

## Matrix Models as Solvable Glass Models

L. F. Cugliandolo,\* J. Kurchan,<sup>†</sup> and G. Parisi

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma I, INFN-Sezione di Roma I, La Sapienza, Roma, Italy*

F. Ritort

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma II, INFN-Sezione di Roma I, Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy*

(Received 25 July 1994)

We present a family of solvable models of interacting particles in high dimensionalities without quenched disorder. We show that the models have a glassy regime with aging effects. The interaction is controlled by a parameter  $p$ . For  $p = 2$  we obtain matrix models and for  $p > 2$  “tensor” models. We concentrate on the cases  $p = 2$  which we study analytically and numerically.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Nr, 64.60.Cn, 64.70.Pf

Disordered systems such as structurally disordered materials (glasses) and spin glasses are characterized by complex free-energy landscapes and nonequilibrium phenomena with time scales exceeding the experimental times [1–5]. In the glass transition, being mainly kinetic, one has to face the full dynamical problem in order to grasp many aspects of the physical behavior of these systems. This is a very difficult problem for realistic models.

As regards to *spin-glass* systems, it has been recently noticed that simple yet microscopically inspired models, for which the mean-field solution is exact [4], have both solvable and nontrivial dynamics which agree at least qualitatively with that of realistic systems [6–8]. Spin glasses are described by Hamiltonians with quenched (random) disorder included *by hand* and do not have an ordered ground state to which the system can possibly decay. Structural glasses instead have an ordered ground state, though when cooled sufficiently fast they remain in a regime of (self-induced) disorder. Various aspects of the glassy behavior have been studied with phenomenological scenarios, dynamical theories, toy kinetic models, and numerical simulations (see, e.g., Refs. [1–3]).

However, unlike the case of *spin glasses*, there has been a lack of simple, solvable Hamiltonians capturing the essentials of structural glasses. Several recent papers investigate mean-field models which, despite having no explicit quenched disorder, still have a glassy transition [9–12]. In particular, the model of Ref. [12] has been shown to obey dynamical equations identical to those of the  $p$  spin glass solved in Ref. [6]. It is not clear whether the emergence of such glassy behavior in these models is a consequence of using “complicated” (i.e., quasirandom) Hamiltonians.

The object of this Letter is to present a family of very simple models having a supercooled liquid phase and a glassy regime. The models represent interacting particles in high dimensionalities allowing for a natural definition of chemical potential, compressibility, etc.

We consider  $n$  particles moving in an  $N$ -dimensional

space, in the limit  $n, N \rightarrow \infty$  [13]. The particle coordinates are  $s^a = (s_1^a, \dots, s_N^a)$  and  $a = 1, \dots, n$ . In the “spherical” case the particles are constrained to move on the surface  $|s^a|^2 = N, \forall a$ . In the  $\pm$  case they can occupy only the vertices of a hypercube  $s_i^a = \pm 1$ . The Hamiltonian reads

$$H \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \neq b} (s^a \cdot s^b)^p. \quad (1)$$

The two-particle interaction is a function of the distance; its range is inversely proportional to the parameter  $p$ . The constraints counterbalance the repulsive force and confine the particles.

We choose  $n$  in order to have nontrivial dynamics. This is fulfilled by the set of choices  $\beta \sim O(\sqrt{n/N^{p-1}})$  and, in particular, we use  $n = 2\alpha N^{p-1}/p!$  with  $\beta \sim O(1)$  or  $n = 2\alpha N/p!$  with  $\beta \sim O(N^{1-p/2})$  (they coincide for  $p = 2$ ).

We concentrate on the model with  $p = 2$ ,

$$Z = e^{\beta N^2} \text{Tr}_{\{s\}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\beta}{\alpha N} \text{tr}(S^\dagger S S^\dagger S) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $S$  is the  $N \times n$  rectangular matrix of elements  $s_i^a$ , and  $\text{Tr}_{\{s\}}$  runs over either the spherical or the Ising measure. The cases  $\alpha > 1$  and  $\alpha < 1$  are related; if  $\alpha > 1$ , the free energy satisfies  $F(\alpha, \beta) = (1/\alpha)F(1/\alpha, \tilde{\beta})$  with  $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha\beta + (\alpha - 1)N^2$ . We also report very briefly some results for the model with  $p = 3, 4$ , and, furthermore, for the  $\pm$  version of (2) but with *symmetrical*  $S$ .

The partition function (2) is that of a rectangular matrix model. In the spherical case it can be solved exactly; it does not have a glassy phase transition but behaves like a “liquid” at all temperatures. The  $\pm$  model has, instead, three phases, and its phase diagram is similar to the one described in Ref. [10]: (i) A high-temperature (liquid) phase in which its free energy coincides (up to a constant) with that of the spherical model. (ii) Low-temperature  $T < T_f$  (“crystalline”) states that dominate the low-temperature Gibbs measure. The statistical transition is first order. (iii) A dynamical low temperature (“glass”) regime  $T < T_g$ .

Our strategy is as follows: We first show the equivalence between spherical and  $\pm$  models in the high-temperature phase, and we solve the spherical model for all temperatures. Then we briefly discuss the nature of the crystalline states of the  $\pm$  model. Finally, we verify numerically, using Monte Carlo dynamics, these analytical results. From the simulations it becomes clear that the  $\pm$  model has a dynamical transition at a temperature  $T_g$ : Below  $T_g$  a large enough system asymptotically reaches an energy that is higher than the analytical continuation of the high-temperature phase, and it never (in the limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) “falls” into a crystalline state. Furthermore, we show that the dynamics in the glass phase is remarkably similar to that of both mean-field and realistic *spin glasses*. We expect that similar results should be obtained with, e.g., Langevin or Glauber dynamics.

Let us first perform a Gaussian decoupling of the quadratic term in Eq. (2) by introducing auxiliary variables  $M_{ab}$ :

$$Z = \chi(\beta) \int DM \text{Tr}_{\{s^a\}} \exp \left( -i \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} \sum_{a,b} M_{ab} s^a \cdot s^b \right). \quad (3)$$

The measure  $DM$  depends on the  $M$  ensemble we consider, both choices  $DM \equiv \prod_{a<b} dM_{ab} \sqrt{N/4\pi} \exp(-N/4\text{tr}M^2)$  ( $M$  real, symmetric with zero diagonal) and  $DM \equiv \prod_{a<b} d\text{Re}(M_{ab}) \times \sqrt{N/4\pi} \prod_{a<b} d\text{Im}(M_{ab}) \times \sqrt{N/4\pi} \exp(-N/4\text{tr}M^2)$  ( $M$  Hermitian) are possible. Then  $\chi = 1$  and  $\chi = e^{\beta N^2}$ , respectively.

For the spherical model we have

$$Z_{\text{sph}} = \chi(\beta) \int \prod_a \frac{dz^a}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left[ \frac{iN\beta}{2\alpha} \sum_a z^a \right] \int DM \exp \left[ -\frac{N}{2} \text{tr} \ln \left( i \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \delta_{ab} z^a + 2i \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{\alpha}} M_{ab} \right) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Since  $z^a$  are only  $N$  variables and the exponent is symmetric with respect to the permutations of the indices of  $z^a$ , an admissible saddle point is  $-iz^a|_{\text{s.p.}} = \mu, \forall a$ . This implies that the solution coincides, in the large  $N$  limit, with that of the same model with the *global* constraint,  $\sum_{i,a} (s_i^a)^2 = nN$ .

The model written in this form, with Hermitian  $M$ , can be recognized as a form of the generalized Penner model

[14] or of the Penner-Kontsevich model before integrating over  $z^a$  [15].

We now prove that the high-temperature expansions for the free energies of the spherical and  $\pm$  models coincide to all orders in  $\beta$ . Let us go back to the  $\pm$  version of Eq. (3) and add a term  $0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \nu_a (N - |s^a|^2)$ . We later fix  $\nu_a$  appropriately. With the symmetric decoupling Eq. (3) becomes

$$Z_{\pm} = e^{(N/2) \sum_a \nu_a} \int DM \exp \left[ N \ln \text{Tr}_{\{s^a\}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ab} s^a D_{ab} s^b \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

with  $D_{ab} = 2i\sqrt{\beta/\alpha} M_{ab} + \delta_{ab} \nu_a$ . Performing the trace over the  $s^a$  after a Gaussian decoupling, the exponent in (5),  $NW(M, \nu)$ , is

$$W(M, \nu) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \ln(\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{I}) + n \ln 2 + \ln \int \prod_a \lambda_a \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ab} \lambda_a \Delta^{-1}_{ab} \lambda_b - \sum_a \frac{\lambda_a^4}{12} + \dots \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\Delta^{-1} \equiv \mathbf{D}^{-1} + \mathbf{I}$  and the dots stand for the higher orders of the series of  $\ln(\cos \lambda_a)$ .

The off-diagonal elements of the propagator  $\Delta_{ab}$  are  $O(1/\sqrt{N})$ . We now choose the  $\nu_a$  to impose that the diagonal elements are also of that order. This yields for  $\nu_a$  the implicit relations  $[\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{I}]_{aa}^{-1} = 1$ , and  $W(M, \nu(M))$  becomes

$$W(M, \nu) = \frac{N}{2} \sum_a \nu_a - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \ln(\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{I}) + n \ln 2 + \text{diag}(M). \quad (7)$$

The term  $\text{diag}$  stands for the diagrams generated by the higher orders in  $\lambda_a$  in (6) with the propagator  $\Delta$ . These are functions of  $M$  which can then be treated as perturbations of  $\text{tr}M^2$  in the integral over  $M$  (for example, the first term is  $\sum_{ab} [M_{ab}]^4$ ). They are, in turn, vertices of the “fat diagrams” (with propagator  $\text{tr}M^2$ ) which lead to nonplanar diagrams, and hence can be neglected in the large  $N$  limit (order by order in  $\beta$ ). This is in contradistinction to the vertices in the fat diagrams coming from the trace of the logarithm in (7) (of the form

$\text{tr}M^k$ ) which cannot be neglected for any  $k$ .

Identifying  $\nu_a \leftrightarrow i\beta z_a/\alpha - 1$ , the condition for the  $\nu_a$  now coincides with the saddle point equation for the  $z^a$  in the spherical model. Hence both free energies coincide to leading order in  $N$ , up to an additive constant in the entropy.

In order to solve the spherical model we return to Eq. (2). Assuming  $\alpha \geq 1$  and using the large  $N$  equivalence with the global constraint we get, up to constant multiplicative factors,

$$Z_{\text{sph}} \sim e^{\beta N^2} \int d\mu \int \prod_{i=1}^N dx_i \exp\left(-N^2 \frac{\beta \mu}{2} - \beta E[x_i]\right). \quad (8)$$

The  $x_i \sqrt{N}$  are the “diagonal” values of  $S$  in its canonical form and  $E[x_i]$  reads

$$E[x] = N \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{\alpha} x_i^4 - \frac{\mu}{2\alpha} x_i^2 - \frac{(\alpha-1)}{\beta} \ln|x_i| \right) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \sum_{i \neq j} \ln|x_i^2 - x_j^2|. \quad (9)$$

We define a symmetric density of eigenvalues  $\rho(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i [\delta(x - x_i) + \delta(x + x_i)]$ . Following Refs. [16,17] we propose the generating function

$$F(z) = \frac{4z^3}{g} - \frac{\mu z}{g} - \frac{(\alpha-1)}{z} - \frac{4z}{g} \sqrt{(z^2 - a^2)(z^2 - b^2)(z^2 + c^2)}, \quad (10)$$

$g \equiv 2\alpha T$ . The jump across the cut of  $F$  yields  $\rho$ . The constants  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ , and the saddle point value of  $\mu$  are determined by the following conditions: (i)  $\rho \sim 1/z$  as  $z \rightarrow \infty$  (normalization), (ii)  $F(z)$  has no pole in  $z = 0$ , and (iii) the constraint  $\sum x_i^2 = n = \alpha N$ . Defining  $a_{\pm} \equiv a^2 \pm b^2$ , these conditions yield fifth degree polynomials for  $a_+$ ,  $a_-^2$ ,  $c^2$ , and  $\mu$ . The energy density is obtained from a contour integral of  $z^4 F(z)$  around the cut and gives  $\epsilon \equiv E/nN = (1/\alpha)[-1 + (a_-^2/32g\alpha)(a_-^2 + 4a_+^2 + 8a_+c^2)]$ . In Fig. 1 we plot  $\epsilon$  vs  $T$  for  $\alpha = 1$ .

At  $T \sim 0$ ,  $E = N^2[(\alpha-1) + T/4]$  for  $\alpha > 1$  (and  $E = N^2 T/4\alpha^2$  for  $\alpha < 1$ ), showing explicitly that the entropy tends to  $-\infty$  logarithmically at  $T = 0$ . Then the entropy of the high-temperature solution vanishes at some temperature  $T_0 > 0$  (for  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $T_0 \sim 0.15$ ). The  $\pm$  model has positive entropy, and hence there must be a temperature  $T_f \geq T_0$  in which the equivalence with the spherical model breaks down and the  $\pm$  system undergoes a *static* transition. Two possibilities then arise: the low- $T$  partition function is dominated either by a glassy state or by an ordered “crystalline state” [10]. For the spherical

model a little algebra shows that the ground states are obtained by constructing the  $N \times n$  matrix  $S$  with rows (columns) of orthogonal vectors of norm  $\sqrt{n}$  ( $\sqrt{N}$ ) for  $n > N$  ( $N > n$ ). For the  $\pm$  model, we are not always able to construct such a matrix with  $\pm 1$  elements, though for some values of  $n, N$  this is possible (e.g.,  $n = N = 2^k$ ), in which case the energy of the lowest configuration coincides with that of the spherical model. For these  $N, n$ , these states dominate the low- $T$  partition function; for other values we have observed numerically other states which though nonoptimal play the same role at low  $T$ . The important point is that these crystalline ground states are different from the glassy regime and are not reached dynamically by large enough systems, as we shall see.

In Fig. 1 we show the analytic and numerical results for the temperature dependence of the energy. The numerical points were obtained by means of a slow annealing in temperature using a Metropolis algorithm with random updating. The energy densities obtained in this way (“dynamical energies”) tend to have a well-defined limit with  $N$ , for  $N$  large enough. For the spherical model the dynamical energy and the analytically predicted static energy coincide for all temperatures. In the high-temperature phase the dynamical energies of the spherical and  $\pm$  models also coincide.

Below the glass temperature  $T_g \sim 0.5$  ( $\alpha = 1$ ), the dynamical energy of the  $\pm$  model is higher than that of the spherical model. For the cases in which the ground state is known (e.g.,  $N = n = 2^k$ ), we have checked that the system takes a time that grows fast with  $N$  to fall into a crystalline state.

In order to understand the nature of the glass phase, we have studied the decay of the autocorrelation functions  $C(t + t_w, t_w) \equiv (1/Nn) \langle \sum_a s^a(t + t_w) \cdot s^a(t_w) \rangle$  ( $t_w$  is the time after a fast temperature quench). Above  $T_g$  for the  $\pm$  model, and at all temperatures for the spherical model, the averaged autocorrelations decay with a time translationally invariant law [ $C(t + t_w, t_w) = C(t)$ ] as in a system in equilibrium. Below  $T_g$  the  $\pm$  model presents aging effects [5]: The autocorrelation functions shown in Fig. 2 are clearly those of a system away from equilibrium even for very long times. The autocorrelations have, for large  $t, t_w$ , an approximate  $t/t_w$  dependence [for large  $t/t_w$ ,  $C \sim (t/t_w)^{-0.05}$ ] and are strikingly similar to the




FIG. 1. Numerical values for the energy density vs temperature for the spherical (crosses) and  $\pm$  (diamonds) models.  $N = n = 50$ ,  $\alpha = 1$ . The solid line shows the analytical solution for the spherical model.




FIG. 2. Aging curves for the  $\pm$  model for  $\alpha = 1$  at  $T = 0.2$  ( $< T_g$ );  $\ln - \ln$  plot,  $C(t + t_w, t_w)$  vs  $t/t_w$  for  $t_w = 1000, 300, 100, 30$ ,  $t$  up to 3000.  $N = n = 500$ .

corresponding ones of mean field [6–8] and  $d = 3$  spin glasses [18].

Let us mention in passing that we have performed dynamical simulations of the  $\pm$  model (1) with  $p = 3$  [ $n \sim N^2$ ,  $\beta \sim O(1)$ ], with  $p = 4$  [ $n \sim N$ ,  $\beta \sim O(1/N)$ ] and also of (2) with  $S^\dagger = S$ . In all these cases we have glassy behavior.

In order to make contact with the theory of systems with quenched disorder we first note that quenching  $n - 1$  particles in random positions in the system described by Eq. (1) the dynamics of the remaining particle is that of neural network models (at negative temperature) [19]; systems known to have a *spin-glass* behavior.

A different strategy that can be used to solve all the models we have described consists in proposing a model with quenched disorder which is expected to have the same dynamical behavior [9,10]. For the case  $p = 2$  the natural choice is to consider the Hamiltonian (1) with the  $s_i^a$  defined by  $s_i^a = U(ai, bj) t_j^b$ , where  $t_i^a$  are either spherically constrained or  $\pm 1$ . The tensor  $U(ai, bj)$  is a quenched random variable taken from the ensemble of orthogonal transformations  $\mathcal{R}^{n \times N} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{n \times N}$  [i.e., preserving the norm  $\|t\|^2 \equiv \sum (t_i^a)^2$ ]. One then considers (quenched) averaged quantities over  $U$ .

The analysis of the statics uses the replica trick and goes along the lines of Ref. [10]. We do not describe it in detail here, but report some results: If the  $t_i^a$  are spherically constrained, the disordered model coincides with the nondisordered spherical model for all temperatures. If the  $t_i^a$  take values  $\pm 1$ , the high-temperature phase (uncoupled replicas) also coincides with the spherical model. In order to analyze the low-temperature (glassy) phase of the disordered model one ends up with a replicated matrix model. Perhaps more ambitiously, one could try to face

the full dynamical problem as developed for mean-field spin glasses [6].

We wish to acknowledge useful suggestions from S. Franz, E. Marinari, J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, and G. Zemba.

\*Present address: Service de Physique de l'Etat Condensé, CEA, Saclay, France.

†Present address: LPT, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, France.

- [1] R. Palmer and D. Stein, in *Lectures in the Science of Complexity*, edited by D.L. Stein (Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., Reading, MA, 1989).
- [2] W. Götze, in *Liquids, Freezing and Glass Transition*, Proceedings of the Les Houches Summer School, Session LI, edited by J.P. Hansen, D. Levesque, and J. Zinn-Justin (Elsevier Sc. Publishers BV, Amsterdam, 1991).
- [3] W. Paul and J. Baschnagel, in *Monte Carlo and Molecular Dynamics Simulations in Polymer Science*, edited by K. Binder (Oxford University Press, New York, 1994), and references therein.
- [4] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M.A. Virasoro, *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987).
- [5] L.C.E. Struik, *Physical Aging in Amorphous Polymers and Other Materials* (Elsevier, Houston, 1978).
- [6] L.F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 173 (1993); J. Phys. A **27**, 5749 (1994); Report No. cond-mat 9403040 [Philos. Mag. (to be published)]; the dynamics of the Potts glass can be solved along these lines: L.F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan (unpublished).
- [7] L.F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and F. Ritort, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 6331 (1994).
- [8] S. Franz and M. Mézard, Europhys. Lett. **26**, 209 (1994); Physica (Amsterdam) **209A**, 1 (1994).
- [9] J.-P. Bouchaud and M. Mézard, J. Phys. I (France) **4**, 1109 (1994).
- [10] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and F. Ritort, Report No. hep-th 9405148; Report No. cond-mat 9406074.
- [11] W. Krauth and M. Mézard, Report No. cond-mat 9407029; G. Migliorini and F. Ritort, Report No. cond-mat 9407105.
- [12] S. Franz and J. Hertz, Report No. cond-mat 9408079.
- [13] For the role of high dimensionalities in this context, see T.R. Kirkpatrick and P.G. Wolynes, Phys. Rev. A **35**, 3072 (1987).
- [14] R.C. Penner, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **15**, 73 (1986); J. Diff. Geom. **27**, 35 (1988).
- [15] L. Chekhov and Yu. Makeenko, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **14**, 1223 (1992).
- [16] E. Brézin, C. Itzykson, G. Parisi, and J.-B. Zuber, Commun. Math. Phys. **59**, 35 (1978).
- [17] G.M. Cicuta, L. Molinari, E. Montaldi, and F. Riva, J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.) **28**, 1716 (1987); A. Anderson, R. Myers, and V. Periwal, Phys. Lett. B **254**, 89 (1991); Nucl. Phys. **B360**, 463 (1991); M. Srednicki, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **7**, 2857 (1992).
- [18] H. Rieger, J. Phys. A **26**, L615 (1993).
- [19] J.J. Hopfield, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **79**, 2554 (1982); D.J. Amit, H. Gutfreund, and H. Sompolinsky, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **173**, 30 (1987); E. Gardner, J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.) **20**, 3453 (1987); L.F. Abbot and Y. Arain, Phys. Rev. A **36**, 5091 (1987).