Dependent Double Branching Annihilating Random Walk

Joint with Attila László Nagy

Márton Balázs

University of Bristol

SPA 2014, 29 July, 2014.

Non-attractivity and the second class particle

A mean field model

Positive recurrence

Two words on the proof

Conservative IPS Think e.g. zero range:



































































The second class particle: attractive case

States ω and ω only differ at one site.

































































































A single discrepancy t, the second class particle, is conserved.




















































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













































We are facing a

- nearest neighbour
- parity conserving
- branching
- annihilating process
- on the dynamic background of first class particles.

The aim is to control the number of \dagger and \downarrow 's. Idea from Bálint Tóth.

→ homog2.avi



































































































































































A model we can say something about:



Jump with annihilation: flip (voting)
A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:



A model we can say something about:





Jump with annihilation: flip (voting)





Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

A model we can say something about:



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

Double branching-annihilating random walks (DBARW)



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

- Double branching-annihilating random walks (DBARW)
- t's and \'s always alternate;

A model we can say something about:



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

- Double branching-annihilating random walks (DBARW)
- is and is always alternate;
- their algebraic sum is constant in time.

A model we can say something about:



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

- Double branching-annihilating random walks (DBARW)
- is and is always alternate;
- their algebraic sum is constant in time.
- Nothing is monotone.

A model we can say something about:



Branching with annihilation: exclusion

- Double branching-annihilating random walks (DBARW)
- t's and is always alternate;
- their algebraic sum is constant in time.
- Nothing is monotone.

Question: Is the process, as seen by the leftmost t, recurrent?



First instance of DBARW we could find in the literature: A. Sudbury '90. Positive recurrence: V. Belitsky, P.A. Ferrari, M.V. Menshikov and S.Y. Popov '01; A. Sturm and J.M. Swart '08. *Results are very sensitive to the details of branching.*



First instance of DBARW we could find in the literature: A. Sudbury '90. Positive recurrence: V. Belitsky, P.A. Ferrari, M.V. Menshikov and S.Y. Popov '01; A. Sturm and J.M. Swart '08. *Results are very sensitive to the details of branching.*

But: true second class particles interact (*common background of first class particles*).



First instance of DBARW we could find in the literature: A. Sudbury '90. Positive recurrence: V. Belitsky, P.A. Ferrari, M.V. Menshikov and S.Y. Popov '01; A. Sturm and J.M. Swart '08. *Results are very sensitive to the details of branching.*

But: true second class particles interact (*common background of first class particles*).

→→ Repeat the Sturm-Swart proof with configuration dependent jump rates. Jump rates can depend on the whole configuration.

Conditions on the jumping and branching rates:

Translation invariance.

- Translation invariance.
- Uniform lower bound on jumping rates: no particles are stuck.

- Translation invariance.
- Uniform lower bound on jumping rates: no particles are stuck.
- Bounds on the branching rates.

- Translation invariance.
- Uniform lower bound on jumping rates: no particles are stuck.
- Bounds on the branching rates.
- ▶ Bounds on the difference for branching rates of t's and ↓'s.

- Translation invariance.
- Uniform lower bound on jumping rates: no particles are stuck.
- Bounds on the branching rates.
- ► Bounds on the difference for branching rates of t's and t's.
- Weak dependence on particles far away.

- Translation invariance.
- Uniform lower bound on jumping rates: no particles are stuck.
- Bounds on the branching rates.
- ▶ Bounds on the difference for branching rates of *t*'s and *t*'s.
- Weak dependence on particles far away.
- No repulsion in the jumping rates between particles. (A bit of repulsion locally is still OK.)

Positive recurrence

Theorem

Then, starting from a single t:

 The process takes finitely many steps in finite time (construction).

Positive recurrence

Theorem

Then, starting from a single t:

- The process takes finitely many steps in finite time (construction).
- The width of the process has all moments finite.

Positive recurrence

Theorem

Then, starting from a single t:

- The process takes finitely many steps in finite time (construction).
- The width of the process has all moments finite.
- The process as seen from the leftmost t is positive recurrent.
Positive recurrence

Theorem

Then, starting from a single t:

- The process takes finitely many steps in finite time (construction).
- The width of the process has all moments finite.
- The process as seen from the leftmost t is positive recurrent.
- The stationary distribution sees a finite expected number of particles.

Positive recurrence

Theorem

Then, starting from a single t:

- The process takes finitely many steps in finite time (construction).
- The width of the process has all moments finite.
- The process as seen from the leftmost t is positive recurrent.
- The stationary distribution sees a finite expected number of particles.
- (Extension of all this to non nearest neighbour symmetric branching.)

An example

- Branching rates: constant.
- Jump rate to the right:

$$\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\text{particle on right}} \frac{1}{\text{distance}^{\alpha}},$$

jump rate to the left:



 $\alpha > 1.$

An example

- Branching rates: constant.
- Jump rate to the right:



jump rate to the left:



α > 1.

Unfortunately we do not seem to be there yet... This is not covered at the moment.

Another example

- Branching rates: constant.
- Jump rate to the right:

$$\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\text{gaps } L_i \text{ on the right }} \frac{1}{L_i^{\alpha}}$$

jump rate to the left:

$$\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\text{gaps } L_i \text{ on the left }} \frac{1}{L_i^{\alpha}}$$

 $\alpha >$ 1. (\sim like a rank dependent model but decreasing with distance.)

Another example

- Branching rates: constant.
- Jump rate to the right:

$$\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\text{gaps } L_i \text{ on the right }} \frac{1}{L_i^{\alpha}}$$

jump rate to the left:

$$\frac{1}{2} + \sum_{\text{gaps } L_i \text{ on the left }} \frac{1}{L_i^{\alpha}}$$

 $\alpha >$ 1. (\sim like a rank dependent model but decreasing with distance.)

This one is fine.

Two words on the proof



Main tool 1: the number of inversions, i.e., wrongly ordered 1-0 pairs.

If there are too many of them, the generator is negative of the number of these pairs.

Two words on the proof



Main tool 1: the number of inversions, i.e., wrongly ordered 1-0 pairs.

If there are too many of them, the generator is negative of the number of these pairs.

<u>Main tool 2:</u> if the process is not tight, then on the long run there cannot be any finite number of particles:

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbf{P}\{\text{number}(t) < N\} \, \mathrm{d}t \to \mathbf{0} \qquad (\forall N).$$

Two words on the proof



Main tool 1: the number of inversions, i.e., wrongly ordered 1-0 pairs.

If there are too many of them, the generator is negative of the number of these pairs.

Main tool 2: if the process is not tight, then on the long run there cannot be any finite number of particles:

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \mathbf{P}\{\text{number}(t) < N\} \, \mathrm{d}t \to \mathbf{0} \qquad (\forall N).$$

Thank you.