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Quasilocalized modes appear in the vibrational spectrum of amorphous solids at low frequency. Though never formalized, these modes are believed to have a close relationship with other important local excitations, including shear transformations and two-level systems. We provide a theory for their frequency density, \( D_L(\omega) \sim \omega^\alpha \), that establishes this link for systems at zero temperature under quasistatic loading. It predicts two regimes depending on the density of shear transformations \( P(x) \sim x^\theta \) (with \( x \) the additional stress needed to trigger a shear transformation). If \( \theta > 1/4 \), then \( \alpha = 4 \) and a finite fraction of quasilocalized modes form shear transformations, whose amplitudes vanish at low frequencies. If \( \theta < 1/4 \), then \( \alpha = 3 + 4\theta \) and all quasilocalized modes form shear transformations with a finite amplitude at vanishing frequencies. We confirm our predictions numerically.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike crystals, amorphous solids do not present topological defects due to their lack of long-range order. Instead they display excitations where a group of particles can rearrange. These essentially local excitations lead to a dipolar change of stress in the medium, which can effectively couple them. An example of local excitations is two-level systems that govern the low-temperature properties of glasses, for which the particles’ rearrangement is induced by quantum tunneling [1–3]. The nature of two-level systems and the role of their interactions, argued to lead to a pseudogap in their density, is still debated [4–6]. Another example of local excitations is shear transformations [7–11], in which a rearrangement, or plastic event, can occur in the absence of any quantum or thermal fluctuations by a local increase in stress that triggers a saddle-node bifurcation [12]. In this case, the important role of interactions is established: They lead to bursts of avalanches of many plastic events [13,14]. This behavior is a necessary consequence [15,16] of the presence of a pseudogap \( P(x) \sim x^\theta \) in the density of these excitations [17–21] (where \( x \) is the additional shear stress that must be applied locally to trigger a new event). Treating the effect of interactions as a mean-field mechanical noise leads to the prediction that \( \theta \) varies nonmonotonically as shear stress is applied [22], as confirmed numerically [16,23,24].

These local excitations correspond to directions in phase space with little restoring forces, suggesting that the low-frequency part of the vibrational spectrum contains information on their respective nature. This view is supported by the early observation that quasilocalized modes are present at low frequencies [25], leading to a considerable numerical effort to characterize them. Most studies find that their density follows \( D_L(\omega) \sim \omega^\alpha \) with \( \alpha = 4 \) [26–32], although \( \alpha \approx 3 \) has also been reported [33,34]. Theoretically, it has been argued, for general bosonic disordered systems, that \( \alpha = 4 \) in the ground state and \( \alpha = 3 \) in generic metastable states [35,36]. This theory, however, neglects interactions between quasilocalized modes. Its apparent success thus seems to be at odds with the established role of interactions in determining the properties of plastic deformation and yielding [13–21].

In this article, we provide a theory for the density of quasilocalized modes for classical systems at zero temperature, which takes their interactions into account and clarifies their relationship with shear transformations. In particular, we introduce and treat analytically a mesoscopic model of interacting quasilocalized modes. We predict two distinct regimes, whereby shear transformations are found to be the dominant source of quasilocalized modes only in one of them. We confirm our predictions by independently measuring the exponents \( \alpha \) and \( \theta \), using molecular dynamics simulations of quasistatically sheared glasses obtained at distinctly different quench rates.

II. MESOSCOPIC MODEL AND THEORETICAL PREDICTION

We model an amorphous solid as a collection of mesoscopic blocks whose size is comparable to that of quasilocalized modes. In each block we consider the softest quasilocalized mode. We denote by \( s \) the displacement along that mode and by \( u_i(s) \) the Taylor expansion of the energy [37] in a block \( i \):

\[
u_i(s) = \frac{1}{2!} \lambda_i s^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \kappa_i s^3 + \frac{1}{4!} \lambda_i s^4 + O(s^5) \quad (1)
\]

Numerical measurements of \( \chi_i \) have shown that its distribution is narrow [29], and we thus assume that it does not depend on \( i \) and choose the units of the displacement \( s \) so that \( \chi = 1 \). Consequently, \( \lambda_i \) and \( \kappa_i \) determine the shape the potential. Note that \( \lambda_i = \alpha \omega_i^2 \) is the smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian of the block.

The shear stress \( \sigma_i \) in the block can change either due to a global applied stress or due to an interaction with another block in which a rearrangement occurred. A change of shear stress by \( \delta \sigma_i \) tilts the potential \( u_i(s) \):

\[
\tilde{u}_i(s, \delta \sigma_i) = u_i(s) - s C_i \delta \sigma_i \quad (2)
\]
the relevant range of $\Phi$ (without any singularity, in particular around $\Phi = 0$).

Following elastoplastic models [39–41], we describe the change of shear stress on block $i$ as $\delta \sigma_i = d \Sigma + \eta_i$, where $d \Sigma$ is the increment of globally applied stress, and $\eta_i$ stems from the rearrangements (saddle-node bifurcations) of other blocks. $\eta_i$ is of zero mean and displays a power-law distribution [17,22]. During an avalanche of rearrangements, $\delta \sigma_i$ thus performs a random flight. In the mean-field approximation where $\eta_i$ is assumed to be uncorrelated in space and time, it corresponds to a Lévy flight, and exact calculations are possible [22]. Our arguments below, however, do not rely on this approximation.

The spectrum of the Hessian, $P(\lambda)$, can be calculated as a marginal distribution of the density of states $P(\lambda, \kappa)$. A change of variables allows us to express $P(\lambda, \kappa)$ in terms of $\Delta \sigma$ and $\Phi$:

\begin{equation}
P(\lambda, \kappa) = 2\lambda P(\Delta \sigma, \Phi),
\end{equation}

where $\Delta \sigma$ is the accumulated stress change relative to an arbitrary reference and the factor $2\lambda$ corresponds to the absolute value of the Jacobian $|\partial(\Delta \sigma, \Phi)/\partial(\lambda, \kappa)|$ (see Appendix C). We first consider passive modes for which $\Phi < 0$ and for convenience chose to define $\Delta \sigma = 0$ at $\kappa = 0$. If many rearrangements take place in the system (as expected after a fast quench or after a succession of avalanches triggered by increasing the stress), then the flights in each block will lead to a finite distribution for $P(\Delta \sigma)$ at any $\Phi < 0$, independently of the initial conditions, as long as $P(\Phi) > 0$. In particular, $P(\Delta \sigma = 0, \Phi = 0) > 0$, implying that $P(\lambda, \kappa) \sim \lambda$ in the limit of vanishing $\lambda$. Thus the contribution of passive modes to the spectrum of the Hessian is as follows:

\begin{equation}
P(\lambda) = \int_{\Phi < 0} P(\lambda, \kappa) d\kappa \sim \lambda \int_{\kappa < \sqrt{2\lambda}} d\kappa \sim \lambda^{3/2}.
\end{equation}

For a fixed $\Phi > 0$, failure occurs when $\lambda = 0$. An example is shown in Fig. 1 as point $D$ and its mirror image $D’$. Thus the dynamics after a fast quench or a big avalanche corresponds to a stochastic walk with absorbing conditions at these points and reinsertion in points $B’$ ($B$) if failure happened in $D$ ($D’$).

We then identify $x = \Delta \sigma = \Delta \sigma^{(1)}$ as the additional stress needed to trigger a shear transformation. The density of states can be shown to display a power law between the absorption and reinsertion points $D$ and $B$ [42]. From Ref. [22] we know that $P(x, \Phi) \sim (x/x^*)^\theta$ for $x < x^*$, where $x^*$ corresponds to point $B$. For $x \gg x^*$, $P(x)$ will vary smoothly. It is straightforward to show that $x^* \sim \lambda^{1/2}$ and that for $x \ll x^*, x \sim \lambda^2/\kappa$ and $\Phi \sim \kappa^2$ (see Appendix D). Using Eq. (5) we finally obtain:

\begin{equation}
P(\lambda, \kappa) \sim \frac{\lambda^{20+1}}{\kappa^{10}} \text{ for } \lambda \ll \kappa^2.
\end{equation}

Equation (7) readily gives the contribution of shear transformations to the spectrum of the Hessian:

\begin{equation}
P(\lambda) = \int_{\Phi > 0} P(\lambda, \kappa) d\kappa \sim \begin{cases} \frac{\lambda^{20+1}}{\lambda^{3/2}} & \text{if } \theta < 1/4 \\ \frac{\lambda^{20+1}}{\lambda^{3/2}} & \text{if } \theta \geq 1/4 \end{cases}
\end{equation}

Thus if $\theta < 1/4$, then shear transformations dominate the low-frequency spectrum of the Hessian. Following Eq. (7), the
integral in Eq. (8) is dominated by large \( \kappa \), implying that shear transformations leading to large plastic events are observed as \( \lambda \to 0 \). By contrast, for \( \theta \geq 1/4 \) both shear transformations and passive modes contribute equally. In that case the integral in Eq. (8) is dominated by small \( \kappa \sim \sqrt{\lambda} \), implying that low-frequency shear transformations lead to tiny rearrangements.

Concerning the density of vibrational modes, using \( \omega^2 \sim \lambda \) and Eqs. (6) and (8) we get:

\[
D_L(\omega) = P(\lambda) \frac{d\lambda}{d\omega} \sim \omega^\alpha, \quad \alpha = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
4\theta + 3 & \theta < 1/4 \\
4 & \theta \geq 1/4.
\end{array} \right.
\]

Note that in the absence of interactions \( \theta = 0 \), and, consequently, our result is consistent with the theoretical prediction for noninteracting modes \( \alpha = 3 \) [35,36]. In the presence of interactions \( \theta \) will generally be nonzero and will depend on the system preparation. The latter allows us to test our theory, which we now do using molecular dynamics simulations for different preparation protocols.

### III. MOLECULAR DYNAMICS

As mentioned in the introduction, mean-field theory predicts that \( \theta = 1/2 \) after a quench, then drops and rises again as a function of the applied shear strain \( \gamma \) [22]. The drop is expected to be more pronounced for well-annealed glasses [22], as confirmed numerically [16,23,24]. To test our theory we thus measure \( \alpha \) and \( \theta \) as a function of \( \gamma \) for glasses obtained using different preparations. We consider the three-dimensional bidisperse glass of Ref. [33], composed of \( N \) particles interacting by purely repulsive inverse power-law potentials, which are continuous up to the third derivatives.

We consider two distinct preparation protocols: (i) a rapid quench, which results in a poorly annealed glass, obtained by a steepest descent after instantaneously cooling from a temperature \( T = T_0 \) (higher than the glass transition temperature) to \( T = 0 \); and (ii) a slow quench, which results in a better annealed glass, obtained by first cooling it at a low rate from \( T = T_0 \) to \( T = T_0/10 \), followed by a steepest descent to remove the remaining heat. Details are provided in Appendix E.

After the glass is prepared, we quasistatically apply a simple shear using Lee-Edwards periodic boundary conditions [43]. As commonly reported, we find that the stress-strain curve \( \langle \Sigma(\gamma) \rangle \) is monotonic after a rapid quench and displays an overshoot after a slower quench, as shown in Figs. 2(a,b). The pseudogap exponent \( \theta \) is readily extracted using extreme value statistics [18,20], which uses the fact that \( \langle x_{\min} \rangle \sim N^{-1/(1+\theta)} \), where \( x_{\min} \) characterizes the shear transformation closest to an instability. More precisely, it is the additional stress needed to trigger the next plastic event. It is proportional to the strain increment between events, \( \gamma_{\min} \), illustrated in the inset of Fig. 2(a). \( \langle \gamma_{\min}(N) \rangle \) is reported in Figs. 2(c,d), from which the exponent \( \theta \) is extracted via a power-law fit. The results are reported in Figs. 3(a,b) where the predicted nonmonotonicity of \( \theta(\gamma) \) is observed. We find that for the rapidly quenched glass, \( \theta > 1/4 \) for all \( \gamma \), leading to the prediction that \( \alpha = 4 \). By contrast, the slowly quenched glass displays a range of strains for which \( \theta < 1/4 \), where our prediction is that \( \alpha < 4 \).

To measure the exponent \( \alpha \), we diagonalize the Hessian to obtain \( D_L(\omega) \). We then determine \( \alpha \) in two ways. One way is to use the fact that the mean lowest frequency scales with the system size as \( \langle \omega_{\min} \rangle \sim N^{-1/(1+\alpha)} \). We show this scaling at three representative values of strain \( \gamma \) in Figs. 2(e,f) and measured values of \( \alpha \) are shown as blue line in Figs. 3(c,d).
The exponent \( \alpha \) can also be measured directly from \( D_L(\omega) \), in contrast to \( \theta \), that cannot be obtained directly from the distribution \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \), as we explain in Appendix F. However, this measurement is challenging as it is polluted by the influence of plane waves and by finite-size effects at low frequencies (see Figs. 2(g,h) and Appendix G). In order to perform this measurement, we follow a protocol [30] that separates quasilocalized modes from plane waves based on their participation ratio \( e \equiv 1/N \sum_j (\Psi_j^2) \), where \( \Psi_j \) is the eigenmode component on the \( j \)th particle. Examples of participation ratios are shown in insets of Figs. 2(g,h) where the employed threshold \( e_c \) is indicated by a horizontal line. We have verified robustness of our results below by raising and lowering \( e_c \) by 20%. \( \alpha \) is fit on the “filtered” \( D_L(\omega) \), whereby the fitting range is bounded on the upper side by the point where the power-law scaling is clearly interrupted by the plane waves. A range of lower bounds has been used for which the measurement of \( \alpha \) is robust (see Appendix H for details). The employed fitting range is indicated using green bars in Figs. 2(g,h).

The results, in Figs. 3(c,d), show that the two different measurements of \( \alpha \) are in a good qualitative agreement. The results are consistent with our theoretical prediction for \( \alpha \). In rapidly quenched systems \( \alpha = 4 \), also true in the steady state (shown in Appendix I), while in slowly quenched systems we find that \( \alpha \) is significantly smaller than 4 precisely in the range where \( \theta < 1/4 \). To our knowledge, this is the first time that such a nonmonotonic behavior of \( \alpha \) as a function of shear has been measured directly from molecular dynamics simulations.

### IV. CONCLUSION

We have provided a theory for the density of localized soft modes in classical amorphous solids at zero temperature. Our approach goes beyond previous ones by taking long-range interactions between these modes into account. We have found two regimes, one in which modes near a saddle-node bifurcation are dominant, and one in which they contribute to a finite fraction of the spectrum (the rest consisting of passive modes that are irrelevant as far as plasticity and two-level systems are concerned). The first regime does not appear in rapidly quenched materials (and is thus presumably absent in foams and granular materials). By contrast it is expected to be very pronounced in real glasses which are much more stable than the “slowly quenched” configurations studied here. This view is supported by recent measurements in simulated glasses prepared by a swap algorithm (that are comparable to experimental cooling rates), which indeed show extremely small values for \( \theta \) [24]. Note that our argument appears to be rather generic and may apply to other disordered systems with long-range interactions, e.g., in crystals with defects.

Our work is a necessary first step to describe systems at finite temperatures or shear rates. For example, it is interesting to reflect on the role of thermal fluctuations in a perturbative manner if a very small temperature would have been switched on in the configurations we have described. Modes in which the high energy well is occupied would eventually switch states (an effect that is faster for small \( \lambda \) and \( \kappa \) where barriers are small and activation is fast). In the \( (\lambda, \kappa) \) plane this would lead to a depleted region whose right border corresponds to a limiting parabola where wells are of equal depth (including point C and the origin Fig. 1). In time the depleted region will grow away from the origin and a pseudogap may open at the limiting parabola [5,44,45]. Away from this region we expect our described solutions to hold. Measuring the joint distribution \( P(\lambda, \kappa) \) for this kind of protocol, a task for which recent numerical methods are being designed [33], would shed light on the nature of bottom of the energy landscape in glasses.
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### APPENDIX A: POTENTIAL SHAPE DYNAMICS

Here we derive Eq. (3) of the main text. Following Eqs. (1) and (2), the tilted potential under shear stress in a block \( i \) is

\[
\tilde{u}_i(\delta\sigma_i) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_i\delta^2 + \frac{1}{3!}\kappa_i\delta^3 + \frac{1}{4!}\lambda_i\delta^4 - \delta\sigma_i, \tag{A1}
\]
which can be equivalently expressed as
\[ \bar{u}_i(s, \delta\sigma_i) = \frac{1}{2!} \bar{\kappa}_{ij} (s - s_0)^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \bar{\kappa}_{ijk} (s - s_0)^3 + \frac{1}{4!} (s - s_0)^4, \]
(A2)
where \( s_0 \) is the displacement that corresponds to the new minimum, and \((\bar{\kappa}_{ij}, \bar{\kappa}_{ijk})\) are the new Taylor expansion coefficients around \( s = s_0 \). The relation between \((\bar{\kappa}_{ij}, \bar{\kappa}_{ijk}, s_0)\) and \((\lambda_i, \kappa_i, \delta\sigma_i)\) reads:
\[
\begin{align*}
\delta\kappa_i &\equiv \bar{\kappa}_{ij} = s_0 \\
\delta\lambda_i &\equiv \bar{\kappa}_{ij} - \lambda_i = \bar{\kappa}_{ij} - \lambda_i - s_0 - \frac{1}{2} s_0^2 \\
\delta\sigma_i &\equiv s_0 - \frac{1}{2} s_0^2 - \frac{1}{3} s_0^3.
\end{align*}
(A3)
\]
In the limit \( \delta\sigma_i \to 0 \) we obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\delta\kappa_i}{\delta\sigma_i} &= \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \\
\frac{\delta\lambda_i}{\delta\sigma_i} &= \kappa_i.
\end{align*}
(A4)
\]
**APPENDIX B: DERIVATION OF THE PARABOLA \( \kappa^2 - 8\lambda/3 = 0 \) AFTER THE BLOCK FAILS**

When the block fails, it drops to a new minimum. The potential expanded around at the new minimum is
\[
\bar{u}(s) = \frac{1}{2!} \lambda s^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \kappa s^3 + \frac{1}{4!} s^4.
(B1)
\]
At the inflection point, it satisfies:
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\bar{u}(s)}{ds} &= 0 \\
\frac{d^2\bar{u}(s)}{ds^2} &= 0.
\end{align*}
(B2)
\]
We eliminate \( s \) and obtain the relation: \( \kappa^2 - 8\lambda/3 = 0 \).

**APPENDIX C: DERIVATION OF THE JACOBIAN \( |\partial(\Delta\sigma, \Phi)/\partial(\lambda, \kappa)| \)**

To calculate the Jacobian \(|\partial(\Delta\sigma, \Phi)/\partial(\lambda, \kappa)|\) we first express \( \sigma \) as a function of \( \lambda \) and \( \kappa \). To this end we substitute \( \lambda = (\kappa^2 - \Phi)/2 \) [Eq. (4)] into \( \partial\kappa/\partial\Delta\sigma = 1/\lambda \) [Eq. (3)]:
\[
\left( \frac{\kappa^2 - \Phi}{2} \right) \frac{\partial\kappa}{\partial\Delta\sigma} = 1, \tag{C1}
\]
so that
\[
1 \frac{\partial(\kappa^3 - 3\Phi\kappa)}{6 \partial\Delta\sigma} = 1, \tag{C2}
\]
and therefore
\[
\Delta\sigma = \frac{\kappa^3 - 3\lambda\kappa}{3} + c_0, \tag{C3}
\]
where \( c_0 \) is an integration constant. Hence, the Jacobian is
\[
\left| \frac{\partial(\Delta\sigma, \Phi)}{\partial(\lambda, \kappa)} \right| = \left| \frac{\partial\Delta\sigma}{\partial\lambda} \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\kappa} - \frac{\partial\Delta\sigma}{\partial\kappa} \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial\lambda} \right| = 2\lambda. \tag{C4}
\]

**APPENDIX D: DISTANCE TO THE INSTABILITY**

When \( \Phi > 0 \) we choose the integration constant \( c_0 \) in Eq. (C3) such that \( x = 0 \) at \( \lambda = 0 \). We find that
\[
x = \frac{\lambda\kappa - (\kappa - \text{sign} (\kappa)\sqrt{\kappa^2 - 2\lambda}) (\kappa^2 - 2\lambda)}{3}. \tag{D1}
\]
In the limit \( \lambda \ll \kappa^2 \)
\[
x = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\lambda^2}{\kappa}. \tag{D2}
\]
When a block fails, it is reinserted on the parabola \( \kappa^2 - 8\lambda/3 = 0 \) and therefore the distance to instability of the reinserted block is
\[
x^* = \frac{1}{12} \kappa^3 = \frac{2}{3} \Phi^{3/2}. \tag{D3}
\]

**APPENDIX E: SYSTEM PREPARATION PROTOCOL**

The glass system that we use is identical to the one in Ref. [32]. It consists of a binary mixture of point-masses (“particles”). All details including all parameter-values can be found in its supplemental material.

We consider glasses obtained by two different system preparation protocols. Each glass is represented by an ensemble of 1000 independent realizations. Each realization is obtained by a temperature quench that starts from a state of thermal equilibrium at a temperature \( T = T_0 \) that is higher than the glass transition temperature. The two quenching protocols are as follows: (i) an instantaneous quench, referred to as “rapid quench,” in which fully overdamped dynamics are used until all the particles’ velocities have converged to zero (here \( T_0 = .0001\text{ergs} \), where \( \epsilon \) is a microscopic energy scale and \( k_B \) is Boltzmann’s constant), and (ii) a continuous quench, referred to as “slow quench,” in which the system is first solidified at a cooling rate of \( T = 10^{-3} T_0/\tau_c \) until the temperature \( T = 0.17 T_0 \) is reached; overdamped dynamics are then employed to remove the remaining heat. Here \( \tau_c \equiv \sqrt{md^2/\epsilon} \), \( m \) is the mass of each particle and \( d \) is the diameter of the “small” particles.

**APPENDIX F: MEASUREMENT OF \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \)**

To accurately measure \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \) a loading protocol has been developed in which the applied shear \( \gamma \) is adaptively refined when an instability. More practically, when an instability is detected the system is rewound to its last known equilibrium state before the instability. The instability is then approached using smaller steps for \( \delta\gamma \). This protocol is repeated a number of times, such that the value of \( \gamma \) at which the instability occurs is characterized with a sufficient accuracy. The instability is detected by monitoring a quantity \( Q \equiv \max(\delta F)/\text{(Ls)} \gamma \), where \( L \) is the linear system size and \( \text{max}(\delta F) \) is the maximal change in the nonaffine displacement of a particle for the given increment in applied affine shear \( \delta\gamma \). When the response is elastic, \( Q \) is of order one. (Note that the factor \( 1/L \), used to define a dimensionless \( Q \), changes with the system size. We do not expect that this size dependence affects our results because \( L \sim N^3 \) changes by a factor of 3.3 between \( N = 2000 \) and \( N = 64000 \), which is less than the typical fluctuation of \( Q \) in different realizations at fixed \( N \).) However, if there is a
shear transformation, then \( Q \) is significantly higher. To detect the shear transformation we set a threshold \( Q_c \) to be much larger than the typical \( Q \) in elastic shearing and then monitor the three successive \( Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 \) that results from the strain history \( \gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \gamma_3 \). If \( Q_2 > Q_1 \) and \( Q_1, Q_2 < Q_3 \), then we go back from \( \gamma_3 \) to \( \gamma_2 \) and set the strain increment \( \delta \gamma/10 \) (see Fig. 4). This is repeated until the strain increment is smaller than \( 10^{-6} \). At this final resolution, we use an additional condition \( 100Q_1 < Q_2 \) to make sure that \( Q \) is discontinuous which implies that the instability is present. In our simulations, the initial strain increment \( \delta \gamma = 10^{-4} \) and \( Q_c = 100 \). In the end, we could ensure the error of \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \) to be less than \( 10^{-3} \).

APPENDIX G: FINITE-SIZE EFFECTS IN \( D_L(\omega) \) AND RELATION TO \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \)

We now discuss finite-size effects that affect the distribution \( D_L(\omega) \) at low frequencies. They stem from the fact that the states of the glass are sampled at a given value of the accumulated strain \( \gamma \) (see the inset of Fig. 2(a) in the main text). As a consequence, there is a finite probability density to sample a state that is arbitrarily close to the next instability and therefore we are more likely to sample a shear transformation. This sampling also prevents us from measuring \( \theta \) by directly fitting \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \). Namely, as there will be a uniform probability density of finding a shear transformation close to the instability, \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \) will be uniform at small values of \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \). Note that \( \gamma = 0 \) is a special point because the system is always sampled directly after an avalanche.

To confirm this explanation we measured exponents \( \theta' \) and \( \alpha' \) defined by \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \sim \gamma_{\text{min}}^{\theta'} \) and \( D_L(\omega_{\text{min}}) \sim \omega_{\text{min}}^{\alpha'} \), respectively, where \( \omega_{\text{min}} \) is the frequency of the softest quasilocalized mode. Figures 5(a,b) compare distributions \( D_L(\omega) \) and \( D_L(\omega_{\text{min}}) \) at three representative strain \( \gamma = 0, 0.02, 0.09 \). As observed, \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha' \) are clearly different. The distributions \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \) are also shown in Figs. 5(c,d) at the three representative strain. Also the values of \( \theta' \) are clearly different from \( \theta \), as displayed in main text in Figs. 3(a,b).

In Figs. 6(a,b) we report values of \( \theta' \) respectively in rapidly and slowly quenched glasses. In both cases \( \theta' \) is practically 0. This confirms our explanation presented above. The corresponding values of \( \alpha' \) are shown in Figs. 6(c,d), for which a reasonable agreement is found with the values predicted by the theory. This confirms our explanation: When a small \( \omega_{\text{min}} \) is measured it almost always corresponds to a system sampled by chance close to the instability. Therefore, \( D_L(\omega_{\text{min}}) \) is dominated by shear transformations even if \( D_L(\omega) \) is not. This can be clearly seen by comparing regions where \( \alpha = 4 \) for all \( \gamma \) (both shear transformations and passive modes contribute significantly to \( D_L(\omega) \)) but \( \alpha' < 4 \) (shear transformations are dominant).

FIG. 4. Sketch of the protocol to detect the instability. The cyan curve, the blue curve, and the red curve correspond to shear steps \( \delta \gamma, \delta \gamma/10, \delta \gamma/100 \), respectively. The dashed curves represent the trial steps. If at some point \( Q_2 > \max(Q_1, Q_3, Q_c) \) the trial steps are reversed and the strain step is reduced by a factor 10.

FIG. 5. The left column shows results obtained after a rapid quench of a system of \( N = 16000 \) particles and the right column after a slow quench for \( N = 32000 \). [(a) and (b)] The comparison between \( D_L(\omega) \) and \( D_L(\omega_{\text{min}}) \) at three representative \( \gamma = 0, 0.02, 0.09 \) (red, yellow, blue). The black markers on the axes indicate the fitting range of \( D_L(\omega_{\text{min}}) \). The green markers on the axes indicate the same fitting range used in the main text [cf. Figs. 2(g) and 2(h)]. [(c) and (d)] The distribution of \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \) at the same three representative \( \gamma = 0, 0.02, 0.09 \) (red, yellow, blue).

FIG. 6. The left column shows results obtained after a rapid quench for \( N = 16000 \) using 1000 realizations and the right column results obtained after a slow quench for \( N = 32000 \) using 5000 realizations. [(a) and (b)] \( \theta' \) is obtained by fitting \( P(\gamma_{\text{min}}) \) at different \( \gamma \). [(c) and (d)] Measured values of \( \alpha' \) (red line) are in good agreement with the theoretical prediction \( \alpha' = 4\theta' + 3 \) (blue line).
FIG. 7. $\alpha$ measured at different lower bounds of fitting ranges after (a) a rapid quench and (b) a slow quench. The results that are reported in the main text (Figs. 3(c) and 3(d)) correspond to the red lines.

**APPENDIX II: COMPARISON OF $\alpha$ OBTAINED USING DIFFERENT FITTING RANGES OF $\omega$**

To test the robustness of the fit of the exponent $\alpha$, we measure it using different lower bounds of the range over which $D_L(\omega)$ is fit. Note that at this point plane waves have been filtered out by the protocol described in the main text. This has set the upper bound of the fitting range to be there where the power-law scaling is clearly interrupted by the plane waves. In Figs. 7(a,b) we show that there is a range of lower bounds for which the measured values of $\alpha$ are robust in rapidly and slowly quenched glasses, respectively.

FIG. 8. (a) $\theta$ obtained from finite-size scaling analysis in steady state. (b) The density of states of quasilocalized vibrational modes $D_L(\omega)$ at low frequencies $\omega$ for $N = 16000$ after modes with a participation ratio above the threshold $e_c$ have been removed. The green markers on the axes indicate the same fitting range that is used in the main text (cf. Fig. 2(g)).

**APPENDIX I: $\theta$ AND $\alpha$ IN STEADY STATE IN RAPIDLY QUENCHED SYSTEMS**

In the steady state, $\theta$ and $\alpha$ should no longer depend on the system preparation. In Figs. 8(a,b), we show $\theta$ and $\alpha$ at large strains for the system prepared by a rapid quench. Clearly, $\theta$ converges to a constant larger than 1/4 and $\alpha \simeq 4$.
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