

Casimir-like forces in cooperative exclusion processes

Mauro Sellitto

Dipartimento di Ingegneria, Università degli Studi della Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”,

Via Roma 29, 81031 Aversa, Italy.

The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics,

Strada Costiera 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy.

Abstract

I show that cooperative exclusion processes with selective kinetic constraints exhibit fluctuation-induced forces that can be attractive or repulsive, depending on the density of boundary reservoirs, when their density-dependent diffusion coefficient exhibits a minimum. A mean-field analysis based on a nonlinear diffusion equation provides an estimation of the magnitude and sign of such a tunable Casimir-like force and suggests its occurrence in interacting particle systems with a diffusivity anomaly.

Casimir forces, experienced by objects immersed in a fluctuating medium with long-range correlations, are virtually present in all fields of physics, from exotic states of matter such as evaporating black holes, to the more ordinary liquid state structure (where they are embodied as van der Waals forces) and critical phenomena [1–3]. There has been a substantial theoretical and experimental effort to precisely characterize those physical situations where such forces are repulsive rather than attractive (see, for example, [4–10]), as initially found by Casimir in the ideal case of two parallel and perfectly conducting metal plates. This possibility, predicted by the Lifshitz theory when the dielectric properties of the plates and the intervening medium are properly chosen, offers the opportunity of engineering Casimir forces for the practical design of micro- and nano-structured electro-mechanical devices and materials [11, 12]. Parallel to these developments, Casimir-like forces induced by *non-equilibrium* fluctuations have received a growing attention in the past few years [13–18]. Interest in this extension of the Casimir effect lies in the intrinsic long-range nature of correlations in nonequilibrium steady states [19, 20], which offers the advantage of requiring no fine-tuning of the external control parameters. Compared to their quantum or critical counterpart these situations are relatively less understood as the dynamical contribution to the force is more difficult to access.

The paradigmatic case of driven diffusive systems coupled to particle reservoirs at different density, ρ_+ and ρ_- , has been recently addressed in Ref. [21]. The authors found the remarkable result that the fluctuation-induced force between two parallel slabs at distance d is given, to the leading quadratic order in $\Delta\rho = \rho_+ - \rho_-$, by the formula:

$$F \simeq \frac{k_B T (\Delta\rho)^2}{24 d} P'' \left[\left(\frac{\rho}{P'} \right)'' + \left(\frac{\rho}{P'} \frac{D'}{D} \right)' \right], \quad (1)$$

where $D(\rho)$ is a density-dependent diffusion coefficient, P is the pressure, and the prime denotes the derivative with respect to the particle density ρ , evaluated at ρ_- . Eq. (1) is intriguing because it suggests that the fluctuation-induced force can be either attractive (negative) or repulsive (positive), depending of the relative sign and the magnitude of the two terms in the square brackets. In particular, the second term on the right-hand-side shows an explicit dependence on the dynamics through the appearance of the diffusion coefficient (and its first and second derivatives). Unfortunately, computing the bulk diffusion is feasible only under a very special circumstance, known as the “gradient condition”, according to which the current through a lattice bond can be written as the difference (i.e., the discrete

gradient) of some local function. In this case the dynamical contribution to the Green-Kubo formula (represented by the spatial sum of the time integral of current-current correlation) vanishes and the bulk diffusion coefficient can be computed as a static average [22, 23]. For non-gradient systems, such as those considered here, there are multi-site interactions that make this task very challenging (see, however [24, 25] for some progress in this direction), and therefore, identifying a class of systems for which the sign of the force can be reversed remains a widely open problem. By using a mean-field approximation, we show in this paper that the fluctuation-induced force, in exclusion processes with a minimum in the diffusion coefficient $D(\rho)$, can be made attractive or repulsive when the density of the boundary reservoirs is near the minimum of $D(\rho)$.

We consider *cooperative* exclusion processes in which a particle can move only if it has certain specific numbers of vacant neighbours, before and after the move. This notion, that generalises the idea of kinetic constraints typically used for modelling the slow relaxation of glassy systems [26, 27], can be equivalently reformulated by saying that the move of a particle is *not* allowed if the number of vacant neighbours, before or after the move (not counting the departure and target site), belongs to a certain subset \mathcal{S} of non-negative integer lower than c , the lattice coordination number. Cooperative exclusion processes with such selective kinetic constraints are unambiguously identified by \mathcal{S} and c . One important feature of their dynamics is the microscopic time reversibility, i.e., the detailed balance condition (as the constraint acts in exactly the same way on the departure and target sites). Since the only static interaction is the hard-core particle exclusion, the equilibrium measure is that of a non-interacting lattice-gas and, therefore, the entropy density is $s(\rho) = -k_B [\rho \ln \rho(1 - \rho) + \ln(1 - \rho)]$. This means that for all members of this family the pressure at particle density ρ is:

$$P(\rho) = -k_B T \log(1 - \rho). \quad (2)$$

The interesting consequence is that, after a straightforward manipulation of the terms in the square brackets of Eq. (1), the force F turns out to be repulsive if:

$$-2 + (1 - 2\rho)\frac{D'}{D} + \rho(1 - \rho)\frac{D''}{D} - \rho(1 - \rho)\left(\frac{D'}{D}\right)^2 > 0. \quad (3)$$

The analysis of the sign of the various terms suggests that this inequality holds if there is range of density in which $D'' > 0$. Therefore, driven diffusive systems with a minimum in the diffusion coefficient are the most suitable candidates in which the sign of the fluctuation-induced force can be reversed. For some examples of physical systems displaying such a type

of diffusivity anomaly, where the relaxation dynamics becomes first slower and then faster upon increasing isothermal compression, see [28, 29].

To estimate the diffusion coefficient of cooperative exclusion processes we use a mean-field argument which neglects particle correlations, according to which the average of the hopping probability, which is a certain function of multi-site occupancy variables, is approximated as a function of the average of the single site occupancy variable (i.e., the particle density ρ). This gives [30]:

$$D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{NC}}(\rho) = \left[1 - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \binom{c-1}{i} \rho^{c-1-i} (1-\rho)^i \right]^2, \quad (4)$$

where the binomial terms account for the multiplicity of possible configurations of particles and vacancies, that prevent hopping (with the power 2 coming from the detailed balance condition). This mean-field or no-correlation (NC) approximation provides a general upper bound on the actual diffusion coefficient and, although rather crude, it is surprisingly good and versatile in predicting unusual convexity-change density profiles in boundary-driven nonequilibrium steady-states [30]. Moreover, for sufficiently large system size, transverse local density fluctuations are uncorrelated [30]:

$$\langle \rho(x)^2 \rangle - \langle \rho(x) \rangle^2 = L^{-1} \langle \rho(x) \rangle (1 - \langle \rho(x) \rangle), \quad (5)$$

with L being the distance between the particle reservoirs. This confirms that in the steady state the local pressure at position x can be computed by means of Eq. (2) with $\rho = \langle \rho(x) \rangle$. To substantiate in more detail the above analysis of we now analyze three specific cooperative exclusion processes on a square lattice, $c = 4$.

- $\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$. This is the Kob-Andersen model of glassy dynamics [27] in which particle hopping to a vacant neighbour is not allowed if the particle has only one vacant neighbour, before or after the move. The dynamics is strongly cooperative and the diffusion coefficient steeply decreases to zero as $\rho \rightarrow 1$. It can be approximated as:

$$D_0^{\text{NC}}(\rho) = (1 - \rho^3)^2. \quad (6)$$

When coupled to particle reservoirs at its ends this model generally exhibits convex profiles [24, 25].

- $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 3\}$. This is the particle-hole symmetric analog of the Kob-Andersen model. Particle hopping to a vacant neighbour is forbidden if the particle has one or four vacant neighbours, before or after the move. The dynamics is strongly cooperative when ρ tends to 0 or 1. The approximated diffusion coefficient is:

$$D_{0,3}^{\text{NC}}(\rho) = [1 - \rho^3 - (1 - \rho)^3]^2, \quad (7)$$

an displays a maximum at $\rho^* = 1/2$. When coupled to particle reservoirs at its ends the model shows convexity-change profiles depending on the reservoirs density [30].

- $\mathcal{S} = \{1\}$. Particle hopping to a vacant neighbour is not allowed if the particle has two vacant neighbours, before or after the move. This dynamics is moderately cooperative in an intermediate range of density as the kinetic constraint becomes ineffective at very low or high density. The approximated diffusion coefficient is:

$$D_1^{\text{NC}}(\rho) = [1 - 3\rho^2(1 - \rho)]^2, \quad (8)$$

and has a minimum at $\rho^* = 2/3$. When coupled to particle reservoirs at its ends the model exhibits convexity-change profiles depending on the reservoirs density [30].

The approximated diffusion coefficient, D_S^{NC} , of the above exclusion processes is shown in Fig. 1. With these ingredients one can now easily estimate the fluctuation-induced force F_S^{NC} . In Fig. 2 we show the results obtained for the three cooperative exclusion processes in terms of the rescaled force:

$$\tilde{F}_S^{\text{NC}} = F_S^{\text{NC}} \frac{24d}{k_B T (\Delta\rho)^2}. \quad (9)$$

We see that when the diffusion coefficient decreases monotonically, $\mathcal{S} = \{0\}$, the fluctuation-induced force is always attractive and its strength becomes larger and larger as the reservoir density ρ_- increases. This behaviour is qualitatively similar to what has been observed in the simple exclusion process [21], but it is enhanced by the larger dynamical correlations needed for particle rearrangements in the presence of kinetic constraints. This interpretation is confirmed by the stronger attraction observed for the case $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 3\}$ which is highly cooperative at both high and low density. The most interesting and perhaps surprising case occurs when the diffusion coefficient displays a minimum, $\mathcal{S} = \{1\}$. In this case the




FIG. 1. Bulk diffusion coefficient $D_{\mathcal{S}}^{\text{NC}}$ in the no-correlation (NC) approximation for cooperative exclusion processes with selective constraint \mathcal{S} on a square lattice. The horizontal solid line corresponds to the exact value of the diffusion coefficient for the simple symmetric exclusion process (SSEP).

fluctuation-induced force becomes repulsive in an intermediate range of density around the minimum of the diffusion coefficient and attractive outside (so there are two crossover densities at which the Casimir-like force vanishes). A direct inspection of Fig. 2 shows that the maximum of the repulsive force, which is attained at reservoir density $\rho_- \simeq 0.55$, is twice as strong as the attractive force in the simple exclusion process (and equals in magnitude to the attractive force in the Kob-Andersen model). More importantly, the presence of a repulsive force can be inferred from the convexity properties of density profiles at different values of the density of boundary reservoirs [30], as suggested by the relation $x'(\rho) = D(\rho)$ (which follows from the expression of the steady-state current $J = -D(\rho)\partial_x\rho$). This macroscopic static signature can be a useful diagnostic in the experimental or numerical investigation of model systems when a detailed knowledge of the bulk diffusion coefficient is lacking. Since Eq. (4) holds in the limit of vanishing dynamical correlations, the results computed above should be considered as a lower bound on the actual magnitude of the fluctuation-induced force (therefore, one should observe forces of larger magnitude in Montecarlo simulation of




FIG. 2. Fluctuation-induced force, \tilde{F}_S^{NC} , in the no-correlation (NC) approximation vs particle reservoir density, ρ_- , for cooperative exclusion processes with selective constraint \mathcal{S} on a square lattice. The exact value for the simple symmetric exclusion process (SSEP) is shown as a solid line for comparison.

cooperative exclusion process). Although improved estimations can be obtained by using more refined expression of the diffusion coefficient with the systematic approaches developed in [24, 25], we expect that corrections are rather mild. In particular, the prediction of the force sign and the location of the crossover between the attractive and repulsive regime should be quite accurate, as expected from numerical simulation of convexity-change profiles in the nonequilibrium steady state [30].

It would be interesting to validate the above predictions by Montecarlo simulations and to investigate how they are possibly modified when small inclusions, rather than parallel slabs, are considered. The ability to control the strength and sign of these forces should provide further opportunities for manipulating and assembling particles in nonequilibrium condition on the soft matter microscopic scales. It is also tempting to speculate that they might play a role in the quasi-isothermal cellular environment, where cooperativity is the

rule rather than an exception.

- [1] S.K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Today **60**, 40 (2007).
- [2] S.Y. Buhmann, *Dispersion Forces I*, (Berlin: Springer 2012).
- [3] M. Kardar and R. Golestanian, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1233 (1999).
- [4] A. Ajdari, L. Peliti, and J. Prost, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1481 (1991).
- [5] J.N. Munday, F. Capasso, and V.A. Parsegian, Nature **457**, 170 (2009)
- [6] C. Hertlein, L. Helden, A. Gambassi, S. Dietrich and C. Bechinger Nature **451**, 172 (2008).
- [7] U. Nellen, L. Helden, and C. Bechinger, Europhys. Lett. **88**, 26001 (2009).
- [8] J.-J. Liétor-Santos and J.C. Burton, Soft Matter **13**, 1142 (2017).
- [9] Q.-D. Jiang and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. B **99**, 125403 (2019).
- [10] R. Zhao, L. Li, S. Yang, W. Bao, Y. Xia, P. Ashby, Y. Wang, and X. Zhang, Science **364**, 984 (2019).
- [11] R. H. French et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1887 (2010).
- [12] L.M. Woods et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 045003 (2016).
- [13] H. Wada and S. I. Sasa, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 065302(R) (2003).
- [14] A. Najafi and R. Golestanian, Europhys. Lett. **68**, 776 (2004).
- [15] C. Cattuto, R. Brito, U. Marini Bettolo Marconi, F. Nori, and R. Soto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 178001 (2006).
- [16] M. R. Shaebani, J. Sarabadani, and D. E. Wolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 198001 (2012).
- [17] A. Furukawa, A. Gambassi, S. Dietrich, and H. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 055701 (2013).
- [18] T. R. Kirkpatrick, J. M. Ortiz de Zárate, and J. V. Sengers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 235902 (2013).
- [19] J.M. Ortiz de Zárate and J.V. Sengers, *Hydrodynamic Fluctuations in Fluids and Fluid Mixtures* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006).
- [20] J.R. Dorfman, T.R. Kirkpatrick and J.V. Sengers, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **45**, 213 (1994).
- [21] A. Aminov, Y. Kafri, and M. Kardar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 230602 (2015).
- [22] H. Spohn, *Large Scale Dynamics of Interacting Particles* (Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1991).
- [23] M. Sasada, Ann. Appl. Prob. **28**, 2727 (2018).
- [24] E. Teomy and Y. Shokef, Phys. Rev. E **95**, 022124 (2017).

- [25] C. Arita, P. L. Krapivsky, and K. Mallick, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **51**, 125002 (2018).
- [26] F. Ritort and P. Sollich, Adv. Phys. **52**, 219 (2003).
- [27] W. Kob and H.C. Andersen, Phys. Rev. E **48**, 4364 (1993).
- [28] L. Berthier, A.J. Moreno, and G. Szamel, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 060501(R) (2010).
- [29] M. Pica Ciamarra and P. Sollich, J. Phys.: Condens. Mat. **27**, 194128 (2015).
- [30] M. Sellitto, Phys. Rev. E **100**, 040102(R) (2019).