

Jamming and replica symmetric braking of weakly disordered crystals

Harukuni Ikeda^{1,*}

¹*Laboratoire de Physique de l'École Normale Supérieure, Université PSL,
CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Université de Paris, 75005 Paris, France*

(Dated: November 1, 2019)

We discuss the physics of crystals with small polydispersity near the jamming transition point. For this purpose, we introduce an effective single-particle model taking into account the nearest neighbor structure of crystals. In the limit of large dimensions, the model can be solved analytically by using the replica method. If there is no polydispersity, the replica symmetric solution is stable until the jamming transition point, which leads to the standard scaling of perfect crystals. On the contrary, for finite polydispersity, the model undergoes the replica symmetric breaking (RSB) transition before the jamming transition point. In the RSB phase, the model exhibits the same scaling as amorphous solids near the jamming transition point. These results are fully consistent with the recent numerical simulations of crystals with polydispersity. The simplicity of the model also allows us to derive the scaling behavior of the vibrational density of states that can be tested in future experiments and numerical simulations.

PACS numbers: 64.70.Q-, 05.20.-y, 64.70.Pf

Introduction – Physics of crystal and amorphous solids are qualitatively different. For instance, low frequency eigenmodes of crystals are phonon, and thus the vibrational density of states $D(\omega)$ follows the Debye law $D(\omega) \sim \omega^{d-1}$ where d denotes the spatial dimensions [1]. On the contrary, amorphous solids have excess non-phonon excitations. As a consequence, the density of states normalized by the Debye's prediction $D(\omega)/\omega^{d-1}$ shows a peak at a certain frequency $\omega = \omega_{\text{BP}}$ [2–5]. This phenomenon is known as the *boson peak* and thought to be one of the universal properties of amorphous solids [6].

Crystal and amorphous solids also show distinct elastic properties near the (un) jamming transition point at which constituent particles lose contacts, and simultaneously the pressure vanishes [7]. Here we focus on the jamming of spherical and frictionless particles interacting with finite and repulsive potentials. The scaling of these models is now well understood due to extensive numerical simulations [7, 8] and theories [9–12]. The shear modulus G of crystals does not show the strong pressure p dependence and remains a constant at the jamming transition point [1]. On the contrary, G of amorphous solids shows the power law as a function of p and vanishes at the jamming transition point [7, 8]. The behavior of G is directly related to the contact number z as $G \propto \delta z \equiv z - z_{\text{iso}}$ where $z_{\text{iso}} = 2d$ denotes the isostatic number, *i.e.*, the minimal contact number per particle required to constraint all degrees of freedom [10]. At the jamming transition point, $\delta z > 0$ for perfect crystals, while $\delta z = 0$ for amorphous solids, leading to the vanishing behavior of the shear modulus $G = 0$ [7, 8].

Crystal and amorphous are two extreme states of solids: the former is a state free from disorders while the latter is a state of maximum disorder. From both theoretical and practical point of views, it is important to understand how the physical properties shift from that

of crystal to amorphous on the increase of the strength of disorders. Previous numerical simulations show that small disorders only play a moderate role far from the jamming transition point $p \sim 1$. For instance, numerical studies of crystals with polydispersity show that the amplitude of the boson peak $D(\omega_{\text{BP}})/\omega_{\text{BP}}^{d-1}$ only continuously increases on the increase of the polydispersity η , if η is small enough [13, 14]. Near the jamming transition point $p \ll 1$, on the contrary, even small disorders dramatically change the physical properties of crystals. Numerical simulations of crystals with defects prove that, $D(\omega)$ develops a flat region for $\omega \gtrsim \delta z$ as with amorphous solids [15], which enhances the boson peak $D(\omega_{\text{BP}})/\omega_{\text{BP}}^{d-1}$ at $\omega_{\text{BP}} \sim \delta z$. In particular, in the jamming limit $p \rightarrow 0$, $D(\omega_{\text{BP}})/\omega_{\text{BP}}^{d-1}$ diverges as $\omega_{\text{BP}} \rightarrow 0$, in sharp contrast to perfect crystals where $D(\omega)$ does not show the strong p dependence. Furthermore, for crystals with small defects or polydispersity, G and δz exhibit the same power law scaling of amorphous solids sufficiently near the jamming transition point [15, 16]. In particular, G and δz vanish at the jamming transition point if there is even infinitesimally small polydispersity [16, 17], while for perfect crystals, G and δz remain finite.

Our aim here is to construct a solvable mean field model being able to describe the above striking effects of disorders on crystals near the jamming transition point. We consider a model in the limit of large dimensions, which is a popular mean field limit in theoretical physics [18, 19]. In this limit, only the first virial corrections give a relevant contribution [19, 20], implying that the information of nearest neighbor structures is enough to describe the physics. Motivated by this consideration, we introduce an effective single-particle model that only takes into account the interactions between a particle of interest and particles on the nearest-neighbor lattice sites. For zero polydispersity $\eta = 0$, our model

correctly reproduces the scaling of perfect crystals. For finite η , on the contrary, our model predicts that the existence of the replica symmetric braking (RSB) transition [21] at finite pressure $p = p_{\text{RSB}}$. For $p \leq p_{\text{RSB}}$, the model exhibits the same scaling as amorphous solids. Thereby, our model can reproduce sharp cross over from the scaling of crystal to amorphous observed in previous numerical simulations of weakly disordered crystals.

Model – One of the motivations of using mean field models, such as the fully connected spin models, is to reduce a difficult many-body problem to a simple one-body problem [22]. In a sense, the perceptron is the most successful model that has achieved this goal in the context of the jamming transition [23]. From the geometrical point of view, the perceptron can be considered as a one-body problem, namely, a model consisting of a single tracer particle and (quenched) obstacles fixed at random positions [23] [24]. For small enough density of obstacles, the tracer particle does not contact with the obstacles, and thus the system is unjammed. On the contrary, for high enough density, the tracer particle is blocked by the obstacles, as schematically shown in Fig. 1, meaning that the system is jammed. The unjammed and jammed phases are separated by the jamming transition point. In the $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the jamming transition of the model becomes a genuine phase transition accompanied by the divergence of the susceptibility. Detailed studies proved that the perceptron correctly reproduces the scaling of the jamming transition observed in numerical simulations of spherical particles interacting with the soft harmonic potential [25]. For instance, (i) at the jamming transition point, the contact number is just one greater than the number of degrees of freedom, meaning that the system is isostatic [23], as schematically shown in the left panel of Fig. 1, (ii) the excess contact number δz from the isostatic value exhibits the power law $\delta z \sim p^{1/2}$ [25], and (iii) the vibrational density of states $D(\omega)$ exhibits the plateau above the characteristic frequency $\omega_* \sim \delta z$ [26].

The jamming transition of crystals is qualitatively different from that of amorphous solids and perceptron. Nearest neighbor particles of crystals are not randomly distributed. Due to this high symmetry, crystals become hyperstatic at the jamming transition point $\delta z > 0$, *i.e.*, the contact number is larger than the isostatic number, see the middle panel in Fig. 1. As a consequence, G , and ω_* of crystals do not show the power law behaviors.

In this work, we want construct a model that can reproduce the hyperstaticity of perfect crystals in the absence of polydispersity. We consider a simple isotropic crystal, where the nearest neighbor particles are at the same distances from the equilibrium position of the tracer particle. At the jamming transition point, the tracer particle marginally contacts with almost all obstacles, leading to a hyperstatic configuration, see the right panel in Fig. 1. More concretely, our model consisting of a tracer particle and (quenched) M obstacles. The obstacles are placed




FIG. 1. Configurations at the jamming transition point in $d = 2$ where the tracer particle has d number of translational degrees of freedom. The gray and black circles denote the tracer and obstacles, respectively. The red dashed lines denote contacts between the tracer and obstacles. (Left panel) Configuration of the perceptron. The number of contacts is $d + 1$, and thus the system is isostatic. (Middle panel) Configuration of crystals. The number of contacts is larger than $d + 1$, and thus the system is hyper static. (Right panel) Configuration of our model. The blue solid line denotes the hypersphere on which the obstacles are fixed. The number of contacts is larger than $d + 1$, and thus the system is hyper static.

randomly on a d dimensional hypersphere of the radius R . The interaction potential between the tracer particle and the obstacles is given by

$$V(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mu=1}^M v_{\mu}(r_{\mu}), \quad (1)$$

where $v_{\mu}(r)$ denotes the pair interaction between the tracer and μ -th obstacle. r_{μ} denotes the distance between the tracer and μ -th obstacle:

$$r_{\mu} = |\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{y}^{\mu}|, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_d\}$ and $\mathbf{y}^{\mu} = \{y_1^{\mu}, \dots, y_d^{\mu}\}$ denote the positions of the tracer particle and μ -th obstacle, respectively. As the obstacles are fixed on the hypersphere, the components of $\mathbf{y}^{\mu}$ should satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^d (y_i^{\mu})^2 = R^2$. For the interaction potential, we choose the one-sided harmonic potential:

$$v_{\mu}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mu} + \sigma}{2} - r \right)^2 \theta \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mu} + \sigma}{2} - r \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\theta(x)$ denotes the Heaviside step function, and σ and σ_{μ} denote the radiuses of the tracer and μ -th obstacle, respectively.

Free energy – We investigate the model in the large dimensional limit $d \rightarrow \infty$. Here we derive an asymptotic form of the interaction potential in this limit. For this purpose, it is convenient to set $\sigma = \sqrt{d}$ and consider it as a dimensionless quantity. Also, we introduce the new variables $\mathbf{x}$, $\hat{\delta}$, and B_{μ} defined by

$$\mathbf{X} = \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad R = \sqrt{d} \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\delta}}{d} \right), \quad \frac{\sigma + \sigma_{\mu}}{2} = \sqrt{d} \left(1 + \frac{B_{\mu}}{d} \right). \quad (4)$$

From the physical point of view, $\hat{\delta}$ controls the volume, and B_μ represents the polydispersity. The variables are chosen so that the jamming transition of the zero polydispersity system $B_\mu = 0$ takes places at $\hat{\delta} = 0$. Then, we can expand the interaction potential as

$$v_\mu(r_\mu) = \frac{1}{d} \hat{v}(h_\mu) + O(d^{-3/2}), \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{v}(x) = x^2 \theta(-x)/2$, and

$$h_\mu = \frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}}{2d} - \frac{\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}^\mu}{\sqrt{d}} + \hat{\delta} - B_\mu. \quad (6)$$

For simplicity, hereafter, we assume that B_μ follows the Gaussian distribution of zero mean and variance η^2 .

In order to calculate the free energy, one should take the average over the quenched randomnesses, $\mathbf{y}^\mu$ and B_μ . This is possible by using the replica method

$$-\beta F = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \overline{Z^n}}{nd}, \quad (7)$$

where the overline denotes the average for $\mathbf{y}^\mu$ and B_μ . We have introduced the replicated partition function as

$$Z^n = \left(\int \prod_{a=1}^n d\mathbf{x}^a \right) \prod_{a=1}^n e^{-\hat{\beta} \sum_{\mu=1}^M \hat{v}(h_\mu(\mathbf{x}^a))}, \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\beta} = \beta/d$ denotes the normalized inverse temperature. In the $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit, by using the saddle point method, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \overline{Z^n} &\sim \frac{d}{2} \log \det Q \\ &+ M \log \left[e^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ab} (Q_{ab} + \eta^2) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h_a \partial h_b}} \prod_{a=1}^n e^{-\beta v(h_a)} \right]_{h_a = q_0/2 + \hat{\delta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $Q_{ab} = \langle \mathbf{x}^a \cdot \mathbf{x}^b \rangle / d$, and $q_0 = Q_{aa}$.

Scaling of contact number – We define the contact number as $z = \langle \sum_{\mu=1}^d \theta(-h_\mu) \rangle / d$. When the system is isostatic, $z = z_{\text{iso}} = (1+d)/d$, especially $z_{\text{iso}} \rightarrow 1$ in the $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit. We want to discuss the scaling of $\delta z = z - z_{\text{iso}}$. For comparison with experimental and numerical results, we use the pressure $p = -\langle \hat{v}(h) \rangle$ as a control parameter instead of $\hat{\delta}$. Below, we shall sketch how to calculate δz as a function of p .

We start from the simplest replica symmetric (RS) solution $Q_{ab} = q_0 \delta_{ab} + q(1 - \delta_{ab})$. For low temperature T , one can use the harmonic expansion $q_0 - q = T\chi + O(T^2)$. Substituting these equations into Eq. (9), one can derive the saddle point conditions for q_0 and χ :

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\chi}\right)^2 q_0 &= \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 dh P_{\text{RS}}(q_0, h) h^2, \\ \left(1 + \frac{1}{\chi}\right) &= \alpha \int_{-\infty}^0 dh P_{\text{RS}}(q_0, h) (1+h), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$




FIG. 2. Phase diagram for $\alpha = 10$. Markers denote the exact results of p_{RSB} , while the solid line denotes a quadratic fit $p_{\text{RSB}} \propto \eta^2$.

where $\alpha = M/d$ and

$$P_{\text{RS}}(q_0, h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(q_0 + \eta^2)}} e^{-\frac{(q_0/2 + \hat{\delta} - h)^2}{2(q_0 + \eta^2)}}. \quad (11)$$

Also, we shall introduce the gap distribution:

$$\begin{aligned} g(h) &= \frac{1}{d} \left\langle \sum_{\mu=1}^d \delta(h - h_\mu) \right\rangle = \frac{\delta F}{\delta v(h)} \\ &= \begin{cases} \alpha(1 + \chi) P_{\text{RS}}(q_0, (1 + \chi)h) & h \leq 0 \\ \alpha P_{\text{RS}}(q_0, h) & h > 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

which allows us to calculate z and p as

$$z = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dh g(h) \theta(-h), \quad p = - \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dh g(h) \theta(-h) h. \quad (13)$$

To see the stability of the RS solution, we consider the Hessian of the potential:

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij} = \frac{\partial V(\mathbf{X})}{\partial X_i \partial X_j} \sim \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\mu=1}^M (y_i^\mu y_j^\mu + \delta_{ij} h_\mu) \theta(-h_\mu), \quad (14)$$

where we neglected the terms $O(d^{-1/2})$. The matrix $\mathcal{H}$ is now identified with a Wishart matrix [27] with an additional diagonal term. The eigenvalue distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ is easily calculated as [25]

$$\rho(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\sqrt{(\lambda - \lambda_-)(\lambda_+ - \lambda)}}{\lambda + p}, \quad \lambda_{\pm} = (\sqrt{z} \pm 1)^2 - p. \quad (15)$$

λ_- calculated with the RS solution is positive for not very small p . However, λ_- vanishes at a certain pressure $p = p_{\text{RSB}}$, which is the signature of the RSB transition. In Fig. 2, we show p_{RSB} as a function of the polydispersity η . For $\eta \ll 1$, p_{RSB} shows a quadratic scaling $p_{\text{RSB}} \propto \eta^2$. It is noteworthy that the RS solution always becomes




FIG. 3. Scaling of the excess contact number δz as a function of the pressure p for $\alpha = 10$. (a) Filled circles denote the exact results. $\star$ denotes the RSB transition point. The black solid line denotes $z = \alpha$, the blue dotted line denotes $\delta z \sim p$, and the red dashed line denotes $\delta z \sim p^{1/2}$. (b) The same data with the rescaled pressure.

unstable before reaching the jamming transition point $p = 0$ if $\eta > 0$.

For $p \leq p_{\text{RSB}}$, the model is described by the (full) RSB solutions. From previous works of spin glasses and perceptrons, it is known that the RSB solution is marginally stable $\lambda_- = 0$ [21, 26]. From this condition and Eq. (15), one can determine z as a function of p :

$$z = (1 + p^{1/2})^2. \quad (16)$$

This implies that the model is isostatic $z = z_{\text{iso}} = 1$ at the jamming transition point $p = 0$, and exhibits the square root scaling $\delta z = z - z_{\text{iso}} \propto p^{1/2}$ for $p \ll 1$. Those properties are the same as the original perceptron and amorphous solids consisting of soft harmonic particles [25].

Following the above procedures, we calculate z for $\alpha = 10$ and several η . We summarize our results in Fig. 3. There are three different scaling regions. For $p \gg \eta$, z takes a constant value $z \approx \alpha = 10$, meaning that the tracer particle contact with most obstacles, see the black line. For $\eta^2 \ll p \ll \eta$, the contact number decreases as $\delta z \sim p$, see the blue dotted line. At $p = p_{\text{RSB}} \sim \eta^2$, the RS solution becomes unstable, and for $p \leq p_{\text{RSB}}$, one should use the RSB solution. For $p \ll \eta^2$, the RSB solution predicts $\delta z \sim p^{1/2}$, see the red dashed line. For $p \geq p_{\text{RSB}}$, the results for different η collapse on a single curve if one plots δz as a function of $\eta^{-1}p$, see Fig. 3 (b). This is consistent with a previous numerical simulation [16] and perturbation theory [28]. It is noteworthy that the two limits $\eta \rightarrow 0$ and $p \rightarrow 0$ are not commutative: if one takes the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ first and then takes the limit $p \rightarrow 0$, one gets $\delta z > 0$, contrary, if one takes the limits in reverse order, one gets $\delta z = 0$.

Here we rely on a rather heuristic argument to calculate z in the RSB phase. But the same result can be derived by directly solving the RSB equation, which will




FIG. 4. Scaling of the boson peak for $\alpha = 10$. Filled circles denote the exact results, the blue dotted line denotes p^{-2} , and the red dashed line denotes p^{-1} . $\star$ denotes the RSB transition point.

be presented in a longer version.

Density of states – An important quantity to characterize the physics of solids is the vibrational density of states $D(\omega)$. Using Eq. (15), $D(\omega)$ is calculated by $D(\omega) = 2\omega\rho(\omega^2)$. Near the jamming transition point for small ω , $D(\omega)$ asymptotically behaves as [26, 29]

$$D(\omega) \sim \begin{cases} \text{constant} & \delta z \ll \omega \ll 1 \\ \delta z^{-2}\omega^2 & \omega_0 < \omega \ll \delta z \\ 0 & \omega \leq \omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $\omega_0 = \sqrt{\lambda_-}$. In the RS phase, $\omega_0 > 0$ and $D(\omega)$ has a finite gap. ω_0 decreases on the decreasing of p and eventually vanishes at $p = p_{\text{RSB}}$. In the RSB phase $p \leq p_{\text{RSB}}$, $\omega_0 = 0$ and $D(\omega)$ is gapless. For $\omega \ll 1$, the density of states exhibits the quadratic scaling $D(\omega) \sim \omega^2$. This is the same result as previous mean field theories of amorphous solids [26, 29]. In the jamming limit $p \rightarrow 0$ for $\eta > 0$, $D(\omega)$ always exhibits the plateau for small ω , which is fully consistent with previous numerical simulations of weakly disordered crystals near the jamming transition point [15, 30].

Now we want to calculate the boson peak. For comparison with numerical simulations, we consider the height of $D(\omega)/\omega^m$ at its peak $\omega = \omega_{\text{BP}}$, where $m = 1$ and $m = 2$ correspond to the Debye predictions in two and three spatial dimensions, respectively. Using the scaling of δz and (17), one can deduce the asymptotic behavior for $m \leq 2$ [31]:

$$\frac{D(\omega_{\text{BP}})}{\omega_{\text{BP}}^m} \sim \begin{cases} \text{constant} & \eta \ll p \ll 1 \\ (\eta^{-1}p)^{-m} & \eta^2 \ll p \ll \eta \\ p^{-\frac{m}{2}} & p \ll \eta^2, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

For concreteness, in Fig. 4, we show the exact results for $\alpha = 10$ and $m = 2$. Eq. (18) shows that the boson peak begins to increase at around $p \sim \eta$. This is consistent with a previous numerical simulation of crystals

with small polydispersity [16]. It is noteworthy that for $p \ll \eta^2$, the strength of the boson peak does not depend on the polydispersity η . Further experiments and numerical simulations are desirable to test this conjecture.

Summary and discussions – In this work, we have introduced a mean field model to describe the jamming transition of crystals with small polydispersity. We solved the model by using the replica method and determined the full scaling behaviors of the contact number and density of states above the jamming transition point. The results are well agreed with previous numerical simulations.

Strikingly, our result suggests that crystals with finite polydispersity always exhibit the replica symmetric breaking (RSB) transition at a critical pressure. In other words, the infinitesimal polydispersity is enough to cause the RSB. It is interesting to see if such a transition really exists in finite dimensions. A promising result was reported for polydisperse crystals *below* the jamming transition point [30]. It is desirable to perform similar experiments and numerical simulations above the jamming transition point.

We thank G. Tsekenis, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi for kind discussions. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement n. 723955-GlassUniversality).

* harukuni.ikeda@ens.fr

- [1] C. Kittel *et al.*, *Introduction to solid state physics*, Vol. 8 (Wiley New York, 1976).
- [2] U. Buchenau, N. Nücker, and A. J. Dianoux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 2316 (1984).
- [3] V. Malinovsky and A. Sokolov, *Solid State Commun.* **57**, 757 (1986).
- [4] T. Grigera, V. Martin-Mayor, G. Parisi, and P. Verrocchio, *Nature* **422**, 289 (2003).
- [5] H. Shintani and H. Tanaka, *Nature materials* **7**, 870 (2008).
- [6] W. A. Phillips and A. Anderson, *Amorphous solids: low-temperature properties*, Vol. 24 (Springer, 1981).
- [7] M. van Hecke, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **22**, 033101 (2009).
- [8] C. S. O’Hern, L. E. Silbert, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 011306 (2003).
- [9] M. Wyart, L. E. Silbert, S. R. Nagel, and T. A. Witten, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 051306 (2005).
- [10] M. Wyart, *arXiv preprint cond-mat/0512155* (2005).
- [11] P. Charbonneau, J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Nature communications* **5**, 3725 (2014).
- [12] P. Charbonneau, J. Kurchan, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **8**, 265 (2017).
- [13] H. Mizuno, S. Mossa, and J.-L. Barrat, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **104**, 56001 (2013).
- [14] Z. Guo-Hua, S. Qi-Cheng, S. Zhi-Ping, F. Xu, G. Qiang, and J. Feng, *Chinese Physics B* **23**, 076301 (2014).
- [15] C. P. Goodrich, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel, *Nature Physics* **10**, 578 (2014).
- [16] H. Tong, P. Tan, and N. Xu, *Scientific reports* **5**, 15378 (2015).
- [17] R. Mari, F. Krzakala, and J. Kurchan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 025701 (2009).
- [18] A. Georges, G. Kotliar, W. Krauth, and M. J. Rozenberg, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 13 (1996).
- [19] G. Parisi and F. Zamponi, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **82**, 789 (2010).
- [20] H. L. Frisch and J. K. Percus, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 2942 (1999).
- [21] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, Vol. 9 (World Scientific Publishing Company, 1987).
- [22] H. Nishimori and G. Ortiz, *Elements of phase transitions and critical phenomena* (OUP Oxford, 2010).
- [23] S. Franz and G. Parisi, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **49**, 145001 (2016).
- [24] To be precise, the perceptron considering here is defined on the hypersphere. We neglected this geometry because the curvature does not change the critical properties of the jamming transition.
- [25] S. Franz, G. Parisi, M. Sevelev, P. Urbani, F. Zamponi, and M. Sevelev, *SciPost Physics* **2**, 019 (2017).
- [26] S. Franz, G. Parisi, P. Urbani, and F. Zamponi, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 14539 (2015).
- [27] G. Livan, M. Novaes, and P. Vivo, *Introduction to random matrices: theory and practice* (Springer, 2018).
- [28] P. Acharya, S. Sengupta, B. Chakraborty, and K. Ramola, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06352* (2019).
- [29] E. DeGiuli, A. Laversanne-Finot, G. Düring, E. Lerner, and M. Wyart, *Soft Matter* **10**, 5628 (2014).
- [30] P. Charbonneau, E. I. Corwin, L. Fu, G. Tsekenis, and M. van der Naald, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 020901 (2019).
- [31] For $m > 2$, $D(\omega_{\text{BP}})/\omega_{\text{BP}}^m$ diverges in the RSB phase.