Evidence of a glass transition induced by rigidity self-organization in a network form ing uid.

A drian H uerta, G erardo G . N aum is ¹Instituto de F isica, U niversidad N acional A utonom a de M exico (U N A M) A partado P ostal 20-364, 01000, D istrito Federal, M exico. (M arch 22, 2024)

A Monte Carlo method is used in order to simulate the competition between the molecular relaxation and crystallization times in the formation of a glass. The results show that nucleation is avoided during supercooling and produce self-organization in the sense of the rigidity theory, where the number of geometrical constraints due to bonding and excluded volume are compared with the degress of freedom available to the system . Following this idea, glass transitions were obtained by producing self-organization, and in the case of geometrical fustration, self-organization is naturally observed.

I. IN TRODUCTION

W hen a liquid melt is cooled, usually two things can happen: the melt crystallize, or if the speed of cooling is high enough to avoid equilibrium, a solid without long range order (a glass) is formed. This last process is known as the glass transition (GT), and although is very important from the fundam ental and technological point of view, there are still m any unsolved questions related to it [1]. Not all m aterials are able to form glasses, and many criteria have been proposed in order to explain the ability of a material to reach the glassy state [2]. The tem perature where the GT occurs, is called the glass transition tem perature (Tg). M any factors determ ine the T_q , but an ong these, the chem ical composition is fundam ental. Chalcogenide glasses (form ed with elem ents of the VI column) are very useful for understanding the effects of the chem ical composition [3]. In fact, T_{α} can be raised or lowered by adding in purities, and the fragility of the glass can be changed from strong to fragile [4]. Recently, by using stochastic matrices [5,6], the empirical modi ed Gibbs-D iM arzio law that accounts for the relation between $T_{\rm q}$ and the concentration of m odi ers [7] has been obtained, including the characteristic constant that appears in the law for alm ost any chalcogenide glass [8].

The ease of glass form ation in covalent glasses can be explained at least in a qualitative way by the rigidity theory (RT), introduced rst by Phillips [9] and further re ned by Thorpe [10]. By considering the covalent bonding as a mechanical constraint, within this theory, the ease of glass form ation is related with the proportion of available degrees of freedom and the num ber of constraints. If the num ber of constraints is lower than the degrees of freedom, there are zero

frequency vibrationalm odes called oppy [11], and the resulting network is under-constrained. A transition occurs when the lattice becomes rigid, and at the corresponding chem ical composition, the glass is easy to form. Many features of this transition have been experimentally observed [3] [12]. A lso, one of the authors proposed that rigidity can be related with the statistics of the phase space energy landscape [13], since the number of oppy modes is equal to the number of dierent con gurations of the system with nearly equal minimal energies [13], and thus is a way to evaluate the function that gives the number of minim a energy basins [14].

In a recent paper, Thorpe et. al. [15], rem arked that in real glasses, even though form ed at relative high tem peratures, where the entropic e ects are dom inant, it is not correct to fully ignore energetic contributions which can favor particular structural arrangem ents over others, (e.g. in a binary system chem ical aggregation between unlike particles favor local chem ical aggregation). One interesting question that they address is how the structure itself can incorporate non-random features in order to m in in ize the free energy at the tem perature of form ation. They answer this question by proposing that the structure can self-organize avoiding stress in the random form ed network [15]. In the literature exists experim ental evidence for self-organization in glasses [16], this evidence has been associated with the interm ediate phase proposed by Phillips [17]. In a previous work [19], we observed that in a model of an associative uid (the Cummings-Stellmodel), som e therm odynam ics features can be associated with a rigidity transition, and in particular, it was shown that a glass transition occurs very near to the RT.Also, we showed that using the MC step as a time parameter in a NPT ensemble, we were able to control the cooling rate of a liquid melt in a qualitative way. In this work, we go further by looking at the self-organization properties in the Cumm ings-Stellm odel (CS), using a Monte-Carlo (MC) computer simulation in a grand canonical (GC) ensemble. Compared with the NPT ensemble, the GC ensemble has the advantage of reaching equilibrium faster [20], given the opportunity to visit a wider range of equilibrium an non-equilibrium phases. In order to talk about the therm odynam ic properties of these phases, we basis our assumptions in the fact that their life time is larger than the observation time (averaged time) [21]. This time is also larger than the molecular relaxation time, which we can adjust by tuning the M C steps of single particle m ovem ents, and the MC steps of the form ed clusters movem ents. As a consequence, the slower a liquid is cooled, the longer the time available for con guration sampling at each tem perature, and hence the access to the hom ogeneous nucleation which leads to crystallization. W e point that this nucleation produces stress

in the obtained structure, as a counting of oppy modes reveals. As a counter part, the faster the liquid is cooled, there is less time available for hom ogeneous nucleation and hence less stress is produced in the structure, inducing a local selforganization. This fram ework allow us to address the question of what are the structural and therm odynam ic properties of a self-organized structures and how they behave as the system is cooled. With this in mind, we perform MC simulations where con gurations that produce stress in the system are rejected, in a similar way to that proposed by Thorpe et. al. [15] for studying rigidity self-organization. A swew ill see, our results are in agreem ent with ref. [15], since the avoidance of stress, bias the system to a glass state. The layout of this work is as follows, in section II we introduce the model to be used, in section III a method for indirect controlling of the various relaxation times is introduced, and in section IV we discuss the e ect of self-organization. Finally, in section V the conclusions of the work are given.

II.M ODEL

We choose a simple model of an associative uid: the Cummings-Stell model (CSM) of a two component system (A and B) of associating disks in 2D, both of the same size [19]. The particles interact via a potential permitting core interpenetration of the A and B monom er discs, so that the bond length L is less than the core diam eter . W ithout loss of generality we assume = 1. The interactions are given as follow s:

$$\begin{split} U_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) &= U_{ij}^{hd}(\mathbf{r}) + (1 \quad _{ij})U_{as}(\mathbf{r}); \\ U_{AA}^{hd}(\mathbf{r}) &= U_{BB}^{hd}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{array}{c} 1 & \mathbf{r} < 1; \\ 0 & \mathbf{r} > 1; \\ (1 & \mathbf{r} < \mathbf{L} & 0.5w; \\ U_{AB}^{hd}(\mathbf{r}) &= U_{BA}^{hd}(\mathbf{r}) = \begin{array}{c} D & \mathbf{L} & 0.5w; \\ 0 & \mathbf{r} > 1; \\ (0 & \mathbf{r} < \mathbf{L} & 0.5w; \\ U_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \end{array} \\ U_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \\ \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \end{array} \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r}) &= \\ u_{as}(\mathbf{r})$$

where i and j stand for the species of the particles and take values A and B.r is the separation between centers, L is the bonding distance and w is the width of the attractive intracore square well (g. 1). The model allows the form ation of dim er species for sm all values of the bonding length param eter, the form ation of chains, if the bonding length is slightly larger, and also vulcanization with xed maximum coordination number for di erent bonding length values close to the diam eter of particles, as shown in g. 1. In order to be able to x a maximum coordination number in each simulation, we take D ! 1 as was done before in other works [19], [22], [23]. This choice has the e ect that unlike particles avoid bond-lengths between L + 0:5w and 1; and thus coordinations higher than a desired maximum are not allowed. Num erically, this condition means that in the MC simulations, we never consider bond distances in the previous range. The corresponding values for each maximum coordination number are given in the following table,

r _{m ax}	L	W
срх 3	0 : 65	0:1
cpx 4	0 : 78	0:1
cpx 5	0:91	0:1

Table 1. Parameters of the CS model that x the maximum coordination of the particles as used in this work. The notation cpx r, means complex of particles with maximum coordination r_{max} .

III.GLASS TRANSITION BY CONTROLLING RELAXATION TIMES

W e start by pointing out that a supercooled liquid phase is metastable with respect to the crystalline state, and this supercooling can be achieved if nucleation is inhibited during cooling [21] . One way of inhibit nucleation is by perform ing a rapid quench of the liquid; in these terms, two characteristic times 1 (the time required for crystallization) and 2 (the time corresponding to molecular relaxation) compete between crystallization and vitri cation [21]. In this work, we simulate this e ect in two di erent ways, which we will show that at the end turn out to be very sim ilar: one is to use the M C steps as a time parameter in the G C ensemble [24], where we tune the ratio between $_1$ and $_2$ in an indirect way, by controlling the ratio between steps of particle and cluster rearrangements, since the st is the most important factor for molecular relaxation, while the second optimize crystallization. The second way which we observed that leads to supercooling is the self-organization of rigidity, as we will see in the next section.

To implement supercooling using the MC steps by indirect control of the relaxation times, we use a GC M etropolis M onte-C arlo m ethod [25]. The procedure has two nested loops. In the inner one, the particles are m oved inside the volum e, and an interchange of particles with the particle reservoir is allowed. This loop is perform ed N $_{\rm m}$ times. The particle m ovem ents inside the volum e allow to rearrange the structure, and thus this is related with the molecular relaxation of the structure ($_2$). In the outer loop, cluster rearrangem ents and the average of the therm odynam ical quantities are perform ed, each tim e that N m cycles of the inner loop are nished. The external loop is related with crystallization, since cluster m ovem ents prom ote the growth of bigger clusters. Is clear that if N_m is high enough, the probability of having local cluster nucleation is high, and thus cluster movem ents allow to form a crystal by successive aggregation of sm all clusters. W hen N $_{\rm m}\,$ is small, the local con gurations are not in equilibrium , and hence the cluster m ovem ents prom ote the generation of a random network.

In g. 2, we show the results of the inverse density (1) against reduced temperature (T = ($^{"}_{as}$) 1) for several N_m cycles which simulate di erent $_{2}$ times. In this gure, we xed the parameters of the CSM that allows as maximum coordination four (cpx4), L = 0:78;w = 0:1, restricted to equimolar concentration $_{A} = _{B} = 0:4$. Finally, after each N_m steps of the inner cycle, we allow the possibility of one cycle cluster rearrangement. In order to simulate the same cooling rate with several $_{2}$ times, we x the outer cycle for 100 steps during the quasi-equilibration run, and 2000

times for a productive run. In such a way, we averaged over the same number of con gurations for each dierent N $_{\rm m}$. As can be seen, for N $_{\rm m}=1500$ a crystallization is observed, while for the other values, a glass transition is obtained, as is revealed by the gure and by a direct inspection of the resulting structures. In all the procedure, MC steps are controlled to have an acceptance ratio between 20 30%.

A n interesting observation, is that the fraction of particles with maximum coordination $_4$, depends strongly on N_m. In table 2, we show this fraction against temperature for the same simulations presented in g. 2. When the crystal is formed, $_4$ is nearly one, while for the supercooled liquid at the same temperature, $_4$ remains at the same order of magnitude. We can understand this e ect as follows: if full therm al equilibrium of the system is not allowed, is not possible to access the global minimum of the energy potential [26], and hence the nucleation is prohibited, with the consequence that the supercooled liquid is structurally arrested at a nite temperature and restricted to explore the con gurational space correspondent to a single basin in the energy landscape. In the next section, we use this idea to relate this observation with the self-organization of rigidity.

Т	$N_m = 12$	$N_{m} = 40$	$N_{m} = 150$	$N_{m} = 1500$
0.40	0.0011	0.00113	0.0025	0.0019
0.38	0.0046	0.00103	0.0053	0.0040
0.36	0.0022	0.00404	0.0043	0.0079
0.34	0.0007	0.01287	0.0152	0.0188
0.32	0.0077	0.01677	0.0495	0.0591
0.30	0.0108	0.04376	0.1353	0.9395
0.28	0.0258	0.05391	0.1538	0.9786
0.26	0.0366	0.05138	0.2229	0.9666
0.24	0.0725	0.07417	0.3100	0.9487
0.22	0.1057	0.08355	0.3292	0.9622
0.20	0.1116	0.07762	0.3496	0.9617

Table 2. Fraction of maximum coordinated particles as a function of the reduced temperature (T) and molecular relaxation time, controlled by the parameter $N_{\rm m}$.

IV . G LASS TRANSITION BY

SELF-ORGANIZATION OF RIGIDITY

The fact that the maximum coordination is not achieved for most of the particles in the supercooled liquid, means that inhibit nucleation is a natural way of inhibit crystallization, as was discussed in the introduction. This simple idea can be put in contact with the rigidity ideas of Phillips [17] and Thorpe [11]. A swemmention before, in this theory, the ability for making a glass is optimized when the number of freedom degrees, in this case 2N; where N is the number of particles, is equal to the number of mechanical constraints (N $_{\rm c}$) that are given by the bond length and angles between bonds.

 $(2N N_c)=2N$ gives the fraction of cyclic variables of the H am iltonian, and also corresponds to the number of vibrational m odes with zero frequency (f), called oppy m odes, with respect to the total number of vibrational m odes. The counting of oppy m odes in a m ean-eld, known as M axwell

counting, goes as follows: since each of the r bonds in a site of coordination r is shared by two sites, there are r=2 constraints due to distance xing between neighbours. If the angles are also rigid, in 2D there are (r = 1) constraints, to give,

$$f = \frac{2N N_c}{2N} = 1 \frac{\langle r \rangle}{4} (r 1)x_r$$

where the last term corresponds to the angular constraints, r is the fraction of particles with coordination r, and < r > is the average coordination number, de ned as,

$$\langle r \rangle = r_r$$

A rigidity transition occurs when f = 0 and the system pass from a oppy network to rigid one. If f is a negative number, i.e., if there are more constraints than degrees of freedom, the lattice is overconstrained and f is the number of stressed bonds. In 2D, the rigidity transition leads to the critical value < r > = 2.0 if all angular constraints are considered, and < r > = 4.0 if the angular restoring forces are not strong.

W ithin the Cummings-Stellmodel, rigidity comes from the association of particles: each bond generates a constraint, and the angular constraints are only produced by geometrical hindrance, i.e., the angles between particles can change without a cost in energy, but within certain limits in posed by the restriction of the hard-core interaction between like particles, as shown in g. 3. For maximum coordination four, this means that only sites with coordination four have a contribution to angular constraints. It is true that sites with coordination two and three in principle should provide extra angular constraints, since the hard core interaction gives a minimum angle between particles. How ever, the angles are not xed and they have a wide region to allow particle movements, and thus do not contribute to the restriction counting.

Taking into account the geometrical hindrance of the model, the number of oppy modes is now given by,

$$f = 1 \quad \frac{\langle r \rangle}{4} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X \\ r_{max} (r \quad 1) x_{r} \end{array}$$

where $r_{m ax}$ is the maximum allowed coordination, and $rr_{m ax}$ is a K ronecker delta. From here, is clear that when in a cluster we have a site with maximum coordination, rigidity raises since the delta function is di erent from zero and m ore constraints are added that over-constraint the cluster. Thus, sites with maximum coordination nucleate rigidity and produce stress in the lattice. For example, in a crystal with coordination four, $_4 = 1$ and f = 3=2, which means that the lattice is over-constrained. A coording to Phillips, when f = 0, it is easy to form a glass, since the material is neither over-constrained (that produce explosive exotherm ic crystal-lization due to strain energy [27]) norunder-constrained (leading to the form ation of a molecular crystal), the system is trapped in a con gurational lim bo [27], where uctuations do not provide a pathway to the crystalline phase.

Furtherm ore, in the last section we have showed that the fraction of particles with maximum coordination is in close connection with the molecular relaxation time, which in other words means that to form a glass, nucleation of stress must be prevented. From our previous results, we can observe that

the probability of form ation of a nucleated structure is sm all due to the high molecular relaxation time. We decided to follow these ideas by proceeding in the opposite way than in the last section, i.e., we inhibit rigidity nucleation by rejecting con gurations with maximum coordination and then we see if we are able to bias the system to a glassy state, in such a way that we simulate long molecular relaxation times. Observe that rejecting con gurations that produce stress is the same e process of self-organization that was considered by Thorpe et. al. in order to form stress-free lattices [15]. In that sense, we look if self-organization of rigidity is able to produce a glass transition. This kind of simulation is usually called biased M onte-C arb [28].

To study the e ect of self-organization, we made the same M C procedure described in the previous section, but with N_m xed to the value that gives crystallization (N_m = 1500). The only di erence with the previous case is that now we reject particle movem ents that produce a site with maximum coordination.

In gure 4, we present the behaviour of the inverse of the density (1) as a function of the reduced temperature T = ($"_{as}$) 1 , with the condition that allows maximum four neighbours (cpx4), restricted to equimolar concentration $_{A} = _{B} = 0.4$, (open squares). As the temperature is slowed down, we can observe a continuous decrease in 1 . However, for reduced temperatures lower that 0.30, a jump in

¹ is observed when all the con gurations are allowed. This jump corresponds to the crystalline like phase transition, as can be argued by the shape of the transition, from an inspection of the con guration obtained, and by the radial distribution function. Due to the fact that it is possible to keep the system without stress, we develop the same simulation as before but rejecting in the simulation every con guration that contains a particle with coordination four. The results are presented in g.4 with dashed squares. In that case, the system remains as a supercooled uid. Moreover, the system can not form a crystal structure as occurs in the simulation in which we allow stress, and thus do not present a usual phase transition, instead a glass like transition is observed. These results shows that self-organization of rigidity is able to produce a glass.

An important remark is that avoiding congurations with maximum coordination is not equivalent to consider a CSM without self-organization but with a lower maximum coordination. For example, in g. 4 we plot the results of a sim ulation without rejection for a CSM that allows maximum coordination three (cpx3). As can be seen, the model also presents crystallization.

In gure 5, we present the results for the same kind of simulation but for a system that allows maximum coordination three (cpx3). As can be seen, the rejection of stressed con gurations also leads to a glass like transition.

Now we turn our interest to the condition of maximum coordination ve (cpx5), as show in g. 6. As can be seen, in this case the glass transition is produced even when the stressed con gurations are rejected. This fact can be understood in terms of rigidity in the following way: when $r_{max} = 5$, it is impossible to have a crystal due to geometric frustration at equim olar condition $_{A} = _{B} = 0.4$, and $_{5}$ 1: Since the rigidity transition without angular restrictions oc-

curs only when < r > = 4; most of the con gurations do not produce stress and the system behaves freely (i.e. we do not need to reject any con guration) as a self-organized system . In this sense, geom etric frustration induce self-organization of the system. As a corroboration of this fact, in q.7 we show the number of oppy modes as a function of the average coordination number, using the Maxwell counting. We remark that each coordination corresponds to a certain tem perature of the simulation. For example, at high tem peratures, all the models with di erent maximum coordination fall in the same line, since in the liquid the probability of nucleation is very low. However, for the case of cpx5, cpx3 and cpx4 without stress, all the simulations fall again in the same line even for low tem peratures, since the self-organization m eans that the clusters grow without angular constraints (stress free). W hen this line is extrapolated to f = 0, we obtain $\langle r \rangle = 4$, which is the value for a rigidity transition without angular constraints. If angular constraints are allowed, the simulations for low tem peratures falls outside the line determ ined by self-organization, and the rigidity transition occurs at lower values of < r > : Finally, we can compare these results to the oppy mode counting made for the glass transition using the method of tuning the dierent relaxation times. In g. 8, we present the number of oppy modes as a function of < r >. As can be seen, when N $_{\rm m}\,$ is high, there is a transition of rigidity due to nucleation, while for low N m the system tends to stay in the line of self-organization.

V.CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have explored the connection between selforganization of rigidity, and the supercooling of a liquid to form a glass. By considering an associative uid model, we show ed that the com petition between two di erent characteristic times, molecular relaxation and crystallization times, can be modelled using a M C simulation, where the number of cycles between particle and cluster moves is controlled. The results of these simulations, suggested that nucleation is avoided during supercooling and produce self-organization in the sense of the rigidity theory. This idea was also tested by making MC simulations but avoiding stressed con gurations. As a result, we were able to produce glass transitions using selforganization. In a m odel (cpx5) with geom etrical frustration, this self-organization is provided by geometry, and thus glass transition occurs without rejecting con gurations. All of the results of this article are in agreem ent with the Phillip sidea that glass transition is related with rigidity due to the lack of a pathway to crystallization [27]. Many of these facts, can also be studied form an energy landscape point of view, as we will show in future works.

A cknow ledgm ents. This work was supported by DGAPA UNAM project IN 108199, and the supercomputer facilities of the DGSCA-UNAM .A H .thanks the econom ical and credit supports given by CONACYT project GO010-E and ref. 167165

- [1] P.W. Anderson, Science 267, 1615 (1995).
- [2] J.Jackle, Rep. Pro. Phys. 49, 171 (1986).
- [3] D. Selvanathan, W J. Bresser and P. Bookhand, Phys. Rev.B 61, 15061 (2000).
- [4] M. Tatsum isago, B L. Halfpap, JL.G reen, S M. Lindsay, C A. Agnell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 1549 (1990).
- [5] R.Kemer, Physica B 215, 267 (1995).
- [6] R.Kemer, G.G. Naum is, J. of Phys: Condens. M atter 12, 1641 (2000).
- [7] A N. Sreeram, D R. Swiler, A K. Varshneya, J. Non-Cryst. Solids 127, 287 (1991).
- [B] M. M icoulaut, G.G. Naum is, Europhys Lett. 47, 568 (1999).
- [9] J.C. Phillips, J. Non {Cryst. Solids 34, 153 (1979).
- [10] M F. Thorpe, J. Non-Cryst. Solids 57, 355 (1983).
- [11] H.He and M.Thorpe, Phys.Rev.Lett. 54, 2107 (1985).
- [12] P. Bookhand, Insulating and sem iconducting glasses, (W orld Scienti c, London, 2000).
- [13] G G.Naum is, Phys.Rev.B 61, R 92605 (2000).
- [14] P G. D ebenedetti and F H. Stillinger, Nature 410, 259 (2000).
- [15] M.F.Thorpe, D.J.Jacobs, M.V. Chubynsky and J.C. Phillips, J.Non-Cryst. Solids 266-269, 859 (2000).
- [16] P. Bookhand, et. al., Evidence for the intermediate phase in chalcogenide glasses, in: Phase Transitions And Self-Organization in Electronic and Molecular Networks. Ed. JC Phillips and M F. Thorpe, Kluwer Academ ic/Plenum Publishers, 2001.
- [17] JC. Phillips, in Phase transitions and Self-Organization in electronic and molecular networks, ed. by JC. Phillips and M F. Thorpe, K luwer A cadem ic/P lenum Publishers, New York, 2001.
- [18] Y. W ang, J. W ells, D.G. Georgiev, P. Bookhand, K. Jackson, M. M icoulaut, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87,185503 (2001).
- [19] A. Huerta, G. G. Naum is, A coepted, Phys. Lett. A Accepted, (2002).
- [20] G. B iroli and M. M ezard, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 025501-1 (2002).
- [21] P.G. Debenedetti, M etastable Liquids, Princeton Unv. Press, 1996.
- [22] A. Huerta, Yu. Duda, O. Pizio, D. Wasan, Mol. Phys.
 96, 795 (1999); D. Henderson, A. Huerta, O. Pizio A.
 Trokhym chuk, Mol. Phys. 90, 571 (1997).
- [23] Yu.V.K alyuzhnyi, G.Stell, M.L.LLano-Restrepo, W. G.Chapman, M.F.Holovko, J.Chem. Phys., 101, 7939 (1994).
- [24] M E J. Newman, G. T. Barkema, Monte-Carlo Methods in Statistical Physics, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [25] M P.Allen, D J.T ildesley, Computer Simulation of Liquids, Oxford: C laredon Press, 1987.
- [26] D S.Corti, P.G. Debenedetti, S.Sastry, F.H. Stillinger, Phys. Rev. E 55, 5522 (1997).
- [27] J.C. Phillips, in Rigidity Theory and Applications, ed. by J.C. Phillips and P.M.: Duxbury, Kluwer Academ ic/Plenum Publishers, New York, 1999.
- [28] D. Frenkel, Understanding Molecular Simulation, Academ ic Press, 1996. Figures
 - 1.-Cummings-Stellmodel.

2.—Inverse of the density (1) as a function of the scaled tem perature (T) for di erent values of N $_{\rm m}$.

3.-C ounting of angular constraints in the Cummings-Stell m odel. A cluster of two particles has no angular constraints, since one of the particles can rotate 360 around the other, while a in a cluster with coordination four the angle between particles is xed, which leads to 3 angular constraints.


4. The same as g. 2 for the case of stress free nucleation for a system with maximum allowed coordination four (cpx4), with and without stress (squares and dashed squares). We include a simulation for maximum coordination three (cpx3) with stress.


5.- Inverse of the density $(^{1})$ as a function of the scaled temperature (T) for maximum coordination three with and without stress (triangles and dashed triangles).


6.-Inverse of the density (1) as a function of the scaled temperature (T) for maximum coordination ve (qpx5) with and without stress (pentagons and dashed pentagons). For comparison purposes, we include a simulation of qpx4 without rejecting con gurations (squares).


7.Number of oppy modes as a function of the coordination number (< r >) for each of the models with di erent maximum coordination number.


8. Number of oppy modes as a function of < r > for several N_m relaxation times without rejecting any conguration.

















<r>

