

Comment on “Reexamination of experimental tests of the fluctuation theorem” by Narayan and Dhar

R. van Zon and E.G.D. Cohen

Rockefeller University, 1230 York Avenue, New York, NY 10021

July 11, 2003

Our result in Ref. [1] that, instead of the conventional heat fluctuation theorem (FT), a new FT holds for heat fluctuations for a Brownian particle in a moving confining potential[2], was claimed to be disproved in a very recent preprint by Narayan and Dhar[3]. This comment is meant to show that their assertion is not correct. The point is that they formulate their FT differently than we do ours. Effectively, their FT speaks about a physically irrelevant limiting case of our new FT. This implies that the two FTs are not in contradiction with each other. Furthermore, we point out an incorrect assumption in their derivation.

First, let us remark that although we have a FT for all times in Ref. [1], we only discuss the infinite time version in this comment.

What we consider as the conventional and the new FT, and what Narayan and Dhar in Ref. [3] consider the FT to be, respectively, can be formulated as follows.

We [1]: $P(Q_\tau = p\sigma\tau)$ denotes the probability that the heat Q_τ produced in a time interval τ , has the value $p\sigma\tau$, where σ is the average heat produced per unit time ($= \langle Q_\tau \rangle / \tau$) in the stationary state over positive times[4, 5].*

Narayan and Dhar [3]: $P(Q_\tau = A)$ denotes the probability that the heat Q_τ produced in a time τ has the fixed value A , where A is independent of τ . We note that in Ref. [3] this is formulated in terms of S , which is the entropy production in a time τ , and is given by $S = Q_\tau / T$, with T the temperature of the fluid in which the Brownian particle moves.

As a consequence, there are two similarly looking FTs, but at closer inspection they are physically

radically different.

We [1] consider the conventional FT in the form

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta p \sigma \tau} \log \left[\frac{P(Q_\tau = p\sigma\tau)}{P(Q_\tau = -p\sigma\tau)} \right] = 1 \quad (1)$$

for fixed p , where p characterizes Q_τ in units of $\sigma\tau = \langle Q_\tau \rangle$ and $\beta = 1/k_B T$. This is consistent with Refs. [4, 5].

Narayan and Dhar [3] consider the conventional FT to be

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\beta A} \log \left[\frac{P(Q_\tau = A)}{P(Q_\tau = -A)} \right] = 1 \quad (2)$$

for fixed, finite A .

Narayan and Dhar’s FT is so formulated — because of the independence of A from τ — that when τ approaches infinity, so that $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$ also approaches infinity, the fluctuation value A remains always finite and therefore much smaller than $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$. Then only values of A much smaller than $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$, but no values either near or larger than $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$, are considered in Narayan and Dhar’s FT. Hence, only an increasingly restricted range of fluctuation values A are actually studied in this FT as τ approaches infinity.

We, in contrast, consider all fluctuation values A , because we scale the value A with τ , so that when $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$ grows ($\sim \tau$), so does $A = p\sigma\tau$, as is written explicitly in our formulation in Eq. (1) for the FT. A τ -proportional A means that for a given $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$, any heat fluctuations ($Q_\tau = p\sigma\tau$) can be considered by an appropriate choice of p , even as τ approaches infinity.[†]

So we claim that Eq. (1) is consistent with Eq. (2) since a constant finite A — as Narayan and Dhar’s FT

*In Ref. [1], σ is called w .

[†]This issue of scaling is analogous to using the proper scaling to derive, e.g., the diffusion equation for the random walk, which requires an l^2/t scaling. Other scalings (like e.g., l/t) would not lead to a physically meaningful description of diffusion[7].

uses in Eq. (2) — can also be obtained from Eq. (1), by taking the limit $p \rightarrow 0$ (when $\tau \rightarrow \infty$). In other words, Eq. (2) is a very special case of Eq. (1) which covers strictly speaking only the value $p = 0$, while Eq. (1) covers all values of p .

We will now argue that the FT of Narayan and Dhar in Eq. (2) is also consistent with our new FT found in Ref. [1]. In Ref. [1] the conventional FT [Eq. (1)] was found to be incorrect as a FT for heat fluctuations in the system described above, and had to be replaced by a new FT. However, for the special region $-1 \leq p \leq 1$, this new FT turns out to coincide with the conventional form of Eq. (1), which includes $p = 0$. Therefore, there is no contradiction between our new FT and Narayan and Dhar's FT in Eq. (2) either.

The above is enough to conclude that our new FT in Ref. [1] is not in contradiction with the result Eq. (2) (or their Eq. (1) in Ref. [3]). Moreover, our theory leading to the new FT in Ref. [1] has been compared in detail with two independent numerical calculations, one, a numerically carried out inverse Fourier transform explained in Ref. [1], and another, a sampling method, which is yet to be published[8]. Both give perfect agreement with each other as well as with the new FT. So also from this, we have no reason to distrust the results in Ref. [1].

We take this opportunity to address very briefly two other points in Ref. [3].

Firstly, in their derivation of their (conventional) FT for Q_τ in their Sec. III, Narayan and Dhar neglect a term in their Eq. (17) which one can neglect for the average $\langle Q_\tau \rangle$, but not for the fluctuations of Q_τ . In fact, it is precisely this term which gives rise to exponential rather than Gaussian behavior of the tails of the distribution $P(Q_\tau)$ — the existence of which Narayan and Dhar also notice — and through

these exponential tails, this term also gives rise to our new FT, instead of to the conventional one. To substantiate this, a saddle point method[1, 8], involving a complicated study of the behavior of the Fourier transform of $P(Q_\tau)$, in particular, its singularities in the complex plane, is needed, which goes beyond the scope of this comment.

Secondly, Narayan and Dhar seem to suggest that the singularity of the Langevin equation for vanishing mass m of the particle might be a problem in the derivation of a FT. However, setting $m = 0$ from the start in their Eq. (12) or setting $m = 0$ at the end in their Eqs. (17) and (19), give the same FT, i.e., no singularity is encountered in this derivation with respect to $m = 0$.

References

- [1] R. van Zon and E. G. D. Cohen, An extension of the fluctuation theorem, 2003, cond-mat/0305147.
- [2] G. M. Wang, E. M. Sevick, E. Mittag, D. J. Searles, and D. J. Evans, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 050601 (2002).
- [3] O. Narayan and A. Dhar, Reexamination of experimental tests of the fluctuation theorem, 2003, cond-mat/0307148.
- [4] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2694 (1995).
- [5] E. G. D. Cohen and G. Gallavotti, J. Stat. Phys. **96**, 1343 (1999).
- [6] R. van Zon and E. G. D. Cohen, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 046102 (2003), (cond-mat/0212311).
- [7] M. Kac, Am. Math. Monthly **54** (1947), see section 2; This paper was reprinted in N. Wax, editor, *Selected papers on noise and stochastic processes* (Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1954).
- [8] R. van Zon and E. G. D. Cohen, (in preparation).