A method for measuring the nonlinear response in dielectric spectroscopy through third harm onics detection

C. Thibierge, D. L'Hôte, F. Ladieu,^y and R. Tourbot Service de Physique de l'Etat Condense (CNRS/M IPPU/URA 2464), DSM/IRAM IS/SPEC CEA Saclay, Bat.772, F-91191 G if-sur-Y vette Cedex France

Abstract

We present a high sensitivity method allowing the measurement of the non linear dielectric susceptibility of an insulating material at nite frequency. It has been developped for the study of dynam ic heterogeneities in supercooled liquids using dielectric spectroscopy at frequencies 0.05 H z 10^4 Hz . It relies on the m easurem ent of the third harm on ics component of the current f 3 owing out of a capacitor. We rst show that standard laboratory electronics (am pliers and voltage sources) nonlinearities lead to limits on the third harm onics measurem ents that preclude reaching the level needed by our physical goal, a ratio of the third harm onics to the fundam ental signal about 10 7 . We show that reaching such a sensitivity needs a method able to get rid of the nonlinear contributions both of the measuring device (lock-in amplier) and of the excitation voltage source. A bridge using two sources ful 11s only the rst of these two requirem ents, but allows to measure the nonlinearities of the sources. Our nalmethod is based on a bridge with two plane capacitors characterized by di erent dielectric layer thicknesses. It gets rid of the source and ampli er nonlinearities because in spite of a strong frequency dependence of the capacitors in pedance, it is equilibrated at any frequency. We present the rst measurements of the physical nonlinear response using our method. Two extensions of the method are suggested.

E lectronic address: denis.lhote@ cea.fr

^yE lectronic address: francois.ladieu@ cea.fr

I. IN TRODUCTION

M easuring the nonlinear response of a physical system to an excitation is a way to investigate physical properties often unreachable through the linear response. Understanding nonlinear e ects allowed decisive breakthrough in condensed matter physics. Spin glasses[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], ferroelectric, freezing, or dipolar glass transitions[7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19], isotropic-liquid crystal transition [20, 21] or binary mixtures [22, 23], superconductivity [24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29], eld [0, 31, 32, 33, 34] or heating [35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40] e ects in electrical transport, heating due to electric eld excitation of supercooled liquids [41, 42] are a few among many topics where non linear m easurem ents have proven to be a precious tool.

The detection of harm on ics of the fundam ental response is a powerful method for studying nonlinear elects. It allows to get rid of the linear response signal, which usually is much larger than the sought nonlinear signals. We consider in this paper the nonlinear response of a dielectric system to a time-dependent electric eld E (t). The method we present allows to extract very low level harm onics in the response to a sinusoidal excitation. The most general relationship relating the response (polarisation P (t)) to the excitation E (t) can be written as a series expansion in E (the even term s are forbidden because of the symmetry with respect to eld reversal E (t) ! E (t)): $\frac{P(t)}{0} = \frac{Z_{1}}{1} \frac{ZZZ_{1}}{1} \frac{ZZZ_{1}}{1}$ (1)

In this equation $_0$ is the dielectric constant of vacuum, $_1$ the linear susceptibility and $_3$ the cubic nonlinear susceptibility. The dots in Eq.1 indicate an in nite sum involving higher order non linear susceptibilities $_5$, etc. Note that causality in plies $_i$ (t < 0) = 0. The Fourier transform of Eq.1 for a purely a.c. eld $E = E_0 \cos(!t)$ gives

$$\frac{P(!^{0})}{0} = \frac{E_{0}}{2} \quad _{1}(!) + \frac{3E_{0}^{2}}{4} \quad _{3}(\; !; !; !) + ::: \quad (!^{0} \; !) \\ + \frac{E_{0}}{2} \quad _{1}(\; !) + \frac{3E_{0}^{2}}{4} \quad _{3}(!; \; !; \; !) + ::: \quad (!^{0} + !) \\ + \frac{E_{0}^{3}}{8} \quad _{3}(!; !; !) \quad (!^{0} \quad 3!) \\ + \frac{E_{0}^{3}}{8} \quad _{3}(\; !; \; !; \; !) \quad (!^{4} + 3!) + :::; \qquad (2)$$

where the polarization P and the susceptibilities i are now in the frequency dom ain and

the dots indicate again in nite sums involving higher order terms. The response P (t) to E (t) = E₀ $\cos(! t)$ can thus be written

$$P(t) = {}_{0} = Re(E_{0,1}(!) + 3 = 4E_{0,3}^{3}(!) + :::)e^{i!t} + Re 1 = 4E_{0,3}^{3}(!)e^{i3!t} + ::: + :::; (3)$$

where we have used the fact that because $_1$ and $_3$ are real in the time domain, their Fourier transform verify $_1(!) = _1(!)$ and $_3(!_1;!_2;!_3) = _3(!_1; !_1; !_1)$ (the star denotes the complex conjugate), and the invariance of $_3$ by permutation of its arguments. For simplicity, we write $_3(!) = _3(!;!;!)$ and $_3(!) = _3(!;!;!)$. Eq.3 can be written

P (t)=
$$_{0}$$
 = E₀ ($_{1}^{0} \cos ! t + _{1}^{0} \sin ! t$) + 3=4E $_{0}^{3}$ ($_{3}^{0} \cos ! t$
+ $_{3}^{0} \sin ! t$) + :::+ 1=4E $_{0}^{3}$ ($_{3}^{0} \cos 3 ! t + _{3}^{0} \sin 3 ! t$) + :::;

11	١
(4)

where the susceptibilities $_{i}$ are written as a function of their real and in aginary parts $_{i}^{0}$ and $_{i}^{0}$. For practical applications, the modulii and arguments j_{i} j and $_{i}$ are rather used:

$$P(t) = {}_{0} = E_{0} j_{1} j cos(!t_{1}) + 3 = 4E_{0}^{3} j_{3} j cos(!t_{3}) + + :::+ 1 = 4E_{0}^{3} j_{3} j cos(3!t_{3}) + ::: (5)$$

We see in the set and second terms of the shs in Eqs3-5 that the nonlinear susceptibility $_{3}$ could be extracted from a measurement at the fundamental frequency by varying E_{0} . However, in most experiments $j_{1}j_{1}E_{0}^{2}j_{3}j_{3}j_{4}$ thus the nonlinear part can hardly be separated from the much larger $_{1}$ linear term. On the contrary measuring the harmonics yields directly the physical information contained in $_{3}$, $_{5}$, etc. In our case the physical information of interest is contained in $_{3}$ (see section II). We thus chose to measure the third harmonics. However, its relative magnitude with respect to the fundamental was so low that we had to develop a special method for obtaining an accurate measurement.

Experimentally, various methods have been used to extract a very small third, fth, etc. harmonics signal [7, 10, 25, 31, 35, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46]. A bridge technique has been often used: The rst arm of the bridge contains the sample under study, and the second arm a well known impedance with zero nonlinear response[43]. This is the case for speci c heat spectroscopy based on thermal di usion into a thick sample from a thin metallic Im that serves simultaneously as heater and therm on eter[37, 44, 46] or similarly for the study of a heating resistor where the third harm onics is related to its electrotherm alparam eters [35, 45]. The bridge technique has also been used to measure the nonlinear inductive response of a superconducting Im 25], the nonlinear behaviour of power piezoceram ic materials [10], etc. The bridge techniques evoked above cannot be used for our purpose because the balancing of the bridge at the fundam ental frequency would be lost at the third harm onics: The strong frequency dependence of our sample impedance can hardly be m imicked by a combination of resistors and capacitors in the second arm. As a result, the third harm onics generated by the voltage source would not be cancelled in the bridge.

In this paper, we report on a two sam ples bridge m ethod allow ing to m easure properly the third harm onics (i.e. the third term in the rhs of Eqs 3-5), and eventually other harm onics of the polarization induced by the ac E - ekl excitation of a dielectric sample placed between the two electrodes of a plane capacitor. This is done through the m easurement of the third harm onics of the current induced by the ac voltage excitation. Such a m easurement yields directly the cubic nonlinear term $_3$ of the response (assuming that the higher order contributions related to $_5$, $_7$, etc. to the third harm onics are weak which is the case in our experiment). We developed it for studying supercooled liquids such as glycerol. In part II we rst brie y summarize the physical interest of such m easurements. Part III is devoted to describing the experimental problems to solve. In part IV we present the two sam ple capacitors bridge m ethod which allows to measure $_3$. Part V gives our rst m easurements using this m ethod. Finally, in part V I we consider possible developments or extensions of this m ethod.

II. PHYSICAL MOTIVATION: DYNAMICAL CORRELATIONS IN GLASS FORMERS

The physics of structural glasses still lacks a m experimental basis for a growing length scale when the temperature T decreases towards the glass transition temperature T_g [47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52]. A basic feature of glassforming supercooled liquids is the spectacular increase of the characteristic relaxation time (T) as T decreases towards T_g . T_g is conventionally de ned by $(T_g)'$ 100 s. is often obtained from dielectric spectroscopy [48, 50, 53]. Fig. 1 shows an example of linear dielectric susceptibility _1(!) m easurement for glycerol ($C_3O_3H_8$, T_g' 190 K) at T = 211.8 K. The imaginary part

4

Im (1) is maximum, and the real part Re(1) is approximately half its maximum plateau for ! = 2 = . At present, the fast decrease of ! with T has not received a unique m icroscopic physical interpretation, but a sem inal concept [54, 55] is that of cooperative e ects: W hen $T_{\rm a}$ is approached, m olecules belonging to larger and larger regions (called dynam ical heterogeneities, DH) should move in a correlated way to allow relaxation. Correlation lengths probing such cooperative e ects have been extracted experim entally, leading to length scales estimates of 4 12 m olecular diameters 47, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61]. However these experiments were not able to test the expected increase of the correlation length as T decreases towards T_q which is of fundamental interest. For spin glasses the increase of the correlation length close to the critical tem perature is associated to the divergence of $_{\rm i}$ 3) [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. This suggests to investigate (T) (i 3) close to the structural (i glass transition, although no divergence is expected. Up to very recently, the nonlinear susceptibility $_{3}(!)$ had never been measured in these systems (see however [41, 42, 62]) contrary to spin glasses. However, some important theoretical progress was made recently by Bouchaud and Biroli [63] who established that:

$$_{3}(!) = \frac{0}{k_{\rm B}} \frac{2}{1} (0) a^{3}}{k_{\rm B}} N_{\rm corr} H (!);$$
(6)

where a^3 is the molecular volume and H is a complex scaling function which should have a maximum (in modulus) for ! '2. N_{corr} is the maximum of the number of correlated particles N_{corr} (t) which increases with the time t, reaches its maximum N_{corr} fort and then goes to 0 fort ! 1. This is rejected in the frequency space by the fact that jH (!) j should be maximum for ! !. Thus, measuring the nonlinear dielectric response 3 gives the size N_{corr} of the correlated regions and its T-dependence.

W hat is the value of $_{3}(!)$ that can be expected from Eq.6? The answer cannot be very precise since little is known about H which, theoretically, should reach a maximum of \order 1" for ! \oforder 1" fo]. A conservative estimate of $j_{3j_{max}} = \max_{1}(j_{3}(!))$ for N_{corr} = 1 can be drawn by assuming max₁ ($j_{1}(!)$) = 1. We consider the case of glycerol at 200 K. $_{1}(0)$ should be replaced by $_{1}(0)$ $_{1}(1) =$ 72 ($_{1}(!) =$ (!) 1) because only the contribution of them olecularm otion to the dielectric response is considered. a³ / 0.115 nm³ is obtained from the density at 200 K [64] and the molecular mass 92.09 g. As a reference, we take j (! = 2 =)j = jl + $_{1}(!)j'$ 52, and nd by using Eq.6, $j_{3j_{max}} = j(!)j'$ 3:685 10¹⁷ m² N². We shall use this value in section IIIA to determ ine the sensitivity required in our experim ents.

III. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ELECTRON-ICS

A. Cryogenics and nonlinear dielectric m easurem ents

The experiments were performed in a cryostat connected to a cryogenerator with a base tem perature of 10 K. The experimental cell is a closed metallic box placed in vacuum, related to the cold stage of the cryogenerator through a therm al impedance [53]. The tem perature T in the cell is set by a PID LakeShore^R 331 controller which regulates the heating power owing through the therm al impedance. The cell contains two independent plane capacitors of equal surfaces S but di erent thicknesses L_{thick} and L_{thin} (The reason for two capacitors instead of one is given in section IV). The capacitors are used to m easure the dielectric susceptibilities of a glassform ing liquid (glycerol) placed between the electrodes. For each capacitor, the two electrodes are immersed in the liquid. We used two experimental setups A and B. In setup A, the electrodes of the two capacitors are polished and gold plated brass squares (S $^{\prime}$ 5.5 cm 2), separated by three 0.03 cm 2 M ylar R discs of thickness $\rm L_{th\,in}$ ' 30 m for the thinner sample and $\rm L_{th\,ick}$ ' 60 m for the thickest sample. Setup B is an improved version, in which the electrodes are gold plated copper disks (m etallic m irrors) with L_{thin} ' 19 m, L_{thick} ' 41 m and S = 3.14 cm². W e m in im ized the spacers volume in order to minimize their contribution to the dielectric response of the capacitors. The supercooled liquid was allowed to ow in and out of the volum e between the electrodes in order to avoid pressure e ects due to the di erent dilatation coe cients of the supercooled liquid and the spacers. The results presented in sections III, IV (resp.V) were obtained using setup A (resp. B). A pressure of 2 bars of Argon was set in the cell at room temperature to ensure that, at the working temperature of 200 K, the pressure in the cell rem ains above 1 bar, preventing the form ation of bubbles of the gas adsorbed at the surface of the electrodes or dissolved in glycerol. Coaxial shielding was ensured all along the circuit, from the measurement apparatus at room temperature down to the experimental cellat low tem perature.

W hen a voltage V (t) = $V_0 \cos(!t)$ is applied to the electrodes of a plane capacitor of

6

thickness L and surface S, the resulting eld E (t) = V (t)=L induces a polarization P (t) and an electrical displacement D (t) = $_0E$ (t) + P (t). As a result, a current I (t) ows in the circuit, the current density I=S being the time derivative of D (t). Using Eq 3, in which only the rst terms of the fundamental and third harmonics series are kept, we thus have

$$I(t) = Re(I(!)e^{i!t} + I(3!)e^{i3!t});$$
(7)

where I(!) and I(3!) are complex numbers giving the magnitude and the phase of the two components of the current. The linear part of the current is given by $I(!) = Y(!)V_0$ where the adm ittance Y (!) = G + i! C comprises the conductance G = $_0!$ Im $(_1(!))$ S=L and the capacitance $C = {}_{0}Re(1 + {}_{1}(!))S=L.As$ depicted in the upper inset of Fig. 1, we measure the current I(!) through the voltage drop V_A (!) across a resistor r = 1 k in series with the capacitor. All the voltage measurem ents presented in this paper were perform ed with a standard commercialphase sensitive lock-in ampli er with an input impedance Z, of 10 M in parallel with 25 pF. The accuracy of the V_A (!) measurement is typically not much better than 0:1%, which justi es that in the analysis of I(!) we neglect the contributions of the nonlinear term s of the series giving the response at the fundam ental frequency. The voltage sources were limited to V_s (!) 7 V (rm s) for the measurements with setup A presented in sections III, IV and IV B and to V_s (!) 14 V (m s) for those with setup B presented in section V. The frequency range was about 0.05 Hz !=2 10Hz. All the voltage 3 and current m agnitudes presented hereafter are rm s.

The calculation of the third harm onics component of the current, I (3!) $e^{i3!t}$ (see Eq. 7) from the time derivative of D (neglecting the contribution of the term s proportional to 5, 7,...), gives

$$I(3!) = \frac{3i}{4} {}_{0}! {}_{3}(!)S \frac{V_{0}}{L}^{3}:$$
(8)

In what follows, we investigate the measurement of I(3!) (and I(!)) for our liquid dielectric capacitors (that will be called \sample capacitors" or \samples" for simplicity). As the third harmonics current is simply added to the fundamental (Eq. 7), the sample can be represented for what concerns the third harmonics by a current source given by Eq. 8 and placed in parallel with the liquid dielectric capacitor, whose complex admittance is Y (3!) (see lower inset of Fig. 1). Note that due to the Thevenin theorem, one could, as well, represent the sample at 3! by a voltage source $V_{\text{sam ple}} = I(3!) = I(3!)$ in series with the impedance Z (3!) = 1=Y (3!).

From the estimate of j₃ j in section II, we can determ ine the required sensitivity of our measurements. The complex currents I(!) and I(3!) being obtained from the complex fundamental and third harmonics components of the displacement, we have I(!) = $i! S (1 + 1)_0 E_0$ and I(3!) = $3i=4! S_{-3}_0 E_0^3$, thus

$$\frac{\mathbf{j}(3!)\mathbf{j}}{\mathbf{j}(!)\mathbf{j}} = \frac{3\mathbf{j}_{3}(!)\mathbf{j}}{4\mathbf{j}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{E}_{0}^{2} \mathbf{\prime} 2:76 \quad 10^{17} \mathbf{E}_{0}^{2}; \tag{9}$$

where the numerical factor is obtained for ! = !, and E_0 is in V/m. We have assumed, according to the theoretical prediction [63] that $j_3(!)j' j_3j_{max}$, and used the value of j_3j_{max} estimated in section II. The maximum eld E_0 in our experiments is 200 kV/m for setup A (7 V on 30 m), and 740 kV/m for setup B (14 V on 19 m), thus jI(3!)=I(!)j' 1:1 10⁶ or 1:5 10⁵. The required sensitivity on the measurement of jI(3!)=I(!)jbwer than these values, about 1 10⁷ because of the uncertainty on H and to allow the measurement of $_3(!)$ when its magnitude is below j_3j_{max} . We thus look for a setup whose relative parasitic contributions at 3! remain below 10⁷.

B. Nonlinear behavior of the lock-in am pli er

In this section we see why the simplest possible circuit, depicted in the upper inset of Fig.1, cannot work to detect I (3!). For simplicity we assume that the resistance r is small with respect both to the impedance of the sample $\frac{1}{2}$ (!) jand to the input impedance of the lock-in amplier $\frac{1}{2}$ (!). The voltage drop accross r at the fundamental frequency is thus V_A (!) ' $V_s r=2$ (!). Fig.2 shows that applying a 1! signal directly at the input of the lock-in amplier induces the measurement of a rather important 3! signal. We found by using the method described in section IIIC that this signal does not come from the source (which is that of the lock-in amplier) which is expected to generate small harmonics in addition to the 1! signal. It thus comes from the nonlinearities of the lock-in amplier itself. We checked that the behavior reported in Fig.2 does depend neither on the frequency, nor on the output impedance of the source r_0 .

The magnitude of the 3! signal due to the lock-in ampli er nonlinearities is much larger than the one expected from a glycerol sample in the simplest possible circuit, i.e. the sample in series with a measuring resistance r, see upper inset of Fig. 1. A ssum ing r J_{z} (!) j one nds that I (3!), see Eq.8, yields a voltage $V_{A;sample}$ (3!) ' rI (3!), while I (!) ' $V_{s}=Z$ (!), thus:

$$\frac{V_{A;sample}(3!)}{V_{s}} \cdot \frac{r}{Z(!)} \frac{I(3!)}{I(!)}$$
(10)

We have seen in section IIIA that a typical maximum expected value of jI(3!)=I(!)jwas about 10⁶ - 10⁵. There is an optimum of the ratio r=jZ(!)j which maximizes $jV_{A;sam ple}(3!)j$ (see section IVA), and a reasonnable value is 0.1. Thus Eq. 10 gives $V_{A;sam ple}(3!)=V_s$ 10⁷ - 10⁶. The corresponding V_s is of the order of 10 V and gives $V_A(!)$ ' 1 V, thus by using Fig. 2 we nd that the lockin nonlinearities give $V_A(3!)=V_s$ 10³, i.e. values much larger than the sam ple contribution.

To sum m arize this section, we found that the nonlinearities of a standard lock-in am pli er are such that, due to our very low physical JI(3!)=I(!)J ratio, the 1! component must be \rem oved from the signal", before it enters into the lockin for the 3! detection. This is why, in the next sections, we shall report results obtained with bridges perform ing a 1! subtraction".

C. Nonlinear behavior of the voltage source

1. Two sources bridge

Let us consider the circuit depicted in the inset of F ig. 3. It uses two 1! voltage sources $V_{s;1}$ (!) and $V_{s;2}$ (!) with a common ground and a tunable relative phase shift. The lock-in ampli er (input impedance Z_L) is used to measure the voltage at point A which is connected to the reference resistor R and to the sample capacitor (impedance Z (!)). Considering, for simplicity, the case R; Z_L j we calculate the voltage at point A at the fundamental frequency :

$$V_{A}(!) = \frac{Z(!)V_{s;1}(!) + RV_{s;2}(!)}{Z(!) + R}$$
(11)

The balancing condition which ful $lls V_A$ (!) = 0 (see section IIIB) is

$$\frac{V_{s;1}(!)}{V_{s;2}(!)} = \frac{R}{Z(!)}$$
(12)

We used a Tektronix ^R AFG 3102 dual channel voltage source for which the relative phase between $V_{s;1}$ (!) and $V_{s;2}$ (!) is tunable with an accuracy of 0.01 degree, while $\mathbf{j}V_{s;1}$ (!) jand $\mathbf{j}V_{s;2}$ (!) jcan be tuned with a relative precision of 10⁴. As a consequence, $\mathbf{j}V_A$ (!)= $V_{s;2}$ (!) j can be made as smallas 5 10⁵. As a result, we nd by extrapolating the curve of Fig.2, that the lock-in nonlinearities contribution to V_A (3!) remains much below 2 nV for the maximum voltage $V_{s;2}$ (!) = 7 V (which gives jV_A (!) j' 5 10^5 7 V = 0:35 10^3 V).

This value 2 nV is small in comparison with the expected physical signal $V_{A;sam ple}$ (3!). The latter can be estimated by using the circuit equivalent to the sam ple at 3!: a current source I (3!) in parallel with the sam ple of impedance Z (3!) (see section IIIA and Fig.1).

$$\frac{V_{A;\text{sam ple}}(3!)}{V_{s;2}(!)} = \frac{R=Z(!)}{1+R=Z(3!)} \frac{I(3!)}{I(!)};$$
(13)

where we have assumed R; \underline{z} j \underline{z}_{L} j. We chose R ' 0.084 \underline{z} (!) j (The maximum voltage cannot be applied to the sample if $\underline{R} = \underline{Z}$ (1!) j 1). For the capacitor we used ($\underline{L}_{thin} = 30$ m), ! = 2 = (see section II) and $V_{s;2}$ (!) = 7 V, and by using the value \underline{J} (3!)=I (!) j' 10⁷ obtained in section IIIA as the required sensitivity of our measurements, as well as \underline{z} (!)=Z (3!) j 1.85, we nd $\underline{y}_{;sample}$ (3!) j' 6 10⁸ V > 2 nV. Thus the problem of the lock-in nonlinear contribution is solved by the two sources bridge.

Despite this important feature, we shall see now that the two sources bridge does not reach the required resolution of $jI(3!)=I(!)j' 1 10^7$. This com es from the fact that the two sources, as any active electronic device, have a non-zero harm onic distortion: They generate $V_{s,1}$ (3!) and $V_{s,2}$ (3!) voltages in addition to $V_{s,1}$ (!) and $V_{s,2}$ (!). Thus a possible remaining problem is the contribution of $V_{s,1}$ (3!) and $V_{s,2}$ (3!) to V_A (3!). To reduce it, we low-pass litered the sources outputs with a dual channel six poles elliptic active liter, with a corner frequency f_c chosen close to the working frequency !=2. The liter dam ps the 3! component of the incoming signal, while it does not a ect the 1! component. We veried that this ltering reduced signi cantly the harm onics magnitude. Fig3 shows the measured V_A (3!) for the two sources bridge at ! = ! . The results are the same for the thin and the thick sample of setup A ($L_{thin} = 30$ m and $L_{thick} = 60$ m), which shows that the m easured signals do not com e from the sam ples. Indeed, Eq. 8 gives a current jl (3!) jeight tim es larger for the thin sample than for the thick one. We took R ' 0:084 ½ (!) jin order to keep sim ilar values of $V_{s,1}$ (!) and $V_{s,2}$ (!) for the thin and the thick sample measurem ents, thus, from Eq.13, the expected ratio of V_A (3!) for the two samples is 4, instead of the \no change" result of Fig. 3. Thus we conclude that the third harm onics generated by the voltage sources are responsible for the results of Fig. 3. We veried that the expected physical value $V_{A;sample}$ (3!) (see section IIIA) is indeed lower than the measured V_{A} (3!).

A closer look at the equilibrium condition (Eq. 12) of our two sources bridge reveals

that once the circuit is balanced at 1!, it should not be in general balanced at 3!, for two reasons. First, because of the strong change of Z (!) when going from 1! to 3! (due to the $_1$ (!) dependence, see Fig. 1) while R remains constant. Note that to m in ick the Z (!) dependence by using an impedance m ade of resistors and capacitors instead of R would be hardly feasible because its components should be changed and tuned for each frequency and temperature. Second, and m ore importantly, because $V_{s;1}$ (3!) di ers from $V_{s;2}$ (3!) as can be deduced from the comparison of the 3! signals measured when the two sources are exchanged (see Fig. 3).

2. Measurement of the harm onics signals generated by the sources

The two sources bridge cannot be used to measure the nonlinear response of the samples, however it can be used to measure with a great accuracy the harm onics $V_{s;1}$ (n!) and $V_{s;2}$ (n!) of our voltage sources. This is of general interest for characterizing the harm onic distortion of any source, and it will be used in section IV (N ote that we propose another method in section V). We now consider only the thickest sample of setup A for which I (3!) is negligible. A ssum ing that the voltage measured at point A at frequency n!, V_A (n!), is due to the sources, we don't for the circuit in the inset of Fig.3

$$V_{A}(n!) = \frac{YV_{s;1}(n!) + Y(n!)V_{s;2}(n!)}{Y + Y(n!) + Y_{L}(n!)};$$
(14)

with y = 1=R, Y(n!) = 1=Z(n!) and $Y_L(n!) = 1=Z_L(n!)$. For any given n, another equation is necessary to determ ine the unknown complex quantities $V_{s;1}(n!)$ and $V_{s;2}(n!)$. It is obtained by exchanging the two sources in the circuit. The measured signal becomes $V_{A,ex:}$:

$$V_{A,ex:}(n!) = \frac{Y(n!)V_{s;1}(n!) + yV_{s;2}(n!)}{y + Y(n!) + Y_{I_{s}}(n!)};$$
(15)

Note that $V_{s;1}$ (n!) and $V_{s;2}$ (n!) are two functions of respectively $V_{s;1}$ (1!) and $V_{s;2}$ (1!) which can be dimension from each other. Thus, for Eqs.14,15 to contain the same unknown quantities, we had to choose $R = \frac{1}{2}$ (1!) jin order that $\frac{1}{2}_{s;1}$ (1!) j = $\frac{1}{2}_{s;2}$ (1!) jbecause of the equilibration condition (see Eq.12). As a result Eqs 14 and 15 can be easily solved.

Figure 4 displays the harm onics $V_{s,1}$ (n!) of source 1 and $V_{s,2}$ (n!) of source 2 obtained by using the two sources bridge m ethod, for ! = (2) = 88 Hz. The main features are: i) The second harm onics of both sources are similar in magnitude and phase. $jV_{s,i}(2!)j$ increases as the power two of the 1! voltage.ii) The third harm onics is twice smaller for source 2 than for source 1. One nds $\mathbf{j}_{s,2}(3!)\mathbf{j}/|\mathbf{j}_{s,2}(1!)\mathbf{j}^{16}$, i.e. a nearly cubic dependence which could have been m istaken with the physical signal if the tests mentionned above had not been performed. iii) The Total H arm onic D istortion (THD), given by sum ming up all the harm onics magnitudes n 2 and dividing by the magnitude of the fundam ental signal, is dominated by the second harm onics. Thus, from Fig. 4, at $V_s = 7$ V the THD is of the order of 5 10^5 , well below the 10^4 specil cation which is usually ensured by high quality electronic devices. These features remain basically true for all the frequencies we studied in the 1–100 H z range. Fig. 5 gives the second and third harm onics of the second source at 428 H z that will be used in the next section.

We sum marize this section III by emphasizing the two main requirements that have to be met to measure the nonlinear response of our samples: First, the 1! part of the signal has to be suppressed before amplifying the sought 3! signal, and this can be done by using a bridge technique. Second the bridge must be balanced at ! and 3!.

IV. A SETUPALLOW ING THE MEASUREMENT OF $_3(!)$ of supercooled glycerol

A. One source bridge with two sam ples

Let us consider the circuit depicted in the inset of Fig. 6. It uses only one source and is inspired from the W heastone bridge, but it contains two liquid dielectric capacitors of di erent thicknesses L_{thin} and L_{thick} . The right arm of the bridge contains the thin capacitor (\thin sample") of impedance Z_{thin} / L_{thin} in series with a chosen impedance Z_{thin} , while the left arm contains the thick capacitor (\thick sample") of impedance Z_{thick} / L_{thick} in series with a chosen impedance z_{thick} . The signal V_m is measured between the two middle points of the two arm swith our lock-in ampli er in di erentialm ode. The input impedances of the lock-in are much larger than j_{thin} jand j_{thick} j thus the measured voltage V_m is at any frequency, due to the source voltage V_s at the same frequency is

$$\frac{V_{m ;s}(!)}{V_{s}(!)} = \frac{Z_{thin} Z_{thick}}{(Z_{thin} + Z_{thin}) (Z_{thick} + Z_{thick})};$$
(16)

where the impedances are taken at the frequency considered. The bridge is balanced for

$$z_{\text{thin}} Z_{\text{thick}} = z_{\text{thick}} Z_{\text{thin}}$$
(17)

The key point is that if we choose z_{thin} and z_{thick} of the same nature (e.g. two resistances, or two capacitances), once Eq.17 is full led at a given frequency, it is full led at any frequency. This is because the relative variations of the two sam ples in pedances with frequency are the same on both sides of Eq.17. As a result, if the equilibration condition (Eq.17) is full led at 1!, all the harm onics V_s (n!) generated by the source will give a zero contribution to V_m . This two-capacitors bridge thus allows to get rid of both the nonlinearities of the am plier (see section IIIB) and of the harm onics generated by the source (see section IIIC).

O by iously, the physical contributions from the sam ples yield a non-zero m easured signal $V_{m \ sam ple}(3!)$ because the two current sources at 3! corresponding to the sam ples verify $I_{thin}(3!) / L_{thin}^3$ and $I_{thick}(3!) / L_{thick}^3$ (see section IIIA). For a typical $L_{thick} = 2I_{thin}$, the factor 8 between the two currents is not compensated by the factor 2 between z_{thick} and z_{thin} : The relation between the measured signal and the two physical currents is

$$V_{m ; sam ple} (3!) = \frac{I_{thin} (3!)}{Y_{thin} (3!) + Y_{thin} (3!)} - \frac{I_{thick} (3!)}{Y_{thick} (3!) + Y_{thick} (3!)};$$
(18)

where $Y_{thin} = 1 = Z_{thin}$, $Y_{thick} = 1 = Z_{thick}$, $y_{thin} = 1 = z_{thin}$ and $y_{thick} = 1 = z_{thick}$. By using Eqs 8,17 and $Y_{thick} = Y_{thin} = L_{thin} = L_{thick}$, Eq. 18 becomes

$$V_{m ; sam ple}(3!) = \frac{I_{th in}(3!)}{y_{th in}(3!) + Y_{th in}(3!)} \qquad 1 \qquad \frac{L_{th in}}{L_{th ick}}^{2!} :$$
(19)

In practice, z_{thin} and z_{thick} were resistors (r_{thin} and r_{thick}), but we in proved the equilibration by adding a small capacitor c_{thin} in parallel with $r_{thin} \cdot c_{thin}$ compensates for the unavoidable stray capacitances between the circuit and the ground. The equilibration was realized by tuning r_{thin} , r_{thick} and c_{thin} to minimize jV_m jat 1!. In practice, the equilibration at n! (n > 1) is not perfect: Small asymetries between the two samples, stray capacitances which are not proportionnal to the samples thicknesses etc make that V_m (n!) is not exactly zero. The bridge is thus characterized by the quality factors (n!) = jV_m (n!)=V s(n!)j which can be measured by tuning the source fundam ental frequency at n!. W ith setup A (S ' 5.5 cm², L_{thin} ' 30 m, L_{thick} ' 60 m, see section IIIA), we reached e.g. (1!) ' 3 10⁵, (2!) ' 5:9 10³ and (3!) ' 12 10² for !=2 = 27 H z and ! ' ! (T = 208 K).W ith setup B (S ' 3.14 cm², L_{thin} ' 19 m, L_{thick} ' 41 m), we obtained (1!) ' 2:7 10⁶, (2!) ' 6:6 10⁴ and (3!) ' 1:4 10³ for !=2 = 29 H z and ! ' ! (T = 209.5 K). Note that smaller values of (3!) are obtained in the range ! ! (i.e. when the capacitances of the samples are the largest): for example, with setup B, for T = 204:5K and ! = ! = 0.0567, we nd $(3!)' 2 = 10^{\circ}$ while (1!) is only one order of m agnitude lower.

There is an optimum of the ratio $r_{thin} = \not Z_{thin} (1!) j = r_{thick} = \not Z_{thick} (1!) j$ which maximizes the measured voltage $\not y_{m ;sam ple}(3!) j$. If this ratio decreases, the voltage $V_0 = V_s (1!) \not Z_{thin} = (r_{thin} + Z_{thin}) j$ applied to the sam ples increases, thus $jI(3!) j / V_0^3$ increases too; but at the same time, the contribution of I(3!) to $V_m ;_{sam ple}(3!)$ decreases because it results from this current owing through $\not z_{thin}$ (or r_{thick}) in parallel with $Z_{thin}(3!)$ (or $Z_{thick}(3!)$). We found that this optimum was $r_{thin} = \not Z_{thin}(1!) j = r_{thick} = \not Z_{thick}(1!) j' 0.36$. This value depends only weakly on the frequency and on (T) (see section II).

B. Detection of the nonlinear dielectric response of glycerol

We show in this section that by using the two sample bridge with setup A (see section IIIA) and the source 2 (whose harm onic distortion has been studied in section IIIC), we reached the sensitivity needed to detect the physical signal. We compare the measured voltage due to the source harm onics $V_{m,s}$ (3!) to the expected physical signal $V_{m,sam,ple}$ (3!), for the maximum source voltage $V_{s,2}$ (!) = 7 V at !=(2) = 4.28 Hz (!=! 1 for T = 203.7 K), with setup A (L_{thin} = 30 m, L_{thick} = 60 m). Using the results reported in Fig.5 and the measured (3!)' 1.4 10², we nd $j'_{m,ss}$ (3!)= $V_{s,2}$ (1!)j 7 10⁸. By using jI (3!)=I (!)j' 1.1 10⁶ (see section IIIA and Eq 9) and Eq. 19, we obtain $j'_{m,sam,ple}$ (3!)= $V_{s,2}$ (1!)j 8 10⁸. The measured voltage is V_m (3!) = $V_{m,ss}$ (3!) + V_m, sam, ple (3!), and the physical signal should contribute to V_m (3!).

Figs 6 and 7 give the measured V_m (2!) and V_m (3!) for the same frequency 4.28 H z and temperature 203.7 K.Fig. 6 shows that the measured V_m (2!) can be calculated by assuming that it is only due to V_s (2!) generated by the source, in agreement with I (2!) = 0 due to the eld reversal symmetry mentionned in the introduction. On the contrary, Fig.7 shows a discrepancy between V_m (3!) and the $V_{m,s}$ (3!) value that should be measured if it was only due to V_s (3!) generated by the source, strongly suggesting that a physical signal is present. A s for n = 2, we used $jV_{m,s}$ (3!) j= (3!) jV_s (3!) j with a proper treatment of the phase. The physical signal should grow as V_s (!)³, while $V_{s,2}$ (3!) grows as V_s (!)^{2.6} (see section IIIC 2). This di erence of exponents explains that V_m (3!) grows slower at high voltages where the physical signal should dom in the progressively $V_{m,s}$ (3!). This also explains the evolution of the phase. The V_m (3!) vs. V_s (!) data can be tted by a sum of V_m ; (3!) and a physical signal $[V_s(!)]^3$ where is a complex number. The same can be done at other temperatures and frequencies. However, we rather present in the next section the results obtained with setup B using another source: The improved quality factor and J(3!)=I(!) jratic for this setup, and the lower THD of the source allowed the rst accurate measurement of 3.

V. MEASUREMENT OF THE NONLINEAR DIELECTRIC RESPONSE OF A SUPERCOOLED LIQUID

W e present in this section our st m easurem ents of the nonlinear dielectric susceptibility of supercooled glycerol. We used the two samples bridge, with setup B (see section IIIA: L_{thin} ' 19 m, L_{thick} ' 41 m and S = 3.14 cm²). We used a voltage source with a lower total harm onic distortion (THD) than the sources used in sections III, IV: It was a SRS^R DS360 ultra low distorsion function generator, with V_s 14 V and a typical THD ranging from -98 dB to -109 dB (for $V_s = 10 \text{ V}$) in our frequency range. Note that due to the very low level of our physical signal, our bridge technique remains necessary even with such a low THD.Fig.8 shows the current I_{thin} (3!) calculated from the measured $V_{m ; sam ple}$ (3!) by using Eq. 19, as a function of the source voltage magnitude V_s ; for T = 210.2 K, !=2 = ! = 2 = 43.76 Hz. A clear $J_{\text{thin}}(3!) j / J_s(!) j^3$ dependence is found, while the phase of I(3!) does not depend on y_s (!) j. These results are a strong indication that the origin of the signal is really the nonlinear response of the sam ples. A constant phase suggests that no other signal than the physical one is present, contrary to the results of the previous section. The magnitude is of the order of the estimated physical value $\frac{1}{1}(3!)=I(!)\frac{1}{5}$ 10⁵ for $V_s = 14 V$ (see section III) which gives J (3!) J' 3 10¹⁰ A.

To con m the physical origin of ourm easurem ent, we compared these results to the data obtained by using a passive notch the method. The principle of this method is depicted in the inset of Fig. 8: The source voltage V_s (!) is applied to a sample capacitor (in pedance Z) in series with a resistor r. The 3! voltage a point A (V_A (3!)) is measured by the lock-in ampliter. However, contrary to the method depicted in section IIIB, the fundamental component of the voltage at point A, V_A (!) is strongly attenuated by a \twin-T " passive notch there with a center frequency $f_c = !=2$. The twin-T notch there is made of three capacitors C, C, 2C and three resistors 2R, 2R R, and $f_c = 1=2$ RC [65]. A passive the

avoids the nonlinearities related to active components, and we verilled that the resistors and capacitors did not yield noticeable 3! contribution to V_A . The attenuation coellicient at 1! (a few 10⁴) was such that the 1! component at the lock-in input yielded a negligible 3! harmonics (see Fig. 2). To subtract the contribution to V_A (3!) of the third harmonics due to the source V_s (3!), the measurement was repeated with a circuit in which the sample was replaced by a resistor of impedance f_z (!) j. Finally, the currents I (3!) obtained by using this method with the thin or the thick capacitor were proportional to the thicknesses at the power 3 as expected (see Eq.8). The current I (3!) obtained with the twin-T liter method is in remarkable agreement with the current obtained using the two sample bridge, both in what concerns the phase and the magnitude (see Fig. 8).

We also con med the purely physical origin of our results of Fig.8 by verifying that the two possible contributions to V_m (3!) due to the source and to the lock-in ampli er were negligible in the case of the two samples bridge. As explained above, Vs (3!) was measured by using the twin-T notch lter method with the sample replaced by a resistor. Its value depends on ! and V_s , but we found that its contribution to V_m (3!) remained much smaller than the physical contribution for the two samples bridge, e.g. for T = 210.2 K and ! = (2)= 43.76 Hz, it is 3 orders of magnitude below. The contribution of the lockin was negligible because the equilibration of the bridge led to V_m (!) values below 1 mV: Fig. 2 shows that the resulting third harmonics is well below 40 nV, a negligible value with respect to the measured V_m (3!) of a few V. This remained true when the lockin-in ampli er was used in the di erential mode provided that the voltages on each input remained below about 1.4 V. A nother possible spurious contribution to the measured third harm onics could come from the resistors r_{thin}, r_{thick} and the capacitor c_{thin}. We veri ed in experiments using bridges m ade only of resistors or of capacitors or of com binations of both that the nonlinearities of metal Im resistors and polystyrene Im capacitors (we rejected ceramic capacitors) were negligible. Finally, another veri cation of the physical origin of our data was that j_{M} (2!) j remained much weaker than y_m (3!)j.

VI. POSSIBLE DEVELOPM ENTS OF THE TW O SAM PLES BRIDGE METHOD

The equilibration (Eq. 17) of the two-sample bridge is realized by tuning z_{thin} and z_{thick} (two resistors in our case) in series with the two in pedances of the samples, Z_{thin} and Z_{thick}

(see section IV and the insets of Figs. 6,7). This is time consuming because in order to keep the ratio $r_{thin} = Z_{thin} (1!) j = r_{thick} = Z_{thick} (1!) j at its optimum value, it has to be done for each temperature or frequency change. A possible solution is a four sam ples bridge: In such a device, the two sample capacitors of di erent thicknesses are kept, but the two impedances <math>z_{thin}$ and z_{thick} are replaced by two other sample capacitors. Thus, neither the equilibration, nor the ratio of impedances in each arm depend on T or !. The rst (resp. second) arm of a four sample bridge would contain sample 1 (resp. 2) connected to the source and sample 3 (resp. 4) connected to the ground. The thicknesses are L_i (i = 1,4) and the electrode surfaces S_i (i = 1,4). If the surfaces are the same in an arm ($S_1 = S_3$ or $S_2 = S_4$), the contribution of the two physical currents (I_1 (3!) and I_3 (3!), or I_2 (3!) and I_4 (3!)) to the measured 3! voltage $V_{m, sam ple}$ (3!) is zero. This is because the electric eld at 1! in the two capacitors in an arm would be the sam e: The di erent thicknesses (see Eq.8) are compensated by the voltage division between the two capacitors. Thus $S_1 \in S_3$ and $S_2 \in S_4$ are needed. The balancing condition $Z_1Z_4 = Z_2Z_3$ leads to $L_1L_4S_2S_3 = L_2L_3S_1S_4$. Follow ing the lines of section IV A, the measured 3! voltage is given by

$$\frac{V_{m \text{;sam ple}}(3!)}{V_{s}^{3}(1!)} / \frac{S_{1}S_{3}L_{1}L_{3}}{(L_{1}S_{3} + L_{3}S_{1})^{4}} (S_{3}^{2} - S_{1}^{2}) - \frac{S_{2}S_{4}L_{2}L_{4}}{(L_{2}S_{4} + L_{4}S_{2})^{4}} (S_{4}^{2} - S_{2}^{2}):$$
(20)

The two (or four) sample capacitors bridge methods can be generalized to any physical situation in which a sinusoidal excitation F (t) = $\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{F}_{0}e^{\mathrm{i}!t}]$ gives a response R (t) = $\operatorname{Re}[\operatorname{I}_{1}(!)\operatorname{F}_{0}e^{\mathrm{i}!t} + \frac{1}{4}]_{3}(!)\operatorname{F}_{0}^{3}e^{3\mathrm{i}!t} + :::]$ where I_{3} , I_{5} are to be measured. If F₀ depends on a parameter analogous to our capacitor thickness, it is possible to design a bridge in which each arm contains an experimental unit with two dimenstrates of \cdot . A gain, the advantage of such a bridge with respect to a bridge where the sample response is balanced by the response of an impedance [10, 25, 35, 37, 43, 45] (or possibly with two sources as discussed in section IIIC) is that if I_{1} depends on the frequency, the equilibration at 1! implies also an equilibration at n! . Am ong the possible applications of this principle, we can think of a bridge would be replaced by coils with sample cores, and the parameter would be the number of turns of the coils.

VII. CONCLUSION

M any experiments in physics consit in applying an \excitation" (electric, m agnetic, m echanical, etc.) to a sample at a nite frequency and measuring the response. The nonlinear part of this response is present in its harm onics. Their measurem ent is a hard task for weak nonlinear responses because the electronic devices used for the excitation and for the m easurem ent are always non linear at a certain level. Our experiment, devoted to the m easurem ent of the nonlinear response of dielectric supercooled liquids, m easures the third harm onics component of the polarization when an electric eld is applied to a sample layer in a plane capacitor. It consists in measuring a current I (3!) at a frequency three (possibly ve, etc.) times that of the linear response I(!) when a voltage $V_{\alpha}(!)$ is applied to the capacitor. Both the lock-in ampli er and the voltage source yield a third harm onics component which precludes measuring the nonlinear response in a simple experiment such as this presented in section IIIB. To overcome this problem, we have used a method based on a bridge with two capacitors of di erent thicknesses. We have shown that such a device strongly reduces the two spurious third harm onics component of the measured signal: That of the voltage source and that of the lock-in ampli er. This \two-sample" bridge, used with a low distortion voltage source allowed to reach our goal of a sensitivity better than 10 7 and to realize our st measurements of the nonlinear response of a supercooled liquid close to the glass transition.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e wish to thank Patrick Pari and Philippe Forget of the SPEC C ryogenics Laboratory for their valuable help in designing and realizing the cryostat and the experimental cell. This work was supported in part by A N R. under G rant "D ynH et".

18

- [1] I.D zyaloshinskii and G.E.Volovik, J.Phys. (Paris) 39, 693 (1978).
- [2] L.P.Levy and A.T.Ogliesky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 3288 (1986).
- [3] L.P.Levy, Physical Review B 38, 4963 (1988).
- [4] T.Jonsson, P.Svedlindh, and M.Hansen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 3976 (1998).
- [5] P.Jonsson, R.M athieu, W.W emsdorfer, A.Trachuck, and B.Barbara, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 256403 (2007).
- [6] S.Nair and A.Nigam, Phys.Rev.B 75, 214415 (2007).
- [7] H.Fay, Rev.Sci.Instrum. 38, 197 (1967).
- [8] M.Maglione, U.Hochli, and J.Jorin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 436 (1986).
- [9] S. Ikeda, H. Kom inam i, K. Koyam a, and Y. W ada, J. Appl. Phys. 62, 3339 (1987).
- [10] J.Garcia, R.Perez, and A.A Bareda, J.Phys.D: Appl. Phys. 34, 3279 (2001).
- [11] J.Hemberger, P.Lunkenheimer, R.Viana, R.Bohmer, and A.Loidl, Phys.Rev.B 52, 13159 (1995).
- [12] J.Hemberg, H.Ries, A.Loidl, and R.Bohmer, Phys.Rev.Lett. 76, 2330 (1996).
- [13] J. Hemberger, M. Nicklas, R. Viana, P. Lunkenheimer, A. Loidl, and R. Bohmer, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 8, 4673 (1996).
- [14] A. Levstik, Z. Kutnjak, C. Filipic, and R. Pirc, Phys. Rev. B 57, 11204 (1998).
- [15] W.Kleemann, J.Dec, R.W ang, and M. Itoh, Phys. Rev. B 67, 092107 (2003).
- [16] V. Bobnar, B. Vodopivec, A. Levstik, Z. Cheng, and Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B 67, 094205 (2003).
- [17] B. Vodopivec, C. Filipic, A. Levstik, J. Holc, Z. Kutnjak, and H. Beige, Phys. Rev. B 69, 224208 (2004).
- [18] J.Dec, W.K. Leemann, and M. Itoh, Ferroelectrics 337, 1185 (2006).
- [19] S.M iga, J.Dec, and K.Cwikiel, Phase Transitions 80, 95 (2007).
- [20] A. Drozd-Rzoska, S. J. Rzoska, M. Paluch, S. Pawlus, J. Ziolo, P. G. Santangelo, C. M. Roland, K. Czuprynski, and R. Dabrowski, Phys. Rev. E 71, 011508 (2005).
- [21] A.D rozd-R zoska and S.J.R zoska, Phys.Rev.E 65, 041701 (2002).
- [22] S.J.Rzoska, Phys.Rev.E 48, 1136 (1993).
- [23] M.Gomy, J.Ziolo, and S.J.Rzoska, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 67, 4290 (1996).

- [24] J.H.Classen, M.E.Reeves, and R.J.Soulen, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 62, 996 (1991).
- [25] S.P.Lee, C.U. Jung, Y.K.Kim, W. Jo, and T.W. Noh, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 64, 2385 (1993).
- [26] C. Senatore, N. Clayton, P. Pace, and R. Flukiger, IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. 15, 3329 (2005).
- [27] E.Bauer, P.Ho, M.Maple, T.Schauerte, D.Cox, and F.Anders, Phys. Rev. B 73, 094511 (2006).
- [28] N.Kuzmichev, V.Slavkin, Y.Martinov, and A.Golovashkin, Physica C 460-462, 454 (2007).
- [29] M. Suzuki, I. Suzuki, T. Noji, Y. Koike, and J. Walter, Phys. Rev. B 75, 184536 (2007).
- [30] M iddleton and W ingreen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3198 (1993).
- [31] L.T.Liand S.A.Boggs, Rev.Sci.Instrum. 70, 3749 (1999).
- [32] F.Ladieu, D.L'Hôte, and R.Tourbot, Physical Review B 61, 8108 (2000).
- [33] C.Godet and J.K leider, J.M ater Sci.: M atter E lectron. 17, 413 (2007).
- [34] B. Ham adani, C. Richter, D. Gundlach, R. Kline, I. McCulloch, and M. Heeney, J. Appl. Phys. 102, 044503 (2007).
- [35] L.A.Rosenthal, Rev.Sci. Instrum. 36, 1179 (1965).
- [36] H S.Ahluwalia, E JP.M ay, and L K J.Vandam m e, J. of Appl. Phys. 53, 6482 (1982).
- [37] N.Birge, P.Dixon, and N.Menon, Therm ochimica Acta 304/305, 51 (1997).
- [38] R. Leturoq, D. L'Hôte, R. Tourbot, V. Senz, U. Gennser, T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, G. Dehlinger, and D. Grutzmacher, Europhys. Lett. 61, 499 (2003).
- [39] Y.G.Gurevich and G.G.de la Cruz, Sem icond. Sci. Technol. 21, 1686 (2006).
- [40] G.G. de la Cnuz and Y.G. Gurevich, J. Phys.: Condens. M atter 19, 456220 (2007).
- [41] R.Richert and S.W einstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 095703 (2006).
- [42] S.W einstein and R.Richert, Phys.Rev.B 75,064302 (2007).
- [43] T.Guldbrandsen, N.I.Meyer, and J.Schjaer-Jakobsen, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 36, 743 (1965).
- [44] P.K.Dixon and S.R.Nagel, Phys.Rev.Lett. 61, 341 (1988).
- [45] D. Jung, T. Kwon, D. Bae, I. Moon, and Y. Jeong, Meas. Sci. Technol. 3, 475 (1992).
- [46] N.Menon, J.Chem. Phys. 105, 5346 (1996).
- [47] M.D.Ediger, Annu.Rev.Phys.Chem.51, 99 (2000).
- [48] P.Lunkenheimer, U.Schneider, R.Brand, and A.Loidl, Contem p.Phys. 41, 15 (2000).
- [49] E.Donth, The Glass Transition. Relaxation dynamics in Liquids and Disordered Materials (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2001).

- [50] R.Richert, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 14, R 703 (2002).
- [51] L. Berthier, G. Biroli, J. Bouchaud, L. Cipeletti, D. E. Masri, D. L'Hôte, F. Ladieu, and
 M. Pierno, Science 310, 1797 (2005).
- [52] C. Dalle-Ferrier, C. Thibierge, C. Alba-Sim ionesco, L. Berthier, G. Biroli, J. Bouchaud, F. Ladieu, D. L'Hôte, and G. Tarjus, Phys. Rev. E 76, 041510 (2007).
- [53] F. Ladieu, C. Thibierge, and D. L'Hôte, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 19, 205138 (2007).
- [54] G.Adam and J.H.Gibbs, J.Chem. Phys. 43, 139 (1965).
- [55] S.W hitelam, L.Berthier, and J.P.Garrahan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 185705 (2004).
- [56] U. Tracht, M. W ilhem, A. Heuer, H. Feng, K. Schm idt-Rohrv, and H. W. Spiess, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2727 (1998).
- [57] E.Weeks, J.Crocker, A.C.Levitt, A.Schoeld, and D.A.Weitz, Science 287, 627 (2000).
- [58] E.VidalRusseland N. Israelo, Nature 408, 695 (2000).
- [59] L.A.Deschenes and D.A.Vanden Bout, Science 292, 255 (2001).
- [60] H.Sillescu, R.Bohmer, G.Diezemann, and G.Hinze, J.Non-Cryst. Solids 307, 16 (2002).
- [61] K.S.Sinnatham by, H.Oukris, and N.E.Israelo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 067205 (2005).
- [62] L.Wu, Phys. Rev. B 43, 9906 (1991).
- [63] G.Biroli and J.Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. B 72, 064204 (2005).
- [64] A.Reiser, G.Kasper, and S.Hunklinger, Phys. Rev. B 72, 094204 (2005).
- [65] P.Horowitz and W.Hill, The Art of Electronics (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1989).



FIG. 1: M easurem ent of the dielectric susceptibility = 0 + i 0 = $_{1}$ + 1. The experiment is shown in the upper inset: The capacitor with glycerol as dielectric material is equivalent to a non-dissipative capacitor C (!) / 0 in parallel with a conductance G (!) / ! 0 . The impedance Z (!) = (G + iC !) 1 is obtained by measuring the voltage drop across the resistor r at point A when the excitation voltage V = $V_{s} cos ! t$ is applied in B. The measured values of C and G =! are shown as a function of !=2 for T = 211.8 K. In the low er right corner, the equivalent circuit corresponding to the physical third harm onics source is shown: an ideal current source in parallel with a capacitor C (3!) and a conductance G (3!).



FIG. 2: M agnitude of the m easured third harm onics voltage as a function of the source voltage when the latter is directly applied at the input of the lock-in ampli er (for ! = (2) = 88 Hz).



FIG. 3: The third harm onics voltage \mathbf{j}_{A} (3!) jm easured at point A vs. the source voltage \mathbf{j}_{S} (!) j= m ax ($\mathbf{j}_{S;1}$ (1!) j; $\mathbf{j}_{S;2}$ (1!) j) applied to the sam ple for the two sources bridge depicted in the inset. The components of the circuit are the sam ple (impedance Z), the two voltage sources ($V_{S;1}$ (!) and $V_{S;2}$ (!)), the resistor R and the lock-in input impedance Z_L . C losed diam onds with short dashed line: Source 2 applied to a thin sam ple ($L_{thin} = 30$ m). Open squares with continuous line: Sam e circuit, but with a thick sam ple ($L_{thick} = 60$ m). Open triangles with long dashed line: Source 1 is applied to the thin sam ple, and source 2 to R. The tem perature of the sam ples is 211.8 K and !=(2) = ! = (2) = 88 Hz



FIG. 4: M agnitude (left axis) and phase (right axis) of the second and third harm onics generated by the source 1 (closed symbols) and source 2 (open symbols) of the two sources bridge, obtained by solving Eqs. 14,15 for a frequency of 88 Hz.



FIG.5: M agnitude (left axis) and phase (right axis) of the second and third harm onics generated by the source 2 of the two sources bridge, obtained by solving Eqs. 14,15 for a frequency of 4.28 Hz.



FIG. 6: M agnitude (left axis) and phase (right axis) of the second harm onics V_m (2!) m easured in the two samples bridge depicted in the inset. The experimental data (closed symbols) are com – pared to the values (open symbols) calculated by assuming that V_m (2!) is only due to the second harm onics generated by the source V_s (2!) which was obtained from the two sources measurements: y_m (2!) j= (2!) y_s (2!) j. !=(2) = 4.28 Hz and T = 203.7 K



FIG.7: M agnitude (left axis) and phase (right axis) of the third harm onics V_m (3!) m easured in the two sam ples bridge depicted in the inset. The experimental data (closed symbols) are compared to the values (open symbols) calculated by assuming that V_m (3!) would be only due to the third harm onics generated by the source V_s (3!). ! = (2) = 4.28 Hz and T = 203.7 K



FIG. 8: Open circles: The current J_{thin} (3!) jcalculated from the measured $V_{m ; sam ple}$ (3!) in the two sam ples bridge, as a function of the source voltage magnitude $J_{s}(!)_{j}$ for T = 210.2 K, !=2= 43.76 Hz. Closed diamonds: J_{thin} (3!) jobtained using twin-T liter method. The continuous line is the power 3 dependence. Inset: The twin-T notch liter method (see text).