Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for Langevin dynamics by scaling time
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The thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) quantifies a relationship between current fluctuations and dissipation in out-of-equilibrium overdamped Langevin dynamics, making it a natural counterpart of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem in equilibrium statistical mechanics. For underdamped Langevin dynamics, the situation is known to be more complicated, with dynamical activity also playing a role in limiting the magnitude of current fluctuations. Progress on those underdamped TUR-like bounds have thus far come from applications of the information-theoretic Cramér-Rao inequality. Here, we present an alternative perspective by employing the contraction principle of large deviation theory. The approach offers a general, unified treatment of TUR-like bounds for both overdamped and underdamped Langevin dynamics built upon current fluctuations achieved by scaling time. The resulting bounds are similar to known results but with differences we discuss and rationalize.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nonequilibrium systems are characterized by currents and dissipation. In small systems, fluctuations in both quantities can be significant. Over the last two decades, the mathematical framework of large deviation theory has brought new understanding about the restrictions imposed on these fluctuations. One notable advance was the development of fluctuation theorems, which express a symmetry relating positive fluctuations to their negative counterparts [1–6]. This symmetry is particularly notable because it holds even outside the linear-response regime. More recently, large-deviation techniques have been used to derive the thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR), an inequality revealing that steady-state fluctuations of a current \( j \) cannot be arbitrarily large. Rather, these fluctuations are restricted by the system’s accumulated entropy production \( \Sigma \) according to the bound

\[
\frac{\text{var}(j)}{(\langle j \rangle)^2} \geq \frac{2}{\langle \Sigma \rangle}.
\]  

First derived for a Markov jump process in the long-time limit [7–9], the TUR has since been extended to a family of results for finite-time systems [10, 11], Markov chains [12, 13], diffusions [14–19], periodic driving [20], quantum systems [21–25], along with further generalizations [26–28] and specializations [29, 30]. We now understand that, in its most general form, a TUR holds because of an involutive symmetry in the system’s equation of motion, the most prominent of which is time reversal [31–33]. The involutive symmetry alone suffices to bound current fluctuations as

\[
\frac{\text{var}(j)}{(\langle j \rangle)^2} \geq \frac{2}{e^{\langle \Sigma \rangle} - 1},
\]  

which is equivalent to Eq. (1) in the short-time limit but provides essentially no information in the long-time limit [34]. Arriving at a TUR like Eq. (1) that governs the long-time limit requires that the symmetry be supplemented with additional structure from the equation of motion. For Markov jump processes and overdamped Langevin dynamics, this additional structure arises from the ability to compute the likelihood of realizing current fluctuations in a particular manner by collectively scaling all microscopic currents. Since current fluctuations can be realized in that manner or in many other ways, the fluctuations have to be at least as large as the current-scaling construction prescribed.

The corresponding result for underdamped Langevin dynamics is significantly harder to derive. Simple extensions of the overdamped derivation do not work because the probability of scaling all microscopic currents cannot be computed in the underdamped regime. Progress on this front came by constructing a virtual perturbation of the dynamics in terms of some parameter \( \theta \), then applying the Cramér-Rao bound on said parameter to establish an inequality [17–19, 23, 27, 30, 35]. In this paper, we derive a similar underdamped inequality from a large-deviation perspective. Our derivation is based on constructing potentially suboptimal ways to realize current fluctuations by scaling the equation of motion in time, a procedure that can be applied in a physically transparent manner to both the overdamped and underdamped settings.

II. RESULTS

A. TUR from contraction

From the large deviation perspective, the TUR is fundamentally built around the contraction principle. In many cases, the probability of measuring a current \( j \) in an observation time \( \tau \) adopts the long-time asymptotic
form
\[ \rho(j) \propto e^{-\tau I(j)}, \]
where \( I(j) \) is the large-deviation rate function for the current fluctuations. This rate function has a minimum at \( \langle j \rangle \), and its value at any given \( j \) reflects how unlikely it is to realize a trajectory with that value of the current on an exponential scale. For all but the simplest systems, explicit derivation of \( I(j) \) is intractable and numerical computation is challenging. This difficulty arises because, in the long-time limit, \( I(j) \) depends only on the probability of the most likely realization yielding a current \( j \); solving for that optimal realization is generally prohibitively difficult. On the other hand, it is easy to construct a subset of all possible realizations, and an upper bound on \( I(j) \) follows if one can compute the likelihood of sampling those particular realizations.

Such a bound was developed for Markov jump processes [8] and extended to overdamped Langevin dynamics [15]. This was accomplished by scaling the microscopic steady-state currents by a factor \( \eta \) to generate valid large-deviation bounds, suggesting a new approach. Neverthless, the time-scaling procedure appears to encounter a mathematically prohibitively difficult. On the other hand, it is easy to construct a subset of all possible realizations, and an upper bound on \( I(j) \) follows if one can compute the likelihood of sampling those particular realizations.

This analysis worked for Markov jump processes and overdamped Langevin dynamics because, exceptionally, the large-deviation rate functions for the empirical density and current (level 2.5) were known explicitly for those systems. In contrast, the level-2.5 rate function is not known for underdamped Langevin dynamics, and the underdamped TUR cannot be derived following the same approach. We suggest that this difficulty can be overcome by working with trajectories, in which case an expression for the level-3 underdamped rate functional is known. Motivated by the appearance of \( \eta \) as a scale parameter for the current in the overdamped regime, we re-interpret \( \eta \) in this new context as a scale parameter for time. In other words, we generate scaled trajectories with a timestep of \( \eta \Delta t \) rather than a timestep of \( \Delta t \). As before, this construction holds the system’s density fixed and varies its current, again with \( j = \langle j \rangle /\eta \).

The central aim of this paper is to construct large-deviation bounds—and the corresponding uncertainty relations—by computing the asymptotic probability of current fluctuations realized via scaling time in this fashion. The procedure encounters a mathematically problematic comparison of scaled and unscaled Langevin trajectories, a known issue in the Brownian motion literature. Nevertheless, the time-scaling procedure appears to generate valid large-deviation bounds, suggesting a way to extend the large-deviation perspective from overdamped to underdamped dynamics.

### B. Overdamped Langevin dynamics

We analyze a \( d \)-dimensional system, working in discrete time and ultimately recovering continuous-time results by taking the limit \( \Delta t \to 0 \); the continuous trajectory \( x(t) \) becomes the collection of discrete points \( \{x_i\} \), and similarly with the noise \( \xi(t) \). The overdamped Langevin equation is given by
\[ \gamma \dot{x} = F(x) + \sqrt{2\gamma T} \xi, \]
or in discretized form as
\[ \gamma \Delta x_i = F_i \Delta t + \sqrt{2\gamma T \Delta t} \xi, \]
where the subscript indexes timesteps, \( \gamma \) is the friction coefficient, \( F_i = F(x_i) \) is a position-dependent force, \( T \) is the temperature, and \( \xi_i \) is standard Gaussian noise satisfying \( \langle \xi_i \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle \xi_i \xi_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \mathbf{1}_d \), \( \mathbf{1}_d \) being the \( d \)-dimensional identity matrix. Solutions of this equation over a time interval \( \tau = N \Delta t \) are stochastic trajectories \( \{x_i\} \) parametrized by \( i \). Using the large-deviation machinery explained in the last section, we will derive our first main result,
\[ \frac{\text{var}(j)}{(j)^2} \geq \frac{2\gamma T}{\tau \langle \mathbf{F}^2 \rangle} = \frac{2}{\langle \Sigma \rangle - \gamma \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} \rangle/\gamma}. \]

Compared to the standard TUR for overdamped Langevin processes, Eq. (1), Eq. (7) differs by the additive term \(-\gamma \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} \rangle/\gamma \) in the denominator. If \( \langle \nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} \rangle = 0 \), this term vanishes and we recover Eq. (1). One way that this expectation value can vanish is if the divergence vanishes throughout space. This is true for a solenoidal vector field, one in which there are no sources or sinks.

To derive the first main result, we begin by expressing the rate function \( I(\{x_i\}) \) associated with a discrete trajectory \( \{x_i\} \) in terms of the noise history \( \{\xi_i\} \). The rate function must vanish for a typical trajectory \( \{x_i\} \) with noise history \( \{\xi_i\} \) satisfying \( \langle \xi_i \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle \xi_i^2 \rangle = d \), so we have
\[ I(\{x_i\}) = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} -\frac{1}{\tau} \ln \frac{\pi(\{x_i\})}{\pi(\{x_i^*\})} = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{1}{2\tau} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (\xi_i^2 - d), \]
where
\[ \pi(\{\xi_i\}) \propto \exp \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \xi_i^2 \right) \]
is the noise density. We would normally need to include a Jacobian factor when transforming from \( \pi(\{\xi_i\}) \) to \( \pi(\{x_i\}) \), but this factor would cancel out because it is identical for \( \pi(\{\xi_i\}) \) and \( \pi(\{\xi_i^*\}) \)
FIG. 1. Schematic of time-scaling construction. The original trajectory in blue, with timestep $\Delta t = 1$ is scaled by a factor $\eta = 0.5$ to generate a scaled trajectory in orange, which has timestep $\eta \Delta t = 0.5$. Both trajectories visit the same points in space, but the orange trajectory is sped up by a factor of two, and thus has twice the current.

We consider a trajectory $\{x_i\}$ and construct a corresponding scaled trajectory $\{\tilde{x}_i\}$ that visits the same discrete points with a scaled timestep (see Fig. 1). That scaled trajectory satisfies the scaled equation of motion (with timestep $\eta \Delta t$)

$$
\gamma \Delta \tilde{x}_i = F_i \eta \Delta t + \sqrt{2 \gamma T \eta \Delta t} \xi_i,
$$

where $\xi_i$ samples the same unit normal distribution as $\xi_i$. Enforcing the constraint that the two trajectories visit identical points in phase space ($\Delta x_i = \Delta \tilde{x}_i$), though with different clocks, links the noises $\xi_i$ and $\xi_i$ through their respective equations of motion to yield

$$
\xi_i = \sqrt{\eta} \xi_i + F_i \sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{2 \gamma T}} (\eta - 1).
$$

In the long-time limit $\tau \to \infty$, the trajectory $\{x_i\}$ is almost surely typical and yields the typical current $\langle j \rangle$. Because the scaled trajectory passes through exactly the same points in space as the unscaled trajectory in a time $\eta \tau$, it has current $\langle j \rangle / \eta$. The asymptotic probability of generating an unscaled trajectory with such a current will be bounded from below by the probability of generating this scaled trajectory, because the former subset of trajectories encapsulates the latter. Thus, we find

$$
I(j) \geq I(\{\tilde{x}_i\}) = \frac{\eta - 1}{2 \Delta t} + \frac{(\eta - 1)^2}{4 \gamma T},
$$

where the expression for the rate function follows from inserting Eq. (11) into Eq. (8) and then applying the typicality conditions $\langle \xi_i^2 \rangle = 0$ and $\langle (\xi_i^*)^2 \rangle = d$. The average squared force

$$
\langle F^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} F_i^2
$$

averages over all degrees of freedom and all timesteps. The first term of the right-hand side of Eq. (12) diverges in the limit $\Delta t \to 0$ for all $\eta \neq 1$, an artifact that results from scaling the noise directly in the equation of motion. For the moment, our interest in the $\Delta t \to 0$ limit motivates us to discard this term, resulting in the bound

$$
I(j) \leq (\eta - 1)^2 \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{4 \gamma T}.
$$

The divergent term will be discussed more carefully in Section IID. From Eq. (14), we take two derivatives with respect to the current $j$ to yield

$$
\frac{1}{\text{var}(j)} = I''(\langle j \rangle) \leq \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^2} \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{2 \gamma T}.
$$

Rearranging Eq. (15) gives our first main result, Eq. (7).

The inequality can be re-expressed in terms of the entropy production by recognizing that the entropy production $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is the time-antisymmetric part of the action, $\tau I(\{x_i\})$, and takes the form

$$
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{2 T} \sum_i \langle (F_i + F_{i+1}) \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle
$$

$$
\approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_i \langle F_i \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2 T} \sum_i \langle \Delta x_i \cdot \nabla F \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle
$$

$$
= \frac{\tau \langle F^2 \rangle}{\gamma T} + \frac{\tau}{\gamma} \langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle,
$$

where the approximation becomes exact as $\Delta t \to 0$.

Our overdamped bound, Eq. (7), reproduces prior work [8] when $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle$ vanishes, but otherwise appears weaker because $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle$ tends to be negative, as evidenced by numerical simulation and the following argument. Given that both bounds were built from the contraction principle using similar constructions, it is natural to consider why the time-scaling bound would be weaker than the current-scaling TUR. Both large-deviation bounds require that we pass from a high-dimensional distribution to the single-variable distribution over a current. In our time-scaling construction, the high-dimensional level-3 distribution is over trajectories. By contrast, the current-scaling construction involves a level-2.5 distribution over densities and currents; each realization of the system at this level of description corresponds to multiple trajectories. By scaling the currents at level 2.5, rather than the trajectories themselves at level 3, we can consider a larger subset of all possible trajectories and hence generate a tighter bound. Notably, in the constant-force scenario with $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle = 0$, exactly the same bound is obtained from the level-3 or level-2.5 description.

C. Underdamped Langevin dynamics

We repeat the analysis for underdamped Langevin dynamics,

$$
\dot{x} = -\gamma x + F(x) + \sqrt{2 \gamma T} \xi,
$$

where $F(x)$ is the total force on the system and $\xi$ is a Gaussian white noise process. The average squared force

$$
\langle F^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} F_i^2
$$

averages over all degrees of freedom and all timesteps. The first term of the right-hand side of Eq. (12) diverges in the limit $\Delta t \to 0$ for all $\eta \neq 1$, an artifact that results from scaling the noise directly in the equation of motion. For the moment, our interest in the $\Delta t \to 0$ limit motivates us to discard this term, resulting in the bound

$$
I(j) \leq (\eta - 1)^2 \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{4 \gamma T}.
$$

The divergent term will be discussed more carefully in Section IID. From Eq. (14), we take two derivatives with respect to the current $j$ to yield

$$
\frac{1}{\text{var}(j)} = I''(\langle j \rangle) \leq \frac{1}{\langle j \rangle^2} \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{2 \gamma T}.
$$

Rearranging Eq. (15) gives our first main result, Eq. (7).

The inequality can be re-expressed in terms of the entropy production by recognizing that the entropy production $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is the time-antisymmetric part of the action, $\tau I(\{x_i\})$, and takes the form

$$
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{2 T} \sum_i \langle (F_i + F_{i+1}) \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle
$$

$$
\approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_i \langle F_i \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2 T} \sum_i \langle \Delta x_i \cdot \nabla F \cdot \Delta x_i \rangle
$$

$$
= \frac{\tau \langle F^2 \rangle}{\gamma T} + \frac{\tau}{\gamma} \langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle,
$$

where the approximation becomes exact as $\Delta t \to 0$.

Our overdamped bound, Eq. (7), reproduces prior work [8] when $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle$ vanishes, but otherwise appears weaker because $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle$ tends to be negative, as evidenced by numerical simulation and the following argument. Given that both bounds were built from the contraction principle using similar constructions, it is natural to consider why the time-scaling bound would be weaker than the current-scaling TUR. Both large-deviation bounds require that we pass from a high-dimensional distribution to the single-variable distribution over a current. In our time-scaling construction, the high-dimensional level-3 distribution is over trajectories. By contrast, the current-scaling construction involves a level-2.5 distribution over densities and currents; each realization of the system at this level of description corresponds to multiple trajectories. By scaling the currents at level 2.5, rather than the trajectories themselves at level 3, we can consider a larger subset of all possible trajectories and hence generate a tighter bound. Notably, in the constant-force scenario with $\langle \nabla \cdot F \rangle = 0$, exactly the same bound is obtained from the level-3 or level-2.5 description.
with unit mass. Following the discretization scheme in [36], we have
\[
\Delta x_i = b \Delta t \left( \dot{x}_i + \frac{F_i \Delta t}{2} \right) + \frac{b \Delta t}{2} \sqrt{2 \gamma T \Delta t} \xi_i, 
\]
(20)
\[
\Delta \dot{x}_i = \frac{\Delta t}{2} (F_i + F_{i+1}) - \gamma \Delta x_i + \sqrt{2 \gamma T \Delta t} \xi_i, 
\]
(21)
where \( b \equiv (1 + \gamma \Delta t/2)^{-1} \). As before, we generate a scaled trajectory \( \{\tilde{x}_i\} \) which is spatially identical to the unscaled trajectory, with \( \tilde{x}_i = x_i \). In the underdamped regime, scaling time requires that we scale the velocity in the same fashion, generating the additional constraint \( \eta \tilde{x}_i = \dot{\tilde{x}}_i \). The same procedure as in the overdamped regime yields our second main result,
\[
\frac{\text{var}(j)}{\langle j \rangle^2} \geq \frac{2 \gamma T}{\tau \langle 4 (F^2_i - 3 \gamma^2 \langle x^2 \rangle + 4 \gamma^2 T) \rangle} 
\]
(22)
\[
= \frac{2}{16 \langle \Upsilon \rangle + 9 \langle \Sigma \rangle - 3 \gamma^2 T}. 
\]
(23)
where \( \langle \Upsilon \rangle \) is the dynamical activity, the time-symmetric part of the action that excludes the functional measure [17]. See Appendix A for more details. This term does not appear in the overdamped bound because, in that regime, the entropy production and dynamical activity are Legendre duals and hence not independent [37, 38]. Our bound mirrors that of [17], but with an additional term \(-3 \gamma^2 T\) in the denominator. This additional term tightens our bound, particularly for large \( \gamma \).

By analogy with Eq. (11), we identify a relationship between the scaled and unscaled noises by applying the constraints \( \Delta \mathbf{x} = \Delta \mathbf{x} \) and \( \Delta \dot{\mathbf{x}} = \eta \Delta \dot{\mathbf{x}} \). This relationship is given by
\[
\xi_i = \epsilon n^{3/2} \tilde{x}_i + \frac{2 \tilde{x}_i}{\sqrt{2 \gamma T \Delta t}} (1 - \epsilon) + F_i \sqrt{\frac{\Delta t}{2 \gamma T}} (1 - \epsilon n^2), 
\]
(24)
where
\[
\epsilon = \frac{1 + \gamma \Delta t/2}{1 + \gamma \Delta t/2} = \frac{1}{1 + (1 - b)(\eta - 1)}, 
\]
(25)
and hence
\[
I(\{\tilde{x}_i\}) = \frac{\epsilon^2 n^3 - 1}{2 \Delta t} + \frac{\langle \tilde{x}_i^2 \rangle}{\gamma T \Delta t} (1 - \epsilon)^2 + \frac{\langle F^2_i \rangle}{4 \gamma T} (1 - \epsilon n^2)^2 
\]
\[
+ \frac{\langle F_i \cdot \dot{x}_i \rangle}{\gamma T \Delta t} (1 - \epsilon) (1 - \epsilon n^2), 
\]
(26)
\[
= \frac{\epsilon^2 n^3 - 1}{2 \Delta t} + (\eta - 1)^2 \langle \Xi \rangle + O((\eta - 1)^3), 
\]
(27)
where
\[
\langle \Xi \rangle = \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{\gamma T} - \frac{\langle F \cdot \dot{x} \rangle}{T} + \frac{\gamma \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle}{4T}. 
\]
(28)
Taking two derivatives and again discarding the divergent term yields
\[
\frac{1}{\text{var}(j)} = I''(\langle j \rangle) \leq \frac{2 \langle \Xi \rangle}{\langle j \rangle^2}, 
\]
(29)
which can be rearranged to give Eq. (22) by applying the identity
\[
\langle F \cdot \dot{x} \rangle = \gamma \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle - \gamma T. 
\]
(30)
To proceed from Eq. (22) to Eq. (23), we would like to express the bound in terms of the entropy production and dynamical activity. In Appendix B, we prove Eq. (30) and show that for underdamped dynamics,
\[
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{\tau \langle F \cdot \dot{x} \rangle}{T} = \tau \frac{\gamma \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle}{T} - \gamma \tau, 
\]
(31)
\[
\langle \Upsilon \rangle = \frac{\tau}{4} \left( \frac{\langle F^2 \rangle}{\gamma T} - \frac{3 \gamma^2 \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle}{T} + 4 \gamma \right). 
\]
(32)
Combining these expressions with Eq. (29) recovers our second main result, Eq. (23).

D. Divergent terms

We return now to the troubling issue of the divergence of the first term in Eqs. (12) and (27). These divergences reflects our inability to compare two sets of dynamics with different diffusion coefficients. The unscaled dynamics has effective diffusion coefficient \( D = \gamma T \), whereas the scaled dynamics has effective diffusion coefficient \( \tilde{D} = \eta D = \eta \gamma T \). Unless \( \eta = 1 \), trajectories generated with one dynamics are almost surely incapable of being generated by the other; the dynamics with the larger diffusion coefficient will have a larger variance. Formally, the measures associated with the two dynamics are not mutually absolutely continuous, Girsanov’s theorem does not apply, and there is no appropriate change of measure between them [39].

Because our scaling of time is so similar to the scaling of currents discussed in Section II A, it is instructive to consider why that prior work [8, 15] did not run into a similar divergence. There, the level-2.5 rate function measured the likelihood of joint fluctuations in the empirical density and empirical currents. The current-scaling construction took a typical realization of the system, which sampled the steady-state density and steady-state currents, and scaled only its currents to construct an explicit realization that would produce the scaled current over the fixed observation time.

Here, by constructing a realization based on scaling time, our constructed trajectory has a different observation time and a different timestep than the original trajectory. Comparing two trajectories with altered timesteps is challenging to handle in a rigorous manner. For overdamped dynamics, the challenge is that the left-hand side of Eq. (12) is a rate function involving only the fixed timestep \( \Delta t \), whereas the right-hand side involves a rate function with an \( \eta \)-dependent timestep. Typical large-deviation manipulations freely shift a rate function by a constant so that its minimum value is zero. The time-scaling construction means that we are not merely...
comparing trajectories with current \( \langle j \rangle \) to those with current \( j/\eta \)—we must also compare \( I(j) \) for a timestep \( \Delta t \) to the corresponding \( I(\langle j \rangle) \) for a timestep \( \eta \Delta t \). We anticipate that the divergent term emerges from an attempt to compare rate functions with different timesteps, and that it can ultimately be discarded when comparing current fluctuations with a fixed timestep \( \Delta t \). In lieu of a mathematically rigorous justification for removing the divergence, we focus our attention on numerical demonstrations that valid bounds are produced even when this term is discarded.

E. Numerical verification of TUR bounds

In the overdamped regime, rearranging Eq. (14) gives the nondimensional result

\[
\frac{4\gamma T}{\langle F^2 \rangle} I(j) \leq (\eta - 1)^2.
\]  

(33)

On the other hand, the large-deviation bound on the underdamped rate function is not perfectly quadratic due to the increased order of the associated stochastic differential equation (see Eq. (27)). The underdamped TUR, Eq. (29), corresponds to the nondimensional quadratic truncation

\[
\frac{I(j)}{2\langle \Xi \rangle} \leq (\eta - 1)^2,
\]  

(34)

which must hold in the neighborhood of \( \eta = 1 \).

We verify the bounds Eqs. (33) and (34) numerically for a single particle on a ring subject to a spatially dependent force \( F(x) \) for various choices of \( F(x) \), as illustrated in Fig. 2. In both plots, the solid blue line representing the bound lies above each of twenty rate functions obtained from numerical simulation. In the overdamped regime, the bound is saturated in the special case of a constant driving force \( F(x) \equiv F \), shown in black circles. In the underdamped regime, the bound is not saturated even in this special case; in this scenario, we have

\[
I(j) \leq (\eta - 1)^2 \left( \langle \Xi \rangle - \frac{\gamma}{4} \right),
\]  

(35)

where the additive term \( \gamma/4 \) is responsible for the lack of saturation.

We attribute this lack of saturation to the fact that the underdamped equation of motion is of higher order than the overdamped equation of motion. The overdamped equation is first order and stochastic in \( x \), whereas the underdamped equation is second order and stochastic in \( \dot{x} \). This difference in order implies that the derivation of the overdamped Langevin equation from the underdamped one is subtle and cannot be effected by the simple limit \( m \to 0 \). Instead, the conventional argument takes the limit \( \gamma \to \infty \) and invokes a separation of timescales between the position and momentum degrees of freedom [40]. The friction coefficient \( \gamma \) is responsible for characterizing one such relevant timescale, so we expect that it will also modulate the bound.

III. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have described a method of developing TUR-like bounds by introducing a continuous parameter that scales time and generates atypical trajectories which serve to bound the system’s rate function. Passing such trajectories through standard large-deviation machinery generates the aforementioned bounds.

This method generalizes that used in the derivation of the TUR. Because it works directly with trajectories, rather than with the reduced densities and currents, it is applicable to both the underdamped and overdamped regimes. We are unable to demonstrate that this bound holds with full mathematical rigor, but the results of numerical simulation and theoretical arguments are suggestive. The resulting bounds are comparable but slightly different from known results in the overdamped and un-
derdamped regime, and we rationalize this discrepancy by considering the different levels of description from which these bounds were derived.

We emphasize the general utility of this procedure and suggest that it may be used fruitfully to derive other related bounds.
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Appendix A: Entropy production and dynamical activity

In this appendix, we formalize the definitions of the entropy production and dynamical activity. These definitions are usually presented using stochastic calculus, but we will instead work directly with the discretized equations of motion used in the main text. Consider a trajectory \( \{ x_i \} \) and its time reversal \( \{ \bar{x}_i \} \equiv \{ x_{N-i} \} \). For simplicity, we will consider a one-dimensional underdamped system, though these calculations generalize to multiple dimensions and the overdamped regime as well.

The probability of observing such a trajectory can be expressed in terms of its action \( \tau I(\{ x_i \}) \) as

\[
\pi(\{ x_i \}) \propto \exp(-\tau I(\{ x_i \})).
\]

The entropy production \( \Sigma \) and dynamical activity \( \Upsilon \) are respectively defined as the time-antisymmetric and time-symmetric components of the action. More precisely, we have

\[
-\tau I(\{ x_i \}) = \Upsilon(\{ x_i \}) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\{ x_i \})
\]

\[
-\tau I(\{ \bar{x}_i \}) = \Upsilon(\{ \bar{x}_i \}) + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\{ \bar{x}_i \})
\]

\[
\Upsilon(\{ x_i \}) - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma(\{ x_i \}).
\]

Hence solving for \( \Sigma(\{ \bar{x}_i \}) \) and \( \Upsilon(\{ x_i \}) \) gives

\[
\Sigma(\{ x_i \}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Delta x_i \left( \ddot{F}_i - \frac{\Delta \dot{x}_i}{\Delta t} \right),
\]

\[
\Upsilon(\{ \bar{x}_i \}) = \frac{\Delta t}{4\gamma T} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ 2\ddot{F}_i \frac{\Delta \dot{x}_i}{\Delta t} - 2\dddot{x}_i - 2 \left( \frac{\Delta \dot{x}_i}{\Delta t} \right)^2 \right].
\]

Taking the expectation values of these quantities in the steady state leads to the entropy production \( \langle \Sigma \rangle \) and dynamical activity \( \langle \Upsilon \rangle \), precise expressions for which are given in Appendix B. We note in particular that our expression for dynamical activity differs from that in [17] and in the main text. It differs from our expression by the additive term \( \gamma T/\tau \). The source of this discrepancy is as follows: whereas we have used standard Brownian motion as a reference in Eq. 8 and hence canceled out a term involving \( \dddot{x} \) as well as \( \gamma T/\tau \) from the action, [17] removed only the term involving \( \dddot{x} \). For ease of comparison with [17], the expression for the dynamical activity in the main text is that used in [17], but we derive here the expression we would otherwise have obtained for the dynamical activity.

Appendix B: Evaluation of some expectation values

As in Appendix A, we perform our derivations in one dimension for simplicity. For the entropy production, we would like to show that

\[
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \tau \frac{\langle F \dot{x} \rangle}{T} = \frac{\gamma \langle \dddot{x} \rangle}{T} - \gamma \tau.
\]

We will do this sequentially, first proving the first equality and then the second.

Taking expectations directly from Eq. (A8), we have

\[
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \Delta x_i \left( \ddot{F}_i - \frac{\Delta \dot{x}_i}{\Delta t} \right) \rangle
\]

\[
\approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \Delta x_i \dddot{F}_i \rangle
\]

\[
\approx \frac{\tau}{T} \langle F \dot{x} \rangle + O(\Delta t).
\]

In the second equality, we have removed \( \Delta x_i \Delta \dot{x}_i \sim O((\Delta t)^{3/2}) \), which is negligible with respect to the first term, which is first order in \( \Delta t \). In the fourth equality, we replace \( \dddot{F}_i \) with \( F_{i+1} \), which incurs an error of \( O(\Delta t) \) that vanishes as \( \Delta t \to 0 \). Note that this holds only in the underdamped regime; in the overdamped regime, we have \( \Delta x_i \sim O(\sqrt{\Delta t}) \) compared to the underdamped \( \Delta x_i \sim O(\Delta t) \), reflecting the fact that, in the underdamped Langevin equation, the noise is applied to \( \dddot{x} \) rather than to \( x_i \).

It remains to prove that

\[
\langle F \dot{x} \rangle = \gamma \langle \dddot{x} \rangle - \gamma T.
\]
First, we prove the auxiliary result that
\[ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \dot{x}_i \Delta x_i \rangle = -\gamma T \tau, \quad (B6) \]
which follows from
\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{2} (\dot{x}_i + \dot{x}_{i+1}) \Delta x_i \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ \langle \dot{x}_i \Delta x_i \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle (\Delta x_i)^2 \rangle \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ \langle \dot{x}_i \Delta x_i \rangle + \gamma T \Delta t + O((\Delta t)^{3/2}) \right],
\end{align*}
\]
where the first equality holds for a telescoping sum in the steady state and the final equality is obtained by direct computation from the underdamped Langevin equation, Eq. (A6). Hence multiplying Eq. (A6) by \( \dot{x}_i \) and taking expectations gives
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \dot{x}_i \Delta x_i \rangle \approx \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Delta t ((F_i \dot{x}_i) - \gamma \langle \dot{x}_i^2 \rangle),
\]
and combining this with Eq. (B6) gives Eq. (B5), which verifies the expression for \( \langle X \rangle \).

For the dynamical activity, we would like to show that
\[
\langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle = \frac{\tau}{4\gamma T} \left[ (F^2) - 2\gamma \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle - \gamma^2 \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle \right],
\]
and we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle \dot{F}_i \Delta x_i \rangle &\approx \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle F_i \Delta x_i \rangle \\
&\approx \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \langle F_i \dot{F}_i \rangle \Delta t - \gamma \langle F_i \dot{x}_i \rangle,
\end{align*}
\]
where the first equality follows from expanding \( F_{i+1} \) and using the fact that \( \langle \Delta x_i \Delta x_i \rangle \) is negligible with respect to the other term, as we have argued previously. Dividing through by \( \Delta t \) gives
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left( \dot{F}_i \frac{\Delta x_i}{\Delta t} \right) \approx \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left[ (F^2_i) - \gamma (F \dot{x}_i) \right].
\]
Continuing from Eq. (B12) gives
\[
\langle \mathcal{Y} \rangle = \frac{\tau}{4\gamma T} \left[ (F^2) - 2\gamma \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle - \gamma^2 \langle \dot{x}^2 \rangle \right],
\]
as desired. As mentioned in Appendix A, this result differs from that used in the main text by the additive term \( \gamma \tau/2 \).
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