

Thermodynamic stability implies causality

L. Gavassino, M. Antonelli & B. Haskell

Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Bartycka 18, 00-716 Warsaw, Poland

The stability conditions of a relativistic hydrodynamic theory can be derived directly from the requirement that the entropy should be maximised in equilibrium. Here we use a simple geometrical argument to prove that, if the hydrodynamic theory is stable according to this entropic criterion, then localised perturbations cannot propagate outside their future light-cone. In other words, within relativistic hydrodynamics, acausal theories must be thermodynamically unstable. We show that the physical origin of this deep connection between stability and causality lies in the relationship between entropy and information.

Introduction - A hydrodynamic theory is said to be stable if small deviations from the state of global thermodynamic equilibrium do not have the tendency to grow indefinitely, but remain bounded over time. It is said to be causal if signals do not propagate faster than light. Every hydrodynamic theory should guarantee the validity of these two principles, the former arising from the definition of equilibrium as the state towards which dissipative systems evolve (as $t \rightarrow +\infty$), the latter arising from the principle of relativity (if signals were superluminal, there would be a reference frame in which the effect precedes the cause). Whenever a new theory is proposed, it needs to pass these two tests, to be considered reliable. To date, these properties have been mostly studied as two distinct, disconnected features of the equations of the theory, to be discussed separately. Intuitively, this approach seems natural, as stability and causality are two principles which pertain to two complementary branches of physics: thermodynamics [1] and field theory [2].

However, in reality these two features appear to be strongly correlated. Divergence-type theories are causal if and only if they are stable [3] while Israel-Stewart theories are causal if they are stable [4, 5]. Geroch and Lindblom [6] analysed a wide class of causal theories for dissipation and found that many causality conditions have an important stabilising effect. Finally, Bemfica *et al.* [7] have recently proven a theorem, according to which, if a theory is stable in the fluid rest-frame, and it is causal, then it is stable in every reference frame, formalising a widespread intuition [8, 9]. All these results suggest the existence of an underlying physical mechanism connecting causality and stability. Discovering it would lead to a complete change of paradigm. In fact, it would provide a new insight into the physical meaning of the (usually complicated) mathematical structure which ensures causality. Furthermore, it would importantly simplify the (usually tedious) job of testing both causality and stability, maybe reducing one to the other.

To date, a “fully explanatory” mechanism connecting causality and stability has never been proposed. In fact, such a connection is usually found a posteriori, by direct comparison between the two distinct sets of conditions (as in [4]), or through complicated mathematical proofs,

as in [7]. The goal of this letter is to finally explain simply the relationship between causality and stability. We prove, with a geometrical argument, that if a theory is *thermodynamically* stable, namely if the entropy is maximised at equilibrium (see Gavassino [10]), it is also causal. We show that the key to understand this result from a physical perspective is the underlying relationship between entropy and information. Furthermore, we explain why causality alone does *not* imply stability (see e.g. [11]), but one needs at least to prove stability in a particular reference frame (in agreement with [7]).

We adopt the signature $(-, +, +, +)$ and we work in natural units $c = k_B = 1$.

Thermodynamic stability - Consider a relativistic fluid located in a stationary (fixed) background spacetime [12]. Given a selection of the macroscopic fields (φ_i) which carry information about the local state of the fluid (e.g. the fluid four-velocity or the temperature field) we consider two solutions of the hydrodynamic equations, φ_i and $\varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i$. The first is the state of global thermodynamic equilibrium, while $\delta\varphi_i$ is a small perturbation which conserves the total energy and any other conserved quantity (such as the total baryon number).

Assume that the fluid is thermodynamically stable. Then, following [10], we know that, for an arbitrary *space-like* Cauchy 3D-surface Σ , the quantity

$$E[\Sigma] := S[\Sigma, \varphi_i] - S[\Sigma, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i], \quad (1)$$

quantifying the entropy difference between the equilibrium and the perturbed state, can be written as the flux

$$E[\Sigma] = \int_{\Sigma} E^a n_a \sqrt{|\gamma|} d^3y \quad (2)$$

of a four-current $E^a = E^a[\varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i]$, which has the following properties:

- (i) - For any unit vector n^a , time-like and past-directed ($n^a n_a = -1$, $n^0 < 0$), we have

$$E^a n_a \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

- (ii) - $E^a = 0$ on any point where the perturbation of every measurable quantity is zero, and only on these points.

(iii) - The four-divergence of E^a is non-positive:

$$\nabla_a E^a \leq 0. \quad (4)$$

The first condition is simply the Gibbs stability criterion, according to which $E \geq 0$ (namely, the entropy is maximised in equilibrium) for any possible choice of Σ and $\delta\varphi_i$. In fact, the vector $n^a = n^a[\Sigma]$ appearing in (2) is the unit normal to Σ ; it is time-like past-directed. The second condition is a consequence of how the current E^a is explicitly constructed, as minus the second-order perturbation to the entropy current [10]. The third condition is the second law of thermodynamics.

The criterion for *thermodynamic stability* described above is a sufficient condition for *hydrodynamic stability* [10], but contains more information than a direct hydrodynamic stability analysis. In fact, while the latter is a dynamical property of the field equations (an on-shell criterion [13]), the former is a property of the constitutive relations (it must be respected also off-shell). Thermodynamic stability implies stability of any field equation, realistic or not, which obeys the global conservation laws and the second law of thermodynamics. It also implies stability to virtual processes and thermal fluctuations, even if these are not explicitly modelled in the hydrodynamic theory. To better understand this point, consider the case of a perfect fluid, whose current E^a is [4, 10]

$$TE^a = \frac{u^a}{2}(\rho + p)\delta u^b \delta u_b + \delta u^a \delta p + \frac{u^a}{2} \left[\frac{1}{c_s^2} \frac{(\delta p)^2}{\rho + p} + \frac{nT}{c_p} (\delta\sigma)^2 \right], \quad (5)$$

where u^a , n , T , ρ , p , σ , c_s and c_p are fluid velocity, particle density, temperature, energy density, pressure, entropy per particle, speed of sound and specific heat at constant pressure. The condition (i) produces the thermodynamic inequalities (assuming $n, T > 0$)

$$0 < c_s^2 \leq 1 \quad \rho + p > 0 \quad c_p > 0. \quad (6)$$

The third inequality is a condition of stability to heat transfer, a process that is, however, not allowed in a perfect fluid. Hence, $c_p > 0$ is not a condition of hydrodynamic stability (as long as the fluid is perfect) because the mechanism driving the instability is a virtual process, i.e. a process that is forbidden on-shell. However, thermodynamic stability implies stability also to virtual processes [14], which become real when thermal fluctuations are included in the description [15, 16].

The argument for causality - Our goal is to show that the conditions (i,ii,iii) also imply causality. We work, for clarity, in 1+1 dimensions, on a scale that is assumed sufficiently small that we can neglect the gravitational field, but the argument can be straightforwardly generalised. Working in an inertial coordinate system (t, x) ,




FIG. 1. Visualization of the geometric argument. The initial perturbation (in red) is located to the left of the origin. Causality requires it to stay confined in the $t \geq x$ half-plane. We build the triangle ABC in such a way that all its edges are space-like. B and C intersect at the origin. We can regulate B to be arbitrarily close to the line $t = x$. The green arrows are a Euclidean representation of the unit normals to the edges and are taken inward-pointing, consistently with our choice of metric signature [17].

we consider a perturbation that is initially confined in the semi-axis $x \leq 0$, namely

$$\delta\varphi_i(0, x) = 0 \quad \forall x > 0. \quad (7)$$

We apply the Gauss theorem to the triangle ABC shown in figure 1 and use condition (iii):

$$E[A] + E[B] + E[C] = \int_{(\text{triangle})} \nabla_a E^a dt dx \leq 0. \quad (8)$$

The 1D surfaces A , B and C are all space-like, so that their unit normal vector must be taken inward-pointing [17]. Combining (7) with condition (ii) we immediately obtain $E[C] = 0$. Furthermore, since the unit normals to A and B are time-like past-directed, we can use (i) to show that both $E[A]$ and $E[B]$ are non-negative, so that (8) implies

$$E[A] = E[B] = 0. \quad (9)$$

But this implies, recalling (ii), that $\delta\varphi_i$ must be zero on all the sides of the triangle. Since we can make the triangle arbitrarily long (A and C may extend to $x = +\infty$) and the side B may be arbitrarily close to the line $t = x$ (without crossing it, because B must be space-like), we finally obtain

$$\delta\varphi_i(t, x) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x > t. \quad (10)$$

This shows that no perturbation can propagate outside the light-cone, hence causality.

Physical interpretation - To be able to understand the physical meaning of the argument above, we need first to have an intuitive interpretation of E^a .

Within the usual interpretation of entropy as uncertainty, in the sense that S reflects our ignorance, interpreted as lack of information [18], about the exact system's microstate (recall Boltzmann's formula $S = \ln \Gamma$, where Γ is the number of microscopic realizations of a given macrostate), the definition (1) can be rewritten as

$$E = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Ignorance at} \\ \text{equilibrium} \end{array} \right) - \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Ignorance in the} \\ \text{perturbed state} \end{array} \right). \quad (11)$$

Hence, E is the net information carried by the perturbation. The Gibbs stability criterion ($E \geq 0$), then, is the statement that any perturbation increases our knowledge about the microstate. Now, if we look at equation (2) and invoke the condition (ii), it follows that we can identify E^a with the current of information transported by the perturbation [19]. In fact, if $E^a = 0$ in a given region of space \mathcal{R} , then the average value of any observable on \mathcal{R} coincides with the microcanonical average (i.e. the equilibrium value). Since the microcanonical ensemble assigns equal a priori probability to every microstate, there is no information in \mathcal{R} . The reader can see Supplementary Material for a more rigorous proof that E^a is the current of information.

Now that we have an interpretation of E^a , let us examine the conditions (i) and (iii). The latter is just the second law of thermodynamics, as seen from the point of view of information theory: our initial information about the microstate of the system can only be lost (or transported from one place to another) in time, but never created, because all the initial conditions tend, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$, to the same final macrostate (the equilibrium). However, the most interesting condition for us is (i): it is easy to show that imposing (i), namely that the density of information is non-negative, is equivalent to requiring that E^a is time/light-like future-directed, namely

$$E^a E_a \leq 0 \quad E^0 \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

This is where the contact with causality is established. In fact, if information is transported by a non-space-like four-current, it propagates along causal trajectories and cannot exit the light-cone. This is the most fundamental definition of causality.

The inverse argument - At this point it is natural to ask whether we can reverse the argument and show that causality implies stability. This is in general not true (see e.g. [11]). In fact, let us assume that we still have an information current E^a , defined by equation (2), and that conditions (ii) and (iii) are valid (they are typically ensured by construction when there is an entropy current). The causality requirement reduces to imposing that E^a is time/light-like, but this does not specify its orientation. It might be the case that E^a , for some configurations, is




FIG. 2. Visualization of the geometric argument for the theorem of Bemfica *et al.* [7]. All the edges of the triangle ABC are space-like. We create an arbitrary initial perturbation (in red) on the side C . Since A is outside the causal future of C , we are free to set the initial perturbation to zero on A . The inverse temperature four-vector β^a (dark green) is aligned with the t -axis. The light green arrows are a Euclidean representation of the unit normals to the edges.

past-directed, generating instability. Thus, in general

$$(\text{Causality}) \quad \not\Rightarrow \quad (\text{i}).$$

However, to fix the orientation we only need to assume that there is a preferred reference frame in which $E^0 \geq 0 \forall \delta\varphi_i$. It is natural, and it usually simplifies the calculations, to take this reference frame to be aligned with the equilibrium inverse-temperature four-vector β^a , which always exists, is unique and is time-like future-directed [20–22]. Hence, we can conclude that

$$(\text{Causality}) \quad + \quad (E^a \beta_a \leq 0) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (\text{i}),$$

which leads to the theorem of Bemfica *et al.* [7].

We can also give a more rigorous geometrical proof of this result, considering the triangle in figure 2, assuming causality and that $E^a \beta_a \leq 0$. The setting is similar to that of the previous geometric argument, however, note that now (t, x) is not an arbitrary inertial frame, but it has been chosen in such a way that $\beta^a \propto \delta^a_t$. Furthermore, the arbitrary initial perturbation has now been freely imposed on the side C of the triangle and not on the x -axis. Again we can apply the Gauss theorem, to obtain

$$E[A] + E[B] + E[C] \leq 0. \quad (13)$$

Since there is no perturbation on A , we know that $E[A] = 0$. Furthermore, given that the normal to B is

$$n^a[B] = -\frac{\beta^a}{\sqrt{-\beta^b \beta_b}}, \quad (14)$$

we can use the condition $E^a \beta_a \leq 0$ to show that $E[B] \geq 0$. Hence, we have

$$-E[C] \geq E[B] \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

However, noting that $E[C]$ is computed taking the normal to C future-directed, as in figure 2, we conclude that $-E[C]$ quantifies the information contained in C . Its positivity, for any possible choice of initial perturbation on C and for any possible triangle (having the properties described in figure 2), leads to (i) and hence to stability.

Example 1: perfect fluids - We conclude the letter with some examples. Consider the information current of a perfect fluid (5), assuming that $\delta\sigma = 0$ to the first order. Then, the condition of stability in the fluid rest frame reduces to (note that $u^a = T\beta^a$)

$$-E^a u_a = (\rho + p) \frac{\delta u^b \delta u_b}{2} + \frac{(\delta p)^2}{2(\rho + p)c_s^2} \geq 0. \quad (16)$$

This produces the conditions $\rho + p > 0$ (positive inertial mass [23]) and $c_s^2 \geq 0$ (stability of the fluid against compression), which exist also in the Newtonian theory. The causality requirement $E^a E_a \leq 0$ reads explicitly

$$(\rho + p)\delta u^b \delta u_b + \frac{(\delta p)^2}{(\rho + p)c_s^2} \pm 2\delta p \sqrt{\delta u^b \delta u_b} \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

which produces the well-known condition $c_s^2 \leq 1$ (subluminal speed of sound). The reader might be surprised that this condition turns out to be also a stability condition. After all, a sound-wave that propagates faster than light is still governed by a wave equation, hence its amplitude should remain bounded over time. However, again we need to remember that a system is *thermodynamically* stable if it is stable also to virtual processes. One can verify that a virtual process in which the amplitude of a sound-wave grows with time increases the entropy of the fluid in all those reference frames in which the sound-wave moves backwards in time, generating an instability. Indeed, it is well-known that if a causal microscopic Lagrangian produces an effective macroscopic fluid theory with $c_s^2 > 1$, then the equilibrium state is unstable and the perfect fluid description is not applicable, because high frequency modes must grow [24–26].

Example 2: Cattaneo equation - As a second example we consider a rigid infinite solid bar (1+1 dimensions in flat spacetime), with uniform density, and we model the heat propagation within extended irreversible thermodynamics [27]. We take the fields $(\varphi_i) = (T, q)$, representing temperature and heat flux, as degrees of freedom and impose, in the rest-frame of the solid, the conservation law

$$nc_p \partial_t T + \partial_x q = 0. \quad (18)$$

The (t, x) components of the entropy current are postulated to be

$$s^a = \left(s - \frac{1}{2}\chi q^2, \frac{q}{T} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $s = s(T)$ is the equilibrium entropy density. Combining the conservation law (18) and the constitutive relation (19), one can show (just apply the technique of

[10]) that the information current is

$$E^a = \left(\frac{nc_p(\delta T)^2}{2T^2} + \frac{1}{2}\chi(\delta q)^2, \frac{\delta q \delta T}{T^2} \right). \quad (20)$$

Now, the requirement $E^t > 0$ for $\delta\varphi_i \neq 0$ immediately produces the stability conditions

$$c_p > 0 \quad \chi > 0, \quad (21)$$

the first ensuring stability to heat diffusion [1], the second to fluctuations of q . The requirement that E^a should not be space-like ($E^a E_a \leq 0$) produces

$$\frac{1}{\chi nc_p T^2} \leq 1. \quad (22)$$

This is, indeed, the causality condition of the model (but it is also an important stability condition, see [28], Appendices 3-4). In fact, if we postulate an information annihilation rate $\nabla_a E^a = -(\delta q)^2/(\kappa T^2) \leq 0$ (κ is the positive heat conductivity coefficient), the resulting linearised field equation is the Cattaneo equation

$$\chi nc_p T^2 \partial_t^2 \delta T - \partial_x^2 \delta T + \frac{nc_p}{\kappa} \partial_t \delta T = 0, \quad (23)$$

whose characteristic maximum signal propagation speed is $(\chi nc_p T^2)^{-1/2}$. Again, we see that the causality condition is merely thermodynamic (it involves only thermodynamic coefficients) and is unaffected by the value of the kinetic coefficient κ . In fact, while causality is a geometric constraint on the direction of the information current, κ only quantifies the rate at which the information is destroyed. In the limit in which $\kappa \rightarrow +\infty$, heat does not propagate infinitely fast. Instead, information becomes a conserved quantity, and (23) becomes a non-dissipative causal wave equation.

Example 3: kinetic theory - All our results remain valid also in ideal-gas kinetic theory: one only needs to replace the fields $\varphi_i = \varphi_i(x)$ with the invariant distribution function $f = f(x, p)$, counting the number of particles in a small phase-space volume centered on (x, p) . The entropy current, particle current and stress-energy tensor of the gas are (working in local inertial coordinates)

$$\{s^a, N^a, T^{ab}\} = \int \{ \sigma, f, fp^b \} p^a \frac{g_s d^3 p}{p^0}, \quad (24)$$

where g_s is the spin degeneracy and $\sigma = \sigma(f)$ is a function that depends on the type of particle (distinguishable, bosons or fermions). The equilibrium states are given by

$$\frac{d\sigma}{df} = -\alpha - \beta_b p^b \quad \alpha = \text{const}, \beta^b \text{ Killing}. \quad (25)$$

The information current can be computed using the formula $E^a = -\delta s^a - \alpha \delta N^a - \beta_b \delta T^{ab}$ (see Supplementary Material for the proof) and is given by

$$E^a = - \int \frac{d^2 \sigma}{df^2} \frac{\delta f^2}{2} p^a \frac{g_s d^3 p}{p^0}. \quad (26)$$

Imposing that E^a is time/light-like future directed for any δf produces the conditions

$$p^a p_a \leq 0 \quad \frac{d^2 \sigma}{df^2} < 0. \quad (27)$$

The first condition (subluminal motion of particles) is a well-known causality requirement. However, it also constitutes a stability condition, because hypothetical tachyons would be able to bounce (as a result of collisions) backwards and forward in time an unlimited number of times, arbitrarily increasing their apparent number with no energy cost. This would generate a tachyon condensation instability, analogous to the one observed in field theories [25]. The second condition is the ubiquitous concavity requirement for the entropy function [29, 30], which is obeyed by every classical and quantum statistics (including anyons [31], in 2+1 dimensions).

Conclusions - The implications of this work are twofold. On the practical side, it shows that the entropy-based stability criterion developed in [10] is enough also to ensure causality, simplifying considerably the job of testing the reliability of a theory. On the more theoretical side, it reveals the central importance of the information current E^a in relativistic hydrodynamics, shedding a new light on the role of information theory in a relativistic context. The reason why it took so long to achieve this understanding is that the focus has been up to now on trying to connect causality with *hydrodynamic* stability, while the real connection is with *thermodynamic* stability, which is a much more complete reliability criterion.

This work was supported by the Polish National Science Centre grants SONATA BIS 2015/18/E/ST9/00577 and OPUS 2019/33/B/ST9/00942. Partial support comes from PHAROS, COST Action CA16214. LG thanks Masoud Shokri and Giorgio Torrieri for stimulating discussions.

[1] D. Kondepudi and I. Prigogine, *Modern Thermodynamics* (John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, 2014).
 [2] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, *An introduction to quantum field theory* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, USA, 1995).
 [3] R. Geroch and L. Lindblom, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1855 (1990).
 [4] W. A. Hiscock and L. Lindblom, Annals of Physics **151**, 466 (1983).
 [5] T. S. Olson, Annals of Physics **199**, 18 (1990).
 [6] R. Geroch and L. Lindblom, Annals of Physics **207**, 394 (1991).
 [7] F. S. Bemfica, M. M. Disconzi, and J. Noronha, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2009.11388 (2020), arXiv:2009.11388 [gr-qc].
 [8] G. S. Denicol, T. Kodama, T. Koide, and P. Mota,

Journal of Physics G Nuclear Physics **35**, 115102 (2008), arXiv:0807.3120 [hep-ph].
 [9] S. Pu, T. Koide, and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114039 (2010).
 [10] L. Gavassino, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2104.09142 (2021), arXiv:2104.09142 [gr-qc].
 [11] M. Kiamari, M. Rahbardar, M. Shokri, and N. Sadooghi, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2102.11695 (2021), arXiv:2102.11695 [hep-th].
 [12] The stationarity of the spacetime guarantees the conservation of the total energy of the fluid associated with the Killing field.
 [13] By *on-shell* we mean “along solutions of the field equations”, by *off-shell* we mean “independently from the field equations”.
 [14] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics and an introduction to thermostatistics; 2nd ed.* (Wiley, New York, NY, 1985).
 [15] P. Kovtun, G. D. Moore, and P. Romatschke, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 025006 (2011), arXiv:1104.1586 [hep-ph].
 [16] G. Torrieri, Journal of High Energy Physics **2021**, 175 (2021), arXiv:2007.09224 [hep-th].
 [17] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 [18] E. T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **106**, 620 (1957).
 [19] To avoid confusion, we remark that, chosen a fluid element X , $E^a[X]$ does *not* describe the flow of information relative to the microstate of X (this would be given by $s^a[X, \varphi_i] - s^a[X, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i]$, where s^a is the entropy current). Instead, $E^a[X]$ quantifies the flow of information relative to the microstate of the *whole fluid* that we can extract by performing measurements on X .
 [20] F. Becattini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 244502 (2012).
 [21] F. Becattini, Acta Physica Polonica B **47**, 1819 (2016), arXiv:1606.06605 [gr-qc].
 [22] L. Gavassino, Found. Phys. **50**, 1554 (2020), arXiv:2005.06396 [gr-qc].
 [23] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Co., 1973* (1973).
 [24] M. Ruderman, Phys. Rev. **172**, 1286 (1968).
 [25] Y. Aharonov, A. Komar, and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **182**, 1400 (1969).
 [26] S. A. Bludman and M. A. Ruderman, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 3243 (1970).
 [27] D. Jou, J. Casas-Vázquez, and G. Lebon, Reports on Progress in Physics **51**, 1105 (1999).
 [28] L. Gavassino, M. Antonelli, and B. Haskell, Physical Review D **102** (2020), 10.1103/physrevd.102.043018.
 [29] H. S. Leff, The Physics Teacher **50**, 170 (2012).
 [30] J. Amigó, S. Balogh, and S. Hernández, Entropy **20**, 813 (2018).
 [31] Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 922 (1994).
 [32] W. Israel and J. Stewart, Annals of Physics **118**, 341 (1979).
 [33] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics*, 2nd ed. (John Wiley & Sons, 1987).

Supplementary Material

Here we prove some properties of the current E^a presented in the main text. In particular we show that:

- E^a is unique;
- For simple fluids, E^a is given by $E^a = -\delta s^a - \alpha \delta N^a - \beta_b \delta T^{ab}$;
- If the theory is causal and stable, E^a is the current of information carried by the perturbation.

Assumptions and notation

We work in the physical setting described in [10], adopting also the same notation, according to which φ_i are the (macroscopic) fields in equilibrium and $\varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i$ are the fields in a perturbed state. For a generic observable \mathcal{A} , its perturbation is defined as

$$\delta\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}[\varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i] - \mathcal{A}[\varphi_i]. \quad (28)$$

The background spacetime is fixed (hence $\delta g_{ab} = 0$) and has one and only one independent symmetry generator K^a , which is assumed time-like future-directed. In equilibrium it is possible to define the inverse temperature four-vector field $\beta^a = u^a/T$ ($u^a u_a = -1$) and the chemical potential scalar field μ , such that [21]

$$\frac{\mu}{T} = \alpha \quad \beta^a = \beta K^a \quad \alpha, \beta = \text{const} \quad \beta > 0. \quad (29)$$

The complete set of possibly independent conserved (i.e. divergence-free) currents of the system is

$$\{ f(T)\beta^a, s^a, N^a, T^{ab}K_b, \delta N^a, \delta T^{ab}K_b \}, \quad (30)$$

where s^a , N^a and T^{ab} are entropy current, particle current and symmetric stress-energy tensor. The scalar $f(T)$ is an arbitrary function of the temperature. The conservation of $f(T)\beta^a$, for any f , follows from the fact that β^a is a Killing vector field.

Uniqueness

Let us prove that the vector field $E^a = E^a[\varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i]$, defined through equations (1) and (2) of the main text and satisfying the conditions (i,ii,iii), is unique. To show it, we will assume that there are two vector fields E^a and \tilde{E}^a which satisfy all the requirements and we will verify that they must be identical.

First of all, we note that, for equations (1) and (2) of the main text to be valid for any space-like Cauchy 3D-surface Σ , we must require (using the Gauss theorem)

$$\nabla_a E^a = \nabla_a \tilde{E}^a = -\nabla_a \delta s^a. \quad (31)$$

It follows that the difference $z^a := E^a - \tilde{E}^a$ is a conserved current ($\nabla_a z^a = 0$). But since (30) is a basis for all the independent conserved currents that we can build out of φ_i and $\delta\varphi_i$, it follows that z^a must be a linear combination of them (with constant coefficients h_j):

$$z^a = h_0 f(T)\beta^a + h_1 s^a + h_2 N^a + h_3 T^{ab}K_b + h_4 \delta N^a + h_5 \delta T^{ab}K_b. \quad (32)$$

Condition (ii) implies that wherever the perturbation is absent we must have $E^a = \tilde{E}^a = z^a = 0$, hence $h_0 = h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = 0$ and we can write

$$z^a = h_4 \delta N^a + h_5 \delta T^{ab}K_b. \quad (33)$$

Finally, we note from condition (i) that, under the transformation $\delta\varphi_i \rightarrow -\delta\varphi_i$, the sign of E^a and \tilde{E}^a cannot change. Hence z^a (like E^a and \tilde{E}^a) is a second-order quantity in the perturbations $\delta\varphi_i$. However, both δN^a and δT^{ab} contain non-zero first-order contributions, so that the only way for z^a to be of second order is that $h_4 = h_5 = 0$. This implies that $z^a = E^a - \tilde{E}^a = 0$, completing our proof.

Thermodynamic interpretation

If the current E^a is unique, there must be a general thermodynamic formula for it. Here we compute it. From (31) it immediately follows that $w^a := E^a + \delta s^a$ is a conserved current ($\nabla_a w^a = 0$), which again implies

$$w^a = m_0 f(T) \beta^a + m_1 s^a + m_2 N^a + m_3 T^{ab} K_b + m_4 \delta N^a + m_5 \delta T^{ab} K_b \quad y_j = \text{const.} \quad (34)$$

Since both E^a and δs^a are zero wherever the perturbation is absent, we must impose $m_0 = m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 0$ and we can write

$$E^a = -\delta s^a + m_4 \delta N^a + m_5 \delta T^{ab} K_b. \quad (35)$$

This relation is indeed consistent with the identity $\delta s^a = (\text{zfc}) - E^a$ invoked in [10]. We are left with the problem of determining the value of the constant coefficients m_4 and m_5 . In order to compute them, we consider a small region of space \mathcal{R} (i.e. a small space-like 3D-surface element) which is locally orthogonal to K^a . The particles, energy and entropy contained in \mathcal{R} are

$$\{N, U, S\} = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \{N^a, -\delta T^{ab} K_b, \delta s^a\} n_a \sqrt{|\gamma|} d^3 y \quad n^a \text{ past-directed}, \quad (36)$$

so that equation (35), truncated to the first order in the perturbation (namely neglecting E^a), implies

$$\delta S = m_4 \delta N - m_5 \delta U. \quad (37)$$

If we work in local inertial coordinates aligned with K^a (and \mathcal{R} is sufficiently small) then,

$$U = - \int_{\mathcal{R}} T^{ab} K_b n_a \sqrt{|\gamma|} d^3 y = K \int_{\mathcal{R}} T^{00} d^3 x \quad K = \sqrt{-K^b K_b}. \quad (38)$$

This implies that U/K is the internal energy (dividing by the red-shift factor K we effectively remove the gravitational potential energy) as measured by a local inertial observer moving with four-velocity u^a , so that from standard thermodynamics we know that (to the first order)

$$\delta S = -\frac{\mu}{T} \delta N + \frac{\delta U}{KT}. \quad (39)$$

Comparing (37) with (39) we finally obtain

$$m_4 = -\frac{\mu}{T} \quad m_5 = -\frac{1}{KT}. \quad (40)$$

Inserting them into (35) we have our formula for the information current:

$$E^a = -\delta s^a - \alpha \delta N^a - \beta_b \delta T^{ab}. \quad (41)$$

This formula is, indeed, not unexpected. In fact, since E^a must be a pure second-order quantity, the first-order truncation of (41) produces the identity

$$\delta s^a = -\alpha \delta N^a - \beta_b \delta T^{ab}, \quad (42)$$

which is Israel's condition of equilibrium [32].

We finally note that, if we multiply (41) by T , we are able to define a new current

$$\delta \Omega^a = T E^a = -u_b \delta T^{ab} - T \delta s^a - \mu \delta N^a, \quad (43)$$

whose flux across \mathcal{R} is

$$\delta \Omega = \frac{\delta U}{K} - T \delta S - \mu \delta N. \quad (44)$$

But this is nothing but the perturbation to the grand potential of the region \mathcal{R} at fixed T and μ . So, the condition (i), which implies $\delta \Omega \geq 0$, in the end reduces to the statement that the grand potential of small fluid elements is minimised in equilibrium. Also this result is not surprising, as we may regard the volume element \mathcal{R} as a small system which can exchange both energy and particles with a large environment (the rest of the fluid) at temperature T with chemical potential μ .

Current of information

The final result that we want to prove is that E^a is the current of information carried by the perturbation $\delta\varphi_i$.

First of all we need to state precisely how we quantify the information. We define our *ignorance* about the state of a system as the natural logarithm of the number of microstates in which the system can be, compatibly with our knowledge. We assume that the energy and the number of particles of the system are known to be in the intervals $[U, U + \Delta U]$ and $[N, N + \Delta N]$, with $\Delta E \ll E$ and $\Delta N \ll N$, so that the maximum amount of ignorance possible is the microcanonical entropy. If we make a measurement of a property of the system, our *ignorance* is reduced by an amount that we call *information*.

Following this line of thoughts, we can define the amount of information $I[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i]$ carried by a perturbation $\delta\varphi_i$, contained in a region of space \mathcal{R} , as the information that we would gain about the system (about the system as a whole, not just about the region \mathcal{R}) measuring all the macroscopic fields $\varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i$ on \mathcal{R} , assuming to have no previous knowledge (apart from that of U and N and hence of the equilibrium fields φ_i , which are microcanonical averages, so they do not constitute additional knowledge). Thus, it follows from the definition that

$$I[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = -\ln \left(\frac{\Gamma[U, \Delta U, N, \Delta N, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}]}{\Gamma[U, \Delta U, N, \Delta N]} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \Gamma = (\text{number of microstates}). \quad (45)$$

Now we only need to rewrite the right-hand side as a hydrodynamic integral. We call \mathcal{R}^c (namely, the complementary of \mathcal{R}) an arbitrary portion of space such that

$$\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}^c = \Sigma \quad \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}^c = \emptyset, \quad (46)$$

where Σ is a smooth space-like Cauchy 3D-surface. Then we can use Boltzmann's formula for the entropy and make the identifications

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \Gamma[U, \Delta U, N, \Delta N, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}] &= S[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i] + \max_{\delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}^c} S[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i] \\ \ln \Gamma[U, \Delta U, N, \Delta N] &= S[\Sigma, \varphi_i]. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The maximum in the first formula appears because $\Gamma[U, \Delta U, N, \Delta N, \varphi_i + \delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}]$ constrains only the value of $\delta\varphi_i$ on \mathcal{R} , while it sums over all the admissible choices of $\delta\varphi_i$ outside \mathcal{R} (in the thermodynamic limit the configuration $\delta\varphi_i$ that maximizes the entropy dominates the sum [33]). In addition, note that, in the computation of the maximum, we are not completely free to choose $\delta\varphi_i$ on \mathcal{R}^c because the perturbation needs to conserve the total energy and particle number (which are known). Thus we must impose the constraint

$$\delta U[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = -\delta U[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] =: -\delta U_{\mathcal{R}} \quad \delta N[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = -\delta N[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] =: -\delta N_{\mathcal{R}}. \quad (48)$$

Combining (45), (47) and (48), recalling the formula (41), we obtain

$$I[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = E[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] + \min_{\delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}^c} E[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i]. \quad (49)$$

Finally, let us study the second term on the right-hand side. To derive a qualitative upper bound on its typical value we can restrict our attention to configurations $\delta\varphi_i$ on \mathcal{R}^c which are approximately homogeneous across the domain occupied by the fluid, namely

$$(\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}^c} \sim \text{const}. \quad (50)$$

This is possible only if the theory is causal: in acausal theories the initial data imposed on \mathcal{R} might propagate on \mathcal{R}^c , producing unphysical constraints on $\delta\varphi_i$. To estimate the order of magnitude of $(\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}^c}$, assuming (50), we can use equation (48), recalling that φ_i are intensive variables, to derive the estimates

$$V (\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}} \sim \{\delta N_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta U_{\mathcal{R}}\} \sim V_c (\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}^c}, \quad (51)$$

with

$$V = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Volume} \\ \text{of } \mathcal{R} \end{array} \right) \quad V + V_c = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Total volume} \\ \text{occupied by the fluid} \end{array} \right). \quad (52)$$

These estimates, in turn, can be used to show that (recall that E^a is quadratic in the perturbation)

$$V E[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] \sim V^2 (\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}}^2 \sim V_c^2 (\delta\varphi_i)_{\text{on } \mathcal{R}^c}^2 \sim V_c E[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i]. \quad (53)$$

Hence, we have obtained the qualitative bound

$$0 \leq \min_{\delta\varphi_i \text{ on } \mathcal{R}^c} E[\mathcal{R}^c, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] \lesssim \frac{V}{V_c} E[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i], \quad (54)$$

where the first inequality is a consequence of stability. In the limit in which the region \mathcal{R} is infinitely small compared to the size of the whole fluid (namely $V \ll V_c$), equation (49) reduces to

$$I[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = E[\mathcal{R}, \varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] = \int_{\mathcal{R}} E^a[\varphi_i, \delta\varphi_i] n_a \sqrt{|\gamma|} d^3y, \quad (55)$$

proving that E^a can be interpreted as the current of information.