Universal aspects of the random first order phase transition theory of the structural glass transition

T.R. Kirkpatrick[1] and D. Thirumalai[2]
[1] *Institute for Physical Science and Technology and Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742*
[2] *Institute for Physical Science and Technology and Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742*
(Dated: February 27, 2022)

We analyze the ways in which the random first order phase transition (RFOT) of the glass transition differs from the well-studied regular first order and second order (or continuous) phase transitions. Just as is the case in the latter two classes of phase transitions, the RFOT also exhibits universal features. Here, we discuss these features and compare and contrast the RFOT with other types of transitions with an emphasis on the structural glass transition problem. An important feature of the complete RFOT theory is that it has at least two distinct transition temperatures, one of which is a dynamical (avoided) transition signaling loss of effective ergodicity, and the other is an equilibrium ideal glass transition. Particular attention is paid to the coherence, or correlation, length associated with these transitions in the RFOT. We also derive universal scaling relations for several experimentally measurable quantities that are valid near the ideal glass transition. In particular, activated scaling ideas are used to obtain a scaling equation for the non-linear structural glass susceptibility as the ideal glass transition is approached. Important finite corrections to the ideal glass transition temperature are also discussed. Our work provides additional criteria for assessing the validity of RFOT theory of the liquid to glass transition, and provides a firm theoretical foundation for analyzing experimental data on the temperature dependence of the relaxation times.

PACS numbers: 64.60.Bd, 64.70.kj

arXiv:1401.2024v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 9 Jan 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

When undercooled rapidly almost all liquids undergo a transition to a glassy state, characterized by a dramatic increase in viscosity over a narrow temperature range. Because of the central importance of this phenomenon in condensed matter physics, material science, and biology there has been considerable interest in understanding the characteristics of the structural glass transition (SGT) [1–5]. In the late 1980s, we along with Wolynes developed the random first order phase transition (RFOT - a phrase that was first introduced in [6]) theory of the glass transition [6–11] to explain many the unique aspects of the structural glass transition (SGT) problem. Although initially motivated by precise solutions of a class of infinite range spin glass models, we subsequently established that the generic aspects of RFOT, found in systems even without quenched disorder [12], describes a new type of phase transition that is in a precise sense between a regular first order phase transition, and a conventional second order phase transition. It was further argued that the structural glass transition is an example of a RFOT. Subsequently, the RFOT has been much discussed in this context and in many ways clarified and further extended [13–16].

Two of the basic ideas behind the RFOT have not been stressed sufficiently in recent discussions. The first is that there are necessarily at least two (see [7, 8]) distinct transitions within the RFOT theory. When the temperature is decreased, the liquid undergoes the so-called dynamical transition at a temperature, T_d. This transition is, in general, not a true equilibrium phase transition, although it is related to the topology of the state space of an equilibrium system in that at T_d there is a breakdown in effective ergodicity. Technically, it can be described by using either an equilibrium approach [12, 17, 18], or a dynamical approach [10, 19–21]. The dynamical approach is consistent with the mode coupling theory glass transition [19, 20, 22] in that both the theories show that the nature of relaxation dynamics changes at T_d. The dynamical order parameter of the theory is a freezing of the density fluctuations [23]. To further characterize the nature of the transition at T_d, we introduced [24] a four point correlation function ($\chi_4(t)$ where t is time), which is the natural susceptibility for this transition [16, 24, 25]. We showed that $\chi_4(t)$ at T_d is also a measure of broken ergodicity - a finding that has been confirmed in computer simulation studies [26]. A number of studies have also shown that $\chi_4(t)$ also gives information on the dynamical heterogeneity in glassy liquids [27–29].

The second transition, which has unfortunately become the sole focus of RFOT theory in a majority of the more recent studies, is a true equilibrium phase transition occurring at a lower temperature denoted by T_K, for historical reasons. The transition at T_K is a new type of equilibrium phase transition, where the order parameter is both random and, in a technical sense, discontinuous at T_K, and one that has a unique and different coherence or correlation length exponent associated with it compared to other well-studied phase transitions. It has recently been emphasized that within the RFOT theory there will be yet another transition deep inside the glassy phase. This so-called Gardner transition [30] will not be discussed here.

The question of whether or not there are, at least, two transition temperatures in the STG problem is open to debate. The plausible importance of T_d was already anticipated by Goldstein [31], who argued that below a certain temperature transport in liquids is determined by activated transitions. Since then there is overwhelming evidence from theoretical, simulation [26], and experimental [32] studies that there is a material-dependent special temperature, T_d, or temperature region, below which ergodicity breaking, dynamic heterogeneity, aging effects play an important role. This temperature, T_d, is generally well above what is conventionally called the glass transition temperature T_g, defined roughly when the viscosity reaches a value of 10^{13} poise (see Fig. 1). The existence of an ideal glass transition at T_K in RFOT is more debatable. It is difficult to unequivocally probe the existence of T_K experimentally because below T_g ($> T_K$) the equilibration times vastly exceed the observation times. Here, we assume that it does exist, and given that it does, we determine some of the universal properties associated with this transition.

In this paper, a number of things are accomplished. We compare and contrast both the transitions in the RFOT with the conventional first order and with second order, or continuous, phase transitions. Our aim is to sharpen the differences between these classes of phase transitions, so that computer simulations and/or real experiments can distinguish between them for the very important problem of the SGT. In the process, we provide new insights into the RFOT theory. We also use activated scaling ideas to predict a number of new effects that should occur as T_K is approached. Important finite size corrections to the ideal glass transition temperature are also discussed.

The contents of this paper are as follows. In Section II of this paper we discuss the important characteristics of a RFOT, with an eye towards the SGT and on the two distinct (dynamical and equilibrium) transitions within RFOT. We also obtain previously unnoticed scaling relations for some aspects of the RFOT theory. In Section III, we compare a RFOT transition with more conventional phase transition theories for the structural glass transition. We conclude in Section IV with a discussion.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RFOT THEORY OF THE SGT

A. The order parameter

The glassy state may be visualized as a frozen liquid state with elastic properties. To describe a glassy state, we introduce two key ideas. First, we imagine an order parameter description in terms of frozen density fluctuations, $\delta n = n - n_l$, where n is a local number density, and n_l is the spatially average density that is identical to the liquid state density. Other order parameters can be imagined, but frozen density fluctuations are the simplest, and are most directly related to an important characteristic of a solid: elastic properties and a nonzero Debye-Waller factor. Because the glassy phase is amorphous or has random characteristics, the frozen density order parameter is specified by a functional probability measure $DP[\delta n]$ [12, 33]. The first two moments of this measure are,

$$\overline{\delta n(\mathbf{x})} = \int DP[\delta n]\delta n(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{V}}\int \mathrm{d}\mathbf{x}\delta\mathrm{n}(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \tag{1}$$

and

$$q \equiv \overline{[\delta n(\mathbf{x})]^{\mathbf{2}}} = \int DP[\delta n][\delta n(\mathbf{x})]^{\mathbf{2}} = \frac{1}{V}\int d\mathbf{x}[\delta n(\mathbf{x})]^{\mathbf{2}}. \tag{2}$$

The final equalities in these equations assume self-averaging. From Eq.(2) it follows that the zero in Eq.(1) is a term of $O(V^{-1/2})$ with V the system volume and the bulk limit is always taken.

B. State degeneracy and two transition temperatures

The second key idea in the formulation of RFOT is that, in general, one expects a large number of distinct metastable glassy states as the dynamics starts to become sluggish. If the number of low free energy metastable states is large enough, this in turn leads to two distinct transitions. The physical arguments leading to this conclusion proceed as follows. We denote a particular glassy state by the label s, with the frozen density in that state, $n_s = n_l + \delta n_s$, and the free energy in that state being equal to F_s [the density fields in Eqs. (1) and (2) should also be labelled by s]. Exact calculation for some infinite range spin-glass models show that below a temperature, which we denote by T_d, there are an extensive number (the number of states scales like $\exp[\alpha N]$ for a Nparticle system) of global statistically similar incongruent metastable glassy states [34]. In the RFOT, it is assumed that, in a restricted sense (cf below), this feature also holds in realistic structural glass systems. Statistically similar states have the same spatially averaged correlation functions, and incongruent states have zero overlap,

$$q_{ss'} = \delta_{ss'}q = \frac{1}{V}\int d\mathbf{x}\delta n_s(\mathbf{x})\delta n_{s'}(\mathbf{x}). \tag{3}$$

Because the states are statistically similar one cannot simply use an external field to pick out a particular state, as could be done in a regular Ising model for example. The canonical free energy, F_c, is then given by the partition function via

$$Z = \exp[-\beta F_c] = Tr\exp[-\beta H] = \sum_s \exp[-\beta F_s]. \tag{4}$$

In the STG, there are two important cases when F_c is not the physical free energy. First, if the barrier between states is actually infinite then F_c cannot be a physically meaningful free energy. Second, if the barriers are finite but the experimental time scale is too short for fluctuations to probe the various states, then it is also not a physical free energy. These considerations also apply to cases where there is a multiplicity of long-lived metastable states in any system.

A component averaged free energy can be defined by

$$\overline{F} = \sum_s P_s F_s \tag{5}$$

with P_s the probability to be in the state s,

$$P_s = \frac{1}{Z}\exp[-\beta F_s] \tag{6}$$

F_c and $\overline{F}$ are related by

$$F_c = \overline{F} + T\sum_s P_s \ln P_s \equiv \overline{F} - TS_s. \tag{7}$$

Here, S_s is the state entropy (sometimes called the complexity, I), which is bounded from above by what is usually meant by the configurational entropy, S_c, in non-mean-field models where there will be transitions between the various states. In general, S_s is related to the solution degeneracy and is extensive (and $F_c \neq \overline{F}$) if there are an exponentially large number of states. Note that in infinite range models with a RFOT and a nonzero S_s the physical free energy is $\overline{F}$ because the S_s in Eq. (7) is an entropy term which is a measure of parts of state space not explored in a finite amount of time. Since a physical entropy should only be associated with accessible configurations, it follows that F_c is not a physically meaningful free energy.

The scenario for the two transitions in the RFOT theory is obtained as follows. For $T > T_d$ transport is not collective, and the topology of state space is trivial. However, as $T \to T_d^+$ the dynamics slows down because at T_d an extensive number of statistically similar, incongruent globally glassy metastable states emerge. If activated transport is neglected, these states are infinitely long lived. The liquid state free energy, F_l is lower than the physical glassy state free energy, $\overline{F}$, but it is equal to the canonical free energy, F_c. Because there is a multiplicity of glassy states, a liquid with unit probability will get stuck in one of the metastable glassy states at temperatures below T_d. If activated transport is ignored, it will remain in that state for all times. For infinite range models with an RFOT, exact dynamical calculations shows a continuous slowing down and freezing occurs as $T \to T_d^+$. The same result is also found for some approximate, mean-field like, calculations of dynamics in realistic liquid state models even in the absence of quenched randomness [12]. The transition at T_d is also closely related to the temperature at which mode coupling theory of the glass transition predicts a power law divergence of the relaxation times.

In realistic systems, with particles interacting with short-range interactions, activated transport does take place at $T < T_d$. The change from diffusive transport to sluggish dynamics, which occurs at surprisingly low viscosities, is the reason T_d is associated with a dynamical transition. It is a sharp transition only in infinite range models, but in general it sets a temperature at which the dynamics becomes glassy like. In support of this interpretation, whose origins in retrospect can be traced to the insightful arguments given by Goldstein [31], there is considerable experimental evidence that at T_d the nature of transport changes from being diffusive to activated [32]. As a result, it is our view, that theories (for example [35]) in which the analogue of T_d does not naturally emerge cannot describe the STG.

The driving force for the activated transport in the RFOT theory for temperatures less than T_d is entropic, and is given by the state or configurational entropy, S_s, Eq.(7). At a lower temperature denoted by T_K, after the so-called Kauzmann temperature, the configurational entropy vanishes, and transport ceases. In other words, the second transition at T_K is the ideal or equilibrium glass transition temperature. Fits to viscosity data for an extremely wide class of materials point to the existence of non-zero T_K (for a recent compilation of experimental data see Ref. [36]).

C. The dynamic transition and the associated correlation length

We characterize the dynamical transition as follows. Consider the dynamical order parameter,

$$q(\mathrm{t}) =< \hat{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathrm{t}) > =< \delta\mathbf{n}(\mathbf{x}, \mathrm{t})\delta\mathrm{n}(\mathbf{x}, 0 >, \tag{8}$$

Above T_d, this correlation decays as $t \to \infty$ but as $T \to T_d^+$ the decay gets slower and slower in a power law fashion. At T_d it no longer decays, (except in non-mean-field models) on the longest time scale. Effectively, it is the Edwards-Anderson order parameter for the glass transition:

$$q_{EA} = \lim_{t\to\infty} q(t) \tag{9}$$

Because the order parameter involves the square of the density fluctuations it is clear that the susceptibility will be non-linear involving higher order correlations [24],

$$\chi_{NL}(\mathbf{x}, t) =< \hat{q}(\mathbf{x}, t)\hat{q}(\mathbf{0}, t) > - < \hat{q}(\mathbf{x}, t) >< \hat{q}(\mathbf{0}, t) > \tag{10}$$

We have previously shown [24] that the 'static' susceptibility for the glass transition at T_d is

$$\chi_{NL}(k) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \int d\mathbf{x} \exp(-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\chi_{NL}(\mathbf{x}, t) \tag{11}$$

It is also interesting to define a dynamical frequency dependent susceptibility using,

$$\chi_{NL}(k,\omega) = \int dt \int d\mathbf{x} \exp(-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x})\chi_{NL}(\mathbf{x},t) \tag{12}$$

As $r = T/T_d - 1 \to 0$, the homogeneous static susceptibility, $\chi_{NL} = \chi_{NL}(k \to \mathbf{0})$, in a mean-field like theory, diverges as,

$$\chi_{NL} \sim 1/\sqrt{r} \tag{13}$$

,and at finite and small wavenumber,

$$\chi_{NL}(\mathrm{k}) \sim 1/[k^2 + \xi_o^{-2}\sqrt{r}] \tag{14}$$

with ξ_o a microscopic (correlation) length. This in turn defines a divergent length scale as $T \to T_d^+$ given by [9],

$$\xi \sim \xi_o/r^{1/4}. \tag{15}$$

This is the same divergence seen at a mean-field spinodal point.

There is considerable on going work beyond mean-field theory to describe the dynamics in glassy liquids just right below T_d. Remarkably, the dynamics has been related to a cubic field theory with a random field [37, 38]. This in turn means that ideas and technical results for the magnetic random field problems (which do not typically have a cubic term) can be applied. A very interesting aspect of these works is that it suggest that somewhere in the phase diagram there is a critical point with properties related to the random field Ising model. It has even been suggested that the experimental glass transition at T_g is generically due to this critical point being in proximity.

D. The equilibrium transition and its correlation length

According to RFOT, the ideal glass transition at T_K is a discontinuous transition. Hence, care must be taken in defining and interpreting a correlation or coherence length. For ordinary first order phase transitions (liquid to a periodic crystal for example) Fisher and Berker (FB) [39] have formally described the meaning of such a length scale. They conclude that there are two distinct interpretations of a divergent length, referred to as coherence or persistent length for a first order transition. The first, using a scaling analysis and the observation that the definition of long range order is consistent with a correlation length exponent given by $\nu_H = 1/d$, with d being the spatial dimension. The second is via a finite-size scaling analysis and the divergent length is the length scale where the sharp first order phase transition becomes rounded in a finite system. This correlation length exponent is also given by $\tilde{\nu} = 1/d$.

Here, we generalize the arguments of FB to a RFOT, further elaborating on our previous study [6]. We use the density order parameter discussed in Section II.A. For the conjugate field we use a chemical potential $h = \mu(T,p) - \mu(T_K,p_K)$, allowing for the location of the glass transition to depend on both temperature and pressure.

We then give two further distinct arguments for the exponent characterizing the divergence of the correlation length. The first is an exact calculation for an infinite range spin-glass model with a RFOT that gives an identical result. The final argument that gives the same exponent is a partly dynamical/nucleation-like one and is presented in Sec II.E. All together there are four separate arguments that give the same result.

1. Scaling analysis

If we define a renormalization group (RG) length rescaling factor by b then the conjugate field h should be associated with the largest RG eigenvalue, b^λ, and therefore should scale as,

$$h' = b^\lambda h \tag{16}$$

while the free energy density will scale like,

$$f(h) = b^{-d} f(h'). \tag{17}$$

In addition, the scaling of the correlation length should by definition follow,

$$\xi(h) = b\xi(h'). \tag{18}$$

If we choose $b = h^{-1/\lambda}$ then we formally obtain,

$$f(h) = h^{d/\lambda} f(1), \tag{19}$$

and

$$\xi(h) = h^{-1/\lambda} \xi(1). \tag{20}$$

Now, the order parameter q is related to the second derivative of f with respect to h or,

$$q \sim h^{d/\lambda - 2}. \tag{21}$$

At the RFOT, q is discontinuous which gives $\lambda = d/2$. Equation (20), on the other hand implies that the correlation length exponent is $\nu_h = 1/\lambda$, or

$$\nu_h = 2/d. \tag{22}$$

These considerations establish, rather rigorously, that as long as long as FB type scaling holds near a first order transition it is inevitable that the correlation length should diverge at T_K with an exponent $\frac{2}{d}$ at RFOT. The difference in the values of the correlation length exponent is due to the differing nature of the order parameter describing RFOT and first order transitions. In the first order transition density itself is discontinuous whereas in RFOT at T_K it is the square of the density (EA parameter) that changes abruptly.

2. Finite size effects

Next we consider a system with finite size, L, and do a finite size scaling argument. We postulate that the scaling part of the free energy behaves as,

$$f(h, L) \sim L^{-\zeta} f(L/\widetilde{\xi}) \equiv L^{-\zeta} Y(hL^{1/\widetilde{\nu}}) \tag{23}$$

where $\xi \sim h^{-\widetilde{\nu}}$ is the (finite-size correlation or coherence length) length scale where finite size rounding of the RFOT takes place at T_K. By noting that the order parameter q is related to the second derivative of f with respect to h, we find,

$$q \sim L^{2/\widetilde{\nu} - \zeta} Y''(hL^{1/\widetilde{\nu}}) \tag{24}$$

The discontinuous nature of the transition gives,

$$\zeta = 2/\widetilde{\nu} \tag{25}$$

Note that if we used dimensional analysis to obtain $\zeta = d$ then it immediately follows that

$$\widetilde{\nu} = 2/d \tag{26}$$

As an alternative, we follow the FB treatment, and examine the susceptibility, χ, for this transition. Because the order parameter for the transition already involves two density fluctuations, the susceptibility, as used in Section I.C, will involve four density fields. Accordingly, it is related to the fourth derivative of f with respect to h. The finite size scaling relation will then be something like,

$$\chi(h, L) \sim L^{2/\widetilde{\nu}} Y''''(hL^{1/\widetilde{\nu}}) \tag{27}$$

One can then argue that χ will attain a maximum value at $h = 0$, and will scale as $\sim L^d$. This in turn again gives $\widetilde{\nu} = 2/d$. The inescapable conclusion is that the arguments leading to $\widetilde{\nu} = 2/d$ are robust, and theoretically well-founded.

3. Exact results for an infinite range model

Finally, there is an exact calculation for an infinite range p-state ($p > 4$) Potts spin glass model with a RFOT [9, 10] that gives a length scale that diverges with a correlation length exponent of $\nu = 2/d$ as the transition is approached. In particular, it has been shown that as T_K is approached from above the complexity or state entropy (which here and below we denote by the configurational entropy, S_c) behaves as,

$$S_c \sim \exp[N\epsilon] \tag{28}$$

with N the number of lattice sites ($N \to \infty$) and $\epsilon = 1 - T/T_K$ the dimensionless distance from the RFOT. On the other hand, as T_K is approached from below one finds that S_c diverges as,

$$S_c \sim \exp[1/|\epsilon|] \tag{29}$$

If we identify N with a system volume $\sim L^d$ then these two equations give a length scale where even below T_K the system behaves as though it was not frozen. Defining a correlation length, ξ, in this way gives,

$$\xi \sim 1/|\epsilon|^{2/d} \tag{30}$$

or,

$$\nu = 2/d. \tag{31}$$

Notice that this definition of a correlation length is closely related to a finite size correlation length.

4. Finite size shift in the glass transition temperature

Understanding glassy physics in a finite geometry is technologically important, and is needed to analyze results from computer simulations. From a phase transition perspective, many authors starting with the pioneering studies by Ferdinand and Fisher [40] have stressed that there are two important finite size effects at any phase transition. The first is the rounding of the transition as described in Sec II.D.2 above. The second distinct effect is the finite size shift in the transition temperature. Naturally, we expect them both to be relevant near RFOTs.

Physically, the ϵ (or h) in the above expressions should be replaced by $\dot{\epsilon} = \epsilon - \Delta\epsilon(L)$, where $\Delta\epsilon(L)$ measures the shift in the glass transition temperature due to the finite size. We give two distinct arguments for the L dependence of $\Delta\epsilon(L)$. The first uses that the free energy difference between two coexisting states at the RFOT is of order $\sim T_K L^{d/2}$. The temperature difference, ΔT, where the system cannot distinguish between the two states is the total free energy difference, which is proportional to $\sim L^d \Delta T$. Equating these two free energies we obtain,

$$\Delta\epsilon(L) \sim \frac{1}{L^{d/2}} \tag{32}$$

The second argument hinges on an old result of Imry [41] who suggested that at an ordinary first order phase transition the finite size shift in the transition temperature is given by,

$$\Delta T \sim \frac{1}{L^d s} \tag{33}$$

where s is the latent heat associated with the transition. At an RFOT, though, the latent heat vanishes as the configurational entropy or, $s \sim \xi^{-1/\nu} \sim L^{-d/2}$ in a finite system. Using this we recover the first argument for $\Delta\epsilon(L)$.

If the predicted L-dependent shift in the ideal glass transition temperature can be systematically studied then measuring the above exponent would be an important verification of the RFOT theory. Recent important developments in computer simulations probing the equilibrium glass transition by random pinning of a fraction of particles [42] as L is varied could be a way of verifying Eq. (32).

E. The specific heat at the equilibrium RFOT transition

First order phase transitions are associated with strong coupling RG fixed points [39]. As a result, dangerous irrelevant variables are not expected to play any role, which in turn implies that hyperscaling is valid in all dimensions.

If the same applies to random first order phase transitions, then the standard hyperscaling relation for the specific heat exponent,

$$\alpha = 2 - \nu d \tag{34}$$

should always hold. With $\nu = 2/d$ one then finds that $\alpha = 0$ at a RFOT. This scaling result for the specific heat is also consistent with exact calculations for infinite range models with an RFOT. For structural glasses, this result presumably implies a discontinuity in the specific heat, as is always observed experimentally.

It is worth emphasizing at this juncture that the Adams-Gibbs theory would predicts $\alpha = 1$ (a latent heat) if hyperscaling is assumed because in the AG theory $\nu = 1/d$.

F. Transport near the equilibrium RFOT

An important characteristic of a glass transition is the occurrence of extremely long time scales associated with transport below T_d. The critical slowing down at an ordinary transition means that the time scale grows as a power of the correlation length, $\tau \sim \xi^z$ with z being the dynamical scaling exponent. In sharp contrast, at a glass transition the critical time scale grows exponentially with ξ,

$$\ln(\tau/t_o) \sim \xi^\psi \tag{35}$$

with t_o a microscopic time scale, and ψ a generalized dynamical scaling exponent. Effectively, this implies $z = \infty$. As a result of such extreme slowing down, the equilibrium behavior of the system near T_K becomes inaccessible for all practical purposes. In other words, the experimentally accessible time scales are not sufficient for the system to reach equilibrium. It is in this sense the glassy system falls out of equilibrium.

Activated scaling, as described by Eq. 35, follows from a barrier crossing picture of the system's free energy landscape. In the context of the STG, it is related to cooperative motions [35] involving particles within a length scale that continues to grow as $T \to T_K$. In the temperature range, $T_d > T > T_K$, there is an entropic driving force that causes a, compact, glassy state of size ξ^d to make a transition to a different glassy state, with approximately the same free energy, also of size ξ^d. The physical picture that results is a system that looks like a patchwork, of different glassy regions separated by diffuse or fuzzy interfaces slowly making a transition to yet other glassy states. This is also called the mosaic state. For the uncorrelated states that exist above T_K, the law of large numbers is consistent with a barrier that scale like $\sim \xi^{d/2}$. This is also consistent with scaling and an entropic driving force $\epsilon\xi^d \sim \xi^{d-1/\nu}$, if $\nu = 2/d$. Thus, the driving force and the free energy barrier scale in the same way, if and only if $\nu = 2/d$. Activated transport with the barriers scaling as $\sim \xi^{d/2}$ was also recently argued by Langer [43].

In the original RFOT paper, a wetting argument first given by Villain [44] for the random field Ising model was modified and applied to the structural glass problem which also led to barriers scaling like $\xi^{d/2}$. Here we give a different but related argument. We first imagine a putative compact glassy state of size r^d. There will in general two distinct driving forces that can cause it to make a transition to another glassy state: An entropic one scaling like $\sim \epsilon r^d$ and a free energy one $\sim r^{d/2}$ because there are states that typically have a lower free energy by this amount. Opposing the transition is a barrier that naively scales like a surface tension term $\sim \sigma r^{d-1}$. Now assume a bump (or an excitation) of scale also $\sim r$ (another scale can be introduced but the final result is not altered) forms on the interface because of the free energy driving force. The free energy change due to the creation of the bump is,

$$\delta F \sim -r^{d/2} + \sigma r^{d-1} \tag{36}$$

The physical effect of the bump forming is that the surface tension is reduced compared to its naive value. The scale dependent surface tension can be obtained by minimizing δF with respect to r with the result,

$$\sigma(r) \sim r^{(d-2)/2} \tag{37}$$

The barriers to transport therefore scale as $\sim \sigma(r) r^{d-1} = r^{d/2}$.

All of these arguments in turn imply a Vogel-Fulcher law for relaxation as the glass transition is approached,

$$\tau \sim \tau_o \exp[\frac{D}{T/T_K - 1}] \tag{38}$$

with D a positive constant.

Note that the barriers scaling like $\xi^{d/2}$ implies there is really no interface between two of the statistical similar glassy states. Rather, to go from one state to another, roughly $N^{1/2}$ of the N particles in a correlated volume must be rearranged, as noted earlier by Bouchaud and Biroli [15].

G. Activated scaling as T approaches T_K

Activated scaling was developed to understand finite dimensional (i.,e., three dimensions) spin glasses and random field magnets where the dynamics is controlled by large, possibly divergent, free energy barriers [45]. Similar ideas can be applied to the structural glass problem, also in three-dimensions.

Here we examine the behavior of the glass transition susceptibility, introduced in Sec II.C using activated scaling ideas [45] as the ideal glass transition is approached. We start with the observation that in SecII.D that the scale dimension of $q(\mathbf{x},t)$ was zero. This and the activated scaling ansatz implies that the wavenumber and time dependent glass transition susceptibility will satisfy the scaling law,

$$\chi_{NL}(\epsilon,k,t) = b^d F_\chi[\epsilon b^{1/\nu}, bk, \frac{b^{d/2}}{\ln(t/t_o)}] \tag{39}$$

where $\epsilon = T/T_K - 1$ is the dimensionless distance from the ideal glass transition, t_o is some microscopic time scale, and F_χ is a scaling function. Note that we have used here that the barrier height scales as $b^{d/2} \sim \xi^{d/2}$. This equation implies a number of non-trivial results. For example, at zero wavenumber, and at the ideal glass transition temperature we can choose $b = [\ln(t/t_o)]^{2/d}$ to obtain,

$$\chi_{NL}(0,0,t\to\infty) \sim [\ln(t/t_o)]^2. \tag{40}$$

This dynamic scaling result is valid as long as $\epsilon \ln(t/t_o) < 1$. This in also defines a dynamic crossover ϵ being given by,

$$\epsilon_x \sim 1/[\ln(t/t_o)] \tag{41}$$

Physically this means that the large correlations that exist at T_K can be measured by examining the slow growth in time of the glass transition susceptibility around $k = 0$. This should be experimentally relevant. If the exponent of 2 in Eq.(40) can be experimentally demonstrated then that would be very strong evidence for the validity of the RFOT theory of the SGT.

The frequency dependent glass transition susceptibility defined by Eq.(40) can similarly be expressed as a scaling function. In general the ϵ_x given by Eq.(41) will give the scale distinguishing static critical behavior from dynamical critical behavior for all quantities as $T \to T_K$.

Although not as rigorously founded as the scaling law for χ_{NL}, we can also give a scaling law for the frequency dependent shear viscosity, $\eta(\epsilon,\omega)$, if we assume that because it is related to a time integral of a time correlation function its static value is proportional to τ given by Eq. (38). We then obtain,

$$\eta(\epsilon,\omega) = \exp(b^{d/2}) F_\eta[\epsilon b^{1/\nu}, \frac{b^{d/2}}{\ln(1/t_o\omega)}] \tag{42}$$

with F_η a scaling function. The static or zero frequency shear viscosity then behaves as τ but for $\epsilon < 1/\ln(1/t_o\omega)$ it behaves as

$$\eta[\epsilon \ln(1/t_o\omega) < 1] \sim \frac{1}{t_o\omega}. \tag{43}$$

Again, the important physical and experimental point is that ϵ_x given by Eq.(41) sets the crossover scale in either time or frequency ($t \to 1/\omega$) space. Note that η being simply proportional to τ in Eq.(42) is needed to obtain Eq.(43), which in turn is required for the proper stress/strain relation in the glassy phase.

III. COMPARING RFOT TO OTHER PHASE TRANSITION THEORIES FOR THE GLASS TRANSITION

In this Section we make compare and contrast the RFOT theory with conventional first and second order phase transitions, with particular focus on the STG.

A. First order phase transition theory for the glass transition

There have been attempts to characterize the SGT as freezing into an amorphous state using a density functional free energy [46, 47] similar to that first used by Ramakrishnan and Yussouff [48] to describe the liquid to crystal transition. By generating random sites of a large system to describe the amorphous state (viewed as an aperiodic solid instead of periodic crystal characterizing an ordered solid) it was shown numerically that the RY free energy functional has a metastable solution, which presumably corresponds to a static description of the glassy state. The transition to such an aperiodic state was deemed to be first order occurring at a density below the putative crystallization density.

Although such a description might capture aspects of the amorphous state it differs qualitatively from the RFOT in two important aspects: (1) The transition to the aperiodic state is first order with density itself exhibiting a discontinuity where as in RFOT it is the analogue of the EA parameter describing density fluctuations (Eq. 2) that has a jump at T_K. A regular first order transition would also have a latent heat, and exhibit something that resembles a discontinuity in the specific heat. In contrast, RFOT theory predicts absence of latent heat at T_K. It is also unclear if the identified freezing density is close to the analogue of T_K. (2) The RY theory was not used to identify a dynamical transition temperature or density. More importantly, the link between T_d and T_K requiring the emergence of exponentially large number of low free energy metastable glassy states, which is the most important aspect of the RFOT theory was not demonstrated. (3) Finally, if one were to associate a divergent length scale or exponent with an ordinary first order phase transition then it would be the Berker-Fisher value $\nu = 1/d$ discussed in Sec II.D. Such a value is not consistent with the equality found using the RFOT theory (further discussed in Sec III.C), nor is it in accord with recent simulation results [49, 50].

B. Second order phase transition theory for the STG

Over the years there have been numerous theories of the SGT that can be classified as standard second order or continuous phase transitions. The earliest ones were the Adam-Gibbs (AG) [35] and Gibbs-DiMarzio (GDM) and DiMarzio of the STG and rubber transitions in polymer systems [51]. A recent scenario along these lines has been potulated by Tanaka based on computer simulations, which has been further discussed by Langer [43]. It is worth remarking that these theories do not consider consequences of the change in the nature of transport at $T \approx T_d$.

We first remark that it is hard to imagine how any equilibrium order parameter description of a liquid to glass transition would not generically have a discontinuous character, at least according to Landau theory. At isolated critical points, a continuous transition is possible. In fact, within RFOT this has been discussed by others, and related to a critical point for a random field problem [37, 38]. Second, in a second order transition the concept of a metastable state is not obvious. As a consequence it is difficult to see how such transitions can have a temperature crossover scale (in RFOT, it is T_d) and also a a true equilibrium transition temperature (in RFOT, it is T_K) at lower temperatures. The existence of two distinct temperatures in supercooled liquids seems to be well confirmed both numerically, as well as experimentally. The existence of the temperature scale T_d at which loss of ergodicity starts to manifest itself [52] also tidily explains dynamic heterogeneity and aging. Technically, the problem with a second order phase transition scenario is that by definition there is only one temperature where the system becomes unstable to infinitesimal fluctuations everywhere.

C. Self-generated quenched disorder implies $\nu \geq 2/d$

For systems with quenched disorder, the correlation length exponent at any phase transition must satisfy the inequality $\nu \geq 2/d$. For the structural glass problem, there is effectively quenched disorder that is self generated. Here, we argue the self generated quenched randomness in the structural glass problem also leads to the inequality $\nu \geq 2/d$.

We begin by noting that below T_d (technically close to T_K) the glassy state can be partitioned into cluster of particles of size ξ. Because the observation time is much greater than the relaxation time for particles in two clusters to interchange, the motion of particles in one cluster is essentially isolated from another. Since ξ is sufficiently large each cooperatively rearranging (CRR) region will have differing thermodynamic properties, which clearly is a violation of large numbers. In particular, we expect fluctuations of the ideal glass transition temperature, δT_K, in the various clusters to scale as $\sqrt{(\delta T_K)^2} \sim 1/\xi^{d/2}$. In order for the ideal glass transition to exist, this fluctuation must be smaller than the distance to the ideal glass transition, $\epsilon \sim 1/\xi^{1/\nu}$. Consequently, ν must satisfy $\nu \geq 2/d$.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have attempted to clarify, using a variety of arguments, the differences between RFOT and conventional first and second order phase transitions. The RFOT theory, which is a viable theory of the structural glass transition, provides a coherent picture of the state of matter as it is cooled. We have given physical arguments, rooted in theory, that the two temperatures, one attributable to change in transport at T_d and the other in which a genuine equilibrium transition with both first and second order characteristics emerge from a single static theory. By expanding on our prior works [6, 7, 24] we have also obtained a number of new results. (1) We give a variety of arguments to show that a characteristic length diverges at T_K with an exponent $\nu = 2/d$. In many ways this makes rigorous our earlier predictions [6], and this finding is an important corner stone of RFOT. (2) We also predict that there are large finite size effects at T_K. The theory predicts a specific rounding of the transition, as well as a specific shift in the location of T_K, due to finite size effects. This implies that there will be variations in the value of T_K depending on the system size. This prediction is amenable to test by computer simulations using the random pinning method [42, 53, 54]. (3) Using ideas based on activated scaling [45], we predict that the non-linear susceptibility near T_K on long length scales diverges as $\sim [ln(t/t_0)]^2$. We have also obtained the cross-over scale that distinguishes between dynamical critical effects and static critical effects as T_K is approached.

The equilibrium transition in the RFOT theory is a novel type of transition and as such, it has certain universal properties. The implication is that most of the features of the ideal glass transition discussed here are independent of the Kauzmann-like interpretation of T_K. For example, the order parameter definition given by Eqs. (1) and (2) does not hinge on an entropy or state solution like crisis, rather it is motivated by a glass being characterized by a frozen and random density order parameter. Physically this seems necessary to obtain the elastic behavior of a glass. Any field theory, or Landau theory, for such a transition will necessarily have a first order nature because general symmetry allows for a cubic term in the theory. This implies in general, that if an ideal glass transition exists with such an order parameter it will be a RFOT with some sort of divergent length scale, characterized by an exponent of $\nu = 2/d$. Given this, results like the specific heat behavior discussed in Section II.E will be equally generic. To discuss transport near an ideal glass transition we have largely used many state type arguments to obtain free energy barriers that scale like $\xi^{d/2}$. However, this result too seems to go beyond an entropy crisis picture: It only depends on local particle rearrangements to go from two uncorrelated one glassy configurations. The law of large numbers suggests that if the volume in question contains N-particles then this sort of fluctuation will scale as $N^{1/2} \sim \xi^{d/2}$ [12, 55]. The fundamental conclusion from this sort of reasoning is that results like Eq. (38), Eq. (39) and Eq. (40) should hold even if mechanism for an ideal glass transition is not precisely a Kauzmann-like transition.

In deriving the universal aspects of RFOT at T_K we have assumed that the equilibrium ideal glass transition exits. The temperature dependence of viscosity of a large class of glass forming materials have been analyzed using the VFT law with non-zero T_K [36]. More recently, computer simulations point to the existence of an equilibrium transition below T_d [53]. Among them the most notable ones are those which have observed a phase transitions in model glass forming systems by randomly pinning a fraction of particles at low temperatures [42, 53, 54]. This procedure, which apparently allows one to probe equilibrium behavior, clearly shows that an equilibrium transition with characteristics predicted by the RFOT theory does occur. Although the wealth of experimental data as well computer simulations provides strong evidence that $T_K \neq 0$ additional tests of universal behavior predicted here for RFOT are needed before fully validating all the aspects of the RFOT theory of the SGT.

Historically, the Adam-Gibbs (AG) theory [35] was the first to propose an explanation for the possible divergence of relaxation times at T_K based on vanishing of configurational entropy. The predictions based on the more *ad hoc* AG mechanism is distinct from the RFOT theory in at least two ways. First, in the AG theory there is no analogue of T_d giving the impression that the character of transport changes only at T_K or at all temperatures. This would be inconsistent with many observations suggesting that at T_d, particle transport is no longer diffusive. Indeed, there are innumerable computer simulations that support this picture. More importantly, by analyzing data for a number of glass forming materials Novikov and Sokolov have proposed that there may be a near "universal" value of 10^{-7}s [32] (larger than the estimate by Goldstein [31]) for relaxation, which sets the boundary between diffusive transport and onset of activated transitions. Of course, the value of T_d at which relaxation exceeds 10^{-7}s is clearly material dependent. Several computer simulations have noted that the nature of transport (non-Gaussian behavior in van Hove correlation functions and evidence for hopping mechanism [26, 56, 57]) changes even before T_d is reached, further supporting the accepted view that the dynamical transition is avoided. We surmise that theories, such as the AG theory, which cannot describe the dynamical changes at T_d may not be suitable for describing glass transition. Second, RFOT predicts a much stronger growth of the correlation length than the AG theory. Interestingly, recent computer simulation studies support the predictions of RFOT theory first by identifying the existence of T_K (or

equivalently density [58]), and second by confirming that $\nu = \frac{2}{d}$ [49, 50].

The mode coupling theory has been remarkably successful in describing the change in the character of relaxation of undercooled liquids in the neighborhood of T_d. However, because MCT predicts that relaxation times only grow as power law as temperature is decreased it cannot account for activated transitions. As a result MCT cannot describe transport deep into the supercooled regime.

In our view, currently RFOT theory encompassing both T_d and T_K, appears to be the only theory that accounts for changes in phase space structure, break down of effective ergodicity, emergence of dynamic heterogeneity as a consequence of violation of law of large numbers, and growth of ξ. Most importantly, both the equilibrium and dynamical aspects at T_d and T_K emerge naturally without having to treat the physics at these temperatures separately as done by MCT or the AG theory. The result of the RFOT theory is that analysis of experimental relaxation data must be done in two steps. For $T \leq T_d$ the relaxation time should be analyzed using a power law. In the temperature range, $T_K \leq T \leq T_d$ the temperature dependence of the relaxation data should follow VFT. Attempts to fit the data over the entire range by activated dynamics could lead to inconsistent values of the parameters.

Finally, it should also be emphasized that systematic expansions around an infinite dimensional hard sphere liquid has shown that all aspects of RFOT persist in finite dimensional liquid state models [18, 30]. These important studies show that the RFOT scenario is not a mean-field artifact of an infinite dimensional or infinite range model. Despite the successes of the RFOT theory we should caution the reader that if the predictions made here and in our previous studies are not validated then RFOT theory cannot be considered a complete description of the structural glass transition.


Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Hansuk Kang for useful discussions and for making the figure. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Nos. DMR-09-01907 and CHE-09-10433.

[1] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Transp. Theor. and Stat. Phys. **24**, 927 (1995).
[2] A. Cavagna, Phys. Rep. **476**, 51 (2009).
[3] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 789 (2010).
[4] L. Berthier and G. Biroli, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 587 (2011).
[5] G. Biroli and J. P. Bouchaud, in *Structural glasses and supercooled liquids: theory, experiment and applications*, edited by V. Lubchenko and P. Wolynes (Johh-Wiley, 2012) pp. 31–114.
[6] T. R. Kirkpatrick, D. Thirumalai, and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1045 (1989).
[7] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2091 (1987).
[8] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 5388 (1987).
[9] T. R. Kirkpatrick and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. B. **36**, 8552 (1987).
[10] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 5342 (1988).
[11] T. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, J. de Physique I **5**, 777 (1995).
[12] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, J. Phys. A **22**, L149 (1989).
[13] M. Mezard and G. Parisi, J. Phys. A **29**, 6515 (1996).
[14] M. Mezard and G. Parisi, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **12**, 6655 (2000).
[15] J. Bouchaud and G. Biroli, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 7347 (2004).
[16] C. Toninelli, M. Wyart, L. Berthier, G. Biroli, and J.-P. Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. E **71**, 041505 (2005).
[17] S. Franz, H. Jacquin, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, Proc. Natl. acad. Sci. **109**, 18725 (2012).
[18] S. Franz, H. Jacquin, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 12A540 (2013).
[19] E. Leutheusser, Phys. Rev. A. **29**, 2765 (1984).
[20] U. Bengtzelius, W. Goetze, and A. Sjolander, J. Phys. C **17**, 5915 (1984).
[21] D. Thirumalai and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 4881 (1988).
[22] S. Das, Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 785 (2004).
[23] Approximate solutions to certain non-linear oscillator equations lead to glassy like behavior that looks like the MC dynamical transition. An exact solution of the starting equation shows that this behavior is an artifact of the approximations. This is to be contrasted with various exactly soluble models which do show the dynamical transition discussed here, and to various systematic liquid state theories which also show such a transition.
[24] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 4439 (1988).
[25] C. Donati, S. Franz, S. C. Glotzer, and G. Parisi, J. Non-Cryst. Solids **307**, 215 (2002).
[26] D. Thirumalai and R. D. Mountain, Phys. Rev. E **47**, 479 (1993).
[27] E. Flenner and G. Szamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 217801 (2010).
[28] E. Flenner, M. Zhang, and G. Szamel, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 051501 (2011).
[29] S. C. Glotzer, V. N. Novikov, and T. B. Schroder, The Journal of Chemical Physics **112**, 509 (2000).
[30] J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, J. Phys. Chem. B **117**, 12979 (2013).
[31] M. Goldstein, J. Chem. Phys. **51**, 3728 (1969).
[32] V. Novikov and A. Sokolov, Phys. Rev. E **67**, 031507 (2003).
[33] R. Monasson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2847 (1995).
[34] D. Huse and D. Fisher, J. Phys. A. **20**, L997 (1987).
[35] G. Adam and J. Gibbs, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 139 (1965).
[36] S. Capaccioli, G. Ruocco, and F. Zamponi, J. Phys. Chem. B **112**, 10652 (2008).
[37] S. Franz, G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and T. Rizzo, Eur. Phys. J. E **34**, 102 (2011).
[38] G. Biroli, C. Cammarota, G. Tarjus, and M. Tarzia, .
[39] M. Fisher and A. Berker, Phys. Rev. B **26**, 2507 (1982).
[40] A. Ferdinand and M. Fisher, Phys. Rev. **185**, 832 (1969).
[41] Y. Imry, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 2042 (1980).
[42] L. Berthier and W. Kob, Phys. Rev. E **85**, 011102 (2012).
[43] J. S. Langer, Phys. Rev. E. **88**, 012122 (2013).
[44] J. Villain, J. de. Physique **46**, 1843 (1985).
[45] D. Fisher and D. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 373 (1988).
[46] Y. Singh, J. Stoessel, and P. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1059 (1985).
[47] C. Dasgupta and O. Valls, Phys. Rev. E. **59**, 3123 (1999).
[48] T. Ramakrishnan and M. Yussouff, Phys. Rev. B **19**, 2775 (1979).
[49] M. Mosayebi, E. Del Gado, P. Ilg, and H. C. Ottinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 205704 (2010).
[50] H. Tanaka, T. Kawasaki, H. Shintani, and K. Watanabe, Nat. Mater. **9**, 324 (2010).
[51] J. Gibbs and E. Dimarzio, J. Chem. Phys. **28**, 373 (1958).
[52] D. Thirumalai, R. D. Mountain, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. A **39**, 3563 (1989).
[53] W. Kob and L. Berthier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 245702 (2013).
[54] S. Karmakar and G. Parisi, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **110**, 2752 (2013).
[55] D. Thirumalai, J. Phys. I (Fr.) **5**, 1457 (1995).
[56] H. Miyagawa, Y. Hiwatari, B. Bernu, and J. Hansen, J. Chem. Phys. **88**, 3879 (1988).
[57] W. Kob and H. Andersen, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 4626 (1995).

[58] H. Kang, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. E. **88**, 042308 (2013).

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Key predictions of the RFOT theory of the liquid to glass transition. Schematic sketch of the dependence of the α relaxation time on the inverse temperature. Above T_d particle motion occurs by a diffusive process. Activated transition, marked by $\tau_\alpha \approx 10^{-7}$ ([32]), occurs below T_d. The temperature dependence of τ_α till T_d follows a power law. Below T_d, τ_α increases faster than predicted by Arrhenius law, and can be captured using the VFT law. The inverse of the laboratory glass transition temperature is defined by the condition that shear viscosity is $\approx 10^{13}$ poise. At the inverse equilibrium transition temperature, T_K, the relaxation time diverges. In the temperature range $T_K \leq T \leq T_d$ the correlation length, depicted by the compact droplets,increase eventually diverging at T_K with an exponent $2/d$. Relaxation times for several glass forming materials can be analyzed using the RFOT predictions.


>10^5
τα
≈10^-7
Td^-1
T^-1
Tg^-1
TK^-1