

Statistical Thermodynamics and Data Infinitum: Conjugate Variables as Forces, and their Statistical Variations

Ying-Jen Yang* and Hong Qian†

Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195

(Dated: May 20, 2022)

Following ideas of Szilard, Mandelbrot and Hill, we show that a statistical thermodynamic structure can emerge purely from the infinitely large data limit under a probabilistic framework independent from their underlying details. Systems with distinct values of a set of observables are identified as different thermodynamic states, which are parameterized by the entropic forces conjugated to the observables. The ground state with zero entropic forces usually has a probabilistic model equipped with a symmetry of interest. The entropic forces lead to symmetry breaking for each particular system that produces the data, *cf.* emerging of time correlation and breakdown of detailed balance. Probabilistic models for the excited states are predicted by the Maximum Entropy Principle for sequences of i.i.d. and correlated Markov samples. Asymptotically-equivalent models are also found by the Maximum Caliber Principle. With a novel derivation of Maximum Caliber, conceptual differences between the two principles are clarified. The emergent thermodynamics in the data infinitum limit has a mesoscopic origin from the Maximum Caliber. In the canonical probabilistic models of Maximum Caliber, the variances of the observables and their conjugated forces satisfy the asymptotic thermodynamic uncertainty principle, which stems from the reciprocal-curvature relation between “entropy” and “free energy” functions in the theory of large deviations. The mesoscopic origin of the reciprocity is identified. As a consequence of limit theorems in probability theory, the phenomenological statistical thermodynamics is universal without the need of mechanics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Theories in science have a hierarchical structure based on the scales at which they apply [1, 2]. Many systems in our daily life are consist of microscopic units which are themselves complex objects: two hemoglobin molecules have their individualism [3]. Probabilistic models are therefore used to represent these complex systems [4–7]. In the modern probability theory pioneered by Kolmogorov [8], a probabilistic model consists of a space of atomic events Ω , a space of all possible events \mathcal{F} , and a probability measure that gives the probability of events. The former two prescribe a class of systems of interest, and different probability measures lead to systems with different statistical properties in the class [9, 10] In this paper, we consider this class of systems as systems in different “*thermodynamic states*”.

When we have a system in hand, a fundamental task is thus to identify which thermodynamic state it is in, *i.e.* seeking its underlying probability measure. Such information is revealed by measuring a set of observables of interest $G(\omega) : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^m$. With a reference probability measure \mathbb{P} chosen as the *ground state*, the measurement of the observables will indicate whether the system is in the ground state or is actually in an *excited state* described by a different probability \mathbb{Q} . The *information* of the measurement is represented as a change of probability measure (CPM), from the *prior* \mathbb{P} to the *posterior* \mathbb{Q} [9, 10]. For independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) or Markov-correlated data, the CPM can be carried out by the Gibbs conditioning principle in mathematics [11–15] and the Maximum Entropy Principle (MEP) in standard statistical physics [16–18].

The information from the measurement of observables is only considered to be conclusive in the idealized infinitely large data, *data infinitum*. In fact, the MEP described above is formulated in the data infinitum limit, by using the large deviation theory (LDT) that describes the singular convergence of probabilities in the limit [13, 17, 19]. Importantly, this data infinitum limit, $T \rightarrow \infty$, can be considered as a generalization to the classical thermodynamic limit [20, 21]. A statistical thermodynamics then emerges purely from the limit theorem called the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in the LDT [22, 23]. Thermodynamic notions of *entropy*, *free energy*, and *entropic forces* conjugated to the thermodynamic observables are defined by the LDT [20, 21]. As envisioned by Szilard, Mandelbrot, and Hill, a thermodynamic theory can be formulated phenomenologically [24–26]. Furthermore, this statistical thermodynamics emerges purely from the data infinitum and does not require mechanics. The theory is thus *de-mechanized* and can be generally applied to any layer in P. W. Anderson’s hierarchy of scientific theories described by stochastic models [1, 2].

The MEP is motivated from the (asymptotic) equivalence between the Bayesian conditional probability and the conditional average empirical frequency [11–13]. It is not the only CPM that leads to a posterior probabilistic model “consistent” (to be defined in Eq. (9)) with the measurement of the observable g . Chetrite and Touchette showed that the posterior of the MEP is asymptotically equivalent to the Boltzmann-Gibbs exponentially-tilted posterior [14, 15]. In this paper, we demonstrate that the aforementioned statistical thermodynamics is universal among general posterior probabilistic models consistent with the measurement. Moreover, by conceptually connecting the Boltzmann-Gibbs exponentially-tilted posterior discussed in Refs.[14, 15] to the Maximum Caliber Principle (MCP) [27, 28], we demonstrate that the MCP can be regarded as the mesoscopic origin of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem in the LDT that dictates the statistical thermodynamics in

* yangyj@uw.edu

† hqian@uw.edu

data infinitum.

Instead of the axiomatic approach [29–34], we provide a novel derivation to the MCP with the “i.i.d. multiverse”, akin to the many-world interpretation in quantum physics. The asymptotic equivalence between the MEP and the MCP is then revisited, and their conceptual differences are clarified. In our statistical thermodynamics, the ground state is with zero entropic forces and has a probabilistic model equipped with a symmetry of interest. Nonzero entropic forces explain symmetry breaking and parameterized the posterior probabilistic models in the excited states. We discussed two examples of such measurement-predicted symmetry breaking, comparing the emergence of time correlation and breakdown of time reversibility. The former provides a novel decomposition to the entropy in Markov processes. The latter generalizes Onsager’s entropy production principle [35] to systems arbitrarily far from equilibrium.

The “canonical” Boltzmann-Gibbs posterior of the MCP has more thermodynamic structures. As the MEP is asymptotically equivalent to the MCP, the nice asymptotic thermodynamic properties from the MCP are shared to the posterior of the MEP. We use the LDT to derive the Asymptotic Thermodynamic Uncertainty Principle (ATUP) between the statistical variations of the observables g and their conjugated forces $\beta(g)$ in finite data [36, 37]. The ATUP stems from the reciprocal curvature relation between the entropy and the free energy. It gives the reciprocity a novel thermodynamic interpretation. We further identify the mesoscopic origin of the ATUP and the reciprocity [38, 39].

The key results in our paper are summarized in Fig. 1. We first formulate the statistical thermodynamics for a general CPM consistent with the data in Sec. II. We then briefly revisit the MEP for i.i.d. sampling and its extension to Markov processes in Sec. III. For simplicity, only the MEP for discrete-time Markov chain is presented in the main content. The MEP for continuous-time Markov processes can be found in the Appendix. We then provide the i.i.d.-multiverse derivation of the MCP in Sec. IV and compare the posteriors of the MEP and the MCP in Sec. V. The two examples of measurement-inferred symmetry breaking are provided in Sec. VI. In Sec. VII, we introduce the aforementioned ATUP and identify the mesoscopic origin of ATUP. Finally, we summarize the paper in Sec. VIII with comparisons to the literature and future directions.

II. DATA INFINITUM DICTATES STATISTICAL THERMODYNAMICS

A. Data Infinitus Limit as Generalized Thermodynamic Limit

We consider a general (sampling) process with state space \mathcal{X} that runs discretely or continuously from time 0 to arbitrarily large T . The length- T path $X_{0:T}$ is stochastic. We denote a particular path in the path space $\Omega := \mathcal{X}^{[0,T]}$ in lower cases $x_{0:T}$. The *data infinitus limit*, i.e. the long-term limit of a process, $T \rightarrow \infty$ is considered as a generalized thermodynamic limit [20, 21].




Figure 1. This figure summarizes the statistical thermodynamics formulated in the present work. Ground state of the system is equipped with a given symmetry of interest. Prior probabilistic model \mathbb{P} is then assigned with respect to the symmetry. Nonzero entropic forces β explains broken symmetry in the excited states. Probabilistic models for the existed states can be obtained by measuring Thermodynamic observables G in the data infinitus limit and using the Maximum Entropy Principle (MEP) or the Maximum Caliber Principle (MCP). Thermodynamic states can be parameterized by the measured values of the observables or their conjugated entropic forces. Asymptotic thermodynamic uncertainty principle describes the statistical variations of the conjugated pair in large but finite data $T \gg 1$.

A set of extensive path observables $G(x_{0:T}) : \mathcal{X}^{[0,T]} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^m$ is considered to be *thermodynamic observables* if its intensive form $g(x_{0:T}) := G(x_{0:T})/T$ satisfies a LLN in the data infinitus limit $T \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} g(x_{0:T}) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(x_{0:T})}{T} = \bar{\gamma}. \quad (1)$$

When g is the empirical mean value of observables, this is known as ergodicity when empirical mean value is equal to the expected value w.r.t. the invariant probability. Here, we require the distribution of the intensive observable g to converge singularly to a delta function with an asymptotic Wentzel-Kramers-Brillouin (WKB) form in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ [13, 17, 40],

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{true}} \{g(x_{0:T}) \in d\gamma\} = e^{-T\varphi_g^{\text{true}}(\gamma) + O(\ln T)} \quad (2)$$

where φ_g^{true} is called the large deviation rate function (LDRF) of g under the (unknown) true probability measure \mathbb{P}_{true} . Here, $\mathbb{P}_{\text{true}} \{g(x_{0:T}) \in d\gamma\}$ is a short-hand for the probability of g to be in an infinitesimal interval $[\gamma, \gamma + d\gamma]$. In the data infinitus limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, the observed event $\{g(x_{0:T}) \in d\bar{\gamma}\} \equiv \{G(x_{0:T})/T \in d\bar{\gamma}\}$ would be *typical* with all other events $\{g(x_{0:T}) \notin d\bar{\gamma}\}$ are exponentially rare under the path probability \mathbb{P}_{true} of the system. In mathematics, this is expressed as an (exponential) asymptotic equivalence [41],

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{true}} \{g(x_{0:T}) \in d\bar{\gamma}\} \asymp 1, \quad (3)$$

implying that $\varphi_g^{\text{true}}(\bar{\gamma}) = 0$.

When the system has a different underlying path probability measure \mathbb{P}_{true} , the intensive thermodynamic observables g

will take different values $\bar{\gamma}$. We consider systems with the same (Ω, \mathcal{F}) but different $\bar{\gamma}$ (and \mathbb{P}_{true}) as systems in different *thermodynamic states*. The values of $\bar{\gamma}$ are the *thermodynamic parameters* that parameterize the thermodynamic states. When we have a system in hand, we don't really know which thermodynamic state the system is in. We resort to measuring the thermodynamic observables (the extensive G or the intensive g) to get $\bar{\gamma}$ and infer the underlying \mathbb{P}_{true} .

B. Fundamental Roles of the Entropic Forces

In standard thermodynamics, a system is considered to be driven by *entropic forces* to change from one thermodynamic state to the other and explain the different values $\bar{\gamma}$ of the thermodynamic observables [36, 42]. To identify such notions of entropic forces conjugated to the thermodynamic observables, we need a notion of *entropy* for general probabilistic models. We show below that such notion is obtained from the LDT.

Among all the possible thermodynamic states, the ground state is the state where the entropic forces are zero. Such state serves as a reference probability measure \mathbb{P} is often ‘‘assigned’’ based on certain symmetries of interest in physics. The symmetry comes from, for examples, exchangeability between particles, translational symmetry, *etc.* This way, the entropic forces represent the ‘‘cause’’ of symmetry breaking [1, 43]. The observed event $\{g = \bar{\gamma}\}$ is not necessarily typical under \mathbb{P} . If the event is typical under \mathbb{P} , then we consider that \mathbb{P} to be ‘‘consistent’’ with the measurement $\{g = \bar{\gamma}\}$ and the system is in the ground state. However, if the observed event is non-typical under \mathbb{P} , the non-typicality translates to having a nonzero LDRF $\varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}) \neq 0$ in the WKB form of the probability distribution of g ,

$$\mathbb{P}\{g \in d\gamma\} = e^{-T\varphi_g(\gamma) + o(T)}. \quad (4)$$

The measurement $\{g = \bar{\gamma}\}$ then inform us to update from the reference measure \mathbb{P} as a prior to a posterior probability measure \mathbb{Q} such that the observed event is typical under it, *i.e.*

$$\mathbb{Q}\{g \in d\gamma\} = e^{-T\tilde{\varphi}_g(\gamma) + o(T)} \quad (5)$$

and $\tilde{\varphi}_g(\bar{\gamma}) = 0$. This change of probability measure (CPM) is mathematically represented by another observable called the Radon-Nikodym derivative (RND) [9, 10], which can be intuitively thought of as the path probability ratio in our discussion in this paper.

Any RND that changes the probability measure can be decomposed into a part tilting the probability of level sets $\{g \in d\gamma\}$ and the part reweighing the conditional probability for finding a path $x_{0:T}$ in a level set:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}(x_{0:T}) = \frac{\mathbb{Q}\{g(x_{0:T})\} \mathbb{Q}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}{\mathbb{P}\{g(x_{0:T})\} \mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}. \quad (6)$$

The former part changes the statistics of g in the CPM whereas the latter does not. Then, with the WKB form of Eq. (4) and

Eq. (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}(x_{0:T}) &= T[\varphi_g(\gamma) - \tilde{\varphi}_g(\gamma)] + o(T) \\ &\quad + \ln \frac{\mathbb{Q}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}{\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

As $\varphi_g \neq \tilde{\varphi}_g$, this clearly shows that the desired RND in Eq. (6) must be an exponential tilting to change the typicality of the thermodynamic observables g . The fundamental reason of representing the information of data, *i.e.* the CPM, as the logarithmic RND is due to the singular convergence of probability in data infinitus limit, *i.e.* by LDT [13, 17, 40].

As the RND should be indicated by the measured value $\bar{\gamma}$, we suppose that the RND is parameterized by a set of parameters $\theta(\bar{\gamma})$ and denote the essential ingredients in Eq. (7) as

$$s_{\theta(\gamma)} := \varphi_g(\gamma) - \tilde{\varphi}_g(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad (8a)$$

$$c_{\theta(\gamma)} := \ln \frac{\mathbb{Q}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T}) \in d\gamma\}}{\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T}) \in d\gamma\}}. \quad (8b)$$

The condition for a posterior to be consistent to a measurement $g = \bar{\gamma}$ is

$$\mathbb{Q}\{g \in d\bar{\gamma}\} \asymp 1. \quad (9)$$

In LDT (for locally differentiable $\tilde{\varphi}_g$), this typicality condition becomes $\tilde{\varphi}_g(\bar{\gamma}) = 0$, $\nabla \tilde{\varphi}_g(\bar{\gamma}) = 0$, and $\nabla \nabla \tilde{\varphi}_g(\bar{\gamma}) \succeq 0$, which translate to the following three conditions in terms of φ_g from the prior and $s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}$ from the tilting:

$$s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}[\bar{\gamma}] = \varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}), \quad (10a)$$

$$\nabla s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}[\bar{\gamma}] = \nabla \varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}), \quad \text{and} \quad (10b)$$

$$\nabla \nabla s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}(\bar{\gamma}) \preceq \nabla \nabla \varphi_g[\bar{\gamma}] \quad (10c)$$

As we expect $\tilde{\varphi}_g(\gamma)$ and $\varphi_g(\gamma)$ to be analytic near the observed value $\bar{\gamma}$, we Taylor expand $s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}(\gamma)$ around $\bar{\gamma}$ and get

$$s_{\theta(\bar{\gamma})}(\gamma) = \varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}) + \beta \cdot \delta\gamma + \delta\gamma \cdot A\delta\gamma + O(\delta\gamma^3) \quad (11a)$$

$$= \varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}) - \beta \cdot \bar{\gamma} + \beta \cdot \gamma + O(\delta\gamma^2) \quad (11b)$$

where $\delta\gamma := \gamma - \bar{\gamma}$ and both β and A are parameters in the parameter set $\theta(\bar{\gamma})$. The typicality condition in Eq. (10b) immediately tells us that the parameters

$$\beta = \nabla \varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}) \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (12)$$

We note that the LDRF defined by

$$\varphi_g := - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \ln \mathbb{P}\{g \in d\gamma\} \quad (13)$$

can be regarded as an notion of *entropy* [10, 17, 20, 44–46]. The parameters β are then the ‘‘entropic forces’’ that tilts the average of g in the posterior \mathbb{Q} . This means that a CPM must have the entropic forces β in its set of parameters $\theta(\bar{\gamma})$ such that the measured event $\{g \in d\bar{\gamma}\}$ is typical under the posterior.

According to Gärtner-Ellis theorem [22, 23], if the LDRF φ_g is convex (as we shall generally assume in this paper), then Eq. (12) can be inverted by

$$\bar{\gamma} = \nabla \psi_g(\beta) \quad (14)$$

where ψ_g is the scaled cumulant generating function (sCGF) [17, 20]:

$$\psi_g(\beta) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \ln \mathbb{E} [e^{T\beta \cdot g}]. \quad (15)$$

In this case, β would be the *only* set of parameters in the posterior, *i.e.* all parameters $\theta(\bar{\gamma})$ can be parameterized by the entropic forces β . This explains the fundamental roles of the entropic forces β as the *thermodynamic parameters* dual to $\bar{\gamma}$ for parameterizing the *thermodynamic state*.

C. Thermodynamic Relations

The sCGF ψ_g is understood as the (asymptotic) intensive form of *free energy* $\Psi_g = \ln \mathbb{E} [e^{\beta \cdot G}]$ in our thermodynamic theory. By its definition in Eq. (15), it can always be expressed as the Legendre-Fenchel transform (LFT) of the *entropy* φ_g [17],

$$\psi_g(\beta) = \sup_{\gamma} [\beta \cdot \gamma - \varphi_g(\gamma)]. \quad (16)$$

When ψ_g exists and is differentiable (we will assume this throughout this paper), the Gärtner-Ellis theorem [22, 23] tells us that the *entropy* φ_g can also be expressed as the LFT of the *free energy* ψ_g and is thus strictly convex [17],

$$\varphi_g(\gamma) = \sup_{\beta} [\beta \cdot \gamma - \psi_g(\beta)]. \quad (17)$$

Convex duality between φ_g and ψ_g then emerges and the LFT can be reduced to the familiar Legendre transform

$$\varphi_g(\gamma) + \psi_g(\beta) = \beta \cdot \gamma \quad (18)$$

with dual coordinates β or γ . In particular, γ can be parameterized by β by

$$\gamma = \nabla \psi_g(\beta). \quad (19)$$

and β can be parameterized by γ by

$$\beta = \nabla \varphi_g(\gamma). \quad (20)$$

The Gärtner-Ellis theorem indicates a dual structure, leading to an emergent thermodynamics solely from the LDT in the data infinitus limit [20, 21]. Notions of “entropy” φ_g and “free energy” ψ_g are defined from the LDT of the data infinitus limit. With $\gamma = \nabla \psi_g(\beta)$ and $\beta = \nabla \varphi_g(\gamma)$, thermodynamic differential relations between the “entropy” φ_g and “free energy” ψ_g in LDT can be written down

$$d\varphi_g = \beta \cdot d\gamma \quad (21a)$$

$$d\psi_g = \gamma \cdot d\beta. \quad (21b)$$

We will show later in Sec. IV that this thermodynamic structure has a “mesoscopic origin” from the Maximum Caliber Principle [28].

While we have concluded that a thermodynamic state (the posterior \mathbb{Q}) is parameterized by entropic force β with a thermodynamic structure, the functional form of \mathbb{Q}_β is not yet specified. In particular, in the general expression

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}(x_{0:T}) = & T [\varphi_g(\bar{\gamma}) - \beta \cdot \bar{\gamma} + \beta \cdot g(x_{0:T}) + O(\delta\gamma^2)] \\ & + o(T) + \ln \frac{\mathbb{Q}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}{\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

all the terms $O(\delta\gamma^2)$, $o(T)$, and $\ln \frac{\mathbb{Q}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}{\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|g(x_{0:T})\}}$ are parameterized by β but their specific forms need to be determined. Below, we introduce the posterior probabilistic models predicted from the Maximum Entropy Principle (MEP) and from the Maximum Caliber Principle (MCP), motivated by the Bayesian conditional probability and the Boltzmann-Gibbs exponential tilting respectively.

III. GIBBS CONDITIONING PRINCIPLE AND MAXIMUM ENTROPY PRINCIPLE

A. I.I.D. prior with Singleton Observable

We first consider an i.i.d. prior $\mathbb{P}\{X_{1:T} = x_{1:T}\} = \prod_{t=1}^T p(x_t)$. Here, for later notation simplicity, we relabel underlying discrete-time path as $x_{1:T}$ with length T instead of $x_{0:T}$ with length $T+1$. We suppose the path observable g is the empirical mean of a singleton observable $\hat{g}(x)$,

$$g(x_{1:T}) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}(x_t) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \nu(x) \hat{g}(x), \quad (23)$$

which becomes a functional of the (singleton) *empirical frequency* defined as

$$\nu(x) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_x(x_t). \quad (24)$$

Here $\delta_x(x_t)$ is a Kronecker delta function which is 1 when $x_t = x$ and is 0 otherwise. With a measurement $\{g \in d\gamma\}$, a natural posterior would be to compute the Bayesian conditional probability under the prior

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_s = \xi | g(X_{1:T}) \in d\gamma\}, \text{ for } s = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}.$$

With the translational symmetry of the i.i.d. X_s under \mathbb{P} , it can be shown that

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_s = \xi | g(X_{1:T}) \in d\gamma\} = \mathbb{E}[\nu | g(X_{1:T}) \in d\gamma] \quad (25)$$

for any $s = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ and any data size T [13].

In the data infinitus limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, the conditional average empirical frequency on the right-hand side of Eq. (25) can

be computed. By Sanov's theorem [47], the distribution of the empirical frequency has the WKB form $\mathbb{P}\{\nu \in df\} = e^{-T\varphi_\nu(f)+o(T)}$ with its LDRF

$$\varphi_\nu(f) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \ln \frac{f(x)}{p(x)} \quad (26)$$

in the Kullback-Leiber relative entropy form [48]. Further with $\mathbb{P}\{g \in d\gamma\} = e^{-T\varphi_g(\gamma)+o(T)}$, we get that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\nu \in df | g \in d\gamma\} = \frac{\mathbb{P}\{\nu \in df\}}{\mathbb{P}\{g \in d\gamma\}} \quad (27a)$$

$$= e^{-T[\varphi_\nu(f) - \varphi_g(\gamma)] + o(T)} \quad (27b)$$

where the Kronecker delta factors $\delta_{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x)\hat{g}(x)}(\gamma)$ are omitted on the right-hand sides of Eqs. (27).

In the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, the conditional probability of ν concentrates at the empirical frequency q such that $\varphi_\nu(q) = \varphi_g(\gamma)$, which is also the conditional average in the limit. By the contraction principle in LDT [13, 17], the LDRF of g can be derived from the LDRF of the empirical frequency ν since g is a functional of ν :

$$\varphi_\nu(q) = \varphi_g(\gamma) = \inf_{f: \sum_x f\hat{g} \in d\gamma} \varphi_\nu(f). \quad (28)$$

Therefore, the desired q is the **empirical frequency** that minimizes the LDRF of the empirical frequency w.r.t. the prior p :

$$q = \arg \inf_f \left\{ \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \ln \frac{f(x)}{p(x)} - \beta \cdot \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) \hat{g}(x) - \gamma \right] - \mu \left[\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x) - 1 \right] \right\} \quad (29)$$

This is the Gibbs conditioning principle and the Maximum Entropy Principle for i.i.d. prior with singleton observables [11, 13, 49]. The path posterior probability is i.i.d. in the data infinitus limit [13]:

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{X_{1:n} = x_{1:n} | g \in d\gamma\} = \prod_{t=1}^n q(x_t), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (30)$$

The asymptotic equivalency between the MEP posterior $q(x)$ and the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}\{X_s = x | \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}(x_t) \in d\gamma\}$ is known as the equivalence between microcanonical ensemble and canonical ensemble in physics. Since the LDRF of observable g can be obtained from the LDRF of the empirical frequency ν , the LDT of the empirical mean of path observables g is often called level-1 and the LDT of empirical frequency ν is called level-2 [50].

The posterior from MEP in Eq. (29) has the Boltzmann-Gibbs form,

$$q(x) = \frac{e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}(x)}}{Z(\beta)} p(x) \quad (31)$$

where $Z(\beta) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta \cdot g}]$ is known as the partition function in physics or the generating function in mathematics. If the observable $\hat{g}(x_t)$ is the indicator function itself, $\delta_x(x_t)$, which has the dimension of the state space \mathcal{X} , the posterior would have the form of

$$q(x) = \frac{e^{u(x)}}{\mathbb{E}[e^u]} p(x) \quad (32)$$

where the thermodynamic conjugated forces u of empirical frequency become a generalized notion of energy [21].

B. Markov Prior and Transition-type Observables

The Gibbs Conditioning Principle can be generalized to the case where we assumed Markov processes as a prior and measure transition-type observables [12, 15]. Here, we provide a brief introduction for the simplest discrete-time Markov chain (DTMC) case. Brief introduction for the continuous-time Markov processes can be found in Appendix and with more details in Refs. [14, 15, 18].

We start with a time-homogeneous DTMC prior specified by the transition matrix $M_{y|x}$ and the initial distribution p_x as a *prior*. The prior path probability of path $x_{0:T}$ is then given by $p_{x_0} M_{x_1|x_0} \cdots M_{x_T|x_{T-1}}$. An i.i.d. prior is a special case when $M_{y|x} = p_y$. The empirical pair frequency measurement is given by

$$\nu_{i,j}(x_{0:T}) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \delta_{ij}(x_{t-1}x_t). \quad (33)$$

When $T \rightarrow \infty$, the probability of having a specific empirical frequency has a WKB asymptotic form $\mathbb{P}\{\nu \in df\} = e^{-T\varphi_\nu[f]+o(T)}$ and the LDRF is given by [13]

$$\varphi_\nu[f] = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \ln \frac{f_{ij}}{(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ik}) M_{j|i}}. \quad (34)$$

The LDT for empirical pair in a Markov process is often referred to the LDT level 2.5 [50].

We consider a generic transition-type observables:

$$G(x_{0:T}) := \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}_{x_{t-1}, x_t} \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (35)$$

and its intensive form as the empirical mean of \hat{g} :

$$g(x_{0:T}) := \frac{G(x_{0:T})}{T} = \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \nu_{x,y} \hat{g}_{x,y} \quad (36)$$

We are interested in the posterior of the transition matrix M , and we seek the conditional joint probability of $X_{s(T)}$ and $X_{s(T)+1}$:

$$P_T(x, y) := \mathbb{P}\{X_s = x, X_{s+1} = y | g(x_{0:T}) \in d\gamma\} \quad (37)$$

where both $s(T) \rightarrow \infty$ and $T - s(T) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ [12]. Then, as the system reaches its steady state as $s(T) \rightarrow \infty$, the conditional probability $P_T(x, y)$ satisfies

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_T(x_{s(T)}, x_{s(T)+1}) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\nu | g \in d\gamma] \quad (38)$$

as proven rigorously by Ref. [12]. Csiszar *et al.* further proved that the posterior from conditioning is a time-homogeneous Markov process in the data infinitus limit Csiszár *et al.* [12]. Specifically, if we denote $q_{ij} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\nu | g \in d\gamma]$, $q_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij}$, and $q_{j|i} = q_{ij}/q_i$, then, for any n ,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{X_{s:s+n} = x_{0:n} \mid g \in d\gamma\right\} = q_{x_0} \prod_{t=1}^n q_{x_t | x_{t-1}}. \quad (39)$$

The limiting form of the conditional expectation of empirical pair frequency, *i.e.* q_{ij} , can be computed by the contraction principle [17] by the LDT of empirical frequencies in DTMC [13]. Since we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\nu \in df | g \in d\gamma\} = e^{-T[\varphi_\nu(f) - \varphi_g(\gamma)] + o(T)} \delta_{\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \hat{g}_{i,j}}(\gamma),$$

the contraction principle in the LDT tells us that

$$q = \arg \inf_f \left\{ \varphi_\nu[f] - \beta \cdot \left(\sum_{i,j} f_{ij} \hat{g}_{i,j} - \gamma \right) - \sum_i \sigma_i \sum_j (f_{ij} - f_{ji}) - \mu \left(\sum_{i,j} f_{ij} - 1 \right) \right\}. \quad (40)$$

The desired q is the empirical frequency that minimizes the LDRF $\varphi_\nu[f]$ under the typicality constraint $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \hat{g}_{i,j} \in d\gamma$, stationarity constraint

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ji}, \quad (41)$$

and the normalization constraint $\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} = 1$. The MEP here is using the ‘‘entropy’’ given by the LDRF of empirical pair frequencies $\varphi_\nu[f]$ in Eq. (34), which is *not* the Kullback-Leibler relative entropy between the prior pair probability and the posterior pair probability. As shown Eq. (73), $\varphi_\nu[f]$ is in fact a combination of two relative entropies when one assumes an i.i.d. prior.

Taking the derivative of $\{\dots\}$ in Eq. (40) w.r.t. f gives us

$$\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j} = \ln \frac{f_{ij}}{(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ik}) M_{j|i}} + \sigma_j - \sigma_i - \mu, \quad (42)$$

which leads to the posterior transition matrix in the following form:

$$\frac{f_{ij}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ik}} = M_{j|i} \frac{e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} e^{-\sigma_j}}{e^{-\mu} e^{-\sigma_i}}. \quad (43)$$

By summing over j on both sides, one gets

$$e^{-\mu} e^{-\sigma_i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{X}} M_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} e^{-\sigma_j}, \quad (44)$$

which implies that $e^{-\mu}$ is an eigenvalue λ of the tilted matrix

$$\tilde{M}_{ij} := M_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} \quad (45)$$

and $e^{-\sigma_i}$ is the corresponding right eigenvector r_i . The posterior transition matrix then takes the form of

$$\bar{M}_{j|i} = \frac{r_j(\beta)}{\lambda(\beta) r_i(\beta)} M_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}. \quad (46)$$

The stationary marginal distribution of the posterior Markov chain with transition matrix $\bar{M}_{j|i}$ is $l_i r_i$, where l_i is the left eigenvector. The posterior stationary pair frequency in the steady state is then

$$q_{ij} = l_i \frac{\tilde{M}_{ij}}{\lambda} r_j = l_i \frac{M_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}}{\lambda} r_j. \quad (47)$$

The eigenvalue and eigenvectors here are actually the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue λ_{\max} of the tiled matrix \tilde{M} [13–15]. An intuitive way to see this is by plugging the q from different eigenvalues in Eq. (47) back into Eq. (40). We will notice that for a fixed β , we are finding the q_{ij} from different eigenvalues that minimizes $\beta \cdot \gamma - \ln \lambda(\beta)$, implying that we should choose the largest eigenvalue λ_{\max} . A more rigorous way is as followed. Notice that the result of the MEP calculation in Eq. (40) is by the contraction principle the LDRF of the path observable $g = G/T$. We can easily see that the LDRF of g can be rewritten as

$$\varphi_g(\gamma) = \varphi_\nu(q) = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij} \ln \frac{e^{\beta(\gamma) \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} r_j}{\lambda_{\max} r_i} \quad (48a)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij} \beta(\gamma) \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j} - \ln \lambda_{\max}[\beta(\gamma)] \quad (48b)$$

$$= \beta(\gamma) \cdot \gamma - \ln \lambda_{\max}[\beta(\gamma)]. \quad (48c)$$

We now compare this with the process of computing φ_g by the Gärtner-Ellis theorem. The LDRF of g can be obtained by

$$\varphi_g(\gamma) = \sup_{\beta} [\beta \cdot \gamma - \psi_g(\beta)] \quad (49)$$

where $\psi_g(\beta) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \ln \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta \cdot G}]$ is the sCGF of g . Since $G := \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}$. We can see that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\beta \cdot G}] = \sum_{x_{0:T}} p_{x_0} \prod_{t=1}^T M_{x_t | x_{t-1}} e^{\sum_{t=1}^T \beta \cdot \hat{g}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}} \quad (50a)$$

$$= p \cdot (M e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}})^T \mathbf{1} = e^{T \ln \lambda_{\max} + o(T)} \quad (50b)$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$ is a column vector with all components equal to 1. It then follows that $\psi_g(\beta) = \ln \lambda_{\max}(\beta)$.

IV. CANONICAL POSTERIOR AND MAXIMUM CALIBER PRINCIPLE

A. Formulation of the Maximum Caliber Principle

We now formulate the Maximum Caliber Principle (MCP) with a rather novel derivation different from the axiomatic approach [28–34]. We recall that the intensive form g of the

extensive thermodynamic observable $G(x_{0:T})$ is assumed to satisfy the LLN. The ideal data infinitum will give us a definite value of the observable g . Since the measured value is deterministic, any i.i.d. copy of the system will give us the same value of g , although generally with different microscopic path $x_{0:T}$. Hence, if we have many i.i.d. copy of the system (either mentally or physically) and if each of them has infinitely long trajectory, then the empirical mean of the path measurements will be exactly the same as any one of i.i.d. realization. We can thus use the one value we had to compute the posterior path measure from these i.i.d. copies by “the MEP for i.i.d. (path) sampling”. The resulting calculation is historically called the Maximum Caliber Principle [27, 28].

More precisely and more generally, suppose we have n i.i.d. systems, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, with each of the system providing us length- T measurement of an extensive path observable G with value $\Gamma_T^{(i)}$ where $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We can then compute the empirical mean of G for these i.i.d. systems,

$$\bar{\Gamma}_T := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_T^{(i)}. \quad (51)$$

We assume an arbitrary prior path measure \mathbb{P} that can give us path probability from x_0 to x_L , i.e. $\mathbb{P}\{X_{0:L} = x_{0:L}\}$ or in short as $\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:L}\}$, where $L \geq T$ and L can be arbitrarily large. We now imagine $N - n$ numbers of “imaginative i.i.d. copies of the system”, with certain (unknown) $\Gamma_T^{(i)}$ values for $i \in \{n+1, \dots, N\}$. The total empirical average of the N copies is

$$\Gamma_T := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_T^{(i)} = \frac{n}{N} \bar{\Gamma}_T + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=n+1}^N \Gamma_T^{(i)}, \quad (52)$$

the MEP of i.i.d. sampling can give us a posterior by taking the infinite copy limit $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Denoting the “empirical frequency of length- L path” as $f(x_{0:L})$, we would compute

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta(x_{0:L}) = \arg \inf_f \left\{ \sum_{x_{0:L}} f(x_{0:L}) \ln \frac{f(x_{0:L})}{\mathbb{P}(x_{0:L})} - \beta \cdot \left[\sum_{x_{0:T}} f(x_{0:T}) G(x_{0:T}) - \Gamma_T \right] \right\} \quad (53)$$

where f are normalized path measures. Note that since the constraint is only up to time T , we can decompose the optimization of f into the part $f(x_{0:T})$ and the part for $f(x_{T+1:L}|x_{0:T})$. It can be straightforwardly shown that the optimization for $f(x_{T+1:L}|x_{0:T})$ for every given $x_{0:T}$ guarantees that the posterior stays as the prior for $t > T$, i.e. $f(x_{T+1:L}|x_{0:T}) = \mathbb{P}(x_{T+1:L}|x_{0:T})$. Only the first length- T of the path probability gets updated.

Now, we don’t know the values of $\Gamma_T^{(i)}$ in our mental i.i.d. copy, $n < i \leq N$. We can only “approximate” Γ_T by $\bar{\Gamma}_T$. Yet, we know that when $T \rightarrow \infty$, each and every $\Gamma_T^{(i)}/T \rightarrow \gamma$. This means that with infinitely long trajectory $T \gg 1$, $\bar{\Gamma}_T \in d\Gamma_T$ and we can compute Eq. (53) with Γ_T replaced by

$\bar{\Gamma}_T$. This leads to the canonical Boltzmann-Gibbs exponential path measure:

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta(x_{0:L}) = \frac{e^{\beta \cdot G(x_{0:T})}}{\mathbb{E}[e^{\beta \cdot G(x_{0:T})}]} \mathbb{P}(x_{0:L}) \quad (54)$$

where β is determined by $\bar{\Gamma}_T$. Note that in our derivation, the legitimacy of using the MCP is based on the LLN of the thermodynamic observable G in the data infinitum limit $T \rightarrow \infty$. Applying the MCP to finite T is an approximation.

B. Properties of the Maximum Caliber Principle

The MCP formulated above has several nice properties as we summarize them here.

1. Minimum Tilting and Sufficient Statistics

From our discussion, the MCP is the minimum, necessary exponential tilting on the path probability to give a posterior such that the measurement is typical under it, cf. Refs. [16, 51]: the CPM in the MCP is given by a simple linear form,

$$\ln \frac{d\mathbb{Q}_\beta}{d\mathbb{P}} = \beta \cdot G - \Psi(\beta) = T[\beta \cdot g - \psi(\beta)] + o(T). \quad (55)$$

Compared this to the general tilting in CPM previously shown in Eq. (22), all the nonlinear terms $O(\delta\gamma^2)$ and also $\ln \frac{\mathbb{Q}_\beta\{x_{0:T}|G(x_{0:T})\}}{\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|G(x_{0:T})\}} = 0$ are set to zero in the MCP. The latter, in fact, implies that the RND from the MCP is a function of path only through the observable G . The condition

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta\{x_{0:T}|G \in d\Gamma\} = \mathbb{P}\{x_{0:T}|G \in d\Gamma\}, \quad (56)$$

means that the conditional probability of an observed event $\{G \in d\Gamma\}$ is the same for the whole family, independent to the parameters β . When we measure the observable G , we only have information about the level set of G . We do not have any information inside a level set of G , so the posterior distribution inside is kept the same as the prior. In a sense, the fact that $\mathbb{Q}_\beta\{x_{0:T}|G(x_{0:T}) \in d\Gamma\}$ is independent to β means that the measurement of G have captured a “full information” of β . In statistics, such an observable G is said to be a *sufficient statistic* of the parameters β . The fact that the RND is a functional of G implies that G is a sufficient statistic of β is known as the Fisher-Neyman factorization theorem. The Pitman-Koopman-Darmois theorem in statistics tells us that only the exponential family has a finite-dimensional sufficient statistics when sample size increases, among the families whose range is independent to the parameters [52–54].

2. Origin of the Emergent Thermodynamic Structure

For each path prior \mathbb{P} and a given set of path observables of interest $G(x_{0:T})$, the MCP gives an exponential family of

potential posterior parameterized by β as the ‘‘excited states’’ and the prior \mathbb{P} as the ‘‘ground state’’ where $\beta = 0$. For a given measurement of $G \in d\Gamma$, the β in the posterior can be determined. In the calculation of Eq. (53), the parameter β as a Lagrange multiplier is determined such that the mean value under the posterior \mathbb{Q}_β is the measured value Γ . The mean value of G under \mathbb{Q}_β can be obtained by the cumulant generating function (CGF) of G under \mathbb{P} :

$$\Psi_T(\beta) := \ln \mathbb{E} [e^{\beta \cdot G}] \quad (57)$$

(assume it exists and is differentiable), which can be understood as the *free energy* in statistical physics. The desired β then satisfies

$$\Gamma = \mathbb{E}_\beta [G] = \nabla \Psi_T(\beta) \quad (58)$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\beta [\cdot]$ represents taking expectation under \mathbb{Q}_β . As Ψ_T is strictly convex, Eq. (58) can be inverted to give an uniquely determined parameter

$$\beta(\Gamma) = \nabla \Phi_T(\Gamma) \quad (59)$$

by $\Phi_T(\Gamma) = \beta(\Gamma) \cdot \Gamma - \Psi_T[\beta(\Gamma)]$ as the Legendre transform of Ψ_T . We also notice that

$$\Phi_T(\Gamma) = \ln \frac{d\mathbb{Q}_\beta(\Gamma)}{d\mathbb{P}}(\Gamma) \quad (60)$$

characterizes the change of measure from \mathbb{P} to the posterior $\mathbb{Q}_\beta(\gamma)$ and is thus a generalized notion of entropy [9, 10]. That is, β is the ‘‘entropic force’’. A pair of ‘‘thermodynamic-like’’ equations for the Φ_T and the Ψ_T can be written down:

$$d\Phi_T(\Gamma) = \beta(\Gamma) \cdot d\Gamma \quad (61a)$$

$$d\Psi_T(\beta) \in d\Gamma(\beta) \cdot d\beta. \quad (61b)$$

Relations above can be done in an ‘‘intensive’’ way. If we define $\gamma := \Gamma/T$,

$$\phi_T(\gamma) := \Phi_T(T\gamma)/T, \quad (62)$$

and $\psi_T(\beta) := \Psi_T(\beta)/T$, then the ‘‘intensive’’ parameter has the form of $\beta_i = \frac{\partial \Phi_T(\Gamma)}{\partial \Gamma_i} = \frac{\partial \phi_T(\gamma)}{\partial \gamma_i}$. In the data infinitus limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\phi_T \rightarrow \varphi_g$ and $\psi_T \rightarrow \psi_g$. Eqs. (61) becomes the two fundamental statistical thermodynamic equations shown in Eqs. (21). These Eqs. (61) from the MCP can be treated as the ‘‘mesoscopic’’ origin of the emergent thermodynamic structure in the data infinitum [20].

3. Maximum-Likelihood Estimator and the Gärtner-Ellis Theorem

The uniquely determined $\beta(\Gamma)$ is actually the β that maximizes the likelihood of observing the event $\mathbb{Q}_\beta \{G(x_{0:T}) \in d\Gamma\}$ among the exponential family. We have

$$\sup_\beta \mathbb{Q}_\beta \{G \in d\Gamma\} = \sup_\beta \frac{e^{\beta \cdot \Gamma}}{Z(\beta)} \mathbb{P} \{G \in d\Gamma\} \quad (63a)$$

$$= e^{\sup_\beta [\beta \cdot \Gamma - \Psi_T(\beta)]} \mathbb{P} \{G \in d\Gamma\}. \quad (63b)$$

Therefore, the predicted β from Eq. (59) is also the *maximum-likelihood estimator* in statistics. We also see that the entropy Φ_T here is actually maximized as the Legendre-Fenchel transform of the CGF Ψ_T ,

$$\Phi_T(\Gamma) = \sup_\beta [\beta \cdot \Gamma - \Psi_T(\beta)]. \quad (64)$$

Eq. (64) clearly gives rise to the Gärtner-Ellis Theorem in Eq. (17). The Gärtner-Ellis Theorem in the LDT actually reflects the existence of the canonical exponentially-tilted posterior of the MCP.

V. COMPARISON BETWEEN MAX ENTROPY AND MAX CALIBER

Both the MEP and the MCP introduced above are formulated in the ideal data infinitus limit. They lead to asymptotic equivalent posteriors and the same asymptotic statistics for the observable [14, 15]. However, the MEP and the MCP are conceptually very different, and their differences can only be seen when observing transition-type observable.

In the MEP formulated above, we started with either an i.i.d. prior or a time-homogeneous Markov prior. Then, through Gibbs conditioning principle [11, 13] and its Markov extension [12, 14, 15], conditional probabilities are then connected to the conditional average empirical frequencies, specifically in Eq. (25) and Eq. (38). The LDP then allows one to use the contraction principle in LDT [17, 19] to compute the conditional average empirical frequencies by a maximum/minimum entropy computation, with entropy given by the LDRF of empirical frequencies in LDT level 2 [47] and level 2.5 [50, 55, 56]. The posterior of the MEP is a time-homogeneous Markov chain with transition matrix given by $\bar{M}_{j|i}$ defined in Eq. (46). Note that the MEP is about the dynamics, *i.e.* the transition matrix. The Markov extension of the Gibbs conditioning principle does not tell us the posterior initial distribution [12]. As the information of initial distribution of a Markov process vanishes in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$, we consider the inference of the initial distribution as an issue separate from the dynamics inference.

On the other hand, the MCP is formulated by assuming that the single measurement of the observable $g(x_{0:\infty}) := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{G(x_{0:T})}{T} \in d\gamma$ from the ideal infinite-long trajectory $x_{0:\infty}$ is one sample of an imaginative i.i.d. ‘‘multiverse’’, akin to the many-world interpretation in quantum physics. Since $g(x_{0:\infty})$ is deterministic in the data infinitus limit, the one measurement we had is enough to infer the imaginative ‘‘empirical mean of the i.i.d. multiverse’’, which allows us to use a traditional MEP for i.i.d. prior and singleton observables. We compute the posterior from the MEP of i.i.d. paths for an given T and then taken the data infinitus limit.

In MCP, the canonical posterior length- L path probability we get from a length- T measurement $g(x_{0:T}) := G(x_{0:T})/T \in d\gamma_T$ is given by Eq. (54). While it is known that a transition-type path observable $G(x_{0:T}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}$ leads to a Markov process in the MCT [57],

it is less known that this canonical posterior is actually time-inhomogeneous for $0 \leq t \leq T$ when we have finite data with length $T < \infty$ and only becomes time-homogeneous in the data infinitus limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ [15]. We revisit this time-inhomogeneity issue briefly below.

With a time-homogeneous DTMC prior characterized by initial distribution p_{x_0} and transition matrix $M_{y|x}$ (i.i.d. as a special case when $M_{y|x} = p_y$), the posterior from the MCP is

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta \{x_{0:L}\} = \frac{p_{x_0}}{Z_T} \prod_{t=1}^T \tilde{M}_{x_{t-1}, x_t} \prod_{t=T+1}^L M_{x_t|x_{t-1}} \quad (65)$$

where $\tilde{M}_{i,j} = M_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}$ is the tilted matrix defined in Eq. (45) and

$$Z_T = p \cdot (M e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}})^T \mathbf{1} \asymp \lambda_{\max}^T \quad (66)$$

where λ_{\max} is the largest eigenvalue of \tilde{M} . We first show that Eq. (65) gives a time-inhomogeneous Markov structure for $0 \leq t \leq T$. We compute the posterior conditional probability from time $t-1$ to t :

$$\hat{M}_{x_t|x_{t-1}}^{T-t} := \mathbb{Q}_\beta \{X_t = x_t | X_{t-1} = x_{t-1}\} \quad (67a)$$

$$= \frac{v_{x_t}(T-t)}{v_{x_{t-1}}(T-t+1)} \tilde{M}_{x_{t-1}, x_t} \quad (67b)$$

where $v(n) = \tilde{M}^n \mathbf{1}$. Notation $v_j(s)$ represents the j -th component of the vector v . The t -dependence of \hat{M} clearly shows the time inhomogeneity.

The initial distribution from the MCP posterior is given by

$$\hat{q}_x^T := \mathbb{Q}_\beta(X_0 = x) = p_x \frac{v_x(T)}{Z_T}. \quad (68)$$

The Markov structure of the joint distribution in Eq. (65) is thus by the following expression:

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta \{x_{0:L}\} = q_{x_0}^T \prod_{s=1}^T \hat{M}_{x_s|x_{s-1}}^{T-s} \prod_{t=T+1}^L M_{x_t|x_{t-1}}. \quad (69)$$

When the data infinitus limit is taken, the MCP posterior transition matrix \hat{M} converge to the time-homogeneous posterior transition matrix from MEP,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \hat{M}_{y|x}^s = \frac{r_y}{\lambda_{\max} r_x} M_{y|x} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{x,y}} = \bar{M}_{y|x}. \quad (70)$$

Therefore, the posterior path probability from MCP is asymptotic equivalent to the one from MEP [14, 15]. The initial distribution converges to

$$q_x := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \hat{q}_x^T = \frac{p_x r_x}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_x r_x}. \quad (71)$$

The posterior of MCP in the idealized data infinitus limit is then

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta \{x_{0:\infty}\} = \frac{p_{x_0} r_{x_0}}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_x r_x} \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} \bar{M}_{x_t|x_{t-1}} \quad (72)$$

We note here that if we follow the standard ‘‘thermodynamic’’ concept of applying the limiting result back to the finite case as a leading order approximation [1], we would use the measured value γ_T from $g(x_{0:T})$, $T \gg 1$ to get $\beta(\gamma_T)$, λ_{\max} and r . Then, use Eq. (72) as the posterior of MCP, instead of using Eq. (69).

VI. MEASUREMENT-PREDICTED SYMMETRY BREAKING

We now provide two examples of the symmetry-breaking indicated by the measurement, using the posterior probabilistic models from MEP and MCP.

A. Transition-type Measurement and Time Correlation

When a pair frequency is measured in a discrete-time Markov chain, the LDRF is given by LDT 2.5, $\varphi_\nu(f) = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \ln \frac{f_{ij}/f_i}{M_{j|i}}$. If the prior process is i.i.d., i.e. $M_{j|i} = p_j$, the time correlation in the posterior is solely indicated by the measurement. This leads to an informative decomposition of the LDRF $\varphi_\nu(f)$ of LDT 2.5 in DTMC,

$$\sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \ln \frac{f_{ij}}{f_i p_j} = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} f_{ij} \ln \frac{f_{ij}}{f_i f_j} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{X}} f_i \ln \frac{f_i}{p_i}. \quad (73)$$

The entropy for a DTMC is actually the mutual information between the two consequent states and the relative entropy between the empirical distribution and the prior. These two terms should be understood as follows: there are two parts in the model assumption: 1) i.i.d. and 2) the form of the probability distribution. The first term reports the deviation from i.i.d., and the second term gives deviation from the probability distribution. The significance of this result is that these two different kinds of deviations from the model can be quantified by a single ‘‘quantity’’, the entropy (mutual information) of dependence and the entropy of deviation of the distribution are simply added together. We consider this relation as one fundamental reason why mutual information is a natural measure of dependence. This result connects the LDT 2.5 for DTMC [13] to Sanov’s theorem [47] and information theory [58].

Furthermore, with the i.i.d. prior $\mathbb{P}\{x_{0:\infty}\} = \prod_{t=0}^{\infty} p(x_t)$ but a general transition-type observable g defined in Eq. (36). The MEP will give us a posterior transition matrix $\bar{M}_{j|i}$ defined in Eq. (46). Moreover, because of the i.i.d. prior, the Bayesian conditional pair probability is the same for any $s = \{1, \dots, T\}$:

$$\mathbb{P}\{X_{s-1} = x, X_s = y | g \in d\gamma_T\} = \mathbb{E}[v_{x,y} | g \in d\gamma_T] \quad (74)$$

where ν is the empirical pair frequency defined in Eq. (33). This means that the posterior initial distribution is given by the posterior stationary distribution $l_x r_x$ of the transition matrix \bar{M} . The posterior path probability from the MEP is then

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta^{\text{MEP}} \{x_{0:\infty}\} = l_{x_0} r_{x_0} \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} \bar{M}_{x_t|x_{t-1}} \quad (75)$$

On the other hand, the posterior path probability from the MCP, according to Eq. (72), is given by

$$\mathbb{Q}_\beta^{\text{MCP}} \{x_{0:\infty}\} = \frac{p_{x_0} r_{x_0}}{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p_x r_x} \prod_{t=1}^{\infty} \bar{M}_{x_t | x_{t-1}}. \quad (76)$$

We see that the two posteriors have different posterior initial distributions but the posterior path measures are asymptotically equivalent. Both posteriors have a data-induced Markov structure with the same transition matrix \bar{M} . Time correlation emerges in measuring the transition-type observable.

B. Non-Gradient Observable and Irreversibility

For a possibly non-equilibrium Markov process, the natural ground state would be the state with detailed balance [59, 60]. We show here that when a detailed balanced prior is used, we can predict nonequilibrium posterior only when the path observable g is non-symmetric under path reversal. The entropy production at the nonequilibrium steady state (NESS) in the posterior is then shown to be in Onsager's form [35, 36].

For DTMC, the path observable we measure is

$$g(x_{0:T}) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{g}_{x_{t-1}, x_t}. \quad (77)$$

The posterior pair distribution at NESS was given by $q_{ij} = l_i \frac{M_{j|i} e^{\beta(\gamma) \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}}{\lambda} r_j$. With detailed balance $M_{j|i}$, the entropy production at NESS (*a.k.a.* housekeeping heat, see [10] for a review) would be

$$q_{\text{hk}} := \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij} \ln \frac{q_{ij}}{q_{ji}} = \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij} \ln \frac{M_{j|i} e^{\beta(\gamma) \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}}{M_{i|j} e^{\beta(\gamma) \cdot \hat{g}_{j,i}}} \quad (78a)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}} q_{ij} \beta \cdot [\hat{g}_{i,j} - \hat{g}_{j,i}]. \quad (78b)$$

We see that only the anti-symmetric part of the matrix $\hat{g}_{i,j}$ contribute to the entropy production. Furthermore, due to the stationarity constraint of q_{ij} in Eq. (41), the entropy production is zero if the pair observable is gradient-like $\hat{g}_{i,j} = u_j - u_i$ [15, 61]. These tells us that only the measurement from non-symmetric, non-gradient transition observable $\hat{g}_{i,j}$ can lead us to an non-equilibrium posterior DTMC.

For diffusion, we measure a set of values γ from the observable vector $g(x_{0:T}) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \hat{h}(x_t) dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \hat{g}(x_t) \circ dx_t$. For later convenience, let us denote $\gamma_{\hat{g}} := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \hat{g}(x_t) \circ dx_t$. The posterior process is described by $b_{\rho,J} = b + 2D(\beta \cdot \hat{g}) + 2D\nabla \ln r$ according to Eq. (B9) and Refs. [14, 15]. If $\gamma_{\hat{g}} = 0$, *i.e.* the measurement is not on the transitions, the posterior is only driven by a generalized gradient force, which lead to equilibrium posterior. The posterior can only be irreversible when $\gamma_{\hat{g}} \neq 0$. Furthermore, suppose we have detailed bal-

anced prior b , the posterior entropy production at NESS is

$$q_{\text{hk}} := \int_{\mathcal{X}} J \cdot (D^{-1} b_{\rho,J}) dx \quad (79a)$$

$$= 2\beta \int_{\mathcal{X}} J \cdot \hat{g} dx = 2\beta(\gamma) \cdot \gamma_{\hat{g}} \quad (79b)$$

where $J = \rho b_{\rho,J} - D\nabla \rho$ with $\rho(x) = l(x)r(x)$. Since J is divergence-free, q_{hk} can only be non-zero when \hat{g} is non-gradient [14, 15], *i.e.* with nonzero curl [62].

Note that the entropy production in posterior Markov processes in both Eq. (78) and Eq. (79) can be summarized by the following expression in $T \rightarrow \infty$:

$$q_{\text{hk}} = \beta(\gamma) \cdot [g(x_{0:T}) - g(x_{T:0})] \quad (80)$$

where $x_{T:0}$ is the reversed trajectory of $x_{0:T}$ and γ is the measured value of $g(x_{0:T})$. This is in fact a generalization to Onsager's theory [35, 36]. For arbitrarily nonequilibrium systems, the entropy production is the product of the irreversible part of the path observables g and the thermodynamic conjugated forces β of the whole observables g . The posterior Markov process can only be nonequilibrium if the path observable breaks path reversal symmetry $g(x_{0:T}) \neq g(x_{T:0})$ in the data infinitus limit. The result here gives us a notion of the "underlying" equilibrium process for a non-equilibrium process. We start with a equilibrium prior and the data from measuring the observables g reveal the irreversibility of the process to us. The conjugated variables $\beta(\gamma)$ drive the system from equilibrium to a non-equilibrium posterior process. Generic properties of the conjugated force $\beta(\gamma)$ is further shown in the following section.

VII. THERMODYNAMIC FORCES AND THEIR STATISTICAL VARIATION

The thermodynamic conjugated forces $\beta = \nabla \varphi_g$ parameterize posteriors and are functions of the measured values of the observable g , previously denoted as γ . The definite level of the conjugated forces are revealed when the data is infinite. When the data are large but finite, the values of g fluctuate leading to a fluctuating predicted conjugated force $\beta(g)$. The statistical variations of g and $\beta(g)$ satisfy an uncertainty principle derived by Landau and Lifshitz from a linear theory of β [36]. We shall call it the *Asymptotic Thermodynamic Uncertainty Principle* (ATUP) here to better distinguish it from the recently-celebrated "thermodynamic uncertainty relation" in stochastic thermodynamics [63–65]. The ATUP lead to debates on whether the temperature of a system (or more generally thermodynamic conjugated variables) actually fluctuates or not. These debates were settled by Mandelbrot who explained that the aforementioned ATUP was about the "estimation" of temperature one predicted from observation on our isolated system [37]. The estimation, as a function of energy, gives an prediction about the temperature of the reservoir the system once contacted with. Their values fluctuate due to the energy fluctuation in our system when we disconnected our system from the reservoir.

Here, we present the LDT derivation of the ATUP and identify its mesoscopic origin. By doing so, we connect three results associated with the fluctuation of observables and thermodynamic conjugated forces: (1) the LDT formulation of the ATUP of Landau and Lifshitz for finite but large T and its relation to the reciprocal curvatures of LDRF φ and the sCGF ψ ; (2) the susceptibility of the statistics of observables due to variation of thermodynamic conjugated forces; (3) Schlögl's uncertainty relation [38, 39] as the mesoscopic version of the ATUP. The LDRF of the conjugated forces we derived also allows us to access higher order cumulants of them.

A. Asymptotic Thermodynamic Uncertainty Principle (ATUP) and Reciprocal Curvatures of Entropy and Free Energy

Suppose our system of interest is described by the probabilistic model \mathbb{Q}_α from either the MCP or the MEP with thermodynamic conjugated force α . Here, since the posteriors from MEP and from MCP are asymptotically equivalent, we will work with the Boltzmann-Gibbs posterior from MCP. For a finite but large T measurement of g , the values of g fluctuates according to the probability $e^{-T\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma)+O(\ln T)}$, where $\varphi_{g;\alpha}$ is the LDRF of g under \mathbb{Q}_α . The LDRF $\varphi_{g;\alpha}$ is related to the LDRF of g under the reference measure \mathbb{P} by the exponential tilting of MCP:

$$\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma) = \varphi_g(\gamma) - [\alpha \cdot \gamma - \psi_g(\alpha)]. \quad (81)$$

The sCGF of g under \mathbb{Q}_α is

$$\psi_{g;\alpha}(\eta) = \psi_g(\eta + \alpha). \quad (82)$$

When $\alpha = 0$, we have $\mathbb{Q}_0 \equiv \mathbb{P}$. The mean and covariance of g under \mathbb{Q}_α , in the leading order, would be given by the derivatives of its sCGFs $\psi_{g;\alpha}(\eta)$ with $\eta = 0$ plugged in, *e.g.* $\mathbb{E}_\alpha[g] \sim \nabla\psi_g(\alpha)$ and $T\text{CoV}_\alpha[g] \sim \nabla\nabla\psi_g(\alpha)$.

Based on the measured value of g , we would predict the thermodynamic conjugated force by [66]

$$\beta(g) = \nabla\varphi_g(g) \quad (83)$$

which is also a random variable because g fluctuates. For large T , the most-likely value of β is the correct one $\alpha = \nabla\varphi_g(\gamma_\alpha)$ where $\gamma_\alpha := \mathbb{E}_\alpha[g]$. The fluctuation of $\beta(g)$ under large but finite T can be approximated by the LDRF of $\beta(g)$ under \mathbb{Q}_α , again obtained by the contraction principle:

$$\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}(\eta) = \inf_{y:\beta(y)=\eta} \varphi_{g;\alpha}(\eta) \quad (84a)$$

$$= \varphi_{g;\alpha}(\nabla\psi_g(\eta)) \quad (84b)$$

$$= \varphi_{g;\alpha}(\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\delta)). \quad (84c)$$

For simplicity, we have denoted $\delta = \eta - \alpha$ as the deviation of the predicted thermodynamic conjugated force.

By the convex duality between the LDRF $\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma)$ and the sCGF $\psi_{g;\alpha}(\beta)$, one has the reciprocity between the curvature (Hessian) of the two functions,

$$\mathbf{I} = [\nabla\nabla\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma)] \left[\nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\beta) \Big|_{\beta=\nabla\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma)} \right] \quad (85a)$$

$$= \left[\nabla\nabla\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma) \Big|_{\gamma=\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\beta)} \right] [\nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\beta)] \quad (85b)$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. This allows one to compute the leading-order fluctuation of the thermodynamic forces β from its LDRF, we compute

$$T\text{CoV}_\alpha[\beta] \sim \nabla\nabla\psi_{\beta;\alpha}(0) \quad (86a)$$

$$= [\nabla\nabla\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}(\nabla\psi_{\beta;\alpha}(0))]^{-1}. \quad (86b)$$

To continue, we compute

$$\nabla\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}(\eta) = \delta \cdot \nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\delta) \quad (87)$$

and

$$\nabla\nabla\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}(\eta) = \nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\delta) + \delta \cdot \nabla\nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(\delta). \quad (88)$$

Note that based on Eq. (86b), $\eta := \nabla\psi_{\beta;\alpha}(0)$ takes the value such that $0 = \nabla\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}(\eta)$. With invertible $\nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}$, this means $\delta = 0$ and thus $\eta = \alpha$. Hence, $\beta(g)$ has a covariance

$$T\text{CoV}_\alpha[\beta] \sim [\nabla\nabla\psi_{g;\alpha}(0)]^{-1} = \nabla\nabla\varphi_{g;\alpha}(\gamma_\alpha) \quad (89a)$$

$$= [\nabla\nabla\psi_g(\alpha)]^{-1} = \nabla\nabla\varphi_g(\nabla\psi_g(\alpha)) \quad (89b)$$

This shows that the reciprocity of the two dual functions in Eq. (85b) reflects the asymptotic reciprocal relation between g and β under the measure \mathbb{Q}_α as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$[T\text{CoV}_\alpha[\beta(g)]] [T\text{CoV}_\alpha(g)] \sim \mathbf{I}. \quad (90)$$

The statistically-predicted conjugated force $\beta = \nabla\varphi(g)$ has a small fluctuation if the observable g has big fluctuation, and both are $O(1/T)$. This is the asymptotic ‘‘thermodynamic uncertainty principle’’ between an observable and its conjugated force derived by Landau and Lifshitz [36] and discussed by Mandelbrot [37]. We provide the unifying LDT derivation here and give the well-known reciprocal curvature of φ_g and ψ_g in LDT a thermodynamic interpretation.

B. Susceptibility and Fisher Information

Different measured values of $g := G/T$ lead to different predicted conjugated forces β and a different posterior path distribution \mathbb{Q}_β . We shall see how susceptible the statistics of observables are under variation of β . Here, we use the posterior from MCP, which is an exponential family

$$d\mathbb{Q}_\beta(x_{0:T}) = \frac{e^{\beta \cdot G(x_{0:T})}}{Z(\beta)} d\mathbb{P}(x_{0:T}) \quad (91)$$

where $Z(\beta) = \mathbb{E}[e^{\beta \cdot G}]$ is the ‘‘partition function’’ and $\ln Z(\beta)$ is the CGF of G .

The Cramér-Rao inequality in statistics, which is an application of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, gives upper bound for

susceptibility of observables. Consider a general vector observable that does not depend on β , say $H(x_{0:T})$. The susceptibility of its mean value is then related to the covariance between its value and the value of G :

$$C_{ij} := \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_j} \mathbb{E}_\beta [H_i] = \text{CoV}_\beta [H_i, G_j]. \quad (92)$$

There are at least three interesting implications of Eq. (92). First, Each components of susceptibility has an upper bound given by the variance:

$$C_{ij}^2 \leq \mathbb{V}_\beta [H_i] \mathbb{V}_\beta [G_j] \quad (93)$$

This is from the direct use of Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (Cramér-Rao inequality) for scalar.

Second, when $H = G$, the above inequality becomes an equality, implying that the susceptibility matrix is symmetric for G :

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_\beta [G_i]}{\partial \beta_j} = \text{CoV} [G_i, G_j] = \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_\beta [G_j]}{\partial \beta_i}. \quad (94)$$

This gives rises to all the Maxwell's relations in our statistical thermodynamics. When $i = j$, Eq. (94) further indicates that the value of $\mathbb{E}_\beta [G_i]$ would increase with increasing β_i with slope given by the fluctuation level $\mathbb{V}_\beta [G_i] \geq 0$, giving a nice intuition of β_i as the driving force of G_i and why the prediction of β can be unique.

Third, applying the generalized Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (Cramér-Rao inequality) for vectors [67], we further gets a ‘‘lower bound’’ for the covariance matrix of H , $(\Xi_H)_{ij} = \text{CoV}_\beta [H_i, H_j]$, given by the susceptibility matrix:

$$\Xi_H \succeq C \mathcal{I}_\beta^{-1} C^\top \quad (95)$$

where the covariance of G is denoted as $(\mathcal{I}_\beta)_{ij} = \text{CoV}_\beta [G_i, G_j]$ since it is also the *Fisher information* of β and for exponential family \mathbb{Q}_β [68]. Below, we show that Eq. (95) leads to the mesoscopic origin of the AUR in Eq. (90).

C. Mesoscopic Origin of the ATUP

Consider the stochastic entropy of the observable $g = G/T$, $S_{g;\beta}(\gamma) := -\ln q_{g;\beta}(\gamma)$ where $q_{g;\beta}(\gamma)$ is the probability density of the observable g under \mathbb{Q}_β [46, 69]. Here $q_{g;\beta}(\gamma) d\gamma = \frac{e^{T\beta \cdot \gamma}}{\mathcal{Z}(\beta)} p(\gamma) d\gamma$ is related to the probability density $p(\gamma)$ of the observable g under \mathbb{P} . By choosing $H_i(g) = \left. \frac{\partial S_{g;\beta}}{\partial \gamma_i} \right|_{\gamma=g}$ (or simply $H_i = \partial_i S_{g;\beta}$) and assuming vanishing boundary conditions of $q_{g;\beta}$, one can show that,

$$\text{CoV}_\beta [g_i \partial_j S_{g;\beta}] = \delta_{ij}. \quad (96)$$

This states that the i th component of the observable g is uncorrelated (but not necessarily independent) to the j th component of the entropic conjugated force $\nabla S_{g;\beta}$.

Eq. (93) becomes

$$\mathbb{V}_\beta [g_i] \mathbb{V}_\beta [\partial_j S_{g;\beta}] \geq \delta_{ij} \quad (97)$$

which is a ‘‘thermodynamic uncertainty relation’’ first obtained by Schlögl [38, 39]. Eq. (95) then gives the mesoscopic origin of ATUP,

$$\text{CoV}_\beta [g] \text{CoV}_\beta [\nabla S_{g;\beta}] \succeq \mathbf{I}. \quad (98)$$

This mesoscopic ATUP actually holds for any boundary-vanishing probability density q_g of random variable g : it needs not be exponentially distributed. To see its connection to the ATUP in Eq. (90), we note that $\text{CoV}_\beta [\nabla S_{g;\beta}] \sim T^2 \text{CoV}_\beta [\nabla \varphi_{g;\beta}] = T^2 \text{CoV}_\beta [\nabla \varphi_g]$. The inequality becomes asymptotically an equality in the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ since the leading order of fluctuation is captured by a Gaussian-distributed g [36].

VIII. DISCUSSION

Summary Szilard, Mandelbrot, and Hill envisioned that a statistical thermodynamics can be formulated phenomenologically with only mechanics-like concepts [24–26]. The requirement of such mechanics-like concepts can be further removed by treating the data infinitus limit, or equivalently the long-term limit in processes, as the generalized thermodynamic limit [20, 21]. A *de-mechanised* statistical thermodynamics emerge purely from the limit theorems in LDT. Carrying on this concept, our paper has four main results. First, we demonstrate the universality of the statistical thermodynamics and the omnipresence of the entropic forces as the thermodynamic parameters of thermodynamic states. Second, the MEP [11, 16] with its Markov extension [12], and the MCP [27, 28] are revisited as standard CPMs that are parameterized by the entropic forces. We review their asymptotic equivalence [14, 15, 18], and clarify their conceptual differences with our novel derivation of the MCP. Third, when the baseline of the entropic forces is chosen w.r.t. a given symmetry of interest, the measurement-predicted level of entropic forces explains the symmetry breaking [1]. We provide two examples for this, comparing breakdown of time independency and time reversibility. Lastly, we use LDT to derive the asymptotic thermodynamic uncertainty principle (ATUP) [36, 37] for the statistical variations of the observables and their conjugated forces. The mesoscopic origin of ATUP is also identified [38, 39].

Compared to the LDT literature Many mathematical results in our paper have been discussed in the past in the literature of LDT [13–15, 17, 18, 70, 71]. However, there are at least three key conceptual differences between our work and those in the past: we emphasize the posterior probabilistic models, the thermodynamic conjugated forces that parameterized them, and the emergent statistical thermodynamics. The LDT, as suggested by its name, is about the asymptotic probability of a ‘‘rare event’’ deviated from the mean. However, whether an event is rare or not is actually w.r.t a probability measure. Under a reference measure as a prior \mathbb{P} , the observed event in the data infinitus limit could be exponentially rare under \mathbb{P} . The mathematics of LDT can carry on the statistical analysis and treat the system as a large deviation. It is,

however, more natural for physicists and applied mathematicians to treat the probability measure as an intrinsic property of the system and consider the “rareness” of the event as an indication that the system is “driven” by the entropic forces β to its thermodynamic excited states.

Comparison to the Bayesian’s School and the Frequentist’s School in Statistics In our statistical thermodynamics, the ground state is determined by the reference probability measure \mathbb{P} and the excited states are described by probabilistic models \mathbb{Q}_β parameterized by the entropic forces. The information from the measurement of the thermodynamic observables g is encoded as a change of probability measure, *i.e.* a statistical inference, from the prior \mathbb{P} to the posterior \mathbb{Q}_β . The MEP, and the MCP as its path extension, is a combined approach of the frequentist inference, Bayesian inference, and limit theorems. The result of a MEP calculation is the conditional average empirical frequency but is motivated by the Bayesian conditional probability with connection specified by the Gibbs conditioning principle. If empirical frequencies are the thermodynamic observables one measures, the resulting posterior of the MEP is exactly the empirical frequency one measured in the data infinitus limit, as in the frequentists’ school. However, like the Bayesian’s school, our theory emphasizes the pair of the prior \mathbb{P} and the posterior \mathbb{Q}_β , and, more importantly, the associated thermodynamic forces β that characterizes their differences.

Higher-order statistics of the predicted entropic force From the large deviation rate function (LDRF) of the predicted $\beta(g)$ under the posterior \mathbb{Q}_α in Eqs. (84), we can compute the leading order approximation for other cumulants of $\beta(g)$. For example, for a scalar observable g , the skewness of g and $\beta(g)$ can be found. As the third derivative of sCGF is related to the third derivative of the LDRF by

$$\psi'''(y) = -\varphi'''(x(y))\psi''(y), \quad (99)$$

we can compute the third derivative of the sCGF of $\beta(g)$ under \mathbb{Q}_α , denoted as $\psi'''_{\beta;\alpha}$, by the third derivative of its LDRF under \mathbb{Q}_α , $\varphi_{\beta;\alpha}$. A straightforward calculation will tell us that the leading-order skewness of $\beta(g)$ is related to the leading-order skewness of g by

$$\psi'''_{\beta;\alpha}(0) = -\frac{2\psi'''_{g;\alpha}(0)}{\psi''_{g;\alpha}(0)}. \quad (100)$$

We leave the comprehensive discussion of β ’s asymptotic statistics to future studies.

Synthesis with the Energetics The statistical thermodynamics presented here could also shed lights on inference mechanisms in biological systems, *e.g.* active prediction in the brain [72, 73] and concentration inference of cells [74]. An interesting future direction would be to study the role of the thermodynamic conjugated entropic forces β in such biological inference machinery and to potentially connect the statistical thermodynamics in the present work with the stochastic thermodynamics of the underlying biochemical signaling networks [74].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Erin Angelini, Ken Dill, Dalton Sakthivadivel, and Lowell Thompson for many helpful feedback on our manuscript and for the many stimulating discussions they had with the authors.

Appendix A: Maximum Entropy Principles for Continuous-Time Markov Chain

In a continuous time Markov chain (CTMC), a path is described by $(x_0, t_0; x_1, t_1; \dots; x_K, t_K)$ where the system jumps from x_{k-1} to x_k at time t_k , set $t_0 = 0$ and $t_K \leq t_{K+1} = T$. The most informative observables would be the combination of singleton frequency and transition frequency:

$$f_i = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta_i(x_t) dt, \quad \text{and} \quad (A1a)$$

$$f_{ij} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^K \delta_i(x_{k-1}) \delta_j(x_k), \quad i \neq j. \quad (A1b)$$

The LDRF of these observables is

$$\varphi_\nu[f] = \sum_{i \neq j} f_{ij} \ln \frac{f_{ij}/f_i}{p_{j|i}} - \sum_{i \neq j} f_{ij} + \sum_{i \neq j} f_i p_{j|i} \quad (A2)$$

where $p_{j|i}$ is the reference Markov transition rate matrix [55]. Here and below, $\sum_{i \neq j}$ is a simplified summation notation for summing all transitions $i \in \mathcal{X}$ to $j \in \mathcal{X}$ ($i \neq j$). The path observable of interest is

$$G(x_{0:T}) = \int_0^T \hat{h}_{x_t} dt + \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{g}_{x_{k-1}, x_k}. \quad (A3)$$

The MEP is again subject to typicality, normalization and stationarity conditions:

$$\arg \inf_{f_i, f_{ij}} \left\{ \varphi_\nu[f] - \beta \cdot \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{X}} f_i \hat{h}_i + \sum_{i \neq j} f_{ij} \hat{g}_{i,j} - \gamma \right] - \mu \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{X}} f_i - 1 \right] - \sum_{i \neq j} \sigma_i (f_{ij} - f_{ji}) \right\} \quad (A4)$$

Taking functional derivatives gives us

$$\beta \cdot \hat{h}_i = - \sum_{j(\neq i)} \frac{f_{ij}}{f_i} + \sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{j|i} - \mu \quad (A5)$$

and

$$\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j} = \ln \frac{f_{ij}}{f_i p_{j|i}} + \sigma_j - \sigma_i, \quad i \neq j. \quad (A6)$$

Here and below $\sum_{j(\neq i)}$ is a simplified notion of summing all $j \in \mathcal{X}$ except i .

Eq. (A6) gives us $f_{j|i} = p_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} \frac{e^{-\sigma_j}}{e^{-\sigma_i}}$. Plugging this to Eq. (A5), we then have

$$\sum_{j(\neq i)} p_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} e^{-\sigma_j} + \beta \cdot \hat{h}_i e^{-\sigma_i} - \sum_{k(\neq i)} p_{k|i} e^{-\sigma_i} = -\mu e^{-\sigma_i}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

If we define a tilted matrix

$$\tilde{q}_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}}, & , i \neq j \\ \beta \cdot \hat{h}_i - \sum_{k(\neq i)} p_{k|i} & , i = j \end{cases}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

then $e^{-\sigma_i}$ is the right-eigenvector of \tilde{q} , r_i , with $-\mu$ is the corresponding eigenvalue, λ . Similar to DTMC, one can show that $l_i r_i$ where l_i being the left eigenvector would be the invariant distribution of the posterior Markov chain described by \tilde{q}_{ij} . The posterior transition matrix is

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} \frac{r_j(\beta)}{r_i(\beta)} & , i \neq j \\ -\sum_{k(\neq i)} p_{k|i} + \beta \cdot \hat{h}_i - \lambda_{\max}(\beta) & , i = j \end{cases} \quad (\text{A9})$$

with posterior stationary singleton distribution $\rho_i = l_i r_i$ and posterior stationary pair distribution $q_{ij} = l_i q_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} r_j$. Similar to DTMC, the requirement of λ_{\max} being the largest eigenvalue [14, 15] could be intuitively seen by plugging in the posterior $q_i = l_i r_i$ and $q_{ij} = l_i q_{j|i} e^{\beta \cdot \hat{g}_{i,j}} r_j$ into Eq. (A4).

Appendix B: Maximum Entropy Principle for Diffusion

In continuous time Markov processes (diffusion) in \mathbb{R}^n described by Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t p = -\nabla \cdot [b(x)p - D(x)\nabla p], \quad (\text{B1})$$

path observables we consider are

$$G(x_{0:T}) = \int_0^T \hat{h}(x_t) dt + \int_0^T \hat{g}(x_t) \circ dx_t \quad (\text{B2})$$

where \circ denotes Stratonovich midpoint integration: $\hat{g}(x_t) \circ dx_t = \hat{g}(x_t + \frac{1}{2} dx_t) \cdot dx_t$. Generally when the observable is a vector $G \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\hat{h} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector and $\hat{g} \in \mathbb{R}^{m^2}$ is a matrix. The level-2.5 LDT of diffusion process is formulated with empirical singleton frequency ρ and empirical current J :

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta(x_t - x) dt \quad (\text{B3a})$$

$$J(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \delta(x_t - x) \circ dx_t \quad (\text{B3b})$$

with constraints on normalization $\int_{\mathcal{X}} \rho(x) dx = 1$ and stationarity $\nabla \cdot J = 0$ [14, 15, 50, 56]. The LDRF of them is often known in the form of

$$\varphi[\rho, J] = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (J - J_\rho) \cdot (\rho D)^{-1} (J - J_\rho) dx \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $J_\rho := \rho b - D\nabla\rho$. Note that J_ρ is in general not divergence-free, a less known but more natural form of φ is actually

$$\varphi[\rho, J] = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathcal{X}} (b_{\rho,J} - b) \cdot D^{-1} (b_{\rho,J} - b) \rho dx \quad (\text{B5})$$

where $b_{\rho,J} := -D\nabla(-\ln\rho) + J/\rho$ is vector field decomposition from stationary distribution and flux [75], note that J is divergence free so $b_{\rho,J}$ can be further rewritten in terms of its bivector potential [62, 76]. The alternative form of Eq. (B5) shows that the tilting due to frequencies measurement is about updating the vector field b , *i.e.* as before, the average behavior.

The MEP for the observable G is then

$$\arg \inf_{\rho, J} \left\{ \varphi[\rho, J] - \beta \cdot \left[\int_{\mathcal{X}} \rho \hat{h} dx + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \hat{g} J dx - \gamma \right] - \int k \nabla \cdot J dx - \mu \left[\int \rho dx - 1 \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Denoting $u = b_{\rho,J} - b$, functional derivatives w.r.t. ρ and J lead us to

$$\beta \cdot \hat{h} = -\frac{1}{4} u \cdot D^{-1} u - \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot u - \frac{1}{2} b \cdot D^{-1} u - \mu \quad (\text{B7})$$

and

$$\beta \cdot \hat{g} = \frac{1}{2} D^{-1} u - \nabla k. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Similar to DTMC and CTMC, plugging the latter into the former gives us the eigenvalue problem in Ref. [15] with linear operator $\mathcal{L}_\beta := b \cdot (\nabla + \beta \cdot \hat{g}) + (\nabla + \beta \cdot \hat{g}) \cdot D (\nabla + \beta \cdot \hat{g}) + \beta \cdot \hat{h}$. The equation then shows that $k = \ln r$ where r is the right eigenfunction of \mathcal{L}_β with $\lambda = -\mu$ as the corresponding eigenvalue: $\mathcal{L}_\beta[r] = \lambda r$. The posterior probability current is then $J = \rho b_{\rho,J} - D\nabla\rho$. One can also show from $\nabla \cdot J = 0$ that the stationary singleton distribution is $\rho(x) = l(x)r(x)$ where $l(x)$ is the left eigenfunction of \mathcal{L}_β corresponding to λ , satisfying $\mathcal{L}_\beta^*[l] = \lambda l$ where $\mathcal{L}_\beta^* := -(\nabla - \beta \cdot \hat{g}) \cdot b + (\nabla - \beta \cdot \hat{g}) \cdot D (\nabla - \beta \cdot \hat{g}) + \beta \cdot \hat{h}$ is the linear operator conjugate to \mathcal{L}_β w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. Plugging in the posterior $\rho = lr$ and $J = \rho b_{\rho,J} + D\nabla\rho$ back to Eq. (B6) would show that λ should be the largest eigenvalue. The posterior diffusion process is described by the posterior drift

$$b_{\rho,J} = b + 2D\nabla \ln r + 2D(\beta \cdot \hat{g}) \quad (\text{B9})$$

with information of singleton observable h hidden in the right eigenvector r . Posterior stationary distribution is then $\rho(x) = l(x)r(x)$ and posterior stationary probability current is $J(x) = \rho b_{\rho,J} + D\nabla\rho$.

- [1] P. W. Anderson, More Is Different, *Science* **177**, 393 (1972).
- [2] S. Chibbaro, L. Rondoni, and A. Vulpiani, *Reductionism, Emergence and Levels of Reality: The Importance of Being Borderline* (Springer International Publishing, 2014).
- [3] P. G. de Gennes, Molecular Individualism, *Science* **276**, 1999 (1997).
- [4] G. Nicolis and I. Prigogine, *Self-Organization in Nonequilibrium Systems: From Dissipative Structures to Order through Fluctuations*, 1st ed. (Wiley, New York, 1977).
- [5] H. Haken, *Synergetics: An Introduction Nonequilibrium Phase Transitions and Self-Organization in Physics, Chemistry and Biology*, 2nd ed., Springer Series in Synergetics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1978).
- [6] I. Prigogine, *The End of Certainty*, 1st ed. (Free Press, New York, 1997).
- [7] H. Qian, P. Ao, Y. Tu, and J. Wang, A framework towards understanding mesoscopic phenomena: Emergent unpredictability, symmetry breaking and dynamics across scales, *Chemical Physics Letters* **665**, 153 (2016).
- [8] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Foundations of the Theory of Probability: Second English Edition*, 2nd ed. (Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2018).
- [9] H. Qian, Y.-C. Cheng, and L. F. Thompson, Ternary Representation of Stochastic Change and the Origin of Entropy and Its Fluctuations, [arXiv:1902.09536](https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.09536) (2019).
- [10] Y.-J. Yang and H. Qian, Unified formalism for entropy production and fluctuation relations, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 022129 (2020).
- [11] J. van Campenhout and T. Cover, Maximum entropy and conditional probability, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **27**, 483 (1981).
- [12] I. Csiszár, T. Cover, and Byoung-Seon Choi, Conditional limit theorems under Markov conditioning, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **33**, 788 (1987).
- [13] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2009).
- [14] R. Chetrite and H. Touchette, Nonequilibrium Microcanonical and Canonical Ensembles and Their Equivalence, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 120601 (2013).
- [15] R. Chetrite and H. Touchette, Nonequilibrium Markov Processes Conditioned on Large Deviations, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **16**, 2005 (2015).
- [16] E. T. Jaynes, Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620 (1957).
- [17] H. Touchette, The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics, *Physics Reports* **478**, 1 (2009).
- [18] R. Chetrite and H. Touchette, Variational and optimal control representations of conditioned and driven processes, *J. Stat. Mech.* **2015**, P12001 (2015).
- [19] H. Qian and Y.-C. Cheng, Counting single cells and computing their heterogeneity: from phenotypic frequencies to mean value of a quantitative biomarker, *Quant Biol* **8**, 172 (2020).
- [20] Z. Lu and H. Qian, Emergence and Breaking of Duality Symmetry in Generalized Fundamental Thermodynamic Relations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 150603 (2022), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [21] J. Commons, Y.-J. Yang, and H. Qian, Duality Symmetry, Two Entropy Functions, and an Eigenvalue Problem in Gibbs' Theory, [arXiv:2108.08948 \[cond-mat\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.08948) (2021).
- [22] J. Gärtner, On Large Deviations from the Invariant Measure, *Theory Probab. Appl.* **22**, 24 (1977).
- [23] R. S. Ellis, Large Deviations for a General Class of Random Vectors, *The Annals of Probability* **12**, 1 (1984).
- [24] L. Szilard, Über die Ausdehnung der phänomenologischen Thermodynamik auf die Schwankungserscheinungen, *Z. Phys.* **32**, 840 (1929).
- [25] B. Mandelbrot, On the Derivation of Statistical Thermodynamics from Purely Phenomenological Principles, *J. Math. Phys.* **5**, 164 (1964).
- [26] T. L. Hill, *Thermodynamics of Small Systems, Parts I & II* (Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2013).
- [27] E. T. Jaynes, The Minimum Entropy Production Principle, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **31**, 579 (1980).
- [28] S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, J. Lee, and K. A. Dill, Principles of maximum entropy and maximum caliber in statistical physics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 1115 (2013).
- [29] J. Shore and R. Johnson, Axiomatic derivation of the principle of maximum entropy and the principle of minimum cross-entropy, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theor.* **26**, 26 (1980).
- [30] J. Uffink, Can the maximum entropy principle be explained as a consistency requirement?, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* **26**, 223 (1995).
- [31] S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, J. Lee, and K. A. Dill, Nonadditive Entropies Yield Probability Distributions with Biases not Warranted by the Data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 180604 (2013).
- [32] C. Tsallis, Conceptual Inadequacy of the Shore and Johnson Axioms for Wide Classes of Complex Systems, *Entropy* **17**, 10.3390/e17052853 (2015).
- [33] S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, J. Lee, and K. A. Dill, Reply to C. Tsallis' "Conceptual Inadequacy of the Shore and Johnson Axioms for Wide Classes of Complex Systems", *Entropy* **17**, 5043 (2015).
- [34] P. Jizba and J. Korbel, Maximum Entropy Principle in Statistical Inference: Case for Non-Shannonian Entropies, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 120601 (2019).
- [35] L. Onsager, Reciprocal Relations in Irreversible Processes. I., *Phys. Rev.* **37**, 405 (1931).
- [36] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics, Third Edition, Part 1: Volume 5*, 3rd ed. (Butterworth-Heinemann, Amsterdam u.a., 1980).
- [37] B. B. Mandelbrot, Temperature Fluctuation: A Well-Defined and Unavoidable Notion, *Physics Today* **10.1063/1.2810881** (1989).
- [38] F. Schlögl, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation, *Journal of Physics and Chemistry of Solids* **49**, 679 (1988).
- [39] J. Uffink and J. van Lith, Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relations, *Foundations of Physics* **29**, 655 (1999).
- [40] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers: Asymptotic Methods and Perturbation Theory*, 1999th ed. (Springer, New York, 1999).
- [41] $f_\epsilon(x) \asymp g_\epsilon(x)$ means $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \log \frac{f_\epsilon(x)}{g_\epsilon(x)} = 0$.
- [42] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics, 2nd Edition*, 2nd ed. (Wiley, New York, 1987).
- [43] C. N. Yang, Symmetry and Physics, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* **140**, 267 (1996).
- [44] C. E. Shannon, A Mathematical Theory of Communication, *Bell Syst. Tech.* **27**, 379 (1948).
- [45] A. Y. Khinchin, *Mathematical Foundations of Information Theory*, 1st ed. (Dover Publications, Mineola, N.Y., 1957).
- [46] U. Seifert, Entropy Production along a Stochastic Trajectory and an Integral Fluctuation Theorem, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 040602 (2005).
- [47] I. N. Sanov, On the probability of large deviations of random

- variables, *Mat. Sbornik* **1**, **42**, 11 (1958).
- [48] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, On Information and Sufficiency, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **22**, 79 (1951).
- [49] Y.-C. Cheng, H. Qian, and Y. Zhu, Asymptotic Behavior of a Sequence of Conditional Probability Distributions and the Canonical Ensemble, *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **22**, 1561 (2021).
- [50] A. C. Barato and R. Chetrite, A Formal View on Level 2.5 Large Deviations and Fluctuation Relations, *J Stat Phys* **160**, 1154 (2015).
- [51] S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics*, new edition ed. (Dover Publications, Mineola, N.Y, 1997).
- [52] E. J. G. Pitman, Sufficient statistics and intrinsic accuracy, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **32**, 567 (1936).
- [53] G. Darrois, Sur les lois de probabilités a estimation exhaustive, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **200**, 1265 (1935).
- [54] B. O. Koopman, On distributions admitting a sufficient statistic, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **39**, 399 (1936).
- [55] C. Maes and K. Netočný, Canonical structure of dynamical fluctuations in mesoscopic nonequilibrium steady states, *EPL* **82**, 30003 (2008).
- [56] C. Maes, K. Netočný, and B. Wynants, Steady state statistics of driven diffusions, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **387**, 2675 (2008).
- [57] H. Ge, S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, and K. A. Dill, Markov processes follow from the principle of maximum caliber, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **136**, 064108 (2012).
- [58] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory 2nd Edition*, 2nd ed. (Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, N.J, 2006).
- [59] R. M. L. Evans, Rules for Transition Rates in Nonequilibrium Steady States, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 150601 (2004).
- [60] R. M. L. Evans, Detailed balance has a counterpart in nonequilibrium steady states, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**, 293 (2005).
- [61] C. Monthus, Non-equilibrium steady states: maximization of the Shannon entropy associated with the distribution of dynamical trajectories in the presence of constraints, *J. Stat. Mech.* **2011**, P03008 (2011).
- [62] Y.-J. Yang and H. Qian, Bivectorial Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics: Cycle Affinity, Vorticity Potential, and Onsager's Principle, *J Stat Phys* **182**, 46 (2021).
- [63] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relation for Biomolecular Processes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [64] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, Dissipation Bounds All Steady-State Current Fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 120601 (2016).
- [65] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations constrain non-equilibrium fluctuations, *Nat Phys* **16**, 15 (2020).
- [66] The thermodynamic conjugated force is defined with zero point chosen to be the reference measure \mathbb{P} with certain symmetries. It should be always defined by the gradient of the LDRF of g under \mathbb{P} , even if our system in-hand is at macrostate \mathbb{Q}_β .
- [67] G. Tripathi, A matrix extension of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, *Economics Letters* **63**, 1 (1999).
- [68] Denoting $Q_\beta(x_{0:T}) = e^{\beta G(x_{0:T}) - \ln Z(\beta)} P(x_{0:T})$ as the path measure, we consider the Shannon-Khinchin entropy $S := -\ln Q_\beta$. The Fisher information is given by $(\mathcal{I}_\beta)_{ij} := \mathbb{E}_\beta [\partial_{\beta_i} \partial_{\beta_j} S] = \text{CoV}_\beta [(\partial_{\beta_i} S), (\partial_{\beta_j} S)] = \text{CoV}_\beta [G_i, G_j]$ where the last equality comes from $(\partial_{\beta_i} S) = G_i$.
- [69] H. Qian, Mesoscopic nonequilibrium thermodynamics of single macromolecules and dynamic entropy-energy compensation, *Phys. Rev. E* **65**, 016102 (2001).
- [70] R. S. Ellis, *Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics*, 2006th ed. (Springer, Leipzig, 2005).
- [71] E. Smith, Large-deviation principles, stochastic effective actions, path entropies, and the structure and meaning of thermodynamic descriptions, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **74**, 046601 (2011).
- [72] P. Dayan, G. E. Hinton, R. M. Neal, and R. S. Zemel, The Helmholtz Machine, *Neural Computation* **7**, 889 (1995).
- [73] N. Sajid, P. J. Ball, T. Parr, and K. J. Friston, Active Inference: Demystified and Compared, *Neural Computation* **33**, 674 (2021).
- [74] A. H. Lang, C. K. Fisher, T. Mora, and P. Mehta, Thermodynamics of Statistical Inference by Cells, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 148103 (2014).
- [75] J. Wang, L. Xu, and E. Wang, Potential landscape and flux framework of nonequilibrium networks: Robustness, dissipation, and coherence of biochemical oscillations, *PNAS* **105**, 12271 (2008).
- [76] Y.-J. Yang and Y.-C. Cheng, Potentials of continuous Markov processes and random perturbations, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **54**, 195001 (2021).