

Thermodynamical definition of mean temperature

A. E. Allahverdyan^{1,2}, S. G. Gevorkian^{1,3}, Yu. A. Dyakov⁴, and Pao-Kuan Wang^{4,5,6}

¹*Alikhanian National Laboratory (Yerevan Physics Institute),
Alikhanian Brothers Street 2, Yerevan 0036, Armenia*

²*Yerevan State University, 1 A. Manoogian street, Yerevan 0025, Armenia,*

³*Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Nankang, Taipei, 11529, Taiwan*

⁴*Research Center for Environmental Changes, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan,*

⁵*Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan*

⁶*Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA*

The notion of mean temperature is crucial for a number of fields including climate science. However, so far its correct thermodynamical foundation is lacking or even believed to be impossible. A physically correct definition should not be based on mathematical notions of the means (e.g. the mean geometric or mean arithmetic), because those ignore the peculiarities involved with the notion of temperature, and because they are not unique. We offer a thermodynamic definition of the mean temperature that is based upon the following two premises. First, as the correct definition should necessarily involve thermalization processes in the initially non-equilibrium system, the mean temperature is bounded from below and above via looking at (respectively) the reversible versus fully irreversible extremes of thermalization. Second, within the thermodynamic approach we assume that the mean temperature is determined mostly by energy and entropy. Together with the dimensional analysis, the two premises lead to a unique definition of the mean temperature. The mean temperature for ideal and (van der Waals) non-ideal gases with temperature-independent heat capacity is given by a general and compact formula that (besides the initial temperatures) only depends on the heat-capacities and concentration of gases.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a result of several important problems, it is necessary to define the mean temperature in a non-equilibrium system. An example is the use of the mean temperature of Earth's (surface) atmosphere as an indicator in climate change discussions [1–3]. The Earth atmosphere is certainly a non-equilibrium system, but it supposed to admit a quasi-equilibrium description with a mean temperature. Another example is a living body, which is a non-equilibrium system with different temperatures for different degrees of freedom, but it supposedly admits a single-temperature, quasi-equilibrium description, which is employed in a macroscopic description of organisms e.g. in physiology or medical studies; see [4] for recent challenges in this field.

These two pertinent examples show that the notion of the mean temperature is already employed in one way or another. However, this notion so far lacks physical foundations [3]. There are several inter-related reasons for that. First, the place of temperature among other physical variables is a peculiar one, because it is defined with respect to a conventionally chosen thermometer [5–7]. To some extent, this conventionality is reflected in the well-known difference between the Celsius and Fahrenheit scales. Hence the notions of larger and smaller are well-defined for temperature, but purely mathematical definitions of the mean temperature (e.g. as the mean arithmetic, geometric or harmonic) are inconsistent without further clarifications; see section II.

Second, and beyond conventionality of its formal definition, temperature is defined only in equilibrium [5]. This means that for defining a mean temperature in a non-equilibrium state we should invoke physically meaningful thermalization processes.

Our aim is to come up with a thermodynamic definition of the mean temperature that is applicable to a non-equilibrium state and that takes into account both of the above issues. We start by setting upper and lower bounds to the mean temperature. These bounds describe two extremes of thermalization processes: one that is completely reversible and thermally-isolated, releasing work, and one that is completely irreversible and energy-isolated, increasing entropy by dissipating the available work. These two extremes refer to, respectively, the maximal decrease of (internal) energy and the maximal increase of entropy. The respective temperatures \hat{T} and \tilde{T} ($\hat{T} < \tilde{T}$) that (as we postulate) correspond to an upper and lower bounds of the mean temperature \bar{T} solve the first issue above, i.e. they are independent of changes in the temperature measurement setup.

Next, we postulated that within the thermodynamic description, the mean temperature \bar{T} is defined only via entropies and energies of the initial (non-equilibrium) state and possible final equilibrium state. This assumption, along with a dimensional analysis, suffices to define the mean temperature \bar{T} . It holds $\hat{T} \leq \bar{T} \leq \tilde{T}$, and refers to partially irreversible process that balances between the reversibility and complete irreversibility. The mean temperature \bar{T} depends both on the initial non-equilibrium state of the considered system and also on the very substance it refers

to; e.g. the mean temperature for two pieces of iron having temperatures T_1 and T_2 will be different from two pieces of wood having the same temperatures T_1 and T_2 . However, for a class of systems especially relevant for atmospheric physics—ideal and (van der Waals) non-ideal gases with a temperature-independent heat-capacity—the mean temperature assumes a general expression that (aside of the initial temperatures) depends only on heat-capacities and concentrations of gases.

We emphasize that the proposed definition is a thermodynamic one, i.e. it does not take into account dynamical factors, e.g. those given by hydrodynamics or kinetic theory. This is both strength and weakness, also because our results become more generally applicable and independent on dynamical details (e.g. heat-conductivity). Nonetheless, we note that our method of placing upper and lower bounds on the mean temperature, and then determining the latter from more fine-grained reasoning, will be useful also in more specific, dynamic situations, also because those situations do assume fixed reference states [8].

The rest of this work is organized as follows. The next section discusses the intricacies of temperature definition. Section III poses an upper and lower bounds on the mean temperature. Section IV proposes the general definition of the mean temperature, while section V works out this definition for gases. We summarize in the last section emphasizing pertinent connections with literature.

II. MATHEMATICAL DEFINITIONS OF MEAN TEMPERATURE ARE INSUFFICIENT

There are several mathematical ways of defining a mean; e.g. arithmetic, geometric, harmonic *etc.* The definition of the mean of a physical quantity does require additional physical reasoning, i.e. this is not a mathematical definition.

For extensive quantities (e.g. length, volume, energy for ideal gases) the operational procedure of defining the mean clearly selects the arithmetic mean. Now the definition of the mean amounts to putting the systems together, calculating the composite quantity, and then properly normalizing it. Here are two examples: for calculating the mean length of two sticks with lengths L_1 and L_2 we should put them together, obtain the composite length $L_1 + L_2$, and then divide it over the number of sticks producing $\frac{1}{2}(L_1 + L_2)$ for the mean. Likewise, given two ideal gases with number of particles N_1 and N_2 , and internal energies $N_1 u_1$ and $N_2 u_2$, we put them together, calculate the composite energy $N_1 u_1 + N_2 u_2$, and then normalize it over the total number of particles $N_1 + N_2$. The resulting mean energy $\frac{N_1}{N_1+N_2} u_1 + \frac{N_2}{N_1+N_2} u_2$ is just the arithmetic mean with proper weights ¹.

This procedure cannot be applied to temperature. First, because it is not an extensive quantity, i.e. it does not scale with the number of particles [3]. Second, because temperature is defined with respect to a general class of thermometers [5–7]. The choice of a concrete thermometer is conventional. The readings t_1 and t_2 of two thermometers 1 and 2 relates to each other via a monotonous transformation $t_1 = f(t_2)$ [5–7]. One particular example of $f(x)$ is an affine transformation $f(x) = ax + b$, where a and b are constants. For example, the three basic everyday scales—Celsius (T_C), Fahrenheit (T_F) and Kelvin (T_K)—are related to each other via an affine transformation:

$$T_C = \frac{5}{9}(T_F - 32), \quad T_C = T_K - 273.15, \quad (1)$$

where the coefficients here are conventional. It is clear that (say) the geometric and harmonic means do not stay covariant with respect to an affine transformation. In more detail, if we define the harmonic mean $\sqrt{T_{F,1}T_{F,2}}$ of two temperatures in Fahrenheit, and then translate it to Celsius, we shall get a different result compared to $\sqrt{T_{C,1}T_{C,2}}$, where $T_{C,k} = \frac{5}{9}(T_{F,k} - 32)$ ($k = 1, 2$) relate to each other via (1).

The arithmetic mean $\frac{1}{2}(T_{F,1} + T_{F,2})$ is covariant with respect to an affine transformations, but is not covariant with respect to more general monotonous transformations; e.g. to $f(x) = 1/x$. Indeed, it is legitimately argued that frequently the inverse temperature $\beta = 1/T$ provides a better physical description than the temperature itself, e.g. because it provides a better of account non-equilibrium physics [5]. Note that e.g. spin physics almost always employs β instead of T , also because in that field β passing through zero is usual, unlike “dramatic” changes implied by $T = 1/\beta$ passing through the infinity [9]. Also, the usage of β (instead of T) makes the third law more intuitive, since this law now tells about impossibility to reach $\beta = \infty$ [5].

¹ Despite appearing straightforward, this argument has a caveat. The ideal gas model applies mostly to equilibrium situations. For non-equilibrium gases the interaction is usually not negligible, since this interaction (however weak) ensures relaxation to equilibrium (equilibration). Hence, if the gases are not in equilibrium with each other, the above definition of the mean energy applies only to relatively short times, where the interaction can be neglected. Otherwise, we have the same problem as when defining the mean temperature, i.e. we need to specify the equilibration process.

These arguments come to stress that we cannot just apply the mathematical definitions of the mean to temperature. Obviously, we should follow the above operational road, which for the present case will mean taking the two systems at different temperatures together and letting them relax to a common temperature; see below.

III. UPPER AND LOWER BOUNDS ON THE MEAN TEMPERATURE

Consider two equilibrium systems A_1 and A_2 at *different absolute* temperature T_1 and T_2 , with the number of particles N_1 and N_2 , volumes V_1 and V_2 , internal energies $U_1(T_1, V_1, N_1)$ and $U_2(T_2, V_2, N_2)$, and entropies $S_1(T_1, V_1, N_1)$ and $S_2(T_2, V_2, N_2)$, respectively.

We assume that $A_1 + A_2$ is a thermally isolated system. We allow $A_1 + A_2$ to equilibrate and reach some joint temperature, which can be then related to the mean temperature. The equilibration process is not unique, it depends on the external conditions [5]; e.g. it depends on whether and to which extent we allow for work-extraction from $A_1 + A_2$. Below we resolve this non-uniqueness.

We shall work with the absolute temperature scale (in energy units, i.e. with $k_B = 1$), but at several key places we shall emphasize the covariance of our conclusions with respect to monotonous transformations of temperature.

A. Reversible equilibration

Within the reversible equilibration, A_1 and A_2 interact through a working body B , which sequentially interacts with A_1 and A_2 via weak thermal contacts. Between interactions B delivers work to the external source [5]. The thermodynamic state of B changes cyclically. Hence the overall entropy change is given by the change of the entropies of A_1 and A_2 . The process is reversible, and the overall entropy stays constant:

$$S_1(T_1, V_1, N_1) + S_2(T_2, V_2, N_2) = S_1(\hat{T}, V_1, N_1) + S_2(\hat{T}, V_2, N_2), \quad (2)$$

where \hat{T} is the final temperature, which is the same for A_1 and A_2 . Since $A_1 + A_2$ is thermally isolated due to (2), the overall energy deficit is the extracted work:

$$U_1(T_1, V_1, N_1) + U_2(T_2, V_2, N_2) - U_1(\hat{T}, V_1, N_1) - U_2(\hat{T}, V_2, N_2) \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

We emphasize from (2, 3) that within this set-up the volumes V_1 and V_2 , as well as the particle numbers N_1 and N_2 , stay fixed for both A_1 and A_2 ; see section IIID for clarification of this point. Hence we shall below omit the arguments (V_1, N_1) and (V_2, N_2) without risk of confusion.

Fig. 1 illustrates the situation of (2, 3) on the energy-entropy diagram. It is seen that possible non-equilibrium states $(U_{\text{in}}, S_{\text{in}})$ are bound (from left) by an increasing and concave equilibrium energy-entropy curve. The reason of concavity is reminded in the caption of Fig. 1. For our situation $U_{\text{in}} = U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2)$ and $S_{\text{in}} = S_1(T_1) + S_2(T_2)$. Note from Fig. 1 that (3) is the maximal work that can be extracted under the restriction of the second law and fixed (V_1, N_1) and (V_2, N_2) :

$$U_1(\hat{T}) + U_2(\hat{T}) = \min_{\hat{T}_1, \hat{T}_2} \left[U_1(\hat{T}_1) + U_2(\hat{T}_2) \mid S_1(T_1) + S_2(T_2) \leq S_1(\hat{T}_1) + S_2(\hat{T}_2) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Indeed, if we allow more general processes, where the final entropy is larger than $S_{\text{in}} = S_1(T_1) + S_2(T_2)$, then the final energy is also larger than $U_1(\hat{T}) + U_2(\hat{T})$ due to the fact that the equilibrium energy-entropy curve $S(E)$ is increasing; see Fig. 1.

In the context of atmospheric thermodynamics work-extraction means increasing the hydrodynamic kinetic energy due to internal energy [8]. Recall that this kinetic energy is defined via the mean velocity. Carefully accounting for this energy balance requires hydrodynamics, and not just purely thermodynamic reasoning related to the work-extraction in a thermally isolated process; see e.g. [20].

B. Fully irreversible equilibration

The second pertinent scenario of equilibration looks at another extreme. Now A_1 and A_2 are isolated from the rest of the world and are subject to the fully irreversible equilibration via thermal contacts; i.e. again (V_1, N_1) for A_1 and (V_2, N_2) for A_2 stay fixed. Now the total energy is conserved

$$U_1(T_1, V_1, N_1) + U_2(T_2, V_2, N_2) = U_1(\tilde{T}, V_1, N_1) + U_2(\tilde{T}, V_2, N_2), \quad (5)$$




FIG. 1: A schematic representation of the entropy-energy diagram. The blue concave curve shows $S(U)$: the equilibrium entropy S as a function of equilibrium energy U for a fixed volume and particle number. This curve is growing, $S'(U) > 0$, since the temperature is positive. The curve is concave, $S''(U) < 0$, because the heat-capacity (at a fixed volume and particle number) is positive due to thermodynamic stability [5]. To show $S''(U) < 0$, one can employ the known relation $\partial_\beta S|_V = \beta \partial_\beta E|_V$, which can be derived also from the partition function directly.

Now $(U_{\text{in}}, S_{\text{in}})$ denoted by the blue point means the initial non-equilibrium state; e.g. this can be a two-temperature state for two systems. This state can thermalize via (at least) two processes: the irreversible scenario refers to a constant energy and monotonically increasing entropy; see the black-dashed (vertical) line. Equilibrium values are denoted as (\tilde{U}, \tilde{S}) (redpoint) and refer to temperature \tilde{T} ; cf. (7). The second process is the reversible one, where the entropy stays constant, while the energy decreases till equilibrium values (\hat{U}, \hat{S}) (temperature \hat{T}) are reached, as in (4); see the blue-dashed (horizontal) line reaching the green point. The mean temperature \bar{T} refers to an equilibrium state (\bar{U}, \bar{S}) located in between: $\hat{T} < \bar{T} < \tilde{T}$; see (13).

defining the final temperature \tilde{T} . The entropy increase is clearly positive:

$$S_1(\tilde{T}) + S_2(\tilde{T}) - S_1(T_1) - S_2(T_2) > 0. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, as seen from Fig. 1, (6) is the maximal entropy increase for the conserving energy plus fixed (V_1, N_1) and (V_2, N_2) :

$$S_1(\tilde{T}) + S_2(\tilde{T}) = \max_{\tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2} \left[S_1(\tilde{T}_1) + S_2(\tilde{T}_2) \mid U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2) = U_1(\tilde{T}_1) + U_2(\tilde{T}_2) \right]. \quad (7)$$

C. Upper and lower bounds for the mean temperature

As we confirm below, the temperatures \hat{T} and \tilde{T} hold

$$\min[T_1, T_2] \leq \hat{T} \leq \tilde{T} \leq \max[T_1, T_2], \quad (8)$$

which naturally implies that all other temperatures found via partially irreversible processes will be located between \hat{T} and \tilde{T} ; see Fig. 1.

Thus, our first assumption is formulated as follows: All acceptable notions of the mean temperature \bar{T} should locate between \hat{T} and \tilde{T} :

$$\hat{T} \leq \bar{T} \leq \tilde{T} \quad (9)$$

The motivation for (9) is that once the temperature relates to the heat content, we should decide what to do with the available work. Two extreme options are to dissipate it completely (\tilde{T}), or to extract it fully (\hat{T}). We cannot add any external work, since this will potentially change the heat content. Moreover, if we start adding work to the overall system $A_1 + A_2$, the final temperature can be made arbitrary large. Eq. (9) rules out some mathematical definitions of "mean temperature".

We emphasize that \hat{T} and \tilde{T} are covariant with respect to monotonous transformations of the absolute temperature. This follows from the very definitions (2, 5). Put differently, \hat{T} and \tilde{T} are covariant with respect to employing any other reasonable thermometer instead of the thermometer that leads to the absolute temperature.




FIG. 2: The mean temperature \bar{T} for a two-temperature system *versus* temperature T_1 of one of systems; see (21). From top to bottom (red, blue, black curves): $T_2 = 2, 1, 0.1$. For each curve its dashed (dotted) counterpart of the same color denotes the arithmetic mean $\tilde{T} = (T_1 + T_2)/2$ (geometric mean $\hat{T} = \sqrt{T_1 T_2}$) calculated at the same value of T_2 . It is seen that $\tilde{T} \geq \bar{T} \geq \hat{T}$.

D. Why we do not consider more general equilibration processes?

Above we restricted ourselves with reversible and fully irreversible processes that proceed via thermal contacts; i.e. they are realized at fixed values of the volumes (V_1, V_2) and the particle numbers (N_1, N_2). In particular, we did not involve pressure differences into the work-extraction, because even when A_1 and A_2 have initially the same temperature T , their final temperature (after work has been extracted from pressure differences as well) will be lower than T ; see Appendix A. This would obviously contradict our intention of defining the mean temperature, since e.g. condition (8) will not anymore hold. Similar issues arise when A_1 and A_2 are composed of different (distinguishable) particles, and we allow the mixing of gases during the work-extraction. Then the final temperature will be lower than T due to the Gibbs mixing term even when initial pressures and temperatures are equal; see Appendix A.

This issue is not restricted to the reversible mode of operation only. For example, during an irreversible mixing of two *non-ideal* gases A_1 and A_2 having initially the same temperature T , their final temperature will be lower than T , if the irreversible process is extended to include pressure differences; see Appendix A.

These factors emphasize a natural point: the definition of a mean temperature in a non-equilibrium system requires equilibration processes that proceed mostly through thermal conductivity.

IV. MEAN TEMPERATURE

Guided by (4, 7), we postulate that the mean temperature \bar{T} is found through optimization of a four-variable function of the initial and final energy and entropy:

$$\bar{T} = \operatorname{argmax}_T (F[U_1(T) + U_2(T), S_1(T) + S_2(T), S_1(T_1) + S_2(T_2), U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2)]). \quad (10)$$

To find F , we emphasize that \bar{T} in (10) should be invariant with respect to changing dimensions of the entropy and energy, as well as adding to these quantities arbitrary constants b and d [5]:

$$S \rightarrow aS + b, \quad U \rightarrow cU + d, \quad a > 0, \quad c > 0, \quad (11)$$

where the constants a and c come from changing the dimensions. In addition, (10) should hold (9). Indeed, the invariance with respect to changing the dimensions is a natural condition to demand, while the invariance with respect adding arbitrary constants reflect the freedom energy and entropy enjoy in thermodynamics².

The only expression that holds all above conditions, and is invariant with respect to (11) can be presented as follows [21]³:

$$\bar{T}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = \operatorname{argmax}_T \{ [U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2) - U_1(T) - U_2(T)]^{\alpha_1} [S_1(T) + S_2(T) - S_1(T_1) - S_2(T_2)]^{\alpha_2} \}, \quad (12)$$

² We understand that the third law fixes the entropy value to zero at $T = 0$. However, this law is derived from quantum statistics and has many exclusions within that discipline, so in thermodynamics it is reasonable to assume that entropy (just like energy) is defined up to an additive constant.

³ A more general perspective on relations similar to (4, 7, 12) is provided by cooperative game theory [22, 23].

where $\alpha_1 \geq 0$ and $\alpha_2 \geq 0$ are weights. All other possibilities are equivalent to (12) in one way or another.

Note that for $\alpha_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $\alpha_2 \rightarrow 0$ we revert to (resp.) (7) and (4). It should be also clear that $\hat{T} \leq \bar{T}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \leq \tilde{T}$. How to choose α_1 and α_2 ? First note that instead of the function to be maximized in (12) we can maximize its logarithm, which makes clear that only the ratio α_1/α_2 is important for $\bar{T}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. In other words, we can assume $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 1$. Then once we do not know the weights, the ignorance (or the most unbiased, or the maximum entropy) interpretation forces us to choose $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1/2$. Thus we end up from (12) to the final definition of the mean temperature:

$$\bar{T} = \operatorname{argmax}_T \{ [U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2) - U_1(T) - U_2(T)] [S_1(T) + S_2(T) - S_1(T_1) - S_2(T_2)] \}. \quad (13)$$

Eq. (13) achieves a balance between no work extraction (complete irreversibility) and the complete reversibility: now some work is still extracted, but the entropy does increase. The unique argmax of (13) automatically appears in the interval $[\hat{T}, \tilde{T}]$. Note as well that the generalization of (13) to several initially non-interacting, equilibrium systems at different temperatures (plus fixed volumes and particle numbers) is straightforward.

We emphasize that \bar{T} from (13) is invariant with respect to monotonically increasing changes of temperature (i.e. going from one reasonable thermometer to another), since it is defined via optimization of thermodynamic observables. This is one difference between (13) and (say) a naive definition $(\tilde{T} + \hat{T})/2$.

Note that \bar{T} from (13) is the temperature that corresponds to values (\bar{U}, \bar{S}) found via

$$(\bar{U}, \bar{S}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{S,U} [(S - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U)], \quad S_{\text{in}} = S_1(T_1) + S_2(T_2), \quad U_{\text{in}} = U_1(T_1) + U_2(T_2), \quad (14)$$

where the maximization is carried out over all allowed physical (also non-equilibrium) values of S and U . Recall from Fig. 1 that those physical values are bound into a convex domain by the equilibrium curve $S(U)$. It is clear that the maximization in (14) is reached in that curve; otherwise one can always increase S or decrease U so as to reach this curve. We also naturally have $\hat{S} \leq \bar{S} \leq \tilde{S}$ and $\hat{U} \leq \bar{U} \leq \tilde{U}$; see (14) and Fig. 1. Finally, note that the maximum in (14) [hence also in (13)] is unique⁴. Indeed, if the maximum is reached at two different points (U_1, S_1) and (U_2, S_2) such that $(S_1 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_1) = (S_2 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_2)$, then $\frac{1}{2}(U_1 + U_2, S_1 + S_2)$ is also in the maximization domain of (14), because that domain is a convex set. This fact follows from the concavity of $S(U)$ curve in Fig. 1. Now

$$\frac{1}{4}(S_1 - S_{\text{in}} + S_2 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_1 + U_{\text{in}} - U_2) > (S_1 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_1) = (S_2 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_2), \quad (15)$$

contradicts to the assumption that $(S_1 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_1) = (S_2 - S_{\text{in}})(U_{\text{in}} - U_2)$ provide maxima. Hence, we proved that $(U_1, S_1) = (U_2, S_2)$, i.e. the maximum in (14) is unique.

We stress that (14) can be applied without demanding that (\bar{U}, \bar{S}) are in equilibrium, and without requiring the bounds (9). As we saw above, these features come out automatically from (14) together with the uniqueness of the maximum point (\bar{U}, \bar{S}) . Hence, there are a number of generalizations that can be made from (14). In particular, it can be generalized to those cases, where there are additional (e.g. dynamic) restrictions towards attaining the equilibrium curve.

V. MEAN TEMPERATURE FOR GASES

A. Ideal gases

The simplest and the most natural case is that of M ideas gases with volumes V_k , number of particles N_k , internal energies U_k , entropies S_k , *constant* (i.e. temperature-independent) fixed-volume heat-capacities c_k , and temperatures T_k [5]:

$$S_k = N_k \ln \frac{V_k}{N_k} + N_k c_k \ln T_k, \quad U_k = N_k c_k T_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, M, \quad (16)$$

⁴ The mathematical structure of this argument is taken from [22]; cf. also [23].

where in S_k and in U_k we omitted certain inessential constants. Now \hat{T} and \tilde{T} read from (4, 7):

$$\hat{T} = \prod_{l=1}^M T_l^{n_l c_l / \bar{c}}, \quad \tilde{T} = \sum_{l=1}^M \frac{n_l c_l}{\bar{c}} T_l, \quad (17)$$

$$\bar{c} = \sum_{l=1}^M n_l c_l, \quad n_l = \frac{N_l}{N}, \quad N = \sum_{l=1}^M N_l, \quad (18)$$

where \bar{c} is the mean heat-capacity and n_l are concentrations. Hence \hat{T} (\tilde{T}) in (17) reduces to a weighted geometric (arithmetic) average with weights $n_l c_l / \bar{c}$. We emphasize that the arithmetic and geometric average of the absolute temperature is found for ideal gases having temperature-independent heat-capacities, i.e. it does not hold generally.

Now (13) is represented as $\max_T [(\tilde{T} - T) \ln(T/\hat{T})]$. The maximization is carried out by differentiating. This leads for the mean temperature \bar{T} :

$$\bar{T} = \tilde{T} / W \left[e \tilde{T} / \hat{T} \right], \quad (19)$$

where $e = 2.71828$, and where $W[z]$ is the Lambert special function [24]. It solves the equation $W e^W = z$, has various applications in physics [25], and is tabulated with major computational platforms; e.g. Python and Mathematica (as `PolyLog[z]`). Now $W[z] \simeq z$ for a small z , while for $z \geq e$ we have [25]:

$$L_1 - L_2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{L_2}{L_1} \leq W(z) \leq L_1 - L_2 + \frac{e}{e-1} \frac{L_2}{L_1}, \quad L_1 = \ln z, \quad L_2 = \ln \ln z. \quad (20)$$

In the simplest case of equal heat-capacities, $c_1 = \dots = c_M$, we find from (19) for $M = 2$ (with obvious generalization to $M > 2$):

$$\bar{T} = \frac{T_1 + T_2}{2W \left[e (T_1 + T_2) / (2\sqrt{T_1 T_2}) \right]}. \quad (21)$$

Fig. 2 illustrates the behavior of (21) along with \hat{T} and \tilde{T} .

Note that the same formulas (17–21) apply also to the case, where the single-temperature system k ($k = 1, \dots, M$) at temperature T_k is not a single ideal but a mixture of ideal gases. Then the only change in (17–21) is that c_k ($k = 1, \dots, M$) is the average (temperature-independent) heat-capacity of the mixture. This case refers to the mean temperature of two stations that measured temperatures T_1 and T_2 (resp.) for air with different composition of the main atmospheric gases: nitrogen, oxygen and argon. This difference translates into different values of c_1 and c_2 , and then (17–21) apply.

Eqs. (17–21) do not apply if the heat-capacity c depends on temperature. In that case we should proceed directly from (4, 7, 13) solving transcendental equations. Recall that such a dependence is small for air: c changes by 0.4% for temperature T varying between 300 K and 350 K.

Thus, we conclude that (17–21) directly apply to calculating the mean temperature of air.

B. Non-ideal gases

For the van der Waals non-ideal gas model entropy and energy read, respectively [5] [cf. (16)]:

$$S_k = c_k N_k \ln T_k + N_k \ln \left[\frac{V_k - N_k b_k}{N_k} \right], \quad U_k = c_k N_k T_k - \frac{N_k^2 a_k}{V_k}, \quad k = 1, \dots, M, \quad (22)$$

where c_k is the constant-volume heat capacity—which are again assumed to be constants—while a_k and b_k are van der Waals parameters. Recall that $a_k > 0$ enters only into the energy, i.e. it characterizes the inter-particle interaction, while $b_k > 0$ enters only the entropy, as it stands for the excluded volume. It should be clear from (22) that $\frac{N_k b_k}{V_k}$ holds $0 < 1 - \frac{N_k b_k}{V_k}$. An upper bound on $1 - \frac{N_k b_k}{V_k}$ comes from the stability condition $\frac{\partial P}{\partial V}|_T < 0$ [5]. Hence two bounds together can be written as: $0 < 1 - \frac{N_k b_k}{V_k} < \sqrt{\frac{T_k}{2a_k \frac{N_k}{V_k}}}$.

Given these restrictions on the van der Waals parameters we find back the same formulas (17–21). In particular, they apply for defining averages between metastable states described by the van der Waals equation.

VI. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The concept of the mean temperature has a strange status. It is widely used in climate science, but is believed to be impossible physically [3]. The present paper provided a step toward resolving this paradoxical situation, presenting a thermodynamic approach to defining the mean temperature based on two (or more) systems at different temperatures. The resolution starts with the same procedure used for defining the mean value of extensive quantities. The systems whose temperature is to be averaged out are put together and allowed to relax to equilibrium, where their joint temperature is well-defined. This temperature does depend on which specific equilibration (also known as thermalization or relaxation) processes is considered. Various equilibration processes can be categorized into two extremes: reversible and fully irreversible, and we can use the corresponding temperatures to bound the mean temperature from below and from above. However, for determining the mean temperature \bar{T} uniquely, we need an additional thermodynamic postulate: the partially irreversible process that refers to \bar{T} is found solely by the initial and final (equilibrium) energies and entropies of the involved systems. Together with with the dimensional analysis and the ignorance interpretation of weights, this postulate leads to a unique definition of the mean temperature \bar{T} . We mentioned that this approach can be generalized in several directions, also for incorporating dynamic constraints; see the discussion after (14).

The appealing feature of \bar{T} is that for ideal and (van der Waals) non-ideal gases with a constant (temperature-independent) heat-capacity, \bar{T} holds a general formula (19) that besides the initial temperatures contains only heat-capacities and concentrations. This formula may be sufficient for basic needs of climate science, i.e. for defining and interpreting the mean temperature obtained via separate temperature measurements of several stations. For the present paper, however, we avoided analyzing real temperature data, and instead focused on the theoretical analysis of the mean temperature concept and its thermodynamic foundations.

We conclude by discussing two relevant connections between our results and existing literature.

There is a notion of effective temperature which was studied in non-equilibrium statistical physics in various contexts [15–19]. Here specific degrees of freedom of a non-equilibrium system effectively thermalize and acquire a temperature, though other degrees of freedom may have a different temperature, or may not even thermalize [15–19]. In that case we still face the problem of defining the mean temperature for overall system, which can be done via the formalism developed here. It is thus important not to confuse the concept of mean temperature with that of effective temperature.

As we stressed above, the cornerstone of our approach is that the equilibration (relaxation) processes—employed to define the mean temperature—are categorized as the fully irreversible *versus* reversible and work-extracting. Within atmospheric thermodynamics, work-extraction refers to the emergence of a macroscopic motion (wind, storm or circulation) in a non-equilibrium [11, 12]; see [8] for a review. The maximum work extraction under a constant entropy (and constant total mass) is known from pioneering works by Margules [11] and Lorenz [12], which viewed the extracted work as the source of atmospheric circulation. Refs. [11, 12] looked at two sources of work: internal energy—without accounting for vertical gradients of temperature—and the potential energy in a homogeneous gravity field of Earth. In our scheme we do not account for this potential energy (though accounting for this is straightforward), since we are interested mostly by surface temperatures. The approach of Refs. [11, 12] was generalized in several directions; see [8, 14] for recent reviews. In particular, Ref. [13] studied the maximal extracted work and the maximal entropy increase as features of a non-equilibrium atmosphere.

Acknowledgments

We thank B. Andresen for critical remarks. This work was supported by SCS of Armenia, grants No. 20TTAT-QTa003 and No. 21AG-1C038.

-
- [1] S. E. Schwartz, *Resource Letter GECC-1: The Greenhouse Effect and Climate Change: Earth's Natural Greenhouse Effect*, Am. J. Phys. **86**, 565 (2018).
 - [2] W Collins, R. Colman, J. Haywood, M.R. Manning, and P. Mote, *The physical science behind climate change*, Scientific American, 297, 64-73 (2007).
 - [3] C. Essex, R. McKittrick, B. Andresen, *Does a Global Temperature Exist?*, Journal of Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics, 32, 1-27 (2007).
 - [4] M. Suzuki and T. Plakhotnik, *The challenge of intracellular temperature*, Biophysical Reviews, **12**, 593-600 (2020).
 - [5] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics, Part 1* (Pergamon Press, 1980).
 - [6] H. Chang, *Inventing temperature: Measurement and scientific progress* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004).

- [7] B. Skow, *Does Temperature have a Metric Structure?*, *Philosophy of Science*, **78**, 472-489 (2011).
- [8] R. Tailleux, *Available Potential Energy and Exergy in Stratified Fluids*, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **45**, 35-58 (2013).
- [9] M. Goldman, *Spin Temperature and NMR in Solids* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970).
- [10] *A Critical Review of Thermodynamics*, edited by E.B. Stuart, B. Gal-Or, and A. J. Brainard (Mono Book Corporation, Baltimore, MD, 1970).
- [11] M. Margules, *On the energy of storms*, *Smithson. Misc. Collect.* **51**, 533-595 (1905) (translated by C. Abbe).
- [12] E.N. Lorenz, *Available potential energy and the maintenance of the general circulation*, *Tellus* **7**, 157-167 (1955).
- [13] J. Huang and M.B. McElroy, *Thermodynamic disequilibrium of the atmosphere in the context of global warming*, *Climate Dynamics*, **45**, 3513-3525 (2015).
- [14] M.S. Singh and M.E. O'Neill, *The climate system and the second law of thermodynamics*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 015001 (2022).
- [15] L.F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and L. Peliti, *Energy flow, partial equilibration, and effective temperatures in systems with slow dynamics*, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3898 (1997).
- [16] A.E. Allahverdyan, Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, *Steady adiabatic state : Its thermodynamics, entropy production, energy dissipation and violation of Onsager relations*, *Phys. Rev. E*, **62**, 845 (2000).
- [17] J. Casas-Vazquez and D. Jou, *Temperature in non-equilibrium states: a review of open problems and current proposals*, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **66**, 1937-2023 (2003).
- [18] A. E. Allahverdyan and N.H. Martirosyan, *Free energy for non-equilibrium quasi-stationary states*, *EPL*, **117**, 50004 (2017).
- [19] S.L. Sobolev, *Hyperbolic heat conduction, effective temperature, and third law for nonequilibrium systems with heat flux*, *Phys. Rev. E* **97**, 022122 (2018).
- [20] D.G. Andrews, *A note on potential energy density in a stratified compressible fluid*, *J. Fluid Mech.* **107**, 227-236 (1981).
- [21] J. Aczel, F.S. Roberts, and Z. Rosenbaum, *J. Math. Analysis Appl. On Scientific Laws without Dimensional Constants*, **119**, 389416 (1986).
- [22] A.E. Roth, *Axiomatic Models of Bargaining* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1979).
- [23] S. G. Babajanyan, A. E. Allahverdyan, and Kang Hao Cheong, *Energy and entropy: Path from game theory to statistical mechanics*, *Phys. Rev. R* **2**, 043055 (2020).
- [24] E.W. Weisstein, *Lambert W-Function*. From MathWorld—A Wolfram Web Resource. <https://mathworld.wolfram.com/LambertW-s2Function.html>
- [25] S.R. Valluri, D.J. Jeffrey, and R.M. Corless, *Some Applications of the Lambert W Function to Physics*, *Canad. J. Phys.* **78**, 823-831 (2000).

Appendix A: General classes of equilibration processes

This Appendix shows that there are reversible and irreversible processes that are not restricted to thermal contacts and that are not suitable for determining the mean temperature for a number of interesting reasons.

1. Ideal gases

Recall (16) for entropy and energy of $k = 2$ ideal gases. The two gases together form a thermally isolated system. The total volume $V_1 + V_2$ and the total number of particles $N_1 + N_2$ are conserved.

First we assume that $c_1 \neq c_2$, i.e. the gases are different. Let now they mix together and equilibrate via an entropy conserving process. Hence only $V_1 + V_2$ and $N_1 + N_2$ are conserved, but not V_1 and N_1 separately. In the final equilibrated state each gas occupies volume $V = V_1 + V_2$ and they both have the same temperature \hat{T} . Hence the condition that the final entropy equals initial entropy reads from (16)

$$\sum_{k=1}^2 N_k \left(\ln \frac{V}{N_k} + c_k \ln \hat{T} \right) = \sum_{k=1}^2 N_k \left(\ln \frac{V_k}{N_k} + c_k \ln T \right). \quad (\text{A1})$$

Now (A1) leads to

$$\hat{T} = e^{-\frac{1}{\bar{c}} \sum_{i=1}^2 n_i \ln \frac{1}{v_i}} \prod_{l=1}^2 T_l^{n_l c_l / \bar{c}}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$n_k = \frac{N_k}{\sum_{l=1}^2 N_l}, \quad v_k = \frac{V_k}{\sum_{l=1}^2 V_l}, \quad \bar{c} = \sum_{l=1}^2 n_l c_l, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{1}{v_l} \geq 0$ is the Gibbs mixing term. We now have for $T_1 = T_2$:

$$\hat{T} = e^{-\frac{1}{\bar{c}} \sum_{i=1}^2 n_i \ln \frac{1}{v_i}} < T_1 = T_2, \quad (\text{A4})$$

i.e. this equilibration scheme is not suitable for the definition of a mean temperature.

Now assume that the gases are identical, hence $c_1 = c_2 = c$. The final equilibrated gas should be treated as a single entity with number of particles $N = N_1 + N_2$, temperature \hat{T}_{id} and volume $V = V_1 + V_2$. The constant entropy condition reads instead of (A2)

$$N \ln \frac{V}{N} + c \ln \hat{T}_{\text{id}} = \sum_{k=1}^2 N_k \left(\ln \frac{V_k}{N_k} + c \ln T \right), \quad (\text{A5})$$

which implies [cf. (A3)]

$$\hat{T}_{\text{id}} = e^{-\frac{1}{c} \sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{n_l}{v_l}} \prod_{l=1}^2 T_l^{n_l}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Recall from the fact that $\sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{n_l}{v_l}$ is a relative entropy:

$$\sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{1}{v_l} \geq \sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{n_l}{v_l} \geq 0, \quad (\text{A7})$$

and $\sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{n_l}{v_l} = 0$ only when $n_l = v_l$ ($l = 1, 2$). It is seen again that even when $T_1 = T_2$ in (A6) we still have that $\hat{T}_{\text{id}} < T_1 = T_2$. Noting the equation of state $P_k V_k = N_k T_k$ (where P_k is pressure and $k = 1, 2$) for initial gases, we see that for $T_1 = T_2$ we can have $\sum_{l=1}^2 n_l \ln \frac{n_l}{v_l} > 0$ only when $P_1 \neq P_2$. Hence the inequality of pressures in the initial state makes $\hat{T}_{\text{id}} < T_1 = T_2$.

Thus due to $\hat{T}_{\text{id}} < T_1 = T_2$ and $\hat{T} < T_1 = T_2$ these processes are not suitable for defining a lower bound on the mean temperature.

2. Non-ideal gases

Recall from (22) the van der Waals non-ideal gas model. For simplicity we take $c_k = c > 0$ (temperature-independent constant), $a_k = a > 0$, $b_k = b > 0$, and $k = 1, 2$. Let us assume that the two gases mix in a completely irreversible way and reach temperature \tilde{T} (or \tilde{T}_{id}) that is determined from the energy conservation:

$$\tilde{T} = \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k T_k - \frac{aN}{cV} \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k \left(\frac{n_k}{v_k} - 1 \right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\tilde{T}_{\text{id}} = \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k T_k - \frac{aN}{cV} \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k^2 \left(\frac{1}{v_k} - 1 \right), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where n_k and v_k are defined by (A3). Eq. (A8) refers to the distinguishable situation (non-identical gases), where in the final state we still have 2 gases with particle numbers N_1 and N_2 occupying volume $V = V_1 + V_2$. Eq. (A9) refers to identical gases, where the final state is a single gas at volume $V = V_1 + V_2$, particle number $N = N_1 + N_2$ and temperature \tilde{T}_{id} . We emphasize that for non-ideal gases also the irreversible mixing temperature starts to feel whether the particles are identical.

Note from (A8, A9) that

$$\tilde{T} < \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k T_k, \quad \tilde{T}_{\text{id}} < \sum_{k=1}^2 n_k T_k. \quad (\text{A10})$$

The second relation in (A10) is obvious from $v_k < 1$. The first relation follows from (A7) upon noting there $\ln \frac{n_l}{v_l} \leq \frac{n_l}{v_l} - 1$. Eq. (A10) confirms that $T_1 = T_2 > \tilde{T}$ and $T_1 = T_2 > \tilde{T}_{\text{id}}$, i.e. this irreversible process is not suitable for defining an upper bound on the mean temperature.