

12-01-04

THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT FOR FINITE DIMENSIONAL CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM DISORDERED SYSTEMS

Pierluigi Contucci¹, Cristian Giardinà²

Dipartimento di Matematica

Università di Bologna, 40127 Bologna, Italy

and

Joseph Pulé³

Department of Mathematical Physics

University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland

Abstract

We prove the existence of the thermodynamic limit for the quenched specific pressure for classical and quantum disordered systems on a d -dimensional lattice, including spin glasses. We develop a method which relies simply on Jensen's inequality and which works for any disorder distribution with the only condition (stability) that the quenched specific pressure is bounded.

¹contucci@dm.unibo.it

²giardina@dm.unibo.it

³Joe.Pule@ucd.ie

1 Introduction, definitions and results

In this paper we study the problem of the existence of the thermodynamic limit for a wide class of disordered models defined on finite dimensional lattices. We consider both the classical and quantum case with random two-body or multi-body interaction. Using only thermodynamic convexity and a mild stability condition we prove the existence and monotonicity of the quenched specific pressure. A similar result for spin glasses has been obtained, for the classical case, in [1] by using an interpolation technique introduced in [2, 3]. For this case (non-quantum) see also [4, 5] and [6].

We shall treat the classical and quantum cases in parallel. In the classical case to each point of the lattice $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we associate a copy of the *spin space* \mathcal{S} , which is equipped with an a priori probability measure μ . We shall denote this by \mathcal{S}_i . In the quantum analogue we associate to each $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ a copy of a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , denoted by \mathcal{H}_i and a set of self-adjoint operators, *spin operators*, on \mathcal{H}_i .

Following [7], (see also [8]), we define the interaction in the following way. In the classical case for each finite subset of \mathbb{R}^d , X , we let $\mathcal{S}_X := \times_{i \in X} \mathcal{S}_i$ and $\{\Phi_X^{(j)} \mid j \in n_X\}$ is a finite set of bounded function from \mathcal{S}_X to \mathbb{R} . In the quantum case each $\Phi_X^{(j)}$ is a self-adjoint element of the algebra generated by the set of operators, *spin operators* on $\mathcal{H}_X := \otimes_{i \in X} \mathcal{H}_i$. We set $\Phi_\emptyset = c$ where c is a constant. In both cases we take the interaction to be translation invariant in the sense that if τ_a is translation by $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then

$$n_{\tau_a X} = n_X \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\tau_a X}^{(j)} = \tau_a \Phi_X^{(j)} \quad \text{for } j \in n_X. \quad (1)$$

We now define the random coefficients. For each X let $\{J_X^{(j)} \mid j \in n_X\}$ be a set of random variables. We assume that the $J_X^{(j)}$'s are independent random variables with zero mean. We also require that $J_{\tau_a X}^{(j)}$ and $J_X^{(j)}$ have the same distribution for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. At the end of the paper we shall discuss the case when the means of the $J_X^{(j)}$'s are not zero. We shall denote the average over the J 's by $\text{Av}[\cdot]$.

Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a finite set of a regular lattice in d dimension and denote by $|\Lambda| = N$ its cardinality. We define the *random potential* as

$$U_\Lambda(J, \Phi) := \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} J_X^{(j)} \Phi_X^{(j)}. \quad (2)$$

We stress here that the distributions of the $J_X^{(j)}$'s are independent of the volume Λ . This characterizes the short range case, such as the Edwards-Anderson one. In mean field (long range) models, such as the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick one, the variance of $J_X^{(j)}$ has to decrease with N in order to have finite energy density.

The complete definition of the model we are considering requires that we specify also the interaction on the frontier $\partial\Lambda$, i.e. boundary conditions. However standard surface over volume arguments imply that if the quenched specific pressure for one boundary condition converges, then it also converges for all other boundary conditions. Therefore to prove the convergence of the quenched specific pressure it is sufficient to consider the free boundary condition. Thus in the sequel we shall assume the free boundary condition and prove that in this case the quenched pressure is monotonically increasing in the volume.

We would like to emphasize the fact that though we have used the terminology *spin space* and *spin operators* our results are not restricted to spin systems.

Examples:

1. *Classical Edwards-Anderson model*

$\mathcal{S} = \{-1, 1\}$, $\mu(\sigma_i) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(\sigma_i + 1) + \frac{1}{2}\delta(\sigma_i - 1)$. The interaction is only between nearest neighbours: $\Phi_{i,j}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i\sigma_j$ for $|i - j| = 1$, $\Phi_X = 0$ otherwise. To ensure that the specific pressure is bounded it is enough that

$$\text{Av} [\exp (|J_{ij}|)] < \infty. \quad (3)$$

More generally one may consider a short range interaction with $\Phi_{i,j}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i\sigma_j/R(|i - j|)$ with a sufficient condition for boundedness, for example

$$\prod_i \text{Av} \left[\exp \left(\frac{|J_{0i}|}{R(|i|)} \right) \right] < \infty \quad (4)$$

or a many-body interaction with a suitable decay law.

We refer the reader to [1] for more classical examples.

2. *Quantum Edward-Anderson model*

$\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$. The spin operators are the set of the Pauli matrices: $\sigma_i = (\sigma_i^x, \sigma_i^y, \sigma_i^z)$

$$\sigma^x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma^y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \sigma^z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

which commutation and anticommutation relations

$$[\sigma_i^\alpha, \sigma_i^\beta] = 2i\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \sigma_i^\gamma \quad (6)$$

$$\{\sigma_i^\alpha, \sigma_i^\beta\} = 2\delta_{\alpha\beta} \quad (7)$$

The interaction is again only between nearest neighbours: $\Phi_{i,j}(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j = \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y + \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$ for $|i - j| = 1$, $\Phi_X = 0$ otherwise. A transverse field $\Phi_i(\sigma_i) = \sigma_i^z$ can also be added. One can have an asymmetric version with local interaction

$$J_{i,j}^x \Phi_{i,j}^x(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) + J_{i,j}^y \Phi_{i,j}^y(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) + J_{i,j}^z \Phi_{i,j}^z(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) \quad (8)$$

where $\Phi_{i,j}^x(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x$, $\Phi_{i,j}^y(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y$ and $\Phi_{i,j}^z(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) = \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z$. As in (1) one may consider a short range interaction with a suitable decay law.

Notation: We shall use the notation Tr to denote both the classical expectation over \mathcal{S}^N with the measure $\mu(d\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^N \mu(d\sigma_i)$ and the usual trace in quantum mechanics on the Hilbert space $\otimes_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}$.

Definition 1 *We define in the usual way:*

1. *The random partition function, $Z_\Lambda(J)$, by*

$$Z_\Lambda(J) := \text{Tre}^{U_\Lambda(J, \Phi)}, \quad (9)$$

2. *The quenched pressure, P_Λ , by*

$$P_\Lambda := \text{Av}[\ln Z_\Lambda(J)], \quad (10)$$

3. *The quenched specific pressure, p_Λ , by*

$$p_\Lambda := \frac{P_\Lambda}{N}. \quad (11)$$

We are now ready to state our main theorem:

Theorem 1 *The quenched pressure is superadditive:*

$$P_\Lambda \geq \sum_{s=1}^n P_{\Lambda_s} . \quad (12)$$

This theorem combined with the boundedness of the specific pressure is sufficient to ensure the convergence of the specific pressure in the thermodynamic limit (see for example [7] Chapter IV). To prove the boundedness of the specific pressure we need the following stability condition.

Definition 2 *We shall say that the random potential is stable if*

$$K := \prod_{X \ni 0} \prod_{j \in n_X} \left(\text{Av} \left[\exp \left(|J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{|X|}} < \infty, \quad (13)$$

where $\|\Phi_X^{(j)}\|$ denotes the supremum norm in the classical case and the operator norm in quantum case.

With this definition we can prove that the specific pressure is bounded.

Theorem 2 *For a stable random potential the quenched specific pressure is bounded.*

Proof: We have

$$\|U_\Lambda(J, \Phi)\| \leq \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\|. \quad (14)$$

In the classical case

$$\text{Av} [Z_\Lambda] \leq \text{Av} \left[\text{Tr} \exp \left(\sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{Av} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \\
&= \prod_{X \subset \Lambda} \prod_{j \in n_X} \text{Av} \left[\exp \left(|J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \\
&\leq \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \prod_{X \ni x} \prod_{j \in n_X} \left(\text{Av} \left[\exp \left(|J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}} \\
&= \left(\prod_{X \ni 0} \prod_{j \in n_X} \left(\text{Av} \left[\exp \left(|J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}} \right)^N = K^N. \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by Jensen's inequality

$$P_\Lambda = \text{Av} [\log Z_\Lambda] \leq \log \text{Av} [Z_\Lambda] \leq N \log K \quad (16)$$

and consequently

$$p_\Lambda \leq \log K. \quad (17)$$

In the Quantum case we use the fact that if A is a self-adjoint operator on a finite dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H} then

$$\text{Tr} e^A \leq (\dim \mathcal{H}) \|e^A\| \leq (\dim \mathcal{H}) e^{\|A\|}. \quad (18)$$

This gives in the same way as above

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Av} [Z_\Lambda] &\leq \text{Av} \left[\text{Tr} \exp \left(\sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \\
&= (\dim \mathcal{H})^N \text{Av} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \leq (\dim \mathcal{H})^N K^N. \quad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$p_\Lambda \leq \log(\dim \mathcal{H}) + \log K. \quad (20)$$

□

2 Proof of Theorem 1

We start with the following definition.

Definition 3 Consider a partition of Λ into n non empty disjoint sets Λ_s :

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{s=1}^n \Lambda_s , \quad (21)$$

$$\Lambda_s \cap \Lambda_{s'} = \emptyset . \quad (22)$$

For each partition the potential generated by all interactions among different subsets is defined as

$$\tilde{U}_\Lambda := U_\Lambda - \sum_{s=1}^n U_{\Lambda_s} . \quad (23)$$

From (2) it follows that

$$\tilde{U}_\Lambda = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}_\Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} J_X^{(j)} \Phi_X^{(j)} \quad (24)$$

where \mathcal{C}_Λ is the set of all $X \subset \Lambda$ which are not subsets of any Λ_s .

The idea here is to eliminate \tilde{U}_Λ from the partition function. We shall use the following three lemmas.

Lemma 1 Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables with zero mean. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be such that for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ $x_i \mapsto F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is convex, then

$$\mathbb{E} [F(X_1, \dots, X_n)] \geq F(0, \dots, 0) \quad (25)$$

where \mathbb{E} denotes the expectation with respect to X_1, \dots, X_n .

Proof: This follows by applying Jensen's Inequality to each X_i successively.

□

The following two lemmas are related to the thermodynamic convexity of the pressure.

Lemma 2 *Let μ be a probability measure on a space Ω , and let A and B_1, \dots, B_n be measurable real valued functions on Ω . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\log \int_{\Omega} \exp \left\{ A(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i B_i(\sigma) \right\} \mu(d\sigma) \right] \geq \log \int_{\Omega} \exp[A(\sigma)] \mu(d\sigma). \quad (26)$$

Proof: We just have to check that if

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \log \int_{\Omega} \exp \left\{ A(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i B_i(\sigma) \right\} \mu(d\sigma)$$

then $x_i \mapsto F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is convex. Let

$$\langle C \rangle := \frac{\int_{\Omega} C(\sigma) \exp \{ A(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i B_i(\sigma) \} \mu(d\sigma)}{\int_{\Omega} \exp \{ A(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i B_i(\sigma) \} \mu(d\sigma)}. \quad (27)$$

Then, computing the derivatives, we have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} = \langle B_i \rangle \quad (28)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_i^2} = \langle B_i^2 \rangle - \langle B_i \rangle^2 = \langle (B_i - \langle B_i \rangle)^2 \rangle \geq 0. \quad (29)$$

□

The next lemma is the quantum analogue of the previous one.

Lemma 3 *Let \mathcal{H} be finite-dimensional Hilbert space, and let A and B_1, \dots, B_n be self-adjoint operators on \mathcal{H} . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\log \text{Tr} \exp \left(A + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i B_i \right) \right] \geq \log \text{Tr} \exp A. \quad (30)$$

Proof: Again we just have to check that if

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \log \text{Tr} \exp(A + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i B_i),$$

then $x_i \mapsto F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is convex. The first derivative gives

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} = \langle B_i \rangle \quad (31)$$

where

$$\langle C \rangle := \frac{\text{Tr} C e^{-H}}{\text{Tr} e^{-H}}. \quad (32)$$

with

$$-H = A + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i B_i$$

while, for the second derivative, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_i^2} = (B_i, B_i) - \langle B_i \rangle^2 \quad (33)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the Du Hamel inner product (see for example [8]):

$$(C, D) := \frac{\text{Tr} \int_0^1 ds e^{-sH} C^* e^{(1-s)H} D}{\text{Tr} e^{-H}}. \quad (34)$$

By using the fact that $(C, 1) = \overline{\langle C \rangle}$ and $(1, D) = \langle D \rangle$ we see that

$$\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_i^2} = (B_i - \langle B_i \rangle, B_i - \langle B_i \rangle) \geq 0. \quad (35)$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1

$$\begin{aligned} P_\Lambda &= \text{Av} [\ln \text{Tr} \exp U_\Lambda] \\ &= \text{Av} \left[\ln \text{Tr} \exp \left(\sum_{s=1}^n U_{\Lambda_s} + \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}_\Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} J_X^{(j)} \Phi_X^{(j)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Applying Lemma 2 (resp. Lemma 3) for the classical (resp. quantum) case with $A = \sum_{s=1}^n U_{\Lambda_s}$ and $B_i = \Phi_X^{(j)}$, $n = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{C}_\Lambda} n_X$ we get

$$P_\Lambda \geq \text{Av} \left[\ln \text{Tr} \exp \left(\sum_{s=1}^n U_{\Lambda_s} \right) \right] = \sum_{s=1}^n \text{Av} [\ln \text{Tr} \exp U_{\Lambda_s}] = \sum_{s=1}^n P_{\Lambda_s}. \quad (37)$$

□

Remark

Finally we discuss the case when the J 's do not have zero mean. Let $a_X^{(j)} := \text{Av}[J_X^{(j)}]$ and $\tilde{J}_X^{(j)} := J_X^{(j)} - a_X^{(j)}$ so that $\tilde{J}_X^{(j)}$ has zero mean. Let

$$U_\Lambda^{(1)}(J, \Phi) := \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} \tilde{J}_X^{(j)} \Phi_X^{(j)}, \quad (38)$$

$$U_\Lambda^{(2)}(J, \Phi) := \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} \left(a_X^{(j)} \Phi_X^{(j)} + |a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \quad (39)$$

and

$$\tilde{U}_\Lambda(J, \Phi) := U_\Lambda^{(1)}(J, \Phi) + U_\Lambda^{(2)}(J, \Phi). \quad (40)$$

Then

$$U_\Lambda(J, \Phi) = \tilde{U}_\Lambda(J, \Phi) - \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\|. \quad (41)$$

Thus

$$P_\Lambda = \tilde{P}_\Lambda - \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \quad (42)$$

where \tilde{P}_Λ is the pressure corresponding to $\tilde{U}_\Lambda(J, \Phi)$. If

$$C := \sum_{X \ni 0} \sum_{j \in n_X} \frac{|a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\|}{|X|} < \infty, \quad (43)$$

then

$$\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \sum_{j \in n_X} |a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| = C. \quad (44)$$

Therefore to prove that the specific pressure converges, it is sufficient to prove that \tilde{P}_Λ is super-additive. One can do this by treating the terms in $U_\Lambda^{(1)}(J, \Phi)$ as before since each $\tilde{J}_X^{(j)}$ has zero mean and by using the fact that all the terms in $U_\Lambda^{(2)}(J, \Phi)$ are positive (cf [8]).

Note that the stability condition in Definition 2 implies that $C < \infty$ since

$$\text{Av} \left[\exp \left(|J_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \right] \geq \exp \left(\text{Av} \left[|J_X^{(j)}| \right] \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \geq \exp \left(|a_X^{(j)}| \|\Phi_X^{(j)}\| \right) \quad (45)$$

and therefore $C \leq \log K < \infty$.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank B. Nachtergaele for very constructive suggestions. JVP wishes to thank the Department of Mathematics of the University of Bologna, Italy, for their kind hospitality and University College Dublin for the award of a President's Fellowship. PC and CG wish to thank S. Graffi for some very useful discussions.

References

- [1] P. Contucci, S. Graffi, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0302013> to appear in *J. Stat. Phys.*
- [2] F. Guerra and F. Toninelli, *Commun.Math.Phys.* **230**, 71-79, (2002).
- [3] P.Contucci, M.Degli Esposti, C.Giardinà and S.Graffi, *Commun.Math.Phys.*, **236**, 55-63, (2003).

- [4] L.A.Pastur and A.L.Figotin, *Theor.Math.Phys.* **35**, 193-202, (1978).
- [5] K.M.Khanin and Ya.G.Sinai, *J.Stat.Phys.* **20**, 573-584, (1979).
- [6] A.C.D.van Enter, and J.L.van Hemmen, *J.Stat.Phys.* **32**, 141-152 (1983).
- [7] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics, Rigorous Results*, W.A.Benjamin, New York 1969.
- [8] B. Simon, *The Statistical Mechanics of Lattice Gases*, Princeton University Press, 1992.