

# Driving Rate Effects on Crackling Noise

Robert A. White and Karin A. Dahmen

*Loomis Laboratory, University of Illinois At Urbana, 1110 W. Green St., Urbana, IL 61801, USA*

(Dated: File generated April 14, 2024. Submitted for publication Feb. 6, 2002)

Many systems respond to slowly changing external conditions with crackling noise, created by avalanches or pulses of a broad range of sizes. Examples range from Barkhausen Noise in magnets to earthquakes. Here we discuss how the scaling behavior of the avalanche size and duration distribution and the power spectra of this noise depend on the rate at which the external conditions are changed. We derive an exponent inequality as a criteria for the relevance of adding a small driving rate to the adiabatic model. We use the zero temperature nonequilibrium random field Ising model to test our results, which are expected to be applicable to a large class of systems with crackling noise. They also agree with recent experiments on Barkhausen noise in various materials.

PACS numbers: 75.60.Ej, 05.40.-a, 64.60.Ht

Jerky response to smoothly varying forces has been enjoying increasing attention for more than a decade. One reason for this is the surprising universality observed in the noise statistics of vastly different systems. Earthquake faults, magnetic tapes, vortices in type II superconductors, charge density waves, mechanically failing materials, and many other systems respond to slowly changing external conditions with discrete, impulse-like events (“avalanches”, or “pulses”, leading to familiar “crackling noise” [1]) that span a huge range of sizes: earthquakes for example are known to range from tiny tremors to devastating magnitude 9 quakes on the Richter scale [2]. Martensites crackle when subjected to slow temperature or stress changes [3, 4]. Similarly, when a magnetic tape is slowly magnetized by an external magnetic field, the process happens in steps (“Barkhausen noise” (BN)), by avalanches of re-orienting magnetic domains, that range from microscopic to macroscopic in size [5]. The avalanche size and duration distributions are often described by universal power laws over a broad range of sizes. The scaling behavior on long length scales is independent of the microscopic details, and only dependent on a few basic properties, such as symmetries, dimensions, interaction range, and dynamics (and a few others). In many systems this universality has been explained theoretically as being due to either proximity to an underlying critical point [6], or so called “self-organized criticality” (SOC) [7].

Typically these systems are studied in the adiabatic limit where the rate at which the driving force  $F = \tau$  is increased, is taken to zero allowing for a separation of the time scale of the fast local relaxation (given by the avalanche durations) from the scale set by the slow external driving (given by the rate  $\tau$ ). For experiments and commercial applications it is important to understand the effect of a finite but small driving rate  $\tau > 0$  on the pulse statistics. In this letter we study this question, specifically focusing on the experimentally readily accessible BN in magnets as the primary example. Our results are fairly general in nature and expected to be ap-

plicable to a much larger class of systems with crackling noise.

A number of models have been used to study crackling noise ranging from interface depinning models and sandpile models, to models with many interacting interfaces due to domain nucleation. While we believe the main results we report in this letter will apply to many approaches in the slow sweep rate regime we use a variant of the zero temperature, nonequilibrium random field Ising model (ztneRFIM) to illustrate our results. The ztneRFIM is a simple model for hysteresis and avalanches (BN) in magnets [6, 8]. Neglecting the microscopic details it assumes a hypercubic lattice of spins  $s_i = \pm 1$  with the Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} s_i s_j - \sum_i (H(t) + h_i) s_i \quad (1)$$

where the first term represents the ferromagnetically coupled nearest neighbors (with coupling  $J > 0$ ),  $H(t) = \tau$  is the external applied field, and  $h_i$  is the random magnetic field with Gaussian distribution  $\langle h_i \rangle = 0$ ,  $\langle h_i^2 \rangle = \langle h_j^2 \rangle = \langle h_i h_j \rangle = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .  $h_i$  models uncorrelated quenched disorder. Other types of disorder, such as random anisotropies, and random ferromagnetic bonds are expected to be in the same universality class [9, 10].

We study the model at zero temperature, far from thermal equilibrium to model systems in which the thermal relaxation time scale is much larger than experimental time scales. One sweep in our simulation begins at  $H = -1$  causing all spins to be down. We then raise the external field slowly and flip each spin  $s_i$  when its local effective field

$$h_i^{\text{eff}} = H(t) + \sum_{j \in \text{nn}(i)} J_{ij} s_j + h_i \quad (2)$$

changes from negative to positive. (Here  $\text{nn}(i)$  stands for the nearest neighbors of site  $i$ .) A single spin flip takes a microscopic time  $\tau = 1$ . It can trigger an avalanche

of spin flips propagated through the ferromagnetic interactions [6]. In the adiabatic limit  $\dot{H} \rightarrow 0$ , the external magnetic field is kept constant during each avalanche, it is only increased in between avalanches, until the next avalanche is triggered. The avalanche time profile  $V(t)$ , which is the number of spins flipped during the time interval of length  $t$  at time  $t$  is proportional to the voltage time profile  $V(t)$  measured in the induction coil in a corresponding BN experiment during a BN pulse.

For the adiabatic case it has been shown [6] that near a critical amount of disorder  $R = R_c$  and a critical value of the magnetic field  $H = H_c$  the avalanche size and duration distributions scale on long length scales as  $D_s(S) \sim S^{-D_s} (Sh^{1-\alpha})^{\beta}$ ;  $h=r$ ) and  $D_t(T) \sim T^{-D_t} (Th^{1-\alpha})^{\beta}$ ;  $h=r$ ), respectively, where  $r = j(R - R_c) = R_j$  and  $h = j(H - H_c) = H_j$ .  $D_s$  and  $D_t$  are universal scaling functions and  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \zeta$  are all universal exponents that are known for the adiabatic case and are not all independent [9]. The scaling relation between the size and duration,  $T \sim S^z$  relates to through  $\gamma = \frac{1}{z} + 1$ . Numerical simulations render  $\gamma = 1.60 \pm 0.06$  and  $\beta = 2.05 \pm 0.05$  for this model [11]. Away from the critical point the correlation length  $\xi_r(h=r)$  is finite, as is reflected by a cut-off to the power law scaling regime at a largest avalanche  $S^{1-\alpha} = S_c$  and a largest duration  $T^{1-\alpha} = T_c$ . (Here  $\alpha$  is another universal scaling function.)

At finite  $\dot{H}$  new avalanches can be triggered by the increasing external field before a previous one is completed. In this regime pulses observed in the time series  $V(t)$  do not necessarily correspond to the avalanches found in the adiabatic limit. (We stress here the subtle but necessary distinction between “avalanche” and “pulse”.) Since there is no mechanism in the model for the sweep rate to effect the local dynamics of a spin flip (a spin flips in one time step if its local field goes from negative to positive regardless of how large the positive local field is) the observed differences between pulses for finite  $\dot{H}$ , and avalanches for zero  $\dot{H}$ , are a result of the simultaneous propagation of avalanches as well as the possible internal changes to avalanches induced by spatial overlap of simultaneously propagating avalanches at finite  $\dot{H}$ . For comparison with experiments it is important to understand how the pulse size and duration distributions are affected by temporal and spatial overlap of the avalanches as  $\dot{H}$  is increased from zero.

A number of experimental results have been reported in the literature regarding sweep rate effects on scaling exponents of pulse statistics [12, 13, 14]. For BN in soft magnets without applied stress and with  $(\dot{H} = 0) = 2$  it has been reported that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  exhibit a linear sweep rate dependence on  $\dot{H}$  as  $\dot{H}$  is increased from zero, whereas experiments with applied stress give  $(\dot{H} = 0) < 2$  and at finite  $\dot{H}$  the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  exponents do not depend on  $\dot{H}$ . In the following we will show that these results can, in fact, be generalized and explained by straight forward




FIG. 1: Simulated BN voltage  $V$  (number of spins flipping per  $t$ ) as a function of applied external magnetic field  $H_{ext}(t)$  (measured in units of coupling  $J$ ), obtained using the  $ztneR$ -FIM. At the bottom one can observe separate pulses. As sweep rate is increased the pulses merge and become bigger until no separate pulses can be observed.

temporal superposition of the adiabatic avalanches as is increased.

There are two important threshold sweep rates,  $\dot{H}_t$  and  $\dot{H}_s$  that mark the transitions to avalanches overlapping in time ( $\dot{H} > \dot{H}_t$ ), and in space *and* time ( $\dot{H} > \dot{H}_s$ ):

(1) The lowest sweep rate  $\dot{H}_t$  at which on average successive avalanches overlap in *time* so that one obtains a macroscopic uninterrupted pulse (see Fig 1), is called the upper bound of “slow” (note that for  $\dot{H} > \dot{H}_t$  the number of pulses is greatly reduced making it difficult to obtain pulse statistics at all). To estimate  $\dot{H}_t$  we set the increase in  $H$  during the mean avalanche duration  $\langle H \rangle$  equal to the mean separation  $\frac{1}{a(H)}$  (in  $H$ ) between successive avalanche seeds, and find

$$\dot{H}_t = \frac{1}{a(H) \langle H \rangle} = \left( \frac{1}{a(H) \langle H \rangle} \right) \frac{1}{L^d}; \quad (3)$$

where  $a(H) = a(H) L^d$  is the non-universal number of avalanche seeds per unit field increase, and  $a(H)$  is independent of the system size  $L^d$  (here  $L$  is the linear system size and  $d$  is the dimension of the system). In general it is expected that  $\dot{H}_t$  will be proportional to  $1/n$  where  $n$  is the number of spins in principle available to nucleate an avalanche (volume in our model, and surface for single domain wall propagation). Eq.(3) implies that in the thermodynamic limit any finite sweep rate results in the loss of distinct pulses, since all avalanches merge into only one big pulse.

(2) The lowest sweep rate  $\dot{H}_s$  at which successive avalanches tend to overlap not only in *time*, but also *space* can be estimated as follows: at  $\dot{H}_s$  the expected number of new avalanche seeds triggered by the increasing external magnetic field within the volume of a large propagating avalanche of adiabatic size  $S$ , during its duration  $T$ , is a finite fraction of  $S$ . If  $\dot{H} > 2$  (i.e.  $\dot{H} S$  is not

divergent)  $\propto \frac{1}{T}$  (for large enough  $L$ ). If  $\alpha < 2$ , in terms of the adiabatic quantities, we find [15]

$$S \propto \frac{(\alpha - 2)^{-1}}{T} \quad (\alpha - 2 > 0) : \quad (4)$$

For large enough system sizes  $L$ , for finite correlation length  $\xi$ , one again obtains  $\propto \frac{1}{T}$ . Therefore, the resulting time series  $V(t)$  in a BN experiment in the “slow” sweep rate regime  $\alpha < 2$  is simply a superposition of voltages produced by the individual simultaneously propagating avalanches.

Superimposing power law distributed pulses yields results consistent with the experiments. The reason for this requires discussion: on the one hand, the time between successive avalanche nucleations decreases for increasing sweep rate  $\dot{h}$ . On the other hand the duration of the avalanche results from the dynamics of the material and, in the slow sweep rate regime, does not depend on the  $\dot{h}$ . This is true for all avalanche models we have considered. The resulting pulse distributions are affected in two ways: (A) an avalanche of a certain size can appear to take longer, since a second avalanche starts before the first one ends, and runs longer (“swelling”). (B) Avalanches can completely disappear (“absorption”) from the distributions due to their time interval of propagation lying entirely within that of another avalanche.

(A) To illustrate the relationship between swelling and the adiabatic exponents we note that the largest avalanche nucleated during the propagation of another avalanche of duration  $T$  (with  $\alpha > 1$ ) is given by-

$$T_{\text{max}}^{(2)} \propto (a(H)T)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \quad (5)$$

If  $\alpha > 2$  the avalanche of duration  $T$  will not swell appreciably since  $T_{\text{max}}^{(2)} \ll T$  where  $\alpha < 1$  and the new “swollen” pulse is, at its largest,  $T + T_{\text{max}}^{(2)} \approx T$  for large  $T$ . For  $\alpha < 2$ , however  $T_{\text{max}}^{(2)} > T$  is no longer negligible: by iteration the process runs away for very small sweep rate (for  $\alpha > 2$   $\frac{1}{L^{\alpha+2(2-\alpha)}}$ , see eqn(3) for  $\alpha < 2$ ). For  $\alpha = 2$  there is a linear increase in the duration that is  $T \rightarrow T + T_{\text{max}}^{(2)}$ . In this case, as we see below, absorption leads to a linear change of  $S$  with the sweep rate.

The discussion for the pulse size distribution runs analogously: The largest secondary avalanche triggered by the increasing field during a primary avalanche of duration  $T$  has size (for  $\alpha > 1$ )

$$S_{\text{max}}^{(2)} \propto (a(H)T)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \quad (6)$$

The sweep rate significantly affects the distribution only if  $S_{\text{max}}^{(2)} \approx S$ . This occurs if  $\frac{2}{1-\alpha} \approx 1$ , i.e. if  $\alpha \approx 2$  in agreement with the above argument for the duration distribution. If  $\alpha < 2$  the effects of sweep rate on the size distribution can be seen in [16] which we would argue

results not in a decrease in the exponents, as suggested, but in a decreasing region  $S < S_0$  over which the distribution can be described by a power law at all (see [15] for more details) with  $S \propto \frac{(\alpha-1)}{(\alpha-1)(2-\alpha)}$ .

(B) The relationship between absorption and the adiabatic exponents is similar. As  $\dot{h}$  is increased from zero, note, that for an avalanche to maintain its identity (in terms of size and duration) it must not be absorbed into (i.e. propagate simultaneously with) larger ones. We assume the avalanches are uncorrelated in amplitude and have a nucleation density which can be described by a smoothly varying function of  $h$  and the probability  $D(T; \alpha)$  that a certain avalanche of duration  $T$  remains a pulse of duration  $T$  as  $\dot{h}$  is increased is given by

$$D(T; \alpha) = D(T; \alpha=0) \prod_{T^0 > T} (1 - P(T^0; \alpha=0)); \quad (7)$$

where  $P(T^0; \alpha=0)$  is the probability that the avalanche of duration  $T$  is absorbed in an avalanche of duration  $T^0$ . A detailed analysis of both swelling and absorption is given elsewhere [15]. One finds that the effect of a slow but finite sweep rate depends on the adiabatic value of the exponent  $\alpha$ : (1) For  $(\alpha = 0) > 2$ , on long length and time scales, we expect no change in the scaling exponents due to the introduction of a slow sweep rate  $\alpha < 2$ . (2) For  $(\alpha = 0) = 2$  we find a linear dependence of some of the exponents on the (slow) sweep rate:

$$\alpha = 2 \quad \alpha = \frac{3}{2} \quad \alpha = \frac{3}{2} \quad (8)$$

where  $\alpha$  is a non-universal constant. This is in agreement with the results found earlier for the ABBM model [17, 18, 19], a single domain wall model [20], as well as for experiments in soft magnets with BN due to the propagation of parallel domain walls [13]: all of these systems have  $(\alpha = 0) = 2$ . (3) For  $(\alpha = 0) < 2$  the pulse perspective is lost even for very small sweep rates since temporal overlap takes over (leading to a large runaway pulse). For finite (but large) system size, in the slow sweep rate regime  $\alpha < 2$ , so that one can actually still observe distinct pulses, these pulses will be distributed according to the adiabatic scaling forms, since in this case they tend to be very sparse on the time axis. This result also agrees with experimental results of Durin and Zapperi on soft magnets with stress induced anisotropies [13].

Numerically in the 3-d ztneRFIM we find that  $(\alpha)$  appears to have a linear dependence on  $\dot{h}$  since the ztneRFIM has  $\alpha = 2.05 \pm 0.05$ , i.e. very close to 2 (see fig. 2). We would expect, however, that if  $\alpha > 2$ , for very large durations (roughly  $T \approx 10^4$  where  $\alpha = 2 + \epsilon$ , for our problem  $\epsilon \approx 0.05$ ) we would find, in the large system size limit, the finite but slow sweep rate to leave the exponent




FIG. 2: Distribution of avalanche durations  $T$  (number of time steps  $t = 1$ ) at  $H = H_c$  and  $R = R_c$  for different sweep rates for the ztneRFIM in  $d = 3$  dimensions. Inset shows linear sweep rate dependence of the exponent taken from power law fits to the duration distributions. The simulated systems have  $L^d = 500^3$  spins. The data has been averaged over 20 disorder realizations.

unchanged. We estimate the system size required to bring the exponent to within the error bars (i.e.  $\pm 0.5$ ) of the adiabatic value for  $\Omega = 2.05$  and we find the system size must be orders of magnitude larger than the largest system we can simulate ( $500^3$ ) (see [21] for details of the base algorithm). It should be easier to observe the exponent independence in models with  $d$  significantly greater than 2.

Conveniently it can be shown [22] that the high frequency scaling behavior of the *power spectra* (PS) of the the BN voltage time series is independent of the sweep rate for  $\Omega < \Omega_s$ . This is a direct consequence of the time series being a mere superposition of the uncorrelated adiabatic avalanches. For Poissonian distributed avalanche nucleation events (as in the ztneRFIM) the PS of the time series is a simple superposition of the PS of the individual pulses [22, 23] and we note no difference in the scaling even in the lowest frequency of the PS. Since we are able to directly extract many of the exponents associated with the adiabatic avalanches ( $z$ ,  $z_z$ ,  $z_z$ ,  $\frac{3}{z}$ ,  $\frac{2}{z}$ ) from the PS regardless of sweep rate, collapses of the PS provide a useful tool for probing the collective behavior without needing to address temporal overlap of avalanches. For  $\Omega > \Omega_s$  where pulse statistics are lost and avalanche interactions become important as seen in [24] one *must* use spectral tools.

In summary we have found that the experimental observations of sweep rate dependence/independence of pulse duration and size distribution exponents can be understood as a consequence of temporal superposition of the avalanches that would be observed in the adia-

batic limit. This conclusion is borne out by our numerical work on the ztneRFIM where we know that the pulses are simply a superposition of the adiabatic avalanches. We also provide criteria for determining for which sweep rates pulse statistics provide insight into the adiabatic collective behavior and when spectral methods will serve better.

We thank Jim Sethna and Mike Weissman for very clarifying discussions. This work was supported by the Materials Computation Center, grant NSF-DMR 99-76550, and NSF grant DMR 00-72783. K.D. also gratefully acknowledges support from an A.P. Sloan fellowship. We thank IBM for a very generous equipment award that made extensive numerical simulations for this work possible.

- 
- [1] J. P. Sethna, K. A. Dahmen, and C. R. Myers, *Nature* **410**, 242 (2001).
  - [2] B. Gutenberg and C. F. Richter, *Seismicity of the Earth and Associated Phenomena* (Princeton University, Princeton, NJ, 1954).
  - [3] J. Ortín et al., *J. de Physique IV* **5**, 209 (1995).
  - [4] L. Carillo et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1889 (1998).
  - [5] G. Bertotti, *Hysteresis in Magnetism* (Academic Press, 1998).
  - [6] J. P. Sethna et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3347 (1993).
  - [7] P. Bak, C. Tang, and K. Wiesenfeld, *Phys. Rev. A* **38**, 364 (1988).
  - [8] H. Ji and M. O. Robbins, *Phys. Rev. B* **46**, 14519 (1992).
  - [9] K. Dahmen and J. P. Sethna, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 14872 (1996).
  - [10] E. Vives, J. Goicoechea, J. Ortín, and A. Planes, *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, R5 (1995).
  - [11] O. Perković, K. Dahmen, and J. P. Sethna, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4528 (1995).
  - [12] G. Bertotti, G. Durin, and A. Magni, *J. Appl. Phys.* **75**, 5490 (1994).
  - [13] G. Durin and S. Zapperi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4705 (2000).
  - [14] S. Zapperi, P. Cizeau, G. Durin, and E. H. Stanley, *Phys. Rev. B* **58**, 6353 (1998).
  - [15] R. A. White and K. A. Dahmen, in preparation.
  - [16] S. de Queiroz and M. Bahiana, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 066127 (2001).
  - [17] B. Alessandro, C. Beatrice, G. Bertotti, and A. Montorsi, *J. Appl. Phys.* **68**, 2901 (1990).
  - [18] B. Alessandro, C. Beatrice, G. Bertotti, and A. Montorsi, *J. Appl. Phys.* **68**, 2908 (1990).
  - [19] G. Durin, G. Bertotti, and A. Magni, *Fractals* **3**, 351 (1995).
  - [20] P. Cizeau, S. Zapperi, and G. Durin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4669 (1997).
  - [21] M. C. Kuntz et al., *Comp. Sci. Eng.* **1**, 73 (1999).
  - [22] A. Travesset, R. A. White, and K. A. Dahmen, *cond-mat/0112133*.
  - [23] P. Mazzetti, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **25**, 1322 (1962).
  - [24] T. Hwa and M. Kardar, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 7002 (1992).