

Mean-field equations for spin models with orthogonal interaction matrices

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1995 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 28 5267

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/28/18/016>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 171.66.16.68

The article was downloaded on 02/06/2010 at 00:30

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

Mean-field equations for spin models with orthogonal interaction matrices

Giorgio Parisi and Marc Potters†

Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Università di Roma La Sapienza, P A Moro 2, 00185 Rome, Italy

Received 28 March 1995, in final form 26 May 1995

Abstract. We study the metastable states in Ising spin models with orthogonal interaction matrices. We focus on three realizations of this model, the random case and two non-random cases, i.e. the fully-frustrated model on an infinite-dimensional hypercube and the so-called sine model. We use the mean-field (or TAP) equations which we derive by resumming the high-temperature expansion of the Gibbs free energy. In some special non-random cases, we can find the absolute minimum of the free energy. For the random case we compute the average number of solutions to the TAP equations. We find that the configurational entropy (or complexity) is extensive in the range $T_{RSB} < T < T_M$. We also present an apparently unrelated replica calculation which reproduces the analytical expression for the total number of TAP solutions.

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study the mean-field equations (the TAP equations) for the local magnetization for the fully-frustrated Ising model on a hypercube, or equivalently on a single cell of a hypercubic lattice in the limit of infinite dimensions.

The model is very interesting and has been widely studied. It belongs to the wide class of models which have a non-random Hamiltonian, but behave in a similar (or identical) way to other random models. These models can be studied using the usual techniques for random systems (e.g. the replica method) and in this way one can obtain the correct results (with maybe the exception of the equilibrium behaviour at low temperature, similar to the crystalline state of a structural glass) [1, 2].

In this model (as in the other models of the same class) there are at least two transitions.

- The dynamical transition at which the correlation time diverges. At this temperature static (i.e. equal time quantities) are fully regular.
- An equilibrium transition at which the replica symmetry is broken. Below this temperature there are many equilibrium states available to the system.

If we cool an infinite system below the dynamical transition, its energy does not go to the equilibrium energy and the system remains trapped in a metastable state of higher energy.

Generally speaking one can associate to each stable or metastable state a solution of the TAP equation. On the contrary the inverse relation does not hold. There are many solutions of the TAP equations which do not correspond to stable or metastable states. According to

† E-mail address: potters@venus.roma1.infn.it

the folklore a TAP solution corresponds to a metastable state only if it is separated from other solutions by a barrier whose height diverges with the volume; it seems most of the solutions are separated from other solutions by finite barriers.

The relation between metastable states and the exponentially large persistency time in a given metastable state on one hand, and the properties of the solutions of the TAP equations, on the other, have never been fully understood. The aim of this paper is to contribute in this direction by computing some of the properties of the solutions of the TAP equation in a model which has metastable states.

Another interesting property of the model (absent in its random correspondent) is the presence of a very low-energy state, which cannot be reached with continuity coming from the high-temperature phase. At a given temperature the system has a first transition to a state with very low energy (the crystal state). The behaviour of the system in this low-temperature phase may be understood with good precision by considering the corresponding TAP equation.

There is also another point to which we would like to call the attention of the reader. For the Sherrington–Kirkpatrick (SK) model it has already been noticed that the computation of the total number of solutions of the TAP equations turns out to be equivalent to an apparently unrelated replica computation. More precisely it was found that

$$\tilde{N} \sim \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z_m \quad (1)$$

where prefactors have been neglected and only the exponentially large terms have been taken into account. Z_m is the partition function computed by breaking the replica symmetry into two groups of replicas, one with m elements, the other with $n - m$ terms.

The relation is quite surprising, because the right-hand side may be evaluated without having to write down the very TAP equation.

Apparently there is no known explanation for this phenomenon. Our contribution to this point is to observe that the previous relation also holds in this case, where the form of the TAP equation is much more complex. It is quite likely (as also suggested by Cugliandolo and Kurchan) there should be an isomorphism of two algebraic structures which explains this equality, but we have not progressed in this direction.

It may be interesting to recall that a similar phenomenon happens in ferromagnetic systems with a random temperature or magnetic field. Let us consider the case of a random magnetic field. Here we are interested in finding the probability of having more than one solution to the stochastic differential equation

$$-\Delta\phi(x) + m^2\phi(x) + g\phi(x)^3 = h(x) \quad (2)$$

which plays the role of the TAP equation in this model.

In the replica approach [3–5] it was found that the existence of many solutions is related to the presence of non-trivial saddle points, where the field $\phi_a(x)$ for $a = 1, n$ ($n = 0$) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_a(x) &= f(x) & \text{for } 1 \leq a \leq m \\ \phi_a(x) &= f(x) + \frac{g(x)}{m} & \text{for } m < a \leq n \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and one considers the limit where $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Also in this case the replica symmetry is broken by dividing the replicas into two groups, one with m elements, the other with $n - m$ terms, and taking the limit $m \rightarrow \infty$. This phenomenon seems to be quite widespread.

The plan of the paper is as follows.

In section 2 we recall the definitions of three different models, which have the same high-temperature expansion: the random orthogonal model (ROM) where the coupling matrix is a random orthogonal matrix, the sine model, where the elements of the coupling matrix can be written as the sine of an appropriate expression, and the fully-frustrated models on a single hypercubic cell (FFM). These three models are identical in the high-temperature expansion, because they have very similar coupling matrices.

In section 3 we use the high-temperature expansion to derive the TAP equations.

In section 4 we study the property of the solution of the TAP equation corresponding to the lowest lying state (of zero energy) which exists in the sine model and quite likely exists in the fully-frustrated hypercube (the so-called *crystal* state).

In section 5 we compute the average number of TAP solutions for ROM first using the technique of Bray and Moore [16] and then using the two-replica-group method described above.

In section 6, we study their properties as a function of their free energy both at $T = 0$ and $T \neq 0$. We also find a relation among the properties of the TAP equations and the marginality condition for the dynamical transition and show that, above the RSB transition, the replica symmetric free energy can be written as the sum of contributions from a large number of metastable states.

Finally, in section seven, we present a few concluding remarks and in the two appendices, some technical details needed in the computations of section 5.

2. The model

In what follows we will consider the model defined by the Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j \quad (4)$$

where $\{\sigma_i\}$ is a set of N Ising spin variables ($\sigma_i = \pm 1$) and J_{ij} is an $N \times N$ symmetric orthogonal matrix with large connectivity ($z \gg 1$). To lighten the notation, the matrix J_{ij} will be taken to have zeros on the diagonal†.

2.1. Random orthogonal model

In the random orthogonal model (ROM) the coupling matrix is chosen at random in the set of orthogonal symmetric matrices. The probability distribution (or integration measure) is defined by writing $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{O}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{O}^{-1}$ with \mathbf{D} a diagonal matrix composed of ± 1 and \mathbf{O} a generic orthogonal matrix (not necessarily symmetric) whose probability distribution is defined by the Haar measure on the orthogonal group. We will make use of the identity [6]

$$\int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{J} \exp \left\{ \text{Tr} \frac{\mathbf{J}\mathbf{A}}{2} \right\} = \exp \left\{ N \text{Tr} G \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}}{N} \right) \right\} \quad (5)$$

which holds in the large- N limit when \mathbf{A} is a symmetric matrix of finite rank and where $G(x)$ is given by

$$G(x) = -\frac{1}{4} \log \left(\frac{\sqrt{1+4x^2}+1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{1+4x^2} - \frac{1}{4}. \quad (6)$$

Notice that integration over matrices chosen from a Gaussian distribution (SK model) also yields (5) but with $G(x) = x^2/4$.

† Strictly speaking a generic matrix \mathbf{J} in the ROM and the one for the sine model have non-zero diagonal elements, nevertheless the matrix obtained by setting those elements to zero will also be orthogonal in the large- N limit.

2.2. Sine model

The coupling matrix for the sine model is given by

$$J_{ij} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2N+1}} \sin\left(\frac{2\pi ij}{2N+1}\right). \quad (7)$$

The matrix \mathbf{J} is obviously symmetric and its orthogonality follows from orthonormality relations among simple harmonics. This model was introduced in [6] as a simple Hamiltonian that admits a complex ground state for special values of N . More precisely, if $2N+1$ is prime and N is odd then the Legendre sequence

$$\sigma_j = j^N \pmod{2N+1} \quad (8)$$

which consists of ± 1 is a ground-state configuration of the sine model with energy density $-\frac{1}{2}$. This fact is by no means obvious; the interested reader is referred to [6] for details.

Monte Carlo simulations have shown that the thermodynamical properties of the sine model are the same as those of ROM. The only difference is that for the sine model with $2N+1$ prime there exists a low-lying state—never seen for large N when cooling from high temperature—in which the system remains (at low temperature) if it is put there by hand. One explanation of the similarity between the sine model and ROM is that (7) can be viewed as a (bad) pseudo-random generator, and therefore the couplings are, for all practical purpose, random.

2.3. Fully-frustrated model

Frustration in an Ising-like system (with $J_{ij} = \pm 1$) is defined by the product of the couplings over a given plaquette [7]. If this product is -1 the plaquette is said to be frustrated. One can construct a coupling matrix on a d -dimensional simple cubic lattice such that every plaquette is frustrated. This construction is not unique but all realizations are gauge equivalent so the thermodynamical properties of the model are unique. For a single hypercubic cell, the fully-frustrated condition imposes [8]

$$\sum_k J_{ik} J_{kj} = d \delta_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

Therefore if we divide the couplings by \sqrt{d} the matrix \mathbf{J} will be orthogonal and symmetric. The thermodynamical limit will be taken by letting d go to infinity, which will also ensure that the coordination number is large.

Note that unlike SK on a cubic lattice, for the fully-frustrated model (FFM) the $d \rightarrow \infty$ limit of a single hypercube is not completely equivalent to that of the lattice. The reason is that for SK the distribution of the eigenvalues of the coupling matrix (the celebrated Wigner semi-circle law) is the same both on the single cell and on the lattice. In the fully-frustrated case, the matrix \mathbf{J} has only two eigenvalues $\{-1, 1\}$ for the unit hypercube, while it has a continuous distribution for the lattice, in the range $[-2, 2]$ with RMS value $\sqrt{2}$ [9]. Heuristically, in the high- T phase the system is sensitive to all eigenvalues of the matrix: as we shall see, both models (lattice and unit cell) have the same free energy up to a rescaling of β by a factor of $\sqrt{2}$. On the other hand, in the low- T phase, it is the largest eigenvalues of \mathbf{J} that matter: for example, the ground state of the lattice has twice the energy density of that of the unit cell. It is this difference between 2 and $\sqrt{2}$ that makes it impossible to go from a single cell to the lattice with a simple rescaling of the temperature: their qualitative behaviour should nevertheless be the same.

The ground-state configuration of FFM is not known for $d > 8$. It is conjectured that, with the \sqrt{d} normalization, the ground-state energy density goes to $-\frac{1}{2}$ for large d and

that it is equal to $-\frac{1}{2}$ when d is a perfect square. As with the sine model, Monte Carlo simulations of FFM are well described by ROM; furthermore, they show ageing effects, which strengthens our belief that FFM is a glassy system [10].

3. Mean-field free energy

3.1. Standard high-temperature expansion

Our goal is to derive the TAP equations for the orthogonal model using the high-temperature expansion of the magnetization-dependent (Gibbs) free energy. Before doing so, let us try to understand the standard ($m_i = 0$) high-temperature expansion. We can write

$$e^{-\beta F} = 2^N \det^{1/2}(\beta \mathbf{J}) \int \prod_i \frac{d\phi_i}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\beta} \sum_{ij} J_{ij}^{-1} \phi_i \phi_j + \sum_i \log \cosh(\phi_i + h_i) \right\} \quad (10)$$

where we have introduced a site-dependent magnetic field h_i for later convenience; in this section we set it to zero. We can view this partition function as a theory of N fields in zero dimension. In this language the high-temperature free energy $F(\beta)$ is the sum of connected diagrams whose vertex factors are the coefficients of the Taylor series for $\log \cosh x$, with the propagator βJ_{ij} . The first few terms are

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta F(\beta) &= N \log 2 + \text{diagram 1} + \text{diagram 2} + \text{diagram 3} + \text{diagram 4} + \text{diagram 5} + O(\beta^5) \\ &= N \log 2 + \frac{\beta^2}{4} \sum_{ij} J_{ij}^2 + \frac{\beta^3}{6} \sum_{ijk} J_{ij} J_{jk} J_{ki} \\ &\quad - \frac{\beta^4}{4} \sum_{ijk} J_{ij}^2 J_{jk}^2 + \frac{\beta^4}{12} \sum_{ij} J_{ij}^4 + \frac{\beta^4}{8} \sum_{ijkl} J_{ij} J_{jk} J_{kl} J_{li} + O(\beta^5) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $J_{ii} = 0$ excludes ‘petals’—terms involving $\sum J_{ii}$. The only terms that survive the large- N limit are the so-called ‘cactus’ diagrams—trees made out of loops joined at the vertices (see figure 1). The sum of J_{ij} ’s for cactus diagrams is equal to N if the lengths of all loops are even (even-cacti) and zero otherwise. To show this, we take a cactus diagram and contract each loop to a point starting from the outermost loops, the contraction is done using the orthogonality relation

$$\sum_k J_{ik} J_{kj} = \delta_{ij}. \quad (12)$$




Figure 1. (a) A diagram with a petal, (b) and (c) two non-cactus diagrams, (d) a generic even-cactus diagram.

In other words, the high-temperature free energy is given by N times the sum over the combinatorial factors and powers of β of all even-cactus diagrams. In particular, this free energy is independent of the particular choice of the orthogonal matrix \mathbf{J} .

There is more than one way to calculate this sum. Since it is independent of the matrix \mathbf{J} it must be equal to the (annealed) average over such matrices, recovering the result of [6]

$$-\beta F(\beta) = N \log 2 + NG(\beta) \quad (13)$$

with $G(x)$ given by (6).

More directly, we notice that the desired diagrams are precisely those summed by the high-temperature series of the spherical model. In the spherical model the Ising variables σ_i are replaced by continuous variables S_i constrained to have $\sum_i S_i^2 = N$. Fixing this last constraint with a Lagrange multiplier, the sum over all configurations is then a Gaussian integral which can be done exactly knowing the eigenvalues of the matrix \mathbf{J} , i.e. 1 and -1 in equal proportions. After eliminating the Lagrange multiplier, we find

$$-\beta F_{\text{sph}}(\beta) = \frac{N}{2}(\log 2\pi + 1) + NG(\beta) \quad (14)$$

with the same $G(x)$. The first terms in (13) and (14) are the volume of phase space of the two respective models. A similar analysis was done in [9] for FFM on the full lattice. They also found (13) but with $G(\beta)$ replaced with $G(\sqrt{2}\beta)$.

For comparison, the high-temperature series for SK is easily done; the only surviving diagram is the first one in (11) leaving us with

$$-\beta F_{\text{SK}}(\beta) = N \log 2 + N \frac{\beta^2}{4} \quad (15)$$

where we have used that $\sum J_{ij}^2$ is self-averaging.

3.2. Gibbs free energy

The high- T free energy we have just calculated does not tell us anything about the low-temperature phase. It does not have any singularity for positive β which might signal a phase transition. What we need to compute is the magnetization-dependent free energy (often called the Gibbs free energy). In SK this quantity is exactly the TAP free energy which is still valid in the low-temperature phase. The program is simple, we need to expand (10) in powers of β and h_i and perform a Legendre transform, passing from the variables h_i to m_i using

$$\Phi(\beta, m_i) \equiv F(\beta, h_i) - \sum_i h_i m_i \quad \text{with} \quad m_i \equiv \frac{\partial F}{\partial h_i}. \quad (16)$$

Calculating the first few terms in β by hand, we find

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta \Phi(\beta, m_i) = & -\frac{1}{2} \sum \left\{ (1 + m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + m_i) \right] + (1 - m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - m_i) \right] \right\} \\ & + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} m_i m_j + \frac{\beta^2}{4} \sum_{ij} J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_i^2)(1 - m_j^2) + O(\beta^3). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The first term is the entropy of Ising spins constrained to have magnetization $\{m_i\}$, the second one is minus the 'naive' mean-field energy, and the third corresponds to the Onsager reaction term. In [11] the TAP equations for SK were re-derived in this way, the higher-order terms being negligible in that case. The analysis of the previous section ($m_i = 0$) tells us that for a model with an orthogonal matrix, the high-temperature series will include an infinite

number of non-negligible terms. We must therefore find a systematic way of calculating all the terms in the Gibbs free energy.

In standard field theory, the Legendre transform can be formulated in diagrammatical terms. The Gibbs free energy, also called the effective potential in particle physics, is given by the sum over connected one-particle-irreducible diagrams. This is not true in our case. The reason is that the external field h_i does not appear as a linear source term in (10), instead it appears inside the potential. A shift in ϕ_i would not simplify matters since it would introduce a term quadratic in h_i sufficient to render invalid the usual 1PI derivation. The present authors do not know of any diagrammatic expansion of the Gibbs free energy for the Ising-like system.

It is, however, possible to perform such an expansion algebraically and to give it a diagrammatic interpretation [12]. The weak point of this method is that the vertex weight and the combinatorial factors cannot be calculated systematically. Nevertheless, one can see that the cactus diagrams[†], will appear in the Gibbs free energy with the same weight but with an extra factor of $(1 - m_i^2)$ for each vertex i_k [13]. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\beta\Phi = & -\frac{1}{2} \sum \left\{ (1 + m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + m_i) \right] + (1 - m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - m_i) \right] \right\} + \frac{\beta}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} m_i m_j \\
 & + \frac{\beta^2}{4} \sum_{ij} J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_i^2)(1 - m_j^2) - \frac{\beta^4}{4} \sum_{ijk} (1 - m_i^2) J_{ij}^2 (1 - m_j^2) J_{jk}^2 (1 - m_k^2) \\
 & + \frac{\beta^4}{8} \sum_{ijkl} (1 - m_i^2) J_{ij} (1 - m_j^2) J_{jk} (1 - m_k^2) J_{kl} (1 - m_l^2) J_{li} + O(\beta^6). \quad (18)
 \end{aligned}$$

We now argue that in the large- N limit, all those terms (except for the ‘entropic’ and ‘energetic’ one) are self-averaging, that is, the error introduced by substituting m_k^2 by $q \equiv N^{-1} \sum_i m_i^2$ vanishes in the thermodynamical limit. Equivalently in SK the Onsager term in the free energy is often replaced by $\beta^2(1 - q)^2/4$. We can now resum (18), by noticing that we are now summing over the same diagrams as in the $m = 0$ case. We recover the reaction term of (13) with β replaced by $\beta(1 - q)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta\Phi = & \frac{1}{2} \sum \left\{ (1 + m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + m_i) \right] + (1 - m_i) \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - m_i) \right] \right\} \\
 & - \frac{1}{2} \beta \sum_{ij} J_{ij} m_i m_j - NG(\beta(1 - q)) \quad (19)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the function $G(x)$ is again given by (6).

The same result can be obtained in a more heuristic way. We saw in the previous section that the spherical model reproduces the high-temperature expansion of the model with Ising spins except for the entropic term. It is quite plausible that the two models will have the same Gibbs free energy, except once again for the entropic term. This argument has been used (the other way around) to deduced the right TAP equations for the spherical p -spin model [14]. The general Gibbs free energy for a spherical model with quadratic interaction is given by

$$\beta\Phi_{\text{sph}} = \log \det^{1/2}(\lambda - \beta\mathbf{J}) - \frac{1}{2}N(\log 2\pi + \lambda) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} m_i(\lambda\delta_{ij} - \beta J_{ij})m_j \quad (20)$$

[†] What we call cactus diagrams are called ‘loop diagrams’ in [12]. The difference in terminology arises from the fact that these authors consider restricted sums (sums over different indices with combinatorial factors) while we consider unrestricted sums. The vertex weights coming from the expansion of $\log \cosh x$ are precisely those necessary to go from one type of sum to the other.

with λ determined by the saddle-point equation. Specializing to the case where the eigenvalues of \mathbf{J} are $\{+1, -1\}$ in equal proportions and after eliminating λ we find

$$\beta \Phi_{\text{sph}} = -\frac{1}{2}N(\log[2\pi(1-q)] + 1) - \frac{1}{2}\beta \sum_{ij} J_{ij}m_i m_j - NG(\beta(1-q)) \quad (21)$$

with $q \equiv N^{-1} \sum_i m_i^2$. The first term is the entropy of spherical spins constrained to have magnetization m_i . As expected, it is the only term that differs from (19). Note that in this case we did not need to substitute $1 - m_k^2$ with its average value $(1 - q)$.

Armed with the free energy (19), we can now write down the 'mean-field' or TAP equations for our model. They are given by the partial derivatives of Φ with respect to the m_i 's:

$$\tanh^{-1} m_i + 2\beta G'(\beta(1-q))m_i - \beta \sum_j J_{ij}m_j = 0. \quad (22)$$

Finally, we note that if we substitute in (19) and (22) $G(x) = x^2/4$ we recover the standard result of [15] for SK just as the same substitution in our integration formula (5) recovers the integration over a Gaussian distribution. In section 5, this fact will provide us with an easy way to compare our formulae against those of [16].

4. Minimum of the free energy

The orthogonality of J imposes a simple bound on the energy of any spin configuration. Indeed, a configuration vector $\{\sigma_i\}$ can be decomposed into its projection $\{s_i^+\}$ on the eigenspace with eigenvalue $+1$ and $\{s_i^-\}$ on the complement with eigenvalue -1 . Then we have

$$E(\sigma) = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j = -\frac{1}{2}(|\mathbf{s}^+|^2 - |\mathbf{s}^-|^2). \quad (23)$$

In other words, the energy is bounded below by $-N/2$ and this bound is reached iff σ is an eigenvector of \mathbf{J} with eigenvalue $+1$. Later we shall argue that for a generic large orthogonal matrix the existence of an eigenvector whose every component is either $+1$ or -1 is highly improbable. Nevertheless, we can construct such a matrix, for example the sine model for odd N with $2N + 1$ a prime number. Whether or not FFM admits such a ground state for special values of d and/or in the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ is still an open question. Unfortunately, neither an $e = -\frac{1}{2}$ spin configuration for $d \geq 9$ has been found nor has a proof that it cannot exist.

For the remaining part of this section, we will consider a model that admits an $e = -\frac{1}{2}$ ground state. The TAP equations (22) admit in this case a solution of the form

$$m_i = \sqrt{q} \epsilon_i \quad (24)$$

where the $\{\epsilon_i\}$ are ± 1 and form an eigenvector of \mathbf{J} with eigenvalue $+1$. With this ansatz (22) reduces to

$$q = \tanh^2 \left\{ \beta \sqrt{q} \left[1 + \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + 4\beta^2(1-q)^2}}{2\beta(1-q)} \right] \right\} \quad (25)$$

where we have used (6) to compute $G'(x)$. This solution has specific free-energy given by

$$\beta f = \frac{1 + \sqrt{q}}{2} \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{q}) \right] + \frac{1 - \sqrt{q}}{2} \log \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{q}) \right] - \frac{\beta}{2} q - G(\beta(1-q)). \quad (26)$$

For a given value of q , this is the lowest free energy solution. In fact, the energetic term reaches its lower bound from orthogonality, the entropy is maximum (at fixed q) when all

the local magnetizations are equal in magnitude and the reaction term only depends on q . The absolute minimum of the free energy must therefore be of this form. Equation (25) always admits a solution with $q = 0$. At low temperature it will also admit a solution with non-zero q . Numerically one finds that below $T_a = 0.400\dagger$ a solution with $q = 0.92$ appears but with higher free energy than the paramagnetic solution. At $T_{cr} = 0.178$ ($q = 0.99995$) this solution becomes the true minimum of the free energy.

One might conclude as in [13], that the system undergoes a first-order transition at T_{cr} . This transition is not seen in Monte Carlo simulations of FFM or the sine model when cooling down from high temperature. Besides equation (24), there are many other solutions to the mean-field equations. As we shall see in the next section, for a generic interaction matrix and below a certain critical temperature, their number grows exponentially with the size of the system. It is those solutions and the large free-energy barriers between them that prevent the system from finding the true minimum of the free energy and gives it instead a glassy behaviour.

When the ground-state configuration is known—as in the sine model for special N —it is, however, possible to see this ‘crystalline state’ in Monte Carlo simulations. One has to start in the ground state at $T = 0$ and continuously increase the temperature. Figure 10 of [6] shows the result of such a simulation (sine model $N = 44$ and 806). Calculation of the internal energy for our solution reproduces those curves exactly. Note that for the larger value of N the system stays trapped beyond the point where the paramagnetic solution becomes stable ($T_{cr} = 0.712$ on their scale), this is a clear sign that barriers between different metastable states are very high.

The solution (24) can be transposed directly to the FFM on the lattice by taking care of the appropriate factors of 2 and $\sqrt{2}$ recovering the result of [13]. One important point, though, is that this solution is only valid if the ground-state energy density is $-\frac{1}{2}$ (-1 for the full lattice), otherwise $\{\epsilon_i\}$ is not an eigenvector of \mathbf{J} and (22) does not reduce to (25).

5. Number of TAP solutions

5.1. General result

In this section we will compute the average number of metastable states for ROM. We will follow as much as possible the steps and the notation of [16] where the corresponding result for SK was first derived. Recall our TAP equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_i &\equiv \tanh^{-1} m_i + 2\beta G'(\beta(1-q))m_i - \beta \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} m_j = 0 \\ &\equiv g(m_i) - \beta \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} m_j = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

with corresponding free energy written as a sum of single-site terms:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= (\beta N)^{-1} \sum_i \left[-\log 2 - G(\beta(1-q)) - \beta q G'(\beta(1-q)) + \frac{1}{2} m_i \tanh^{-1} m_i \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \log(1 - m_i^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

We write the number of solutions as the integral over all possible values of m_i fixing with δ -functions that the $\{m_i\}$ form a solution of (27) with free energy f . Using a Fourier

\dagger This paper contains many numbers obtained from numerical analysis, they are noted with equal signs and every digit is significant.

representation of the δ -function, we obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_s(f) = N^2 \int_0^1 dq \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \frac{du}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty}^{i\infty} \prod_i \left(\frac{dx_i}{2\pi i} \right) \int_{-1}^1 \prod_i (dm_i) \exp \left[-N(\lambda q + uf) - \lambda \sum_i m_i^2 + u \sum_i f(m_i) + \sum_i x_i g(m_i) - \beta \sum_{i < j} J_{ij} (x_i m_j + x_j m_i) \right] |\det \mathbf{A}| \quad (29)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \frac{\partial \Gamma_i}{\partial m_j} = [(1 - m_i^2)^{-1} + 2\beta G'(\beta(1 - q))] \delta_{ij} - \beta J_{ij} \\ &\equiv a_i \delta_{ij} - \beta J_{ij} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

dropping a term in $m_i m_j / N$ (see appendix A).

We can now proceed to average (29) over the random couplings J_{ij} . We should really be averaging $\log \mathcal{N}_s$, the extensive quantity, not \mathcal{N}_s . To do so we would need to introduce replicas. The replica-symmetric computation would be tedious but straightforward leaving us not with seven unknown parameters (as will be the case below) but of the order of 14. On the other hand, the direct average will be sufficient to provide us with a clear picture of the metastable states.

There are two terms that depend on the $\{J_{ij}\}$. It is shown in appendix A that the two can be averaged independently. Using equation (5) to average the term involving x_i and m_i , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \exp \left[-\beta \sum_{i < j} J_{ij} (x_i m_j + x_j m_i) \right] \right\rangle &= \exp \left\{ N \operatorname{tr} G \left[\beta \frac{\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{x}}{N} \right] \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ N [G(v + \sqrt{w}) + G(v - \sqrt{w})] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where

$$v = \frac{\beta}{N} \sum_i x_i m_i \quad \text{and} \quad w = \frac{\beta^2 q}{N} \sum_i x_i^2. \quad (32)$$

The second equality in (31) follows from an analysis of the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{x}$. This matrix has only two non-zero eigenvalues corresponding to the two terms: $v + \sqrt{w}$ and $v - \sqrt{w}$.

To compute the average of the determinant we will need to drop the absolute value. This corresponds to weighting each solution with the sign of the determinant of its Hessian matrix. Formally, we would be computing a topological invariant (from Morse theory) which has little to do with our original goal. Nevertheless, the calculation without the absolute value gives sensible results (here and in [16, 17]) and connects smoothly with the zero temperature results where the calculation can be done without this pathology. This problem is discussed in more detail in [18, 19].

We introduce a set of anti-commuting (Grassman) variables $\{\theta_i, \bar{\theta}_i\}$ to express the determinant as an exponential,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \det \mathbf{A} \rangle &= \left\langle \int d\theta d\bar{\theta} \exp \left[\sum_i a_i \bar{\theta}_i \theta_i - \beta \sum_{(ij)} J_{ij} (\bar{\theta}_i \theta_j + \bar{\theta}_j \theta_i) \right] \right\rangle \\ &= \int d\theta d\bar{\theta} \exp \left\{ \sum_i a_i \bar{\theta}_i \theta_i + N \operatorname{Tr} G \left[\beta \frac{\bar{\theta} \otimes \theta - \theta \otimes \bar{\theta}}{N} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

If we expand $\text{Tr } G[\dots]$ in a Taylor series, we can use the following property of Grassman variables:

$$(\bar{\theta}_{i_1}\theta_{i_2} + \bar{\theta}_{i_2}\theta_{i_1})(\bar{\theta}_{i_2}\theta_{i_3} + \bar{\theta}_{i_3}\theta_{i_2}) \dots (\bar{\theta}_{i_n}\theta_{i_1} + \bar{\theta}_{i_1}\theta_{i_n}) = -2 \prod_{k=1}^n \bar{\theta}_{i_k}\theta_{i_k} \tag{34}$$

which allows us to resum the series and find

$$\langle \det \mathbf{A} \rangle = \int d\theta d\bar{\theta} \exp \left\{ \sum_i a_i \bar{\theta}_i \theta_i - 2NG \left[\frac{\beta}{N} \sum_i \bar{\theta}_i \theta_i \right] \right\}. \tag{35}$$

Finally we fix $r = (\beta/N) \sum_i \bar{\theta}_i \theta_i$ using a Lagrange multiplier R , which allows us to perform the integration over the Grassman variables, leaving us with

$$\langle \det \mathbf{A} \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dr \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dR}{2\pi i} \prod_i (a_i + \beta R) \exp\{N[-rR - 2G(r)]\}. \tag{36}$$

We now collect results from (29), (31) and (36), introduce Lagrange multipliers V and W to impose (32), perform the x_i integration, drop multiplicative prefactors and finally set $V = 2G'(\beta(1-q)) - \Delta$, $R = B/\beta - 2G'(\beta(1-q))$ and $r = \beta b$, to obtain

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_s(f) \rangle = \text{Ext} \exp \left\{ N \left[-\lambda q - uf - bB - v\Delta - wW/q + G(\bar{v} + \sqrt{w}) + G(v - \sqrt{w}) - 2G(\beta b) + 2(\beta b - v)G'(\beta(1-q)) + \log I \right] \right\} \tag{37}$$

where

$$I = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{dm}{2\beta\sqrt{\pi W}} \left(\frac{1}{1-m^2} + B \right) \exp \left[-\frac{(\tanh^{-1} m - \beta \Delta m)^2}{4\beta^2 W} + \lambda m^2 + uf(m) \right]. \tag{38}$$

We have indicated by Ext that the right-hand side of (37) is to be extremized with respect to the nine variables: $\lambda, q, u, b, B, v, \Delta, w$ and W . By partial differentiation with respect to those variables, we obtain the saddle-point equations. They admit a solution with $B = 0$ which implies $b = 1 - q$; following [16] we adopt this solution. This choice will also lead us to the correct $T = 0$ result.

As mentioned earlier, the result for SK can be obtained from (37) by setting $G(x) = x^2/4$. In this case, three variables can be eliminated using the saddle-point equations to give the same expression as in [16].

5.2. Two-group method

In this section we will divert slightly from our analysis of the thermodynamics of the orthogonal model to look at a puzzling analytical ‘coincidence.’ Indeed, the expression for the average number of TAP solutions can be obtained by computing the partition function for a certain replica-symmetry breaking scheme. The ‘two-group model’ was first introduced in [20] as an attempt to break replica symmetry in SK. It was later noticed [21] that the partition function $(\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \langle Z_{2G}^n \rangle_J)$ in this framework is not equal to unity but instead one has

$$\langle Z_{2G}^n \rangle = \int df \langle \mathcal{N}_s(f) \rangle e^{-n\beta N f} \tag{39}$$

and in particular $\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \langle Z_{2G}^n \rangle_J$ gives the average number of TAP solutions $(\langle \mathcal{N}_s \rangle_J)$.

Here we sketch the similar result for ROM. We compute the average partition function with n replicas,

$$\langle Z^n \rangle_J = \int d\mathbf{Q} d\Lambda \exp \left\{ N \left[\text{Tr } G(\beta \mathbf{Q}) - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Lambda \mathcal{Q}) + \log Z_0(\Lambda) \right] \right\} \tag{40}$$

with

$$Z_0(\Lambda) \equiv \sum_{\sigma^a} \exp \left\{ \sum_{a < b} \Lambda_{ab} \sigma^a \sigma^b \right\}. \tag{41}$$

Using a replica-symmetry breaking ansatz such that the matrices Λ and \mathbf{Q} are made up of two diagonal blocks of size $m \times m$ and $(n - m) \times (n - m)$ and have equal elements outside those blocks,

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{u_1}^m & \overbrace{u}^{n-m} \\ u & u_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{q_1}^m & \overbrace{q}^{n-m} \\ q & q_2 \end{pmatrix} \tag{42}$$

with $\Lambda_{aa} = 0$ and $Q_{aa} = 1$. We then let the block size m go to infinity, while fixing the relations between the variables u, u_1 and u_2 and q, q_1 and q_2 in order to ensure a finite limit for the partition function. We find that (39) is satisfied. The details of the derivation are in appendix B. Since the derivation is independent of the explicit form of the function $G(x)$, the result should be valid for any model whose coupling matrix is chosen from a distribution that obeys a relation such as (5). We recover the result for SK in the case $G(x) = x^2/4$.

It is still unclear to us exactly why the two-group partition function should count the number of metastable states. The fact that this ‘coincidence’ extends beyond the SK model reinforces our conviction that there exists a yet-to-be-discovered formal connection between the two computations.

6. Analysis

6.1. $T = 0$ result

We now come back to the analysis of (37) and its solutions. Let us start by studying its $T = 0$ limit. In this limit, $q \rightarrow 1$, λ decouples, and the five other parameters have a finite value. The integral in (38) can then be done analytically using a change of variable $m = 1 - \exp(-\beta y)$ and keeping only terms with a finite limit when $\beta \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} I = \exp(u^2 W/4 - \Delta u/2) \operatorname{erfc} \left(\frac{uW - \Delta}{2\sqrt{W}} \right). \tag{43}$$

Shifting Δ and doing the integral over u , we obtain

$$\langle N_s(f) \rangle = \operatorname{Ext} \exp \left\{ N \left[-v\Delta - wW + (f + vW + \Delta/2)^2/W + G(v + \sqrt{w}) + G(v - \sqrt{w}) + \log \operatorname{erfc}(-\Delta/2\sqrt{W}) \right] \right\}. \tag{44}$$

The same result can be obtained directly by counting the average number of spin configurations $\{\sigma_i\}$ satisfying

$$\forall i \sigma_i \sum_{j \neq i} J_{ij} \sigma_j > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f = - \sum_{i < j} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j \tag{45}$$

This computation can be done in rather a straightforward way using Heaviside step functions instead of δ -functions. This approach is free of the problem of the absolute value of the determinant.

The saddle-point equations obtained from (44) were solved numerically to give the shape of the distribution of one-flip stable configurations as a function of energy density (figure 2, full curve). Note that since (44) involves the function $G(x)$ for potentially complex arguments (the complex conjugate term assures us that the final result will always be real)




Figure 2. Logarithm of the density of metastable states divided by N as a function of free energy ($N^{-1} \log \langle N_s(f) \rangle$) versus f at $T = 0$ (full curve); $T = 0.134$ (broken curve) and $T = 0.065$ (dotted curve); Simulation at $T = 0$ for $N = 48$ ROM (data points).

one has to choose a sign convention for the square-root terms in the definition of $G(x)$ (cf equation (6)). It was chosen such that the real part of the square-root is always of the same sign as v in $G(v + \sqrt{w})$; this way the saddle point never has to cross any cut in the complex plane.

As one follows the saddle point to the rightmost part of the curve ($e > -0.36$), the argument of the error function in equation (44) goes through infinity after which all four parameters become complex. It is not clear if the contour of the integral computed by the saddle-point method can be deformed to have this complex saddle point as its main contribution. This issue was not investigated any further for it is of marginal interest.

In addition, an approximate enumeration of the one-flip stable configurations for a relatively small ($N = 48$) ROM was done. Random configurations were generated and then cooled at zero temperature, the resulting one-flip stable configurations were compared with previously stored ones and were stored if not previously obtained. After 4×10^6 iterations, the low-energy configurations were each found about a hundred times while only a few high-energy ones remained unfound. The resulting distribution was binned and its logarithm (divided by 48) is shown as the data points on figure 2. An overall normalization constant (not predicted by the saddle-point method) was added to the simulation data to make them fall on the predicted curve. Points on the x -axis correspond to energy bins where no metastable states were found. The agreement between the theory and this simulation is very good. Similar data (not shown) for the sine model also gave very good agreement with the ROM prediction. For FFM the Diophantine constraints (integer spin and integer field) are such that for small d only a few values of the energy are allowed for a metastable state (e.g. 2 for $d = 5$ and 3 for $d = 6$). Those constraints might not be so important for large d , but for $d \geq 6$ ($N \geq 64$) an exhaustive search becomes impossible. Whether the distribution of metastable states in FFM follows that of ROM remains an open question.

The point where the curve shown in figure 3 intersects the x -axis on the left, corresponds to the minimum energy (E_{nsol}) at which there are on average exponentially many configurations. It is almost equal to the approximate ground-state energy ($E_{1\text{-step}}$) from the one-step replica breaking solution of this model [6]. Careful analysis of the equations leading to these two quantities done using arbitrary precision arithmetic shows that while they are not equal they differ by less than 30 parts in a billion. Precisely, $E_{\text{nsol}} = -0.484119415$ and $E_{1\text{-step}} = -0.484119428$. The true average ground-state




Figure 3. Normalized logarithm of the average total number of TAP solutions for ROM as a function of temperature ($N^{-1} \log \langle \mathcal{N}_s \rangle$ versus T) (full curve); same curve but for solutions that contribute to the free energy (broken curve).

energy density for ROM is probably well approximated by either of these two quantities.

6.2. Finite T results

By taking partial derivatives of (37), we can write the number of metastable states in terms of the solution of six coupled non-linear equations, three of which contain definite integrals. A numerical solution of these equations was done by following the $T = 0$ solution of the previous section to finite T . At fixed T , varying u traces out the $N^{-1} \log \langle \mathcal{N}_s \rangle$ versus f curve. Typical curves (for $T = 0.134$ and $T = 0.065$) are shown in figure 2 (broken and dotted curves); results for other temperatures are quite similar. The abrupt stop on the right-hand side of these curves is due to the divergence of the definite integral in (37), it is possible that the saddle point can be analytically continued to complex values giving a smooth curve all the way to zero as in the $T = 0$ case. This issue has not been investigated since the interesting points lie on the low free energy end of the curve.

Setting $u = 0$ in (37) gives the total number of TAP solutions. It gives a positive value for $N^{-1} \log \langle \mathcal{N}_s \rangle$ starting from 0.2854 at $T = 0$ and decreasing all the way to 0 at $T_{\text{nsol}} = 0.32$. Above this temperature, the $q = 0$ saddle point with $\log \langle \mathcal{N}_s \rangle = 0$ is the correct one. The full results are plotted in figure 3 (full curve).

In the thermodynamics of the model nothing special happens at the temperature $T_{\text{nsol}} =$ at which exponentially many TAP solutions appear. These metastable states have too high free energy to contribute to the partition function. Instead, if we write

$$e^{-\beta F} = \sum_{\alpha} e^{-\beta F_{\alpha}} \approx \int df \langle \mathcal{N}_s(f) \rangle e^{-N\beta f} \approx \max_f e^{NA(f)} \quad (46)$$

where α labels TAP solutions and with

$$A(f) \equiv N^{-1} \log \langle \mathcal{N}_s(f) \rangle - \beta f \quad (47)$$

we find that the solutions which contributes to the free energy are those for which $A(f)$ is maximum. They are given by setting $u = -\beta$ in (37). With this substitution, the saddle-point equations admit a simple solution of the form:

$$v = \beta - \frac{\beta q}{2} \quad w = \frac{\beta^2 q^2}{4} \quad \Delta = G'(\beta) - G'(\beta(1-q)) \quad W = \frac{\Delta}{\beta} \quad \lambda = \frac{\beta \Delta}{4}. \quad (48)$$

In the language of the two-group model, this solution corresponds to an unbroken two-group (i.e. $\alpha = \gamma = t = r = 0$, see appendix B). The number of contributing TAP solutions reduces to

$$\langle \mathcal{N}_{cs} \rangle = \exp \{ N (\beta f + G(\beta) + \log 2) \} \tag{49}$$

where

$$f = \beta^{-1} \left[-\log 2 - G(\beta(1 - q)) - \beta q G'(\beta(1 - q)) + \beta \Delta - e^{-\beta \Delta} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-z^2/2} \cosh(\sqrt{2\beta \Delta} z) \log \cosh(\sqrt{2\beta \Delta} z) \right] \tag{50}$$

with $\Delta(q)$ as above and q determined variationally. The function f corresponds to the free energy of the contributing solutions. We notice that the logarithm of the number of contributing solutions, often called *complexity*, can be written as

$$\log \langle \mathcal{N}_{cs} \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial m} \beta F_{1\text{-step}}(\beta, m, q) \right|_{m=1} \tag{51}$$

where $F_{1\text{-step}}$ is the free energy computed with one-step replica symmetry breaking with RSB parameter m , $q_0 = 0$ and extremized over $q_1 = q$ (equation (44) in [6]). Equality (51) is in fact more general than what is presented in here, for a more direct derivation and its physical interpretation see [22].

The condition for (49) to have a saddle point at a non-zero value of q is equivalent to the marginality condition ($T < T_M = 0.134$). At this temperature, one finds $q = 0.962$ with $N^{-1} \log \langle \mathcal{N}_{cs} \rangle = 0.158$. Monte Carlo simulations have indicated that all three orthogonal models considered here (FFM, ROM and the sine model) undergo a dynamical glassy transition at a temperature equal or very near T_M [6, 10].

The complexity goes to zero at the replica symmetry breaking transition $T_{RSB} = 0.065$. For temperatures below T_{RSB} , equation (49) gives an unphysical negative complexity: the above saddle point is no longer valid and the contributing solutions are those with the smallest free energy (the leftmost points of the curves of figure 2). The full curve of complexity versus temperature is plotted in figure 3 (broken curve).

We finally notice that we naturally have

$$\max_f A(f) = \log 2 + G(\beta) = -\beta f_{RS} . \tag{52}$$

In other words even in the region between T_{RSB} and T_M , where a large number of solutions contribute to the free energy, the replica symmetric (RS) free energy is still valid. The decomposition of the RS free energy into contributions from many metastable states below a temperature ' T_g ' higher than T_{RSB} has been discussed in the context of many different models [23–26].

Above T_M , one can still find a saddle point of (37) with $u = -\beta$, corresponding to the maximum of $A(f)$, but it is no longer of the simple form of (48): the two-group symmetry is broken. Numerically one finds that for those temperatures, $\max A(f) < -\beta f_{RS}$. The TAP solutions do not contribute to the free energy.

It may seem surprising that the RS solution is still valid while a very large number of different states contribute to the free energy. The explanation is that their number is so large that if one chooses randomly two such states the probability of finding the same one is zero, therefore the order parameter $P(q)$ only measures the overlap between different states which is always equal to $q_0 = 0$. Only when the complexity ceases to be extensive can the $P(q)$ become non-trivial, leading to replica symmetry breaking.

7. Conclusion

We now have a simple intuitive scenario for the phase diagram of models such as ROM where the order parameter jumps discontinuously at the transition (see table 1). At a relatively high temperature T_{nsol} the number of metastable states increases dramatically, but their free energy is so high that they influence neither the statics nor the dynamics. At T_M , a large number of these states start contributing to the free energy. At this temperature, all static thermodynamical quantities are perfectly regular, but the time scales involved with the dynamics diverge and the system is no longer able to thermalize. Phenomena such as ageing start to appear. At T_{RSB} the entropy of the contributing states goes to zero, $P(q)$ becomes non-trivial and replica symmetry is broken.

We have also seen that the number of TAP solutions can be computed using the two-group method and that in the temperature range $T_{\text{RSB}} < T < T_M$ the solutions that contribute to the free energy correspond to an unbroken two-group, recovering the results of [22].

Table 1. Interesting temperatures for the orthogonal model, from text and adapted from [6] to the present normalizations.

Symbol	Temp.	Comments
T_a	0.40	Metastable crystalline phase (if present)
T_{nsol}	0.32	Exponential number of TAP solutions
T_{cr}	0.18	Stability of crystalline solution (if present)
T_M	0.134	TAP solutions start contributing to the free energy, ‘marginality condition’ and dynamical phase transition
T_{RSB}	0.065	Complexity goes to zero and replica-symmetry breaking

Acknowledgments

We thank J Kurchan, E Marinari, R Monasson, F Ritort and M Wexler for useful discussions.

Appendix A. Separation of averages

We will now proceed to show that the determinant of the matrix A and the term $\sim J_{ij}x_i m_j$ (cf equation (29)) can be averaged separately. Had we kept them together, introduced Grassman variables and integrated over the couplings, we would have obtained a term like this

$$\exp \left\{ N \text{Tr} G \left[\beta \frac{\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{m} \otimes \mathbf{x} + \bar{\theta} \otimes \theta - \theta \otimes \bar{\theta}}{N} \right] \right\}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Therefore we need to show that the cross-terms in the Taylor expansion of $\text{Tr} G[\dots]$ are irrelevant in the large N limit. A typical cross-term is

$$\frac{1}{N^{n-1}} \sum_{\{i_k\}} x_{i_1} m_{i_2} x_{i_2} m_{i_3} \theta_{i_3} \bar{\theta}_{i_4} \bar{\theta}_{i_4} m_{i_5} x_{i_6} \dots \bar{\theta}_{i_n} \theta_{i_1}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We can consider these terms as a perturbation about the fermionic Gaussian integral (35). We need to compute all connected diagrams generated by these new θ and $\bar{\theta}$ vertices, contracting them with the Gaussian propagator $(a_i + \beta R)^{-1} \delta_{ij}$. The point is that since the propagator is diagonal, all such contractions will be at most of order 1 while the logarithm

of the unperturbed result (equation (36)) is of order N . The same is true of the term we dropped in writing (30).

Appendix B. Two-group partition function

In this appendix, we will compute the two-group partition function for ROM and recover, as mentioned in section 5.2, the average number of TAP solutions. We specialize right away to the case $n = 0$ which will make some of our formulae look a bit strange but will make the notation more compact. The following derivation can be extended without much difficulty to the $n \neq 0$ case. We parametrize the matrix elements of Λ and \mathbf{Q} as

$$u_1 = u + t/m + r/m^2 \quad u_2 = u - t/m + r/m^2 \tag{B1}$$

$$q_1 = q + \alpha/m + \gamma/m^2 \quad q_2 = q - \alpha/m + \gamma/m^2 \tag{B2}$$

which will ensure a finite limit when m goes to infinity. We now compute the different parts of (40);

$$\text{Tr}(\Lambda\mathbf{Q}) = 2(\alpha t + qr + \gamma u) - 2(\alpha u + qt). \tag{B3}$$

To compute $\text{Tr} G(\beta\mathbf{Q})$ we find the different eigenvalues of the matrix \mathbf{Q} and their multiplicity, leading us to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} G(\beta\mathbf{Q}) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (m-1)G(\beta(1-q_1)) - (m+1)G(\beta(1-q_2)) + G(\beta q^+) + G(\beta q^-) \\ &= -2G(\beta(1-q)) - 2\alpha\beta G'(\beta(1-q)) + G(\beta q^+) + G(\beta q^-) \end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

where

$$q^\pm = q - \alpha - 1 \pm \sqrt{2q(\gamma - \alpha)}. \tag{B5}$$

The $Z_0(\Lambda)$ term requires more work,

$$Z_0(\Lambda) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t} \sum_{\sigma_a} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[uS^2 + \left(\frac{t}{m} + \frac{r}{m^2} \right) S_+^2 + \left(-\frac{t}{m} + \frac{r}{m^2} \right) S_-^2 \right] \right\} \tag{B6}$$

where

$$S = \sum \sigma_a \quad S_+ = \sum_{a \leq m} \sigma_a \quad \text{and} \quad S_- = \sum_{a > m} \sigma_a. \tag{B7}$$

If we make three Hubbard–Stratonovich transformations to linearize the quadratic terms and do the sum over spins, we find

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(\Lambda) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} e^{-t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dh}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{m dh_+ dh_-}{2\pi t} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[-\frac{h^2}{u} + \frac{r(h_+^2 + h_-^2)}{t^2} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + m \left[\log \cosh(h + h_+) - \log \cosh(h + h_-) - \frac{h_+^2}{2t} + \frac{h_-^2}{2t} \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{B8}$$

where we have put in evidence the terms with a factor of m . We can now use the saddle-point method to compute the $m \rightarrow \infty$ limit of the last expression. To leading order in m , the saddle-point equations for h_+ and h_- are the same. They do differ by a term of order $1/m$ but this perturbation only contributes to the saddle point at order $1/m$ (it does not contribute at order one because the derivative of the order m term vanishes). At the saddle point, one has $h_+ = h_- = h_0$ which solves

$$E(h, h_0) \equiv \tanh(h + h_0) - \frac{h_0}{t} = 0. \tag{B9}$$

The order m contributions to the saddle point of h_+ and h_- exactly cancel each other leaving us with a finite result as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Including Gaussian fluctuations, we find

$$Z_0(\Lambda) = e^{-t} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dh}{t\sqrt{2\pi u}} \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial h_0} \right)^{-1} \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{h^2}{u} + \frac{2rh_0^2}{t^2} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Using the implicit function theorem,

$$dh \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial h_0} \right)^{-1} = dh_0 \left(\frac{\partial E}{\partial h} \right)^{-1} = dh_0 \left(1 - \frac{h_0^2}{t^2} \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{B11})$$

we can change the integration variable from h to h_0 which we rescale† to find

$$Z_0(\Lambda) = e^{-t} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{dm}{\sqrt{2\pi u}} \left(\frac{1}{1-m^2} \right) \exp \left[-\frac{(\tanh^{-1} m - tm)^2}{2u} + rm^2 \right]. \quad (\text{B12})$$

Finally if we collect the results from (B3), (B4) and (B12), make the following change of variables:

$$\Delta = t/\beta \quad W = u/2\beta^2 \quad \lambda = r \quad w = \beta^2[2q(\gamma - \alpha)] \quad v = \beta(\alpha + 1 - q), \quad (\text{B13})$$

and extremize over the six parameters, we recover $\langle N_s \rangle$ given by (37) with $u = 0$ where the saddle point with $B = 0$ and $b = 1 - q$ has been chosen. Had we not set $n = 0$, we would have recovered the right-hand side of (37) with $u = -n\beta$ and without the $-uf$ term. In other words $\langle Z_{2G}^n \rangle$ is the Laplace transform of $\langle N_s(f) \rangle$ with $-n\beta N$ conjugate to f .

References

- [1] Bouchaud J-P and Mézard M 1994 Self induced quenched disorder: a model for the glass transition *J. Physique I* **4** 1109
- [2] Marinari E, Parisi G and Ritort F 1994 Replica field theory for deterministic models: binary sequences with low autocorrelation *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 7615
- [3] Parisi G 1987 Some applications of field theory to amorphous systems *Quantum Field Theory and Quantum Statistics. Essays in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of E S Fradkin* ed I A Batalin, C J Isham and G A Vilkovisky (Bristol: Hilger)
- [4] Parisi G 1992 *Field Theory, Disorder and Simulations* (Singapore: World Scientific)
- [5] Parisi G and Dotsenko V 1992 Random magnetic fields and instantons in replica space *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** 3143
- [6] 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
- [7] Toulouse G Theory of frustration effect in spin glasses: I 1977 *Commun. Phys.* **2** 115
- [8] Derrida B, Pomeau Y, Toulouse G and Vannimenus J 1979 Fully frustrated simple cubic lattices and the overblocking effect *J. Physique* **40** 617
- [9] Derrida B, Pomeau Y, Toulouse G and Vannimenus J 1980 Fully frustrated simple cubic lattices and phase transitions *J. Physique* **41** 213
- [10] Marinari E, Parisi G and Ritort F 1995 The fully frustrated hypercubic model is glassy and aging at large D *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **28** 327
- [11] Plefka T 1982 Convergence condition of the TAP equation for the infinite-range Ising spin glass model *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **15** 1971
- [12] Georges A and Yedidia J S 1991 How to expand around mean-field theory using high-temperature expansions *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24** 2173
- [13] Yedidia J S and Georges A 1990 The fully frustrated Ising model in infinite dimensions *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23** 2165

† Note that we call m the rescaled integration variable h_0/t to make the connection with (37), it is not to be confused with the replica-symmetry breaking parameter m which has been taken to infinity.

- [14] Kurchan J, Parisi G and Virasoro M A 1993 Barriers and metastable states as saddle points in the replica approach *J. Physique I* **3** 1819
- [15] Thouless D J, Anderson P W and Palmer R G 1977 Solution of 'solvable model of a spin glass' *Phil. Mag.* **35** 593
- [16] Bray A J and Moore M A 1980 Metastable states in spin glasses *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **13** L469
- [17] Rieger H 1992 The number of solutions of the Thouless-Anderson-Palmer equations for the p -spin-interaction spin glasses *Phys. Rev. B* **46** 14 655
- [18] Parisi G and Sourlas N 1982 Supersymmetric field theories and stochastic differential equations *Nucl. Phys. B* **206** 321
- [19] Kurchan J 1991 Replica trick to calculate means of absolute values: applications to stochastic equations *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **24** 4969
- [20] Bray A J and Moore M A 1978 Replica-symmetry breaking in spin-glass theories *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41** 1068
- [21] Bray A J and Moore M A 1980 Broken replica symmetry and metastable states in spin glasses *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **13** L907
- [22] Monasson R 1995 The structural glass transition and the entropy of the metastable states *Preprint cond-mat/9503166*
- [23] Kirkpatrick T R and Thirumalai D 1987 p -spin interaction spin-glass models: connections with the structural glass problem *Phys. Rev. B* **36** 5388
- [24] Kirkpatrick T R and Wolynes P G 1987 Stable and metastable states in mean-field Potts and structural glasses *Phys. Rev. B* **36** 8552
- [25] Crisanti A and Sommers H-J 1995 On the TAP approach to the spherical p -spin SG model *Preprint TNT-94-5, cond-mat/9406051* (submitted to *J. Physique I*)
- [26] Monasson R and O'Kane D 1994 Domains of solutions and replica symmetry breaking in multilayer neural networks *Europhys. Lett.* **27** 85