

# A test of non-equilibrium thermodynamics in glassy systems: the soft-sphere case

E. La Nave\*, F. Sciortino\*, P. Tartaglia\*

*\*Dipartimento di Fisica, INFN UdR and Center for Statistical Mechanics and Complexity,  
Università di Roma La Sapienza, P.le A. Moro 5, I-00185 Rome, Italy*

M. S. Shell<sup>†</sup> and P. G. Debenedetti<sup>†</sup>

*<sup>†</sup>Department of Chemical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544*

The scaling properties of the soft-sphere potential allow the derivation of an exact expression for the pressure of a frozen liquid, i.e., the pressure corresponding to configurations which are local minima in its multidimensional potential energy landscape. The existence of such a relation offers the unique possibility for testing the recently proposed extension of the liquid free energy to glassy out-of-equilibrium conditions and the associated expression for the temperature of the configurational degrees of freedom. We demonstrate that the non-equilibrium free energy provides an exact description of the soft-sphere pressure in glass states.

The potential energy landscape (PEL) formalism [1] has provided a transparent formulation of the equilibrium free energy of supercooled liquids based on the statistical properties of a system's multidimensional potential energy surface [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], i.e., in terms of the number, depth, and associated phase-space volume of local potential energy minima [9]. This formalism, in which the PEL minima are termed inherent structures (IS), is well suited to the description of supercooled liquids and glasses. While the liquid explores an exponentially large number of distinct PEL basins, a glass explores only a very small fraction of these (within an experimentally-accessible time frame.) The equilibrium free energy is written as sum of two contributions: an entropic term,  $-TS_{\text{conf}}(E_{\text{IS}})$ , which accounts for the number of basins of depth  $E_{\text{IS}}$ , and the term  $E_{\text{IS}} + F_{\text{vib}}(T, E_{\text{IS}})$ , which describes the free energy of the system confined to an average basin of depth  $E_{\text{IS}}$ . Here,  $S_{\text{conf}}$  is associated with the energy degeneracy of mechanically stable configurations and hence is termed the configurational entropy, while  $F_{\text{vib}}$  is associated with the “vibrational,” kinetic distortions of the system around these configurations. Analogous expressions have been derived from alternative theoretical approaches [10, 11, 12, 13].

The extension of the supercooled liquid free-energy to the out-of-equilibrium case has recently been proposed [12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. In the PEL formalism, out-of-equilibrium conditions are implemented by imposing the constraint that the basin explored by the system while aging does not coincide with the typical equilibrium one [17]. The proposed free energy is given by

$$F(V, T, T_e) = -T_e S_{\text{conf}}(V, E_{\text{IS}}) + E_{\text{IS}} + F_{\text{vib}}(V, T, E_{\text{IS}}) \quad (1)$$

The main distinction between this expression and the equilibrium case is that while  $F_{\text{vib}}$  is still evaluated at the

thermostat temperature  $T$ , the configurational entropy term is weighted by an additional temperature  $T_e$ , which may be thought of as the temperature of the (out-of-equilibrium) configurational degrees of freedom. When  $T_e$  and  $T$  differ, the system is in a non-equilibrium state. While in equilibrium the value of  $E_{\text{IS}}$  is controlled only by  $T$  and  $V$  via the condition  $\partial F(T, V)/\partial E_{\text{IS}} = 0$ , in this non-equilibrium setting the value of  $E_{\text{IS}}$  is also a function of  $T_e$ . In this case the basin depth which the system samples,  $E_{\text{IS}}(V, T, T_e)$ , is the solution of

$$1 + \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} - T_e \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} = 0 \quad (2)$$

This expression is based on the hypothesis that the out-of-equilibrium system samples a distribution of basins similar to the one explored in equilibrium [14, 15, 16, 17]. Inverting  $E_{\text{IS}}(V, T, T_e)$  provides an estimate of  $T_e$  when the bath temperature is  $T$  and the system is confined to a basin of depth  $E_{\text{IS}}$ . As already discussed [17], the expression for  $T_e$  coincides with the experimentally determined fictive temperature [19] for models in which  $\partial F_{\text{vib}}/\partial E_{\text{IS}} = 0$ , i.e., when the phase-space volume of basins is independent of their depth. The same expression for  $T_e$  has been derived also by Franz and Virasoro [16] in the context of  $p$ -spin systems, once the basin free energy is identified with the TAP free energy [10].

Starting from the proposed free energy (Eq. 1) it is possible to calculate the thermodynamic pressure in out-of-equilibrium conditions, when the bath temperature is  $T$  and the configurational temperature is  $T_e$  (i.e. when the system is exploring basins different from those explored in equilibrium at temperature  $T$ ). To this end, we evaluate the constant- $T$  volume-derivative of the free energy in Eq. 1,

$$P(V, T, T_e) = - \left( \frac{\partial F(V, T, T_e)}{\partial V} \right)_{T, T_e} \quad (3)$$

$$= T_e \left[ \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_V \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, T_e} + \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial V} \right)_{E_{\text{IS}}} \right] - \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, T_e} - \left( \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_{T, V} \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, T_e} - \left( \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, E_{\text{IS}}}, \quad (4)$$

and rearranging:

$$P(V, T, T_e) = \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, T_e} \left[ T_e \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_V - 1 - \left( \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_{T, V} \right] + T_e \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial V} \right)_{E_{\text{IS}}} - \left( \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, E_{\text{IS}}}. \quad (5)$$

The first term in the rhs of Eq. 5 is zero by the  $E_{\text{IS}}$  condition in Eq. 2. Thus,

$$P(V, T, T_e) = T_e \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial V} \right)_{E_{\text{IS}}} - \left( \frac{\partial F_{\text{vib}}}{\partial V} \right)_{T, E_{\text{IS}}}. \quad (6)$$

The above expression, when evaluated at the bath temperature  $T = 0K$ , provides the theoretical expression for the pressure experienced in an inherent structure,  $P_{\text{IS}}$ . Indeed, an infinite cooling rate quench to  $T = 0K$  brings the system to the local inherent structure [1, 20]. In other words, the steepest descent procedure used numerically to locate an inherent structure is equivalent to the physical process of setting the bath temperature to  $T = 0K$ . The absolute zero bath temperature eliminates any contribution arising from the vibrational free energy and hence,  $P_{\text{IS}}(V, E_{\text{IS}})$  is

$$P_{\text{IS}}(V, E_{\text{IS}}) = P(V, 0, T_e) = T_e \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial V} \right)_{E_{\text{IS}}}. \quad (7)$$

Using the mathematical identity

$$\left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial V} \right)_{E_{\text{IS}}} = - \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_V \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{S_{\text{conf}}}, \quad (8)$$

and the  $E_{\text{IS}}$  condition in Eq. 2 evaluated at  $T = 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{IS}}(V, E_{\text{IS}}) &= -T_e \left( \frac{\partial S_{\text{conf}}}{\partial E_{\text{IS}}} \right)_V \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{S_{\text{conf}}} \\ &= - \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{S_{\text{conf}}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which provides an alternative definition of the inherent structure pressure.

We now show that the scaling properties of the soft-sphere potential provides a consistency check for the derived expression for  $P_{\text{IS}}$  and, simultaneously, the validity of Eqs. 1 and 2. Indeed, the thermodynamic expression for  $P_{\text{IS}}$  is explicit in the case of the soft-sphere

potential, without further assumptions. This potential has been extensively studied as a model for liquids and glasses [8, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. The potential energy  $E$  of a system composed of  $N$  particles interacting via a soft-sphere potential is  $E(\mathbf{r}^N) = \sum_{i,j>i=1}^N \epsilon (\sigma/|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|)^n$ , where  $\mathbf{r}^N = \{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N\}$  with  $\mathbf{r}_i$  the coordinates of particle  $i$ , and  $\epsilon$  and  $\sigma$  fix the energy and length scales, respectively.

The self-similar nature of the soft-sphere potential has a remarkable property in that uniform scaling of particle coordinates does not produce changes the topology of the potential energy landscape, since  $E(\lambda \mathbf{r}^N) = \lambda^{-n} E(\mathbf{r}^N)$  [30, 31]. In the PEL formalism this scaling property implies that the total number of inherent structures and basins is invariant to volume changes. The scaling has two important additional consequences which we exploit in the present study: (i) an isotropic compression of a configuration which is a local potential energy minimum remains a local minimum; the potential energy change associated with the compression coincides with the change in the  $E_{\text{IS}}$  value; (ii) an isotropic compression moves the soft-sphere system along a path of constant configurational entropy (since the number of basins of depth  $E_{\text{IS}}$  at volume  $V$  is identical to the number of basins of depth  $E_{\text{IS}} + \delta E_{\text{IS}}$  at volume  $V + \delta V$ ). Because  $P_{\text{IS}}$  is the measure of the change of system's energy under a compression of an  $\text{IS}$ -configuration, these two considerations allow us to write  $P_{\text{IS}}$  as the volume derivative of the inherent structure energy along a constant configurational entropy path:

$$P_{\text{IS}}(V, E_{\text{IS}}) = - \left( \frac{\partial E_{\text{IS}}}{\partial V} \right)_{S_{\text{conf}}}. \quad (10)$$

This expression, whose derivation has been based only on the self-similar nature of the soft-sphere potential, coincides with the general expression in Eq. 9 derived from the out-of-equilibrium thermodynamic approach and provides a strong validation of the proposed Eqs. 1-2.

To the extent that the out-of-equilibrium formalism is an appropriate description of systems beyond soft-

spheres, the expression for the inherent structure pressure given by Eq. 9 is quite general. Encouraging support for this statement is given by the behavior of the inherent structure pressure below an ideal glass transition[32].

To summarize, the present Letter provides support for the recently proposed out-of-equilibrium approach to supercooled liquids and its corresponding definition of configurational temperature (i.e., the temperature characterizing a system's sampling of inherent structures which are distinct from those it would sample in equilibrium.) In the context of the soft-sphere system, this non-equilibrium formalism provides a consistent expression for the inherent structure pressure,  $P_{IS}$ . Furthermore, the results presented in this Letter provide a formal and general derivation of  $P_{IS}$  (Eq. 9) in terms of statistical properties of the landscape [8, 18] and open the way for a consistent formulation of thermodynamic properties in disordered materials based on a separation of configurational and vibrational properties.

The Roma group acknowledges support from Miur COFIN 2002 and FIRB and INFM-PRA GenFdT. MSS gratefully acknowledges the support of the Fannie and John Hertz Foundation. PGD gratefully acknowledges the support of the Department of Energy, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences, Office of Basic Energy Science (grant DE-FG02-87ER13714.) We thank J. Kurchan, L. Leuzzi and G. Parisi for constructive criticisms.

---

[1] F. H. Stillinger and T. A. Weber, Phys. Rev. A **25**, 978 (1982).  
 [2] F. Sciortino, W. Kob and P. Tartaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3214 (1999).  
 [3] S. Sastry, Nature (London) **409**, 164 (2001).  
 [4] R. J. Speedy, J. Chem. Phys. **114**, 9069 (2001).  
 [5] A. Heuer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 4051 (1997); S. Büchner, and A. Heuer, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 6507 (1999).  
 [6] P. G. Debenedetti, F. H. Stillinger, T. M. Truskett, and C. P. Lewis Adv. Chem. Eng., **28**, 21 (2001).  
 [7] E. La Nave, S. Mossa and F. Sciortino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 225701 (2002).  
 [8] M. S. Shell, P. G. Debenedetti, E. La Nave and F. Sciortino, J. Chem. Phys. (submitted) (2003).  
 [9] A basin is properly defined as the set of points in configuration space which map to the same local minima under

a steepest descent path.  
 [10] D. J. Thouless, P. W. Anderson and R. G. Palmer, Phil. Mag., **35**, 593 (1977). A. Crisanti, H. Horner and H.J. Sommers, Z. Phys. B **92**, 257 (1993).  
 [11] M. Mezard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 747 (1999).  
 [12] T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5580 (1998); T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, J. Phys. A **L201**, 31 (1998).  
 [13] M. Shultz, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 11319 (1998).  
 [14] L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and L. Peliti, Phys. Rev. E **55**, 3898 (1997).  
 [15] L. Leuzzi and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. E, **64**, 066125 (2001); L. Leuzzi and T. M. Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 011508 (2001).  
 [16] S. Franz and M. A. Virasoro, J. Phys. A **33**, 891 (2000).  
 [17] F. Sciortino and P. Tartaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 107 (2001).  
 [18] S. Mossa *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. B **30**, 351 (2002).  
 [19] A. Q. Tool, J. Am. Ceram. Soc. **29**, 240 (1946).  
 [20] We consider a quench of infinite cooling rate to be the continuous depletion of kinetic energy; as a result of this procedure, the system relaxes to its local mechanically stable configuration.  
 [21] Note that the excess free energy of the soft-sphere system is a function of only one thermodynamic variable  $z = \sigma^3 \frac{(\beta\epsilon)^{3/n}}{V}$  [22].  
 [22] J. P. Hansen and I. R. McDonald, *Theory of simple liquids*, Academic press. hansen  
 [23] R. W. Hall and P. G. Wolynes, cond matt/0210207 (2003).  
 [24] G. Parisi, Phys Rev Lett. **79** 3660-3663 (1997).  
 [25] B. Coluzzi, M. Mezard, G. Parisi and P. Verrocchio, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 9039 (1999).  
 [26] B. Coluzzi and G. Parisi, J. Phys. A-Math Gen. **31** 4349 (1998).  
 [27] P. G. Debenedetti, F. H. Stillinger, T. M. Truskett, and C. J. Roberts, J. Phys. Chem. B **103**, 7390 (1999).  
 [28] F. H. Stillinger, P. G. Debenedetti, T. M. Truskett, J. Phys. Chem. B, **105**, 11809 (2001).  
 [29] R. Speedy, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. (in press) (2003).  
 [30] F. H. Stillinger, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 48 (1999).  
 [31] F. H. Stillinger, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 63 (2001).  
 [32] Intuitively, configurational properties should be temperature-independent at temperatures below an ideal glass transition, where the system is confined to a configurationally unique structure. We see from Eq. 9 that if the average inherent structure energy is  $T$ -independent and the system is in a unique configuration ( $S_{\text{conf}} = 0$ ), the inherent structure pressure is indeed also  $T$ -independent[8].