Replica-exchange molecular dynam ics simulation for supercooled liquids

RyoichiYam am oto^1 and W alter K ob^2

¹D epartm ent of P hysics, K yoto U niversity, K yoto 606-8502, Japan

² Institute of Physics, Johannes-Gutenberg University, Staudinger W eg 7, D-55099, G erm any

(April 14, 2024)

W e investigate to what extend the replica-exchange M onte C arb m ethod is able to equilibrate a simple liquid in its supercooled state. We nd that this method does indeed allow to generate accurately the canonical distribution function even at low temperatures and that its e ciency is about 10-100 times higher than the usual canonical molecular dynamics simulation.

PACS numbers: 02.70 Lq, 02.70 Ns, 65.20.+ w, 61.43 Fs

If a liquid is cooled to a tem perature close to its glass transition tem perature, its dynam ical properties show a drastic slow ing-down. At the same time, a crossover from highly unham onic liquid-like behavior to ham onic solidlike behavior is expected in its static (therm odynam ic) properties at a certain tem perature T_K , the K auzm ann tem perature [1]. Very recently the value of T_K of sim ple model liquids have been determ ined analytically [2] and num erically [3,4] and some possibilities of a therm odynam ic glass transition at T_K have been discussed. Although the values of T_K obtained with the di erent m ethods are consistent with each other, it was necessary for the num erical calculations of T_K to extrapolate high tem perature data (T & 0:45) of the liquid and disordered solid branches of the con gurational entropy S (T) down to signi cantly lower temperatures (\mathbb{T}_{k} ' 0:3). With a T ^{0:4} guide of an analytic prediction for liquids, S (T) [5], and for harm onic solids, S (T) log T, a crossing of the two branches has been found and used to calculate T_K . However, to make those observations more reliable, very accurate calculations of therm odynam ics properties are necessary in the deeply supercooled regime, which is di culat since the typical relaxation times of the system are large.

In recent years, severale cient sin ulation algorithm s have been developed to generate canonical distributions also for complex system s. Examples are the multicanonical [6,7], the sin ulated tempering [8,9], and the replica-exchange (RX) [10,11] m ethods. A lthough these m ethods were originally developed for Ising-type spin system s, their applications to any o -lattice m odel by use of M onte C arlo or m olecular dynam ics simulations are rather straightforward [12{15]. However, it has been found that the application of some of these algorithm s to supercooled liquids or structural glasses is of only lim ited use [16]. The m ain motivation of the present paper is to test the e ciency of the RX m ethod, which seem s to be in m any cases the m ost e cient algorithm, to the case of highly supercooled liquids [17].

The system we study is a two-component (AB) Lennard-Jones mixture, which is a well characerized m odel system for supercooled simple liquids. The total number of particles is N = 1000, and they interact via the (truncated and shifted) potential $(r_{ij}) =$ 4 $[(=r_{ij})^{12}$ $(=r_{ij})^6]$, where r_{ij} is the distance between particles i and j, and the interaction parameters are ; 2 A;B, $_{AA} = 1$, $_{AB} = 1.5$, $_{BB} = 0.5$, $_{AA} = 1$, $_{AB} = 0.3$, and $_{BB} = 0.88$. O ther simulation parameters and units are identical as in [18]. The time step t for num erical integration is 0.018.

The algorithm of our replica-exchange molecular dynamics (RXMD) simulation is essentially equivalent to that of Ref. [15], and therefore we summarize our sim – ulation procedure only brie y. (i) We construct a system consisting of M noninteracting subsystems (replicas), each composed of N particles, with a set of arbitrary particle con gurations fq; $_{\rm M}$; q and momenta fp₁; $_{\rm M}$; p. The Ham iltonian of the m-th subsystem is given by

$$H_{m}(p_{m};q_{m}) = K(p_{m}) + _{m} E(q_{m});$$
 (1)

where K is the kinetic energy, E is the potential energy, $_{\rm M}$;g is a parameter to scale the poand $m 2 f_{1}$; tential. (ii) A M D simulation is done for the total system, whose Hamiltonian is given by $H = \prod_{m=1}^{M} H_m$, at a constant tem perature T = 0^{1} using the constraint method [19]. Step (ii) generates a canonical $_{M}$; q_{0}) = $_{m=1}^{M}$ P (q_{m} ; $_{m}$ 0) / distribution P (q_1 ; exp $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & M \\ m=1 & m \end{bmatrix}$ (q_m)] in conguration space [20]. (iii) At each time interval $t_{R\,X}$, the exchange of the potential scaling param eter of the m -th and n-th subsystem are considered, while fq1; $_{M}$;g and fp₁; м;**9** are unchanged. The acceptance of the exchange is decided in such a way that it takes care of the condition of detailed balance. Here we use the Metropolis scheme, and thus the acceptance ratio is given by

$$u_{m;n} = \begin{cases} 1; & m;n & 0 \\ \exp((m;n); & m;n > 0; \end{cases}$$
(2)

where $m_{;n} = 0$ (n_m) $(E(q_m)) E(q_n)$. (iv) Repeat steps (ii) and (iii) for a su cient long time. This scheme leads to canonical distribution functions P (E; i)

ħ

at a set of inverse tem peratures $_{i} = _{i 0}$. To make a m easurem ent at an inverse tem perature $_{1}$ one has to average over all those subsystems (i 2 1; ;M) for which we have (tem porarily) $_{1} = _{i 0}$. U sual canonical molecular dynam ics (CMD) simulations are realized if we skip step (iii).

In the present simulation, we take M = 16, $_0 =$ 0:45 1 , $_{i} = 1$ 0:0367 (i 1) and thus cover a tem perature range 0:45 T 1. Exchange events are exam ined only between subsystems that have scaling parameters $_{i+1}$ and $_{i+1}$ that are nearest neighbors; the events with ori= 2;4;6; i= 1;3;5; every t_{RX} intervals. We not that the highest average acceptance ratio for this type of move is 0:186 for the exchange of $_1$ and $_2$, and the lowest is 0.027 for $_{15}$ and 16. A lthough these values can be made more similar by optimizing the dierent gaps between i and i+1 for a xed choice of $_1$ and $_{\rm M}$, only sm all improvem ents were obtained by such a sim ple optim ization in our case. W e also note that the choice of t_{RX} strongly a ects the efciency of the RX method; t_{XX} should be neither too smallor too large [21]. We used $t_{RX} = 10^3$ t, a time which is a bit larger than the one needed for a particle to do one oscillation in its cage, and data are accumulated for 0 t 5 10⁶ tafter having equilibrated the system for the same amount of time. At the beginning of the production run, the subsystem swere renum bered so that at t = 0 we had for all m = m.

In Fig.1(a), we show the time evolution of the subsystems in temperature space. One can see that the subsystems starting from the lowest (m = 1) and the highest (m = 16) temperature explore both the whole temperature space from i = 1 to 16. Fig.1(b) presents the mean squared displacements (M SD)

$$R^{2}(t) = jq_{m}(t) q_{m}(0) j^{2} = N$$
 (3)

for the RXM D (with m = 1) and for the CM D perform ed at T = $(1 \ 0)^{-1} = 0.45$. From this gure we recognize that, due to the temperature variation in the RXM D m ethod, the system m oves very e ciently in con guration space, while in the CM D the system is trapped in a single m etastable con guration for a very long time. If one uses the MSD to calculate an e ective di usion constant, one nds that this quantity is around 100 times larger in the case of the RXM D than in the CM D case, thus demonstrating the e ciency of the form erm ethod.

Fig. 2 shows the canonical distribution function of the total potential energy at the di erent tem peratures,

$$P_{i}(E) P(E; i_{0});$$
 (4)

obtained by a single RXMD simulation. For adjacent temperatures the corresponding distribution functions should have enough overlap to obtain a reasonable exchange probabilities and hence can be used to optim ize

To make a the e ciency of the algorithm. Further use of these dise has to av-;M) for which whether or not one has indeed equilibrated the system. uicalmolecd if we skip possible to calculate the canonical distribution functions

$$P_{i}(E; j_{0}) = \frac{P_{i}(E) \exp[(j_{1} - j) - 0E]}{dE^{0}P_{i}(E^{0}) \exp[(j_{1} - j) - 0E^{0}]}$$
(5)

at a new temperature $T_j = (j_0)^{-1}$ from any $P_i(E)$. Note that in equilibrium the left hand side should be independent of ito within the accuracy of the data.

are repeated alternatively. In Fig. 3 we plot di erent $P_i(E; 4_0)$, using as input the highest average $e \pm 0.186$ for the exis 0.186 for the exis 0.027 for 15 and ade m ore sim ilar by m_i and $_{i+1}$ for a im provem ents were ion in our case. We ongly a ects the efould be neither too $x = 10^3$ t, a time ded for a particle to

Fig. 4 shows the temperature dependence of the potential energy $E\ (T\)$ obtained from RXMD simulations via

$$E (T_{j}) = dE^{0} P (E^{0}; j_{0})E^{0} :$$
 (6)

For the sake of comparison we have also included in this plot data from CMD with the same length of the production run as well as data from CMD simulations which were signi cantly longer (about one order of magnitude) β]. The solid line is a to the RXMD results with the function E (T) = E₀ + AT^{0.6}, a functional form suggested by analytical calculations [5]. One can see that RXMD and CMD results coincide at higher temperatures, but deviations become signi cant at low temperatures (see Inset). Furtherm ore, we see that the present RXMD results agree well with CMD data of the longer simulations.

As a nalcheck to see whether the RXMD is indeed able to equilibrate the system also at low temperatures, we have calculated the temperature dependence of the (constant volum e) heat capacity C_{ν} (T) via the two routes

$$C_v(T) = @E(T)=@T$$
 (7)

=
$$(hE^{2}i hE^{2}i)=T^{2};$$
 (8)

and plot the results in Fig. 5. Again we see that within the accuracy of our data the two expressions give the same answer, thus giving evidence that the system is indeed in equilibrium.

Sum m ary: W e have done replica-exchange m olecular dynam ics and canonicalm olecular dynam ics simulations for a binary Lennard-Jones m ixture in order to check the e ciency of the replica-exchange m ethod for a structural glass form er in the strongly supercooled regim e. W e

nd that at low tem peratures the RXMD is indeed significantly more electent than the CMD, in that the effective dilusion constant of the particles is around 100 times larger in the RXMD. However, accurate simulations are still dil cult for T < 0.45 even with RXMD. Finding an optim alchoice of M, f₁; M;g, and t_{RX} may be important in order to allow simulations also for T < 0.45 within reasonable computation times. Furthermore it might be that the electency of RXMD improves even more if one uses it below the critical temperature of mode-coupling theory [23], since there is evidence that below this temperature the nature of the energy land-scape is not changing anym ore [24].

The authors acknow ledge the nancial support from the DFG through SFB 262. RY acknow ledges the G rants in A id for Scienti c Research from the M inistry of E ducation, Science, Sports and C ulture of Japan and thanks P rof. B.K im for valuable discussions. C alculations have been perform ed at the H um an G enom e C enter, Institute of M edical Science, U niversity of Tokyo.

- [1] A W .Kauzmann, Chem.Rev., 43, 219 (1948).
- [2] M. Mezard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, 747 (1999).
- [3] F.Sciortino, W .Kob, and P.Tartaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett., 83, 3214 (1999).
- [4] B. Coluzzi, G. Parisi, and P. Vernocchio, condmat/9904124 (J. Chem. Phys., in press); condmat/9906172 (Phys.Rev.Lett., in press).
- [5] Y. Rosenfeld and P. Tarazona, Molec. Phys., 95, 2807 (1998).
- [6] B A. Berg and T. Neuhaus, Phys. Lett. B, 267, 249 (1991); Phys. Rev. Lett., 68, 9 (1992).
- [7] J.Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett., 71, 211 (1993).
- [8] A P. Lyubartsev, A A. Martsinovski, S.V. Shevkunov, and P.N. Vorontsov-Velyam inov, J. Chem. Phys., 96 1776 (1992).
- [9] E. Marinari and G. Parisi, Europhys. Lett., 19, 451

(1992), see also E.M arinari, p. 50 in Advances in Computer Simulation, edited by J.K ertesz and Im re K ondor (Springer, Berlin, 1998)

- [10] K. Hukushim a and K. Nemoto, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 65, 1604 (1996); K. Hukushim a, H. Takayam a, and H. Yoshino, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn., 67, 12 (1998).
- [11] A similar idea to the replica-exchange method was proposed also by R H. Swendsen and J.S.W ang, Phys. Rev. Lett., 57, 2607 (1996).
- [12] U H E. Hansmann, Y. Okamoto, and F. Eisenmenger, Chem. Phys. Lett., 259, 321 (1996).
- [13] N. Nakajima, H. Nakamura, and A. Kidera, J. Phys. Chem. B, 101, 817 (1997).
- [14] M. Achenbach, D iplom a Thesis, (Johannes-Gutenberg Universitat, Mainz, 1998).
- [15] Y. Sugita, Y. O kam oto, Chem. Phys. Lett., in press.
- [16] K.K.Bhattacharya and JP.Sethna, Phys. Rev. E, 57, 2553 (1998).
- [17] For very sm all system s, N 36, this m ethod has been applied to structural glasses also by B.Coluzzi and G. Parisi, J.Phy.A 31 4349 (1998).
- [18] W . Kob and H. C. Andersen, Phys. Rev. E, 51, 4626 (1995); ibid., 52, 4134 (1995).
- [19] M.P.Allen and D.J.Tildesley, Computer Simulation of Liquids (Clarendon, Oxford, 1987).
- [20] S.Nose, Prog. Theo. Phys. Suppl, 103, 1 (1991).
- [21] If t_{RX} is large, it obviously slows down the algorithm since the num ber of exchange trials in a single sim ulation is inversely proportional to t_{RX} . On the other hand, if an exchange event between i and i+1 (or i-1) has occurred at t = 0, the properties of the subsystem at tem perature i 0 for t 0 will depend for a characteristic (aging or equilibration) time m on whether it previously was at temperature i+1 0 or i 1 0.So tRX should be larger than m for e cient random walks in the tem perature space, otherwise strong memory e ects will make the exchanges ine cient. The value of m depends strongly on the details of the system considered and is possibly very large in our system , particularly at low tem peratures. A ctually with a choice of $t_{RX} = 200 t$, the subsystem s initially at the lowest three tem peratures do not reach the highest tem perature state within our sim ulation time.
- [22] A M. Ferrenberg and R H. Swendsen, Phys. Rev. Lett., 61, 2635 (1988).
- [23] W .Gotze, J.Phys.: Condens.M atter 10A, 1 (1999).
- [24] J.Horbach and W .Kob, Phys. Rev. B 60, 3169 (1999).



FIG.1. (a) Typical walks of the subsystem s in tem perature space. (b) T in e dependence of the mean squared displacement. The solid line shows R²(t) from RXMD for a subsystem which at t = 0 was at T = 0.45 (i = 1), and the dashed line is R²(t) from CMD at T = 0.45. The two curves have been calculated by starting from the same initial con guration.



FIG.2. The canonical distribution function $P_1(E)$ at various temperatures T_1 (1 i 16) obtained by a single RXMD simulation. Here, $T_1 = 0.45$ and $T_{16} = 1.0$.



FIG.3. The canonical distribution function at $T = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = 0.506$ by reweighting $P_i(E)$ for 1 = 0.606 by RXMD (a) and standard CMD (b) simulations. Numbers in the parentheses present temperatures at which simulations were done. The same function at $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = 0.45$ obtained by RXMD (c) and CMD (d). Note that in both simulations the length of the runs is the same (8:7 10^4 time units).



FIG.4. Temperature dependence of the potential energy E (T) obtained via RXMD () and CMD (+) of runs with the same length. presents values from much longer CMD runs. The solid line is the best t to the RXMD data with a t function $E = E_0 + AT^{0.6}$, where $E_0 = -8.656$ and A = 2.639 are t parameters.



FIG.5. Tem perature dependence of the heat capacity $C_v(T)$ obtained via RXMD. presents data from $C_v = @E(T)=@T$, and presents data from $C_v = (hE^2i hEi^2)=T^2$. The solid line is the result of a t $C_v = 0.6AT^{-0.4}$, with the same value of A as in Fig.4.