

The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics



International Atomic Energy Agency

SMR.1763-16

SCHOOL and CONFERENCE on COMPLEX SYSTEMS and NONEXTENSIVE STATISTICAL MECHANICS

31 July - 8 August 2006

Dynamics and Statistical Mechanics of (Hamiltonian) many body systems with long-range interactions

A. Rapisarda

Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN sezione di Catania, Università di Catania Italy www.ct.infn.it/rapis



School and Conference on Complex Systems and Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics July 30 - August 8 2006, ICTP Trieste

Dynamics and Statistical Mechanics of (Hamiltonian) many body systems with long-range interactions



A. Rapisarda

Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN sezione di Catania, Università di Catania Italy www.ct.infn.it/rapis





School and Conference on Complex Systems and Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics July 30 - August 8 2006, ICTP Trieste

main collaborators

Alessandro Pluchino	Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN sezione di Catania, Università di Catania Italy
Vito Latora	Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia and INFN sezione di Catania, Università di Catania Italy
Filippo Caruso	Scuola Superiore di Catania and Scuola Normale di Pisa , Italy
Salvo Rizzo	ENAV Firenze and Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia Università di Catania , Italy



Group web page: www.ct.infn.it/cactus

3 Plan of the lectures



4 Motivation

Why one should study long-range interacting systems...

•Long-range interactions are important for phase transitions in finite size systems, for example: fragmenting nuclei and atomic clusters

•For understanding how one can treat statistically selfgravitating objects and plasmas.

•Long-range correlations are also frequently observed in out-of-equilibrium and complex systems

In general long-range interactions pose fundamental problems to standard statistical mechanics, so one needs new statistical tools to treat them properly

5 The HMF model

The Hamiltonian Mean Field (HMF) model

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{p_{i}^{2}}{2} + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} [1 - \cos(\theta_{i} - \theta_{j})]$$

Antoni and Ruffo PRE 52 (1995) 2361

•The system has an infinite range force

•It is a useful paradigmatic model to study Hamiltonian long-range interacting (nonextensive) systems as for example astrophysical systems, but also fragmenting nuclei and atomic clusters

Phase transition at equilibrium

The model can be seen as N classical interacting spins or particles moving on the unit circle. One can define the total magnetization **M** as an **order parameter**

$$\vec{M} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \vec{m}_i$$

6

where the single spin is

 $\vec{m}_i = (\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i)$

The model shows a **second-order phase transition**, passing from a clustered phase to a homogeneous one as a function of energy



Equilibrium solution

By using the saddle point method, one gets for the free energy F

$$-\beta F = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{2\pi}{\beta} \right) - \frac{\beta}{2} + \max_{y} \left(\frac{-y^{2}}{2\beta} + \log \left(2\pi I_{0}(y) \right) \right)$$
where $\beta = \frac{1}{k_{B}T}$ and $k_{B}=1$ is the Boltzmann constant
Then one gets the consistency equation $\frac{y}{\beta} - \frac{I_{1}}{I_{0}} = 0$ (1) ,
where $M = \frac{I_{1}}{I_{0}}$ and I_{i} is the modified Bessel function of *ith* order.
Solving eq.(1) one gets the **exact canonical equilibrium expression**
 $U = \frac{E}{N} = \frac{\partial(\beta F)}{\partial \beta} = \frac{1}{2\beta} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - M^{2})$ Caloric curve

Critical behavior of the model

The model has a second order phase transition.

The critical point is at

$$U_c = \frac{3}{4}$$
 and $T_c = \frac{1}{2}$

Close to the critical point one gets for $\beta \rightarrow \beta_c^+$

$$M \approx \frac{4}{\beta} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\beta}} \qquad \qquad U \approx \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta - 2)}{\beta} \right] + \frac{1}{2\beta} \left[1 - \frac{8(\beta -$$

Hence M vanishes with the classical critical mean field exponent 1/2

On the other hand, the specific heat
$$C_V = \frac{\partial(U)}{\partial T}$$
 is
 $C_V(T_c) = \frac{5}{2}$ and $C_V = \frac{1}{2}$ for $T > T_c$
Close to the critical point $C_V \approx (T_c - T)^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha = 0$

9 Dynamics vs Thermodynamics		
	 The model can be studied also dynamically by means of microcanonical numerical simulations. 	
	 One can compare dynamical aspects with thermodynamical ones. 	
	 One can study finite size effects. 	
	 One can also study how the system relax to equilibrium 	

10 Dynamics

The equations of motion are:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial t} = p_i \\ \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t} = -M_x \sin \theta_i + M_y \cos \theta_i \end{cases}$$

The potential is connected to the magnetization \mathbf{M} as

$$V = \frac{N}{2} \left[1 - \left(M_{x}^{2} + M_{y}^{2} \right) \right] = \frac{N}{2} \left(1 - M^{2} \right)$$

The equations are solved numerically by using a fourth order simplectic algorithm (Yoshida , Physica A 150 (1990) 262). Energy is conserved with an error smaller than $\frac{\Delta E}{E} = 10^{-5}$ for a number of time steps $\approx 10^{6}$

Critical behavior of the model for finite sizes

Microcanonical simulations follow the canonical prediction, even for N=100

11



12 Equilibrium

Good agreement between exact canonical solution and numerical microcanonical simulations at equilibrium for various sizes N of the system



Dynamics at Equilibrium

One finds a maximum of the largest Lyapunov exponent (LLE) in connection to the critical point, where both the <u>fluctuations in</u> <u>kinetic energy</u> and temperature and the <u>specific heat</u> present a peak

Latora, Rapisarda and Ruffo Physica D **131** (1999) 38

13



14 Dynamics at Equilibrium: scaling of the LLE



15 Lyapunov spectra at Equilibrium

In Hamiltonian systems with N degrees of freedom



 $\lambda_i = -\lambda_{2N-i+1}$

At low energy only a few degrees of freedom are active.

A. RAPISARDA ICTP 2006

16 Lyapunov spectra at Equilibrium

No significant change in the shape of the spectra across the critical point is observed





18 Scaling laws fot the Kolmogorov Sinai entropy



19

Antiferromagnetic behavior of HMF

The HMF model can have also an antiferromagnetic behavior if one considers





21 LLE in the thermodynamical limit

In the thermodynamic limit, the LLE goes to zero for the whole energy range in the antiferromagnetic case, while it remains finite, for energies smaller than the critical one (Uc=0.75), in the ferromagnetic one. In the latter case it goes to



22 LLE in the antiferromagnetic case

Both the LLE and the KS entropy go to zero as in the antiferromagnetic case





23 Equilibrium PDFs for the HMF model

In the continuum limit, considering the one-body distribution function F, the evolution of the HMF model is described by the Vlasov equation

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + p \frac{\partial F}{\partial \vartheta} - \frac{\partial V}{\partial \vartheta} \frac{\partial F}{\partial p} = 0$$

Supposing a factorization of the distribution function

$$F = f(p)g(\theta, t)$$

One gets the stationary equilibrium solution

$$f = f_0 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} e^{-p^2/2T}$$
where $g_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi I_0(M/T)}$, ϕ is the phase of M
and I_0 is the Bessel function
In the overcritical region $M = 0 \Rightarrow g = \frac{1}{2\pi}$
In the low energy region $I_0(z) \approx \frac{e^z}{\sqrt{2\pi z}} \left[1 + \frac{1}{8z} + ...\right] \Rightarrow g \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-g^2/2\sigma^2}$

Latora, Rapisarda and Ruffo Physica D 131 (1999) 38

24 Comparison with numerical pdfs



25 Comparison with numerical pdfs at equilibrium



26 Anomalous dynamics HMF model in the out-of-equilibrium case

27 OUT-OF-EQUILIBRIUM CASE
When the system is started with initial conditions very far from equilibrium
we observe many dynamical anomalies, in particular in an energy range below the critical point.

28 Negative specific heat



In a region before the critical point the specific heat becomes negative:

the temperature decreases, by increasing the energy density.

This phenomenon has been observed in multifragmentation nuclear reactions and atomic clusters, but also in selfgravitating stellar objects, i.e. for nonextensive systems.

See for example:

•Thirring, Zeit. Physik 235 (1970) 339

Lynden-Bell, Physica A 263 (1999) 293

D.H.E.Gross, *Microcanonical Thermodynamics: Phase transitions in Small systems*, World Scientific (2001).

•M. D'Agostino et al, Phys. Lett. B 473 (2000) 279

•Schmidt et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 1191

29 Quasi Stationary States



30 QSS: initial evolution

QSS regime is reached almost immediately



31 QSS and numerical accuracy

QSS do not depend on the accuracy of the integration



32 QSS lifetime and Temperature



15 The energy density U=0.69





35 Vanishing Lyapunov exponents




37 Anomalous diffusion in the QSS regime



38 Anomalous diffusion: typical dynamics



39 Anomalous diffusion

The cross-over times, from anomalous to normal diffusion, *coincide with the relaxation times*



40 Lévy walks: walking and trapping time PDFs

For a one dimensional system which shows sticking and flying particles with constant velocity, one finds:



Time evolution of velocity PDFs

41



42 Non-Gaussian velocity PDF



43 Role of initial conditions for QSS

We have recently studied the nature of the anomalous QSS regime by starting from different initial magnetizations with $0 \le M \le 1$

(considering in all cases a uniform distribution in momenta: *water bag*).

Dynamical anomalies depend on the initial conditions. The most interesting are those observed for initial magnetization $M \sim 1$

44 QSS for different initial conditions: M1 vs. M0



Dependence of QSS on the initial magnetization



46 Correlations in phase space for different IC







































Dependence of µ-space structures on the i.c.



66 Entropy and free energy for QSS



67 Relaxation to equilibrium



68 Aging and strong memory effects



For M1 IC, the system, in going towards equilibrium, shows strong memory effects and aging, i.e. the correlation functions depend on t and on the waiting time t_w

$$+t_{w},t_{w}) = \frac{\langle \mathbf{P}(t+t_{w})\mathbf{P}(t_{w})\rangle - \langle \mathbf{P}(t+t_{w})\rangle \langle \mathbf{P}(t_{w})\rangle}{\sigma(t+t_{w})\sigma(t_{w})}$$

Montemurro, Tamarit and Anteneodo PRE 67 (2003) 031106 Pluchino, Latora and Rapisarda, Physica D 193 (2004) 315

A. RAPISARDA ICTP 2006

C(t -

69 Dynamical frustration



"Critical" cluster size distribution



Cluster size distribution vs initial conditions


Cluster formation vs initial conditions



Cluster formation vs initial conditions





75 The generalized HMF model



α -XY model and nonextensive effects



Anomalies depend in a crucial way on the range of the interaction

The lifetime τ of the QSS does not diverge for all $\alpha...$

see A. Campa et al. Physica A 305 (2002) 137

Decreasing the range of the interaction, i.e. diminishing nonextensivity $(\alpha > 0)$ this anomalous behaviour disappears:

- Relaxation is very fast $(\tau \propto e^{-lpha})$
 - No negative specific heat is observed

Long-range Lennard-Jones potential

Another example which support the long-range nature of the interaction as the origin of negative specific heat is the 2-d Lennard-Jones gas with attractive potential

$$V \propto r^{-lpha}$$

Borges and Tsallis Physica A 305 (2002)148

Again decreasing the range of the interaction, i.e. diminishing non extensivity this anomalous specific heat disappears. In correspondence they also find *non-Boltzmann velocity distributions*

Further similar examples have been found in self-gravitating systems, see

Sota et al PRE 64 (2001) 056133



More precisely the potential energy is

$$V = C_{\alpha} \sum_{i < j}^{N} \left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ij}} \right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r_{ij}} \right)^{\alpha} \right]$$

$$C_{\alpha} = \varepsilon \left(\frac{b}{\alpha^{\alpha}}\right)^{\frac{1}{12}-\alpha} / N(12-\alpha)$$

 σ is the diameter of the particles, b is a constant and ϵ is the energy scale.

For $\alpha = 6$ one gets the usual Lennard-Jones



80 Tsallis generalized thermostatistics

In the last decade a lot of effort has been devoted to understand if thermodynamics can be generalized to nonequilibrium complex systems

In particular one of these attempts is that one started by Constantino Tsallis with his seminal paper J. Stat. Phys. 52 (1988) 479

For recent reviews see for example:

- C. Tsallis, *Nonextensive Statistical Mechanics and Thermodynamics*, Lecture Notes in Physics, eds. S. Abe and Y. Okamoto, Springer, Berlin, (2001);
- Proceedings of *NEXT2001*, special issue of Physica A 305 (2002) eds. G. Kaniadakis, M. Lissia and A Rapisarda;
- C. Tsallis, A. Rapisarda, V. Latora and F. Baldovin in "*Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Systems with Long-Range Interactions*", T. Dauxois, S. Ruffo,E. Arimondo, M. Wilkens eds., Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 602, Springer (2002) 140;
- ``Nonextensive Entropy Interdisciplinary Applications", C. Tsallis and M. Gell-Mann eds., Oxford University Press (2003).
- A. Cho, Science 297 (2002) 1268; S. Abe and A.K. Rajagopal, Science 300, (2003)249;
 A. Plastino, Science 300 (2003) 250; V. Latora, A. Rapisarda and A. Robledo, Science 300 (2003) 250.

For a regularly updated bibliografy: <u>http://tsallis.cat.cbpf.br/biblio.htm</u>

Tsallis conjecture for nonextensive systems





Figure 4. Central conjecture of the present work, assuming a Hamiltonian system which includes two-body (attractive) interactions which, at long distances, decay as $r^{-\alpha}$. The crossover at $t = \tau$ is expected to be slower than indicated in the figure (for space reasons).

82 Generalized velocity pdfs



83 q-exponential decay of C(t,0)



62 q-exponential decay also for different i.c.



85 q-exponential decay for aging



Also for the aging behavior, the power law decay of the correlation functions, after a proper rescaling, can be reproduced with a qexponential function.

In this case we get **q=1.65**.

64 q vs initial Magnetization



63 Anomalous diffusion for different i.c.





66 Summary of most recent results regarding HMF model and q-statistics



90 Most recent results

Some unpublished results on recent criticism



Recent criticism

A few comments on recent criticism regarding anomalous diffusion in the HMF model and q-statistics It seems that velocity pdfs can be described using Lynden-Bell entropy within a Vlasov approach.. There are however several discrepancies.....due to dynamical effects and initial conditions



FIG. 2: Velocity distribution functions. Symbols refer to numerical simulations, while dashed solid lines stand for the theoretical profile (9). Panels a), b) and c) present the three cases $M_0 = 0.3$, $M_0 = 0.5$ and $M_0 = 0.7$ in lin-log scale, while panel d) shows the case $M_0 = 0.3$ in lin-lin scale. The numerical curves are computed from one single realization with $N = 10^7$ at time t = 100. Here e = H/N = 0.69.

It seems that velocity pdfs can be described using Lynden-Bell entropy within a Vlasov approach.. There are however several discrepancies.....due to dynamical effects and initial conditions





Anomalous diffusion is a finite size effect?



FIG. 3: The exponent $\gamma = d \log(\sigma^2)/d \log(t)$ is plotted as a function of the rescaled time $\tau = t/N$. Starting from the initial ballistic value 2, it converges to the normal diffusion exponent 1. Simulations refer to $M_0 = 0.3$, and $M_0 = 0.9$. Here $N = 10^5$ and e = H/N = 0.69.

Anomalous diffusion is a finite size effect?

Moyano and Anteneodo

cond-mat/0601518

On the diffusive anomalies in a long-range Hamiltonian system

Luis G. Moyano

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas - Rua Xavier Šigaud 150, 22290-180, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Celia Anteneodo

Departamento de Física, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, CP 38071, 22452-970, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

We scrutinize the anomalies in diffusion observed in an extended long-range system of classical rotors, the HMF model. Under suitable preparation, the system falls into long-lived quasi-stationary states presenting super-diffusion of rotor phases. We investigate the diffusive motion of phases by monitoring the evolution of their probability density function for large system sizes. These densities are shown to be of the q-Gaussian form, $P(x) \propto (1 + (q - 1)[x/\beta]^2)^{1/(1-q)}$, with parameter q increasing with time before reaching a steady value $q \simeq 3/2$. From this perspective, we also discuss the relaxation to equilibrium and show that diffusive motion in quasi-stationary trajectories strongly depends on system size.

PACS numbers: 05.20.-y, 05.60.Cd, 05.90.+m

I. INTRODUCTION

Systems with long-range interactions constitute a very appealing subject of research as they display a variety of dynamic and thermodynamic features very different from those of short-range systems treated in the textbooks (see [1] for a review on the subject). Moreover, in recent years, the study of long-range models have raised at energies close below $\varepsilon_c[5]$. In a QS state, the temperature (twice the specific mean kinetic energy) is almost constant in time and lower than the canonical value to which it eventually relaxes. However, the duration of QS states increases with the system size N, indicating that these states are indeed relevant in the $(N \to \infty)$ thermodynamical limit (TL).

Several other peculiar features have been found for

518 v3 25 Jan 2006





10

Anomalous diffusion is a finite size effect?







FIG. 3: Averaged time series of (a) temperature T, (b) local exponent γ and parameter q (symbols), as a function of $t/N^{1.7}$. Data are the same presented in Fig. 2.

FIG. 2: Averaged time series of (a) temperature T, (b) deviation σ , (c) diffusion exponent γ and (d) parameter q, for $\varepsilon = 0.69$ and different values of N ($N = 500 \times 2^k$, with $k = 0, \ldots, 9$). Bold lines correspond to N = 500, as reference, and N increases in the direction of the arrows up to N = 256000. Averages were taken over $2.56 \times 10^5/N$ realizations, starting from a waterbag configuration at t = 0. In panel (d), the fitting error is approx. 0.03. Dotted lines are drawn as references. In (a), they correspond to temperatures at equilibrium ($T_E q = 0.476$) and at QS states in the TL ($T_Q s = 0.38$). In (b), to ballistic motion ($\gamma = 2$) and normal diffusion ($\gamma = 1$).

 $\sigma P(\theta)$ 10^{2} $10^{$

sponds to normal diffusion, $\gamma < 1$ to sub-diffusion and super-diffusion occurs for $\gamma > 1$. The evolution of σ is shown in Figs. 2b and 5b, for water-bag and equilibrium initial preparations, respectively. In order to detect different regimes, it is useful to obtain an instantaneous exponent γ as a function of time by taking the logarithm in both sides of Eq. (6) and differentiating with respect to lnt:









Recently a dynamical transition as a function of the initial magnetization was claimed by Chavanis

Lynden-Bell and Tsallis distributions for the HMF model

P.H. Chavanis

Apr

5

>

Kiv:cond-mat/0604234

O Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, Université Paul Sabatier, 118 route de Narbonne 31062 Toulouse, France e-mail: chavanis@irsamc.ups-tlse.fr To be included later

Abstract, Systems with long-range interactions can reach a Quasi Stationary State (QSS) as a result of a violent collisionless relaxation. If the system mixes well (ergodicity), the QSS can be predicted by the statistical theory of Lynden-Bell (1967) based on the Vlasov equation. When the initial distribution takes only two values, the Lynden-Bell distribution is similar to the Fermi-Dirac statistics. Such distributions have recently been observed in direct numerical simulations of the HMF model (Antoniazzi et al. 2006). In this paper, we determine the caloric curve corresponding to the Lynden-Bell statistics in relation with the HMF model and analyze the dynamical and thermodynamical stability of spatially homogeneous solutions by using two general criteria previously introduced in the literature. We express the critical energy and the critical temperature as a function of a degeneracy parameter fixed by the initial condition. Below these critical values, the homogeneous Lynden-Bell distribution is not a maximum entropy state but an unstable saddle point. Known stability criteria corresponding to the Maxwellian distribution and the water-bag distribution are recovered as particular limits of our study. In addition, we find a critical point below which the homogeneous Lynden-Bell distribution is always stable. We apply these results to the situation considered by Antoniazzi et al. For a given energy, we find a critical initial magnetization above which the homogeneous Lynden-Bell distribution ceases to be a maximum entropy state, contrary to the claim of these authors. For an energy U = 0.69, this transition occurs above an initial magnetization $M_x = 0.897$. In that case, the system should reach an inhomogeneous Lynden-Bell distribution (most mixed) or an incompletely mixed state (possibly fitted by a Tsallis distribution). Thus, our theoretical study proves that the dynamics is different for small and large initial magnetizations, in agreement with numerical results of Pluchino et al. (2004). This new dynamical phase transition may reconcile the two communities.

PACS. 05.45.-a Nonlinear dynamics and nonlinear dynamical systems

Recently a dynamical transition as a function of the initial magnetization was claimed by Chavanis See Chavanis ε=0.76 (U=0.69) cond-mat/0604234 μ_{crit} 0.75 For an initial magnetization b=M_ 0.5 M>0.897 (if U=0.69) STABLE UNSTABLE The homogeneous Linden-Bell distribution becomes 0.25 unstable and the system can be trapped into an incomplete $\mu_{min}(\epsilon)$ mixed state, where Tsallis 0.468 statistics is a possible 0.668 0.868 1.068 1.268 1.468 explanation μ

Fig. 10. Initial magnetization $b = M_x$ as a function of the degeneracy parameter μ for a given value of the energy. There exists a critical magnetization, corresponding to $\mu_{crit}(\epsilon)$, above which the homogeneous Lynden-Bell distribution is unstable.

Recently a dynamical transition as a function of the initial magnetization was claimed by Chavanis See Chavanis unstable cond-mat/0604234 0.3 b) 0,25 For an initial magnetization M>0.897 (if U=0.69) 0.2 $\left| M \right|_{QSS}$ The homogeneous Linden-Bell 0.15 distribution becomes unstable and the system can be trapped 0,1 into an incomplete mixed state, stable where Tsallis statistics is a 0.05 possible explanation 0 0.7 0.6 0,8 0,9 $|\mathbf{M}|_0$ Antoniazzi et al cond-mat/0601518

Several numerical simulations confirm this transition, but further investigation is needed



Also Morita and Kaneko recently found anomalous collective dynamics which cannot be explained with Vlasov states

PRL 96, 050602 (2006)

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

week ending 10 FEBRUARY 2006

Collective Oscillation in a Hamiltonian System

Hidetoshi Morita1,2,* and Kunihiko Kaneko2,3

¹Faculty of Science and Engineering, Waseda University, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan ²Department of Basic Science, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan ³ERATO Complex Systems Biology Project, JST, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan (Received 11 June 2005; published 9 February 2006)

Oscillation of macroscopic variables is discovered in a metastable state of the Hamiltonian system of the mean-field XY model. The duration of the oscillation is divergent with the system size. This long-lasting periodic or quasiperiodic collective motion appears through Hopf bifurcation, which is a typical route in low-dimensional dissipative dynamical systems. The origin of the oscillation is explained, with a self-consistent analysis of the distribution function, as the self-organization of a self-excited swing state through the mean field. The universality of the phenomena is discussed.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.050602

PACS numbers: 05.70.Ln, 05.45.-a, 87.10.+e

Dissipative systems often show periodic, quasiperiodic, and chaotic motion at a macroscopic level, when they are far away from equilibrium. The motion is described as lowdimensional dynamics, and its discovery has marked an epoch of nonlinear dynamics studies in physics. Recalling that the microscopic degrees of freedom involved are large, such macroscopic behavior is a result of collective motion that emerges out of high-dimensional microscopic dynamics. The collective motion, indeed, has been intensively and Letter, the essence of this discovery is briefly reported, especially in the mean-field *XY* model [8].

We adopt the Hamiltonian system of the mean-field XY model, or globally coupled pendula [5,9,10],

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{p_i^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} [1 - \cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)]. \quad (1)$$

All the N pendula interact with each other through phase

PRL 96, 050602 (2006)

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

$f^0_{\theta}(\theta; M_0) = \frac{1}{Z_{\theta}(M_0)} \exp\left[\frac{M_0}{T_{\text{eq}}(M_0)} \cos\theta\right], \quad (5)$

where $Z_{\theta}(M_0)$ is the normalization. Next, the distribution Here we note that another metastable state in this model has been intensively investigated for a decade, especially by taking a rectangular (*water bag*) initial momentum distribution [5,6]. This metastable state exists only in the region just below the critical energy of the phase transition, and there M(t) and T(t) take smaller values than those in equilibrium, leading to a branch of negative specific heat. This state is regarded as a reflection of a stable stationary solution of the corresponding Vlasov equation. On the other hand, the metastable state that we have discovered

takes larger values of M(t) and T(t) than those in equilib-



FIG. 1 (color). A time series of M(t). The abscissa axis is a log scale. The dotted line is the equilibrium value. Inset: The duration of the plateau τ_{plateau} against N. U = 0.69 [6] and $M_0 = 1$.

week ending 10 FEBRUARY 2006

rium and exists over a much broader region than the negative specific heat branch. Thus the present metastable state is not explained by the above stationary solution of the Vlasov equation and is a novel one.

creasing total energy, the temporal pattern of the macroscopic variable changes as stationary \rightarrow periodic \rightarrow quasiperiodic. This is regarded as a "bifurcation" of the collective motion. Here we note the similarity to the typical bifurcation route in low-dimensional dissipative dynamical systems, fixed point \rightarrow limit cycle \rightarrow torus, through Hopf bifurcations. Hence it is suggested that the present bifurcation of the collective motion is described as that of lowdimensional dynamical systems, in particular, by Hopf bifurcations.

We next investigate the bifurcation in more detail. The mean amplitude of M(t) against U in the vicinity of the



FIG. 2 (color). (a) A time series of M(t) in the metastable state. (b) The decay rate γ of the amplitude of the oscillation, where $M_{\text{amp}}(t) = M_{\text{amp}}(t_0) - \gamma \log(t/t_0)$. U = 0.5 and $M_0 = 0.9$.
Microscopic dynamics can be very different according to the initial conditions (as for other fully-coupled systems, for example the Kuramoto model) and different theoretical approaches can be applied

Most probably the Vlasov equation cannot explain all the anomalies found, which on the other hand, are found also in other models with long-range interactions

Anomalies have a clear dynamical origin.

q-statistics provides a coherent scenario and at the same time does not excludes other interpretations



109 Glassy phase in HMF



110 The polarization p

One can introduce the "*elementary polarization*":

$$\langle \vec{s}_i \rangle = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{1}^{\tau} \vec{s}_i(t) dt$$

i.e. the temporal average, over a time interval \mathbf{t} , of the successive positions of each elementary spin vector.

The modulus of the "*elementary polarization*" has to be furtherly averaged over the quenched disorder of the N spin configurations, to finally obtain the "*polarization*" *p* :

$$p = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \langle \vec{s}_i \rangle \right|$$

92 Polarization & Glassy phase



112 Polarization and QSS



113 p and M in the QSS regime vs N



114 Dependence of p on the integration time

The polarization **p** does not depend on the integration time interval inside the QSS regime



115 p and M at equilibrium



102 Polarization vs initial conditions



103 Polarization vs initial conditions



68 Monte Carlo simulations



105 Glassy thermodynamics for the QSS regime

A. Pluchino PhD thesis (2005) and cond-mat/0506665 Physica A (2006) in press

Let us start from the following effective spin-glass Hamiltonian

$$H = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i, j=1}^{N} J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j \quad (1)$$

Using the following distribution probability for the interaction J_{ij} :

with average and variance

with
$$\vec{s}_i = (\cos \theta_i, \sin \theta_i)$$

$$p(J_{ij}) = (\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_J)^{-1} e^{-\frac{(J_{ij}-J_0)^2}{2\sigma_J^2}}$$

$$\overline{J_{ij}} = J_0 = 1/N$$
, $\overline{J_{ij}^2} - \overline{J_{ij}^2} = \sigma_J^2 = 1/N$

This distribution implies a random coupling among spins with a probability on average $J_0=1/N$ which simulates a glassy behavior similar to what we observe in the QSS regime.

In the thermodynamic limit we have no interaction and the system remains frozen for ever.

In the thermodynamic limit the Hamiltonian (1) reduces to the potential part of the HMF Hamiltonian. One can treat the kinetic part considering a heat bath with T=2K/N

General HMF Hamiltonian :

ing a heat bath
A. RAPISARDA ICTP
$$H = K + V = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{p_i^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} J_{ij} \vec{s}_i \cdot \vec{s}_j$$

75 Comparison with numerical data

By applying the replica method, after some standard calculations one can extract from the Hamiltonian (1), the following selfconsistent equation for the spinglass order parameter

$$p_{SG} = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{p}} \beta^{-1} \int_{0}^{\infty} r^{2} dr \exp\left(-\frac{r^{2}}{2}\right) \frac{I_{1}\left[\beta r \sqrt{p/2}\right]}{I_{0}\left[\beta r \sqrt{p/2}\right]}$$

Which can be compared with numerical molecular dynamics calculation of the polarization in the thermodynamic limit of the QSS regime considering

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{N}_{\infty}) = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{OSS}}$$



The comparison is good and gives further support to the connection between glassy systems and the QSS regime of the HMF model

Schematic summary



Summary for the HMF model

- Summarizing, the Hmf model represents a paradigmatic model for nonextensive (long range interacting or finite) systems, as for example self-gravitating objects, nuclear and atomic systems.
- Several **dynamical metastable anomalies** are present: negative specific heat, very slow dynamics, anomalous diffusion, power-law relaxation, fractal-like structures, vanishing of lyapunov exponents, ergodicity breaking and aging
- This **metastable anomalous behavior can become stable** if the infinite size limit is performed before the infinite time limit: *the two limits do not commute.*
- There are links to Tsallis generalized statistics.
- It is possible to treat the QSS regime in terms of a glassy phase.

•But one can find similarities with other non Hamiltonian systems....

Some references on the HMF model

- ✓ Antoni and Ruffo, Phys. Rev. E 52 (1995) 2361
- ✓ Latora, Rapisarda, Ruffo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 698. Physica D 131 (1999) 38
- ✓ Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 2104
- ✓ Latora, Rapisarda, Tsallis, Phys. Rev. E 64 (2001) 056134
- ✓ Dauxois, Latora, Rapisarda, Ruffo, Torcini, Lectures Notes in Phys., Springer 602 (2002).
- ✓ Tsallis, Rapisarda, Latora, Baldovin, Lectures Notes in Phys., Springer 602 (2002).
- ✓ Montemurro, Tamarit, Anteneodo Phys. Rev E (2003)

✓ Yamaguchi, Barrè, Bouchet, Dauxois, Ruffo, Physica A 337 (2004) 36

Pluchino, Latora, Rapisarda, Physica D 193 (2004) 315; Phys. Rev. E 69 (2004) 056113, Physica A 338 (2004) 60, Cont. Mech. and Therm. 16 (2004) 245, cond-mat/0506665 and cond-mat/0507005, Europhysics News 36 (2005) 202 Physica A 365 (2006) 184

Most recent results

✓ Tamarit, Maglione, Anteneodo, Stariolo, Phys. Rev. E 71 (2005) 036148

For the generalized version of the HMF model see:

✓ Anteneodo and Tsallis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 5313; Tamarit and Anteneodo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 (20
 ✓ Campa, Giansanti and Moroni, J. Phys. A 36 (2003) 6897.



- The Kuramoto Model
- Coupled Logistic maps with noise
- Soc models for earthquakes dynamics

125 Non Hamiltonian systems

The Kuramoto model

The Kuramoto Model

(Kuramoto 1975)



112 Metastability in the Kuramoto Model



113 Metastability in the Kuramoto Model

Also for the Kuramoto model metastability seems to diverge with the system size



Coupled maps on a lattice

102 Coupled Maps on a lattice

We consider a model of Coupled Logistic Maps on a lattice, i.e.

$$f(x) = sign(x) \cdot \text{mod} \left\{ 2 \left[\alpha \cdot g_{\mu}(x) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot w \right], 1 \right\}$$
(1)
$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t(i)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} [f(x_t(i+1)) - 2f(x_t(i)) + f(x_t(i-1))]$$
(2)

$$g_{\mu} = 1 - \mu x^2$$

Here w is a white noise term controlled by the parameter $\alpha \in [0,1]$

See the poster by S. RIZZO

Phase diagram of CML



FRP= frozen random patterns

- BD = brownian motion of defect
- DT = defect turbulence
- PCI= pattern competition intermittency
- FDT= fully developed turbulence

K. Kaneko, *Simulating Physics with Coupled Map Lattices*, World Scientific (1990)

103 Coupled Maps on a lattice



103 Dynamics of Coupled Maps on a lattice

1D Coupled Map Lattice for μ =1.8322; ϵ =0.7; α = 1 Time evolution with no noise -0.8 50 -0.6 (α=1) -0.4 100 0.2 **+** 150 0 µ=1.8322 -0.2 200 -0.4 ε=0.7 -0.6 250 -0.8 300 20 45 55 80 100 Sites

104 Dynamics of Coupled Maps on a lattice



105 Dynamics of Coupled Maps on a lattice



105 Autocorrelation for Coupled Maps on a lattice



106 Fluctuations of Coupled Maps on a lattice

One can consider the difference between two maps and study the fluctuations of this new variable.

We considered for example

$$u(t) = x(45) - x(55)$$

The time behavior of **u(t)** can be very intermittent and one can apply a superstatistic approach

(more details in the poster by

S. RIZZO)



106 Coupled Maps on a lattice



107 Pdfs of Coupled Maps on a lattice



108 Coupled Maps on a lattice

The pdf of β , the inverse variance of u(t), obeys a Lognormal distribution.

But a Gamma distribution is very close to it and represents a good approximation



SOC model with long-range interactions for earthquakes dynamics

Conclusions

Summarizing, long-range interacting systems present several dynamical anomalies which pose severe problems to standard statistical mechanics and which can find a natural description in term of q-statistics *"ALL THE TRUTHS PASS THROUGH THREE STAGES:*

FIRST, THEY ARE CONSIDERED RIDICULOUS,

SECOND, THEY ARE VIOLENTLY ADVERSED,

THIRD, THEY ARE ACCEPTED AND CONSIDERED SELF-EVIDENT."

A. SCHOPENHAUER