

Fluctuation-Dissipation relations in Driven Granular Gases

A. Puglisi, A. Baldassarri and V. Loreto

La Sapienza" University in Rome, Physics Department, P.le A. Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy and
INFM, Center for Statistical Mechanics and Complexity, Rome, Italy

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

We study the dynamics of a 2d driven inelastic gas, by means of Direct Simulation Monte Carlo (DSMC) techniques, i.e. under the assumption of Molecular Chaos. Under the effect of a uniform stochastic driving in the form of a white noise plus a friction term, the gas is kept in a non-equilibrium Steady State characterized by fractal density correlations and non-Gaussian distributions of velocities; the mean squared velocity, that is the so-called granular temperature, is lower than the bath temperature. We observe that a modified form of the Kubo relation, which relates the autocorrelation and the linear response for the dynamics of a system at equilibrium, still holds for the out-of-equilibrium, though stationary, dynamics of the system under investigation. Interestingly, the only needed modification to the equilibrium Kubo relation is the replacement of the equilibrium temperature with an effective temperature, which results equal to the global granular temperature. We present two independent numerical experiments, i.e. two different observables are studied: (a) the staggered density current, whose response to an impulsive shear is proportional to its autocorrelation in the unperturbed system and (b) the response of a tracer to a small constant force, switched on at time t_w , which is proportional to the mean-square displacement in the unperturbed system. Both measures confirm the validity of Kubo's formula, provided that the granular temperature is used as the proportionality factor between response and autocorrelation, at least for not too large inelasticities.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 45.70.-n, 05.70.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past few years granular materials [1] have become a fast growing field of research. In this framework, a strong interest has arisen in the subject of the so-called granular gases, systems of grains at very low density so that the collisions can be considered always binary and instantaneous [2]. The collisions among the grains are dissipative, and the amount of energy lost in each collision is parametrized by the so-called restitution coefficient r (see below for a precise definition). Since the energy of the system is therefore not conserved an external forcing is usually applied to obtain a dynamic stationary state. For this kind of systems, the analogy with perfect gases allows to introduce a granular temperature [3] defined as the mean square fluctuation of the velocity, that is $T_G = \langle v^2 \rangle / 3$ even though the velocity distribution could not be Gaussian.

In the case of zero external forcing [4] (i.e. the so-called free cooling), granular temperature decreases in time and goes asymptotically to zero when all the particles finally stop. When an energy input feeds the system, instead, the granular temperature may reach a stationary value and several modeling for the stochastic driving have been proposed employing a constant [5, 6, 7, 8, 9] or a random [10] restitution coefficient.

In numerical simulations or in experiments, T_G is often measured taking the average $\langle v^2 \rangle$ on the whole system. However strong fluctuations in the local granular temperature are usually observed [7]. Even considering only the global granular temperature, i.e. for small spatial inhomogeneities, it is not clear to which extent T_G can be considered the "temperature" of the system.

There are of course several possible paths to face this problem. One interesting point of view is that of investigating the response properties of an external thermometer coupled to a granular gas [11]. This corresponds to study the fluctuation-dissipation properties of the system [12]. For a system slightly perturbed from its stationary equilibrium state linear response theory allows to relate the response to the correlation functions through the fluctuation-dissipation relations [13].

In the simplest case, given a perturbing field A , a fluctuation-dissipation relation relates the response of an observable B at the time t , after an impulsive perturbation at time 0, to the correlation of the observable B and the field A , conjugated to A , measured in the unperturbed system,

$$\frac{\partial \langle B(t) \rangle}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{T} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \langle B(t) A(0) \rangle; \quad (1)$$

where T is the equilibrium temperature of the system.

Recently Green-Kubo expressions for a homogeneous cooling granular gas have been obtained [14, 15, 16] and numerical simulations have confirmed their validity [17]: cooling granulars lack an equilibrium state, therefore the

Homogeneous Cooling State (which is characterized by scaling properties) is used as reference state to be perturbed, but in this case the Green-Kubo relations must be changed in order to keep into account new terms arising from the time dependence of the reference state and the non-conservative character of collisions (see [15]). However, in the case of steady state granular gases, a rigorous derivation of Green-Kubo relations has not yet been performed to our knowledge.

In this paper we perform numerical investigations in order to check the validity of standard Kubo formulas [13, 18] to steady state inelastic gases. We perform in particular two different sets of numerical experiments on heated granular gases. We choose two different conjugated pairs of variables constituted by the autocorrelation of a given variable and the corresponding response to a perturbation applied to the gas. Kubo's formula, i.e. the proportionality between response and the autocorrelation in the unperturbed system, is verified to hold using the granular temperature as the correct proportionality factor, at least for not too strong inelasticities ($r > 0.5$). For stronger inelasticities (smaller values of r) Kubo's formula can be verified with a different effective temperature. It should be noted how the adopted simulation scheme (i.e. Direct Simulation Monte Carlo) represents the numerical implementation of the Boltzmann equation (given for example in [7]) which assumes Molecular Chaos hypothesis and therefore neglects short range correlations. For this reason, for very strong inelasticities the Boltzmann equation (and the DSMC scheme) cannot be considered realistic and one should use Molecular Dynamics simulations.

These results differ from the analogous results obtained for dense granular assemblies, where "slow" degrees of freedom thermalize at an effective temperature which is far higher than the external imposed temperature [19, 20]. However the gas-like state of granular matter has nothing to do with these systems, as their stationary state is governed by a rapid decay of the fluctuations and the granular temperature turns out to be the right choice in the description of linear response to slight perturbations.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In section II we define the model as well as its simulation scheme and give a brief review of known results about the peculiar features of its non-equilibrium stationary state. Section III reviews Kubo's formula and its extension to non-Hamiltonian perturbations. In section IV we describe numerical experiments using a sinusoidal shear and measuring as response the density current. In section V we perform a diffusion vs. mobility experiment upon a tracer (i.e. perturbing a single particle). Finally section VI is devoted to the conclusions.

II. THE MODEL

We simulate a gas of N identical particles of unitary mass in a two-dimensional box of side $L = \sqrt{\frac{P}{N}}$ with periodic boundary conditions. The particle collisions are inelastic: the total momentum is conserved, while the component of the relative velocity parallel to the direction joining the center of the particles is reduced to a fraction r (with $0 < r < 1$) of its initial value, lowering in this way the kinetic energy of the pair:

$$\mathbf{v}_1^0 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \frac{1+r}{2} ((\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_2^0 = \mathbf{v}_2 + \frac{(1+r)}{2} ((\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{n}}) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \quad (2b)$$

where \mathbf{v}_1^0 and \mathbf{v}_2^0 are the velocities of the colliding particles after the collision.

In the interval between two subsequent collisions, the motion of each particle i is governed by the following Langevin equation [7]:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{v}_i(t) = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i(t)}{\tau_B} + \sqrt{\frac{r}{2\tau_B}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(t) \quad (3a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x}_i(t) = \mathbf{v}_i(t) \quad (3b)$$

where the function $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i(t)$ is a stochastic process with average $\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(t) \rangle = 0$ and correlations $\langle \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(t) \boldsymbol{\xi}_j(t') \rangle = \delta_{ij} \delta(t-t')$ (and i, j being component indexes), i.e. a standard white noise. This means that each particle feels a hot fluid with a temperature T_B and a viscosity characterized by a time τ_B .

The question about the most proper way of modeling a stochastic driving is still open. Many authors for instance use Eq. (3) without viscosity [5]. This is equivalent to the limit $\tau_B \rightarrow 0$ and $T_B \rightarrow 0$ with keeping $D = T_B \tau_B$ constant. In this limit long and short-range correlations in the velocity and density fields have been observed [8]. We have measured correlations in the velocity field in the model with viscosity, concluding that they are highly reduced by the viscous term that breaks Galilean invariance (the frame $\mathbf{v} = 0$ is preferred) [21]. Our choice of the stochastic

driving with viscosity has the following advantages: a) it guarantees that in the elastic limit ($r = 1$) the system, after a transient time of the order of τ_B , still reaches a stationary state, characterized by a uniform density and a Gaussian distribution of velocities with temperature T_B ; b) it is a heat bath with a well defined temperature T_B that can be compared with the granular temperature T_G and the effective temperature T_{eff} measured by means of Fluctuation-Dissipation relations (see ahead).




FIG. 1: Rescaled (in order to have unitary variance) distribution of the horizontal component of the velocity of the gas $P(v_x)$ versus v_x , with $N = 500$, $L^2 = N$, heat bath with $T_b = 1$, $\tau_b = 10$, $\tau_c = 1$, and different restitution coefficients. The Gaussian is plotted as a reference for the eye.

In spite of the drastic reduction of velocity correlations, this model exhibits several interesting features which are parametrized by the restitution coefficient r and the ratio, $\tau_c = \tau_B$, between the mean free time (the average interval of time between two subsequent collisions of the same particle) and the viscosity time. When $\tau_B > \tau_c$ and $r < 1$ the system is in a non-equilibrium stationary state with a granular temperature $T_G < T_B$. This state is characterized [7] by fractal density clustering and non-Gaussian distributions of velocities (see Fig. 1) with a dependence upon r and $\tau_c = \tau_B$. This situation persists when Direct Simulation Monte Carlo (DSMC) [22] is used to perform more rapid and larger simulations of the system. The DSMC simulation scheme consists of a discrete time integration of the motion of the particles. At each time step of length Δt the following operations are performed:

1. Free streaming: Eq. (3) is integrated for a time step Δt disregarding possible interactions among the particles.
2. Collisions: every particle has a probability $p = \Delta t / \tau_c$ of undergoing a collision. Its collision mate is chosen among the particles in a circle of fixed radius r_B with a probability proportional to its relative velocity. The unitary vector \mathbf{n} , which should be parallel to the line joining the centers of particles, is chosen randomly instead and the collision is performed using rule (2).

III. SHORT REVIEW ABOUT KUBO'S FORMULA

In this section we review the Kubo's formula, which must hold in the case of equilibrium dynamics. First we show the case of an Hamiltonian dynamics, and then for non-Hamiltonian equilibrium dynamics of a system subjected to an (impulsive) shear force. The first case is presented just for completeness and to set the notations, the formulas presented in the second case will be numerically checked for an elastic system and extended to the inelastic case in the next sections.

A. Kubo's formula for Hamiltonian systems

For an Hamiltonian system, the temporal evolution of the phase space distribution $f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}; t)$ is ruled by the Liouville equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}; t) = i[\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}_{ext}(t)] f(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{q}; t) \quad (4)$$

where L and L_{ext} are the Liouville operators relative to the unperturbed Hamiltonian and to its perturbation respectively. They are defined by means of classical Poisson bracket:

$$iL f = (H; f) = \sum \left(\frac{\partial H}{\partial q} \frac{\partial}{\partial p} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p} \frac{\partial}{\partial q} \right) f \quad (5)$$

The perturbation is assumed to be given by coupling a force $F(t)$ with an observable of the system \hat{A} , i.e.:

$$H_{\text{ext}} = \hat{A}(p; q) F(t) \quad (6)$$

The phase space distribution is assumed to be canonical (i.e. at equilibrium) in the infinite past: $f(p; q; -\infty) = f_{\text{eq}}(p; q)$. An approximate solution of (4) to the first order in the perturbation L_{ext} is given by:

$$f(p; q; t) = f_{\text{eq}}(p; q) + \int_1^t dt^0 \exp[i(t-t^0)L](H_{\text{ext}}(t^0); f_{\text{eq}}(p; q)) + \dots \quad (7)$$

With this approximation, the deviation, due to the perturbation (6), of the expectation of a physical quantity \hat{B} can be written as the following convolution:

$$\hat{B}(t) = h\hat{B}i_t - h\hat{B}i_1 = \int_1^t dt^0 \chi_{BA}(t-t^0) F(t^0) \quad (8)$$

where $h\hat{B}i_t$ denotes averages taken over the ensemble given by $f(p; q; t)$; $\chi_{BA}(t-t^0)$, called response function, represents the response $\hat{B}(t)$ to the pulsed force $F(t) = \delta(t-t^0)$, and reads:

$$\chi_{BA}(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_1^t dt^0 \int_1^{t^0} dt^1 f_{\text{eq}}(p; q) (\hat{A}(p; q); \hat{B}(p; q)) = h(\hat{A}; \hat{B}(t))i \quad (9)$$

where $A = \hat{A} - h\hat{A}i$ (and identically for \hat{B}), while $(p_t; q_t)$ is the image of the initial phase point $(p; q)$ determined by the total Hamiltonian (including the perturbation).

Kubo has shown that the response function can be written in a simpler form [13, 18]:

$$\chi_{BA}(t) = h \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{A}(0) \hat{B}(t) i = h A(0) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \hat{B}(t) i \quad (10)$$

where β is the inverse of the temperature.

B. Fluctuation-Dissipation for non-Hamiltonian equilibrium systems (the case of shear force)

Let consider a gas of particles and define a non-conservative perturbation (force) acting on particle i placed at $r_i(t)$ at time t as

$$F(r_i; t) = -\gamma \dot{r}_i(t) \quad \text{with the properties } r_i \in [0, L] \quad \dot{r}_i = 0: \quad (11)$$

For small enough perturbation and for any variable ("observable") $O(r)$ such that $hOi_1 = 0$, equation (8) with the Kubo formula (10) reads [23, 24]:

$$hO(r)i_t = \int_1^t dt^0 \int_1^{t^0} dt^1 \sum_i \dot{r}_i(t^0) F(r_i(t^0)) g_{i1}(t-t^0) \quad (12a)$$

$$h\hat{O}(k)i_t = \int_1^t dt^0 \sum_i \dot{r}_i(t^0) \exp[ik \cdot r_i(t^0)] g_{i1}(t-t^0) \hat{O}(k; t^0) \quad (12b)$$

where the Fourier transform $G \rightarrow \hat{G}$ is defined as

$$\hat{G}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{V} \int d\mathbf{r} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} G(\mathbf{r}) \quad (13)$$

A force satisfying the properties ((11)) is for instance given by:

$$\mathbf{F}_k(\mathbf{r};t) = \frac{0}{\exp(i\mathbf{k}_x \cdot \mathbf{x})} \quad (14)$$

whose spatial Fourier transform reads:

$$\mathbf{F}_k(\mathbf{k};t) = \frac{0}{V} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_x) \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}_x; 0)$ (having chosen \mathbf{k}_x compatible with the periodic boundary conditions, i.e. $\mathbf{k}_x = 2n_k/L_x$ with n_k integer and L_x the linear horizontal dimension of the box where the particles move). Note that \mathbf{F} must have the dimensions of a momentum, i.e. of a velocity (taking unitary masses). With this choice, eqs. (12b) become:

$$\hat{h}(\mathbf{k})i_t = \frac{1}{V} \hat{h}(\mathbf{k};t) \sum_i \mathbf{y}_i(0) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i(0)) g_{i1} \quad (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_x) \quad (16)$$

If we now define the staggered y-current as:

$$J_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{r};t) = \sum_i \mathbf{y}_i(t) (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i(t)) \quad (17a)$$

$$\hat{J}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_i \mathbf{y}_i(t) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i(t)); \quad (17b)$$

then, using this current as observable O the relation (16) is written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{h}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t)i_t &= \frac{1}{V^2} \hat{h} \sum_{ij} \mathbf{y}_i(t) \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i(t)) \mathbf{y}_j(0) \exp(i\mathbf{k}_x \cdot \mathbf{x}_j(0)) g_{i1} \quad (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_x) \\ &= \hat{h}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t) \hat{J}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};0) i_1 \quad (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_x) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

A real linear combination of forces of the kind in eq. (14) is

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{r};t) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{F}_k(\mathbf{r};t) + \mathbf{F}_{-k}(\mathbf{r};t)) = \frac{0}{\cos(\mathbf{k}_x \cdot \mathbf{x})} \quad (19)$$

With this choice of the perturbation, the relation (18) becomes:

$$\hat{h}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t)i_t = \frac{1}{2} \hat{h}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t) \hat{J}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};0) i_1 \quad ((\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_x) + (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}_x)): \quad (20)$$

This is a fluctuation-dissipation relation which expresses the fact that the response of the \mathbf{k} -component of the transverse current to the perturbing field in eq. (19) is proportional to the auto-correlation of the same transverse current measured in the system without perturbation.

The real part of the response calculated at \mathbf{k} (per unit of perturbing field) is directly computable and reads:

$$\text{Re} \frac{1}{V} \hat{h}_y^{\text{st}}(\mathbf{k};t)i_t = \frac{1}{V} \sum_i \mathbf{y}_i(t) \cos(\mathbf{k}_x \cdot \mathbf{x}_i(t)) i_t: \quad (21)$$

From eq.(20) one obtains the relation:

$$\frac{1}{V} \sum_i \mathbf{y}_i(t) \cos(\mathbf{k}_x \cdot \mathbf{x}_i(t)) i_t = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} \mathbf{y}_i(t) \mathbf{y}_j(0) \cos(\mathbf{k}_x \cdot [\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(0)]) g_{i1} : \quad (22)$$

IV. FLUCTUATION-DISSIPATION MEASURE I: SHEAR VS. CURRENT

The first set of measures we have performed has been aimed to verify relation (22) for a system as described in the previous paragraph. In order to do this we have used the following recipe proposed in [23]:

1. Initialize system U with random positions $\mathbf{r}_i^U(0)$ and random velocities $\mathbf{v}_i^U(0)$.
2. Let it evolve with the unperturbed dynamics until time t_w which must be chosen larger than the largest characteristic time of the system (e.g. τ_c or τ_b). The unperturbed dynamics consists of the time-discretized (τ) integration of the Langevin equation (3):

$$\mathbf{v}_i(t + \tau) = \mathbf{v}_i(t) - \frac{\tau}{\tau_b} \mathbf{v}_i(t) + \frac{r}{\tau_b} \sqrt{\frac{2T_b \tau}{m}} \mathbf{R}(t) \quad (23)$$

plus inelastic collisions with parameter r (restitution coefficient). The collisional step is separated from the Langevin step and is implemented by means of a local Monte Carlo, i.e. random choice of pairs to collide inside a region of diameter τ_b ; the collision probability is proportional to a fixed collision frequency $1/\tau_c$ and to the relative velocity of the particles; τ_c is chosen to be compatible with an homogeneous gas-like dynamics, i.e. $\tau_c \tau_b = \hbar v^2 i_1$.

3. At time t_w a copy of system U is created (and named P) and the vectors $\mathbf{f}_i(t_w)$ and $\mathbf{f}_i(t_w)$ memorized in order to be used in the computation of the auto-correlation.
4. The system U is let evolve with the unperturbed dynamics. The system P is made evolve with the additional forcing described in eqs. (11) and (19) for only the time step $[t_w; t_w + \tau]$, i.e. the equation for the update of velocities in this particular step being:

$$\mathbf{v}_i^P(t_w + \tau) = \mathbf{v}_i^P(t_w) - \frac{\tau}{\tau_b} \mathbf{v}_i^P(t_w) + \frac{r}{\tau_b} \sqrt{\frac{2T_b \tau}{m}} \mathbf{R}(t_w) + i \cos[k_x x_i^P(t_w)] \quad (24)$$

with $k_x = 2\pi/\lambda_x = L_x$. Note again that the perturbation intensity has exactly the dimensions of a velocity.

5. The dynamics of systems U and P are thereafter followed in the unperturbed style, i.e. using eq. (23). The functions to be measured are:

$$R(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \mathbf{v}_i^P(t_w + \tau) \cos k_x x_i^P(t_w + \tau) \quad (25a)$$

$$C(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{v}_i^U(t_w + \tau) \mathbf{v}_j^U(t_w) \cos k_x [x_i^U(t_w + \tau) - x_j^U(t_w)] g; \quad (25b)$$

where $\tau = t - t_w$. It is expected that $R(0) = 1/2$ and $C(0) = \hbar v^2 i$, while $R(1) = C(1) = 0$.

6. The above steps are repeated for many different realizations (or even in the same realization, provided its length is much longer than the typical correlation time) and the averages over those realizations of $R(t - t_w)$ and $C(t - t_w)$ are computed (see figure 2).

To the aim of checking the whole numerical machinery, we first consider the $r = 1$ elastic case. In all the cases investigated we have checked the linearity of the response by changing the perturbation amplitude in the range $2 \in [0.005; 0.05]$. Within the specific framework chosen for the observables, the Kubo formula to be verified is given by:

$$\hbar R(t - t_w) i = \frac{-\hbar C(t - t_w) i}{2} \quad (26)$$

We have performed the following experiments:




FIG. 2: Left: time dependent response to the impulsive shear perturbation defined in 11 and 19: $R(t-t_w)$ vs. $t-t_w$ for three simulations with elastic systems, one without them al bath and two with them al bath, and with different choices of the wave number n_k of the perturbation. Right: time correlation function $C(t-t_w)$ vs. $t-t_w$ for the same systems. In the simulations $r = 1$, $N = 500$, $\epsilon_c = 1$, and for the two cases with the heat bath $T_b = 1$ and $\epsilon_b = 10$. The applied force has $\epsilon = 0.01$, $t_w = 100$. The averages have been obtained over 10000 realizations.




FIG. 3: Parametric plot of $R(t-t_w)$ vs. $C(t-t_w)$ for the numerical experiment of type I (impulsive shear perturbation) with $r = 1$, with or without heating bath, and for different choices of the wave number n_k of the perturbation. The initial temperature for the case without heat bath is chosen to be 1 while $T_b = 1$ and $\epsilon_b = 10$ for the two cases with the heat bath. $N = 500$, $\epsilon_c = 1$, $\epsilon = 0.01$, $n_k = 8$, with average over 10000 realizations, using $t_w = 100$.

gas with elastic interactions and absence of them al bath (see gure 3).

gas with elastic interactions with the therm al bath (see gure 3).

From gure 2 it can already be appreciated that response and autocorrelations in the elastic gas decay on a time of the order of ϵ_c (however this decay is not exponential, as can be observed in the inset of the gure). The parametric plot of the two curves in gure 3 shows the perfect agreement with equation (26) using $\epsilon = 1=T_b$. In this case, of course, $T_b = T_G$.

We have repeated the same measures on the gas with restitution coefficient $r < 1$, i.e.

gas with inelastic interactions with the bath (in this case the bath is essential, to avoid cooling), see gure 4.

obtaining again a very good agreement with equation (26) using $\epsilon = 1=T_G$. This is the main finding in this set of numerical experiments: even if the gas is out of equilibrium, being driven by a therm al bath at temperature T_b , its unperturbed autocorrelation is still proportional to the linear response, and its effective temperature measured by means of Fluctuation-Dissipation theory is exactly the granular temperature T_G . This is true for every inelasticity $r \geq 0.5$.

At lower inelasticities we have still obtained an agreement with equation (26) but with a $T_{\text{eff}} = 1 = \epsilon T_G$: we do not think that these measures can be interesting, as the DSMC algorithm is not reliable at such values of r . A real

system of inelastic particles with $r < 0.5$ should exhibit, even at low densities, a high degree of clusterization which cannot be observed within the DSMC framework.

It also must be noted that relation (26) is verified for many values of the wave number n_k , i.e. the system does not show a scale dependent effective temperature.




FIG. 4: Parametric plot of $R(t-t_w)$ vs. $C(t-t_w)$ for the numerical experiment of type I (impulsive shear perturbation) with $r < 1$, with heating bath, and for different choices of the wave number n_k of the perturbation. $T_b = 1$ and $\gamma_b = 10$, $N = 500$, $\alpha_c = 1$, $\alpha = 0.01$, $n_k = 8$, with averages over 10000 realizations, using $t_w = 100$.

V. FLUCTUATION-DISSIPATION MEASURE II: DIFFUSION

Another independent confirmation of the validity of the modified Linear Response theory for granular gas comes from the study of the diffusion properties, i.e. of the large time behavior of the mean squared displacement $B(t; t_w) = \langle [x(t) - x(t_w)]^2 \rangle = 2D(t - t_w)$. In this case the Einstein relation is expected to hold $D = \langle \dot{x} \dot{x} \rangle_{\text{corr}}$, where $\langle \dot{x} \dot{x} \rangle_{\text{corr}} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \langle [x(t) - x(t_w)]^2 \rangle$: this relation however, often addressed as a sort of FD relation, is always verified and just represents a check of the correctness of the simulation. Instead some surprise could arise from mobility measurements: a small static drag force (switched on at time t_w) of intensity \hat{x} (in the direction of the unitary vector \hat{x} of the x axis) is applied to a given particle (tracer, e.g. particle with index 0 and position r_0). The tracer reaches, as a result of the viscous force generated by the gas surrounding it, a limit constant velocity such that $\dot{x}(t; t_w) = \hat{x} [x_0(t) - x_0(t_w)] / t$, where μ is the mobility which is expected to be related to the diffusion coefficient through the Einstein relation $\mu = D / \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle = 2D / T$ (if the force is applied on the direction x in the two-dimensional system).

In our experiments we have checked the linearity of the relation between $\langle [x_0(t) - x_0(t_w)]^2 \rangle$ and $\langle [x(t) - x(t_w)]^2 \rangle$ (see fig. 5). In particular if Kubo's formula was valid one should have:

$$\frac{\langle [x_0(t) - x_0(t_w)]^2 \rangle}{4} = \frac{\langle [x(t) - x(t_w)]^2 \rangle}{4}; \quad (27)$$

with $\mu = 1/T$ if the system is in thermodynamic equilibrium at temperature T .

In all the simulations we have checked the linearity of the response by changing the perturbation amplitude in the range $2 \in [0.005; 0.05]$.

Figure 5 shows the mean squared displacement (in the unperturbed system) and the x displacement of the tracer (when it is accelerated) divided by the intensity of the perturbing force versus time: it can be appreciated how both these quantities grow linearly with time, defining the diffusion coefficient and the mobility.

Figures (6,7) report the parametric plots of the response to the force versus the mean squared displacement in the unperturbed system, showing how relation (27) is very well satisfied at different inelasticities. What can be observed in this kind of measures is a departure from the relation $\mu = 1/T_G$ already at inelasticity $r = 0.5$ (i.e. where the check of fluctuation-dissipation theorem with the first type of measures still was positive): it appears that $\mu = 1/T_{\text{eff}}$

with $T_b > T_{\text{eff}} > T_G$. This breakdown of fluctuation-dissipation relation should be related to cluster formation (i.e. spatial lack of homogeneity), which is present even in the case of DSMC solutions of Boltzmann equation (see for example [7]). This violation is more pronounced than in the previous experiment, therefore appearing earlier, because this is a "local" measurement of FD, i.e. only one particle is perturbed: this means that the fluctuations of the local granular temperature strongly influence the trajectory of the tracer and its statistical properties.




FIG. 5: Simulations of systems coupled to a thermal bath with elastic or inelastic collisions. $N = 500$, $c = 1$, $T_b = 0.1$ and $b = 10$, $\Xi = 0.01$, $t_w = 100$. The results are obtained by averaging over 10000 realizations. Left: mean squared displacement $B(t; t_w)$ vs. $t - t_w$. Right: Integrated response $\langle x_0(t; t_w) \rangle$ to a constant force applied to the particle numbered as 0 vs. $t - t_w$.




FIG. 6: Parametric plot of $\langle x_0(t; t_w) \rangle$ vs. $B(t; t_w)$ for the numerical experiment of type II (constant force applied on one particle) with $r = 1$, $r = 0.8$ and $r = 0.7$, with heating bath, and for different choices of the intensity of the perturbation, using $T_b = 0.1$ and $b = 10$, $N = 500$, $c = 1$, $t_w = 100$. The results are obtained by averaging over 10000 realizations.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion in this paper we have investigated the validity of Kubo's relations in Driven Granular Gases in two dimensions. We have compared in particular two sets of measures. On the one hand we have measured the proportionality factor between the response of the staggered density current to an impulsive shear forcing and its autocorrelation function in the unperturbed system. On the other hand we have monitored the velocity of a tracer by checking the proportionality between its response to a small constant force, switched on at time t_w , and its mean squared displacement in the unperturbed stationary state.

In both cases a proportionality is observed, in analogy with the Linear Response theory for equilibrium dynamics. Furthermore the proportionality factor in the Kubo formulas is equal to the inverse of the granular temperature (at least for the restitution coefficients larger than $r > 0.5$), which hence plays the role of the equilibrium temperature in the elastic case. It is important to remark how these results are recovered by two completely independent measurement schemes.




FIG. 7: Parametric plot of $\langle x_0(t) - x_0(t_w) \rangle$ vs. $\langle |r(t) - r(t_w)|^2 \rangle$ for the numerical experiment of type II (constant force applied on one particle) with $r = 0.5$, with heating bath, and for different choices of the intensity of the perturbation, using $T_b = 0.1$ and $t_b = 10$, $N = 500$, $\zeta = 1$, with average on 10000 realizations, using $t_w = 100$. This case $r = 0.5$ exhibits a slope compatible with $T_{eff} = 0.051$ which is above T_G .

Several remarks are in order. First of all, though a granular gas is a non-trivial out-of-equilibrium system, from the point of view of its thermodynamics it exhibits properties which seem much simpler than the corresponding properties observed in a compacting granular medium. In this case in fact apparently no slow modes are present or at least their presence does not give rise to the existence of several effective temperatures depending on the time-scales investigated [12]. On the other hand the proportionality factor between response and autocorrelation we have found cannot be considered a temperature from the point of view of equilibrium thermodynamics since it does not rely on any known statistical ensemble.

Another point to stress concerns the validity of the zeroth principle of thermodynamics. The question that immediately arises could be summarized as follows: if the granular temperature represents the correct temperature from the point of view of the Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem, should we expect it rules the thermalization properties of two different granular gases put in contact? As already mentioned the answer to this question is far from being trivial as witnessed by all recent results obtained on mixtures [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35] where a lack of equipartition is observed. However these results (validity of fluctuation-dissipation relations and lack of equipartition) can coexist simply because heated granular gases have not only a thermal source but also a thermal sink (dissipative collisions) and therefore any zero principle should be stated in terms of a balance equation among energy fluxes instead of a strict equivalence between temperature of systems in contact.

We again remark, also, that there are other common ways of driving a granular gas in a stationary state, e.g. stochastic driving without viscosity [8], stochastic restitution coefficient models [10], multiplicative noise models [9] and so on. In some of these models a more pronounced departure from homogeneity (for example correlations in the velocity field [8]) and therefore a breakdown of fluctuation-dissipation relations should be investigated.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to S. Roux a preliminary and enlightening discussion, and to A. Barrat and E. Trizac for many interesting discussions as well as a critical reading of the manuscript. This work has been partially supported by the European Network-Fractals under contract No. FM RX CT 980183. A.B. acknowledges support from the INFN Giovanni Valenti fellowship. V.L. and A.P. acknowledge support from the INFN Center for Statistical Mechanics and Complexity (SMC).

-
- [1] H.M. Jaeger, S.R. Nagel and R.P. Behringer, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 1259 (1996); Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Physics of Dry Granular Media, Eds. H. J. Herrmann et al, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands (1998); A. M. ehta and T.C. Halsey Eds., Proceedings of the conference "Challenges in Granular Physics", ICTP Trieste August 2001, Advances in Complex Systems Vol.4 (2001).
 - [2] T. Poschel and S. Luding (Eds.), Granular Gases, Springer, Berlin (2001).
 - [3] Ogawa S., Proc. of US-Japan Symp. on Continuum Mechanics and Statistical Approaches to the Mechanics of Granular Media, eds. S.C. Cowin and M. Satake (Gakujutsu Bunken Fukyu-kai, 1978), p.208.
 - [4] I. Goldhirsch and G. Zanetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1619 (1993).

- [5] D.R. Williams and F.C. MacKintosh, Phys. Rev. E 54, R9 (1996).
- [6] T.P.C. van Noije and M.H. Ernst, Gran. Matter 1, 57 (1998).
- [7] A. Puglisi, V. Loreto, U.M.B. Marconi, A. Petri, and A. Vulpiani, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3848 (1998); A. Puglisi, V. Loreto, U.M.B. Marconi, and A. Vulpiani, Phys. Rev. E 59, 5582 (1999).
- [8] T.P.C. van Noije, M.H. Ernst, E. Trizac, and I. Pagonabarraga, Phys. Rev. E 59, 4326 (1999); I. Pagonabarraga, E. Trizac, T.P.C. van Noije, Phys. Rev. E 65, 011303 (2002).
- [9] R. Caero, S. Luding and H.J. Herrmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 6014 (2000).
- [10] Alain Barrat, Emmanuel Trizac and Jean-Noel Fuchs, Eur. Phys. J. E 5, 161 (2001).
- [11] R. Exartier and L. Peliti, Eur. Phys. J. B 16, 119-126 (2000).
- [12] L.F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and L. Peliti, Phys. Rev. E 55, 3898-3914 (1997).
- [13] R. Kubo, M. Toda and N. Hashitsume, Statistical Physics II, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (1991).
- [14] J.W. Dufty and V. Garzo, J. Stat. Phys. 105, 723 (2001).
- [15] J.W. Dufty and J.J. Brey, unpublished, available on condmat/0201361; J.W. Dufty, J.J. Brey and J. Lutsko, unpublished, available on condmat/0201367.
- [16] I. Goldhirsch and T.P.C. van Noije, Phys. Rev. E 61, 3241 (2000).
- [17] J. Lutsko, J.W. Dufty and J.J. Brey, unpublished, available on condmat/0201369.
- [18] R. Kubo, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 12, 570 (1957).
- [19] A. Barrat, J. Kurchan, V. Loreto and M. Sellitto, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 5034 (2000).
- [20] H.A. Makse and J. Kurchan, Nature 415, 614 (2002).
- [21] Unpublished preliminary results, see A. Puglisi, Ph.D. Thesis, available on <http://axtnt3.phys.uniroma1.it/~puglisi/thesis/>.
- [22] G.A. Bird. Molecular Gas Dynamics and the Direct Simulation of Gas Flows, Clarendon, Oxford, 1994
- [23] G. Cicotti, G. Jacucci and I.R. McDonald, J. Stat. Phys. 21, 1 (1979)
- [24] J.L. Jackson and P. Mazur, Physica 30, 2295 (1964)
- [25] V. Garzo and J. Dufty, Phys. Rev. E 60 5706 (1999).
- [26] L. Huilin, L. Wenti, B. Rushan, Y. Lidan and D. Gidaspow, Physica A 284, 265 (1999).
- [27] W. Losert, D.G.W. Cooper, J. Delour, A. Kudrolli and J.P. Gollub, Chaos 9, 682 (1999).
- [28] K. Feitosa and N. Menon, preprint cond-mat/0111391.
- [29] R.D. Wildman and D.J. Parker, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 064301 (2002).
- [30] J.M. Montanero and V. Garzo, Gran. Matter 4, 17 (2002).
- [31] R. Celland and C.M. Henry, Phys. Rev. E 65, 031301 (2002).
- [32] J.M. Montanero and V. Garzo, preprint cond-mat/0201175.
- [33] U. Marini Bettolo Marconi and A. Puglisi, preprints cond-mat/0112336 and cond-mat/0202267.
- [34] A. Barrat, E. Trizac, preprint cond-mat/0202297-
- [35] Ph. A. Martin and J. Piascki, Europhys. Lett. 46, 613 (1999).