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5 Quenched random systems

No material is perfectly homogeneous: impurities of different kinds are distributed randomly throughout the samples. In ultra-cold atom systems, so much studied nowadays, disorder can be realised, for example, using speckle laser light. It is quite natural to expect that disorder will change the equilibrium and dynamical properties of the systems on which it acts.

A natural effect of disorder should be to lower the critical temperature of a macroscopic interacting system. Much attention has been payed to the effect of weak disorder on phase transitions, that is to say, situations in which the nature of the ordered and disordered phases is not modified by the impurities but the critical phenomenon is. On the one hand, the critical exponents of second order phase transitions might be modified by disorder, on the other hand, disorder may smooth out the discontinuities of first order phase transitions rendering them of second order. Strong disorder instead changes the nature of the low-temperature phase and before discussing the critical phenomenon one needs to understand how to characterise the new ordered ‘glassy’ phase.

In this Section we shall discuss several types of quenched disorder and models that account for it. We shall also overview some of the theoretical methods used to deal with the static properties of models with quenched disorder, namely, scaling arguments and the droplet theory, mean-field equations, and the replica method.

5.1 Quenched and annealed disorder

Imagine that one mixes some random impurities in a melt and then very slowly cools it down in such a way that the impurities and the host remain in thermal equilibrium. If the interest sets on the statistical properties of the full system, one has to compute the full partition function in which a sum over all configurations of the host components and the impurities has to be performed. This is called annealed disorder.

In the opposite case in which upon cooling the impurities do not equilibrate with the host nor with the environment but remain blocked in random fixed positions, one talks about quenched disorder. Basically, the relaxation time associated with the diffusion of the impurities in the sample is so long that these remain trapped:
\[ t_{\text{obs}} \sim 10^4 \text{ sec} \ll t_{\text{diff}}. \] (5.1)

As concerns the host variables, they have their own, typically microscopic time scale that is much smaller than the observational time scale and therefore fluctuate. For example, in magnetic system, this time scale is the typical time-scale needed to reverse a spin, \( \tau_o \sim 10^{-12} - 10^{-15} \text{ sec} \ll t_{\text{obs}}. \)

The annealed case is easier to treat analytically but it brings in less theoretical novelties and, in many cases of interest, is of less physical relevance. The quenched one is the one that leads to new phenomena and ideas that we shall discuss next.

Quenched disorder is static. Instead, in annealed disorder the impurities are in thermal equilibrium in the experimental time-scales, and they can simply be included in the
statistical mechanic description of the problem, by summing over their degrees of freedom in the partition function.

5.2 Properties

Let us list a number of properties of systems with frozen-in randomness.

5.2.1 Lack of homogeneity

It is clear that the presence of quenched disorder, in the form of random interactions, fields, dilution, etc., breaks spatial homogeneity and renders single samples heterogeneous. Homogeneity is recovered though, if one performs an average of all possible realisations of disorder, each weighted with its own probability.

5.2.2 Frustration

We already discussed frustration in the context of magnetic models without disorder. It is quite clear that disorder will also introduce frustration in magnetic (and other) systems.

An example of an Ising model with four sites and four links is shown in Fig. 5.1-left, where we took three positive exchanges and one negative one all, for simplicity, with the same absolute value, $J$. Four configurations minimise the energy, $E_f = -2J$, but none of them satisfies the lower link. One can easily check that any closed loop such that the product of the interactions takes a negative sign is frustrated. Frustration naturally leads to a higher energy and a larger degeneracy of the number of ground states. This is again easy to grasp by comparing the number of ground states of the frustrated plaquette in Fig. 5.1-left to its unfrustrated counterpart shown on the central panel. Indeed, the energy and degeneracy of the ground state of the unfrustrated plaquette are $E_u = -4J$ and $n_u = 2$, respectively.

\[ + + + + \]
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Figure 5.1: A frustrated (left) and an unfrustrated (center) square plaquette for an Ising model with nearest-neighbour interactions. A frustrated triangular plaquette (right).

Frustration may also be due to pure geometrical constraints. The canonical example is an antiferromagnet on a triangular lattice in which each plaquette is frustrated, see Fig. 5.1-right.

In short, frustration arises when the geometry of the lattice and/or the nature of the interactions make impossible the simultaneous minimisation of the energy of all pair couplings between the spins. Any loop of connected spins is said to be frustrated if the
product of the signs of connecting bonds is negative. In general, energy and entropy of the ground states increase due to frustration.

Later in this Section, in Eq. (5.19), we will introduce the interaction energy between any pair of spins in a spin-glass sample. Depending on the value of the distance $r_{ij}$, the numerator in this expression can be positive or negative implying that both ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions exist. This leads to frustration, which means that in any configuration some two-body interactions remain unsatisfied. In other words, there is no spin configuration that minimises all terms in the Hamiltonian.

### 5.2.3 Random parameters

Each given sample has its own peculiar realisation of the quenched disorder (the interactions between the fluctuating and the frozen-in variables) that is determined by the way in which the sample was prepared. It would be illusory, and quite impossible, to know all details about it. The idea put forward by several theoreticians is to consider that quenched disorder will be typical and hence modelled by random exchanges, fields or potentials, taken from time-independent probability distribution functions. What one has to determine first are the characteristics of these distributions (functional form, mean, variance, momenta). Having this modelisation in mind, one then talks about quenched randomness.

**Exercise 5.1** This exercise provides a useful example of the distinction between typical and average values of random variables. Consider a random variable $z$ that takes only two values $z_1 = e^{\alpha\sqrt{N}}$ and $z_2 = e^{\beta N}$, with $\alpha$ and $\beta$ two positive and finite numbers with $\alpha > \beta > 1$. The probabilities of the two events are $p_1 = 1 - e^{-N}$ and $p_2 = e^{-N}$. First, confirm that these probabilities are normalised. Second, compute the average $\langle z \rangle$, where the angular brackets indicate average with the probabilities $p_1, p_2$, and evaluate it in the limit $N \to \infty$. Third, calculate the most probable value taken by $z$, that we call $z_{typ}$, for typical (indeed, if we were to draw the variable we would typically get this value). Compare and conclude. Now, let us study the behaviour of the quantity $\ln z$ that is also a random variable. Compute its average. By which value of $z$ is it determined? Does $\langle \ln z \rangle = (\ln z)_{typ}$ in the large $N$ limit? Is $\langle \ln z \rangle = \ln(\langle z \rangle)$? The last result demonstrates the difference between what are called quenched and annealed averages. Which value is larger? Does the comparison comply with Jenssen’s inequality? (See App. 5.A for its definition.)

**Exercise 5.2** Take two independent identically distributed ($i.i.d.$) random variables $x$ and $y$ that can take values 0 and 2 with probability a half. What are the typical and average values of the product $z = xy$? Are they equal?

**Exercise 5.3** Consider a distribution function, $p(x)$, with support on a finite interval centred at $x = 0$. Is the average, $\langle x \rangle$, equal to the typical, $x_{typ}$, value? Under which conditions?

**Exercise 5.4** Are the average and typical values of an asymmetric probability distribution
function always different?

5.2.4 Self-averageness

Say that the quenched randomness is given by random exchanges (i.e., random $J_{ij}$ in an Ising model). If each sample is characterised by its own realisation of the exchanges, should one expect a totally different behaviour from sample to sample? Fortunately, many generic static and dynamic properties of spin-glasses (and other systems with quenched disorder) do not depend on the specific realisation of the random couplings and are self-averaging.

Owing to the fact that each disorder configuration has a probability of occurrence, each physical quantity $A$ depends on it and has a probability distribution $P(A)$ given by $P(A) = \sum_J p(J) \delta(A - A_J)$ where we denoted $J$ a generic disorder realisation. When the size of the system increases one expects (and even proves in some cases) that the distribution $P(A)$ becomes narrower and narrower. Therefore the only quantity which can be observed in the thermodynamic limit is the most probable, or typical value, $A_J^{\text{typ}}$, the value around which most of the distribution is concentrated.

For some quantities the typical value is very close to the average over the disorder and

$$A_J^{\text{typ}} = [A_J]$$

in the thermodynamic limit. Henceforth, we use square brackets to indicate the average over the random couplings. More precisely, in self-averaging quantities sample-to-sample fluctuations with respect to the mean value are expected to be $O(N^{-a})$ with $N$ the number of variables in the system and $a > 0$. Roughly, observables that involve summing over the entire volume of the system are expected to be self-averaging. In particular, the free-energy density of models with short-ranged interactions is expected to be self-averaging in the infinite size limit. There can be, though, in the same system quantities for which $B_J^{\text{typ}} \neq [B_J]$ even in the thermodynamic limit. We will show examples of both below.

An example: the disordered Ising chain

The meaning of this property can be grasped from the solution of the random bond Ising chain defined by the energy function $H_J[\{s_i\}] = -\sum_i J_i s_i s_{i+1}$ with spin variables $s_i = \pm 1$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and random bonds $J_i$ independently taken from a probability distribution $P(J_i)$. For simplicity, we consider periodic boundary conditions. The disorder-dependent partition function reads

$$Z_J = \sum_{\{s_i = \pm 1\}} e^{\beta \sum_i J_i s_i s_{i+1}}$$

and this can be readily computed introducing the change of variables $\sigma_i \equiv s_i s_{i+1}$. (Note that these new variables are not independent, since they are constrained to satisfy $\prod_i \sigma_i = 1$ and one should take it into account to perform the sum. However, this constraint
becomes irrelevant in the thermodynamic limit and one can simply ignore it.) One finds

\[ Z_J = \prod_i 2 \cosh(\beta J_i) \Rightarrow -\beta F_J = \sum_i \ln \cosh(\beta J_i) + N \ln 2. \quad (5.4) \]

The partition function is a product of i.i.d. random variables and it is itself a random variable. If the random exchanges have finite mean and variance the partition function has a log-normal distribution. The free-energy density instead is a sum of i.i.d. random variables and, using the central limit theorem, in the large \( N \) limit becomes a Gaussian random variable narrowly peaked at its maximum. The typical value, given by the maximum of the Gaussian distribution, coincides with the average, \( \lim_{N \to \infty}(f^\text{typ}_J - [f_J]) = 0 \) with \( f_J = F_J/N \).

**Exercise 5.5** Take a one dimensional Ising model with a Gaussian probability distribution of the interaction strengths \( J_i \), with zero mean and variance \( J^2 \). Draw histograms of the partition function \( Z_J \), the total free-energy \( F_J \), and the free-energy density \( f_J \). Study these for increasing value of \( N \). Conclude. Repeat the analysis for different probability distributions of the interaction strengths. In particular, consider distribution functions with fat tails, that is to say, with power law decays. What is the difference?

**Exercise 5.6** Take a particle with mass \( m \) in a one dimensional harmonic potential

\[ V(x) = \frac{1}{2} m \omega^2 x^2 \quad (5.5) \]

with the real frequency \( \omega \) taken from a probability distribution \( q(\omega) \). The position of the particle is given by the real variable \( x \).

1. Compute the free-energy at fixed \( \omega \) and inverse temperature \( \beta = 1/(k_B T) \), with \( k_B \) Boltzmann’s constant.
2. Find an expression for the probability distribution of \( F_\omega \) for a generic \( q(\omega) \).
3. Are the fluctuations Gaussian?
4. Express the disorder averaged free-energy \( [F_\omega] \) for a generic distribution of \( \omega \).
5. Calculate the disorder averaged free-energy \( [F_\omega] \) for a Gaussian distribution of \( \omega \) with zero mean and variance \( \sigma^2 \).
6. Explain how the typical value of the free-energy, \( F^\text{typ} \), should be obtained, again for a generic \( q(\omega) \).
7. Determine \( F^\text{typ} \) for a Gaussian distribution of \( \omega \) with zero mean and variance \( \sigma^2 \).
8. Explain the self-averaging property and the conditions under which we proved it in the lectures.
9. Is this model self-averaging? Discuss the result found for the simple harmonic oscillator clearly and justify your answer. Do you expect a phase transition? Why?

A useful integral for this exercise is

\[ \int_0^\infty dy \ e^{-ay^2} \ln y = -\frac{1}{4} (C + \ln 4a) \sqrt{\pi} \alpha \quad \text{where } C \text{ is a constant given by } -C = \int_0^1 dx \ln \ln 1/x. \]
**General argument**

A simple argument justifies the self-averageness of the free-energy density in generic finite dimensional systems with short-range interactions. Let us divide a, say, cubic system of volume \( V = L^d \) in \( n \) subsystems, say also cubes, of volume \( v = \ell^d \) with \( V = nv \). If the interactions are short-ranged, the total free-energy is the sum of two terms, a contribution from the bulk of the subsystems and a contribution from the interfaces between the subsystems:

\[
F_J = \ln Z_J = \ln \sum_{\text{conf}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{conf})} \approx \ln \sum_{\text{conf}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{bulk})} - \beta H_J(\text{surf}) = \ln \sum_{\text{bulk}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{bulk})} + \ln \sum_{\text{surf}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{surf})} = -\beta F_J^{\text{bulk}} - \beta F_J^{\text{surf}}.
\]

We have already neglected the contributions from the interaction between surface and bulk. If, moreover, the interaction extends over a short distance \( \ell \gg \sigma \), the surface energy is negligible with respect to the bulk one, same for the entropic contributions to the free-energy, and \(-\beta F_J \approx \ln \sum_{\text{bulk}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{bulk})}\). In the thermodynamic limit, the disorder dependent free-energy is then a sum of \( n = (L/\ell)^d \) independent random numbers, each one being the disorder dependent free-energy of the bulk of each subsystem: \(-\beta F_J \approx \sum_{k=1}^n \ln \sum_{\text{bulk}} e^{-\beta H_J(\text{bulk}_k)}\). In the limit of a very large number of subsystems \((L \gg \ell \text{ or } n \gg 1)\) the central limit theorem (see App. 5.B) implies that the free-energy density is Gaussian distributed with the maximum reached at a value \( f_J^{\text{typ}} \) that coincides with the average over all realisations of the randomness \([f_J]\). Moreover, the dispersion about the typical value of the total free-energy vanishes in the large \( n \) limit, \( \sigma_{F_J}/[F_J] \propto \sqrt{n/n} = n^{-1/2} \to 0 \) and the one of the free-energy density, or intensive free-energy, \( f_J = F_J/N \), as well, \( \sigma_{f_J}/[f_J] = O(n^{-1/2}) \). In a sufficiently large system the typical \( f_J \) is then very close to the averaged \([f_J]\) and one can compute the latter to understand the static properties of typical systems. This is very convenient from a calculational point of view.

**Exercise 5.7** Take a two dimensional Ising model with a Gaussian probability distribution of the interaction strengths \( J_{ij} \), with zero mean and variance \( J^2 \). Draw histograms of the partition function \( Z_J \), the total free-energy \( F_J \), and the free-energy density \( f_J \). Study these for increasing value of \( N \). Conclude. Repeat the analysis for different probability distributions of the interaction strengths. In particular, consider distribution functions with fat tails, that is to say, with power law decays. What is the difference?

**Lack of self-averageness in the correlation functions**

Once one has \([f_J]\), one derives all disordered average thermal averages by taking derivatives of the disordered averaged free-energy with respect to sources introduced in the partition function. For example,

\[
[\langle s_i \rangle] = -\left. \frac{\partial [F_J]}{\partial h_i} \right|_{h_i = 0},
\]

\[
[\langle s_i s_j \rangle - \langle s_i \rangle \langle s_j \rangle] = -T \left. \frac{\partial^2 [F_J]}{\partial h_i \partial h_j} \right|_{h_i = 0},
\]

with \( H_J \to H_J - \sum_i h_is_i \). Connected correlation functions, though, are not self-averaging
quantities. This can be seen, again, studying the random bond Ising chain. Take \( i < j \).

One can easily check that

\[
\langle s_i s_j \rangle - \langle s_i \rangle \langle s_j \rangle = Z_j^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta J_{j-1}} \cdots \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta J_i} Z_j = \tanh(\beta J_i) \cdots \tanh(\beta J_j),
\]

(5.8)

where we used \( \langle s_i \rangle = 0 \) (valid for a distribution of random bonds with zero mean) and the dots indicate all sites on the chain between the ending points \( i \) and \( j \), i.e. \( i+1 \leq k \leq j-1 \).

The last expression is a product of random variables and it is not equal to its average (5.7) – not even in the large separation limit \( |\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j| \to \infty \).

See the TD on correlation functions for more details on them.

### 5.2.5 Annealed disorder

The thermodynamics of a system with annealed disorder is obtained by averaging the partition function over the impurity degrees of freedom,

\[
Z = [Z_J]
\]

(5.9)

since one needs to do the partition sum over the disorder degrees of freedom as well.

In general, this calculation does not present any particular difficulty. In some cases, the annealed average gives a good description of the high temperature phases of problems with quenched randomness but it fails to predict the phase transition and the low temperature properties correctly.

In general, one can prove

\[
f_{\text{quenched}} \geq f_{\text{annealed}}.
\]

(5.10)

**Exercise 5.8** Prove this inequality using Jenssen’s inequality (see App. 5.A).

### 5.3 Random geometries

In this Section we very briefly present some problems in which the quenched randomness is of pure geometric (and not energetic) origin.

#### 5.3.1 Percolation

The understanding of *fluid flow in porous media* needs, as a first step, the understanding of the static geometry of the connected pores. The typical example, that gave the name to the problem, is coffee percolation, where a solvent (water) filter or trickle through the permeable substance that is the coffee grounds and in passing picks up soluble constituents (the chemical compounds that give coffee its color, taste, and aroma).

Another problem that needs the comprehension of a static random structure is the one of *conduction across a disordered sample*. Imagine that one mixes randomly a set of
conducting and insulating islands. Whether the mix can conduct an electric current from one end to the other of the container is the question posed, and the answer depends on the structure formed by the conducting islands.

Figure 5.2: Left: a measurement of the topography (left) and local current (right) in an inhomogeneous mixture of good and bad conducting polymers. The brighter the zone the more current passing through it. Several grains are contoured in the left image. Right: an example of bond percolation.

Percolation [3, 4, 5, 6] is a simple geometric problem with a critical threshold. It is very helpful since it allows one to become familiar with important concepts of critical phenomena such as fractals, scaling, and renormalisation group theory in a very intuitive way. Moreover, it is not just a mathematical model, since it is at the basis of the understanding of the two physical problems mentioned above among many others.

Site dilute lattices with missing vertices are intimately related to the site percolation problem. Imagine that one builds a lattice by occupying a site with probability $p$ (and not occupying it with probability $1 - p$). For $p = 0$ the lattice will be completely empty while for $p = 1$ it will be totally full. For intermediate values of $p$, on average, order $pL^d$ sites will be occupied, with $L$ the linear size of the lattice. Site percolation theory is about the geometric and statistical properties of the structures thus formed. In particular, it deals with the behaviour of the clusters of nearest neighbour occupied sites.

Similarly, one can construct bond dilute lattices and compare them to the bond percolation problem.

The site percolation problem describes, for example, a binary alloy or dilute ferromagnetic crystal, also called a doped ferromagnet. The question in this context is how much dilution is needed to destroy the ferromagnetic order in the sample at a given temperature. The bond percolation problem corresponds to a randomly blocked maze through which the percolation of a fluid can occur. Many other physical problems can be set in terms of percolation: the distribution of grain size in sand and photographic emulsions, the vulcanisation of rubber and the formation of cross-linked gels, the propagation of an infection, etc.

The main interest lies on characterising the statistical and geometric properties of the clusters on a lattice of linear size $L$ as a function of the probability $p$. The clusters are connected ensembles of nearest neighbour sites. Their easiest geometric property is their
size, defined as the number of sites that compose them. Other geometric properties are also interesting and we will define them below.

The percolation problem is specially interesting since it has a threshold phenomenon, with a critical value \( p_c \) at which a first spanning cluster that goes from one end of the lattice to the opposite in at least one of the Cartesian directions appears. For \( p < p_c \) there are only finite clusters, for \( p > p_c \) there is a spanning cluster as well as finite clusters.

The first natural question is whether the value \( p_c \) depends on the particular sample studied or not, that is to say, whether it suffers from sample-to-sample fluctuations. All samples are different as the sites erased or the links cut are not the same. The threshold value is therefore a random variable and it does not take the same value for different samples. The 'surprise' is that the mean-square deviations of \( p_c \) from its mean value vanish as a power law with the system size,

\[
\delta^2_{p_c}(N) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} (p_c^{(k)} - \bar{p}_c)^2 \simeq C^2 N^{-\nu} ,
\]

\[
\bar{p}_c \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} p_c^{(k)} ,
\]

(5.11)

with \( k \) labelling different measurements and \( N \) counting its total number. \( N \) the number of sites in the sample. (\( C \) turns out to be 0.54 and \( \nu = 1.3 \) in \( d = 2 \).) In the infinite system size limit, \( p_c \) does not fluctuate from sample to sample.

One can then count the number of sites belonging to the largest cluster and compare this number to the total number of sites in the sample:

\[
r_L(p) \equiv \frac{N_{\text{max}}(p)}{N} .
\]

(5.12)

This is, again, a fluctuating quantity that, in the infinite system size limit does no longer fluctuate and defines

\[
r_\infty \equiv \lim_{L \to \infty} r_L(p) .
\]

(5.13)

The precise definition of the critical threshold \( p_c \) involves the infinite size limit and it can be given by

\[
r_\infty(p) = \lim_{L \to \infty} r_L(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } p < p_c \\ > 0 & \text{for } p > p_c \end{cases}
\]

(5.14)

where \( r_\infty(p) \) denotes the fraction of sites belonging to the largest cluster in the finite lattice with linear size \( L \). In the magnetic application of percolation, this means that the magnetisation vanishes for \( p < p_c \) and it takes the value that the magnetisation takes on the largest cluster for \( p > p_c \) (as in both cases the magnetisation on the finite clusters is independent and averages to zero).

An equivalent definition of the critical threshold \( p_c \) is given by

\[
P_\infty(p) = \lim_{L \to \infty} P_L(p) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } p < p_c \\ 1 & \text{for } p > p_c \end{cases}
\]

(5.15)
where $P_L(p)$ denotes the probability of there being a percolating cluster in the finite lattice with linear size $L$.

The percolation threshold $p_c$ depends on the lattice geometry and its dimensionality. Moreover, it is not the same for bond percolation and site percolation. Exact results are known for special lattices as the Cayley tree. Examples of how these results are found are given in [3]. Numerical data for finite dimensional lattices are complemented by rigorous upper and lower bounds and the outcome of series expansions for the mean cluster value. Harris showed that $p_c = 2^{-1}$ for the bond percolation problem on a planar square lattice and the numerics suggests $p_c = 1/2$. Fisher put several bounds on $p_c$ on various $2d$ lattices for the site and bond problem. In particular, $p_c \geq 1/2$ for site percolation on planar regular lattices with no crossings.

### 5.3.2 Bethe lattices and random graphs

The Bethe lattice is a tree, in which each site has $z$ neighbours and each branch gives rise to $z - 1$ new branches, see Fig. 5.3. Two important properties of these lattices are:
- there are no closed loops.
- the number of sites on the border is of the same order of magnitude as the total number of sites on the lattice.
- It is a rooted tree, with all other nodes arranged in shells around the root node, also called the origin of the lattice.

**Exercise 5.9** Show that the total number of sites on the Bethe lattice with $z = 3$ and $g$ generations (or the distance from the site designed as the central one) is $n_{\text{tot}} = 3 \cdot 2^{g-1}$. Prove that the surface to volume ratio tends to $1/2$.

Due to its distinctive topological structure, the statistical mechanics of lattice models on this graph are often exactly solvable.

**Exercise 5.10** Take a hypercubic lattice in $d$ dimensions and estimate the surface to volume
Show that this ratio tends to a finite value only if \( d \to \infty \).

\[ \text{Figure 5.4: Random graphs with } N = 10 \text{ and different probabilities } p \text{ of joining two nodes.} \]

A random graph is obtained by starting with a set of \( n \) isolated vertices and adding successive edges between them at random. A popular ensemble is the one denoted \( G(n, p) \), in which every possible edge occurs independently with probability \( 0 < p < 1 \). Random graphs with fixed connectivity are also commonly used.

Random graphs are used in social sciences modeling (nodes representing individuals and edges the friendship relationship), technology (interconnections of routers in the Internet, pages of the WWW, or production centers in an electrical network), biology (interactions of genes in a regulatory network) \([1, 2]\). Disordered systems are usually defined on random graphs, especially the ones motivated by combinatorial optimisation.

5.4 Energetic models

Let us briefly describe here some representative models with quenched randomness.

5.4.1 Dilute spin models

Lattice models with site or link dilution are

\[
H^\text{site dil}_J = -J \sum_{(ij)} s_i s_j \epsilon_{ij}, \quad H^\text{link dil}_J = -J \sum_{(ij)} s_i s_j \epsilon_{ij},
\]

with \( P(\epsilon_i = 1, 0) = p, 1 - p \) in the first case and \( P(\epsilon_{ij} = 1, 0) = p, 1 - p \) in the second. These models are intimately related to Percolation theory \([3, 4, 5, 6]\). Physically, dilution is realised by vacancies or impurity atoms in a crystal.

Exercise 5.11 Take the site dilute Ising model under a uniform magnetic field defined on any graph. Prove that its annealed average is equivalent to the spin one Blume-Capel model under a
field. Here are some hints to prove this statement. Write the disorder average partition function of the dilute model as

$$Z_\epsilon = \sum_{n=0}^{N} p^n (1-p)^{N-n} Z_n$$

(5.17)

with

$$Z_n = \sum_{\{s_i=\pm 1\}} \sum_{\{\epsilon_i=\pm 1\}} \exp(-\beta H_{\text{site dil}}^{\text{dil}}[\{s_i\}])$$

where $n = \sum_i \epsilon_i$ is the occupation number.

Rewrite it as

$$Z_\epsilon = \sum \sum \exp(-\beta H_{\text{site dil}}^{\text{dil}}[\{s_i\}] - \beta \mu \sum_i \epsilon_i)$$

(5.18)

with $\mu = \beta^{-1} [\ln p - \ln(1-p)]$. Now, use a transformation of variables between $\{s_i, \epsilon_i\}$ and $\sigma_i = \epsilon_i s_i$, for all $i$ and identify, after this change, the partition function of the Blume-Capel model.

### 5.4.2 Spin-glass models

Spin-glasses are alloys in which magnetic impurities substitute the original atoms in positions randomly selected during the chemical preparation of the sample [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The interactions between the impurities are of RKKY type:

$$V_{\text{rkky}} = \frac{J \cos(2\pi r_{ij})}{r_{ij}^3} s_i s_j$$

(5.19)

with $r_{ij} = |\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j|$ the distance between them and $s_i$ a spin variable that represents their magnetic moment. Clearly, the initial location of the impurities varies from sample to sample. The time-scale for diffusion of the magnetic impurities is much longer than the time-scale for spin flips. Thus, for all practical purposes the positions $\vec{r}_i$ can be associated to quenched random variables distributed according to a uniform probability distribution that in turn implies a probability distribution of the exchanges. This is called quenched disorder.

In early 70s Edwards and Anderson proposed a rather simple model that should capture the main features of spin-glasses [15]. The interactions (5.19) decay with a cubic power of the distance and hence they are relatively short-ranged. This suggests to put the spins on a regular cubic lattice model and to trade the randomness in the positions into random nearest neighbour exchanges, independently and identically distributed according to a Gaussian probability distribution function (pdf):

$$H_{\text{EA}}^{\text{EA}} = - \sum_{(ij)} J_{ij} s_i s_j$$

with

$$P(J_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} e^{-\frac{J_{ij}^2}{2\sigma^2}}.$$  

(5.20)

The precise form of the probability distribution of the exchanges is supposed not to be important (though some authors claimed that there might be non-universality with respect to it, see however [20] where this is refuted at least in the random field Ising model case).
Another natural choice is to use bimodal exchanges
\[ P(J_{ij}) = p\delta(J_{ij} - J_0) + (1 - p)\delta(J_{ij} + J_0) \] (5.21)
with the possibility of a bias towards positive or negative interactions depending on the parameter \( p \). A tendency to non-zero average \( J_{ij} \) can also be introduced in the Gaussian pdf.

A natural extension of the EA model in which all spins interact has been proposed by Sherrington and Kirkpatrick
\[ H_{SK}^{\text{SK}} = -\sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij}s_is_j \] (5.22)
and it is called the \textit{SK model} [16]. The interaction strengths \( J_{ij} \) are taken from a Gaussian pdf and they scale with \( N \) in such a way that the thermodynamic limit is non-trivial:
\[ P(J_{ij}) = (2\pi\sigma_N^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{J_{ij}^2}{2\sigma_N^2}} \sigma_N^2 = J^2N . \] (5.23)
The first two-moments of the exchange distribution are \( \langle J_{ij} \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle J_{ij}^2 \rangle = J^2/N \). This is a case for which a mean-field theory is expected to be exact.

### 5.4.3 Neural networks

In the biological context disordered models have been used to describe \textit{neural networks}, \textit{i.e.} an ensemble of many neurons (typically \( N \sim 10^9 \) in the human brain) with a very elevated connectivity. Indeed, each neuron is connected to \( \sim 10^4 \) other neurons and receiving and sending messages \textit{via} their axons. Moreover, there is no clear-cut notion of distance in the sense that axons can be very long and connections between neurons that are far away have been detected. Hebb proposed that the memory lies in the connections and the peculiarity of neural networks is that the connectivity must then change in time to incorporate the process of learning.

The simplest neural network models represent neurons with Boolean variables or spins, that either fire or are quiescent. The interactions link pairs of neurons and they are assumed to be symmetric (which is definitely not true). The memory of an object, action, \textit{etc.} is associated to a certain pattern of neuronal activity. It is then represented by an \( N \)-component vector in which each component corresponds to the activity of each neuron (configuration of the spins). Finally, sums over products of these patterns constitute the interactions. One can then study, for example, the number of chosen specific patterns that the network can store and later recall, or one can try to answer questions on average, as how many typical patterns can a network of \( N \) neurons store. The models then become fully-connected or dilute models of spins in interaction with the exchanges
\[ J_{ij} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{\mu=1}^{p} \xi_i^\mu \xi_j^\mu \quad \xi_i^\mu = \pm 1 \quad \text{with prob } 1/2 . \] (5.24)
\( \xi_i^\mu \) are the components of an \( N \) vector labelled by \( \mu \), the \( \mu \)th pattern stored by the network. The quenched disorder is in the \( J_{ij} \)s. This is the Hopfield model, based on Hebb’s rule.

### 5.4.4 Glass models

A further extension of the EA model is called the \( p \)-spin model

\[
H_j^{p-\text{spin}} = - \sum_{i_1 < \ldots < i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} s_{i_1} \ldots s_{i_p} \tag{5.25}
\]

with \( p \geq 3 \). The sum can also be written as \( \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_p} = 1/p! \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \ldots \neq i_p} \). The exchanges are now taken from a Gaussian probability distribution

\[
P(J_{ij}) = (2\pi \sigma_N^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{J_{ij}^2}{2\sigma_N^2}} \quad \sigma_N^2 = J^2 p!/(2N^{p-1}) . \tag{5.26}
\]

with \([J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}] = 0 \) and \([J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}^2] = \frac{J^2 p!}{N^{p-1}} \). Indeed, an extensive free-energy is achieved by scaling \( J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} \) with \( N^{-(p-1)/2} \). This scaling can be justified as follows. Imagine that at low temperatures the spins acquire local equilibrium expectation values that we call \( m_i \). The ‘local field’ that they induce are \( h_i = 1/(p-1)! \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2 \neq \ldots \neq i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} m_{i_1} \ldots m_{i_p} \) and they should be of order one. Contrary to ferromagnetic models, the \( m_i \)’s take plus and minus signs in the disordered case as there is no tendency to align all moments in the same direction. In particular, we estimate the order of magnitude of this term by working at \( T = 0 \) and taking \( m_i = \pm 1 \) with probability \( \frac{1}{2} \), since there is no external magnetic field nor a non-vanishing mean of the exchanges that could bias the local order in one or the other direction. In order to keep the discussion simple, let us take \( p = 2 \). In this case, if the strengths \( J_{ij} \), are of order one, \( h_i \) is a sum of \( N \) i.i.d. random variables, with zero mean and unit variance,\(^1\) and \( h_i \) is a random variable with zero mean and variance equal to \( N \). Therefore, one can argue that \( h_i \) is of order \( \sqrt{N} \). To make it finite we then chose \( J_{ij} \) to be of order \( 1/\sqrt{N} \) or, in other words, we impose \([J_{ij}^2] = J^2/N \). The generalization to \( p > 2 \) is straightforward.

We classify this model in the “glass” class since it has been shown that its behaviour mimics the one of so-called fragile glasses for \( p > 2 \) \([17, 18, 19]\).

### 5.4.5 Vector spins and spherical models

Extensions to vector spins with two (XY), three (Heisenberg) or \( N \) components also exist. In the former cases can be relevant to describe real samples. One usually keeps the modulus of the spins fixed to be 1 in these cases.

There is another way to extend the spin variables and it is to use a spherical constraint \([21, 22]\),

\[
-\infty \leq s_i \leq \infty \quad \sum_{i=1}^{N} s_i^2 = N . \tag{5.27}
\]

\(^1\)The calculation goes as follow: \( \langle F_i \rangle = \sum_{j} J_{ij} \langle m_j \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle F_i^2 \rangle = \sum_{jk} J_{ij} J_{ik} \langle m_j m_k \rangle = \sum_{j} J_{ij}^2 \).
In this case, the spins $s_i$ are the components of an $N$-dimensional vector, constrained to be an $N$-dimensional sphere.

### 5.4.6 Optimization problems

Cases that find an application in computer science [23, 24] are defined on random graphs with fixed or fluctuating finite connectivity. In the latter case one places the spins on the vertices of a graph with links between couples or groups of $p$ spins chosen with a probability $c$. These are dilute spin-glasses on graphs (instead of lattices).

Optimisation problems can usually be stated in a form that requires the minimisation of a cost (energy) function over a large set of variables. Typically these cost functions have a very large number of local minima – an exponential function of the number of variables – separated by barriers that scale with $N$ and finding the truly absolute minimum is hardly non-trivial. Many interesting optimisation problems have the great advantage of being defined on random graphs and are then mean-field in nature. The mean-field machinery that we will discuss at length is then applicable to these problems with minor (or not so minor) modifications due to the finite connectivity of the networks.

Let us illustrate this kind of problems with two examples. The graph partitioning problem consists in, given a graph $G(N, E)$ with $N$ vertices and $E$ edges, to partition it into smaller components with given properties. In its simplest realisation the uniform graph partitioning problem is how to partition, in the optimal way, a graph with $N$ vertices and $E$ links between them in two (or $k$) groups of equal size $N/2$ (or $N/k$) and the minimal number of edges between them. Many other variations are possible. This problem is encountered, for example, in computer design where one wishes to partition the circuits of a computer between two chips. More recent applications include the identification of clustering and detection of cliques in social, pathological and biological networks.

Another example, that we will map to a spin model, is $k$-satisfiability ($k$-SAT). The problem is to determine whether the variables of a given Boolean formula can be assigned in such a way to make the formula evaluate to ‘TRUE’. Equally important is to determine whether no such assignments exist, which would imply that the function expressed by the formula is identically ‘FALSE’ for all possible variable assignments. In this latter case, we would say that the function is unsatisfiable; otherwise it is satisfiable.

We illustrate this problem with a concrete example. Let us use the convention $x$ for the requirement $x = \text{TRUE}$ and $\overline{x}$ for the requirement $x = \text{FALSE}$. For example, the formula $C_1 : x_1 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_2$ made by a single clause $C_1$ is satisfiable because one can find the values $x_1 = \text{TRUE}$ (and $x_2$ free) or $x_2 = \text{FALSE}$ (and $x_1$ free), which make $C_1 : x_1 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_2$ TRUE. This formula is so simple that 3 out of 4 possible configurations of the two variables solve it. This example belongs to the $k = 2$ class of satisfiability problems since the clause is made by two literals (involving different variables) only. It has $M = 1$ clauses and $N = 2$ variables.

Harder to decide formulae are made of $M$ clauses involving $k$ literals required to take the true value ($x$) or the false value ($\overline{x}$) each, these taken from a pool of $N$ variables. An
example in 3-SAT is

\[ F = \begin{cases} 
C_1 : x_1 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_2 \text{ OR } x_3 \\
C_2 : \overline{x}_5 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_7 \text{ OR } x_9 \\
C_3 : x_1 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_4 \text{ OR } x_7 \\
C_4 : x_2 \text{ OR } \overline{x}_5 \text{ OR } x_8 
\end{cases} \quad (5.28) \]

All clauses have to be satisfied simultaneously so the formula has to be read

\[ F: C_1 \text{ AND } C_2 \text{ AND } C_3 \text{ AND } C_4 . \quad (5.29) \]

It is not hard to believe that when \( \alpha \equiv M/N \gg 1 \) the problems typically become unsolvable while many solutions exist for \( \alpha \ll 1 \). One could expect to find a sharp threshold between a region of parameters \( \alpha < \alpha_c \) where the formula is satisfiable and another region of parameters \( \alpha \geq \alpha_c \) where it is not.

In \textit{random k-SAT} an instance of the problem, i.e. a formula, is chosen at random with the following procedure: first one takes \( k \) variables out of the \( N \) available ones. Second one decides to require \( x_i \) or \( \overline{x}_i \) for each of them with probability one half. Third one creates a clause taking the OR of these \( k \) literals. Forth one returns the variables to the pool and the outlined three steps are repeated \( M \) times. The \( M \) resulting clauses form the final formula.

The Boolean character of the variables in the \( k \)-SAT problem suggests to transform them into Ising spins, i.e. \( x_i \) evaluated to TRUE (FALSE) will correspond to \( s_i = 1 \) (\( -1 \)). The requirement that a formula be evaluated TRUE by an assignment of variables (i.e. a configuration of spins) will correspond to the ground state of an adequately chosen energy function. In the simplest setting, each clause will contribute zero (when satisfied) or one (when unsatisfied) to this cost function. There are several equivalent ways to reach this goal. The fact that the variables are linked together through the clauses suggests to define \( k \)-uplet interactions between them. We then choose the interaction matrix to be

\[ J_{ai} = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if neither } x_i \text{ nor } \overline{x}_i \in C_a \\
1 & \text{if } x_i \in C_a \\
-1 & \text{if } \overline{x}_i \in C_a 
\end{cases} \quad (5.30) \]

and the energy function as

\[ H_J[\{s_i\}] = \sum_{a=1}^{M} \delta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_{ai}s_i, -k \right) \quad (5.31) \]

where \( \delta(x, y) \) is a Kronecker-delta that equals one when the arguments are identical and zero otherwise. This cost function is easy to understand. The Kronecker delta contributes one to the sum over \( a \) only if the \( k \) non-vanishing terms in the sum \( \sum_{i=1}^{N} J_{ai}s_i \) are equal to \( -1 \). This can happen when \( J_{ai} = 1 \) and \( s_i = -1 \) or when \( J_{ai} = -1 \) and \( s_i = 1 \). In both
cases the condition on the variable $x_i$ is not satisfied. Since this is required from all the
variables in the clause, the clause itself and hence the formula are not satisfied.

Another way to represent a clause in an energy function is to consider, for instance for
$C_1$ above, the term $(1 - s_1)(1 + s_2)(1 - s_3)/8$. This term vanishes if $s_1 = 1$ or $s_2 = -1$
or $s_3 = 1$ and does not contribute to the total energy; that is written as a sum of terms
of this kind. It is then simple to see that the total energy can be rewritten in a way that
resembles strongly physical spin models,

$$H_J[\{s_i\}] = \frac{M}{2K} + \sum_{R=1}^{K} \sum_{i_1 < \cdots < i_R} (-1)^R J_{i_1 \cdots i_R} s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_R}$$

and

$$J_{i_1 \cdots i_R} = \frac{1}{2K} \sum_{a=1}^{M} J_{ai_1} \cdots J_{ai_R} .$$

These problems are “solved” numerically, with algorithms that do not necessarily re-
spect physical rules. Thus, one can use non-local moves in which several variables are
updated at once – as in cluster algorithms of the Swendsen-Wang type used to beat crit-
ical slowing down close to phase transitions – or one can introduce a temperature to go
beyond cost-function barriers and use dynamic local moves that do not, however, satisfy
a detail balance. The problem is that with hard instances of the optimization problem
none of these strategies is successful. Indeed, one can expect that glassy aspects, such
as the proliferation of metastable states separated by barriers that grow very fast with
the number of variables, can hinder the resolutions of these problems in polynomial time,
that is to say a time that scales with the system size as $N^\xi$, for any algorithm. These are
then hard combinatorial problems.

5.4.7 Random bond and random field ferromagnets

Let us now discuss some, a priori simpler cases. An example is the Mattis random
magnet with generic energy (5.25) in which the interaction strengths are given by [25]

$$J_{i_1 \cdots i_p} = \xi_{i_1} \cdots \xi_{i_p} \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_j = \pm 1 \quad \text{with prob} = 1/2$$

for any $p$ and any kind of graph. In this case a simple gauge transformation, $\eta_i \equiv \xi_i s_i$,
allows one to transform the disordered model in a ferromagnet, showing that there was
no true frustration in the system.

Random bond ferromagnets (RBFMs) are systems in which the strengths of the inter-
actions are not all identical but their sign is always positive. One can imagine such a
exchange as the sum of two terms:

$$J_{ij} = J + \delta J_{ij} , \quad \text{with} \ J > 0 \ \text{and} \ \delta J_{ij} \ \text{small and random} .$$

There is no frustration in these systems either. Ising models of this kind have also been
used to describe fracture in materials, where the $J_{ij}$ represents the local force needed to
break the material and it is assumed the fracture occurs along the surface of minimum total rupture force [26].

As long as all $J_{ij}$ remain positive, this kind of disorder should not change the two bulk phases with a paramagnetic-ferromagnetic second-order phase transition. Moreover the up-down spin symmetry is not broken by the disorder. The disorder just changes the local tendency towards ferromagnetism that can be interpreted as a change in the local critical temperature. Consequently, this type of disorder is often called random-$T_c$ disorder, and it admits a Ginzburg-Landau kind of description, with a random distance from criticality, $\delta u(\vec{r})$,

$$F_{\text{random mass}}[m(\vec{r})] = \int d^d r \left\{ -h m(\vec{r}) + [r + \delta r(\vec{r})] m^2(\vec{r}) + (\nabla m(\vec{r}))^2 + u m^4(\vec{r}) + \ldots \right\} .$$

The disorder couples to the $m^2$ term in the free-energy functional. In quantum field theory, this term is called the mass term and, therefore, random-$T_c$ disorder is also called random-mass disorder. (In addition to random exchange couplings, random-mass disorder can also be realized by random dilution of the spins.)

Link randomness is not the only type of disorder encountered experimentally. Random fields, that couple linearly to the magnetic moments, are also quite common; the classical model is the ferromagnetic random field Ising model (RFIM) [20, 27]:

$$H_{\text{RFIM}} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} s_i s_j - \sum_i s_i h_i \quad \text{with} \quad P(h_i) = (2\pi \sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{h_i^2}{2\sigma^2}} .$$

The dilute antiferromagnet in a uniform magnetic field is believed to behave similarly to the ferromagnetic random field Ising model. Experimental realisations of the former are common and measurements have been performed in samples like $\text{Rb}_2\text{Co}_{0.7}\text{Mg}_{0.3}\text{F}_4$.

Exercise 5.11 Take a ferromagnetic Ising chain under local random fields $h_i$ that are independent and take the values $h_i = \pm h_0$ with probability a half. Prove that this model can be mapped onto another Ising chain under a uniform field $h_0$ with nearest neighbour interactions with strength $J_i$ that are now quenched random variables. Find the dependence of $J_i$ on the $h_i$s and their probability distribution function.

Note that the up-down Ising symmetry is not preserved in models in the RFIM and any spin model such that the disorder couples to the local order parameter.

In the Ginzburg-Landau description this model reads

$$F[m(\vec{r})] = \int d^d r \left\{ -h(\vec{r}) m(\vec{r}) + r m^2(\vec{r}) + (\nabla m(\vec{r}))^2 + u m^4(\vec{r}) + \ldots \right\}$$

where $h(\vec{r})$ is the local random variable that breaks the up-down spin symmetry. Whether or not the symmetry is broken globally depends on the probability distribution of the random fields. A particularly interesting situation arises if the distribution is even in $h$ such that the up-down symmetry is globally preserved in the statistical sense.
Random-field disorder is generally stronger than random-mass disorder.

The random fields give rise to many metastable states that modify the equilibrium and non-equilibrium behaviour of the RFIM. In one dimension the RFIM does not order at all, in $d = 2$ there is strong evidence that the model is disordered even at zero temperature, in $d = 3$ it there is a finite temperature transition towards a ferromagnetic state [29]. Whether there is a glassy phase near zero temperature and close to the critical point is still and open problem.

The RFIM at zero temperature has been proposed to yield a generic description of material cracking through a series of avalanches. In this problem one cracking domain triggers others, of which size, depends on the quenched disorder in the samples. In a random magnetic system this phenomenon corresponds to the variation of the magnetisation in discrete steps as the external field is adiabatically increased (the time scale for an avalanche to take place is much shorter than the time-scale to modify the field) and it is accessed using Barkhausen noise experiments [30]. Disorder is responsible for the jerky motion of the domain walls. The distribution of sizes and duration of the avalanches is found to decay with a power law tail and cut-off at a given size. The value of the cut-off size depends on the strength of the random field and it moves to infinity at the critical point.

5.4.8 Random manifolds

Once again, disorder is not only present in magnetic systems. An example that has received much attention is the so-called random manifold [31, 32]. This is a $d$ dimensional directed elastic manifold moving in an embedding $N + d$ dimensional space under the effect of a quenched random potential. The simplest case with $d = 0$ corresponds to a particle moving in an embedding space with $N$ dimensions. If, for instance $N = 1$, the particle moves on a line, if $N = 2$ it moves on a plane and so on and so forth. If $d = 1$ one has a line that can represent a domain wall, a polymer, a vortex line, etc. The fact that the line is directed means it has a preferred direction, in particular, it does not have overhangs. If the line moves in a plane, the embedding space has $(N = 1) + (d = 1)$ dimensions. One usually describes the system with an $N$-dimensional coordinate, $\vec{\phi}$, that locates in the transverse space each point on the manifold, represented by the internal $d$-dimensional coordinate $\vec{r}$.

The elastic energy is $H_{\text{elas}} = \gamma \int d^d x \sqrt{1 + (\nabla \phi(\vec{r}))^2}$ with $\gamma$ the deformation cost of a unit surface. Assuming the deformation is small one can linearise this expression and get, upto an additive constant, $H_{\text{elas}} = \frac{\gamma}{2} \int d^d r (\nabla \phi(\vec{r}))^2$.

Disorder is introduced in the form of a random potential energy $V(\vec{\phi}(\vec{r}), \vec{r})$ characterised by its pdf.

The random manifold model is then

$$H_V(\vec{\phi}) = \int d^d r \left[ \frac{\gamma}{2} (\nabla \phi(\vec{r}))^2 + V(\vec{\phi}(\vec{r}), \vec{r}) \right].$$

(5.39)

If the random potential is the result of a large number of impurities, the central limit
theorem implies that its probability density is Gaussian. Just by shifting the energy scale one can set its average to zero, \( [V] = 0 \). As for its correlations, one typically assumes, for simplicity, that they exist in the transverse direction only:

\[
[V(\vec{\phi}(\vec{r}), \vec{r})V(\vec{\phi}'(\vec{r}'), \vec{r}')] = \delta^d(\vec{r} - \vec{r}')V(\vec{\phi}, \vec{\phi}') .
\] (5.40)

If one further assumes that there is a statistical isotropy and translational invariance of the correlations, \( V(\vec{\phi}, \vec{\phi}') = W/\Delta^2 V(\vec{\phi} - \vec{\phi}')/\Delta \) with \( \Delta \) a correlation length and \( (W\Delta^{d-2})^{1/2} \) the strength of the disorder. The disorder can now be of two types: short-ranged if \( V \) falls to zero at infinity sufficiently rapidly and long-range if it either grows with distance or has a slow decay to zero. An example involving both cases is given by the power law \( V(z) = (\theta + z)^{-\gamma} \) where \( \theta \) is a short distance cut-off and \( \gamma \) controls the range of the correlations with \( \gamma > 1 \) being short-ranged and \( \gamma < 1 \) being long-ranged.

This model also describes directed domain walls in random systems. One can derive it in the long length-scales limit by taking the continuum limit of the pure Ising part (that leads to the elastic term) and the random part (that leads to the second disordered potential). In the pure Ising model the second term is a constant that can be set to zero while the first one implies that the ground state is a perfectly flat wall, as expected. In cases with quenched disorder, the long-ranged and short-ranged random potentials mimic cases in which the interfaces are attracted by pinning centres (‘random field’ type) or the phases are attracted by disorder (‘random bond’ type), respectively. For instance, random bond disorder is typically described by a Gaussian pdf with zero mean and delta-correlated

\[
[V(\vec{\phi}(\vec{r}), \vec{r})V(\vec{\phi}'(\vec{r}'), \vec{r}')] = W\Delta^{d-2} \delta^d(\vec{r} - \vec{r}')\delta(\vec{\phi} - \vec{\phi}') .
\]

5.5 Properties of finite dimensional disordered systems

Once various kinds of quenched disorder introduced, a number of questions on their effect on the equilibrium and dynamic properties arise. Concerning the former:

- Are the equilibrium phases qualitatively changed by the random interactions?
- Is the phase transition still sharp, or is it rendered smoother because different parts of the system undergo the transition independently?
- If there is still a phase transition, does its order (first order vs. continuous) change?
- If the phase transition remains continuous, does the critical behavior, i.e., the values of the critical exponents, change?

Now, for the latter:

- Is the dynamic behaviour of the system modified by the quenched randomness?

In the following we explain a series of classical results in this field: the use of random matrix theory to study one dimensional problems, the Harris criterium, the proof of
non-analyticity of the free-energy of quenched disordered systems close to their critical temperature given by Griffiths, the analysis of droplets and their domain wall stiffness, and the derivation of some exact results derived by Nishimori using gauge invariance.

We first focus on impurities or defects that lead to spatial variations with respect to the tendency to order but do not induce new types of order, that is to say, no changes are inflicted on the two phases at the two sides of the transition. Only later we consider the spin-glass case.

### 5.5.1 One dimensional cases

Take the disordered Ising chain

\[ \mathcal{H} = -\sum_{i=1}^{N} (J_{i}s_is_{i+1} + h_is_i) \]  

(5.41)

with \( J_{i} \) and \( h_{i} \) random exchanges and random fields taken from probability distribution. Impose periodic boundary conditions such that \( s_{N+1} = s_1 \). The partition function can be evaluated with the transfer matrix method introduced by Kramers and Wannier [63] and Onsager [64], see also [65]. Indeed,

\[ Z_N = \sum_{\{s_i=\pm 1\}} \prod_{i=1}^{N} e^{\beta J_is_is_{i+1} + \beta h_is_i} = \sum_{\{s_i=\pm 1\}} T_{1s_1s_2}T_{2s_2s_3}\cdots T_{Ns_Ns_1} = \text{Tr} \prod_{i=1}^{N} T_i \]  

(5.42)

where \( T_i \) are \( 2 \times 2 \) matrices in which one takes the two row and column indices to take the values \( \pm 1 \). Then

\[ T_i = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\beta(J_i+h_i)} & e^{\beta(-J_i+h_i)} \\ e^{\beta(-J_i-h_i)} & e^{\beta(J_i-h_i)} \end{pmatrix}. \]  

(5.43)

Note that, for random exchanges and/or fields Eq. (5.42) is a product of random matrices.

The free-energy per spin is given by

\[ -\beta f_N = \frac{1}{N} \ln Z_N = \frac{1}{N} \ln \text{Tr} \prod_{i=1}^{N} T_i \]  

(5.44)

The thermodynamic quantities like the energy per spin, magnetic susceptibility and other can be computed from this expression. The local quantities, such as local averaged magnetisation or correlation functions are evaluated with the help of the spin operator

\[ \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \]  

(5.45)
5.5 Finite dimensional models

as

\[ \langle s_i \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_N} \text{Tr} T_1 T_2 \ldots T_{i-1} \Sigma T_i \ldots T_N \]  
(5.46)

\[ \langle s_i s_j \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_N} \text{Tr} T_1 \ldots T_{i-1} \Sigma T_i \ldots T_{j-1} \Sigma T_j \ldots T_N \]  
(5.47)

Methods from random matrix theory can then be used to study disordered spin chains [66].

5.5.2 The Harris criterium

The first question to ask is how does the average disorder strength behave under coarse-graining or, equivalently, how is it seen at long distances. This is the question answered by the Harris argument that focuses on the effect of disorder on systems with a conventional order-disorder phase transition, say, a ferromagnetic-paramagnetic one.

The Harris’ criterion [34] states that if the specific-heat of a pure system

\[ C_{\text{pure}}(T) \sim |T - T_{c_{\text{pure}}}|^{-\alpha_{\text{pure}}} \]  
(5.48)

presents a power-like divergence with

\[ \alpha_{\text{pure}} > 0 \]  
(5.49)

the disorder may induce a new universality class. Otherwise, if \( \alpha_{\text{pure}} < 0 \), disorder is irrelevant in a renormalisation group sense and the critical behaviour of the model remains unchanged. The criterium does not decide in the marginal case \( \alpha_{\text{pure}} = 0 \) case. Note that the Harris criterium is a necessary condition for a change in critical behaviour but not a sufficient one.

The hyper-scaling relation \( 2 - d \nu_{\text{pure}} = \alpha_{\text{pure}} \) allows to rewrite the Harris criterium as

\[ \text{critical behaviour} = \begin{cases} 
\text{unchanged} & \text{if } \nu_{\text{pure}} > 2/d \\
\text{may change} & \text{if } \nu_{\text{pure}} < 2/d 
\end{cases} \]  
(5.50)

where \( \nu_{\text{pure}} \) is the correlation length exponent

\[ \langle s_0 s_{T} \rangle \simeq e^{-r/\xi_{\text{pure}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi \simeq |T - T_{c_{\text{pure}}}|^{-\nu_{\text{pure}}} \]  
(5.51)

of the pure system.

The proof of the Harris result is rather simple and illustrates a way of reasoning that is extremely useful [34, 33]. Take the full system with frozen-in disorder at a temperature \( T \) slightly above its critical temperature \( T_{c_{\text{dis}}} \). Divide it into equal pieces with linear size \( \xi_{\text{dis}} \), the correlation length at the working temperature. By construction, the spins within each of these blocks behave as a super-spin since they are effectively parallel. Because of disorder, each block \( k \) has its own local critical temperature \( T_{c_{(k)}} \) determined by the interactions (or dilution) within the block. Harris proposes to compare the fluctuations in
the local critical temperatures $\Delta T_{c}^{(k)} \equiv T_{c}^{(k)} - T_{c}^{\text{dis}}$ with respect to the global critical one $T_{c}^{\text{dis}}$, with the distance from the critical point $\Delta T \equiv T - T_{c}^{\text{dis}} > 0$, taken to be positive:

- If $\Delta T_{c}^{(k)} < \Delta T$ for all $k$, $T_{c}^{(k)} - T_{c}^{\text{dis}} < T - T_{c}^{\text{dis}}$ for all $k$, and all blocks have critical temperature below the working one, $T_{c}^{(k)} < T$. The system looks then 'homogeneous' with respect to the phase transition and it is at a higher temperature than the critical temperature of each of the blocks.

- If $\Delta T_{c}^{(k)} > \Delta T$ for some $k$, such blocks are in the ordered (ferromagnetic) phase while others are in the disordered (paramagnetic) phase, making a uniform transition impossible. The inhomogeneity in the system may then be important.

 Require now $\Delta T_{c}^{(k)} < \Delta T$ for all $k$ to have an unmodified critical behaviour. Use also that an unmodified critical behaviour implies $\xi_{\text{dis}} = \xi_{\text{pure}}$ and, consequently, $\nu_{\text{dis}} = \nu_{\text{pure}}$.

As this should be the case for all $k$ we call $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})}$ the generic one. $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})}$ can be estimated using the central limit theorem. Indeed, as each local $T_{c}^{(k)}$ is determined by an average of a large number of random variables in the block (e.g., the random $J_{ij}$ in the Hamiltonian), its variations decay as the square root of the block volume, $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})} \simeq \xi_{\text{pure}}^{-d/2}$. On the other hand, $\Delta T \simeq \xi_{\text{pure}}^{-1/\nu_{\text{pure}}}$. Therefore,

$$\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})} < \Delta T \quad \Rightarrow \quad d\nu_{\text{pure}} > 2.$$  \hfill (5.52)

The interpretation of this inequality is the following. If the Harris criterion $d\nu_{\text{pure}} > 2$ is fulfilled, the ratio $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})}/\Delta T \simeq \xi_{\text{pure}}^{-d/2+1/\nu_{\text{pure}}}$ goes to zero as the critical point is approached. The system looks less and less disordered on larger length scales, the effective disorder strength vanishes right at criticality, and the disordered system features the same critical behaviour as the clean one. An example of a transition that fulfills the
Harris criterion is the ferromagnetic transition in a three-dimensional classical Heisenberg model. Its clean correlation length exponent is $\nu_{\text{pure}} \approx 0.69 > 2/d = 2/3 \approx 0.67$.

In contrast, if $d\nu_{\text{pure}} < 2$, the ratio $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})}/\Delta T$ increases upon approaching the phase transition. The blocks differ more and more on larger length scales. Eventually, some blocks are on one side of the transition while other blocks are on the other side. This makes a uniform sharp phase transition impossible. The clean critical behaviour is unstable and the phase transition can be erased or it can remain continuous but with different critical behaviour. More precisely, the disordered system can be in a new universality class featuring a correlation length exponent that fulfills the inequality $d\nu_{\text{dis}} > 2$. Many phase transitions in classical disordered systems follow this scenario, for example the three-dimensional classical Ising model. Its clean correlation length exponent is $\nu_{\text{pure}} \approx 0.69 > 2/d = 2/3 \approx 0.67$ and violates the Harris criterion. In the presence of random-mass disorder, the critical behaviour changes and $\nu_{\text{dis}} \approx 0.68$. (Note, however, that the difference between these exponents is tiny!)

In the marginal case $d\nu_{\text{pure}} = 2$, more sophisticated methods are required to decide the stability of the clean critical point. Chayes et al. [36] turned this argument around to show rigorously that for all the continuous phase transitions in presence of disorder, the correlation-length critical exponent of the disordered system, $\nu_{\text{dis}}$ verifies $\nu_{\text{dis}} \geq 2/d$, independently of whether or not the critical behaviour is the same as in the uniform system and even when the system does not have a uniform analogue.

Finally, note that the Harris criterion $d\nu_{\text{pure}} > 2$ applies to uncorrelated or short-range correlated disorder. If the disorder displays long-range correlations in space, the inequality needs to be modified because the central-limit theorem estimate of $\Delta T_{c}^{(\text{loc})}$ changes.

**Exercise 5.11** Consider an Ising model on a square lattice with striped randomness. This
means that the exchanges $J_{ij}$ are such that when they lie on horizontal links are equal to $J_0$ while on vertical links they equal $J_0 + \epsilon F(y)$ with $y$ the vertical coordinate of lower site on the vertical bond. $F(y)$ is a random variable taken from a probability distribution with zero mean and finite width $\sigma$. This model has long-range correlated disorder. Adapt the Harris criterion to this problem and show that in this case disorder has a dominant effect on the critical behaviour and hence rounds the transition. For details on this problem see Ref. [37].

Long-range correlated disorder is especially important in quantum phase transitions. The reason is the fact that the statistical properties of quantum systems are studied in an imaginary time formulation that makes a $d$-dimensional quantum problem equivalent to a $d+1$ dimensional classical one. Along this additional spatial direction, quenched randomness is long-range correlated.

### 5.5.3 The Griffiths phase

The critical temperature of a spin system is usually estimated from the high temperature expansion and the evaluation of its radius of convergence (see App. 5.D). However, Griffiths showed that the temperature at which the free-energy of models with quenched disorder starts being non-analytical falls above the critical temperature where the order parameter detaches from zero [38]. The argument applies to models with second order phase transitions.

Griffiths explained his argument using the dilute ferromagnetic Ising model. First, he argued that the critical temperature of the disordered model should decrease for increasing $p$, the probability of empty sites. This is ‘intuitively obvious’ since no spontaneous magnetisation can occur at a finite temperature if the probability of occupied sites is less than the critical percolation probability at which an ‘infinite cluster’ first appears. See Fig. 5.7 where the phase diagram of the dilute Ising ferromagnet is shown. Besides, below the critical temperature of the corresponding pure system, $T_c^0$ in the figure, with a finite (exponentially small) probability there exist arbitrary large dense ferromagnetic ‘islands’ which are critical exactly at the working temperature $T_c(p) < T < T_c^0$. Hence, one can expect the free energy of such random system to be a non-analytic function of the external magnetic field, in the limit $h \to 0$, at any temperature between $T_c(p)$ and $T_c^0$, i.e., the yellow region in the figure.

In the following paragraph we sketch Griffiths’ argument and we use his notation in which $p$ is the probability of occupying a site. For any concentration $p < 1$ the magnetisation $m$ is not an analytic function of $h$ at $h = 0$ at any temperature below $T_c^{\text{pure}}$, the critical temperature of the regular Ising model $p = 1$. As he explains, this fact is most easily explained for $p < p_c$. The magnetisation $m$ per lattice site in the
thermodynamic limit has the form

$$m = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \langle s_i \rangle = \sum_{c} P(c)m(c)$$

(5.53)

where $P(c)$ is the probability that a particular site on the lattice belongs to a cluster $c$ that is necessarily finite for $p < p_c$, and $m(c)$ is the magnetisation density of the cluster $c$, that is to say $m(c) = N^{-1}(c) \sum_{i \in c} \langle s_i \rangle$ with $N(c)$ the number of sites in the cluster.

Griffiths uses the Yang-Lee theorem, see App. 5.C, to express $m(c)$ as

$$m(c) = 1 + \frac{2z}{N(c)} \sum_{i \in c} \frac{1}{\xi_i - z}$$

with $z = e^{-2\beta h}$

(5.54)

and $\xi_i, i = 1, \ldots, N(c)$, complex numbers with $|\xi_i| = 1$. The total magnetisation density is then of the same form

$$m = 1 + z f(z) = \sum_{i} \eta_i (\xi_i - z)^{-1}$$

(5.55)

with $\eta_i = 2P(c)/N(c)$. He then argues that this form is analytic for $z < 1$ but non-analytic at $z = 1$ that corresponds to $h = 0$.

A more intuitive understanding of what is going on in the temperature region above the critical temperature of the disordered model, $T_{c}^{\text{dis}}$, and below the critical temperature the pure one, $T_{c}^{\text{pure}}$, can be reached as follows [33]. The effects of quenched disorder show up already in the paramagnetic phase of finite dimensional systems. Below the critical point of the pure case (no disorder) finite regions of the system can order due to fluctuations in the couplings or, in a dilute ferromagnetic model, they can be regions where all sites are occupied, as shown in Fig. 5.5. As such rare regions are finite-size pieces of the clean system, their spins align parallel to each other below the clean critical temperature $T_{c}^{\text{pure}}$. 

Figure 5.7: The phase diagram of the dilute ferromagnetic Ising model. $p$ is the probability of empty sites in this figure differently from the notation in the main text, figure taken from [33]. With increasing dilution the ordered phase is eventually suppressed.
Because they are of finite size, these regions cannot undergo a true phase transition by themselves, but for temperatures between the actual transition temperature $T^{\text{dis}}_c$ and $T^{\text{pure}}_c$ they act as large superspins.

Note that using the ideas of percolation theory, one can estimate the scaling of $P(c)$ with its size. Recall the one dimensional case. Take a segment of length $L + 2$ on the lattice. A cluster of size $L$ will occupy the internal sites with empty borders with probability $p^L(1 - p)^2$. This is because one needs $L$ contiguous sites to be occupied and its boundary sites be empty. In larger dimensions, this probability will be approximately $p^L(1 - p)^{L-1}$ with the first factor linked to the filled volume and the second to the empty surface. In the one dimensional case, one has $P(c) = (1 - p)^2 e^{L \ln p} \propto e^{-c(p)L}$ where we defined $c(p) = - \ln p > 0$. In the $d > 1$ case, one can make a harsh approximation and use $P(c) \approx \exp\{\ln[p^L(1 - p)^{L-1}]\} = \exp[\ln p^L + \ln(1 - p)^{L-1}] \approx \exp[-c(p)L^d]$ in the large $L$ limit.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure5.8.png}
\caption{Rare regions in a random ferromagnet, figure taken from [33]. On the left, a ferromagnetically ordered region in the paramagnetic bulk ($T > T^{\text{dis}}_c$). On the right, a paramagnetic band in a system that is ordered ferromagnetically in a patchwork way ($T < T^{\text{dis}}_c$).}
\end{figure}

The sum in eq. (5.53) is made of two contributions. On the one hand, there are the large clusters that are basically frozen at the working temperature. On the other, there are the free spins that belong to small clusters and are easy to flip at the working temperature. Let us focus on the former. Their magnetic moment is proportional to their volume $m(c) \approx \mu L^d$. The energy gain due to their alignment with the field is $\Delta E(c) = -h m(c) = -h \mu L^d$ where $h$ is a small uniform field applied to the system, say to measure its susceptibility.

The separation of the clusters in two groups is then controlled by the comparison between $\Delta E(c)$ and the thermal energy: the small clusters with $|\Delta E(c)| < k_B T$ can be flipped by thermal fluctuations, and the large clusters with $|\Delta E(c)| > k_B T$ are frozen in the direction of the field.

The effect of the frozen clusters for which $|\Delta E(c)| > k_B T$ is then

\begin{equation}
\begin{split}
m_{\text{frozen}}(T, h) \approx \sum_{|\Delta E(c)| > k_B T} P(c)m(c) \approx \int_{L_c}^\infty dL \ e^{-c(p)L^d} \mu L^d
\end{split}
\end{equation}
and

\[ |\Delta E(c)| = h\mu L^d \approx k_B T \quad \Rightarrow \quad L_c^d \approx \frac{k_B T}{\mu h}. \tag{5.57} \]

This integral can be computed by the saddle-point method and it is dominated by the lower border in the small \( h \) limit. The result is

\[ m_{\text{frozen}}(T, h) \approx e^{-c(p)L_c^d} = e^{-c(p)k_B T/(\mu h)} \tag{5.58} \]

where we dropped the contribution from \( \mu L^d \) since it is negligible. The result has an essential singularity in the \( h \to 0 \) limit.

It is important to note that the clusters that contribute to this integral are rare regions since they occur with probability \( P(c) \approx e^{-c(p)L^d} \) that is exponentially small in their volume. Still they are the cause of the non-analytic behaviour of \( m(h) \).

The magnetic susceptibility \( \chi \) can be analysed similarly. Each locally ordered rare region makes a Curie contribution \( m^2(c)/k_B T \) to \( \chi \). The total rare region susceptibility can therefore be estimated as

\[ \chi_{\text{frozen}}(T, h) \approx \int_{L_c}^{\infty} dL \ e^{-c(p)L^d} \mu^2 L^{2d} \approx e^{-c(p)L_c^d} \approx e^{-c(p)k_B T/(\mu h)}. \tag{5.59} \]

This equation shows that the susceptibility of an individual rare region does not increase fast enough to overcome the exponential decay of the rare region probability with increasing size \( L \). Consequently, large rare regions only make an exponentially small contribution to the susceptibility.

Rare regions also exist on the ordered side of the transition \( T < T_c \). One has to consider locally ordered islands inside holes that can fluctuate between up and down because they are only very weakly coupled to the bulk ferromagnet outside the hole, see Fig. 5.8. This conceptual difference entails a different probability for the rare events as one needs to find a large enough vacancy-rich region around a locally ordered island.

There are therefore slight differences in the resulting Griffiths singularities on the two sides of the transition. In the site-diluted Ising model, the ferromagnetic Griffiths phase comprises all of the ferromagnetic phase for \( p > 0 \). The phase diagram of the dilute ferromagnetic Ising model is sketched in Fig. 5.7 with \( p \) denoting the probability of empty sites in the figure.

### 5.5.4 Scenario for the phase transitions

The argument put forward by Harris is based on the effect of disorder on average over the local critical temperatures. The intuitive explanation of the Griffiths phase shows the importance of rare regions on the behaviour of global observables such as the magnetisation or the susceptibility. The analysis of the effect of randomness on the phase transitions should then be refined to take into account the effect of rare regions (tails in the distributions). Different classes of rare regions can be identified according to their
dimension $d_{\text{rare}}$ (in the discussion of the dilute ferromagnetic system we used $d_{\text{rare}} = d$). This leaves place for three possibilities for the effect of (still weak in the sense of not having frustration) disorder on the phase transition.

- The rare regions have dimension $d_{\text{rare}}$ smaller than the lower critical dimension of the pure problem, $d_{\text{rare}} < d_L$; therefore the critical behaviour is not modified with respect to the one of the clean problem.

- When the rare regions have dimension equal to the lower-critical one, $d_{\text{rare}} = d_L$, the critical point is still of second order with conventional power law scaling but with different exponents that vary in the Griffiths phase. At the disordered critical point the Harris criterion is satisfied $d_{\text{dis}} > 2$.

- Infinite randomness strength, appearing mostly in problems with correlated disorder, lead to a complete change in the critical properties, with unconventional activated scaling. This occurs when $d_{\text{rare}} > d_L$.

In the derivation of this scenario the rare regions are supposed to act independently, with no interactions among them. This picture is therefore limited to systems with short-range interactions.

### 5.5.5 Domain-wall stiffness and droplets

Let us now just discuss one simple argument that is at the basis of what is needed to derive the droplet theory for disordered magnets and spin-glasses, without entering into the complications of the calculations. Let us summarise the kind of fluctuations expected at high, critical and low temperatures.

At very high temperature the configurations are disordered and one does not see large patches of ordered spins.

Close but above the critical temperature $T_c$ finite patches of the system are ordered (in all possible low-temperature equilibrium states) but none of these include a finite fraction of the spins in the sample and the magnetization density vanishes. However, these patches are enough to generate non-trivial thermodynamic properties very close to $T_c$ and the richness of critical phenomena.

At criticality one observes ordered domains of the two equilibrium states at all length scales – with fractal properties.

Below the critical temperature thermal fluctuations induce the spin reversal with respect to the order selected by the spontaneous symmetry breaking. It is clear that the structure of droplets, meaning patches in which the spins point in the opposite direction to the one of the background ordered state, plays an important role in the thermodynamic behaviour at low temperatures.

M. Fisher and others developed a droplet phenomenological theory for critical phenomena in clean systems. Later D. S. Fisher and D. Huse extended these arguments to
describe the effects of quenched disorder in spin-glasses and other random systems; this is the so-called \textit{droplet model}.\footnote{\textit{Quenched random systems} describe the effects of quenched disorder in spin-glasses and other random systems; this is the so-called \textit{droplet model}.}

\textit{Domain-wall stiffness}\footnote{\textit{Domain-wall stiffness}\footnote{Ordered phases resist spatial variations of their order parameter. This property is called \textit{stiffness} or \textit{rigidity} and it is absent in high-temperature disordered phases. More precisely, in an ordered phase the \textit{free-energy cost} for changing one part of the system with respect to another part far away is proportional to $k_B T$ and usually diverges as a power law of the system size. In a disordered phase the information about the reversed part propagates only a finite distance (of the order of the correlation length, see below) and the stiffness vanishes. Concretely, the free-energy cost of installing a \textit{domain-wall} in a system, gives a measure of the stiffness of a phase. The domain wall can be imposed by special boundary conditions. Compare then the free-energy of an Ising model with linear length $L$, in its ordered phase, with periodic and anti-periodic boundary conditions on one Cartesian direction and periodic boundary conditions on the $d-1$ other directions of a $d$-dimensional hypercube. The $\pm$ boundary conditions forces an interface between the regions with positive and negative magnetisations. At $T=0$, the minimum energy interface is a $d-1$ flat hyper-plane and the energy cost is}

Ordered phases resist spatial variations of their order parameter. This property is called \textit{stiffness} or \textit{rigidity} and it is absent in high-temperature disordered phases.

More precisely, in an ordered phase the \textit{free-energy cost} for changing one part of the system with respect to another part far away is proportional to $k_B T$ and usually diverges as a power law of the system size. In a disordered phase the information about the reversed part propagates only a finite distance (of the order of the correlation length, see below) and the stiffness vanishes.

Concretely, the free-energy cost of installing a \textit{domain-wall} in a system, gives a measure of the stiffness of a phase. The domain wall can be imposed by special boundary conditions. Compare then the free-energy of an Ising model with linear length $L$, in its ordered phase, with periodic and anti-periodic boundary conditions on one Cartesian direction and periodic boundary conditions on the $d-1$ other directions of a $d$-dimensional hypercube. The $\pm$ boundary conditions forces an interface between the regions with positive and negative magnetisations. At $T=0$, the minimum energy interface is a $d-1$ flat hyper-plane and the energy cost is

$$\Delta E(L) \simeq \sigma L^\theta \quad \text{with} \quad \theta = d - 1$$

and $\sigma = 2J$ the \textit{interfacial energy per unit area} or the \textit{surface tension} of the domain wall.

\textit{Droplets - generalisation of the Peierls argument} \footnote{\textit{Droplets - generalisation of the Peierls argument}\footnote{In an ordered system at finite temperature domain walls, surrounding \textit{droplet fluctuations}, or domains with reversed spins with respect to the bulk order, are naturally generated by thermal fluctuations. The study of droplet fluctuations is useful to establish whether an ordered phase can exist at low (but finite) temperatures. One then studies the free-energy cost for creating large droplets with thermal fluctuations that may destabilise the ordered phase, in the way usually done in the simple Ising chain (the Peierls argument).}

In an ordered system at finite temperature domain walls, surrounding \textit{droplet fluctuations}, or domains with reversed spins with respect to the bulk order, are naturally generated by thermal fluctuations. The study of droplet fluctuations is useful to establish whether an ordered phase can exist at low (but finite) temperatures. One then studies the free-energy cost for creating large droplets with thermal fluctuations that may destabilise the ordered phase, in the way usually done in the simple Ising chain (the Peierls argument).

Indeed, temperature generates fluctuations of different size and the question is whether these are favourable or not. These are the \textit{droplet excitations} made by simply connected regions (domains) with spins reversed with respect to the ordered state. Because of the surface tension, the minimal energy droplets with linear size or radius $L$ will be compact spherical-like objects with volume $L^d$ and surface $L^{d-1}$. The surface determines their energy and, at finite temperature, an entropic contribution has to be taken into account as well. Simplifying, one argues that the free-energy cost is of the order of $L^\theta$, that is $L^{d-1}$ in the ferromagnetic case but can be different in disordered systems.

Summarising, in system with symmetry breaking the free-energy cost of an excitation of linear size $L$ is expected to scale as

$$\Delta F(L) \simeq \sigma(T)L^\theta.$$
The sign of $\theta$ determines whether thermal fluctuations destroy the ordered phase or not. For $\theta > 0$ large excitations are costly and very unlikely to occur; the order phase is expected to be stable. For $\theta < 0$ instead large scale excitations cost little energy and one can expect that the gain in entropy due to the large choice in the position of these excitations will render the free-energy variation negative. A proliferation of droplets and droplets within droplets is expected and the ordered phase will be destroyed by thermal fluctuations. The case $\theta = 0$ is marginal and its analysis needs the use of other methods.

As the phase transition is approached from below the surface tension $\sigma(T)$ should vanish. Moreover, one expects that the stiffness should be independent of length close to $T_c$ and therefore, $\theta_c = 0$.

Above the transition the stiffness should decay exponentially

$$\Delta F(L) \simeq e^{-L/\xi}$$

with $\xi$ the equilibrium correlation length.

### 5.5.6 Stability of ordered phases

The classical nucleation theory (CNT) considers the thermally induced generation of stable phase droplets in the metastable surrounding.

**A ferromagnet under a magnetic field**

Let us study the stability properties of an equilibrium ferromagnetic phase under an applied external field that tends to destabilize it. If we set $T = 0$ the free-energy is just the energy. In the ferromagnetic case the free-energy cost of a spherical droplet of radius $R$ of the equilibrium phase parallel to the applied field embedded in the dominant one (see Fig. 5.9-left) is

$$\Delta F(R) = -2\Omega_d R^d h m_{eq} + \Omega_{d-1} R^{d-1} \sigma_0$$

where $\sigma_0$ is the interfacial free-energy density (the energy cost of the domain wall) and $\Omega_d$ is the volume of a $d$-dimensional unit sphere. We assume here that the droplet has a regular surface and volume such that they are proportional to $R^d$ and $R^d$, respectively. The excess free-energy reaches a maximum

$$\Delta F_c = \frac{(d-1)^{d-1} \Omega_{d-1} \sigma_0}{d \Omega_d (2h m_{eq})}$$

at the critical radius

$$R_c = \frac{(d-1) \Omega_{d-1} \sigma_0}{d \Omega_d (2h m_{eq})}$$

see Fig. 5.9-right ($h > 0$ and $m_{eq} > 0$ here, the signs have already been taken into account). The free-energy difference vanishes at

$$\Delta F(R_0) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad R_0 = \frac{\Omega_{d-1} \sigma_0}{\Omega_d (2h m_{eq})}.$$
Several features are to be stressed:

- The barrier vanishes in $d = 1$; indeed, the free-energy is a linear function of $R$ in this case.

- Both $R_c$ and $R_0$ have the same dependence on $hm_{eq}/\sigma_0$: they monotonically decrease with increasing $hm_{eq}/\sigma_0$ vanishing for $hm_{eq}/\sigma_0 \to \infty$ and diverging for $hm_{eq}/\sigma_0 \to 0$.

- In dynamic terms, the passage above the barrier is done via thermal activation; as soon as the system has reached the height of the barrier it rolls on the right side of the ‘potential’ $\Delta F$ and the favourable phase nucleates. It is then postulated that the nucleation time is inversely proportional to the probability of generation of the critical droplet, $t^{-1}_{nuc} \sim P(R_c) \sim e^{-\beta \Delta F(R_c)}$.

- As long as the critical size $R_c$ is not reached the droplet is not favorable and the system remains positively magnetised.

- In models defined on a lattice, or with anisotropic interactions, the droplets need not be spherical and the particular form they may take has an impact on the results derived above that have to be modified accordingly.

The Imry-Ma argument for the random field Ising model at $T = 0$

Take a ferromagnetic Ising model in a random field, defined in eq. (5.37). In zero applied field and low enough temperature, one may expect a phase transition between a ferromagnetic and a paramagnetic phase at a critical value of the variance of the random fields, $\sigma^2_h = [h^2] \propto h^2$, that sets the scale of the values that these random fields can take. Under the effect of a random field with very strong typical strength, the spins align with the local external fields that point in both directions and the system is paramagnetic. It is, however, non-trivial to determine the effect of a relatively weak random field on the...
ferromagnetic phase at sufficiently low temperature. The long-range ferromagnetic order could be preserved or else the field could be enough to break up the system into large but finite domains of the two ferromagnetic phases.

A qualitative argument to decide whether the ferromagnetic phase survives or not in presence of the external random field is due to Imry and Ma [39]. Let us fix $T = 0$ and switch on a random field. If a compact domain $D$ of the opposite order (say down) is created within the bulk of the ordered state (say up) the system pays an energy due to the unsatisfied links lying on the boundary that is

\[ \Delta E_{\text{border}} \sim 2JR^{d-1} \]  

(5.67)

where $R$ is the radius of the domain and $d-1$ is the dimension of the border of a domain embedded in a $d$ dimensional volume, assuming the interface is not fractal. By creating a domain boundary the system can also gain a magnetic energy in the interior of the domain due to the external field:

\[ \Delta E_{\text{random field}} \sim -hR^{d/2} \]  

(5.68)

since there are $N \propto R^d$ spins inside the domain of linear scale $R$ (assuming now that the bulk of the domain is not fractal) and, using the central limit theorem, $-h \sum_{j \in D} s_i \sim -h\sqrt{N} \propto -hR^{d/2}$. $h \approx \sigma_h$ is the width of the random field distribution. In this discussion we neglected all geometric prefactors that are not important to understand the main parameter dependence in the problem.

**One dimensional systems.** In $d = 1$ the energy difference is a monotonically decreasing function of $R$ thus suggesting that the creation of droplets is very favourable. There is no barrier to cross to do it. The larger the droplets to form, the better. The system fully disorders.

**Dimension lower than two.** For any $d < 2$, for small $R$, the modulus of the random field energy, $\Delta E_{\text{rand field}}$, increases faster with $R$ than the domain wall energy, $\Delta E_{\text{border}}$. Therefore, $\Delta E$ takes, initially, negative values. For all non-vanishing random fields, there is a critical $R$ below which forming domains that align with the local random field becomes favourable. Seen as a function of $R$, the energy function has a minimum at an $R_c$ that is conveniently written as

\[ R_c \sim \left( \frac{J}{h} \right)^{\frac{2}{2-d}} \]  

(5.69)

that increases with $J/h \uparrow$

and later crosses zero at an $R_0$ that scales with $J/h$ in the same way. In particular,

\[ R_0 \propto R_c \to \infty \quad \text{for} \quad h/J \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad d < 2 \, . \]  

(5.70)

We note that while this energy function is negative, and this is the case for all $R$ in the limit $h \to 0$ in $d < 2$, it is convenient for the system to reverse droplets with radius $R < R_0$ and thus break the ferromagnetic order in pieces eventually disordering the full system.
Consequently, the uniform ferromagnetic state is unstable against domain formation for arbitrary random field strength. In other words, in dimensions $d < 2$ random-field disorder prevents spontaneous symmetry breaking. In the resulting Imry-Ma state there is only short-range ordering within randomly oriented domains of average size $R_0$ which depends on the ratio $J/h$ in the form given above.

**Dimension equal to two.** This is a marginal case. The function $\Delta E(R)$ is linear and the slope depends on the sign of $2J - h$ (but we neglected many numerical factors) and a more refined study is needed to decide what the system does in this case.

**Dimension larger than two.** The functional form of the total energy variation $\Delta E = \Delta E_{\text{border}} + \Delta E_{\text{random field}}$ as a function of $R$ is again characterised by $\Delta E \to 0$ for $R \to 0$ and $\Delta E \to \infty$ for $R \to \infty$. The function has a minimum at

$$R_c \sim \left(\frac{h}{J}\right)^{\frac{2}{d-2}}$$

that increases with $h/J \uparrow$ (5.71)

and crosses zero at $R_0 \propto R_c$ to approach $\infty$ at $R \to \infty$. The comparison between these two energy scales yields

$$2JR_0^{d-1} \sim hR_0^{d/2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad R_0 \sim \left(\frac{h}{2J}\right)^{\frac{2}{d-2}}$$

In particular,

$$R_0 \propto R_c \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad h/J \to 0 . \quad (5.73)$$

Therefore, in $d > 2$ the energy difference also decreases from $\Delta E(R = 0) = 0$ to reach a negative minimum at $R_c$, and then increases back to pass through zero at $R_0$ and diverge at infinity. The main difference with the $d < 2$ case is the dependence of $R_c$ and $R_0$ with $h/J$, the fact that both vanish, for $h/J \to 0$ in $d > 2$. In consequence, in $d > 2$, under an infinitesimal field, it is not favourable to reverse domains and long-range ferromagnetic order can be sustained in the sample.

In the arguments above, it has been very important the change in parameter dependence of the $R_0$ occurring in $d = 2$,

$$\lim_{h/J \to 0} R_0(h/J) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad d > 2 , \\ \infty & \text{if} \quad d < 2 . \end{cases} \quad (5.74)$$

With this argument one cannot show the existence of a phase transition at $h_c$ nor the nature of it. The argument is such that it suggests that order can be supported by the system at zero temperature and small fields in $d > 2$.

We stress that these results hold for short-range correlated disorder. Otherwise, the scaling will be different and the conclusions can differ as well.

The argument has at least two drawbacks that have been discussed in the literature and shown to be not important for the final conclusions. One is that one should count the number of possible contours with a given length to take into account an entropic
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Figure 5.10: The excess free-energy $\Delta F$ as a function of the radius of the droplet in the RFIM, that is to say, the sum of Eq. (5.67) and Eq. (5.68), for the parameters given in the two panels. Notice that $d < 2$ in the left panel and $d > 2$ in the right one.

contribution to the bubble’s free-energy density at non-vanishing temperature. Another one is that one should consider the possibility of there being contours within contours. Both problems have been taken care of, see e.g. [29].

There are rigorous proofs that random fields destroy long-range order (and thus prevent spontaneous symmetry breaking) in all dimensions $d \leq 2$ for discrete (Ising) symmetry and in dimensions $d \leq 4$ for continuous (Heisenberg) symmetry [28]. The existence of a phase transition from a FM to a PM state at zero temperature in $3d$ was shown in [29].

An elastic line in a random potential

A similar argument has been put forward by Larkin [31] for the random manifold problem.

The interfacial tension, $\sigma$, will tend to make an interface, forced into a system as flat as possible. However, this will be resisted by thermal fluctuations and, in a system with random impurities, by quenched disorder.

Let us take an interface model of the type defined in eq. (5.39) with $N = 1$. If one assumes that the interface makes an excursion of longitudinal length $L$ and transverse length $\phi$ the elastic energy cost is

$$E_{\text{elast}} = \frac{c}{2} \int d^d x \left( \nabla \phi(\vec{x}) \right)^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Delta E_{\text{elast}} \sim c L^d (L^{-1} \phi)^2 = c L^{d-2} \phi^2$$

(5.75)

Ignore for the moment the random potential. Thermal fluctuations cause fluctuations of the kind shown in Fig. 5.11. The interfaces roughens, that is to say, it deviates from being flat. Its mean-square displacement between two point $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{y}$, or its width on a scale $L$ satisfies

$$\langle [\phi(\vec{x}) - \phi(\vec{y})]^2 \rangle \sim T |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|^{2\zeta_T}$$

(5.76)

with $\zeta_T$ the roughness exponent.
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Figure 5.11: Illustration of an interface modeled as a directed manifold. In the example, the domain wall separates a region with positive magnetisation (above) from one with negative magnetisation (below). The line represents a lowest energy configuration that deviates from a flat one due to the quenched randomness. An excitation on a length-scale $L$ is shown with a dashed line. The relative displacement is $\delta h \equiv \delta \phi \simeq L^\alpha$ and the excitation energy $\Delta E(L) \simeq L^\theta$. Figure taken from [40].

The elastic energy cost of an excitation of length $L$ is then

$$\Delta E_{\text{elast}}(L) \simeq cL^{d-2}\phi^2(L) \simeq cTL^{d-2}L^{2\zeta_T}$$

and this is of order one if

$$\zeta_T = \frac{2 - d}{2}. \quad (5.78)$$

In the presence of quenched randomness, the deformation energy cost competes with gains in energy obtained from finding more optimal regions of the random potential. Naively, the energy gain due to the randomness is

$$\int d^d x \ V \simeq [W^2 L^d]^{1/2} \simeq WL^{d/2} \quad (5.79)$$

and the balance with the elastic cost, assumed to be the same as with no disorder, yields

$$cTL^{d-2}L^{2\zeta_D} \simeq WL^{d/2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \zeta_D = \frac{4 - d}{2} \quad (5.80)$$

This result turns out to be an upper bound of the exponent value [40]. It is called the Flory exponent for the roughness of the surface. One then concludes that for $d > 4$ disorder is irrelevant and the interface is flat ($\phi \to 0$ when $L \to \infty$). Since the linearization of the elastic energy [see the discussion leading to eq. (5.39)] holds only if $\phi/L \ll 1$, the result (5.80) may hold only for $d > 1$ where $\alpha < 1$.

Destruction of first order phase transitions under randomness

38
A first order phase transition is characterized by macroscopic phase coexistence at the transition point. For example, at the liquid-gas phase transition of a fluid, a macroscopic liquid phase coexists with a macroscopic vapour phase. Random-mass disorder locally favours one phase over the other. The question is whether the macroscopic phases survive in the presence of disorder or the system forms domains (droplets) that follow the local value of the random-mass.

Consider a single domain or droplet (of linear size $L$) of one phase embedded in the other phase. The free energy cost due to forming the surface is

$$\Delta F_{\text{surf}} \sim \sigma L^{d-1}$$

(5.81)

where $\sigma$ is the surface energy between the two phases. The energy gain from the random-mass disorder can be estimated via the central limit theorem, resulting in a typical magnitude of

$$|\Delta F_{\text{dis}}| \sim W^{1/2} L^{d/2}$$

(5.82)

where $W$ is the variance of the random-mass disorder. (We are here loosely using free-energy language either because we work at zero temperature or because we assume that the scalings of free-energies and energies are the same.) Note the similarity of these scalings with the ones derived for the random Ising model.

The macroscopic phases are stable if $|\Delta F_{\text{dis}}| < \Delta F_{\text{surf}}$, but this is impossible in dimensions $d \leq 2$ no matter how weak the disorder is. In dimensions $d > 2$, phase coexistence is possible for weak disorder but will be destabilized for sufficiently strong disorder.

We thus conclude that random-mass disorder destroys first-order phase transitions in dimensions $d \leq 2$. In many examples, the first-order transition is replaced by (‘rounded to’) a continuous one, but more complicated scenarios cannot be excluded.
The 3d Edwards-Anderson model in a uniform magnetic field

A very similar reasoning is used to argue that there cannot be spin-glass order in an Edwards-Anderson model in an external field [41, 42]. The only difference is that the domain wall energy is here assumed to be proportional to $L^y$ with an \(a priori\) unknown \(d\)-dependent exponent \(y\) that is related to the geometry of the domains.

Comments

These arguments are easy to implement when one knows the equilibrium states (or one assumes what they are). They cannot be used in models in which the energy is not a slowly varying function of the domain wall characteristics.

5.5.7 Consequences of the gauge invariance

H. Nishimori used the gauge transformation to derive a series of exact results for averaged observables of finite dimensional disordered systems [11].

The idea follows the steps by which one easily proves, for example, that the averaged local magnetisation of a ferromagnetic Ising model vanishes, that is to say, one applies a transformation of variables within the partition sum and evaluates the consequences over the averaged observables. For example,

\[
\langle s_i \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\{s_j=\pm 1\}} s_i e^{\beta J \sum_{ij} s_i s_j} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\{s_j=\pm 1\}} (-s_i) e^{\beta J \sum_{ij} s_i s_j} = -\langle s_i \rangle .
\]  

(5.83)

This immediately implies \(\langle s_i \rangle = 0\) and, more generally, the fact that the average of any odd function under \(\{s_i\} \rightarrow \{-s_i\}\) vanishes exactly.

In the case of disordered Ising systems, one is interested in observables that are averaged over the random variables weighted with their probability distribution. The gauge transformation that leaves the Hamiltonian unchanged involves a change of spins accompanied by a transformation of the exchanges:

\[
\bar{s_i} = \eta_i s_i \quad \bar{J}_{ij} = \eta_i \eta_j J_{ij}
\]

(5.84)

with \(\eta_i = \pm 1\). The latter affects the couplings probability distribution as this one, in general, is not gauge invariant. For instance, the bimodal pdf \(P(J_{ij}) = p \delta(J_{ij} - J) + (1 - p) \delta(J_{ij} + J)\) can be rewritten as

\[
P(J_{ij}) = \frac{e^{K_p J_{ij}/J}}{2 \cosh K_p} \quad \text{with} \quad e^{2K_p} = \frac{p}{1 - p} ,
\]

(5.85)

as one can simply check. \(\tau_{ij} \equiv J_{ij}/J\) are just the signs of the \(J_{ij}\). Under the gauge transformation \(P(J_{ij})\) transforms as

\[
\bar{P}(\bar{J}_{ij}) d\bar{J}_{ij} = P(J_{ij}) dJ_{ij} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{P}(\bar{J}_{ij}) = P(J_{ij}(\bar{J}_{ij})) \frac{dJ_{ij}}{d\bar{J}_{ij}}
\]

(5.86)
that implies
\[
\overline{P}(J_{ij}) = \frac{e^{K_p J_{ij} / (\eta_i \eta_j)}}{2 \cosh K_p} \frac{1}{\eta_i \eta_j} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \overline{P}(J_{ij}) = \frac{e^{K_p J_{ij} / \eta_i \eta_j}}{2 \cosh K_p} \tag{5.87}
\]

For instance, applying the gauge transformation to the internal energy of an Ising spin-glass model with bimodal disorder, after a series of straightforward transformations one finds

\[[(H_{J})]_J = -N_B J \tanh K_p \tag{5.88}\]

with \(N_B\) the number of bonds in the lattice, under the condition \(\beta J = K_p\). This relation holds for any lattice. The constraint \(\beta J = K_p\) relates the inverse temperature \(J / (k_B T)\) and the probability \(p = (\tanh K_p + 1)/2\). The curve \(\beta J = K_p\) connects the points \((p = 1, T = 0)\) and \((p = 1/2, T \to \infty)\) in the \((p, T)\) phase diagram and it is called the \textit{Nishimori line}.

The proof of the relation above goes as follows. The full pdf of the interactions is

\[P(\{J_{ij}\}) = \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} P(J_{ij}) \tag{5.89}\]

and the average of any disorder dependent quantity is expressed as

\[\langle A_J \rangle = \sum_{\{J_{ij} = \pm J\}} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} P(J_{ij}) A_J \tag{5.90}\]

The disorder average Hamiltonian reads

\[\langle [H_{J}] \rangle_J = \sum_{\{J_{ij}\}} \frac{e^{K_p \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} / J}}{(2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \frac{\sum_{\{s_i\}} (-\sum_{ij} J_{ij} s_i s_j)}{\sum_{\{s_i\}} e^{\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} s_i s_j}} \tag{5.91}\]

with \(N_B\) the number of bonds in the graph or lattice. Performing the gauge transformation

\[\langle [H_{J}] \rangle_J = \sum_{\{J_{ij}\}} \frac{e^{K_p \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \eta_i \eta_j / J}}{(2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \frac{\sum_{\{s_i\}} (-\sum_{ij} J_{ij} s_i s_j)}{\sum_{\{s_i\}} e^{\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} s_i s_j}} \tag{5.92}\]

where gauge invariance of the Hamiltonian has been used and the spins and interactions have been renamed \(J_{ij}\) and \(s_i\). As this is independent of the choice of the parameters \(\eta_i\) used in the transformation, one can sum over all possible \(2^N\) choices and divide by this number keeping the result unchanged:

\[\langle [H_{J}] \rangle_J = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\{\eta_i\}} \frac{e^{K_p \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} \eta_i \eta_j / J}}{(2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \frac{\sum_{\{s_i\}} (-\sum_{ij} J_{ij} s_i s_j)}{\sum_{\{s_i\}} e^{\beta \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} J_{ij} s_i s_j}} \tag{5.93}\]

If \(\beta\) is chosen to be \(\beta = K_p / J\) the sum over the spins in the denominator (the partition sum in the normalisation) cancels out the sum over the parameters \(\eta_i\) introduced via the gauge
transformation. The sum over \( J_{ij} \) and the remaining sum over the spin configurations can be rewritten

\[
\langle H_J \rangle_J = \frac{1}{2^N (2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \right) \sum_{\{s_i\}} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} \sum_{\{J_{ij} = \pm J\}} e^{\beta J_{ij}s_is_j}.
\]  

(5.94)

Changing now variables in the sum over \( J_{ij} = \pm J \) to \( \tau_{ij} = J_{ij}s_is_j = \pm J \),

\[
\langle H_J \rangle_J = \frac{1}{2^N (2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \right) \sum_{\{s_i\}} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} \sum_{\tau_{ij} = \pm J} e^{\beta \tau_{ij}}
\]

\[= \frac{1}{2^N (2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}} \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \right) 2^N (2 \cosh K_p)^{N_B}, \]

(5.95)

where the sum over the spin configurations yields the \( 2^N \) factor and the sum over the independent \( \tau_{ij} \) configurations yields the last factor. Finally, taking the derivative with respect to \( \beta \):

\[
\langle H_J \rangle_J = -N_B J \tanh K_p
\]

(5.96)

with \( K_p = \beta J \), defining the Nishimori line in the phase diagram.

**Exercise 5.12** For Gaussian distributed quenched randomness there also exists a Nishimori line and the averaged internal energy can also be computed exactly on this line. Work out this case.

Many other relations of this kind exist and are explained in [11]. A timely application appeared recently [47] where the gauge transformation was used to put bounds on the Jarzynski relation [48] for the work done in a non-equilibrium transformation of a spin-glass on the Nishikori line.

### 5.6 Mean-field models

In the previous section we analysed finite dimensional models, with approximation methods and a few exact ones. Here, we focus on what are called mean-field models, or models defined on the complete graph in such a way that the mean-field treatment becomes exact. We present to two techniques: the Thouless-Anderson-Palmer (TAP) approach and the replica trick.

#### 5.6.1 The TAP approach

Disordered models have quenched random interactions. Due to the fluctuating values of the exchanges, one expects that the equilibrium configurations be such that in each equilibrium state the spins freeze in different directions. The local averaged magnetizations need not be identical, on the contrary one expects \( \langle s_i \rangle = m_i \) and, if many states exist, each of them can be identified by the vector \( (m_1, \ldots, m_N) \).
Let us focus on the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model, defined by

$$H_{SK}^{j} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} s_i s_j - \sum_i h_{i}^{\text{ext}} s_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.97)$$

with interaction strengths $J_{ij}$ taken from a Gaussian pdf and scaled with $N$ in such a way that the thermodynamic limit is non-trivial:

$$P(J_{ij}) = (2\pi \sigma_N^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{J_{ij}^2}{2\sigma_N^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.98)$$

and external applied field $h_{i}^{\text{ext}}$. The first two-moments of the exchange distribution are $\langle J_{ij} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle J_{ij}^2 \rangle = \sigma_N^2 = J^2/(2N)$, implying that $J_{ij} \simeq 1/\sqrt{N}$. This scaling is justified by

$$h_{i}^{\text{loc}} \equiv \sum_{j(\neq i)} J_{ij} \langle s_j \rangle \simeq \sum_{j(\neq i)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} m_j \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j(\neq i)} m_j \simeq 1$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.99)$$

because of the central limit theorem. We will use this scaling again below.

One may try to use the naive mean-field equations generalised to local variational parameters $m_i$, to characterise the low temperature properties of these models at fixed quenched disorder:

$$m_i = \tanh (\beta h_{i}^{\text{loc}}) = \tanh \left( \sum_{j(\neq i)} \beta J_{ij} m_j + \beta h_{i}^{\text{ext}} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.100)$$

and determine then the different $\{m_i^\alpha = (m_1^\alpha, \ldots, m_N^\alpha)\}$ values from them, with the label $\alpha$ indicating the possibility of there being many solutions to these equations. It is important to reckon that, in this discussion, the $m_i = \langle s_i \rangle$ are assumed to be average in each thermodynamic state (with no mixture between them).

It has been shown by Thouless-Anderson-Palmer (TAP) [43] that these equations are not completely correct even in the fully-connected disordered case: a term which is called the Onsager reaction term is missing. This term represents the reaction of the spin $i$: the magnetisation of the spin $i$ produces a field $h'_{ij(i)} = J_{ij} m_i = J_{ij} m_i$ on spin $j$; this field induces a magnetisation $m'_{j(i)} = \chi_{ij} h'_{ij(i)} = \chi_{ij} J_{ij} m_i$ on the spin $j$. This magnetisation, in turn, produces a field $h'_{i(j)} = J_{ij} m'_{j(i)} = J_{ij} \chi_{ij} J_{ij} m_i = \chi_{ij} J_{ij}^2 m_i$ on the site $i$. The equilibrium fluctuation-dissipation relation between susceptibilities and connected correlations implies $\chi_{ij} = \beta \langle (s_j - \langle s_j \rangle)^2 \rangle = \beta (1 - m_j^2)$ and one then has $h'_{i(j)} = \beta (1 - m_j^2) J_{ij}^2 m_i$. The idea of Onsager – or cavity method – is that one has to study the ordering of the spin $i$ in the absence of its own effect on the rest of the system. Thus, the total field produced by the sum of $h'_{i(j)} = \beta (1 - m_j^2) J_{ij}^2 m_i$ over all the spins $j$ with which it can connect, has to be subtracted from the mean-field created by the other spins in the sample, i.e.

$$h_{i}^{\text{loc}} = \sum_{j(\neq i)} J_{ij} m_j + h_{i}^{\text{ext}} - \beta m_i \sum_{j(\neq i)} J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_j^2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5.101)$$
where $h_i^{\text{ext}}$ is the external field. The equations then read

$$m_i = \tanh \left[ \sum_{j(\neq i)} (\beta J_{ij} m_j - \beta^2 m_i J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_j^2)) + \beta h_i^{\text{ext}} \right].$$

The reason why the reaction term does not appear in the mean-field equations for ferromagnets is that it is sub-leading with respect to the first one. We now discuss why it is not in the disordered case. Let us study the order of magnitude, as powers of $N$ of each term in the r.h.s. In the first term

$$\sum_{j(\neq i)} m_j \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j(\neq i)} m_j \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j(\neq i)} m_j \simeq 1 \quad (5.102)$$

because of the central limit theorem. In the second term

$$\sum_{j(\neq i)} J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_j^2) \simeq \frac{1}{N} (1 - m_j^2) \simeq 1 \quad (5.103)$$

because all terms in the sum are positive definite. Thus, in disordered systems the reaction term is of the same order as the usual mean-field; a correct mean-field description has to include it. In the ferromagnetic case this term can be neglected since it is sub-leading in $N$, since $J_{ij}^2 = J^2/N^2$ in this case, obtaining $O(1/N)$ for the second term while the first one is $\sum_{j(\neq i)} (1/N) m_j = O(1)$ (since $m_j = m$ in this case).

The argument leading to the Onsager reaction term can be generalised to include the combined effect of the magnetisation of spin $i$ on a sequence of spins (or $p$-spin interactions) in the sample, i.e. the effect on $i$ on $j$ and then on $k$ that comes back to $i$ in the SK model. These higher order terms are indeed negligible only if the series of all higher order effects does not diverge. The ensuing condition is $1 > \beta^2 (1 - 2q_{\text{EA}} + N^{-1} \sum_i m_i^4)$ for the SK model.

Using the fact that there is a sum over a very large number of elements, $J_{ij}^2$ can be replaced by its site-independent variance $[J_{ij}^2] = J^2/N$ in the last term in (5.102). Introducing the Edwards-Anderson parameter $q_{\text{EA}} = N^{-1} \sum_i m_i^2$ the TAP equations follow:

$$m_i = \tanh \left[ \beta \sum_{j(\neq i)} J_{ij} m_j - \beta^2 J^2 m_i^2 (1 - q_{\text{EA}}) + \beta h_i^{\text{ext}} \right]. \quad (5.104)$$

The generalisation of the argument leading to the reaction term to $p$ spin interactions

$$H_J[\{s_i\}] = - \sum_{i_1 < \cdots < i_p} J_{i_1 \cdots i_p} s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_p} \quad \quad \quad [J_{i_1 \cdots i_p}] = \frac{J^2 p!}{2 N^{p-1}} \quad (5.105)$$

is not so straightforward. An alternative derivation has been given by Biroli [44]. The TAP equations for $p$-spin fully connected models read

$$m_i = \tanh \left[ \sum_{i_2 \neq \cdots \neq i_p} \left( \frac{\beta}{(p-1)!} J_{i_2 \cdots i_p} m_{i_2} \cdots m_{i_p} - \beta^2 m_i J_{i_2 \cdots i_p}^2 (1 - m_{i_2}^2) \cdots (1 - m_{i_p}^2) \right) \right]$$
where we set the external field to zero, \( h_i^{\text{ext}} = 0 \). The first contribution to the internal field is proportional to \( J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} \sim N^{-(p-1)/2} \) and once the \( p - 1 \) sums performed it is of order one. The reaction term instead is proportional to \( J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}^2 \) and, again, a simple power counting shows that it is \( O(1) \). Using the fact that there is a sum over a very large number of elements, \( J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}^2 \) can be replaced by its site-independent variance \( [J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}^2] = p! J^2 / (2N^{p-1}) \) in the last term in (5.106). Introducing the Edwards-Anderson parameter \( q_{\text{EA}} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N m_i^2 \) the TAP equations follow:

\[
m_i = \tanh \left[ \frac{\beta}{(p-1)!} \sum_{i_2 \neq \ldots \neq i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} m_{i_1} \ldots m_{i_p} - \frac{\beta^2 J^2 p}{2} m_i (1 - q_{\text{EA}})^{p-1} + \beta h_i^{\text{ext}} \right].
\]

The importance of the reaction term becomes clear from the analysis of the linearised equations, expected to describe the second order critical behaviour for the SK model \((p = 2)\) in the absence of an applied field. The TAP equations become

\[
m_i \sim \beta \sum_{j \neq (\neq i)} J_{ij} m_j - \beta^2 J^2 m_i + \beta h_i^{\text{ext}}. \tag{5.106}
\]

A change of basis to the one in which the \( J_{ij} \) matrix is diagonal leads to \( m_\lambda \sim \beta (J_\lambda - \beta J^2) m_\lambda + \beta h_\lambda^{\text{ext}} \). The notation we use is such that \( J_\lambda \) is an eigenvalue of the \( J_{ij} \) matrix associated to the eigenvector \( \vec{v}_\lambda \). \( m_\lambda \) represents the projection of \( \vec{m} \) on the eigenvector \( \vec{v}_\lambda \), \( m_\lambda = \vec{v}_\lambda \cdot \vec{m} \), with \( \vec{m} \) the \( N \)-vector with components \( m_i \). The \textit{staggered susceptibility} then reads

\[
\chi_\lambda = \frac{\partial m_\lambda}{\partial h_\lambda^{\text{ext}}} \bigg|_{h_\lambda^{\text{ext}} = 0} = \beta \left( 1 - \beta J_\lambda + (\beta J)^2 \right)^{-1}. \tag{5.107}
\]

Random matrix theory tells us that the eigenvalues of the random matrix \( J_{ij} \) are distributed with the semi-circle law. For the normalisation of the \( J_{ij} \)'s that we used, the largest eigenvalue is \( J_\lambda^{\text{max}} = 2J \) [45]. The staggered susceptibility for the largest eigenvalue diverges at \( \beta_c J = 1 \). Note that without the reaction term the divergence appears at the inexact value \( T^* = 2T_c \) (see Sect. 5.6.3 for the replica solution of the SK model).

The TAP equations are the extremization conditions on the \textit{TAP free-energy density}:

\[
f_J^{\text{TAP}}(\{m_i\}) = -\frac{1}{p!} \sum_{i_1 \neq \ldots \neq i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} m_{i_1} \ldots m_{i_p} - \frac{\beta}{4p} \sum_{i_1 \neq \ldots \neq i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p}^2 (1 - m_{i_1}^2) \ldots (1 - m_{i_p}^2) - \sum_i h_i^{\text{ext}} m_i + T \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \frac{1 + m_i}{2} \ln \frac{1 + m_i}{2} + \frac{1 - m_i}{2} \ln \frac{1 - m_i}{2} \right]. \tag{5.108}
\]
are different. The stability properties of each extreme \( \{m_{i}^{\alpha}\} \) are given by the eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix

\[
H_{ij}^{J} = \left. \frac{\partial f_{i}^{\text{tap}}(\{m_{k}\})}{\partial m_{i} \partial m_{j}} \right|_{\{m_{i}^{\alpha}\}} .
\]  

(5.109)

The number of positive, negative and vanishing eigenvalues determine then the number of directions in which the extreme is a minimum, a maximum or marginal. The sets \( \{m_{i}^{\alpha}\} \) for which \( f_{i}^{\text{tap}}(\{m_{i}^{\alpha}\}) \) is the absolute minima yield a first definition of equilibrium or pure states.

The TAP equations apply to \( \{m_{i}\} \) and not to the configurations \( \{s_{i}\} \). The values of the \( \{m_{i}^{\alpha}\} \) are determined as extrema of the TAP free-energy density, \( f_{i}^{\text{tap}}(\{m_{i}\}) \), and they not need to be the same as those of the energy, \( H_{ij}(\{s_{i}\}) \), a confusion sometimes encountered in the glassy literature. The coincidence of the two can only occur at \( T \to 0 \).

The complexity or configurational entropy

There are a number of interesting questions about the extrema of the TAP free-energy landscape, or even its simpler version in which the Onsager term is neglected, that help us understanding the static behaviour of disordered systems:

- For a given temperature, \( T \), how many solutions to the mean-field equations exist? The total number of solutions can be calculated using

\[
\mathcal{N}_{J}(T) = \prod_{i} \int_{-1}^{1} dm_{i} \delta(m_{i} - m_{i}^{\alpha}) = \prod_{i} \int_{-1}^{1} dm_{i} \delta(\text{eq}_{i}^{J}) \left| \det \frac{\partial \text{eq}_{i}^{J}}{\partial m_{j}} \right| .
\]  

(5.110)
\{m_i^\alpha\} are the solutions to the TAP equations that we write as \{eq_{i'} = 0\}. The last factor is the normalization of the delta function after the change of variables, it ensures that we count one each time the integration variables touch a solution to the TAP equations independently of their stability properties. We made explicit the fact the this quantity depends on temperature.

We define the complexity or configurational entropy as the logarithm of the number of solutions at temperature \(T\) divided by \(N\):

\[
\Sigma_J(T) \equiv N^{-1} \ln \mathcal{N}_J(T) .
\]  
(5.111)

The normalization with \(N\) suggests that the number of solutions is actually an exponential of \(N\). We shall come back to this very important point below.

- Does \(\mathcal{N}_J(T)\) depend on \(T\) and does it change abruptly at particular values of \(T\) that may or may not coincide with static and dynamic phase transitions?

- One can define a free-energy level dependent complexity

\[
\Sigma_J(f, T) \equiv N^{-1} \ln \mathcal{N}_J(f, T)
\]  
(5.112)

where \(\mathcal{N}_J(f, T)\) is the number solutions in the interval \([f, f + df]\) at temperature \(T\).

- From these solutions, one can identify the minima as well as all saddles of different type, i.e. with different indices \(K\). These are different kinds of metastable states. Geometry constrains the number of metastable states to satisfy Morse theorem that states \(\sum_{l=1}^{\mathcal{N}_J} (-1)^{\kappa_l} = 1\), where \(\kappa_l\) is the number of negative eigenvalues of the Hessian evaluated at the solution \(l\), for any continuous and well-behaved function diverging at infinity in all directions. (For example, in a one-dimensional double-well function, one has \((-1)^0 + (-1)^1 + (-1)^0 = 1\).)

One can then count the number of solutions to the TAP equations of each index, \(\mathcal{N}_J(K, T)\), and define the corresponding complexity

\[
\Sigma_J(K, T) \equiv N^{-1} \ln \mathcal{N}_J(K, T) ,
\]  
(5.113)

or even work at fixed free-energy density

\[
\Sigma_J(K, f, T) \equiv N^{-1} \ln \mathcal{N}_J(K, f, T) .
\]  
(5.114)

Even more interestingly, one can analyse how are the free-energy densities of different saddles organized. For instance, one can check whether all maxima are much higher in free-energy density than saddles of a given type, etc.

- What is the barrier, \(\Delta f = f_1 - f_0\), between ground states and first excited states? How does this barrier scale with the actual free-energy difference, \(\Delta f\) between these states? To answer this question one has to estimate the nucleation radius for the reversal of a droplet under an applied field, for instance.
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The definitions of complexity given above are disorder-dependent. One might then expect that the complexity will show sample-to-sample fluctuations and be characterized by a probability distribution. The quenched complexity, $\Sigma^{\text{quenched}}$, is then the most likely value of $\Sigma_J$, and it is defined through

$$\max P(\Sigma_J) = P(\Sigma^{\text{quenched}}) . \quad (5.115)$$

In practice, this is very difficult to compute. Most analytic results concern the annealed complexity

$$\Sigma_{\text{ann}} \equiv N^{-1} \ln |\mathcal{N}_J| = N^{-1} \ln [e^{N\Sigma_J}] . \quad (5.116)$$

One can show that the annealed complexity is smaller or equal than the quenched one.

**Weighted averages**

Having identified many solutions to the TAP equations one needs to determine now how to compute statistical averages. A natural proposal is to give a probability weight to each solution, $w_\alpha$, and to use it to average the value of the observable of interest:

$$\langle O \rangle = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J O_\alpha \quad \text{with} \quad O_\alpha = O(\{m_i^\alpha\}) \quad (5.117)$$

where $\alpha$ labels the TAP solutions, $O_\alpha$ is the value that the observable $O$ takes in the TAP solution $\alpha$, and $w_\alpha^J$ are their statistical weights, satisfying the normalization condition $\sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J = 1$. Two examples can illustrate the meaning of this average. In a spin-glass problem, if $O = s_i$, then $O_\alpha = m_i^\alpha$. In an Ising model in its ferromagnetic phase, if $O = s_i$, then $O_\alpha = m_i^\alpha = \pm m$ and $w_\alpha = 1/2$. Within the TAP approach one proposes

$$w_\alpha^J = \frac{e^{-\beta F_\alpha^J}}{\sum_\gamma e^{-\beta F_\gamma^J}} \quad (5.118)$$

with $F_\alpha^J$ the total free-energy of the $\alpha$-solution to the TAP equations. The discrete sum can be transformed into an integral over free-energy densities, introducing the degeneracy of solutions quantified by the free-energy density dependent complexity:

$$\langle O \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_J} \int df \ e^{-N\beta f} \mathcal{N}_J(f, T) \ O(f) = \frac{1}{Z_J} \int df \ e^{-N(\beta f - \Sigma_J(f, T))} \ O(f) . \quad (5.119)$$

The normalization is the ‘partition function’

$$Z_J = \int df \ e^{-N\beta f} \mathcal{N}_J(f, T) = \int df \ e^{-N(\beta f - \Sigma_J(f, T))} . \quad (5.120)$$

We assumed that the labelling by $\alpha$ can be traded by a labelling by $f$ that implies that at the same free-energy density level $f$ the observable $O$ takes the same value. In the $N \to \infty$ limit these integrals can be evaluated by saddle-point, provided the parenthesis
is positive. In order to simplify the calculations, the disorder-dependent complexity is generally approximated with the annealed value introduced in eq. (5.116).

**The equilibrium free-energy**

The total equilibrium free-energy density, using the saddle-point method to evaluate the partition function $Z_J$ in eq. (5.120), reads

$$-\beta f_{eq}^J = N^{-1} \ln Z_J = \min_f [f - k_B T \Sigma_J(f, T)] \equiv \min_f \Phi_J(f, T).$$

(5.121)

It is clear that $\Phi_J(f, T)$ is the *Landau free-energy density* of the problem with $f$ playing the rôle of the energy and $\Sigma_J$ of the entropy. If we use $f = (E - k_B T S)/N = e - T s$ with $E$ the actual energy and $S$ the microscopic entropy one has

$$\Phi_J(f, T) = e - k_B T (s + \Sigma_J(f, T)).$$

(5.122)

Thus, $\Sigma_J$ is an extra contribution to the total entropy that is due to the exponentially large number of metastable states. Note that we do not distinguish here their stability.

Note that $\Sigma_J$ is subtracted from TAP free-energy level $f$. Thus, it is possible that in some cases states lying at a *higher free-energy density* $f$ but being *very numerous* have a *lower total Landau free-energy density* $\Phi$ than lower lying states that are less numerous. Collectively, higher states dominate the equilibrium measure in these cases. This phenomenon actually occurs in $p$-spin models, as explained below.

**The order parameter**

Now that we know that there can be a large number of states (defined as extrema of the TAP free-energy) we have to be careful about the definition of the spin-glass order parameter.

The *Edwards-Anderson parameter* is understood as a *property of a single state*. Within the TAP formalism one then has

$$q_{EA}^\alpha = N^{-1} \sum_i (m_i^\alpha)^2 \quad \text{with} \quad m_i^\alpha = \langle s_i \rangle_\alpha$$

(5.123)

being restricted to spin configurations in state $\alpha$. An average of this quantity over all extrema of the free-energy density yields $\sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J q_{EA}^\alpha = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J N^{-1} \sum_i (m_i^\alpha)^2$.

Instead, the statistical *equilibrium magnetisation*, $m_i = \langle s_i \rangle = \sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J m_i^\alpha$, squared is

$$q_J \equiv \langle s_i \rangle^2 = m_i^2 = \left( \sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J m_i^\alpha \right)^2 = \sum_{\alpha \beta} w_\alpha^J w_\beta^J m_i^\alpha m_i^\beta.$$

(5.124)

If there are multiple phases, the latter sum has crossed contributions from terms with $\alpha \neq \beta$. These sums, as in a usual paramagnetic-ferromagnetic transition have to be taken over half space-space, otherwise global up-down reversal would imply the cancellation of all cross-terms.
Clearly

\[ q_{JEA}^\alpha \neq q_J \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_\alpha w_\alpha^J q_{JEA}^\alpha \neq q_J . \]  

(5.125)

5.6.2 Metastable states in two families of models

High temperatures

For all models, at high temperatures \( f(m_i) \) is characterized by a single stable absolute minimum in which all local magnetizations vanish, as expected; this is the paramagnetic state. The \( m_i = 0 \) for all \( i \) minimum continues to exist at all temperatures. However, even if it is still the global absolute minimum of the TAP free-energy density, \( f_{J,\text{TAP}} \), at low temperatures it becomes unstable thermodynamically, and it is substituted as the equilibrium state, by other non-trivial configurations with \( m_i \neq 0 \) that are the absolute minima of \( \Phi \). Note the difference with the ferromagnetic problem for which the paramagnetic solution is no longer a minimum below \( T_c \).

Low temperatures

At low temperature many equilibrium states appear (and not just two as in an Ising ferromagnetic model) and they are not related by symmetry (as spin reversal in the Ising ferromagnet or a rotational symmetry in the Heisenberg ferromagnet). These are characterized by non-zero values of the local magnetizations \( m_i \) that are different in different states.

At low-temperatures both the naive mean-field equations and the TAP equations have an exponential in \( N \) number of solutions and still an exponential in \( N \) number of them correspond to absolute minima of the \( m_i \)-dependent free-energy density. This means that \( \Sigma_j(T) \) and even \( \Sigma_j(0, f_0, T) \) are quantities \( O(1) \). These minima can be identified as different states that could be accessed by applying the corresponding site-dependent pinning fields.

The derivation and understanding of the structure of the TAP free-energy landscape is quite subtle and goes beyond the scope of these Lectures. Still, we shall briefly present their structure for the SK and \( p \)-spin models to give a flavor of their complexity.

The SK model

The first calculation of the complexity in the SK model appeared in 1980 [49, 50]. After 35 years of research the structure of the free-energy landscape in this system is still a matter of discussion. At present, the picture that emerges is the following. The temperature-dependent annealed complexity is a decreasing function of temperature that vanishes only at \( T_c \) but takes a very small value already at \( T_c \). Surprisingly enough, at finite but large \( N \) the TAP solutions come in pairs of minima and saddles of type one, that is to say, extrema with only one unstable direction. These states are connected by a mode that is softer the larger the number of spins: they coalesce and become marginally
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Figure 5.14: Left: sketch of the temperature dependent complexity, \( \Sigma_J(T) \), of the SK. It actually vanishes only at \( T_c \) but it takes a very small value already at \( \sim 0.6 T_c \). Right: pairs of extrema in the SK model with \( N \) large and \( N \to \infty \) limit.

stable in the limit \( N \to \infty \). Numerical simulations show that starting from the saddle-point and following the ‘left’ direction along the soft mode one falls into the minimum; instead, following the ‘right’ direction along the same mode one falls into the paramagnetic solution. See Fig. 5.14 for a sketch of these results. The free-energy difference between the minimum and saddle decreases for increasing \( N \) and one finds, numerically, an averaged \( \Delta f \sim N^{-1.4} \). The extensive complexity of minima and type-one saddles is identical in the large \( N \) limit, \( \Sigma_J(0, T) = \Sigma_J(1, T) + O(N^{-1}) \) [51] in such a way that the Morse theorem is respected. The free-energy dependent annealed complexity is a smooth function of \( f \) with support on a finite interval \([f_0, f_1]\) and maximum at \( f_{\text{max}} \). The Bray and Moore annealed calculation (with supersymmetry breaking) yields \( f_{\text{max}} = -0.654 \), \( \Sigma_{\text{max}} = 0.052 \), \( \Sigma''(f_{\text{max}}) = 8.9 \). The probability of finding a solution with free-energy density \( f \) can be expressed as

\[
p_f(f, T) = \frac{\mathcal{N}_J(f, T)}{\mathcal{N}_J(T)} = \frac{e^{N\Sigma_J(f, T)}}{\mathcal{N}_J(T)} \sim \sqrt{\frac{N\Sigma''_J(f_{\text{max}})}{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{N}{2}[\Sigma'_J(f_{\text{max}})](f-f_{\text{max}})^2},
\]

(5.126)

where we evaluated the total number of solutions, \( \mathcal{N}_J(T) = \int df \ e^{N\Sigma_J(f,T)} \), by steepest descent. The complexity, approximated by its annealed value, vanishes linearly close to \( f_0 \): \( \Sigma_J(f, T) \sim \lambda(f - f_0) \) with \( \lambda < \beta \).

Only the lowest lying TAP solutions contribute to the statistical weight. The complexity does not contribute to \( \Phi \) in the large \( N \) limit:

\[
\Phi = \beta f - \Sigma_{\text{ann}}(f, T) \simeq \beta f - (f - f_0)\lambda
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial f} \simeq \beta - \lambda > 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \beta > \lambda
\]

(5.127)

and \( \Phi_{\text{min}} \simeq \beta f_{\text{min}} = \beta f_0 \). See Fig. 5.15. The ‘total’ free-energy density in the exponential is just the free-energy density of each low-lying solution.
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5.6.3 The replica method

A picture that is consistent with the one arising from the naive mean-field approximation but contradicts the initial assumption of the droplet model arises from the exact solution of fully-connected spin-glass models. These results are obtained using a method called the replica trick that we will briefly present below.

In Sect. 5.2.4 we argued that the typical properties of a disordered system can be computed from the disorder averaged free-energy [14]

\[
[F_J] = \int dJ P(J) F_J.
\]  

One then needs to average the logarithm of the partition function. In the annealed approximation one exchanges the \(\ln\) with the average over disorder and, basically, considers the interactions equilibrated at the same temperature \(T\) as the spins:

\[
[\ln Z_J] \sim \ln[Z_J].
\]  

This approximation turns out to be correct at high temperatures but incorrect at low ones.

The evaluation of the disordered average free-energy density is difficult for at least two reasons: firstly, virtually all configurations are not translationally invariant; secondly, no factorisation helps one easily reduce the partition sum over one acting on independent variables.

The replica method allows one to compute \([F_J]\) for fully-connected models. It is based on the smart use of the identity

\[
\ln Z_J = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{Z_J^n - 1}{n}.
\]
The idea is to compute the right-hand-side for finite and integer \( n = 1, 2, \ldots \) and then perform the analytic continuation to \( n \to 0 \). Care should be taken in this step: for some models the analytic continuation may not be unique. (Recall the calculation done using the Potts model with \( q \to 1 \) that allows one to recover results for the percolation problem.) It turns out that this is indeed the case for the emblematic Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model, as discussed by van Hemmen and Palmer [56] though it has also been recently shown that the free-energy \( f(T) \) obtained by Parisi [57] with the replica trick is exact! [58, 59]

The disorder averaged free-energy is given by

\[
-\beta [F_J] = - \int dJ P(J) \ln Z_J = - \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n} \left( \int dJ P(J) Z^n_J - 1 \right),
\]

where we have exchanged the limit (term that couple different replica indices). Indeed, integer \( n \) the replicated partition function, \( Z^n_J \), reads

\[
Z^n_J = \sum_{\{s^n_a\}} e^{-\beta[H_J((s^n_1), \ldots, s^n_n)]}.
\]

Here \( \sum_{\{s^a\}} = \sum_{\{s^a_1 = \pm 1\}} \cdots \sum_{\{s^n_n = \pm 1\}} \). \( Z^n_J \) corresponds to \( n \) identical copies of the original system, that is to say, all of them with the same realisation of disorder. Each copy is characterised by an ensemble of \( N \) spins, \( \{s^a_i\} \). We label the copies with a replica index \( a = 1, \ldots, n \). For \( p \)-spin disordered spin models \( Z^n_J \) takes the form

\[
Z^n_J = \sum_{\{s^n_a\}} e^{\beta \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{a=1}^n \left[ \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_p} J_{i_1 \cdots i_p} s^n_{i_1} \cdots s^n_{i_p} + \sum_i h_i s^n_i \right]}.
\]

The average over disorder amounts to computing a Gaussian integral for each set of spin indices \( i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_p \), with \( [J^2_{i_1 \cdots i_p}] = J^2 p!/(2N^{p-1})^2 \). One finds

\[
[Z^n_J] = \sum_{\{s^n_a\}} e^{\beta^2 \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_p} (\sum_{a=1}^n s^a_{i_1} \cdots s^a_{i_p})^2 + \beta \sum_{a=1}^n \sum_i h_i s^n_i} \equiv \sum_{\{s^n_a\}} e^{-\beta F(\{s^n_a\})}.
\]

The function \( \beta F(\{s^n_a\}) \) is not random. It depends on the spin variables only but it includes terms that couple different replica indices. Indeed,

\[
\sum_{i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_p} \sum_a s^a_{i_1} \cdots s^a_{i_p} \sum_b s^b_{i_1} \cdots s^b_{i_p} = \sum_{a,b} \sum_{i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_p} (s^a_{i_1} s^b_{i_p}) \cdots (s^a_{i_p} s^b_{i_1})
\]

We first note that all terms are identical to one for \( a = b \) since \( s^2_i = 1 \). The sum over the spin indices (ignoring the constraint \( i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_p \) that will, in any case give a subdominant contribution in the \( N \to \infty \) limit) and the replica indices of such terms

\[\text{We use } \int dJ_a e^{-J^2_a/(2\sigma^2) - J_a x} \propto e^{x^2/\sigma^2/2}\]
yields $N^p n$. Focusing then on the cases $a \neq b$, ignoring the constraint $i_1 \neq \cdots \neq i_p$, there are $N$ factors here

$$
\beta F(\{s^a_i\}) \approx -\frac{N\beta^2 J^2}{2p!} \left[ \sum_{a \neq b} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i s^a_i s^b_i \right)^p + n \right] - \beta \sum_a \sum_i h_i s^a_i. \tag{5.136}
$$

In writing the last expression we have dropped terms that are sub-leading in $N$. (In complete analogy with what is done for the pure $p$ spin ferromagnet. They correspond to adding terms with self-interactions in the Hamiltonian.) The constant term $-N n \beta^2 J^2 / 2$ originates in the terms with $a = b$, for which $(s^a_i)^2 = 1$.

To summarise, we started with an interacting spin model. Next, we enlarged the number of variables from $N$ spins to $N \times n$ replicated spins by introducing $n$ non-interacting copies of the system. By integrating out the disorder we decoupled the sites but we payed the price of coupling the replicas. Hitherto the replica indices act as a formal tool introduced to compute the average over the bond distribution. Nothing distinguishes one replica from another and, in consequence, the ‘free-energy’ $F(\{s^a_i\})$ is invariant under permutations of the replica indices.

The next step to follow is to identify the order parameters and transform the free-energy into an order-parameter dependent expression to be rendered extremal at their equilibrium values. In a spin-glass problem we already know that the order parameter is not the global magnetisation as in a pure magnetic system but the parameter $q$ – or more generally the overlap between states. Within the replica calculation an overlap between replicas

$$
q_{ab} \equiv N^{-1} \sum_i s^a_i s^b_i \tag{5.137}
$$

naturally appeared in eq. (5.136). The idea is to write the free-energy density as a function of the order parameter $q_{ab}$ and look for their extreme in complete analogy with what is done for the fully-connected ferromagnet. This is, of course, a tricky business, since the order parameter is here a matrix with number of elements $n$ going to zero! A recipe for identifying the form of the order parameter (or the correct saddle-point solution) has been proposed by G. Parisi in the late 70s and early 80s [57]. This solution has been recently proven to be exact for mean-field models by two mathematical physicists, F. Guerra [58] and M. Talagrand [59]. Whether the very rich physical structure that derives from this rather formal solution survives in finite dimensional systems remains a subject of debate.

Introducing the Gaussian integral (Hubbard-Stratonovich transformation)

$$
\int dq_{ab} e^{\beta J q_{ab} \sum_i s^a_i s^b_i - \frac{N}{2} q_{ab}^2} = e^{\frac{N}{2} (\frac{1}{N} \beta J \sum_i s^a_i s^b_i)^2} \tag{5.138}
$$

for each pair of replica indices $a \neq b$, one decouples the site indices, $i$, and the averaged replicated partition function can be rewritten as

$$
[Z^n_J] = \int \prod_{a \neq b} dq_{ab} e^{-\beta F(q_{ab})} \tag{5.139}
$$
and

\[ \beta F(q_{ab}) = -\frac{N\beta^2 J^2}{2} \left[ -\sum_{a \neq b} q_{ab}^p + n \right] - N \ln \zeta(q_{ab}), \quad (5.140) \]

\[ \zeta(q_{ab}) = \sum_{s_a} e^{-\beta H(q_{ab}, s_a)}, \quad (5.141) \]

\[ H(q_{ab}, s_a) = -J \sum_{a b} q_{ab} s_a s_b - h \sum_a s_a, \quad (5.142) \]

where for simplicity we set \( h_i = h \). The factor \( N \) in front of \( \ln \zeta \) comes from the decoupling of the site indices. Note that the transformation (5.138) serves to uncouple the sites and to obtain the very useful factor \( N \) in front of the exponential. The partition function

\[ Z(q_{ab}) = \sum_{\{s_a\}} e^{-\beta H(q_{ab}, s_a)} \quad (5.143) \]

is the one of a fully-connected Ising model with interaction matrix \( q_{ab} \). As it is posed, this problem remains unsolvable. However, important steps forward will be possible taking advantage of the \( n \to 0 \) limit.

**Saddle-point evaluation**

Having extracted a factor \( N \) in the exponential suggests to evaluate the integral over \( q_{ab} \) with the saddle-point method. This, of course, involves the \( a \) priori dangerous exchange of limits \( N \to \infty \) and \( n \to 0 \). The replica theory relies on this assumption. One then writes

\[ \lim_{N \to \infty} -[f_J] \to -\lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n} f(q_{ab}^p) \quad (5.144) \]

and searches for the solutions to the \( n(n-1)/2 \) extremization equations

\[ \left. \frac{\delta f(q_{ab})}{\delta q_{cd}} \right|_{q_{ef}^p} = 0. \quad (5.145) \]

In usual saddle-point evaluations the saddle-point one should use is (are) the one(s) that correspond to absolute minima of the free-energy density. In the replica calculation the number of variables is \( n(n-1)/2 \) that becomes negative! when \( n < 1 \) and makes the saddle-point evaluation tricky. In order to avoid unphysical complex results one needs to focus on the saddle-points with positive (or at least semi-positive) definite Hessian

\[ \mathcal{H} \equiv \left. \frac{\partial f(q_{ab})}{\partial q_{cd} \partial q_{ef}} \right|_{q_{gh}^p}, \quad (5.146) \]

and these sometimes corresponds to **maxima** (instead of minima) of the free-energy density.
The saddle-point equations are also self-consistency equations

\[ q_{ab}^{\text{SP}} = \langle s_a s_b \rangle_{H(q_{ab}, \{s_a\})} = \left[ \langle s_a s_b \rangle \right] \quad (5.147) \]

where the second member means that the average is performed with the single site many-replica Hamiltonian \( H(q_{ab}, \{s_a\}) \) and the third member is just one of the averages we would like to compute.

The partition function in eq. (5.142) cannot be computed for generic \( q_{ab} \) since there is no large \( n \) limit to exploit. On the contrary, \( n \to 0 \). Thus, one usually looks for solutions to eqs. (5.145) within a certain family of matrices \( q_{ab} \). We discuss below the relevant parametrizations.

**Replica symmetry (RS)**

In principle, nothing distinguishes one replica from another one. This is the reason why Sherrington and Kirkpatrick looked for solutions that preserve replica symmetry:

\[ q_{ab} = q \quad \text{for all } a \neq b \quad (5.148) \]

Inserting this Ansatz in (5.140) and (5.142) and taking \( n \to 0 \) one finds

\[ q = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-z^2/2} \tanh^2 \left( \beta \sqrt{\frac{pq^2-1}{2}} z + \beta h \right) \quad (5.149) \]

This equation resembles strongly the one for the magnetisation density of the \( p \)-spin ferromagnet, eq. (??). The free-energy density for \( p = 2 \) is

\[ f = -\frac{\beta}{4}(1-q)^2 - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-z^2/2} \ln[2 \cosh(\beta q^{1/2}z + \beta h)] \quad (5.150) \]

Let us first discuss the case \( p = 2 \), i.e. the SK model. In the absence of a magnetic field, one finds a second order phase transition at \( T_s = J \) from a paramagnetic \((q = 0)\) to a spin-glass phase with \( q \neq 0 \). In the presence of a field there is no phase transition. SK soon realized though that there is something wrong with this solution: the entropy at zero temperature is negative, \( S(0) = -1/(2\pi) \), and this is impossible for a model with discrete spins, for which \( S \) is strictly positive. de Almeida and Thouless later showed that the reason for this failure is that the replica symmetric saddle-point is not stable, since the Hessian (5.146) is not positive definite and has negative eigenvalues [60]. The eigenvalue responsible for the instability of the replica symmetric solution is called the replicon.

Comparison with the TAP equations shows that the RS Ansatz corresponds to the assumption that the local fields \( h_i = \sum_{i_1 \ldots i_p} J_{i_1 \ldots i_p} m_{i_1} \ldots m_{i_p} + h \) are independent and have a Gaussian distribution with average \( h \) and variance \( \sigma^2 = J^2 q^{p-1} \). Numerical simulations clearly show that this assumption is invalid.

Interestingly enough, the numerical values for several physical quantities obtained with the replica symmetric solution do not disagree much with numerical results. For instance,
the ground state zero-temperature energy density is $E^{rs}_{gs} = -0.798$ while with numerical simulations one finds $E^{gs}_{gs} \sim -0.76$.

For the $p > 2$ model one finds that the replica symmetric solution is stable at all temperatures. However, the problem of the negative entropy remains and should be solved by another solution. The transition must then have aspects of a first-order one, with another solution appearing at low temperatures and becoming the most convenient one at the transition.

**One step replica symmetry breaking**

The next challenge is to devise a replica symmetry breaking Ansatz, in the form of a matrix $q_{ab}$ that is not invariant under permutations of rows or columns. There is no first principles way of doing this, instead, the structure of the Ansatz is the result of trial and error. Indeed, a kind of minimal way to break the replica symmetry is to propose a structure in blocks as the one shown in Fig. 5.16-left. The diagonal elements are set to zero as in the RS case. Square blocks of linear size $m$ close to the main diagonal are filled with a parameter $q_1$. The elements in the rest of the matrix take a different value $q_0$ and one takes $0 \leq q_0 \leq q_1$. The matrix $q_{ab}$ depends on three parameters $q_0, q_1, m$ and one has to find the values such that the free-energy density is maximized! The conditions for a extreme are

$$
\frac{\partial f(q_0, q_1, m)}{\partial q_0} = \frac{\partial f(q_0, q_1, m)}{\partial q_1} = \frac{\partial f(q_0, q_1, m)}{\partial m} = 0 .
$$

(5.151)

In the SK model ($p = 2$) the 1RSB Ansatz yields a second order phase transition ($q_0 = q_1 = 0$ and $m = 1$ at criticality) at a critical temperature $T_s = J$, that remains unchanged with respect to the one predicted by the RS Ansatz. The 1RSB solution is still unstable below $T_s$ and in all the low temperature phase. One notices, however, that
the zero temperature entropy, even if still negative and incorrect, takes a value that is closer to zero, \( S(T = 0) \approx -0.01 \), the ground state energy is closer to the value obtained numerically, and the replicon eigenvalue even if still negative has an absolute value that is closer to zero. All this suggest that the 1RSB Ansatz is closer to the exact solution.

Instead, in all cases with \( p \geq 3 \) the 1RSB Ansatz is stable below the static critical temperature \( T_s \) and all the way up to a new characteristic temperature \( 0 < T_f < T_s \). Moreover, one can prove that in this range of temperatures the model is solved exactly by this Ansatz. The critical behaviour is quite peculiar: while the order parameters \( q_0 \) and \( q_1 \) jump at the transition from a vanishing value in the paramagnetic phase to a non-zero value right below \( T_s \), all thermodynamic quantities are continuous since \( m = 1 \) at \( T_s \) and all \( q_0 \) and \( q_1 \) dependent terms appear multiplied by \( 1 - m \). This is a mixed type of transition that has been baptised random first-order. Note that disorder weakens the critical behaviour in the \( p \geq 3 \)-spin models. In the limit \( p \to \infty \) the solutions become \( m = T/T_c \), \( q_0 = 0 \) and \( q = 1 \).

**k-step replica symmetry breaking**

The natural way to generalize the 1RSB Ansatz is to propose a \( k \)-step one. In each step the off-diagonal blocks are left unchanged while the diagonal ones of size \( m_k \) are broken as in the first step thus generating smaller square blocks of size \( m_{k+1} \), close to the diagonal. At a generic \( k \)-step RSB scheme one has

\[
0 \leq q_0 \leq q_1 \leq \cdots \leq q_{k-1} \leq q_k \leq 1 , \quad (5.152)
\]

\[
n = m_0 \geq m_1 \geq \cdots \geq m_k \geq m_{k+1} , \quad (5.153)
\]

parameters. In the \( n \to 0 \) limit the ordering of the parameters \( m \) is reversed

\[
0 = m_0 \leq m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_k \leq m_{k+1} . \quad (5.154)
\]

In the SK model one finds that any finite \( k \)-step RSB Ansatz remains unstable. However, increasing the number of breaking levels the results continue to improve with, in particular, the zero temperature entropy getting closer to zero. In the \( p \geq 3 \) case instead one finds that the 2RSB Ansatz has, as unique solution to the saddle-point equations, one that boils down to the 1RSB case. This suggests that the 1RSB Ansatz is stable as can also be checked with the analysis of the Hessian eigenvalues: the replicon is strictly positive for all \( p \geq 3 \).

**Full replica symmetry breaking**

In order to construct the full RSB solution the breaking procedure is iterated an infinite number of times. The full RSB Ansatz thus obtained generalizes the block structure to an infinite sequence by introducing a function

\[
q(x) = q_i , \quad m_{i+1} < x < m_i \quad (5.155)
\]
with \( 0 \leq x \leq 1 \). Introducing \( q(x) \) sums over replicas are traded by integrals over \( x \); for instance

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \neq b} q_{ab}^l = \int_0^1 dx \, q^l(x).
\] (5.156)

The free-energy density becomes a functional of the function \( q(x) \). The extremization condition is then a hard functional equation. A Landau expansion – expected to be valid close to the assumed second order phase transition – simplifies the task of solving it. For the SK model one finds

\[
q(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x}{2}, & 0 \leq x \leq x_1 = 2q(1), \\
q_{\text{EA}} \equiv q_{\text{max}} = q(1), & x_1 = 2q(1) \leq x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\] (5.157)

at first order in \( |T - T_c| \), with \( q(1) = |T - T_c|/T_c \) and \( x_1 = 2q(1) \). The stability analysis yields a vanishing replicon eigenvalue signalling that the full RSB solution is marginally stable.

One can also recover the particular case of the 1RSB using a \( q(x) \) with two plateaux, at \( q_0 \) and \( q_1 \) and the breaking point at \( x = m \).

**Marginality condition**

In the discussion above we chose the extreme that maximize the free-energy density since we were interested in studying equilibrium properties. We could, instead, use a different prescription, though a priori not justified, and select other solutions. For example, we can impose that the solution is marginally stable by requiring that the replicon eigenvalue vanishes. In the \( p = 2 \) this leads to identical results to the ones obtained with the usual prescription since the full-RSB Ansatz is in any case marginally stable. In the \( p \)-spin models with \( p \geq 3 \) instead it turns out that the averaged properties obtained in this way correspond to the asymptotic values derived with the stochastic dynamics starting from random initial conditions. This is quite a remarkable result.

**Exercise 5.13** Take a particle with mass \( m \) in a one dimensional harmonic potential

\[
V(x) = \frac{1}{2} m \omega^2 x^2
\] (5.158)
5.6 Mean-field models

with real frequency $\omega$ taken from a probability distribution $q(\omega)$. The position of the particle is given by the real variable $x$.

1. Direct calculation.

(a) Compute the free-energy at fixed $\omega$ and inverse temperature $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, with $k_B$ Boltzmann’s constant.

(b) Compute the average over disorder of $F_\omega$ without the use of the replica trick. Pose the calculation for generic $q(\omega)$ and then take the particular case $q(\omega) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-1/2} e^{-\omega^2/(2\sigma^2)}$. Firstly establish the parameter dependence of the result and then go on and find the explicit form of it.

2. Replica method calculation.

(a) Explain the replica method.

(b) Find an expression for the disorder averaged free-energy following the usual steps of the replica method.

(c) Take now a Gaussian probability with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2$ for the frequency $\omega$. What is the averaged free-energy?

Note that the volume of a sphere of unit radius in an $n$-dimensional space is $\Omega_n = 2\pi^{n/2}/\Gamma(\frac{n}{2})$. This is the form to exploit in the calculations above.

We also know $\int_0^\infty dr \frac{r^{n-1}}{\sqrt{1+r^2}} = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{n}{2}\right)$.

A useful integral will be $\int_0^\infty dy e^{-ay^2} \ln y = -\frac{1}{4} (C + \ln 4a) \sqrt{\pi a}$ where $C$ is a constant given by $C = \int_0^1 dx \ln \ln 1/x$.

The Gamma function admits a series expansion $\Gamma(1 + z) = \sum_{k=0}^\infty c_k z^k$ with $c_0 = 1$, $c_1 = -C$, and $C$ the same constant as in the integral above. Therefore, $\Gamma\left(1 - \frac{n}{2}\right) = 1 + C \frac{n}{2} + O(n^2)$.

Interpretation of replica results

Let us now discuss the implications of the solution to fully-connected disordered models obtained with the, for the moment, rather abstract replica formalism.

The interpretation uses heavily the identification of pure states. Their definition is a tricky matter that we shall not discuss in detail here. We shall just assume it can be done and use the analogy with the ferromagnetic system – and its two pure states – and the TAP results at fixed disorder. As we already know, which are the pure states, its properties, number, etc. can depend on the quenched disorder realization and fluctuate from sample to sample. We shall keep this in mind in the rest of our discussion.

Let us then distinguish the averages computed within a pure state and over all configuration space. In a ferromagnet with no applied magnetic field this is simple to grasp: at high temperatures there is just one state, the paramagnet, while at low temperatures there are two, the states with positive and negative magnetization. If one computes the averaged magnetization restricted to the state of positive (negative) magnetization one finds $m_{eq} > 0$ ($m_{eq} < 0$); instead, summing over all configurations $m_{eq} = 0$ even at low temperatures. Now, if one considers systems with more than just two pure states, and one labels them with Greeks indices, averages within such states are denoted $\langle O \rangle_\alpha$ while
averages taken with the full Gibbs measure are expressed as
\[
\langle O \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha}^J \langle O \rangle_{\alpha} .
\] (5.159)

\(w_{\alpha}^J\) is the probability of the \(\alpha\) state given by
\[
w_{\alpha}^J = \frac{e^{-\beta F_{\alpha}^J}}{Z_J}, \quad \text{with} \quad Z_J = \sum_{\alpha} e^{-\beta F_{\alpha}^J}
\] (5.160)

and thus satisfying the normalization condition \(\sum_{\alpha} w_{\alpha}^J = 1\). \(F_{\alpha}^J\) can be interpreted as the total free-energy of the state \(\alpha\). These probabilities, as well as the state dependent averages, will show sample-to-sample fluctuations.

One can then define an overlap between states:
\[
q_{J_{\alpha\beta}} \equiv N^{-1} \sum_i \langle s_i \rangle_{\alpha} \langle s_i \rangle_{\beta} = N^{-1} \sum_i m_i^{\alpha} m_i^{\beta}
\] (5.161)

and rename the self-overlap the Edwards-Anderson parameter
\[
q_{J_{\alpha\alpha}} \equiv N^{-1} \sum_i \langle s_i \rangle_{\alpha} \langle s_i \rangle_{\alpha} \equiv q_{J_{\text{EA}}}
\] (5.162)

(assuming the result is independent of \(\alpha\)). The statistics of possible overlaps is then characterized by a probability function
\[
P_J(q) \equiv \sum_{\alpha\beta} w_{\alpha}^J w_{\beta}^J \delta(q - q_{\alpha\beta}^J)
\] (5.163)

where we included a subindex \(J\) to stress the fact that this is a strongly sample-dependent quantity. Again, a ferromagnetic model serves to illustrate the meaning of \(P_J(q)\). First, there is no disorder in this case so the \(J\) label is irrelevant. Second, the high-\(T\) equilibrium phase is paramagnetic, with \(q = 0\). \(P(q)\) is then a delta function with weight 1 (see the left panel in Fig. 5.18). In the low-\(T\) phase there are only two pure states with identical statistical properties and \(q_{\text{EA}} = m^2\). Thus, \(P(q)\) is just the sum of two delta functions with weight 1/2 (central panel in Fig. 5.18).

Next, one can consider averages over quenched disorder and study
\[
[ P_J(q) ] \equiv \int dJ P(J) \sum_{\alpha\beta} w_{\alpha}^J w_{\beta}^J \delta(q - q_{\alpha\beta}^J)
\] (5.164)

How can one access \(P_J(q)\) or \([ P_J(q) ]\)? It is natural to reckon that
\[
P_J(q) = Z^{-2} \sum_{\sigma_s} e^{-\beta H_J(\{\sigma_s\})} e^{-\beta H_J(\{s_i\})} \delta \left( N^{-1} \sum_i \sigma_i s_i - q \right)
\] (5.165)
that is to say, $P_J(q)$ is the probability of finding an overlap $q$ between two *real replicas* of the system with identical disordered interactions in equilibrium at temperature $T$. This identity gives a way to compute $P_J(q)$ and its average in a numerical simulation: one just has to simulate two independent systems with identical disorder in equilibrium and calculate the overlap.

But there is also, as suggested by the notation, a way to relate the pure state structure to the replica matrix $q_{ab}$. Let us consider the simple case

$$\begin{align*}
\left[ m_i \right] &= \left[ Z_J^{-1} \sum_{\{s_i\}} s_i e^{-\beta H_J(\{s_i\})} \right] = \left[ \frac{Z_J^{n-1}}{Z_J^n} \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} s_i^a e^{-\beta H_J(\{s_i^a\})} \right] \\
&= \left[ \frac{1}{Z_J^n} \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} s_i^a e^{-\beta \sum_{n=1}^\infty H_J(\{s_i^a\})} \right] (5.166)
\end{align*}$$

where we singled out the replica index of the spin to average. This relation is valid for all $n$, in particular for $n \to 0$. In this limit the denominator approaches one and the average over disorder can be simply evaluated

$$\begin{align*}
\left[ m_i \right] &= \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} s_i^a e^{-\beta H_{\text{eff}}(\{s_i^a\})} (5.167)
\end{align*}$$

and introducing back the normalization factor $Z^n = 1 = \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} e^{-\beta \sum_{n=1}^\infty H_J(\{s_i^a\})}$ that becomes $Z^n = \left[ \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} e^{-\beta \sum_{n=1}^\infty H_J(\{s_i^a\})} \right] = e^{-\beta H_{\text{eff}}(\{s_i^a\})}$ we have

$$\begin{align*}
\left[ m_i \right] &= \langle s_i^a \rangle_{H_{\text{eff}}} (5.168)
\end{align*}$$

with $a$ any replica index. The average is taken over the Gibbs measure of a system with effective Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}$. In a replica symmetric problem in which all replicas are identical this result should be independent of the label $a$. Instead, in a problem with replica symmetry breaking the averages on the right-hand-side need not be identical for all $a$. This could occur in a normal vectorial theory with dimension $n$ in which not all components take the same expected value. It is reasonable to assume that the full thermodynamic average is achieved by the sum over all these cases,

$$\begin{align*}
\left[ m_i \right] &= \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a=1}^n \langle s_i^a \rangle_{H_{\text{eff}}} . (5.169)
\end{align*}$$
Let us now take a less trivial observable and study the spin-glass order parameter \( q \)

\[
q \equiv \left[ \langle s_i \rangle^2 \right] = \left[ Z_J^{-1} \sum_{\{s_i\}} s_i e^{-\beta H_J(\{s_i\})} Z_J^{-1} \sum_{\{\sigma_i\}} \sigma_i e^{-\beta H_J(\{\sigma_i\})} \right] = \left[ \frac{Z^{n-2}}{Z^n} \sum_{\{s_i\},\{\sigma_i\}} s_i \sigma_i e^{-\beta H_J(\{s_i\})} - \beta H_J(\{\sigma_i\}) \right]
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{1}{Z_J^n} \sum_{\{s_i^a\}} s^a_i s^b_i e^{-\beta \sum_{a=1}^n H_J(\{s^a_i\})} \right]
\]

(5.170)

In the \( n \to 0 \) limit the denominator is equal to one and one can then perform the average over disorder. Introducing back the normalization one then has

\[
q = \langle s^a_i s^b_i \rangle_{E_{\text{eff}}(\{s^a_i\})}
\]

(5.171)

for any arbitrary pair of replicas \( a \neq b \) (since \( \langle s^a_i s^a_i \rangle = 1 \) for Ising spins). The average is done with an effective theory of \( n \) interacting replicas characterized by \( E_{\text{eff}}(\{s^a_i\}) \). Again, if there is replica symmetry breaking the actual thermal average is the sum over all possible pairs of replicas:

\[
q = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a \neq b} q^{ab}.
\]

(5.172)

A similar argument allows one to write

\[
q^{(k)} = \left[ \langle s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k} \rangle^2 \right] = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a \neq b} q^{k}_{ab}.
\]

(5.173)

One can also generalize this argument to obtain

\[
P(q) = [P_J(q)] = \lim_{n \to 0} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{a \neq b} \delta(q - q^{ab})
\]

(5.174)

Thus, the replica matrix \( q_{ab} \) can be ascribed to the overlap between pure states.

Note that a small applied field, though uncorrelated with a particular pure state, is necessary to have non-zero local magnetizations and then non-zero \( q \) values.

The function \( P(q) \) then extends the concept of order parameter to a function. In zero field the symmetry with respect to simultaneous reversal of all spins translates into the fact that \( P_J(q) \) must be symmetric with respect to \( q = 0 \). \([P_J(q)]\) can be used to distinguish between the droplet picture prediction for finite dimensional spin-glasses – two pure states – that simply corresponds to

\[
[P_J(q)] = \frac{1}{2} \delta(q - q_{\text{EA}}) + \frac{1}{2} \delta(q + q_{\text{EA}})
\]

(5.175)
(see the central panel in Fig. 5.18) and a more complicated situation in which $[ P_J(q) ]$ has the two delta functions at $\pm q_{EA}$ plus non-zero values on a finite support (right panel in Fig. 5.18) as found in mean-field spin-glass models.

The linear susceptibility

Taking into account the multiplicity of pure states, the magnetic susceptibility, eq. (5.159), and using (5.159) becomes

$$ T\chi = T[\chi_J] = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i [\langle s_i \rangle^2] = 1 - \sum_{\alpha\beta} [w^{\alpha}_J w^{\beta}_J] q_{\alpha\beta} = \int dq \left( 1 - q \right) P(q) . \quad (5.176) $$

There are then several possible results for the susceptibility depending on the level of replica symmetry breaking in the system:

- In a replica symmetric problem or, equivalently, in the droplet model,
  $$ \chi = \beta (1 - q_{EA}) . \quad (5.177) $$
  This is also the susceptibility within a pure state of a system with a higher level of RSB.

- At the one step RSB level, this becomes
  $$ \chi = \beta \left[ 1 - (1 - m)q_{EA} \right] . \quad (5.178) $$

- For systems with full RSB one needs to know the complete $P(q)$ to compute $\chi$, as in (5.176).

Note that in systems with RSB (one step or full) the susceptibility is larger than $\beta (1 - q_{EA})$.

A system with $q_{EA} = 1$ in the full low-temperature phase (as the REM model or $p \to \infty$ limit of the $p$ spin model, see below) has just one configuration in each state. Systems with $q_{EA} < 1$ below $T_c$ have states formed by a number of different configurations that
is exponentially large in $N$. (Note that $q_{EA} < 1$ means that the two configurations differ in a number of spins that is proportional to $N$.) The logarithm of this number is usually called the intra-state entropy.

Even if the number of pure states can be very large (exponential in $N$) only a fraction of them can have a non-negligible weight. This is the case if one finds, for example, $\sum_\alpha u_\alpha^2 < +\infty$

**Symmetry and ergodicity breaking**

In all $p \geq 2$ spin models there is a phase transition at a finite $T_s$ at which the rather abstract replica symmetry is broken. This symmetry breaking is accompanied by ergodicity breaking as in the usual case. Many pure states appear at low temperatures, each one has its reversed $s_i \to -s_i$ counterpart, but not all of them are related by real-space symmetry properties.

**The one-step RSB scenario**

In this case the transition has first-order and second-order aspects. The order parameters $q_0$ and $q_1$ jump at the critical point as in a first-order transition but the thermodynamic quantities are continuous.

**The full RSB scenario**

Right below $T_c$ an exponential in $N$ number of equilibrium states appear. The transition is continuous, the order parameter approaches zero right below $T_c$. Lowering further the temperature each ergodic component breaks in many other ones. In this sense, the full spin-glass phase, $T < T_c$, is ‘critical’ and not only the single point $T_c$.

**The pinning field**

We can nevertheless choose a possible direction, given by another field $\sigma(x)$, and compute the free-energy of our system when it is weakly pinned by this external quenched field

$$F_\phi[\sigma, g, \beta] = -\frac{1}{\beta} \log \int d\phi(x) e^{-\beta H[\phi] - \frac{g}{2} \int dx (\sigma(x) - \phi(x))^2}$$  (5.179)

where $g > 0$ denotes the strength of the coupling. This free-energy (5.179) will be small when the external perturbing field $\sigma(x)$ lies in a direction corresponding to the bottom of a well of the unperturbed free-energy. Therefore, we should be able to obtain useful information about the free-energy landscape by scanning the entire space of the configurations $\sigma(x)$ to locate all the states in which the system can freeze after spontaneous ergodicity breaking ($g \to 0$). According to this intuitive idea, we now consider the field $\sigma(x)$ as a thermalized variable with the “Hamiltonian” $F_\phi[\sigma, g, \beta]$. The free-energy of the field $\sigma$ at inverse temperature $\beta m$ where $m$ is a positive free parameter therefore reads

$$F_\sigma(m, \beta) = \lim_{g \to 0^+} -\frac{1}{\beta m} \log \int d\sigma(x) e^{-\beta m F_\phi[\sigma, g, \beta]}$$  (5.180)
When the ratio $m$ between the two temperatures is an integer, one can easily integrate $\sigma(x)$ in Eq.(5.180) after having introduced $m$ copies $\phi^\rho(x)$ ($\rho = 1\ldots m$) of the original field to obtain the relation

$$F(m, \beta) = \lim_{g \to 0^+} -\frac{1}{\beta m} \log \int d\phi^\rho(x) e^{-\beta \sum_{\rho=1}^m H[\phi^\rho] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\rho, \lambda} g^{\rho \lambda} \int dx \phi^\rho(x) \phi^\lambda(x)}$$

where $g^{\rho \lambda} = g(\frac{1}{m} - \delta^{\rho \lambda})$. Let us define two more quantities related to the field $\sigma$ : its internal energy $W(m, \beta) = \frac{\partial (m F_\sigma)}{\partial m}$ and its entropy $S(m, \beta) = \beta m^2 \frac{\partial F_\sigma}{\partial m}$. Since the case $m = 1$ will be of particular interest, we shall use hereafter $F_{hs}(\beta) \equiv W(m = 1, \beta)$ and $S_{hs}(\beta) \equiv S(m = 1, \beta)$ where $hs$ stands for “hidden states”. We stress that $S(m, \beta)$ and $\beta^2 \frac{\partial F_\sigma}{\partial \beta}$ which are respectively the entropies of the fields $\sigma$ and $\phi$ are two distinct quantities with different physical meanings.

When the pinning field $\sigma(x)$ is thermalized at the same temperature as $\phi(x)$, that is when $m = 1$, one sees from Eq.(5.181) that $F_\phi(\beta) = F_\sigma(m = 1, \beta)$. The basic idea of this letter is to decompose $F_\sigma$ into its energetic and entropic contributions to obtain

$$S_{hs}(\beta) = \beta \left[ F_{hs}(\beta) - F_\phi(\beta) \right]$$

To get some insights on the significance of the above relation, we shall now turn to the particular case of disordered mean-field systems. We shall see how it rigorously gives back some analytical results derived within the mean-field TAP and dynamical approaches. We shall then discuss the physical meaning of identity (5.182) for the general case of glassy systems.
5.6 Mean-field models

**Coupling replicas and the effective potential**

Let us take a spin-configuration, \( \{s\} \), in equilibrium at temperature \( T' \), that is to say, drawn from the canonical probability distribution \( P[\{s\}] = \exp(-\beta' H[\{s\}])/Z(T') \). One computes the free-energy cost to keep the system at a fixed overlap \( \bar{\rho} = q_{s,\sigma} \) with \( \{s\} \) at a temperature \( T \) (in general different from \( T' \)):

\[
V_J(\beta, \bar{\rho}, \{s\}) = -\frac{T}{N} \ln Z_J(\beta, \bar{\rho}, \{s\}) - f_J(T);
\]

\[
Z_J(\beta, \bar{\rho}, \{s\}) = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} e^{-\beta H_J[\{\sigma\}]} \delta(\bar{\rho} - q_{s,\sigma})
\]

\[
\beta N f_J(T) = \ln Z_J(\beta) = \ln \sum_{\{s\}} e^{-\beta H_J[\{s\}]}.
\]

\((f_J(T) \) is the disorder-dependent free-energy density without constraint.) In this problem the spins \( s_i \) are quenched variables on the same footing as the random interactions in the Hamiltonian. One then assumes that \( V \) is self-averaging with respect to the quenched disorder and the probability distribution of the reference configuration \( \{s\} \). One then computes the two averages:

\[
NV(\beta, \beta', \bar{\rho}) \equiv N[V_J(\beta, \bar{\rho}, \{s\})]_{\{s\}} = \left[ \sum_{\{s\}} e^{-\beta' H_J[\{s\}]} Z_J(\beta') \left( -T \ln Z_J(\beta, \bar{\rho}, \{s\}) - f_J(T) \right) \right]_J.
\]

This average can be done using the replica method:

\[
NV(\beta, \beta', \bar{\rho}) = -T \lim_{n \to 0} \lim_{m \to 0} \left[ \sum_{\{s\}} e^{-\beta' H_J[\{s\}]} Z_J(\beta')^{n-1} \left( \frac{Z_J(\{s\}; \bar{\rho}, \{s\})^m - 1}{m} \right) \right]_J.
\]

The analytic continuation is performed from integer \( n \) and \( m \). One then has

\[
Z^{(n,m)} = \left[ \sum_{\{s^a\}} \sum_{\{\sigma^a\}} \exp \left[ \beta' \sum_{a=1}^{n} H[\{s^a\}]/2 + \beta \sum_{a=1}^{m} H[\{\sigma^a\}]\right] \prod_{a=1}^{m} \delta \left( \sum_{i} s_i^a \sigma_i^a - N \bar{\rho} \right) \right]_J.
\]

After averaging over the disorder strength distribution one introduces the order parameters:

\[
Q_{ab} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} s_i^a s_i^b, \quad R_{\alpha\gamma} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_i^\gamma, \quad P_{aa} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} s_i^a \sigma_i^\alpha,
\]

with \( a, b = 1, ..., n \) and \( \alpha, \gamma = 1, ..., m \). Combining the order parameters in the single \((n + m) \times (n + m)\) matrix

\[
Q = \begin{pmatrix} Q & P^T \\ P & R \end{pmatrix}
\]

(5.183)
one finds
\[
\frac{1}{N} \log Z^{(n,m)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \beta^2 \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{m} Q_{ab}^p + \beta^2 \sum_{a=1}^{m} R_{a\gamma}^p + 2 \beta \beta' \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} P_{\alpha a}^p \right] + \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \ln Q. 
\]

(5.191)

We shall not present the details of the RSB Ansatz here.

One studies different ranges of \( \beta \) and \( \beta' \) and analyses the minima of \( V \) with respect to \( \tilde{p} \).

The effective potential for four different temperatures, \( T = T' \) for \( p = 3 \) is shown in [53]. From top to bottom, the curves represent the potential at temperature higher than \( T_d \), equal to \( T_d \) between \( T_d \) and \( T_S \), and right at \( T_S \). We can see from the figure that for \( T > T_d \) the potential is monotonically increasing, and the only extremum of the potential is the minimum at \( \tilde{p} = 0 \). At the temperature \( T_d \) where the dynamical transition happens, the potential develops for the first time a minimum with \( \tilde{p} \equiv r \neq 0 \). It is interesting to observe that the energy in this flex point is equal to the asymptotic value of the energy in the out-of-equilibrium dynamics. The same is true for the parameter \( r \) which turns out to be equal to the dynamical Edward-Anderson parameter.

The condition for the potential of having a flex coincides with the marginality condition. Indeed the flex implies a zero eigenvalue in the longitudinal sector and at \( x = 1 \) the replicon and the longitudinal eigenvalues are degenerate. The marginality condition is well known to give exact results for the transition temperatures in p-spin spherical models.

We have observed that in general more then one minimum can be present in the potential. In the p-spin model it happens that two minima develop at the same temperature \( T_d \). The rightmost one, that we will call primary is the one with \( \tilde{p} = r \), while the other, secondary, has \( \tilde{p} < r \). For temperatures smaller than \( T_d \) the minima have a finite depth, i.e. are separated by extensive barriers from the absolute minimum.

The primary minimum is easily interpreted. There the system denoted by \( s \) is in the same pure state as the system \( \sigma \). In the region \( T_S < T < T_D \) the number of pure states is exponentially large in \( N: \mathcal{N} = e^{N\Sigma(T)} \). Consequently the probability of finding two system in the same state is exponentially small and proportional to \( e^{-N\Sigma(T)} \). The free energy cost to constrain two systems to be in the same state is then proportional to the logarithm of this probability, namely we have

\[
V_{\text{primary}} = T\Sigma(T). 
\]

(5.192)

Coherently at the statiscal transition temperature \( T = T_S \) one finds \( V_{\text{primary}} = 0 \). The quantity \( \Sigma \) has been computed for the \( p \)-spin model as the number of solution of the TAP equation with given free energy and coincides with our calculation. The secondary minima, could aso be associated to metastable states, but at present we do not have an interpretation for them. This conclusion on the equivalence of the potential with the number of solution of the TAP equation hold also in the ROM.

The study of the potential for temperatures smaller than \( T_S \) would require to take into account RSB effects, which would complicate a bit the analysis. However it is physically
clear that the shape of the potential in that region it is not different qualitatively from the one at \( T = T_S \). It has a minimum where \( r = \bar{p} \) are equal to the Edwards Anderson parameter and the value of potential is zero.

The study of the effective potential at different gives information about the chaotic properties of the models. We shall not develop it here.

### Appendices

#### 5.A Jenssen’s inequality

Jensen’s inequality relates the value of a convex function of an integral to the integral of the convex function. In its simplest form the inequality states that the convex transformation of a mean is less than or equal to the mean applied after convex transformation; it is a simple corollary that the opposite is true of concave transformations.

In probability theory, the Jenssen’s inequality implies that, for \( x \) a random variable and \( \phi \) a convex function, then

\[
\phi(E(x)) \leq E[\phi(x)]
\]  

where \( E[\ldots] \) is the expectation value of \( \ldots \)

#### 5.B The central limit theorem

In probability theory, the central limit theorem (CLT) establishes that, in most situations, when independent random variables are added, their properly normalized sum tends toward a normal (Gaussian) distribution (informally a "bell curve") even if the original variables themselves are not normally distributed. More precisely, for \( x_i \) i.i.d. with average \( \mu \) and variance \( \sigma^2 \),

\[
X = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i x_i
\]

is a Gaussian distributed with average \( [X] = \mu \) and variance \( [(X - [X])^2] = \sigma^2/N \).

They all express the fact that a sum of many independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables, or alternatively, random variables with specific types of dependence, will tend to be distributed according to one of a small set of attractor distributions. When the variance of the i.i.d. variables is finite, the attractor distribution is the normal distribution. In contrast, the sum of a number of i.i.d. random variables with power law tail distributions decreasing as \( |x|^{-\alpha-1} \) where \( 0 < \alpha < 2 \) (and therefore having infinite variance) will tend to an alpha-stable distribution with stability parameter (or index of stability) of \( \alpha \) as the number of variables grows.
5.C Classical results in statistical physics

We recall here some classical results in statistical physics.

5.D High temperature expansion

The partition function of the Ising ferromagnet reads

\[ Z = \sum_{s_i = \pm 1} e^{\beta J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} s_is_j} = \sum_{s_i = \pm 1} \prod_{\langle ij \rangle} e^{\beta J s_is_j} \]  

(5.D.2)

Using the identity \( e^{\beta J s_is_j} = a(1 + bs_is_j) \) with \( a = \cosh(\beta J) \) and \( b = \tanh(\beta J) \) and the fact that \( b \) is order \( \beta \), an expansion if powers of \( b \) can be established. The average of products of the spins \( s_i \)'s that remains can be non-zero only if each spin appears an even number of times \( s_i \). The expansion can then be represented as graphs on the lattice, a representation that makes the enumeration of terms easier.

5.E Lee-Yang theorem

The Lee-Yang theorem states that if partition functions of models with ferromagnetic interactions are considered as functions of an external field, then all zeros are purely imaginary (or on the unit circle after a change of variable) [62].

5.F Critical behaviour

Second order phase transitions are characterised by the diverge of the correlation length. In normal conditions, far from the critical point, the correlation function of the fluctuations of an observable decay as an exponential of the distance between the measuring points:

\[ C(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \langle [O(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}')] - \langle O(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}') \rangle \rangle \langle (O(\mathbf{r}')) \rangle \rangle \sim e^{-r/\xi} . \]  

(5.F.3)

\( \xi \) is the correlation length that diverges at the critical point as

\[ \xi \simeq |T - T_c|^{-\nu} \]  

(5.F.4)

with \( \nu \) a critical exponent. A power-law singularities in the length scales leads to power-law singularities in observable quantities. We summarise in Table 1 all the critical exponents associated to various quantities in a second order phase transition. The values of the critical exponents generally do not depend on the microscopic details but only on the space dimensionality and the symmetries of the system under consideration.

The collection of all these power laws characterizes the critical point and is usually called the critical behavior.

Whether fluctuations influence the critical behavior depends on the space dimensionality \( d \). In general, fluctuations become less important with increasing dimensionality.
In sufficiently low dimensions, i.e. below the lower critical dimension $d_l$, fluctuations are so strong that they completely destroy the ordered phase at all (nonzero) temperatures and there is no phase transition. Between $d_l$ and the upper critical dimension $d_u$, order at low temperatures is possible, there is a phase transition, and the critical exponents are influenced by fluctuations (and depend on $d$). Finally, for $d > d_u$, fluctuations are unimportant for the critical behavior, and this is well described by mean-field theory. The exponents become independent of $d$ and take their mean-field values. For example, for Ising ferromagnets, $d_l = 1$ and $d_u = 4$, for Heisenberg ferromagnets $d_l = 2$ and $d_u = 4$. 

Table 1: Definitions of the commonly used critical exponents. $m$ is the order parameter, e.g. the magnetization, $h$ is an external conjugate field, e.g. a magnetic field, $u$ denotes the distance from the critical point, e.g. $|T - T_c|$, and $d$ is the space dimensionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>exponent</th>
<th>definition</th>
<th>conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific heat</td>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>$c \propto</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order parameter</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$m \propto (-u)\beta$</td>
<td>$u \to 0$, $h = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susceptibility</td>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>$\chi \propto</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical isotherm</td>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>$h \propto</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation length</td>
<td>$\nu$</td>
<td>$\xi \propto</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation function</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>$G(\vec{r}) \propto</td>
<td>\vec{r}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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