

Hysteresis in one-dimensional reaction-diffusion systems

A. Rakos, M. Paessens, G. M. Schutz

Institut für Festkörperforschung, Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, Germany.

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

We introduce a simple nonequilibrium model for a driven diffusive system with nonconservative reaction kinetics which exhibits ergodicity breaking and hysteresis in one dimension. These phenomena can be understood through a description of the dominant stochastic many-body dynamics in terms of an equilibrium single-particle problem, viz. the random motion of a shock in an effective potential. This picture also leads to the exact phase diagram of the system and suggests a new generic mechanism for "freezing by heating".

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 64.60.Ht, 02.50.Ga

The closely related questions of phase coexistence, ergodicity breaking and hysteresis in noisy one-dimensional systems with short range interactions and finite local state space (such as in spin systems or vertex models) are intriguing. In thermal equilibrium these phenomena cannot occur as there is no local mechanism that could limit the growth of islands of a minority phase inside a majority phase. Far from equilibrium one has found phase separation and spontaneous symmetry breaking in driven diffusive systems provided that either a bulk conservation law, viz. particle number conservation [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], or vanishing local transition rates [6, 7] constrain the local dynamics. As already noted in Ref. [1] the only known exception to this rule, the error-correcting model by Gacs [8], is rather complicated and still not widely understood, see also [9].

Recently it has been demonstrated that phase coexistence occurs in a one-dimensional driven diffusive system even in the presence of Langmuir kinetics $A \rightleftharpoons \emptyset$ which break the bulk conservation law [10]. This mechanism is inspired by the process of motor proteins moving along actin filaments. Earlier this model was introduced as a toy model reproducing stylized facts in limit order markets [11]. The formation of a localized shock in this system which separates a domain of low particle density from a domain of high density has been studied subsequently [12, 13]. However, the two different domains do not represent two possible global steady states. The process is ergodic even in the thermodynamic limit and no hysteresis is possible.

It is the purpose of this letter to present a simple nonequilibrium system with local non-conservative dynamics and finite local state space which exhibits ergodicity breaking and hysteresis in the thermodynamic limit, in the usual sense that in finite volume the sojourn time in two metastable steady states increases exponentially with system size. To be specific we investigate the totally asymmetric exclusion process (TASEP) augmented by nonconservative reaction kinetics. The TASEP is a stochastic model of diffusing particles on a one-dimensional lattice with a hopping bias in one direction [14]. Each site from 1 to L is either empty or

occupied by one particle. In the bulk particles (A) hop stochastically from site i to $i+1$ with unit rate, provided that the target site is empty. The boundaries act as particle reservoirs with densities ρ_+ on the left resp. ρ_- on the right: On site 1 particles are created with rate ρ_+ , provided the site is empty, which corresponds to a particle hopping from the left reservoir onto the first site. Particles on site L are annihilated with rate $1 - \rho_-$, corresponding to a particle hopping from the last site into the right reservoir.

In our model particles also undergo the following reaction process: On a vacant site enclosed by two particles a particle may be attached with rate λ_a , and a particle enclosed by two other particles may be detached with rate λ_d . This process can be symbolically written as $A \rightleftharpoons A \cdots A$ and may be interpreted as activated Langmuir kinetics. Without the TASEP dynamics the stationary density of this process is either $K = \lambda_a/(\lambda_a + \lambda_d)$ or zero, with no correlations [15]. As in previous work we consider the physically interesting case when $L \gg 1$ and these rates are proportional to $1/L$ [10, 11, 12, 13]. Hence we define renormalized rates

$$\lambda_a = \alpha_a/L; \quad \lambda_d = \alpha_d/L \quad (1)$$

where α_a and α_d are kept constant while $L \gg 1$. For other choices of the attachment/detachment (AD) rates the dynamics is either governed by the TASEP ($\alpha_{a,d} < 0$ ($1/L$)) or by the AD process ($\alpha_{a,d} > 0$ ($1/L$)).

We find a stationary phase diagram of the model with five distinct phases (Fig. 1). The stationary density profile ρ_i is not constant as a function of lattice site i . Yet some of the phases are comparable to those of the usual TASEP with open boundaries [16, 17]: in the high density phases ($\text{HD } 1/2$) one finds $\rho_i > 1/2$ while in the low density phase (LD) $\rho_i < 1/2$. In $\text{HD } 1$ the bulk density profile is dependent on ρ_+ , while it is independent of both boundaries in $\text{HD } 2$ as in the maximal current phase of the TASEP. On the other hand two additional phases exist: (i) A coexistence phase which is characterized by a stable shock position, i.e., a jump in the density profile which is localized at a certain position in the bulk of the system. The shock connects a low density domain to




FIG. 1: Phase diagram for $a = 0.7$ and $d = 0.1$ with two high density phases (HD1, HD2), a low density phase (LD), a coexistence phase and the nonergodic phase.

its left with a high density domain to its right as known from related models studied previously [10, 12]. Notice that in the usual TASEP there is a coexistence line in the phase diagram with a nonlocalized shock. In a different parameter regime we find a novel phase with an unstable shock position in the bulk. In this phase both the LD and HD states are stable (if $L \neq 1$) which implies that ergodicity is broken in the thermodynamic limit. Although for finite systems a transition between the two states is possible, the mean life time of each steady state is exponentially large in the system size L (see below). We note that this is not a spontaneous symmetry breaking since there is no symmetry relating the two metastable states. This phase has no analog in the TASEP with open boundaries.

Hysteresis in this nonequilibrium setting was observed by measuring the space-averaged density along the curve of constant $\rho_+ = 0.45$ while changing ρ_- in such a way that the system starting from the LD phase passed through the nonergodic phase and ended up in the HD2 phase. Then the process of changing ρ_- was reversed. A relevant parameter in hysteresis phenomena is the speed of sweeping: in our simulations ρ_- was changed by 10^{-4} in every k MC steps ($k = 500; 1500; 5000$). A time average was not taken, ρ_+ was measured in every k steps. On Fig. 2 one can see the resulting hysteresis loops. We found that the hysteresis loop inates with increasing speed which is reminiscent of hysteresis in usual magnetic systems.

To rationalize these observations we first consider the hydrodynamic limit on the Euler scale, i.e., we take $L \rightarrow 1$ while the lattice constant is scaled by $a = 1/L$ and the time by $t = t_{\text{lattice}}/L$. Thus the spatial coordinate $x = i/L$ becomes continuous. Following the line of arguments of Ref. [12] the hydrodynamic equation for the density




FIG. 2: Hysteresis plot for $L = 2000$, $a = 0.7$, $d = 0.1$, $\rho_+ = 0.45$. ρ_- was changed by 10^{-4} in every 5000 (solid line), 1500 (dashed line) and 500 (dotted line) MC steps. The hysteresis loop gets wider as the speed of changing ρ_- is increased.

takes the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho(x;t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} j(\rho) = S(\rho); \quad (2)$$

with the exact current $j(\rho) = (1 - \rho)$ of the TASEP and the cubic source term

$$S(\rho) = -a^2(1 - \rho) - d\rho^3; \quad (3)$$

resulting from the activated Langmuir kinetics. For the stationary state $\partial_t \rho(x;t) = 0$ holds and using $\partial_x j = \partial j / \partial \rho = \partial \rho / \partial x$ we obtain

$$v_c(\rho) \frac{\partial \rho(x)}{\partial x} = S(\rho); \quad (4)$$

with the collective velocity $v_c = \partial j / \partial \rho$. This nonlinear differential equation can be integrated analytically and yields the flow field

$$x(\rho) = -\frac{1}{a} + \frac{a-d}{a^2} \ln \frac{1}{K} - \frac{1}{a} + c \quad (5)$$

with an integration constant c .

As the differential equation is of first order and the boundary conditions fix the density at two positions, following a line of the flow field does not represent a solution of the boundary problem in general. In the original lattice model this inconsistency is resolved by the appearance of a shock and/or boundary layers as described in [12]. Apart from the discontinuities the stationary density profile follows the flow field of eq. (4).

In order to understand quantitatively the selection of the stationary shock position (which determines the phase diagram) and also to explain the phenomenon of hysteresis from a microscopic viewpoint we describe the dominant dynamical mode of the particle system in terms

of the random motion of the shock. To this end we generalize the approach of [18] and introduce space-dependent hopping rates

$$w_{x!x+a} = \frac{j_R(x)}{R(x) + L(x)}$$

$$w_{x+a!x} = \frac{j_L(x)}{R(x) + L(x)}; \quad (6)$$

for jumps of the shock over a lattice constant a . Here the indices L and R denote the solutions (lines of the row eld (5)) on the left resp. right of the shock. Similar hopping rates are used in [13]. The space-dependent hopping rates furnish us with the picture of a random walker in an effective energy landscape $E(x)$ inside a finite box. The energy landscape is generated by the interplay of the particle current with the reaction kinetics. In this way we relate the original nonequilibrium many-particle system to an equilibrium single-particle model. Let $p(x)$ be the equilibrium probability of the shock being at position x . Then due to detailed balance

$$\frac{w_{x!x+a}}{w_{x+a!x}} = \frac{p(x+a)}{p(x)} = \exp(-E(x+a) + E(x)); \quad (7)$$

which defines the energy landscape.

The potential $E(x)$ is monotonically increasing (decreasing) function for the HD (LD) phase (Fig. 3). This implies that although there are fluctuations the shock is always driven to the left (right) boundary. In the co-existence phase there is a global minimum in the bulk resulting in a stable shock position (Fig. 3) at a macroscopic distance from the boundaries. Here the dynamics can be well approximated by a random walker in a harmonic potential which gives a Gaussian distribution for the shock position. Hence the width of the shock distribution is proportional to \sqrt{L} [15] which was also found in [10, 13] for the TASEP with Langmuir kinetics.

The nonergodic phase is characterized by a global energy maximum in the bulk (Fig. 3), leading to an unstable bulk fixed point of the shock. The two minima at the left and right boundary correspond to the two stable stationary states. Starting with an initial condition close to one of the minima, the random walker will drift most likely into this local minimum and stay in its vicinity for a time of the order of the mean first passage time before it traverses to the other minimum. This leads to hysteresis. Using a formula for the mean first passage time derived by Murthy and Kehr [19] one expects that τ grows exponentially with the system size L . Moreover, one expects the transition from one minimum to the other to be a random Poisson process with an average waiting time τ .

This simple one-particle picture is well borne out by MC simulations. For judiciously chosen parameters it is possible to perform simulations up to times much larger than τ . Using multispin coding [20] for the MC algorithm rather good statistics become available for the waiting




FIG. 3: Examples for the energy landscape in four phases. Note that in the HD and LD phases $E(x)$ can be either convex or concave




FIG. 4: Snapshot of the time evolution of the scaled position of the second class particle for $L = 1000$; $\rho_- = 0.2705$; $\rho_+ = 0.63$; $a = 0.5$; $d = 0.1$. A position of the second class particle near the left boundary ($x \approx 0$) corresponds to the high density state, while a position near the right boundary ($x \approx 1$) corresponds to the low density state.

time (the time the system spends in one of the stationary states before switching to the other). For tracing the position of the shock we use the second class particle technique [21]. We measured the position of the second class particle as a function of time: a typical realization is shown in Fig. 4.

As shown in Fig. 5 the numerically determined cumulative distribution function $\Phi(t) = P(\tau < t)$ of the waiting time τ is hardly distinguishable from the expected exponential distribution

$$\Phi(t) = 1 - \exp(-t/\tau); \quad (8)$$

With this picture of a moving shock in mind and using the expression (5) it is also possible to derive the exact phase transition lines defining the phase diagram presented above. Adapting the arguments of [12] the




FIG. 5: Numerically determined cumulative distribution of the transition times from the upper state to the lower (solid line) compared to the exponential distribution (dashed line) with parameters as in 4. Similar results are found for the transition in the other direction, but with a different [15].

analysis of the stability of boundary layers yields a high density phase for $\gamma > 1/2$. Because of a boundary layer the bulk solution of the density profile is independent of x if $\gamma < 1/2$. Thus in this region the phase diagram is only ruled by γ . For $\gamma = 1/2$ the two lines in the phase diagram bounding the coexistence phase and nonergodic phase resp. are determined by the stationary shock position. Crossing the line separating LD/coexistence phase and nonergodic/HD phase from left to right results in a change of the sign of $\partial_x E$ (1) from $+$ to $-$. Crossing the other line separating coexistence/HD phase and LD/nonergodic phase from left to right results in a change of the sign of $\partial_x E$ (0) from $+$ to $-$. The sign of the slope of the energy profile, i.e., the stability of the shock position can be analysed by considering the average shock velocity

$$v_s = \frac{j_R(x)}{R(x)} - \frac{j_L(x)}{L(x)} : \quad (9)$$

A shock position at the boundary is stable when it is driven toward the boundary, i.e., $v_s(0) < 0$ at the left, $v_s(1) > 0$ at the right boundary. Thus the lines separating the phases are calculated by comparing the values of $j_L(x)$ and $j_R(x)$ at the positions $x = 0; 1$.

To conclude we have demonstrated the existence of hysteresis and broken ergodicity (in the thermodynamic limit) in a driven dissipative system without bulk conservation law. We stress that the two different stationary distributions are not ordered states in which the activated Langmuir reaction kinetics would be dynamically suppressed. Surprisingly, adding noise which is on average spatially homogeneous (the nonconservative reaction process) to a conservative spatially homogeneous nonequilibrium system with a nonvanishing particle current leads to a space-dependent effective potential which determines the stationary position of the shock. In the

absence of this noise, i.e., in the usual TASEP, the shock performs an unbiased random walk and hence is unlocalized, whereas suitably chosen reaction kinetics may create a variety of effective potentials which localize the shock. An increase in noise strength is usually associated with heating up a system whereas localization reduces the amount of disorder, corresponding to cooling. Thus we have identified a novel generic mechanism for the phenomenon of freezing by heating. The description of the nonequilibrium many-body dynamics in terms of a collective single-particle mode moving under equilibrium conditions yields the exact stationary phase diagram as well as the numerically verified hopping process between the metastable states of the finite system. Details of the hopping dynamics will be presented elsewhere [15].

A. Rakos thanks the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) for financial support.

-
- [1] M. R. Evans, D. P. Foster, C. Godreche and D. Mukamel, J. Stat. Phys. 80 69 (1995)
 - [2] M. R. Evans, Y. Kafri, H. M. K. Oduvele and D. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 425 (1998)
 - [3] R. Barlovic, L. Santen, A. Schadschneider and M. Schreckenberg, Eur. Phys. J. B 5 793 (1998)
 - [4] P. F. A. M. T. H. Einzel and V. Rittenberg J. Phys. A 31 L45 (1998).
 - [5] Y. Kafri, E. Levine, D. Mukamel, G. M. Schutz and J. Torok, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 035702 (2002)
 - [6] D. Helbing, D. Mukamel and G. M. Schutz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 10 (1999)
 - [7] M. R. Evans, Y. Kafri, E. Levine and D. Mukamel, J. Phys. A 35 L433 (2002)
 - [8] P. Gacs, J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 32 15 (1986), J. Stat. Phys. 103 45 (2001)
 - [9] L. F. Gray, J. Stat. Phys. 103 1 (2001)
 - [10] A. Parmeggiani, T. Franosch, and E. Frey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 086601 (2003)
 - [11] R. D. Williams, G. M. Schutz and D. Challet, Physica A 316 430 (2002)
 - [12] V. Popkov, A. Rakos, R. D. Williams, A. B. Kolomeisky, and G. M. Schutz, cond-mat/0302208
 - [13] M. R. Evans, R. Juhasz and L. Santen, cond-mat/0303484
 - [14] G. M. Schutz in Phase transitions and Critical Phenomena Vol 19, Eds. C. Domb and J. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 2001).
 - [15] A. Rakos and M. Paessens, in preparation
 - [16] G. Schutz and E. Domany, J. Stat. Phys. 72 277 (1993)
 - [17] B. Derrida, M. R. Evans, V. Hakim and V. Pasquier, J. Phys. A 26 1493 (1993)
 - [18] A. B. Kolomeisky, G. M. Schutz, E. B. Kolomeisky and J. P. Straley, J. Phys. A 31 6911 (1998).
 - [19] K. P. N. Murthy and K. W. Kehr, Phys. Rev. A 40, 2082 (1989); Phys. Rev. A 41, 1160 (1990).
 - [20] G. T. Barkema and M. E. J. Newman, Monte Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics, (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1999).
 - [21] P. A. Ferrari, C. Kipnis and E. Saada, Ann. Prob. 19 226 (1991).