

# A Statistical Mechanics Approach to the Inherent States of Granular Media

Antonio Coniglio<sup>a</sup> and Mario Nicodemi<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Napoli “Federico II”, INFN and INFN di Napoli, Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, London, SW7 2BZ, U.K.*

We consider a Statistical Mechanics approach to granular systems by following the original ideas developed by Edwards. We use the concept of “inherent states”, defined as the stable configurations in the potential energy landscape, introduced in the context of glasses. Under simplifying assumptions, the equilibrium inherent states can be characterized by a configurational temperature,  $1/\beta$ . We link  $\beta$  to Edwards’ compactivity and address the problem of its experimental measure. We also discuss the possibility to describe the time dependent distribution probability in the inherent states with an appropriate master equation.

The possibility to describe general features in the physics of granular media with the concepts of Statistical Mechanics was suggested few years ago by Edwards [1]. As much as systems of standard Statistical Mechanics, each macroscopic state of a granular medium corresponds to a huge number of microstates. Furthermore, these systems show very general reproducible macroscopic behaviors characterized by a few control parameters [2]. In granular media, however, in absence of some external driving the microstates are “frozen”, i.e., they don’t evolve in time as thermal energy is negligible compared to gravitational energy. Therefore the external thermal bath can be considered at zero temperature. Thermal motion of grains can be replaced, instead, by agitation induced by shaking or other form of driving, which may generate a dynamics among “frozen” microstates. In facts, granular systems are just one example of a broad category of materials which can be found in “frozen states”. An other interesting example is the state of a supercooled liquid which has been cooled at zero temperature and falls in one of the microstates corresponding to the minima of the potential energy, called “inherent structures” [3]. Actually, the analogy between slow dynamics in granular media and glassy behaviors of supercooled liquids has been proposed in various forms [1,4-9].

In this Letter we will further extend this analogy to develop a statistical mechanics approach to granular materials, following Edwards pioneering ideas [10]. For simplicity we consider here a granular material as made of particles which may have a distribution of shapes and interacting via hard core potentials, so that they are not allowed to overlap. Due to gravitational energy, each particle configuration  $\{r_i\}$  corresponds to a potential energy  $U\{r_i\}$ . The stable packing configurations are the minima or saddle points of the potential energy or, more generally, all the states which, due for instance to friction, are mechanically stable. These states are the frozen configurations which by analogy with the glass terminology we call *inherent states*. If there is no ambiguity throughout the paper we call them simply states. We label each state by an index  $s$  and call  $E_s$  the corresponding energy.

The dynamics from one state to another can be induced by some form of driving such as, for instance, by sequences of shakes or “taps” of given amplitude as in typical experimental realizations (see references [2,4]). The kinetic energy driven in the packs by the “shakes” is totally dissipated when the shake is over and the system is almost instantaneously “frozen” in one of the inherent states. The actual dynamics depends on several parameters such as the tap amplitude  $\Gamma = a/g$  ( $a$  is the shake peak acceleration and  $g$  the gravity acceleration), frequency and others [11]. We say that the system is at stationarity if its macroscopic properties don’t change any longer with respect to the given dynamics allowing transitions from one microstate to another. We refer to these states as stationary states, or quasi-stationary if the macroscopic properties change very slowly.

A very important issue is to individuate the states distribution, namely what is the probability to find the system in a given inherent state  $s$ . We can expect that under stationary condition [12] the system has been “randomized” enough, and therefore, following essentially Edwards original ideas, we make the assumption that such a distribution is given by a maximization of the entropy under the condition that the average energy is fixed.

More precisely we consider a statistical ensemble of equivalent systems all prepared in the same way. We indicate with  $\{E_r\}$  the energies of the accessible inherent microscopic states of each system and with  $n_r$  the number of systems with energy equal to  $E_r$ . The average energy per system is thus  $E = \sum_r P_r E_r$  where  $P_r = n_r/N$  is the probability to have a system in the inherent state  $r$ .

The configurational entropy can be defined as  $S = -\sum_r P_r \ln P_r$ . We assume that the stationary distribution is given by the maximal entropy under the constraint which fixes the average energy  $E$ . This requirement leads to the Gibbs distribution function:

$$P_r = \frac{e^{-\beta E_r}}{Z} \quad (1)$$

where the partition function  $Z = \sum_r e^{-\beta E_r}$  is a normalization factor and  $\beta$  a Lagrange multiplier determined by the constraint on the energy.

As in standard Statistical Mechanics, we can show that in the thermodynamic limit  $S$  is the logarithm of the number of microscopic inherent states,  $\Omega$ , corresponding to the macroscopic energy  $E$ . Actually, we have that  $\ln Z = S - \beta E$ . On the other hand  $Z$  can be written as  $Z = \sum_r e^{-\beta E_r} = \sum_{\mathcal{E}} \Omega(\mathcal{E}) e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}}$  and using the steepest descent method, in the thermodynamic limit one obtains:  $\ln Z = \ln \Omega(E) - \beta E$ . Thus, we have that:  $S = \ln \Omega(E)$  and

$$\beta = \frac{\partial S}{\partial E}. \quad (2)$$

We call  $\beta^{-1} \equiv T_{conf}$  the *configurational temperature*. We note that beside the configurational temperature  $T_{conf}$  there is a second “temperature” related to the grains kinetic energy, the external effective bath temperature,  $T_{bath}$ , which is zero. While the fast degree of freedom, related to the momentum distribution, equilibrates with the temperature of the external bath resulting into a zero kinetic energy, the non zero configurational temperature characterizes the equilibrium distribution among the inherent states. Note that two granular systems in “thermal contact” have always the same  $T_{bath} = 0$  while the configurational temperature  $T_{conf}$  may be different. However the configurational temperature characterizes the equilibrium states of the system and depends only on the average energy of the inherent states and not on the particular dynamics used.  $T_{conf}$  enters as a parameter in the equilibrium distribution allowing to substitute, as in usual Statistical Mechanics, time averages, which are theoretically difficult to evaluate, with ensemble averages.

The existence of two effective temperatures is quite familiar in the context of glassy systems [13,14]. If one quenches these systems in their glassy phase at a low bath temperature,  $T_{bath}$ , after a relative short transient the fast degree of freedom come quickly in equilibrium with  $T_{bath}$ , while the slow degree of freedom related to configurational rearrangement fall out of equilibrium and are characterized by an internal temperature  $T_{int}$  [14,15]. Interesting enough when  $T_{bath} = 0$ ,  $T_{int}$  coincides with the configurational temperature introduced in eq.(2):  $T_{int} = T_{conf}$  [15,16].

There are however some differences between glassy systems quenched at  $T_{bath}$  almost equal to zero and granular materials. In the former the energy depends on the equilibrium temperature before quenching and the dynamics among the inherent states is due to an activated thermal process at extremely low temperature. In granular media the energy depends on the shaking amplitude  $\Gamma$  and the dynamics in general proceeds with a tapping process with the same fixed amplitude. It would be interesting to study glassy materials using the dynamics of granular materials and vice-versa. For example one could introduce in glass formers a “tap dynamics”, in which the temperature  $T_{bath}$  is cyclically varied between zero and a finite value  $T_{\Gamma}$  [17]. On the contrary in granular material one might first reach a given value of the energy by shaking the system with an amplitude  $\Gamma$  and then evolve the system by gently shaking with very low value of  $\Gamma$ .

We now show that in the particular case in which the particles density  $\rho$  is constant,  $\beta$  can be easily related to the “compactivity”, introduced by Edwards in his seminal papers [1]. An “inherent state” can be characterized by the particle density function  $\rho(\vec{r})$ . When the system has a constant density profile, i.e.,  $\rho(\vec{r}) = \rho_0$  in the packs, a one to one correspondence exists between energy and volume. Let’s consider for sake of simplicity only hard core and gravity interactions. Actually, if  $A$  is the horizontal area of the container and  $h$  the packs height (its volume is  $V = hA$ ), the system energy is:  $E = mg\rho_0 Ah^2/2 = \mathcal{P}V/2$ , where  $m$  is the grain mass and the characteristic pressure  $\mathcal{P} = mg\rho_0 h$  is the weight of the sample per unit surface. Then we have:

$$\beta \equiv \frac{\partial S}{\partial E} = \frac{2}{\mathcal{P}} \frac{\partial S}{\partial V} = \frac{2}{\mathcal{P}} X_E^{-1} \quad (3)$$

The quantity  $X_E^{-1} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial V}$  is Edwards’ “compactivity” [1], which in this case is simply proportional to  $\beta$ .

To see how the formalism can work we consider a simple example where  $\rho$  is not a constant. As stated, the inherent states of a granular system can be characterized by their coarse-grained density spatial distribution,  $\rho(\vec{r})$ , and the partition function of the system may be written as:  $Z = \int \mathcal{D}\rho e^{-\beta \mathcal{F}[\rho]}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}[\rho] = E[\rho] - \beta^{-1} S[\rho]$  is the free energy functional for the system in its inherent states and the integral is over all inherent states. In the simplest cases the gravitational energy  $E[\rho]$  is given by:  $E_g[\rho] = mg \int_V d\vec{r} z \rho(\vec{r})$  ( $z$  is the component of  $\vec{r}$  along gravity acceleration,  $\vec{g}$ ).  $S$  can be approximated by the entropy of a lattice gas of non overlapping grains with :

$$S = - \int_V d\vec{r} \left\{ \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \ln \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} + \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right) \ln \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right) \right\} \quad (4)$$

Here  $\rho_0$  is the maximal accessible density. The minimum of the free energy gives the following Fermi-Dirac equilibrium density profile:

$$\rho(\vec{r}) = \rho_{FD}(z) = \frac{\rho_0}{e^{mg\rho_0\beta(z-\lambda)} + 1} \quad (5)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a chemical potential which fixes the total number of particles. This result is in agreement with experimental [2,18] and other theoretical [7,19] findings.

The configurational temperature can be evaluated by introducing a small perturbation  $\gamma U$  where  $\gamma$  is a small parameter and  $U$  is an observable. If  $U_r$  is the value of  $U$  in the inherent state  $r$  the energy of the inherent state changes from  $E_r$  to  $E_r + \gamma U_r$ . Using the fluctuation dissipation relation

$$\left. \frac{\partial \langle U \rangle}{\partial \gamma} \right|_{\gamma=0} = \beta (\langle U^2 \rangle - \langle U \rangle^2) \quad (6)$$

The ratio of the response function to the fluctuation of  $U$  gives  $\beta$ . It is possible that such response function cannot be measured experimentally. Another way to link  $\beta$  to observable quantities easier to measure, is the following

From eq.(1) using standard statistical mechanics immediately follows

$$\frac{\partial \langle E \rangle}{\partial \beta} = \langle E^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle^2 \quad (7)$$

which relates the fluctuation of the energy to the energy derivative. The average is over the equilibrium distribution of eq.(1). Both the energy and its fluctuation,  $C = \langle E^2 \rangle - \langle E \rangle^2$ , can be experimentally measured as function of  $\Gamma$ . Using  $\frac{\partial \langle E \rangle}{\partial \beta} = \frac{\partial \langle E \rangle}{\partial \Gamma} \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \beta}$  from eq. (7) we obtain

$$\beta(\Gamma) - \beta_0 = \int_{\Gamma_0}^{\Gamma} \frac{1}{C(\Gamma)} \frac{\partial \langle E \rangle}{\partial \Gamma} d\Gamma \quad (8)$$

where  $\Gamma_0$  is a reference point which could be adequately chosen. Therefore a part from an additive constant in principle it is possible to obtain  $\beta$  as function of  $\Gamma$ . This procedure was experimentally proposed in ref. [4]. We note that this approaches predicts an universal value of  $\beta$ , independent on the particular control parameter  $\Gamma$  used in different experiments [11].

So far for simplicity we have considered the case in which the distribution is stationary. From the experiments [4] and from granular models [7] we know that the dynamics often enters a quasi stationary regime in which average macroscopic quantities, like the energy or density, changes extremely slowly in time. In these situations we expect the distribution be quasi stationary as in glass models [15], namely still given by (1) where  $\beta$  is slowly dependent on time. Here,  $\beta$  can also be defined from generalized dynamical fluctuation dissipation relations (FDR) extended to granular media [20]. In analogy to eq.(6), in the linear response theory the FDR relates the system response to a perturbation to its time dependent correlation function in the unperturbed state [21,22].

The distribution given by eq.(1) is the equilibrium distribution. When the system is not in equilibrium the probability  $P_r$  will depend on the discrete time  $t_n = n\tau$  where  $n$  is the  $n$ -th tap and  $\tau$  the duration of a single tap. In principle it is possible to write a master equation for such time dependent distribution:

$$\frac{\partial P_r}{\partial t_n} = - \sum_s P_r W_{rs} + \sum_r P_s W_{sr} \quad (9)$$

where  $W_{rs}$  are the transition probabilities from the inherent state  $r$  and the inherent state  $s$ . If the system has to approach the equilibrium distribution in the inherent states space we can assume that detailed balance must be satisfied:

$$W_{rs}/W_{sr} = \exp[-\beta(E_s - E_r)] \quad (10)$$

Now we want to discuss how the statistical mechanics formalism discussed in this paper can work. In a realistic model for granular medium, in order to reproduce a tap process and then calculate the macroscopic quantities, one should consider the detailed dynamical, including the energy dissipated during the collision and then calculate the time average. The formalism developed here suggest to calculate the macroscopic quantities when the system has reached a stationary distribution, by taking ensemble averages instead of time averages. Exchanging time averages with ensemble averages is in fact one of the powerful feature of statistical mechanics. To construct the statistical ensemble one does not need to follow necessarily the exact dynamics but any dynamics which leads to stationarity. In principle one could evaluate  $P_r(t_n)$  directly from (10). Another possibility is to construct a dynamics which allows to visit the inherent states and mimics the tapping process. For instance, at the simplest level, a single tap can be schematically reproduced by introducing an effective time dependent bath temperature,  $T_{bath}(t)$ , which is a step function which assumes two values:  $T_{bath}(t) = T_{\Gamma} > 0$  when the vibration is on (and the grains average kinetic

energy is larger than zero) and  $T_{bath}(t) = 0$  when the vibration is over (and the kinetic energy is zero). A “tapping sequence” is the cyclical repetition of the above schematic tap [7,9]. This mimics the shaking process where  $T_\Gamma$  plays the role of the shaking amplitude  $\Gamma$  in the experiments, and allows to explore the inherent states visited when  $T_{bath} = 0$ . In general the parameter  $T_\Gamma$  is different from the temperature  $T_{conf}$  previously introduced to describe stationary inherent states:  $T_\Gamma$  is related to the agitation of grains induced by the external drive, while  $T_{conf}$  is the configurational temperature which characterizes the “frozen” inherent states. These two quantities are linked through the functional relation (8) where  $\Gamma$  is replaced by  $T_\Gamma$ .

During the shaking process, when the kinetic energy is different from zero, the state  $k$  of the system is not necessarily a mechanical stable configuration. Say  $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$  the probability that the system is in one of such states at time  $t$ . After each tap the system goes into one of the inherent states, say  $r$ . Thus the probability,  $P_r(t_n)$ , to be in the inherent state  $r$  after the  $n$ -th tap is related to the the probability  $\mathcal{P}_r(t)$  by the following relation:

$$P_r(t_n) = \mathcal{P}_r(n\tau) \tag{11}$$

So, within the above models it is possible to evaluate the time dependent distribution function for such particular dynamics and the corresponding energy. At stationarity say  $E$  the value of the average energy, the asymptotic distribution is given by eq.(2) with  $\beta$  corresponding to the energy  $E$ . The above simplified approach to the dynamics of granular media has been recently also discussed in Ref. [23], with an interesting detailed discussion.

Like in statistical mechanics the basic postulate that time averages can be substituted by Gibbs ensemble averages can be considered as a working hypothesis which cannot be proven but can be accepted only a posteriori if the results which follow are correct.

There are many lattice models for granular media [6,7,9] which are based on the above tap dynamics. They are based on an Hamiltonian formalism which takes into account gravity and hard core repulsions which may generate geometric frustration by not allowing two grains to overlap (for a review see [9]). Although the models are rather crude, they have given general results in excellent agreement with experimental findings ranging from logarithmic compaction to segregation, density fluctuations, “memory” and “aging” effects, Fermi-Dirac density profiles, non Gaussian density distributions and others (for a review see [9]). As an example, we show in Fig.1 the average density of the inherent states,  $\rho$ , in one of these models, the Tetris [9], as a function of  $T_\Gamma$ . The system is “shaken” with a given  $T_\Gamma$  for a long time and, after switching off the shaking, the density of the obtained “frozen” state is recorded.

It is very interesting that the results of Fig.1 reproduce qualitatively the reversible line in granular compaction [4] and closely remember the energy of inherent structures as a function of their equilibration temperature before quenching [3].

In conclusion, in this paper we have elaborated the original Edwards’ statistical mechanics approach to granular media to describe the quasi-static distribution of the system in their state at rest that we have called inherent states, in analogy with glassy systems. We have distinguished two different temperatures the zero external bath temperature and the internal configuration temperature related to Edwards’ compactivity, which can be experimentally measured and linked to the driving  $\Gamma$ . We have postulated a Master equation, eq.(9), for the evolution of granular packs among its inherent states. A straightforward application of these ideas reproduces the Fermi-Dirac density distribution found experimentally.

Models from standard statistical mechanics, which can be well understood in the present unifying formalism, are able to describe a variety of properties of granular media [1,5–7,9,19,20,23,24].

This work was partially supported by the TMR Network ERBFMRXCT980183, INFM-PRA(HOP) and INFM Parallel Computing Initiative.




FIG. 1. The average density of the inherent states,  $\rho$ , of a model of granular media (Tetris) as a function of the adimensional shaking amplitude  $T_\Gamma$ . The asymptote (the horizontal dashed line) corresponds to the minimal stability density  $\rho_m$ .

- 
- [1] S.F. Edwards and R.B.S. Oakeshott, *Physica A* **157**, 1080 (1989). A. Mehta and S.F. Edwards, *Physica A* **157**, 1091 (1989). S.F. Edwards, in *Granular Matter: an interdisciplinary approach*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994), A. Mehta ed.
- [2] H.M. Jaeger and S.R. Nagel, *Science* **255**, 1523 (1992); H.M. Jaeger, S.R. Nagel and R.P. Behringer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 1259 (1996).
- [3] S. Sastry, P.G. Debenedetti, F.H. Stillinger, *Nature* **393**, 554 (1998). F. Sciortino, W. Kob, P. Tartaglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3214 (1999);
- [4] J.B. Knight, C.G. Fandrich, C. Ning Lau, H.M. Jaeger and S.R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. E* **51**, 3957 (1995). E. R. Novak, J.B. Knight, E. Ben-Naim, H.M. Jaeger and S.R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. E* **57**, 1971 (1998).
- [5] A. Mehta and G. C. Baker, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 394 (1991); G. C. Baker and A. Mehta, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, 3435 (1992); *Phys. Rev. E* **61**, 6765 (2000).
- [6] A. Coniglio and H.J. Herrmann, *Physica A* **225**, 1 (1996).
- [7] M. Nicodemi, A. Coniglio, H.J. Herrmann, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3962 (1997); *J. Phys. A* **30**, L379 (1997).
- [8] T. Boutreux and P.G. de Gennes, *Physica A* **244**, 59 (1997).
- [9] A. Coniglio, M. Nicodemi, *J. Phys.: Cond. Matt.* **12**, 6601 (2000).
- [10] A connection between Edwards approach and glass theory has also been recently discussed by A. Barrat, J. Kurchan, V. Loreto and M. Sellitto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5034 (2000); cond-mat/0011492.
- [11] For sake of brevity, here we use the symbol  $\Gamma$  to represent all the set of relevant control parameters.
- [12] Even if quasi-equilibrium is reached our basic assumption is legitimated, like the physics of glassy systems suggests.
- [13] J.P. Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and M. Mezard in *Spin-glasses and random fields*, A. P. Young, Ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
- [14] L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan and L. Peliti, *Phys. Rev. E* **55**, 3898 (1997).
- [15] F. Sciortino and P. Tartaglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 107 (2001).
- [16] S. Franz and M. A. Virasoro *J. Phys. A* **33**, 891 (2000)
- [17] D.S. Dean and A. Lefevre, cond-mat/0101166.
- [18] E. Clement and J. Rajchenbach, *Europhys. Lett.* **16**, 133 (1991).
- [19] H. Hayakawa and D.C. Hong, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2764 (1997).
- [20] M. Nicodemi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3734 (1999).
- [21] R. Kubo, M. Toda, N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics*, (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1985).
- [22] see for instance refs in L.F. Cugliandolo, D. Dean, J. Kurchan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2168 (1997).
- [23] A. Prados, J.J. Brey, B. Sánchez-Rey, *Physica A* **284**, 277 (2000).
- [24] D.A. Head and G.J. Rodgers, *J. Phys. A* **31**, 107 (1998). D.A. Head, *Phys. Rev. E* **62**, 2439 (2000).