



2254-15

Workshop on Sphere Packing and Amorphous Materials

25 - 29 July 2011

Glass and Jamming Transition from the Mean-Field Perspectives

Kunimasa MIYAZAKI Institute of Physics, University of Tsukuba Tennodai 1-1-1, Tsukuba 305-8571 Ibaraki JAPAN

Glass and Jamming Transition from the Mean-Field Perspectives



Kunimasa Miyazaki

- Phys. Rev. E 81, 040501(R) (2010)
- Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 255704 (2010)
- Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 015701 (2011)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



Atsushi Ikeda Misaki Ozawa Takeshi Kuroiwa











Patrick Charbonnau Duke University

OVERVIEW

Introduction

Numerical Test of Mean Field Scenario

- Glass transition in Higher dimensions
- Glass transition for Ultra-Soft Fluids
- Jamming transition vs. MCT transition
- Replica Theory vs Mode-Coupling Theory

Conclusions

INTRODUCTION

• What is the Glass Transition?



Drastic slow down of dynamics of supercooled liquids at low temperature

INTRODUCTION

• A Mean Field Scenario of the Glass Transition



If this mean field scenario is correct,

D MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions

□ MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)

MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions



If this mean field scenario is correct,

MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions

□ MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)

MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

Long-ranged Potential = Dense Ultra-Soft Potential



MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

MCT works unprecedentedly well !



٠	
L.	

	KA LJ	GCM (ρ = 1.5)	GCM (ρ = 2.0)
T _{mct} (simulation+fitting)	0.435	0.202 × 10 ⁻⁵	0.266 × 10 ⁻⁶
T _{mct} (theory)	0.922	0.266 × 10 ⁻⁵	0.340 × 10 ⁻⁶
Deviations	112 %	33 %	28 %

MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

MCT works unprecedentedly well ! And dynamic heterogeneities are weak !!

Weaker violation of Stokes-Einstein relation



If this mean field scenario is correct,

MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems

Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)

Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)



$$_{RCP} = \lim_{P \to \infty} \varphi(P)$$

 $= \varphi_J \quad \text{for } \varphi_{ini} < \varphi_{met}$

 $> \varphi_J \quad \text{for } \varphi_{ini} > \varphi_{met}$

Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)



Ozawa, Kuroiwa, Ikeda, and KM (in preparation)

If this mean field scenario is correct,

MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions
 MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems
 Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)



CONCLUSIONS

GRADE of MCT

MCT should work better in Higher Dimensions ???
 MCT should work better for Long-Ranged Systems
 Dynamic(MCT) transition point should mark the crossover of the inherent structure (Jamming transition point!)