

Non-trivial link overlap distribution in 3-dimensional Ising spin glasses

Guy Hed¹ and Eytan Domany²

¹Department of Science Teaching and ²Department of Physics of Complex Systems,
Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel

(Dated: December 2, 2024)

We investigate the distributions of the link overlap, $P(Q)$, in 3-dimensional Ising spin glasses. We use clustering methodology to identify a set of pairs of states from different Gibbs states, and calculate its contribution to $P(Q)$. We find that the distribution over this set does not become trivial as the system size increases.

I. INTRODUCTION

While equilibrium properties of infinite range spin glasses¹ are completely understood within the framework of replica symmetry breaking (RSB)^{2,3,4,5}, spin glasses with short range interactions are the subject of considerable current debate and controversy. Open questions address the nature of the low temperature phases^{4,5,6,7,8} and their theoretical description. Resolution of these issues by experiments or simulations is hindered by the extremely long relaxation time required for equilibration.

The the Edwards-Anderson model is the most widely studied type of short-range Ising spin glass

$$H(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{(i,j)} J_{ij} s_i s_j, \quad (1)$$

where the sum is over nearest neighbor sites, (i, j) , of a simple (hyper) cubic lattice with periodic boundary conditions, $s_i = \pm 1$, and the couplings, J_{ij} , are independent random variables taken from a normal distribution with zero average and standard deviation $J = 1$. For the infinite range Sherrington Kirkpatrick (SK) model the sum in Eq. 1 is over all pairs of sites and $J = 1/\sqrt{N}$.

The system (in 3 or more dimensions) has a finite critical temperature. Recent numerical analysis of 3-dimensional Ising spin glasses (3DISG) yielded⁹ $T_c = 0.951(9)$, whereas for the SK model $T_c = 1$. The high temperature phase of the model is a disordered paramagnet. As the temperature decreases below T_c the system undergoes a transition into a frozen spin-glass phase.

In the spin glass phase, the microstates are divided into Gibbs states; each constitutes an ergodic subset of phase space, i.e. a maximal subspace that the system can span (or visit) as time tends to infinity. In a finite system phase space consists of one such state; however, we identify the infinite volume Gibbs states with subsets of the phase space surrounded by free energy barriers, whose height diverges as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Here the term ‘‘Gibbs states’’ refers to such subsets.

Extensive recent numerical investigations, done at finite T ^{10,11,12}, as well as ground state analysis^{13,14,15,16}, suggest evidence for a multiplicity of Gibbs states in the low temperature phase of the 3DISG. The most widely

measured properties are

$$q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i t_i, \quad (2)$$

the site overlap between any two microstates \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{t} , the *global* distribution of q ,

$$p_J(q) = Z^{-2} \sum_{\mathbf{s}} e^{-H(\mathbf{s})} \sum_{\mathbf{t}} e^{-H(\mathbf{t})} \delta(q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - q), \quad (3)$$

and, in particular, $p(q) = \overline{p_J(q)}$, the distribution averaged over the random variables $\{J_{ij}\}$. In (3) Z is the partition function of the system.

There is general agreement that in 3DISG the averaged distribution $p(q)$ is not trivial (that is, does not converge to a δ -function in the infinite volume limit) and is not self averaging, in agreement with RSB theory.

As to the droplet theory^{6,17}, although its common interpretation involves a trivial $p(q)$ ¹⁸, it explicitly predicts only the triviality of the *local* $p(q)$ - the overlap distribution over a finite (large) window in an infinite system. That is, *locally* there is only one Gibbs state for the system (up to a spin-flip symmetry), so that when a finite window of an infinite system is viewed, the system will be almost always in this Gibbs state.

In order to test this prediction numerically, one should observe the site overlap in a finite constant window as the system size increases¹⁹. An alternative is to measure the link overlap

$$Q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = N_b^{-1} \sum_{(i,j)} s_i s_j t_i t_j, \quad (4)$$

summing over all the N_b bonds in the system, e.g. over all nearest neighbors pairs in the case of 3DISG. The distribution of the link overlap, $P_J(Q) = \langle \delta(Q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - Q) \rangle$, is defined similarly to $p_J(q)$ in Eq. 3. The average over realizations is $P(Q) = \overline{P_J(Q)}$.

According to the droplet theory $P(Q)$ is trivial and consequently $P_J(Q) = P(Q)$. This was predicted earlier from scaling analysis of numerical results^{20,21}. Newman and Stein^{8,22} showed that triviality of $P(Q)$ for given boundary conditions may be deduced from general considerations even if one relaxes some of the scaling assumptions of the droplet theory. However, according to




FIG. 1: The variance of the link overlap distribution, $P(Q)$, for 3DISG systems.

RSB $P(Q)$ is not trivial. Unlike the case of $p(q)$, the triviality of $P(Q)$ is still an open question^{8,23,24,25}.

II. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In the present work we analyze 3DISG systems of sizes $L = 8, 10, 12$. We generated 65 realizations of the disorder, $\{J_{ij}\}$, for each system size. For each realization we produced a weighted sample of microstates. We used simulated tempering Monte Carlo²⁶. The number of temperatures, N_T , and their values were determined so that in each inter-temperature step the transition probability is larger than 0.25.

We used $N_T = 16$ for $L = 8$, and $N_T \geq 27$ for $L = 10, 12$. The lowest and highest temperatures were $T_1 = 0.24J/k_B$ and $T_{N_T} = 2J/k_B$ ($T_{N_T} = 0.92J/k_B$ for $L = 8$). For every realization, we took $700N_T$ samples (i.e. microstate-temperature pairs). We ran $20N_T^2$ sweeps to thermalize the system, and the same number of sweeps between samples.

In most realizations the temperatures of consecutive samples were decorrelated, so that the system often went above T_c , where it lost spin correlations. For some realizations the decorrelation times were as large as 10 sampling cycles.

III. LINK OVERLAP DISTRIBUTION

One approach used to study the link overlap is to measure the fractal dimension of the surface of low energy excitations^{11,24}. Such studies are limited by the small system sizes available for numerical investigation.

Another approach is to calculate directly the moments of the link overlap distribution, $P(Q)$ ^{27,28}. In Fig. 1 we present $\overline{(Q^2)} - \overline{(Q)}^2$, the second moment of $P(Q)$. As the system size increases, the second moment decreases (apparently towards zero) at all temperatures, indicating that $P(Q)$ becomes trivial as $L \rightarrow \infty$.

However, characterization of the behavior of a distribution on the basis of a single parameter, such as a fractal dimension or a particular moment, may be misleading. This was demonstrated in Ref. 29 for the site overlap

distribution, and the same holds for the link overlap distribution.

The distribution $P_J(Q)$, measured for a particular realization of the random $\{J_{ij}\}$, may consist of many modes, which correspond to different peaks in the graph of $P_J(Q)$. Each such mode is related to the distribution of overlaps between two given Gibbs states. We denote by G_1 the Gibbs state with the highest statistical weight.

As temperature decreases the variation of the statistical weight of the Gibbs states increases. In particular, the weight of G_1 approaches 1 as T goes to zero. Thus, at low temperatures the most dominant mode of $P_J(Q)$ is

$$P_1(Q) = \text{Prob}(Q(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = Q \mid \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \in G_1) \quad (5)$$

- the distribution of overlaps within G_1 - which is trivial in the thermodynamic limit. At small system sizes, as the ones considered in this work, the peak of $P_1(Q)$ is still wide, and it narrows as L increases. Since even at finite (albeit low) temperatures $P_1(Q)$ dominates the distribution, one would expect a clear decrease of the variance of $P(Q)$ with size, as observed in Fig. 1, even if $P(Q)$ is non-trivial in the thermodynamic limit. Hence decrease of the second moment of the distribution with size may capture nothing but the narrowing of the dominant single peak part of a non-trivial $P(Q)$; in order to test non-triviality, it is much more effective to measure the size dependence of a quantity which is independent of the dominant (but uninformative) $P_1(Q)$.

We present $P(Q)$ in Fig. 2(a) for two temperatures, one above and one below T_c , for three system sizes. Above T_c , $P(Q)$ consists of a single peak which narrows as the L increases, approaching $\delta(Q - \overline{(Q)})$. Below T_c the distribution consists of a dominant peak, whose main contribution comes from $P_1(Q)$, and a tail at lower values of Q . As L increases, the peak narrows and since the weight of the peak is much larger than that of the tail, a single measured parameter (say moment) may reflect mainly the convergence of the peak to a δ function, which is expected irrespective of whether $P(Q)$ is trivial or not. To address this question one has to assess whether the weight of the tail of $P(Q)$, say, in the range $0 \leq Q \leq 0.8$, decreases with increasing system size.

If $P(Q)$ is to have a non-trivial component at the thermodynamic limit, it must originate from pairs of microstates that belong to different Gibbs states. Ideally, we would like to calculate the link overlap distribution over all such pairs. In finite systems this is not possible since we cannot identify the Gibbs states unambiguously. However, the coarsest partitions of phase space *can* be observed clearly, even for very small systems^{12,16}. This partition consists of two sets of microstates, \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 , which we identify by the *average linkage* agglomerative clustering algorithm³⁰.

The statistical weights of the sets \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 remain finite as the system size increases, and the average site overlap between them remains different from the overlap between two microstates that belong to the same




FIG. 2: (a) The link overlap distribution measured for 3DISG systems at $T = 0.28J/k_B < T_c$ (black) and $T = 1.35J/k_B > T_c$ (grey). (b) The distribution $P_o(Q)$ for $T = 0.28J/k_B$, which gives a finite contribution to $P(Q)$. All distributions are normalized to unity.

set¹². Therefore the contribution of the set of pairs of microstates $\{(s, t) | s \in C_1, t \in C_2\}$ to $P(Q)$ remains finite as the system size increases.

Following the method described in Ref. 29 for $p(q)$, we define

$$P_o(Q) = \text{Prob}(Q(s, t) = Q | s \in C_1, t \in C_2). \quad (6)$$

In order to move from a state in C_1 to a state in C_2 , some groups of spins (domains) have to be flipped. We refer to the surfaces that separate these flipped domains from spins that did not flip as domain walls. If these domain walls have a vanishing density, the fraction of

links affected by switching one micro-state from C_1 to C_2 goes to zero as the system size increases, and hence at the thermodynamic limit we will have $P_o(Q) = P(Q)$.

In Fig. 2(a) we observe that for 3DISG at $T = 0.28J/k_B$, $P(Q)$ seems to converge to a peak at $Q \simeq 0.9$. If $P_o(Q)$ does not converge to the same distribution, we expect it to have a non-vanishing weight at $Q < 0.9$. We calculate $\int_0^{0.8} P_o(Q) dQ$. For $L = 8, 10, 12$ the values of the integral are 0.81, 0.83, 0.80 respectively, suggesting that the weight of $P_o(Q)$ for $0 \leq Q \leq 0.8$ converges to ~ 0.8 . Thus, $P_o(Q)$ does not converge to the peak at $Q \simeq 0.9$ which dominates $P(Q)$.

These results imply that the domain walls between C_1 and C_2 occupy a finite fraction of the volume of the system. Since C_1 and C_2 remain finite and distinguishable as the system size increases¹², $P_o(Q)$ (shown in Fig. 2(b)) constitutes a finite contribution to $P(Q)$. Consequently, $P(Q)$ is not trivial at the thermodynamic limit.

IV. DISCUSSION

According to RSB theory, $P(Q)$ is not trivial. More over, all overlap measures are equivalent^{23,31}, so Q is determined by the value of the site overlap q . This statement is trivial for the SK model, where the sum in Eq. 4 is over all pairs of sites, so $Q(s, t) = (q^2(s, t) - N^{-1}) / (1 - N^{-1})$. In 3DISG the site overlap and bond overlap have different roles: given two states of the system, the site overlap is given by the volume of spin-domains flipped between the states, and the link overlap by the surface area of the domain walls.

Recent numerical investigation of 3DISG systems²⁵ indicated that the two overlaps are equivalent. This result along with previous numerical evidence for the non-triviality of the site overlap, $p(q)$, yield a non-trivial $P(Q)$ and support the results presented here.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge useful discussions with Ido Kanter, and a most helpful correspondence with A. Peter Young, Pierluigi Contucci and Cristian Giardinà.

¹ D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1792 (1975).

² G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1754 (1979).

³ G. Parisi, J. Phys. A **13**, 1101 (1980).

⁴ G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1946 (1983).

⁵ M. Mézard, G. Parisi, N. Sourlas, G. Toulouse, and M. Virasoro, J. Phys. (Paris) **45**, 843 (1984).

⁶ D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 386 (1988).

⁷ D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, J. Phys. A **20**, L1005 (1987).

⁸ C. M. Newman and D. L. Stein, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter

15, R1319 (2003).

⁹ H. G. Katzgraber, M. Körner, and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **73**, 224432 (2006).

¹⁰ E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 14852 (1998).

¹¹ H. G. Katzgraber, M. Palassini, and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 184422 (2001).

¹² E. Domany, G. Hed, M. Palassini, and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 224406 (2001).

¹³ E. Marinari and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 11677 (2000).

- ¹⁴ S. Franz and G. Parisi, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 485 (2000).
- ¹⁵ J. Houdayer, F. Krzakala, and O. C. Martin, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 467 (2000).
- ¹⁶ G. Hed, A. K. Hartmann, D. Stauffer, and E. Domany, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3148 (2001).
- ¹⁷ D. A. Huse and D. S. Fisher, J. Phys A **20**, L997 (1987).
- ¹⁸ D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1601 (1986).
- ¹⁹ M. Palassini and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5126 (1999).
- ²⁰ W. McMillan, J. Phys. C **17**, 3179 (1984).
- ²¹ A. Bray and M. Moore, J. Phys. C **17**, L463 (1984).
- ²² C. M. Newman and D. L. Stein (2005), cond-mat/0503344.
- ²³ G. Parisi and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, J. Phys. A **33**, 113 (2000).
- ²⁴ F. Krzakala and O. C. Martin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3013 (2000).
- ²⁵ P. Contucci, C. Giardinà, C. Giberti, and C. Vernia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 217204 (2006).
- ²⁶ E. Marinari and G. Parisi, Europhys. Lett. **19**, 451 (1992).
- ²⁷ P. Contucci and C. Giardinà, Ann. Henri Poincaré **6**, 915 (2005).
- ²⁸ P. Contucci, C. Giardinà, C. Giberti, G. Parisi, and C. Vernia (2006), cond-mat/0607376.
- ²⁹ G. Hed, A. K. Hartmann, and E. Domany, Europhys. Lett. **55**, 112 (2001).
- ³⁰ A. K. Jain and R. C. Dubes, *Algorithms for Clustering Data* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1988).
- ³¹ P. Contucci, J. Phys. A **36**, 10961 (2003).