

# Autocorrelation exponent of conserved spin systems in the scaling regime following a critical quench

Clement Sire

Laboratoire de Physique Theorique (UMR 5152 du CNRS),  
 Universite Paul Sabatier, 118, route de Narbonne,  
 31062 Toulouse Cedex 4, France  
 E-mail: clement.sire@irsam.cups-tlse.fr

We study the autocorrelation function of a conserved spin system following a quench at the critical temperature. Defining the correlation length  $L(t) \sim t^{1/z}$ , we find that for times  $t^0$  and  $t$  satisfying  $L(t^0) \ll L(t) \ll L(t^0)$  well inside the scaling regime, the spin autocorrelation function behaves like  $\langle s(t)s(t^0) \rangle \sim L(t^0)^{-(d+2+\epsilon)} [L(t)=L(t^0)]^{\epsilon}$ . For the  $O(n)$  model in the  $n \rightarrow 1$  limit, we show that  $\epsilon = d+2$  and  $z=2$ . We give a heuristic argument suggesting that this result is in fact valid for any dimension  $d$  and spin vector dimension  $n$ . We present numerical simulations for the conserved Ising model in  $d=1$  and  $d=2$ , which are fully consistent with the present theory.

The quench of a ferromagnetic spin system [1], from high temperature ( $T_0 > T_c$ ) to low temperature (typically  $T=0$  or  $T=T_c$ ) is characterized by the growth of a correlation length scale (or domain length scale when domains can be identified),  $L(t) \sim t^{1/z}$ . In the non conserved case,  $z$  depends on the final temperature of the quench ( $z=2$  for  $T < T_c$ , while  $z$  is the dynamical critical exponent for  $T=T_c$  [2]). If the order parameter  $s(x;t)$  (possibly a vector) is locally conserved,  $z=3$  (scalar) or  $z=4$  (vector) for a quench below  $T_c$  [1], while  $z=4$  [2] for a quench at  $T_c$ . Another interesting and fundamental quantity is the spin autocorrelation  $A(t;t^0) = \langle s(x;t)s(x;t^0) \rangle \sim L(t)^{-\epsilon}$  [3, 4, 5]. For non conserved dynamics, whatever the temperature of the quench, is non trivial (except in  $d=1$  [1]) and only approximate theories are available for  $T=0$  [1, 4], while for  $T=T_c$  [3], the  $\epsilon$ -expansion of  $\epsilon$  can be calculated. In the case of conserved dynamics, it is now well established that  $\epsilon = d$  for quenches at and below  $T_c$  [6, 7, 8]. Hence, for fixed  $t^0$  and  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $A(t;t^0) \sim L(t)^{-d}$ . However, for  $t^0$  and  $t > t^0$  both in the scaling regime (in a sense to be defined later), several authors have observed numerically [9, 10, 11] and experimentally [12] a faster power law decay of the autocorrelation. More precisely, in the case of a quench of an Ising system at  $T_c$  (critical quench), the authors of [11] obtained numerically

$$A(t;t^0) \sim L(t^0)^{-(d+2+\epsilon)} \frac{L(t^0)^{\epsilon}}{L(t)}; \quad (1)$$

in  $d=1$  (where formally  $\epsilon=1$  and  $T_c=0$ ) and  $d=2$ . They respectively found  $\epsilon=2.5$  in  $d=1$  and  $\epsilon=3.5$  in  $d=2$ . They also suggested a general scaling relation

$$A(t;t^0) \sim L(t)^{-d} C \frac{L(t)}{L(t^0)}; \quad (2)$$

where  $C(x)$  goes to a non zero constant for  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $C(x) \sim x^{-(\epsilon/d)}$  for  $x \rightarrow 0$ , and

$$\epsilon = 1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon/d}; \quad (3)$$

As noticed in [11], this scaling implies the existence of a new relevant length scale  $L(t^0)$ , which is the crossover length between the two observed regimes. Its physical meaning has yet to be elucidated.

In the present Letter, we address the problem of the actual analytical derivation of  $\epsilon$  in the case of the  $O(n)$  model in the limit of infinite  $n$ . Within this model, the diffusive nature of this new length scale can be understood, and one finds  $\epsilon = d+2$  and  $z=2$ . By generalizing the interpretation of this diffusive crossover length scale to any  $O(n)$  spin system, we conjecture that the result  $\epsilon = d+2$  holds and that  $z=2$   $\Rightarrow z=2$ .

We first examine the exactly solvable  $O(n)$  model in the limit  $n \rightarrow 1$  and for dimensions  $d > 2$ . This model is known to be pathological for a quench at zero temperature, displaying multiscaling [13], whereas normal scaling should be restored at infinite  $n$  [1, 14]. However, after a quench at  $T_c$ , the structure factor obeys standard scaling even for  $n \rightarrow 1$  [7]. In the standard Cahn-Hilliard equation describing the evolution of the magnetization field  $s(x;t)$ ,  $s^2(x;t)=n$  can be replaced by its average in the limit  $n \rightarrow 1$ . Thus, any spin component satisfies

$$\frac{\partial s}{\partial t} = -s + k_0^2 s - \nabla^2 s; \quad (4)$$

where  $k_0^2$  is a constant,  $s(x;t)$  is a conserved delta-correlated noise satisfying  $\langle s(k;t)s(k^0;t^0) \rangle = 2T_c k^2 \delta(k+k^0) \delta(t-t^0)$ , and  $\nabla^2 s$  has to be computed self-consistently. Although the derivation of the structure factor has already appeared in the literature [7], we briefly repeat it as it furnishes a useful basis for our final derivation.

Eq. (4) can be solved in Fourier space, leading to

$$s(k;t) = s(k;0) + \int_0^t e^{q(k;\tau)} \langle \nabla^2 s(k;\tau) \rangle d\tau e^{-q(k;t)}; \quad (5)$$

where

$$q(k;t) = k^4 t - k^2 \int_0^t \langle k_0^2 s^2(x;\tau) \rangle d\tau; \quad (6)$$

Assuming an uncorrelated initial condition such that  $hs(\mathbf{k};0)s(\mathbf{k};0)i = s_0^2$ , we then find the structure factor  $S(\mathbf{k};t) = hs(\mathbf{k};t)s(\mathbf{k};t)i$

$$S(\mathbf{k};t) = s_0^2 + 2T_c k^2 \int_0^t e^{2q(\mathbf{k};\tau)} d\tau e^{2q(\mathbf{k};t)}: \quad (7)$$

We now express the self-consistent condition  $hs^2(\mathbf{x};t)i = \int_{\mathbf{R}} S(\mathbf{k};t) \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d}$ , where  $\int_{\mathbf{R}}$  is the inverse of a lattice cutoff.  $T_c$  is such that  $S(\mathbf{k};t \rightarrow 1) \sim k^{-2+z}$ , where  $z$  is the usual critical exponent controlling the decay of the static correlation function ( $z = 0$  for  $n = 1$ ). This leads to

$$T_c \int_{\mathbf{R}} k^{-2} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} = k_0^2: \quad (8)$$

Finally, if the above condition is satisfied, we find that  $q(\mathbf{k};t)$  obeys a scaling relation for large  $t$

$$q(\mathbf{k};t) = q(\mathbf{k}t^{1/4}) = k^4 t^{-c_d} k^2 t^{1/2}; \quad (9)$$

where  $c_d$  is a universal constant determined by a simple integral relation ( $c_d = 0$  for  $d > 4$ ) [7], and  $q(u) = u^4 - c_d u^2$ . We thus find  $L(t) = t^{1-z}$ , with  $z = 4$ , in agreement with the general result  $z = 4 - 2\epsilon$  [2]. We hence reproduce the general form of the structure factor

$$S(\mathbf{k};t) = s_0^2 e^{-2q(\mathbf{k}t^{1/4})} + t^{(2-z)/2} F(\mathbf{k}t^{1/4}): \quad (10)$$

For the  $O(n = 1)$  model, we have  $z = 4$ ,  $c_d = 0$ , and

$$F(u) = 2T_c u^2 \int_0^1 e^{-2u^4(1-v) + 2c_d u^2(1-v^{1/2})} dv: \quad (11)$$

Note the following asymptotics for  $F(u)$

$$F(u) \sim 2T_c u^2; \quad u \rightarrow 0; \quad (12)$$

$$F(u) \sim T_c u^{-2}; \quad u \rightarrow +\infty: \quad (13)$$

In the scaling limit, the first term of the right hand side (RHS) of Eq. (10) is negligible compared to the second term. In real space, Eq. (10) illustrates the fact that conventional (critical) scaling is obeyed

$$hs(\mathbf{x};t)s(\mathbf{0};t)i = L(t)^{(d-2+z)/2} f[\mathbf{x}/L(t)]; \quad (14)$$

where  $f$  is simply the inverse Fourier transform of  $F$ .

We now move to the calculation of the two-time correlation function, focusing on the case where both considered times  $t^0$  and  $t > t^0$  are in the scaling regime, a notion which will be made more precise hereafter. Using Eq. (5), and working along the line of the derivation of  $S(\mathbf{k};t)$ , we find the following expression for  $C(\mathbf{k};t) = hs(\mathbf{k};t)s(\mathbf{k};t^0)i$

$$C(\mathbf{k};t;t^0) = A_1(\mathbf{k};t;t^0) + A_2(\mathbf{k};t;t^0); \quad (15)$$

$$A_1(\mathbf{k};t;t^0) = s_0^2 e^{-q[\mathbf{k}L(t^0)] - q[\mathbf{k}L(t)]}; \quad (16)$$

$$A_2(\mathbf{k};t;t^0) = L(t^0)^2 e^{q[\mathbf{k}L(t^0)] - q[\mathbf{k}L(t)]} F[\mathbf{k}L(t^0)]; \quad (17)$$

For a fixed  $t^0$  and  $t \rightarrow 1$ , the contribution of  $A_2$  becomes negligible, as for large  $t$  and hence  $L(t)$ , only the contribution of small wave vector  $\mathbf{k} \sim L(t)^{-1}$  matters. Using the result of Eq. (12), we indeed find that this term is of order  $k^2 L(t)^{-2}$ , whereas the main contribution  $A_1$  in Eq. (16) is of order  $s_0^2$  which is a constant. Contrary to what occurs for  $S(\mathbf{k};t)$ , it is now the term depending on the initial conditions via  $s_0^2$  which dominates. Hence in this limit of fixed  $t^0$  and  $t \rightarrow 1$ , we find

$$C(\mathbf{k};t;t^0) - C(\mathbf{k};t;0) = s_0^2 e^{-q[\mathbf{k}L(t)]} = G[\mathbf{k}L(t)]; \quad (18)$$

and in real space

$$hs(\mathbf{x};t)s(\mathbf{0};t^0)i = L(t)^{-d} g[\mathbf{x}/L(t)]; \quad (19)$$

where  $g$  is the inverse Fourier transform of  $G$ . One recovers, in the limit  $t \rightarrow t^0$  to be made more precise later, that the large time autocorrelation exponent is  $c = d$ , which is observed in all conserved models including thermal fluctuations [6, 7]. In this limit, conventional scaling holds. However, we will now show that the contribution of Eq. (17) which has not so far been considered dominates in a well defined time regime, and will prompt us to introduce another autocorrelation exponent  $c_c$ .

For general  $t^0$  and  $t > t^0$ , we now proceed to calculate the autocorrelation for a spin on a given lattice site. Denoting  $A(t;t^0) = hs(\mathbf{x};t)s(\mathbf{x};t^0)i$ , we finally find  $A(t;t^0) = A_1(t;t^0) + A_2(t;t^0)$ , where

$$A_1(t;t^0) = s_0^2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-q[\mathbf{k}L(t^0)] - q[\mathbf{k}L(t)]} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d}: \quad (20)$$

After a change of variable and noting that the region of  $\mathbf{k} \sim L(t)^{-1}$  barely contributes to the integral, we find

$$A_1(t;t^0) = L(t)^{-d} a_1[L(t^0)/L(t)]; \quad (21)$$

Thus,  $A_1(t;t^0)$  obeys conventional scaling for any  $t^0$  and  $t > t^0$ . We explicitly find

$$a_1(u) = s_0^2 \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-k^4(1+u^4) + c_d k^2(1+u^2)} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d}; \quad (22)$$

where this integral is now over the entire space.  $a_1(u)$  remains bounded and of order  $s_0^2$  for any value of  $u = L(t^0)/L(t) \rightarrow 1$ . Keeping the notation  $u = L(t^0)/L(t) \rightarrow 1$ , the expression for  $A_2(t;t^0)$  can be written in the rescaled form

$$A_2(t;t^0) = L(t^0)^{(d-2)} u^d \int_{\mathbf{R}} e^{-k^4(1-u^4) + c_d k^2(1-u^2)} F(ku) \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d}: \quad (23)$$

Let us analyze the different asymptotics for  $A_2(t;t^0)$ . First of all, for large  $t = t^0$  ( $u = 1$ ), the integral is dominated by the region of large  $k$ 's. Using Eq. (8), we find the expected result  $A_2(t;t) \sim k_0^2$ , which is the

equilibrium value of  $h s^2 i$ . Note that if  $t \ll t_0$ , we obtain  $A_2(t; t^0) = A_2(t; t) - K_d(t - t^0) + \dots$ , where  $K_d$  is a computable constant. We now assume that  $1 - L(t) - L(t^0) - L(t^0)$ , which ensure that  $u$  is very close to 1. In this regime, we find that

$$A_2(t; t^0) = J_d L(t)^{(d-2)/4} \frac{L(t^0)}{L(t)}; \quad (24)$$

$$J_d^0(t - t^0)^{(d-2)/4}; \quad (25)$$

where  $J_d$  and  $J_d^0$  can be written exactly as simple integrals. Finally, and this constitutes the central result of this Letter, we consider the regime  $1 - L(t^0) - L(t)$ . In this case,  $u \ll 1$ , and the integral of Eq. (23) is dominated by the region of  $k$  of order unity, so that the small argument asymptotics can be taken for  $F(ku)$  in Eq. (23). We find

$$A_2(t; t^0) = d L(t^0)^{(d-2)/4} \frac{L(t^0)^{d+2}}{L(t)}; \quad (26)$$

$$d = 2T_c \int_0^1 k^2 e^{-k^4 + c_d k^2} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d}; \quad (27)$$

Eq. (26) takes exactly the expected form of Eq. (1), with

$$\frac{0}{c} = d + 2; \quad (28)$$

Hence, we find that  $A_2(t; t^0)$  prevails over  $A_1(t; t^0)$  for  $L(t^0) - L(t) - L_0(t^0)$ , with  $L_0(t^0) - L(t^0)$  and  $\frac{0}{c} = 2$ . For  $L(t^0) - L(t) - L_0(t^0)$ , the autocorrelation  $A(t; t^0)$   $A_2(t; t^0)$  is then given by Eq. (26). Moreover, Eq. (23) shows that instead of Eq. (2), the correct scaling is rather

$$A(t; t^0) = A(t; 0) + L(t^0)^{(d-2)/4} D[L(t) - L(t^0)]; \quad (29)$$

with  $D(1-u) \sim u^{\frac{0}{c}}$  for  $u \ll 1$ . Both scaling are equivalent only for  $u \ll 1$ . We now present an heuristic argument based on dimensional analysis which suggests that the result  $\frac{0}{c} = d + 2$  may be of general validity for conserved spin systems. Indeed, the occurrence of a new length scale bigger than  $L(t)$  could have been inferred from the small  $k$  behavior of  $S(k; t)$ . In the  $n \rightarrow 1$  limit and for  $k \rightarrow 0$ , Eq. (10) leads to

$$S(k; t) = \xi_0^2 + 2T_c k^2 L(t)^4 + \dots \quad (30)$$

A natural momentum scale  $k_0(t) = L_0(t)^{-1}$  arises by matching the two terms of the RHS of Eq. (30), which leads to  $\frac{0}{c} = 2$  and hence  $\frac{0}{c} = d + 2$ .

In the general case, for short-range correlated initial conditions, we expect the following general form to hold

$$S(k; t) = F_1[kL(t)] + L(t)^2 F_2[kL(t)]; \quad (31)$$

with  $F_1(0) = s_0^2$  being a non zero constant (equal to the variance of the initial total magnetization normalized by the volume), while the scaling contribution should vanish for  $k = 0$ , implying  $F_2(0) = 0$ . Imposing  $F_2(p) \sim p$ ,




FIG. 1: Illustrating the result of Eq. (29), we plot  $A(t; t_k)$   $A(t; 0) = D[L(t) - L(t_k)]$ , for  $L(t_k) = L(0)^k$ , with  $r = 1.75$  and  $k = 1, \dots, 7$  (40000 samples of length  $N = 5000$ ). Although the initial slope is smaller ( $\frac{0}{c} = 2.5$  [11]; dotted line), the asymptotic exponent is very close to  $\frac{0}{c} = 3$  (dashed line). The bottom inset shows the original data for  $A(t; t_k)$  and  $A(t; t_k) - A(t; 0)$  (dashed lines). The top inset shows  $L(t)[A(t; t_k) - A(t; 0)]$  as a function of  $L(t) - L(t_k)$  (with  $\frac{0}{c} = 3/2$ ). Lines of slope  $\frac{0}{c} = 1$  are shown for  $\frac{0}{c} = 3$  (dashed line) and  $\frac{0}{c} = 2.5$  (dotted line).

is necessarily an even integer. If  $\frac{0}{c}$  were not integer, the correlation function scaling function  $f$  defined in Eq. (14) would have a power law decay for large distance, which is unphysical as such correlations cannot develop in a finite time starting from short-range ones.  $\frac{0}{c}$  cannot be an odd integer as space isotropy guarantees that  $f$  should be an even function. Contrary to the case of a quench at  $T = 0$ , for which convincing theoretical arguments for  $d = 2$  [15] and experiments [16] show that  $F_2(p) \sim p^d$ , there is no reason to expect the same for critical quenches. Generically, we expect  $F_2(p) \sim p^2$  as found for the  $d = 1$  conserved Ising model [6, 7], and in the present Letter for the  $O(n)$  model for  $n \neq 1$ . Finally, the small  $k$  behavior of the structure factor should be of the form

$$S(k; t) = \xi_0^2 + C_0 k^2 L(t)^4 + \dots \quad (32)$$

where  $C_0 > 0$  is a constant. Assuming that the length scale obtained by matching both terms of the RHS of Eq. (32) is the same as the crossover length between the two observed regimes for the autocorrelation, and using the general result of Eq. (3), we obtain

$$\frac{0}{c} = 2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{0}{c} = 2 + \frac{2}{\frac{0}{c} d}; \quad (33)$$

which implies  $\frac{0}{c} = d + 2$ . This result also extends to  $d = 1$  after formally taking  $\frac{0}{c} = 1$ , leading to  $\frac{0}{c} = 3$  and  $\frac{0}{c} = 3/2$ . Note that the crossover scale can also be written  $L_0(t) = t^{-z} = t^{d/2}$ , which is the diffusion scale associated to thermal noise. At least in  $d = 1$ , this scale can be related to the equilibrium diffusion of tagged spins observed in [17]. We now present simulations of the Ising model Kawasaki dynamics in  $d = 1$  and  $d = 2$  after a




FIG. 2: In the bottom inset, we plot  $A(t; t_k)$  and  $A(t; t_k) - A(t; 0)$  (dashed lines) as a function of  $L(t)$ , for  $L(t_k) = L(t) r^k$ , with  $r = 1.5$  and  $k = 1, \dots, 5$  (16 samples of size  $N = 500$ ,  $L(0) = 1 = \bar{L}$ ). The main plot shows  $L(t_k) [A(t; t_k) - A(t; 0)] = D [L(t) = L(t_k)]$ . Although the initial slope is consistent with  $\alpha_c = 3.5$  [11] (dotted line), the effective exponent certainly increases and the asymptotic slope is more compatible with  $\alpha_c = 4$  (dashed line). The top inset shows  $L(t)^{-2} [A(t; t_k) - A(t; 0)]$  as a function of  $L(t) = L(t_k)$  (with  $r = 1.5$ ). Although not as clean as in  $d = 1$ , the scaling plot is better described by the line corresponding to  $\alpha_c = 4$  (dashed line) rather than  $\alpha_c = 3.5$  (dotted line).

quench at  $T_c$ . In the  $d = 1$  case, we use the accelerated algorithm introduced in [7], which is faster than that used in [11] (but does not permit to compute simply the response function as was needed in [11]). By fitting  $A(t; t^0)$  in the scaling regime, the authors of [11] found  $\alpha_c = 2.5$  lower than our prediction  $\alpha_c = 3$ . However, for the moderately large numerically accessible times, the contribution of  $A_1(t; t^0) - A(t; 0)$  is significant. When plotting  $A(t; t^0) - A(t; 0)$  as a function of  $L(t)$ , one actually finds  $\alpha_c = 3$  instead of  $\alpha_c = 2.5$ . Results of simulations for the  $d = 2$  Ising model evolving with Kawasaki dynamics at  $T_c$  are shown on Fig. 2. Considering the very slow growth of  $L(t) \sim t^{1/5}$ , it is difficult to obtain data spanning more than one decade in  $L(t)$ . Hence, the regime of interest  $1 = L(t^0) = L(t)$  cannot be reached and the separation of scales properly achieved. Still, subtracting  $A(t; 0)$  from  $A(t; t^0)$  leads to  $\alpha_c = 4$ , significantly greater than the value  $\alpha_c = 3.5$  found in [11].

In conclusion, in view of the exact result for the  $O(n = 1)$  model, a general argument for any  $n$  and  $d$ , and convincing simulations in  $d = 1$  (and consistent in  $d = 2$ ), we have strongly suggested that  $\alpha_c = d + 2$  and  $\beta = z = 2$  generally holds. We also find that the scaling form of Eq. (29) is more appropriate than Eq. (2). The

compelling generalization of our heuristic argument to a quench at  $T < T_c$  (in  $d = 2$ , and admitting  $F_2(p) \sim p^d$ ) leads to  $A(t; t^0) = [L(t) = L(t^0)]^{\alpha_c}$  for  $L(t^0) = L(t)$ .  $L(t^0)$ , with  $\alpha_c = d + 4$  and  $\beta = 1 + d = 4$ . In  $d = 2$ , the prediction  $\alpha_c = 6$  is significantly larger than the numerical result  $\alpha_c = 4$  [9]. However, the fit in [9] was performed in the short scaling regime over less than a decade in  $L(t)$ , and subtracting  $A(t; 0)$  before performing the fit could lead to a significantly higher value for  $\alpha_c$ , as noted in the two examples treated in this Letter.

- 
- [1] A. J. Bray, Adv. Phys. 43, 357 (1994).
  - [2] P. Hohenberg and B. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 49, 435 (1977).
  - [3] H. K. Janssen, B. Schaub, and B. Schmittmann, Z. Phys. B 73, 539 (1989); D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 40, 304 (1989).
  - [4] D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 38, 373 (1988); G. F. Mazenko, Phys. Rev. B 42, 4487 (1990); C. Sire and S. N. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 4321 (1995).
  - [5] N. Mason, A. N. Pargellis, and B. Yurke, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 190 (1993).
  - [6] S. N. Majumdar, D. A. Huse, and B. D. Lubachevsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 182 (1994).
  - [7] S. N. Majumdar and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. E 52, 270 (1995).
  - [8] F. J. Alexander, D. A. Huse, and S. A. Janowsky, Phys. Rev. B 50, 663 (1994).
  - [9] C. Yeung, M. Rao, and R. C. Desai, Phys. Rev. E 53, 3073 (1996).
  - [10] J. F. Marko and G. T. Barkema, Phys. Rev. E 52, 2522 (1995).
  - [11] C. Godreche, F. Krzakala, and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, JSTAT P04007 (2004).
  - [12] T. Nagaya and J.-M. Gilli, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 145504 (2004).
  - [13] A. Coniglio and M. Zannetti, Europhys. Lett. 10, 575 (1989); A. Coniglio, P. Ruggiero, and M. Zannetti, Phys. Rev. E 50, 1046 (1994).
  - [14] A. D. Rutenberg and A. J. Bray, Phys. Rev. E 51, 5499 (1995); S. Puri, A. J. Bray, and F. Rojas, Phys. Rev. E 52, 4699 (1995); F. Rojas and A. J. Bray, Phys. Rev. E 51, 188 (1995).
  - [15] C. Yeung, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1135 (1988); H. Furukawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2567 (1989); H. Furukawa, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 58, 216 (1989).
  - [16] P. Wiltzius, F. S. Bates, and W. R. Heiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1538 (1988).
  - [17] C. Godreche and J. M. Luck, J. Phys. A 36, 9973 (2003).