

Diffusion Coefficient and Mobility of a Brownian Particle in a Tilted Periodic Potential

Kazuo SASAKI* and Satoshi AMARI

Department of Applied Physics, Tohoku University, Aoba-yama, Sendai 980-8579

(Received November 2, 2018)

The Brownian motion of a particle in a one-dimensional periodic potential subjected to a uniform external force F is studied. Using the formula for the diffusion coefficient D obtained by other authors and an alternative one derived from the Fokker-Planck equation in the present work, D is compared with the differential mobility $\mu = dv/dF$ where v is the average velocity of the particle. Analytical and numerical calculations indicate that inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$, with k_B the Boltzmann constant and T the temperature, holds if the periodic potential is symmetric, while it is violated for asymmetric potentials when F is small but nonzero.

KEYWORDS: Brownian motion, diffusion coefficient, mobility, Fokker-Planck equation

1. Introduction

The response of a system in thermal equilibrium to an external disturbance has close relation to fluctuations produced spontaneously in the system in the absence the disturbance. This relation can be formulated as the fluctuation-dissipation theorem.^{1,2} The Einstein relation $D = \mu_0 k_B T$ is a famous example, where D is the diffusion coefficient and μ_0 is the mobility of a Brownian particle, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the temperature. In this example, D measures the fluctuation of the particle position or velocity v and $\mu_0 = \lim_{F \rightarrow 0} v/F$ represents the response of the particle velocity to a small external force F .

For systems far from thermal equilibrium, any particular relation between D and μ_0 is expected, because we do not know general laws like the fluctuation-dissipation theorem for such systems. However, recent investigations³⁻⁵ into certain one-dimensional systems in nonequilibrium steady states suggest that inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ with $\mu = dv/dF$ being the *differential mobility* may hold in these systems: numerical data show that D is greater than $\mu k_B T$ for a Brownian particle moving in sinusoidal potentials,³ for flushing ratchets⁴ and for rocking ratchets.⁵ Is there any rule that tells under what conditions inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ holds? Finding such a rule, if exists, would provide an important insight into understanding the behavior of nonequilibrium systems.

The purpose of the present paper is to figure out whether inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ holds

*E-mail address: sasaki@camp.apph.tohoku.ac.jp.

generally in the system of a Brownian particle moving in a one-dimensional periodic potential subjected to a uniform external force. This system is one of the simplest systems that exhibit nonequilibrium steady states, and convenient formulas for calculating D and μ are known.^{3,6} From analytical and numerical investigations based on these formulas and the one we derive from the steady-state solution to the Fokker-Planck equation in the present work, we find that this inequality is likely to be valid for any symmetric potentials whereas it is violated for small external forces if the potential is asymmetric.

2. Formulas

We shall investigate the overdamped motion of a Brownian particle moving along the x axis under the influence of a periodic potential $V(x)$ of period l and a uniform external force F . The total potential $U(x)$ for the particle is given by

$$U(x) = V(x) - Fx, \quad V(x+l) = V(x). \quad (1)$$

In what follows periodic functions $I_{\pm}(x) = I_{\pm}(x+l)$ defined by

$$I_{\pm}(x) = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^l e^{\pm\beta U(x) \mp \beta U(x \mp y)} dy \quad (2)$$

play important roles, where $\beta = 1/k_{\text{B}}T$. The average of a periodic function $f(x)$ of period l over the period will be denoted by $\langle f \rangle$:

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^l f(x) dx, \quad f(x+l) = f(x). \quad (3)$$

The “normalized” functions

$$J_{\pm}(x) = I_{\pm}(x)/\langle I_{\pm} \rangle, \quad (4)$$

which satisfy $\langle J_{\pm} \rangle = 1$, are also of use.

It was shown by Stratonovich⁷ that the average velocity v of the particle can be calculated by the formula^{3,8}

$$v = D_0(1 - e^{-\beta Fl})/l\langle I_{\pm} \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where D_0 is the diffusion coefficient of a freely moving Brownian particle ($V = F = 0$) and it is related with the frictional coefficient ζ of the particle through $D_0 = k_{\text{B}}T/\zeta$. It is noted that $\langle I_+ \rangle = \langle I_- \rangle$. The differential mobility $\mu = dv/dF$ can be calculated by differentiating eq. (5) with respect to F . The result can be expressed in a succinct form:⁶

$$\mu = D_0\langle J_+ J_- \rangle/k_{\text{B}}T. \quad (6)$$

The formula for D in the presence of both $V(x)$ and F was derived recently by Reimann et al.:³

$$D = D_0\langle J_{\pm} J_+ J_- \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Note that $\langle J_+^2 J_- \rangle$ is equal to $\langle J_+ J_-^2 \rangle$. Reimann et al.³ derived this formula by considering the moments of first passage time. Later, Hayashi and Sasa⁶ obtained the same result by considering the system with an additional potential that varies much slowly than the original periodic potential $V(x)$.

If the periodic potential $V(x)$ and the external force F are given, the diffusion coefficient D and the differential mobility μ can be figured out by carrying out the two-dimensional integrals involved in eqs. (7) and (6); from the results we find whether or not D is larger than $\mu k_B T$. Nevertheless, an alternative formula may be useful in studying the sign of $D - \mu k_B T$. From the steady-state solution to the Fokker-Planck equation we can derive (see the appendix) the formula

$$D - \mu k_B T = vl \langle (J_+ - 1) K_- \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where periodic functions $K_{\pm}(x)$ of period l are defined by

$$K_{\pm}(x) = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^x [J_{\pm}(y) - 1] dy. \quad (9)$$

Because the sign of v is the same as that of F as evident from eq. (5), formula (8) indicates that $D > \mu k_B T$ if the sign of

$$s = \langle (J_+ - 1) K_- \rangle \quad (10)$$

is the same as that of F . In analytic investigations, evaluation of eq. (10) is usually much easier than calculating eqs. (6) and (7) and then subtracting one from the other. By contrast, it is better to use eqs. (6) and (7) in numerical calculations, because the evaluation of the three-dimensional integral involved in eq. (10) is time consuming.

3. Example

In this section we present the numerical results for the diffusion coefficient D and the differential mobility μ obtained from formulas (7) and (6), respectively, with a particular choice of potential:

$$V(x) = A[\sin(2\pi x/l) - \lambda \sin(4\pi x/l)], \quad (11)$$

where $A > 0$ and λ are parameters. This potential is symmetric if $\lambda = 0$ or $\lambda = \infty$, and asymmetric otherwise. The potential height W , defined as the difference between the maximum and minimum values of V , is given by

$$W = 2(1 - 2\lambda c)\sqrt{1 - c^2} A, \quad (12)$$

where c is defined by

$$c = (1 - \sqrt{1 + 32\lambda^2})/8\lambda. \quad (13)$$

Note that this potential has a single minimum and a single maximum in each period if $0 \leq |\lambda| < 1/2$, while it has an extra pair of local minimum and maximum if $1/2 < |\lambda| < \infty$.




Fig. 1. The difference $D - \mu k_B T$ in units of D_0 as a function of the external force F in the dimensionless form (βFl) for the system with the potential given by eq. (11). The potential height is chosen as $W = 5.0 k_B T$, and the results for different values of parameter λ are shown. The inset presents the dependence of D/D_0 and $\mu k_B T/D_0$ on βFl in the case that $\beta W = 5.0$ and $\lambda = 0.25$.

The inset of Fig. 1 shows the dependence of D and $\mu k_B T$ on the external field F in the case that $\beta W = 5.0$ and $\lambda = 0.25$. It appears that D is always larger than $\mu k_B T$. However, closer inspection reveals that D is smaller than $\mu k_B T$ in a certain range of F near $F = 0$: See Fig. 1, where the difference $D - \mu k_B T$ is plotted against F in expanded scales for several values of λ with $\beta W = 5.0$; the results for negative values of λ is obtained from the corresponding results for $-\lambda$ (which is now positive) by changing the sign of F , as the symmetry property indicates. In the case of symmetric potential ($\lambda = 0$) we observe that $D \geq \mu k_B T$ (the equality holds when $F = 0$).

For potentials with positive (negative) λ , we find that $D < \mu k_B T$ in a range $0 < F < F_0$ ($F_0 < F < 0$) of F where the upper (lower) bound F_0 depends on λ , W and β . Figure 2 shows the dependence of $\beta F_0 l$ on βW for several values of positive λ . One sees that $\beta F_0 l$ is a monotonically increasing function of βW . If $\lambda \leq 1/2$ (the solid lines in Fig. 2), the value of $\beta F_0 l$ for a fixed βW decreases with decreasing λ and becomes zero as $\lambda = 0$ is approached. By contrast, $\beta F_0 l$ decreases with increasing λ when $\lambda \geq 1$ (the dashed lines in Fig. 2). These behaviors may be summarized that as the potential becomes symmetric, the range of F in which inequality $D < \mu k_B T$ holds shrinks to zero.

4. Conjectures

We have calculated D and μ numerically for various periodic potentials $V(x)$ in addition to the one described in the preceding section; some of the results will be presented in the following




Fig. 2. The upper bound F_0 of the interval for external force in which inequality $D < \mu k_B T$ holds is plotted as a function of the potential height W for the system with the potential given by eq. (11). The results for different choices of parameter λ are shown.

section. We have also carried out analytic study on the sign of $D - \mu k_B T$ in several limiting cases, which will be discussed in the next section. From the results of these investigations, we have been lead to postulate the following conjectures.

- (i) Inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ holds for arbitrary *symmetric* potentials V .
- (ii) Suppose that the potential is *asymmetric* and has a single minimum and a single maximum in each period. Let a be the distance from a minimum to the adjacent maximum on the right (see Fig. 3). Then, we have $D < \mu k_B T$ for $0 < F < F_0$ ($F_0 < F < 0$) and $D \geq \mu k_B T$ outside this interval of F if $a > l/2$ ($a < l/2$), where F_0 is a positive (negative) constant that depends on potential $V(x)$ and temperature T .

Note that in the example considered in the preceding section distance a is given by

$$a = (l/\pi) \arccos c, \tag{14}$$

where c is defined by eq. (13), and hence condition $a > l/2$ corresponds to $\lambda > 0$. Therefore, the results shown in Fig. 1 are consistent with these conjectures.

5. Evidence

The conjectures stated in the preceding section are based on the analyses presented in this section. We first describe the analytical investigations, in several limiting cases, into the sing of $D - \mu k_B T$ using formula (8). Then, considering the results of these investigations and supplementary numerical calculations, we will argue for the validity of the conjectures.




Fig. 3. Two examples of periodic potential $V(x)$ of period l that has a single minimum and a single maximum in a period are schematically shown. The one represented by the solid line has rounded peaks at its maxima and rounded valleys at its minima, while the one represented by the dashed line has cusps at its maxima. The location of a minimum is x_0 , and the distance from this minimum to the adjacent maximum on the right is a . The potential height W is defined as the difference between the maximum and minimum values (V_{\max} and V_{\min}) of V .

5.1 Small external force

The first limiting case we study is the case of small external force represented by condition $\beta|F|l \ll 1$. In this case the factor s defined by eq. (10) may be expanded in powers of βFl as

$$s = s_0 + s_1\beta Fl + s_2(\beta Fl)^2 + \dots \quad (15)$$

In order to express the expansion coefficients s_0 , s_1 and so on concisely, we introduce periodic functions (of period l) $\psi_{\pm}(x)$ and $\chi_{\pm}(x)$ by

$$\psi_{\pm}(x) = e^{\pm\beta V(x)} / \langle e^{\pm\beta V} \rangle \quad (16)$$

and

$$\chi_{\pm}(x) = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^x [\psi_{\pm}(y) - 1] dy. \quad (17)$$

It is not difficult to see that periodic functions $I_{\pm}(x)$ defined by eq. (2) can be expressed as

$$I_{\pm}(x) = \langle e^{\mp\beta V} \rangle e^{\pm\beta V(x)} \{ 1 - \beta Fl [1/2 \mp \chi_{\mp}(x) \pm \langle \chi_{\mp} \rangle] + O[(\beta Fl)^2] \}. \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the normalized functions $J_{\pm}(x)$ defined by eq. (4) are given by

$$J_{\pm}(x) = \psi_{\pm}(x) \{ 1 \pm \beta Fl [\chi_{\mp}(x) - \langle \psi_{\pm} \chi_{\mp} \rangle] + O[(\beta Fl)^2] \}, \quad (19)$$

from which the following expression for $K_{\pm}(x)$ defined by eq. (9) is obtained:

$$K_{\pm}(x) = \chi_{\pm}(x) \pm \beta F \int_0^x \psi_{\pm}(y) [\chi_{\mp}(y) - \langle \psi_{\pm} \chi_{\mp} \rangle] dy + O[(\beta Fl)^2]. \quad (20)$$

Substituting eqs. (19) and (20) into eq. (10), one finds

$$s_0 = \langle (\psi_+ - 1)\chi_- \rangle \quad (21)$$

and

$$s_1 = \langle \psi_+ \chi_-^2 \rangle - \langle \psi_+ \chi_- \rangle^2 + \langle \psi_- \chi_+^2 \rangle - \langle \psi_- \chi_+ \rangle^2. \quad (22)$$

It is worth noting that coefficient s_1 cannot be negative:

$$s_1 \geq 0, \quad (23)$$

where the equality holds only in the trivial case of a constant potential V . This property comes from the Schwarz inequality

$$\langle \psi_{\pm} \rangle \langle \psi_{\pm} \chi_{\mp}^2 \rangle \geq \langle \psi_{\pm} \chi_{\mp} \rangle^2 \quad (24)$$

and identity $\langle \psi_{\pm} \rangle = 1$ resulting from the definition (16) of ψ_{\pm} ; the equality in eq. (24) holds if and only if χ_{\pm} is a constant (i.e., V is a constant).

By contrast, the leading term s_0 in expansion (15) can be positive or negative. However, in the case of symmetric potential, i.e., if there exists a constant α such that $V(x) = V(2\alpha - x)$ holds for any x , we have $s_0 = 0$. The reason is the following: for such a symmetric potential, $\psi_{\pm}(x)$ is symmetric and $\chi_{\mp}(x)$ is antisymmetric about $x = \alpha$, hence we obtain $\langle \psi_{\pm} \chi_{\mp} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \chi_{\mp} \rangle = 0$, which imply $s_0 = 0$. This fact and inequality (23) indicate that inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ holds for any symmetric potentials as long as F is small, which supports conjecture (i) stated in the preceding section.

In the case of asymmetric potential, it is expected that $s_0 \neq 0$. Then, what property of V determines the sign of s_0 (i.e., the sign of $D - \mu k_B T$ for small F)? It seems difficult to answer this question for arbitrary potentials. However, if we restrict our attention to a certain class of potentials, we can, at least partly, answer the question. Let us consider a potential that has only one minimum and one maximum in a period, as shown in Fig. 3. Let x_0 be the location of a minimum, a be the distance from a minimum to the adjacent maximum on the right, W be the potential height defined as the difference between the maximum and minimum values of V . The potential V may have a rounded peak at its maximum and a rounded valley at its minimum as shown by the solid line in Fig. 3. It may have a cusp at its maximum (the dashed line in Fig. 3), or at its minimum, or at both. We shall analyze the sign of s_0 in the limiting cases of large potential height ($\beta W \gg 1$) and small potential height ($\beta W \ll 1$).

Let us consider the case of large potential height, $\beta W \gg 1$. In order to make the analysis simple, we assume that the origin of the x axis is chosen in such a way that condition $0 < x_0 < x_0 + a < l$ is satisfied. In evaluating s_0 given by eq. (21), it is noted that function $\psi_+(x)$ has a sharp peak at $x = x_0 + a$ and vanishes rapidly as one moves away from the peak. Therefore s_0 can be approximated by

$$s_0 \simeq \langle \psi_+ \rangle \chi_-(x_0 + a) - \langle \chi_- \rangle, \quad (25)$$

since $\chi_-(x)$ does not vary rapidly in the vicinity of $x = x_0 + a$ as we shall see in a moment. Function $\chi_-(x)$ defined by eq. (17) is the sum of

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^x \psi_-(y) dy \quad (26)$$

and $-x/l$. Since the integrand $\psi_-(y)$ in eq. (26) is practically zero except a narrow region around the sharp peak at $y = x_0$, function $\sigma(x)$ behaves like a step function: as x is increased from zero to l , $\sigma(x)$ increases rapidly from zero to unity around $x = x_0$. Therefore, $\chi_-(x)$ is well approximated by $\chi_-(x) \simeq 1 - x/l$ near $x = x_0 + a$ and it does not change rapidly in the vicinity of $x = x_0 + a$. We also find that $\langle \chi_- \rangle = 1/2 - x_0/l$ if the small correction of order $1/\beta W$ is neglected. From these arguments and identity $\langle \psi_+ \rangle = 1$ we obtain

$$s_0 \simeq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{a}{l}. \quad (27)$$

This expression for s_0 reveals that the sign of s_0 is determined by whether the location of the top of the potential hill between a pair of neighboring valleys is closer to the left valley ($a/l < 1/2$) or the right one ($a/l > 1/2$), which supports conjecture (ii) in the preceding section.

Now we turn our attention to the case of small potential height, $\beta W \ll 1$. It will be assumed that (an arbitrary constant is added to V such that) the maximum and minimum values of V are of order W . Then condition $\beta W \ll 1$ implies $|\beta V| \ll 1$. Expanding $\psi_{\pm}(x)$ and $\chi_{\pm}(x)$ defined by eqs. (16) and (17) in powers of βV , and then substituting them into eq. (21), we obtain

$$s_0 = -\beta^3 \langle (V^2 - \langle V^2 \rangle) \mathcal{V} \rangle + O[(\beta V)^4], \quad (28)$$

where periodic function $\mathcal{V}(x)$ of period l is defined by

$$\mathcal{V}(x) = \frac{1}{l} \int_0^x [V(y) - \langle V \rangle] dy. \quad (29)$$

Unlike the case of $\beta W \gg 1$, we have not been able to relate the sign of s_0 approximated by eq. (28) to that of $l/2 - a$ for general asymmetric potentials. Here we investigate the sign of s_0 for three examples of potential $V(x)$. The first example is the one considered in Sec. 3, see eq. (11). The second example is a piecewise-cubic function given by

$$V(x) = A\{(x/l)^2 + \lambda(x/l)[1 - 4(x/l)^2]\} \quad (|x| \leq l/2), \quad (30)$$

where A and λ are parameters; $V(x)$ outside the range $|x| \leq l/2$ is defined such that it is a periodic function of period l . We shall assume that $A > 0$ and $|\lambda| < 1/2$. Then $V(x)$ has a cusp at its maximum, as the one represented by the dashed line in Fig. 3 does. The distance a from a minimum to the adjacent maximum on the right is given by

$$a = l \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{1 + \sqrt{1 + 12\lambda^2}} \right), \quad (31)$$

Table I. Approximate expression for s_0 given as the leading term in eq. (28) obtained for three examples of $V(x)$.

	Example 1	Example 2	Example 3
$V(x)$	eq. (11)	eq. (30)	eq. (33)
s_0	$-\frac{3\lambda(\beta A)^3}{16\pi}$	$-\frac{\lambda(\beta A)^3}{1575}\left(\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{11}\lambda^2\right)$	$\frac{(\beta W)^3}{360}\left(1 - \frac{2a}{l}\right)$

and the potential height W by

$$W = A \left[\frac{2}{9} + \frac{1 + 12\lambda^2}{18(1 + \sqrt{1 + 12\lambda^2})} \right]. \quad (32)$$

The third example is a piecewise-linear (sawtooth) potential

$$V(x) = \begin{cases} Wx/a & 0 \leq x < a \\ W(l-x)/(l-a) & a \leq x < l, \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

where W and a are positive parameters with restriction $0 < a < l$; again, $V(x)$ outside the range $0 \leq x < l$ is defined such that it is a periodic function of period l . Parameter W represents the potential height, and parameter a corresponds to the distance from a minimum of $V(x)$ and the adjacent maximum on the right.

For each example, the leading term of s_0 given in eq. (28) has been calculated. The results are summarized in Table I. In all the three examples the sign of s_0 is the same as that of $l/2 - a$ (remember that $l/2 > a$ if $\lambda < 0$ in the first two examples). This observation is consistent with conjecture (ii).

It is interesting to note that s_0 is of higher order in βW than

$$s_1 = 2\beta^2 (\langle \mathcal{V}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{V} \rangle^2) + O[(\beta V)^3] \quad (34)$$

in the case of small potential height. This fact implies that s change its sign at small βFl when the latter is varied. Let F_0 be the value of F at which s changes its sign, then one finds from eq. (15) that

$$\beta F_0 l \simeq -\frac{s_0}{s_1} \simeq \frac{\beta \langle (V^2 - \langle V^2 \rangle) \mathcal{V} \rangle}{2(\langle \mathcal{V}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{V} \rangle^2)}, \quad (35)$$

which is of order βW . For the first example considered above, we obtain

$$\beta F_0 l \simeq \frac{3\pi\lambda}{4(1 + \lambda^2/4)} \beta A. \quad (36)$$

This relation and eq. (12) explain the behavior of the graphs in Fig. 2 near the origin.

5.2 Large external force

If the external force F is large enough ($\beta|F|l \gg 1$), the dominant contribution to the integral in eq. (2) defining $I_{\pm}(x)$ comes from the narrow region near $y = 0$ (if $F > 0$) or $y = l$

(if $F < 0$). Therefore, $I_{\pm}(x)$ may be expanded as

$$I_{\pm}(x) \simeq \frac{e^{\pm\beta V(x)}}{l} \int_0^{\infty} [h_{\mp}(0) + yh'_{\mp}(0) + \dots] e^{-\beta Fy} dy \quad (37)$$

if $F > 0$, where $h_{\mp}(y) = e^{\mp\beta V(x \mp y)}$, and $h'_{\mp}(y)$ is the derivative of $h_{\mp}(y)$. A similar expansion in the case of $F < 0$ can be made. Using these expansions, periodic functions $I_{\pm}(x)$, $J_{\pm}(x)$, and $K_{\pm}(x)$ are expressed as the power series in $1/F$. Substitution of $J_{+}(x)$ and $K_{-}(x)$ thus obtained into eq. (10) yields

$$s = \frac{1}{\beta Fl} \left[\frac{2\langle(V')^2\rangle}{F^2} + \frac{5\langle(V')^3\rangle}{F^3} + O\left(\frac{1}{F^4}\right) \right], \quad (38)$$

where $V'(x)$ is the derivative of potential $V(x)$. This expression is valid both for $F > 0$ and for $F < 0$. The leading term of s given by eq. (38) has the same sign as that of F and hence inequality $D > \mu k_{\text{B}}T$ holds if $|F|$ is large enough.

5.3 Small potential height

The last limiting case we study is the limit of small potential height; the strength of the external force F can be arbitrary. In this case we find it convenient to express the potential $V(x)$ in the Fourier series as

$$V(x) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{V}_n e^{ik_n x}, \quad k_n = \frac{2\pi}{l}n. \quad (39)$$

In the integrand of eq. (2), factor $e^{\mp\beta V(x \mp y)}$ is expanded in powers of $\beta V(x \mp y)$ and then eq. (39) is substituted to carry out the integral. Once $I_{\pm}(x)$ are obtained in this way, it is straightforward to calculate $J_{\pm}(x)$ and $K_{\pm}(x)$. Substituting the resulting expressions for $J_{+}(x)$ and $K_{-}(x)$ into eq. (10), we have

$$s = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{4\beta F k_n^2 |\beta \hat{V}_n|^2}{l[(\beta F)^2 + k_n^2]^2} + O[(\beta V)^3]. \quad (40)$$

The sign of the leading term in this expression for s is the same as that of F , and hence inequality $D > \mu k_{\text{B}}T$ holds if βW is small enough.

It is noted that in the limit of small βFl the leading term in eq. (40) approaches to

$$4\beta Fl \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\beta \hat{V}_n|^2}{(lk_n)^2} = 2\beta^2(\langle\mathcal{V}^2\rangle - \langle\mathcal{V}\rangle^2)\beta Fl. \quad (41)$$

This expression agrees with the leading term of eq. (34) multiplied by βFl . This is expected from the consistency of the analysis. Similarly, the term of order $(\beta V)^3$ in eq. (40) should converge to the first term of s_0 given in eq. (27) in the limit $F \rightarrow 0$, which we have not checked. In the opposite limit, $\beta|F|l \gg 1$, the leading term in eq. (40) converges to the leading term in eq. (38), because $\sum_n k_n^2 |\hat{V}_n|^2 = \langle(V')^2\rangle$.

5.4 Symmetric potentials

Here, we consider the case of symmetric potential and argue for the validity of conjecture (i). In this case, s is an odd function of F ($D - \mu k_B T$ is an even function of F), and therefore we need to examine the sign of s only for $F \geq 0$. Remember that $s > 0$ is equivalent to $D > \mu k_B T$ when $F > 0$. It has been shown that

$$s \simeq s_1 \beta F l \quad (42)$$

with $s_1 > 0$ for small $\beta F l$ (§5.1) and $s \simeq 2\langle(V')^2\rangle/\beta F^3 l$ for large $\beta F l$ (§5.2). Hence, it is concluded that inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ holds (the equality holds when $F = 0$) in these two extremes. Furthermore, this inequality has been found to be valid in the entire range of F if the potential height is small compared to the temperature (§5.3).

In order to assert the validity of conjecture (i), we have to demonstrate that $s > 0$ for intermediate values of $\beta F l$ when βW is not small. For this purpose, numerical calculations of $s = (D - \mu k_B T)/vl$ are carried out using formula

$$s = \frac{\langle I_+^2 I_- \rangle - \langle I_+ \rangle \langle I_+ I_- \rangle}{\langle I_+ \rangle^2 (1 - e^{-\beta F l})} \quad (43)$$

obtained from (5), (6) and (7); as remarked earlier, this method of evaluating s is more convenient for numerical calculations than using formula (10). Symmetric potentials $V(x)$ of the following type are examined:

$$V(x) = A \sum_{n=1}^N c_n \cos(2n\pi x/l), \quad (44)$$

where N is a positive integer, c_n are arbitrary coefficients, and the overall factor A is determined such that the potential height is W for given values of W and c_1, c_2, \dots, c_N .

Figure 4 shows the numerical results for a potential with an arbitrarily chosen set of coefficients $\{c_n\}$ in the case of $N = 3$. Here, s is plotted as a function of $\beta F l$ for several values of βW . As F is increased from zero, s starts to increase linearly in F as eq. (42) predicts and it continues to increase until it reaches a maximum value, and then decreases monotonically. Qualitatively the same behavior of s are observed for other potentials corresponding to different sets of $\{c_n\}$ with $N = 3$ or $N = 5$ (data not shown), which strongly suggests the validity of conjecture (i).

In Fig. 4, the analytic results, the leading terms in eqs. (40) and (38), are also plotted. It is remarkable that the approximate expression (40), which is valid for small βW , agrees quite well with the numerical results for βW as large as $\beta W \simeq 1$. For βW larger than about unity, the dependence of s on F is well approximated by the leading term of eq. (38) if F is larger than a few to several times the maximum slope $V'_{\max} = \max_x \{V'(x)\}$ of potential $V(x)$; in the example shown in Fig. 4, $V'_{\max} \simeq 8.1W/l$.

In addition to the numerical analysis concerning the dependence of s on F , shown in Fig. 4, for more than ten different potentials, we have carried out more extensive search for




Fig. 4. Dependence of s on βFl numerically obtained for a symmetric potential (44) with $N = 3$ and $c_1 = 0.265947$, $c_2 = 0.823433$, $c_3 = -0.522984$; the inset depicts the potential function. The results for different choices of potential height W are shown. The dashed line represents the analytic expression (40) valid for small βW , and the dash-dotted lines indicate the leading term in eq. (38) for large βFl . It is remarked that the graphs of 10 times s instead of s are plotted for $\beta W = 1.0$.

possibility of negative s . Symmetric potentials expressed by eq. (44) with $N = 3$ and those with $N = 5$ are studied. For a given N , every coefficient c_n ($n = 1, 2, \dots, N$) is chosen from a random number uniformly distributed in interval $(-1, 1)$. For each set $\{c_n\}$ of the coefficients, the potential height W is chosen from a uniform random number in interval $(0, W_{\max})$ where W_{\max} is set to be $20k_B T$; and for a given W , the external force F is chosen from a uniform random number in $(0, F_{\max}(W))$ where F_{\max} is set to be $2V'_{\max}$. We have examined 1000 sets of $\{c_n\}$ and 300 sets of $\{W, F\}$ for each set of $\{c_n\}$ in the case of $N = 3$, and 2000 sets of $\{c_n\}$ and 100 sets of $\{W, F\}$ in the case of $N = 5$. In the data of these 5×10^5 samples we have not detected any instance in which $s < 0$.

All these analytical and numerical investigations firmly indicate that the statement of conjecture (i) should be true.

5.5 Asymmetric potentials

Now we discuss conjecture (ii) associated with asymmetric potentials. If the potential height is small ($\beta W \ll 1$), the analyses of §5.1 and §5.3 show that inequality $D > \mu k_B T$ holds for almost entire range of F except a small interval of order W/l . This interval is given by $0 < F < F_0$ or $F_0 < F < 0$ depending on the sign of F_0 given by eq. (36).

If the potential height is not small, we do not have enough evidence to support conjecture (ii). It is true that $D - \mu k_B T$ change its sign at $F = 0$ when F is varied (§5.1) and that it is

positive for large enough $|F|$ (§5.2). Furthermore, it is shown (§5.1) that in the case of large potential height ($\beta W \gg 1$) we have $D < \mu k_B T$ for $F > 0$ ($F < 0$) if $a > l/2$ ($a < l/2$) and $|F|$ is small. These results are consistent with conjecture (ii), but we are not certain, from the analytical study given above, whether there is only one interval on the F axis (as the conjecture states) where inequality $D \geq \mu k_B T$ is not satisfied. The numerical investigation presented in §3 for potential given by eq. (11) and a similar one (data not shown) for the piecewise-linear potential (33) support the validity of conjecture (ii).

6. Conclusion

We have postulated two conjectures (§4) concerning the diffusion coefficient and the differential mobility of a Brownian particle moving in a one-dimensional periodic potential under the influence of a uniform external force. We are quite certain about the validity of conjecture (i) associated with symmetric potentials (§5.4). It should be possible to prove it mathematically, although we have not yet succeeded. Conjecture (ii) related with asymmetric potentials is partly speculative (§5.5).

The ratio $\Theta = D/\mu k_B T$ may be interpreted as an effective temperature^{5,6} of the system in nonequilibrium steady state. Then, our conjectures imply that the effective temperature is higher than the temperature of the heat bath if the potential is symmetric or if the external force is not too small in the case of asymmetric potential.

Very recently Hayashi and Sasa¹⁰ have reported an alternative inequality associated with the diffusion coefficient and the differential mobility. They have proved that inequality $D/D_0 \geq (\mu k_B T/D_0)^2$ holds in general for the system considered in the present work.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank F. Matsubara, T. Nakamura, K. Hayashi, S. Sasa and T. Harada for useful comments and discussions.

Appendix: Derivation of eq. (8)

Our derivation of formula (8) is based on a prescription to calculate the diffusion coefficient from the solution to the Fokker-Planck equation.^{4,8,9} Let $P(x)$ be the probability distribution function of the particle in the steady state. It satisfies the Fokker-Planck equation

$$D_0 \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{dU}{dx} \right) P(x) = 0 \quad (\text{A}\cdot 1)$$

for the steady state. We assume that $P(x)$ is periodic [$P(x+l) = P(x)$] and normalized such that $\int_0^l P(x) dx = 1$. Such a solution is found to be given by

$$P(x) = J_-(x)/l. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 2)$$

The average velocity v can be calculated from $P(x)$ as

$$v = -lD_0 \left(\frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{dU}{dx} \right) P(x), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 3)$$

and this leads to formula (5). Note that the right-hand side in eq. (A·3) is independent of x due to the Fokker-Planck equation (A·1). In order to calculate the diffusion coefficient D , we need to solve the differential equation

$$D_0 \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{dU}{dx} \right) Q(x) = \left(v + D_0 \frac{d}{dx} \right) P(x) - \frac{v}{l} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 4)$$

for $Q(x)$, where $P(x)$ is the probability distribution function given by eq. (A·2). The diffusion coefficient is calculated from a periodic solution $Q(x) = Q(x + l)$ to eq. (A·4) as

$$D = D_0 - \int_0^l \left(\beta D_0 \frac{dU}{dx} + v \right) Q(x) dx. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 5)$$

Any periodic solution Q yields the same result for D . Festa and d'Agliano⁹ solved eq. (A·4) in the case of no external force ($F = 0$), and obtained a formula for D , which is similar to eq. (7) but much simpler. Here, we solve eq. (A·4) in the case of nonzero external force, and derive eq. (8).

Integrating eq. (A·4) once, we have

$$\left(\frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{dU}{dx} \right) Q(x) = q(x), \quad (\text{A}\cdot 6)$$

where $q(x)$ is given by

$$q(x) = J_-(x)/l + vK_-(x)/D_0. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 7)$$

Here, $K_-(x)$ is defined in eq. (9). We have chosen the integration constant arbitrarily to get $q(x)$ in eq. (A·6), since any periodic solution $Q(x)$ is acceptable as remarked above. Integrating eq. (A·6), we arrive at

$$Q(x) = -\frac{e^{-\beta U(x)}}{1 - e^{-\beta Fl}} \int_0^l e^{\beta U(x+y)} q(x+y) dy \quad (\text{A}\cdot 8)$$

after some manipulations. This time, the integration constant has been determined such that $Q(x)$ is periodic.

Now we substitute eq. (A·8) into eq. (A·5) to study the diffusion coefficient. Making use of eq. (A·6) and the periodicity of $Q(x)$, we rewrite eq. (A·5) as

$$D = D_0 - D_0 \int_0^l q(x) dx - v \int_0^l Q(x) dx. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 9)$$

The second term, without the minus sign, on the right-hand side in this equation reads

$$D_0 \int_0^l q(x) dx = D_0 + vl \langle K_- \rangle, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 10)$$

according to the definitions of $q(x)$ and $J_-(x)$. Insertion of eq. (A·8) into the third term in eq.(A·9) yields the integral

$$\int_0^l dx e^{-\beta U(x)} \int_0^l dy e^{\beta U(x+y)} q(x+y) = l \int_0^l I_+(x) q(x) dx, \quad (\text{A}\cdot 11)$$

where the right-hand side is obtained by interchanging the order of integral and by using the fact that $U(x+y) - U(x)$ and $q(x)$ are periodic functions of x . From this identity and eqs. (A·8) and (5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} v \int_0^l Q(x) dx &= -D_0 \int_0^l J_+(x)q(x) dx \\ &= -\mu k_B T - vl \langle J_+ K_- \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A}\cdot 12)$$

where the second equality is due to eqs. (A·7) and (6). Substitution of eqs. (A·10) and (A·12) into eq. (A·9) gives eq. (8).

The equivalence between formula (8) for the diffusion coefficient and the one, eq. (7), obtained by other authors can be shown as follows. Since it can be seen by integration by parts that $\langle (J_+ - 1)K_+ \rangle = 0$, eq. (8) may be written as

$$D = \mu k_B T + vl \langle (J_+ - 1)(K_- - K_+) \rangle. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 13)$$

Now, it is not difficult to see from the definitions of $J_{\pm}(x)$ that

$$\frac{d}{dx} [J_-(x)J_+(x)] = \frac{(1 - e^{-\beta Fl})[J_-(x) - J_+(x)]}{l \langle I_{\pm} \rangle}. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 14)$$

This relation and the definition (9) of $K_{\pm}(x)$ lead to

$$K_-(x) - K_+(x) = \frac{[J_+(x)J_-(x) - J_+(0)J_-(0)] \langle I_{\pm} \rangle}{1 - e^{-\beta Fl}}. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 15)$$

Substituting this equation into eq. (8) and using formula (5) for v , we find

$$D = \mu k_B T + D_0 \langle J_+^2 J_- \rangle - D_0 \langle J_+ J_- \rangle. \quad (\text{A}\cdot 16)$$

Here, the first and the third terms on the right-hand side cancel out due to eq. (6). Therefore eq. (A·16) is identical to formula (7), and the equivalence between eqs. (8) and (7) has been proved.

References

- 1) R. Kubo, M. Toda and N. Hashitsume: *Statistical Physics II: Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991) 2nd ed.
- 2) R. Zwanzig: *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2001).
- 3) P. Reimann, C. Van den Broeck, H. Linke, P. Hänggi, J.M. Rubi and A. Pérez-Madrid: Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 010602; Phys. Rev. **E65** (2002) 031104.
- 4) K. Sasaki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **72** (2003) 2497.
- 5) T. Harada and K. Yoshikawa: Phys. Rev. E **69** (2004) 021113.
- 6) K. Hayashi and S. Sasa: Phys. Rev. E **69** (2004) 066119.
- 7) R.L. Stratonovich: Radiotekhnika; elektronika **3** (1958) 497, as quoted by Refs.8 and 3.
- 8) H. Risken: *The Fokker-Planck Equation: Methods of Solutions and Applications* (Springer-verlag, Berlin, 1989) 2nd ed.
- 9) R. Festa and E. G. d'Agliano: Physica **90A** (1978) 229.
- 10) K. Hayashi and S. Sasa: cond-mat/0409537 (to be published in Phys. Rev. E).