

# The simplest spin glass revisited: finite-size effects of the energy landscape can modify aging dynamics in the thermodynamic limit

Bin Li<sup>1,2</sup> and Yuliang Jin<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Center for Theoretical Interdisciplinary Sciences, Wenzhou Institute, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wenzhou, Zhejiang 325001, China*

(Dated: January 3, 2025)

The random energy model is one of the few glass models whose asymptotic activated aging dynamics are solvable. However, the existing aging theory, i.e., Bouchaud’s trap model, does not agree with dynamical simulation results obtained in finite-sized systems. Here we show that this discrepancy originates from non-negligible finite-size corrections in the energy barrier distributions. The finite-size effects add a logarithmic decay term in the time-correlation aging function, which destroys the asymptotic large-time plateau predicted by Bouchaud’s trap model in the spin glass phase. Surprisingly, the finite-size effects also give corrections, preserved even in the thermodynamic limit, to the value of the asymptotic plateau. It results in an unexpected dynamical transition where weak ergodicity breaking occurs, at a temperature  $T_d$  above the thermodynamic spin-glass transition temperature  $T_c$ . Based on the barrier distributions obtained by a numerical barrier-tree method and an expansion theory, we propose a generalized trap model to incorporate such finite-size effects. The theoretically derived aging behavior of the generalized trap model explains the Monte-Carlo dynamical simulation data of random energy models with Gaussian and exponential random energies. Our results suggest that the double limits of large system size and long time are not interchangeable for the activated aging dynamics.

**Introduction.** Glassy systems, including spin glasses [1], structural glasses [2], polymers [3], colloidal suspensions [4], granular materials [5], active matter [6] and artificial neural networks [7], are characterized by multiple thermodynamically metastable states (glass basins) that are separated by energy barriers in the energy landscape [8], and non-equilibrium aging dynamics [9–11]. Aging refers to the dynamical slowing down of relaxation processes with an increasing “age” quantified by the waiting time (or the aging time)  $t_w$  elapsed after the system is quenched.

Two mechanisms of aging have been proposed previously. (i) The first type, called mean-field aging, is studied by a set of closed equations for the two-time correlation and response functions in mean-field glass models [12–15]. Mean-field aging is related to slow descent in the (free) energy landscape after quenching, during which paths to find lower energies become more and more scarce – called an “entropic effect” [9, 16–18]. Because energy barriers are infinite in mean-field models (in the thermodynamic limit), activated barrier-crossing processes do not occur in mean-field aging.

(ii) The second type, called activated aging, corresponds to activated barrier-crossing processes. With an increasing  $t_w$ , the probability of the system being trapped in deeper basins increases, which results in a longer hopping time to escape the basin and thus slower relaxation dynamics. The fundamental theoretical model for activated aging is Bouchaud’s trap model (BTM) [19, 20],

which was initially proposed to describe aging dynamics in the simplest spin glass model [21], i.e., the random energy model (REM) [22]. A particularly interesting outcome from the BTM is the so-called weak ergodicity breaking in the spin glass phase (at a temperature  $T$  below the spin glass transition temperature  $T_c$ ), where the aging function (see the definition below) converges, in the large-time limit, to a plateau whose value is determined by the so-called arcsin law. Such asymptotic solutions of the BTM are supported by recent rigorous mathematical derivations [23–26]. However, this result is inconsistent with Monte-Carlo (MC) simulations of the REM (with Gaussian random energies) consisting of a finite number  $N$  of spins [27, 28]: the obtained aging functions do not show any sign of convergence to the predicted plateau.

This study considers the activated aging dynamics in the REMs with Gaussian and exponential energy distributions (GREM and EREM) [22, 27, 29], with  $T_c = 1/\sqrt{2\log 2} \approx 0.849$  [22] and  $T_c = 1$  respectively. We show that the activated aging dynamics obtained by MC simulations of the REMs can be theoretically explained by a generalized trap model (GTM), which takes into account the finite-size corrections in the barrier energy distribution. The aging dynamics are characterized by the function  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  that describes the probability of not leaving the glass basin between two times  $t_w$  and  $t_w + t$ , starting from a random initial configuration at  $t = 0$ . The  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  is related to the (aging part) spin auto-correlation function  $C(t_w, t_w + t) = \langle S(t_w)S(t_w + t) \rangle$  via  $C(t_w, t_w + t) = q_{EA}\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$ , where  $q_{EA}$  is the Edwards-Anderson order parameter [17]. Further details on the models and methods are provided in Appendixes A-C.

\* yuliangjin@mail.itp.ac.cn




FIG. 1. **Aging functions for the (a) GREM and (b) EREM.** In both models,  $w = 0.5$  and  $T = 0.75$ . Open points are MC simulation data. The dotted line represents the BTM plateau (a)  $H_{x,w} \approx 0.136$  with  $x = T/T_c \approx 0.883$  ( $T_c \approx 0.849$ ) and (b)  $H_{x,w} \approx 0.303$  with  $x = 0.75$  ( $T_c = 1$ ). The purple line represents the short-time behavior  $\Pi_w^s(t_w) = 1 - Ct_w$  with (a)  $C \approx 0.099$  and (b)  $C \approx 0.214$ . In (a), the dashed line represents the GTM plateau  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} \approx 0.854$  with  $x_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.246$ ; the MC data with  $t > 1$  are fitted (lines) to  $\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w) = H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}(1 + At_w^{-\alpha}) - \frac{B}{N} \ln t_w$  (see Eq. (7)) using  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} \approx 0.854$ ,  $\alpha = 1 - x_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.754$ ,  $A \approx 0.068$  from the theory, and  $B = 0.702$  from the fitting (the same  $B$  for all  $N$ ); the brown line is the  $\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w)$  with an inaccessible large  $N = 5000$ .

**Bouchaud's trap model (BTM).** The BTM assumes an exponential distribution of the barrier energy  $\Delta E$ ,

$$p_{\text{BTM}}(\Delta E) = \exp(-\Delta E/T_c), \quad (1)$$

in the spin glass phase  $T < T_c$  (the Boltzmann constant  $k_B = 1$ ), independent of  $T$ . This exponential form is consistent with the one-step replica breaking (1RSB) scheme of the organization of states in the spin glass phase of the GREM [1]. The hopping time  $\tau$  is related to  $\Delta E$  through the Arrhenius law,  $\tau(\Delta E) \sim \exp(\Delta E/T)$ . It can be shown that the Arrhenius law is consistent with the simulation results of the REM (see Appendix D; the time unit is  $N$ ). Based on Eq. (1) and the Arrhenius law,  $\tau$  follows a power-law distribution,  $\psi(\tau) \sim \tau^{-(1+x)}$ , where  $x = T/T_c$  is the reduced temperature. Because  $0 < x < 1$  in the spin glass phase, the mean of  $\tau$  diverges. Thus the system takes infinite time to reach equilibrium, leading to long-time aging.

Based on this model, Bouchaud showed an interesting property called *weak-ergodicity breaking (WEB)* [12, 19, 20]: for a finite, fixed  $t_w$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Pi(t_w, t_w + t) = 0$ , but if the ratio  $t/t_w = w$  is fixed, the *aging function*  $\Pi_w(t_w) \equiv \Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  converges asymptotically to a non-zero constant,

$$\lim_{t_w \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_w(t_w) = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi} \int_w^\infty \frac{du}{u^x(1+u)} \equiv H_{x,w}, \quad (2)$$

which is called an arcsin law [30]. The arcsin law is proven to be rigorous in the asymptotic regime, taking  $N \rightarrow \infty$  first and then  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$  [24, 31]. It can be shown theoretically that [32] (see SI Sec. S1),

$$\Pi_w^{\text{BTM}}(t_w) \sim \begin{cases} 1 - Ct_w, & t_w < \tau_0, \\ H_{x,w}(1 + At_w^{-\alpha}), & t_w > \tau_0, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau_0 \sim O(1)$  is a microscopic time scale,  $\alpha = 1 - x$ ,  $C = \frac{wx}{1+x}$  and  $A = \frac{1}{(1-x)\Gamma(1-x)\Gamma^2(x)}$ , with  $\Gamma(x)$  a gamma function. The aging behavior is dominated by the large-time regime  $t_w > \tau_0$ , which shows power-law convergence to the asymptotic plateau, similar to the early  $\beta$ -relaxation scaling in the mode-coupling theory [33, 34].

However, the arcsin law Eq. (2) is challenged by the simulation results of the finite-sized GREM obtained by MC simulations, as shown in [27]. Up to the largest system size and time ( $N \sim 20$  and  $t_w \sim 10^{10}$ ) that can be simulated by regular CPUs, there is no sign that the simulation data of  $\Pi_w(t_w)$  would converge to the predicted plateau  $H_{x,w}$  (see Fig. 1a). In contrast, such convergence is well observed in the EREM [27] (see Fig. 1b). Thus the aging theory built on phenomenological BTM cannot fully explain the real dynamics of microscopic models (REMs).





FIG. 2. **Phase diagram of the GTM.** (a) The asymptotic plateau value of the aging function  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  vs the weight parameter  $W$ , at different  $T$  (lines). Yellow and blue areas represent the WEB ( $W < 1$ ) and frozen ( $W > 1$ ) phases respectively, with (inset) schematic energy landscapes. The EREM and GREM correspond to  $W = 0$  and  $W \approx 0.721$  (triangle). (b) In the GREM, the dynamical transition occurs at  $T_d \approx 3.05 \approx 3.6T_c$  (star) and the thermodynamical transition at  $T_c \approx 0.849$  (triangle). (c) In the EREM, the two transitions occur simultaneously at  $T_d = T_c = 1$ .

**A generalized trap model (GTM).** To explain the dynamical data in the finite-sized GREM, we propose a generalized trap model. The GTM retains the assumptions and input of the original BTM (e.g., the Arrhenius law), except that the energy barrier distribution is not purely exponential anymore but a mixture of exponential and Gaussian distributions,

$$p_{\text{GTM}}(\Delta E) = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{T_c}\Delta E - \frac{1}{2Na}(\Delta E - \bar{E})^2\right], \quad (4)$$



**FIG. 3. Barrier energy distributions in the GREM and EREM.** (a) A sub-tree formed by local minima and saddle points for the  $N = 6$  GREM obtained by the barrier-tree method, with corresponding spin configurations and energies ( $E$ -axis). The blue nodes are non-minimum-non-saddle configurations in the basins. The barrier energy  $\Delta E$  is the difference between the local minimum energy and saddle point energy. (b) Distribution of the barrier energy  $p_{\text{GREM}}^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$  by the barrier-tree method (points) and  $p_{\text{GTM}}(\Delta E)$  (Eq. 4) with  $a = 1.12$  and  $k = 0.96$  (line), for the  $N = 20$  GREM. (c)  $p_{\text{EREM}}^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$  and  $p_{\text{BTM}}(\Delta E)$  (Eq. 1) for the  $N = 20$  EREM. (e-f)  $\ln p(\Delta E) + \Delta E/T_c$  for the (e) GREM and (f) EREM, where open points are obtained by the barrier-tree algorithm (the data do not cover the full range due to limited statistics), solid-filled points by the tree-expansion theory, and lines in (e) are fitting to the Gaussian function. The variance  $\sigma^2$  and mean  $\bar{E}$  obtained by the Gaussian fitting are plotted in (d) as functions of  $N$ . Linear fitting of the data in (d) gives  $a = 1.12$  and  $k = 0.96$  ( $\sigma^2 = aN$  and  $\bar{E} = kN$ ).

where  $a$  is a model-dependent parameter, and  $\bar{E} = kN$  is assumed to be extensive in general. Note that the Gaussian term follows the standard central limit theorem. Equation (4) will be explicitly examined in REMs below, but for now we take it as input to the GTM and derive theoretically the corresponding aging behavior (see details in SI Sec. S1 [32]).

There are two important finite-size effects due to the Gaussian term in Eq. (4). The first effect modifies the asymptotic plateau  $H_{x,w}$  in Eq. (2) with  $x$  replaced by an

effective  $x_{\text{eff}}$ . The second effect introduces a logarithmic decay term  $\sim \frac{1}{N} \ln t_w$  in the pre-asymptotic behavior in Eq. (3), which avoids the asymptotic plateau for a small  $N$ . Next we discuss these two effects in detail.

Expanding Eq. (4) gives (neglecting the constant term),  $\ln p_{\text{GTM}}(\Delta E) \sim -\frac{1}{T_c} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{E}T_c}{Na}\right) \Delta E - \frac{1}{2Na} \Delta E^2$ . The linear coefficient suggests an effective  $x$  parameter,

$$x_{\text{eff}} = \left(1 - \frac{kT_c}{a}\right) x = (1 - W)x, \quad (5)$$

where  $x = T/T_c$  is the same as in the BTM. Note that the correction  $-kT_c/a$  is independent of  $N$ , and thus this modification does not disappear even in the thermodynamic limit. Correspondingly, the asymptotic plateau  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  is modified with  $x$  replaced by  $x_{\text{eff}}$  in Eq. (2).

In microscopic models (such as the GREM and EREM), the parameters  $k, a$ , and the transition temperature  $T_c$ , are model-dependent. Their combination, the *weight parameter*  $W = kT_c/a$ , weights the contributions of linear and Gaussian terms in Eq. (4). The  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  versus  $W$  phase diagram is presented in Fig. 2 (without loss of generality, we set  $w = 1/2$ ). Two phases can be identified. (i) A WEB phase with  $W < 1$ . For a given  $W$ , the WEB occurs at a temperature  $T = T_d > T_c$ , where,

$$T_d = \frac{T_c}{1 - W}, \quad (6)$$

such that  $x_{\text{eff}} = (1 - W)T_d/T_c = 1$ . To distinguish from the thermodynamic spin glass transition temperature  $T_c$ , we call  $T_d$  a *dynamical transition temperature*. When  $W \rightarrow 0$ , the original BTM is recovered. (ii) A frozen phase with  $W > 1$ . Here  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} = 1$  independent of  $T$ , suggesting completely frozen dynamics. It means that when the Gaussian term dominates ( $x_{\text{eff}} \leq 0$ ) in Eq. (4), the effective temperature  $T_{\text{eff}} = x_{\text{eff}} T_c \leq 0$ , and trap escaping is impossible.

The second finite-size effect is caused by the quadratic term  $\sim \Delta E^2/N$  in Eq (4), which is  $O(1/N)$ . This term adds a logarithmic decay term (higher-order corrections are neglected) to the pre-asymptotic behavior in Eq. (3), as derived in SI Sec. S1D [32]:

$$\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w) \sim \begin{cases} 1 - C t_w, & t_w < \tau_0, \\ H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} (1 + A t_w^{-\alpha}) - \frac{B}{N} \ln t_w, & t_w > \tau_0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where  $\alpha, A, C$  have the same expressions as in Eq. (3) with  $x$  replaced by  $x_{\text{eff}}$ , and  $B = -\frac{T^2 H'_{x_{\text{eff}},w}}{a}$ . For small  $N$ , the logarithmic decay dominates the overall behavior of the aging function, which is the reason why the predicted plateau is not observable in GREM. Below we present such analyses.

**Aging dynamics of finite-sized GREM and EREM explained by the GTM.** To explain the MC data in Fig. 1 using the GTM, firstly we need to determine the parameters  $a$  and  $k$  in the barrier distribution Eq. (4). This requires obtaining accurate barrier distributions in finite-sized GREM and EREM. To do that,




FIG. 4. **Dynamical transition in the GREM.** (a)  $\Pi_w(t_w)$  are obtained for the GREM ( $N = 20$ ,  $w = 0.5$ ) by MC simulations at rescaled times  $Ct_w$  with  $C = \frac{w x_{\text{eff}}}{1+x_{\text{eff}}}$ . The solid line is  $\Pi_w^s(t_w) = 1 - Ct_w$  (see Eq. 7). The dotted line is  $\Pi^* = 0.2$ , and the two time scales  $t_w^{s,*}$  (circle) and  $t_w^*$  (crosses) are marked. (b)  $R = t_w^*/t_w^{s,*}$  vs  $T$  for the GREM with different  $N$ .  $T_d \approx 3.6T_c$  is indicated (star). (c-d) Analogous data for the EREM. (b-inset)  $R$  as a function of  $N$  at  $T = 1.17T_c$ .

we employ two independent approaches. The first one is an exhaustive enumeration of energy barriers using the barrier-tree (BT) algorithm [35–38] (see Fig. 3a for an example sub-barrier-tree and Appendix B for algorithm details). The method provides the exact  $p^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$ , but is restricted to small systems ( $N \leq 20$ ). We also develop a tree-expansion (TE) theory to compute analytically and approximately  $p^{\text{TE}}(\Delta E)$ , which works for any  $N$  (see SI Sec. S2A [32]). The difference between  $p^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$  and  $p^{\text{TE}}(\Delta E)$  is unnoticeable, as shown in Fig 3b-f.

While the EREM distribution  $p_{\text{EREM}}(\Delta E)$  (Fig. 3c) is very close to the exponential Eq. (1) as expected by the original BTM, it is obvious that the GREM distribution  $p_{\text{GREM}}(\Delta E)$  (Fig. 3b) deviates from a pure exponential distribution. To reveal further this deviation, the exponential part Eq. (1) is subtracted, and the difference  $\ln p(\Delta E) + \Delta E/T_c$  is plotted in Fig. 3e,f for both models. The data for GREM in Fig. 3e can be well fitted by an Gaussian function  $\exp\left[-\frac{(\Delta E - \bar{E})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right]$ . The variance  $\sigma^2 = aN$  and mean  $\bar{E} = kN$  linearly depend on  $N$ , as shown in Fig. 3d. From the linear fitting, we obtain  $a = 1.12$  and  $k = 0.96$  for the GREM. In sharp contrast, the difference for the EREM in Fig. 3f is negligible. Thus for the EREM, the barrier distribution is exponential, and the original BTM works well even for small systems, which explains why the BTM plateau  $H_{x,w}$  is well-observed in the MC data (see Fig. 1b).

To understand the MC results for the GREM in Fig. 1a, it is necessary to consider the GTM (with the above-obtained parameters  $a = 1.12$  and  $k = 0.96$ ). Due to strong higher-order corrections in small-sized GREM, Eq. (7) does not agree exactly with the MC data if the theoretical coefficients  $A, B$  and  $C$  are used (see SI Fig. S4 [32]). Nevertheless, the MC data of different  $N$  can be fitted to Eq. (7) with only one  $N$ -independent fitting parameter  $B$  (we keep theoretical values of  $A$  and  $C$ ). As can be seen from the data, in small- $N$  GREM, the aging dynamics are dominated by the logarithmic decay. Unlike in the EREM, the plateau at  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  in the GREM is only visible for much larger  $N$ , which is inaccessible by the current computational power (see Fig. 1a). Importantly, in the large- $N$  limit, the GREM plateau should converge to  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  predicted by the GTM, rather than  $H_{x,w}$  by the BTM. Thus the finite-size effects, unconventionally, remain in the thermodynamic limit. This is because the quadratic term in Eq. (4) introduces an  $O(1)$  correction, as discussed above (see Eq. 5).

**An unexpected dynamical transition in the GREM.** An interesting prediction from the GTM is the dynamical transition at  $T_d$  (Eq. 6) for the onset of WEB, at which the asymptotic plateau  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$  vanishes. This result is surprising, because it is conventionally believed that, in REMs, the onset of WEB occurs simultaneously with the thermodynamic spin glass transition at  $T_c$ , where the entropy density  $s$  vanishes [19]. According to the GTM results (Fig. 2b,c), such a coincidence ( $T_d = T_c$ ) only exists in the EREM ( $W = 0$ ), but not in the GREM ( $W > 0$  and  $T_d > T_c$ ). It should be emphasized the dynamic transition at  $T_d$  does not disappear even in the thermodynamic limit, since the correction  $W = kT_c/a$  in Eq. (6) is independent of  $N$ . Using  $a = 1.12$  and  $k = 0.96$  obtained above, we derive  $T_d \approx 3.05 \approx 3.6T_c$  in the GREM.

Can we observe the dynamic transition in the MC simulations of the GREM? To show that, in Fig. 4a we plot the MC data of  $\Pi_w(t_w)$  for the GREM, with  $t_w$  rescaled by  $C = \frac{w x_{\text{eff}}}{1+x_{\text{eff}}}$  to collapse the short-time behavior  $\Pi_w^s(t_w) = 1 - Ct_w$  (note that  $C$  is not a fitting parameter). In the ergodic phase ( $T > T_d$ ), the dynamics should be dominated by this short-time behavior. The deviation from it, which occurs at  $T < T_d$ , characterizes the WEB. For this reason, we define short-time and long-time scales,  $t_w^{s,*}$  and  $t_w^*$ , by  $\Pi_w^s(t_w^{s,*}) = 1 - Ct_w^{s,*} = \Pi^*$  and  $\Pi_w(t_w^*) = \Pi^*$ , where (without loss of generality)  $\Pi^* = 0.2$ . The ratio  $R = t_w^*/t_w^{s,*}$  characterizes the WEB: if  $R = 1$ , then  $\Pi_w(t_w)$  follows  $\Pi_w^s(t_w)$  without dynamical slowing down; if  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\Pi_w(t_w)$  develops a plateau and the weak ergodicity is broken. As shown by the data in Fig. 4b,  $R \approx 1$  for  $T > T_d$ . For  $T < T_d$ ,  $R > 1$  increases with  $N$ , suggesting WEB in the thermodynamic limit. In contrast, in the EREM,  $R \approx 1$  as long as  $T > T_c$  (see Fig. 4c-d). To emphasize the difference between the two models, we show the  $N$ -dependence of  $R$  at a fixed  $T = 1.17T_c$  (see Fig. b-inset). At this  $T$ , the EREM is ergodic ( $R \approx 1$ ), while the GREM shows WEB ( $\ln R \sim N$ ,

meaning that  $R \rightarrow \infty$  when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ). The above numerical analyses are fully consistent with the prediction from the GTM (Fig. 2), i.e., there is an additional dynamical transition at  $T_d > T_c$  in the GREM, but not in the EREM.

**Discussion.** This study suggests that the double limits  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$  are not interchangeable. Taking  $N \rightarrow \infty$  first and then  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$ , as done in previous mathematical computations [23–26], reconciles Eqs. (1) and (4), and therefore the BTM and GTM. However, generally in MC simulations, long-time simulations are performed for small  $N$  – to describe such settings, one should send  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$  and then  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . In the future, it will be interesting to generalize the present analysis to spin-llass models with a hierarchical energy landscape [1], such as

the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model [39], and structural glasses.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We warmly thank Hajime Yoshino and Haijun Zhou for discussions. We acknowledge financial support from NSFC (Grants 12161141007, 11935002 and 12047503) and from Wenzhou Institute (Grant WIU-CASQD2023009). In this work access was granted to the High-Performance Computing Cluster of Institute of Theoretical Physics - the Chinese Academy of Sciences.

- 
- [1] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, Vol. 9 (World Scientific Publishing Company, 1987).
- [2] G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Theory of simple glasses: exact solutions in infinite dimensions* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- [3] L. C. E. Struik *et al.*, *Physical aging in amorphous polymers and other materials*, Vol. 106 (Citeseer, 1978).
- [4] R. E. Courtland and E. R. Weeks, Direct visualization of ageing in colloidal glasses, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **15**, S359 (2002).
- [5] P. A. Gago and S. Boettcher, Universal features of annealing and aging in compaction of granular piles, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 33072 (2020).
- [6] G. Janzen and L. M. Janssen, Aging in thermal active glasses, *Physical Review Research* **4**, L012038 (2022).
- [7] M. Baity-Jesi, L. Sagun, M. Geiger, S. Spigler, G. B. Arous, C. Cammarota, Y. LeCun, M. Wyart, and G. Biroli, Comparing dynamics: Deep neural networks versus glassy systems, in *International Conference on Machine Learning* (PMLR, 2018) pp. 314–323.
- [8] F. H. Stillinger, *Energy landscapes, inherent structures, and condensed-matter phenomena* (Princeton University Press, 2015).
- [9] J.-P. Bouchaud and M. Mézard, Aging in glasses: Traps and mode-coupling theory, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **126**, 181 (1997).
- [10] L. F. Cugliandolo, Dynamics of glassy systems, in *Slow Relaxations and nonequilibrium dynamics in condensed matter*, edited by J.-L. Barrat, M. Feigelman, J. Kurchan, and J. Dalibard (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003) pp. 367–521.
- [11] F. Arceri, F. P. Landes, L. Berthier, and G. Biroli, Glasses and aging, a statistical mechanics perspective on, in *Statistical and Nonlinear Physics* (Springer, 2022) pp. 229–296.
- [12] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Analytical solution of the off-equilibrium dynamics of a long-range spin-glass model, *Physical Review Letters* **71**, 173 (1993).
- [13] L. F. Cugliandolo and P. Le Doussal, Large time nonequilibrium dynamics of a particle in a random potential, *Physical Review E* **53**, 1525 (1996).
- [14] A. Altieri, G. Biroli, and C. Cammarota, Dynamical mean-field theory and aging dynamics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **53**, 375006 (2020).
- [15] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, On the out-of-equilibrium relaxation of the sherrington-kirkpatrick model, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **27**, 5749 (1994).
- [16] J. Kurchan and L. Laloux, Phase space geometry and slow dynamics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **29**, 1929 (1996).
- [17] J.-P. Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and M. Mézard, Out of equilibrium dynamics in spin-glasses and other glassy systems, *Spin glasses and random fields* **12**, 161 (1998).
- [18] E. Agoritsas, T. Maimbourg, and F. Zamponi, Out-of-equilibrium dynamical equations of infinite-dimensional particle systems i. the isotropic case, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **52**, 144002 (2019).
- [19] J.-P. Bouchaud, Weak ergodicity breaking and aging in disordered systems, *Journal de Physique I* **2**, 1705 (1992).
- [20] J.-P. Bouchaud and D. S. Dean, Aging on parisi’s tree, *Journal de Physique I* **5**, 265 (1995).
- [21] D. J. Gross and M. Mézard, The simplest spin glass, *Nuclear Physics B* **240**, 431 (1984).
- [22] B. Derrida, Random-energy model: Limit of a family of disordered models, *Physical Review Letters* **45**, 79 (1980).
- [23] J. Černý and T. Wassmer, Aging of the metropolis dynamics on the random energy model, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **167**, 253 (2017).
- [24] V. Gayrard, Aging in metropolis dynamics of the rem: a proof, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **174**, 501 (2019).
- [25] V. Gayrard and L. Hartung, Dynamic phase diagram of the rem, in *Statistical Mechanics of Classical and Disordered Systems: Luminy, France, August 2018* (Springer, 2019) pp. 111–170.
- [26] B. Derrida, P. Mottishaw, and V. Gayrard, Random energy models: broken replica symmetry and activated dynamics, in *Spin Glass Theory and Far Beyond: Replica Symmetry Breaking after 40 Years* (World Scientific, 2023) pp. 657–677.

- [27] M. Baity-Jesi, G. Biroli, and C. Cammarota, Activated aging dynamics and effective trap model description in the random energy model, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2018**, 013301 (2018).
- [28] D. A. Stariolo and L. F. Cugliandolo, Activated dynamics of the ising p-spin disordered model with finite number of variables, *Europhysics Letters* **127**, 16002 (2019).
- [29] J.-P. Bouchaud and M. Mézard, Universality classes for extreme-value statistics, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **30**, 7997 (1997).
- [30] G. B. Arous and J. Černý, Course 8 dynamics of trap models, *Mathematical statistical physics, École d'Été de physique des houches session LXXXIII*, 331 (2006).
- [31] V. Gayrard, Convergence of clock processes and aging in metropolis dynamics of a truncated rem, in *Annales Henri Poincaré*, Vol. 17 (Springer, 2016) pp. 537–614.
- [32] See Supplemental Material at [URL](#), containing aging theory of the generalized trap model and a tree-expansion theory of the finite-size random energy model.
- [33] W. Götze, *Complex dynamics of glass-forming liquids: A mode-coupling theory*, Vol. 143 (Oxford University Press, USA, 2009).
- [34] D. R. Reichman and P. Charbonneau, Mode-coupling theory, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2005**, P05013 (2005).
- [35] C. Flamm, W. Fontana, I. L. Hofacker, and P. Schuster, Rna folding at elementary step resolution, *Rna* **6**, 325 (2000).
- [36] F. F. Ferreira, J. F. Fontanari, and P. F. Stadler, Landscape statistics of the low-autocorrelation binary string problem, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **33**, 8635 (2000).
- [37] J. F. Fontanari and P. F. Stadler, Fractal geometry of spin-glass models, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**, 1509 (2002).
- [38] C. Flamm, I. L. Hofacker, P. F. Stadler, and M. T. Wolfinger, Barrier trees of degenerate landscapes, (2002).
- [39] D. Sherrington and S. Kirkpatrick, Solvable model of a spin-glass, *Physical review letters* **35**, 1792 (1975).
- [40] C. Monthus and J.-P. Bouchaud, Models of traps and glass phenomenology, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **29**, 3847 (1996).

## End Matter

**Appendix A: Random energy models.** A REM comprises  $2^N$  configurations. Each configuration consists of  $N$  Ising spins, whose energy is drawn randomly from a Gaussian probability distribution,

$$\rho_{\text{Gauss}}(E) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi N}} \exp(-E^2/2N). \quad (8)$$

This original version with the Gaussian distribution  $\rho_{\text{Gauss}}(E)$  is called Gaussian random energy model (GREM). An alternative version, called Exponential random energy model (EREM) [27, 29], has been introduced previously, with  $\rho_{\text{Gauss}}(E)$  replaced by

$$\rho_{\text{exp}}(E) = \frac{1}{T_c} \exp(E/T_c) \Theta(-E), \quad (9)$$

where  $\Theta(x)$  is the Heaviside step function. In each realization, the energy assignment of  $2^N$  configurations is fixed (quenched disorder) in the following static barrier-tree analyses and dynamical simulations. The procedure is then repeated for  $\sim 20000 - 1000$  realizations (for  $N = 8 - 20$ ) to take the statistical average.




FIG. 5. **Probability distribution function of the internal entropy for the GREM.** The data points are  $g^{\text{BT}}(S)$  obtained by the numerical barrier-tree method, and the solid line is Eq. (11). (inset) Average numerical entropy  $\langle S \rangle$  as a function of  $N$ , where the dashed line is  $S_\infty \approx 0.212439$  (Eq. 10).

**Appendix B: Barrier-tree method.** The barrier-tree algorithm searches for all local minima and saddle points in the energy landscape, and organizes them into a barrier tree (see Fig. 3a for an example of a sub-tree). A spin configuration is referred to as a local minimum if its energy is lower than the energy of any adjacent configuration (each configuration has  $N$  adjacent configurations related by a single spin flip). The complete set of local minima are found by exhaustive search. To find the saddle point between two local minima, the algorithm first searches for all possible paths (a path is a series of subsequent spin flips) between the two minima, with the maximum energy point identified along each path – the




FIG. 6. **Basin hopping dynamics in MC simulations.** Data are obtained for the GREM at  $T = 0.75$  with  $N = 20$ . (a) An example of configuration trajectory, where  $E(t_w)$  is the energy of the configuration at  $t_w$ . (b) Corresponding basin trajectory, where  $\tilde{E}(t_w)$  is the energy of the basin or the saddle point at  $t_w$ . With this, a sequence of hopping events with the barrier energy  $\Delta E_k$  and the hopping time  $\tau_k$  are identified. (c) The hopping time probability distribution function (pdf)  $\psi(\tau)$  and the conditional distribution  $\psi(\tau_2|\tau_1)$  measured in MC simulations, (c) without and (d) with return hops;  $\psi^{\text{BT}}(\tau)$  is converted from the static distribution  $p_{\text{GREM}}^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$  using the Arrhenius law.

saddle point is then defined as the lowest energy point among all maxima (min-max).

The barrier tree is constructed recursively in the following way: (i) find all  $N_b$  local minima; (ii) connect the two lowest local minima by a saddle point, and replace this sub-tree with a new node whose energy is equivalent to the saddle point energy (the new set has  $N_b - 1$  nodes); (iii) repeat (i) and (ii) until only one node is left in the set ( $N_b = 1$ ). More details about the saddle-tree algorithm can be found in Refs. [35–38].

As shown in Fig. 3a, generally a local minimum can be connected to multiple saddle points. For a given local minimum with an energy  $E_{\text{lm}}$ , we define  $E_{\text{sp}}$  as the lowest energy of its connected saddle points, and the barrier energy is given by  $\Delta E = E_{\text{sp}} - E_{\text{lm}}$ . Our definition of  $\Delta E$  is also consistent with the above min-max definition of saddle points in Appendix B. In this way, each local minimum is assigned to an energy barrier  $\Delta E$ . The probability distribution of  $\Delta E$  gives  $p^{\text{BT}}(\Delta E)$ .




FIG. 7. **Arrhenius law.** (a) Correspondence between  $\tau$  and  $\Delta E$  in MC simulations of the GREM at  $T = 0.75$  with  $N = 20$ , where the color represents the logarithm of the joint probability  $\ln \Psi(\tau, \Delta E)$  (see the color bar). (b) The conditional probability  $\Psi(\tau|\Delta E = 10)$  multiplied by  $\tau$ ; the solid line follows Eq. (13). (b-inset)  $\tau_0$  vs  $N$ .

Each glass basin corresponds to a local minimum and a saddle point defined in the above way. A glass basin also contains other configurations that are neither local minima nor saddle points – they form a set of configurations connected to the local minimum whose energies are all below  $E_{\text{sp}}$ . Numerically, we start from the given local minimum, and search for its direct neighbours with a single-spin flip, the neighbours of neighbours, ..., until the configuration's energy  $E$  is larger than  $E_{\text{sp}}$ . In this way, for a given realization of the REM model with a finite  $N$ , we find all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_b$  basins. Each basin corresponds to a set  $\mathcal{B}_i$  of configurations belonging to it, a local minimum energy  $E_{\text{lm}}^i$ , a saddle point energy  $E_{\text{sp}}^i$ , and a barrier energy  $\Delta E_i = E_{\text{sp}}^i - E_{\text{lm}}^i$ . Note that many configurations do not belong to any basins.

The internal entropy  $S = \ln \Omega$  is the logarithm of the number of configurations  $\Omega$  in a basin. Figure 5 shows the probability distribution function  $g^{\text{BT}}(S)$  obtained by the barrier-tree method, which is nearly independent of  $N$ . The inset of Fig. 5 shows that the mean internal entropy  $\langle S \rangle$  converges to a value  $S_\infty \approx 0.21$  in the large- $N$  limit. Then the average number of configurations in a basin is  $\Omega \approx e^{0.21} \approx 1.2$ , i.e., each basin contains approximately one configuration in average. Thus in the spin glass phase, the mean internal entropy per spin vanishes ( $\langle S \rangle/N \rightarrow 0$ ) in the thermodynamic limit, consistent with thermodynamic theory of the REM [22]. Alternatively,  $S_\infty$  can be computed by the tree-expansion theory (see SI Sec. S2B):

$$S_\infty \equiv \sum_{\Omega=1}^{\infty} g_\infty(\Omega) \ln \Omega \approx 0.212439, \quad (10)$$

where

$$g_\infty(\Omega) = \frac{\Omega!}{\Omega^{\Omega+1}} - \frac{\Omega!}{(\Omega+1)^{\Omega+1}} \quad (11)$$

is the probability of basins with  $\Omega$  configurations. This theoretical result is fully consistent with the data obtained by the barrier-tree method (Fig. 5-inset).

**Appendix C: Obtaining the correlation function  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  in MC simulations.** Dynamical trajectories, which are time sequences of configurations  $\mathcal{C}(t)$ , are obtained by standard single-spin flip MC simulations, starting from random initial configurations. An example is provided in Fig. 6a, where the energy  $E(t_w)$  of the configuration at  $t_w$  is plotted. In order to obtain the aging function  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$ , our task is to transform the configuration trajectory to a basin trajectory (Fig. 6b). The detailed procedure is described below.

During the dynamics, the system is in the basin  $\mathcal{B}_i$  if  $\mathcal{C}(t) \in \mathcal{B}_i$  and it leaves the basin if  $\mathcal{C}(t) \notin \mathcal{B}_i$  anymore. The duration in the basin defines the hopping time (trapping time)  $\tau$ . In this way, we identify a sequence of hopping events with  $\{\tau_k, E_{\text{lm}}^{i_k}, E_{\text{sp}}^{i_k}, \Delta E_{i_k}\}$ , where  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $1 \leq i_k \leq N_b$  denotes that the  $k$ -th event is in the basin  $i_k$  (Fig. 6b). Note that the transient time between basins is negligible, i.e., we assume that once the system leaves a basin, it immediately falls into the next basin.

Occasionally, after leaving a basin, the system jumps back to the same basin. Following the previous study [27], the two events are merged in such cases. The effects of return jumps are revealed in Fig. 6c, d, by the conditional probability  $p(\tau_2|\tau_1)$ , which is distribution of the next-event hopping time  $\tau_2$  when the current-event hopping time is  $\tau_1$ . Only when the return jumps are merged, the  $p(\tau_2|\tau_1)$  is independent of  $\tau_1$ , which means that the two consecutive jumps are independent. The independence of consecutive jumps (called renewal mechanism) is a basic assumption in the trap model. In order to be consistent with the renewal mechanism, we employ the no-return treatment.

#### Appendix D: Verification of the Arrhenius law.

In the trap model, the hopping time  $\tau$  and the barrier energy  $\Delta E$  are related through the Arrhenius law,

$$\tau(\Delta E) = \tau_0 \exp(\Delta E/k_B T), \quad (12)$$

where  $\tau_0$  the microscopic timescale. We find that the Arrhenius law is consistent with the  $\bar{\tau}(\Delta E)$  data ( $\bar{\tau}$  is the mean hopping time for the given  $\Delta E$ ) obtained by MC simulations (Fig. 7a), with  $\tau_0 \sim O(1)$  as shown in Fig. 7b-inset (the time unit is  $N$ ).

When  $N$  is finite, for a given  $\Delta E$ ,  $\tau$  follows a distribution

$$\Psi(\tau|\Delta E) = (1-r)^{\tau-1} r \approx e^{-\tau r} r, \quad (13)$$

where  $r = \exp(-\Delta E/T)$ . To derive  $\Psi(\tau|\Delta E)$ , consider a discretized time  $\tau$ : if a system is trapped in a basin with a  $\Delta E$ -barrier for  $\tau$  steps, it should remain in the basin for  $\tau-1$  steps with a probability  $1-r$  at each step, and jumps out the basin at the final step with a probability  $r$ . Equation (13) is also verified by the simulation data (see Fig. 7b). Note that the mean hopping time of Eq. (13),  $\bar{\tau}(\Delta E) = \int_0^\infty \tau \Psi(\tau|\Delta E) d\tau$ , consistently recovers the Arrhenius law Eq. (12). In short, the Arrhenius law is verified by our MC data.

# Supplementary Information

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	5
References	5
S1. Aging theory of the generalized trap model	9
A. Outline of the general strategy	9
B. Long-time power-law convergence to the asymptotic plateau	10
C. Short-time linear decay	11
D. Logarithmic decay due to finite-size effects in the generalized trap model	12
S2. Thermodynamics of the finite-size random energy model: a tree-expansion theory	14
A. Probability distributions	14
1. The first order: $\Omega = 1$	15
2. The second order: $\Omega = 2$	15
3. The third order: $\Omega = 3$	16
4. Verification with the numerical barrier-tree algorithm	16
B. Internal entropy	18
C. Number of basins	19

## S1. AGING THEORY OF THE GENERALIZED TRAP MODEL

### A. Outline of the general strategy

Our theoretical derivation of the behavior of the aging function  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  follows the strategy provided in Refs. [20, 40]. If the system is trapped in a basin with a trapping time  $\tau$ , then the probability of the system remaining in the basin after a time  $t$  decays exponentially as  $\sim e^{-t/\tau}$ . According to this, one can write,

$$\Pi(t_w, t_w + t) = \left\langle \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_b} Q(t_w, \tau_\beta) e^{-t/\tau_\beta} \right\rangle = N_b \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau Q(t_w, \tau) e^{-t/\tau} \psi(\tau), \quad (\text{S1})$$

where  $N_b$  is the total number of basins,  $Q(t_w, \tau)$  is the probability of the system being in a basin with a hopping time  $\tau$  at a waiting time  $t_w$ ,  $\psi(\tau)$  is the hopping time probability distribution function, and  $\tau_0$  is the minimum hopping time (the unit of time). The distribution  $\psi(\tau)$  is normalized as,

$$\int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau \psi(\tau) = 1. \quad (\text{S2})$$

In the original Bouchaud's trap model (BTM), the energy barrier distribution is exponential (see Eq. 1). Using the Arrhenius law  $\tau(\Delta E) \sim \exp(\Delta E/T)$ , the exponential barrier distribution  $P(\Delta E) \sim \exp(-\Delta E/T_c)$  can be converted to a power-law hopping time distribution  $\psi(\tau)$ ,

$$\psi(\tau) = x\tau_0^x \tau^{-(1+x)}, \quad (\text{S3})$$

where  $x = T/T_c$ . Note that Eq. (S3) is normalized according to Eq. (S2).

Bouchaud et al. showed that it is convenient to work in the Laplace transform of  $Q(t_w, \tau)$ ,

$$\hat{Q}(s, \tau) = \mathcal{L}\{sQ(t_w, \tau)\} = \int_0^{\infty} dt_w e^{-st_w} sQ(t_w, \tau). \quad (\text{S4})$$

When the consecutive hops are independent, as verified numerically in Appendix C, the probability  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau)$  is [20, 40],

$$\hat{Q}(s, \tau) = \frac{\frac{s\tau}{s\tau+1}}{\mathcal{C}N_b \left\langle \frac{s\tau}{s\tau+1} \right\rangle}, \quad (\text{S5})$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a normalization constant. If one considers  $t_w$  as an exponentially distributed random variable, as suggested by Eq. (S4), then Eq. (S5) can be understood as  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \sim \tau/(\tau + \bar{t}_w)$ , where the mean waiting time  $\bar{t}_w \sim 1/s$ . It suggests that the probability of being in a basin with a hopping time  $\tau$  increases with  $\tau$  and decreases with the waiting time  $\bar{t}_w$ . Let us consider several limiting cases. For any finite  $\tau$ ,  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \rightarrow 1$  when  $\bar{t}_w \rightarrow 0$  (the probability of escaping from any basin is zero without waiting), and  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\bar{t}_w \rightarrow \infty$  (all basins can be escaped from after long-time waiting). For any finite  $\bar{t}_w$ ,  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\tau \rightarrow 0$  (the probability to stay in the basin with  $\tau = 0$  is zero), and  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \rightarrow 1$  when  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  (the basin can not be escaped from if its  $\tau$  is infinite).

With Eqs. (S1), (S3), (S4) and (S5), the aging function  $\Pi(t_w, t_w + t)$  can be obtained. For the generalized trap model (GTM), Eq. (S3) needs to be modified in order to include the finite-size correction, but the other equations can be kept. In the following analyses, the results in Sections S1B and S1C are general for long-time and short-time dynamics in the BTM and GTM, while the logarithmic decay discussed in Section S1D is uniquely due to the finite-size effects in the GTM.

## B. Long-time power-law convergence to the asymptotic plateau

Here we give a theoretical derivation of the second line ( $t_w > \tau_0$ ) in Eq. (3). In Eq. (S5), the normalization constant  $\mathcal{C} = 1$  in the large-time limit  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$ . With  $\mathcal{C} = 1$ , the plateau  $H_{x,w}$  of the aging function can be determined as given by the arcsin law Eq. (2). In order to obtain the behavior of how the aging function converges to the plateau, it is crucial to consider the next-order  $1/t_w$ -correction to  $\mathcal{C}$ , as shown below. Note that in this section, we use the BTM distribution Eq. (S3) without finite-size corrections. With Eq. (S3), the average in the denominator of Eq. (S5) becomes,

$$\left\langle \frac{s\tau}{s\tau + 1} \right\rangle = \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau \frac{s\tau}{s\tau + 1} \psi(\tau) = {}_2F_1(1, x; 1 + x; -\frac{1}{s\tau_0}), \quad (\text{S6})$$

where  ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; z)$  is the ordinary hypergeometric function. In the large waiting time limit  $t_w \rightarrow \infty$  (or equivalently in the limit  $s \rightarrow 0$ ),  ${}_2F_1(1, x; 1 + x; -\frac{1}{s\tau_0}) \approx x\tau_0^{-x} s^{-x} \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi x)}$ . Thus an approximate expression of  $\hat{Q}(s, \tau)$  is,

$$\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \approx \frac{\sin(\pi x)\tau_0^{-x}}{\mathcal{C}N_b\pi x} \frac{s\tau}{(s\tau + 1)} s^{-x}. \quad (\text{S7})$$

The probability distribution  $Q(t_w, \tau)$  can be obtained by performing an inverse Laplace transform to Eq. (S7) and then applying the convolution theorem,

$$Q(t_w, \tau) = \mathcal{L}^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{s} \hat{Q}(s, \tau) \right\} \approx \frac{\sin(\pi x)\tau_0^{-x}}{\mathcal{C}N_b\pi x\Gamma(x)} \int_0^{t_w} dt' (t_w - t')^{x-1} e^{-t'/\tau}, \quad (\text{S8})$$

where  $\Gamma(x)$  is the gamma function. The normalization condition requires that,

$$\left\langle \sum_{\beta}^{N_b} Q(t_w, \tau_{\beta}) \right\rangle = N_b \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau Q(t_w, \tau) \psi(\tau) = 1, \quad (\text{S9})$$

or,

$$\mathcal{C} = \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi\Gamma(x)} \times \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau \int_0^{t_w} dt' \tau^{-(1+x)} (t_w - t')^{x-1} e^{-t'/\tau}. \quad (\text{S10})$$

Note that  $\mathcal{C}$  depends on  $t_w$ . Plugging Eqs. (S3) and (S8) into Eq. (S1), we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(t_w, t_w + t) &\approx \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\mathcal{C}\pi\Gamma(x)} \int_0^{\infty} d\tau \int_0^{t_w} dt' \tau^{-(1+x)} (t_w - t')^{x-1} e^{-(t'+t)/\tau} \\ &\approx \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\mathcal{C}\pi} \int_0^{t_w} dt' \left( \frac{t + t'}{t_w - t'} \right)^{-x} (t_w - t')^{-1} \\ &= \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\mathcal{C}\pi} \int_w^{\infty} du u^{-x} (1 + u)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

where  $u = \frac{t+t'}{t_w - t'}$  and  $w = t/t_w$ .

To the zeroth order of  $t_w$ , Eq. (S10) gives  $\mathcal{C} \approx 1$ , and then Eq. (S11) recovers the arcsin law Eq. (2). Expanding Eq. (S10) to the next order of  $1/t_w$ , we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &= 1 - \frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi \Gamma(x)} \int_0^\infty du (1+u)^{-1} u^{-x} \Gamma\left(x, \frac{u}{1+u} \frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right) \\ &\approx 1 - \frac{1}{(1-x)\Gamma(1-x)\Gamma^2(x)} \left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)^{x-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S12})$$

Combing Eqs. (S11), (S12) and (2) gives,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_w^{\text{BTM}}(t_w) &\approx H_{x,w} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{(1-x)\Gamma(1-x)\Gamma^2(x)} \left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)^{x-1} \right] \\ &= H_{x,w} \left[ 1 + A \left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)^{-\alpha} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S13})$$

where  $\alpha = 1 - x$  and  $A = \frac{1}{(1-x)\Gamma(1-x)\Gamma^2(x)}$ . We have thus derived the large- $t_w$  form of Eq. (3). Finally, we compare the analytic expression Eq. (S13) with the numerical results obtained by the inverse Laplace transform of the exact expressions Eqs. (S5) and (S6), confirming the validity of Eq. (S13) in the asymptotic regime (see Fig. S1a). Note that, without loss of generality, we fix  $w = 0.5$  in this study.




FIG. S1. **Comparison between the analytical approximation of the aging function for the BTM and the exact numerical results using the inverse Laplace transform.** (a) Large- $t_w$  power-law convergence to the asymptotic plateau. (b) Small- $t_w$  linear decay. The points are exact results obtained by the numerical inverse Laplace transform of Eqs. (S5) and (S6). The solid lines are Eq. (S13) in (a) and Eq. (S18) in (b).

### C. Short-time linear decay

For short-time dynamics, similarly we begin with Eq. (S6) in the last section. In the short-time limit  $t_w \rightarrow 0$  (corresponding to the limit  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ),  ${}_2F_1(1, x; 1+x; -\frac{1}{s\tau_0}) \approx 1$ , and

$$\hat{Q}(s, \tau) \approx \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}N_b} \frac{s\tau}{s\tau + 1}. \quad (\text{S14})$$

The probability distribution  $Q(t_w, \tau)$  is again obtained by the inverse Laplace transform:

$$Q(t_w, \tau) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}N_b} e^{-t_w/\tau}. \quad (\text{S15})$$

Then the aging function is obtained,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi(t_w, t_w + t) &= N_b \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau Q(t_w, \tau) e^{-t/\tau} \psi(\tau) \\
&= \frac{x}{\mathcal{C}} \left( \frac{t + t_w}{\tau_0} \right)^{-x} \left[ \Gamma(x) - \Gamma \left( x, \frac{t + t_w}{\tau_0} \right) \right] \\
&= \left( \frac{t_w}{t + t_w} \right)^x \frac{\Gamma(x) - \Gamma \left( x, \frac{t + t_w}{\tau_0} \right)}{\Gamma(x) - \Gamma \left( x, \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right)},
\end{aligned} \tag{S16}$$

where the normalized constant is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} &= \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau e^{-t_w/\tau} \psi(\tau) \\
&= x \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right)^{-x} \left[ \Gamma(x) - \Gamma \left( x, \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{S17}$$

Expanding Eq. (S16) around  $t_w = 0$ , we obtain,

$$\Pi_w^s(t_w) \approx 1 - \frac{wx}{x+1} \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right) = 1 - C \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right). \tag{S18}$$

Similar to the long-time case, the analytic result Eq. (S18) can be confirmed by exact numerical calculations using the inverse Laplace transform (see Fig. S1b).

#### D. Logarithmic decay due to finite-size effects in the generalized trap model

The GTM aging function is computed using the formula Eq. (S1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w) &= \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau \psi_{\text{GTM}}(\tau) Q_{\text{GTM}}(t_w, \tau) e^{-wt_w/\tau} \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} d\tau e^{f_{\text{GTM}}(t_w, \ln \tau)},
\end{aligned} \tag{S19}$$

The GTM barrier energy distribution Eq. (4) leads to the modified trapping time distribution (via the Arrhenius law),

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{\text{GTM}}(\tau) &\sim \tau^{-x_{\text{eff}}-1} \exp[-\xi \ln^2(\tau/\tau_0)] \\
&\sim \tau^{-x_{\text{eff}}-\xi \ln(\tau/\tau_0)-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{S20}$$

where  $\xi \equiv \frac{T^2}{2Na}$ , and  $x_{\text{eff}} = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{E}T_c}{Na}\right)x$ . The  $Q_{\text{GTM}}(t_w, \tau)$  can be computed by the inverse Laplace transform of Eq. (S5), where  $\left\langle \frac{s\tau}{s\tau+1} \right\rangle = \int_{\tau_0}^{\infty} d\tau \frac{s\tau}{s\tau+1} \psi_{\text{GTM}}(\tau)$ .

It is hard to directly analyze Eq. (S19). However, based on a saddle-point approximation, we find that the aging functions in the two models can be related by shifting the effective reduced temperature,

$$\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w; x) \sim \Pi_w^{\text{BTM}}(t_w; \tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}), \tag{S21}$$

where

$$\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}} = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{E}T_c}{Na}\right)x + \frac{T^2}{Na} \ln t_w = x_{\text{eff}} + 2\xi \ln t_w. \tag{S22}$$

In other words, the aging function  $\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w; x)$  of the GTM at a temperature  $T = T_c x$  is approximately equivalent to the aging function  $\Pi_w^{\text{BTM}}(t_w; \tilde{x}_{\text{eff}})$  of the BTM at the temperature  $\tilde{T}_{\text{eff}} = T_c \tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  with  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  given by Eq. (S22). Equation (S21) is essentially due to the relation between the maximum of  $f_{\text{GTM}}(t_w, \ln \tau)$  in Eq. (S19) and that of  $f_{\text{BTM}}(t_w, \ln \tau)$ ,

$$\ln \tau_{\text{GTM}}^*(t_w, x) \approx \ln \tau_{\text{BTM}}^*(t_w, \tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}), \tag{S23}$$




FIG. S2. **Verification of Eq. (S23).** The data points are obtained by numerical evaluation of the maximum  $f(t_w, \ln \tau^*)$  of the function  $f(t_w, \ln \tau)$  defined in Eq. (S19). As shown by the data,  $\ln \tau^*$  is linearly proportional to  $\ln t_w$  in (a) BTM and (b) GTM, for  $T = 0.21, 0.42, 0.64, 0.85$  (or  $x = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0$ ), and  $N = 64$ . At the same  $T$ , the BTM and GTM data do not collapse in (a,b). However, the GTM data (dotted point-line) at  $T = T_c x$  and the BTM data (solid point-line) at  $\tilde{T}_{\text{eff}} = T_c \tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  collapse, where  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  is given by Eq. (S22), for different (c)  $T$  (with  $N = 128$  fixed) and (d)  $N$  (with  $T = 0.42$  fixed).

where  $f(t_w, \ln \tau)$  is maximized at  $\ln \tau^*$  with other parameters ( $t_w, T$ , etc.) fixed. Equation (S23) is consistent with the numerically evaluated maximum point  $\ln \tau^*$  (see Fig. S2). As shown by the data, in general  $\ln \tau^* \sim \ln t_w$  in both models (Fig. S2a,b). The GTM data at  $x$  and the BTM data at the corresponding  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  (see Eq. S22) collapse for different  $x$  and  $N$  (Fig. S2c,d), and thus Eq. (S23) is verified.

Equation (S22) means that, the Gaussian term in the GTM barrier distribution Eq. (4) gives rise to two effects compared to the BTM. First, it shifts the reduced temperature effectively from  $x = T/T_c$  to an  $N$ -independent  $x_{\text{eff}} = T_{\text{eff}}/T_c$ . This shift modifies the asymptotic plateau of the aging function from  $H_{x,w}$  to  $H_{x_{\text{eff}},w}$ , in the thermodynamic limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Second, the next-order correction adds a term  $\frac{1}{N} \ln t_w$  as  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}} - x_{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{1}{N} \ln t_w$ . This correction disappears in the thermodynamic limit, but brings in a  $\ln(t_w)$  decay term to the aging function for a finite  $N$ , as we show below.

With Eq. (S21),  $\Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w)$  can be conveniently analyzed using the Arcsin law, with  $x$  in Eq. (S13) replaced by  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$ . For large  $N$ , the difference between  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}}$  and  $x_{\text{eff}}$ ,  $\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}} - x_{\text{eff}} \sim \frac{1}{N} \ln t_w$ , can be considered as a perturbation to the original form. Expanding around  $x_{\text{eff}}$  to the first order, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Pi_w^{\text{GTM}}(t_w) &\approx H_{\tilde{x}_{\text{eff}},w} \left[ 1 + A \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right)^{-\alpha} \right] \\
 &\approx H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} \left[ 1 + A \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right)^{-\alpha} \right] + \frac{T^2 H'_{x_{\text{eff}},w}}{Na} \ln \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right) \\
 &= H_{x_{\text{eff}},w} \left[ 1 + A \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right)^{-\alpha} \right] - \frac{B}{N} \ln \left( \frac{t_w}{\tau_0} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{S24}$$

where  $B = -\frac{T^2 H'_{x_{\text{eff}},w}}{a}$ , and  $H'_{x,w}$  is the derivative of  $H_{x,w}$  with respect to  $x$ . The analytic expression of the logarithmic




FIG. S3. **Logarithmic decay in the GTM at (a)  $T = 0.64$  and (b)  $T = 1$ .** The data points are obtained by numerical integration of Eq. (S19). The lines are the  $-\frac{B}{N} \ln\left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)$  term in Eq. (S24).




FIG. S4. **Comparison between the MC aging function (points) and Eq. (S24) (lines), at  $T = 0.75$ .** No fitting parameters are used for the lines.

decay  $-\frac{B}{N} \ln\left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)$  with  $B = -\frac{T^2 H'_{x_{\text{eff}},w}}{a}$  is compared to the numerical integration of Eq. (S19) in Fig. S3: the agreement is converged with increasing  $N$ . We further compare the theoretical results  $-\frac{B}{N} \ln\left(\frac{t_w}{\tau_0}\right)$  with the MC data in Fig. S4. While the logarithmic form is robust, the coefficient  $B$  is not exact due to strong higher-order corrections for small  $N$  in MC simulations. In the main text Fig. 1, we treat  $B$  as a fitting parameter.

## S2. THERMODYNAMICS OF THE FINITE-SIZE RANDOM ENERGY MODEL: A TREE-EXPANSION THEORY

### A. Probability distributions

Our aim is to obtain statistical properties of the energy landscape for the finite-sized REM model with  $N$  spins, where  $N$  is sufficiently small so that the system is far from the thermodynamic limit ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ). We assume that each basin only has one nondegenerate local minimum, and that basins are independent. The probability distribution of the local minimum  $E_{\text{lm}}$  is,

$$\begin{aligned} p_N^{\text{lm}}(E_{\text{lm}}) &= (N+1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}}) \left[ \int_{E_{\text{lm}}}^{\infty} dE \rho(E) \right]^N \\ &= (N+1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}}) L^N(E_{\text{lm}}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

where  $L(E) \equiv \int_E^\infty dE \rho(E)$  is a complementary cumulative distribution function, and  $\rho(E)$  is the probability distribution function of the configuration energy  $E$ . The above expression requires that the  $N$  direct neighbors of the local minimum, which are related to the local minimum by a single spin flip, have an energy  $E$  higher than  $E_{\text{lm}}$ . The factor  $N + 1$  comes from the  $N + 1$  choices of the local minimum among the  $N + 1$  configurations. For the GREM,  $\rho(E) = \rho_{\text{Gauss}}(E)$  given by Eq. (8), which results in  $L(E) = L_{\text{Gauss}}(E)$ , where

$$L_{\text{Gauss}}(E) = \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}(E/\sqrt{2N}), \quad (\text{S26})$$

with  $\text{erfc}(x)$  the complementary error function. For the EREM,  $\rho(E) = \rho_{\text{exp}}(E)$  as in Eq. (9), and  $L(E) = L_{\text{exp}}(E)$ , where

$$L_{\text{exp}}(E) = [1 - \exp(E)]\Theta(-E). \quad (\text{S27})$$

The probability distributions of the saddle point energy  $E_{\text{sp}}$  and the barrier energy  $\Delta E$  cannot be explicitly obtained. They need to be computed by integrating out the other variable in the joint distribution  $\lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}})$ ,

$$p_N^{\text{sp}}(E_{\text{sp}}) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dE_{\text{lm}} \lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}), \quad (\text{S28})$$

$$p_N(\Delta E) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dE_{\text{sp}} \lambda_N(E_{\text{sp}} - \Delta E, E_{\text{sp}}). \quad (\text{S29})$$

The joint distribution  $\lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}})$  characterizes the probability of a basin with a local minimum energy  $E_{\text{lm}}$  and a saddle point energy  $E_{\text{sp}}$ . Our key task is to compute  $\lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}})$ . To do that, we develop an approach named *tree-expansion theory*. The starting point is to write  $\lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}})$  as a summation,

$$\lambda_N(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}) \equiv \sum_{\Omega=1}^N \lambda_N^{(\Omega)}(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}), \quad (\text{S30})$$

where  $\Omega$  is the number of configurations in the basin. For example,  $\Omega = 1$  means that there is only a local minimum in the basin, and  $\Omega = 2$  means that there is another configuration in the basin besides the local minimum, etc. The summation converges quickly with the increasing  $\Omega$ . We next explicitly consider the first three orders,  $\Omega = 1, 2, 3$ .

### 1. The first order: $\Omega = 1$

When  $\Omega = 1$ , as shown in Fig. S5, the basin contains only the local minimum without any other configurations. By definition, the saddle point should have the lowest energy among the  $N$  neighbors of the local minimum – the probability of this condition is  $L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}})$ . The saddle point also has  $N$  neighbors, including the local minimum and  $N - 1$  other neighbors. The energies of the other  $N - 1$  neighbors cannot be all higher than  $E_{\text{sp}}$  – otherwise the saddle point would be a configuration inside the basin (not a saddle point). This condition imposes a constraint given by  $1 - L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}})$ . Putting these considerations together, we can write the first-order joint distribution as

$$\lambda_N^{(1)}(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}) = (N + 1)N\rho(E_{\text{lm}})\rho(E_{\text{sp}})L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}}) [1 - L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}})], \quad (\text{S31})$$

where the extra factor  $(N + 1)N$  comes from the permutation of choosing a local minimum from the  $N + 1$  configurations and a saddle point from the rest of the  $N$  configurations.

### 2. The second order: $\Omega = 2$

The second-order joint distribution corresponds to two graphs as shown in Fig. S6. Besides the local minimum, the basin contains one configuration whose energy is between  $E_{\text{sp}}$  and  $E_{\text{lm}}$  – the corresponding probability is  $\int_{E_{\text{lm}}}^{E_{\text{sp}}} dE \rho(E)$ . The permutation of choosing one saddle point, one local minimum and another configuration in the basin gives a factor of  $(N + 1)N(N - 1)$ . The two graphs in Fig. S6 coincidentally have the same expression, which gives an extra factor of two. Finally, the second-order joint distribution can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_N^{(2)}(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}) &= 2(N + 1)N(N - 1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}})\rho(E_{\text{sp}})L^{2N-3}(E_{\text{sp}}) [1 - L^{N-2}(E_{\text{sp}})] \int_{E_{\text{lm}}}^{E_{\text{sp}}} dE \rho(E) \\ &= 2(N + 1)N(N - 1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}})\rho(E_{\text{sp}})L^{2N-3}(E_{\text{sp}}) [1 - L^{N-2}(E_{\text{sp}})] [L(E_{\text{lm}}) - L(E_{\text{sp}})] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S32})$$




FIG. S5. **Graphic representation of the first-order joint distribution Eq. (S31).** Each node represents a configuration, and the height of the node represents the configuration energy  $E$ . Any pair of configurations connected by a link are related by a single-spin flip. The saddle point energy  $E_{\text{sp}}$  is marked by the dotted line. For  $\Omega = 1$ , there is only one configuration in the basin ( $E < E_{\text{sp}}$ ), which is the local minimum. The number of nodes in the circled cluster is indicated (in this case, both clusters have  $N - 1$  nodes). For simplification, only  $N = 4$  nodes are shown.




FIG. S6. **Graphic representation of the second-order joint distribution Eq. (S32).**

### 3. The third order: $\Omega = 3$

To compute the third-order joint distribution, we need to consider six graphs as shown in Fig. S7. The top three graphs correspond to the term with  $1 - L^{N-3}(E_{\text{sp}})$  in the following expression Eq. (S33), and the bottom three graphs correspond to the term with  $1 - L^{N-2}(E_{\text{sp}})$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_N^{(3)}(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}) &= 3(N+1)N(N-1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}})\rho(E_{\text{sp}})L^{3N-6}(E_{\text{sp}}) \times \\
 &\quad \times \left\{ (N-2) [1 - L^{N-3}(E_{\text{sp}})] + (N-1) [1 - L^{N-2}(E_{\text{sp}})] \right\} \int_{E_{\text{sp}} > E_1 > E_2 > E_{\text{lm}}} dE_1 dE_2 \rho(E_1) \rho(E_2) \\
 &= \frac{3}{2}(N+1)N(N-1)\rho(E_{\text{lm}})\rho(E_{\text{sp}})L^{3N-6}(E_{\text{sp}}) \times \\
 &\quad \times \left\{ (N-2) [1 - L^{N-3}(E_{\text{sp}})] + (N-1) [1 - L^{N-2}(E_{\text{sp}})] \right\} [L(E_{\text{lm}}) - L(E_{\text{sp}})]^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{S33}$$

### 4. Verification with the numerical barrier-tree algorithm

The above theoretical results are compared with the numerical data obtained by the barrier-tree algorithm for both GREM and EREM with  $N = 24$  spins (Fig. S8). The expression Eq. (S25) of the local minimum energy distribution  $p_N^{\text{lm}}(E_{\text{lm}})$  is tested in Fig. S8a. The tree-expansion results of the saddle point energy distribution  $p_N^{\text{sp}}(E_{\text{sp}})$  (see Eq. S28) and the barrier energy distribution  $p_N(\Delta E)$  (see Eq. S29) are tested in Fig. S8b-d. It can be seen that the first-order results are already very close to the numerical data. Note that the distribution  $\rho(E)$  in the theoretical expressions shall be replaced by Eq. (8) and (9) in the End Matter for the corresponding REMs.




FIG. S7. Graphic representation of the third-order joint distribution Eq. (S33).




FIG. S8. Comparison between the tree-expansion theory (lines) and the barrier-tree method (points), for the GREM and EREM with  $N = 24$  spins. (a) Probability distribution function (pdf) of the local minimum energy. The line represents Eq. (S25). (b) Pdf of the saddle point energy. (c,d) Pdf of the barrier energy distribution. In (b-d), the red line represents the tree-expansion theoretical results up to the first-order ( $\Omega = 1$ ), and the black line represents the results up to the third-order results ( $\Omega = 3$ ).




FIG. S9. Probability  $g_N(\Omega)$  of having  $\Omega$  configurations in a basin. Lines are tree-expansion theory results Eq. (S35), and points are numerical data obtained by the barrier-tree algorithm.

### B. Internal entropy

The probability of having  $\Omega$  configurations in a basin is,

$$g_N(\Omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE_{\text{sp}} \int_{-\infty}^{E_{\text{sp}}} dE_{\text{lm}} \lambda_N^{(\Omega)}(E_{\text{lm}}, E_{\text{sp}}). \quad (\text{S34})$$

Using the above tree-expansion results, Eqs. (S31), (S32) and (S33), we obtain the first three orders,

$$\begin{aligned} g_N(1) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dE_{\text{sp}} \rho(E_{\text{sp}}) N(N+1) L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}}) [1 - L^{N-1}(E_{\text{sp}})] [1 - L(E_{\text{sp}})] \\ &= \int_0^1 d\sigma N(N+1) \sigma^{N-1} (1 - \sigma^{N-1}) (1 - \sigma) \\ &= \frac{3N-3}{4N-2} \\ &\stackrel{N \rightarrow \infty}{=} \frac{3}{4}, \\ g_N(2) &= \int_0^1 d\sigma (N-1)N(N+1) \sigma^{2N-3} (1 - \sigma^{N-2}) (1 - \sigma)^2 \\ &= \frac{(N+1)(N-2)(19N-12)}{6(2N-1)(3N-4)(3N-2)} \\ &\stackrel{N \rightarrow \infty}{=} \frac{19}{108}, \\ g_N(3) &= \int_0^1 d\sigma (N-1)N(N+1) \sigma^{3N-6} \left[ \frac{N-2}{2} (1 - \sigma^{N-3}) + \frac{N-1}{2} (1 - \sigma^{N-2}) \right] (1 - \sigma)^3, \\ &= \frac{N(N+1)(2N-3)}{(3N-5)(3N-4)(3N-2)} - \frac{3(N-1)N(N+1)}{4(2N-3)(4N-7)(4N-5)} \\ &\stackrel{N \rightarrow \infty}{=} \frac{175}{3456}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S35})$$

Note that the results in Eq. (S35) are model-independent, i.e., independent of  $\rho(E)$ . The numerical data obtained by the barrier-tree algorithm confirm the tree-expansion theory Eq. (S35) (see Fig. S9).

In the thermodynamic limit ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ), the probability  $g_N(\Omega)$  converges to an analytical expression that is universal

for any  $\Omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_\infty(\Omega) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 d\sigma \frac{N!}{(N - \Omega - 1)!} \sigma^{\Omega N - \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\Omega+1)} (1 - \sigma^{N-\Omega}) (1 - \sigma)^\Omega \\
&= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N! \Omega!}{(N - \Omega - 1)!} \left[ \frac{(\Omega N - \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\Omega + 1))!}{((\Omega N - \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\Omega + 1) + 1))!} - \frac{((\Omega + 1)N - \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\Omega + 3))!}{((\Omega + 1)N - \frac{1}{2}\Omega(\Omega + 1) + 1)!} \right] \\
&= \frac{\Omega!}{\Omega^{\Omega+1}} - \frac{\Omega!}{(\Omega + 1)^{\Omega+1}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S36}$$

The internal entropy of the whole system in the thermodynamic limit is

$$S_\infty \equiv \sum_{\Omega=1}^{\infty} g_\infty(\Omega) \log \Omega \approx 0.212439. \tag{S37}$$

This result is consistent with the numerical data obtained by the barrier-tree method (see Fig. 5 in End Matter). Note that the internal entropy per spin  $S_\infty/N$  vanishes in the thermodynamic limit.

### C. Number of basins

We assume that each basin contains one local minimum. Two local minima cannot be directly related via a single-spin flip – otherwise the two basins cannot be separated. Thus, in average, we can assume that each basin occupies  $N + 1$  configurations, i.e., one local minimum and its  $N$  neighbours. The total number of configurations for a  $N$ -spin REM is  $2^N$ . Therefore, the total number of basins is,

$$N_b = \frac{2^N}{N + 1}. \tag{S38}$$

Figure S10 shows that this simple consideration Eq. (S38) describes well the numerical data obtained by the barrier-tree method.




FIG. S10. Number of basins  $N_b$  as a function of the system size  $N$ . The line represents Eq. (S38), and the points are data obtained by the numerical barrier-tree algorithm.