

PAPER: Classical statistical mechanics, equilibrium and non-equilibrium

Dynamical phase coexistence in the Fredrickson–Andersen model

Robert L Jack^{1,2,6}, Takahiro Nemoto^{3,4} and Vivien Lecomte⁵

- ¹ DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom
- 2 Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1EW, United Kingdom
- ³ Philippe Meyer Institute for Theoretical Physics, Physics Department, École Normale Supérieure & PSL Research University, 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France
- ⁴ Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases Unit, Institut Pasteur, 25-28 Rue du Docteur Roux, 75015 Paris, France
- 5 LIPhy, Université Grenoble Alpes & CNRS, F-38042 Grenoble, France E-mail: rlj22@cam.ac.uk

Received 6 December 2019 Accepted for publication 17 February 2020 Published 28 May 2020

Online at stacks.iop.org/JSTAT/2020/053204 https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/ab7af6

Abstract. We analyse a first-order dynamical phase transition that takes place in the Fredrickson–Andersen (FA) model. We construct a two-dimensional spin system whose thermodynamic properties reproduce the dynamical large deviations of the FA model and we analyse this system numerically, comparing our results with finite-size scaling theory. This allows us to rationalise recent results for the FA model, including the exponential divergence of its susceptibility at phase coexistence. We also discuss a simple interfacial model that reproduces quantitatively the behaviour of the FA model at coexistence.

Keywords: large deviations in non-equilibrium systems, fluctuation phenomena, dynamical processes



 $^{^{6}\}operatorname{Author}$ to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Large deviations in the FA model2.1. Model.2.2. Large deviations.2.3. Dynamical phase transition.	4 4 5 5
3.	 From the 1D FA model to a 2D spin system 3.1. Discrete-time FA model 3.2. Corresponding spin model 3.3. Free energy and large deviation formalism 3.4. Periodic boundary conditions 	6 6 7 9 10
4.	Phase transition in the 2D spin model: behaviour in finite systems4.1. Dynamical phase transition4.2. Finite-size scaling for $L \sim Y$ 4.3. Finite-size scaling and consequences for dynamical large deviations4.4. 2D spin model for $Y \gg L$ 4.5. Connection to previous studies of dynamical phase transitions	11 . 11 . 11 . 13 . 15 . 17
5.	Interfacial model of phase coexistence5.1. Definition of interfacial model5.2. Large deviation analysis5.2.1. Eigenvalue problem in continuous space5.2.2. Solution of the eigenvalue problem5.2.3. Active phase5.2.4. Inactive phase5.2.5. Phase coexistence	18 . 18 . 19 . 20 . 22 . 23 . 24 . 24
6 .	Conclusion	27
	Acknowledgments	. 28
A	ppendix A. MC simulation of the 2D spin model	2 8
A	ppendix B. Simple model for multi-domain phase coexistence	29
A	ppendix C. Discrete and continuous versions of the interfacial modelC.1. Continuum limitC.2. Simplification for small FC.3. Numerical demonstrations	30 . 30 . 32 . 32
	References	33

1. Introduction

Large deviation theory is an increasingly useful tool for understanding dynamical fluctuations in statistical mechanics [1-6]. For example, by analysis of probability distributions of time-averaged quantities, one gains understanding of entropy production and dissipation [7-9], transport phenomena [2, 10-13], and metastability in glassy systems [14-17]. The tails of these probability distributions can have characteristic forms, which are related to a particular type of dynamical phase transition [10, 14, 15]. These are analogous to thermodynamic phase transitions, in that one analyses ensembles of dynamical trajectories in a manner that is exactly analogous to the classical analysis of thermodynamic ensembles. While the principles of thermodynamics are restricted to static and quasistatic phenomena, applications of large deviation theory to trajectories of these systems can be viewed as an extension of the thermodynamic formalism to the analysis of dynamical phenomena [3, 4, 18, 19].

The analogy between static and dynamical phase transitions means that methods from thermodynamics can often be generalised, in order to study dynamical transitions. For example, the dynamical analogue of the free energy can be obtained as the solution to an eigenvalue problem [2, 5, 20], just as the thermodynamic free energy can be obtained as the largest eigenvalue of a transfer matrix. The numerical method of transition path sampling [21] generalises Monte Carlo (MC) sampling techniques from static configurations to dynamical trajectories [19, 22]. However, there are also methods that harness directly the dynamical aspects of trajectory ensembles, including cloning (population dynamics) methods for numerics [23, 24], and control-theoretic approaches that aim to describe dynamical rare events by constructing controlled processes where these events become typical [16, 25, 26].

In a recent paper [27], we analysed the finite-size scaling of a first-order dynamical phase transition in the Fredrickson–Andersen (FA) model [28]. This simple model describes glassy systems [29, 30] and has been studied extensively in that context. Its dynamical phase transition is also amenable to analytic and numerical studies [4, 14, 17, 27, 31–33]. In [27], we used a cloning method to demonstrate an exponential divergence of the susceptibility with system size, and we explained this behaviour analytically. This exponential divergence stands in contrast to the usual finite-size scaling behaviour at *thermodynamic* first-order transitions, where one observes a power-law divergence with system size. The different scaling behaviour arises from the way in which the thermodynamic limit is taken: when considering the distribution of a time-averaged quantity, the large-time limit is taken before the large system-size limit, requiring the analysis of two distinct scaling variables. In this work, we analyse in more detail the connection between finite-size scaling analyses for thermodynamic and dynamical phase transitions.

Our results consist of two main parts. First, we define a two-dimensional (2D) spin model whose behaviour can be related directly to trajectories of the one-dimensional FA model. This spin model has a thermodynamic phase transition that reproduces all aspects of the FA dynamical phase transition. We present numerical results that illustrate this fact. In particular, we show that by considering systems on lattices with different aspect ratios, we can capture the differences in finite-size scaling behaviour

between the usual thermodynamic setting (aspect ratio close to unity) and the dynamical one (very large aspect ratio). This observation is related to a theoretical analysis of thermodynamic finite-size scaling by Privman and Fisher [34] and Borgs and Kotecký [35, 36]. In the second part of this paper, we revisit the analytical results of [27], which concern an interfacial model that captures quantitatively the finite-size scaling behaviour of the FA model. We show how some of the results can be simplified by taking a suitable limit, and we discuss the physical interpretation of this model in more detail. We explain that our results for finite-size scaling behaviour are generic for first-order dynamical transitions.

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 reviews the behaviour of the FA model and its phase transition. Section 3 introduces the 2D spin model and section 4 has the results for this model. Section 5 analyses the interfacial model. Our conclusions are summarised in section 6.

2. Large deviations in the FA model

This section recalls the definition of the FA model [28] and summarises some previous results for its dynamical phase transition [4, 14].

2.1. Model

The (one-dimensional) FA model is a Markov chain in continuous time. It consists of L spins on a 1D lattice with periodic boundaries, the *i*th spin is $n_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $\boldsymbol{n} = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_L)$. Spin *i* can flip (that is, change its state) only if a constraint function $C_i(\boldsymbol{n})$ is non-zero. In this work we take $C_i(\boldsymbol{n}) = n_{i+1} + n_{i-1} - n_{i+1}n_{i-1}$ so that $C_i \in \{0, 1\}$. We also introduce a numerical parameter $c \in (0, 1)$. Then, spins with $n_i = 0$ flip to $n_i = 1$ with rate $c \ C_i(\boldsymbol{n})$; spins with $n_i = 1$ flip to $n_i = 0$ with rate $(1 - c) C_i(\boldsymbol{n})$. We note in passing that some other studies take instead $C_i = n_{i-1} + n_{i+1}$ which leads to very similar behaviour. Our choice in this work is convenient because it simplifies the spin model defined in section 3.2 below. Note also that no spin flips can ever cause the system to enter or leave the state $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Hence, in order to ensure that the dynamics is irreducible, we define its configuration space as the set of all spin configurations except for $\mathbf{0}$.

The FA model respects detailed balance with respect to a steady-state (equilibrium) probability distribution where all spins are independent, and $\langle n_i \rangle_0 = c$. That is, in the equilibrium state one has

$$p(\boldsymbol{n}_t) \propto \exp\left(-(h/T)\sum_i n_{i,t}\right),$$
 (1)

where $(h/T) = \log[(1-c)/c]$; we identify T as the temperature and h as the energy difference between spins with $n_i = 1$ and $n_i = 0$. [To be precise, (1) is applicable only if $n_t \neq 0$]

2.2. Large deviations

We briefly describe the large-deviation formalism for the dynamical activity. For full details see [4], general discussions of large deviation theory can be found in [1, 5]. Consider a dynamical trajectory where the time t runs from 0 to τ . Let $K(\tau)$ be the total number of spin flip events that occur during this time interval. The average $\langle K(\tau) \rangle_0 = \tau \overline{k}L$ with $\overline{k} = 2c^2(2-c)(1-c)$. Since the model is a finite irreducible Markov chain, the probability distribution for $K(\tau)$ obeys a large-deviation principle (LDP) [1, 3–5, 37]:

$$\operatorname{Prob}[K(\tau) \approx \tau kL] \asymp \exp[-\tau I_L(k)],\tag{2}$$

where I_L is the rate function, which is analytic and strictly convex. Note that the speed of this LDP is τ and that the system size L is fixed as $\tau \to \infty$.

Large deviation theory describes rare events where $K(\tau)$ takes a value far from its mean. To analyse these rare events it is convenient to introduce a biasing field s and to define the scaled cumulant generating function (SCGF)

$$G_{L,\tau}(s) = \frac{1}{\tau} \log \left\langle e^{-sK(\tau)} \right\rangle_0.$$
(3)

The angle brackets with subscript 0 indicate a steady-state (equilibrium) average over trajectories running between time 0 and τ . Also define

$$G_L(s) = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} G_{L,\tau}(s).$$
(4)

Then the rate function can be obtained as $I_L(k) = \sup_s [-skL - G_L(s)]$. Also, the rare events of interest can be analysed by considering biased ensembles of trajectories in which the average of any (trajectory-dependent) observable O is

$$\langle O \rangle_s = \frac{\left\langle O e^{-sK} \right\rangle_0}{\left\langle e^{-sK} \right\rangle_0}.$$
(5)

Results for equivalence of ensembles [3, 38] show that for a large class of observables O, the biased average $\langle O \rangle_s$ converges (as $\tau \to \infty$) to a conditional average of O in the original (unbiased) process, where $K(\tau)$ is constrained to take a particular value. This constraint is $K(\tau) = \tau L \times k_L(s)$ with $k_L(s) = -G_L'(s)/L$.

Let $p_{L,\tau}(K)$ be the probability to observe exactly K spin flips and let $\rho_{L,\tau}(k) = \tau L \times p_{L,\tau}(\tau Lk)$ be an associated probability density for $k = K/(L\tau)$. The rate function that appears in (2) may be obtained as

$$I_L(k) = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{-1}{\tau} \log \rho_{L,\tau}(k).$$
(6)

2.3. Dynamical phase transition

Since the FA model is an irreducible finite-state Markov chain, the Perron–Frobenius theorem establishes that $I_L(k)$ and $G_L(s)$ are analytic and (strictly) convex [3, 5, 20]. To



Figure 1. Sketches of $\mathcal{I}(k)$ and $\mathcal{G}(s)$ for the FA model, based on the theory of [4, 14]. The first derivative of \mathcal{I} is continuous at $k = \overline{k}$ but the second derivative is discontinuous there. (Note $\mathcal{I}'(k) = 0$ for $k \leq \overline{k}$.) The first derivative of \mathcal{G} is discontinuous at s = 0 (with $\mathcal{G}'(s) = 0$ for s > 0).

reveal the dynamical phase transition that occurs in the model, one defines a bulk free energy density and a scaled rate function

$$\mathcal{G}(s) = \lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{1}{L} G_L(s), \qquad \mathcal{I}(k) = \lim_{L \to \infty} \frac{1}{L} I_L(k).$$
(7)

The form of these limiting functions \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I} is not constrained by the Perron–Frobenius theorem, see [39] for a discussion. In the FA model, these functions have singularities, as sketched in figure 1. Note in particular that $\mathcal{I}(k) = 0$ for $0 < k \leq \overline{k}$ and $\mathcal{G}(s) = 0$ for all $s \geq 0$ [4, 14, 31]. In the analogy with equilibrium statistical mechanics, this corresponds to a first-order phase transition.

3. From the 1D FA model to a 2D spin system

In this section we formulate a discrete-time FA (dFA) model with synchronous spin updates. The time between updates is δt and taking $\delta t \rightarrow 0$ recovers the (original) FA model. We also explain how trajectories of this model can be mapped onto configurations of a 2D spin system. Hence dynamical large deviations of the dFA and FA models can be analysed by computing thermodynamic properties of this 2D spin system.

3.1. Discrete-time FA model

The configuration of the discrete-time FA model at time t is n_t . The configuration at time $t + \delta t$ is generated by the following (stochastic) procedure. We first construct a set of random variables $m_t = (m_{1,t}, m_{2,t}, \ldots, m_{L,t})$ with $m_{i,t} \in \{0, 1\}$. The idea is that if $m_i = 0$ then spin n_i cannot change its state between times t and $t + \delta t$. The *m*-variables are chosen from a distribution (independent of t and n):

$$p(\boldsymbol{m}) = \frac{1}{z(\gamma)} \exp\left(-\gamma \sum_{i} m_{i}\right) \prod_{i} \tilde{C}_{i}(m_{i}, m_{i+1})$$
(8)

where γ is a parameter and $z(\gamma)$ is a normalisation constant (see below); also $\tilde{C}(m_i, m_{i+1}) = 1 - m_i m_{i+1}$, which enforces that adjacent sites cannot both have m = 1.

Given the vector \mathbf{m}_t , the spin variables $n_{i,t+\delta t}$ are then generated independently, by the following rule:

If
$$C_i(\boldsymbol{n}_t) = 0$$
 or $m_i = 0$ then $n_{i,t+\delta t} = n_{i,t}$
otherwise $n_{i,t+\delta t} = 1, 0$ with probes $c, (1-c)$ respectively (9)

The dependence on m_i together with the constraint \tilde{C} means that if spin n_i flips on a given time step then neither spin n_{i-1} nor spin n_{i+1} can flip. Hence, if spin *i* flips then $C_i(\mathbf{n}_t) = 1 = C_i(\mathbf{n}_{t+\delta t})$. This last property can be used to show that the update rule respects detailed balance with respect to the same steady state distribution as the FA model.

Positive values of the parameter γ increase the probability that $m_i = 0$ and reduce the number of sites at which the *n*-spins can flip. It is easily seen that $z(\gamma)$ is the partition function for a gas of 1D hard rods with length 2 and chemical potential $-\gamma T$, on a lattice of size *L*. For large γ , the typical number of spins that are able to flip in a single update is small, and *z* is close to the partition function for an ideal gas. This means that the $m_{i,t}$ variables become asymptotically independent as $\gamma \to \infty$, and the fraction of such variables with $m_{i,t} = 1$ is $\langle m_{i,t} \rangle = (1 + e^{\gamma})^{-1}$.

To match the behaviour of the dFA model to the FA model, one should reformulate the FA dynamics as follows: every spin is proposed to flip with rate 1 (independently); if the spin is facilitated then the relevant flip is accepted with probability c or 1 - c, according to its state. In the dFA model, *m*-variables with $m_{i,t} = 1$ correspond to events where spin *i* was proposed to flip, between time *t* and $t + \delta t$. If these proposals are independent and happen with rate 1 then we recover the FA dynamics. It is then sufficient to take

$$\gamma = -\log \frac{\delta t}{1 - \delta t},\tag{10}$$

with $\delta t \to 0$. Then the *m*-variables are independent with $\langle m_{i,t} \rangle = \delta t$, as required.

3.2. Corresponding spin model

We now define the 2D spin model whose configurations correspond to trajectories of the dFA model. For a trajectory of length τ , let $Y = \tau/\delta t$ be the number of time steps in the discrete-time FA model. The 2D model is defined on a decorated lattice, illustrated in figure 2(a). The lattice contains $(L \times Y)$ primary sites, which are associated with variables $n_{i,y} \in \{0,1\}$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, L$ and $y = 1, 2, \ldots, Y$. The index y indicates the position along the *time-like* axis (horizontal in figure 2) and the index i is the position on the space-like axis. The *m*-variables of the dFA model are defined on the time-like bonds of the lattice. They are $m_{i,y} \in \{0,1\}$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, L$ and $y = 1, 2, \ldots, (Y-1)$.

The configurations of this model are in exact correspondence with trajectories of the discrete-time FA model, as long as one enforces the following constraints: the FA





Figure 2. Illustration of the 2D spin model. (a) The model is defined on a square lattice. It is anisotropic, with a space-like direction corresponding to the 1D lattice of the analogous FA model and a time-like direction that corresponds to the time axis for the FA model. The vertices (sites) of the square lattice are occupied by *n*-variables, and sites with $n_{iy} = 1$ are indicated with filled circles. All other vertices have $n_{iy} = 0$. The horizontal (time-like) bonds are occupied by *m*-variables: bonds with $m_{iy} = 1$ are indicated by open squares. (b) A representative configuration of this model obtained by MC sampling with c = 0.38, $\gamma = 0$, and (L, Y) = (32, 128). Only the *n*-variables are shown. This resembles a typical trajectory of the continuous-time FA model [29].

configuration **0** is not allowed so $\sum_{i} n_{i,y} > 0$ for all y; the *m*-variables on spatially adjacent sites cannot both be in state 1 so $m_{i,y}m_{i+1,y} = 0$ for all y; an FA spin can only flip if $m_{i,y} = 1$ and $C_i(\mathbf{n}_t) = 1$, so $\delta(n_{i,y} - n_{i,y+1}) + m_{it}(n_{i-1,y} + n_{i+1,y}) > 0$ where $\delta(x) = 1$ if x = 0 and $\delta(x) = 0$ otherwise. These constraints define the configuration space of the spin model.

We now define an energy function so that the Boltzmann–Gibbs distribution of the 2D model at temperature T = 1 corresponds to the steady-state trajectory measure for the discrete-time FA model. This energy is

$$E_{0} = -\log \rho_{0}(\boldsymbol{n}_{1}) - \sum_{y=1}^{Y-1} \log P(\boldsymbol{n}_{y+1} | \boldsymbol{n}_{y}), \qquad (11)$$

where $\rho_0(\mathbf{n})$ is the steady-state probability of configuration \mathbf{n} in the FA model, and $P(\mathbf{n}|\mathbf{n}')$ is the transition probability for the discrete-time dynamics. The result is

$$E_{0} = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{y=1}^{Y-1} \left\{ \gamma m_{it} + C_{i}(\boldsymbol{n}_{y}) m_{i,y} \left[\log \frac{1}{1-c} - \frac{1}{2} (n_{i,y+1} + n_{i,y}) \log \frac{c}{1-c} \right] \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{L} (n_{i,1} + n_{i,Y}) \log \frac{c}{1-c}.$$
(12)

In deriving this, it is useful to note that the constraints on the configuration space of the model imply that $(n_{i,y+1} - n_{iy}) = C_i(\mathbf{n}_y) m_{i,y}(n_{i,y+1} - n_{iy})$; on summing this equation over y the left-hand side reduces to $n_{i,Y} - n_{i,1}$. One sees from (12) that the energy is symmetric under reversal of the time-like direction $(n_{i,y}, m_{i,y}) \rightarrow (n_{i,Y+1-y}, m_{i,Y-y})$. This symmetry is the same as time-reversal symmetry of the steady state of the dFA model, which follows from its detailed balance property.

Correspondence between the continuous-time FA model and this spin model requires that γ is large, by (10). This means that sites with $m_i = 1$ are rare and also that for a given trajectory length τ , it is necessary to use a very large lattice (because Y is large). However, numerical simulations are inefficient in this case. All qualitative features of this model depend weakly on γ , so we focus in the following on $\gamma = 0$.

Figure 2(b) shows a representative configuration of the spin model with c = 0.38and $\gamma = 0$, generated by MC sampling (see appendix A). Since the mapping between the discrete-time FA model and the spin model is exact, this is also a representative trajectory of the dFA model. (A dynamical simulation of the dFA model would be a much simpler way to generate a similar trajectory, but this figure illustrates proof of principle.) The trajectory shown in figure 2(b) is also consistent with the behaviour of the FA model, see for example [29].

3.3. Free energy and large deviation formalism

The biased trajectory ensembles defined in (5) can be analysed by considering the 2D spin model with a modified energy function. For any given 2D spin configuration, the number of spin flips in the corresponding dFA model trajectory is

$$K = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{y=1}^{Y-1} [n_{iy}(1 - n_{i,y+1}) + (1 - n_{i,y})n_{i,y+1}].$$
(13)

Hence the biased trajectory ensemble for the discrete-time FA model corresponds to a Boltzmann–Gibbs distribution of the 2D spin model, where the energy E_0 is replaced by

$$E_s = E_0 + sK$$

= $E_0 + s \sum_{i=1}^{L} \sum_{y=1}^{Y-1} \left[n_{iy} + n_{i,y+1} - 2n_{iy}n_{i,y+1} \right].$ (14)

For s > 0, this represents an additional ferromagnetic coupling for the spins, along the time-like bonds. The free energy difference (per site) between systems with energy E_s and E_0 is a scaled cumulant generating function:

$$\hat{G}_{L,Y}(s) = \frac{1}{LY} \log \left\langle e^{-sK} \right\rangle_0, \tag{15}$$

where the angle brackets with subscript zero now indicate a Boltzmann average with energy E_0 . This free energy \hat{G} is analogous to (3), but note the different normalisation: in the dynamical case we normalised by the trajectory length τ (analogous to Y in this case); here we also normalised by L, to obtain a free energy per site. We use carets (hats) to distinguish functions for the 2D spin model from their counterparts in the original FA model. Also define $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k)$ as the probability density for k = K/(LY) [analogous to $\rho_{L,\tau}(k)$ in section 2.2]. The analogue of (7) is

$$\hat{\mathcal{G}}(s) = \lim_{L \to \infty} \lim_{Y \to \infty} \hat{G}_{L,Y}(s), \qquad \hat{\mathcal{I}}(k) = \lim_{L \to \infty} \lim_{Y \to \infty} \frac{-1}{LY} \log \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k).$$
(16)

We identify $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ as the bulk free energy density. Note that there are no long-ranged terms in the energy function and the spin model has no other pathological features so we expect on general thermodynamic grounds that the order of limits should be irrelevant in these definitions, and that $\hat{\mathcal{G}}(s)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}(k)$ should be related by Legendre transformation. We have not proven these results rigorously but all our results (and previous results for the FA model) are consistent with this hypothesis.

3.4. Periodic boundary conditions

In numerical studies of the dynamical phase transition that occurs in the FA model and other glassy models [4, 14, 15], finite-size scaling analyses are affected by the initial conditions in the trajectory averages of (3) and (5). For the 2D spin model considered here, the equilibrium ensemble of trajectories of the dFA model corresponds to taking free boundary conditions at y = 1 and y = Y, as in (12), (13).

However, for the spin model, it is much more natural to consider a fully periodic system, instead of free boundary conditions. This also helps to reduce finite-size effects. To achieve this, we introduce an extra column of *m*-variables to the picture in figure 2(a), which are $\mathbf{m}_Y = (m_{1,Y}, m_{2,Y}, \ldots, m_{L,Y})$. We also periodize (12) and (13) by adding extra terms that couple the spins $\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_Y, \mathbf{m}_Y$. In terms of the dFA model, this means that we consider the ensemble of trajectories that are periodic in time, see also [40]. Thermodynamic arguments indicate that the bulk free energy density should be $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ independent of boundary conditions. This result can be confirmed in this case because

$$\hat{G}_L(s) = \lim_{Y \to \infty} \hat{G}_{L,Y}(s) \tag{17}$$

can be obtained as the largest eigenvalue of a particular matrix [3, 4] (the tilted generator [20]), and this result is independent of whether one uses periodic or free boundary conditions at y = 1, Y.

All numerical results for the 2D spin model use periodic boundary conditions, except where explicitly stated. Details of the simulation methods are given in appendix \mathbf{A} including some results with open boundaries. Note that some care is required with simulation of this spin model, because MC moves that flip single n or m variables are not sufficient to allow access to all configurations of the system, if periodic boundary conditions are used. However, MC moves that additionally flip adjacent pairs of spins are sufficient to allow exploration of the whole configuration space, as discussed in appendix \mathbf{A} .

4. Phase transition in the 2D spin model: behaviour in finite systems

The dFA model has a dynamical phase transition, which corresponds to a thermodynamic phase transition in the 2D spin model. This means that the functions $\hat{\mathcal{G}}(s), \hat{\mathcal{I}}(k)$ in (16) have the same behaviour as was illustrated in figure 1 for \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{I} . This can be proven by direct generalisation of the arguments of [4].

This section presents numerical results for the thermodynamic transition in the 2D spin model. As usual for numerical studies of phase transitions, the results are obtained in finite systems, so finite-size scaling analysis is required in order to interpret the results. Since these systems are anisotropic, this analysis requires some care with the ratio of Y/L, in the thermodynamic limit [34].

4.1. Dynamical phase transition

To analyse the phase transition using data for finite systems we consider

$$k_{L,Y}(s) = \frac{1}{LY} \langle K \rangle_s = -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s} \hat{G}_{L,Y}(s), \qquad (18)$$

which is the mean value of the order parameter, as well as the associated susceptibility

$$\chi_{L,Y}(s) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s} k_{L,Y}(s),\tag{19}$$

which is proportional to the variance of K. The system has an active phase with large k and an inactive phase where most spins have $n_i = 0$ and k is small. However, since configurations with $\sum_i n_{i,y} = 0$ are forbidden, the inactive phase always includes at least one excitation line.

Figure 3 shows results for a system with L = 32 and Y = 512. As expected, the order parameter $k_{L,Y}$ shows a crossover as s increases, with an associated peak in $\chi_{L,Y}$. Define the field $s_{L,Y}^*$ to be the value of s that maximises $\chi_{L,Y}(s)$. Then the probability distribution

$$\hat{\rho}_*(k) = \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*) \tag{20}$$

has a characteristic bimodal form in which the two peaks correspond to configurations from the active and inactive phases. The intermediate trough corresponds to configurations at phase coexistence. The configurations that are typical of the trough of $\hat{\rho}_*$ depend on details of the system, including the aspect ratio Y/L and the surface tension between the phases. In this system, the fact that the inactive phase always contains at least one excitation line is also relevant. For the case considered in figure 3, one sees that phase coexistence corresponds to domains of active and inactive phases, with interfaces that lie parallel to the time-like axis.

4.2. Finite-size scaling for $L \sim Y$

The data of figure 3 show the classical features of a first order phase transition. However, it is important to note that the behaviour of $\hat{\rho}$ and the nature of the representative



Figure 3. Results for the 2D spin model L = 32 and Y = 512 and fully periodic boundary conditions. (a) Order parameter k(s). (b) Susceptibility $\chi(s)$. (c) Histogram of the order parameter at $s = s_{L,Y}^* = 0.0043$. (d) Representative configurations taken from the two peaks of the histogram (active/inactive phases) and from the trough (phase coexistence). This is the expected behaviour in the regime $L \sim Y$.

Y = 512

configurations depend on the aspect ratio Y/L. The behaviour of figures 3(c) and (d) is expected when L, Y are of the same order of magnitude, that is $L \sim Y[34]$. In this case, the two peaks of $\hat{\rho}_*(k)$ appear at values $k_{\rm a}, k_{\rm i}$ that are characteristic of the phases and depend weakly on L, Y. Hence the variance of k is of order unity, which corresponds to a peak in the susceptibility whose height diverges with the total size of the system:

$$\chi^* = \chi_{L,Y}(s_{L,Y}^*) \approx LY(k_{\rm a} - k_{\rm i})^2/4.$$
(21)

Interfaces between active and inactive phases incur a free energy cost which depends on their orientation with respect to the lattice axes. Hence we define two surface tension parameters Γ_t, Γ_s , which are associated with interfaces that are parallel to the time-like and space-like axes respectively. (See also [22].) Since the interfaces in figure 3(d) are parallel to the time-like axis, we infer that the costs of the time and space directions satisfy $Y\Gamma_{\rm t} \ll L\Gamma_{\rm s}$ so that $\Gamma_{\rm t} \ll (L/Y)\Gamma_{\rm s}$. The total length of the interface is 2 Y, so the peak-to-trough ratio of the distribution $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}^*$ scales as $e^{-2Y\Gamma_{\rm t}}$, if one considers systems where the aspect ratio Y/L is held constant as $Y \to \infty$. With this scaling we emphasise that for values of k within the trough (that is, $k_i < k < k_a$), one has

$$\lim_{L,Y \to \infty} \frac{-1}{LY} \log \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*) = \lim_{L,Y \to \infty} (2\Gamma_{\rm t}/L) = 0.$$
(22)

Hence from (16) one has $\mathcal{I}(k) = 0$ throughout this range, consistent with figure 1. The physical content of this result is that, in terms of cost, differences between configurations from the trough and the peaks of $\hat{\rho}$ are localised at the interfaces. Since the interfaces occupy a vanishing fraction of the system, the difference in free energy between these

(a)

 $k_{L,Y}(s)$

(d)

configurations is subextensive, and the value of $\frac{1}{LY} \log \hat{\rho}$ is the same. This is related to the Maxwell construction and the double tangent construction in thermodynamics [41].

4.3. Finite-size scaling and consequences for dynamical large deviations

So far, we analysed the behaviour of a finite system following the standard methods of thermodynamics. To make contact with the methods used for dynamical phase transitions, recall from (4) that the dynamical free energy is conventionally defined with a limit of large time τ at fixed system size L. In the 2D spin model, this corresponds to taking $Y \to \infty$ at fixed L. The finite-size scaling behaviour for $Y \gg L$ is quite different to that shown in figure 3, which applies for $Y \sim L$. This distinction was discussed by Privman and Fisher [34], who analysed thermodynamic phase transitions for different aspect ratios Y/L. This section discusses the physical picture that follows from their analysis. Its consequences for the dynamical phase transition in the FA model will be discussed in section 4.5.

From general thermodynamic arguments, the free energy $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ and its Legendre transform $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ in (16) are bulk quantities, independent of the aspect ratio. In particular, one should obtain the same result on interchanging the order of limits in (16), or on taking $L, Y \to \infty$ together, with a fixed ratio Y/L. Moreover, figure 1 indicates that $\hat{\mathcal{I}} = 0$ for $k < \overline{k}$ in the FA model. Consistency of this picture with the dFA model requires that $\frac{1}{LY} \log \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*) \to 0$ in large systems, throughout the range $0 < k < \overline{k}$ [see equation (22)]. For the situation where $L \sim Y$ and the aspect ratio $\alpha = Y/L$ is fixed in the thermodynamic limit, the expected behaviour is that

$$\log \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*) \approx -L\mathcal{F}_{\sim}(k,\alpha,\Gamma_{\rm s},\Gamma_{\rm t}), \quad k_{\rm i} < k < k_{\rm a}$$

$$\tag{23}$$

where \mathcal{F}_{\sim} is the free energy cost for the interfaces associated with phase coexistence. The function \mathcal{F}_{\sim} also depends on the boundary conditions. The general form (23) is consistent with the behaviour of (22), which is relevant for the specific example in figure 3(d): in that case $\mathcal{F}_{\sim}(k, \alpha, \Gamma_{\rm s}, \Gamma_{\rm t}) = 2\alpha\Gamma_{\rm t}$. We note that while rate functions and SCGFs are defined by taking limits where $L, Y \to \infty$, the result (23) is for a finite system. For this approximate equality to be valid, it is assumed throughout this section that L, Y are both large compared to the microscopic correlation lengths of the 2D spin model—for small c then the correlations become long-ranged and strongly anisotropic so this requires [for $\gamma = O(1)$] that $cL \gg 1$ and $c^3 Y \gg 1$, by analogy with results for the FA model in continuous time [42, 43].⁷

Note that (23) is an LDP with speed L, which describes the behaviour of the system at phase coexistence. Compared with the bulk result (16), it gives a more detailed description of the behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}$, for $k_i < k < k_a$. That is, the probability density $\hat{\rho}$ obeys two LDPs: the 'bulk' result (16) which has speed LY and the 'interfacial' result (23). The bulk LDP has rate function zero throughout $0 < k < \overline{k}$, and this is independent

⁷ If γ is also large then we require $c^3 Y e^{-\gamma} \gg 1$ because the effect of large γ is that correlations along the time-like direction become scaling functions of $ye^{-\gamma}$, consistent with the approach to the continuous-time limit as $\gamma \to \infty$, where $ye^{-\gamma}$ can be identified with the time *t*, by (10). In general we quote all scaling predictions assuming $\gamma = O(1)$, for simplicity. Cases where γ is large can be obtained by treating $t = ye^{-\gamma}$ as a scaling variable.



Figure 4. The finite-size scaling crossover of Privman and Fisher [34]. (a) For systems with $Y \sim L$, the classical picture of phase coexistence has a bimodal distribution of the order parameter. Representative configurations of the system are illustrated. The peaks correspond to the pure phases (illustrated in white and grey) and the trough corresponds to phase coexistence, shown here with domain walls parallel to the horizontal axis, as in figure 3(b). For systems with $Y \gg L$ the situation is different. The distribution of the order parameter is unimodal and typical configurations have many domains of both phases. The typical distance between domain walls scales as $e^{L\Gamma_s}$, see the text for a discussion.

of aspect ratio and boundary conditions. The interfacial LDP has a non-trivial rate function in this range of k; it depends on both the aspect ratio and the boundary conditions.

To make contact with dynamical phase transitions, we now consider systems with $Y \gg L$, which are relevant for the dynamical LDP (2) and for (7). Figure 4 shows the behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}$ predicted by the theory of Privman and Fisher [34], and corresponding configurations of the system. For $Y \gg L$, phase coexistence is dominated by interfaces that are parallel to the space-like direction. The free-energy cost of a single interface is $\Gamma_s L$ and these interfaces can appear anywhere along the time-like direction. It follows that for very large Y, the statistical properties of these domain walls are those of a one-dimensional ideal gas with density $e^{-\Gamma_s L}$. Hence their number follows a Poisson distribution with mean

$$\overline{n} \approx Y e^{-\Gamma_s L}.$$
(24)

Recalling (4) we are considering $Y \to \infty$ at fixed L: to saturate this limit requires $\overline{n} \gg 1$ or $Y \gg e^{\Gamma_s L}$. In this work, we use $Y \gg L$ as a short-hand for the limit where $Y \to \infty$ before any limit of large L. This corresponds to an extremely large aspect ratio Y/L. In thermodynamics, this regime is less often studied than the classical case $Y \sim L$, see however [34]. It is also harder to access by conventional MC simulations. However, it is the natural limit for the population dynamics (cloning) methods that are used to analyse dynamical large deviations [23, 24].

In this limit, the Poisson distribution for the number of domains means that the distribution $\hat{\rho}^*(k)$ is peaked at $(k_a + k_i)/2$. The probability to have $k \approx k_a$ or $k \approx k_i$ can be estimated as the probability to have no domain walls at all, which for a Poisson distribution is simply $e^{-\overline{n}}$. In fact the statistics of the configurations shown in figure 4(b) are exactly those of a *one-dimensional* Ising model of size Y where the density of domain walls is $e^{-\Gamma_s L}$. Equivalently one can identify these configurations with trajectories of a

two-state Markov chain where each state corresponds to one of the phases, and the rate for transitions between the phases is $e^{-\Gamma_s L}$. In either case, the statistics of the activity are easily computed (see appendix B) and one obtains

$$\log \hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*) \approx -Y \mathcal{F}_{\gg}(k), \quad k_{\rm i} < k < k_{\rm a}$$

$$\tag{25}$$

with

$$\mathcal{F}_{\gg}(k) = \mathrm{e}^{-\Gamma_{\mathrm{s}}L} f\left(\frac{2(k-k_0)}{\Delta k}\right), \quad f(x) = 1 - \sqrt{1-x^2}, \tag{26}$$

where $k_0 = (k_a + k_i)/2$ is the average activity of the two phases and $\Delta k = k_a - k_i$ is their difference. Equation (25) is the analogue of (23) for systems with $Y \gg L$. We identify it as an LDP with speed Y. Again, this result gives extra detail on the behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}$, in the regime of phase coexistence. Consistent with the bulk LDP one has $\frac{1}{LY} \log \rho \to 0$. Note however that the LDP (25) is quite different from its counterpart (23) for $L \sim Y$. In particular, the rate function \mathcal{F}_{\gg} has a simple form that is convex, consistent with the unimodal distribution $\hat{\rho}_*$ in figure 4(b)—by (25) and (26) the distribution $\hat{\rho}_*$ sketched in that figure obeys a central limit theorem and has Gaussian behaviour close to k_0 , with a small variance of order $e^{L\Gamma_s}(\Delta k)^2/(4Y)$. In contrast, \mathcal{F}_{\sim} in (23) is non-convex in general, consistent with the bimodal distributions in figures 3(c) and 4(a).

Noting that the LDP (25) applies to the distribution $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s_{L,Y}^*)$, define $s(k) = s_{L,Y}^* - \mathcal{F}'_{\gg}(k)$, and note that the inverse of the function s(k) is $k_{L,\infty}(s)$. Hence

$$k_{L,\infty}(s) = k_0 - \frac{(s - s_{L,\infty}^*)(\Delta k)^2}{2\sqrt{(s - s_{L,\infty}^*)^2(\Delta k)^2 + 4e^{-2\Gamma_s L}}}$$
(27)

which describes the crossover between the phases as shown (for example) in figure 5(a). We will return to this result in section 5, below. Note that (25) and (27) are generic for first-order dynamical phase transitions in two dimensions. The extension to higher dimensions is straightforward in the case where the system size along one dimension is much larger than the size along all others, in which case one should replace $\Gamma_{\rm s}L$ by $\Gamma_{\rm s}L^{d-1}$ for a suitably-defined surface tension parameter $\Gamma_{\rm s}$. For dynamical phase transitions of mean-field systems, one expects a similar formula with an 'interfacial cost' $\Gamma_{\rm s}N$ where N is the system size, see [44]. In diffusive systems described by the macroscopic fluctuation theory, see [45] for a discussion of similar phenomena.

4.4. 2D spin model for $Y \gg L$

Figure 5 illustrates the finite-size scaling crossover for the 2D spin model with L = 16. If Y is not too large then one observes a bimodal distribution of the order parameter, as in figure 3. However, one sees for larger Y a crossover to a unimodal form, consistent with figure 4. The representative configurations also show the crossover anticipated in figure 4, although the typical configurations have only one active and one inactive domain, even for the largest Y that we analysed. (To observe many domains would require even larger Y, which is numerically expensive.)





Figure 5. Results for L = 16. (a) Activity k(s) for different values of Y, as labelled, the data for Y = 512 are very close to those for Y = 1024. (b) Susceptibility $\chi(s)$, the symbols and colours are the same as for panel (a). (c) Histograms of the activity at $s = s^*$. For smaller Y one sees a bimodal structure but for larger Y one sees a single peak, this is the Privman–Fisher crossover [34]. (d) Configurations at Y = 256showing behaviour that is representative of the two peaks in ρ^* (inactive/active phases), and of the intervening trough. (e) A configuration from Y = 1024 that is representative of the peak of ρ_* , showing both phases coexisting in a single configuration. For even larger values of Y, typical trajectories would include multiple domains of each phase.

For large Y, one also sees that the order parameter $k_{L,Y}(s)$ approaches a limiting form $k_{L,\infty}(s)$. To understand this, note that the thermodynamic analogue of the dynamical SCGF $G_L(s)$ in (4) is

$$\hat{G}_{L,\infty}(s) = \lim_{Y \to \infty} \hat{G}_{L,Y}(s).$$
(28)

(To be precise, this corresponds to $G_L(s)/L$.) Following the same arguments as in the dynamical case, this limit exists and $\hat{G}_{L,\infty}$ is strictly convex and analytic. Its derivative gives the limiting form of the order parameter $k_{L,\infty}(s) = -G'_{L,\infty}(s)$. From (27) one has also the corresponding susceptibility which is

$$\chi_{L,\infty}(s^*) \approx \frac{(\Delta k)^2}{4} e^{L\Gamma_s}.$$
(29)

This quantity diverges exponentially with L, in contrast to the power-law divergence of (21), which we recall was applicable for $L \sim Y$. This exponential scaling was observed for the (original) FA model in [27], where the connection to the work of Privman and

Fisher was identified. Quantitative predictions for Γ_s were also obtained in that case, see section 5.

4.5. Connection to previous studies of dynamical phase transitions

We have used the 2D spin model of section 3.2 to illustrate the finite-size scaling crossover of Privman and Fisher [34]. To connect this model to the FA model in continuous time, we recall that $Y = \tau/(\delta t)$ and we require $\delta t \to 0$ with $\gamma \to \infty$ in accordance with (10). Note also that the continuous-time SCGF is defined with a scaling factor of τ [in (4)] while the SCGF for the dFA model is defined with a scaling factor of Y[in (15)]. Hence translation from \hat{G} to G requires a scaling by δt . Similarly the dFA activity $k_{L,Y}(s)$ is defined per site, while the FA activity $k_L(s)$ is defined per unit time, so these also differ by a factor of δt . In addition, the natural generalisation of aspect ratio α to the continuous-time cases is $\alpha_{\text{cont}} = \tau/L$ which is $\alpha \delta t$. It is a straightforward exercise to translate results from the dFA to the FA context, and all results given here for scaling behaviour are robust. For example, the analogue of (25) is given by

$$\log \rho_{L,\tau}(k) - s^* k L \tau = -\tau \mathcal{F}_{\gg}(k), \quad k_{\rm i} < k < k_{\rm a} \tag{30}$$

where $\rho_{L,\tau}(k)$ was defined in section 2.2 so the left-hand side is analogous to $\hat{\rho}_{L,Y}(k|s^*)$; on the right-hand side then F_{\gg} is still given by (26), but with parameters k_i , k_a defined as activities per unit time (instead of per site). The parameters s^* , Γ_s will also have different numerical values, due to the rescaling. Nevertheless, all these parameters remain of order unity on taking the continuous-time limit so the results that we have presented here for the dFA model are all reproduced in the (continuous-time) FA model. (The validity of (30) requires that α_{cont} be large enough that a typical trajectory contains many domain walls).

Since the thermodynamics of the 2D spin model are directly related to dynamical large deviations of the dFA model (and the FA model), we are now able to rationalise some of the previous work on finite-size scaling of dynamical phase transitions.

In particular, note that analysis of these phase transitions by transition path sampling [21] typically focusses on finite-size scaling with $L \sim \tau$ [15, 17], corresponding here to $L \sim Y$. For example the analysis of [15] assumes the scenario shown in figure 3, with a bimodal histogram of the order parameter. The associated peak-to-trough ratio increases with Y (or in that case τ), which was used in [15] as evidence for a first-order transition. Similar behaviour is seen in [17, 46]. In those cases one expects a power-law divergence of $\chi_{L,Y}(s*)$.

On the other hand, analyses of dynamical phase transitions [23, 24] by cloning methods typically concentrate on the limit $\tau \gg L$ (corresponding to $Y \gg L$), as do analytical (and other) methods that estimate of the largest eigenvalue of a tilted generator [33]. In these cases the behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_*$ close to its peak is described by (27), in which \mathcal{F}_{\gg} is a convex function. It follows that $\hat{\rho}_*$ is unimodal, consistent with figures 4(b) and 5(c). We emphasise that this unimodal behaviour of $\hat{\rho}_*$ is fully consistent with the existence of a phase transition, despite some of the arguments presented in [47]. In this case the susceptibility $\chi_{L,\infty}(s^*)$ is expected to diverge exponentially with L, as observed in reference [27] for the FA model.

5. Interfacial model of phase coexistence

We have combined general theoretical arguments about first-order phase transitions with numerical calculations for the 2D spin model. We now take an analytic approach to the dynamical phase transition in the FA model. Specifically, we expand on the work of [27], and we also correct some typographical errors in that work.⁸ Our results yield a detailed understanding of the phase coexistence regime presented in the last section, and it gives a numerical value of the surface tension parameter Γ_s that determines the rate of exponential growth of the susceptibility.

5.1. Definition of interfacial model

We describe the phase transition in the FA model by a simplified interfacial model [31, 32], see also [27, 48]. We assume that the FA model at time t has a single large inactive domain where all spins have $n_i = 0$. Following [31, 32], we consider a continuous time Markov chain where the size of the *active* domain at time t is $x_t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$, so the size of the inactive domain is $L - x_t$. A possible trajectory of this system is illustrated in figure 6. The dynamical rule is that x follows an asymmetric random walk: it increases by a step of 1 with rate 2q and decreases by a step of 1 with rate 2p. If such a jump would lead to x > L or x < 1 then it is rejected and x is unchanged. To reproduce the behaviour of the FA model requires

$$p = c(1-c), \quad q = c.$$
 (31)

Since p < q then the random walk is asymmetric and biased towards x = 1 (which is the active phase). To parameterise the asymmetry of the walk we define

$$F = \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{q}{p} \tag{32}$$

which is positive but small in magnitude for our examples (of order c). The natural microscopic time scale in the problem is (p + q).

For a trajectory of the FA model where the size of the active domain is x(t), one expects a dynamical activity

$$K(\tau) \approx \mathcal{K}(\tau) = \overline{k} \int_0^\tau x(t) dt$$
(33)

where the second equality defines $\mathcal{K}(\tau)$, which is the dynamical activity of a trajectory of the interfacial model. Equation (33) assumes that behaviour within the active domain is close to the typical behaviour of the model, so the activity density there is close to \overline{k} . Note that $\overline{k} = 4c^2(1-c)$ in this model [27, 31, 32], different from the one introduced in previous sections.

⁸ In particular, the main formula (9) of reference [27] is incorrect: F(c) in the left-hand side should be replaced by F(c)/2 and also the definition of F(c) should be $(1/2) \log [1/(1-c)]$ instead of $(1/2) \log [c/(1-c)]$.



Figure 6. Sketch of a trajectory of the interfacial model. Grey shading indicates the active phase (in space-time) and white indicates the inactive phase. At any given time there is (at most) one large inactive domain whose size is $L - x_t$; the size of the corresponding active domain is x_t .

For large L, it is convenient to replace the integer-valued domain size x by the fraction of the system that is covered by this domain, that is

$$y(t) = \frac{x(t)}{L}.$$
(34)

In [27], this variable y(t) was denoted by $\tilde{x}(t)$. The analogue of the SCGF $G_{L,\tau}(s)$ for this model is $\Psi_{L,\tau}(sL)$ where

$$\Psi_{L,\tau}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\tau} \log \left\langle e^{-\lambda \int_0^\tau y(t) dt} \right\rangle.$$
(35)

To the extent that the interfacial model captures the relevant physics in the FA model, we expect

$$G_{L,\tau}(s) \approx \Psi_{L,\tau}(sL).$$
 (36)

The interfacial model does not capture all aspects of the FA model, in particular the fact that there are no fluctuations within the active phase is a coarse approximation. However, we will find that it is valid (at best) in regimes where the trajectories of the FA model contain large coexisting domains of active and inactive phases, with at most one large domain being present at any time t. This corresponds to values of s that are close to peaks of the susceptibility χ that can be seen in figures 3 and 5.

5.2. Large deviation analysis

We now consider large deviations of the interfacial model in the limit of large τ , so we define

$$\Psi_L(\lambda) = \lim_{\tau \to \infty} \Psi_{L,\tau}(\lambda) \tag{37}$$

analogous to $G_L(s)$ in the FA model, see (4). The following analysis applies for $\lambda \ge 0$ and we also assume that $F \ll 1$, which simplifies the analysis. The results are summarised in figure 7. For large-*L* this result is consistent with figure 1(b), but we emphasise again that the behaviour for finite *L* is specific to a system where the limit of large time τ is taken before any limit of large *L*. Note also that Ψ_L is decreasing and convex, so we have for $\lambda \ge 0$ that

$$-\lambda \overline{k} \leqslant \Psi_L(\lambda) \leqslant 0. \tag{38}$$



Figure 7. Sketch of the SCGF $\Psi_L(\lambda)$, shown as a solid line. The dashed lines show the behaviour of the active and inactive phases. The active phase has $\Psi_a \approx -\lambda \overline{k}$ with a correction at order 1/L (the mean activity $\mathcal{K}/(L\tau)$ of this phase is \overline{k}). Also $\Psi_i \approx -2\sqrt{pq}F^2$, with a finite-size correction of order $L^{-2/3}$, see (61). The dashed lines cross at $\lambda = \lambda^* \approx 2F^2\sqrt{pq}/\overline{k}$. The SCGF Ψ deviates from $\max(\Psi_a, \Psi_i)$ by a quantity that scales as $e^{-L\Gamma}$, where the constant Γ is given by (71). This means that the curvature $\Psi''(\lambda)$ is exponentially large for $\lambda \approx \lambda^*$.

5.2.1. Eigenvalue problem in continuous space. The SCGF can be obtained by solving an eigenproblem, based on the master equation for the dynamics [4]. Within the bulk of the system $(y \neq \frac{1}{L}, 1)$ one has

$$\Psi_L(\lambda)P_L(y) = 2p\left[P_L(y+\frac{1}{L}) - P_L(y)\right] + 2q\left[P_L(y-\frac{1}{L}) - P_L(y)\right] - \lambda y\overline{k}P_L(y)$$
(39)

where the eigenvector P_L is a (discrete) probability distribution for y. In the following we sometimes omit the subscripts L, for compactness of notation. At the boundaries one has

$$\Psi P\left(\frac{1}{L}\right) = 2pP\left(\frac{2}{L}\right) - 2qP\left(\frac{1}{L}\right) - \lambda \overline{k}/L$$

$$\Psi P(1) = 2qP\left(\frac{L-1}{L}\right) - 2pP(1) - \lambda \overline{k}.$$
(40)

Equations (39) and (40) define an eigenvalue problem for an $L \times L$ matrix, which is easily solved numerically. Here we adopt an analytical approach, which gives insight into the limit of large L. Our analysis also requires that $F \ll 1$.

In the large-L limit, we find that the eigenvector P takes the form

$$P(y) = \exp[Lf(y)],\tag{41}$$

where f is of order unity. For example, in the absence of any bias, f(y) = 2Fy and the distribution of y is exponentially increasing, with a maximum at y = 1. (This is the active phase.)



Figure 8. The rate functions f(y) and $\tilde{f}(y)$ at coexistence, evaluated for finite values of L by diagonalizing the eigenvalue problem (39). The value of c is set to 0.3. The value of λ is tuned to the special value that maximizes the curvature $\Psi''(\lambda)$ for each L. The figures show that $\tilde{f}(y)$ has two maxima at coexistence, whereas f(y) does not. As $L \to \infty$, the heights of the maxima are equal (consistent with phase coexistence) and the positions of the maxima tend to 0 and 1, which are the average values of y in the coexisting phases.

In general, the eigenfunction P gives the distribution of the size of the active domain, evaluated at the final time τ . The meaning of (41) is that this size obeys an LDP with speed L and rate function -f(y). It is convenient to define also $Q(y) = P(y)e^{-LFy}$, in which case $Q(y)^2$ is a (non-normalised) probability distribution for the domain size y_t , where t is in the 'bulk' of the trajectory (i.e. far from initial and final times).⁹ In the notation of [27], we thus have $P_{ave}(y) \propto Q(y)^2$ and $P_{end}(y) = P(y)$. One sees that P_{ave} also satisfies an LDP with speed L, that is

$$Q(y)^2 = \exp[L\tilde{f}(y)], \quad \tilde{f}(y) = 2[f(y) - yF].$$
 (42)

At the dynamical phase transition, $\tilde{f}(y)$ presents two maxima as shown in figure 8 for finite L, and the corresponding values of y are the sizes of the active domain in the coexisting phases. We emphasise however that the LDPs (41) and (42) for y_t are distinct from the LDP for the time-integrated quantity \mathcal{K} that is our main interest here.

The passage from the discrete-space problem to a continuum one is discussed in appendix C. We define

$$\mu = \left(\frac{\lambda \overline{k}}{2\sqrt{pq}}\right)^{1/3}, \quad \psi_L = \frac{\Psi_L(\lambda)}{2\sqrt{pq}} + F^2.$$
(43)

Note that $\mu \ge 0$ is known (it depends only on the parameters of the model) but ψ_L is unknown (it depends on the eigenvalue Ψ_L). We recognise ψ_L as the difference between the solid line and the horizontal dotted line in figure 7. The function Q satisfies the

⁹Note that $Q(y)^2/P(y)$ can also be characterised as the solution of an adjoint eigenproblem for (39), and that Q(y) can be characterised as the solution of a corresponding symmetrised (self-adjoint) eigenproblem.

self-adjoint eigenvalue equation (C.11) which reduces to

$$\frac{1}{L^2}Q_L''(y) - \mu^3 y Q_L(y) = \psi_L Q_L(y).$$
(44)

This equation is to be solved subject to the boundary conditions (C.12) which are

$$\frac{Q'(0)}{LQ(0)} = \gamma_0 = F + (\psi - F^2) + O(F^3), \quad \frac{Q'(1)}{LQ(1)} = \gamma_1 = F + (\psi + \mu^3 - F^2) + O(F^3).$$
(45)

This equation defines γ_0, γ_1 . (The quantities in round brackets are $O(F^2)$, we retain them for later convenience. Note that ignoring terms at $O(F^3)$ can sometimes lead to artificial solutions to the eigenproblem with $\psi > 0$, see appendix C.3).

Since the coefficient of Q'' in (44) is small, one may obtain approximate solutions to the eigenproblem. This is equivalent to a WKB-like saddle-point analysis method. Here we take a different route, using that (44) can be solved exactly using Airy functions.

5.2.2. Solution of the eigenvalue problem. The Airy functions are solutions of the Airy equation f''(x) - xf(x) = 0, and are denoted by Ai(x) and Bi(x). For negative x, these functions oscillate around zero. For positive x, Ai is a decreasing function and Bi is increasing. For large positive x they behave as

$$Ai(x) \simeq \exp\left(-\frac{2}{3}x^{3/2}\right) \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}x^{1/4}} \left[1 + O(x^{-3/2})\right],$$

$$Bi(x) \simeq \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}x^{3/2}\right) \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}x^{1/4}} \left[1 + O(x^{-3/2})\right].$$
(46)

Note in particular that Bi(x) grows super-exponentially when its argument is large.

By changing variables in (44), its solution can be seen to be

$$Q_L(y) = \hat{a}_L \mathcal{A}_L(y) + \hat{b}_L \mathcal{B}_L(y)$$
(47)

where \hat{a}_L, \hat{b}_L are coefficients with a normalisation condition $\hat{a}_L + \hat{b}_L = 1$ and

$$\mathcal{A}_{L}(y) = \operatorname{Ai}\left[L^{2/3}\left(\mu y + \frac{\psi_{L}}{\mu^{2}}\right)\right],$$
$$\mathcal{B}_{L}(y) = \frac{1}{\operatorname{Bi}\left(L^{2/3}\left(\mu + \frac{\psi_{L}}{\mu^{2}}\right)\right)}\operatorname{Bi}\left[L^{2/3}\left(\mu y + \frac{\psi_{L}}{\mu^{2}}\right)\right].$$
(48)

Note that \mathcal{B} is normalised such that $\mathcal{B}_L(1) = 1$. From (38) and (43) we have

$$-\mu^3 \leqslant (\psi - F^2) \leqslant 0 \tag{49}$$

which implies in particular that $\psi + \mu^3$ is (strictly) positive, and the asymptotic expansions of (46) are relevant. To keep track of exponential factors in the large-*L* limit, it is useful to define

$$\epsilon_L = \exp\left[-\frac{2}{3}L\left(\mu + \frac{\psi_L}{\mu^2}\right)^{3/2}\right].$$
(50)

which is exponentially small when L is large. With this choice one sees that $\mathcal{A}_L(1)$ and $\mathcal{B}_L(0)$ are both of order $\epsilon_L \times L^{-1/6}$.

The physical interpretation of (47) is that \mathcal{A}_L and \mathcal{B}_L have peaks near 0 and 1 respectively and represent contributions to the eigenfunction from the two phases. The weights \hat{a}, \hat{b} and the unknown quantity ψ_L must now be determined from the boundary condition (45). This requires that

$$\frac{\hat{a}_L}{\hat{b}_L} = \frac{\mathcal{B}'(0) - L\gamma_0 \mathcal{B}(0)}{L\gamma_0 \mathcal{A}(0) - \mathcal{A}'(0)} = \frac{\mathcal{B}'(1) - L\gamma_1 \mathcal{B}(1)}{L\gamma_1 \mathcal{A}(1) - \mathcal{A}'(1)}.$$
(51)

Recall that $\mathcal{B}(0)$ and its derivative are exponentially small when L is large, and similarly for $\mathcal{A}(1)$. To compensate these exponential factors, define

 $\eta_L = [\mathcal{B}'(0) - L\gamma_0 \mathcal{B}(0)]/\epsilon_L, \quad \xi_L = [L\gamma_1 \mathcal{A}(1) - \mathcal{A}'(1)]/\epsilon_L.$ (52)

To simplify notation define also

$$V_L = L\gamma_0 \mathcal{A}(0) - \mathcal{A}'(0), \quad W_L = \mathcal{B}'(1) - L\gamma_0 \mathcal{B}(1).$$
(53)

Then the second equality in (51) is

$$\frac{\epsilon_L \eta_L}{V_L} = \frac{W_L}{\epsilon_L \xi_L}.$$
(54)

The objects η_L , V_L , W_L , ξ_L do not depend on \hat{a}_L or \hat{b}_L but they do depend on μ , F (which are parameters of the model) and on ψ_L . The presence of the small quantity ϵ_L in these equations allows the behaviour of ψ_L to be determined.

Observe that none of η_L , V_L , W_L , ξ_L grow exponentially with L. Hence there are three possibilities in (54). The first is that W_L is proportional to ϵ_L^2 for large L, but V_L is wellbehaved (in the sense that it does not have an exponential dependence on L). In this case \hat{a}_L/\hat{b}_L is proportional to ϵ_L so the eigenfunction Q is dominated by a peak at $y \approx 1$. This will correspond to the active phase. The second possibility is that V_L is proportional to ϵ_L^2 for large L, but W_L is well-behaved. In this case \hat{b}_L/\hat{a}_L is proportional to ϵ_L so the eigenfunction Q is dominated by a peak at $y \approx 0$. This will be the inactive phase. The third possibility is that both V_L and W_L are proportional to ϵ_L so that \hat{b}_L/\hat{a}_L is well-behaved. This corresponds to phase coexistence.

We consider the three cases in turn. Note there is no symmetry between the two phases in this problem.

5.2.3. Active phase. The active phase corresponds to exponentially small values of W_L which means that

$$\mathcal{B}'(1) = L\gamma_1 \mathcal{B}(1) + O(\epsilon_L^2). \tag{55}$$

Within the active phase, we ignore the exponentially small correction. For large x the Airy function has $\operatorname{Bi}'(x)/\operatorname{Bi}(x) \approx x^{1/2}$ from which one obtains

$$\mu^3 + \psi_L \approx \gamma_1^2 \tag{56}$$

Recalling that F is small, we have from (45) that $\gamma_1^2 = F^2 + O(F^3)$ which yields $\psi_L - F^2 \approx \mu^3 + O(F^3)$ or equivalently

$$\Psi_L \approx \Psi_a = -\lambda \overline{k} \tag{57}$$

which was the result anticipated in figure 7 for the active phase. (The second equality is the definition of $\Psi_{\rm a}$, the first equality is approximate and holds up to corrections at $O(F^3)$).

5.2.4. Inactive phase. For the inactive phase then V_L is small which means that

$$L\gamma_0 \mathcal{A}(0) = \mathcal{A}'(0) + O(\epsilon_L^2).$$
(58)

As before we drop the term at order ϵ_L^2 and obtain

$$L\gamma_0 \operatorname{Ai}(L^{2/3}\psi_L/\mu^2) = \mu L^{2/3} \operatorname{Ai}'(L^{2/3}\psi_L/\mu^2).$$
(59)

Recall that $\gamma_0 = F + O(F^2)$ is positive. The derivative Ai'(x) is negative for x > 0 so $\psi_L < 0$. However, Ai'(x) oscillates for $x < \alpha_0$ where $\alpha_0 \approx -23$ is the zero of Ai closest to x = 0. It follows that for large L, the argument of the Airy function must converge to α_0 and one sees that

$$\psi_L \approx -|\alpha_0| \mu^2 L^{-2/3}.$$
 (60)

Hence

$$\Psi_L(\lambda) \approx \Psi_i(\lambda) = -2\sqrt{pq}F^2 + O(L^{-2/3})$$
(61)

as anticipated in figure 7. This behaviour was discussed in [31, 32]. The non-integer power in the finite-size correction reflects the fact that $\mathcal{A}_L(y)$ tends to zero as $y \to 0$ but it has a maximum at a value of order $L^{-2/3}$, indicating that the typical value of x = yLis large but subextensive, of order $L^{1/3}$. That is, the inactive phase contains a single domain where the activity is non-zero: this domain covers a large number of sites, but not enough to constitute a finite fraction of the system [31, 32].

5.2.5. Phase coexistence. From the analysis of the two phases and recalling figure 7, we see that the crossover between the phases takes place when $\Psi_{\rm a} \approx \Psi_{\rm i}$, which corresponds to $\mu = \mu_L^*$ with

$$\mu_L^* \approx F^{2/3} \tag{62}$$

or equivalently

$$\lambda_L^* \overline{k} \approx 2\sqrt{pq} F^2 \tag{63}$$

consistent with figure 7. Note also that $\psi_L^* \approx 0$ by (60). Within each individual phase, one of the factors V_L and W_L in (54) is exponentially small, such that (51) is satisfied. Close to λ^* , both these quantities are small. We analyse this situation in a

general setting with minimal assumptions on the functions V_L , W_L . The method is quite generic for first-order phase transitions: it amounts to constructing an eigenfunction Q_L from two basis functions (here \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) which have exponentially small overlap. The aim is to compute the behaviour of the eigenvalue ψ as the parameter μ is increased.

Consider (55), (58), and drop the correction terms at $O(\epsilon_L^2)$. These equations can be solved simultaneously for (μ, ψ) . We denote the solution by (μ_L^*, ψ_L^*) , which corresponds to the point where $\Psi_a = \Psi_i$ in figure 7. Note that if we substitute the values (μ_L^*, ψ_L^*) then $V_L = 0 = W_L$ exactly but (54) is manifestly not satisfied in this case. In fact, the true value of ψ_L at this value of μ differs from ψ_L^* by a correction at $O(\epsilon_L)$, recall again figure 7.

We are not able to estimate (μ_L^*, ψ_L^*) with exponential accuracy, but we are able to make an expansion about $\mu = \mu_L^*$ that captures the small deviation of ψ_L from ψ_L^* . To this end, write

$$(\mu_L, \psi_L) = (\mu_L^* + \delta\mu, \psi_L^* + \delta\psi) \tag{64}$$

and substitute in (54). Using ∂_{μ} to indicate a partial derivative with respect to μ , and similarly ∂_{ψ} , one obtains

$$\epsilon_L^2 \eta_L \xi_L = \left[(\delta \mu) \partial_\mu W_L + (\delta \psi) \partial_\psi W_L \right] \cdot \left[(\delta \mu) \partial_\mu V_L + (\delta \psi) \partial_\psi V_L \right]$$
(65)

where all derivatives are evaluated at (μ^*, ψ^*) . It is not necessary to estimate these derivatives directly, instead we rewrite the equation in a generic form by introducing new constants X_1, X_2, Z (dependent on the model parameters and on μ_L^*, ψ_L^*), such that

$$(\delta\psi + X_1\delta\mu) \cdot (\delta\psi + X_2\delta\mu) - \epsilon_L^2 Z^2 (X_2 - X_1)^2 = 0.$$
(66)

Consistency of this approach requires $X_1 \neq X_2$ and $Z^2 > 0$ but this is always the case in practice. We take $X_2 > X_1$ without loss of generality. Solving for $\delta \psi$, we obtain

$$\delta\psi = \pm \frac{1}{2} (X_2 - X_1) \sqrt{(\delta\mu)^2 + (\epsilon_L Z)^2} - \frac{X_1 + X_2}{2} \delta\mu.$$
(67)

We take the + sign for the square root because ψ is known to be a convex function of μ , see also below. Using (43) one has for small $\delta\mu$ that $\lambda - \lambda_L^* \approx C\delta\mu$ with $C = \frac{6\sqrt{pq}}{k}(\mu_L^*)^2$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{pq}}\Psi_L(\lambda) = \psi_L^* - F^2 + \frac{X_2 - X_1}{C}\sqrt{(\lambda - \lambda_L^*)^2 + (\epsilon_L Z C)^2} - \frac{X_1 + X_2}{2C}(\lambda - \lambda_L^*)$$
(68)

which is the finite-size scaling form for Ψ , valid for small $\lambda - \lambda_L^*$. Differentiating with respect to λ gives the behaviour of the order parameter near the transition:

$$k_L(\lambda) = -\Psi'_L(\lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{pq}}{C} \left[(X_2 + X_1) - \frac{(X_2 - X_1)(\lambda - \lambda_L^*)}{\sqrt{(\lambda - \lambda_L^*)^2 + (\epsilon_L Z C)^2}} \right].$$
 (69)



Figure 9. The logarithm of the second derivative of SCGF at the transition point λ_L^* as a function of the system size L: $\Psi_L''(\lambda_L^*)$. We numerically diagonalize the matrix of the largest eigenvalue problem (39), evaluate the second derivative of the largest eigenvalue $\Psi_L(\lambda)$, and find the maximum of the second derivative $\Psi_L''(\lambda)$: $\max_{\lambda} \Psi_L''(\lambda) \equiv \Psi_L''(\lambda_L^*)$. Red circles, blue squared, green diamonds, yellow triangles correspond to c = 0.3, c = 0.5, c = 0.7, c = 0.9, respectively. We also plot the analytical prediction equation (71) as solid lines: $\log \Psi_L''(\lambda_L^*) = (2F/3)L + \text{const.}$

This function is of the same form as (27), showing that the general analysis of section 4.3 is consistent with the specific calculation of this section. It shows a crossover at $\lambda = \lambda_L^*$, from a value $2\sqrt{pq}X_2/C$ (at small λ) to $2\sqrt{pq}X_1/C$ (at large λ). Comparing with (27) one identifies these quantities as the activities of the two phases. The width of the crossover is $1/(CZ\epsilon_L)$, which diverges exponentially with the system size when L is large. From (27) we identify this with $e^{\Gamma_s L}/(\Delta k)^2$ where Δk is the difference in activity between the phases. The maximal susceptibility is

$$\Psi_L''(\lambda_L^*) = \frac{X_2 - X_1}{2ZC^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\epsilon_L}$$
(70)

which indeed diverges exponentially with L, as anticipated in figure 7. The rate of this exponential divergence is fixed by the scaling of ϵ_L . Using (62) and that $\psi_L^* \approx 0$ one obtains from (50) exponential divergence of the susceptibility:

$$\Psi_L''(\lambda_L^*) \sim e^{\Gamma_s L}, \quad \Gamma_s = 2F/3 + O(F^2). \tag{71}$$

The exponential scaling is consistent with the general arguments of section 4.4 and we identify Γ_s as the surface tension. In figure 9, we compare (71) with numerical results for $\Psi''_L(\lambda_L^*)$, showing good agreement. The analysis of this section also predicts the eigenfunction Q which gives the probability distribution of y_t , at the coexistence point [recall figure 8(b)]. Note that the prediction (71) for Γ_s is accurate up to corrections at $O(F^2)$. A more accurate numerical prediction is also available if one accounts for higher-order terms when solving (56), see [27] for details.

We conclude that the interfacial model predicts the scaling of the order parameter near the dynamical phase transition to be (69) and it also makes quantitative predictions including (63) and (71). These have been shown [27, 33] to agree very well with numerical computations on the FA model. This confirms the prediction (36) that the interfacial model can capture the behaviour of the FA model close to its dynamical phase transition, including the relevant phase behaviour.

6. Conclusion

We have analysed the dynamical phase transition that occurs in the FA model, by two methods. In section 4, we invoked a correspondence between FA model trajectories and configurations of the 2D spin model, in order to relate dynamical properties of FA model to thermodynamic properties of this spin model. We used the analysis of Privman and Fisher [34] to rationalise the finite-size scaling properties of this spin model, and we emphasised the differences in behaviour for systems with $Y \sim L$ and $Y \gg L$. In the dynamical analysis, the first case corresponds to trajectories where the time τ and the system size L are both large; the second case is relevant on taking the limit $\tau \to \infty$ before any limit of large L, as is often the case in studies of dynamical LDPs.

In this second case, we explained how the distribution of the order parameter at phase coexistence takes a unimodal form for large τ , and the associated susceptibility diverges exponentially fast with L. This is in contrast to the case $Y \sim L$ which is more conventionally analysed in thermodynamics, where the distribution is bimodal and the susceptibility diverges as a power law. For $Y \gg L$, we also derived the general predictions (25) and (27) for the finite-size scaling behaviour close to phase coexistence, based on the physical picture of figure 4(b). See also [39].

We note that the mapping between trajectories of a d-dimensional system and configurations of a (d + 1)-dimensional model is a very general idea [4, 16, 39], here we have illustrated it by directly constructing the 2D spin model. Our analysis is relevant for a first-order phase transition, but other phase transitions are also possible. For example, large deviations of the 1D Glauber-Ising chain are related to the critical point of the 2D Ising model [16, 39]: an explicit mapping like the one in this work could also be made, leading to a 2D spin model that reproduces the Glauber dynamics of the 1D Ising chain. There are also second-order phase transitions in softened variants of the FA model [17]. An interesting open question concerns the situation for exclusion processes and other interacting particle systems [2, 10, 45, 49] where large deviations have been studied extensively, including dynamical phase transitions [6, 45, 50-53]. A mapping is possible from 1D exclusion processes to 2D spin systems in this case, but the thermodynamic properties of the 2D systems are unusual, this is related to the presence of slow hydrodynamic modes in the interacting particle systems, see also [39].

In section 5 we performed a specific analysis of the behaviour close to dynamical phase coexistence in the FA model, using the interfacial model discussed in [27], see also [31, 32]. The result is consistent with the general formulae (25), (27) but it also gives more detailed predictions, including the value of the surface tension parameter Γ_s , and the forms of the eigenfunctions Q, which specify the probability distribution for the instantaneous size of the large inactive domain in the system.

The FA model is simple enough to enable this analysis, but the phase transitions that we have analysed exhibit the full phenomenology of first-order phase transitions in finite-dimensional systems. We hope that these results will be useful in guiding the future analysis of other dynamical phase transitions and their finite-size scaling properties.

Acknowledgments

V L is supported by the ERC Starting Grant No. 680275 MALIG, the ANR-18-CE30-0028-01 Grant LABS and the ANR-15-CE40-0020-03 Grant LSD.

Appendix A. MC simulation of the 2D spin model

To analyse thermodynamic properties of the 2D spin model, we use MC simulations. Given a configuration C we propose a new configuration C'. The new configuration is accepted with probability $\min(1, e^{E_s(C) - E_s(C')})$ where the energy E_s is given by (14), generalised to periodic boundaries if applicable. Otherwise the old configuration is retained.

In the simplest MC algorithm, one chooses either a spin $n_{i,y}$ or $m_{i,y}$ at random and one proposes a new configuration by flipping this spin. However, for systems with periodic boundaries, the constraints on the *n* and *m* variables means that updating the configuration in this way does not allow access to every possible configuration of the system. As an example, consider the following configuration of a periodic system with (L, Y) = (4, 5), where X and . indicate sites with $n_i = 1, 0$ respectively and – indicates a bond with $m_i = 1$.

- X X X X X
- Х-. .-Х Х
- X X-. .-X
- X X X X X

It can be checked that there is no sequence of single-spin flips that connect this configuration to the state where $n_{i,y} = 1$ for all i, y. The essential problem is that there are two spins in the third column with $n_{i,y} = 0$ (indicated by .), but neither of these spins is able to flip, because of the constraint that $m_{i\pm 1} = 0$ if $m_i = 1$.

The solution is that in addition to proposed moves where only one spin is flipped, we also propose occasionally moves where two spins $n_{i,y}$ and $n_{i,y+1}$ are both flipped simultaneously. We claim that this gives an MC method that samples the full configuration space of the model. For small systems we have verified explicitly every allowed configuration can be reached from every other configuration.

With this MC algorithm, the system explores its configuration space slowly, but computations are feasible. For calculations in large systems close to phase transitions (figures 3 and 5), we use two methods. For L = 16 we performed long simulations with $s \approx s^*$, so that the system visits both phases many times during the coarse of a single MC run. A histogram of K is accumulated in this run, and k(s) and $\chi(s)$ are obtained as weighted average with respect to that histogram. For L = 32 we performed parallel tempering simulations in which multiple replicas of the system are simulated at different values of s, with all values of s being close to s^* . The histograms from the data at different s are combined using the unbinned weighted histogram analysis method [54], which yields an estimate for the distribution of K. This distribution is then used to derive k(s) and $\chi(s)$ by weighted averages.





Figure 10. Data for the 2D spin model at L = 8. We show results for systems with periodic boundaries (pbc), and for systems with energy (14), which includes boundary terms that are chosen to recover the equilibrium trajectory ensemble of the dFA model (eqm). (a) Order parameter $k_{L,Y}(s)$. (b) Susceptibility $\chi_{L,Y}(s)$, the colours and symbols are the same as in panel (a). (c) Finite size scaling of $\hat{\rho}_*$, only for the periodic case. Even if the function $k_{L,Y}(s)$ has saturated to its large-Y limit, the shape of this distribution still depends on Y.

Finally, to demonstrate the effect of different boundary conditions, figure 10 shows data for a very small system (L = 8). Taking $Y \to \infty$ at fixed L, one expects convergence of k(s) and $\chi(s)$ to smooth limiting forms at large Y. The figure shows that Y = 128 is already very close to convergence of this limit in a system with periodic boundaries. By contrast, the system which corresponds exactly to the equilibrium trajectory ensemble of the dFA model has a much stronger finite-size effect, in that larger Y is required to see convergence to the large-Y limit. The reason is that the regions close to y = 1 and y = Y are biased by the boundary conditions towards the active phase, which hinders characterisation of the phase coexistence regime. See also [17].

Appendix B. Simple model for multi-domain phase coexistence

We describe the fluctuations in configurations such as those sketched in figure 4(b). These are representative configurations of the 2D spin model at $s = s^*$. They can be modelled by considering a 1D Ising model with periodic boundaries whose typical domain size is $\kappa \approx e^{\Gamma_s L} \gg 1$. The same results may alternatively be obtained by considering large deviations of a two-state Markov chain. Working at temperature T = 1 we introduce a magnetic field $h \ll 1$ so the free energy of the Ising model can be obtained by standard methods as $\lambda(h) = -\frac{1}{Y} \log \operatorname{Tr}(M_h^Y)$ where the transfer matrix is

$$M_h = \begin{pmatrix} 1+h & \kappa^{-1} \\ \kappa^{-1} & 1-h \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (B.1)

where we work at leading order in h, κ^{-1} . For large Y then $\lambda(h)$ is given by (the negative of) the largest eigenvalue of this matrix so $\lambda(h) = -1 - \sqrt{h^2 + \kappa^{-2}}$. The SCGF for the total magnetisation of the 1D Ising model (in this limit) is $g(h) = \lambda(0) - \lambda(h)$ so

$$g(h) = \sqrt{h^2 + \kappa^{-2}} - \kappa^{-1}.$$
 (B.2)

The derivative of this function gives the mean magnetisation as a function of the field

$$m(h) = g'(h) = \frac{h}{\sqrt{h^2 + \kappa^{-2}}}.$$
 (B.3)

The total magnetisation obeys an LDP whose speed is the number of sites in this 1D Ising model, which is Y. The rate function for this total magnetisation is $J(m) = \sup_{h}(hm - g(h))$ which yields

$$J(m) = \kappa^{-1}(1 - \sqrt{1 - m^2}), \quad -1 < m < 1.$$
(B.4)

This rate function describes the fluctuations of the amount of each phase, assuming that the domain walls in the configuration of figure 4(b) are a dilute ideal gas. Neglecting fluctuations within the phases, we identify the (intensive) activity of a configuration as $k = k_0 + (m\Delta k/2)$ where k_0 is the average activity of the two phases, and Δk is the difference between their activities. Hence (B.4) yields (25) and (26).

Appendix C. Discrete and continuous versions of the interfacial model

C.1. Continuum limit

We show how the interfacial model (defined on a discrete lattice) can be analysed by considering a continuous probability distribution for y. Starting from (39) and using (41) we obtain (after Taylor expansion of f with $L \gg 1$):

$$\Psi + \lambda y \bar{k} = 2p \left(e^{f'(y)} [1 + f''(y)/(2L)] - 1 \right) + 2q \left(e^{-f'(y)} [1 + f''(y)/(2L)] - 1 \right).$$
(C.1)

So far this result only requires that L is large. In order to obtain an eigenvalue problem for the continuous function P, we now assume additionally that $|f'(y)| \ll 1$ everywhere, which leads to

$$\Psi + \lambda y \bar{k} = (2p - 2q)f'(y) + (p + q)[f'(y)^2 + f''(y)/L].$$
(C.2)

We will see that this corresponds physically to approximating the binomial distribution of the discrete random walk by a Gaussian distribution, as in a diffusion process. When considering the typical behaviour of the system, this approximation is exact for large L, but large deviations can be sensitive to the full distribution of hop sizes. For the problem considered here, we make an approximation when expanding over f' but the resulting theory still gives semi-quantitative predictions (see figure 9 and figure C1). Identifying

$$Lf'(y) = \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}y}\log P(y) = \frac{P'(y)}{P(y)}$$
(C.3)

and

$$Lf''(y) = \frac{d^2}{dy^2} \log P(y) = \frac{P''(y)}{P(y)} - \frac{P'(y)^2}{P(y)^2},$$
(C.4)



Figure C1. (a) The SCGF $\Psi(\lambda)$ obtained from the discrete eigenvalue problem (39) (solid lines) and continuous eigenvalue problem (44) (dashed lines). The value of c is 0.3. The active and inactive solutions for the continuous problem are obtained following the procedure detailed in the main text. (b) The behaviour of $f(y) = (1/L)\log P_L(y)$ in the inactive phase, for $(c, \lambda) = (0.3, 0.2)$. We show good agreement between solutions of the discrete problem [equation (39), solid lines] and those obtained by solving the continuous problem [equation (44), dashed lines].

one obtains

$$(\Psi + \lambda y)P(y) = \frac{2(p-q)}{L}P'(y) + \frac{p+q}{L^2}P''(y)$$
(C.5)

which is an eigenvalue equation for the continuous function P. The boundary conditions (40) are treated similarly, in order to obtain constraints on f'(0) and f'(1). However, the point about which the Taylor expansion is performed is optimised to minimise errors associated with the expansion at small f'. To this end note that

$$\frac{P((n+1)/L) - P(n/L)}{P((n+1)/L) + P(n/L)} = \frac{e^{f'} - 1}{e^{f'} + 1} = \tanh(f'/2) = \frac{f'}{2} + O(f')^3$$
(C.6)

where we use the shorthand $f' = f'\left(\frac{2n+1}{2L}\right)$, for compactness of notation. The correction on the right-hand side is $O(f')^3$: other representations of the derivative are possible but would have corrections at $O(f')^2$ which is less accurate. The boundary conditions (40) are

$$\frac{P(2/L) - P(1/L)}{P(2/L) + P(1/L)} = c_0, \quad \frac{P(1) - P((L-1)/L)}{P(1) + P((L-1)/L))} = c_1 \tag{C.7}$$

with $c_0 = \frac{2q-2p+\Psi_L}{2q+2p+\Psi_L}$ and $c_1 = \frac{2q-2p-\Psi_L-\lambda \overline{k}}{2q+2p+\Psi_L+\lambda \overline{k}}$. Hence (C.6) provides values for $f'\left(\frac{3}{2L}\right)$ and $f'\left(\frac{2L-1}{2L}\right)$ which we identify (at large L) with f'(0) and f'(1). Using again (C.3) yields

$$\frac{P'(0)}{P(0)} = 2c_0L, \quad \frac{P'(1)}{P(1)} = 2c_1L.$$
(C.8)

C.2. Simplification for small F

Note that in addition to a large-*L* limit, we have assumed that $f'(y) \ll 1$. For $\lambda = 0$ it is easily verified that the exact eigenvector of the discrete problem has $f'(y) = 2F = \log(q/p)$ so self-consistency requires that this parameter be small. Physically, this requires that the hop rate for the asymmetric random walk x_t is much larger than its drift, that is $(p-q)/(p+q) \ll 1$.

In this case it is consistent to identify $(p-q) = 2\sqrt{pq} \sinh F \approx 2F\sqrt{pq}$ and $(p+q) = 2\sqrt{pq} \cosh F \approx (2+F^2)\sqrt{pq}$. Using this result in (C.5) yields (at leading order)

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{pq}}(\Psi + \lambda \overline{k}y)P(y) = \frac{2F}{L}P'(y) + \frac{1}{L^2}P''(y)$$
(C.9)

and the associated boundary conditions are

$$\frac{P_L'(0)}{P_L(0)} = 2L \cdot \frac{F\sqrt{pq} + (\Psi_L/4)}{\sqrt{pq} + (\Psi_L/4)}, \quad \frac{P_L'(1)}{P_L(1)} = 2L \cdot \frac{F\sqrt{pq} - (\Psi_L + \lambda \overline{k})/4}{\sqrt{pq} + (\Psi_L + \lambda \overline{k})/4}.$$
(C.10)

To see that the small-*F* approximation is self-consistent, note that for $\lambda = 0$ one has $\Psi_L = 0$ and this recovers $P(y) = e^{2LFy}$, which is the exact result in the discrete case.

To transform the eigenvalue problem to a self-adjoint form we define $Q(y) = P(y)e^{-LFy}$, which yields

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{pq}}(\Psi + \lambda \overline{k}y)Q(y) = \frac{1}{L^2}Q''(y) - F^2Q(y).$$
(C.11)

As $L \to \infty$, one sees (consistent with figure 7) that both Ψ and $\lambda \overline{k}$ will be $O(F^2)$. Hence the boundary conditions for Q can be derived as

$$\frac{Q'(0)}{Q(0)} = L\left(F + \frac{\Psi}{2\sqrt{pq}} + O(F^3)\right), \quad \frac{Q'(1)}{Q(1)} = L\left(F - \frac{\Psi + \lambda \overline{k}}{2\sqrt{pq}} + O(F^3)\right).$$
(C.12)

C.3. Numerical demonstrations

We use numerical results to compare solutions of the continuous eigenvalue problem (44) and the original discrete eigenvalue problem (39), in order to demonstrate the validity of the continuous limit.

For the discrete problem, we numerically diagonalize the matrix on the right-hand side of (39) and obtain $\Psi(\lambda)$ as the largest eigenvalue and $P_L(y)$ as the associated eigenvector. For the continuous problem, we use the general solution (47) of the eigenvalue problem (44) and (45), where the parameter \hat{b}_L is set to 1 without loss of generality and the parameter \hat{a}_L is determined using one of the boundary conditions (44) and (45). The other boundary condition is used to determine the value of ψ (as the largest solution that satisfies the boundary condition), from which we obtain $\Psi(\lambda)$. There are

two technical remarks related to the boundary conditions. First, depending on which boundary condition is used to determine \hat{a}_L , the obtained solution ψ changes: if the boundary condition for y = 0 (or y = 1) is used to determine \hat{a}_L , we obtain the solution of ψ that corresponds to the active (or inactive) phase. This means that, irrespective of the value of λ , we can construct both active and inactive solutions by exploiting this property (see figure C1, the solution with larger ψ gives the free energy and the other solution corresponds to a metastable state). Second, if we ignore the $O(F^3)$ terms in the boundary conditions (44) and (45), we may obtain an artificial solution in some cases (with $\psi > 0$). To avoid this problem, we use the full expression of the boundary conditions (i.e., the expression that includes $O(F^3)$ terms¹⁰). Alternatively, this problem can be avoided by retaining the truncated boundary conditions and restricting to solutions with $\psi < 0$.

Figure C1(a) shows $\Psi(\lambda)$ for these discrete and continuous problems. Figure C1(b) shows $f(y) = (1/L)\log P_L(y)$ for a representative state point in the inactive phase. For large-*L*, there is good agreement between the solutions of the discrete and continuous eigenvalue problems, as expected. Recall that we derived the continuous eigenvalue equation (44) from the discrete eigenvalue equation (39) by assuming that the slope of f(y) is small. Our numerical observation shows that f(y) has a zero slope for $y \sim 0.5$, and keeps a relatively small slope around $y \sim 0.5$ (except for around y = 0 or y = 1), which is consistent with this small-f'(y) assumption. Figure C1 shows results for c = 0.3; qualitatively similar results were also obtained in the range of c between c = 0.1 and c = 0.7 (not shown).

To understand the physical interpretation of the results in figure C1(b), recall from section 5.2.1 that the maximum of f corresponds to the most likely value of y_{τ} , where τ is the final time of the trajectory. The different behaviours of P_L and Q_L [defined in equations (41) and (42)] mean that the most likely value of y_{τ} differs from the typical values of y_t in the bulk of the trajectory (far from initial and final times). The average values of y_t in the bulk of these trajectories are (0.117, 0.0771, 0.0506) for L = (100, 200, 400); these small values are consistent with the system being in the inactive phase.

ORCID iDs

Robert L Jack https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0086-4573 Takahiro Nemoto https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2981-4035 Vivien Lecomte https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4025-5852

References

- [1] den Hollander F 2000 Large Deviations (Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society)
- [2] Derrida B 2007 Non-equilibrium steady states: fluctuations and large deviations of the density and of the current *J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp.* 2007 P07023

¹⁰ The complete boundary condition that includes $O(F^3)$ can be derived from (C.10), it is also provided in supplementary material of reference [27].

- [3] Lecomte V, Appert-Rolland C and van Wijland F 2007 Thermodynamic formalism for systems with Markov dynamics J. Stat. Phys. 127 51
- [4] Garrahan J P, Jack R L, Lecomte V, Pitard E, van Duijvendijk K and van Wijland F 2009 First-order dynamical phase transition in models of glasses: an approach based on ensembles of histories J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 42 075007
- [5] Touchette H 2009 The large deviation approach to statistical mechanics Phys. Rep. 478 1
- [6] Bertini L, De Sole A, Gabrielli D, Jona-Lasinio G and Landim C 2015 Macroscopic fluctuation theory Rev. Mod. Phys. 87 593
- [7] Lebowitz J L and Spohn H 1999 A Gallavotti-Cohen-type symmetry in the large deviation functional for stochastic dynamics J. Stat. Phys. 95 333
- [8] Gingrich T R, Horowitz J M, Perunov N and England J L 2016 Dissipation bounds all steady-state current fluctuations *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 116 120601
- [9] Nemoto T, Fodor É, Cates M E, Jack R L and Tailleur J 2019 Optimizing active work: dynamical phase transitions, collective motion, and jamming *Phys. Rev.* E 99 022605
- [10] Bodineau T and Derrida B 2004 Current fluctuations in nonequilibrium diffusive systems: an additivity principle Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 180601
- [11] Baule A and Evans R M L 2008 Invariant Quantities in shear flow Phys. Rev. Lett. 101 240601
- [12] Hurtado P I, Espigares C P, del Pozo J J and Garrido P L 2014 Thermodynamics of currents in nonequilibrium diffusive systems: theory and simulation J. Stat. Phys. 154 214
- [13] Gao C Y and Limmer D T 2019 Nonlinear transport coefficients from large deviation functions J. Chem. Phys. 151 014101
- [14] Garrahan J P, Jack R L, Lecomte V, Pitard E, van Duijvendijk K and van Wijland F 2007 Dynamical first-order phase transition in kinetically constrained models of glasses *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** 195702
- [15] Hedges L O, Jack R L, Garrahan J P and Chandler D 2009 Dynamic order-disorder in atomistic models of structural glass formers Science 323 1309
- [16] Jack R L and Sollich P 2010 Large deviations and ensembles of trajectories in stochastic models Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. 184 304
- [17] Elmatad Y S, Jack R L, Chandler D and Garrahan J P 2010 Finite-temperature critical point of a glass transition Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 107 12793
- [18] Ruelle D 1978 Thermodynamic Formalism (Reading, MA: Addison and Wesley)
- [19] Merolle M, Garrahan J P and Chandler D 2005 Space-time thermodynamics of the glass transition Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 102 10837
- [20] Chétrite R and Touchette H 2015 Nonequilibrium Markov processes conditioned on large deviations Ann. Henri Poincaré 16 2005
- [21] Bolhuis P G, Chandler D, Dellago C and Geissler P L 2002 Transition path sampling: throwing ropes over rough mountain passes, in the dark Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 53 291
- [22] Jack R L, Garrahan J P and Chandler D 2006 Space-time thermodynamics and subsystem observables in a kinetically constrained model of glassy materials J. Chem. Phys. 125 184509
- [23] Giardina C, Kurchan J and Peliti L 2006 Direct evaluation of large-deviation functions Phys. Rev. Lett. 96 120603
- [24] Lecomte V and Tailleur J 2007 A numerical approach to large deviations in continuous time J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2007 P03004
- [25] Jack R L and Sollich P 2015 Effective interactions and large deviations in stochastic processes Eur. Phys. J.: Spec. Top. 224 2351
- [26] Chétrite R and Touchette H 2015 Variational and optimal control representations of conditioned and driven processes J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2015 P12001
- [27] Nemoto T, Jack R L and Lecomte V 2017 Finite-size scaling of a first-order dynamical phase transition: adaptive population dynamics and an effective model Phys. Rev. Lett. 118 115702
- [28] Fredrickson G H and Andersen H C 1984 Kinetic Ising model of the glass transition Phys. Rev. Lett. 53 1244
- [29] Garrahan J P and Chandler D 2002 Geometrical explanation and scaling of dynamical heterogeneities in glass forming systems *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 035704
- [30] Chandler D and Garrahan J P 2010 Dynamics on the way to forming glass: bubbles in space-time Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 61 191
- [31] Bodineau T and Toninelli C 2012 Activity phase transition for constrained dynamics Commun. Math. Phys. 311 357
- [32] Bodineau T, Lecomte V and Toninelli C 2012 Finite size scaling of the dynamical free-energy in a kinetically constrained model J. Stat. Phys. 147 1

- [33] Bañuls M C and Garrahan J P 2019 Using matrix product states to study the dynamical large deviations of kinetically constrained models *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** 200601
- [34] Privman V and Fisher M E 1983 Finite-size effects at first-order transitions J. Stat. Phys. 33 385
- [35] Borgs C and Kotecký R 1990 A rigorous theory of finite-size scaling at first-order phase transitions J. Stat. Phys.
 61 79
- [36] Borgs C and Roman K 1992 Finite-size effects at asymmetric first-order phase transitions Phys. Rev. Lett. 68 1734
- [37] Donsker M D and Varadhan S R S 1975 Asymptotic evaluation of certain markov process expectations for large time, I. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. 28 1
- [38] Chetrite R and Touchette H 2013 Nonequilibrium microcanonical and canonical ensembles and their equivalence Phys. Rev. Lett. 111 120601
- [39] Jack R L Ergodicity and large deviations in physical systems with stochastic dynamics *Eur. Phys. J. B* (arXiv:1910.09883)
- [40] Biroli G and Kurchan J 2001 Metastable states in glassy systems Phys. Rev. E 64 016101
- [41] Huang K 2010 Introduction to Statistical Physics 2nd edn (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press)
- [42] Jack R L, Mayer P and Sollich P 2006 Mappings between reaction-diffusion and kinetically constrained systems: $A + A \leftrightarrow A$ and the Fredrickson-Andersen model have upper critical dimension $d_c = 2 J$. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2006 P03006
- [43] Garrahan J P, Sollich P and Toninelli C 2010 Kinetically constrained models Dynamical Heterogeneities in Glasses, Colloids, and Granular Media ed Berthier L, Biroli G, Bouchaud J-P, Cipelletti L and van Saarloos W (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [44] Nemoto T, Lecomte V, Sasa S I and van Wijland F 2014 Finite-size effects in a mean-field kinetically constrained model: dynamical glassiness and quantum criticality J. Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2014 P10001
- [45] Baek Y, Kafri Y and Lecomte V 2018 Dynamical phase transitions in the current distribution of driven diffusive channels J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 51 105001
- [46] Speck T and Chandler D 2012 Constrained dynamics of localized excitations causes a non-equilibrium phase transition in an atomistic model of glass formers J. Chem. Phys. 136 184509
- [47] Whitelam S 2018 Large deviations in the presence of cooperativity and slow dynamics *Phys. Rev. E* 97 062109
 [48] Dolezal J and Jack R L 2019 Large deviations and optimal control forces for hard particles in one dimension J.
- Stat. Mech.: Theory Exp. 2019 123208
- [49] Appert-Rolland C, Derrida B, Lecomte V and van Wijland F 2008 Universal cumulants of the current in diffusive systems on a ring Phys. Rev. E 78 021122
- [50] Bodineau T and Derrida B 2005 Distribution of current in nonequilibrium diffusive systems and phase transitions Phys. Rev. E 72 066110
- [51] Tizon-Escamilla N, Perez-Espigares C, Garrido P L and Hurtado P I 2017 Order and symmetry breaking in the fluctuations of driven systems *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** 090602
- [52] Baek Y, Kafri Y and Lecomte V 2017 Dynamical symmetry breaking and phase transitions in driven diffusive systems Phys. Rev. Lett. 118 030604
- [53] Shpielberg O, Nemoto T and Caetano J 2018 Universality in dynamical phase transitions of diffusive systems Phys. Rev. E 98 052116
- [54] Tan Z, Gallicchio E, Lapelosa M and Levy R M 2012 Theory of binless multi-state free energy estimation with applications to protein-ligand binding J. Chem. Phys. 136 144102