

Composable entropy and deviation from macroscopic equilibrium

Ramandeep S. Johal
643-L, Model Town, Jalandhar-144003, India.

December 23, 2021

Abstract

We formulate, under general conditions, the problem of maximisation of the total entropy of the system, assumed to be in a composable form, for fixed total value of the constrained quantity. We derive the general form of the composability function and also point out the criterion which leads to a violation of the zeroth law of thermodynamics.

Macroscopic thermodynamics is based on an entropy function, which is additive with respect to independent subsystems [1]. The theory of statistical mechanics, which provides microscopic foundations for thermodynamics, also naturally treats entropy as additive, and predicts exponential distributions as the equilibrium distributions. Recently, various generalized entropic functionals [2, 3, 4], which may or may not be additive with respect to independent subsystems, have been proposed in order to generalize the statistical mechanical formalism. This is in part motivated by the observation that in nature very often, non-exponential, non-gaussian and power law distributions better describe the statistical properties of complex phenomena.

Along with these studies, it is also of high current interest to understand as to which general forms of entropy are consistent with the thermodynamical framework. Recently, the notion of compossibility has been found useful to understand these issues [5, 6, 7]. A generalized entropy, when in a composable form, implies that the total entropy of the composite system made up of say, two subsystems A and B, can be written as

$$S(A;B) = f(S(A);S(B)); \quad (1)$$

where f is a certain bivariate function, such that the function itself and all its derivatives are continuous. Moreover, f is symmetric in its arguments:

$$f(S(A);S(B)) = f(S(B);S(A)); \quad (2)$$

The function f satisfies the following natural properties:

$$f(0;S(B)) = S(B); \quad f(S(A);0) = S(A); \quad (3)$$

and

$$f(0;0) = 0; \quad (4)$$

Some known forms of the function f , which have been studied in literature are:

$$S(A;B) = S(A) + S(B); \quad (5)$$

which is obeyed, for instance, by entropic forms proposed by Renyi and Shannon. On the other hand, certain non-additive entropic functionals are also in vogue these days. Tsallis entropy [2], for instance, obeys

$$S(A;B) = S(A) + S(B) + \lambda S(A)S(B); \quad (6)$$

where the real parameter λ represents the degree of nonadditivity. Tsallis entropy is also obviously in a composable form. Many papers have been devoted recently [8], to study how laws and various thermodynamic relations are generalized or left invariant when Tsallis entropy is employed. The non-exponential distributions predicted by employing the maximum entropy variational principle, have been applied to the stationary states of certain nonextensive systems.

The concept of entropic compossibility puts a stringent constraint on the form of total entropy. An important question is what kind of compossibility functions f make the entropy consistent with laws of thermodynamics. It is evident that compossibility does not by itself guarantee this consistency. A step was made in this direction in Ref. [6] by showing that the Tsallis kind of nonadditivity is the simplest example of compossibility, that may be compatible with the existence of thermodynamic equilibrium, specially, with the zeroth law of thermodynamics. In this paper, we revisit this approach and generalise it further in order to analyse as to when a composable entropic form may not follow the zeroth law of thermodynamics.

First, let us review the approach adopted in Ref. [6]. To be able to formulate thermodynamics, the simplest condition one can put is to

maximize the total entropy (1), subject to some additive constraints.

Let the only constraint be expressed as

$$E(A;B) = E(A) + E(B); \quad (7)$$

where the quantity E may represent the internal energy. By making the variations of the total entropy, $dS(A;B)$, and of the total value of the constraint quantity, $dE(A;B)$, vanish, we get

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)} \frac{\partial S(A)}{\partial E(A)} = \frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)} \frac{\partial S(B)}{\partial E(B)}; \quad (8)$$

Now if the entropy function is simply additive (Eq. (5)), then the first partial derivative on either side of the above equation is identically equal to unity. In this standard case, after defining a quantity called temperature $T = (\partial S / \partial E)^{-1}$, this equation yields that the temperatures of the two subsystems are equal. This condition defines the state of thermal equilibrium between the subsystems, in macroscopic thermodynamics [1].

To obtain such an equality condition for the more general case of a composable entropy, an additional condition was assumed [6]: the relation (8) should yield a separable system of equations. To accomplish this, the following factorizability condition is a natural choice [6]:

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)} = g[S(A)]h[S(B)]; \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)} = g[S(B)]h[S(A)]; \quad (10)$$

where g and h are some functions. In particular, h has to be a differentiable function. Clearly, using the above equations in (8) and rearranging, we can obtain separation of variables of the form $F(A) = F(B)$. The hope is that we can then identify temperature-like quantity for the subsystems and thus arrive at a generalized version of the zeroth law.

We reserve further remarks about this approach till the discussion in the end of the paper.

Proceeding further, for any subsystem, say A , one can then show that

$$g[S(A)] = \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{dh[S(A)]}{dS(A)}; \quad (11)$$

Now Tsallis type nonadditivity (Eq. (6)) is consistent with this framework, if we identify

$$h[S(A)] = 1 + \beta S(A); \quad (12)$$

and similarly for system B . This yields $g[S(A)] = g[S(B)] = 1$. Thus Eqs. (9) and (10) simplify to

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)} = 1 + \beta S(B); \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)} = 1 + \beta S(A); \quad (14)$$

It may be important to emphasize again that in standard thermodynamics, we consider additive nature of both total entropy and the constraints. The only further assumption is that the total entropy of the composite system is maximized, under a fixed total value of the constrained quantity (E). Separability in the form of $F(A) = F(B)$, is achieved automatically there. The motivation of Ref. [6] is to infer the form of the composability function, by imposing further conditions like factorizability as in Eqs. (9) and (10). In our opinion, these conditions must restrict the possible forms of the composability function, that may be consistent with the maximum of the total entropy.

In this paper, following the spirit of standard thermodynamics, we study the consequences of just one assumption: maximization of the entropy of the total system, under a fixed total value of the constrained quantity. In other words, we do not start with the simple factorized forms (9) and (10), but assume more general non-factorisable forms. As

will become clear, we do however, make use of a separability criterion at a later stage. Our analysis not only incorporates Tsallis type of nonadditivity as a special case, but also naturally leads to further classes of the compossibility function, though they may not lead to formulation of a zeroth law (or equality of temperatures for subsystems). Thus we also arrive at a criterion as to when this violation of the zeroth law may be expected, for a composable entropic form.

A simple choice violating the separability condition for (8) may be as follows:

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)} = l[S(A)]m[S(B)] + n[S(B)]; \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)} = l[S(B)]m[S(A)] + n[S(A)]; \quad (16)$$

Here l , m and n are arbitrary continuous functions. Particularly, n may have continuous derivatives upto an arbitrary order. Using the fact that

$$\frac{\partial^2 S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)\partial S(A)} = \frac{\partial^2 S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)\partial S(B)}; \quad (17)$$

we get

$$l[S(A)]\frac{dm[S(B)]}{dS(B)} + \frac{dn[S(B)]}{dS(B)} = l[S(B)]\frac{dm[S(A)]}{dS(A)} + \frac{dn[S(A)]}{dS(A)}; \quad (18)$$

This is a relation between three unknown functions l , m and n . To analyse further, we have to introduce the following simplification. Let m be a linear function of its argument

$$m[x] = a + bx; \quad (19)$$

A convenient choice is $a = 0$, if we demand that $f(0;0) = S(A;B) = 0$.

Here, b is another constant. Then (18) is simplified to

$$bl[S(A)] + \frac{dn[S(B)]}{dS(B)} = bl[S(B)] + \frac{dn[S(A)]}{dS(A)}; \quad (20)$$

This leads to a separation of variables and can be written as

$$b_1[S(A)] \frac{dn[S(A)]}{dS(A)} = b_1[S(B)] \frac{dn[S(B)]}{dS(B)} = !; \quad (21)$$

where ! is a constant of separation.

Then using (19) and (21), the conditions (15) and (16) can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(A)} = \frac{dn[S(A)]}{dS(A)} + ! [S(B) + n[S(B)]]; \quad (22)$$

$$\frac{\partial S(A;B)}{\partial S(B)} = \frac{dn[S(B)]}{dS(B)} + ! [S(A) + n[S(A)]]; \quad (23)$$

either of which may be integrated to give the form of composability function:

$$f(S(A);S(B)) = S(A;B) = n[S(B)]S(A) + n[S(A)]S(B) + !S(A)S(B): \quad (24)$$

This function satisfies the symmetry condition, Eq. (2), as required. As special cases of this form of composability function, let n be a constant equal to unity. Then we obtain Tsallis type nonadditivity of degree !. Alternately, we can set ! = 0 and discuss special cases of the following composable function

$$f(S(A);S(B)) = S(A;B) = n[S(B)]S(A) + n[S(A)]S(B): \quad (25)$$

First note that, using the condition (3), we obtain $n[0] = 1$. Now

i) if n is a constant, say equal to unity, we obtain the additivity of entropy.

ii) if n is a linear function, $n[x] = 1 + \alpha x$, we obtain Tsallis type of nonadditivity with degree α .

iii) if n is a nonlinear function of its argument, then separation of variables in the form $F(A) = F(B)$ in Eq. (8), cannot be achieved and thus we cannot arrive at the notion of equal temperatures for the two

subsystem s . We illustrate this with an example. A composable and nonadditive entropic form was recently studied in Ref. [9]. This form was motivated in the context of special relativity. It satisfies

$$S(A;B) = S(A) \frac{q}{1 + x^2 S(B)^2} + S(B) \frac{q}{1 + x^2 S(A)^2}; \quad (26)$$

which goes to the additive form, when the real parameter $x \rightarrow 0$.

However, the above form is a particular instance of (25) with $n[x] = \frac{p}{1 + x^2}$. The function n satisfies the condition (iii) and clearly therefore, the notion of equal temperatures cannot be formulated with this function, upon maximisation of the total entropy.

Summarising, we have revisited the problem of maximisation of a composable entropy under the fixed value of a constrained quantity (total energy) [6]. We have approached the problem from more general considerations and have not imposed the factorisation condition as discussed in [6]. The factorisation assumption was crucial there in order to arrive at a generalised version of the zeroth law when using composable entropic forms. However, this approach has also been analysed further in many papers, where a mapping to an additive entropy is shown [10, 11]. In other words, the separation of variables in the form $F(A) = F(B)$, may be interpreted as equivalent to the maximisation of an additive entropy under fixed value of additive constraints, where then F is identified as the intensive variable. On the other hand, zeroth law is essentially valid for macroscopic thermodynamics. It is known that for finite systems, the intensive variables, such as temperature are not equal over the subsystems [12, 13]. In view of the growing interest in finite systems [14, 15, 16], it is of importance to investigate if generalised entropies can describe effects of finiteness [4]. The main motivation of present work is to formulate and point out the conditions which lead

to violation of the zeroth law for a composable entropy. Seen in this context, the present analysis may give further clues about the relevance of composable entropies in the description of finite systems.

References

- [1] H. B. Callen. Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics. John Wiley & Sons, New York, second edition, 1985.
- [2] C. Tsallis. J. Stat. Phys., 52:479, 1988.
- [3] E. K. Lenzi, R. S. Mendes, and L. R. da Silva. Physica A, 280:337, 2000.
- [4] A. G. Orban and I. Karlin. Phys. Rev. E, 67:016104, 2003.
- [5] M. Hotta and I. Joichi. Phys. Lett. A, 262:302, 1999.
- [6] S. Abe. Phys. Rev. E, 63:061105, 2001.
- [7] Q. A. Wang, L. N. Ivanen, A. Le Mehaute, and M. Pezeril. J. Phys. A : Math. Gen., 35:7003, 2002.
- [8] Full bibliography related to this formalism is available at.
<http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.htm>.
- [9] G. Kaniadakis. Phys. Rev. E, 66:056125, 2002.
- [10] R. S. Johal. Phys. Lett. A, 318:48, 2003.
- [11] R. S. Johal. Zeroth law of thermodynamics and transformation from nonextensive to extensive framework. cond-mat/0207268, 2002.
- [12] T. L. Hill. Thermodynamics of Small Systems. Dover, New York, 1994.
- [13] H. B. Prosper. Am. J. Phys., 61:54, 1993.
- [14] T. L. Hill. Nano Lett., 1(3):111, 2001.

[15] T .L .H ill. Nano Lett., 1 (5) 273, 2001.

[16] G .M .W ang et. al. Phys. Rev. Lett., 89:050601, 2002.