Transition vitreuse et relaxation dans les liquides surfondus : Un aperçu théorique

Gilles Tarjus

(LPTMC, CNRS/Univ. Paris 6)

Fréjus GDR Verres 2015

Outline

- What is there to be explained about the glass transition and the viscous slowing down of relaxation?
- Are there growing characteristic lengths associated with glass-forming behavior?
- Theoretical approaches: in search of an effective theory and an appropriate order parameter.

What is there to be explained about the glass "transition" ?

Glass formation by cooling a liquid (or a polymer)



Observed glass "transition" = kinetic crossover

One of the most spectacular phenomena in all of physics in terms of dynamical range



Frequency-dependent dielectric susceptibility (imaginary part) for liquid propylene carbonate (Lunkenheimer et al., JCP 2001)

Dramatic super-Arrhenius temperature dependence of relaxation times (and viscosity)

Arrhenius plot of the reorientational time of molecular liquids [Roessler et al., 2013]



Nonexponential and multi-step relaxation

Time versus frequency domain:





Time-dependent response/correlation function

Frequency-dependent dynamic susceptibility

Nonexponential relaxation (contd)

"Stretched"
$$\alpha$$
-relaxation: $\phi(t) \simeq e^{-(\frac{t}{\tau})^{\beta}}$ (K.W.W.)
 $\chi(\omega) = \chi_{\infty} + \frac{(\chi_0 - \chi_{\infty})}{(1 - i\omega\tau_{cd})^{\beta_{cd}}}$

Stretched relaxation of liquid m-toluidine (C. Alba-Simionesco, 2001)



Left, dielectric spectrum. Right, photon correlation spectroscopy.

Signature of a distribution of local relaxation times?

Dramatic temperature dependence of relaxation time and viscosity

Arrhenius plot of the viscosity of liquid ortho-terphenyl



- Phenomenon is universal and spectacular
- Slowing down faster than anticipated from high-T behavior

Tempting to look for a detail-independent collective explanation!

Interlude: Explanations of slow dynamics

• "Non-cooperative": Arrhenius T-dependence for chemical relaxation time

$$\tau \sim \exp\left(\frac{E}{T}\right)$$

with a roughly constant activation energy E.



• "Cooperative":

Critical slowing down of relaxation (approaching a critical point at T_c)

- * Diverging correlation length: $\xi \sim |T T_c|^{-\nu}$
- * Diverging relaxation time: $\tau \sim \xi^z \sim |T T_c|^{-z\nu}$

Interlude (contd.) However...

• Viscous slowing down of relaxation seems of cooperative (or collective) nature... T-dependent effective



• ... But with an activated T-dependence: e.g., empirical fit to VTF formula $\tau \sim \tau_0 \exp\left(\frac{C}{T-T_0}\right)$

Expected collective behavior, but... large differences among glass-formers: "Fragility"

Arrhenius plot with T scaled to $T_{\rm g}$







Expected collective behavior, but....

- No observed, nor nearby, singularity in the dynamics and the thermodynamics.
- Correlation length obtained from the pair density correlation function (structure factor) is small and does not vary with temperature.



Static structure factor S(Q) of liquid m-toluidine at several temperatures from just above melting (T_m) to below the glass transition (T_g).

[C. Alba-Simionesco et al.]

Only significant change in thermodynamic data: Rapid decrease of the entropy



"Configurational" entropy, normalized by its value at melting versus T/T_m.

$$\Delta S = S_{liquid} - S_{xtal}$$

What makes the problem interesting...

There are hints that glass formation involves *some form of universality *some form of collective/cooperative behavior

Yet, of an unusual kind...

- If dynamics in the viscous regime is dominated by a unique **mechanism**, what is its nature?
- What are the characteristic (growing?) **length scales**?
- If the collective glass-forming behavior is assigned to an **underlying phase transition** (critical point), where is it located, what are its properties, what is the **local order parameter**?

Recent advances: Are there growing characteristic lengths associated with collective behavior in glass-forming liquids?

[No relevant info from the dynamics or the structure at a **2-body** level]

Spatially heterogeneous dynamics

When approaching glass formation: Presence of fast and slow moving regions over an increasing time scale

Computer simulation



Experiment on colloids



Confocal microscopy of a colloidal suspension. Large spheres: fast moving particles (0.5 diam. during τ_{α}). [Weeks et al., 2000]

The info is embodied in multi-point space-time correlation functions

Dynamic heterogeneity and multi-point space-time correlations

Local probe for atom *j*, e.g.: $f_j(\mathbf{k}, t) = \Re\{e^{i\mathbf{k}[\mathbf{r}_j(t) - \mathbf{r}_j(0)]}\}$ with *k* of the order of inverse of interatomic distance

Average dynamics: self intermediate scattering function

$$F_s(k,t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \langle f_j(\mathbf{k},t) \rangle$$

• Fluctuations in the dynamics: $\delta f_j(\mathbf{k}, t) = f_j(\mathbf{k}, t) - \langle f_j(\mathbf{k}, t) \rangle$

$$G_4(r,t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \delta(\mathbf{r}_{ij} - \mathbf{r}) < [\delta f_i(\mathbf{k},t)] [\delta f_j(\mathbf{k},t)] >$$

From which: correlation length $\xi_4(t)$ and susceptibility $\chi_4(t)$

$$\chi_4(t) = \int d^3 r G_4(r,t) = \frac{1}{N} < [\sum_{j=1}^N \delta f_j(\mathbf{k},t)]^2 >$$

Spatial correlations in the dynamics and associated length scale

Need multi-point space-time correlation/response functions

(Simulation, Imaging techniques, nonlinear dielectric spectroscopy, solid-state NMR)



Correlation length never grows bigger than 5-10 molecular diameters

How about a growing static length scale ?

Relation between the relaxation time and a static correlation length:

 $au(T) \leq au_{\infty} \exp[rac{C}{T} \xi_{PS}(T)^3]$ [Montanari-semerjian, 2006]

=> If super-Arrhenius dependence of τ (T): at some point, $\xi_{PS}(T)$ must grow when $T\downarrow$.



How about a growing static length scale ?

General idea: Try to measure the length associated with the bound on the relaxation time $\tau(T) \lesssim \tau_{\infty} \exp[\frac{C}{T} \xi_{PS}(T)^3]$

=> **Point-to-set correlation** function and associated length, extracted *e.g.* from the influence of amorphous boundary conditions.

- Evidence for some (limited) growth with decreasing temperature in computer simulations.
- Hard to access experimentally. No progress thus far.

Theoretical approach(es): in search of an effective theory of glass-forming liquids

What is the appropriate local order parameter? A thermodynamic/structural or a purely kinetic approach?

Different strategies for determining a local order parameter

• Based on physical intuition on 3-D glass-forming liquids:

=> **Structural view**: a complex local arrangement in liquids that is incompatible with crystallization (frustration).

=> **Dynamical view**: a mobility field with constraints (dynamical facilitation).

• A more generic route:

Derive the proper **mean-field theory** and the **order parameter** (à *la* Landau) + include **spatial fluctuations** of this order parameter.

Then: Renormalization group & nucleation theory

[Compare with the well-known case of the gas-liquid transition]

Some theoretical ingredients

• Frustration: The energy of a system cannot be minimized by simultaneously minimizing all the local interactions.

=> Multiplicity of low-energy ("metastable") states.

=> Thwarts crystallization.

• Thermal activation in a rugged (free) energy landscape:

Presence of an exponentially large number of metastable states that may trap the system.

=> Relaxation slowdown is associated with thermally activated escape from metastable states.

• Dynamical facilitation: Mobility triggers mobility in nearby regions.

=> Spatial correlations in the dynamics.

Different ways to incorporate the ingredients in a general theory!

Putative local order parameter(s)

• Local structural order: Observables characterizing the locally preferred molecular arrangement in the liquid, if present (e.g., related to bond-orientational order).

=> Such a local order (e.g., poly-tetrahedral in metallic glasses) can be detected by multi-point, not simply pair, static correlation functions.

Similarity or "overlap" between configurations: Measures of the similarity between two equilibrium configurations of the liquid.
 High overlap => in the same state ("localized")
 Low overlap => in different states ("delocalized")

• Local mobility field: Mobility or activity defined by following the dynamics in small volumes of space over short periods of time. => Easier at low T where mobility is localized and scarce.

Theories based on an underlying dynamic transition

• Mode-coupling theory [Götze & coll (80's to now)]

Self-consistent kinetic freezing: relaxation channel for density fluctuations via product of density modes.

= an <u>avoided</u> transition at $T_c > T_g$

• Dynamical facilitation and kinetic constraints [Fredrickson-Andersen (80's)... Garrahan-Chandler]

Sparse mobility defects in an essentially frozen background; mobility triggers mobility.

=> an <u>unreachable</u> critical point at T=0



Theories based on an underlying thermodynamic transition

- Frustration-based approach [Nelson, Sadoc et al (80's), Kivelson
- + GT, Tanaka et al]
 - Frustration = incompatibility between extension of the local order preferred in a liquid and tiling of the whole space
 - => competition
 - => an <u>avoided</u> transition at $T^* > T_g$



- Random first-order transition theory: [Wolynes & coll (80's to now), Parisi & coll + Many...]
 - Dynamic slowdown driven by the decrease of the configurational entropy
 - => an <u>unreachable</u> transition at $T_K < T_g$

The free-energy landscape/RFOT scenario as the mean-field theory of glass-forming liquids

Analog of the van der Waals theory for the gas-liquid transition

[Wolynes, Kirkpatrick, Thirumalai, 80's + Parisi-Mezard-Franz-Zamponi + many]





Summary of the characteristic (theoretical) temperatures

Unreachable (extrapolated):

 $T_0 \approx T_K$ (RFOT), T = 0 (facilitation).

Avoided (crossover):

T* (frustration), $T_c = T_d$ (MCT & RFOT).

Experimental: T_m, T_g

(T-dependent viscosity of o-TP)



Weak constraints from comparison to experimental data...

With the help of (unavoidable ?) adjustable parameters, several theories fit the same data equally well



log(viscosity or time) vs Tg/T

Conclusion

- No consensus on theory of glass transition. Still a challenging problem!
- Existence and nature of growing length scales = key issue for understanding the glass transition.
- New developments in theories of the glass transition that may allow more stringent internal consistency checks and more rigorous treatments... but weak constraints from experiments.

A few references

- S. Kivelson and G. Tarjus, "In search of a theory of supercooled liquids", Nature Mat. 7, 831 (2008); ArXiv:0804.1718.
- G. Tarjus, "An overview of the theories of the glass transition", (in *Dynamical Heterogeneities in Glasses...,* L. Berthier et al. Eds. (Oxford Univ. Press, 2011); ArXiv:1010.2938.
- L.Berthier and G. Biroli, "Theoretical perspective on the glass transition and amorphous materials", Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 587 (2011).
- M. D. Ediger and P. Harrowell, "Perspective: Supercooled liquids and glasses", J. Chem. Phys. **137**, 080901 (2012).

Empirical correlations

Correlations among characteristics of the slow dynamics







Correlation between translation-rotation decoupling and stretching at T_g for liquids and polymers (Ediger, 2000)

+ Correlation fragility & nonlinear relaxation
+ Universality of alpha relaxation
+ Density/temperature scaling
+ oto

Correlations between slow dynamics and thermodynamics





Correlation between heat capacity jump at Tg and fragility for molecular liquids (Stevenson-Wolynes, 2005)

+ Correlation between dynamic and thermodynamic fragilities (Ito et al., 1999)
 + Correlation between VTF T₀ and Kauzmann T_K
 + etc...

Correlations between slow dynamics and fast dynamics (in liquid or glass)

Example:

Large intensity of boson peak small fragility



Correlations between slow dynamics and fast dynamics (in liquid or glass)

Correlations between <u>fragility</u> and: Poisson ratio of elastic moduli, relative amplitude of Boson peak, mean-square displacement, ergodicity parameter at T_g, etc...



Yannopoulos et al. 2000

Caution!!!

- Correlation does not mean causality
- Large body of data and systems are required to ascertain correlation
- Large error bars
- Correlations may not be robust when studying effect of additional control parameters (pressure, molecular weight,...)