

Identifying structural signature of dynamical heterogeneity via the local softness parameter

Mohit Sharma,¹ Manoj Kumar Nandi,² and Sarika Maitra Bhattacharyya^{1,3, a)}

¹*Polymer Science and Engineering Division, CSIR-National Chemical Laboratory, Pune-411008, India*

²*Department of Engineering University of Campania "Luigi Vanvitelli" 81031 Aversa (CE), Italy*

³*Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), Ghaziabad 201002, India*

In a recent study by some of us, we have proposed a new measure of the structure of a liquid, the softness of the mean-field caging potential, and shown that it can describe the temperature dependence of the dynamics. In this work, we put this parameter through a stringent test and study the causal relationship between this softness parameter at the local level and the local dynamics. We first extend the earlier study to describe the local softness. We find a distribution of the softness value where the distribution has reasonably strong temperature dependence. This shows that the parameter can identify the local structural heterogeneity. We then study the lifetime of the softness parameter and show that its lifetime is connected to the well-known cage structure in the supercooled liquids. Finally, our theory predicts that the local softness and the local dynamics is causal below the onset temperature where there is a decoupling between the short and long time dynamics, thus allowing a static description of the cage. We find that at lower temperatures, the structural heterogeneity increases, and also, the structure becomes a better predictor of the dynamics, thus giving rise to dynamic heterogeneity. We also find that the softness of a hard, immobile region evolves with time and becomes soft and eventually mobile due to the rearrangements in the neighbourhood, confirming the well-known facilitation effect.

I. INTRODUCTION

When a liquid is cooled fast, it evades crystallization, and below the onset temperature enters a supercooled liquid domain where the properties of the liquid appear quite different from that at high temperatures. Although the average structure across the onset temperature appears to change continuously, the dynamics shows a marked difference and below the onset temperature, it slows down substantially and also becomes heterogeneous^{1,2}. The origin of this dynamic heterogeneity in supercooled liquids is a topic of intense research³⁻⁸. In analogy with crystals where under external perturbation regions with structural defects show a higher probability of rearrangements^{9,10} it is often suggested that in supercooled liquids such structural defects may also be present, giving rise to the dynamic heterogeneity. However, while identifying structural defects in crystals with otherwise well-defined structure is trivial, doing the same in a supercooled liquid where particles are arranged in a disordered manner is a non-trivial task.

Harowell and coworkers investigated different properties of the initial configuration of a supercooled liquid and analyzed their correlation with irreversible rearrangements in the system³⁻⁵. They found that the local inherent structure potential energy⁴ and free volume⁵ does not have any correlation with these rearrangements but the Debye-Waller Factor⁴ and the low-frequency normal modes of the systems are spatially correlated with the

irreversible structural rearrangements³. Liu and Manning have shown that under shear, the rearrangements of particles take place in the regions which contribute to these low-frequency normal modes¹¹. Smessaert and Rottler did a quantitative analysis of these low-frequency soft modes and showed that they are long-lived⁷. There are also studies where the dynamics is connected to the elastic properties of the system¹²⁻¹⁵. The heterogeneity of the local elastic modulus was found to be correlated with the dynamic heterogeneity showing regions with low shear modulus have higher plastic activity¹³. A recent study has proposed that the slowing down of the dynamics is controlled by the mesoscopic elastic stiffness parameter, which is more sensitive than the shear modulus¹⁴.

There are other studies that calculates properties that are purely structural in nature. In a study using mutual information technique, it was shown that coarse-grained energy and density correlates with the dynamics¹⁶. In studies using the machine learning (ML) technique, the softness is described in terms of a large number of local parameters^{6,8,17}. It was shown that below the onset temperature, the dynamics is controlled by this softness parameter⁶ and this softness parameters for attractive and repulsive systems are different, which eventually leads to the difference in their dynamics¹⁷. It was also shown that this softness parameter could identify structural defects which are similar to dislocation in the crystalline solids, and ductile materials have a large number of soft spots compared to brittle materials¹⁸. A recent experimental study of colloidal glasses showed that this ML softness parameter can predict the devitrification process¹⁹. Despite the success of the ML study, the connection between this softness which is determined by

^{a)}Electronic mail: mb.sarika@ncl.res.in

a large number of local parameters, and the structure, is not clear.

In a recent work by some of us, a new measure of the softness parameter was introduced, which is the softness of a mean-field caging potential^{20,21}. The parameter is described from a microscopic theory and is purely structural in nature. A master equation was proposed between the dynamics, and the softness parameter and it was shown that, indeed, the dynamics for different systems, when scaled by the temperature and system-dependent parameters, demonstrate a data collapse when plotted against softness²⁰. This implies that there exists a direct correlation between the softness and the dynamics. However, this study was done for the overall dynamics and softness of the system where both the dynamics and the softness parameter can have a local microscopic variation. It is well-known that the correlation between average quantities does not guarantee a correlation at the microscopic level.

In this paper, we study the correlation of softness and dynamics at a microscopic level. We first extend the definition of the softness parameter to calculate the value of the softness at a microscopic level. We then show that this microscopic softness has a distribution, thus suggesting that our formalism can capture the structural heterogeneity. We also find that this distribution has a reasonably strong temperature dependence. We show that the lifetime of the softness parameter is similar to the lifetime of the cage. We next study the correlation between the local dynamics, which we express as rearrangement events²² and the local softness. Our study predicts that the probability of a rearrangement below the onset temperature depends on the softness and this dependence becomes stronger at lower temperatures. We also find that the probability of rearrangement can be expressed in an Arrhenius form where the activation energy is a function of softness. We compare our results with the ML study and show that the present microscopic formalism can provide a microscopic picture of the observations made in the ML studies.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we provide the simulation details. In section III, we present the formalism we use to identify local rearrangements. Section IV presents the details of the calculation of the softness parameter at the local level and look at its distribution and time evolution. In section V we study the correlation between the local rearrangement events and the local softness. Finally, in section VI, we present the conclusion.

II. SIMULATION DETAILS

The system we studied is the Kob-Andersen model for glass forming liquid, which is a binary mixture (80:20) of Lennard-Jones (LJ) particles²³. The interaction between the particles i and j , where $i, j = A, B$ (the type of the particles) is given by

$$U_{ij}(r) = \begin{cases} U_{ij}^{(LJ)}(r; \sigma_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}) - U_{ij}^{(LJ)}(r_{ij}^{(c)}; \sigma_{ij}, \epsilon_{ij}), & r \leq r_{ij}^{(c)} \\ 0, & r > r_{ij}^{(c)} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $u(r_{ij}) = 4\epsilon_{ij}[(\sigma_{ij}/r_{ij})^{12} - (\sigma_{ij}/r_{ij})^6]$, r_{ij} is the distance between particles i and j and σ_{ij} is effective diameter of particle and $r_{i,j}^{(c)} = 2.5\sigma_{ij}$. The length, temperature, and time are given in units of σ_{AA} , ϵ_{AA}/k_B , $(m\sigma_{AA}^2/\epsilon_{AA})^{1/2}$, respectively.

We use $\sigma_{AA} = 1.0$, $\sigma_{AB} = 0.8$, $\sigma_{BB} = 0.88$, $\epsilon_{AA} = 1.0$, $\epsilon_{AB} = 1.5$, $\epsilon_{BB} = 0.5$, $m_A = m_B = 1$ and Boltzmann constant $k_B = 1$. In our simulations we have used periodic boundary conditions and Nosé-Hoover thermostat with integration timestep 0.0025τ . The time constants for Nosé-Hoover thermostat are taken to be 100 timesteps. The total number density $\rho = N/V = 1.2$ is fixed, where V is the system volume, and $N=4000$ is the total number of particles

III. IDENTIFYING REARRANGEMENTS

In this work, we aim to correlate structure parameter with the mobility at a local level; for identifying fast particle or an event, there are many ways which can be used, such as doing iso-configurational runs and identify irreversible reorganisations³ or tracking the mean square displacement over a period of time. Here we have used a method which was first proposed by Candelier and group^{22,24} where they calculate a quantity $p_{hop}(i, t)$ which captures for every particle i in a certain time window $W = [t_1, t_2]$, the cage jumps when the average position of the particle changes rapidly. The expression for $p_{hop}(i, t)$ is

$$p_{hop}(i, t) = \sqrt{\langle (\vec{r}_i - \langle \vec{r}_i \rangle_U)^2 \rangle_V^{1/2} \langle (\vec{r}_i - \langle \vec{r}_i \rangle_V)^2 \rangle_U^{1/2}} \quad (2)$$

for all $t \in W$, where averages are performed over the time intervals surrounding time t , i.e., $U = [t - \Delta t/2, t]$ and $V = [t, t + \Delta t/2]$ where Δt should be a timescale over which the particles can rearrange. For a time window W the small value of p_{hop} means the particle is contained within same cage and conversely if p_{hop} is large this means particle is within two distinct cage. To identify a rearrangement event we set a threshold value p_c , as done in Ref.²⁵ where p_c is chosen as the root mean squared displacement $\langle \Delta r(t)^2 \rangle$ value, computed at a time where the non-Gaussian parameter $\alpha_2 = \frac{3\langle \Delta r^4(t) \rangle}{5\langle \Delta r^2(t) \rangle^2} - 1$ has a maximum. When $p_{hop} > p_c$ we consider that a rearrangement event has taken place. We also vary Δt from 15 to 75 LJ units and find that qualitatively the results remain quite similar. For the rest of the work we consider $\Delta t = 15$ LJ unit.

IV. COMPUTING LOCAL SOFTNESS

In the mean field theory developed by some of us^{20,21} we defined a caging potential of a particle as function of displacement of the particle from the center of its equilibrium position, Δr , as,

$$\beta\Phi^{av}(\Delta r) = - \int \frac{d\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{uv} C_{uv}(q) \sqrt{x_u x_v} [S_{uv}(q) - \delta_{uv}] e^{-\frac{q^2 \Delta r^2}{6}} \quad (3)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$ and $x_{u/v}$ represent the fraction of particle of type A/B in the binary mixture. In the above expression, $S_{uv}(\mathbf{q}) = (1/\sqrt{N_u N_v}) \sum_{i=1}^{N_u} \sum_{j=1}^{N_v} \exp[-i\mathbf{q} \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i^u - \mathbf{r}_j^v)]$ and $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{S}^{-1}(\mathbf{q})$, where $S_{uv}(\mathbf{q})$ is the partial structure factor of the liquid and $\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{q})$ are in matrix form. Note that this is a mean field potential and the assumption is that the cage described by the structure of the liquid remains static when the particle moves by a distance Δr . The superscript 'av' implies that these are global quantities averaged over all particles and also over ensembles. To quantify the average softness of the potential, we fit the potential near $\Delta r = 0$ to a harmonic form, $\beta\Phi^{av}(r) = \beta\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0) + \frac{1}{2}(\Delta r)^2/S^{av}$, where S^{av} is the softness parameter and $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ is the value of the potential at the minima,

$$\beta\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0) = - \int \frac{d\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{uv} C_{uv}(q) \sqrt{x_u x_v} (S_{uv}(q) - \delta_{uv}) \quad (4)$$

The subscript q in $\Phi_q^{av}(r = 0)$ implies that for the calculation of the depth of the potential the parameters are first expressed in the wavenumber plane and then integrated over 'q'. From our earlier study²⁰ and also as shown in Fig.1(a) we find that the softness is inversely proportional to the depth of the potential $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$. We can write $1/S^{av} = a_0 + a_1 \Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ where the parameters a_0 and a_1 appear to be constant for a system.

In this present work, the aim is to study the softness at the local level, *i.e.* the softness of each particle in a single time frame. According to our theory, this will require calculating the structure factor in a single snapshot for each particle. The calculation of structure factor without time and particle averaging leads to a sharply fluctuating non-integrable function. Thus we cannot use Eq.4 to calculate the depth of the mean caging potential at the local level.

However, this equation can also be written as an integration over the radial distance and is given by,

$$\beta\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0) = - \int \frac{dr}{2} \sum_{uv} C_{uv}(r) \sqrt{x_u x_v} g_{uv}(r) \quad (5)$$

where $g_{uv}(r)$ is the partial radial distribution function and $C_{uv}(r)$ is the partial direct correlation function in real space. Here again, the subscript 'r' in $\beta\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$

implies that for the calculation of the depth of the potential the functions are first expressed in the 'r' plane and then integrated over 'r'. This 'r' denotes the distance between the central tagged particle whose softness is being calculated and its neighbours. We should not confuse it with Δr in Eq.3 which denotes the displacement of the tagged particle within its cage.

Thus we show that the depth of the potential can be expressed both in terms of the structure factor and the radial distribution function (rdf) (Eq.4 and Eq.5). In Eq.5 apart from the rdf we need the information of the direct correlation function. This is usually calculated by Fourier transforming $C(q)$, which in turn depends on $S(q)$. Since the aim here is to formulate a theory that can calculate the local softness and, as discussed before, calculating $S(q)$ at a local level is not possible; thus, for the calculation of $C(r)$, we make an approximation. In the integral equation theory, the hypernetted chain (HNC) approximation provides an expression for $C(r)$ in terms of the rdf and the interaction potential,

$$C_{uv}(r) = -\beta U_{uv}(r) + (g_{uv}(r) - 1) - \log(g_{uv}(r)) \quad (6)$$

where $U_{uv}(r)$ is the interaction potential given by Eq.1, which is an input to the theory. Here we neglect the bridge function present in the HNC approximation. Using this approximate form for $C(r)$ we calculate $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ and compare it with $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ (inset Fig.1(a)). Since we use an approximate form for $C(r)$ we find that $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0) \neq \Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ but it shows a linear proportionality. This can be expressed as $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0) = b_0 + b_1 \Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$. Note that if we know the values of b_0 and b_1 which appear to be constant for a system, then from the approximate value of the depth of the potential, $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ we can obtain the actual value of the depth of the potential, $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$. We can then exploit the relation between $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ and S to obtain the softness parameter. Thus we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} 1/S^{av} &= a_0 + a_1 * (b_0 + b_1 \Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)) \\ &= c_0 + c_1 \Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $c_0 = a_0 + a_1 * b_0$ and $c_1 = a_1 * b_1$. This predicted linearity between the softness and the approximate depth of the potential $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ is shown to be valid in Fig.1(b). The values of the parameters are constant for a system and we obtain them by calculating the depth of the potential and its softness at the whole system level. We now assume that Eq. 7 also describes the relationship between the local softness and the depth of the local potential with the same values of the parameters. Thus to calculate the softness at a local level, we need to calculate the local $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$, which only requires the information of the local rdf. The parameters without the superscript 'av' describes them at a local level.

Although at local level we cannot calculate $S(q)$, we can calculate the rdf. The single particle rdf in single frame can be expressed as a sum of Gaussians and is




FIG. 1: (a) $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ is plotted against $1/S^{av}$ at different temperatures and in inset $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ is plotted against $\Phi_q^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ at different temperatures, they both show linear proportionality. (b) $\Phi_r^{av}(\Delta r = 0)$ vs $1/S^{av}$ is also linear.

given by²⁶.

$$g_{ab}^i(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \sum_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\delta^2}} e^{-\frac{(r-r_{ij})^2}{2\delta^2}} \quad (8)$$

where δ is the variance of Gaussian distribution. The variance is used to make the otherwise discontinuous function a continuous one. Usually the value of δ is assumed to be $0.12\sigma_{BB}$ ^{16,18,26}. For this work we assume $\delta = 0.09$. As shown in Fig.2, the smaller the value of δ the more accurate is the description of the rdf. Using Eqs.5,6 and 8 we calculate the $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ at a local level. Then using Eq.7 we calculate the softness at a local level where c_o and c_1 are predetermined. The results shown here are only for the 'A' particles. In this cal-




FIG. 2: $g_{AA}(r)$ vs 'r' when the rdf is calculated for each particle using the approximate form given by Eq.2 and then averaged over time and particles. For comparison we also plot the average rdf. With increase in δ the first peak becomes wider.

ulation (Eq.5) there are two terms, one describing the interaction with other 'A' particles and is a function of g_{AA} and the other describing the interaction with the 'B' particles and is a function of g_{AB} . We find that the correlation between the dynamics and softness is best described when we set an upper limit to the r integration such that they correspond to the respective minimum of




FIG. 3: (a) Distribution of $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ at different temperatures. $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ is calculated from Eq.5 using the local $g(r)$ (Eq.8). (b) Distribution of softness calculated using Eq.7 for different temperatures. The c_o and c_1 values are obtained from Fig.1

g_{AA} and g_{AB} . This implies that it is the first nearest neighbours which contribute most to the softness. Since we have a finite value of δ , the approximate rdf at low 'r' has a finite value where the actual rdf goes to zero (see Fig. 2). The depth of the mean-field caging potential, $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ is calculated as a product of $C(r)$ and $g(r)$ (Eq. 5) and the $C(r)$ has terms proportional to the interaction potential, $u(r)$ which diverges at small 'r'. Thus in this range, small errors in the rdf value get magnified in the calculation of $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$. To minimize this error, we also put a lower cutoff in the 'r' integration. This lower cutoff in 'r' range is chosen as the value where the actual rdf vanishes.

A. Distribution of local softness

In Fig.3(a) we plot the distribution of $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ for different temperatures. With a decrease in the temperature, we find a broadening and shift of the distribution to higher values of $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$. This shows that our formalism captures the heterogeneity in the structure and its temperature variation. The broadening of the distribution at lower temperatures predicts that with a decrease in the temperature there is an increase in the heterogeneity of the structure. The shift to higher values of $\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ is an effect of the structure becoming more well defined at lower temperatures leading to a deeper caging potential.

We also plot the distribution of the softness $P(S)$ at different temperatures (Fig.3). We find that with lowering of temperature, as expected, and in concurrence, with our previous study²⁰ the distribution of softness moves to smaller values. Also, note that with lowering of temperature the distribution becomes narrower. The narrowing of the $P(S)$ at lower temperatures might appear to contradict the increase in structural heterogeneity. However, note that this is a combined effect of the inverse correlation between the depth of the mean field potential and the softness (Eq.7) and the fact that at lower temperatures $P(\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0))$ shifts to higher values of




FIG. 4: **Time evolution of softness.** (a) Time evolution of softness for different temperatures. For comparison we also plot the overlap function, here the solid lines are $C_S(t)$ and dotted lines are $Q(t)$ values. The temperatures studied are 0.80(black), 0.53(red) and 0.47(dark-green). (b) The time evolution of the softness propagator, $G(S, S_0, t)$ for a collection of particles with initial softness $S_0 \approx 0.001$ at $t = 0$ (black), $t = 0.01$ (red), $t = 10$ (dark-green) and $t = 1000$ (blue). (c) The time evolution of the average softness for particles which do not move beyond 0.5 till time 't'. This is plotted for several groups of particles which have initial softness values ranging from $S_0 \approx 0.002$ (black) to $S_0 \approx 0.001$ (magenta).

$\Phi_r(\Delta r = 0)$ which leads to the shift of the $P(S)$ to lower values of softness. This narrowing of softness distribution at lower temperatures can also be seen in the ML studies¹⁷.

The shift of the softness distribution with temperature is similar to but more prominent than that observed in the ML study⁶ and different from the study where the softness was expressed as low-frequency vibrational modes, and the distribution was found to be almost temperature-independent⁷. To the best of our knowledge, such a strong temperature effect of the softness distribution has not been seen in other existing formalism. However, in one of the earlier studies, such shift in the local (per molecule) inherent structure energy distribution with temperature was observed²⁷.

B. Time evolution of local softness

For the softness field to have some effect on the dynamics, it has to have a finite lifetime. In this section, we study the time evolution of the softness field. We also compare the lifetime of the softness field with the dynamics of the system. Following an earlier work⁷ we define the time evolution of the softness field as the average of the Pearson correlation given by,

$$C_S(t) = \left\langle \frac{[S_i(t') - \bar{S}_i(t')][S_i(t+t') - \bar{S}_i(t+t')]}{\sigma_{S(t')} \sigma_{S(t+t')}}} \right\rangle \quad (9)$$

where $\bar{S}_i(t) = 1/N \sum_i S_i(t)$ is average softness value at time t over all particles and $\sigma_S(t)$ is the standard deviation of the softness at time t . The final average given by the angular brackets is over time origin, t' and also over particles.

In Fig.4(a) we plot the time evolution of the softness,

$C_S(t)$ and also the overlap function, $Q(t)$ given by,

$$Q(t) = \frac{1}{N} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^N \omega(|\mathbf{r}_i(t) - \mathbf{r}_i(0)|) \right\rangle \quad (10)$$

where function $\omega(x)$ is 1 when $0 \leq x \leq a$ and $\omega(x) = 0$ otherwise, where a is chosen to be 0.3. We find that the time evolution of the softness shows a similar two-step decay as the overlap function. The plateau becomes more prominent at lower temperatures. This connects the softness parameter to the local cage around a particle. However, note that initially, there is a sharper drop in $C_S(t)$. Ideally, we would expect that when a particle moves leading to the decay of the overlap function, the local softness around that particle changes. However, the softness field can change even when the particle does not move out of the cage. This change in the softness field around a particle happens due to rearrangements in the neighbourhood. Following the ML study⁶ we define the softness propagator $G(S, S_0, t)$ which describes the time evolution of the softness of particles that move less than a distance '0.5' till time 't'. In Fig.4(b) we plot $G(S, S_0, t)$ at $T = 0.47$ where we choose particles whose initial value of softness $S_0 = 0.001$. Note that these are hard particles. We see that with progress in time the softness distribution of these particles initially sharply peaked because our choice of particles becomes wider and the peak position shifts to the right. Eventually, the distribution reaches the average form of the distribution. This evolution of softness of particles which are confined in a region of ' $\Delta r = 0.5$ ' leads to the initial sharp drop in $C_S(t)$. The time evolution of the local softness without the particle breaking out of the cage can help a region that is hard to eventually become soft. In Fig.4(c) we plot the time evolution of the average softness, $\langle S(t) \rangle_{S_0}$ for those particles which start with the softness value S_0 and displace less than the distance '0.5' at a time 't'. We find that the softness evolves with time and at times larger




FIG. 5: **The relationship between softness and dynamics.** (a) The distribution of softness of all particles in the system (black) and of those which are about to rearrange (red). (b) The softness dependence of the fraction of particles with softness value S which undergo rearrangement, $P_R(S)$, for different temperatures. (c) $P_R(S)$ as a function of $1/T$ for five different softness values from $S \approx 0.001$ (magenta) to $S \approx 0.0025$ (black). ΔE is obtained from this plot assuming $P_R(S) = \exp(-\Delta E/T)$. The inset shows the collapse of these probabilities when P_R/P_0 is plotted against $\Delta E/T$. (d) The softness dependence of energy barrier, ΔE versus S and in the inset ΔE versus $1/S$.

than the alpha relaxation time ($\tau_\alpha = 700$ at $T=0.47$) all of them reach the average value. This evolution of the softness field has also been observed in the ML study⁶.

V. CORRELATION BETWEEN LOCAL REARRANGEMENT AND LOCAL SOFTNESS

The main objective of this work is to identify a parameter that can describe structural heterogeneity and understand its role in dynamical heterogeneity. We have already shown that the softness of the mean-field potential can explain structural heterogeneity. We also find that the lifetime of this softness parameter is comparable with the timescale of the system dynamics. We put this parameter through a more stringent test and study the causal relationship between the softness and dynamics.

First in Fig.5(a) we plot the probability distribution of the local softness, $P(S)$ as obtained from Eq.7 at $T=0.47$. In the same figure, we also plot the probability distribution of the softness of the particles just before they undergo a rearrangement, $P(S|R)$. We find that about 75% of the particles that undergo rearrangement has a softness value greater than the peak value of the distri-

bution. This is similar to that observed in the Machine learning study where they found that the rdf provides 77% prediction accuracy of rearrangements⁶.

Rearrangement is a stochastic process; thus, to quantify the correlation between softness value and a rearrangement event, we calculate the fraction of particles having a specific value of softness that undergoes rearrangement, $P_R(S)$ as a function of S at different temperatures (Fig.5(b)). We find that at all temperatures, $P_R(S)$ has a softness dependence. Particles with higher values of softness have a higher probability of rearranging. This dependence becomes orders of magnitude stronger at lower temperatures. This shows that at lower temperatures, the dynamics get more coupled to the local structure. We have already demonstrated that with a decrease in temperature, the structural heterogeneity increases. We believe that these two factors, i) increase in structural heterogeneity ii) larger coupling between structure and dynamics, together lead to the well-known increase in the dynamic heterogeneity at lower temperatures. Particles with small softness values (confined in a deeper mean-field potential) are less mobile compared to particles which have larger values of softness (confined in a shallower mean-field potential).

Note that one of the main results of our earlier study

was that the average dynamics of the system can be expressed in an Arrhenius form where the energy barrier is dependent on the average softness parameter²⁰. We now check if the probability of a local rearrangement can also be expressed in a similar Arrhenius form *i.e.* $P_R(S) = P_0(S)\exp(-\Delta E(S)/T)$ where the activation energy is a function of softness. We plot in Fig.5(c) the $\log P_R(S)$ as a function of temperature for different softness values and find a linear behaviour at all softness values, thus confirming the Arrhenius form. The energy barrier, $\Delta E(S)$, the slopes of the lines, are a function of S . In the inset of (Fig.5(c)), we plot P_R/P_0 against $\Delta E(S)/T$, which shows a data collapse, thus further validating the Arrhenius form for describing the temperature dependence of $P_R(S)$. We find that at smaller values of softness, $P_R(S)$ strongly depends on T . In Fig.5(c), we find that the extrapolated lines cross each other at a certain temperature and above this temperature, it appears that $P_R(S)$ increases with a decrease in S , which is an unphysical result. Thus above this temperature, where the extrapolated lines cross the correlation between $P_R(S)$ and softness does not remain valid.

The soft spots are equivalent to the defects in the crystals. Thus they should come from a solid-like description of the system. When describing the softness we assume a well-defined cage that remains static over the time period that we are calculating the dynamics. We have also shown that the lifetime of the softness has a correlation with the lifetime of the cages. It is well known that in supercooled liquids these cages appear below the onset temperature where the decoupling between the short and long time dynamics starts. Thus our theoretical formalism rightly predicts that the correlation between softness and dynamics starts around the onset temperature, and at lower temperatures where there is a larger decoupling between the short and long time dynamics leading to a longer lifetime of the cages, the local softness becomes a better predictor of the local rearrangement events. Interestingly in Fig.5(c) we find that the extrapolated lines cross at $T = 0.801$. Thus the onset temperature predicted in this present analysis is in the same range as that obtained using other methods²⁸ and also the same as predicted in the ML studies⁶.

In Fig.5(d) we plot the activation energy, $\Delta E(S)$ as a function of S , and it shows that as softness decreases, the activation energy increases. Note that there is a slight deviation from linearity in the large softness limit, which is also observed in the ML work⁶.

According to our earlier work, the activation energy of the average dynamics is inversely proportional to the overall softness²⁰. In the inset of Fig.5(d), we plot the $\Delta E(S)$ against $1/S$, which shows a linear behaviour with a deviation from linearity at small softness values. Thus note that the correlation obtained in the present study between the local mobility and the local softness is similar to that obtained earlier between the average dynamics of the system and the average softness²⁶.

VI. CONCLUSION

In a recent study by some of us, we have defined a mean-field caging potential²⁰ described by the static structure factor of the liquid²¹. The softness, inversely proportional to the depth of the potential is thus related to the structure factor of the liquid. In the study, it was shown that the overall softness could describe the overall dynamics of the system. A master equation between the softness field and the relaxation time was found to hold for a large number of systems²⁰. These results suggested that there might be a correlation between the dynamical heterogeneity and the local structural heterogeneity in the liquid described by this softness parameter. However, it is well-known that the correlation between the average values does not guarantee a correlation at a microscopic level.

In this work, we extend the existing theory. We describe the depth of the mean-field caging potential and its softness at the local level. To identify the local rearrangement events, we adopt a well-established method used in earlier studies^{6,17,22}. First, we show that the depth of the mean field caging potential has a distribution that shifts to higher values and becomes wider at lower temperatures. This clearly shows that our formalism can capture the system's structural heterogeneity, which increases with decrease in temperature. Using the correlation between the depth of the caging potential and softness, we next calculate a distribution of the softness parameter. Our study reveals that this softness parameter is long-lived, and the lifetime of the softness parameter is correlated with the well-known cage structure in the supercooled liquids.

We then correlate the softness and the rearrangement at a microscopic level and show that particles with higher value of softness have a higher probability of undergoing rearrangement. This softness dependence of rearrangement becomes stronger at lower temperatures. Similar to our earlier study of average dynamics²⁰ we show that even at a local level, the probability of rearrangement can be expressed in an Arrhenius form where the activation energy grows with decreasing softness. We further show that even for particles that do not undergo rearrangement, the softness parameter evolves in time due to the dynamics in the neighbourhood. Since the softness parameter is connected to the dynamics, the evolution of the softness can give rise to the well-known facilitation effect^{29,30}. An immobile hard region can eventually become soft and have a higher probability of becoming mobile due to rearrangements in the neighbourhood.

The results presented here are strikingly similar to that obtained in the ML work, although the methodology of obtaining the softness in the two different studies are entirely different⁶. As suggested by the Authors themselves in the ML study, since the softness depends on a large number of local parameters, it is difficult to interpret the physical meaning of the softness³¹. The conjecture is that through the multiple local parameters, the infor-

mation of the local cage around particles is incorporated in the softness however, there is no direct proof of it. The advantage of the present study is it calculates the softness from a microscopic theory. The theory first describes the caging potential in terms of the structure of the liquid and then calculates its softness. This microscopic definition of softness allows us to clearly provide physical meaning to the observations made in both our work and the earlier ML studies^{6,8,17}.

In this study, the softness is determined by the structure and the two-body interaction potential. Thus according to the present theory systems with similar structure but different two-body interaction potential will have different dynamics. Also, given the direct correlation of the present softness parameter and the liquid structure, it will be interesting to understand its correlation with other existing definitions of the soft fields like the quasi localized vibrational modes. These problems will be addressed in future studies.

Availability of Data

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

- ¹M. D. Ediger, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **51**, 99 (2000).
- ²W. Kob, C. Donati, S. J. Plimpton, P. H. Poole, and S. C. Glotzer, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, 2827 (1997).
- ³A. Widmer-Cooper, H. Perry, P. Harowell, and D. Reichman, *naturephysics* **4**, 711 (2016).
- ⁴A. Widmer-Cooper and P. Harowell, *Physical Review Letters* **96**, 185701 (2006).
- ⁵A. Widmer-Cooper and P. Harowell, *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids* **352**, 5098 (2006), *Proceedings of the 5th International Discussion Meeting on Relaxations in Complex Systems*.
- ⁶S. Schoenholz, E. Cubuk, D. Sussman, E. Kaxiras, and A. Liu, *naturephysics* **12**, 469 (2016).
- ⁷A. Smessaert and J. Rottler, *Royal society of chemistry* **10**, 8533 (2014).
- ⁸E. D. Cubuk *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 108001 (2015).
- ⁹G. I. Taylor, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character* **145**, 362 (1934).
- ¹⁰A. M. Alsayed, M. F. Islam, J. Zhang, P. J. Collings, and A. G. Yodh, *Science* **309**, 1207 (2005), <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/309/5738/1207.full.pdf>.
- ¹¹M. L. Manning and A. J. Liu, *Physical Review Letters* **107**, 108302 (2011).
- ¹²J. C. Dyre, *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids* **235-237**, 142 (1998).
- ¹³M. Tsamados, A. Tanguy, C. Goldenberg, and J.-L. Barrat, *Physical Review E* **80**, 026112 (2009).
- ¹⁴G. Kapteijns *et al.*, *Does mesoscopic elasticity control viscous slowing down in glassforming liquids?*, 2021, 2103.11404.
- ¹⁵J. Krausser, K. H. Samwer, and A. Zaccone, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 13762 (2015), <https://www.pnas.org/content/112/45/13762.full.pdf>.
- ¹⁶I. Williams *et al.*, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **30**, 094003 (2018).
- ¹⁷F. P. Landes, G. Biroli, O. Dauchot, A. J. Liu, and D. R. Reichman, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 010602 (2020).
- ¹⁸D. Richard *et al.*, *Physical Review Materials* **4**, 113609 (2020).
- ¹⁹D. Ganapathi, D. Chakrabarti, A. K. Sood, and R. Ganapathy, *Nature Physics* **17**, 114 (2021).
- ²⁰M. K. Nandi and S. M. Bhattacharyya, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 208001 (2021).
- ²¹M. K. Nandi, A. Banerjee, C. Dasgupta, and S. M. Bhattacharyya, *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 265502 (2017).
- ²²R. Candelier *et al.*, *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 135702 (2010).
- ²³W. Kob and H. C. Andersen, *Physical Review Letters* **73**, 1376 (1994).
- ²⁴A. Smessaert and J. Rottler, *Physical Review E* **88**, 022314 (2013).
- ²⁵F. Landes, G. Biroli, O. Dauchot, A. Liu, and D. Reichman, *Physical Review E* **101**, 010602 (2020).
- ²⁶P. Piaggi, O. Valsson, and M. Parrinello, *Physical Review Letters* **119**, 015701 (2017).
- ²⁷F. Sciortino, W. Kob, and P. Tartaglia, *Physical Review Letters* **83**, 3214 (1999).
- ²⁸A. Banerjee, M. K. Nandi, S. Sastry, and S. Maitra Bhattacharyya, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **147**, 024504 (2017).
- ²⁹J. P. Garrahan and D. Chandler, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**, 9710 (2003).
- ³⁰D. Chandler and J. P. Garrahan, *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry* **61**, 191 (2010).
- ³¹J. W. Rocks, S. A. Ridout, and A. J. Liu, *APL Materials* **9**, 021107 (2021).