Dynamics of the four-dimensional spin glass in a magnetic field

Giorgio Parisi,* Federico Ricci-Tersenghi,† and Juan J. Ruiz-Lorenzo‡
Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma La Sapienza, P. A. Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy
(Received 21 November 1997)

We study the four-dimensional Gaussian spin glass in presence of a magnetic field. Using off-equilibrium numerical simulations we have found that the probability distribution of the overlaps is built in the same way as that of the mean-field approximation with replica symmetry breaking. Finally, we have studied the violation of the fluctuation-dissipation theorem in presence of a magnetic field. [S0163-1829(98)05418-6]

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the main open questions in the study of finite-dimensional spin glasses is the existence of a phase transition in presence of an external field. While in the absence of a magnetic field the droplet model[1] and the mean-field (MF) picture[2] both predict the existence of a phase transition, in presence of a magnetic field the situation is completely different: mean field predicts a phase transition whereas the droplet model shows that the magnetic field destroys the frozen phase.

Moreover there are some analytical arguments that imply that the phase transition in the presence of a magnetic field is of a rather peculiar type. For instance, Bray and Roberts,[3] working with a reduced theory (obtained by projecting the original theory in the replicon subspace; in presence of magnetic field that is the only critical mode), have shown that there is no weak-coupling fixed point in magnetic field in their renormalization-group equations also near 6 dimensions. An absence of a weak-coupling fixed point is often taken as an indication of a first-order transition. Here the situation is quite less clear.

The very existence of a transition is still controversial and not too much work has been devoted to its study. Numerical simulations have been done in the past.[4] They were compatible with the possibility of a transition, but the situation was not so clear cut and no convincing conclusions could be reached. Only recently, an off-equilibrium numerical simulation in 4 dimensions has strongly suggested the existence of a phase transition in the presence of a magnetic field.[5]

Two main advantages in using dynamical methods are that we can simulate very large systems (up to 40^4 in this work) loosing practically all the finite-size effects and that they are quicker with respect to an equilibrium simulation, because we do not need to thermalize. These methods have been already largely used in the numerical studies of spin glasses (see, for instance, Ref. 6).

In the broken replica symmetry solution of the Sherrington-Kirkpatrick (SK) model[2,7] there is also a phase transition when the system is plunged into a magnetic field and the line $T_c(h)$ that separates the paramagnetic from the spin glass phase is called the Almeida-Thouless (AT) line.[8] The order parameter of the mean-field theory is the probability distribution of the overlaps, $P(q)$.

In absence of external field $P(q)$ is a δ function centered on $q=0$ for $T>T_c$, while for $T<T_c$ it becomes a highly nontrivial function with two δ functions on the values $q=\pm q_{EA}$ (q_{EA} is the maximum allowed value for the overlap) and a nonzero part between them.

When a magnetic field is switched on, the function $P(q)$ becomes zero for every negative overlap and the minimum allowed value for q is shifted upwards from $-q_{EA}$ to $q_{min}>0$, while the maximum value (q_{EA}) almost does not change. This means, in terms of the distribution function of the overlaps, that for $T>T_c(h)$ the function $P(q)$ is a δ function centered on a strictly positive value and that for $T<T_c(h)$ the function $P(q)$ is the sum of a δ function on the maximum value $q_{max}=q_{EA}$ plus a nonzero part down to $q_{min}>0$ and a smaller weighted δ function on q_{min}.

In this paper we present evidence for a mean-field-like phase transition at finite temperature. We show that the order parameter $P(q)$ has a nonzero support: we have characterized numerically the mean, the minimum, and the maximum value allowed, denoted $\overline{q}, q_{min}$, and q_{max}, respectively, and we have found that $q_{min}<\overline{q}<q_{max}$.

The plan of the paper is the following. In the next section we fix the notation and we describe the quantities we have measured. In Sec. III we show the numerical results. Finally, we present the conclusions.

II. THE MODEL AND THE OBSERVABLES

We have simulated the Gaussian Ising spin glass in four dimensions on a hypercubic lattice of volume $N=L^4$ with periodic boundary conditions. The Hamiltonian of the system is given by

$$\mathcal{H}=-\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma_i J_{ij}\sigma_j-\sum_i \sigma_i h_i. \tag{1}$$

By $\langle ij\rangle$ we denote the sum over nearest-neighbor pairs. We use Ising spin variables, $\sigma_i=\pm 1$. The J_{ij} are Gaussian variables with zero mean and unitary variance. The external field is also Gaussian with zero mean and variance h_0^2. We have studied systems with $h_0=0.05,0.1,0.2,0.3,0.5$.

We can justify the choice of a Gaussian magnetic field as follows. The starting point is the Ising spin glass Hamiltonian with an uniform magnetic field h_0

$$\mathcal{H}_0=-\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma_i J_{ij}\sigma_j-h_0\sum_i \sigma_i. \tag{2}$$

 © 1998 The American Physical Society

We can perform the following transformation (a ''local gauge transformation'') on the couplings: $J_{ij} \rightarrow J'_{ij} \equiv n_i J_{ij} n_j$, where $n_i = +1$ or -1. This transformation leaves the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0$ unchanged because the probability distribution of the couplings is Gaussian $[J_{ij}^2 = (J'_{ij})^2]$. Now we recast the spins to $s_i \equiv n_i \sigma_i$, and finally our Hamiltonian reads

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = -\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} s_i J_{ij} s_j - \sum_i (h_0 n'_i) s_i, \tag{3}$$

where $n'_i = 1/n_i$. We remark the full arbitrariness of the choice of n'_i's. In particular we can choose them from a bimodal distribution: i.e., $n'_i = 1$ with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and $n'_i = -1$ with the same probability. And so, if we define $h'_i \equiv h_0 n'_i$, the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = -\sum_{\langle ij \rangle} s_i J_{ij} s_j - \sum_i h'_i s_i. \tag{4}$$

We have therefore shown that a spin glass with an uniform magnetic field (h_0) is equivalent to a spin glass in which the magnetic field is random with zero mean and variance h_0^2. The probability distribution of such a magnetic field is bimodal, not Gaussian. Nevertheless, there is no reason to suppose a different physical behavior for these two cases (bimodal and Gaussian). We have chosen a Gaussian distribution, and not a bimodal one, because in the Gaussian case there are exact relations among some quantities.

We are interested in measuring, without doing expensive equilibrium simulations, the mean value of the overlap between two replicas, which is defined as $\overline{q} = \int q P(q) \mathrm{d}q$ [as usual $P(q)$ is the equilibrium probability distribution of the overlap $q = N^{-1} \Sigma_i \sigma_i \tau_i$, where σ_i and τ_i are the spins of two systems with the same disorder]. If we take two replicas in random configurations (as we do at the beginning of a simulation) their overlap is zero $[q(t) \equiv N^{-1} \Sigma_i \sigma_i(t) \tau_i(t) = 0$ for $t = 0]$. Letting them evolve, the overlap will never increase beyond $q_{\min}$, defined as the minimum overlap allowed at the equilibrium.[9] This fact has been largely verified also in off-equilibrium simulations without magnetic field: during the simulation the overlap fluctuates around zero or slightly grows. This observation gives us a practical tool to calculate $q_{\min}$ via an infinite-time extrapolation, but also asserts that we cannot get information on the whole $P(q)$ simply by looking at the off-equilibrium overlap.

To measure $\overline{q}$, we have exploited a relation valid at equilibrium when the applied field is Gaussian, which reads

$$\frac{\overline{\langle \sigma_i h_i \rangle}}{h_0^2} = \frac{1 - \overline{q}}{T}, \tag{5}$$

where with the overline we mean an average over the quenched random interactions and external fields. This relation can be easily obtained via an integration by parts (exploiting that h_i is a Gaussian random variable) and it is exact also in a finite volume. In order to compute $\overline{q}$ we can measure $\overline{\langle \sigma_i(t) h_i \rangle}$, which is a quantity that rapidly converges to its infinite-time value. The fact that $q_{\min}$ differs from $\overline{q}$ is a clear signal of replica symmetry breaking.

The second part of our study is focused on the fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) and its generalization in the out of equilibrium regime,[11–13] called off-equilibrium fluctuation-dissipation relation (OFDR). In Ref. 13 a detailed study of such a relation in finite-dimensional spin glasses without a magnetic field can be found. Here we extend those studies in presence of a magnetic field, obtaining similar results, which confirm the mean-field behavior of the phase transition.

To study the OFDR we have measured the spin-spin autocorrelation function $C(t,t_w)$ and the integrated response of the system $\overline{\langle \sigma_i \tilde{h}_i \rangle / \epsilon_0^2}$, where the perturbation to the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ [Eq. (1)], $\tilde{h}$, is a random Gaussian magnetic field with zero mean and variance ϵ_0^2. In the following paragraphs we will obtain a formula that links, even in the early times of the dynamics, the response and the autocorrelation function.

Given a quantity $A(t)$ that depends on the local variables of our original Hamiltonian ($\mathcal{H}$). We can define the associate autocorrelation function

$$C(t,t') \equiv \langle A(t) A(t') \rangle, \tag{6}$$

and the response function

$$R(t,t') \equiv \left. \frac{\delta \langle A(t) \rangle}{\delta \epsilon(t')} \right|_{\epsilon = 0}, \tag{7}$$

where we have assumed that the original Hamiltonian has been perturbed by a term

$$\mathcal{H}' = \mathcal{H} + \int \epsilon(t) A(t)\, dt. \tag{8}$$

The brackets $\langle (\cdots) \rangle$ in Eqs. (6) and (7) imply here a double average, one over the dynamical process and a second over the disorder.

In the dynamical framework assuming time translational invariance it is possible to derive the fluctuation-dissipation theorem, that reads

$$R(t,t') = \beta \theta(t - t') \frac{\partial C(t,t')}{\partial t'}. \tag{9}$$

In spin models a common choice for $A(t)$ is $A(t) = \sigma_i(t)$ or $A(t) = N^{-1/2} \Sigma_i \sigma_i(t)$. In this case, because the system feels a magnetic field, to have a simpler response we should perturb it with a random field $\tilde{h}$ and measure the staggered magnetization. In order to derive a fluctuation theorem where the response is related to the one site correlation, we must chose a perturbation such that the off-site elements of the response are zero.[14] So here we put $A(t) = N^{-1/2} \Sigma_i n_i \sigma_i(t)$, where $n_i = \tilde{h}_i / \epsilon_0$. Thanks to the fact that $\langle n_i n_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$, we have that with this choice

$$C(t,t') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \langle \sigma_i(t) \sigma_i(t') \rangle \tag{10}$$

and

$$R(t,t') = \frac{\delta m_s[\tilde{h}](t)}{\delta \tilde{h}(t')}, \tag{11}$$

where

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)=\frac{1}{N}\sum_i \langle n_i\sigma_i(t)\rangle \tag{12}$$

is the staggered magnetization, which is a functional of the magnetic field $\tilde{h}(t)$ and a function of the time.

The fluctuation-dissipation theorem holds in the equilibrium regime, but in the early times of the dynamics we expect a breakdown of its validity. Mean-field studies[15] suggest the following modification of the FDT:

$$R(t,t')=\beta X(t,t')\theta(t-t')\frac{\partial C(t,t')}{\partial t'}. \tag{13}$$

It has also been suggested in Refs. 15–17 that the function $X(t,t')$ is only a function of the autocorrelation: $X(t,t')=X[C(t,t')]$. We can then write the following generalization of FDT, which should hold in early times of the dynamics, the OFDR, that reads

$$R(t,t')=\beta X[C(t,t')]\theta(t-t')\frac{\partial C(t,t')}{\partial t'}. \tag{14}$$

We can use the previous formula, Eq. (14), to relate the observable quantities defined in Eqs. (10) and (12). Using the functional Taylor expansion we can write

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)=m_s[0](t)+\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}dt'\left.\frac{\delta m_s[\tilde{h}](t)}{\delta\tilde{h}(t')}\right|_{\tilde{h}(t)=0}\tilde{h}(t')+\mathrm{O}(\tilde{h}^2). \tag{15}$$

Exploiting the definition of Eq. (11) and using the fact that $m[0](t)=0$ for every perturbing field orthogonal to the preexisting one, i.e., such that $\Sigma_i\langle n_i h_i\rangle=0$ (which is true if h_i is another (uncorrelated) random field, as happens in our case), we obtain

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)=\int_{-\infty}^{t}dt'R(t,t')\tilde{h}(t')+\mathrm{O}(\tilde{h}^2). \tag{16}$$

This is just the linear-response theorem neglecting higher orders in $\tilde{h}$.

By applying the OFDR we obtain the dependence of the staggered magnetization with time in a generic time-dependent magnetic field (with a small strength), $\tilde{h}(t)$,[18]

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)\simeq\beta\int_{-\infty}^{t}dt'X[C(t,t')]\frac{\partial C(t,t')}{\partial t'}\tilde{h}(t'). \tag{17}$$

Now we can perform the following experiment. We let the system evolve with the unperturbed Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) from $t=0$ to $t=t_w$, and then we turn on the perturbing magnetic field $\tilde{h}$, which is Gaussian distributed with zero mean and time-independent variance, ϵ_0^2. Finally, with this choice of the magnetic field, we can write[19]

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)\simeq\epsilon_0\beta\int_{t_w}^{t}dt'X[C(t,t')]\frac{\partial C(t,t')}{\partial t'}, \tag{18}$$

and by performing the change of variables $u=C(t,t')$, Eq. (18) reads

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)\simeq\epsilon_0\beta\int_{C(t,t_w)}^{1}duX[u], \tag{19}$$

where we have used the fact that $C(t,t)\equiv 1$ (always true for Ising spins). In the equilibrium regime (FDT holds, $X=1$) we must obtain

$$m_s[\tilde{h}](t)\simeq\epsilon_0\beta[1-C(t,t_w)], \tag{20}$$

i.e., $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)T/\epsilon_0$ is a linear function of $C(t,t_w)$ with slope -1. We remark that we can use this formula to obtain $q_{\max}$ as the point where the curve $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)$ versus $C(t,t_w)$ leaves the line with slope $-\beta\epsilon_0$ (as we will explain).

In the limit $t,t_w\to\infty$ with $C(t,t_w)=q$, one has that $X(C)\to x(q)$, where $x(q)$ is given by

$$x(q)=\int_{q_{\min}}^{q}dq'P(q'), \tag{21}$$

where $P(q)$ is the equilibrium probability distribution of the overlap. Obviously $x(q)$ is equal to 1 for all $q>q_{\max}$, and we recover FDT for $C(t,t_w)>q_{\max}$. This link between the dynamical function $X(C)$ and the static one $x(q)$ has been already verified for finite-dimensional spin glasses.[13]

For future convenience, we define

$$S(C)\equiv\int_C^1 dq\,x(q)=\int_C^1 dq\int_{q_{\min}}^{q}dq'P(q'). \tag{22}$$

or equivalently

$$P(q)=-\left.\frac{d^2S(C)}{d^2C}\right|_{C=q}. \tag{23}$$

In the limit where $X\to x$ we can write Eq. (19) as

$$\frac{m_s[\tilde{h}](t)T}{\epsilon_0}\simeq S[C(t,t_w)]. \tag{24}$$

Looking at the relation between the correlation function and the integrated response function for large t_w we can thus obtain $q_{\max}$, the maximum overlap with nonzero $P(q)$, as the point where the function $S(C)$ becomes different from the function $1-C$, and $q_{\min}$ as the smallest value of C.

At this point we have numerical methods to compute three important different values of q: $q_{\max}$, $q_{\min}$, and $\bar{q}$.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

A. $\bar{q}$ and $q_{\min}$

We are interested in the behavior of the system in the out of equilibrium regime, so we do not need to thermalize the sample and we can simulate very large samples of millions of spins (24^4, 32^4, and 40^4). We expect our data not to be affected by large finite-size bias: we find that, in the range of temperature considered, the data for different lattice sizes ($L=24,32,40$) coincide within the error bars, with the largest systems ($L=32,40$) giving practically the same values.



FIG. 1. Data of $q(t)$ (bottom) and $1-\overline{\langle\sigma_i(t)h_i\rangle}T/h_0^2$ (top) versus Monte Carlo time. The curves are the best fits (see text). $L=40$, $h_0=0.3$, and $T=0.5$.



FIG. 2. $\overline{q}$ (top) and $q_{\min}$ (bottom) versus T for $L=40$ and $h_0=0.3$.

All the numerical simulations have been performed on the parallel supercomputer APE100.[20] In the first part of our study we have done simulations using the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1) without perturbing the system ($\tilde{h}=0$).

According to our dynamical approach, we are interested in doing measurements in the off-equilibrium regime of large times. So we perform the simulations following an annealing schedule, with slower and slower cooling rates. This is equivalent to run a simulation at a fixed temperature, considering larger and larger waiting times.[13,21] The advantage is twice: within a single run we are able to collect data at different temperatures and there are smaller finite-time effects because when the temperature is lowered by an amount ΔT the time needed to ''forget'' the previous temperature is smaller than if it had been quenched from $T=\infty$. In the present case the range of temperatures[22] is from $T=3.0$ down to $T=0.5$ with a step of $\Delta T=0.25$. The cooling rates have been chosen in such a way that in the sth annealing run the number of Monte Carlo steps (MCS) is proportional to 2^s, with s ranging from 0 to 12. The annealing procedure is the following: indexing the temperatures from the highest ($i_{T=3.0}=1$) to the lowest ($i_{T=0.5}=11$) the number of MCS at each temperature is $2^s i_T^2$. This means that in the slowest run the system will stay at the lowest temperature for about half a million MCS.

To analyze the data, we fix a temperature, we recollect the data at that temperature from different annealing runs and we extrapolate the result in the limit of infinitely slow cooling. This will give us information on the large times off-equilibrium regime.

In particular, we look at the overlap between two replicas $q(t)$, which start very far from each other: $q(t=0)=0$. In the limit $t\to\infty$ this overlap will tend to the minimum overlap allowed at the equilibrium, $q_{\min}$. Also we have measured $\overline{\langle\sigma_i(t)h_i\rangle}$ from which we obtain the value of $\overline{q}$ using Eq. (5). In Fig. 1 we show the data ($L=40$, $h_0=0.3$, and $T=0.5$) whose infinite-time extrapolation gives the mean and the minimum value for the overlap (top and bottom data, respectively).

We fit the data plotted in Fig. 1 with the following formula: $q(t)=At^{-B}+C$. If the value of the exponent B were too small the uncertainty on the value of C should be very large and the significance of the fit very poor. We have found that it decreases with decreasing temperature or magnetic field and we have checked in all our fits that it were not too small. In Fig. 1 we present the worst case we can fit satisfactory (lowest temperature and $h_0=0.3$), obtaining as the best parameters: $A=-0.069(2)$, $B=0.20(3)$, and $C=\overline{q}=0.792(5)$ for the top data and $A=-1.4(2)$, $B=0.20(3)$, and $C=q_{\min}=0.64(2)$ for the bottom data. Both fits have very good χ^2 values. Note that the best B exponent is the same in both fits. The presence of a power law approach to equilibrium can be associated to the existence of a well defined off-equilibrium correlation length in finite-dimensional spin glasses that grows with a power law of the time.[21,23,24]

The dynamical approach in presence of a magnetic field has the advantage that, using a fitting function of the type $At^{-B}+C$ for any observable in the off-equilibrium regime, the best value for the exponent B is always greater than in the case of exactly zero external field and moreover it has a finite limit when $T\to 0$, while for $h=0$ very often $B\propto T$. The reasons for this difference in behavior are unclear to us.[25]

Now we clearly see the usefulness of the trick of using a Gaussian magnetic field: we can calculate $\overline{q}$ from the extrapolation of $\overline{\langle\sigma_i(t)h_i\rangle}$, which is a practically constant quantity with respect to $q(t)$ (see Fig. 1). Moreover, we do not need to do any limit of small h and so we do not have the problem of very small B exponents.

The same kind of fitting analysis has been done for all temperatures, obtaining values for $q_{\min}(T)$ and $\overline{q}(T)$, plotted in Fig. 2. In the high-temperature phase the extrapolated values for $q_{\min}$ and $\overline{q}$ coincide (as they should because the equilibrium overlap distribution function is a δ function) confirming the correctness of the dynamical method.

Figure 2 gives clear evidence of a wide region ($T<T_c(h_0=0.3)\simeq 1.2$) where the order parameter $P(q)$ is not a single δ function. We have calculated the functions $q_{\min}(T)$ and $\overline{q}(T)$ also for different values of the magnetic field. We see a clear bifurcation also for $h_0=0.5$ at a temperature $T_c(h_0=0.5)\simeq 1.0$, while for lower magnetic fields the results are less clean because the errors are larger (due to the just described problem in the extrapolation procedure).

The last result we present in this section is the shape of the equilibrium magnetization in a magnetic field as a func-



FIG. 3. $\langle\overline{\sigma_i h_i}\rangle/h_0^2$ versus T for $L=40$ and $h_0=0.3$. The curve is only a guide to the eye.



FIG. 4. $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)T/\epsilon_0$ versus $C(t,t_w)$, with $T=0.75$, $h_0=0.3$, and $\epsilon_0=0.06$. The straight line is $1-C$.

tion of the temperature. More precisely, what we show in Fig. 3 is the staggered magnetization $\langle\overline{\sigma_i h_i}\rangle/h_0^2$, but we have verified that it behaves qualitatively and also almost quantitatively like the magnetization in a constant field.

We observe a behavior similar to the one measured in experiments on real samples: the magnetization has a little peak, whose height is greater than the zero-temperature value by a few percent. We want to stress that the peak is at a temperature higher than the critical one, so the magnetization peak is not exactly on the AT line.

B. Fluctuation dissipation in presence of magnetic field

In the second part of our study we have simulated an Ising spin glass in a Gaussian magnetic field with variance h_0^2 ($h_0=0.2,0.3,0.5$) at a fixed temperature ($T=0.75,1.0,1.5$). We have measured, for various waiting times ($t_w=2^8,2^{11},2^{14},2^{17}$), the autocorrelation function, defined in Eq. (10), and the staggered magnetization, defined in Eq. (12), with different amplitudes of the perturbing field ($\epsilon_0=0.02,0.03,0.06$). We are interested in the relation between these two quantities, which tends to the function $X(C)$ in the large t_w limit [see Eq. (24)]. The data do not depend on the choice of ϵ_0 or L, so the results we will show are in the linear-response regime and they are not affected by large finite size biases. In these runs the starting configuration of the spins is always random.

We can keep in mind the possible link between the static and dynamics (that we do not study in the present paper) for a spin glass in presence of a magnetic field and we can compute the qualitative form of the function $X(C)$ using as input the $S(C)$ function obtained in the mean-field approximation and in the droplet model.

From the function $S(C)$ we can get information on the overlap distribution function $P(q)$, through Eq. (23). Here we recall what should be the shape of the function $S(C)$ assuming the validity of one of the competing theories described in the Introduction. The droplet model predicts $P(q)=\delta(q-\hat{q})$ and, consequently,

$$S(C)=1-\hat{q} \quad \text{for } C\leqslant\hat{q},$$
$$1-C \quad \text{for } C>\hat{q}, \tag{25}$$

i.e., there is no dependence of the staggered magnetization on $C(t,t_w)$ in the off-equilibrium regime ($C\leqslant\hat{q}$), like an ordered ferromagnet.[26] On the other hand, the mean-field-like prediction for the overlap distribution[2] $P(q)=(1-x_M)\delta(q-q_{\max})+x_m\delta(q-q_{\min})+\tilde{p}(q)$ (where the support of $\tilde{p}(q)$ belongs to the interval $[q_{\min},q_{\max}]$), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} S(C)=S(0) &\quad \text{for } C\leqslant q_{\min},\\ \tilde{s}(C) &\quad \text{for } q_{\min}<C\leqslant q_{\max},\\ 1-C &\quad \text{for } C>q_{\max}, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\tilde{s}(C)$ is a quite smooth and monotonically decreasing function such that

$$\tilde{p}(q)=-\left.\frac{d^2\tilde{s}(C)}{dC^2}\right|_{C=q}. \tag{27}$$

In Fig. 4 we plot $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)T/\epsilon_0$ versus $C(t,t_w)$, with $T=0.75$, $h_0=0.3$, and $\epsilon_0=0.06$. The data are the average over 6 samples of a 32^4 system. We can see from Fig. 4 that, when the data are not on the straight line (FDT or quasiequilibrium regime), they do not lie on an horizontal line, i.e., they depend on the value of the autocorrelation also in the off-equilibrium regime. So we can conclude that the droplet theory is not able to describe the data in the frozen phase.

From Fig. 4 we can obtain also the value of $q_{\max}$ as the point where the data leave the straight line (as explained in Sec. II). Our estimation is $q_{\max}(T=0.75)=0.77(3)$. The same analysis for a different temperature gives $q_{\max}(T=1.0)=0.61(3)$. Both values satisfy the inequality $q_{\min}<\overline{q}<q_{\max}$. More in detail: for $T=0.75$ we have found $q_{\min}=0.60(2)<\overline{q}=0.686(5)<q_{\max}=0.77(3)$ and for $T=1.0$, $q_{\min}=0.55(1)<\overline{q}=0.577(5)<q_{\max}=0.61(3)$.

Interpreting the data using the mean-field picture, we deduce from the small curvature of the function $S(C)$ in the region $C\leqslant q_{\max}$ (Ref. 27) that $\tilde{p}(q)$ is small. Anyway the existence of two different δ functions in $P(q)$ is clear.

To verify the correctness of the method we present in Fig. 5 the same kind of plot for a system which is in the para-



FIG. 5. $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)T/\epsilon_0$ versus $C(t,t_w)$, with $T=1.5$, $h_0=0.3$, and $\epsilon_0=0.02$. The straight line is $1-C$. See text for the short vertical and horizontal lines.

magnetic phase ($T=1.5$, $h_0=0.3$, and $\epsilon_0=0.02$). The data stay, as they should, on the equilibrium line $S(C)=1-C$. The few points which leave the straight line are those with the lowest t_w and large t. This effect is due to the fact that the autocorrelation $C(t,t_w)$ tends to $q_{\min}$ only if the system at time t_w has reached equilibrium. On the contrary if the system is in a random configuration at time t_w the autocorrelation will tend to zero also in a magnetic field. In our simulation the system is in an intermediate situation and so the lowest value for the autocorrelation with $t_w=2^{11}$ is something smaller than $q_{\min}$, while for $t_w=2^{17}$ we think that the system is nearly equilibrated and the autocorrelation does not decrease beyond $q_{\min}$. In Fig. 5 we have reported the value for the equilibrium overlap, $\overline{q}=q_{\min}=q_{\max}\simeq 0.356$, calculated with the annealing runs (vertical line) and the corresponding staggered magnetization (horizontal line). Though it is not very clear from Fig. 5, we have verified that for every t_w the staggered magnetization saturates to the value marked with an horizontal line and that for the greater waiting time the autocorrelation tends to the vertical line.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have obtained, using off-equilibrium simulations, $q_{\min}$, $q_{\max}$, and $\overline{q}$ for the four-dimensional Gaussian spin glass in presence of a magnetic field finding that in the low-temperature region $q_{\min}<\overline{q}<q_{\max}$ according with the predictions of mean-field theory.

This result points clearly toward a phase transition between a spin-glass phase with spontaneously broken replica symmetry ($q_{\min}<\overline{q}<q_{\max}$) and a phase where the replica symmetry is stable ($q_{\min}=\overline{q}=q_{\max}$).

Moreover we have extended the numerical studies of the validity of the fluctuation-dissipation theory obtaining that the function that determines the violation depends only on the correlation, as mean-field theory predicts. We plan in the future to try to link this function (X) with that obtained from the static of the system (x) as it has been done in absence of a magnetic field although some indirect evidences of this link has been shown in the present paper.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge interesting discussions with E. Marinari and F. Zuliani. J. J. R.-L. was supported by an EC HMC (ERBFMBICT950429) grant.

*Electronic address: giorgio.parisi@roma1.infn.it
†Electronic address: riccife@chimera.roma1.infn.it
‡Electronic address: ruiz@chimera.roma1.infn.it

[1] W. L. McMillan, J. Phys. C **17**, 3179 (1984); A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore, *ibid.* **18**, L699 (1985); G. J. Koper and H. J. Hilhorst, J. Phys. (France) **49**, 429 (1988); D. S. Fisher and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 386 (1988); *ibid.* **38**, 373 (1988).
[2] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1987).
[3] A. J. Bray and S. A. Roberts, J. Phys. C **13**, 5405 (1980).
[4] S. Caracciolo, G. Parisi, S. Patarnello, and N. Sourlas, Europhys. Lett. **11**, 783 (1990): J. Phys. (France) **51**, 1877 (1990); E. R. Grannan and R. E. Hetzel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 907 (1991): J. C. Ciria, G. Parisi, F. Ritort, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. I **3**, 2207 (1993); M. Picco and F. Ritort, *ibid.* **4**, 1619 (1994).
[5] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and F. Zuliani (unpublished).
[6] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, in *Spin Glasses and Random Fields*, edited by P. Young (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
[7] G. Parisi, *Field Theory, Disorder and Simulations* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
[8] J. R. L. de Almeida and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. A **11**, 983 (1978).
[9] This can be better understood if we think that $P(q)$ is the equilibrium distribution of a dynamical variable which feels a potential $V(q)=-\log P(q)$. The peak at $q=q_{\min}$ in $P(q)$ corresponds to a deep well in $V(q)$ and if q starts with a value less than $q_{\min}$ it will go downhill towards $q_{\min}$. See Ref. 10 for more details.
[10] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo (unpublished).
[11] J.-P. Bouchaud, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and M. Mézard, in *Spin Glasses and Random Fields* (Ref. 6).
[12] S. Franz and H. Rieger, J. Stat. Phys. **79**, 749 (1995).
[13] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. A **31**, 2611 (1998).
[14] We notice also that in absence of a magnetic fields, a constant field perturbation is gauge equivalent to a random magnetic field.
[15] L. F. Cugliandolo and J. Kurchan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 173 (1993); Philos. Mag. B **71**, 501 (1995); J. Phys. A **27**, 5749 (1994).
[16] S. Franz and M. Mézard, Europhys. Lett. **26**, 209 (1994).
[17] A. Baldassarri, L. F. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, and G. Parisi, J. Phys. A **28**, 1831 (1995).
[18] The symbol $\simeq$ means that the equation is valid in the region where linear response holds.
[19] We ignore in our notation the fact that $m_s[\tilde{h}](t)$ depends also on t_w.
[20] C. Battista *et al.*, Int. J. High Speed Comput. **5**, 637 (1993).
[21] G. Parisi, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. A **29**, 7943 (1996).
[22] We remind that in the four dimensional Gaussian Ising spin glass without external field the transition temperature is $T_c=1.8$.[21]
[23] E. Marinari, G. Parisi, J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, and F. Ritort, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 843 (1996).

[24] G. Parisi, P. Ranieri, F. Ricci-Tersenghi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. A **30**, 7115 (1997).

[25] We would like to recall that numerical simulations of relative small size systems for the SK model indicate that the time for passing at equilibrium from one value of q to an other value of q with the same sign increases as $\exp(AN^{1/4})$ while that for changing the sign of q increases as $\exp(AN^{1/2})$. In magnetic field only the first processes are present and in the SK model they correspond to much faster movements.

[26] A. Barrat, Phys. Rev. E **57**, 3629 (1998).

[27] The data can be fitted also with a straight line, whose nonzero inclination is almost t_w independent.