

Slow Logarithmic Decay of Magnetization in the Zero Temperature Dynamics of an Ising Spin Chain: Analogy to Granular Compaction

Satya N. Majumdar^{1,2}, David S. Dean¹ and Peter Grassberger³

1. Laboratoire de Physique Quantique (UMR C5626 du CNRS), Université Paul Sabatier, 31062 Toulouse Cedex, France

2. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai-400005, India

3. NIC, Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich, Germany

(april 22 2000)

We study the zero temperature coarsening dynamics in an Ising chain in presence of a dynamically induced field that favors locally the ‘-’ phase compared to the ‘+’ phase. At late times, while the ‘+’ domains still coarsen as $t^{1/2}$, the ‘-’ domains coarsen slightly faster as $t^{1/2} \log(t)$. As a result, at late times, the magnetization decays slowly as, $m(t) = -1 + \text{const.}/\log(t)$. We establish this behavior both analytically within an independent interval approximation (IIA) and numerically. In the zero volume fraction limit of the ‘+’ phase, we argue that the IIA becomes asymptotically exact. Our model can be alternately viewed as a simple Ising model for granular compaction. At late times in our model, the system decays into a fully compact state (where all spins are ‘-’) in a slow logarithmic manner $\sim 1/\log(t)$, a fact that has been observed in recent experiments on granular systems.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 82.20.Mj

The effect of *quenched disorder* on the relaxation dynamics of many body systems has been studied quite extensively [1]. In systems such as structural glasses, where quenched disorder is absent, an alternative approach has been put forward that considers the slow relaxation due to *kinetic disorder*, induced by the dynamics itself [2]. Another important system where kinetic disorders give rise to slow relaxation is granular material. The density relaxation of loosely packed glass beads has been studied in recent experiments and it was found that the density $\rho(t)$ compactified slowly as, $\rho(\infty) - \rho(t) \sim 1/\log(t)$, under mechanical tapping [3]. It is natural to expect that such kinetic disorders may play important roles in the dynamics of other systems as well. In this Letter we study, for the first time, the effect of a dynamically self-induced *field* in an important class of out of equilibrium problems, namely the domain growth problems, and show that such systems also exhibit logarithmic relaxation, suggesting that inverse logarithmic relaxation is quite robust.

Domain growth following a rapid quench in temperature in ferromagnetic spin systems is one of the better understood out of equilibrium phenomena [5]. For example, if an Ising system is quenched rapidly from infinite temperature to zero temperature without breaking the symmetry between the two ground states, domains of up and down spins form and grow with time. The average linear size of a domain grows with time as $l(t) \sim t^{1/2}$ for zero temperature nonconserved dissipative dynamics. However if one puts on a small uniform external field (say in the down direction), then even at zero temperature the system quickly reaches the pure state of magnetization -1 in a finite time proportional to the initial size of the up domains. A natural question is: what happens when, instead of applying a global external bias, the symmetry between the pure states is broken locally by the dynamics

itself ?

In this Letter we address this question in the context of a simple Ising spin chain with spins $S_i = \pm 1$. Starting from a given initial configuration, the system evolves by single spin flip continuous time dynamics. Let $W(S_i; S_{i-1}, S_{i+1})$ denote the rate at which the flip $S_i \rightarrow -S_i$ occurs when the two neighboring spins are S_{i-1} and S_{i+1} . In our model the rates are specified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W(+; ++)&= W(-; --)=0 \\ W(+; -+)&= W(+; +-)= W(-; +-)= W(-; -+)=\frac{1}{2} \\ W(+; --)&=1 \\ W(-; ++)&=\alpha \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here we restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha = 0$. We note that the case $\alpha = 1$ corresponds to the usual zero temperature Glauber dynamics [6]. The only difference is that for $\alpha = 0$, the move $(+, -, +) \rightarrow (+, +, +)$ is not allowed and thereby the symmetry between ‘+’ and ‘-’ spins is locally dynamically broken. Thus isolated ‘-’ spins (surrounded on both sides by a ‘+’) block the coalescence of ‘+’ domains and locally favor the ‘-’ spins. As a result, we show below, the system eventually decays into the state where all spins are ‘-’ but does so in a very slow manner, $m(t) + 1 \sim 1/\log(t)$.

Our main results can be summarized as follows. In contrast to the case $\alpha = 1$ (where the average size of both ‘+’ and ‘-’ domains grow as $l_{\pm}(t) \sim t^{1/2}$ at late times [7] and the average magnetization $m(t) = (l_+ - l_-)/(l_+ + l_-)$ is a constant of motion [6]), for $\alpha = 0$ we show that at late times, while $l_+(t) \sim t^{1/2}$, $l_-(t) \sim t^{1/2} \log(bt)$ where b is a constant that depends on the initial condition. Thus due to the dynamically generated local bias, the ‘-’ domains

grow slightly faster than the ‘+’ domains and as a result the magnetization decays as, $m(t) = -1 + \text{const}/\log(bt)$ for large t . Notice that the average domain size grows faster for $\alpha = 0$ than for $\alpha = 1$, i.e. paradoxically coarsening is *enhanced* by putting one of the rates to zero.

Our model can alternately be viewed as a toy model of granular compaction if one identifies the ‘-’ spins as particles, ‘+’ spins as holes and the 1-d lattice as a section of the bottom layer of a granular system. The final state where all spins are negative (magnetization, $m = -1$) then corresponds to the fully compact state with particle density 1. The basic mechanism for granular compaction can be summarized as follows. There exist local kinetic ‘defects’ and the system can gain in compaction only by relaxing such local defects. Such relaxation happens via the tapping process. However, these defects become rarer with time and it becomes harder and harder for the system to find such a local defect, relax it and thereby gain in compaction. This is the origin of the slow logarithmic relaxation. In our model, the triplets ‘+ - +’ play the role of such local defects which decay only via the diffusion of kinks. Thus the diffusion effectively plays the role of tapping. The density of these triplets decays with time and the system finds it progressively harder to relax. Such logarithmic relaxation has been found previously in various models of granular systems [4]. However our model differs from these models in an important way. In previous models, the density, while increasing as $\rho(\infty) - \rho(t) \sim 1/\log(t)$ at intermediate times, finally saturates to its steady state value exponentially fast [4] for finite values of the rates of microscopic processes. In contrast, in our model, the approach to the final state is logarithmic asymptotically even at very late times.

In terms of the motion of the domain walls between ‘+’ and ‘-’ phases, our model can also be viewed as a reaction diffusion process. We need to distinguish between the two types of domain walls $-+ \equiv A$ and $+- \equiv B$. Note that by definition (originating from a spin configuration) the A ’s and B ’s always occur alternately. The A ’s and B ’s diffuse and when an A and a B meet, they annihilate only if A is to the left of B , otherwise there is hard core repulsion between them.

To start with, we set up our notations. We define $P_n(t)$ and $R_n(t)$ to be the number of domains of size n per unit length of ‘+’ and ‘-’ types respectively. Then, $N(t) = \sum_n P_n = \sum_n R_n$ is the number of domains of either ‘+’ or ‘-’ spins per unit length. The density of kinks is therefore $2N(t)$. We also define the normalized variables, $p_n = P_n/N$ and $r_n = R_n/N$. p_n (or r_n) denotes the conditional probability that given a domain of ‘+’ (or ‘-’) has occurred, it is of length n . Let $L_+(t) = \sum_n nP_n$ and $L_-(t) = \sum_n nR_n$ denote the densities of ‘+’ and ‘-’ spins. Clearly $L_+(t) + L_-(t) = 1$ and the magnetization per unit length is $m(t) = L_+(t) - L_-(t)$.

The average size of a ‘+’ and a ‘-’ domain are denoted respectively by $l_+(t) = \sum np_n = L_+(t)/N$ and $l_-(t) = \sum nr_n = L_-(t)/N$.

Following Glauber’s calculation for the $\alpha = 1$ case, it is easy to show [10] that for $\alpha = 0$ case, the domain density $N(t) = (1 - \langle S_i S_{i+1} \rangle)/4$ of either phase, and the fraction of ‘+’ spins, $L_+(t) = (1 + \langle S_i \rangle)/2$ evolve according to the exact equations,

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = -P_1, \quad (2)$$

and

$$\frac{dL_+}{dt} = -R_1. \quad (3)$$

where $P_1(t) = \langle (1 - S_{i-1})(1 + S_i)(1 - S_{i+1}) \rangle/8$ and $R_1(t) = \langle (1 + S_{i-1})(1 - S_i)(1 + S_{i+1}) \rangle/8$ are respectively the density of ‘+’ and ‘-’ domains of unit length, i.e., the density of triplets ‘- + -’ and ‘+ - +’. It is easy to see physically the origin of these two exact equations. Eq.(2) arises from the fact that the domain density can decrease only via the annihilation of the triplets ‘- + -’. Also, on average, the fraction of ‘+’ spins can decrease only due to the blockage by ‘+ - +’ triplets giving rise to Eq.(3).

Using $m(t) = \langle S_i \rangle = 2L_+(t) - 1$, we find from Eq.(3) that $dm/dt = -2R_1$. We note that for the case $\alpha = 1$, $dm/dt = 0$ [6], indicating that the magnetization does not evolve with time. In our case, due to the triplet defects ‘+ - +’, the average magnetization decays with time. We also note that, unlike the $\alpha = 1$ case, the evolution equation (3) for the single point correlation function involves two and three point correlations (via $R_1(t)$). Writing down the analogous equations for $R_n(t)$ gives an infinite hierarchy which makes an exact solution difficult for $\alpha = 0$.

Using $R_1 = r_1 N$ and $L_+ = l_+ N$ in Eq.(3), one can formally solve for $N(t)$ in terms of r_1 and l_+ as,

$$\frac{N(t)}{N(t_0)} = \frac{l_+(t_0)}{l_+(t)} \exp \left(- \int_{t_0}^t \frac{r_1(t')}{l_+(t')} dt' \right). \quad (4)$$

Furthermore if the density of the ‘+’ phase is $L_+(t_0) = \epsilon$, then, using the relation $N(t) = 1/[l_-(t) + l_+(t)]$ in Eq.(4), we find

$$\frac{l_-(t)}{l_+(t)} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \exp \left(\int_{t_0}^t \frac{r_1(t')}{l_+(t')} dt' \right) - 1, \quad (5)$$

clearly showing that the ratio $l_-(t)/l_+(t)$ is growing due to the presence of the triplets ‘+ - +’. Note that the asymmetry between the growth of ‘-’ and ‘+’ domains is evident due to the triplet defects ‘+ - +’, present with density $R_1 = r_1 N$.

In order to make further analytic progress, we first use the IIA where correlations between neighboring domains

are neglected. The IIA was used previously for the pure Glauber-Ising model, i.e., the $\alpha = 1$ case [8]. It yielded results in agreement, qualitatively as well as quantitatively to a fair degree of accuracy, with the exact results available [6,9]. Following the derivation of the IIA equations in the $\alpha = 1$ case, it is straightforward to derive the corresponding equations for the $\alpha = 0$ case [10]. Under this approximation, the domain densities $P_n(t)$ and $R_n(t)$ evolve as [10]

$$\frac{dP_n}{dt} = P_{n+1} + P_{n-1} - 2P_n + \frac{R_1}{N}(P_n - P_{n-1}) \quad (6)$$

for all $n \geq 1$ with $P_0 = 0$ (absorbing boundary condition) and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dR_n}{dt} &= R_{n+1} + R_{n-1} - 2R_n - \frac{P_1}{N}(R_n + R_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{P_1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} R_i R_{n-i-1}; \quad n \geq 2 \\ \frac{dR_1}{dt} &= R_2 - R_1 - \frac{P_1}{N} R_1, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $N(t) = \sum P_n = \sum R_n$. It can be easily checked that these two IIA equations satisfy Eqs.(2) and (3) exactly, and consequently also Eqs.(4) and (5).

To calculate $N(t)$ using Eq.(4), we need to evaluate two quantities from the IIA equations: (i) $r_1(t) = R_1/N$ and (ii) $l_+(t) = \sum np_n$ where $p_n = P_n/N$. In order to calculate these two quantities, it is useful to write the IIA equations in terms of the normalized variables, $p_n = P_n/N$ and $r_n = R_n/N$. From Eqs.(6) and (7), we then get,

$$\frac{dp_n}{dt} = p_{n+1} + p_{n-1} - 2p_n + r_1(p_n - p_{n-1}) + p_1 p_n \quad (8)$$

for all $n \geq 1$ with $p_0 = 0$ (absorbing boundary condition) and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dr_n}{dt} &= r_{n+1} + r_{n-1} - 2r_n - p_1 r_{n-1} \\ &\quad + p_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} r_i r_{n-i-1}; \quad n \geq 2 \\ \frac{dr_1}{dt} &= r_2 - r_1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It is easy to check that the normalization condition $\sum p_n = \sum r_n = 1$ is satisfied by these two equations.

The two IIA equations above are coupled nonlinear equations with infinite number of variables and hence are difficult to solve exactly. Our approach is a combination of a scaling assumption and then rechecking this assumption for self-consistency. Consider first the p_n equation, i.e. Eq.(8). We substitute $p_n(t) = t^{-1/2} f(nt^{-1/2}, t)$ in Eq.(8) and ask if the resulting equation allows for a steady state scaling solution as $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., if the scaling

function becomes explicitly independent of t as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is easy to verify that if $r_1(t)$ decays faster than $t^{-1/2}$, such a time-independent scaling solution is possible with $f(x) = \frac{x}{2} \exp(-x^2/4)$. In this case, $l_+(t) = \sum np_n \approx t^{1/2} \int_0^\infty x f(x) dx = \sqrt{\pi t}$ at late times.

Next we consider the r_n equation, i.e., Eq.(9). Since $p_1 = -d \log N / dt$, a natural choice would be to write $r_n(t) = N(t) g(nN(t), t)$. Substituting this in Eq.(9), we find that in the $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the equation allows for a time independent scaling function, $g(x) = c \exp(-cx)$ (c is a constant), provided $N(t)$ decays faster than $t^{-1/2}$. In this case, $r_1 = N(t)g(0) = cN(t)$. Thus if scaling starts holding beyond some time t_0 , then $c = r_1(t_0)/N(t_0)$.

Using the results (i) $r_1(t) = r_1(t_0)N(t)/N(t_0)$ and (ii) $l_+(t) = \sqrt{\pi t}$ in the exact equation Eq.(4), we find

$$\frac{N(t)}{N(t_0)} = \sqrt{\frac{t_0}{t}} \frac{\log(b)}{\log(bt/t_0)} \quad (10)$$

where $\log(b) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{r_1(t_0)\sqrt{t_0}}$. Substituting this result in the expression for $r_1(t)$, we find

$$r_1(t) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{t} \log(bt/t_0)}. \quad (11)$$

We now use the late time result Eq.(10) in the exact relation Eq.(2) and find,

$$p_1 = \frac{1}{2t} + \frac{1}{t \log(bt/t_0)}. \quad (12)$$

From the above expressions, it is clear that both $r_1(t)$ and $N(t)$ decay faster than $t^{-1/2}$ and hence our scaling solutions are completely self-consistent.

It is easy to see that these IIA results become exact in the zero density limit of the '+' phase ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$). In this limit, the average size of a '-' domain is $1/\epsilon$ times larger than the average size of a '+' domain. As time increases, the '+' domains will certainly grow in size. But a typical '+' domain will disappear (via the absorbing boundary condition) much before encountering other '+' domains, i.e., before feeling the presence of the constraint due to triplets '+ - +'. The probability of such an event is of order $O(\epsilon)$. Thus, effectively, the dynamics of the system will proceed via eating up of the '+' domains. Hence, if there is no correlation between domains in the initial condition, the dynamics is not going to generate correlations between them and hence IIA becomes exact. The picture in this limit is similar to the zero temperature dynamics of the q state Potts model in the limit $q \rightarrow 1^+$ [8]. For other volume fractions, it is likely that IIA predicts the correct fixed point picture at late times. This is confirmed by Monte Carlo simulations of the model.

To improve efficiency, these simulations were made for a version of the model with simultaneous updating. This should not change any of the above conclusions. For

convenience, we chose initial conditions such that all domains of minority spins had length 1, while the lengths of majority spin domains were distributed exponentially. At each time t , all kink positions were written into an array K , and only this array is used to generate the array K' for the next time step. For each value of $m(0)$ we simulated between 20 and 200 lattices of 2^{26} sites for 3×10^7 time steps.




FIG. 1. $l_-(t)/l_+(t)$ versus t for runs with different initial magnetizations.




FIG. 2. $\sqrt{t}N(t)$ versus $t/\tau[m(0)]$ for the same runs as in Fig.1. The solid line is the prediction $\text{const}/\log(t/\tau)$.

Data for $l_-(t)/l_+(t)$, plotted in Fig.1, show the predicted monotonic increase with t . This increase is logarithmic for $t > t_0$, while it is faster for $t < t_0$. For a detailed comparison with the above theory we need to know how t_0 (and thus also b) depends on $m(0)$. We expect it to be exponential for $m(0) \ll 1$, but this is not sufficient for a detailed analysis. Thus we determine for each $m(0)$ a τ such that the data for $l_-(t)/l_+(t)$, for $\sqrt{t}N(t)$, for $tp_1(t)$ and for $\sqrt{t}r_1(t)$ collapse when plotted against t/τ . The fact that a single $\tau[m(0)]$ exists which gives a good data collapse in all four plots is highly non-trivial. We just show such plots for $N(t)$, $p_1(t)$ and $r_1(t)$ in Figs.2 and 3. We see good agreement with the theoretical predictions. In particular, data collapse is excellent (showing that the only memory left from the initial con-

ditions is the current value of the magnetization). But the detailed predictions for the scaling function show substantial corrections which seem however to disappear for $t \rightarrow \infty$.




FIG. 3. $tp_1(t)$ (top) and $\sqrt{t}r_1(t)$ (bottom) versus $t/\tau[m(0)]$. To avoid overcrowding, only results for $m(0) = -2/3, 0$, and $2/3$ are shown. The dashed curves show the predictions $1/2 + 1/\ln(t/\tau)$ and $\sqrt{\pi}/\ln(t/\tau)$.

We thank M. Barma and C. Sire for useful discussions. A related reaction diffusion model has recently been studied numerically by Odor and Menyhárd [cond-mat/0002199]. We thank G. Odor for communicating his results to us.

-
- [1] J.P. Bouchaud, L.F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and M. Mézard, in *Spin Glasses and Random Field*, edited by A.P. Young (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
 - [2] G.H. Fredrickson, Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem. **39**, 149 (1988); J. Jackle and S. Eisinger, Z. Phys. B **84**, 115 (1991); P. Sollich and M.R. Evans, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3238 (1999).
 - [3] E.R. Nowak, J.B. Knight, E. Ben-Naim, H.M. Jaeger, and S.R. Nagel, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 1971 (1998).
 - [4] E. Caglioti, V. Loreto, H.J. Herrmann, and M. Nicodemi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 1575 (1997); M. Nicodemi, A. Coniglio, and H.J. Herrmann, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 3962 (1997); E. Ben-Naim, J.B. Knight, E.R. Nowak, H.M. Jaeger, and S.R. Nagel, Physica D **123**, 380 (1998); J. J. Brey, A. Prados, and B. Sanchez-Rey, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5685.
 - [5] A.J. Bray, Adv. Phys. **43**, 357 (1994).
 - [6] R.J. Glauber, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 294 (1963).
 - [7] A.J. Bray, J. Phys. A **22**, L67 (1990); J.G. Amar and F. Family, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 3258 (1990); S.N. Majumdar and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 270 (1995).
 - [8] P.L. Krapivsky and E. Ben-Naim, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 3788 (1997).
 - [9] B. Derrida and R. Zeitak, Phys. Rev. E **54**, 2513 (1996).
 - [10] S.N. Majumdar, D.S. Dean and P. Grassberger, unpublished.