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Progressive quenching (PQ) is the stochastic process during which we fix one after another the degrees of freedom of a globally coupled Ising spin system while letting it thermalize through a heat bath. It has previously been shown that during the PQ, the mean equilibrium spin value follows a martingale process and that this process can characterize the memory of the system. In the present study, we find that the aforementioned martingale process implies a local invariance of the path-weight for the total quenched magnetization, the Markovian process whose increment is the lastly fixed spin. As a consequence of the local invariance, the PQ lets the probability distribution for the total quenched magnetization to evolve in keeping the canonical structure, or non-equilibrium Boltzmann factor, consisting of the path-independent potential and the path-counting entropy. Moreover, at each stage of the PQ, the above-mentioned non-equilibrium probability distribution is found to be at the same time the limit distribution of what we call the Recycled Quenching (RQ), the process in which a randomly chosen quenched spin is unquenched after a single step of PQ. The PQ has, therefore, an envelope property so that PQ generates a family of limit cycles. Through the local invariance, the martingale process behind the PQ brings about the new aspects of non-equilibrium physics, of the type different from those obtained by a new application of theorems known for martingale process.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Martingales\textsuperscript{1} have been widely known to physicists as a useful tool for studying stochastic processes. By converting a stochastic process into a martingale, one can use many theorems derived from probability theory in order to obtain results that would otherwise be difficult or laborious to obtain. Recently in non-equilibrium statistical physics, it was recognized that some variables of physical significance can be interpreted in light of martingales. In such cases the martingale property brings directly consequences of physical interest.

The first and now widely known case is the path probability ratios appearing in a variety of fluctuation theorems or non-equilibrium equalities. The authors of\textsuperscript{2}[3] brought to the physicists' attention that such ratios are recognized by mathematicians as the Radon-Nikodym derivative and that they are martingale processes. Their work improved the understanding of the entropy production as an action functional and allowed to introduce the concept of stopping time, such as the random cycle duration of autonomous mesoscopic heat engine\textsuperscript{4, 5}.

The second case is what we call Progressive Quenching (PQ). In this process a globally interacting spin system undergoes the fixation - or quenching - of an Ising spin one after another with a sufficient time interval so that the unquenched spins remain in equilibrium with a heat bath. We found that the evolution of the mean equilibrium spin of the unquenched part constitutes a martingale process\textsuperscript{6}, where the discrete time is represented by the number of quenched spins. While the context is more specific than the first case, the mechanism leading to martingale is independent of the Radon-Nikodym derivative. In this system the martingale property leads to a persistent memory by which we could infer the past data\textsuperscript{6} or predict approximately the future distribution\textsuperscript{7}.

In the present article, we further explore the consequences of the martingale property in the PQ. It is a general property of the Ising spin that the mean equilibrium spin determines completely the probability of the next quenched spin,\textsuperscript{8} When, furthermore, the mean equilibrium spin is martingale, the Markovian evolution of the total quenched spin is found to have a local invariance of path weight. After the brief description of model and notations in §II, this invariance property is explained in §III A. There are two major consequences both of which are totally unexpected at least for us and are first recognized through numerical simulations.

Our first finding is that, given the number of quenched spins $T$, the probability distribution for the quenched magnetization $M$ can be expressed by the non-equilibrium Boltzmann factor containing a "path-weight potential" and a "path-counting entropy," defined on the $(T, M)$-space. This result challenges our conventional distinction between the equilibrium and non-equilibrium statistics, and will be described in the remaining part of §III.

The second finding is that the above-mentioned probability distribution under a given number of quenched spins can also be obtained as the stable limit distribution of the different process that we call recycled quenching (RQ). The latter process consists of the alternative application of single-step unquenching and single-step quenching of randomly chosen quenched spin and unquenched spin, respectively. The detail of RQ is described in §IV, and its connection to PQ is shown in §V. This result challenges our conventional distinction between the diffusing system (described by a parabolic PDE) and stationary one (by elliptic PDE).
Our results based on a particular model show what the martingale can bring beyond its original definition in terms of the conditional expectation. For the moment it is unknown to what extent our results can be generalized. More discussion is given in §VI.

II. MODEL DESCRIPTION, TERMINOLOGY, AND SHORT SUMMARY OF THE PREVIOUS RESULTS

Globally coupled spin model: We consider the ferromagnetic Ising model on a complete network of $N_0$ spins. Any one of the spins interacts with all the other spins with equal coupling constant, $j/N_0$. The temperature of the heat bath is fixed and we absorb $\beta = (k_BT)^{-1}$ in $j$. It is known that in the limit $N_0 \to \infty$ the system undergoes the mean-field transition at the critical coupling, $j = j_{\text{crit}}(N_0) = \infty = 1$. In order to see clearly the effect of fluctuations, we set the coupling constant $j$ such that the whole system before the progressive quenching is at the critical point of the finite system, $j_{\text{crit}}(N_0)$, determined numerically from the Curie’s law (for the details, see [6]).

Progressive quenching (PQ): We fix one after another the spin quasi-statically at the state which it took. We call this operation “quench”. We mean by the stage-$T$, or simply $T$, that there are $T$ spins that have been quenched, see Fig.1a for illustration. We denote by $N$ the number of unquenched spins, i.e., $N = N_0 - T$ at the stage-$T$. By quasi-static we mean that the interval between the consecutive quenching is large enough for the unquenched spins remains in thermal equilibrium with the heat bath under the influence of the already quenched $T$ spins which exerts the constant field, $\frac{j}{N}M$, where $M$ is the sum of quenched spins. We shall call $M$ the quenched magnetisation for short, and will write $M_T$ when we need to specify the stage $T$.

PQ as Markov process of $M$: We denote by $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ the mean equilibrium spin at the stage-$T$ when the quenched magnetisation $M$.

$$m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M_{T-1}} = E[M_{T} - M_{T-1}|M_{T-1}], \quad (1)$$

where $E[A|B]$ means the conditional expectation of $A$ under the condition $B$. The quenched magnetization $M_T$ is a Markovian stochastic process if we regard $T$ as the integer time. For the transition from the stage-$T$ to $(T + 1)$, probability for the newly quenched spin to be $\pm 1$ is $(1 \pm m^{(eq)}_{T,M})/2$, respectively. Accordingly the value of quenched magnetisation $M$ changes by $\pm 1$. See Fig.1b.

Fock-like space of probability distributions: The statistical quantity of main interest is the probability distribution of quenched magnetization, $\{P(T,M)\} \equiv \{P(T,-T), P(T,-T+2), \ldots, P(T,T)\}$ at each stage $T$. Such distribution can be treated as a vector $\vec{P}(T)$ in the $(T + 1)$-dimensional Euclidean space. Because of the normalization condition this vector in fact spans a $T$-dimensional simplex. When we consider the evolution of probability distribution from $T = 0$, where $P(0,0) = 1$, up to $T = N_0$, we effectively use a kind of Fock space in which $\vec{P}(T)$ is found in the $T$-th sector. The process of PQ is a linear mapping between adjacent sectors from, for example $\vec{P}(T)$ to $\vec{P}(T+1)$ through a transfer matrix. We have found [6] that under the critical coupling $j = j_{\text{crit}}(N_0)$ the distribution $\vec{P}(T)$ undergoes a unimodal to bimodal transition for some $T$, whose value depends on $N_0$. “Hidden” martingale, $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$: A part from the bimodality of distribution $P(T,M)$, it has been found that $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ is a martingale process induced by the Markovian process $\{M_T\}$ [6]. The martingale property reads:

$$E[m^{(eq)}_{T,M_T}|M_{T-1}] = m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M_{T-1}}, \quad (2)$$

Eqs.(2) and (1) are the general definition of the “hidden” martingale, being independent of the details of the PQ model and of the coupling strength, $j$. In the case of PQ, there is a finite-size correction of $O(N_0^{-2})$. This correction is, however, harmless even if it is cumulated over $\sim N_0$ times. Therefore, we ignore hereafter this correction unless otherwise mentioned.

III. MARTINGALE PROPERTY AS A LOCAL INVARIANCE AND ITS CONSEQUENCE IN PQ

A. Local invariance of the path weight

When $M_T - M_{T-1}$ takes the Ising spin variable, the conditional probabilities are given in terms of $m^{(eq)}_{T,M_{T-1}}$ in (2), and we have

$$m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M_{T-1}} = m^{(eq)}_{T,M_{T-1}+1} \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M_{T-1}}}{2} + m^{(eq)}_{T,M_{T-1}-1} \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M_{T-1}}}{2} \quad (3)$$

FIG. 1. (a) In the complete network of $N_0 (= 9)$ spins, $T (= 3)$ spins have been quenched and there remain $N = N_0 - T (= 6)$ free spins. Every spin interacts with all the other ones by a ferromagnetic coupling constant, $j/N_0$. (b) PQ process is a Markov process representable by a 2D directed network on the integer lattice coordinated by $T$ and $M = M_T = \sum_{k=1}^T s_k$. Those lattice points which are not visited by the parity reason are masked. The inset shows the probabilities associated to the transitions.
FIG. 2. (a): Local invariance of the path weight as a consequence that the mean equilibrium spin $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ is martingale. The upper (blue) and lower (red) paths are weighted, respectively, by the l.h.s. and r.h.s. of Eq.(4). (b): Three representative paths connecting $(T, M) = (0, 0)$ and $(5, -1)$. All the three paths have the same probability weight due to the local invariance relation Eq.(4).

and further in the form of local invariance of the path-weight for the stochastic process $M[9]$

$$
\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M}}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T,M+1}}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M}}{2} \right) \left( \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T,M-1}}{2} \right)
$$

(4)

where $M_{T-1}$ has been simply denoted by $M$. Schematically (4) implies that the path weight is invariant under a local change between $(T - 1, M) \rightarrow (T, M + 1) \rightarrow (T + 1, M)$ and $(T - 1, M) \rightarrow (T, M - 1) \rightarrow (T + 1, M)$, see Fig.2(a).

The local invariance shown in Fig.2(a) reduces significantly the number of independent transition probabilities down to just an extensive one. In fact, the $\sum_{T'}^{T}$ plaquettes [10] like Fig.2(a) between $T = 0$ ant $T = \frac{T}{2}$ impose as many constraints on $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ with $0 \leq T' \leq T - 1$. As the latter counts $T(T+1)$ values, the difference makes $T$. Moreover, the symmetry with respect to $\pm M$ reduces the freedom among $\left\{ m^{(eq)}_{M,T} \right\}$ down to $\left\lfloor \frac{T}{2} \right\rfloor$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the floor function. The reduction of independent weight may reflect the persistent memory that we have found before [7].

**B. Probability distributions of PQ**

The new property of the martingale $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ in (4) reveals a unexpected “thermodynamic” structure in the evolution of $P(T)$. In general, the probability $P(T,M)$ is the sum of the path weight over all paths arriving at $(T, M)$ from $(0, 0)$. However, the relation (4) in the present system implies the degeneracy of all such path weights. For illustration Fig.2(b) shows the three paths among those reaching $(T, M) = (5, 1)$ from $(0, 0)$. The green path can be represented as a binary sequence, 10110, where 1 [0] means, respectively, to quench +1 [−1] spin. The relation (4) means that the path weight is unchanged if we exchange any pair of neighbouring bits. Therefore, the orange path, 11010, and then the blue path, 11100, have the same path weight as the green path.

The immediate consequence is that all the paths connecting the origin $(0, 0)$ to a certain destination $(T, M)$ through PQ have the same weight, which only depends on the number of 1 [0] bits, or equivalently, on $(T, M)$, see Fig. 2(b).

We shall denote such weight by $e^{-\beta E(T,M)}$, where $\beta \equiv 1$ and the function $E(T,M)$ gives a “path-weight potential” landscape on the $(T, M)$ plane. Having known the individual path weight, the sum of the path weight is obtained by counting the number of distinct paths connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(T, M)$, which is $(\frac{T}{T+1})$. We shall denote this number by $e^S$, where $S$ represents a “path-counting entropy”. The latter is analogous to the conformational entropy of one-dimensional random walk or free polymer chain. If we regard $(T, M)$ as the mesoscopic "state variable" of PQ, the associated microstates (i.e. the paths reaching $(T, M)$) satisfies equi-partition.

In summary the probability $P^{(PQ)}(T, M)$ is given by the non-equilibrium Boltzmann factor of a “path free energy”, $E - \frac{1}{\beta}S$, so that

$$
P^{(PQ)}(T, M) = e^{S(T,M) - \beta E(T,M)},
$$

(5)

where

$$
e^{-\beta E(T,M)} = \prod_{i=0}^{\frac{T(T-M)}{2}} \left( \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T,i}}{2} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{T(M+1)}{2}} \left( \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-i,M-i}}{2} \right)
$$

(6)

This is the first of our main results. In Fig.3 the red curve shows $\beta E - S$ for $T = N_0 = 256$, while the red-dotted one represents $\log P(T, M)$ which is directly calculated by solving the master equation for the distribution. In § V we will find Eq. (5) by a completely different approach, “recycled quenching”.

As a natural extension of the above argument of the path-weight potential and path-counting entropy, we can also have the compact expression of the propagator, $P^{(PQ)}(T, M; T_0, M_0)$ with $0 \leq T_0 \leq T \leq N_0$, which gives the conditional probability for $M_T = M$ to occur at the stage-$T$ given the initial condition, $P^{(PQ)}(T_0, M; T, M_0) = \delta(M - M_0)$. Following the same argument as (5) and (6) the value of $P^{(PQ)}(T, M; T_0, M_0)$ can be given in terms of $E(T, M; T_0, M_0)$ and $S(T, M; T_0, M_0)$, whose detailed account may not be necessary to repeat. We note here that the
path-weight potential is not of the type which can be handled by the Feynman-Kac formula [11, 12] because it is the non-local (−grad \( \tilde{E} \)) that should be assigned to each element of the path.

C. Origin of the bimodality as “potential-entropy” trade-off

We have encountered bimodal distribution for \( M \) during PQ even if the coupling \( j/N_0 \) is not in the ferromagnetic regime. While the symmetry breaking does not occur for the finite size \( N_0 \), the propensity of non-zero \( M \) should be understood by a mechanism outside of the equilibrium phase transition scenario. The above “thermodynamic” decomposition allows us to understand how the bimodality of the probability distribution can arise on the level of “space-time” statistics. We may constitute the following qualitative argument: When the total magnetisation \( M \) is non-zero, the molecular field, \( (j/N_0)M \), on the unquenched spins makes non-zero mean equilibrium spin, \( m_{eq,T,M} \). This causes the biased probability of subsequently quenched spin, which in turn reinforces the non-zero magnetization \( M \) as positive feedback. This is the scenario for the instability of \( \tilde{E} - S \) around \( M = 0 \). By contrast, the path-counting entropy factor becomes highly diminished for \( |M| \sim T \), reflecting the limited availability of paths. This explains the high rise of \( \tilde{E} - S \) for \( |M| \sim T \). The balance of these two factors can give rise to the bimodal distribution. At the early stages, \( T \ll N_0 \), however, the entropy factor prevails and the distribution is unimodal [7].

While the above “thermodynamic” picture explains a qualitative origin of bimodality, more subtle question would be whether such aspect persists in the limit of large system, \( N_0 \to \infty \), especially when \( j \) is chosen to be at the critical point. Leaving the detailed account in § V and the Supplemental Material (section S1), the short answer is affirmative and we expect that \( P(T = N_0; M) \) has maxima at \( M = \pm M^0(N_0) \), where \( M^0(N_0) \sim (N_0)^{1-\nu} \) with \( \nu \simeq 0.933 \) being the finite-size scaling exponent such that \( j_{\text{crit}}(N_0) = 1 + c(N_0)^{-\nu} [6] \).

IV. RECYCLED QUENCH (RQ)

A. Single-step unquenching \( S \) and single-step quenching \( K \)

Let us digress from the analysis on progressive operation of quenching (PQ) and rather consider the cyclic operation of a single-step quenching and un-quenching (recycled quench, or RQ for short). See Fig.4. We propose the following process: Take again a system of \( N_0 \) Ising spins on a complete network as being specified in § II. Suppose \( T \) spins are quenched with a total quenched magnetization \( M \) while the \( N = N_0 - T \) remaining spins are thermalized with a bath. We then select at random a quenched spin and allow it to be un-quenched (operation \( S \)). Subsequently we apply a single step of quenching step as in § II and [6][7] (operation \( K \)). While the number of quenched spin returns from \( T - 1 \) to \( T \), the updated state of the system may have its quenched magnetization either set to \( M \) or \( M \pm 2 \).

By applying alternatively the unquenching (\( S \)) and quenching (\( K \)) we generate a series of probability distributions, which may be written as follows:

\[ S \to \tilde{Q}^{[\ell]}(T-1) \to K \to \tilde{P}^{[\ell]}(T) \to S \to \tilde{Q}^{[\ell+1]}(T-1) \to K \to \tilde{P}^{[\ell+1]}(T) \to S \]

where the superfix \( [\ell] \) etc. merely counts the number of iterated operations, and the number of fixed spins, \( T \), is no more the ‘time’.

If we focus on \( \tilde{P}(T) \)'s, a single application of this recycling process can be seen as transformation over the probability vector \( \tilde{P}(T) \) by two operators : \( S \) then \( K \), leading to

\[ \tilde{P}^{[\ell+1]}(T) = (K S) \tilde{P}^{[\ell]}(T). \]

Alternatively, if we focus on \( \tilde{Q}(T-1)'s \), we can think of a adjoint process, where the two steps are reversed in order, i.e. \( K \) then \( S \), leading to

\[ \tilde{Q}^{[\ell+1]}(T-1) = (S K) \tilde{Q}^{[\ell]}(T-1). \]

In either point of view the recycling process retains the number of quenched spins. Altogether we can schematize the operation of unquenching and quenching in the form of Fig.5. The detailed action of \( K \) and \( S \) over a probability distribution is accounted in the Supplemental Material, section S2.

B. Stationary distributions – Case studies

Because the number of quenched spins remains the same after the action of \( K S \) and \( S K \), these combined operations are
FIG. 4. *Top law:* Schematic representation of the recycled quenching process: (a) Step *S:* A quenched spin (here in blue and circled in red) is picked at random and is un-quenched. (b) Step *K:* A unquenched spin (here in red and circled in blue) is quenched as in the Progressive Quenching. (c) Updated state of the system after operating *S,* then *K.* *Bottom law:* Probability tree of the operation of *S* (left) and *K* (right) over a distributions for the stages *T* = 1 and *T* = 2.

The transfer matrix *KS* is, in this case:

\[
KS = \begin{pmatrix}
    a & \frac{a}{2} & 0 \\
    1-a & 1-a & 1-a \\
    0 & \frac{a}{2} & a
\end{pmatrix}
\]

A simple induction gives an explicit formula for \((KS)^N\) and its convergence:

\[
(KS)^N \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix}
    \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} - \frac{a^N}{2} \\
    1-a & 1-a & 1-a \\
    \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} & \frac{a}{2} + \frac{a^N}{2}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Therefore, from whatsoever distribution \(\bar{P}_2\) the result of RQ cycle, \((KS)^N \bar{P}_2(2),\) converges to the stationary distribution \(\bar{P}^{[\infty]}(2) = \left(\frac{a}{2}, 1-a, \frac{a}{2}\right)^T.\) We notice that this stationary distribution coincides with the one obtained by the progressive quenching from \(P(PQ)(0,0) = 1,\) that is \(\bar{P}^{(PQ)}(2) = \bar{P}^{[\infty]}(2).\) See below.

**T = 3 case:** We can make the scheme similar to Fig.4.
(bottom) to find the transfermatrix $KS$. We then obtain:

$$KS = \begin{pmatrix}
  b & b & 0 & 0 \\
 1 - b & 2b & -b & 0 \\
 0 & 1 & 2b & -b \\
 0 & 0 & 1 & b
\end{pmatrix},$$

where $b = \frac{1 + m_{eq}^{(2)}}{2} = \frac{1 - m_{eq}^{(2)}}{2}$. Expression for $(KS)^N$ is rather cumbersome but we know the convergence of $(KS)$ by its eigenspectrum, $\{1, \frac{2b+1}{2}, \frac{2b}{3}, 0\}$, where we have $1 > (2b + 1)/3 > 2b/3 > 0$ because $0 < b < 1$. The normalized eigenvector corresponding to the steady state is: $\vec{P}^{(\infty)} = \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{b}{2}, \frac{1 - b}{2}, \frac{1 - b}{2}\right)$. The last vector is not generally the same as the distribution obtained by the progressive quenching: With $b$ just defined and $a \equiv \frac{1 + m_{eq}^{(1)}}{2}$ already defined above, the latter reads $\vec{P}^{(PQ)}(3) = \left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{1 - a}{2}, \frac{1 - a}{2}, \frac{1 - a}{2}\right)$. We see that $\vec{P}^{(\infty)} \neq \vec{P}^{(PQ)}$. Nevertheless, we observe $\vec{P}^{(\infty)} \approx \vec{P}^{(PQ)}$ for large system size $N_0$. We will come to this point in the next section.

C. Stationary distributions – General case

Altogether, from the previous case studies we admit that the iterative operation of $(KS)$ or $(SK)$ on a probability vector of the T-sector brings about the convergence to $\vec{P}^{(\infty)}$ and $\vec{Q}^{(\infty)}$, respectively, as stable fixed points:  

$$(KS)\vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T) = \vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T)$$  

$$(SK)\vec{Q}^{(\infty)}(T) = \vec{Q}^{(\infty)}(T)$$  

(11)

These fixed points are also the eigenvectors of these operators with the maximum eigenvalue. Using the concrete expressions for the action of $(KS)$ and $(SK)$ detailed in the Supplemental Material (S2), the equations in (11) can be rewritten as follows, where we use the notations, $p_M = P^{(\infty)}(T, M)$ and $q_M = Q^{(\infty)}(T, M)$:

$$0 = p_{M-2} \left(1 - \frac{M - 2}{T}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M-1}\right)$$

$$- p_M \left(1 + \frac{M}{T}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M-1}\right)$$

$$- [p_M \left(1 - \frac{M}{T}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right)$$

$$- p_{M+2} \left(1 + \frac{M + 2}{T}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right)$$

and similarly:

$$0 = q_{M-2} \left(1 - \frac{M - 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T, M-2}\right)$$

$$- q_M \left(1 + \frac{M - 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T, M}\right)$$

$$- [q_M \left(1 - \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T, M}\right)$$

$$- q_{M+2} \left(1 + \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T, M+2}\right)$$

(12)

Since $[\cdots]$ in the second lines are simply shifted by $+2$ for the variable $M$ with respect to the first lines, the “first integrals” are

$$p_M \left(1 - \frac{M}{T}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right)$$

$$- p_{M+2} \left(1 + \frac{M + 2}{T}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right) = c_+$$

and

$$q_M \left(1 - \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T, M}\right)$$

$$- q_{M+2} \left(1 + \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T, M+2}\right) = c_-$$

where $c_\pm$ are independent of $T$. Moreover, it is only for $c_+ = 0$ or $c_- = 0$ that $p_{T+2}$ or $q_{T+2}$ are not generated. Therefore, $c_\pm = 0$. We then have

$$p_{M+2} \left(1 - \frac{M}{T}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right)$$

$$- p_M \left(1 + \frac{M + 2}{T}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1, M+1}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{q_M}$$

(14)

and

$$q_{M+2} \left(1 - \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 + m^{(eq)}_{T, M}\right)$$

$$- q_M \left(1 + \frac{M + 1}{T+1}\right) \left(1 - m^{(eq)}_{T, M+2}\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{p_M}.$$  

(15)

With the aid of the normalization conditions, the iterative conditions (14) and (15) should give the stationary distributions $\vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T)$ and $\vec{Q}^{(\infty)}(T)$, respectively.

V. MARTINGALE CONNECTS STATIONARY DISTRIBUTIONS OF RQ TO PQ

A. Numerical comparisons

Having characterized $\vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T)$ and $\vec{Q}^{(\infty)}(T)$ with any value of $T$ as the stable fixed distributions of $(KS)$ and $(SK)$, respectively, we evaluated numerically these distributions for different $T$ and for $N_0$. It is done by seeking the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest eigenvalue (1). To our surprise, our analysis shows that the two stationary distributions, $\vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T)$ and $\vec{Q}^{(\infty)}(T)$, are extremely similar, and that the similitude increases with the number of spins in the entire system $N_0$. Moreover, they are also almost identical to the distribution of the Progressive Quenching, $\vec{P}^{(PQ)}(T)$, when $N_0 \gg 1$. Fig.6 shows the comparison between $\vec{P}^{(PQ)}(T)$ and $\vec{P}^{(\infty)}(T)$ (upper inset) and $\vec{Q}^{(PQ)}(T)$ (lower inset). The difference of order $10^{-7}$ (solid curve in red) is much smaller than the probability distribution, which is of order $10^{-2}$ (dashed curve in blue) in the case of $N_0 = T = 256$.

B. Implication of Martingale

The key to understand the above mentioned “coincidence” is the martingale. In fact the local invariance (4),
which is equivalent to the martingale property of \( m^{(\text{eq})}_{T+1, T} \).

Eq.(2), assures that the r.h.s. of (14) and that of (15) are the same. To show this we have also used the identity,

\[
\frac{1 - M/T}{1 + M + 2/T} = \left( 1 - \frac{M + 1}{T + 1} \right)/\left( 1 + \frac{M + 1}{T + 1} \right).
\]

Under the normalisation condition, these two equations, therefore, defines the unique distribution: \( \tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T) = \tilde{Q}^{[\infty]}(T) \). The consequence of this equality is profound if we recall (7) with \( \ell = \infty \), because the latter implies

\[
\begin{align*}
K & \tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T - 1) = \tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T) \quad \text{(16)} \\
S & \tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T) = \tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T - 1) \quad \text{(17)}
\end{align*}
\]

Eq.(16) tells in fact that the whole family of stationary distributions of Recycled Quenching, \( \{ \tilde{F}^{[\infty]} \}_{T=0}^{N_0} \), is generated by the Progressive Quenching one after another starting from the initial one, \( \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(0) = 1 \).

\[
\tilde{F}^{[\infty]}(T) = \tilde{Q}^{[\infty]}(T) = \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T).
\]  

This is the second of our main results. This fact, a kind of envelope relation, can be also verified by directly “integrating” (14) and comparing with (5) and (6) (the details not shown). Eq.(17) tells that the random unquenching of a spin by \( S \) allows to step back the distribution of the Progressive Quenching. Schematically we may represent these by Fig.7.

We note that this is “on-shell” property, which concerns only the stationary distributions of RQ. In the sense “off-shell,” the family \( \{ \tilde{F}^{(PQ)} \}_{T=0}^{N_0} \) constitutes a set of stable attractors of the RQ operations, \( KS \) and \( SK \).

### VI. DISCUSSION

The PQ (operation \( K \)) is an operation through which the repartition between the system (Sys) and the external system (Ext) is updated, and the operation \( S \) is a kind of its inverse.

![Fig. 7. While the progressive quenching (the symbol \( K \) and blue arrows) generates \( \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T) \) from \( \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T - 1) \), the random un-quenching of quenched spins (the symbol \( S \) and red arrows) generates \( \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T - 1) \) from \( \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T) \) as the “on-shell” reverse operation. At the same time, the family of these distributions \( \{ \tilde{F}^{(PQ)}(T) \}_{T=0}^{N_0} \) are the attracter of the Recycling Quenching, \( KS \) and \( SK \) (the upward and downward thick arrows). Such flexibilities of repartition opens the niche where we may find new concepts. In fact the martingale property of the mean equilibrium spin showed us the two features which have not been reported in the literatures of non-equilibrium statistical physics.

The first feature is the path-weight potential that gives the probability for the individual path in the way that the weight depends only on the initial and final locations of the path in the \( (T, M) \)-“space-time”. Together with the path-counting entropy, which is the configurational entropy of the paths under the specified initial and final locations, a kind of canonical weight on the \( (T, M) \)-“space-time” showed up. Thus the concept of Boltzmann weight in the canonical ensemble is extended to a non-equilibrium “space-time” context. We note that all these holds if we have the transition network of Fig.1b and the martingale of the form Eq.(3) even if they were not from the spins on the complete network.

The second feature is that the evolution of the Progressive Quenching (PQ) generates the family of stable steady states of Recycling Quenching (RQ), which consists of the alternation of single-step quenching and single-step unquenching of randomly chosen spin. The family of steady distributions plays a role of a stable manifold in the space of distributions with multi-sectors. The flow converging to the stable manifold is driven by the two operations, \( K \) and \( S \).

There are several questions that we have not exploited and left for the future study. We have not addressed the kinetic aspects of the RQ, which might bring more informations about this new realm of flexible Sys-Ext repartition. As for the PQ, we have not yet studied the consequences when \( T \) is a stopping time [4, 5]. Often the many advantages of martingale theory come with this concept. More generally it is a future task to distinguish what aspects of our “solvable” system are generic and what others are specific. At least we have shown to what extent the martingale property can bring unexpected statistical properties.
If we denote the mean equilibrium spin by $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ as function of the number of quenched spins $T$ and the quenched magnetization $M$, the subsequently quenched spin is $\pm 1$ with the probability $(1 \pm m^{(eq)}_{T,M})/2$.

The transformation uses the identity $2c-a(1+c)-b(1-c) = (1+c)(1-a) - (1-c)(1+b)$.

S1. BIMODALITY OF DISTRIBUTION UNDER CRITICAL COUPLING

We present an argument to assert that the distribution $P(T = N_0, M)$ remains bimodal in the asymptotic limit $N_0 \to \infty$. Even though the split is of order close to $(\sqrt{N_0})$ the limit distribution is not Gaussian.

Preparation of $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$: The basic quantity is the mean equilibrium spin $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$ which is defined by $m^{(eq)}_{T,M} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \left( \log \frac{Z}{N} \right)$, where $Z$ is the partition function for the $N = N_0 - T$ Ising spins with the pair coupling $\frac{j}{N_0}$ and under the “molecular field” $h \equiv \frac{j}{N_0} M$. Using the Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation it reads $Z = \log \int e^{N \psi(m)} dm$, where

$$\psi(m) := -\frac{j_{\text{eff}}}{2} m^2 + \log[\cosh(h + j_{\text{eff}} m)],$$

$$j_{\text{eff}} := \frac{N}{N_0} j = \left(1 - \frac{T}{N_0}\right) j.$$

We will use the saddle-point approximation for the integral in $Z$, which is valid for $T$ such that $\mathcal{O}(\frac{N}{N_0}) = 1$ and also $\mathcal{O}(\frac{T}{N_0}) = 1$.

$$\int e^{N \psi(m)} dm \simeq e^{N \psi(m^*)} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{N \psi''(m^*)}},$$

$$m^* = \tanh(h + j_{\text{eff}} m^*),$$

where the second equation defining $m^*$ originates from $\psi'(m^*) = 0$. Using the formulas of $\tanh$ etc. we can show the formula like, $\frac{\partial \psi(m^*)}{\partial h} = m^*$, $\psi''(m^*) = -j_{\text{eff}} + (j_{\text{eff}})^2(1 - (m^*)^2)$, $\frac{\partial m^*}{\partial h} = \frac{1 - (m^*)^2}{1 - j_{\text{eff}}(1 - (m^*)^2)}$. Combining these, we arrive at a closed equations giving $m^{(eq)}_{T,M}$:

$$m^{(eq)}_{T,M} = m^* = \frac{1}{2N} \frac{j M}{N_0} \frac{m^*[1 - (m^*)^2]}{\left[1 - \frac{j M}{N_0} m^*[1 - (m^*)^2]\right]^2},$$

$$m^* = \tanh\left(\frac{j M}{N_0} + \frac{j N}{N_0} m^*\right) \quad (S1)$$

The condition $\mathcal{O}(\frac{N}{N_0}) = 1$ is also necessary when $j$ is close to the critical value, which is 1 for $N_0 \to \infty$. Since $j$ appears through $j_{\text{eff}} = j N/N_0$, the denominator of the second term on the r.h.s. of the first equation in (S1) can become very small for small values of $T$, invalidating (S1). In assuming both $\mathcal{O}(\frac{N}{N_0}) = 1$ and $\mathcal{O}(\frac{T}{N_0}) = 1$, we will ignore this term as $\mathcal{O}(N_0^{-1})$. In short, in (S1) the $\mathcal{O}(N^{-1})$ term serves only for detecting its validity limit.
Split of the maxima of probability, $M^o(T)$. The extrema $M = M^o(T)$ of the probability distribution $P(T, M)$ is found from Eq.(14) of the main text, such that $P(T, M^o - 1) = P(T, M^o + 1)$. The result reads

$$m^{(eq)}_{T, M^o(T)} = \frac{M^o(T)}{T + 2}. \hspace{1cm} (S2)$$

(We generalize this condition for non-integer $M^o$ because $M^o \gg 1$ for large $N_0$.) Apparently $M^o(T) = 0$ is always the solution by the symmetry reason. Besides, if $M^o > 0$ exists, $(-M^o)$ does also. Using (S1) with ignoring the second term on the r.h.s. of the first equation, (S2) becomes:

$$\frac{M^o(T)}{T + 2} = \tanh \left[ j(1 + \frac{2}{N_0}) M^o(T) \right].$$

It tells that $M^o(T)/(T + 2)$ is independent of $T$. This linearity, $M^o(T) \propto (T + 2)$ for $O(\frac{N_0}{T}) = 1$ and $O(\frac{T}{N_0}) = 1$, is verified by direct calculation of the distributions. Anticipating that $M^o(T)/(T + 2) \ll 1$ for $N_0 \gg 1$ we can use $\tanh z \simeq z - \frac{1}{3} z^3$. Especially, when $0 < j - 1 \ll 1$ we have

$$\frac{M^o(T)}{T + 2} \simeq \sqrt{3 \left( \frac{2}{N_0} + j - 1 \right)} \hspace{1cm} (S3)$$

and the result is consistent, i.e., $M^o(T)/(T + 2) \ll 1$.

If we use $j$ at the “critical value,” $j_{\text{crit}}(N_0) \simeq 1 + \frac{c}{(N_0)^{\nu}}$ with $c = 5.06$ and $\nu = 0.933$ according to [1], the above approximation expects $M^o(T) \simeq \alpha(N_0) \frac{N_0^{1/2}}{N_0^{\nu}}$ with $\alpha(N_0) = \sqrt{3(2 + cN_0^{1-\nu})}N_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In Fig.S1 we show the numerical result for $M^o(T)$ vs $\frac{T}{N_0}$ for different sizes, $N_0$, without the saddle-point approximation. What we observed so far is that, once the bimodality appears at some stage of progressive quenching, $T = T_0(< N_0)$, it remains for any $T$ with $T_0 \leq T \leq N_0$. Admitting this as a fact, we conclude that the bimodality of $P(T = N_0, M)$ remains and we expect $\alpha(N_0) \simeq \sqrt{3cN_0^{1-\nu}}$. As for small values of $T$, the full numerical results show the unimodal-bimodal transition with $T$.

S2. CALCULATION OF TRANSFER MATRICES UNDER $K$, $S$, $KS$ AND $SK$

In this Supplemental Material we derive the transfer matrix elements for the probability vector under the operation of progressive quench $K$, unquenching of randomly selected spin $S$, as well as their combinations $KS$ and $SK$. 

FIG. S1. Position of the bimodal peak of $P^{(\infty)}(T, M)$ versus $\frac{T}{N_0}$ for $N_0 = 256$ and $N_0 = 1024$ obtained numerically (solid curves). The dashed red curves show the asymptotic formula Eq.(S3).
We will use the symbol $\delta(\cdot)$ for the Kronecker’s delta, i.e., $\delta(n)$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ takes the value 1 for $n = 0$ and 0 otherwise. We also write the conditional expectation using the symbol $E$ such as $E[X|Y]$ for the expectation of $X$ given the knowledge of $Y$. When $Y$ is a random variable, $E[X|Y]$ does also. The component $P(T, M)$ of the probability vector $\tilde{P}(T)$ reads

$$P(T, M) = E[\delta(M - \hat{M}_T)].$$

We will abuse the operators $K$ and $S$ to act both on the quenched magnetization $\hat{M}_T$ when $T$ spins are fixed and also on the probability vector $\tilde{P}(T)$, i.e., on the ensemble of systems having different $M_T$ according the given weights. When $L$ stands for the operators, $K$, $(KS)$, etc.,

$$E[\delta(M - L\hat{M}_T)|\hat{M}_T] = \sum_k \delta(M - (\hat{M}_T + k)) a_{T,k}(\hat{M}_T)$$

$$= \sum_k \delta((M - k) - \hat{M}_T)a_{T,k}(M - k),$$

where $a_{T,k}()$ are the weights, can be translated into the usual representation in terms of the transfer matrix elements as

$$LP(T, M) = \sum_k P(T, M - k)a_{T,k}(M - k),$$

(S5)

**Operation of $K$:** As described above $K\hat{M}_T$ means the quenched magnetization after a unquenched spin out of $N_0 - T$ ones has been quenched. The system then has $T + 1$ quenched spin. The conditional distribution of the resulting magnetisation reads,

$$E[\delta(M - K\hat{M}_T)|\hat{M}_T] = \delta(M - (\hat{M}_T + 1)) \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T,\hat{M}_T}}{2}$$

$$+ \delta(M - (\hat{M}_T - 1)) \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T,\hat{M}_T}}{2}$$

$$= \delta(M - M - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T,M - 1}}{2}$$

$$+ \delta(M + 1 - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T,M + 1}}{2}$$

(S6)

For the later convenience we rewrite (S6) with $T \to T - 1$.

$$E[\delta(M - K\hat{M}_{T-1})|\hat{M}_{T-1}] =$$

$$\delta(M - 1 - \hat{M}_{T-1}) \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M - 1}}{2}$$

$$+ \delta(M + 1 - \hat{M}_{T-1}) \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M + 1}}{2}$$

(S7)

or, using the general relationship (S4) we find $K\tilde{P}(T - 1)$ as the probability vector in the $T$-sector with the component,

$$(K\tilde{P}(T - 1))_M = P(T - 1, M - 1) \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M - 1}}{2}$$

$$+ P(T - 1, M + 1) \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1,M + 1}}{2}$$

(S8)

**Operation of $S$:** We denote by $S\hat{M}_T$ the quenched magnetization after a quenched spin out of $T$ ones has been unquenched. The system has $T - 1$ quenched spins and $N_0 - T + 1$ unquenched spins. The conditional distribution of the resulting magnetisation reads:

$$E[\delta(M - S\hat{M}_T)|\hat{M}_T] = \delta(M - (\hat{M}_T - 1)) \frac{1 + \hat{M}_T}{2}$$

$$+ \delta(M - (\hat{M}_T + 1)) \frac{1 - \hat{M}_T}{2}$$

$$= \delta(M + 1 - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 + \hat{M} + 1}{2}$$

$$+ \delta(M - 1 - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 - \hat{M} - 1}{2}.$$
**Operation of KS:** $K(S\hat{M}_T)$ means to unquench randomly a spin among $T$ quenched ones then quench randomly a spin among $N_0 - (T - 1)$ thermalized spins. Replacing in (S7) $\hat{M}_{T-1}$ by $S\hat{M}_T$, where $S\hat{M}_T$ is given in (S9), the result reads:

$$E[\delta(M - K(S\hat{M}_T))|\hat{M}_T] = \delta(M - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 + \hat{M}_T}{2} + \frac{1 + m^{(eq)}_{T-1,\hat{M}_T-1}}{2},$$

(S10)

By taking the expectation over $\hat{M}_T$, i.e. the weighted summation $\sum_{\hat{M}_T=-T}^{T} P(M_T, T)$, we have the evolution of $\vec{P}$ after a single cycle of operation, $KS$. The fixed point equation (Eq.(12) of the main text) in the main text is obtained by requiring $(KS)\vec{P}(T) = \vec{P}(T)$. The rewriting this into the form of Eq.(12) is very close to the transformation from Eq.(3) to Eq.(4) of the main text. The close relationship between the martingale and the harmonic function has long been known [2].

**Operation of SK:** $S(K\hat{M}_T)$ means to quench randomly a spin among the $N_0 - T$ thermalized ones then unquench randomly a spin among $T + 1$ quenched ones. In the manner similar to the case of operating $KS$, the result reads

$$E[\delta(M - S(K\hat{M}_T))|\hat{M}_T] = \delta(M - \hat{M}_T) \frac{1 - \hat{M}_T}{2} + \frac{1 - m^{(eq)}_{T-1,\hat{M}_T+1}}{2},$$

(S11)

By taking the expectation over $\hat{M}_T$, i.e. the weighted summation $\sum_{\hat{M}_T=-T}^{T} P(M_T, T)$, we have the evolution of $\vec{Q}$ upon after a single cycle of operation, $SK$. The fixed point equation - Eq.(13) in the main text - is obtained by requiring $(SK)\vec{Q}(T) = \vec{Q}(T)$.