Entropic bottlenecks to nematic ordering in an RP^2 apolar spin model

B. Kamala Latha¹, V.S.S. Sastry², and S. R. Shenoy³

¹School of Physics, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad 500046, India

²Centre for Modelling, Simulation and Design, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad 500046, India and

³Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Hyderabad 500046, India

(Dated: March 18, 2025)

The Lebwohl-Lasher model of liquid crystals with (d = 2, n = 3) describes interacting apolar spins, with an RP^2 order-parameter topology. Simulations with a modified Wang-Landau Monte Carlo protocol, that includes a density of states (DoS) factor, had previously found a zero latent-heat transition at $T = T_n$ to a novel nematic order, coexisting with unbound defects whose binding is completed only on cooling. We find through this entropically augmented MC protocol, that there is a deep dip in the DoS at an energy preceding global ordering, reflecting *sparse* intermediate configurations, or entropy barriers. The narrow entropic bottleneck induces a cusp in the initially rising nematic correlation length, at a micro-canonical *precursor* temperature $T = T_p$. A finite-scale cooperativity of defects and nematic clusters penetrates the bottleneck at T_p to enable a third-order phase transition at a lower T_n : a rare pathway, overlooked by energy-only acceptance protocols.

PACS numbers: 64.70.M-,64.70.mf

Keywords: 2D RP^2 model, Long Range order, Entropic bottlenecks, Density of states simulations

There has been continuing interest in lattice models with RP^{n-1} order parameter (OP) symmetries of ncomponent continuous variables, supporting stable topological excitations [1–18]. The RP^2 model with n = 3 dimensional apolar spin manifolds at each of $N = L^2$ lattice sites, has a non-trivial first fundamental group $\Pi_1 = Z_2$ [1]. For n = 3, d = 3 apolar spins (bulk nematics), there is a weak first-order transition with Long Range Order (LRO). Whereas an n = 2, d = 2 apolar model, with half-integer defect charges, formally equivalent to a 2DXY model, exhibits the conventional Berenzenskii -Kosterlitz - Thouless (BKT) transition [19-21]. The nature of the transition for the n = 3, d = 2 apolar-spin (RP^2) model is not resolved. Early Boltzmann Monte Carlo (BMC) simulations [22] found a BKT-type binding of $\pm 1/2$ defect pairs [3, 5–7, 11]. Other results included a first-order transition; a crossover to a zero-temperature transition; a new universality class without a critical line; or a non-divergent screening length [4, 8–10, 13–18].

The Wang-Landau protocol [23–27] determines the density of states g(E) of the system (DoS), and the system's bin-wise (configurational) entropy $S_{\mu}(E_{\mu}) \equiv \log g(E_{\mu})$, is adopted as a measure of the micro-canonical entropy. Augmenting the BMC acceptance criterion with probabilities arising from entropy increments, the Entropically Augmented (Boltzmann) Monte Carlo sampling, say EAMC protocol, led to the prediction of a more complex ordering, with two transitions on cooling [12]. At the transition $T = T_n$ without latent heat, a novel phase appeared of nematic order, coexisting with unbound defects of density that vanished only at a lower $T = T_{BKT} < T_n$. The Binder cumulant [28, 29] in the nematic order parameter was size-independent, at $T = T_n$ where LRO set in [12].

The inter-bin entropy-slope $\beta_{\mu}(E_{\mu}) \equiv dS_{\mu}(E_{\mu})/dE_{\mu}$ is identified with the thermodynamic inverse effectivetemperature $\beta_{eff}(e) \equiv dS(E)/dE = ds/de$, where s and e are entropy and energy values per site. The $\beta_{eff}(e)$ and its derivatives can identify cooperative changes, at sharp energies in finite systems [30–34]. The $\beta_{eff}(e)$ also controls the Partial Equilibration Scenario (*PES*) under MC dynamics for relaxation of the post-quench energy e(t), since the evolving $\beta_{eff}(e(t))$ governs heat-releases to the bath [35–41].

The physical realizations of RP^2 symmetries include the fully frustrated Heisenberg antiferromagnet [42], and uniaxial liquid crystals. The latter have long been satisfactorily described by the Lebwohl-Lasher (LL) Hamiltonian [43]:

$$H = -\epsilon \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} P_2(\cos \Phi_{ij}).$$

Here P_2 is the second Legendre polynomial; Φ_{ij} is the n = 3 spin-space angle between nearest-neighbour 'directors' on $N = L^2$ sites; and T absorbs the ϵ energy scale.

In this Letter, the EAMC protocol is applied to study the multi-step ordering of this RP^2 model, focussing on the possible mechanism that yields qualitatively different results from the EAMC and BMC protocols. The computed observables with periodic boundary conditions are [12]: energy per site $e \equiv E/N$; microcanonical entropy per site s(e); inverse microcanonical system-temperature $\beta_{eff}(e) = ds(e)/de$; specific heat per site $C_v(T)$; nematic order parameter $S_n(T)$, and nematic susceptibility $\chi(T)$ [44]; canonical free energy per site $f(T) \equiv F(T, N)/N$ by a Legendre transformation on s(e) [45]; unbound defectdensity ρ_d , and δ the degree of topological order [3]. Unless otherwise stated, L = 128.

Entropy Barriers:

The micro-state observables are monitored during the system's long uniform-energy random walk encompass-



FIG. 1. (color online) (a) Contour plot of the distribution of microstates from a uniform-energy random walk projected onto the (e, S_n) plane. Canonical-equilibrium averages from BMC (dashed red line) and EAMC protocols (black solid line) are superimposed on the plot. (b) Corresponding per-site entropy $s \equiv S/N$ as a mesh plot over the same plane.

ing the nematic transition region with the EAMC protocol, effected by biasing it with the inverse of the DoS. The resulting distribution of micro-states is projected as contour maps of 3D mesh plots, onto planes of different observable pairs. Fig. 1(a) shows a contour-map on the (e, S_n) plane. One observes a sparse region, bracketed by population-rich segments on either side. Superimposed on the contours are lines of quasi-statically guided canonical averages of (e, S_n) from BMC and EAMC protocols, that match till $e \leq -1.1$. For lower energies, the EAMC protocol locates and traverses the sparse-pathway regions, while this configuration space is overlooked by the BMC protocol. Fig. 1(b) shows a 3D mesh plot of the representative entropy $s(e, S_n)$. The minimum height of the entropic tunnel identifies the rarest configuration space, or highest entropy barrier, corresponding to a crossover between the two separated segments, near $(e, S_n) = (-1.122, 0.14)$. Over the interval from (-1.1, 0.05) to this saddle point, an entropy drop by an order of magnitude reflects the pathway scarcity.

Fig. 2 is the contour plot of the EAMC - derived Landau free energy $f(S_n, T)$ projected on the (T, S_n) plane. There is a narrow pathway-constriction, or 'bottleneck', at $T = T_p$. Fig. 2 also shows that a superimposed C_v per site has a cusp at a lower $T = T_n$. The bottleneck precedes the nematic phase, reminiscent of a finite critical



FIG. 2. (color online) For L = 128, the 3D plot of free-energy per site $f(S_n, T)$ is projected as a contour map on the (T, S_n) plane, with resolution $\Delta T = 0.001$, showing a narrow contour bottleneck. The superimposed $C_v(T)$ (red solid line) shows a spike at $T = T_n = 0.585$. A maximum-curvature point defines a precursor (vertical dash line through the bottleneck) at $T = T_p = 0.590 > T_n$.

droplet preceding (and inducing) symmetry-breaking.

Signatures of T_p , T_n for finite L are also seen in both $C_v(T)$ and ρ_d . Fig. 3(a) shows that the specific heat slope $dC_v/dT \sim d^3 f(T)/dT^3$ has a discontinuity across $T = T_n$, implying a *third-order* transition [46, 47]. Fig. 3(a) also shows that the nematic correlation length $\xi_n(T)$ is locked to the BKT length $\xi_+(T)$ for $T > T_p$; peels downwards forming a cusp at $T = T_p$; is continuous at the LRO onset $T = T_n$; and rises for lower T. Here $\xi_+(T) = A_0 e^{[A_1/(T-T_{BKT})^{1/2}]}$ [21], with a fitted $T_{BKT} = 0.413$ and constants $A_0 = 0.129$, $A_1 = 1.392$. Fig. 3(b) shows the microstate distribution versus $T = T_{eff}$ and $\rho_d(T)$, with non-zero dips at $T = T_p, T_n$.

Precursor and transition temperatures:

Finite systems such as nuclei, atomic clusters, or biomolecules, can nonetheless have cooperativity changes at sharp special energies $e = e_{tr}$: from transitions over system scales $\sim L$, or from transformations over finite microstructure scales (<< L). In both cases, the special system-temperatures are $T(e_{tr}, 1/L) \equiv$ $1/\beta(e_{tr}, 1/L)$. The location and Ehrenfest order of the cooperativity changes are diagnosed by β and its derivatives: $\beta^{(m)}(e, 1/L) = d^{m+1}s(e, 1/L)/de^{m+1}$, where m =0, 1, 2, ... are the entropy slope, entropy curvature, slope of entropy-curvature, etc [30, 31]. The diagnostic signatures were identified through the exactly soluble Baxter-Wu (first-order) and Ising (second-order) models; and from EAMC simulations of polymer adhesion and protein folding [31–34]. Interestingly, finite-size precursor transformations could precede and foreshadow, the later system-size phase transitions [32].

Fig. 4 shows $\beta(e, 1/L)$ and its derivatives versus energy e. The decreasing $\beta > 0$ curve flattens slightly, but has no positive slopes [31, 34]. Such behaviour rules out a first-order transition. For increasing L, the slopes $\beta^{(1)} < 0$ show peaks that move to the higher energy region, with flat, negative values. This differs from the second-order Ising signatures of slope-peaks moving to



FIG. 3. (color online) (a) The nematic correlation length $\xi_n(T)$ (in lattice units), initially locked to the rising BKT screening length (red dash line), peels off as a cusp at $T = T_p = 0.590$, where $\xi_n \simeq 3.6$. The specific heat slopes dC_v/dT are of opposite sign, on either side of $T = T_n$. (b) Mesh plot of the microstate distribution over the (T, ρ_d) plane shows structure at T_p, T_n (in-plane arrows).

lower energies, while rising to value zero (so β has stationary, symmetric maxima) [33]. Such behaviour rules out a second-order transition.

The curvatures $\beta^{(2)}$ are negative for -1.17 < e < -1.0, and vanish at points defined by $\beta^{(2)}(e_0, 1/L) = 0$, (where $\beta^{(1)} \neq 0$). For L = 128 the point $e_0 \simeq -1.166$ corresponds to $T(e_0, 1/L) \equiv 1/\beta(e_0, 1/L) = T_n(1/L) = 0.585$, the nematic transition temperature. Hence the thirdorder transition of this LL model is identified with a non-stationary point of inflexion of β . Fig. 4(a) has a nonlinear term $\sim [-(e - e_0)^3]$. A linear extrapolation as $1/L \rightarrow 0$ shows a nonzero separation of temperatures $T_p(0) = 0.591$ and $T_n(0) = 0.586$. Curiously, the curvatures of all sizes cross at a common $e_{cross} = -1.174$, when $\beta^{(2)}(e_{cross}, 1/L) = 0.723$, analogous to the Binder cumulant [28, 29], as noticed in the Ising case [33]. The finite-scale transformation at T_p unlocks access to the system-scale transition at T_n . See End Matter.

Time evolution of coupled order parameter and defects:



FIG. 4. (color online) The inverse effective-temperature $\beta(e, 1/L) > 0$ and its derivatives $\beta^{(m)}(e, 1/L)$ plotted versus e, for sizes L = 60, 80, 128. (a) The $\beta(e, 1/L)$ curve. (b) The β slope or $\beta^{(1)}(e, 1/L)$ curve. (c) The β curvature or $\beta^{(2)}(e, 1/L)$. Curvatures vanish at $e_0(1/L)$ on the dash-line; for L = 128 the marked inflexion point is $e_0(1/L) = -1.166$. (d) The third derivative $\beta^{(3)}(e, 1/L)$. See text.

The generic PES governs the sequential passage of a non-equilibrium system between micro-canonical shells of decreasing energy, through sparse, inter-connecting bottlenecks. The heat-release probability is controlled by the $T_{eff}(t) = 1/\beta_{eff}(t)$ at time t, during (quenchinduced) large deviations [46, 47] from initial to final equilibrium. The PES evolution ideas (under BMC protocols) were applied to entropy-barrier passage of ageing harmonic oscillators, and to re-equilibration of martensitic steels [35–41]. We implement here a free-running PES-type dynamics [35, 36] to explore a larger (and non-equilibrium) configurational range, during the microstructural co-evolution of topological defects and nematic clusters, under EAMC protocols. For BMC quench simulations the acceptance of a randomly chosen microstate is determined by energy increments only, while EAMC quench acceptances involve both energy and entropy changes. The sequences of the Markov Chains so constructed, define the system pathways of the quench evolution runs.

The system is initially equilibrated at $T_{init} = 2.0$, and allowed to evolve for 5×10^3 Monte Carlo lattice sweeps (MCS). This bath temperature is then suddenly quenched at t = 0 to fixed temperatures T =0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5; and 500 such independent quench runs are made, to determine statistical averages. Averaged correlation functions G(r, t) are calculated at 75 chosen MCS time points during each evolution. Like the static case [12], the EAMC-derived $G(r, t) \equiv \langle P_2(\Phi_{ii}(r, t)) \rangle$ is





FIG. 5. (color online) After a quench to T = 0.5, time evolutions under BMC and EAMC free-running dynamics of energy e(t) are shown, with re-equilibration after $t \sim 1 \times 10^4$ MCS. The EAMC evolution of topological order $\delta(t)$ is also shown. The Inset shows the order parameter $S_n(t)$, and correlation length $\xi(t)$ that initially locks to the BKT coarsening length $L_c(t)$ (dashed line), but peels off where $\xi(t) \simeq 3.6$. See text.

parametrized as $G(r,t) = G(0,0) \exp(-r/\xi(t)) + S_n^2(t)$, where the initial $S_n(0)$ is taken as zero at T_{init} . The run-averaged observables $e(t), S_n(t), \delta(t), s(t), \beta_{eff}(t)$ are computed.

Fig. 5 shows how post-quench, interacting nematic clusters and unbound-defect cores, mutually modify their director textures, to squeeze through the entropic bottleneck. The main figure shows for a quench to $T = 0.5 < T_n < T_p$, that the EAMC evolution of energy e(t), detours (relative to the BMC generated data) through a flattening regime, before re-equilibrating beyond $t \sim 1 \times 10^4$ MCS. The post-quench topological order parameter $\delta(t)$ remains flat over the same time scale, when $S_n(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ undergo complex, correlated evolutions.

The inset of Fig. 5 shows that $S_n(t)$ rises slightly from its high temperature value of zero and falls back to nearly zero at $t \sim 0.3 \times 10^4$ MCS. The evolving correlation length is locked to the BKT coarsening length: $\xi(t) = L_c(t) \sim$ $[t/\ln t]^{1/2}$ describing self-similar defect-coarsening without symmetry breaking [13, 48–50], until $\xi(t) \sim 3.6$. The correlation function $[G(r,t) - S_n(t)^2]/G(0,0)$ in this regime shows data collapse in $r/\xi(t)$ as in dynamical scaling (not shown). Subtle microscopic cooperativity changes enable passage through rare transition states of the bottleneck, at a constant effective search temperature. The resultant onset of symmetry-breaking enabled by EAMC dynamics, increases nematic cluster sizes to $\xi(t) \sim 8$ lattice units, before falling to a (lower) equilibrium value $\xi_n(T) \sim 3.4$, after $t \sim 1 \times 10^4$ MCS. The finite-size director clusters at the transformation might

FIG. 6. (color online) Profiles of $T_{eff}(t)$ showing equilibration to quenched bath temperatures T. The Inset shows the (per-site) entropy production rate R(t) from the irreversible processes of entropy-barrier crossings, equilibrating to zero.

support a relevant scaling field, driving a crossover away from a BKT phase of bound defects without LRO, and towards a nematic LRO phase with unbound defects [12].

Fig. 6 shows that large deviations [46, 47], in this case for the post-quench PES effective temperature and entropy production rate R(t), do correctly re-equilibrate to T and zero, respectively. Here, the total entropy change of a system-plus-bath, $\Delta S_{total} = dS(E) + dS_{bath}(E_{bath}) > 0$ at constant $E + E_{bath}$, yields the rate per system-site, $R(t) \equiv \dot{S}_{total}/N = [\beta_{eff}(t) - \beta]\dot{e}(t)$. The BMC-protocol acceptance probability involves a weight factor $e^{-\Delta E/T}$. The EAMC acceptance also includes an entropic factor $e^{\Delta S} \sim e^{[-(|\Delta E|/T_{eff})+...]}$, suggesting $T_{eff}(t)$ is a search temperature for bottleneck pathways. Time-averaging a quantity $q(t,T) \equiv [1 - e^{-tR(t)}]$ for different T, yields small values $(5.2, 2.6, 1.8, 1.5) \times 10^{-3}$.

A novel understanding thus emerges for the longstanding puzzle of the nature and mechanism of apolar RP^{2} transitions. We find that nematic-film realizations have unusual transition regions dominated by sparse-state entropy barriers. The entropic bottlenecks are missed by energy-only MC protocols, but can be traversed by entropically-augmented MC protocols that locate rare crossover pathways. These involve finite-scale correlations of *coexisting* order and disorder variables, usually taken as mutually exclusive. The local transformations at a precursor temperature $T = T_p$ induce a global nematic third-order phase transition at a slightly lower $T = T_n$. There is symmetry breaking without latent heat, and a non-divergent correlation length of a novel nematic order, containing a (nonzero wave-vector) liquid of random defects [12, 51–56]. The n = 3 nonAbelian rotation constraints [3] are plausibly responsible for the sparsity of pathways between the isotropic and nematic director clusters, bracketing the bottleneck.

Further work could involve duality transforms for the 2D LL model as for XY models [21, 57–64]. The effective Hamiltonians for $\pm 1/2$ interacting topological charges, with familiar XY-like RG flows of defect coupling and fugacity within a zero-OP plane, might now include exit flows [4] of an extra scaling field for a nematic-cluster core, favouring and preserving nematic order [58–60].

Finally, the EAMC protocols [23, 25–29] and β diagnostics [30–34] used here, could be diversely applied to biaxial liquid crystal phases [65–68]; to interacting molecules [69] of a glassy melt; and to protein folding by entropic golf-hole passage [40, 41, 70–72].

We acknowledge computational support from the Centre for Modelling Simulation and Design (CMSD) at the University of Hyderabad. B.K.L acknowledges financial support from the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India vide Grant No. DST/WOS-A/PM-4/2020 to carry out this work.

- [1] N. D. Mermin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 51, 591 (1979).
- [2] S.Solomon, Y. Stavans and E. Domany, Phys. Lett. B 112B, 373 (1982).
- [3] H. Kunz and G. Zumbach, J. Phys. A: Math.Gen. 22, L1043 (1989); Phys. Rev. B 46, 662 (1992).
- [4] S. M. Catterall, M. Hasenbusch, R. R. Horgan and R. Renken, Phys. Rev. D 58, 074510 (1998).
- [5] C. Chiccoli, P. Pasini and C. Zannoni, Physica (Amesterdam) 148A, 298 (1998).
- [6] E. Mondal and S. K. Roy, Phys. Lett. A 312, 397 (2003).
- [7] S. Dutta and S. K. Roy, Phys. Rev. E 70, 066125 (2004).
- [8] R. Paredes V., A.I. Farinas-Sanchez and R. Botet, Phys. Rev. E 78, 051706 (2008).
- [9] A.I. Farinas-Sanchez, R. Botet, B. Berche, and R Paredes, Cond. Matt. Phys., 13, 13601 (2010).
- [10] Y. Tomita, Phys. Rev. E 90, 032109 (2014).
- [11] S. Shabnam, S. DasGupta and S. K. Roy, Physics Letters A 380, 667 (2016).
- [12] B. K. Latha and V. S. S. Sastry Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 217801 (2018).
- [13] Y. Ozeki, A. Matsuda and Y. Echinaka, Phys. Rev. E 99, 012116 (2019).
- [14] G. Delfino, Y. Diouane and N. Lamsen, J. Phys. A : Math.Theor 54, 03LT01 (2021).
- [15] C. Bonati, A. Franchi, A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. D 102, 034513 (2020).
- [16] Y. Diouane, N. Lamsen and G. Delfino, J. Stat. Mech., 2021, 033214 (2021).
- [17] A. Ueda and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. E 106, 014104 (2022).
- [18] L. Burgelman, L. Devos, B. Vanhecke, F. Verstraete and L. Vanderstraeten, Phys. Rev. E 107, 014117(2023).
- [19] V. L. Berezenskii, Sov. Phys. JETP **32**, 493 (1971); Sov. Phys. JETP **34**, 610 (1972).
- [20] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C 6, 1181

(1973).

- [21] J.M. Kosterlitz, J. Phys. C : Solid State Physics, 7, 1046 (1974).
- [22] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller, and E. Teller, J. Chem. Phys. 21, 1087 (1953).
- [23] F. Wang and D. P. Landau, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2050 (2001); Phys. Rev. E 64, 056101 (2001).
- [24] D.P. Landau and F. Wang, Comp. Phys. Comm. 147, 674 (2002).
- [25] C. Zhou, T. C. Schulthess, S. Torbrugge, and D. P. Landau, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 120201 (2006).
- [26] D. Jayasri, V. S. S. Sastry, and K. P. N. Murthy, Phys. Rev. E 72, 036702 (2005).
- [27] B. Kamala Latha, R. Jose, K. P. N. Murthy and V. S. S. Sastry, Phys. Rev. E 92, 012505 (2015).
- [28] K. Binder, Z. Phys. B: Condens. Matter 43, 119 (1981).
- [29] D. P. Landau and K. Binder, A Guide to Monte Carlo Simulations in Statistical Physics, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2005).
- [30] D. H. E. Gross *Microcanonical Thermodynamics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).
- [31] S. Schnabel, D.T. Seaton, D. P. Landau and M. Bachmann, Phys. Rev. E 84, 011127 (2011).
- [32] T. Koci and M. Bachmann, Phys. Rev. E 95, 032502 (2017).
- [33] K. Qi and M. Bachmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 120, 180601(2018).
- [34] W. Liu, F. Wang, P.Sun and J. Wang, J. Stat. Mech. 9, 093206 (2022).
- [35] F. Ritort, J. Phys. Chem. B 108, 6893 (2004).
- [36] L.L. Bonilla, F.G. Padilla and F. Ritort, Physica A, 250, 315 (1998).
- [37] A. Garriga and F. Ritort, Phys. Rev. E 72, 031505 (2005).
- [38] A. Crisanti and F. Ritort, Europhys. Lett. 66 253 (2004).
- [39] A. Crisanti, M. Picco and F. Ritort, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 080601 (2013).
- [40] N. Shankaraiah, K.P.N .Murthy, and S.R. Shenoy, EPL 142, 36003 (2023).
- [41] N. Shankaraiah, K.P.N. Murthy, and S.R. Shenoy, arXiv : 2210.01997v1 [cond-mat .stat-mech].
- [42] H. Kawamura, A. Yamamoto and T. Okubo J. Phys. Soc. Japan, 79, 023701 (2010).
- [43] P. A. Lebwohl and G. Lasher, Phys. Rev. A 6, 426 (1973).
- [44] C. Zannoni Liquid Crystals and their Computer Simulations, (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2022).
- [45] H. B. Callen, Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatics, 2nd ed. (Wiley Publishers, New York, 1991).
- [46] S. Majumdar and G. Schehr, arXiv: 1711.07571v1 [condmat .stat-mech].
- [47] H. Touchette, Phys. Rep. 478, 1 (2009).
- [48] F. Rojas and A. D. Rutenberg, Phys. Rev. E60, 212 (1999).
- [49] S. Dutta and S. K. Roy, Phys. Rev. E 71, 026119 (2005).
- [50] A. Singh and S. Singh, Eur. Phys. J. E 36, 122 (2013).
- [51] P.C. Hohenberg, Phys.Rev. **158**, 383 (1967).
- [52] N.D. Mermin and H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17, 1133 (1966).
- [53] B. Halperin, J. Statist. Phys. 175, 521 (2019).
- [54] G. Palle and D.K. Sunko, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 54, 315001 (2021).
- [55] E.C. Marino, D. Niemeyer, V. S. Alves, T. H. Hansson, and S. Moroz, New J. Phys. 20, 083049 (2018).

- [56] J. Pearl, Appl. Phys. Lett. 5, 65 (1964).
- [57] R. Savit, Rev Mod. Phys. 52, 453 (1980).
- [58] M.S. Lau and C. Dasgupta, Phys. Rev. B 39, 7212 (1989).
- [59] G. Kohring, R. E. Shrock and P. Wills, Phys. Rev, Lett. 57, 1358 (1986).
- [60] S. R. Shenoy, Phys. Rev. B 42, 8595 (1990).
- [61] S. R. Shenoy, Current Science 65, 392 (1993).
- [62] S. R. Shenoy Notes on Josephson Junction Arrays, Troisieme cycle de la physique en Suisse romande, CERN Library code 90-0798-0 (EPFL. Lausanne, Lausanne, 1989).
- [63] J. F. Yu, Z. Y. Xie, Y. Meurice, Y. Liu, A. Denbleyker, H. Zou, M. P. Qin, J. Chen, and T. Xiang, Phys. Rev. E 89, 013308 (2014).
- [64] L. Vanderstraeten, B. Vanhecke, A. M. Lauchli and F. Verstraete, Phys. Rev. E 100, 062136 (2019).
- [65] B. Kamala Latha and V. S. S. Sastry, Liq. Cryst. 45, 2197 (2018).
- [66] B. Kamala Latha and V. S. S. Sastry, Phys. Rev. E 102, 040701 (2020).
- [67] B. Kamala Latha, S. Dhara and V. S. S. Sastry, Phys. Rev. E 104, 064701 (2021).
- [68] B. Kamala Latha, Ph. D thesis, University of Hyderabad, 2014. http://hdl.handle.net/10603/214857.
- [69] M.S. Shell, P.G. Debenedetti, and A. Z. Panagiotopaulis, Phys. Rev. E 66, 056703 (2002).
- [70] A. S'ali, E. Shakhnovich and M. Karplus, Nature 369, 248 (1994).
- [71] P.G. Wolynes, Proc. Am. Philos. Soc., 145, 555 (2001).
- [72] J. Udgaonkar, Physics 17, 11 (2024).

End Matter

To present additional features of the complex (n = 3, d = 2) transition, we compute for L = 128, the persite free energy f(T, 1/L) derived from the system energy e(1/L) and the corresponding entropy s(e, 1/L). A Legendre transformation of the entropy [45], yields $s(e, 1/L) - [e(1/L)\beta_{eff}(e, 1/L)] \equiv [-f(T, 1/L)/T]$; numerically identical results are obtained by a thermal average of the energy with a DoS times a Boltzmann factor. We can in particular, evaluate the free energy with other variables specified: we choose the order parameter S_n , and the disorder parameter ρ_d (unbound defect-density).

For n = 3, d = 3 biaxial liquid crystals, the free energy per site as a function of the order parameter and temperature show competing Landau minima in the OP, that vary with T, and yield a first order transition [65, 68].

For n = 3, d = 2 uniaxial liquid crystals, Fig. 7(a) shows the Landau free energy per site $f(S_n, T)$ as a 3D mesh covering the nematic transition region. The unusual shape is of a 'tilted washboard' potential. Fig. 7(b) shows $\Delta f(S_n, T) \equiv f(S_n, T) - f(S_n = 0, T)$ that subtracts the background value at zero OP $f(S_n = 0, T)$ for each T. The two main minima are degenerate at the vanishing of the temperature deviation $(T - T_p)$ where $T_p = 0.590$. Thus the finite-scale precursor transformation at T_p controls access to the downhill run towards



FIG. 7. (color online) (a) Mesh plot of Landau free energy density $f(S_n, T)$ in the (S_n, T) plane for L = 128. (b) $\Delta f(S_n, T)$ versus S_n for different T, showing the nematic ordering onset is controlled by the search-temperature deviation from the precursor, $(T - T_p)$. The inset shows the smaller S_n region.

the system-scale phase transition at T_n , where simultaneously, there are spikes in the specific heat and nematic susceptibility, and an onset of nematic LRO.

A toy model for a (tilted) third-order transition at $T = T_n$, could be written as $f \sim [(T - T_n)\eta^4 + \eta^6 + h\eta]$ with a tilt field $h \sim (T - T_p)$. (Here the order parameter η could be a nematic OP S_n plus a constant.) For $T \leq T_p$ the large-OP minimum is favoured.

Fig. 8(a) shows the free energy $f(\rho_d, T)$ as a 3D mesh: the disorder parameter mesh is complementary to the order parameter. On cooling, the disorder parameter decreases as the order parameter increases. Fig. 8(b) shows $\Delta f(\rho_d, T)$ that subtracts for each T, the background value at zero defect density $f(\rho_d = 0, T)$. The two main minima are degenerate at the *same* precursor $T = T_p = 0.590$ as for the OP of Fig. 7(b).

Fig. 9 depicts the distribution of states during the energy-uniform Random Walk across the entropy barrier region, shown as a mesh plot projected on the bin-level $(S_{\mu}, T_{(eff,\mu)})$ plane. There is a manifest accumulation of states in the entropy barrier region.

Computational details:

An efficient algorithm to estimate accurately the density of states (DoS) of the system was proposed [23, 24],



FIG. 8. (color online) (a) Mesh plot of free energy density $f(\rho_d, T)$ in the (ρ_d, T) plane for L = 128. (b) $\Delta f(\rho_d, T)$ versus ρ_d for different T, showing the defect disorder decrease is controlled by the search-temperature deviation from the precursor, $(T - T_p)$. The Inset shows the smaller ρ_d region.



FIG. 9. (color online) Mesh plot of the distribution of microstates collected during an energy-uniform Random Walk bracketing the crossover region, as function of bin-level entropy and effective temperature T_{eff} . Compare Fig. 1(b).

by effecting a suitably biased Random Walk (RW) over the energy range of interest. Subsequently, algorithmic performance was significantly enhanced by successively guiding the walk preferentially to lower energy/entropy regions [25] by an adaptive sampling method. This involves tracking periodically, the range of the higher energy region over which the DoS has converged satisfactorily, and identifying a lower energy bound E_b or frontier. A small positive constant value, or boost, was added to the DoS for all energies above the frontier E_b . This forced the system to perform a RW mostly in the low energy/entropy region beyond the frontier, till its DoS built up enough, to match the value of the boost.

Further frontiers were sequentially introduced, making the system progress systematically towards a specified lowest energy limit, thereby determining the system DoS over the range of energies, to a desired tolerance [23– 25, 29]. The quality of convergence was tested by examining the uniformity of a RW, carried out with the inverse bias of the DoS so determined. The usually acceptable standard deviation of the distribution is 10%. This modified Wang-Landau algorithm augmented with frontiersampling was applied to liquid crystals with continuousspin degrees of freedom [27], yielding EAMC protocols for uniaxial and biaxial liquid crystals. Such protocols were used in the earlier RP^2 work [12].

Recently, better convergence of the DoS was attempted by making the boost value energy-dependent, gradually increasing it as lower energy regions are accessed. This indeed resulted in an improved convergence of the DoS, with a lower standard deviation ~ 3%. The algorithm of course, reproduced the previous physical results [12]. The characteristic temperatures obtained had only a uniform upward shift of +0.021, with differences unchanged. The version of EAMC used in this paper (finding $T_n = 0.585$, $T_p = 0.590$), incorporated the improved convergence from the energy-dependent boost.