

# THE INHOMOGENEOUS $t$ -PUSHTASEP AND MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS AT $q = 1$

ARVIND AYYER, JAMES MARTIN, LAUREN WILLIAMS

ABSTRACT. We study a multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP system on a finite ring of  $n$  sites with site-dependent rates  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be a partition whose parts represent the species of the  $n$  particles on the ring. We show that for each composition  $\eta$  obtained by permuting the parts of  $\lambda$ , the stationary probability of being in state  $\eta$  is proportional to the ASEP polynomial  $F_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$  at  $q = 1$ ; the normalizing constant (or partition function) is the Macdonald polynomial  $P_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$  at  $q = 1$ . Our approach involves new relations between the families of ASEP polynomials and of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 1$ . We also use *multiline diagrams*, showing that a single jump of the PushTASEP system is closely related to the operation of moving from one line to the next in a multiline diagram. We derive symmetry properties for the system under permutation of its jump rates, as well as a formula for the current of a single-species system.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Basic properties of the $t$ -PushTASEP	7
3.	Background on Macdonald and ASEP polynomials	10
4.	Nonsymmetric Macdonald and ASEP polynomials at $q = 1$	14
5.	Multiline diagrams	19
6.	Proof of Theorem 1.1	23
7.	Formulas for density and currents	25
	References	28

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Multispecies versions of the *asymmetric simple exclusion process* (ASEP) and its relatives have been the subject of intense study in recent years, from diverse perspectives in physics, probability, algebra, and combinatorics. The connection between the multispecies ASEP on a ring and Macdonald polynomials was developed by Cantini, de Gier and Wheeler [CdGW15] and Chen, de Gier and Wheeler [CdGW20]. In these works, they define the family of *ASEP polynomials*, which are polynomials in variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  whose coefficients are rational functions in  $q$  and  $t$ . When specialised to  $q = 1$  and  $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$ , the ASEP polynomials describe the stationary distribution of a multispecies ASEP on a ring

---

*Date:* March 15, 2024.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A10, 05A19, 05A05, 05E05, 05E10, 33D52, 60J10, 60K35.

*Key words and phrases.* Macdonald polynomials, PushTASEP, ASEP polynomials, exclusion process, multiline diagram, permuted basement Macdonald polynomials, nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials.

with  $n$  sites. The ASEP polynomials are in fact special cases of the *permuted-basement Macdonald polynomials* introduced in [Fer11], as shown in [CMW22].

A construction of the stationary distribution of the multispecies ASEP in terms of *multiline diagrams* was given in [Mar20], building on the construction for the TASEP by Ferrari and Martin [FM07] and the matrix product representation for the ASEP given by Prohac, Evans and Mallick [PEM09]. Corteel, Mandelshtam and Williams [CMW22] then showed that a generalisation of the multiline diagrams from [Mar20] could be used to give a combinatorial formula for the ASEP polynomials with general  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ ,  $q$  and  $t$ .

The description of the mASEP stationary distribution in terms of ASEP polynomials with identical  $x_i$  invites the question: is there a natural multitype particle system, with inhomogeneous (i.e. site-dependent) jump rates, whose stationary probabilities are given by the ASEP polynomials with general  $x_i$ ? An inhomogeneous version of the ASEP itself is not believed to have nice algebraic properties. The main result of this article is that a related process, the *multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP with inhomogeneous rates*, does indeed have its stationary distribution given by the ASEP polynomials with general  $x_i$  – see Theorem 1.1.

Our approach involves new relations between the families of ASEP polynomials and of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 1$ , building on the work of Alexandersson and Sawhney [AS19]. Among other results, we show that certain ratios of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials become symmetric in the particular case  $q = 1$ . We also use the multiline diagram construction – a single jump of the PushTASEP system is closely related to the operation moving from one line to the next in a multiline diagram.

Systems related to the multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP have previously appeared in various contexts. The multispecies system in the case  $t = 0$  with homogenous rates was already studied by Ferrari and Martin [FM06], under the name of *discrete-space Hammersley-Aldous-Diaconis process* (or long-range exclusion process [Spi70]). A related process in discrete time (dubbed the “frog model”) defined on the ring was recently used by Bukh and Cox to study problems involving the longest common subsequence between a periodic word and a word with i.i.d. uniform entries. Moving to the inhomogeneous case, a single-type PushTASEP in the case  $t = 0$  on the half-line was considered by Petrov [Pet20], and the multi-type  $t > 0$  case on a finite interval has been investigated by Borodin and Wheeler [BW22, Section 12.5] in the context of the coloured stochastic six-vertex model

Most recently, in independent work, Aggarwal, Nicoletti and Petrov [ANP23] obtain closely related results. They write the stationary distribution of the multitype inhomogeneous PushTASEP (and other related models including the mASEP and the multi-type TAZRP) in terms of vertex models, which are closely related to multiline diagrams and to matrix product formulae. Their approach is entirely different to ours, making extensive use of Yang-Baxter interchange relations.

In a companion paper [AM23], two of the authors focus on the particular case  $t = 0$ . We employ more direct probabilistic methods involving time-reversal and coupling to connect the stationary distribution to multiline diagrams, and we describe symmetry properties under permutation of the rates, which apply to evolutions of the system out of equilibrium as well as to the stationary distribution.

**1.1. Definition of the  $t$ -PushTASEP.** In this paper we study the inhomogeneous  $t$ -PushTASEP on a ring with  $n$  sites, which generalizes the PushTASEP studied in [AM23].

A configuration of the system is a vector (or *composition*)  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  whose entries are non-negative integers. The entry  $\eta_j$  denotes the species of the particle at site  $j$ . If two

particles have species  $i_1$  and  $i_2$  with  $i_1 > i_2$ , we say that the particle of species  $i_1$  is *stronger* and the particle of species  $i_2$  is *weaker*. We often refer to particles of species 0 as *holes* or *vacancies*.

The  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics will preserve the number of particles of each species, so we may take the state-space of the system to be  $S_\lambda = S_n(\lambda)$ , the set of compositions which are permutations of some given *partition*  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  with  $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0$ . We can describe such a partition by its vector of types  $\mathbf{m} = (m_0, m_1, \dots, m_s)$ , where  $m_i = \#\{j : \lambda_j = i\}$  gives the number of particles of species  $i$ , and where  $s$  is the largest species in the system. Sometimes we denote our partition by  $\lambda = \langle s^{m_s}, \dots, 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle$ . We have  $\sum_{i=0}^s m_i = n$ . We will always require that  $m_0 \geq 1$ , i.e. that the system has at least one vacancy. The partition  $\lambda$  is called the *content* of the system.

The system has positive real parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . We first define the transitions of the PushTASEP, i.e. the case  $t = 0$ . For each site  $j$ , there is an exponential clock which rings with rate  $1/x_j$ . The effect of a bell ringing at site  $j$  is as follows. If site  $j$  contains a vacancy then nothing changes. If instead site  $j$  contains a particle of species  $r_0 > 0$ , this particle becomes “active”. It moves clockwise around the ring until it finds a site  $j_1$  with a particle of smaller species  $r_1 < r_0$ . The active particle now settles at site  $j_1$ . If in fact  $r_1 = 0$  (i.e. the site  $j_1$  was previously vacant) then the procedure stops; otherwise the particle of label  $r_1$  becomes active and itself starts to move clockwise around the ring looking for a site with a particle of smaller species  $r_2 < r_1$ . Such a procedure continues until a vacancy is found. All the transitions occur simultaneously and the original site  $j$  becomes vacant at the end of the transition.

The  $t$ -PushTASEP is a generalization of the PushTASEP, with an additional parameter  $t$  which for convenience we take to be in  $[0, 1)$  (though it is easy to extend to  $t \geq 1$ ). Again each site  $j$  has a bell ringing at rate  $1/x_j$ , and we describe the effect of such a bell. If site  $j$  is vacant then nothing changes. Otherwise, as above, the particle of type  $r_0 > 0$  at site  $j$  becomes “active” and will move to the location of a weaker particle. However, for  $t > 0$  the move is not deterministic. Suppose there are  $m$  particles in the system whose species is less than  $r_0$  (including vacancies). Recall that  $[m]_t = 1 + t + \dots + t^{m-1} = \frac{1-t^m}{1-t}$  denotes the  $t$ -analogue of the integer  $m$ . Then the particle at site  $j$  will travel clockwise around the ring, and with probability  $t^{k-1}/[m]_t$ , it will move to the location of the  $k$ 'th of these lower-species particles. If this location is not vacant, then the particle there becomes active, and chooses a weaker particle to displace in the same way. The procedure continues until a vacancy is chosen. All these transitions occur simultaneously. Again the site  $j$  itself always becomes vacant at the end of the transition.

We may interpret the procedure above by saying that the active particle moves clockwise around the ring looking for a weaker particle to displace, but rejects each option with probability  $t$ . See Section 4.1 for an equivalent definition along these lines.

See Figure 1 for examples of transitions from a given configuration on a ring of size 8. The state diagram for the system defined by  $\lambda = (2, 1, 0)$ , i.e.  $\mathbf{m} = (1, 1, 1)$ , is given in Figure 2.

**1.2. Main results.** Our main result is a description of the stationary distribution of a  $t$ -PushTASEP system in terms of the *ASEP polynomials*, cf. Definition 3.9.

**Theorem 1.1.** *In the multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP with content  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  and parameters  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , the stationary probability of a configuration  $\eta \in S_\lambda$  is given*

Configuration	Rate
$(2, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{3}, 2, 4, 1, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{1}{[4]_t}$
$(2, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{1}, \underline{3}, 4, \underline{2}, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{t}{[4]_t} \frac{1}{[2]_t}$
$(2, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{2}, \underline{3}, 4, 1, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{t}{[4]_t} \frac{t}{[2]_t}$
$(2, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{1}, 2, 4, \underline{3}, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{t^2}{[4]_t}$
$(\underline{3}, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{2}, 2, 4, 1, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{t^3}{[4]_t} \frac{1}{[2]_t}$
$(\underline{3}, 4, \underline{0}, \underline{1}, 2, 4, \underline{2}, 3)$	$\frac{1}{x_3} \frac{t^3}{[4]_t} \frac{t}{[2]_t}$

FIGURE 1. Let  $\eta = (2, 4, 3, 0, 2, 4, 1, 3)$  with  $n = 8$  and  $s = 4$ . If the bell rings at site 3, some particles will move – the table shows the possible destination configurations, along with the rate of the jump to each one. In each case the particles which moved are underlined. The transition corresponding to the 4th line of the table is illustrated on the right. Site 1 is shown at the top of the ring, and site 3 where the bell rings is on the extreme right.

by

$$\pi_\lambda(\eta) = \frac{F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)},$$

where  $F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  is the ASEP polynomial from Definition 3.9 associated to  $\eta$ , and  $P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  is the Macdonald polynomial associated to  $\lambda$ .

**Example 1.2.** The steady state probabilities for the example from Figure 2 are proportional to the ASEP polynomials  $F_\eta$  at  $q = 1$ , which are given in the following table. (Example 3.12 shows the same ASEP polynomials but for general  $q$ .) The sum of these polynomials is the Macdonald polynomial

$$P_{(2,1,0)}(x_1, x_2, x_3; 1, t) = (x_1 + x_2 + x_3)(x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3),$$



A combinatorial formula for the ASEP polynomials in terms of multiline diagrams was given in [CMW22]. Combining this with Theorem 1.1, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Consider a multiline diagram as defined in [CMW22] of type  $\lambda$ , with parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_n, t$  and  $q = 1$ . The distribution of the bottom line of the diagram is the same as the stationary distribution of the  $t$ -PushTASEP with content  $\lambda$ .*

We will define multiline diagrams in Section 5.2 for the special case where  $\lambda$  has all parts distinct. See [CMW22] for the general definition.

From Theorem 1.1, we can also derive a symmetry property for the  $t$ -PushTASEP under permutation of the jump-rate parameters  $x_i$ . If  $O$  is an observable (an event or a random variable), write  $\langle O \rangle$  for its probability or expectation in the stationary distribution.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Fix  $k < n$  and let  $O$  be any observable in the stationary distribution of multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP which depends only on the configuration in sites  $1, 2, \dots, k$ . Then  $\langle O \rangle$  is symmetric in the parameters  $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ .*

Note that in [AM23], a symmetry result which is stronger than Theorem 1.4 is proved in the case  $t = 0$ . That result extends also to observables depending on the *path* of the process (not just its state at a single time), and also to processes out of equilibrium (if started from suitable initial states). Whether this stronger symmetry property also holds for  $t > 0$  is an interesting open question (see e.g. [AMM22] for related discussions in the case of the totally asymmetric zero-range process).

We now consider other important quantities for the  $t$ -PushTASEP in its stationary distribution. Two natural such quantities are the density of a particular species, which is the probability of seeing a particle of that species at some site, and the current, which is the number of particles of a given species crossing an edge per unit time.

We will show in Corollary 7.1 that the formulas for the density are independent of  $t$ , and hence the same as that for  $t = 0$  given in [AM23]. The case of the current is much more interesting. It turns out that even when we have only a single species, the formula is nontrivial. We will prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.5.** *The current between two adjacent sites (say sites  $n$  and  $1$ ) in the stationary distribution of the single species  $t$ -PushTASEP on  $S_{\langle 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle}$  is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} J_{m_0, m_1} &= \frac{1 + 2t + 3t^2 + \dots + m_0 t^{m_0-1}}{1 + t + \dots + t^{m_0-1}} \cdot \frac{e_{m_1-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{e_{m_1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \\ &= \frac{\frac{d}{dt}(1 + t + t^2 + \dots + t^{m_0})}{1 + t + \dots + t^{m_0-1}} \cdot \frac{e_{m_1-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{e_{m_1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)}, \end{aligned}$$

The  $t = 0$  case of this result was proved in [AM23] using a coloring argument. We will prove the result in Section 7. Generalizing the formula for the current to the multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP seems considerably harder, and in Section 7 we explain why the coloring approach does not work in that case.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss some basic properties of the  $t$ -PushTASEP, including an important recoloring property. In Section 3 we provide background on nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials, ASEP polynomials, (symmetric) Macdonald polynomials, and permuted basement Macdonald polynomials. In Section 4 we prove some properties of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials and ASEP polynomials at the specialization  $q = 1$ , in particular Theorem 4.18, which will be a main ingredient in our

proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 5 we define multiline diagrams and explain their relation to the  $t$ -PushTASEP. In Section 6 we prove our main result, Theorem 1.1. We end the paper with the formulas for the density and the current in stationarity in Section 7.

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Per Alexandersson, Gidi Amir, Luigi Cantini, Pablo Ferrari, Jan de Gier, Svante Linusson, Leo Petrov, and Michael Wheeler for helpful discussions. We especially thank Omer Angel for valuable discussions while this project was in its formative stages. AA acknowledges support from the DST FIST program - 2021 [TPN - 700661]. and by SERB Core grant CRG/2021/001592. LW is supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. DMS-2152991. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

## 2. BASIC PROPERTIES OF THE $t$ -PUSHTASEP

In this section we discuss some basic properties of the  $t$ -PushTASEP system which we will rely on in the later analysis.

**2.1. Projections and couplings.** The multispecies dynamics defined above have an important “recolouring” property. If we relabel the particles while (weakly) preserving the order of the labels, the resulting system still follows  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics. This allows us to project from a “finer” multispecies system to a “coarser” one, by merging groups of two or more adjacent species into one.

As an extreme case, we can consider all particles of species  $i, \dots, s$  as “particles” (with the new label 1) and all particles of species  $1, \dots, i - 1$  as vacancies (with the new label 0), to obtain a single-species process with a total of  $a_i := m_i + \dots + m_s$  particles and  $n - a_i$  vacancies. Considering such projections for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ , we can identify the multispecies process as a coupling of  $s$  single-species processes. This is a version of the *basic coupling* [Lig85, Chapter VIII, Section 2] (under which the bells ring at the same sites at the same types in all the coupled single-species systems).

To state the above projection (or lumping) properties precisely, we make the following definition.

**Definition 2.1.** We say that a function  $\phi$  from  $\mathbb{N}$  to  $\mathbb{N}$  is *weakly order-preserving* if  $\phi(i) \leq \phi(j)$  whenever  $i \leq j$ . For such a function  $\phi$  and a composition  $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n)$ , define  $\phi(\rho)$  componentwise by  $\phi(\rho) = (\phi(\rho_1), \dots, \phi(\rho_n))$ .

For example, the function  $\phi$  which sends elements of  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$  to 2, elements of  $\{5, 6\}$  to 4, and is the identity otherwise, is a weakly order-preserving function. Note that if  $\rho$  is a partition then so is  $\phi(\rho)$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{N} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$  be a weakly order-preserving function with  $\phi(0) = 0$ . Consider a multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP process with content given by the partition  $\lambda$ . Via the map  $\phi$ , this process projects to a multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP with content  $\mu$ , where  $\mu = \phi(\lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* Recall the description of the  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics from Section 1.1. Consider an active particle of species  $r$ , in a system with  $m$  particles weaker than  $r$  (including vacancies). For  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , the particle moves to the  $k$ th out of the  $m$  locations containing such a weaker particle (considered in order clockwise from its current location) with probability

$\frac{t^{k-1}}{1+t+\dots+t^{m-1}}$  – it displaces the particle currently occupying that site, which itself becomes active.

We may alternatively describe the procedure as follows. The particle moves clockwise around the ring, and each time it passes a site with a weaker particle, it settles at that site with probability  $1 - t$ , and continues moving with probability  $t$ . If it passes the  $m$ th such site, then it continues cyclically around the ring, with the  $(m + 1)$ st option it considers being the same as the first, and so on. Hence for  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , it chooses the  $k$ th available option with probability

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - t)(t^{k-1} + t^{k-1+m} + t^{k-1+2m} + \dots) &= (1 - t)t^{k-1}(1 + t^m + t^{2m} + \dots) \\ &= \frac{t^{k-1}}{1 + t + \dots + t^{m-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

as in our original description of the procedure.

We make use of one further freedom – when the active particle passes a site containing a particle with the same label, it makes no difference whether we allow the active particle to displace its “twin” or not.

This description allows us to maintain a coupling between a system of particles  $(\eta(u), u \geq 0)$  with content  $\lambda$  and a system of particles  $(\zeta(u), u \geq 0)$  with content  $\mu$ , such that at all times  $u \geq 0$ ,  $\zeta(u) = \phi(\eta(u))$ , i.e.  $\zeta_j(u) = \phi(\eta_j(u))$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . The bells ring at the same time in both systems. When a bell rings at some site in the  $\lambda$ -system currently in configuration  $\eta$ , we observe some collection of transitions of particles according to the description above, with each active particle moving clockwise and settling on an available location with probability  $1 - t$ . Under the coupling, if a particle from some site  $j$  moves to some new site  $j'$  in the  $\lambda$ -system, exactly the same will occur in the  $\mu$ -system. Since  $\eta(j) > \eta(j')$  and  $\phi$  is weakly order-preserving, we have that  $\phi(\eta(j)) \geq \phi(\eta(j'))$ , and the same transition is possible in the  $\mu$ -system as required.

Note that this can also be interpreted as a commutation property. Let  $\eta \in S_\lambda$  be a configuration of the  $\lambda$ -system, and let  $j$  be any site. Consider the follow two operations to obtain  $\zeta \in S_\mu$ : (a) generate a configuration  $\eta'$  resulting from the ring of a bell at site  $j$ , and then recolour  $\eta'$  by  $\phi$  to obtain a state  $\zeta = \phi(\eta')$ ; (b) recolour  $\eta$  to give  $\zeta' = \phi(\eta)$ , and then generate a configuration  $\zeta$  from  $\zeta'$  resulting from the ring of a bell at site  $j$ . The coupling above shows that (a) and (b) lead to the same distribution of  $\zeta \in S_\mu$ . This commutation gives the required projection property.  $\square$

We can then immediately deduce a corresponding recolouring property for the stationary distributions:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{N} \mapsto \mathbb{N}$  be a weakly order-preserving function with  $\phi(0) = 0$ , and suppose we have partitions  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  with  $\phi(\lambda) = \mu$ . Let  $\pi_{(\lambda)} = (\pi_{(\lambda)}(\eta), \eta \in S_\lambda)$  and  $\pi_{(\mu)} = (\pi_{(\mu)}(\eta), \eta \in S_\mu)$  denote the stationary distributions of the  $t$ -PushTASEP with content  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ . Then for all  $\eta \in S_\mu$ ,*

$$(2.1) \quad \pi_{(\mu)}(\eta) = \sum_{\zeta \in S_\lambda: \phi(\zeta) = \eta} \pi_{(\lambda)}(\zeta).$$

**2.2. Transition rates.** For completeness and later use, we give here a direct description of the transition rates for the  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics. Let  $\lambda$  be a partition, and as above let  $m_i$  be the number of entries  $i$  in  $\lambda$ .

Let  $\eta, \eta' \in S_\lambda$ . It follows from the description in Section 1.1 that a bell at  $j$  can cause a transition from the configuration  $\eta$  to the configuration  $\eta'$  precisely if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $j$  is the unique site which is vacant in  $\eta'$  and not vacant in  $\eta$ . For every other site  $i$ ,  $\eta'(i) \geq \eta(i)$ .
- For each type  $h > 0$  with  $m_h > 0$ , either:
  - (1) the sites occupied by species  $h$  are the same in  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$ ; or,
  - (2) There exists exactly one site  $j(h)$  such that  $\eta_{j(h)} = h$  and  $\eta'_{j(h)} \neq h$ . It follows that there also exists exactly one site  $j'(h)$  such that  $\eta'_{j'(h)} = h$  and  $\eta_{j'(h)} \neq h$ .

Define  $w_{\eta, \eta'}(h)$  for each  $h$  as follows. If case (1) holds then  $w_{\eta, \eta'}(h) = 1$ . If case (2) holds then let  $K_h$  be the number of entries of  $\lambda$  smaller than  $h$  (including zeros). Let  $\ell_h$  be the number of sites in the cyclic interval  $(j(h), j'(h))$ , excluding endpoints, with value smaller than  $h$  in  $\eta'$ . Let

$$w_{\eta, \eta'}(h) = \frac{t^{\ell_h}}{1 + t + \dots + t^{K_h - 1}}.$$

Suppose the system is in state  $\eta$ . When a bell rings at  $j$ , a jump occurs to  $\eta'$  with probability

$$(2.2) \quad \prod_{h > 0: m_h > 0} w_{\eta, \eta'}(h).$$

(The species  $h$  for which case (2) holds above are precisely those for which some particle of species  $h$  becomes “active” during the transition, in the sense of Section 1.1.) The transition rate from  $\eta$  to  $\eta'$  is therefore

$$\frac{1}{x_j} \prod_{h > 0: m_h > 0} w_{\eta, \eta'}(h).$$

**2.3. Single-species stationary distributions.** In the case that we have only one species of particle, it turns out that the stationary distribution is independent of  $t$ . It thus matches the distribution when  $t = 0$  given in [AM23].

**Proposition 2.4.** *Let  $\lambda = \langle 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle$  where  $m_1 + m_0 = n$ , and define*

$$(2.3) \quad \pi(\eta) := \frac{1}{e_{m_1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ \eta_i=1}}^n x_i.$$

*Then the stationary probability of  $\eta \in S_\lambda$  for the  $t$ -PushTASEP is  $\pi(\eta)$ .*

*Proof.* Since the  $t$ -PushTASEP is irreducible, it suffices to verify the global balance equations. The total weight of outgoing transitions from the configuration  $\eta$  which involve a particle at site  $j$  is  $\pi(\eta)/x_j$ , since the particle at site  $j$  makes a transition to some vacancy with rate  $1/x_j$ .

As for the incoming rate to  $\eta$ , note that a configuration  $\tau$  makes a transition to  $\eta$  if there exist a pair of positions  $j \neq k$  such that  $\eta_j = 1$ ,  $\eta_k = 0$ ,  $\tau_j = 0$ , and  $\tau_k = 1$ , and  $\eta$  and  $\tau$  agree outside of positions  $j$  and  $k$ . Then  $\pi(\eta)/\pi(\tau) = x_j/x_k$ . If there are  $a$  vacancies strictly between positions  $k$  and  $j$  (traveling in the clockwise direction starting at  $k$ ), then the weight of the transition from  $\tau$  to  $\eta$  is  $\pi(\tau) \cdot \frac{1}{x_k} \cdot \frac{t^a}{[m_0]_t} = \pi(\eta) \cdot \frac{1}{x_j} \cdot \frac{t^a}{[m_0]_t}$ . But now if we fix  $j$  and sum over all possible  $k$  (and corresponding  $\tau$ ), the weight of all these transitions to  $\eta$  will be  $\pi(\eta) \cdot \frac{1}{x_j}$ . This is exactly the same as the total weight of outgoing transitions from

$\eta$  involving the particle at site  $j$ , as argued above. Summing over all possible locations of particles completes the proof.  $\square$

Proposition 2.4 will be useful when we discuss the generation of multiline diagrams in Section 5.2. We will also use this result to analyze the density of particles in Section 7.

### 3. BACKGROUND ON MACDONALD AND ASEP POLYNOMIALS

In this section we define nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials, ASEP polynomials, and (symmetric) Macdonald polynomials. We also mention some relations with permuted basement Macdonald polynomials. All of the above polynomials are elements of the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  in variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , with coefficients in  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)$ .

**3.1. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials.** Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial can be defined as eigenfunctions of the  $q$ -Dunkl or Cherednik operators. We will mostly follow the notation of [CMW22].

For  $f := f(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t) \in \mathbb{R}$ , we define the operators  $s_i$  and  $L_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  as

$$s_i(f) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, x_i, x_{i+2}, \dots, x_n)$$

and

$$L_i(f) = \frac{tx_i - x_{i+1}}{x_i - x_{i+1}} (f - s_i(f)).$$

Using these, we define operators  $T_i$  and  $T_i^{-1}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , as

$$(3.1) \quad T_i(f) = tf - L_i(f), \quad T_i^{-1}(f) = t^{-1}f - t^{-1}L_i(f).$$

These operators satisfy the Hecke algebra relations,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} (T_i - t)(T_i + 1) &= 0, & T_i T_{i+1} T_i &= T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}, \\ T_i T_j &= T_j T_i & \text{if } |i - j| &\geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the shift operator  $\omega$  as

$$(3.3) \quad (\omega f)(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(qx_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

Using the operators  $T_i, T_i^{-1}$  and  $\omega$  we define the Cherednik-Dunkl operators  $Y_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  by

$$Y_i = t^{-(i-1)} T_i^{-1} \dots T_{n-1}^{-1} \omega T_1 \dots T_{i-1}.$$

One can show that these  $Y_i$ 's mutually commute and can therefore be simultaneously diagonalized.

**Remark 3.1.** Let  $h, f \in \mathbb{Q}(q, t)[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  such that  $h$  is symmetric in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . It follows from the definition of the operator  $T_i$  that  $T_i(hf) = hT_i(f)$  for all  $i$ .

A (weak) composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  is a tuple of nonnegative integers. Let

$$(3.4) \quad y_i(\eta; q, t) = q^{\eta_i} t^{-|\{j > i \mid \eta_j \geq \eta_i\}| - |\{j < i \mid \eta_j > \eta_i\}|}.$$

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathcal{P}_n$  denote the set of partitions of  $n$ . The dominance order on partitions, denoted  $\leq$ , is a partial order on the partitions in  $\mathcal{P}_n$  with fixed size, defined as follows. We say that  $\lambda \leq \mu$  if  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_i \leq \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

To extend the dominance order to an order on compositions  $\eta$ , let  $\eta^+$  be the partition obtained by ordering the parts of  $\eta$  in weakly decreasing order. We write  $\eta \leq \nu$  for compositions  $\eta$  and  $\nu$  if either  $\eta^+ \leq \nu^+$ , or  $\eta^+ = \nu^+$  and  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_i \leq \nu_1 + \dots + \nu_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Note that this partial order is not the natural generalization of the dominance order to compositions.

**Definition 3.3.** [Che95, Mar99] The *nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial*  $E_\eta = E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  associated to a composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  is the polynomial uniquely defined by the conditions

- (1)  $E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  has the monomial expansion

$$E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = \sum_{\zeta \leq \eta} v_{\eta, \zeta}(q, t) \mathbf{x}^\zeta,$$

where  $\mathbf{x}^\zeta$  is shorthand for  $x_1^{\zeta_1} \cdots x_n^{\zeta_n}$ , and  $v_{\zeta, \zeta} = 1$ .

- (2)  $Y_i E_\eta = y_i(\eta; q, t) E_\eta$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and all compositions  $\eta$ .

The existence of these polynomials is highly nontrivial.

**Remark 3.4.** It follows from (3.4) that two distinct nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials  $E_\eta$  and  $E_\tau$  have distinct tuples of eigenvalues  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  as functions of  $q$  and  $t$ . However, they may not be distinct as functions of  $t$  when we set  $q = 1$ ; then for example,  $E_{210}$ ,  $E_{211}$ , and  $E_{100}$  all have the same eigenvalues.

However, if  $\eta$  and  $\tau$  are permutations of the same partition then it still does hold that the tuples of their eigenvalues remain distinct under the specialisation  $q = 1$ .

**Example 3.5.** Consider all permutations of the partition  $(2, 1, 0)$  as compositions. The nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials for each of them, along with their eigenvalues, are as follows:

$\eta$	$E_\eta(x_1, x_2, x_3)$	$y_1(\eta)$	$y_2(\eta)$	$y_3(\eta)$
$(0, 1, 2)$	$\frac{(t-1)(q^2t^3-2qt^2+t^2-t+1)}{(qt-1)^3(qt+1)}x_1^2x_2 + \frac{(t-1)^2}{(qt-1)^2}(x_1x_2^2 + x_1^2x_3) + x_2x_3^2 + \frac{(t-1)(q^3t^3+2q^2t^3-3q^2t^2-2qt+q-t+2)}{(qt-1)^3(qt+1)}x_1x_2x_3 + \frac{1-t}{1-qt}(x_2^2x_3 + x_1x_3^2)$	$t^{-2}$	$qt^{-1}$	$q^2$
$(0, 2, 1)$	$\frac{(t-1)^2}{(qt-1)^2(qt+1)}x_1^2x_2 + \frac{1-t}{1-qt}x_1x_2^2 + \frac{1-t}{1-q^2t^2}x_1^2x_3 + \frac{(t-1)(q^2t^2+qt-q-1)}{(qt-1)^2(qt+1)}x_1x_2x_3 + x_2^2x_3$	$t^{-2}$	$q^2$	$qt^{-1}$
$(1, 0, 2)$	$\frac{(t-1)^2}{(qt-1)^2(qt+1)}x_1^2x_2 + \frac{1-t}{1-q^2t^2}x_1x_2^2 + \frac{1-t}{1-qt}x_1^2x_3 + \frac{(t-1)(q^2t^2+qt-q-1)}{(qt-1)^2(qt+1)}x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_3^2$	$qt^{-1}$	$t^{-2}$	$q^2$
$(1, 2, 0)$	$\frac{1-t}{1-qt}x_1^2x_2 + x_1x_2^2 + \frac{q(1-t)}{1-qt}x_1x_2x_3$	$qt^{-1}$	$q^2$	$t^{-2}$
$(2, 0, 1)$	$\frac{1-t}{1-qt}x_1^2x_2 + x_1^2x_3 + \frac{q(1-t)}{1-qt}x_1x_2x_3$	$q^2$	$t^{-2}$	$qt^{-1}$
$(2, 1, 0)$	$x_1^2x_2 + \frac{q(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$	$q^2$	$qt^{-1}$	$t^{-2}$

**3.2. ASEP polynomials.** Cantini, de Gier and Wheeler [CdGW15] related Macdonald polynomials  $P_\lambda$  at  $x_i = 1$  and  $q = 1$  to the multispecies ASEP on a ring, via the notion of a  $qKZ$  family, which we now explain.

The following notion of  $qKZ$  family was introduced in [KT07], also explaining the relationship of such polynomials to nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. We use the conventions of [CdGW15, Section 1.3].

**Definition 3.6.** Fix a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ . We say that a family  $\{f_\eta\}_{\eta \in S_\lambda}$  of homogeneous degree  $|\lambda|$  polynomials in  $n$  variables  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , with coefficients which are rational functions of  $q$  and  $t$ , is a *qKZ family* if they satisfy

$$(3.5) \quad T_i f_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = f_{s_i \eta}(\mathbf{x}; q, t), \text{ when } \eta_i > \eta_{i+1},$$

$$(3.6) \quad T_i f_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = t f_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t), \text{ when } \eta_i = \eta_{i+1},$$

$$(3.7) \quad q^{\eta_n} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = f_{\eta_n, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n-1}}(qx_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; q, t).$$

We say that a family of polynomials is a *KZ family* if they satisfy the above relations at  $q = 1$ .

**Remark 3.7.** Note that (3.7) can be rephrased as

$$q^{\eta_n} f_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = (\omega f_{\eta_n, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n-1}})(\mathbf{x}; q, t).$$

**Remark 3.8.** Using the fact that  $T_i^2 = (t-1)T_i + t$ , together with (3.5), we see that any qKZ family also satisfies

$$(3.8) \quad T_i f_\eta = (t-1)f_\eta + t f_{s_i \eta} \text{ when } \eta_i < \eta_{i+1}.$$

The following polynomials were first introduced in [CdGW15]. They were subsequently shown to be generating functions for multiline queues in [CMW22], see Theorem 5.5. They were called *ASEP polynomials* by Chen, de Gier and Wheeler [CdGW20].

**Definition 3.9** (ASEP polynomials). Given a partition  $\lambda$ , the *ASEP polynomials*

$$\{F_\eta := F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t) \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$$

are the unique family of polynomials which are a qKZ family and such that  $F_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = E_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$ .

We can use the ASEP polynomials to define Macdonald polynomials. The fact that Definition 3.10 agrees with the original definition of Macdonald polynomials comes from [CdGW15, Lemma 1].

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $\lambda$  be a partition. We define the *Macdonald polynomial*  $P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  by

$$(3.9) \quad P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = \sum_{\eta} F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; q, t),$$

where the sum runs over all  $\eta \in S_\lambda$ , i.e. the permutations  $\eta$  of  $\lambda$ .

When we specialize the  $x_i$ 's and  $q$  to be 1, we obtain a relation between the ASEP polynomials and the multispecies ASEP.

**Proposition 3.11.** [CdGW15, Corollary 1] *Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be a partition. The steady state probability that the multispecies ASEP is in state  $\eta \in S_\lambda$  is*

$$\frac{F_\eta(1, \dots, 1; 1, t)}{P_\lambda(1, \dots, 1; 1, t)}.$$

Macdonald showed [Mac95, Section VI, Chapter 4] that

$$(3.10) \quad P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $\lambda'$  denotes the conjugate partition of  $\lambda$ , and  $e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{x})$  denotes the corresponding elementary symmetric polynomial.

Note that by (3.10),  $P_\lambda(1, \dots, 1; 1, t)$  is independent of  $t$ .

**Example 3.12.** Consider all permutations of the tuple  $(0, 1, 2)$  as compositions. The ASEP polynomials for each of them are as follows:

$\eta$	$F_\eta(x_1, x_2, x_3; q, t)$
$(0, 1, 2)$	$x_2x_3^2 + \frac{t(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$
$(0, 2, 1)$	$x_2^2x_3 + \frac{(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$
$(1, 0, 2)$	$x_1x_3^2 + \frac{(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$
$(1, 2, 0)$	$x_1x_2^2 + \frac{qt(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$
$(2, 0, 1)$	$x_1^2x_3 + \frac{qt(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$
$(2, 1, 0)$	$x_1^2x_2 + \frac{q(1-t)}{1-qt^2}x_1x_2x_3$

One can check that  $F_{(2,1,0)} = E_{(2,1,0)}$  from Example 3.5.

**Example 3.13.** The expansions of the Macdonald polynomials for partitions of size 3 in the variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  in terms of monomial symmetric functions  $m_\lambda = m_\lambda(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  are as follows:

$\lambda$	$P_\lambda(x_1, x_2, x_3; q, t)$
$(3, 0, 0)$	$m_{(3)} + \frac{(q^2+q+1)(t-1)}{q^2t-1}m_{(2,1)} + \frac{(q+1)(q^2+q+1)(t-1)^2}{(qt-1)(q^2t-1)}m_{(1,1,1)}$
$(2, 1, 0)$	$m_{(2,1)} + \frac{(t-1)(2qt+q+t+2)}{qt^2-1}m_{(1,1,1)}$
$(1, 1, 1)$	$m_{(1,1,1)}$

Note that the sum of the ASEP polynomials from Example 3.12 equals  $P_{(2,1,0)}$  as given above. It turns out that the expansion of the Macdonald polynomials is the same irrespective of the number of variables (as long as there are enough variables).

The following result will be useful in proving Theorem 1.4.

**Lemma 3.14.** [CMW22, Theorem 3.4 (18)] *Let  $\eta$  be a composition and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then  $F_\eta + F_{s_i\eta}$  is symmetric in  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$ .*

**3.3. Permuted basement Macdonald polynomials.** There is a more general class of polynomials that generalize both the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials and the ASEP polynomials. These polynomials are called *permuted basement Macdonald polynomials*  $E_\alpha^\sigma(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  (where  $\sigma \in S_n$  and  $\alpha$  is a composition with  $n$  parts); they were introduced by Ferreira in [Fer11] and further studied in [Ale19] and [AS19]. We do not need here the definition, but only the fact that they specialize to both the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials and the ASEP polynomials. In particular, the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial  $E_\eta$  is equal to  $E_{\text{rev}(\eta)}^{w_0}$ , where  $\text{rev}(\eta)$  denotes the reverse composition  $(\eta_n, \eta_{n-1}, \dots, \eta_1)$  of  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  and  $w_0$  denotes the longest permutation  $(n, \dots, 2, 1)$  in one-line notation. We also have the following.

**Proposition 3.15.** [CMW22, Proposition 4.1] *For  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , define  $\text{inc}(\eta)$  to be the sorting of the parts of  $\eta$  in increasing order. Then*

$$F_\eta = E_{\text{inc}(\eta)}^\sigma$$

where  $\sigma$  is the element of  $S_n$  with longest length such that

$$\eta_{\sigma(1)} \leq \eta_{\sigma(2)} \leq \dots \leq \eta_{\sigma(n)}.$$

4. NONSYMMETRIC MACDONALD AND ASEP POLYNOMIALS AT  $q = 1$ 

The main goal of this section is to prove Theorem 4.18, which will be a main ingredient in our proof of Theorem 1.1. Along the way we will prove various properties of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials and ASEP polynomials at the specialization  $q = 1$ .

**4.1. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 1$ .** In this section we show that certain ratios of nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 1$  are elementary symmetric polynomials, building on work of [AS19]. Our first main result is the following.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Consider a composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  such that its parts of sizes  $a$  and  $b$  (with  $a < b$ ) occur in increasing order from left to right in  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , and such that  $\eta$  has no parts of size  $h$  for any  $a < h < b$ . (In this case, we say that the classes  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent.) Let  $\hat{\eta}$  be the composition obtained from  $\eta$  by changing all  $a$ 's to  $b$ , or changing all  $b$ 's to  $a$ . Then at  $q = 1$ ,*

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{E_\eta}{E_{\hat{\eta}}} = \left( \frac{e_{\#\{i|\eta_i \geq b\}}}{e_{\#\{i|\hat{\eta}_i \geq b\}}} \right)^{b-a}.$$

**Example 4.2.** At  $q = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_{2515}}{E_{2212}} &= \left( \frac{e_2}{e_0} \right)^3, & \frac{E_{2515}}{E_{5515}} &= \left( \frac{e_2}{e_3} \right)^3, \\ \frac{E_{201}}{E_{200}} &= \left( \frac{e_2}{e_1} \right)^1, & \frac{E_{3311220}}{E_{3311110}} &= \left( \frac{e_4}{e_2} \right)^1. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 4.3.** *Some results from [AS19] will be useful to us. However, we have to be careful of conventions. Sage and [CMW22] have the same conventions, but those conventions are different from [AS19]; in particular, the compositions indexing Macdonald polynomials are reversed in these references. That is, the polynomial called  $E_{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m)}$  in [AS19] is the same as the polynomial called  $E_{(\eta_m, \dots, \eta_1)}$  in Sage and [CMW22].*

**Definition 4.4.** The *weak standardization* of a composition  $\eta$ , denoted  $\tilde{\eta}$ , is the lexicographically smallest composition with the property that if  $\eta_i < \eta_j$ , then  $\tilde{\eta}_i < \tilde{\eta}_j$  for all pairs  $i, j$ . The *conjugate*  $\eta'$  of a composition  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  is obtained by drawing a left-justified diagram consisting of rows of lengths  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , then reading the columns from left to right and recording the number of boxes in each column.

For example, if  $\eta = (2, 5, 1, 4, 4, 5, 4)$ , then  $\tilde{\eta} = (1, 3, 0, 2, 2, 3, 2)$ , and  $\eta' = (7, 6, 5, 5, 2)$ . The theorem below is due to [AS19], but we have phrased it using the conventions of Sage and [CMW22].

**Theorem 4.5.** [AS19, Equation (2) and Theorem 18] *Choose a basement  $\sigma \in S_n$  and composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , and let  $\tau = \tilde{\eta}$  denote the weak standardization of  $\eta$ . Then*

$$(4.2) \quad E_\eta^\sigma(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = \left( \frac{e_{\eta'}(\mathbf{x})}{e_{\tau'}(\mathbf{x})} \right) E_\tau^\sigma(\mathbf{x}; 1, t),$$

where  $\eta'$  denotes the composition which is conjugate to  $\eta$ , and  $e_{\eta'}(\mathbf{x})/e_{\tau'}(\mathbf{x})$  is an elementary symmetric polynomial independent of  $t$ . And if the composition  $\eta$  has weakly increasing parts, then

$$E_\eta^\sigma(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = e_{\eta'}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Note that if  $\mu$  is a partition and  $\eta \in S_\mu$ , then  $\eta' \in S_{\mu'}$ , that is, both  $\eta'$  and  $\mu'$  have the same set of parts. Using Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 3.15, we now obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.6.** *Let  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  be a partition, and let  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in S_\mu$ . Then we have*

$$\frac{F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}{F_{\hat{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)} = h_\mu(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $h_\mu(\mathbf{x}) := e_{\mu'}(\mathbf{x})/e_{\hat{\mu}'}(\mathbf{x})$  is a (symmetric) polynomial in  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  which is independent of  $\eta$  and of  $t$ .

And if the composition  $\eta$  has weakly increasing parts, then the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial  $E_\eta$  satisfies

$$E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = e_{\eta'}(\mathbf{x}).$$

**Proposition 4.7.** [AS19, Proposition 16] *If  $\eta$  is a composition, then*

$$\frac{E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}{E_{\hat{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}$$

is an elementary symmetric polynomial.

Before proving Theorem 4.1, we recall the *shape permuting operator* from [HHL08, Equation (17)].

**Proposition 4.8.** [HHL08] *Let  $\nu$  be a composition, and suppose  $\nu_i > \nu_{i+1}$ . Write*

$$r_i(\nu) = \#\{j < i \mid \nu_{i+1} < \nu_j \leq \nu_i\} + \#\{j > i \mid \nu_{i+1} \leq \nu_j < \nu_i\}.$$

Then

$$(4.3) \quad E_{s_i \nu}(\mathbf{x}; q, t) = \left( T_i + \frac{1-t}{1 - q^{\nu_{i+1} - \nu_i} t^{r_i(\nu)}} \right) E_\nu(\mathbf{x}; q, t).$$

(In the terminology of [HHL08], the exponent  $\nu_{i+1} - \nu_i$  of  $q$  appearing in Equation (4.3) is  $1 + \text{leg}(u)$ , and the exponent  $r_i(\nu)$  of  $t$  is  $\text{arm}(u)$ , where  $u$  is the box  $(i, \nu_{i+1} + 1)$  in the column diagram of the composition  $\nu$ .)

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We start by reducing the proof of Theorem 4.1 to the case of a composition whose parts are weakly increasing. Note that by our assumptions on  $\eta$  and  $\hat{\eta}$ , we will have  $\eta_i > \eta_{i+1}$  if and only if  $\hat{\eta}_i > \hat{\eta}_{i+1}$ . In this case, it is not hard to see that  $r_i(\eta) = r_i(\hat{\eta})$ . Thus if we set  $q = 1$ , then the shape permuting operator is the “same” for both  $\eta$  and  $\hat{\eta}$ , that is,

$$E_{s_i \eta}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = \left( T_i + \frac{1-t}{1-t^r} \right) E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)$$

and

$$E_{s_i \hat{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = \left( T_i + \frac{1-t}{1-t^r} \right) E_{\hat{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t),$$

where  $r = r_i(\eta) = r_i(\hat{\eta})$ . By applying the same sequence of shape permuting operators at  $q = 1$  to  $E_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)$  and  $\left( \frac{e^{\#\{i \mid \eta_i \geq b\}}}{e^{\#\{i \mid \hat{\eta}_i \geq b\}}} \right)^{b-a} E_{\hat{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)$ , and using Remark 3.1, we can therefore reduce to the case of a composition whose parts are weakly increasing.

We now suppose that  $\eta$  has weakly increasing parts; likewise  $\hat{\eta}$  has weakly increasing parts. We now apply Corollary 4.6, which says that at  $q = 1$ ,

$$\frac{E_\eta}{E_{\hat{\eta}}} = \frac{e_{\eta'}}{e_{\hat{\eta}'}}.$$

We have that  $\frac{e_{\eta'}}{e_{\hat{\eta}'}} = \left( \frac{e_{\#\{i|\eta_i \geq b\}}}{e_{\#\{i|\hat{\eta}'_i \geq b\}}} \right)^{b-a}$ , so we are done.  $\square$

Now what we are really interested in is quantities like  $E_{201}/E_{100}$  or  $E_{3311220}/E_{2211110}$ . The denominator is obtained in two stages from the numerator: by merging two adjacent classes  $a < b$  appearing in increasing order as in Theorem 4.1, and then applying weak standardization, as in Proposition 4.7. By applying Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.7, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.9.** *Consider a composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  such that its parts of sizes  $a$  and  $b$  (with  $a < b$ ) occur in increasing order from left to right in  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$ , and such that  $\eta$  has no parts of size  $h$  for any  $a < h < b$ . Let  $\hat{\eta}$  be the composition obtained from  $\eta$  by changing all  $a$ 's to  $b$ , or changing all  $b$ 's to  $a$ . Let  $\tilde{\eta}$  be the composition obtained from  $\hat{\eta}$  by applying the weak standardization (i.e. we find the smallest composition whose parts are in the same relative order as those of  $\hat{\eta}$ ). Then at  $q = 1$ ,  $E_\eta/E_{\tilde{\eta}}$  is a ratio of elementary symmetric polynomials.*

**4.2. Projections of ASEP polynomials at  $q = 1$ .** In this section we explain some properties of ASEP polynomials that hold true at  $q = 1$ . These properties are algebraic analogues of the recolouring properties of the  $t$ -PushTASEP discussed in Section 2.1, in particular Proposition 2.3.

Recall the definition of weakly order-preserving from Definition 2.1. Throughout this section we will fix the following notation.

**Notation 4.10.** *Let  $\phi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be a weakly order-preserving function. Let  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  and  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be partitions with  $\phi(\lambda) = \mu$ . For  $\eta \in S_\mu$ , let*

$$(4.4) \quad G_\eta = G_\eta(\mathbf{x}; t) := \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t).$$

**Example 4.11.** Suppose that  $\phi(0) = \phi(1) = 1$  and  $\phi(j) = j$  for  $j \notin \{0, 1\}$ . Let  $\lambda = (2, 1, 0)$  and  $\mu = \phi(\lambda) = (2, 1, 1)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(2,1,1)} &= F_{(2,1,0)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) + F_{(2,0,1)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = x_1(x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3), \\ G_{(1,2,1)} &= F_{(1,2,0)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) + F_{(0,2,1)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = x_2(x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3), \\ G_{(1,1,2)} &= F_{(1,0,2)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) + F_{(0,1,2)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = x_3(x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3), \end{aligned}$$

where the values of the ASEP polynomials are taken from Example 1.2.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Use Notation 4.10. Then the family  $\{G_\eta \mid \eta \in S_\mu\}$  is a KZ family, i.e. it satisfies the relations of Definition 3.6 at  $q = 1$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove Proposition 4.12 when  $\phi$  has a particular form: namely, there is a natural number  $\ell$  such that  $\phi(\ell) = \phi(\ell + 1) = \ell + 1$ , and  $\phi(j) = j$  for  $j \notin \{\ell, \ell + 1\}$ . Suppose that the components of  $\lambda$  contain  $a$  instances of  $\ell$  and  $b$  instances of  $\ell + 1$ . Then each  $\eta \in S_\mu$  contains  $a + b$  instances of  $\ell + 1$ , and  $G_\eta$  is a sum of the  $\binom{a+b}{a}$  polynomials  $F_\zeta$ , where  $\zeta$  is obtained from  $\eta$  by changing  $a$  of the  $\ell + 1$ 's in  $\eta$  to  $\ell$ .

Suppose that  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$  is a position such that at most one of  $\eta_i$  and  $\eta_{i+1}$  equals  $\ell + 1$ . Then each  $\zeta$  occurring in the right-hand-side of (4.4) has the property that  $\zeta_i$  and  $\zeta_{i+1}$  have the same relative order as  $\eta_i$  and  $\eta_{i+1}$ . Without loss of generality say that  $\eta_i > \eta_{i+1}$ . (The

arguments in the other cases are similar.) Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T_i G_\eta &= \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} T_i(F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} F_{s_i(\zeta)}(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) \\ &= G_{s_i(\eta)}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired, where we used the fact (cf Definition 3.9) that the polynomials  $F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$  are themselves a qKZ family.

Now suppose that  $\eta_i = \eta_{i+1} = \ell + 1$ . Then the  $\zeta$  appearing on the right-hand side of (4.4) satisfy either  $\zeta_i = \zeta_{i+1}$ , or  $\zeta_i = \ell + 1$  and  $\zeta_{i+1} = \ell$ , or  $\zeta_i = \ell$  and  $\zeta_{i+1} = \ell + 1$ , so we will divide up the sum accordingly. In what follows, we will abbreviate  $F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)$  by  $F_\zeta$ , and omit the conditions that  $\zeta \in S_\lambda$  and  $\phi(\zeta) = \eta$  in all sums below. So we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_i G_\eta &= \sum_{\zeta_i = \zeta_{i+1}} T_i(F_\zeta) + \sum_{\zeta_i = \ell + 1, \zeta_{i+1} = \ell} T_i(F_\zeta) + \sum_{\zeta_i = \ell, \zeta_{i+1} = \ell + 1} T_i(F_\zeta). \\ &= \sum_{\zeta_i = \zeta_{i+1}} tF_\zeta + \sum_{\zeta_i = \ell, \zeta_{i+1} = \ell + 1} F_\zeta + \sum_{\zeta_i = \ell, \zeta_{i+1} = \ell + 1} ((t-1)F_\zeta + tF_{s_i \zeta}). \\ &= \sum_{\zeta_i = \zeta_{i+1}} tF_\zeta + \sum_{\zeta_i = \ell, \zeta_{i+1} = \ell + 1} (tF_\zeta + tF_{s_i \zeta}). \\ &= tG_\eta, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

Finally since the polynomials  $F_\zeta$  satisfy (3.7), at  $q = 1$  we get

$$F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = F_{(\zeta_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1})}(x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; 1, t).$$

But then we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_\eta(\mathbf{x}; t) &= \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} F_{(\zeta_n, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{n-1})}(x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; 1, t) \\ &= G_{(\eta_n, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_{n-1})}(x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, t), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.13.** *Suppose that  $\{f_\eta \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$  and  $\{g_\eta \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$  are both KZ families. If the ratio  $h := g_\lambda/f_\lambda$  of the partition-indexed terms in the two families is symmetric in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , then the families  $(f_\eta)$  and  $(g_\eta)$  are proportional to each other, i.e.  $g_\eta/f_\eta = h$  for all  $\eta \in S_\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda$  be a partition and let  $\eta \in S_\lambda$ . We can obtain  $\eta$  from  $\lambda$  by a sequence of nearest-neighbour transpositions, each of which changes a pair of entries from decreasing order into increasing order. Hence from (3.5) we have  $f_\eta = T_{i_k} \dots T_{i_1} f_\lambda$  and  $g_\eta = T_{i_k} \dots T_{i_1} g_\lambda$ , for some sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_k$ . Then by induction and Remark 3.1, if  $g_\lambda = h f_\lambda$  where  $h$  is symmetric in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , then  $g_\eta = h f_\eta$ .  $\square$

**Definition 4.14.** Use Notation 4.10. Let  $\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)$  be the lexicographically smallest  $\zeta \in S_\lambda$  such that  $\phi(\zeta) = \mu$ .

**Example 4.15.** Suppose  $\phi(6) = \phi(5) = \phi(4) = 5, \phi(3) = 4, \phi(2) = \phi(1) = 1$ . Let  $\lambda = (6, 6, 6, 5, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ , so that  $\mu = (5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ . Then  $\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi) = (4, 5, 6, 6, 6, 3, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2)$ .

**Proposition 4.16.** Use Notation 4.10. We have that  $G_\mu = E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}(q = 1)$ .

*Proof.* The ASEP polynomials and the nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials are related via a triangular change of basis [CdGW15, (23)], and hence the span of  $\{E_\eta(q = 1) \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$  is the same as the span of  $\{F_\eta(q = 1) \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$ . Therefore  $G_\mu$  lies in the span of  $\{E_\eta(q = 1) \mid \eta \in S_\lambda\}$ .

We know from Proposition 4.12 that  $\{G_\eta \mid \eta \in S_\mu\}$  is a KZ family. Proceeding as in the proof of [CMW22, Lemma 1.23], we can use the relations of the KZ family to show that  $G_\mu$  is an eigenvector of each  $Y_i$ , and that the eigenvalue of  $Y_i$  on  $G_\mu$  is the same as the eigenvalue of  $Y_i$  on  $F_\mu = E_\mu$  when  $q = 1$ . But now it is easy to see from (3.4) that the eigenvalues of  $Y_i$  on  $E_\mu$  at  $q = 1$  are the same as the eigenvalues of  $Y_i$  on  $E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}$  at  $q = 1$ . Recall from Remark 3.4 that the polynomials  $\{E_\eta(q = 1), \eta \in S_\lambda\}$  have distinct tuples of eigenvalues at  $q = 1$ . Since  $G_\mu$  is in the span of those polynomials and its eigenvalues agree with those of  $E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}$ , it must be a multiple of  $E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}$ . Since both polynomials have the same leading term, it follows that in fact  $G_\mu = E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.17.** Use Notation 4.10. We have that at  $q = 1$ ,  $E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}$  is a symmetric function multiple of  $E_\mu = F_\mu$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\mu$  is a partition, we have that  $F_\mu = E_\mu$  from the definition of ASEP polynomials. Now this theorem can be obtained by repeated applications of Corollary 4.9, together with Proposition 4.7.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.18.** Use Notation 4.10. For all  $\eta \in S_\mu$  and for  $q = 1$ , we have

$$\frac{G_\eta}{P_\lambda} = \frac{G_\eta}{\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} G_\theta} = \frac{F_\eta}{\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} F_\theta} = \frac{F_\eta}{P_\mu}.$$

*Proof.* By Proposition 4.16, we have that  $G_\mu = E_{\text{inc}(\lambda, \phi)}(q = 1)$ . Since  $\mu$  is a partition, we also know by Definition 3.9 that  $F_\mu = E_\mu$ . So by Theorem 4.17,  $h := G_\mu/F_\mu(q = 1)$  is symmetric in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . We can therefore apply Lemma 4.13 to conclude that  $G_\eta = hF_\eta$  for all  $\eta \in S_\mu$ . But now it follows that

$$\frac{G_\eta}{\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} G_\theta} = \frac{F_\eta(q = 1)}{\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} F_\theta(q = 1)}.$$

The other equalities in the proposition follow after using the fact that  $\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} F_\theta = P_\mu$  and  $\sum_{\theta \in S_\mu} G_\theta = \sum_{\xi \in S_\lambda} F_\xi(q = 1) = P_\lambda(q = 1)$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.19.** We continue Example 4.11. Let  $\eta = (1, 2, 1)$ . Then by Theorem 4.18, when we specialize to  $q = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{G_{(1,2,1)}}{P_{(2,1,0)}} &= \frac{G_{(1,2,1)}}{G_{(2,1,1)} + G_{(1,2,1)} + G_{(1,1,2)}} \\ &= \frac{F_{(0,2,1)} + F_{(1,2,0)}}{F_{(2,0,1)} + F_{(2,1,0)} + F_{(0,2,1)} + F_{(1,2,0)} + F_{(0,1,2)} + F_{(1,0,2)}} \\ &= \frac{F_{(1,2,1)}}{F_{(2,1,1)} + F_{(1,2,1)} + F_{(1,1,2)}} = \frac{F_{(1,2,1)}}{P_{(2,1,1)}} = \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2 + x_3}. \end{aligned}$$

## 5. MULTILINE DIAGRAMS

In this section we define *multiline diagrams*. These are combinatorial objects which were introduced in the context of the multispecies TASEP in [FM09], and have subsequently been generalised to a range of related settings, including in [Mar20] in the context of the multispecies ASEP, and in [CMW22] in the context of Macdonald polynomials.

**5.1. Definition of multiline diagrams.** The definition we present here is a special case of the definition given in [CMW22]: we impose  $q = 1$ , and only define multiline diagrams with bottom row  $\eta$ , where  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  is a composition whose nonzero parts are distinct.

Fix a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \langle s^{m_s}, \dots, 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle$ , where  $\lambda_1 = s$  and  $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i \geq 1$ . Let  $a_i = \sum_{r=i}^s m_r$  be the number of particles of type  $i$  or higher.

**Definition 5.1.** A *ball system* with *content*  $\lambda$  is an array with  $s$  rows and  $n$  columns in which each of the  $sn$  positions is either empty or occupied by a ball, and in which the number of balls in row  $i$  is  $a_i$ . We number the rows from 1 to  $s$  from bottom to top, and the sites from 1 to  $n$  from left to right.

**Definition 5.2.** Given a ball system  $B$  with content  $\lambda$ , a *multiline diagram*  $D$  (with pattern  $B$ ) is an assignment of types (positive integers) to the balls of  $B$ . The  $a_i$  balls in row  $i$  are given distinct labels from the set (of size  $a_i$ )  $\{r \geq i : m_r = 1\}$ . The labelling satisfies the following constraint: if two vertically adjacent sites  $(i, j)$  and  $(i, j + 1)$  both contain a ball, then the label of the lower site  $(i, j)$  must be at least as large as the label of the upper site  $(i, j + 1)$ . We also call  $\lambda$  the *content* of the diagram.

Each row  $i$  of a multiline diagram  $D$  gives rise to a composition  $\rho^{(i)} = (\rho_1^{(i)}, \dots, \rho_n^{(i)})$ , where

$$\rho_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} h & \text{if } D \text{ has a ball with label } h \text{ at } (i, j); \\ 0 & \text{if } (i, j) \text{ is empty in } D. \end{cases}$$

The composition  $\rho^{(1)}$  associated to the bottom row of  $D$  is sometimes called the *type* of  $D$ . If  $D$  has content  $\lambda$  then  $\rho^{(1)}(D) \in S_\lambda$ .

**5.2. Generating multiline diagrams.** We next explain a procedure for randomly generating a multiline diagram with content  $\lambda$ . As above let  $s$  be the largest entry of  $\lambda$ , so that the diagram has  $s$  rows.

We first generate the ball system. The occupancies on different rows are independent. On row  $r$ , where we require  $a_r$  balls, we occupy a given set of sites  $A_r \subset [n]$  of size  $a_r$  with probability proportional to  $\prod_{j \in A_r} x_j$ . (This is precisely the stationary distribution of the

single-type  $t$ -PushTASEP, as given in Proposition 2.4 – the normalising constant is given by the elementary symmetric function  $e_{a_r}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

Now we assign labels to the balls in the system. This is done recursively line by line, working from top (row  $s$ ) to bottom (row 1).

- We assign the single ball on row  $s$  (the top row) the label  $s$ .
- Now suppose we have already labelled the rows from  $s$  down to  $r + 1$ , and it is time to label row  $r$ . We consider the balls in row  $r + 1$  one by one in decreasing order of their label. We match each one to a ball on row  $r$ , and that ball on row  $r$  will be given the same label.

Suppose we are considering the ball with label  $h$  on row  $r + 1$ , with position in some column  $j$ . First we check whether the site immediately below it,  $(r, j)$ , has a ball which has not yet been labelled. If so we match to that ball, labelling it  $h$ . This is called a *trivial match*. Otherwise, consider all the balls remaining in row  $r$  which have not yet been labelled – there are a total of  $K := a_r - a_{h+1}$  of them. Suppose their columns, listed from left to right in cyclic order starting from column  $a$ , are  $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_K$ : that is,

$$0 < (j_1 - j) \pmod{n} < (j_2 - j) \pmod{n} < \dots < (j_K - j) \pmod{n}.$$

Now we match the  $h$ -labelled ball at  $(r + 1, j)$  to the ball at position  $(r, j_k)$  with probability  $t^{k-1}/(1 + t + \dots + t^{K-1})$ , and assign the label  $h$  to that ball.

- In this way every ball on row  $r + 1$  gets matched to a ball on row  $r$ . If  $a_r = a_{r+1}$  then we have labelled every ball on row  $r$ , and we move on to labelling the balls in the rows below. If instead  $a_r = a_{r+1} + 1$ , then there remains a single unlabelled ball on row  $r$ , and we assign it label  $r$ .

Proceeding in this way we construct a labelling having the properties in Definition 5.2.

**5.3. Weight function for multiline diagrams.** Closely related to the above sampling procedure, we define a weight function on multiline diagrams. For a given collection of particle counts, and given parameters  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $t$ , the probability of sampling a given diagram using the procedure above is proportional to its *weight*, as defined in Definition 5.3.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $D$  be a multiline diagram with pattern  $B$ , where  $B$  is a  $s \times n$  ball system.

For  $1 \leq j \leq n$  let  $c_j$  be the number of balls in column  $j$ . Then the  $x$ -weight of the diagram is defined by  $\text{wt}_x(D) = \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{c_j}$ .

The  $t$ -weight is defined as follows. Consider  $h \geq 2$  such that  $m_h = 1$ . Then there is one ball with label  $h$  in each of the rows  $h$  and below. For each  $r = 1, \dots, h - 1$  we associate a local weight  $w_D(h, r)$  to the ball with label  $h$  in row  $r$  as follows:

- If the balls of label  $h$  in rows  $r + 1$  and  $r$  are in the same column (corresponding to a trivial match), then  $w_D(h, r) = 1$ .
- Otherwise:
  - Let  $K$  be the number of balls in row  $r$  with label at most  $h$ ;
  - Let  $j$  be the column with the ball labelled  $h$  in row  $r + 1$ , and  $j'$  the column with the ball labelled  $h$  in row  $r$ . Consider the interval with left endpoint  $j$  and right endpoint  $j'$  (wrapping cyclically around the ring if necessary). Let  $\ell$  be the number of balls in row  $r$  between columns  $j$  and  $j'$  with label less than  $h$ . We have  $0 \leq \ell \leq K - 1$ .

Then define

$$(5.1) \quad w_D(h, r) = \frac{t^\ell}{1 + t + \dots + t^{K-1}}.$$

The  $t$ -weight of the diagram is then the product of all these  $w_D(h, r)$  weights:

$$(5.2) \quad \text{wt}_t(D) = \prod_{r=1}^{s-1} \prod_{\substack{r < h \leq s: \\ m_h = 1}} w_D(h, r).$$

Finally we define the *weight*  $\text{wt}(D)$  of diagram  $D$  to be the product of its  $x$ -weight and  $t$ -weight, that is,

$$\text{wt}(D) = \text{wt}_x(D) \text{wt}_t(D).$$

Note first that  $\text{wt}_x(D)$  is proportional to the probability of generating the ball system  $B$  of  $D$  in the first step of the procedure above. (The constant of proportionality is  $\prod_{r=1}^s e_{a_r}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .)

Also note that for each  $h$  and  $r$ ,  $w_D(h, r)$  is precisely the probability of making the given matching of the  $h$ -labelled ball between rows  $r + 1$  and  $r$  at the relevant step of the labelling process.

As a result, the conditional probability of obtaining the configuration of  $D$  on row  $r$ , given the ball system and the configuration of  $D$  on rows  $s$  down to  $r + 1$ , is the product

$$(5.3) \quad \prod_{\substack{h:r < h \leq s: \\ m_h = 1}} w_D(h, r),$$

which depends on  $D$  only through its rows  $r$  and  $r + 1$ .

Hence the probability of generating a given diagram  $D$  is proportional to  $\text{wt}_x(D)$  multiplied by the product of (5.3) over  $r$  from  $s - 1$  down to 1. This yields exactly  $\text{wt}(D)$ , as required. See Figure 3 for an example of a multiline diagram and its weight function.




FIGURE 3. A multiline diagram  $D$  with  $n = 6$  columns and  $s = 5$  rows, with content  $\lambda = (5, 4, 3, 1, 0, 0)$  and bottom row  $\rho^{(1)}(D) = (4, 0, 1, 5, 3, 0) \in S_\lambda$ . It has weight  $\text{wt}(D) = \text{wt}_x(D) \text{wt}_t(D) = x_1^3 x_3^2 x_4^4 x_5^2 x_6^2 t^2$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \langle s^{m_s}, \dots, 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle$  be a partition with distinct entries, no entry equal to 1, and exactly one entry equal to 0. That is,  $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $m_1 = 0$ , and  $m_0 = 1$ . Let  $\eta, \eta' \in S_\lambda$ , and  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then the following quantities are equal.*

- the probability in the  $t$ -PushTASEP of transitioning from state  $\eta$  to state  $\eta'$ , when a bell rings at site  $j$  in state  $\eta$ ;
- given a multiline diagram with content  $\lambda$ , such that row 2 has configuration  $\eta$  and the unique vacancy in row 1 is at site  $j$ , the conditional probability that row 1 has configuration  $\eta'$ .

*Proof.* Note that by the condition on  $\lambda$ , both row 2 and row 1 of the diagram have a single vacant site. It follows from the constraint in Definition 5.2 that the first quantity in Lemma 5.4 is nonzero if and only if the second quantity in Lemma 5.4 is nonzero.

From (5.3) with  $r = 1$ , the conditional probability of obtaining a specific configuration  $\eta'$  on row 1, given the configuration  $\eta$  on row 2, is given by

$$\prod_{\substack{h:1 < h \leq s: \\ m_h = 1}} w_D(h, 1),$$

where  $D$  is any diagram agreeing with  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  on rows 2 and 1 respectively.

But because of the equivalence of (2.2) and (5.1), that conditional probability is exactly the same as (2.2), which is the probability of obtaining  $\eta'$  when a bell rings at site  $j$  in the state  $\eta$  under the  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics.

In the special case where  $\eta_j = \eta'_j = 0$ , i.e. both rows 1 and 2 of the multiline diagram  $D$  have their unique vacancy in position  $j$ , all particles in  $D$  must form a trivial match between rows 2 and 1, and the configuration in the two rows is identical. Correspondingly, under the  $t$ -PushTASEP dynamics, if the bell rings at the site of an existing vacancy, then the system stays in its current state.  $\square$

**5.4. ASEP polynomials from multiline diagrams.** The following result, which is a special case of a result from [CMW22], relates the distribution of the bottom row of a multiline diagram with bottom row  $\eta$  to the ASEP polynomial indexed by  $\eta$ .

**Theorem 5.5** ([CMW22, Definition 1.9, Theorem 1.25, Lemma 1.26]). *For any composition  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  whose nonzero parts are distinct, the ASEP polynomial  $F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)$  at  $q = 1$  can be computed in terms of multiline diagrams as follows:*

$$(5.4) \quad F_\eta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) = \sum_{D: \rho^{(1)}(D) = \eta} \text{wt}(D)$$

**Remark 5.6.** *The result from [CMW22] is more general than Theorem 5.5 because it holds for any composition and for general  $q$ . However, we do not need the more general version in this paper.*

**Remark 5.7.** *Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) = \langle s^{m_s}, \dots, 0^{m_0} \rangle$ . The ASEP polynomials appearing as numerators of stationary probabilities in Theorem 1.1 are polynomials in  $\mathbf{x}$  with coefficients which are rational functions (but not necessarily polynomials) in  $t$ . Using the connection with multiline diagrams, one can show that these probabilities can be rewritten with numerators that are polynomials in both  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $t$  and with common denominator given by*

$$(5.5) \quad P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t) \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{[m_1 + \dots + m_i]_t!}{[m_i]_t!} = e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}) \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{[m_1 + \dots + m_i]_t!}{[m_i]_t!}.$$

*In the case of Example 1.2, this common denominator is*

$$(t + 1)(x_1 + x_2 + x_3)(x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3).$$

*The factor in (5.5) involving  $t$ -factorials is the same as that in [Mar20] for the ASEP.*

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. We start by proving it in the case where  $\lambda$  has distinct parts, and then we generalize it to the case of repeated parts, using properties of ASEP polynomials at  $q = 1$ .

6.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1 when  $\lambda$  has distinct parts.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a partition with distinct entries and no entry equal to 1. Consider a random multiline diagram  $D$  with content  $\lambda$ , with distribution proportional to the weight  $\text{wt}(D)$ . The configurations given by the bottom row (row 1) and by the next-to-bottom row (row 2) have the same distribution.*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi$  be the weakly order-preserving function given by  $\phi(x) = x - 1$  for all  $x \geq 1$  and  $\phi(0) = 0$ . If  $s$  is the largest entry of  $\lambda$ , then  $\phi(\lambda)$  has largest entry  $s - 1$ .

Let  $D$  be a random multiline diagram with content  $\lambda$ , with distribution proportional to weight. The diagram  $D$  has  $s$  rows. Recall that  $\rho^{(1)}$  denotes the sequence of balls in the bottom row of  $D$ , and  $\rho^{(2)}$  denotes the sequence of balls in row 2 of  $D$ .

Let  $D'$  be a random multiline diagram with content  $\phi(\lambda)$ , again distributed proportional to weight. The diagram  $D'$  has  $s - 1$  rows.

In view of the generation process from Section 5.2, if we take rows  $s$  down to 2 of the diagram  $D$ , and subtract 1 from the label of every ball, then the resulting diagram has distribution identical to that of the diagram  $D'$ . In particular, comparing row 2 of  $D$  to row 1 of  $D'$ , we have that  $\phi(\rho^{(2)}(D))$  and  $\rho^{(1)}(D')$  have the same distribution.

But we may instead compare row 1 of  $D$  to row 1 of  $D'$ . By Theorem 5.5, for  $\eta \in S_\lambda$ , the probability that  $\rho^{(1)}(D) = \eta$  equals  $\frac{F_\eta(\mathbf{x};1,t)}{\sum_{\tau \in S_\lambda} F_\tau(\mathbf{x};1,t)}$ , and the probability that  $\rho^{(1)}(D') = \phi(\eta)$  equals  $\frac{F_{\phi(\eta)}(\mathbf{x};1,t)}{\sum_{\nu \in S_{\phi(\lambda)}} F_\nu(\mathbf{x};1,t)}$ . But  $\eta$  and  $\phi(\eta)$  have the same weak standardisation, so by Corollary 4.6, these two probabilities are equal. It follows that  $\phi(\rho^{(1)}(D))$  has the same distribution as  $\rho^{(1)}(D')$ .

We have proved that both  $\phi(\rho^{(1)}(D))$  and  $\phi(\rho^{(2)}(D))$  have the same distribution as  $\rho^{(1)}(D')$ . But  $\phi$  is a bijection from  $S_\lambda$  to  $S_{\phi(\lambda)}$ . So in fact  $\rho^{(1)}(D)$  and  $\rho^{(2)}(D)$  have the same distribution, as required. See Figure 4 for an illustration.  $\square$




FIGURE 4. On the left, a multiline diagram  $D$  with content  $\lambda = (4, 3, 2, 0)$ . On the right, a multiline diagram  $D$  with content  $\phi(\lambda) = (3, 2, 1, 0)$  (where  $\phi$  is defined as in the proof of Lemma 6.1). The configurations  $\rho^{(2)}(D)$  and  $\rho^{(1)}(D)$  (the two lowest rows of  $D$ ) have the same distribution, and the distribution of  $\phi(\rho^{(1)}(D))$  and of  $\phi(\rho^{(2)}(D))$  is the same as that of  $\rho^{(1)}(D')$ .

Write  $p_j(\eta, \eta')$  for the probability of obtaining  $\eta'$  from  $\eta$  using the  $t$ -PushTASEP jump dynamics when a bell rings at site  $j$ .

Now we average over  $j$ . Specifically, we take a weighted average of  $p_j$  with weights proportional to  $x_j^{-1}$ :

$$(6.1) \quad p(\eta, \eta') = \sum_j \frac{x_j^{-1}}{x_1^{-1} + x_2^{-1} + \cdots + x_n^{-1}} p_j(\eta, \eta').$$

Since  $x_j^{-1}$  is the rate at which the bell at site  $j$  in the  $t$ -PushTASEP, we have that  $p$  defined by (6.1) gives the transition probabilities of a discrete-time Markov chain whose stationary distribution is the same as that of the continuous-time  $t$ -PushTASEP.

By Lemma 5.4,  $p_j(\eta, \eta')$  also gives the probability of obtaining  $\eta'$  as row 1 of a multiline diagram with content  $\lambda$ , given that row 2 is  $\eta$  and that the vacancy in the bottom row is at site  $j$ . But the probability of having a vacancy at  $j$  is proportional to  $x_j^{-1}$ , independently of the rows above, so  $p(\eta, \eta')$  defined by (6.1) is the probability of obtaining  $\eta'$  as row 1 of the diagram, given that row 2 is  $\eta$ .

We also know from Lemma 6.1 that the distributions of row 1 and row 2 are the same. Since row 1 is obtained from row 2 by a single update of the dynamics  $p$ , this tells us that their common distribution is a stationary distribution for  $p$ , and hence also for the continuous-time  $t$ -PushTASEP.

But this common distribution is also proportional to the ASEP polynomials. So we obtain that  $\pi_\lambda(\eta), \eta \in S_\lambda$  is proportional to  $F_\eta$  as required to give the result of Theorem 1.1 in this case.

**6.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1 in the general case.** To extend the result from the previous section to prove the general case of Theorem 1.1, we apply the results from Section 4.

Consider some partition  $\mu$  (as ever, assumed to have at least one entry 0). We can find some  $\lambda$  satisfying the conditions of Section 6.1 (i.e. having distinct entries, no entry 1, and exactly one entry 0) and some weakly order-preserving function  $\phi$ , such that  $\mu = \phi(\lambda)$ . Proposition 2.3 then tells us that

$$(6.2) \quad \pi_\mu(\eta) = \sum_{\zeta \in S_\lambda: \phi(\zeta) = \eta} \pi_\lambda(\zeta).$$

But we also know from Theorem 1.1 (which we now know holds in the case that  $\lambda$  has distinct parts) that for  $\zeta \in S_\lambda$ ,

$$\pi_\lambda(\zeta) = \frac{F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}.$$

We then obtain from (6.2) that

$$\pi_\mu(\eta) = \sum_{\substack{\zeta \in S_\lambda \\ \phi(\zeta) = \eta}} \frac{F_\zeta(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}.$$

Now by (4.4) we have that

$$\pi_\mu(\eta) = \frac{G_\eta(\mathbf{x}, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)}.$$

Finally using Theorem 4.18, we obtain that

$$\pi_\mu(\eta) = \frac{F_\eta(\mathbf{x}, t)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)},$$

as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $A \subset S_\lambda$  be any event (i.e. collection of configurations) that is conserved by exchanging the contents of sites  $i$  and  $i + 1$ ; that is,  $A = s_i A = \{s_i \eta \mid \eta \in A\}$ .

Since  $s_i$  is a bijection on  $S_\lambda$ , we then have  $\sum_{\eta \in A} F_\eta = \sum_{\eta \in A} F_{s_i \eta}$ , giving

$$\sum_{\eta \in A} F_\eta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in A} (F_\eta + F_{s_i \eta}).$$

By Lemma 3.14, this quantity is symmetric in  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$ .

Now suppose  $A$  depends only on the configuration in sites  $1, 2, \dots, k$ . Then the above holds for any  $i$  with  $k < i < n$ . We obtain that for any such  $i$ , the probability of  $A$  in the stationary distribution,

$$p^{(\lambda)}(A) := \sum_{\eta \in A} p_\eta^{(\lambda)} = \sum_{\eta \in A} \frac{F_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_n; 1, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{x}; 1, t)},$$

is symmetric in  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  (since the Macdonald polynomial in the denominator is symmetric). But then the probability is in fact symmetric in all of  $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ . This gives the symmetry required for Theorem 1.4.  $\square$

## 7. FORMULAS FOR DENSITY AND CURRENTS

In this section we discuss the density of particles and the current in the  $t$ -PushTASEP. In particular, we give a formula for the density of particles in Corollary 7.1. We also prove Theorem 1.5, which gives a formula for the current in the single species case. We end with a discussion of the current in the multispecies case.

Let us consider the single species  $t$ -PushTASEP first. By Proposition 2.4, the density (in the stationary distribution) of particles is the same as for the PushTASEP at  $t = 0$ . As we will explain, this continues to hold for the multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP. Let  $\eta_j^{(i)}$  denote the occupation variable for the particle of species  $i$  at site  $j$ , i.e.  $\eta_j^{(i)} = 1$  (resp.  $\eta_j^{(i)} = 0$ ) provided the  $j$ 'th site is occupied (resp. not occupied) by  $i$ . The formula for the density of particles in the multispecies PushTASEP is obtained directly from that in the single species case: the density of the particle of species  $j$  is the density of the particle of species 1 in the single species PushTASEP with  $m_j + \dots + m_s$  particles minus the density of the particle of species 1 in the single species PushTASEP with  $m_{j+1} + \dots + m_s$  particles. The formula for the density, shown in Corollary 7.1 below, is the same as given for the  $t = 0$  case in [AM23, Proposition 18]. The proof is identical and is omitted.

**Corollary 7.1.** *The density of species  $r$  at the first site in the multispecies  $t$ -PushTASEP with content  $\lambda = (s^{m_s}, \dots, 0^{m_0})$  on  $n = \sum_i m_i$  sites is given by*

$$\langle \eta_1^{(r)} \rangle = x_1 \frac{s_{(2^{a_r+1}, 1^{m_r-1})}(x_2, \dots, x_n)}{e_{a_r}(\mathbf{x}) e_{a_r+1}(\mathbf{x})},$$

where  $s_\mu$  is the Schur polynomial indexed by  $\mu$ , and  $a_r = m_r + \dots + m_s$  for  $1 \leq r \leq s$ .

We now move on to studying the current (at stationarity) for the single species  $t$ -PushTASEP. Let  $\lambda = \langle 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle$ , where  $m_1 + m_0 = n$ , so that we are studying a system with  $m_1$  particles and  $m_0$  vacancies. Recall that the *current (at stationarity)* of a particle across a given edge (say  $(n, 1)$ ) of the lattice is the number of particles per unit time that cross that edge in the long-time limit. Because of particle conservation, the current is independent of the edge. We will denote the stationary current in our system of particles by  $J_{m_0, m_1}$ .

In terms of the stationary distribution for the  $t$ -PushTASEP, we can compute  $J_{m_0, m_1}$  as follows. If a particle is at position  $k$  and there is a vacancy at position  $j < k$ , then the particle at  $k$  can make a transition to  $j$ , and contributes to the current across the edge  $(n, 1)$  in doing so. If there are  $h$  vacancies in sites  $k + 1, \dots, n, 1, \dots, j - 1$ , then the rate of this transition is  $t^h/x_k$ . Formally, we can write the current as

$$(7.1) \quad J_{m_0, m_1} = \sum_{h=0}^{m_0-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-m_0+h} \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{t^h}{x_k} \sum_{\eta} \pi(\eta),$$

where the sum on the right is over all

$$\{\eta \in S_{\langle 1^{m_1}, 0^{m_0} \rangle} \mid \eta_k = 1, \eta_j = 0, \text{ and } \eta \text{ has } h \text{ vacancies in sites } k + 1, \dots, n, 1, \dots, j - 1\}.$$

The formula we need to prove Theorem 1.5 is the following identity for elementary symmetric functions, which seems to be new.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Fix  $n$  and  $m_0 < n$  positive integers. Then, for all  $0 \leq h \leq m_0 - 1$ , we have*

$$(7.2) \quad (h+1)e_{n-m_0-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{a=m_0-h}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-a} e_{h-m_0+a}(x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+a-1}) \times e_{n-h-1-a}(x_{j+a+1}, \dots, x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}).$$

*Proof.* For convenience, set  $m_1 = n - m_0$ . We need to show that every monomial in  $e_{m_1-1}$  occurs on the right hand side exactly  $h + 1$  times. So fix a subset  $S = \{1 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_{m_1-1} \leq n\}$  and consider the summand in the right hand side of (7.2). It depends on two parameters  $j$  and  $a$  and we set  $k = j + a$ . Thus, the sum depends on two parameters,  $j$  and  $k$  instead. The first factor in the summand is an elementary symmetric function depending on the variables strictly between  $j$  and  $k$ , and the second is one depending on variables between  $k$  and  $j$  counted cyclically. Therefore, we must choose  $j$  and  $k$  to be in the set  $[n] \setminus S$  such that there are  $h + k - j - m_0$  elements of  $S$  between  $j$  and  $k$ . To complete the proof, it will suffice to show that there are exactly  $h + 1$  many choices.

To make the argument easier to follow, let us first consider the case where  $h = m_0 - 1$ . Then, we have to choose  $j$  and  $k$  so that there is no element of  $[n] \setminus S$  strictly between them. There is exactly one way of choosing  $j \in [1, s_1 - 2]$  and that is with  $k = j + 1$ . We can also choose  $j = s_1 - 1$  with  $k = s_1 + 1$ . Thus,  $j$  can be chosen to be any position between 1 and  $s_1 - 1$  in exactly one way. Similarly,  $j$  can be chosen to be any position between  $s_i + 1$  and  $s_{i+1} - 1$  in one way, for  $1 \leq i \leq m_1 - 2$ . Lastly,  $j$  can be chosen to be any element between  $s_{m_1-1} + 1$  and  $n - 1$  with  $k = j + 1$ . Summing all of these possibilities, we get  $n - m_1 = m_0 = h + 1$ , which is independent of  $S$ .

The argument for general  $h$  goes the same way. Between each  $s_i + 1$  and  $s_{i+1} - 1$ , there is exactly one way of choosing  $k$  so that there are  $h + k - j - m_0$  elements of  $S$  between  $j$  and  $k$ , for small values of  $i$ . The change occurs at the end as we get closer to  $n$ . Every

time the value of  $h$  increases by 1, the number of possibilities of  $j$  reduces exactly by 1. It is easy to see that this argument is independent of the choice of  $S$ .

As a sanity check, consider the case of  $h = 0$ . In that case, the only possibility is to choose  $j$  (resp.  $k$ ) to be the smallest (resp. largest) element of  $[n] \setminus S$ , which is consistent with what we want to prove.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* The current is independent of the edge being considered. So look at the edge connecting  $n$  to 1. For a particle hop to count towards the current across this edge, it must hop from a site  $k \in [2, n]$  to a vacant site  $j < k$ . If there are  $h$  holes between the sites  $k + 1$  to  $j - 1$  (of which there are  $n - k + j - 1$  many), then the rate of this transition is  $t^h / ([m_0]x_k)$ . Therefore the total stationary weight of these configurations is  $e_{n-h-1-k+j}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1})$ . Similarly, there are  $m_0 - h - 1$  holes between the  $k - j - 1$  sites between  $j + 1$  and  $k - 1$  and so the total stationary weight of such configurations is  $e_{h-m_0+k-j}(x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+a-1})$ . Summing over all possible values of  $j$  and  $k$ , we see that the current is

$$J_{m_0, m_1} = \sum_{h=0}^{m_0-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-m_0+h} \sum_{k=j+1}^n \frac{t^h}{[m_0]} \frac{e_{h-m_0+k-j}(x_{j+1}, \dots, x_{j+a-1})}{e_{m_1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \\ \times e_{n-h-1-k+j}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}).$$

Now substituting  $a = j - k$  and using Lemma 7.2, we arrive at

$$J_{m_0, m_1} = \frac{e_{m_1-1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{e_{m_1}(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \sum_{h=0}^{m_0-1} \frac{(h+1)t^h}{[m_0]},$$

which gives the desired result.  $\square$

Now we would like to compute the current for the multispecies case. The current of species  $j$  in the  $t$ -PushTASEP on  $\Omega_\lambda$  is the difference of the total currents of species  $j$  through  $s$  minus the total currents of species  $j + 1$  through  $s$ . Following the argument in [AM23, Proposition 19], we would like to calculate both these in terms of the single species  $t$ -PushTASEP using Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 2.2. Unfortunately, this does not work as in the  $t = 0$  case if  $j < s$ . The main reason is that an edge can contribute towards multiple currents in a single transition when  $t > 0$ .

We illustrate this with the example of  $\lambda = (2, 1, 0)$  shown in Figure 2. Consider the current of species 1 across the edge  $(3, 1)$ . Using the colouring argument, we would get this current to be

$$J_{1,2} - J_{2,1} = \frac{e_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{e_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)} = \frac{1 + 2t e_0(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{1 + t e_1(x_1, x_2, x_3)},$$

which gives, after some manipulations,

$$J_{1,2} - J_{2,1} = \frac{(1+t)(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2) + (x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3)}{(1+t)e_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, x_3)}.$$

Now let us calculate the current by brute force. Particle 1 jumps across the edge  $(3, 1)$  only for the following states when either the 1 jumps, or when the 2 jumps displacing the 1:

- $(0, 1, 2)$ ,
- $(0, 2, 1)$ ,
- $(2, 0, 1)$ .

The sum of these contributions gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{x_2 x_3}{e_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, x_3)} \left( \frac{x_1 t}{1+t} + x_3 \right) \left( \frac{1}{x_2} + \frac{t}{x_3(1+t)} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{x_2 x_3}{e_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, x_3)} \left( \frac{x_1}{1+t} + x_2 \right) \left( \frac{1}{x_3} + \frac{1}{x_2(1+t)} \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{x_1 x_3}{e_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, x_3)} \left( x_1 + \frac{x_2 t}{1+t} \right) \left( \frac{1}{x_3} + \frac{t}{x_1(1+t)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which after simplifying becomes

$$\frac{(1+t)^2(x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2) + (1+2t+2t^2)(x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3 + x_2 x_3)}{(1+t)^2 e_{2,1}(x_1, x_2, x_3)},$$

and this does not match  $J_{1,2} - J_{2,1}$ . The main reason is that (i) in the transition from  $(0, 1, 2)$  where the 2 displaces the 1, both particles end up crossing the edge  $(3, 1)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [Ale19] Per Alexandersson. Non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials and Demazure-Lusztig operators. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 76:Art. B76d, 27, [2016–2019].
- [AM23] Arvind Ayyer and James Martin. The inhomogeneous multispecies PushTASEP: Dynamics and symmetry. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09740>, 2023.
- [AMM22] Arvind Ayyer, Olya Mandelshtam, and James B. Martin. Modified Macdonald polynomials and the multispecies zero range process: II, 2022. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.09859>.
- [ANP23] Amol Aggarwal, Matthew Nicoletti, and Leonid Petrov. Colored interacting particle systems on the ring: Stationary measures from Yang-Baxter equation, 2023. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11865>.
- [AS19] Per Alexandersson and Mehtaab Sawhney. Properties of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 1$  and  $q = 0$ . *Ann. Comb.*, 23(2):219–239, 2019.
- [BW22] Alexei Borodin and Michael Wheeler. *Coloured stochastic vertex models and their spectral theory*, volume 437 of *Astérisque*. Paris: Société Mathématique de France (SMF), 2022.
- [CdGW15] Luigi Cantini, Jan de Gier, and Michael Wheeler. Matrix product formula for Macdonald polynomials. *J. Phys. A*, 48(38):384001, 2015.
- [CdGW20] Zeying Chen, Jan de Gier, and Michael Wheeler. Integrable stochastic dualities and the deformed Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 2020(19):5872–5925, 2020.
- [Che95] Ivan Cherednik. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (10):483–515, 1995.
- [CMW22] Sylvie Corteel, Olya Mandelshtam, and Lauren Williams. From multiline queues to Macdonald polynomials via the exclusion process. *Amer. J. Math.*, 144(2):395–436, 2022.
- [Fer11] Jeffrey Paul Ferreira. *Row-strict Quasisymmetric Schur Functions, Characterizations of Demazure Atoms, and Permuted Basement Nonsymmetric Macdonald Polynomials*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2011. PhD thesis, University of California, Davis.
- [FM06] Pablo A. Ferrari and James B. Martin. Multi-class processes, dual points and  $M/M/1$  queues. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, 12(2):175–201, 2006.
- [FM07] Pablo A. Ferrari and James B. Martin. Stationary distributions of multi-type totally asymmetric exclusion processes. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(3):807–832, 2007.
- [FM09] Pablo A. Ferrari and James B. Martin. Multiclass Hammersley-Aldous-Diaconis process and multiclass-customer queues. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 45(1):250–265, 2009.
- [HHL08] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, and N. Loehr. A combinatorial formula for nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(2):359–383, 2008.
- [KT07] Masahiro Kasatani and Yoshihiro Takeyama. The quantum Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov equation and non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, 50(3):491–509, 2007.

- [Lig85] Thomas M. Liggett. *Interacting particle systems*, volume 276 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [Mac95] Ian Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1995. With contributions by A. Zelevinsky, Oxford Science Publications.
- [Mar99] Dan Marshall. Symmetric and nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Ann. Comb.*, 3(2-4):385–415, 1999.
- [Mar20] James B. Martin. Stationary distributions of the multi-type ASEP. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:1–41, 2020.
- [PEM09] S Prohac, M R Evans, and K Mallick. The matrix product solution of the multispecies partially asymmetric exclusion process. *J. Phys. A*, 42(16):165004, 2009.
- [Pet20] Leonid Petrov. PushTASEP in inhomogeneous space. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 25:1 – 25, 2020.
- [Spi70] Frank Spitzer. Interaction of Markov processes. *Adv. Math.*, 5(2):246 – 290, 1970.

ARVIND AYYER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE 560012, INDIA.

*Email address:* `arvind@iisc.ac.in`

JAMES MARTIN, DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, UK.

*Email address:* `martin@stats.ox.ac.uk`

LAUREN WILLIAMS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE MA, 02138.

*Email address:* `williams@math.harvard.edu`