## Classical and quantum facilitated exclusion processes

Amit Kumar Chatterjee<sup>1</sup> and Adhip Agarwala<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

<sup>2</sup>Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kalyanpur, Kanpur, India 208 016

We demonstrate exciting similarities between classical and quantum many body systems whose microscopic dynamics are composed of non-reciprocal three-site facilitated exclusion processes. We show that the quantum analog of the classical facilitated process engineers an interesting quantum absorbing transition where the quantum particles transit from an unentangled direct-product absorbing phase to an entangled steady state with a finite current at density  $\rho = 1/2$ . In the generalized classical facilitated exclusion process, which includes independent hopping of particles with rate p, our analytical and Monte-Carlo results establish emergence of a special density  $\rho^* = 1/3$  that demarcates two regimes in the steady state, based on the competition between two current carrying modes (facilitated and independent). The corresponding quantum system also displays similar qualitative behaviors with striking non-monotonic features in the bipartite entanglement. Our work ties the two sub-fields of classically interacting exclusion processes, and interacting non-Hermitian quantum Hamiltonians to show common themes in the non-equilibrium phases they realise.

Introduction: Classical and quantum non-equilibrium phenomena has been a cornerstone of all of physics. In the classical domain, their applicability has ranged from understanding transport phenomena<sup>1</sup>, out-of-equilibrium materials<sup>2,3</sup>, disease-modelling<sup>4</sup>, game theory<sup>5</sup>, biological systems  $^{6,7}$  and even socio-economic structures  $^8$ . In the quantum regime, such systems have been studied in context of open quantum systems (such as cold $atoms^{9-12}$ ), and have been recently explored in random quantum circuits<sup>13</sup> and broadly in context of non-Hermitian physics<sup>14–17</sup>. While the classical and quantum community has been working on the various aspects of such systems, their motivations and quantities of interest have also been varied. For instance, while in classical Markovian systems, non-equilibrium steady states<sup>18–20</sup> as well as relaxations towards steady states  $^{21-23}$  have been centre of interests for interacting many particle systems; in quantum non-Hermitian phenomena largely the focus has been on single-particle spectra and their topological properties<sup>24-31</sup>. Very recently interacting non-Hermitian Hamiltonians<sup>16,32-50</sup>, and the long-time steady states they may realize have been studied - however the field remains broadly unexplored.

Investigations on the common themes between the physics of such classical-quantum problems have been far and few<sup>51-54</sup>, for instance only recently the rare trajectories of a Markovian system was mapped to the ground states of a quantum topological Hamiltonian<sup>55</sup>. This broadly builds on idea that Markov matrices of the classical rate processes could be mapped to a sub-class of constrained quantum many body Hamiltonians. But apart from deriving such structural equivalence between the mathematical structures not a lot of work has gone into finding common physics in the non-equilibrium phases they realize.

In this work, we demonstrate intriguing resemblance in macroscopic physical characteristics between classical and quantum many body systems, whose dynamics are based on a three site microscopic process in one dimension. This three site process, familiar as *facilitated totally* 

asymmetric simple exclusion process (F-TASEP), allows unidirectional hopping of particle to a vacant neighbor only if its other neighbor is occupied. The F-TASEP, interestingly, is known to exhibit absorbing phase transition between active and inactive phases with  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  being the transition point where  $\rho$  is the conserved particle density. We introduce QF-TASEP, the quantum version of F-TASEP, for which the bipartite entanglement and current remarkably exhibit quantum absorbing phase transition at  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  with active and inactive phases, similar to the classical F-TASEP. Such active-inactive phase transitions disappear for both classical and quantum cases as we generalize the F-TASEP by including the independent hopping (i.e. not facilitated by neighboring particles) of particles with rate p, consequently termed as pF-TASEP (classical) and pQF-TASEP (quantum) respectively. Due to the presence of multiple current carrying modes (fa*cilitated* and *independent*), we compare their individual contributions to the total steady state particle current in the  $\rho - p$  plane. Interestingly, our exact analytical calculations for pF-TASEP reveals the emergence of a special point  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  that demarcates between two different regimes. For the system density with any fixed value between  $0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , the independent current always dominates over the facilitated current for any p. On the contrary, for  $\frac{1}{3} < \rho < 1$ , there is always a finite  $p^*$  such that the facilitated (independent) current dominates for  $p < p^*$   $(p > p^*)$ . Remarkably, in the quantum problem pQF-TASEP, the bipartite entanglement shows striking features around  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  indicating towards its speciality similar to the classical case.

*Model:* We start with the toy model F-TASEP defined on a one dimensional periodic lattice with the following microscopic dynamics

$$110 \xrightarrow{1} 101,$$
 (1)

where 1 and 0 denote particle and vacancy respectively and each lattice site can be occupied by at most one particle. The model is a special instance of the Katz-



FIG. 1. **QF-TASEP:** (top) The variation of steady state current as a function of density of particles  $\rho$  in the quantum version of F-TASEP (see eqn. (2)). The dashed lines corresponds to mean-field expectations (see text). (bottom) The bipartite entanglement entropy of the first site with the rest of the system in the steady state as a function of density. Dashed line corresponds to the result for a free Fermi gas.

Lebowitz-Spohn model<sup>56,57</sup> broadly used to model superionic conductors<sup>56,58</sup>, vehicular traffic flow<sup>59,60</sup> etc. Notably, alongside non-equilibrium physics literature<sup>61–68</sup>, the F-TASEP and its variations have gained lot of recent interests in the area of probability and mathematics<sup>69–76</sup>. The F-TASEP as discussed in<sup>61</sup>, shows a finite density transition at  $\rho_c = \frac{1}{2}$  where the system transits from inactive and non-ergodic state to a current carrying and ergodic steady state. This active-inactive transition is characterised by the order parameter  $\langle 110 \rangle$  which actually measures the activity (density of active sites) or current in the system. The order parameter remains zero for  $0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$  whereas it is non-zero for  $\rho > \frac{1}{2}$  and it varies as  $(\rho - \rho_c)^{\beta}$  with the exponent  $\beta = 1$ .

We now study the corresponding quantum process QF-TASEP by introducing the following non-Hermitian quantum Hamiltonian given by

$$H = \sum_{i} n_{i-1} c_{i+1}^{\dagger} c_i \tag{2}$$

Given a set of many body eigenvalues  $E_n$ , the quantum steady state is given by the eigenstate whose imaginary component of the eigenvalue is maximum such that given the time evolution of every many body state  $|\psi_n\rangle$  with energy  $E_n$  the state grows as a function of time  $(|\psi_n(t)\rangle = \exp(-iE_nt)|\psi_n\rangle)$  and gets chosen as the steady state at infinite time.

Quantum Absorbing Phase Transition: Investigating the steady states of QF-TASEP (see eqn. (2)) and measuring the current operator

$$J_Q = \frac{1}{L} \sum_j -i \langle c_{j+1}^{\dagger} c_j - c_j^{\dagger} c_{j+1} \rangle \tag{3}$$

on the non-equilibrium quantum steady state shows a similar absorbing transition as a function of density – where the system transits to a current carrying steady state when  $\rho > \frac{1}{2}$  (see Fig. 1). Remarkably, although the quantum current operator defined in Eq. (3) is different from the usual classical current  $J = \langle 110 \rangle$  for F-TASEP, they essentially capture similar characteristics. For  $\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ , the correlated hopping process as described above, given any initial state forms charge density wave patches where every time a dipole is formed (01), the region is rendered inactive. This charge-density wave patch spans the complete lattice at  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  – at which any additional particle leads to a finite current steady state. This active-inactive transition can be also found in the density of active sites  $\langle n_{i-1}n_i(1-n_{i+1})\rangle$ , which is basically the classical order parameter. Given the quantum nature of the state, it would be interesting to ask if we can find the signature of quantum absorbing phase transition in a bipartite entanglement. Indeed, it shows a discontinuous jump at  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  as shown in Fig. 1. A trivial mean-field where the  $n_i \rightarrow \rho$  (average density) reduces to an effective Hatano-Nelson model<sup>35</sup> where the hopping is renormalized by density. This leads to a boosted Fermi sea steady state where the finite momentum modes lead to a finite current state with  $J_Q = \frac{2}{\pi} \sin(\rho \pi)$ , as seen in the dashed line in Fig. 1(a) where the current matches the analytical result quite well. Near  $\rho \sim 0.5$ , we have effective carriers as  $\tilde{\rho} = \rho - \frac{1}{2}$  which matches the current profile near  $\rho \sim \frac{1}{2}$ where  $J_Q \sim \frac{2}{\pi} \sin(2\tilde{\rho}\pi)$ . It is interesting that this dynamical transition has no symmetry broken order parameter but current itself can be thought of as an order parameter, with the critical exponent  $\beta = 1 \left[ J_Q \sim (\rho - \rho_c)^{\beta} \right]$ same as that of the classical case. Interestingly, the bipartite entanglement entropy of a site with rest of the system, follows  $S(\rho) = -(\rho \log(\rho) + (1-\rho)\log(1-\rho))$ (similar to a free Fermi gas) (see the analytical curve in Fig. 1(b)) as soon as  $\rho > \frac{1}{2}$ , showing a discrete jump in the entanglement entropy characteristic of this quantum transition.



FIG. 2. p**F-TASEP phase diagram:** Analytically obtained phase diagram for the pF-TASEP (see eqn. (4)) with both facilitated and independent hopping. The figure compares the steady state contributions of the two different current modes  $J_{fa}$  and  $J_{in}$ . The point  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  distinguishes between two different regimes. For  $0 < \rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , the independent current is always dominant irrespective of the value of p. In sharp contrast, for  $\frac{1}{3} < \rho < 1$ , there exists a finite  $p^*(\rho)$  (see eqn. (6)) that decides which mode (facilitated or independent) will be dominant for a fixed density.

Generalization to pF-TASEP.- Both the classical F-TASEP and quantum QF-TASEP exhibit absorbing phase transition which for  $\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$ , is identified by the nonergodicity in the system due to the presence of multiple absorbing or inactive configurations. However, such absorbing phase transition vanishes as we generalize the dynamics of F-TASEP [Eq. (1)] by initiating another mode of hopping, namely the *independent* hopping of particles which occurs without any facilitation from the neighbor. This generalized classical process, which we call *p*F-TASEP, is defined as

$$110 \xrightarrow{1} 101, \qquad 010 \xrightarrow{p} 001.$$
 (4)

Clearly, the limits p = 0 and p = 1 of pF-TASEP correspond to F-TASEP and TASEP respectively. The independent hopping of particles with rate p restores ergodicity in the system for any density. The model has been studied previously as a cooperative exclusion process, in context of time evolution of a step initial condition leading to rich phenomena like formation of shocks and compression or rarefaction waves<sup>77</sup>. Our focus for pF-TASEP would be to make a comparative study of the individual contributions to steady state current produced by two different modes, facilitated current  $J_{fa}$  and independent current  $J_{in}$ . Analysis of multiple current carrying modes become naturally important for wide range of scenarios e.g. multiple chemical reagents diffusing through narrow channels and undergoing specific reactions among selective pairs, different types of vehicles moving through

same road, decision making in teams with sub-groups etc. We reformulate the Ising model like pair-factorized steady state of *p*F-TASEP as a non-equilibrium matrix product state by obtaining the particles and vacancies as two non-commuting matrices obeying certain matrix algebra (see<sup>78</sup> for details). These matrix algebra help us to analytically calculate the observables of interest,  $J_{fa} = \langle 110 \rangle$  and  $J_{in} = p \langle 010 \rangle$ . The exact expressions are obtained to be

$$J_{fa}(\rho, p) = \frac{z(2\rho - 1)}{(1 - p)(z - p)} \frac{z(1 - \rho) - p\rho}{z\rho - p(1 - \rho)},$$
  

$$J_{in}(\rho, p) = \frac{p(1 - \rho)}{(1 - p)} \frac{z(1 - \rho) - p\rho}{z\rho - p(1 - \rho)},$$
  
where  $z(\rho, p) = \frac{1}{2\rho(1 - \rho)} [1 + 2\rho(1 - \rho)(p - 2)] - (1 - 2\rho)\sqrt{1 - 4\rho(1 - \rho)(1 - p)}].$  (5)

V

To extract the competition between the two current carrying modes in  $\rho - p$  plane, one has to simply equate  $J_{fa}$ and  $J_{in}$  from Eq. (5) and consequently find the curve that separates the region of dominance between the facilitated mode and the independent mode in the  $\rho - p$ plane. This leads us to the following non-trivial solution

$$p^*(\rho) = \frac{3\rho - 1}{1 - \rho}.$$
 (6)

The interesting fact evident from Eq. (6) is that no physical solution for  $p^*(\rho)$  exists for  $\rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$ . This implies that, for pF-TASEP with conserved density  $0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , one mode has always higher contribution to current than the other irrespective of how small or large p is. We identify this dominant mode as the independent mode in Fig. 2 where we present the comparison between two current carrying modes in the  $\rho - p$  plane. Contrary to  $0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{3}$ , for any conserved system density  $\frac{1}{3} \leq \rho \leq 1$ , there is a finite  $p^*$  such that  $J_{fa}$  dominates over  $J_{in}$  for  $p < p^*$ whereas  $J_{in}$  acts as the higher current carrying mode for  $p > p^*$ . Clearly, as shown in Fig. 2,  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  emerges as a special density which demarcates between two regimesone with  $p^* = 0$  (for  $0 \le \rho \le \frac{1}{3}$ ) and the other with  $p^* > 0$ (for  $\frac{1}{3} \leq \rho \leq 1$ ). Note that the demarcator point  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$ for  $p \check{\mathrm{F}}\text{-}\mathrm{TASEP}$  is different from the absorbing transition point  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  for F-TASEP and QF-TASEP.

To show the individual behaviors of  $J_{fa}$  and  $J_{in}$  explicitly, as functions of the parameter p, we present Fig. 3 (a)-(b). In both figures, we observe that our exact analytical results (solid lines) agree with Monte Carlo simulation results (dots). The Fig. 3(a) shows that the independent current is always higher than the facilitated current as expected for  $\rho < \frac{1}{3}$ . In contrast, we observe in Fig. 3(b)  $(\rho > \frac{1}{3})$  that  $J_{fa}$  and  $J_{in}$  cross each other at  $p = p^*$ .

Quantum analogue of pF-TASEP.- In order to develop pQF-TASEP, the quantum process corresponding to classical pF-TASEP, we study the following non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{i} n_{i-1} c_{i+1}^{\dagger} c_{i} + p(1 - n_{i-1}) c_{i+1}^{\dagger} c_{i}.$$
 (7)



FIG. 3. Facilitated and Independent steady state currents: The behavior of facilitated steady state current  $(J_{fa})$ and independent current  $(J_{in})$  as a function of p at  $\rho = 0.2$  $(<\frac{1}{3})$  in (a) and for  $\rho = 0.4$   $(>\frac{1}{3})$  in (b). Analytical results are shown with a line and Monte Carlo results (ensemble averages are performed over  $10^6$  configurations) are shown in dots. For  $\rho > 1/3$  there is a finite p below which  $J_{fa} > J_{in}$ .

As observables, we analyze  $\langle 110 \rangle$  and  $\langle 010 \rangle$  which are directly related to the facilitated and independent currents that have played crucial roles in the discussions in the previous section. In connection to the activity  $\langle 110 \rangle$ for F-TASEP and QF-TASEP, we can term  $\langle 110 \rangle$  and  $\langle 010 \rangle$  as *facilitated activity* and *independent activity*, respectively, in cases of *p*F-TASEP and *p*QF-TASEP. For these expectation values, we show the analogy between the classical and quantum cases in Fig. 4. Since at p = 1the *p*F-TASEP reduces to the usual TASEP that has un-



FIG. 4. p**F-TASEP and** p**QF-TASEP**: Comparison between the facilitated activity and independent activity in the classical and quantum facilitated processes for different values of p (0.001, 0.01, 0.5, 1.0). (Analytical results from MPS in classical and numerical ED for L = 14 in the Quantum case)

correlated steady state, classically both these expectation values behave as  $\rho^2(1-\rho)$  and as  $(1-\rho)^2\rho$  as shown via the dashed curves in Fig. 4 (top). With decreasing p, the independent hopping decreases, thereby increasing  $\langle 010 \rangle$  for some fixed density. On the other hand,  $\langle 110 \rangle$ decreases with decreasing p since the production rate of nearest neighbor particle pair  $\langle 11 \rangle$  through the process  $0101 \xrightarrow{p} 0011$  reduces. The situation becomes most dramatic at  $p \to 0$  where  $\langle 110 \rangle$  shows the near-critical behavior reflective of the absorbing phase transition. Interestingly, similar qualitative behaviors are observed for pQF-TASEP (see Fig. 4 (bottom)), where we study the expectation value of the two operators  $\langle n_i n_{i+1} (1-n_{i+2}) \rangle$ and  $\langle (1 - n_i)n_{i+1}(1 - n_{i+2}) \rangle$ . Thereby, the quantum steady state fascinatingly shows a behavior equivalent to the classical non-equilibrium steady state.



FIG. 5. Enhanced bipartite entanglement: The behavior of the bipartite entanglement entropy of half of the system with the other half, as a function of density  $\rho$  for the pQF-TASEP (see eqn. (7)) for different values of p for L = 16.

We next investigate the bipartite entanglement entropy of this system. The corresponding behavior is shown in Fig. 5. Interestingly at p = 1 when the system is just the quantum Hatano-Nelson model, the entanglement behaves characteristic of a equilibrium Fermi sea where  $S(\rho) \sim \log(L\rho(1-\rho))$  since the steady state can be thought of as the boosted Fermi sea. Similarly at p = 0 when the system shows a quantum active-inactive transition at  $\rho \sim \frac{1}{2}$  one finds that  $\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\langle S \rangle = 0$  as is expected for an absorbing state. What is interesting is the rise in entanglement at small values of p for less than half filling in the system. We suspect that this rise is due to the formation of doublons in the system. For instance at  $p \to 0$ , the doublon state  $|110\rangle$  disperses with a second order process with an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian  $\sim pe^{ik}$ . Notably, the entanglements for sufficiently small values of p exhibit maximums near  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ . The striking behaviors of the bipartite entanglement entropy for  $p\ensuremath{\mathbf{QF}}\xspace{-}\ensuremath{\mathbf{TASEP}}\xspace$  and the relation between  $p\ensuremath{\mathbf{F}}\xspace{-}\xspace$ *p*QF-TASEP in context of  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  being a special point, will be explored further in the future work.

Conclusion.-In this work we study similarities in macroscopic behaviors of classical and quantum many body systems, based on a three site microscopic process, the facilitated exclusion process. Remarkably, analogous to the absorbing phase transition shown by classical F-TASEP, we find that the quantum facilitated process Q-FTASEP exhibits quantum absorbing phase transition characterized by the bipartite entanglement entropy and current. Notably, the absorbing transition for both the classical and quantum models occur at  $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$  and the current, acting as the order parameter, varies as  $(\rho - \rho_c)^{\beta}$ with  $\beta = 1$  for both cases. The absorbing transition vanishes as we generalize the classical F-TASEP to pF-TASEP by including the independent hopping of particles with rate p. Intriguingly, the comparison between the two sources of current (facilitated and independent) reveals the existence of a special density  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$  which demarcates between two regimes, one where the independent current always dominates irrespective of p value and the other where a finite p distinguishes between the region of dominance of the two currents. The corresponding quantum model pQF-TASEP displays similar qualitative behaviors as the classical one and particularly the bipartite entanglement manifests striking features including sudden rise and maximal values near  $\rho = \frac{1}{3}$ . It would be interesting to further explore these classicalquantum connections for deeper understandings. Some immediate future directions include the investigations of classical-quantum connections with reciprocal hopping, open boundary conditions and relaxation phenomena. We believe that our present study paves paths to explore interesting connections for non-equilibrium phenomena overlapping between generic many-body classical systems and interacting non-Hermitian quantum Hamiltonians.

Acknowledgements.- We thank Diptarka Das, Subrata Pacchal, Abhisodh Prakash, Arghya Das, Urna Basu, Hisao Hayakawa, Diptiman Sen for discussions. AA acknowledges support from IITK Initiation Grant (IITK/PHY/2022010) and workstation Wigner at IITK. A.K.C. gratefully acknowledges postdoctoral fellowship from the YITP and partial support from Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Grant No. JP21H01006). We acknowledge use of open-source QuSpin<sup>79,80</sup> for exact diagonalisation calculations. Several numerical calculations and simulations have been done on the cluster Yukawa-21 at YITP. Both of us acknowledge hospitality at ICTS, Bangalore.

238(2016).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Andreas Schadschneider, Debashish Chowdhury, and Katsuhiro Nishinari, *Stochastic Transport in Complex Systems* (Elsevier, 2011).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Claudio Giannetti, Massimo Capone, Daniele Fausti, Michele Fabrizio, Fulvio Parmigiani, and Dragan Mihailovic, "Ultrafast optical spectroscopy of strongly correlated materials and high-temperature superconductors: a non-equilibrium approach," Advances in Physics **65**, 58–

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Marta Tena-Solsona, Benedikt Rieß, Raphael K. Grötsch, Franziska C. Löhrer, Caren Wanzke, Benjamin Käsdorf, Andreas R. Bausch, Peter Müller-Buschbaum, Oliver Lieleg, and Job Boekhoven, "Non-equilibrium dissipative supramolecular materials with a tunable lifetime," Nature Communications 8 (2017).

 $<sup>^4\,</sup>$  Alex Kamenev and Baruch Meerson, "Extinction of an in-

fectious disease: A large fluctuation in a nonequilibrium system," Physical Review E **77** (2008).

- <sup>5</sup> S. G. Babajanyan, A. E. Allahverdyan, and Kang Hao Cheong, "Energy and entropy: Path from game theory to statistical mechanics," Physical Review Research 2 (2020).
- <sup>6</sup> Elizabeth S. Allman and John A. Rhodes, *Mathematical Models in Biology* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- <sup>7</sup> R A Blythe and A J McKane, "Stochastic models of evolution in genetics, ecology and linguistics," Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2007**, P07018– P07018 (2007).
- <sup>8</sup> Claudio Castellano, Santo Fortunato, and Vittorio Loreto, "Statistical physics of social dynamics," Reviews of Modern Physics 81, 591–646 (2009).
- <sup>9</sup> Maciej Lewenstein, Anna Sanpera, Veronica Ahufinger, Bogdan Damski, Aditi Sen(De), and Ujjwal Sen, "Ultracold atomic gases in optical lattices: mimicking condensed matter physics and beyond," Advances in Physics 56, 243– 379 (2007), https://doi.org/10.1080/00018730701223200.
- <sup>10</sup> Immanuel Bloch, Jean Dalibard, and Wilhelm Zwerger, "Many-body physics with ultracold gases," Rev. Mod. Phys. 80, 885–964 (2008).
- <sup>11</sup> Tim Langen, Remi Geiger, and Jörg Schmiedmayer, "Ultracold atoms out of equilibrium," Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics 6, 201– 217 (2015), https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-conmatphys-031214-014548.
- <sup>12</sup> Qian Liang, Dizhou Xie, Zhaoli Dong, Haowei Li, Hang Li, Bryce Gadway, Wei Yi, and Bo Yan, "Dynamic signatures of non-hermitian skin effect and topology in ultracold atoms," Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 070401 (2022).
- <sup>13</sup> Christoph Fleckenstein, Alberto Zorzato, Daniel Varjas, Emil J. Bergholtz, Jens H. Bardarson, and Apoorv Tiwari, "Non-hermitian topology in monitored quantum circuits," Phys. Rev. Res. 4, L032026 (2022).
- <sup>14</sup> Simon Lieu, "Non-hermitian majorana modes protect degenerate steady states," Phys. Rev. B **100**, 085110 (2019).
- <sup>15</sup> Simon Lieu, "Topological symmetry classes for nonhermitian models and connections to the bosonic bogoliubov-de gennes equation," Phys. Rev. B **98**, 115135 (2018).
- <sup>16</sup> Animesh Panda and Sumilan Banerjee, "Entanglement in nonequilibrium steady states and many-body localization breakdown in a current-driven system," Phys. Rev. B **101**, 184201 (2020).
- <sup>17</sup> Johan Carlström, "Correlations in non-hermitian systems and diagram techniques for the steady state," Phys. Rev. Research 2, 013078 (2020).
- <sup>18</sup> R A Blythe and M R Evans, "Nonequilibrium steady states of matrix-product form: a solver's guide," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 40, R333 (2007).
- <sup>19</sup> Xue-Juan Zhang, Hong Qian, and Min Qian, "Stochastic theory of nonequilibrium steady states and its applications. part i," Physics Reports **510**, 1–86 (2012).
- <sup>20</sup> Hao Ge, Min Qian, and Hong Qian, "Stochastic theory of nonequilibrium steady states. part II: Applications in chemical biophysics," Physics Reports **510**, 87–118 (2012).
- <sup>21</sup> P. L. Krapivsky, S. Redner, and E. Ben-Naim, in A *Kinetic View of Statistical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- <sup>22</sup> Martin R Evans, Satya N Majumdar, and Grégory Schehr, "Stochastic resetting and applications," Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **53**, 193001 (2020).
- $^{23}\,$  Zhiyue Lu and Oren Raz, "Nonequilibrium thermodynam-

ics of the markovian mpemba effect and its inverse," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **114**, 5083–5088 (2017).

- <sup>24</sup> VM Martinez Alvarez, JE Barrios Vargas, Matias Berdakin, and LEF Foa Torres, "Topological states of non-hermitian systems," The European Physical Journal Special Topics **227**, 1295–1308 (2018).
- <sup>25</sup> Ananya Ghatak and Tanmoy Das, "New topological invariants in non-hermitian systems," Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter **31**, 263001 (2019).
- <sup>26</sup> Luis EF Foa Torres, "Perspective on topological states of non-hermitian lattices," Journal of Physics: Materials 3, 014002 (2019).
- <sup>27</sup> Yuto Ashida, Zongping Gong, and Masahito Ueda, "Nonhermitian physics," Advances in Physics **69**, 249–435 (2020).
- <sup>28</sup> Emil J Bergholtz, Jan Carl Budich, and Flore K Kunst, "Exceptional topology of non-hermitian systems," Reviews of Modern Physics **93**, 015005 (2021).
- <sup>29</sup> Zongping Gong, Yuto Ashida, Kohei Kawabata, Kazuaki Takasan, Sho Higashikawa, and Masahito Ueda, "Topological phases of non-hermitian systems," Phys. Rev. X 8, 031079 (2018).
- <sup>30</sup> Kohei Kawabata, Ken Shiozaki, Masahito Ueda, and Masatoshi Sato, "Symmetry and topology in nonhermitian physics," Phys. Rev. X 9, 041015 (2019).
- <sup>31</sup> Ching Hua Lee and Ronny Thomale, "Anatomy of skin modes and topology in non-hermitian systems," Physical Review B **99**, 201103 (2019).
- <sup>32</sup> Kohei Kawabata, Ken Shiozaki, and Shinsei Ryu, "Manybody topology of non-hermitian systems," Phys. Rev. B 105, 165137 (2022).
- <sup>33</sup> Kohei Kawabata, Ken Shiozaki, and Shinsei Ryu, "Topological field theory of non-hermitian systems," Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 216405 (2021).
- <sup>34</sup> Takahiro Fukui and Norio Kawakami, "Breakdown of the mott insulator: Exact solution of an asymmetric hubbard model," Phys. Rev. B 58, 16051–16056 (1998).
- <sup>35</sup> Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson, "Localization transitions in non-hermitian quantum mechanics," Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 570–573 (1996).
- <sup>36</sup> Zuo Wang, Li-Jun Lang, and Liang He, "Emergent mott insulators and non-hermitian conservation laws in an interacting bosonic chain with noninteger filling and nonreciprocal hopping," Phys. Rev. B **105**, 054315 (2022).
- <sup>37</sup> L. Crippa, J. C. Budich, and G. Sangiovanni, "Fourthorder exceptional points in correlated quantum many-body systems," Phys. Rev. B **104**, L121109 (2021).
- <sup>38</sup> Zhihao Xu and Shu Chen, "Topological bose-mott insulators in one-dimensional non-hermitian superlattices," Phys. Rev. B **102**, 035153 (2020).
- <sup>39</sup> Tao Liu, James Jun He, Tsuneya Yoshida, Ze-Liang Xiang, and Franco Nori, "Non-hermitian topological mott insulators in one-dimensional fermionic superlattices," Phys. Rev. B **102**, 235151 (2020).
- <sup>40</sup> Sen Mu, Ching Hua Lee, Linhu Li, and Jiangbin Gong, "Emergent fermi surface in a many-body non-hermitian fermionic chain," Phys. Rev. B **102**, 081115 (2020).
- <sup>41</sup> Kazuki Yamamoto, Masaya Nakagawa, Kyosuke Adachi, Kazuaki Takasan, Masahito Ueda, and Norio Kawakami, "Theory of non-hermitian fermionic superfluidity with a complex-valued interaction," Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 123601 (2019).
- <sup>42</sup> Masaya Nakagawa, Norio Kawakami, and Masahito Ueda,

"Non-hermitian kondo effect in ultracold alkaline-earth atoms," Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 203001 (2018).

- <sup>43</sup> Song-Bo Zhang, M. Michael Denner, Tomá š Bzdušek, Michael A. Sentef, and Titus Neupert, "Symmetry breaking and spectral structure of the interacting hatano-nelson model," Phys. Rev. B **106**, L121102 (2022).
- <sup>44</sup> Ayan Banerjee, Suraj S. Hegde, Adhip Agarwala, and Awadhesh Narayan, "Chiral metals and entrapped insulators in a one-dimensional topological non-hermitian system," Phys. Rev. B **105**, 205403 (2022).
- <sup>45</sup> X. Z. Zhang and Z. Song, "η-pairing ground states in the non-hermitian hubbard model," Phys. Rev. B **103**, 235153 (2021).
- <sup>46</sup> X. M. Yang and Z. Song, "Dynamic transition from insulating state to η-pairing state in a composite non-hermitian system," Phys. Rev. B **105**, 195132 (2022).
- <sup>47</sup> Lei Pan, Shu Chen, and Xiaoling Cui, "Interacting nonhermitian ultracold atoms in a harmonic trap: Two-body exact solution and a high-order exceptional point," Phys. Rev. A **99**, 063616 (2019).
- <sup>48</sup> Solofo Groenendijk, Thomas L. Schmidt, and Tobias Meng, "Universal hall conductance scaling in nonhermitian chern insulators," Phys. Rev. Res. 3, 023001 (2021).
- <sup>49</sup> Soumi Ghosh, Sparsh Gupta, and Manas Kulkarni, "Spectral properties of disordered interacting non-hermitian systems," Phys. Rev. B **106**, 134202 (2022).
- <sup>50</sup> Sascha Heußen, Christopher David White, and Gil Refael, "Extracting many-body localization lengths with an imaginary vector potential," Phys. Rev. B **103**, 064201 (2021).
- <sup>51</sup> Merlijn van Horssen, Emanuele Levi, and Juan P. Garrahan, "Dynamics of many-body localization in a translationinvariant quantum glass model," Phys. Rev. B **92**, 100305 (2015).
- <sup>52</sup> K Kavanagh, S Dooley, J K Slingerland, and G Kells, "Effects of quantum pair creation and annihilation on a classical exclusion process: the transverse xy model with tasep," New Journal of Physics **24**, 023024 (2022).
- <sup>53</sup> Ludwig Hruza and Denis Bernard, "Coherent fluctuations in noisy mesoscopic systems, the open quantum ssep and free probability," (2022).
- <sup>54</sup> Ludovic Berthier, Patrick Charbonneau, Andrea Ninarello, Misaki Ozawa, and Sho Yaida, "Zero-temperature glass transition in two dimensions," Nature communications **10**, 1–7 (2019).
- <sup>55</sup> Juan P. Garrahan and Frank Pollmann, "Topological phases in the dynamics of the simple exclusion process," (2022).
- <sup>56</sup> Sheldon Katz, Joel L. Lebowitz, and Herbert Spohn, "Nonequilibrium steady states of stochastic lattice gas models of fast ionic conductors," Journal of Statistical Physics **34**, 497–537 (1984).
- <sup>57</sup> J. S. Hager, J. Krug, V. Popkov, and G. M. Schütz, "Minimal current phase and universal boundary layers in driven diffusive systems," Physical Review E **63**, 056110 (2001).
- <sup>58</sup> W. Dieterich, P. Fulde, and I. Peschel, "Theoretical models for superionic conductors," Advances in Physics **29**, 527– 605 (1980).
- <sup>59</sup> L. Gray and D. Griffeath, "The ergodic theory of traffic jams," Journal of Statistical Physics **105**, 413–452 (2001).
- <sup>60</sup> E. Levine, G. Ziv, L. Gray, and D. Mukamel, "Phase transitions in traffic models," Journal of Statistical Physics 117, 819–830 (2004).
- <sup>61</sup> Urna Basu and P. K. Mohanty, "Active-absorbing-state

phase transition beyond directed percolation: A class of exactly solvable models," Phys. Rev. E **79**, 041143 (2009).

- <sup>62</sup> Alan Gabel, P. L. Krapivsky, and S. Redner, "Facilitated asymmetric exclusion," Physical Review Letters **105**, 210603 (2010).
- <sup>63</sup> T. Antal and G. M. Schütz, "Asymmetric exclusion process with next-nearest-neighbor interaction: Some comments on traffic flow and a nonequilibrium reentrance transition," Physical Review E **62**, 83–93 (2000).
- <sup>64</sup> Qi-Hong Shi, Rui Jiang, Mao-Bin Hu, and Qing-Song Wu, "Phase transitions induced by competition of two driven parts in a periodic system," Physical Review E 85 (2012).
- <sup>65</sup> Qing-Yi Hao, Zhe Chen, Xiao-Yan Sun, Bing-Bing Liu, and Chao-Yun Wu, "Theoretical analysis and simulation for a facilitated asymmetric exclusion process," Physical Review E **94** (2016).
- <sup>66</sup> Amit Kumar Chatterjee and P. K. Mohanty, "Assisted exchange models in one dimension," Physical Review E 98 (2018).
- <sup>67</sup> D. Botto, A. Pelizzola, and M. Pretti, "Dynamical transitions in a driven diffusive model with interactions," EPL (Europhysics Letters) **124**, 50004 (2018).
- <sup>68</sup> Alessandro Pelizzola, Marco Pretti, and Francesco Puccioni, "Dynamical transitions in a one-dimensional katz-lebowitz-spohn model," Entropy **21**, 1028 (2019).
- <sup>69</sup> Jinho Baik, Guillaume Barraquand, Ivan Corwin, and Toufic Suidan, "Facilitated exclusion process," in *Computation and Combinatorics in Dynamics, Stochastics and Control* (Springer International Publishing, 2018) pp. 1– 35.
- <sup>70</sup> S Goldstein, J L Lebowitz, and E R Speer, "Exact solution of the facilitated totally asymmetric simple exclusion process," Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2019**, 123202 (2019).
- <sup>71</sup> S Goldstein, J L Lebowitz, and E R Speer, "The discretetime facilitated totally asymmetric simple exclusion process," Pure and Applied Functional Analysis 6, 177–203 (2021).
- <sup>72</sup> Oriane Blondel, Clément Erignoux, Makiko Sasada, and Marielle Simon, "Hydrodynamic limit for a facilitated exclusion process," Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques 56 (2020).
- <sup>73</sup> Oriane Blondel, Clément Erignoux, and Marielle Simon, "Stefan problem for a nonergodic facilitated exclusion process," Probability and Mathematical Physics 2, 127–178 (2021).
- <sup>74</sup> S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, and E. R. Speer, "Stationary states of the one-dimensional discrete-time facilitated symmetric exclusion process," Journal of Mathematical Physics **63**, 083301 (2022).
- <sup>75</sup> A. Ayyer, S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, and E. R. Speer, "Stationary states of the one-dimensional facilitated asymmetric exclusion process," (2020), arXiv:2010.07257 [math.PR].
- <sup>76</sup> G. Barraquand, O. Blondel, and M. Simon, "Weakly asymmetric facilitated exclusion process," (2023), arXiv:2301.04689 [math.PR].
- <sup>77</sup> Alan Gabel and S Redner, "Cooperativity-driven singularities in asymmetric exclusion," Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2011**, P06008 (2011).
- <sup>78</sup> See Supplemental Material for the detailed matrix product states and calculation of facilitated and independent currents.
- $^{79}$  Phillip Weinberg and Marin Bukov, "Quspin: a python

package for dynamics and exact diagonalisation of quantum many body systems part i: spin chains," SciPost Phys 2 (2017), 10.21468/SciPostPhys.2.1.003.

2 (2017), 10.21468/SciPostPhys.2.1.003.
Phillip Weinberg and Marin Bukov, "Quspin: a python package for dynamics and exact diagonalisation of quantum many body systems. part ii: bosons, fermions and higher spins," SciPost Phys. 7, 020 (2019).

## Supplemental Material for "Classical and quantum facilitated exclusion processes"

In this supplementary material, we briefly describe the matrix product steady state of pF-TASEP, defined in the main text as

$$110 \xrightarrow{1} 101, \qquad 010 \xrightarrow{p} 001.$$
 (8)

The model obeying the microscopic dynamics Eq. (8) evolves according to the Master equation  $\frac{\mathrm{d}|P\rangle}{\mathrm{d}t} = M|P\rangle$  where the vector  $|P\rangle$  includes probabilities of all possible configurations  $P(\{s_1, \ldots, s_L\})$ . The Markovian rate matrix M can be decomposed as

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^{L} I \otimes \dots I \otimes h_{i-1,i,i+1} \otimes I \dots \otimes I,$$
(9)

where  $h_{i-1,i,i+1}$  is the local three site matrix with dimension  $8 \times 8$  and I is  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix sitting at every site except the triad (i-1, i, i+1). The off-diagonal elements of  $h_{i-1,i,i+1}$  contain the transition rates between two different local three site configurations, whereas the diagonal terms carry the total outward rates from a three site configuration. The explicit form of the matrix  $h_{i-1,i,i+1}$  for dynamics in Eq. (8) is

The steady state, by definition, implies  $M|P\rangle = 0$ . We make the following matrix product ansatz, assuming that any configuration in the steady state can be represented as a product of matrices and the corresponding probability would be determined as

$$P\left(\{s_i\}\right) \propto Tr\left[X_i\right],$$
  

$$X_i = D\delta_{s_i,1} + E\delta_{s_i,0},$$
(11)

with D and E representing particle and vacancy respectively. A sufficient condition to ensure the steady state is to consider the following local (probability) flux cancellation scheme

$$h_{i-1,i,i+1} \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D} \\ \tilde{E} \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} D \\ E \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D} \\ \tilde{E} \end{pmatrix},$$
(12)

where  $\tilde{D}$  and  $\tilde{E}$  are known as *auxiliary* matrices that have to be chosen suitably such that the correct steady state is achieved. Such a suitable pair of choices for the present model turns out to be  $\tilde{D} = -1$  and  $\tilde{E} = 0$ . Along with these choices, from Eq. (12), we find the matrix algebra to be satisfied the matrices D and E, are

$$DDE = DE,$$
  
$$pEDE = EE.$$
 (13)

A possible set of explicit matrix representations satisfying Eq. (13) are obtained to be

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad E = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (14)

If we put p = 0 (i.e. the F-TASEP) in the matrix algebra in Eq. (13) and matrix representations in Eq. (14), the matrix algebra ( $D^2 = D$  and  $E^2 = 0$ ) and matrix representations for the active phase in F-TASEP are correctly recovered<sup>61</sup>. With the explicit steady state matrix representations being obtained [Eq. (14)], we can proceed to

calculate observables, in particular the currents of the facilitated mode and independent mode,  $J_{fa}$  and  $J_{in}$  respectively. These quantities can be calculated analytically as

$$J_{fa} = \langle 110 \rangle = \frac{Tr[DDET^{L-3}]}{Tr[T^L]},$$
  

$$J_{in} = p\langle 010 \rangle = p \frac{Tr[EDET^{L-3}]}{Tr[T^L]},$$
(15)

where T is the transfer matrix, translating which over the lattice sites generates all possible configurations, so that the partition function becomes  $Tr[T^L]$ . The matrix T is defined as

$$T = zD + E = \begin{pmatrix} p & z \\ 1 & z \end{pmatrix},$$
(16)

where z acts as the fugacity associated with the particles. As usual, the transfer matrix can be brought into diagonal form by  $T_d = U^{-1}TU$  where the unitary matrix U has eigenvectors of T as its columns

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{-} - z & \lambda_{+} - z \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

with  $\lambda_{\pm}$ , the eigenvalues of T, are given by

$$\lambda_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \left( p + z \pm \sqrt{(p - z)^2 + 4z} \right).$$
(18)

We perform the calculations for the classical *p*-FASEP in the thermodynamic limit  $L \to \infty$ . Correspondingly, the partition function simplifies to  $Tr[T^L] \approx \lambda_+^L$ . In this limit, it is straightforward to show that the currents for two different modes from Eq. (15) result in

$$J_{I} = \frac{z^{2}}{\lambda_{+}^{3} \Delta U} (U_{11} - U_{21}) U_{12},$$
  

$$J_{II} = \frac{pz}{\lambda_{+}^{3} \Delta U} (U_{11} - pU_{21}) U_{12},$$
(19)

where  $U_{jk}$  correspond to the entry of matrix U [Eq. (17)] in *j*-th row and *k*-th column,  $\Delta U$  is the determinant of the matrix U. Following few simple intermediate steps, we can arrive at the expressions of the currents given in Eq. (5). The fugacity z is determined from the density-fugacity relation  $\rho = \frac{z}{\lambda_+} \frac{d}{dz} \lambda_+$ , as a function of the input parameters  $\rho$  and p. The corresponding solution  $z(\rho, p)$  is provided in Eq. (5) of the main text.