

# A real space renormalization group approach to spin glass dynamics

Falk Scheffler,<sup>1</sup> Hajime Yoshino,<sup>2</sup> and Philipp Maass<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Fachbereich Physik, Universität Konstanz, 78457 Konstanz, Germany*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Earth and Space Science, Faculty of Science,  
Osaka University, Toyonaka, 560-0043 Osaka, Japan*

<sup>3</sup> *Institut für Physik, Technische Universität Ilmenau, 98684 Ilmenau, Germany*  
(Dated: February 16, 2003)

The slow non-equilibrium dynamics of the Edwards–Anderson spin glass model on a hierarchical lattice is studied by means of a coarse-grained description based on renormalization concepts. We evaluate the isothermal aging properties and show how the occurrence of temperature chaos is connected to a gradual loss of memory when approaching the overlap length. This leads to rejuvenation effects in temperature shift protocols and to rejuvenation–memory effects in temperature cycling procedures with a pattern of behavior parallel to experimental observations.

Almost all glassy systems exhibit aging effects [1] which reflect a slowing down of the dynamics. Spin glasses exhibit the unusual feature that even small changes of temperature let them appear as if they had experienced a much shorter thermalization period, which is known as rejuvenation. Puzzlingly, they on the other hand keep quite accurate memories of their past thermal histories [2, 3]. These phenomena call for a consistent theoretical explanation.

In this Letter, we construct a simple yet powerful coarse-grained approach for the relaxational dynamics of the Edwards–Anderson (EA) Ising spin glass model on the hierarchical lattice associated with the Migdal–Kadanoff (MK) approximation. This approach allows us to incorporate the exact real space renormalization group (RSRG) transformations [4, 5] into an effective non-equilibrium dynamics on large time and length scales, which remain out of reach by the conventional Monte Carlo technique. By employing computer simulations of the effective dynamics and analytical approaches combined with scaling arguments we show how temperature chaos [4, 5, 6, 7] progressively rejuvenates the system after temperature shifts and how memory effects emerge after temperature cycling.

The hierarchical lattice of the MK approximation for the EA model in three dimensions is constructed iteratively as depicted in Fig. 1. To each bond in this lattice, a random exchange interaction is assigned drawn from a

Gaussian distribution with zero mean and variance  $J^2$ .

The hierarchical construction of the lattice implies a hierarchy of time scales in the system’s relaxation. The spins  $\{S^{(0)}\}$  with only two neighbors introduced in the last iteration step belong to the lowest level of the hierarchy and relax most quickly. Spins  $\{S^{(n)}\}$  at increasingly higher levels  $n$  in the hierarchy have an exponentially increasing number  $2 \times 4^n$  of nearest neighbors and relax with correspondingly slower rates. In the MK renormalization approach the spins  $\{S^{(n)}\}$  are associated with an exponentially increasing length scale  $L_n = 2^n L_0$  where  $L_0$  is the lattice constant. For temperatures  $T$  below the spin glass transition temperature  $T_c \simeq 0.88J$  [5], the effective energy barrier  $E_n$  for excitations (“flips” of domains or droplets [7], see below) of length scale  $L_n$  will scale as  $E_n \sim J(L_n/L_0)^\psi$  with some exponent  $\psi$ . Hence we define the relaxation time  $t_n$  for spins at level  $n$  as

$$t_n/\tau_0 = \exp[(J/T)(L_n/L_0)^\psi] = \exp[2^{n\psi}(J/T)], \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau_0$  is a microscopic time unit. The time period  $t_n$  is denoted as the  $n$ th epoch following [7].

Our effective dynamics proceeds by successive epochs. Since these grow with level  $n$  exponentially even on a logarithmic time axis, we consider, in the  $n$ th epoch, the spins  $\{S^{(n+1,n+2,\dots)}\}$  to be frozen in and the spins  $\{S^{(n,n-1,\dots,0)}\}$  to fluctuate with strongly decreasing relaxation times  $t_n \gg t_{(n-1)} \gg \dots \gg t_0$ . In the  $n$ th epoch, we then first thermalize (align with Boltzmann weights) the spins  $S_i^{(n)}$  in their effective (time-averaged) local fields  $h_i^{(n)} = \sum_j J_{ij}^{(n)} S_j^{(n+1,n+2,\dots)}$ . Here  $J_{ij}^{(n)}$  are the effective couplings given by the RSRG transformation [4, 5]  $J_{ij}^{(n)} = T \sum_{k=1}^4 \tanh^{-1}[\tanh(J_{ik}^{(n-1)}/T) \tanh(J_{jk}^{(n-1)}/T)]$ , which take into account the thermalization of the faster spins at lower levels  $n' < n$ . In the second step, the spins  $S_i^{(n-1)}$  are thermalized in their effective local fields  $h_i^{(n-1)}$ , which depend on the spins  $S_i^{(n)}$  updated in the first step (and the effective couplings  $\{J^{(n-1)}\}$ ). By repeating this procedure, the spins  $\{S^{(n)}\}, \{S^{(n-1)}\}, \dots, \{S^{(0)}\}$  are updated one after the other in the  $n$ th epoch.




FIG. 1: Sketch of the hierarchical lattice. The iterative construction corresponds to going from the left to the right in the figure. Each bond in one iterative step is replaced by four pairs of bonds with a new Ising spin in between.

To characterize the non-equilibrium properties of the system we consider a quench from  $T = \infty$  to  $T < T_c$  at time zero and study the spin autocorrelation function

$$C(t_m, t_n) = \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha} \sum_{i_{\alpha}} \overline{\langle S_{i_{\alpha}}^{(\alpha)}(t_n + t_m) S_{i_{\alpha}}^{(\alpha)}(t_n) \rangle}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denotes a thermal average and an average over random initial spin orientations for a fixed realization of the disorder, while the bar denotes the disorder average over the random bonds. The  $w_{\alpha} > 0$ ,  $\sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha} = 1$ , are weighting factors, which allow one to take into account that spins at different levels are not equivalent. A natural choice is to take  $w_{\alpha}$  proportional to the connectivity  $\propto 4^{\alpha}$  of spins  $\{S^{(\alpha)}\}$  and we present our results for this case. We have checked, however, that the choice  $w_{\alpha} = \text{const.}$  [8] yields analogous results. Recently, direct experimental measurements of the correlation function have been conducted in a spin glass [10].

The time evolution of the system is best analyzed in terms of clusters, which are realizations of domains or droplets postulated in scaling arguments [7]. A cluster is defined for each effective coupling  $J^{(\alpha)}$  and consists of all faster spins at levels below  $\alpha$ , which are traced out in the RSRG to give  $J^{(\alpha)}$ . Each cluster has two boundary spins which are the spins connected by  $J^{(\alpha)}$  after renormalization. One is a spin  $S^{(\alpha)}$  at level  $\alpha$ , which we call the “master spin” of the cluster. The other is a still slower spin of level  $\gamma > \alpha$ . An important remark is that  $2J^{(\alpha)}$  is the difference of the cluster’s free energies of the cases that the boundary spins are parallel and anti-parallel. If the master spin flips but the slower boundary spin keeps unchanged, the spins in the interior of the cluster are exposed to a “twisted-boundary condition”, which triggers flips of a  $O(1)$  fraction of these spins. It is by this mechanism that fluctuations occurring at high levels propagate down and erase correlations of the low-level spins.

In fact, these de-correlations caused by twisted boundaries can be quantified in a precise manner. Let us consider a certain spin  $\hat{S}^{(\alpha)}$  at level  $\alpha$ . Since the clusters are hierarchically nested, this spin  $\hat{S}^{(\alpha)}$  is part of unique clusters with master spins  $\hat{S}^{(\gamma)}$ ,  $\gamma > \alpha$ . By using symmetry considerations we can write for the correlator appearing in Eq. (2)

$$\overline{\langle \hat{S}^{(\alpha)}(t_n + t_m) \hat{S}^{(\alpha)}(t_n) \rangle} = \frac{1}{[1 - 2r_{\alpha}(t_m, t_n)] \prod_{\gamma=\alpha+1}^m [1 - r_{\gamma}(t_m, t_n)]}, \quad (3)$$

where  $r_{\gamma}(t_m, t_n)$  is the probability that the spin  $\hat{S}^{(\gamma)}$  flips between  $t_n$  and  $t_n + t_m$  under the condition that the master spins  $\hat{S}^{(\gamma)}$  remained unchanged (for a given realization of the disorder). The product over  $\gamma$  in Eq. (3) is the consequence of the twisted boundary effect: None of the boundary spins of the “super”-clusters




FIG. 2: Spin autocorrelation function  $C(t_m, t_n)$  as a function of  $L(t_m)$  at  $T/T_c = 0.3$  (open symbols) and  $T_c = 0.7$  (filled symbols) for  $L(t_n)/L_0 = 2^0, 2^2, \dots, 2^{14}$  (from left to right). Here and in the following, the system size was  $2^{15} L_0$ .

containing the spin  $\hat{S}^{(\alpha)}$  is allowed to flip between  $t_n$  and  $t_n + t_m$ , if  $S^{(\alpha)}(t_n + t_m)$  should give a non-zero overlap with  $S^{(\alpha)}(t_n)$ . For small flip probabilities  $r_{\gamma} \ll 1$ , the right hand side of Eq. (3) can be linearized, yielding  $1 - 2\bar{r}_{\alpha} - \sum_{\gamma=\alpha+1}^m \bar{r}_{\gamma}$ .

*Isothermal aging* – Let us first discuss the isothermal aging properties. Fig. 2 shows the simulated  $C(t_m, t_n)$  as a function of  $L(t_m)/L_0 = [(T/J) \log(t_m/\tau_0)]^{1/\psi}$  [cf. Eq. (1)]. Clearly, there are two different regimes, a quasi-equilibrium regime with a slow decay for  $L(t_m) \leq L(t_n)$  and the aging regime with a fast decay for  $L(t_m) > L(t_n)$ .

Relaxation in the quasi-equilibrium regime  $L(t_m) \leq L(t_n)$  is close to that of the equilibrium limit  $C_{\text{eq}}(t_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C(t_m, t_n)$ . In the low- $T$  limit the behavior of  $C_{\text{eq}}(t_m)$  can be derived by considering thermal fluctuations from the ground states. At  $T = 0$  a spin  $S_i^{(\alpha)}$  points in the direction of the effective local field  $h_i^{(\alpha)}$ . Accordingly, for  $T \gtrsim 0$  spin flips become likely if the energy gap  $\Delta_{\alpha} = 2|h_i^{(\alpha)}|$  is smaller than the thermal energy  $T$ . We have investigated numerically the distribution  $\rho(\Delta_{\alpha})$  of the energy gaps and found that it follows an analogous scaling form as the distribution of renormalized bonds [7]

$$\rho(\Delta_{\alpha}) d\Delta_{\alpha} = \tilde{\rho} \left( \frac{\Delta_{\alpha}}{J(L_{\alpha}/L_0)^{\theta}} \right) \frac{d\Delta_{\alpha}}{J(L_{\alpha}/L_0)^{\theta}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\tilde{\rho}(0) > 0$  and  $\theta \simeq 0.26$  [5] is the stiffness exponent. As a consequence, we obtain up to terms of order  $O(T^2, L_{\alpha}^{-1-\theta})$  for the disorder averaged flip probabilities  $\bar{r}_{\gamma} \sim c(T/J)(L_{\gamma}/L_0)^{-\theta} \ll 1$  with  $c = \tilde{\rho}(0)/2$ . Using the linearized form of Eq. (3) this yields

$$C_{\text{eq}}(t_m) \sim q_{\text{EA}} + c' \frac{T}{J} \left( \frac{L(t_m)}{L_0} \right)^{-\theta}, \quad (5)$$

where  $c' = c/(2^{\theta} - 1)$  and the Edwards–Anderson order parameter  $q_{\text{EA}}$  decreases linearly with  $T$ ,  $q_{\text{EA}} \sim 1 - \text{const.} T$ . Indeed, we could well fit the data in Fig. 2

to Eq. (5) and thereby extract  $q_{\text{EA}}$ , which we found to decrease linearly with  $T$  except possibly close to  $T_c$ .

In the aging regime  $L(t_m) > L(t_n)$ , the master spins at levels  $n < \gamma \leq m$  are newly thermalized and flip with probability  $r_\gamma = 1/2$ . Taking this into account in Eq. (3) we find the exact relation

$$C(t_m, t_n) = C(t_n, t_n) \left( \frac{L(t_m)}{L(t_n)} \right)^{-\lambda} \quad (6)$$

with  $\lambda = 1$ . Equations (5,6) agree with the scaling forms suggested by the droplet scaling theory [7].

*Temperature/bond shift protocols* – Next we proceed to our central issue and investigate the implication of temperature chaos on aging and rejuvenation effects in




FIG. 3: (a) Spin autocorrelation function  $C(t_m, t_n)$  as a function of  $L(t_m)$  in twin temperature shift protocols ( $0.3T_c, 0.7T_c$ ) (open symbols) and ( $0.7T_c, 0.3T_c$ ) (filled symbols) for  $L(t_n)/L_0 = 2^0, 2^2, \dots, 2^{14}$  (from left to right). According to [5], the overlap length between the two temperatures is  $L^*/L_0 = 2^7 - 2^8$ . (b) Scaling plot of the normalized autocorrelation function  $\hat{C}_\infty(t_m; \delta)$  as a function of  $[L(t_m)/L^*(\delta)]^\zeta$  with  $\zeta = 0.74$  [5]. The open/filled symbols are for temperature/bond shifts with  $\delta = 0.1$  (square),  $0.2$  (circle) and  $0.5$  (triangle). The  $T$ -shifts started from  $T_1 = 0.3T_c$ , while the bond shifts were in the  $T = 0$ -limit of the dynamics. The prefactor of  $L^*(\delta)$  is chosen such that the two master curves for temperature and bond shifts merge with each other. The inset shows the initial decay of  $\hat{C}_\infty(t_m; \delta)$  in agreement with Eq. (7).

temperature shift protocols ( $T_1, T_2$ ). The system evolves first at temperature  $T_1$  for time  $t_n$  and then the temperature is switched to  $T_2 = T_1 + \Delta T$ , corresponding to a perturbation of strength  $\delta \equiv |\Delta T|/T_c$ .

Figure 3a shows the correlation function  $C(t_m, t_n)$  as a function of  $L(t_m)$  obtained from our computer simulations. As in Fig. 2, we can identify an aging regime for  $L(t_m) > L(t_n)$ . Indeed the scaling from Eq. (6) holds exactly with the same underlying mechanism as in the isothermal case. In this respect the aging effect does not stop. However, the limiting curve  $C_\infty(t_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C(t_m, t_n)$  decays to zero for  $t_m \rightarrow \infty$  while that of isothermal aging converges to the plateau  $q_{\text{EA}}$  [see Eq. (5)]. Hence the aging effect becomes progressively irrelevant and the system rejuvenates, suggesting that temperature chaos effect is coming into play.

Another remarkable observation from Fig. 3a is that  $C(t_m, t_n)$  remains unchanged when  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are interchanged. Due to symmetry this must hold true for  $t_m = t_n$ , and, because of (6), it is exactly valid for  $t_m > t_n$  also. For  $t_m < t_n$ , it can be shown based on Eq. (3) that deviations, if occurring at all, must be very small. The symmetry supports the results of recent “twin-experiments” performed on a spin glass [9].

To understand the behavior of  $C_\infty(t_m)$  it is important to note that a temperature shift affects the spin flip probabilities in two ways: (i) it changes the effective couplings due to the  $T$ -dependence of the RSRG transformations and hence the effective fields, and (ii) it changes the weighting of these fields in the Boltzmann probabilities. In order to isolate the subtle effect (i) from the obvious effect (ii) we introduce a correlation function that is normalized by the isothermal correlation functions at temperatures  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ,  $\hat{C}_\infty(t_m) \equiv C_\infty(t_m)/\sqrt{C_{\text{eq}}(t_m)_{T_1} C_{\text{eq}}(t_m)_{T_2}}$ . It can be shown that  $\hat{C}_\infty = 1 + O(\delta^2)$  if effect (i) is absent.

Now we can focus on effect (i) and estimate the induced flip probability  $\bar{r}_\alpha(\delta)$  of a master spin  $\hat{S}^{(\alpha)}$ . A flip of such a spin becomes likely if the typical change of effective couplings  $\Delta J^{(\alpha)}$  induced by the temperature shift exceeds the original energy gap  $\Delta_\alpha$  before the shift, i.e.  $\bar{r}_\alpha(\delta) \sim \int_0^{\Delta J^{(\alpha)}} d\Delta_\alpha \rho(\Delta_\alpha)$ . As noted above,  $2J^{(\alpha)}$  is the difference of the free energies of the associated cluster between the two states with parallel and anti-parallel boundary spins, which below  $T_c$  have a “relative domain wall” that passes through  $L_\alpha^{d-1}$  links. Accordingly, one can write for the free energy change  $2\Delta J^{(\alpha)} \sim \Delta[TS_\alpha]$ , where  $S_\alpha$  is the difference of the entropies associated with the two states. As shown in [5, 6, 7],  $S_\alpha$  is the sum of random local entropy fluctuations associated with the  $L_\alpha^{d-1}$  links along the relative domain wall, yielding  $S_\alpha \sim L_\alpha^{(d-1)/2}$ . It follows that  $\Delta J^{(\alpha)} \sim \delta L_\alpha^{(d-1)/2}$  and hence  $\bar{r}_\gamma(\delta) \sim \int_0^{[L_\gamma/L^*(\delta)]^\zeta} dy \tilde{\rho}(y)$ , where  $L^*(\delta)/L_0 \sim \delta^{-1/\zeta}$  is the so-called overlap length. The exponent  $\zeta = (d-1)/2 - \theta \simeq 0.74$  is called the chaos exponent




FIG. 4: Rejuvenation and memory: relaxation of the autocorrelation function after one-step temperature cycling  $T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_1$  with  $T_1 = 0.3T_c$  and  $T_2 = 0.7T_c$ . The duration of the first stage is varied as  $L(t_n)/L_0 = 2^0, 2^2, \dots, 2^{14}$  from left to right. The duration of the second stage is  $L(t_{n'})/L_0 = 2^4$  (open symbols) and  $2^8$  (filled symbols).

[6, 7].

In the *weakly perturbed regime*  $L(t_m) \ll L^*(\delta)$  the flip rates are small,  $\bar{r}_\gamma(\delta) \sim \tilde{\rho}(0)[L_\gamma/L^*(\delta)]^\zeta$ , and using the linearized Eq. (3) we obtain

$$\hat{C}_\infty(t_m; \delta) = 1 - c\tilde{\rho}(0) \left( \frac{L(t_m)}{L^*(\delta)} \right)^\zeta \quad (7)$$

where  $c$  is a constant. Quite importantly this means that the rejuvenation effect does not appear suddenly at the overlap length  $L^*(\delta)$  but rather gradually emerges. Very similar scaling for the emergence of the rejuvenation effect is found in the “twin-experiment” mentioned above [9].

In the late stage  $L(t_m) \gg L^*(\delta)$ , which we call *strongly perturbed regime*, the flip rates become  $1/2$ . Then similarly to Eq. (6) we expect,

$$\hat{C}_\infty(t_m; \delta) \sim \left( \frac{L(t_m)}{L^*(\delta)} \right)^{-\lambda} \quad (8)$$

with  $\lambda = 1$ .

Equivalent effects are expected for bond shifts [6, 7]. In a bond shift, the bare couplings  $J_{ij}$  are replaced by  $(J_{ij} + \delta J'_{ij})/\sqrt{1 + \delta^2}$ , where  $J'_{ij}$  are Gaussian random numbers obeying the same statistics as the  $J_{ij}$ , and  $\delta$  is the perturbation strength.

We tested the above scaling ansatz numerically. As demonstrated in Fig. 3, they work very well. Quite remarkably the form of the master curve is apparently universal for both temperature and bond shifts.

*Temperature cycling*—Finally, we study rejuvenation and memory effects after one step temperature cycling. Therein, the system evolves at a temperature  $T_1$  for a time  $t_n$  and subsequently at another temperature  $T_2$  for a time  $t_{n'}$ . Then the temperature is put back to  $T_1$  and we measure the autocorrelation function  $C(t_m, t_{n'}, t_n)$ ,

which is the overlap between the spin configuration at time  $t_n + t_{n'}$  and that after some additional time  $t_m$ .

Figure 4 shows the simulated data. The initial decay shows rejuvenation: There is no trace of aging during the first stage and  $C(t_m, t_{n'}, t_n)$  follows the autocorrelation function  $C(t_m, t_{n'}; \delta = |T_1 - T_2|/T_c)$  as after a simple  $T$ -shift ( $T_2, T_1$ ). If  $L_{T_1}(t_n) > L_{T_2}(t_{n'})$ , this rejuvenated, new aging is however terminated after the recovery time  $t_{m^*}$  determined by  $L_{T_1}(t_{m^*}) = L_{T_2}(t_{n'})$  [11]. There, a plateau region shows up indicating that the system’s evolution recovers length scales already thermalized at temperature  $T_1$  during the first stage. Eventually, for  $t_m > t_n$ , the system also memorizes the limits of this first thermalization and  $C(t_m, t_{n'}, t_n)$  enters a steep decay analogous to Eq. (6) in the isothermal case. We confirmed that bond cycling yields analogous results.

The two stage relaxation is reminiscent of the experimentally observed rejuvenation–memory effects [2, 3]. Here slow spins play the role of ghost domains proposed in [11]. After strong perturbations, configurations of faster spins which occupy a dominant portion of the volume of a cluster are changed but slower spins in the same volume retain their original configuration. The slower spins act as remanent symmetry breaking fields by which both the original *amplitude* and *sign* of the overlap with respect to the equilibrium state can be restored.

F.S. thanks the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Japanese Ministry of Science (MEXT) for financial support during a stay in Japan. H.Y. is supported by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research 14740233.

- 
- [1] J.-P. Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and M. Mézard, in *Spin Glasses and Random Fields*, A. P. Young Editor (World Scientific, 1998).
  - [2] E. Vincent, J. Hamman, M. Ocio, J.-P. Bouchaud, and L. F. Cugliandolo, in *Proceeding of the Sitges Conference on Glass Systems*, E. Rubi Editor (Springer, 1996).
  - [3] P. Nordblad and P. Svedlindh, in *Spin Glasses and Random Fields*, A. P. Young Editor (World Scientific, 1998).
  - [4] J. R. Banavar and A. J. Bray, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 8888 (1987); M. Ney-Nifle and H. J. Hilhorst, Physica A **193**, 48 (1993).
  - [5] T. Aspelmeier, A. J. Bray, and M. A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 197202 (2002).
  - [6] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 57 (1987).
  - [7] D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 386 (1988); *ibid.* **373** (1988).
  - [8] F. Ricci-Tersenghi and F. Ritort, J. Phys. A **33**, 3727 (2000).
  - [9] P. E. Jönsson, H. Yoshino, and P. Nordblad, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 097201 (2002); *ibid.* **90**, 059702 (2003).
  - [10] D. Hérisson and M. Ocio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 257202 (2002).
  - [11] H. Yoshino, A. Lemaitre, and J.-P. Bouchaud, Eur. Phys. J. B **20**, 367 (2001).