

Percolation of frozen order in glassy combinatorial problems

P.M. Duxbury

Dept. of Physics & Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

A local order parameter which is important in the analysis of phase transitions in frustrated combinatorial problems is the probability that a node is frozen in a particular state. There is a percolative transition when an infinite connected cluster of these frozen nodes emerges. In this contribution, we develop theories based on this percolation process and discuss its relation to conventional connectivity percolation. The emergence of frozen order may also be considered to be a form of constraint percolation (CP) which enables us to draw analogies with rigidity percolation and its associated matching problems. We show that very simple CP processes on Bethe lattices lead to the replica symmetric equations for KSAT, coloring and the Viana-Bray model.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k, 05.50.+q, 75.10.Nr

I. INTRODUCTION

There is intense interest in the relations between statistical physics and computational complexity, from both the computer science and physics communities[1, 2]. This activity has resulted in the application of physics methods to computer science [3] and clever extensions of computer science methods to glassy problems[4]. One fascinating result which has emerged from these studies is the existence of phase transitions in computational complexity. These phase transitions are continuous in some cases and are discontinuous in others[5]. More recently the k connectivity and k core[6] problems have attracted interest, for example in designing redundant networks[7]. k connectivity is the generalisation of the conventional connectivity percolation problem to the requirement of k fold connectivity. That is, a graph is k -connected if for each pair of vertices in the graph there exist at least k mutually independent paths connecting them. The k core of a graph is the largest subgraph with minimum vertex degree k . The Bethe lattice equations for the k -core were actually first derived in the context of k -bootstrap percolation[8]. k -bootstrap percolation is the percolation process found by recursively deleting all nodes which have connectivity less than k . More recently the Bethe lattice k core equations have been used to develop theories for rigidity percolation [9, 10, 11]. In this paper, we give a brief introduction to the connectivity percolation and q rigidity equations on Bethe lattices and then describe similar percolation processes which are important in the Viana-Bray spin-glass model, the coloring problem and the K-SAT problem. For these problems we develop equations for the probability that a infinite frozen cluster emerges. We then show that in the simplest approximation, this formalism reproduces the replica symmetric equations in a surprisingly straightforward manner.

Frozen order is a unifying concept in the analysis of glasses and geometrically frustrated systems in

physics[12] and also in NP-complete problems in computer science, such as coloring[13] and K-SAT[2]. Frozen long-range order is most easily understood at zero temperature. At zero temperature the paradigm geometry is to fix the variables on a surface of the system and then to test whether these frozen degrees of freedom cause the propagation of frozen order into the bulk of a sample. A spin is frozen only if the spin is fixed or constrained by the spin configurations of its neighbors, as we shall demonstrate explicitly below using the Viana-Bray model. Frozen order may occur even though the variables (e.g. the spins in a spin glass) at each vertex of a graph look random. Furthermore, not all of the variables in the system need to freeze. However for the system to be in the frozen ordered ground state, the frozen component must percolate.

The vertex q -coloring problem is equivalent to finding the ground state of the q -state Potts antiferromagnet[14]. Each node of a complex graph may have any one of q colors. The objective is to find the color configuration which minimizes the number of edges which have the same color at each end. The propagation of frozen color has many conceptual similarities with the propagation of rigidity in central force networks[15, 16]. However there is a key difference which makes the coloring problem NP-complete whereas the rigidity problem is polynomial. The key difference is that the constraints in coloring are distinguishable while the constraints in rigidity percolation are not.

Spin glasses and many frustrated antiferromagnets map exactly to problems in the NP-complete class[1]. NP-complete problems are of central interest in computer science (CSE)[17] and have motivated many attempts to design quantum algorithms for their efficient solution. The phase transitions which physicists study often correspond to a change in the computational complexity of the corresponding CSE problem. Since these problems are of enormous interest in physics, CSE and also in practical applications it is not surprising that there is a burgeoning of efforts to better understand the phase transition which occurs in NP-complete problems.

It is necessary to consider the effects of randomness on physics problems as randomness is present in most magnetic and electronic materials. The CSE interest in

Electronic address: duxbury@pa.msu.edu

random instances is from a different perspective. The motivation is to find “typical” problem instances which are then used to test the algorithmic complexity of new algorithms. A result of broad importance is the observation of a phase transition in computational complexity in random satisfiability problems[5]. The key quantity is the ratio of the number of constraints, M , to the number of variables, N , and this ratio is $\beta = M/N$. For $\beta < 1$ it is believed that random SAT problems are almost surely in P, while for $\beta > 1$ random SAT problems are almost surely in NP. In addition there is a phase transition as measured by the number of violated clauses in the optimal solution. For $\beta < \beta_c$, the number of violated clauses is of order one, while for $\beta > \beta_c$ the number of violated clauses is of order N . It is believed that $\beta_c = 1$.

The physics community has applied the replica method to NP combinatorial problems with remarkable success[3, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. In addition new algorithms have been developed based on a combination of replica symmetry breaking ideas from physics and belief propagation ideas from the artificial intelligence community[4, 24, 25]. Though the replica method is an excellent tool, it is quite difficult both technically and intuitively. We show that a simple combinatorial procedure based on percolation ideas can reproduce many of the successes of the replica method. The percolation process occurring at the phase transition can be thought of as either percolation of constraint or percolation of frozen order. In this contribution, we derive the replica symmetric theories for K-SAT, the Viana-Bray model and coloring using percolation concepts.

The next section of the paper gives a brief review of the analysis of connectivity percolation on Bethe lattices and random graphs, and also describes its extension to k-connectivity percolation. Section III describes the analysis of the glass transition, at $T = 0$, in the Viana-Bray model. Section IV focuses on the coloring problem, while Section V presents an analysis of K-SAT. Section VI contains a brief summary.

II. CONNECTIVITY AND RIGIDITY PERCOLATION

Percolation on diluted Bethe lattices was analysed by Fisher and Essam[26], who defined the probability that a node is part of the infinite cluster, T . They found that the probability that a node is not on the infinite cluster, $Q = 1 - T$, only requires that all of its connected neighbors also not be part of the infinite cluster, so that,

$$Q = (1 - p(1 - Q))^z \quad (1)$$

where p is the probability that an edge is present in the Bethe lattice, and $z = z - 1$, where z is the co-ordination number of the Bethe lattice. Note that this expression

may be written as,

$$T = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l} (pT)^{l-1} (1 - pT)^{1-l} \quad (2)$$

which is more convenient for the generalisation to rigidity percolation. From Eq. (1), it is easy to show that there is a phase transition at $p_c = 1/z$ and that $T \sim (p - p_c)^1$ near the critical threshold. The phase transition is thus continuous with order parameter exponent one. Somewhat earlier, this transition was also studied in the graph theory community by Erdős and Rényi[27]. They concentrated on random graphs, which consist of highly diluted complete graphs. A complete graph is a graph where every node is connected to every other node. In fact they defined $p = c/N$, where c is finite and showed that a giant (extensive) connected cluster emerges at $c = 1$. They derived an equation for the probability that a node is on the giant cluster, T . Their equation is found from Eq. (2), by taking the limit $p = c/N$; $N = z \rightarrow \infty$, to find $T = 1 - e^{-cT}$. Near the critical point $c = 1$, $T \sim (c - 1)^2$ so, as expected based on the universality hypothesis, also has an order parameter exponent of one.

Rigidity percolation on Bethe lattices, is described by a simple generalisation of Eq. (2). In this generalisation, each node has g degrees of freedom. For example if we wish to model rigidity percolation on central force networks, then $g = d$, where d is the lattice dimension. In order to make a giant g -rigid cluster, we need to constrain the g degrees of freedom at each node with at least g bonds, so we generalise Eq. (2) to,

$$T_g = \sum_{l=g}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l} (pT_g)^{l-1} (1 - pT_g)^{1-l} \quad (3)$$

which is the simple generalisation of Eq. (2) to the requirement of at least g neighbor connections.

Eq. (3) was first invented in the context of a Bethe lattice theory for Bootstrap percolation[8] and has been used more recently to develop a Bethe lattice theory for rigidity percolation [9, 10, 11]. In the random graph limit, Eq. (3) reduces to,

$$T_g = 1 - e^{-c_g T_g} \sum_{l=0}^{g-1} \frac{(c_g T_g)^l}{l!} \quad (4)$$

When $g = 1$ this gives the Erdős-Rényi result[27] for the emergence of a giant cluster in random graphs, while for $g > 1$, there is a discontinuous onset of a finite solution at a sharp threshold c_g [9]. Numerical solution of Eq. (4) indicates that for $g = 2$, $c_2 = 3.3510(1)$. This value has also been found in a recent mathematical analysis[6] of the threshold for the emergence of the giant 3-core on random graphs. The k -core problem is equivalent to the k -bootstrap percolation problem. However the $k+1$ -core is, in general different than the k -rigidity problem, and even on Bethe lattices and random graphs there are some important differences.

The most important difference is that for g -rigidity, the finite solution T_g is metastable for a range of $c > c_g$ [9, 10]. The true rigidity transition actually sets in at $c_r > c_g$ and is identified using constraint counting arguments [10, 11]. Nevertheless the probability of being on the infinite rigid cluster is correctly found from Eq. (4), provided $c > c_r$, where c_r is the rigidity threshold [10, 11]. As we shall see below the analogous theories for glassy combinatorial problems, in particular the Viana Bray model, K-SAT and q -coloring, provide solutions at the level of the replica symmetric theory. Moreover, as will be described elsewhere, the methodology we introduce here can be used to develop simple and accurate recursive algorithms for these glassy problems on general graphs. In the case of first order transitions, as occurs in q -coloring (with $q = 3$) and for K-SAT ($K = 3$), the transition point we find below may mark the onset of metastability. In order to find the true threshold we need to find the ground state energy from the order parameter, in a manner similar to that used in rigidity percolation. This is non trivial and will be elucidated elsewhere.

III. VIANA-BRAY MODEL

We first analyse the onset of frozen order in the Viana-Bray (VB) spin-glass model [28], which provides a basic model for disordered and frustrated magnets, such as $Eu_xSr_{1-x}S$ [29]. The Hamiltonian for the VB model is,

$$H = \sum_{ij} J_{ij} S_i S_j \quad (5)$$

where $S_i = \pm 1$. The exchange constants J_{ij} are randomly drawn from the distribution,

$$D_p(J_{ij}) = p \frac{1}{2} (J_{ij} + J) + \frac{1}{2} (J_{ij} - J) + (1-p) \delta(J_{ij}); \quad (6)$$

As above we focus on the random graph limit $p = c/N$. We introduce the following probabilities:

- P = probability a site is frozen in the up state
- M = probability a site is frozen in the down state
- D = probability a site is degenerate

In the absence of an applied field and within a symmetric assumption, $P = M$ and $D = 1 - 2M$. We then need consider only one of these probabilities. However for clarity and for ease of generalisation, we continue to include M and P separately. In terms of these order parameters, the magnetisation is given by, $m = P - M$ and the spin glass order parameter is, $q = P + M$. The recurrence formula for P , using $p = c/N$ is,

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k! l! (1 - k - l)!} \left(\frac{cP}{2N} + \frac{cM}{2N} \right)^k \left(\frac{cM}{2N} + \frac{cP}{2N} \right)^l \left(1 - \frac{c}{N} (M + P) \right)^{k+l} \quad (7)$$

This is understood as follows. If a bond connects a site at the lower level to a site at the upper level then the site at the upper level wants to be frozen up: if the connecting bond is ferromagnetic and the lower level spin is frozen up; *or* if the connecting bond is antiferromagnetic and the lower level spin is frozen down. This event has probability, $cP/2N + cM/2N$. Similarly, the probability that a spin at the upper level of the bond wants to be frozen down (negative) is given by, $cM/2N + cP/2N$. The newly added spin at the upper level is frozen up if there is a larger number of connections from the upper to the lower level which prefer the frozen up state. The sum in Eq. (7) is thus restricted to events of this sort. The event $(1 - c(P + M)/N)$ is the probability that a site at the lower level in the tree is either degenerate or disconnected from the newly added site. In the large N limit, Eq. (7) reduces to,

$$q = 2e^{-cP} e^{-cM} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\frac{cP}{2}\right)^{k+1}}{k! l!} = 1 - e^{-cP} I_0(cP) \quad (8)$$

where we have used the fact that we are considering a case where the magnetisation $m = 0$. In that case, $M = P = q/2$, where q is the spin glass order parameter. I_0 is the spherical Bessel function of zeroth order. The result (8) has been found before within the replica symmetric solution to the Viana-Bray (VB) model (see Eq. (15) of [19]). Thus symmetric constraint percolation (CP) in the VB model is equivalent to the ground state spin glass transition as found within the replica symmetric approach. The CP approach is attractive because it is simple, it avoids the mathematical difficulties of the replica method and it is physically transparent. The construction we have used makes it clear that simple connectivity is sufficient to ensure propagation of spin glass order in the VB model. Constraint percolation occurs at $c = 1$ and the order parameter approaches zero as $q = \frac{4}{3c^2} (c - 1)$, so the CP transition in this case is continuous, with the same exponent as the Erdős-Rényi transition.

IV. COLORING

Now we turn to the coloring problem. Our analysis centers on the probability F_1 ($1 = 1, 2, \dots, q$), which is the probability that a site is frozen in color 1. The probability F_1 is given by the recursion relation,

$$F_1 = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k_2=s+1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_q=s+1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_{q+1}=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s! k_2! k_3! \dots k_q! k_{q+1}!} (pF_1)^s (pF_2)^{k_2} \dots (pF_q)^{k_q} (1 - p - F_1)^{k_{q+1}} (s + k_1)^{q-1} \quad (9)$$

This formula is understood as follows. In order for a site to be frozen in the color “1”, all of the other $q-1$ colors must appear, and be frozen, on one of the connected neighbor sites. In addition the frozen color “1” must occur, on these neighbor sites, a strictly smaller number of times than any other frozen color. The probability that a neighbor site is connected and frozen in color “1” is pF_1 . This event occurs s times. We thus have a term $(pF_1)^s$ for the color “1”. A similar term applies for each of the other required $q-1$ frozen neighbor colors, with each of them occurring k_1 times. We must also allow for the possibility of events which are not of the type pF_1 , which leads to the term $(1-pF_1)^{k_{q+1}}$. This probability is summed from 0 to infinity as it does not have to exist in a configuration in order to ensure that F_1 be finite. Note however that $(1-pF_1)$ is by far the most likely event in the random graph limit, where $p \ll 1$. All of these probabilities are exclusive and independent. We must also allow for all ways of arranging this set of $q+1$ exclusive events amongst the possible connections between our newly added site and the sites at the lower level in the tree. This leads to the multinomial factor. An equation like (9) occurs for each of the q colors which are allowed. If we assume that all colors have the same probability (which is natural provided there are no symmetry breaking terms), then $F_1 = F_2 = \dots = F_q = F$. Using this, and taking the random graph limit yields,

$$F = qe^{-cF} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s!} \left(\frac{cF}{q}\right)^s \left[\sum_{k=s+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\frac{cF}{q}\right)^k \right]^{q-1} \quad (10)$$

This equation is valid for arbitrary q provided $q \geq 2$.

For $q = 2$, we assume that F is continuous near the percolation threshold and expand this expression in powers of F which yields,

$$F = cF - \frac{3}{4}(cF)^2 + O((cF)^3) \quad (11)$$

This has the solution,

$$F = \frac{4}{3c^2}(c-1) \quad c > 1 \quad (12)$$

This is, other than a prefactor of $4/3c^2$ instead of $2/c^2$, the same as the critical behavior of the giant cluster probability in random graphs[26, 27]. For c well away from the transition, we solve Eq. (10) numerically. The s and k sums are rapidly convergent and for the c range near criticality, only a few terms are required for high accuracy results. From the solution for F we obtain all of the results of interest and they are presented in Fig. 1. The continuous behavior of 2-coloring near threshold is evident from these data.

For $q = 3$, an attempt to find a continuous transition by expanding in powers of F fails. Numerical solution of Eq. (10) is presented in Fig. 2 where it is seen that there is a jump discontinuity in the infinite frozen cluster probability at a sharp threshold. We find that




Figure 1: The coloring order parameters for $q = 2$. The lower two curves are the probability that a site is frozen and colorable, G (the $s = 0$ term in Eq. (10)), and the probability that a site is frozen and frustrated, H (the $s = 1$ term in Eq. (10)). The top curve is the probability that a site has a frozen color $F = G + H$, which is found by solving Eq. (10) with $q = 2$.




Figure 2: The coloring order parameters for $q = 3$. The lower two curves are the probability that a site is frozen and colorable, G (the $s = 0$ term in Eq. (10)), and the probability that a site is frozen and frustrated, H (the $s = 1$ term in Eq. (10)). The top curve is the probability that a site has a frozen color $F = G + H$, which is found by solving Eq. (10) with $q = 3$.

$c_c = 5.14(1)$ and that the jump in the order parameter is $F_c = 0.365(1)$. We thus find that the coloring transition for $q = 3$ is first order as has been found in numerical simulations[13] on random graphs. Our coloring threshold is consistent with a recent replica symmetric numerical calculation, which yielded $c_c = 5.1[21]$, but is significantly higher than that found in the simulation work of Culberson and Gent[13] where $c_c = 4.5 - 4.7$ or in the numerical work on survey propagation[22], which yields $c_c = 4.42$. Nevertheless the nature of the transition is correctly captured by the simple CP theory. It is also important to note that the solution found here may also be metastable for a range of c , as was found in the rigidity case[10]. The onset of metastability is an important threshold from the point of algorithmic efficiency, as it marks the onset of glassy relaxation dynamics. The coloring theory developed above can be formulated in a

very similar way to the formulation of the propagation of the k -core. However there is a critical difference. The constraints in the coloring theory have to be treated as distinguishable, while the constraints in the k -core calculation are indistinguishable.

V. K-SAT

The satisfiability problems we consider ask the question: Given a set of binary variables, $z_i = 0;1$ or equivalently $z_i = \text{True or False}$, is it possible to satisfy a specified set of constraints on these variables? In the K-SAT case, a typical constraint is of the form,


$$(z_1 \wedge \bar{z}_j \wedge z_k) \quad (13)$$

where \wedge is the logical OR operation and the overline indicates a negated variable. This logical clause is satisfied (SAT) if any one of the variables in the clause is SAT. The variables z_i and z_k are SAT if they are true (T), which we take to be $z_i = z_k = 1$, while the variable \bar{z}_j is SAT when z_j is false (F), which corresponds to $z_j = 0$. We shall also fix the number of variables in each clause to be K , which is the K-SAT problem. In these SAT problems we shall randomly choose a set of M clauses like that in Eq. (13) and try to find the assignment of the binary variables which minimizes the number of violated clauses. Each variable appearing in a clause is negated with probability $1/2$ and the number of variables is N . The key ratio is $\phi = M/N$. We would like to find the threshold for constraint percolation. That is, what is the threshold for the appearance of a giant cluster of clauses where each clause is completely specified or “frozen”. These completely specified clauses cannot be altered without increasing the total number of violated clauses, so that they are non-degenerate. There are three types of clauses in an optimal assignment of a formula: (i) Clauses that are SAT but are degenerate; (ii) Clauses that are SAT but are frozen; (iii) Clauses that are UNSAT but are degenerate. Only type (ii) clauses propagate constraint. We seek a formula for the probability, V , that a variable is frozen and the probability, F , that a clause is frozen and SAT.

We make a tree construction of the factor graph for the K-SAT problem (see Fig. 3). The probability that a *variable* is frozen and part of the giant frozen cluster is V and the probability that a *clause* is frozen and part of the giant frozen cluster is F . The branching of the variable nodes has maximum co-ordination M , but the probability that a link actually exists between a node and clause is $p = K/N$. We start by assuming that a variable is frozen at level 1 (see Fig. 3) and then determine the consequences of this assumption at levels 2 and 3.

The probability that a clause is frozen, F , at level 2, given the probability, V , that a variable is frozen at level 1 is given by,

$$F = \left(\frac{V}{2}\right)^{K-1} : \quad (14)$$



$V = \text{probability a variable node is frozen}$
 $F = \text{probability a clause node is frozen}$

Figure 3: The factor graph used to construct the recurrence relations. The circles denote variable nodes, while the square nodes are the clause nodes. V is the probability that a variable node is frozen, while F is the probability that a clause node is frozen (see the text). We assume that a variable at level 1 is frozen and find the probability that a variable at level 3 is frozen. The clause nodes have co-ordination K , while the variable nodes have co-ordination M

This equation is understood as follows. In order for a clause at level 2 to be frozen by the variables at level 1, all of the level 1 variables to which it is connected must be frozen and in conflict with the assignment in the clause. This imposes a fixed assignment on the variable 3. This is the only configuration of variables at level 1 which propagates constraint through a clause to level 3. Now we must consider the cumulative effect of all of the clauses which are connected to the variable at level 3. There are $M-1$ such clauses of which a fraction F propagate constraint (are frozen) according to the mechanism of the previous paragraph. Some of these frozen clauses propagate the requirement x and others propagate the requirement \bar{x} . The variable at level 3 then has three possible states, P = positive, N = negative and D = degenerate. The state of the level 3 variable is degenerate if the number of constrained connections which favor the positive state (x) is the same as the number of connections which favor the negative state (\bar{x}). The probability this variable is frozen (ie. either negated or not) is $V = P + N = 1 - D$ as we are considering the case where the probability that a variable is negated is $1/2$. It is straightforward to generalise to the case of unequal probabilities. The probability that the node at level 3 is degenerate is then,

$$D = \sum_{k=0}^M \frac{M!}{(k!)^2 (M-2k)!} \left(\frac{pF}{2}\right)^{2k} (1-pF)^{M-2k} \quad (15)$$

Where we have used the fact that the probability that a connection occurs between a variable node and a clause node is $p = K/N$. Eq. (15) is understood as follows. The probability that a clause at level 2 is frozen and connected (ie it propagates constraint), and it requires the variable at level 3 to be x is $pF/2$. The probability that this clause propagates constraint and requires the variable at level 3 to be \bar{x} is also $pF/2$. The variable at




Figure 4: The probability that a clause is frozen, F , as a function of $a = \frac{2}{K}$, for 2-SAT.

level 3 is degenerate if these two events occur an equal number of times, hence the term $(pF=2)^{2k}$. The combinatorial factor gives all ways of arranging these events, taking into account that the x and \bar{x} events are distinct. In the thermodynamic limit, using $pM = K$, we find,

$$D = e^{-K F} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(k!)^2} \left(\frac{K F}{2}\right)^{2k} \quad (16)$$

This provides the recurrence formula for $V = 1 - D$ which may be written in the form,

$$V = 1 - e^{-K F} I_0(K F) \quad (17)$$

where I_0 is the spherical Bessel function of zeroth order. Note that $I_0(0) = 1$. For completeness, we note that the probability that the new variable is frozen in the positive (not negated) state is,

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{M!}{(k!)^2 (M-k-l)!} \left(\frac{pF}{2}\right)^{k+1} (1-pF)^{M-k-l} \quad (18)$$

The probability that the variable is frozen in the N state is the same as P for the case we are considering, where the variables have equal probability of being negated and not negated.

Equations (14) and (18) provide the self consistent theory for the onset of a giant constrained cluster in K-SAT. We now analyse this theory for the two typical cases.

The 2-Sat case ($K = 2$)

In this case Eq. (14) is $F = V=2$. Expanding Eq. (17) in powers of F , we then have,

$$F = \frac{1}{2} [1 - (1 - 2F + 2^{-2}F^2 + \dots)(1 + 2^{-2}F^2)] \quad (19)$$

This has the trivial solution $F = 1$. It also has the non-trivial solution

$$F = \frac{2}{3} \quad (20)$$

Thus the random 2-Sat giant cluster emerges smoothly at $a = 1$. Numerical calculation of F from Eqs. (14)




Figure 5: The probability that a clause is frozen, F , as a function of $a = \frac{3}{K}$, for the 3-SAT problem

and (17) is presented in Fig. 4.

The $K = 3$ -Sat case

In these cases, Eq. (14) with (17) do not have a non-trivial solution with a smooth behavior near a critical point. However they do have a non-trivial solution which has a discontinuous onset at a threshold value, $a_c(K)$. This solution is found by iteration of Eq. (14) and Eq. (17) and the results are presented in Fig. 5. We find that although the emergence of the giant cluster is discontinuous, for any $K > 2$ the size of the first order jump decreases quite rapidly with increasing K . This indicates that the K-SAT transition is weakly first order and that an analytic analysis at large K is possible. The 3-SAT critical value which we find, $a_c(3) = 4.6673(3)$, is consistent with the replica symmetric solution[23] for the metastability point, and significantly higher than the numerical values for the K-SAT transition which lie around 4.3[4]. The numerical results we have found (using Eq. (18)) for metastability point and the jump in F at that point are: $a_c(3) = 4.6673(3)$; $F_c = 0.0680(1)$; $a_c(4) = 11.833(1)$; $F_c = 0.0341(3)$; $a_c(5) = 29.91(1)$; $F_c = 0.016(1)$; $a_c(6) = 64.1(1)$; $F_c = 0.0071(1)$.

VI. SUMMARY

We have shown that the probability that a site is on the infinite frozen cluster may be calculated using simple combinatorial methods. This provides a general analytic approach to many hard combinatorial problems, and provides a useful complement to the replica method. Although we concentrated on the symmetric theory here, cavity methods[4] hold promise for generalising this approach to the unsymmetric case, as will be presented elsewhere.

The coloring transition is continuous for $q = 2$ and discontinuous for $q = 3$, similarly K-SAT is continuous for $K = 2$ and discontinuous for $K = 3$. In contrast the VB model of glasses has a continuous phase transition. As found in the rigidity percolation problem[9], processes which require more than 2-connectivity in order to propagate constraint have a tendency toward first

order transitions. However a counter example is rigidity percolation on triangular lattices, where the rigidity transition is continuous[30]. It thus seems a difficult task to determine the conditions which produce continuous as opposed to discontinuous percolation transitions in complex combinatorial problems.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the DOE under contract DE-FG02-90ER45418. PMD acknowledges useful

discussions with Radu Cojocaru, Remi Monasson and Bart Selman. PMD thanks Chris Farrow for a careful reading of the manuscript.

-
- [1] G. P. M. Mézard and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond* (World Scientific, 1987).
 - [2] in *Theoretical Computer Science, volume 265*, edited by O. Dubois, R. Monasson, B. Selman, and R. Zecchina (2001).
 - [3] R. Monasson, R. Zecchina, S. Kirkpatrick, B. Selman, and L. Troyansky, *Nature* **400**, 133 (1999).
 - [4] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and R. Zecchina, *Science* **297**, 812 (2002).
 - [5] S. Kirkpatrick and B. Selman, *Science* **264**, 1297 (1994).
 - [6] B. Pittel, J. Spencer, and N. Wormald, *J. Comb. Theory B* **67**, 111 (1996).
 - [7] S. Kirkpatrick, W. Wilcke, R. Garner, and H. Huels, *Physica* **314**, 220 (2002).
 - [8] J. Chalupa, P. Leath, and G. R. Reich, *J. Phys. C* **12**, L31 (1979).
 - [9] C. Moukarzel, P. M. Duxbury, and P. L. Leath, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 5800 (1997).
 - [10] P. M. Duxbury, D. J. Jacobs, M. F. Thorpe, and C. Moukarzel, *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 2084 (1999).
 - [11] C. Moukarzel, Preprint (2003).
 - [12] K. Binder and A. P. Young, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **58**, 801 (1986).
 - [13] J. Culberson and I. Gent, *Theor. Comp. Sci.* **265**, 227 (2001).
 - [14] F. Y. Wu, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **54**, 235 (1982).
 - [15] C. Moukarzel and P. M. Duxbury, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4055 (1995).
 - [16] D. J. Jacobs and M. F. Thorpe, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 3683 (1996).
 - [17] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability* (W.H. Freeman and company, 1979).
 - [18] Y. Fu and P. Anderson, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **19**, 1605 (1986).
 - [19] I. Kanter and H. Sompolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **58**, 164 (1987).
 - [20] A. K. Hartmann and M. Weigt, *Theor. Comp. Sci.* **265**, 199 (2001).
 - [21] J. van Mourik and D. Saad, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 56120 (2002).
 - [22] R. Mulet, A. Pagnani, M. Weight, and R. Zecchina, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 268701 (2002).
 - [23] R. Monasson and R. Zecchina, *Phys. Rev. E* **56**, 1357 (1997).
 - [24] M. Mézard and R. Zecchina, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 56126 (2002).
 - [25] A. Braunstein, R. Mulet, A. Pagnani, M. Weight, and R. Zecchina, *Cond-Mat* **0304558** (2003).
 - [26] M. E. Fisher and J. W. Essam, *J. Math. Phys.* **2**, 609 (1961).
 - [27] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* **5**, 17 (1960).
 - [28] L. Viana and A. Bray, *C* **18**, 3037 (1985).
 - [29] H. Maletta and W. Felsch, *Phys. Rev. B* **20**, 1245 (1979).
 - [30] C. Moukarzel and P. M. Duxbury, *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 2614 (1999).