

Real-space model for activated processes in rejuvenation and memory behavior of glassy systems

Mahajabin Rahman and Stefan Boettcher

Department of Physics, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA

We offer an alternative real-space description based purely on activated processes for the understanding of relaxation dynamics in hierarchical landscapes. To this end, we use the cluster model, a coarse-grained lattice model of a jammed system, to analyze rejuvenation and memory effects during aging after a hard quench. In this model, neighboring particles on a lattice aggregate through local interactions into clusters that fragment with a probability based on their size. Despite the simplicity of the cluster model, it has been shown to reproduce salient observables of the aging dynamics in colloidal systems, such as those accounting for particle mobility and displacements. Here, we probe the model for more complex quench protocols and show that it exhibits the same rejuvenation and memory effects attributed to the complex hierarchical structure of a glassy energy landscape. Beyond studying rejuvenation and memory effects, we also demonstrate that this model can be used for predictive purposes on the end of memory.

The morphology of energy landscapes in high-dimensional configuration spaces is at the heart of complex dynamics for a broad range of statistical systems [1, 2]. Examples are legion in disparate systems: Glassy materials like amorphous fluids [3], jammed grains [4, 5], colloids [6, 7], disordered magnets [8, 9], or entangled polymers [10–13], all face frustration while relaxing their free energy. Similar phenomena are observed in biological systems when energy is replaced with fitness or functionality, as in the case of evolution [14–16] or of protein folding [17]. In engineering systems, this energy would be replaced by a cost, as in the case of optimization and learning in artificial intelligence [18–23] or econophysics [24]. The unifying principle is that competing variables exert geometric or energetic constraints on each other that impose a complex, multimodal landscape on the space of all possible configurations that describe the collective states of a large number of variables and transitions between them. Thus, a universal framework to understand how any of these systems traverses their landscape is of wide-ranging scientific interest.

Much progress has been made recently in characterizing different phases of behavior in particular for structural glasses in the context of mean-field replica theory [25]. Remarkably it appears that some of those predictions – from a physical space with infinite dimensions – are valid all the way down to realistic hard-sphere systems in a two-dimensional plane. However, a common caveat made in applying those results concern their lack of including collective, activated processes which are expected to supersede some of the microscopic dynamics in the glassy regime. Such activated process set in when significant barriers in the free energy landscape localizes the motion [26], as would be the case for “caging” in a colloidal glass, for example. Here, we consider the physical implications of a simple, real-space model that, in contrast to mean-field theory, is based on the *predominance* of such activated processes. We find that such a model reproduces much of the macroscopic phenomenology that is often seen as evidence for a mean-field interpretation [27, 28].

A standard approach to gain insight into the complexity of the landscape of a glassy system, whether in experiment or in simulation, is through a hard quench [10] from the liquid-like

high-temperature (or low-density) to a low temperature (or high density) regime, initiating a non-equilibrium relaxation dynamics known as aging [3, 5, 29–40]. Such a quench takes the system instantly deep into the glassy landscape. There, a hierarchy of barriers emerges that quite naturally calls for an effective description of the ensuing dynamics in terms of a sequence of activated events that is called *record dynamics* (RD) [41], since that hierarchy renders all but the largest fluctuations ineffectual and relaxation is characterized by timescales for barrier crossings that exceed all others [9, 42–44]. There is significant experimental evidence indicating the dominance of such large, intermittent events in driving the relaxation dynamics [38, 45–49]. Accordingly, in RD incremental relaxation is coarse-grained into a sequence of record barrier crossing events that are required to unlock farther reaches in the landscape [22, 44].

Further subjecting an aging system to temperature shifts should trigger rejuvenation and memory effects. For example, in spin glasses it is easy to demonstrate rejuvenation and the imprinting of entire histories [50–55] under small variations of temperature and fields after a quench. It has been less clear whether structural glasses would exhibit those effects also, or to what extent. This question has recently been addressed by Scalliet and Berthier using molecular dynamics (MD) simulations of 3D soft spheres [27]. With an appropriate definition of a response function to measure the dynamic susceptibility of the system under a temperature shift, both the rejuvenation and the subsequent recovery of a prior state (memory) have been demonstrated, as well as the slow convergence towards a plateau value similar to an Edwards-Anderson-like order parameter for caging [56], which has been seen as supporting the mean-field perspective. In the following, we will show that our alternative model based on RD exhibits a matching phenomenology.

As a real-space incarnation of RD, a simple on-lattice “cluster model” has been designed [57] that captures the combined temporal *and* spatial heterogeneity found in a generic aging system. In this cluster model, particles completely fill a lattice, one on each site, but each particle by itself either forms an isolated and therefore *mobile* cluster of size $h = 1$, or it is jammed in with adjacent particles (i.e.,

immobile) as a member of a cluster of size $h > 1$. At the time of the quench, $t = 0$, all particles are mobile, owing to the prior “liquid” high- T or low-density state of the system. When picked for an update at any $t > 0$,

1. ($h = 1$): a mobile particle swaps position with a random neighbor and joins the neighbor’s cluster; or
2. ($h > 1$): a jammed particle may activate an event with an h -dependent probability per sweep [58],

$$P(h) \propto e^{-\beta h}. \quad (1)$$

For a sufficiently large value of the external control parameter β (that acts as a density or an inverse temperature), mobile particles soon accrete into jammed clusters only to be remobilized necessitating ever larger and thus ever more rare fluctuations after a time *exponential* [9, 59] in the size of that cluster, h . The effect of regular fluctuations that only rarely achieve such a significant event beyond reversible in-cage rattle is coarse-grained into $P(h)$. Following a quench out of the liquid state of mobile particles, clusters form and break up *irreversibly* to distribute their particles to neighboring clusters. Their growth, in turn, decelerates the dynamics, since only ever larger and fewer clusters remain, which signifies the slow structural changes that characterizes aging.

Despite its simplicity, the model has already been shown to reproduce [60, 61] salient experimental [38] and simulational [62] results for quenches in colloids. In particular, the two-time mean-square displacement (MSD),

$$\Delta(t, t_w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\langle |\vec{r}_i(t) - \vec{r}_i(t_w)|^2 \right\rangle, \quad (2)$$

was shown to grow logarithmic as $\Delta(t, t_w) \sim A \ln(t/t_w)$, depending on the waiting time t_w after the quench when the measurement commences. In RD, this is a direct consequence of the $\sim A/t$ decline [63] in the rate of cluster break-up events (such a rate for irreversible events was explicitly verified in experimental data aging colloids [60]). In Fig. 1, we demonstrate that the proportionality factor A is a function of β , similar to what has been observed for domain growth in spin-glass simulations [64] but also for MSD in colloidal experiments at different densities [60].

In the following, we use two-step quench temperature cycles in the cluster model to elicit rejuvenation and memory effects. To that end, we will simulate the model on a square lattice of length $L = 64$, employing periodic boundary conditions. Such investigations require measurements over many decades in time, which is conveniently accomplished in the cluster model using a waiting-time algorithm [57, 65]. This method orders all possible breakup events in a chronology based on their probability of occurring, thus avoiding rejected moves that occur in conventional Monte Carlo algorithms. And since each cluster break-up event typically moves many particles simultaneously, this method can rapidly telescope into the future within just a few update




FIG. 1. Increase of (a) MSD and (b) average cluster size with the logarithm of time, for different values of β in Eq. (1). The results show that motion slows systematically with increasing β . Panel (c) shows the dependence of the log-slope A on β in fitting $\Delta \sim A \ln(t)$ to the cluster sizes $\langle h \rangle$ in (b), yielding $A \approx \beta^{-\gamma}$ with $\gamma \approx 0.721$. The inset demonstrates the collapse of the appropriately rescaled data from (b).

steps. Specifically, each of the k clusters is assigned a survival time, $\{\delta t_i\}_{i=1}^k$, based on its current size h_i according to [65]

$$\delta t_i = -\log(X_i)/P(h_i), \quad (3)$$

with $P(h_i)$ as given in Eq. (1) and made stochastic by employing a random number X_i sampled from a uniform distribution. Then, the event with the lowest $\delta t_{\min} = \min_i \{\delta t_i\}$ is selected, updating the global time to $t + \delta t_{\min}$ and assigning a new δt to the most recently modified clusters.

In Fig. 2, we illustrate that our simple model is capable of exhibiting both rejuvenation and memory effects. Following Ref. 27, we employ the MSD given in Eq. (2) to define a dynamic susceptibility function

$$\chi(t_w, \omega) = \beta \Delta(t_w + \omega^{-1}, t_w), \quad (4)$$

where $\tau = \omega^{-1}$ sets a time-window over which the decay of the instantaneous mobility at time t_w is assessed. The initial quench occurs from an infinite temperature ($\beta = 0$) to $\beta_1 = 0.5$. At that point, χ drops as a function of t_w , using a window size of $\tau = 2$ (in sweeps), while the system is aged up to $t_1 = 50$ sweeps. At that time the system has developed a Poissonian cluster-size distribution with average cluster size reaching about $\langle h \rangle \approx 30$, see Fig. 1(b), leaving a number of the smallest and most marginally stable clusters below that size most likely to break. In fact, as illustrated in Fig. 2(c), a fraction of those clusters are in the process of steadily collapsing at time t_1 in a large enough system.

At time t_1 , we perform a further quench of the system, down to $\beta_2 = 5$. At this much reduced temperature, only clusters below the corresponding average cluster of $\langle h \rangle \approx 3$, as shown in Fig. 1(b), would qualify as unstable on this time-scale. Clearly, all of the existing clusters are much too large and are completely frozen at this temperature. Only those currently freed particles from the cluster break-ups that are already in progress can contribute to the instantaneous




FIG. 2. Rejuvenation and memory effects produced on an $L = 64$ square lattice subject to a temperature cycle. The system at $t_w = 0$ undergoes a hard quench to $\beta_1 = 0.5$, ages until time (in sweeps) $t_1 = 50$, when temperature is reduced once more to $\beta_2 = 5$. After aging further until $t_2 = 500$, it is reset to β_1 . In (a), the susceptibility χ defined in Eq.(4) is plotted as a function of t_w using $\tau = \omega^{-1} = 2 \ll t_1$. In turn, (b) shows that χ , when reheated at t_2 , is a continuation of the dynamics from the system prior to the second quench at t_1 . Both can therefore be "stitched together". In (c), a physical depiction of the situation is provided. The top row shows the cluster formation on the lattice (different colors indicate separate clusters). The bottom row shows the corresponding lattice configuration, here color coded with the survival time δt for that cluster to collapse. The region most affected by the quench at t_1 is circled in all the snapshots. There, some cluster of size $h = 22$ happens to break up and solely its freed particles are able to move during a time window of size $\tau = 2$ after t_1 . Right before the lattice is reheated, we see that many of those particles integrated into surrounding clusters. Once reheated, the cluster-size distribution is almost identical to the first column, which is why the dynamics seems to pick up where they left off prior to the second quench.

mobility in this part of the temperature cycle. This small but extensive fraction of mobile particles, in turn, relives the entire history of an aging system freshly quenched to β_2 , within the background of otherwise frozen clusters. As in Ref. 27, the overall reduction in mobility Δ is partially compensated by the relative factor of β (here, $\beta_2/\beta_1 = 10$) in the definition of χ in Eq. (4). Thus, χ "rejuvenates", immediately jumping up above the previous level reached before t_1 , before decaying itself. When the temperature is then reset to $\beta_1 = 0.5$ after $t_1 + t_2 = 100$ sweeps, the impact left by the rejuvenating subsystem had a minimal effect on the entire system. Merely those clusters already breaking up at t_1 advanced minutely. Accordingly, its instantaneous mobility returns to the level frozen in at t_1 .

As a further validation of rejuvenation, Ref. 27 compared the age-dependent (two-time) MSD observed following the initial quench to β_1 with the MSD found after the second quench to β_2 while using its starting point t_1 as the new origin of time. Indeed, in their Figs. 3 and 4(a), they demonstrate that in both measurements the two-time MSD behaves analogously, as if t_1 was an entirely independent quench.




FIG. 3. MSD (a) after quench to $\beta_1 = 0.5$ (without subsequent temperature changes) and (b) after a subsequent quench at $t_1 = 50$ to $\beta_2 = 5.0$. In both cases, the quenched system is aged up to certain waiting time t_w , before the dynamics of the particles are measured relative to the configuration at t_w as a function of lag-time $\tau = t - t_w$. Both (a) and (b) show the characteristic dependence of MSD on the age t_w . For (b) this implies that the second quench actually rejuvenated the system, albeit at a much lower mobility due to the lower temperature.

To replicate these results in RD, we employ for the cluster model the same setting as in Fig. 2 but with a simple quench to $\beta = 0.5$. Now, the system is aged (without second quench)

up to various waiting times t_w to measure MSD $\Delta(t_w + \tau, t_w)$ for the lag-time $\tau = t - t_w$. This data is plotted in Fig. 3(a), which reproduces Fig. 3 of Ref. 27. It demonstrates that a system that was aged up to a time t_w remains confined for a corresponding time $\propto t_w$ before exhibiting any discernible MSD. Incidentally, this fact, as well as a collapse of this data as function of t/t_w , was previously explained for experiments on colloids in terms of RD in Ref. 60. Although mean-field arguments would suggest that MSD after a transient should saturate at long times [56], the existence of activated dynamics in real systems induce further (logarithmic) growth.

More importantly, the rejuvenation effect seen in Fig. 4(a) of Ref. 27 is captured for the cluster model in Fig. 3(b) which presents the two-time MSD of particles for several t_w during the second stage of the temperature cycle. Having undergone the initial quench to $\beta = 0.5$, the dynamics are evolved up to time $t_1 = 50$ sweeps, at which time the system is cooled down even further to $\beta = 5$. Once the particles are quenched to the second temperature, they are aged up to a given waiting time t_w , now taking t_1 as the new origin of time. As above, the dynamics are measured as a function of lag-time $\tau = t - t_w$ for each t_w . While the MSD after the second quench differs by a magnitude compared to Fig. 3, the t_w dependence shows that rather than continuing the dynamics from the prior quench, the process re-initializes and dynamics are refreshed based on t_w , the age of the system following the second quench at t_1 . It is apparent from this analysis that in the cluster model the intervening quench to β_2 (if it is not excessively long, see below) leaves little mark on the large fraction of frozen-in clusters, which on re-heating at $t_1 + t_2$ continue their mobility where it froze in at t_1 .

We note that, unlike in Figs. 3 and 4(a) of Ref. 27, the coarse-grained motion in our model *by design* eliminates both, the (trivial) initial ballistic motion and the subsequent rattle particles experience at the shortest times while confined within their cages. Thus, the lower plateau visible for the continuum MD simulation there, due to rattle within a finite-sized cage, is strictly zero for particles that are bound to discrete lattice sites until an event occurs.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that the cluster model reproduces the macroscopic observable rejuvenation behavior of the structural glass studied in Ref. 27. However, we would like to qualify some of their conclusions. For one, that these results fit well with predictions of mean-field theory should not necessarily be taken as evidence that all aspects of the theory apply to real systems. As our dramatically simplified model suggest, an elementary description of the requisite hierarchical landscape features [60] may exist that the much more intricate mean-field theory also *happens* to provide. It does not follow that all aspects of that theory apply. Rejuvenation and memory by themselves are not even sufficient to imply glassy behavior [55].

Furthermore, we disagree with the conclusion, based on the pdf of particle displacements, $\mathcal{P}(\log \Delta r^2)$, shown Fig. 7 in Ref. 27, that "all particles are involved in the aging dynamics" which occurs "due to very collective particle motion involving




FIG. 4. Demonstration for the end of memory. In (a), we measure the MSD $\Delta(t_1 + \tau, t_1)$ for particles in the cluster model initially quenched to $\beta_1 = 1.0$, then aged for $t_1 = 25$ sweeps, when it undergoes the second quench to β_2 . The system remains entrenched in its metastable state attained at t_1 for a time $\tau = \tau_2$ that depends on β_2 , before significant displacement occurs that erases the memory of that state. In (b), this data collapses when τ is rescaled according to Eq. (5).

the entire system...". We observe that these pdf are each distributed around the respective plateau values of MSD in Figs. 3 and 4(a) of Ref. 27, thus representing ordinary in-cage rattle. While this may appear as "featureless" and therefore homogeneous, it has been shown that the actual *irreversible* events that drive relaxation during aging are highly intermittent and localized [42], and are likely hidden deep within the large- Δr^2 tail of those pdf. (Note, e.g., the minute bump near $\Delta r^2 \approx 10^0$ in Fig. 7.) This heterogeneity is exactly what is captured by the break-up of clusters in our model, after coarse-graining out the in-cage rattle, as that rattle only rarely amounts to meaningful (record-sized) displacements [44].

Finally, we can make some salient predictions based on our model, for instance, for the end of memory. In Fig. 2, the system ages from the initial quench at temperature β_1 and at t_1 has entrenched itself in a metastable state of some free-energy barrier ΔF . To escape the memory of that state at β_1 , a record fluctuation is needed, which according to RD typically occurs at time $\tau_1 \approx t_0 \exp\{\beta_1 \Delta F\}$ with $\tau_1 \sim t_1$, where t_0 is some system-specific microscopic time. Quenching anew at t_1 from β_1 to β_2 leaves the system even deeper entrenched within *that* state, now needing a time $\tau_2 \approx t_0 \exp\{\beta_2 \Delta F\}$ to lose its memory. Thus, reheating at a time $t_2 \gg \tau_2$, i.e., beyond

$$\tau_2 \sim B t_1^{\beta_2/\beta_1}, \quad (5)$$

with some constant $B = t_0^{1-\beta_2/\beta_1}$, memory will have been lost. In Fig. 4, we demonstrate this effect in the cluster model.

-
- [1] H. Frauenfelder, ed., *Landscape Paradigms in Physics and Biology* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1997).
 - [2] D. J. Wales, *Energy landscapes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).

- [3] K. Vollmayr-Lee, C. H. Gorman, and H. E. Castillo, *Journal of Chemical Physics* **144**, 234510 (2016).
- [4] Q. Liao and L. Berthier, *Physical Review X* **9**, 011049 (2019).
- [5] P. A. Gago and S. Boettcher, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 33072 (2020).
- [6] P. Charbonneau, J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Nature Communications* **5**, 3725 (2013).
- [7] J.-C. O. dit Biot, P. Souillard, S. Barkley, E. R. Weeks, T. Salez, E. Raphael, and K. Dalnoki-Veress, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 023070 (2020).
- [8] P. Sibani and K. H. Hoffmann, *Physical Review Letters* **63**, 2853 (1989).
- [9] S. Boettcher and M. Rahman, *Physical Review B* **103**, 024201 (2021).
- [10] L. Struik, *Physical aging in amorphous polymers and other materials* (Elsevier Science Ltd, New York, 1978).
- [11] C. A. Angell, *Science* **267**, 1924 (1995).
- [12] A. Parker and V. Normand, *Soft Matter* **6**, 4916 (2010).
- [13] C. Roth, *Polymer Glasses* (CRC Press, 2016).
- [14] S. A. Kauffman and E. D. Weinberger, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **141**, 211 (1989).
- [15] K. Christensen, S. A. di Collobiano, M. Hall and H. J. Jensen, *J. theor. Biol.* **216**, 73 (2002).
- [16] V. Mustonen and M. Lässig, *Trends in genetics* **25**, 111 (2009).
- [17] H. Frauenfelder, S. Sligar, and P. Wolynes, *Science* **254**, 1598 (1991).
- [18] S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt, and M. P. Vecchi, *Science* **220**, 671 (1983).
- [19] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987).
- [20] P. F. Stadler and W. Schnabl, *Physics Letters A* **161**, 337 (1992).
- [21] S. Boettcher and A. Percus, *Artificial Intelligence* **119**, 275 (2000).
- [22] S. Boettcher and P. Sibani, *The European Physical Journal B* **44**, 317 (2005).
- [23] L. Zdeborová and F. Krzakala, *Advances in Physics* **65**, 453 (2016).
- [24] D. Challet, M. Marsili, and Y. C. Zhang, eds., *Minority games* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005).
- [25] P. Charbonneau, J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **8**, 265 (2017).
- [26] K. Chen, E. J. Saltzman, and K. S. Schweizer, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **1**, 277 (2010).
- [27] C. Scalliet and L. Berthier, *Physical Review Letters* **122**, 255502 (2019).
- [28] A. P. Hammond and E. I. Corwin, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 5714 (2020).
- [29] L. Lundgren, P. Svedlindh, P. Nordblad, and O. Beckman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 911 (1983).
- [30] J. Bouchaud, *J. Phys. I France* **2**, 1705 (1992).
- [31] J. M. Hutchinson, *Progress in Polymer Science* **20**, 703 (1995).
- [32] T. Jonsson, J. Mattsson, C. Djurberg, F. A. Khan, P. Nordblad, and P. Svedlindh, *Physical Review Letters* **75**, 4138 (1995).
- [33] T. Komori, H. Yoshino and H. Takayama, *J. Phys. Soc. Japan* **68**, 3387 (1999).
- [34] W. Kob and J.L. Barrat, *European Physical Journal B* **13**, 319 (2000).
- [35] G. F. Rodriguez, G. G. Kenning, and R. Orbach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 037203 (2003).
- [36] J.-L. Barrat, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **15**, S1 (2003).
- [37] D. ElMasri, M. Pierno, L. Berthier, and L. Cipelletti, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **17**, S3543 (2005).
- [38] P. Yunker, Z. Zhang, K. B. Aptowicz, and A. G. Yodh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 115701 (2009).
- [39] A. Amir, Y. Oreg, and Y. Imry, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 1850 (2012).
- [40] M. Bernaschi, A. Billoire, A. Maiorano, G. Parisi, and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 17522 (2020).
- [41] P. Anderson, H. J. Jensen, L. P. Oliveira, and P. Sibani, *Complexity* **10**, 49 (2004).
- [42] P. Sibani and H. J. Jensen, *Europhys. Lett.* **69**, 563 (2005).
- [43] P. Sibani and H. J. Jensen, *Stochastic Dynamics of Complex Systems* (Imperial College Press, 2013).
- [44] S. Boettcher, P. A. Gago, and P. Sibani, *Physica A* **587**, 126522 (2022).
- [45] H. Bissig, S. Romer, L. Cipelletti, V. Trappe, and P. Schurtenberger, *Phys. Chem. Comm.* **6**, 21 (2003).
- [46] L. Buisson, L. Bellon, and S. Ciliberto, *J. Phys. Cond. Mat.* **15**, S1163 (2003).
- [47] L. Buisson, S. Ciliberto and A. Garciamartin, *Europhys. Lett.* **63**, 603 (2003).
- [48] P. Sibani, G.F. Rodriguez and G.G. Kenning, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 224407 (2006).
- [49] T. Kajiyama, T. Narita, V. Schmitt, F. Lequeux, and L. Talini, *Soft Matter* **9**, 11129 (2013).
- [50] P. Nordblad and P. Svedlindh, in *Spin glasses and random fields*, edited by A. P. Young (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998).
- [51] V. Dupuis, E. Vincent, J.-P. Bouchaud, J. Hammann, A. Ito, and H. A. Katori, *Physical Review B* **64**, 174204 (2001).
- [52] P. Sibani and H. J. Jensen, *JSTAT*, P10013 (2004).
- [53] V. Dupuis, F. Bert, J. P. Bouchaud, J. Hammann, F. Ladieu, D. Parker, and E. Vincent, *Pramana* **64**, 1109 (2005).
- [54] E. Vincent, in *Ageing and the Glass Transition*, Springer Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 716, edited by M. Henkel, M. Pleimling, and R. Sanctuary (Springer, Heidelberg, 2007) condmat/063583.
- [55] F. Krzakala and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **40**, 42 (2006).
- [56] Y. Jin and H. Yoshino, "Computer simulations of the Gardner transition in structural glasses," (2022).
- [57] N. Becker, P. Sibani, S. Boettcher, and S. Vivek, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **26**, 505102 (2014).
- [58] S. Boettcher and P. Sibani, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **23**, 065103 (2011).
- [59] J. D. Shore, M. Holzer, and J. P. Sethna, *Physical Review B* **46**, 11376 (1992).
- [60] D. M. Robe, S. Boettcher, P. Sibani, and P. Yunker, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **116**, 38003 (2016).
- [61] D. Robe and S. Boettcher, *Soft Matter* **14**, 9451 (2018).
- [62] D. ElMasri, L. Berthier, and L. Cipelletti, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 031503 (2010).
- [63] B. C. Arnold, N. Balakrishnan, and H. N. Nagaraja, *A First Course in Order Statistics, Chap. 9* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008).
- [64] P. Sibani and S. Boettcher, *Physical Review B* **98**, 054202 (2018).
- [65] J. Dall and P. Sibani, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **141**, 260 (2001).