Replica field theory for deterministic models: I. Binary sequences with low autocorrelation

1994 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 27 7615

(http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/27/23/010)

J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 27 (1994) 7615–7645. Printed in the UK

Replica field theory for deterministic models: I. Binary sequences with low autocorrelation

Enzo Marinari†‡, Giorgio Parisi§ and Felix Ritort†§

† Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Viale della Ricerca Scientifica, 00133 Rome, Italy

‡ NPAC, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13210, USA

§ Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, 00187 Rome, Italy

Received 6 June 1994, in final form 6 October 1994

Abstract. We study systems without quenched disorder with a complex landscape, and we use replica-symmetry theory to describe them. We discuss the Golay–Bernasconi–Derrida approximation of the low autocorrelation model, and we reconstruct it by using replica calculations. We then consider the full model, its low-T properties (with the help of number theory) and a Hartree–Fock resummation of the high-temperature series. We show that replica theory allows us to solve the model in the high-T phase. Our solution is based on one-link integral techniques, and is based on substituting a Fourier transform with a generic unitary transformation. We discuss this approach as a powerful tool to describe systems with a complex landscape in the absence of quenched disorder.

1. Introduction

This paper has been prompted by two main motivations. One comes from a problem whose solution has relevant practical applications, while the other one is more abstract in nature, and is generated from what we have learned in the last few years about disordered systems [1, 2].

We will be dealing with the problem of finding binary sequences with low autocorrelation [3–5]. Sequences of this kind are important in favouring efficient communication, and the practical side of the problem is obvious. We hope we will convince the reader that it is also fascinating from a theoretical point of view.

When we search binary sequences of $+1$ and -1 having minimal autocorrelation we are dealing with a completely deterministic problem, and disorder is not a part of the game. In our starting rules there is nothing random. Still, we will see how the system can indeed have a behaviour that is very much reminiscent of a random system. Changing one spin to optimize a given set of correlations can increase other correlation functions, with a competitive effect which turns out to be typical of a system which contains disordered couplings. We will see that replica-symmetry theory [1, 2] can be a useful tool even for describing this kind of system. We will be able, by using the analogy with a relevant disordered system, to capture the general features of the model. We will try to understand and stress the differences which distinguish a low autocorrelation model from a spin-glass-like model; this will lead us to a detailed discussion of the low-temperature properties of the low autocorrelation model.

0305-4470/94/237615+31$19.50

We present a careful investigation of some statistical mechanic aspects of the problem, by largely extending previous results due to Golay [4] and to Bernasconi [5]. We establish a relation between this deterministic problem and random spin glasses, which we consider a very interesting outcome of this study. Some ideas typical of spin glasses, such as replica-symmetry breaking, can be used successfully in this context.

In section 2 we define the models we will discuss in the rest of the paper. In section 3 we discuss the ground-state structure of the model (also by using well known number theory; see, for example, [6]) and we begin a discussion of its phase diagram and of the low-temperature phase. In section 4 we discuss the validity of the Golay–Bernasconi approximation. We introduce the replica-symmetry approach, define a disordered model and study its behaviour. In section 5 we investigate, in more detail, the high-temperature regime. We perform and describe a high-temperature expansion. We introduce a Hartree–Fock approximation which allows us to write a closed form for the free-energy.

In section 7 we discuss the full phase diagram of the model. In section 6 we introduce one more model which can be solved by using the replica approach. The solution is the same as we get with the Hartree–Fock approximation. In section 8 we draw our conclusions.

The readers who find this problem interesting will be happy to know that much related material is becoming available. Reference [7] mainly contains a study of the dynamical properties of the system which uses the *tempering* Monte Carlo approach [8]. Reference [9] discusses aging in low autocorrelation models. References [10, 11] introduce and discuss more models and analogies with random systems (and, in particular, the open low autocorrelation model; see later). More results, which partially overlap with ours, will be discussed by Bouchaud and Mézard in [12].

2. Definition of the model

Let us consider a sequence of length N of spin variables σ_j. They are labelled by a one-dimensional index j (σ_j, $j = 1, N$), and can take the values ± 1. The Hamiltonian is defined by

$$H \equiv \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} C_k^2 \tag{1}$$

where C_k is the sum of the $\sigma_i - \sigma_j$ correlation functions at a distance $k \equiv |i - j|$. The choice of the boundary conditions, i.e. of the terms we will include in the sum (1), allows us to define two different models.

- The *open* model is defined by using open boundary conditions. In this case C_k is obtained by summing $N - k$ terms:

$$C_k \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N-k} \sigma_j \sigma_{j+k} \,. \tag{2}$$

- The *periodic* model is defined by using periodic boundary conditions. Here we are considering a closed chain, and

$$C_k \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sigma_j \sigma_{(j+k-1)(\mathrm{mod}N)+1} \,. \tag{3}$$

  Here we have summed N contributions, considering all spin couples at a distance k on the closed chain.

The periodic model has some peculiarities which allow us to study it in greater detail. The main tool we will use is the Fourier-transform. We can rewrite the periodic Hamiltonian as

$$H = \frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{p=1}^{N}\left(|B(p)|^4 - 1\right) + 1 \tag{4}$$

where the $B(p)$ are the Fourier-transformed σ_i, and the Fourier transform is defined as

$$B(p) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{i(2\pi p/N)j}\sigma_j \,. \tag{5}$$

In equation (4) we had to subtract a constant factor since in the sum of (1) we do not include the constant correlation at distance zero.

In this paper we will focus on the periodic model. Further results about the open model will be given in [11].

As we have already discussed, much attention has been devoted to the problem of finding the ground state of such a model [3–5]. Here we will continue this effort, but we will also (and mainly) extend our study to the thermodynamical behaviour of the model. We will study its behaviour as a function of the inverse temperature $\beta \equiv 1/T$. Our main efforts will be devoted to the computation of the free-energy density. We define the partition function of our system as

$$Z_N(\beta) \equiv \sum_{\{\sigma\}} e^{-\beta H(\{\sigma\})} \tag{6}$$

where the sum runs over the 2^N allowed configurations of the spin variables, and the free-energy density as

$$f(\beta) \equiv \lim_{N\to\infty}\left(-\frac{1}{\beta N}\ln(Z_N(\beta))\right). \tag{7}$$

Once again, we note that this approach has both a practical interest and a theoretical one. It is interesting to study the full thermodynamical behaviour of the system since this gives more information about the features of the low autocorrelation sequences. We will be interested, for example, in their number and their basin of attraction, and in their stability properties (which can be very relevant for practical applications). On the other hand such a statistical mechanics approach will help us to shift towards the realm of disordered systems.

3. The ground-state energy and a first look at thermodynamics

The ground state of the periodic model defined by the Hamiltonian (1) (with C_k given by (3)) is not known in general. No systematic procedure to construct ground-state configurations for generic N is known. A remarkable exception holds for given values of N, where *ad hoc* constructions exist. Such constructions are mainly based on number theory [6], and they produce spin sequences with a total energy of order 1, i.e. with an energy density $e \equiv H/N$ of order $1/N$ (which tends to zero in the thermodynamical limit).

Let us describe a simple construction†, which works when N is a prime larger than 2 [6]. We set the σ_j variables to -1, 0 or $+1$ by identifying

$$\sigma_j = j^{\frac{1}{2}(N-1)} \bmod N \,. \tag{8}$$

† The same spin sequence can be obtained by directly using Legendre quadratic residues [6]. For all positive integer $j < N$ we compute $J \equiv (j \cdot j) \pmod N$, and we set $\sigma_J = +1$. In all locations but the Nth one (where we set $\sigma_N = 0$), which cannot be obtained through this procedure, we set $\sigma_I = -1$.

In this way we get† $\sigma_j = \pm 1$ for $j < N$, and $\sigma_N = 0$. For example, for $N = 13$, by using this construction we get the sequence

j	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
σ_j	+1	−1	+1	+1	−1	−1	−1	−1	+1	+1	−1	+1	0.

By following this procedure we have obtained a sequence which, except for its last spin, is a legitimate one (in the sense that it is composed by ± 1). Now we will proceed by first evaluating the energy of this quasi-legal sequence, and eventually by computing the effect of modifying the last spin to ± 1, to get a truly legal sequence. We will show that such a sequence is, in some cases, a true ground state (i.e. it has the minimum allowed energy).

Computing the energy of such a sequence is an easy task. Theorems well known by mathematicians [6] tell us that in this case all correlation functions C_k are equal to -1 (we remind the reader we are discussing the periodic model). We can also use Gauss' theorem [6] to notice that here the Fourier-transformed variables take the form

$$B(p) = G(N)\,\sigma_p \tag{9}$$

where $G(N) = 1$ if the prime N has the form $4n + 1$ (with positive integer n), and $G(N) = -\mathrm{i}$ if it has the form $4n + 3$ (in other words, on our sequences the Fourier-transformed variables are equal or proportional to the original x-space variables). It is clear that the Hamiltonian (1) of the periodic model takes the value 1 on our slightly illegal spin sequence .

Now we have to understand what happens when we modify the spin σ_N, by setting it to ± 1. It is easy to see that, when we do, the Hamiltonian changes by a finite amount. Indeed, for N of the form $4n + 3$ the Hamiltonian does not change, and keeps it value of 1. The point is that (as can be easily verified by inspection) the ± 1 sequences are, in this case, antisymmetric around the site N. For N of the form $4n + 1$ the ± 1 sequences are symmetric around the site N, and on the fully legal sequence H takes a value of 5.

Since we are considering N odd, it is clear that for N prime of the form $4n + 3$ the two fully legal sequences we have built (and the sequences obtained by using the translational invariance of the problem, and the ± 1 symmetry) are true ground states. This is because for N odd the minimum value allowed for each C_k is 1, and the minimum value allowed for H is 1. We have exhibited configurations with the minimal allowed energy, i.e. ground states.

Let us state again our conclusion. In the case of N prime of the form $4n + 3$ we have obtained a thermodynamical ground state, whose energy density goes to zero when the volume goes to infinity. Translational invariance and spin-flip invariance imply that the degeneracy of the ground state is at least $2N$.

For other values of N, for example, of the form $N = 2^p - 1$, there are alternative techniques to construct the ground state, based, for example, on the theory of Galois fields [6]. For example, for $N = 2^{57} - 1 = 144\,115\,188\,075\,855\,871$ one finds that the sequence which satisfies the relation

$$\sigma_j = \sigma_{j-24}\sigma_{j-57} \tag{10}$$

is a ground state. If we exclude the trivial case of σ_i identically equal to 1 (which is not a ground state), such a sequence is unique, apart from a translation‡ [6, 13].

† A theorem by Fermat [6] tells us that if j is not a multiple of N than $j^{(N-1)} = 1$, mod N. Therefore in this case $j^{\frac{1}{2}(N-1)} = \pm 1$.

‡ The sequence is specified by its first $p = 57$ elements. Therefore there are $2^p - 1$ different sequences, which is exactly the number of possible translations. It can be shown that every subsequence of p elements appears once and once only, apart from the subsequence with all 1's, which is forbidden.

It is rather interesting to note that in this case the Fourier transform is also very similar to the original sequence. One finds that there exists a value of s such that

$$B(p) = \sigma_{p+s} \,. \tag{11}$$

The deep reasons for this duality between the configuration and Fourier space escape us.

It is quite remarkable that this last sequence is considered, to all practical effects, a good random sequence (see, for example, [13]). We can summarize the status of things by saying that the ground state of our model can be obtained as the *output of a random number generator*! This is surprising, but maybe not so much. When designing a random number generator one wants bit sequences with low autocorrelation. This means that for large values of N the correlation functions should not be proportional to N. A true sequence of random numbers should have autocorrelations of order $N^{1/2}$. One is doing 'better' than this by obtaining sequences with autocorrelation of order 1, and does not seem to cause any practical problem.

For generic values of N we do not have any method to explicitly exhibit the ground state, and we do not know the ground-state energy. The very existence of the thermodynamic limit is non-trivial. One could get different results when N goes to infinity depending on the arithmetic properties of the N sequence one selects. We shall see later that in the high-temperature region the N^{-1} corrections are different for sequences consisting of even or odd values of N. The corrective terms proportional to N^{-3} also change depending whether one selects an N series such that N is or is not a multiple of 3. We will see that, in general, things become more and more complex when we look at higher-order corrections.

In order to get the first hints about the ground states and the thermodynamical behaviour of the system we have used two approaches. In the first approach we have solved exactly (by computing the density of states by exact enumeration) systems of size up to $N = 38$. By examining all configurations we have computed the number of configurations of a given energy $\mathcal{N}(E)$ as a function of E. We have looked at the ground-state energy E_0, and stored and analysed the ground-state and the first-excited-state configurations (at least for some of the N values). From $\mathcal{N}(E)$ we are able to reconstruct the partition function, the free-energy density and all the related thermodynamical quantities.

As a second step we have looked for the ground-state energy by using a minimization procedure. For a given N value we start from a random σ_i configuration, and we minimize its energy by single spin-flips. We repeat this procedure until satisfied. We assume we have reached the ground state when the minimum energy has been found F times†. In the case where we also have the exact solution ($N \leqslant 38$) this procedure easily gives the correct ground-state energy. The choice of $F = 100$ recognitions is still safe in the region with N going up to $N = 50$. Low-energy states with a small basin of attraction are the most dangerous. For the case of the good prime $N = 47$ (where by good we mean here of the form $4n + 3$) the first excited state is found a number of times of the order of 50 before finding the true ground state (which in this case, as we have explained, we know exactly).

In figure 1 we plot $(N - 1)$ times the ground-state energy as a function of N. The small filled triangles are from the minimization search. For $N \leqslant 38$ they are circled by larger empty circles (which reminds the reader that in this case we also have the exact result, which coincides with the the minimization result).

At first glance the ground-state energy (E_0) depends quite randomly on N, but we notice some regular patterns which can be of some importance.

† In [14] we are using the same procedure to try to find all solutions of the mean-field equations for the random-field Ising model in 3D.



Figure 1. The ground-state energy times $(N-1)$ as a function of N. The small full triangles are from the minimization search. For $N \leqslant 38$, where we also have the exact solution, the small triangles are circled by larger open circles.

- For N prime of the form $4n+3$ the ground-state energy is the one given by the exact construction we have described before. This is a test of our programs and procedures.
- For N of the form $4n+2$, n zero and a positive integer, i.e. for all of the n we have analysed, we find

$$E_N = 4\,. \tag{12}$$

  We cannot be sure that this behaviour is not an accident, but we have to note that we find it for all values of N of this kind.
- For N of the form $4n+1$, $n \geqslant 8$, i.e. for $N \geqslant 33$, we have found that

$$E_N = 5 - \frac{96}{N-1}\,. \tag{13}$$

  For N of this form, even for N prime, our number-theory-based ground-state construction does not necessarily give a ground state.

We can use these results to try some claims about the $N \to \infty$ limit for the ground-state energy. The *merit factor*, used for estimating how good a low autocorrelation sequence is, for a sequence of length N (and N large, or to agree with standard definitions we need to multiply by N and divide by $N-1$) is given by

$$F^{(N)} \equiv \frac{N}{E^{(N)}}\,. \tag{14}$$

If the energy goes to a constant value in the large-N limit, that means that the system will have a zero energy density, and a diverging merit factor. We know for the primes N of the form $4n+3$ this is exactly what happens. But we also know that such N values



Figure 2. $\mathcal{N}(E)$, the number of configurations of energy E as a function of E. (a) $N = 31$ (a good prime); (b) $N = 33$ (of the form $4n + 1$, non-prime); (c) $N = 34$ (of the form $4n + 2$); (d) $N = 37$ (of the form $4n + 1$, prime).

have zero measure, and selecting such a sequence could not be a reliable way to go to the infinite-volume limit for generic values of N. If the behaviour we have described in (12) and (13) survives in the large-N limit, we have two finite measure sequences (including one N value over 2) which asymptotically have a zero energy density. For the other N values we are not able to draw even tentative and qualitative conclusions like the above.

The number of configurations of a given energy $\mathcal{N}(E)$ allows us, as we have explained, to evaluate the thermodynamical properties of the system. In figures 2(a)–(d) we show $\mathcal{N}(E)$, the number of configurations of energy E as a function of E, for $N = 31$ (a good prime), 33 (of the form $4n + 1$, non-prime), 34 (of the form $4n + 2$) and 37 (of the form $4n + 1$, prime), respectively. In figures 3 and 4 we show the internal energy minus the ground-state energy (normalized between zero and one) and the specific heat as a function of T, for the same N values and a smaller volume, $N = 19$, respectively.

At this point we are able to draw a few tentative conclusions.



Figure 3. The internal energy $E(T)$ minus the ground-state energy (and normalized between zero and one) as a function of T, respectively for $N = 19$ and 31 (good primes chain and dotted curve, respectively), 33 (of the form $4n + 1$, non-prime, short broken curve), 34 (of the form $4n + 2$, long broken curve) and 37 (of the form $4n + 1$, prime, full curve).



Figure 4. As in figure 3, but for the specific heat as a function of T.

- Changing N by a small amount, typically $\Delta N = 1$ (when N is already of order 40), induces large variations in the thermodynamic observable quantities in the low-T region. Fluctuations from one volume size N to a similar one are large, and macroscopic. Such fluctuations forbid any simple extrapolation to the $N \to \infty$ infinite-volume limit (they decrease, however, for increasing N). Their amplitude is compatible with also being proportional to N^{-1} at finite temperature.
- A pronounced peak in the specific heat increases with N, suggesting strongly that in the infinite-volume limit the system undergoes a phase transition. The T position of the maximum of the specific heat decreases with increasing N (in an irregular pattern). In the region of $N \simeq 30$–40 from the position of the peak we estimate a critical temperature $T_c \simeq 0.5$. The nature and the order of the phase transition are difficult to assess.
- The density of states $\mathcal{N}(E)$ for low energies depends on E approximately as

$$\mathcal{N}(E) = 2N\,e^{AE} \tag{15}$$

(remember that the minimal degeneracy of the ground state is $2N$). In our N region A turns out to be strongly dependent on N. Such a dependence can be fitted well by a linear behaviour. This is the same effect we can see in the N dependence of the location of the peak in figure 4. For our large-N values (of order 30–40) the constant A is of the order of 1.5.

- The configurations with energy slightly larger that the ground-state energy are on average not similar to the ground state. The typical mutual overlap of a ground state and a first excited state is not large when N increases†. In particular, typical first-excited-state configurations are not obtained by a single spin-flip operation on one of the ground states. The configurations which are generated by a single spin-flip on the ground state have, on average, energy higher than the first excited state. For example, in the case of N prime of the form $4n + 3$ the energy gap among the ground states and its one spin-flipped excitation is at least of 3. In this case no first excited state is a single spin-flip of the ground state.

  Let us analyse this point in greater detail. For a ground-state configuration s_0^α (the series of the N spin variables σ which form the ground state α) we define the overlap with the first excited state as

$$O_{(0,1)}^\alpha \equiv \frac{1}{N-2} \max_A \left(s_0^\alpha \cdot s_1^A\right) \tag{16}$$

where A runs over all first excited state configurations, α can take values over all ground-state configurations, and the $\cdot$ is the sum over sites of the product of the two spin variables. $O_{(0,1)}^\alpha$ is 1 when the ground state α corresponds to a first excited state which differs from the configuration α in a single spin-flip. This is the maximum possible overlap. If there is the same number of equal spins and different spins $O_{(0,1)}^\alpha = 0$. For a given N value we define the maximum overlap of the ground state and the first excited state as

$$O_{(0,1)}^M = \max_\alpha O_{(0,1)}^\alpha \tag{17}$$

where the maximum is taken over all configurations which have the minimum energy. We plot $O_{(0,1)}^M$ as a function of N in figure 5. The maximum overlap is 1 only for a few values of N (for large-N, the ones of the form $4n + 2$). For good primes it is always very low.

† We define the overlap q of two configurations σ and τ as $q \equiv \frac{1}{N}\sum_k \sigma_k \tau_k$.



Figure 5. $O^M_{(0,1)}$ as a function of N.



Figure 6. $\langle O_{(0,1)} \rangle$ as a function of N.

More useful information can be gathered if we look at the average ground-state to first-excited-state overlap. We define

$$\langle O_{(0,1)} \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_0} \sum_{\alpha} O^{\alpha}_{(0,1)} \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_0$ is the sum running over all ground states and $\mathcal{N}_0$ is their number. We plot



Figure 7. $(N-1)$ times the ground-state energy (full curve), first-excited-state energy (broken curve) and the average energy of configurations obtained by a single spin-flip from the ground state (dotted curve) as a function of N.

$\langle O_{(0,1)} \rangle$ in figure 6. As N increases, the average overlap decreases, and for $N > 22$ we never find a very large average overlap between the ground and first excited states.

At last, in figure 7 we plot the ground-state energies, the first-excited-state energies and the average energy of configurations obtained by a single spin-flip from the ground state (all of them multiplied by $(N-1)$). The difference between a single spin-flip and the first excited state is large, and in this case (even more than in figure 6) the effect does not depend dramatically from the cardinality of N.

- A few configurations with very small energy start to dominate the partition function at low $T < T_c$. We note that our estimate for the constant A coincides with our finite-size estimate for the critical temperature (from the location of the specific-heat peak). The relation $T_c \simeq 1/A$ (which holds in the REM model [15]) seems to apply here with reasonable precision.

  This scenario is very similar to the one we are used to seeing in spin glasses, when a replica-symmetry broken phase exists. In particular, it reminds us of Derrida's random energy model (REM) [15], where at low temperature only a very small set of configurations dominates the partition function [15, 16].
- As we can already see from figure 4, the specific heat becomes very small in the low-temperature region, and very likely be to exponentially small in the thermodynamical limit. We expect that the N^{-1} corrections (which in the REM [15] are proportional to $(N(\beta - \beta_c))^{-1}$) dominate the specific heat in the low-temperature phase for N not too large.
- Derrida's model does not have the divergence of the specific heat at the transition point which we have here. This is likely to be the signature of a transition of a different nature than the one in Derrida's model.

4. The Golay–Bernasconi approximation and a first replica computation

Let us now try to give an approximate analytic evaluation of the thermodynamical properties of the model. We will follow the approach Golay [4] originally introduced (see also Bernasconi work [5]) for the open model, and apply it to the periodic model. We will stress the interest and the obvious limitations of such a simple approximation (which basically amounts to considering the correlation functions C_k as independent variables).

Let us consider the periodic model, and the correlation function C_k as defined from (3). The basic observation is that on a generic random configuration of σ the correlation functions turn out to also be independent variables, randomly distributed according to a Gaussian distribution with variance N. Therefore for the probability distribution of the correlation function C_k we can write

$$P(C_k) = (2\pi N)^{-1/2} \mathrm{e}^{-C_k^2/2N} \tag{19}$$

which holds under our statistical-independence hypothesis. Here k can vary from 1 to N. Let us take N odd. Since in this case the correlation functions satisfy the relation

$$C_k = C_{N-k} \tag{20}$$

for all k values, the Hamiltonian (1) can be rewritten as

$$H \equiv \frac{2}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{(N-1)/2} C_k^2 . \tag{21}$$

In this case we only need to consider $(N-1)/2$ modes. For N even we should add to H the contribution at $k = N/2$ without the factor 2.

In this approximation the partition function is given by

$$Z(\beta) = 2^N \prod_{k=1}^{(N-1)/2} \left\{ \int \mathrm{d}C_k \, P(C_k) \, \mathrm{e}^{-\beta H(C_k)} \right\} \tag{22}$$

where we have used (20) and (21) to have k running only up to $(N-1)/2$. Substituting, we get

$$Z(\beta) = 2^N \prod_{k=1}^{(N-1)/2} \left\{ \int \frac{\mathrm{d}C_k}{\sqrt{2\pi N}} \mathrm{e}^{-C_k^2\left(\frac{1}{2N} + \frac{2\beta}{N-1}\right)} \right\} . \tag{23}$$

For N large we get finally

$$Z(\beta) = \mathrm{e}^{N(\ln(2) - \frac{1}{4}\ln(1+4\beta))} . \tag{24}$$

We have obtained (24) under the assumption that the σ_i are independent variables (and then so are the C_k). This is obviously not true as soon as $\beta > 0$, and the expression (24) fails. Indeed the C_k are not Gaussian independent random variables. For $\beta > 0$ when evaluating the partition function we sample the tail of the probability distribution $P(C_k)$, where the expression (19) is not valid (we will see that the high-T expansion does not coincide with the correct one even at first order). Here we are trying to understand (since until now we have been lacking a better approach: but see later) whether at least in a high-temperature phase (24) we can find a useful approximation to the true behaviour of our system.

From the approximate result for the partition function of (24) we can compute the free-energy density (7), and the usual thermodynamic energy density and entropy. We find

$$f(\beta) = \frac{1}{\beta}\left(\tfrac{1}{4}\ln(1+4\beta) - \ln(2)\right)$$
$$e(\beta) = \frac{1}{1+4\beta} \tag{25}$$
$$s(\beta) = \ln(2) - \tfrac{1}{4}\ln(1+4\beta) + \frac{\beta}{1+4\beta}\,.$$

The behaviour of the energy density is quite reasonable, while the entropy density $s(\beta)$ becomes negative at low temperature (it goes to $-\infty$ at $T = 0$). The entropy density $s(\beta)$ becomes zero at $\beta_G = 10.3702$, where the energy density has the value $e_G \equiv e(\beta_G) = 0.023\,54$.

A possible approximate approach to the problem (along the direction hinted at by Golay and Bernasconi) would be based on saying that this solution is close to the correct one in the high-T phase, for $\beta \leqslant \beta_G$. One would then claim that a good approximation is to state that for $\beta > \beta_G$ general thermodynamical properties (i.e. the fact that both the specific heat and the entropy are not allowed to become negative) imply that the energy density has to remain constant

$$e(\beta) = e_G \qquad \forall\, \beta \geqslant \beta_G\,. \tag{26}$$

We have a scenario which is very reminiscent of the REM [15]. As we have already noticed, an obvious drawback of this point of view, which is built on a series of arbitrary assumptions, is that it does not reproduce correctly even the first non-trivial order of the high-T series expansion. It captures, however, some of the relevant features of the model (like, for example, the presence of an abrupt transition at finite T), and it seems worthwhile to try to understand its features better.

Now we will try to apply the replica method to the problem of sequences with low autocorrelation (as a first stage to try to recover the results of the Golay–Bernasconi–Derrida (GBD) approximation we have just discussed). We know that replica methods have been applied quite successfully [1, 2] to the analysis of systems whose behaviour has remarkable similarities to one of our low autocorrelation sequences. Yet, until now the replica approach has been dealing with a system in which quenched randomness plays a major role. There is nothing *a priori* random in our low autocorrelation sequences, and the replica method could seem out of place here.

However, if it is true that the generic properties of the behaviour of low autocorrelation sequences have something to do (at least for not too low T) with those of a system with quenched disorder, then we can hope to use the replica techniques†.

We will want a random system which mimics the properties of our original ordered system. We will have to identify such a system on the basis of some general principle, and we will see that this will be more or less easy in the different cases.

One possible approach is based on considering a Hamiltonian

$$H_{\{J\}}(\{\sigma\}) \tag{27}$$

which depends on the quenched control parameters $\{J\}$, which are randomly distributed. For a particular realization of the sequence $\{J\}$ such a random Hamiltonian coincides with our original Hamiltonian (in the present case with (21)). Let us suppose that we are able

† The following conclusions and the replica computation presented in the following paragraphs have been obtained independently for the open model by Bouchaud and Mézard [12].

to use the replica approach to compute the average of the thermodynamic functions for the system described by (27). Now we can hope that the result obtained for a generic realization of the random variables $\{J\}$ is the same as we would have obtained by selecting the exact $\{J\}$ sequence which leads to the original Hamiltonian (21). In this case the replica symmetry gives the correct result for the deterministic model. This way of reasoning is potentially very dangerous, and can lead to disaster. The 3D Edwards–Anderson model, once understood (for recent progress see [17]), will very probably not lead to the same solution of the ferromagnetic 3D Ising model. The issue here deals with how *generic* is the special $\{J\}$ sequence which gives the original deterministic Hamiltonian, and cannot be solved *a priori*. *A posteriori*, for example, one can verify if the deterministic and the random models have the same high-temperature expansion (of course this may lead to surprises in the low-temperature region).

A second possible approach is based on the introduction of a control parameter ϵ, and of a Hamiltonian

$$H_{\epsilon,\{J\}}(\{\sigma\}) \tag{28}$$

which interpolates from the random Hamiltonian at $\epsilon = 0$ to the deterministic Hamiltonian at $\epsilon = 1$. If the interpolation is smooth and there are no phase transitions in the interval $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the perturbative expansion around the result $\epsilon = 0$ (which one should be able to obtain) could be used to estimate the results for $\epsilon = 1$.

This is the general framework. We hope that, by using one of these approaches, the replica method will enable us to obtain qualitative and quantitative predictions about the deterministic problem.

Let us start by trying to reproduce the GBD result (i.e. the simple approximation we have just studied) in the framework of replica theory. Our aim will be to consider a soluble random model such that the probability distribution of correlation functions is Gaussian, as in (19). In the high-temperature phase the free-energy density of such a model should be given by the GBD approximation.

We will consider the Hamiltonian

$$H \equiv \frac{2}{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{(N-1)/2} \tilde{C}_k^2 . \tag{29}$$

In this new model the $\tilde{C}_k$ are not simply correlation functions anymore, but they are given by

$$\tilde{C}_k \equiv \sum_{m,j} J_{m,j}^k \, \sigma_m \sigma_j \tag{30}$$

where J are quenched random variables with an average value of order $1/N$ and variance $1/N$. The precise form of the distribution is irrelevant. A possible choice for the distribution of the J variables is

$$\begin{aligned} J_{i,j}^k &= 0 \qquad \text{with probability} \quad 1 - \frac{1}{N} \\ J_{i,j}^k &= 1 \qquad \text{with probability} \quad \frac{1}{N} . \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Random J variables allow connections of random site couples $i - j$. Since the σ_j are connected randomly it is reasonable to expect that in the large-N limit the modified correlation functions $\tilde{C}_k$ are indeed distributed as independent Gaussian variables. So we expect our random model defined by (29) and (30) to have the same behaviour (at least in the high-temperature phase) as the deterministic model defined by (19) and (21).

The model can be studied by means of the usual replica techniques. The partition function

$$Z_{\{J\}}(\beta) = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp\left\{-\frac{2\beta}{N-1}\sum_{k=1}^{(N-1)/2} \tilde{C}_k^2\right\} \tag{32}$$

is quartic in the spin variables σ. We can introduce the variables X_k to disentangle the interaction, getting

$$Z_{\{J\}}(\beta) = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \prod_{k=1}^{N/2} \int \frac{dX_k}{\sqrt{8\pi\beta}} \exp\left\{-\frac{X_k^2}{8\beta} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{N}} X_k \sum_{m,j} J_{m,j}^k \sigma_m \sigma_j\right\} \tag{33}$$

(where for large-N we have written N instead of $N-1$).

We want to compute averages over the $\{J\}$ of the free-energy density of the system,

$$f(\beta) \equiv \lim_{N\to\infty}\left(-\frac{1}{\beta N}\overline{\ln(Z_{\{J\}}(\beta))}\right) \tag{34}$$

where the average is a *quenched* average over the disorder. We can now employ the replica trick, rewriting the average over the disorder of the $\ln Z$ as

$$f(\beta) \equiv \lim_{N\to\infty}\left(-\frac{1}{\beta N}\lim_{n\to 0}\frac{\overline{Z_{\{J\}}(\beta)^n} - 1}{n}\right). \tag{35}$$

By adopting the usual abuse of inverting the two limits we finally get

$$f(\beta) \equiv \lim_{n\to 0} \phi^{(n)}(\beta) \tag{36}$$

where

$$\phi^{(n)}(\beta) \equiv \lim_{N\to\infty}\left(-\frac{1}{\beta N}\frac{\overline{Z_{\{J\}}(\beta)^n} - 1}{n}\right). \tag{37}$$

Computing the average over the disorder of Z^n is easy. By assuming a Gaussian distribution for the J variables† (with zero expectation value and width $1/N$) we find that

$$\overline{Z_{\{J\}}(\beta)^n} = \sum_{\{\sigma\}} \prod_{k=1}^{N/2} \int \prod_{a=1}^{n}\left(\frac{dX_k^a}{\sqrt{8\pi\beta}}\right) \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{8\beta}\sum_{a=1}^{n}(X_k^a)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{m,j}\left(\sum_{a=1}^{n} X_k^a \sigma_m^a \sigma_j^a\right)^2\right\}. \tag{38}$$

The second term in the exponential couples the different replicas. We can rewrite it as

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{a,b} X_k^a \left(\sum_m \sigma_m^a \sigma_m^b\right)\left(\sum_j \sigma_j^a \sigma_j^b\right) X_k^b. \tag{39}$$

In order to decouple this interaction we write 1 as

$$1 = \prod_{a,b}\int dQ_{a,b}\,\delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sigma_j^a\sigma_j^b - NQ_{a,b}\right) \tag{40}$$

and use the Lagrange multipliers $\Lambda_{a,b}$ to rewrite the δ-functions

$$1 = \prod_{a,b}\left[\int dQ_{a,b}\,d\Lambda_{a,b}\exp\left\{i\Lambda_{a,b}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N}\sigma_j^a\sigma_j^b - NQ_{a,b}\right)\right\}\right]. \tag{41}$$

† The result of the computation depends only on the variance of J. Imposing *a priori* $\langle J\rangle = 0$ does not change the result.

Now using (41) in (38) we can integrate over the X_k^a variables, and disintegrate the sum over the σ_j configurations. We get

$$\overline{Z_{\{J\}}(\beta)^n} = \int \prod_{a,b} (\mathrm{d}Q_{a,b}) \prod_{a,b} (\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{a,b}) \mathrm{e}^{-NA(\Lambda,Q)} \tag{42}$$

where

$$A(\Lambda, Q) \equiv G(Q) + F(\Lambda) + T(\Lambda, Q) \tag{43}$$

and we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} G(Q) &\equiv \tfrac{1}{4}\mathrm{Tr}\,\ln\left(\delta_{a,b} + 4\beta Q_{a,b}^2\right) \\ F(\Lambda) &\equiv -\ln\left(\sum_{\{\sigma\}} \exp\left\{\sum_{a,b} \Lambda_{a,b}\sigma^a\sigma^b\right\}\right) \\ T(\Lambda, Q) &\equiv \mathrm{Tr}\,\{\Lambda_{a,b}Q_{b,a}\} \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where the trace Tr is taken over the replica indices, and the integral over $\Lambda_{a,b}$ is taken over the imaginary axis.

In the large-N limit $\overline{Z_{\{J\}}(\beta)^n}$ is dominated by its saddle-point value, i.e. we get that

$$\phi^{(n)}(\beta) = \frac{1}{\beta}\frac{A_{\mathrm{SP}}}{n} \tag{45}$$

where by A_{SP} we have indicated the saddle-point value of (43).

In the high-temperature phase we can look at the replica-symmetric solution, where $Q_{a,b} = 0$ for $a \neq b$. The saddle-point equations for Λ imply that $Q_{a,a} = 1$ (this result is valid at all temperatures). In this way the expression for the free-energy reduces to (25). The result is, as we promised before, the same as the GBD approximation.

Before studying the properties of the broken-replica solution of this stationary equation, we can get some further insight into the model by considering the following generalization:

$$H_{(\alpha)} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha}(N-1)} \sum_{k=1}^{\alpha N/2} \tilde{C}_k^2 \tag{46}$$

where the quantities $\tilde{C}_k$ are defined as in (30). Here we have only changed the number of J values which can couple two sites i and j. Since here we are not dealing with pure correlation functions but with terms which are coupled or not according to the value of a random variable, there are no reasons for fixing the total number of non-zero J values to be of order N^2. For $\alpha = 1$ we recover our previous model.

The model can be solved for generic α and one finds results that are very similar to the previous case. The only difference is that now

$$G(Q) \equiv \tfrac{1}{4}\alpha\mathrm{Tr}\,\ln\left(1 + \frac{4\beta Q^2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right). \tag{47}$$

In the limit in which α goes to infinity all sites are coupled and the model describes an infinite-range 4-spin interaction. In this limit one gets

$$G(Q) \to \tfrac{1}{4}\alpha^{1/2} - \tfrac{1}{8}\sum_{a,b} Q_{a,b}^4 \tag{48}$$

which is the result known for the $p = 4$ model [16]. For α going to zero, frustration disappears. In other words the models based on H_α are related to the generic 4-spin random models in the same way as the Hopfield models are related to the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick model.

In the limit $p \to \infty$ the model with a p-spin interaction coincides with the REM [15]. In the low-temperature phase, replica symmetry is broken at one step [15, 16]. In this case (where $p \to \infty$) the entropy at the transition and below the transition point is zero, and the self-overlap parameter $q(1)$ jumps from 0 to 1 at the transition point [16]. Let us also note that in some sense [16] the $p = 2$ Sherrington–Kirkpatrick case is a special case, and that as soon as $p > 2$ things change. For example, as soon as $p > 2$ the phase transition becomes, as far as the function $q(x)$ is concerned, first order.

We have computed the one-step replica-broken solution for our α-dependent model. In this case the matrices Q and Λ are described by the break-point m and by their value inside a block. In the limit $n \to 0$ we find that

$$G(Q) = \frac{(m-1)\alpha}{4m} \ln\left(1 + \frac{4\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha}}(1-q^2)\right) + \frac{\alpha}{4m} \ln\left(1 + \frac{4\beta}{\sqrt{\alpha}}(q^2 m + 1 - q^2)\right)$$

$$F(\Lambda) = \lambda - \frac{1}{m} \ln \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-x^2/2} \cosh^m(\sqrt{2\lambda}x) - \ln(2) \tag{49}$$

$$T(\Lambda, Q) = \lambda q(m-1).$$

We can now solve the saddle-point equations for A_{SP} under the form (49) for the $p = 4$ spin interaction (our model for $\alpha = \infty$). This gives the free-energy density of the one-step replica-broken solution (that is, exact for the $p \to \infty$ model). Here we find that the entropy at the transition is very small (about 0.01) and that the self-overlap parameter $q(1)$ is very close to 1 (it is greater than 0.95). The GBD approximation describes a scenario with a zero entropy at the transition point, and $q(1)$ jumping from 0 to 1. This means that the difference between the GBD approximation and the infinite-range 4-spin interaction is of the order of a few per cent (with the expectation values of typical thermodynamical observables).

The situation improves if we look at to our model with $\alpha = 1$. In this case, assuming one-step replica-symmetry breaking, we find that the entropy at the transition is tiny (smaller than 0.0001) and that the self-overlap parameter $q(1)$ is very close to 1 (it is greater than 0.99). The inverse transition temperature is practically identical to the one we have found in the GBD approximation (after (25)). Here the Golay–Bernasconi–Derrida approximation is practically perfect.

This completes a quite detailed look at our α-dependent disordered model. We have obtained the one-step replica-broken solution of the model, and it has been useful to show that the model undergoes a finite-T phase transition to a glassy region, where the partition function is dominated by a restricted set of states. The corrections to the GBD approximation can be computed and they turn out to be very small.

5. The high-temperature expansion of the low autocorrelation model and a Hartree–Fock resummation

In the previous section we have used replica theory to analyse and solve a model which does not have the same high-temperature expansion as the low autocorrelation model we started from, i.e. the one defined from (1) and (3). Altogether we have been acting quite recklessly. We have introduced a (maybe not so good) approximation to our original deterministic model, and we have defined (in (46) and (30)) and solved a model with quenched random disorder which reproduces such an approximation. This has been useful to show that replica theory can play an important role even in the understanding of statistical models which do not contain quenched disorder in their formulation. Still, now we are interested in stepping forward, and getting a deeper understanding of our original model.

The first tool we will use to learn more about the full low autocorrelation sequence model is the high-temperature expansion. As a matter of principle this can be done in a very straightforward way, but on practical grounds the fact that the model is non-local creates a lot of complications. For example, the coefficients of the high-T expansion (of the energy density, let us say) are not polynomial in N, as they would be for a well behaved interaction. Only the leading contribution (in N^{-1}) at each order in β is universal, while subleading corrections tend to depend on the cardinality of N (for example, we can have a given polynomial for N odd and a different one for N even, and so on with more and more complicated behaviour).

The direct evaluation of the high-temperature approximation in x-space is possible, but not very convenient, because of the problems we have just described. We have just used it to check the general behaviour of particular classes of diagrams. We have found it convenient to instead use the momentum-space representation Hamiltonian (4). We have computed the leading terms in N^{-1} of the first three non-trivial β^{-k} expansion coefficients for the free-energy density, i.e. we have only considered connected diagrams in the expansion of the partition function $Z(\beta)$.

For example, the coefficient of the β^2 term (for the free-energy density) is

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{3!}\frac{1}{N^7}\left[\sum_{k_1,k_2,k_3} |B(k_1)|^4|B(k_2)|^4|B(k_3)|^4\right]_c \tag{50}$$

where 'c' signifies that in the sum we have only included contributions from connected diagrams. In order to compute the diagrams† one has to analyse separately the case where $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$, the case where two k_i are equal and the one where all the three k's are different. By using this approach we have been able to find that the first three orders of the small-β expansion of the energy density (deduced from the free-energy density by the usual relation $e(\beta) = -\partial(\beta f(\beta))/\partial\beta$) are given by

$$e(\beta) = 1 - 8\beta + 160\beta^2 + O(\beta^3)\,. \tag{51}$$

We have also looked at subleading contributions to the β^2 energy-density term, both in real space and in momentum space. One easily sees that in this case there are diagrams which are proportional to

$$\frac{1}{N^3}\sum_{k_1}\delta_N(3k_1) \tag{52}$$

where $\delta_N(k) = 1 \iff k = 0(\text{mod } N)$. A term of this kind gives a non-zero contribution only if N is a multiple of 3.

The number of relevant diagrams proliferates at the next order in β ($O(\beta^3)$ for the internal energy). Here subleading corrections also contain terms proportional to

$$\frac{1}{N^4}\sum_{k_1}\delta_N(5k_1) \tag{53}$$

which now also distinguish the N values which are multiples of 5.

At last we have been able to check that at order β^4 (again for the internal energy) there are terms of order N^{-5} which even for N odd have a different expression depending on whether $N = 1(\text{mod } 4)$ or not.

Indeed the easiest way to compute the high-temperature expansion coefficients turned out to be based on the exact solution of the systems with size up to $N = 38$ we have described before (together with the insight about the diagram structure we have described

† One has to be be careful in noticing that $|B(p)| = |B(-p)|$, in order to avoid double counting.

in the former paragraphs). Here we have used the density of states $\mathcal{N}_N(E)$. The cumulant of order k

$$\langle H^k \rangle_c^{(N)} \qquad (\beta = 0) \tag{54}$$

can indeed be used to fit the N^{-j} coefficients of the β^k term in the high-temperature expansion. In better educated models such coefficients would be a simple polynomial in N, and the information we have (for N up to 38) would allow us to fit a large number of terms. Here, on the contrary, we have polynomial behaviour only on selected subsequences of N values (which we have discussed before). So the number of terms we have been able to work out is quite low.

Already the term of order 1 in the energy density is different for odd and even N values. We find that

$$e_0^{(o)}(\beta, N) = 1 - \frac{1}{N} \qquad e_0^{(e)}(\beta, N) = 1 \tag{55}$$

where by the subscript to e we indicate the order in β, and by the superscripts (e) and (o) we indicate even and odd, respectively. The same structure survives at the next order in β, giving

$$\begin{aligned} e_1^{(o)}(\beta, N) &= \beta\left(-8 + \frac{24}{N} - \frac{16}{N^2}\right) \\ e_1^{(e)}(\beta, N) &= \beta\left(-8 + \frac{32}{N^2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

We have been able to check directly from the diagrammatic expansion the full expressions (55) and (56) (including all subleading corrections).

We have already explained that at order β^2 we get different results depending on whether N is a multiples of 3 or not. For N of the form $3n + 1$ and $3n + 2$ (integer n) we find

$$e_2^{(\bar{3})}(\beta, N) = \beta^2\left(160 - \frac{1008}{N} + \frac{1856}{N^2} - \frac{1008}{N^3}\right) \tag{57}$$

while for N multiples of 3 we get

$$e_2^{(3)}(\beta, N) = \beta^2\left(160 - \frac{1008}{N} + \frac{1856}{N^2} - \frac{752}{N^3}\right) \tag{58}$$

where here by the superscripts (3) and $(\bar{3})$ we have designated N values which are and are not multiples of 3.

At the next order in β (β^3 for the internal energy density) we have only been able to find the exact polynomial for N not a multiple of 3 or 5 (which for our N values, and indeed up to $N = 77$, coincide with prime values). Here we had nine numbers (the momenta for primes going from 7 to 37) and five coefficients to find. This is redundant enough to allow us to check carefully that we did the right thing. For the other N-value subsequences at this order, and next orders in β, we have not been able to calculate the expansion coefficients. Here we find (with obvious notation)

$$e_3^{(\bar{3},\bar{5})}(\beta, N) = \beta^3\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\left(-5248 + \frac{43\,520}{N} - \frac{124\,672}{3N^2} - \frac{781\,312}{3N^3}\right). \tag{59}$$

As far as the leading N^{-k} term is concerned we have, in this way, gained one order in our small-β expansion, by finding

$$e(\beta) = 1 - 8\beta + 160\beta^2 - 5248\beta^3 + O(\beta^4). \tag{60}$$

Can we learn something more about the model in its high-temperature phase? We hope so, and in order to do that we will now try to write down a statistical model which hopefully resums the high-temperature expansion.

But, for a trivial shift in the energy, we can rewrite the partition function of the low autocorrelation model as

$$Z(\beta) = \int \prod_{i=1}^{N} [\mathrm{d}\sigma_i] \exp\left\{ -\frac{2\beta}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |B_p|^4 \right\} \tag{61}$$

where B_p are the Fourier-transformed variables defined in (5). Let us define now the new Hamiltonian

$$H_\nu(B) \equiv \frac{2}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |B_p|^{2\nu} \tag{62}$$

where now B_p are fundamental variables of the model. In the case, where $\nu = 2$, this Hamiltonian coincides (apart from the trivial energy shift) with the one from the original model. The case $\nu = 1$ will be of great importance, since in this case $H_1 = N$ for all $\{\sigma\}$ configurations.

We can obtain a very simple result if we select only the contributions to the high-T expansion which come from diagrams in which all momenta are set to be equal. This means, for example, we choose from (50) only contributions with $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$.

It is easy to resum these diagrams. In this case we find that the probability distribution for the B_p factorizes in an independent contribution for each momentum, and we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle f(B) \rangle \equiv \int \mathrm{d}B\, \mathrm{d}\overline{B}\, f(B) P(B) \\ &P(B) \propto \exp\left(-|B|^2 - \beta |B|^\nu \right). \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

This result cannot be the correct, complete answer, since it implies that $|B|^2$ is a function of β, while we know that for all β values the correct answer is

$$\langle |B|^2 \rangle = \langle \sigma^2 \rangle = 1 . \tag{64}$$

However, we will see with pleasure that we are not very far from the correct answer.

It is clear that leading contributions coming from diagrams where the flowing momenta are different exist, and we will have to consider them. These contributions generate an interaction in our effective Hamiltonian, and they cannot be neglected. A detailed inspection of the large-N leading contributions in the high-temperature expansion leads us to conjecture that for large-N the partition function of the low autocorrelation model can be written (at least in the high-T phase) as

$$Z_\nu(\beta) \equiv \int \prod_{p=1}^{N/2} [\mathrm{d}B_p\, \mathrm{d}\overline{B}_p] \exp\left\{ -\sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |B_p|^2 \right\} \exp\left\{ \tfrac{1}{2} N g(\mathcal{D}) \right\} \exp\left\{ -\beta \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} H_\nu(B) \right\} \tag{65}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{D}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv \frac{2}{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial B_p \partial \overline{B}_p} \tag{66}$$

the integral is taken over real and imaginary parts of B_p, and g is a function which *does not* depend on ν and which we will compute explicitly.

We have here a guess for the form of $P(B)$. We have a Gaussian weight over the B's, a weight given by the Hamiltonian and an interaction correction term, the function

g. Such a conjecture comes from a comparison with the dominant contributions in the high-temperature expansion of the original formulation of the model. For all terms we have been able to think about the correspondence holds†. As we shall see later, the expression we have conjectured essentially corresponds to a Hartree–Fock approximation.

Let us start by evaluating the partition function (65) for a generic function g.

As usual it is convenient to introduce the representation

$$1 = \int \mathrm{d}x\, \delta(x - \mathcal{D}) = \int \mathrm{d}x \int \mathrm{d}\lambda\, \exp\{\mathrm{i}\lambda(x - \mathcal{D})\}\,. \tag{67}$$

By inserting the δ-function the $\mathrm{d}B\,\mathrm{d}\overline{B}$ integrals factorize, and we get

$$Z_v(\beta) = \int \mathrm{d}x \int_{\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}\lambda\, \mathrm{e}^{\frac{N}{2}(\lambda x + g(x))} \left[\mathrm{d}B\,\mathrm{d}\overline{B} \mathrm{e}^{-|B|^2} \mathrm{e}^{-\lambda(\partial^2/\partial B\,\partial\overline{B})} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta|B|^{2v}}\right]^{N/2} \tag{68}$$

where the derivative operator only acts on the last exponential function.

In order to compute $Z_v(\beta)$ we can use the now familiar expression for the heat kernel. Let us consider the real variable z, and the operator O acting on functions f. The kernel of O, K_O, is defined as

$$(Of)(z) = \int \mathrm{d}z'\, K_O(z, z') f(z')\,. \tag{69}$$

If we now consider the operator $\exp\{-\lambda\partial^2/\partial z^2\}$ we find that its kernel (the heat kernel) has the form

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\lambda}} \mathrm{e}^{-(z-z')^2/4\lambda}\,. \tag{70}$$

We can use this last formula to rewrite $Z_v(\beta)$ (the most transparent approach consists of using the real and imaginary parts of B as independent variables, resulting in two real heat kernels). Now the integrals over the left-hand variable of the two kernels are Gaussian. After integrating them out we are left with the expression

$$Z_v(\beta) = \int \mathrm{d}x \int_{\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}\lambda\, \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{2}N[x/4\mu + \tilde{g}(x) + \ln(\mu) + L(\beta,\mu)]} \tag{71}$$

where we have defined $\mu \equiv (1 + 4\lambda)^{-1}$, $\tilde{g}(x) \equiv g(x) - \frac{1}{4}x$, and

$$L(\beta, \mu) \equiv \ln\left\{\int \mathrm{d}B\,\mathrm{d}\overline{B}\, \mathrm{e}^{-\mu|B|^2 - \beta|B|^{2v}}\right\}. \tag{72}$$

The former expression can be evaluated in the large-N limit by taking its saddle point. One finds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{g}'(x) + \frac{1}{4\mu} = 0 \\ &-\frac{x}{4\mu^2} + \frac{1}{\mu} - \langle|B|^2\rangle_{\mathrm{eff}} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the expectation value is computed with the effective local Hamiltonian,

$$\mathcal{H}(B) \equiv \mu|B|^2 + \beta|B|^{2v}\,. \tag{74}$$

We have also to impose that the sum of $|B|^2$ is one, which was a crucial feature of our original model. If the expectation value of $|B|^2$ is one than the expectation value over the effective Hamiltonian also has to be one, which gives us a third equation

$$\langle|B|^2\rangle_{\mathrm{eff}} = 1\,. \tag{75}$$

† The doubtful reader will find a different derivation of this result in section 6.

We have found that the saddle-point free energy is determined from

$$\tilde{g}'(x) + \frac{1}{4\mu} = 0 \qquad -\frac{x}{4\mu^2} + \frac{1}{\mu} = 1 \qquad \langle |B|^2 \rangle_{\text{eff}} = 1 \,. \tag{76}$$

The second equation of (76) gives us x as a function of μ, i.e.

$$x = 4(\mu - \mu^2) \,. \tag{77}$$

Now we can use the first equation of (76) to determine the function $\tilde{g}$. We find that

$$\tilde{g}'(x) = -\frac{1}{2(1 + (1-x)^{1/2})} \tag{78}$$

which gives

$$\tilde{g}(x) = -\ln(1 + \sqrt{1-x}) + \sqrt{1-x} \tag{79}$$

(where we have omitted an irrelevant constant).

Now it easy to compute the saddle-point free-energy density. One only has to use the third equation of (76) to determine the saddle-point value of μ. The expression for $\ln(Z_\nu(\beta))$ eventually greatly simplifies.

If we are only interested in computing the expectation value of the energy density we can use a shortcut, by noticing that the energy density of the model is the derivative with respect to β of the logarithm of the partition function, and can be expressed as

$$e(\beta) = \langle |B|^{2\nu} \rangle_{\text{eff}} \,. \tag{80}$$

The former identity has to be supplemented by the condition (75), i.e. μ is fixed by setting the expectation value of $|B|^2$ over the effective Hamiltonian to one. In a language suitable to field-theory addicts we can say that only tadpole diagrams have survived. The total contribution of the tadpoles is fixed by the condition (75). Given the simplicity of the result it is quite likely that our proof may be simplified.

*We have tested the correctness of our conjecture by computing the corresponding high-*temperature expansion and by verifying that the first four coefficients are indeed correct, and coincide with (60). Our Hartree–Fock resummation is equivalent, as far as we can see, to the complete low autocorrelation model at least in the whole high-T phase.

6. The replica approach

In the previous section we have succeeded in writing a closed form for the solution of our model in the high-T phase. We are ready now to try to achieve the main result of this paper, and show that replica theory can be used to obtain the solution of a non-random spin model. We will define a disordered model which has the correct high-temperature expansion of the initial non-random model (and contrary to the GBD case here we will not need an approximation), and that can be solved at *all* temperatures by using the replica method.

The model we propose is based on the simple observation that the Fourier transform is a very special unitary operator. Naively one could think to write a model where the Hamiltonian is the one defined in (62) with $\nu = 2$, but the basic configurational variables which will be integrated over are

$$B(p) \equiv \sum_j U_{p,j} \sigma_j \tag{81}$$

where the U matrices are generic unitary transformations, and compute the thermodynamic properties of the model for a random choice of the U matrices. The point here is that the

Fourier transform is *one particular* unitary transformation, and we try to understand what happens if we substitute it with a random transformation.

One has to be slightly more sophisticated than that, since by using generic unitary matrices U at the first orders of the high-T expansion one already gets a result which is different from the one obtained when using the Fourier transform. This effect can be traced to the fact that by using a generic unitary transformation we are ignoring the fact that in the original model we were transforming real functions, and there

$$B(p) = \overline{B(-p)}. \tag{82}$$

This reality property turns out to be crucial, and our model with quenched disorder will have to account for it. In order to satisfy this constraint we will consider the Fourier transform as an orthogonal transformation which carries a real function in a complex one, which satisfies (82). We introduce the variables $A(p)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &B(0) = A(1) \qquad B\left(\tfrac{1}{2}N\right) = A(N) \\ &B(p) = A(2p) + \mathrm{i}A(2p+1) \qquad \text{for} \quad p = 1, \tfrac{1}{2}(N-1) \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

and (for even N) rewrite the Hamiltonian (62) as

$$H = \sum_{p=1}^{(N-1)/2} |A(2p) + \mathrm{i}A(2p+1)|^4 + |A(1)|^4 + |A(N)|^4. \tag{84}$$

Our random model will be defined, in the large-N limit, from the equivalent Hamiltonian (we are forgetting contributions of relative order of magnitude N^{-1})

$$H \equiv \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |A(2p-1) + \mathrm{i}A(2p)|^4 \tag{85}$$

where the A variables are defined from the spin variables s_j as

$$A(p) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N} O_{p,j}\sigma_j \tag{86}$$

and the $O_{p,j}$ are random orthogonal transformations, over which we will integrate.

The model we have obtained can be studied using the replica approach. In order to present the replica computation for models of this kind in a compact way we will describe the solution of a model based on unitary matrices. An explicit computation shows that if we solve the orthogonal model (86) along the same lines we obtain (apart from a rescaling of β) the same thermodynamical behaviour in the large-N limit. We define the Hamiltonian

$$H \equiv \sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |C(p)|^{2\nu} \tag{87}$$

where

$$C(p) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{N/2} U_{p,j}\,\tau_j \tag{88}$$

the U's are random unitary transformations and $\tau_j \equiv \sigma_{2j-1} + \mathrm{i}\sigma_{2j}$. We have effectively written a model which is based on $N/2 \times N/2$ unitary matrices (naively we would have used $N \times N$ unitary matrices), ensuring in this way of getting the correct normalization of the free energy in the high-T expansion. The aim of this section will be to solve this model (which will eventually be of interest for us for $\nu = 2$) and to show that its high-temperature expansion is the same as that for the original low autocorrelation sequence model.

We proceed as in section 4 and introduce replicas. We find that

$$\overline{Z^n} \propto \int \mathrm{d}U\, \mathrm{d}\lambda\, \mathrm{d}C\, \overline{\mathrm{d}\lambda\, \mathrm{d}C}$$
$$\times \sum_{|\tau|} \exp\left\{ \sum_a \left[\sum_{p=1}^{N/2} |C^a(p)|^{2\nu} + \left(\mathrm{i}\left(\lambda_a(p) C^a(p) - \lambda_a(p) \sum_{j=1}^{N/2} U_{p,j} \tau_j^a \right) + \mathrm{HC} \right) \right] \right\} \tag{89}$$

where with $\mathrm{d}\lambda$ and $\mathrm{d}C$ we indicate $\prod_{a,p} \lambda_a(p)$ and $\prod_{a,p} C_a(p)$, with $(a = 1, n)$ and $(p = 1, \frac{1}{2}N)$, respectively. The integrals are taken over the real and imaginary parts of the variables λ and C, and the integral over $\mathrm{d}U$ is over the unitary group. We have to compute an integral of the form

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \exp\left\{ \sum_{p,j=1}^{N/2} \Omega_{p,j} U_{p,j} + \mathrm{HC} \right\} \tag{90}$$

with $\Omega_{p,j} = \sum_a \lambda_a(p) \tau_j^a$, $\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Omega U) \sim N$, and the integral is performed over the unitary group. This problem has been solved in full generality by Brezin and Gross [18]. However, their formula is more complicated than what we need here. At finite non-zero n, in the limit of N going to infinity, only the terms containing one single trace operation survive, and the integral is given by

$$\int \mathrm{d}U \exp\{\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Omega U + \mathrm{HC})\} = \exp\left\{ \tfrac{1}{2} N \mathrm{Tr}\, G\left(\frac{\Omega \Omega^*}{N^2} \right) \right\} \tag{91}$$

where $G(z)$ is a function the form of which we want to derive. Let us consider the case in which the matrix Ω has one single element different from zero, for example $\Omega_{11} \equiv \frac{1}{2} z N$. We define the function $G(z)$ from the relation

$$I \equiv \int \mathrm{d}U \exp\left\{ \tfrac{1}{2} N z U_{1,1} + \mathrm{HC} \right\} = \exp\left\{ N G\left(\tfrac{1}{4} |z|^2 \right) \right\}. \tag{92}$$

The integral over the unitary group is given by

$$I = \int \mathrm{d}U \exp\left(\tfrac{1}{2} N z U_{1,1} + \mathrm{HC} \right)$$
$$= \int \mathrm{d}x\, \delta\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_j^2 - 1 \right) \exp\left\{ \tfrac{1}{2} N z x_1 \right\}$$
$$\simeq \int \mathrm{d}x_1 \left(1 - x_1^2\right)^{N/2} \exp\left\{ \tfrac{1}{2} N z x_1 \right\}. \tag{93}$$

Here we have used the fact that a randomly chosen line of the unitary matrix is only constrained to have the sum of its elements equal to one. The last integral can be evaluated by using the saddle-point method. We find

$$I \sim \int \mathrm{d}x_1 \exp\left(\tfrac{1}{2} N f(x_1, z) \right)$$
$$= \int \mathrm{d}x_1 \exp\left(\tfrac{1}{2} N \left(\log\left(1 - x_1^2\right) + z x_1 \right) \right). \tag{94}$$

The stationary point x_0 of this saddle-point equation gives $I \sim \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}Nf(Z)\right)$. Using (92) we find

$$G(z) = -\ln(\sqrt{1+z}+1) + \sqrt{1+z}\,. \tag{95}$$

This result can also be derived using the Brezin and Gross formulae [18]. G corresponds to the function $\tilde{g}$ of the previous section.

Now we have to compute $\operatorname{Tr} G(\Omega\Omega^*/N^2)$. It is easy to verify that for all positive integer values of P

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left\{\left(\frac{\Omega\Omega^*}{N^2}\right)^P\right\} = \operatorname{Tr}\{(\Lambda Q)^P\} \tag{96}$$

where Λ and Q are $n \times n$ matrices, defined as

$$\Lambda_{a,b} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{p=1}^{N/2} \lambda(p)^a \overline{\lambda(p)^b} \qquad Q_{a,b} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N/2} \tau_k^a \overline{\tau_k^b} \tag{97}$$

which implies

$$\operatorname{Tr} G\left(\frac{\Omega\Omega^*}{N^2}\right) = \operatorname{Tr} G(\Lambda Q)\,. \tag{98}$$

The computation now continues using the standard techniques introduced in section 4. First we introduce auxiliary fields R and M associated with the matrices Q and Λ, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \prod_{ab}\int \mathrm{d}Q_{ab}\,\delta\left(Q_{ab} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_i \tau_i^a\overline{\tau_i^b}\right) \\ &= \prod_{ab}\int \mathrm{d}Q_{ab}\,\mathrm{d}R_{ab}\,\exp\left\{\mathrm{i}R_{ab}\left(Q_{ab} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_i \tau_i^a\overline{\tau_i^b}\right)\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

and analogously for Λ_{ab} and the Lagrange multipliers M_{ab}

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \prod_{ab}\int \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{ab}\,\delta\left(\Lambda_{ab} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_p \lambda(p)^a\overline{\lambda(p)^b}\right) \\ &\sim \prod_{ab}\int \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{ab}\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{M}_{ab}\,\exp\left\{\mathrm{i}\tilde{M}_{ab}\left(\Lambda_{ab} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_p \lambda(p)^a\overline{\lambda(p)^b}\right)\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

Putting it all together we find that we need to compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{Z^n}\sum_\tau \int \mathrm{d}\lambda\,\mathrm{d}\bar{\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}C\mathrm{d}\overline{C}\int \mathrm{d}\Lambda\,\mathrm{d}\tilde{M}\,\mathrm{d}Q\,\mathrm{d}R \\ &\quad\times \exp\left\{\mathrm{i}\tilde{M}\left(\Lambda - \frac{1}{N}\sum_p \lambda_p\overline{\lambda_p}\right)\right\}\exp\left\{\mathrm{i}\tilde{R}\left(Q - \frac{1}{N}\sum_i \tau_i\overline{\tau_i}\right)\right\} \\ &\quad\times \exp\{NG(\Lambda Q)\}\,\exp\left\{|C|^{2\nu}\right\}\,\exp\{\mathrm{i}\lambda C + \mathrm{HC}\}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Performing the integration over the λ variables we finally obtain that $(N\ln(Z))^{-1}$ is given by the stationary point of

$$\overline{Z^n} = \int \mathrm{d}Q\,\mathrm{d}R\,\mathrm{d}\Lambda\,\mathrm{d}M\,\exp\{NA[R, Q, \Lambda, M]\} \tag{102}$$

(where we have defined $M \equiv (4\tilde{M})^{-1}$) which means

$$\beta f = -\frac{1}{Nn}A_{\mathrm{SP}}[R, Q, \Lambda, M]\,. \tag{103}$$

The function A is given by

$$A[R, Q, \Lambda, M] = F_f(M) + \mathrm{Tr}\,\ln(M) - \mathrm{Tr}\frac{\Lambda}{4M} + \mathrm{Tr}\,G(\Lambda Q) - \mathrm{Tr}\,RQ + F_s(R) \tag{104}$$

where

$$\exp\{F_f(M)\} = \int \mathrm{d}C\,\mathrm{d}\overline{C}\,\exp\left\{-\beta\sum_a |C_a|^{2\nu} - \sum_{a,b} C_a M_{a,b}\overline{C_b}\right\}$$

$$\exp\{F_s(R)\} = \int \mathrm{d}\{\tau\}\,\exp\left\{\sum_{a,b} R_{a,b}\tau_a\overline{\tau_b}\right\}. \tag{105}$$

The previous formula is also valid in the case of a continuous distribution of the spins σ. In the present case the spin take the discrete values ± 1, and we have to substitute for the integral by a sum.

In order to solve the saddle-point equations we start by eliminating some of the auxiliary variables. The full set of saddle-point equations for A gives

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial R_{ab}} = -Q_{ab} + \frac{\partial F_s(R)}{\partial R_{ab}} = 0 \tag{106}$$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial \Lambda_{ab}} = -\left(\frac{1}{4M}\right)_{ab} + (QG'(\Lambda Q))_{ab} = 0 \tag{107}$$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial Q_{ab}} = -R_{ab} + (\Lambda G'(\Lambda Q))_{ab} = 0 \tag{108}$$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial M_{ab}} = \frac{\partial F_f(M)}{\partial M_{ab}} + \left(\frac{1}{M}\right)_{ab} + \left(\frac{\Lambda}{4M^2}\right)_{ab} = 0. \tag{109}$$

After some algebra and using the relation

$$G'^2(z) = \frac{1}{4z} - \frac{G'}{z} \tag{110}$$

we can phrase our result in a very simple form. The free energy is given by the stationary point of

$$A[M, R] = F_f(M) + F_s(R) + \mathrm{Tr}\,\ln(4(M - R)). \tag{111}$$

The expectation values of quantities which are local in momentum or in configuration space can be computed using, respectively, the simple Hamiltonians

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{M}} &\equiv -\beta\sum_a |C_a|^{2\nu} - \sum_{a,b} C_a M_{a,b}\overline{C_b} \\ \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{R}} &\equiv \sum_{a,b} R_{a,b}\tau_a\overline{\tau_b}. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

The saddle-point equations for the stationary free energy are now

$$\langle C_a\overline{C_b}\rangle_M = \langle \tau_a\overline{\tau_b}\rangle_R = Q_{a,b} \qquad (M - R)\,Q = 1 \tag{113}$$

where the mean values $\langle\cdots\rangle_M$ and $\langle\cdots\rangle_R$ are evaluated using the Hamiltonians $\mathcal{H}_C$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{R}}$, respectively. The first condition is a clear consequence of the unitarity of the transformation. The second equation has a less clear meaning†.

† We feel a bit guilty at presenting such a complicated proof for such simple results, but this is the best we have been able to do.

In the high-temperature phase the different matrices are non-zero only in their diagonal part. This can be computed in the annealed case $n = 1$. In this case the different matrices have a unique element $Q = 1$, $\Lambda = \lambda$, $R = r$ and M. The free energy is given by

$$\beta f = -\ln \int \mathrm{d}C\, \mathrm{d}\overline{C}\ \exp\left\{-\beta|C|^{2\nu} - M|C|^2\right\} - \log(2) \tag{114}$$

where M is determined by the simple equation

$$\langle |C|^2 \rangle_M = 1\,. \tag{115}$$

The internal energy is given by the relation

$$u(\beta) = \frac{\partial(\beta f)}{\partial \beta} = \langle |C|^{2\nu} \rangle_M \tag{116}$$

which coincides with the corresponding equations of the previous section a part from a rescaling of β.

We have shown that our model reproduces the high-temperature expansion of the effective action conjectured in the previous section. For a random system it is well known that the annealed free energy is a lower bound to the quenched free energy, which enables us to develop at least a partial analysis of our results without doing the explicit computation of the replica-symmetry breaking in the limit $n \to 0$. Indeed, let us notice that in this light the results of the previous section imply that the ground-state energy of the model is greater than 0.025.

Explicit formulae can be written in the case of one-step replica-symmetry breaking. We want all the three matrices R, Q, M to commute. To this end we break each one of these matrices into sub-blocks of equal size m. The different elements are, for instance in the case of the matrix M, $M_{aa} = M_D$ and $M_{ab} = M_1$ if the indices (a, b) do belong to the same sub-block of size m, while otherwise $M_{ab} = 0$. The same holds for the matrix R. The variational parameters are now m, M_D, M_1, R_D, R_1 and $q_1 (Q_{aa} = 2)$, and the saddle-point equations are

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \mathrm{d}\mu(z)\, \langle |C|^2 \rangle_z = 2 \\
&\int \mathrm{d}\mu(z)\, |\langle C \rangle_z|^2 = \int \mathrm{d}\rho(h)\, |\langle \tau \rangle_h|^2 = q_1 \\
&(M_D - R_D) + (m-1) q_1 (M_1 - R_1) = 1 \\
&(M_1 - R_1)(1 + (m-2) q_1) + (M_D - R_D) q_1 = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d}\mu(z) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{|z|^2}{2M_1}\right) \mathcal{Z}(z)^m\, \mathrm{d}z\, \mathrm{d}\overline{z} \\
&\langle f(C) \rangle_z = \int \mathrm{d}C\, \mathrm{d}\overline{C}\ \exp\left(-\beta|C|^{2\nu} - (M_D - M_1)|C|^2 - 2\mathcal{R}(zC)\right) f(C) \\
&\mathrm{d}\rho(h) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{|h|^2}{2R_1}\right) \cosh^m(h_\mathrm{R}) \cosh^m(h_\mathrm{I})\, \mathrm{d}h\, \mathrm{d}\overline{h} \\
&\langle \tau \rangle_h = \tanh(h_\mathrm{R}) + \mathrm{i} \tanh(h_\mathrm{I})\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

We have not studied the solutions of these equations in detail, but from the previous experience we conjecture that there is a transition very similar to the Derrida model, and that such a transition corresponds to a first step of replica-symmetry breaking. We expect the free-energy lower bound we have obtained from the annealed approximation to be very good.

7. A Discussion of the phase diagram

If our initial conjecture about our effective theory and Hartree–Fock resummation is correct we have solved the model in the high-T phase (with two different approaches). This does not mean we have acquired a large deal of information about the low-T phase. Indeed the formulae we have found cannot be valid at all temperatures since (analogously to what happens in the GBD approximation) it leads to negative entropies at low temperatures, and the entropy diverges logarithmically at zero temperature.

In figure 8 we plot our result for the energy as a function of T. In our solution the energy goes to zero only at $T = 0$. In an approximation of the GBD-type the entropy becomes zero at a non-zero T_G, about 0.1, and the $T = 0$ energy does not change in the cold phase, and remains fixed to its value at T_G and different from zero (i.e. about 0.025). It is clear that we have to expect that the high-temperature approximation breaks down before T is lowered to the point where the entropy is zero. More precisely it should break in the region where the free energy is still negative, since the exact result is that the free energy is zero at $T = 0$ (at least for prime values of N and quite likely for all N).

The comparison of these analytic results with the exact computations is very interesting, and we show it in figure 9. In the whole high-temperature region where the energy varies from 1.0 to 0.2 the agreement is very good, strongly supporting the correctness of our solution in this temperature range. There is a disagreement in the region where the energy becomes smaller and $T \to 0$.

The temperature where the free energy becomes zero is about $T_F = 0.30$ (where the internal energy is about 0.074).

At such low T values the probability of finding the system in an excited state, typically a single spin-flip of the ground state, is negligible, since we know that the energy gap is at least of order 3. Let us draw a few possible, plausible scenarios:

- The high-temperature approximation is valid down to a temperature very close to T_F.



Figure 8. The analytic result for the energy as a function of T.



Figure 9. Comparison of the analytic results and the small-N exact solutions. The full curve shows the analytic solution, the dotted curve is for $N = 31$ and the broken curve is for $N = 37$.

At this temperature there is a first-order phase transition to a state with practically zero energy density. In this case the discontinuity in the energy will be close to 0.074, and the discontinuity in entropy close to 0.25. This is the possibility that is favoured from our evidence.

- The high-temperature approximation breaks down at a temperature higher that T_F, i.e. about $T = 0.5$. In this case the transition could very well be of second order from the thermodynamic point of view. We do not have any evidence for this possibility, but we cannot exclude it.
- It is also possible that when $N \to \infty$ for some values of N the energy density remains different from zero. If that is what is happening the analytic results obtained by using replica theory could be exact at all T values, even in the low-T region for these values of N. In other words we suggest the possibility that two different thermodynamic limits can be obtained if we send $N \to \infty$ along different sequences. This would be a rather strange phenomenon (which can happen only due to the infinite-range nature of the forces), however, the non-unicity of the thermodynamic limit is present in a related spin-glass model [11].

From our results we are not able to discriminate in a definitive way between these possibilities.

8. Conclusions

Let us summarize. We have succeeded in obtaining a large body of information about a deterministic system by using replica-symmetry theory. We have defined a deterministic, quite complex model, and as a first step we have studied a simple approximation. We have shown that it is easy to reproduce such a simple approximation by using replica theory. We have resummed the high-temperature expansion of the model, and we have shown that the

replica theory does indeed allow us to solve the model in the whole high-T region. We have found indications about the nature of the transition regime, but we have not been able to describe, in detail, the transition point and the low-T phase.

In order to get the bulk of our analytical results we have written a disordered model, where we have substituted the Fourier transform with a generic unitary transformation (after some thinning of degrees of freedom). The two models coincide at high temperature, but they do (very probably) differ at low temperature. The deterministic model has (very probably) zero energy density at zero temperature, while the second one has a ground-state energy density equal to 0.025. Still, we have to note that if for generic values of N (non-good primes, where we know we get a zero energy density) the deterministic system would admit a ground state with energy equal to $0.025N$, we could appreciate the effect only for N very large, of the order of 200, while we have been able to solve the model only up to $N = 38$. We cannot exclude that in the deterministic model the energy density is indeed non-zero for generic values of N, or even that for different choices of N (of non-zero measure) one could get different behaviour.

We believe that the use of replica field theory for studying systems without quenched noise is a very promising tool, which will be able to lead to precise results both in the high- and in the low-temperature phase. Systems without built-in disorder can have a complex landscape, and one can use replica theory to understand it.

Acknowledgments

We are more than happy to acknowledge very useful discussions and a continuous fruitful collaboration on subjects related to the one of this paper with Leticia Cugliandolo, Silvio Franz, Jorge Kurchan, Marc Mezard, Gabriele Migliorini and Miguel Virasoro. In particular, we are grateful to Marc Mezard for discussing his results with us prior to publication.

References

[1] Mézard M, Parisi G and Virasoro M A 1987 *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond* (Singapore: World Scientific)
[2] Parisi G 1992 *Field Theory, Disorder and Simulations* (Singapore: World Scientific)
[3] Boehemer A B 1967 Binary pulse compression codes *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT13** 156
Turyn R 1968 *Sequences with Small Correlation* in *Error Correcting Codes* ed H B Mann (New York: Wiley) p 195
Schroeder M R 1970 Synthesis of low peak factor signals and binary sequences with low autocorrelation *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT16** 85
Golay M J E 1972 A class of finite binary sequences with alternate autocorrelation values equal to zero *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT18** 449
Lindner J 1975 Binary sequences up to length 40 with best possible autocorrelation function *Electron. Lett.* **11** 507
[4] Golay M J E 1977 Sieves for low autocorrelation binary sequences *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT23** 43
Golay M J E 1982 The merit factor of long low autocorrelation binary sequences *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **IT28** 543
[5] Bernasconi J 1987 Low autocorrelation binary sequences: statistical mechanics and configuration space analysis *J. Physique* **48** 559
[6] See, for example, Schroeder M R 1984 Number theory in science and communication (Berlin: Springer)
[7] Migliorini G 1994 Sequenze binarie in debole autocorrelazione *Tesi di Laurea* Università di Roma Tor Vergata (Rome); to be published
[8] Marinari E and Parisi G 1992 Simulated tempering: a new Monte Carlo scheme *Europhys. Lett.* **19** 451
[9] Migliorini G and Ritort F 1994 Dynamical behaviour of low auto-correlation models *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 7669

[10] Marinari E, Parisi G and Ritort F 1994 Replica field theory for deterministic models: II. A non-random spin glass with glassy behaviour *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 7647
[11] Marinari E, Parisi G and Ritort F 1994 Replica field theory for deterministic models: on the Golay–Bernasconi open model, to be published
[12] Bouchaud J P and Mézard M 1994 Self induced quenched disorder: a model for the glassy transiton *Preprint* cond-mat/9405075
[13] Knuth D E 1969 *The Art of Computer Programming* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley)
[14] Lancaster D, Marinari E and Parisi G in preparation
[15] Derrida B 1981 Random-energy model: an exactly solvable model of disordered system *Phys. Rev.* B **24** 2613
[16] Gross D J and Mézard M 1984 The simplest spin glass *Nucl. Phys.* B **240** 431
[17] Marinari E, Parisi G and Ritort F 1994 On the 3D Ising spin glass *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 2687
[18] Brezin E and Gross D J 1980 The external field problem in the large-N limit of QCD *Phys. Lett.* **97B** 120