

Linear response formula for current-like observables¹

Hal Tasaki, Feb. 5, 2012

For any f_x , we have seen in the lecture that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f \rangle_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}} &= \langle f \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} + \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} \langle \psi(t) f(N) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= \langle f \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} + \sum_{t=-\infty}^{-1} \langle \psi(t) f(0) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + O(\varepsilon^2),\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where the second formula is obtained by shifting and extending the time interval. This is OK.

Now let us consider an arbitrary “current-like” observable $g_{x \rightarrow y}$, which satisfies $g_{x \rightarrow y} = -g_{y \rightarrow x}$. As in the lecture the corresponding observable with a single x is defined as

$$\tilde{g}_x := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} g_{x \rightarrow y}.\tag{2}$$

By substituting this into (1), we have²

$$\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}} = \langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} + \sum_{t=-\infty}^{-1} \langle \psi(t) g(0) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + O(\varepsilon^2),\tag{3}$$

where $g(t)[\hat{x}] := g_{x(t) \rightarrow x(t+1)}$ is the quantity g viewed as a function of path \hat{x} . When I was preparing the lecture, I thought (carelessly) that the first term $\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}}$ was negligible, as its counterpart in continuous time formulation is indeed vanishing. But (as you know) I realized that something was wrong here when I was explaining this part in the lecture. I did not have enough time to think it back during the short lunch break, and had forgot about this. I apologize you for the mistake and for having left it unexplained.

The truth is that $\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}}$ has a nonvanishing contribution, and it makes the final expression neat. Let me explain this.

From the definitions, we have

$$\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} = \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{e^{-\beta H_x}}{Z} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} g_{x \rightarrow y}.\tag{4}$$

Noting that the definition of $\psi_{x \rightarrow y}$ implies³

$$e^{-\beta H_x} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} = e^{-\beta H_y - \psi_{y \rightarrow x}} \tau_{y \rightarrow x},\tag{5}$$

¹This is a supplement to a series of lectures that I gave in U. Osaka recently, and does not make quite sense by itself.

²For simplicity I assume $g = O(1)$.

³This is nothing but the detailed balance condition if $\psi_{x \rightarrow y} = 0$.

and recalling that $g_{x \rightarrow y} = -g_{y \rightarrow x}$, one has

$$\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} = - \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{e^{-\beta H_y - \psi_{y \rightarrow x}}}{Z} \tau_{y \rightarrow x} g_{y \rightarrow x} = - \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{e^{-\beta H_x - \psi_{x \rightarrow y}}}{Z} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} g_{x \rightarrow y}, \quad (6)$$

where we have simply switched the two dummy variables x and y to get the final expression. By averaging (4) and (6), we see

$$\langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{e^{-\beta H_x}}{Z} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} g_{x \rightarrow y} \psi_{x \rightarrow y} + O(\varepsilon^2) = \frac{1}{2} \langle \widetilde{g \psi} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad (7)$$

where $(\widetilde{g \psi})_x := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \tau_{x \rightarrow y} g_{x \rightarrow y} \psi_{x \rightarrow y}$. Going to the path-space formalism, one finds that

$$\langle \widetilde{g \psi} \rangle_{\mathbf{p}^{\text{eq}}} = \langle g(t) \psi(t) \rangle^{\text{eq}} \quad (8)$$

with an arbitrary t in the interval⁴. Thus the expression (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{g} \rangle_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}} &= \sum_{t=-\infty}^{-1} \langle \psi(t) g(0) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + \frac{1}{2} \langle \psi(0) g(0) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + O(\varepsilon^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} \langle g(0) \psi(t) \rangle^{\text{eq}} + O(\varepsilon^2), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we have used the time reversal symmetry to get the final expression. As you see the demonstration of the reciprocal relation becomes automatic with this neat form.

⁴To be precise the whole time interval must at least contain t and $t + 1$.