# Anomalous fluctuations in one dimensional interacting systems

Joint with Júlia Komjáthy and Timo Seppäläinen

Márton Balázs

University of Bristol

Sheffield, 28 November, 2013.

#### The models

Asymmetric simple exclusion process Zero range Bricklayers

#### Hydrodynamics

Characteristics

Tool: the second class particle

Single Many second class particles

Results

Normal fluctuations Abnormal fluctuations

#### Proof

Upper bound Lower bound Microscopic concavity/convexity



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.


Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.



Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution;  $\omega_i = 0$  or 1.

Particles try to jump

to the right with rate p, to the left with rate q = 1 - p < p.

The jump is suppressed if the destination site is occupied by another particle.

The Bernoulli( $\varrho$ ) distribution is time-stationary for any ( $0 \le \varrho \le 1$ ). Any translation-invariant stationary distribution is a mixture of Bernoullis.





























#### AZRP ABLP

## The asymmetric zero range process








































Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [\mathbf{r}(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [\mathbf{r}(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + \mathbf{r}(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .


Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .



Poisson-type distribution;  $\omega_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

a brick is added with rate  $p \cdot [r(\omega_i) + r(-\omega_{i+1})]$ a brick is removed with rate  $q \cdot [r(-\omega_i) + r(\omega_{i+1})]$ .
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i - 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} + 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i + 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with rate  $p(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$ ,

with rate 
$$q(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$$
, where

 p and q are such that they keep the state space (ASEP, ZRP),

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i - 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} + 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i + 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with rate  $p(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$ ,

with rate 
$$q(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$$
, where

- p and q are such that they keep the state space (ASEP, ZRP),
- *p* is non-decreasing in the first, non-increasing in the second variable, and *q* vice-versa (attractivity),

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i - 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} + 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i + 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with rate  $p(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$ ,

with rate 
$$q(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$$
, where

- p and q are such that they keep the state space (ASEP, ZRP),
- *p* is non-decreasing in the first, non-increasing in the second variable, and *q* vice-versa (attractivity),
- they satisfy some algebraic conditions to get a product stationary distribution for the process,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i - 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} + 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega_i \\ \omega_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_i + 1 \\ \omega_{i+1} - 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with rate  $p(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$ ,

with rate 
$$q(\omega_i, \omega_{i+1})$$
, where

- p and q are such that they keep the state space (ASEP, ZRP),
- *p* is non-decreasing in the first, non-increasing in the second variable, and *q* vice-versa (attractivity),
- they satisfy some algebraic conditions to get a product stationary distribution for the process,
- they satisfy some regularity conditions to make sure the dynamics exists.











 $h_{Vt}(t)$  = height as seen by a moving observer of velocity V. = net number of particles passing the window  $s \mapsto Vs$ .

(Remember: particle current=change in height.)

- ... is the properties of  $h_{Vt}(t)$  under the time-stationary evolution.
  - ► E(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t)) = t · E(growth rate) is easily computed with martingales.

- ... is the properties of  $h_{Vt}(t)$  under the time-stationary evolution.
  - ► E(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t)) = t · E(growth rate) is easily computed with martingales.
  - ► Law of Large Numbers:  $\frac{h_{Vt}(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \to \infty]{} \mathbf{E}(\text{growth rate})$  by ergodicity arguments.

- ► E(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t)) = t · E(growth rate) is easily computed with martingales.
- ► Law of Large Numbers:  $\frac{h_{Vt}(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \to \infty]{} \mathbf{E}(\text{growth rate})$  by ergodicity arguments.
- Var(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t))? That is, time-order and scaling limit? Central Limit Theorem, if relevant at all?

- ► E(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t)) = t · E(growth rate) is easily computed with martingales.
- ► Law of Large Numbers:  $\frac{h_{Vt}(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \to \infty]{} \mathbf{E}(\text{growth rate})$  by ergodicity arguments.
- Var(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t))? That is, time-order and scaling limit? Central Limit Theorem, if relevant at all?
- Distributional limit of h<sub>Vt</sub>(t) in the correct scaling?

- ► E(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t)) = t · E(growth rate) is easily computed with martingales.
- ► Law of Large Numbers:  $\frac{h_{Vt}(t)}{t} \xrightarrow[t \to \infty]{} \mathbf{E}(\text{growth rate})$  by ergodicity arguments.
- Var(h<sub>Vt</sub>(t))? That is, time-order and scaling limit? Central Limit Theorem, if relevant at all?
- Distributional limit of h<sub>Vt</sub>(t) in the correct scaling?

The *density*  $\varrho := \mathbf{E}(\omega)$  and the *hydrodynamic flux*  $H := \mathbf{E}[$ growth rate] both depend on a parameter of the stationary distribution.

The *density*  $\varrho := \mathbf{E}(\omega)$  and the *hydrodynamic flux*  $H := \mathbf{E}[$ growth rate] both depend on a parameter of the stationary distribution.

•  $H(\varrho)$  is the hydrodynamic flux function.

The *density*  $\varrho := \mathbf{E}(\omega)$  and the *hydrodynamic flux*  $H := \mathbf{E}$ [growth rate] both depend on a parameter of the stationary distribution.

- $H(\varrho)$  is the hydrodynamic flux function.
- If the process is *locally* in equilibrium, but changes over some *large scale* (variables X = εi and T = εt), then

 $\partial_T \varrho(T, X) + \partial_X H(\varrho(T, X)) = 0$  (conservation law).

The *density*  $\varrho := \mathbf{E}(\omega)$  and the *hydrodynamic flux*  $H := \mathbf{E}$ [growth rate] both depend on a parameter of the stationary distribution.

- $H(\varrho)$  is the hydrodynamic flux function.
- If the process is *locally* in equilibrium, but changes over some *large scale* (variables X = εi and T = εt), then

 $\partial_T \varrho(T, X) + \partial_X H(\varrho(T, X)) = 0$  (conservation law).

► The characteristics is a path X(T) where *e*(T, X(T)) is constant.

$$\partial_T \varrho + \partial_X H(\varrho) = 0$$

$$\partial_{\mathcal{T}} \varrho + \partial_{\mathcal{X}} H(\varrho) = 0$$
  
$$\partial_{\mathcal{T}} \varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{\mathcal{X}} \varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \partial_{X} H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}T} \varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \partial_{X} H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = \frac{d}{dT} \varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \partial_{X} H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = \frac{d}{dT} \varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \partial_{X} H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = 0 \quad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\partial_{T} \varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X} \varrho = \frac{d}{dT} \varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

So,  $\dot{X}(T) = H'(\varrho) = : C$  is the *characteristic speed*.

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \partial_{X}H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = \frac{d}{dT}\varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

So,  $X(T) = H'(\varrho) = : C$  is the characteristic speed. If  $H(\varrho)$  is convex or concave, then the Rankine-Hugoniot speed for densities  $\rho$  and  $\lambda$  is

$$R=rac{H(\varrho)-H(\lambda)}{arrho-\lambda}.$$

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \partial_{X}H(\varrho) = 0$$
  

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = \frac{d}{dT}\varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

So,  $X(T) = H'(\varrho) = : C$  is the characteristic speed. If  $H(\rho)$  is convex or concave, then the Rankine-Hugoniot speed for densities  $\rho$  and  $\lambda$  is

$$R=\frac{H(\varrho)-H(\lambda)}{\varrho-\lambda}.$$

This would be the speed of a shock of densities  $\rho$  and  $\lambda$ .

$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \partial_{X}H(\varrho) = 0$$
  
$$\partial_{T}\varrho + H'(\varrho) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = 0 \qquad \text{(while smooth)}$$
  
$$\partial_{T}\varrho + \dot{X}(T) \cdot \partial_{X}\varrho = \frac{d}{dT}\varrho(T, X(T)) = 0$$

So,  $\dot{X}(T) = H'(\varrho) = : C$  is the *characteristic speed*. If  $H(\varrho)$  is convex or concave, then *the Rankine-Hugoniot speed* for densities  $\varrho$  and  $\lambda$  is

$$R=\frac{H(\varrho)-H(\lambda)}{\varrho-\lambda}.$$

This would be the speed of a shock of densities  $\rho$  and  $\lambda$ .

$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$

Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$

Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$

Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



$$C = H'(\varrho)$$

$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$

Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



 $R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



$$C = H'(\varrho) > R = rac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

 $R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$





 $C = H'(\varrho)$ 

$$R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$$
# Characteristics (very briefly)

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$C = H'(\varrho)$$
  $R = rac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$ 

 $R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

 $C = H'(\varrho)$ 

# Characteristics (very briefly)

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$C = H'(\varrho) < R = rac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

<

 $R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

 $C = H'(\varrho)$ 










































































States  $\omega$  and  $\omega$  only differ at one site.

Growth on the left: rate > rate with rate-rate:

























Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

 $\mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Q}(t)) = C \cdot t$ 

in the whole family of processes.

 $C = H'(\varrho)$ 

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

 $\mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Q}(t)) = C \cdot t$ 

in the whole family of processes.

C is the characteristic speed.

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

 $\mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Q}(t)) = C \cdot t$ 

in the whole family of processes.

*C* is the characteristic speed.

The second class particle follows the characteristics, people have known this for a long time.

$$C = H'(\varrho)$$
 <  $R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

 $\mathsf{E}(\mathsf{Q}(t)) = C \cdot t$ 

in the whole family of processes.

*C* is the characteristic speed.

The second class particle follows the characteristics, people have known this for a long time.

 $C = H'(\varrho) = EQ/t$   $< R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 









<







<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 







 $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 















<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 









 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<



















<





<


























<

 $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ 

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 







<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 







 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 





<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 





<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<



 $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 





 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$  $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$  $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$  $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 


$C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 





 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 





 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<

 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$ 



<



 $C = H'(\rho) = EQ/t$  $R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ <



#### Picture:

The position X(t) of  $\uparrow^0$  follows the Rankine-Hugoniot speed *R*.





#### Picture:

The position X(t) of  $\uparrow^0$  follows the Rankine-Hugoniot speed R.

 $C = H'(\rho) = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{Q}/t$ < **E** $X/t = R = [H(\rho) - H(\lambda)]/(\rho - \lambda)$ 

#### Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



Recall 
$$C = H'(\varrho) > R = rac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

#### Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



Recall 
$$C = H'(\varrho) > R = \frac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$
  
Do we have  $Q(t) \stackrel{?}{\geq} X(t)$ 

#### Convex flux (some cases of AZRP, ABLP):



Recall  $C = H'(\varrho) > R = \frac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$ Do we have  $Q(t) \stackrel{?}{\geq} X(t)$  - tight error

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$C = H'(\varrho) < R = rac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$C = H'(\varrho) < R = \frac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$
  
Do we have  $Q(t) \stackrel{?}{\leq} X(t)$ 

#### Concave flux (ASEP, AZRP):



$$C = H'(\varrho) < R = \frac{H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)}{\varrho - \lambda}$$
  
Do we have  $Q(t) \stackrel{?}{\leq} X(t) + \text{tight error}$ 







 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 







 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <
























 $C = H'(\varrho) = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{Q}/t$ <  $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 





 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <







 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <





 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <





 $\mathbf{E}X/t = R = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = R = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

















 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 







 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ <



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 



 $\mathbf{E}X/t = \mathbf{R} = [\mathbf{H}(\varrho) - \mathbf{H}(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 


















































 $C = H'(\varrho) = EQ/t$   $< EX/t = R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 









#### Microscopic convexity/concavity

We say that a model has the microscopic convexity property, if there is such a three-process coupling by which  $Q(t) \ge X(t)$ -tight error can be achieved.

$$C = H'(\varrho) = EQ/t$$
  $< EX/t = R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

#### Microscopic convexity/concavity

We (almost) say that a model has the microscopic convexity property, if there is such a three-process coupling by which  $Q(t) \ge X(t)$ -tight error can be achieved.

$$C = H'(\varrho) = EQ/t$$
  $< EX/t = R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

# Microscopic convexity/concavity

We (almost) say that a model has the microscopic convexity property, if there is such a three-process coupling by which  $Q(t) \ge X(t)$ -tight error can be achieved.

We (almost) say that a model has the microscopic concavity property, if there is such a three-process coupling by which  $Q(t) \le X(t)$ +tight error can be achieved.

$$C = H'(\varrho) = EQ/t$$
  $< EX/t = R = [H(\varrho) - H(\lambda)]/(\varrho - \lambda)$ 

#### Normal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property,

#### Normal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, Theorem (Ferrari-Fontes (ASEP); B. (TAZRP, TABL))



# Normal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, Theorem (Ferrari-Fontes (ASEP); B. (TAZRP, TABL))



Initial fluctuations are transported along the characteristics on this scale.

#### Abnormal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property,

#### Abnormal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, On the characteristics V = C,

Theorem (B. - Komjáthy - Seppäläinen (ASEP, WASEP, exponential concave TAZRP, exponential convex TABLP so far...))

$$0 < \liminf_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} \leq \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} < \infty.$$
# Abnormal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, On the characteristics V = C,

Theorem (B. - Komjáthy - Seppäläinen (ASEP, WASEP, exponential concave TAZRP, exponential convex TABLP so far...))

$$0 < \liminf_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} \leq \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} < \infty$$

Important preliminaries were Cator and Groeneboom 2006, B., Cator and Seppäläinen 2006.

# Abnormal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, On the characteristics V = C,

Theorem (B. - Komjáthy - Seppäläinen (ASEP, WASEP, exponential concave TAZRP, exponential convex TABLP so far...))

$$0 < \liminf_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} \le \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} < \infty.$$

Important preliminaries were Cator and Groeneboom 2006, B., Cator and Seppäläinen 2006.

Other exclusion processes: Quastel and Valkó 2007.

# Abnormal fluctuations:

Once we have the microscopic convexity/concavity property, On the characteristics V = C,

Theorem (B. - Komjáthy - Seppäläinen (ASEP, WASEP, exponential concave TAZRP, exponential convex TABLP so far...))

$$0 < \liminf_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} \le \limsup_{t \to \infty} \frac{\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))}{t^{2/3}} < \infty.$$

Important preliminaries were Cator and Groeneboom 2006, B., Cator and Seppäläinen 2006.

Other exclusion processes: Quastel and Valkó 2007.

There is a huge literature now on limit distribution results, using combinatorial and asymptotic analytic tools.









































































































































#### Proof: many second class particles



Second class particle current: difference in growth.

### Proof: many second class particles



Second class particle current: difference in growth.

### Proof: many second class particles



Second class particle current: difference in growth.

 $P{Q(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

#### Micro conc.: Q(t) < X(t) + tight error

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\leq \mathbf{P}$ {too many 's have crossed *Ct*}

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\leq \mathbf{P}$ {too many 's have crossed Ct}

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}\}.$ 

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

$$\leq \mathbf{P}$$
{too many 's have crossed  $Ct$ }

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ .

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

$$\leq \mathbf{P}$$
{too many 's have crossed  $Ct$ }

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

$$\leq \mathbf{P}$$
{too many 's have crossed  $Ct$ }

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}(\lambda)\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

$$\leq \mathbf{P}$$
{too many  $\uparrow$ 's have crossed  $Ct$ }

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}(\lambda)\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

Optimize "too large( $\lambda$ )" in  $\lambda$ ,

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\leq \mathbf{P}$ {too many is have crossed Ct}

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}(\lambda)\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

Optimize "too large( $\lambda$ )" in  $\lambda$ , use Chebyshev's inequality and relate **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ) to **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ).

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\leq \mathbf{P}$ {too many is have crossed Ct}

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too } large(\lambda)\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

Optimize "too large( $\lambda$ )" in  $\lambda$ , use Chebyshev's inequality and relate **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ) to **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ).

The computations result in (remember E(Q(t)) = Ct)

$$\mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)).$$

Micro conc.: Q(t) < X(t) + tight error

 $\mathbf{P}{\mathbf{Q}(t) \text{ is too large}} \le \mathbf{P}{X(t) \text{ is too large}}$ 

 $\leq \mathbf{P}$ {too many 's have crossed Ct}

 $\leq \mathbf{P}\{h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t) \text{ is too large}(\lambda)\}.$ 

Centering  $h_{Ct}(t) - h_{Ct}(t)$  brings in a second-order Taylor-expansion of  $H(\varrho)$ . This is another point where concavity of the flux matters.

Optimize "too large( $\lambda$ )" in  $\lambda$ , use Chebyshev's inequality and relate **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ) to **Var**( $h_{Ct}(t)$ ).

The computations result in (remember E(Q(t)) = Ct)

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)).$$

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))$$

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

 $\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) = c \cdot \mathsf{E}|\frac{\mathsf{Q}(t)}{\mathsf{Q}(t)} - C \cdot t|$ 

in the whole family of processes.

$$\mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathbf{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))$$

$$EQ(t) = Ct$$

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

$$\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) = c \cdot \mathbf{E}|\mathbf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t|$$

in the whole family of processes.

Hence proceed with

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{E}|\mathsf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t|$$

EQ(t) = Ct

$$\mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{Var}(h_{Ct}(t))$$

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

$$\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) = c \cdot \mathbf{E} |\mathbf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t|$$

in the whole family of processes.

Hence proceed with

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \geq u\} &\leq c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{E}|\mathsf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t| \\ \mathsf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathsf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \leq c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{E} \end{split}$$

 $\begin{array}{l} \underset{\mathbf{Q}(t)}{\text{with } \widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t) := \mathbf{Q}(t) - Ct \text{ and } E := \mathbf{E} |\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)|. \\ \mathbf{P} \{ \mathbf{Q}(t) - Ct \ge u \} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) \\ \end{array}$ 

Theorem (B. - Seppäläinen; also ideas from B. Tóth, H. Spohn and M. Prähofer)

Started from (almost) equilibrium,

$$\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) = c \cdot \mathbf{E}|\mathbf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t|$$

in the whole family of processes.

Hence proceed with

$$\begin{split} \mathsf{P}\{\mathsf{Q}(t) - Ct \geq u\} &\leq c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{E}|\mathsf{Q}(t) - C \cdot t| \\ \mathsf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathsf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \leq c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot \mathsf{E} \end{split}$$

with  $\widetilde{Q}(t) := Q(t) - Ct$  and  $E := \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{Q}(t)|$ .  $\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{Q}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$  Upper bound We had  $\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E.$ 

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

# Upper bound We had $\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$ . $E = \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \, \mathrm{d}u$

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

# Upper bound We had $\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$ . $E = \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \, \mathrm{d}u$ $= E \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v$

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

Upper bound We had  $\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E.$   $E = \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \, \mathrm{d}u$   $= E \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v$  $\le E \int_{1/2}^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v + \frac{1}{2}E$ 

$$\mathsf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathsf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

Upper bound We had  $\mathbf{P}\{|\mathbf{Q}(t)| > u\} < c \cdot \frac{t^2}{t^4} \cdot E$ .  $E = \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| = \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \, \mathrm{d}u$  $= E \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v$  $\leq E \int_{1/2}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v + \frac{1}{2}E$  $\leq \mathbf{c}\cdot\frac{t^2}{E^2}+\frac{1}{2}E,$ 

that is,  $E^3 \leq c \cdot t^2$ .

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

Upper bound We had  $\mathbf{P}\{|\mathbf{Q}(t)| > u\} < c \cdot \frac{t^2}{t^4} \cdot E$ .  $E = \mathbf{E}|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \, \mathrm{d}u$  $= E \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v$  $\leq E \int_{1/2}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > vE\} \, \mathrm{d}v + \frac{1}{2}E$  $\leq \mathbf{c}\cdot\frac{t^2}{E^2}+\frac{1}{2}E,$ that is,  $E^3 < c \cdot t^2$ .  $\operatorname{Var}(h_{Ct}(t)) \stackrel{\mathsf{Thm}}{=} \operatorname{const.} \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{Q}(t) - Ct]$ 

$$= \text{ const.} \cdot E \leq c \cdot t^{2/3}.$$

$$\mathbf{P}\{|\widetilde{\mathbf{Q}}(t)| > u\} \le c \cdot \frac{t^2}{u^4} \cdot E$$

#### Lower bound

#### In the upper bound, the relevant orders were

$$u$$
 (deviation of  $Q(t)$ ) ~  $t^{2/3}$ ,  $\varrho - \lambda \sim t^{-1/3}$ .

The lower bound works with similar arguments: compare models of which the densities differ by  $t^{-1/3}$ , and use connections between Q(t), X(t) and heights.

#### Lower bound

In the upper bound, the relevant orders were

$$u$$
 (deviation of  $Q(t)$ ) ~  $t^{2/3}$ ,  $\varrho - \lambda \sim t^{-1/3}$ .

The lower bound works with similar arguments: compare models of which the densities differ by  $t^{-1/3}$ , and use connections between Q(t), X(t) and heights.

The critical feature in both the upper bound and lower bound was microscopic convexity/concavity:  $Q(t) \ge X(t)$  (convex) or  $Q(t) \le X(t)$  (concave).

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP			

Model	<u> Н(</u> <u></u> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave		

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)			

<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
concave		
	H(ϱ) is concave concave	$H(\varrho)$ isMicro c.?concave $Q(t) \leq X(t)$ concave

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved ( <mark>BS</mark> .)
	I.	I	I

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP			
Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
--------------	--------------------------	------------------------	----------------------
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave		

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP			

<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved ( <mark>BK</mark> .)
concave		
	<i>H</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is concave concave concave	$H(\varrho)$ isMicro c.?concave $Q(t) \leq X(t)$ concave $Q(t) \leq X(t)$ +Errconcave $Q(t) \leq X(t)$ concave $Q(t) \leq X(t)$

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
	1		

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP			

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex		

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved ( <mark>BKS.</mark> )
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	t <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	proved (BKS.)

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved ( <mark>BKS</mark> .)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	proved ( <mark>BKS.</mark> )
less concave/convex rate (T)AZRP, (T)ABLP			

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	proved (BKS.)
less concave/convex rate (T)AZRP, (T)ABLP	concave/ convex		

Model	<u> </u>	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	proved (BKS.)
less concave/convex rate (T)AZRP, (T)ABLP	concave/ convex	??	

Model	<i>Η</i> ( <i>ϱ</i> ) is	Micro c.?	<i>t</i> <sup>2/3</sup> law
TASEP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BS.)
ASEP (WASEP)	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BS.)
rate 1 TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \leq X(t)$	proved (BK.)
concave exp rate TAZRP	concave	$Q(t) \le X(t) + Err$	proved (BKS.)
convex exp rate TABLP	convex	$Q(t) \ge X(t) - Err$	proved (BKS.)
less concave/convex rate (T)AZRP, (T)ABLP	concave/ convex	??	??



<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.









 $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) = [\text{the label of } \uparrow \text{ at } \mathbf{Q}(t)] = 0$  $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) \le 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(t) \le X(t).$ 



<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.



<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.











<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.


















































































<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.











<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.






























<u>Goal</u>: to understand Q(t) on the background process of the t's.

 $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) = [\text{the label of } \uparrow \text{ at } \mathbf{Q}(t)] = \oplus 1$  $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) \le 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(t) \le X(t).$ 

> ↑ ≜-1↑<sup>0</sup>

**^**-2



<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>

 $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) = [\text{the label of } \uparrow \text{ at } \mathbf{Q}(t)] = -1$  $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) \le 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(t) \le X(t).$ 



 $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) = [\text{the label of } \uparrow \text{ at } \mathbf{Q}(t)] = -1$  $m_{\mathsf{Q}}(t) \le 0 \Rightarrow \mathbf{Q}(t) \le X(t).$ 



This process  $m_Q(t)$  is influenced by the background, and is pretty complicated in general.

This process  $m_Q(t)$  is influenced by the background, and is pretty complicated in general.

In the cases we succeeded so far,  $m_Q(t)$  behaved nicely:

This process  $m_Q(t)$  is influenced by the background, and is pretty complicated in general.

In the cases we succeeded so far,  $m_Q(t)$  behaved nicely:

► Either m<sub>Q</sub>(t) ≤ 0 a.s. (TASEP, Rate 1 TAZRP); deterministicly adorable!

This process  $m_Q(t)$  is influenced by the background, and is pretty complicated in general.

In the cases we succeeded so far,  $m_Q(t)$  behaved nicely:

- ► Either m<sub>Q</sub>(t) ≤ 0 a.s. (TASEP, Rate 1 TAZRP); deterministicly adorable!
- Or  $m_Q(t) \stackrel{d}{\leq}$  Geometric (ASEP, concave exponential rate TAZRP,  $\stackrel{d}{\geq}$  –Geometric for convex exponential rate TABLP); behaves like a drifted simple random walk.

This process  $m_Q(t)$  is influenced by the background, and is pretty complicated in general.

In the cases we succeeded so far,  $m_Q(t)$  behaved nicely:

- ► Either m<sub>Q</sub>(t) ≤ 0 a.s. (TASEP, Rate 1 TAZRP); deterministicly adorable!
- ► Or  $m_Q(t) \stackrel{d}{\leq}$  Geometric (ASEP, concave exponential rate TAZRP,  $\stackrel{d}{\geq}$  –Geometric for convex exponential rate TABLP); behaves like a drifted simple random walk.

This is the form of microscopic concavity we currently use:  $m_Q(t)$  is dominated by a time-independent distribution with finite variance.

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations.

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations. Drifted random walk only wants to cross the origin occasionally, hence the geometric bound.

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations. Drifted random walk only wants to cross the origin occasionally, hence the geometric bound.

If we drop "exponentially", we loose the uniform bound. Then  $m_Q(t)$  starts behaving like a diffusion.

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations. Drifted random walk only wants to cross the origin occasionally, hence the geometric bound.

If we drop "exponentially", we loose the uniform bound. Then  $m_Q(t)$  starts behaving like a diffusion. Diffusion in the random environment of second class particles!

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations. Drifted random walk only wants to cross the origin occasionally, hence the geometric bound.

If we drop "exponentially", we loose the uniform bound. Then  $m_Q(t)$  starts behaving like a diffusion. Diffusion in the random environment of second class particles!

We don't yet see the techniques to bound this diffusion in the order of magnitude our arguments would require.

The exponentially convex/concave rates make it possible to separate the drift of  $m_Q(t)$  from the background process: the drift has a uniform lower bound for all background configurations. Drifted random walk only wants to cross the origin occasionally, hence the geometric bound.

If we drop "exponentially", we loose the uniform bound. Then  $m_Q(t)$  starts behaving like a diffusion. Diffusion in the random environment of second class particles!

We don't yet see the techniques to bound this diffusion in the order of magnitude our arguments would require.

Once this is done, we could proceed with less and less convex/concave models to see how  $t^{1/3}$  scaling turns to  $t^{1/4}$  for linear models (random average process, linear rate AZRP)...

Thank you.