

How to compute efficiently the analytical solution to Heisenberg spin glass models on sparse random graphs and their de Almeida-Thouless line

Luca Maria Del Bono,¹ Flavio Nicoletti,¹ and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi^{1,2}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, Rome 00185, Italy*

²*CNR-Nanotec, Rome unit and INFN, sezione di Roma1, Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, Rome 00185, Italy*

Results regarding spin glass models are, to this day, mainly confined to models with Ising spins. Spin glass models with continuous spins exhibit interesting new physical behaviors related to the additional degrees of freedom, but have been primarily studied on fully connected topologies. Only recently some advancements have been made in the study of continuous models on sparse graphs. In this work we partially fill this void by introducing a method to solve numerically the Belief Propagation equations for systems of Heisenberg spins on sparse random graphs via a discretization of the sphere. We introduce techniques to study the finite-temperature, finite-connectivity case as well as novel algorithms to deal with the zero-temperature and large connectivity limits. As an application, we locate the de Almeida-Thouless line for this class of models and the critical field at zero temperature, showing the full consistency of the methods presented. Beyond the specific results reported for Heisenberg models, the approaches presented in this paper have a much broader scope of application and pave the way to the solution of strongly disordered models with continuous variables.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last four decades, starting from the pioneering work of Parisi [1–5], the theory of spin glasses has become a benchmark for the study of disordered and complex systems [6]. While the nature of the transition in finite dimensions is not yet fully understood, solvable mean-field models of spin glasses have proven to be a solid framework for obtaining reliable qualitative predictions. The most famous spin glass solvable model is arguably the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model [7], a fully connected model with Ising spins and random couplings. The solution to the model presents a paramagnetic solution at high temperature or large external field, which becomes locally unstable on the so-called de Almeida-Thouless critical line [8]. Below such a critical line, the very rich spin glass phase appears, well described by the Replica Symmetry Breaking (RSB) scheme proposed solution by Parisi [9].

Most initial efforts were devoted to the study of the simpler case of Ising spins. However, in the last decade, there has been a renewed interest in the study of versions of the SK model with vector spin variables of fixed norm [10–12]. These models present a richer physics, due to the continuous nature of the degrees of freedom: of particular interest are the cases of spins with $d = 2$ components (XY spins) and $d = 3$ components (Heisenberg spins), due to their ability to model a wide range of phenomena in condensed matter.

While in the absence of a magnetic field the behavior of the SK model with vector spins does not change qualitatively at the transition [13], the application of a uniform field generates another instability line, the Gabay-Toulouse (GT) line [14, 15]. The GT line is connected with the freezing of the degrees of freedom transverse to the direction of the external field. On the GT line a weak form of RSB takes place¹, and the dAT line becomes a crossover line from a weak to a strong RSB [16]. Indeed, the critical behavior on the GT line of anisotropic spin glasses with d -dimensional spins is equivalent to the one of an isotropic spin glass with $(d - 1)$ -dimensional spins [17].

To avoid the GT transition and make the dAT line a distinct boundary between the RS and RSB phases, it is necessary to apply a field whose direction changes randomly from site to site, so that the system is on average isotropic. The location of the dAT line in the case of fields with Gaussian components of variance H^2 has been computed for general d and fully connected (FC) topologies in [10]. At low fields, one has the behavior $H \propto (T_g - T)^{3/2}$ which coincides with that found in [8] for Ising variables.

The computation in [10] reports a zero temperature transition at $H_c(T = 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m-2}}$: it is interesting to notice that, for both $d = 1$ (Ising) and $d = 2$ (XY) the FC models do not have such a $T = 0$ transition in a field, given that the critical dAT line diverges to infinity for $T \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, for $d > 2$ the critical field $H_c(T = 0)$ is finite and the dAT line has no divergence. More importantly, the nature of the $T = 0$ phase transition at a finite field $H_c(T = 0)$ can be studied analytically by computing the spectrum of the energy Hessian via the random matrix theory. In Ref. [11] it was shown that soft modes undergo a delocalization transition.

A natural question to ask is to what extent predictions on the critical behavior of spin glasses coming from mean-field theories apply to spin glasses in finite dimensions. While the zero field critical behavior of the SK model seems to

¹ The Parisi overlap $q(x)$ behaves as $1 - q(x) \propto (x_b - x)^2$ close to the breaking point x_b , while in ordinary full RSB transitions $1 - q(x) \propto (x_b - x)$.

qualitatively apply also in finite dimensions [18, 19], the finite field and low-temperature regimes are less understood. In [20] it was found that at zero temperature the spin glass susceptibility of the 3D Heisenberg spin glass is non-divergent for any external field $H > 0$. In contrast, in the vector SK model, the spin glass susceptibility diverges at the zero-temperature critical field [10]. It then follows that, if the transition in a field exists in finite dimensions, at $T = 0$ it must be qualitatively different from the one described by mean-field theory. The standard step to go beyond mean-field theories on FC networks is to consider spin glasses defined on sparse random graphs. In the thermodynamic limit, the model can be solved exactly using the Cavity Method [9]. While sparse random graphs retain an infinite-dimensional topology, the sparsity of the interaction network makes them closer to finite-dimensional systems.

When considering spin glass models on sparse random graphs the literature is very diverse. While models with Ising or Potts variables have received more attention [21–31], results on vector spin glasses are very scarce [32–36]. In particular, in the seminal paper [32] the authors were able to compute the critical points for XY and Heisenberg spin glasses on Erdos-Renyi graphs as functions of the mean connectivity and temperature, but only for zero external fields.

The important effects induced by an external field on the critical behavior of these models were considered only very recently [34, 35] thanks to the numerical approximations introduced in [33]. In Ref. [34] the authors study both GT and dAT lines, by considering the cases of constant field and randomly oriented fields respectively. In both cases the zero-temperature critical field is finite [34]. Moreover, they have shown explicitly the freezing phenomenon that differentiates between the GT and dAT lines. Finally, it has also been established in the XY case that the dAT line appears to be more robust to perturbations of the random field.

However, extending the results above obtained for the XY model to models with more components (e.g. Heisenberg spins) turned out to be very difficult. The bottleneck is the required discretization of the variables domain: in XY models variables live on a circle which can be easily discretized by the clock model [33], but Heisenberg variables live on a sphere and the sphere discretization is a notoriously difficult problem. Only recently we came up with a new discretization scheme of the sphere that produces a very uniform set of discrete points [37] and this can be used for our purposes.

In this work, we consider Heisenberg spin glass models on random regular graphs (RRG) with randomly oriented external fields of fixed norm H . By solving the cavity equations of the model through the Population Dynamics Algorithms (PDA) we measure the location of the dAT line in the (T, H) plane. Firstly, we consider the case with connectivity $Z = 3$, which corresponds to the sparsest non-trivial random graph. As a preliminary step, we study the effect of the sphere discretization on the estimate of the dAT line. The $T = 0$ case is studied separately, as a different algorithm is needed in this special case. Secondly, we characterize the low temperature and low field regimes analytically and numerically, for growing values of the connectivity, and compare our results with the FC mean-field limit $Z = \infty$.

II. MODEL

The model we study is defined by the following Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}[\mathbf{s}] = - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j - \sum_{i \in V} \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{s}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are N Heisenberg spins with norm $|\vec{s}_i| = \sqrt{3}$, the couplings are quenched random parameters $J_{ij} = \pm 1$ with equal probability and the fields $\vec{H}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are quenched random parameters distributed uniformly on the sphere of radius H . These disorder distributions ensure a spatially homogeneous strength of the disorder, as $|J_{ij}| = 1$ and $|\vec{H}_i| = H$ for any $(i, j) \in E$ and $i \in V$, being E and V the edge set and the vertex set of the random graph respectively. The model is studied on random regular graphs (RRG) of size $|V| = N$ and fixed connectivity Z . The case $Z = 3$ (sparsest graph) is studied in detail for checking the effect of the sphere discretizations when approaching the $T = 0$ limit, whereas higher values of Z are studied mainly to compare with the result in the FC limit ($Z = \infty$).

III. METHODS

A. The Belief Propagation equations at finite temperature

1. Introducing the Belief Propagation equations

We will start by introducing the Belief Propagation (BP) equations for a model of Heisenberg spins on a graph described by Hamiltonian (1). Let us consider a pair of neighboring nodes i and j . The following cavity marginals can be defined

- $\nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i)$, the marginal on \vec{s}_i in absence of node j ,
- $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i)$, the marginal on \vec{s}_i in absence of all neighboring nodes except for j ,

which can be interpreted as the message passed from node i to node j and the message received by node i from node j , respectively. The cavity marginal ν can be related to the $\hat{\nu}$ (and vice-versa) assuming that the graph is a tree. Indeed, under this assumption,

$$\nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}_{i \rightarrow j}} e^{\beta \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i} \prod_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \quad (2)$$

and

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j), \quad (3)$$

where ∂i is the set of neighbors of vertex i , the integral is over the uniform measure on the sphere of radius $\sqrt{m} = \sqrt{3}$ and $\beta = 1/T$ (the Boltzmann constant is set to 1) is the inverse temperature. Plugging (2) into (3) yields the self consistency equations for the $\hat{\nu}$:

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_j} \prod_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) \quad (4)$$

Estimates of marginals for a single variable or a pair of neighbors can be written in term of cavity marginals

$$b_i(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{e^{\beta \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i}}{\mathcal{Z}_i} \prod_{j \in \partial i} \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \quad b_{ij}(\vec{s}_i, \vec{s}_j) = \frac{e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j}}{\mathcal{Z}_{ij}} e^{\beta \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i} \nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_j} \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j), \quad (5)$$

All \mathcal{Z} in equations above are normalization factors.

The stability of the BP solution can be checked through the addition of small perturbations $\delta \nu_{i \rightarrow j}$, $\delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}$. Then, (4) becomes, up to the first order in perturbations,

$$\delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \left[\int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_j} \sum_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \delta \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) \prod_{\ell \in \partial j \setminus (i, k)} \hat{\nu}_{\ell \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) - \delta \hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i} \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \right] \quad (6)$$

where now

$$\delta \hat{\mathcal{Z}} \equiv \int d\mu(\vec{s}_i) \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} e^{\beta \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i} \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} \delta \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \prod_{\ell \in \partial i \setminus (j, k)} \hat{\nu}_{\ell \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i). \quad (7)$$

2. Solving the Belief Propagation equations numerically

The set of equations (4) can be solved numerically by starting from a random set of marginals $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$ and setting up the recursive equation

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t+1)}(\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_j} \prod_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t)}(\vec{s}_j), \quad (8)$$

where t denotes the step of the recursion. In this way, the fixed point (if unique) can be found simply by iterating for an equilibration time t_{eq} large enough. The case of multiple fixed points to the BP equations is outside the scope of the present work which focuses on the critical line.

To follow this path, we introduce a discretization of the sphere made of a finite number N_p of points. The problem of choosing such N_p points is discussed at length in Ref. [37]. There, we illustrate a possible way of measuring how uniform a distribution of points on the sphere is. Indeed, we look at the standard deviation of the distribution of distances between first neighbors, a feature directly related to the local ordering of the points on the sphere. After testing a series of algorithms, we find those performing better. These are the ones we will use in the paper to solve the BP equations. In particular, we mainly adopt the Lattice Point method of [38], which consists of placing lattices of points on the faces of an icosahedron and then projecting them on the sphere. The points are then optimized by minimizing the power-law interaction potential, $V(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}$, between any pair of points. Again, the reader should refer to Ref. [37] for more details.

In this work, we use the Population Dynamics approach (or *infinite graph* limit) [39] to find out the probability distribution of marginals $\mathbb{P}[\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}]$. Indeed, in this way, we can write

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}, J, \vec{H}} \int \prod_{k=1}^{d_j-1} (\mathcal{D}\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j} \mathbb{P}[\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}]) \delta(\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i} - \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]), \quad (9)$$

where the expectation is taken over the ensemble of random regular graphs $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ and over the disorder (couplings J_{ij} and the fields \vec{H}_i). The integral is computed over the set of marginals with the constrain that they must satisfy (4). Here, d_j is the degree of node j (a constant for RRG) and the δ assures self-consistency according to the functions $\mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}$ governing the evolution of the marginals:

$$\mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j](\vec{s}_i) \equiv \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_j} \prod_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) \quad (10)$$

or, for a discretization of the sphere,

$$\mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j](\vec{s}_i) = \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_p} e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_n} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_n} \prod_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_n). \quad (11)$$

Here, n is an index between 1 and N_p that indicates which of the points on the grid is taken into account. Computationally, this approach is implemented by storing a population of \mathcal{N}_{pop} marginals and then refreshing it at every step using (11) until convergence. The procedure is described in the pseudocode in Alg. 1.

Algorithm1 Population Dynamics algorithm for marginals

```

1: Initialize  $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  randomly
2: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{eq}}$  do ▷  $t_{\text{eq}}$  time to reach equilibrium
3:   for  $j = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}$  do
4:     Extract the field  $\vec{H}_j$  according to the field distribution
5:     Draw an integer  $d_j$  from the degree distribution ▷ Skip if RRG
6:     Draw  $d_j - 1$  integers  $\{k\}$  uniformly in the range  $[1, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}]$ 
7:     Draw a coupling  $\{J_{ij}\}$  from the coupling distribution ▷ Skip if  $J_{ij} = \text{const}$ 
8:      $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$ 
9:   end for
10: end for

```

In order to check the stability of a solution one considers a set of randomly-initialized perturbations $\delta\hat{\nu}$ and then evolves them using a discretized, recursive version of (6). The function governing the evolution of perturbations then becomes

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, \{\delta\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j](\vec{s}_i) \equiv \frac{1}{\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i}} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{N_p} e^{\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_n} e^{\beta \vec{H}_j \cdot \vec{s}_n} \sum_{k \in \partial j \setminus i} \delta\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) \prod_{\ell \in \partial j \setminus (i, k)} \hat{\nu}_{\ell \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) - \delta\hat{\mathcal{Z}}_{j \rightarrow i} \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \right] \quad (12)$$

Stability can then be checked by measuring whether the discretized L_2 norm of the perturbations

$$\Delta(t) \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}} \sum_{n=1}^{\mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{\{\vec{s}_i\}} |\delta \hat{\nu}_{n,j \rightarrow i}^{(t)}(\vec{s}_i)|^2}, \quad (13)$$

grows or decays in time. Indeed, the evolution of the norm for large times is governed by the Lyapunov factor λ as in

$$\Delta(t) \sim \lambda^t, \quad t \gg 1. \quad (14)$$

so that $\lambda = 1$ signals the onset of the onset of the RSB phase.

Since the absolute norm of the perturbations does not actually matter, perturbations can be rescaled at every step so that, before applying the evolution rule (12), $\Delta = 1$. In this way, the value of Δ after application of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ gives directly the measured λ at that step, as described in the pseudocode in Alg. 2.

Algorithm2 Linearized BP algorithm

```

1: Initialize  $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  using Alg. 1
2: Initialize  $\delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  randomly
3: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{tot}}$  do
4:   for  $n = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}$  do
5:     Extract the field  $\vec{H}_j$  according to the field distribution
6:     Draw an integer  $d_j$  from the degree distribution ▷ Skip if RRG
7:     Draw  $d_j - 1$  integers  $\{k\}$  uniformly in the range  $[1, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}]$ 
8:     Draw a coupling  $\{J_{ij}\}$  from the coupling distribution ▷ Skip if  $J_{ij} = \text{const}$ 
9:      $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$  ▷ Refresh the population
10:     $\delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, \{\delta \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$ 
11:   end for
12:   Compute  $\Delta(t)$ 
13:   Compute  $\log \lambda(t) \leftarrow \log \Delta(t)$ 
14:    $\delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \delta \hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} / \Delta(t)$ 
15: end for
16: Average  $\log \lambda(t)$  to get  $\log \lambda$ 

```

While, in principle, $\Delta(t)$ could be measured more easily by considering two different but close populations of marginals, in practice this approach leads to saturation problems which on the contrary do not affect the linearized algorithm. Details are given in App. A.

B. Belief Propagation at zero temperature: the max-sum equations

1. Analytical expressions for the zero-temperature limit: the max-sum equations

When moving to the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit, one needs to rewrite (4) and (6) to avoid divergences. In order to do so, let us consider the new functions $h_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $u_{i \rightarrow j}$ such that

$$\nu_{i \rightarrow j} = e^{\beta h_{i \rightarrow j}}, \quad (15)$$

$$\hat{\nu}_{i \rightarrow j} = e^{\beta u_{i \rightarrow j}}, \quad (16)$$

and then proceed in the same way with the BP equations at finite temperature. Notice that $h_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $u_{i \rightarrow j}$ are, fundamentally, large deviation functions, and they have to be negative semi-definite (with a maximum equal to zero) in order for $\nu_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{i \rightarrow j}$ to be well-defined quantities.

Since now $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, every time an integral has to be computed, it is sufficient to perform a saddle point evaluation. After normalization one gets:

$$h_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) = \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) - \max_{\vec{s}_i} [\vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i)] \quad (17)$$

$$u_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) = \max_{\vec{s}_i} [J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + h_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i)] - \max_{\vec{s}_j} \{ \max_{\vec{s}_i} [J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + h_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i)] \}. \quad (18)$$

As predicted, normalization makes the h and u functions negative semi-definite. Putting together the previous equations one gets the *max-sum equations*:

$$\boxed{u_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) = \max_{\vec{s}_i} [J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i)] + \text{normalization}}, \quad (19)$$

where the additional normalization constant is given by $-\max_{\vec{s}_j} u_{i \rightarrow j}$. Adding a small perturbation leads to

$$\boxed{\delta u_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) = \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} \delta u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i^*(\vec{s}_j)) + \text{normalization}} \quad (20)$$

The additive normalization constant makes the perturbation equal to zero in correspondence of the largest (i.e. the null) marginal and

$$\vec{s}_i^*(s_j) \equiv \operatorname{argmax}_{\vec{s}_i} [J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i)]. \quad (21)$$

In the end, the functions governing the evolution are

$$\mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j](\vec{s}_i) \equiv \max_{\vec{s}_i} [J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + \vec{H}_i \cdot \vec{s}_i + \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i)] + \text{normalization} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, \{\delta \hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j](\vec{s}_i) \equiv \sum_{k \in \partial i \setminus j} \delta u_{k \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i^*(\vec{s}_j)) + \text{normalization}. \quad (23)$$

2. Numerical implementation of the max-sum algorithm

A naive discretization of (19) and (20) leads to a largely wrong estimate of the critical field (see also Fig. 12 and Fig. 13). Therefore, it is necessary to apply an interpolation procedure, as successfully done in the XY case [33, 35].

While for XY variables the interpolation was easy because any one-dimensional function can be well approximated by a simple parabola close to its maximum, when dealing with Heisenberg spins the interpolation process is more complicated because it has to be carried out in a two-dimensional space, as it is well explained in App. B. Schematically, we adopt the following procedure to maximize any function $f(\vec{s})$ defined on a sphere:

- We find the maximum of $f(\vec{s})$ over the N_p discrete points and we call P the discrete point where $f(\vec{s})$ reaches its “discrete” maximum.
- We perform an interpolation with a paraboloid around P. We assume a flat curvature for the sphere, close enough to P, so that we are effectively working in a two-dimensional xy space tangent to the sphere. Therefore the paraboloid is defined by 6 parameters which can be uniquely determined by considering 6 discrete points.
- As interpolation points, we consider P and 5 of its neighbors. If P has more than 5 neighbours, the 5 points are chosen uniformly at random among the neighbors.
- We compute the point of zero gradient for the paraboloid and we call it Q. Since this point could also be a saddle point (and in that case the function in Q is often lower than in P), we keep Q as the candidate maximum only if $f(Q) > f(P)$. Otherwise we use the discrete maximum in P.
- Sometimes the interpolating paraboloid has an almost flat curvature and this may bring the point Q very far from P. This case must be discarded as the true maximum must lie close to P. We only keep a point Q if its distance from P is not larger than ρr_0 , where ρ is a suitably chosen fixed constant (see App. C for details on how to choose it) and

$$r_0 = \sqrt{\frac{48\eta}{N_p}} \quad (24)$$

is the average distance between first neighbours. The constant $\eta = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{12}} \approx 0.91$ is related to the packing density of the 2D hexagonal lattice[40].

The algorithm is summarized by the pseudocode in Alg. 3.

Algorithm3 Max-sum algorithm

```

1: Initialize  $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  randomly
2: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{eq}}$  do ▷ Find the fixed point for the marginals
3:   for  $n = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}$  do
4:     Extract the field  $\vec{H}_j$  according to the field distribution
5:     Draw an integer  $d_j$  from the degree distribution ▷ Skip if RRG
6:     Draw  $d_j - 1$  integers  $\{k\}$  uniformly in the range  $[1, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}]$ 
7:     Draw a coupling  $\{J_{ij}\}$  from the coupling distribution ▷ Skip if  $J_{ij} = \text{const}$ 
8:      $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$ 
9:   end for
10: end for
11: Initialize  $\delta\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  randomly
12: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{tot}}$  do
13:   for  $n = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}$  do
14:     Extract the field  $\vec{H}_j$  according to the field distribution
15:     Draw an integer  $d_j$  from the degree distribution ▷ Skip if RRG
16:     Draw  $d_j - 1$  integers  $\{k\}$  uniformly in the range  $[1, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}]$ 
17:     Draw a coupling  $\{J_{ij}\}$  from the coupling distribution ▷ Skip if  $J_{ij} = \text{const}$ 
18:     Interpolate using marginals
19:      $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$  ▷ Using interpolated maximum
20:      $\delta\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, \{\delta\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$  ▷ Using interpolated argmax
21:     Normalize  $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)}$  using interpolation
22:     Normalize  $\delta\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)}$  using interpolation
23:   end for
24:   Compute  $\Delta(t)$ 
25:   Compute  $\log \lambda(t) \leftarrow \log \Delta(t)$ 
26:    $\delta\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \delta\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} / \Delta(t)$ 
27: end for
28: Average  $\log \lambda(t)$  to get  $\log \lambda$ 
29: Obtain  $H_c$  via a linear fit and cheking when  $\log \lambda = 0$ 

```

C. The large-connectivity limit

1. The large connectivity expansion

To check that our generic computation recovers in the limit $Z \rightarrow \infty$ the results obtained for fully connected (FC) models we can solve the BP equations via the vectorial ansatz introduced in [41]. Indeed, in this limit, couplings must scale like $J_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{Z})$, and thus we can expand the BP equation (4) obtaining

$$\hat{\nu}_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_j) \propto 1 + \beta J_{ij} \int d\mu(\vec{s}_i) \nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j \propto \exp(\beta J_{ij} \vec{m}_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot \vec{s}_j), \quad (25)$$

where we have introduced the *cavity magnetizations*

$$\vec{m}_{i \rightarrow j} \equiv \int d\mu(\vec{s}_i) \nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) \vec{s}_i. \quad (26)$$

The other cavity marginal (2) can be written in exponential form as well

$$\nu_{i \rightarrow j}(\vec{s}_i) \propto \exp\left(\beta \vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot \vec{s}_i\right). \quad (27)$$

Then one can write self-consistent equations to compute the parameters $\vec{m}_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}$ and, from them, calculate the location of the dAT line (see App. D for details). The result in the $Z = \infty$ limit is equivalent to the computation by Sharma and Young [10].

The advantage of deriving this limit from the BP equations is that we can also access finite Z corrections by adding additional terms to the expansion in βJ_{ij} . One can then write a set of closed equations for $\nu_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $\hat{\nu}_{i \rightarrow j}$ such that cavity marginals are in the form of an exponential of a polynomial of a given degree of the spins (see App. E for details). The first correction to the vectorial ansatz is of order $\mathcal{O}(1/Z)$ and requires to go up to fourth powers of βJ_{ij} (App. E). Once one has computed all the combinatorial terms at a given power of $1/Z$, one can set up a numerical procedure to find the polynomial coefficients via the Population Dynamics algorithm. Although averages such as (26) cannot be computed analytically for finite Z (at variance to the leading term), these can be computed numerically using the usual sphere discretization.

2. Asymmetric Stability Checking (ASC) algorithm for the large connectivity expansion

Finding the dAT line via the linearized procedure requires using the linearized BP equations, which in principle can be messy to compute and, in particular, are order-dependent, so adding additional terms to the $1/Z$ expansion requires a modification of the equations.

We therefore introduce a novel algorithm that avoids the problem of computing the linearized equations. The method is based on the well-known technique of evolving two close-by populations [42] and checking whether, during the evolution, they tend to come closer or farther apart. To correctly perform this check we need to keep the two populations at the proper distance, in particular avoiding the saturation problems described in App. A.

Algorithm4 Asymmetric Stability Check (ASC) algorithm

```

1: Initialize  $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  using Alg. 1
2: Initialize  $\hat{\mu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(0)}$  randomly so that  $\Delta = \epsilon \ll 1$ 
3: Set  $\tilde{\Delta}(0) = 1$ 
4: for  $t = 1, \dots, t_{\text{tot}}$  do
5:   for  $n = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}$  do
6:     Extract the field  $\vec{H}_j$  according to the field distribution
7:     Draw an integer  $d_j$  from the degree distribution ▷ Skip if RRG
8:     Draw  $d_j - 1$  integers  $\{k\}$  uniformly in the range  $[1, \mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}}]$ 
9:     Draw a coupling  $\{J_{ij}\}$  from the coupling distribution ▷ Skip if  $J_{ij} = \text{const}$ 
10:     $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\nu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$ 
11:     $\hat{\mu}_{j \rightarrow i}^{(t)} \leftarrow \mathcal{F}_{j \rightarrow i}[\{\hat{\mu}_{k \rightarrow j}^{(t-1)}\}, J_{ij}, \vec{H}_j]$ 
12:  end for
13:  Compute  $\lambda(t) \leftarrow \Delta(t)/\tilde{\Delta}(t-1)$ 
14:  if  $\lambda(t) > 1$  then
15:     $M_{j \rightarrow i} \leftarrow (\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i} + \hat{\mu}_{j \rightarrow i})/2$ 
16:     $D_{j \rightarrow i} \leftarrow (\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i} - \hat{\mu}_{j \rightarrow i})/2$ 
17:     $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i} \leftarrow M_{j \rightarrow i} + D_{j \rightarrow i}/\lambda(t)$  ▷ Move the populations closer together
18:     $\hat{\mu}_{j \rightarrow i} \leftarrow M_{j \rightarrow i} - D_{j \rightarrow i}/\lambda(t)$ 
19:  else
20:    Set  $\tilde{\Delta}(t) \leftarrow \Delta(t)$ 
21:  end if
22: end for
23: Average  $\log \lambda(t)$  to obtain  $\log \lambda$ 

```

Our algorithm, which we call Asymmetric Stability Checking (ASC), works as follows. Let us call $\{\hat{\nu}_k, \hat{\mu}_k\}$ the two populations of cavity marginals and λ the Lyapunov factor of (14) measured in the last step. Our idea is to renormalize the two populations in a way such that they can not go too far apart, thus leaving the regime of linear response. For every element of the two populations, we apply the following transformation only if $\lambda > 1$

$$\hat{\nu}_k \leftarrow M_k + \frac{D_k}{\lambda}, \quad \hat{\mu}_k \leftarrow M_k - \frac{D_k}{\lambda}, \quad \text{with} \quad M_k \equiv \frac{\hat{\nu}_k + \hat{\mu}_k}{2}, \quad D_k \equiv \frac{\hat{\nu}_k - \hat{\mu}_k}{2}. \quad (28)$$

The above transformation avoids any divergence in the distance between the two populations while preserving the small difference between the two which permits the measure of the largest eigenvalue of the linear operator close to the BP fixed point.

If $\lambda > 1$, the transformation in (28) decreases the distance between the two populations by the same factor λ that increased during the last step of the population dynamics, which is the goal of the procedure. The transformation is linear and keeps both marginals well normalized.




FIG. 1: *Main plot*: dAT line for the spin glass Heisenberg model on a RRG of degree $Z = 3$. Different sizes of the sphere grid are considered. *Inset*: zoom-in of the low- T , high- H region, in which discretization effects start to become important. Error bars have sizes comparable to data points. Lines are just a guide for the eye.

The reason why we can not apply transformation in (28) when $\lambda < 1$ is because the new marginals may become negative, which clearly unacceptable. Nonetheless when $\lambda < 1$ the two populations tend to get closer and this is not a problem until the differences are larger than numerical precision (and we always work in that regime). The only needed caution is to redefine the baseline value for $\Delta(t)$.

The whole procedure is described in Alg. 4.

IV. RESULTS

All results in this section have been obtained using a population of $\mathcal{N}_{\text{pop}} = 10^4$ marginals. Moreover, couplings have been taken as $J_{ij} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{Z-1}}$. Strictly speaking, this corresponds to the antiferromagnetic case. However, since we work on RRG, we expect half of the loops to be frustrated, exactly as in the case of the random couplings. Hence, the location of the dAT line is the same, but the computational complexity is lower.

A. Finite temperature, finite connectivity results

In order to get the critical field defining the dAT line as a function of temperature, $H_c(T)$, one can simply compute the logarithm of the Lyapunov factor as a function of H using Alg. 2 and then perform an interpolation (either linear or quadratic) to find the value H_c at which $\log \lambda = 0$.

We considered RRG of connectivity $Z = 3$ and different number of points N_p to discretize the sphere. Results are presented in Fig. 1. The curves for different N_p collapse onto each other for large enough values of the temperature. However, finite-size effects start to appear when T is decreased very much. This is reasonable, since finite-grid effects are known to appear in other models, e.g. differentiating between the clock model with a finite number of states and the XY model [33]. Going to lower temperatures requires using more points on the sphere, and eventually changing to Alg. 3 to reach the $T \rightarrow 0$ limit.

To obtain the critical temperature at zero field, T_g , we run the BP algorithm without an external field. We can consider a rather rough discretization, namely one with $N_p = 272$, since finite-grid effects only appear at low temperatures, as previously shown. The critical temperature found from this approach is

$$T_g = 0.627 \pm 0.001. \quad (29)$$

The critical temperature T_g can be obtained also analytically as the solution of the following equation

$$(Z-1) \left[\coth \left(\frac{3}{\sqrt{Z-1} T_g^*} \right) - \frac{\sqrt{Z-1} T_g^*}{3} \right]^2 = 1 \quad (30)$$




FIG. 2: Critical field $H_c(T)$ as a function of $(T_g - T)^{3/2}$. The black line acts as a comparison. The behavior of the dAT line is clearly linear in this region. $N_p = 492$.




FIG. 3: Critical field of the dAT line as a function of T^a , where $a = 0.405$, together with the infinite-grid extrapolation. Error bars have sizes comparable to data points.

We find for $Z = 3$

$$T_g^* \approx 0.626 \quad (31)$$

which perfectly agrees with the numerical result. We show in appendix G how to derive equation (30).

When moving at temperatures $T \lesssim T_g$, one expects the behavior to be in the form $H \propto (T_g - T)^{3/2}$, as in the XY model [43]. Indeed, as shown in Fig. 2, the value of $3/2$ of the critical exponent is correct also in the case of Heisenberg spins.

Finally, as previously stated, when going to the zero temperature limit, discretization effects start to become important. In order to compute the critical field at zero temperature, therefore, we have to resort to extrapolation from finite T (Fig. 3). Details of the extrapolation are presented in App. F. The extrapolation yields

$$H_c(0) = 1.20 \pm 0.02 \quad (32)$$

as our estimate of the zero temperature critical field.

B. Zero temperature results

The critical field at zero temperature found using the extrapolation procedure can be checked against that found using the algorithm at zero temperature described in Sec. III B 2. We ran the algorithm for different values of N_p . In Fig. 4, the resulting $\log \lambda$ vs H plot is reported.




FIG. 4: *Main plot:* behaviour of $\log \lambda$ vs H at $T = 0$ for different values of N_p (V potential with $\alpha = 1$). *Inset:* zoom-in of the $\log \lambda \simeq 0$ region of the plot. Error bars are smaller than data points. Dashed lines are linear fits. For each N_p , the highest- H point has been ignored in order to avoid non-linear behaviours. In order to reduce noise, all the results have been obtained by averaging together ten different runs of $t_{\text{tot}} = 500$ steps each ($t_{\text{ther}} = 100$ steps were excluded to take into account thermalization effects).




FIG. 5: Critical field at zero temperature, $H_c(T = 0)$, as a function of N_p . Colours of data points are chosen in order to match those in Fig. 4. The dashed line was obtained via a fit to the function defined in (33), excluding $N_p = 272$. Error bars are smaller than data points.

The scaling of $H_c(T = 0)$ as a function of N_p is depicted in Fig. 5. There is still a dependence on the number of points N_p but the convergence to the exact value ($N_p \rightarrow \infty$) is very fast and can be very well fitted by the following law

$$H_c(N_p) = H_c(\infty) + B \exp\left(-\sqrt{N_p}/C\right). \quad (33)$$

The $\sqrt{N_p}$ in the argument of the exponential can be justified by noticing that on a sphere, the average distance between points scales as the inverse of the square root of the number of points, as in (24). The lowest value of N_p , that is $N_p = 272$, has been excluded from the fitting procedure, to avoid small-grid effects. The parameters estimates




FIG. 6: Difference between the critical field for $N_p(\infty)$ and that at finite N_p as a function of $\sqrt{N_p}$ in semi-log scale. Colors of data points are chosen to match those in Fig. 4. The dashed line is a fit to the function defined in (33). Error bars are smaller than data points.




FIG. 7: Critical field at zero temperature, $H_c(T = 0)$, as a function of $\exp(-\sqrt{N_p}/C)$. Colors of data points are chosen to match those in Fig. 4. The dashed line is a fit to the function defined in (33). Error bars are smaller than data points.

resulting from the fitting procedures are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_c(\infty) &= 1.214 \pm 0.003 \\
 B &= -0.327 \pm 0.005 \\
 C &= 24.7 \pm 0.9
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{34}$$

To check the goodness of this fit, the behavior of $H_c(\infty) - H_c(N_p)$ as a function of $\sqrt{N_p}$ in a semi-log plot is shown in Fig. 6. Moreover, the scaling of H_c as a function of $\exp(-\sqrt{N_p}/C)$, together with the extrapolation to infinite N_p , is depicted in Fig. 7. In both cases, the behavior is clearly linear in the range of N_p considered.

Taking into account also the $N_p = 272$ point does not appear to change significantly the visual goodness of the fit, but it does increase the χ^2 value. The corresponding critical field, however, is $H_c = 1.199 \pm 0.006$, not very far off from the previous estimate. Moreover, excluding additional points from the fit changes only slightly the value of $H_c(N_p = \infty)$. In the end, the field resulting from the fit (34) appears to be a good estimate of the critical field at zero temperature:

$$H_c(T = 0) = 1.214 \pm 0.003.
 \tag{35}$$




FIG. 8: Comparison between the dAT lines for different connectivities Z of the RRG (data points) and the solution for the Fully Connected topology (full black line). Dashed lines are the dAT lines obtained running the ASC algorithm with the quartic ansatz. Error bars are smaller than data points. Parameters: $t_{\text{eq}} = 30$, $t_{\text{therm}} = 50$, $t_{\text{tot}} = 100$, $N_p = 272$ (V potential with $\alpha = 7$).

A more careful analysis could be performed in order to have a better estimate of the uncertainty. However, even as it is, this value of the critical field is in complete agreement with the result $H_c(T=0) = 1.20 \pm 0.02$ presented above.

We point out that, even though, up to this point, the focus was on random regular graphs and fields distributed uniformly on the sphere, the techniques presented are very general and can be applied with minimal adjustments to different topologies of the network (such as Erdős-Rényi graphs) or distributions of the fields (e.g. fields whose components are distributed as Gaussians of zero mean and variance H^2).

C. Large connectivity limit

Finally, we move to the large connectivity limit. In Fig. 8 we compare the dAT lines obtained using Alg. 2 for different connectivities Z (data points) to the one obtained in the FC limit (black line). The agreement improves as the connectivity increases. Moreover, with dashed lines, we also report the approximated dAT lines obtained using Alg. 4 with the quadratic ansatz for the form of the marginals (but still using the discretization). The agreement is excellent at high temperatures, thus showing that a quartic ansatz is powerful enough to describe the marginals at large connectivities. At low temperatures the disagreement increases, as can be expected by an expansion in terms of βJ_{ij} .

V. DISCUSSION

In this work, we studied extensively the Heisenberg spin glass model with a random field on sparse random graphs.

Firstly, we have introduced a way to solve the Belief Propagation equations at finite temperatures and connectivities exploiting a discretization of the sphere. We have shown how perturbations can be studied via a linearized form of the Belief Propagation equations and used these results to compute the de Almeida-Thouless line in the field-temperature plane (see Fig. 1). As a check, we have shown that the zero-field critical temperature matches the analytical value. Moreover, the behavior of the dAT line for small fields has been shown to obey a very general scaling that has been observed in similar models (see Fig. 2).

In the second place, we have shown how to deal with the zero-temperature limit and the corresponding max-sum equations. We have shown that the strong discretization effects that appear when lowering the temperature can be greatly reduced via a smart interpolation procedure. This technique improves a lot the one used previously for the XY model because it is performed in a two-dimensional space. We then applied the max-sum algorithm with the smart

interpolation to find the critical field at zero temperature. We have observed a very smooth behavior as a function of the number of grid points N_p and exponentially fast convergence to the $N_p \rightarrow \infty$ limit (see Fig. 5 to 7). The resulting critical field is in a very good agreement with the extrapolation performed using finite-temperature data (Fig. 3).

Finally, we have considered the large connectivity limit of the model. We have shown how to carry on the expansion and explicitly computed $1/Z$ corrections. We have compared the de Almeida-Thouless line found with this ansatz to the true lines obtained by solving the complete Belief Propagation equations and found excellent agreement (see Fig. 8).

While our numerical analysis has been carried out for random regular graphs and fields distributed uniformly of the sphere, we highlight that the same procedures can be applied to study different ensembles of graphs (such as Erdős–Rényi graphs) and fields (like Gaussian ones).

Finally, we point out that a possible follow-up to this paper is using the described algorithms and techniques to study the response of single, well-defined graphs to the addition of a perturbation. This analysis, which could be performed both at finite and, thanks to the max-sum algorithm we have presented, zero temperature, might shed additional light on how this system reacts to excitations, thus granting additional information on the physics of the sparse disordered Heisenberg model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Chiara Cammarota for helpful discussions. The research has received financial support from ICSC – Italian Research Center on High-Performance Computing, Big Data, and Quantum Computing, funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU.

-
- [1] Giorgio Parisi. Infinite number of order parameters for spin-glasses. *Physical Review Letters*, 43(23):1754, 1979.
 - [2] Giorgio Parisi. Toward a mean field theory for spin glasses. *Physics Letters A*, 73(3):203–205, 1979.
 - [3] Giorgio Parisi. A sequence of approximated solutions to the sk model for spin glasses. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 13(4):L115, 1980.
 - [4] Giorgio Parisi. Magnetic properties of spin glasses in a new mean field theory. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 13(5):1887, 1980.
 - [5] Giorgio Parisi. The order parameter for spin glasses: a function on the interval 0-1. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 13(3):1101, 1980.
 - [6] Patrick Charbonneau, Enzo Marinari, Giorgio Parisi, Federico Ricci-Tersenghi, Gabriele Sicuro, Francesco Zamponi, and Marc Mezard. *Spin Glass Theory and Far Beyond: Replica Symmetry Breaking after 40 Years*. World Scientific, 2023.
 - [7] David Sherrington and Scott Kirkpatrick. Solvable model of a spin-glass. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 35:1792–1796, Dec 1975.
 - [8] Jairo RL de Almeida and David J Thouless. Stability of the sherrington-kirkpatrick solution of a spin glass model. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 11(5):983, 1978.
 - [9] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, and Miguel Angel Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, volume 9. World Scientific Publishing Company, 1987.
 - [10] Auditya Sharma and A. P. Young. de almeida–thouless line in vector spin glasses. *Phys. Rev. E*, 81:061115, Jun 2010.
 - [11] Silvio Franz, Flavio Nicoletti, Giorgio Parisi, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Delocalization transition in low energy excitation modes of vector spin glasses. *SciPost Physics*, 12(1):016, 2022.
 - [12] Silvio Franz, Flavio Nicoletti, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Linear low energy excitations in fully-connected models of glasses. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2022(5):053302, 2022.
 - [13] Jairo RL de Almeida, Raymund C Jones, John M Kosterlitz, and David J Thouless. The infinite-ranged spin glass with m-component spins. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 11(21):L871, 1978.
 - [14] Marc Gabay and Gérard Toulouse. Coexistence of spin-glass and ferromagnetic orderings. *Physical Review Letters*, 47(3):201, 1981.
 - [15] Marc Gabay, Thomas Garel, and C De Dominicis. Symmetry breaking a la parisi in the n-component sk model of a spin glass. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 15(35):7165, 1982.
 - [16] Dinah M Cragg and David Sherrington. Spin-glass with local uniaxial anisotropy. *Physical Review Letters*, 49(16):1190, 1982.
 - [17] Michael A Moore and Alan J Bray. Critical behaviour at the spin glass transition in a magnetic field. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 15(10):L301, 1982.
 - [18] R Alvarez Banos, A Cruz, LA Fernandez, JM Gil-Narvion, A Gordillo-Guerrero, M Guidetti, A Maiorano, F Mantovani, E Marinari, V Martin-Mayor, et al. Nature of the spin-glass phase at experimental length scales. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2010(06):P06026, 2010.

- [19] R Alvarez Banos, A Cruz, LA Fernandez, JM Gil-Narvion, A Gordillo-Guerrero, M Guidetti, D Iniguez, A Maiorano, F Mantovani, E Marinari, et al. Sample-to-sample fluctuations of the overlap distributions in the three-dimensional edwards-anderson spin glass. *Physical Review B*, 84(17):174209, 2011.
- [20] Marco Baity-Jesi, Víctor Martín-Mayor, Giorgio Parisi, and Sergio Perez-Gaviro. Soft modes, localization, and two-level systems in spin glasses. *Physical review letters*, 115(26):267205, 2015.
- [21] Michael W. Klein, Leo J. Schowalter, and Prabodh Shukla. Spin glasses in the bethe-peierls-weiss and other mean-field approximations. *Phys. Rev. B*, 19:1492–1502, Feb 1979.
- [22] Laura C S Viana and Alan J Bray. Phase diagrams for dilute spin glasses. *J. Phys. C Solid State Phys.*, 18(15):3037, may 1985.
- [23] P. Mottishaw. Replica symmetry breaking and the spin-glass on a bethe lattice. *Europhysics Letters*, 4(3):333, aug 1987.
- [24] Marc Mézard and Giorgio Parisi. The Bethe lattice spin glass revisited. *Eur. Phys. J. B*, 20(2):217, 2001.
- [25] Marc Mézard and Giorgio Parisi. The Cavity Method at Zero Temperature. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 111(1-2):1, 2003.
- [26] F. Krzakala and L. Zdeborova. Potts glass on random graphs. *Europhysics Letters*, 81(5):57005, feb 2008.
- [27] G Parisi, F Ricci-Tersenghi, and T Rizzo. Diluted mean-field spin-glass models at criticality. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2014(4):P04013, apr 2014.
- [28] Giorgio Parisi. The Marginally Stable Bethe Lattice Spin Glass Revisited. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 167(3):515, 2017.
- [29] Francesco Concetti. The Full Replica Symmetry Breaking in the Ising Spin Glass on Random Regular Graph. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 173(5):1459, 2018.
- [30] Francesco De Santis and Giorgio Parisi. Computation of the zero temperature rsb parameter in bethe lattice spin glasses, 2019.
- [31] Gianmarco Perrupato, Maria Chiara Angelini, Giorgio Parisi, Federico Ricci-Tersenghi, and Tommaso Rizzo. Ising spin glass on random graphs at zero temperature: Not all spins are glassy in the glassy phase. *Phys. Rev. B*, 106:174202, Nov 2022.
- [32] Anthony CC Coolen, Nikos S Skantzos, I Pérez Castillo, CJ Pérez Vicente, Jonathan PL Hatchett, Bastian Wemmenhove, and Theodore Nikolettopoulos. Finitely connected vector spin systems with random matrix interactions. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 38(39):8289, 2005.
- [33] Cosimo Lupo and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Approximating the xy model on a random graph with a q-state clock model. *Physical Review B*, 95(5):054433, 2017.
- [34] Cosimo Lupo and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Comparison of gabay–toulouse and de almeida–thouless instabilities for the spin-glass xy model in a field on sparse random graphs. *Physical Review B*, 97(1):014414, 2018.
- [35] Cosimo Lupo, Giorgio Parisi, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. The random field xy model on sparse random graphs shows replica symmetry breaking and marginally stable ferromagnetism. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 52(28):284001, 2019.
- [36] Flavio Nicoletti. Low energy excitations of vector spin glasses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09228*, 2023.
- [37] Luca Maria Del Bono, Flavio Nicoletti, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. The most uniform distribution of points on the sphere. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01503*, 2024.
- [38] Eric Lewin Altschuler, Timothy J. Williams, Edward R. Ratner, Robert Tipton, Richard Stong, Farid Dowla, and Frederick Wooten. Possible global minimum lattice configurations for thomson’s problem of charges on a sphere. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78:2681–2685, Apr 1997.
- [39] Marc Mezard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [40] Hai-Chau Chang and Lih-Chung Wang. A simple proof of thue’s theorem on circle packing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.4322*, 2010.
- [41] Adel Javanmard, Andrea Montanari, and Federico Ricci-Tersenghi. Phase transitions in semidefinite relaxations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(16):E2218–E2223, 2016.
- [42] Andrea Pagnani, Giorgio Parisi, and Mathieu Ratiéville. Near-optimal configurations in mean-field disordered systems. *Physical Review E*, 68(4):046706, 2003.
- [43] Cosimo Lupo. Critical properties of disordered xy model on sparse random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08899*, 2017.

Appendix A: Saturation problems when dealing with two populations

Aside from linearizing the BP equations, stability of a solution can be also checked by introducing a slightly perturbed population, $\hat{\mu}$, such that, for each i and j , $\hat{\mu}_{i \rightarrow j} = \hat{\mu}_{i \rightarrow j} + \epsilon v_{ij}$ and ϵv_{ij} is uniformly distributed in the interval $[-1,1]$, and evolving it with the same set of equations as the unperturbed one, \hat{v} . If the distance Δ between the two populations grows in time, then the fixed point is unstable, otherwise it is stable.

The practical problem of applying this procedure is that, given that marginals are well-normalized on the sphere, the distance between the two populations eventually saturates for long enough times (Fig. 9). If the saturation time is long enough, there is a sufficient number of steps between thermalization and saturation, so that a reliable estimate of the slope, and therefore of the Lyapunov factor, can be carried out nonetheless. However, saturation occurs quicker and quicker for higher fields and lower temperatures, making it impossible to apply the previous procedure to find the critical field in the low- T , high- H region. While this problem is temporarily solved by decreasing the initial perturbation, this issue appears again at lower values of the temperature (and higher values of the field), so that one has to continuously decrease the initial perturbation as the temperature is lowered. Since it is not possible to make the initial perturbation small at will due to the finite precision of the computer, a different solution must be used when going to very low temperatures.



(a) $T = 0.2$.(b) $T = 0.3$.

FIG. 9: Δ vs time in semi-log scale for two different values of the temperature. Saturation effects are clearly visible: Δ stops growing before reaching 10^{-2} . Parameters: $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$, $t_{eq} = 30$, $N_p = 272$ (V potential with $\alpha = 7$).

Appendix B: Additional complications when dealing with Heisenberg spins with respect to XY spins

Dealing with Heisenberg spins at zero temperature using the max-sum equations introduces the additional following complications with respect to the XY case:

- since a truly uniform distribution of points on the sphere cannot be achieved, relative positions of points with respect to each other vary. As a consequence, it is necessary to store, for each of the N_p points of the discretization, the relative position of the neighbours, in order to use them during interpolation;
- a 6-parameter interpolation (compared to the 3-parameter one of the XY model) is required. Indeed, considering the space around the discrete argmax locally flat, a second-order polynomial in the xy space has to be considered in order to carry out the interpolation. This means that we need to evaluate the marginals (19) at six different points to find the interpolating polynomial. Since in the grids we are considering (almost) each point has six neighbours, if we take a point and all its neighbours we end up with seven points, so one has to be discarded.² We have elected to ignore one of the six neighbouring points at random.³ Again, this is unlike the XY case, in which the choice of the three points to perform the interpolation is obvious;
- quadratics in two dimensions can have not only minima and maxima but also saddle points. As a consequence, when we try to maximize the function by taking the zero-derivative point there is no guarantee that it will actually be a maximum, but it might very well be a saddle point that lies below the discretized argmax. Moreover, even when the zero-derivative point is actually a maximum, it may lay very far away from the interpolation points. Notice that these issues do not arise in the XY case, in which only maxima are present, and all the maxima lay between the first and the third of the three points considered.

Appendix C: Selecting the ρ parameter

In order to study the effects of ρ on the interpolation procedure, we have first computed numerically the probability distribution $P(x)$ of having the zero-derivative point at a given distance x from the discrete argmax. We expect the distribution to behave almost linearly. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that the zero-derivative point is distributed uniformly around the discrete argmax, up to half the average distance between neighbours (x_m). This leads, for $m \geq 2$, to

$$P(x) = C_m x^{m-2} \theta(x_m - x), \quad (\text{C1})$$

where C_m is a normalization constant that depends on the dimension. For $m = 2$ and $m = 3$ we have

$$x_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{Q} \quad C_2 = \frac{1}{x_2}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$x_3 = \frac{r_0}{2} \quad C_3 = \frac{2}{x_3^2}, \quad (\text{C3})$$

respectively. Here, Q is the number of points used to discretize the circle (i.e. the number of *colours* in the clock model).

We check these hypotheses against data corresponding to the both XY and Heisenberg spins, using the linearized BP algorithm. Our prediction is clearly verified for the XY model, in which we have a uniform distribution, as reported in the left panel of Fig. 10. As is visible in the right panel, the agreement is also satisfactory in the Heisenberg model. Indeed, in this case the starting behaviour is clearly linear, although with a slightly smaller slope than that predicted in (C3), and a smoothed-out cutoff is present at $x_3 = r_0/2$. The small discrepancies may be due to the fact that the distribution of points on the sphere is not perfectly uniform, so that distances between neighbours are not exactly equal to x_3 , and moreover defects are present. Additionally, the space surrounding a point should actually be considered a hexagonal Voronoi cell. In order to take (at least partially) into account these effects, we have combined different distributions in the form (C1) in which x_3 was modified by adding a Gaussian noise (with standard deviation

² The alternative would be to perform a fit. However, since the interpolation procedure has to be carried out numerous times at every step of the simulation, it is not computationally feasible to go down this path. Hence, we have chosen to only consider six points and find the (only) paraboloid passing through them.

³ In the case of defects, which only have five neighbours, the choice of the six points is straightforward.




FIG. 10: Probability distribution of the distance x of the zero-derivative point from the discrete argmax. *Left*: XY model with $Q = 128$ points; *right*: the Heisenberg model with $N_p = 272$ (V optimization with $\alpha = 7$) points and $\rho = 1$. For both distributions, the corresponding $P(x)$ has been depicted as a solid line. For the Heisenberg, case an additional prediction has been obtained by combining different distributions in the form (C1), as described in the text. Notice that, in the second case, two different linear regimes are captured in the distribution of the distances. The first is up until the distance reaches the edge of the Voronoi cell, the second is when it reaches its corner.




FIG. 11: Examples of distribution of the distance from the discrete argmax of the zero-derivative point, for different values of the ρ parameter and of the H field, together with the cutoff ρr_0 for each distribution (dashed line). Data were obtained using $N_p = 272$ (V optimization with $\alpha = 7$) and looking at the 50-th step of the equilibration of the marginals.

given by the standard deviation of distances between first neighbours) and rescaling everything by $1/\cos\theta$, where θ is distributed uniformly in the $[-\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{\pi}{6}]$ interval. The latter procedure has been used to account for, to some extent, the shape of the Voronoi cell. This second prediction appears to resemble closely the empirical distribution of distances.

It can then be investigated how the distribution modifies when ρ changes (Fig. 11). When the cutoff introduced by ρ comes before the natural cutoff of the distribution, a large part of it is discarded. Hence, the algorithm will behave poorly and will not give a correct estimate of the critical field for the continuous model. From this visual analysis alone, values of at least $\rho \gtrsim 0.7$ (corresponding to cutoff distances $\rho r_0 \gtrsim 0.28$) have to be used.

In order to check more quantitatively what happens when ρ is changed, the max-sum algorithm can be used to find, for various ρ , the Lyapunov factor at different H and then the value of the critical field at zero temperature. For $N_p = 272$, the values of $\log\lambda$ vs H are shown in Fig. 12. The corresponding $H_c(0)$ as a function of ρ is depicted in Fig. 13. The H_c vs ρ curve has a sigmoidal shape. Clearly, $\rho = 0.71$ ($\rho^2 = 0.5$) already gives a good estimate of the asymptotic value, since we have reached the high- ρ plateau. This result is in agreement with the visual estimate coming from Fig. 11. When ρ reaches unity we are well placed in the plateau, as expected from geometrical considerations (interpolated maxima should not be further away from the discrete maxima than first neighbours), and consequently we can choose $\rho = 1$ as a good value of the parameter for the following simulations. The reader should notice that the $\rho \rightarrow 0$ limit (for practical purposes, $\rho \lesssim 0.1$) gives the result of the max-sum algorithm when no interpolation is carried out. This estimate of the zero-temperature critical field is macroscopically wrong.




FIG. 12: Behaviour of $\log \lambda$ vs H at $T = 0$ for different values of the ρ parameter. Error bars are smaller than data points. Dashed lines are linear fits. Data for $\rho \leq 0.71$ ($\rho^2 \leq 0.5$) basically collapse onto each other and give the same $H_c(T = 0)$ within errors. All the results have been obtained by averaging together five different runs of $t_{\text{tot}} = 1000$ steps each ($t_{\text{ther}} = 100$ steps were excluded to take into account thermalization effects) in order to reduce the noise.




FIG. 13: Critical field at zero temperature, $H_c(T = 0)$, as a function of the ρ parameters. Colours of data points are chosen in order to match those in Fig. 12. Errors are smaller than data points. Notice a smooth transition from the non-interpolating regime at $\rho \gtrsim 0$ to the high- ρ plateau. This difference is the reason why using the max-sum equations without interpolation leads to macroscopically wrong estimates of the critical field.

Appendix D: Computation of the dAT line using the vectorial ansatz

1. General computation

Starting from (27) and (25), the self-consistency equations for the cavity fields and the cavity magnetizations become

$$\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j} = \vec{H}_i + \sum_{k \notin \{i, j\}} J_{ik} \vec{m}_{k \rightarrow i} \quad (\text{D1})$$

$$\vec{m}_{i \rightarrow j} = \frac{\int d\mu(\vec{s}_i) \exp(\beta \vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot \vec{s}_i) \vec{s}_i}{\int d\mu(\vec{s}_i) \exp(\beta \vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j} \cdot \vec{s}_i)} = \sqrt{3} f_3(\sqrt{3} \beta |\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}|) \frac{\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}}{|\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}|} \quad (\text{D2})$$

thanks to the symmetry of the numerator's integrand around $\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}$. Here,

$$f_3(x) = \frac{1}{\tanh(x)} - \frac{1}{x} \quad (\text{D3})$$

and the $\sqrt{3}$ factor comes from the normalization of the spins. For completeness we also write down the Ising and XY cases: $f_1(x) = \tanh(x)$ and $f_2(x) = I_1(x)/I_0(x)$. Moreover, $f_m(x) \simeq 1 - (m-1)/(2x)$ for $x \rightarrow \infty$ for any dimension m of the variables, a fact that will be used later when dealing with the zero-temperature limit.

Perturbations around the BP fixed point can now be studied by linearizing the previous equations. Indeed, we can consider the susceptibility (Greek indices run over coordinates)

$$\chi_{\alpha\gamma} \equiv \frac{dm_\alpha}{dh_\gamma} = \sqrt{3} \frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)}{h} \delta_{\alpha,\gamma} + \left(3\beta f'_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h) - \sqrt{3} \frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)}{h} \right) \frac{h_\alpha h_\gamma}{h^2}, \quad (\text{D4})$$

where the $i \rightarrow j$ subscripts have been omitted and $h = |\vec{h}|$. Calling $\vec{n}_{i \rightarrow j} = \vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j} / |\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}|$, the susceptibility matrix can then be written as

$$\chi_{i \rightarrow j} = \sqrt{3} \frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h_{i \rightarrow j})}{h_{i \rightarrow j}} \mathbf{1} + \left(3\beta f'_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h_{i \rightarrow j}) - \sqrt{3} \frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h_{i \rightarrow j})}{h_{i \rightarrow j}} \right) |\vec{n}_{i \rightarrow j}\rangle \langle \vec{n}_{i \rightarrow j}| \quad (\text{D5})$$

$\mathbf{1}$ being the identity matrix. Linear perturbations then evolve according to the random matrix

$$\mathbf{B}_{i \rightarrow j} = \sum_{k \notin \{i,j\}} J_{ik} \chi_{k \rightarrow i}, \quad (\text{D6})$$

and this implies that the covariance of their distribution \mathbf{C} evolves according to $\mathbf{C}^{t+1} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{C}^t\mathbf{B}$. Assuming that the initial perturbations are randomly distributed according to a normal distribution of zero mean and covariance $\mathbf{1}$, their evolution can be readily obtained from the study of

$$\mathbf{B}_{i \rightarrow j}^2 \simeq \mathbb{E}[\chi_{i \rightarrow j}^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[2 \left(\frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)}{h} \right)^2 + 3 \left(\beta f'_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h) \right)^2 \right] \mathbf{1}, \quad (\text{D7})$$

where we have used $\mathbb{E}[|\vec{n}\rangle \langle \vec{n}|] = \mathbf{1}/3$. The average is over the probability distribution of the norm of $\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}$. Finally, the dAT line is defined by the condition

$$\mathbb{E}_h \left[2 \left(\frac{f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)}{h} \right)^2 + 3 \left(\beta f'_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h) \right)^2 \right] = 1. \quad (\text{D8})$$

Equation (D8) is equivalent to the condition $\lambda = 1$ encountered in the main text and it is easy to check that provides the same dAT line computed in [10].

2. Solving the stability equations at zero temperature

a. Gaussian fields

Let us consider the case in which the components of the field are distributed as Gaussian variables of zero mean and variance H^2 . Then, by the central limit theorem, cavity fields $\vec{h}_{i \rightarrow j}$ are Gaussian random variables of zero mean and covariance matrix $\sigma_h^2 \mathbf{1}$, with σ_h^2 satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_h^2 &= H^2 + \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{E}[\vec{m}^2] = H^2 + \mathbb{E}[f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)^2] = \\ &= H^2 + \frac{\int_0^\infty dh h^2 e^{-h^2/(2\sigma_h^2)} f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)^2}{\int_0^\infty dh h^2 e^{-h^2/(2\sigma_h^2)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D9})$$

In the zero temperature limit the equation reduces to $\sigma_h^2 = H^2 + 1$. The average appearing in (D8) then has the form

$$\mathbb{E}[\bullet] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \frac{dh h^2}{\sigma_h^3} \bullet e^{-\frac{h^2}{2\sigma_h^2}} \quad (\text{D10})$$

and, in the zero temperature limit, the dAT condition becomes

$$1 = 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^\infty \frac{dh e^{-\frac{h^2}{2\sigma_h^2}}}{\sigma_h^3} = \frac{2}{\sigma_h^2} \implies H_c(T=0) = 1. \quad (\text{D11})$$

In general, for m -dimensional variables the critical field is at $H_c(T=0) = 1/\sqrt{m-2}$, in complete agreement with the result in [10]. Notice that the zero-temperature critical field diverges for $m \leq 2$.

b. Uniformly distributed fields

Now, let us move to the case in which fields are distributed uniformly on the sphere of radius H . Due to isotropy, equations are invariant under the rotation of the local field \vec{H} , so we can fix its direction suitably. For instance, we can consider it aligned in the direction $\hat{n} = (1, 1, 1)$, so that (again, we drop the $i \rightarrow j$ subscripts to simplify the notation)

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= \frac{H}{\sqrt{3}} + \sigma z_1 \\ h_2 &= \frac{H}{\sqrt{3}} + \sigma z_2 \\ h_3 &= \frac{H}{\sqrt{3}} + \sigma z_3 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D12})$$

and z_α , $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ are normal variables of zero mean and variance one. Due to symmetry, the standard deviation σ is the same for all components. Since the variance of the field is zero in this case, σ has to satisfy

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{E}[\vec{m}^2]. \quad (\text{D13})$$

From (D2) with $\beta \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(m_1)^2 + (m_2)^2 + (m_3)^2 = 3 \quad (\text{D14})$$

and the fact that the three components are equal, it follows that

$$\sigma = 1. \quad (\text{D15})$$

Then, the expected value in (D8) can be easily computed by generating the components of \vec{h} as Gaussian variables of mean $H/\sqrt{3}$ and standard deviation 1.

Alternatively, we can align the external field to the $\hat{n} = \hat{x} = (1, 0, 0)$ direction so that

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= H + \sigma z_1 \\ h_2 &= \sigma z_2 \\ h_3 &= \sigma z_3 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D16})$$

where $\sigma = 1$ as before. Then again, we can compute the expected value in (D8) numerically for different values of the field, obtaining the curve of the expected value as a function of H .

The comparison between the lines at zero temperature for Gaussian and uniformly distributed fields is carried out in Fig. 14, in which the agreement between the two different methods described above for the uniform-distribution case can also be appreciated.

In the end, the zero-temperature critical fields are

$$H_c^{\text{Gauss}}(T=0) = 1, \quad (\text{D17})$$

$$H_c^{\text{Unif}}(T=0) = 1.505 \pm 0.001, \quad (\text{D18})$$

respectively. The first result derives from the analytical computation (D11); the second one comes from a linear fit of the curves presented in Fig. 14 in the region of interest.




FIG. 14: Comparison of the FC lines of the expected value in (D8) at $T = 0$, for Gaussian and uniformly distributed fields. The critical field is identified by the reaching of unity. The two curves obtained aligning the field in the $(1, 0, 0)$ and $(1, 1, 1)$ directions (see main text) coincide.

3. Solving the stability equation at finite temperature

When going to $T > 0$ (D8) can still be solved using fundamentally the same procedure used when dealing with the zero-temperature limit. Indeed, we can still use, for example, the first method described in the previous section in order to write the expected value in (D8). The main difference with the $T = 0$ case is that now f_3 is not identically equal to one, so $\sigma \neq 1$ and its value is not known from the beginning. The exact value of σ can, however, be found as $\sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[\bar{m}^2]/3$, where now

$$\bar{m}^2 = 3f_3(\sqrt{3}\beta h)^2 \quad (\text{D19})$$

from (D2). Hence, for a given temperature T , we can set up a recursive procedure, using σ to evaluate, via (D12), \vec{h} (and therefore $h = |\vec{h}|$) and then using the latter to compute first \bar{m}^2 using (D19) and then a new value of σ . The value to which the process converges is the estimate of σ , that can then be used to compute the expected value in (D8). As in the $T = 0$ case, the procedure can be applied at different field intensities H and the value $H_c(T)$ at which the expected value reaches one signals the onset of the spin glass phase.

The process can be repeated at different temperatures in order to compute the whole dAT line. Results can then be checked against those obtained at finite Z in order to verify that the former are obtained in the $Z \rightarrow \infty$ case, as done in Fig. 8. Despite some differences, in particular in the low- T region, the convergence to the FC case can be clearly appreciated for increasing values of the connectivity, as evidenced by the fact that the data points move closer to the FC solution for larger values of Z .

Appendix E: Quartic expansion of the BP equations

Starting from (3) and expanding the exponential under the assumption that βJ_{ij} is small we find, up to the fourth order:

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \propto \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) \left[1 + \beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j + \frac{1}{2} (\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j)^2 + \frac{1}{3!} (\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j)^3 + \frac{1}{4!} (\beta J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j)^4 \right] \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j), \quad (\text{E1})$$

which, once we have defined the correlation functions of $\nu_{j \rightarrow i}$,

$$m_{i \rightarrow j}^\alpha = \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j) s_j^\alpha \quad (\text{E2})$$

$$C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} = \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j) s_j^\alpha s_j^\beta \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$T_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j) s_j^\alpha s_j^\beta s_j^\gamma \quad (\text{E4})$$

$$T_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \int d\mu(\vec{s}_j) \nu_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_j) s_j^\alpha s_j^\beta s_j^\gamma s_j^\delta \quad (\text{E5})$$

becomes:

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \propto 1 + \beta J_{ij} \sum_{\alpha} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} s_i^{\alpha} + \frac{(\beta J_{ij})^2}{2} \sum_{\alpha\beta} C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} + \frac{(\beta J_{ij})^3}{3!} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} T_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} s_i^{\gamma} + \frac{(\beta J_{ij})^4}{4!} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} T_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} s_i^{\gamma} s_i^{\delta} \quad (\text{E6})$$

Writing $\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}$ as the exponential of the logarithm and, again, expanding for small βJ_{ij} yields the quartic approximation of the marginals

$$\hat{\nu}_{j \rightarrow i}(\vec{s}_i) \propto \exp \left\{ \sum_{\alpha} \tilde{m}_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} s_i^{\alpha} + \sum_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{C}_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} + \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \tilde{T}_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} s_i^{\gamma} + \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \tilde{T}_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} s_i^{\alpha} s_i^{\beta} s_i^{\gamma} s_i^{\delta} \right\} \quad (\text{E7})$$

where

$$\tilde{m}_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} = \beta J_{ij} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} \quad (\text{E8})$$

$$\tilde{C}_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{(\beta J_{ij})^2}{2} \left(C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} - m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\beta} \right) \quad (\text{E9})$$

$$\tilde{T}_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} = (\beta J_{ij})^3 \left(\frac{1}{6} T_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \frac{1}{2} C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\gamma} + \frac{1}{3} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\beta} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\gamma} \right) \quad (\text{E10})$$

$$\tilde{T}_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = (\beta J_{ij})^4 \left(\frac{1}{24} \tilde{T}_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} - \frac{1}{8} C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\gamma\delta} + \frac{1}{2} C_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\gamma} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\delta} - \frac{1}{4} T_{3,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\delta} - \frac{1}{6} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\beta} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\gamma} m_{i \rightarrow j}^{\delta} \right) \quad (\text{E11})$$

This form is preserved for $\nu_{j \rightarrow i}$, from (2). Therefore, starting from $\nu_{j \rightarrow i}$, one can find the values of the parameters (E2)-(E5), than those of (E8)-(E11) and from these compute again the $\nu_{j \rightarrow i}$ from (2). The procedure can then be repeated until convergence is reached. Notice that, if one is interested only in results up to $\mathcal{O}(1/Z)$, as we are in this paper, one only has to consider positive elements of $\tilde{T}_{4,i \rightarrow j}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, that is, elements for which indices are either all equal or pairwise equal.

Appendix F: Zero temperature extrapolation from finite-temperature data

The procedure used to estimate the critical field at zero temperature from the finite-temperature data is the following. First, we exclude $H_c(0)$ from the picture in order to reduce the number of fitting parameters. This is done by assuming a power-law behaviour at low temperatures in the form

$$H_c(T) \simeq H_c(0) - AT^a, \quad (\text{F1})$$

we can consider

$$\Delta H_c(T) \equiv H_c(T) - H_c(2T), \quad (\text{F2})$$

which then, according to (F1), goes as

$$\Delta H_c(T) \simeq AT^a(2^a - 1). \quad (\text{F3})$$

Taking the logarithm yields:

$$\log \Delta H_c(T) \simeq a \log T + \text{constant}, \quad (\text{F4})$$

so via a linear fit in log-log scale we can obtain the value of a . The procedure is depicted in Fig. 15 and the corresponding value a found in this way is

$$a = 0.405 \pm 0.014. \quad (\text{F5})$$

Notice that, in order to have a reliable estimate of the exponent a , the points affected by finite size effects must be ignored.




FIG. 15: $\Delta H_c(T)$ vs T for different numbers of points N_p in semi-log scale. Data were obtained using the linearized BP algorithm. Multiple points with the same colour (that is, with the same N_p) correspond to different values of $\alpha = 1, 4, 7$ in the choice of the optimization potential for the grid $V(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}$ (see [37] for details). Squares: LP grids optimized with V potential with $\alpha = 1$; circles: LP grids optimized with V potential with $\alpha = 4$; triangles: LP grids optimized with V potential with $\alpha = 7$. Black hexagons are averages, and the dotted line is the result of the fit.

The fitting procedure is in good accord with the measurements. Now we can go back to (F1) and fit the data using the known value of a (Fig. 3). This procedure yields

$$H_c(0) = 1.20 \pm 0.02 \quad (\text{F6})$$

as our estimate of the zero temperature critical field. The second fit, i.e. the one that determines $H_c(0)$ starting from the values of A and a , depends on the results of the first one. Consequently, it is affected by their uncertainties. In order to take into account this effect, the error is given by looking at the difference between the value of H_c obtained using the best estimates of A and a and the extreme values obtained by varying A and a within the range defined by their errors.

Appendix G: The equation for the zero field critical temperature

In [32] it is shown that the critical temperature of vector spin glasses in absence of an external magnetic field is obtained by requiring that the maximal eigenvalue of the following kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(\vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2, \vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2) = \frac{B \exp[\beta J (\vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{t}_1 + \vec{s}_2 \cdot \vec{t}_2)]}{\int_{\mathcal{S}_d(1)} d\vec{s}' \exp(\beta J \vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}') \int_{\mathcal{S}_d(1)} d\vec{s}'' \exp(\beta J \vec{s}_2 \cdot \vec{s}'')} \quad (\text{G1})$$

restricted to odd eigenfunctions $\int_{\mathcal{S}_d(1)^2} d\vec{t}_1 d\vec{t}_2 \psi(\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2) = 0$ is equal to unity. Here B is the branching ratio, J is the absolute value of couplings and $\mathcal{S}_d(1)$ is the unit sphere in dimension $d = 3$. In our case, $B = Z - 1$ since we consider a random regular graph and $J = 1/\sqrt{Z-1}$; moreover, since our spins have norm $\sqrt{3}$, we shall rescale $\beta \rightarrow 3\beta$ in eq. (G1). In the following, we show how to derive (30). The function

$$\psi^*(\vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{t}_1 \cdot \vec{t}_2 \quad (\text{G2})$$

is an eigenfunction of (G1). In fact, one has that ($\beta' = 3\beta/\sqrt{Z-1}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{S}_3(1)^2} d\vec{t}_1 d\vec{t}_2 \mathcal{K}(\vec{s}_1, \vec{s}_2, \vec{t}_1, \vec{t}_2) \frac{1}{2} \vec{t}_1 \cdot \vec{t}_2 &= \frac{Z-1}{2} \frac{\partial \log \int_{\mathcal{S}_3(1)} d\vec{t}_1 e^{\beta' \vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{t}_1}}{\partial(\beta' \vec{s}_1)} \cdot \frac{\partial \log \int_{\mathcal{S}_3(1)} d\vec{t}_2 e^{\beta' \vec{s}_2 \cdot \vec{t}_2}}{\partial(\beta' \vec{s}_2)} \\ &= (Z-1) \frac{f_3(\beta')^2}{2} \vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}_2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G3})$$

where $f_3(\beta')$ is the function defined in (D3). Imposing that the eigenvalue defined in this last equation is equal to one, we find the critical condition (30). We verified that $\lambda_* = (Z-1)f_3(\beta')^2$ is the largest odd eigenvalue numerically, by approximating the kernel (G1) with a 500×500 matrix and diagonalising it.