

Generic Microscopic Theory for the Universality of Glass TTLS Meissner-Berret Ratio

Di Zhou¹, Anthony J. Leggett¹

¹*Department of Physics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,
1110 West Green St, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*

(Dated: July 19, 2022)

Tunneling-two-level-system (TTLS) has successfully explained several experimental results for amorphous solid which do not exist in crystalline counterparts. However longitudinal and transverse phonon-TTLS coupling constants' ratio γ_l/γ_t has been found to lie between 1.44 and 1.84 for 13 different amorphous solids which cannot be explained within TTLS model. In this paper by developing an interacting generic block model with random stress tensors, we show the universality essentially comes from interaction between generic blocks, independent of the material's microscopic structure. In the appendix we also give a detailed correction for non-elastic stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ derived by Joffrin and Levelut³.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been more than 50 years since the first experiment⁷ by Zeller and Pohl showed at ultra-low temperatures below 1K the thermal properties of amorphous solids behave entirely different from that of crystalline counterparts. Anderson, Halperin and Varma⁸ group and Phillips⁹ independently developed a model which was later known as tunneling two level system (TTLS). It successfully explained several universal experimental results of amorphous solids which cannot be found in crystalline solids, e.g., linear heat capacity, saturation, echoes, low-temperature heat conductivity etc. In TTLS model people assume amorphous solid's Hamiltonian is the summation of elastic (phonon) part of Hamiltonian, a set of non-elastic two level systems and phonon-two level system couplings. The longitudinal and transverse phonon-TTLS coupling constants denoted as $\gamma_{l,t}$ are adjustable parameters. However, in 1987 it was Meissner and Berret's experiment¹⁰ first pointed out the coupling constants $\gamma_{l,t}$ are not arbitrary: below temperature $T < 1K$, the ratio between them γ_l/γ_t turns out to lie between 1.44 and 1.84 for a wide variety of amorphous materials, regardless of their chemical compounds and microscopic molecular structure. Such universality suggests coupling constants $\gamma_{l,t}$ come from more general mechanism which cannot be explained within TTLS model. In the rest of this paper, we use "Meissner-Berret Ratio" to represent for "TTLS coupling constants' ratio γ_l/γ_t ".

Besides this dilemma, there are a number of other problems in TTLS model. First, while TTLS successfully explained several universal properties of amorphous solid below 1K, there are more universalities cannot be explained by it in between the temperature $1K < T < 30K$ ⁶, e.g. low-temperature heat capacity plateau around 10K. Second, the model itself has too many adjustable parameters, for example, random distribution function $f(\epsilon, \Delta)$ for two level system's diagonal and off-diagonal matrix elements ϵ, Δ ; coupling constants $\gamma_{l,t}$, etc. Experimental results could be explained by adjusting these parameters within a certain extent. Third, the model lacks the consideration that as the interaction with phonon

strain field, TTLS must generate a mutual RKKY-type interaction³. Taking this virtual-phonon exchange interaction into account may not only change current theoretical results, but also question the validity of TTLS.

In this paper we want to focus on the universality of Meissner-Berret ratio ($\gamma_l/\gamma_t \approx (1.44 \sim 1.84)$) by developing a theory of coupled generic blocks. We start by expanding non-elastic part of amorphous solid Hamiltonian in orders of strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ and consider its resonance energy absorption due to the input of external longitudinal and transverse phonons. Within TTLS model the resonance energy absorption per unit time $\dot{E}_{l,t}$ is proportional to the square of coupling constant $\gamma_{l,t}$; in our generic coupled block model the resonance energy absorption is only functional of longitudinal/transverse speed of sound. We believe this experimentally measurable quantity which does not rely on adjustable parameters can help explain the universality of Meissner-Berret Ratio.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In section 2 we set up the main goal of this paper, universality of Meissner-Berret ratio from experiments when measuring TTLS parameters. Different from TTLS model we derive an interacting generic block Hamiltonian with the presence of external phonon strain field, and introduce the most important concept, non-elastic stress-stress susceptibility. In section 3 we study the resonance energy absorption of N_0^3 interacting single blocks due to the input of external longitudinal (transverse) phonon strain field. By assuming the external strain field is weak enough, we expand energy absorption up to the second order of it, and derive single blocks and super block's resonance energy absorption relation. In section 4 we use renormalization technique to carry out the Meissner-Berret ratio at experimental length scale. We prove this experimental measurable quantity is independent of the material's microscopic nature. We also use least square method to fit theoretical and experimental data relation for 13 different amorphous materials listed in section 4. In section 5 we give a detailed discussion on electric dipole interaction's influence on Meissner-Berret ratio for dielectric amorphous solids. The influence of electric dipole-dipole

interaction to Meissner-Berret ratio is renormalization irrelevant, although its strength is the same order of magnitude as that of non-elastic stress-stress interaction. In the appendix (A) we give a detailed derivation regarding non-elastic stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$, and point out 4 differences between our result and that derived by Joffrin and Levelut³.

II. THE SET UP OF MEISSNER-BERRET RATIO PROBLEM

A. Generic Block Hamiltonian in terms of $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ Expansions

Based on TTLS model the amorphous solid Hamiltonian with the linear coupling between two level systems and phonon strain field is written as¹²

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} E & 0 \\ 0 & -E \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\gamma_{l,t}}{2} Ak \begin{pmatrix} D & M \\ M & -D \end{pmatrix} e^{i\omega t} \quad (2.1)$$

where the Hamiltonian is written in two level system eigenbasis with $E = \sqrt{\Delta^2 + \Delta_0^2}$ the energy splitting; $D = \Delta/E$ and $M = \Delta_0/E$ are diagonal and off-diagonal matrix elements¹ of coupling between two level system and phonon strain field, and by definition they are no greater than 1; Ak is the product of phonon wave amplitude A and wave number k ; ω is the frequency of input external phonon; $\gamma_{l,t}$ is the longitudinal and transverse coupling constants. Because in amorphous solid there are a set of TTLS with different paramters $\Delta, \Delta_0, \gamma_{l,t}$, those TTLS in resonance with external phonon field $E = \hbar\omega$ can absorb energy which linearly increases with time t . Using Fermi golden rule the resonance energy absorption per unit time is proportional to coupling constant squared:

$$\dot{E}_{l,t} = \frac{\pi}{2\hbar} A^2 k^2 M^2 E \tanh\left(\frac{1}{2}\beta\hbar\omega\right) \delta(E - \hbar\omega) \gamma_{l,t}^2 \propto \gamma_{l,t}^2 \quad (2.2)$$

where we take phonon strain $e = Ak$ to be identical for longitudinal and transverse input phonons.

Since the set up of TTLS model is based on these parameters, within it we cannot explain the universality of γ_l/γ_t . Therefore, we start by building up generic interacting blocks to consider their energy absorption due to external phonon fields, and try to explore if the ratio of energy absorption due to longitudinal and transverse phonon is independent of materials' chemical compound.

Let us consider a block of amorphous solid with the dimension L much greater than the atomic distance $a \sim 10\text{\AA}$. The elastic strain $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ can be defined as the spacial derivative of displacement $\vec{u}(\vec{x}, t)$ for the matter located at \vec{x} :

$$e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial u_i(\vec{x}, t)}{\partial x_j} + \frac{\partial u_j(\vec{x}, t)}{\partial x_i} \right) \quad (2.3)$$

We write \hat{H} for the Hamiltonian of the amorphous solid block, and expand it in orders of elastic strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ in long wavelength limit:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \int d^3x \sum_{ij} e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{O}(e_{ij}^2) \quad (2.4)$$

where the definition of stress tensor $\hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x})$ is the first order derivative of Hamiltonian regarding strain field

$$\hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) = \frac{\delta \hat{H}(t)}{\delta e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)} \quad (2.5)$$

Next we can define stress-stress tensor susceptibility, the derivative of stress tensor \hat{T}_{ij} regarding strain field e_{kl} :

$$\chi_{ijkl}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}'; t - t') = \left\langle \frac{\delta \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)}{\delta e_{kl}(\vec{x}', t')} \right\rangle \quad (2.6)$$

In the above definition the average operator $\langle \rangle$ represents thermal average and quantum average. For an arbitrary operator \hat{A} , $\langle \hat{A} \rangle = \sum_m \mathcal{Z}^{-1} e^{-\beta E_m} \langle m, t | \hat{A} | m, t \rangle$ with $|m\rangle$ the eigenbasis of Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 and \mathcal{Z} the distribution function with the temperature $\beta = (k_B T)^{-1}$.

Let us separate Hamiltonian \hat{H} into purely elastic part \hat{H}^{el} and non-elastic part \hat{H}^{non} . The elastic part \hat{H}^{el} is usually written in terms of phonon wave functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}^{\text{el}} &= \text{Const} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \left(\sum_{ijkl} \chi_{ijkl}^{\text{el}} e_{ij}(\vec{x}) e_{kl}(\vec{x}) + \sum_i \rho \dot{u}_i^2(\vec{x}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

From the above definition we can also define the elastic part of stress tensor \hat{T}_{ij}^{el} ,

$$\hat{T}_{ij}^{\text{el}}(\vec{x}) = \sum_{kl} \chi_{ijkl}^{\text{el}} e_{kl}(\vec{x}) \quad (2.8)$$

The corresponding elastic stress-stress susceptibility can be derived by using linear response theory, and it obeys the generic form of arbitrary isotropic material:

$$\chi_{ijkl}^{\text{el}} = (\chi_l^{\text{el}} - 2\chi_t^{\text{el}}) \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \chi_t^{\text{el}} (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk}) \quad (2.9)$$

in the limit of elastic continuum $\chi_{l,t}^{\text{el}}$ are given by longitudinal and transverse speed of sound (with the wavelength λ , $a \ll \lambda \ll L$):

$$\chi_{l,t}^{\text{el}} = \rho c_{l,t}^2 \quad (2.10)$$

where ρ is the mass density of amorphous solid. Subtracting the elastic part of Hamiltonian, we can also define a new stress tensor which comes from non-elastic part of it:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}^{\text{non}}(t) &= \hat{H}_0^{\text{non}} + \int d^3x \sum_{ij} e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{\text{non}}(\vec{x}) + \mathcal{O}(e_{ij}^2) \\ \hat{T}_{ij}^{\text{non}}(\vec{x}) &= \frac{\delta \hat{H}^{\text{non}}(t)}{\delta e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

The non-elastic stress-stress susceptibility is then defined as $\chi_{ijkl}^{\text{non}}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}'; t - t') = \langle \delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{\text{non}}(\vec{x}, t) / \delta e_{kl}(\vec{x}', t') \rangle$. In the rest of this paper we will always use \hat{H}_0 , χ_{ijkl} and \hat{T}_{ij} to stand for non-elastic part of \hat{H}_0^{non} , χ_{ijkl}^{non} and $\hat{T}_{ij}^{\text{non}}$.

To calculate the space average of non-elastic stress-stress susceptibility $\chi_{ijkl}(\omega) = \frac{1}{L^3} \int d^3x d^3x' \chi_{ijkl}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}'; \omega)$ let's denote $|m\rangle$ and E_m to be the eigenbasis and eigenvalues of unperturbed non-elastic Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 . The eigenbasis $|m\rangle$ is a generic multiple-level-system. By putting in external weak strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ the system receives a perturbation $\int d^3x \sum_{ij} e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t) \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x})$. Using linear response theory on $\langle \hat{T}_{ij} \rangle(\vec{x}, t)$ regarding perturbation $e_{ij} \hat{T}_{ij}$, we obtain non-elastic susceptibility as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}(T, \omega) &= \sum_m \frac{e^{-\beta E_m}}{\mathcal{Z}} \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) \\ \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) &= \frac{\pi}{L^3} \int d^3x d^3x' \sum_n \langle m | \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{T}_{kl}(\vec{x}') | m \rangle \\ &\quad [\delta(E_n - E_m - \omega) - \delta(E_n - E_m + \omega)] \quad (2.12) \end{aligned}$$

Where $\mathcal{Z} = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n}$ is the distribution function, and we set $\hbar = 1$. Because $E_n \geq E_0$ for arbitrary $n \geq 0$, the definition of $\text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega)$ in Eq.(2.12) is only valid when $E_m \geq \omega \geq -E_m$; otherwise we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) &= \frac{\pi}{L^3} \int d^3x d^3x' \sum_n \langle m | \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{T}_{kl}(\vec{x}') | m \rangle \\ &\quad \times [-\delta(E_n - E_m + \omega)] \quad \text{if } \omega < -E_m \\ \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) &= \frac{\pi}{L^3} \int d^3x d^3x' \sum_n \langle m | \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{T}_{kl}(\vec{x}') | m \rangle \\ &\quad \times \delta(E_n - E_m - \omega) \quad \text{if } \omega > E_m \quad (2.13) \end{aligned}$$

it is convenient to rewrite the imaginary susceptibility Eq.(2.12) into reduced imaginary susceptibility $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}$ as follows for future use:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \chi_{ijkl}(T, \omega) &= (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega}) \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}(T, \omega) \\ \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}(T, \omega) &= \sum_m \frac{e^{-\beta E_m}}{\mathcal{Z}} \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) \\ \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}^{(m)}(\omega) &= \frac{\pi}{L^3} \int d^3x d^3x' \sum_n \langle m | \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{T}_{kl}(\vec{x}') | m \rangle \\ &\quad \times \delta(E_n - E_m - \omega) \quad (2.14) \end{aligned}$$

Again, for an arbitrary isotropic system the non-elastic susceptibility must satisfy the genetic form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}(T, \omega) &= (\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T, \omega) - 2 \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega)) \delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} \\ &\quad + \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega) (\delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{il} \delta_{jk}) \quad (2.15) \end{aligned}$$

where please note we use $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega)$ to stand for imaginary part of non-elastic longitudinal transverse stress-stress susceptibility $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}^{\text{non}}(T, \omega)$. The real part non-elastic susceptibility $\text{Re } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}(T, \omega)$ can be obtained by Kramers-Kronig relation from the imaginary part.

B. Virtual Phonon Exchange Interactions

From the definition Eq.(2.11), within the consideration of single-block problem, non-elastic stress tensor $\hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x})$ is just a generalization of two-level-systems (see Eq.(2.1)). There is not much difference between generic block model and TTLS. However, if we combine a set of such blocks together, the interaction between single blocks will be taken into account. Since the stress-strain interacting term $e_{ij} \hat{T}_{ij}$ contains phonon field e_{ij} , the exchange of virtual phonons will give an effective RKKY-type interaction between blocks via stress tensor products:

$$\hat{V} = \int d^3x d^3x' \sum_{ijkl} \Lambda_{ijkl}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) \hat{T}_{kl}(\vec{x}') \quad (2.16)$$

where the coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}')$ was first derived by Joffrin and Levelut³. We give a further correction to it in Appendix (A).

$$\Lambda_{ijkl}(\vec{x} - \vec{x}') = -\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}(\vec{n})}{8\pi\rho c_t^2 |\vec{x} - \vec{x}'|^3} \quad (2.17)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl} &= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ (\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l) \delta_{ik} + (\delta_{jk} - 3n_j n_k) \delta_{il} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\delta_{ik} - 3n_i n_k) \delta_{jl} + (\delta_{il} - 3n_i n_l) \delta_{jk} \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{c_t^2}{c_l^2} \right) \left\{ -(\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{jk} \delta_{il}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 3(n_i n_j \delta_{kl} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + n_j n_k \delta_{il} + n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k n_l \delta_{ij}) - 15n_i n_j n_k n_l \right\} \quad (2.18) \end{aligned}$$

where \vec{n} is the unit vector of $\vec{x} - \vec{x}'$, and i, j, k, l runs over 1, 2, 3 cartesian coordinates. We will call Eq.(2.16) non-elastic stress-stress interaction. In the following of this paper we always use the approximation to replace $\vec{x} - \vec{x}'$ by $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$ for the pair of the s -th and s' -th blocks, when \vec{x}_s denotes the center of the s -th block, and that $\int_{V^{(s)}} \hat{T}_{ij}(\vec{x}) d^3x = \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$ is the uniform stress tensor of the s -th block. Also, from now on we use $e_{ij}^{(s)}(t)$ to denote the phonon strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ located at the s -th block. By combining $N_0 \times N_0 \times N_0$ identical $L \times L \times L$ unit blocks to form a $N_0 L \times N_0 L \times N_0 L$ super block, the Hamiltonian without external strain field is written as

$$\hat{H}^{\text{super}} = \sum_s^{N_0^3} \hat{H}_0^{(s)} + \sum_{s \neq s'}^{N_0^3} \sum_{ijkl} \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \quad (2.19)$$

From now on we make the assumption that these block space-averaged stress tensors $\hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$ are diagonal in space coordinates: $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}^{(ss')}(T, \omega) = \frac{1}{L^3} \langle \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \rangle = \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{ijkl}(T, \omega) \delta_{ss'}$.

C. Full Hamiltonian of Amorphous Solid with the Presence of External Strain field

In this section let us write amorphous solid Hamiltonian with the presence of external strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ as a perturbation. It seems the Hamiltonian Eq.(2.19) simply adds a stress-strain interacting term $\sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$. However, more questions arise with the appearance of external strain field.

First of all these non-elastic stress tensors $\hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$ might be modified. A familiar example is that strain field can modify electric dipole moments by changing relative positions of positive-negative charge pairs (to the leading order of strain): $\Delta p_i(t) = \sum_j (\partial u_i(t)/\partial x_j) p_j$ where i, j are cartesian coordinates, and $\vec{u}(\vec{x}, t)$ is phonon field. In principle we need to obtain the modification of stress ten-

sors, $\Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t)$ to the leading order in $e_{ij}^{(s)}(t)$ for it's resonance energy absorption contribution. However, we only qualitatively know the expansion of $\Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t)$ in orders of strain $e = Ak$ is $\Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \sim e(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} + \mathcal{O}(e^2)$. Within qualitative Taylor series technique we calculate it's energy absorption contribution in section 3, Eq.(3.5). We will show this energy absorption contribution is renormalization irrelevant at experimental length scale in section 4 via scaling analysis.

There is a second problem arising from external phonon strain field: the relative positions of unit blocks $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$ can be changed, resulting in the modification of stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}(e)$. To the first order expansion in strain field the modification of $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} &= \left(\frac{x_{ss'}}{\Delta x_{ss'}} \Delta \tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}^{(ss')} - 3 \tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \cos \theta_{ss'} \right) \frac{\Delta x_{ss'}}{x_{ss'}^4} \\ \Delta \tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}^{(ss')} &= \left\{ \frac{3}{4} \left[2(n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_j n_k \delta_{il} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk}) \cos \theta_{ss'} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - [(m_j n_l + m_l n_j) \delta_{ik} + (m_j n_k + m_k n_j) \delta_{il} + (m_i n_k + m_k n_i) \delta_{jl} + (m_i n_l + m_l n_i)] \delta_{jk} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 3\alpha \cos \theta_{ss'} \left(n_k n_l \delta_{ij} + n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k n_j \delta_{il} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_j \delta_{kl} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{3}{2} \alpha \left[m_i (n_l \delta_{jk} + n_k \delta_{jl} + n_j \delta_{kl}) + m_j (n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k \delta_{il} + n_i \delta_{kl}) + m_k (n_l \delta_{ij} + n_i \delta_{jl} + n_j \delta_{il}) + m_l (n_k \delta_{ij} + n_i \delta_{jk} + n_j \delta_{ik}) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{15}{2} \alpha \left(m_i n_j n_k n_l + m_j n_i n_k n_l + m_k n_i n_j n_l + m_l n_i n_j n_k \right) + 30\alpha n_i n_j n_k n_l \cos \theta_{ss'} \right\} \frac{\Delta x_{ss'}}{x_{ss'}^4} \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - c_i^2/c_j^2$, $x_{ss'} = |\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}|$, $\Delta \vec{x}_s = \vec{u}(\vec{x}_s, t)$, $\Delta x_{ss'} = |\Delta \vec{x}_s - \Delta \vec{x}_{s'}|$, $\cos \theta_{ss'} = (\Delta \vec{x}_{ss'} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'})/\Delta x_{ss'} x_{ss'}$ is the angle between $\Delta \vec{x}_{ss'}$ and $\vec{x}_{ss'}$, and $\vec{m} = \Delta \vec{x}_{ss'}/\Delta x_{ss'}$ is the unit vector of $\Delta \vec{x}_{ss'}$. Finally by taking everything into account the total Hamiltonian for super block amorphous solid with the presence of external weak strain field $e(\vec{x}, t)$ reads

$$\hat{H}^{\text{super}}(e) = \sum_s^{N_0^3} \left(\hat{H}_0^{(s)} + \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \right) + \sum_{s \neq s'}^{N_0^3} \sum_{ijkl} \left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} + \Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} + 2\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \right) \quad (2.21)$$

III. SECOND ORDER PERTURBATION THEORY TO ENERGY ABSORPTION OF SUPER BLOCK

In previous discussions we know within TTLS model the resonance energy absorption per unit time is proportional to coupling constant squared: $\dot{E}_{l,t} \propto \gamma_{l,t}^2$. In this section we use generic interacting block model to consider it from longitudinal and transverse phonons. We first consider a single-block amorphous solid with dimension $L \times L \times L$, with the unperturbed Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 and perturbation $\sum_{ij} e_{ij}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}$, so it's total Hamiltonian is

$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{ij} e_{ij}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}$. We denote $|n\rangle$ and E_n to be the n -th eigenstate and eigenvalue of unperturbed Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 . Thus the single-block energy absorption rate is $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta E_n}}{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\langle n_I, t | \hat{H}_I(t) | n_I, t \rangle - \langle n | \hat{H}_0 | n \rangle \right)$, where $|n_I, t\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^t \sum_{ij} e_{ij}(t') \hat{T}_{ij(I)}(t') dt'} |n\rangle$ is the interaction picture wavefunction, and $\hat{H}_I(t)$ and $\hat{T}_{ij(I)}(t')$ are interaction picture operators. For an arbitrary interaction picture operator $\hat{A}_I(t)$ we have $\hat{A}_I(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar} \hat{A}(t) e^{-i\hat{H}_0 t/\hbar}$. The single-block's resonance energy absorption per unit time is

$$\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}} = 2L^3 A^2 k^2 \omega (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega}) \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega) \quad (3.1)$$

where Ak is the strength of strain field e_{ij} , ω is its frequency. With the argument by D. C. Vural and A. J. Leggett⁶ and the experiment by R. O. Pohl, X. Liu and E. Thompson¹⁶ we assume that within a certain extent of frequency $\omega < \omega_c$ below 1K the longitudinal and transverse imaginary susceptibility can be approximately treated as a constant of frequency $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega) \approx \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T)$. In section 4, Eq.(4.3) we will discuss the order of magnitude of ω_c in details. Given the external phonon field amplitude A and wave number k the energy absorption per unit time for single-block amorphous solid is proportional to longitudinal and transverse imaginary susceptibility $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T)$: $\dot{E}_l^{\text{single}}/\dot{E}_t^{\text{single}} = \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T)/\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T)$. Compare this with energy absorption rate from TTLS model, i.e., $\dot{E}_l^{\text{single}}/\dot{E}_t^{\text{single}} = \gamma_l^2/\gamma_t^2$, we get the relation between imaginary susceptibility and coupling constant $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T)/\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T) = \gamma_l^2/\gamma_t^2$.

Within single-block considerations one cannot extract more information from generic block model than TTLS. However, the exchange of virtual phonons allows non-elastic stress-stress interaction between blocks. Let's think about a set of N_0^3 identical single blocks with the dimension $L \times L \times L$ combined together to form a super block $N_0L \times N_0L \times N_0L$. The presence of many-block interaction \hat{V} affects the energy absorption of super block. To explore this problem we follow three steps: (1) turn off stress-stress (many-block) interaction \hat{V} . These N_0^3 identical single blocks are non-interacting. Thus the Hamiltonian for super block is the summation of single block Hamiltonians $\hat{H}_0 = \sum_s \hat{H}_0^{(s)}$, where s denotes the s -th block which runs over $s = 1, 2, \dots, N_0^3$. We denote $|n\rangle = \prod_s |n^{(s)}\rangle$ and $E_n = \sum_s E_n^{(s)}$ to be the n -th eigenstate and eigenvalue for Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 ; (2) turn on non-elastic stress-stress interaction $\hat{V} = \sum_{ss'} \sum_{ijkl} \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}$ as static perturbation. The eigenstate and eigenvalue change as follows:

$$|n^*\rangle = |n\rangle + \sum_{l \neq n} \frac{\langle l | \hat{V} | n \rangle}{E_n - E_l} |l\rangle + \dots$$

$$E_n^* = E_n + \langle n | \hat{V} | n \rangle + \sum_{l \neq n} \frac{|\langle l | \hat{V} | n \rangle|^2}{E_n - E_l} + \dots \quad (3.2)$$

where $|n^*\rangle$ and E_n^* are the n -th eigenstate and eigenvalue for $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$; (3) take $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$ as static Hamiltonian of interaction picture, we turn on time-dependent perturbation $\hat{H}'(t) = \sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} + \sum_{ss'} \sum_{ijkl} \left(\Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} + 2 \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \right)$ to calculate the energy absorption rate of super block Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$:

$$\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta E_n^*}}{\mathcal{Z}^*}$$

$$\left(\langle n_I^*, t | \hat{H}_{0I}(t) + \hat{V}_I(t) | n_I^*, t \rangle - \langle n^* | \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V} | n^* \rangle \right) \quad (3.3)$$

where $\mathcal{Z}^* = \sum_n e^{-\beta E_n^*}$ is the distribution function for

static Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$; $|n_I^*, t\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^t \hat{H}'(t') dt'} |n^*\rangle$ is the interaction picture wavefunction; $\hat{H}'_I(t)$, $\hat{V}_I(t)$ and \hat{H}_{0I} are interaction picture operators: for arbitrary operator $\hat{A}(t)$ its interaction picture version is $\hat{A}_I(t) = e^{i(\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V})t/\hbar} \hat{A}(t) e^{-i(\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V})t/\hbar}$. Please note $\hat{H}_{0I}(t) \neq \hat{H}_0$ and $\hat{V}_I(t) \neq \hat{V}$, but we have $\hat{H}_{0I}(t) + \hat{V}_I(t) = \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}$.

By expanding up to the second order in phonon strain field $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ there are four terms in total energy absorption rate Eq.(3.3). Three of them come from perturbation $\hat{H}'(t)$, the last one comes from non-elastic stress-stress interaction \hat{V} . We first consider the energy absorption rate due to perturbation $\hat{H}'(t)$. It contains three terms, one is quadratic in operator $\sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$, giving the energy absorption rate $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{(1)}(L) = N_0^3 \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L)$. The second term is quadratic in the expectation value of $\sum_{ss'} \sum_{ijkl} \Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}$:

$$\dot{E}_l^{(2)}(L) = (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega})$$

$$\left[(55 + 176\alpha + 688\alpha^2) + 44(1 + 4\alpha + 4\alpha^2)x(T, \omega) \right]$$

$$\frac{A^2 k^2 N_0^3 \ln N_0}{40\pi^3 (\rho c_t^2)^2} \omega \int \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \Omega) \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega - \Omega) d\omega$$

$$\dot{E}_t^{(2)}(L) = (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega})$$

$$\left[(35 + 112\alpha + 656\alpha^2) + 28(1 + 4\alpha + 4\alpha^2)x(T, \omega) \right]$$

$$\frac{A^2 k^2 N_0^3 \ln N_0}{40\pi^3 (\rho c_t^2)^2} \omega \int \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \Omega) \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega - \Omega) d\omega \quad (3.4)$$

where $\alpha = 1 - \frac{c_t^2}{c_l^2}$ and $x(T, \omega) = \frac{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega)}{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega)} - 2$. Again we assume $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega) \approx \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T)$ is weakly dependent on frequency within a certain extent $\omega < \omega_c$ for $T < 1K$. For details of discussions regarding ω_c , please refer to section 4, Eq.(4.3). Eq.(3.4) are given by the convolution between $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \Omega)$ and $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega - \Omega)$. The third term is quadratic in $2\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}$. By substituting qualitative first order expansion $\Delta \hat{T}_{ij} \sim e \hat{T}_{ij} + \mathcal{O}(e^2)$ the energy absorption rate due to external phonon is

$$\dot{E}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L) \sim K_{l,t} (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega})$$

$$\frac{A^2 k^2 N_0^3 \ln N_0}{\pi^3 (\rho c_t^2)^2} \omega \int \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \Omega) \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega - \Omega) d\Omega \quad (3.5)$$

where $K_{l,t}$ are constants for longitudinal and transverse cases, of order ~ 1 . By comparing Eq.(3.4) and (3.5), the energy absorption from $\Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}$ and $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}$ have the same scale dependence. In the next section we will demonstrate both of them are renormalization irrelevant at experimental length scale. Finally we consider the fourth contribution of energy absorption from non-elastic stress-stress interaction \hat{V} . By

expanding it to the second order of $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$, the energy absorption rate is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}_{l,t}(L) &= (1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega}) \frac{4N_0^3 L^3 A^2 k^2 \ln N_0}{\rho c_{t,l}^2} \\ &\quad \omega \operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{t,l}(T, \omega) \operatorname{Re} \tilde{\chi}_{t,l}(T, \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

The total energy absorption of super block is given by the summation of the above four terms $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L) = \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(1)}(L) + \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(2)}(L) + \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L) + \dot{V}_{l,t}(L)$. Because ‘‘super block’’ at length scale L is the ‘‘single block’’ at length scale $N_0 L$, we have the important relation $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(N_0 L) = \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L)$. Super block energy absorption ratio due to longitudinal and transverse input phonon is therefore $\dot{E}_l^{\text{single}}(N_0 L) / \dot{E}_t^{\text{single}}(N_0 L)$. The Meissner-Berret ratio at length scale $N_0 L$ is $\gamma_l^2 / \gamma_t^2 = \dot{E}_l^{\text{single}}(N_0 L) / \dot{E}_t^{\text{single}}(N_0 L)$ which is different from that at length scale L , $\gamma_l^2 / \gamma_t^2 = \dot{E}_l^{\text{single}}(L) / \dot{E}_t^{\text{single}}(L)$. This implies that Meissner-Berret ratio is not a constant with the increase of length scale because of non-elastic stress-stress interaction. To study the universality of Meissner-Berret ratio we need to obtain energy absorption rate $\dot{E}_{l,t}$ at experimental length scale R .

IV. RENORMALIZATION PROCEDURE OF SUSCEPTIBILITY

In this section we want to get the energy absorption rate at experimental length scale by repeating renormalization procedure of combining single blocks into a super block. From the argument by D. C. Vural and A. J. Leggett⁶ we start the renormalization procedure at length scale $L_1 \sim 50\text{\AA}$. Since the final result only logarithmically depends on this choice, it will not be sensitive. In the n -th step renormalization, we combine N_0^3 single blocks with the dimension $L_n \times L_n \times L_n$ to form a n -th step super block with the dimension $N_0 L_n \times N_0 L_n \times N_0 L_n$. In the next step single block dimension is $L_{n+1} = N_0 L_n$. By plugging in a weak phonon, the n -th step single and super block energy absorption rates are $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_n)$ and $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L_n)$. From the relation $\dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L_n) = \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_{n+1})$ we get the following recursion of energy absorption rate from step n to $n+1$:

$$\begin{aligned} N_0^3 \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_n) + \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(2)}(L_n) + \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L_n) + \dot{V}_{l,t}(L_n) \\ = \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_{n+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

It is convenient to define ‘‘energy absorption rate per volume’’: $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_n) = L_n^{-3} \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_n)$, $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L_n) = L_{n+1}^{-3} \dot{E}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L_n)$, $\dot{v}_{l,t}(L_n) = L_{n+1}^{-3} \dot{V}_{l,t}(L_n)$ and $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_{n+1}) = L_{n+1}^{-3} \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{single}}(L_{n+1})$. Repeat renormalization procedure $\log_{N_0}(R/L_1)$ times from unit block length scale $L_1 \sim 50\text{\AA}$ to experimental length scale R ,

the energy absorption rate per volume is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}(R) \\ = \left(\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}(L_1) + \dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2)}(L_1) + \dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L_1) \right) + \dot{v}_{l,t} \log_{N_0} \left(\frac{R}{L_1} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

First of all we compare the volume dependence of $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2)}(L)$, $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L)$ and $\dot{v}_{l,t}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L)}{\dot{v}_{l,t}} &= \frac{1}{\rho c_{l,t}^2 L^3} \frac{\int \operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \Omega) \operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega - \Omega) d\Omega}{\operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega) \int \frac{\Omega \operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(\Omega) d\Omega}{\Omega^2 - \omega^2}} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\rho c_{l,t}^2 L^3} \frac{\omega_c}{\int^{\omega_c} \Omega d\Omega / (\Omega^2 - \omega^2)} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\rho c_{l,t}^2 L^3} \frac{\omega_c}{\ln(\omega_c / \omega)} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where L is length scale. In the above result we use the assumption that susceptibility $\operatorname{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega)$ is roughly a constant of frequency for $\omega < \omega_c$ below temperature 1K. $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L)$ and $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ have the same unit (energy per volume per unit time), however the upper limit of integrals ω_c in Eq.(4.3) does not increase with the increase L , $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2)}(L)$ and $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(3)}(L)$ are L^{-3} volume dependent while $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ is scale invariant. With the increase of length scale eventually $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ will be greater than $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L)$ beyond critical length L_c . We use ultrasonic frequency $\omega \sim 10^6 \text{ rad/s}$, amorphous solid mass density $\rho \sim 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3$ and speed of sound $c \sim 10^3 \text{ m/s}$ to estimate the critical length scale when $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L)$ and $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ become comparable. The upper limit of ω_c is of order 10^{15} rad/s corresponding to temperature 10^4 K , so the largest possible L_c is of order $\sim 10\text{\AA}$, even smaller than starting length of renormalization procedure $L_1 \sim 50\text{\AA}$. Therefore throughout the entire process of renormalization, $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L)$ is always negligible compared to $\dot{v}_{l,t}$. We conclude $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}(L_1)$ is renormalization irrelevant in Eq.(4.2).

Next let us compare the renormalization relevance between $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}(L_1)$ and $\dot{v}_{l,t} \log_{N_0}(R/L_1)$. The input ultrasonic phonon frequency usually takes the order $\sim 10^6 \text{ Hz}$, corresponding to wavelength $R \sim 10^{-3} \text{ m}$. Therefore the experimental length scale R is the wavelength of external phonon, because it's smaller than the actual size of amorphous samples. With this choice $\ln N_0 \log_{N_0}(R/L_1) = \ln(R/L_1) \sim 20 \gg 1$, so we assume unit block's energy absorption rate per volume $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}(L_1)$ is much smaller than that from stress-stress interactions $\dot{v}_{l,t} \log_{N_0}(R/L_0)$. At experimental length scale the energy absorption rate is dominated by $\dot{v}_{l,t}$, independent of material microscopic nature. The ratio between longitudinal and transverse energy absorption rate per volume at experimental length scale is given as follows:

$$\frac{\dot{\epsilon}_l(R)}{\dot{\epsilon}_t(R)} = \frac{\dot{v}_l}{\dot{v}_t} \quad (4.4)$$

Note the r.h.s. of Eq.(4.4) is functional of $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega)$; for the l.h.s., at experimental length scale the entire amorphous sample can be treated as a huge block, with the energy absorption rate per volume $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}(R) = 2A^2k^2\omega(1 - e^{-\beta\hbar\omega}) \text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega)$. So the l.h.s. of Eq.(4.4) equals to $\frac{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T, \omega)}{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T, \omega)}$. Eq.(4.4) is a self-consistent equation for $\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_{l,t}(T, \omega)$. The only parameter enters it is speed of sound ratio c_l/c_t and it's a non-adjustable quantity.

By solving Eq.(4.4) we get the ratio between

longitudinal and transverse imaginary susceptibilities: $\sqrt{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T)/\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T)} = c_l/c_t$. On the other hand by comparing TTLS energy absorption $\dot{E}_{l,t} \propto \gamma_{l,t}^2$ we have $\sqrt{\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_l(T)/\text{Im } \tilde{\chi}_t(T)} = \gamma_l/\gamma_t$, so theoretical Meissner-Berret ratio $\gamma_l/\gamma_t = c_l/c_t$. This result is in fairly good agreement with 13 materials we list below. Experimental coupling constants $\gamma_{l,t}$, Meissner-Berret ratio $(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{exp}}$ and speed of sound $c_{l,t}$ are from the data by Meissner and Berret¹⁰; $(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{theo}}$ is our self-consistent result:

Material	$\gamma_l(\text{eV})$	$\gamma_t(\text{eV})$	$(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{exp}}$	$c_l(\text{km/s})$	$c_t(\text{km/s})$	$(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{theo}} = c_l/c_t$	$\frac{\text{theo-exp}}{\text{exp}}$
a-SiO ₂	1.04	0.65	1.60	5.80	3.80	1.53	-4.38%
BK7	0.96	0.65	1.48	6.20	3.80	1.63	+10.1%
As ₂ S ₃	0.26	0.17	1.53	2.70	1.46	1.85	+20.9%
LaSF-7	1.46	0.92	1.59	5.64	3.60	1.57	-1.26%
SF4	0.72	0.48	1.50	3.78	2.24	1.69	+12.7%
SF59	0.77	0.49	1.57	3.32	1.92	1.73	+10.2%
V52	0.87	0.52	1.67	4.15	2.25	1.84	+10.4%
BALNA	0.75	0.45	1.67	4.30	2.30	1.87	+12.0%
LAT	1.13	0.65	1.74	4.78	2.80	1.71	-1.72%
a-Se	0.25	0.14	1.79	2.00	1.05	1.90	+6.14%
Zn-Glass	0.70	0.38	1.84	4.60	2.30	2.00	+8.70%
PMMA	0.39	0.27	1.44	3.15	1.57	2.01	+39.6%
PS	0.20	0.13	1.54	2.80	1.50	1.87	+21.4%

Among 13 materials, BK7, As₂S₃, SF4, SF59, V52, BALNA, Zn-Glass, PMMA and PS's theoretical results deviate larger than the others, especially for As₂S₃, PMMA and PS. SF4 and SF59 contains Sulfur atoms which might be the reason to modify stress-stress interaction; V52, BALNA and LAT are fluorozirconate, we believe fluorin and zirconium play an important role in stress-strain interaction by affecting their molecular structure; dielectric materials such as As₂S₃, PS and PMMA¹⁴'s theoretical results deviate 20% ~ 40% from experimental data, at first we believe it is their huge electric dipole moment interactions to modify Meissner-Berret ratio. After a detailed calculation in the following section we find electric dipole interaction is not strong enough to modify such great values; we have no idea how conducting electrons affect phonon energy absorption, so we don't know how metallic glass, Zn-Glass's theoretical Meissner-Berret ratio deviate ~ 8% from it's experimental data.

To further investigate the correspondance between theoretical and experimental Meissner-Berret ratio we use least square method. For 13 materials including large deviations of As₂S₃, PMMA and PS, the fitted linear relation is $\left(\frac{\gamma_l}{\gamma_t}\right)^{\text{theo}} = 1.102 \left(\frac{\gamma_l}{\gamma_t}\right)^{\text{exp}}$ with the correlation coefficient $r = 0.261$, which means linear fitting is not good for them; for 10 materials excluding As₂S₃, PMMA and

PS, the fitted linear relation is $\left(\frac{\gamma_l}{\gamma_t}\right)^{\text{theo}} = 1.061 \left(\frac{\gamma_l}{\gamma_t}\right)^{\text{exp}}$ with the correlation coefficient $r = 0.745$, which means except for large deviations As₂S₃, PMMA and PS, c_l/c_t is a moderate fitting for other 10 materials. We plot these data as follows, where x and y -axis represent experimental and theoretical Meissner-Berret ratio:

Instead of resonance energy absorption measurements, the original experiment of Meissner-Berret ratio¹⁰ was to measure relative speed of sound shift to temperature, $\Delta c_{l,t}/c_{l,t} = C_{l,t} \ln(T/T_0)$, where the experimental measured constant $C_{l,t}$ is derived by TTLS parameters $C_{l,t} = \bar{P}\gamma_{l,t}^2/\rho c_{l,t}^2$. The definition of \bar{P} is¹²: in TTLS model the diagonal matrix element Δ and tunneling parameter $\lambda = \ln(\hbar\Omega/\Delta_0)$ are assumed to be independent of each other and to have a constant distribution $P(\Delta, \lambda)d\Delta d\lambda = \bar{P}d\Delta d\lambda$. By measuring $C_{l,t}$, $c_{l,t}$ and \bar{P} one can experimentally calculate coupling constants $\gamma_{l,t}$. However, it may not always be true that Δ, λ exactly obeys constant distribution. We search experimental data for low-temperature specific heat: As₂S₃ measured by R. B. Stephens¹⁷; PMMA and PS measured by R. B. Stephens, G. S. Cieloszyk and G. L. Salinger¹⁸; PMMA measured by R. C. Zeller and R. O. Pohl⁷. At temperatures $T < 1\text{K}$ their heat capacity temperature dependences largely deviate from $C_v(T) = AT + BT^3$, where A and B are experimentally determined parameters. Their huge deviations from "linear temperature dependence"




FIG. 1. Least square fitting for experimental-theoretical Meissner-Berret ratio. The linear fitting is $y = 1.06x$; correlation coefficient $r = 0.261$ for 13 materials' data; $r = 0.745$ for 10 materials' data excluding PMMA, PS and As_2S_3 . The dashed line is our anticipation on theory $(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{exp}} = c_l/c_t$.

implies that TTLS assumptions may not be a suitable description below 1K, especially when measuring quantities sensitive to distribution constant \bar{P} like $\gamma_{l,t}$. We believe this is the reason why theoretical Meissner-Berret ratio γ_l/γ_t for As_2S_3 , PMMA and PS deviate more than 20% from experimental data.

V. THE MODIFICATION OF MEISSNER-BERRET RATIO FROM ELECTRIC DIPOLE-DIPOLE INTERACTIONS

Electric dipole moments interact with each other via r^{-3} long range interaction similar with non-elastic stress-stress interactions. The input mechanical waves (not electromagnetic waves) can change the relative positions $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$ of dipole moments at \vec{x}_s and $\vec{x}_{s'}$; on the other hand, electric dipole moment is proportional to the separation of positive-negative charges: $\vec{p} = q\vec{l}$. Thus external phonons also modify dipole moments by changing charge separation $\vec{l} \rightarrow \vec{l} + \Delta\vec{l}$. Finally, external phonons will change electric dipole interactions, resulting in the change of amorphous material energy absorption.

Let's first qualitatively estimate the order of magnitude for electric dipole interaction compared to non-elastic stress-stress interaction. With the measurement from S. Hunklinger and M. V. Schickfus¹³ we discuss two dielectric materials, BK7 and SiO_2 .

For BK7, TTLS parameters are of order $n_0 M^2 \sim 10^8 \text{erg/cm}^2$, where M is the average value of off-diagonal matrix element for two-level-system (see Eq.(2.1)) and

n_0 is it's number density; dielectric constant $\epsilon = 3.7$; $n_e \mu^2 = 6 \times 10^{-3}$ where μ is the average value of dipole moment and n_e is dipole moment number density; mass density $\rho = 2.51 \text{g/cm}^3$; speed of sound $c = 6.5 \times 10^5 \text{cm/s}$. From these data we find the strength of electric dipole-dipole interaction versus non-elastic stress-stress interaction is $(n_e \mu^2 / \epsilon : n_0 M^2 / \rho c^2) \sim (1.62 \times 10^{-3} : 0.94 \times 10^{-4})$, which means electric dipole interaction is one order of magnitude greater than non-elastic stress-stress interaction for BK7.

For SiO_2 , TTLS parameters $n_0 M^2 = 2.04 \times 10^8 \text{erg/cm}^2$; $\epsilon = 3.81$; electric dipole moment parameters $n_e \mu^2 = 1.46 \times 10^{-4}$; $\rho = 2.2 \text{g/cm}^3$; $c = 5.8 \times 10^5 \text{cm/s}$; the strength of electric dipole interaction versus non-elastic stress-stress interaction is $(n_e \mu^2 / \epsilon : n_0 M^2 / \rho c^2) \sim (3.83 \times 10^{-5} : 2.76 \times 10^{-4})$, which means for SiO_2 , electric dipole interaction is one order of magnitude smaller than non-elastic stress-stress interaction.

The above qualitative arguments suggest electric dipole interaction in dielectric materials is roughly of the same order of non-elastic stress-stress interactions. However, after a detailed calculation we demonstrate electric dipole interaction's energy absorption contribution is renormalization irrelevant. We use the approximation to replace $\vec{x} - \vec{x}'$ by $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$ for the pair of the s -th and s' -th blocks, when \vec{x}_s denotes the center of the s -th block, and $\int_{V^{(s)}} \hat{p}_i(\vec{x}) d^3x = \hat{p}_i^{(s)}$ is the uniform electric dipole moment for s -th block. By combining $N_0 \times N_0 \times N_0$ identical $L \times L \times L$ unit blocks to form a $N_0 L \times N_0 L \times N_0 L$ super block, the electric dipole interaction

$$\hat{V}_{\text{dipole}} = \sum_{s \neq s'}^{N_0^3} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \mu_{ij}^{(ss')} \hat{p}_i^{(s)} \hat{p}_j^{(s')} \quad (5.1)$$

in the above equation we define the coefficient $\mu_{ij}^{(ss')}$

$$\mu_{ij}^{(ss')} = \frac{(\delta_{ij} - 3n_i n_j)}{8\pi\epsilon |\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}|^3} \quad (5.2)$$

in Eq.(5.1, 5.2) i, j runs over 1, 2, 3 cartesian coordinates and \vec{n} is the unit vector of $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$. The input phonon field $\vec{u}(\vec{x}, t)$ can modify (1) dipole interaction coefficient $\mu_{ij}^{(ss')}$ by changing relative positions of blocks $\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}$.

We denote it $\Delta\mu_{ij}^{(ss')}$:

$$\Delta\mu_{ij}^{(ss')} = \frac{3\Delta x_{ss'}}{8\pi\epsilon x_{ss'}^4} [(5n_i n_j - \delta_{ij}) \cos \theta_{ss'} - (n_j m_i + n_i m_j)] \quad (5.3)$$

where $x_{ss'} = |\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_{s'}|$, $\Delta\vec{x}_s = \vec{u}(\vec{x}_s, t)$, $\Delta x_{ss'} = |\Delta\vec{x}_s - \Delta\vec{x}_{s'}|$, $\cos \theta_{ss'} = (\Delta\vec{x}_{ss'} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'}) / \Delta x_{ss'} x_{ss'}$ and $\vec{m} = \Delta\vec{x}_{ss'} / \Delta x_{ss'}$. (2) Phonon field can also change dipole operators $\hat{p}^{(s)}$, because positive negative charges in electric dipole are driven from original positions $\vec{x}_s \pm \frac{1}{2}\vec{l}_s$ to new positions $\vec{x}_s \pm \frac{1}{2}\vec{l}_s + \vec{u}(\vec{x}_s \pm \frac{1}{2}\vec{l}_s, t)$, leading to the change of dipole operators $\Delta\hat{p}^{(s)}$

$$\Delta\hat{p}_i(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_k \frac{\partial u_i(\vec{x}, t)}{\partial x_k} \hat{p}_k(\vec{x}) \quad (5.4)$$

Therefore with the presence of external phonon field the total electric dipole interaction is given by

$$\hat{V}_{\text{dipole}}(\mathbf{e}) = \sum_{s \neq s'}^{N_0^3} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \left(\mu_{ij}^{(ss')} \hat{p}_i^{(s)} \hat{p}_j^{(s')} + \Delta \mu_{ij}^{(ss')} (t) \hat{p}_i^{(s)} \hat{p}_j^{(s')} + 2\mu_{ij}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{p}_i^{(s)} (t) \hat{p}_j^{(s')} \right) \quad (5.5)$$

Let's define electric dipole-dipole susceptibility $\chi_{ij}(T, \omega)$ for future use:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im} \chi_{ij}(T, \omega) &= (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega}) \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{ij}(T, \omega) \\ \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{ij}(T, \omega) &= \sum_m \frac{e^{-\beta E_m}}{\mathcal{Z}} \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{ij}^{(m)}(\omega) \\ \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{ij}^{(m)}(\omega) &= \frac{\pi}{L^3} \sum_n \langle m | \hat{p}_i^{(s)} | n \rangle \langle n | \hat{p}_j^{(s')} | m \rangle \delta(E_n - E_m - \omega) \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Since the dipole-dipole susceptibility must be invariant under SO(3) group transformations, it takes the generic form $\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_{ij}(T, \omega) = \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \omega) \delta_{ij}$.

To consider energy absorption we follow two steps: (1) turn off stress-stress interaction \hat{V} and dipole interaction \hat{V}_{dipole} . These N_0^3 non-interacting blocks' Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_0 = \sum_s \hat{H}_0^{(s)}$. We denote $|n\rangle = \prod_s |n^{(s)}\rangle$ and $E_n = \sum_s E_n^{(s)}$ to be the eigenstates and eigenvalues for \hat{H}_0 ; (2) turn on time-dependent perturbation $\hat{H}'(t) = \sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)}(t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} + \sum_{ss'} \sum_{ijkl} \left(\Delta \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} (t) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} + 2\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} (t) \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \right) + \sum_{ss'} \sum_{ij} \left(\Delta \mu_{ij}^{(ss')} (t) \hat{p}_i^{(s)} \hat{p}_j^{(s')} + 2\mu_{ij}^{(ss')} \Delta \hat{p}_i^{(s)} (t) \hat{p}_j^{(s')} \right)$ and static interaction $\hat{V} + \hat{V}_{\text{dipole}}$ to consider energy absorption of super block Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0 + \hat{V} + \hat{V}_{\text{dipole}}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{super}}(L) &= \partial_t \sum_n \frac{e^{-\beta E_n}}{\mathcal{Z}} \\ &\left(\langle n_I, t | \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V}_I(t) + \hat{H}'_I(t) | n_I, t \rangle - \langle n | \hat{H}_0 + \hat{V} | n \rangle \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

with $|n_I, t\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^t \hat{H}'_I(t') dt'} |n\rangle$, and $\hat{H}'_I(t)$ and $\hat{V}_I(t)$ are interaction picture wavefunction and operators we discussed previously.

Besides the energy absorption terms we have obtained in Eq.(3.4), Eq.(3.5) and Eq.(3.6), there is one extra term from electric dipole interactions. Expand the extra contribution to energy absorption in orders of $e_{ij}(\vec{x}, t)$ the

first order vanishes; the second order expansion is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{E}_t^{\text{dipole}} &= \frac{94A^2 k^2 N_0^3 \ln N_0}{960\pi^2 \epsilon^2} (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega}) \\ &\omega \int \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \Omega) \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \omega - \Omega) d\Omega \\ \dot{E}_t^{\text{dipole}} &= \frac{53A^2 k^2 N_0^3 \ln N_0}{960\pi^2 \epsilon^2} (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega}) \\ &\omega \int \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \Omega) \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \omega - \Omega) d\Omega \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Next we need to plug the above contribution, Eq.(5.8) into renormalization procedure Eq.(4.1), repeat RG steps, and obtain experimental length scale self-consistent equation for Meissner-Berret ratio $\gamma_l/\gamma_t = \sqrt{\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_l(T)/\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_t(T)}$. However, let's stop for the moment and discuss the scale dependence of Eq.(5.8). It is convenient to define "energy absorption per volume" $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}} = (N_0 L)^{-3} \dot{E}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$. $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$ has the same volume dependence as $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}$. The ratio between $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$ and $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ is

$$\frac{\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}}{\dot{v}_{l,t}} \approx \frac{\frac{(\text{Im} \tilde{\chi})^2}{\epsilon^2} \omega_c}{\frac{L^3 (\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_t)^2}{\rho c_{l,t}^2} \ln(\omega_c/\omega)} \quad (5.9)$$

where in the above result we assume dipole-dipole susceptibility $\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T, \omega) \approx \text{Im} \tilde{\chi}(T)$ is roughly a constant of frequency within a certain extent $\omega < \omega_c$ as well. Again the critical length scale L_c when $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ becomes comparable to $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$ is $L_c = \left(\frac{(\text{Im} \tilde{\chi})^2 \rho c_{l,t}^2 \omega_c}{\epsilon^2 (\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_t)^2 \ln(\omega_c/\omega)} \right)^{1/3}$, above which $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ starts to overwhelm $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$. The largest possible dipole-dipole susceptibility $\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}/\epsilon$ is one order of magnitude greater than stress-stress susceptibility $\text{Im} \tilde{\chi}_t/\rho c_{l,t}^2$ for the reason in BK7 dipole-dipole interaction strength is one order greater than stress-stress interaction. The upper limit for ω_c is 10^{15} rad/s, resulting in the upper limit for $L_c \sim 10 \text{\AA}$, same critical length scale when $\dot{v}_{l,t}$ starts to overwhelm $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}$. The same scaling dependence of $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{\text{dipole}}$ and $\dot{\epsilon}_{l,t}^{(2,3)}$ means throughout the entire renormalization procedure we can always neglect their energy absorption contributions.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we develop a generic interacting block model without specifying assumptions other than certain randomness. Within long wavelength limit we expand general Hamiltonian in orders of phonon strain field $e_{ij}^{(s)}(t)$ at position \vec{x}_s , and the first order derivative of Hamiltonian regarding strain field is denoted as $\hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$. The assumption of randomness takes place when correlation function between stress tensors $\langle \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \rangle = \langle \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s)} \rangle \delta_{ss'}$ vanishes for different blocks $s \neq s'$. We use this model to investigate TTLS parameters' universality

of Meissner-Berret ratio discovered in 13 different amorphous materials, regardless of their microscopic properties. The theoretical results are in fairly good agreement with experimental data, mostly within $\sim 10\%$ deviations. We believe the universality essentially comes from the way how longitudinal and transverse phonons interact with amorphous solid Hamiltonian.

The exchange of virtual phonons allows long-range non-elastic stress-stress interaction with the r^{-3} behavior. As the system size increases more particles (stress tensors) join in total Hamiltonian. The number of stress-stress interactions is quadratically proportional to the number of stress tensors, while the number of single-block Hamiltonians is linearly proportional to it, at large length scale non-elastic stress-stress interactions dominate. These interactions are independent of materials' microscopic properties. We use renormalization procedure to iterate Meissner-Berret ratio from starting small length scale to experimental length scale. The choice of small and large length scale only logarithmically enters into it, so they are not sensitive.

External phonon strain fields have three ways to modify stress-stress interactions: the modification of stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ by changing relative positions of single blocks; the modification of stress tensor operators $\hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)}$; the change of eigenstates $|n, t\rangle$. The former two contributions to energy absorption rate per volume decrease $\propto L^{-3}$ with the increase of system size

L , while the latter contribution keeps scale invariant. Because the critical length scale when they are comparable to each other is of order one atomic distance, the scale invariant term always dominates in resonance energy absorption rate, leading to self-consistent Meissner-Berret ratio solution $\gamma_l/\gamma_t = c_l/c_t$.

Among 13 materials measured by Meissner and Berret¹⁰, 10 of them agree fairly good with theoretical results while other 3 are not. At first we thought it's because of huge electric dipole interactions. However qualitative measurements from Thomas, Ravindran and Varma¹⁴ indicate that electric dipole interaction is too weak to affect Meissner-Berret ratio. We believe their huge deviations come from the reason that experimental data γ_l/γ_t were inferred from TTLS model in which parameter distribution $P(\Delta, \lambda)$ was assumed to be constant. R. B. Stephens¹⁷, G. S. Cieloszyk, G. L. Salinger¹⁸, R. C. Zeller and R. O. Pohl⁷'s measurements on heat capacity indicate that constant parameter distribution for As_2S_3 , PS and PMMA may not be a suitable description below 1K, so $(\gamma_l/\gamma_t)^{\text{exp}}$ inferred from TTLS parameters for them may deviate from their original natures.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

D.Z. would like to thank insightful discussions with Dervis C. Vural and Xianhao Xin for insightful discussions.

Appendix A: Derivation Details of Non-Elastic Stress-Stress Interaction Coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$

It was Joffrin and Levelut³ who firstly gave the detailed derivation of amorphous solid non-elastic stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$. We give a further correction to their results. To compare their result with ours, let us denote $\left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}\right)_{\text{Joffrin}}$ for their stress-stress interaction coefficient :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V} &= \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl}^{N_0^3} \left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}\right)_{\text{Joffrin}} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \\ \left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}\right)_{\text{Joffrin}} &= - \frac{\left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}(\vec{n})\right)_{\text{Joffrin}}}{8\pi\rho c_t^2 |\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_s'|^3} \\ \left(\tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}(\vec{n})\right)_{\text{Joffrin}} &= -2(\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l) \delta_{ik} \\ &+ 2\alpha \{ -(\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{jk} \delta_{il}) + 3(n_i n_j \delta_{kl} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk} + n_j n_k \delta_{il} + n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k n_l \delta_{ij}) - 15n_i n_j n_k n_l \} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\alpha = 1 - c_t^2/c_l^2$. We consider long wavelength limit. We will derive $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ starting from amorphous solid Hamiltonian written in the summation of phonon part, phonon-stress tensor coupling and non-elastic part of Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \left(\frac{|p_\mu(\vec{q})|^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2} m \omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2 |u_\mu(\vec{q})|^2 \right) + \sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} + \hat{H}_0^{\text{non}} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where μ is phonon polarization, i.e., longitudinal and transverse; \vec{q} is momentum and m the mass of elementary block, $p_\mu(\vec{q})$ and $u_\mu(\vec{q})$ are momentum and displacement operators, respectively for phonon modes in wave vector \vec{q} and polarization μ . Strain field $e_{ij}^{(s)}$ is defined the same as Eq.(2.3), $e_{ij}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial u_i^{(s)} / \partial x_j + \partial u_j^{(s)} / \partial x_i \right)$. The displacement operator $\vec{u}^{(s)}$ and $\vec{u}_\mu(\vec{q})$'s relation is set up by Fourier transformation:

$$u_i^{(s)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} u_\mu(\vec{q}) e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}_s} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\vec{e}_\mu(\vec{q})$ is the unit vector representing the direction of vibrations, N is the number density of unit block, and by definition we automatically get $Nm = \rho$. For longitudinal mode $\mu = l$, $e_{li}(\vec{q}) = q_i/q$, whereas for transverse modes t_1 and t_2 , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{e}_{t_1}(\vec{q}) \cdot \vec{q} = \vec{e}_{t_2}(\vec{q}) \cdot \vec{q} = \vec{e}_{t_1}(\vec{q}) \cdot \vec{e}_{t_1}(\vec{q}) = 0 \\ \sum_{\mu=t_1, t_2} e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) e_{\mu j}(\vec{q}) = \delta_{ij} - \frac{q_i q_j}{q^2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

the strain field is therefore written as $e_{ij}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} i u_\mu(\vec{q}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}_s} [q_j e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) + q_i e_{\mu j}(\vec{q})]$. Since for an arbitrary function $f(\vec{q})$ we always have the following relation, $\sum_{\vec{q}} f(\vec{q}) = \sum_{\vec{q}} \frac{1}{2} [f(\vec{q}) + f(-\vec{q})]$, and the displacement $u_i(\vec{x})$ is real, i.e., $u_i(\vec{x}) = u_i^*(\vec{x})$, we have $u_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) = u_{\mu i}^*(-\vec{q})$. With these properties of $u_\mu(\vec{q})$ operators we can rewrite the stress-strain coupling term as follows,

$$\sum_s \sum_{ij} e_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{N}} \sum_{ij} \sum_s \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \left[(i u_\mu(\vec{q}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}_s}) + (i u_\mu(\vec{q}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}_s})^* \right] (q_j e_{\mu j}(\vec{q}) + q_i e_{\mu i}(\vec{q})) \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \quad (\text{A5})$$

Because the stress-strain coupling term is linear in displacement operators $u_\mu(\vec{q})$, we can absorb it into terms quadratic in $u_\mu(\vec{q})$, i.e., the quadratic displacement term of phonon Hamiltonian, by completing the square. An extra term comes out as follows:

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \left(\frac{|p_\mu(\vec{q})|^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2}{2} |u_\mu(\vec{q}) - u_\mu^{(0)}(\vec{q})|^2 - \frac{m\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2}{2} |u_\mu^{(0)}(\vec{q})|^2 \right) + \hat{H}^{\text{non}} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where the ‘‘equilibrium position’’ $u_\mu^{(0)}(\vec{q})$ is

$$u_\mu^{(0)}(\vec{q}) = \frac{i}{2\sqrt{N}m\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2} \sum_{ij} \sum_s \left[q_j e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) + q_i e_{\mu j}(\vec{q}) \right] \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}_s} \quad (\text{A7})$$

The extra term left out after completing the square is the effective interaction between non-elastic stress tensors. It can be rewritten into two parts, the first part represents non-elastic stress-stress interaction within the same block, while the second part represents the interaction between different blocks:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \left(\frac{m\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2}{2} |u_\mu^{(0)}(\vec{q})|^2 \right) \\ & = - \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \frac{1}{8Nm\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2} \sum_{ijkl} \left[q_j e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) + q_i e_{\mu j}(\vec{q}) \right] \left[q_k e_{\mu l}(\vec{q}) + q_l e_{\mu k}(\vec{q}) \right] \sum_s \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s)} \\ & - \sum_{\vec{q}\mu} \frac{1}{8Nm\omega_{\vec{q}\mu}^2} \sum_{ijkl} \left[q_j e_{\mu i}(\vec{q}) + q_i e_{\mu j}(\vec{q}) \right] \left[q_k e_{\mu l}(\vec{q}) + q_l e_{\mu k}(\vec{q}) \right] \sum_{s \neq s'} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \cos(\vec{q} \cdot (\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}'_s)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

We denote the second term in Eq.(A8) as \hat{V} , non-elastic stress-stress interaction. Applying the properties of unit vector for longitudinal and transverse phonons, it's further simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V} & = \frac{1}{2Nm} \left(\frac{1}{c_t^2} - \frac{1}{c_l^2} \right) \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl} \sum_{\vec{q}} \left(\frac{q_i q_j q_k q_l}{q^4} \right) \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'}) T_{ij}^{(s)} T_{kl}^{(s')} \\ & - \frac{1}{8Nm} \frac{1}{c_t^2} \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl} \sum_{\vec{q}} \left(\frac{q_j q_l \delta_{ik} + q_j q_k \delta_{il} + q_i q_l \delta_{jk} + q_i q_k \delta_{jl}}{q^2} \right) \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'}) T_{ij}^{(s)} T_{kl}^{(s')} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

where $\vec{x}_{ss'} = \vec{x}_s - \vec{x}'_s$. If we assume the inter-atomic distance is much smaller than phonon wavelength (long wavelength limit), we can use integral to replace summation over momentum \vec{q} . For convenience of discussion we write \hat{V} into two parts, $\hat{V}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{V}^{(2)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{V}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2Nma^3} \left(\frac{1}{c_t^2} - \frac{1}{c_l^2} \right) \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl} \left\{ \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{q_i q_j q_k q_l}{q^4} \right) \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'}) \right\} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \\ \hat{V}^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{8Nma^3} \frac{1}{c_t^2} \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl} \left\{ \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \left(\frac{q_j q_l \delta_{ik} + q_j q_k \delta_{il} + q_i q_l \delta_{jk} + q_i q_k \delta_{jl}}{q^2} \right) \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}_{ss'}) \right\} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A10})$$

In the above two equations, we need to evaluate the following two integrals:

$$\begin{aligned}f_{ijkl}^{(1)} &= \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{q_i q_j q_k q_l}{q^4} \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}) \\ f_{jl}^{(2)} &= \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{q_j q_l}{q^2} \cos(\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x})\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A11})$$

Let us introduce a new parameter λ and take the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ eventually

$$\begin{aligned}f_{ijkl}^{(1)}(\lambda) &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \right) \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{(q^2 + \lambda^2)^2} \frac{1}{2} (e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}} + e^{-i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}}) \\ f_{jl}^{(2)}(\lambda) &= -\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \right) \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{(q^2 + \lambda^2)^2} \frac{1}{2} (e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}} + e^{-i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}})\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A12})$$

Using contour integral, and choose the pole at $q = -i\lambda$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}f_{ijkl}^{(1)}(\lambda) &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \right) \frac{1}{8\pi\lambda} e^{-\lambda x} \\ f_{jl}^{(2)}(\lambda) &= -\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_l} \right) \frac{1}{4\pi x} e^{-\lambda x}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A13})$$

Finally, take the derivatives and we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} f_{ijkl}^{(1)}(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{8\pi x^3} \left\{ (\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{jk} \delta_{il}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 3(n_i n_j \delta_{kl} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk} + n_j n_k \delta_{il} + n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k n_l \delta_{ij}) + 15n_i n_j n_k n_l \right\} \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} f_{jl}^{(2)}(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{4\pi x^3} (\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l)\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A14})$$

Finally, plugging the above results of integrals, we eventually get our non-elastic stress-stress interaction coefficient $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{V} &= \sum_{s \neq s'} \sum_{ijkl} \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \hat{T}_{ij}^{(s)} \hat{T}_{kl}^{(s')} \\ \Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} &= -\frac{\tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}(\vec{n})}{8\pi\rho c_t^2 |x_s - x'_s|^3} \\ \tilde{\Lambda}_{ijkl}(\vec{n}) &= \frac{1}{4} \{ (\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l) \delta_{ik} + (\delta_{jk} - 3n_j n_k) \delta_{il} + (\delta_{ik} - 3n_i n_k) \delta_{jl} + (\delta_{il} - 3n_i n_l) \delta_{jk} \} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \alpha \{ -(\delta_{ij} \delta_{kl} + \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} + \delta_{jk} \delta_{il}) + 3(n_i n_j \delta_{kl} + n_i n_k \delta_{jl} + n_i n_l \delta_{jk} + n_j n_k \delta_{il} + n_j n_l \delta_{ik} + n_k n_l \delta_{ij}) - 15n_i n_j n_k n_l \}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A15})$$

Compare $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ in Eq.(A15) and $\left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \right)_{\text{Joffrin}}$ in Eq.(A1), there are 4 differences between our result and Joffrin and Levelut's result:

(1). The first term without α in $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$, is $\frac{1}{4} \{ (\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l) \delta_{ik} + (\delta_{jk} - 3n_j n_k) \delta_{il} + (\delta_{ik} - 3n_i n_k) \delta_{jl} + (\delta_{il} - 3n_i n_l) \delta_{jk} \}$, while it's $(\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l) \delta_{ik}$ in $\left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')} \right)_{\text{Joffrin}}$. This difference is fine, because in Joffrin and Levelut's calculation their

strain tensor e_{ij} is defined as $\partial u_i/\partial x_j$, while ours is symmetrized: $(\partial u_i/\partial x_j + \partial u_j/\partial x_i)/2$. Using the definition $e_{ij} = \partial u_i/\partial x_j$ at the start of our calculation will give the same unpermuted result $(\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l)\delta_{ik}$;

(2). Our $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ is smaller by a total factor of 1/2 compared to $\left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}\right)_{\text{Joffrin}}$;

(3). We do not have the negative sign in the term not multiplied by α , while Joffrin and Levelut's term has: $-(\delta_{jl} - 3n_j n_l)\delta_{ik}$;

(4). The second term which is multiplied by α has an extra factor of 1/2 in our $\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}$ compared to $\left(\Lambda_{ijkl}^{(ss')}\right)_{\text{Joffrin}}$.

- ¹ W. A. Phillips, *Amorphous Solids Low-Temperature Properties*; Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005 Heidelberg New York (1981).
- ² M.J. Demkowicz, Y. B-Zion, and A. S. Argon, Liquidlike Atomic Environments Act as Plasticity Carriers in Amorphous Silicon, *Phys. Rev. B.*, **72**, 245206 (2005).
- ³ J. Joffrin, A. Levelut, Virtual Phonon Exchange in Glasses, *Journal de Physique*, Vol. 36, Issue 9, pp. 811-822 (1975).
- ⁴ K A. Dahmen, Y. B-Zion, and J. T. Uhl, Micromechanical Model for Deformation in Solids with Universal Predictions for Stress Strain Curves and Slip Avalanches, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **102**, 175501 (2009).
- ⁵ C. Maloney and A. Lematr, Universal Breakdown of Elasticity at the Onset of Material Failure, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **93**, 1 (2004).
- ⁶ D. C. Vural, A. J. Leggett, Universal Sound Absorption in Amorphous Solids: A Theory of Elastically Coupled Generic Blocks, *Journal of Non-Crystalline Solids* **357**, 19 : 3528-3537 (2011).
- ⁷ R. C. Zeller, R. O. Pohl, Thermal Conductivity and Specific Heat of Noncrystalline Solids, *Phys. Rev. B.*, **4**(6):2029 (1971).
- ⁸ P. W. Anderson, B. I. Halperin and C. M. Varma, Anomalous Low-Temperature Thermal Properties of Glasses and Spin Glasses, *Philos. Mag.* **1972**, 25, 1.
- ⁹ W. A. Phillips, Two-Level States in Glass, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **50** 1657-1708 (1987).
- ¹⁰ M. Meissner, J.F. Berret, How Universal are the Low Temperature Acoustic Properties of Glasses? *Z. Phys. B - Condensed Matter* **70**, 65-72 (1988).
- ¹¹ J.Jackle, On the Ultrasonic Attenuation in Glasses at Low Temperatures, *Z. Physik* **257**, 212-223 (1972).
- ¹² S. Hunklinger, A. K. Raychaudhuri, Thermal and Elastic Anomalies in Glasses at Low Temperatures, *Progress in low temperature physics*, Vol.IX (1986).
- ¹³ S. Hunklinger, M. V. Schickfus, Acoustic and Dielectric Properties of GLass, *Topics in Current Physics: Vol. 24, Amorphous Solids Low-Temperature Properties*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York (1981).
- ¹⁴ P. Thomas, R.S. Ernest Ravindran and K.B.R.Varma, Dielectric Properties of PMMA/CaCu₃Ti₄O₁₂ Composites, arxiv.org/pdf/1301.4070.
- ¹⁵ B. Golding and E. Graebner, Phonon Echoes in Glass, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **37**, 13 (1976).
- ¹⁶ R. O. Pohl, X. Liu, E. Thompson, Low-temperature thermal conductivity and acoustic attenuation in amorphous solids, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74** (2002).
- ¹⁷ R. B. Stephens, Low-Temperature Specific Heat and Thermal Conductivity of Noncrystalline Dielectric Solids, *Phys. Rev. B*, **8**, 6, (1973).
- ¹⁸ R. B. Stephens, G. S. Cieloszyk, G. L. Salinger, Thermal Conductivity and Specific Heat of Non-Crystalline Solids: Polystyrene and Polymethyl Methacrylate, *Physics Letters*, **38A**, 3, (1972).