Critical properties of the three- and four-dimensional gauge glass

 $H elm ut G.K atzgraber^1$ and $I.A.C am pbell^2$

¹Theoretische Physik, ETH Honggerberg, CH-8093 Zurich, Switzerland

²Laboratoire des Verres, Universite Montpellier II, 34095 Montpellier, France

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

The gauge glass in dimensions three and four is studied using a variety of numerical methods in order to obtain accurate and reliable values for the critical parameters. Detailed comparisons are made of the sensitivity of the dimension techniques to corrections to nite-size scaling, which are generally the major source of systematic error in such measurements. For completeness we also present results in two dimensions. The variation of the critical exponents with space dimension is compared to results in Ising spin glasses.

PACS num bers: 75.50 Lk, 75.40 Mg, 05.50.+q

I. IN TRODUCTION

Spin glasses have long been recognized to be the canonical examples of complex systems and so are of fundam ental interest for statistical physics and in particular the statistical physics of phase transitions. The critical behavior at standard continuous transitions in systems without disorder is now understood very precisely and in in pressive detail thanks to the renorm alization group (RG) approach. An important step forward towards the com prehension of the vast fam ily of glassy transitions would be to arrive at a sim ilar degree of understanding concerning the critical behavior at the spin-glass transition. Unfortunately this task has proven to be extrem ely di cult. First of all, below the upper critical dimension (d = 6), the renorm alization group theory that works so well for standard transitions has been found to present form idable technical di culties¹ and is of little guidance in lowerdim ensions. Second, on the purely practical side, num erical work is laborious and has tended to lead to im precise values of ordering tem peratures and critical exponents. R andom ly disordered sam ples are m icroscopically inequivalent to each other and to obtain data that are truly representative of the global average, m easurem ents must bem ade over large num bers of disorder realizations. T in e scales are long and obtaining therm al equilibrium in large system sizes is hard. Finite-size scaling methods are invariably used to estimate exponents but are carried out on a restricted range of sizes as the need for extensive computer time escalates when the system sizes increase. Because measurements are thus intrinsically restricted to small or moderate system sizes, it is essential to take into account possible artifacts due to corrections to nite-size scaling. Little is known about the magnitude of these corrections a priori and nevertheless the data must be analyzed in such a way that existing corrections are identi ed and allowed for.

A m ong spin glasses the Ising (ISG) system s have been by far the m ost studied numerically for obvious practical reasons. Here we report results using a variety of numerical techniques on the gauge glass (GG) in space dimensions d = 3 and 4. This system is of interest in its own right because vector spin system s are generally much closer to experimental realizations of spin-glass ordering than are ISG s. Most laboratory spin glasses are made up of Heisenberg spins with O (3)-symmetry and it has been suggested that chiral ordering plays an important role in spin freezing.^{2,3} Vortex glasses in type II superconductors can be modeled by X Y vector spins [D (2) symmetry], and GG s have already been studied extensively in this context.^{4,5,6,7} GG s are vector spin glasses which, due to symmetry arguments, do not show chiral ordering.⁶

This work has two main aim s. The rst is to take this particular fam ily of spin glasses as a case study in order to demonstrate that there exists a whole toolbox of num erical techniques available to identify spin-glass ordering transitions and to attempt to estimate as reliably and precisely as possible the related critical exponents and the associated corrections to scaling. Each of these techniques can have its advantages and disadvantages, and we evaluate the reliability of the di erent methods. Second, having values for the GG exponents in hand which are as precise as possible, it is of interest to follow the evolution of their values as a function of space dimension in this particular fam ily and to com pare with values obtained in other fam ilies of spin glasses.

We have checked for and analyzed corrections to nitesize scaling in the observables m easured; the relative inuence of these corrections varies considerably from one observable to another. This can explain inconsistencies between the estim ates of critical tem peratures and critical exponents in various spin glasses which have been reported. W e conclude that the \current" de ned later (related to the dom ain-wallsti ness at low tem peratures) is little a ected by corrections to nite-size scaling and thus provides reliable estim ates of the ordering tem perature T_c. Measurements using the spin-glass susceptibility (L;T), alone or together with nonequilibrium measurements, are also accurate and reliable. On the other hand in the system s with nite-tem perature transitions we have studied the intersection of the correlation length divided by system size, $_{\rm L}$ (T)=L, and nd that the method is very sensitive to corrections to nite-size scaling even for sizes where these corrections have becom e negligible for other observables. This method on its own would give imprecise orm isleading estimates for the ordering temperature of the GG.N evertheless it can relatively well pinpoint if $T_{\rm c}>0$, or not, in general.

In Sec. II we introduce the model studied. In Sec. III we discuss the equilibration test used in the (paralleltem – pering) M onte C arlo m ethod and describe the equilibrium observables measured. O -equilibrium M onte C arlo m ethods and observables are discussed in Sec. IV, followed by results in d = 4 in Sec.V and d = 3 in Sec.V I. Some results for d = 2 are presented in Sec.V II. We conclude w ith a sum m ary and a com parison of the techniques used to determ ine the critical param eters in Sec.V III and w ith a discussion about the dimensional dependence of the critical exponents in Sec. IX. Concluding remarks are presented in Sec.X.

II. MODEL

The gauge glass is a canonical vector spin glass (see, for instance, Ref. 6) where X Y spins on a [hyper]cubic lattice of size L interact through the Ham iltonian

$$H = J \cos(i j A_{ij}); \quad (1)$$

the sum ranging over nearest neighbors. The angles $_{i}$ represent the orientations of the X Y spins and the A_{ij} are quenched random variables uniform by distributed between [0;2] with the constraint that A_{ij} = A_{ji}. J is conventionally set equal to 1. Periodic boundary conditions are applied.

III. EQUILIBRIUM OBSERVABLES

Equilibrium m easurements are carried out with samples fully thermalized using the exchange M onte Carlo (parallel tempering) technique.^{8,9} W e ensure equilibration by checking that di erent observables do not change with the amount of M onte Carlo steps and m easure by doubling the number of M onte Carlo steps. Once the last three m easurements agree within error bars we are satis ed with the equilibration.

For X Y spin systems there is a choice to be made in the allowed single-spin acceptance angle for individualupdating steps. To optimize the updating procedure, the limiting angle is often chosen to be less than 2 for an X Y spin¹⁰ and linearly dependent on temperature. The num erical prefactor for the temperature-dependent window is chosen so that the acceptance ratios for the local M onte C arlo updates is 0.4. As far as the nal equilibrium parameters are concerned, this choice plays no role. However, for the nonequilibrium simulations to be introduced later on it is important to use the full 2 acceptance angle.

In Table I, we show N $_{\rm sam \, p}$ (num ber of sam ples), N $_{\rm sw \, eep}$ (total num ber of sw eeps perform ed by each set of spins),

TABLE I: Param eters of the equilibrium simulations in four dimensions. N $_{sam \, p}$ is the number of sam ples, N $_{sw \, eep}$ is the total number of M onte C arlo sw eeps for each of the 2N $_{\rm T}$ copies (two replicas per temperature) for a single sam ple, and N $_{\rm T}$ is the number of temperatures used in the parallel tempering m ethod. N $_{sam \, p}$ ($_{\rm L}$) is the total number of disorder realizations used in the calculation of the two-point correlation length $_{\rm L}$ (de ned below). The lowest temperature used is 0.70, the highest 1.345.

L	N sam p	N $_{\rm sam \; p}$ ($_{\rm L}$)	N sw eep	N _T
3	5000	1660	2 : 0 10 ⁴	17
4	5000	1250	8 : 0 10 ⁴	17
5	5000	1000	4 : 0 10 ⁵	17

TABLE II: Param eters of the equilibrium simulations in three dimensions. The lowest temperature simulated is 0.05, the highest 0.947. The diment quantities are explained in the caption of Table I.

L	N sam p	N $_{\rm sam \; p}$ ($_{\rm L}$)	N _{sw eep}	N _T
3	10000	2660	6 : 0 10 ³	53
4	10000	2000	2 : 0 10 ⁴	53
5	10000	1600	6 : 0 10 ⁴	53
6	5000	1330	2 : 0 10 ⁵	53
8	2000	1000	$12 10^{6}$	53

and N $_{\rm T}$ (num ber oftem perature values), used in the sim – ulations in four dimensions. Table II has the corresponding values for the simulations in three dimensions. The parameters for the simulations in two dimensions are presented in Table III (see also Ref. 11).

A prim ary observable for a spin glass is the equilibrium spin-glass susceptibility at nite system size L, (L;T). The susceptibility is de ned as⁷

$$= N \left[hq^2 i \right]_{av} ; \qquad (2)$$

where q is the spin-glass order param eter:

$$q = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \exp[i(i_{i} i_{i})]:$$
(3)

TABLE III: Param eters of the equilibrium simulations in two dimensions. The lowest temperature used is 0.13, the highest 1.058. For L = 24 the lowest temperature studied is 0.20. The diment quantities are explained in the caption of Table T

L	N sam p	N $_{\mbox{sam}\mbox{p}}$ ($_{\mbox{L}}$)	N sw eep	Ν _T
4	10400	4000	8 : 0 10 ⁴	30
6	10150	2660	8 : 0 10 ⁴	30
8	8495	2000	2 : 0 10 ⁵	30
12	6890	1330	8 : 0 10 ⁵	30
16	2500	1000	2 : 0 10 ⁶	30
24	2166		2 : 0 10 ⁶	24

Here, and are two replicas of the system with the same disorder and [av represents a disorder average, whereash ber of spins in the system . The standard nite-size scaling form for the equilibrium spin-glass susceptibility is

$$(L) = L^2 \quad C [L^{1=} (T \quad T_c)]:$$
 (4)

The function \mathcal{C} tends to a constant at the critical tem perature so that at T_c

$$(L) / L^2$$
; (5)

where and are the usual critical exponents. Follow ing the RG approach, the spin-glass susceptibility, like the other observables, will be modied at small L by a correction to scaling factor [1 + AL [!] +], where ! is the correction exponent arising from the leading irrelevant operator in the RG and A is a constant. How ever, in general there are also λ attice artifact" correction term s^{12} giving at T_c

$$(L) / L^2 + B + ;$$

where B has no relation to the RG correction. This leads to an elective leading correction factor [1+ B ^{0}L $^{(2)}$]. If ! > (2)) corrections will be dom instead by the leading \analytic" term with an e ective correction exponent (2), 12, 13, 14

Spin-glass susceptibility measurem ents can be used directly to estimate T_c. As (L) in absence of corrections to scaling increases as L^2 at the ordering tem perature, a log-log plot 15 of (L) against L is linear at $T_{\rm c}$. At higher tem peratures the plot will curve dow nw ard and at lower tem peratures it will curve upward. The crossover from negative to positive curvature at large L should give a precise m easure of T_c. A lternatively one can plot ln[(nL)= (L)] as functions of T for di erent L, and, for instance, n = 2. The curves will intersect at T_c . Direct scaling of (L;T) according to Eq. (4) on the contrary provides a very poor indication for T_c .⁷ In the presence of corrections there will be an additional curvature at sm all L which should be essentially tem perature independent near T_c. If data on a reasonably wide range of L are available it is possible to identify the leading correction term and to estim ate T_c using data at L values large enough for the correction term to be negligible.

The Binder ratio¹⁶ for the GG is de ned by¹⁷

$$g(\mathbf{T}) = 2 \quad \frac{\left[\mathbf{hq}^{4} \mathbf{i} \right]_{av}}{\left[\mathbf{hq}^{2} \mathbf{i} \right]_{av}^{2}} : \tag{7}$$

F in ite-size scaling predicts

$$g(T;L) = G[L^{1=}(T T_c)]:$$
 (8)

This dimensionless observable should be independent of L at T_c, except for corrections to scaling. The Binder ratio is a bona de \work horse" widely used to obtain an estim ate of the critical tem perature of statistical system s.

It has frequently been used in ISG studies to estimate ordering tem peratures. How ever, even in ISG sthe B inder i represents a therm alaverage; N is the num crossing point m ethod is not e cient for determ ining T $_{
m c}$ precisely, at least in dimension three, because the g(T;L) curves tend to lie very close to each other so the estim ate of the crossing point is very sensitive to corrections to scaling.¹⁸ In the particular case of the GG, the method is inoperable because the B inder curves do not intersect, at least for the range of sizes that have been studied here.

> For vector system s it is possible to measure a dom ainwall-sti ness-like parameter, the $\current", 4,5,6,7$ which is the rate of change of the free energy with respect to a twist angle at the boundaries. For the gauge glass:

$$I(L) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sin(i + i + i) = A_{i,i+i} + A_{i,i+i}$$

In this case, the twist is applied along the \hat{x} direction. As $hI(L)i_{av} = 0$, we actually calculate the root-m eansquare current $I_{m s}$ between two replicas:

$$I_{ms} = [hI(L) ihI(L) i]_{av} :$$
(10)

The root-m ean-square currents for dierent L cross at T_c and splay out at lower tem peratures. They have a nitesize scaling form for a nite-tem perature transition⁷

$$I = I^{T}[L^{1=} (T T_{c})]: \qquad (11)$$

The intersection of the $I_{m s}$ (L) curves gives a clear indication of the value of T_c. Corrections to nite-size scaling must be allowed for, but in practice these are weak. The main drawback of this method is the fact that in current m easurem ents intrinsic sam ple-to-sam ple uctuations are very strong so that data must be taken on a large number of independent disorder realizations in therm alequilibrium .

A further in portant observable is the two-point correlation length. In an in nite sample the correlation function

$$G(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) = [hS_i \quad S_i^{2}]_{av}$$
(12)

is of the form

(6)

G (
$$r_{ij}$$
) / $r_{ij}^{(d 2+)} e^{r_{ij}=(T)}$; (13)

where i and j represent the position of the magnetic mo-(T) is the correlation length, which diverges m ents. T_c) . In some system s G (r) has been directly as (T recorded; when T_{c} is known, the measurement of G (r) at T_c on reasonably large samples provides a very direct m easurem ent of . (M easurem ents have also been made as a function of anneal time for temperatures lower than T_c in the Edwards Anderson ISG .¹⁹) Under periodic boundary conditions there must clearly be a cuto for G (r) at $r_{ij} = L = 2$, and even before this cuto the behavior is modied as G (r_{ij}) must become r-independent at

the cell boundary so as to be compatible with the periodic boundary conditions. A size-dependent correlation length $_{\rm L}$ can be de ned through^{20,21,22,23}

$$_{\rm L} = \frac{1}{2\sin(k_{\rm m in} j=2)} \frac{\ddot{G}(0)}{\dot{G}(k_{\rm m in})} \frac{\#_{1=2}}{1}; \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{G}(0)$ and $\hat{G}(k_{min})$ are Fourier transforms of the spatial correlation function $G(r)^{24}$, and $k_{min} =$ (2 = L;0;0) is the smallest nonzero wave vector. This second-moment correlation length is in fact an observable having the dimension of length, which become esequal to the correlation length in the limit L . It is referred to as the \size-dependent correlation length" even in the limit of $T = T_c$ and below, where the in nitesize correlation length has diverged. The ratio $_L$ =L at T_c should be L-independent¹¹ as the form of the whole function G (r) scales appropriately with L. Curves for the ratio of the nite-size correlation length to sam ple length $_L$ (T)=L for di erent L cross at T_c and then splay out at lower T, 11,20,21,25 i.e.,

$$_{\rm L} = L = X^{\sim} [L^{1=} (T T_{\rm c})]$$
: (15)

This makes this observable very attractive for estim ating T_c . Unfortunately at smalland moderate L, the ratio $_L$ =L can be very susceptible to corrections to scaling. In addition, the de nition of $_L$ through Eq. (14) is a convention and other de nitions having the same limiting form at in nite L are equally plausible.¹² At small and moderate L there are correction terms L^2 from the subleading term in the sine factor in the conventional de nition. There may be a \lattice artifact" correction term ¹² of order 1=L, in addition to the \true" correction term in L [!] arising from the leading irrelevant operator. Physically, \hat{G} (0) is the sum over the spins within a box

L^d correlated to a central spin and so is equal to the equilibrium (L). \hat{G} (2 =L) contains a positive term from spins close to the central spin together with a term from some of the spins further from the central spin which is negative because of the cosine factor. A slight change in the form of the function G (r) with L will have little e ect on the L-dependence of \hat{G} (0) while it can modify the Fourier transform $\hat{G}(2 = L)$ much more drastically. Hence one can expect that at low and moderate L, $_{\rm L}$ =L will be much more sensitive to corrections to nite-size scaling than (L) will. Even for the canonical ferrom agnetic Ising model in two dimensions, the corrections in $_{\rm L}$ =L (or to the variant second m om ent correlation length ⁰_L=L with a slightly di erent de nition¹²) at criticality are strong for L 20, with di erent correction terms contributing.¹² A s a consequence, correlation-length data should as a general rule be treated with caution unless detailed results exist over a wide range of L from which the various correction contributions can be evaluated.

Taken over the entire tem perature range, ratios such as $_{2L}$ (T)= $_{L}$ (T) or (2L;T)= (L;T) should be universal scaling functions of $_{L}$ (T)=L.²⁵ If there are corrections to

scaling, scaling curves for di erent L will not be identical; this provides an operational method for checking for corrections to scaling in $_{\rm L}$ =L not only at or near T_c, but over the whole range of tem peratures.

F inally, we also record the equilibrium energy per spin. As is well known, the energy of glassy systems varies sm oothly through the ordering tem perature, but the size dependence of the energy has a behavior linked to the ordering tem perature. This is discussed elsew here.²⁶

IV. OUT OF EQUILIBRIUM METHODS

Com plem entary out-of-equilibrium measurem ents are also carried out. Large samples of size L are initialized in a disordered (in nite tem perature) state; they are then held at a bath tem perature T for an anneal time t_w . The spin-glass susceptibility (t;tw) is monitored as a function oft. At T_c dynam ic scaling rules hold; the spin-glass susceptibility increases proportional to $\mathsf{t}^{(2\ =z)}$, as clusters of correlated spins build up over tim e.27 This equation is not valid at very short time scales as is identically equal to 1 for a sam ple of any size and dimension in the totally disordered state, so the scaling equation will only set in after a crossover from this initial zero-time value. Even after this crossover, there can be corrections to scaling in the nonequilibrium susceptibility data, when only small clusters have been built up. Here the corrections appear as corrections to nite-time scaling but are physically equivalent to corrections to nite-size scaling. Including the correction term ,

$$(t) = A t^{(2 = z)} (1 + B t^{w = z} +);$$
(16)

where w is a dynam ic correction to scaling exponent analogous to !.²⁸ In principle w and ! have no fundam ental reason to be exactly equal but can be expected to be sim ilar. Finally, if the m easurem ent is continued long enough, the long-time susceptibility will cross over to a saturation value which is just the equilibrium susceptibility (L;T) for the m easurem ent tem perature T and the sam ple size L used.

It is clear from a comparison of the equations for the equilibrium susceptibility and the dynam ic susceptibility at T_c that for all interm ediate times between the very short time limit and the L-dependent long-time limit, the measurement after a time t_w on a large sample should be equivalent to the measurement at equilibrium on a sample of size

$$L = A t^{1=z} ; (17)$$

with A a constant and z the dynamic scaling exponent. (L) and (L) can be displayed on the same graph; with a judicious choice of parameters A (T) and z (T) the set of

(L) scale onto the set of equilibrium data (L). This provides us with a direct m ethod for estimating z(T). A l-ternative techniques which have been used for estimating the value of z(T) independently of the other exponents

are the m onitoring of the tim e variation of the B inder parameter for di erent sam ple sizes²⁹ or the scaling of the tim e-dependent spin-glass susceptibility (L;t) for different sizes L^6 . The present m ethod is m ore convenient than the B inder parameter m easurem ents as the latter are intrinsically noisy.

We have carried out dynam ical measurements over a range of temperatures and not just at the putative ordering temperature. If we assume that there is an elective dynamic scaling exponent z(T) at each temperature T and not only at T_c, then at each T we should be able to translate (t) data into (L) data by a suitable choice of A(T) and z(T). If dynamic scaling continues to hold at other T, then once again it should be possible to make the (L) data scale onto the (L) data. The assumption of an elective z(T) has been made before in a dilerent context, but applied only at temperatures below T_c (see, for instance. Refs. 19 and 30).

Finally, after a long annealtim e_w the ultimate conguration $fS_i(t_w)g$ is registered. The updating procedure is then pursued for a further time t considerably less than t_w and the autocorrelation function decay

$$q(t;t_{w}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} hS_{i}(t_{w} + t) \qquad S(t_{w})i \qquad (18)$$

is monitored starting from what can now be considered a quasi-equilibrium con guration. In Eq. (18) S₁ represents the vector spins in the plane. In the context of Ising spin glasses it has been show n^{19,31,32} that the initial decay behavior of q(t;t_w) is not dependent on the sample having achieved perfect them al equilibrium; as long as the time scale over which q(t;t_w) is monitored is much shorter than the annealing time t_w, then the form of q(t;t_w) is characteristic of the in nite-size limit initial relaxation in equilibrium. Again at T_c, for a large sam – ple in equilibrium, the autocorrelation function q(t;t_w) decays algebraically as q(t;t_w) t[×] w ith³³

$$x = (d 2 +)=2z$$
 (T = T_c): (19)

M easurements in Ising spin glasses^{19,31,32,34} have shown that at all temperatures below T_c the $q(t;t_w)$ data can be accurately tted by this power-law form of decay with a temperature-dependent e ective exponent x (T). For temperatures higher than T_c , the decay of $q(t;t_w)$ has the same initial power-law form which is now multiplied by a further factor \mathcal{Q} [t= (T)], where \mathcal{Q} is a scaling function and (T) is a relaxation time diverging as (T T)² when T_c is approached from above.³³ In ISG measurements $q(t;t_w)$ shows very little short-time corrections to scaling; at T = T_c and below, $q(t;t_w)$ for large well-annealed sam ples follows a strict power-law decay beyond very few M onte C arlo steps after \zero" time.

N onequilibrium m easurements can be used in combination with the equilibrium susceptibility measurements to obtain an estimate of T_c from consistency arguments.³⁵ The elective dynamical exponent z (T) is measured from

TABLE IV: Param eters of the o -equilibrium simulations as a function of space dimension d. L is the size of the system used, t the equilibration time, and t_w is the \waiting time" to calculate $q(t;t_w)$, Eq. (18). N_{sam p} is the number of sam ples used for the disorder average.

d	L	N _{sam p}	t		tw	
2	64	500	1:638	10 ⁴	4:069	10 ³
3	16	200	8:192	10 ³	8:192	10 ³
4	10	200	1:310	10 ⁵	4:096	10 ³

the comparison of equilibrium and nonequilibrium susceptibility measurements. The elective exponent (T) is measured from the size-dependent equilibrium susceptibility measurements through $(L;T)=L^2 = L^{(T)}$. Then, at T_c , the relaxation decay exponent x must be equal to (d 2 +)=2z. The consistency between the directly measured x (T) and the other exponents gives an electent criterion for determining T $_c$. This technique has a number of advantages. x (T) and z (T) can be measured on alm ost arbitrarily large samples and so can be rendered free of corrections to scaling. In addition, they can be measured without the need to achieve complete therm al equilibrium. The most laborious measurement is the size-dependence of (T) in equilibrium; how ever,

(L;T) measurements are generally only subject to weak corrections to nite-size scaling so a limited range of L can be adequate.

The parameters of the o -equilibrium simulations using simple M onte C arb updates are listed in Table IV .

V. FOUR DIMENSIONS

In this section we compare di erent observables as well as critical exponents and transition temperatures derived from nite-size scaling arguments for the fourdimensional gauge glass.

A. Root-mean-square current

Current measurements are made for sizes L = 3 { 5. The details of the simulation are shown in Table I. The intersection of the $I_{\rm rm~s}$ curves shown in Fig. 1 gives an estimate $T_c = 0.890$ 0.015. This is significantly lower than the value of 0.96 0.01 reported by Reger and Young,⁵ although their data are almost compatible with the present intersection point within the statistical error bars. Corrections to nite-size scaling appear to be m inim al for these measurements. However, current measurements are intrinsically noisy with strong sample-to-sample variations at equilibrium, so it is in perative to average over large numbers of samples. In Fig.2 we show a scaling plot of the data in Fig.1 according to Eq. (11). The data scale well for the (modest) range of sizes and



FIG.1: (Color online) D ata for the the root-mean-square current $I_{\rm rm\ s}$ in four dimensions. The data show a crossing at $T_{\rm c}=0.89$.



FIG.2: (Color online) Scaling of the root-m ean-square current $I_{\rm rm~s}$ in four dimensions according to Eq. (11). The data scale well for the range of sizes shown and we estimate 1= 1:42 with T_c 0:89.

we estim ate 1 = 1.42 0.03 together with the abovem entioned estim ate of T_c . The previously quoted error is estim ated by varying the scaling param eters until the data do not collapse well. This method is also used in all subsequent estim ates of error bars of scaling exponents and critical tem peratures derived from scaling plots.



FIG.3: (Coloronline) D ata for ln ($=\!\!L^2$) vs ln (L) for di erent tem peratures in four dimensions. At T_c one expects L^2 . The data show a change in curvature while scanning through T_c 0.89.

B. Equilibrium susceptibility

The susceptibility data at equilibrium are obtained from the same data set in Sec.VA and shown in Fig.3. The data are plotted in the form of curves for $\ln[(L)=L^2]$ against $\ln L$ at di erent tem peratures. As discussed above, if corrections to scaling are negligible, this form of plot gives a straight line of slope at L, together with curves which bend dow nward for $T > T_c$ and upward for $T < T_c$. For the four-dimensional GG, corrections are very weak because even including values for L = 2 the log-log plot of the data at the tem perature closest to T_c as estim ated above follows the straight line behavior very closely.

In order to obtain an independent estimate for T_c , we have plotted the ²-deviation from a straight line t to the data over a range of tem peratures around T = 0.89, together with the curvature for three-parameter ts, Figs. 4 and 5. The results indicate straight-line behavior for T = 0.895 0.015 which is an independent measurement of T_c . In Fig. 5 we also show the elective slope

(T) from the three-parameter t. The slope of the straight line at $T_{\rm c}$ gives an estimate of the critical exponent = 0:74 0:03. As far as we are aware of, this is the rst published estimate for this parameter for the GG in four dimensions.

W ith values for $T_{\rm c}$ and $% T_{\rm c}$ in hand, the whole (L;T) data set can be plotted in a standard manner: (L;T)=L^2 as a function of L^{1=} (T T_{\rm c}), adjusting to obtain optimal scaling. The results lead to 1= = 1:42 0:03, as shown in Fig. 6, and are in agreement with an estimate from the scaling of the currents



FIG. 4: (Color online) ²-deviation from a straight-line t for the susceptibility data in four dimensions shown in Fig. 3. The data show a minimum at T 0.89, indicating that the optim al thappens around T = T_c (marked by an arrow).

presented in Fig. 2.

C. Correlation length

The data for the ratio $_{\rm L}$ (T)=L for di erent sizes are shown in Fig. 7. Although the data appear to cleanly intersect at one point, it can be seen that the intersection tem peratures for these sizes are around T 1:0, and are only approaching the true ordering tem perature, $T_c = 0.89$, very slow ly with increasing L. The comparison with the behavior observed for (L) or the current is striking. For each of these two parameters the critical behavior at T_c is virtually correction-free, while for the same range of sm all values of L, the $_{\rm L}$ =L intersections give a very poor indication of the true ordering tem perature. There are clearly strong corrections to scaling at sm all L which appear to be intrinsic to this form of measurem ent.

D. Nonequilibrium susceptibility

Large samples (L = 10 in four dimensions) are initialized in random (in nite temperature) con gurations. They are then put in contact with a heat bath at a temperature T, and the spin-glass susceptibility is recorded as a function of annealing time. At T_c the spin-glass susceptibility will increase as $t^{(2)} = z$ until the susceptibility arrives at the equilibrium value for that size L. We present the data in terms of the scaled time-dependent e ective length $L = A t^{1=z}$ at each temperature. When A and z are suitably chosen, the equilibrium suscepti-



FIG.5: (C olor online) D ata for the e ective exponent $_{\rm e}$ (T) as a function of tem perature in four dimensions. The vertical dashed line m arks our estimate of $T_{\rm c}$ from current and susceptibility m easurements, $T_{\rm c}=0.89$. In addition, is shown, which is an elective exponent derived from o -equilibrium calculations (described in detail in Sec. IV). One expects $_{\rm e}$ and to cross at $T_{\rm c}$, which is the case in our data within error bars. D ata for the curvature of the susceptibility shown in Fig. 3 from a second-order polynomial t are also displayed. The data cross zero curvature (horizontal dashed line) at T 0:90, a value slightly higher than the other estimates.



FIG.6: (Color online) Scaling plot according to Eq. (4) of the susceptibility data presented in Fig.3 in four dimensions. The data scale well for T_c 0:89, 1= 1:42, and 0:74. Note that only the data for L = 2 show corrections to scaling.



FIG.7: (Color online) Correlation length $_{\rm L}$ divided by L for dimensions system sizes in four dimensions. The data cross at T 1:0 indicating that there are strong corrections to scaling. The inset shows a zoom of the data in the main panel focusing on the crossing point around T 1.

bility (L) and the nonequilibrium susceptibility (L) before saturation scale well together. An example for a temperature close to T_c , T = 0.894, is shown in Fig.8. From the data, the dynam ical scaling exponent z (T) can be determined accurately, see Fig.9. The behavior of the elective dynam ical exponent z (T) shows no apparent special behavior at the critical temperature. Elective temperature-dependent values z (T) have been reported in ISG s for T < T_c (see, for instance, Ref. 30). We can conclude from the present data for the GG that z (T) is a well-de ned parameter for a whole range oftem peratures including T > T_c . At T = T_c we estim at z = 4.50 0.05.

E. Autocorrelation function decay

In the GG we have found unexpectedly that q(t) only assum es a pure power-law behavior after a relatively long time, of the order of 100 M onte C arlo steps, hereafter referred to as MCS, (as compared with 5 MCS in ISGs), see Fig. 10. For earlier times the decay is a ected by short-time corrections. In practice this means that the measurements of x (T) as de ned above are less precise than in ISGs as they are limited at short times by the correction term and at long times by the condition that the maximum t_w should be much less than t.

We compare, for a set of temperatures around T_c , the value of (T) directly obtained from the equilibrium susceptibility measurements with a value calculated indirectly from the x(T) and z(T) data, (T) = (d 2) 2z(T)x(T).We expect (T) = (T) at T = T_c . This can be seen in Fig. 5 where the vertical dashed



FIG. 8: (Color online) Spin-glass susceptibility from equilibrium measurements (L) at T = 0.894 in four dimensions. (L) is the susceptibility determined from the o - equilibrium simulations with L = $A t^{1=z}$, A = 1.22, and z 4.5. By suitably choosing L the data for (L) and (L) fall on a straight line. This allows us to determ ine the dynamical critical e ective exponent z (T) as a function of temperature. When L (t) approaches the sample size (here L = 10), (L) necessarily saturates. The dashed line is a guide to the eye.



FIG. 9: (Color online) D ynam ical critical exponent z as a function of 1=T in four dimensions as determined from the procedure described in the text and in the caption of Fig. 8. The data are consistent with $z(T = T_c) = 4.50 \quad 0.05$. Note that the error is estimated \by eye": the data are varied until the two expressions for the susceptibility di ernoticeably thus allowing us to give an upper bound for the error bars. The dashed line is a guide to the eye.



1.2L ЗD ▲3 1.1 $\Box 4$ • 5 1 ×6 08 rms 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.3 0.35 0.4 0.45 0.5 0.55 0.6 Т

FIG.10: (C olor online) D ata for the autocorrelation function q(t) in four dimensions as a function of time (measured in M onte Carlo steps). The dashed line has slope x = 0.147 from which we can determ ine , a \dynamical" e ective exponent . D etails are described in the text.

line m arks our estim ate of $T_{\rm c}$. The two curves cross at $T=0.90~0.01,~=~0.74~0.02, which again de nes the ordering tem perature and the critical exponent <math display="inline">% T_{\rm c}$. As for this particular system $T_{\rm c}$ is already reliably established from the previously mentioned methods, the comparison provides a critical benchm ark test for the nonequilibrium technique. The good agreem ent with the standard methods, such as susceptibility scaling and the crossing of root-mean-square currents in this case shows that this method is reliable, in plying that it can be used for other system s.

VI. THREE DIM ENSIONS

A number of estimates have already been given of the ordering temperature and critical exponents of the GG in dimension three.⁶ In this section we present estimates for the critical temperature and exponents as derived from our simulations. In comparison to the four-dimensional data presented in Sec. V we not strong corrections to scaling in three dimensions. In what follows the dimension results for dimensional entry observables are presented.

A. Root-m ean-square current

O lson and Young⁶ estimated that $T_c = 0.47$ 0.03 from the intersection of the root-mean-square current induced by an in nitesimal twist along the boundaries. The present current data are shown in Fig. 11. Our results

FIG.11: (Color online) Root-mean-square current $I_{rm\,s}$ as a function of temperature for the three-dimensional GG. The data show a crossing at T 0.46. Note that the data for L = 3 show strong corrections to scaling.

agree with the data of Ref. 6 within error bars. A consistent intersection point for all the data taken together occurs at T = 0.46 0.01, with only the data for L = 3 lying slightly below the region of intersection. We conclude that this temperature indeed represents the correct ordering temperature for the system, corrections to nite-size scaling being small for L 4. The precision is limited mainly by the statistical error bars, as the curves for di erent sizes lie rather close together. A scaling plot of the root-m ean-square current according to Eq. (11) is shown in Fig. 12 for 1= = 0.72 and T_c = 0.46.

B. Equilibrium susceptibility

A log-log plot of the equilibrium susceptibility divided by L² as function of L for di erent tem peratures is show n in Fig. 13. In absence of corrections to scaling this plot should be straight at T_c . We see that for T > 0.46 the data curve down, indicative that we are above the critical tem perature. For T < 0.46 the data show a slight upw ard curvature,³⁶ in agreem ent with $T < T_c$. U sing Eq. (5) at $T = T_c$ we obtain = 0:47 0:02 and a correction AL[!]) with ! factor (1 2:5 and A = 0:6. For tem peratures below T_c a higher e ective (T) is obtained at each temperature and the correction factor appears to be tem perature-independent. The correction term is 4; if we make straight line ts alm ost negligible for L to $\ln[(T)=L^2]$ against $\ln L$ for L = 4 to 8, we nd values which increase sharply above T 0:40, and which rise slow ly for tem peratures below T 0:40, see Fig. 14.

In both Ising spin glasses and GGs the rst term in the RG -expansion for the leading irrelevant operator



FIG.12: (Cobronline) Scaling of the root-mean-square current $I_{\rm rm\ s}$ in three dimensions according to Eq. (11). We see acceptable scaling of the data around T=0.46. Deviations at higher T are presumably due to corrections to scaling. This plot is for l=~=~0.72 and $T_c=~0.46$.

is ! (d) (6 d)^{7,38} in plying that ! will be high in dimension three. High-temperature series expansion data show that ! is greater than 3 in dimension three for the ISG ³⁹. If we make the plausible assumption that this is the case also for the GG, the leading correction term will be due to the lattice artifact so the correction factor is $[1 + AL^{(2)}]$. Fits to all 3D GG (L;T) data from L = 2 to 8 using this correction factor give a clear minimum in ² as a function of temperature at T = 0.45 0.02 (inset to Fig. 14), which we can identify with T_c. The e ective exponent _e (T) is shown in Fig.16.

An overall scaling plot of $(L;T)=L^2$ as a function of $L^{1=}$ (T T_c) for L 4 is shown in Fig. 15. We estimate 1= = 0:72 0:02.

C. Binder param eter

In spin glasses the Binder parameter g de ned in Eq. (7) is independent of system size at the transition tem perature as it is proportional to a function which only depends on $L^{1=}$ (T T_c). Consequently dierent lines at dierent tem peratures cross at T_c . In vector system s this is not the case: data for dierent system sizes splay for T > T_c but not for T < T_c , as can be seen in Fig. 17. From the data one can, at best, estimate T_c roughly because the data do not cross. The same behavior is found in the three-dimensionalXY spin glass.⁴⁰ This has been ascribed to the ordering being chiral in this model. As no chirality can be de ned for the gauge glass, this is not the case here and the behavior of g for the GG remains to be understood.



FIG.13: (Color online) D ata for h (=L²) vs h L for di erent tem peratures in three dimensions. The data show a change in curvature in the log-log plot while scanning through the T_c estimate from the root-mean-square currents, 0.46. At T_c we expect L².



FIG.14: (Color online) ²-deviation from a straight-line t for the susceptibility data in three dimensions. The main panel shows data for a twith no corrections to scaling due to lattice artifacts, whereas in the inset we show the data where corrections to scaling are included in the ts of ln ($=L^2$). The data in the inset show a minimum at T 0:45, in agreement with data from R ef. 6 and with the root-mean-square current estimate from Sec.VIA.



 $\nu = 0.72 \ \eta = -0.47 \ T_{o} = 0.46$

З

FIG. 15: (Color online) Scaling plot according to Eq. (4) of the susceptibility data presented in Fig. 13 in three dimensions. Optimal scaling is obtained for T_c 0:46, 1= 0:72, and 0:47.



FIG.17: (C olor online) D ata for the B inder ratio g as a function of temperature for several system sizes. We see that the data do not cross for $T = T_c$ 0.46 and also do not splay for T sm aller than T_c . The inset zoom s into the region T 0.6.

D. Correlation length

The data for the ratio $_{\rm L}$ (T)=L are shown in Fig.18. As in four dimensions there are strong nite-size correction e ects; in addition, the curves for dimension L lie close together. The intersections between curves for dimension L change with temperature in such a way that from these data alone it would be very hard to identify T_c to better than $T_c = 0.50$ 0.05.

E. Nonequilibrium susceptibility

In just the same way as in four dimensions the nonequilibrium susceptibility is recorded for large system sizes, L = 16. The elective dynamical exponent z(T) is estimated from the comparison of the time-dependent nonequilibrium susceptibility and the size-dependent equilibrium susceptibility, Fig. 19, and the effective dynamical critical exponent z(T) is shown as a function of temperature in Fig. 20. At T = 0.46 we obtain z(T) = 4.7 0.1, in agreement with the results from Ref. 6 but with smaller error bars.

F. Autocorrelation function decay

Corrections to nite time scaling in three dimensions extend to times of the order of 100 MCS, limiting the precision of the measurement of the exponent x(T), as in four dimensions. For this particular system the directly measured elective exponent (T) and the indirectly es-



FIG.16: (Coloronline) D ata for the elective exponent $_{\rm e}$ (T) as a function of temperature in three dimensions. A loo plotted is as estimated from o -equilibrium simulations. B oth exponents do not cross cleanly making it di cult to determ ine T_c. The vertical dashed line marks our estimate for T_c, 0.46. A loo shown is the curvature of the susceptibility data (see Fig.13) from a second-order polynomial t. The data cross zero curvature (horizontal dashed line) at T = 0.44 0.01, a value slightly low er than other estimates of T_c.



FIG. 18: (Color online) Correlation length $_{\rm L}$ divided by L for di erent system sizes in three dimensions. The data cross at T 0:5 but only splay slightly making it di cult to give a precise estimate of the transition temperature.



FIG.20: (Color online) D ynam ical critical exponent z as a function of 1=T in three dimensions. For details see the text. The data are consistent with $z(T = T_c) = 4.7$ 0.1, where the error is estimated by shifting the data until they visibly do not agree. The dashed line is a guide to the eye.



FIG.19: (Color online) Spin-glass susceptibility from equilibrium measurements (L) at T = 0.434 in three dimensions. (L) is the susceptibility determined from the oequilibrium simulations with $L = A t^{1=z}$, A = 1.27, and z 4.67. We choose L so that the data for (L) and (L) fall on a straight line allowing us to determ ine the dynam ical critical elective exponent z (T) as a function of temperature. W hen L (t) approaches the sample size (here L = 16), (L) necessarily saturates. The dashed line is a guide to the eye.



FIG.21: (Color online) Data for the autocorrelation function q(t) in three dimensions as a function of time (measured in M onte Carlo steps). The dashed line is a guide to the eye to emphasize the asymptotic slope of q(t) in a log-log plot.

tim ated (T) are very similar over a range of tem peratures, as shown in Fig. 16. Hence it is not possible to obtain an independent measurement of T_c using the consistency criterion outlined above (see Fig. 21).

2D

0.6 0.5 0.2 0 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 ξ_L/L FIG . 22: (C olor online) Scaling plot of the data for $_{\rm 2L}$ =2 $_{\rm L}$ vs $_{\rm L}$ =L in two dimensions. The deviations at large $_{\rm L}$ =L suggest corrections to scaling. If T_c is nite, the curves must

VII. TWO DIMENSIONS

go through $_{2L}$ =2 $_{L}$ = 1 at T = T_c. The data only tend

asym ptotically to 1 proving that T > T_c .

The gauge glass in two dimensions has been studied extensively in Refs. 7 and 11. In particular it was found that for this model $T_c = 0$, inferred from the values of critical exponents and several tests m ade. In this section we present results for o -equilibrium simulations, as well as another test which shows that the system orders at zero tem perature in two dim ensions.

A. Correlation length

The GG in dimension two has been extensively studied.^{5,7,41,42,43,44,45} M easurem ents on various observables, in particular the correlation length, have established that the ordering temperature is either zero or much lower than our lowest measuring tem perature, T =0:13.¹¹ In Fig. 22 we show correlation length data presented in the form of plots of the ratio (2L)=2 (L) $_{2L}$ =2 $_{L}$ against (L)=L. In the absence of corrections to scaling all points should fall on a single scaling curve, which for a nite ordering temperature should pass (2L)=2 (L) = 1 at $T = T_{e}$ [here (L)=L is through independent of L] 25 . For ordering which takes place only at zero tem perature the ratio should tend asym ptotically to a value which can be less than 1. The data show this form of behavior, dem onstrating conclusively that for this system $T_c = 0$.

FIG.23: (Color online) Examples of excellent dynam ic scaling well into the paramagnetic region in two dimensions. Spin-glass susceptibility from equilibrium measurements (L) (triangles) and (L) from scaled dynamical measurements (squares) at two temperatures: T = 0.130 (upper set of curves) and T = 0.309 (lower set of curves).

B. Nonequilibrium scaling

Measurements of the equilibrium susceptibility (L) for L = 4 to 16 (or to 24 above T = 0.20) and of the nonequilibrium susceptibility (t) for samples of size L = 64 are shown in Fig. 23. As for the other dimensions, the nonequilibrium data are scaled using $L = At^{1-z}$ with A and z chosen at each temperature so that the two sets of susceptibility data scale together. The scaling is particularly satisfactory because a wide range of L could be used for the equilibrium measurements, and because the nonequilibrium sample sizes have been chosen such that for all measurements L is much smaller than the sample size, so there are no saturation e ects at long times. This demonstrates once again, but more clearly than for higher dim ensions, that a dynam ical exponent z (T) can be de ned relating the annealing tim e t to an e ective length L (t) for tem peratures well above any critical tem perature. The scaling holds to within the present statistical accuracy for the whole range of L from L = 4 to L = 24, or alternatively for anneal times from 2 M C S to over 16000 M C S. It appears that the dynam ic scaling concept is ubiquitous and is not just valid at critical points. Finally, Fig. 24 shows data for the autocorrelation function q(t). One can clearly see that the data, presented in a log-log plot, are strongly curved suggesting that the standard scaling functions for a nite-tem perature transition do not apply.







 $\Lambda \chi(L)$ $\nabla \chi(L^*)$

 10^{3}



FIG. 24: (Color online) D ata for the autocorrelation function q(t) in two dimensions as a function of time (measured in M onte Carlo steps). Here L = 64 and T = 0.13. The curvature of the log-log plot demonstrates yet again that any freezing is well below this temperature.

VIII. COMPARISON OF TECHNIQUES

We can draw comparisons between the di erent techniques for estimating $T_{\rm c}$ and the critical exponents. It should be noted that equilibrium data for the di erent observables studied are taken within the same runs which allows a comparison of the relative statistical precision of the di erent m easurem ents for exactly the same computational e ort. As an example, for m easurem ents made at L = 8 at T = 0.461 in dimension three and with the simulation parameters listed in Table II, the spin-glass susceptibility is accurate to 0.5%, the correlation length (L) to 0.7%, the current $I_{\rm m\ s}$ to 1.6% (and the internal energy to 0.02%) with the quoted errors purely statistical.

The major di culty in the interpretation of the data is not statistics but corrections to scaling. In the gauge glass the current method turns out to be relatively insensitive to corrections to nite-size scaling and is therefore already reliable for relatively small samples. A veraging over large numbers of samples is, how ever, essential for these measurements because of strong intrinsic sample to sample uctuations. In ISG smeasurements of the critical behavior of the domain-wall stiness (see, for instance, Ref. 46) could well provide an equally e cient and reliable method to estimate T_c , applicable quite generally.

D irect analysis of the spin-glass susceptibility (L;T) on its own is also reliable and e cient, particularly as the statistical precision of this parameter is high. At T = T_c there is pure power-law behavior, (L;T)= L^2 L^(T). The onset of deviations from the pure power-law behavior

below and above the ordering temperature provides a clear signature for ${\rm T}_{\rm c}$.

In dimension four, even with the restricted range of L available, there is a downward deviation from the pure power law as soon as $T > T_c$, and an upward deviation from the pure power law for temperatures $T < T_c$. Corrections appear to be negligible as the straight line t at T_c is excellent even for L = 2.

In dimension three the onset of deviation from a pure power law to a downward curvature at temperatures above T $0.46~{\rm gives}$ a clear indication of $T_{\rm c}$ but the low-temperature uptum is weak. Corrections are present as there is a weak curvature at small L for all temperatures. If the plausible assumption is made that the leading correction to scaling is the leading analytic term, a precise estimate for $T_{\rm c}$ is obtained from the using all the

(L;T) data over the whole range of L. This estimate is consistent with the value from the current measurements.

The susceptibility m ethod (see Secs. V B and V IB) becomes progressively more precise when data for larger samples are available. In the present case, data up to L = 5 only are su cient for dimension four, but in dimension three it would have been very helpfulto have had data up to L = 12; with such data in hand it would be possible to pinpoint the transition temperature to even higher precision from susceptibility measurements alone.

The technique involving the consistency of observables deduced from nonequilibrium scaling and equilibrium susceptibility gives an estimate for T_c which has been found to be in excellent agreem ent with those obtained from the other methods for dimension four. This despite the presence of short-time corrections to scaling in q(t) that were unexpected. In dimension three consistency between alternative methods of estimating param eters holds over a range of tem peratures rather than at a unique tem perature which could be identied with T_{c} . This accidental consistency has not been observed in other system s and rem ains to be understood, but m eans that the technique in this particular case cannot be used to estimate T_c with any precision. The nonequilibrium m easurem ents are relatively econom ical in com putational resources as full therm odynam ic equilibration is not required.

E stim ates of T_c from the intersections of correlation length ratios (L)=L turn out to be m isleading in dimension four because of strong intrinsic corrections to nitesize scaling for the small or moderate system sizes to which computational resources generally limit measurements in spin-glass systems at high dimensions. This param eter thus gives a qualitative indication that spin-glass ordering is occurring but it is not reliable for extracting precise values of the ordering temperature from small L data even in a situation where other measurements can give consistent and satisfactory estimates for an equivalent range of L. It can be noted that while corrections to nite-size scaling in measurements of (L) appear to be negligible for the GG in dimension four, the corrections for (L)=L are still very strong at size L = 5. Even in

TABLE V: Critical temperature T_c and critical exponents for the GG in di erent space dimensions d and from di erent references. In the table KC represents results from this work, whereas RY represents Ref. 5 by Reger and Young, OY Ref. 6 by O lson and Young, and K Ref. 11 by K atzgraber.

d	R eference	T _c			Z	!
4	RY	0 : 96(1)		0 : 70 (15)		
4	КC	0:89(1)	0 : 74 (3)	0:70(1)	4:50(5)	
3	ΟY	0 : 47 (3)	0 : 47(7)	1:39(20)	4:2(6)	
3	КC	0:460 (15)	0 : 47 (2)	1:39(5)	4:7(1)	2:5(5)
2	K	0	0	2:56 (20)	1	

dimension three where the corrections are weaker, this observable remains a poor tool for estimating the transition temperature. Strong correction e ects in (L)=L can also be seen in data reported for X Y spin glasses²¹ and have been found in certain ISG s. Therefore the correction e ect appears to be generic and this technique should be applied only with caution.

Finally, estimates from the Binder parameter are inappropriate for the GG as the curves for dienent system sizes do not intersect for the range of L over which measurements are carried out. It is possible that there are strong nite-size corrections for this parameter so that intersections would only be seen for much larger L.

Once $T_{\rm c}$ has been estimated, the susceptibility measurements at that temperature give immediately the corresponding value of the critical exponent . The precision for this parameter is limited entirely by the accuracy with which $T_{\rm c}$ is known. The exponent is estimated from scaling plots of current data and from scaling plots of susceptibility data. Once again precision is limited by the accuracy with which $T_{\rm c}$ has been determined. The dynamical exponent z can be measured accurately from a comparison of equilibrium and nonequilibrium susceptibilities. The data show that z(T) can be estimated operationally over a wide range of T including temperatures well above the ordering temperature [z(T) varies continuously through the ordering temperature].

In the light of this extensive analysis, it would seem appropriate to critically re-assess the estimates for the critical exponents in the ISG family.

IX . CRITICAL PARAM ETERS AS A FUNCTION OF SPACE D IM ENSION

The critical parameters for the GG obtained from this and earlier work are listed in Table V .

In both dimensions three and four the GG ordering temperatures T_c are roughly half of those for the G aussian ISG.By interpolation between the zero-temperature current sti ness exponents (d) in dimensions 1, 2, and $3,^7$ we can estimate the lower critical dimension for the GG as the dimension at which (d) passes through zero: d_{lcd} 2:5, very similar to that of the ISG systems with

d	R eferen <i>c</i> e	Tc			Z
4	PRR	1:80(1)	0:35(5)	1:0(1)	
4	CEA	1:78(1)	0 : 44 (2)	1:08 (10)	4:9(4)
3	MPR	0 : 95 (4)	0:36(6)	2:00 (15)	
3	CEA	0 : 92(2)	0 : 42 (3)	1 : 65 (5)	6 : 45 (10)
2	ΒΥ	0	0	3:63 (10)	

continuous interaction distributions 47,48 (see Table VI and Refs. 49,50,51,52).

The corrections to scaling in the GG follow just the same pattern as in the bim odal (J) ISG s. In the Gaussian ISG the corrections to scaling for (L) at T_c appear very weak and so unmeasurable. In dimension four for both cases the correction to scaling for the susceptibility (L) is so weak as to be unobservable even down to L = 2. In dimension three there is a clear correction to scaling for (L) which can be tted satisfac- $(1 + AL^{!})$. !, in the ISG torily to the form case has been interpreted as the leading irrelevant operator correction, 18 and this could also be the case for the three-dim ensionalGG.However, it seem sm ore likely that the correction is dom inated by a \lattice artifact" giving $!_e = 2$, which has no relation to the leading irrelevant operator.^{12,13} For both the three-dimensional GG and the three-dimensional bim odal ISG, the value of the apparent correction to scaling exponent is com patible with this interpretation, which would imply that the leading irrelevant operator term has an exponent value ! > 2

Finally, we can give an overview of the critical exponents in the G G and ISG families as a function of space dimension. It should be noted that there are some constraints that apply to both families: at the upper critical dimension d = 6, = 1=2, = 0, and z = 4. If $T_c = 0$, = 1=, where is the sti ness exponent. Therefore, at the lower critical dimension where the sti ness exponent = 0, is in nite. For systems with a nondegenerate ground state (such as the GG or the ISG with G aussian interactions, but not the ISG with bim odal interactions), when T = 0 there is no decay of the correlation function G (r) with r. This necessarily implies that when $T_c = 0$, (d) 2 d. For system s with degenerate ground states (d) > 2 d].

The leading terms in the RG -expansion for the GG are (d) = 1=2+5=24 and (d) = =6. For the ISG (d) = 1=2+5=12 and (d) = $=53^{+54}$ It can be seen in Figs. 25 and 26, respectively, that in the GG as well as for the ISG the leading -expansion term gives the right sign and a qualitative indication of the strength of the variations of the exponents just below the upper criti-





FIG.25: (Color online) Critical exponent as a function of space dimension for the ISG with Gaussian bonds and the GG (data taken from Tables VI and V, respectively). The shaded region denotes the area where one expects the lower critical dimension. The solid [dashed] line represents the RG -expansion estimate for the GG [ISG], as shown in the text, and the dotted lines are guides to the eye. At the lower critical

dimension one expects $(d ! d_{cd}) ! 1$. The data for the ISG and GG support this behavior.

cal dimension. The leading terms in the expansion for cannot, however, be used to predict that the (d) values are much more negative in the GG than in the ISG. The observed exponents deviate strongly from the curves calculated to third order for the ISG where the second and third order expansion terms are very large. This deviation is smaller for the GG. The leading term in the

-expansion for the exponent works better, with (d) being higher for the GG than for the ISG, in agreement with the relative strengths of the leading terms (including higher order terms would entirely destroy the agreement). This is all in striking contrast to the canonical ferrom agnets (Ising, XY, or Heisenberg) without disorder, where the third order -expansion correction gives excellent predictions for (d) an (d).

If we look at the overall behavior of the exponents over the whole range of d, the shape of the (d) curves is fairly sim ilar for the GG and Gaussian ISG fam ilies, although the divergence at the lower critical dimension d_{lcd} 2.5 is distinctly narrower in the GG case. The shapes of the

(d) curves are on the other hand dram atically di erent. The leading terms in the -expansions agree poorly with the data even for d = 4, with an inversion of the m easured positions of (d) as compared with the expansion predictions. For the G aussian ISG family (d) decreases as the dimension drops from the upper critical dimension to the lower critical dimension. For the G G there is a deep minimum in (d) somewhere in the region of

FIG. 26: (Color online) Critical exponent as a function of space dimension. The diagonal dotted line represents the physical limit line (d) = 2 d, whereas the horizontal dotted line represents = 0. The solid and dashed lines represent the -expansion estimates for for the GG and ISG, respectively. For all d < $d_{\rm lcd}$ 2:5 (d) must join the limit line. The shaded region denotes the area where one expects the lower critical dimension.

d = 4 (data at d = 5 would be needed to pin down the position of the minimum). In spin glasses, sim ply going from Ising to vector spins changes this exponent considerably, whereas in three-dimensional ferrom agnets is very sm all and practically independent of the type

of spin sym m etry.

Finally, in Fig. 27 the critical dynamical exponent z (d) can be compared near d = 6 with the van H ove approx- $)_{I}^{55}$ or for the ISG case with the imation z = 2(2)rst order -expansion z = 2 (2) $= (1 + =4)^{6}$. The van Hove expression can provide a qualitative indication for z (d) once the num erical values of (d) are known, but if the directly measured (d) values are used rather than the epsilon expansion estimates, this expression would predict higher z values at each d for the GG com pared with the ISG values, which is not what is observed. z (d) must diverge at the lower critical dimension, while curiously the GG z (d) values only increase slightly between d = 4 and d = 3. For the Gaussian ISG, z(d) shows an indication of divergence as the space dimension drops.

X. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have studied the critical parameters of the GG, in dimensions two, three and four. The data con rm that $T_{\rm c}$ is zero in two dimensions. It appears that the most reliable and accurate methods for estimating critical temperature and exponent values are direct susceptibil-



FIG. 27: (Color online) C ritical exponent z as a function of space dimension. The horizontal dotted line marks the meaneld asymptotic value z = 4, whereas the shaded region denotes the area where one expects the lower critical dimension. The solid (dashed) curve shows the asymptotic behavior as predicted from the van Hove approximation (Ref. 55) for the GG (ISG). One expects that z (d ! d_{lcd}) ! 1 . The ISG data show this behavior whereas the GG data are inconclusive.

ity m easurem ents, e ective sti ness m easurem ents (current m easurem ents in the GG case), and a combination of nonequilibrium and susceptibility m easurem ents. In each case corrections to scaling are either so sm all as to be negligible or can be taken into account. B inder param eter m easurem ents are inappropriate as the B inder param eter curves do not intersect, at least for the system sizes used, and correlation length m easurem ents are not alw ays reliable because there can be strong deviations from nite-size scaling.

From these results a general strategy for obtaining (high-precision) critical parameters numerically in any glassy system can be sketched out. It is essential to be able to rely on high-quality equilibrium susceptibility data over a wide range of sizes and to as large a size as computational resources allow. Careful analysis of these data allowing for the leading correction to scaling term should provide reliable estimates of the ordering tem perature and of the equilibrium critical exponents. Further m easurem ents of the ective sti ness as a function of tem perature together with nonequilibrium behavior can then con m the value of the ordering tem perature and give further information on other exponents including the critical dynamical exponent z. Parameters involving ratios (such as the Binder parameter or the correlation length) seem frequently to be biased, at small and moderate sizes, by complicated corrections to scaling and should be treated with caution.

If we compare with other systems having d = 6 as upper critical dimension, ISGs and percolation, the exponent (d) always evolves regularly, diverging when the dim ension reaches the lower critical dim ension. The exponent (d) on the other hand changes dram atically in form from one family to the next. For the Gaussian ISG (d) grows smoothly more negative as the dimension drops from the upper critical dimension to the lower critical dimension. For the percolation system s (d) has a weak m in im um around d = 3 before becom ing positive at $d = 2.5^{7}$ The present results show that for the GG there is a deep minimum in (d) near d = 4. This is in stark contrast to the situation in the canonical Ising, X Y, or Heisenberg systems with no disorder where (d) hardly changes at all when the degrees of freedom of the spin are modied. In addition, for the canonical system s the RG

-expansion to third order gives excellent predictions for the exponents at dimensions well below the upper critical dimension, while for the ISG and GG systems the -expansion to the same order^{53,54} gives poor predictions for dimensions quite close to the upper critical dimension d = 6.

We have thus proposed a road plan for determ ining critical exponents reliably and accurately from simulations; however, the results con rm once again that the canonicalRG theory lacks essential ingredients when applied to glassy systems. The physical signi cance of the exponent values obtained, however good they are, must remain obscure until the appropriate theoretical approach going beyond the traditional RG is found for interpreting them.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e would like to thank J. Salas for helpful correspondence. C.DeD om inicis and A.J.Bray kindly supplied us with the leading term for the exponent ! in the expansion for the ISG and the GG cases, respectively. The simulations were performed on the Asgard cluster at ETH Zurich.

- ¹ C. de Dom inicis, I. Kondor, and T. Tem esari, Beyond the sherrington-kirkpatrick model, in Spin G lasses and Random Fields, edited by A. Young (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1998).
- ² H.Kawamura, Chiral ordering in Heisenberg spin glasses

in two and three dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3785 (1992).

³ H. Kawamura, Dynam ical Simulation of Spin-G lass and Chiral-G lass Orderings in Three-D im ensional H eisenberg spin glasses, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5421 (1998).

- ⁴ J.D.Reger, T.A.Tokuyasu, A.P.Young, and M.P.A. Fisher, Vortex-glass transition in three dimensions, Phys. Rev.B 44, 7147 (1991).
- ⁵ J.D.Regerand A.P.Young, M onte carlo study of a vortex glass m odel, J.Phys.A 26, 1067 (1993).
- ⁶ T.Olson and A.P.Young, Finite tem perature ordering in the three-dimensional gauge glass, Phys.Rev.B 61, 12467 (2000), (cond-m at/991229).
- ⁷ H. G. Katzgraber and A. P. Young, Numerical studies of the two- and three-dimensional gauge glass at low temperature, Phys. Rev. B 66, 224507 (2002), (condmat/0205206).
- ⁸ K. Hukushim a and K. Nemoto, Exchange Monte Carlo method and application to spin glass simulations, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 65, 1604 (1996).
- ⁹ E. Marinari, Optim ized Monte Carlo methods, in Advances in Computer Simulation, edited by J.K ertesz and I.K ondor (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998), p. 50, (condmat/9612010).
- ¹⁰ H.G.Katzgraber and A.P.Young, Nature of the spinglass state in the three-dimensional gauge glass, Phys.Rev. B 64, 104426 (2001), (cond-mat/0105077).
- ¹¹ H.G.Katzgraber, On the existence of a nite-tem perature transition in the two-dimensional gauge glass, Phys. Rev. B 67, 180402 (R) (2003), (cond-m at/0305393).
- ¹² J. Salas and A.D. Sokal, Universal Amplitude Ratios in the Critical Two-D in ensional Ising M odel on a Torus, J. Stat. Phys. 98, 551 (2000), (cond-m at/9904038).
- ¹³ J. Salas and A. D. Sokal, The 3-State Square-Lattice Potts Antiferrom agnet at Zero Tem perature, J. Stat. Phys. 92, 729 (1998).
- ¹⁴ H. G. Ballesteros, L. Fernandez, V. Martin-Mayor, G.Parisi, and J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, Scaling corrections: site percolation and Ising model in three dimensions, J.Phys. A 32,1 (1999).
- ¹⁵ In this work \ln" refers to the natural logarithm, whereas \log" refers to the logarithm with base 10.
- ¹⁶ K. Binder, Critical properties from Monte Carlo coarse graining and renorm alization, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 693 (1981).
- ¹⁷ H. Kawamura, Simulation studies on the stability of the vortex-glass order, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 69, 29 (2000).
- ¹⁸ P.O. M ari and I.A. C am pbell, The ordering tem perature and critical exponents of the bim odal Ising spin glass in dim ension three, Phys. Rev. B 65, 184409 (2002).
- ¹⁹ L. Berthier and J. P. Bouchaud, Geometrical aspects of aging and rejuvenation in the Ising spin glass: A num erical study, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054404 (2002).
- ²⁰ H. G. Ballesteros, A. Cruz, L. Fernandez, V. Martin-Mayor, J.Pech, J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, A. Tarancon, P. Tellez, C. L. Ullod, and C. Ungil, Critical behavior of the threedimensional Ising spin glass, Phys. Rev. B 62, 14237 (2000), (cond-mat/0006211).
- ²¹ L.W. Lee and A.P.Young, Single spin- and chiral-glass transition in vector spin glasses in three dimensions, Phys. Rev.Lett. 90, 227203 (2003), (cond-m at/0302371).
- ²² F.Cooper, B.Freedman, and D.Preston, Solving ⁴_{1,2} theory with Monte Carlo, Nucl. Phys. B 210, 210 (1982).
- ²³ V. Mart n-Mayor, A. Pelissetto, and E. Vicari, Critical structure factor in ising systems, Phys. Rev. E 66, 26112 (2002).
- ²⁴ J.K.Kim, A.J.F.de Souza, and D.P.Landau, Num ericalcomputation of nite size scaling functions: an alternative approach to nite size scaling, Phys. Rev. E 54, 2291

(1996).

- ²⁵ M.Palassini and S.Caracciolo, Universal Finite-Size Scaling Functions in the 3D Ising Spin Glass, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 5128 (1999).
- ²⁶ H.G.Katzgraber and I.A.Campbell, Size-dependence of the InternalEnergy in Ising and Vector Spin G lasses, Phys. Rev.B 68, 180402 (R) (2003), (cond-m at/0309278).
- ²⁷ D.A.Huse, Remanent magnetization decay at the spinglass critical point: A new dynamic critical exponent for nonequilibrium autocorrelations, Phys. Rev. B 40, 304 (1989).
- ²⁸ G.Parisi, F.Ricci-Tersenghi, and J.J.Ruiz-Lorenzo, Universality in the o -equilibrium critical dynamics of the three-dimensional diluted Ising model, Phys. Rev. E 60, 5198 (1999).
- ²⁹ R.E.Blundell, K.Humayun, and A.J.Bray, Dynamic exponent of the 3D Ising spin glass, J.Phys.A 25, L733 (1992).
- ³⁰ E. Marinari and G. Parisi, On the e ects of changing the boundary conditions on the ground state of Ising spin glasses, Phys. Rev. B 62, 11677 (2000).
- ³¹ H.R ieger, N onequilibrium dynam ics and aging in the threedim ensional Ising spin-glass m odel, J. Phys. A 26, L615 (1993).
- ³² Y. O zeki and N. Ito, N onequilibrium relaxation study of Ising spin glass m odels, P hys. Rev. B 64, 024416 (2001).
- ³³ A.T.Ogielski, Dynam ics of three-dimensional Ising spin glasses in thermal equilibrium, Phys. Rev. B 32, 7384 (1985).
- ³⁴ J. Kisker, L. Santen, M. Schreckenberg, and H. Rieger, O -equilibrium dynamics in nite-dimensional spin-glass models, Phys. Rev. B 53, 6418 (1996).
- ³⁵ L.W. Bemardi, S.Prakash, and I.A.Campbell, Ordering Temperatures and CriticalExponents in Ising Spin G lasses, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 2798 (1996).
- ³⁶ This e ect is weak and can only be seen in a full-size plot.
- ³⁷ C.de Dominicis, (private communication).
- ³⁸ A.J.Bray, (private communication).
- ³⁹ L.K lein, J.Adler, A.Aharony, A.B.Harris, and Y.Meir, Series expansions for the ising spin glass in general dim ension, Phys. Rev. B 43, 11249 (1991).
- ⁴⁰ H. Kawamura and M. S. Li, Nature of the ordering of the three-dimensionalXY spin glass, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 187204 (2001), (cond-m at/0106551).
- ⁴¹ M.P.A.Fisher, T.A.Tokuyasu, and A.P.Young, Vortex variable-range-hopping resistivity in superconducting lms, Phys.Rev.Lett. 66, 2931 (1991).
- ⁴² M. J. P. Gingras, Numerical study of vortex-glass order in random -superconductor and related spin-glass models, Phys. Rev. B 45, 7547 (1992).
- ⁴³ N. Akino and J. M. Kosterlitz, Domain wall renorm alization group study of XY model with quenched random phase shifts, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054536 (2002), (condmat/0203299).
- ⁴⁴ M.V.Simkin, Comment on \Voltage-Current Characteristics of the Two-D im ensionalG auge G lass M odel" (1996), (cond-m at/9604178).
- ⁴⁵ E.Granato, Current-voltage scaling of chiral and gaugeglass models of two-dimensional superconductors, Phys. Rev.B 58, 11161 (1998).
- ⁴⁶ K.Hukushima, Domain-wallfree energy of spin-glass models: Numerical method and boundary conditions, Phys. Rev.E 60, 3606 (1999).
- ⁴⁷ J.-P.Bouchaud, F.K rzakala, and O.M artin, Energy expo-

nents and corrections to scaling in Ising spin glasses, P hys. Rev.B 68, 224404 (2003), (cond-m at/0212070).

- ⁴⁸ Note that for the upper critical dimension, d = 6, we expect mean-eld exponents, i.e., = 1=2, = 0, and z = 4.
- ⁴⁹ G.Parisi, F.R. icci-Tersenghi, and J.J.R. uiz-Lorenzo, Equilibrium and o -equilibrium simulations of the 4d Gaussian spin glass, J.P. hys. A 29, 7943 (1996).
- ⁵⁰ E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, On the phase structure of the 3d Edwards Anderson spin glass, Phys. Rev. B 58, 14852 (1998).
- ⁵¹ I.A.Campbell, D.Petit, P.O.Mari, and L.W.Bernardi, Critical exponents in Spin G lasses : num erics and experiments, J.Phys.Soc.Jap.Suppl.A 69, 186 (2000).
- ⁵² R.N. Bhatt and A.P.Young, Num erical studies of Ising spin glasses in two, three and four dim ensions, Phys. Rev.

В 37,5606 (1988).

- ⁵³ J. E. Green, Critical behaviour of a random m-vector model, J. Phys. A 17, L43 (1985).
- ⁵⁴ M. A. Moore and S. Murphy, Critical exponents of the vortex glass to order ³, Phys. Rev. B 42, 2587 (1990).
- ⁵⁵ A.Zippelius, Critical dynam ics of spin-glasses, Phys. Rev. B 29, 2717 (1984).
- ⁵⁶ G.Parisi and P.Ranieri, O ne-loop contribution to the dynam ical exponents in spin glasses, J.Phys.A 30, L415 (1997), (cond-m at/9701160).
- ⁵⁷ J. Adler, A. Meir, A. Aharony, and A. B. Harris, Series study of percolation moments in general dimension, Phys. Rev. B 41, 9183 (1990).