

Determining Stiffness Exponents from the Reduction of Dilute Lattice Spin Glasses

Stefan Boettcher^{1,*}

¹*Physics Department, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia 30322, USA*

(Dated: December 21, 2018)

Accurate numerical values are presented for the stiffness exponent of the Ising spin glass in dimensions $d = 3$ and $d = 4$, which are $y_3 = 0.240(5)$ and $y_4 = 0.60(1)$. System sizes of $L \leq 20$ are considered, significantly larger than in previous studies, by using bond-diluted lattices just above the critical bond fraction p^* , found to be $p_3^* = 0.274(1)$ and $p_4^* = 0.1655(5)$. For bond fractions $p \in (p^*, 1]$ the corresponding spin glass appears to have a finite glass transition temperature, i. e. $T_g > 0$, since defect energies increase with L for $p > p^*$. The numerical data suggest that the asymptotic scaling of the width of the defect energy distribution is *independent* of p for $p > p^*$, although strong scaling corrections persist close to the transition. To reach accurate statistics and large system sizes, a reduction algorithm eliminates all low-connected spins while preserving the ground-state energy *exactly*, followed by a determination of the ground state of the reduced graph using the extremal optimization heuristic.

PACS number(s): 05.50.+q, 64.60.Cn, 75.10.Nr, 02.60.Pn.

The stiffness exponent y (often labeled θ) is one of the most fundamental quantities to characterize the low-temperature state of a disordered spin system [1]. It provides an insight into the effect of low-energy excitations of such a system [2, 3]. A recent study suggested the importance of this exponent for the scaling corrections of many observables in the low-temperature regime [4].

To illustrate the meaning of the stiffness exponent, one may consider an ordinary Ising ferromagnet of size L^d , which is well-ordered at $T = 0$ for $d > 1$, with periodic boundary conditions. If we make the boundary along one spatial direction anti-periodic, the system would form an interface of violated bonds between misaligned spins, which would raise the energy of the system by $\Delta E \sim L^{d-1}$. This “defect”-energy ΔE provides a measure for the energetic cost of growing a domain of overturned spins, which in a ferromagnet simply scales with the surface of the domain. In a disordered system, say, a spin glass with an equal mix of anti- and ferromagnetic couplings, the interface of such a growing domain can take advantage of inevitably-present violated bonds to grow at a reduced or even vanishing cost. To wit, the typical range $\sigma(\Delta E)$ of the defect-energy may scale like

$$\sigma(\Delta E) \sim a L^y \quad (1)$$

where L refers to the typical size of the excited domain, or of a system with an inverted boundary condition. Clearly, it must be $y \leq d - 1$, and a bound of $y \leq (d-1)/2$ has been argued for disordered systems generally [2]. Particular ground states of systems with $y \leq 0$ would be unstable with respect to spontaneous fluctuations, which could grow at no cost, like in the case of the one-dimensional ferromagnet where $y = d - 1 = 0$. Such a system does not manage to attain an ordered state for any finite temperature. Conversely, a positive sign for y at $T = 0$ indicates a finite-temperature transition into an ordered regime while its value is a measure of the stability of the ordered state. Furthermore, in a d -dimensional

family of systems, the marginal value $y_{d_c} = 0$ would provide the lower critical dimension d_c for such systems.

Accordingly, there have been many attempts to obtain the value of stiffness exponents in finite-dimensional spin glasses [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15], using transfer matrix, optimization, or renormalization group techniques. In the early days of spin-glass theory, it was soon argued that $y < 0$ for $d \leq 2$ and $y > 0$ for $d \geq 3$ [5, 8]. Only recently, the stiffness exponent for $d = 2$, below the lower critical dimension, has been improved to considerable accuracy, $y = -0.282(2)$ [13, 14]. Unfortunately, there has been little progress in the accurate determination of its physically more interesting value for $d \geq 3$ in the last 25 year, despite significant increases in computational power. In particular, in three dimensions y is expected to be positive but small, and the accepted value so far has been $y_3 \approx 0.19$ [8, 11], although there have been investigations recently pointing to a larger values, such as 0.23 [10] or 0.27 [13]. In four dimensions the most accurate value reported to date has been $y_4 \approx 0.64(5)$ [12]. All of these studies are based on fitting power-laws over exceedingly narrow scaling windows at relatively small system sizes and carry large error bars.

In this Letter we combine recent insights into the properties of diluted lattices [15], a powerful new reduction algorithm [16], and an efficient optimization heuristic [17] to improve those values to $y_3 = 0.240(5)$ and $y_4 = 0.60(1)$. Our value in $d = 3$ is at the higher end of most previous studies and amazingly close to (but distinct from) the value obtained with the Migdal-Kadanoff approximation, $y_{MK,3} = 0.25546(3)$ [15]. Our value for $d = 4$ is consistent with Ref. [12] and quite below the Migdal-Kadanoff value, $y_{MK,4} = 0.7380(5)$.

It is important to appreciate the complexity of the task: Most numerical studies are based on sampling the variance $\sigma(\Delta E) = \sqrt{\langle \Delta E^2 \rangle - \langle \Delta E \rangle^2}$ of the distribution of defect energies obtained via inverted boundary conditions (or variants thereof [13]). Thus, for an Ising spin

glass with periodic boundaries, an instance of fixed, random bonds is generated, its ground-state energy determined, then all bonds within a hyperplane have their sign reversed and the ground-state energy is determined again. The defect energy ΔE is the often minute difference between those two ground state energies. Then we have to generate many such instances of a given size L to determine the distribution of ΔE and a measure of its width $\sigma(\Delta E)$ accurately. Finally, we have to obtain differences in $\sigma(\Delta E)$ for a large range of L .

The most difficult part of this procedure, limiting the range of L that can be achieved, is the accurate determination of the ground state energies in the first place. Already small errors in the energy for either boundary condition, by way of their subtraction, quickly lead to extreme inaccuracies in ΔE . While for $d \leq 2$ efficient algorithms exist to determine ground state energies exactly, and large system sizes can be obtained, for $d \geq 3$ no such algorithm appears to exist: The problem is known to be NP-hard [18] with the cost of exact algorithms rising faster than any power of L . Hence, the values quoted previously for y_3 were either based on exceedingly small systems, $L \leq 4$ [8], or on costly heuristic methods with $L \leq 10$ that lead to significant statistical (and possibly systematic) errors [10, 11].

To overcome those limitations, we propose here an alternative approach to the problem. In a recent study of spin glasses on diluted lattices in the Migdal-Kadanoff approximation [15], we observed that the asymptotic scaling behavior expressed in Eq. (1) is *independent* of the degree of bond-dilution, as long as the fraction occupied bonds p exceeded a characteristic threshold p^* [19]. In addition, we have developed a new, exact algorithm [16], that is capable of drastically reducing the size of sparsely connected spin glass systems, leaving a much reduced graph whose ground state can be determined with great accuracy. The combination of these facts suggests that much larger system sizes and better statistical averages for the defect energies may be obtained by considering bond-diluted Ising spin glasses for some value of p ; as small as possible for an effective reduction but sufficiently above p^* to avoid strong scaling corrections.

We will describe the reduction algorithm in more detail elsewhere [16], including its ability to also determine the entropy density and overlap for sparse spin glass systems (see also [15]). To use the algorithm to determine defect energies at $T = 0$, we focus here only on the reduction rules for the energy. These rules are quite general and apply to Ising spin glass Hamiltonians

$$H = - \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{i,j} x_i x_j \quad (2)$$

with any bond distribution $P(J)$ on arbitrary sparse graphs. For instance, we have used these reduction rules previously for large three-connected Bethe lattices [21].

But in this Letter, we use exclusively a $\pm J$ bond distribution, and bond-diluted hyper-cubic lattices in $d = 3$ and 4 dimensions. (Our experiments with a continuous Gaussian bond distribution have shown much faster converging averages but extremely long transients toward scaling, requiring provably large sizes L .)

The reductions effect both spins and bonds, eliminating recursively all zero-, one-, two-, and three-connected spins and their bonds, but also adding new bonds between spins which may or may not have been connected previously. (It may occur that after a reduction previously connected spins obtain additional bonds!) These operations hence can eliminate and add terms to the expression for the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2), and we account for offsets in the energy in a variable H_o . These reductions work because we can account precisely for the effect on the energy caused by the elimination of a spin *assuming that the spin configuration is to take on its ground state*. Only for vertices with 3 or fewer connections such an accounting is possible that is independent of the remaining spins and that does not alter the form of Eq. (2).

Rule I: An isolated spin, which does not contribute to the sum in Eq. (2) at all, can be eliminated without changing that sum.

Rule II: A one-connected spin i can be eliminated, since its state can always be chosen in accordance with its neighboring spin j to satisfy the bond $J_{i,j}$. For the energetically most favorable state we adjust $H_o := H_o - |J_{i,j}|$ and then eliminate the term $-J_{i,j} x_i x_j$ from H .

Rule III: A double bond, $J_{i,j}^1$ and $J_{i,j}^2$, between two vertices i and j can be combined to a single bond by setting $J_{i,j} = J_{i,j}^1 + J_{i,j}^2$ or be eliminated entirely, if the resulting bond vanishes. This operation is very useful, since it lowers the connectivity of i and j at least by one.

Rule IV: A two-connected spin i can be eliminated in the following way. Consider the two terms in Eq. (2) referring to the two bonds of i , for which we can write

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(J_{i,1}x_1 + J_{i,2}x_2) &\leq |J_{i,1}x_1 + J_{i,2}x_2| = J_{1,2}x_1x_2 + \Delta H, \\ J_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{2} (|J_{i,1} + J_{i,2}| - |J_{i,1} - J_{i,2}|), \\ \Delta H &= \frac{1}{2} (|J_{i,1} + J_{i,2}| + |J_{i,1} - J_{i,2}|), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

leaving the graph with a new bond $J_{1,2}$ between spin 1 and 2 (which may itself vanish) and an increment of




FIG. 1: Depiction of the “star-triangle” relation to reduce a three-connected spin (center-left). The values for the new bonds on the right are obtained in Eq. (4).

$H_o := H_o + \Delta H$. The bound in Eq. (3) becomes *exact* when the remaining graph takes on its ground state!

Rule V: A three-connected spin i can be reduced via the equivalent of a “star-triangle” relation (see Fig. 1):

$$\begin{aligned} J_{i,1} x_i x_1 + J_{i,2} x_i x_2 + J_{i,3} x_i x_3 \\ \leq J_{1,2} x_1 x_2 + J_{1,3} x_1 x_3 + J_{2,3} x_2 x_3 + \Delta H, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$J_{1,2} = -A - B + C + D, \quad J_{1,3} = A - B + C - D,$$

$$J_{2,3} = -A + B + C - D, \quad \Delta H = A + B + C + D,$$

$$A = \frac{1}{4} |J_{i,1} - J_{i,2} + J_{i,3}|, \quad B = \frac{1}{4} |J_{i,1} - J_{i,2} - J_{i,3}|,$$

$$C = \frac{1}{4} |J_{i,1} + J_{i,2} + J_{i,3}|, \quad D = \frac{1}{4} |J_{i,1} + J_{i,2} - J_{i,3}|.$$

Reducing 4- and higher-connected spins would lead to new bonds that connect more than 2 spins, creating a hyper-graph. (In principle, the algorithm can be extended to reduce Hamiltonians with multi-spin terms.)

After a recursive application of these reduction rules, the original lattice graph is either completely reduced (which is almost always the case for $p < p_c$), in which case H_o provides the exact ground state energy already, or we are left with a highly reduced, compact graph in which no spin has less than four connections. We obtain the ground state of the reduced graph with the extremal optimization heuristic [17], which together with H_o provides a very accurate approximation to the ground state energy of the original diluted lattice instance.

In Refs. [15, 19] it was shown that spin glasses on diluted lattices may possess a distinct critical point p^* in their bond density, which is related to the (purely topological) percolation threshold of the lattice *and* the distribution of the bond weights $P(J)$. Clearly, no long-range correlated state can arise below the percolation threshold. A critical point distinct from percolation, $p^* > p_c$, emerges only when such a correlated state above p_c remains suppressed due to collaborative effects between bonds [19] (as in *Rule III*). Thus, to observe any low-temperature properties on a dilute lattice, we have to determine p^* first. In Ref. [15], we were able to locate p^* for the Migdal-Kadanoff lattice, exactly where theory predicted it to be, by using the defect energy scaling from Eq. (1): For all $p > p^*$ the stiffness exponent y eventually took on its $p = 1$ value, while for any $p < p^*$ defect energies diminished rapidly for increasing L .

We have run the above algorithm on a large number of graphs (about $10^5 - 10^6$ for each L and p) for p increasing from p_c in small steps. (The bond-percolation threshold is at $p_{c,3} \approx 0.249$ in $d = 3$ and $p_{c,4} \approx 0.160$ for $d = 4$ [20].) For each given p , L increased until it was clear that $\sigma(\Delta E)$ would either drop or rise for good. In this way, we bracketed in p^* , as shown in Figs. 2.

Having established the minimal bond density beyond which we would expect Eq. (1) to hold, the mayor part of our numerical experiments has been devoted to extracting the asymptotic scaling of $\sigma(\Delta E)$ for a few conveniently chosen p . We intend to show that the obtained




FIG. 2: Log-log plot of the variance $\sigma(\Delta E)$ of the defect energy as a function of systems size L for various bond fractions $p > p_c$ in $d = 3$ (top) and $d = 4$ (bottom). In each case, $\sigma(\Delta E)$ drops to zero rapidly for increasing L at smaller p , but turns around and rises for larger p , indicative of a nontrivial ordered state at low T . Near the boundary at p^* between these phases, $\sigma(\Delta E)$ undergoes ever longer transients. The plots suggest $p_{d=3}^* = 0.274(1)$ and $p_{d=4}^* = 0.1655(5)$.

value of y is independent of $p > p^*$, and to extract an accurate estimate of y . Although our algorithm for dilute lattices clearly permits us to reach large values of L , the “right” choice of p is crucial to ensure a good compromise between maximal algorithmic performance (for smaller p) and minimal scaling corrections (for larger p) that maximizes the scaling actual window. While we can estimate the effect of p on the performance of our algorithm, we have a-priori no information about scaling corrections. But with some trial-and-error we soon find three values of p for each dimension, that satisfy those criteria and that are sufficiently apart to yield independent results.

In our experiments we have used $p = 0.30, 0.35$, and 0.40 and system sizes up to $L = 20, 14$, and 13 , respectively, in $d = 3$, and $p = 0.20, 0.22$, and 0.25 and system sizes up to $L = 12, 9$, and 8 , respectively, in $d = 4$. While much larger system sizes could have been handled, it proved to be more important to obtain better statistics at these smaller L . At each combination of p and L , we have averaged over $> 10^6$ instances for smaller sizes, but at least $\approx 10^4$ for the largest sizes. Error bars given




FIG. 3: Extrapolation plot of $\ln(\sigma)/\ln(L)$ vs. $1/\ln(L)$ according to Eq. (5). To be asymptotic, data would have to fall on a line whose extrapolation to $1/\ln(L) = 0$ would provide an approximation for y . For $d = 3$ (top) and $d = 4$ (bottom) we each plot data for three different values of p . Each set of data is fitted asymptotically by a line, weighting points by L and inverse error and dropping points outside the scaling regime. The extrapolation results are discussed in the text.

for each $\sigma(\Delta E)$ are proportional to the inverse square-root of the number of instances contained in the average. The following data was taken during about a week on a dedicated cluster of 16 Pentium-4 PCs running Linux.

To demonstrate our assumption that y would be independent of p , we convert Eq. (1) into

$$\frac{\ln(\sigma)}{\ln(L)} \sim y + \frac{\ln(a)}{\ln(L)} \quad (5)$$

for a linear extrapolation plot of our data. Fig. 3 shows that there is not only a sizable scaling regime for each p , but that each linear extrapolation converges almost exactly toward the same value of y , independent of p . The linear fits to the data in the scaling regime have been weighted with respect to L and inverse error. The fitted values are $y_3 = 0.243(3)$, $0.240(5)$, and $0.240(3)$ in $d = 3$ and $y_4 = 0.610(5)$, $0.607(4)$, and $0.594(3)$ in $d = 4$, respectively, for the above values of p . Based on these values, we estimate $y_3 = 0.240(5)$ for $d = 3$ and $y_4 = 0.60(1)$ for $d = 4$, ignoring possible systematic errors that may arise from our assumptions.




FIG. 4: Log-log plot of the data for $d = 3$ according to Eq. (1), where a was chosen for a convenient comparison of the data for different p . The dashed lines are proportional to our best estimate of the leading asymptotic behavior, L^y with $y = 0.240$, and are merely drawn to access the convergence of all data toward this scaling behavior. Besides the data shown in Fig. 3 for $d = 3$, we have also included our data for $p = 1$ for the undiluted lattice to demonstrate its difficulty to observe scaling. Remarkably, scaling is reached fastest for intermediate values of p , see $p = 0.4$.

To demonstrate the consistency of our result in $d = 3$, and to compare with reference data we have obtained for the undiluted lattice at $p = 1$, we also plot all data according to Eq. (1) on a log-log scale (with a conveniently chosen value of a). We see that the value of $y = 0.240$ provides an excellent fit to the data, especially for $p = 0.40$ where scaling corrections appear to be small. Scaling corrections are more noticeable for smaller p but, surprisingly, also for $p = 1$ [22], which may explain the difficulty in obtaining y with undiluted lattices [8, 11].

The appearance of diminished scaling corrections (combined with the accessibility of larger systems) on diluted lattices for observables of the spin glass state is very encouraging. In the future, we intend to bring our full algorithm to bear on diluted lattices at $p > p^*$ to measure additional ground state properties, such as overlaps [15, 16], addressing long-standing questions regarding finite dimensional spin glasses at $T < T_g$.

I would like to thank A. Percus and R. Palmer for helpful discussions, and our IT staff for providing access to our student computing lab during spring break.

* Electronic address: www.physics.emory.edu/faculty/boettcher

- [1] K. H. Fischer and J. A. Hertz, *Spin Glasses* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991).
- [2] D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1601-1604 (1986).
- [3] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 57-60 (1987).
- [4] J.-P. Bouchaud, F. Krzakala, and O.C. Martin, *Energy*

- exponents and corrections to scaling in Ising spin glasses*, cond-mat/0212070.
- [5] B. W. Southern and A. P. Young, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **10**, 2179-2195 (1977).
- [6] S. Kirkpatrick, Phys. Rev. B **15**, 1533-1538 (1977).
- [7] J. R. Banavar and M. Cieplak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 832-835 (1982).
- [8] A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys. **17**, L463-L468 (1984).
- [9] M. Cieplak and J. R. Banavar, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **23**, 4385-4398 (1990).
- [10] M. Palassini and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5126-5129 (1999).
- [11] A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. E **59**, 84-87 (1999).
- [12] A. K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. E **60**, 5135-5138 (1999).
- [13] A. C. Carter, A. J. Bray, and M. A. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 077201 (2002).
- [14] A. K. Hartmann, A. J. Bray, A. C. Carter, M. A. Moore, A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 224401 (2002).
- [15] S. Boettcher, *Reduction of Spin Glasses applied to the Migdal-Kadanoff Hierarchical Lattice*, cond-mat/0302424.
- [16] S. Boettcher, in preparation.
- [17] S. Boettcher and A. G. Percus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5211-5214 (2001).
- [18] F. Barahona, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **15**, 3241-3253 (1982).
- [19] A. J. Bray and S. Feng, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 8456-8460 (1987).
- [20] B. D. Hughes, *Random Walks and Random Environments*, Vol. 2, (Clarendon, Oxford, 1996).
- [21] S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. B **67**, R060403 (2003).
- [22] B. Drossel and M. A. Moore, Eur. Phys. J. B **21**, 589-594 (2001).