution under $\tilde{P}$. Also write $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{v}$ to indicate the time-reversal of the trajectory segment $\mathbf{x}^{v}$.

In the next subsection, I derive fluctuation theorems concerning probabilities of trajectories, and in the following subsection, I derive fluctuation theorems concerning the joint probability that each of the subsystem EPs has some associated specified value.

#### A. Fluctuation theorems for trajectories

Plugging Eq. (12) into the usual detailed fluctuation theorem (DFT) gives the novel DFT,

$$
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x})} \right] = \sum_{v=1}^{|V|} \left( \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}) - \Delta I_{v}(\mathbf{x}) \right)
$$

for all $\mathbf{x}$ with nonzero probability under $P$. Exponentiating both sides of Eq. (13) and then integrating results in a novel IFT:

$$
\left\langle e^{-\sum_{v=1}^{V} \sigma_{v} - \Delta I_{v}} \right\rangle := \int dx P(\mathbf{x}) e^{-\sum_{v=1}^{V} \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}) - \Delta I_{v}(\mathbf{x})} = 1
$$

In addition to applying to the running of the entire MBN, the usual DFT applies separately to successive time intervals, i.e., to each successive interval at which exactly one node and its parents co-evolve as that node’s conditional distribution is executed. Therefore for all $v$,

$$
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\mathbf{x}^{v})}{P(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^{v})} \right] = \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}) - \Delta I_{v}(\mathbf{x})
$$

which results in an IFT analogous to Eq. (14).

We can also use Eq. (12) to establish fluctuation theorems based on summing up EP over precisely those intervals $v \in g^{-1}(i)$ during which some subsystem $i$ evolves. For example, the DFT governing the composite dynamics of subsystem $i$ over all intervals in which it evolves is

$$
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\mathbf{x}^{-i})}{\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x}^{-i})} \right] = \sum_{v \in g^{-1}(i)} \left( \sigma_{v}(\mathbf{x}^{v}) - \Delta I_{v}(\mathbf{x}) \right)
$$

which results in the IFT

$$
\left\langle e^{-\sum_{v \in g^{-1}(i)} \sigma_{v} - \Delta I_{v}} \right\rangle = 1
$$

Note that by combining Eqs. (13) and (15), we get

$$
\mathcal{I}(P(\mathbf{x})) = \mathcal{I}(\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x}))
$$

where I define

$$
\mathcal{I}(P(\mathbf{x})) := \ln \left[ \frac{P(\mathbf{x})}{\prod_{v=1}^{V} P(\mathbf{x}^{v})} \right]
$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{I}(\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x}))$. Intuitively, $\mathcal{I}(P(\mathbf{x}))$ is an extension of multi-information to concern probabilities of entire trajectories of the joint system. Note that Eq. (19) can be rewritten as

$$
\frac{P(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x})} = \prod_{v} \frac{P(\mathbf{x}^{v})}{\tilde{P}(\mathbf{x}^{v})}
$$
which can be derived directly, without invoking DFTs [23].

We can also combine Eqs. (13) and (15) to derive DFTs and IFTs involving conditional probabilities, in which the trajectories of one or more of the subsystems are fixed (and arbitrary). To illustrate this, pick any \( V' \subset V \), and plug Eq. (15) into Eq. (13) for all subsystems \( v \in V' \). Define \( x^{V'} := (x^{v'} : v' \in V') \), i.e., the “partial trajectory” given by all segments \( v' \in V' \) of the trajectory \( x \). Then after clearing terms we get the following “conditional DFT”, which must hold for all partial trajectories \( x^{V'} \) with nonzero probability under \( P \):

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(x|x^{V'})}{P(x|\bar{x})} \right] = \ln \left[ \frac{P(x^{V'}|x^{V'})}{P(x^{V'}|\bar{x})} \right] = -I(P(x^{V'})) + \sum_{v \in V \setminus V'} (\sigma_v(x^{v'}) - \Delta I_v(x))
\]

(21)

(Note that the multi-information term on the RHS of Eq. (21) concerns only those densities \( P(x,v') \) for \( v' \in V' \).) In turn, Eq. (21) gives the following “conditional IFT” which must hold for each partial trajectory \( x^{V'} \) with nonzero probability under \( P \):

\[
\left\langle e^{(I + \sum_{v \in V \setminus V'}(\Delta I_v - \sigma_v))} \right\rangle_{P(x^{V'})} = 1
\]

(22)

As an example of these conditional fluctuation theorems, for the case of a single node in \( V' \), \( V' = \{v\} \), the multi-information term in Eq. (21) disappears and we get

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(x|x^v)}{P(x|\bar{x})} \right] = \ln \left[ \frac{P(x|v)}{P(x|\bar{x})} \right] = \sum_{v' \neq v} (\sigma_v(x^{v'}) - \Delta I_v(x))
\]

while Eq. (22) becomes

\[
\left\langle e^{\sum_{v' \neq v}(\Delta I_v - \sigma_v)} \right\rangle_{P(x^v)} = 1
\]

(24)

Note that in addition to these results which hold when considering the entire system \( X \), since each subsystem process is a solitary process, the usual DFT and IFT must hold for each subsystem \( v \) considered in isolation, in the interval during which it is updated. So for example,

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(x^v)}{P(x^\bar{v})} \right] = \sigma_v(x^v)
\]

(25)

(Compare to Eq. (15).) Eq. (25) gives us an additional set of conditional DFTs and IFTs. For example, it gives the following variant of Eq. (23)

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(x|x^{V'})}{P(x|\bar{x})} \right] = -\Delta I_v(x) + \sum_{v' \neq v} (\sigma_v(x^{v'}) - \Delta I_v(x))
\]

(26)

The numerator of the expression inside the logarithm on the LHS of Eq. (26) is a distribution conditioned on the joint trajectory of (the subsystem corresponding to) node \( v \) and its parents when node \( v \) runs. In contrast, the numerator inside the logarithm on the LHS of Eq. (23) is a distribution conditioned on the joint trajectory of all of the subsystems when node \( v \) runs (not just the joint trajectory of \( v \) and its parents).

**Example 1.** Suppose we have a solitary process over a time interval \([t_0,t_1]\) with evolving subsystems \( A \) and semi-fixed subsystem \( B \), which are correlated when the process begins. We can represent this as an MBN with a 4-node DAG, where the evolving subsystem is represented by root node 1 feeding into leaf node 3, and the fixed subsystem is represented by root node 2 feeding into leaf node 4. Write the starting time for the process as \( t_0 \) and the ending time as \( t_1 \).

In the special case of solitary processes, there is no EP generated by subsystem \( B \). So Eq. (23) gives the DFT,

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(x_B|x_A)}{P(x_B|\bar{x})} \right] = I_{t_0}(x_A;x_B) - I_{t_1}(x_A;x_B)
\]

(27)

which must hold for all \( x_A \) with nonzero probability. (Note that the terms on the LHS of this equation involve entire trajectories, whereas those on the RHS involve only starting and ending states.) Similarly, Eq. (24) gives the IFT,

\[
\int dx_A P(x_B|x_A) e^{I_{t_0}(x_A;x_B) - I_{t_1}(x_A;x_B)} = 1
\]

(28)

which must hold for all \( x_A \) with nonzero probability.

Eq. (13) through Eq. (24) all hold for general semi-fixed processes, not just solitary processes, if we replace \( \sigma_v(x^v) = \sigma_v(x^{v'}) \) throughout with \( \sigma_v(x^v) = \sigma_v(x^{v'}) \), and also replace \( \Delta I_v(x) \) throughout with

\[
\Delta I_v(x) := I_{p \rightarrow v}(x^{v'}; x^{v''}) - I_{p \rightarrow v}(x^{v''}; x^{v''})
\]

(29)

(Indeed, [14] is an investigation of the variant of Eq. (17) that applies to semi-fixed processes, where we make these replacements.) However, Eqs. (25) and (26) along with the associated IFTs need not hold for general semi-fixed processes.

**B. Fluctuation theorems for EP**

We can use the DFTs of the previous subsection which concern probabilities of trajectories, to construct “joint DFTs”, which instead concern probabilities of vectors of the joint amounts of EP generated by all of the subsystems (see Sec. 6 in [17]).

To begin, define \( \overline{\Delta I}_v(x) := -\Delta I_v(x) \). Similarly define

\[
\overline{\sigma}_v(x) := \ln \left[ \frac{\bar{P}(x^{v'})}{\bar{P}(x^{v'})} \right]
\]

(30)

\[
\overline{\Delta I}_v(x) := \overline{\sigma}_v(x^v) - \overline{\sigma}_v(x^{v'})
\]

(31)
In the special case that \( p^v = p^{v-1} \), we can rewrite this as \( \sigma_v(x_v') \bar{P}_v(x_v') \), \( \{ \text{EP} \} \) generated by running (the part of the protocol that implements) the conditional distribution at node \( v \) backwards in time, starting from the distribution over \( X_v \) that is the ending distribution when node \( v \) is implemented going forward in time. We cannot rewrite it that way in general though; see discussion of Eq. 85 in [37].

Using this notation, for any set of real numbers \( \{ \alpha_v, \gamma_v : v \in V \} \),

\[
P(x : \{ \alpha_v(x_v') = \alpha_v, \Delta I_v(x) = \gamma_v : v \in V \}) = \int dx P(x) \prod_v \delta(\sigma_v(x_v') - \alpha_v) \delta(\Delta I_v(x) - \gamma_v)
\]

\[
= e^{\sum_v \alpha_v - \gamma_v} \int dx P(x) \prod_v \delta(\sigma_v(x_v') - \alpha_v) \delta(\Delta I_v(x) - \gamma_v)
\]

\[
= e^{\sum_v \alpha_v - \gamma_v} \int dx \bar{P}(x) \prod_v \delta(\bar{\sigma}_v(x_v') - \alpha_v) \delta(\bar{\Delta} I_v(x) - \gamma_v)
\]

\[
= e^{\sum_v \alpha_v - \gamma_v} \bar{P}(\{ \bar{\sigma}_v(x_v') = -\alpha_v, \bar{\Delta} I_v(x) = -\gamma_v : v \in V \})
\]  

(32)

We can write Eq. (32) more succinctly as

\[
\ln \frac{P(\{ \sigma_v = \alpha_v, \Delta I_v = \gamma_v : v \in V \})}{P(\{ \bar{\sigma}_v = -\alpha_v, \bar{\Delta} I_v = -\gamma_v : v \in V \})} = \sum_v \alpha_v - \gamma_v
\]  

(33)

or just

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \})}{P(\{ -\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v \})} \right] = \sum_v (\sigma_v - \Delta I_v')
\]  

(34)

for short.

In addition to Eq. (34), which concerns the entire MBN, the conventional extension of the DFT must hold separately for the time interval when each evolving subsystem \( (v) = \text{pa}(v) \cup \{ v \} \) runs:

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \})}{P(\{ -\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v \})} \right] = \sigma_v - \Delta I_v
\]  

(35)

Combining Eqs. (34) and (35) establishes that

\[
\frac{P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \})}{P(\{ -\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v \})} = \prod_v \frac{P(\sigma_v, \Delta I_v)}{P(\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v)}
\]  

(36)

(Note that it is not true that \( P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \}) = \prod_v P(\sigma_v, \Delta I_v) \) in general.) This should be compared to Eq. (18).

Combining Eqs. (34) and (35) also gives a set of conditional fluctuation theorems, analogous to Eqs. 21 and 22, only conditioning on values of EP and drops in mutual information rather than on components of a trajectory. For example, subtracting Eq. (35) from Eq. (34) gives the conditional DFT,

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \})}{P(\{ -\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v \})} \right] = \sum_v (\sigma_v - \Delta I_v')
\]  

(37)

which must hold for all pairs \( (\sigma_v, \Delta I_v) \) that have nonzero probability under \( P \). This in turn gives the conditional IFT,

\[
\left( \sum_v (\sigma_v - \Delta I_v') \right) P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \}) = 1
\]  

(38)

which must hold for all \( (\sigma_v, \Delta I_v) \) with nonzero probability under \( P \).

As usual, since each subsystem process is a solitary process the usual DFTs and IFTs must hold for each subsystem \( v \) considered in isolation, in the interval during which it is updated. So for example,

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\sigma_v)}{P(\bar{\sigma}_v)} \right] = \sigma_v
\]  

(39)

(Compare to Eq. (15).) Combining Eqs. (34) and (39) gives us an additional set of DFTs and IFTs. For example, it gives the following variant of Eq. (37):

\[
\ln \left[ \frac{P(\{ \sigma_v, \Delta I_v \})}{P(\{ -\bar{\sigma}_v, -\bar{\Delta} I_v \})} \right] = -\Delta I_v + \sum_v (\sigma_v - \Delta I_v')
\]  

(40)

**Example 2.** Consider an arbitrary subsystem process with \( N \) simultaneously evolving subsystems. Suppose that each subsystem starts at a Boltzmann distribution for its own Hamiltonian, which is a function of only its own state. Suppose though that the joint initial distribution is not a product of Boltzmann distributions.
Under these circumstances, the EP of each subsystem equals the dissipated work done on that subsystem $[3,4,38]$. Accordingly, for each subsystem $i$, define $\Delta F^i$ to be the change in its (equilibrium) free energy during the process, $w_i$ to be the work done on it during that process, and $\Delta I_i$ to be the change in the mutual information between its state and that of the other $N$ subsystems during the process. Then Eq. (54) gives a “multi-system” variant of Crooks’ fluctuation theorem $[3,5]$:  

$$ \frac{P(w_i, \Delta I_i)}{P(-w_i, -\Delta I_i)} = e^{\Sigma \Delta F^i - \Delta I_i} \quad (41) $$

which results in a “multi-system” variant of the Jarzynski equality $[7,32]$,  

$$ \langle e^{\Sigma \Delta F^i} \rangle = e^{-\sum_i \Delta F^i} \quad (42) $$

In particular, in the special case where $N = 2$, the mutual information $\Delta I_i$ is the same for all subsystems and we get  

$$ \frac{P(\Delta I_i, w_i)}{P(-\Delta I_i, -w_i)} = e^{2\Delta I + \Sigma \Delta F^i} \quad (43) $$

$$ \langle e^{2\Delta I + \Sigma \Delta F^i} \rangle = e^{-\Sigma \Delta F^i} \quad (44) $$

Eq. (54) through Eq. (38) also hold for semi-fixed processes in general, as usual throughout those equations we replace $\sigma_y$ with $\sigma_y$ and replace $\Delta I_y$ with $\Delta I_y$. However, Eqs. (59) and (40) along with the associated IFTs need not hold for semi-fixed processes in general.

IV. THERMODYNAMIC UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR MULTI-SYSTEM BAYESIAN NETWORKS

In this section I show how to combine Eq. (12) with some recently derived thermodynamic uncertainty relations to derive a bound on the precision of time-integrated currents in MBNs. I then present a simple example of this bound.

A. The generalized uncertainty relation and MBNs

[7] analyzes the relationship between an arbitrary stochastic process $P(y)$ generating trajectories $y$ over some finite space $Y$ (even a non-Markovian process) and an arbitrary associated time-antisymmetric real-valued function $f(y)$, i.e., a function obeying $f(y) = -f(y)$. They derive the tight inequality,  

$$ \frac{\langle f \rangle^2}{\langle f^2 \rangle} \leq \left( \tanh \frac{\sigma[P,y]}{2} \right) \quad (45) $$

where for any real-valued function $g(y)$,  

$$ \langle g \rangle := \int dy P(y) g(y) \quad (46) $$

$$ \delta[P,y] := \ln \frac{P(y)}{P(y')} \quad (47) $$

(Note that the denominator of the logarithm in Eq. (47) is $P(y)$, not $P(y')$.) They then show that Eq. (45) implies the (weaker) lower bound on the precision of $P$,  

$$ \frac{\langle f \rangle^2}{\text{Var}f} = \frac{\langle f \rangle^2}{\langle f^2 \rangle - \langle f \rangle^2} \leq \frac{e^{\delta[P]} - 1}{2} \quad (48) $$

where $\delta[P] := \langle \delta[P,y] \rangle$. Eq. (48) means that we cannot increase the precision of a current beyond a certain point without “paying for it” by increasing $\delta[P]$. Alternatively, it means that if we can experimentally measure the precision of a current, then we can lower-bound the sum of all contributions to $\delta[P]$ that are not directly experimentally measurable.

As an example of Eq. (48), since any linear combination of currents is a current, setting $f := \sum f_i$ for a set of currents $f_i$ implies  

$$ \frac{(\sum_i f_i)^2}{\sum_i \text{Cov}(f_i,f_i)} \leq \frac{e^{\delta[P]} - 1}{2} \quad (49) $$

In particular, suppose we define a set of currents $f_v$ which are each (time-antisymmetric) functions of $x_{v,t}$  

$$ \sigma[P] \geq \ln \left[ \frac{2(\sum_v (f_v)^2)}{\sum_v \text{Cov}(f_v,f_v')} + 1 \right] \quad (50) $$

This illustrates that for a fixed value of $\sigma[P]$, there is a tradeoff among the precisions of all of the currents, $(f_v)^2/\text{Var}(f_v)$, and the correlations among different currents.

As [7] emphasizes, while the inequalities Eqs. (45) and (48) always hold, $\delta[P]$ only has thermodynamic meaning when certain conditions are met. In particular, suppose that the process $P$ is a CTMC evolving over time interval $[0,1]$, LDB holds, and the starting and ending distribution of $Y$ are identical. Suppose as well that the driving protocol is time-symmetric, i.e., both the trajectories of Hamiltonians and the trajectory of rate matrices are invariant if we replace all times $t$ with $1-t$. Under such circumstances, $\delta[P] = \sigma[P]$ $f$, and so $\delta[P]$ can be identified with the dissipated work done on the system. This special case of Eq. (48) is known as the “generalized thermodynamic uncertainty relation” (GTUR), and was first derived in $[8]$.

In light of these results, consider an MBN formulated as a sequence of solitary processes, where the protocol of each separate solitary process is time-symmetric about the middle of the interval that it takes place. Assume as well that the beginning marginal distribution of every subsystem $(v)$ when it begins to run is the same as the
ending marginal distribution of that subsystem after it finishes running [26]. So for each subsystem \( (v) \), using obvious notation, \( \delta_v[P_v] = \sigma_v[P_v] \). Therefore by using first Eq. (12) and then Eq. (48), rather than Eq. (50) we get

\[
\sigma[P] = \sum_v (\delta_v[P_v] - \Delta I_v(P)) \geq \sum_v \left( \ln \left[ \frac{2(f_v)^2}{\text{Var}(f_v)} + 1 \right] - \Delta I_v(P) \right)
\]

(51)

where the random variable \( f_v \) is any time-asymmetric function of \( x_v^{(v)} \).

Eq. (51) illustrates a trade-off among the precisions of currents of the various subsystems, the sum of the drops in mutual information, and the total dissipated work of the joint system. In particular, it suggests that without changing the conditional distributions at the nodes of the MBN, and without incurring any additional global EP, if we can change the initial distribution \( p^0 \) in a way that reduces the mutual information changes, \( \Delta I_v(P) \), then it is possible to increase the precisions of the currents in the subsystems.

This suggestion must be treated with care though. The rate matrix of a solitary process evolving \( x_v^{(v)} \) only couples the subsystems specified in \( (v) \). Therefore the precision of any current defined in terms of \( x_v^{(v)} \) is fully specified by the combination of that rate matrix and the initial distribution \( p(x_v^{(v)}) \). So as long as we leave both of those quantities alone, changing the statistical coupling between \( x_v^{(v)} \) and \( x_{-v}^{(v)} \) at the start of that solitary process cannot affect the precision of that current.

On the other hand, suppose we did not restrict ourselves to using a solitary process to evolve \( x_v^{(v)} \) allowing ourselves to instead use a semi-fixed process to implement the same conditional distribution \( \pi_v \) over \( x_v^{(v)} \) during the interval \([v-1, v]\). In this case the rate matrix for the dynamics of \( x_v^{(v)} \) would be allowed to involve values of both \( x_{-v}^{(v)} \) and \( x_{-v}^{(v)} \). So in theory at least, the rate matrix could be designed to exploit that coupling to reduce the system-wide EP generated in implementing \( \pi_v \) or alternatively, keeping the EP unchanged, the rate matrix could be designed to exploit that coupling to increase the precision of \( f_v \).

**B. Example of the uncertainty relation for MBNs**

Suppose we have three subsystems, \( A, B \) and \( C \), and that their joint evolution is given by a sequence of two solitary processes. In the first solitary process the evolving subsystem is the composite system \( AB \), where \( C \) is the fixed subsystem. In the second solitary process the evolving subsystem is the composite system \( BC \), where \( A \) is the fixed subsystem. Presume as well that subsystem \( B \) does not change its state from the beginning to the end of the full process. The associated MBN has six nodes, representing the initial and final states of the three subsystems. Three of those nodes are root nodes, and the remaining three are leaf nodes. Assume that both of the solitary processes take place during a time interval of length 1.

Take \( X_B \) to be binary. In addition assume that both \( X_A \) and \( X_C \) have at least three elements. (Recall that a system with two states cannot have a non-equilibrium steady state (NESS.) Then we can (for example) take \( f_A \) to be the net number of jumps from some specific state \( x_A \) to some specific other state \( x'_A \) and similarly for \( f_C \). (Since \( x_B \) does not change in the dynamics, \( f_B \) is irrelevant.)

Assume as well that while each solitary process runs, the rate matrix governing the system dynamics is time-homogeneous, i.e., that the matrix discontinuously changes when the first solitary process ends and the second begins, but other than that it never changes. Since \( x_B \) does not change, we can write the rate matrix governing the evolution of \( X_A \) during the first solitary process as \( W_{X_A|x_A}^B \), or just the \( [X_A|x_A] \) matrix \( W_{X_A}^B \) for short. We will be interested in the case where both matrices \( W_{X_B} \) have a (unique) NESS over \( X_A \), but that the NESS differs for the two \( x_B \) values.

Using this notation, we can write the conditional distribution for how the first solitary process transforms the state \( x_A \) as \( \exp(W_{X_A}^B) \). This conditional distribution differs for the two values of \( x_B \). Together, those two conditional distributions give the stochastic rule for the ending value of \( x_A \), based on its starting value and on the value of \( x_B \).

Suppose further that \( x_A = x_C \) when the process begins, and that \( x_B \) is statistically coupled with \( x_A \) then (and therefore also with \( x_C \)). So

\[
p^0(x_A, x_B, x_C) = p^0(x_B)p^0(x_A|x_B)\delta(x_C, x_A)
\]

(52)

Assume as well that for both values of \( b \), \( p^0(x_A|x_B) \) is the NESS of the associated rate matrix \( W_{X_A}^B \). This guarantees that the ending joint distribution over \( (x_A, x_B) \) is the same as the starting distribution, regardless of \( p^0(x_B) \). In addition, since the rate matrix is time-homogeneous during the first solitary process, it is time-symmetric about the middle of that process. Therefore all the conditions are met to ensure that \( \delta_{AB}[P] = \sigma_{AB}[P] \), and so Eq. (45) applies to the first solitary process.

For completeness, assume that the second solitary process proceeds the same way as the first one, just with subsystem \( C \) substituted for subsystem \( A \). Therefore all the conditions are met to ensure that \( \delta_{BC}[P] = \sigma_{BC}[P] \), and so Eq. (45) applies to the second solitary process as well as the first one. Therefore Eq. (51) applies to the sequence of both solitary processes, implementing the full MBN.

Recall that there are nonzero probability currents in an NESS. Accordingly, there is nonzero probability that the ending state of \( x_A \) after the first solitary process runs differs from the state of \( x_C \) then. However, with probability 1 their initial states were identical. Accordingly,
there must be a drop in (expected) mutual information between the evolving and fixed subsystems of the first solitary process. The same is true for the second solitary process. These two drops in mutual information increase the RHS of Eq. (\[51\]). That increase can either be paid for by an increase in the global EP, $\sigma[P]$, or by a reduction in the precisions of the two solitary processes.

As an alternative, consider implementing that same MBN with a different process. Just like the process described above, this alternative process would first update the state of $X_A$, and then when that was done it would update the state of $X_C$. However, those two updates would not be done with solitary processes. Instead, the state of $X_A$ would be updated with a CTMC whose rate matrix evolves $x_A$ based on the current state of all three variables, $x_A, x_B,$ and $x_C$. (In contrast, as discussed in Section IIB if $x_{AB}$ is updated with a solitary process, then the associated rate matrix can only involve $x_A$ and $x_B$.) This allows the CTMC to exploit the initial coupling of $x_A$ and $x_C$ in order to reduce the total EP generated by updating $x_A$. The result is that Eq. (\[51\]) would be still hold with the $\Delta I_i$ terms removed. Since those terms are both negative, this would (in theory) allow the process to generate the same global EP as the original process but with greater precisions of both of the currents.

V. DISCUSSION

Suppose we have a set of physical subsystems of an overall system, and that they evolve independently of one another. Suppose as well that each of them evolves with a process that is thermodynamically reversible, and so which incurs zero irreversible entropy production if considered by itself. In general, if the initial states of those subsystems were statistically coupled, then even though they are separately thermodynamically reversible, the joint system will not be thermodynamically reversible; there will be nonzero entropy production (EP) incurred when its subsystems have all run [2, 41, 42]. This “Landauer loss” reflects the fact that running the full system backwards, starting from its ending distribution, will not recreate its initial distribution in general — the initial statistical coupling among the subsystems will have been diminished.

It has recently become appreciated that this Landauer loss can have significant, nontrivial consequences. For example, in a conventional digital circuit, each gate evolves independently of the others, and the initial states of the gates are (highly) correlated with one another. Accordingly, the Landauer loss is nonzero, and the circuit unavoidably generates entropy when it runs. Moreover, a pair of circuits that differ in their layout but implement the same overall Boolean function will have different values for this unavoidable EP, in general.

In this paper I use this phenomenon to derive fluctuation theorems and thermodynamic uncertainty relations for systems that comprise multiple interacting subsystems. Following the pioneering work of [13], I formulate the interactions of those subsystems as (extensions of) Bayesian networks. However, in contrast to the work in [13], I choose the subsystems to ensure that the expected EP of each one is non-negative. (This in fact is crucial for deriving the uncertainty relations.) In addition, whereas [13] only derived a fluctuation theorem concerning a single one of the subsystems, I derive a set of fluctuation theorems that concern the dynamics of the full system.

As a result, I am able to derive “conditional fluctuation theorems”, relating the conditional probabilities of events rather than (as in conventional fluctuation theorems) unconditioned probabilities. Similarly, considering the full system allows me to derive “multi-system” versions of Crooks’ theorem and of the Jarzynski equality. It also allows me to derive uncertainty relations involving statistical precisions of currents in all of the subsystems to the global EP.
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Appendix A: The role of hidden states

In general it is not possible to implement an arbitrary discrete-time conditional distribution \( \pi_v(x_{v+1}^v|x_v^v) \) using a CTMC over \( X_{g(v)} \). Instead, in order to use a CTMC to model the dynamical process that results in that conditional distribution, there must be a set of extra “hidden” states of subsystem \( g(v) \), in addition to the “visible” states in \( X_{g(v)} \), and the CTMC must couple those two sets of states when it runs that conditional distribution to update that subsystem \([27, 40]\).

However, at both \( t = v - 1 \) and \( t = v \), the beginning and end of when node \( v \) is run, the state of subsystem \( g(v) \) must be visible, i.e., it must lie in \( X_v \) at those two times. (If that weren’t the case, then we could not be sure that the discrete time dynamics is actually given by \( \pi_v(x_{v+1}^v|x_v^v) \) operating on \( p^v(x_v^v \mid \text{pa}(v)) \). Accordingly, any hidden states can be ignored in calculating the drop in mutual information as node \( v \) is updated. For the same reason, the change in \( \ln[p_v(x_v)] \) from \( t = v \) to \( t = v + 1 \) doesn’t depend on whether hidden states exist. So their only effect on Eq. (7) is to modify the EF function of the process updating node \( v \), \( \mathcal{Q}_v(.,.) \) (and similarly for Eq. (6)). Therefore their only result on Eq. (9) — which is the starting point for the results in this paper concerning solitary process formulations of MBNs — is to change the EF function implicitly defining \( \sigma_1(.,.) \). Since the detailed form of the EF function is irrelevant for the results in this paper (that function is subsumed in the function \( \sigma_p(.,.) \)), we can ignore hidden states for the purposes of this paper.