

Information geometry of excess and housekeeping entropy production

Artemy Kolchinsky,¹ Andreas Dechant,² Kohei Yoshimura,³ and Sosuke Ito^{1,3}

¹*Universal Biology Institute, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

²*Department of Physics No. 1, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

³*Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan*

A nonequilibrium system is characterized by a set of thermodynamic forces and fluxes, which give rise to entropy production (EP). We demonstrate that these forces and fluxes have an information-geometric structure, which allows us to decompose EP into nonnegative contributions from different types of forces. We focus on the excess and housekeeping decomposition, which reflects contributions from conservative and nonconservative forces, in the general setting of discrete systems (linear master equations and nonlinear chemical dynamics). Unlike the nonadiabatic/adiabatic (Hatano-Sasa) approach, our decomposition is always well-defined, including in systems with odd variables and nonlinear systems without steady states. It is also operationally meaningful, leading to far-from-equilibrium thermodynamic uncertainty relations and speed limits.

Entropy production (EP) is the fundamental thermodynamic cost of implementing an irreversible processes. A major goal of nonequilibrium thermodynamics is to understand this thermodynamic cost from an operational point of view, in terms of tradeoffs between EP and functional properties such as speed of dynamical evolution [1, 2] and precision of fluctuating observables [3]. At the same time, EP can arise from different mechanisms, including relaxation from nonequilibrium states, time-dependent driving, nonconservative forces, and exchange of conserved quantities between different reservoirs. In this Letter, we use methods from information geometry [4, 5] to decompose EP into nonnegative contributions from different sources and to study their operational consequences.

We focus in particular on the decomposition of EP into *housekeeping* and *excess* terms [6–8]. At a general level, excess EP reflects the contribution that arises from conservative forces (i.e., due to a change of some state potential), and it vanishes in steady state. The housekeeping EP reflects the contribution from nonconservative forces, such as those that generate cyclic fluxes in nonequilibrium steady states. The housekeeping EP can be arbitrarily large, and it can diverge during quasistatic transformations between steady states [9, 10]. The original goal of the decomposition was to derive a nonequilibrium generalization of the Clausius inequality stated in terms of the excess EP, which becomes tight for quasistatic transformations [8]. More generally, in the presence of nonconservative forces, the excess EP (rather than the total EP) may be used to derive tighter thermodynamic tradeoffs.

While this decomposition is well understood at a conceptual level, identifying the correct formal definition of excess and housekeeping EP remains an open research area [10–15]. In stochastic thermodynamics, the best known decomposition was proposed by Hatano and Sasa (HS) for Langevin dynamics [7] and later generalized to stochastic jump processes [6, 16] and nonlinear chemical reaction networks [17, 18] (where it is also called the *adiabatic/nonadiabatic* decomposition). However, the HS decomposition has several drawbacks. First, its physical significance is unclear and it is difficult to connect it to experimental measurements [10, 19, 20]. Second, it has a limited range of validity, being undefined for systems that lack steady states, e.g., nonlinear chemical reaction networks

that exhibit oscillations [14]. Even when a steady state exists, the HS decomposition can sometimes give unphysical negative values, e.g., in the presence of odd variables [12, 13, 21] or in chemical systems that violate complex balance [17, 18]. These drawbacks suggest that the HS decomposition is not the ultimate definition of housekeeping and excess EP.

Here we propose an excess/housekeeping decomposition for discrete systems which resolves all of these issues. Our decomposition is always well-defined, including for systems with odd variables and nonlinear systems without steady states. It is derived geometrically, in terms of the projection of a system's thermodynamic forces onto the subspace of conservative forces. Our decomposition has important operational consequences, including thermodynamic uncertainty relations (TURs) and thermodynamic speed limits (TSLs) which can be tight even in the far-from-equilibrium regime.

Our approach is related to the excess/housekeeping decomposition proposed by Maes and Netočný (MN) for Langevin systems [10]. This decomposition was studied from a geometric perspective in Refs. [19, 20, 22], and generalized to discrete systems by the present authors in Ref. [14]. However, unlike these previous papers, which worked within a generalized Euclidean geometry, we consider the non-Euclidean setting of information geometry, which is more appropriate for systems that are far from equilibrium. Our approach can be seen as a far-from-equilibrium generalization of the (MN) decomposition. (For a detailed comparison with Ref. [14], see Sec. A in Supplemental Material [SM] [23].)

This Letter complements a growing body of research on the relationship between stochastic thermodynamics and information geometry. However, most previous research analyzed the information geometry of thermodynamic states at a single time point [24–33], rather than the information geometry of forces and fluxes as done here. One exception is Ref. [34], which considered the information geometry of trajectories; however it did not consider decompositions based on constraints on thermodynamic forces, nor did it consider their thermodynamic implications. Another exception is Ref. [35], a recent preprint which considers fluxes and forces but uses a different kind of information geometry (see Sec. I in SM [23] for a summary and numerical comparison with Ref. [35]).

Setup.— We consider a discrete system with N species or states whose distribution at time t is given by $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$. The system evolves in continuous time, either as a linear master equation (stochastic jump process) or a nonlinear rate equation (deterministic chemical reaction system). The dynamics are represented by a vector of fluxes $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_M) \in \mathbb{R}_+^M$ across a set of M “edges”, corresponding to different reactions or transitions. The system’s evolution obeys the continuity equation $d_t \mathbf{p} = \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}$, where $\mathbb{B} \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \times M}$ is the discrete gradient operator (matrix that maps fluxes to species). Note that \mathbf{p} and \mathbf{j} generally depend on time, though we leave this dependence implicit in the notation. Also note that we do not assume any particular form of the dynamics (such as mass action kinetics) except where otherwise stated.

The thermodynamic forces across the edges, which may arise from relaxation or driving, are indicated by the vector $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^M$. Assuming local detailed balance holds, the force across edge ρ is $f_\rho = \ln(j_\rho/\tilde{j}_\rho)$, where j_ρ and \tilde{j}_ρ is the forward and time-reversed flux across edge ρ respectively. We define an exponential family of fluxes $\mathbf{j}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ parameterized by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^M$,

$$j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := j_\rho e^{\theta_\rho - f_\rho} = \tilde{j}_\rho e^{\theta_\rho}. \quad (1)$$

The information-theoretic distance between members of this family is given by the (generalized) Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence [5] for non-normalized nonnegative vectors,

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}') = \sum_\rho j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \left[\ln \frac{j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}')} + \frac{j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}')}{j_\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta})} - 1 \right] \geq 0. \quad (2)$$

In the parameterized family of fluxes $\mathbf{j}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, the vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ plays the role of thermodynamic forces. The actual fluxes are recovered when $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{f}$, while the reverse fluxes are recovered when $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$. The entropy production rate (EPR) is the KL divergence between the forward and reverse fluxes (see Fig. 1),

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}). \quad (3)$$

To make things concrete, consider the example of a linear master equation without odd variables (for master equations with odd variables, see Sec. B in SM [23]). In this case, \mathbb{B} is the incidence matrix and \mathbf{p} is a normalized probability distribution which evolves as $d_t p_x = \sum_{j(\neq i), \alpha} (p_y R_{xy}^\alpha - p_x R_{yx}^\alpha)$, where R_{yx}^α is the rate of transitions $x \rightarrow y$ mediated by reservoir α . For each transition $x \rightarrow y, \alpha$, there is an edge ρ with flux $j_\rho = p_x R_{yx}^\alpha$, reverse flux $\tilde{j}_\rho = p_y R_{xy}^\alpha$, and incidence matrix entries $\mathbb{B}_{z\rho} = \delta_{zy} - \delta_{zx}$. The EPR is then given by the standard expression, $\dot{\sigma} = \sum_\rho j_\rho \ln(j_\rho/\tilde{j}_\rho)$, which follows from Eqs. (2) and (3) and $\sum_\rho j_\rho = \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho$. Alternatively, for deterministic chemical systems, \mathbf{p} is a nonnegative concentration vector and \mathbb{B} is the stoichiometric matrix (see details in Sec. C in SM [23]).

For clarity, we use the calligraphic \mathcal{D} to indicate KL divergence between parameterized flux vectors, as in Eq. (2). We write the KL divergence between other kinds of nonnegative vectors as $D(\mathbf{a} \parallel \mathbf{b}) = \sum_x a_x (\ln(a_x/b_x) + b_x/a_x - 1)$.

Housekeeping vs. excess EPR.— We now introduce our first set of results, an excess/housekeeping decomposition of the EPR which is well-defined for all discrete systems.




Figure 1. Illustration of housekeeping/excess decomposition, Eq. (6). The EPR $\dot{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0})$ is decomposed into $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^*)$ plus $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^* \parallel \mathbf{0})$ using the Pythagorean relation for KL divergence. $-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^*$ is the vector of optimal conservative forces.

Recall that the goal of this decomposition is to separate the thermodynamic contributions of conservative and nonconservative forces. A vector of forces is called *conservative* if it is the negative gradient of some potential function. For example, for a master equation that obeys detailed balance, $R_{xy} \pi_y^{\text{eq}} = R_{yx} \pi_x^{\text{eq}}$, the forces are conservative for the potential $\phi_x = \ln p_x / \pi_x^{\text{eq}}$, since $f_{yx} = \ln(j_{yx}/\tilde{j}_{yx}) = \phi_x - \phi_y$. In our notation, a vector of forces \mathbf{f} is conservative if $\mathbf{f} = -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}$ for some potential function $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Generally speaking, the housekeeping EPR should vanish when a system only has conservative forces. Motivated by this, we define the housekeeping EPR as the information-theoretic distance between \mathbf{f} , the vector of actual thermodynamic forces, and the closest vector of conservative forces:

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} := \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}) \geq 0. \quad (4)$$

We define the excess EPR as the remainder, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} := \dot{\sigma} - \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}$. Note that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \geq 0$ by non-negativity of the KL divergence, vanishing when \mathbf{f} is conservative. In addition, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \leq \dot{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0})$ since $\mathbf{0} = -\mathbb{B}^T \mathbf{0}$ is in the feasible set of the optimization problem. Thus, we also have $0 \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \leq \dot{\sigma}$.

In information geometry, Eq. (4) is called the information projection of \mathbf{f} onto the linear subspace $\text{im } \mathbb{B}^T$ [5]. Information projections exhibit a dual structure, which allows us to write $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ in terms of the following variational principle:

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^M} \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \parallel \mathbf{0}) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = d_t \mathbf{p}, \quad (5)$$

Thus, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}$ is the smallest distance from any $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to the origin, such that the fluxes $\mathbf{j}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ have the same temporal evolution as the actual fluxes \mathbf{j} . The optimal $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ in Eq. (5) exists and is equal to $-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^*$, the optimal conservative force in Eq. (4) [36]. This gives the *Pythagorean relation for KL divergence* [4, 5]:

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) = \underbrace{\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^*)}_{\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}} + \underbrace{\mathcal{D}(-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^* \parallel \mathbf{0})}_{\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}}. \quad (6)$$

Eq. (6) is analogous to the Pythagorean Theorem in Euclidean geometry, with the KL divergence playing the role of squared Euclidean distance. Fig. 1 illustrates this decomposition.

It can also be shown that excess EPR satisfies the following variational principle:

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \max_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left[-(\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p})^T \phi - \sum_{\rho} \tilde{j}_{\rho} (e^{-[\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_{\rho}} - 1) \right], \quad (7)$$

which follows from $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) - \min_{\phi} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \phi)$ and rearranging. Mathematically, Eq. (7) says that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ is the Legendre transform of a convex function (which here is the time derivative of a cumulant generating function). Below, we use Eq. (7) to derive far-from-equilibrium TURs and TSLs.

The Pythagorean relation and the variational principles in Eqs. (4) to (7) are well-known in information geometry (for completeness, we provide derivations in Sec. D in SM [23]). Importantly, the corresponding optimization problems are convex and can be solved using standard numerical techniques. Finally, note that while we introduced our decomposition in the context of finite-dimensional systems for simplicity, the definitions in Eqs. (4) and (5) also holds for discrete systems with infinite dimensions, such as chemical master equations.

Systems without odd variables.— Let us briefly restrict our attention to systems without odd variables (sometimes called “overdamped” systems), such that each edge ρ has a unique reversed edge $-\rho$ with $\tilde{j}_{\rho} = j_{-\rho}$ and $\mathbb{B}_{x,\rho} = -\mathbb{B}_{x,-\rho}$ (producing the time-reversal symmetry $\mathbb{B}\tilde{\mathbf{j}} = -\mathbb{B}\mathbf{j}$). Given this assumption, we emphasize three aspects of our decomposition.

First, although our definitions make no explicit reference to steady state, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ vanishes in steady state if one exists. In particular, for a system in steady state, $\tilde{\mathbf{j}} = \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{0})$ satisfies the constraint in Eq. (5), $\mathbb{B}\tilde{\mathbf{j}} = -\mathbb{B}\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, and achieves the minimum $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{0} \parallel \mathbf{0}) = 0$. More generally, by properties of KL divergence and the definition (5), $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \sim \epsilon^2$ when $\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p} \sim \epsilon$. Thus, the integral of excess EP vanishes in the quasistatic limit of slow driving, $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p} \sim 1/\tau$ [9].

Second, we can relate our decomposition to the HS decomposition for linear master equations and (more generally) complex-balanced chemical systems with mass action kinetics. As we show in Sec. F in SM [23], if a steady state distribution π^{ss} exists, then the HS housekeeping EPR can be written as $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}})$ where $\phi_x^{\text{ss}} = \ln p_x / \pi_x^{\text{ss}}$. Eq. (4) then implies that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}}$ and $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \geq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}}$. Noet that the remainder defines a “coupling term” $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{cpl}} = \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} - \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \geq 0$, which has recently been considered for Fokker-Planck dynamics [20]. We emphasize that in steady state, $\phi^{\text{ss}} = \mathbf{0} = \phi^*$.

Third, the optimal potential ϕ^* in Eq. (6) generalizes the free energy potential, which plays an important role in conservative systems. In particular, just as the evolution of a conservative system is a gradient flow for the free energy potential [37, 38], the evolution of a nonconservative system is a gradient flow for the potential ϕ^* (see Sec. G in SM [23] for details).

Trajectory-level.— In our second set of results, we derive a trajectory-level expression of excess EP for stochastic jump processes, and show that this expression leads to an information-theoretic speed limit. We consider a stochastic system that starts from the initial distribution $\mathbf{p}(0)$ and then evolves under a time-dependent rate matrix over $t \in [0, \tau]$,

producing the trajectory distribution P_{Γ} . As standard in stochastic thermodynamics [6, 13], we also consider the time-reversed driving protocol which starts from distribution $\mathbf{p}(\tau)$ and evolves backwards in time, producing the reverse trajectory distribution \tilde{P}_{Γ} . It is well known that the integrated EP can be written as the KL divergence between these two trajectory distributions, $\Sigma(\tau) = \int_0^{\tau} \dot{\sigma}(t) dt = D(P_{\Gamma} \parallel \tilde{P}_{\Gamma})$ [6, 13]. It turns out that the integrated excess EP, $\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) = \int_0^{\tau} \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}(t) dt$, can also be expressed in terms trajectory-level KL divergence, via the following variational expression:

$$\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) = \inf_{Q_{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{C}} D(Q_{\Gamma} \parallel \tilde{P}_{\Gamma}) : \mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(t) \quad t \in [0, \tau], \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{C} is the set of all continuous-time Markov chain trajectory distributions, and the constraint says that the marginal distribution over system states is the same under Q_{Γ} and \tilde{P}_{Γ} at all times. In words, Σ_{ex} is the distance from the reverse trajectory distribution to the closest trajectory distribution that has the same marginals as the forward distribution. Eq. (8) is derived by plugging Eq. (5) into the expression for the KL divergence between trajectory distributions (see Sec. E in SM [23]).

By using the monotonicity property of KL divergence and the constraint that $\mathbf{q}(0) = \mathbf{p}(0)$, Eq. (8) implies the bound

$$\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) \geq D(\mathbf{p}(0) \parallel \tilde{\mathbf{p}}(0)), \quad (9)$$

so $\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau)$ is bounded by the distance between the initial distribution of the forward process and the final distribution of the reverse process. Eq. (9) leads to an information-theoretic speed limit for systems without odd variables and time-independent driving, or more generally time-symmetric driving (where the rate matrices obey $R(t) = R(\tau - t)$). Imagine carrying out a time-symmetric protocol over $t \in [0, \tau/2]$, and the reverse protocol over $t \in [\tau/2, \tau]$. The overall effect is the same as carrying out the forward protocol over $t \in [0, \tau]$, so $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}(0) = \mathbf{p}(\tau)$. Given $\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) \geq \Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau/2)$ and Eq. (9), we have

$$\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) \geq D(\mathbf{p}(0) \parallel \mathbf{p}(\tau)). \quad (10)$$

For linear master equations subject to conservative forces, the bounds in Eqs. (9) and (10) were previously derived in terms of total EP Σ in Ref. [39]. Our approach generalizes these results to nonconservative systems, and tightens them by stating in terms of excess EP. It is also interesting that Eq. (7) generalizes the variational principle proposed in Ref. [39] to nonconservative systems (see Sec. H in SM [23]).

The general form of Eq. (8) points to fundamental connections between our excess EP and existing ideas in statistics and optimal transport. In statistical inference, Eq. (8) is termed a “Maximum Caliber” problem [40–48] (a generalization of Maximum Entropy inference to trajectory distributions), with the reverse protocol serving as the “prior”. In optimal transport, Eq. (8) is called an “extended Schrödinger problem” [49], which is closely related to the Schrödinger bridge problems [50–53]. Finally, as for the Schrödinger problems [52], our definition can be related to a large deviations principle. In particular, the excess EP controls the empirical




Figure 2. Left: finite-time scaling in Eq. (12) vs. $1/\tau$ scaling in standard TSLs, given a fixed \mathcal{L} and $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. In our result, excess EP diverges as $\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\min} = \mathcal{L}/\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Right: our bound on total variation speed, Eq. (11), compared to previous proposals (details in text).

probability that trajectories sampled from the reverse protocol have marginal statistics like the forward protocol. We leave investigation of these connections for future work.

TURs and TSLs.—In our final set of results, we derive TURs and TSLs for arbitrary state observables. Our results hold for systems without odd variables, including both deterministic nonlinear chemical systems and linear master equations. Derivations are at the end of this section.

Consider any state observable ϕ , and let $\mathcal{J}_\phi := (\mathrm{d}_t \mathbf{p})^T \phi = \sum_\rho j_\rho [\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_\rho$ indicate the observable’s speed of evolution and $\mathcal{A}_\phi := \sum_\rho j_\rho |\mathbb{B}^T \phi|_\rho$ the observable’s symmetric activity. Without loss of generality, we assume that the observable is scaled to be 1-Lipschitz, $\max_{\rho: j_\rho > 0} |\mathbb{B}^T \phi|_\rho \leq 1$ (i.e., the change across any active edge is bounded in magnitude by 1). We then have the following TUR:

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \geq 2\mathcal{J}_\phi \operatorname{arctanh} \frac{\mathcal{J}_\phi}{\mathcal{A}_\phi} \geq 2\mathcal{J}_\phi \operatorname{arctanh} \frac{\mathcal{J}_\phi}{A}, \quad (11)$$

where $A = \sum_\rho j_\rho$ the dynamical activity of the fluxes. We also derive a finite-time version of Eq. (11). Consider a physical process over time $t \in [0, \tau]$ and any time-dependent potential $\phi(t)$ which is 1-Lipschitz at all times. Then,

$$\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) \geq 2\mathcal{L} \operatorname{arctanh} \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\tau \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle} \geq 2\mathcal{L} \operatorname{arctanh} \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\tau \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle}. \quad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \int_0^\tau |\dot{\phi}| dt$ is the path length, $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \mathcal{A}_\phi^t dt$ is the time-averaged activity of the observable, and $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^\tau \sum_\rho j_\rho(t) dt$ is the time-averaged dynamical activity of the fluxes. A simple rearrangement of Eq. (12) leads to a far-from-equilibrium speed limit:

$$\tau \geq \tau_{\min} \coth [\Sigma_{\text{ex}}/(2\mathcal{L})]. \quad (13)$$

where $\tau_{\min} = \mathcal{L}/\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ is the minimum required time.

In most of the literature on TURs and TSLs, EP bounds have the general form $2\mathcal{L}^2/(\tau \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)$, scaling quadratically with length \mathcal{L} and inversely with duration τ [1, 2, 14, 22, 54–57]. Such bounds are tight near equilibrium and do not diverge even when absolute irreversibility is approached. In contrast, Eq. (12) diverges in the limit $\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \tau$, which occurs when all activity is channeled into directed movement (i.e., when

transitions become absolutely irreversible and without futile cycles [56]). Equivalently, as $\tau \rightarrow \tau_{\min}$, $\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau)$ scales as $-\ln(\tau - \tau_{\min})$, which is stronger than the $1/\tau$ scaling. The difference between these finite-time scaling relations is shown in Fig. 2(left). Our results are similar to far-from-equilibrium TURs and TSLs that have recently appeared in the literature [56, 58–62]. However, these recent results are either stated in terms of total EP or HS excess EP, while ours is based on our information-geometric definition of excess EP. For this reason, unlike previous results, our bounds apply to general chemical reaction networks, not just stochastic jump processes.

We also derive a far-from-equilibrium Wasserstein distance speed limit for stochastic systems [1, 56, 63]. To review, for a given distance function d , the (L_1) -Wasserstein distance between two probability distributions \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} is $W_d(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \min_{\mathbf{q}} \sum_{x,y} d_{xy} q_{xy}$, where the minimization is over joint distributions \mathbf{q} with marginals \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} . Now consider a time-dependent master equation over $t \in [0, \tau]$, and let $\dot{W}(t) := \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} W_d(t)(p(t), p(t+s))/s$ be the instantaneous Wasserstein speed at time t . Following Ref. [56], we choose $d_{yx}(t)$ as the path length between x and y on the unweighted graph of allowed transitions, $G = \{(x, y) : j_{xy}(t) > 0\}$. Using Eq. (13), we arrive at a Wasserstein speed limit,

$$\tau \geq (\mathcal{L}_W/\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle) \coth [\Sigma_{\text{ex}}/(2\mathcal{L}_W)], \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_W = \int_0^\tau \dot{W}(t) dt$ is the Wasserstein length [22]. Note that if the distance function is constant in time, we also have $\mathcal{L}_W \geq W_d(\mathbf{p}(0), \mathbf{p}(\tau))$ from the triangle inequality.

Finally, we demonstrate our results with a numerical experiment. To allow comparison to prior work, we consider the instantaneous speed of total variation distance in a stochastic jump processes. Imagine a system with 8 states on a ring with nearest neighbor transitions, where transition $x \rightarrow x-1$ occurs with rate 1 and transition $x \rightarrow x+1$ occurs with rate 2. To control distance from the uniform steady state, we vary the probability of the first state p_1 , while states 2 through 8 are assigned $p_x = (1-p_1)/7$. Define the observable ϕ where $\phi_x = 1$ if $\mathrm{d}_t p_x > 0$ and $\phi_x = 0$ otherwise, so that $\dot{d}_{TV} := \mathcal{J}_\phi = (\mathrm{d}_t \mathbf{p})^T \phi$ is the speed of evolution in total variation distance. We consider four bounds on \dot{d}_{TV} : (1) using $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ and numerical inversion of second inequality in Eq. (11), (2) numerical inversion of a far-from-equilibrium TUR for $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}}$ from Delvenne et al. [58, eq. 76 and eq. 17], (3) $\sqrt{A \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}}/2} \geq \dot{d}_{TV}$ from Van Vu et al. [64, Eq. 19], (4) using our previous work on a generalized Euclidean decomposition under the Onsager metric [14, Eq. 73] (see Sec. A in SM [23]). In Fig. 2(right) we plot the error of each bound (the value of the bound minus the actual value of \dot{d}_{TV}). The Onsager bound [14] is tightest near steady-state, while the bound from Eq. (11) is tightest far from steady state. (In our numerical experiments, our bound was tighter than the Delvenne bound for some but not all parameter choices.)

Derivation.—To derive Eq. (11), restrict the maximization in Eq. (7) to scalar multiples of ϕ . Rearranging, and using the

assumption of no odd variables, gives

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \geq \max_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \left[-\lambda \mathcal{J}_\phi - \sum_{\rho} j_{\rho} (e^{\lambda [\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_{\rho}} - 1) \right]. \quad (15)$$

Note that $[\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_{\rho} \in [-1, 1]$ by assumption, and that $e^{\lambda x} - 1 \leq x(e^{\lambda} - 1)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$ and $e^{\lambda x} - 1 \leq -x(e^{-\lambda} - 1)$ for $x \in [-1, 0]$. Plugging these inequalities into the sum in Eq. (15) and rearranging gives a lower bound on the objective, $-\lambda \mathcal{J}_\phi + \mathcal{A}_\phi - \mathcal{A}_\phi^+ e^{\lambda} - \mathcal{A}_\phi^- e^{-\lambda}$, where $\mathcal{A}_\phi^+ = (\mathcal{A}_\phi + \mathcal{J}_\phi)/2$ and $\mathcal{A}_\phi^- = (\mathcal{A}_\phi - \mathcal{J}_\phi)/2$ indicates the positive and negative movement of the observable. This lower bound can be maximized in closed form to give the first inequality in Eq. (11) after rearranging. The second inequality follows immediately by noting that $\mathcal{A}_\phi \leq \mathcal{A}$ due to the 1-Lipschitz assumption.

To derive Eq. (12), let \mathcal{J}_ϕ^t and \mathcal{A}_ϕ^t indicate the speed and activity of observable $\phi(t)$ at time t . Eq. (11) implies $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}(t) \geq 2\mathcal{A}_\phi^t \Phi(|\mathcal{J}_\phi^t|/\mathcal{A}_\phi^t)$ where $\Phi(x) = x \tanh^{-1} x$. Integrating both sides gives $\Sigma_{\text{ex}}(\tau) \geq 2 \int_0^\tau \mathcal{A}_\phi^t \Phi(|\mathcal{J}_\phi^t|/\mathcal{A}_\phi^t) dt \geq 2\tau \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \Phi[\mathcal{L}/(\tau \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)]$, where we applied Jensen's inequality to the convex function Φ . Rearranging leads to the first inequality in Eq. (12). The second inequality follows from $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle \leq \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.

Discussion.— In this work, we proposed an information-geometric decomposition of EP into housekeeping and excess terms. The housekeeping term obeys a variational principle under force constraints, Eq. (4), while the excess term obeys a variational principle under flux constraints, Eq. (5). The fact that these two variational principles are optimized by the same flux vector $\mathbf{j}(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*)$ reflects a fundamental duality in information geometry, which says that there are two equivalent coordinate systems for picking out elements of an exponential family such as $\phi \rightarrow \mathbf{j}(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi)$. These coordinate systems formalize the duality between conjugate forces and fluxes in nonequilibrium thermodynamics: the first coordinates specify a conservative force $-\mathbb{B}^T \phi$ via the choice of potential $\phi \in \mathbb{R}^N$, the second coordinates specify fluxes via expectation constraints such as $\mathbb{B} \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p}$. This type of duality also appears in equilibrium thermodynamics, where an equilibrium distribution for a fixed potential may be identified either via expected energy or via inverse temperature. Thus, our approach suggests a unified framework for reasoning about equilibrium and nonequilibrium thermodynamics.

We also showed that the excess EPR can be expressed as an unconstrained maximization problem (a Legendre transform), Eq. (7). This formulation allowed us to derive far-from-equilibrium TURs and TSLs on the change of an arbitrary state observable. Note that, while we did not pursue this in this Letter, it is also possible to express the housekeeping EPR as a Legendre transform, which may lead to thermodynamic bounds on cyclic forces and/or fluxes. We leave this direction of investigation for future work.

As discussed in Sec. A in SM [23], for discrete systems near local equilibrium, our information-geometric approach reduces to the generalized Euclidean decomposition investigated in Ref. [14], which itself is an extension of the MN excess/housekeeping decomposition for Langevin dynam-

ics [10, 19, 20]. In the generalized Euclidean setting, the projection of the force vector onto the conservative manifold satisfies a minimum EP principle, i.e., the excess EPR is the minimum EPR incurred by a corresponding optimal protocol [14]. At first glance, Eqs. (3) and (5) may suggest that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ can also be interpreted as the minimal EPR achievable under a constraint on the temporal evolution. In fact, this is not generally correct, and our information-geometric projection does not correspond to the minimization of EP. This is because the exponential family in Eq. (1) is defined relative a fixed set of reverse fluxes, and the fluxes $\mathbf{j}(\theta)$ do not in general satisfy local detailed balance for the forces θ , so $\mathcal{D}(\theta||0)$ should not be understood as the EPR generated by the fluxes $\mathbf{j}(\theta)$.

Finally, we note that our general approach is not restricted to housekeeping/excess decomposition of EP. In fact, it can be used to decompose EP into contributions from different kinds of forces, not just conservative/nonconservative ones. Specifically, one can replace the incidence matrix \mathbb{B} in Eq. (4) with some other matrix, thereby considering projections onto a different subspace of forces. For example, one may consider a restricted subset of conservative forces, with potentials belonging to a linear subspace. Alternatively, one may consider a subspace of nonconservative forces spanned by a low-dimensional control parameter, or the subspace of nonconservative forces that are additive over separate degrees of freedom in a multivariate system. For any choice of \mathbb{B} , our approach leads not only an additive decomposition as in Eq. (6), but also far-from-equilibrium TURs as in Eq. (11). We leave exploration of such alternative decompositions, as well as their operational implications, for future work.

S. I. thanks Masafumi Oizumi for fruitful discussions. A. D. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. 19H05795, and No. 22K13974. K. Y. is supported by Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows (Grant No. 22J21619). S. I. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. 19H05796, No. 21H01560, and No. 22H01141, and UTEC-UTokyo FSI Research Grant Program.

-
- [1] E. Aurell, C. Mejía-Monasterio, and P. Muratore-Ginanneschi, “Optimal protocols and optimal transport in stochastic thermodynamics,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 106, no. 25, p. 250601, 2011.
 - [2] N. Shiraishi, K. Funo, and K. Saito, “Speed limit for classical stochastic processes,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 121, no. 7, Aug. 2018.
 - [3] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, “Dissipation bounds all steady-state current fluctuations,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 116, no. 12, p. 120601, 2016.
 - [4] S.-i. Amari, *Information geometry and its applications*. Springer, 2016, vol. 194.
 - [5] N. Ay, J. Jost, H. Vân Lê, and L. Schwachhöfer, *Information geometry*. Springer, 2017, vol. 64.
 - [6] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, “Three detailed fluctuation theorems,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 104, no. 9, p. 090601, 2010.

- 2010.
- [7] T. Hatano and S.-i. Sasa, “Steady-state thermodynamics of langevin systems,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 86, no. 16, p. 3463, 2001.
 - [8] Y. Oono and M. Paniconi, “Steady state thermodynamics,” *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement*, vol. 130, pp. 29–44, 1998.
 - [9] D. Mandal and C. Jarzynski, “Analysis of slow transitions between nonequilibrium steady states,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, vol. 2016, no. 6, p. 063204, 2016.
 - [10] C. Maes and K. Netočný, “A nonequilibrium extension of the clausius heat theorem,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 154, no. 1, pp. 188–203, 2014.
 - [11] T. S. Komatsu, N. Nakagawa, S.-i. Sasa, and H. Tasaki, “Steady-state thermodynamics for heat conduction: microscopic derivation,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 100, no. 23, p. 230602, 2008.
 - [12] R. E. Spinney and I. J. Ford, “Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of stochastic systems with odd and even variables,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 108, no. 17, p. 170603, 2012.
 - [13] H. K. Lee, C. Kwon, and H. Park, “Fluctuation theorems and entropy production with odd-parity variables,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 110, no. 5, p. 050602, 2013.
 - [14] K. Yoshimura, A. Kolchinsky, A. Dechant, and S. Ito, “Geometrical approach to excess/housekeeping entropy production in discrete systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15227*, 2022.
 - [15] T. Sagawa and H. Hayakawa, “Geometrical expression of excess entropy production,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 84, no. 5, p. 051110, 2011.
 - [16] M. Esposito, U. Harbola, and S. Mukamel, “Entropy fluctuation theorems in driven open systems: Application to electron counting statistics,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 76, no. 3, p. 031132, 2007.
 - [17] R. Rao and M. Esposito, “Nonequilibrium thermodynamics of chemical reaction networks: wisdom from stochastic thermodynamics,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 041064, 2016.
 - [18] H. Ge and H. Qian, “Nonequilibrium thermodynamic formalism of nonlinear chemical reaction systems with waage–guldberg’s law of mass action,” *Chemical Physics*, vol. 472, pp. 241–248, 2016.
 - [19] A. Dechant, S.-i. Sasa, and S. Ito, “Geometric decomposition of entropy production in out-of-equilibrium systems,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. L012034, 2022.
 - [20] —, “Geometric decomposition of entropy production into excess, housekeeping and coupling parts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.04331*, 2022.
 - [21] I. J. Ford and R. E. Spinney, “Entropy production from stochastic dynamics in discrete full phase space,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 86, no. 2, p. 021127, 2012.
 - [22] M. Nakazato and S. Ito, “Geometrical aspects of entropy production in stochastic thermodynamics based on wasserstein distance,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 043093, 2021.
 - [23] See the supplemental material.
 - [24] S. Ito, “Stochastic thermodynamic interpretation of information geometry,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 121, no. 3, p. 030605, 2018.
 - [25] S. Ito and A. Dechant, “Stochastic time evolution, information geometry, and the cramér-rao bound,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 021056, 2020.
 - [26] S. Ito, “Information geometry, trade-off relations, and generalized glansdorff–prigogine criterion for stability,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 55, no. 5, p. 054001, 2022.
 - [27] T. Nakamura, H. Hasegawa, and D. Driebe, “Reconsideration of the generalized second law based on information geometry,” *Journal of Physics Communications*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 015015, 2019.
 - [28] A. Kolchinsky and D. H. Wolpert, “Work, entropy production, and thermodynamics of information under protocol constraints,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 041024, 2021.
 - [29] K. Yoshimura and S. Ito, “Information geometric inequalities of chemical thermodynamics,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 013175, 2021.
 - [30] N. Ohga and S. Ito, “Information-geometric legendre duality in stochastic thermodynamics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11008*, 2021.
 - [31] Y. Sughiyama, D. Loutchko, A. Kamimura, and T. J. Kobayashi, “A hessian geometric structure of chemical thermodynamic systems with stoichiometric constraints,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.12403*, 2021.
 - [32] N. Ohga and S. Ito, “Information-geometric dual affine coordinate systems for chemical thermodynamics,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13813*, 2021.
 - [33] T. J. Kobayashi, D. Loutchko, A. Kamimura, and Y. Sughiyama, “Kinetic derivation of the hessian geometric structure in chemical reaction systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14910*, 2021.
 - [34] S. Ito, M. Oizumi, and S.-i. Amari, “Unified framework for the entropy production and the stochastic interaction based on information geometry,” *Physical Review Research*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 033048, 2020.
 - [35] T. J. Kobayashi, D. Loutchko, A. Kamimura, and Y. Sughiyama, “Geometry of nonequilibrium chemical reaction networks and generalized entropy production decompositions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0911.4863*, 2022.
 - [36] I. Csiszár, “I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems,” *The Annals of Probability*, pp. 146–158, 1975.
 - [37] J. Maas, “Gradient flows of the entropy for finite Markov chains,” *Journal of Functional Analysis*, vol. 261, no. 8, pp. 2250–2292, Oct. 2011.
 - [38] A. Mielke, “A gradient structure for reaction–diffusion systems and for energy-drift-diffusion systems,” *Nonlinearity*, vol. 24, no. 4, p. 1329, 2011.
 - [39] N. Shiraishi and K. Saito, “Information-theoretical bound of the irreversibility in thermal relaxation processes,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 123, no. 11, p. 110603, 2019.
 - [40] A. Filyukov and V. Y. Karpov, “Method of the most probable path of evolution in the theory of stationary irreversible processes,” *Journal of engineering physics*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 416–419, 1967.
 - [41] E. T. Jaynes, “The minimum entropy production principle,” *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 579–601, 1980.
 - [42] P. D. Dixit, J. Wagoner, C. Weistuch, S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, and K. A. Dill, “Perspective: Maximum caliber is a general variational principle for dynamical systems,” *The Journal of chemical physics*, vol. 148, no. 1, p. 010901, 2018.
 - [43] S. Pressé, K. Ghosh, J. Lee, and K. A. Dill, “Principles of maximum entropy and maximum caliber in statistical physics,” *Reviews of Modern Physics*, vol. 85, no. 3, p. 1115, 2013.
 - [44] C. Maes, “The fluctuation theorem as a gibbs property,” *Journal of statistical physics*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 367–392, 1999.
 - [45] R. Dewar, “Information theory explanation of the fluctuation theorem, maximum entropy production and self-organized criticality in non-equilibrium stationary states,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 36, no. 3, p. 631, 2003.
 - [46] R. Evans, “Detailed balance has a counterpart in non-

equilibrium steady states,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 38, no. 2, p. 293, 2004.

- [47] A. Simha, R. Evans, and A. Baule, “Properties of a nonequilibrium heat bath,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 77, no. 3, p. 031117, 2008.
- [48] R. Evans, “Statistical physics of shear flow: a non-equilibrium problem,” *Contemporary physics*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 413–427, 2010.
- [49] A. Baradat and C. Léonard, “Minimizing relative entropy of path measures under marginal constraints,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.10920*, 2020.
- [50] I. Gentil, C. Léonard, and L. Ripani, “About the analogy between optimal transport and minimal entropy,” *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse : Mathématiques*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 569–600, Jun. 2017.
- [51] Y. Chen, T. T. Georgiou, and M. Pavon, “Optimal Transport in Systems and Control,” *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 89–113, May 2021.
- [52] C. Léonard, “A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport,” *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series A*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1533–1574, 2014.
- [53] G. Kawakita, S. Kamiya, S. Sasai, J. Kitazono, and M. Oizumi, “Quantifying brain state transition cost via schrödinger bridge,” *Network Neuroscience*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 118–134, 2022.
- [54] T. Van Vu and Y. Hasegawa, “Geometrical bounds of the irreversibility in markovian systems,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 126, no. 1, p. 010601, 2021.
- [55] K. Yoshimura and S. Ito, “Thermodynamic uncertainty relation and thermodynamic speed limit in deterministic chemical reaction networks,” *Physical review letters*, vol. 127, no. 16, p. 160601, 2021.
- [56] A. Dechant, “Minimum entropy production, detailed balance and wasserstein distance for continuous-time markov processes,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 2022.
- [57] R. Hamazaki, “Speed limits for macroscopic transitions,” *PRX Quantum*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 020319, 2022.
- [58] J.-C. Delvenne and G. Falasco, “The thermo-kinetic relations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13050*, 2021.
- [59] J. S. Lee, S. Lee, H. Kwon, and H. Park, “Speed limit for a highly irreversible process and tight finite-time landauer’s bound,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07388*, 2022.
- [60] D. S. Salazar, “Lower bound for entropy production rate in stochastic systems far from equilibrium,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00875*, 2022.
- [61] V. T. Vo, T. Van Vu, and Y. Hasegawa, “Unified thermodynamic kinetic uncertainty relation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11501*, 2022.
- [62] Y.-Z. Zhen, D. Egloff, K. Modi, and O. Dahlsten, “Inverse linear versus exponential scaling of work penalty in finite-time bit reset,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 105, no. 4, p. 044147, 2022.
- [63] A. Dechant and Y. Sakurai, “Thermodynamic interpretation of wasserstein distance,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.08405*, 2019.
- [64] T. Van Vu, Y. Hasegawa *et al.*, “Unified approach to classical speed limit and thermodynamic uncertainty relation,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 102, no. 6, p. 062132, 2020.
- [65] N. G. Van Kampen, *Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry*. Elsevier, 1992, vol. 1.
- [66] M. Esposito and C. Van den Broeck, “Three faces of the second law. I. Master equation formulation,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 82, no. 1, p. 011143, 2010.
- [67] M. Feinberg, *Foundations of Chemical Reaction Network Theory*, ser. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Cham: Springer

International Publishing, 2019, vol. 202.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A. COMPARISON TO THE “ONSAGER-PROJECTIVE DECOMPOSITION” FROM REF. [14]

This paper builds on recent work by the present authors [14], which considered excess and housekeeping EPR in discrete Markovian systems, including both linear master equations and nonlinear chemical reaction networks (see also Refs. [19, 20] for continuous systems).

As in the present paper, Ref. [14] considers the excess and housekeeping decomposition from a geometric perspective. In that paper, the EPR is written as the squared (generalized) Euclidean norm of the force vector under an appropriate metric:

$$\dot{\sigma} = \|\mathbf{f}\|_L^2 \equiv \mathbf{f}^T L \mathbf{f}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ is the thermodynamic force (same as in this paper) and L is a diagonal matrix $\mathbb{R}_+^{M \times M}$ of edgewise Onsager coefficients,

$$L_{\rho\rho} = \frac{1}{2}(j_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho)/f_\rho. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

(The factor 1/2 appears here, and not in Ref. [14], due to a minor change of convention: unlike Ref. [14], in this paper we consider reversible reactions as two separate reactions.) The force vector is projected onto the subspace of conservative forces, which gives rise to the optimal potential,

$$\phi_{\text{ons}}^* = \arg \min_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^M} \|\mathbf{f} - (-\mathbb{B}^T \phi)\|_L^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where “ons” refers to the Onsager metric. The housekeeping EPR is then defined as the squared (generalized) Euclidean distance from \mathbf{f} to the subspace of conservative forces, while the excess EPR is defined as the squared (generalized) Euclidean norm of the projected conservative force,

$$\dot{\sigma} = \|\mathbf{f}\|_L^2 = \underbrace{\|\mathbf{f} - (-\mathbb{B}^T \phi_{\text{ons}}^*)\|_L^2}_{\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{ons}}} + \underbrace{\|\mathbb{B}^T \phi_{\text{ons}}^*\|_L^2}_{\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We call $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{ons}}$ and $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}$ the Onsager-projective housekeeping and excess EPR terms.

As discussed in the main text, in this paper work within the non-Euclidean setting of information geometry, where distance is measured in terms of KL divergence rather than generalized Euclidean norm. It is clear that Eq. (4) is the information-geometric analogue of Eq. (A.3), while Eq. (6) is the information-geometric analogue of Eq. (A.4).

Euclidean geometry suffices for systems that exhibit Onsager-type linear relations between thermodynamic forces and fluxes, as occurs near steady state or near equilibrium. On the other hand, far-from-equilibrium analysis requires an information-geometric treatment. For this reason, the TURs and TSLs derived in Ref. [14] in general are only tight for systems that are close to equilibrium and/or steady state, while

the bounds derived in this paper can be tight arbitrarily far from equilibrium.

It is also possible to relate the two decompositions for systems without odd variables. First, consider the KL divergence between the fluxes corresponding to \mathbf{f} and any other force vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$:

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\rho} j_{\rho}(e^{-(f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho})} + (f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}) - 1), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which follows by rearranging Eq. (2). For a system without odd variables, each edge ρ can be paired one-to-one with a reverse edge $-\rho$ such that $j_{-\rho} = \tilde{j}_{\rho}$ and $f_{-\rho} = -f_{\rho}$. Then, for any antisymmetric force vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ ($\theta_{\rho} = -\theta_{-\rho}$), we can equivalently rewrite Eq. (A.5) as

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\rho} \tilde{j}_{\rho}(e^{f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}} - (f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}) - 1). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

For notational convenience, define $\gamma_{\rho} = f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}$. We can combine Eqs. (A.5) and (A.6) to write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\rho} \tilde{j}_{\rho} \left[(e^{f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}} - (f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}) - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{f_{\rho}}(e^{-(f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho})} + (f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}) - 1) \right] \\ &= \|\mathbf{f} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_L^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\rho} j_{-\rho} h(f_{\rho} - \theta_{\rho}, f_{\rho}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where we used that $\|\mathbf{f} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_L^2 = \sum_{\rho} j_{-\rho} \gamma_{\rho}^2 (e^{f_{\rho}} - 1)/f_{\rho}$ and for convenience defined the following function:

$$h(\gamma, f) = \gamma^2 \left[\frac{(e^{\gamma} - \gamma - 1) + e^f(e^{-\gamma} + \gamma - 1)}{\gamma^2} - \frac{e^f - 1}{f} \right].$$

By taking derivatives, it can be shown that the minimum of the expression inside the brackets with respect to γ is 0, which is achieved at $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = f$ (note also that $h(\gamma, f)$ is symmetric under the change of the variable $\gamma \rightarrow f - \gamma$). This implies that $h(\gamma, f) \geq 0$ and therefore that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geq \|\mathbf{f} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_L^2$. Thus, we arrive at an inequality between the information-geometric and Onsager-projective housekeeping EPR,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} &= \min_{\phi} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \phi) \\ &\geq \min_{\phi} \|\mathbf{f} - (-\mathbb{B}^T \phi)\|_L^2 = \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{ons}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and the converse inequality for excess EPR,

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

We now consider the limit in which the two decompositions agree. The difference between these two decomposition is captured by the function $h(\gamma, f)$, which vanishes at $\gamma = f$ and $\gamma = 0$. In the context of the housekeeping/excess decomposition, $\gamma = f$ holds when $\mathbb{B}^T \phi^* = 0$ (the system is in steady

state) while $\gamma = 0$ holds when $\mathbf{f} = -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*$ (the system is conservative). It can also be verified that $h(\gamma, f)$ vanishes to first order in γ around $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma = f$. This means that both decomposition agree to first order around $\mathbb{B}^T \phi^* = 0$ and $\mathbf{f} = -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*$, therefore we ask whether the decompositions agree to second order.

A Taylor expansion of $h(\gamma, f)$ in γ and/or f demonstrates that second order terms do not agree unless $f \approx 0$, i.e., the thermodynamic force is small and therefore the system is near local equilibrium. But if the system is near local equilibrium, the optimal conservative force $\mathbf{f}^* = -\mathbb{B}^T \phi_{\text{ons}}^*$ must also vanish, since

$$c_2 \|\mathbf{f}\|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{f}\|_L^2 \geq \|\mathbf{f}^*\|_L^2 \geq c_1 \|\mathbf{f}^*\|^2$$

where $c_1 = \min_\rho \sqrt{j_\rho j_{-\rho}}$, $c_2 = \max(j_\rho + j_{-\rho})/2$, and $\|\cdot\|$ is the usual Euclidean norm (we used Eq. (A.4) for the middle inequality, the others are bounds on the logarithmic mean in Eq. (A.2)). Since we are interested in $\gamma \approx 0$ or $\gamma \approx f$, near equilibrium we can assume that γ is small. We now expand h to fourth order in each argument to give

$$h(\gamma, f) = \frac{1}{12} \gamma^2 (\gamma - f)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^5) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for $f, \gamma \sim \epsilon$. Plugging into Eq. (A.7) implies that $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \|\mathbf{f} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_L^2 \sim \epsilon^4$, so the two geometries agree near equilibrium to fourth order.

For a numerical comparison between the decomposition proposed in this manuscript and Ref. [14], see Fig. 2 and Section I in the SM.

B. SYSTEMS WITH ODD VARIABLES

Here we consider stochastic jump process for systems with odd variables, that is variables which must be conjugated under time reversal (e.g., systems with momentum, or subject to a magnetic field). We demonstrate that our excess/housekeeping decomposition is well-defined and nonnegative in all such cases. In this sense, it differs from the HS decomposition, which can given unphysical negative values for systems with odd variables [12, 13, 21]

We first derive the expression of EPR for systems with odd variables starting from a discrete-time formulation. Consider a system with odd variables that evolves over some time interval $\tau \ll 1$. For simplicity of notation, we assume that the system is coupled to a single thermodynamic reservoir (extension to multiple reservoirs is straightforward). Let $p_x(t)$ indicate the probability of state x at time t , and let $T_{yx}(t, \tau)$ indicate the conditional probability of state y at time $t + \tau$, given initial state x at time t . The condition of local detailed balance states that the entropy production (EP) involved in jump $x \rightarrow y$ is

$$\sigma_{yx} = \ln \frac{p_x(t) T_{yx}(t, \tau)}{p_y(t) T_{\epsilon x \epsilon y}(\tau)} =: \ln \frac{p_{yx}(\tau)}{\tilde{p}_{yx}(\tau)}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where for convenience we defined $p_{yx}(\tau) = p_x(t) T_{yx}(t, \tau)$, $\tilde{p}_{yx}(\tau) = p_y(t) T_{\epsilon x \epsilon y}(\tau)$, and ϵx is the conjugation of state x

with odd-parity variables flipped in sign (this is the standard definition of local detailed balance for systems with odd variables [65, chapter VI]). The EPR can then be calculated as the temporal derivative of the expected EP,

$$\dot{\sigma} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \sum_{y,x} p_{yx}(\tau) \ln \frac{p_{yx}(\tau)}{\tilde{p}_{yx}(\tau)}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Assume that the transition matrices $T(\tau)$ are generated by a continuous-time Markov chain with rate matrix R ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\tau p_{yx}(\tau) &= p_x(t) R_{yx} &=: j_{yx} \quad (x \neq y) \\ \partial_\tau \tilde{p}_{yx}(\tau) &= p_y(t) R_{\epsilon x \epsilon y} &=: \tilde{j}_{yx} \quad (x \neq y) \\ \partial_\tau p_{xx}(\tau) &= \partial_\tau \left(1 - \sum_{y(\neq x)} p_{yx}(\tau)\right) &= - \sum_{y(\neq x)} j_{yx} \\ \partial_\tau \tilde{p}_{xx}(\tau) &= \partial_\tau \left(1 - \sum_{y(\neq x)} \tilde{p}_{yx}(\tau)\right) &= - \sum_{y(\neq x)} \tilde{j}_{yx} \end{aligned}$$

Using these expressions, we evaluate the derivative in Eq. (B.2) at $\tau = 0$ to give

$$\dot{\sigma} = \sum_{y \neq x} \left(j_{yx} \ln \frac{j_{yx}}{\tilde{j}_{yx}} - j_{yx} + \tilde{j}_{yx} \right). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Eq. (B.3) does not have the usual flux/force form $\dot{\sigma} = \sum_\rho j_{yx} \ln(j_{yx}/\tilde{j}_{yx})$ unless the forward and reverse fluxes balance, $\sum_{y \neq x} j_{yx} = \sum_{y \neq x} \tilde{j}_{yx}$. Nonetheless, this expression still has the form of the generalized KL divergence between forward and reverse fluxes,

$$\dot{\sigma} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{j} \|\mathbf{0}), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

as appears in Eq. (3). Our housekeeping/excess decomposition of EPR, Eqs. (4) to (6), relies only on the fact that the EPR can be expressed as Eq. (B.4). Therefore, it applies without modification, giving a well-defined and nonnegative decomposition for systems with odd variables.

As we note explicitly in the main text, some of the subsequent results do depend on properties of systems with even variables. For instance, some of our results exploit the time-reversal symmetry $\mathbb{B}\mathbf{j} = -\mathbb{B}\tilde{\mathbf{j}}$ and/or $\sum_{y \neq x} j_{yx} = \sum_{y \neq x} \tilde{j}_{yx}$. As one example, for systems with odd variables, it is no longer guaranteed that excess EPR vanishes in steady state. For this to hold, an additional assumption is required, which is that the steady state fluxes are symmetric under conjugation (see Ref. [13] for a discussion of this condition).

See also section F for a discussion of the HS decomposition in the presence of odd variables.

C. DETERMINISTIC CHEMICAL SYSTEMS

Here we explain how our formalism can be used to analyze deterministic chemical systems, and how the continuity equation $d_t \mathbf{p} = \mathbb{B}\mathbf{j}$ gives the deterministic rate equation.

Consider a chemical system with N species and m reversible reactions. Let the $r \in \{1..m\}$ reversible reaction be

$$\sum_x \nu_{xr} Z_x \rightleftharpoons \sum_x \kappa_{xr} Z_x, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where Z_x is the x -th species, and ν_{xr} and κ_{xr} are stoichiometric coefficients. We also write the forward and reverse flux across this reaction as j_r^{\rightarrow} and j_r^{\leftarrow} . As an example, if the chemical system has mass action kinetics, these fluxes are given by

$$j_r^{\rightarrow} = k_r^{\rightarrow} \prod_x c_x^{\nu_{xr}}, \quad j_r^{\leftarrow} = k_r^{\leftarrow} \prod_x c_x^{\kappa_{xr}}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where k_r^{\rightarrow} and k_r^{\leftarrow} are the forward and reverse rate constants and c_x is the concentration of Z_x . (Note that mass action kinetics are used as an example, our results do not assume mass action kinetics except where explicitly stated.)

In our formalism, each reversible reaction is treated as two separate ‘‘edges’’ ρ and $-\rho$, thus m reversible reactions give rise to a total of $M = 2m$ edges. The edges ρ and $-\rho$ associates with reversible reaction r have associated forward and reverse fluxes,

$$j_\rho = j_r^{\rightarrow}, \quad \tilde{j}_\rho = j_r^{\leftarrow} \quad j_{-\rho} = j_r^{\leftarrow}, \quad \tilde{j}_{-\rho} = j_r^{\rightarrow}, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

as well as associated stoichiometric entries for $x = 1..N$,

$$\mathbb{B}_{x\rho} = \nu_{xr} - \kappa_{xr} \quad \mathbb{B}_{x,-\rho} = \kappa_{xr} - \nu_{xr}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Using these definitions, the deterministic rate equation is

$$d_t c_x = \sum_{r=1}^m (\nu_{xr} - \kappa_{xr}) (j_r^{\rightarrow} - j_r^{\leftarrow}) = \sum_{\rho=1}^M \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} j_\rho. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Thus, the deterministic rate equation can be written as $d_t \mathbf{p} = \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}$ if we use the notation $c_x = p_x$.

We also point out that our definition of the EPR is the conventional one for chemical reaction networks:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma} &= \sum_{\rho=1}^M j_\rho \ln \frac{j_\rho}{\tilde{j}_\rho} = \sum_{r=1}^m j_r^{\rightarrow} \ln \frac{j_r^{\rightarrow}}{j_r^{\leftarrow}} + \sum_{r=1}^m j_r^{\leftarrow} \ln \frac{j_r^{\leftarrow}}{j_r^{\rightarrow}} \\ &= \sum_{\rho=1}^{M/2} (j_r^{\rightarrow} - j_r^{\leftarrow}) \ln \ln \frac{j_r^{\leftarrow}}{j_r^{\rightarrow}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

We remark that we used a slightly different convention in Ref. [14]. There, we treated each reversible reaction r as a single edge ρ with net flux $J_\rho = j_r^{\rightarrow} - j_r^{\leftarrow}$ (which can be negative). In that paper, m reversible lead to M edges, with the associated rate equation $d_t c_x = \sum_{\rho=1}^m \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} J_\rho$.

D. INFORMATION-GEOMETRIC FUNDAMENTALS

Here we provide derivations of the information-geometric results that are used in this paper, including the Pythagorean

relation for KL divergence in Eq. (6) and the variational principles in Eqs. (4), (5) and (7).

In our derivations, we use the following identity, which follows simply from Eq. (2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}') - \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta} \parallel \boldsymbol{\theta}'') &= \\ \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho \left[e^{\theta_\rho} (\theta''_\rho - \theta'_\rho) + e^{\theta'_\rho} - e^{\theta''_\rho} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

In addition, we indicate the optimal conservative force, as given by the optimal potential ϕ^* in Eq. (4), as

$$\mathbf{f}^* = -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}^*. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

We begin by deriving the Pythagorean relation. First, we evaluate the partial derivatives of the objective in Eq. (4),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\phi_x} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}) &= \partial_{\phi_x} \sum_\rho j_\rho \left[f_\rho + [\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}]_\rho + e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}]_\rho - f_\rho} - 1 \right] \\ &= \sum_\rho j_\rho \left[\mathbb{B}_{x\rho} - e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}]_\rho - f_\rho} \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} \right] \\ &= \sum_\rho \left[j_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \boldsymbol{\phi}]_\rho} \right] \mathbb{B}_{x\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Since all partial derivatives must vanish at the optimizer, the expression in the last line vanishes for each x when $\boldsymbol{\phi} = \boldsymbol{\phi}^*$,

$$\sum_\rho \left[j_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} \right] \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} = 0. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

Next, write

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{f}^*) + \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

where $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{f}^*)$. Using Eq. (D.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} &= \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho \left[e^{f_\rho} f_\rho^* + 1 - e^{f_\rho^*} \right] \\ &= - \sum_x \phi_x^* \sum_\rho j_\rho \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} + \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho - \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} \\ &= - \sum_x \phi_x^* \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} + \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho - \sum_\rho \tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} \\ &= \sum_\rho \left[\tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} f_\rho^* + \tilde{j}_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho e^{f_\rho^*} \right] = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f}^* \parallel \mathbf{0}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where in the third line used Eq. (D.3). This shows that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f}^* \parallel \mathbf{0})$, which leads to the Pythagorean Theorem in Eq. (6) when plugged into Eq. (D.4).

We now prove that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f}^* \parallel \mathbf{0})$ can also be expressed in terms of the variational principle in Eq. (5). We rewrite that optimization problem in the equivalent space of nonnegative fluxes,

$$\min_{\mathbf{j}' \in \mathbb{R}_+^M} \sum_\rho \left(j'_\rho \ln \frac{j'_\rho}{\tilde{j}_\rho} - j'_\rho + \tilde{j}_\rho \right) \quad \text{where } \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}' = d_t \mathbf{p}. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Note that Eq. (D.3) implies that

$$\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p} = \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{f}^*), \quad (\text{D.7})$$

therefore $\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{f}^*)$ is in the feasible set of Eq. (D.6). Now consider any other \mathbf{j}' that satisfies $\mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}' = \mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p}$, and define the convex mixture $\mathbf{j}(\lambda) := (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{j}^* + \lambda\mathbf{j}'$ between $\mathbf{j}^* \equiv \mathbf{j}(\mathbf{f}^*)$ and \mathbf{j}' . The directional derivative of the objective function in Eq. (D.6) at \mathbf{j}^* toward \mathbf{j}' is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \left[\sum_{\rho} j_{\rho}(\lambda) \ln \frac{j_{\rho}(\lambda)}{\tilde{j}_{\rho}} + \tilde{j}_{\rho} - j_{\rho}(\lambda) \right] \Big|_{\lambda=0} &= \\ &= \sum_{i,j} (j'_i - j^*_i) \ln \frac{j_{\rho}(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0}}{\tilde{j}_{\rho}} = \sum_{i,j} (j'_i - j^*_i) f^*_{\rho} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} (j'_i - j^*_i) [-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*]_{\rho} = (\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p})^T \phi^* = 0, \end{aligned}$$

Since this directional derivative vanishes in all directions, $\mathbf{j}(\mathbf{f}^*)$ is the solution of the optimization problem in Eq. (5).

We finish by deriving the variational principle in Eq. (7). We first use our definitions to write

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} &= \dot{\sigma} - \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) - \min_{\phi} \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \phi) \\ &= \max_{\phi} [\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel \mathbf{0}) - \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \parallel -\mathbb{B}^T \phi)] \end{aligned}$$

Eq. (D.1) then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} &= \max_{\phi} \sum_{\rho} \tilde{j}_{\rho} \left[e^{f_{\rho} \phi} (-\mathbb{B}^T \phi)_{\rho} + 1 - e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_{\rho}} \right] \\ &= \max_{\phi} \left[-(\mathbf{d}_t \mathbf{p})^T \phi - \sum_{\rho} \tilde{j}_{\rho} (e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \phi]_{\rho}} - 1) \right]. \quad (\text{D.8}) \end{aligned}$$

The variational principle in Eq. (D.8) is general, and holds without any assumptions about odd or even variables.

E. DERIVATION OF Eq. (8)

Consider a system that evolves according to a time-dependent linear master equation over time $t \in [0, \tau]$,

$$\mathbf{d}_t p_x(t) = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} [p_y(t) R_{xy}^{\alpha}(t) - p_x(t) R_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)],$$

where $R_{xy}^{\alpha}(t)$ is the transition rate from state y to state x at time t mediated by reservoir α . Given some initial distribution $\mathbf{p}(0)$, this generates a probability distribution over trajectories $P_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x})$, where a trajectory is specified by a starting state x_0 and a sequence of jumps, $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, (x_1, t_1, \alpha_1), \dots, (x_N, t_N, \alpha_N))$, where x_i, t_i, α_i indicate the state, time, and reservoir of jump i . Given a trajectory \mathbf{x} , we will also write $x(t)$ to indicate the state at time t . Note that $P_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a time-inhomogeneous continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) distribution. We will denote the set of all such CTMC distributions as \mathcal{C} .

We also consider the reverse process, which starts from the initial distribution $\mathbf{p}(\tau)$ and undergoes the time-reversed protocol $\tilde{R}^{\alpha}(\tau - t)$, i.e., the time-reversed rate matrix with odd variables conjugated. This generates the distribution of reverse trajectories under the reversed protocol \tilde{P}_{Γ} . The probability of a time-reversed trajectory under the reversed protocol is [6]

$$\tilde{P}_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = p_{x_N}(\tau) e^{-\int_0^{\tau} \tilde{R}_{x(t)}(t) dt} \prod_{i=1}^N \tilde{R}_{x_{i-1}x_i}^{\alpha_i}(t_i),$$

where $\tilde{R}_x(t) = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} \tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)$ is the escape rate from state x at time t .

Now consider any other time-dependent master equation with initial distribution $\mathbf{q}(0)$ and time-dependent rate matrices $\hat{R}^{\alpha}(t)$. Its trajectory distribution $Q_{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{C}$ can be written as

$$Q_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}) = q_{x_0}(0) e^{-\int_0^{\tau} \hat{R}_{x(t)}(t) dt} \prod_{i=1}^N \hat{R}_{x_{i-1}x_i}^{\alpha_i}(t_i)$$

where $\hat{R}_x(t) = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)$. The log ratio of the probability of a trajectory under Q_{Γ} and \tilde{P}_{Γ} is

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{Q_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x})}{\tilde{P}_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x})} &= \ln \frac{q_{x_0}(0)}{p_{x_N}(\tau)} + \int_0^{\tau} \left[\sum_i \delta(t - t_i) \ln \frac{\hat{R}_{x_i x_{i-1}}^{\alpha_i}(t_i)}{\tilde{R}_{x_{i-1} x_i}^{\alpha_i}(t_i)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} (\tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) - \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)) \right] dt. \quad (\text{E.1}) \end{aligned}$$

The KL divergence between Q_{Γ} and \tilde{P}_{Γ} is the expected log ratio,

$$D(Q_{\Gamma} \parallel \tilde{P}_{\Gamma}) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\Gamma}} [\ln(Q_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}) / \tilde{P}_{\Gamma}(\mathbf{x}))]. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

Using Eq. (E.1), the right side of Eq. (E.2) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{\Gamma} \parallel \tilde{P}_{\Gamma}) &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\Gamma}} [\ln[q_{x_0}(0) / p_{x_N}(\tau)]] + \\ &\quad \int_0^{\tau} \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} q_x(t) \left[\hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) \ln \frac{\hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)}{\tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)} + \tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) - \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) \right] dt. \quad (\text{E.3}) \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce the assumption that Q_{Γ} has the same marginals as the forward distribution, $\mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, \tau]$ as in Eq. (8). This assumption implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{\Gamma}} [\ln[q_{x_0}(0) / p_{x_N}(\tau)]] &= S(\mathbf{q}(\tau)) - S(\mathbf{q}(0)) \\ &= \int_0^{\tau} \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} q_x(t) \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) \ln \frac{q_x(t)}{q_y(t)} dt. \quad (\text{E.4}) \end{aligned}$$

We now plug Eq. (E.4) into Eq. (E.3), while using $q_x(t) = p_x(t)$ for all t and x , to write

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{\Gamma} \parallel \tilde{P}_{\Gamma}) &= \int_0^{\tau} \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} p_x(t) \left[\hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) \ln \frac{p_x(t) \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)}{p_y(t) \tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \tilde{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) - \hat{R}_{yx}^{\alpha}(t) \right] dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^\tau \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} \left[\hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) \ln \frac{\hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t)}{\tilde{j}_{xy}^\alpha(t)} + \tilde{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) - \hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\tau \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} \left[\hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) \ln \frac{\hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t)}{\tilde{j}_{xy}^\alpha(t)} + \tilde{j}_{xy}^\alpha(t) - \hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\tau \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{j}(t) \| \tilde{\mathbf{j}}(t)) dt, \tag{E.5}
\end{aligned}$$

where we defined the forward and reverse fluxes, $\hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) = p_x(t) \hat{R}_{yx}^\alpha(t)$ and $\tilde{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) = p_x(t) \tilde{R}_{yx}^\alpha(t)$, and used that $\sum_{x \neq y} \hat{j}_{yx}^\alpha(t) = \sum_{x \neq y} \tilde{j}_{xy}^\alpha(t)$.

Now suppose that we choose the closest $Q_\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ to \tilde{P}_Γ under the constraint on the marginals, as in Eq. (8). The constraint can be equivalently written as $\mathbf{q}(0) = \mathbf{p}(0)$ and $d_t \mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}^\mathcal{Q}(t) = d_t \mathbf{p}(t)$ for $t \in [0, \tau]$. Thus, Eq. (8) involves minimizing $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{j}(t) \| \tilde{\mathbf{j}}(t))$ at each time point, subject to the constraint that $\mathbb{B} \mathbf{j}^\mathcal{Q}(t) = d_t \mathbf{p}(t)$. Since this minimum is given by $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}(t)$, we recover Eq. (8) :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{\text{ex}} &= \int_0^\tau \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}(t) dt \\
&= \inf_{Q_\Gamma} D(Q_\Gamma \| \tilde{P}_\Gamma) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{q}(t) = \mathbf{p}(t) \forall t. \tag{E.6}
\end{aligned}$$

F. COMPARISON TO HATANO-SASA DECOMPOSITION

Here we briefly review the Hatano-Sasa (HS) decomposition of the EPR, $\dot{\sigma} = \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} + \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}}$, and discuss how it relates to our decomposition.

Consider a linear master equation without odd variables that has a steady-state distribution π^{ss} , which we write as π for short. The HS housekeeping and excess terms are given by [16, 66]

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}} = \sum_{y \neq x, \alpha} p_x R_{yx}^\alpha \ln \frac{R_{yx}^\alpha \pi_x}{R_{xy}^\alpha \pi_y} \tag{F.1}$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \dot{\sigma} - \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}} = \sum_{y \neq x, \alpha} p_x R_{yx}^\alpha \ln \frac{p_x \pi_y}{\pi_x p_y}. \tag{F.2}$$

More generally, consider a chemical system with mass action kinetics, as in Eq. (C.2). In that case, the HS excess and housekeeping EPR is given by [17, 18]

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}} = - \sum_\rho j_\rho \sum_x \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} \ln \frac{c_x}{\pi_x}. \tag{F.3}$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \dot{\sigma} - \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}} = \sum_\rho j_\rho \left[\ln \frac{j_\rho}{\dot{j}_\rho} + \sum_x \mathbb{B}_{x\rho} \ln \frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right], \tag{F.4}$$

where π is the vector of steady-state concentrations. It can be verified that Eqs. (F.1) and (F.2), are special cases of Eqs. (F.3) and (F.4). We will assume that the chemical system obeys complex balance, meaning that the net current entering and leaving each chemical complex vanishes in steady state [67].

Given these assumptions, we show that the HS housekeeping EPR can be written as

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \| -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}), \tag{F.5}$$

where $\phi_x^{\text{ss}} = \ln c_x / \pi_x$. Given that our housekeeping EPR satisfies the variational principle in Eq. (4), Eq. (F.5) implies that our housekeeping EPR is always smaller than the HS housekeeping EPR,

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \| -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}) \geq \min_\phi \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \| -\mathbb{B}^T \phi) = \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}, \tag{F.6}$$

and conversely $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \geq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{HS}}$.

We now derive Eq. (F.5) for complex-balanced chemical systems with mass action kinetics (this includes linear master equations as a special case). First, note that Eq. (F.4) can be written as

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} = \mathbf{j}^T (\mathbf{f} + \mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}).$$

Using this expression and Eq. (2), we write

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \| -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}) = \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} - \sum_\rho (j_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_\rho}).$$

We will prove Eq. (F.5) by showing that the sum in this expression vanishes. We split the sum into contribution from the forward and negative side of each reversible reaction r (see discussion of notation in Sec. C in SM [23]),

$$\sum_r (j_r^\rightarrow - j_r^\leftarrow e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_r}) + \sum_r (j_r^\leftarrow - j_r^\rightarrow e^{[\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_r}). \tag{F.7}$$

Using Eq. (C.2), each term in the first sum can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
j_r^\rightarrow - j_r^\leftarrow e^{[-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_r} &= k_r^\rightarrow \prod_x c_x^{\nu_{xr}} - k_r^\leftarrow \prod_x c_x^{\kappa_{xr}} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\nu_{xr} - \kappa_{xr}} \\
&= \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\nu_{xr}} \left(k_r^\rightarrow \prod_x \pi_x^{\nu_{xr}} - k_r^\leftarrow \prod_x \pi_x^{\kappa_{xr}} \right) \\
&= \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\nu_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}}
\end{aligned}$$

where J_r^{ss} is the net current across reversible reaction r in steady-state. Using a similar derivation, we write each term in the second sum in Eq. (F.7) as

$$j_r^\leftarrow - j_r^\rightarrow e^{[\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_r} = - \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\kappa_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}}. \tag{F.8}$$

Combining, we write the sum as Eq. (F.7) as

$$\sum_r \left[\prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\nu_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}} - \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\kappa_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}} \right]. \tag{F.9}$$

Next, let C indicate the set of reactant and product complexes, where each element of C is a vector $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ with η_x indicating

the number of species x in complex η . We split the sums in Eq. (F.9) into contributions from each reactant complex and each product complex,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\eta \in C} \left[\sum_{r: \nu_r = \eta} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\nu_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}} - \sum_{r: \kappa_r = \eta} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\kappa_{xr}} J_r^{\text{ss}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\eta \in C} \left[\sum_{r: \nu_r = \eta} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\eta_x} J_r^{\text{ss}} - \sum_{r: \kappa_r = \eta} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\eta_x} J_r^{\text{ss}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\eta \in C} \prod_x \left(\frac{c_x}{\pi_x} \right)^{\eta_x} \left[\sum_{r: \nu_r = \eta} J_r^{\text{ss}} - \sum_{r: \kappa_r = \eta} J_r^{\text{ss}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\sum_{r: \nu_r = \eta} J_r^{\text{ss}} - \sum_{r: \kappa_r = \eta} J_r^{\text{ss}}$ for each η by the definition of complex balance [67]. Therefore, the sum in Eq. (F.9) vanishes and $\sum_r (j_r^{\leftarrow} - j_r^{\rightarrow} e^{[\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ss}}]_r}) = 0$. This proves Eq. (F.5).

For linear master equations with odd variables, the above derivation does not always hold. In fact, for such systems, it is known that in some cases $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}} < 0$, so the inequality $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}}$ cannot be valid in general [12, 13, 21]. However, for such systems, Ref. [12] proposed a “generalized housekeeping EPR”, a nonnegative expression that becomes equal to $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{HS}}$ when the steady-state is symmetric under conjugation of odd variables ($\pi_x = \pi_{\epsilon x}$ for all x). Written in our notation (and in continuous time), the generalized housekeeping EPR is

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ghk}}^{\text{HS}} := \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} \left(R_{xy}^{\alpha} p_y \ln \frac{R_{xy}^{\alpha} p_x}{R_{\epsilon y \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x \frac{\pi_{\epsilon y}}{\pi_{\epsilon x}}} - R_{xy}^{\alpha} p_y + R_{\epsilon y \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x \right). \quad (\text{F.10})$$

It is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x \neq y} R_{\epsilon y \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x \frac{\pi_{\epsilon y}}{\pi_{\epsilon x}} - R_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x \\ &= \sum_x \frac{p_x}{\pi_{\epsilon x}} \sum_{y (\neq x)} (R_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}^{\alpha} \pi_{\epsilon y} - R_{\epsilon y, \epsilon x}^{\alpha} \pi_{\epsilon x}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows since π is the steady-state distribution. Hence we can substitute $R_{\epsilon y \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x$ with $R_{\epsilon y \epsilon x}^{\alpha} p_x \frac{\pi_{\epsilon y}}{\pi_{\epsilon x}}$ in Eq. (F.10). Using Eq. (2) and a bit of rearranging gives

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ghk}}^{\text{HS}} = \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{f} \| -\mathbb{B}^T \phi^{\text{ess}}), \quad (\text{F.11})$$

where $\phi_x^{\text{ess}} = \ln p_x / \pi_{\epsilon x}$. This is the version of Eq. (F.5) for stochastic jump processes with odd variables. It implies that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ghk}}^{\text{HS}}$.

G. GRADIENT FLOW

For a conservative system, the temporal evolution can be expressed as the gradient flow of a relative entropy potential. This result has been shown for both linear master equations [37, 54] and for chemical systems with mass action kinetics [38]. We briefly review these results (using our own notation). Given

a conservative system with equilibrium distribution π^{eq} , define the relative entropy potential

$$\phi_x^{\text{cons}} = \ln \frac{p_x}{\pi_x^{\text{eq}}} - 1 + \frac{\pi_x^{\text{eq}}}{p_x}. \quad (\text{G.1})$$

Then, the temporal evolution is a gradient flow

$$\text{d}_t \mathbf{p} = -K \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \langle \phi^{\text{cons}} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}}, \quad (\text{G.2})$$

where K is a $N \times N$ Onsager matrix and $\langle \phi^{\text{cons}} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_x p_x \phi_x^{\text{cons}}$ indicates an “expectation” with respect to \mathbf{p} , which may be a normalized probability distribution or a non-normalized concentration vector. The Onsager matrix is given by $K = \mathbb{B} L \mathbb{B}^T$, where $L \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times M}$ is a diagonal matrix with entries $L_{\rho\rho} = \frac{1}{2} (j_{\rho} - \tilde{j}_{\rho}) / f_{\rho}$. Specifically, L is an Onsager matrix that maps forces to net fluxes at the level of individual edges.

Our decomposition generalizes Eq. (G.2) to the general setting of nonconservative systems, with the optimal potential ϕ^* from Eq. (6) playing the role of ϕ^{cons} . First, define the parameterized edge-level Onsager matrix $L(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times M}$ as a diagonal matrix with the following entries,

$$L_{\rho\rho}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{j}_{\rho} (e^{\theta_{\rho}} - 1) / \theta_{\rho}. \quad (\text{G.3})$$

$L(\theta)$ maps forces to the net fluxes at the level of individual edges, where the forward fluxes are given by the exponential family in Eq. (1),

$$L(\theta) \theta = \frac{1}{2} (j(\theta) - \tilde{j}). \quad (\text{G.4})$$

We also define the $N \times N$ species-level Onsager matrix $K(\theta) = \mathbb{B} L(\theta) \mathbb{B}^T$, which can be verified to be positive-semidefinite. We now show that the temporal evolution is a gradient flow for $\langle \phi^* \rangle_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_x p_x \phi_x^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} -K(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*) \nabla_{\mathbf{p}} \langle \phi^* \rangle_{\mathbf{p}} &= -\mathbb{B} L(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*) \mathbb{B}^T \phi^* \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{B} (j(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*) - \tilde{j}) \\ &= \text{d}_t \mathbf{p}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.5})$$

where the last line used $\mathbb{B} j(-\mathbb{B}^T \phi^*) = \text{d}_t \mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbb{B} \tilde{j} = -\text{d}_t \mathbf{p}$.

Note that a similar gradient flow result was also derived in Ref. [14]. However, that results was based on a different optimal potential (specifically, it was the optimal potential ϕ_{ons}^* from Eq. (A.3), discussed in section A above), as well as a different Onsager matrix.

H. GENERALIZATION OF VARIATIONAL PRINCIPLE FROM REF. [39]

Here we show that, for linear master equations without odd variables, excess EPR can be expressed in terms of the variational principle,

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \max_{\mathbf{q}} [-\text{d}_t D(\mathbf{p}(t) \| \mathbf{q}(-t))]. \quad (\text{H.1})$$

where the maximization in Eq. (H.1) is over all probability distributions \mathbf{q} . In this result, $\mathbf{p}(t)$ is the actual probability distribution which evolves according to a master equation, $d_t p_x(t) = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} (p_y R_{xy}^\alpha - p_x R_{yx}^\alpha)$. The notation $\mathbf{q}(-t)$ in Eq. (H.1) indicates that \mathbf{q} evolves according to the same master equation but backwards in time,

$$-d_t q_x(-t) = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} (q_y R_{xy}^\alpha - q_x R_{yx}^\alpha). \quad (\text{H.2})$$

Thus, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ is the fastest rate of contraction of KL divergence between the actual distribution \mathbf{p} evolving forward time and any other distribution evolving backwards in time. The maximum is achieved by a “pseudo-equilibrium” distribution $q_x \propto p_x e^{-\phi_x^*}$ defined by the optimal potential ϕ^* in Eq. (6).

Interestingly, Eq. (H.1) is a generalization of a variational principle for EPR that Ref. [39] demonstrated for conservative systems (where the maximum was achieved by the equilibrium distribution).

To derive Eq. (H.1), we specialize Eq. (7) to the case of linear master equations without odd variables,

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} = \max_{\phi} \left[- \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \phi_x - \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} j_{xy}^\alpha (e^{\phi_y - \phi_x} - 1) \right].$$

We now change the variable of optimization from potentials to positive distributions \mathbf{q} that are expressed as $\ln q_x = \ln p_x - \phi_x + \text{const}$. We then rewrite $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\mathbf{q}} & \left[- \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln \frac{p_x}{q_x} - \sum_{x \neq y, \alpha} j_{xy}^\alpha \left(\frac{p_x q_y}{q_x p_y} - 1 \right) \right] \\ & = \max_{\mathbf{q}} \left[- \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln \frac{p_x}{q_x} + p_x d_t \ln q_x(-t) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.3})$$

where in the second line we used that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} j_{xy}^\alpha \left(\frac{p_x q_y}{q_x p_y} - 1 \right) & = \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} \left(\frac{p_x q_y}{q_x p_y} p_y R_{xy}^\alpha - p_x R_{yx}^\alpha \right) \\ & = \frac{p_x}{q_x} \sum_{y(\neq x), \alpha} (q_y R_{xy}^\alpha - q_x R_{yx}^\alpha) \\ & = - \frac{p_x}{q_x} d_t q_x(-t) = -p_x d_t \ln q_x(-t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.4})$$

where the last line employed Eq. (H.2). Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} - \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln \frac{p_x}{q_x} & = - \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln p_x + \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln q_x \\ & = - \sum_x (d_t p_x(t) \ln p_x) + \sum_x (d_t p_x(t)) \ln q_x. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.5})$$

Eq. (H.1) follows by combining Eqs. (H.3) and (H.5) and rearranging.

I. NUMERICAL COMPARISON WITH REFS. [14] AND [35]

Here, we numerically compare three decompositions; the Onsager-projective decomposition defined in Sec. A in SM [23], the Hessian decomposition which was recently proposed in Ref. [35], and the information-geometric decomposition that propose in this Letter. While we have an inequality between the Onsager decomposition and our decomposition, Eqs. (A.8) and (A.9), no inequality between the Hessian decomposition and them has been proved analytically. Nonetheless, our simulation proves that they are different and suggests that the Hessian decomposition gives intermediate values between the other two decompositions.

To be self-contained, we briefly review the Hessian decomposition presented in Ref. [35] in our notation. We consider systems without odd variables so that we can define net fluxes $J_r := j_\rho - \tilde{j}_\rho$. We adopt the notation defined in Sec. C in SM [23], which labels reversible reactions by $r \in \{1, 2, \dots, M/2\}$. We also define the frenetic activity by $\omega_r := \sqrt{j_r^\rightarrow j_r^\leftarrow}$, which is fixed when we take partial derivatives.

Given the force \mathbf{f} and the frenetic activity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, the net flux \mathbf{J} is given as

$$J_r = 2\omega_r \sinh(f_r/2) \quad (\text{I.1})$$

$$= \sqrt{j_r^\rightarrow j_r^\leftarrow} \left(\sqrt{\frac{j_r^\rightarrow}{j_r^\leftarrow}} - \sqrt{\frac{j_r^\leftarrow}{j_r^\rightarrow}} \right) = j_r^\rightarrow - j_r^\leftarrow. \quad (\text{I.2})$$

Conversely, this equation can be solved for f_r as

$$f_r = 2 \sinh^{-1}(J_r/2\omega_r),$$

where we write $J_r/(2\omega_r)$ as $J_r/2\omega_r$ for simplicity. These relations can also be derived from a higher level structure. Define two dual convex functions which are the Legendre conjugate of each other: Given $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, the convex function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J}') & := 2 \sum_r J'_r \sinh^{-1}(J'_r/2\omega_r) \\ & \quad - 2 \sum_r \omega_r \left[\sqrt{1 + (J'_r/2\omega_r)^2} - 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

is the Legendre conjugate of

$$\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^*(\mathbf{f}') = 4 \sum_r \omega_r [\cosh(f'_r/2) - 1],$$

and they provide the relations

$$J_r = \partial_{f_r} \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^*(\mathbf{f}), \quad f_r = \partial_{J_r} \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J})$$

for the actual current \mathbf{J} and force \mathbf{f} . Note that for any $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{0}) = \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^*(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ holds and it is their minima. In general, a convex function $\varphi(x)$ leads to the Bregman divergence $D(x||x') := \varphi(x) - \varphi(x') - \langle x - x', \nabla_x \varphi(x) \rangle \geq 0$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the normal inner product [4]. For a fixed $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, we can define the Bregman divergences $D_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}$ and the dual one $D_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^*$ by

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J}'||\mathbf{J}'') := \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J}') - \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J}'') - \langle \mathbf{J}' - \mathbf{J}'', \nabla_{\mathbf{J}''} \Psi_{\boldsymbol{\omega}}(\mathbf{J}'') \rangle,$$

$$D_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'\|\mathbf{f}'') := \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}') - \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'') - \langle \mathbf{f}' - \mathbf{f}'', \nabla_{\mathbf{f}''} \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'') \rangle.$$

As a general property of Bregman divergences and the Legendre transformation, we have

$$D_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}'\|\mathbf{J}'') = D_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}''\|\mathbf{f}') \quad (\text{I.3})$$

when $(\mathbf{J}', \mathbf{f}')$ and $(\mathbf{J}'', \mathbf{f}'')$ are Legendre dual coordinates. In this situation, we also have

$$D_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}'\|\mathbf{J}'') = \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}') + \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'') - \langle \mathbf{J}', \mathbf{f}'' \rangle, \quad (\text{I.4})$$

which leads to

$$\dot{\sigma} = \langle \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{f} \rangle = \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}) + \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}). \quad (\text{I.5})$$

Note that in general, these Bregman divergences cannot be expressed as KL divergence because the net fluxes J_r can be negative. Therefore, they cannot be related to the EPR, unlike the way we relate one-way fluxes to EPR via the divergence \mathcal{D} in Eq. (3).

The Hessian decomposition [35] is defined by using two special points represented by dual coordinates $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{eq}})$ and $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{st}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{st}})$ as

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{hess}} := \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}}) + D_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}\|\mathbf{f}_{\text{st}}), \quad (\text{I.6})$$

$$\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{hess}} := \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}_{\text{st}}) + D_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}\|\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}}). \quad (\text{I.7})$$

To explain how $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{eq}})$ and $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{st}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{st}})$ are determined, we define two kinds of sets. We define $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{J}')$ as the set of currents that induce the same dynamics as \mathbf{J}' by

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{J}') := \{\mathbf{J}'' \in \mathbb{R}^{M/2} \mid \mathbb{B}\mathbf{J}'' = \mathbb{B}\mathbf{J}'\}. \quad (\text{I.8})$$

The other space $\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\mathbf{f}')$ is defined as the set of currents that are given by \mathbf{f}' plus some conservative forces:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\mathbf{f}') := \{\nabla \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'') \mid \mathbf{f}'' \in \mathbf{f}' + \text{im } \mathbb{B}^T\}, \quad (\text{I.9})$$

where $\mathbf{f}' + \text{im } \mathbb{B}^T := \{\mathbf{f}' + \mathbb{B}^T \phi \mid \phi \in \mathbb{R}^N\}$. Then, \mathbf{J}_{eq} and \mathbf{J}_{st} are given as unique intersections as

$$\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}} := \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{J}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\mathbf{0}), \quad \mathbf{J}_{\text{st}} := \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{0}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{\omega}(\mathbf{f}), \quad (\text{I.10})$$

while the corresponding forces \mathbf{f}_{eq} and \mathbf{f}_{st} are provided as $\nabla \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}})$ and $\nabla \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}_{\text{st}})$. Therefore, we see that, with frenetic activity being fixed, \mathbf{J}_{eq} is the current induced by a conservative force which recovers the original dynamics, while \mathbf{J}_{st} is the stationary current which is given by a force that has the same nonconservative contribution as the actual force.

We note variational characterizations of $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{eq}})$ and $(\mathbf{J}_{\text{st}}, \mathbf{f}_{\text{st}})$, which can make easier to calculate the decomposition numerically. \mathbf{J}_{eq} is given by

$$\mathbf{J}_{\text{eq}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{J}' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{J})} \Psi_{\omega}(\mathbf{J}'), \quad (\text{I.11})$$

while \mathbf{f}_{st} is obtained as

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{st}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{f}' \in \mathbf{f} + \text{im } \mathbb{B}^T} \Psi_{\omega}^*(\mathbf{f}'). \quad (\text{I.12})$$





Figure 3. Comparison of three EPR decompositions. We calculate EPRs of the chemical reaction network in Eq. (I.13) for two distinct rate constants (detailed values are given in the text).

Next, let us focus on a specific chemical reaction network. In Ref. [35], the authors discuss the reaction network



assuming the mass action kinetics with rate constants presented in the chemical equations. We calculate our EPRs $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}$, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}$, the Onsager EPRs $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{ons}}$, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}$, and the Hessian EPRs $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{hk}}^{\text{hess}}$, $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{hess}}$, with the same parameters as Ref. [35]. Concretely, we used the rate constants $k_1^+ = 1/2$, $k_1^- = 2$, $k_2^+ = 4$, $k_2^- = 47/4$, $k_3^+ = \sqrt{2}$, and $k_3^- = 15/2 + 2\sqrt{2}$ to obtain (a) in Fig. 3, or $k_1^+ = 1/2$, $k_1^- = 2$, $k_2^+ = 1/17$, $k_2^- = 85/8$, $k_3^+ = 273/68$, and $k_3^- = 137/68$ to obtain (b). The three decompositions are exhibited in Fig. 3, which reproduces numerical results obtained in Ref. [35]. The inequality $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}$ is also verified. In addition, we observe numerically that $\dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{hess}} \leq \dot{\sigma}_{\text{ex}}^{\text{ons}}$, although we have not proved analytically that these inequalities hold in general.