

Bounds for diluted mean-field spin glass models

Dmitry Panchenko, Michel Talagrand^y

March 20, 2022

Abstract

In an important recent paper, [2], S. Franz and M. Leone prove rigorous lower bounds for the free energy of the diluted p -spin model and the K -sat model at any temperature. We show that the results for these two models are consequences of a single general principle. Our calculations are significantly simpler than those of [2], even in the replica-symmetric case.

Key words: spin glasses.

1 Introduction.

Let $p \geq 2$ be an even integer that will be fixed throughout this paper. For $N \geq 1$ let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. Consider a random function $\sigma : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a sequence $(\sigma_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ of independent copies of σ . Consider an i.i.d. sequence of indices $(i_{p,k})_{k=1}^\infty$ with uniform distribution on $\{1, \dots, N\}$; and let M be a Poisson r.v. with mean $\mathbb{E}M = N$. Let us define the Hamiltonian $H_N(\cdot)$ on $\mathcal{N}$ by

$$H_N(\cdot) = \sum_{k=1}^M \sigma(i_{1,k}; \dots; i_{p,k}) + H_N^0(\cdot); \quad (1.1)$$

where $H_N^0(\cdot)$ is an arbitrary random function on $\mathcal{N}$ independent of all other r.v. in (1.1). The main goal of this paper is to prove upper bounds for

$$F_N = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{N}} \exp(H_N(\sigma));$$

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139 email: panchenk@math.mit.edu

^yEquipe d'Analyse de l'Institut Mathématique, 4 place Jussieu, 75230 PARIS Cedex 05 and Department of Mathematics, the Ohio-State university, Columbus, OH 43210. email: talagran@math.ohio-state.edu
Supported by NSF grant

We will make the following assumptions on the random function : We assume that there exists a random function $f : \mathbb{R}^{1+1g} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\exp(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) = a(1 + bf_1(-\lambda_1) \dots f_p(-\lambda_p)); \quad (1.2)$$

where $f_1, \dots, f_p$ are independent copies of f ; b is a r.v. independent of $f_1, \dots, f_p$ that satisfies the condition

$$8n - 1 - E(b)^n = 0; \quad (1.3)$$

and a is an arbitrary r.v. Finally, we assume that

$$|bf_1(-\lambda_1) \dots f_p(-\lambda_p)| < 1 \text{ a.s.} \quad (1.4)$$

Let us consider two examples when the conditions (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) are satisfied.

Example 1. (p-spin model) Consider $\gamma > 0$ and a symmetric r.v. J : The p-spin model corresponds to the choice of

$$(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) = -J_{-1} \dots -J_{-p};$$

(1.2) holds with $a = \text{ch}(\gamma)$; $b = \text{th}(\gamma)$ and $f(\lambda) = -\lambda$ and condition (1.3) holds since we assume that the distribution of J is symmetric.

Example 2. (K-sat model) Consider $\gamma > 0$ and a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli r.v. $(J_l)_{l=1}^{\infty}$ with $P(J_l = -1) = 1/2$: The K-sat model corresponds to

$$(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) = \prod_{l=1}^p \frac{1 + J_{l-1}}{2};$$

(1.2) holds with $a = 1$; $b = e^{-\gamma}$ and $f_1(-\lambda_1) = (1 + J_{l-1})/2$ and (1.3) holds since $b < 0$:

We now introduce certain quantities that will play a fundamental role in the paper. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a vector $x = (x_1; \dots; x_p)$ let us define

$$h f i_x = \frac{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l}{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l}$$

(so that $h f i_x$ implicitly depends on the last coordinate x_p) and

$$h f i_x = \frac{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l}{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l};$$

Let us define

$$E(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p) = \exp(-\lambda_1; \dots; -\lambda_p);$$

If the condition (1.2) holds then

$$\begin{aligned} h E i_x &= h \exp i_x = \frac{D}{a(1 + bf_1(-\lambda_1) \dots f_p(-\lambda_p))} \frac{E}{x} \\ &= a(1 + bf_p(-\lambda_p)) \frac{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_l(-\lambda_l) \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l}{\prod_{l=1}^p \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right) d\lambda_l} = a(1 + bf_p(-\lambda_p)) \frac{\prod_{l=1}^p \text{Av} f_l(-\lambda_l) \exp \left(\sum_{l=1}^p x_l \lambda_l \right)}{\text{ch}(x_1)}; \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

where Av means average over $\mu = 1$ and, similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} i_x = a + b \text{Av}_{1 \leq p \leq Y} \frac{f_1(\mu) \exp(x_1 \mu)}{\text{ch}(x_1)} : \quad (1.6)$$

Finally, let us define

$$U(\mu; x_1; \dots; x_{p-1}; \mu) = \log \mathbb{E} i_x \mu_p = \mu : \quad (1.7)$$

In the case of the p -spin model, we have

$$\mathbb{E} i_x = \text{ch}(J) + \text{th}(J) \text{Av}_{1 \leq p \leq Y} \text{th}(x_1)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} i_x = \text{ch}(J) + \text{th}(J) \text{Av}_{1 \leq p \leq Y} \text{th}(x_1) :$$

In the case of the K -sat model, we have

$$\mathbb{E} i_x = 1 + (e - 1) \text{Av}_{1 \leq p \leq Y} \frac{1 + J_p \mu_p}{2} \frac{1 + J_1 \text{th}(x_1)}{2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} i_x = 1 + (e - 1) \text{Av}_{1 \leq p \leq Y} \frac{1 + J_1 \text{th}(x_1)}{2} :$$

2 The replica-symmetric bound.

Given an arbitrary probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ consider an i.i.d. sequence $x_1^{ij}; i, j; 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq p$ with distribution μ and consider $U_{ij}(\mu) = U(\mu; x_1^{ij}; \dots; x_{p-1}^{ij}; \mu)$; where x_1^{ij} are independent copies of μ : Let us consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_{N, \mu}(\mu) = \sum_{k=1}^X \log(\mu_{i_k, k}; \dots; \mu_{i_p, k}) + \sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^X U_{ij}(\mu) + H_N^0(\mu); \quad (2.1)$$

where M_t is a Poisson r.v. with mean $\mathbb{E} M_t = t N$; and $k_{i,t}; i \leq N$ are i.i.d. Poisson r.v. with mean $\mathbb{E} k_{i,t} = (1 - t) p$: Let us define

$$\phi'(t) = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E} \log \sum_{i=1}^X \exp(H_{N, \mu}(\mu)) :$$

Clearly, $F_N = \phi'(1)$: The following Theorem holds.

Theorem 1 (RS bound). If conditions (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) hold then

$$F_N(\mu) = \phi'(0) - (p - 1) \mathbb{E} \log \mathbb{E} i_x; \quad (2.2)$$

where $x = (x_1; \dots; x_p)$ is a vector of i.i.d. r.v. with the distribution μ :

First of all, since F_N does not depend on β ; Theorem 1 implies

$$F_N(\beta) = \inf_{\beta \geq 0} F_N(\beta); \quad (2.3)$$

Even though Theorem 1 holds for any $H_N^0(\beta)$; it is particularly interesting when

$$H_N^0(\beta) = \sum_{i=1}^N h_i \beta_i; \quad (2.4)$$

where $(h_i)_{i=1}^N$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables. With this choice we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(\beta) &= \frac{1}{N} E \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^N U_{ij}(\beta_i) + h_i \beta_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} E \log \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^Y \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_{ij}} U_{j,k}(\beta_k) + h_i \beta_i \right) \\ &= \log 2 + E \log A v \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^Y U_j(\beta) + h \beta \right); \end{aligned}$$

where $A v$ mean average over $\beta = \beta_1$; and (U_j) ; h and k are copies of $(U_{1,j})$; h_1 and $k_{1,1}$ correspondingly. In this case the bound (2.2) is usually written in Physics in terms of the functions $B(x_1; \dots; x_{p-1})$ and $u(x_1; \dots; x_{p-1})$ defined by

$$\phi''(\beta) = \frac{1}{N} B e^{\beta u} = h E i_x; \quad (2.5)$$

In the case of the p -spin model (2.5) defines

$$u = \frac{1}{p} \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^p x_i \right)$$

and $B = \frac{1}{p} \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^p x_i \right)$: In the case of the K -sat model

$$u = \frac{b}{2} \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \frac{1 + J_1 \exp(x_1)}{2} + \frac{b}{2} \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \frac{1 + J_1 \exp(x_1)}{2}$$

and

$$B = \frac{1}{p} \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \frac{1 + J_1 \exp(x_1)}{2};$$

To write $\phi'(\beta)$ in terms of these functions B and u , we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(\beta) &= \log 2 + E \log A v \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^Y U_j(\beta) + h \beta \right) \\ &= \log 2 + E \log \sum_{j=1}^Y B_j A v \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_j} u_j(\beta_k) + h \beta \right); \\ &= \log 2 + p E \log B + E \log \sum_{j=1}^Y \exp(u_j + h); \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

using that $E k = p$ in the last line.

In the case when $H_N^0(\cdot) = 0$; it was proved in [9] (see Chapter 7, [10]) that for n small enough,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N = \phi(\cdot) = \inf \psi(\cdot)$$

where ϕ is the unique solution of the equation

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} u_j x^j;$$

where $u_j = u_j(x_1^j; \dots; x_{p-1}^j)$ is defined in (2.5), x and x_1^j are i.i.d. with the distribution μ ; k is Poisson with $E k = p$ and $\sim$ means equality in distribution.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let us consider the partition function

$$Z = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_N} \exp(-H_N(\mathbf{z}))$$

(for simplicity of notations we omit the dependence of Z on N and t) and define

$$Z_m = Z_{M_t=m} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{i;k} = Z_{k_{i,t}=k} :$$

If we denote the Poisson p.f. as $\mu(k) = (e^{-p} p^k / k!)$ then

$$E \log Z = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (t^N \mu(m)) E \log Z_m$$

and, for any $i \leq N$,

$$E \log Z = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((1-t)^p \mu(k)) E \log Z_{i;k} :$$

Using the notation $I(m-1) = 1$ if $m-1$ and $I(m-1) = 0$ if $m=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(t) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{d}{dt} (t^N \mu(m)) \frac{1}{N} E \log Z_m + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{d}{dt} ((1-t)^p \mu(k)) \frac{1}{N} E \log Z_{i;k} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (t^N \mu(m-1) I(m-1) - (t^N \mu(m)) E \log Z_m \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((1-t)^p \mu(k-1) I(k-1) - ((1-t)^p \mu(k)) E \log Z_{i;k} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (t^N \mu(m)) E \log Z_{m+1} - E \log Z \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ((1-t)^p \mu(k)) E \log Z_{i;k+1} - E \log Z : \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

If we denote by h_m^i the averaging w.r.t. the Gibbs measure corresponding to the Hamiltonian (2.1) for a fixed $M_t = m$ then

$$Z_{m+1} = Z_m \exp_{m+1}^D (i_{1,m+1}; \dots; i_{p,m+1})^E_m$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{m=0}^X (t; N; m) E \log Z_{m+1} &= \mathbb{E}_{m=0}^X (t; N; m) E \log Z_m \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{m=0}^X (t; N; m) E \log \exp_{m+1}^D (i_{1,m+1}; \dots; i_{p,m+1})^E_m \\ &= E \log Z + \frac{1}{N^p} \mathbb{E}_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^X E \log \exp^D (i_1; \dots; i_p)^E; \end{aligned}$$

where h_i now denotes averaging w.r.t. the Gibbs measure corresponding to the Hamiltonian (2.1) and i is independent of the randomness in h_i : Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E}_{k=0}^X ((1-t)^p; k) E \log Z_{i,k+1} = E \log Z + E \log \exp^D U(i)^E;$$

where $U(i) = U(x_1; \dots; x_{p-1}; i)$ and where $x_1, \dots, x_{p-1}$ are independent of randomness in h_i : Finally, (2.7) implies

$$\rho'(t) = \frac{1}{N^p} \mathbb{E}_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^X E \log \exp^D (i_1; \dots; i_p)^E - p \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{i=1}^X E \log \exp^D U(i)^E; \quad (2.8)$$

Since $\rho'(1) = \rho'(0) + \int_0^1 \rho''(t) dt$ and since $E \log h E i_x$ does not depend on t , to prove Theorem 1 it suffices to show that

$$\frac{1}{N^p} \mathbb{E}_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^X E \log \exp^D (i_1; \dots; i_p)^E - p \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{i=1}^X E \log \exp^D U(i)^E + (p-1) E \log h E i_x = 0; \quad (2.9)$$

By assumptions (1.2) and (1.3) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \log \exp^D (i_1; \dots; i_p)^E &= \log a + \log (1 + b f_1(i_1) \dots f_p(i_p))^E \\ &= \log a + \mathbb{E}_{n=1}^X \frac{(b)^n}{n} f_1(i_1) \dots f_p(i_p)^{E_n}; \end{aligned}$$

Using replicas $i_1, \dots, i_n$ we have

$$f_1(i_1) \dots f_p(i_p)^{E_n} = \mathbb{E}_{1 \leq n}^D f_1(\frac{1}{i_1}) \dots f_p(\frac{1}{i_p})^E$$

and, thus,

$$\frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^p f_j(i_j) = \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} A_{j,n} ;$$

where

$$A_{j,n} = A_{j,n}(i_1, \dots, i_n) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \prod_{l=1}^n f_j(i_l) ;$$

Denote by $\mathbb{E}_0$ the expectation in $f_1, \dots, f_p$ and $x_1, \dots, x_p$ only (the r.v. $x_1, \dots, x_p$ are not present here and will appear in the term s below). Since $f_1, \dots, f_p$ are i.i.d. and independent of the randomness in h_i , $\mathbb{E} h_{j,p} A_{j,n} i = \mathbb{E}_0 h_{j,p} A_{j,n} i = \mathbb{E} B_n^p i$ where $B_n = \mathbb{E}_0 A_{j,n}$. Therefore, since we also assumed that b is independent of $f_1, \dots, f_p$,

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^N \log \exp \left(\prod_{j=1}^p f_j(i_j) \right) = \mathbb{E}_0 \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} B_n^p : \quad (2.10)$$

A similar analysis applies to the second term in (2.9). First of all, (1.5) implies that

$$\exp U(i) = h \exp \left(\prod_{p=1}^p f_p(i) \right) = a \left(1 + b \prod_{p=1}^p f_p(i) \right)^{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{A v f_l(i) \exp(x_l)}{\text{ch}(x_l)}} ;$$

and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \exp U(i) &= \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} \prod_{p=1}^p f_p(i) \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{A v f_l(i) \exp(x_l)}{\text{ch}(x_l)} \\ &= \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} \prod_{p=1}^p f_p(i) \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{A v f_l(i) \exp(x_l)}{\text{ch}(x_l)} ; \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used replicas. Now,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \exp U(i) = \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} A_{p,n} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{A v f_l(i) \exp(x_l)}{\text{ch}(x_l)}$$

and taking the expectation w.r.t. $f_1, \dots, f_p$ and $x_1, \dots, x_p$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \exp U(i) = \mathbb{E}_0 \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} B_n^p (C_n)^{p-1} \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$C_n = \mathbb{E}_0 \frac{A v f_l(i) \exp(x_l)}{\text{ch}(x_l)} ;$$

Finally, in absolutely similar manner

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \log h \mathbb{E} i_x = \mathbb{E}_0 \log a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(b)^n}{n} (C_n)^p : \quad (2.12)$$

Combining (2.10), (2.11) and (2.12) we see that (2.9) can be written as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(b)^n}{n} E(B_n^p - pB_n C_n^{p-1} + (p-1)(C_n)^p) = 0 \quad (2.13)$$

which holds true using condition (1.3) and the fact that $x^p - pxy^{p-1} + (p-1)y^p = 0$ for all $x, y \geq 0$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1. $\square$

3 A general weighting scheme.

The use of weighting scheme as considered in this section is directly motivated by the paper [1]. It is a very useful device, see e.g. [11].

We consider a countable index set I , an arbitrary sequence of r.v. $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ and let $(x_1^{i,j})_{i \in I, j=1, \dots, p}$ for $i, j=1, \dots, p$ be its independent copies of this sequence. We define

$$U_{i,j}(\mu) = U(x_1^{i,j}; \dots; x_p^{i,j}; \mu)$$

where $x_1^{i,j}$ are independent copies of x_i and consider the Hamiltonian

$$H_{N,t}(\mu) = \sum_{k \in M_t} \sum_{i \in I} k(i_{1,k}; \dots; i_{p,k}) + \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^p U_{i,j}(\mu) + H_N^0(\mu); \quad (3.1)$$

where M_t and $k_{i,t}; i \in I$ are defined as in (2.1).

Consider an arbitrary random sequence $(v_i)_{i \in I}$ independent of all r.v. in (3.1) and such that $\sum_{i \in I} v_i = 1$ and define the Gibbs measure on $\mathcal{M}_N$ by

$$G(f; \mu) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_N} f(\mu) \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mu)) = Z_N$$

where the partition function Z_N is given by $Z_N = \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_N} \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mu))$; For a function $f(\mu)$ on $\mathcal{M}_N$; $\langle f \rangle$ will now denote the average with respect to the Gibbs measure G

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_N} \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_N} f(\mu) \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mu)); \quad (3.2)$$

Let

$$F_N'(t) = \frac{1}{N} E \log \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^p v_i \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mu));$$

Clearly, $F_N = F_N'(1)$. The following Theorem holds.

Theorem 2. If conditions (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) hold then

$$F_N' = F_N'(0) + (p-1) \int_0^1 E \log \langle h e_{i_x} \rangle dt; \quad (3.3)$$

where $x = (x_1; \dots; x_p)$ and where $(x_1)_{i \in I}$ are independent copies of $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ for $1 \leq p$:

Of course, the integrand $E \log h E i_x$ in the last term of (3.3) depends on t through h since $h E i_x$ is a function of t :

Proof. The proof follows that of Theorem 1 with almost no changes. (2.8) now becomes

$$\dot{\rho}^0(t) = \frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^N E \log \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^D \left(\sum_{j=1}^p h_{ij} x_{ij} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i=1}^N E \log \exp U(i) \quad (3.4)$$

where h is given by (3.2). Similarly to (2.9) we will now show that

$$\frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_p=1}^N E \log \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^D \left(\sum_{j=1}^p h_{ij} x_{ij} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{N^p} \sum_{i=1}^N E \log \exp U(i) + (p-1) E \log h E i_x = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

This clearly implies the statement of Theorem 2 since if we denote $c(t) = (p-1) E \log h E i_x$ then equation (3.5) yields $\dot{\rho}^0(t) + c(t) = 0$ and therefore

$$\rho^0(1) - \rho^0(0) = \int_0^1 c(t) dt$$

which is precisely the statement of the Theorem.

In the proof of Theorem 1 we showed that (2.9) is equivalent to (2.13). Following the same arguments one can show that (3.5) can be written as

$$\sum_{n=1}^X \frac{E(b)^n}{n} E B_n^p - p B_n C_n^{p-1}(1; \dots; 1) + (p-1) C_n^p(1; \dots; 1) = 0$$

where now

$$C_n(1; \dots; 1) = E_0 \sum_{j=1}^Y \frac{A v f_1(\mathbf{u}) \exp \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_1^j}{\text{ch}(\mathbf{x}_1^j)} :$$

The one difference with the case of Theorem 1 is the fact that using replicas to represent h now involves both $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{x}$: For instance, in the calculations leading to (2.11) there will appear a term

$$\sum_{i=1}^D f_p(i) \sum_{j=1}^{Y-1} \frac{A v f_1(\mathbf{u}) \exp \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_1^j}{\text{ch}(\mathbf{x}_1^j)} E_n$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_1^j)_{j=1}^{Y-1}$ are independent copies of $(\mathbf{x})_{j=1}^Y$ independent of the randomness in h . Using replicas $(1; 1; \dots; 1; n; n)$, this term can be written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^D f_p(i) \dots f_p(n) \sum_{j=1}^{Y-1} \sum_{k=1}^{Y-1} \frac{A v f_1(\mathbf{u}) \exp \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_1^j}{\text{ch}(\mathbf{x}_1^j)} :$$

Averaging for i and taking expectation E_0 w.r.t. $f_1; \dots; f_p$ and $(\mathbf{x}_1)$ yields

$$E_0 \sum_{i=1}^D A_{p,i} \sum_{j=1}^{Y-1} \sum_{k=1}^{Y-1} \frac{A v f_1(\mathbf{u}) \exp \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{x}_1^j}{\text{ch}(\mathbf{x}_1^j)} = \sum_{j=1}^D B_n C_n^{p-1}(1; \dots; 1; j) :$$

Similarly, the calculations leading to (2.12) will produce $hC_n^p(\nu_1; \dots; \nu_p)$. The rest of the argument is the same.

□

4 The 1-step of replica-symmetry breaking bound.

In the context and with the notations of the previous section we will now make specific choices of the random sequences (v) and $(x_1^{i,j})$: From now on we will also assume that $H_N^0(\cdot)$ is given by (2.4).

We denote by M_1 the set of probability measures on R ; and M_2 the set of probability measures on M_1 : Consider $\mu \in M_2$, our basic parameter on which will depend the bound we are going to obtain. We consider a sequence $(\nu_1; x_1)_{1 \leq 1}$ with the following properties. The sequence (ν_1) is an i.i.d sequence of M_1 distributed according to μ . Conditionally on this sequence, the sequence (x_1) is independent and x_1 is distributed like ν_1 . We consider i.i.d. copies $(\nu_1^j; x_1^j)$ of the sequence $(\nu_1; x_1)$.

Theorem 3 Suppose that (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) hold and $H_N^0(\cdot)$ is given by (2.4). Let $U_j(\mu) = U(\nu_1^j; x_1^j; \dots; x_p^j; \mu)$; where ν_j are independent copies of ν ; $x = (x_1; \dots; x_p)$ and let k be a Poisson r.v. with mean $E k = p$: Then, for $m \in (0; 1)$ we have

$$F_N(\mu; m) = \log 2 + \frac{1}{m} E \log E^0 A \vee \exp \sum_{j,k} U_j(\mu) + h^m \quad (p-1) \frac{1}{m} E \log E^0 (h E i_x)^m; \quad (4.1)$$

where E^0 is the expectation w.r.t. (x_1) and (x_1^j) for fixed (ν_1) and (ν_1^j) and E denotes the expectation w.r.t. $(\nu_1); (\nu_1^j); (x_j); k$ and h :

Of course, Theorem 3 implies that

$$F_N(\mu) = \inf_m F_N(\mu; m):$$

It should also be noted that Theorem 3 is a generalization of Theorem 1, as is seen by taking $m \rightarrow 0$ and μ concentrated at one point of M_1 .

The term $s E^0(\cdot)$ will magically appear with the proper choice of the sequence v , that we explain next. Let N be a set of natural numbers N : We consider a non-increasing enumeration $(u)_{1 \leq 1}$ of the points generated by Poisson process on R^+ of intensity measure x^{m-1} : To avoid repetition, we will say that such a sequence has distribution μ_m . We define a sequence $(v)_{1 \leq 1}$ by

$$v = \frac{u}{\phi_2(u)}:$$

With the notation of [10], this sequence has the Poisson-Dirichlet distribution μ_m . This key property is as follows (see e.g. Proposition 6.5.15 in [10]).

Proposition 1 Consider a r.v. $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and independent copies $(\theta_i)_{i=1}^m$. Then the sequences $(u_i)_{i=1}^m$ and $u_i = (\theta_i^m)^{1-m}$ have the same distribution and, therefore,

$$E \log \prod_{i=1}^m v_i = E \log \prod_{i=1}^m u_i = E \log \prod_{i=1}^m u_i = \frac{1}{m} \log E^m : \quad (4.2)$$

Proof of Theorem 3. We consider an element θ of M_1 that is distributed according to θ and a sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^m$ that, given θ , is i.i.d distributed according to θ . For $i, j; 1 \leq i, j \leq m$ we consider independent copies (θ_{ij}) and (x_{ij}) of these variables. We also consider other independent copies (θ_i) and (x_i) of these variables. We denote by F the σ -algebra generated by the variables $\theta_{ij}; \theta_i; x_{ij}$ and x_i .

Let us first consider the integrand $E \log h E i_x$ in the last term of (3.3). Let us denote

$$Z_t(\theta) = \exp \left(- \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{N,t}(\theta_{ij}) \right)$$

and $e(\theta) = h E i_x$. Note that $e(\theta)$ depends on $x_i; 1 \leq i \leq m$ and $Z_t(\theta)$ depends on $x_{ij}; i, j; 1 \leq i, j \leq m$ through the Hamiltonian $H_{N,t}$. By construction, given F , the sequences $(Z_t(\theta))_{t=1}^m$ and $(e(\theta))_{t=1}^m$ are i.i.d. and independent of each other. If we denote by E^0 conditional expectation given F then, using Proposition 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E^0 \log h E i_x &= E^0 \log \frac{\prod_{i,j=1}^m e(\theta_{ij}) Z_t(\theta_{ij})}{\prod_{i,j=1}^m v_i Z_t(\theta_{ij})} = E^0 \log \prod_{i,j=1}^m v_i e(\theta_{ij}) Z_t(\theta_{ij}) = E^0 \log \prod_{i,j=1}^m v_i Z_t(\theta_{ij}) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 e Z_t^m = \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 Z_t^m = \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 e^m E^0 Z_t^m = \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 Z_t^m = \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 e^m ; \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of t and, therefore, this yields the last term of (4.1).

Next let us consider the first term in (3.3), $\theta'(0)$: First of all,

$$\theta'(0) = \frac{1}{N} E \log \prod_{i=1}^N v_i Z_0(\theta_i);$$

where

$$Z_0(\theta) = \exp \left(- \sum_{i,j=1}^m H_{N,0}(\theta_{ij}) \right) = 2^N \prod_{i=1}^N \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^m U_{ij}(\theta_{ij}) + h_i \right) = 2^N \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(\theta_i);$$

and where we introduced the notation $F_i(\theta) = \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^m U_{ij}(\theta_{ij}) + h_i \right)$: By construction, given F , the sequences $F_i(\theta_i); i=1, \dots, N$ are i.i.d. and independent for different indices i : Therefore, application of Proposition 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} E^0 \log 2^N \prod_{i=1}^N v_i \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(\theta_i) &= \log 2 + \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(1) = \log 2 + \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 F_i(1)^m \\ &= \log 2 + \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{m} \log E^0 F_i(1)^m ; \end{aligned}$$

and taking expectation w.r.t. all the other r.v. implies

$$\psi'(0) = \log 2 + \frac{1}{m} E \log E^0 F_1(1)^m;$$

which is precisely the first two terms in (4.1).

□

5 The r -step of replica-symmetry breaking bound.

We will first explain the choice of weights (v) and r.v. (x) in Theorem 2 that will yield the r -step of replica symmetry breaking bound of Theorem 4 below.

We take $m = N^r$ and define a sequence $(v)_2$ using Derrida-Ruelle cascades (see [8]). Consider arbitrary parameters $0 < m_1 < \dots < m_r < 1$. Let us consider sequences $(u_1)_{1 \leq i \leq m_1}; \dots; (u_r)_{1 \leq i \leq m_r}$ with the distributions $\mu_1; \dots; \mu_r$ correspondingly. For $2 \leq l \leq r$ let us consider a sequence $(u_{1;\dots;l})_{1 \leq i \leq m_{1;\dots;l}}$ that for any fixed $(1;\dots;l)$ is an independent copy of the sequence $(u_1)_{1 \leq i \leq m_1}$. We define $u_{1;\dots;r} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^r u_{1;\dots;l}$ and

$$v_{1;\dots;r} = \frac{u_{1;\dots;r}}{\bigotimes_{l=1}^r u_{1;\dots;l}}. \quad (5.1)$$

Next we define the set of r.v. $x_l(1;\dots;r)$ for $l \geq 2$ and $1;\dots;r-1$:

Let M_1 be a set of probability measures on R ; and by induction for $l \geq r$ we define M_{l+1} as a set of probability measures on M_1 : Let us $x \in M_{r+1}$ (our basic parameter) and define a random sequence $(x_1(1);\dots;x_1(r-1);x(1;\dots;r))$ as follows. The element x_1 of M_r is distributed according to x . Given x_1 , the sequence $(x_{11}(1);\dots;x_{11}(r-1))$ of elements of M_{r-1} is iid distributed like x_1 . For $1 \leq l \leq r-1$, given all the elements $(x_{11};\dots;x_{1s})$ for all values of the integers $a_1;\dots;a_s$ and all $s \leq l$, the sequence $(x_{11;\dots;l}(1);\dots;x_{11;\dots;l}(r-1))$ of elements of M_{r-1} is iid distributed like $(x_{11};\dots;x_{1l})$, and these sequences are independent of each other for different values of $(1;\dots;l-1)$. Finally, given all the elements $(x_{11};\dots;x_{1s})$ for all values of the integers $a_1;\dots;a_s$ and all $s \leq r-1$ the sequences $x(1;\dots;r);_{r-1}$ is an iid. sequence on R with the distribution $(1;\dots;r-1)$ and these sequences are independent for different values of $(1;\dots;r-1)$: The process of generating x 's can be represented schematically as

$$x_1 \rightarrow x_{11} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_{11;\dots;l} \rightarrow x(1;\dots;r): \quad (5.2)$$

For simplicity of notations instead of writing various combination of indices $i;j$; let us first consider an arbitrary countable index set I : For $l \geq 2$, we consider independent copies $(x_{11}(1);\dots;x_{11}(r-1);x(1;\dots;r))$ of $(x_1(1);\dots;x_1(r-1);x(1;\dots;r))$.

For $0 \leq j \leq r-1$; let us denote by F_j the σ -algebra generated by $x_{11}(1;\dots;l)$ for $l \geq 2$; $1 \leq j \leq 1;\dots;l-1$, and by the r.v. h_{ij} , i_{ij} and k_{ij} . Let us denote by E_j the expectation given F_j or, in other words, w.r.t. $x_{11}(1;\dots;l)$ for $l \geq 2$; $l > j$; $1;\dots;l-1$ and $x_l(1;\dots;r)$ for $l \geq 2$; $1;\dots;r-1$: In particular F_0 is generated by the variables x_1, h_{ij}, i_{ij} and k_{ij} .

For a random variable $U \in [0, 1]$ we define $T_r U = U$ and by induction, for $0 \leq r \leq m$ we define the r.v. U_1 by

$$T_1 U = E_1(T_{1+1} U)^{m_{1+1}} : \quad (5.3)$$

Let us consider a function $V : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $V \geq 0$, and the r.v.

$$V(x_1, \dots, x_r) = V(x_1, \dots, x_r) : \quad (5.4)$$

The distribution of the r.v. $V(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is independent of the value $(x_1, \dots, x_r)$, and the r.v. $T_1(V(x_1, \dots, x_r))$ depends only on $x_1, \dots, x_1$.

The following key property is based on iterative application of Proposition 1. It should be obvious to a reader familiar with Derrida-Ruelle cascades ([8]). In fact the essential ideas of the present scheme of proof are apparently known to the authors of [1], but for lack of references, it seems appropriate to give complete details.

Proposition 2 If V is defined by (5.4) and $E V^2 < 1$ then

$$E \log \prod_{i=1}^X V(x_1, \dots, x_r) = E \log T_0 V : \quad (5.5)$$

Proof. Let E^0 denote the expectation w.r.t. $(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ and $(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ given F_0 ; i.e. for a fixed sequence (x_i) . Let us first consider

$$E^0 \log \prod_{i=1}^X V(x_1, \dots, x_r) :$$

By the definition of $u_{1, \dots, r}$ we can write

$$\prod_{i=1}^X V(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \prod_{i=1}^X \prod_{j=1}^{m_{r-1}} V(x_1, \dots, x_r) : \quad (5.6)$$

For a fixed $(x_1, \dots, x_{r-1})$, and given F_{r-1} , the sequence $V(x_1, \dots, x_r)$; $r \leq m$ is iid. while the sequence $(u_{1, \dots, r})_{r=1}^m$ has distribution μ_r . Therefore, writing for simplicity $T_{r-1} V$ rather than $T_{r-1} V(x_1, \dots, x_r)$, Proposition 1 implies that

$$\prod_{i=1}^X V(x_1, \dots, x_r) = (T_{r-1} V)^{\prod_{i=1}^X u_{1, \dots, r}} = (T_{r-1} V) S_{r-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}) ; \quad (5.6)$$

where $\sim$ means equality in distribution and where we introduced the notation

$$S_{r-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{r-1}) = \prod_{i=1}^X u_{1, \dots, r-1, i} :$$

Of course, $T_{r-1} V$ depends on $(x_1, \dots, x_{r-1})$, although this is not explicit in the notation.

Moreover, given F_{r-1} ; both sides of (5.6) are by construction independent for different indices $(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1})$ and, thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} V(i_1; \dots; i_r) \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-1} V) S_{r-1}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-2}, i_{r-1}, i_r} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} \sum_{i_{r-1}, i_r} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-1} V) S_{r-1}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) : \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

For a fixed $(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2})$, and given F_{r-2} , the sequences

$$(T_{r-1} V)(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) \text{ and } S_{r-1}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) \text{ for } i_{r-1} = 1$$

are i.i.d. and by construction the sequence $(u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}})_{i_{r-1}=1}^{m_{r-1}}$ has distribution μ_{r-1} . Therefore, Proposition 1 now implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-1} V)(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) S_{r-1}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1}) \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-2} V) C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} \\ &= (T_{r-2} V) C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} S_{r-2}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2}); \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where $S_{r-2}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2}) = \sum_{i_{r-1}=1}^P u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}}$ and

$$C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} = E S_{r-1}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-1})^{m_{r-1} - 1} = E \sum_{i_1=1}^X u_{i_1}^{m_{r-1} - 1};$$

where $(u_{i_1})_{i_1=1}^{m_{r-1}}$ has distribution μ_{r-1} . One can easily check that $C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} < 1$ due to the fact that $m_{r-1} < m_r$:

Given F_{r-2} ; both sides of (5.8) are independent for different $(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2})$ and, therefore, (5.7) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} V(i_1; \dots; i_r) \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-2} V) C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} S_{r-2}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-3}, i_{r-2}, i_{r-1}, i_r} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} \sum_{i_{r-2}, i_{r-1}} u_{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}} (T_{r-2} V) C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} S_{r-2}(i_1; \dots; i_{r-2}) : \end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$C_{m_j, m_{j-1}} = E \sum_{i_j=1}^X u_{i_j}^{m_{j-1} - 1};$$

where the sequence $(u_{i_j})_{i_j=1}^{m_j}$ has distribution μ_j and let

$$C_{j-1} = C_{m_r, m_{r-1}} \dots C_{m_j, m_{j-1}} :$$

Denote

$$S_j(i_1; \dots; i_j) = \sum_{i_{j+1}=1}^X u_{i_1, \dots, i_{j+1}} :$$

Repeating the same argument as above one can show by decreasing induction over j that

$$\sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^r V(i; \dots; r) = \sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^Y (T_j V) C_{j+1} S_j(i; \dots; j) : \quad (5.9)$$

In particular, for $j = 0$; (5.9) reads

$$\sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^r V(i; \dots; r) = (T_0 V) C_1 \sum_{i=1}^X u_i;$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} E^0 \log \sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^r V(i; \dots; r) &= E^0 \log \sum_{i=1}^X \sum_{j=1}^r V(i; \dots; r) = E^0 \log \sum_{i=1}^X u_i \\ &= E^0 \log (T_0 V) C_1 \sum_{i=1}^X u_i = E^0 \log C_1 \sum_{i=1}^X u_i = \log T_0 V : \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation gives (5.5). □

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a set of different combinations $(i; j; l); (j; l); l$ that appear as indices of all different r.v. in Section 3. We consider iid copies $(\cdot)_{i,2}$ of $\cdot$: Let $x_i(i; \dots; r)$ and $v_{i, \dots, r}$ be defined by (5.2) and (5.1) and let $(x_i)_{i,2}$ be an independent copy of $(x_i(1; \dots; 1))_{i,2}$: The following Theorem is a consequence of Theorem 2.

Theorem 4 Suppose that (1.2), (1.3) and (1.4) hold and $H_N^0(\cdot)$ is given by (2.4). Let $U_j(\cdot) = U(j; x_1^j; \dots; x_p^j; \cdot)$; $x = (x_1; \dots; x_p)$ and let k be a Poisson r.v. with mean $E k = p$: Then

$$F_N(\cdot; m_1; \dots; m_r) = \log 2 + E \log T_0 \sum_{j=k}^X U_j(\cdot) + h \quad (p-1) E \log T_0 h E i_x; \quad (5.10)$$

where T_0 is defined in (5.3) and E denotes the expectation w.r.t. $(\cdot)_1; (\cdot)_1^j; (\cdot)_j; k$ and h :

Of course, the Theorem implies that

$$F_N(\cdot) = \inf_{m_1, \dots, m_r} F_N(\cdot; m_1; \dots; m_r):$$

One expects that as in the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model ([12]) these bounds are always exact, i.e.

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} F_N = \inf_{r \geq 0} \cdot;$$

where $\cdot_0$ was defined in (2.3). Probably, this is going to be much harder to prove than the Parisi formula in the SK model. The hope that these bounds are exact is not based on anything concrete but rather on what may be called the generalized Parisi conjecture that the Replica Symmetry Breaking scheme, when properly applied, always yields the correct free energy.

Proof of Theorem 4. The proof is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 3 with Proposition 2 now playing the role of Proposition 1. To simplify the notations we will write $\mathbf{x} = (x_1; \dots; x_r)$, and to match the notations of Theorem 2 we write $x_i = x_i(1; \dots; r)$. Let us first consider the integrand $E \log hE_{i_x}$ in the last term of (3.3). Let us denote

$$Z_t(\mathbf{x}) = \int \exp(-H_{N,t}(\mathbf{x}))$$

and $e(\mathbf{x}) = hE_{i_x}$: Note that $e(\mathbf{x})$ depends on $x_1(1; \dots; r)$ and $Z_t(\mathbf{x})$ depends on $x_1^{ij}(1; \dots; r); i, j; 1 \leq i, j \leq l$ through the Hamiltonian $H_{N,t}$: By construction, given F_0 ; the sequences $(Z_t(\mathbf{x}))$ and $(e(\mathbf{x}))$ are defined as in (5.4) and independent of each other. Using Proposition 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E \log hE_{i_x} &= E \log \frac{\int e(\mathbf{x}) Z_t(\mathbf{x})}{\int Z_t(\mathbf{x})} = E \log \int e(\mathbf{x}) Z_t(\mathbf{x}) - E \log \int Z_t(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= E \log T_0(e Z_t) - E \log T_0 Z_t = E \log (T_0 e) (T_0 Z_t) - E \log T_0 Z_t = E \log T_0 e; \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of t and, therefore, this yields the last term of (5.10).

Next let us consider the first term in (3.3), $\phi'(0)$: First of all,

$$\phi'(0) = \frac{1}{N} E \log \int \exp(-H_{N,0}(\mathbf{x}))$$

where

$$Z_0(\mathbf{x}) = \int \exp(-H_{N,0}(\mathbf{x})) = 2^N \int \prod_{i=1}^N \exp \left(\sum_{j \in K_{i,0}} U_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) + h_i \mathbf{x} \right) = 2^N \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(\mathbf{x});$$

and where we introduced the notation $F_i(\mathbf{x}) = \int \prod_{j \in K_{i,0}} \exp(U_{ij}(\mathbf{x}) + h_i \mathbf{x})$: Given F_0 ; the sequences $(F_i(\mathbf{x}))_{2^{N^r}}$ are independent for different indices i : Therefore, the application of Proposition 2 gives, writing $F_i(1) = F_i(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} = (1; \dots; 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} E \log 2^N \int \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \log 2 + \frac{1}{N} E \log T_0 \prod_{i=1}^N F_i(1) \\ &= \log 2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E \log T_0 F_i(1) = \log 2 + E \log T_0 F_1(1); \end{aligned}$$

which is precisely the first two terms in (5.10). □

References

- [1] Aizenman, M., Sims, R., Starr, S. (2003) An extended variational principle for the SK spin-glass model. arXiv cond-mat/0306386.

- [2] Franz, S., Leone, M. (2003) Replica bounds for optimization problems and diluted spin systems. *J. Statist. Phys.* 111, no. 3-4, 535 – 564.
- [3] Guerra, F. (2003) Broken replica symmetry bounds in the mean field spin glass model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 233, no. 1, 1 – 12.
- [4] Kanter, I., Sompolinsky, H. (1987) Mean-field theory of spin-glasses with finite coordination number. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 58, 164.
- [5] Mezard, M., Parisi, G., Virasoro, M. A. (1987) *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond*. World Scientific.
- [6] Mezard, M., Parisi, G. (2001) The Bethe lattice spin glass revisited. *Eur. Phys. J. B Condens. Matter Phys.* 20, no. 2, 217 – 233.
- [7] Mezard, M., Ricci-Tersenghi, F., Zecchina, R. (2003) Two solutions to diluted p-spin models and XOR-SAT problems. *J. Statist. Phys.* 111, no. 3-4, 505 – 533.
- [8] Ruelle, D. (1987) A mathematical reformulation of Derrida's REM and GREM. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 108, no. 2, 225 – 239.
- [9] Talagrand, M. (2001) The high temperature case for the random K-sat problem. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 119, no. 2, 187 – 212.
- [10] Talagrand, M. (2003) *Spin Glasses: a Challenge for Mathematicians*. Springer-Verlag.
- [11] Talagrand, M. (2003) On Guerra's broken replica-symmetry bound, to appear.
- [12] Talagrand, M. (2003) The generalized Parisi formula. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 337, no. 2, 111-114.