Abstract
We compare the fluctuations in the velocity and in the fraction of time spent at a given position for minimal models of a passive and an active particle: an asymmetric random walker and a run-and-tumble particle in continuous time and on a 1D lattice. We compute rate functions and effective dynamics conditioned on large deviations for these observables. While generally different, for a unique and non-trivial choice of rates (up to a rescaling of time) the velocity rate functions for the two models become identical, whereas the effective processes generating the fluctuations remain distinct. This equivalence coincides with a remarkable parity of the spectra of the processes’ generators. For the occupation-time problem, we show that both the passive and active particles undergo a prototypical dynamical phase transition when the average velocity is non-vanishing in the long-time limit.
1 Introduction

A core theme of statistical physics is the characterization of fluctuations in physical observables in the vicinity of and far away from their typical values. Quantitative answers to such questions can be obtained using large deviation theory [1]. In recent years, this theory has been applied to nonequilibrium processes and fluctuations in density profiles and particle currents [2], the number of state transitions (i.e. dynamical activity) [3,4], entropy production [5], and more generally dynamical observables $O_t$ which integrate some quantity over a long time-interval $t$ [3,6–11].

A common situation is that, given an underlying stochastic dynamics, a dynamical observable $O_t$ satisfies the large deviation principle

$$\text{Prob}(O_t/t = \rho) = e^{-I(\rho)t+o(t)} \quad \text{as } t \to \infty .$$

(1.1)

The rate function $I(\rho) \geq 0$ quantifies the likelihood of the observable taking a particular value in the long-time limit. Larger values of $I(\rho)$ indicate a lower likelihood while the case $I(\rho) = 0$ determines those $\rho$ that are the possible stationary values. Although the scaling (1.1) is commonplace (and the case that we will be concerned with in this work), it is worth noting that it doesn’t always apply. Sometimes other scaling forms are considered, e.g. when the long-time limit is taken simultaneously with a low-noise [12] or large system-size limit [13]. In some cases, different scaling forms occur under different parameter regimes within the same model [14,15].

In this work, our aim is to gain insight into how fundamental features of the model dynamics influence the structure of dynamical fluctuations. We achieve this by comparing two paradigmatic Markov jump processes—the simple asymmetric random walker (ARW) and the asymmetric run-and-tumble particle (RTP)—for the fluctuations in two elementary dynamical observables—the total particle displacement, and the time spent at a given position or region. The corresponding time-intensive quantities ($O_t/t$ for large $t$) are the asymptotic velocity and occupation time-fraction (occupation, for short). The setting is continuous time and an infinite one-dimensional (1D) lattice. The first model (ARW) is a passive process in contrast to the second model (RTP) which is active in the sense of possessing an internal state deciding its direction of motion. RTPs have been studied extensively over the years revealing a wealth of nonequilibrium phenomena for both single and interacting particles [16–22]. To make the comparison of the RTP and ARW more direct (and to generalize parts of our analysis) we view them as examples drawn from a broader class of multi-state random walks [23,24] described in section 2.

In the four problems we consider (two models and two observables) we calculate the respective rate functions. In addition, we also wish to understand how a given fluctuation is realized. For Markov processes, one can construct an effective process [1], which by construction acquires any specified long-time average of the dynamical observable [3,8,9,11,25,26]. The transition rates of the effective process reveal how the original process should be modified to render typical what was the large deviation. We therefore calculate the effective rates in our scenarios. In the interest of a self-contained presentation, we briefly recapitulate the mathematical theory of rate functions and the effective process in section 3.

Velocity fluctuations for the ARW have previously been derived by Lebowitz and Spohn [27] and extended to inhomogeneous space in [28,29]. Meanwhile, asymmetric
two-state processes in 1D have been studied in different formal setups \cite{30–32}, while the behaviour of the symmetric RTP in $d$ dimensions were recently studied in-depth, both on- and off-lattice, observing dynamical phase transitions for $d \geq 6$. Moreover, an accelerated RTP has been shown to exhibit several scaling regimes of velocity fluctuations different from (1.1) \cite{15}.

In section 4 of the present work we study velocity fluctuations of the two systems within a unified framework which allows direct comparison. We arrive at a finding that we believe has not been reported before, namely that the rate functions (appropriately scaled) for the ARW and the RTP exactly coincide when the rates for the latter process take certain unique and non-trivial values. It should be noted that these parameters do not yield an exact isomorphism between the two processes. Whereas the existence of a well-defined rate function and its qualitative features (e.g. convexity, or presence of singularities) are subject to universality, its exact form generally depends on model details. The asymptotic equivalence of velocity fluctuations for the ARW and fine-tuned RTP is therefore surprising. By determining the corresponding effective processes, we can observe that the trajectories that realize a given large deviation are in fact distinct in the two model systems.

Returning to a general discussion of large deviations and associated rate functions, a situation of interest is where the rate function $I(\rho)$ exhibits a nonanalyticity at some critical $\rho_c$ (see e.g. \cite{5, 8, 26, 33, 34}). Such a nonanalyticity is sometimes referred to as a dynamical (phase) transition. Alternatively, a model control parameter, e.g. a transition rate tending to zero, may produce singularities \cite{30, 32}. The minimal conditions under which such dynamical transitions arise have not yet been pin-pointed, nor is a full taxonomy of possible dynamical fluctuation phenomena available.

A simple example of a dynamical transition was analysed by Tsobgni Nyawo and Touchette \cite{34–36}. They consider the fraction of time $\rho$ that a biased Brownian particle in one dimension spends in a given finite interval. A transition occurs between a regime $\rho < \rho_c$ where the rate function is linear, and a regime $\rho > \rho_c$ where it is convex. At $\rho_c$, the effective process shows a transition from a non-confining potential (after some time the particle escapes the interval) to a confining potential (the particle remains localized around the interval). It was concluded that one should expect the presence of this transition for random walks possessing two main qualities. The original process must be transient rather than recurrent, i.e. with probability one the particle revisits its starting point only finitely often; or at least it allows transience to emerge upon conditioning on the large deviations if originally it was recurrent. Furthermore, the tilted process generator, which deforms the original generator through a continuous parameter $s$ (see section 3), must allow eigenvalue crossings in $s$. This cannot be the case for an original equilibrium process, whose tilted generator is necessarily symmetrizable and hence avoids crossings \cite{3}.

In our treatment of occupation fluctuations in section 5, we find support for the above conclusions. The ARW case is a lattice formulation of continuous-space problem considered in \cite{34}. While these related formulations produce the same phenomenology, the former, in contrast to the latter, allows closed-form expressions for the rate function and effective process which we derive. While for the ARW transience holds if and only if there is a hopping bias, the situation is more subtle for the RTP. Asymmetric hopping rates and tumbling rates can conspire to produce a vanishing net velocity in the long-time limit, signifying recurrence of the process. Indeed, we find for the RTP that the above dynamical transition is observed if and only if the velocity is non-vanishing.
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(a) Asymmetric random walker (ARW)

(b) A multi-step walker

(c) Asymmetric run-and-tumble particle (RTP)

(d) A three-state model: run-and-tumble particle with a refractory state.

Figure 1: Examples from the class of models described by the master equation (2.3).

We summarize and reflect on these findings in section 6.

2 Model description

In this section we set out a general class of random walks on the one-dimensional lattice.

2.1 A class of multi-state random walks

A Markov jump process on a discrete state space \( \{C, C', \ldots\} \) has a probability distribution evolving by the master equation

\[
\partial_\tau P(C, \tau) = \sum_{C'} M(C, C') P(C', \tau) .
\]  

The Markov matrix, i.e. forward generator of the process, is defined in terms of the transition rates \( W(C \to C') \) and escape rates \( \xi(C) = \sum_{C' \neq C} W(C \to C') \) as

\[
M(C', C) = W(C \to C') - \xi(C) \delta_{C,C'} .
\]

For a multi-state random walker in 1D, \( C = (i, n) \) specifies the internal state \( i \) and lattice site \( n \) of the walker. When in internal state \( i \), the particle makes a step of \( \Delta n \) lattice sites (which may be a positive or negative number) with rate \( \gamma_i(\Delta n) \). The particle switches internal state from \( i \) to \( j \) with a rate \( \omega_{ij} \) (with \( \omega_{ii} = 0 \)). Importantly, we take all rates to be independent of the spatial coordinate \( n \) (i.e., the process is translationally invariant). Then

\[
\partial_t P_i(n) = \sum_k \gamma_i(k)[P_i(n - k) - P_i(n)] + \sum_j [\omega_{ij} P_j(n) - \omega_{ji} P_i(n)] .
\]
Examples of models contained in this class are illustrated in Figure 1.

To solve the master equation (2.3), we introduce the generating function

\[ g_i(z,t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} z^n P_i(n,t) \].

(2.4)

Taking \( z = e^{iq} \) retrieves a Fourier series, which has the inversion

\[ P_i(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z^{n+1}} g_i(z), \]

(2.5)

where \( D \) is the complex unit disc. Using vector notation, \( g = (g_1, \ldots, g_N)^\top \), where \( N \) is the number of internal states. The transform of Eq. (2.3) can be written succinctly as

\[ \partial_t g(z,t) = W(z)g(z,t) \].

(2.6)

Here, the \( N \times N \) matrix \( W(z) \) has elements

\[ W_{ii}(z) = \sum_k \gamma_i(k)(z^k - 1) - \sum_j \omega_{ji}, \]

(2.7a)

\[ W_{ij}(z) = \omega_{ij} \quad (i \neq j). \]

(2.7b)

The simple form of these equations arises from the translational invariance of the process.

In this work we focus on two instances from this general class of models. The first is the **asymmetric random walker** (hereafter, ARW). This has a single internal state, and has the hopping rates shown in Figure 1a. Without loss of generality we have chosen units of time such that the right hopping rate is unity and the left hopping rate is \( \gamma \leq 1 \).

The master equation reads

\[ \partial_t P(n) = P(n-1) + \gamma P(n+1) - (1 + \gamma)P(n) \]

\[ W(z) = z + \gamma z^{-1} - (1 + \gamma). \]

(2.8)

(2.9)

The second model instance is the **run-and-tumble particle** (RTP). It has two internal states, denoted + and −, which indicate the allowed hopping direction when in that state. This model thus introduces persistence of motion, which can be thought of as inertia or self-propulsion. As shown in Figure 1c, the particle hops to the right with rate 1 when in the + state, and to the left with rate \( \gamma \leq 1 \) (same parameter as the ARW) when in the − state. Switching from the + state to the − state occurs at rate \( \omega_+ \), and from − to + at rate \( \omega_- \). In the bacterial system that serves as inspiration for this model [37], this velocity-switching is referred to as **tumbling** and we shall use this term in the present work.

Given this definition, the master equation for the RTP is

\[ \partial_t P_+(n) = P_+(n-1) + \omega_- P_-(n) - (1 + \omega_)P_+(n) \]

\[ \partial_t P_-(n) = \gamma P_-(n+1) + \omega_+ P_+(n) - (\gamma + \omega_-)P_-(n) \]

\[ W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z - 1 & \omega_- & \omega_- \\ \omega_+ & \gamma(z^{-1} - 1) & \omega_- \end{pmatrix}. \]

(2.10a)

(2.10b)

(2.11)

In the degenerate limit \( \omega_- = \omega_+ \to \infty \), the RTP becomes identical to an ARW with left and right rates \( \gamma/2 \) and \( 1/2 \). If instead \( \omega_+ \to 0 \) and \( \omega_- \to \infty \) the RTP becomes the above ARW with \( \gamma = 0 \).
2.2 Activity and Dissipation

Later in this work we will construct effective processes that are designed to realize a desired value $\rho$ of a dynamical observable. To interpret these, it is useful to adopt a generalization of the parametrization of Maes [38] for the transition rates. First we define the operator $\theta$ which acts on a configuration $C$. In the case of a RTP $\theta$ reverses the particle’s velocity and keeps the position the same: $\theta(\pm, n) = (\mp, n)$. Thus $\theta$ can be thought of as momentum reversal. In the case of an ARW $\theta$ is simply the identity.

Then we may decompose the transition rates as

$$W(C \rightarrow C') = \psi(C, C')e^{\sigma(C \rightarrow C')/2}$$

where

$$\psi(C, C') = [W(C \rightarrow C')W(\theta C' \rightarrow \theta C)]^{1/2}$$

$$\sigma(C \rightarrow C') = \log \frac{W(C \rightarrow C')}{W(\theta C' \rightarrow \theta C)}$$

describe the time-symmetric and anti-symmetric aspects, respectively. We refer to $\psi$ and $\sigma$ as activity and dissipation parameters.

3 Dynamical large deviation theory

We now set out the main ideas behind dynamical large deviation theory in the context of time-homogeneous Markov jump processes, referring the reader to Refs. [7,8,11] for a more complete account.

Over a time $t$, a Markov jump process generates a sequence of configurations wherein a transition from configuration $C_{i-1}$ to $C_i$ takes place at time $t_i$, with $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < t$. Together, the sequence of configurations and jump times constitute a trajectory $T_t$. We consider the class of dynamical observables $O[T_t]$ which are time-additive: $O = A + B$, with

$$A[T_t] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \alpha(C_i \rightarrow C_{i+1})$$

$$B[T_t] = (t - t_n)b(C_n) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (t_{i+1} - t_i)b(C_i) = \int_0^t dt' b(C(t')) .$$

The $A$-part implements a weighted transition counting via the function $\alpha(C \rightarrow C')$, and the $B$-part measures the total amount of some quantity continually produced with a state-dependent rate $b(C)$.

The goal of dynamical large deviation theory is to (i) characterize the likelihood of a given fluctuation in $O$, and (ii) inform us as to which trajectories typically realize that fluctuation.

3.1 The rate function

Formally, goal (i) above asks for the rate function appearing in Eq. (1.1), more precisely defined by

$$I(\rho) = - \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln P(\rho, t) ,$$

where
where
\[ P(\rho, t) = \int D[\mathcal{T}_t] \text{Prob}[\mathcal{T}_t] \delta(\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{T}_t] - \rho t). \] (3.3)

Eq. (3.3) invokes the notion of a dynamical ensemble; a probability measure over the set of trajectories generated by (2.1). In direct analogy with equilibrium statistical mechanics, one can construct microcanonical and canonical ensembles—with trajectories replacing equilibrium microstates, and the dynamical observable replacing energy. That is, in the microcanonical ensemble, the value of the dynamical observable \( \rho \) is considered fixed, whereas in the canonical ensemble it may fluctuate through exchange with some ‘reservoir’ at fixed ‘inverse temperature’ \( s \).

In this canonical ensemble, we can define the (dynamical) partition function as
\[ Z(t, s) = \int D[\mathcal{T}_t] \text{Prob}[\mathcal{T}_t] e^{-s\mathcal{O}[\mathcal{T}_t]} = \langle e^{-s\mathcal{O}} \rangle_t. \] (3.4)

Similar to a free energy density, the scaled cumulant generating function (SCGF) is defined from it as
\[ \Lambda(s) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln Z(t, s). \] (3.5)

A central result of large deviation theory, the Gärtner-Ellis theorem [1], holds that if \( \Lambda(s) \) exists and is differentiable in \( s \), then the large deviation principle (3.3) is valid, and
\[ \Lambda(s) = \max_{\rho} \{-I(\rho) - s\rho\}. \] (3.6)

If the rate function is convex, as is often but not always the case (see e.g. [32]), one has the inversion
\[ I(\rho) = \max_s \{-\Lambda(s) - s\rho\}. \] (3.7)

Otherwise this operation returns the convex envelope of the true rate function. Assuming the convexity of \( I(\rho) \), we need then only determine \( \Lambda(s) \). To this end, we return to the master equation (2.1) to define a new tilted generator
\[ M(C', C; s) = W(C \to C') e^{-s\alpha(C \to C')} - \xi(C) + sb(C) \delta_{C, C'}. \] (3.8)

This generator does not conserve the ‘probability’ \( P(C, t; s) \), and is merely a computational aid. Its usefulness stems from the fact that [8]
\[ Z(t, s) = \sum_C P(C, t; s). \] (3.9)

Therefore, if the spectrum of \( M(s) \) (3.8) is gapped, one can conclude via (3.5) that \( \Lambda(s) \) is the dominant eigenvalue (i.e. with largest real part) of \( M(s) \), since \( P(C, t; s) \sim e^{\Lambda(s)t} \) for large \( t \). By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, this eigenvalue is real and simple (at least on finite lattices).

In the net displacement problem, we obtain \( \Lambda(s) \) directly from \( M(s) \). In the occupation fluctuation problem, we take the route of determining the Laplace-transform \( \tilde{Z}(u, s) \) of \( Z(t, s) \). It then suffices to determine the location of singularity that lies furthest to the
right in the complex-$u$ plane, $u^*(s)$. Then, for large $t$, $Z(t, s) \sim e^{u^*(s)t}$, and hence from (3.5) we have that $\Lambda(s) = u^*(s)$.

For our multi-state random walkers where $C = (i, n)$, it proves useful to define

$$Z_i(t, s) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} P_i(n, t; s).$$  \hfill (3.10)

Writing in vector notation $Z = (Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_N)^\top$ and recalling that $N$ is the number of internal states, we find $Z$ to be related to the generating function $g(z, t; s)$ of the tilted process by

$$Z(t, s) = g(1, t; s),$$  \hfill (3.11)

and to $Z$ via

$$Z(t, s) = 1^\top Z(t, s),$$  \hfill (3.12)

where $1$ is the appropriate column vector of ones.

### 3.2 The effective process

Coming now to question (ii) of which trajectories realize a certain fluctuation, the exact answer is given by the microcanonical distribution, $\text{Prob}[T_t | O[T_t] = \rho_t]$. This distribution is difficult to find directly. It is however possible to construct a time-homogeneous Markov process called the effective process, which represents the same long-time stochastic dynamics (in a sense discussed below). For any value of the parameter $s$, the effective process has rates

$$W_{\text{eff}}(C \rightarrow C'; s) = \frac{\ell(C'; s)}{\ell(C; s)} W(C \rightarrow C') e^{-s \alpha(C \rightarrow C')},$$  \hfill (3.13)

where $\ell(C; s)$ is the left eigenvector corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue $\Lambda(s)$ of the matrix $M(s)$ defined by (3.8). We usually require the normalization

$$\sum_C \ell(C) r(C) = 1,$$  \hfill (3.14)

with $r$ the matching right eigenvector, as $\ell(C) r(C)$ gives the steady-state probability distribution of the effective process (if it exists) [7, 8].

By construction, if $I(\rho)$ is differentiable and strictly convex at $\rho$, the choice $s = I'(\rho)$ (i.e. the maximizer of (3.7)) makes the fluctuation $\rho$ of the original process typical under the effective process. Therefore, the typical realizations of the effective process approximate the microcanonical set of trajectories constrained on achieving $\rho$ (see [11] for a mathematically precise statement). In some cases, such as at the dynamical phase transition points discussed in section 5 below, we find that the SCGF is non-differentiable, undermining the applicability of the Gärtner-Ellis theorem. Here, the large deviation principle (1.1) must then be justified on physical grounds or motivated by simulation data.
4 Velocity fluctuations

We now obtain the rate functions and effective processes for the ARW and RTP for the case where the dynamical observable $O_t$ is the net displacement of the particle up to time $t$. Recalling that $C = (i, n)$ denotes a configuration where the particle is in internal state $i$ at position $n$, the displacement between two configurations $C$ and $C' = (j, m)$ is $m - n$. The net displacement is then an observable of the $A$-type \((3.1a)\) with

$$\alpha ((i, n) \rightarrow (i, n + k)) = k$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

for each pair of configurations with a nonzero transition rate, $\gamma_i(k) > 0$.

Within the generating function formulation, the tilted process satisfies an equation of the form \((2.6)\) with a suitably tilted $W$ matrix. The elements of this matrix are

$$W_{ij}(z; s) = \begin{cases} \sum_k \gamma_i(k)(z^k e^{-sk} - 1) - \sum_{k \neq i} \omega_{ki} & \text{if } i = j \\ \omega_{ij} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.2)

Our aim is to find the dominant eigenvalue of the $NL \times NL$ tilted Markov matrix $M$. When the lattice size $L$ is finite and periodic, the eigenvalues of this matrix $M$ are obtained by collecting together the eigenvalues from the $L$ different $N \times N$ matrices $W(z; s)$ obtained by putting $z = 1, e^{2\pi i/L}, \ldots, e^{2(L-1)\pi i/L}$. As the size, $L$, of the lattice does not affect the velocity fluctuations of a single particle, the largest eigenvalue must come from the case $z = 1$ (the only allowed value of $z$ for $L = 1$). The problem thus reduces to that of finding the largest eigenvalue of the $N \times N$ matrix $W(1; s)$ given by \((4.2)\), or equivalently, $W(e^{-s})$ with $W(z)$ given by \((2.7)\). Since $N$ is finite, the Perron-Frobenius theorem dictates that the dominant eigenvalue $\Lambda(s)$ is simple, and hence does not cross with other eigenvalues as $s$ is varied. Since the matrix elements are differentiable in $s$, so is $\Lambda(s)$, and the Gärtner-Ellis theorem is applicable.

The asymptotic average velocity $\bar{v}$, for which we will find $I(\bar{v}) = 0$, can be computed from

$$\bar{v} = \sum_i P_i^r \bar{v}_i$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.3)

where $P_i^r$ is steady state distribution over the internal states $i$ and $\bar{v}_i$ the average velocity of the particle conditioned on being in state $i$,

$$\bar{v}_i = \sum_k \gamma_i(k)k$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

4.1 Asymmetric random walker—rate function

The case of the ARW is particularly simple, as the number of internal states $N = 1$, and the matrix \((4.2)\) is a scalar equal to its only (and hence dominant) eigenvalue. To express this eigenvalue, it is convenient to introduce the functions

$$\cosh_\gamma(x) := \frac{e^x + \gamma e^{-x}}{2}, \quad \sinh_\gamma(x) := \frac{e^x - \gamma e^{-x}}{2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.5)

Then, from \((4.2)\) with $z = 1$ we have

$$\Lambda(s) = W_{11}(1; s) = 2[\cosh_\gamma(-s) - \cosh_\gamma(0)].$$ \hspace{1cm} (4.6)
Putting $\rho = v$, the desired asymptotic velocity, into (3.7), we find the maximizer $s^*$ to be

$$\sinh_\gamma(-s^*) = v/2 \iff s^* = \ln \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} - v/2 \right) \right]. \quad (4.7)$$

Using $\cosh_\gamma(x) = (\gamma + \sinh^2_\gamma(x))^{1/2}$, we find the rate function

$$I_\gamma(v) = 1 + \gamma - 2\sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} - v \ln \left[ \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} - v/2 \right) \right]. \quad (4.8)$$

This result, previously obtained in e.g. [5, 27, 28], is plotted in Figure 2a.

Recall that $I_\gamma(v)$ gives a measure of the probability of observing a particular velocity $v$ over a long time, via (1.1). As expected, it has a zero at the average velocity $\bar{v} = 1 - \gamma$.

In the totally asymmetric limit $\gamma = 0$,

$$I_0(v) = 1 + v(\ln v - 1), \quad v \geq 0. \quad (4.9)$$

### 4.2 Asymmetric random walker—effective process

The rates of the effective process, (3.13), involve the left eigenvector of the tilted $M$ matrix corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue. Since in this case, the problem reduces to a $1 \times 1$ eigenvalue problem, it follows that the left eigenvector is uniform over all configurations, and one quickly finds that

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n + 1) = e^{-s} \quad (4.10a)$$

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n + 1 \rightarrow n) = \gamma e^s. \quad (4.10b)$$

Substituting (4.7) for $s$,

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n \pm 1) = \gamma_{\text{eff}}(\pm 1) = \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} \pm v/2. \quad (4.11)$$

These rates are plotted in Figure 2b.

The effective process generally preserves some aspects of the original process [11], in this case the spatial homogeneity and the value of the activity parameters (see Eq. (2.13a).
and section 2). Because the activity parameters, which govern the total number of jumps irrespective of direction, do not change, the effective process demonstrates that an atypical velocity $v$ of the original process tends to arise through a trajectory where the total number of jumps (irrespective of direction) is the same as for the case of the typical velocity $\bar{v}$, but where the relative probability of jumps in each direction (determined by the dissipation parameter (2.13b)) is modified to obtain the desired $v$. Intuitively, a trajectory achieving $v$ with an atypically large (or small) number of jumps can be made more probable if an equal number of left and jumps are removed (or added). This explains the preservation of activity parameters.

### 4.3 Asymmetric run-and-tumble particle—rate function

We now perform the equivalent calculation for the RTP. The key difference here is that the matrix $W(z; s)$ defined by (2.11) is two-dimensional. When $z = 1$, the larger eigenvalue is

$$\Lambda(s) = \cosh_\gamma(-s) - \cosh_\gamma(0) - \omega + \sqrt{\omega^2 - \delta\omega^2 + (\sinh_\gamma(-s) - \sinh_\gamma(0) - \delta\omega)^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.12)

recalling the definitions (4.5) and introducing

$$\omega = \frac{\omega_+ + \omega_-}{2}, \quad \delta\omega = \frac{\omega_+ - \omega_-}{2}. \hspace{1cm} (4.13)$$

The maximizer $s^* = I'(v)$ satisfies

$$v = x + \frac{(x - x_0 - \delta\omega)\sqrt{\gamma + x^2}}{\sqrt{\omega^2 - \delta\omega^2 + (x - x_0 - \delta\omega)^2}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.14)

where

$$x = \sinh_\gamma(-s^*) \quad \text{and} \quad x_0 = \sinh_\gamma(0).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.15)

Solving (4.14) for $x$ (and therewith $s^*$) amounts to factorizing a cubic polynomial, which we can always do, but the result is unwieldy. But supposing we have obtained the solution

Figure 3: Velocity rate function for RTP
\[ x = x(v), \] for example by numerical evaluation of the cubic formula, we then have
\[ s^* = \ln \left( \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \sqrt{\gamma + x(v)^2} - x(v) \right) \right), \tag{4.16} \]
and \( I(v) \) is easily written down in in terms of \( x(v) \). We present the solution in the form of a plot of the rate function in Figure 3 for some illustrative parameter values.

Some special cases warrant a closer investigation.

4.3.1 ARW asymptotic equivalence

If we take the tumbling rates to be\[ \omega_+ = \gamma, \quad \omega_- = 1, \tag{4.17} \]
then \( \delta \omega + x_0 = 0 \) and (4.14) simplifies to \( x(v) = v/2 \). Consequently, the rate function \( I(v) \) is exactly identical to that of the ARW, Eq. (4.8). This is a non-trivial phenomenon, because the RTP dynamics at the microscopic scale are not the same as that of the ARW.

To illustrate this point, consider a particle (ARW or RTP) that has just hopped to the right. We now ask for the probability \( P(+|+) \) that the next hop (whenever it occurs) is also to the right. For the ARW, all hops are independent, and trivially we have
\[ P_{\text{ARW}}(+|+) = P_{\text{ARW}}(+|-) = \frac{1}{1 + \gamma}. \tag{4.18} \]
For the RTP, we have to take into account that the particle may tumble back and forth between the + and − states multiple times before it eventually hops to the right again. Thus, we must sum the probabilities of hopping to right before a tumble; tumbling twice before hopping to the right; tumbling four times before hopping to the right and so on:
\[ P_{\text{RTP}}(+|+) = \frac{1}{1 + \omega_+} \left( 1 + \frac{\omega_+}{1 + \omega_+} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\omega_-}{1 + \omega_+ \gamma + \omega_-} \right)^2 + \cdots = \frac{\gamma + \omega_-}{\gamma + \omega_- + \gamma \omega_+}. \tag{4.19} \]
A similar calculation shows that \( P_{\text{RTP}}(+|-) = \frac{\omega_-}{\gamma + \omega_- + \gamma \omega_+} \) and clearly the two probabilities \( P_{\text{RTP}}(+|+) \) and \( P_{\text{RTP}}(+|-) \) can only coincide when \( \gamma = 0 \). Thus, for \( \gamma > 0 \) the direction of a hop of the RTP is never independent of that of the previous hop (as is always the case for the ARW). Therefore the identity of the rate functions for the two processes under the special choice of rates (4.17) is not a priori expected.

To shed some light onto what underlies this asymptotic equivalence, we consider the spectra of the original Markov matrices \( M \), of dimension \( L \) for the ARW and \( 2L \) for the RTP, as a function of the model parameters. In a previous work [22] we derived the spectrum of the symmetric RTP (\( \gamma = 1, \omega_\pm = \omega \)), and found this to exhibit a macroscopic (i.e., \( L \)-fold) degeneracy at the special value 1 of the symmetric tumbling rate \( \omega \). In the present asymmetric case, the corresponding macroscopic degeneracy occurs precisely for the special rates (4.17): it is readily verified that \( -(1 + \gamma) \) is then an eigenvalue of \( W(z) \) for all the \( L \) values of \( z \). The remaining \( L \) eigenvalues map exactly on to the spectrum of the ARW. The situation is illustrated in Figure 4. Evidently, the special rates (4.17) imply a symmetry of the RTP state space which underlies its asymptotic equivalence with ARW for the present observable, but its physical origin remains obscure.
4.3.2 Zero average velocity

If we set the tumbling rates to be
\[ \omega_+ = \delta, \quad \omega_- = \gamma \delta, \]
the average velocity is zero for all values of \( \gamma \). To see this, note that the tumbling process is independent of the hopping process. The steady state condition for the two-state tumbling process is
\[ P_+^* \omega_+ = P_-^* \omega_- , \]
which yields
\[ P_+^* = \frac{\omega_-}{\omega_+ + \omega_-}, \quad P_-^* = \frac{\omega_+}{\omega_+ + \omega_-}. \]

The velocity (4.3) is then given by
\[ \nu = P_+^* - \gamma P_-^* = \frac{\omega_- - \gamma \omega_+}{\omega_+ + \omega_-}. \]

Thus (4.20) yield zero velocity.

As \( \delta \) becomes small \( I(v) \approx 0 \) for \( -\gamma < v < 1 \). This means that velocities in this entire range are (relatively) likely to be realized. These fluctuations arise from the fact that particles can hop many times in the same direction between velocity reversals. The presence of a widely fluctuating velocity for random walks with large time-scale separations has been reported on previously [30, 32]. The effective process that we derive in the next section provides another means to investigate this phenomenon.

4.3.3 ARW limit

Finally, taking the limit \( \delta \omega = 0, \omega \to \infty \) in (4.14) we find \( v \to x \), and the rate function is \( I_\gamma(2v)/2 \) (compared to (4.8)), which amounts to the ARW of the previous section but with rates rescaled by 1/2.
\[ (\ell_+ - \ell_-) = \left( x(v) - x_0 - \delta \omega + \sqrt{\omega^2 - \delta \omega^2 + (x(v) - x_0 - \delta \omega)^2} \right). \]  

(4.24)

The rates (3.13) of the effective process realizing the fluctuation \( v \) are

\[ \gamma_{+}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2 \pm v/2}, \]  

(4.25a)

\[ \omega_{+}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\omega^2 - \delta \omega^2 + (x(v) - x_0 - \delta \omega)^2 \pm (x(v) - x_0 - \delta \omega)}. \]  

(4.25b)

The activity parameter remains unchanged, with the same explanation as in section 4.2.

For the special rates of the asymptotic ARW equivalence, we get the effective rates

\[ \gamma_{+}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} \pm v/2, \]  

(4.26a)

\[ \omega_{+}^{\text{eff}} = \sqrt{\gamma + (v/2)^2} \mp v/2. \]  

(4.26b)

This shows that the hopping rates are modified in exactly the same way as for the ARW. In addition to the activity parameter, they retain the property that \( \gamma_{+}^{\text{eff}} = \omega_{+}^{\text{eff}} \). Nevertheless, the trajectories that generate a velocity \( v \) look different from those of the ARW. This is for the same reason as previously noted, that the directions of subsequent hops are correlated in the RTP, whilst they are independent for the ARW.

In Figure 5 we plot the effective rates (normalized by original rates) for when the original process satisfies the zero-velocity condition (4.20) with \( \gamma = 0.1 \) (cf. Figure 3b). For \( \delta = 100 \), the rate function is close to symmetric around \( v = 0 \), whilst both hopping and tumbling rates are highly asymmetric. From Figure 5a we see that a fluctuation \( |v| > 0 \) is caused by atypical hopping frequencies, but with typical sequences of tumbles. This is because the effective tumbling rates normalized by the original ones remain close
to unity whereas the effective hopping rates change considerably with \( v \). For \( \delta = 0.01 \), Figure 5b reveals that the near-flat interval \([-0.1, 1]\) of the rate function is entirely due to an atypical ratio of left to right tumbles, as the normalized hopping rates remain close to one. On either side of this interval, all four rates are simultaneously modified in the direction of increasing the translational bias. For instance, for \( v \) slightly more negative than \(-0.1\), the particle drastically increases the tumbling rate from the + to the − state while also increasing the average speed in the − state. The opposite direction of changes is applied to the other two rates, further reducing translation to the right.

5 Occupation fluctuations

We now turn to the second of the two large-deviation problems. The dynamical observable \( \mathcal{O}_t \) under consideration is defined by the time spent by the walker at a given lattice site, which we take to be site 0. The fraction of time \( \rho = \mathcal{O}_t / t \) we will refer to as occupation. We will take site 0 to be the initial site of the particle and further assume that the initial internal state is chosen uniformly. In fact, the initial condition does not affect the resulting rate function \( I(\rho) \), except in the case where a particle can move only in one direction.

This dynamical observable is of the \( B \)-type (3.1b). Specifically, \( b((i, n)) = \delta_{n,0} \). The tilted process therefore adds a term \( -s\delta_{n,0}P_i(0,t) \) to the master equation, and likewise to the generating function equation:

\[
\partial_t g(z, t; s) = W(z; s)g(z, t; s) - s\delta_{n,0}p(0, t; s),
\]

with

\[
p(0, t; s) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz'}{z'} g(z', t; s).
\]

In this instance, the dominant eigenvalue \( \Lambda(s) \) of the tilted Markov matrix cannot be straightforwardly related to the eigenvalues of \( W(z) \). Instead, we obtain \( \Lambda(s) \) from (3.5), which tells us that it equals the right-most singularity in the complex plane of the Laplace transformed \((t \rightarrow u)\) dynamical partition function, \( \tilde{Z}(u, s) \). In Appendix A we derive for our class of multi-state walkers

\[
\tilde{Z}(u, s) = \frac{1}{u} \cdot [I + s\mathcal{I}]^{-1} 1,
\]

\[
\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z} (uI - W(z))^{-1}.
\]

There is in general a pole at \( u = 0 \), so that \( \Lambda(s) \geq 0 \). As we will see, there is an additional largest positive pole which crosses the zero at some value \( s^* \leq 0 \).

5.1 Asymmetric random walker—rate function

In section A.2 we evaluate (5.3) to find

\[
\tilde{Z}(u, s) = \frac{1}{u} \cdot \left[ 1 + \frac{s}{\sqrt{u(u + 2(1 + \gamma)) + (1 - \gamma)^2}} \right]^{-1}.
\]

Only if \( s < s^* = -(1 - \gamma) \) does there exist a positive pole, namely

\[
u^* = -(1 + \gamma) + \sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma}.
\]
Figure 6: The rate function for fraction of time $\rho$ spent at the origin, normalized to a total hopping rate of 1, plotted for $\gamma = 0.2, 0.3, 0.6$ (blue, yellow, green). The dashed lines indicate the phase transition point.

We therefore conclude

$$\Lambda(s) = \begin{cases} 
-(1 + \gamma) + \sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma}, & s < s^*, \\
0, & s \geq s^*. 
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.6)

Note that in contrast to the version of this problem in continuous space [34], we are able here to obtain an explicit expression for $\Lambda(s)$.

We can see directly that $\Lambda(s)$ is not analytic in $s$, which means that the Gärtner-Ellis theorem does not apply. We assume nonetheless the validity of (3.7), as this was demonstrated for the continuous-space process [34]. In the restricted range $s \geq s^*$, the maximizer of (3.7) is $s^*$. For $s \leq s^*$, the maximizer is instead

$$s^\dagger = -\frac{2\rho\sqrt{\gamma}}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.7)

provided that $s^\dagger < s^*$. This condition is equivalent to

$$\rho > \rho_c = \frac{1 - \gamma}{1 + \gamma}. \hspace{1cm} (5.8)$$

The rate function is therefore

$$I_\gamma(\rho) = \begin{cases} 
(1 - \gamma)\rho, & \rho \leq \rho_c, \\
1 + \gamma - 2\sqrt{\gamma(1 - \rho^2)}, & \rho > \rho_c, 
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.9)

which is plotted in Figure 7a. The salient feature is the change from linear to convex shape at $\rho_c$, which reveals a dynamical phase transition (first order since the ‘free energy’ $\Lambda(s)$ has discontinuous derivative). We remark that in the case where $\gamma = 0$ the rate function is entirely linear, which follows immediately from the Poisson distribution of leaving the origin, after which a return is impossible. This observation already suggests that the linear part for non-zero $\gamma$ is due to trajectories that stay close to the origin for the chosen time-fraction before venturing off to infinity. The effective process corroborates this statement.
In the effective process for $\rho > \rho_c$, jumps toward the origin occur with rates $\gamma_0(\rho)$ and away from the origin with rates $\gamma_\infty(\rho)$.

(b) Dissipation rate in the effective process for $s^* < s < 0$ (light to dark), $\gamma = 0.5$. Confinement ($\sigma < 0$) in a finite region around the origin, for $n > 0$. For $n < 0$ the particle is always biased to the right.

5.2 Asymmetric random walker—effective process

The left eigenvectors needed in (3.13) to construct the transition rates of the effective process are derived in section B.1. For $s < s^*$,

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n+1) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma + s}), & n \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma - s}), & n < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n+1 \rightarrow n) = \gamma / W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n+1).$$

The activity parameters are preserved, but the spatial homogeneity of the original rates is lost since the observable is spatially dependent (i.e., it singles out a specific site on the lattice). To make a fluctuation $\rho \geq \rho_c$ typical, we substitute $s^\dagger$ (5.7) for $s$. The resulting effective process is described by Figure 7a with

$$\gamma_0(\rho) = \sqrt{\frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho}}, \quad \gamma_\infty(\rho) = \sqrt{\frac{1-\rho}{1+\rho}}.$$

Since $\gamma_0/\gamma_\infty > 1$, the particle is biased towards the origin, i.e. it lives in a linear confining potential that becomes steeper as $\rho$ is increased. As noted in [34], the time-asymmetric component of the dynamics, $\sigma \equiv \ln(\gamma_0/\gamma_\infty)$, is independent of $\gamma$, because the original bias must be effectively cancelled by the rare events that keep the particle localized around the origin. Exactly at the transition point $\rho_c$, $\gamma_0 = 1$ and $\gamma_\infty = \gamma$. The original dynamics has then been modified by mirroring the dynamics for the negative half-lattice to achieve symmetry about the origin.

For $\rho < \rho_c$, since the rate function is not strictly convex, the asymptotic equivalence of the effective process and the conditioned process breaks down, as we can plainly see: For $s > s^* = -(1-\gamma)$ the rates are

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n+1) = \begin{cases} \frac{s(1-\gamma^{n+1})+1-\gamma}{s(1-\gamma^n)+1-\gamma}, & n \geq 0 \\ 1, & n < 0 \end{cases}$$

$$W_{\text{eff}}(n+1 \rightarrow n) = \gamma / W_{\text{eff}}(n \rightarrow n+1).$$
Figure 8: SCGF (a) and rate function (b) for the RTP/residence time problem. Blue graph has symmetric hopping and tumbling rates (and is therefore recurrent) whereas the other graphs have some level of rate asymmetry making the process transient. In the latter cases, but not the former, is there a singularity of the SCGF, which gives rise to the linear-convex crossover of the rate function (assuming the validity of the large-deviation principle).

Substituting in $s = s^* = -(1 - \gamma)$ we would conclude $\gamma_0(\rho) = 1$ and $\gamma_\infty(\rho) = \gamma$ which always gives a typical occupation $\rho_c$, and not the chosen $\rho < \rho_c$. Although in the linear large-deviation regime the effective process is no longer asymptotically equivalent to the original one, its behaviour for $s$ around $s^*$ is suggestive of the mechanism underlying the dynamical phase transition. The dissipation rate (2.13b) for $s > s^*$ is

$$\sigma(n \to n+1) \equiv \ln \frac{W^{\text{eff}}(n \to n+1)}{W^{\text{eff}}(n+1 \to n)} = \begin{cases} \ln(1/\gamma) + 2 \ln \left[ \frac{s(1-\gamma^{n+1})+1-s}{s(1-\gamma^n)+1-s} \right] & n \geq 0 \\ \ln(1/\gamma) & n < 0 \end{cases}$$

and is plotted in Figure 7b. Whenever the dissipation is positive, the particle is biased to the right, otherwise to the left. On the negative half-lattice, the particle is biased towards the origin, whereas on the positive half-lattice, for $s$ not much larger than $s^*$, there is a finite range of sites $0, 1, \ldots, n^*$ where the particle would tend to travel back towards the origin. Past $n^*$, the bias is reversed and the particle would tend to drift off to infinity. Therefore, we expect a residence time-fraction $\rho < \rho_c$ to be generated by trajectories that stay close to the origin for some time, before wandering off to infinity, never to return.

5.3 Asymmetric run-and-tumble particle—rate function

We now turn to the last of the four problems, namely, the occupation-time problem for the RTP. Recall that $\Lambda(s)$ was given by the largest positive singularity of the Laplace-transformed partition function $\tilde{Z}(u,t)$ which has the form (5.3). In section A.3 we derive for the RTP

$$\tilde{Z}(u,s) = \frac{1}{u} (1 \ 1) (I + s\mathcal{I})^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{a_-(z_+ - z_-)} \begin{pmatrix} a_- - \frac{z_+}{z_-} & \omega_- \\ \omega_+ & a_+ - z_- \end{pmatrix},$$

(5.14)
\[ \Lambda(s) \]

(a) SCGF

\[ I(\rho)/I(1) \]

(b) Rate function (normalized)

**Figure 9:** SCGF and rate function for RTP/residence time problem with rates (4.20), \( \gamma = 0.1, \delta = 10, 5, 1, 0.1 \) from dark to light.

where

\[
\begin{align*}
a_+ &= u + 1 + \omega_+, \\
a_- &= u + \gamma + \omega_-, \\
z_\pm &= \frac{1}{2a_-} \left[ a_+a_- + \gamma - \omega_+\omega_- \pm \sqrt{(a_+a_- + \gamma - \omega_+\omega_-)^2 - 4\gamma a_+a_-} \right].
\end{align*}
\]

(5.15a)  \hspace{1cm} (5.15b)  \hspace{1cm} (5.15c)

Taking into account that \( z_\pm > 0 \) for \( u > 0 \), one can conclude that the positive poles of \( \tilde{Z}(u, s) \) are given by \( \det(I + sI) = 0 \), i.e.

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
a_-(z_+ - z_-) + s(a_- - \frac{\gamma}{z_+}) \\
\frac{s\omega_-}{a_-} \\
\end{vmatrix} = 0.
\]

(5.16)

This polynomial equation can be solved numerically for the largest pole \( u^* = \Lambda(s) \).

**Figure 8** shows that the resulting SCGF becomes zero for \( s \) larger than some \( s^* < 0 \) in a non-differentiable fashion when the velocity is non-zero. Assuming the validity of (3.7), the rate function develops a linear-convex transition corresponding to the singularity of the SCGF. We note further that the special ARW-RTP equivalence at certain parameter values found in the velocity fluctuation problem does not repeat itself with the occupation observable. When we choose rates according to (4.20) producing zero limiting velocity, we obtain **Figure 9**. As \( \delta \) becomes small, the SCGF approaches a singularity at \(-\gamma\). Meanwhile, the rate function evolves continuously from convex to linear. As tumble events become rare, the time spent at the origin is dominated by the time it sits there before its first exit.

### 5.4 Biased run-and-tumble particle—effective process

As we derive the effective process by determining the relevant left eigenvectors in section B.2, three distinct cases emerge depending on the sign of the asymptotic velocity \( \bar{v} \). We express the effective rates using the parameters \( a_\pm, z_\pm \) of (5.15), but with \( u^* = \Lambda(s) \) substituted.
Figure 10: Effective rates corresponding to Figure 9 as a function of $\rho$, normalized by the unmodified values. Top row (a),(b),(c): hopping rates; bottom row (d),(e),(f): tumbling rates; whole line: + state; dashes line: − state). The tumbling rates are plotted on a log-scale. (See main text for interpretation)

Figure 11: Steady-state particle current $J$ on the positive half-lattice for parameter giving $\bar{v} > 0$ ($\gamma = 0.3$, $\omega_+ = 0.3$, $\omega_- = 1$)
for \( u \) in their definitions. For \( s < s^* \), that is, in the convex regime of the rate function,

\[
W_{\text{eff}}(+, n \rightarrow +, n + 1) = \begin{cases} 
  z_- & n > 0 \\
  z_- \frac{a_- a_+ - z_+}{a_- + a_+ - z_-} & n = 0 \\
  z_+ & n < 0
\end{cases}
\]  
(5.17a)

\[
W_{\text{eff}}(-, n \rightarrow -, n - 1) = \begin{cases} 
  \gamma/z_+ & n > 0 \\
  (\gamma/z_+) \frac{a_- + s}{a_-} & n = 0 \\
  \gamma/z_- & n < 0
\end{cases}
\]  
(5.17b)

\[
W_{\text{eff}}(+, n \rightarrow -, n) = \begin{cases} 
  \omega_+ \omega_- \frac{a_+}{a_+ - (a_- - z_+)} & n > 0 \\
  \omega_+ \omega_- \frac{a_+}{a_+ - (a_- + s)(a_+ - z_-)} & n = 0 \\
  \omega_+ \omega_- \frac{a_+}{a_+ - a_-} & n < 0
\end{cases}
\]  
(5.17c)

\[
W_{\text{eff}}(-, n \rightarrow +, n) = \omega_+ \omega_- / W_{\text{eff}}(+, n \rightarrow -, n).
\]  
(5.17d)

In contrast to the ARW, the activity parameters are not unchanged by the effective process. Furthermore, the particle has a special set of rates at the origin.

If \( \bar{v} = 0 \), then the above solution is fully sufficient as the maximizer \( s(\rho) \leq s^* = 0 \).

Figure 10 shows the effective rates corresponding to the rates function Figure 9. In the original process the particle hops faster to the right, but spends more time in the left-oriented state. For \( n < 0 \), the effective process increases both hopping rates, while increasing tumbling frequency into the right-moving state, and decreasing the tumbling frequency out of it. For \( n > 0 \), all hopping rates are decreased, while tumbles into the left-moving state becomes relatively more favoured. A more remarkable result is that at the origin, the left hopping rates are decreased dramatically, even for small \( \rho \), and the tumbles into the left-moving states are simultaneously increased. Overall, away from the origin the effective process generates a bias towards it, and at the origin the likelihood of being in the left state is increases by an order of magnitude, and its hopping rate decreased by and order of magnitude, effectively trapping it there.

Otherwise, if \( \bar{v} > 0 \), i.e. \( \omega_-/\omega_+ > \gamma \) (or in the opposite case of \( \bar{v} < 0 \)), then \( s^* < 0 \) and there is a distinct effective process for \( s^* < s < 0 \), corresponding to the linear branch of the rate function. As for the ARW, the asymptotic equivalence of the effective process evaluated at the saddle-point \( s(\rho) \) and the microcanonical ensemble breaks down, but we use the behaviour of the effective process as a function of the tilt parameter \( s \) to suggest the mechanism behind the dynamical phase transition. The left eigenvectors from which the effective rates are constructed are given in section B.2.2, Eqs. (B.35) and (B.36). We note that for \( \bar{v} > 0 \), the rates are unmodified for \( n < 0 \) (or \( n > 0 \) for \( \bar{v} < 0 \)). On this half-lattice, the particle is naturally biased toward the origin. On the other half-lattice, at \( s = s^* \) the effective process switches from a confining dynamic in which the particle is always biased toward the origin, to one in which the confining regions can be escaped, as the bias directed towards the origin only extends to a finite number of sites in one half-lattice. Beyond this limit, the particle has essentially the unmodified bias giving velocity \( \bar{v} \) away from the origin. To demonstrate this, we plot the net average particle current

\[
J(n) = P_{\text{eff}}(n) W_{\text{eff}}(+, n \rightarrow +, n + 1) - P_{\text{eff}}(n + 1) W_{\text{eff}}(-, n + 1 \rightarrow -, n)
\]  
(5.18)

in the steady state in Figure 11 for an asymmetric choice of all rates. Similar to the dissipation rate of the ARW, Figure 7b, at a finite distance from the origin the particle
current changes sign. If the particle goes beyond this point, it has escaped the ‘trap’ that attracts it toward the origin. Therefore, we conclude again that the linear part of the rate function is generated by trajectories that stay localized around the origin for some time fraction before drifting off into infinity.

6 Summary and conclusion

In this work our aim was to establish basic large-deviation properties for the contrasting cases of a passive and an active particle, represented by an asymmetric random walker (ARW) and run-and-tumble particle (RTP) respectively. The essential difference between these two processes is that the RTP exhibits a persistent motion implying memory of its history.

Two of the simplest dynamical observables are the particle velocity and the fraction of time spent at the origin. In the case of velocity fluctuations, we were able to obtain analytical expressions for the rate functions and the effective process for both models. Surprisingly, we found that there exists a choice of non-trivial rates for the RTP under which its rate function becomes identical to that of an ARW. By non-trivial rates, we mean that they do not make RTP model itself identical to an ARW, as happens when the tumbling rates tend to infinity. Specifically, the persistence property of the RTP, manifested as the direction of successive hops being correlated random variables, continues to distinguish it from the ARW even when the rate functions coincide. Furthermore, this equivalence is not explained by that the fact that RTPs behave diffusively in the long time limit, as that is true for every set of parameters, not just this fine-tuned choice.

We further observe that for the spectrum of the RTP’s Markov matrix, at these special rates half of the eigenvalues are \(L\)-fold degenerate, while the other half exactly coincides with the spectrum of the ARW. This suggests that these two processes may possess a deeper equivalence, for example, some underlying symmetry or invariance. It would be interesting to establish whether a class of models exists where this same asymptotic equivalence is manifest, and if so, what the unifying feature of this class is.

Another new feature afforded by the dynamics of the RTP, that is absent in the ARW, is the possibility of a time-scale separation. This is obtained by letting the tumbling rates become much larger or smaller than the hopping rates, while keeping left and right tumbling rates at a fixed ratio. Specifically, we may chose this ratio such that the limiting velocity is zero. For fast tumbling rates, the rate function can be made approximately symmetric around zero, while the mechanism generating a positive or negative fluctuations differs, as the rates are highly asymmetric but in a complementary way. In the other limit of small tumbling rates, a flat region develops with a finite width, and as the tumbling rates tend to zero, the rate function approaches a singularity at endpoints of this region. This flat region is due to fluctuations in the times between tumbles being amplified by the relatively rapid hopping events. However, sending transition rates to zero sends the associated time-scale of the transition to infinity, an operation which does not necessarily commute with the long-time limit of the dynamical large deviation theory. Care therefore has to be taken in interpreting such singular limits [32].

For the residence-time fluctuations, our main conclusion is the robustness of the dynamical phase transition observed by Nyawo and Touchette [34] for biased Brownian motion in continuous 1D space. One advantage of studying this observable on the lattice (as opposed to the continuum) is that we were able to obtain an explicit expression for the rate function that applies to the ARW. The ensuing analysis led, as expected, to the same
conclusions, namely that if the particle has a hopping bias, the rate function exhibits a transition from linear to convex at a critical time-fraction $\rho_c$. At the corresponding value of the tilt parameter $s$, the effective process switches from a universal bias towards the origin, to allowing escape from this bias beyond a finite distance. Effectively, the effective process switches between recurrent and transient, while the original process was transient for the transition to be observed.

We further established that the same picture carries over to the RTP, although the complications of dealing with internal states meant we could not find closed formulas for the rate function and critical time-fractions. For the RTP, it is however possible to achieve zero net velocity (hence recurrence) by an asymmetric choice of rates, and we indeed observed the linear-convex transition only when net velocity was non-zero, making the original process transient. We believe then that, in support of the hypothesis of [34], transience and a non-symmetrizable Markov matrix are the key ingredients. We found for the RTP specifically that a non-zero velocity was a necessary and sufficient condition for the transition to take place. It is worthwhile noting that for the transition to occur breaking detailed balance is necessary but not sufficient, as the RTP trivially breaks detailed balance but may still have zero velocity.

In addition to a deeper understanding of the asymptotic equivalence of the ARW and RTP velocity fluctuations at special parameter values, it would be satisfying to obtain a rigorous argument for the dynamical phase transition in occupation arising generally for transient walks. Contrariwise, it would be curious if a counter-example of a transient walk within our 1D class was found for which the transition was absent.
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A Occupations fluctuations: Calculation of dynamical partition function

A.1 General formula

We here derive the formula (5.3). In the following we suppress the $s$-argument. The Laplace transform $t \to u$ of (5.1) yields

$$u\tilde{g}(z, u) - 1 = W(z)\tilde{g}(z, u) - s\tilde{p}(0, u),$$

(A.1)

where the initial condition

$$g(z, 0) = Z(0) = 1,

(A.2)

need not be normalized since ‘probability’ is not conserved. Now, by setting $z = 1$ in (A.1) we find

$$u\tilde{Z}(u) - 1 - \frac{1}{u}w = -s\tilde{p}(0, u),$$

(A.3)

wherein we have defined

$$(w)_i = (W(1)1)_i = \sum_j (\omega_{ij} - \omega_{ji}).$$

(A.4)
We then use (A.3) to eliminate $\tilde{p}(0,u)$ in (A.1), thereby obtaining after rearrangements

\[(uI - W(z))\tilde{g}(z, u) = u\tilde{Z}(u) - \frac{1}{u}w.\]  

(A.5)

Upon inverting the matrix multiplying $\tilde{g}$, and applying $-(s/2\pi i) \oint dz/z$ on both sides of the equation we find

\[-\frac{s}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z} \tilde{g}(z, u) = -\left[\frac{s}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z} (uI - W(z))^{-1}\right] \left(u\tilde{Z}(u) - \frac{1}{u}w\right).\]  

(A.6)

Recognizing the left hand side as $-s\tilde{p}$ we again eliminate it using (A.3). Rearranging the resulting expression,

\[\left[I + \frac{s}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z} (uI - W(z))^{-1}\right] \left(u\tilde{Z}(u) - \frac{1}{u}w\right) = 1.\]  

(A.7)

Finally, we invert the expression in square bracket, and apply $1^\top$ from the left. Noting that $1^\top w = 0$ we arrive at (5.3).

A.2 Evaluation for ARW

The integral to be computed in (5.3) is

\[\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z} \frac{1}{u - (z + \gamma z^{-1} - (1 + \gamma))} = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial D} \frac{dz}{z^2 - 2az + \gamma},\]  

(A.8)

with $a = (u + 1 + \gamma)/2$. The poles are

\[z_{\pm} = a \pm \sqrt{a^2 - \gamma}.\]  

(A.9)

One verifies that $z_+(u = 0) = 1$ and $\partial_u z_+ > 0$, hence this pole lies outside $D$ for $u > 0$; $z_-(u = 0) = \gamma$, $z_-(u \to \infty) = 0$ whilst $\partial_u z_- < 0$, hence this pole lies inside $D$ for $u > 0, \gamma < 1$. Using the residue theorem,

\[\mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{z_+ - z_-} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a^2 - \gamma}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(u + 2(1 + \gamma)) + (1 - \gamma)^2}}.\]  

(A.10)

A.3 Evaluation for RTP

Let us write (2.11) as

\[W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \mu(z) & \omega_+ \\ \omega_- & \nu(z)/z \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mu(z) = z - 1 - \omega_+, \quad \nu(z) = -z(\gamma + \omega_-) + \gamma.\]  

(A.11)

Then

\[[uI - W(z)]^{-1} = \frac{1}{(u - \mu(z))(uz - \nu(z)) - \omega_+ \omega_- z} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_- & \omega_+ \\ \omega_+ z & \gamma \end{pmatrix}.\]  

(A.12)

Every element in the above has two poles given by the zeroes of the quadratic

\[(u - \mu(z))(uz - \nu(z)) - \omega_+ \omega_- z = -a_-(z - z_+)(z - z_-),\]  

(A.13)
where
\[ z_\pm = \frac{1}{2a_-} \left[ a_+ a_- + \gamma - \omega_+ \omega_- \pm \sqrt{(a_+ a_- + \gamma - \omega_+ \omega_-)^2 - 4\gamma a_+ a_-} \right], \quad (A.14a) \]
\[ a_+ = u + 1 + \omega_+, \quad (A.14b) \]
\[ a_- = u + \gamma + \omega_-. \quad (A.14c) \]

One can verify that \( z_- \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \partial \mathbb{D} \) (unit disk) and \( z_+ \notin \mathbb{D} \) for the relevant parameter ranges and \( u > 0 \) (in fact, both roots are real, \( z_+ > 1 \), and \( 1 > z_- > 0 \)). Then by means of the residue theorem and after some algebraic simplifications we find
\[ \mathcal{I} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\partial \mathbb{D}} \frac{dz}{z} [uI - W(z)]^{-1} = \frac{1}{a_- (z_+ - z_-)} \begin{pmatrix} a_- - \frac{\omega_-}{z_+} & \omega_- \\ \omega_+ & a_+ - z_- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (A.15) \]

**B Occupations fluctuations: Left eigenvectors of tilted generator**

**B.1 ARW**

The left eigenvector \( \ell(n) \) is given by the solution to
\[ \Lambda(s) \ell(n) = \ell(n + 1) + \gamma \ell(n - 1) - (1 + \gamma) \ell(n) - s \ell(0) \delta_{n,0}, \quad (B.1) \]
with \( \Lambda(s) \) given by (5.6). Without loss of generality we put \( \ell(0) = 1 \). We consider separately \( s \gtrsim s^* = -(1 - \gamma) \).

**B.1.1 \( s < s^* \)**

In this case (B.1) becomes
\[ \ell(n + 1) + \gamma \ell(n - 1) - \sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma} \ell(n) = s \delta_{n,0}. \quad (B.2) \]
The generating function equation for \( \hat{\ell}(z) = \sum_n z^n \ell(n) \) is
\[ (z^{-1} + \gamma z - \sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma}) \hat{\ell}(z) = s. \quad (B.3) \]
Solving for \( \hat{\ell}(z) \),
\[ \hat{\ell}(z) = \frac{s z}{\gamma (z_- - z_+)} \left[ \frac{1}{z - z_-} - \frac{1}{z - z_+} \right], \quad (B.4) \]
where
\[ z_\pm = \frac{1}{2\gamma} \left[ \sqrt{s^2 + 4\gamma} \mp s \right]. \quad (B.5) \]

We note that \( z_- \in \mathbb{D} \), whereas \( z_+ \notin \mathbb{D} \). Applying the residue theorem to the inversion formula (2.5) and using \( z_- z_+ = 1/\gamma \), we find
\[ \ell(n) = \frac{s}{\gamma (z_- - z_+)} \begin{cases} z_+^{-n}, & n \geq 0 \\ (\gamma z_+)^{-|n|}, & n < 0. \end{cases} \quad (B.6) \]
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B.1.2 \( s > s^* \)

Following the generating function approach above, there would be a pole at \( z = 1 \), on the integration contour. The integral must then be defined in a principal value sense. Instead, we take a different approach. Consider \( n > 0 \). Then (B.1) reduces to

\[ \ell(n + 1) + \gamma \ell(n - 1) - (1 + \gamma)\ell(n) = 0. \]

(B.7)

The second boundary condition in addition to \( \ell(0) = 1 \) is \( \ell(1) = a \), with \( a \) to be determined self-consistently. The solution by elementary techniques is

\[ \ell(n) = \frac{1 - a}{1 - \gamma} \gamma^n + \frac{a - \gamma}{1 - \gamma}, \quad n \geq 0. \]

(B.8)

To solve for the negative half-lattice, define for positive \( n \), \( r(n) = \ell(-n) \). Then

\[ \gamma r(n + 1) + r(n - 1) - (1 + \gamma)r(n) = 0, \]

(B.9)

with the boundary conditions \( r(0) = 1 \) and

\[ r(1) = \frac{1}{\gamma}(1 + \gamma + s - a) \]

(B.10)

found from \( n = 0 \) in (B.1). The solution is

\[ r(n) = \frac{1 + s - a}{1 - \gamma} \gamma^{-n} + \frac{a - s - \gamma}{1 - \gamma}. \]

(B.11)

Since \( \gamma < 1 \), the first term grows unboundedly with \( n \), and our normalization condition (3.14) implies that we must make its coefficient vanish by choosing \( a = 1 + s \). The full solution is then

\[ \ell(n) = \begin{cases} \frac{s + \gamma^n}{1 - \gamma} + 1, & n > 0 \\ 1, & n \leq 0. \end{cases} \]

(B.12)

B.2 RTP

The equations for the left eigenvector \( \ell_\pm(n) \) are

\[
\Lambda(s) \ell_+(n) = \ell_+(n + 1) + \omega_+ \ell_-(n) - (1 + \omega_+ + s \delta_{n,0}) \ell_+(n)
\]

(B.13a)

\[
\Lambda(s) \ell_-(n) = \gamma \ell_-(n - 1) + \omega_- \ell_+(n) - (\gamma + \omega_- + s \delta_{n,0}) \ell_-(n).
\]

(B.13b)

It was found numerically that \( \Lambda(s) > 0 \) for \( s \) smaller than some \( s^* \), and zero above it. We treat these cases separately.

B.2.1 \( s < s^* \)

We use again the definitions (A.14) but with \( u = \Lambda(s) \). Then (B.13) transforms to

\[
\left( z^{-1} - a_+ \omega_+ \omega_- \gamma z - a_- \right) \hat{\ell}(z) = s \ell(0).
\]

(B.14)
Inverting the matrix,
\[
\hat{\ell}(z) = \frac{sz}{a_+\gamma(z - z_-(z - z_+)} \begin{pmatrix} a_- - \gamma z & \omega_+ \\ \omega_- & a_+ - z^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \ell(0),
\]
with
\[
\tilde{z}_\pm \equiv (a_-/\gamma a_+)z_\pm = 1/z_\mp
\]
following from \(z_+z_- = \gamma a_+ a_-\). Applying the inversion formula,
\[
\ell(n) = -sQ(n)\ell(0)
\]
\[
Q(n) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{\bar{D}} \frac{dz}{z^n} \frac{1}{\gamma a_+(z - z_+(z - z_-)} \begin{pmatrix} a_- - \gamma z & \omega_+ \\ \omega_- & a_+ - z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}
\]
Since \(\Lambda(s) > 0\), we have \(\tilde{z} \in D \setminus \partial D\), while \(\tilde{z} \notin D\). For \(n = 0\) we get the eigenvalue equation
\[
[I + sQ(0)]\ell(0) = 0,
\]
with \(Q(0)^+ = \mathcal{I}|_{u=\Lambda(s)}\) of (A.15). We require a non-trivial solution, which implies that \(I + s\mathcal{I}\), whose inverse appears in the dynamical partition function (5.3), is singular at \(u = \Lambda(s)\). This indeed follows from the fact this value of \(u\) is a pole of \(\tilde{Z}\) (see (5.16)). We may choose
\[
\ell(0) = \begin{pmatrix} a_- (z_+ + z_-) + s(a_+ + z_-) \\ -s\omega_- \end{pmatrix}
\]
For \(n \geq 1\) we find instead
\[
Q(\pm n) = \frac{(z_\mp)^{\pm n}}{a_- (z_+ + z_-)} \begin{pmatrix} a_- - \frac{z_\mp}{z_\pm} & \omega_+ \\ \omega_- & a_+ - z_\mp \end{pmatrix}
\]
The relevant ratios of eigenvector components can be worked out to
\[
\ell_(n+1)/\ell(n) = \begin{cases} z_- & n > 0 \\ z_- - \frac{a_- a_+ z_\mp}{a_+ + a_-} & n = 0 \\ z_+ & n < 0 \end{cases}
\]
\[
\ell_(n-1)/\ell_(n) = \begin{cases} z_+^{-1} & n > 0 \\ z_+^{-1} - \frac{a_- a_+}{a_+ + a_-} & n = 0 \\ z_+^{-1} & n < 0 \end{cases}
\]
\[
\ell_(n)/\ell_(n+1) = \begin{cases} \omega_- - \frac{a_-}{a_+ (a_+ + z_-)} & n > 0 \\ \omega_- - \frac{a_-}{a_+ + a_- (a_+ + z_-)} & n = 0 \\ \omega_- - \frac{a_-}{a_+ - (a_+ + z_-)} & n < 0 \end{cases}
\]

**B.2.2 \(s > s^*\)**

Consider \(n > 0\). Then by shifting \(n \rightarrow n+1\) in (B.13b), one can rewrite (B.13) vectorially as \(\mathcal{A}\ell(n+1) + B\ell(n) = 0\). Thus with \(C = -A^{-1}B\), \(\ell(n+1) = C\ell(n)\), i.e. \(\ell(n) = C^n \ell(1)\). We find
\[
C = \frac{1}{a_-} \begin{pmatrix} a_- a_+ & -\omega_+ a_- \\ \omega_- a_+ & \gamma - \omega_+ \omega_- \end{pmatrix}
\]
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where we use the definitions (A.14) with $u = \Lambda(s) = 0$, i.e.,

$$a_+ = 1 + \omega_+, \quad a_- = \gamma + \omega_-.$$  \hfill (B.24)

Defining $\mathbf{r}(n) = \mathbf{\ell}(-n)$ for $n > 0$, we find similarly $\mathbf{r}(n) = (C')^{n-1}\mathbf{r}(1)$, with

$$C' = \frac{1}{\gamma a_+} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma - \omega_+ \omega_- & \omega_+ a_- \\ -\omega_+ a_- & a_+ a_- \end{pmatrix}. \hfill (B.25)$$

We seek to diagonalize $C'$ to determine its powers. The eigenvalues of $C$ are $z_{\pm}$ and for $C'$ they are $1/z_{\pm}$, simplifying to

$$z_{\pm} = \begin{cases} \gamma a_+/a_- & \omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma, \\ 1 & \omega_-/\omega_+ \geq \gamma \end{cases} \hfill (B.26)$$

$$z_{\pm} = \begin{cases} 1 & \omega_-/\omega_+ \leq \gamma, \\ \gamma a_+/a_- & \omega_-/\omega_+ > \gamma \end{cases} \hfill (B.27)$$

Note that $z_+ \geq 1$ and $z_- \leq 1$, with at least one of them being unity for any parameter choice. It emerges that $\omega_-/\omega_+ = \gamma$, i.e. zero average velocity, is a special parameter choice that makes the eigenvalue degenerate. However, we know that this choice leads to $s^* = 0$ and a strictly convex rate function which is covered by the previous subsection and we ignore this case here. The matrix of eigenvectors $P^{(i)}$ of $C^{(i)}$ can be chosen

$$P = P' = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_+ a_- & 1 \\ \omega_- a_+ & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{if} \quad \omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma,$$  \hfill (B.28)

and in the complementary case the columns are swapped. Thus

$$\mathbf{\ell}(n+1) = P \begin{pmatrix} z_+^n & 0 \\ 0 & z_-^n \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} \mathbf{\ell}(1), \hfill (B.29)$$

$$\mathbf{r}(n+1) = P \begin{pmatrix} z_-^n & 0 \\ 0 & z_+^n \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} \mathbf{r}(1). \hfill (B.30)$$

To determine $\mathbf{\ell}(1)$, $\mathbf{\ell}(0)$, and $\mathbf{r}(1)$, we first take $n = 0$ in (B.13) to obtain

$$\gamma \ell_-(0) + \omega_- \ell_+(0) - (a_+ + s) \ell_+(0) = 0, \hfill (B.31a)$$

$$\gamma r_-(1) + \omega_- \ell_+(0) - (a_- + s) \ell_-(1) = 0. \hfill (B.31b)$$

When we wrote down the vectorial recurrence relations for $\mathbf{\ell}$ and $\mathbf{r}$, we omitted (B.13a) for $n = 1$, and (B.13b) for $n = -1$.

$$\gamma \ell_-(0) + \omega_- \ell_+(1) - a_- \ell_-(1) = 0, \hfill (B.32a)$$

$$\ell_+(0) + \omega_+ r_-(1) - a_+ r_+(1) = 0. \hfill (B.32b)$$

Without loss of generality we choose $\ell_+(0) = 1$, and then let $\ell_-(0) = b$, to be determined as a function of $s$ and the model parameters. The solution of (B.31) and (B.32) are

$$\ell_+(1) = a_+ + s - \omega_+ b$$  \hfill (B.33a)

$$\ell_-(1) = \frac{1}{a_-}[(\gamma - \omega_+ \omega_-)b + \omega_-(a_+ + s)]$$  \hfill (B.33b)

$$r_-(1) = \frac{1}{\gamma}[(a_- + s)b - \omega_-]$$  \hfill (B.33c)

$$r_+(1) = \frac{1}{\gamma a_+}[(\gamma - \omega_+ \omega_- + \omega_+(a_- + s)b]$$  \hfill (B.33d)
To finally determine $b$, note that for $\omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma$, $z_n^n$ grows unboundedly with $n$, and we must therefore make its coefficient vanish to satisfy the normalization (3.14). Similarly, for $\omega_-/\omega_+ > \gamma$, $z_{-n}$ must be killed off. These constraints dictate that

$$b = \begin{cases} \frac{s+a+}{a_+} & \omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma \\ \frac{a}{s+a-} & \omega_-/\omega_+ > \gamma \end{cases} \quad (B.34)$$

To reveal the symmetry of the solution, we rescale $\ell \to (1/b)\ell$, but only for $\omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma$. The full solution is then the following. For $\omega_-/\omega_+ < \gamma$ and $n > 0$

$$\ell(0) = \left(\frac{a_+}{s+a+}\right)$$

$$\ell(n) = \left(\frac{1}{1}\right)$$

$$\ell(-n) = \frac{a_+}{s+a+} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\omega_+/a_+}{s+a_+} + \frac{z_n^n}{\gamma \omega_+ - \omega_-}\right)(s + a_+ + a_-)s\right)$$

For $\omega_-/\omega_+ > \gamma$,

$$\ell(0) = \left(\frac{a_-}{s+a_-}\right)$$

$$\ell(n) = \frac{a_-}{s+a_-} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\omega_-/a_-}{\omega_- - \gamma \omega_+} - \frac{z_n^n}{\omega_- - \gamma \omega_+}\right)(s + a_+ + a_-)s\right)$$

$$\ell(-n) = \left(\frac{1}{1}\right)$$
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