Unifying fluctuation-dissipation temperatures of slow-evolving nonequilibrium systems from the perspective of inherent structures
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For nonequilibrium systems, how to define temperature is one of the key and difficult issues to solve. Although effective temperatures have been proposed and studied to this end, it still remains elusive what they actually are. Here, we focus on the fluctuation-dissipation temperatures and report that such effective temperatures of slow-evolving systems represent characteristic temperatures of their equilibrium counterparts. By calculating the fluctuation-dissipation relation of inherent structures, we obtain a temperature-like quantity $T_{IS}$. For monocomponent crystal-formers, $T_{IS}$ agrees well with the crystallization temperature $T_c$, while it matches with the onset temperature $T_o$ for glass-formers. It also agrees with effective temperatures of typical nonequilibrium systems, such as aging glasses, quasi-static shear flows, and quasi-static self-propelled flows. From the unique perspective of inherent structures, our study reveals the nature of effective temperatures and the underlying connections between nonequilibrium and equilibrium systems and confirms the equivalence between $T_o$ and $T_c$.

INTRODUCTION

To understand the physics of nonequilibrium systems is one of the major challenges in condensed matter and materials physics (1, 2). An important and core issue of nonequilibrium systems is how to define temperature. In equilibrium systems, there are multiple ways to define temperature, e.g., from thermodynamic fundamental laws, Gibbs relation, transport quantities, fluctuation-dissipation relations (FDRs), kinetic energy, and potential energy, and they all lead to an identical temperature. In nonequilibrium systems, however, although we can still use these definitions, they normally result in different “temperatures,” which are called effective temperatures (3–5). Even in simple systems such as ideal gases and electromagnetic radiation, the definition of nonequilibrium temperature is also a problem (5–7). Because there are multiple definitions of effective temperatures, each of which has its own meaning, it remains elusive what these effective temperatures really represent.

In this work, we focus on one of the definitions of effective temperatures, the fluctuation-dissipation temperature derived from the FDR. This effective temperature has been paid much attention to and widely adopted in the study of typical nonequilibrium systems such as aging glasses, sheared particulate systems, and active matter. In these systems, the FDR is violated (8–11). The ratio of the correlation to the response, which is the well-defined heat bath temperature $T$ in thermal equilibrium, has been shown to be time dependent (11–17). At short times, it is equal to $T$. At long times, however, it is higher, which has been defined as the effective (fluctuation-dissipation) temperature $T_{eff}$. The emergence of $T_{eff}$ is expected to have theoretical merit to explain why solid-like states with the heat bath temperature being too low to overcome energy barriers can still undergo structural relaxation under nonequilibrium conditions. Although expected to play an important role in the understanding of nonequilibrium systems, like other definitions of effective temperatures, it still remains elusive what $T_{eff}$ actually is and whether it is indeed a unique temperature of nonequilibrium systems with abstract physical meanings. People have also put effort into the modification of the FDR under certain nonequilibrium conditions (7, 18, 19), from which other different effective temperatures could probably be obtained, but these attempts still could not settle the questions above.

In view of the potential energy landscape, the aging of glasses and flowing of particles under shear or self-propulsion are processes that the system moves among different inherent structures (20, 21), i.e., zero-temperature metastable states at local potential energy minima, separated by energy barriers. It has been shown that inherent structures can provide special insight into physics of nonequilibrium systems. For instance, inherent structures have the predictive power of heterogeneous dynamics of supercooled liquids (22–25), instability and particle rearrangements under excitations (26–29), and glass transition (30). Compared to the success in linking local structural and vibrational properties of inherent structures to specific features of excited nonequilibrium systems, less attention has been paid to the statistical mechanical aspects of inherent structures. Just for the FDR (9, 12–15), there has been no attempt yet to investigate whether there is a meaningful relation between some kind of correlation and response of inherent structures. If such a relation could be constructed, a temperature might be derived from it. Such a temperature may shed light on our understanding of effective temperatures from the perspective of zero-temperature solids and thus broaden the predictive power of inherent structures.

Here, we implement the calculation of the density correlation and response of inherent structures. A quantity with the temperature dimension, $T_{IS}$, is derived from their ratio. For several widely studied model systems in both two (2D) and three (3D) dimensions, $T_{IS}$ agrees well with the crystallization temperature of monocomponent systems and the onset temperature (to be defined later) of glass-formers. We also compare $T_{IS}$ of inherent structures obtained from the fast quenching of high-temperature states with that of ultrastable inherent structures obtained from the swap Monte Carlo algorithm (31), corresponding to extremely slow quenching, and find
identical results. Note that we deal with nonequilibrium systems in the absence of dynamics (i.e., at zero temperature), so it is not straightforward that the calculation could lead to equilibrium temperatures. This finding builds up the links between nonequilibrium and equilibrium systems and between onset and crystallization temperatures and suggests an indirect way to obtain characteristic temperatures of equilibrium systems. Driven by the curiosity about whether the agreement between onset and crystallization temperatures is the wave vector along the $x$ direction satisfying the periodic boundary conditions, $\vec{r}_j$ is the location of particle $j$, and $\xi_j$ is randomly chosen to be 1 or $-1$ with a zero mean. As most of previous studies, we choose $k$ to be approximately the value at which the static structure factor reaches the first maximum, which quantifies the average separation between nearest neighbors. We apply a weak external field by introducing a perturbation ($\rho$, $\xi$)
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$$\Delta H = -\hbar \rho_k$$

(2)

to the Hamiltonian, where $\hbar$ is the strength of the field. This leads to an external force $-\nabla_{\rho} (\Delta H)$ on particle $j$. In most of our studies, inherent structures are obtained by quenching high-temperature states to local energy minima at a given density and in the presence of a given external field via the fast inertial relaxation engine (FIRE) minimization algorithm (33). Then, we decrease $\hbar$ by a small step size $\delta \hbar$ and perform the FIRE minimization again. We repeat this procedure until $\hbar$ decays to zero. In the small $\hbar$ limit, we obtain the linear response

$$R = \lim_{\hbar \to 0} \frac{\langle \rho_{k, IS} \rangle_0 - \langle \rho_{k, IS} \rangle_0}{\hbar}$$

(3)

where $\rho_{k, IS}$ denotes the density of inherent structures, and $\langle . \rangle$ denotes the ensemble average with the subscript showing the field. For inherent structures with $\hbar = 0$, we also calculate the correlation

$$C = \langle \rho_{k, IS}^2 \rangle_0 - \langle \rho_{k, IS} \rangle_0^2$$

(4)

where $\langle . \rangle$ also denotes the ensemble average. Borrowing the FDR, we define a temperature-like quantity

$$T_{IS} = \frac{C}{R}$$

(5)

The expression of $T_{IS}$ has exactly the same form of the effective temperatures derived from the FDR in previous studies (10–17), only that, here, $T_{IS}$ is calculated directly from zero-temperature states in the absence of dynamics. It is not straightforward to tell whether $T_{IS}$ can be a meaningful temperature and whether it can be related to effective temperatures of evolving systems with dynamics.

To check whether $T_{IS}$ relies on quench rate, we also calculate $T_{IS}$ of ultrastable inherent structures. To obtain an ultrastable state, we first equilibrate a polydisperse system at a temperature lower than the glass transition temperature using the swap Monte Carlo algorithm (31) and then quench the system to the local minimum via FIRE. The resultant ultrastable inherent structures can be viewed as states quenched with extremely slow rates. In the following, if not specified, the results are for fast-quenched inherent structures.

We first focus on mono- and bidisperse systems in 3D. Figure 1 shows the density evolution of $R$, $C$, and $T_{IS}$. For both LJ and RLJ systems, Fig. 1A shows that the response $R$ monotonically decreases as the density $\rho$ increases. Over the range of densities studied, $R$ changes over a decade. In contrast, the correlation $C$ varies more mildly, fluctuating by at most a factor of two, as shown in Fig. 1B. Therefore, the density dependence of $T_{IS}$ is mainly determined by $R(\rho)$. As shown in Fig. 1C, $T_{IS}$ monotonically increases with $\rho$ for both mono- and bidisperse systems. At high densities, RLJ and LJ systems behave quantitatively the same, where attraction in LJ systems acts just as a small perturbation (30, 34–36). With the decrease
of $\rho$, they depart from each other and the bifurcation is more and more pronounced, indicating the growth of the nonperturbative role of attraction (30, 35, 36). The presence of attraction helps to stabilize LJ systems at low densities, leading to a smaller response and consequently a higher $T_{IS}$.

Figure 1D indicates that the $R(\rho)$ of HARM systems is qualitatively different from those of RLJ and LJ systems. With the increase of $\rho$, $R$ initially decreases but increases after reaching a minimum. Because $C(\rho)$ also varies relatively mildly (see Fig. 1E), this nonmonotonic behavior of $R(\rho)$ results in a nonmonotonic $T_{IS}(\rho)$. As shown in Fig. 1F, $T_{IS}(\rho)$ exhibits a maximum.

**Agreement between $T_{IS}$ and characteristic temperatures of equilibrium systems**

The density dependence of $T_{IS}$ resembles some well-known liquid-solid transition temperatures, e.g., the crystallization temperature and the glass transition temperature. RLJ and LJ potentials have the same repulsive core, only that the LJ potential has an attractive tail. It has been shown that the glass transition temperature of LJ systems is higher than that of RLJ systems at low densities due to the nonper- 

$$T_{IS} \approx \rho^\gamma$$

with $\gamma \approx 5$ (30, 36–38). All these features are reproduced in $T_{IS}(\rho)$. As shown in Fig. 1C, $T_{IS} \approx T_{IS} \approx \rho^\gamma$ at high densities and $T_{IS} > T_{IS}$ at low densities. Note that the crystallization temperature should have similar density dependence to the glass transition temperature (30, 35, 36, 39–41). The HARM potential is intrinsically different from LJ and RLJ potentials due to its soft-core nature (41). Because of this, HARM systems exhibit reentrant crystallization and glass transition, i.e., the crystallization and glass transition temperatures are nonmonotonic in density and have a maximum value (25, 41–43). This reentrant behavior is exactly reproduced in $T_{IS}^{HARM}(\rho)$, as shown in Fig. 1F.

Monodisperse systems are easy to crystallize, so compared to crystallization temperatures, it is not straightforward to determine their glass transition temperatures. In contrast, the bidisperse systems studied here have been widely used as typical glass-formers, which hinder the crystallization. However, for both mono- and bidisperse systems, we obtain $T_{IS}(\rho)$. In addition, note that FIRE minimization always leads to inherent structures with glassy (disordered) structures in 3D (44). It is then plausible to expect that $T_{IS}$ represents the same type of characteristic temperatures, independent of systems. Because crystallization and glass transition temperatures are intrinsically different, it would be bizarre if $T_{IS}$ agrees with the crystallization temperature for monodisperse systems but the glass transition temperature for bidisperse systems. Then, the question is whether $T_{IS}$ indeed reflects any known temperature or it just happens to capture the temperature dependence of some characteristic temperatures qualitatively.

To answer this question, it is necessary to directly compare all these temperatures. For all thermal systems, we perform molecular dynamics simulations in the canonical (NpT) ensemble, collecting data after relaxing the system over a long time. We locate the characteristic temperatures such as $T_g$ and $T_c$ are defined as the temperature at which the pressure $p$ shows a discontinuous jump with the decrease of temperature. For bidisperse systems, we calculate the intermediate scattering function

$$F_0(k, t) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_j \exp \left[ i k \cdot \left[ \hat{r}_j(t) - \hat{r}_j(0) \right] \right]$$

where $\langle \rangle$ denotes the ensemble average and all the other symbols are the same as those in Eq. 1, from which the relaxation time $\tau$ satisfying $F_0(k, \tau) = e^{-1}F_0(k, 0)$ is obtained. Figure 2A shows some examples of $F_0(k, t)$ at various temperatures. The glass transition temperature $T_g$ is determined by fitting the low-temperature part of $\pi(T)$ in Fig. 2B into the Vogel-Fulcher function, $\tau = \tau_0 \exp [M/(T - T_g)]$, where $\tau_0$ and $M$ are fitting parameters.

In Fig. 2C, we first compare $T_{IS}$ with $T_g$ of bidisperse systems and $T_c$ of monodisperse systems for all systems shown in Fig. 1. While $T_c$ seems to quantitatively agree with $T_{IS}$, $T_g$ is apparently lower than $T_{IS}$. The comparison indicates that $T_{IS}$ may reflect the crystallization temperature but is not related to the glass transition temperature. The agreement between $T_{IS}$ and $T_c$ at least suggests that $T_{IS}$ should not be a meaningless quantity, but the question is what $T_{IS}$ represents for bidisperse systems.

Note that for glass-formers, there is another characteristic temperature named as the onset temperature, which separates the high-temperature simple liquids from the low-temperature “landscape-influenced” supercooled liquids (23, 45). As shown in Fig. 2B, the relaxation time $\tau(T)$ at high temperatures is Arrhenius, $\tau = \tau_0 \exp (E_a/T)$ with $\tau_0$ and $E_a$ being the prefactor and activation energy, respectively. This is a typical behavior of simple liquids. The Arrhenius behavior is destroyed and replaced with the super-Arrhenius behavior described
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by, for example, the Vogel-Fulcher function, when the temperature is lower than the onset temperature $T_{on}$. It is then interesting to know whether $T_{IS}$ of bidisperse systems can agree with $T_{on}$.

We then compare $T_{on}$ with $T_{IS}$ in Fig. 2C. They turn out to agree well. Recent studies have proposed that $T_{on}$ is consistent with the melting (crystallization) temperature (23, 45–47), especially a direct illustration of the quantitative agreement between them (47). The fact that both $T_c$ and $T_{on}$ agree with $T_{IS}$ provides a strong piece of evidence linking the onset temperature of glass-formers to the crystallization temperature from the unique perspective of inherent structures. It is also intriguing that the calculation of $T_{IS}$ from nonequilibrium inherent structures results in equilibrium temperatures.

**Dependence on spatial dimension and quench rate**

It is well known that due to the interference of interfacial energy, there is a hysteresis effect in the crystallization and melting processes for some materials so that the melting temperature $T_m$ is higher than $T_c$. As shown in Fig. 3A, taking the 3D monodisperse HARM systems as the example, there is indeed a hysteresis effect. Here, we find that $T_{IS}$ agrees with $T_c$ but not $T_m$. A possible explanation is that $T_c$ is the lower temperature limit for liquids with Arrhenius behavior to exist, while $T_{on}$ plays the same role. In Fig. 2D, we show that liquids between $T_m$ and $T_c$ still exhibit an exponentially decayed $F_R(k, t)$ and an Arrhenius $\tau(T)$, similar to the behaviors of simple liquids above $T_{on}$ for glass-formers.

In 2D, the hysteresis effect is weak and $T_m \approx T_c$, as shown in Fig. 3D. If $T_{IS}$ could still agree with $T_c$, the link between $T_{IS}$ and the crystallization (melting) process would be less vague. In Fig. 2D, we compare $T_{IS}$ with $T_c$ for 2D monodisperse HARM systems. They turn out to agree well. Figure 2D also shows that $T_{IS} \approx T_{on} > T_g$ for 2D bidisperse systems. Therefore, our argument that $T_{IS}$ is connected to $T_c$ and $T_{on}$ does not rely on spatial dimension.

Another issue probably affecting the robustness of our argument is the quench rate. We calculate $T_{IS}$ for ultrastable inherent structures obtained from the swap Monte Carlo algorithm. As shown in Fig. 2D, $T_{IS}$ still matches well with $T_{on}$ of the corresponding polydisperse system but is larger than $T_g$. Ultrastable inherent structures correspond to extremely slow quench rates. Therefore, our argument does not depend on quench rate, either.

**Effective temperatures**

Although derived from the FDR, $T_{IS}$ is obtained in the absence of dynamics, different from previous studies of effective temperatures in typical nonequilibrium systems such as aging glasses, shear flows, and active matter (10–17, 48–50). It is then important to know the relationship between $T_{IS}$ and previously defined effective temperatures. Can $T_{IS}$ be the effective temperature of any or all these systems in the slow dynamics limit?

We then calculate the time-dependent FDR for bidisperse systems of aging glasses, quasi-static shear flows, and quasi-static self-propelled active flows. The time-dependent correlation and response functions are calculated as $C(t) = \langle p_x(t + \omega_{0}) p_x(t) \rangle_0 - \langle p_x(t) \rangle_0^2$ and $R(t) = \langle [p_x(t + \omega_{0})] h - \langle p_x(t + \omega_{0}) \rangle_0 h \rangle / h$, where $\omega_{0}$ is the waiting time and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the ensemble average with the subscript showing the strength of the perturbation field $h$.

Figure 4 (A and B) shows an example of $C(t)$ and $R(t)$, respectively, for an aging glass of HARM systems in 3D. To study the aging, we suddenly drop the temperature of the equilibrium liquid below the glass transition temperature and take the measurement after a waiting time $t_w$. With the increase of time, $C(t)$ decays, while $R(t)$ increases.

When we plot $R(t)$ against $C(t)$, as shown in Fig. 4C, there are apparently two distinct short- and long-time behaviors. This is different from equilibrium systems. It is well known that equilibrium systems show a linear $R(C)$ at all times and the temperature can be calculated from the slope of the $R(C)$ curve: $T = -\frac{dC}{dT}$. As discussed in most of previous studies (11–17, 48–50), the slope is time dependent for nonequilibrium systems. If we still define temperature from the slope, the temperature will vary with time. At short times, $-\frac{dC}{dT}$ is approximately equal to the heat bath temperature $T$. With the increase of time, $R(C)$ first exhibits a nonlinear crossover and then becomes linear at long times, from which the effective temperature $T_{eff} = -\frac{dC}{dT}$ is defined. It has been shown that the effective temperature is independent of waiting time $t_w$ (48). In Fig. 4C, we compare $R(C)$ curves of aging glasses at three different temperatures. Although their heat bath temperatures are different, their $R(C)$ curves are parallel at long times, indicating that they have the same $T_{eff}$.

Remember that we intend to see whether there are any connections between $T_{IS}$ and $T_{eff}$. Therefore, in Fig. 4D, we compare $T_{eff}$ of aging glasses at various temperatures with $T_{on}$, which is $T_{IS}$ for bidisperse systems. They all agree well with $T_{on}$.

Then, we repeat the work for quasi-static shear flows and quasi self-propelled active flows and show the results in Fig. 4 (E to H). The simulation details of both types of flows are described in Materials and Methods. For both types of flows, the waiting time $t_w$ is sufficiently large to guarantee that the measurements are taken in steady flows.

![Figure 3. Hysteresis effect in crystallization and melting. (A) Equation of state $p(T)$ for 3D monodisperse HARM systems at $\rho = 1.5$. We repeat the cooling and heating processes for multiple times (in different colors), and the hysteresis always exists. The vertical dashed lines label the crystallization temperature $T_c$ and melting temperature $T_m$. (B) Intermediate scattering function $F_R(k, t)$ for states at $T_c < t < T_m$. They all show roughly exponential decay. (C) Temperature dependence of the relaxation time $\tau$ of liquid states above $T_c$. The squares and triangles are above and below $T_m$. The line is the Arrhenius fit to $\tau(T)$. Systems at $T_c < t < T_m$ still exhibit Arrhenius behavior. (D) Equation of state for 2D monodisperse HARM systems at $\rho = 1.4$. We also show multiple cooling-heating cycles. The vertical dashed line labels $T_c$. The hysteresis effect is weak in 2D systems.](image-url)
Figure 4 (E and G) show that for both flows, \( R(C) \) curves are also linear at long times and parallel for different shear rates \( \dot{\gamma} \) or self-propulsion velocities \( v_{sp} \) studied here. As shown in Fig. 4 (F and H), in the quasi-static flow regime, \( T_{\text{eff}} \) is also equal to \( T_{\text{on}} \) for both sheared and self-propelled systems.

Now, we see that \( T_{\text{eff}} \) of aging glasses, quasi-static shear flows, and quasi-static self-propelled flows all agree with \( T_{\text{on}} \) \( (T_{23}) \) for bidisperse systems. According to our argument that \( T_{23} \approx T_{c} \) for monodisperse systems, if \( T_{\text{eff}} \) of slow-evolving systems indeed reflects \( T_{23} \), we should see \( T_{\text{eff}} \approx T_{c} \) for monodisperse systems. In Fig. 4 (F and H), we also compare \( T_{\text{eff}} \) of quasi-statically sheared and self-propelled monodisperse HARM systems. As expected, \( T_{\text{eff}} \approx T_{c} \).

Figures 5 and 6 are counterparts of Fig. 4 for bidisperse LJ and R LJ systems in 3D. They tell the same story. On the basis of the results of Figs. 4 to 6, we are able to claim that \( T_{23} \) measures the effective (fluctuation-dissipation) temperatures of slow-evolving nonequilibrium systems, independent of particle interactions and ways to drive the system to evolve. Therefore, our results suggest that fluctuation-dissipation temperatures of slow-evolving nonequilibrium systems may not be so mysterious as initially imagined. They all reflect the characteristic equilibrium temperatures, crystallization, and onset temperatures. This also provides another evidence of the connection between \( T_{c} \) and \( T_{\text{on}} \).

**DISCUSSION**

By calculating the FDR of inherent structures, we obtain a temperature-like quantity \( T_{23} \), which agrees well with the crystallization temperature of monodisperse systems and the onset temperature of bi- and polydisperse glass-formers. This statistical approach of inherent structures is crucial in several aspects. First, it shows that inherent structures have the predictive power of characteristic temperatures of equilibrium systems, providing another evidence of the underlying connections between equilibrium and nonequilibrium systems (41). Second, it suggests a fast and easy way to indirectly calculate the crystallization and onset temperatures. Third, it evidences that the onset temperature and the crystallization temperature are essentially consistent.

Then, the question is why \( T_{23} \) agrees with \( T_{c} \) and \( T_{\text{on}} \). Note that \( T_{23} \) is calculated from the FDR of inherent structures. It thus assumes the “exploration” of inherent structures even in the absence of dynamics. In this sense, \( T_{23} \) could be regarded as the effective temperature at \( T = 0 \), which may correspond to the lowest heat bath temperature required to drive the system to traverse the potential energy landscape by overcoming energy barriers and explore all inherent structures. For monocomponent crystal-formers, the crystallization temperature \( T_{c} \) naturally acts as such a kind of temperature, because when \( T < T_{c} \), the system crystallizes and loses the ability to freely explore the potential energy landscape. We do find that \( T_{23} \approx T_{c} \) consistent with our expectation. For glass-formers, previous studies have suggested that the onset temperature \( T_{\text{on}} \) plays a similar role as \( T_{c} \) (23, 45–47). It is then reasonable to expect that \( T_{23} \approx T_{\text{on}} \) for glass-formers, which is exactly what we find here. Conversely, \( T_{23} \approx T_{\text{on}} \) and \( T_{23} \approx T_{c} \) found here directly illustrate the consistency between \( T_{\text{on}} \) and \( T_{c} \). Of course, the situation is more complicated for glass-formers. Unlike crystals at \( T < T_{c} \), supercooled liquids at \( T < T_{\text{on}} \) can still diffuse. However, it is well known that systems at \( T < T_{\text{on}} \) are in the landscape-influenced regime and selective of configurations (23), showing special dynamics distinct from simple liquids at \( T > T_{\text{on}} \) such as two-step structural relaxation and dynamic heterogeneity (39, 51, 52). The fact that \( T_{23} \approx T_{\text{on}} \) consistently reflects that the system starts to explore the potential energy landscape in a way different from simple liquids when \( T < T_{\text{on}} \).
Fig. 5. Effective temperatures of slow-evolving bidisperse LJ systems and their relations to the onset temperatures. The results are for 3D systems at $\rho = 1.2$.

(A, C, and E) Relation between $R(t)$ and $C(t)$ for aging glasses at various temperatures $T$ and with $t_w = 10^3$, quasi-static shear flows at various shear rates $\gamma$, and quasi-static self-propelled flows at various self-propulsion velocities $v_{sp}$ respectively. The lines show the long-time linear FDR, from which the effective temperature $T_{eff}$ is determined.

(B, D, and F) Ratio of the effective temperature to the onset temperature, $T_{eff}/T_{on}$, against the temperature $T$ for aging glasses, shear rate $\gamma$ for shear flows, and self-propulsion velocity $v_{sp}$ for self-propelled flows, respectively. The horizontal dashed lines show $T_{eff} = T_{on}$.

Fig. 6. Effective temperatures of slow-evolving bidisperse RLJ systems and their relations to the onset temperatures. The results are for 3D systems at $\rho = 1.2$.

(A, C, and E) Relation between $R(t)$ and $C(t)$ for aging glasses at various temperatures $T$ and with $t_w = 10^3$, quasi-static shear flows at various shear rates $\gamma$, and quasi-static self-propelled flows at various self-propulsion velocities $v_{sp}$ respectively. The lines show the long-time linear FDR, from which the effective temperature $T_{eff}$ is determined.

(B, D, and F) Ratio of the effective temperature to the onset temperature, $T_{eff}/T_{on}$, against the temperature $T$ for aging glasses, shear rate $\gamma$ for shear flows, and self-propulsion velocity $v_{sp}$ for self-propelled flows, respectively. The horizontal dashed lines show $T_{eff} = T_{on}$. 
Although easy to crystallize, monodisperse systems can still form glasses with sufficiently fast quench rates. We may then view $T_c$ as $T_{on}$ for the glass-formation of monodisperse systems on the basis of the consistency between $T_c$ and $T_{on}$. On the other hand, widely used glass-formers, especially bidisperse systems, may slowly evolve to microphase or phase separation with sufficiently slow quench rate (41, 53). If phase separation occurs, $T_{on}$ could be regarded as the onset temperature of the separation (ordering) as well. Therefore, whether crystals (phase separation) or glasses are formed is usually time dependent for some materials. However, $T_{IS}$ has nothing to do with time, so does the characteristic temperature it represents, i.e., the lowest temperature for simple liquids with the Arrhenius behavior to exist. Below such a temperature, crystallization (phase separation) and glass-formation can occur at different time scales, but both processes exhibit dynamics deviating from the Arrhenius behavior. Then, how to interpret the temperature represented by $T_{IS}$ (as $T_c$ or $T_{on}$) depends on the form of the resultant solid.

Under certain conditions, bi-disperse systems can also form complex crystals such as Laves phases (54). In the parameter space studied in this work, we do not see any sign of the formation of complex crystals. If complex crystals could be formed, we expect that $T_{IS}$ would still measure the crystallization temperature on the basis of our findings here. This requires the realization of complex crystals, which is beyond the scope of this work and will be left for future studies.

Acting as the zero-temperature effective temperature, $T_{IS}$ unifies fluctuation-dissipation temperatures of typical slow-evolving non-equilibrium systems, such as aging glasses, shear flows, and self-propelled active matter. This clarifies the long-standing puzzles about the effective temperature: what the effective temperature defined from the FDR represents and whether it is a well-defined thermodynamic temperature unique to nonequilibrium systems. Our work reveals that it actually reflects the characteristic temperatures of equilibrium systems. For given systems, the crystallization or onset temperature is just a function of density. Therefore, once the density if fixed, the effective temperature of the corresponding slow-evolving system is fixed. In another word, the effective temperature is governed by density. If such an effective temperature could act as a thermodynamic temperature as the heat bath temperature in equilibrium systems does, it would obey the zeroth law of thermodynamics. Namely, for example, if we put two quasi-ideal shear flows with different effective temperatures into thermal contact, i.e., allowing heat to transfer between them, then we would expect that the effective temperature gradient causes “heat” flux to equilibrate the temperatures and, lastly, their effective temperatures are equal, although no particle exchange is allowed between the two systems and their densities are not allowed to change. However, this cannot happen (49). Because effective temperatures are controlled by density, as long as the densities of the two contacting shear flows are fixed, the effective temperature gap between them will maintain and no heat flux can be produced. Our work thus calls for the revisit of the effective temperature and the theories based on it. Being possibly the simplest case, the effective temperature of sheared ideal gases and its multiple definitions (6, 7) may be the good starting point.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**System details**

Our systems are equilateral boxes with a side length $L$, containing $N = 1000 (1024)$ particles with the same mass $m$ in 3D (2D). In bidisperse systems, there are $N_A A$ particles and $N_B (= N - N_A)$ $B$ particles, while $N_A = N$ and there are only $A$ particles in monodisperse systems. We apply Lees-Edwards boundary conditions (55) when studying shear flows and periodic boundary conditions in all directions for all the other cases.

For LJ and RLJ systems, the interaction potential between particles $i$ and $j$ is

$$U(r_{ij}) = \frac{\epsilon_{ij}}{2} \left[ \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}} \right]^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r_{ij}} \right)^{6} + f(r_{ij}) \quad (7)$$

where $r_{ij}$ is the separation between the two particles, $\epsilon_{ij}$ and $\sigma_{ij}$ depend on the types of interacting particles, and $f(r_{ij})$ ensures that $U = U' = 0$ at the truncation $r_{ij} = r^T_{ij}$. For bidisperse systems, we use the Kob-Anderson model (56): $N_A = 0.8 N$ and $N_B = 0.2 N$ with the parameters $\epsilon_{AB} = 1.5 \epsilon_{AA}$, $\epsilon_{BB} = 0.5 \epsilon_{AA}$, $\sigma_{AB} = 0.8 \sigma_{AA}$, and $\sigma_{BB} = 0.88 \sigma_{AA}$. The potential cutoff $r^T_{ij}$ is 2.5$\sigma_{ij}$ for LJ potential and $2^{6/3} \sigma_{ij}$ for RLJ potential.

For HARM systems, the interaction potential is

$$U(r_{ij}) = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{ij}} \right)^2 \Theta \left( 1 - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{ij}} \right) \quad (8)$$

where $\sigma_{ij}$ is the sum of radii of particles $i$ and $j$, and $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function. For bidisperse systems, $N_A = N_B = 0.5 N$ and the diameters of A and B particles are $\sigma_A$ and $\sigma_B/1.4$, respectively. We also use polydisperse HARM systems to efficiently generate ultrastable inherent structures. For polydisperse systems, the particle diameters $\sigma$ are chosen from the distribution $P(\sigma) \sim \sigma^{-3}$, where $\sigma \in [0.73 \sigma_0, 1.63 \sigma_0]$.

**Calculation of onset temperature**

To locate the onset temperature, we fit the intermediate scattering function $F_1(k, t)$ with the Kohlrausch-Williams-Watts stretched exponential form, $F_1(k, t) \sim \exp\left[t/(\tau)^\beta\right]$. For simple liquids with Arrhenius behavior, $\beta = 1$. When $T < T_{on}$ and the liquids exhibit super-Arrhenius behavior, $\beta < 1$. We set $T_{on}$ as the temperature at which $\beta$ decays to 0.8 $\sim$ 0.9 (57, 58).

**Simulation of shear flows**

To mimic shear flows, we apply the shear in the $x$ direction with a shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$ and integrate the equation of motion

$$m \frac{d^2 \vec{r}_i}{dt^2} = -\sum_j \left[ \frac{dU(r_{ij})}{d\vec{r}_j} + \eta(\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j) \right] \quad (9)$$

where $\vec{r}_i$ and $\vec{v}_i$ are the location and velocity of particle $i$, $\eta$ is the damping coefficient, and the sum is over all particles interacting with particle $i$. Here, we use $\eta = 0.5$ in units to be defined below.

**Simulation of self-propelled flows**

For self-propelled active systems, we study a minimal model governed by the overdamped equation of motion (59)

$$\chi \vec{v}_i = -\sum_j \frac{dU(r_{ij})}{d\vec{r}_j} + f \vec{n}_i = \vec{F}_i + f \vec{n}_i \quad (10)$$

where $\chi$ is the damping coefficient, $f$ and $\vec{n}_i$ are the strength and orientation of self-propulsion, respectively, and the sum is over all
particles interacting with particle $i$. The orientation $\vec{n}_i$ is set at the beginning of the simulation and remains fixed, satisfying $\sum_i \vec{n}_i = 0$. To probe quasi-static flows of self-propelled particles [see (60) for the reasons in detail], we use a recently developed constant propulsion velocity algorithm (60) by setting

$$f = \chi v_{sp} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \vec{v}_i \cdot \vec{n}_i$$

(11)

where $v_{sp} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i$ is the average self-propulsion velocity. Then, we are able to control $v_{sp}$ and access quasi-static flows in the $v_{sp} \to 0$ limit.

**Units**

For LJ and RLJ systems, we set the units of length, mass, and energy to be $\sigma_{AA}$, $m$, and $\epsilon_{AA}$, respectively. The temperature is in units of $\epsilon_{AA}/k_B$, with $k_B$ being the Boltzmann constant. The density $\rho$ is defined as $N \sigma_{AA}^3$. For self-propelled systems with $m = 0$, the time is in units of $\sigma_{AA} v_{sp}/\epsilon_{AA}$. For all the other systems, the time is in units of $m^{1/2} \sigma_{AA} \epsilon_{AA}^{1/2}$. For HARM systems, we replace $\sigma_{AA}$ and $\epsilon_{AA}$ with $\sigma_0$ and $\epsilon$.
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