

Evidence for existence of many pure ground states in 3d $\pm J$ Spin Glasses

Alexander K. Hartmann

hartmann@tphys.uni-heidelberg.de

Institut für theoretische Physik, Philosophenweg 19,
69120 Heidelberg, Germany

Tel. +49-6221-549449, Fax. +49-6221-549331

(March 23, 2022)

Ground states of 3d EA Ising spin glasses are calculated for sizes up to 14^3 using a combination of genetic algorithms and cluster-exact approximation. The distribution $P(|q|)$ of overlaps is calculated. For increasing size the width of $P(|q|)$ converges to a nonzero value, indicating that many pure ground states exist for short range Ising spin glasses.

75.10.N, 75.40.H, 02.10

Introduction The behavior of the Edwards-Anderson (EA) $\pm J$ Ising spin glass with short range (i.e. realistic) interactions is still not well understood. The EA Ising spin glass is a system of N spins $\sigma_i = \pm 1$, described by the Hamiltonian

$$H \equiv - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (1)$$

The sum $\langle i,j \rangle$ goes over nearest neighbors. In this letter we consider 3d cubic systems with periodic boundary conditions, $N = L^3$ spins and the exchange interactions (bonds) take $J_{ij} = \pm 1$ with equal probability under the constraint $\sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} = 0$.

One of the most important questions is, whether many pure states exist for realistic spin glasses. For the infinite ranged Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) Ising spin glass this question was answered positively by the replica-symmetry-breaking mean-field (MF) scheme by Parisi [1]. Some authors [2] disbelieve that the MF theory is valid in total for realistic spin glasses. But also a complete different model is proposed: the Droplet Scaling (DS) theory [3–7] suggests that only two pure states (related by a global flip) exist and that the most relevant excitations are obtained by reversing large domains of spins (the droplets). In [8] ground states were calculated using multicanonical sampling, but no decision between MF and DS could be made. Recent results of Monte Carlo (MC) simulations [9] at finite temperature find evidence for the MF picture.

In this letter we show our results for the calculation of spin glass ground states using a hybrid of genetic algorithms [10,11] and cluster-exact approximation (CEA) [12]. CEA is a discrete optimization procedure which is based on the construction of spin clusters exhibiting no frustration and calculating exact ground states for these

clusters using graph theoretical methods. By calculating the distribution of overlaps for different sizes L we find evidence for the existence of many pure ground states for the $\pm J$ spin glass.

Observables For a fixed realization $J = \{J_{ij}\}$ of the exchange interactions and two statistical independent configurations (replicas) $\{\sigma_i^\alpha\}, \{\sigma_i^\beta\}$, the overlap [1] is defined as

$$q^{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_i^\beta \quad (2)$$

The ground state of a given realization is characterized by the probability density $P_J(q)$. Averaging over the realizations J , denoted by $[\cdot]_{av}$, results in (Z = number of realizations)

$$P(q) \equiv [P_J(q)]_{av} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_J P_J(q) \quad (3)$$

Because no external field is present the densities are symmetric: $P_J(q) = P_J(-q)$ and $P(q) = P(-q)$. So only averages of $|q|^n$ are relevant:

$$\overline{|q_J|^n} \equiv \int_{-1}^1 |q|^n P_J(q) dq \quad (4)$$

$$\overline{|q|^n} \equiv \int_{-1}^1 |q|^n P(q) dq \quad (5)$$

The Droplet model predicts that only two pure states exist, implying that $P(q)$ converges for $L \rightarrow \infty$ to $P(q) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta(q - \overline{|q|}) + \delta(q + \overline{|q|}))$ (we don't indicate the L dependence by an index), while in the MF picture the density remains nonzero for a range $-q_1 \leq q \leq q_1$ with peaks at $\pm q_{\max}$ ($0 < q_{\max} \leq q_1$). Consequently the variance

$$\sigma^2(|q|) \equiv \int_{-1}^1 (\overline{|q|} - |q|)^2 P(q) dq = \overline{|q|^2} - \overline{|q|}^2 \quad (6)$$

stays finite for $L \rightarrow \infty$ in the MF pictures ($\sigma^2(|q|) = a_1 + a_2/L^3$) while $\sigma^2(|q|) \sim L^{-y} \rightarrow 0$ according to the DS approach. Here y is the zero-temperature scaling exponent [3] denoted Θ in [5,6].

We have measured the energy per spin e as well. Additionally to the usual fits other scaling corrections were discussed [10], including an exponential one ($e = a_\infty + a_1 \exp(-a_2 L)$).

Results We performed ground state calculations for sizes $L = 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14$. We calculated from 100 realizations for $L = 14$ up to 4000 realizations for $L = 3$. One $L = 14$ run needs typically 540 CPU-min on a 80MHz PPC601 processor (70 CPU-min for $L = 12, \dots$, 0.2 CPU-sec for $L = 3$). For each realization 40 independent runs were made. Each run resulted in one configuration, which was stored, if it exhibited the ground state energy. For $L = 14$ this resulted in an average of 9.9 ground states per realization while for $L = 3$ we got an average of 39.9 ground states. Details of the algorithm, simulation parameters and more results are given in [13]. The results of the calculations are summarized in table I.

Because we want to estimate the quality of the minimization procedure, we discuss the average ground state energy at first. By comparison with previous calculations [8,10] we can see that we have obtained the same or slightly lower (i.e. better) energy, except for $L = 12$ in [8] which is based only on 7 realizations. So we are confident that we get very close to the true ground states using our approximation procedure.

We extrapolate to $L \rightarrow \infty$ by using finite size scaling (FSS) fits. We used the Levenberg-Marquard Method implemented in [14] which gives also the probability Q of finding such a bad data-set (provided that the fit function is exact).

Table II show the results for FFS fits for the following three functions:

$$f(L) \equiv a_\infty + a_1/L^3 \quad (7)$$

$$g(L) \equiv a_\infty + a_1 L^{-a_2} \quad (8)$$

$$h(L) \equiv a_\infty + a_1 \exp(-a_2 L) \quad (9)$$

For $\sigma^2(|q|)$ results for fits of the first two functions $f(L)$ and $g(L)$ (with a_∞ set to 0) are given in the same table as well.

We get a ground state energy of the infinite system of $e_\infty = a_\infty = -1.7868(3)$ ($Q=0.20$) resp. $e_\infty = a_\infty = -1.7876(3)$ with $a_2 = 2.84(3)$ ($Q=0.77$). The exponential fit is ruled out ($Q=10^{-7}$). Our ground state energy is lower than some previous results: $e_\infty = -1.75$ [15], $e_\infty = -1.76(2)$ [16], and of the same magnitude as the most accurate study so far $e_\infty = -1.7863(4)$ [10]. In [8] a lower value was found ($e_\infty = -1.839(4)$), but that study suffers from only seven $L = 12$ realizations.

The result for the energy, together with the best fit, is displayed in fig. 1.

In [10] a L^{-3} fit was ruled out, instead a $L^{-2.97}$ fit was preferred. Our data shows a similar tendency, but the data for the energy is not accurate enough to decide this question. The second fit supports the MF picture too, because the value $y = a_2 = 2.84$ of the exponent exceeds the limit $y \leq (d-1)/2$ proposed by DS. Since the aim of this letter is to distinguish whether only two or infinitely

many pure ground states exist, we proceed by analyzing the order parameter distribution $P(|q|)$.

In fig. 2 the probability density of the overlap is displayed for $L = 6$ and $L = 12$. Each realization enters the sum with the same weight, even if different numbers of ground states were available for the calculation of $P_J(|q|)$. Only a small difference for high q -values is visible, which is reflected also in a slight shift of the average to smaller values (see table I). But especially for $|q| \leq 0.8$ no significant reduction in the probability is visible. So many different ground states still exist for higher L . This result is supported quantitatively by the variances of $|q|$ as function of L which are shown in fig. 3. For all sizes the magnitude of the values is higher than in [8], indicating that their MC algorithm does not explore the configuration space sufficiently. Our fits show a higher probability for the existence of many pure states ($Q = 0.79$) against the two state picture ($Q = 0.09$).

Another interesting questions is whether the difference between the density functions of single realizations and the average $P(|q|)$ remains nonzero for increasing L , i.e. whether the short range spin glasses exhibit lack of self-averaging. But presently we have not computed enough ground states per realization for large sizes to address this question.

Conclusion By the calculation of ground states using genetic cluster-exact approximation we find evidence for the existence of many pure states in short range spin glasses. The major drawback of our method is that the ground states are not exact, but for these lattice sizes this is beyond the power of actual algorithms and computers. By comparison with other results we feel confident that the energy of our states is very close to the true ground state energy. In the moment we do not have enough ground states per realization calculated (for higher L) to decide whether short range spin glasses exhibit lack of self-averaging or not.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank D.W. Heermann for manifold support and G. Reinelt for fruitful discussions. We thank G. Pätzold for critical reading of the manuscript and the *Paderborn Center for Parallel Computing* for the allocation of computer time. This work was supported by the Graduiertenkolleg "Modellierung und Wissenschaftliches Rechnen in Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften" at the *Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für Wissenschaftliches Rechnen* in Heidelberg.

-
- [1] G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1754 (1979); J. Phys. A 13, 1101 (1980); 13, 1887 (1980); 13, L115 (1980); Phys. Rev. Lett. 50, 1946 (1983).
 - [2] C.M. Newman and D.L. Stein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 515

- (1996)
- [3] W.L. McMillan, J. Phys. C 17, 3179 (1984).
 - [4] A.J. Bray and M.A. Moore, J. Phys. C 18, L699 (1985).
 - [5] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 1601 (1986).
 - [6] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 38, 386(1988).
 - [7] A. Bovier and J. Fröhlich, J. Stat. Phys. 44, 347 (1986).
 - [8] B.A. Berg, U.E. Hansmann, T.Celik, Phys. Rev. B 50, 16444 (1994).
 - [9] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, F. Ritort, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 843 (1996).
 - [10] K.F. Pál, Physica A 223, 283 (1996).
 - [11] Z. Michalewicz, Genetic Algorithms + Data Structures = Evolution Programs, (Springer, Berlin 1992).
 - [12] A.K. Hartmann, Physica A, 224, 480 (1996).
 - [13] A.K. Hartmann, to be published.
 - [14] W.H. Press, B.P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky, W.T. Vetterlin, Numerical Recipes in C, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1988).
 - [15] S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B 16, 4630 (1977).
 - [16] I. Morgenstern and K. Binder, Z. Phys. B 39, 227 (1980)




FIG. 1. Ground state energy for $3 \leq L \leq 14$ and best FSS fit




FIG. 2. $P(|q|)$ for $L = 6, 12$




FIG. 3. Variances $\sigma^2(|q|)$ for $3 \leq L \leq 14$ and FSS fits

L	e	$\overline{ q }$	$\sigma^2(q)$
3	-1.6731(19)	0.742(3)	0.0731(9)
4	-1.7370(9)	0.748(3)	0.0669(9)
5	-1.7603(8)	0.743(4)	0.0628(13)
6	-1.7723(7)	0.742(4)	0.0632(15)
8	-1.7802(5)	0.726(6)	0.0621(20)
10	-1.7840(4)	0.737(6)	0.0588(22)
12	-1.7851(4)	0.698(8)	0.0593(30)
14	-1.7865(7)	0.701(20)	0.0583(72)

TABLE I. Results.

	fit	a_∞	a_1	a_2	Q
e	f(L)	-1.7869(3)	3.15(5)	-	0.20
e	g(L)	-1.7876(3)	2.60(15)	2.84(5)	0.77
e	h(L)	-1.7846(8)	1.01(17)	0.75(5)	10^{-7}
$\sigma^2(q)$	f(L)	0.0608(6)	0.34(3)	-	0.79
$\sigma^2(q)$	g(L)	0	0.088(4)	0.18(3)	0.09

TABLE II. Result of FSS-fits.