Scaling, dom ains, and states in the four-dim ensional random eld Ising m agnet

A. Alan Middleton

Departm ent of Physics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244

(D ated: August 8, 2002)

The four dimensional Gaussian random eld Ising magnet is investigated numerically at zero tem perature, using samples up to size 64^4 , to test scaling theories and to investigate the nature of dom ain walls and the therm odynam ic lim it. As the magnetization exponent is more easily distinguishable from zero in four dimensions than in three dimensions, these results provide a useful test of conventional scaling theories. Results are presented for the critical behavior of the heat capacity, magnetization, and sti ness. The fractal dimensions of the domain walls at criticality are estimated. A notable di erence from three dimensions is the structure of the spin domains: frozen spins of both signs percolate at a disorder magnitude less than the value at the ferrom agnetic to param agnetic transition. Hence, in the vicinity of the transition, there are two percolating clusters of opposite spins that are xed under any boundary conditions. This structure changes the interpretation of the dom ain walls for the four dimensional case. The scaling of the e ect of boundary conditions on the interior spin con guration is found to be consistent with the dom ain wall dimension. There is no evidence of a glassy phase: there appears to be a single transition from two ferrom agnetic states to a single param agnetic state, as in three dimensions. The slowing down of the ground state algorithm is also used to study this model and the links between combinatorial optim ization and critical behavior.

I. IN TRODUCTION

eld Ising magnet (RFIM) is a rela-As the random tively well-studied model of a disordered material, general questions about therm odynam ic phases and transitions have been addressed using it as a model system . Experimental studies of random eld Ising magnets are also available for com parison with theoretical predictions. The statics of the RFIM have been studied in detail theoretically, both analytically and num erically. It has been proven that there are at least two phases in dim ensions greater than two, 1 scaling argum ents have been constructed,² the replica approach has been applied,³ and the model has been analyzed on hierarchical lattices. The RFM also has a rich num erical history, including extensive M onte Carlo simulations^{5,6,7,8} and zero tem perature ground state studies.^{9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17} Som e questions about the model remain unsettled, though, and the physical picture of excitations is somewhat incom plete. Studying these properties of the model will be useful in building a more com plete picture, especially when addressing questions about dynam ics.

There has been an active discussion about the nature of the phase diagram for the random eld Ising model (RFIM). One controversy has been whether the transition from the ferrom agnetic phase to param agnetic phase, which occurs as the disorder strength or tem perature is varied, is continuous in three dim ensions.^{2,5,12,13} Recent work^{16,17} provides further strong evidence that the transition is second order in this case and that previously derived scaling relations apply. However, as the ratio = of the order param eter exponent to the correlation length exponent is very small, som e scaling predictions are hard to verify. It is of interest to pursue this investigation in higher dimension, where = is larger, to verify the general theoretical picture suggested

for the RFIM in nite dimensions.

II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Numerical simulations have been carried out for the Gaussian RFM on a simple hypercubic lattice in four dimensions. The Ham iltonian (for a review of the RFM see Ref.2) is de ned over spin con gurations f_{S} = 1g,

$$H = J s_i s_j h_i s_i;$$
(1)
hiji i

with hiji indicating nearest neighbor sites i; j and the random elds h are chosen independently from a Gaussian distribution with m ean zero and variance h^2 . Here the energy scale is xed by setting J = 1 in the computations, with temperature T = 0. Exact ground states for this H am iltonian are found using a m ax- ow algorithm, as in previous work.^{9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17}

The magnetization is more useful in studying the 4D RFIM than the 3D RFIM, as the magnetization exponent is more easily distinguished from zero. The B inder parameter is used to locate the ferrom agnetic-to-paramagnetic transition relatively precisely at $h_c = 4:179(2)$. A nite-size study of the magnetization allows the ratio = to be estimated as = = 0:19(3). Besides its relevance to the magnetization, this ratio is important in studying the nature of the states and comparing dom ain wall exponents.

The ground state energies and their dependence on boundary conditions can be used to study the heat capacity and sti ness exponents of the RFIM. The sti ness (violation of hyperscaling) exponent is determ ined to be = 1.82 0.07, consistent with conventional exponent bounds.^{18,20} Unlike the 3D case, the value for is numerically distinguishable from d=2. The heat capacity exponent inferred from the ground state energies is estimated as = 0.26 0.05, apparently distinct from = 0 and again consistent with the conventional disorder variant of W idom scaling, 18,19 (d $\,$) = 2 $\,$.

The spatial structure of the spins for the 4D RFM is found to di er from the structure for the 3D RFIM, over the length scales studied. In the case of three dim ensions, the spins appear to form a nested sets of dom ain walls at criticality.^{16,19} In 4D, the frozen spins (those invariant under all boundary conditions) percolate in the ferrom agnetic phase. This implies that dom ain walls cannot be simply identied as surfaces between connected sets of same-sign spins. Simulations show that the frozen spins percolate at a value $h_p^f = 3.680(5)$. At a slightly higher value of h, h_{p}^{m} , the minority spins (frozen spins of a sign opposite to the magnetization) percolate. Evidence is given in Sec.VI that this percolation takes place even when the spins are coarse grained, with the critical value ofh dependent on the scale of the coarse graining. W hile this percolation does not a ect therm odynam ic quantities such as the bond part of the mean ground state energy, E_{J} , or the magnetization, the denition of the dom ain walls and the description of the spin-spin correlation function turns out to not be as straightforw ard as in the case of d = 3.

The qualitative nature of the therm odynam ic lim it in the 4D RFIM can be addressed by studying the in u-ence of boundary conditions on the con guration in a

xed window. In Sec.VII, the e ect of up (+) and down () boundary conditions at the surface of the sam ple are compared with periodic boundary conditions (P). The probability of the interior spins in the P con guration being identical to either the + or con guration approaches 1, as L ! 1, for all h. Taking the periodic boundary condition as a generic case, then, in the large volume limit, the interior of the ground state con guration is found in one of the two ferrom agnetic states for $h < h_c$ or the param agnetic state for $h > h_c$. The probability for the P con guration to be either + or in the interior scales in a manner consistent with the 3D results¹⁶ and the general case where there are few states in the therm odynam ic limit.²¹

A. A lgorithm and error bars

The variant of the push-relabel algorithm used is the same as described in Ref. 16. Near criticality, ground states for sam ples of size 64^4 were found in about 3000 s using 1 GHz Pentium III processors. G round states for smaller sam ples were found using a faster, but less memory-e cient, version of the algorithm; using the same processors, near-critical sam ples of volume 32^4 were solved in approximately 60 s.

E mor bars for exponent values throughout this paper include both estim ated system atic errors due to apparent nite size e ects and errors due to statistical uncertainties; the error bars represent an estim ated range of



FIG.1: Plot of the sam ple average of the absolute value of the magnetization, jn j of the 4D RFIM as a function of disorder h and system size L, for periodic boundary conditions.

values in which the value lies, with high condence. In contrast, error bars in the gures for raw data relect 1 statistical uncertainties computed from the standard deviation, except for the B inder cum ulant, where the error bars were computed by resampling. Plots of tted values, such as estimated peak heights, include both statistical errors and an error bar that relects uctuations in values that result from varying the degree of the polynomial t and the chosen range of the t.

In some of the plots, exponent values that di er from the \best" value from other plots are used to scale the data, to indicate that there is some exibility in the exponent values, depending on the method. All of the values derived for the exponents from various methods are consistent with each other to within statistical and estimated system atic errors. Table I gives a sum mary of the num erical values of the best estimates for the exponents.

III. MAGNETIZATION

As the exponent is more readily determined in the 4D RFIM, compared with the 3D case, it is useful in 4D to study the magnetization as a rst guide to the critical behavior and to locate the transition. The mean value of the absolute value of the magnetization is de ned as

$$\overline{jn} j = N^{-1} \overline{j} \frac{x}{s_i} j$$
(2)

where the overline indicates an average over samples of volum $eN = L^4$. The magnetization is directly computed for each sample from the ground state with periodic boundary conditions. The dependence of the sample-averaged magnetization on disorder h is plotted in Fig.1.

TABLE I: Table of num erical estim ates for the 4D Gaussian RFIM on the simple hypercubic lattice.

| Sym bol | Value | | De nition and data used |
|---------|----------------|----------------|--|
| hc | 4:179 | 0:002 | Critical value of the random eld for coupling $J = 1$. |
| | | | The critical point is determ ined prim arily from scaling of magnetization |
| | | | distribution (e.g., B inder cum u lant as shown in Fig. 2); |
| | | | this h_c is consistent with extrapolation in L of the location of peaks in the |
| | | | specic heat and the number of operations used to nd the ground state |
| | | | and the value at which the probability of stiness being zero is independent of L . |
| h_p^f | 3:680 | 0 : 005 | Value of the random eld at which the frozen spins percolate. Sec. VI. |
| h_p^m | 3 : 875 | 0 : 005 | Value of the random eld at which the minority spins percolate. See Sec. VI and Fig. 11. |
| = | 0:19 | 0:03 | Ratio of magnetization exponent $$ to correlation length exponent $$. |
| | | | Determ ined from the scaling of jn jvs.L at criticality for 12 L 64 . |
| | | | See Fig. 3, Fig. 4 and Sec. III. |
| = | 0:31 | 0:04 | Heat capacity exponent divided by . |
| | | | Found from peaks C_{max} (L), computed from the derivative of t to \overline{E}_{J} (h;L). |
| | | | See Figs. 6 and 7. |
| (1)= | 0 : 94 | 0:06 | Combination of heat capacity exponent $\;$ and $\;$. |
| | | | Found from t to power law for the discrete estimate of $dE_J = d \ln (L)$ evaluated at peak of C . |
| | 0 : 82 | 0:06 | Correlation length exponent. |
| | | | Jointly estimated from magnetization scaling, $=$ and $($ 1)= , and the scaling of the sti ness. |
| | | | with L.Consistent with the scaling of the width of the number of algorithm operations. |
| | 0:16 | 0:03 | M agnetization exponent, found from $=$ and . |
| | 026 | 0:05 | Heat capacity exponent, found from $=$ and . |
| | 1:82 | 0 : 07 | V iolation of hyperscaling or the scaling of the sti ness at h_{c} . |
| | | | Found from scaling of stiness with L and h h_c , see Sec.V and Fig.9. |
| ds | 3:94 | 0:06 | Fractal dimension of connected domain wall at $h = h_c$. |
| | | | Note that the result is indistinguishable from $d = 4$. |
| | | | See Fig. 10 and Sec. V. |
| dı | 3:20 | 0:12 | Incongruent fractal dimension of domain wall at criticality. |
| | | | Box counting of incongruent volum es (disconnected wall). See Sec.V . |
| | | | Consistent with scaling of state overlap probabilities shown in Fig.13 and Fig.14. |
| dJ | 2 : 94 | 0:12 | Energy $fractal dimension"$ at $h = h_c$. Found from the exchange part, J , of the stiness. |
| | | | See Fig. 10 and Sec. V. |

A . B inder cum u lant and $h_{\rm c}$

One method for determining the value of h_c is to use the Binder cumulant. The value of the cumulant, $q = (3 \text{ m}^4 = \text{m}^2) = 2$, should be q = 1 in the ferrom agnetic phase and should take on the value g = 0 in the param agnetic phase. The xed point he is found by the intersection of the g(h) curves for various L. Som e caution should be used with this method, as the magnetization exponent is small, so that the sam ple distribution of m is bin odal for even large samples near the transition. The assumptions of Gaussian behavior about the mean in the param agnetic phase are di cult to achieve. Nonetheless, the plots of (h) show a consistent behavior that indicates the nite-size trends in the data for the magnetization. The plot of g(h) for L = 4 through L = 64 is shown in Fig. 2. For sm aller system sizes, about 5 10^d ground states were found; for the L = 64 system s near h_c , about

5 10^3 ground states were computed. The apparent intersection point is g_c 0:975, but this quantity likely has not converged to its scaling value. The location of the transition can be assigned with more certainty to the range $h_c = 4.179$ 0:002. This is an acceptable value for the set of lengths used here and likely will continue to hold for scales that are somewhat larger. It is also quite consistent with the scaling of the stiness, location of the speci c heat peaks, and the algorithm ic slowing down discussed in the other sections of this paper.

B. M agnetization

The ratio of the m agnetization exponent to the correlation exponent length is computed from the e ective nite size exponent for the m agnetization. G iven standard nite size scaling, the m agnetization at the transi-



FIG. 2: Plot of the Binder cumulant (3 $m^{\frac{4}{4}}m^{\frac{2}{2}}$)=2 as a function of h for various L. The curves are smoothed spline ts to indicate the trends. This plot is used to determ ine the location of the transition, $h_c = 4.179(2)$.

tion will scale as (h_c) L = . The bcalexponent = is found by the discrete derivative of $h(j_n j)$ with respect to h(L). The results of this computation are plotted in Fig. 3. This evaluation gives a location for the transition that is consistent, but slightly less precise, than the B inder cum ulant analysis. The value of the local exponent that is most consistent with a constant value gives the estim ate

$$= = 0:19 \quad 0:03:$$
 (3)

In Fig. 4, the scaled m agnetization (for the same samples used to compute g(h)) is plotted as a function of scaled distance to the transition, in agreement with the nite-size scaling form

$$\overline{jm} j = L = f_m [(h h_e)L^{1=}]; \qquad (4)$$

where the value = 0.83 gives the best scaling collapse, with xed = = 0.19 and h = 4.179. The value of in Table I indicates the range of values found by distinct estimates; there is no clear best m easurement of in the data.

C . $\ensuremath{\mathsf{F}}\xspace$ fuctuations in the magnetization

In addition to the scaling of the mean magnetization, the uctuations in the magnetization can be checked for consistency with nite-size scaling. The sampleto-sample uctuations $_{\rm M}$ in the total magnetization ${}^{\rm M}$ j = N jn j = $_{\rm i}$ s_i can be estimated, using the number of independent volumes and the uctuations in the magnetization of such volumes. De ning the nite size scaling variable x = (h $h_{\rm c}$)L¹⁼, at large jxj the relevant volumes are of size (h h), while at small jxj the volume is nite-size limited. The uctuations in



FIG. 3: Plot of estimates for = found from the discrete derivative $(=)_{loc} = ln(jn j(h;L_2)-jn j(h;L_1)) = ln(L_2=L_1)$. The apparent convergence to a uniform value for h 4:18 im plies that the value = = 0:19(3) accurately describes the elective critical behavior for L 12! 64.



FIG.4: Scaled magnetization $\frac{1}{10}$ fr = as a function of scaled disorder (h h_c)L¹⁼ for = = 0.19 and = 0.83.

the magnetization over a volume 'd are M , d = and the number of such volumes is n, $(L=')^d$. Taking uctuations over each volume to be independent, one can write a version of the scaling as

$$M = M \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} L^{d=2} (h h_c)^{d=2} f(x);$$
 (5)

where in the lim it of large $j_{k,j}$ f approaches a constant whose value depends on the sign of $j_{k,j}$. For sm all values of $j_{k,j}$ f (x) $j_{k,j}$ $j^{+d} = 2$. This scaling form is veried by the data displayed in Fig. 5. The data at sm all $j_{k,j}$ is roughly consistent with the range of power laws + d = 2 1:48 0:15 plotted in Fig. 5 (this comparison is rather sensitive to the location of h_c and the value of .) At large $j_{k,j}$ ML d^{-2} (h h_c) d^{-2} approaches a constant.



FIG.5: Plot of the scaled uctuations in the magnitude of the magnetization M j. The scaling variable h_c , $L^{1^{=}}$ on the horizontal axis is the scaled distance to the critical point while the vertical axis variable, M_{j_m} , $L^{d=2}$ (h h_c)^{d=2} is the magnitude of the uctuation in the magnetization, normalized by the expected number of correlation volumes and the magnetization of the correlation volumes of linear size (h h_c). The approach to a constant value at large

scaling variable is consistent with independently oriented regions for $h > h_c$ (upper branch) and m agnetization uctuations about the ferrom agnetic state over regions of size when $h < h_c$ (lower branch.) The solid line represents a power law exponent + d = 2 1:48, while the upper (lower) dashed line has slope 1:63 (1:33.)

IV. HEAT CAPACITY

The speci c heat of the 3D RFIM is a quantity that can be measured experimentally, directly^{22,23} or indirectly.^{23,24} The divergence of the speci c heat has also been estimated numerically, though not allestimates agree and the experimental situation is unclear. Because of these discrepancies, it is useful to also study this quantity in the case of four dimensions, to check the validity of the standard scaling picture.

The heat capacity can be estimated using ground state calculations and applying them odynamic relations employed by Hartmann and Young.¹⁵ This approach was also applied in Refs. 16 and 25. The method relies on studying the singularities in the bond energy density

$$E_{J} = L \overset{d}{\underset{hiji}{\overset{X}{\overset{}}}} s_{i}s_{j}:$$
(6)

This bond energy density is the st derivative @E = @J of the ground state energy with respect to h (equivalently, up to constants, with respect to J.) The derivative of the sample averaged quantity \overline{E}_J with respect to h then gives the second derivative with respect to h of the total energy and thus the sample-averaged heat capacity C. The singularities in C can also be studied by computing the singular part of \overline{E}_J , as \overline{E}_J is just the integral of C with respect to h. The nite-size scaling for the singular part of the speci c heat $C_{\!\rm s}$ is

$$C_{s} L^{=} C^{*} [(h h_{e})L^{1=}]; \qquad (7)$$

while the scaling for the leading part (through the $\;$ rst singular term) of the sample averaged bond energy at h = $h_{\rm c}$ is

$$\overline{E}_{J;s} (L; h = h_c) = c_1 + c_2 L^{(1)};$$
(8)

with c_1 and c_2 constants.

The data analysis is based upon direct ts using E_{J} . This approach avoids complications that arise in computing the uncertainties when thing to nite-di erenced estim ates for C, but is otherwise equivalent to tting to such nite di erences. The twas a least squares tof a cubic to $h(E_J)$ for xed values of L. This t to the inverse function was more stable than thing to E_{J} (h). The t function was then inverted to give the estim ate for $E_{\rm J}$ (h). The maximum slope of this estimated function is in turn used to estim ate the peak in C (h) for each L. The uncertainties at any point, especially when determ ining the peak value C_{max} (L), in the analysis can be estimated using a bootstrap technique (resampling the data.) The data for E_J are plotted directly in part (a) of Fig. 6. The sam ples used were the sam e as used for the magnetization and Binder cum ulant analysis. The derivatives of the tare plotted in part (b) of this gure and com pared with the heat capacity values determ ined by nite di erencing. Note that the nite di erenced values are relatively noisy due to the di erentiation. This apparent noise can be reduced by less re nem ent in the values of h sam pled, but this would reduce the resolution in C (h) and the location of the peak in C. By directly thing to E_J rather than the nite di erences, this com plication is reduced (but could be managed with appropriate care in the error analysis.)

The estimates for the maximum values of the heat capacity are plotted as a function of L in Fig. 7(a). The relatively precise data are not consistently t by a power law until L > 16. The t for these values gives = = 0:31 0:04, where the errors are purely statistical. Given the short range of the t (from L = 22to L = 64), one must allow for the possibility of corrections to scaling giving a di erent value at larger system sizes (possibly slightly lower.) A tof these data to C_{m ax} ln (L) is less successful, how ever (see the inset in Fig. 7(a).) As always, it is di cult to distinguish a logarithm ic behavior, suggested for C_{max} in Ref.25, from a small-power-law behavior. In Fig. 7 (b), the local discrete derivatives are plotted for the cases where the behavior should be a power law (main part of the gure) and logarithm ic (inset.) The power law does seen to be more consistent with a convergence to a xed slope for this range of sizes. Though the ts are not de nitive, the

tted power law behavior is most consistent with scaling relations and other data and does seem to explain the computed singularity in the bond part of the energy.

The speci c heat can also be used to infer . This can be done directly through scaling the widths of the





(a)

5

FIG.6: (a) The points show the computed dependence of \overline{E}_J , the number density of broken bonds, on h, for L = 4 :::64 (not all L values are included, for clarity.) Fits to cubics for the inverse function h(E_J) are shown. (b) Estimated heat capacity $d\overline{E}_J$ =dh, derived from the di erences between the \overline{E}_J values. Solid lines show the derivatives of the ts to \overline{E}_J de ned in the text. These derivatives are used to estimate the heights of the peaks in the speci c heat, C_{max} (L).

peaks in C, but a more robust procedure was to use the indirect procedure of thing E_J , which, being the integral over h of C, incorporates the width of the peak in C. The quantity (1) = was found by using the the value of E_J at h_c . The derivative of E_J (h_c) with respect to ln (L) gives the power law (1) = 0.94 0.06. With the value for =, this gives the estimate = 0.80 0.06.

V. STIFFNESS & DOMAIN WALLS

The nature of responses to external perturbations is used to characterize distinct phases, in general. One of the more important responses to study is the response to changes in the boundary conditions. For example, ferrom agnetic phases in pure materials can be identied due

FIG.7: (a) Plot of C_{max} (L) vs. L. The solid line is a t to the nite size scaling form C_{max} (L) L =, with = = 0:31 0:04. The inset shows a semi-log plot with a least-squares t to the last 3 data points (L 32.) (b) Local derivatives of the plots in (a).

to the nite energy density of dom ain walls induced by twisted boundary conditions. The application of twisted boundary conditions to sti ness and dom ain walls to disordered systems was introduced for spin glasses by M cM illan²⁶ and B ray and M oore.²⁷ Sti ness and dom ain walls were studied for the 3D RFIM in Ref. 16. The approach taken quantities studied here for the 4D RFIM are the same, though the results are somewhat distinct in avor from the 3D results.

M easuring the sti ness quanti es the change in energy due to a change in boundary conditions. The sym m etrized sti ness is de ned as

$$= (E_{+} + E_{+} E_{++} E_{++} E_{++}) = 2; \qquad (9)$$

where $E_{\rm ab}$ is the ground state energy for boundary spins

xed to be a at one end of the sample and b at the other end of the sample (periodic boundary conditions are used in the other d 1 dim ensions). This de nition minimizes the e ects of surface terms and has the value = 0 if the two ends of the sample are \decoupled", with the e ect of the boundary conditions penetrating only a nite distance into the sample. The value will be zero with high probability in the param agnetic phase, for large samples, and is expected to scale as L^{d-1} in the ferrom agnetic phase, for xed h.

A. Sti ness at criticality

The sample averaged sti ness is a quantity that is useful for investigating scaling and the order of the transition. Near a second order transition, the average sti ness scales with a characteristic scale L , where is the \violation of hyperscaling" or sti ness exponent. The natural scaling assumption is that this sti ness varies over a scale given by the reduced disorder, giving

$$\overline{C} LS [L^{1=} (h h_{c})K];$$
 (10)

with \overline{C} and K nonuniversal constants and S a function dependent on the shape of the sample. Another characterization of the distribution of sti ness over samples is $P_0(h;L)$, which is the probability that the sti ness will be exactly zero. As the distribution of the sti ness can be scaled at the critical point, with = 0 invariant under rescaling of by L, $P_0(h_c;L)$ approaches a constant as L! 1, with the asymptotic value set by sample shape, disorder distribution, and lattice type. This convergence to a constant was used in Ref. 16 to locate h_c for the 3D RFM.

The probability of zero sti ness P_0 is plotted in Fig. 8, for sam ples of shape 3L L³. Less an isotropic sam ples had a very small value of P_0 and therefore had more statistical error. As the running time for a given L is larger and the ground states for four di erent boundary conditions were computed, fewer samples were studied here than in the magnetization and energy study. For L = 32, up to 5 10[°] realizations were studied, while for the sm allest sam ples, $E_{\rm J}$ was calculated for about 5 10⁴ sam ples. The estimates plotted are consistent with P_0 approximately constant in L for h_c 4:18. This is in accord with other estim ates of h_c, though the uncertainty in using this plot to determ ine h_c is som ew hat larger than from other methods.

A scaling plot showing the collapse of the sti ness calculations for sam ples of the same shape, 3L L^3 , is shown in F ig. 9. A ssuming the scaling form Eq. (10), a collapse to a single function should be found when plotting L as a function of $(h \ h_c)L^{1=}$. This collapse is unreasonably good (that is, is not too bad for L = 6), using $h_c = 4:177$, = 1:82 and = 0:80. The computations strongly support the picture of a second order transition with a value for obeying the bounds^{18,19,20}

d=2 = d=2: (11)

W hen d = 3, it has not been possible to determ ine whether $\frac{1}{6} d=2$, given that = is so small. Here, given



FIG. 8: Plot of the probability of zero stiness . The samples have a cross section volume of L^3 with a distance of 3L between the controlled faces. The probability is constant to within numerical errors for h 4:18.



FIG.9: Scaling plot for the sti ness. The samples have a cross section volume of L^3 with a distance of 3L between the controlled faces. The scaled sti ness L is plotted vs. the scaled disorder (h h_c) $L^{1=}$ for the values = 1:82 and = 0:80.

the larger value of =, it is possible to discrim inate between and d=2, with the result suggesting that < d=2(in addition, the result is consistent with saturation of the lower bound.)

B. Domain walls

The calculations for the set of boundary conditions ++, ,+ , and + on the two opposite controlled faces (separated by 3L) have also been used to study the dom ain walls in the 4D RFIM . Following the de nitions of Ref. 16, three de nitions of the dom ain wall are considered. The rst is found by com paring ++ and + boundary conditions, with the spins xed to be + on the left end in both cases. The set of spins which is connected to the left end and xed under both sets of boundary conditions has an internal boundary that intersects W $_{\rm S}$ bonds. A ssum ing scaling at h_c, the surface m easure scales as

$$\overline{W}_{s}$$
 $L^{d_{s}}$; (12)

de ning the domain-wall dimension d. The next dom ain-wall measure exponent is found by comparing the + con guration with the and + + con gurations. The number of bonds which are unsatis ed only with + boundary conditions gives a dom ain wallm easure W_T.Under and ++ boundary conditions, there are unsatis ed bonds due to frozen spin regions, where the random eld is strong enough to x the spins under all boundary conditions. The unsatis ed bonds with either of these two boundary conditions are not counted as part of the + dom ain wall under this de nition. The only broken bonds which are counted as part of W $_{\rm I}$ are those broken due to the twisted boundary conditions. This measure similarly de nes an incommensurate surface exponent by

$$\overline{W}_{I}$$
 $L^{d_{I}}$: (13)

The third de nition of the e ect of boundary conditions is given by the bond or exchange part of the sti ness,

$$J = (E_{+}^{J} + E_{+}^{J} + E_{++}^{J} + E_{++}^{J} = 2; \quad (14)$$

where $E_J = J^{r}_{hiji} s_i s_j$. This count includes som e broken bonds with negative sign and is in uenced by frozen islands. The \dim ension" d_J is then

$$_{\rm J}$$
 ${\rm L}^{\rm d_{\rm J}}$: (15)

As $_{\rm J}$ is the derivative of $\,$ with respect to J, therm o-dynam ic relations^{16} in ply that

$$d_{\rm J} = + \frac{1}{-}$$
: (16)

The values of d_s , d_I and d_J were estimated by taking the discrete logarithm ic derivatives of \overline{W}_s , \overline{W}_I and \overline{J}_J ,

$$p_{d_{s;I;J}} \stackrel{p}{\underbrace{}}_{L_1 L_2} = \ln [W (L_2) = W (L_1)] = \ln (L_2 = L_1); \quad (17)$$

with W being one of the measures of the domain wall. The results are plotted in Fig. 10.

O ne of the more striking di erences between the 3D and 4D calculations is that, while $d_s \notin d$ in 3D, when d = 4 the value of d_s is consistent with the relation

$$d_{s} = d$$
: (18)

Thus, the dom ain wallde ned by the surface of connected

xed spins anchored at the xed end of the sample has dimension consistent with the spatial dimension. This surface, the internal boundary between ipped and xed spins, appears to be space-lling. A dditionally, the estimated value of $d_I = 3.20$ 0:12 is clearly distinct from d, in contrast with the near equality seen in 3D.¹⁶ These differences will be addressed in more detail in Sec. V I, when examining the frozen spins for $h < h_c$.



FIG.10: Estimate of the dimensions (a) d_s , (b) d_I , and (c) d_J obtained from the discrete logarithm ic derivatives of wall area W_s , the number of bonds W_I created by twisted BC's relative to uniform sign BC's, and the exchange stimes J_J with respect to L for several h. These plots are used to infer $d_s = 3:94$ 0:06, $d_I = 320$ 0:12 and $d_J = 2:94$ 0:12.

$\ensuremath{\mathsf{C}}$. Dom ain walls and scaling

The value computed here for d_J , $d_J = 2.94$ 0.12, is just consistent with Eq. (16). As the derivation of Eq. (16) is quite robust, this consistency should not be supprising. Though the arguments are apparently sound, the conjecture m ade originally for 3D,¹⁶ namely that

$$d_{I} = d_{J} + = ;$$
 (19)

has a non-rigorous derivation, especially as in the above form , $d_{\rm s}$ in the original version has been replaced by $d_{\rm I}$, which here more clearly relects the measure of the dom ain walls induced by boundary condition changes. However, this scaling relation is easily consistent with the computed values of the dom ain wall exponents and = .

The value found here for (1)= also satis es the relationship $d_{\rm I}$ d = = (1)= , which was used in Ref.16, except for the replacement here of d_s by d_I, motivated in the 4D RFIM by the more natural de nition of domain walls using d_I and the spatial structure of frozen spins.

VI. FROZEN AND M INORITY SPINS

The result that one measure of the dom ain walldim ension, d_s, is near to the spatial dimension d suggests that the picture of the spin con gurations must di er between the cases d = 3 and d = 4. The picture of the con quration at the transition in d = 3 described in Ref. 16 is that of nested dom ain walls, where the dom ain walls are the boundaries separating connected sets of spins of the same sign (see also Ref. 19.) In this section, results are presented that necessitate a di erent picture in d = 4, due to the percolation of m inority spins for h less than the critical disorder h_c . (These results should be com pared with those for the 3D RFIM presented in Ref. 28, which support the existence of two interpenetrating spanning domains in the 3D RFM for $h > h_c$, and those of Ref. 29, where the surprising claim is made that there is a second critical $h_p > h_c$ where there is rst simultaneous spanning by up and down spin clusters.) The percolation of m inority spins in d = 4 for $h < h_c$ m akes the identication of dom ain walls with connected sets of uniform

spins problem atic.

G iven a disorder realization fh_ig , there are two natural sets of spins to consider when de ning dom ain walls and percolation clusters. The m inority spins are simply those that have spin opposite to the mean magnetization. The fraction of spins that fall into this category is (1 jm j)=2. Frozen spins are those that are invariant under all boundary conditions. These spins are minority spins under either all up or all down boundary conditions, so that the fraction of frozen spins is 1 jn j, when L . If either m inority or frozen spins were distributed independently in space, the clustering of these spins would m ap directly onto simple percolation. A sthere are strong interactions between these spins and the boundaries between them are related to dom ain walls, the percolation is not sim ple, on short length scales. For $h < h_c$, the correlations should vanish in the limit of separations much greater than

The clustering and percolation behavior of these spins can be directly studied to learn more about the domain walls. From ground state con gurations for L = 8through L = 64, computed both for all up and all down boundary spins, the frozen and minority spin sets were identi ed. These sets can be studied directly or in a coarse grained sense. (Coarse grained spin blocks were determined by whether the minority or frozen spins were a majority of the block, with ties random ly broken.) The spanning clusters were de ned as those that connected two opposite faces of the hypercubic sam ple.

Fig.11 is a plot of the percolation probability p_b (i.e., the probability of at least one spanning cluster) of minority spins on scales b = 1;2;4 as a function of h. From this plot, an extrapolation of the curve crossings to large L suggests that the minority spins percolate in the in nite-volum e limit at $h_p^m = 3:850 \quad 0:005$. P lots for the frozen spins are qualitatively similar, with a lower percolation threshold of $h_p^f = 3:680 \quad 0:005$. In each case, the num ber of spanning clusters peaks near h_p^m ; f, with the peak num - ber increasing with L. The percolation point tends toward h_c as the scale b increases, consistent with a scaling toward the ferrom agnetic state of uniform magnetization for h < h_c.

Implications for the simple domain wall picture in d = 4 follow directly. As the minority spins percolate in the ferrom agnetic phase, $h < h_c$, the boundaries of connected sets of same-sign spins are space lling. The de nition of dom ain walls using simply these connected sets is thus not clearly inform ative about the e ect of boundary condition changes. The surfaces de ned by the incongruent bonds are more useful in understanding the dom ain walls. These are the surfaces that separate the two ferrom agnetic ground states; the frozen spinsm ake a space- lling background that is common to both states, even for $h < h_c$. (In three dimensions, at $h = h_c$, there is a fractal set of spins that can be controlled by the boundary conditions.) In addition, the relationship in 3D between = and $_1$, the probability of crossing a dom ain wallper factor of e in length scale, would be much more di cult to investigate in 4D, as the dom ain walls are not readily identi able.

VII. STATES

In earlier sections, it has been (som et in es in plicitly) assumed that the transition in the 4D RFIM is consistent with the simple picture of a ferrom agnetic to param agnetic transition, with the sign of the m agnetization in the ferrom agnetic state dependent on boundary conditions and the spin con guration independent of boundary condition in the param agnetic state, far from the boundaries. This assumption is examined in this section. The approach is inspired in large part by analytic work.^{30,31} A discussion of the num erical study of the nature of the therm odynam ic states is presented in R ef. 21 and the applications to the 3D RFM can be found in Ref. 16. In sum m ary, one test of the num ber of states in the therm odynam ic lim it is to determ ine the correlation functions (in this case, the ground state) in the interior of the sam ple under several di erent boundary conditions. For a



FIG.11: P bt of the percolation probability form inority spins as a function of disorder strength h, for L = 8;16;32;64. The dashed line indicates h = h_c . (a) Percolation probability p_1 for m inority spins. The percolation probability approaches unity for large system s for h_p^f = 3:875 0:005. (b) Percolation probability p_2 for m inority block spins of size 2^4 . The percolation threshold is closer to h_c . (c) Percolation probability p_4 for m inority block spins of size 4^4 .

sm all num ber (one or two for Ising models) of them odynam ic lim its, there will be a sm all num ber of interior con gurations. The probability that the interior of the ground states will di er from one of the large volum e lim it con gurations decreases as a power law dependent on the dimension of the dom ain wall.

The degeneracy of the ground state was directly addressed for the 4D RFIM by studying the e ect of changing boundary conditions on the ground state spin con guration in the interior of the sam ple. In particular, the periodic (P), all spins up (+), all spins down (), and open (O) boundary conditions were compared. As the 4D computations are much more time consuming, the comparison between the ground states of a system and a sm aller subsystem, each with open boundary conditions, was not extensively studied, as it was in the 3D RFIM.

A sum m ary of the results for com parisons between P is presented in Figs. 12 and 13. The results for and + / 0 vs.+/ are quite sim ilar. The plots show the (scaled) probability $P_{P;+}$ (2;h;L), for a given h and L, that the ground-state P con guration is distinct from both the ground-state + and con gurations in the central volum e of size 2⁴. A s L increases, this probability decreases toward zero at all h. This suggests that in large sam ples, the interior con guration for a num ber of boundary conditions (including periodic and open) can be found by im posing either + or boundary conditions. It was also found, as in the 3D case, that for $h > h_c$, as L increases, the interior con gurations for the + and boundary conditions becom e identical with unit probability. Together, assuming the extrapolation to large L is correct, these results show the existence of a single state for $h > h_c$ (for if the interior con guration di ers between any two boundary conditions, it must di er between + and) and strongly suggest the existence of only two states for $h < h_c$.

The scaling of $P_{P\,;+}$ is consistent with previous work on disordered m odels. 21,32 As a function of the scaled disorder (h $h_{\rm b}){\rm L}^{1=}$, the function approaches a single curve when the probability $P_{P\,;+}$ is scaled by ${\rm L}^{\rm d}$ $^{\rm d_{I}}$. This scaling results from assuming that the number of large (size L) domain walls induced by generic boundary condition changes is constant as L ! 1. This assumption is consistent with the observation that $d_{\rm I} > d$ 1. The chance that an interior volume of xed linear size w intersects a domain wall is expected to behave as $(w=L)^{\rm d}$. The clean collapse of the data for larger system sizes, using values determined from m agnetization and domain wall m easurements, lend quantitative support to this picture.

The dimension d_I could be alternatively deduced from this data. Fig. 14 shows the dependence of the peak value of P_{P;+} on L. A sum ing d d gives this slope, the data for L = 12 ! 44 gives $d_I = 3:19(2)$. This value could be taken as the best one for d_I , but this is not done here and is instead used as a con mation of the scaling picture.

VIII. ALGORITHM IC SLOW ING DOW N

In the 3D RFM, it was found that the number of operations carried out by the ground state algorithm diverged near the ferrom agnetic-param agnetic transition. In this section, sim ilar results are presented for the 4D RFM. The scaling results here have greater accuracy near the transition. The scaling is found to be quite consistent with the heuristic picture presented in Ref. 33.

The key quantitative relation to be elucidated is that



FIG.12: P lot of $P_{P;+}$ (2;h;L), the probability that, at given sample size L and disorder h, the ground state with periodic boundary conditions will dier from ground state con gurations for both xed + and boundary conditions, in a volum e of size 2^4 in the center of the volum e L^4 . Note that extrapolating to L ! 1 suggests that $P_{P;+}$ (2;h;L) ! 0 for all h. The solid lines are least-squares ts to quartics in $\ln (P)$.



FIG.13: Scaling plot for $P_{P;+}$ (2;h;L), using the scaled probability $P_{P,+}$ L^d d_I and scaled disorder (h h_c)L¹⁼, with values d_I = 32 and = 0.8. The scaling collapse suggests that the changes in boundary conditions typically introduce a nite num ber of dom ain walls (say, one of size L) with $L^{d_{L}}$ bonds at $h = h_c$.

between the number of prim it ive operations carried out to nd the ground state and the physical understanding of the phase transition and correlation volumes. In Ref. 33, it was argued that the time per spin to nd the ground state in the RFIM is directly proportional to the linear size L near the transition. This results from the nature of the push-relabel algorithm 16,34 used, which ef-

ciently constructs a \height" eld over the lattice that



FIG. 14: Plot of the dependence of the maximum of $P_{P_{j+}}$ (2;h;L) over h on the system size L. The solid line isa tto P P;+ L $^{(d d_{I})}$, with d $d_{I} = 0.81 0.02$.



FIG.15: (a) P bt of the num ber of relabel operations per spin, r, carried out by the ground state algorithm as a function of h, for L = 4 ::: 64. (b) P lot of the sam ple-to-sam ple uctuations r in the num ber of relabel operations per spin. This quantity provides an especially sharp and quickly diverging curve for estim ating h_c.

Ref. 33 and supports the relationship between the physical correlation length and the evolution of the algorithm .

IX. SUMMARY

By computing the ground state for a large number of samples of volume up to $L^4 = 64^4$, the quantitative and qualitative therm odynam ic properties of the 4D RFIM have been studied. The derived exponents satisfy the conventional scaling relations. The values of the exponents and location of the transition are consistent with, but are based on larger systems than, the results for the Gaussian 4D RFM published in Refs. 11,25. Note that, as in previous work, the value for is the least certain and that errors in propagate to estimates of and . The picture of a single transition from a nearly-two-folddegenerate ferrom agnetic state to a single param agnetic state is con med by comparing ground states with varying boundary conditions. Strong evidence is presented that the picture of dom ain walls developed¹⁶ for the 3D RFM must be modi ed to describe the 4D RFM. In particular, the percolation of frozen and m inority spins within the ferrom agnetic phase implies that the sets of connected sam e-sign spins are not the boundaries of dom ain walls. The empirical running times for the ground state algorithm peak near the phase transition in a manner consistent with previous descriptions,^{16,33} with the peak running time per spin apparently proportional to the linear system size. The algorithm ic running times provide a check on the location of the transition and the scaling exponent .

I would like to thank D anielF isher for discussions and A lexandar H artm ann for communicating related work prior to its submission. This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under G rant No. DM R-0109164.



FIG.16: Linear plot of the height of the peak $r_p(L)$ in r vs. h. The value of r_p scales alm ost exactly linearly with L.

guides the \setminus ow " (corresponding to the redistribution of excess \setminus uid" or external magnetic eld $\underline{h}.)$

The relabel operation is one of the primitive operations carried out during the convergence of the algorithm to the physical ground state. In Fig. 15, the sam ple average r of the num ber of relabel operations per spin and the sam pleto-sam ple uctuations in r, r, are plotted as a function of h for di erent L. (Results for the num ber of the other primitive operations, the push operations, are quite sim – ilar.) There is clearly a peak in both quantities near h_c, with the peak in the sam pleto-sam ple uctuations being m ore sharply peaked, relative to the non-critical contribution³⁵.

The r(h) curves were twith fourth-order polynom ials to extract the peak value $r_p(L)$. The plot of this quantity is shown in Fig.16. A linear t is shown, which is remarkably consistent with the data over a wide range of L. The result is in agreement with the arguments of

- ¹ J. Z. Imbrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 1747 (1984); Comm. M ath. Phys. 98, 145 (1985). J. Briam ont and A. Kupiainen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 1829 (1987). M. A izenm an and J. W ehr, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2503 (1989).
- ² For a review, see T.N attern ann in \Spin G lasses and R andom Fields", ed.A.P.Young (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1998).
- ³ M. M ezard and A.P. Young, Europhys. Lett. 18, 653 (1992); M. M ezard and R. M onasson, Phys. Rev. B 50, 7199 (1994).
- ⁴ M.S.Cao and J.M achta, Phys. Rev. B 48, 3177 (1993).
- ⁵ H.Rieger and A.P.Young, J.Phys. A 26, 5279 (1993).
- ⁶ H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. B 52, 6659 (1995), condmat/9503041.
- ⁷ M.E.J.Newman and G.T.Barkema, Phys.Rev.E 53, 393 (1996), cond-mat/9507044.
- 8 J.Machta, M.E.J.Newman, and L.B.Chayes, Phys.

Rev.E 62,8782 (2000), cond-m at/0006267.

- ⁹ J.C.A. d'Auriac, M. Preissmann, and R.Rammal, J. Phys.Lett. 46, L173 (1985).
- ¹⁰ A.T.Ogielski, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 1251 (1986).
- ¹¹ M.R.Swift, A.J.Bray, A.Maritan, M.Cieplak, and J.R.Banavar, Europhys. Lett. 38, 273 (1997), condmat/9705289.
- ¹² J.C. Angles d'Auriac and N. Sourlas, Europhys. Lett. 39, 473 (1997), cond-m at/9704088.
- ¹³ N. Sourlas, Comp. Phys. Comm. 121, 184 (1999), condmat/9810231.
- ¹⁴ A.K.Hartmann and U.Nowak, Eur. Phys. J.B 7, 105 (1999), cond-m at/9807131.
- ¹⁵ A.K. Hartmann and P.Young, Phys. Rev. B 64, 214419 (2001), cond-m at/0105310.
- ¹⁶ A.A.M iddleton and D.S.Fisher, Phys.Rev.B 65, 134411 (2002), cond-m at/0107489.

- ¹⁷ I.Dukovskiand J.Machta, cond-mat/0207438.
- ¹⁸ D.S.Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 416 (1986).
- ¹⁹ J.Villain, J.Phys. 46, 1843 (1985).
- ²⁰ M. Schwartz and A. So er, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 2499 (1985).
- ²¹ A.A.M iddleton, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 1672 (1999), condm at/9904285.
- ²² J. Satooka, H. A. K atori, A. Tobo and K. K atsum ata, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 709 (1998), cond-m at/9801039.
- ²³ R. J. Birgeneau, Q. Feng, Q. J. Harris, J. P. Hill, A. P. Ram irez, and T. R. Thurston, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1198 (1995).
- ²⁴ D.P.Belanger, A.R.King, V.Jaccarino, and J.L.Cardy, Phys. Rev. B 28, 2522 (1983).
- ²⁵ A.K.Hartmann, cond-m at/0201441.
- ²⁶ W .L.M cM illan, Phys. Rev. B 30, 476 (1984).
- ²⁷ A.J.Bray and M.A.Moore, Phys. Rev. B 31, 631 (1985).
- ²⁸ J. Esser, U. Nowak, and K. D. Usadel, Phys. Rev. B 55, 5866 (1997), cond-m at/9612022.
- ²⁹ E.T. Seppala, A.M. Pulkkinen, and M.J.A lava, cond-

m at/0206376.

- ³⁰ D.A.Huse and D.S.Fisher, J.Phys.A 20, L997 (1987); D.S.Fisher and D.A.Huse, J.Phys.A 20, L1005 (1987).
- ³¹ C. M. Newm an and D. L. Stein, Phys. Rev. B 46, 973 (1992); Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2286 (1994); 76, 515 (1996), adap-org/9508006; 76, 4821 (1996); C. M. Newm an and D. L. Stein, Phys. Rev. E 55, 5194 (1997), cond-m at/9612097; 57, 1356 (1998), cond-m at/9711010.
- ³² M. Palassini and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 60, 9919 (1999), cond-m at/9904206.
- ³³ A.A.M iddleton, Phys.Rev.Lett.88, 017202 (2002), condm at/0104185.
- ³⁴ M J.A lava, P M .D uxbury, C .M oukarzeland H .R ieger, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenom ena, Vol. 18, eds. C .D om b and J.L.Lebow itz, (A cadem ic Press, San D iego, 2001).
- 35 The non-critical background to r or $\rm _r$ m ay, however, have a m agnitude that slow ly diverges with L , as discussed in R ef. 33.