Subextensive singularity in the 2D J Ising spin glass

Ronald Fisch

382 W illowbrook Dr.

North Brunswick, NJ 08902

(Dated: March 23, 2024)

Abstract

The statistics of low energy states of the 2D Ising spin glass with +1 and -1 bonds are studied for L L square lattices with L 48, and p = 0.5, where p is the fraction of negative bonds, using periodic and/or antiperiodic boundary conditions. The behavior of the density of states near the ground state energy is analyzed as a function of L, in order to obtain the low temperature behavior of the model. For large nite L there is a range of T in which the heat capacity is proportional to T^{5:33} 0:12. The range of T in which this behavior occurs scales slow ly to T = 0 as L increases. Sim ilar results are found for p = 0.25. O ur results indicate that this model probably obeys the ordinary hyperscaling relation d = 2, even though $T_c = 0$. The existence of the subextensive behavior is attributed to long-range correlations between zero-energy dom ain walls, and evidence of such correlations is presented.

PACS numbers: 75.10 Nr, 75.40 Mg, 75.60 Ch, 05.50.+ q

In 1977, Thouless, Anderson and Palm er¹ (TAP) perform ed a m ean- eld theory analysis of the ring diagram s which contribute to the free energy of the Ising spin glass.^{2,3} They found that, above the critical temperature T_g , the contribution of these ring diagram s was subextensive. This means that, while the sum of these diagram s is divergent at T_g , their contribution at any $T > T_g$ can be neglected in the therm odynam ic lim it.³ Therefore, in this lim it, no signature of the transition is visible in the equilibrium therm odynam ic functions for $T > T_g$. However, one can still study the critical scaling behavior of nite system s.

W hile it is true that hyperscaling is always violated in a mean-eld theory, TAP showed that a spin glass has severe uctuations of the order parameter even at the mean-eld level. Later, it was shown by Som polinsky and Zippelius^{4,5} that the Ising spin glass also violates the uctuation-dissipation theorem. Thus one should not be surprised if it turns out that the spin glass does not obey other relations which work for ordinary phase transitions.

In this work we analyze data obtained from exact calculations of the density of low -energy states for nite two-dimensional (2D) lattices. The same data have also been used to study the scaling behavior of dom ain walls for this model.⁶ W e will discover that an unusual eet, sim ilar to the violation of hyperscaling found in mean- eld theory, also occurs in 2D. The data were obtained using a slightly modi ed version of the computer program of Vondrak,^{7,8} which is based on the P fa an method. O ur data are completely consistent with the data of Lukic et al.,^{10,11} which were obtained using the same algorithm. O ur analysis of the heat capacity is more detailed than theirs, however, and thus we arrive at somewhat di erent conclusions.

In two dimensions (2D), the spin-glass phase is not stable at nite temperature. Because of this, it is necessary to treat cases with continuous distributions of energies (CDE) and cases with quantized distributions of energies (QDE) separately.^{12,13} In this work we will study the QDE case.

The Hamiltonian of the EA model for $Ising spins^2$ is

$$H = \begin{array}{c} X \\ J_{ij \ i \ j}; \\ h_{iji} \end{array}$$
(1)

where each spin $_{i}$ is a dynam ical variable which has two allowed states, +1 and -1. The hiji indicates a sum over nearest neighbors on a simple square lattice of size L L.W e choose each bond J_{ij} to be an independent identically distributed quenched random variable, with



FIG.1: (color online) Finite-size scaling of $E_0 = L^2$ vs. $1 = L^2$.

the probability distribution

$$P(J_{ij}) = p(J_{ij} + 1) + (1 p)(J_{ij} 1);$$
 (2)

so that we actually set J = 1, as usual. Thus p is the concentration of antiferrom agnetic bonds, and $(1 \ p)$ is the concentration of ferrom agnetic bonds. Here we will discuss primarily the equal mixture case, p = 0.5, but results for p = 0.25 will also be given.

The ground state (GS) entropy is de ned as the natural logarithm of the number of ground states. For each sample the GS energy E_0 and GS entropy S_0 were calculated for the four combinations of periodic and antiperiodic toroidal boundary conditions along each of the two axes of the square lattice. W hen p = 0.5, all four of these types of boundary conditions are statistically equivalent.

D ata were obtained for lattices of sizes L = 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 21, 24, 29, 32, 41 and 48. For each L, 500 di erent random sets of bonds were studied, for each of the four boundary conditions. Thus, combining the data for the di erent boundary conditions, we have 2000 values of E_0 and S_0 for each L.

W ith the boundary conditions we are using, for which there is no well-de ned surface, the value of E_0 averaged over samples of the random bonds, is expected to obey

$$E_0 = L^2 = e_0 + a_e = L^2$$
 (3)

to lowest order in L. Fig. 1 shows that this works well, and that the value of e_0 obtained from our data is $e_0 = 1.40151 \quad 0.00027$. In principle, higher order corrections exist, but



FIG.2: (color online) Finite-size scaling of $S_0=L^2$ vs. $1=L^2$.

they are not necessary at the level of precision of our data. This agrees with the result found by Lukic et al.¹⁰ All statistical error estimates shown in this work represent one standard deviation. The best estimate of e_0 is still the one of Palmer and Adler,¹⁴ which uses a method for which one can go to much larger L, because the entropy is not calculated.

The nite-size scaling behavior of S₀ is slightly more complex. Lukic et al.¹⁰ used a single correction-to-scaling term, with an exponent $(2 + _{\rm S})$. From a fundamental view point,¹⁵ how ever, when $_{\rm S}$ is positive the natural form to use when adding another thing parameter is

$$S_0 = L^2 = s_0 + a_s = L^2 + b_s = L^4$$
: (4)

In Fig. 2 we see that this form works well, and gives a value of $s_0 = 0.07211$ 0.00015. This value is slightly higher than the one quoted by Lukic et al., but the di erence comes primarily from the di erent form of the thing function rather than from di erences in the data. By comparing with the work of Bouchaud, K rzakala and M artin,¹⁵ one sees that Lukic et al. have m ade a sign error, and that their tactually uses a negative value for s, which is incorrect.^{16,17}

W hile our values of the energy and entropy of the GS of nite L L lattices for p = 0.5 are generally consistent with those of other workers, our results for L = 32 di er substantially with those reported by B lackm an and Poulter.¹⁸ (See Figs. 7 and 8 of their paper.) The origin of this discrepancy is unclear, but it appears to be too large to be explained by the



FIG.3: (color online) Scaling of S_1 S_0 with L.

di erent boundary conditions used by them. Their num bers of sam ples com puted are rather sm all, and it m ay be that they have sim ply underestim ated their statistical errors. However, their algorithm, unlike the one used here, does not use exact integer arithmetic to calculate the partition function. Therefore, it is likely that they have a problem with roundo errors. In a strongly correlated system such as the one we are studying, substantial roundo errors can result in distributions which are too narrow.

In order to obtain information about the low temperature behavior, it is useful to study the scaling with L of S_1 S_0 , which is the logarithm of the ratio of the degeneracies of the lowest excited state and the GS.^{10,16,17,19} W e found that

av $(\ln (S_1 S_0)) = \ln (\ln ((L^2)!)) + 0.528 0.011;$ (5)

with

$$= 0:1921 \quad 0:0015$$
 (6)

gives an excellent t for L > 10, as shown in Fig. 3. av() is a conguration average over random samples. The points for L = 7 and 8 (not shown in the gure) are below the tted line, due to corrections to scaling at small L.

The choice $\ln(\ln((L^2)!))$ may appear arbitrary to the reader, but it was suggested by the behavior of the fully frustrated 2D Ising model.^{16,17} In principle, if one could go to very large values of L, one could obtain by plotting the data against $2\ln(L)$. From



FIG.4: Histogram of the distribution of S_1 S_0 for L = 48.

Stirling's approximation one sees in mediately that the di erence between using $2 \ln (L)$ and $\ln (\ln ((L^2)!))$ is a logarithm ic correction to scaling. This logarithm ic correction appears to be present in the data, however, and a much better t is obtained if one does things as shown here.

If one uses $2 \ln (L = 3)$ an excellent t over the range of the data is obtained. However, this seem s completely articial to the author. In any case the value of = 0.1948 = 0.0008 which one nds from this form is close to the one shown in Fig. 3. (The reason why the statistical error in this number is so sm all is that no contribution from the uncertainty in the tting parameter 3" is included.)

The reason for taking the con guration average of $\ln (S_1 \quad S_0)$ rather than taking the logarithm of av $(S_1 \quad S_0)$ is that in this way we nd the most probable value.^{20,21} The probability distributions for $S_1 \quad S_0$ are highly skewed, and the most probable value scales di erently with L than av $(S_1 \quad S_0)$ does. To illustrate this point, in Fig. 4 we show a histogram of the distribution of $S_1 \quad S_0$ for the L = 48 lattices. If one plots the data using av $(S_1 \quad S_0)$, one nds an apparent value for of 0.233 (3). U sing the median value gives 0.222 (3). It is the typical or most probable value which is the experimentally observable quantity, as established by Edwards and Anderson² for the spin glass.

From this analysis, we obtain the typical value of S_1 S_0 to be

$$S_1 S_0 = f(L) A[ln((L^2)!)];$$
 (7)

with A = 1:696 0:019, or, using Stirling's approximation,

$$f(L) = A[L^2(2\ln(L) - 1)]$$
: (8)

It follows immediately that the scaling of $S_1 = S_0$ with L is approximately a power law, with an exponent close to 0.4, times ln(L). This variation with L is much more rapid than the hypothesis of W and and Swendsen,¹⁹ who argued for a dependence like 4 ln(L). To this extent, it agrees with the claims of Jorg et al.¹¹

To obtain the actual behavior of the low temperature specic heat, we must carry the analysis further. The heat capacity of a sample of size L L at temperature T is given by

$$C(L;T) = h(E(L)) h (L)i^{2}i = T^{2};$$
 (9)

where the angle brackets indicate a therm all average, and we are using units in which Boltzm ann's constant is 1.

W riting the partition function of a nite sample with periodic boundary conditions explicitly gives

$$Z (T) = \exp (S_n S_0 4n=T):$$
(10)

The heat capacity is then

C (L;T) = (T²Z)¹
$$f_{X^0} = \frac{1}{2} 16 (n n)^2 \exp(S_n S_0 4n = T);$$
 (11)

where n is the value of n for which the argument of the exponential has its maximum for a given sample at temperature T.

The average values of S_n S_0 for sm all values of n are shown in Fig. 5, over our full range of L. The slope de ned by these points, om itting the n = 1 points, is plotted versus 1=L in Fig. 6. The limiting value of this slope for large L obtained from this plot is found to be

$$= 0.842 \quad 0.003:$$
 (12)

This means that for n L^2

$$S_n = S_0 = f(L)n$$
; (13)

and im plies

$$(n (L;T))^1$$
 f(L)T=4: (14)



FIG. 5: (color online) Scaling of av $(S_n S_0)$ with L, for sm all values of n. The axes are scaled logarithm ically.



FIG.6: (color online) Slope of av (S $_{\rm n}$ $\,$ S $_{\rm 0})$ vs. 1=L, for n = 2 to 8.

This can only be valid, however, if 0 < n L^2 . If we take the lim it T ! 0, holding L xed, then n ! 0. Thus the lim iting low temperature behavior of C (L;T), for any xed L is proportional to exp (4=T), as it must be. We expect to see this behavior when T < T₁, where

$$T_1(L) = 4[L^2(2\ln(L) \ 1)] = (A)$$
 (15)

is the tem perature where n = 1. We have found a positive value for , which means that

 $T_1 ! 0 as L ! 1 .$

The reason for om itting the n = 1 points shown in Fig. 5 from the ts is that they all lie well below the straight lines. The quantity $S_1 = S_0$ does not behave in the same way that the other $S_{n+1} = S_n$ do. The author understands this elect by analogy with the well-known behavior of random matrices. The gap at the band edge is special, because it only feels level repulsion from one side.

Substituting our expressions for n and $S_n = S_0$ into Eqn. (10) gives

$$C(L;T) = 16T^{2} \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{P} \sum_{n=0}^{j=0} (n (AT=4)^{l=(1)} (L^{2} (2 \ln (L) 1))^{=(1)})^{2} \exp (g(n;L))}{\sum_{n=0}^{P} \sum_{n=0}^{j=0} \exp (g(n;L))}; (16)$$

where

 $g(n;L) = n [A (L^2 (2 ln (L) 1)) 4n^1 =T]:$ (17)

W hen we try to take the lim it L ! 1 holding T xed, we get a surprise. The exponent $=(1 \)$ is 1.216 0.033. Because this exponent is greater than than 1, the power-law behavior described by the exponent of Eqn. (12) is only valid for T < T_x, where T_x must go to zero as L increases. n cannot become larger than L²! This condition requires that, when L ! 1, T_x must also go to zero at least as fast as

$$T_x(L) = 4L^{2(+1)}(2\ln(L) - 1) = (A)$$
: (18)

A lthough we do not have data to show that T_x actually behaves precisely in this way, it is at least plausible that T_x goes to zero more slowly than T_1 as L increases, since < 1.

W hat this means is that the singularity we are studying is subextensive, just as the thermal singularity above T_g is in the TAP mean-eld theory.^{1,3} It also means that for L large, but nite, we expect there exists a temperature regime T_1 T T_x in which the scaling behavior controlled by this singularity is observable.

controls the therm albehavior in the tem perature range $0 < T < T_1$, and controls the behavior in the range $T_1 < T < T_x$. Therefore, these exponents are independent. A simple scaling relation between exponents de ned in di erent ranges of T which have independent behaviors is in possible. This statement is not in contradiction with the fact that the value of T_x clearly depends on both and . The entire procedure used here is quite similar to the theory of nested boundary layers.²²

Since hE (L)i is essentially 4n (L;T), the heat capacity for $T_1 < T < T_x$ is easily seen to be proportional to T⁼⁽¹⁾, which is T^{5:33} 0:12</sup>. Because T_x ! 0 as L ! 1, this behavior

disappears in the therm odynam ic limit. The exponent 2 (+ 1) is 0.068 0.009. This is small, so T_x is going to zero quite slow ly. Thus the power-law behavior of C (L;T) should be visible for macroscopic values of L. Note that this e ect is not caused by our choice of logarithm ic averaging of S_1 S_0 , since the use of simple averaging would give a larger value for .

A lthough our statistical errors are small, the estimate of depends on our choice of the nite-size scaling thing function. Notice that the estimate of the scaling exponent for the T dependence of C (L;T) depends only on , and is independent of . Therefore, our estimate

$$=$$
 5:33 0:12 (19)

is independent of whether $T_x \ ! \ 0 \ \text{as L} \ ! \ 1$.

All of the calculations for p = 0.5 described above were repeated for p = 0.25. Using the same procedures as discussed above, we not for p = 0.25 the exponents = 0.1874 0.0019 and = 0.8527 0.0017. Therefore we obtain 2(+ 1) = 0.080 0.007 and =

5:79 0:08. These results are quite consistent with universality of the critical exponents, since the quoted statistical errors do not include any allowance for errors in the assumed scaling form s.

Recently, Jorg et al.¹¹ have claim ed that a power-law behavior of C (L;T) is evidence that the QDE is in the same universality class as the CDE. However, they have not calculated directly. They have calculated the correlation length exponent 3.5, and assumed that

could be obtained via the modi ed hyperscaling relation of B aker and B onner.²³ T he fact that our value of is not close to 7 shows that this relation is not obeyed. Our value seem s to indicate that the ordinary hyperscaling relation, d = 2, is obeyed. has never been calculated directly for the CDE, so we cannot say whether the values of are the same for the QDE and the CDE.

F inally, we discuss the origin of the subextensive singularity. Such behavior in a 2D m odel probably requires the existence of som e kind of long-range interactions. Such interactions are not present explicitly in our H am iltonian, Eqn. (1), but they m ay arise spontaneously. Since dom ain walls are extended objects, it would not be very surprising for interactions between dom ain walls to have long range, especially at T = 0.

U sing the same computer program which was used here to obtain the heat capacity and additional procedures described in a recent publication,⁶ we have calculated the average

10



FIG. 7: (color online) Scaling of average entropy of zero-energy dom ain walls for lattices of size L M vs. $M = L^{1:25}$. These dom ain walls run across the lattice in the short direction, which has length L.

dom ain-wall entropy for zero-energy dom ain walls on lattices of size L M, where L M. Rem arkably, the average dom ain-wall entropy for the zero-energy dom ain walls which run across the lattice in the short (L) direction scales to zero exponentially in the variable $M = L^{1.25}$. This is shown in Fig. 7. The exponent 1.25 is suggestive of the relation recently proposed by Am oruso, H artm ann, H astings and M core,²⁴ which gives a value of 1.25 for the fractal dimension of dom ain walls for this m odel. From the data displayed here we can say that this exponent m ust be 1.25 0.05. Because their entropy scales to zero so rapidly, these zero-energy dom ain walls m ust be highly correlated.

This e ect is strong evidence for long-range interactions between the zero-energy dom ain walls. It does not occur for dom ain walls of other energies. Am onuso et al. do not explicitly specify that the behavior of the zero-energy dom ain walls should be special. However, this was suggested by the work of W ang, Harrington and Preskill.²⁵ This dom ain-wall entropy calculation will be described m ore fully in a subsequent publication.²⁶

In this work we have calculated in detail the low temperature therm all behavior of the 2D Ising spin glass with an equal mixture of +1 and 1 bonds. We have found that this behavior bears a strong qualitative resemblance to the behavior found in the TAP meaneld-theory analysis. For nite L there is a range of T for which C (L;T) is proportional to

11

 $T^{5:33}$. However, this behavior disappears slow ly as L ! 1. This subextensive behavior is attributed to correlations between zero-energy dom ain walls.

A cknow ledgm ents

The author thanks Jan Vondrak for providing his computer code, and for help in learning how to use it. He is grateful to D avid Huse and A lex Hartm ann for stimulating conversations, to M ike Moore for noting an error in the manuscript, and to Princeton University for providing use of facilities.

ron@princeton.edu

- ¹ D.J.Thouless, P.W. Anderson and R.G. Palmer, Phil.M ag. 35, 593 (1977).
- ² S.F.Edwards and P.W .Anderson, J.Phys.F 5, 965 (1975).
- ³ P.W. Anderson, in Ill-Condensed Matter, R.Balian, R.Maynard and G.Toulouse, ed. (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) pp.162-261.
- ⁴ H.Som polinsky and A.Zippelius, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 359 (1981).
- ⁵ H.Som polinsky and A.Zippelius, Phys. Rev. B 25, 6860 (1982).
- ⁶ R.Fisch, J.Stat. Phys. 125, 793 (2006).
- ⁷ A.Galluccio, M. Loebland J. Vondrak, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5924 (2000).
- ⁸ A.Galluccio, M. Loebland J. Vondrak, Math. Program., Ser. A 90, 273 (2001).
- ⁹ I.A.Campbell, A.K.Hartmann and H.G.Katzgraber, Phys. Rev. B 70, 054429 (2004).
- ¹⁰ J.Lukic, A.Galluccio, E.Marinari, O.C.Martin and G.Rinaldi, Phys.Rev.Lett. 92, 117202 (2004).
- ¹¹ T.Jorg, J.Lukic, E.Marinari and O.C.Martin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 237205 (2006).
- ¹² A.J.Bray and M.A.Moore, Heidelberg Colloquium on Glassy Dynamics, J.L. van Hemmen and I.Morgenstern, ed., (Springer, Berlin, 1986), pp.121-153.
- ¹³ C.Amoruso, E.Marinari, O.C.Martin and A.Pagnani, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 087201 (2003).
- ¹⁴ R.G. Palmer and J.Adler, Int. J.M od. Phys. C 10, 667 (1999).
- ¹⁵ J.P.Bouchaud, F.K rzakala and O.C.Martin, Phys. Rev. B 68, 224404 (2003).
- ¹⁶ L.Sauland M.Kardar, Phys. Rev. E 48, R 3221 (1993).

- ¹⁷ L.Sauland M.Kardar, Nucl. Phys. B 432, 641 (1994).
- ¹⁸ J.A.Blackm an and J.Poulter, Phys. Rev. B 44, 4374 (1991).
- ¹⁹ J.-S.W ang and R.H.Swendsen, Phys. Rev.B 38, 4840 (1988).
- ²⁰ B.Derrida and H.Hilhorst, J.Phys.C 14, L539 (1981).
- ²¹ F.M erz and J.T.Chalker, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054413 (2002).
- ²² C.M. Bender and S.A.Orszag, Advanced M athem atical M ethods for Scientists and Engineers,
 (M cG raw H ill, N ew York, 1978), pp. 453-455.
- ²³ G.A.Baker, Jr. and J.C.Bonner, Phys. Rev. B 12, 3741 (1975).
- ²⁴ C.Amoruso, A.K.Hartmann, M.B.Hastings and M.A.Moore, Phys.Rev.Lett. 97, 267202 (2006).
- ²⁵ C.W ang, J.Harrington and J.Preskill, Ann.Phys. (N.Y.) 303, 31 (2003).
- ²⁶ R.Fisch, cond-m at/0703137.