

Force distributions near the jamming and glass transitions

C. S. O'Hern^{1,3}, Stephen A. Langer², Andrea J. Liu¹, and S. R. Nagel³

¹ *Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1569*

² *Information Technology Laboratory, NIST, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8910*

³ *James Franck Institute, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637*

(May 20, 2019)

We measure the distributions of interparticle normal forces $P(F)$ near the glass transition in supercooled liquids and near the jamming transition in foams and compare them to those obtained in recent experiments on static granular packings. We find that the distributions $P(F)$ for glasses, jammed foams, and static granular packings are very similar, showing a plateau or small peak at small forces. We propose that the formation of this peak signals the development of a yield stress in glasses and jammed systems.

64.70.Pf, 81.05.Rm, 83.70.Hq,

Granular materials can flow when they are shaken, but jam when the shaking intensity is lowered [1]. Similarly, foams and emulsions can flow when they are sheared, but jam when the shear stress is lowered [2]. These systems are athermal because the thermal energy is insufficient to change the packing of grains, bubbles, or droplets. When the energy provided by an external driving force is insufficient to cause particle rearrangements, these materials become amorphous solids and develop a yield stress. A supercooled liquid, on the other hand, is a thermal system that turns, as the temperature is lowered, into a glass—an amorphous solid with a yield stress [3]. Despite the significant differences between driven, athermal systems and quiescent, thermal systems, it has been suggested that the process of jamming—developing a yield stress in an amorphous state—may lead to common behavior, and that these systems can be unified by a jamming phase diagram [4]. If this speculation is correct, there should be quantitative similarities in these different systems as they approach the jamming or glass transition. In this Letter, we test this speculation by measuring a specific quantity, the distribution of interparticle normal forces $P(F)$, in model supercooled liquids and foams, and by comparing our results to experimental results for granular materials [5].

The quantity $P(F)$ is particularly apt for studies of jamming because when granular materials jam, the distribution of stresses is known to be inhomogeneous [6,7]. One way to quantify this effect, which was pointed out in Ref. [7], is to measure $P(F)$. Experiments [5,8] and simulations [9] on static granular packings find that $P(F)$ is nearly flat at small forces and decays exponentially at large forces. The decay can be interpreted with a scalar model of force propagation [7]. For supercooled liquids, however, we can use equilibrium statistical mechanics to gain insight into the shape of $P(F)$. Since forces depend only on particle separations, $P(F)dF = G(r)dr$, where $G(r)dr$ is the probability of finding a particle between r

and $r + dr$ given a particle at the origin. Thus, $G(r) = \rho/(N-1)S_D(r)g(r)$, where N is the number of particles, ρ is the number density, $g(r)$ is the pair distribution function, and $S_D(r)$ is the surface area of a D -dimensional sphere with radius r . In a jammed system like a granular material an analytic expression for $g(r)$ is not known and $P(F)$ must be measured directly. However, in an *equilibrium* system at temperature T , the large-force behavior of $P(F)$ can be obtained from the small-separation behavior of $g(r)$: $g(r) \propto \exp[-V(r)/k_bT]$ [10] in the limit $r \rightarrow 0$ (or $F \rightarrow \infty$), where $V(r)$ is the pair potential. This leads to the large-force limit,

$$P[F(r)] \sim A(\rho, T)r^{D-1} \frac{dr}{dF} \exp[-V(r)/k_bT], \quad (1)$$

where $A(\rho, T)$ does not depend on r . Thus, the large-force tail depends on the pair potential and T .

From our simulations, we calculate directly the force distributions in systems that are out-of-equilibrium, such as glasses and sheared foams, as well as systems in equilibrium, such as supercooled liquids. Our measurements yield three main results. First, the *large-force* behavior of $P(F)$ for supercooled liquids at all temperatures is the same as that observed for static granular packings [5,8], i.e. both distributions decay exponentially for large F . Second, $P(F)$ for *glasses* has the same form as that for static granular packings over the *entire* range in F . This suggests a new interpretation of the large-force behavior of $P(F)$ for granular materials. The exponential tail may arise from random motions of grains that were quenched in after they were poured into the container. Third, a peak or plateau at the average force develops in $P(F)$ near the glass transition for model supercooled liquids and near the jamming transition for a model foam. For granular materials, $P(F)$ also has a plateau at forces near and below the average [5,8]. This suggests that the glass transition may indeed be related to jamming transitions in foams and granular materials.

We first focus on the force distributions for supercooled

liquids. We perform constant temperature molecular dynamics simulations on binary mixtures in 2D [11]. The masses m of the particles are the same, but the ratio of particle diameters, $\sigma_2/\sigma_1 = 1.4$, ensures that the system does not crystallize [12]. We confine $N = 1024$ particles (512 of each variety) to a square box of side L and use periodic boundary conditions. For each simulation, we choose one of the following interparticle pair potentials:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ab}^{SC}(r) &\equiv \epsilon (\sigma_{ab}/r)^{12} \\ V_{ab}^{LJ}(r) &\equiv 4\epsilon \left[(\sigma_{ab}/r)^{12} - (\sigma_{ab}/r)^6 \right] \\ V_{ab}^{LJR12}(r) &\equiv 4\epsilon \left[(\sigma_{ab}/r)^{12} - (\sigma_{ab}/r)^6 \right] + \epsilon; \quad r/\sigma_{ab} \leq 2^{1/6} \\ V_{ab}^{LJR24}(r) &\equiv \frac{2^{8/3}\epsilon}{3} \left[(\sigma_{ab}/r)^{24} - (\sigma_{ab}/r)^6 \right] + \epsilon; \\ &\quad r/\sigma_{ab} \leq 2^{1/9} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma_{ab} = (\sigma_a + \sigma_b)/2$ for $a, b = 1, 2$. Note that for V^{LJR12} and V^{LJR24} , the potentials are zero above the specified cutoff, at which the force $-dV^{LJR}/dr$ vanishes smoothly. The SC, LJR12 and LJR24 potentials are purely repulsive, while the Lennard-Jones (LJ) potential includes an attraction. Below, we measure time, force, temperature, and density in units of $\sigma_1(m/\epsilon)^{1/2}$, ϵ/σ_1 , ϵ/k_b , and σ_1^{-2} respectively. The SC, LJR12, and LJR24 simulations were carried out at constant density $\rho = 0.747$; the LJ simulations were carried out at zero average pressure.




FIG. 1. $P(F)$ for all interparticle force pairs versus F/T for LJR12 obtained for seven temperatures in the range $1.2 < T < 5.0$ with T decreasing from top to bottom.

The hallmark of the glass transition is the extreme slowing down of the dynamics as temperature is lowered toward the glass transition. Since relaxation times increase so rapidly near the transition, simulations and experiments can only reach equilibrium for temperatures $T > T_g$, where T_g is determined by the maximum waiting time of the particular experiment or simulation. The pair potentials in Eq. 2 all give rise to glass transitions as temperature is lowered [12]. We determine T_g by

measuring the self-part of the intermediate scattering function $F_2(k_p, t)$ for the large particles at a wavevector k_p corresponding to the first peak of the static structure factor [12,13]. For high temperatures, the liquid equilibrates quickly and $F_2(k_p, t)$ decays exponentially to zero. The relaxation time τ_r is defined as the time at which $F_2(k_p, t)$ decays to $1/e$; this is a measure of the α -relaxation time [12,13]. For each potential, we define T_g as the temperature below which $\tau_r > 1000$. For our parameter choices, the glass transition temperatures are $T_g^{SC} = 0.38$, $T_g^{LJR12} = 1.1$, $T_g^{LJR24} = 3.0$ and $T_g^{LJ} = 0.17$.




FIG. 2. Top: $P(F)$ versus F for SC obtained after a quench from $T_i = 3.0 > T_g$ to $T_f = 0.8 > T_g$. The solid and dashed curves are the equilibrium distributions at $T = 3.0$ and $T = 0.8$, respectively; the dotted curves show $P(F)$ as a function of time after the quench. Bottom: Same as the top except $T_f = 0.1 < T_g$.

For $T > T_g$ we measure $P(F)$ for all interparticle force pairs from at least 250 configurations after equilibrating each configuration for $10 - 100\tau_r$. Fig. 1 shows $P(F)$ plotted versus F/T for LJR12 for 7 temperatures above T_g with temperature decreasing from top to bottom. We have shifted each curve vertically by a scaling factor to obtain collapse of the data for large forces. From Eq. 1, we expect that the large-force tail should scale asymptotically as $\exp(-BF^{12/13}/T)$, where B is a constant and the power $12/13$ derives from the $1/r^{12}$ repulsion. Thus, for particles with harder cores (steeper repulsions), the tail becomes closer to an exponential in F/T . At high temperatures, we see in Fig. 1 that $P(F)$ increases with decreasing F over the entire range of F . As temperature is lowered towards T_g , a plateau in $P(F)$ forms at small forces at temperature T_p . Below T_p , $P(F)$ contains a peak. For all potentials, T_p lies above but close to the glass transition T_g .




FIG. 3. $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ versus $F/\langle F \rangle$ for both LJR12 and LJR24 after a quench to $T_f = 0.8$. Data from experiments on static granular packings from [5] are also shown.

We also study $P(F)$ out of equilibrium by performing thermal quenches from $T_i > T_g$ to T_f . For $T_f > T_g$, the system is out of equilibrium for short times following the quench, but eventually reaches equilibrium for $t \gg \tau_r$. In the top frame of Fig. 2, we show $P(F)$ for such a quench for the SC potential. In this plot, we have not scaled the abscissa, so the tail has a larger slope at T_f than T_i . After the quench, the tail quickly adjusts to the new temperature. The excess forces then adjust downwards, inducing a shoulder in $P(F)$ that moves to smaller forces with time. For $t \sim \tau_r$, the quenched distribution is indistinguishable from the equilibrium one at T_f . Similar behavior is found for the other three potentials.

In the bottom frame of Fig. 2, we show $P(F)$ following a quench to a final temperature T_f far below T_g for the SC potential. The system therefore remains out of equilibrium even at long times. After the quench, the slope of the tail again increases quickly and a peak of excess forces forms. This peak travels to smaller F with time, but eventually stops at a reproducible value of force. We find that the reproducible temperature T_{tail} corresponding to the slope of the tail is not the final temperature T_f , but rather satisfies $T_f < T_{tail} < T_g$. Thus, a fraction of the large thermal forces cannot relax in the glassy state. The behavior of $P(F)$ when quenched well below T_g is qualitatively the same for all potentials studied, showing that the peak arises in a system with attractive interactions and no applied pressure as well as systems with purely repulsive interactions under pressure.

The potentials LJR12 and LJR24 in Eq. 2 are most similar to granular materials since they produce purely repulsive forces that vanish at finite separation r_c . We compare $P(F)$ in the glassy state for LJR12 and LJR24 to $P(F)$ for static granular packings in Fig. 3. For both LJR12 and LJR24, we have quenched to $T_f = 0.8 < T_g$. Remarkably, the force distributions, when scaled by the average force $\langle F \rangle$, are nearly identical for LJR12, LJR24, and experiments on static granular packings [5] over the entire range of forces. This implies that for sufficiently

hard repulsive potentials, the shape of the distribution is not sensitive to the shape of the potential. In the limit of hard spheres, where the power of the repulsive term in the potential diverges, we expect similar behavior. It also suggests that the exponential tail observed in experiments on static granular packings may originate from random motions that are quenched in as grains are poured into the container, just as large thermal forces are quenched in as a supercooled liquid becomes a glass.




FIG. 4. Top: $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ versus $F/\langle F \rangle$ for foams with $\sigma_{xy} = 0$ for several ϕ near random close-packing. Bottom: $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ for foams with $\phi = 0.9 > \phi_0$ and σ_{xy} lowered towards σ_y .

Fig. 3, in conjunction with Fig. 1, implies that the signature of jamming in $P(F)$ for static granular packings is the plateau near the average force, rather than the exponential tail. Is a peak or plateau in $P(F)$ also observed in other jammed systems? To answer this, we have studied model two-dimensional foams [14,15], where bubbles are treated as circles that can overlap and interact via two types of pairwise interactions. The first models the repulsive energy when bubbles are pushed together and deform each other. This is a harmonic repulsion that is nonzero when the distance between centers of two bubbles is less than the sum of their radii. The other interaction models the dissipation that occurs when bubbles move relative to each other, and is a simple dynamical friction proportional to the relative velocities of two neighboring bubbles. In foam, thermal motion of bubbles is negligible. We simulate a 400-bubble system at constant area with periodic boundary conditions in the x -direction and fixed boundaries in the y -direction. Bubble radii R_i are chosen from a flat distribution with $0.2 < R_i/\langle R \rangle < 1.8$.

At packing fractions ϕ above random close packing ($\phi_0 \approx 0.84$), a quiescent foam is an amorphous solid with a yield stress σ_y . However, when a shear stress $\sigma_{xy} > \sigma_y$ is applied, the foam flows. There are therefore two ways

to approach the amorphous solid. We can either increase ϕ towards ϕ_0 at zero applied shear stress (route 1), or we can decrease the shear stress towards the yield stress at fixed $\phi > \phi_0$ (route 2). In Fig. 4, we show $P(f)$ along these two routes. The distributions along route 1 in the top frame were measured after quenching 50 configurations from $\phi_i \ll \phi_0$ to ϕ by increasing each particle radius. Note that the distributions have Gaussian tails, consistent with the expectation in Eq. 1 for this harmonic pair potential. At packing fractions below close packing, $\phi < \phi_0$, $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ increases monotonically as $F/\langle F \rangle$ decreases. As ϕ increases above ϕ_0 , a local maximum forms in the distribution near the average force. A similar trend is found along route 2. To obtain these distributions, we averaged over at least 500 configurations with each brought to steady state for a strain of ≈ 10 . In all cases shown, σ_{xy} exceeds the yield stress, so the systems are flowing. We find that at large shear stress, $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ is nearly constant at small F . When the shear stress is lowered towards $\sigma_y \approx 0.10$, a peak in $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ forms near $F/\langle F \rangle \sim 1$. Similar behavior is observed in $P(F/\langle F \rangle)$ as a function of ϕ in experiments on sheared deformable disks [16] and as a function of confining stress in experiments and simulations of deformable spheres [17].

In this Letter, we have established that four different model supercooled liquids develop peaks or plateaus in $P(F)$ near the average force as the temperature is lowered towards the glass transition. A model foam also develops a peak in $P(F)$ near $\langle F \rangle$ as it approaches jamming along two different routes. Thus, a peak in $P(F)$ appears as the system jams along each of the axes of the jamming phase diagram [4]. Static granular packings exhibit a plateau or peak in $P(F)$ as well. This similarity of behavior suggests that the glass transition may indeed be a jamming transition and that jamming leads to common behavior in different systems.

This still leaves the question of *why* the formation of a peak or plateau in the force distribution appears to signal the development of a yield stress in jammed or glassy systems. The forces at the peak are among the slowest to relax. This is because these forces correspond to separations near the first peak of $g(r)$, which correspond to wavevectors near the first peak in the static structure factor, which are the slowest to relax [13,18]. Note that the presence of a peak or plateau near the average force also implies that there are a large number of forces near the average value. The formation of the peak in $P(F)$ may mean that increasingly more particles belong to linear force chains with *balanced* forces acting along the chain. We speculate that systems develop a yield stress—they jam—when there are enough forces in force chains to support the stress over the time scale of the measurement. This implies that force chains observed in granular packings may also be important to the glass transition. Also, large kinetic heterogeneities that ap-

pear near the glass transition [19] may be linked to the formation of force chains. This interpretation suggests that force chains may provide the key to the elusive order parameter for the glass transition. The fact that force chains do not couple strongly to density fluctuations may explain why an order parameter has not yet been found.

We thank Susan Coppersmith, Heinrich Jaeger, Robert Leheny, Daniel Mueth, Thomas Witten, Walter Kob, and Gilles Tarjus for instructive discussions. Support of NSF Grant Nos. DMR-9722646 (CSO,SRN), CHE-9624090 (CSO,AJL), and PHY-9407194 (SAL,AJL,SRN) is gratefully acknowledged.

-
- [1] H. M. Jaeger, S. R. Nagel, and R. P. Behringer, *Rev. Mod. Physics* **68**, 1259 (1996).
 - [2] D. J. Durian and D. A. Weitz, "Foams," in *Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, 4 ed., ed. J.I. Kroschwitz (Wiley, New York, 1994), Vol. 11, p. 783.
 - [3] M. D. Ediger, C. A. Angell, and S. R. Nagel, *J. Phys. Chem.* **100**, 13200 (1996).
 - [4] A. J. Liu and S. R. Nagel, *Nature* **396** (N6706), 21 (1998).
 - [5] D. M. Mueth, H. M. Jaeger, and S. R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. E* **57**, 3164 (1998); D. L. Blair, N. W. Mueggenburg, A. H. Marshall, H. M. Jaeger, and S. R. Nagel, (unpublished).
 - [6] P. Dantu, *Géotechnique* **18**, 50 (1968).
 - [7] C.-h. Liu, S. R. Nagel, D. A. Schecter, S. N. Coppersmith, S. Majumdar, O. Narayan, and T. A. Witten, *Science* **269**, 513 (1995); S. N. Coppersmith, C.-h. Liu, S. Majumdar, O. Narayan, and T. A. Witten, *Phys. Rev. E* **53**, 4673 (1996).
 - [8] G. Løvøll, K. J. Måløy, and E. G. Fekkøy, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 5872 (1999).
 - [9] F. Radjai, M. Jean, J.-J. Moreau, and S. Roux, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 274 (1996); C. Thornton, *KONA Powder Part.* **15**, 81 (1997).
 - [10] B. Widom, *J. Phys. Chem.* **86**, 869 (1982).
 - [11] M. P. Allen and D. J. Tildesley, *Computer Simulations of Liquids*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987).
 - [12] D. N. Perera and P. Harrowell, *Phys. Rev. E* **59**, 5721 (1999).
 - [13] W. Kob and H. C. Anderson, *Phys. Rev. E* **52**, 4134 (1995).
 - [14] D. J. Durian, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4780 (1995); *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 1739 (1997).
 - [15] S. A. Langer and A. J. Liu, *Europhys. Lett.* **49**, 68 (2000); S. Tewari, D. Schiemann, D. J. Durian, C. M. Knobler, S. A. Langer, and A. J. Liu, *Phys. Rev. E* **60**, 4385 (1999).
 - [16] D. Howell and R. P. Behringer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5241 (1999).
 - [17] H. A. Makse, D. L. Johnson and L. M. Schwartz, *cond-mat/0002102*.
 - [18] P.-G. de Gennes, *Physica* **25**, 825 (1959).
 - [19] M. D. Ediger, *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* (in press).