Chaotic Hypothesis, Fluctuation Theorem and Singularities

F. Bonetto,[1,2] G. Gallavotti,[3,4] A. Giuliani,[2,3] and F. Zamponi[4,5]

[1] *School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta Georgia 30332*
[2] *Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma* Tor Vergata, *V.le della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133, Roma, Italy*
[3] *INFN, Università di Roma* La Sapienza, *P. A. Moro 2, 00185, Roma, Italy*
[4] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma* La Sapienza, *P. A. Moro 2, 00185, Roma, Italy*
[5] *SOFT-INFM-CNR, Università di Roma* La Sapienza, *P. A. Moro 2, 00185, Roma, Italy*

The chaotic hypothesis has several implications which have generated interest in the literature because of their generality and because a few exact predictions are among them. However its application to Physics problems requires attention and can lead to apparent inconsistencies. In particular there are several cases that have been considered in the literature in which singularities are built in the models: for instance when among the forces there are Lennard-Jones potentials (which are infinite in the origin) and the constraints imposed on the system do not forbid arbitrarily close approach to the singularity even though the average kinetic energy is bounded. The situation is well understood in certain special cases in which the system is subject to Gaussian noise; here the treatment of rather general singular systems is considered and the predictions of the chaotic hypothesis for such situations are derived. The main conclusion is that the chaotic hypothesis is perfectly adequate to describe the singular physical systems we consider, *i.e.* deterministic systems with thermostat forces acting according to Gauss' principle for the constraint of constant total kinetic energy ("isokinetic Gaussian thermostats"), close and far from equilibrium. Near equilibrium it even predicts a fluctuation relation which, in deterministic cases with more general thermostat forces (*i.e.* not necessarily of Gaussian isokinetic nature), extends recent relations obtained in situations in which the thermostatting forces satisfy Gauss' principle. This relation agrees, where expected, with the fluctuation theorem for perfectly chaotic systems. The results are compared with some recent works in the literature.

PACS numbers: 47.52.+j, 05.45.-a, 05.70.Ln, 05.20.-y

Introduction

There is a quite strong interest in stationary states of systems subject to the action of non conservative forces. These forces perform work on the system while by suitable mechanisms heat is extracted, so that the system can stay in a statistically stationary state. Theoretical and experimental works are steadily becoming avalaible on the matter. Theoretical work implement the heat extraction in several ways introducing "thermostat models", which can be stochastic or deterministic forces.

A strong idealization of a system in a nonequilibrium steady state subject to deterministic forces is provided by the Anosov systems: their motion can be considered to be paradigm of chaotic behavior, playing in chaotic dynamics the role that harmonic motions play in regular dynamics. The chaoticity of the motions is immediately apparent from the definition of Anosov systems: locally around each point it has to be possible to draw three coordinate surfaces W_s, W_u, W such that segments of curves on W_s, W_u contract exponentially as time grows to $+\infty$ or, respectively, recedes to $-\infty$ while segments on W, the one dimensional "neutral" flow direction, neither expand nor contract. They change their length but keep it of the same order of the initial one. If the dynamics is described by a map the neutral direction is omitted in the definition.

The chaotic hypothesis, [1, 2], see below, proposes that chaotic systems should be considered as Anosov systems "for practical purposes". This has several consequences: in particular about fluctuations in time reversible models, where the hypothesis leads to severe constraints through the *Fluctuation Theorem.* This is a mathematical property of the large deviations function of the phase space contraction of a *time reversible* Anosov map S. However, some obvious restrictions, analogous to the ones that are (often tacitly) assumed when one says that the "pendulum is isochronous" or that phonons in a crystal correspond to "harmonic excitations", have to be taken into account when applying the hypothesis to realistic systems, which are not strictly Anosov systems.

The prediction has been tested in several simulations and we summarize the precise statement of it below: usually the results have been positive. However, there have been, in the literature, a few claims of failure of the chaotic hypothesis based on the apparent failure of the predictions of the fluctuation theorem. Here we concentrate on one such attempt, which studies systems violating the Anosov property because singularities of the interparticle potentials play an important role in the dynamics, [3]: a situation considered, correctly, in the literature as not important for most physical properties but which requires care if the fluctuation relation is specifically tested on such systems (in the same way care has to be used if isochrony is tested on a pendulum or harmonicity is tested in a crystal model).

Here we show that even in singular systems the chaotic hypothesis and the fluctuation theorem are not in con-

tradiction: we develop a theory that extends the fluctuation theorem to singular systems continuing ideas that were introduced to study a special Gaussian noise thermostat, [4], (this is a "random thermostat" not to be confused with the thermostats satisfying Gauss' principle for some non holonomic constraint, like the isokinetic constraint).

The structure of the paper is the following: in section I we recall the basic notations and statements, and some alternative formulations of the fluctuation relation. We discuss its (trivial) form in equilibrium and how one can take a meaningful and non-trivial equilibrium limit. In section II we discuss the application of the chaotic hypothesis to singular systems. First we present a very simple example which shows that the effect of singularities is very important. Then we discuss how one can obtain quantitative predictions on the modification of the fluctuation relation due to the presence of singularities. Finally we discuss a prescription to remove singularities that follows from a careful examination of the proof of the fluctuation theorem for Anosov flows. The results are compared with recent numerical simulations. In section III we draw the conclusions and compare our interpretation with the one of [3].

I. THE FLUCTUATION RELATION

We shall denote by Ω the *phase space* (a smooth compact boundaryless Riemannian manifold), by $S:\Omega\to\Omega$ an invertible map on Ω and by $\sigma(x)$ the volume *contraction*

$$\sigma(x) = -\log|\det\partial_x S(x)| \tag{1}$$

Time reversal is defined as an isometry $I:\Omega\longleftrightarrow\Omega$ with

$$IS = S^{-1}I, \qquad \sigma(Ix) = -\sigma(x) \tag{2}$$

If S is an Anosov maps, existence of a unique invariant probability distribution μ, called the *SRB distribution* and describing the long–time statistics of the motions whose initial data are chosen randomly with respect to the volume measure, is established, [5, 6]. It has the property that, with the exception of points $x\in\Omega$ in a set of 0–volume, we have

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{t=0}^{\tau-1}F(S^t x)\stackrel{def}{=}\langle F\rangle = \int_\Omega F(y)\mu(dy) \tag{3}$$

for all smooth observables F defined on phase space.

It is intuitive that "phase space cannot expand"; this is expressed by the following result of Ruelle [7]:

If $\sigma_+\stackrel{def}{=}\langle\sigma\rangle$ *it is* $\sigma_+\ge 0$

Clearly if S is volume preserving $\sigma_+=0$. If $\sigma_+>0$ the system does not admit any stationary distribution of the form $\mu(dx)=\rho(x)dx$, with density with respect to the volume measure dx (often called *absolutely continuous* with respect to the volume).

This motivates calling systems for which $\langle\sigma\rangle>0$ *dissipative* and *conservative* the others.

For Anosov systems which are *transitive* (*i.e.* with a dense orbit), reversible and dissipative one can define the dimensionless phase space contraction, a quantity often related to entropy creation rate (see [8]), averaged over a time interval of size τ. This is

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma_+\tau}\sum_{k=-\tau/2}^{\tau/2-1}\sigma(S^k x) \tag{4}$$

provided *of course* $\sigma_+>0$.

Then for such systems the probability with respect to the stationary state, *i.e.* to the SRB distribution μ, that the variable $p(x)$ takes values in $\Delta=[p,p+\delta p]$ can be written as $\Pi_\tau(\Delta)=e^{\tau\max_{p\in\Delta}\zeta(p)+O(1)}$, where $\zeta(p)$ is a suitable function and, for any fixed choice of Δ contained in an open interval $(-p^*,p^*)$, $p^*\ge 1$, the correction term at the exponent is $O(1)$ with respect to τ^{-1}, as $\tau\to\infty$ (this is often informally expressed as $\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\log\Pi_\tau(p)=\zeta(p)$ for $-p^*<p<p^*$). The function $\zeta(p)$ is called in probability theory the *rate function* for the large deviations of p.

The function $\zeta(p)$ is analytic in p and *convex* in the interval of definition $(-p^*,p^*)$. Analyticity and convexity of large deviation rates are general properties, established by Sinai and valid for the SRB-averages of smooth observables (in Anosov systems), [6, 9, 10]. In fact more can be said for the specific case of the large deviation rate of the observable p, and one can prove the following *fluctuation theorem*:

In transitive time reversible dissipative Anosov systems the rate function $\zeta(p)$ for the dimensionless phase space contraction $p(x)$ defined in (4) is analytic and strictly convex in an interval $(-p^*,p^*)$ with $+\infty>p^*\ge 1$ and $\zeta(p)=-\infty$ for $|p|>p^*$. Furthermore

$$\zeta(-p)=\zeta(p)-p\sigma_+, \qquad \text{for} \qquad |p|<p^* \tag{5}$$

which is called the "fluctuation relation" (FR).

Strict convexity follows from a theorem of Griffiths and Ruelle which shows that the only way strict convexity could fail is if $\sigma(x)=\varphi(Sx)-\varphi(x)+c$ where $\varphi(x)$ is a smooth function (typically a Lipschitz continuous function) and c is a constant, see propositions (6.4.2) and (6.4.3) in [6]. The constant c vanishes if time reversal holds and $\sigma(x)=\varphi(Sx)-\varphi(x)$ contradicts the assumption that $\sigma_+>0$, because $\tau^{-1}\sum_{-\tau/2}^{\tau/2-1}\sigma(S^k x)=\tau^{-1}\big[\varphi(S^{\tau/2-1}x)-\varphi(S^{-\tau/2}x)\big]\to 0$ as $\tau\to\infty$.

The value of p^* must be $p^*\ge 1$ otherwise the average of p could not be 1 (as it is by its very definition): it is defined, adopting the natural convention that $\zeta(p)=-\infty$ for the values of p whose probability goes to 0 with τ faster than exponentially, as the infimum of the $p>0$ for

which $\zeta(p) = -\infty$. Alternatively $\pm p^*$ are the asymptotic slopes as $\lambda \to \pm\infty$ of the Laplace transform $\log\langle e^{\lambda p}\rangle_{SRB}$ [11].

The fluctuation relation was discovered in a numerical experiment, [12], dealing with a non smooth system (hence not Anosov). The formulation and proof of the above proposition is in [1] and in the context of Anosov systems the relation (5) is properly called the *fluctuation theorem.* The difference between this theorem and other fluctuation relations proposed in the literature has been clarified in [13]. The theorem can be extended to Anosov flows (*i.e.* to systems evolving in continuous time), [14].

Alternative formulations

Sometimes, *e.g.* in [3, 15], rather than the above p the quantity $a = \tau^{-1}\sum_{j=-\tau/2}^{\tau/2-1}\sigma(S^j x)$ is considered and eq.(5) becomes

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = \widetilde{\zeta}(a) - a, \qquad \text{for } |a| < a^* \equiv p^*\sigma_+ \tag{6}$$

where $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ is trivially related to $\zeta(p)$. This form dangerously suggests that in systems with $\sigma_+ = 0$ the distribution of a is asymmetric (because the extra condition $|a| < p^*\sigma_+$ might be forgotten, see [16]).

Note that p^* is certainly $< +\infty$ because the variable $\sigma(x)$ is bounded (being continuous on the bounded manifold on which the Anosov map is defined).

However no confusion should be made between $p^*\sigma_+$ and $\sigma_{max} \stackrel{def}{=} \max|\sigma(x)|$: unlike σ_{max} the quantity p^* is a *non trivial* dynamical quantity, independent on the metric used on phase space to measure distances, hence volume. This point has not been always understood and confusion has appeared in the published literature with unexpected consequences. In fact it is very easy to build examples of Anosov systems in which $p^*\sigma_+ < \sigma_{max}$: still, this does not mean that fluctuation relation is violated for such systems. Some explicit examples are discussed in next Section.

Conservative systems and the equilibrium limit

Considering more closely the cases $\sigma_+ = 0$ it follows that $\sigma(x) = \varphi(Sx) - \varphi(x)$ (again by the above mentioned result of Griffiths and Ruelle), with φ a smooth function of phase space. Hence the variable

$$a = \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{j=-\tau/2}^{\tau/2-1}\sigma(S^j x) \equiv \frac{\varphi(S^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}x) - \varphi(S^{\frac{\tau}{2}}x)}{\tau} \tag{7}$$

is *bounded* and tends to 0 *uniformly.* One could repeat the theory developed for p when $\sigma_+ > 0$ but one would reach the conclusion that $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = -\infty$ for $|a| > 0$ and we see that the result is trivial. In fact in this case it follows that the system admits an absolutely continuous SRB distribution. The distribution of a is symmetric (trivially by time reversal symmetry) and becomes a delta function around 0 as $\tau \to \infty$.

Nevertheless the fluctuation relation is *non trivial* in cases in which the map S depends on parameters $\underline{E} = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ and becomes volume preserving ("conservative") as $\underline{E} \to \underline{0}$: in this case $\sigma_+ \to 0$ as $\underline{E} \to \underline{0}$ and one has to rewrite the fluctuation relation in an appropriate way to take a meaningful limit.

The result is that the limit as $\underline{E} \to \underline{0}$ of the fluctuation relation in which both sides are divided by $\underline{E}^2$ makes sense and yields (in the case considered here of transitive Anosov dynamical systems) relations which are non trivial and that can be interpreted as giving Green–Kubo formulae and Onsager reciprocity for transport coefficients, [17, 18].

In fact the very definition of the duality between currents and fluxes so familiar in nonequilibrium thermodynamics since Onsager can be set up in such systems using as generating function the σ_+ regarded as a function of $\underline{E}$. Note that the fluxes are usually "currents" divided by the temperature: therefore via the above interpretation one can try to define the temperature even in nonequilibrium situations, [8, 19, 20].

II. SINGULAR SYSTEMS

The fluctuation relation has been proved only for Anosov systems. However, a *Chaotic Hypothesis* has been proposed, which states that, *for the purpose of studying the physically interesting observables*, a chaotic dynamical system can be considered as an Anosov system, [1, 21, 22].

In applying the chaotic hypothesis to singular systems, *e.g.* a system of particles interacting via a Lennard-Jones potential (which is infinite in the origin), one might encounter apparent difficulties. We will discuss them in the following.

The effect of a change of metric for Anosov flows

The simplest example (out of many) is provided by the simplest conservative system which is strictly an Anosov transitive system and which has therefore an SRB distribution: this is the geodesic flow S_t on a surface of constant negative curvature, [23]. We discuss here an evolution in continuous time because the matter is considered in the literature for such systems, [16] (even simpler examples are possible for time evolution maps).

The phase space M is compact, time reversal is just momentum reversal and the natural metric, induced by the Lobatchevsky metric $g_{ij}(q)$ on the surface, is time reversal invariant: the SRB distribution is the Liouville distribution and $\sigma(x) \equiv 0$. However one can introduce a function $\Phi(x)$ on M which is very large in a small

vicinity of a point x_0, arbitrarily selected, constant outside a slightly larger vicinity of x_0 and positive everywhere. A new metric could be defined as $g_{new}(x) = (\Phi(x) + \Phi(Ix))g(x) \stackrel{def}{=} e^{-F(x)}g(x)$: it is still time reversal invariant but its volume elements *will no longer be invariant* under the time evolution S_t associated with the geodesic flow with respect to the Lobatchevsky metric. The rate of change of phase space volume in the new metric will be $\sigma_{new}(x) = \frac{d}{dt}F(x)$. Then the phase space contraction $\sigma_{new}(x)$ takes values that not only are not identically 0 but which can in general be arbitrarily large, depending on the specific choice of $\Phi(x)$. The distribution of $a = \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau \sigma_{new}(S_t x)dt = \tau^{-1}\big[F(S_\tau x) - F(x)\big]$, at any finite time, will violate (6), simply because it is symmetric around 0, by time reversal.

In the limit $\tau \to \infty$, as long as $F(x)$ is bounded, $a = \tau^{-1}\big[F(S_\tau x) - F(x)\big] \xrightarrow[\tau\to\infty]{} 0$ uniformly in x, as in the corresponding map case, and the SRB distribution of a will tend to a delta function centered in 0 (hence $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = -\infty$ for $a \neq 0$). However, if $F(x)$ is not bounded (*e.g.* if it is allowed to become infinite in x_0) this is not the case in general, as we shall discuss in detail in next section.

The effect of singular boundary terms

One can realize that terms of the form $\tau^{-1}\big[F(S_\tau x) - F(x)\big]$ with $F(x)$ not bounded can affect the large fluctuations of $\sigma(x)$, at least if the probability of an arbitrarily large value of F is not too small, *i.e.* if asymptotically for big values of F it is exponentially small in F (or larger), *e.g.* it is of the form $\sim e^{-\kappa F}$, for some constant $\kappa > 0$. This is a valuable and interesting remark brought up for the first time, and correctly interpreted, already in [4] and in the following papers [24, 25]. The analysis of [4, 24, 25] applies to cases where the unbounded fluctuations are driven by an external white noise. In the following we extend the theoretical analysis in [24, 25] to cases in which the unbounded fluctuations do not arise from a Gaussian noise but from a deterministic evolution like the ones in [3, 15]: this is a simple extension of the main idea and method of [24] and provides an alternative interpretation to the analysis in [3, 15].

Our analysis can be applied to the example of the Anosov flow with singular metric considered above and to more realistic systems: among them systems of particles interacting via an unbounded potential (like a Lennard–Jones (LJ) or a Weeks–Chandler–Andersen (WCA) potential), driven by an external field and subject to an isokinetic or a Nosé–Hoover thermostat. To be definite one can consider system of N particles in d dimensions, described by evolution equations $\dot{\mathbf{p}}_i = \mathbf{E} - \partial_{\mathbf{q}_i}\Phi - \alpha\mathbf{p}_i$, $\dot{\mathbf{q}}_i = \mathbf{p}_i$. For an isokinetic Gaussian thermostat, α is a function of $\mathbf{p}_i$, chosen so to keep the total kinetic energy fixed to $\sum_i \mathbf{p}_i^2 = Nd\beta^{-1}$. For a Nosé–Hoover thermostat $\alpha(t)$ is a variable independent of $\mathbf{q}_i(t), \mathbf{p}_i(t)$ and satisfying the evolution equation $\dot{\alpha} = \frac{1}{Q}\big[\sum_i \mathbf{p}_i^2 - Nd\beta^{-1}\big]$, with $Q, \beta > 0$ parameters.

In both cases the phase space contraction $\sigma(x)$ has the form $\sigma_0(x) - \beta\frac{d}{dt}V(x)$, where β has the interpretation of inverse temperature. In the isokinetic case, $\sigma_0(x)$ is bounded, and $V = \Phi$. In the Nosé–Hoover case $\sigma_0(x)$ has, in the SRB distribution, a fast decaying tail (Gaussian at equilibrium, and likely to remain such in presence of external forcing) and $V = \sum_i \frac{\mathbf{p}_i^2}{2} + \Phi(\mathbf{q}) + Q\frac{\alpha^2}{2}$, [26, 27].

In both cases, *in equilibrium*, the SRB probability of V has an exponential tail $\sim e^{-\beta V}$ (possibly with power-law corrections). *For the purpose of illustration* we assume, from now on, that the same happens in presence of the force $\mathbf{E}$. This is an *essential and far from obvious assumption* useful, as discussed below, to understand the possible role of the singularities, but it should not be assumed lightly as it is well known that the SRB distributions may have very peculiar E dependence and, at the moment, a not intuitive character, [28, 29]. Nevertheless, in preliminary numerical simulations, it seems approximately correct, at least within the accuracy of the numerical data and for $|\mathbf{E}|$ not too large; furthermore the analysis that follows can be naturally adapted to more general assumptions on the tails.

In such cases the non normalized variable a (introduced before Eq. (6)) has the form $a_0 + \frac{\beta}{\tau}(V_i - V_f)$ where V_i, V_f are the values of $V(x)$ at the initial and final instants of the time interval of size τ on which a is defined, and $a_0 \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau \sigma_0(S_t x)dt$:

$$a = \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau \sigma(S_t x)dt \equiv a_0 + \frac{\beta}{\tau}(V_i - V_f) \tag{8}$$

If the system is chaotic and τ is large, the variables a_0, V_i, V_f can be regarded as independently distributed, because a_0 depends essentially only on the length τ of the time interval, while V_i and V_f depend on the precise locations of the extremes of the interval. Moreover the distribution of $V = V_i$ or $V = V_f$ is essentially $\sim e^{-\beta V}dV$ to leading order as $V \to \infty$, as discussed above. Therefore the rate function of the variable a can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\log\int_{-p^*\sigma_+}^{p^*\sigma_+} da_0 \int_0^\infty dV_i \int_0^\infty dV_f \,\cdot \\ &\cdot\, e^{\tau\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0) - \beta V_i - \beta V_f}\,\delta[\tau(a - a_0) + \beta V_i - \beta V_f] \qquad (9) \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{1}{\tau}\log\int_{-p^*\sigma_+}^{p^*\sigma_+} da_0\, e^{\tau\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0) - \tau|a - a_0|} \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ is the rate function of a_0; thus

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = \max_{a_0\in[-p^*\sigma_+, p^*\sigma_+]}\Big[\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0) - |a - a_0|\Big] \tag{10}$$

Defining $a_\mp$ by $\widetilde{\zeta}_0'(a_\mp) = \pm 1$, by the strict convexity of $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ it follows

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = \begin{cases} \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_-) - a_- + a \;, & a < a_- \\ \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a) \;, & a \in [a_-, a_+] \\ \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_+) + a_+ - a \;, & a > a_+ \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

If we assume that $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ satisfies FR (as expected from the chaotic hypothesis, see below), then $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0) = \widetilde{\zeta}_0(-a_0) + a_0$ and by differentiation it follows that $a_- = -\sigma_+$, where σ_+ is the location of the maximum of $\widetilde{\zeta}_0$, *i.e.* is the average of a, and that $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_-) = \widetilde{\zeta}_0(-\sigma_+) = \widetilde{\zeta}_0(\sigma_+) - \sigma_+ = -\sigma_+$. Moreover it is clear that $a_+ > \sigma_+$ because $\widetilde{\zeta}_0'(a_+) < 0$. Using these informations one can show that, for $a \geq 0$:

$$\widetilde{\zeta}(a) - \widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = \begin{cases} a \ , & a < \sigma_+ \\ \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a) + a \ , & \sigma_+ \leq a \leq a_+ \\ \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_+) + a_+ \ , & a > a_+ \end{cases} \qquad (12)$$

It follows that, if $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ satisfies FR up to $a = p^*\sigma_+$, then $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ satisfies FR only in the interval $|a| < |a_-| = \sigma_+$. Outside this interval $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ does not satisfy the FR and in particular for $a \geq a_+$ it is $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) - \widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = const.$, as already described in [24]. Eq. (12) is the generalization of the result of [24] to the case where $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ is not Gaussian.

Translated into the normalized variables $p_0 = a_0/\sigma_+$ and $p = a/\sigma_+$, this means that, even if the rate function of p_0 satisfies FR up to $p^* > 1$, the rate function of p verifies FR only for $|p| \leq 1$. This is the effect due to the presence of the singular boundary term. Note that the scenario above applies only to the case in which V_i, V_f are unbounded and have exponential tails. A repetition of the discussion above in the case that V_i, V_f are unbounded but with tails faster than exponential would lead to the conclusion that $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$. In particular if V_i, V_f are assumed to be bounded $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = \widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$. Of course in these cases the times of convergence of $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ to $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$ will depend on the details of the tails of V_i, V_f (for instance if V_i, V_f are bounded by a constant B, the times of convergence will grow with B). Note also that the result above does not depend on the details of the distribution of V_i, V_f for small V (in particular it does not depend on the lower cutoff $V = 0$ assumed in Eq. 9).

An example of $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ is reported in Fig. 1: it is a simple stochastic model for the FT (taken from Sect. 5 in [30], see also the extensions in [31, 32]). The example is the Ising model without interaction in a field h, *i.e.* a Bernoulli scheme with symbols $\pm$ with probabilities $p_\pm = \frac{e^{\pm h}}{2\cosh h}$. Defining $a_0 = \frac{1}{\tau}\sum_{i=0}^{\tau-1} 2h\sigma_i$, so that $\sigma_+ = \langle a_0 \rangle = 2h\tanh h$, and setting $x \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1+a_0/(2h)}{2}$, and $s(x) = -x\log x - (1-x)\log(1-x)$, one computes $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0) = s(x) + \frac{1}{2}a_0 + const$ which is *not Gaussian* and it is defined in the interval $[-a^*, a^*]$ with $a^* = 2h$. In this case the large deviation function $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ satisfies FR for $|a_0| \leq a^*$. If a singular term $V = -\log(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{-i-1}\frac{\sigma_i+1}{2})$ is added to a_0, defining $a = a_0 + \beta(V_i - V_f)$ (with $\beta = \log_2(1+e^{2h})$ so that the probability distribution of V is $\sim e^{-\beta V}$ for large V), the resulting $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ does not verify FR for $a > \langle a \rangle = 2h\tanh h$. In particular, for $h \to 0$, the interval in which the FR is satisfied vanishes.



FIG. 1: An example in a stochastic model of FR. The graph gives the two functions $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$ and $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ for $h = 0., 0.25, 0.5$. The average of a is $\langle a \rangle = \sigma_+ = 2h\tanh h$, $a_+ = 2h\tanh 3h$ and $a^* = 2h$. The function $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ is obtained from $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$ by continuing it for $a < a_- = -\sigma_+$ and $a > a_+$ with straight lines of slope ± 1. It does not satisfy the FR for $|a| > \langle a \rangle$. As $h \to 0$, $\langle a \rangle \to 0$, which means that the interval in which the FR is verified shrinks to 0. In this limit $a_+ \to 0$, so $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ approaches $-|a|$ (dashed lines). Rephrasing this in terms of $p = \frac{a}{\langle a \rangle}$ one obtains that FR remains always valid for $|p| < 1$, even as $h \to 0$. The three curves for $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$ have the same tangent on left side. The function $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a)$ is finite *only* in the interval $[-2h, 2h]$ and it is $-\infty$ outside it, while the function $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ is finite for all a'a and is a straight line outside $[a_-, a_+]$.

How to remove singularities

From the discussion above it turns out that singular terms which are proportional to total derivatives of unbounded functions (like the term $\frac{dV}{dt}$ that appears in the phase space contraction rate of thermostatted systems) can induce "undesired" (or "unphysical") modifications of the large deviations function $\zeta(p)$.

On heuristic grounds, when dealing with singular systems, one could follow the prescription that unbounded terms in $\sigma(x)$ which are proportional to total derivatives should be *subtracted* from the phase space contraction rate. If the resulting $\sigma_0(x)$ is bounded (as it is *e.g.* for the Gaussian isokinetic thermostat models considered) or at least if the tails of its distribution decay faster than exponentially, then its large deviations function should verify the FR for $|p| \leq p^*$, p^* being the intrinsic dynamic quantity defined above.

Note that after the subtraction of the divergent terms the remaining contraction, in the considered cases, is bounded for isokinetic thermostats or has a tail decaying faster than exponential in the case of Nosé–Hoover thermostats. In the following for definiteness we will assume σ_0 bounded but the same discussion is valid for σ_0

unbounded with tails decaying faster than exponential.

If the singular terms are not subtracted, the FR *will appear to be valid only for* $|p| \le 1$ *even if* $p^* > 1$. This seems to have generated statements that the Chaotic Hypothesis does not apply to isokinetic systems, see [3].

The heuristic prescription above can be motivated by a careful analysis of the proof of the fluctuation theorem for Anosov flows. In the following let us call again a the integral of the total phase space contraction rate $\sigma(x)$ (which includes singular terms) and a_0 the integral of the bounded variable $\sigma_0(x)$ from which singular total derivatives have been removed.

The fluctuation theorem was proved in [1, 2, 33] *for Anosov maps* and only later it has been extended in [14] to Anosov flows. Very sketchily, the extension of the fluctuation theorem to Anosov flows in [14] is proved as follows. One reduces the Anosov flow on Ω to a map via a Poincaré's section, associated with surfaces on Ω transversal to the flow. The passage of the flow through any one of such surfaces is called a *timing event*. The map between two consecutive timing events is called a "Poincaré's map". The union Ω_P of the surfaces represents the phase space of the Poincaré's map. The surfaces in Ω_P can be suitably chosen, in such a way that the Poincaré's map is a chaotic map which although not smooth, hence not an Anosov map, has (a non trivial fact [14]), all the properties necessary to prove the fluctuation theorem (which therefore applies to systems more general than the Anosov maps, although there is not a general characterization of the systems which are not Anosov and to which it applies). So, for such a map the fluctuation theorem holds and this in turn leads to a FR for the flow by the theory in [14] *under the assumption that the variable* $\sigma(x)$ *is bounded.*

If, as in the case under analysis, $\sigma(x)$ is not bounded, we can interpret the chaotic hypothesis as applying to the map associated with a Poincaré's section which avoids the singularities of the potential, a very natural prescription which allows us to apply the theory in [14] and derive a FR for both the map and the flow. For instance, we can choose as timing events the instants in which either the potential energy or the Nosé's "extended Hamiltonian" exceed some fixed value $\bar{V}$. If we make this choice, the (discrete) average $\hat{a}$ of $\sigma(x)$ over a sequence of iterations of the Poincaré's map will coincide with the (discrete) average $\hat{a}_0$ of $\sigma_0(x)$ along the same sequence: this simply follows from the remark that by construction the total increment of $\sigma(x) - \sigma_0(x)$ between two timing events, given by $\beta(V_f - V_i)$, is 0 (by construction Ω_P is chosen as a subset of $\{x \in \Omega : V(x) = \bar{V}\}$ where $V_f = V_i$). Then, by the same argument in [14], the fact that the rate function of $\hat{a}_0$ satisfies a FR and that $\sigma_0(x)$ is bounded implies that the rate function of the continuous average a_0 of $\sigma_0(x)$ along a trajectory of the flow will satisfy the fluctuation theorem.

Therefore the distribution of a_0 will satisfy the FR (*by the chaotic hypothesis*) for $|a_0| < p^*\sigma_+$. By the above maximum argument, the distribution of a *will also verify, as a consequence*, the FR but only for $|a| \le \sigma_+$, *i.e.* in the form (12).

Then the (natural) prescription to study FR for chaotic flows is to reduce the problem to a chaotic map considering only Poincaré's sections which do not pass through a singularity of $\sigma(x)$. The sum of $\sigma(x)$ over a large number of timing events on such sections is equal to the time integral of $\sigma_0(x)$ plus a bounded term which can be neglected. Thus the prescription on the choice of Poincaré's sections is equivalent to the heuristic prescription of removing from $\sigma(x)$ all the unbounded total derivatives.

It follows that the chaotic hypothesis leads to a clear prediction on the outcome of possible numerical simulations of particle systems interacting via unbounded potentials and subject to the isokinetic or the Nosé–Hoover thermostat: the FR will hold for all $|a| \le \sigma_+$ and, once the term $\frac{dV}{dt}$ is removed, for all $|a_0| < p^*\sigma_+$ with $p^* \ge 1$. Note that in the cases under analysis a_0 coincides with the dissipation function of Evans and Searles that was in fact predicted to satisfy FR [3, 15], even though for different reasons. We believe that the correct interpretation of the fact that FR for $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ holds for all $|a_0| < p^*\sigma_+$ is the one given above.

The numerical results of [34–36] agree with the prediction that FR for the rate function of a_0 is valid even beyond $a_0 = \sigma_+$. The prediction that (at least near equilibrium) the rate function of a should satisfy FR only up to $a = \sigma_+$ and that should become linear for $a \ge a_+$ at the moment has been experimentally confirmed only in Gaussian cases [4, 24, 25]. It would be very interesting to investigate in detail the structure of $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ even in non Gaussian cases. Note that this is far from being an easy task (in particular the analysis in [36] was not sophisticated enough to study this problem). In fact, as discussed in detail in [35], the presence in the definition of σ of a total derivative of an unbounded function may enlarge of 2 orders of magnitudes the times needed for the probability distribution of a to reach its asymptotic shape: even in the Gaussian region (small fluctuations of a around σ_+) the convergence times for $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ are found to be of order 1000 decorrelation times, versus a time of order 10 decorrelation times needed for $\widetilde{\zeta}_0(a_0)$ to converge to its asymptotic shape [35]. Clearly, for times of order 1000 decorrelation times, it is very hard to observe fluctuations of a larger than $a_+ - \sigma_+$. In order to verify the prediction for the shape of $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$ beyond $a = a_+$ an experiment specifically designed for this purpose would be needed, together with a detailed investigation of the finite time corrections to $\widetilde{\zeta}(a)$, along the lines in [36].

III. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS

We showed that the Chaotic Hypothesis can be applied even to singular chaotic systems (in particular even to Gaussian isokinetic or Nosé–Hoover thermostatted systems), by identifying their macroscopic behavior

with that of reversible Anosov systems with singular metric. Reversible Anosov systems with singular metric are systems to which the mathematical analysis usually leading to FR can be (rigorously) repeated to lead to a modified FR, illustrated by Eq.s (11), (12). Note that for $\sigma_+ \to 0$ Eq. (11) tends to the distribution $\widetilde{\zeta}(a) = -|a|$ violating the usual FR (simply because the limiting distribution is symmetric, by time reversal). For Anosov systems with singular metric, the prescription to avoid oddities (*i.e.* to avoid a modified FR) is to subtract from $\sigma(x)$ a total derivative dV/dt, in such a way that the variable $\sigma_0 = \sigma - dV/dt$ is bounded or has faster than exponential tails. The distribution of σ_0 will verify the FR also for $|p| > 1$. This prescription is equivalent to the very reasonable prescription that the Poincaré's section used for mapping the flow into a map does not pass through a singularity of $\sigma(x)$. Accepting the Chaotic Hypothesis, we propose to apply the same prescription to remove singularities to singular chaotic systems. Our prescription coincides with other prescriptions proposed earlier (for different reasons) in the literature.
The analysis in Sect. 2 above applies as well to understand how to apply the FR to systems with Gaussian (or unbounded) noise and the compatibility between the general theory of [31, 32, 37] with the works [24] and [25, 38].

Note that the picture we propose is different from the interpretation of the apparent violations to FR in singular systems proposed recently in [3], where in particular it is argued that FR and CH do not hold for thermostatted systems near equilibrium. We conclude by comparing more closely our discussion with the corresponding discussion in [3].

(1) As stressed above it is dangerous (and wrong) to consider (6) without the restriction $|a| \le p^*\sigma_+$ as the prediction of fluctuation theorem. In [3] the authors, after having correctly pointed out this point, seem (quite surprisingly!) to forget about this condition in the following. For instance, when studying the problem of approach to equilibrium, in order to show a contradiction between FR and GK relations, they assume that the relation Eq.(6) without the condition $|a| < p^*\sigma_+$ "is correct both at equilibrium and near equilibrium" and they proceed to infer from this a contradiction. Of course such assumption is wrong and the fact that from this contradictions follow is not an argument against CH or FR.
(2) An argument in [3] is supposed to prove that the relation $\widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = \widetilde{\zeta}(a) - a$ (without the condition $|a| < p^*\sigma_+$) holds for reversible Anosov systems for all a's, also for $\sigma_+ = 0$ (in particular they say that "*the division by σ_+ does not seem to be necessary for the proof in [37]*"). This is not the case: at equilibrium as well as near equilibrium, as remarked above and as illustrated also by [23], there are examples of systems for which the proof of FR can be *rigorously* repeated step by step but for which the correct conclusion of the proof is that the relation $\widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = \widetilde{\zeta}(a) - a$ is violated for $a > p^*\sigma_+$. For instance, this is the case for a conservative Anosov flow with singular metric (in which the relation above is violated trivially by time reversal). These counterexamples show that the assumption $\sigma_+ > 0$ *is, instead, essential* for the proof of fluctuation theorem. The necessity of the assumption $\sigma_+ > 0$ is stressed in the early paper [11] which the Authors of [3] quote; it is stressed also in the paper [2] which also makes clear that $\widetilde{\zeta}(-a) = \widetilde{\zeta}(a) - a$ can only hold under the assumption that $|a|$ does not exceed a maximum value.
(3) The analysis in Sect. 2 above shows that the probability distribution describing isokinetic systems near equilibrium *are SRB distributions* (contrary to what is claimed in [3]): this is mathematically obvious by the very definition of SRB distribution in the case of Anosov systems (*even if isokinetic* or in general with singular metric, see *e.g.* the geodesic flow discussed above) and it appears to be true also in non Anosov systems that have so far been considered.
(4) In the case of the thermostatted particle systems considered in [3] the unbounded derivative $\frac{dV}{dt}$ is also the contraction rate of the volume in equilibrium, *i.e.* with $\mathbf{E} = 0$. Thus, for $\mathbf{E} \neq \mathbf{0}$, one can remove the total derivative from $\sigma(x)$ simply considering the contraction *with respect to the equilibrium invariant distribution* $e^{-\beta V}$, as stated in [3, 15]. However, this observation does not provide a general prescription to remove the singular part from the phase space contraction rate because it rests on the very special fact that the singularities of the function $V(x)$ (*i.e.* of the potential Φ) do not depend on $\mathbf{E}$. The prescription that the phase space contraction should be computed on non singular Poincaré's sections, instead, does not require any other assumption. In general the two prescriptions and the corresponding predictions differ and we believe that in general the prescription of computing σ with respect to the equilibrium invariant distribution has not the desired effect of removing all singularities (then in general σ with respect to the equilibrium invariant distribution could violate FR for $\sigma_+ < a < p^*\sigma_+$).

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to E.G.D. Cohen, and R. Van Zon for many enlightening discussions. F.Z. wish to thank G.Ruocco for many useful discussions. G.G is indebted to Rutgers University, I.H.E.S and École Normale Supérieure, where he spent periods of leave while working on this project.

[1] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, Physical Review Letters **74**, 2694 (1995).

[2] D. Ruelle, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 393 (1999).

[3] D. J. Evans, D. J. Searles, and L. Rondoni, Physical Review E **71**, 056120 (+12) (2005).
[4] R. Van Zon and E. G. D. Cohen, Physical Review Letters **91**, 110601 (+4) (2003).
[5] D. Ruelle, *Turbulence, strange attractors and chaos* (World Scientific, New-York, 1995).
[6] G. Gallavotti, F. Bonetto, and G. Gentile, *Aspects of the ergodic, qualitative and statistical theory of motion* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2004).
[7] D. Ruelle, Journal of Statistical Physics **85**, 1 (1996).
[8] G. Gallavotti, Chaos **14**, 680 (2004).
[9] Y. Sinai, Russian Mathematical Surveys **27**, 21 (1972).
[10] Y. Sinai, *Lectures in ergodic theory*, Lecture notes in Mathematics (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1977).
[11] G. Gallavotti, Mathematical Physics Electronic Journal (MPEJ) **1**, 1 (1995).
[12] D. J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss, Physical Review Letters **71**, 2401 (1993).
[13] E. G. D. Cohen and G.Gallavotti, Journal of Statistical Physics **96**, 1343 (1999).
[14] G. Gentile, Forum Mathematicum **10**, 89 (1998).
[15] D. J. Searles and D. J. Evans, Journal of Chemical Physics **113**, 3503 (2000).
[16] G. Gallavotti, cond-mat/0402676 (2004).
[17] G. Gallavotti, Physical Review Letters **77**, 4334 (1996).
[18] G. Gallavotti and D. Ruelle, Communications in Mathematical Physics **190**, 279 (1997).
[19] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, Physical Review E **69**, 035104(R) (+4) (2004).
[20] F. Zamponi, F. Bonetto, L. F. Cugliandolo, and J. Kurchan, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment p. P09013 (2005).
[21] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen, Journal of Statistical Physics **80**, 931 (1995).
[22] G. Gallavotti, *Statistical Mechanics. A short treatise* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
[23] F. Bonetto, G. Gentile, and V. Mastropietro, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **20**, 681 (2000).
[24] R. Van Zon and E. G. D. Cohen, Physical Review E **69**, 056121 (+14) (2004).
[25] R. Van Zon, S. Ciliberto, and E. G. D. Cohen, Physical Review Letters **92**, 130601 (+4) (2004).
[26] S. Nosé, Journal of Chemical Physics **81**, 511 (1984).
[27] W. G. Hoover, Physical Review A **31**, 1695 (1985).
[28] B. Derrida, J.L.Lebowitz, and E.R.Speer, Physical Review Letters **89**, 030601 (2002).
[29] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, Physical Review Letters **87**, 040601 (2001).
[30] F. Bonetto, G. Gallavotti, and P. Garrido, Physica D **105**, 226 (1997).
[31] J. Lebowitz and H. Spohn, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 333 (1999).
[32] C. Maes, Journal of Statistical Physics **95**, 367 (1999).
[33] G. Gallavotti, Journal of Statistical Physics **84**, 899 (1996).
[34] M. Dolowschiák and Z. Kovács, Physical Review E **71**, 025202(R) (2005).
[35] F. Zamponi, G. Ruocco, and L. Angelani, Journal of Statistical Physics **115**, 1655 (2004).
[36] A. Giuliani, F.Zamponi, and G. Gallavotti, Journal of Statistical Physics **119**, 909 (2005).
[37] J. Kurchan, Journal of Physics A **31**, 3719 (1998).
[38] N. Garnier and S. Ciliberto, Physical Review E **71**, 060101 (2005).

e-mail: `bonetto@math.gatech.edu`
`giovanni.gallavotti@roma1.infn.it`
`alessandro.giuliani@roma1.infn.it`
`francesco.zamponi@phys.uniroma1.it`
web: `http://ipparco.roma1.infn.it`
Dip. Fisica, U. Roma 1,
00185, Roma, Italia

REVTEX