

Tricritical behavior in dynamical phase transitions

Tal Agranov,¹ Michael E. Cates,¹ and Robert L. Jack^{1,2}

¹*DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA*

²*Yusuf Hamied Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1EW, United Kingdom*

We identify a new scenario for dynamical phase transitions associated with time-integrated observables occurring in diffusive systems described by the macroscopic fluctuation theory. It is characterized by the pairwise meeting of first- and second-order bias-induced phase transition curves at two tricritical points. We formulate a simple, general criterion for its appearance and derive an exact Landau theory for the tricritical behavior. The scenario is demonstrated in three examples: the simple symmetric exclusion process biased by an activity-related structural observable; the Katz-Lebowitz-Spohn lattice gas model biased by its current; and in an active lattice gas biased by its entropy production.

Introduction – In non-equilibrium statistical mechanics, theoretical results for simple lattice models have guided understanding of dynamical processes and fluctuations [1–4, 7–10]. For interacting particle systems, macroscopic fluctuation theory (MFT) [4, 11–15] enables analysis of hydrodynamic scales, exposing behavior independent of microscopic details. Alongside models’ typical behavior, MFT predicts rare fluctuations. For example, it identifies the fluctuation mechanism for time-integrated quantities whereby atypical values of the current [3, 11–14, 18, 21, 22] or dynamical activity [5, 8, 25, 28] are sustained over long times. These are examples of large deviations, which have also been analysed numerically [29], and by other theoretical methods [30]. A rich behavior emerges [19, 21, 33], including dynamical phase transitions (DPTs), often involving spontaneous symmetry breaking by these (macroscopically atypical) system trajectories [1, 5, 7, 8, 12–14, 18, 22, 25, 28, 29].

DPTs are conceptually intriguing, and also provide practical insight, in part because large deviation analyses relate directly to optimal control theory [15, 20, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39]. Here rare events are characterized via extra control forces, added to the system dynamics, to make them become typical. This approach has applications in numerical experiments and for material design [1, 20, 33, 40–44]. In this setting, DPTs signify qualitative changes in the types of control force required.

Several well-studied DPTs occur in the simple symmetric exclusion process (SSEP), with periodic boundary conditions. Its steady states are homogeneous (H), but large deviations towards low activity occur through spatially inhomogeneous (IH) states, while those with large activity exhibit hyperuniformity [5, 8]. The transition from H to IH spontaneously breaks translational symmetry and is continuous. In contrast, discontinuous DPTs also arise, in exclusion processes [18] and other models [1].

In this work, we explore a new type of dynamical phase behavior for fluctuations of time-integrated quantities, which manifests as a pair of tricritical points. These live on H-IH phase boundaries and signal a change in character of the H-IH transition, from continuous to discontinuous. We analyse this scenario using MFT, showing

it has a universal status – occurring generically when simple criteria are met. We exemplify this with three large-deviation calculations: fluctuations of a structural observable akin to the activity in SSEP; fluctuations of the current in a Katz-Lebowitz-Spohn (KLS) type lattice gas; and fluctuations of the entropy production in an active lattice gas model.

Note that current fluctuations in 1D have been extensively studied [3, 12–14, 18, 21, 22], including recent exact solutions via MFT [45–47], for cases where the mobility depends quadratically on density. We show below that tricriticality generically arises when the mobility has an inflection point, absent in those studies, creating a much richer picture for DPTs than previously identified. (The possibility of discontinuous transitions was noted in [13], but tricritical points have not been explored, to our knowledge.)

Large deviations in SSEP – We first address fluctuations of time-integrated structural quantities in the SSEP. Consider a one-dimensional periodic lattice with L sites and N particles; each site contains at most one particle, and particles hop to vacant neighbors with rate D_0 . To analyse the hydrodynamic scale, let the position of site i be $x = i/L$, and write $\rho(x, t)$ for the hydrodynamic density, with time t measured on the hydrodynamic scale. (The microscopic time is then $\hat{t} = L^2 t$.) Also write $J(x, t)$ for the hydrodynamic current, and denote by $\mathcal{X} = \{\rho(x, t), J(x, t)\}_{x \in [0, 1], t \in [0, T]}$ a dynamical trajectory of duration T . Such trajectories respect the continuity equation $\partial_t \rho = -\nabla \cdot J$, so the total density of the system, $\rho_0 = N/L$, is conserved.

Within MFT, the probability of a trajectory is $P(\mathcal{X}) \simeq e^{-LS(\mathcal{X})}$ [2, 4, 11–15], with action

$$S_T(\mathcal{X}) = \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx \frac{|J + D(\rho)\nabla\rho|^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} \quad (1)$$

where $D(\rho) = D_0$ and $\sigma(\rho) = 2D_0\rho(1 - \rho)$. Below we retain D and σ as general functions, specialising to SSEP where appropriate. We consider large deviations of time-integrated structural quantities of the form

$$K_T(\mathcal{X}) = L \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx \kappa(\rho), \quad (2)$$

with two exemplar choices for $\kappa(\rho)$:

$$\kappa_1(\rho) = \rho(1 - \rho) \quad , \quad \kappa_2(\rho) = \rho(1 - \rho)^2 . \quad (3)$$

For $\kappa = \kappa_1$, K_T measures the dynamical activity [5, 8]: it counts the number of possible particle hops (i.e., particles with a vacant neighbor). Meanwhile, κ_2 counts particles with *two* vacant neighbors [48]. Despite their physically similar definitions, these quantities have contrasting large deviation behaviors.

To analyse this, we define the scaled cumulant generating function (CGF) $\Psi(\Lambda) = \lim_{L,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{LT} \log \langle e^{\Lambda K_T} \rangle$, where angle brackets indicate a steady-state average. Analogous to a thermodynamic potential, the CGF is a ‘dynamical free energy’ for an ensemble of trajectories biased by the field Λ conjugate to K_T [19–21, 33]. For large L , the average is dominated by the most likely trajectory and for large T this is homogeneous in time, so that [48]

$$-\Psi(\Lambda) = \inf_{\rho: \int_0^1 dx \rho = \rho_0} \int_0^1 dx [M(\rho) |\nabla \rho|^2 - \Lambda \kappa(\rho)] \quad (4)$$

where $M(\rho) = D(\rho)^2 / 2\sigma(\rho)$.

An alternative characterization of large deviations involves the rate function \mathcal{I} . The probability density for K_T obeys for large L, T

$$\log \text{Prob}[K_T / (LT) \approx k] \simeq -LT \mathcal{I}(k) . \quad (5)$$

\mathcal{I} corresponds to a thermodynamic potential dual to Ψ , governing an ensemble of trajectories where K_T is fixed. It can be computed in terms of a dominant path which minimises the action at constrained K_T :

$$\mathcal{I}(k) = \inf_{\mathcal{X}: K_T(\mathcal{X}) = kLT} S_T(\mathcal{X}) / T . \quad (6)$$

As in thermodynamics, enforcing the constraint by Lagrange multiplier shows that \mathcal{I} and Ψ are related by Legendre transform.

Dynamical phase transitions in SSEP – Fig. 1 shows dynamical phase diagrams for large deviations of K_T in ensembles biased via κ_1 and κ_2 . Both cases support H-IH phase transitions, but biasing by κ_2 introduces tricritical points, absent for κ_1 . To explain this, we first establish a simple condition for discontinuous transitions, related to previous arguments at microscopic level [1, 2, 48]. This sufficient condition only involves $\kappa(\rho)$, although discontinuous transitions could also arise for sufficiently elaborate choices of $M(\rho)$ [48].

IH states occur when the minimizer of (4) has $\rho(x) \neq \rho_0$. The latter is optimal for $\Lambda = 0$, whereas for $\Lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ the gradient term is negligible and we minimise $\int \kappa(\rho) dx$. The outcome depends on the convexity of κ : IH profiles are optimal whenever $\kappa(\rho)$ differs from its lower convex envelope, which is the lower boundary of the convex hull. (This condition is analogous to the double tangent construction for thermodynamic phase separation.) The resulting minimiser has two spatial regions, separated by




FIG. 1. (A,B) SSEP dynamical phase diagrams for (A) $\kappa = \kappa_1$; (B) $\kappa = \kappa_2$, showing H and IH states. Arrows demarcate the range of densities ρ_0 for which IH states appear as $|\Lambda_c| \rightarrow \infty$. The thick (orange) lines indicates continuous transitions at $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,2}$ (7) and the dashed continuations indicate discontinuous transitions. These meet at tricritical points (black dots).

an interface of width $O(|\Lambda|^{-1/2})$. For both κ_1 and κ_2 these have bulk densities $\rho = 0, 1$.

In such cases, the system is IH for $\Lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ but H for $\Lambda = 0$: clearly there must be an intervening DPT where translational symmetry is broken. The same argument applies for $\Lambda \rightarrow +\infty$, on replacing κ by $-\kappa$. The arrows in Fig. 1(B), show the regions of IH for large $|\Lambda|$. Only if κ has an inflection point (so that neither of $\pm\kappa$ is convex) do IH states exist for both signs of Λ .

We next establish conditions governing the order of these DPTs. At a *continuous* transition $\rho(x)$ deviates smoothly from ρ_0 as bias is increased. Using (4) with $\Lambda < 0$, this requires a small perturbation to reduce $\int \kappa(\rho) dx$, implying $\kappa''(\rho_0) < 0$. Conversely, if $\kappa''(\rho_0) > 0$ any transition must be discontinuous. Summarising: for any ρ_0 at which κ differs from its lower convex envelope then an H-IH transition must occur for some $\Lambda < 0$. If $\kappa''(\rho_0) > 0$, then it *must* be first-order; otherwise it may be continuous or discontinuous. (Analogous results again hold for $\Lambda > 0$, on replacing $\kappa \rightarrow -\kappa$.)

Since $\kappa_2''(\rho_0)$ changes sign at $\rho_0 = 2/3$, any H-IH transitions at $\Lambda > 0$ is discontinuous for $\rho_0 < 2/3$; likewise for $\rho_0 > 2/3$ when $\Lambda < 0$. (In fact, the transitions are discontinuous over broader ranges; see below.) In contrast, $\kappa_1''(\rho_0) < 0$ for all ρ_0 : the H-IH transition is always continuous in that case.

To analyse these DPTs quantitatively, we develop a Landau theory [5, 7, 13, 18], valid close to tricriticality. We expand the density as $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + A \cos 2\pi x + B \cos 4\pi x$, where A is a small amplitude and $B = O(A^2)$ [48]. Substituting into (4) yields

$$-\Psi(\Lambda) \approx -\Lambda \kappa(\rho_0) + \inf_A \left[\frac{\Lambda_{c,2} - \Lambda}{4} \kappa''(\rho_0) A^2 + \beta(\rho_0) A^4 \right] \quad (7)$$




FIG. 2. Tricriticality in SSEP for $\kappa = \kappa_2$. (A) Minimizers of (4), for $\rho_0 = 0.54$ and $\Lambda = (0.9, 1, 1.11, 1.12) \times \Lambda_{c,1}$, close to the discontinuous transition at $\Lambda_{c,1}$. (B) Amplitude A for various ρ_0 , near the tricritical point at $(\rho_0, \Lambda) = (\rho_c, \Lambda_{c,2})$. For $\rho_0 < \rho_c$, a continuous transition occurs at $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,2}$ where $A \propto |\Lambda_{c,2} - \Lambda|^{1/2}$ (dashed red line) as predicted by (7). At $\rho_c \simeq 0.515$ the growth follows $A \propto |\Lambda - \Lambda_{c,2}|^{1/4}$ (dashed purple). For $\rho_0 > \rho_c$, a discontinuous transition occurs at $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,1}$. The discontinuity grows as $\Delta A|_{\Lambda=\Lambda_{c,1}} \propto |\Lambda_{c,2} - \Lambda_{c,1}|^{1/4}$ (dotted green line). Solid lines are numerical solutions of (4).

where \approx means terms of $O(A^6)$ are omitted; here

$$\Lambda_{c,2} = \frac{8\pi^2 M(\rho_0)}{\kappa''(\rho_0)}, \quad \beta = \frac{\pi^2 M(\rho_0)}{24} [3a(\rho_0) - b^2(\rho_0)], \quad (8)$$

with $a = 2M''/M - \kappa'''/\kappa''$ and $b = 3M'/M - \kappa'''/\kappa''$.

The behavior of the Landau theory (7) is familiar: if $\beta > 0$ there is a continuous transition at $\Lambda_c = \Lambda_{c,2}$ beyond which $A \propto \sqrt{|\Lambda - \Lambda_{c,2}|}$. This happens for the SSEP with $\kappa = \kappa_1$ [5]. From (8), the sign of $\Lambda_{c,2}$ matches that of κ'' , as argued previously.

In contrast, if $\beta < 0$, symmetry breaking can only happen discontinuously, as already noted in [13]. Points with $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,2}$ and $\beta(\rho_0) = 0$ are tricritical [9, 50, 51]: here the transition changes character from continuous to discontinuous [48]. Note also that wherever $\kappa''(\rho_0) \rightarrow 0$, $b^2(\rho_0) \rightarrow \infty$. Hence from (8), β is negative in a range of ρ around any inflection point in κ , such as the one for κ_2 at $\rho_0 = 2/3$ (while generically, as in our examples, staying positive elsewhere). The two tricritical points that limit this range are easily identified since $\Lambda_{c,2}$ and β are explicit functions [48]; see Fig. 1(B).

The full tricritical scenario is illustrated in Fig. 2 and discussed in [48]. If $\beta < 0$, and assuming the expansion (7) is stabilized by a term γA^6 with $\gamma > 0$, then precisely at the tricritical point, $\beta = 0$, one finds $A \propto |\Lambda - \Lambda_{c,2}|^{1/4}$. For $\beta < 0$ the transition is discontinuous; it takes place at $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,1}$ with $|\Lambda_{c,1} - \Lambda_{c,2}| \propto (\rho_0 - \rho_c)^2$. The discontinuity in A grows as $\Delta A|_{\Lambda=\Lambda_{c,1}} \propto |\Lambda_{c,2} - \Lambda_{c,1}|^{1/4}$. These universal, tricritical exponents are exemplified by the theoretical curves in Fig. 2(B) which depend on γ , which we extracted from numerical solutions of (4) [48].

Constrained ensemble – The variational problem (4) is computationally convenient, but additional physical insight is gained via the rate function. Fig. 3(A,B) show dynamical phase diagrams for the constrained ensemble,




FIG. 3. Dynamical phase diagrams for (A) SSEP conditioned on κ_1 , (B) SSEP conditioned on κ_2 , (C) active lattice gas conditioned on IEPR, (D) KLS model conditioned on current. Miscibility gaps are denoted by magenta shading (see inset in (D)). Black dots are tricritical points. Orange tick marks indicate inflection points where $\kappa'' = 0$ (or $\sigma'' = 0$ in (D)). Blue tick marks indicate the boundaries of regions where $-\kappa$ (or $-\sigma$ in (D)) differs from its lower convex envelope. Grey regions in (A,B) are not accessible by hydrodynamic fluctuations.

indicating the fluctuation mechanism, for different values of K_T , corresponding to optimal paths in (6). These can be obtained from Ψ by Legendre-Fenchel transform, noting that in the presence of first-order DPTs, such optimal paths are inhomogeneous in time [19, 33, 48]. The corresponding regions of ‘time-like phase separation’ (analogous to miscibility gaps in thermodynamics [48]) are indicated in Fig. 3(B), further highlighting the presence of discontinuous transitions and tricritical points.

When constructing these phase diagrams, it is important that all homogeneous states are identical in MFT, so the entire H phases in Fig. 1(A,B) collapse onto the lines $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$ in Fig. 3(A,B); see also plots in [48] showing $\Psi'(\Lambda) = \kappa(\rho_0)$ throughout the H phase. Physically, this reflects that fluctuations of K_T occur by hydrodynamic mechanisms: the slow relaxation of long-wavelength density modes make their persistent fluctuations much less rare than fluctuations in microscopic structure. However, some values of k are not reached by any hydrodynamic mechanism; in this case the constrained minimisation (6) has no solution. Characterisation of such fluctuations lies beyond MFT (although some aspects of the inaccessible regime can nonetheless be determined [8, 25, 28]).

To conclude our study of DPTs in SSEP note that, alongside the emergence of tricritical points, biasing with

κ_2 differs from κ_1 in that IH states occur for atypical fluctuations at both high and low κ . At the densities concerned, H states are restricted to a narrow “tightrope” of unbiased dynamics, $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$. (In contrast, for κ_1 , IH states arise only for low k fluctuations; states at $k > \kappa(\rho_0)$ remain homogeneous [8].) We emphasize that this phenomenology should be generic in variational problems like (4), whenever κ has a point of inflection. To illustrate this, we now present two further, very different systems where a similar tricritical scenario arises.

Current fluctuations – We consider large deviations of the integrated current $Q_T = L \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx J(x, t)$ within MFT. For $L, T \rightarrow \infty$, the probability that $Q_T \approx qLT$, as a function of q , takes a large deviation form, similar to (5). Here though, H-IH transitions involve formation of travelling waves with velocity V , so that $\rho = \rho(x - Vt)$ and $J = J(x - Vt)$ [11–14, 18]. The rate function for current then satisfies [48]

$$\mathcal{I}(q) = \inf_{\rho(x), \alpha} \int_0^1 dx [M(\rho)|\nabla\rho|^2 + q^2 \kappa_J(\rho; \rho_0, \alpha)], \quad (9)$$

with $\kappa_J = [1 + \alpha(\rho - \rho_0)]^2 / (2\sigma(\rho))$, where $\alpha = V/q$ is a variational parameter. This problem is symmetric in q , so we now restrict to $q \geq 0$.

The minimisation problem (9) for $\mathcal{I}(q)$ is similar to the problem (4), which previously gave the CGF. Repeating the previous analyses of convexity and the Landau theory yields two analogous results, detailed in [48]. First, as $q \rightarrow \infty$, a travelling wave state is found whenever $-\sigma(\rho_0)$ differs from its lower convex envelope. Second, the quartic term βA^4 in the corresponding Landau theory has $\beta \rightarrow -\infty$ whenever the mobility σ has an inflection point, giving tricritical points ($\beta = 0$).

The mobility σ in this problem plays the same role as κ did in large deviations of K_T for SSEP. This correspondence is further exemplified by a model of Katz-Lebowitz-Spohn type [15–18], for a kinetically constrained lattice gas [56]. This is a 1d simple exclusion process where the hop rates depend on the occupancies of neighboring sites as

$$0100 \xleftrightarrow{D_0} 0010, \quad 1100 \xleftrightarrow{D_0/2} 1010, \quad 0101 \xleftrightarrow{D_0/2} 0011.$$

The transition $1101 \leftrightarrow 1011$ is kinetically forbidden [57], but the hydrodynamic behavior still obeys diffusive MFT with $D(\rho) = D_0(1 - \rho)$ and $\sigma = 2D_0\rho(1 - \rho)^2$ [18].

The resulting phase diagram shows a tricritical point at $q > 0$ (Fig. 3(D)) whose partner lies at negative q (not shown). Since $\sigma(\rho) \propto \kappa_2(\rho)$, this phase diagram resembles the upper half of Fig. 1(B). Its form is robust to variations in hop rates [48].

Active lattice gas – Our final example considers a 1d active lattice gas (ALG) model [58], first introduced to study motility-induced phase separation [59]. It comprises two species of diffusing particles, whose hops are biased in opposite directions, with an additional ‘tumbling’ process where particles change species. Its hydrodynamic behavior can be analysed within MFT [60, 61]; the resulting action S_{act} is analogous to (1).

We discuss here the emergence of tricritical DPTs in large deviations of the information entropy production rate (IEPR), which were previously analysed in [10]. Write \mathcal{X} for a hydrodynamic trajectory, and let \mathcal{X}^R be the corresponding time-reversed trajectory. Then the IEPR, $\mathbb{S}_T \equiv [S_{\text{act}}(\mathcal{X}) - S_{\text{act}}(\mathcal{X}^R)]/T$ [63, 64], quantifies time-reversal symmetry breaking at hydrodynamic scales. Its average is $\langle \mathbb{S}_T \rangle = Ls_0 \bar{a}(\rho_0)$ where $\bar{a}(\rho) = \rho(1 - \rho)^2$ and s_0 is a constant [10]. The IEPR obeys a large deviation principle resembling (5),

$$\log \text{Prob}[\mathbb{S}_T / (Ls_0) \approx a] \simeq -LT \mathcal{I}(a) \quad (10)$$

where the rate function $\mathcal{I}(a)$ can be characterised variationally, similarly to (6). The resulting phase diagram, fully derived in [10], is shown in Fig. 3(C). It is more complex than for the SSEP. As well as the smoothly modulated state (SM) which is analogous to the IH states discussed above, it supports collective motion (CM) and traveling band (TB) states which break the symmetry between species, and a sharply phase-separated (PS) state. Nonetheless, the small- a behavior resembles Fig. 3(B).

In the ALG, the dominant fluctuations involve local particle motions that remain typical for the given local density which becomes non-typical. This results in [10]

$$\mathcal{I}(a) \propto \inf_{\rho(x): a = \int_0^1 dx \bar{a}(\rho)} \int dx \mathcal{M}(\rho) |\nabla\rho|^2 \quad (11)$$

where \mathcal{M} encodes all the cost arising from inhomogeneities of the density [10]. Observing that $\bar{a}(\rho_0) = \kappa_2(\rho_0)$, this variational problem is again similar to (6) with $\kappa = \kappa_2$. As a result, the behavior in the SM state in Fig. 3(C) is analogous to the inhomogeneous state in Fig. 3(B), including the tricritical points and the time-like phase separation. A central result of this Letter is that the tricritical phenomena unexpectedly encountered in [10] are *not* specific to the ALG, instead exemplifying a quite general scenario as explored above.

Outlook – We demonstrated a new class of tricritical behavior that occurs in fluctuations of time-integrated observables when the dynamical action has the general structure (4). We gave three examples from the hydrodynamic analysis of large deviations. In all cases, pairs of tricritical points occur on homogeneous-inhomogeneous phase boundaries, separating continuous from discontinuous transitions. Our results significantly enrich the theory of dynamical phase transitions and add to the classes of systems showing tricriticality in non-equilibrium [65–68], for example in fluctuations of instantaneous rather than time-integrated quantities [69].

The discontinuous transitions in Fig. 3 show that even if k is close to its mean value, the large-deviation mechanism may differ strongly from the typical (homogeneous) state: for suitable ρ_0 , time-like phase separation can appear once k deviates from $\kappa_2(\rho_0)$, in either direction. Alongside aforementioned relevance to optimal control and design [1, 20, 33, 40–44], such transitions should be directly realizable in several experimental settings

[18]. These include wave transmission in disordered media [70, 71] and mesoscopic electronic transport [72, 73] where, intriguingly, the relevant mobility can show inflection points [74], as required for tricriticality to emerge.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Yariv Kafri for useful comments. TA is funded by the Blavatnik Postdoctoral Fellowship Programme. Work funded in part by the European Research Council under the Horizon 2020 Programme, ERC grant agreement number 740269. MEC was funded by the Royal Society.

-
- [1] G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim, and M. E. Vares, “Large deviations for a reaction diffusion model,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **97**, 339–361 (1993).
 - [2] Claude Kipnis and Claudio Landim, *Scaling Limits of Interacting Particle Systems*, Grundlehren Der Mathematischen Wissenschaften No. 320 (Springer, Berlin Heidelberg, 2010).
 - [3] Joel L. Lebowitz and Herbert Spohn, “A Gallavotti–Cohen-Type Symmetry in the Large Deviation Functional for Stochastic Dynamics,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **95**, 333–365 (1999).
 - [4] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Fluctuations in Stationary Nonequilibrium States of Irreversible Processes,” *Physical Review Letters* **87**, 040601 (2001).
 - [1] J. P. Garrahan, R. L. Jack, V. Lecomte, E. Pitard, K. van Duijvendijk, and F. van Wijland, “Dynamical First-Order Phase Transition in Kinetically Constrained Models of Glasses,” *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 195702 (2007).
 - [4] Bernard Derrida, “Non-equilibrium steady states: Fluctuations and large deviations of the density and of the current,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P07023–P07023 (2007).
 - [7] Alexandre Lefevre and Giulio Biroli, “Dynamics of interacting particle systems: Stochastic process and field theory,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P07024–P07024 (2007).
 - [8] T. Bodineau, B. Derrida, V. Lecomte, and F. van Wijland, “Long Range Correlations and Phase Transitions in Non-equilibrium Diffusive Systems,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **133**, 1013–1031 (2008).
 - [9] Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, “From Fluctuations in Hydrodynamics to Nonequilibrium Thermodynamics,” *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **184**, 262–275 (2010).
 - [10] P. L. Krapivsky, Kirone Mallick, and Tridib Sadhu, “Large Deviations in Single-File Diffusion,” *Physical Review Letters* **113**, 078101 (2014).
 - [11] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Macroscopic Fluctuation Theory for Stationary Non-Equilibrium States,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **107**, 635–675 (2002).
 - [12] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Large Deviations for the Boundary Driven Symmetric Simple Exclusion Process,” *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry* **6**, 231–267 (2003).
 - [13] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Minimum Dissipation Principle in Stationary Non-Equilibrium States,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **116**, 831–841 (2004).
 - [14] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Stochastic interacting particle systems out of equilibrium,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P07014–P07014 (2007).
 - [15] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim, “Macroscopic fluctuation theory,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **87**, 593–636 (2015).
 - [3] T. Bodineau and B. Derrida, “Current Fluctuations in Nonequilibrium Diffusive Systems: An Additivity Principle,” *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 180601 (2004).
 - [11] T. Bodineau and B. Derrida, “Distribution of current in nonequilibrium diffusive systems and phase transitions,” *Physical Review E* **72**, 066110 (2005).
 - [18] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Current Fluctuations in Stochastic Lattice Gases,” *Physical Review Letters* **94**, 030601 (2005).
 - [12] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, “Non Equilibrium Current Fluctuations in Stochastic Lattice Gases,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **123**, 237–276 (2006).
 - [13] Thierry Bodineau and Bernard Derrida, “Cumulants and large deviations of the current through non-equilibrium steady states,” *Comptes Rendus Physique* **8**, 540–555 (2007).
 - [21] Bernard Derrida and Antoine Gerschenfeld, “Current Fluctuations in One Dimensional Diffusive Systems with a Step Initial Density Profile,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **137**, 978–1000 (2009).
 - [22] O. Shpielberg and E. Akkermans, “Le Chatelier Principle for Out-of-Equilibrium and Boundary-Driven Systems: Application to Dynamical Phase Transitions,” *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 240603 (2016).
 - [14] Lior Zarfaty and Baruch Meerson, “Statistics of large currents in the Kipnis–Marchioro–Presutti model in a ring geometry,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 033304 (2016).
 - [18] Yongjoo Baek, Yariv Kafri, and Vivien Lecomte, “Dynamical Symmetry Breaking and Phase Transitions in Driven Diffusive Systems,” *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 030604 (2017).
 - [25] C. Appert-Rolland, B. Derrida, V. Lecomte, and F. van Wijland, “Universal cumulants of the current in diffusive systems on a ring,” *Physical Review E* **78**, 021122 (2008).
 - [5] Vivien Lecomte, Juan P. Garrahan, and Frédéric van Wijland, “Inactive dynamical phase of a symmetric exclusion process on a ring,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **45**, 175001 (2012).
 - [8] Robert L. Jack, Ian R. Thompson, and Peter Sollich, “Hyperuniformity and Phase Separation in Biased Ensembles of Trajectories for Diffusive Systems,” *Physical*

- Review Letters **114**, 060601 (2015).
- [28] Matthieu Vanicat, Eric Bertin, Vivien Lecomte, and Eric Ragoucy, “Mapping current and activity fluctuations in exclusion processes: Consequences and open questions,” *SciPost Physics* **10**, 028 (2021).
- [29] Pablo I. Hurtado and Pedro L. Garrido, “Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking at the Fluctuating Level,” *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 180601 (2011).
- [30] Bernard Derrida and Joel L. Lebowitz, “Exact Large Deviation Function in the Asymmetric Exclusion Process,” *Physical Review Letters* **80**, 209–213 (1998).
- [19] Hugo Touchette, “The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics,” *Physics Reports* **478**, 1–69 (2009).
- [21] Raphaël Chetrite and Hugo Touchette, “Nonequilibrium microcanonical and canonical ensembles and their equivalence,” *Physical review letters* **111**, 120601 (2013).
- [33] Robert L. Jack, “Ergodicity and large deviations in physical systems with stochastic dynamics,” *The European Physical Journal B* **93**, 74 (2020).
- [7] Jakub Dolezal and Robert L. Jack, “Large deviations and optimal control forces for hard particles in one dimension,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2019**, 123208 (2019).
- [35] Dimitri P. Bertsekas, *Dynamic Programming and Optimal Control. Volume 1*, fourth edition ed. (Athena Scientific, Belmont, Mass, 2017).
- [36] Paul Dupuis and Richard S. Ellis, *A Weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics (Wiley, New York, 1997).
- [20] Robert L. Jack and Peter Sollich, “Large Deviations and Ensembles of Trajectories in Stochastic Models,” *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **184**, 304–317 (2010).
- [38] R. L. Jack and P. Sollich, “Effective interactions and large deviations in stochastic processes,” *The European Physical Journal Special Topics* **224**, 2351–2367 (2015).
- [39] Raphaël Chetrite and Hugo Touchette, “Variational and optimal control representations of conditioned and driven processes,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2015**, P12001 (2015).
- [40] Rattachai Pinchaipat, Matteo Campo, Francesco Turci, James E. Hallett, Thomas Speck, and C. Patrick Royall, “Experimental Evidence for a Structural-Dynamical Transition in Trajectory Space,” *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 028004 (2017).
- [41] Bérengère Abou, Rémy Colin, Vivien Lecomte, Estelle Pitard, and Frédéric van Wijland, “Activity statistics in a colloidal glass former: Experimental evidence for a dynamical transition,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **148**, 164502 (2018).
- [42] Laura Tociu, Étienne Fodor, Takahiro Nemoto, and Suriyanarayanan Vaikuntanathan, “How Dissipation Constrains Fluctuations in Nonequilibrium Liquids: Diffusion, Structure, and Biased Interactions,” *Physical Review X* **9**, 041026 (2019).
- [43] Takahiro Nemoto, Étienne Fodor, Michael E. Cates, Robert L. Jack, and Julien Tailleur, “Optimizing active work: Dynamical phase transitions, collective motion, and jamming,” *Physical Review E* **99**, 022605 (2019).
- [44] Étienne Fodor, Takahiro Nemoto, and Suriyanarayanan Vaikuntanathan, “Dissipation controls transport and phase transitions in active fluids: Mobility, diffusion and biased ensembles,” *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 013052 (2020).
- [45] Eldad Bettelheim, Naftali R. Smith, and Baruch Meerson, “Inverse Scattering Method Solves the Problem of Full Statistics of Nonstationary Heat Transfer in the Kipnis-Marchioro-Presutti Model,” *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 130602 (2022).
- [46] Kirone Mallick, Hiroki Moriya, and Tomohiro Sasamoto, “Exact Solution of the Macroscopic Fluctuation Theory for the Symmetric Exclusion Process,” *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 040601 (2022).
- [47] Aurélien Grabsch, Alexis Poncet, Pierre Rizkallah, Pierre Illien, and Olivier Bénichou, “Exact closure and solution for spatial correlations in single-file diffusion,” *Science Advances* **8**, eabm5043 (2022).
- [48] See Supplemental Material which includes refs.[6, 22, 23].
- [2] Juan P. Garrahan, Robert L. Jack, Vivien Lecomte, Estelle Pitard, Kristina van Duijvendijk, and Frédéric van Wijland, “First-order dynamical phase transition in models of glasses: An approach based on ensembles of histories,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 075007 (2009).
- [50] Robert B. Griffiths, “Thermodynamics Near the Two-Fluid Critical Mixing Point in He 3 - He 4,” *Physical Review Letters* **24**, 715–717 (1970).
- [51] Robert B. Griffiths, “Phase diagrams and higher-order critical points,” *Physical Review B* **12**, 345–355 (1975).
- [9] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [15] Sheldon Katz, Joel L. Lebowitz, and Herbert Spohn, “Nonequilibrium steady states of stochastic lattice gas models of fast ionic conductors,” *Journal of Statistical Physics* **34**, 497–537 (1984).
- [16] V. Popkov and G. M. Schütz, “Steady-state selection in driven diffusive systems with open boundaries,” *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* **48**, 257–263 (1999).
- [17] J. S. Hager, J. Krug, V. Popkov, and G. M. Schütz, “Minimal current phase and universal boundary layers in driven diffusive systems,” *Physical Review E* **63**, 056110 (2001).
- [56] P. Gonçalves, C. Landim, and C. Toninelli, “Hydrodynamic limit for a particle system with degenerate rates,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* **45** (2009), 10.1214/09-AIHP210.
- [57] Juan P. Garrahan, Peter Sollich, and Cristina Toninelli, “Kinetically constrained models,” in *Dynamical Heterogeneities in Glasses, Colloids, and Granular Media*, edited by Ludovic Berthier, Giulio Biroli, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, Luca Cipelletti, and Wim van Saarloos (Oxford University Press, Oxford UK, 2011) pp. 341–369.
- [58] Mourtaza Kourbane-Houssene, Clément Erignoux, Thierry Bodineau, and Julien Tailleur, “Exact Hydrodynamic Description of Active Lattice Gases,” *Physical Review Letters* **120**, 268003 (2018).
- [59] Michael E. Cates and Julien Tailleur, “Motility-Induced Phase Separation,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **6**, 219–244 (2015).
- [60] Tal Agranov, Sunghan Ro, Yariv Kafri, and Vivien Lecomte, “Exact fluctuating hydrodynamics of active lattice gases—typical fluctuations,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2021**, 083208 (2021).
- [61] Tal Agranov, Sunghan Ro, Yariv Kafri, and Vivien Lecomte, “Macroscopic Fluctuation Theory and Cur-

- rent Fluctuations in Active Lattice Gases,” (2022), [arXiv:2208.02124 \[cond-mat\]](#).
- [10] Tal Agranov, Michael E. Cates, and Robert L. Jack, “Entropy production and its large deviations in an active lattice gas,” (2022), [arXiv:2209.03000 \[cond-mat\]](#).
- [63] Étienne Fodor, Robert L. Jack, and Michael E. Cates, “Irreversibility and Biased Ensembles in Active Matter: Insights from Stochastic Thermodynamics,” *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **13**, 215–238 (2022).
- [64] J. O’Byrne, Y. Kafri, J. Tailleur, and F. van Wijland, “Time irreversibility in active matter, from micro to macro,” *Nature Reviews Physics* **4**, 167–183 (2022).
- [65] Andrea Antoniazzi, Duccio Fanelli, Stefano Ruffo, and Yoshiyuki Y. Yamaguchi, “Nonequilibrium Tricritical Point in a System with Long-Range Interactions,” *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 040601 (2007).
- [66] M. Keskin, Ü. Temizer, O. Cankö, and E. Kantar, “Dynamic phase transition in the kinetic Blume–Emery–Griffiths model: Phase diagrams in the temperature and interaction parameters planes,” *Phase Transitions* **80**, 855–866 (2007).
- [67] Matteo Marcuzzi, Michael Buchhold, Sebastian Diehl, and Igor Lesanovsky, “Absorbing State Phase Transition with Competing Quantum and Classical Fluctuations,” *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 245701 (2016).
- [68] Minjae Jo and B. Kahng, “Tricritical directed percolation with long-range interaction in one and two dimensions,” *Physical Review E* **101**, 022121 (2020).
- [69] Avi Aminov, Guy Bunin, and Yariv Kafri, “Singularities in large deviation functionals of bulk-driven transport models,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2014**, P08017 (2014). J. O’Byrne, Y. Kafri, J. Tailleur, and F. van Wijland, “Time irreversibility in active matter, from micro to macro,” *Nature Reviews Physics* **4**, 167–183 (2022).
- [70] R. Pnini and B. Shapiro, “Fluctuations in transmission of waves through disordered slabs,” *Physical Review B* **39**, 6986–6994 (1989).
- [71] Raktim Sarma, Alexey Yamilov, Pauf Neupane, Boris Shapiro, and Hui Cao, “Probing long-range intensity correlations inside disordered photonic nanostructures,” *Physical Review B* **90**, 014203 (2014).
- [72] Eugene V. Sukhorukov and Daniel Loss, “Noise in multiterminal diffusive conductors: Universality, nonlocality, and exchange effects,” *Physical Review B* **59**, 13054–13066 (1999).
- [73] S. Pilgram, A. N. Jordan, E. V. Sukhorukov, and M. Büttiker, “Stochastic Path Integral Formulation of Full Counting Statistics,” *Physical Review Letters* **90**, 206801 (2003).
- [74] Y.-W. Tan, Y. Zhang, K. Bolotin, Y. Zhao, S. Adam, E. H. Hwang, S. Das Sarma, H. L. Stormer, and P. Kim, “Measurement of Scattering Rate and Minimum Conductivity in Graphene,” *Physical Review Letters* **99**, 246803 (2007).
- [6] Yongjoo Baek, Yariv Kafri, and Vivien Lecomte, “Dynamical phase transitions in the current distribution of driven diffusive channels,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 105001 (2018).
- [22] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan, “Asymptotic evaluation of certain markov process expectations for large time, I,” *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **28**, 1–47 (1975).
- [23] Hugo Touchette, “Introduction to dynamical large deviations of Markov processes,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **504**, 5–19 (2018).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL TO THE PAPER “TRICRITICAL BEHAVIOR IN DYNAMICAL PHASE TRANSITIONS” BY T. AGRANOV, M. E. CATES, AND R. L. JACK

This supplemental material serves two main purposes. First, we review some previous results that are discussed in the main text. They are presented here in a way which is consistent with the notation used in our work, in order to make this study as self-contained as possible. These are Secs. I, II, III, IV, V A, V C and V D.

In addition, we provide detailed derivations of some of the new results of the main text. In Sec. V B, we show how the arguments (in main text) for the fluctuations of K_T can be extended to analyse fluctuations of the current J_T . In Sec. VI, we explain the construction of the phase diagram in Fig. 3. In Sec. VII we briefly discuss how our results for existence of discontinuous transitions are related to previous works on glassy systems. This section also mentions the microscopic origin of κ_2 in Eq. (3).

Table of contents

- (I.) Time homogeneous optimal path for the biased ensemble.
- (II.) Landau theory derivation, Eq. (7).
- (III.) Review of tricritical exponents in Fig. 2.
- (IV.) Tricriticality for sufficiently elaborate choice of M .
- (V.) Current fluctuations
 - V.A Deriving the minimization problem, Eq. (9).
 - V.B Predicting phase transitions and tricriticality by adapting the arguments of the main text.
 - V.C Landau theory.
 - V.D Current fluctuations in the KLS lattice gas.
- (VI.) Dynamical phase diagram and ‘time-like phase separation’ in Fig. 3.
- (VII.) Relating the variational argument for H-IH transitions to the previous works [1, 2].

I. TIME HOMOGENEOUS OPTIMAL PATH FOR THE BIASED ENSEMBLE

In this section we provide the proof that the optimal profile of the biased ensemble is time independent (the so called additivity principle [3]).

The optimal path of the biased ensemble minimizes the action of the biased ensemble

$$S_T^\Lambda(\mathcal{X}) = \inf_{\rho, J: \dot{\rho} = -\nabla \cdot J} \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{|J + D(\rho)\nabla\rho|^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} - \Lambda\kappa(\rho) \right]. \quad (12)$$

with some prescribed initial condition in time. At long times, the only role of the latter is to set the total mass at all times $\int_0^1 dx \rho(x, t) = \rho_0$. Expanding the square we have

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 dx \frac{|J + D(\rho)\nabla\rho|^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} = \int_0^T \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{J^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} + M(\rho)|\nabla\rho|^2 \right] + \int_0^T \int_0^1 dx J \cdot \nabla \frac{\delta F}{\delta \rho} \quad (13)$$

where $M = D^2(\rho)/2\sigma(\rho)$ and $F[\rho] = \int dx f(\rho)$ is the free energy of the unbiased dynamics with density $f''(\rho) = D(\rho)/\sigma(\rho)$, see e.g. [4]. Integrating by parts this second term, and using the continuity constraint, we have

$$S_T^\Lambda(\mathcal{X}) = \inf_{\rho, J: \dot{\rho} = -\nabla \cdot J} \left\{ \int_0^T \int_0^1 dx \frac{J^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} + \int_0^T \int_0^1 dx [M(\rho)|\nabla\rho|^2 - \Lambda\kappa(\rho)] + \int_0^1 dx (F[\rho_{t=T}] - F[\rho_{t=0}]) \right\}. \quad (14)$$

The last term is sub-extensive in time, and can be neglected (apart from un-physical profiles ρ for which the free energy diverges).

Now for the second term, compare any time in-homogeneous history $\rho(x, t)$, with the optimal time homogeneous one $\rho(x)$, with the same total mass ρ_0 . At any time instant we have that

$$\int_0^1 dx [M(\rho(x, t))|\nabla\rho(x, t)|^2 - \Lambda\kappa(\rho(x, t))] \geq \inf_{\rho: \int_0^1 dx \rho(x) = \rho_0} \int_0^1 dx [M(\rho(x))|\nabla\rho(x)|^2 - \Lambda\kappa(\rho(x))] . \quad (15)$$

Lastly, since the first integral in (14) is non negative, and vanishes for $J = 0$ which corresponds to the time homogeneous solution, we conclude that at long times, the optimal history has no persistent currents and becomes homogeneous in time $[\rho(x), J = 0]$.

II. LANDAU THEORY DERIVATION, EQ. (7)

In this section we present the derivation of the Landau expansion Eq. (7). Such an expansion appeared in several previous works that studied similar second order transitions within the MFT framework [5–8]. We repeat it here for the convenience of the reader within a consistent notation.

Consider the variational problem

$$-\Psi(\Lambda) = \inf_{\rho: \int_0^1 dx \rho = \rho_0} \int_0^1 dx [M(\rho)|\nabla\rho|^2 - \Lambda\kappa(\rho)] \quad (16)$$

For $\Lambda = 0$, the homogeneous state is a local minimiser in this problem. By considering small perturbations about this state, we will show that the homogeneous state is no longer a local minimiser if the bias Λ is strong enough. To this end, write $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \delta\rho(x)$ and expand to second order in $\delta\rho$. Mass conservation requires $\int_0^1 dx \delta\rho(x) = 0$ so the question is whether the homogeneous state is a local minimiser of

$$\int_0^1 dx [M_0 \delta\rho'(x)^2 - \Lambda\kappa_0'' \delta\rho(x)^2] \quad (17)$$

where primes denote derivative with respect to the argument, and the subscript $_0$ denotes evaluating at ρ_0 , that is, $M_0 = M(\rho)|_{\rho=\rho_0}$ and $\kappa_0'' = d^2\kappa(\rho)/d\rho^2|_{\rho=\rho_0}$. Any instability that occurs takes place via the principal mode $\delta\rho(x) \propto \cos(2\pi x)$ so it is easily verified that the homogeneous state is stable if $\Lambda\kappa_0'' < 8\pi^2 M_0$, as in Eq. (8). We write

$$\Lambda_{c,2} = \frac{8\pi^2 M_0}{\kappa_0''} \quad (18)$$

for the value of the bias at the instability. Note that this bias has the same sign as κ_0'' , which may be either positive or negative. If $\kappa_0'' > 0$ then the homogeneous state is unstable for $\Lambda > \Lambda_{c,2} > 0$ while for $\kappa_0'' < 0$ it is unstable for $\Lambda < \Lambda_{c,2} < 0$. We write

$$\epsilon = \frac{\Lambda - \Lambda_{c,2}}{\Lambda_{c,2}} . \quad (19)$$

so that the stability criterion is $\epsilon < 0$.

To obtain the behaviour in the unstable regime, we expand the density about the homogeneous state as [5, 7]

$$\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \sqrt{\epsilon}\rho_1(x) + \epsilon\rho_2(x) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{3/2}). \quad (20)$$

Since mass conservation must be obeyed at any order of the expansion we have that

$$\int_0^1 dx \rho_1(x) = \int_0^1 dx \rho_2(x) = 0. \quad (21)$$

Also, the linear stability analysis above already indicates that $\rho_1 \propto \cos(2\pi x)$ so it is natural to write $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + A \cos(2\pi x) + \epsilon\rho_2(x)$ with $A = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{1/2})$. Plugging this solution into Eq. (16) one can show, using mass conservation, integration by parts and the relation (18), that

$$\begin{aligned} -\Psi(\Lambda) &= -\Lambda_{c,2}\kappa_0(1 + \epsilon) \\ &+ \Lambda_{c,2}^2 \epsilon^2 \inf_{A_0, \rho_2} \int_0^1 dx \left\{ M_0 [\rho_2'(x)^2 - 4\pi^2 \rho_2(x)^2] + 2\pi^2 \rho_2(x) A_0^2 \cos(4\pi x) \left(3M_0' - M_0 \frac{\kappa_0'''}{\kappa_0''} \right) + \frac{\kappa_0''}{4} A_0^2 + A_0^4 \pi^2 M_0 \left(\frac{M_0''}{4M_0} - \frac{\kappa_0''''}{8\kappa_0''} \right) \right\} \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{5/2}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$




FIG. 4. The function $\beta(\rho_0)$ (25) for the case of the SSEP, and the observable $\kappa_2(\rho) = \rho(1-\rho)^2$. The black points are its roots, marking tricriticality. The $2/3$ tick marks the inflection point $\kappa_2'' = 0$ where $\beta \rightarrow -\infty$.

where $A_0 = \epsilon^{-1/2}A = \mathcal{O}(1)$. Minimizing with respect to ρ_2 (which should be orthogonal to ρ_1), one finds

$$\rho(x) = \rho_0 + A \cos(2\pi x) + B \cos(4\pi x) \quad \text{with} \quad B = -A^2 \left(\frac{M'_0}{4M_0} - \frac{1}{12} \frac{\kappa_0'''}{\kappa_0''} \right). \quad (23)$$

so $B = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. Plugging this solution back into (22) and re-expressing the solution in terms of A, Λ we arrive at the Landau expansion

$$-\Psi(\Lambda) = -\Lambda \kappa(\rho_0) + \inf_A \left[-2\pi^2 M_0 \epsilon A^2 + \beta(\rho_0) A^4 + \mathcal{O}(A^6) \right] \quad (24)$$

with

$$\beta(\rho_0) = \frac{\pi^2 M_0}{24} \left[6 \frac{M_0''}{M_0} - 3 \frac{\kappa_0'''}{\kappa_0''} - \left(3 \frac{M_0'}{M_0} - \frac{\kappa_0'''}{\kappa_0''} \right)^2 \right], \quad (25)$$

as reported in Eq. (7) and Eq. (8).

Fig. 4 shows the function $\beta(\rho)$ for the case of the SSEP, and the observable $\kappa_2(\rho) = \rho(1-\rho)^2$. The roots of β at $\rho_{c,1} = 0.514\dots$ and $\rho_{c,2} = 0.723\dots$ are positioned on opposite sides of the inflection point $\kappa_2'' = 0$ where $\beta \rightarrow -\infty$.

III. REVIEW OF TRICRITICAL EXPONENTS IN FIG. 2

In this section we recall the universal exponents describing tricriticality in the Landau expansion (24). Their derivation can be found in textbooks on critical phenomena such as [9].

For $\beta > 0$, the minimization (24) is given by $A = 0$ for $\epsilon < 0$, while it follows the usual square root growth at positive $\epsilon > 0$

$$A = \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon \pi^2 M_0}{\beta}} \quad (26)$$

For $\beta < 0$, the minimization (24) must be stabilized by higher order terms. From symmetry these only include even powers of A and so the minimization reads

$$-\Psi(\Lambda) = -\Lambda \kappa(\rho_0) + \inf_A \psi_A(A) \quad , \quad \psi_A(A) = -2\pi^2 M_0 \epsilon A^2 + \beta(\rho_0) A^4 + \frac{\gamma}{3} A^6 + \mathcal{O}(A^8). \quad (27)$$

We will assume $\gamma > 0$. We found that this holds true for the case we considered here by direct numerical solutions of the full minimization problem Eq. (16), see Fig. 5.

Now consider how the behavior depends on ϵ . For $\beta = 0$, there is a tricritical point and the transition is still continuous: one has $A = 0$ for $\epsilon < 0$, while for small positive ϵ the amplitude follows a modified power law growth

$$A = \left(\frac{2\pi^2 \epsilon M_0}{\gamma} \right)^{1/4} \quad (28)$$




FIG. 5. A plot of $4 \log A - c$ with $c = \log(-\kappa_0''/4)$ as a function of $\log(\Lambda_{c,2}\epsilon)$ at $\rho_0 = \rho_{c,1}$ in thick black line. It was obtained by numerical solution of the full minimization problem (16), where A is the amplitude of the principal Fourier component $\rho = A \cos(2\pi x) + \dots$. The dashed line indicates the constant slope 1 as predicted by (28). The intersection at $\log(\Lambda_{c,2}\epsilon) = 0$ provides the value of $\gamma = 290$ (2 sig fig).

as reported in the main text and plotted in Fig. 2 (B). By solving the minimization problem (16) numerically, we can then extract the value of γ from the plot for A , see Fig. 5. From here we find that for the SSEP biased by κ_2 this value is $\gamma = 290$ (2 sig fig).

For $\beta < 0$, one has $A = 0$ for large negative ϵ ; this changes discontinuously at $\epsilon = -3\beta^2/(8\pi^2 M_0 \gamma) < 0$. Recalling that $\epsilon = (\Lambda - \Lambda_{c,2})/\Lambda_{c,2}$ the discontinuous transition appears at $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,1}$ with

$$\Lambda_{c,1} = \Lambda_{c,2} \left(1 - \frac{3\beta^2}{8\pi^2 M_0 \gamma} \right) \quad (29)$$

so that $|\Lambda_{c,1}| < |\Lambda_{c,2}|$: the discontinuous transition occurs at a weaker bias than the second order (spinodal) instability at $\Lambda_{c,2}$. As long as β has a simple root at ρ_c , the difference in the critical biases grows with the distance to the tricritical density as

$$|\Lambda_{c,1} - \Lambda_{c,2}| \propto (\rho_0 - \rho_c)^2, \quad (30)$$

as discussed in the main text.

At the critical value $\Lambda = \Lambda_{c,1}$, the jump discontinuity in A reads

$$\Delta A = \sqrt{\frac{-3\beta}{2\gamma}} = |\Lambda_{c,2} - \Lambda_{c,1}|^{1/4} \left(\frac{3|\kappa_0''|}{4\gamma} \right)^{1/4}, \quad (31)$$

where in the second equality we plugged the relation (29) and used the definition (18). This curve is plotted in dotted green line in Fig. 2 (B). The thick curves in Fig. 2 (B) were computed from the numerical solution of the minimization (16) where A is the amplitude of the principal mode in the Fourier decomposition $\rho(x) = A \cos(2\pi x) + \dots$.

IV. TRICRITICALITY FOR SUFFICIENTLY ELABORATE CHOICE OF M

In the main text we have derived a sufficient condition for the appearance of tricriticality in the variational problem (16). This condition only involves the coefficient $\kappa(\rho)$. Nevertheless, one could have other scenarios for tricriticality involving the coefficient $M(\rho)$. The necessary condition for tricriticality is set by the vanishing of the coefficient β (25) in the Landau expansion. For instance, for any model where $M(\rho_0)$ has a degenerate root at ρ_0 , then β must vanishes. We are not aware of a diffusive lattice model where this is the case. However, for the active lattice gas model [10], this happens to be true. For this model, the equivalent coefficient $\mathcal{M}(\rho)$ (see Eq. (11)) has a double root at the MIPS critical point. This is a special property of this model which we do not expect to appear in generic lattice gases.

V. CURRENT FLUCTUATIONS

A. Deriving the variational problem Eq. (9)

We now turn to the analysis of current fluctuations. We review here a derivation that appeared in several previous works [11–14]. We look for solutions to the constrained minimization

$$I(q) = \min_{\rho, J: Tq = \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx J} \left[\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx \frac{|J + D(\rho) \nabla \rho|^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} \right] \quad (32)$$

in the form of traveling wave solutions

$$\rho(x, t) = \rho(x - Vt) \quad , \quad J(x, t) = J(x - Vt). \quad (33)$$

with velocity V . In (32) we also implicitly assume the conservation equation

$$\partial_t \rho = -\nabla \cdot J, \quad (34)$$

and that the total mass is set to $\rho_0 = \int_0^1 dx \rho(x, t)$. Then the constraint (34) together with the constraint on the integrated current enforces the relation

$$J = q + V(\rho - \rho_0). \quad (35)$$

Plugging this into the action (32), and using integration by parts for the cross product term, we arrive at the minimization

$$I(q) = \inf_{\alpha, \rho(x): \rho_0 = \int_0^1 dx \rho(x)} \int_0^1 dx \{ M(\rho) |\nabla \rho|^2 + q^2 \kappa_J(\rho; \rho_0, \alpha) \} \quad , \quad \kappa_J(\rho; \rho_0, \alpha) = \frac{[1 + \alpha(\rho - \rho_0)]^2}{2\sigma(\rho)} \quad (36)$$

where $\alpha = (V/q)$ corresponds to a rescaling of the variational parameter V , by the integrated current. This is Eq. (9).

The main difference between the variational problem (36) and the one of (16), is the addition of the variational parameter α . The minimization with respect to α can be performed explicitly to give [11, 13]

$$\alpha_* = - \frac{\int_0^1 dx \frac{\rho - \rho_0}{\sigma(\rho)}}{\int_0^1 dx \frac{(\rho - \rho_0)^2}{\sigma(\rho)}}. \quad (37)$$

However this makes it a non-trivial functional of the yet undetermined optimal density, which leaves the two problems (36) and (16) distinct. Still, in the next section we will show how one can adapt the same treatment employed for the first problem (16) to (36).

B. Predicting phase transitions and tricriticality by adapting the arguments of the main text

In this section we analyse the minimization (36) by adapting the convexity arguments that appeared in the main text. This analysis did not appear in previous works; it is analogous to the similar argument in the main text for the minimisation (16).

1. Phase-separated minimizers as $|q| \rightarrow \infty$

Consider the minimization (36) in the large current limit $|q| \rightarrow \infty$. Then following the same argument presented for (16), the gradient term in (36) becomes negligible and we are left with minimizing the integral $\min_{\alpha, \rho} \int_0^1 dx \kappa_J(\rho; \rho_0, \alpha)$.

As in the main text, the solution to this problem should either be a homogeneous minimizer, or a sharply phase-separated state with coexisting densities ρ_h, ρ_l separated by sharp interfaces of width $\mathcal{O}(|q|^{-1})$. The homogeneous case has $\kappa_J = 1/(2\sigma(\rho_0))$ so it only remains to compare this with the value for the optimal phase-separated profile. For this latter case, one sees from (37) that

$$\alpha_* \simeq \frac{\sigma(\rho_h) - \sigma(\rho_l)}{\sigma(\rho_l)(\rho_h - \rho_0) + \sigma(\rho_h)(\rho_0 - \rho_l)}. \quad (38)$$

Plugging this expression into (36), κ_J is now an explicit function of the five variables $(\rho, \rho_0, \rho_l, \rho_h)$.

We seek a phase-separated solution that minimises this κ_J . The method is again analogous to the double tangent construction for thermodynamic phase coexistence. Since the total density is fixed at ρ_0 , the fraction of the system that is occupied by the low-density phase must be

$$y = \frac{\rho_h - \rho_0}{\rho_h - \rho_l}. \quad (39)$$

(this is the lever rule from thermodynamics). The search for the phase-separated minimisers then amounts to construction of the lower convex envelope of κ_J , or to finding a common tangent that touches κ_J at $\rho = \rho_l, \rho_h$. Assuming that ρ_l, ρ_h are not extremal densities (such as $\rho = 0, 1$ in the SSEP), this requires three conditions

- The tangents at ρ_l, ρ_h have the same gradient

$$\left. \frac{\partial \kappa_J}{\partial \rho} \right|_{\rho=\rho_l} = \left. \frac{\partial \kappa_J}{\partial \rho} \right|_{\rho=\rho_h} \quad (40)$$

- The two tangents are part of a common straight line

$$\rho_l \left. \frac{\partial \kappa_J}{\partial \rho} \right|_{\rho=\rho_l} - \kappa_J|_{\rho=\rho_l} = \rho_h \left. \frac{\partial \kappa_J}{\partial \rho} \right|_{\rho=\rho_h} - \kappa_J|_{\rho=\rho_h} \quad (41)$$

- The phase-separated profile has a lower value of κ_J than the homogeneous solution

$$\kappa_J|_{\rho=\rho_l} y + \kappa_J|_{\rho=\rho_h} (1 - y) < \kappa_J|_{\rho=\rho_0} \quad (42)$$

If one phase, say ρ_h , is at an extremal point, the first two conditions are replaced by a single one.¹

Plugging (38) into (36), an explicit computation shows that the first condition (40) is met whenever

$$\sigma'(\rho_h) = \sigma'(\rho_l). \quad (43)$$

Using this in the second condition (41) we find

$$\rho_l \sigma'(\rho_l) - \sigma(\rho_l) = \rho_h \sigma'(\rho_h) - \sigma(\rho_h). \quad (44)$$

Lastly, using both the relations (38) and (39) in (42), we find that

$$\sigma(\rho_0) < \sigma(\rho_l) y + \sigma(\rho_h) (1 - y). \quad (45)$$

The three conditions (43,44,45) for σ mirror exactly (40,41,42) for κ , up to a change of sign: they amount to a lower convex envelope (or common tangent) construction on $-\sigma(\rho)$.

To summarize, as $|q| \rightarrow \infty$ the optimal solution to (36) becomes sharply separated between bulk phases found by a lower convex envelope construction for $-\sigma(\rho)$. (This mirrors the simpler minimization (16) analysed in the main text.) As the system is homogeneous at $|q| = 0$ there must be an intermediate critical value q_c where a DPT sets in into a state of a traveling density wave. In the following section we establish a condition for this transition to be discontinuous.

2. Connection of discontinuous transitions to local convexity

As we have seen for the simpler minimization (16), to establish the existence of a discontinuous transition it is enough to consider small perturbations of ρ around ρ_0 . We take ρ_0 such that $-\sigma(\rho_0)$ differs from its lower convex envelop so that from the previous Sec. VB1 we know that a DPT sets in at some critical value $|q_c|$. Now if small perturbations about ρ_0 only increase the integral of κ_J in (36), this DPT must be discontinuous.

¹ In this case, $(\rho_h - \rho_l) \partial \kappa_J / \partial \rho|_{\rho=\rho_l} = \kappa_J|_h - \kappa_J|_l$. For the KLS model with $\sigma = 2D_0\rho(1 - \rho)^2$ and $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ then indeed the optimal $\rho_h = 1$. The following analysis also carries through in

this case.

To determine whether this is the case, we first evaluate the parameter α that enters in (36), for small density modulations, $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \delta\rho(x)$. Following [11, 13], one obtains from (37) that

$$\alpha_* = \frac{\sigma'_0}{\sigma_0} + \mathcal{O}(\delta\rho). \quad (46)$$

Using this value in (36), κ_J again becomes an explicit function of the density profile. Thus, a small variation of ρ about ρ_0 will increase the integral over κ_J whenever $\kappa_J(\rho; \alpha = \frac{\sigma'_0}{\sigma_0}, \rho_0)$ is a locally convex function of ρ at ρ_0 . Observing that

$$\left. \frac{\partial_\rho^2 \kappa_J(\rho; \alpha = \frac{\sigma'_0}{\sigma_0}, \rho_0)}{\partial \rho^2} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma''(\rho_0)}{\sigma^2(\rho_0)} \quad (47)$$

one sees that κ_J is locally convex if and only if $\sigma''(\rho_0) < 0$.

Combining this with the results of the previous Section, we finally arrive at following conclusion: Whenever $-\sigma(\rho)$ differs from its lower convex envelope a dynamical phase transition sets in at some critical current $|q_c|$, and this transition is bound to be discontinuous in the range of densities ρ_0 where $\sigma''(\rho_0) > 0$. In order that $-\sigma(\rho_0)$ differs from its lower convex envelope, while still having $\sigma''(\rho_0) > 0$, it must have an inflection point: $\sigma''(\rho_*) = 0$ for some ρ_* .

C. The Landau theory for current fluctuations

In this section we show how the variational formula (36) for current fluctuations can be converted to a Landau theory for the amplitude A of a travelling wave of the form (33). The result of this computation was previously derived in [13]. Here we present an alternative derivation that highlights the similarities between the variational problems (36) and (16). (Note that (16) gives the CGF for fluctuations of K_T while (36) gives the rate function for fluctuations of J_T , so the physical content of these formulae is quite different. It is their mathematical structures that are analogous.)

The Landau theory applies to small density modulations of the homogeneous state, that is $\rho = \rho_0 + \delta\rho(x)$. In that case, it was already shown in Sec. VB 2 that

$$\alpha_* = \alpha_0 + \delta\alpha, \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_0 = \frac{\sigma'_0}{\sigma_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\alpha = \mathcal{O}(\delta\rho). \quad (48)$$

Inserting this into the definition for κ_J in (36) yields

$$\kappa_J(\rho(x); \rho_0, \alpha_*) = \kappa_0(\rho(x); \rho_0) + \frac{\delta\alpha\delta\rho(x)[1 + \alpha_0\delta\rho(x)] + \delta\rho(x)^2\delta\alpha^2}{2\sigma(\rho(x))} \quad (49)$$

with

$$\kappa_0(\rho; \rho_0) = \frac{1}{2\sigma(\rho)} \left[1 + \frac{\sigma'_0}{\sigma_0}(\rho - \rho_0) \right]^2 \quad (50)$$

From (49), it can additionally be shown that

$$\int_0^1 dx [\kappa_J(\rho(x); \rho_0, \alpha_*) - \kappa_0(\rho(x); \rho_0)] = \mathcal{O}(\delta\rho^4) \quad (51)$$

where we used $\int_0^1 dx [\rho(x) - \rho_0] = 0$ together with the definition of α_0 and a suitable Taylor expansion of $1/\sigma(\rho(x))$. Hence, plugging (49) into (36) and using that α_* solves the minimization over α , we obtain

$$I(q) = \inf_{\rho: \rho_0 = \int_0^1 dx \rho(x)} \left[\int_0^1 dx [M(\rho)\rho'^2 + q^2\kappa_0(\rho; \rho_0)] + \mathcal{O}(\delta\rho^4) \right]. \quad (52)$$

By analogy with the stability analysis of (16), the homogeneous state of this system becomes unstable for $q^2 > q_c^2$ with

$$q_c^2 = -\frac{8\pi^2 M_0}{\left. \frac{\partial^2 \kappa_0(\rho; \rho_0)}{\partial \rho^2} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0}} = \frac{16\pi^2 M_0 \sigma_0^2}{\sigma_0''}. \quad (53)$$

which is analogous to $\Lambda_{c,2}$ in (18). Note however that while $\Lambda_{c,2}$ might be either positive or negative, $q^2 = q_c^2$ can only be achieved if $q_c^2 > 0$, so this theory only supports critical points for $\sigma'' > 0$. The instability of the homogeneous state occurs via the principal mode.

By analogy with Sec. II we now assume that $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + A \cos 2\pi x + B \cos 4\pi x$ with $B = \mathcal{O}(A^2)$. In this case we have from (37) that $\alpha_* = \alpha_0 + \mathcal{O}(A^2)$ and hence $\int_0^1 (\kappa_J - \kappa_0) dx = \mathcal{O}(A^6)$. Then the integrand of (52) becomes $[M(\rho)\rho'^2 + q^2\kappa_0(\rho; \rho_0)] + \mathcal{O}(A^6)$. The Landau expansion of M and κ_0 in powers of A follows Sec. II. The relevant coefficients are then obtained from (24,25); they require evaluation of various derivatives of κ_0 . We find

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 \kappa_0}{\partial \rho^2} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma''(\rho_0)}{\sigma^2(\rho_0)} \quad , \quad \left. \frac{\partial^3 \kappa_0}{\partial \rho^3} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma'''(\rho_0)}{\sigma^2(\rho_0)} \quad , \quad \left. \frac{\partial^4 \kappa_0}{\partial \rho^4} \right|_{\rho=\rho_0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma''''(\rho_0)}{\sigma^2(\rho_0)} + 3 \frac{\sigma''^2}{\sigma^3}. \quad (54)$$

Then (52) becomes

$$I(q) = q^2 \kappa_0(\rho_0) + \inf_A \left[-\frac{(q^2 - q_c^2) \sigma_0''}{8 \sigma_0^2} A^2 + \beta(\rho_0) A^4 + \mathcal{O}(A^6) \right] \quad (55)$$

with

$$\beta(\rho_0) = \frac{\pi^2 M(\rho_0)}{24} \left[\frac{6M''(\rho_0)}{M(\rho_0)} - \frac{3\sigma''''(\rho_0)}{\sigma''(\rho_0)} + 18 \frac{\sigma''(\rho_0)}{\sigma(\rho_0)} - \left(3 \frac{M'(\rho_0)}{M(\rho_0)} - \frac{\sigma'''(\rho_0)}{\sigma''(\rho_0)} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (56)$$

One can show that this expression is in agreement with the analyses of ref. [13], although the comparison involves some lengthy algebra. In addition, the expression (56) almost coincides with (25) under $\kappa(\rho) \rightarrow \sigma(\rho)$, the only difference being the third term in (56). The key point is that β in (56) must become negative in the vicinity of an inflection point $\sigma'' = 0$; this is directly analogous to the behaviour of (25) when $\kappa'' \approx 0$.

D. Current fluctuations in the KLS lattice gas

A general form of one-dimensional KLS lattice gas is given in terms of hopping rates [15–18]

$$\begin{aligned} 0100 \xrightarrow{D_0(1+\delta)/2} 0010 \quad , \quad 1101 \xrightarrow{D_0(1-\delta)/2} 1011, \\ 1100 \xrightarrow{D_0(1+\epsilon)/2} 1010 \quad , \quad 0101 \xrightarrow{D_0(1-\epsilon)/2} 0011, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where $|\delta|, |\epsilon| < 1$. The expression for the corresponding gas coefficients $D(\rho)$ and $\sigma(\rho)$ can be found in [18]. Importantly for our discussion, $\sigma(\rho)$ has an inflection point for a suitable range of the parameters ϵ and δ [18]. Correspondingly, tricriticality occurs over throughout this range.

For concreteness and to make connection with the other examples presented in the paper we set $\epsilon = 0, \delta = 1$ for which $D(\rho) = D_0(1 - \rho)$ and $\sigma(\rho) = 2D_0\rho(1 - \rho)^2$ [18]. The resulting expression for β has a pair of roots on both sides of the inflection point $\sigma''(\rho = 2/3) = 0$.

Recall that for current fluctuations, tricriticality is only possible in regions of local convexity $\sigma'' > 0$, see discussion below Eq.(53). Thus, of the two roots, the only relevant one which marks a tricritical point lies in the region of local convexity $\rho_0 \in (2/3, 1]$. This point is found to be $(\rho_c \simeq 0.755, q_c \simeq 0.634)$ and is denoted in Fig. 3 (D) of the main text (the twin tricritical point at $(\rho_c, -q_c)$ is not shown).

VI. DYNAMICAL PHASE DIAGRAM AND ‘TIME-LIKE PHASE SEPARATION IN FIG. 3

In this section we recall the transformation from the biased ensemble (Λ, ρ_0) to the constrained ensemble (k, ρ_0) . We then show how to use it to construct the phase diagram Fig. 3, and establish the miscibility gap. A similar analyses can be found in [2].

A. Change of ensembles

The transformation from the biasing parameter Λ to the constrained observable k relies on an ensemble equivalence, akin to that of equilibrium thermodynamics, which is well established within large deviation theory [2, 19–21]. The

CGF $\Psi(\Lambda)$ serves as a thermodynamic potential of an ensemble of trajectories that are biased by their structural observable K_T . The probability of trajectory \mathcal{X} within this ensemble is

$$P_\Lambda(\mathcal{X}) = \frac{e^{\Lambda K_T(\mathcal{X})} P(\mathcal{X})}{Z_\Lambda}, \quad (58)$$

where $P(\mathcal{X})$ is the corresponding unbiased probability, under the stochastic dynamics of the model. The normalization is $Z_\Lambda = \int d\mathcal{X} e^{\Lambda K_T(\mathcal{X})} P(\mathcal{X}) = \langle e^{\Lambda K_T(\mathcal{X})} \rangle$. Since the definition of the CGF is

$$\Psi(\Lambda) = \lim_{L, T \rightarrow \infty} (LT)^{-1} \log \langle e^{\Lambda K_T(\mathcal{X})} \rangle \quad (59)$$

one has for large L, T that $Z_\Lambda \sim e^{LT\Psi(\Lambda)}$. Moreover, the expectation of $k = K_T/LT$ with respect to (58) behaves for large L, T as

$$\langle k \rangle_\Lambda = \Psi'(\Lambda). \quad (60)$$

Similarly, define the probability distribution for trajectories in the constrained ensemble (with $K_T = kLT$):

$$P_k(\mathcal{X}) = \frac{P(\mathcal{X}) \delta(K_T - kLT)}{P_k(k)}, \quad (61)$$

where $P(k) = \int d\mathcal{X} P(\mathcal{X}) \delta(K_T - kLT)$ is a (rescaled) probability density function for k . For large L, T ,

$$P(k) \sim e^{-LT\mathcal{I}(k)}, \quad (62)$$

where \mathcal{I} is the rate function [19].

By analogy with the equivalence of ensembles in thermodynamics, one has that for large L, T , trajectories in the biased ensemble (58) at a given value of Λ are representative of the trajectories in a constrained ensemble (61), for some appropriate value of k . This value is $k = \langle k \rangle_\Lambda$ as defined in (60).

In principle, one should therefore solve $k = \Psi'(\Lambda)$, to obtain the value of Λ that corresponds to a constrained ensemble with some given k . The function Ψ' is non-decreasing. If Ψ' is continuous then the relationship between biased and constrained ensembles is straightforward, and Ψ and \mathcal{I} are related by Legendre transform. However, if $\Psi'(\Lambda)$ has a discontinuity at some Λ_* where it jumps between two values k_1 and k_2 , then there will be no Λ that achieves $k_1 < \Psi'(\Lambda) < k_2$. Hence, representative trajectories for the constrained ensemble with $k \in (k_1, k_2)$ cannot be obtained by mapping to a biased ensemble. The generic result for such cases is that representative trajectories of the constrained ensemble P_k exhibit time-like phase separation: each trajectory has two parts, which separately resemble trajectories of biased ensembles with $\Lambda = \Lambda_*^\pm$, which have $k = k_1, k_2$. The division of the total duration T into the two parts is given by the usual lever rule of thermodynamics. We refer to the range of k between k_1 and k_2 as a miscibility gap (it is also known as a regime of time-like phase coexistence).

B. Building the phase diagram of the constrained ensemble

We describe how the phase diagrams in the (ρ_0, k) plane are constructed in practice. Our discussion is general for any observable K_T . As an accompanying example, we consider $K_T(\mathcal{X}) = L \int_0^T dt \int_0^1 dx \kappa_{2.5}(\rho)$ with

$$\kappa_{2.5}(\rho) = \rho(1 - \rho)^{2.5}. \quad (63)$$

The advantage of this $\kappa_{2.5}$, over κ_2 which was presented in the main text is that the features of the positive K_T fluctuations are better resolved graphically, see Fig. 6 below. Apart from that, the dynamical phase behavior for $\kappa_{2.5}$ is representative of the generic phase diagram for an observable with a pair of tricritical points, such as κ_2 . For $\kappa_{2.5}$ the region where $-\kappa_{2.5}$ differs from its lower convex envelope is $2/5 < \rho_0 < 1$, and the inflection point is at $\rho_0 \simeq 0.6$.

We first discuss the parts of the (ρ_0, k) phase diagram that are inaccessible via hydrodynamic mechanisms (the gray regions in Fig. 3, and Fig. 6). From Eq. (6), the accessible region is obtained by considering all possible k and ρ_0 values that can be realized by a stationary profile $\rho(x)$

$$k = \int_0^1 dx \kappa[\rho(x)] \quad , \quad \rho_0 = \int_0^1 dx \rho(x). \quad (64)$$




FIG. 6. Schematic phase diagram in the variables (ρ_0, k) for the SSEP conditioned on $\kappa_{2.5}$. Miscibility gaps are denoted by magenta shading. Black dots at $\rho_{c,1}$ and $\rho_{c,2}$ are tricritical points. They are placed on both sides of the inflection point $\kappa''_{2.5} = 0$ (orange tick mark). The blue tick mark at $\rho_0 = 2/5$ indicate the boundaries of regions where $-\kappa_{2.5}$ differs from its lower convex envelope. Gray region is not accessible by hydrodynamic fluctuations.




FIG. 7. The expectation $\langle k \rangle_\Lambda = \Psi'(\Lambda)$ (60), with respect to the biased ensemble (58) at different values of the total density ρ_0 : (A) $0 < \rho_0 < 2/5$, (B) $2/5 < \rho_0 < \rho_{c,1}$, (C) $\rho_{c,1} < \rho_0 < \rho_{c,2}$, (D) $\rho_{c,2} < \rho_0 < 1$. The dotted lines indicate the miscibility gap which correspond to discontinuity in $\langle k \rangle_\Lambda = \Psi'(\Lambda)$.

These two relations define the convex hull of the curve $\kappa(\rho_0)$, as denoted by the green shading in Fig. 6 (or Fig. 3). The density profiles $\rho(x)$ on the boundaries of this region are either homogeneous (with $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$ and rate function $\mathcal{I} = 0$) or sharply phase-separated (with rate function $\mathcal{I} \rightarrow \infty$). Outside of this region the two constraints (64) cannot be achieved for any density profile ρ .²

We now consider the phases and the miscibility gaps shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 6. Recall that (60) relates the k -values to corresponding values of the bias Λ .

Note that for $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$, one may always solve $k = \Psi'(\Lambda)$ by taking $\Lambda = 0$, which corresponds to a homogeneous (H) state. In fact, any homogeneous state that obeys (64) must have exactly this value of k . Hence the entire H phase in the biased ensemble (white regions in Fig. 1) must collapse to the line $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$ in the constrained ensemble.

For the transition into the IH phases and regimes of time-like phase separation there are different scenarios according to the value of ρ_0 . These are determined by the position of ρ_0 with respect to the tricritical points. As for κ_2 , we find that for the SSEP biased by $\kappa_{2.5}$ there are two tricritical points at $\rho = \rho_{c,1}, \rho_{c,2}$ (positioned on both sides of the inflection point), see Fig. 6. As a result there are four different scenarios that we consider in the panels of Fig. 7:

A. $0 < \rho_0 < 2/5$

In this regime, $-\kappa_{2.5}$ is equal to its lower convex envelope, which means that $k > \kappa(\rho_0)$ is not hydrodynamically

² For these values, the large deviation scaling behaviour is different, in fact $\log \text{Prob}[K_T/(LT) \approx k] \simeq -L^3 T \mathcal{I}_m(k)$ where \mathcal{I}_m is a different rate function. It is important here that the trajectory duration T is measured in hydrodynamic time units, so

that $\hat{T} = L^2 T$ is the duration measured in microscopic units, so $L^3 T \mathcal{I}_m(k) = L \hat{T} \mathcal{I}_m(k)$. This is the scale for fluctuations that involve a change in the microscopic structure of the system, see for example [8].

accessible (gray shading), and also $\Psi'(\Lambda) = \kappa(\rho_0)$ whenever $\Lambda > 0$. On the other hand, $\kappa_{2.5}$ differs from its lower convex envelope. Also, Ψ' is continuous, and deviates from $\kappa(\rho_0)$ for $\Lambda < \Lambda_{c,2} < 0$. By (60), this corresponds to a continuous H-IH transition in Fig. 6 (there is no time-like phase separation). This is a “single-sided” transition since IH states only appear for $k - \kappa(\rho_0) < 0$.

B. $2/5 < \rho_0 < \rho_{c,1}$

Both $\kappa_{2.5}$ and $-\kappa_{2.5}$ differ from their convex envelopes so DPTs must exist in the biased ensemble for both positive Λ and negative Λ (“double-sided” transitions). We find $\kappa''_{2.5} < 0$ so the transition for positive Λ must be discontinuous. By (60), this leads to time-like phase separation for $k > \kappa(\rho_0)$, shown in Fig. 6 by the pink miscibility gap. On the other hand, the H-IH transition for $k < \kappa(\rho_0)$ is continuous in this range of density.

C. $\rho_{c,1} < \rho_0 < \rho_{c,2}$

In this regime, both $\kappa_{2.5}$ and $-\kappa_{2.5}$ still differ from their convex envelopes so one still has double-sided behaviour. The resulting transitions are both discontinuous, so there are miscibility gaps on both sides of the line $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$ in Fig. 6.

D. $\rho_{c,2} < \rho_0 < 1$.

The situation is similar to B, except that now the transition for positive Λ is continuous and the one for negative Λ is discontinuous. Hence the miscibility gap in Fig. 6 lies below the line $k = \kappa(\rho_0)$.

VII. RELATING THE VARIATIONAL ARGUMENT FOR H-IH TRANSITIONS TO THE PREVIOUS WORKS [1, 2]

This Section points out a connection between the variational argument used here to establish discontinuous DPTs, and previous work in [1, 2]. It is not essential for the arguments of the main text, but it provides useful context.

A. Variational representation of the microscopic CGF

The authors of [1, 2] exploited a variational formula for an CGF similar to $\Psi(\Lambda)$, to establish existence of discontinuous DPTs in kinetically constrained models. We first define the variational formula, based on Donsker-Varadhan large deviation theory [22, 23]. The microscopic configuration of the model is denoted by $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_L)$ where η_i is the occupancy of the i th lattice site. The transition rate from η to η' is $W(\eta', \eta)$ and we adopt the convention that $W(\eta, \eta) = -\sum_{\eta'} W(\eta', \eta)$. Interpreting W as a matrix, this means that its columns sum to zero. To connect to the hydrodynamic arguments of the main text, we assume that the total particle number $N(\eta) = \sum_i \eta_i$ is conserved under the stochastic dynamics.

Recall that the time variable t used in this work is measured in hydrodynamic units. It is related to the microscopic time \hat{t} as $t = \hat{t}/L^2$. The arguments of [1, 2] use microscopic units and we use $\hat{\cdot}$ to indicate this. We consider trajectories of duration \hat{T} (measured in microscopic units), and the analog of the observable K_T is

$$K_{\hat{T}}(\mathcal{X}) = \int_0^{\hat{T}} d\hat{t} \hat{\kappa}(\eta(\hat{t})). \quad (65)$$

where $\hat{\kappa}$ is a suitable local observable. For example, consider the SSEP with $\hat{\kappa} = \hat{\kappa}_2$ with $\hat{\kappa}_2(\eta) = \sum_i \eta_i(1 - \eta_{i+1})(1 - \eta_{i-1})$. Then large deviations of this $K_{\hat{T}}$ correspond to large deviations of K_T defined in Eq. 2 on taking $\kappa = \kappa_2$, at least for those fluctuations that take place by hydrodynamic mechanisms.

Now consider the microscopic CGF

$$\hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) = \frac{1}{L} \lim_{\hat{T} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\hat{T}} \log \langle e^{s K_{\hat{T}}} \rangle \quad (66)$$

where the average is taken in the steady state of the microscopic dynamics, at density ρ_0 . This object coincides [1, 2] with the largest eigenvalue of a matrix $W_{\hat{\kappa}}$ whose elements are

$$W_{\hat{\kappa}}(\eta, \eta') = W(\eta, \eta') + s \hat{\kappa}(\eta) \delta_{\eta, \eta'}. \quad (67)$$

Note: since the total particle number is conserved, W (and hence $W_{\hat{\kappa}}$) has a block-diagonal form where each block corresponds to a specific number of particles. The CGF $\hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0)$ is the largest eigenvalue of the block corresponding to the relevant number of particles $N = \rho_0 L$.

To obtain a variational formula for this eigenvalue, we use that this matrix can be symmetrised. For a generic model whose rates are in detailed balance with respect to an equilibrium probability distribution P_{eq} , we write $\tilde{W}(\eta, \eta') = P_{\text{eq}}^{-1/2}(\eta)W(\eta, \eta')P_{\text{eq}}^{1/2}(\eta')$. Detailed balance means that for $\eta \neq \eta'$ we have $\tilde{W}(\eta, \eta') = \sqrt{W(\eta, \eta')W(\eta', \eta)}$, so \tilde{W} is symmetric.³

Then the Ritz variational formula for the largest eigenvalue of the relevant block of the matrix yields

$$\hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) = \frac{1}{L} \max_{V(\eta)} \frac{\sum_{\eta, \eta'} V(\eta) [\tilde{W}(\eta, \eta') + s\hat{\kappa}(\eta)\delta_{\eta, \eta'}] V(\eta')}{\sum_{\eta} V(\eta)^2}. \quad (68)$$

with the constraint that $V(\eta) = 0$ if $N(\eta) \neq \rho_0 L$. At $s = 0$ this maximum is achieved by the (canonical) equilibrium distribution $V(\eta) = \sqrt{P_{\text{eq}}(\eta)}\delta_{N(\eta), \rho_0 L}$ which gives $\hat{\Psi}(0, \rho_0) = 0$. The insight of [1, 2] was that discontinuous DPTs can be established by considering the behaviour of (68) for very small s .

B. Relating to the hydrodynamic limit

Comparing the definition of the CGF (59) with the microscopic CGF (66) and noting $\hat{T} = TL^2$ we have

$$\Psi(\Lambda) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} L^2 \hat{\Psi}_L(\Lambda/L^2) \quad (69)$$

That is, the bias parameter s in the microscopic setting is related to the hydrodynamic bias Λ as $s = \Lambda/L^2$, because of the hydrodynamic rescaling of time.

We will show that Eq. (4) – which is a variational representation of Ψ – is related to (68), which is a variational formula at microscopic level. Using this relationship, we discuss conditions for existence of discontinuous DPTs. We consider here the specific example of the SSEP, but the argument can be generalised quite easily. As a suitable (grand-canonical) equilibrium distribution we take a product Bernoulli measure with mean density ρ , that is $P_{\text{eq}}(\eta) = \prod_i \nu_\rho(\eta_i)$ where ν_ρ is the (marginal) distribution on each site.

The analysis of lattice gas models in [1, 2] used a phase-separated state as variational ansatz in (68). (This is phase separation in space, there should be no confusion with time-like phase separation.) Write ρ_l, ρ_h for the coexisting densities and

$$y(\rho_l, \rho_h, \rho_0) = (\rho_h - \rho_0)/(\rho_h - \rho_l) \quad (70)$$

for the fraction of the system that is occupied by the low density phase. Then we take

$$V(\eta) = \left[\prod_{i=1}^{yL} \nu_{\rho_l}(n_i) \right]^{1/2} \left[\prod_{j=yL+1}^L \nu_{\rho_h}(n_j) \right]^{1/2} \delta_{N(\eta), \rho_0 L} \quad (71)$$

as a variational ansatz corresponding to a phase-separated state with exactly $\rho_0 L$ particles.

Plugging the test vector (71) into (68), it can easily be checked that the term involving \tilde{W} yields a contribution of $O(1/L)$, because the system is locally equilibrated everywhere except in the vicinity of the two interfaces at $y = 0$ and $y = 1$. However, the term proportional to s gives a contribution at $O(1)$, and the result is

$$\hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) = \max_{\rho_l, \rho_h} \{sy(\rho_l, \rho_h, \rho_0)\kappa(\rho_l) + s[1 - y(\rho_l, \rho_h, \rho_0)]\kappa(\rho_h)\} + O(1/L) \quad (72)$$

where $\kappa(\rho)$ is the average of $\hat{\kappa}$ in an equilibrium state at density ρ_0 .

Maximising (72) over ρ_l, ρ_h gives a convex envelope construction on κ similar to the discussion in the main text. The result is that for $s \leq 0$, the maximum is achieved by coexistence between the densities that realize the lower convex envelope construction over κ ; similarly for $s \geq 0$ one requires the lower convex envelope of $-\kappa$. However, exactly at $s = 0$ the slope of $\hat{\Psi}$ is given by the expected value [19] $\hat{\Psi}'_L(0, \rho_0) = \kappa(\rho_0)$.

³ We will take P_{eq} as a grand canonical equilibrium distribution so that $P_{\text{eq}}(\eta) > 0$ for all η . The resulting \tilde{W} does not depend

on the value of the chemical potential of this distribution.




FIG. 8. A plot of the lower bound for $\hat{\Psi}(s)$, the right hand side of Eq.(72) for κ_2 at density $\rho_0 = 0.85$. Here $\kappa_2^+(\rho_0) = 0$ is the lower convex envelope of κ_2 and $\kappa_2^-(\rho_0) = 0.0375$ is the lower convex envelope of $-\kappa_2$ at ρ_0 . The dashed line is the slope at the origin $\hat{\Psi}'(s=0) = \kappa_2(\rho_0) \simeq 0.019$.

Denote by $\kappa^+(\rho_0)$ the lower convex envelope of κ , and similarly $\kappa^-(\rho_0)$ is the lower convex envelope of $-\kappa$. The result is that (up to corrections at $O(1/L)$):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) &\geq s\kappa^-(\rho_0), & s > 0 \\ \hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) &\approx s\kappa(\rho_0), & |s| \lesssim L^{-2} \\ \hat{\Psi}_L(s, \rho_0) &\geq s\kappa^+(\rho_0), & s < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

In cases where κ (or $-\kappa$) differs from its convex envelope, this establishes discontinuities in $(\partial/\partial s) \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \Psi_L(s, \rho_0)$ at $s = 0$. Such discontinuities were identified in [1, 2] as DPTs. An example is shown in Fig. 8 for $\kappa = \kappa_2$, where κ differs from both κ^\pm .

The essential point is that the phase-separated density profiles that appear in this argument (and the corresponding convex envelopes) are exactly the same as those that appear in the discussion of the main text for the limits of $\Lambda \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Recall that (69) indicates that $\Lambda = sL^2$. Then at $L \rightarrow \infty$ one expects correspondence between the hydrodynamic behaviour at large Λ and the microscopic behaviour at small non-zero s , consistent with the above analyses.

-
- [1] J. P. Garrahan, R. L. Jack, V. Lecomte, E. Pitard, K. van Duijvendijk, and F. van Wijland, *Physical Review Letters* **98**, 195702 (2007).
 - [2] J. P. Garrahan, R. L. Jack, V. Lecomte, E. Pitard, K. van Duijvendijk, and F. van Wijland, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **42**, 075007 (2009).
 - [3] T. Bodineau and B. Derrida, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 180601 (2004).
 - [4] B. Derrida, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2007**, P07023 (2007).
 - [5] V. Lecomte, J. P. Garrahan, and F. van Wijland, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **45**, 175001 (2012).
 - [6] Y. Baek, Y. Kafri, and V. Lecomte, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **51**, 105001 (2018).
 - [7] J. Dolezal and R. L. Jack, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2019**, 123208 (2019).
 - [8] R. L. Jack, I. R. Thompson, and P. Sollich, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 060601 (2015).
 - [9] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, 1st ed. (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
 - [10] T. Agranov, M. E. Cates, and R. L. Jack, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2022**, 123201 (2022).
 - [11] T. Bodineau and B. Derrida, *Physical Review E* **72**, 066110 (2005).
 - [12] L. Bertini, A. D. Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, and C. Landim, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **123**, 237 (2006).
 - [13] T. Bodineau and B. Derrida, *Comptes Rendus Physique* **8**, 540 (2007).
 - [14] L. Zarfaty and B. Meerson, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 033304 (2016).
 - [15] S. Katz, J. L. Lebowitz, and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **34**, 497 (1984).
 - [16] V. Popkov and G. M. Schütz, *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* **48**, 257 (1999).
 - [17] J. S. Hager, J. Krug, V. Popkov, and G. M. Schütz, *Physical Review E* **63**, 056110 (2001).
 - [18] Y. Baek, Y. Kafri, and V. Lecomte, *Physical Review Letters* **118**, 030604 (2017).
 - [19] H. Touchette, *Physics Reports* **478**, 1 (2009).
 - [20] R. L. Jack and P. Sollich, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **184**, 304 (2010).
 - [21] R. Chetrite and H. Touchette, *Physical review letters* **111**, 120601 (2013).
 - [22] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **28**, 1 (1975).

- [23] H. Touchette, [Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications](#) **504**, 5 (2018).
-