

Current fluctuations of a self-interacting diffusion on a ring

Francesco Coghi^{1,*}

¹*Nordita, KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University,
Hannes Alfvéns väg 12, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

(Dated: June 26, 2024)

We investigate fluctuations in the average speed or current of a self-interacting diffusion (SID) on a ring, mimicking the non-Markovian behaviour of an agent influenced by its own path. We derive the SID's phase diagram, showing a delocalisation-localisation phase transition from self-repelling to self-attracting. Current fluctuations are analysed using: (i) an adiabatic approximation, where the system reaches its stationary distribution before developing current fluctuations, and (ii) an original extension of level 2.5 large deviations for Markov processes. The latter, combined with perturbation theory, provides an upper bound to current fluctuations, which is tight in the self-repelling region, while the former approximates current fluctuations well in all regimes. Both methods accurately estimate the asymptotic variance and suggests a phase transition at the onset of the localised regime.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Model, typical behaviour and current observable	2
A. Model formulation	2
B. Typical behaviour	3
1. Stationary Fokker–Planck equation	4
2. Phase diagram for ρ_{inv}	5
C. Current observable	6
III. Methods	7
A. Adiabatic approximation	7
B. Extended level 2.5 large deviations	8
1. Markov processes	8
2. Self-interacting diffusions	9
3. Current contraction and the Euler–Lagrange equation	10
4. Perturbation theory around ρ_{inv}	11
5. Current rate function for small j	13
IV. Results	14
A. Asymptotic variance	14
B. Comparison with Monte-Carlo simulations	15
V. Conclusion	15
Acknowledgments	16
A. Linear stability of $\rho_{\text{inv}} = (2\pi)^{-1}$	17
B. Connection to the mean-field XY model	18
References	18

I. INTRODUCTION

We consider the Self-Interacting Diffusion (SID) on the ring \mathcal{S}^1 described by the process $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ solution of the Stochastic Differential Equation (SDE)

$$d\theta_t = \sqrt{D}dW_t + dt \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} 2c \sin(\theta - \theta_t) \rho_t(\theta) d\theta, \quad (1)$$

* francesco.coghi@su.se

where $D > 0$ is the diffusion coefficient of the Brownian motion $W_t = \int_0^t dW_s$ on the ring, $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ a constant determining the magnitude of the periodic drift and ρ_t the empirical occupation measure of the process, which is a scalar field marking the fraction of time spent by the process on each and every point of the ring, up to time t . Roughly, the process evolves stochastically on a ring and its position at time t is affected by the whole path of the process up to time t through ρ_t . We refer the reader to Sec. II for further details on the process. We are interested in the study of the average speed, or current, observable

$$j_t = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t d\theta_s, \quad (2)$$

and aim to characterise its fluctuation behaviour in the long-time limit using large deviation theory methods.

An SID is a type of non-Markov (memory-dependent) process that has been introduced in the probability community in [1] as an example of a continuous-time path-interaction (or reinforcement) process to model growing polymers, extending [2, 3], and discrete-time reinforced random walks; we refer the reader to [4] for a thorough historical account of self-interacting random processes. Asymptotic properties of SIDs have been studied in [1, 5–7] restricting to compact spaces and symmetric interaction potentials and extended to \mathbb{R}^d in [8–10] requiring confining potentials. More recently, in [11, 12], refinements of Kramer’s law for SIDs have also appeared (as well as in [13] for generalised overdamped Langevin systems).

In parallel, various forms of SIDs have been employed in statistical physics to model autochemotaxis—the ability of organisms to communicate through local secretions that form chemical trails, which would enter ρ_t . Researchers have studied models where the signaling molecule remains in place to mark the trail, as seen in ants [14–17], as well as models where the signal diffuses away, similar to bacteria [18, 19]. For the latter, stochastic modeling has provided insights into the behaviour of living microorganisms and self-propelled colloids, extending beyond traditional deterministic Keller–Segel equations [20–27].

Most existing studies focus on the asymptotic properties of SIDs and autochemotactic systems, explaining typical behaviour. However, there remains a significant gap in our understanding of atypical and rare events in these systems, despite their crucial influence on future dynamics. To gain insights into the dynamics of SIDs, a comprehensive theory of fluctuations and large deviations of time-averaged quantities, such as (2), is necessary. It is known, for instance, that long-range memory effects profoundly impact fluctuation behaviour, diverging from the established large deviation theory for Markovian cases [28–32]. Non-Markovian random walks have revealed memory-driven effects [33–37], with studies showing a different *speed* in the occurrence of large deviations. Recently, a long-time large deviation theory for a discrete-time version of an SID has been derived in [38, 39].

In this work, we provide a comprehensive study of fluctuations of the observable (2) using large deviation theory. In particular,

- In Sec. II we detail the model and give an overview of its typical, or asymptotic, behaviour. We derive the phase diagram for the SID, revealing a delocalisation-localisation phase transition from a regime where the SID is self-repelled to a regime where it is self-attracted by its own trajectory.
- In Sec. III, we introduce two methodologies to analyse the fluctuating dynamics of (2), namely, (i) the *adiabatic* approximation, where the system reaches its stationary distribution before current fluctuations develop, and (ii) an extension of the so-called *level 2.5 large deviations* for Markov processes.
- By comparison with Monte Carlo simulations, we show in Sec. IV that the latter, combined with perturbation theory, provides an upper bound on current fluctuations, which is tighter the less localised the SID is, while the former effectively approximates current fluctuations across all regimes. Additionally, we also demonstrate that both methods accurately estimate the asymptotic variance and suggest a phase transition at the onset of the localised regime.
- Finally, in Sec. V, we summarise our findings and outline open questions for future research.

II. MODEL, TYPICAL BEHAVIOUR AND CURRENT OBSERVABLE

We begin by formulating a general model for an SID based on the framework of [1], and then we restrict our focus to the specific SDE displayed in (1). Subsequently, we examine the asymptotic properties of (1) and discuss a phase diagram that characterises the long-term behaviour of the empirical occupation measure ρ_t .

A. Model formulation

We consider the general process $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0} \in \mathcal{M}$ (for the moment a non-specified manifold) solution of the following SDE:

$$dX_t = \sigma dW_t - \frac{1}{t} \left(\int_0^t \nabla V_{X_s}(X_t) ds \right) dt, \quad (3)$$

where $W_t = \int_0^t dW_s$ is a Brownian motion on \mathcal{M} characterised by independent and Gaussian increments, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[dW_t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[dW_t dW_{t'}] = \delta(t - t')dt$, $\sigma : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ a matrix that defines the coupling of the system to Gaussian white noise, and $V_x : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a ‘potential’ function responsible for the interaction between the current state of the system X_t and all previous states X_s for $0 < s < t$.

By introducing the empirical occupation measure

$$\rho_t(x) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta(X_s - x) ds, \quad (4)$$

which is the fraction of time spent by the process on every position of the manifold \mathcal{M} , (3) can be rewritten as

$$dX_t = \sigma dW_t - \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla V_x(X_t) \rho_t(x) dx \right) dt, \quad (5)$$

where the time integral has been replaced by a spatial integral over \mathcal{M} , clearly demonstrating the functional dependence of the process on its own trajectory via the empirical occupation measure ρ_t . For simplicity, we will refer to the entire process $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ as X_t , with context providing clarity.

X_t alone is not a Markov process, as long-range interactions in time directly enter the SDE and may drive the long-term behaviour of the system. We also introduce the notation

$$F_{\rho_t}(X_t) = - \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla V_x(X_t) \rho_t(x) dx, \quad (6)$$

for the effective drift acting on the SID, which will be useful later on.

We now restrict ourselves to the case where $\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{S}^1$, i.e., the unidimensional torus or ring $[0, 2\pi)$ with periodic boundary conditions, and consider the periodic potential

$$V_\theta(\theta_t) = 2c \cos(\theta - \theta_t + \phi), \quad (7)$$

with $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ and further restrict to $\sigma = \sqrt{D}$ with $D \in \mathbb{R}^+$ (also notice the change $X_t \rightarrow \theta_t$). We therefore rewrite (5) as

$$d\theta_t = \sigma dW_t - \left(\int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \frac{d}{d\theta_t} 2c \cos(\theta - \theta_t + \phi) \rho_t(\theta) d\theta \right) dt, \quad (8)$$

with the drift in (6) given by the explicit form

$$F_{\rho_t}(\theta_t) = - \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \frac{d}{d\theta_t} 2c \cos(\theta - \theta_t + \phi) \rho_t(\theta) d\theta. \quad (9)$$

The constant c determines the strength of the potential, the greater the c the stronger the interaction between the current state θ_t and all previously visited states in ρ_t . The phase ϕ , on the other hand, determines the type of potential. Consider the diffusion that originates in $\theta_0 = 0$. If $\phi = 0$, the potential is self-repelling because the particle starts from its maximum and is therefore attracted to the bottom of the potential, which lies at a distance π from the origin. The opposite occurs when $\phi = \pi$; in this case, the particle originates already at the bottom of the potential and is most self-attracted. All intermediate cases can be explored by properly tuning ϕ . It is also important to note that the interaction potential is integrated over time, and therefore, the effective drift experienced by the diffusing particle changes over time and is ultimately determined by the random realisation of the noise in (8).

B. Typical behaviour

General results for the asymptotic behaviour of (5) for various classes of potentials have been investigated in [1, 5, 6] with \mathcal{M} considered as a compact manifold using stochastic approximation methods [40, 41]. These methods have been used to describe the asymptotic behaviour of the occupation measure ρ_t by a limiting nonautonomous differential equation (see (19) below). These results have later been extended to \mathbb{R}^d in [8–10] for strictly convex interaction potentials. Remarkably, [6] showed that for symmetric potentials, ρ_t almost surely converges to a local minimum of a nonlinear free-energy functional, which has many critical points, each chosen randomly with a certain probability. Specifically, when the potential is symmetric and self-repelling (known as Mercer potentials in the mathematics community), the free-energy functional is strictly convex, ensuring ρ_t almost surely reaches a single global minimum in the long-time.

1. Stationary Fokker–Planck equation

Restricting to the case of (8) and assuming stationarity, the long-time behaviour $\rho_t \rightarrow \rho_{\text{inv}}$ can also be studied solving the following stationary non-linear Fokker–Planck equation:

$$0 = \frac{d}{d\theta} (F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta)\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta)) + \frac{D}{2} \frac{d^2 \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta)}{d\theta^2}, \quad (10)$$

with the drift given by the spatial convolution

$$F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta) = \left(\int_{S^1} 2c \sin(\theta' - \theta + \phi) \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta') d\theta' \right). \quad (11)$$

We remark that a time-dependent Fokker–Planck equation for the stochastic process $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ alone is not defined because the transition probability function will necessarily depend on the occupation measure ρ_t .¹ Asymptotically, however, due to the fact that the effective drift experienced by the particle will eventually converge as ρ_t in (4) carries a t^{-1} factor, we can assume $\rho_t \rightarrow \rho_{\text{inv}}$ and consider the stochastic process $\{\theta_t\}_{t \rightarrow \infty}$ as a simple Markov process whose drift is given by (11). In this limit, (10) is a well defined object to study, but it will not necessarily explain all asymptotic dynamics of (1), such as the non-stationary asymptotic evolution of ρ_t .

A solution of (10) is clearly given by the *delocalised* function $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$, representing the uniform distribution over the ring. However, this is not the only solution; another *localised* solution also exists. By integrating (10) once we obtain

$$J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta)\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) + \frac{D}{2} \frac{d\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta)}{d\theta}, \quad (12)$$

where $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}$ is a constant expressing the stationary probability current of the process. A precise form of $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}$ can be obtained by imposing periodicity of the solution, viz. $\rho_{\text{inv}}(0) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(2\pi)$, and reads

$$J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = \frac{c(\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2) \sin \phi}{\pi}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\alpha_1 = \int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \cos \theta d\theta \quad (14)$$

$$\alpha_2 = \int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \sin \theta d\theta. \quad (15)$$

Noticeably, we expect that if a stationary solution ρ_{inv} exists then $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = 0$ because the long-time drift $F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}$ in (11) is a conservative potential over S^1 . This condition over (13) implies either $\phi = 0$ or $\phi = \pi$ for all α_1 and α_2 satisfying (14) and (15), or $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ for all $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$, which results in the trivial uniform solution $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$.

Equation (12) for $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = 0$ can be rewritten as

$$\frac{D}{2} \frac{d \ln \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta)}{d\theta} = -F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta), \quad (16)$$

and formally solved considering (14) and (15) via direct integration. The solution is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{2}{D} \int_0^\theta F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta') d\theta'}}{\mathcal{Z}} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{4c}{D} (\cos(\theta-\phi)\alpha_1 + \sin(\theta-\phi)\alpha_2)}}{\mathcal{Z}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with \mathcal{Z} the normalisation constant. Equation (17), along with (14) and (15), form a closed system of equations that can be solved as a function of c , D , and ϕ . Summarising, we have found the following solutions

$$\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = \begin{cases} (2\pi)^{-1} & \forall \phi \in [0, 2\pi) \\ (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{-\frac{4c}{D} (\cos(\theta-\phi)\alpha_1 + \sin(\theta-\phi)\alpha_2)} & \text{for } \phi \in \{0, \pi\} \end{cases}. \quad (18)$$

¹ A high-dimensional time-dependent Fokker–Planck equation could in principle be rigorously written considering both the stochastic process $\{\theta_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and the empirical occupation measure over time $\{\rho_t\}_{t \geq 0}$.

These stationary solutions are not new. They already appeared in [1] and were used to define a deterministic flow of a non-autonomous differential equation of the form

$$\frac{d\rho_t}{dt} = -\rho_t + \frac{e^{-\frac{2}{D} \int_0^\theta F_{\rho_t}(\theta') d\theta'}}{\mathcal{Z}}, \quad (19)$$

to study the asymptotic behaviour of ρ_t . In the following, we discuss the stability of the solution $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$, which will help draw a phase diagram for ρ_{inv} and discuss an ergodicity-breaking phase transition controlled by the parameter c/D .

2. Phase diagram for ρ_{inv}

It is possible to prove via a linear stability approach (see Appendix A and [42–44]) that the solution $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$ is stable for

$$\frac{c}{D} \cos \phi \geq -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (20)$$

We show in the left panel of Fig. 1 the phase diagram of ρ_{inv} . The region where the uniform solution, first line of (18), is stable is marked in yellow and named the *self-repelling* region as the SID is repelled by its own trajectory. The blue dashed line marks the region where the localised solution, second line of (18), appears and is stable; this region is named *self-attracting* because the SID is attracted by its own past and corresponds to a *non-ergodic* phase for reasons that will become clear below. The third white region cannot be understood by studying the stationary Fokker–Planck equation in (10), and therefore, it is where we expect non-stationary behaviour. We remark that for $\phi = 0$ the uniform distribution is always stable because of the positivity of both c and D whereas for $\phi = \pi$, at the onset $c/D = 1/2$, $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$ loses stability in favour of $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{-\frac{4c}{D}(\cos(\theta-\phi)\alpha_1 + \sin(\theta-\phi)\alpha_2)}$. In particular, in the following we show that the latter is not unique but come with an $O(2)$ symmetry, i.e., it is valid for all α_1 and α_2 such that $\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = r^2$ where r is a parameter that only depends on the ratio c/D (see right panel of Fig. 1). Because of this property, the critical value $c/D = 1/2$ marks an ergodicity-breaking phase transition, viz. the invariant measure of the process is no longer unique for $c/D \geq 1/2$.




FIG. 1: On the left, the phase diagram of ρ_{inv} shows three distinguished phases: the self-repelling phase in yellow where the uniform stationary distribution is stable, the self-attracting phase as a blue dashed line where a new localised stationary distribution is stable and the uniform one is no longer and a white region where nonstationary behaviour is expected. On the right, the order parameter $r = \sqrt{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2}$ is plotted as a function of the control parameter c/D . As discussed in the text, $c/D = 1/2$ marks a second-order phase transition characterised by a square-root singularity (see (28)), transitioning from the self-repelling phase to a self-attracting phase where the SID is typically localised.

We consider $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{-\frac{4c}{D}(\cos(\theta-\phi)\alpha_1 + \sin(\theta-\phi)\alpha_2)}$. We remark that α_1 and α_2 fully determine where the typical value θ_{max} (the maximum) of the localised solution falls on the ring via

$$\alpha_1 \tan(\theta_{\text{max}} - \phi) = -\alpha_2. \quad (21)$$

By moving to polar coordinates $\alpha_1 = r \cos \psi$ and $\alpha_2 = r \sin \psi$, (14) and (15) take the form

$$r \cos \psi = \int_{S^1} \cos \theta \frac{e^{-\frac{4cr}{D}(\cos(\psi+\phi-\theta))}}{\mathcal{Z}} d\theta \quad (22)$$

$$r \sin \psi = \int_{S^1} \sin \theta \frac{e^{-\frac{4cr}{D}(\cos(\psi+\phi-\theta))}}{\mathcal{Z}} d\theta. \quad (23)$$

By replacing $\psi + \phi - \theta = \theta'$ and recalling that $\phi \in \{0, \pi\}$ we get

$$r = \int_{S^1} \cos(\phi - \theta') \frac{e^{-\frac{4cr}{D} \cos \theta'}}{\mathcal{Z}} d\theta', \quad (24)$$

for all $\psi \in [0, 2\pi)$ or, in the equivalent cartesian formulation, $\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = r^2$.

In the following, we calculate the value of the parameter r . For $\phi = 0$, (24) can be written in terms of I_0 and I_1 , i.e., the modified Bessel functions of the first kind [45], as

$$r = \int_{S^1} \cos \theta' \frac{e^{-\frac{4cr}{D} \cos \theta'}}{\mathcal{Z}} d\theta' = -\frac{I_1\left(\frac{4cr}{D}\right)}{I_0\left(\frac{4cr}{D}\right)}. \quad (25)$$

In particular, as $I_0 \geq 0$ and $I_1 \geq 0$ for $r \geq 0$, the only solution to (25) is $r = 0$ and therefore $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$: we re-obtain the stable uniform distribution. On the other hand, for $\phi = \pi$, (24) takes the form

$$r = -\int_{S^1} \cos \theta' \frac{e^{-\frac{4cr}{D} \cos \theta'}}{\mathcal{Z}} d\theta' = \frac{I_1\left(\frac{4cr}{D}\right)}{I_0\left(\frac{4cr}{D}\right)}, \quad (26)$$

and in this case it is evident that a solution $r > 0$ is admitted. The value of r can be calculated numerically by solving (26) and depends solely of the ratio c/D . We plot the behaviour of r as a function of c/D in the right panel of Fig. 1. Evidently, the greater the ratio (e.g., the smaller the noise), the higher the value of r which asymptotically tends to 1. Conversely, for very small ratios (e.g., high noise), r approaches 0.

The critical value $c/D = 1/2$ that is marked in Fig. 1 can be derived from (26) by taking a derivative with respect to r at $r = 0$ on both sides of the equation and imposing that left and right hand side of the equation must be the same. If we do so, we get

$$1 = \frac{d}{dr} \Big|_{r=0} \left(\frac{I_1(kr)}{I_0(kr)} \right) = \frac{k}{2} + \frac{k}{2} \frac{I_2(kr)}{I_0(kr)} \Big|_{r=0} - k \frac{I_1^2(kr)}{I_0^2(kr)} \Big|_{r=0} = \frac{k}{2}, \quad (27)$$

where we use the shorthand notation $k = 4c/D$ and the last equality follows from properties of the modified Bessel functions of the first kind [45]. Evidently, we must have $k = k_c := 2$ and therefore $c/D = 1/2$ at criticality. By expanding (26) for $r \rightarrow 0$ and keeping the lowest meaningful order in r we also get

$$r = \sqrt{\frac{8(k-2)}{k^3}} \stackrel{k \approx k_c}{\approx} (2\kappa)^\beta, \quad (28)$$

with $\kappa = (k - k_c)/k_c$ and $\beta = 1/2$.

In conclusion, $k_c = 2$ or, equivalently, $c/D = 1/2$ marks a second-order phase transition characterised by a square-root singularity from a self-repelling phase for $c/D < 1/2$ where the only stationary solution of the SID is uniform over the ring to a self-attracting phase where the SID typically localises at θ_{\max} solution of (21) with an $O(2)$ symmetry. Given the fact that where the process localises depends on the realisation of the noise and therefore the SID admits more than one stationary distribution, the self-attracting phase is non-ergodic.

This phase transition is reminiscent of a disorder-order phase transition of a mean-field XY model (also known as mean-field Kuramoto or Sakaguchi model). In fact, the asymptotic behaviour is the same and, in the Appendix B, we show that the stationary Dean's equation of a mean-field XY model, in the limit of infinitely many interacting spins, reduces to the stationary non-linear Fokker-Planck equation in (10). Notably, works in this field, such as [42–44, 46] use a parameter very similar to r in (24), representing the phase-overlap responsible for the synchronisation among all spins in the lattice. Similarly, here r can be interpreted to represent the ‘synchronisation’ of the SID with its own past trajectory.

The parallel between the SID of (5) and interacting many-particle systems is more profound, extending as well to the much-studied McKean-Vlasov process in probability theory. The McKean-Vlasov process is a stochastic process described by an SDE whose drift depends on the law of the process itself, i.e., the probability distribution of paths in the configuration space. Under certain assumptions, such as a self-interacting potential, the law of a McKean-Vlasov process converges to the invariant measure ρ_{inv} , the solution of (10) (see [10, 47, 48]). The asymptotic properties of these two processes can be studied similarly. For instance, it is customary in probability to study the typical behaviour of an SID or a McKean-Vlasov process by examining the behaviour of a many-particle system with mean-field interactions [49].

C. Current observable

In the following, we focus on the fluctuations of the current observable in (2) for $\phi = \pi$. We will move along the blue dashed line in Fig. 1 by varying the ratio c/D and study how the fluctuation behaviour of j_t changes as we transition from the self-repelling region, characterised by a delocalised solution for ρ_{inv} , to the self-attracting

region, where the solution ρ_{inv} is localised. Although we only study the behaviour for $\phi = \pi$, the results found to hold in the self-repelling case extend to the whole self-repelling region of Fig. 1. This work does not focus on the case where ρ_t does not admit a stationary solution (white region in the left panel of Fig. 1).

In the infinite-time limit we expect j_t to converge to the stationary probability current, or average speed, $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}$. This object, in the relevant case of having a stationary behaviour $\rho_t \rightarrow \rho_{\text{inv}}$, is shown above to be $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = 0$ (see [50, 51] for general derivations in the case of a drifted particle in a periodic potential). Hence, we have

$$j_t \rightarrow 0, \quad (29)$$

for almost all (in the probability sense) paths of the SID in (1). Although the current *concentrates* at 0 in the long time limit, j_t fluctuates around this typical value. It is this fluctuation behaviour that is of interest here.

According to large deviation theory, for a (possibly driven) diffusing particle on the ring subject to a periodic potential (not the SID in (1)), the distribution of j_t is shown in [52] to take the general form

$$P(j_t = j) = e^{-tI(j)+o(t)} \quad (30)$$

in the limit $t \rightarrow \infty$. The dominant scaling term in (30) is exponential and its *rate function* I is given by the limit

$$I(j) = - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln P(j_t = j). \quad (31)$$

This object controls the rate at which the probability $P(j_t = j)$ decays to 0 with time for any $j \neq J_{\text{typ}}$. As a consequence, $I \geq 0$ with equality reached only at $j = J_{\text{typ}}$. Evidently, the fact that $I > 0$ for any other values of j shows that fluctuations away from the typical value are exponentially unlikely at large times.

Although the long-time limit of the current j_t is understood for the SID in (1) as given in (29), its fluctuation behaviour has not yet been proved to satisfy the large deviation relation in (30). In the following, we provide evidence that such a large deviation behaviour may hold for the SID, at least under certain assumptions.

III. METHODS

In this Section, we discuss two methods used in Sec. IV to study the fluctuations of the current observable (2). The first method, adiabatic approximation, is based on a separation of time scales. The second method is based on an extension of level 2.5 of large deviation theory to non-Markov processes of the general form (3).

A. Adiabatic approximation

By simulating the SID process in (1) in the relevant region of the phase diagram in Fig. 1, i.e., $\phi = \pi$, we observe that the effective potential (and consequently the drift) converges rapidly in both the self-repelling and self-attracting phases. As we are interested in the long time fluctuations of the current, it seems reasonable to assume a separation of time scales whereby $\rho_t \rightarrow \rho_{\text{inv}}$, solution of (10), more rapidly than $j_t \rightarrow J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} (\equiv 0)$. Hence, the current in (2) is now defined on the Markov process

$$d\theta_t = \sqrt{D}dW_t + 2c(\cos(\theta_t)\alpha_2 - \sin(\theta_t)\alpha_1)dt, \quad (32)$$

which has been obtained from (1) replacing ρ_t with ρ_{inv} and where α_1 and α_2 are given by (14) and (15) respectively.

In the self-repelling case we have $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ and the process in (32) reduces to a trivial Brownian motion. In the self-attracting case instead, α_1 and α_2 are not known a priori and their value depend on the realisation of the noise driving the SID. However, they simply are constant values and therefore we can study the fluctuation behaviour of j_t considering them as parameters.

As mentioned earlier, due to the Markovian character of (32) it is already known that the fluctuations of j_t take the general large deviation form in (30). Therefore, we only need to calculate the rate function, namely I_a where the subscript a stands for adiabatic.

To do so we use the Gärtner–Ellis theorem, which states that the rate function is given by the Legendre–Fenchel transform

$$I_a(j) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}} (kj - \lambda_a(k)), \quad (33)$$

of the scaled cumulant generating function (SCGF) of j_t given by

$$\lambda_a(k) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \ln \mathbb{E} [e^{tkj_t}], \quad (34)$$

when the latter exists and is differentiable with respect to k . For time-additive observables of Markov processes, such as j_t , λ_a is known to be given by the dominant eigenvalue of the so-called tilted generator

$$\mathcal{L}_k = 2c(\cos(\theta_t)\alpha_2 - \sin(\theta_t)\alpha_1) \left(\frac{d}{d\theta} + k \right) + \frac{D}{2} \left(\frac{d}{d\theta} + k \right)^2, \quad (35)$$

which acts on bounded periodic functions of $[0, 2\pi)$. \mathcal{L}_k is a linear operator obtained by modifying/tilting the infinitesimal generator of (32). For further details on the theory we refer the reader to [30, 53] and for details related to a driven diffusive particle in a periodic potential to [52].

The eigenvalue problem that we need to solve reads

$$\mathcal{L}_k r_k = \lambda_a(k) r_k, \quad (36)$$

where r_k is the dominant right eigenfunction of the tilted operator in (35). We follow [52] and expand r_k in a Bloch–Fourier series as

$$r_k = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{in\theta}. \quad (37)$$

Replacing (37) in (36) along with (35), using Euler formulas for cosine and sine, and performing some algebraic manipulations and sum shifts, we obtain the following tridiagonal system of recurrence relations:

$$c_n \left(-\frac{D}{2} n^2 + kDin + \frac{D}{2} k^2 - \lambda_a(k) \right) + c_{n-1} [c\alpha_2 (i(n-1) + k) + c\alpha_1 (1 - n + ik)] + c_{n+1} [c\alpha_2 (i(n+1) + k) + c\alpha_1 (n + 1 - ik)] = 0. \quad (38)$$

This can be solved by truncating to some finite value of n and studying the kernel of the truncated tridiagonal matrix. The SCGF λ_a is left as a parameter in the system and is determined as the real value for which the determinant of the matrix becomes zero. This condition is necessary and sufficient for having a non-trivial kernel).

We notice that in the simple self-repelling case, since (32) reduces to a Brownian motion, we already know that fluctuations have a Gaussian shape and therefore

$$I_a(j) = \frac{j^2}{2D}. \quad (39)$$

In the self-attracting case instead, I_a is a complicated function and it will be calculated with the method explained above. In Sec. IV we will plot the rate functions I_a obtained in the self-repelling and self-attracting case and compare them with simulations of the SID.

B. Extended level 2.5 large deviations

1. Markov processes

Given a Markov diffusion process $\{Y_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ in \mathbb{R}^d , the level 2.5 of large deviations describes the likelihood of joint fluctuations of the empirical occupation measure ρ_t in (4) and empirical current given by the formal relation

$$j_t(y) = \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta(Y_t - y) \circ dY_t. \quad (40)$$

where \circ symbolises the use of Stratonovich integration. The joint distribution of empirical occupation and current $P(\rho_t = \rho, j_t = j)$ is known to take a large deviation form with an explicit rate function, namely $I_{2.5}$.² This function can be calculated in different ways, either by combining *tilting* with the Girsanov relation or using spectral methods combined with the Gärtner–Ellis theorem. Regardless of the method applied, the joint rate function is

$$I_{2.5}[\rho, j] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (j - J_{F,\rho})(\rho D)^{-1} (j - J_{F,\rho}) dy & \text{if } \nabla \cdot j = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (41)$$

² Intuitively, the form is explicit because for Markov processes drift and diffusion are uniquely identified by the stationary distribution and the stationary current of the process.

where

$$J_{F,\rho} = F\rho - D\frac{\rho}{2}, \quad (42)$$

is the probability current associated with the drift F of the Markov process Y_t and density ρ and D is, in general, any invertible noise matrix (not necessarily a scalar) given by $D = \sigma\sigma^\top$ entering (3). We refer the to [54–57] for details on the different derivations.

2. Self-interacting diffusions

In the following, we show a heuristic derivation of an extension of level 2.5 large deviations for SIDs with the general form (3). The validity of the formula obtained below in (52) will be tested in Sec. IV. In the calculation we apply a tilting approach. However, given that the noise appearing in (3) is additive, we will not need to resort to the Girsanov relation. Furthermore, we work on the validity of two assumptions:

- There exists an ergodic process $\{Y_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ with probability path measure $d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}$, such that its empirical occupation measure ρ_t converges to ρ and its empirical current j_t in (40) converges to $j := J_{F'_\rho, \rho}$ where

$$F'_\rho(x) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nabla V'_y(x) \rho(x) dx, \quad (43)$$

is the spatial convolution of V'_y , an auxiliary self-interacting potential, and ρ the invariant measure of Y_t . This auxiliary process is a (Markov) diffusion with noise matrix D , but with a modified drift given by (43) which can be cast as a function of j as

$$F'_\rho(x) = \frac{j(x)}{\rho(x)} + \frac{D}{2} \nabla \ln \rho(x). \quad (44)$$

As a consequence, ρ is unique and $\nabla \cdot j = 0$.

- The original path measure of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ and the auxiliary one of $\{Y_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ are absolutely continuous with respect to each other. This implies that the Radon–Nikodym derivative is well defined and its asymptotic behaviour is identified by a function $I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}$ such that the relation

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{X_t, [0, t]}[x]}{d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}[x]} = e^{-tI_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[x] + o(t)}, \quad (45)$$

with x a general path, is well defined.

These two assumptions already seem to impose strict limitations on the types of fluctuations we can analyse for SIDs. Notably, an SID is not a Markov process, yet we are assuming that a fluctuation in a non-Markov process can be represented by a Markov process, where the drift is uniquely generated by the spatial convolution of an auxiliary interaction potential and the stationary distribution ρ . At best, any information that the function $I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}$ provides regarding the likelihood of fluctuations will only serve as an upper bound in terms of rate functions or a lower bound in terms of actual probabilities. We will investigate in Sec. IV how effective this approach is in providing a bound.

We start off by formally re-expressing the joint probability of density and current in terms of the path measure of X_t , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\rho_t = \rho, j_t = j) &= \mathbb{E}_{X_t} [\delta_{\rho_t[X_t], \rho} \delta_{j_t[X_t], j}] \\ &= \int d\mathbb{P}_{X_t, [0, t]}[x] \delta_{\rho_t[x], \rho} \delta_{j_t[x], j}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

and select paths $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 0} = x$ using Kronecker- δ (or indicator) functions. We now introduce the new tilted path measure $d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}$ and express the newly-appearing Radon–Nikodym derivative as in (45) to get

$$P(\rho_t = \rho, j_t = j) \sim \mathbb{E}_{Y_t} \left[e^{-tI_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[Y_t]} \delta_{\rho_t[Y_t], \rho} \delta_{j_t[Y_t], j} \right]. \quad (47)$$

Eventually, noticing that $\mathbb{E}_{Y_t} [\delta_{\rho_t[Y_t], \rho} \delta_{j_t[Y_t], j}] = 1$ because of the properties of the auxiliary process Y_t , we get

$$P(\rho_t = \rho, j_t = j) \sim e^{-tI_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j]}, \quad (48)$$

and we are only left with calculating $I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}$.

In the simple case of additive noise Onsager–Machlup fluctuation theory applies and we can therefore write

$$\ln \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{X_t, [0, t]}[X_t]}{d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}[X_t]} \right) = \ln \left(\frac{\exp^{-\int_0^t ds \frac{1}{2} [(\dot{X}_s - F_{\rho_s})^\top \cdot D^{-1}(\dot{X}_s - F_{\rho_s}) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot F_{\rho_s}]} }{\exp^{-\int_0^t ds \frac{1}{2} [(\dot{X}_s - F'_\rho)^\top \cdot D^{-1}(\dot{X}_s - F'_\rho) + \frac{1}{2} \nabla \cdot F'_\rho]} } \right), \quad (49)$$

where we have used the Itô convention and therefore divergence terms appear in the integrals and, only in this equation, we mark with $\dot{}$ the temporal derivative. Furthermore, we notice that at the numerator the drift F_{ρ_t} is defined as in (6) and is non-Markovian in nature, whereas at the denominator F'_ρ is given in (44) and is related to the auxiliary Markov process introduced above. Expanding the products on the right hand side of (49), merging numerator and denominator in a single expression and introducing the definitions of ρ_t in (4) and \mathbf{j}_t in (40) we get

$$\ln \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{X_t, [0, t]}[X_t]}{d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}[X_t]} \right) = -t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbf{j}_t \cdot D^{-1} (F'_\rho - F_{\rho_t}) dx - \frac{t}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \rho_t [\nabla \cdot (F_{\rho_t} - F'_\rho) - (F_{\rho_t} - F'_\rho) \cdot D^{-1} (F_{\rho_t} + F'_\rho)] dx. \quad (50)$$

By replacing F'_ρ from (44) and $J_{F_{\rho_t}, \rho}$ from (42), with the change $F \rightarrow F_{\rho_t}$, we get

$$\ln \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{X_t, [0, t]}[X_t]}{d\mathbb{P}_{Y_t, [0, t]}[X_t]} \right) = -t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \mathbf{j}_t \cdot D^{-1} \left(\frac{j - J_{F_{\rho_t}, \rho}}{\rho} \right) + \frac{\rho_t}{2} \left[\nabla \cdot \left(\frac{-j + J_{F_{\rho_t}, \rho}}{\rho} \right) - \left(\frac{j - J_{F_{\rho_t}, \rho}}{\rho} \right) \cdot D^{-1} \left(\frac{j - J_{F_{\rho_t}, \rho}}{\rho} - 2F'_\rho \right) \right] \right\} dx. \quad (51)$$

Finally, integrating by parts the second term in the integral, collecting the common factor and using again (44) to isolate a current j , we get

$$I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (j - J_{F_{\rho}, \rho}) \cdot (\rho D)^{-1} (j - J_{F_{\rho}, \rho}) dx & \text{if } \nabla \cdot j = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

This rate function is similar to the one known for diffusion processes in (41), with the only difference that the instantaneous current $J_{F_{\rho}, \rho}$ now depends on a drift that is represented by a spatial convolution with the density ρ .

For the case of interest in this paper, that is the SID in (1), (52) reduces to

$$I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2D} \int_{S^1} \rho^{-1} J_{F_{\rho}, \rho}^2 d\theta + \frac{j^2}{2D} \int_{S^1} \rho^{-1} d\theta - \frac{j}{D} \int_{S^1} \rho^{-1} J_{F_{\rho}, \rho} d\theta & \text{if } \frac{dj}{d\theta} = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (53)$$

where it is evident that j must be a constant over the ring. We can further simplify the expression in (53) expanding $J_{F_{\rho}, \rho}$ and manipulating the expression appropriately to find

$$I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j] = \begin{cases} \frac{D}{2} \int_{S^1} \left[\rho \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right)^2 + \frac{j^2}{4\pi^2 D^2} \rho^{-1} \right] d\theta & \text{if } \frac{dj}{d\theta} = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (54)$$

where, from now on, $\dot{}$ denotes a spatial derivative, and we have used the fact that integration by parts gives $\int_{S^1} \rho^{-1} \dot{\rho} d\theta = 0$. We also consider that \dot{j}_t in (2) is related to \mathbf{j}_t via $\dot{j}_t = 2\pi \mathbf{j}_t$, and therefore, $j = 2\pi \mathbf{j}$.

3. Current contraction and the Euler–Lagrange equation

We are interested in the current large deviations. Given the formula for the extended level 2.5 rate function in (54), we can obtain the current rate function via contraction as follows:

$$I(j) = \inf_{\rho=1} \inf_{S^1} I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j], \quad (55)$$

where we notice that no minimisation has to be carried out over the current j because the latter is a constant over the circle as remarked just below (53).

The minimisation in (55) can be tackled by introducing the Lagrangian functional

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho, \dot{\rho}] = \frac{D}{2} \int_{S^1} \left[\rho \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right)^2 + \rho^{-1} \frac{j^2}{4\pi^2 D^2} + k(\rho - 1) \right] d\theta, \quad (56)$$

where k is the constant Lagrangian multiplier that fixes the normalisation constraint, i.e., $0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial k} = \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \rho d\theta - 1$. The Euler–Lagrange equation is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left(\frac{d}{d\epsilon} \mathcal{L} [\rho + \epsilon\eta, \dot{\rho} + \epsilon\dot{\eta}] \right)_{\epsilon=0} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \left[\eta \left(\left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right)^2 + k - \frac{\rho^{-2}j^2}{4\pi^2 D^2} \right) + 2\rho \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right) \left(\frac{\dot{\eta}}{2\rho} - \frac{2\dot{\rho}\eta}{(2\rho)^2} - \frac{2c}{D} \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \sin(\theta_1 - \theta)\eta(\theta_1) d\theta_1 \right) \right] d\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and is valid for η -variations such that $\int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \eta d\theta = 0$. After integrating by parts the term with $\dot{\eta}$, swapping integrals over the last term, and recognising that the resulting expression must hold for all η -variations, we obtain the following simplified Riccati-like expression for the Euler–Lagrange equation:

$$0 = \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right)^2 + k - \frac{\rho^{-2}j^2}{4\pi^2 D^2} - \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right) - \frac{\dot{\rho}}{\rho} \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right) - \frac{4c}{D} \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \rho \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho} - \frac{F_\rho}{D} \right) \sin(\theta - \theta_1) d\theta_1, \quad (58)$$

whose solution, namely ρ^* , is the minimiser of $I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}$ for any fixed fluctuation j of the current.

Evidently, the uniform distribution $\rho^*(\theta) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$ is always solution of (58). This means that whenever $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$ is stable, i.e., in the self-repelling region, fluctuations of the SID current far from the typical value ($j \neq J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = 0$) are generated by a process that preserves the uniform stationary distribution. Hence, such a process will simply be a drifted Brownian motion over the ring.

On the opposite, the localised distribution $\rho^*(\theta) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{\frac{4c}{D}(\cos(\theta)\alpha_1 + \sin(\theta)\alpha_2)}$ is only solution for $j = 0$. Therefore, in the self-attracting region, fluctuations $j \neq 0$ are generated by a process whose stationary distribution ρ^* is not given by ρ_{inv} . In the following we show how to derive the minimiser ρ^* solution of (58).

4. Perturbation theory around ρ_{inv}

An exact analytic solution of (58) is hard to find. For this reason, we consider the perturbative analytic approximation for small currents j that follows:

$$\rho = \rho_{\text{inv}} + j\tilde{\rho} + o(j), \quad (59)$$

with the normalisation condition given by $\int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \rho_{\text{inv}} d\theta = 1$ and $\int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \tilde{\rho} d\theta = 0$. We do not know a priori whether a perturbative approach will work in general, nor whether the current should appear linearly in (59). In the worst case scenario, this approach will provide us with a weak(er) upper bound for the current rate function.

Replacing (59) in (58) and keeping only the first order contribution in j (the zeroth one is 0) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{inv}}\dot{\tilde{\rho}}}{2} + \frac{2\rho_{\text{inv}}\tilde{\rho}F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}^2 + \rho_{\text{inv}}^2 F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} F_{\tilde{\rho}}}{D^2} + k\rho_{\text{inv}}\tilde{\rho} - \frac{\tilde{\rho}\ddot{\rho}_{\text{inv}} + \ddot{\tilde{\rho}}\rho_{\text{inv}}}{2} + \frac{2\rho_{\text{inv}}\tilde{\rho}\dot{F}_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} + \rho_{\text{inv}}^2 \dot{F}_{\tilde{\rho}}}{D} + \\ &\quad - \frac{4c}{D}\rho_{\text{inv}}^2 \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \left[\sin(\theta - \theta_1)\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta_1) \left(\frac{\dot{\rho}}{2\rho_{\text{inv}}} - \frac{\dot{\rho}_{\text{inv}}\tilde{\rho}}{2\rho_{\text{inv}}^2} - \frac{F_{\tilde{\rho}}}{D} \right) (\theta_1) \right] d\theta_1, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

which is still a complicated expression to deal with. We further consider the following relations:

$$\dot{\rho}_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \frac{4c}{D} (\alpha_2 \cos \theta - \alpha_1 \sin \theta) \quad (61)$$

$$\ddot{\rho}_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \frac{16c^2}{D^2} (\alpha_2 \cos \theta - \alpha_1 \sin \theta)^2 + \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \frac{4c}{D} (-\alpha_2 \sin \theta - \alpha_1 \cos \theta) \quad (62)$$

$$F_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta) = -\alpha_1 \sin \theta + \alpha_2 \cos \theta \quad (63)$$

$$\dot{F}_{\rho_{\text{inv}}}(\theta) = 2c(-\alpha_1 \cos \theta - \alpha_2 \sin \theta) \quad (64)$$

$$F_{\tilde{\rho}}(\theta) = 2c(\bar{\alpha}_2 \cos \theta - \bar{\alpha}_1 \sin \theta) \quad (65)$$

$$\dot{F}_{\tilde{\rho}}(\theta) = 2c(-\bar{\alpha}_2 \sin \theta - \bar{\alpha}_1 \cos \theta), \quad (66)$$

along with the definitions

$$\bar{\alpha}_1 = \int_{S^1} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) \cos \theta d\theta \quad (67)$$

$$\bar{\alpha}_2 = \int_{S^1} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) \sin \theta d\theta \quad (68)$$

$$\bar{\alpha}_3 = \int_{S^1} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) \cos^2 \theta d\theta \quad (69)$$

$$\bar{\alpha}_4 = \int_{S^1} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) \cos \theta \sin \theta d\theta \quad (70)$$

$$\bar{\alpha}_5 = \int_{S^1} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) \sin^2 \theta d\theta \quad (71)$$

$$\alpha_3 = \int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \cos^2 \theta d\theta \quad (72)$$

$$\alpha_4 = \int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \cos \theta \sin \theta d\theta \quad (73)$$

$$\alpha_5 = \int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \sin^2 \theta d\theta, \quad (74)$$

and obtain, after some simplifications, the following equation for the perturbed density $\tilde{\rho}$:

$$0 = -\ddot{\tilde{\rho}}(\theta) + \frac{4c}{D} \dot{\tilde{\rho}}(\theta)(\alpha_2 \cos \theta - \alpha_1 \sin \theta) - \frac{4c}{D} \tilde{\rho}(\theta)(\alpha_1 \cos \theta + \alpha_2 \sin \theta) + g(\theta), \quad (75)$$

with

$$g(\theta) = \frac{4c}{D} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \left[\frac{2c}{D} (\alpha_2 \cos \theta - \alpha_1 \sin \theta)(\bar{\alpha}_2 \cos \theta - \bar{\alpha}_1 \sin \theta) - 2(\bar{\alpha}_2 \sin \theta + \bar{\alpha}_1 \cos \theta) + \frac{4c}{D} (\alpha_2(\bar{\alpha}_3 \sin \theta - \bar{\alpha}_4 \cos \theta) + \alpha_1(\bar{\alpha}_5 \cos \theta - \bar{\alpha}_4 \sin \theta) + \bar{\alpha}_2(\alpha_3 \sin \theta - \alpha_4 \cos \theta) + \bar{\alpha}_1(\alpha_5 \cos \theta - \alpha_4 \sin \theta)) \right]. \quad (76)$$

The homogeneous solution of (75) is

$$\tilde{\rho}^G(\theta) = c_1 y_1(\theta) + c_0 y_0(\theta), \quad (77)$$

with

$$y_0(\theta) = \mathcal{Z} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) e^{-\frac{4c}{D} \alpha_1} \quad (78)$$

$$y_1(\theta) = \mathcal{Z} \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \left(\int_0^\theta e^{-\frac{4c}{D} (\alpha_1 \cos \theta_1 + \alpha_2 \sin \theta_1)} d\theta_1 \right), \quad (79)$$

where we remind the reader that $\mathcal{Z} = \int_{S^1} e^{\frac{4c}{D} (\cos \theta \alpha_1 + \sin \theta \alpha_2)} d\theta$. Using the Wronskian $W(y_1, y_0) = y_1 \dot{y}_0 - y_0 \dot{y}_1 = -y_0$, we can find a particular solution to the complete heterogeneous problem in (75), which reads

$$\tilde{\rho}^P(\theta) = y_1(\theta) \int_{S^1} g(\theta) d\theta - y_0(\theta) \int_{S^1} \frac{y_1(\theta) g(\theta)}{y_0(\theta)} d\theta. \quad (80)$$

The final (formal) solution of (75) is given by

$$\tilde{\rho}(\theta) = \tilde{\rho}^G(\theta) + \tilde{\rho}^P(\theta) = \rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \left(\tilde{c}_0 + c_1 \int_0^\theta \rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta_1) d\theta_1 + \int_0^\theta \rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta_1) d\theta_1 \int g(\theta) d\theta - \int \left[g(\theta) \int_0^\theta \rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta_1) d\theta_1 \right] d\theta \right), \quad (81)$$

with $\tilde{\rho}^G$ given in (77) and $\tilde{\rho}^P$ in (80) (and $\tilde{c}_0 = \mathcal{Z} e^{-\frac{4c}{D} \alpha_1} c_0$ is just another constant). Eq. (81) along with (14), (15), and (67)–(74) form a closed system of equations that can be solved to explicitly determine (81). Additionally, by imposing the condition $\tilde{\rho}(0) = \tilde{\rho}(2\pi)$ and considering the notation $G(\theta) = \int g(\theta) d\theta$ and $\bar{G}(\theta) = \mathcal{Z}^{-1} \int \left[g(\theta) \int_0^\theta \rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta_1) d\theta_1 \right] d\theta$ we obtain the constant

$$c_1 = \mathcal{Z} e^{-\frac{4c}{D} \alpha_1} \left(\frac{\bar{G}(2\pi) - \bar{G}(0)}{\int_{S^1} \rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta) d\theta} \right) - G(2\pi). \quad (82)$$




FIG. 2: Exemplary graphs of $\tilde{\rho}(\theta)$ for $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{\frac{4cr}{D} \cos(\theta)}$ —obtained setting $\alpha_1 = r$ solution of (26) and $\alpha_2 = 0$ —localised where the SID starts, at increasing values of c/D .

Eventually, the constant c_0 (or \tilde{c}_0) is fixed by imposing the normalisation constraint $\int_0^{2\pi} \tilde{\rho}(\theta) d\theta = 0$.

To summarise, the function $\tilde{\rho}$ in (81) is the small-current change to the stationary distribution ρ_{inv} characterising the optimal solution to the minimisation problem (55). Therefore, according to the driven process theory [30] for a small current j , the density $\rho^* = \rho_{\text{inv}} + j\tilde{\rho}$ characterises the stationary distribution of the auxiliary process that typically generates the current j . Notice that, because of the first assumption made in III B 2, i.e., the existence of an auxiliary dynamics which typically converges to a fluctuation of ρ_t and j_t , and the general linear-in- j form of the expansion (59), the inherently-Markovian dynamics of the auxiliary process just determined may not be the most likely dynamics that generate the current j in an SID. Therefore, in this sense, the auxiliary process is only sub-optimal, as much as the rate function $I(j)$ in (55) is expected to only be an upper bound of the real current rate function for the SID.

5. Current rate function for small j

As mentioned in the last paragraph of III B 2, in the self-repelling region fluctuations of the SID current are generated by an auxiliary drifted Brownian dynamics over the ring whose stationary distribution is uniform. Therefore, we expect $\tilde{\rho} = 0$. To check this we plug $\rho_{\text{inv}} = (2\pi)^{-1}$, along with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_4 = 0$ and $\alpha_3 = \alpha_5 = 1/2$ from (14), (15) and (72)–(74), in (81) and obtain

$$\tilde{\rho}(\theta) = \left(\frac{4c}{\pi D} - \frac{4c^2}{\pi D^2} \right) (\bar{\alpha}_1 \cos \theta + \bar{\alpha}_2 \sin \theta), \quad (83)$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_1$ and $\bar{\alpha}_2$ are the only two parameters left to be determined. Solving for them from (67) and (68) we get $\bar{\alpha}_1 = \bar{\alpha}_2 = 0$ and, as a consequence, $\tilde{\rho} = 0$ as expected.

In the self-attracting region where a localised distribution ρ_{inv} is reached, the form of $\tilde{\rho}$ will have to be determined by solving the system of equations given by (81) along with (14), (15) and (67)–(74). To build intuition, we plot exemplary graphs of $\tilde{\rho}(\theta)$ in Fig. 2 for $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (\mathcal{Z})^{-1} e^{\frac{4cr}{D} \cos(\theta)}$ localised at the origin of the ring, where the SID starts, at increasing values of c/D . From the plots, we notice that the form of $\tilde{\rho}$ is always antisymmetric with respect to the origin with a positive part just to the left of the origin and a negative one to the right. This means that the final form of $\rho^* = \rho_{\text{inv}} + j\tilde{\rho}$, which generates the small current j will still be highly localised at 0, but with a small bulge on the left and a dip on the right. This form breaks the symmetry of ρ_{inv} and favours the generation of a counterclockwise current j . The opposite behaviour, i.e., clockwise current, is generated similarly by considering the change $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow -\tilde{\rho}$. Additionally, from Fig. 2 we also notice that the higher the ratio c/D (greater localisation) the thinner the peaks of $\tilde{\rho}$ and therefore the more localised the bulge and the dip in ρ^* .

Now that we have a perturbative form for the optimal ρ^* solution of (55), we can use this to determine the shape of the rate function $I(j)$ for small currents j . To do so, we take the ansatz (59) (plus a ‘bookkeeping’ term of $O(j^2)$ that will anyway disappear), plug it into $I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho, j]$ in (54) and keep terms up to $O(j^2)$ to eventually get

$$I_c(j) = I_{2.5}^{(\text{SID})}[\rho_{\text{inv}} + j\tilde{\rho} + \frac{j^2}{2}\tilde{\tilde{\rho}} + o(j^2)] \quad (84)$$

$$= \frac{j^2}{2} D \int_{S^1} \left[\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\frac{\tilde{\rho}(\theta)}{\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta)} \right) - \frac{F_{\tilde{\rho}}(\theta)}{D} \right)^2 + \frac{\rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(\theta)}{4\pi^2 D^2} \right] d\theta + o(j^2). \quad (85)$$

In doing so, we realise that the form of the rate function $I_c(j)$ should explicitly depend on the parameters α_1 and α_2 , which fully determine ρ_{inv} (along with other parameters) around which we are expanding. However, as we explain later, this dependence does not change the form of the rate function for small currents, and therefore, we do not keep track of it. We remark that the factor

$$\left(D \int_{\mathcal{S}^1} \left[\rho_{\text{inv}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d\theta} \left(\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\rho_{\text{inv}}} \right) - \frac{F_{\tilde{\rho}}}{D} \right)^2 + \frac{\rho_{\text{inv}}^{-1}}{4\pi^2 D^2} \right] \right)^{-1} =: \sigma_c^2[\tilde{\rho}], \quad (86)$$

which multiplies $j^2/2$ in (85), is a lower bound on the so-called asymptotic variance, i.e.,

$$\sigma^2 := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t \mathbb{E} [(j_t - J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}})^2], \quad (87)$$

of the current of the SID process converging to ρ_{inv} . Evidently, from the quadratic form of $I_c(j)$, fluctuations j are Gaussian, with a width determined by (86), around $J_{\rho_{\text{inv}}} = 0$.

IV. RESULTS

A. Asymptotic variance

We discuss the behaviour of the asymptotic variance in (86) in both the self-repelling ($c/D \leq 1/2$) and self-attracting ($c/D > 1/2$) region. In the self-repelling region, $\rho_{\text{inv}}(\theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\rho} = 0$, and therefore

$$\sigma_c^2[0] = D, \quad (88)$$

proving once again that the auxiliary process determining small-current fluctuations is a simple drifted Brownian motion over the ring. In the self-attracting region, for generic values of c and D , σ_c^2 can only be evaluated numerically. Remarkably, although $\sigma_c^2[\tilde{\rho}]$ has a ‘hidden’ dependence on ρ_{inv} through the parameters α_1 and α_2 that fully determine ρ_{inv} , we can show numerically that σ_c^2 does not change with varying α_1 and α_2 given the relation $\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = r^2$ with r solution of (26). In other words, the $O(2)$ symmetry of ρ_{inv} is inherited by the rate function and, in particular, by the asymptotic variance.

In Fig. 3 we compare the diffusion coefficient of a pure Brownian motion $dB_t = \sqrt{D}dW_t$ with the lower bound σ_c^2 we have on the asymptotic variance of the SID in (86) and with the asymptotic variance σ_a^2 of the adiabatic process in (32). The latter is calculated as $\sigma_a^2 = \lambda_a''(k)|_{k=0}$, where λ_a is given in (34). It shows numerically the same $O(2)$ symmetry of σ_c^2 and is therefore invariant as well with respect to the choice of α_1 and α_2 . Evidently, for $c/D < 1/2$ we have (88) and the three curves fully overlap. On the other hand, for $c/D > 1/2$, σ_c^2 and σ_a^2 start decreasing exponentially fast, deviating from the pure diffusive behaviour. A sudden transition in the behaviour of σ_c^2 and σ_a^2 arises at $c/D = 1/2$, which we believe is consequence of the delocalisation-localisation phase transition discussed in IIB 2.

The current state of our research does not include an analytical proof to support the claim of the transition at the level of the asymptotic variance. However, the numerical results are clear. Furthermore, the overall description aligns with the transition observed in [58] (see Sect. 1.10 and Eq. 1.34) regarding the transport coefficient of a noisy mean-field Kuramoto model. This model’s associated Hamiltonian is the same as that of the XY model discussed in the last paragraph of IIB 2 and in Appendix B).




FIG. 3: Lower bound σ_c^2 on the asymptotic variance of the SID in (86) and asymptotic variance σ_a^2 of the adiabatic process in (32) compared with the diffusion coefficient D of a pure Brownian motion. Given c/D , σ_c^2 and σ_a^2 are both constant with varying α_1 and α_2 such that $\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = r^2$ with r solution of (26). [For the plot we chose $\alpha_1 = r$ and $\alpha_2 = 0$.]

Additionally, the fact that the lower bound on the asymptotic variance σ_c^2 of the SID always overlap with the asymptotic variance of the adiabatic process σ_a^2 means that for small current fluctuations the adiabatic process and the SID behave similarly at long times. A more detailed comparison of these fluctuations follows.

B. Comparison with Monte-Carlo simulations

In the self-repelling scenario, the long-time behaviour of the current observable j_t in (2) associated to an SID process is equivalent to considering the ensemble average. In general, in a self-attracting scenario, this is no longer true. By assuming an ensemble point of view, i.e., considering infinitely many realisations of the SID process in (1), the distribution of the current $P_e(j_t = j)$ can be written as

$$P_e(j_t = j) = \int_{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 = r^2} P_e(j_t = j | a_{t,1} = \alpha_1, a_{t,2} = \alpha_2) P(a_{t,1} = \alpha_1, a_{t,2} = \alpha_2) d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2, \quad (89)$$

where we have introduced new random variables $a_{t,1}$ and $a_{t,2}$, whose values depend on the entire realisation of the noise up to time t in (1), along with their joint distribution, and made use of the law of conditioning. In general, a different convergence of the empirical measure of the SID, fully determined by the values α_1 and α_2 , could lead to different fluctuations in the current.

On the other hand, our analytical and numerical results for the long-time limit of $P(j_t = j)$ show no dependence on α_1 and α_2 , i.e., the large deviation form

$$P(j_t = j) \approx e^{-tI}, \quad (90)$$

holds, and the rate functions $I \equiv I_a$ or $I \equiv I_c$, actually only the small-current limit of the latter, are invariant with respect to a change of α_1 and α_2 as mentioned above. We therefore expect that by running long simulations

$$P_e(j_t = j) \approx P(j_t = j) \approx e^{-tI_a/c(j)}, \quad (91)$$

which means that the current observable behaves ergodically.

To check this statement and our analytical and numerical results above, we run Monte-Carlo simulations for long times t for different values of c/D . For each of these, starting from the histogram of currents $f_t(j)$, which is expected to converge (at long times) to $P_e(j_t = j)$ in (89), the function

$$I_t(j) = -\frac{1}{t} \ln f_t(j) \quad (92)$$

should converge to the true rate function of the SID process. In Fig. 4, we compare this function with the current rate functions I_a in (33) associated to the adiabatic process, I_c derived from the contraction over the extended level 2.5 large deviation theory in the small-current limit of (85), and $I_D(j) = j^2/(2D)$ of a pure Brownian motion over the ring.

From the plots, we notice that in the self-repelling phase ($c/D \leq 1/2$), all curves and simulation data points perfectly overlap: long-time fluctuations of the current are simply generated by pure Brownian motion over the ring. In the self-attracting phase ($c/D > 1/2$), we investigate three scenarios with increasing localisation: $c/D = 0.6$, $c/D = 0.8$, and $c/D = 1$. Recall that the greater the localisation the sharper ρ_{inv} around its typical value. In all cases, I_D greatly underestimates I_t providing a lower-bound that becomes weaker the greater the localisation. For weak localisation, both I_a and I_c well estimate simulations. For strong localisation, I_c overestimates I_t , whereas I_a still captures the global behaviour of fluctuations. However, for small current fluctuations, the rate functions I_a and I_c are equivalent, as suggested by the asymptotic variances in Fig. 3. In conclusion, I_a effectively captures the behaviour of current fluctuations in all regimes investigated, whereas I_c provides an upper bound that is tight in the self-repelling region and becomes weaker with increased localisation, though it remains a good estimate.

V. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have explored the fluctuations of the average speed or current of a self-interacting diffusion on a ring. Our analysis revealed a delocalisation-localisation phase transition characterised by a shift from a self-repelling to a self-attracting regime. We employed two methods to analyse the current fluctuations: the adiabatic approximation and an original extension of level 2.5 large deviation theory along with perturbation theory.

Monte Carlo simulations confirmed our analytical predictions, showing that in the self-repelling phase ($c/D < 1/2$), the fluctuations of the current are well-described by pure Brownian motion over the ring. In the self-attracting phase ($c/D > 1/2$), increasing localisation sharpened the stationary distribution ρ_{inv} around its typical value, influencing the fluctuation behaviour. Our results indicated that while I_D , the current rate




FIG. 4: Monte Carlo simulations, plotted as $I_t(j)$ in (92), were obtained by running the SID process in (1) for $t = 1000$ with $dt = 0.025$, $c=1$, and $D = 4, 1.67, 1.25, 1$ respectively for the four plots from top left to bottom right. These simulations are compared with the current rate functions: I_a in (33) for the adiabatic process, I_c derived from extended level 2.5 large deviation theory in the small-current limit of (85), and $I_D(j)$ of a pure Brownian motion over the ring.

function of a pure Brownian motion, can only be accounted as a weak lower bound of simulations I_t , the adiabatic approximation I_a effectively captures the behaviour of current fluctuations across all regimes and I_c derived from the extended level 2.5 along with perturbation theory serves as an upper bound, especially tight for weakly localised regimes. Finally, both the methods employed accurately estimated the asymptotic variance and suggested a phase transition at the onset of the localised regime.

Several open questions remain for future research. One key area of interest is determining whether rare events, beyond small-to-moderate current fluctuations, can be effectively captured by the adiabatic approximation and accurately estimated using the extended level 2.5 large deviation theory. Initial and transient noise paths could significantly influence the memory term, potentially leading to rare events that are not easily detected by the current framework. Additionally, gaining a deeper understanding of the non-stationary behaviour in the white region of the phase diagram, where the stationary Fokker–Planck equation fails, is crucial. Exploring how different potential forms and interaction strengths affect the fluctuation behaviour of SIDs could also provide valuable insights. Extending these methods to other systems could also help uncover more about the universal properties of self-interacting diffusions and assess whether the level 2.5 large deviation theory can generally apply beyond the perturbative approach introduced in this work. Lastly, alongside theoretical work, there is considerable scope for applied research, particularly in understanding fluctuations of relevant observables in reinforcement mechanisms used in autochemotactic agents [16], swarm intelligence [59], and machine learning algorithms [60].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is deeply grateful to R. Chetrite for introducing him to the topic and for the initial discussions and insights that fueled this work. The author also expresses gratitude to J. Barré, R. Harris, Sarah A. M. Loos, K. S. Olsen, G. Pavliotis, H. Touchette and P. Vivo. for their engaging and enlightening discussions. This work was partially supported by the Swedish Research Council Grant No. 638-2013-9243.

Appendix A: Linear stability of $\rho_{\text{inv}} = (2\pi)^{-1}$

We study the time-dependent Fokker–Planck equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho_t(\theta)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (\rho_t(\theta) F_{\rho_t}(\theta)) + \frac{D}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \rho_t(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

with

$$\rho_t(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} + \epsilon \eta_t(\theta), \quad (\text{A2})$$

for $\epsilon \ll 1$ and F_{ρ_t} defined in (9). Notice that although (A1) is not valid in general as discussed in the main text, it is valid in the linear stability study that follows as we look at a perturbation in time only around the stationary solution $\rho_{\text{inv}} = (2\pi)^{-1}$ as in (A2).

Due to the normalisation of $\rho_t(\theta)$ it follows that η_t has zero mean, i.e.,

$$\int_{S^1} \eta_t(\theta) d\theta = 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Additionally, η_t is also 2π -periodic, i.e., $\eta_t(0) = \eta_t(2\pi)$.

Replacing (A2) in (A1) we get, at order ϵ ,

$$\frac{\partial \eta_t(\theta)}{\partial t} = -\frac{c}{\pi} \int_{S^1} \cos(\theta_1 - \theta + \phi) \eta_t(\theta_1) d\theta_1 + \frac{D}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \eta_t(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

We now expand the perturbation $\eta_t(\theta)$ in a Fourier series, i.e.,

$$\eta_t(\theta) = d(t)e^{i\theta} + d^*(t)e^{-i\theta} + \eta_t^\perp(\theta), \quad (\text{A5})$$

where we only highlight the first oscillation mode.

We replace (A5) in (A4) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial d(t)}{\partial t} e^{i\theta} + \frac{\partial d^*(t)}{\partial t} e^{-i\theta} + \frac{\partial \eta_t^\perp(\theta)}{\partial t} \right) &= -\frac{c}{\pi} \int_{S^1} \cos(\theta_1 - \theta + \phi) (d(t)e^{i\theta_1} + d^*(t)e^{-i\theta_1} + \eta_t^\perp(\theta_1)) d\theta_1 + \\ &+ \frac{D}{2} \left(-d(t)e^{i\theta} - d^*(t)e^{-i\theta} + \frac{\partial^2 \eta_t^\perp(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

We only focus on the equation for the amplitude d of the fundamental oscillatory mode, which reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial d(t)}{\partial t} e^{i\theta} &= -\frac{cd(t)}{\pi} \int_{S^1} \cos(\theta_1 - \theta + \phi) e^{i\theta_1} d\theta_1 - \frac{Dd(t)}{2} e^{i\theta} \\ &= -\frac{cd(t)}{2\pi} \int_{S^1} \left(e^{i\theta_1} e^{i(-\theta+\phi)} + e^{-i\theta_1} e^{i(\theta-\phi)} \right) e^{i\theta_1} d\theta_1 - \frac{Dd(t)}{2} e^{i\theta} \\ &= -cd(t)e^{i\theta} e^{-i\phi} - \frac{Dd(t)}{2} e^{i\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

Hence, the amplitude equation eventually becomes

$$\frac{dd(t)}{dt} = -cd(t)e^{-i\phi} - \frac{D}{2}d(t). \quad (\text{A8})$$

It is interesting to notice that higher modes do not influence the linear stability. This can be seen extrapolating the equation for η_t^\perp from (A6), which reads

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \eta_t^\perp(\theta)}{\partial t} &= -\frac{c}{\pi} \int_{S^1} \cos(\theta_1 - \theta + \phi) \eta_t^\perp(\theta_1) d\theta_1 + \frac{D}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \eta_t^\perp(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2} \\ &\stackrel{(\text{A3})}{=} \frac{D}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \eta_t^\perp(\theta)}{\partial \theta^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

If we now replace³

$$\eta_t^\perp(\theta) = \sum_{k \geq 2} a_k(t) e^{ik\theta}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

³ $a_k = a_{-k}$ as $\eta_t^\perp \in \mathbb{R}$.

into (A9), we get

$$\frac{da_k}{dt} = -\frac{Dk^2}{2}a_k, \quad (\text{A11})$$

which has solution

$$a_k(t) = a_k(0)e^{-\frac{Dk^2}{2}t}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Eventually, we find that

$$\eta_t^\perp(\theta) = \sum_{k \geq 2} a_k(0)e^{-\frac{Dk^2}{2}t}e^{ik\theta}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

which means that higher harmonics decay to zero exponentially fast in time for $D > 0$, and so everything is controlled by the first oscillation mode. To study the spectrum of (A8) we write $d(t) = be^{\lambda t}$ and replace it in (A8). Linear stability is guaranteed by $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$, that is

$$\text{Re}(\lambda) = \text{Re}\left(-ce^{-i\phi} - \frac{D}{2}\right) < 0 \iff \frac{c}{D} \cos \phi \geq -\frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

Appendix B: Connection to the mean-field XY model

We introduce the mean-field XY model (or $\equiv O(2)$ model) on a finite complete graph \mathcal{G} of N vertices. At each site i of \mathcal{G} there is a spin taking values in S^1 . The state space of the whole system is $(S^1)^N$. The corresponding mean-field Hamiltonian $H_N : (S^1)^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$H_N = -\frac{B}{N} \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{G}} \cos(\theta^{j,N} - \theta^{i,N} + \phi), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $\theta^{i,N}$ represents the phase of spin i , and ϕ is a phase-shift affecting the two-body interaction between spins. In the following, we will set $B = -2c$, and $\phi = \pi$.

We now consider the dynamics of each site individually [28], i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} d\theta_t^{i,N} &= -\frac{dH_N}{d\theta_t^{i,N}} + \sqrt{D}dW_t^{i,N} \\ &= \frac{2c}{N} \sum_{j \in V} \frac{d}{d\theta_t^{i,N}} \cos(\theta_t^{j,N} - \theta_t^{i,N}) + \sqrt{D}dW_t^{i,N}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where $(W_t^{i,N})_{i=1}^N$ are N independent Brownian motions on S^1 such that

$$\mathbb{E} [dW_t^{i,N}, dW_{t+s}^{j,N}] = 2\delta_{ij}\delta(s). \quad (\text{B3})$$

Following [61], the Dean's equation, i.e., the evolution equation for the overall distribution ρ_t^N of the spins given by

$$\rho_t^N(\theta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_t^{i,N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\theta_t^{i,N} - \theta), \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $\rho_t^{i,N}$ is the density function of a single diffusing particle, reads

$$\frac{\partial \rho_t^N(\theta)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(2c\rho_t^N(\theta) \int_{S^1} \sin(\theta_1 - \theta) \rho_t^N(\theta_1) d\theta_1 \right) + \frac{D}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \rho_t^N(\theta) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left(\eta_t(\theta) (\rho_t^N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \quad (\text{B5})$$

where η_t is an uncorrelated white noise such that

$$\mathbb{E} [\eta_t(\theta), \eta_{t+s}(\theta')] = \frac{2}{N} \delta(\theta - \theta') \delta(s). \quad (\text{B6})$$

Remarkably, in the limit for $N \rightarrow \infty$ the multiplicative noise term in (B5) disappears and, along with $t \rightarrow \infty$, we recover the stationary Fokker–Planck equation (10) for the SID. Hence, the infinite-time and infinite-size limit of a mean-field XY model is equivalent to the stationary limit of an SID.

[1] M. Benaïm, M. Ledoux, and O. Raimond, “Self-interacting diffusions,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 122, no. 1, pp. 1–41, 2002.

- [2] M. Cranston and Y. Le Jan, “Self attracting diffusions: Two case studies,” *Mathematische Annalen*, vol. 303, no. 1, pp. 87–93, 1995.
- [3] O. Raimond, “Self-attracting diffusions: Case of the constant interaction,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 107, no. 2, pp. 177–196, 1997.
- [4] R. Pemantle, “A survey of random processes with reinforcement,” *Probability Surveys*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–79, 2007.
- [5] M. Benaïm and O. Raimond, “Self-interacting diffusions II: convergence in law,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1043–1055, 2003.
- [6] M. Benaïm and O. Raimond, “Self-interacting diffusions. III. Symmetric interactions,” *Annals of Probability*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 1716–1759, 2005.
- [7] M. Benaïm and O. Raimond, “Self-interacting diffusions IV: rate of convergence,” *Electronic Journal of Probability*, vol. 16, no. 66, pp. 1815–1843, 2011.
- [8] A. Kurtzmann, “The ODE method for some self-interacting diffusions on \mathbb{R}^d ,” *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probability and Statistics*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 618–643, 2010.
- [9] S. Chambeu and A. Kurtzmann, “Some particular self-interacting diffusions: ergodic behaviour and almost sure convergence,” *Bernoulli*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1248–1267, 2011.
- [10] V. Kleptsyn and A. Kurtzmann, “Ergodicity of self-attracting motion,” *Electronic Journal of Probability*, vol. 17, no. none, pp. 1–37, 2012.
- [11] A. Aleksian, P. Del Moral, A. Kurtzmann, and J. Tugaut, “On the exit-problem for self-interacting diffusions,” *arXiv:2201.10428v1*, 2022.
- [12] A. Aleksian, P. Del Moral, A. Kurtzmann, and J. Tugaut, “Self-interacting diffusions: Long-time behaviour and exit-problem in the uniformly convex case,” *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, vol. 28, pp. 46–61, 2024.
- [13] A. Barbier-Chebbah, O. Bénichou, R. Voituriez, and T. Guérin, “Long-term memory induced correction to Arrhenius law,” *arXiv:2406.04720*, 2024.
- [14] W. T. Kranz, A. Gelimson, K. Zhao, G. C. Wong, and R. Golestanian, “Effective Dynamics of Microorganisms That Interact with Their Own Trail,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 117, no. 3, p. 038101, 2016.
- [15] W. T. Kranz and R. Golestanian, “Trail-mediated self-interaction,” *Journal of Chemical Physics*, vol. 150, no. 21, p. 214111, 2019.
- [16] J. D’Alessandro, A. Barbier-Chebbah, V. Cellerin, O. Benichou, R. M. Mège, R. Voituriez, and B. Ladoux, “Cell migration guided by long-lived spatial memory,” *Nature Communications*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2021.
- [17] A. Barbier-Chebbah, O. Bénichou, and R. Voituriez, “Self-Interacting Random Walks: Aging, Exploration, and First-Passage Times,” *Physical Review X*, vol. 12, 2022.
- [18] Y. Tsori and P.-G. de Gennes, “Self-trapping of a single bacterium in its own chemoattractant,” *Europhysics Letters*, vol. 66, no. 4, p. 599, 2004.
- [19] A. Sengupta, S. van Teeffelen, and H. Löwen, “Dynamics of a microorganism moving by chemotaxis in its own secretion,” *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, vol. 80, no. 3, p. 031122, 2009.
- [20] M. P. Brenner, L. S. Levitov, and E. O. Budrene, “Physical Mechanisms for Chemotactic Pattern Formation by Bacteria,” *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 74, no. 4, pp. 1677–1693, 1998.
- [21] R. Grima, “Strong-coupling dynamics of a multicellular chemotactic system,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 95, no. 12, p. 128103, 2005.
- [22] J. Taktikos, V. Zaburdaev, and H. Stark, “Collective dynamics of model microorganisms with chemotactic signaling,” *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics*, vol. 85, no. 5, p. 051901, 2012.
- [23] R. Golestanian, “Collective behavior of thermally active colloids,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 108, no. 3, p. 038303, 2012.
- [24] O. Pohl and H. Stark, “Dynamic clustering and chemotactic collapse of self-phoretic active particles,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 112, no. 23, p. 238303, 2014.
- [25] A. Gelimson and R. Golestanian, “Collective dynamics of dividing chemotactic cells,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 114, no. 2, p. 028101, 2015.
- [26] T. Grafke, M. E. Cates, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, “Spatiotemporal Self-Organization of Fluctuating Bacterial Colonies,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 119, no. 18, p. 188003, 2017.
- [27] B. V. Hokmabad, J. Agudo-Canalejo, S. Saha, R. Golestanian, and C. C. Maass, “Chemotactic self-caging in active emulsions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 119, no. 24, p. e2122269119, 2022.
- [28] F. den Hollander, *Large Deviations*. American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [29] H. Touchette, “The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics,” *Physics Reports*, vol. 478, no. 1-3, pp. 1–69, 2009.
- [30] R. Chetrite and H. Touchette, “Nonequilibrium Markov processes conditioned on large deviations,” *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré*, vol. 16, no. 9, pp. 2005–2057, 2015.
- [31] R. L. Jack, “Ergodicity and large deviations in physical systems with stochastic dynamics,” *Eur. Phys. J. B.*, vol. 93, no. 4, p. 74, 2019.
- [32] G. Carugno, P. Vivo, and F. Coghi, “Graph-combinatorial approach for large deviations of Markov chains,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, vol. 55, no. 29, p. 295001, 2022.
- [33] G. M. Schütz and S. Trimper, “Elephants can always remember: Exact long-range memory effects in a non-Markovian random walk,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 70, no. 4, p. 045101, 2004.
- [34] A. Rebenshtok and E. Barkai, “Distribution of time-averaged observables for weak ergodicity breaking,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 99, no. 21, p. 210601, 2007.
- [35] R. J. Harris and H. Touchette, “Current fluctuations in stochastic systems with long-range memory,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 42, no. 34, p. 342001, 2009.
- [36] R. J. Harris, “Fluctuations in interacting particle systems with memory,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, vol. 2015, no. 7, p. P07021, 2015.

- [37] R. L. Jack and R. J. Harris, “Giant leaps and long excursions: fluctuation mechanisms in systems with long-range memory,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 102, no. 1, p. 012154, 2020.
- [38] A. Budhiraja and A. Waterbury, “Empirical measure large deviations for reinforced chains on finite spaces,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 169, p. 105379, 2022.
- [39] A. Budhiraja, A. Waterbury, and P. Zouboulglou, “Large Deviations for Empirical Measures of Self-Interacting Markov Chains,” *arXiv:2304.01384*, 2023.
- [40] V. S. Borkar, “Asynchronous stochastic approximations,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 840–851, 1998.
- [41] M. Benaïm, “Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms,” tech. rep., Strasbourg, 1999.
- [42] J. D. Crawford, “Amplitude expansions for instabilities in populations of globally-coupled oscillators,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 74, no. 5-6, pp. 1047–1084, 1994.
- [43] S. H. Strogatz and R. E. Mirollo, “Stability of incoherence in a population of coupled oscillators,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 63, no. 3-4, pp. 613–635, 1991.
- [44] S. H. Strogatz, “From Kuramoto to Crawford: exploring the onset of synchronization in populations of coupled oscillators,” *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, vol. 143, no. 1-4, pp. 1–20, 2000.
- [45] R. F. Boisvert and C. W. Clark, *Handbooks of Mathematical Functions, Versions*. No. September, Cambridge University Press, 1st ed., 2011.
- [46] H. Sakaguchi, “Cooperative Phenomena in Coupled Oscillator Systems under External Fields,” *Progress of Theoretical Physics*, vol. 79, no. 1, pp. 39–46, 1988.
- [47] P. Cattiaux, A. Guillin, and F. Malrieu, “Probabilistic approach for granular media equations in the non-uniformly convex case,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 140, no. 1-2, pp. 19–40, 2008.
- [48] A. Aleksian, *Exit-problem for Self-interacting and Self-stabilizing Diffusion Processes*. PhD thesis, Université Jean Monnet, 2023.
- [49] F. Malrieu, *Inégalités de Sobolev logarithmiques pour des problèmes d’évolution non linéaires*. PhD thesis, Université Paul Sabatier-Toulouse III, 2001.
- [50] P. Reimann, C. Van Den Broeck, H. Linke, P. Hänggi, J. M. Rubi, and A. Pérez-Madrid, “Giant Acceleration of Free Diffusion by Use of Tilted Periodic Potentials,” *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 87, no. 1, p. 010602, 2001.
- [51] R. Pavlov, S. Schmieding, J. W. Murphy, C. Meakin, S. Eliëns, J.-S. Caux, T. Speck, A. Engel, and U. Seifert, “The large deviation function for entropy production: the optimal trajectory and the role of fluctuations,” *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, vol. 2012, no. 12, p. P12001, 2012.
- [52] P. Tsobgni Nyawo and H. Touchette, “Large deviations of the current for driven periodic diffusions,” *Physical Review E*, vol. 94, no. 3, p. 032101, 2016.
- [53] H. Touchette, “Introduction to dynamical large deviations of Markov processes,” *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, vol. 504, pp. 5–19, 2018.
- [54] C. Maes and K. Netoný, “Canonical structure of dynamical fluctuations in mesoscopic nonequilibrium steady states,” *Europhysics Letters*, vol. 82, no. 3, 2008.
- [55] V. Y. Chernyak, M. Chertkov, S. V. Malinin, and R. Teodorescu, “Non-equilibrium thermodynamics and topology of currents,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 137, no. 1, pp. 109–147, 2009.
- [56] S. Kusuoka, K. Kuwada, and Y. Tamura, “Large deviation for stochastic line integrals as Lp-currents,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 147, no. 3, pp. 649–667, 2010.
- [57] A. C. Barato and R. Chetrite, “A formal view on level 2.5 large deviations and fluctuation relations,” *Journal of Statistical Physics*, vol. 160, no. 5, pp. 1154–1172, 2015.
- [58] M. G. Delgadino, R. S. Gvalani, and G. A. Pavliotis, “On the Diffusive-Mean Field Limit for Weakly Interacting Diffusions Exhibiting Phase Transitions,” *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 241, no. 1, pp. 91–148, 2021.
- [59] J. Kennedy, R. C. Eberhart, and Y. Shi, *Swarm Intelligence*. Elsevier Science & Technology, 2001.
- [60] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. A Bradford Book, 2nd ed., 1998.
- [61] S. D. Dean, “Langevin equation for the density of a system of interacting Langevin processes,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, vol. 29, no. 24, p. L613, 1996.