## Exact dynam ics of a reaction-di usion m odel with spatially alternating rates

M. Mobilia, B. Schmittmann and R. K. P. Zia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Stochastic Processes in Science and Engineering,

Department of Physics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, 24061-0435, USA

(D ated: February 24, 2005)

We present the exact solution for the full dynam ics of a nonequilibrium spin chain and its dual reaction-di usion m odel, for arbitrary initial conditions. The spin chain is driven out of equilibrium by coupling alternating spins to two therm all baths at di erent tem peratures. In the reaction-di usion m odel, this translates into spatially alternating rates for particle creation and annihilation, and even negative \tem peratures" have a perfectly natural interpretation. O bservables of interest include the m agnetization, the particle density, and all correlation functions for both m odels. Two generic types of tim e-dependence are found: if both tem peratures are positive, the m agnetization, density and correlation functions decay exponentially to their steady-state values. In contrast, if one of the tem peratures is negative, dam ped oscillations are observed in all quantities. They can be traced to a subtle com petition of pair creation and annihilation on the two sublattices. We com ment on the limitations of mean-eld theory and propose an experimental realization of our m odel in certain conjugated polymers and linear chain com pounds.

PACS num bers: 02.50.-r, 75.10.-b, 05.50.+q, 05.70.Ln

### I. IN TRODUCTION

Nonequilibrium many-body systems abound in the physical and life sciences and have recently received much attention (see e.g. [1, 2, 3] and references therein). Despite these e orts, a comprehensive theoretical fram ework is still lacking: As yet, there is no equivalent of Gibbs ensemble theory for nonequilibrium systems. As a consequence, in contrast to equilibrium statistical mechanics, macroscopic observables cannot be computed without explicit reference to the imposed dynamics, generally described by a master equation, and most progress in the eld is made by studying paradigmatic models [2]. In this context, exact solutions of simple models are scarce, but very precious, since they can serve as testing grounds for approxim ate and/or num erical schem es and shed light on general properties of whole classes of related m odels. N ot surprisingly, nontrivial solutions are alm ost entirely restricted to one dimension (1D; see e.g. [2, 3]), and have focused on completely uniform lattices with site-independent rates. C learly, how ever, one would like to take into account m ore com plex situations, e.g., those with spatially varying coupling constants or rates. A rguably, one of the simplest generalizations beyond a completely uniform system is one with alternating rates. In the following, we consider a 1D kinetic Ising chain (K ISC), coupled to two alternating tem peratures and endowed with G lauber-like dynamics. Our analysis of this m odel provides a full description of its dual counterpart, namely a reaction-di usion system (RDS), characterized by spatially alternating annihilation and creation rates. Members of these two classes { i.e., kinetic Ising and reaction-di usion m odels { are prototypical nonequilibrium system s which have been thoroughly studied on hom ogeneous lattices [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. Yet, they still o er surprises and novel behaviors, when non-trivial spatial rates are investigated.

O ur model was rst introduced by Racz and Zia [8] who recognized that (stationary) two-point correlation functions are easily found exactly, even though spins on alternating sites are coupled to di erent temperatures. Schm ittm ann and Schm user subsequently realized that all stationary correlation functions are exactly calculable [9]. W hile this information is equivalent to the full stationary solution, its representation as exp( $H_e$ ) is non-trivial, involving a proliferation of longer-ranged multispin couplings [10]. F inally, we recently reported the exact solution for all dynam ic correlation functions, starting from a very sim ple initial condition, i.e., zero m agnetization and vanishing correlations [11].

In this article, we complete these earlier studies by dem onstrating how competing site-dependent rates may dram atically a ect the dynam ics by giving rise to an oscillatory approach toward the nonequilibrium steady state. We use a generating functional approach to obtain the complete solution for all correlation functions with arbitrary initial conditions. We focus speci cally on the dynam icalm agnetization and the spin-spin correlations and explore their long-tim e behavior. W e w ill also consider the dynam ics of dom ain walls in the spin chain which can be mapped onto a reaction-di usion system. Interpreting our results in the language of particle annihilation and creation, negative \tem peratures" acquire a natural physical meaning, leading to unexpected oscillatory dynamics. From a more technical point of view, we are able to obtain a complete solution for two nontrivial nonequilibrium many-body system swhich provides som e insight into the solvability of two whole classes of related m odels.

The mapping to a reaction-di usion system is of inter-

E lectronic address: m m obilia, schm ittm, rkpzia @vt.edu

est for two reasons. On the theoretical side, the equations for densities and correlation functions in the RDS form an in nite hierarchy whose solution is not at all apparent until one recognizes the equivalent spin chain m odel. A lso, from an experimental perspective, it is well known that di usion-limited reactions with annihilation and creation of pairs of particles are good m odels for the photogrow th properties of excited states (solitons/antisoliton pairs) in certain conjugated polymers and linear chain com pounds [12, 13, 14]. We propose that spatially alternating creation/annihilation rates in these systems { especially in MX chain com pounds { can be generated with the help of a laser with spatially m odulated power output.

This article is organized as follows: In the next section we introduce the kinetic spin chain and its dual reactiondi usion system. Section III presents the complete solution of the spin chain. Some technical details are relegated to two Appendices. In Section IV, we map the two-tem perature spin chain onto a reaction-di usion system with alternating rates, whose density and correlation functions are computed. We analyze the conditions under which dam ped oscillations characterize the approach to the steady state, and we com pare our exact results to a sim ple mean- eld description. Section V is devoted to a brief discussion of the solvability of related models, with Section V I reserved for our conclusions.

### II. THE MODELS

W e consider two closely related nonequilibrium m anyparticle systems on a one-dimensional lattice: (i) a kinetic Ising spin chain (K ISC) endowed with a generalized G lauber-like dynamics; and (ii) a reaction-di usion system (RDS), with spatially periodic pair annihilation and creation rates. For convenience, we restrict ourselves to a periodic lattice (a ring) with an even num ber of sites and study the therm odynam ic lim it. W e expect our exact results to be valid for the general cases of odd num ber of sites and/or arbitrary boundary conditions, apart from the usual caveats.

Since the RDS follows from the spin chain via a duality relationship, we focus m ainly on the detailed description of model (i). A spin variable, j = 1, denotes the value of the spin at site j, with j = 1;2;::L, and L an even integer. N earest-neighbor spins interast according to the usual Ising H am iltonian:  $H = J_{j j j+1}$ , where J > 0 (J < 0) is the (anti-) ferrom agnetic exchange coupling. Our model is endowed with a nonequilibrium generalization of the usual G lauber [5] dynamics: spins on even and odd sites experience di erent tem peratures,  $T_e$  and  $T_o$ , which in plies the violation of detailed balance [8, 9, 10]. To be speci c, a con guration f  $_1; _2;:::; Lg$  evolves into a new one by random sequential spin ips: A spin j ips to j with rate

$$\frac{1}{2} \quad \frac{j}{4} \quad j \quad (j \quad 1 + j + 1) \quad (1)$$

where  $_{2i} = _{e} = \tanh (2J=k_{b}T_{e})$  and  $_{2i+1} = _{o} = \tanh (2J=k_{b}T_{o})$ , on even (j = 2i) and odd (j = 2i + 1) sites. The time-dependent probability distribution P (f g;t) obeys the master equation:

$$\begin{array}{l} \underset{X}{\overset{(l)}{\theta}_{t}P} (f g;t) = \\ = & w_{j} (f g^{j})P (f g^{j};t) \quad w_{j} (f g)P (f g;t) \quad (2) \end{array}$$

where the state f  $g^{j}$  di ers from f g only by the spin ip of <sub>j</sub>. Our main goal in this work is to compute the time-dependent distribution P (f g;t). To do go, we compute all correlation functions h  $j_{1}$  :::  $j_{n}$  it f g  $j_{1}$  :::  $j_{n}$  P (f g;t) and invoke the following relationship [5]:

$$X X X$$

$$2^{L} P (f g;t) = 1 + ih_{i}h_{t} + j_{k}h_{jk}h_{t} + i_{t} + j_{k}h_{jk}h_{t} + i_{t} + j_{k}h_{jk}h_{t} + j_{k}h_{jk}h_{t} + j_{k}h_{jk}h_{t} + j_{k}h_{t} + j_{k$$

This expression illustrates that the knowledge of all equal-time correlation functions is equivalent to the complete knowledge of the distribution function P (f g;t). Recently, this implication was exploited for the steady state [9], and for the time-dependent situation yet restricted to a particularly simple initial condition [11].

The spin-ip dynamics of this Ising chain can be expressed in terms of the creation, annihilation and diffusion of domain walls, i.e., pairs of spins with opposite sign. For example, ipping in the local con guration  $j_1 = j_{j+1} = +1$  creates two domain walls:  $j_1 = j_j$  and  $j_j = j_{j+1}$ , located on the bonds (j 1; j) and (j; j + 1). Similarly, ipping j in the local conguration  $j_1 = j_{j+1} = +1$  has the e ect of moving the dom ain wall on bond (j; j + 1)by one lattice constant to the left, corresponding to dom ain walldi usion. By identifying a dom ain wallwith a \particle", A, our spin- ip dynam ics can be recast as a reaction-di usion m odel, and the two examples translate into ;; ! AA and ;A ! A;, respectively. The mapping from the KISC into its dual RDS is described in detail in Table 1.

C learly, the presence of alternating temperatures  $T_{e,r}$ To in spin language translates into alternating pair annihilation and creation rates (1 <sub>e;o</sub>)=2 in the RDS.We can see easily that letting Te or To vanish sim ply prohibits pair creation entirely at even or odd sites. Rem arkably, we can derive an additional, and possibly rather unexpected, bene t from this mapping: Assigning negative values for the tem peratures  $T_e$  and/or  $T_o$  m ay appear arti cial in the K ISC, but is perfectly natural in the RDS: For example,  $T_e < 0 \sin ply$  corresponds to a creation  $_{\rm e}$ )=2 > 1=2 which is easily implemented in a rate (1 simulation. In other words, the RDS version is physically m eaningful, and readily accessible, on a much wider param eter space.

 ${\tt TABLE}\ {\tt I:Basic processes}\ {\tt underlying\ the\ K\ ISC}\ ({\tt left})\ {\tt and\ RD\ S}\ ({\tt m\ idd}\ {\tt le})\ {\tt dynam\ ics}$ 

	Spin	ip of site j		Reactions at bonds next to site j	Rates
+	! + +	and + !	+ +	A; ! ; A and ; A ! A;	1=2
	+ + !	+ + + (jeven)		AA ! ;; (jeven)	(1 + <sub>e</sub> )=2
	+ + !	+ + + (j odd)		AA ! ;; (jodd)	(1 + <sub>o</sub> )=2
	+ + + !	+ + (jeven)		;; ! AA (jeven)	(1 <sub>e</sub> )=2
	+ + + !	+ + (jodd)		;; ! AA (jodd)	(1 <sub>o</sub> )=2

# III. COMPLETE SOLUTION OF THE KINETIC SPIN CHAIN

In this section, we can pletely solve the dynam ics of the K ISC. It was shown previously [15] that the generating function, and hence the full distribution P (f g;t), of a broad class of Ising m odels can be computed from two very basic observables, nam ely: (i) the m agnetization, m<sub>j</sub>(t) = h<sub>j</sub>i<sub>t</sub> for arbitrary initial condition, and (ii) a particular two-point equal-time correlation function, c<sub>j,k</sub>(t) = h<sub>j</sub> ki<sub>t</sub>, the resultant from the special initial conditions: m<sub>j</sub>(0) = c<sub>j,k</sub>(0) = 0 (see Appendix A for a more detailed discussion of this statem ent). Here, h<sub>t</sub>i f g P (f g;t) denotes the usual con gurational average. In the follow ing, we assem ble the necessary inform ation about these two observables.

### A. The generalt-dependent m agnetization.

From our earlier work [11], we recall that the magnetization m<sub>j</sub>(t) = h<sub>j</sub>i<sub>t</sub> of the K ISC obeys the equation of motion,  $\frac{d}{dt}$  m<sub>j</sub>(t) =  $\frac{j}{2}$  [n<sub>j 1</sub>(t) + m<sub>j+1</sub>(t)] m<sub>j</sub>(t) which is easily derived from the master equation, Eqn. (2). As shown in [11], the general solution of this linear equation takes the form m<sub>j</sub>(t) =  $_{k}$  M<sub>j,k</sub>(t) m<sub>k</sub>(0); where the \propagator"M<sub>j,k</sub>(t) can be written in term of modie ed Bessel functions of rst kind I<sub>n</sub>(t) [16]:

$$M_{j;k} (t) = e^{t} \frac{j}{k} I_{k j} (t); w \text{ ith } (e_{o})^{1=2} (4)$$

If  $e \circ < 0$ , the propagator becomes M  $_{j;k}$  (t) = i(1)<sup>(k j)=2</sup> j =  $_k j^{=2}e^{t}J_{k j}$  (j t) [11], where  $J_n$  (t) is a Bessel function of the rst kind, with damped oscillatory asymptotic behavior [16]. This translates into an oscillatory decay of the magnetization [11].

# B. A special two-point equal-time correlation function.

The second fundam ental quantity, i.e., the equal-time spin-spin correlation function  $q_{k,j}(t)$ , with k > j, is already known from [11]. For our purposes, it su ces to consider an initial condition with zero m agnetization and zero initial correlations. W ith the boundary condition  $h_{j,k}i_t = 1$  for j = k, this basic correlation depends only

on the distance between the two sites and their parity, (k); (j) 2 fe;og [11]:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} c_{k,j}(t) & c_{k,j}^{(k); (j)}(t) \\ & = \frac{p}{2} \frac{p}{j k} (k j) \frac{Z_{2t}}{0} \frac{d}{2} e & I_{k,j}(j) (5) \end{array}$$

where

$$(_{e} + _{o})=2:$$
 (6)

For long times, these settle into their stationary values [8, 9], independent of initial conditions:

!

$$h_{jk}i_1 \quad q_{k;j}(1) = p_{j1k1} !^{kj};$$
 (7)

where

$$\frac{p}{1+p_{1}^{2}};$$
 (8)

a quantity that reduces to the familiar tanh (J=k<sub>b</sub>T) in the equilibrium Ising chain. The approach to these values is exponential and monotonic, as e<sup>2(1)</sup>tt <sup>3=2</sup>, provided <sub>e o</sub> > 0. However, for <sub>e o</sub> < 0, the approach is oscillatory and damped by e<sup>2tt 3=2</sup> [11]. For later reference, it is convenient to display the parity dependence explicitly. Since translation invariance ensures  $c_{k}^{oe}$ ; (t) =  $c_{k}^{eo}$ ; (t), we need to distinguish three types of correlations. The simplest display, which manifestly show s the underlying symmetries, is

Note that the last factor is of exactly the same form as in the ordinary Ising chain coupled to a single thermal bath, the only di erence being the geom etric mean of the two 's here plays the role of = tanh  $(2J=k_bT)$ . Before turning to the general case, let us rem ind the reader that Eqns. (5) and (9) give the time-dependent correlations only for a system with no initial magnetization and twospin correlations (e.g., a random distribution). In particular, these form s, also used in the next sections, should not be confused with the more general cases considered in Appendix B.

# C. Generating function and general multi-spin correlations.

In this section, starting from our know ledge of  $m_j(t)$  and  $q_{k,j}(t)$ , we compute the generating function of the K ISC, following [15]. By construction, this generating function allows us to nd all correlation functions, subject to arbitrary initial conditions. A few additional technical details are provided in Appendix A.

 $_{Q}$ The generating function is de ned via (f g;t) h  $_{j}(1 + _{j})_{it}$ , where the f  $_{j}$ g are standard G rassmann variables [15, 17]. In the therm odynamic limit, L ! 1, it simplies to

If the initial magnetization and all initial correlations vanish, the average  $h:::i_0$  on the right hand side of Eqn. (10) reduces to unity, and one recovers the bilinear form for (f g;t) which we already reported in [11]. Eqn. (10) is one of the key results of this paper.

Given the generating function, all correlation functions can be obtained by simple di erentiation [11, 15]: h<sub>j1</sub> :::  $j_n i_t = \frac{e^n (f g_j t)}{e_{j_n} \dots e_{j_1}}$ . As an illustration, we compute the equal-time spin-spin correlation functions, for k > j:

$$h_{j,k}i_{t} = \frac{\varrho^{2} (f_{g}t)}{\varrho_{k}\varrho_{j}} = q_{k;j}(t) +$$
(11)

W e emphasize that this is a completely general result, valid for any initial conditions, whether hom ogeneous or inhom ogeneous, translationally invariant or not. The two terms in (11) have simple interpretations. W hile the second term re ects the decay of the initial correlations, the rst provides the buildup to the nal stationary values given above (7). Thus, we see explicitly how the stationary spin-spin correlation function becomes independent of the initial values.

Higher order correlations are can also be evaluated but are rather complex for general initial conditions. For uncorrelated, non-magnetized initial conditions, how ever, they sim plify signi cantly [11]. For example, the 4-point function  $h_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4} i_t$  factorizes into two-point functions, according to h  $_{j_1} \ _{j_2} \ _{j_3} \ _{j_4} \, i_t =$  $c_{j_2}, j_1$  (t) $c_{j_4}, j_3$  (t)  $c_{j_3}, j_1$  (t) $c_{j_4}, j_2$  (t) +  $c_{j_4}, j_1$  (t) $c_{j_3}, j_2$  (t) for je j<sub>1</sub> [11]. Sim ilar factorizations j4 jз hold for all correlations. Their steady-state behavior can be computed directly from the master equation [9] or from the stationary limit of the generating function, (f g; 1) = exp $_{k>j j k} q_{k;j} (1)$ . Thanks to this simple form, the 2n-point correlations factorize into a product of 2-point correlations:  $h_{j_1 j_2} ::: j_{2n 1} j_{2n} i_1 = h_{j_1 j_2} i_1 ::: h_{j_{2n 1} j_{2n}} i_1$ , where  $j_{2n} > j_{2n-1} > \dots > j_2 > j_1$ .

Finally, following Refs [5, 11], we can also derive the unequal-time spin-spin correlation functions  $c_{k,j}$  ( $t^0$ ;t) describing how a spin on site k at time t is correlated with the spin on site j at a later time t +  $t^0$ :

$$Q_{k;j}(t^{0};t) = \bigwedge^{X} M_{j}(t^{0}) h_{k} i_{t}$$

$$= \bigwedge^{X} M_{j;}(t^{0}) Q_{k;}(t) + \bigwedge^{X} M_{k_{1}} i_{1} i_{0} M_{j;}(t^{0}) M_{k_{1};k}(t) M_{i_{1};}(t) M_{k_{1};i}(t) M_{i_{1};k}(t)]$$
(12)

As an illustration of these general results, in Appendix B we speci cally compute the spin-spin correlation functions for general translationally invariant initial conditions.

## IV. CONSEQUENCES FOR A REACTION -D IFFUSION MODEL W ITH ALTERNATING RATES

In this section, our exact results will be translated into the language of the corresponding reaction-di usion model. We rst associate a site  $\uparrow$  on the dual lattice

with every bond (j 1; j) of the original chain. Since the particles of the RDS are identified with domain walls in the spin chain, they obviously reside on the dual lattice. Each site  $\uparrow$  can be occupied by at most one particle, described by an occupation variable  $n_{\uparrow}$  which takes the value 0 (1) if the site is empty (occupied). Since a domain wall involves two neighboring spins, the mapping from spin to particle language is nonlinear, nam ely,  $n_{\uparrow} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & j & 1 & j \end{bmatrix}$ . As before, we seek the probability, P (fng;t), to nd con guration fing at time t, and its averages: the local particle density  $\uparrow$ (t)  $n_{\uparrow}i_{t}$ 

 $f_{ng} n_{\uparrow} \hat{P}$  (fng;t) and the m-point correlation functions,

 $n_{n_1} n_{n_1} ::: n_{n_m} \not \to fng;t$ ). To simplify  $hn_{\uparrow_1}$  ::: $n_{\uparrow_m}$   $i_t$ notation, we continue to denote averages by h \_i for both spins and occupation variables, even though they are controlled by di erent statistical weights, P (f g;t) and P (fng;t), respectively. In each case, it should be perfectly clear from the context which distribution is relevant. The dynamics of our model is characterized by symmetric di usion of particles (with rate 1=2) and pair annihilation/creation of particles with spatially alternating rates (1  $_{i}$ )=2. In this case, the two particles are created on the (dual lattice) sites  $\uparrow$  and  $\uparrow$  + 1, by ipping a spin on the (original lattice) site j. Since j can be positive or negative, subject only to 1 j 1 for all j, two very distinct behaviors em erge: (i) when both e and o are positive (corresponding to positive \tem peratures" in the spin m odel), the annihilation process always occurs with a larger rate than the creation process, irrespective of whether j is even or odd; (ii) when, e.g.,  $_{\circ}$  is negative and  $_{e}$  positive, the system displays a mild site-dependent frustration: at even sites j (i.e.,  $\uparrow$  even and  $\uparrow$  + 1 odd) annihilation is more likely than creation, whereas the situation is reversed on odd sites (where  $\uparrow$  odd and  $\uparrow$ + 1 even). As we will see shortly, this gives rise to oscillatory dynam ics.

Before diving into the details, some further remarks on physical realizations of this model are in order. When the rates are uniform (e = o), it is well known that such an RDS describes the dynamics of photo-excited solitons in conjugated polymers or linear chain com pounds. MX chain compounds,  $\mathbb{P}t(en)_2$ ] $\mathbb{P}t(en)C_2$ ] $Y_4$ , where Y stands for  $C IO_4$  or  $BF_4$  and (en) for enthylenediam ine, are of particular experim ental interest [12, 13]. In these compounds, photogenerated solitons are so longlived that they can be experim entally studied. Irradiation with continuous wave (non-pulsed) blue light generates soliton-antisoliton pairs which can di use apart or annihilate. Their static and dynam ic properties are in quantitative agreem ent with theoretical models [4, 18]. Since creation, annihilation, and hopping rates can be controlled by tuning the laser power, we believe that spatially alternating rates such as ours will be generated if an M X chain compound is exposed to a spatially modulated light intensity.

R etuming to ourm odel, our goal in this section is rst, to derive all correlation functions from our exact solution of the K ISC. We will also comment on the validity of a sim plem ean-eld theory which is widely used for the homogeneous ( $_{e} = _{o}$ ) case [18, 19]. Further, we show that particle hops in the RDS develop a peculiar directional preference in the steady state, even though there is no explicit bias in the rates, boundary or initial conditions. Finally, we illustrate how oscillatory behaviorsm ay result from a competition of the underlying processes.

## 5

### A. Density of particles in the RDS

The observable of m ost im m ediate interest is the average density of particles,  $\uparrow$  (t), in the RDS. Its equation of m otion can be derived easily from the associated m aster equation, resulting in:

$$2\frac{d}{dt} \uparrow (t) = (2 \quad j \quad j \quad 1) + (j \quad 1 \quad \uparrow \quad 1 \quad (t) \\ + \quad j \quad \uparrow \quad 1 \quad (t)) \quad (4 \quad j \quad j \quad 1) \quad \uparrow (t) \\ 2 \quad [j \quad h \quad \uparrow \quad h \quad \uparrow \quad 1 \quad i_t \quad + \quad j + 1 \quad h \quad h \quad \uparrow \quad h \quad i_t \quad ] \quad (13)$$

It is worthwhile noting that this equation is the rst member of an in nite hierarchy, connecting low er-order correlations to higher-order ones. In general, such hierarchies cannot be solved directly, without recourse to crude approximations. Here, the mapping to the spin chain develops its full power, allow ing us to compute all correlation functions for the RDS.

The mapping from spins to particles implies that  $\uparrow$  (t)  $\ln \uparrow i = \frac{1}{2} [1 \quad h_{j-1-j}i_t]$ , so that we can just turn to Eqn. (11) to read o the answer. To express it fully in RDS language, we also need to translate the initial correlations,  $h_k \sim i_0$ . For k < `and any t (including t = 0), we may write  $h_k \sim i_t = h_k k_{k+1-k+1-k+2} ::: \cdot_1 \sim i_t = h(1 \quad 2n_{\hat{k}+1}) (1 \quad 2n_{\hat{k}+2}) ::: (1 \quad 2n_{\hat{\lambda}})i_t [18, 20]$  whence we obtain, for arbitrary initial condition:

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2} f1 \quad c_{j;j \ 1} (t)g$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\hat{k} < \hat{\gamma}} h(1 \quad 2n_{\hat{k}+1}) (1 \quad 2n_{\hat{k}+2}) ::: (1 \quad 2n_{\hat{\gamma}})i_{0}$$

$$M_{k;j \ 1} (t)M_{\gamma;j} (t) \quad M_{k;j} (t)M_{\gamma;j \ 1} (t)] \quad (14)$$

Since the <code>\propagators" M  $_{\rm i;j}$ (t)</code> decay exponentially as t ! 1 , the steady-state density is independent of initial conditions and spatially uniform :

(1) 
$$_{j}(1) = \frac{1}{2} \quad 1 \quad \frac{p_{--}}{e_{0}} ! : (15)$$

In Appendix B, we explicitly evaluate Eqn. (14) for a generic but simple initial condition, characterized by a uniform, uncorrelated initial distribution of particles, with density (0). For simplicity, we discuss only its longtime limit here, for (0) = 1=2. We observe two distinct kinds of behaviors:

(i) W hen  $_{e \circ} > 0$ , the stationary density of particles is approached exponentially fast [except when  $_{e \circ} = _{o \circ} =$ 

1, see (B15)], with inverse relaxation-time 2(1 ), and a subdom inant power-law prefactor t  $^{3=2}$ :

(t) = 
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 1  $-\frac{2}{0} \frac{2}{2t} \frac{d}{d} = I_1(0)$   
(1) +  $\frac{t}{2} \frac{3^{3-2}e^{-2(1-t)t}}{2(1-t)}$ : (16)

This long-time behavior is very similar to that found in the usual ( $_{e} = _{o} \in 1$ ) pair di usion, annihilation, and creation process AA ;; [4, 18].

(ii) For  $_{\circ e} < 0$ , we observe a competition between the di erent processes. For example, when 1  $_{\circ} < 0$  and  $0 < _{e}$  1, the annihilation (creation) reaction dom – inates on even (odd) sites. As a result, the stationary density is reached exponentially fast with damped oscillations:

$$(t) = \frac{1}{2} \quad 1 \quad \frac{Z_{2t}}{1 \quad j_{0}} = J_{1}(0) \quad (17)$$

$$' (1) e^{2t} \frac{\sin(2jt}{4}) + j\cos(2jt)}{4(1+jf)t}$$

For initial densities other than 1=2, as shown in Appendix B, only the am plitude, or the subdom inant powerlaw prefactor, of the expressions (16, 17) change. Since they depend on allparam eters of the model, including the initial density, the dynam ics is manifestly nonuniversal.

## B. Two-point correlation functions of the RDS

A deeper understanding of the tim e-dependent spatial structures of our RDS is provided by the m-point correlation functions,  $hn_{\uparrow_1} ::: n_{\uparrow_m} i_t$  of such a model. These are related to the correlation functions of the dual spin chain, via  $hn_{\uparrow_1} ::: n_{\uparrow_m} i_t = 2^m h(1)$ ji 1 ji) **:::(**1  $i_{m-1}$   $i_{m}$  )  $i_{t}$ , and are therefore exactly known. It is interesting to note that the m-point correlation function for the RDS is a superposition of all 2n-point correlation functions for the spin chain, with n = 1;2; ...; m. In the following, we focus on the most directly observable correlation, namely, the two-point function. To avoid unnecessary technical com plications which add little insight, we speci cally consider a system that is initially hom ogeneously half-lled with A particles, without any initial correlations:  $\uparrow(0) = 1=2$  and  $hn_{\uparrow}(0)n_{c}(0)i = 1=4$ , for  $\uparrow \in \hat{k}$ . Such an initial con guration corresponds, in the K ISC picture, to a system with initially neither magnetization nor correlations. In this case, as we showed in [11], the generating function takes a rather sim ple bilinear form which simplies the spin-spin correlations.

W ith this initial condition, both the spin chain and the RDS are translationally invariant, modulo period 2. As a result, the two-point correlations  $C_{\hat{k}} \stackrel{(\hat{k});}{\uparrow}(t) = \ln_{\uparrow}n_{\hat{k}}i_t$  between two sites  $\uparrow$  and  $\hat{k}$  (with  $\hat{k} > \uparrow$ ) depend only on the distance  $\hat{k} \uparrow \uparrow$  and the parity ( $\hat{k}$ ); ( $\uparrow$ ) 2 fe;og of the two sites. We therefore need to distinguish four distinct correlation functions:  $C_{\hat{k}} \stackrel{e}{\uparrow}(t), C_{\hat{k}} \stackrel{e}{\uparrow}(t), C_{\hat{k}} \stackrel{e}{\uparrow}(t)$ , and  $C_{\hat{k}} \stackrel{o}{\uparrow}(t)$ . By virtue of our mapping to the K ISC, these are determ ined by the 2- and 4-point spin correlations as explained in Section III.C [from Eqns. (9) and (10)]. Exploiting translational invariance, the two-point correlations for the RDS, for  $\hat{k} > \uparrow$ , then follow as:

$$hn_{\uparrow}n_{\hat{k}}i_{t} = \frac{1}{4}^{h}(1 - c_{1}^{eo}(t))^{2} - h_{jk}i_{t}^{2}$$

$$-\frac{1}{4}h_{j1}k_{t}h_{jk}l_{t};$$
 (18)

Now we are ready to discuss our results. First of all, we consider a special case, namely, nearest-neighbor correlations. If  $\hat{k} = \uparrow + 1$ , Eqn. (18) reduces to

$$\ln_{\uparrow} n_{\uparrow+1} i_{t} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1 - 2c_{1}^{e^{\circ}}(t) + c_{2}^{o^{\circ}}(t)}{4} = C_{1}^{o^{e}}(t); \uparrow even \\ \frac{1 - 2c_{1}^{e^{\circ}}(t) + c_{2}^{e^{e}}(t)}{4} = C_{1}^{e^{\circ}}(t); \uparrow odd \end{cases}$$
(19)

A gain, we should emphasize that the quantities  $c_n^{eo}(t)$ ,  $c_n^{ee}(t)$  and  $c_n^{oo}(t)$  which appear in this section are the spin correlations for a particular initial condition (cf. Eqn. (9)), in contrast to the more general correlations computed in Appendix B.

It is interesting to note that, generically,  $C_1^{oe}(t) \in C_1^{eo}(t)$ . Of course, after a little thought this becomes less surprising, since  $\ln_{\uparrow}n_{\uparrow+1}i_t$  involves the 4-spin correlation  $h_{j-1-j-j+1}i_t = h_{j-1-j+1}i_t$ . So, if  $\uparrow$  is odd (even), both j 1 and j+1 are even (odd), leading to a contribution of  $c_2^{ee}(t)$  vs.  $c_2^{oo}(t)$ , respectively.

For the general case, when  $\hat{k}$  and  $\uparrow$  are not nearest neighbors, this di erence between  $C_{\hat{k}}^{eo} \uparrow(t)$  and  $C_{\hat{k}}^{oe} \uparrow(t)$  does not persist. If  $\hat{k}$  is even and  $\uparrow$  is odd, we nd:

$$C_{\hat{k}}^{eo}(t) = \frac{1}{4}^{h} (1 c_{1}^{eo}(t))^{2} [c_{k}^{eo}_{j}(t)]^{2}^{i} + \frac{1}{4} c_{k}^{ee}_{j+1}(t) c_{k}^{oo}_{j-1}(t)$$
(20)

and for  $\hat{k}$  odd and  $\uparrow$  even, one obtains

$$C_{\hat{k}}^{\circ e} \uparrow (t) = \frac{1}{4}^{h} (1 c_{1}^{e\circ} (t))^{2} [c_{k}^{e\circ} j(t)]^{2} + \frac{1}{4} c_{k}^{o\circ} j_{j+1} (t) c_{k}^{ee} j_{j-1} (t)$$
(21)

Thanks to the simple relation between even-even and odd-odd spin correlations, Eqn. (9), the two right-hand sides are now identical.

A similar line of reasoning shows that  $C_{\hat{k}}^{ee} \uparrow (t) = C_{\hat{k}}^{oo} \uparrow (t)$  for arbitrary separation  $\hat{k} \uparrow$ . Invoking the two-spin correlations again, we may write

$$C_{\hat{k}}^{ee} \uparrow (t) = C_{\hat{k}}^{oo} \uparrow (t)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4}^{h} (1 c_{1}^{eo} (t))^{2} c_{k}^{oo} j (t) c_{k}^{ee} j (t) + c_{k}^{eo} j (t) c_{k}^{eo} j (t)$$

$$(22)$$

In the following, we discuss the consequences of these results. We rst consider the steady state. Recalling our previous analysis of the spin correlations, Eqn. (7), the stationary limit of the density-density correlations becomes very simple: Provided  $\hat{k} \uparrow > 1$ , we nd  $C_{\hat{k}} \uparrow^{(\hat{k})}$ ;  $(\uparrow)$  (1) =  $\frac{1}{4} (1 c_1^{eo}(1))^2 = {}^2(1)$ . In other words, the two-point correlations of non-nearest-neighbor sites factorize into one-point functions, independent of parity. This kind of mean-eld-like behavior

is typical of free ferm ion system s [4, 18]. However, the nonequilibrium nature of this model still in poses its signature. Turning to the nearest-neighbor correlations, we

nd that this simple factorization no longer holds { except in the special case where  $_{e} = _{o}$ . More specially, we nd

$$C_1^{\text{oe}}(1) = {}^2(1) {}^2_{\text{e}} {}^2_{\text{o}} {}^2_{\frac{1}{4}} {}^2$$
 (23)

and

$$C_1^{eo}(1) = {}^2(1) + {}^2_e {}^2_o {}^2_{\frac{1}{4}}$$
 (24)

Considering, e.g.,  $0 < {}_{\circ} < {}_{e}$ , we nd that  $C_1^{\circ\circ}(1)$  is enhanced over the mean-eld result while  $C_1^{\circe}(1)$  is suppressed. This can be understood easily: Since  ${}_{\circ} < {}_{e}$  implies  $T_e < T_o$ , energetically costly spin ips occurm one frequently on odd sites j, creating a particle pair on the nearest-neighbor dual sites  $(\uparrow + 1; \uparrow)$ . Clearly, these sites form an (e; o) pair. Moreover, the rate for pair annihilation is lower on (e; o) sites. Hence, particle pairs are more likely to reside on (e; o) than on (o; e) sites. This also implies that (e; o) sites act as net particle sources, while (o; e) sites function as sinks [10]. Not surprisingly, therefore, we nd  $C_1^{\circ\circ}(1) > C_1^{\circ\circ}(1)$ . By virtue of this reasoning, it is also immediately apparent that this difference can only persist for nearest-neighbor correlations. The same argument holds for  ${}_{\circ} < 0 < {}_{e}$ .

A direct consequence of  $C_1^{oe}(t) \in C_1^{eo}(t)$  is the presence of a peculiar directional preference in the RDS. If we consider a particle on site  $\uparrow$ , we can ask for the average rate,  $R_{\uparrow}(t)$ , with which it will jump to the left (i.e., to site  $\uparrow$  1) vs to the right, de ned as  $R_{\uparrow}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \ln_{\uparrow}(1 n_{\uparrow+1}) n_{\uparrow}(1 n_{\uparrow+1}) t_{t}$ . Here, the rst (second) term is the average rate for a particle on site  $\uparrow$  to jump to site  $\uparrow+1$  ( $\uparrow$  1). In our case, one m ight expect this di erence to vanish since neither bulk rates nor boundaries in pose a directional bias. M oreover, to avoid a potential bias at t = 0, we start from a translationally invariant initial condition with (0) = 1=2 . Yet, since  $R_{\uparrow}(t) / C_1^{oe}(t)$ 

$$R_{\uparrow}(t) = \begin{cases} 8 & h & 1 \\ \frac{1}{8}h^{1} & \frac{-}{e}c_{2}^{ee}(t) , \uparrow even \\ \frac{1}{8}h^{2} & \frac{-}{e}c_{2}^{ee}(t) , \uparrow odd : \end{cases}$$
(25)

which even persists in the steady state:

$$R_{\uparrow}(1) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ e &$$

Speci cally, for  $_{\circ} < _{e}$ , particles on an even (odd) site jump preferentially to the right (left). Of course, this directional preference vanishes as soon as  $_{e} = _{\circ}$ . Moreover, even when it is nonzero, it does not generate a mass current. Counting the net ow of particles between sites  $\uparrow$  and  $\uparrow$ + 1, the natural de nition of such a current is  $J_{\uparrow}(t) = \frac{1}{2}h(1 \quad n_{\uparrow})n_{\uparrow+1} \quad n_{\uparrow}(1 \quad n_{\uparrow+1})i_{t}$ . Clearly, t! 1. Let us conclude this section with a few brief remarks about the validity of the mean-eld approximation for this system. We already noted that it does not predict the nearest-neighbor correlations correctly, except in the specialcase  $_{e} = _{o}$ . We now show that it also generically misses the stationary density.

exhibits nonzero transients for nite times but decays as

We begin by recalling Eqn. (13). Seeking a translationally invariant (modulo 2) solution with  $_{2\uparrow}(t) = _{e}(t)$ ,  $_{2\uparrow+1}(t) = _{\circ}(t)$  for all  $\uparrow$ , the mean-eld approximation corresponds to truncating two-point functions:  $\ln_{\uparrow}(t)n_{\uparrow-1}(t)i' = _{e}(t) \circ (t)$ . Starting from a uniform initial density (0), we nd  $_{e}(t) = _{\circ}(t) = _{M}(t)$ , with

$${}_{M F}(t) = \frac{p[(0) m] m[(0) p]e^{t^{\frac{p}{4}} \frac{p}{4(e^{+} o)^{2}}}}{(0) m+[(0) p]e^{t^{\frac{p}{4}} \frac{q}{4(e^{+} o)^{2}}}},$$

where

$$p_{pm} = \frac{1}{2} 1 \frac{2}{e^{+} \circ} \frac{p}{e^{+} \circ} \frac{p}{e^{+} \circ}$$

The stationary limit is clearly MF (1) = p which differs from our exact result, Eqn. (15), except if  $_{\rm e}$  =  $_{\rm o}$ . In other words, the remarkable accuracy [18, 19] of the mean-eld approximation for the stationary state of the uniform system ( $_{\rm e}$  =  $_{\rm o}$ ) appears to be an \accident" due to the fact that when rates are uniform the steady state is a product measure. We also note that the exact relaxation time to the steady state,  $_{\rm exact}$  =  $\left[2 \quad \frac{P}{e \ o}\right]^{-1}$ , does not coincide with the mean-eld prediction, MF =  $\left[\frac{P}{4} \quad (e + \ o)^2\right]^{-1}$ . For such dynamic quantities, the exact and the approximate results di er for any choice of  $_{\rm e}$  and  $_{\rm o}$ . In particular, the mean-eld theory always predicts an exponential decay to the steady state, com pletely missing the possibility of oscillatory behavior.

# V . SOLVABILITY AND RELATIONSHIP W ITH FREE FERM ION SYSTEMS

The crucial ingredient for the solvability of the K ISC is the quadratic spin dependence of its G lauber-like kinetics. Thanks to this simple form, the hierarchy of equations for the correlation functions is closed: to solve the equations for the N -spin correlation functions, one needs to know only m -point correlations with m n.

In RDS language, the dynam ics of the particles can be rewritten as a free ferm ion model, by dening a suitable quadratic (but non-Hermitian)  $\$  stochastic Ham iltonian". Following standard methods [3, 4, 18, 21], we can rewrite the master equation for the RDS as a form al imaginary-time Schrödinger equation: (d=dt) p (t) i = H p (t) i. The Ham iltonian H is constructed by associ-

The key to the solvability of this Schrodinger equation lies in the bilinear dependence of the Ham iltonian on the Paulim atrices. This is due to the fact that the spin-ip rates (1) implicitly ful 11 the free ferm ion constraint [3, 4, 18]. In RDS language, this condition requires that the sum of the particle di usion rates equal the sum of the (local) annihilation and creation rates, i.e., 1=2+1=2=(1+i)=2+(1)<sub>i</sub>)=2 with j 2 fe;og in our case. If this relation is violated, H includes quartic term s, of the form RDS can no longer be solved exactly. It can, of course, be simulated, and for those cases investigated so far, it appears that the quartic term s are irrelevant for the longtime dynamics [4, 19]. It is also worth noting that the free ferm ion constraint is not particularly arti cial: the simplest models for photogenerated solitons in MX chain com pounds satisfy it quite naturally [12].

Here we decided to invoke generating function techniques instead of diagonalizing (27). In our view this is the most convenient and system atic approach to solve simultaneously both the K ISC and RDS, for two reasons. First, the free-ferm ion approach requires various technical steps (e.g. introduction of so-called pseudo-ferm ion operators and a Bogoliubov-like transform ation) which make the general treatment rather involved, especially for arbitrary initial conditions [4, 18]. Further, the diagonalization of (27) yields only correlation functions with an even number of spins (see Section III and IV); the calculation of correlations involving an odd number of spins requires a dual transform ation of (27) into a new stochastic H am iltonian which must also be diagonalized [20].

Let us also mention that dam ped oscillatory decay has been observed before in certain reaction-di usion models [3]. However, those models, and hence the physical mechanisms leading to the oscillations, are completely di erent from ours. As an example, a di usion-limited fusion model [3] is de ned by three processes: (i) biased di usion: A; !; A with rate D (1 + ),; A ! A; with rate D (1 ) (with 0 < D); (ii) biased fusion: AA !; A with rate D (1 + 2), AA ! A; with rate D (1 2); and (iii) hom ogeneous pair production: ;; ! AA , with rate D. With this special choice of rates, the equation of motion for the density closes and becom es solvable. In order to observe oscillatory decay of the particle density, the initial condition must be inhom ogeneous. For a hom ogeneous initial condition, the density decays exponentially. In contrast, the equation in our reaction-di usion model does not close, and the oscillatory behavior is generic: it occurs for any initial condition, inhom ogeneous or not.

#### VI. CONCLUSIONS.

To sum marize, we have presented a full exact solution for the dynamics of a non-equilibrium Ising spin chain, with arbitrary initial condition. The model is characterized by a generalization of G lauber dynamics: spins on even/odd sites are coupled to alternating temperatures,  $T_e$  and  $T_o$ . We obtain all correlation functions from a generating functional. As an illustration, we have discussed the equal-time and the two-time spin-spin correlation functions.

Identifying dom ain walls in the spin system with particles on the dual lattice, the model can also be interpreted as a reaction-di usion system . Particles are created and annihilated in pairs; the rates for these processes alternate from even to odd sites. This mapping opens up an interesting extension of parameter space: while negative tem peratures are unphysical for the spin chain, the corresponding rates are perfectly natural in the context of the RDS. By expressing particle-particle correlations as superpositions of spin-spin correlation functions, the RDS becom es exactly soluble. This is not entirely trivial since the BBGKY [22] hierarchy for the RDS is not closed: its solution is far from obvious unless one recognizes the connection to the spin chain.

For  $0 < e_{0}$ , energetically favorable spin ips always dom inate over unfavorable ones, irrespective of whether they occur on even or odd sites. In RDS language, pair annihilation is always more probable than pair creation. As a consequence, we nd that all quantities decay exponentially to their steady-state values. In contrast, for  $e_{0} < 0$ , we observe (dam ped) oscillatory behavior. Its origin can be traced to a competition of pair creation and annihilation on even vs odd sites on the original lattice: If, say,  $o_{0} < 0$ , then pair creation dom inates over annihi

lation on odd sites while the relation is reversed on the even sites. Hence, a given initial particle density may rst decrease, due to annihilation processes and then recover, as the available empty sites are (partially) led again by the strong creation process, and so on, until the stationary density is reached.

Remarkably, even in the absence of any bias in the rates, boundary or initial conditions, particles still \know" the di erence between right and left: For, e.g.,  $_{o} < _{e}$ , particles on even (odd) sites jump preferentially to the right (left). Even though this directional preference does not lead to a system atic particle current, it is still som ew hat surprising. How ever, once we recall that particles are most often created (annihilated) on pairs of neighboring sites, with the odd site on the left (right), we recognize that the directional preference is simply a response to this density gradient. Since exact solutions, especially of a full nonequilibrium dynamics are rare, we hope that our model can serve as a testing ground for various generalizations or approximations. The features reported here { exponential decays, damped oscillations, and directional preference { should be generic for a whole class of genuine out-of-equilibrium models. Moreover, they should be experimentally observable in M X chain compounds exposed to spatially modulated laser light.

A cknow ledgm ents: It is a pleasure to acknow ledge fruitful discussions with I. Georgiev, H. Hilhorst, J.R. He in, and U.C. Tauber. M.M. acknow ledges the support of Swiss NSF Fellow ship No. 81EL-68473. This work was also partially supported by U.S. NSF DMR-0088451, 0308548 and 0414122.

### APPENDIX A: THE DERIVATION OF THE GENERATING FUNCTION

In this appendix we provide some details for the derivation of the generating function (10), which is one of the key results of this work. We follow A liev's work and notation [15]. A liev established that the generating functions of a very general class of disordered G lauber-Ising spin chains, including our case, can form ally be expressed in terms of two functions M<sub>j,k</sub> (t) and two additional quantities W<sub>j,k</sub> (t), which depend in a very involved fashion on M<sub>k;j</sub> (t). Below, we will see that these quantities are closely related to physical observables, namely, the magnetization and the two-point correlations. Here, we follow A liev by noting that the Laplace transform of M<sub>j,k</sub> is the inverse of an L L band matrix (s + 1)1  $\frac{1}{2}$ U. For our case, the entries of this matrix can be taken from the rates and read explicitly (L is even):

$$(s+1)\mathbb{1} \quad \frac{1}{2}U = (s+1)_{2j}_{1;k} \quad \frac{\circ}{2}(_{2j}_{1;k}_{1}+_{2j}_{1;k+1}); \quad (1 < j = L=2)$$

$$(s+1)\mathbb{1} \quad \frac{1}{2}U = (s+1)_{2j;k} \quad \frac{e}{2}(_{2j;k}_{1}+_{2j;k+1}) \quad (1 = j < L=2)$$

$$(s+1)\mathbb{1} \quad \frac{1}{2}U = (s+1)_{1;k} \quad \frac{\circ}{2}(_{2;k}_{2;k}_{k;L})$$

$$(s+1)\mathbb{1} \quad \frac{1}{2}U = (s+1)_{L;k} \quad \frac{\circ}{2}(_{L-1;k}_{1;k}) \quad (A1)$$

G iven (A1), it is easy to evaluate the inverse of  $[(s + 1)1 \frac{1}{2}U]_{j;k}$ :

$$\hat{M}_{k;j} = \frac{1}{L} \frac{r}{j} \frac{e^{i(k-j)}}{s+1} \frac{e^{i(k-j)}}{s+1} ;$$
(A2)

where  $\frac{1}{n} = \frac{(2n-1)}{L}$  and  $\frac{2}{L}$ , with n = 1;2; :::;L. In the therm odynam ic lim it L ! 1, the two quantities  $\hat{M}_{ik}^{+}$  and  $\hat{M}_{ik}$  coincide whence we simply have

$$\hat{M}_{k;j}! \hat{M}_{k;j} = \frac{r - \frac{z}{k}}{j} \frac{d}{2} \frac{e^{i(k-j)}}{s+1} cos :$$
(A3)

Taking the inverse Laplace transform of (A 3), we recover Eqn. (4) for the propagator.

Since the W<sub>j,k</sub> (t) can be expressed in terms of the M<sub>j,k</sub> (t), we may immediately conclude that W<sub>j,k</sub> (t) ! W<sub>j,k</sub> (t) as L ! 1. A coording to A liev, W<sub>j,k</sub> (t) is simply the two-point correlation function, h<sub>j k6j</sub>i<sub>t</sub>, for a particular initial condition, namely, m<sub>j</sub>(0) = 0 and h<sub>j k6j</sub>i<sub>0</sub> = 0. For our case, these correlations were given in Eqn.(5).

For readers fam iliar with A liev's work [15], these remarks llin the gaps between A liev's form aland general analysis and the special case we are interested in here. It follows that the generating function of our K ISC adm its the compact and explicit representation of Eqn. (10) which encodes the complete dynam ics of the system.

## APPENDIX B:TRANSLATIONALLY -INVARIANT IN IT IAL CONDITIONS:THE SPIN -SPIN CORRELATION FUNCTIONS AND THE PARTICLE DENSITY

In Section IIIB, we have derived an exact expression, Eqn. (11), for the spin-spin correlation functions of our K ISC, valid for arbitrary initial conditions. Here, we impose a natural restriction, namely, translational invariance, on the initial conditions. Thanks to the symmetry, Eqn. (11) simplies considerably, as we will show now.

As we already pointed out in [11], for translationally invariant initial conditions, we only need to consider the correlations between spins at two even sites, two odd sites, and one even, one odd site. We denote these by  $c_{2n}^{ee}$  (t)  $h_{2, 2(1+n)}i_t$ ,  $c_{2n}^{oo}$  (t)  $h_{2, 1, 2, 1+2n}i_t$ ,  $c_{2n}^{eo}_1$  (t)  $c_{2n}^{eo}_1$  (t)  $h_{2, 2(1+n)}i_t$ ,  $c_{2n}^{oo}_2$  (t)  $h_{2, 1, 2}$ ,  $h_{2n}i_t$ ,  $c_{2n}^{eo}_1$  (t)  $h_{2, 2(1+n)}i_t$ ,  $h_{2, 2(1+n)}i$ 

Let us recall from [11] that in the translationally-invariant case the quantities  $a_{2n}$  (t)  $\frac{1}{2} \left[ e_{2n}^{o\circ}(t) + e_{2n}^{ee}(t) \right]; a_{2n-1}(t) = c_{2n-1}^{eo}(t), \text{ obey the following simple equation: } \frac{d}{dt}a_j = 2a_j + [a_{j-1} + a_{j+1}]; j > 0 \text{ with the initial condition } a_0(t) = and (e_{j+1}) = 2. The equations of motion of the K ISC [11] also give the following relationships among the correlators: <math>c_{2n}^{o\circ}(t) = \frac{e_{j+1}}{e_{j+1}} + c_{2n}^{o\circ}(0) = \frac{e_{j+1}}{e_{j+1}} + c_{2n}^{o\circ}(0) = \frac{e_{j+1}}{e_{j+1}} + c_{2n}^{o\circ}(0) = \frac{e_{j+1}}{e_{j+1}} + c_{2n}^{o\circ}(0) = \frac{e_{j+1}}{e_{j+1}} + c_{j+1}^{o\circ}(0) = \frac{e$ 

The explicit expressions for the correlators follow from (11), or by the methods of images directly from  $a_n(t) = a_n(1) + e^{2t^2} a_n(0) a_m(1)$  of  $a_n(1) = 1$ ,  $a_n$ 

$$c_{2n}^{ee}(t) = -\frac{e}{o}c_{2n}^{oo}(t) - \frac{e}{o}c_{2n}^{oo}(0) - c_{2n}^{ee}(0) = e^{-2t}$$

$$= \frac{a_{2n}(1)}{o} + \frac{e^{-2t}X}{o} [a_{2m}(0) - a_{2m}(1)] - I_{2(n-m)}(2, t) - I_{2(n+m)}(2, t)$$

$$+ \frac{e^{-2t}X}{o} [c_{2m}^{eo} - 1(0) - c_{2m-1}^{eo}(1)] - I_{2(n-m)+1}(2, t) - I_{2(n+m)-1}(2, t)$$

$$= \frac{e^{-2t}}{2} (e^{-2t}C_{2n}^{oo}(0) - e^{-2t}C_{2n}^{ee}(0)) :$$
(B1)

Following the same steps for  $c_{2n-1}^{eo} = c_{2n-1}^{oe}$ , we obtain, for (n > 0):

$$c_{2n 1}^{eo}(t) = c_{2n 1}^{eo}(1) + e^{2t} \begin{bmatrix} c_{2m 1}^{eo}(0) & c_{2m 1}^{eo}(1) \end{bmatrix} I_{2(n m)}(2t) I_{2(n+m 1)}(2t) + \frac{e^{2t} X}{m > 0} \\ \left[ a_{2m}(0) & a_{2m}(1) \end{bmatrix} I_{2(n m) 1}(2t) I_{2(n+m) 1}(2t) :$$
(B2)

The expressions (B1)-(B2) illustrate that the time-dependence of the spin-spin correlation function depends non-trivially on the initial condition, and we may therefore anticipate non-universal behavior. Of course, when  $_{e} = _{o}$ , the expressions (B1), (B2) coincide with those obtained by G lauber [5].

An interesting situation occurs when, say,  $_{\circ}$  is negative while  $0 < _{e}$  1, so that = ij j. Then, we have  $I_{2n}$  (2ij j) = (1)<sup>n</sup> J<sub>2n</sub> (2j j) and  $I_{2n-1}$  (2ij j) = i(1)<sup>n</sup> J<sub>2n-1</sub> (2j j), where  $J_n$  (x)  $_{0}$   $\frac{dq}{dc} \cos (x \sin q - nq)$  is the Bessel function of rst kind [16]. Further, when = ij j the expressions (B1), (B2) become:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2n}^{ee}(t) &= -\frac{e}{\circ}c_{2n}^{o\circ}(t) & -\frac{e}{\circ}c_{2n}^{o\circ}(0) & c_{2n}^{ee}(0) & e^{-2t} \\ &= -\frac{a_{2n}(1)}{j_{\circ}j} & \frac{e^{-2t}X}{j_{\circ}j_{m-0}} [a_{2m}(0) & a_{2m}(1)](1)^{n+m} & J_{2(n-m)}(2j_{\circ}) & J_{2(n+m)}(2j_{\circ}) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{j j e^{-2t}}{j_{\circ} j} \sum_{m > 0}^{X} [c_{2m}^{e^{\circ}} \ _{1}(0) \ c_{2m}^{e^{\circ}} \ _{1}(1)](1)^{n+m} \ _{J_{2}(n-m)+1}(2j j) + J_{2}(n+m) \ _{1}(2j j)$$

$$\frac{e^{-2t}}{2_{\circ}} (e^{c_{2n}^{\circ}}(0) \ _{\circ}c_{2n}^{e^{\circ}}(0)):$$
(B3)

$$c_{2n 1}^{eo}(t) = c_{2n 1}^{eo}(1) + e^{2t} X_{m > 0}^{Eo}(t) + e^{2t} I_{2m 1}^{eo}(0) + I_{2m 1}^{eo}(1) I_{2m 1}^{(n+m)} J_{2(n-m)}(2jt) + J_{2(n+m-1)}(2jt) + J$$

In the long-time limit, these expressions exhibit a dam ped oscillatory approach to the stationary state.

We now turn to the equivalent RDS. As we have seen in Section IV A , the density of particles is related to the nearest-neighbor spin correlations,  $c_1^{eo}$ , according to  $(t) = \frac{1}{2} (1 c_1^{eo}(t))$ . Here, our goal is to determ ine the long-time behavior of this density for a hom ogeneous (but otherwise arbitrary) initial concentration of particles (0). In this respect, the expressions (B2) and (B4) are not very practical as they involve in nite sum s of Bessel functions. At this point, for further convenience, it is useful to introduce four auxiliary functions de ned as follows (with 0 1):

F<sub>2</sub>(;t)   

$$X = 2^{m} e^{2t} fI_{2m-1} (2 t) I_{2m+1} (2 t)g = 2^{2} \frac{dq}{0} e^{2t(1 \cos q)} \frac{\sin 2q \sin q}{1 + 4 2^{2} \cos 2q}$$
 (B6)

To establish these expressions, we have invoked the integral representation of the Bessel functions [16] and the properties of geometric series. W ith these functions and the help of Eqn. (14), the density of particles in the RDS m odel can now be recast in compact form. Two cases emerge naturally:

W hen  $_{e o} > 0$ :

(t) 
$$(1) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ F_1(!;t) + F_2(!;t) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ F_1(1 - 2 (0);t) + -F_2(1 - 2 (0);t) \right]$$
 (B9)

W hen  $_{e o} < 0$ :

(t) 
$$(1) = \frac{1}{2jj} [G_2(1 \ 2 \ (0);t) \ iG_1(!;t)] \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{jj} G_2(!;t) + G_1(1 \ 2 \ (0);t)$$
 (B10)

The case  $_{e o} = 0$  is special and gives rise to a purely exponential time-dependence:

$$(t) = \frac{2}{2} + \frac{2}{4} + (0) e^{2t}$$
(B11)

We now proceed with the analysis of the long-time behavior of these expressions. Again, we rst consider the case where  $_{e o} > 0$  and then  $_{e o} < 0$ .

W hen  $_{e o} > 0$ , the main contribution to the long-time behavior arises from the small q contribution in the expression of the functions  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Therefore, one may expand the integrand of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  in Eqn. (B9). It is also essential to pay due attention to the initial condition:

1. W hen 0 <  $_{\rm e~o}$  < 1 and 0 < (0) < 1 (also (0)  $\clubsuit$  (1 )), we obtain

(t) (1) 
$$\frac{1}{4} = \frac{!}{(1 ! 2)} = \frac{1 + -f1 2 (0)g + 2 (0)^2}{(0) (1 (0))} = \frac{e^{2(1 )t}}{t^{p} - t}$$
: (B12)

2.W hen  $0 < e_o < 1$  and (0) = 0, we nd

(t) (1)' 1+ 
$$-\frac{!}{(1 ! 2)} \frac{1}{t} \frac{e^{2(1 )t}}{4^{p} t}$$
: (B13)

3. When  $0 < e_{0} < 1$  with (0) = 1, we have

(t) (1)' 1 - + 
$$\frac{!}{(1 ! 2)} \frac{1}{t} \frac{e^{2(1 )t}}{4 t}$$
: (B14)

These results show that for  $e_0 > 0$ , the density generically approaches its stationary value as / t  $^{3=2}e^{2(1)}$ , with some nontrivial amplitude. Only if the lattice is initially completely empty/occupied by particles, the long-time behavior is modiled to / t  $^{1=2}e^{2(1)}t$  (provided -6 1).

4. The case where  $_{e} = _{o} = = 1$  is critical and we can check from (B9) that one recovers the previously known results [4, 18]:

(t) (1) 
$$\frac{p}{2^{p}-1}$$
: (B15)

In this case, it is well known [4, 18] that the density of particles approaches the steady state algebraically slow ly (/ t  $^{1=2}$ ). For = 1 (only pair annihilation), the stationary value is (1) = 0; in contrast, we nd (1) = 1 for = 1 (only pair creation). We emphasize that for such a critical dynam ics neither the dynam ical exponent nor the amplitude of (B15) depend on the initial condition.

W hen  $_{e o} < 0$ , it is dicult to directly analyze the long-time behavior of the oscillating function G<sub>1</sub> and G<sub>2</sub>; instead, we seek upper and lower bounds for  $\epsilon$  1. We observe that the denominator of the integrand in the expressions for G<sub>1</sub> and G<sub>2</sub> can be bounded as follows:  $(1 \ ^2)^2 \ (1 + \ ^4 + 2 \ ^2 \cos 2q) \ (1 + \ ^2)^2$ . Therefore, we obtain for the auxiliary functions G<sub>1</sub> and G<sub>2</sub>:

$$\frac{1}{1+2} = \frac{e^{2t} J_1(2jt)}{2jt} \quad G_1(t) = \frac{(1+2)}{(1-2)^2} = \frac{e^{2t} J_1(2jt)}{2jt}$$
(B16)

$$2 \frac{1}{1+2} = \frac{2}{2j \pm} \frac{e^{-2t} J_2(2j \pm)}{2j \pm} = G_2(jt) = 2 \frac{1}{1-2} = \frac{2}{2j \pm} \frac{e^{-2t} J_2(2j \pm)}{2j \pm};$$
(B17)

If = 1, one has the exact expressions:  $G_1(1;t) = G_1(1;t) = e^{2t} J_0(2j t)$ ;  $G_2(1;t) = G_2(1;t) = \frac{e^{2t}}{2j t} J_1(2j t)$ : At long times and for nite n,  $e^{2t} J_n(2j t)$ ,  $\frac{e^{-2t}}{j t} \cos 2j t \frac{1}{4}(2n + 1)$  and therefore the upper and lower bounds in Eqns. (B16) and (B17) display the same time-dependence. With the help of Eqn.(B10), we thus deduce:

1. W hen 0 < (0) < 1 (and obviously  $(0) \in (1)$ ),

(t) (1)' 
$$t^{3=2}e^{2t}$$
 A cos 2j  $t + \frac{1}{4}$  + B cos 2j  $t - \frac{1}{4}$ ; (B18)

where A and B are some amplitudes depending nontrivially on all the parameters of the system and on the initial density.

2. W hen (0) = 1, we obtain an explicit expression for the long-time behavior of the density:

(t) (1) 
$$\frac{e^{2t}}{2} J_0(2jt) \frac{e^{2t}}{2t} \cos 2jt \frac{1}{4}$$
 (B19)

3. When (0) = 0, we also have an explicit expression for the long-time behavior of the density:

(t) (1)' 
$$\frac{e^{2t}}{2} J_0(2jt)' \frac{e^{2t}}{2jt} \cos 2jt + \frac{3}{4}$$
: (B20)

These results show that, for  $e_0 < 0$ , the density displays oscillations which are damped by a factor t  $e^{2t}$ , where = 3=2 for generic initial densities (0), with two exceptions: we have = 1=2 if the system is initially completely empty or occupied.

O f course, following the same approach one would be able to compute every n point correlation functions, for both, the KISC and RDS.W hile perfectly straightforward, these computations become rather tedious.

- [1] B. Schm ittm ann and R K P. Zia, Statistical mechanics of driven di usive system s. In: Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena , Vol. 17, ed. by C. Domb and JL. Lebow itz (A cadem ic Press, New York 1995); D. M ukam el, Phase transitions in non-equilibrium system s, In: Soft and Fragile M atter: Nonequilibrium Dynamics, M etastability and Flow, eds.M E. Cates and M R. Evans (IO P Publishing, Bristol, 2000).
- [2] Nonequilibrium StatisticalMechanics in OneDimension, edited by V. Privman (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
- [3] G.M. Schutz, Integrable stochastic many-body system s. In: Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, Vol. 19, ed.by C.Domb and J.Lebowitz (A cademic Press, London, 2000).
- [4] A.A. Lushnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP 64, 811 (1986); M.D. Grynberg, T.J. Newm an and R.B. Stinchcombe, Phys. Rev.E 50, 957, (1994); M.D.Grynberg and R.B. Stinchcombe, Phys.Rev.Lett. 74, 1242 (1995); M.D.Grynberg and R.B. Stinchcombe, Phys.Rev.E 52, 6013 (1995); M.D.Grynberg and R.B. Stinchcombe, Phys.Rev.E 52, 6013 (1995); M.D.Grynberg and R.B. Stinchcombe, Phys.Rev.Lett. 76, 851 (1996); P.A. Bares and M. Mobilia, Phys.Rev. E 59, 1996 (1999); P.A. Bares and M. Mobilia, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 5214 (1999); S.-C. Park, J.-M. Park and D.K im, Phys.Rev.Lett.85, 892 (2000); P.A. Bares and M. Mobilia, Phys. Rev.Lett. 85, 893 (2000).
- [5] R.J.G lauber, J.M ath. Phys. 44, 294 (1963).
- [6] Z.Racz, Phys.Rev.Lett. 55, 1707 (1985).
- [7] F.Fam ily and J.G.Am ar, J.Stat. Phys. 55, 1235 (1991).
- [8] Z.Racz and R.K.P.Zia, Phys.Rev.E 49, 139 (1994).
- [9] B. Schm ittm ann and F. Schmuser, Phys. Rev. E 66, 046130 (2002).
- [10] F.Schmuser and B.Schm ittm ann, J.Phys. A 35, 2569

(2002).

- [11] M. Mobilia, R.K. P. Zia and B. Schm ittm ann, J. Phys. A 37, L407 (2004).
- [12] N.Kuroda, M.Nishida, Y.Tabata, Y.W akabayashiand K.Sasaki, Phys. Rev. B 61, 11217 (2000).
- [13] N. Kuroda, Y. W akabayashi, M. Nishida, N. W akabayashi, M. Yam ashita, and N. M atsushita, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2510 (1997); N. Kuroda, Y. Tabata, M. Nishida, and M. Yam ashita Phys. Rev. B 59, 12973 (1999); Y. Tabata and N. Kuroda, Synth. M et. 101, 329 (1999); Y. Tabata and N. Kuroda, Phys. Rev. B 61, 3085 (2000); H. Tanaka, K. M arum oto, S. Kuroda and M. Yam ashita, Synth. M et. 101, 135 (2003).
- [14] R.Kroon, H.Fleurent and R.Sprik, Phys. Rev. E 47, 2462 (1993); R.Kopelman, C.S.Li, and R.Sprik, J. Lum in. 45, 40 (1990).
- [15] M . A . A liev, Physica A 277, 261 (2000).
- [16] M .A bram ow itz and I.Stegun, H andbook of M athem atical Functions (D over, NY, 1965).
- [17] C. Itzykson and J.M. Drou e, Statistical eld theory. Vol. 1 (C am bridge University Press, C am bridge 1989).
- [18] M. Mobilia, Phys. Rev. E 65, 046127 (2002); M. Mobilia and P.-A. Bares, Phys. Rev. E 63, 056112 (2001); M. Mobilia, PhD Thesis EPFL N. 2552 (April 2002).
- [19] J.R.G.M endoca and M.J.de O liveira, J.Stat.Phys. 78, 1429 (1998).
- [20] J.E.Santos, J.Phys.A 30, 3249 (1997).
- [21] B.U.Felderhof, Rep. M ath. Phys. 1, 215 (1971), and 2, 151 (1971).
- [22] N. N. Bogoliubov, Studies in Statistical Mechanics, edited by J. de Boer and E. Uhlenbeck (North-Holland Publishing, Am sterdam 1962), Vol. 1.