

# Comment on the paper “Exact decay of the persistence probability in the $\text{Airy}_1$ process” by Ferrari and Liu

Sylvain Prohac

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, UPS, Université de Toulouse,  
France

December 11, 2024

## Abstract

We point out that the non-trivial function obtained by Ferrari and Liu for the persistence probability of the  $\text{Airy}_1$  process has a strikingly similar form as a large deviation function found earlier by the author for current fluctuations of the totally asymmetric exclusion process with periodic boundaries conditioned on flat initial and final states. A proposed explanation for this observation, which relates similar yet clearly distinct quantities, is that both results pertain to conditioning on the same kind of rare events where a current larger than typical is maintained throughout the system.

The paper [1] mentioned in the title studies the  $\text{Airy}_1$  process  $\mathcal{A}_1(x)$ , which describes universal spatial correlations of one-dimensional growing interfaces at the KPZ fixed point, when the infinitely long interface is initially completely flat. More precisely, the persistence probability for the  $\text{Airy}_1$  process is proved in [1] to vanish as  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_1(x) \leq u, x \in [0, \ell]) \simeq A e^{-2\ell\varphi(2u)}$  at large  $\ell$ , with  $A$  a constant and  $\varphi$  a non-trivial function known explicitly, see below.

Interestingly, the very same function  $\varphi$  had appeared earlier [2] for the one-dimensional totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP), a Markov process where driven particles on a lattice move from any site  $i$  to the next one  $i + 1$  with unit rate, and which converges to the KPZ fixed point at large scales. More precisely, it was found in [2] that  $\varphi$  describes large deviations of current fluctuations for TASEP with periodic boundaries conditioned on specific initial and final states corresponding to a flat interface in the KPZ language.

From [3], the result of [1] mentioned above about persistence for the  $\text{Airy}_1$  process can be rewritten in terms of TASEP *on the infinite line*  $\mathbb{Z}$  prepared at time  $t = 0$  in the *flat state* (in the growing interface language) where even sites are occupied and odd sites are empty, as

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-\frac{4}{t^{1/3}}(Q_L^{\min}(t) - \frac{t}{4}) \leq u\right) \simeq A e^{-\frac{t}{t^{2/3}}\varphi(u)} \quad (1)$$

when  $1 \ll t \ll L^{3/2}$ , with  $Q_L^{\min}(t) = \min\{Q_i(t), i = 1, \dots, L\}$  and  $Q_i(t)$  the total number of particles that have moved from site  $i$  to site  $i + 1$  between time 0 and time  $t$ .

On the other hand, [2] considers TASEP with  $L$  sites and *periodic boundaries*, for an evolution *conditioned on beginning and ending in the flat state* (defined as above). Then, in terms of the mean current  $\bar{Q}(t) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L Q_i(t)$  with  $Q_i(t)$  as above, one has

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-\frac{4}{t^{1/3}}(\bar{Q}(t) - \frac{t}{4}) \in [u, u + du]\right) \simeq \frac{B\sqrt{L}}{t^{1/3}} e^{-\frac{t}{t^{2/3}}(\varphi(u) + \frac{3u}{2} + C)} du, \quad (2)$$

in the regime  $1 \ll t \ll L^{3/2}$ , with  $B$  and  $C$  known constants.

The striking resemblance of the leading contribution in (1) and (2) can be motivated physically by noting that both cases evaluate the probability of rare events where the current is maintained larger than typical throughout a large region of  $L$  sites (which is arbitrary in the former case, and equal to the system size in the latter case) : this is true in (1) since large enough negative fluctuations of the  $Q_i(t)$  are suppressed at any site  $i$  within the region considered, while in (2) the system being close to the flat state at the end of the evolution ensures that particles are not blocked by their neighbours then and leads to a current higher than for the free evolution. Additionally, the regime  $t \ll L^{3/2}$  ensures that the correlation length, which grows as  $t^{2/3}$ , stays much smaller than the system size in (2), so that no difference is expected between TASEP on  $\mathbb{Z}$  and TASEP on  $L$  sites with periodic boundaries here.

The leading contributions in (1) and (2) are related to the function

$$\psi(u) = - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Ai}'(u n^{2/3})}{n^{5/3}}, \quad (3)$$

with Ai the Airy function, which is analytic except for discontinuities of its derivative at  $u \in -(3\pi\mathbb{N})^{2/3}$ . Analytic continuation, which can be performed explicitly [1, 2], leads in particular to  $\psi_+(u)$  and  $\psi_-(u)$  analytic for  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and coinciding with  $\psi(u)$  respectively for  $u > 0$  and  $-(3\pi)^{2/3} < u < 0$ , and related by  $\psi_-(u) = \psi_+(u) + \frac{3u}{2}$ . Then, the leading contributions in (1) and (2) are respectively

$$\varphi(u) = \psi_+(u), \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(u) + \frac{3u}{2} + C = \psi_-(u) - \psi_-(u_*) \quad (4)$$

with  $u_* \approx -2.050$  the location of the unique minimum of  $\psi_-$ . In particular, (2) indicates that the random variable  $\chi(t) = -\frac{4}{t^{1/3}}(\overline{Q}(t) - \frac{t}{4})$  is equal to  $u_*$  almost surely, with Gaussian typical fluctuations of standard deviation  $\sim t^{1/3}/\sqrt{L} \ll 1$ . The simple shift by which the leading contributions in (1) and (2) differ is then reminiscent of an exponential tilting, corresponding to conditioning  $\chi(t)$  on its mean value  $u_*$ .

**Acknowledgement** : it is a pleasure to thank P. Ferrari for exchanges last February about a possible relation between the results in [1] and [2].

## References

- [1] P.L. Ferrari and M. Liu. Exact decay of the persistence probability in the Airy<sub>1</sub> process. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 29: 1-44, 2024.
- [2] S. Prolhac. Current fluctuations and large deviations for periodic TASEP on the relaxation scale. *J. Stat. Mech.*, P11028, 2015.
- [3] A. Borodin, P.L. Ferrari, M. Prähofer and T. Sasamoto. Fluctuation Properties of the TASEP with Periodic Initial Configuration. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 129:1055-1080, 2007.