



CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Schloegl's second model for autocatalysis on hypercubic lattices: Dimension dependence of generic two-phase coexistence

Chi-Jen Wang, Da-Jiang Liu, and J. W. Evans

Phys. Rev. E **85**, 041109 — Published 9 April 2012

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.85.041109](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.85.041109)

SCHLOEGL'S SECOND MODEL FOR AUTOCATALYSIS ON HYPERCUBIC LATTICES: DIMENSION-DEPENDENCE OF GENERIC TWO-PHASE COEXISTENCE

Chi-Jen Wang,^{1,2} Da-Jiang Liu,¹ and J.W. Evans^{1,2,3}

Ames Laboratory – USDOE¹ and Departments of Mathematics² and Physics & Astronomy³, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011

ABSTRACT

Schloegl's second model on a $d \geq 2$ dimensional hypercubic lattice involves: (i) spontaneous annihilation of particles with rate p ; and (ii) autocatalytic creation of particles at vacant sites at a rate proportional to the number of suitable pairs of neighboring particles. This model provides a prototype for non-equilibrium discontinuous phase transitions. However, it also exhibits non-trivial generic two-phase coexistence: stable populated and vacuum states coexist for a finite range, $p_f(d) < p < p_e(d)$, spanned by the orientation-dependent stationary points for planar interfaces separating these states. Analysis of interface dynamics from Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) simulation, and from discrete reaction-diffusion equations (dRDE) obtained from truncation of the exact master equation, reveals that $p_{eff} \sim 0.2113765 + c_{eff}/d$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where $\Delta c = c_e - c_f \approx 0.014$. A metastable populated state persists above $p_e(d)$ up to a spinodal $p = p_s(d)$, which has a well-defined limit $p_s(d \rightarrow \infty) = 1/4$. The dRDE display artificial propagation failure, absent in the stochastic model due to fluctuations, a feature which is amplified for increasing d thus complicating our analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic lattice-gas reaction and reaction-diffusion models prescribe kinetic rules and rates for the creation and annihilation of various species residing on a lattice [1,2]. The reaction steps are often cooperative and sometimes irreversible. The lack of detailed-balance condition on the governing rates means that these systems may evolve to non-equilibrium steady-states which are not characterized by a Gibbs measure familiar for thermodynamic equilibrium in Hamiltonian models. However, these steady states can display phase transitions somewhat analogous to those in thermodynamic systems [1,2]. For both equilibrium [3] and non-equilibrium [1] lattice-gas models, it can be instructive to consider behavior as a function of lattice dimension, d . For models exhibiting continuous transitions or criticality, an upper critical dimension exists above which fluctuations are weak and mean-field behavior applies [1,3]. One also expects that either equilibrium or non-equilibrium discontinuous transitions may be erased due to strong fluctuations below some critical $d = d^*$ [1-3].

A candidate for non-equilibrium discontinuous transitions is Schloegl's second model for autocatalysis [4-13] on a hypercubic lattice which involves: (i) spontaneous annihilation of particles, X , at occupied sites at rate p ; and (ii) autocatalytic creation of particles at vacant sites, \emptyset , induced by suitable nearby pairs of particles [8,9-13]. Schematically, the reaction steps are:

$X \rightarrow \emptyset$ (spontaneous annihilation @ rate p); $\emptyset + 2X \rightarrow 3X$ (autocatalytic creation).

Mean-field (MF) analysis suggests the existence of a discontinuous transition between an active state with particle concentration $C > 0$, for $0 < p < p_e$, and an absorbing vacuum state $C = 0$, for all $p > 0$. However, Kinetic Monte Carlo (KMC) analysis of Grassberger's version of this model found only a continuous transition for $d < 4$ suggesting a critical $d^* = 4$ [5]. In contrast, our KMC analysis for a version of the model based on Durrett's Quadratic Contact Process or QCP (see below) revealed a discontinuous transition for $d = 2$ [9] and $d = 3$ [13], suggesting that $d^* = 2$.

In addition, our analysis of the QCP version revealed a *non-trivial generic two-phase coexistence (2PC)* for $d=2$ and $d=3$ wherein the stable populated and vacuum phases coexist for a finite range of annihilation rate, p [9-13]. (Trivial 2PC occurs due to a “quirk” in the QCP rules. For any $p>0$, the vacuum state can always resist the growth of active droplets which cannot escape any rectangular region containing them [8]. Trivial 2PC disappears upon perturbing the model, e.g., to include particle hopping or spontaneous creation.) The non-trivial 2PC derives from an orientation-dependence of the value of the annihilation rate $p=p_{eq}$ corresponding to a stationary planar interface separating the two phases. This non-trivial generic 2PC feature may persist for $d>3$. This behavior contrasts phase coexistence in an equilibrium Hamiltonian system where planar interface separating phases is stationary at a unique point corresponding to equality of chemical potentials. As an aside, generic 2PC was first explored in Toom’s model for voter dynamics [14,15] where the kinetic rules have an unappealing [16] asymmetry.

Our goal here is to elucidate fundamental aspects of the dependence on dimension, d , of discontinuous transitions in lattice-gas reaction models which display generic 2PC. In this paper, we consider only our QCP version of Schloegl’s second model, but the features displayed and issues analyzed will undoubtedly have broad applicability. Analogous studies for equilibrium systems would be performed using the ferromagnetic Ising model. One might expect the kinetics to approach mean-field behavior, and also enhanced metastability, as $d\rightarrow\infty$. However, the d -dependence of features related to equistability of distinct phases is perhaps less clear, and is the focus of the current contribution. Although contentious [22], we claim that equistability for infinite lattices should be determined by stationarity of planar interfaces separating coexisting states (cf. [4,17-21]). Consideration of equistability is complicated by the presence of generic 2PC for which we provide the first analysis of its d -dependence and disappearance as $d\rightarrow\infty$.

With regard to development and application of general methodologies, we apply discrete reaction-diffusion equations (dRDE) to elucidate interface dynamics. dRDE are derived from truncation approximations to the exact master equations for spatially inhomogeneous states. This approach has received little attention previously, and then only for $d=1-3$ and mainly using the lowest-order mean-field truncation approximation. We exploit the dRDE to obtain exact limiting behavior as $d\rightarrow\infty$. However, we find that these dRDE can display artificial propagation failure (APF), an effect which is absent due to fluctuations in the stochastic model and which is strongly amplified with increasing d . Nonetheless, dRDE analysis of suitable interface orientations avoiding APF is shown to still capture behavior in the stochastic model. While we treat only our QCP model, this dRDE methodology and the observed APF behavior and its resolution should have broad applicability.

In Sec.2, we provide a detailed description of our stochastic reaction model for general $d\geq 2$. New KMC simulation results are reported for $d = 2-5$. In Sec.3, we present the exact master equations for general d , and develop dRDE for spatially heterogeneous states by applying the MF and pair approximations. The dRDE are used to assess the propagation of planar interfaces between active and vacuum states, specifically stationarity and artificial propagation failure (APF), in Sec.4. The interpretation of the dRDE results and their relationship to exact behavior of the stochastic reaction model is described in Sec.5. Conclusions are provided in Sec.6.

2. MODEL PRESCRIPTION FOR GENERAL DIMENSION AND KMC ANALYSIS

Our model involves particle annihilation and creation at the sites of an infinite d -dimensional hyper-cubic lattice with sites labeled by $\underline{i} = (i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_d)$. Note that the total number of pairs of sites selected from the $2d$ nearest-neighbors (NN) of any site satisfies $k_{tot} =$

$(2d)(2d-1)/2! = d(2d-1)$. We divide all such pairs into two subsets: linear pairs where one site is $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j+1, \dots, i_d)$ and the other is $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j-1, \dots, i_d)$; and “diagonal” pairs with one site is at one of $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_j \pm 1, \dots, i_d)$ and another at one of $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k \pm 1, \dots, i_d)$ and where $j \neq k$. The number of linear pairs satisfies $k_{lin} = d$, and thus the number of diagonal pairs satisfies $k_{max} = k_{tot} - k_{lin} = 2d(d-1)$. Our QCP version of Schloegl’s second model for any $d \geq 2$ generalizes Durrett’s prescription [18] for a $d=2$. It involves: (i) spontaneous creation of particles at unoccupied sites at rate p ; (ii) autocatalytic annihilation of particles at empty sites at rate k/k_{max} , where k is the number of “diagonal” pairs of particles on neighboring sites. This prescription produces a simple d -independent form for the mean-field kinetics of the model. Furthermore, it enables an exact simplification of the master equations, as described in Sec.3.

For spatially homogeneous states, we define the particle concentration, C , as the mean probability that a site is occupied, so that $0 \leq C \leq 1$. We find that a stable populated steady-state with concentration $C > 0$ exists for a range of annihilation rates, $0 \leq p \leq p_e(d)$. Previous KMC studies found $p_e(d=2) = 0.09443$ [9] and $p_e(d=3) = 0.13939$ [13]. Below we report behavior for $d > 3$. In the “active” populated state, particles are continually created and annihilated. Increasing p to higher $p > p_e(d)$ results in a discontinuous transition to a stable absorbing “vacuum” state with $C=0$. An ill-defined metastable extension of the active state exists for a small range of $p_e(d) < p < p_s(d)$, where $p_s(d)$ denotes the spinodal with $p_s(d=2) \approx 0.101$ [12] and $p_s(d=3) \approx 0.15$ [13].

Previous studies for $d=2$ and 3 [9,12] found non-trivial generic 2PC wherein stable active and vacuum states coexist for a finite range $p_f(d) \leq p \leq p_e(d)$. This range is spanned by the orientation-dependent “equistability” values $p = p_{eq}$ for stationary planar interfaces separating these states, where $p_e(d) = \max p_{eq}$ corresponds to a diagonal ($d=2$) or skew ($d=3$) interface. For a general orientation, when $0 \leq p < p_{eq}$, the active state displaces the vacuum state. For $p_{eq} < p < p_e(d)$, the vacuum state displaces the active state. For $p_e(d) < p < p_s$, the vacuum state transiently displaces the metastable active state until the latter spontaneously converts to the vacuum. One caveat is that for an exactly vertical interface ($i_l=0$), the active state can never propagate into the vacuum (empty sites in this vacuum state have at most one occupied neighbor). More precisely, a vertical interface is stationary for all $p \leq p_f(d)$, but the vacuum state expands for $p > p_f(d)$. See [9-13] and **Fig.1**. As noted above, trivial 2PC occurs for all $p \leq p_e(d)$ as the vacuum state is stable against expansion of droplets of the active state. These features are shown to persist for $d > 3$.




Fig.1. (Color online) Steady-state C versus p for: (a) $d=2$; (b) $d \rightarrow \infty$ MF behavior. p_e (p_f) = upper (lower) 2PC boundaries; p_s = spinodal. Inset to (a): dependence of equistability p_{eq} on interface orientation. Inset to (b): profile of a hyperskew interface for $d \rightarrow \infty$ at $p_e = p_f = 0.2113765$.

Model behavior is characterized by performing KMC simulations on finite hypercubic lattices of L^d sites with periodic boundary conditions. In conventional constant- p ensemble simulations, processes are implemented with probabilities proportional to their rates. However, to assess p_{eq} , we implement alternative constant- C ensemble simulations [9,23]. System sizes were typically $L = 1024, 128, 48,$ and 20 , for $d = 2, 3, 4,$ and 5 , respectively. Simulation data was collected over times $\sim 10^6$ Monte Carlo steps (MCS) for $d = 2 - 4$ and $\sim 10^4$ MCS for $d=5$.

For $d \geq 2$ dimensions, the interface orientation where $a i_1 + b i_2 + c i_3 + \dots = m$ is constant (with $a, b, c, \dots,$ and m as integers) is labeled by $(abc\dots)$. Vertical interfaces correspond to $a=1$ and $b=c=\dots=0$ (so $i_1 = m$) are (10), (100), (1000), etc. for $d=2, 3, 4, \dots,$ respectively, and have $p_{eq}(d) = p_f(d)$ defined as the upper boundary of the region of propagation failure $0 < p < p_f(d)$. We define a ‘‘hyperskew’’ orientations as that where $a=b=c=\dots=1$ (so $i_1+i_2+i_3+\dots+i_d=m$) which constitutes the furthest-from-vertical orientation. This hyperskew orientation corresponds to diagonal (11), skew (111), 4th-order skew (1111),..., for $d=2, 3, 4, \dots,$ respectively, and have $p_{eq}(d) = p_e(d)$, i.e., p_{eq} is highest for orientations furthest-from-vertical where the active state can most easily displace the vacuum state. New results for $p_{eq}(d=2-5)$ for various interface orientations are shown in **Table I**. In Sec.5, we show that $p_{eq}(d \rightarrow \infty) = 0.2113765$ for all orientations. Our data suggests that $p_{eq}(d) \approx p_{eq}(d \rightarrow \infty) + c/d$, where c depends weakly on orientation. See **Fig.2**. The width of the 2PC region satisfies $\Delta p_{eq}(d) = p_e(d) - p_f(d) \approx 0.014/d$.

$d=2$	10: 0.0871	11: 0.09440 (2)			
$d=3$	100: 0.1353	110: 0.139027(7)	111: 0.139386(7)		
$d=4$	1000: 0.1548	1100: 0.157593(9)	1110: 0.158091(8)	1111: 0.158284(8)	
$d=5$	10000: 0.1664	11000: 0.16824(1)	11100: 0.168847(7)	11110: 0.169055(6)	11111: 0.169137(6)

Table I: KMC values of $p=p_{eq}$ for stationary planar interfaces separating populated and vacuum states for orientations indicated before the colon; $p_{eq} \rightarrow 0.211377$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, for all orientations.




Fig.2. KMC results for p_{eq} versus $1/d$ for hyperskew (filled square) and vertical (open square) interfaces, where the exact result is also shown for $d \rightarrow \infty$.

3. MASTER EQUATIONS FOR HOMOGENEOUS AND INHOMOGENEOUS STATES

Let x (o) denote a filled (empty) site, and let P 's denote the probabilities for various configurations of clusters of sites. For general spatially inhomogeneous states, the probability that a site is occupied or vacant depends on its location. Thus, we let $C_i = P[x_i]$ denote the probability that site $\underline{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d)$ is occupied. Then, $P[o_i] = 1 - P[x_i]$ is the probability that site

\underline{i} is empty. Let $\underline{e}_1 = (1,0,0,\dots)$, $\underline{e}_2 = (0,1,0,\dots)$, etc., denotes vectors between NN sites. Then $P[x_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1}]$ ($P[o_i o_{i+\underline{e}_1}]$) denotes the probability that sites in the NN pair \underline{i} , $\underline{i}+\underline{e}_1$ are both occupied (empty). Also, $P[x_i o_{i+\underline{e}_1}]$ and $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1}]$ denote the probabilities of mixed occupied-empty pairs. Conservation of probability implies that $P[x_i] + P[o_i] = 1$, $P[x_i o_{i+\underline{e}_1}] + P[x_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1}] = P[x_i]$, $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1}] + P[o_i o_{i+\underline{e}_1}] = P[o_i]$, etc. For the special case of spatially homogeneous states, these quantities do not depend on site location, so $P[x_i] = P[x] = C$, $P[o_i] = P[o] = 1-C (= C')$, etc.

The exact master equations for our reaction model can be written as a coupled hierarchy for the evolution of the probabilities for empty single sites, empty pairs, etc. [24]. Terms in these equations simply account for all possible gain pathways due to spontaneous particle annihilation, and all possible loss pathways associated with autocatalytic particle creation.

3A. LOWEST-ORDER HIERARCHICAL EQUATION FOR SINGLE-SITE PROBABILITIES

For spatially inhomogeneous states, the equations for single empty sites have the exact form

$$d/dt P[o_i] = p P[x_i] - (1/k_{max})\{P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i+\underline{e}_2}] + P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i-\underline{e}_2}] + P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i+\underline{e}_3}] + \dots\}. \quad (1)$$

The first gain term on the right-hand-side (RHS) of (1) corresponds to spontaneous particle annihilation at site \underline{i} at rate p . The other loss terms correspond to autocatalytic particle creation at empty site \underline{i} where one term appears for each of the k_{max} possible configurations of diagonal pairs of particles on sites NN to \underline{i} . We have shown explicitly only three out of these k_{max} creation terms. From (1), it is clear that for a spatially homogeneous state, the evolution equation for the probability of a single empty site has the d -independent exact form

$$d/dt P[o] = p P[x] - P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ o \quad x \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The loss term on the right-hand-side denotes the probability of a filled site with a specific diagonal pair of filled sites, where the state of the $2d-2$ other neighboring sites is unspecified.

In deriving the loss terms in (1), $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i+\underline{e}_2}]$ corresponds to a sum of contributions for different configurations of the $2d$ sites surrounding o_i , but all including a diagonal pair of particles at sites $\underline{i}+\underline{e}_1$ and $\underline{i}+\underline{e}_2$. One case is the configuration with all other $2d-2$ neighboring sites empty so $k=1$, associated with a creation rate of $1/k_{max}$. The general case has $k-1$ additional diagonal pairs with creation rate k/k_{max} . We associate a fraction $1/k$ of this contribution with the term $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i+\underline{e}_2}]$, and the rest is equally distributed between the other terms. Summing all contributions associated with $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i+\underline{e}_2}]$ thus yields $1/k_{max}$ times the probability that site \underline{i} is empty and the indicated diagonal pair is occupied (with all other neighbors of the empty site in an unspecified state). A similar analysis generates $P[o_i x_{i+\underline{e}_1} x_{i-\underline{e}_2}]$ and the other terms.

For spatially inhomogeneous states corresponding to planar interfaces between populated and vacuum states, (1) adopt a simpler form. For specific orientations, the $C_{i1, i2, \dots, id}$ and related probabilities can be independent of some i_k or dependent only on certain combinations of them. Also, some probabilities for configurations of clusters of sites become identical. For example, for vertical interfaces where $C_{i1, i2, \dots, id} = C_{i1}$, the first two particle creation terms in (1) are equivalent.

3B. HIERARCHICAL EQUATION FOR PAIR PROBABILITIES

One can also obtain equations for probabilities of adjacent empty pairs of sites, and for larger clusters of empty sites. For a spatially inhomogeneous state, the evolution equation for the pair probability $P[o_i o_{i+\underline{e}_1}]$ has the exact form

$$d/dt P[o_i o_{i+e_l}] = p \{P[x_i o_{i+e_l}] + P[o_i x_{i+e_l}]\} - (1/k_{max}) \{P[o_i o_{i+e_l} x_{i+2e_l} x_{i+e_l+e_2}] + \dots\} \\ - (1/k_{max}) \{P[x_{i+e_l+e_2} x_{i-e_l} o_i o_{i+e_l}] + \dots\}. \quad (3)$$

The first two gain terms on the RHS corresponds to spontaneous particle annihilation at site \underline{i} and $\underline{i+e_l}$ at rate p . The next group of loss terms correspond to autocatalytic particle creation at empty site $\underline{i+e_l}$ where one term appears for each of the $2(d-1)$ possible configurations of diagonal pairs of particles NN to this site, where neither particle is on the neighboring site \underline{i} . We have shown explicitly only one out of the subset of $2(d-1)$ configurations where one particle forms a linear triple with the empty pair. There is another larger subset of $2(d-1)(d-2)$ configurations where neither particle forms a linear triple with the empty pair. The analogous last group of loss terms correspond to autocatalytic particle creation at empty site \underline{i} , where one term appears for each of the total of $2(d-1)^2$ possible configurations of diagonal pairs of particles NN to this site.

From (3), it follows that for a spatially homogeneous state, the equation for evolution of the probability of an empty pair has the exact form

$$d/dt P[o o] = 2p \cdot P[x o] - \{4(d-1)/k_{max}\} P \begin{bmatrix} x & & \\ o & o & x \end{bmatrix} - \{4(d-1)(d-2)/k_{max}\} P \begin{bmatrix} x & & \\ o & \otimes & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $P \begin{bmatrix} x & & \\ o & o & x \end{bmatrix}$ and $P \begin{bmatrix} x & & \\ o & \otimes & \end{bmatrix}$ represent probabilities of an empty pair where the right site

in this pair has a diagonal neighboring pair of particles. In the first, one filled site forms a linear triple with the empty pair. In the second, both filled sites form bent triples with the empty pair.

Derivation of the loss terms in (3) due to autocatalytic particle creation follows a similar strategy to that for (1) above. Each term corresponds to a sum of contributions associated with different configurations of the $2d-1$ sites at the relevant end the empty pair $o_i o_{i+e_l}$ but which all include the diagonal pair of particles indicated explicitly in (3). Summing all contributions associated with the specific pair thus yields $1/k_{max}$ times the probability that the pair is empty and the specific diagonal pair is occupied (with other neighbors of the empty pair unspecified).

4. APPROXIMATIONS AND DISCRETE REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATIONS

4A. TRUNCATION APPROXIMATIONS

In the simplest mean-field (MF) or site approximation, one neglects all correlations in the occupancy of different sites. Thus, for example, one has that

$$P[o_i x_{i+e_l} x_{i+e_2}] \approx P[o_i] P[x_{i+e_l}] P[x_{i+e_2}] \quad (\text{reducing to } P \begin{bmatrix} x & & \\ o & x & \end{bmatrix} \approx P[o] P[x]^2), \quad (5)$$

for inhomogeneous (homogeneous) states. In the next higher-order pair approximation, probabilities configurations of clusters of sites are factorized in terms of those for all constituent pairs where one also compensates for double-counting of some sites. Thus, one has that

$$P[o_i x_{i+e_l} x_{i+e_2}] \approx P[o_i x_{i+e_l}] P[o_i x_{i+e_2}] / P[o_i], \text{ and} \\ P[o_i o_{i+e_l} x_{i+2e_l} x_{i+e_l+e_2}] \approx P[o_i o_{i+e_l}] P[o_{i+e_l} x_{i+2e_l}] P[o_{i+e_l} x_{i+e_l+e_2}] / P[o_{i+e_l}]^2 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{(reducing to } P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ o \ x \end{bmatrix} \approx P[xo]^2/P[o] \text{ and } P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ o \ o \ x \end{bmatrix} \approx P \begin{bmatrix} x \\ o \ \otimes \end{bmatrix} \approx P[o \ o]P[x \ o]^2/P[o]^2),$$

for inhomogeneous (homogenous) states.

4B. MEAN-FIELD TYPE KINETICS FOR HOMOGENEOUS STATES

The MF site-approximation to (2) yields the d-independent MF kinetics

$$d/dt C = -p C + C^2(1-C) \equiv R(C), \text{ so } d/dt \ln C' = (C/C')[p - CC'], \quad (7)$$

where $C' = 1-C$ gives the probability of an empty site. Steady-state analysis reveals a stable vacuum state with $C=0$ for all $p>0$, and a stable active state with $C = C_{act}(\text{MF}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - 4p)^{1/2}$ for a bistability regime $0 \leq p \leq p_s(\text{MF}) = \frac{1}{4}$ [4,8-10]. In the pair approximation, a natural variable is the conditional concentration, $K = P[x \ o]/P[o]$, representing the probability of finding a particle next to a site specified empty. Setting $K' = 1-K$ (the conditional probability of an empty site) and $c_d = (d-1)/d$, the pair kinetics can be instructively formulated as

$$d/dt \ln C' = (C/C')[p - CC'(K/C)^2] \text{ and } d/dt \ln K' + d/dt \ln C' = 2(K/K')[p - c_d KK']. \quad (8)$$

A steady-state analysis yields a stable vacuum state with $C = K = 0$ for all $p>0$, and a stable active state $K = K_{act}(\text{pair}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - 4p/c_d)^{1/2}$ for a bistability regime $0 \leq p \leq p_s(\text{pair}) = c_d/4$. Since $c_d \rightarrow 1$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$, it is clear comparing (7) and (8) that site and pair approximations converge.

More generally, consider the evolution of the probability, $P[\{o\}_n]$, of finite connected cluster of n vacant sites, $\{o\}_n$. The key observation is that as $d \rightarrow \infty$, all sites are on the perimeter and almost fully coordinated with sites not in the cluster. More precisely, the fractional deficit from full coordination scales like $1/d$. Thus, the structure of the evolution equation is similar to that for the probability, $(P[o])^n$, for n isolated far separated sites. It follows that $P[\{o\}_n] \rightarrow (P[o])^n$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, a general feature applying for any lattice-gas reaction model.

4C. MEAN-FIELD-TYPE DISCRETE REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATIONS (dRDE)

We will consider only spatially inhomogeneous states corresponding to planar interfaces between active and vacuum states. As in Sec.2, interface orientations where $a i_1 + b i_2 + c i_3 + \dots = m$ is constant is labeled by $(abc\dots)$ for $d \geq 2$ dimensions. In these case, the concentrations $C_{i1,i2,\dots, id} = C_{ai1+bi2+ci3+\dots=m} = C_m$ are labeled by a single integer m . Applying MF factorization to (1) produces closed discrete reaction-diffusion (dRDE) type equations for the C_m . The “diffusion” type terms reflect spatial coupling in the reaction model rather than particle hopping. These type of MF dRDE have been explored previously for other reaction-diffusion models, but just for $d \leq 3$ [25-27]. It is convenient to define a pseudo-diffusion coefficient $D_j(C) = C(1-C)/j$, and the discrete Laplacian

$$\Delta C_m = C_{m+1} - 2C_m + C_{m-1}, \text{ so that } (C_{m+1} + C_{m-1})^2 - (2C_m)^2 = 4C_m \Delta C_m + (\Delta C_m)^2. \quad (9)$$

For hyper-skew (1111...) interfaces where $C_{i1,i2,\dots, id} = C_{i1+i2+\dots+id=m}$, one obtains the MF dRDE

$$\begin{aligned} d/dt C_m &= -pC_m + \frac{1}{4} (1-C_m)(C_{m+1} + C_{m-1})^2 \\ &= R(C_m) + D_1(C_m) \Delta C_m + \frac{1}{4} (1-C_m) (\Delta C_m)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which have a form independent of d . As a consequence, the MF-value of p_{eq} for the $d=2$ diagonal, $d=3$ skew, and $d>3$ hyperskew orientations will be identical. It should be noted that the physical Euclidean distance between adjacent planes, m and $m+1$, equals $d^{1/2}$, and thus the physical width of the concentration profile across the interface also scales like $d^{1/2}$.

For vertical (1000...) interfaces where $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1=m}$, one obtains the distinct MF dRDE

$$d/dt C_m = R(C_m) + D_d(C_m) \Delta C_m, \quad (11)$$

incorporating weak spatial coupling for large d due to small $D_d \sim 1/d$. Since $R(0) = 0$ and $D_d(0) = 0$, (10) appropriately ensures that the active state cannot displace the vacuum state.

Next, consider more general low-index interfaces including diagonal (11000...) interfaces where $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1+i_2=m}$, skew (11100...) interfaces $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1+i_2+i_3=m}$, and the natural generalization to n^{th} -order skew interfaces where $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1+i_2+i_3+\dots+i_n=m}$. For the general n^{th} -order skew case, one obtains the MF RDE

$$d/dt C_m = R(C_m) + n D_d(C_m) \Delta C_m + \frac{1}{4} n(n-1) d^{-1} (d-1)^{-1} (\Delta C_m)^2. \quad (12)$$

This result includes vertical ($n=1$), diagonal ($n=2$), skew ($n=3$) orientations as special cases, and reveals weak spatial coupling in all cases with $n=O(1)$ and large d , in contrast to (9).

For reasons discussed below, it will also be instructive to consider near-vertical orientations. When $S i_1 + i_2 = m$, corresponding to a near-vertical interface with large slope S and far-spaced rare ‘‘horizontal steps’’ (see **Fig.3a**), one obtains the MF dRDE

$$\begin{aligned} d/dt C_m = & -p C_m + d^{-1} (d-1)^{-1} (d-2)(d-3)(1-C_m)(C_m)^2 \\ & + d^{-1} (d-1)^{-1} (d-2)(1-C_m) C_m (C_{m-1} + C_{m+1} + C_{m-S} + C_{m+S}) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} d^{-1} (d-1)^{-1} (1-C_m) (C_{m-1} + C_{m+1}) (C_{m-S} + C_{m+S}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

When $S i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_d = m$, corresponding to a near-vertical interface with large slope S and far-spaced rare ‘‘maximally kinked’’ or hyperskew steps’’ (see **Fig.3b**), one obtains the MF dRDE

$$\begin{aligned} d/dt C_m = & -p C_m + \frac{1}{4} d^{-1} (d-2)(1-C_m) (C_{m-1} + C_{m+1})^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} d^{-1} (1-C_m) (C_{m-1} + C_{m+1}) (C_{m-S} + C_{m+S}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Writing (13) and (14) in the form $d/dt C_m = R(C_m) + \text{‘‘diffusion-type terms’’}$, these diffusion terms are of order $1/d$ in (13), but of order unity in (14) (which reduces to (9) as $d \rightarrow \infty$).




Fig.3. (Color online) Schematic for $d=3$ of a rare horizontal (a) and hyperskew (b) step on a vertical interface.

One can also apply the pair approximation to (1) and (3) for planar interfaces between active and vacuum states to obtain pair dRDE for C_m and related pair probabilities. See **Appendix A** for the special cases of hyperskew (1111...) and vertical (1000...) interfaces.

5. DISCRETE RDE ANALYSIS: MEAN-FIELD AND PAIR RESULTS

We now present results from numerical integration of the dRDE's for evolution of planar interfaces between the active and vacuum states. The initial data are chosen as a sharp interface between the active state $C_m = C_{act}$, for $m < m^*$, and the vacuum state $C_m = 0$, for $m \geq m^*$. In the pair approximation, we also specify certain pair occupations determined from $K_{act}(\text{pair})$. The interface location is determined from $\langle m \rangle = \sum_m C_m / C_{act}$ for a large finite system of ~ 1000 sites. The interface velocity, $V(p) = d/dt \langle m \rangle$, is determined for long times $t \approx 4 \times 10^4$. Our focus is on assessing variation of $V(p)$ with p to determine stationarity and propagation failure.

5A. HYPERSKEW (1111...) ORIENTATION

The MF dRDE for the hyperskew orientation where $m = i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_d$ have the special feature of being independent of d . Analysis of interface propagation reveals that $V(p)$ vanishes at a single stationary point which has the d-independent MF value $p_{eq}(111\dots) = 0.2113765(4)$. See **Table II**. The pair dRDE for the hyperskew orientation predict qualitatively similar interface evolution with $V(p)$ vanishing at a single stationary point. However, the pair $p_{eq}(111\dots)$ depends on dimension and increases smoothly to converge to the MF value as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Table III**. Continuously deviating from a hyperskew orientation produces continuous deviations from the above behavior either at the MF or pair level with p_{eq} shifting to lower values.

5B. VERTICAL (1000...) AND NEAR-VERTICAL ORIENTATIONS

The MF dRDE for vertical interfaces where $m = i_1$ predict propagation failure for $0 < p < p_{eq}(100\dots)$ where MF $p_{eq}(100\dots)$ increases with d . In fact, MF $p_{eq}(100\dots) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, where the interface is stationary over the entire bistability regime. See **Table II**. Additional analysis elucidates the sharpening of the stationary interface at $p = p_{eq}$ as d increases. See **Appendix B**. Analysis of the pair dRDE (15) reveals the same qualitative behavior where the pair $p_{eq}(100\dots) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, but the rate of convergence is slower. See **Table III**. Deviation from a vertical orientation with rare horizontal (H) "steps" (cf. **Fig.3a**). Both MF and pair analysis for near-vertical orientations with rare horizontal steps ($S_{i_1+i_2}=m$ with large $S = 1024$) indicates a unique stationary point $p_{eq}(100\dots H)$ for $d=2-5$ which shifts upward with d . For $d \geq 6$, a finite range of propagation failure emerges over a regime $p_-(100\dots H) < p < p_+(100\dots H)$. This regime expands with increasing d to cover the entire region of bistability, i.e., $p_-(100\dots H) \rightarrow 0$ and $p_+(100\dots H) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Tables II-III**. Deviation from a vertical orientation with rare hyperskew (HS) steps (cf. **Fig.3b**). Orientations defined by $S_{i_1+i_2+\dots+i_d} = m$ with large S correspond to a vertical interface $i_1=0$ mis-oriented by occasional hyperskew (maximally kinked) "steps" separated by vertically S lattice constants. Analysis based on both the MF and pair dRDE for $S=1024$ indicates a unique stationary point for which $p_{eq}(100\dots HS) \rightarrow \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} p_{eq}(111\dots) = 0.2113765$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Tables II-III**.

5C. DIAGONAL (11000...), SKEW (11100...), AND OTHER ORIENTATIONS

Analysis of the MF and pair dRDE for diagonal (11000...) interfaces where $m = i_1 + i_2$ reveals that except for small d , one has propagation failure over a regime $p_-(1100\dots) < p < p_+(1100\dots)$. The regime of propagation failure expands with increasing d to cover the entire region of

bistability, i.e., $p_-(1100\dots) \rightarrow 0$ and $p_+(1100\dots) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Tables II-III**. Motivated by the analysis of near-vertical interfaces, we also consider deviations from diagonal orientations associated with rare hyperskew (maximally kinked) steps as a route to eliminate propagation failure. These orientations are described by $S(i_1+i_2)+i_3+i_4+\dots+i_d = m$, where we choose $S=1024$. Analysis for the MF and pair dRDE reveals a lack of propagation failure with stationary point $p_{eq}(1100\dots HS) \rightarrow \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} p_{eq}(111\dots) = 0.2113765$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Tables II-III**.

Analysis of both MF and pair dRDE for skew (11100\dots) interfaces reveals that except for small d , one has propagation failure over a regime $p_-(1110\dots) < p < p_+(1110\dots)$. Again, the regime of propagation failure expands with increasing d to cover the entire region of bistability, i.e., $p_-(1110\dots) \rightarrow 0$ and $p_+(1110\dots) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. It is also the case that propagation failure can be eliminated by deviating from skew orientations with rare hyperskew steps. These orientations are described by $S(i_1+i_2+i_3)+i_4+\dots+i_d = m$, where we choose $S=1024$. The stationary point $p_{eq}(1110\dots HS) \rightarrow \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} p_{eq}(111\dots) = 0.2113765$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. See **Table II-III**.

One can extend the above investigations to consider n^{th} -order skew orientations as defined in Sec.4B. One anticipates analogous behavior, i.e., development of propagation failure with increasing d which engulfs the entire bistable regime as $d \rightarrow \infty$. It is also anticipated that deviating from these orientation with rare hyperskew steps will eliminate propagation failure.

6. RELATING dRDE PREDICTIONS TO STOCHASTIC MODEL BEHAVIOR

In relating MF-type dRDE predictions to stochastic reaction model behavior, it is instructive to first focus on two key interface orientations, hyperskew and vertical.

For hyperskew (111\dots) interfaces, the correspondence is unambiguous: there is no propagation failure for MF or pair dRDE, and the predicted $p_{eq}(111\dots)$ corresponds to that in the stochastic model. The large discrepancy between the d-independent MF predictions and KMC values of $p_{eq}(111\dots)$ for smaller d is largely removed in the pair approximation. As noted previously, the simple form $p_{eq}(111\dots) \approx 0.2113765 + c/d$ describe well observed d-dependence.

For vertical (100\dots) interfaces, recall that propagation failure is expected for p below some critical value, $p_{eq}(1000\dots)$ as the active state cannot displace the vacuum state for any $p \geq 0$. For $p > p_{eq}(1000\dots)$, the vacuum state displaces the populated state. This feature applies to both the stochastic model and to various MF-type dRDE. However, $p_{eq}(1000\dots)$ from MF-type treatments does not correspond to that for the stochastic model as estimated by KMC simulations. Specifically, MF-type formulations “artificially extend” the regime of propagation failure. This feature is amplified for increasing d , recalling that MF-type $p_{eq}(1000\dots) \rightarrow p_s(\text{MF}) = 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

Artificial propagation failure (APF) in MF-type dRDE treatments can be understood as follows. For smooth vertical interfaces in the stochastic lattice-gas reaction model, propagation of the vacuum state into the populated state for $p > p_{eq}$ is associated with fluctuation-mediated nucleation and growth of $(d-1)$ -dimensional droplets of the vacuum state in the layer adjacent to the completely empty edge layer of the vacuum state. This feature not reflected in MF-type treatments where more difficult “spatially homogeneous propagation” of the vacuum state into the next layer is required. Considering near-vertical interfaces in MF-type treatments, i.e., vertical interfaces with far-separated “steps”, could potentially avoid APF. However, introducing “smooth” horizontal steps does not avoid APF. Why? Step propagation must still occur “spatially homogeneous” propagation rather than by fluctuation-mediated nucleation and growth of new rows of empty sites adjacent to the step as in the stochastic reaction model. However, introducing more easily-propagating maximally-kinked hyperskew step avoids APF.

The amplification of APF with increasing d follows from the form of the MF-type dRDE. For vertical interfaces, the spatial coupling in MF-type dRDE is $\sim 1/d$ [cf. (11)]. The diminution of this coupling with increasing d produces an amplification of APF. The same diminution of coupling persists upon introducing rare horizontal steps to a vertical interface [cf. (13)], thus preserving APF. However, introduction of rare hyperskew steps results in strong spatial coupling [cf. (14)], as for the hyperskew interface orientation [cf. (10)], thus avoiding APF.

Next, consider the d -dependence of the boundaries of the regime of 2PC. As noted above, there is a direct correspondence between $p_{eq}(111\dots) = p_e$ (the upper boundary) in KMC analysis and MF-type treatments. However, due to APF, $p_{eq}(100\dots)$ in MF-type treatments does not correspond to the lower boundary, p_f , of the 2PC regime (as it does in KMC analysis). We claim that p_f can be estimated in MF-type treatments from the stationary point for near vertical interfaces with rare hyperskew steps, i.e., $p_f = \lim_{S \rightarrow \infty} p_{eq}(1000\dots HS)$, as such steps eliminate APF. Support for this claim comes from the results in **Table IV**. The behavior $p_{e(f)} \sim 0.2113765 + c_{e(f)}/d$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$, as determined from KMC analysis, is confirmed from the MF-type analysis where the $1/d$ -scaling is seen as a natural consequence of the form of the spatial coupling. As an aside, this strategy allows comparison of KMC and MF dRDE results for other orientations [25].

	KMC p_e	Pair p_e	δp_e		KMC p_f	Pair p_f	δp_f
$d=2$	0.09440	0.1083	0.0139		0.0871	0.1056	0.0185
$d=3$	0.13939	0.14295	0.0036		0.1353	0.1399	0.0046
$d=4$	0.15828	0.16014	0.0019		0.1548	0.1572	0.0024
$d=5$	0.16914	0.17042	0.0013		0.1664	0.1679	0.0015

Table IV: KMC and pair estimates of p_e and p_f , and small errors $\delta p_{e(f)} = p_{e(f)}(\text{pair}) - p_{e(f)}(\text{KMC})$.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis indicates shrinking of the width, $\Delta p_{eq}(d) \approx 0.014/d$, of the regime of generic 2PC associated with the discontinuous transition in our QCP version of Schloegl's second model on a hypercubic lattice with increasing dimension d . Appropriate application of MF-type dRDE is shown to be effective in elucidating this behavior particularly the scaling with d . These features and the utility of the dRDE analysis are expected to be general for non-equilibrium reaction models displaying discontinuous transitions. One could extend this analysis to consider nucleation of the more stable phase from the less stable one just outside the 2PC region. The orientation-dependence of interface propagation will be reflected in the shapes of evolving droplets [10,11], a feature which again can be elucidated by a MF-type dRDE analysis.

A significant feature of the MF-type dRDE treatment is the appearance of artificial propagation failure (APF). APF is artificial in the sense that it does not occur in the stochastic lattice-gas model due to fluctuations at the interface. Propagation failure in dRDE's of interest in its own right [26-28]. Studies often identify a critical value in spatial coupling below which there exists propagation failure, behavior which is amplified upon further reducing this coupling [28]. These observations are consistent with our observations, e.g., amplified APF for increasing d .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE), Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences, through the Ames Laboratory Chemical Physics and PCTC projects. The Ames Laboratory is operated for the USDOE by Iowa State University under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358.

APPENDIX A. PAIR DISCRETE REACTION-DIFFUSION EQUATIONS (dRDE)

The pair approximation is applied to (1) and (3) for spatially inhomogeneous states corresponding to planar interfaces between active and vacuum states. For planar interfaces with a hyper-skew (1111...) orientation, so that $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1+i_2+\dots+i_d} = C_m$, we let $\varepsilon_m = 1 - C_m$ denote the probability that a site on the hyper-skew plane $m = i_1 + i_2 + \dots + i_d$ is empty. The probability of a NN empty pair with one site in plane m and the other in plane $m+1$ is denoted by $\phi_{m+1/2}$. Then, the corresponding dRDE have the form

$$d/dt \varepsilon_m = p(1 - \varepsilon_m) - (2\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m+1/2} - \phi_{m-1/2})^2 / (4\varepsilon_m), \quad (15a)$$

$$d/dt \phi_{m-1/2} = p(\varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_{m-1} - 2\phi_{m-1/2}) \quad (15b)$$

$$-\phi_{m-1/2} [d(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m+1/2})^2 + 2(d-1)(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m+1/2})(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m-1/2}) + (d-2)(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m-1/2})^2] / [4d(\varepsilon_m)^2]$$

$$-\phi_{m-1/2} [d(\varepsilon_{m-1} - \phi_{m-3/2})^2 + 2(d-1)(\varepsilon_{m-1} - \phi_{m-3/2})(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m-1/2}) + (d-2)(\varepsilon_m - \phi_{m-1/2})^2] / [4d(\varepsilon_{m-1})^2].$$

These pair dRDE reduce to those of the MF dRDE in the limit as $d \rightarrow \infty$.

For a vertical (1000...) interface where $C_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} = C_{i_1} = C_m$, we let $\varepsilon_m = 1 - C_m$. The probability of a NN empty pair with one site in plane m and the other in plane $m+1$ [i.e., sites (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) and (i_1+1, i_2, \dots, i_d)] is denoted by $\phi_{m+1/2}$. In addition, we must consider the distinct probability, ψ_m , of NN empty pair with both sites in plane m . The corresponding dRDE have the form

$$d/dt \varepsilon_m = p[1 - \varepsilon_m] - [\varepsilon_m - \psi_m] [d\varepsilon_m - (d-2)\psi_m - \phi_{m+1/2} - \phi_{m-1/2}] / [d\varepsilon_m], \quad (16a)$$

$$d/dt \phi_{m-1/2} = p[\varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_{m-1} - 2\phi_{m-1/2}]$$

$$-\phi_{m-1/2} [\varepsilon_m - \psi_m] [(d-1)\varepsilon_m - (d-1)\psi_m - \phi_{m+1/2}] / [d(\varepsilon_m)^2]$$

$$-\phi_{m-1/2} [\varepsilon_{m-1} - \psi_{m-1}] [(d-1)\varepsilon_{m-1} - (d-1)\psi_{m-1} - \phi_{m-3/2}] / [d(\varepsilon_{m-1})^2], \quad (16b)$$

$$d/dt \psi_m = 2p[\varepsilon_m - \psi_m]$$

$$-\psi_m [\varepsilon_m - \psi_m] [2(d-1)^2\varepsilon_m - 2(d-2)^2\psi_m - (2d-3)(\phi_{m+1/2} + \phi_{m-1/2})] / [d(d-1)(\varepsilon_m)^2]. \quad (16c)$$

Examination of the form of (16) reveals that the active state cannot displace the vacuum state, consistent with exact behavior in the stochastic model.

APPENDIX B: dRDE PERTURBATION ANALYSIS FOR VERTICAL INTERFACES AS $d \rightarrow \infty$

For a stationary planar vertical interface between the vacuum state on the left for $m = 0, -1, -2, \dots$ and a populated state on the right for $m=1, 2, \dots$, the MF dRDE (11) imply that

$$p - C_m(1-C_m) = d^{-1}(1-C_m)(C_{m+1} - 2C_m + C_{m-1}), \text{ for } m \geq 1, \quad (17)$$

where $C_0 = 0$. For large d , the RHS is small which forces $p - C_m(1-C_m) \approx 0$ or $C_m \approx C_{act}$. Thus, it is natural to write $C_m = C_{act} - \delta_m$ for $m \geq 1$ where $\delta_m \ll 1$ from which one obtains

$$(2C_{act} - 1)\delta_l - d^{-1}C_{act}(1-C_{act}) - (\delta_l)^2 - d^{-1}(2-3C_{act})\delta_l - d^{-1}(1-C_{act})\delta_2 - d^{-1}\delta_l(\delta_2 - 2\delta_l) = 0, \quad (18a)$$

$$(2C_{act} - 1)\delta_m - d^{-1}(1-C_{act})(\delta_{m+1} - 2\delta_m + \delta_{m-1}) - (\delta_m)^2 - d^{-1}\delta_m(\delta_{m+1} - 2\delta_m + \delta_{m-1}) = 0, \text{ for } m > 1. \quad (18b)$$

First, we consider the general case of a stationary interface for fixed $p < p_{eq}(d)$ where $2C_{act} - 1 = (1-4p)^{1/2} = O(1)$. It follows from (18a) where the first two terms dominate that $\delta_l \approx d^{-1}C_{act}(1-C_{act})(2C_{act} - 1)^{-1} = O(d^{-1})$. Then, considering the first two dominant terms in (18b) implies that $\delta_m \approx d^{-1}(1-C_{act})(2C_{act} - 1)^{-1} \delta_{m-1}$, which in turn yields

$$\delta_m \approx C_{act}(1-C_{act})^m (2C_{act} - 1)^{-m} d^{-m}, \text{ for } m \geq 1. \quad (19)$$

Second, in the special case of a stationary interface for $p = p_{eq}(d)$, one might anticipate distinct scaling behavior in the situation where $p_{eq}(d) \rightarrow 1/4$, as $d \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed analysis of numerical data in **Table II** indicates that $1/4 - p_{eq}(d) \approx A/d$ where $A \approx 0.25$, so that $2C_{act} - 1 = (1-4p)^{1/2} \approx B/d^{1/2}$ where $B \approx 1.0$. This forces modified scaling from (18) above. Now, the first three terms in (18a) dominate, and one concludes that $B \geq 1$ and $\delta_l \approx E/d^{1/2}$ where $E = 1/2[B \pm (B^2 - 1)^{1/2}]$. Then, considering the first two dominant terms in (18b) implies that $\delta_m \approx 1/2 d^{-1/2} B^{-1} \delta_{m-1}$ for $m > 1$, which in turn yields

$$\delta_m \approx (2B)^{-m+1} E d^{-m/2}, \text{ for } m \geq 1. \quad (20)$$

Data from numerical analysis of the MF dRDE's supports this analysis. See **Table V**.

d	δ_1	δ_2	δ_3	δ_4	δ_5	δ_6	δ_6
10	0.1687	2.02×10^{-2}	22.0×10^{-4}	2.39×10^{-4}	2.58×10^{-5}	2.78×10^{-6}	3.01×10^{-7}
100	0.0504	2.25×10^{-3}	9.79×10^{-5}	4.26×10^{-6}	1.85×10^{-7}		
1000	0.0161	2.44×10^{-4}	3.69×10^{-6}	5.57×10^{-8}			
10000	0.0077	3.56×10^{-5}	1.67×10^{-7}				

Table V. Behavior of δ_m versus m and versus d from a MF dRDE analysis for vertical interfaces at $p = p_{eq}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Marro and R. Dickman, *Nonequilibrium Phase Transitions in Lattice Models* (Cambridge UP, Cambridge, 1999).
- [2] G. Odor, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **76**, 663 (2004).
- [3] J. Cardy, *Scaling and Renormalization in Statistical Physics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996).
- [4] F. Schloegl, *Z. Phys.* **253**, 147 (1972).
- [5] P. Grassberger, *Z. Phys. B Cond. Matt.* **47**, 365 (1982).
- [6] J.P. Boon, D. Dab, R. Kapral, and A. Lawniczak, *Phys. Rep.* **273**, 55 (1996).
- [7] S. Prakash and G. Nicolis, *J. Stat. Phys.* **86**, 1289 (1997).
- [8] R. Durrett, *SIAM Rev.* **41**, 677 (1999).
- [9] D.-J. Liu, X. Guo, and J.W. Evans, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 050601 (2007).
- [10] X. Guo, J.W. Evans, and D.-J. Liu, *Physica A* **387**, 177 (2008).
- Sites in the last two loss terms in eq. (17) are mislabeled. One should replace i with $i-1$.
- [11] X. Guo, D.-J. Liu, and J.W. Evans, *J. Chem. Phys.* **130**, 074106 (2009).
- [12] X. Guo, Y. de Decker, and J.W. Evans, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 021121 (2010).
- [13] C.-J. Wang, X. Guo, D.-J. Liu, and J.W. Evans, *J. Stat. Phys.* **144**, 1308 (2011).
- [14] A.L. Toom in *Multicomponent Random Systems*, edited by R.L. Dobrushin and Y.G. Sinai (Dekker, New York, 1980).
- [15] C.H. Bennett and G. Grinstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 657 (1985).
- [16] R.S. MacKay, *Nonlinearity* **21**, T273 (2008).
- [17] R.M. Ziff, E. Gulari, and Y. Barshad, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 2553 (1986).
- [18] P. Fischer and U.M. Titulaer, *Surf. Sci.* **221**, 409 (1989).
- [19] J.W. Evans and T.R. Ray, *Phys. Rev. E* **50**, 4302 (1994).
- [20] R. H. Goodman, D. S. Graff, L. M. Sander, P. Leroux-Hugon, and E. Clément, *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, 5904 (1995).
- [21] Y. De Decker, G.A. Tsekouras, A. Provata, Th. Erneux, and G. Nicolis, *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 036203 (2004).
- [22] For systems with finite linear size, L , an alternative criterion is to balance rates for transitions between states due to homogeneous fluctuations. See G. Nicolis and J.W. Turner, *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* **316**, 251 (1979), and J. Ross, K.L.C. Hunt, and M.O. Vlad, *J. Phys. Chem. C* **106**, 10951 (2002). Only for $L \gg L_c$ (characteristic interface width) does this criterion match stationary interfaces.
- [23] R.M. Ziff and B.J. Brosilow, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 4630 (1992).
- [24] J.W. Evans, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **65**, 1281 (1993).
- [25] KMC estimates for $p_{eq}(110\dots)$ of 0.1390, 0.1576 and 0.1682 compare with pair estimates of 0.1425, 0.1594 and 0.1694 for $d=3, 4$ and 5 , respectively. KMC estimates for $p_{eq}(1110\dots)$ of 0.1581 and 0.1688 compare with pair estimates of 0.1599 and 0.1700 for $d=4$ and 5 , respectively.
- [26] J.P. Keener, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **47**, 556 (1987).
- [27] S.-N. Chow, J. Mallet-Paret, and E. S. Van Vleck, *Int. J. Bifurc. Chaos* **6**, 1605 (1996).
- [27] G. Fath, *Physica D* **116**, 176 (1998).

	Vertical 1000...	$S_{i_1+i_2}$	S_{i_1} $+i_2+\dots+i_d$	Diagonal 11000...	$S(i_1+i_2)$ $+i_3+\dots+i_d$	Skew 11100..	$S(i_1+i_2+i_3)$ $+i_4+\dots+i_d$	Hyperskew 111...
$d=2$	0.2071068	0.20505						0.2113765
$d=3$	0.21038	0.20602	0.20605	0.21023 -0.21037	0.21030			0.2113765
$d=4$	0.21514	0.20720	0.20732	0.20949- 0.21027	0.20990	0.21093	0.21092	0.2113765
$d=5$	0.21953	0.20782- 0.20829	0.20834	0.20820- 0.21099	0.20974	0.21060- 0.21075	0.21068	0.2113765
$d=6$	0.22312	0.20717- 0.20974	0.20906	0.20583- 0.21246	0.20971	0.21024- 0.21081	0.21053	0.2113765
$d=7$	0.22600	0.20468- 0.21175	0.20957	0.20222- 0.21437	0.20977	0.20959- 0.21120	0.21045	0.2113765
$d=10$	0.23188	0.18816- 0.21845	0.21039	0.18559- 0.22035	0.21015	0.20496- 0.21414	0.21039	0.2113765
$d=100$	0.24774	0.03235- 0.24558	0.211365	0.03234- 0.24566	0.21135	0.04977- 0.24370	0.21134	0.2113765
$d=1000$	0.24976	0.00339- 0.24952	0.2113764	0.00340- 0.24952	0.2113763	0.00531- 0.24929	0.2113765	0.2113765
$d=\infty$	0-0.25	0-0.25		0-0.25		0-0.25		0.2113765

Table II: MF results for stationary points $p=p_{eq}$ or for regimes of propagation failure for planar interfaces separating populated and vacuum states.

	Vertical 100...	$S_{i_1+i_2}$	S_{i_1} $+i_2+\dots+i_d$	Diagonal 11000...	$S(i_1+i_2)$ $+i_3+\dots+i_d$	Skew 11100...	$S(i_1+i_2+i_3)$ $+i_4+\dots+i_d$	Hyperskew 111...
$d=2$	0.106016	0.105596		0.108312				0.108312
$d=3$	0.14123	0.13989	0.13989	0.14251	0.14251			0.14295
$d=4$	0.16084	0.15714	0.15716	0.15930- 0.15941	0.15936	0.15990	0.15990	0.16014
$d=5$	0.17471	0.16784	0.16794	0.16902- 0.16972	0.16939	0.17002	0.17001	0.17042
$d=6$	0.18500	0.17476- 0.17533	0.17527	0.17460- 0.17726	0.17608	0.17664- 0.17677	0.17671	0.17726
$d=7$	0.19288	0.17860- 0.18138	0.18055	0.17713- 0.18349	0.18090	0.18120- 0.18175	0.18149	0.18215
$d=10$	0.20814	0.17446- 0.19593	0.19003	0.17204- 0.19769	0.18985	0.18683- 0.19256	0.19012	0.19093
$d=100$	0.24525	0.03219- 0.24310	0.20932	0.03218- 0.24318	0.20931	0.04952- 0.24124	0.20930	0.20933
$d=1000$	0.24951	0.00339- 0.24926	0.21117	0.00339- 0.24927	0.21117	0.00539- 0.24904	0.21117	0.21117
$d=\infty$	0-0.25	0-0.25		0-0.25		0-0.25		0.2113765

Table III: Pair approximation results for stationary points $p=p_{eq}$ or for regimes of propagation failure for planar interfaces separating populated and vacuum states. Results shown for $S=1024$.