

# Current Fluctuations in One-Dimensional Diffusion-Reaction Systems via Tensor Networks

Jiayin Gu<sup>✉\*</sup>

School of Physics and Technology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, China

## Abstract

We present an innovative application of tensor networks to the study of current fluctuations in a typical one-dimensional diffusion-reaction system – semiconductor. Two kinds of species of charge carriers, holes and electrons, diffuse in this system with the pair-generation and -recombination reaction occurring between them. The tensor networks are used to numerically calculate the cumulant generating function of the current statistics. By comparing the cases whether the reaction is turned on or off, the influence of the reaction on current fluctuations is clearly manifested, and this provides a numerical evidence of an interesting inequality setting an upper bound on the diffusivity in terms of the mean current and the driving force or affinity.

## 1 Introduction

It is widely recognized that large deviation theory provides a general framework for the statistical physics [1–4]. For nonequilibrium systems in steady state, the time-integrated current satisfies the large deviation principle, and all the information about its statistics is encoded in the so-called rate function or cumulant generating function, which respectively plays the same role as entropy or free energy in equilibrium system. Theoretical progress in the last three decades reveals that microreversibility leaves its footprint in the current statistics so that the associated cumulant generating function satisfy a symmetry relation, which is dubbed as fluctuation theorem [5–8]. Starting from this theorem, Onsager reciprocal relations and their generalizations to nonlinear transport properties can be derived [9–12]. However, more physics about the current fluctuations originated from the underlying dynamics is still hidden. To uncover it, full information about the cumulant generating function is needed. Except for a handful of nontrivial cases where it can be calculated exactly, e.g., simple exclusion process [13, 14], cumulant generating function can only be calculated by means of numerical tools.

There are a variety of numerical methods for computing the cumulant generating function. For stochastic processes ruled by master equations, the Monte Carlo methods, such as cloning algorithm [15–17] and transition path sampling [18], are available. However, they exhibit low statistical efficiency to access rare fluctuations, especially when applied to systems with many degrees of freedom. As is always the case, the underlying state space grows exponentially with the system size. In recent years, tensor networks have emerged as a very promising alternative in handling such numerical complexity. The standard way to access large deviations of a dynamical observable is by computing its cumulant generating function from the leading eigenvalue of the deformed or tilted generator. In this respect, some tensor network algorithms, e.g., density matrix renormalization group (DMRG) [19–22], time evolving block decimation (TEBD) [23, 24], or time dependent variational principle (TDVP) [25, 26], are applied to first find the desired leading eigenvector represented by some tensor network states, and then use them to compute the leading eigenvalue [27–35]. Besides, tensor networks also find applications in many other respects. For example, they are used to calculate work statistics for quantum many-body systems under prescribed driven protocols [36, 37], to study the heat transfer in non-Markovian open quantum systems [38], or efficiently sample rare events [39, 40]. Recently, we become aware that they are also used to quantify rare events in stochastic reaction-diffusion dynamics [41].

---

\*gujiayin@njnu.edu.cn




Figure 1: Schematic diagram of the 1D diffusion-reaction system. The white dots represent holes and the black ones represent electrons.

In this work, we numerically calculate the cumulant generating function of current statistics in 1D diffusion-reaction systems, with the focus on the influence of reaction on current fluctuations. The fluctuating current across the system is induced by imposing asymmetric boundary conditions. After the procedure of spatial discretization, a master equation is established to describe the stochastic evolution the system state and, thereby, the full counting statistics for the current is performed through including a counting parameter. The distribution function of the system state is represented by a matrix product state (MPS), and its tilted generator by a matrix product operator (MPO). DMRG is used to determine the leading eigenvalue of the tilted generator, giving the cumulant generating function.


## 2 One-Dimensional Diffusion-Reaction Systems

A typical one-dimensional (1D) diffusion-reaction system of physical interest is the semiconductor, as shown in Fig. 1. The mobile charge carriers distributed inside the system are positively-charged holes and negatively-charged electrons with their densities expressed as functions of position  $p(x)$ ,  $n(x)$ . The two terminals of the system are in contact with the reservoirs with fixed concentrations of holes and electrons,  $p_L$ ,  $p_R$ ,  $n_L$ ,  $n_R$ . The diffusion of the charge carriers are quantified by their respective coefficients that are assumed equal here for simplicity,  $D_p = D_n = D$ . Moreover, holes and electrons are generated and recombined by the reaction



where  $k_+$  and  $k_-$  are respectively the hole-electron pair generation and recombination rate constants. The thermal agitation inside the system generates incessant erratic movements for holes and electrons, in turn causing local fluctuations in hole diffusion, electron diffusion, and reaction.

The time evolution of the distribution of holes and electrons in the system can also be described as a Markov jump process, which is formulated in terms of a master equation. For this purpose, we spatially discretize the system into  $L$  cells of width  $\Delta x$  and volume  $\Omega$ . So, the system state is specified by the hole numbers  $\mathbf{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^L$  and electron numbers  $\mathbf{N} = \{N_i\}_{i=1}^L$  in these cells. The left (respectively, right) reservoir is modeled as a cell containing fixed numbers of holes and electrons  $\bar{P}_L \equiv P_0 = p_L \Omega$ ,  $\bar{N}_L \equiv N_0 = n_L \Omega$  (respectively,  $\bar{P}_R \equiv P_{L+1} = p_R \Omega$ ,  $\bar{N}_R \equiv N_{L+1} = n_R \Omega$ ). Here, for notational consistency, the two reservoir cells are also indexed with  $i = 0$  and  $i = L+1$ , respectively. In this discretization scheme, the system randomly jump between its states according to the network



The probability  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, t)$  that the cells contain the particle numbers  $\mathbf{P} = \{P_i\}_{i=1}^L$  and  $\mathbf{N} = \{N_i\}_{i=1}^L$  for

time  $t$  is ruled by the master equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{P}}{dt} = \hat{L}\mathcal{P} = & \sum_{i=0}^L \left[ \left( e^{+\partial P_i} e^{-\partial P_{i+1}} - 1 \right) W_i^{(+P)} \mathcal{P} + \left( e^{-\partial P_i} e^{+\partial P_{i+1}} - 1 \right) W_i^{(-P)} \mathcal{P} \right. \\ & \left. + \left( e^{+\partial N_i} e^{-\partial N_{i+1}} - 1 \right) W_i^{(+N)} \mathcal{P} + \left( e^{-\partial N_i} e^{+\partial N_{i+1}} - 1 \right) W_i^{(-N)} \mathcal{P} \right] \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^L \left[ \left( e^{-\partial P_i} e^{-\partial N_i} - 1 \right) W_i^{(+)} \mathcal{P} + \left( e^{+\partial P_i} e^{+\partial N_i} - 1 \right) W_i^{(-)} \mathcal{P} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\hat{L}$  is the generator, the transition rates are given by  $W_i^{(+P)} = kP_i$ ,  $W_i^{(-P)} = kP_{i+1}$ ,  $W_i^{(+N)} = kN_i$ ,  $W_i^{(-N)} = kN_{i+1}$ ,  $W_i^{(+)} = \Omega k_+$ ,  $W_i^{(-)} = k_- N_i P_i / \Omega$ , and here  $k \equiv D / \Delta x^2$  for brevity. It is necessary to mention that the raising and lowering operators acting on the reservoir cells do not actually take effect, i.e.,  $e^{\pm \partial P_0} = e^{\pm \partial N_0} = e^{\pm \partial P_{L+1}} = e^{\pm \partial N_{L+1}} = 1$  by mandatory stipulation. The advantage of this approach is that the usual phenomenological parameters suffice for the stochastic description. In order to simplify the problem, we have here neglected the electrostatic interaction between charge carriers. The full description of the above diffusion-reaction system including electrostatic interactions have been employed in the extensive studies for diodes and transistors by simulating stochastic trajectories [42, 43]. The fluctuation theorem is shown to hold in these systems and their electronic functionalities are realized.

### 3 Tensor Networks

We now turn to the tensor-network representation of the Markov jump process (2), and instead, the distribution function is focused on here. We first introduce notation  $|P_i N_i\rangle$  or its adjoint  $\langle P_i N_i|$  for the local state that there are  $P_i$  holes and  $N_i$  electrons in the  $i$ -th cell. Similarly, the system state is denoted as  $|\mathbf{PN}\rangle \equiv |P_i N_i\rangle^{\otimes_{i=1}^L}$  or  $\langle \mathbf{PN}| \equiv \langle P_i N_i|_{i=1}^{\otimes L}$ . Following the quantum-mechanical convention, the normalization and orthogonality are assumed, i.e.,  $\langle P'_i N'_i | P_i N_i \rangle = \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{P}' \mathbf{N}' | \mathbf{PN} \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{P}} \delta_{\mathbf{N}', \mathbf{N}}$ . In this way, an arbitrary distribution function  $F(\mathbf{PN})$  can be expressed as  $|\bar{F}(\mathbf{PN})\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{PN}} F(\mathbf{PN}) |\mathbf{PN}\rangle$ , and the normalization is also required here,  $\langle \bar{F}^\dagger(\mathbf{PN}) | \bar{F}(\mathbf{PN}) \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{PN}} F^\dagger(\mathbf{PN}) F(\mathbf{PN}) = 1$ . Since the distribution function  $F(\mathbf{PN})$  is a real in the context, we actually have  $F^\dagger(\mathbf{PN}) = F(\mathbf{PN})$ . Next, we introduce the local operators accounting for elementary jump events in the network. The particle transitions between two neighboring cells can be associated with a local annihilation operator acting on one cell and a local creation operator acting on the other. Following this reasoning, we define the annihilation operator for holes  $a_i^-$ , creation operator for holes  $a_i^+$ , annihilation operator for electrons  $b_i^-$ , and creation operator for electrons  $b_i^+$ , by

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | a_i^- | P_i N_i \rangle = k P_i \delta_{P'_i, P_i-1} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}, \quad (3)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | a_i^+ | P_i N_i \rangle = \delta_{P'_i, P_i+1} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}, \quad (4)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | b_i^- | P_i N_i \rangle = k N_i \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i-1}, \quad (5)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | b_i^+ | P_i N_i \rangle = \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i+1}, \quad (6)$$

where  $kP_i$ ,  $kN_i$  appearing in the definitions of local creation operators express their meaning of transition rates. It should be pointed out that the operator definitions by Eqs. (3)-(6) are only applicable to the cells for the intermediate system,  $1 \leq i \leq L$ . For the reservoir cells at the boundaries,  $i = 0, L+1$ , these operators should be defined separately,

$$a_0^- = k\bar{P}_L, \quad a_0^+ = a_{L+1}^+ = 1, \quad a_{L+1}^- = k\bar{P}_R. \quad (7)$$

$$b_0^- = k\bar{N}_L, \quad b_0^+ = b_{L+1}^+ = 1, \quad b_{L+1}^- = k\bar{N}_R. \quad (8)$$

The reason for this is obviously that the particle numbers in the reservoir cells are maintained constant. Besides, we define local operators accounting for the probability lose,  $a_i$  for holes, and  $b_i$  for electrons, by

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | a_i | P_i N_i \rangle = k P_i \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}, \quad (9)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | b_i | P_i N_i \rangle = k N_i \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}, \quad (10)$$

which are here intuitively dubbed as particle number operators. These definitions applies to any cell,  $0 \leq i \leq L + 1$ . Similarly, for the reactive events in each cell,  $1 \leq i \leq L$ , we may also define the so-called recombination and generation operators, as well as the associated operator for probability lose,  $c_i^-$ ,  $c_i^+$ ,  $c_i$  by

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | c_i^- | P_i N_i \rangle = k_- \frac{P_i N_i}{\Omega} \delta_{P'_i, P_i-1} \delta_{N'_i, N_i-1}, \quad (11)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | c_i^+ | P_i N_i \rangle = k_+ \Omega \delta_{P'_i, P_i+1} \delta_{N'_i, N_i+1}, \quad (12)$$

$$\langle P'_i N'_i | c_i | P_i N_i \rangle = \left( k_+ \Omega + k_- \frac{P_i N_i}{\Omega} \right) \delta_{P'_i, P_i} \delta_{N'_i, N_i}. \quad (13)$$

To characterize the current fluctuations, we perform full counting statistics of transfers of the unit charge flowing from the left reservoir into the system. Since the current is composed of holes and electrons, a proper counting scheme is assumed depending on whether the carrier is positively- or negatively-charged and jumps toward left or right. We introduce the extended probability distribution  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, Z, t)$  by including the charge transfers  $Z$  in time interval  $[0, t]$ . and furtherly, the function  $F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, t) \equiv \sum_Z \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, Z, t) e^{-\lambda Z}$  in terms of the counting parameter  $\lambda$ , then we have the equation of time evolution,

$$\frac{d}{dt} F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, t) = \hat{L}_\lambda F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, t), \quad (14)$$

where the tilted generator  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  can be expressed in terms of the above-defined local operators,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_\lambda = & a_0^- \otimes a_1^+ e^{-\lambda} + a_0^+ \otimes a_1^- e^{+\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^L (a_i^- \otimes a_{i+1}^+ + a_i^+ \otimes a_{i+1}^-) - \sum_{i=0}^L (a_i + a_{i+1}) \\ & + b_0^- \otimes b_1^+ e^{+\lambda} + b_0^+ \otimes b_1^- e^{-\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^L (b_i^- \otimes b_{i+1}^+ + b_i^+ \otimes b_{i+1}^-) - \sum_{i=0}^L (b_i + b_{i+1}) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^L (c_i^+ + c_i^- - c_i). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The cumulant generating function for the current statistics can be defined as

$$Q(\lambda) \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{t} \ln \sum_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}} F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}, t), \quad (16)$$

and its value is actually equal to the minus sign of the leading eigenvalue of  $\hat{L}_\lambda$ . The mean current and its diffusivity can be obtained by taking successive derivatives with respect to the counting parameter,

$$J \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \langle Z(t) \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial Q(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} \right|_{\lambda=0}, \quad (17)$$

$$D \equiv \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2t} \langle (Z(t) - Jt)^2 \rangle = \left. -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 Q(\lambda)}{\partial \lambda^2} \right|_{\lambda=0}. \quad (18)$$

In the following, we show how to numerically determine the leading eigenvalue of  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  with tensor networks. The algorithm DMRG is adopted here. For this purpose, we first represent an arbitrary function  $F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N})$  as a matrix product state (MPS) [20], and represent the tilted generator  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  as a matrix product operator (MPO). In the MPS representation of  $F_\lambda(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N})$ , there is a total of  $L$  sites, and the physical index of each site is compositely denoted as  $P_i N_i$ . If  $P_i$  and  $N_i$  both take the  $M$  possible values by truncation,  $0, 1, \dots, M-1$ , then, with a naive mapping,  $P_i N_i$  would take  $M^2$  possible values. Accordingly, the local operator, e.g.,  $a_i^-$ ,  $c_i^+$ , have a matrix form of dimension  $M^2 \times M^2$ . The representation of  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  as an MPO is achieved in the following. Actually, this is one of the most crucial steps. This tilted generator is now split into three parts

$$\hat{L}_\lambda = \hat{L}_\lambda^{(1)} + \hat{L}_\lambda^{(2)} + \hat{L}_\lambda^{(3)}, \quad (19)$$

Table 1: The parameter values specified in numerical computations.

$D = 0.01$	$\Delta x = 0.1$
$\Omega = 4$	$L = 10$
$\bar{P}_L = \bar{N}_R = 8$	$\bar{P}_R = \bar{N}_L = 2$
$M = 25$ (truncation parameter)	

with each constructed as an MPO,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_\lambda^{(1)} &= a_0^- \otimes a_1^+ e^{-\lambda} + a_0^+ \otimes a_1^- e^{+\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^L (a_i^- \otimes a_{i+1}^+ + a_i^+ \otimes a_{i+1}^-) \\ &= (a_1^- \quad a_1^+ \quad a_1^+ k \bar{P}_L e^{-\lambda} + a_1^- e^{+\lambda} \quad 1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & a_i^+ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_i^- & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ a_i^- & a_i^+ & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} a_L^+ \\ a_L^- \\ 1 \\ a_L^- + a_L^+ k \bar{P}_R \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L}_\lambda^{(2)} &= b_0^- \otimes b_1^+ e^{+\lambda} + b_0^+ \otimes b_1^- e^{-\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^L (b_i^- \otimes b_{i+1}^+ + b_i^+ \otimes b_{i+1}^-) \\ &= (b_1^- \quad b_1^+ \quad b_1^+ k \bar{N}_L e^{+\lambda} + b_1^- e^{-\lambda} \quad 1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & b_i^+ & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & b_i^- & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ b_i^- & b_i^+ & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} b_L^+ \\ b_L^- \\ 1 \\ b_L^- + b_L^+ k \bar{N}_R \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\hat{L}_\lambda^{(3)} = \sum_{i=0}^L (-a_i - a_{i+1} - b_i - b_{i+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^L (c_i^+ + c_i^- - c_i) = (1 \quad E_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 & E_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{pmatrix} E_L \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where

$$E_1 = -k \bar{P}_L - k \bar{N}_L - 2a_1 - 2b_1 + c_1^+ + c_1^- - c_1, \quad (23)$$

$$E_i = -2a_i - 2b_i + c_i^+ + c_i^- - c_i, \quad (24)$$

$$E_L = -k \bar{P}_R - k \bar{N}_R - 2a_L - 2b_L + c_L^+ + c_L^- - c_L. \quad (25)$$

The boundary operators acting on reservoir cells are explicitly expressed according to Eqs. (7)-(8) and combined with their neighboring ones. So, there are  $L$  tensors in each MPO, in agreement with the case of MPS. If we denote  $\hat{L}_\lambda^{(1)} = l_{1,\lambda}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_i^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_L^{(1)}$ ,  $\hat{L}_\lambda^{(2)} = l_{1,\lambda}^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_i^{(2)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_L^{(2)}$ , and  $\hat{L}_\lambda^{(3)} = l_{1,\lambda}^{(3)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_i^{(3)} \otimes \cdots \otimes l_L^{(3)}$ , then the MPO representation of  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  can be constructed in this way,  $\hat{L}_\lambda = \left( l_{1,\lambda}^{(1)}, l_{1,\lambda}^{(2)}, l_{1,\lambda}^{(3)} \right) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{diag} \left( l_i^{(1)}, l_i^{(2)}, l_i^{(3)} \right) \otimes \cdots \otimes \left( l_L^{(1)}, l_L^{(2)}, l_L^{(3)} \right)$ , whose bond dimension is 10. It should be pointed out that the tilted generator  $\hat{L}_\lambda$  is different from the quantum Hamiltonian in that it is intrinsically non-symmetric or non-Hermitian. This implies that (i) the right eigenvectors are not identical to the corresponding left eigenvectors; and (ii) the right (left) eigenvectors are not mutually orthogonal with each other. Next, utilizing the DMRG algorithm, we variationally optimize the MPS  $|\mathcal{F}_\lambda(\mathbf{PN})\rangle$  to find the one corresponding the leading eigenvalue,  $|\Psi_\lambda(\mathbf{PN})\rangle$ , which is normalized. Readers are referred to Ref. [33] for the detailed exposition of the DMRG algorithm applied in a nonequilibrium diffusion system. The cumulant generating function is then calculated as

$$Q(\lambda) = -\langle \Psi_\lambda^\dagger(\mathbf{PN}) | \hat{L}_\lambda | \Psi_\lambda(\mathbf{PN}) \rangle. \quad (26)$$

In addition, the steady state distribution of the number of holes and electrons can be calculated as  $\mathcal{P}_{\text{st}}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}) = \Psi_0(\mathbf{PN}) / \sum_{\mathbf{PN}} \Psi_0(\mathbf{PN})$ , which naturally guarantees that  $\sum_{\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}} \mathcal{P}_{\text{st}}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N}) = 1$ .




Figure 2: Cumulant generating function. The asterisks with solid line joining them are results for the system parameter values listed in Table 1 and, respectively,  $k_+ = k_- = 0.01, 0.1, 10.0$ . The dots are results with values listed in Table 1 and  $k_+ = k_- = 0$ . The dash line is plotted from the analytical solution (29) with the same values as those for dots.  $A = \ln 4$  is the affinity calculated from Eq. (27).

## 4 Results

We choose suitable numerical values of the physical quantities and parameters, some of which are listed in Table 1. We also notice that the boundary conditions are symmetric under inversion and permutation between holes and electrons, i.e.,  $\bar{P}_L = \bar{N}_R$  and  $\bar{P}_R = \bar{N}_L$  in Table 1. This is also deliberate so that we have an unambiguous affinity driving the system out of equilibrium,

$$A = \ln \frac{\bar{P}_L}{\bar{P}_R} \equiv \ln \frac{\bar{N}_R}{\bar{N}_L}, \quad (27)$$

which is evaluated with Schnakenberg graph analysis [44]. The result of this work is the numerical calculation of cumulant generating function  $Q(\lambda)$ , which is presented in Fig. 2. In this figure,  $Q(\lambda)$  is plotted in several cases,  $k_+ = k_- = 0, 0.01, 0.1, 10.0$ , all with the same other parameter values listed in Table 1. It is obviously that  $Q(\lambda)$  satisfies the Gallavotti–Cohen symmetry [5, 8, 45] in these cases,

$$Q(\lambda) = Q(A - \lambda), \quad (28)$$

as expected. When  $k_+ = k_- = 0$ , the reaction is turned off and the charge transport is reduced to the pure diffusion of holes and electrons. In this case,  $Q(\lambda)$  can be analytically solved [33, 46] with the solution given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\lambda) &= \frac{k\bar{P}_L}{L+1} (1 - e^{-\lambda}) + \frac{k\bar{P}_R}{L+1} (1 - e^{+\lambda}) \\ &= \frac{k\bar{N}_L}{L+1} (1 - e^{+\lambda}) + \frac{k\bar{N}_R}{L+1} (1 - e^{-\lambda}). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Excellent agreement is found between numerical results and the analytical solution, manifesting the validity of the application of tensor networks to this kind of nonequilibrium system. From Eq. (29), the mean current and its diffusivity can be evaluated according to Eqs (17)-(18),

$$J = \frac{k}{L+1} (\bar{P}_L - \bar{P}_R + \bar{N}_R - \bar{N}_L), \quad (30)$$

$$D = \frac{k}{2(L+1)} (\bar{P}_L + \bar{P}_R + \bar{N}_L + \bar{N}_R), \quad (31)$$

where the diffusivity  $D$  here should not be confused the diffusion coefficient. Recall that the affinity  $A$  is given by Eq. (27), we can immediately obtain the relation

$$A = \ln \frac{2D + J}{2D - J}. \quad (32)$$

For the cases  $k_+ = k_- = 0.01, 0.1, 10.0$ , we can only rely on the numerical values of  $Q(\lambda)$  to analyze the current fluctuations. From Fig. 2, it seems that the  $Q(\lambda)$  have the same slope at  $\lambda = 0$  for all cases. This directly indicates that the system have the same current  $J$  whether there is reaction between holes and electrons or not. With a bit of analysis, it is indeed so. Suppose that the holes and electrons have the linear profiles  $p(x), n(x)$  in the case  $k_+ = k_- = 0$ . When the reaction is turned on, the profiles would become  $p(x) + \delta p(x)$  and  $n(x) + \delta n(x)$ , respectively. Because the reaction always leads to generation or recombination of holes and electrons in pairs, it is arguably that  $\delta p(x) = \delta n(x)$ . The current have the same value for all cases,  $J = \langle j_p - j_n \rangle = -D\partial_x[p(x) + \delta p(x) - n(x) - \delta n(x)] = -D\partial_x[p(x) - n(x)]$ . We also compare the trends of slope change (second derivatives) of the  $Q(\lambda)$  at  $\lambda = 0$  for all cases. It is apparently discernible that the current diffusivity is smaller in the cases  $k_+ = k_- = 0.01, 0.1, 10.0$  than that in the case  $k_+ = k_- = 0$ . So, starting from the equality (32), we arrive at the following interesting inequality

$$2D \leq J \coth(A/2), \quad (33)$$

where the equality sign holds when there is no reaction. This inequality seems to manifest that there exist a upper bound for the variance of a current. It was also found in a charge transport system where electrostatic interaction between charged particles plays an important role (see future publications). If proved in general contexts, Eq. (33) would give a new thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR), whereas the existing one states that the variance of a current is lower bounded [47, 48]. The code for numerical calculation was written in C++ with the ITensor library [49].

## 5 Conclusions

We have presented in detail how to compute the cumulant generating function of the current statistics in a 1D nonequilibrium diffusion-reaction system with tensor networks. By comparing the cases whether the reaction is turned on or off, we demonstrated that the reaction between holes and electrons has influence on the transport properties. The current fluctuations are damped by the reaction. We hope this would raise some interests in peer scientists, and to see more investigations in this regard. Besides, our work adds to the continuously expanding applications of tensor networks to study the dynamical fluctuations in classical stochastic systems, providing significant promise for the tensor networks to become standard tools in this field of nonequilibrium statistical physics.

## 6 Acknowledgments

The author thanks Pierre Gaspard for reading the manuscript and for his helpful remarks.

## References

- [1] Richard S. Ellis. *Entropy, Large Deviations, and Statistical Mechanics*. Springer, 2006.
- [2] Angelo Vulpiani, Fabio Cecconi, Massimo Cencini, et al., eds. *Large Deviations in Physics: The Legacy of the Law of Large Numbers*. Springer, 2014.
- [3] Hugo Touchette. “The Large Deviation Approach to Statistical Mechanics”. In: *Physics Reports* 478 (2009), pp. 1–69.
- [4] Hugo Touchette. “Introduction to Dynamical Large Deviations of Markov Processes”. In: *Physica A* 504 (2018), pp. 5–19.
- [5] Denis J. Evans, E. G. D. Cohen, and G. P. Morriss. “Probability of Second Law Violations in Shearing Steady States”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 71 (1993), pp. 2401–2404.
- [6] Giovanni Gallavotti. “Extension of Onsager’s Reciprocity to Large Fields and the Chaotic Hypothesis”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 77 (1996), pp. 4334–4337.

- [7] Jorge Kurchan. “Fluctuation Theorem for Stochastic Dynamics”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 31 (1998), pp. 3719–3729.
- [8] Joel L. Lebowitz and Herbert Spohn. “A Gallavotti-Cohen-Type Symmetry in the Large Deviation Functional for Stochastic Dynamics”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 95 (1999), pp. 333–365.
- [9] David Andrieux and Pierre Gaspard. “Fluctuation Theorem and Onsager Reciprocity Relations”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 121 (2004), pp. 6167–6174.
- [10] David Andrieux and Pierre Gaspard. “A Fluctuation Theorem for Currents and Non-Linear Response Coefficients”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, P02006 (2007).
- [11] Pierre Gaspard. “Multivariate Fluctuation Relations for Currents”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 15, 115014 (2013).
- [12] M. Barbier and P. Gaspard. “Microreversibility, Nonequilibrium Current Fluctuations, and Response Theory”. In: *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* 51, 355001 (2018).
- [13] Kirone Mallick. “Some Exact Results for the Exclusion Process”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, P01024 (2011).
- [14] Kirone Mallick. “The Exclusion Process: A Paradigm for Non-Equilibrium Behavior”. In: *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 418 (2015), pp. 17–48.
- [15] Cristian Giardinà, Jorge Kurchan, and Luca Peliti. “Direct Evaluation of Large-Deviation Functions”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 96, 120603 (2006).
- [16] Vivien Lecomte and Julien Tailleur. “A Numerical Approach to Large Deviations in Continuous Time”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, P03004 (2007).
- [17] Cristian Giardinà, Jorge Kurchan, Vivien Lecomte, et al. “Simulating Rare Events in Dynamical Processes”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 145 (2011), pp. 787–811.
- [18] Peter G. Bolhuis, David Chandler, Christoph Dellago, et al. “Transition Path Sampling: Throwing Ropes Over Rough Mountain Passes, in the Dark”. In: *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* 53 (2002), pp. 291–318.
- [19] U. Schollwöck. “The Density-Matrix Renormalization Group”. In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 77 (2005), pp. 259–315.
- [20] Ulrich Schollwöck. “The Density-Matrix Renormalization Group in the Age of Matrix Product States”. In: *Annals of Physics* 326 (2011), pp. 96–192.
- [21] Steven R. White. “Density Matrix Formulation for Quantum Renormalization Groups”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 69 (1992), pp. 2863–2866.
- [22] Steven R. White. “Density-Matrix Algorithms for Quantum Renormalization Groups”. In: *Physical Review B* 48 (1993), pp. 10345–10356.
- [23] Guifré Vidal. “Efficient Classical Simulation of Slightly Entangled Quantum Computations”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 91, 147902 (2003).
- [24] Guifré Vidal. “Efficient Simulation of One-Dimensional Quantum Many-Body Systems”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 93, 040502 (2004).
- [25] Jutho Haegeman, J. Ignacio Cirac, Tobias J. Osborne, et al. “Time-Dependent Variational Principle for Quantum Lattices”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 107, 070601 (2011).
- [26] Jutho Haegeman, Christian Lubich, Ivan Oseledets, et al. “Unifying Time Evolution and Optimization with Matrix Product States”. In: *Physical Review B* 94, 165116 (2016).
- [27] Mieke Gorissen, Jef Hooyberghs, and Carlo Vanderzande. “Density-Matrix Renormalization-Group Study of Current and Activity Fluctuations Near Nonequilibrium Phase Transitions”. In: *Physical Review E* 79, 020101(R) (2009).
- [28] Mieke Gorissen and Carlo Vanderzande. “Current Fluctuations in the Weakly Asymmetric Exclusion Process with Open Boundaries”. In: *Physical Review E* 86, 051114 (2012).
- [29] Mieke Gorissen, Alexandre Lazarescu, Kirone Mallick, et al. “Exact Current Statistics of the Asymmetric Simple Exclusion Process with Open Boundaries”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 109, 170601 (2012).



- [30] Mari Carmen Bañuls and Juan P. Garrahan. “Using Matrix Product States to Study the Dynamical Large Deviations of Kinetically Constrained Models”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 123, 200601 (2019).
- [31] Phillip Helms, Ushnish Ray, and Garnet Kin-Lic Chan. “Dynamical Phase Behavior of the Single- and Multi-Lane Asymmetric Simple Exclusion Process via Matrix Product States”. In: *Physical Review E* 100, 022101 (2019).
- [32] Phillip Helms and Garnet Kin-Lic Chan. “Dynamical Phase Transitions in a 2D Classical Nonequilibrium Model via 2D Tensor Networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 125, 140601 (2020).
- [33] Jiayin Gu and Fan Zhang. “Tensor-Network Approaches to Counting Statistics for the Current in a Boundary-Driven Diffusive System”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 24, 113022 (2022).
- [34] Nils E. Strand, Hadrien Vroylandt, and Todd R. Gingrich. “Using Tensor Network States for Multi-Particle Brownian Ratchets”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 156, 221103 (2022).
- [35] Nils E. Strand, Hadrien Vroylandt, and Todd R. Gingrich. “Computing Time-Periodic Steady-State Currents via the Time Evolution of Tensor Network States”. In: *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 157, 054104 (2022).
- [36] Jiayin Gu, Fan Zhang, and H. T. Quan. “Tensor-Network Approach to Work Statistics for One-Dimensional Quantum Lattice Systems”. In: *Physical Review Research* 4, 033139 (2022).
- [37] Feng-Li Lin and Ching-Yu Huang. “Work Statistics for Quantum Spin Chains: Characterizing Quantum Phase Transitions, Benchmarking Time Evolution, and Examining Passivity of Quantum States”. In: *Physical Review Research* 6, 023169 (2024).
- [38] Maria Popovic, Mark T. Mitchison, Aidan Strathearn, et al. “Quantum Heat Statistics with Time-Evolving Matrix Product Operators”. In: *PRX Quantum* 2, 020338 (2021).
- [39] Luke Causer, Mari Carmen Bañuls, and Juan P. Garrahan. “Optimal Sampling of Dynamical Large Deviations via Matrix Product States”. In: *Physical Review E*, 062144 (2021).
- [40] Luke Causer, Mari Carmen Bañuls, and Juan P. Garrahan. “Optimal Sampling of Dynamical Large Deviations in Two Dimensions via Tensor Networks”. In: *Physical Review Letters*, 147401 (2023).
- [41] Schuyler B. Nicholson and Todd R. Gingrich. “Quantifying Rare Events in Stochastic Reaction-Diffusion Dynamics Using Tensor Networks”. In: *Physical Review X* 13, 041006 (2023).
- [42] Jiayin Gu and Pierre Gaspard. “Stochastic Approach and Fluctuation Theorem for Charge Transport in Diodes”. In: *Physical Review E* 97, 052138 (2018).
- [43] Jiayin Gu and Pierre Gaspard. “Microreversibility, Fluctuations and Nonlinear Transport in Transistors”. In: *Physical Review E* 99, 012137 (2019).
- [44] J. Schnakenberg. “Network Theory of Microscopic and Macroscopic Behavior of Master Equation Systems”. In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 48 (1976), pp. 571–585.
- [45] G. Gallavotti and E. G. D. Cohen. “Dynamical Ensembles in Stationary States”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 80 (1995), pp. 931–970.
- [46] David Andrieux and Pierre Gaspard. “Fluctuation Theorem for Transport in Mesoscopic Systems”. In: *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, P01011 (2006).
- [47] Andre C. Barato and Udo Seifert. “Thermodynamic Uncertainty Relation for Biomolecular Processes”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 114, 158101 (2015).
- [48] Todd R. Gingrich, Jordan M. Horowitz, Nikolay Perunov, et al. “Dissipation Bounds All Steady-State Current Fluctuations”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 116, 120601 (2016).
- [49] Matthew Fishman, Steven R. White, and E. Miles Stoudenmire. “The ITensor Software Library for Tensor Network Calculations”. In: *SciPost Physics Codebases*, 4 (2020).