

Nonexistence of time-reversibility in statistical physics

C. Y. Chen

Department of Physics, Beijing University of Aeronautics
and Astronautics, Beijing, 100083, P. R. China

Abstract: Contrary to the customary thought prevailing for long, the time reversibility associated with beam-to-beam collisions does not really exist. Related facts and consequences are presented. The discussion, though involving simple mathematics and physics only, is well-related to the foundation of statistical theory.

1 Introduction

More than one hundred years ago, the debate concerning time reversibility arose in a confusing way: Boltzmann derived his kinetic equation from the time reversibility of mechanics while the equation itself was of time irreversibility [1]. Even today, though a long time has passed and countless papers in the literature have revealed a variety of aspects of the issue, paradoxical things still bother some of us [2].

Here, it will be shown that the real problem of Boltzmann's theory is related not to the time irreversibility assumed by it, but to the time reversibility assumed by it. To make the topic more intriguing and more profound, the investigation will manifest that any attempt to formulate the 'true distribution function' will fail in the ultimate sense.

2 Particle-to-particle and beam-to-beam collisions

Before entering the detailed discussion, it is essential to establish distinction between particle-to-particle collisions and beam-to-beam collisions.

A particle-to-particle collision involves two individual particles. The time reversal symmetry of it has been fully elucidated in classical mechanics and it says that if the collision expressed by $(v_1; v_2) \rightarrow (v_1^0; v_2^0)$ is physically possible, where v_1, v_2 are respectively the velocities of the two particles

before the collision and v_1^0, v_2^0 after the collision, then the inverse collision expressed by $(v_1^0; v_2^0) \rightarrow (v_1; v_2)$ is also physically possible. This kind of time reversibility is not truly relevant to the subject herein and we shall not discuss it too much in this paper.

Beam-to-beam collisions, involving particle densities or distribution functions, are of great significance to statistical mechanics. For instance, Boltzmann's theory treats $f(v)dv$ as a beam and derives its formulation on the premise that certain types of time-reversibility are there.

However, we happen to realize that no time-reversibility of any form can be defined in the context of Boltzmann's theory. This conclusion is surprising, seems very imprudent and directly contradicts what has been embedded in our mind. In view of such strong resistance, it is felt that a very clear and very detailed discussion should be given. In this section the subject will be studied intuitively and in the next two sections mathematical investigations will be presented.




Figure 1: A candidate for time reversibility of beam-to-beam collision: (a) the original collisions; and (b) the inverse collisions.

Take a look at Fig. 1. Fig. 1a shows a process in which two beams with two definite velocities collide and the produced particles diverge in space. Fig. 1b illustrates the inverse process, in which converging beams collide and the produced particles form two definite beams. In no need of detailed discussion, we surely know that the first process makes sense in statistical mechanics while the second one does not.

3 Note time-reversibility in terms of cross sections

In the textbook treatment, the time reversibility concerning beam-to-beam collisions is expressed in terms of cross sections[1]:

$$(v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0) = (v_1^0; v_2^0 \rightarrow v_1; v_2); \quad (1)$$

where $(v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0)$ is defined in such a way that

$$N = (v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0) dv_1^0 dv_2^0 \quad (2)$$

represents the number of type-1 particles emerging, after collisions, between v_1^0 and $v_1^0 + dv_1^0$ per unit incident flux and unit time, while the type-2 particle emerges between v_2^0 and $v_2^0 + dv_2^0$.




Figure 2: Constraints imposed by the energy and momentum conservation laws.

Unfortunately, the cross section in (1) and (2) is ill-defined. Notice that the energy and momentum conservation laws state that (assuming every particle to have the same mass for simplicity)

$$c = c^0 \quad \text{and} \quad |j| = |j^0| \quad u; \quad (3)$$

where $2c = v_1 + v_2$, $2c^0 = v_1^0 + v_2^0$, $2u = v_2 - v_1$ and $2u^0 = v_2^0 - v_1^0$. Fig. 2a shows how v_1 and v_2 determine c and u , while Fig. 2b shows how c and u form four constraint constants on v_1^0 and v_2^0 . Notably, v_1^0 , as well as v_2^0 , falls on the spherical shell S of radius u in the velocity space, which will be called the accessible shell. With these constraints in mind, two

problems associated with the definition (2) will surface by themselves. The first is that, after dv_1^0 is specified, specifying dv_2^0 in the definition is a work overdone (since v_1^0 and v_2^0 are not independent of each other). The second is that the cross section should be defined in reference to surface elements rather than to volume elements.

To see the second problem aforementioned more vividly, let's consider dv_1^0 shown in Fig. 3a, which is cube-shaped with equal sides l . If we let σ denote the area density of particles on the accessible shell caused by unit flux of type-1 particles, the number of type-1 particles found in dv_1^0 can be expressed as $N = \sigma l^2$. Then, the cross section defined by (2) is equal to, with dv_2^0 omitted,

$$\sigma = \frac{N}{dv_1^0} = \frac{\sigma l^2}{l^3} = \frac{\sigma}{l}; \quad (4)$$

which depends on l and tends to infinity as the cube becomes smaller and smaller. Nevertheless, if dv_1^0 is chosen to be a slim box in Fig. 3b and the box becomes slimmer and slimmer, then σ tends to zero; if dv_1^0 is chosen to be a short box in Fig. 3c and the box becomes shorter and shorter, σ tends to infinity again. These representative examples inform us that the cross section defined by (2), and thus the time reversibility expressed by (1), does not mean anything.




Figure 3: In defining the cross section, the velocity volume elements dv_1^0 may take on different shapes.

As a matter of fact, the above problem can be examined more briefly. For any definite velocities v_1 and v_2 , the six components of v_1^0 and v_2^0 are under four constraint equations imposed by the energy-momentum conservation laws. This literally means that the free space of v_1^0 and v_2^0 is just two-dimensional and there are not enough degrees of freedom allowing us to define a cross section in reference to six-dimensional volume elements.

4 N o t i m e-reversibility in term s of velocity volum es

Another form of time reversibility is sin ultaneously em ployed in such textbooks[1]:

$$dv_1 dv_2 = dv_1^0 dv_2^0 : \quad (5)$$

It should be noted that there is a conceptual con ict between (1) and (5). In connection with (1), when incident particles have two de nite velocities the velocities of scattered particles are allowed to distribute over alm ost the entire velocity space; whereas, in connection with (5), an in nitesimal velocity range of incident particles strictly corresponds to another in nitesimal velocity range of scattered particles. Nevertheless, for purposes of this paper, we shall leave this con ict alone.

The m athem atical proof of (5) goes as follow s. First,

$$dv_1 dv_2 = kJk dc du \quad \text{with} \quad kJk = \frac{\partial (v_1; v_2)}{\partial (c; u)} : \quad (6)$$

Then,

$$dv_1^0 dv_2^0 = kJ^0k dc^0 du^0 \quad \text{with} \quad kJ^0k = \frac{\partial (v_1^0; v_2^0)}{\partial (c^0; u^0)} : \quad (7)$$

In view of that

$$kJk = kJ^0k; \quad c = c^0 \quad du = du^0; \quad (8)$$

we obtain (5).

Unfortunately again, the form ulation given above also involves errors. All equations in (6), (7) and (8) hold except $du = du^0$. Referring to Fig. 2, we nd that when u is a de nite vector, u distributes over a spherical shell, pointing in any direction. This means that if $du = u^2 du u$ is an in nite thin line-shaped volume element (say, du is in nitesimal while du nite), the corresponding volume element du^0 will be a spherical shell with nite thickness. It is then obvious that the two elements are not equal in volume.

The issue can be analyzed more econom ically in term s of variable transformation. If we identify $v_{1x}; v_{1y}; v_{1z}$ and $v_{2x}; v_{2y}; v_{2z}$ as six variables and identify $v_{1x}^0; v_{1y}^0; v_{1z}^0$ and $v_{2x}^0; v_{2y}^0; v_{2z}^0$ as six new variables, then we have

$$dv_1 dv_2 = kJk dv_1^0 dv_2^0 : \quad (9)$$

What has been proven by equations (6), (7) and (8) is nothing but $\hat{k}^2 = 1$. However, in order for (9) to make sense, there must exist six independent equations connecting those variables. In our case, we have four equations only. That is to say, the 'variable transformation' is incomplete and expression (9) is not truly legitimate.

It is instructive to look at the issues discussed in the last and this sections in a unifying way. If there were no single constraint equation, defining the cross section could make sense; if there were six independent constraint equations, defining the Jacobian would be meaningful. Since there are four and only four constraint equations, neither the cross section nor the Jacobian can be defined.

5 Formulation of beam-to-beam collisions

It is now rather clear that the concepts and methodologies of Boltzmann's theory are in need of reconsideration.

For instance, one of the major steps in deriving Boltzmann's equation is to identify $f(v_1^0)dv_1^0$ and $f(v_2^0)dv_2^0$ as two definite beams and then to determine how many beam-1 particles will emerge between v_1 and $v_1 + dv_1$ due to collisions of the two beams. As has been shown, this context leads to nothing but an absurd result: the number of such emerging particles actually depends on the size and shape of dv_1 , varying drastically from zero to infinity.

In what follows, we shall propose a new context to do the job. Surprisingly, the formulation will reveal some of deep-rooted properties of statistical mechanics.

To involve less details, we adopt the following assumptions: (i) The zeroth-order, collisionless, distribution function of the gas is completely known. (ii) Each particles, though belonging to the same species, is still distinguishable (which is possible in terms of classical mechanics). (iii) No particle collides twice or more. (General treatments can be accomplished along this line[3].)

Referring to Fig. 4, we consider that two typical beams, denoted by $f_1^{(0)}(v_1^0)dv_1^0$ and $f_2^{(0)}(v_2^0)dv_2^0$, collide with each other, and suppose that a particle detector has been placed somewhere in the region. Let S be the entry area of the detector and N_1 be the number of the beam-1 particles entering the detector within the velocity range $v_1 v_1^2 - v_1$ during dt . Since

any beam of the system can be regarded as the first beam, or the second beam, aforementioned, the total distribution function due to collisions is, at the detector entry,

$$f_1^{(1)}(t; r; v_1; S; v_1; \Omega_1) = \frac{\int_0^P \int_0^P N_1}{(\int_0^S v_1 dt) (\int_0^{\Omega_1} v_1^2 \Omega_1)}; \quad (10)$$

in which r is the representative position of S and v_1 is the representative velocity of $v_1 \Omega_1^2 \Omega_1$. According to the customary thought, when S , v_1 and Ω_1 shrink to zero simultaneously, expression (10) stands for the 'true distribution function' there; for reasons to be clear a bit later, we shall, in the following formulation, assume that S and v_1 are infinitely small while Ω_1 is kept fixed and finite (though rather small). The spatial region Ω_1 , that has been shaded in Fig. 4 and 'opposite' to the velocity solid-angle range Ω_1 in (10), will be called the effective cone. It is intuitively obvious that the particles that collide somewhere in the effective cone and move, after the collision, toward the detector entry along their free trajectories will contribute to N_1 . (Even if such particles are allowed to collide again, some of them will still arrive at the detector freely, which means the concept of effective cone holds its significance rather generally.)




Figure 4: Two beams collide and a particle detector is placed in the region.

Observing the colliding beams in the center-of-mass reference frame, we find that the number of collisions in a volume element dr^0 , which is located inside the effective cone, can be represented by, as in Boltzmann's theory,

$$[dr^0 f_1^{(0)}(v_1^0) dv_1^0] [f_2^{(0)}(v_2^0) dv_2^0] [2u_c(u^0; u) d\Omega_c dt]; \quad (11)$$

where Ω_c is the solid angle between u^0 and u , and $\sigma_c(u^0; u)$ is the cross section in the center-of-mass frame. By integrating (27) over the effective cone and

taking account of all the particles that are registered by the detector, the right side of (10) becomes

$$\int_1^Z dr^0 \int_{v_1-1}^Z d_c \int_1^Z dv_1^0 \int_{v_1-1}^Z dv_2^0 \frac{2u_c(u^0;u)f_1^{(0)}(v_1^0)f_2^{(0)}(v_2^0)}{(j^2 - f^2 - v_1^2 - v_1^2 - 1)}; \quad (12)$$

where Ω_0 is the solid-angle range formed by a representative point in dr^0 (as the apex) and the detector entry area S (as the base). In view of that S is truly small and v_1-1 is fixed and finite by our assumption, we know that $\Omega_0 \approx \Omega_1$ and every particle starting its free journey from the effective cone and entering the detector can be treated as one emerging within v_1-1 . Then, we can rewrite expression (12) as, with help of the variable transformation from $(v_1^0;v_2^0)$ to $(c^0;u^0)$,

$$\int_1^Z dr^0 \int_{v_1-1}^Z d_c \int_0^Z dc^0 \int_0^Z du^0 kJk \frac{2u_c(u^0;u)f_1^{(0)}(c^0-u^0)f_2^{(0)}(c^0+u^0)}{(j^2 - f^2 - v_1^2 - v_1^2 - 1)}; \quad (13)$$

in which $kJk = \Omega(v_1^0;v_2^0) = \Omega(c^0;u^0)$ and the subindex v_1-1 has been replaced by v_1-0 . In view of the energy-momentum conservation laws, we arrive at

$$\int_1^Z dr^0 \int_0^Z dc^0 \int_0^Z d u^0 \int_{v_1-0}^Z d_c \int_0^Z du \frac{2u_c(u^0;u)f_1^{(0)}(c^0-u^0)f_2^{(0)}(c^0+u^0)}{(j^2 - f^2 - v_1^2 - v_1^2 - 1)}; \quad (14)$$




Figure 5: The relation between the velocity element $v_1^2 - v_1^2 - 0$ and the velocity element $u^2 du d_c$.

By examining the situation shown in Fig. 5, which is drawn in the velocity space, the following relation can be found out:

$$\int_{v_1=0}^{\infty} u^2 du d\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{2} v_1 v_0 : \quad (15)$$

Therefore, the distribution function due to collisions is equal to

$$f_1^{(1)}(t; \mathbf{r}; \mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{c}_1) = \frac{1}{v_1} \int_{\mathbf{c}_1=0}^{\infty} d\mathbf{r}^0 \int_{\mathbf{c}^0=0}^{\infty} d\mathbf{u}^0 \frac{2kT k_c(u^0; \mathbf{u}) f_1^{(0)}(\mathbf{c}^0 - \mathbf{u}^0) f_2^{(0)}(\mathbf{c}^0 + \mathbf{u}^0)}{u^2 \mathbf{r}^0 \cdot \mathbf{r}^0}; \quad (16)$$

in which u is determined by $u = |\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{v}_1|$ (\mathbf{v}_1 is in principle along the direction of $\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^0$) and u^0 by u and \mathbf{u}^0 . It should be noted that $f_1^{(1)}$ in (16) differs from that in (10) in the sense that S and \mathbf{v}_1 cease to be arguments and \mathbf{v}_1 takes the place of \mathbf{v}_1 .

If the zeroth-order distribution functions depend on time and space, the replacement

$$f_1^{(0)}(\mathbf{c}^0 - \mathbf{u}^0) f_2^{(0)}(\mathbf{c}^0 + \mathbf{u}^0) \rightarrow f_1^{(0)}(t^0; \mathbf{r}^0; \mathbf{c}^0 - \mathbf{u}^0) f_2^{(0)}(t^0; \mathbf{r}^0; \mathbf{c}^0 + \mathbf{u}^0) \quad (17)$$

needs to be taken, where $t^0 = t - \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 / v_1^2$ stands for the time delay.

Since \mathbf{c}_1 has been set finite, expression (16) is nothing but the distribution function averaged over \mathbf{c}_1 , which is not good enough according to the standard theory. At first glance, if we let \mathbf{c}_1 become smaller and smaller, expression (16) will finally represent the true distribution function there. However, the discussion after (12) has shown that if \mathbf{c}_1 shrinks to zero the definition of the effective cone will collapse and thus the entire formalism will no longer be valid.

A careful inspection tells us that, if we assumed S to be finite and \mathbf{c}_1 to be infinitesimal at the starting point, a different average distribution function, averaged over S , would be obtained. The fact that no distribution function can be determined if \mathbf{c}_1 and S simultaneously take on their infinitesimal values suggests that even in classical statistical mechanics there also exists an uncertainty principle. The connection between this uncertainty principle and the uncertainty principle in quantum mechanics remains to be seen.

In view of that the integration in (16) is carried out over an effective region defined by free trajectories of particles, this methodology has been named as a path-integral approach [3]. As (16) has partially shown, anything taking place in the effective region can make direct impact along 'free' paths and any macroscopic structures, continuous or not, will help shape microscopic structures elsewhere along 'free' paths. Concepts like the aforementioned, though appearing to be foreign from the viewpoint of differential approach, are in harmony with what takes place in realistic gases.

6 Summary

It has been shown that, when we concern ourselves with beam-to-beam collisions, part of the system's information has, knowingly or not, been disregarded, and the information loss is characterized by the fact that we have four and only four constraint equations (rather than six). Since statistical mechanics deals with beam-to-beam collisions, the time-reversibility related to each individual collision becomes irrelevant from the very beginning and will not reemerge at any later stage.

By proposing a new context in which what can be really measured in an experiment is of central interest, beam-to-beam collisions have been reformulated. The new formulation reveals that only distribution functions averaged over certain finite ranges make good physical sense.

Apparently, this paper raises many difficult questions related to the very foundation of statistical physics. Reference papers can be found in the regular and e-print literature [2, 3, 4].

Acknowledgments: The author is very grateful to professor Oliver Penrose, who reminded me of possibility of defining the cross section of delta-function type. Such definition and its possible consequences are discussed in Appendix A. This paper is supported by School of Science, BUAA, PRC.

Appendix A. An alternative cross section

As revealed in Sect. 3, the original cross section $\sigma(v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0)$ defined by (2) cannot be interpreted as a function of the usual kind due to the existence of the energy-momentum conservation laws. However, one may still wish to

define cross sections in which the time reversibility related to a collision of two particles plays a certain role. Interestingly, this can be done and doing so will help us to find out what kind of problems Boltzmann's equation really has.

If we adopt the definition of (2) and, at the same time, take the energy-momentum conservation laws into account, we are led to a cross section of delta-function type

$$(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0) = \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0)}{q \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1^0)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2^0)^2}{(\mathbf{v}_1)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2)^2}} \delta^3[(\mathbf{v}_1^0 + \mathbf{v}_2^0) - (\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2)] : \quad (18)$$

To work out the physical meaning of (18), we integrate the above expression over a finite but small volume element $\mathbf{v}_1^0 \mathbf{v}_2^0$

$$\int_{\mathbf{v}_1^0 \mathbf{v}_2^0} \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0)}{q \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1^0)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2^0)^2}{(\mathbf{v}_1)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2)^2}} \delta^3[(\mathbf{v}_1^0 + \mathbf{v}_2^0) - (\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2)] d\mathbf{v}_1^0 d\mathbf{v}_2^0 : \quad (19)$$

As shown in Sect. 3, these delta-functions define an accessible shell, denoted by S there, and the integration becomes

$$(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0) = S ; \quad (20)$$

where S is enclosed by $\mathbf{v}_1^0 \mathbf{v}_2^0$ (actually by one of \mathbf{v}_1^0 and \mathbf{v}_2^0 since the two are not independent of each other). By comparing this with the cross section defined in the center-of-mass system $\sigma_c(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{u}^0) d\mathbf{u}$, it is clear that

$$(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0) = \sigma_c(\mathbf{u}; \mathbf{u}^0) = u^2 : \quad (21)$$

The above formalism has illustrated that the introduced delta-functions make good sense as long as they are integrated over an adequate volume (finite or infinitely large). Similarly,

$$(\mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2) = \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2)}{q \frac{(\mathbf{v}_1^0)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2^0)^2}{(\mathbf{v}_1)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_2)^2}} \delta^3[(\mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2) - (\mathbf{v}_1^0 + \mathbf{v}_2^0)] : \quad (22)$$

With help of (21), we see that

$$(\mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0) = (\mathbf{v}_1^0; \mathbf{v}_2^0 \rightarrow \mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2) : \quad (23)$$

This reflects the fact that all collisions, including the original collision and the inverse collision, are of head-on type in the center-of-mass system.

It is now in order to find out whether or not the newly defined cross section is relevant to Boltzmann's equation. We first examine the particles leaving $dr dv_1$ during dt because of collisions. Following the textbook treatment, the number of collisions is represented by

$$2uf(v_1)dv_1][f(v_2)dr dv_2] (v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0)dt: \quad (24)$$

Integrating it over v_1^0, v_2^0 and v_2 yields, by virtue of (18), (20) and (21),

$$dt dr dv_1 \int^Z 2uf(v_1)f(v_2) \sigma_c(u; u^0)dv_2 d: \quad (25)$$

Dividing it by $dt dr dv_1$, we obtain the collision number per unit time and unit phase volume

$$\int^Z 2uf(v_1)f(v_2) \sigma_c(u; u^0)dv_2 d: \quad (26)$$

If we adopt the assumption that the above number is identical to the number of particles leaving the unit phase volume per unit time because of collisions (though a different conclusion is offered in Ref. 2), we find that the above derivation is entirely consistent with that in the standard approach.

Then, we examine the particles entering $dr dv_1$ during dt because of collisions (v_1 has been set finite for a reason that will be clarified). To make our discussion a bit simpler, it is assumed that there are only two incident beams

$$f(v_1^0) \rightarrow v_1^0 \text{ and } f(v_2^0) \rightarrow v_2^0: \quad (27)$$

Again, following the standard approach, we know that the collision number caused by the two beams within dr during dt is

$$2uf(v_1^0) \rightarrow v_1^0][f(v_2^0) \rightarrow v_2^0] (v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0)dt: \quad (28)$$

At this point, a sharp question arises. Can we identify these particles as those entering $dr dv_1$ during dt ? The answer is apparently a negative one. As one thing, only a small fraction of the scattering particles will enter v_1 , and the following integration needs to be done:

$$\int^Z \int_{v_1 \rightarrow v_2} 2uf(v_1^0) \rightarrow v_1^0 \int^Z f(v_2^0) \rightarrow v_2^0 \int^Z (v_1; v_2 \rightarrow v_1^0; v_2^0) dt dv_1 dv_2; \quad (29)$$

in which v_1 has to be finite, since the integrand contains delta-functions, while v_2 can be infinitely large. If we are interested in knowing the number of the entering particles per unit phase volume and unit time, we are supposed to evaluate

$$\lim_{dt \rightarrow 0, dr \rightarrow 0} \frac{N}{dt dr v_1}; \quad (30)$$

where N is nothing but expression (29). Unfortunately, there are problems. As one thing, it has just been pointed out that v_1 has to be finite. As another, expression (4) and the accompanying discussion have shown that the limit expressed by (30) does not exist.

The above discussion, verifiable with numerical computation, suggests that (i) The methodology of determining particles entering a phase volume element must be very different from that of determining particles leaving a phase volume element, namely there is no symmetry. (ii) Taking limits $dt \rightarrow 0$, $dr \rightarrow 0$ and $dv_1 \rightarrow 0$, simultaneously or not, can create unexpected problems. (iii) In order to formulate the collisional dynamics, new concepts and new methodologies are in need.

References

- [1] F. Reif, Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics, (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965, 1987, 1988 in English and German); L. E. Reichl A Modern Course in Statistical Physics, 2nd ed., (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1998).
- [2] C. Y. Chen, Il Nuovo Cimento B V 117B, 177 (2002), which reveals some problems of Boltzmann's equation; C. Y. Chen, Journal of Physics A, 6589, (2002), which discusses something that can actually challenge Liouville's theorem in quantum statistical physics.
- [3] C. Y. Chen, Perturbation Methods and Statistical Theories, in English, (International Academic Publishers, Beijing, 1999).
- [4] C. Y. Chen, cond-mat/0412396; physics/0312043, 0311120, 0305006, 0010015, 0006033, 0006009, 9908062; quant-ph/0009023, 0009015, 9911064, 9907058.