

Comment on "Erratum: Collective modes and gapped momentum states in liquid Ga: Experiment, theory, and simulation"

Taras Bryk^{1,2}, Ihor Mryglod¹, Giancarlo Ruocco^{3,4}

¹ *Institute for Condensed Matter Physics,
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,
UA-79011 Lviv, Ukraine*

² *Institute of Applied Mathematics and Fundamental Sciences,
Lviv National Polytechnic University, UA-79013 Lviv, Ukraine*

³ *Center for Life Nano Science @Sapienza, Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia,
295 Viale Regina Elena, I-00161, Roma, Italy and*

⁴ *Dipartimento di Fisica, Universita' di Roma "La Sapienza", I-00185, Roma, Italy*

(Dated: November 17, 2021)

Abstract

We show, that the theoretical expression for the dispersion of collective excitations reported in [Phys. Rev. B **103**, 099901 (2021)], at variance with what was claimed in the paper, does not account for the energy fluctuations and does not tend in the long-wavelength limit to the correct hydrodynamic dispersion law.

Recently in [1] we reported on different mistakes in the theoretical scheme suggested in [2] for the calculation of the dispersion law of longitudinal collective excitations in liquids. Specifically, in their theoretical approach two types of fluctuations of conserved quantities, namely density and energy fluctuations, were missing that resulted in senseless expressions for the current spectral function and dispersion of collective excitations. In response to our criticism the authors published an Erratum [3] to their original paper explaining that "the equations referred to originally were carried over from an earlier version of the paper in error" [3]. We expected, therefore, that the correct theoretical expressions were published in the Erratum. On the contrary, in [3] the authors reported expressions identical as in an earlier paper [4] confirming in [3] that "the equations used were from our earlier theory". The theoretical method from [4] is a simple continued fraction representation of the single Laplace-transformed density-density time correlation function $\tilde{F}_{nn}(k, z)$, which is equivalent to the standard improvement of the short-time behavior of the density-density time correlation function $F_{nn}(k, t)$ by an account for exact sum rules up to some order defined by the level of terminating the recursion in the continued fraction. The approach and closure relation for terminating the recursion in the continued fraction in [4] do not make explicit use of energy fluctuations. It is difficult to understand why the authors of [2] and [3] claim in [3] that an account for energy fluctuations was made in their scheme.

To emphasize the absence of energy fluctuations in the expression reported in [3] we make reference to the Generalized Collective Modes (GCM) theory for simple and many-component liquids, a generalised hydrodynamic approach developed by some of us [5–7]. The approach is based on an extended set of dynamic variables (hydrodynamic plus orthogonal to them extended ones) [8]. The extended set of dynamic variables (which includes energy density and its derivatives) was used for a matrix form of the generalized Langevin equation, solved in terms of dynamic eigenmodes. The account for energy (or heat) fluctuations leads to simultaneous corresponding account for sum rules of the energy-density and energy-energy correlations with known long-wavelength asymptotes. One can find out in [9] how the thermo-viscoelastic model and corresponding analytical expressions can be reduced to the ones without account for energy (or heat) fluctuations. In [3] the authors claimed that their expressions for the dynamic structure factor $S(k, \omega)$ (their Eq.12) and for the dispersion of collective excitations (their Eq.15), which were identical to those reported in [4] for a single continued fraction representation of $\tilde{F}_{nn}(k, z)$, accounted for energy fluctuations. Let

us perform some simple checks.

In [4] a set of dynamic variables was the following one: $A_0(k, t) = n(k, t)$, $A_1(k, t) = i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{J}(k, t)$, $A_2(k, t) = \dot{A}_1(k, t) + \Delta_1^2(k)A_0(k, t)$, ... , continuing this sequence by the next properly orthogonalized time derivatives of $A_2(k, t)$. In fact, this set of dynamic variables contained only two hydrodynamic ones of space-Fourier components of particle density $n(k, t)$ and of longitudinal component of current density $J^L(k, t)$, plus its time derivatives (extended variables). The "relaxation parameters"

$$\Delta_i^2(k) = \frac{\langle A_i(-k)A_i(k) \rangle}{\langle A_{i-1}(-k)A_{i-1}(k) \rangle}$$

[4] have the known long-wavelength asymptotes:

$$\Delta_1^2(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow c_T^2 k^2, \quad \Delta_2^2(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow (c_\infty^2 - c_T^2)k^2, \quad \Delta_3^2(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow const, \quad (1)$$

and higher ones tending to corresponding constants in that limit. In (1) c_T and c_∞ are the isothermal and the high-frequency speeds of acoustic modes. If one applied these asymptotes to the expression for the dispersion of correlative excitations, presented in [4] and [3], it would result in

$$\omega(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow c_T k,$$

with the isothermal speed of sound, but not being the correct hydrodynamic dispersion law $\omega(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow c_s k$ with the adiabatic speed of sound. This is the standard drawback for the theories missing the coupling with energy fuctuations. Consequently, the approach of [4] is not able to recover the correct origin (and the correct half-width) of the central Rayleigh peak of $S(k, \omega)$ in the long-wavelength region, which in the hydrodynamic regime for one-component liquids comes solely from thermal fluctuations.

However, in [3] the authors reported that a different set of dynamic variables $W_n(k)$, containing the energy density, led to the same (!) expressions for the dynamic structure factor $S(k, \omega)$ and for the dispersion of collective excitations $\omega(k)$ in terms of "relaxation parameters" as in [4]. Remarkably, that in [3] the authors do not provide the explicit expressions for their set of dynamic variables, mentioning only that "... $W_n(k)$ are the dynamical variables associated with the particle density, longitudinal momentum component, energy density, and so on ...". Perhaps "... and so on ..." means the first and higher time derivatives of the $W_1(k)$ and $W_2(k)$ properly orthogonalized, however, this remains unclear being without any

explanation in [3]. Their "relaxation parameters" are expressed via $W_n(k)$ as follows

$$\Delta_n^2(k) = \frac{\langle W_n(-k)W_n(k) \rangle}{\langle W_{n-1}(-k)W_{n-1}(k) \rangle} \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4. \quad (2)$$

Even before making any further checks one can say immediately, that from the point of view of methodology of the continued fraction representation for the density-density time correlation functions[10] the $\Delta_2^2(k)$ must be related to the ratio of the fourth to the second frequency moments of the dynamic structure factor. However, according to (2) and to the sequence of dynamic variables assured as used in [3] the $\Delta_2^2(k)$ is instead directly related to the ratio of the energy-energy to the current-current correlators, that does not make any sense. Nevertheless, let us first try to check the long-wavelength asymptote of the dispersion law (Eq.15) in [3] having the first two dynamic variables exactly the same as in [4], $W_0(k, t) = A_0(k, t)$, $W_1(k, t) = A_1(k, t)$, and the third one being the energy density $e(k, t)$ othogonalized to the density of particles

$$h(k, t) = e(k, t) - n(k, t) \frac{\langle n(-k)e(k) \rangle}{\langle n(-k)n(k) \rangle},$$

i.e. $W_2(k, t) = h(k, t)$. One can immediately notice, that there exists a problem with units of the "relaxation parameters", which in the standard continued fraction all must be of the same dimension of $[1/time^2]$. However, here the "relaxation parameter"

$$\Delta_2^2(k) = \frac{\langle W_2(-k)W_2(k) \rangle}{\langle W_1(-k)W_1(k) \rangle} \equiv \frac{\langle h(-k)h(k) \rangle}{k^2 \langle J^L(-k)J^L(k) \rangle} \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow 0} \frac{mC_V T}{k^2}, \quad (3)$$

i.e. has the dimension of $[energy^2 * time^2]$. In (3) C_V, T, m are specific heat at constant volume, temperature and atomic mass, respectively. The long-wavelength limit of $\Delta_2^2(k)$ diverges as k^{-2} , that immediately causes divergence of the $\mathcal{A}_2(k)$ (expressions after Eq.12 in [3]), which contains $\Delta_2^4(k)$, and other correlators cannot reduce the divergence of $\mathcal{A}_2(k)$ in the long-wavelength limit. All this leads to a senseless result for dispersion law in Eq.15 of [3].

Another possibility for the check is an expression of $W_1(k)$, not explicitly specified in [3], in the form $W_1(k) = J^L(k, t)$, i.e. exactly the longitudinal component of the mass-current density (as mentioned in [3]) without the multiplier k as used in [4] (and which we considered above). With this choice the long-wavelength asymptotes of the "relaxation parameters" are:

$$\Delta_1^2(k \rightarrow 0) \propto const, \quad \Delta_2^2(k \rightarrow 0) \propto const, \quad \Delta_3^2(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow k^2, \quad \Delta_4^2(k \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow const, \quad (4)$$

where we assumed that the fourth and the fifth dynamic variables are $j^L(k)$ and $\dot{h}(k)$, properly orthogonalized. However, there is enough to look at the first two asymptotes in (4) to see that the expression for the dispersion of collective excitations (Eq.15 in [3]) leads to senseless results too.

Hence, we have shown, that the expression for the dispersion of collective excitations reported in the Erratum [3] is not consistent with the sequence of dynamic variables claimed as used ones in [3], and which was an argument for an account for energy/thermal fluctuations in the proposed theoretical scheme. We can conclude that there are no proofs of the claimed account for energy/thermal fluctuations needed to recover the hydrodynamic dispersion law and the thermal origin of the central peak of dynamic structure factors in long-wavelength region. The theoretical scheme [4] does not account for thermal fluctuations in the sequence of dynamic variables too and results in the long-wavelength dispersion law with isothermal speed of sound. We suggest the authors of [3] to provide the explicit expressions for the first five dynamic variables used in their scheme with an account for energy fluctuations as well as to show the explicit expressions for the long-wavelength asymptotes of the corresponding "relaxation parameters". Without these clarifying one can assume that the authors provided untrue information about the account for energy fluctuations by claiming [3]: "This shows that the correlation function has the expected low-frequency limit and that the coupling between energy and density is included in our theory".

Another problem we would like to discuss here. In [1] we made a check of the theoretical scheme only. However, in response of the claim in [3] that "the experimental and modelling parts of the paper are unaffected" we checked out the simulation part of [2]. We would like to stress that the used in [2] solely NPT ensemble cannot be applied to correct calculations of k -dependent quantities. In fact, in NPT simulations the volume of simulation box fluctuates in order to keep the average pressure at the needed value. Consequently the vectors $\mathbf{k} = 2\pi/L(n_x, n_y, n_z)$ with integer numbers $\pm n_x, \pm n_y, \pm n_z$ consistent with periodic boundary conditions for a chosen configuration with the boxlength L will not satisfy the periodic boundary conditions for any next one with the boxlength L' . Hence, since in [3] only NPT simulations were reported, there exist only two choices: either in [2] the authors reported untrue information about the simulation ensembles, or all the k -dependent quantities including dynamic structure factors $S(k, \omega)$ and longitudinal (L) or transverse (T) current spectral functions $C^{L/T}(k, \omega)$ are absolutely wrong and inconsistent with periodic boundary

conditions.

- [1] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, G. Ruocco, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 096301 (2021).
- [2] R.M. Khusnutdinoff, C. Cockrell, O.A. Dicks, A.C.S. Jensen, M.D. Le, L. Wang, M.T. Dove, A.V. Mokshin, V.V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, Phys. Rev. B **101**, 214312 (2020).
- [3] R.M. Khusnutdinoff, C. Cockrell, O.A. Dicks, A.C.S. Jensen, M.D. Le, L. Wang, M.T. Dove, A.V. Mokshin, V.V. Brazhkin, K. Trachenko, Phys. Rev. B **103**, 099901 (2021).
- [4] A.V. Mokshin, B.N. Galimzyanov, J.Phys.:Condens.Matt. **30**, 085102 (2018).
- [5] I.M.Mryglod, I.P.Omelyan, and M.V.Tokarchuk, Mol. Phys. **84**, 235 (1995).
- [6] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, and G. Kahl. Phys. Rev. E **56**, 2903 (1997).
- [7] T. Bryk and I. Mryglod, Phys. Rev. E **63**, 051202 (2001).
- [8] I.M.deSchepper, E.G.D.Cohen, C.Bruin, J.C. van Rijs, W.Montfrooij, and L.A. de Graaf, Phys. Rev. A **38**, 271 (1988).
- [9] T. Bryk, I. Mryglod, T. Scopigno, G. Ruocco, F. Gorelli and M. Santoro, J.Chem.Phys. **133**, 024502 (2010).
- [10] J.R.D. Copley, S.W. Lovesey, Rep. Prog. Phys. **38**, 461 (1975).