

"SPHERICAL" 3-STATE POTTS SPIN GLASS: EXACT SOLUTION

N. V. Gribova, V.N.Ryzhov, and E.E.Tareyeva

Institute for High Pressure Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Troitsk 142190, Moscow region, Russia

(March 22, 2002)

A continuous 3-state Potts model with an analog of spherical constraints is proposed and is shown to have an exact solution in the case of infinite-ranged interactions. "Spherical" 3-state Potts spin glass model is solved using the known properties of a large random matrix. For this model the results are identical to those obtained by the replica approach for replica symmetric solution.

During last decades the so called 1RSB (one-step replica-symmetry breaking) models: the p -state Potts spin glasses (PG) and p -spin spin glasses as well as their continuous versions – are in the focus of investigations in spin glass theory. Although the spherical models are rather unrealistic they present rare examples of many-particle systems which can be solved analitically in three dimensions. It is well known that the behaviour of continuous magnetic systems with spherical constraints differs essentially of their discrete counterparts being in some aspects nonphysical. Nevertheless it seems always interesting to consider models which have exact solutions in regular as well as in random couplings cases.

In this Letter we introduce and solve a new model – "spherical" continuous generalization of three-state Potts model. This can be easily done due to a representation of 3-state Potts model in terms of quadrupole moment operators used in our papers dealing with the 3-state Potts spin glass. The content of this Letter is the straightforward generalization of the paper by Berlin and Kac¹ where the spherical two-spin model was introduced and solved for nearest neighbour interactions on different lattices and that by Kosterlitz, Thouless and Jones² where this model was solved in the case of infinite-ranged interactions with a Gaussian probability distribution (spherical version of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK)³ model).

The p -state Potts spin glass model is a lattice model where each lattice site carries a Potts spin σ_i which can take one of the p values $\sigma_i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$ with the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{p}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} \delta_{\sigma_i \sigma_j} \quad (1)$$

where $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$ is the Kronecker symbol. Thus, a pair $\{\sigma_i, \sigma_j\}$ contributes an energy $-J_{ij}$ if $\sigma_i = \sigma_j$ and zero otherwise. The interactions J_{ij} are quenched random variables described by a Gaussian distribution

$$P(J_{ij}) = (\sqrt{2\pi}J)^{-1} \exp [-(J_{ij} - J_0)^2/2J^2].$$

The Potts glass with an infinite-range interaction $J_0 = \tilde{J}_0/N$, $J = \tilde{J}/N^{1/2}$ has been studied in ⁴⁻¹³. The short-range version has been considered in ¹⁴⁻¹⁶ and is a subject of intense investigation through computer simulations ¹⁷.

The soft-spin version of PG has also been suggested as a starting point for a theory of structural glasses and the transition from the metastable fluid to the glass state ¹⁸. The Potts glass may also serve as a model for orientational glasses in molecular crystals and cluster glasses where a strong single-site anisotropy restricts the orientation of the appropriate molecular group to p distinct directions.

As is well known in SK discrete spin glass ³ the replica symmetric (RS) solution is unstable and one needs to use the Parisi scheme to obtain the stable solution with so called full replica symmetry breaking (FRSB). In the corresponding spherical spin glass the exact solution can be obtained by straightforward thermal averaging and using the known properties of a large random matrix and this solution is identical to RS solution obtained through replica approach ².

In the case of p -spin spherical spin glass with $p > 2$ it was established rigorously by Crisanti and Sommers ¹⁹ that there is a discontinuous transition to 1RSB solution and this solution remains stable till zero temperature. For discrete Ising spin p -spin glass E.Gardner ²⁰ has shown that 1RSB solution is unstable at very low temperature using perturbations about known solutions for the cases $p = 2 + \epsilon$ and $p \rightarrow \infty$. The second transition leads to a phase described by a continuous order parameter full RSB (FRSB) function $q(x)$.

The 3-state Potts spin glass is somehow intermediate system between SK ($p=2$) glass and "canonical" 1RSB glasses. In 3-state PG there is no reflection symmetry and 1RSB solution was shown ^{8,11} to be stable in the vicinity of the RS transition temperature (which coincides with that of 1RSB transition) against the higher stages of RSB, but the

static and dynamical transitions are both continuous, which is not a general property of 1RSB models. Recently, it was shown ²¹ that at low temperature the 1RSB solution becomes unstable and a 2RSB or full RSB can take place.

Let us consider now the system of particles on lattice sites i, j with the reduced Hamiltonian ^{9,10}:

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} (Q_i Q_j + V_i V_j), \quad (2)$$

where $Q = 3J_z^2 - 2$, $\mathbf{J}=1$, $J_z = 1, 0, -1$. A particle quadrupole moment is the second-rank tensorial operator with five components. In the principal axes frame only two of them remain: Q and V . In the subspace $\mathbf{J}=1$ the following equality holds:

$$\frac{1}{6} (Q_{m(i)} Q_{n(j)} + V_{m(i)} V_{n(j)} + 2) = \delta_{mn}.$$

This equality shows the equivalence of (2) to the $p = 3$ Potts Hamiltonian (1). We shall assume that J_{ij} are distributed following the Gaussian law with zero mean:

$$P(J_{ij}) = (\sqrt{2\pi}J)^{-1} \exp[-J_{ij}^2/2J^2],$$

and $J = \tilde{J}/N^{1/2}$.

It is easy to show that the operators Q and V in the subspace $J = 1$ are such that $QV = V$, $Q^2 = 2 - Q$ and $V^2 = 2 + Q$ so that

$$Q^2 + V^2 = 4. \quad (3)$$

This equality is the key one permitting to introduce a continuous "spherical" generalization of the discrete 3-state Potts model. The Hamiltonian (2) with the constraints

$$\sum_i (Q_i^2 + V_i^2) = 4N \quad (4)$$

can be solved exactly and the solution occurs to be identical to the replica symmetric solution obtained through replica approach.

Let us first diagonalize the matrix J_{ij} by an orthogonal transformation. The variables Q_i and V_i are transformed to new variables Q_λ and V_λ defined by

$$Q_\lambda = \sum_i \langle \lambda | i \rangle Q_i; \quad V_\lambda = \sum_i \langle \lambda | i \rangle V_i, \quad (5)$$

where $\langle \lambda | i \rangle$ is the orthonormal eigenvector of J_{ij} belonging to the eigenvalue J_λ . In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ the eigenvalue density $\rho(J_\lambda)$ obeys the semicircular law (see e.g.²²):

$$\rho(J_\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi\tilde{J}^2} (4\tilde{J}^2 - J_\lambda^2)^{1/2}. \quad (6)$$

The constraints (4) on the integration in partition function may be taken into account by use of corresponding δ -function. Using integral representation for δ -function and performing integration over the variables Q_λ and V_λ as is usually done in spherical-model approach we obtain the partition sum in the form (up to unimportant normalization factor):

$$Z = \int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \exp \left[N \left(4z - \frac{1}{N} \sum_\lambda \ln(z - 2\beta J_\lambda) \right) \right], \quad (7)$$

where the contour of integration is to the right of the largest eigenvalue, $2\tilde{J}$.

Using the integration $\int dJ \rho(J) \dots$ with $\rho(J)$ from (6) instead of the summation $(1/N) \sum_\lambda \dots$ we obtain the saddle-point equation for z :

$$z - \sqrt{z^2 - t^2} = 2t^2, \quad (8)$$

where $t = \beta\tilde{J}$. The equation (8) has the solution $z = \frac{1}{4}(1 + 4t^2)$ if $T > T_c$ and T_c is determined by the condition $z^2 = t^2$, that is $4t_c^2 = 1$. For $T < T_c$, Eq. (8) has no solution, and the saddle-point value of z sticks at t , the branch point of the integrand of Eq. (7) (see ²). The partition function (7) gives the free energy per site averaged over the eigenvalue spectrum (²²) ($k_B = 1$):

$$\langle f(T) \rangle_{av} = -T - 2\frac{\tilde{J}^2}{T} - 2T \ln 2, \quad T > T_c, \quad (9)$$

$$\langle f(T) \rangle_{av} = -4\tilde{J} + \frac{T}{2} + T \ln \frac{\tilde{J}}{2T}, \quad T < T_c. \quad (10)$$

Specific heat per site is $4t^2$ for $T > T_c$ and 1 for $T < T_c$. The low-temperature entropy is negative and diverges logarithmically as $T \rightarrow 0$. This nonphysical behaviour is analogous to the standard pathology of spherical models.

Let us consider now the Hamiltonian (2) using replica approach. Using standard procedure we can write the replica free energy per site in the following form (compare with ^{9,10,21}:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\beta f &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{nN} \left\{ \int_{a-i\infty}^{a+i\infty} dz \left[\int dQ_1 \dots dQ_n dV_1 \dots dV_n dy_1 dy_2 dx_1 dx_2 \times \right. \right. \\
&\times \exp \left\{ -\frac{n(n-1)y_1^2}{4} - \frac{n(n-1)y_2^2}{4} - \frac{nx_1^2}{2} - \frac{nx_2^2}{2} + 4nz - z \sum_{\alpha} (Q_{\alpha}^2 + V_{\alpha}^2) \right\} \times \\
&\times \exp \left\{ \frac{ty_1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} Q_{\alpha} Q_{\beta} + \frac{ty_2}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} V_{\alpha} V_{\beta} + \frac{tx_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha}^2 + \frac{tx_2}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha} V_{\alpha}^2 \right\} \Big]^N - 1 \Big\}
\end{aligned}$$

Here $x_1 \sim \langle Q_{\alpha}^2 \rangle$, $x_2 \sim \langle V_{\alpha}^2 \rangle$, $y_1 \sim \langle Q_{\alpha} Q_{\beta} \rangle$, $y_2 \sim \langle V_{\alpha} V_{\beta} \rangle$.

Taking into account that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int dQ_{\alpha_1} \dots dQ_{\alpha_n} \exp \left\{ \frac{ty_1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} Q_{\alpha} Q_{\beta} + \frac{tx_1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha} Q_{\alpha}^2 - z \sum_{\alpha} (Q_{\alpha}^2) \right\} = \\
&= \exp \left[-\frac{n}{2} \ln \left(z - \frac{tx_1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{ty_1}{2} \right) + n \frac{ty_1}{4 \left(z - \frac{tx_1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{ty_1}{2} \right)} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain finally the saddle-point free energy in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\beta f &= 4z - \frac{x_1^2}{2} - \frac{x_2^2}{2} + \frac{y_1^2}{4} + \frac{y_2^2}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(z - \frac{x_1 t}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{y_1 t}{2} \right) + \quad (11) \\
&+ \frac{ty_1}{4 \left(z - \frac{x_1 t}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{y_1 t}{2} \right)} - \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(z - \frac{x_2 t}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{y_2 t}{2} \right) + \frac{ty_2}{4 \left(z - \frac{x_2 t}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{y_2 t}{2} \right)}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the equations for the extremum condition for (11) have a solution $x_1 = x_2 = x$ and $y_1 = y_2 = y$. Now these equations have the form:

$$8(z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2})^2 - 2(z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2}) - ty = 0; \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{t^2 y}{4(z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2})^2} = y; \quad (13)$$

$$x = \frac{t}{4(z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2})} + \frac{t^2 y}{8(z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2})^2} \quad (14)$$

The solution of the equation (12) gives

$$z - \frac{xt}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{yt}{2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}$$

if $y \rightarrow 0$. So, the Eq. (13) gives the critical temperature T_c defined by $4t_c^2 = 1$.

For $T > T_c$ the solution of the equations (12) – (14) is

$$y = 0, x = t\sqrt{2}, z = \frac{1}{4} + t^2$$

and the replica symmetric free energy (11) coincides with that given by (9). For $T < T_c$ we obtain

$$y = 2t - 1, x = t\sqrt{2}, z = t$$

and the replica symmetric free energy (11) coincides with that given by (10). Following ² it is easy to show that the behavior of the order parameters is identical in both approaches. For standard glass order parameter q we have $q = y/t = 2 - 1/t$.

So, the replica symmetric solution for the 3-state "spherical" Potts glass coincides with the exact solution for this model obtained by use of the known properties of large random matrices so that no replica symmetry breaking is needed. This case is in close analogy with the case of spherical version of the SK model.

It is worth making some remarks. First, it is interesting to emphasize that the exact solution is the replica symmetric one, although there is no reflection symmetry in the model. The 3-state spherical Potts glass behaves like spherical SK glass and not like the p -spin spherical model. So, one can conclude that it is not the reflection symmetry that define the replica solution in spin glasses.

Second, the model proposed in this paper permit to consider correctly the dynamics of glass transition.

Third, it is obvious that the regular case can be solved exactly, too. Following ¹ we can consider different lattices and short-ranged interactions. For the case of infinite-ranged regular interaction ($J_{ij} = G$) analogous to that of Kac ²³ model we obtain directly from the partition sum (7)

$$f(T) = -T - 2G - 2T \ln 2, T > T_c, \quad (15)$$

$$f(T) = -4G + T \ln \frac{G}{2T}, T < T_c, \quad (16)$$

with a discontinuity in specific heat at T_c ($T_c = 2G$).

This work was supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Grants No. 02-02-16621 (NVG and EET) and No. 02-02-16622 (VNR)) and NWO-RFBR grant No. 04-01-89005.

¹ T.H.Berlin, H.Kac, Phys.Rev. **86**, 821 (1952).

² J.M.Kosterlitz, D.J.Thouless, and R.C.Jones, Phys.Rev.Lett. **36**, 1217 (1976).

³ D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 1972 (1975); S. Kirkpatrick, D. Sherrington, Phys. Rev. **B17**, 4384 (1978).

⁴ D.Elderfield, and D.Sherrington, J.Phys. C:Solid State Physics, **16** L497, L971, L1169 (1983).

⁵ A. Erzan and E. J. S. Lage, J. Phys. C **16**, L555, L873 (1983).

⁶ D.Elderfield, J.Phys. A:Math.Gen., **17** L517 (1984).

⁷ E. J. S. Lage and J.M.Nunes da Silva, J. Phys. C **18**, L817 (1984).

⁸ D.J.Gross, I.Kanter and H.Sompolinsky. Phys.Rev.Lett. 1985. V. 55. P. 304.

⁹ E.A.Lutchinskaia, E.E.Tareyeva. Theor.Math.Phys. (Moscow). 1991. V. 87. P. 473;

¹⁰ E.A.Lutchinskaia, E.E.Tareyeva. Theor.Math.Phys. (Moscow). 1992. V. 91. P. 157.

¹¹ E. A. Lutchinskaia and E. E. Tareyeva, Europhys. Lett. **17**, 109 (1992); Phys. Lett. A **181**, 331 (1993).

¹² E.A.Lutchinskaia, E.E.Tareyeva. Phys.Rev.B. 1995. V. 52. P. 366.

¹³ E.De Santis, G.Parisi, F.Ritort. J.Phys.A. 1995. V. 28. P. 3025.

¹⁴ Y.Y.Goldschmidt, Phys.Rev.B.**31** 366 (1985).

¹⁵ G. Cwlich and T. R. Kirkpatrick, J. Phys. A **22**, 4971 (1989).

- ¹⁶ G. Cwilich, J. Phys. A **23**, 5029 (1990).
- ¹⁷ K. Binder, J.D. Reger, Advances in Physics **41**, 547 (1992).
- ¹⁸ T. R. Kirkpatrick and P. G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev.B. **36**, 8552 (1987) T.R.Kirkpatrick and D.Thirumalai, Phys.Rev.B **37**, 5342 (1988); D.Thirumalai, and T.R.Kirkpatrick, Phys.Rev.B **38**, 4881 (1988).
- ¹⁹ A.Crisanti, H.J.Sommers, Z.Phys.B. **87**, 341 (1992).
- ²⁰ E.Gardner, Nucl.Phys. **B257** [**FS14**], 747 (1985).
- ²¹ N.V.Gribova, V.N.Ryzhov, E.E.Tareyeva. Phys.Rev.E **68**, 067103 (2003).
- ²² M.L.Mehta, *Random Matrices and the Statistical Theory of Energy Levels* (Academic, NY, 1967), p.240.
- ²³ See, e.g., H.E.Stanley, *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, England, 1971), p.91.