

# Complexity in Mean-Field Spin-Glass Models: Ising $p$ -spin

A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi and T. Rizzo

*Dipartimento di Fisica, SMC and INFM, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", P.le A. Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

The Complexity of the Thouless-Anderson-Palmer (TAP) solutions of the Ising  $p$ -spin is investigated in the temperature regime where the equilibrium phase is one step Replica Symmetry Breaking. Two solutions of the resulting saddle point equations are found. One is supersymmetric (SUSY) and includes the equilibrium value of the free energy while the other is non-SUSY. The two solutions cross exactly at a value of the free energy where the replicon eigenvalue is zero; at low free energy the complexity is described by the SUSY solution while at high free energy it is described by the non-SUSY solution. In particular the non-SUSY solution describes the total number of solutions, like in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model. The relevant TAP solutions corresponding to the non-SUSY solution share the same feature of the corresponding solutions in the SK model, in particular their Hessian has a vanishing isolated eigenvalue. The TAP solutions corresponding to the SUSY solution, instead, are well separated minima.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Nr, 11.30.Pb, 05.50.+q

## I. INTRODUCTION

Mean-field magnetic models of spin glasses with built-in quenched disorder display, in general, different kinds of frozen phases selectable by choosing the type of interaction among their microscopic elements. The pure phase can be either “glass”, described by means of a step function order parameter, the *overlap*  $q = q_0\theta(m-x) + q_1\theta(x-m)$ , or “spin-glass”, in which case the order parameter is a monotonous increasing function  $q(x)$ . The overlap  $q$  and its conjugated  $x$  come out naturally in the replica approach following the Replica Symmetry Breaking (RSB) Ansatz.<sup>1</sup> The parameter  $x$  is, then, the replica group index, and  $q$  represents the similarity between replica groups labeled by  $x$ . The first phase mentioned is a one step RSB (1RSB) phase, for which a two levels hierarchy is hypothesized and replicas can simply lay in the same group ( $q = q_1$ ) or in different groups ( $q = q_0 < q_1$ ). The second kind of phase, instead, is stable only when the replica symmetry is broken an infinite number of times, and one refers to it as Full RSB (FRSB) solution. In a properly said spin-glass, thus, any kind of level of similarity can take place, between the extremal values of  $q(x)$ , being  $q_0$  the minimal and  $q_1$  the maximum. The parameter  $q_1$  is called the self-overlap, i.e. the overlap among replicas in the same group, or Edwards-Anderson<sup>2</sup> parameter.

In the model that we are going to study in the present paper, the Ising  $p$ -spin model,<sup>3,4,5,6,7</sup> both phases occur. In a cooling down from high temperature (paramagnetic phase), below some point the dynamic quantities become stuck out of equilibrium, never reaching their static values. In this temperature regime the time translational invariance of two-time quantities is lost and aging takes place. Cooling further, the high energy states responsible for the slowing down of the dynamics become more and more important down to the point where their free energy becomes lower than the one of the paramagnetic phase. At such temperature a thermodynamic transition occurs to a 1RSB phase. Eventually, at lower temperature, the system undergoes a second phase transition to a FRSB spin-glass phase.

Both frozen phases are characterized by a very high number of stable and metastable states, although of different nature. Such a large range of choice is in its turn the consequence of the disorder and the subsequent frustration characterizing spin-glasses and causing the onset of many different configurations of spins minimizing the thermodynamic potential, organized in the configurational space in rather complicated ways. In order to describe the structure of the landscape of the free energy functional a fundamental tool is the so called complexity, else said, in the framework of structural glasses, configurational entropy. This quantity is the quenched average of the logarithm of the number of metastable states. In the present work we have performed a thoroughly investigation of the complexity of the  $p$ -spin model in the 1RSB phase.

A significant role in the investigation of the properties of the stationary points of the mean-field free energy landscape is played by a Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin fermionic symmetry,<sup>8,9</sup> that arises following a particular formal approach, recalled in Sec. V. The initial symmetry of the action involved in the reckoning of the complexity functional is not always conserved when the complexity saddle point is evaluated. In the present work we deepen and continue the contents of Ref. [10] related to the Ising  $p$ -spin.

In Sec. II we present the Hamiltonian of the model, we recall its basic properties and we define the complexity as the Legendre transform of the replica free energy potential. In sec. III we follow the alternative approach of Thouless, Anderson and Palmer (TAP) to mean-field disordered models and we complete the analysis of the TAP complexity already performed by Rieger.<sup>6</sup> In Sec. IV the two qualitatively different complexities are computed and displayed. There we present a study of the stability of the states counted by the complexity. In Sec. V we give account for the

qualitative differences between BRST and non-BRST complexities in terms of the spectrum of the eigenvalues of the Hessian of the TAP free energy. In Sec. VI we present our conclusions.

## II. MODEL

The Hamiltonian of the model is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} J_{i_1 \dots i_p} \sigma_{i_1} \dots \sigma_{i_p} - h \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i \quad (1)$$

where the dynamical variables  $\sigma_i$  are Ising spins and the couplings  $J_{i_1 \dots i_p}$  are quenched random variables distributed as

$$P(J_{i_1 \dots i_p}) = \frac{N^{p-1}}{\sqrt{\pi p!}} \exp\left(-\frac{J_{i_1 \dots i_p}^2 N^{p-1}}{p!}\right) \quad (2)$$

This is a generalization of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model,<sup>22</sup> recovered for  $p = 2$ , to interactions involving more than two spins. In the following we set  $h = 0$ , since the connection between the different approaches to the computation of the complexity that we will consider here relies on the absence of external magnetic fields.

In the high temperature regime this model is in a paramagnetic phase. As the temperature is decreased, a dynamic transition occurs at  $T_d$ , with onset of an aging regime. Below that temperature two thermodynamic phase transitions take place. We denote by  $T_s$  the critical temperature for the static transition between the paramagnetic and the intermediate (glassy) frozen phase and by  $T_G$  (Gardner temperature) the one at which the transition to the low temperature frozen phase (spin-glass) occurs. The statistical mechanical properties can be computed applying the replica trick. The phase displayed in the temperature range  $[T_G, T_s]$  turns out to be a one step Replica Symmetry Breaking (1RSB) one (even though the replica symmetric solution (RS) stays stable), whereas at the Gardner temperature the system reaches a qualitatively different phase stable only when an infinite number of RSB is performed. Since, for  $p > 2$ , the paramagnetic, RS phase is stable in the replica space at any temperature, the transition temperature  $T_s$  is obtained as the one at which the 1RSB free energy becomes lower than the RS one, that, by the way, in this model coincides with the onset of the 1RSB static solution.

In the present paper we will concentrate on the behavior of the states structure in the 1RSB phase.

### A. Intermediate glassy phase in the replica formalism: complexity as Legendre transform of free energy

For clearness (and to introduce notation) we very shortly summarize the basic results already obtained in the seminal paper of Gardner<sup>5</sup> and recently used in Ref. [7]. Performing the quenched average over the disordered interaction, the free energy is obtained with the replica trick<sup>11</sup> in terms of the overlap order parameter  $q(x) = q_0 \theta(m-x) \theta(x) + q_1 \theta(x-m) \theta(1-x)$ . In the case of zero external field (inducing  $q_0 = 0$ ) it reads:

$$\beta \Phi = -\frac{\beta^2}{4} [1 + (p-1)(1-m) q_1^p - p q_1^p] - \frac{1}{m} \log \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}z \left(2 \cosh z \sqrt{\lambda}\right)^m \quad (3)$$

with  $\lambda \equiv \mu q_1^{p-1}$ ,  $\mu \equiv \beta^2 p/2$  and  $\mathcal{D}z \equiv dz/\sqrt{2\pi} \exp(-z^2/2)$ . The self-overlap  $q_1$  is computed by means of the self-consistency equation

$$q_1 = \left\langle \tanh^2 z \sqrt{\lambda} \right\rangle_m \quad (4)$$

$$\langle (\dots) \rangle_m \equiv \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}z (\dots) \left(\cosh z \sqrt{\lambda}\right)^m}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}z \left(\cosh z \sqrt{\lambda}\right)^m} \quad (5)$$

At  $T \rightarrow T_s$ , the Edwards-Anderson parameter  $q_1$  jumps discontinuously from 0 to a finite value for  $p > 2$ , unlike the SK case for which the order parameter smoothly grows as the temperature crosses the critical value.

Generalizing the definition of entropy in the canonical ensemble to disordered systems, the complexity is usually defined as the Legendre Transform of the free energy averaged over quenched disorder:<sup>12</sup>

$$\Sigma(f) = \beta_e f - \beta_e \Phi(\beta_e) \quad (6)$$




FIG. 1: The complexity versus  $f$  and  $u = -m$  computed at  $T = 0.5$  on the 1RSB static solution at fixed  $m$ , Eq. (9). For  $p = 3$ ,  $T_s = 0.6513$  and  $T_G = 0.2403$ .

with conjugated variables  $f$  and  $\beta_e \equiv \beta m$ . The relationship  $f(m)$  (or equivalently  $m(f)$ ) is thus obtained, at constant temperature, from one of the following formulas:

$$f = \frac{\partial \beta_e \Phi(\beta_e)}{\partial \beta_e} = \frac{\partial m \Phi(m)}{\partial m} \quad (7)$$

$$\beta_e = \frac{\partial \Sigma(f)}{\partial f} \quad (8)$$

as well as the complexity expression

$$\Sigma(m) = \beta_e^2 \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \beta_e} = \beta m^2 \frac{\partial \Phi(m)}{\partial m} = \frac{(\beta m)^2}{4} (p-1) q_1^p + \log \int \mathcal{D}z (2 \cosh z \sqrt{\lambda})^m - m \left\langle \log 2 \cosh z \sqrt{\lambda} \right\rangle_m \quad (9)$$

We notice that the self-consistency equation  $\partial \Phi / \partial m = 0$ , together with Eq. (4) yields the equilibrium values of  $m$  and  $q$ , corresponding with the lowest free energy  $f_{\text{eq}}(T)$  at which stable states are found at temperature  $T$ . Therefore, the complexity vanishes at  $f_{\text{eq}}$ , as lower bound edge. The higher bound edge,  $f_{\text{th}}$  (or  $m_{\text{th}}$ ), is instead the point at which its maximum takes place, see figure 1. Probing the free energy landscape in free energy do not yield, however, metastable states up to  $f_{\text{th}}$ , as we are now going to recall (see also Ref. 7).

The replicon eigenvalue, whose positiveness determines the stability of the phase,<sup>13</sup> computed with the 1RSB Ansatz yields

$$\hat{\Lambda} = 1 - \mu(p-1)q_1^{p-2} \left( 1 - 2q_1 + \left\langle \tanh^4 z \sqrt{\lambda} \right\rangle_m \right) = 1 - \mu(p-1)q_1^{p-2} \left\langle \frac{1}{\cosh^4 z \sqrt{\lambda}} \right\rangle_m > 0 \quad (10)$$

The second transition temperature  $T_G$  is then determined as the point at which  $\hat{\Lambda} = 0$ . Also, at fixed  $T \in [T_G, T_s]$ , the replicon becomes negative above some ‘‘Gardner threshold’’ free energy  $f_G \leq f_{\text{th}}$  (figure 1). Therefore, the complexity in this temperature range is well defined only in the interval  $[f_{\text{eq}}, f_G]$ . At  $T_s$ :  $f_G = f_{\text{th}}$ , at  $T_G$ :  $f_G = f_{\text{eq}}$ .

### III. TAP COMPLEXITY OF THE ISING $p$ -SPIN MODEL

Another method to derive the complexity, inspired to the Boltzmann microscopical interpretation of the entropy, is to directly compute the logarithm of the number of metastable states. The further step is now, in comparison with ordinary statistical mechanics, that the average over the quenched disorder must also be taken. As a first approximation, to be discussed in the following (see also e.g. Refs. [16,18]), we can consider as state a solution of the mean-field equations for the average site magnetizations, else said Thouless-Anderson-Palmer (TAP) equations.

The computation of the total number of TAP solutions of the Ising  $p$ -spin model was performed in Ref. [6]; in this section we will generalize it to the case of solutions of a given free energy. We will compute the average number of solutions of the following TAP equations:

$$\tanh^{-1}(m_i) = \frac{\beta}{(p-1)!} \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_p} J_{ij_2 \dots j_p} m_{j_2}, \dots, m_{j_p} - m_i \frac{\beta^2}{2} p(p-1)(1-q)q^{p-2}. \quad (11)$$

These equations can be obtained considering the behavior of the cavity field as in Ref. [14] but also by differentiation of the following free energy functional:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta F_{TAP}(\{m\})/N &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left( \frac{1+m_i}{2} \ln \frac{1+m_i}{2} + \frac{1-m_i}{2} \ln \frac{1-m_i}{2} \right) + \\ &- \frac{\beta}{N} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_p} J_{i_1 \dots i_p} m_{i_1} \dots m_{i_p} - \frac{\beta^2}{4} ((p-1)q^p - pq^{(p-1)} + 1) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The density of solutions at a given free energy can be expressed as an integral over the whole  $m$ -space of a delta function of the TAP equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(f) &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \int \prod_i dm_i \delta(m_i - m_i^\alpha) \delta[F_{TAP}(m^\alpha) - Nf] = \\ &= \int \prod_i dm_i \delta(\partial_i F_{TAP}(m)) |\det(\partial_i \partial_j F_{TAP}(m))| \delta[F_{TAP}(m) - Nf], \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where:  $\partial_i$  stays for the partial derivative with respect to  $m_i$ ,

$$\partial_i F_{TAP}(m) = \frac{1}{\beta} g(m_i) - \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \sum_{j_2, \dots, j_p} J_{ij_2 \dots j_p} m_{j_2}, \dots, m_{j_p} \quad (14)$$

$$g(m_i) = \tanh^{-1}(m_i) + m_i \frac{\beta^2}{2} p(p-1)(1-q)q^{p-2}. \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i \partial_j F_{TAP}(m) &= \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{1}{1-m_i^2} + \frac{\beta}{2} p(p-1)(1-q)q^{p-2} \right) \delta_{ij} - \tilde{J}_{ij} \\ &+ \frac{\beta}{2} p(p-1)((p-2)q^{p-3} - (p-1)q^{p-2}) \frac{m_i m_j}{2N}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\tilde{J}_{ij} = \frac{1}{(p-2)!} \sum_{k_3, \dots, k_p} J_{ijk_3 \dots k_p} m_{k_3}, \dots, m_{k_p} \quad (17)$$

Notice that the last term in equation (16) is order  $O(1/N)$ , its effect will be discussed below. The delta function over the TAP equations  $\delta(\partial_i F)$  can be expressed in an integral form while, after dropping the modulus, the determinant of the Hessian in Eq. (13) can be expressed in integral form through a replicated bosonic representation<sup>6,15</sup> or through a fermionic representation.<sup>16,17,18,19,20,21</sup> The details of the computation in the case of the Ising  $p$ -spin model can be found in Ref. [6]. Here we concentrate only on the last term in Eq. (13), *i.e.* the delta function on the free energy. Following the original paper of Bray and Moore<sup>15</sup> we use a non-variational form of the free energy function (12) that is valid only on the solutions of the TAP equations. This form is obtained substituting equation (11) in equation (12). We recall that, using this non-variational expression does not break the supersymmetry of the problem, as noted in Ref. [18].

As an intermediate step we report the expression of  $\rho(f)$  in terms of a fermionic-bosonic action:

$$\rho(f) = \int \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}m \mathcal{D}x e^{\mathcal{S}(\{\psi, \bar{\psi}, x, m\})} \quad (18)$$

$$\mathcal{S}(\{\psi, \bar{\psi}, x, m\}) = \beta \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left( x_i + \frac{u}{p} m_i \right) \partial_i F_{TAP}(m) + \sum_{ij} \bar{\psi}_i \psi_j \partial_i \partial_j F_{TAP}(m) + u F_{TAP}(m) - u N f \right\} \quad (19)$$

satisfying the fermionic symmetry:

$$\delta\psi_i = 0 \quad \delta\bar{\psi}_i = -\epsilon x_i \quad \delta m_i = \epsilon\psi_i \quad \delta x_i = \epsilon \frac{u}{p}\psi_i \quad (20)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a fermionic small number. This invariance, said Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST), can otherwise be expressed through Ward identities as:

$$\langle \bar{\psi}_i \psi_i \rangle = -\langle m_i x_i \rangle + \frac{u}{p} \langle m_i^2 \rangle \quad (21)$$

$$u \langle \bar{\psi}_i \psi_i \rangle = \langle x_i^2 \rangle - \langle m_i x_i \rangle + \frac{u^2}{p^2} \langle m_i^2 \rangle \quad (22)$$

where the average is performed over the measure  $e^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

After some further standard manipulations we obtain the free energy of a TAP solution as a sum of  $N$  local terms  $f(m_i)$  where:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta f(m) &= \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - m^2) - \ln 2 + \frac{p-1}{p} m \tanh^{-1}(m) + \\ &- \frac{\beta^2}{4} [1 + (p-2)q^{p-1} - (p-1)q^p] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The last expression allows to obtain the generalization of the equations for the computation of the complexity of the Ising  $p$ -spin model performed by Rieger.<sup>6</sup> The resulting expression is an integral over a finite number of macroscopic variables that can be evaluated by the saddle point method. The variational expression of the annealed complexity is:

$$\Sigma(f) = \frac{1}{N} \ln \overline{\rho(f)} = \text{Ext} - f u \beta - (1-q)(B + \Delta) - q \lambda + \frac{B^2 - \Delta^2}{2q^{p-2}(p-1)\mu} + \ln I \quad (24)$$

where

$$I = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mu q^{p-1}}} \left( \frac{1}{1-m^2} + B \right) \exp \left[ -\frac{(\tanh^{-1}(m) - \Delta m)^2}{2\mu q^{p-1}} + \lambda m^2 + u \beta f(m) \right] dm \quad (25)$$

The saddle point equations obtained extremizing with respect to  $u, \lambda, \Delta, q$  and  $B$  are:

$$f = \langle f(m) \rangle \quad (26)$$

$$q = \langle m^2 \rangle \quad (27)$$

$$\Delta = -\frac{(p-1)\mu(1-q)q^{p-2}}{p} + \frac{(p-1)\langle m \tanh^{-1}(m) \rangle}{pq} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= B + \Delta + \frac{(2-p)q^{1-p}(B^2 - \Delta^2)}{2(-1+p)\mu} - \frac{p-1}{2q} \left( 1 - \frac{\langle (m\Delta - \tanh^{-1}(m))^2 \rangle}{\mu q^{p-1}} \right) + \\ &- \frac{u\beta^2}{4}(p-2)(p-1)q^{p-2} + \frac{u\beta^2 p(p-1)}{4} q^{p-1} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$1-q = \frac{B}{\mu(p-1)q^{p-2}} + \left\langle \left( \frac{1}{1-m^2} + B \right)^{-1} \right\rangle \quad (30)$$

The brackets  $\langle \dots \rangle$  in the previous equations represent averages with respect to the integrand in Eq. (25).

In order to probe the complexity at different free energy levels, Eq. (26) is relaxed and the remaining equations are solved at fixed  $u$ . Moreover, the request of a positive replicon implies that, in Eq. (30), we choose the solution  $B = 0$  (see Ref. [15,18] for  $p = 2$  or App. B for any  $p$ ).

#### IV. THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ISING $p$ -SPIN MODEL

As it was the case in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model,<sup>18</sup> also for  $p > 2$ , two different solutions of the above saddle point equations (27)-(29) exist. In one of them the parameters  $q$ ,  $\Delta$  and  $\lambda$  satisfy the relations

$$\Delta = -\frac{\beta^2}{2}(p-1)u q^{p-1} \quad (31)$$

$$\lambda = \frac{\beta^2}{4} \frac{(p-1)^2}{p} u^2 q^{p-1} \quad (32)$$

deriving from the BRST Ward identities Eqs. (21)-(22). In the second solution, instead, Eqs. (31)-(32) do not hold, i.e. the system is not invariant under the transformation Eq. (20).

We notice that the first solution coincides with the static (1RSB) solution, that is stable in the range of temperature  $T \in [T_G(p), T_d(p)]$ . Therefore the complexity coincides with Eq. (9), as it is clear substituting relations (31)-(32) into Eqs. (24) and (25), changing the integration variable in Eq. (25) as  $m = \tanh(\beta z)$  and eventually setting  $u = -m$ . (see also thoroughly discussion in, e.g., Refs. [16,18]).

Setting  $p = 3$  the first transition temperature is  $T_s = 0.6513$  and the second one turns out to be  $T_G = 0.24026$  (obtained equating Eqs. (10) and (9) to zero). In figure 2, for  $T = 0.5$ , we plot the overlap  $q$  as a function of  $u$  for both solutions of the saddle point equations (27)-(29) and for the 1RSB solution. We also plot the other two parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\Delta$  as a function of  $q^{p-1}u$  and  $q^{p-1}u^2$  respectively. For the BRST solution they are constant (Eqs. (31)-(32)).

In figure 3 we plot  $1/N \log \bar{p}$  on both saddle points. The behavior is shown both versus  $f$  and  $u$ . In the  $f$  plot the BRST complexity (coinciding with  $\Sigma_{1RSB}$ ) has a cusp. We stress, however, that the upper, concave, branch has to be rejected on physical ground because there

$$\frac{1}{\beta} \frac{\partial f}{\partial m} = \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \beta_e^2} > 0 \quad (33)$$

and looking at the complexity as a generalization of standard entropy this corresponds to a thermodynamic instability. Indeed, defining the complexity as the Legendre transform of  $\Phi$  allows us to look at Eq. (8) as the saddle point of the integrand of the partition of the states counted with the measure  $\exp(-\beta_e N f)$ , i.e.

$$\int df \omega(f) \exp\{-\beta_e N f\} = \int df \exp\{-\beta_e N f + N \Sigma(f)\} = \int dF \exp\{-\beta_e \Phi(f)\} \sim \exp\{-\beta_e \Phi(f^{SP})\} \quad (34)$$

and the condition for the integrand to be a maximum is

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial f^2} \Sigma(f) \right|_{sp} = \frac{\partial \beta_e}{\partial f} = \beta \frac{\partial m}{\partial f} < 0 \quad (35)$$

At a given temperature the so-computed complexities start from different lower band edges of free energy  $f_0$ . In the BRST case  $f_0 = f_{eq}$ . In the other case  $f_0 < f_{eq}$ . They cross at the value of  $u$  (or  $-m$  in the replica formalism) at which the overlap-overlap stability eigenvalue, the replicon of Eq. (10) becomes negative for the 1RSB solution. We call this crossing point  $u_G$ , or  $f_G$ , the 'Gardner' stability threshold for low energy metastable states.

In terms of TAP equations the stability criterion<sup>23</sup> analogous to  $\hat{\Lambda} \geq 0$  is formulated as the Plefka criterion<sup>23</sup>

$$x_p = 1 - \mu(p-1)q^{p-2} \langle (1-m^2)^2 \rangle \geq 0 \quad (36)$$

A sketch of the derivation is reported in App. A. When  $x_p$  is computed over the two saddle points one sees that at any  $f$  (or  $u$ ) one, and only one, solution is always stable. The two  $x_p$ , indeed, cross when they both reach zero, one from above and one from below, at  $f_G$ . We explicitly show this in figure 4 where we also plot the difference in complexity over the two saddle points. For  $f < f_G$  the BRST complexity is consistent and larger, whereas for  $f > f_G$  the roles are exchanged.

As the temperature decreases towards  $T_G$  the crossing point shifts towards the lower band edge. To exemplify this, in figure 5 we have plotted complexities and Plefka parameter/replicon for the  $p = 3$  model both at  $T = 0.5$  and  $T = 0.25$ . Exactly at  $T_G = 0.2403$ ,  $f_G$  and  $f_0$  coincide. At this point the BRST complexity, counting the number of minima<sup>30</sup> of the free energy landscape turns out to be physically inconsistent on all states but those at  $f = f_{eq}$ . Lowering further the temperature we end up in a FRSB spin glass phase, for which both the 1RSB solution and the annealed complexity are ill defined. In this region the system behaves exactly as the SK model. This means that, even performing the proper FRSB quenched average, the BRST complexity has to be rejected for any value of  $f$  apart from  $f_{eq}$  (computed in the FRSB phase).<sup>26</sup> The only likely candidate as a metastable states counter remains the non-BRST complexity.




FIG. 2: The self-overlap  $q$  on both complexity saddle points. SP1 is BRST symmetric, SP2 is not. The cross points represent the values obtained in the 1RSB scheme of computation, Eq. (4). On the right side the parameters  $\lambda/(u^2 q^{p-1})$  and  $\Delta/(u q^{p-1})$  are shown versus  $u$ . When the BRST relations (31)-(32) are satisfied they are constant.




FIG. 3: The complexity computed as the annealed average of the logarithm of the number of TAP solutions. Both the BRST and the non-BRST solutions are plotted. The three vertical lines in the left plot stay for, from left to right respectively, the BRST lower band edge  $f_{eq}$ , the crossing point  $f_G$  and the value of maximum non-BRST complexity.

### A. Deepening on The Crossing Point

In appendices A and B we recall that the condition of positivity of  $x_P$  is recovered also in the present context as a condition of physical consistency of the TAP solutions and of analytical consistency of the  $B = 0$  solution. Thus the identification of the crossing point with the point where the replicon vanishes is crucial because it ensures that at all free energies we can choose a solution with a positive value of the replicon. This identification can be justified analytically. The solution at a given value of  $f$  can be continued in a unique way if the Hessian of (24) with respect to  $B, \lambda, \Delta, q$  and  $u$  has no zero eigenvalue, hence a necessary condition to locate a crossing point is that the Hessian must have at least a zero eigenvalue. In the following we will show that the vanishing of the replicon or equivalently of the parameter  $x_P$  is a sufficient condition to have a zero eigenvalue in the Hessian. We start from the following important relationship<sup>15</sup> that can be derived from the saddle point equation:

$$\frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial B} + \frac{\partial \Sigma}{\partial \lambda} = B \left( \frac{1}{\mu (p-1) q^{p-2}} - \left\langle \frac{(1-m^2)^2}{1+B(1-m^2)} \right\rangle \right) \quad (37)$$

It is easily seen that deriving the previous equation with respect to the five parameter  $\lambda, \Delta, q, u, B$  and then setting




FIG. 4: Model with  $p = 3$ . On the left side the complexities are plotted at  $T = 0.5$  vs.  $f$ . The continuous line is for the BRST saddle point of the TAP complexity, the dashed line for the non-BRST saddle point and the the cross points for the static 1RSB complexity (that superimposes on the BRST complexity). In the same figure the replicon and  $x_p$  for both the BRST and the non-BRST complexity saddle points are plotted. The two  $x_p$ 's cross in zero at  $f = f_G$ . On the right side the crossing of the complexities is expressed more clearly by plotting their difference vs.  $f$ . The three vertical lines represent the stationary 1RSB free energy value  $f_{eq}$ , the crossing/1RSB stability value  $f_G$  and the threshold value  $f_{th}$  at which the cusp of the BRST/1RSB complexity occurs.




FIG. 5: The continuous lines are the complexities and Plefka parameters for BRST and non-BRST solutions at  $T = 0.5$  and  $T = 0.25$  ( $T_s = 0.6513, T_G = 0.2403$ ). As the temperature decreases  $f_G$  tends to  $f_{eq}$ . The cross points represent the 1RSB complexity [Eq. (9)] and the 1RSB replicon [Eq. (10)].

$B = 0$  we have:

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial B \partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \lambda^2} = 0 \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial B \partial \Delta} + \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \lambda \partial \Delta} = 0 \quad (39)$$



$$\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial B \partial q} + \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \lambda \partial q} = 0 \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial B \partial u} + \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \lambda \partial u} = 0 \quad (41)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial B^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \Sigma}{\partial \lambda \partial B} = \left( \frac{1}{\mu (p-1) q^{p-2}} - \langle (1 - m^2)^2 \rangle \right) \quad (42)$$

Notice that the r.h.s. of the last equation is proportional to the replicon Eq. (36), therefore if the replicon vanishes the r.h.s.'s of the last five equations are all zero, meaning that two columns of the Hessian of (24) sum up to zero and therefore it must have at least a zero eigenvalue.

## V. SUPERSYMMETRY AND THE SPECTRUM OF THE HESSIAN

In this section we will discuss the TAP complexity of the Ising  $p$ -spin model within the supersymmetry (SUSY) framework. The main result is that *much as in the SK model, the TAP solutions described by the non-SUSY solution valid at high free energies display a vanishing isolated eigenvalue in the spectrum of the Hessian.*

This result, originally obtained for the SK model in [24], was proven rigorously in [21] where it was shown that it is a consequence of SUSY breaking. As such the extension to a SUSY-breaking solution in a different model like the one we are considering here is straightforward. The rest of this section is rather technical and the reader not interested in the details can safely skip to the conclusion.

The details of the calculations are similar to those performed for the SK model<sup>16,17,18,21,25</sup> and will not be presented. In particular, a self-contained derivation of the final results would be a trivial rewriting of the results of [21] and [25], therefore we will simply recall them and discuss the basic steps of their generalization to the Ising  $p$ -spin model. The starting point is the expression of the determinant in (13) by means of a fermionic representation. Then the complexity is expressed as an integral over an action depending on  $4N$  fermionic and bosonic variables. The action is invariant under the so called Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin (BRST) transformation<sup>8,9</sup>. This transformation mixes bosonic and fermionic variables *i.e.* it is a SUSY transformation. Then, through odd and even Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation the complexity is expressed as an integral over the exponential of a macroscopic action depending on four bosonic and four fermionic macroscopic variables  $\{r, t, \lambda, q, \mu, \bar{\mu}, \rho, \bar{\rho}\}$ . The macroscopic action possesses a SUSY as well<sup>17,21</sup>. Setting the fermionic variables to zero and making proper changes of variables one recovers the expression (24) for the Complexity.

The integral over the action can be evaluated by the saddle point method. As we have shown in the previous sections the resulting action admits two solutions, much as the one of the SK model. One of these solutions is SUSY while the other is not but at variance with the SK model none of them is good in the whole range of free energies. Indeed the SUSY solution is correct at low free energies, particularly at the equilibrium value, while the non-SUSY solution is correct at high free energy and in particular must be considered to describe the total complexity. Setting  $B = 0$  the SUSY relationships expressed in the variables of (24) are

$$\Delta = -\frac{u \mu (p-1) q^{p-1}}{p} \quad ; \quad \lambda = \frac{u^2 \mu (p-1)^2 q^{p-1}}{2 p^2} \quad (43)$$

Note that according to these equations the BRST relationships at  $u = 0$  are  $\Delta = 0$  and  $\lambda = 0$ , and imply a zero total complexity, the non-SUSY solution instead predicts a finite complexity while the parameter  $\Delta$  and  $\lambda$  satisfies some proper SUSY Ward identities<sup>25</sup> different from (43). All the properties of the non-SUSY solution derived from SUSY violation in the SK model apply as well in the case of the Ising  $p$ -spin model. In particular it is straightforward to generalize the arguments of [17] and [21] showing that the expansion in power of  $1/N$  of the prefactor to the exponential contribution vanishes at all order at all free energies. In the following we concentrate on the TAP spectrum. The computation of the resolvent of the Hessian (16) without the last  $O(1/N)$  term can be made following the same lines of [27].

The discussion greatly simplifies noticing that the term  $\tilde{J}_{ij}$  in (16) is a random term much as  $J_{ij}$  in the SK model but with a variance dependent on the self-overlap. This effect can be simply accounted for through a rescaling of the temperature. Thus we obtain the same picture of the SK model<sup>27</sup>: *the extensive part of the spectrum is always positive at any value of the magnetizations and is zero only if the following parameter is zero*

$$x_p = 1 - \mu(p-1)q^{p-2} \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (1 - m_i^2)^2. \quad (44)$$

The parameter  $x_P$  controls the value of the susceptibility of the TAP equations, only if  $x_P$  is greater or equal than zero the susceptibility of the TAP solutions has the physical value  $\chi = \beta(1 - q)$ , see also discussion in appendix A. In this context the condition  $x_P \geq 0$  appears only as a condition of physical consistence for the TAP solution, however it can be shown that it is also a condition of analytical consistence for the computation of the complexity once the solution with  $B = 0$  is adopted in (24), see appendix B and the discussion in [10,15,18,27]. It can be also derived as a stability condition in the replica framework<sup>5</sup>.

As originally noted in [24] in the context of the SK model, the last  $O(1/N)$  term in the Hessian (16) splits the lowest eigenvalue outside the continuous band of a finite amount<sup>21,24,25</sup>. This property is related to the fact that this term is proportional to the projector  $P_{ij} = m_i m_j$ . The effect of the isolated eigenvalue on the determinant of the Hessian depends on proper bilinear forms. In particular if the quantity

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} m_i \left( \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial m \partial m} \right)_{ij}^{-1} m_j \quad (45)$$

is divergent then the isolated eigenvalue must be zero. In [21] it was shown that this result holds for the BM solution in the SK model because of the SUSY violation and the argument can be easily applied in the present context. First of all we notice that the effect of a projection term on a matrix does not depends on the model considered, therefore we arrive at the same conclusion that if the quantity (45) is divergent the isolated eigenvalue is zero. This quantity can be expressed as the average of microscopic fermionic variables and then as the average of macroscopic fermionic variables:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} m_i \left( \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial m \partial m} \right)_{ij}^{-1} m_j \propto \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} \langle m_i \bar{\psi}_i \psi_j m_j \rangle \propto \langle \bar{\mu} \rho \rangle \quad (46)$$

The final result is obtained noticing that this average is divergent because at the denominator the integral over the fermionic variables produces a zero prefactor to the bosonic exponential contribution while at the numerator the prefactor is finite because of the presence of the fermionic variables on which the average is performed, see eq. (58-60) in [21].

Finally let us comment on an interesting aspect that is specific of the Ising  $p$ -spin model. In [25] it was shown that while the relevant TAP solutions have a vanishing isolated eigenvalue nevertheless there is an exponential number of couples of TAP solutions with a well defined value of it. These couples of states can be continued upon a variation of the external parameters, *e.g.* the temperature, and as a consequence *the complexity is continuous*. According to the work of Rieger, however, the complexity (non-BRST) of the Ising  $p$ -spin model presents a discontinuity at a given temperature,  $T_c(p)$ . This can be accounted if the Hessian of (24) has a singular behavior at  $T_c(p)$  as the figures 1 and 2 of Ref. 6 suggest. As a consequence the bell shaped curve  $\Sigma(q)$  of [25] collapses to a delta function, meaning that  $T_c(p)$  is the only temperature where *all* the TAP solutions have a zero isolated eigenvalue.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have investigated the complexity of the TAP solutions of the  $p$ -spin model as a function of their free energy in the range of temperatures where the static solution is 1RSB. At any free energy we have found two solutions of the saddle point equations, one is non-BRST, while the other satisfies the BRST symmetry and it is the one computed in the 1RSB framework in 7. At each free energy we can select the correct solution considering the stability of the replicon, indeed where one is solution is stable the other is not. The two solutions coincide at the value of the free energy  $f_G$  where the replicon exactly vanishes. Above  $f_G$  the non-BRST solution must be chosen while below  $f_G$  the BRST one holds. This implies that below  $f_G$  the states computed by the complexity are proper minima, with all positive eigenvalues, whereas above it the large majority of 'states' (exponentially large with  $N$ ) are stationary points of the TAP landscape with a zero eigenvalue in the TAP Hessian, possibly implying a qualitatively different dynamic behavior of the system evolving above and below the Gardner threshold. We also recall that in [25] it was shown the in the non-SUSY phase there are also well-defined minima and saddles of order one. The number of these TAP solutions with a definitively non-zero isolated eigenvalue is exponential in  $N$  although with a lower complexity in comparison with the one of the marginal states. We stress that, unlike in the SK model, in the present case the annealed complexity is exact, yielding the right quantitative values at any  $f$  and that the stability condition holds in the whole dominion. We notice that in a simpler model (without Gardner threshold, nor lower lying FRSB frozen phase) *i.e.* the spherical 3-spin model perturbed by a four spins interaction, quite recently presented in Ref. [28], a similar phenomenon occur. Also there the BRST and the non-BRST complexities cross where the Plefka parameter related to each of them vanishes.

In Ref. 7, where  $f_G$  was introduced, it was conjectured that above the Gardner threshold an exponential number of states continues to exist, their organization being of the FRSB type. What we have found here is rather a SUSY/non-SUSY transition such that, at high free energy ( $[f_G, f_{\text{th}}]$ ), the majority of 'states' shares the property of having an isolated zero eigenvalue and this feature is connected to the violation of the BRST relations. In the SK model the only likely complexity for the whole free energy domain in the whole temperature range below the critical point is non-BRST (this is also the case for the Ising  $p$ -spin model below  $T_G$ ). The only difference with the case here presented being that the annealed complexity is just an approximation for FRSB systems and, at least for the lowest values of  $f$ , the complexity must be corrected by means of a quenched computation. Indeed, in agreement with Montanari and Ricci-Tersenghi<sup>7</sup>, some kind of states are present even above  $f_G$  and their number exponentially grows with the size of the system. However, according to our results, no actual phase transition to a FRSB phase occurs but a different organization of the "valleys" and "passes" of the free energy landscape at high altitude. However the problem of the cluster complexity as suggested in [7] remains open. The SUSY/non-SUSY transition that we have found here may occur also in models defined on locally tree-like lattices like those considered in optimization problems. A theory for the computation of the complexity in tree-like models has been recently presented in [29] through the cavity method; in that context the transition corresponds to the development of non-zero  $z$ -fields.

### Acknowledgments

We thank Andrea Cavagna, Andrea Montanari and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi for useful discussions and for a careful reading of the manuscript.

### Appendix A: Stability analysis

The stability is governed by the Hessian Eq. (16), i.e. the inverse susceptibility matrix

$$\chi_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{h_i}{m_j} = \partial_i \partial_j F_{TAP}(m) = \left( \frac{1}{\beta} \frac{1}{1 - m_i^2} + \frac{\beta}{2} p(p-1)(1-q)q^{p-2} \right) \delta_{ij} - \tilde{J}_{ij} \quad (47)$$

$$\tilde{J}_{ij} = \frac{1}{(p-2)!} \sum_{k_3, \dots, k_p} J_{ijk_3 \dots k_p} m_{k_3}, \dots, m_{k_p} \quad (48)$$

To perform the stability check following the lines of Refs. [23,27] we notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\tilde{J}_{ij}^2} &= \frac{1}{((p-2)!)^2} \overline{\left( \sum_{k_3, \dots, k_p} J_{ijk_3 \dots k_p} m_{k_3}, \dots, m_{k_p} \right)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{((p-2)!)^2} (p-2)! \sum_{k_3, \dots, k_p} \overline{J_{ijk_3 \dots k_p}^2} m_{k_3}^2, \dots, m_{k_p}^2 + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{(p-2)!} N^{p-2} \frac{p!}{2N^{p-1}} q^{p-2} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) = \frac{p(p-1)q^{p-2}}{2} \frac{1}{N} + O\left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Defining  $\alpha_p \equiv p(p-1)q^{p-2}/2$  and

$$K_{ij} \equiv \frac{\tilde{J}_{ij}}{\alpha_p} \quad (50)$$

$$\tilde{\chi}_{ij}^{-1} \equiv \frac{\chi_{ij}^{-1}}{\alpha_p} = \delta_{ij} \left( \frac{1}{\alpha_p} \frac{1}{\beta(1-m_i^2)} + \alpha_p \beta(1-q) \right) - K_{ij} \quad (51)$$

and introducing the resolvent

$$\tilde{R}(z) = \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} (z - \tilde{\chi}^{-1}) \quad (52)$$

satisfying the property  $\Im \tilde{R}(z) > 0$  for  $\Im z < 0$ , the analysis of Refs. [23,27] yields that the physical solution is given by

$$\tilde{R}(z) = z \left( 1 - \frac{1}{x_p} \right) - \alpha_p \beta(1-q) \quad (53)$$

with the condition

$$x_p = 1 - \frac{\alpha_p^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - m_i^2)^2 > 0 \quad (54)$$

This way the local susceptibility takes the right form

$$\chi_l \equiv \frac{1}{N} \text{Tr} \chi = \frac{1}{\alpha_p N} \text{Tr} \tilde{\chi} = \frac{1}{\alpha_p} \left( -\Re(\tilde{R}(z)) \right) \Big|_{z=0} = \beta(1 - q) \quad (55)$$

The condition  $x_p > 0$  over the  $\{m\}$  configurations is equivalent to the replicon positivity in the framework of replicas.

### Appendix B: Connection between the $B = 0$ complexity saddle point and the Plefka parameter.

Performing the computation of the determinat of the Hessian, Eq. (16), one obtains

$$\det \chi_{ij}^{-1} = \int \prod_{i=1}^N d\eta_i d\bar{\eta}_i \exp \left\{ - \sum_{i < j} \tilde{J}_{ij} (\bar{\eta}_i \eta_j + \eta_j \bar{\eta}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q) \right) \right\} \quad (56)$$

Carrying out the average over the effective couplings  $\tilde{J}_{ij}$  leads to

$$\overline{\det \chi^{-1}}_{ij} = \int \prod_{i=1}^N d\eta_i d\bar{\eta}_i \exp \left\{ - \frac{\alpha_p^2}{2N} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{\eta}_i \eta_i \right)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q) \right) \right\} \quad (57)$$

$$= \int \frac{dw}{\sqrt{2\pi/N}} \exp \{ N H(w) \} \quad (58)$$

$$H(w) = -\frac{w^2}{2} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \left( iw\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q) \right) \quad (59)$$

The saddle point of the above integral is determined by the following equations

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial w} = -w + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{i\alpha_p}{iw\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q)} = 0 \quad (60)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial w^2} = -1 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\alpha_p^2}{\left( iw\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q) \right)^2} < 0 \quad (61)$$

Setting  $iv\alpha_p \equiv iw\alpha_p + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q) = iw\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\beta(1 - m_i^2)} + \alpha_p^2 \beta(1 - q)$ , Eqs. (60)-(61) read

$$iv \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha_p^2 \beta^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - m_i^2)^2}{1 + iv\alpha_p \beta(1 - m_i^2)} \right) = 0 \quad (62)$$

$$1 - \frac{\alpha_p^2 \beta^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - m_i^2)^2}{1 + iv\alpha_p \beta(1 - m_i^2)} > 0 \quad (63)$$

Eq. (62) has two solutions:  $v = 0$  and  $v = v^*$ . In the first case the saddle point condition Eq. (63) becomes the Plefka criterion Eq. (36)

$$1 - \frac{\alpha_p^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - m_i^2)^2 = x > 0 \quad (64)$$

If  $v = v^*$  Eq. (63) reduces to

$$iv \frac{\alpha_p^3 \beta^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(1 - m_i^2)^3}{(1 + iv\alpha_p(1 - m_i^2))^2} > 0 \quad (65)$$

Since  $m_i \leq 1$ , it must be  $iv \in R^+$ . In order to make a connection with the replica notation used in Refs. [6,15] we define  $B = iv\alpha_p$  and Eq. (62) becomes

$$1 = \frac{\alpha_p^2 \beta^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1 - m_i^2}{1 + B\beta(1 - m_i^2)} < \frac{\alpha_p^2 \beta^2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (1 - m_i^2)^2 \quad (66)$$

Quite clearly the Plefka criterion is not satisfied for any  $B > 0$ . On the contrary setting  $B = 0$  the solution is consistent with a physical solution.

- <sup>1</sup> G. Parisi, J. Phys. A **13**, L115 (1980).  
<sup>2</sup> S.F. Edwards and P.W. Anderson, J. Phys. F **5**, 965 (1975).  
<sup>3</sup> B. Derrida, Phys. Rev. Lett **45**, 79 (1980).  
<sup>4</sup> D.J. Gross and M. Mezard, Nucl. Phys. B **240**, 431 (1984).  
<sup>5</sup> E. Gardner, Nucl. Phys. B **257**, 747 (1985).  
<sup>6</sup> H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. B **46** (1992) 14655.  
<sup>7</sup> A. Montanari and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, Eur. Phys. J. B **33** (2003) 339.  
<sup>8</sup> C. Becchi, A. Stora and R. Rouet, Commun. Math. Phys. **42** (1975) 127.  
I.V. Tyutin *Lebdev preprint FIAN* **39** (1975) unpublished.  
<sup>9</sup> J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, (1989) Clarendon Press, Oxford.  
<sup>10</sup> A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi, G. Parisi, T. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 127203 (2004).  
<sup>11</sup> M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M.A. Virasoro, "Spin glass theory and beyond", World Scientific (Singapore 1987).  
<sup>12</sup> R. Monasson, Phys. Rev. Lett., **75** 2847 (1995).  
<sup>13</sup> J.R.L. de Almeida and D.J. Thouless, J. Phys. A **11**, 983 (1978).  
<sup>14</sup> D. J. Thouless, P. W. Anderson and R. G. Palmer, Phil. Mag. **35**, 593 (1977).  
<sup>15</sup> A.J. Bray and M.A. Moore, J. Phys. C **13**, L469 (1980).  
<sup>16</sup> A. Cavagna, I. Giardina, G. Parisi and M. Mézard, J. Phys. A **36** (2003) 1175.  
<sup>17</sup> J. Kurchan, J. Phys. A **24** (1991) 4969-4979.  
<sup>18</sup> A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi, G. Parisi and T. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 174401 (2003).  
<sup>19</sup> G. Parisi and N. Sourlas (1979) Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** 744  
<sup>20</sup> G. Parisi and N. Sourlas (1982) Nucl. Phys. B **206** 321  
<sup>21</sup> G. Parisi and T. Rizzo, e-print cond-mat/0401509  
<sup>22</sup> D. Sherrington, S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1792 (1975).  
<sup>23</sup> T. Plefka, J. Phys.A **15** (1982) 1971; Europhys. Lett. **58** (2002) 892.  
<sup>24</sup> T. Aspelmeier, A.J. Bray and M.A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 197202 (2004).  
<sup>25</sup> T. Rizzo e-print cond-mat/0403261  
<sup>26</sup> A. Crisanti, L. Leuzzi, G. Parisi, T. Rizzo, accepted for publication on Phys. Rev. B, cond-mat/0309256  
<sup>27</sup> T. Plefka, Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 224206.  
<sup>28</sup> A. Annibale, G. Gualdi, A. Cavagna, cond-mat/0406466  
<sup>29</sup> T. Rizzo e-print cond-mat/0404729  
<sup>30</sup> By this we mean that the spectrum of the Hessian (16) is strictly positive, with no zero eigenvalue. Different is the case of the "marginal states" counted by the non-BRST complexity that display a zero eigenvalue.