# How to initialise a second class particle?

Joint with Attila László Nagy

#### Márton Balázs

University of Bristol

Advances in Last Passage Percolation 26 June, 2019.

#### The models

Simple exclusion Zero range Bricklayers

#### Hydrodynamics

The second class particle

Ferrari-Kipnis for TASEP

Let's generalise



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\rho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.


Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump to the right with rate 1.

The jump is suppressed if the destination site is occupied by another particle.

The Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution is time-stationary for any ( $0 \le \varrho \le 1$ ). Any translation-invariant stationary distribution is a mixture of Bernoullis.

 $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ 







Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).



Particles jump to the right with rate  $r(\omega_i)$  (*r* non-decreasing).

Extremal translation-invariant stationary distributions are still product, and rather explicit in terms of  $r(\cdot)$ .

Two special cases:

- ▶  $r(\omega_i) = \mathbf{1}\{\omega_i > \mathbf{0}\}$ : classical zero range;  $\omega_i \sim \text{Geom}(\theta)$ .
- $r(\omega_i) = \omega_i$ : independent walkers;  $\omega_i \sim \text{Poi}(\theta)$ .

# Totally asymmetric bricklayers process



## Totally asymmetric bricklayers process



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 

 $(r(\omega) \cdot r(1 - \omega) = 1;$  r non-decreasing).

## Totally asymmetric bricklayers process



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 

 $(r(\omega) \cdot r(1 - \omega) = 1;$  r non-decreasing).


a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$


a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 



a brick is added with rate  $[r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ 

Extremal translation-invariant stationary distributions are still product, and rather explicit in terms of  $r(\cdot)$ .

A special case:  $r(\omega_i) = e^{\beta \omega_i}$ :  $\omega_i \sim \text{discrete Gaussian}(\frac{\theta}{\beta}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}})$ .


























































































































#### Rescaled version: rarefaction fan



#### Rescaled version: rarefaction fan



#### Rescaled version: rarefaction fan
















































































































































States  $\omega$  and  $\eta$  only differ at one site.



States  $\omega$  and  $\eta$  only differ at one site.



States  $\omega$  and  $\eta$  only differ at one site.







Blue TASEP  $\omega$ : Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) for sites {..., -2, -1, 0}, Bernoulli( $\lambda$ ) for sites {1, 2, 3, ...}.

Black TASEP  $\eta$ : Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) for sites {..., -3, -2, -1}, Bernoulli( $\lambda$ ) for sites {0, 1, 2, ...}.



 $h_i(t)$ ,  $g_i(t)$  are the respective numbers of particles jumping over the edge (i, i + 1) by time t (i > 0).

First realization:



First realization:

•  $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\varrho)$  for i < 0



First realization:

•  $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\varrho)$  for i < 0

• 
$$(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (0, 0)$$
 w. prob.  $1 - \varrho$   
 $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 0)$  w. prob.  $\varrho - \lambda$   
 $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 1)$  w. prob.  $\lambda$ 



First realization:

- $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\varrho)$  for i < 0
- $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (0, 0)$  w. prob.  $1 \varrho$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 0)$  w. prob.  $\varrho - \lambda$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 1)$  w. prob.  $\lambda$

•  $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\lambda) \text{ for } i > 0$ 



First realization:

- $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\varrho)$  for i < 0
- $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (0, 0)$  w. prob.  $1 \varrho$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 0)$  w. prob.  $\varrho - \lambda$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 1)$  w. prob.  $\lambda$

•  $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\lambda)$  for i > 0



First realization:

- $\blacktriangleright \omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\rho) \text{ for } i < 0$
- $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (0, 0)$  w. prob.  $1 \rho$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 0)$  w. prob.  $\rho - \lambda$  2<sup>nd</sup> class particle  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 1)$  w. prob.  $\lambda$

•  $\omega_i(0) = \eta_i(0) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\lambda)$  for i > 0



 $\mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = (\rho - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{Q}(t) > i\}.$ 

Second realization:



Second realization:



 $\mathsf{E}h_i(t) - \mathsf{E}g_i(t) = \mathsf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = \mathsf{E}(\eta_i(t) - \eta_i(0)) = \mathsf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathsf{E}\eta_i(0).$ 

Thus,

$$\mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = (\varrho - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{Q}(t) > i\},\\ \mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = \mathbf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathbf{E}\eta_i(0),$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = (\varrho - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{P}\{Q(t) > i\},\\ \mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = \mathbf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathbf{E}\eta_i(0),$$

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) > i\} = \frac{\mathsf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathsf{E}\eta_i(0)}{\varrho - \lambda}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = (\varrho - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{P}\{Q(t) > i\},$$
  
$$\mathbf{E}h_i(t) - \mathbf{E}g_i(t) = \mathbf{E}(h_i(t) - g_i(t)) = \mathbf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathbf{E}\eta_i(0),$$

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) > i\} = \frac{\mathsf{E}\eta_i(t) - \mathsf{E}\eta_i(0)}{\varrho - \lambda}.$$

Combine with hydrodynamics to conclude

$$\frac{Q(t)}{t} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{shock velocity} & \text{in a shock,} \\ U(H'(\varrho), H'(\lambda)) & \text{in a rarefaction wave.} \end{cases}$$

Other models have more than 0 or 1 particles per site. How do we start the second class particle?

Shall we do

Other models have more than 0 or 1 particles per site. How do we start the second class particle?

Shall we do

► Recall for TASEP we increased  $\lambda$  to  $\varrho$  by adding or not adding a 2<sup>nd</sup> class particle.  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (0, 0)$  w. prob.  $1 - \varrho$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 0)$  w. prob.  $\varrho - \lambda$  $(\omega_0(0), \eta_0(0)) = (1, 1)$  w. prob.  $\lambda$  $\varrho_i$ 

Fix  $\lambda < \rho \leq \lambda + 1$ . Is there a joint distribution of  $(\omega_0, \eta_0)$  such that

- the first marginal is  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- the second marginal is  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;

► 
$$\eta_0 \le \omega_0 \le \eta_0 + 1$$
?

Fix  $\lambda < \rho \leq \lambda + 1$ . Is there a joint distribution of  $(\omega_0, \eta_0)$  such that

- the first marginal is  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- the second marginal is  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;

► 
$$\eta_0 \le \omega_0 \le \eta_0 + 1$$
?

Proposition

• Of course for Bernoulli (TASEP).

Fix  $\lambda < \rho \leq \lambda + 1$ . Is there a joint distribution of  $(\omega_0, \eta_0)$  such that

- the first marginal is  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- the second marginal is  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;

► 
$$\eta_0 \le \omega_0 \le \eta_0 + 1$$
?

Proposition

- Of course for Bernoulli (TASEP).
- ▶ No for Geometric (classical TAZRP with  $r(\omega_i) = \mathbf{1}\{\omega_i > \mathbf{0}\}$ ).

Fix  $\lambda < \rho \leq \lambda + 1$ . Is there a joint distribution of  $(\omega_0, \eta_0)$  such that

- the first marginal is  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- the second marginal is  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;

► 
$$\eta_0 \le \omega_0 \le \eta_0 + 1$$
?

Proposition

- Of course for Bernoulli (TASEP).
- ▶ No for Geometric (classical TAZRP with  $r(\omega_i) = \mathbf{1}\{\omega_i > 0\}$ ).
- ▶ No for Poisson (indep. walkers with  $r(\omega_i) = \omega_i$ ).

Fix  $\lambda < \rho \leq \lambda + 1$ . Is there a joint distribution of  $(\omega_0, \eta_0)$  such that

- the first marginal is  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- the second marginal is  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;

► 
$$\eta_0 \le \omega_0 \le \eta_0 + 1$$
?

Proposition

- Of course for Bernoulli (TASEP).
- ▶ No for Geometric (classical TAZRP with  $r(\omega_i) = \mathbf{1}\{\omega_i > \mathbf{0}\}$ ).
- ▶ No for Poisson (indep. walkers with  $r(\omega_i) = \omega_i$ ).
- Yes for discrete Gaussian (bricklayers with  $r(\omega_i) = e^{\beta \omega_i}$ ).

Keep calm and couple anyway.

Find a coupling measure  $\nu$  with

- first marginal  $\omega_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\varrho}$ ;
- second marginal  $\eta_0 \sim$  stati.  $\mu^{\lambda}$ ;
- ► zero weight whenever  $\omega_0 \notin \{\eta_0, \eta_0 + 1\}$ .

Not many choices:

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}\},$$
  

$$\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\},$$
  

$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}\},$$
  

$$\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\},$$
  

$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

$$\nu(x, x) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots x\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots x - 1\},$$
  

$$\nu(x + 1, x) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots x\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots x\},$$
  

$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

**Bad news:**  $\nu(x, x)$  can be negative (e.g., Geom., Poi).

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x} - 1\},$$
  
$$\nu(\mathbf{x} + 1, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\},$$
  
$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

Bad news: ν(x, x) can be negative (e.g., Geom., Poi).
 Good news: Who cares? No 2<sup>nd</sup> class particle there.

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}\},$$
  
$$\nu(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\},$$
  
$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

Bad news: ν(x, x) can be negative (e.g., Geom., Poi).
 Good news: Who cares? No 2<sup>nd</sup> class particle there.
 Good news: ν(x + 1, x) ≥ 0 (attractivity).

$$\nu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x} - 1\},$$
  
$$\nu(\mathbf{x} + 1, \mathbf{x}) = \mu^{\lambda} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\} - \mu^{\varrho} \{-\infty \dots \mathbf{x}\},$$
  
$$\nu = \text{zero elsewhere.}$$

- **Bad news:**  $\nu(x, x)$  can be negative (e.g., Geom., Poi).
- Good news: Who cares? No 2<sup>nd</sup> class particle there.
- Good news:  $\nu(x + 1, x) \ge 0$  (attractivity).

We can still use the *signed measure*  $\nu$  formally, as we only care about  $\nu(x + 1, x)$ . Scale this up to get the initial distribution at the site of the second class particle:

$$\mu(\omega_0, \eta_0) = \mu(\eta_0 + 1, \eta_0) = \frac{\nu(\eta_0 + 1, \eta_0)}{\sum_x \nu(x + 1, x)} = \frac{\nu(\eta_0 + 1, \eta_0)}{\varrho - \lambda}.$$

$$\mu(\omega_0, \eta_0) = \frac{\nu(\eta_0 + 1, \eta_0)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

- is a proper probability distribution;
- actually agrees with the coupling measure ν conditioned on a 2<sup>nd</sup> class particle when ν behaves nicely (Bernoulli, discr.Gaussian);

Theorem  
Starting in  

$$\bigotimes_{i<0} \mu_i^{\varrho} \otimes \mu_0 \otimes \bigotimes_{i>0} \mu_i^{\lambda},$$

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbf{P} \Big\{ \frac{Q(NT)}{N} > X \Big\} = \frac{\varrho(X, T) - \lambda}{\rho - \lambda}$$

where  $\varrho(X, T)$  is the entropy solution of the hydrodynamic equation with initial data

- $\varrho$  on the left
- $\lambda$  on the right.

#### What do we have?

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\Big\{\frac{Q(NT)}{N} > X\Big\} = \frac{\varrho(X, T) - \lambda}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

 $\rightsquigarrow$  The solution  $\varrho(X, T)$  is the distribution of the velocity for Q.

- Shock: distribution is step function, velocity is deterministic (LLN).
- Rarefaction wave: distribution is continuous, velocity is random (e.g., Uniform for TASEP).

## A fun model (B., A.L. Nagy, I. Tóth, B. Tóth)

 $\omega_i = -1, 0, 1;$ 

 $\begin{array}{ll} (0,\,-1) \to (-1,\,0) & \mbox{ with rate } \frac{1}{2}, \\ (1,\,0) \to (0,\,1) & \mbox{ with rate } \frac{1}{2}, \\ (1,\,-1) \to (0,\,0) & \mbox{ with rate } 1, \\ (0,\,0) \to (-1,\,1) & \mbox{ with rate } c. \end{array}$ 

# A fun model (B., A.L. Nagy, I. Tóth, B. Tóth)

Hydrodynamic flux  $H(\varrho)$ , for certain *c*:



Models Hydro 2<sup>nd</sup> cl F-K (TASEP) Gen.

#### A fun model (B., A.L. Nagy, I. Tóth, B. Tóth) Here is what can happen (**R**: rarefaction wave, **S**: Shock):


## A fun model (B., A.L. Nagy, I. Tóth, B. Tóth)

### Examples for $\varrho(T, X)$ :



$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\Big\{\frac{Q(NT)}{N} > X\Big\} = \frac{\varrho(X, T) - \lambda}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

 $\rightsquigarrow$  The solution  $\varrho(X, T)$  is the distribution of the velocity for Q.

I haven't seen a walk with a random velocity of *mixed distribution* before.

## Storytelling...

$$\mu(\omega_0, \eta_0) = \frac{\nu(\eta_0 + 1, \eta_0)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

In the 1/3-fluctuations papers (B., J. Komjáthy, T. Seppäläinen) we had to start the second class particle in a  $\rho = \lambda$  flat environment. We came up with a measure  $\hat{\mu}$  for this which worked nicely with our formulas. *But at that time we had no idea why.* 

As it turns out:  $\hat{\mu} = \lim_{\lambda \nearrow \varrho} \mu$ .

### Symmetric case

Everything works with partially asymmetric models (allow left jumps too).

In fact everything works for symmetric models as well. The hydrodynamic scaling is diffusive there with the limit being of heat equation type. In this case: Symmetric case

### Theorem (Symmetric version) *Starting in*

$$\bigotimes_{i<0} \mu_i^{\varrho} \otimes \mu_0 \otimes \bigotimes_{i>0} \mu_i^{\lambda},$$
$$\lim_{N \to \infty} \mathbf{P} \Big\{ \frac{Q(NT)}{\sqrt{N}} > X \Big\} = \frac{\varrho(X, T) - \lambda}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

where  $\varrho(X, T)$  is the entropy solution of the hydrodynamic equation with initial data

- $\varrho$  on the left
- $\lambda$  on the right.

SSEP: CLT (of course...). Other models: interesting!

### One more result

### Theorem

If  $\mu^{\varrho}$  are the stationary product marginals then, under our initial distribution,  $\eta_{Q(t)}(t)$  is stationary in time.

#### Proof.

Repeat the argument with  $\mathbf{E}\Phi(\eta_i(t))$  instead of  $\mathbf{E}g_i(t)$ .

### One more result

#### Theorem

If  $\mu^{\varrho}$  are the stationary product marginals then, under our initial distribution,  $\eta_{Q(t)}(t)$  is stationary in time.

#### Proof.

Repeat the argument with  $\mathbf{E}\Phi(\eta_i(t))$  instead of  $\mathbf{E}g_i(t)$ .

This was not even a question with exclusion.

### One more result

#### Theorem

If  $\mu^{\varrho}$  are the stationary product marginals then, under our initial distribution,  $\eta_{Q(t)}(t)$  is stationary in time.

#### Proof.

Repeat the argument with  $\mathbf{E}\Phi(\eta_i(t))$  instead of  $\mathbf{E}g_i(t)$ .

This was not even a question with exclusion.

Only the site Q(t)!

# TASEP and the corner growth model





 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution

(particle, hole) pairs become(hole, particle) pairs with rate 1.



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution

(particle, hole) pairs become
(hole, particle) pairs with rate 1.
That is: waiting times ⊕ ~ Exponential(1).
→ Markov process.

Particles try to jump to the right, but block each other.



 $Bernoulli(\varrho)$  distribution

(particle, hole) pairs become
(hole, particle) pairs with rate 1.
That is: waiting times ⊕ ~ Exponential(1).
→ Markov process.

Particles try to jump to the right, but block each other.

The Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution is time-stationary for any ( $0 \le \varrho \le 1$ ). Any translation-invariant stationary distribution is a mixture of Bernoullis.

# TASEP: Surface growth





# TASEP: Surface growth



# TASEP: Surface growth















































































































































Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ .


Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ .



Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ .



Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ .



Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ .



Occupation of  $(i, j) = \text{jump of } P_j \text{ over } H_i$ . Occupation of  $(2, 1) = \text{jump of } P_1 \text{ over } H_2$ . The time when this happens =:  $G_{ij}$ .







 $P_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(1-\varrho)$  process, governed by the right orange part



### Burke's Theorem:

 $P_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(1-\varrho)$  process, governed by the right orange part

 $H_0$  jumps according to a Poisson( $\varrho$ ) process, governed by the left orange part



### Burke's Theorem:

 $P_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(1-\varrho)$  process, governed by the right orange part  $H_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(\varrho)$  process, governed by the left orange part independently of the  $\odot$ 's.



### Burke's Theorem:

 $P_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(1-\varrho)$  process, governed by the right orange part  $H_0$  jumps according to a Poisson $(\varrho)$  process, governed by the left orange part independently of the G's.

Therefore:

$$\begin{array}{c} & & & \\ &$$

















#### occupied



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied



 $\begin{array}{c} \odot \sim \mathsf{Exponential}(1-\varrho) \\ \odot \sim \mathsf{Exponential}(\varrho) \\ \odot \sim \mathsf{Exponential}(1) \end{array} \right\} \text{ independently}$ 

- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- ostarts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- e starts ticking when both its west and south neighbors become occupied



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- starts ticking when both its west and south
  neighbors become occupied



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when both its west and south neighbors become occupied

 $G_{ij}$  = the occupation time of (i, j)



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when both its west and south neighbors become occupied

 $G_{ij}$  = the occupation time of (i, j)

 $G_{ij}$  = the maximum weight collected by a north -east path from (0,0) to (i, j).



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when both its west and south neighbors become occupied

 $G_{ij}$  = the occupation time of (i, j)

 $G_{ij}$  = the maximum weight collected by a north -east path from (0,0) to (i, j).



- Starts ticking when its west neighbor becomes occupied
- starts ticking when its south neighbor becomes occupied
- Starts ticking when both its west and south neighbors become occupied

 $G_{ij}$  = the occupation time of (i, j)

 $G_{ij}$  = the maximum weight collected by a north -east path from (0,0) to (i, j).


























































































Ferrari, Martin, Pimentel (2005)

Which squares are infected via (1,0) and via (0,1)?

The competition interface follows the same rules as the *second class particle* of simple exclusion.



Ferrari, Martin, Pimentel (2005)

Which squares are infected via (1,0) and via (0,1)?

The competition interface follows the same rules as the *second class particle* of simple exclusion.

If it passes left of (m, n), then  $G_{mn}$  is not sensitive to decreasing the  $\odot$  weights on the *j*-axis. If it passes below (m, n), then  $G_{mn}$  is not sensitive to decreasing the  $\bigcirc$  weights on the *i*-axis.



Ferrari, Martin, Pimentel (2005)

Which squares are infected via (1,0) and via (0,1)?

The competition interface follows the same rules as the *second class particle* of simple exclusion.

If it passes left of (m, n), then  $G_{mn}$  is not sensitive to decreasing the  $\odot$  weights on the *j*-axis. If it passes below (m, n), then  $G_{mn}$  is not sensitive to decreasing the  $\bigcirc$  weights on the *i*-axis.

Thank you.