The push-block dynamics [B-Ferrari '08]

Each particle jumps to the right with rate 1. It is blocked by lower particles and it (short-range) pushes higher particles.

- \bullet Left-most particles form TASEP
- \bullet Righ t-most particles form PushTASEP

Previously studied asymptotics thus yields detailed information on large time behavior of these (2+1)d AKPZ and (1+1)d AKPZ models.

Macdonald polynomials $P_{\lambda}(x_1, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{Q}(q,t)$ $[x_1,...,x_n]^{S(N)}$ labelled by partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge ... \ge \lambda_N \ge 0)$ form a basis in symmetric polynomials in N variables over $\mathbb{Q}(q,t)$. They diagonalize $\mathcal{D}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\prod_{\alpha < b} (x_\alpha - x_\beta)^i \right) \top_{t,x_i} \prod_{\alpha < b} (x_\alpha - x_\beta) \right) \top_{q,x_i} = \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{\pm x_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \top_{q,x_i}$ with (generically) pairwise different eigenvalues $(T_{q}f)(z)=f(qz)$ $D_{1}P_{\lambda} = (q^{\lambda_{1}}t^{\mu_{-1}} + q^{\lambda_{2}}t^{\mu_{-2}} + ... + q^{\lambda_{N}})P_{\lambda}.$ Macdonald polynomials have many remarkable properties that

include orthogonality, simple reproducing kernel (Cauchy identity), Pieri and branching rules, index/variable duality, simple higher order Macdonald difference operators that commute with \mathfrak{D}_1 , etc.

Single level distributions

As in the Schur case, one can define probability measures via

$$
\bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \bigoplus_{\mu=\{\mu_{1}\},\dots,\mu_{N}\geq 0\}}^{N(\alpha_{i}-1)} = \sum_{\mu=\{\mu_{1}\},\dots,\mu_{N}\geq 0\}} \bigcap_{\mu=0}^{N} \{ \mu \} \cdot \frac{\bigcap_{\mu} (\alpha_{1},...,\alpha_{N})}{\bigcap_{\mu=0}^{N} (\alpha_{1},...,\alpha_{N})}.
$$

These are time δ distributions of the Markov chain with jump rates

$$
\boxed{(N)}_{Poisson}(\mu \rightarrow v) = \sum_{v} \phi_{v/\mu} \cdot \frac{P_{v}(1,..,1)}{P_{\mu}(1,..,1)} \longrightarrow \text{replace Vandermondes}
$$

with $\varphi_{\nu/\mu}$ given by the Pieri rule (they are 0 or 1 for Schur) $(x_1,...+x_n) P_{\mu}(x_1,...,x_n) = \sum_{v} \varphi_{v/\mu} P_{v}(x_1,...,x_n).$ For $t=0$, $\varphi_{\mu+\vec{e}_j/\mu} = 1 - \varphi_{\mu+j}$ This is a (q,t)-analog of the Dyson Brownian Motion.

Representation theoretic object: Quantum Random Walk.

The (q,t)-Gibbs property

We define stochastic links $\ {\Lambda_{N\text{-}1}}$ between N-tuples and (N-1)-tuples of integers using the branching rule

$$
\frac{P_{\lambda}(x_{1},...,x_{N-1},1)}{P_{\lambda}(1,...,1)} = \sum_{\mu \prec \lambda} \Lambda_{N-1}^{N}(\lambda \downarrow \mu) \cdot \frac{P_{\mu}(x_{1},...,x_{N-1})}{P_{\mu}(1,...,1)}
$$

Def. Random interlacing arrays $\lambda^{(1)}$ $\lambda^{(2)}$ $\lambda^{(2)}$, $\lambda^{(N)}$ have the Macdonald-Gibbs property iff

For t=0 the links are

\n
$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\left(\int_{N-1}^{N}(\lambda^{(1)},\ldots,\lambda^{(N-1)})\left(\lambda^{(N)}\right)^{2} = \bigwedge_{N-1}^{N}\left(\lambda^{(N)}\lambda\lambda^{(N-1)}\right)\bigwedge_{N-2}^{N-1}\left(\lambda^{(N-1)}\lambda\lambda^{(N-2)}\right)\ldots\bigwedge_{A}^{2}\left(\lambda^{(2)}\lambda\lambda^{(1)}\right)\right.\\
&\left.\left.\left.\left.\left.\left.\right.\right.\right.\right.\right)\n\end{aligned}
$$
\nFor t=0, the links are

\n
$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\left(\lambda^{(1)},\ldots,\lambda^{(N-1)}\right)\left(\lambda^{(N-1)}\lambda\lambda^{(N-2)}\right)\ldots\left(\lambda^{(N-2)}\lambda^{(N-2)}\right)\right.\\
&\left.\left.\left.\left.\left.\right.\right.\right.\right.\right)
$$

Macdonald processes

An (ascending) Macdonald process is a distribution on $\lambda^{(1)}\times \lambda^{(2)}\times \lambda^{(3)}\times \cdots$ that is (q,t) -Gibbs (once can also use $(a_1,a_2,...)$ instead of $(1,1,...)$). Example 1: Decompositions of $\prod_{i=1}^{n} e^{\delta(x_i-1)}$ correspond to the `Plancherel specialization' (consistency with Gibbs is nontrivial). Example 2: $t = q^{\theta} \rightarrow 1$, $a_j = t^3$ for $j \ge 1$, `principal specialization'. Single level measures converge to general $\beta = 2\theta$ Jacobi ensembles const. $\prod_{i< j} |y_i - y_j|^{\beta} \prod_i y_i^{s_o} (1 - y_i)^{s_1} dy_i, \quad y_i \in (0, 1).$

Example 3: Plancherel specialization, t=0. Leads to local 2d dynamics, q-TASEP, q-PushASEP, random polymers in (1+1)d. Will be our focus.

Macdonald operators

Macdonald's q-difference operators diagonalized by P_{2} are

$$
\mathcal{D}^{(k)} = \sum_{\mathbf{I} \subset \{1,\dots,N\}} \prod_{\substack{i \in \mathbf{I} \\ j \notin \mathbf{I}}} \frac{\mathbf{L} \alpha_i - \alpha_j}{\alpha_{i} - \alpha_j} \prod_{i \in \mathbf{I}} \mathsf{T}_{q,x_i}, \qquad \mathcal{D}^{(k)} \bigcap_{\lambda} = e_k \left(q^{\lambda_1} t^{N-1}, \dots, q^{\lambda_N} \right) \bigcap_{\lambda} ,
$$

where $e_{\mathbf{k}}(z_1, z_2,...) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} z_{i_1} \cdots z_{i_k}$. Using with these operators gives many observables with explicit averages.

<u>Example 1:</u> For the Jacobi ensembles $\prod_{i < j} |y_i - y_j|^{\beta} \prod_i y_i^{s_o} (1 - y_i)^{s_i}$ this gives averages of the powers sums $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} y_i^k$ and of their products.

<u>Example 2:</u> For t=0 this gives averages of products of $q^{\lambda_{N}+\lambda_{N-1}+\ldots+\lambda_{N-k+1}}$.

Integrals and scaling limits

For t=0 and Plancherel specialization (decomposition of $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} e^{s(x_i-1)}$), turning Macdonald operator D_{k} into a contour integral gives $\mathbb{E} q^{\lambda_{N^{+...+}}\lambda_{N-k}^{(N)}} = \frac{(-1)^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}}{(2\pi i)^k k!} \oint_{\text{around 1}} \prod_{1\leq A\leq B\leq k} (z_A - z_B)^2 \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{j} (z_j - z_j)^{N}}{(1-z_j)^{N}} \frac{dz_j}{z_j} \qquad \qquad \cdots \qquad \qquad \cdots \qquad \qquad \cdots \qquad \qquad \vdots$ The RHS has a clear limit as $q = e^{-\epsilon} \to 1$, δ = const ϵ^1 , z_j 's unchanged. This leads to a LLN $\lambda_j^{(N)} \sim c_j^{(N)} t^2$ and Gaussian fluctuations of size $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\prime\prime}$.

A less obvious limit is Then the RHS behaves as This suggests the following scaling behavior:

Theorem [B-Corwin '11] As $q = e^{\epsilon} \rightarrow 1$, $\delta = \tau \cdot \epsilon^2$, under the scaling

the t=0 Macdonald process with Plancherel specialization weakly converges to a probability distribution on real arrays (*the Whittaker process*).

Is there a probabilistic meaning behind the Whittaker process?

Back to Markov dynamics

pulls with prob. $\ell_j^{(k)}(x^{(k-1)}, x^{(k)})$ pushes with prob. $r_j^{(k)}(x^{(k-1)}, x^{(k)})$ The classification problem for the nearest neighbor Markov dynamics ith particle has just moved that preserve Gibbs measures and coincides with (q,t)-DBM on each level is (as for Schur) equivalen t to a linear system of equations of the form [B-Petrov '13] $B_{j+1}^{(k)}V_{j+1}^{(k)}+B_{j}^{(k)}l_{j+1}^{(k)}+W_{j+1}^{(k)}=A_{j+1}^{(k)}$ For $t=0$, the quantities $A_j^{(k)}$ and $B_j^{(k)}$ are local: $A_j^{(k)} = \frac{(1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k-1)} \sum_{j}^{(k)} })(1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k-1)} \sum_{j+1}^{(k)}+1})}{1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k-1)} \sum_{j}^{(k-1)}+1}}, \qquad B_j^{(k)} = \frac{(1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k-1)} \sum_{j+1}^{(k)}})(1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k-1)} \sum_{j+1}^{(k-1)}+1})}{1-q^{\sum_{j=1}^{(k)} \sum_{j}^{(k-1)}+1}}.$

q-TASEP, q-PushTASEP, and 2d dynamics

There are many solutions. Imposing no pulling/pushing over distances >1 leads to the 2d local dynamics of [B-Corwin '11]:

$$
\ell_{.j} = V_{.j} = 0, \qquad w_{.j}^{(k)} = \frac{(1 - q^{\frac{(k-1)}{j-1} - \lambda_{.j}^{(k)})}(1 - q^{\frac{(k-1)}{j-1} - \frac{(k)}{j+1} + 1})}{1 - q^{\frac{(k-1)}{j-1} - \frac{(k-1)}{j+1} + 1}}.
$$

Projecting to left-most particles of each row yields q-TASEP:

 $\frac{4}{9}$ and $\frac{4}{9}$ Imposing almost sure jump propagation $l_j + r_j \equiv 1$ and $W_j = \begin{cases} 1, & j = 1 \\ 0, & j > 1 \end{cases}$ and further projecting to right-most particles yields q-PushTASEP: r' ate = 1 prob. of pushing = q^{gap} (if moves)
 r' ate = 1 prob. of pushing = q^{gap} (if moves)

Semi-discrete Brownian directed polymers Whittaker scaling on q-PushTASEP (and q-TASEP) yields $dT_{1}^{N} = dB_{N} + e^{T_{1}^{N-1} - T_{1}^{N}} d\tau.$ $N=1$.

with independent Brownian motions $B_1, B_2, ...$ (same for $\{-T_N^N\}_{N>1}$). Solving gives $T_1^N = \log \int e^{B_1(s_1) + (B_2(s_2) - B_2(s_1)) + ... + (B_N(t) - B_N(s_{N-1}))} ds_1...ds_{N-1}$ O<S. <...<SN-I<T

Theorem [O'Connell '09], [B-Corwin '11] Lebesque $T_1^N + ... + T_k^N = log \left(... \left(e^{E(\phi_i) + ... + E(\phi_k)} d\phi_i \cdots d\phi_k \right) \right)$

with integration over nonintersecting paths from $(1,...,k)$ to $(N-k+1,...,N)$. The measure is symmetric with respect to the flip $\{\top^N_k \leftrightarrow \top^N_{N-k+1}\}$.

 $E(\phi) = \int_{\phi} (R \times \mathbb{Z})$ -white noise
= B_j(s₁) + (B_{j+1}(s₂) - B_{j+1}(s₁)) +...

q-TASEP moments

We now focus on left-most particles (q-TASEP)

and wish to study the asymptotics as N gets large.

Theorem [B-Corwin '11], [B-C-Sasamoto '12], [B-C-Gorin-Shakirov '13] For the q-TASEP with step initial data $\{X_n(o) = -n\}_{n \ge 1}$

$$
\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} q^{(k_{N_{i}}(t)+N_{i})+...+(x_{N_{k}}(t)+N_{k})}\right) = \frac{(-1)^{k} q^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}}}{(2\pi i)^{k}} \oint \cdots \oint_{A < B} \prod_{\substack{z_{A} \\ z_{A} = q}} \frac{z_{A} - z_{B}}{z_{A} - q z_{B}} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{e^{(q-1)t_{z_{j}}}}{(1-z_{j})^{N_{j}}} \frac{dz_{j}}{z_{j}}
$$

Proof. Consider the Macdonald process with Plancherel specialization and apply k first order Macdonald operators in $N_1, N_2, ..., N_k$ variables. \square

Another proof via Quantum Integrable Systems will be given in Lecture 3.

Polymer moments via nested integrals By (formal) limit transitions: Fo r $0 < S, \, 2... < S_{N-1} < T$ $E\left[\frac{Z(N_{1},\tau)\cdots Z(N_{k},\tau)}{(2\pi i)^{k}}-\frac{e^{-k/2}}{(2\pi i)^{k}}\oint\cdots\oint_{1\leq A< B\leq k}\prod_{k=1}^{M_{A}-W_{B}-1}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{e^{-w_{i}}}{w_{i}^{k}}dw_{i}\right]$ N_1 $\geq N_2$ $\geq \ldots \geq N_k$ $\left(\cdots\left(\overbrace{\cdot\cdot\cdot}\right)\mathcal{N}_{k}\right)\mathcal{N}_{k-1}\cdots\mathcal{N}_{N_{1}}$ For $Z(x,t) = \underbrace{\sum_{\sqrt{2\pi t}}^{2x^2} \int_{\text{Brownian}}^{x^2}}_{\text{Brownian}} \text{SINR}} \text{ : } exp: \left\{ \int_{0}^{t} \text{W}(s, b(s)) ds \right\} d\theta \qquad \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 z}{\partial x^2} + \dot{w} z \qquad \text{SHE}$
 $\frac{\partial hz}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 hz}{\partial x^2} + \left(\frac{\partial hz}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \dot{w} \qquad \text{KPZ}$ $\left[\frac{1}{2}(x_1,t)\cdots\frac{1}{2}(x_k,t)\right] = \int d\frac{1}{2}d\frac{$

Is this sufficient for determining the distributions of Z's?

Intermittency

Polymer partition functions Z are intermittent. Higher moments are dominated by higher peaks and do not determine the distrib. This is measured by moment Lyapunov exponents $\delta_{\rho} = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\ln E z^p(t)}{t}$. $\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial p}$ = const means intermittency [Zeldovitch et al. '87].

By steepest descent in nested integrals one shows:

 $\gamma_{\rho} = H_{\rho} (z_c),$ where $(\text{for } N = \tau)$ z_c is the crit. point of
 $H_{\rho}(z) = \frac{p^2}{2} + pz - log(\frac{\Gamma(z+p)}{\Gamma(z)})$ on $(o, +\infty)$. Semi-discrete: [B-Corwin '12]

 $\gamma_{p} = \frac{p^{3}}{24}$. Continuous: [Kardar '87], [Bertini-Cancrini '95]

The speed of growth of Lyapunov exp's does not predict fluctuation exponents!

Replica trick

In its simplest incarnation, ignoring intermittency, replica trick analytically continues moments off positive integers and uses $\log Z = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \frac{Z^{\rho} - 1}{\rho}$, $\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\ln Z}{t} = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \frac{e^{t \phi} - 1}{\rho} = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \frac{3\rho}{\rho}$ to predict the almost sure behavior. This gives correct LLN values: <u>Semi-discrete</u>: $\lim_{\rho\to 0} \frac{1}{\rho} \left(\frac{\rho^2}{2} + \rho z - \log \frac{\Gamma(z+\rho)}{\Gamma(z)} \right) = z - (\log \Gamma(z))'$, take value at **Proved**: [O'Connell-Yor '01], [Moriarty-O'Connell '07]

Continuous:
$$
lim_{p\to0} \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{p^3-p}{24} = -\frac{1}{24}
$$
.

Proved: [Amir-Corwin-Quastel '10], [Sasamoto-Spohn '10]

More elaborate treatment of moments gives limiting fluctuations [Dotsenko '10+], [Calabrese-Le Doussal-Rosso '10+]. WHY?

q-TASEP moments and contour deformation The distribution of $q^{\mathfrak{a}_n}$ for q-TASEP particles is NOT intermittent. We can find the distribution and then take the limit to polymers. But nested contours are not suited for very large moments.

This formula plays a key role in spectral analysis of Quantum Integrable Systems in Lecture 3. The dets are similar to inverse squared normes of Bethe eigenstates.

Laplace transforms

It is convenient now to take the generating function $\sum_{k>0} \mathbb{E} \left| \hat{q}^{x_{N}} \right|_{k}^{\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}$ Replace the sum over ordered cluster sizes by that over unordered unrestricted integers $n_1, n_2, ...$ (removes the combinatorial factor), and use the Mellin-Barnes transform

$$
\sum_{n\geq 1} g(q^n) \zeta^n = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\frac{1}{2} - i\infty} [(-s)\Gamma(1+s) (-\zeta)^s g(q^s) ds
$$

The result admits direct term-wise limit to polymers:

$$
\underline{\underline{P}} \underline{\underline{e}}^{-u \underline{\underline{z}}(N,\underline{r})} = 1 + \sum_{\ell \geq 0} \frac{1}{\ell! (\underline{\underline{e}} \pi i)^{2\ell}} \oint_{|v_{j}|=v_{4}} dv_{1} \cdots dv_{\ell} \int_{\underline{z}_{4} - i\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} ds_{1} \cdots ds_{\ell}
$$
\n
$$
\underline{\underline{P}}(\underline{z}) = \frac{\underline{\underline{r}}}{2} \underline{z}^{2} + \underline{z} \cdot \ln u - N \ln \Gamma(\underline{z}) \times \prod_{j=1}^{\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \rfloor} \frac{\pi}{\sin \pi s_{j}} \underline{\underline{e}}^{-\frac{\pi}{2} (s_{j} + v_{j}) - \underline{\underline{P}}(v_{j})} \cdot \det \left[\frac{1}{s_{i} + v_{i} - v_{j}} \right]_{i,j=1}^{\ell}
$$

Limit theorem

Theorem [B-Corwin '11, B-Corwin-Ferrari '12] For any

$$
lim_{N\rightarrow\infty}\mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{Z(N,aN)-f_{x}:N}{g_{x}:N^{1/3}}\leq r\right\}=\mathbb{F}_{GUE}(r)\xrightarrow[\begin{array}{c} N\rightarrow N\\ 3\end{array}]{\underbrace{M\rightarrow N}_{1}}_{I}
$$

The proof is by steepest descent analysis of the last expression. The Tracy-Widom GUE distribution arises as

$$
F_{GUE} (q_{\infty}r) = 1 + \sum_{\ell \ge 1} \frac{1}{\ell! (2\pi i)^{2\ell}} \int \cdots \int da_{i} \cdot da_{i} \cdot da_{\ell} \int \cdots \int d\ell_{i} \cdot d\ell_{\ell}
$$

$$
x \prod_{j=1}^{l} \frac{1}{a_{j} - \ell_{j}} \frac{exp(-\frac{q_{\infty}^{3}}{3}a_{j}^{3} + ra_{j})}{exp(-\frac{q_{\infty}^{3}}{3}a_{j}^{3} + ra_{j})} \cdot det[\frac{1}{\ell_{i} - a_{j}}]_{i,j=1}^{\ell}
$$

Back to the replica trick

The bona fide argument on the q-level is the only currently available explanation of why the replica trick works in this case. This will be extended in Lecture 3.

Aiming at accessing other integrable KPZ systems and more general initial conditions, Lecture 3 will present a different approach.