

Comment on "Microscopic theory of network glasses"

In a recent Letter Hall and Wolynes[1] (HW) ask whether a microscopic theory of network glasses can be developed starting from a model of dense spherical liquids. To do so they constrain the number of nearest neighbors and count their central force interactions separately. They obtain the dynamical transition temperature T_A (below which the system is nonergodic and the motion is landscape-determined), and the entropy crisis (Kauzmann) temperature T_K as functions of n_b , the average number of nearest neighbor bonds/atom. A Lindemann melting criterion on the amplitude of nearest neighbor vibrations defines the glass transition temperature T_G . The model shows that $T_A = T_G$ and $T_K = T_G$ monotonically increase and decrease, respectively, as functions of n_b . For $n_b = 2.4$, $T_A = T_G = 100$, an unreasonable result. Mode coupling theory (MCT) defines a critical nonergodicity temperature T_c beyond which a radical change in the long time limit of e.g. the density-density correlation function occurs. T_c has been plausibly estimated for vitreous silica in molecular dynamics simulations[2] as $T_c = T_G = 2$. Even this temperature is presently outside the reach of experimental investigations[2].

How do these results compare with experiments? There are standard procedures for extrapolating specific heats to obtain T_K , but identifying the onset of nonergodicity at T_A (or T_c) is much more difficult. Chalcogenide glasses are ideal test systems because one can synthesize them over a wide range of n_b by chemical alloying group IV additives in Se base glass. Fortunately, glass transitions of these systems have been recently reinvestigated [3] using modulated DSC (MDSC), a new method which permits separating the usual DSC heat flow endotherm \dot{H}_T into a reversing part \dot{H}_{rev} which is ergodic (and which follows the modulated T -profile) from the non-reversing part \dot{H}_{nr} which is non-ergodic (arising from underlying temperature dependent activated processes) as illustrated in Fig.1a. MDSC permits to establish this temperature T_A at which dynamics become landscape dominated (i.e. in MDSC language dominated by a T -dependent \dot{H}_{nr}) in contrast to the linear response regime (i.e. at high temperatures when the heat flow is \dot{H}_{rev} dominated with a constant activation energy).

In binary $\text{Ge}_x\text{Se}_{1-x}$ glasses, observed variations in $T_A = T_G$ and $T_K = T_G$ as a function of $n_b = 2 + 2x$ are compared to HW predictions in Fig.1b. The $T_K = T_G(n_b)$ results were obtained from a Vogel-Fulcher analysis of viscosity measurements[4]. And one finds the observed and predicted variations in $T_K = T_G(n_b)$ ratio to be in reasonable accord with each other showing a general reduction starting from a value of about 0.9 at $n_b = 2$ to a value of 0.8 near $n_b = 2.7$. Note, however, that the broad global minimum in the observed $T_K = T_G$ ratio near $n_b = 2.4$ is not reproduced by the HW approach. More serious is the fact that observed $T_A = T_G$ values are (i) two orders of




FIG. 1: a: MDSC scan of $\text{As}_{20}\text{Se}_{80}$ bulk glass; T_G is defined as in exion point of \dot{H}_{rev} while T_A is the end point of the \dot{H}_{nr} endotherm. b: $T_A = T_G$ (○) and $T_K = T_G$ (△) for Ge-Se glasses. Lines without symbols are HW predictions [1]

magnitude lower than the HW predictions and (ii) show a global minimum near $n_b = 2.4$ that is in sharp contrast to the almost linear increase (Fig. 1b) predicted by HW. The global minimum in $T_K = T_G$ and $T_A = T_G$ ratios are features related to self-organization of glasses that are missing in the HW approach. Clearly features such as inclusion of local structures[3, 5], structural self-organization [5, 6] and non-central forces (bond-bending) are missing in the theory. Non-bending forces constitute $(4n_b - 6) = (5n_b - 6)$ of the global number of network constraints (e.g. 0.6 at the ideal $n_b = 2.4$) indicating that the directional non-central angular forces have to be included in a successful theory of network glasses.

M. Micoulaut¹ and P. Boolchand²

¹ LPTL, Université Paris VI, 4, place Jussieu 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France

² Department of ECECS, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0030

PACS numbers: 61.43.Fs, 64.70.Pf

- [1] R.W. Hall and P.G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 85505 (2003)
- [2] J. Horbach and W. Kob, Phys. Rev. E 64, 041503 (2001); W. Kob, M. Nauroth, and F. Sciortino, J. Non-Cryst. Solids 107, 181 (2002)
- [3] X. Feng, W. Bresser, P. Boolchand, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 4422 (1997); Y. Wang, J. Wells, D.G. Georgiev, P. Boolchand, K. Jackson, M. Micoulaut, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 5503 (2001).
- [4] C.A. Angell, in Rigidity Theory and Applications, M.F. Thorpe, P.M. Duxbury Eds. (Plenum Press, Kluwer Academic, New York, 1999).
- [5] M. Micoulaut, J.C. Phillips, Phys. Rev. B 67 104204 (2003); J.C. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 216401 (2002).

- [6] P. Bouchand, D. G. Georgiev, B. Goodman, J. Optoelectronics and Adv. Mater. 3, 703 (2001)