

Steady states of asymmetric exclusion processes with inhomogeneous hopping

Atri Goswami,^{1,*} Mainak Chatterjee,^{2,†} and Sudip Mukherjee^{2,‡}

¹*Gurudas College, 1/1, Suren Sarkar Road, Jewish Graveyard,
Phool Bagan, Narkeldanga, Kolkata, West Bengal 700054*

²*Barasat Government College, 10, KNC Road, Gupta Colony, Barasat, Kolkata 700124, West Bengal, India*

We study the nonequilibrium steady states in totally asymmetric exclusion processes (TASEP) with open boundary conditions having spatially inhomogeneous hopping rates. Considering smoothly varying hopping rates, we show that the steady states are in general classified by the steady state currents in direct analogy with open TASEPs having uniform hopping rates. We calculate the steady state bulk density profiles, which are now spatially nonuniform. We also obtain the phase diagrams in the plane of the control parameters, which though have phase boundaries that are in general curved lines, have the same topology as their counterparts for conventional open TASEPs, independent of the form of the hopping rate functions. This reveals a type of universality, not encountered in critical phenomena.

I. INTRODUCTION

Many natural systems are driven by some external fields or are made of self-propelled particles. In the long time limit, these systems evolve into stationary states which carry steady currents, which are hallmarks of nonequilibrium systems. Such states are characterized by a constant gain or loss of energy, which distinguishes them from systems in thermal equilibrium. Examples of such driven systems range from live cell biological systems like ribosomes moving along mRNA or motor molecules “walking” along molecular tracks known as microtubules to ions diffusing along narrow channels, or even vehicles traveling along roads. In order to elucidate the nature of such nonequilibrium steady states and in the absence of a general theoretical framework, it is useful to study purpose-built simple models. To this end, a variety of driven lattice gas models have been introduced and studied extensively [1].

In this work, we focus on driven one-dimensional (1D) models with open boundaries, where particles preferentially move in one direction. In particular, we work on the totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP), that has become one of the paradigms of nonequilibrium physics in low-dimensional systems (see, e.g., Ref. [2] for reviews). In this model identical particles hop unidirectionally and with a uniform rate along a 1D lattice [3]. The hopping movement is subject to exclusion, i.e., when the target site is empty, since a given site can accommodate maximum one particle. Particles enter the system at one side at a specified rate α , and leave the system through the other end at a given rate β ; α and β are the two control parameters of TASEP. It is known that the steady states of TASEPs with open boundaries are rather sensitive to the boundary conditions: by vary-

ing the boundary conditions, i.e., by varying α, β , the steady states of open TASEPs can be varied, resulting into *boundary-induced nonequilibrium phase transitions*. These are genuine nonequilibrium effects, since equilibrium systems are usually insensitive to precise boundary conditions.

In the original TASEP model, the hopping rate in the bulk is assumed to be a constant (of unit value), which is of course an idealisation. In real life examples it is generally expected to have nonuniformity along the bulk of the TASEP channel leading to nonuniform hopping rates. For instance, mRNA in cells are known to have pause sites, where the effective hopping rates are lower [4]. This is a potentially important issue even in urban transport, where the speeds of vehicles (which is the analogue of the hopping rates here) depend sensitively on the bottlenecks along the roads [5]. Such spatially varying hopping rates can either be smoothly varying along the TASEP lanes, or be random quenched disorders with given distribution. We focus here on the case with smoothly varying hopping rates, for which the generic nature of the steady states in TASEPs are still not known. There have been some studies on quenched heterogeneous TASEP; see, e.g., Ref. [6] for some studies on different aspects of heterogeneous TASEP. Recently, the steady states of TASEPs with periodic boundary conditions are affected by smoothly varying hopping rates are studied [7]; see also Ref. [8] for a study on periodic TASEP with random quenched disordered hopping rates. A type of universality has been uncovered, showing the topological equivalence of the phase diagrams independent of the precise form of the space dependence of the hopping rates. Our studies here complement these results by considering the problem in an open TASEP with space-dependent hopping. We set up the analytical mean-field theory (MFT) framework to calculate the steady state density profiles for generic smoothly varying hopping rates. We illustrate the theoretical predictions by calculating the density profiles for a few representative examples of spatially varying hopping rates in Monte-Carlo simulation (MCS) studies. We show that the notion of universality illustrated in Ref. [7] can be extended to systems with open bound-

*Electronic address: goswami.atri@gmail.com

†Electronic address: mainak216@gmail.com

‡Electronic address: sudip.bat@gmail.com, sudip.mukherjee@saha.ac.in

aries as well, establishing the robustness of the notion of universality of the phase diagrams here. The rest of the article is organised as follows. In Sec. II we define and construct our model. Next, in Sec. III A we discuss the algorithm of the MCS study of the model to numerically calculate the steady state densities. Then in Sec. III B, we set up the MFT, and solve it to obtain the steady state densities for smoothly varying hopping rates. In Sec. III C, we present the phase diagrams of the model. Then in Sec. IV, we discuss the phase transitions in the model. We summarise our results in Sec. V.

II. MODEL

The model consists of a 1D lattice of size L . The particles enter through the left end at rate α , hop unidirectionally from the left to the right, all subject to exclusion, i.e., a single site can accommodate maximum one particle at a time, and finally leave the system at a rate β . Labelling each site by an index i that runs from 1 to L , the hopping rate at site i is given by $q_i \leq 1$; see Fig. 1 for a schematic model diagram.




FIG. 1: (Colour online) Schematic model diagram. Broken line represents the TASEP lattice. Particles enter and exit at rates α and β , respectively, and hop from left to right, subject to exclusion.

A microscopic configuration of the model is characterised by a distribution of identical particles on the lattice, i.e., by configurations $\mathcal{C} = \{n_{i=1, \dots, N}\}$, where each of the occupation numbers n_i is equal to either zero (vacancy) or one (particle), as it should be in a model with exclusion. Physically, a hard core repulsion between the particles is imposed, resulting into prohibition of a double or higher occupancy of sites in the model. The full state space then consists of 2^N configurations. The following elementary processes fully define the microscopic dynamical update rules of this model:

- (a) At any site $i = 1, \dots, L - 1$ a particle can jump to site $i + 1$ if unoccupied with a rate $q_i \leq 1$.
- (b) At the site $i = 1$ a particle can enter the lattice with rate $\alpha q(1)$ only if is unoccupied; and
- (c) At the site $i = N$ a particle can leave the lattice with rate $\beta q(L)$ when it is occupied.

In general, $q_i \neq q_j$ for $i \neq j$. Processes (a)-(c) formally define a TASEP with open boundary conditions. If all of $q_i = 1$ for all i identically, then this model reduces to the conventional TASEP with open boundary conditions [2]. We consider some specified choices of q_i that depends explicitly on i , and study their effects on the nonequilibrium steady states of the model. Recall that

the steady states of an open TASEP with α and β as the entry and exit rates, and a uniform hopping rate are characterised by the mean bulk density ρ_T : For $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha < 1/2$, one has $\rho_T = \alpha$ giving the low density (LD) phase, for $\beta < \alpha$ and $\beta < 1/2$, one has $\rho_T = 1 - \beta$ giving the high density (HD) phase, and for $\alpha, \beta > 1/2$, one has $\rho_T = 1/2$ giving the maximal current (MC) phase. This immediately gives the phase boundary in the $\alpha - \beta$ plane [2]. The principal aim of the present study is to find the phases and phase boundaries, and the principles behind obtaining them when the hopping rate is not constant, but spatially smoothly varying.

III. STEADY-STATE DENSITIES

We are interested to calculate the density profiles in the steady states. To this end, we set up MFT which can be solved analytically. We supplement the MFT results by extensive Monte-Carlo simulations (MCS).

A. Monte-Carlo simulations

We consider a lattice of L sites, labelled by an index i with $i \in [1, L]$. Let $n_i(t)$, which is either 0 or 1, be the occupation at site i at time t . We perform MCS studies of the model subject to the update rules (a)-(c) described above in Sec. II by using a random sequential updating scheme. The particles enter the system through the left most site ($i = 1$) at a fixed rate α , subject to exclusion, i.e., if $n_1 = 0$. After hopping through the system from $i = 1$ to L , subject to exclusion, the particles exit the system from $i = L$ at a fixed rate β . Here, α and β are the two simulation parameters, which are varied to produce different steady states. After reaching the steady states, the density profiles are calculated and temporal averages are performed. This produces time-averaged, space-dependent density profiles, given by $\langle n_i \rangle$, which are parametrised by α and β ; here $\langle \dots \rangle$ implies temporal averages over steady states. The simulations have been performed with $L = 10000$ up to 10^7 Monte-Carlo steps.

B. Mean-field theory

The dynamics of TASEP is formally given by rate equations for every site which are *not* closed. In MFT approximation, we neglect correlation effects and replace the average of product of densities by the product of average of densities [9]. While this is an approximation, this has worked with high degree of accuracy in the original TASEP problem and its many variants (see, e.g., Refs. [10–12] as representative examples); we use MFT as a guideline in our analysis below. The dynamical equation for $n_i(t)$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial n_i}{\partial t} = q_i n_{i-1} (1 - n_i) - q_{i+1} n_i (1 - n_{i+1}), \quad (\text{III.1})$$

for a site i in the bulk. Clearly, Eq. (III.1) is invariant under the transformation $n_i(t) \rightarrow 1 - n_{L-i}(t)$ together with $q_i \rightarrow q_{L-i}$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, which is the *particle-hole symmetry* of this model [10].

To proceed further in the MFT approximation, we label the sites by $x = i/L$ and take $L \rightarrow \infty$, which makes x a continuous variable between 0 and 1: $x \in [0, 1]$. In this parametrisation, the hopping rate function is given by $0 < q(x) \leq 1$, that is assumed to vary slowly in x . We define a lattice constant $\varepsilon \equiv L_0/L$, where L_0 is the geometric length of the system. To simplify notation, we fix the total length L_0 to unity without any loss of generality. In the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ is a small parameter. Further, we define $\rho(x) = \langle n_i \rangle$ as the steady state density at x . In the steady state, we expand the different terms on rhs of (III.1) in a Taylor series in powers of ε . We get

$$\rho(x \pm \varepsilon) = \rho(x) \pm \varepsilon \partial_x \rho(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \partial_x^2 \rho(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3) \quad \text{(III.2)}$$

$$q(x \pm \varepsilon) = q(x) \pm \varepsilon \partial_x q(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \partial_x^2 q(x) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3) \quad \text{(III.3)}$$

Substituting the above and retaining up to $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, we get

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [q(x)\rho(x)(1 - \rho(x))] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \quad \text{(III.4)}$$

neglecting terms higher order in ε . Equation (III.4) allows us to extract a bulk current J given by

$$J = q(x)\rho(x)[1 - \rho(x)] + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \quad \text{(III.5)}$$

which must be a constant independent of x in a given steady state. That Eq. (III.4) has the form of an equation of continuity is no surprise - this is because away from the boundaries in the bulk of the TASEP, particles only hop from left to right, subject to exclusion, which keeps the particle number locally conserved. In the continuum limit, $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and hence the average current is

$$J = q(x)\rho(x)[1 - \rho(x)], \quad \text{(III.6)}$$

valid when $\rho(x)$ and $q(x)$ are sufficiently smooth. It is evident that the MFT equations (III.4)-(III.6) are invariant under the particle-hole symmetry discussed above. Due to this property it is enough to restrict the analysis to the LD and MC phase density profiles; the HD phase density can be constructed from the LD phase density by using the particle-hole symmetry.

a. General solutions of the density in MFT:- We now derive the generic steady state density profiles and delineate the phases by using the MFT equation (III.6). As argued below, these solutions holds for any smoothly varying $q(x)$. Equation (III.6) is a quadratic equation in $\rho(x)$. In Eq. (III.6) since J is a constant and $q(x)$ has an explicit x -dependence, $\rho(x)$ must be x -dependent, such that the product of the various factors on the rhs of (III.6), all of which are individually x -dependent, produces an x -independent result J . Equation (III.6) has

two spatially nonuniform solutions $\rho_+(x)$ and $\rho_-(x)$ for a given J :

$$\rho_+(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{4J}{q(x)}} \right] > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{(III.7)}$$

$$\rho_-(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4J}{q(x)}} \right] < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{(III.8)}$$

for any x . Evidently, both $\rho_+(x)$ and $\rho_-(x)$ are continuous functions of x , as long as $q(x)$ itself is a continuous function of x . Further, $\rho_+(x) > 1/2$ everywhere, whereas $\rho_-(x) < 1/2$ everywhere. Clearly, if $q(x)$ is a constant then $\rho(x)$ is also a constant, independent of x (ordinary TASEP with uniform hopping). At this stage J is still unknown. Since $\rho(x)$ is real (in fact positive definite) everywhere, we must have $1 - 4J/q(x) \geq 0$ giving an upper bound on J :

$$J \leq q(x)/4. \quad \text{(III.9)}$$

Inequality (III.9) must hold for *all* x . Clearly, J has a maximum given by

$$J_{\max} = \frac{q_{\min}}{4}, \quad \text{(III.10)}$$

for a given $q(x)$; see also Ref. [13] for an analogous result in a disordered exclusion process. Note that J_{\max} is the *maximum possible* current that can be sustained by the system for all possible choices of the control parameters α, β . However, J may not reach J_{\max} for any α, β ; see below. In the limit of uniform hopping with $q(x) = 1$ everywhere, $J_{\max} = 1/4$, corresponding to the MC phase current in the conventional TASEP. We thus note that in the present model steady states with current $J = J_{\max}$ for a given $q(x)$ should generalise the standard MC phase.

We now systematically derive the conditions for the different phases. To do this, we must calculate J to specify the solutions $\rho_+(x)$ and $\rho_-(x)$ completely.

Recall that in the LD phase of conventional open TASEPs with uniform hopping, the steady state is described by the incoming current, which in the bulk is given by $J_{\text{LD}}^T = \alpha(1 - \alpha) < J_{\text{HD}}^T = \beta(1 - \beta)$, the outgoing current. This corresponds to $\rho = \alpha$ as the bulk density in the LD phase. In contrast, in the HD phase, $J_{\text{HD}} < J_{\text{LD}}$, giving $1 - \beta$ as the HD phase bulk density; a superscript T refers to an open TASEP. The MC phase is associated with the current $J_{\text{MC}}^T = 1/4$ in the bulk. The LD-HD phase boundary is given by the condition $J_{\text{LD}}^T = J_{\text{HD}}^T$ giving $\alpha = \beta$; the LD-MC and HD-MC phase boundaries likewise are given by $J_{\text{LD}}^T = J_{\text{MC}}^T$ and $J_{\text{HD}}^T = J_{\text{MC}}^T$, giving, respectively, $\alpha = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1/2$ as the phase boundaries. We now generalise this picture by finding out the forms of J in the present problem.

b. LD phase:- We start by noting that the current in the bulk of the TASEP channel is $J = q(x)\rho(x)[1 - \rho(x)]$, where $\rho(x)$ is $\rho_+(x)$ or $\rho_-(x)$. Since $\rho(0) = \alpha$, we obtain

$$J_{\text{LD}} = q(0)\alpha(1 - \alpha). \quad \text{(III.11)}$$

Since, the steady state bulk density in the LD phase is less than $1/2$ everywhere, the density profile $\rho_{LD}(x)$ in the LD phase is given by

$$\rho_{LD}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4q(0)}{q(x)}\alpha(1-\alpha)} \right] < \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{III.12})$$

Then we must have $\alpha < 1/2$ as in an open TASEP with a uniform hopping rate. Equation (III.12) gives the steady state density in the LD phase for a given $q(x)$ and depends on the entry rate α , but not on the exit rate β , as expected in the LD phase. With $q(x) = q(0) = \text{const.}$ everywhere, $\rho_{LD}(x) = \alpha$, neglecting the other solution $1 - \alpha > 1/2$ for $\alpha < 1/2$ for an open TASEP with a uniform hopping rate.

We have plotted $\rho_{LD}(x)$ versus x in Fig. 2 for two different and simple choices of the hopping rate function $q(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Choice I: } q(x) &= \frac{1}{1+2x}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1/2, \\ &= \frac{1}{3-2x}, \quad 1/2 \leq x \leq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.13})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Choice II: } q(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[2 - \frac{x^2}{0.49} \right], \quad 0 \leq x \leq 0.7, \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[2 - \frac{(x-1.4)^2}{0.49} \right], \quad 0.7 \leq x \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.14})$$

c. HD phase:- The logic we have developed above to obtain $\rho_{LD}(x)$ can be used to obtain $\rho_{HD}(x)$, the steady state density in the HD phase. Noting that $\rho(1) = 1 - \beta$, we obtain the HD phase current

$$J_{HD} = q(1)\beta(1 - \beta). \quad (\text{III.15})$$

Since, the steady state bulk density everywhere is more than $1/2$, the density profile $\rho_{HD}(x)$ in the HD phase is given by

$$\rho_{HD}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{4q(1)}{q(x)}\beta(1-\beta)} \right] > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{III.16})$$

Therefore, we must have $\beta < 1/2$ as for an open TASEP with uniform hopping. In contrast to $\rho_{LD}(x)$, given by (III.12) above, $\rho_{HD}(x)$ in (III.16) depends on $q(x)$ and the exit rate β , but not on α , as expected in the HD phase. With $q(x) = q(1) = \text{const.}$ everywhere, $\rho_{HD}(x) = 1 - \beta$, neglecting the other solution $\rho_{HD} = \beta < 1/2$ for an open TASEP with a uniform hopping rate.

In an open TASEP with uniform hopping, $\alpha < 1/2$ and $\alpha < \beta$ specify the LD phase, whereas $\beta < \alpha$ and $\beta < 1/2$ specify the HD phase. What are the analogous conditions here? These conditions in the present case

Clearly, $q(x)$ in Choice I is *symmetric* about $x = 1/2$, whereas $q(x)$ in Choice II has *no* particular symmetry. Results from MFT and MCS studies are plotted together in Fig. 2, which show good agreements between MFT and MCS results.

may be obtained by considering the steady state currents. We recall that the above conditions for the LD and HD phases in an open TASEP with uniform hopping can be recast in terms of the steady state currents as $J_{LD} < 1/4$ and $J_{LD} < J_{HD}$ for the LD phase, and $J_{HD} < 1/4$ and $J_{HD} < J_{LD}$ for the HD phase. These conditions may be generalised to the present case with non-uniform hopping. The LD phase now exists for

$$J_{LD} \equiv q(0)\alpha(1-\alpha) < J_{HD} \equiv q(1)\beta(1-\beta), \quad J_{LD} < \frac{q_{\min}}{4}. \quad (\text{III.17})$$

Similarly, for the HD phase to exist we must have

$$J_{HD} < J_{LD}, \quad J_{HD} < \frac{q_{\min}}{4}. \quad (\text{III.18})$$

We have plotted $\rho_{HD}(x)$ versus x in Fig. 3 for $q(x)$ as defined in Choice I above. The HD phase density plots for $q(x)$ as given in Choice II above, likewise, can be obtained from corresponding plots in the LD phase by using the particle-hole symmetry. Results from MFT and MCS studies are plotted together in Fig. 3, which again reveal good agreements between MFT and MCS results.

d. MC phase:- The steady density in the MC phase, $\rho_{MC}(x)$ is somewhat tricky to calculate. We already know




FIG. 2: (Colour online) Plots of the steady state density $\rho_{LD}(x)$ versus x in the LD phase for different choices of the hopping rate functions. (top) $q(x)$ as given in Choice I above for two different sets of values of α and β , (bottom) $q(x)$ Choice II above for two different sets of α and β . In each plot, the green line represents the MFT prediction, the red points are from the corresponding MCS study; the blue line represents $q(x)$. MCS value of the current J is also shown in each plot, which unsurprisingly is a straight line. Good agreement between the MFT and MCS predictions can be seen (see text).

that the steady state current in the MC phase

$$J_{MC} = q_{min}/4, \quad (\text{III.19})$$

which can be used either in $\rho_+(x)$ or $\rho_-(x)$, with these two solutions become identical at $x = x_0$, at which $q(x) = q_{min}$. MCS studies reveal that a part of $\rho_{MC}(x)$ is bigger than $1/2$, whereas elsewhere it is smaller than $1/2$. Thus in order to construct $\rho_{MC}(x)$, we must use both $\rho_+(x)$ and $\rho_-(x)$, i.e., $\rho_{MC}(x)$ is a combination of $\rho_+(x)$ and $\rho_-(x)$, with the two segments meeting at x_0 . This further implies that if x_0 , the location of q_{min} is not in the

bulk, but at the extreme ends (i.e., $x = 0, 1$), $\rho_{MC}(x)$ will consist of only $\rho_-(x)$ or $\rho_+(x)$. Interestingly, this means in general the average density in the MC phase (averaged over the whole TASEP) can be more or less than $1/2$! This is clearly in contrast to TASEP with uniform hopping, where the average density in the MC phase is $1/2$. We have plotted $\rho_{MC}(x)$ versus x in Fig. 4.

Results from MFT and MCS studies are plotted together for several choices of $q(x)$, which again show good agreements between MFT and MCS results.

C. Phase diagram

We now discuss the conditions to obtain the phase diagram and the phase boundaries in the α, β -plane. First

consider the boundary between the LD and HD phases. In the LD phase, the bulk current is given by J_{LD} in




FIG. 3: (Colour online) Plots of the steady state density $\rho_{\text{HD}}(x)$ versus x in the HD phase for the hopping rate function $q(x)$ as given in Choice I above for two different sets of values of α and β . These are connected to the corresponding $\rho_{\text{LD}}(x)$ via the particle-hole symmetry discussed above. In each plot, the green line represents the MFT prediction, the red points are from the corresponding MCS study; the blue line represents $q(x)$. MCS value of the current J is also shown in each plot, which unsurprisingly is a straight line. Good agreement between the MFT and MCS predictions can be seen (see text).

(III.11), whereas the bulk current in the HD phase is given by J_{HD} in (III.15). The two phases meet when $J_{\text{LD}} = J_{\text{HD}}$, which gives the phase boundary between the LD and HD phases that has the form

$$q(0)\alpha(1-\alpha) = q(1)\beta(1-\beta). \quad (\text{III.20})$$

This is a quadratic equation in β in terms of α with two solutions β_{\pm} :

$$\beta_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 \pm \sqrt{1 - 4\mu\alpha(1-\alpha)} \right], \quad (\text{III.21})$$

where $\mu \equiv q(0)/q(1)$, which can be bigger or smaller than unity. Since $\beta < 1/2$ for the HD phase, $\beta = \beta_-$ gives the LD-HD phase boundary. Phase boundary (III.21) automatically reduces to $\alpha = \beta$, the well-known result for the phase boundary or the coexistence line between the LD and HD phases in an open TASEP with a uniform $q(x)$. In fact, *even with nonuniform $q(x)$, $\alpha = \beta$ is the phase boundary*, so long as $q(0) = q(1)$ is maintained, independent of the actual profile of $q(x)$.

The steady state density profile at the LD-HD coexistence line has a special structure. In an open TASEP with uniform hopping rate, it occurs on the line $\alpha = \beta < 1/2$ in the $\alpha - \beta$ plane, and is actually a *delocalised domain wall* (DDW), which is a domain wall or a density “shock” whose position is not fixed but fluctuates along the whole length of the TASEP length. Moreover, the position of the domain wall is equally likely to be anywhere in the TASEP. This means the long time average of the density profile, that essentially captures the envelop of the DDW, is an inclined straight line connecting $\rho_{\text{LD}} = \alpha$ at the entry end and $\rho_{\text{HD}} = 1 - \beta$ at the exit end. Since the MFT neglects all fluctuations, it cannot capture this DDW. We numerically investigate the analogue of a DDW in a uniform open TASEP in the present problem for the case $q(x)$ in Choice I above, for which the coexistence line is still $\alpha = \beta$ due to the symmetry of the function $q(x)$ chosen. We numerically calculate $\rho(x)$ at $\alpha = \beta = 0.07$ and present our result in Fig. 5. More specifically, we calculate $\rho(x)$ over short time windows $\sim 10^6$ MCS steps, and also over MCS steps of 10^7 to obtain the long-time averaged envelop of the density profile. Due to the diffusive nature of the DDW fluctuations, good statistics for the DDW envelop requires averaging over $\sim L^2$ MCS steps. Due to this, we have restricted this particular study to $L = 1000$. We find that over short time windows, $\rho(x)$ has the form of a step function, reminiscent of a *localised domain wall* (LDW) in heterogeneous TASEPs in ring geometries [10, 11]. However, the position of the LDW is *different* at different times, implying a DDW. The long-time averaged envelop of $\rho(x)$ takes the form of an inclined line, as shown in Fig. 5. Due to the computational requirement of a very large time required to obtain the long-time averaged shape of the DDW, we cannot precisely determine its geometrical shape. Going beyond MFT by taking into account of fluctuations should allow us write down a Fokker-Planck equation for the instantaneous position of the density shock [14]. Solving this equation one can in principle determine the mathematical form of the envelop, which is outside the scope of the present study.

Similar considerations allow us to obtain the LD-MC and HD-MC phase boundaries. For example, the LD-MC phase boundary is given by the condition $J_{\text{LD}} = J_{\text{MC}}$, which gives

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{q_{\text{min}}}{q(0)}} \right], \quad (\text{III.22})$$

since $\alpha < 1/2$ for the LD phase. Assuming $q(i) = q_{\text{min}}$




FIG. 4: (Colour online) Plots of the steady state density $\rho_{MC}(x)$ versus x in the MC phase for different choices of the hopping rate functions and for different sets of values of α and β . (top) $q(x)$ as given in Choice I, (bottom) $q(x)$ as given in Choice II. In each plot, the green line represents the MFT prediction, the red points are from the corresponding MCS study; the blue line represents $q(x)$. MCS value of the current J is also shown in each plot, which unsurprisingly is a straight line. Good agreement between the MFT and MCS predictions can be seen (see text).

for some i in the bulk, the effect of a nonuniform $q(x)$ is to shift the boundary line (III.22) *towards* the β -axis. Likewise, the HD-MC phase boundary is given by the condition $J_{HD} = J_{MC}$, giving

$$\beta = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{q_{\min}}{q(1)}} \right]. \quad (\text{III.23})$$

since $\beta < 1/2$ for the HD phase. Again with $q(i) = q_{\min}$ for some i in the bulk, the effect of a nonuniform $q(x)$ is to shift the boundary line (III.23) *towards* the α -axis. The three phase boundaries meet at $\left(\left[1 - \sqrt{1 - q_{\min}/q(0)} \right] / 2, \left[1 - \sqrt{1 - q_{\min}/q(1)} \right] / 2 \right)$. Since $q(0), q(1) \geq q_{\min}$, the general effect of a nonuniform hopping rate appears to be to enlarge the MC phase region and shrink the LD and HD phase regions in the $\alpha - \beta$ -plane. Furthermore, since $q(0) \neq q(1)$ in general, the phase diagram could be asymmetric under in-

terchange of α and β . Phase diagrams for $q(x)$ in Choice I and $q(x)$ in Choice II are shown in Fig. 6 (top) and Fig. 6 (bottom), respectively. Phase boundaries (III.21), (III.22) and (III.23) calculated from MFT, and the corresponding results from MCS studies are superposed. Good agreement between the two are found.

Let us now make some general observations on the phase diagrams in Fig. 6. Clearly, the phase diagrams in Fig. 6 are quantitatively different from the well-known phase diagram of an open TASEP with uniform hopping. First of all, the MC region of the phase diagrams is now distinctly bigger with space-dependent $q(x)$ than in the corresponding phase diagram with a constant hopping rate. Secondly, between the two phase diagrams presented in Fig. 6, the one with $q(x)$ as given in Choice I above with $q(0) = q(1)$ [Fig. 6 (top)] remains unchanged under the interchange of α and β , same as for the phase diagram for an open TASEP with uniform hopping




FIG. 5: (Colour online) Density profile $\rho(x)$ on the coexistence line with $\alpha = \beta = 0.07$ with $q(x)$ as given in Choice I above. Short-time averages of $\rho(x)$ are LDWs with density jumps (green and blue curves), whose positions shift with time; the long-time average is the envelop of the moving LDWs, or a DDW, given by the inclined curved (red) line, whose precise mathematical form cannot be calculated within MFT (see text).

rate. In contrast, the phase diagram with $q(x)$ as given in Choice II, such that $q(0) \neq q(1)$, [Fig. 6 (bottom)] has no such symmetry under the interchange of α and β . These properties are consistent with our discussions above; see Eqs. (III.21), (III.22) and (III.23). Nonetheless, the phase diagrams above have the same topology as that for an open TASEP with uniform hopping: all of them have three phases, which meet at a common point. This establishes the universality of the phase diagram for different choices of the hopping rate function, a key qualitative outcome from the present study, and complements the results of Ref. [7].

IV. PHASE TRANSITIONS

The original TASEP model with open boundaries and uniform hopping, the transition between the LD and HD phases are first order transitions, whereas those between the MC and LD or HD phases are second order transitions. The difference in the average bulk densities of the two phases serves as the order parameter in each of these transitions. We can generalise this in the present study. To start with, we define the mean density

$$\bar{\rho}_a \equiv \frac{1}{L} \int_0^1 \rho_a(x) dx, \quad (\text{IV.1})$$

for the phase a , where $a = \text{LD, HD or MC}$ phase. Since $\rho_{\text{LD}}(x) < 1/2$ in the bulk of the system, $\bar{\rho}_{\text{LD}} < 1/2$ necessarily. Similarly, $\bar{\rho}_{\text{HD}} > 1/2$ necessarily. Interestingly, $\bar{\rho}_{\text{MC}}$ need not be $1/2$, in contrast to conventional open




FIG. 6: (Colour online) Phase diagram in the α - β plane with $q(x)$ in Choice I above (top), and $q(x)$ in Choice II above (bottom). Continuous lines represent the MFT predictions; discrete points are from the corresponding MCS studies, which agree well with the MFT results. LD, HD and MC phases are marked. The two phase diagrams clearly have the same topology (see text).

TASEPs with uniform hopping. In fact, in the present study, with $q(x)$ in Choice I above, $\bar{\rho}_{\text{MC}} = 1/2$ due to the symmetry of $q(x)$ and hence ρ_{MC} about $x = 1/2$. In contrast, for $q(x)$ in Choice II above, $\bar{\rho}_{\text{MC}} > 1/2$. With this, considering the mean density as the order parameter, the transition between the LD and HD phases is a first order transition with

$$\mathbb{O}_{\text{HD-LD}} \equiv \bar{\rho}_{\text{HD}} - \bar{\rho}_{\text{LD}} \quad (\text{IV.2})$$

showing a jump across the LD-HD phase boundary. This jump, given by the magnitude of $\mathbb{O}_{\text{HD-LD}}$ is to be calculated on the phase boundary between the LD and HD phases, and clearly depends on α (or equivalently β). The finite jump of $\mathbb{O}_{\text{HD-LD}}$ tells us that the phase transition in question is a first order transition. To study the phase transitions between the MD and LD or HD phases, we similarly consider

$$\mathbb{O}_{\text{LD-MC}} \equiv \bar{\rho}_{\text{LD}} - \bar{\rho}_{\text{MC}}, \quad (\text{IV.3})$$

$$\mathbb{O}_{\text{HD-MC}} \equiv \bar{\rho}_{\text{HD}} - \bar{\rho}_{\text{MC}}. \quad (\text{IV.4})$$

These transitions are second order in nature with $\mathbb{O}_{\text{LD-MC}}$ and $\mathbb{O}_{\text{HD-MC}}$ vanishing at the respective phase boundaries, which can be seen from the conditions of the respective phase boundaries themselves.

V. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

We have thus studied the totally asymmetric exclusion process with open boundaries having spatially smoothly varying hopping rates. Our study reveals the universal form of the phase diagrams for generic smooth hopping rates. Our results are sufficiently general and applies to any smoothly varying hopping rate functions. We construct the mean-field theory, and use that to outline a scheme to calculate steady state density profiles. Unsurprisingly, the steady state densities are *space varying*, unlike those in the conventional TASEP with uniform hopping. These match well with those obtained from the MCS studies, lending credence to our mean-field analysis. Because of the spatially varying densities, the conventional way to characterise the phases via the densities, i.e., $\rho_{\text{LD}} < 1/2$, $\rho_{\text{HD}} > 1/2$ and $\rho_{\text{MC}} = 1/2$ in the bulk of the TASEP no longer holds. Rather one needs to resort to the equivalent conditions to decide the phases, since the current J is a constant. This together with the condition that $\rho_{\text{LD}}(x) < 1/2$ and $\rho_{\text{HD}}(x) > 1/2$ everywhere in the bulk, allows us to distinguish the LD and HD phases. Further, the maximum steady state current that the system can sustain is no longer $1/4$, but is $q_{\text{min}}/4$, where q_{min} is the minimum hopping rate. Surprisingly, our theory shows that the average bulk density in the MC phase can be more or less than $1/2$, in direct contrast with conventional open TASEPs with uniform hopping. We

show that the general effect of spatially varying hopping rates is to enlarge the MC region of the phase space, while shrinking the LD and HD regions. Furthermore, our work elucidates the universal phase diagram for various choices of the hopping rate function, highlighting the robustness of asymmetric exclusion process in an open system.

Our MFT scheme is sufficiently general. It applies for any $q(x)$ is smoothly and slowly varying. It would be interesting to extend our scheme to situations where $q(x)$ is smooth and slowly varying in general, but can have a few finite discontinuities. This will be studied in the future. In addition, there are *in vivo* situations, where $q(x)$ is rapidly fluctuating in space [15], which breaks down the assumption of slowly varying $q(x)$. How an equivalent analysis may be carried out for such a system, and to what degree the present results may be valid there are interesting questions to study. It would also be interesting to apply the boundary layer theory developed in Ref. [16] on our model, and determine the stationary densities and phases. We hope our work here will provide impetus to studies along these lines in future.

Our results may be verified in model experiments on the collective motion of driven particles with light-induced activity [17] passing through a narrow channel. Spatial modulations of the hopping rate can be created by applying patterned or spatially varying illumination.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank Prof. Abhik Basu (SINP, Kolkata) for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] B. Schmittmann and R. Zia, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J. Lebowitz (Academic Press, London, 1995), Vol. 17.
- [2] B. Derrida and M. Evans, in Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics in One Dimension, edited by V. Privman (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1997), Chap. 14, pp. 277–304; G. Schütz, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C. Domb and J. Lebowitz (Academic Press, San Diego, 2001), Vol. 19, pp. 3–251.
- [3] J. Krug, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1882 (1991).
- [4] T. Chou, K. Mallick, and R. K. P. Zia, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 116601 (2011); S. E. Wells, E. Hillner, R. D. Vale, and A. B. Sachs, Mol. Cell **2**, 135 (1998); S. Wang, K. S. Browning, and W. A. Miller, EMBO J. **16**, 4107 (1997); Z. A. Afonina et al., Nucleic Acids Res. **42**, 9461 (2014); D. W. Rogers et al., PLoS Comput. Biol. **13**, e1005592 (2017).
- [5] C. Richer and S. Hasiak, Town Planning Review **85**, 217 (2014).
- [6] R. B. Stinchcombe and S. L. A. de Queiroz, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 061113 (2011); G. Tripathy and M. Barma, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 1911 (1998); M. Bengrine, A. Benyoussef, H. Ez-Zahraouy, and F. Mhirech, Phys. Lett. A **253**, 135 (1999); C. Enaud and B. Derrida, Europhys. Lett. **66**, 83 (2004); L. B. Shaw, J. P. Sethna, and K. H. Lee, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 021901 (2004); R. J. Harris and R. B. Stinchcombe, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 016108 (2004).
- [7] T. Banerjee and A. Basu, Phys. Rev. Research **2**, 013025 (2020).
- [8] A. Haldar, A. Basu, Phys Rev Research **2**, 043073 (2020)
- [9] R. A. Blythe and M. R. Evans, J. Phys. A: Math. Theo. **40**, R333 (2007).
- [10] A. Parmeggiani, T. Franosch, and E. Frey, Phys. Rev. E **70**, 046101 (2004).
- [11] N. Sarkar and A. Basu, Phys. Rev. E **90**, 022109 (2014).
- [12] T. Banerjee, A. K. Chandra, and A. Basu, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 022121 (2015).
- [13] J. Krug, Braz. J. Phys. **30**, 97 (2000).
- [14] T. Reichenbach, T. Franosch, and E. Frey Eur. Phys. J. E **27**, 47 (2008).
- [15] B. Alberts, A. Johnson, J. Lewis, M. Raff, K. Roberts, and P. Walter, Molecular Biology of the Cell, 4th ed. (Garland Science, 2002); B. Li, M. Carey, and J. L. Work-

- man, *Cell* **128**, 707 (2007); C. Y. Lin, J. Lovén, P. B. Rahl, R. M. Paranal, C. B. Burge, J. E. Bradner, T. I. Lee, and R. A. Young, *ibid.* **151**, 56 (2012); J. L. Workman and R. E. Kingston, *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **67**, 545 (1998).
- [16] S. Mukherjee and S. M. Bhattacharjee, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **38**, L285 (2005); S. Mukherji and V. Mishra, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 011116 (2006); S. M. Bhattacharjee, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**, 1703 (2007); S. Mukherji, *Phys. Rev. E* **79**, 041140 (2009); , **83**, 031129 (2011); A. K. Gupta and I. Dhiman, *ibid.* **89**, 022131 (2014); S. Mukherjee and S. M. Bhattacharjee, *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 5697 (2019).
- [17] See, e.g., I. Buttinoni et al., *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **24**, 284129 (2012).