

Effective Potential in Glass Forming Liquids

Antonio de Candia

*Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli "Federico II" and INFM, Unità di Napoli
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo, Via Cintia, I-80126 Napoli, Italy*

The effective potential formalism is applied to glass forming liquids, choosing a coupling potential such that the "order parameter", conjugated to the coupling strength, is the mean square displacement of the particles from their position in the quenched reference configuration. The potential is linear in some interval of its argument, signaling the coexistence of two phases in the system, one with low and one with high mean square displacement. Within this formalism, one can also compute the free energy of metastable states and their complexity.

PACS numbers: 05.20.-y, 64.70.Pf

The phase space of glassy systems is believed to break up, below some temperature T_c called "mode-coupling temperature", into an extensive number of components, called "free energy valleys" or "metastable states", separated by high free energy barriers. Lowering the temperature, the number of valleys accessible to the system becomes lower and lower, until at some temperature T_K , called "Kauzmann temperature", it becomes non-extensive. The existence of metastable states in the temperature range $T_K < T < T_c$ can be evidenced by the study of a system coupled to a quenched configuration [1–5]. Consider a system described by the variables x , and characterized by the Hamiltonian $H(x)$. Now switch on a coupling potential $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(x_0, x) = -\epsilon Q(x_0, x)$, where x_0 is a configuration of the system thermalized at temperature T , and then kept fixed (quenched), and $Q(x_0, x)$ is a measure of the "similarity" between the configurations x_0 and x (overlap). The free energy per particle $f(\epsilon)$ of the coupled system should be independent from the configuration x_0 in the thermodynamic limit (self-averaging). The effective potential is defined as the Legendre transform $v(q) = \max_\epsilon [f(\epsilon) + \epsilon q]$, and corresponds to the free energy of a system constrained at a fixed overlap $Q(x_0, x) = Nq$ from the reference configuration x_0 , where N is the number of particles.

The effective potential $v(q)$ was computed in mean field p -spin models [2, 3], and in glass forming liquids using the hypernetted chain approximation [4]. In both cases it was found that, besides the thermodynamically stable minimum at $q = 0$, below temperature T_c a secondary minimum appears, at high values of the overlap, signaling the presence of metastable states. The free energy difference between the two minima of the potential corresponds to the logarithm of the number of free energy valleys, that is the complexity, that vanishes at the thermodynamic glass transition T_K . Below T_K , the thermodynamic properties of the glass can still be evaluated by studying m coupled replicas of the system, and analytically continuing the free energy to values $m < 1$ [1, 6–8]. A recent review can be found in Ref. [9].

It is important to point out that, in finite dimensional systems with short range interactions, free energy barriers are finite below T_c due to nucleation effects (that

is activated or hopping processes), and diverge only at T_K . For temperatures $T_K < T < T_c$, the time needed to escape from a free energy valley is large but finite. Moreover the coexistence of different phases, implies that the effective potential has to be a convex function of its argument. This means that $v(q)$ cannot have a secondary minimum, and the dynamical transition T_c cannot be sharply defined.

In this paper, I will apply the effective potential formalism to simple liquids, choosing a particularly convenient coupling potential. The potential is such that the "order parameter", conjugated to the coupling strength ϵ , is the mean square displacement (m.s.d.) of the particles from their position in the quenched reference configuration [10]. Let us consider a liquid composed by N monoatomic particles of mass m enclosed in a cubic box of side L , interacting with a potential energy $U(\mathbf{r})$, where \mathbf{r} is a $3N$ -dimensional vector representing the positions of the particles, with periodic boundary conditions. The equilibrium free energy per particle, at temperature T , is given by (setting $k_B = 1$)

$$f_{\text{eq}}(T) = -\frac{T}{N} \ln \int \frac{d^{3N}\mathbf{r}}{N! \lambda^{3N}} e^{-\beta U(\mathbf{r})}, \quad (1)$$

$0 < r_i < L$

where the integral is done over an hypercubic box of volume V^N , with $V = L^3$, and $\lambda = \hbar \sqrt{2\pi/mT}$ is the thermal wavelength. Let us now consider a (quenched) configuration \mathbf{r}_0 thermalized at temperature T , and define the coupling potential

$$\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r}) = -T \ln \left[(\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{3N}{2}} \sum_{P, \mathcal{T}} e^{-\beta \epsilon |\mathbf{r} - P\mathcal{T}\mathbf{r}_0|^2} \right], \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ is the coupling strength, and $\epsilon_0 = \pi T(\rho/e)^{2/3}$, where $\rho = N/V$ is the density of the liquid. The operator \mathcal{T} runs over all the discrete translations of step L in the $3N$ -dimensional space, and the operator P runs over all the permutations of the particles. The configuration $P\mathcal{T}\mathbf{r}_0$ runs therefore over all the configurations "thermodynamically identical" to \mathbf{r}_0 . It may be said that configuration \mathbf{r}_0 is "partially annealed", because those identical configurations are effectively summed over in the partition function. When

$\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ the potential $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r})$ vanishes, as can be seen doing the substitution

$$\sum_{P, \mathcal{T}} e^{-\beta \epsilon |\mathbf{r} - P\mathcal{T}\mathbf{r}_0|^2} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{N!}{V^N} \int d^{3N} \mathbf{r}_0 e^{-\beta \epsilon |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0|^2}. \quad (3)$$

It can be seen, analogously, that $\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial \epsilon}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r})$ vanishes as well when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, when $\epsilon > 0$, the potential favors the configurations that, apart from a permutation of the particles, or a discrete translation of step L , are “near” to the configuration \mathbf{r}_0 . We can now evaluate the coupled free energy as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\epsilon) &= -\frac{T}{N} \ln \int \frac{d^{3N} \mathbf{r}}{N! \lambda^{3N}} e^{-\beta[U(\mathbf{r}) + \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r})]} \\ &= -\frac{T}{N} \ln \left\{ (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{3N}{2}} \int_{-\infty < r_i < \infty} \frac{d^{3N} \mathbf{r}}{\lambda^{3N}} e^{-\beta U(\mathbf{r}) - \beta \epsilon |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0|^2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where in the last member $U(\mathbf{r})$ has been extended by periodicity outside the domain $0 < r_i < L$. The free energy $f(\epsilon)$ can be also written as

$$f(\epsilon) = -\frac{T}{N} \ln \left\{ (\epsilon/\epsilon_0)^{\frac{3N}{2}} \int_0^\infty dr^2 e^{-\beta N[v(r^2) + \epsilon r^2]} \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where the effective potential $v(r^2)$ is defined by

$$v(r^2) = -\frac{T}{N} \ln \int \frac{d^{3N} \mathbf{r}}{\lambda^{3N}} \delta(r^2 - \frac{1}{N} |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0|^2) e^{-\beta U(\mathbf{r})}. \quad (6)$$

The derivative of the effective potential with respect to r^2 can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial v(r^2)}{\partial r^2} = \frac{3T}{2r^2} [\vartheta(r^2) - 1], \quad (7)$$

where $\vartheta(r^2) = \beta \langle (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0) \cdot \nabla U \rangle_{r^2} / 3N$, and the average $\langle \cdots \rangle_{r^2}$ is done at fixed m.s.d. r^2 from the configuration \mathbf{r}_0 , with the Boltzmann weight $e^{-\beta U(\mathbf{r})}$. From Eq. (6), being \mathbf{r}_0 thermalized at temperature T , it can be derived that $\lim_{r^2 \rightarrow 0} [v(r^2) + (3T/2) \ln(2e\pi r^2/3\lambda^2)] = u_{\text{eq}}(T)$, where $u_{\text{eq}}(T)$ is the mean potential energy per particle. The effective potential can then be computed by integration of $\vartheta(r^2)$,

$$v(r^2) = u_{\text{eq}}(T) + \frac{3T}{2} \left[\ln \left(\frac{3\lambda^2}{2e\pi r^2} \right) + \int_0^{r^2} \vartheta(r^2) d \ln r^2 \right]. \quad (8)$$

It is reasonable to believe that $f(\epsilon)$, $v(r^2)$ and $\vartheta(r^2)$ are self-averaging quantities, that is in the thermodynamic limit they do not depend on the configuration \mathbf{r}_0 , but only on the temperature at which \mathbf{r}_0 is thermalized. The potential $v(r^2)$ can be interpreted as the free energy of a system constrained to be at m.s.d. r^2 from the reference configuration \mathbf{r}_0 . Actually, this is true only if r^2

is not too large. Otherwise, many “thermodynamically identical” configurations, differing only by a permutation of the particles or a discrete translation of step L , will be contained in the hypersphere $\frac{1}{N} |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0|^2 = r^2$, and some “Gibbs correction factor” will be needed in the configurational integral in Eq. (6). The effective potential $v(r^2)$ and the free energy $f(\epsilon)$ are related by the Legendre transform

$$v(r^2) = \max_\epsilon \left[f(\epsilon) + \frac{3T}{2} \ln(\epsilon/\epsilon_0) - \epsilon r^2 \right]. \quad (9)$$

Note that $f(\epsilon) + \frac{3T}{2} \ln(\epsilon/\epsilon_0)$ is a convex function. Being $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} f(\epsilon) = f_{\text{eq}}(T)$, and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon}(\epsilon) = 0$ [11], from Eq. (9) one then finds

$$\lim_{r^2 \rightarrow \infty} \left[v(r^2) + \frac{3T}{2} \ln(r^2/r_{\text{max}}^2) \right] = f_{\text{eq}}(T), \quad (10)$$

where $r_{\text{max}}^2 = 3/(2e^{1/3}\pi\rho^{2/3})$. This equation has a simple interpretation: when r^2 is large, the hypersphere $\frac{1}{N} |\mathbf{r}_0 - \mathbf{r}|^2 = r^2$ contains every configuration of the liquid (modulo a permutation or a translation of step L) a number of times given by the ratio between the volume of the hypersphere and the volume $V^N/N!$ of the “physical” phase space, that is $(r^2/r_{\text{max}}^2)^{3N/2}$. This is the “Gibbs correction factor”, by which the configurational integral in Eq. (6) should be divided, when $r^2 > r_{\text{max}}^2$, to obtain the equilibrium free energy. Therefore, the effective potential $v(r^2)$ represents the constrained free energy only when $r^2 < r_{\text{max}}^2$. On the other hand, when $r^2 > r_{\text{max}}^2$, the liquid is essentially not constrained, and its free energy is $f_{\text{eq}}(T)$. Putting together Eq. (8) and (10), the equilibrium free energy can be computed, obtaining

$$f_{\text{eq}}(T) = u_{\text{eq}}(T) + T \left[\ln(\rho\lambda^3/e) + \frac{3}{2} \int_0^\infty \vartheta(r^2) d \ln r^2 \right]. \quad (11)$$

In a “mean field” picture, it may happen that the effective potential $v(r^2)$ has a metastable minimum at some “Edwards-Anderson” m.s.d. r_{EA}^2 . As it was mentioned before, in a finite dimensional system with short range interactions, the free energy barriers remains finite when the number of particles goes to infinity, due to nucleation effects. Phase coexistence then implies that $v(r^2)$ is a convex function [12]. Nevertheless, at temperatures near or below the mode-coupling temperature T_c , if we let the system evolve from the configuration \mathbf{r}_0 , it will remain trapped for a very long time at some m.s.d. r_{EA}^2 from \mathbf{r}_0 , that corresponds to the *plateau* in $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$ observed in the free evolution. If the time needed to escape from the metastable state is longer than the time needed to thermalize inside it, one can effectively define the free energy of the metastable state as the constrained free energy $v(r_{\text{EA}}^2)$. The complexity, defined as $\Sigma = \frac{1}{N} \ln \mathcal{N}$, where \mathcal{N} is the number of metastable states, can then be computed as the difference between the constrained free energy $v(r_{\text{EA}}^2)$, and the equilibrium one $f_{\text{eq}}(T)$, divided by




FIG. 1: Open circles: function $\vartheta(r^2)$ in LJBM for temperature $T = 0.5$. The Edwards-Anderson m.s.d. is chosen (somewhat arbitrarily) to be $r_{EA}^2 = 0.04$, that corresponds to the maximum of $\vartheta(r^2)$, and is also close to the *plateau* in $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$ observed in the free evolution. The interval in which points are well fitted by the dashed line is possibly characterized by phase coexistence. The critical coupling, corresponding to the (putative) first order transition, is $\epsilon_c = 1.05 \pm 0.10$ for this temperature.

the temperature. We are supposing here that the “constrained potential energy” $\langle U(\mathbf{r}) \rangle_{r_{EA}^2} / N$ coincides with the equilibrium one $u_{eq}(T)$, which is in principle assured only if r_{EA}^2 is a real minimum of $v(r^2)$, so that metastable states have infinite lifetime.

When temperature is low enough, a first order transition line in the $\epsilon - T$ plane is expected to appear. When this happens, there will be an interval in r^2 , corresponding to the coexistence of two different phases in the system, where the effective potential will be a linear function of r^2 , namely $v(r^2) = v_0 - \epsilon_c r^2$, where ϵ_c is the critical value of ϵ for that temperature. In terms of $\vartheta(r^2)$, in the coexistence interval it will be $\vartheta(r^2) = 1 - \frac{2\epsilon_c}{3T} r^2$.

This formalism can be applied to a hard sphere liquid as well. In that case, evaluating $\langle (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0) \cdot \nabla U \rangle_{r^2}$ as a temporal average, and being the time integral of the force $-\nabla U$ equal to the momentum variation $\Delta \mathbf{p}$, the function $\vartheta(r^2)$ can be computed as

$$\vartheta(r^2) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\beta}{3N\Delta t} \sum_i (\mathbf{r}_0 - \mathbf{r}_i) \cdot \Delta \mathbf{p}_i \Big|_{r^2} \quad (12)$$

where the sum is over all the collisions having place in the interval of time Δt , \mathbf{r}_i and $\Delta \mathbf{p}_i$ are the coordinates and momentum variations at the time of the i -th collision, and the liquid is constrained to move at fixed m.s.d. r^2 from the configuration \mathbf{r}_0 .

I have computed the function $\vartheta(r^2)$ in a well known binary mixture of particles interacting by a Lennard-Jones




FIG. 2: Solid line: effective potential $v(r^2)$ in LJBM for temperature $T = 0.5$. The potential is computed by Eq. (8), integrating a function that interpolates the measured values of $\vartheta(r^2)$, and setting $\hbar = m = 1$. The dotted line corresponds to $f_{eq}(T)$, computed by Eq. (11) corrected for mixtures (see text). As in Fig. 1, the interval fitted by the dashed line is possibly characterized by phase coexistence. The difference $[v(r_{EA}^2) - f_{eq}(T)]/T$ gives the complexity, that is $\Sigma = 0.55 \pm 0.03$ for this temperature.

potential (LJBM) [13], namely a mixture of 80% A particles and 20% B particles, with pair potential $v_{\alpha\beta}(r) = 4\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} [(\sigma_{\alpha\beta}/r)^{12} - (\sigma_{\alpha\beta}/r)^6]$, where $\epsilon_{AA} = 1$, $\sigma_{AA} = 1$, $\epsilon_{AB} = 1.5$, $\sigma_{AB} = 0.8$, $\epsilon_{BB} = 0.5$, and $\sigma_{BB} = 0.88$. I simulate the system at density $\rho = (0.94)^{-3}$, where the mode-coupling temperature is $T_c = 0.435$ [13]. In the case of mixtures, in previous equations one has to substitute $N!$ with $N_A!N_B!$. Moreover ϵ_0 has to be multiplied by the factor $(x_A^A x_B^B)^{2/3}$, where x_A and x_B are the fractions of A and B particles, and r_{max}^2 has to be divided by it. Therefore for this system one has $r_{max}^2 = 0.4220$. Finally, the free energy in Eq. (11) gets an extra contribution $T(x_A \ln x_A + x_B \ln x_B)$.

The number of particles simulated is $N = 1000$, in a box of side $L = 9.4$, with pair potential truncated at a distance $2.5\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$ and shifted. First of all, a configuration \mathbf{r}_0 is thermalized at temperature T , and kept fixed. Then, the system is cloned, copying configuration \mathbf{r}_0 into new variables \mathbf{r} . Subsequently, configuration \mathbf{r} is allowed to evolve, until the m.s.d. $\frac{1}{N}|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0|^2$ is equal to r^2 . At this point, while \mathbf{r}_0 is still kept fixed, \mathbf{r} is simulated constraining the m.s.d. to remain constant, by means of the RATTLE algorithm [14]. It is then necessary to “thermalize” configuration \mathbf{r} , by letting it evolve onto the hypersphere for a sufficient time. Finally, a time average of $\beta[(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0) \cdot \nabla U]/3N$ is computed to evaluate $\vartheta(r^2)$. This procedure can be repeated many times, with different and independent configurations \mathbf{r}_0 , to average “over the




FIG. 3: Open circles: distribution of the square displacements of the particles, when the m.s.d. is constrained to be $\langle r^2 \rangle = 0.25$. Solid lines: two Gaussian distributions, with m.s.d. 0.053 and 0.73, and weights 0.61 and 0.23.

disorder”, and evaluate the errors as standard deviations.

In Fig. 1, the function $\vartheta(r^2)$ for temperature $T = 0.5$ is plotted. It shows a maximum at $r^2 = 0.04$, that is very close to the *plateau* observed in $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$, when the system is allowed to evolve freely. This can be then identified with the Edwards-Anderson m.s.d. r_{EA}^2 . The interval where $\vartheta(r^2)$ is well fitted by the function $1 - \frac{2\epsilon_c}{3T} r^2$ corresponds to the coexistence of two phases in the system. The measured values of $\vartheta(r^2)$ were interpolated by a smooth function, that was then integrated to obtain the effective potential $v(r^2)$ by Eq. (8), which is plotted in Fig. 2. Here, the interval of phase coexistence is signaled by the fit with the function $v_0 - \epsilon_c r^2$. Note that the

m.s.d. r_{\max}^2 marks the crossover between the constrained liquid for $r^2 < r_{\max}^2$, whose free energy is $v(r^2)$, and the “unconstrained” liquid for $r^2 > r_{\max}^2$, whose free energy is $f_{eq}(T)$. The complexity for this temperature is equal to $\Sigma = 0.55 \pm 0.03$, a value compatible with the one measured in the inherent structure formalism within the “harmonic approximation” [15].

When the system is homogeneous, the distribution of the square displacements of the particles is expected to be Gaussian, $P(r^2) \propto r^2 \exp(-3r^2/2\langle r^2 \rangle)$ (here we denote by r^2 the square displacement of a single particle, and by $\langle r^2 \rangle$ the m.s.d.) On the other hand, when two phases coexist in the system, we expect that the distribution is given by the superposition of two Gaussians, plus a contribution from the interface. This is shown in Fig. 3, where the distribution measured in the system constrained at m.s.d. $\langle r^2 \rangle = 0.25$ is plotted. On the average, a fraction 0.61 of the particles belong to the “bound phase”, with m.s.d. 0.053, and a fraction 0.23 to the “unbound phase”, with m.s.d. 0.73. The remaining fraction of particles makes up the interface between the two phases. This “non-Gaussian heterogeneity” shows up also in the free evolution of the system [16].

In conclusion, I have applied the effective potential formalism to glass forming liquids, revealing the presence of a first order transition in the $\epsilon - T$ plane, between two phases characterized by low and high mean square displacement with respect to a quenched reference configuration. It would be interesting to understand how much of this picture is relevant to the dynamical behavior of the system. Indeed, near or below the mode-coupling temperature T_c , the relaxation times may be connected to the free energy barrier that must be overcome to nucleate a “unbound bubble” inside the sea of bound particles.

Acknowledgments – It is a pleasure to thank A. Coniglio for many fruitful discussions. This work was partially supported by INFM-PRA (HOP), MURST-PRIN-2003, and MIUR-FIRB-2002.

-
- [1] R. Monasson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2847 (1995).
 - [2] S. Franz and G. Parisi, J. Physique I **5**, 1401 (1995); Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2486 (1997).
 - [3] S. Franz and G. Parisi, Physica A **261**, 317 (1998).
 - [4] M. Cardenas, S. Franz, and G. Parisi, J. Phys. A **31**, L163 (1998); J. Chem. Phys. **110** 1726 (1999).
 - [5] S. Franz, C. Donati, G. Parisi, S.C. Glotzer, Phil. Mag. B **79**, 1827 (1999).
 - [6] M. Mézard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 747 (1998); J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 1076 (1999); J. Phys. Cond. Mat. **12**, 6655 (2000).
 - [7] B. Coluzzi, M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and P. Verrocchio, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 9039 (1999).
 - [8] B. Coluzzi, G. Parisi, and P. Verrocchio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 306 (2000); J. Chem. Phys. **112**, 2933 (2000).
 - [9] M. Mézard, Physica A **306**, 25 (2002).
 - [10] A similar coupling potential was already considered in Ref. [7], in order to compute the free energy of metastable states.
 - [11] This can be derived noting that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial \epsilon}(\epsilon)$ is the thermal average of $\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\epsilon}{\partial \epsilon}(\mathbf{r}_0, \mathbf{r})$, that goes to zero when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.
 - [12] Note however that $v(r^2)$ has not to be convex when $r^2 > r_{\max}^2$, because in that region it does not represent the constrained free energy.
 - [13] W. Kob and H.C. Andersen, Phys. Rev. E **51**, 4626 (1995); Phys. Rev. E **52** 4134 (1995).
 - [14] M.P. Allen and D.J. Tildesley, *Computer Simulations of Liquids*, Clarendon, Oxford (1987).
 - [15] F. Sciortino, W. Kob, and P. Tartaglia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3214 (1999).
 - [16] W. Kob, C. Donati, S.J. Plimpton, P.H. Poole, and S.C. Glotzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2827 (1997).